UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 92 — PART 10

MARCH 11, 1946, TO MAY 6, 1946

(PAGES A1247 TO A2486)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1946

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Cable to Prime Minister Attlee To Set Up Independent "Caretaker" Government in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee was asked today to instruct the three Cabinet ministers entrusted with mission to India to take incisive action, including the formation of an interim national cabinet government, in a cable addressed to him by a group of prominent persons headed by Pearl S. Buck, Louis Fischer, and J. J. Singh. Other signers of the cable included: John Gunther, A. Philip Randolph, Representative Emanuel Celler, Dr. William Ernest Hocking, Dr. James Warbasse, Representative Charles M. LaFollette, Dr. John Childs, Oswald Garrison Villard, Mark Starr, Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Roger N. Baldwin, Dr. Harry W. Laidler, Lewis Corey, Arthur Garfield Hays, and Bruce Bliven.

The message urged that in the proposed set-up the Viceroy hold an analogous status to that of the British King. This government "would then call a convention to draft the national constitution. Without an Indian Government there can be no successful constitutional convention."

The statement continued:

We fear that continued tension in India and, even more, continued outbursts of violence, will hinder the normalization of Britain's economic relations with the United States and of Britain's political relations with the Soviet Union.

Full text of the cable follows:

In addressing you, we are deeply conscious of the gravity and complications of the Indian situation and of Britain's present world position. We are happy to note that the British authorities have indicated they will deal leniently with the personnel involved in the Indian naval mutiny. We hope every effort will be made to meet their just demands. Vindictiveness will not be helpful, and severe punishment will not prevent but may indeed provoke new outbreaks.

We feel that time is running out in India. Any spark may produce an India-wide conflagration which all will regret. This is the hour for wise political action. The threat of famine makes necessary and the preliminary results of the provinicial elections seem to make possible the immediate establishment of an interim national cabinet government for a united India with the Viceroy in an analogous status to that of the British King.

Such a government would then call a convention to draft the national constitution. Without an Indian Government there can be no successful constitutional convention.

We note that many of India's most prominent and influential political leaders are in a mood to cooperate with the British Labor Government to achieve an early settlement. Everything should be done to nourish this mood. We sense that responsible Indians are eager to concentrate on alleviating their countrymen's distress and removing its fundamental causes while the British Government is equally eager to improve its international position. This conjuncture of circumstances could conduce to an agreement; the opportunity should not be lost.

We fear that continued tension in India and, even more, continued outbursts of violence, will hinder the normalization of Britain's economic relations with the United States and of Britain's political relations with the Soviet Union.

For all these reasons, we, and many other American protagonists of a better world, hope you and your government will definitely instruct the three cabinet ministers entrusted with a new Indian mission to proceed forthwith with the incisive, fundamental measures which alone can produce an independent, democratic India in place of the present unhappy, restive India. This will not be a sacrifice for England; it will help England. Above all, it will bring nearer the kind of peaceful world for which the peoples of the earth fought the war. They did not fight to perpetuate empires or to create new empires.

FEBRUARY 28, 1946.

Are Small Businesses To Be Destroyed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the statement of Mr. E. T. Weir, chairman of National Steel Corp., which should be read by every Member of Congress, in both Houses.

If the small steel industries are to be crushed in this way, then the same fate may await the small businessmen in every other line of endeavor.

I have no interest in these small steel companies, nor have I any in the large steel corporations. So far as I know, there are no steel plants in my State. But I cannot escape the force of the argument that if this policy is going to be followed, it will likely mean the death knell of free enterprise in this country, so far as the small businessmen of the Nation are concerned.

The matter referred to follows:

There is a grim warning in the Government's method of settling the steel strike that should be heeded by every thinking person. If this method becomes Government policy, as is indicated, it will have consequences far worse than the most disastrous strike imaginable. The effect of any strike, however serious, is temporary. Government settlement of the steel strike aims a death blow at small business and, consequently, at the livelihood of millions of men and women from one end of this country to the other.

The steel industry is composed of hundreds of individual companies. In size, they range from very large to intermediate to very small. One of them has hundreds of thousands of employees; many have a mere handful. Some are very strong financially; others struggle to keep going. They manufacture thousands of different products. The conditions under which they make and sell their products vary widely.

Yet the terms handed down as the basis on which these hundreds of companies are expected to do business in the future are terms that resulted from dealings by the Government with one company, alone, the United States Steel Corp., the largest in the industry.

The question is, Why? Why does the United States Government force every steel company, regardless of its size, resources, or type of business, to operate under terms made with the biggest, strongest, and richest steel company in the country? Has it not always been a principle of our form of government that people have a right to some voice in matters that vitally concern them? Are not the owners, managers, and employees of smaller steel companies also citizens of the United States?

The steel strike was called against practically the entire industry. The companies not affected could be counted on your fingers. How did it happen that the Federal administration decided to consult with only one company from this vast industry? Why was no other opinion sought? Why was not the slightest attempt made to secure information

on the position of the industry as a whole? What possible reason can be advanced for the failure of the administration to call a meeting of executives who would have been representative of all types of steel companies—large, intermediate, and small? There has been no explanation. Apparently, the administration wanted to deal exclusively with the country's biggest steel company.

This is not intended as criticism of the United States Steel Corp. Mr. Fairless, its president, strongly urged that the administration invite representatives of other companies into its conferences. His suggestion was brushed aside, and the hard economic facts remain that terms were made exclusively with the United States Steel Corp., and that these terms place hundreds of other steel companies in a precarious situation.

A big company may have sufficient resources to operate at a loss for a while and manage to stay in business. The same thing is not true of most small companies. That the Government settlement of the steel strike was no settlement for these smaller companies is proved by the fact that a large number of them, employing many thousands of steelworkers, have been unable to make agreements and are still closed by the strike. Several have announced the intention to go out of business. Others are considering the step.

This is not something that might happen. It is happening in the steel industry, and under this present Government policy it can happen to all small business throughout the Nation. Small and intermediate business has been the backbone of the American economy. It affords the man with limited capital the field in which he can start in business on his own. It provides millions of jobs. It contributes a high proportion of our goods and services. All big business starts as small business.

The Federal administration uses every opportunity to protest its deep concern for small business. Why does it now impose conditions that put small business out of business? Is this tendency of Government to confine its dealings with the one big unit of an industry to be the continuing policy? If it is, the small- and moderate-sized business concerns of this country may as well say "good-by" right now and save themselves the punishment of a struggle in which they cannot hope to win.

A Right Way—A Wrong Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, day follows night. Summer follows winter. We cannot change that. We can have light at night. We can protect ourselves from heat in summer, from cold in winter.

Everyone should do his utmost through work and thrift to get as many and as much of the good things of life as he can without injuring others. When we can get more and better things by joining our efforts with those of others, we should do so. By work and thrift, by endurance and through sacrifice, individually and collectively as people and as a nation, under our form of government—the best so far devised—we have more of everything that man desires than have any other people or nation. So why change to the wrong way?

THE WRONG WAY

But when individuals begin to shirk their responsibility, to selfishly rely upon others or upon their government to do and to furnish the things which they can do and furnish for themselves; when that practice is followed by a majority of the people, then the people and the Nation have reached the peak and are on the downward road.

Both before and since the war, we have been looking to Washington, calling upon an empty Treasury for funds which do not exist; and billions upon billions of borrowed dollars with interest must be repaid, largely by the returning veterans and their descendants.

Three-quarters of a million men gave their lives to establish freedom abroad. A million or more are in hospitals or undergoing treatment in their homes. They and other millions had the right to expect that, when the war was over and they returned there would be jobs and homes and freedom—"equal justice under law"—waiting for them in the land for which they fought; for which their comrades died.

They are returning and hundreds of thousands find it difficult to find jobs which pay them enough to earn a livelihood, to marry, to support their families. Hundreds of thousands find no place to live except with "the old folks," and that term is used with all respect. Our returning veterans are entitled to homes, not as a gift, for the veterans are not asking for charity, but because it was and is our duty to keep open the door to opportunity, the opportunity for employment, the opportunity to be again with their families or, if not married, to marry, to raise a family, to build a home, to care for and educate their children. That opportunity is the thing for which they fought—that and their freedom.

The latest scheme of the planners is to continue themselves in power under the slogan "Homes for the veterans." The planners want to spend the money, build the home; they want to tell the veteran where that home shall be built, what kind of a home it shall be, they want to plan it for him.

The veteran and his wife in need of a home want to plan and build their own home. The dream of every young man and woman is the planning and the owning of the home into which has gone their thoughts, their ideas—not the ideas of some bureaucrat in Washington. They know where they want the kitchen and the nursery. A home is neither a dog-house, a coop, nor a pen; it is the pride, the shrine—the dream come true of all right-minded young people.

Neither plans nor money, nor both combined, will build a home when there is lacking lumber, iron, steel, brick, and cement. If the veterans are to be aided, give them real aid; give them whatever is their due, and let them build their own homes in their own way.

Get men back on their jobs, our production again at its wartime peak. Break OPS's stranglehold on the neck of industry, to permit production at a profit. Then will be produced and made available the lumber, iron, steel, brick and cement—all the material things that enter into the construction of a home. Then the veterans and others who need homes will plan and build their own homes, as did their mothers and fathers.

The planners and the bureaucrats, both before the war and since, have given us too much planning—too much of bureaucracy, too much inefficiency, too much regulation, too much waste. They did not win the war and the veterans can now get along very well without them and their deficit spending.

As a marine with 4 years overseas service said to me earlier in the week, after he sat in the gallery and listened to the debate for a half day: "Give us the opportunity, give us back the country our dads had, and we will need no help from you civilians." And before the lad finished, I wished he had spoken from the well of the House for he unmistakably conveyed to me and to those fortunate enough to hear him the thought that the veteran, given equal opportunity, is able to stand upon his own feet; that he intends to do so, and that we and this administration, rather than the veterans, were the ones who needed regulating, good advice, sound suggestions, a little more common sense and the courage to use it.

OPA Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of Friday, March 8, 1946, entitled "OPA Ceilings":

OPA CEILINGS

With organized workers obtaining pay raises all along the line it follows that living costs must go up.

The dance is on—the dance of rising wages and prices—and the public will pay the bill.

It makes no difference in which branch of industry wages are raised, the raise will be paid for by the purchasers of the products put out by that industry.

In one way or another the additional cost of production will be reflected in the retail prices of the commodities affected.

True enough, we have ceiling prices purported to protect the buying public from gouging.

Hence the clamor by industrial management and producers to abolish the Office of Price Administration, or at least to raise ceilings and to repeal all subsidies now being paid out of Government funds.

Some of the public can stand a raise in living costs; others cannot.

Of one thing we can be certain, and that is if the OPA is abolished we will certainly have staggering inflation, and this just as certain will be followed by a bottomless depression.

It seems that we are between the devil and the deep blue sea and our only recourse is to accept the lesser of two evils and prepare for higher ceiling prices.

As for subsidies, the pressure now is to repeal them and permit a raise of ceilings that will compensate for their abandonment.

This is just another move to put the burden of costs on the small wage earner who in the aggregate is the biggest consumer.

Subsidies are paid out of sums collected in taxes, so it stands to reason that the lower bracket taxpayer will contribute a smaller proportion individually than the big taxpayer.

The lower bracket wage-earner is already putting out about all he makes every week for living costs and if the ceiling is put too high, or inflation sets in, he is sunk.

We had no ceiling prices in 1919 and we did have inflation and most of us well remembered what happened then.

Without ceiling prices we unquestionably would be right in the middle of a ruinous inflationary period right now.

Prices have advanced and the percentage of the rise in living costs has been much greater than wage increases, but we still have ceilings which are holding inflation in check.

Take foodstuffs, for instance: The following table compares what we paid for some foods in 1941 and what we are paying today:

	1941	1946
Chuck roast, per pound	$0.23	$0.26
Hamburger, per pound	.15	.25
Callies, per pound	.16	.35
Pork chops, per pound	.17	.35
Bacon, sliced, per pound	.21	.42
Lard, per pound	.06	.16
Oysters, per pint	.35	.69
Shrimp, per pound	.21	.55
Potatoes, 10 pounds	.19	.39
Cabbage, per pound	.04	.06½
Corn, can	.12½	.16
Pork and beans, can	.05½	.12½
Oranges, per dozen	.30	.40
Grapefruit, 10	.29	.45
Lemons, per dozen	.15	.40
Apples, 5 pounds	.23	.65
Peaches, can	.15	.28
Brick cheese, per pound	.25	.50

The above are not averaged or estimated prices but are taken from food advertisements published in the News-Democrat in March 1941 and last Thursday.

The food merchants were not advertising to any extent back in 1919 so no retail figures are available for that period.

But we still have the wholesale market reports and here is a table that will show that without ceilings, retail prices must have been sky high in the year following World War I:

	1919	1941	1946
Beef, per hundredweight	$15.75	$12.25	$17.25
Hogs, per hundredweight	18.25	7.90	14.80
Spring chickens, per pound	.28	.19	.27
Eggs, per dozen	.35	.16	.30
Butter, per pound	.55	.30	.45
Wheat, per bushel	2.30	.89	1.83
Corn, per bushel	1.20	.64	1.21

Note in the wholesale table just above that basic prices in 1919 and 1946 are fairly close together.

Then note the retail ceiling prices for 1946.

Memory has it that retail food prices in 1919 were in most instances 50 to 100 percent higher than they are today.

That is what the OPA and ceiling prices are doing for the consumer.

And the hold-the-line policy applies to all the other necessities of living with few exceptions.

Now! Do you want the OPA abolished and ceilings taken off?

The Expediter Does Some "Expediting" Before the National Association of Home Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, evidently Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt, Housing Expediter and Administrator of the National Housing Agency, convinced the National Association of Home Builders that he is competent to fill that position. Appearing before the National Association of Home Builders in Chicago on Thursday, February 28, Mr. Wyatt, in a speech to which at first hostility was manifested, won over the builders to his side and left the meeting with an endorsement of the Patman veterans' housing bill and withdrawal of the opposition of that group to the premium-payment feature. A graphic account of the meeting is contained in an article written under the byline of Leonard Castle, appearing in the March 1 edition of the Chicago Sun. In part the article sets forth:

BUILDERS REVERSE STAND, O. K. PREMIUM PAYMENT—ASSOCIATION'S ABOUT-FACE COMES AFTER DIRECTORS' HEART-TO-HEART TALK WITH WYATT

(By Leonard Castle)

Reversing its previous stand, the National Association of Home Builders yesterday approved the premium payment feature of the Wyatt housing program. This is one of the most controversial phases of the plan.

This about-face by the association, meeting at the Stevens Hotel, represented a resounding victory for the missionary work of Wilson W. Wyatt, national housing administrator, who addressed the convention's annual banquet Wednesday night and sat down with the association's directors for a heart-to-heart talk yesterday morning before they adopted the statement of policy.

PLAN DENOUNCED EARLIER

Although the association previously had announced no official policy on the Wyatt program to construct 2,700,000 new homes in the next two years, its retiring president, Joseph E. Merrion, of Chicago, had issued statements attacking the plan and members of the association's public housing and slum clearance committee had denounced it as a "conspiracy for socialized housing."

The premium payment feature of the plan, described by Wyatt as absolutely essential for achievement of the housing goal, provides for incentive payments to manufacturers of building materials to increase production and speed the flow of materials to the builders. The Patman bill, now before Congress, carries an appropriation of $600,000,000 for the purpose.

OTHER PHASES MAY BE ATTACKED

Joseph Meyerhoff, of Baltimore, newly elected association president, announced endorsement of premium payments while the directors were discussing what stand to take on other phases of the program.

Ten hours later, Meyerhoff announced to newspapermen that the directors still had not prepared a printed statement of policy but had decided that they were opposed unalterably to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, a companion measure of the Patman bill.

FEATURES OPPOSED

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill contains provision for some slum clearance and public housing through cooperation with private builders and these were the features to which the home builders objected.

"We are opposed in principle to subsidy payments," Meyerhoff said, "but after hearing the plea of Wyatt that the whole program depends on the premium-payment features, the board voted to approve that portion of the bill."

Meyerhoff reported the board recommended that there be no premium payments to prefabricated home manufacturers but only to "the manufacturers of basic building materials."

WYATT PRAISES CHICAGO

Before leaving for Washington to resume his battle for congressional approval for the Patman bill, Wyatt spoke before a luncheon of the Association of Commerce at the Sherman Hotel and lauded Chicago for taking the lead in modernizing local building codes.

Veteran Charges Real-Estate Interests Are Spending Vast Amounts for Lobbying, But Not One Cent for Better Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from a veteran which I think all of us should read and ponder deeply.

This veteran expresses the viewpoint of literally thousands of our returning servicemen, who are growing more bitter daily over the treatmcnt they are receiving at the hands of Congress. These boys, figuratively speaking, want bread, but the profiteers, are trying to give them stones.

This letter speaks for itself, and under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include it:

FORT WAYNE, IND., *March 5, 1946.*

Representative PATMAN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you on the heroic battle you are fighting to help the returned vets and deserving credit due you on their housing problems.

A long time ago—it seems like a long time—we lay in our fox holes—better and cleaner by far than some of the apartments we have to pay $50 and $60 a month for—and dreamed of that beautiful word, priority. Webster defined it as "to be given first chance or opportunity." I'll bet if the old boy were alive today he would change it to legalized robbing. That is what the word means to the average vet. But then we had the old blah-blah of hero stuff. Today we are heels.

I dreamed of the day when I could use my war bonds I bought with the few paltry dollars I made to buy a little dream house for me and my gal. I must have taken a drag from the wrong pipe. I had to move in with my parents. Their house—62 years old and ready to fall down—was sold last week for $6,250. Now we both have to move. I can't even work because of the GE strike.

I tried to buy a prefabricated house, but a greedy contractor has the monopoly and is soaking the vet $6,950, and you buy your lot.

Two real-estate men have priorities on all the lumber. They build Peasment houses for $7,850 up to $9,850. Plywood interiors. In order to get a $9,850 house you have to make $3,500 a year.

To me the worst thing of all is the wave of abortion and birth control. I was at the Legion Home the other day. Two vets, out on strike, were talking. One said, "Cheer up. The first hundred years are the worst." The other said, "I'm back 3 months on my house, and now my wife is pregnant." The other said, "So was mine. I live in an apartment where no children are allowed, so I couldn't take a chance of being put out. I'll give you the name of a gin-mill quack. He will take care of her." He did, and she almost died. So they not only have bitterness in their hearts, but murder on their conscience. That's what we fought for. Maybe it's God's blessing, in a way. There won't be any great number of children to fight the next war.

Here is a quotation from the morning paper: "Solid partisan Republican opposition to essential program of subsidies threatens to torpedo the measure. The Democratic Party will be held responsible for failing to solve the housing crisis, and we can't let that happen."

Who won the war—the Democrats or the Republican politicians? Or was it the greedy vultures called real estate men—the mercenary property owner, or the landlords?

The real estate boards all over the country are spending a vast amount lobbying, but not one cent for better housing.

We are fighting a bigger thing than the war. We won the war, but we now have to fight for a decent place to live.

Pray God that from all this rotten greed and evil—that from the millions of boys who left good, paying jobs to fight for these greedy vultures, to protect their hides and the real estate they owned and are now trying to sell us at three and four times the assessed value—there may come a great leader—another emancipator—to lead us out of the wilderness into the light. And the pack always follows the leader.

Jesus said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, for such is the Kingdom of Heaven." But he didn't count on the battle of politics before we can have a fit place to rear them.

You have my permission to read this in the House or show it to anyone. I am sure I express the sentiments of Mr Average Vet.

May God bless you and keep you inspired. Bless you for your efforts in our behalf and your patience in reading our complaints.

C. L. DUNIFON.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TACOMA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tacoma, Wash., March 6, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Tacoma Chamber of Commerce by formal vote of its board of trustees has approved H. R. 3643, which will enable the Territory of Hawaii to be admitted as a State, placing its citizens on an equal footing with those in the other 48 States. The people of Hawaii have expressed by majority vote their desire to assume the responsibilities consequent upon their Territory being admitted as a State.

Some of the reasons influencing this organization to approve this proposal are:

There is no question regarding the loyalty and patriotism of the people of the Territory. They demonstrated it beyond a doubt in World War II and prior thereto.

The Territory of Hawaii has attained sufficient importance to qualify as a State and now meets the necessary requirements for that status. Furthermore, there is no question about the importance of Hawaii to the United States because of its strategic military value. It seems only proper that this important military asset should be more closely bound to the whole United States and this would be accomplished by making the territory a State.

Hawaii deserves to be a State because of its self-sustaining economy, its many valuable resources, and the close connection it has with the States of the Pacific coast particularly. Its territorial status to an extent separates it unnecessarily from the western part of the United States.

While Hawaii is a Territory it has been subjected to taxation but has no voting representation in Congress, which is contrary to the fundamental principles which have been recognized ever since the United States became a Nation.

We sincerely hope that you will support Hawaii in its desire to be a State and use your substantial influence to the end that H. R. 3643 will be enacted at the earliest possible date.

If in your opinion we can assist you in any way we will be happy to hear from you in that regard.

Cordially yours,

K. M. KENNELL,
President.

Political Rationing

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this House has just passed the Patman housing bill which has for its objective further restrictions and rationing in connection with the construction of houses. These restrictions and rationings were to be accompanied with the usual and necessary subsidies, because subsidies are a necessary and integral part of all rationing and restricting programs. Of course the subsidies were not in the bill when it passed the House, but since they are an essential part of all rationing programs they will be a part of the bill before it finally becomes law. We might as well face that fact now.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the continuation of the OPA will soon be before us, also the continuance of the War Powers Act. Each of these acts contain rationing powers, which are powers that never should be a part of our peacetime program. The power to ration is the power to control. It is a dangerous power. No government should have this power in peacetime.

In this connection, I include as a part of my remarks a powerful and convincing editorial taken from the Rockford Morning Star, of Thursday, March 7, 1946. I wish other newspapers would take such a definite and courageous stand. Perhaps if more of our newspapers would do so it might result in stiffening and strengthening the congressional opposition to further bureaucratic control, and further regimentation of the American people. It follows:

POLITICAL RATIONING

In his appeal to Congress to extend the War Powers Act unchanged, Reconversion Director Snyder turned his attention specifically to the power to ration scarce commodities, including food. "We have seen in the past few weeks how the food picture can change in a short time," Snyder said. "It would be unwise in light of present-world conditions—and before we know what the 1946 food output will be—to drop safeguards for assuring a fair supply."

Snyder is at least forthright. Others in Government had laid no stress on the ration powers, thinking that the public would not be very observant and the war-powers extension would slide through with rationing still available to Government, to assure fair supply, to permit experiments with our diet, or for any other reason that might occur to anybody as a good idea at the time. Snyder at least isn't offering us a pig in a poke.

As a matter of fact, continuance of rationing power provides for the Government an authority which no government ought to have in peacetime. No government should ask for it. It is a political weapon of the greatest magnitude—and we know how it works. We do not ration meat before an election; but we pay for that generosity after an election with tighter supplies or no supplies.

The totalitarian countries know very well the value of rationing in their schemes. And we note that rationing is being used politically even now in this country. With extension of the War Powers Act about to come to a vote, it is announced that a considerable amount of sugar will be made available for canning this coming summer. If the allocators of sugar are in form, we shall pay later for that outlay.

Congress should remove the rationing power from any modified war powers act. So far as sugar is concerned—and it is now the only food commodity rationed—an equally effective distribution could be obtained through allocation to distributors.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland News, Cleveland, Ohio, of March 8, 1946:

A HORRIBLE EXAMPLE

The housing bill which finally was passed by the House of Representatives after eight weary days of debate offers a prime example of the way Congress should not legislate.

It is, in fact, a bill for which no one wishes to claim responsibility. It is less than the administration says it has to have and more than the Republicans want to give.

It is largely a Republican bill, since language of Republican amendments takes the place of almost all the original Patman measure. Many Republicans, although voting for the substitutes, considered this dubious strategy.

A coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats knocked out of the bill the key provisions sought by Housing Expediter Wyatt, notably the subsidies.

At various times in the long series of teller votes and roll calls, the Republicans were joined by such Democrats as ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, ANDREW J. MAY, HATTON W. SUMNERS, and CARL VINSON, all powerful in the House and party councils. This despite the personal efforts of National Chairman Hannegan to whip party members into line.

Democratic leaders late in the fight confessed inability to get what was wanted and openly suggested hurrying the vote along to get the bill to the Senate, where a fight to recapture subsidies and ceilings might be begun.

Whatever one thinks of the merits of the bill, the level of debate was disheartening. Throughout the discussion the House Chamber rang with pious protestations that all was being done for the welfare of the homeless GI Those favoring the bill did it all for the returning veteran.

Those against it were equally filled with solicitude for the GI's welfare. The uniformed men in the galleries could not be blamed for being bewildered by the tug of war for their affections. It probably occurred to them that less emotional oratory and more factual discussion would have been more profitable.

The GOP leadership in the House covered itself with no glory in its strategy. It has sponsored a measure which will be completely unacceptable to Administrator Wyatt, and for which the Republicans themselves have no fondness. If it should become law, he will be in a position to put the blame for the shortcomings of his housing agency on Republicans.

In fact, there was no strong Republican leadership. Much of the floor discussion was left to such chronic administration baiters as Representative JESSIE SUMNERS, FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Ohio, and CLARE HOFFMAN. At one point the Republicans were so confused that they voted directly contrary to their plans and had to reverse themselves on a subsequent count.

This week of congressional confusion demonstrates the need of guidance on the Republican side of the aisle. It wasn't the kind of performance that can be used for campaign material later this year.

Pacific Veteran Charges Real-Estate Speculators With Racketeering, Asks Why Congress Is Indifferent to Veterans' Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a letter from a veteran marine who was one of those who stormed the beaches of Iwo Jima and other Pacific islands.

He was decorated for heroism. He was discharged in November of 1945, and still has been unable to find a place for his family to live. The real-estate men tell him that it is just too bad that he is a veteran.

This letter speaks for itself, and I am making it public for the edification of those Members who have more concern for the real-estate speculators than they have for the veterans.

The letter follows:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *February 18, 1946.*
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter in desperation, because I see by the newspapers that you are leading the fight for the veterans to put price ceilings on existing homes. I am also sending a copy of this letter to Representative JESSE WOLCOTT, who is quoted by the papers as leading the fight against such price controls, and I ask you to read this letter to Congress if Representative WOLCOTT decides not to.

I am a veteran of Iwo Jima—was with the Third Marine Division in the Solomons, Guam and Iwo. I was decorated for heroism against the Japanese enemy. I was discharged in Washington, D. C., in November 1945. Because I wrote some magazine articles and two books about the Marines, I was fortunate enough to get a job almost immediately writing movies here. But my job means nothing to me because I am still separated from my family. My wife and daughter are still in Washington, waiting for me to find them a place to live. My little daughter is 2½. She was born while I was away. I hardly know her. When I was discharged, I said I'd find a place for us to live, and we'd finally be together again. But for 2 months I've been living out here in someone else's home. My plight isn't unusual. I don't mean to complain, because there are many better guys still worse off than I am.

But I happen to have about $2,500 in the bank that I would gladly use to buy a home—if I could buy a decent place for that. But do you know what's happened out here? There has been such terrific speculation that I can't find a decent home where I don't have to put down at least $5,000 in cash. And I can't raise the other $2,500 because the lending agencies tell me that homes are so unreasonably priced that they're bad buys. The real estate people, meanwhile, are scaring me by telling me that prices are going to continue to go up, month by month, for 2 more years. They all admit that there's a wild inflation. They tell you readily that people are buying and selling homes, not to live in them, but to make quick killings. They complain about nonreal estate people going into the real estate business because profits are so easy to make. They admit that the lack of price ceilings are keeping thousands of homes and apartments off the rental market and are helping to drive up construction costs on new homes. And their attitude through all this is that it's too bad for us veterans, but what can they do. Everyone else is making money, so why shouldn't they? I will be glad, incidentally, to send you the names of real estate men who have talked to me like that, although I'm sure there's no need or use in reducing this to personalities.

But I am a member of both the American Veterans Committee and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in our meetings I can see that my experiences are typical of what's happening to everyone else. At the VFW the other night one of the fellows made a speech wondering why you people in Congress seem so insensitive to the really dreadful unhappiness through which so many of us are going. We gave up homes to go in the service. Why can't we get them back now? Why must we be penalized because we fought for our country? I know that there is a strong real-estate lobby in Washington—wealthy men with lots of power who can talk to you personally and get you to listen to them. But is there no one left who will tell them that they're making enough money and are well enough off for the moment—and please to let you do something to stop the misery of the little people? Please do some lobbying for us, if you have to. Show this letter around to other Congressmen, and write me if I'm wrong or if I'm asking for too much. I'll be glad to read your reply at the AVC and VFW. That's all we guys have left—our organizations. We'd like to hear from you.

Meanwhile if the real-estate lobby thinks a letter like this is mistaken, I'd be glad to get other veterans to supply case histories, showing how their members around Los Angeles are engaging in out-and-out rackets which are victimizing us and milking us of the money we were able to put in war bonds during the war. I'll send canceled checks the American Veterans Committee has collected on several members of the Los Angeles Real Estate Board who have taken bonuses of from $200 to $750 for steering desperate families of veterans to miserable flats renting at $85 a month and more. I'll send the sworn testimony of a fellow in Santa Monica who is being evicted right now by a landlord who objects to the fact that he took in three children—the orphans of a buddy killed in action. And I'll send the names of landlords who wouldn't rent me an apartment because I had a little girl. As I believe you'll agree, the situation is in many ways disgusting. But I don't want to indulge in recriminations or a fight. This letter was written in behalf of price ceilings on already-existing homes. I hope, sir, that I've made my point.

Very truly yours,
ALVIN M. JOSEPHY, Jr.,
Ex-Sergeant, Twenty-first Marines,
Third Marine Division.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from a statement on atomic energy adopted by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America:

International provision for the control of atomic research and its application to the problems of peace and war should fulfill certain elementary conditions. Ultimate control should be assigned to civilian, not military agencies. The development and use of atomic energies should be steadily held in the perspective of concern for the enhancement of human welfare, and both promotion and restrictions should be directed to that end. A major concern of the supervising agencies must be to assure a wide and equitable distribution of whatever economic benefits may result from the use of atomic energy, and to prevent monopolistic exploitation by cartels or other minority groups. The policies of supervision and control, moreover, should be calculated to safeguard intellectual freedom, both among responsible scientists of all nations and, as far as technical difficulties permit, among the peoples whose welfare is at

stake. We can see only harm in a policy of attempted monopoly of either scientific research or political information by either national or international agencies. The only atmosphere in which growing rivalry and suspicion cannot thrive is an atmosphere of free and cooperative enterprise.

Twenty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution and letters:

We, American citizens of Lithuanian descent, of the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland, assembled in mass meeting under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, in commemoration of the twenty-eighth anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, held at Lithuanian Hall on the 17th day of February 1946, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas, we are seriously concerned with the destinies of Lithuania, the country of our ancestors, and particularly her right to take her place in the family of independent nations: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

"Resolved, That we urgently appeal to the President and the Secretary of State to fulfill the promises of the Atlantic Charter and other policy declarations with actual measures directed toward creating conditions for the restoration of the sovereignty and self-government of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by demanding:

"1. That the Soviet Union immediately withdraw its armed forces of occupation and its administrative apparatus from the Baltic States;

"2. That the peoples of the Baltic States be then enabled to form broadly representative interim governments;

"3. That, after the withdrawal of the Soviet occupation forces, direct relief be extended to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by UNRRA;

"4. That the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia be empowered to hold free and unfettered elections; and

"5. That, pursuant to chapter II, article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia be admitted to the United Nations."

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES
OF BALTIMORE,
ANTHONY J. MICEIKA, *President.*
VERA MIKUSAUCKAS, *Secretary.*

LITHUANIAN LEGATION,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1946.
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: You have honored the Lithuanian Nation, a victim of war and aggression, in the most suitable way, when on February 16 and 17, 1946, on the occasion of the commemoration of the twenty-eighth anniversary of the declaration of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, you delivered inspiring addresses. With the help of friends of freedom and justice throughout the world, Lithuania is fighting determinedly for the return of her extorted freedom and independence.

On behalf of my people and of my government, please accept my most sincere thanks.

Sincerely yours,

P. ZADEIKIS,
Minister of Lithuania.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 1, 1946.
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: I have received, by reference from the White House, your letter of February 19, 1946, enclosing a resolution adopted at a meeting held in Baltimore on February 17 under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore to commemorate the twenty-eighth anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The receipt is also acknowledged of the similar letter which you addressed to me on February 19.

The contents of this resolution have been brought to the attention of the appropriate officials of the Department of State.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Officer and Enlisted Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written especially for the Army and Navy Bulletin by Hanson W. Baldwin and entitled "Officer and Enlisted Relations."

OFFICER AND ENLISTED RELATIONS

(Written especially for the Army and Navy Bulletin, by Hanson W. Baldwin)

Bitterness, unparalleled in scope in any victorious army of recent times, is today the earmark of the discharged GI. Elation over victory, pride of the Nation's accomplishment and even any sort of personal objectivity are submerged in far too many soldiers and ex-soldiers in a furious hatred for the Army and for all things military. The same phenomenon is noticeable among the men who wore the Navy blue—though not to so great or so vocal an extent; the Marines, blessed with exceptional esprit, suffer from it far less than either of their sister services.

This bitterness, which is a real and serious factor in shaping our postwar military policy, has many sources, but one main focus—resentment of what enlisted men call the "caste" system in the services, resentment at the archiac nature of the officer-enlisted man relationship.

INFLUENCES POSTWAR POLICY

Many of the bitterest GI's are neither reasoning nor reasonable, but hundreds have expressed the reasons for their feelings with both passion and logic. From the many, many letters I have received and the close contacts I have had with the services, at home and overseas, during the war, it is clear to me that there are substantial and basic reasons for the GI's attitude. These reasons cannot easily be simplified—the "caste" system is not a sufficient answer. Poor leadership is a far more comprehensive answer, but not completely definitive.

The reasons are many and complex, but most of the GI's objections to the Army, and the sailor's to the Navy, can be reduced to a few major common denominators. But even these major factors do not fully explain the poor morale and intensity of feeling which epitomize the attitude of the returned enlisted man. Books could—and undoubtedly will be—written on the subject, and psychologists will explain this phenomenon in their own jargon; this article can do no more than summarize.

First, it is of major importance to realize that this GI bitterness exists, is real, and is extensive. It is a feeling that is bound to influence in some way the postwar defense policy, and if it is ignored or brushed aside, the resultant anger can do the services and the country much harm.

SOME BITTERNESS UNREASONABLE

Second, the major fault has been poor leadership, but the GI himself, public opinion, and the GI's attitude toward the country and the country's toward him also share the blame.

Take the situation as it was, and the tremendous importance of excellent leadership can be understood.

The average American has little liking for the military life, with its discipline and restrictions. Partially this is a strength, partially a weakness. The average American—let's face it—is not well disciplined, if we mean by discipline self-discipline. But the Army is not the institution to inculcate this—indeed, it made no attempt to do so, but merely imposed the discipline of outward forms.

The average American had a higher standard of living and far more luxuries prior to this war than any country on earth. He, his family, his Congressman, his press, demanded as much as possible of the same when he entered the Army, and there is no doubt that our Army and Navy had far more physical comforts and "creature" delights—Red Cross, USO, movies, barracks, quantities of uniforms, furloughs and leaves, etc.—than any other service.

HOME FRONT DIDN'T HELP

Press and people handicapped the services in their prewar and early wartime attempts to toughen and harden the soft human material sent to them for battle training. There was much public tilting of windmills and championing of the lowly private. There was, and has been, much maudlin nonsense about heroes in khaki or blue. The press made every man, once he put on uniform, a hero, instead of recognizing that there are crooks and bums in the services, just as there are in every profession. When a soldier committed murder—vide the Hicswa case—an immediate campaign could be expected to relieve him, as a hero, of the righteous consequences of his crime. This, to put it mildly, was undermining the discipline. This trend has been magnified in the months since the peace and the public demand to get the boys home quickly has not helped. The women of America have a direct responsibility for the mass demonstrations overseas.

The United States went to war reluctantly; the average American didn't want to fight. There was no hoop-la about the last war; this was no great crusade; the average youngster was there because the draft took him.

THIS WAS NO CRUSADE

His own natural dislike for discipline and the military life, his own lukewarm attitude toward the war was compounded by two other factors within the service—failure of the orientation program to really explain why we fought and the continual harping of some of the soldier papers on the grievances of the underprivileged GI. Soldier papers should be the voice of the soldier, but they have a solemn responsibility to the Nation as well as to the soldier, and though most of them valiantly fulfilled it, some of them failed completely to put the greater good of the greater number first. When the Hawaiian edition of "Stars and Stripes"—a soldier paper, written and edited by soldiers—calls

the Secretary of War Public Enemy No. 1, that is not freedom of the press, but incitement to disaffection.

It is necessary to paint this broad canvas before closer analysis, for much of the GI bitterness today is subjective; some of it is a direct reflection of the GI's—and the Nation's—own weakness.

But when this is said, it must at once be reemphasized that the main fault was poor leadership. Given the background painted above, the difficulties of the leader were great, but the good leader did overcome them.

The GI is particularly bitter about the privileges of officers—the officer's clubs, separate messes, etc. Yet what he really objects to is the abuse of privilege, not privilege itself. You cannot eliminate privilege in this world in any profession, least of all the military; if you do, where is the inducement to hard work and long application? Moreover, privilege, or to put it another way, facilities—a more comfortable place to eat, sleep, work, etc.—are a necessary accompaniment of rank, for rank has tremendous responsibilities, the responsibilities of the lives of men, and those responsibilities are more easily fulfilled if rank is given reasonable facilities.

MILITARY NOT A DEMOCRACY

The GI talks a lot about democratizing the Army. Let's be frank and logical. No military organization is, or can be, a democracy. You cannot have complete equality or majority rule or general fraternization and still have a military organization. We have tried it before—in the Civil War, in the Louisiana maneuvers. The Russians tried it, and got a very bloody nose, indeed, in Finland. Today the Red Army's officers have their own clubs, saluting is strictly enforced, etc. Any military organization that tries to be a real democracy will end up by being an armed mob.

There are, however, archaic privileges which have no place in the modern military system, and there are numerous changes which would make the abuse of privilege by incompetent leaders less possible. Some of the subjects that, either are being, or ought to be, investigated, with a view to improving the postwar Army and Navy are itemized below:

Revision of the Articles of War. Some are archaic, and these articles and Army and Navy regulations need careful restudy for the purpose of eliminating inequities between officers and enlisted men.

MILITARY JUSTICE NEEDS REVISION

Revision of courts-martial procedures and practices. In general the need of procedural revision is less important than the institution of some means for insuring similar punishments for similar crimes. Sentences for the same types of crimes have varied far too widely. Officers, far from receiving lighter sentences than enlisted men, should be made examples. Far too often, for offenses for which an officer is dismissed from the service, an enlisted man is dishonorably discharged and sentenced to several years' imprisonment. Yet the greater the responsibility, and the greater the trust reposed in an officer, the greater the transgression. Do not the words of the commission itself mean anything? If they are to be more than figures of speech, punishments for officers must be even stiffer than those for enlisted men. It has been suggested that one or more enlisted men might serve on courts martial of enlisted men. This is a suggestion worthy of consideration, but probably impractical.

Revision of the inspection systems of the Army and Navy and creation of a better mechanism than any that now exists for redress of enlisted men's grievances. The old adage in the Army and Navy, "you can't buck up," has been proved time and again during this war. No matter how great a superior's incompetence and tyranny, a subordinate has few practical means of redress. Increasing the rank of the inspecting officers attached to various echelons of command and perhaps making the inspector general's chain of administrative command independent of the chain of tactical command might be valuable.

Equalization of liquor rations, wherever authorized, between officers and enlisted men.

Provision of clubs and other facilities for enlisted men comparable or superior in space and facilities to those provided for officers.

Provision of travel allowances for all enlisted men's families.

Application of terminal leave provisions to all enlisted men—not retroactively, but as of a certain future date—terminal leave for all not to exceed 60 days.

MANY IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

Continued study of, and where indicated, liberalization of, enlisted men's pay and retirement provisions.

Improved uniforms for enlisted men.

Improved channels for forwarding enlisted men's suggestions to higher authority.

More equitable distribution of awards and medals. Any study of medal awards will indicate that certain medals—specifically, the Legion of Merit—went in far too great proportion to officers, many of whom simply preempted and adopted the suggestions of enlisted men.

Better peacetime opportunities, particularly in the Army, for schooling, and the learning of trades. Enlisted men's school systems should be a major factor in the postwar Army.

Better peacetime opportunity for promotion from ranks. The OCS or some equivalent of it must be continued.

These, and many other improvements can do much to better the officer-enlisted man relationship.

POOR LEADERSHIP BASIC FAULT

But the real problem is not privilege, not rules and regulations, or the lack of them—but the abuse of privilege. The real problem, in other words, is leadership.

Abuse of privilege; i. e. poor leadership is the basic reason behind so much of the GI bitterness. Yet the system of selecting leaders was generally good; it was the execution that was poor. Fundamentally and basically, there has not been enough emphasis in selecting officer candidates—no matter how they are to be trained—upon character; there has been too much, perhaps, upon superficial acquisitions—booklearning, physical condition, etc. Yet character is the key to all successful leadership, and moral courage is even more important to a good leader than physical courage.

The Army and Navy have been cursed with too many "yes men." Better leadership for tomorrow can be insured only by careful selection from the bottom up.

Speech of Maj. Gen. Stanislaw Kwasniewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Stanislaw Kwasniewski, major general in the Polish Army:

Mr. Chairman, Congressmen, representative of the mayor of the city of Baltimore, reverend father, honorable guests, ladies, and gentlemen, first of all I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all who welcomed me here in this celebrated and beautiful city of Baltimore and to thank you, Mr. President, and members of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, for your kind invitation and for the opportunity given to an old Polish soldier to speak once more about Kosciusko, that great national hero of Poland and a faithful soldier of the United States of America.

How is it America and Poland are so distant from each other and have so many high ideals in common? Perhaps it is too bold to compare those two countries. The United States of America is nowadays the third greatest and the first strongest country in the world. Poland, although she was yore in the fifteenth century, the greatest and the strongest country in Europe, is reckoned today among small countries. Why? Because of the aggressiveness of both her neighbors, Germany and Russia. However, it is not the vastness of territory which makes a nation great. So I dare say both the United States of America and Poland were always in the past and are also now in this crucial period of no war and no peace the firmest fortresses of those ideals which enlightened the paths of Washington and Kosciusko, Lincoln, and Traugutt, the hero of the 1863 Polish insurrection; Wilson and Pilsudski, the Polish hero of 1920. What ideals? The ideals of freedom, integrity, and independence. Naturally if I say Poland, I mean the Polish Nation and not the Moscow-controlled Warsaw regime of today.

May I state that those high ideals of freedom, integrity, and independence are still menaced, as before, by nazism and fascism, so now by revolutionism and imperialism.

Kosciusko, before he became a Polish general and statesman, was an American general. From here he brought to Poland not only his military experience but also his illimitable love of freedom and independence. May I be here the mouthpiece of the feelings of the whole Polish Nation and say: "Thanks, America, for Kosciusko's experience; thanks for that great lesson which you gave us through your struggle for independence. Here he fought at the side of your great George Washington against an imperialism. Here he helped you to build a fortress—a fortress of military science and virtue, a fortress of freedom and independence. Here he built West Point. As he fought in Poland for the same ideals—against Russian and Prussian imperialism and tyranny—believe me, he made the whole of Poland a fortress of military virtue and freedom."

Soldiers do not make wars: soldiers are simply defenders of their countries. Both Washington and Kosciusko were soldiers; they were soldiers from the earliest years of their life. They did not make wars; they only resorted to arms in order to liberate their countries. So I think there is no shame to be a soldier. It is not militarism to be a soldier. Nowadays everybody should be a soldier—man and woman, youth and elderly people; even children, are often forced to be soldiers. One always must be prepared to defend his country, to defend his ideals. I do not like wars. I have lost everything in this last crucial war: I have lost my country and home; I have lost my dearest son on board a ship of the Polish Navy. I hate wars. I only admire heroes.

But as a soldier, methinks, I have not only the right but also the duty to tell the truth about the danger of war; I have the duty to warn my fellow countrymen against sluggishness. I see the ideals of Washington and Kosciusko are again threatened. I fear it means war. It means we must defend those ideals. Therefore, let me say, "Soldiers of the United States and Poland, pioneers of those high ideals of freedom, integrity, and independence, prepare yourselves; be ready for

that moment when your country may call you again under her banners."

There is no big difference between war and peace today. Let us analyze those two words: "war" is using arms; "peace," unfortunately, nothing more than preparing arms. There were always wars since the beginning of this world. It is not our fault; it does not depend on us, on the masses of that great community called the people, that there is always war between one interval called peace and another. There always are somewhere some firebrands; we never see them. Allow me to put a question: where is freedom, integrity, and independence now? There is none in my country, there is none in many, many other countries after this most cruel and destructive Second World War. Will there be peace if the victors forget those fundamental conditions declared by your great President Woodrow Wilson: peace without victors and right of nations to have liberty and self-government? May I put here one request: Do not be satisfied with a doubtful appeasement, with a doubtful security; look for real strength and real brotherhood, brotherhood of your own and not for a false ideology imposed upon you by enemy agents. Don't be isolationists; it means not only selfishness, but also shortsightedness; don't forget your best friends, the nation of Kosciusko and Pulaski, the nation who has always fought and in the most sacrificing way for our freedom and for yours. Tell the truth about Poland and claim justice for Poland.

And now to you, young men: Remember, there is here in the United States a wonderful school of military virtue in which you will never lose your sense of freedom. Just the contrary, you will strengthen it. It is West Point, Kosciusko's work. Strive to get into that fortress of military virtue and freedom. If you wish to follow in Washington's and Kosciusko's footsteps, enlist for military training. Don't be ashamed. It does not mean militarism: It means love of those high ideals of Washington and Kosciusko—freedom, integrity, and independence; it means everlasting peace.

The Betrayal of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a recent excerpt from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Many Poles Reject Return to Homeland." How can we remain silent and inactive in the face of overwhelming evidence of brutality, tyranny, and brazen oppression that afflict our noble Polish allies? How can we tolerate for one moment the bold violations of the Atlantic Charter now taking place in Poland? How can we in justice or decency continue to give credit or faith to private Executive agreements secretly arrived at, without the knowledge of the United States Senate and against the will of the American people, which consigned the brave Poles to an abased and degraded political serfdom which is crushing them with more tyrannical and systematic fury than Hitler, if that be possible?

There are clear signs that the American people are eager to reject the betrayal of Poland and to demand that the principles of freedom be effectuated. Our Nation wants and will pursue peace, but will never consent that the great influence of our country in world affairs shall be shaped into a pretext for holding our Polish friends in bondage. Let us say to the apostles of compromise and appeasement on this great moral question that we deplore and renounce the agreements which sold out the Polish Nation and demand that our Government take steps at once to arrange for truly free elections under fair and impartial supervision which will insure complete and unfettered expression of opinion so that the Polish people themselves may be free to throw off their present yoke.

Secret diplomacy has hatched a brood of troubles and injustices all over the world, of which Poland is the outstanding example. Let the American Nation, born itself in the blood bath of sacrifice and dedicated to freedom, take immediate leadership in demanding freedom for all peoples. Our boys fought and died for a free world and we should now do our part to secure it. We should let nothing deter us. We are the mightiest and most powerful Nation on earth. We are possessed of the most destructive weapons ever contrived by the mind of man. We are able to stand on our own feet, to protect our own country, and to make it clear to other nations, whoever they are, which are carrying on world policies of aggression, confiscation, and forcible, ideological penetration, that we do not intend to stand for injustice, that we demand the liberation of peoples who have been overrun and subjugated.

By these sentiments I am not urging war with any nation. We have had enough of war and we want to settle our disputes on an amicable basis. But at the same time we insist on making it manifest to all nations that we are not going to stand by silently while small, defenseless, weak nations are being raped, pillaged, and sold into slavery in violation of the Atlantic Charter and all principles of morality. Let our State Department swing into action. Let our officials of state lay the Polish question and all similar questions before the UNO Council forthwith. Let us demand the call at an early date of the patiently awaited conference for drafting the final peace at which all these matters, so pregnant with danger to lasting world peace, may be discussed and settled. Further delay may well be fatal to the cause of liberty, democracy, and peace.

The article follows:

MANY POLES REJECT RETURN TO HOMELAND

Of the roughly 1,000,000 Poles now outside the boundaries of Poland and the Soviet Union, less than one-third have shown any willingness to return. The majority—whether civilians or soldiers, peasants or professional men—are writing relatives and friends in this country urgently requesting their help for getting admitted to the United States.

According to the most recent tabulation, the 1,000,000 Polish exiles are composed of 700,000 refugees—displaced persons and former prisoners of war—and 270,000 members of the Polish armed forces under British command. The latter are located chiefly in Great Britain, western Europe, Italy, and the Middle East. The civilians are even more widely dispersed, as far as India and south and east Africa.

These Poles are from all parts of prewar Poland, scores of thousands of them from the areas incorporated into the Soviet Union. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders' army of 120,000 consists almost entirely of peasants from those eastern provinces. The majority of the Poles among the refugees and in the army come from the peasant class.

According to a poll taken some time ago, only about one-third of the Polish civilian refugees in western Europe considered to return home. Forty thousand in the armed forces agreed to go, although not all have as yet been repatriated.

No sooner, however, had those accepting repatriation begun to reach Poland than the return from Poland to the west began. For example, of the 1,200 Polish officers who went to Poland from Murnau 47 were back in a short time, bringing word that others were on the way and that some 250 had been arrested at the frontier upon entering Poland. That is only a sample of the steady trickle of repatriates who are reexiling themselves, plus thousands of Poles who endured 6 years of German occupation but see no hope of existence under the present puppet regime. From all these people and from the Warsaw government's own press, the Poles outside learn the truth about the "new Poland."

So they refuse to return to their motherland and instead are begging admittance to a country they have never seen, asserting that Poland has neither the freedom nor independence they fought first to preserve and later to regain, but is governed by Soviet puppets, under whom no Pole who disagrees with Soviet policy is sure even of his life or freedom.

For the prospective repatriant that insecurity is an extremely important fact. He does not know how he will be classified when he enters Poland.

FACE ARREST

If his record, according to information in the hands of the Soviet-dominated commission is Fascist, he knows from what has happened to others preceding him that he will disappear—as did those 250 officers and an unknown number of others. Even if his prewar and war-record pass and he is again integrated into Polish Army or civilian life, he cannot feel secure. He may be arrested at any hour, no explanations given, no matter how careful he is to abstain from politics or criticism. There is no freedom from fear of arrest in Poland.

The arrested go to prison, forced labor, or execution. Names of 28 concentration camps were given in a recent published list, with 10 other special camps. In the cities and towns there are improvised jails where prisoners are held for investigation, which may come relatively soon or long after arrest. The number of political prisoners who have gone through these places is not known, but in Lublin prison alone it is said to have passed the 100,000 mark. Reports of the number at present under arrest vary from 75,000 to 100,000, and the chief of the Security Corps has declared he will not rest until all elements hostile to the regime have been exterminated.

NUMEROUS OBSTACLES

Polish repatriants willing to risk the known insecurity are met at the frontier where a brief examination takes place and then sent on further for verification, provided, of course, that they are not labelled Fascist at the first meeting. If physically fit, and still regarded acceptable, all men between the ages of 21 to 25 inclusive must go into Marshal Michal Rola-Zymierki's army; also all noncommissioned officers of the reserve up to and including those of 40 years of age, of the regular army the age limit being 45; all officers of the reserve up to and includ-

ing men 45 years old, 50 in the regular army; and all specialists, women doctors, and nurses up to 40 years.

Premier Eduard Osubka-Morawski has stated that Marshal Rola-Zymierski's army now numbers 500,000. There are no signs of the promised demobilization or of a cut in the army budget. Men who have seen long service abroad and should be demobilized on entering Poland are compelled to go into the army for political education. Hence Poles who know they could not avoid army service if they should return to Poland fight that return.

The Warsaw government appeals to the refugees and exiles to return and help rebuild their devastated and ruined country, cites the terrible need of experts and skilled labor. Yet some months ago, of seven Polish engineers and technical workers in France who answered that appeal, five were back in a short time. Why? No work.

Poland, stripped first by Germany and then by the Soviets, has neither tools nor materials for rebuilding. To make matters worse, administration everywhere except in the largest cities is in incompetent hands. Nobody who goes back can be sure of employment, even at common labor; and if he gets employment wages are so low and prices so outrageous that he cannot support a family.

Government employees and workers in essential industries receive privileges equal in value to several times their salaries or wage, thus enabling them to buy in the free market, which is only a legalized black market. A Pole who returns to Poland and does not become a member of one of these groups has no place to live and very little chance of obtaining enough food to live on.

RURAL PROGRAM

The rural program in Poland is, say the re-exiled Poles, headed toward collectivization. Contingents of produce demanded by the Government at very low prices are exorbitant. Feeding the Red Army in Poland, today estimated at 1,000,000, is an indescribable burden. The lot of the Polish peasant, instead of being eased by the new regime, has become infinitely harder, the peasants themselves assert.

Peasant soldiers do not desire to go back to such conditions. As for those from the eastern provinces, now incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, they no longer have any homes, for they will not choose to become Soviet citizens.

Of the thousands of letters written by people in Poland to members of their families outside, rare indeed is one suggesting or advising return. Letters coming out by private channels are typified by that from a couple in Silesia, the best economically situated of all the Polish areas. They wrote to a son, around whom their whole life centered that under no condition was he to return to Poland under the present regime, but that he should try to get to America.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and accompanying statement signed by several hundred students at Garrett Biblical Institute, of Evanston, Ill. It expresses their views as to how our Government should handle one of its most critical problems, the control of atomic energy:

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE,
Evanston, Ill., March 8, 1946.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JUDD: Herewith is enclosed a petition, the purpose of which is self-explanatory. We honor you as a Christian and as a Member of our Congress and for this reason address our communication to you. Although Senate bill 1717 is not before the House of Representatives at this time, the May-Johnson bill which is of a contrary nature seems to be still alive. Trusting in your wisdom, we desire that you present our petition either to the proper committee when the Senate bill reaches the House, or present it on the floor of the House when the bill is debated there, or to the Military Affairs Committee which is concerned with the May-Johnson bill. We are concerned that our statement be presented in the place and at the time where it will be of most value. We further request that, if the document is not presented on the floor of the House in debate, you have it read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Garrett Biblical Institute is the largest Protestant seminary in the world for the training of men and women for the Christian ministry. It has a yearly enrollment of 555 different persons of which more than 300 are in residence every quarter. Of the more than 300 students currently in residence, over 200 of them are active ministers serving churches in communities within a 500-mile radius of Chicago. These students are residents from 40 different States.

Prior to its being signed, the enclosed document was presented to a full assembly of students and faculty and was passed without a dissenting vote.

Originals of this document are also being placed in the hands of President Truman and Senator BRIEN MCMAHON. Copies are being sent to all of the Senators, certain Representatives, the press services, and other persons concerned with this legislation.

Respectfully yours,

BERNARD A. KASSILKE,
Student Body President.

We, the undersigned members of the student body and faculty of Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., do hereby declare the following to be our united conviction:

The fact of atomic energy is now with us. The scientists of the United States who by virtue of having released this power and thus being in the best position to know its potentialities are agreed that there are no significant atomic secrets. It is obvious that there is, and can be, no defense or national security where atomic bombs are used as either defensive or offensive weapons.

We feel the urgency of this matter because survival or annihilation are no longer academic propositions. Atomic warfare means annihilation. In light of the above facts, therefore, we respectfully urge the following points of policy:

1. The United States, being morally responsible for having introduced atomic warfare into the world, must now accept the responsibility of leading the world in taking the first steps toward effective and realistic control of this cosmic force.

2. The United States must immediately turn over all atomic information to a United Nations Organization committee under the sole authority of the Assembly in order to eliminate international fear and distrust which are already breeding the third world war.

3. All nations must place complete information on atomic energy in the hands of said UNO committee and relinquish all national sovereignty over such information. Anything short of this will fail to eliminate the fatal fear and distrust.

4. Atomic power has outmoded the age-old method of power politics which has been publicly proposed by many national and military leaders of the day. The United States must at once publicly and officially disassociate itself from implication of approval of such a policy and actively take issue with what has been enunciated.

5. The universality of the Christian Gospel, involving as it does a sense of the sacredness of personality as such, requires a dedication of atomic energy to constructive social uses.

Realizing the possibility that the present military control of atomic energy may become permanent, we strongly urge the passage of Senate bill 1717, known as the McMahon bill, for civilian control, immediately and without amendment.

We are unequivocally opposed to any form of military control, being convinced that such can lead only to world disaster.

We are concerned that action be taken in keeping with these basic convictions at once. We request, therefore, that this statement be read on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Esther E. Bjormbey, Chicago, Ill.; E. Dale Dunlap, Rose Hill, Kans.; Orlando Goering, Moundridge, Kans.; Frank Boutwell, Dallas, Tex.; Louise Huebner, Evanston, Ill.; Robert H. Adams, Jr., Interlaken, N. J.; Mary Forrer, Evanston, Ill.; Eleanor J. Tonkin, Chicago, Ill.; John W. Darlington, Evanston, Ill.; Robt. E. Childs, Leipsic, Ohio; Leonard E. Tinker, Chicago, Ill.; Richard B. Bowersox, Sheridan, Ill.; Merle E. Hall, Dixon, Ill.; Joe Temple, Lee, Ill.; Donald E. Smith, Freeport, Mich.; Harold Nienas, Evanston, Ill.; J. Roland Crandall, Cudahy, Wis.; Dean Walters, Whitewater, Wis.; C. Dwight Hayes, Warren, Ohio; Harold R. Megill, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.; Laura Cooke, Evanston, Ill.; Miriam Moore, Tribune, Kans.; J. Frank Bortteson, Fall River, Wis., Jerhie Scott, Jr., Houston, Tex.; Grace Arnold, Winfield, Kans.; Robert D. McIntyre, Chicago, Ill.; C. Gordon Cleus, Colfax, Ind.; Mary F. Lloyd, La Grange, Ga.; Dorothy E. Wells, Garrett Bldg., Evanston, Ill.; Kenneth T. Holdzkow, Muncie, Ind.; Albert A. Butterfield, Galien, Mich.; Thomas Fisher, Evanston, Ill.; Keith Keidel, Conneaut, Ohio; Juanita Byrd, Alamosa, Colo.; Margaret Cubine, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Rockwell C. Smith, Evanston, Ill.; Barbara A. White, Norfolk, Va.; Dale Dunbar, Evanston, Ill.; George E. Corson, Davenport, Iowa; Ann Fitzpatrick, Vienna, Ga.; M. L. Infinger, Charleston, S. C.; Askew Crumbley, Atlanta, Ga.; Richard T. Markham, Davis, Ill.; Jesse R. De Witt, Winnebago, Ill.; David C. Shipley, Evanston, Ill.; Harold Crume, Chicago, Ill.; Elizabeth Earl, Pasadena, Calif.; Elizabeth Wren, Nashville, Tenn.; Fred R. Jensen, Ames, Iowa; Frances A. Haley, Wooster, Ohio; George Harper, Birmingham, Ala.; Frances W. Dunlap, Rose Hill, Kans.; Marilynn Baker, Linton, Ind.; Newell Knudson, Susanville, Calif.; Robert L. Warren, Chicago, Ill.; Gus Freeburg; Moses C. Crouse, Aurora, Ill.; Donald E. Struchen, Erie, Pa.; Fletcher E. Sharp, Ingleside, Ill.; James Clark Hares, New Castle, Pa.; Bernard A. Kassilke, Waldo, Wis.; Eleanor Nazarenus, Seattle, Wash.; Paul T. Mundell, H. J. Harwood, Evanston, Ill.; E. Katharine Reeves, Farmington, Mo.; Brooks Barker, Wellington, Ill.; Eldon L. Farmer, Plainfield, Ind.; Charles B. Cheffey, Springfield, Mo.; Marguerite Pramann, St.

Cloud, Minn.; Gladys Lummis, Evanston, Ill.; Ann Wills, Chicago; Robert J. Searls, Stephenson, Mich.; Donald J. Walker, Evanston, Ill.; James Compton, Wilmette, Ill.; William D. Rickard, Butler, Wis.; M. R. Burgette, Lakeville, Ind.; Stanley E. Andrews, Aurora, Ill.; A. McK. Cameron, Vass, N. C.; Madele Terry, Seguin, Tex.; Tyler L. Bishop, Niagara Falls, N. Y.; Richard Suzubi, Evanston, Ill.; Quentin L. Hand, La Porte, Ind.; John Huebner, Evanston, Ill.; John K. Moore, New Hartford, Iowa; J. Otis Erwin, Chicago, Ill.; William Brown, Virginia Lehan, Evanston, Ill.; Eugene Darling, Clifton, Ill.; Alexa McCain, Shreveport, La.; Forest E. Straus, Manhattan, Kans.; James Bailey, Pleasant Prairie, Wis.; Libby Anderson, Nashville, Tenn.; Clifford L. Carmichael, Bruceville, Ind.; Marian B. Johnson, Evanston, Ill.; Hiram B. Holdridge, Alger, Ohio; Margaret Dukes, Orangeburg, S. C.; Elaine Glarum, McClusky, N. Dak.; Jim Miller, Owego, N. Y.; Charles C. Klosterman, Louisville, Ky.; B. Sanford Clark, Minister, Community Methodist Church, North Muskegon, Mich.; James Whitehurst, Fort Wayne, Ind.; Lorene Schacht, Lincoln, Nebr.; Charles G. Werner, Winslow, Ariz.; Harold McElvany, Ottawa, Ill.; R. L. Townsend, Steward, Ill.; Dwight Dixon, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Lovell R. Wright, San Diego, Calif.; Esther R. Petty, Quincy, Ill.; Robert Pitsch, Evanston, Ill.; Chester E. Custer, Bowerston, Ohio; Audrey E. Taber, Los Angeles, Calif.; J. Frederick Lawson, Osborn, Mo.; Wayne Julard, Evanston, Ill.; Robert G. Fan, Springfield, Ill.; Clyde King, Evanston, Ill.; Donald H. Koontz, Bourbon, Ind.; Ruth M. Martin, Maude M. Martin, Joliet, Ill.; Kenneth M. Plummer, Sussex, Wis.; Harold J. Coates, Bertrand, Nebr.; John Baker, Abilene, Kans.; Warren J. Bumgarner, Evanston, Ill.; J. D. Klein, Braeburn, Pa.; Harry L. Starbuck, Traverse City, Mich.; Margaret L. Barnhart, Pleasant Unity, Pa.; Keith Irwin, Champaign, Ill.; Richard H. Bauer, Ashley, Ind.; B. Julian Boyd, Chicago, Ill.; Margaret J. Young, Meridian, Miss.; R. T. Prater, Maple Park, Ill.; Albert E. Hartosy, David W. Ash, Shirleyjean Callis, Evanston, Ill.; John E. Moore, Shelbyville, Ind.; Marjorie Sanada, Chicago, Ill.; Howard F. Ball, Crawfordsville, Iowa; Alva I. Cox, Jr., Akron, Ohio; Helen Graham, Radford, Va.; Richard L. Stolp, Evanston, Ill., Jesse Roberts, Birmingham, Ala.; Douglas E. Jackson, Madisonville, Ky.; Harris Franklin Rall, Ronald J. Winsor, Evanston, Ill.; H. K. Gaither, Mahomet, Ill.; Walter L. Sieck, Creston, Ill.; Floyd Conaway, Kingston, Ill.; Fearnis W. Reamer, Ann Reamer, Evanston, Ill.; D. Elton Trueblood, Earlham College, Ind.; William Pyles, Jr., Flint, Mich.; Donald Fleenor, Evanston, Ill.; Donna Roberts, Cherry Valley, Ill.; Eugene Vandoski, Pearl City, Ill.; Wm. Neff, Jr., Tulsa, Okla.; Milton C. Cooprider, Dewey, Okla.; Catherine J. White, Evanston, Ill.; Arthur E. Pierson, Warren, Ill.; Claire A. Nesmith, Chicago, Ill.; L. C. Kelley, Palmyra, Wis.; Charles Easley, Jr., Lyons, Wis.; Cynthia Nixon, Ruston, La.; Thoburn W. Anderson, Bryant, Ind.; George B. Riley, Muncie, Ind.; Stan Fixter, Chicago, Ill; James D. Bell, Angola, Ind.; Murray W. Leiffer, Dorothy C. Leiffer, Evanston, Ill.; Hal B. Dalike, Danville, Ill.; Evan R. Owens, Patterson, Ohio; Horace T. Smith, Evanston, Ill.; Robert W. Smyres, Chemung, Ill.; Maceo Pembroke, Chicago, Ill.; Chas. H. Johnson, Evanston, Ill.; Leonard H. Lowe, Chicago, Ill.; Warren S. Paige, Evanston, Ill.; Lewis Manson Douglass, Mayville, Wis.; Grace Marie Kossilho, Waldo, Wis.; David Russell Lytle, Mary Beth Smyres, C. Rodehiffer, J. M. Batten, Evanston, Ill.; Carl E. Keightley, Ohio, Ill.; William Overend, Chicago, Ill.; Palmer E. Matthews, Roscoe, Ill.; Gehl Devore, Westmont, Ill.; Mary Miller Holden, Gusta Rabinett, Evanston; Donald Severdfeger, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. H. J. Harwood, Warren Nyberg, Douglas W. Cook, John McCallum, Leland Scott, Edmund D. Taper, Lynn C. Rainsberger, Robert R. Rings, Robert Smocks, David Bryse, Edward P. Blain, Maurice J. Novak, all of Evanston, Ill.; Floyd White, New Concord, Ohio; Frank H. Nestler, Charles T. Gerkin, Evanston, Ill.; G. Ben Hershberger, Wabash, Ind.; Lennard Eide, R. L. Semaur, M. Rickard, Evanston, Ill.; Albert Schmitt, Joseph B. Roe, Montgomery, Ill.; Jane Luther, Peninsula, Ohio.

Famine Emergency Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN DOUGLAS MANKIN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mrs. MANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal on the date of March 5, 1946, relative to the obligation and privilege that we, the best fed nation in the world, have to help the destitute and starving children of our former allies in World War II:

TO SHARE OUR ABUNDANCE

If any of us knew that a family in our neighborhood was starving, we would hasten to its help, regardless of such self-denial as might be necessary to share our daily bread. Certainly, we could not endure the thought of living in plenty while children a few doors away suffered and died for want of food.

Millions of families in the war-wrecked lands of Europe and Asia are starving, millions of children are pinched and sick with hunger—our neighbors in a world that is one in its human heartbeat and one in its largest good or ill. What can we Americans, as a nation and as individuals, do to answer these crying needs? The Famine Emergency Committee, sponsored by the White House, is working out a program under which all of us can cooperate voluntarily in an effort to stop food wastes and to consume a bit less of wheats and fats, the essentials in which there is the gravest dearth in the hunger-stricken countries. This program will enlist the aid of hotels, restaurants and food industries, but it must have above all else the earnest support of our home kitchens and family circles if it is to succeed.

Americans have a peculiar obligation and a peculiar privilege, because they are the world's best-fed and most fortunate people. They consume daily the equivalent of some 3,400 calories of food, whereas more than half the inhabitants of Europe are reduced to less than 1,500, against a minimum health requirement of 2,000 calories. In large parts of Asia the destitution is still more appalling. America has been blest with bountiful harvests and untouched by the ravages of war. In many other lands crop failures have been calamitous, and years of military destruction have deepened the misery. From our plenty we can spare enough to do our full part in relieving the distress, and still be well nourished.

The Emergency Famine Committee is not a substitute for government measures nor for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the fundamental agency through which all others cooperate in this tremendous task. But the committee has a special function and a special value in that it affords the rank and file of us an opportunity to help, each in his own way, solve a life-and-death problem for millions of human beings. Such sacrifices as this may call for will be richly compensated by the assurance that we have done something to save our world neighbors and their children from starvation.

If we can tide them over the next 4 or 5 months until another harvest is reaped, the grimmest phase of the emergency will be past. The least we can do in good conscience is to waste no food, to accept cheerfully such wholesome substitutes as may be offered for the customary wheat loaf, and to share our abundance with those who are starving.

OPA and the Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I live in one of the finest dairying sections in the United States. It may not be the largest, but it is one of the most typical American sections of any with which I am acquainted. The men who have built up this splendid dairy industry are well-read, highly intelligent Americans, who have always met their responsibilities as patriotic Americans. These men realize perhaps as well as any other group, which has suffered from OPA regulations, that unless the strangle hold of OPA is removed so that these dairymen can get feed for their livestock they will be forced out of business as numerous industries are being forced out day by day. With the present program of attempting to feed the world with those foods so essential to the survival of those in the famine-stricken areas of the world, it is hard to realize what type of bureaucratic mind insists on destroying one of the most essential food industries in this country. I know that I can speak only as a Member of the minority side of the House. The New Deal majority in control of Congress is under the absolute control of the bureaucratic minds downtown and naturally, when the final test comes, vote in favor of the restrictions and join in the propaganda of the OPA, which falsely claims to be holding the line. The OPA has done more to bring about inflation in this country than any other organization or element connected with the Government. I do not hesitate to say that as an American citizen, sworn to preserve and defend this country against its enemies, foreign and domestic, I would deem it my patriotic duty to vote to wipe the slate clean of OPA and let the economic laws operate. There can be nothing but inflation so long as there are regulations that prevent production. Production and more

production is the open sesame to the future prosperity of this country.

There can be nothing but the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, and the ever-increasing cost of farm products and consumers' goods, under the present program of the OPA.

I hope that an indignant and aroused American public will be as effective in their protests against the OPA as the organized propaganda, paid for by the taxpayers' money, is in supporting the OPA. It is just a case of a great bureaucracy fighting to retain its jobs, and through propaganda attempting to acquire a vested interest in the political jobs which they now hold. It is a Frankenstein which, unless destroyed, root and branch, will bring the American people to their knees and they will find that not all the famine and starvation is to be found in foreign countries. With the removal of the OPA the farmers and industrialists and all producers of essential goods can meet the humanitarian demands without paralyzing and pauperizing the United States.

Just how long the OPA, with its great propaganda machine, financed by the taxpayers' money, can maintain itself in power by controlling New Deal votes is one of the vital questions that now confronts the sovereign people of the United States. The people must speak out through letters and telegrams to their Representatives and make them see by means of concrete examples what the OPA is doing to them. The false propaganda that the OPA is sending out through the schools and through various organizations is a reflection upon the intelligence of the housewives, their children, and others who have to pay the bills for the things that the household needs at this time.

I have petitions from people who evidently are the victims of the OPA propaganda and who have been forced into a state of terror by such propaganda, but it ought to be apparent to any person who will stop and think for 1 minute; that when inflation is being caused by OPA restrictions that prevent the production of goods and also by an oversupply of money in the hands of the purchasers, then the inflation of prices follows as a consequence of such regulations as surely as day follows night. I would be less than patriotic were I to not be straightforward in opposing this organization—OPA, when I know that it is defrauding and swindling the people into signing petitions against their own interests.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting some of the propaganda that is going out by the OPA, the publication and dissemination of which is costing the taxpayers millions of dollars with nothing but disastrous results to the housewives and others who are being deceived by this dishonest statement as to the way of preventing inflation.

The New Deal Congress, as a majority, could easily stop this imposition on the people and bring prices down and the purchasing power of money up.

I am also, under unanimous consent, inserting certain letters received from my district, the names of the firms being omitted because under the totalitarian tyrannical set-up they would be immediately the victims of severe punishment by the OPA and other Government agencies for daring to question the sanctity of the OPA.

OPA CEILING PRICES FOR MEAT—USE THEM TO SMASH THE BLACK MARKET

Black marketeer! Who, me? Yes, you, Mrs. Consumer, are a black marketeer if you (1) pay more for meat than the prices on this list, (2) accept rationed meat without proper points.

Remember—it takes two to make a black market. Most merchants want to play fair. If you put pressure on yours to furnish scarce meats at an over-ceiling price, you are the real black marketeer, not your merchant. He cannot sell at over-ceiling prices without your cooperation and approval.

What can you do? (1) Use this list. Check meat prices every time you shop. (2) If you are overcharged, notify your Price Control Board immediately. If you wish, your name will not be used in investigation. (3) Never buy rationed meat without giving up the proper number of ration points.

Why shouldn't the Government do the whole job? The OPA is taking care of major enforcement cases, but the OPA staff is too small to do the whole job alone. American housewives working with their Price Control Boards and honest retailers must take a big share of the responsibility. Rationing and price control are democratic programs designed to protect the people and are administered and enforced largely by the people working as volunteers on the boards.

How to report an overcharge to the Price Control Board. Find the address or telephone number of your Price Control Board in your telephone book under the heading "U. S. Government." Just tell the price clerk exactly what you bought, when, and where.

These prices are the highest prices that can be charged for meat in any store anywhere in this area. (For prices of kosher cuts see list posted in your "Kosher" store or obtain special kosher list from your local OPA Price Control Board.

If any changes occur, you can get full information on them by calling your local OPA Price Control Board.

Price control is your job. Check your own prices—enlist as a volunteer to work on your Price Control Board.

Groups 1 and 2, retail ceiling prices—fresh, cured, frozen—all prices cents per pound—effective Dec. 1, 1945, zone 8 north

Beef	Grades				
	AA	A	B	C	D
Steaks:					
Porterhouse, T-bone, Club	55	51	44	37	33
Rib:					
10-inch cut	35	33	31	27	23
7-inch cut	38	36	33	29	25
Phi bone, Sirloin	46	44	35	30	26
Sirloin, boneless	57	54	44	37	33
Round:					
Bone in, full cut	45	42	37	31	27
Boneless, top and bottom, Tip	47	44	38	32	28
Precubed, boneless, top and bottom	----	----	----	30	30
Chuck blade or arm—Bone in	31	30	27	24	20
Flank	40	40	39	39	35
Roasts:					
Rib standing:					
10-inch cut	35	33	31	27	23
7-inch cut	38	36	33	29	25
Rib—10-inch cut, boneless and rolled	----	----	----	35	35
Short loin, boneless and rolled, tenderloin in	----	----	----	45	45
Round tip, Rump:	47	44	38	32	28
Boneless					
Bone in	29	27	24	20	16

Groups 1 and 2, retail ceiling prices—Con.

Beef	Grades				
	AA	A	B	C	D
Roasts—Continued					
Chuck or shoulder, boneless	40	38	35	31	27
Chuck blade or arm—bone in, English cut	31	30	27	24	20
Stews and other cuts:					
Short ribs, Plate:	22	22	20	20	16
Bone in, fresh or cured	27	27	25	25	21
Boneless, fresh or cured	27	27	25	25	21
Neck:					
Boneless	33	31	29	26	22
Bone in, Brisket:	27	27	23	23	19
Bone in, fresh or cured	27	27	23	23	19
Boneless, fresh and cured, deckle on	35	35	30	30	26
Boneless, cured, deckle off	40	40	35	35	----
Flank	29	29	28	28	24
Heel of round, boneless	33	31	27	23	19
Shank:					
Bone in, hind and fore	20	20	20	20	16
Boneless, hind and fore	27	27	27	27	23
	All grades				
Soup bone	----	----	3	----	----
Suet	----	----	5	----	----
Ground beef, hamburger	----	----	29	----	----
Dried beef, sliced:					
Bulk, unpackaged	----	----	70	----	----
¼ lb., cellophane	----	----	19	----	----

Veal	Grades				
	AA	A	B	C	D
Steaks and chops:					
Loin chops	47	44	39	33	30
Rib chops	41	40	37	34	27
Shoulder chops, arm or blade	31	29	26	23	20
Round steak, cutlets	49	46	41	36	32
Sirloin steak or chops	39	37	33	29	27
Roasts:					
Rump and sirloin:					
Boneless	51	48	43	37	34
Bone in, Leg, whole, rump off, shank or rump half	36	34	30	26	24
Loin	47	44	39	33	30
Rib	41	40	37	34	27
Blade or arm	31	29	26	23	20
Round	49	46	41	36	32
Shoulder:					
Bone in, square cut	30	29	27	24	19
Boneless, square cut	38	37	34	31	24
Leg or round, boneless, Sirloin strip, boneless, Tenderloin, Regular rib roll, boneless	----	----	----	----	32
Shoulder clod, boneless	----	----	----	----	31
Veal roll, boned, rolled, and tied	----	----	----	----	29
Stews and other cuts:					
Breast, bone in, Neck, bone in, Shank, bone in, hind and fore	22	21	20	18	15
Breast, boneless, Neck, boneless, Shank and heel meat, boneless, hind and fore, Flank meat	31	29	26	23	20
Ground veal and patties	32	32	32	32	32
Neck bones	----	----	----	----	8

Lamb and mutton	Grades						
	Lamb				Mutton		
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R
Steaks and chops:							
Loin	63	60	54	48	34	32	29
Rib, Leg or sirloin	50	47	44	40	23	20	17
Shoulder, blade or arm	43	41	38	35	20	18	15
Roasts:							
Leg, whole, half, or short cut	43	41	37	33	24	22	20
Sirloin roast, bone in, Rib	50	47	44	40	23	20	17

Groups 1 and 2, retail ceiling prices—Con.

Lamb and mutton	Grades						
	Lamb				Mutton		
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R
Roasts—Continued							
Yoke, rattle, triangle:							
Bone in	29	28	28	26	14	13	11
Boneless	44	43	41	39	21	18	16
Chuck or shoulder, bone in:							
Square cut	37	37	37	35	18	17	15
Cross cut	30	30	29	27	15	14	12
Loin	63	60	54	48	34	32	29
Boneless lamb shoulder roll	----	----	----	38	----	----	----
Stews and other cuts:							
Breast and flank	22	21	19	18	11	10	9
Shank, bone in							
Neck:							
Bone in							
Boneless							
Ground lamb and patties	34	34	34	34	20	20	20
Neck bones	----	----	----	8	----	----	8

VARIETY MEATS

	Beef	Veal	Lamb	Mutton	Pork
Brains	17	22	22	22	23
Chitterlings	----	----	----	----	17
Hearts	22	22	22	22	22
Head, pork	----	----	----	----	16
Kidneys	21	30	30	17	19
Leaf lard, raw	----	----	----	----	23
Livers:					
Unblemished	39	82	33	----	24
Blemished	33	77	33	----	----
Overweight [1]	----	53	----	----	----
Sweetbreads:					
Neck	43	69	46	46	----
Heart	23	69	----	----	----
Pairs under 6 oz	----	69	----	----	----
Pairs 6 to 12 oz	----	76	----	----	----
Pairs over 12 oz	----	84	----	----	----
Tails:					
Under ¾ lb	16	----	----	----	----
¾ lb. and up	21	----	----	----	----
Tongues:					
Fresh	38	32	27	27	27
Cured	41	25	----	----	28
Smoked	51	44	----	----	38

[1] Over 5½, not more than 7½ lb.

FIGHT INFLATION WITH THIS OPA MEAT PRICE LIST—PROTECT YOUR DOLLARS—PAY NO MORE THAN CEILING PRICES

Danger ahead. Yes, there is serious danger ahead if we don't succeed in holding prices down. Inflation is still lurking at every turn, ready to pop out if we relax our efforts too soon.

Meat and most other goods are still scarce. Yet demand is heavy and money is plentiful. This is potential dynamite.

Without price control people would bid against each other for scarce goods. Prices would skyrocket. And that means inflation.

Do your part to help prevent such a catastrophe. Refuse to pay more than ceiling prices.

Price control is your business. Do a good job of it. Learn to buy meat correctly. Different cuts and grades have different price ceilings. Your butcher should have the price per pound posted to show the price for each cut and grade of meat. These prices may be the official ceilings, or lower, but in no event higher. Check these prices before you buy. If they are too high, report them to your Price Control Board.

Help OPA help your community. Enlist as a volunteer to work on your Price Control Board.

The fighting is over, but the fight against inflation must go on. Don't get careless about the prices you pay. Don't close your eyes to black-market practices. They are a dangerous threat to: (1) A rapid expansion of peacetime production, (2) Jobs for all, and (3) Stable markets for business and farms.

Use this price list every time you buy meat—report overcharges to your Price Control Board.

Groups 1 and 2, retail ceiling prices—Effective Dec. 1, 1945, zone 7

[All prices in cents per pound]

PORK LOINS

	Whole	Rib half or end or chops	Loin half or end or chops	Center cut (piece or chops)
Pork loins—Roast or chops:				
Fresh or frozen	33	31	33	37
Cured	34	31	34	38
Smoked	38	35	38	43

BACON

Bacon, sliced (rind off)	Smoked
Standard:	
Grade A	41
Grade B	37
Grade C	36
Sliced jowel butts	26
Sliced regular plates	26
Sliced bacon ends	23

Bellies or slab bacon	Whole or piece	Store sliced
Fresh, frozen, or cured:		
With rind	26	29
Derind	29	33
Smoked:		
With rind	32	36
Derind	36	40

Canadian bacon	Smoked	Ready-to-Eat
Sliced packaged	67	72
Store sliced	64	69
Whole or piece	57	62

SAUSAGE

	All beef	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
FRANKFURTERS					
In sheep casing	47	42	42	38	33
Hog or artificial casing or skinless	42	38	38	34	29
BOLOGNA					
In natural casing	40	35	35	31	26
In artificial casing	39	34	34	30	25
PORK OR BREAKFAST SAUSAGE					
Fresh sausage:					
Sheep casing	----	48	41	33	----
Hog casing	----	44	36	29	----
Artificial casing or sealed cardboard waxed cup, not over 1 pound each	----	42	34	27	----
Sealed, cardboard cartons or packages of moisture-resistant paper not over 1 pound each	----	40	32	23	----
Bulk	----	39	31	22	----
Smoked sausage:					
Hog, artificial casing or skinless	----	49	45	34	----
Beef rounds, beef casing	----	----	40	31	----

OTHER SAUSAGE ITEMS

Berliner:	
Natural casing	36
Artificial casing	36
Braunsweiger:	
Sewed hog casing	41
Other hog casing	38
Artificial casing	34
Knackwurst, all beef:	
Natural casing	40
Artificial casing	39

Groups 1 and 2, retail ceiling prices—Effective Dec. 1, 1945, zone 7—Continued

Lebanon bologna:	
Natural casing	47
Artificial casing	45
Liver cheese	43
Liver loaf	34
Liver pudding:	
Beef casing	28
Other casing	28
Liver sausage:	
Smoked, sewed hog casing	40
Other hog casing	38
Artificial casing	35
Fresh, hog casing	35
Beef casing	33
Artificial casing	32
Loaves—	
Type 1—All pork	63
2—80% pork	48
3	34
4	29
Minced luncheon—	
Natural casing	38
Artificial casing	38
New England—	
Natural casing	57
Artificial casing	57
Polish sausage—	
Type 1—All meat, 80% pork	57
2—All meat	46
3	36
Salami, all beef:	
Soft	46
Medium or hard	66
Special type chopped pork—	
Sheep casing	54
Bulk	45

CANNED MEATS—STORE SLICED

Spiced luncheon meat—All pork	57
Spiced ham	59
Pressed ham—Boneless, chopped, all sizes	60
Pressed pork—Boneless, chopped, all sizes	58

HAMS, PICNICS, SHOULDERS, ETC.

	Whole	Shank half or end	Butt, half or end	Center slices
Smoked hams:				
Regular:				
Bone in	33	31	33	47
Boneless	37	37	37	49
Boneless and fatted	44	44	44	58
Skinned:				
Bone in	36	34	35	51
Boneless	40	40	40	53
Skinless: Boneless and fatted	47	47	47	63
Ready-to-eat or cooked hams:				
Regular:				
Bone in	36	34	36	52
Boneless	40	40	40	54
Boneless and fatted, ready-to-eat only	47	47	47	63
Skinned:				
Bone in	39	37	39	56
Boneless	44	44	44	58
Skinless: Boneless and fatted, ready-to-eat only	51	51	51	69
Fresh hams—Fresh, frozen or cured:				
Regular:				
Bone in	32	32	33	36
Boneless	36	35	37	40
Boneless and fatted	42	41	43	47
Skinned:				
Bone in	35	34	36	39
Boneless	39	39	40	44
Skinless: Boneless and fatted	45	44	46	51
Smoked picnics:				
Bone in	31	29	31	44
Boneless	35	33	34	49
Boneless and fatted	42	39	41	59
Ready-to-eat picnics:				
Bone in	34	32	34	49
Boneless	39	36	38	54
Boneless and fatted	46	43	45	65
Fresh picnics—Fresh, frozen, cured:				
Bone in	30	29	31	34
Boneless	34	33	35	38
Boneless and fatted	40	39	41	45

	Whole or piece	Store sliced
Baked and barbecued—Boneless and fatted:		
Ham:		
Regular	56	79
Skinless	60	85
Picnics—Skinless	51	73
Shoulder—Skinned	51	72

Groups 1 and 2, retail ceiling prices—Effective Dec. 1, 1945, zone 7—Continued

	Whole or piece	Store sliced
Cooked or boiled—Boneless and fatted:		
Ham:		
Regular	51	72
Skinless	54	77
Picnics—Skinless	47	66
Shoulders—Skinned	47	-------
Smoked—Boneless and fatted:		
Ham:		
Regular	52	74
Skinless	56	80
Picnics—Skinless	47	67
Dried specialties:		
Aged, dry-cured items:		
Bacon	39	44
Bacon sides:		
Boneless	35	39
Spareribs in	33	38
Ham	53	60
Jowls	25	28
Shoulders	41	46
Sides:		
Packer cured	35	40
Country cured	34	38
Capicolli butts:		
Natural casing	59	67
Artificial casing	58	65
Prosciutto hams:		
Whole or half		51
Center slices: Bone in		57
Sliced: Boneless and fatted		99

Groups 1 and 2, retail ceiling prices—Effective Dec. 1, 1945, zone 7—Continued

Pork shoulder—Cooked:	
Skinned:	
Bone in	37
Boneless	41

	Fresh, frozen, or cured	Smoked
Pork shoulders—Whole only:		
Skinned:		
Bone in	33	34
Boneless	36	37
Boneless and fatted	41	43
Regular	30	31
Rough:		
Neck, bone in	29	30
Neck, bone out	30	31
Plates and jowls:		
Clear plates	16	20
Regular plates	18	21
Jowl butts	16	20
Square jowl butts	18	24

	Long cut front	Hind and short cut front
Pig's feet:		
Fresh or frozen	12	8
Vinegar pickled and cooked	19	15

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

	Fresh or frozen		Cured		Smoked		Ready-to-eat	
	Whole or piece	Store sliced	Whole or piece	Store sliced	Whole or piece	Store sliced	Whole or piece	Store sliced
Boston butts	35	40	35	40	37	42	40	45
Boneless butts	41	46	41	46	47	53	51	57
Briskets	19	-------	21	-------	26	-------	-------	-------
Blade butts	27	-------	27	-------	31	-------	-------	-------
Skins	8	-------	8	-------	10	-------	-------	-------
Backbones	7	-------	7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Dry salt bellies	22	-------	22	-------	26	-------	-------	-------
Fat back	18	-------	18	-------	21	-------	-------	-------
Hocks	21	-------	22	-------	26	-------	-------	-------
Knuckles	17	-------	18	-------	21	-------	-------	-------
Loin ribs	25	-------	26	-------	32	-------	-------	-------
Neck bones	9	-------	9	-------	13	-------	-------	-------
Spareribs	24	-------	26	-------	33	-------	-------	-------
Spareribs—Barbecue, brisket removed	29	-------	30	-------	37	-------	43	-------
Sparerib brisket bones	12	-------	12	-------	17	-------	-------	-------
Tails	15	-------	16	-------	20	-------	-------	-------
Tenderloins	50	-------	50	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Tenderloin tips	47	-------	47	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

ANTI-INFLATION SHOPPING LIST

As a smart woman and a good citizen, use this folder to help protect your bank account, your home, your friends and relatives' jobs, and your community's business people from the devastating effects of run-away prices—and the depression which would follow inflation.

Price control is for the people and by the people. Read this folder, fill out and send in the shopping list, and help yourself and the Nation toward security.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

1. Pay no more than legal ceiling prices.
2. Report every overcharge to your local war price and rationing board. (See phone book for address under heading "U. S. Government.")
3. Remember price control covers nearly everything you pay for, including food, clothing, hardware, furniture, medicines, tobacco, used cars, etc.
4. Ask your local board to help you recover overcharges.
5. Rented homes in rent-controlled areas must be registered with OPA. If you have been overcharged, seek the help of the OPA area rent office. If asked to move, ask the area rent office if you must move.

HOW TO USE THIS SHOPPING LIST

Groceries

Item	Brand	Size or weight	I paid	Ceiling price
			Cents	*Cents*
Tomato soup	Singlow	No. 1	0.07	0.07
Canned milk	Suregood	Small	.05	.05
Coffee	Brand name	1 lb	.36	.34
Pancake flour	So'n so	20 oz	.18	.18
Baked beans	Singlow	18 oz	.10	.10

1. Fill in the shopping lists below with items you purchase this week.
2. It is important to list brands and weight or size, because prices are fixed on these points.
3. Fill in the "ceiling price" if you can. If not, send in your list without it.
4. All grocery stores are in either OPA Group 1, 2, 3, or 4, depending on the size of the business and the amount of trade.
5. Tear off the right one-half of this sheet and mail or take it to your local war price and rationing board. You will find the address in the phone book under "U. S. Government." If you mail, a 3-cent stamp is necessary, and a gummed flap should be used to seal the folder.
6. Your local board will investigate the overcharges you report.
7. Your name will not be used, if you so request.
8. Local board members are your patriotic neighbors who work without pay. They are at the service of both the merchant and the consumer to help them with their price problems.
9. Keep on checking prices. You can ask at your local board for more copies of these lists.

Groceries

Item	Brand	Size or weight	I paid	Ceiling price

Meats

Type	Cut and grade	Weight	I paid	Ceiling price

(Name of store)

(Address of store)

OPA store group No.

Date of purchase

I have made this list of my grocery and meat purchases as part of my responsibility as a citizen to prevent inflation.

(Name and address)

(Your name will be kept confidential, if you so request)

YOUR WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD WILL ACT ON PRICE VIOLATIONS

The price panel of your local war price and rationing board is made up of your patriotic friends and neighbors who serve without pay.

What does it do? It helps merchants with their pricing problems. It keeps merchants up to date on changes in regulations. It discusses any reported overcharges with them. In case of an overcharge it calls the seller in for a conference and takes appropriate action to prevent further violations.

The local board may require the seller to refund an overcharge or pay a larger settlement. It may also refer the case to the OPA district office for enforcement action.

The local board aids the buyer by standing ready to investigate overcharges and on the basis of these reports take the necessary action to prevent further overcharges. Overcharges penalize the consumer's pocketbook and contribute to inflation.

GENTLEMEN: We note from yours of the 26th ultimo that you would like us to ship you some more of the Wood's troy sponge cloth.

We will try to give you two bales next week, but we are very short of this material and have very little coming from the mill, as our mill has withdrawn their goods from sale awaiting issuance of new gray goods ceiling prices by the OPA.

Before shipping you any at the advanced price, we will write for your confirmation.

We assure you we will do what we can to keep you supplied, but this OPA has certainly gummed up the works.

GENTLEMEN: As advised recently we were fortunate in obtaining a small quantity of raw material out of which to make 24/25" No. 23 glazed cambric.

Attached you will find bill of lading showing shipment on February 28, 1946, of carton

3538 which contains 13 pieces, 1,252 yards of this black No. 23 cambric.

Because of the confused state of OPA ceiling regulations at this time we are unable to figure a selling price for this item. It may take 2 or 3 weeks for the situation to be clarified. We know how desperate your need is for cambric and decided to ship now rather than hold the goods until such time as the present regulations are clarified. Therefore, we will have to withhold invoicing for 2 or 3 weeks but in the meantime the goods are on the way to you and we are sure they will be more than welcome.

American Troops in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include portions of a letter to his father from a young American medical officer serving with our armed forces in North China. His description of the people of China and their needs is graphic, but in the latter half of his letter he discusses the tragic results to our Nation of the failure, by and large, of our leaders to make clear to our men in the services just what this war was about. It will take clear heads and strong wills to prevent our losing the victory after they won it for us at such great cost:

PEIPING, CHINA, *January 13, 1946.*

Peiping is really a city I wish you could see—the squalor, filth, and yet the grandeur of the great buildings and walls of the past dynasties is all there. It's Asia itself. And people—always more people.

It's something you can never forget—the never ending masses. The amount of human energy put out is tremendous and something never dreamed of in America—the pure brute energy. Everything is done by hand—transportation is all by hand—produce, etc., is pushed or hauled by people struggling just like animals and harnessed to carts like them.

People travel by other people carrying them or pulling them in rickshaws. Railroads are so few you speak of them as "the railroad." Shoes, furniture, clothes, etc., are practically all hand made, and much of it very skillfully, too. * * *

Labor is cheap and life is cheap—pathetically so. In a way it simplifies things though. A Chinese soldier was hit by a truck and killed the other day. His buddies came along, dug a shallow hole near where he was lying, rolled him in and buried him—just like that. No paper work, no nuthin'! Sometimes it's so pathetic, though. An old man working here was hit in the arm a couple of weeks ago by a car. He went home and evidently called in a Chinese doctor who treated him by putting something on his arm that burned it terribly. He came to us 9 days later with his whole arm infected, gangrenous and stinking—just dripping pus. We had to cut off great gobs of skin and muscle to try to save the arm at all, and we aren't able to turn him in here, and of course there is no one in the city that knows how or with what proper medicines to treat him. All we can do is to have him come back every couple of days. Even if there were competent doctors in town he wouldn't be able to afford treatment. These are the cases that just go on and die if unaided—and it could be so unnecessary. We just don't realize at home how much more we have than any other country in the world has to offer.

Which brings me to these "I wanna go home" demonstrations. It's absolutely nauseating. Why it's even allowed is beyond me. It's the worst thing that could happen to us. Thank God my family isn't clamoring for my return. Of course I want to get home—probably as much as anyone. I am a reserve and I have been deprived of 4 years that I could have spent getting my specialty training, but I certainly don't want it badly enough to throw everything we fought for right into the wastebasket—and that is where it's going.

The prestige we have lost in the eyes of other countries is incalculable. Who can blame our potential future rivals and opponents for thinking us soft and demoralized? It's direct betrayal of those who gave their lives in this war now to turn our backs on what they gained and say, "To hell with it—I want to go home."

I'm so thoroughly disgusted, ashamed, and disillusioned I don't know what to do—except to show people that there are some who don't condone such stupidity.

Much of this I trace back to the trend since 1932 of "Gimmie, gimmie; I've got it coming to me." It's been more evident as a national trend every day * * *. Now it's cropping out in the armed forces. Those who decried strikers back home as sabotaging the war effort are now just as busily, and even more efficiently, in my opinion, sabotaging the peace effort, both immediate and in the long-range perspective.

Congress is up to its very armpits in guilt, too. They were unanimous during the war in vowing internationalism and asserting that they had learned their lesson the hard way once, and that this time it would be different; that the winning of a battle could no longer be considered the winning of a war; that effort, the greatest effort, had still to be made after the fighting had stopped.

But who is putting forth any effort now except to go home?

What the Nation needs is to be taken out in the woodshed for a real old-fashioned paddling and some tough, realistic, straight-from-the-shoulder talk from the top down. Would to God Willkie were here now. I am certain he would speak out from his heart to the people now, chiding them for their childishness and guiding them back into the paths of international thinking.

We are not playing for peanuts, or if we are, there are other countries that I can assure you are not. Our interest in China is vital. Why not out with it that it is to our interest to have a strong, centralized China? The menace to the north is a gathering storm cloud that it is folly to ignore. Already they have stripped most of Manchuria of most of its factories and machinery that China needs so pitifully. Russia knows that with China's internal dissension, its extreme poverty and poor transportation, at best it will be years before she can get back on her feet. And now stripping her of what it took others (and the Chinese too) years to build up in Manchuria, she is striking a vital blow at the roots of her recovery. Why can't people see this? Why don't the papers at home play this up?

Look at who's supporting this sort of thing. Harry Bridges, the Communist from way back, cables the demonstrators over here "Keep pitching your end and we'll keep slugging here." Why don't the papers play that up? Why do they suppose Bridges wants the boys home? Why do they suppose the Chinese Communists and the Russians want us out of here? How can we be so blind?

I'm sorry, but I just had to blow off steam to somebody, and I've still got plenty left. I guess I've at least let off the safety valve.

Thank God, too, that there has been no demonstration amongst the marines here in north China. I think there is some bewilderment as to why we are here (although with hundreds of thousands of Japanese still here I don't see why there should be) but at least there have been no signs of demoralization to the point of demonstrations.

Comparative Per Capita Debt of Britain and United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLLA C. McMILLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many inaccurate statements in discussing the proposed British loan in regard to the comparative present indebtedness of England and the United States that I thought it would be of value to insert in the RECORD the facts.

I find from a letter addressed to me from the Treasury Department that the total local and national per capita indebtedness of England and Wales is $2,037.50; and the local, State, and Federal per capita indebtedness of the United States is $2,109, allowing some variation for dates of computation, making the United States per capita indebtedness approximately $75 more than that of England and Wales combined. The value of the British pound is taken as of this date at $4.0358.

The letter referred to follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE,
Washington, February 11, 1946.

Hon. ROLLA C. MCMILLEN,
House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCMILLEN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 5, 1946, addressed to Secretary Vinson, in which you ask for the per capita governmental indebtedness—Federal and local—of Great Britain and of the United States.

It has not been possible to obtain all of these data for the same date, and in the case of Great Britain the local indebtedness and national debt figures are for different political entities. The British figures and the figure for State and local indebtedness in the United States are the latest official figures in each case; the Federal Government debt figure for the United States has been shown as of June 30, 1945, so that it would be comparable to the State and local figure.

1. (a) Net outstanding local indebtedness (after deducting sinking-fund credits) of England and Wales, March 31, 1942—£1,531,000,000. (The British Information Service informs us that this is the latest official figure of local indebtedness. It appears in Local Government Financial Statistics, England and Wales, 1941–42 Summary. It is not directly comparable to the national debt of the United Kingdom shown below, of course, since the latter includes England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and the Channel Islands.)

(b) Population of England and Wales (as given in Whitaker's Almanac, 1945) for 1941—41,500,000.

(c) Per capita local indebtedness of England and Wales—£37.

2. (a) National debt of the United Kingdom, March 31, 1945—£22,398,000,000. (This

figure is taken from the official British financial statement, 1945–46.)

(b) Population of the United Kingdom (as given in Whitaker's Almanac, 1945) for 1941, 47,900,000.

(c) Per capita debt, £468.

3. (a) State and local indebtedness in the United States, June 30, 1945, $16,293,000,000.

(b) Population, June 30, 1945, 139,600,000.

(c) Per capita State and local indebtedness, $117.

4. (a) Gross public debt, including guaranteed obligations, of the United States, June 30, 1945, $259,115,000,000.

(b) Population, June 30, 1945, 139,600,000.

(c) Per capita Federal Government debt, $1,856.

(The gross public debt of the United States amounted to $279,445,000,000 on January 31, 1946; the per capita debt on that date was $1,992.)

I am glad to have had this opportunity to be of service to you.

Very truly yours,

E. F. BARTELT,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

Special Emergency Conference of American League for Free Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a radio forum participated in by Congressman AUGUSTUS W. BENNET, of New York, and Mr. Fowler Harper, former Solicitor of the Interior, which summarized the findings and conclusions of the special emergency conference on Palestine convoked by the American League for a Free Palestine on February 23 and 24 at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City. The broadcast emanated from the studios of radio station WINS in New York City.

I would like to urge my colleagues to take special note of the fact that this conference included a cross section of some of the most outstanding Americans of our day, and it was their firm conviction America had a right to see to it that the Hebrews of Europe are given a chance for life and dignity in the land of their choice, Palestine, with or without British consent.

The radio broadcast follows:

ANNOUNCER. We are happy to bring you a report on the findings of the Special Emergency Conference on Palestine, just concluded at the Hotel Biltmore, under the auspices of the American League for a Free Palestine. Participating at this conference, which was held during yesterday and today, were Members of both Houses of Congress, public officials, experts on international law, and delegates from all over the United States. To bring the findings of the conference to you, we are fortunate to have two distinguished gentlemen, Fowler Harper, professor of law at the University of Indiana and former Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, and Congressman AUGUSTUS W. BENNET, of New York. Mr. Harper, will you lead off?

Mr. HARPER. Yes, indeed; I will be glad to. The thing that impressed me most about this Conference of the American League for a Free Palestine which has just been concluded at the Biltmore, is this: It was a working conference and not just a forum for the dissemination of high-sounding rhetoric. Don't you think so, Congressman?

Congressman BENNET. That I do. It was quite a commentary on the part of Americans to see justice done that men like yourself, Congressmen Gordon L. McDonough, Kearney, Gillespie, and Angell, Senators Magnuson and Gillette, Judges Bennet and Ehrhorn, Mayor Kirk, of Elizabeth; writers like Konrad Borcovici, Louis Bromfield, Elizabeth Ross Haynes; an actress like Ruth Chatterton, and countless others, spent a whole holiday week end to formulate plans to save people thousands of miles away. They are all busy people and most of them are gentiles. Senator Gillette, as president of the league, certainly started this conference off on a strong note, didn't he?

Mr. HARPER. He certainly did, Congressman. You know these 14 points of indictment against Great Britain for her misconduct and violation of the terms of the Palestine mandate were just about as damning a document as I have heard in many years. How in the world the Labor Government of Great Britain can go along without answering these charges and doing something about them, is beyond me.

Congressman BENNET. Well, I think that the Congress of the United States feels that if we can't get Britain to act on the correction of her policy in Palestine, the United States should undertake unilateral action on its own part; we should assert our right to take a hand because the terms of the British mandate entitle us to do so, and the sense of justice for which Americans are noted will inevitably compel us to try, by every means possible, to save the remnants of the Hebrew people. Americans have always interested themselves in oppressed peoples. Remember the outspoken sympathy for the Cubans prior to the Spanish-American war. That was evidently the consensus of opinion of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and Senator MAGNUSON, all of whom participated in the conference and the statement to the press yesterday.

Mr. HARPER. You are quite right, Congressman, and certainly something should be done and done quickly. Great Britain is now proposing that two-thirds of the mandated Palestine area be separated, without any legal basis whatsoever, giving it a separate status under the name of Trans-Jordan. Now, what will actually happen is that such a move would cut off all the sources of irrigation and watering power for the entire area of Palestine, or what is left of it. It is an act that is hard to explain in the light of the policy of the Labor Party which is now in power in Great Britain. The committee on international law of the Palestinian conference today made a very vigorous report on this subject and the conference resolved to petition the President of the United States to notify Great Britain, formally and at once, that this country would not recognize any independent status for Trans-Jordan, but on the contrary it would regard the setting up of an independent state as a direct violation of the bilateral agreement which was signed between Great Britain and America in 1924.

Congressman BENNET. Trans-Jordan is only one of the many violations of the Anglo-American Conference with which the panel on international law concerned itself. It charged Great Britain with having adopted arbitrary practices relative to impeding industrial development and with having adopted policies relative to the acquisition, use, and disposal of land and its produce, public works and community services, which discriminate against the Hebrew people and are designed to frustrate the purposes of the mandate. It discussed the deportation of innocent Jews and the tricks used to keep down Jewish immigration quotas. There was a lot of talk about methods used to incite Arab uprisings. We were fortunate in having in attendance men who lived through all this.

Mr. HARPER. Yes, and one of the most tragic aspects of the entire problem is that 1,500,000 Hebrews, about all there is left now of the eight million or so who live in Europe at one time prior to Hitler, all of them are still homeless with no place to go and the subjects and victims of local antisemitism which today, in many parts of Europe, is greater than it ever has been in history. The conference took a straightforward attitude on that question, don't you think Congressman?

Congressman BENNET. It most certainly did. It recognized the existence of a Hebrew nation for more than 2,000 years of recorded history and demanded that the right of self-determination be given to the Jewish people of Europe and insisted that those who sought the right to become citizens of the Hebrew nation and renounced all other allegiance should become by virtue of that renunciation, Palestinians, entitled to all the rights and privileges that a free Palestine would imply. It asked that Nazi funds in the allied countries be used to finance not only immigration but the repatriation of the Hebrew people to their homeland in Palestine. Such a step would certainly be an outstanding case of poetic justice, since many of those funds were stolen from Hebrew families.

Mr. HARPER. You are quite right, Congressman, and you know that's a very refreshing and very realistic way of approaching this thing. You know I liked the directness which the American League for a Free Palestine applied to all these problems. I liked its stand for a free democratic state in Palestine, embodying the principles of the Bill of Rights and the American Constitution. I liked the league's insistence on adherence to the terms of the League of Nation's mandate which explicitly recognized the rights of the Hebrew people to self-determination.

Congressman BENNET. Yes, I liked, too, the way the conference, in discussing the general problems had time to discuss the case of one Palestinian, Arieh Ben-Eliezer, who, as you know, left the United States to return to Palestine so as to report on the findings of that important body, the Emergency Conference to Save the Jewish People of Europe, which conference did so much to save Hebrews from massacre by Hitler. Ben-Eliezer has been in a concentration camp for over 2 years and has been denied the right to return through some legal subterfuge. You will recall that the conference voted full funds and assistance to bring Ben-Eliezer's case to the attention of the Privy Council in London, so that the vicious practice now prevalent in Palestine of arrest without charge and imprisonment without trial, may be broken in the name of human decency and freedom.

Mr. HARPER. That's right, Congressman, and I think another important thing which the conference accomplished was this resolution to assemble prominent jurists, statesmen, economists, and other experts, to assist the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation in the drafting of a constitution for a free Palestine, to be submitted later to the people of that country. One of the distinguishing things about the League has been its emphasis upon the existence of a Hebrew nation now. As a matter of fact, a Hebrew nation has been in existence longer than any western power. Merely because the citizens of a nation are, by unlawful force, prevented from going to their homeland, does not make them any the less a nation. The action today of the League in deciding to make available to the citizens of the Hebrew nation the best brains that America can offer to help them draft a constitution for their country, is a concrete and very important step toward the final liberation of the Hebrews from their 2,000 years of bondage.

Congressman BENNET. I agree with you, Mr. Harper, and I think it was equally important that the League today urged the official recognition of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation as the provisional authority to represent the Hebrew nation, until a permanent and independent sovereign state is established, pursuant to the Palestine mandate.

Mr. HARPER. You are quite right. Recognition of the Hebrew committee is fully in line with the recognition of other provisional authorities-in-exile, and this has been a common practice on the part of our Government, and as far as that goes, with the other powers, for the last quarter of a century. By the way, Congressman, the Hebrew committee, as I understand it, is composed completely of citizens of Palestine, is it not?

Congressman BENNET. That is correct. The American League for a Free Palestine is nonsectarian in character, but the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation is, of course, confined to the citizens of that country. No one but Palestinians can represent that people. The British cannot represent them. The Americans cannot represent them. Indeed, even the United Nations Organization cannot represent them. Like any other nation, citizens of the Hebrew Nation must represent themselves. The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation assumes to represent that Nation until the people have the opportunity to establish their own government and select by democratic processes other representatives.

Mr. HARPER. I understand. Another thing about this Conference that I'd like to mention is the extremely high level of sincerity that was evident on the part of everybody. The committee worked hard and diligently, and their reports reflect the determination of the members of the league to leave no stone unturned whatever, until the age-old wrongs against the Hebrew people have been corrected. With a will and spirit like that, the league is bound to make an important contribution toward the solution of this whole matter.

Congressman BENNET. There is one other very definite and concrete result of the Conference which we have not mentioned and which can be put into effect at an early date. I refer to the authorization given to the Chairman of the Conference to open headquarters for the American League for a Free Palestine in Jerusalem, and to request prominent Americans, including a member of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives, to proceed to Palestine and to investigate conditions, with a view of rendering assistance to the Palestinians in preparing for independence. It was my understanding that some of the members of the committee would remain in the Jerusalem headquarters.

Mr. HARPER. That is right, Congressman, that was my understanding, and you will recall that the chairman was directed to include in the committee the best available American members in the fields of economics, government, agriculture, and related subjects. While, of course, some Palestinian problems are peculiar to that country, such a staff could be of enormous value in putting the new nation on a firm governmental and economic basis, from the very outset.

Congressman BENNET. Yes, and such a committee would also constitute an excellent liaison with the American friends of Palestine, and I hope that it wil be selected and on its way overseas, very soon.

Mr. HARPER. I hope so, too, Congressman, and you know, in summing up the findings of this very important conference the last thing I would like to say is that I sincerely hope that their emergency budget of $3,000,000 is raised in record time, so that the tremendous work which they have set for themselves and to which we give our assistance, will bear fruit, and the Hebrew people will assume among the nations of the earth the place which is their just due.

Congressman BENNET. Well, I pledge my full support to see that this comes about and I am sure that all of my colleagues who have helped out in this conference feel the same way about it. I hope that there will be a prompt and liberal response by Americans of all races and creeds. What a demonstration of American unity and ideals that would be.

The German Underground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following illuminating article on the German underground. It appeared in the February 27 issue of Human Events, a weekly analysis edited by Felix Morley. The author of the article, Mr. Maley, was a lieutenant commander in Naval Intelligence. Assigned to the Seventh Army, he went into Germany with the line troops on a special mission, remaining there 5 months. He is now in business in Chicago:

THE EPIC OF THE GERMAN UNDERGROUND

(By Alexander B. Maley)

I

Early in the afternoon of July 20, 1944, Col. Klaus von Stauffenberg walked into a German staff headquarters building behind the eastern front, carrying a bulging brief case in which a carefully muffled time bomb was ticking toward its deadline. Casually he placed the brief case under a table on which was spread a large-scale military map placed there by the direction and for the convenience of Adolf Hitler.

When the führer entered there were no formalities and, as customary, discussion began immediately. Standing by the map, Count Stauffenberg surreptitiously pushed the brief case toward Hitler with his foot and then, in answer to a prearranged official telephone message, apologetically left the room. On hearing the bomb explode, he hurried to the nearby airfield where a fast plane was in readiness to fly him to Berlin.

There the leaders of the conspiracy had everything in readiness to stage an anti-Nazi coup d'état. Five minutes after Stauffenberg reported that the assassination had taken place, the wires were humming with orders to selected army leaders. In faraway Paris, General von Stülpnagel arrested the entire SS staff at their headquarters in Avenue Foch. Throughout Germany, civilian resistance leaders moved to assume control.

But Hitler was not dead. Though the explosion killed several officers, the führer himself was only knocked flat, suffering partial paralysis and a temporary concussion. The resulting confusion gave the conspirators too little time. In many cities local SS and Gestapo headquarters were informed of the failure of the plot before their opponents knew of its assumed success. Before nightfall Stauffenberg was arrested and shot in Berlin. Radio stations remained for the most part in Nazi hands and Goebbels used them cleverly. A stooge for Hitler went on the air to ridicule and minimize the "foolish joke" of the plotters. That night the rank and file of the resistance movement knew only that the end of years of planning had been disastrous failure.

Actually, it was proximity to success which cost the lives of many of the leaders. The trails had been made all too clear for the Gestapo manhunt which immediately swung into action. Generals von Witzleben, von Brockdorf, and others were seized and executed. Generals Beck and von Kluge committed suicide. Deeply implicated by his actions in Paris, General von Stülpnagel hurried to Verdun, where he had fought as a young officer, and there shot himself. Blinded, but by some miracle not killed, he was for some days tortured by Himmler's men in the effort to identify accomplices.

With the military leaders obliterated, the destruction of the civilian underground began. Protestant and Catholic clergy, employers and former trade-union leaders, university professors and students, civil servants and members of the nobility were rounded up in batches—shot, hung or herded into concentration camps together with their families. The number liquidated will never be exactly known, but 20,000 is a conservative estimate. When the concentration camps were finally opened, and advertised as proof of German bestiality, Americans were not told that many of the miserable victims were heroic German men and women who had given their all to overthrow the Nazis.

None can say how much the German military resistance was weakened, and the war shortened, by this desperate anti-Nazi rising. Certainly many an American boy who would otherwise be buried in Europe is alive today because of the Germans who struck from behind the battle lines. The OWI explained to Americans that the attempted revolution was merely a plot on the part of some Junker generals who knew the war was lost and wished to save the General Staff intact for World War III. Now it would seem time for a more judicious appraisal of facts which cannot be kept concealed forever.

II

The origins of the tragic events described above trace to the start of the Hitler regime, when the Social Democrats and other parties dissolved by the Nazis decided to maintain a secret information service for their exiled leaders. While the underground was civilian in origin, a number of army officers, distrustful of Hitler's purposes, and realizing Germany's vulnerability in war, soon began to associate themselves with its work. They were welcomed by the civilian groups, for it was realized from the outset that no revolt against a totalitarian government can succeed without help from the armed forces. So, as early as 1933, a regular liaison with army leaders was established. It was under the direction of Wilhelm Leuschner, a Socialist who had been minister of the interior for the state of Hesse, and who took employment as a salesman to carry on this activity.

The necessity of secrecy for a time encouraged diversity and cross-purposes in the anti-Nazi movement. The Communist organization, working in the Russian interest and, therefore, pro-Hitler when Stalin was in alliance with the Nazis, further confused the picture. Opposed to totalitarianism in principle, the liberal German underground naturally had no desire to swap a German for a Russian dictatorship.

Gradually, however, two principal opposition groups emerged, the one centering around Dr. Karl Gördeler, the former mayor of Leipzig, the other around young Hellmut von Moltke, of the same family as Bismarck's famous general. The Gördeler circle was mainly composed of former civil servants and Nazi-ousted officials with a relatively conservative outlook, such as Dr. Johannes Popitz, former Prussian Minister of Finance. The Moltke circle was less restricted, containing many members of the former Center and Social Democratic Parties, trade-union leaders and leading figures in both the Catholic and Protestant churches, for instance, Pastor Dietrich Bonhöffer, of Berlin.

In 1937 and 1938, deterioration of the international situation hastened consolidation of hitherto divergent opposition groups. A united front of leaders, including clergymen and generals, Social Democrats and Conservatives, trade-unionists, and businessmen began to take shape. Its greatest obstacles were the vigilance and ruthlessness of the Gestapo; the complete Nazi control of press, radio, and communications; the full employment provided by Hitler's war preparation program; and the fuehrer's well-advertised diplomatic achievements as facilitated by the appeasement policy.

III

During the early months of the war, when the German Communists under Russian orders were supporting Hitler, Dr. Gördeler became the tacitly accepted head of the entire anti-Nazi front. In 1936 he had resigned as mayor of Leipzig in protest against the policy of anti-Semitism. After 1937 he was nominally employed as a promotion manager by the famous Bosch Co., manufacturers of magnetos and other electrical equipment.

Robert Bosch, head of this Suttgart firm, had for many years worked valiantly for better Anglo-German and Anglo-French relations and was one of the few big industrialists who actively supported the underground. Many of the Jewish émigrés now safely in this country were financed and otherwise enabled to escape persecution through the aid of Bosch. When Gördeler joined the firm it was understood that he would spend his time working against the Nazis and that subsidies from the Bosch and other companies would be used to develop resistance, in spite of the terrible risks involved.

Following the annexation of Austria, in March 1938, Gördeler visited London to inform members of the Chamberlain government that if they stood firm, in the Sudeten crisis, an important group of anti-Nazi generals would lead a rising against Hitler simultaneously with any overt military act attempted by the latter. Prominent in this group was Gen. Ludwig Beck, then chief of the general staff, one of those who died after the events of July 20, 1944. The Anglo-French appeasement policy ruined this plan, and after the Munich Pact Beck resigned his key post in despair. With Hitler's bloodless victories the task of the German underground became increasingly difficult as well as dangerous. In the words of a memorandum by one of the surviving leaders:

"The year 1938 brought Dr. Gördeler and his friends great disillusionment. Dr. Gördeler felt very dejected and declared that Chamberlain should never have been allowed to give in at Bad Godesberg. His friends in the army, especially Colonel General Beck, had definitely decided not to follow Hitler's orders to march into Czechoslovakia but to put the Führer out of the way. * * * In Stuttgart, however, it was agreed not to give in; to continue the work together with Gördeler and to support his people more than ever before."

IV

In August 1939 Adam von Trott zu Solz, a former German Rhodes scholar, was sent by the underground to London, where he was received by Prime Minister Chamberlain and by Lord Halifax, then Foreign Secretary. Von Trott warned the English leaders that war would make the task of the anti-Nazi movement far more difficult and that it might be temporarily immobilized by patriotic sentiment. Nevertheless, immediately after the German invasion of Poland, von Trott carried through plans to visit the United States, where he stayed from September 1939 to January 1940, making contact with officials and influential private citizens in behalf of the German underground.

Among those whom he saw in Washington was Felix Morley, also a former Rhodes scholar, then editor of the Washington Post, later president of Haverford College, and now editor of Human Events. Dr. Morley, who has assisted in the compilation of this material, contributes the following excerpt from his diary, under date of November 20, 1939:

"Adam von Trott, who left Germany 3 weeks after the declaration of war, had tea with me yesterday and today I arranged lunch for him with [Eugene] Meyer [publisher of the Washington Post] and me at the office. He is over, as a far eastern expert, to attend the conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations at Virginia Beach, but is devoting most of his time to developing a receptive attitude here toward the big change which he thinks is coming in Germany. * * * It is a heroic work in which this noble and idealistic young German is engaged. It may very easily cost him his life and he knows that he is constantly under surveillance, though whether by FBI men or agents of the Gestapo he is uncertain. The former would be quite natural and I trust that is all there is to it. * * * The chief problem is how to insure that a war of extermination against the Nazis will not force behind them all the elements beginning to cohere for Hitler's overthrow. And here von T. confirms my feeling that if a Danzig formula could have been found there would have been no further aggression—because of the coalescing of anti-Hitler sentiment in Germany. Now it is far more difficult."

A part of von Trott's mission in Washington was to inform the Department of State of the aims and personalities of the underground, through a secret memorandum which was also delivered to the British Ambassador, Lord Lothian. This memorandum stated the terms upon which the opposition hoped to terminate the war, after Hitler's overthrow, and included a pledge to prosecute the principal Nazi leaders for common crimes.

Von Trott's efforts were reinforced by other prominent refugees, including Dr. Heinrich Brüning, Catholic pre-Nazi German Chancellor, who visited the White House for this purpose in December 1939. President Roosevelt at first showed interest in the appeal for support of the German underground but soon, apparently on the advice of men close to him, discouraged further contacts. Von Trott was even denounced as a Nazi agent, which is bitterly ironical in view of the sequel. At grave personal risk, after returning to Germany, he continued subversive work and was hanged by the Nazis as a traitor for his part in the July 1944 proceedings.

Although their numbers were decimated by arrests at home, and although they received little, if any, official encouragement from Washington and London, the leaders of the German underground continued throughout the war in their efforts to overthrow the Nazi tyranny and build a peace holding some hope for the civilization common to all of western Europe. Little or nothing in regard to these efforts has been divulged to the American public. Space permits only the briefest summarization here.

In the autumn of 1941, Ulrich von Hassel, former German Ambassador to Rome and a member of the inner circle of the anti-Nazi movement, requested a prominent American businessman then in Berlin to convey a peace proposal to the White House in the names of Generals Beck and Hammerstein.

This proposal, made at a time when Germany seemed everywhere victorious, was along these lines: (1) Resignation, voluntary or enforced, of Hitler and all his government; (2) withdrawal of German armed forces to the borders of the Weimar Republic, excepting the Saar, Danzig, and Austria; (3) settlement of the Polish Corridor issue along the lines suggested by Marshal Pilsudski of Poland (exchange of the corridor for the four eastern districts of East Prussia); (4) no reparations to be asked by either side. The intermediary reached Washington December 1, but was unable to see President Roosevelt before December 7, when Pearl Harbor dashed all hopes.

In May 1942 Pastor Dietrich Bonhöffer, later executed by the Nazis, and Dr. Hans Schönfeld, director of research for the Geneva office of the World Council of Churches, approached the English Bishop of Chichester in Stockholm in behalf of the German underground. They reported on the widespread organization and enlightened aims of the anti-Nazi movement and pointed out that "it was extremely important to know whether the Allied attitude toward a Germany purged of Hitler would be different to the attitude towards a Germany under Hitler."

The bishop personally conveyed this message to Anthony Eden, then British Foreign Secretary, on June 30, 1942. On July 17, he was told that after consideration it had been decided that no action could be taken. Continued affirmation of the unconditional surrender policy made further effort seem fruitless to many German liberals.

Nevertheless, local agents of the underground were ordered, in the spring of 1943, to select reliable anti-Nazis who could take over administration when nation-wide revolt was launched. Many memoranda, some of which are now in this country, were written by eminent scholars, such as Prof. Alfred Weber of Heidelberg, on the democratic reorganization of Germany. A few of these documents fell into gestapo hands, which led to arrests and execution. Other resistance leaders were struck down blindly in the air raids. The survivors closed their ranks and carried on.

Emissaries were sent to Switzerland and Sweden—von Trott was the most prominent in the latter country—to contact British and American representatives. The contacts were made and sympathetically received at lower levels. But always, from White House and Whitehall, came the rebuff of unconditional surrender. On this basis many German generals, not without patriotism and pride, could not persuade themselves to raise the standard of revolt.

By midsummer of 1943, however, Gördeler had decided that the underground, even though wholly unsupported abroad; even though weakened by increasing oppression and despair in Germany, must strike. In July 1943 he wrote secretly to Field Marshal von Kluge:

"It is more and more evident to what national disaster our leadership has brought us. I direct a last plea to you, Field Marshal General. The hour has come for a decision of our own personal fate. Our conscience directs us this dangerous way, but it is honorable and any other will lead to a bitter and terrible regret. * * * Continuation of the war is an outright crime, because for a people there is never an heroic end, but always a having to go on living."

In the spring of 1944, in spite of almost insuperable difficulties, the general plan of government to follow Hitler's assassination was completed. General Beck was named Provisional President of the projected German Republic, with Dr. Gördeler as Chancellor. The veteran Socialist Wilhelm Leuschner was selected as Vice Chancellor, with a special mandate to reconstitute the free trade-unions. Ambassador von Hassel was to be Foreign Minister and Dr. Julius Leber, a left-wing Socialist, Minister of the Interior. Marshal von Witzleben agreed to serve as Commander in Chief of the Army, even thought his first duty would be to negotiate immediate surrender. Governors, all with anti-Nazi records, were chosen for the German States and mayors for the more important cities.

To secure the maximum of civilian support, Dr. Leber, on July 12, 1944, approached three Communist leaders to secure their cooperation. One of the three promptly revealed the plot to the Gestapo. Leber was arrested and a warrant issued for Gördeler.

Thus, on July 20, the liberal underground was forced to strike, though not yet fully prepared.

VI

To what has been said of its failure, only a line about the fate of Gördeler need be added. For a few weeks, sheltered by friends, he escaped arrest, but then was captured in his native East Prussia. He was last seen, a prisoner of the Gestapo, in January 1945, a physical wreck who had been repeatedly drugged in the attempt to make him betray his associates. Perhaps fortunately, most of his papers relating to the underground were destroyed in a Berlin air raid before the Gestapo cound locate them. But from the fragments which remain, the whole story will some day be reconstituted.

Those who went into Germany as the Nazi organization finally collapsed can best understand the heroism of Gördeler and those who vainly worked with him. It is a country of ruined cities, of crippled and broken men, of bewildered widows and orphans conscious only of having to go on living. Against that picture, and against the equally terrible picture of totalitarian Germany in its heyday, the tenacious effort of the German underground seems almost a miracle and will live as a memorial to the ideals for which the war was fought. As von Moltke wrote, on the eve of his execution, "none of us is dying in vain."

Yet for some strange reason the epic of German liberal resistance has been suppressed. Its heroisms have not been told; its sacrifices remain unsung. We have been led to believe that, almost without exception, the German nation concurred in the crimes of its leaders. No evidence to the contrary has ever been allowed to come from the Nuremberg trials, a serious psychological error since nothing would impress the German people more than to know the stories of their countrymen who sacrificed so much for them.

To withhold any part of this untold saga can only injure those who are denied the truth. For without full understanding, in place of blind hate, neither Germany nor Europe as a whole can ever be rehabilitated. In Gördeler's life we gave him no assistance. Now we may at least remember the words he spoke 10 years ago: "What Europe needs most is to reaffirm the concept of human decency."

How Long Will the American Republic Endure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an address How Long Will the American Republic Endure? made by Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, president of Boston University, on January 19, 1946, at the midwinter graduation exercises of Boston University:

HOW LONG WILL THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC ENDURE?

The French Historian, Guizot, once asked James Russell Lowell, "How long will the American Republic endure?"

Lowell replied, "As long as the ideas of the men who founded it continue dominant."

What were those ideas? Do they still dominate the minds of our citizens? Suppose we were as zealous to perpetuate those ideas as the ancient Israelites were to perpetuate the monotheistic faith, and suppose someone should deliver to the Americans a decalogue framed with the purpose of perpetuating the American Republic, what form would it take? If I were challenged to fashion a decalogue for believers in the American system of government, I would speak all these words, to wit:

I. You shall adhere to the republican form of government. It would be well to talk less about democracy and more about the Republic. You can have a democracy without a republican form of government, but you cannot have a republic without democracy. Any encyclopedia will give you the trite definition that a pure democracy requires a country so small that all the people can meet in one place to make their laws and choose the men who are to wield authority. The early New England town meeting was the only true democracy that ever existed on this continent.

But democracy is more than a definition. It is a spirit and way of life. Its essence is the dignity and freedom of the individual. Under our form of government, it is called a republic. A republic is a democracy in a country so large that the people cannot all participate directly in law making. A republic is a government in which the people choose from their whole number certain persons to represent them in a law-making body, and certain others to enforce the laws. The chief executive, usually called president, does not inherit his office for life; he is elected to it for a term. In a republic, every citizen, howsoever humble or obscure, bears his share of responsibility for the government.

An essential idea of a republic is that the people choose their own officers, and hold them responsible. That is the reason why the turning over of so large a part of governmental responsibility to bureaus is a dangerous thing; for bureaus are run by persons who are not directly amenable to the voters. Bureaucratic government, if it is extended much more in this country, may imperil the life of the Republic.

II. You shall keep the system of checks and balances in government inviolable, allowing no one branch to encroach upon another. The framers of the American Constitution knew that it was well to place restraints upon the various branches of government. Thus the President is held in check by Congress; the Congress is held in check by the President, and both the Congress and the President are held within the limits of the Constitution by the Supreme Court.

If there is need of protecting the President so that Congress will not encroach upon his powers, there is even greater need of watchfulness that the President does not usurp the powers of Congress. There has been a tendency in recent years to belittle Congress, to joke about it, to pass uncomplimentary remarks upon it, and to create the public opinion that Congress is a sprag in the wheel of progress, a sort of necessary evil, perhaps. The simple truth is that Congress is the one bulwark between the American people and the possibilities of a dictatorship; for if there should ever be in the Presidency a man both strong and unscrupulous, who could usurp the prerogatives of Congress, our republican form of government would cease to be. Therefore, magnify Congress, exalt it, let each new generation view it with respect and appreciation—and let the Members of Congress always conduct themselves in harmony with the enormous importance of their high position.

III. Remember always that a republic is a government by law and not by men. Therefore, it is the duty of Congress to enact, and the President to approve, just and equal laws, and it is the duty of every citizen to give due and reverent obedience to all laws. A flippant and irreverent attitude toward law menaces the safety of the Republic. It is especially important to keep this in mind at the present time, for every war is followed by a period of lawlessness. Following the Revolutionary War, anarchy stalked through the land. Following the Civil War, there was a malodorous mountain of corruption, malfeasance, and sinister legislation. Following World War I, there was a period when there were really two governments in this country, the legitimate government and the underworld government of gangsters. Prohibition was blamed, but prohibition only furnished an occasion for lawless impulse to express itself, even as conditions now do not make but only furnish an occasion for black markets and all manner of crime.

IV. You shall relegate to desuetude any politician who seeks to ride into office on waves of hate and suspicion, for the essential unity that constitutes us one people is the palladium of our liberty, happiness, safety, and prosperity. The person who, for political advantage, stirs up racial animosities or religious prejudice, or who tries to array section against section, or who appeals to a single group—as to either labor or management—is an enemy of the Republic, and should be known as such.

V. You shall not permit any organized faction or minority group to put its will in place of the will of the Nation. We talk much about protecting the rights of minorities, and we should scrupulously protect them; but sometimes an organized minority, through combinations and pressure methods, through boycotts and bloc voting, can elevate to positions of power selfish and unprincipled men who will try to stay in office by currying political favor with ambitious minorities rather than by serving the whole Nation. There is no tyranny more terrible than that of a selfish minority in the saddle.

VI. You shall keep the spirit and practice of discussion alive. In a republic, the people are the rulers—the persons whom they have chosen to make and enforce their laws are only their servants. Therefore, the people have both the right and the correlative duty of discussion. They must be free to discuss the work of their officials, to criticize it, to find fault with it, to tell the officials what to do, and to dismiss them if they do not do it. Free discussion is the very breath of life to a republican form of government.

VII. You shall preserve a sound economic structure. It is imperative that we should cherish public credit. To that end, the Nation's debts must be paid, its budget honestly balanced, and taxes upon its people kept as low as is consistent with these imperatives. Soundness of its economic structure requires protection of the traditional right of free enterprise. It demands also that the natural human needs of food, clothing, and shelter shall be supplied to its citizens. That means that every one able to work should have an opportunity to do so, and every family should have shelter in which to live a normal family life.

VIII. You shall cultivate cooperative peace and harmony with all nations. No nation can live unto itself, and no nation can die unto itself. Our Nation has grown so great and powerful that it can now dare to assume leadership in giving to the world a demonstration of international justice and benevolence.

IX. You shall maintain the spiritual foundations of the Republic. The men who founded this Republic believed in religious liberty, and they were religious. They believed in freedom of worship and they worshipped. They knew that public morality had to restrain ambitious men, and they also knew that morality without religion is like a flower torn off from its root. The ideas that went into the making of this Republic were the ideas that had been proclaimed from the pulpits of the colonial meeting houses for a hundred years before the Republic was established. Keep regnant the ancient pieties and virtues upon which this Nation was founded. If there ever was a day when we needed honesty in

government it is now. I shall never forget how impressed I was as a boy to read that when John Quincy Adams was President of the United States he forbade his son to use on a private letter a postage stamp which belonged to the Government. Oh, for a return of that old-fashioned honesty, honesty that was more than a legal honesty.

X. You shall promote education. No man embodied more completely the ideas that went into the founding of our republic than did George Washington. Heed, therefore, what he says: "Promote as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

Education is the indispensable means by which the ideas of the men who founded the American Republic can be disseminated and perpetuated. Only through education can the people be kept from becoming greedy and ignorant, from degenerating into a populace incapable of self-government. It is only by education, religion, and morality that the people can save themselves from becoming a willing instrument of their own debasement and ruin. The American Republic will endure only "as long as the ideas of the men who founded it continue dominant."

UNNRA Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention, as I have done several times previously, to the extravagance of the organization known as UNRRA. The black markets which have developed out of UNRRA abroad, and the several hundred people employed by UNRRA engaged in the black markets, have never been given the publicity which this cheap political organization deserved. I, for one who wishes to see the starving people abroad receive the benefit of the generosity of the citizens of this country, feel most gratified that the church organization of the United States and the individual citizens have at last been enabled to distribute food and clothes to the needy overseas. This should have been the program at the very start.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, March 8, 1946, which shows how easy it is to squander money by such a political organization as UNRRA, rather than devote its money to the feeding of starving babies abroad. This convention is uncalled for and the expenditure at such a time for such a purpose is a national disgrace:

UNRRA DELEGATES TO DOUBLE UP IN ATLANTIC CITY'S $16.50 ROOMS

In sharp contrast to the austere setting of its last session in bomb-pitted London UNRRA's council will meet next week in Atlantic City's fashionable Traymore Hotel.

Room reservations, American plan, are $16.50 a day a person.

The international relief organization, struggling to find food and funds for the world's hungry, will bring together nearly 500 delegates, aides, and newsmen for a total outlay of between $75,000 and $100,000 for food and board alone.

Expenses of the delegates and their aides will be borne by the governments they represent. Other conference bills will be met from UNRRA's kitty for administration expenses, a fund to which the United States is by far the greatest contributor.

The $16.50-a-head figure for room and meals at the seashore resort doesn't mean, however, that UNRRA's convention-goers will be sheltered in elaborate suites, nor be given the privacy of a room alone in which to reflect upon the bareness of the world's larder.

UNRRA headquarters here announced that "these rooms must be occuppied by two persons each because of the limitations of space."

At that, the rule should prove almost a luxury by comparison with the rigors of finding a roof and a square meal during the council's conference in London early last fall.

There, many of the organization's clerical personnel slept in tiered bunks in an air-raid shelter.

The more fortunate found hotel rooms at rates running about one pound, $4, a day. The price of meals came extra.

Even UNRRA's officials here acknowledged that the rates for the Atlantic City meeting seemed a bit rough.

One of them, perhaps a bit wistfully, said the organization was planning to seek a general reduction with the understanding that the hotel would serve only austerity meals under the American plan.

He pointed out one bit of cheer in the $16.50 figure. It includes tips.

Most of the American delegation and many of UNRRA's staff will leave for Atlantic City next Thursday by special train.

Top problems on the conference agenda include those of financing UNRRA's work, breaking transportation and shipping bottlenecks, and finding food for the people of liberated but destitute lands.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a summary of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, known as the GI bill of rights, including a review of the benefits accruing under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as of March 7. Both the original bill and the amendments had my support at all times and my vote on final passage.

Time does not permit me to go into too great detail. Moreover, the regulations issued and to be issued in the future by the Veterans' Administration must necessarily be referred to in order to determine the exact rights to which any veteran is entitled. Anyone who reads this closely will know, in general, what benefits do accrue to him or to her under this bill and he or she can then secure more specific information from the Veterans' Administration.

The summary follows:

ELIGIBILITY

In order to be eligible the general rule is that a man or woman must have served in the active forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or any of their component parts, during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and lasting up to the end of the present war. Such person must have served for a period of at least 90 days, or have been sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. In addition, he or she must have been released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. No distinction is made between enlistment and induction.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CLAIMS

1. The Veterans' Administration is declared an essential war agency, and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities on personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials. Priorities for materials are also given to any State institution built or to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. These provisions are extremely important. In practical effect they mean that the minute the war ends, at which time the Army and Navy will have no further pressing need for supplies, then the veterans' hospitals will have first call on the goods on hand. Until that time they will have second call.

2. The bill orders the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization to provide additional necessary hospital facilities and authorizes arrangements for the mutual use of hospitals, and so forth, with the Army and the Navy. For this purpose it authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000. These hospitals will care for diseases and disabilities non-service-connected as well as those incurred in service.

3. Personnel of the Veterans' Administration may be placed in Army and Navy discharge centers to adjudicate disability claims and to give advice as to their rights and benefits to all servicemen about to be discharged. It forbids the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen until a substantial part of their pay is ready or, if disabled, until adequate arrangements have been made for filing claims for benefits provided. These two requirements are extremely helpful.

4. A further clause states that recognized veterans' associations shall place representatives at the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be released. The American Legion, the VFW, the DAV, and other similar patriotic organizations are admirably equipped to do this. They are eager and anxious so to do. They have been doing this job. They can now be of even greater help in the future than in the past to veterans about to leave the service and reenter civilian life.

5. It gives the veteran safeguards in respect to various statements against his own interest, and with respect to review of irregular discharges.

EDUCATION

1. The educational provisions of the GI bill of rights have been materially liberalized by recent amendments. Veterans with 90 days' service (excluding time spent in completing Army and Navy college-training programs) are entitled to education or training at any approved educational or training institution for a period of 1 year, plus the time the veteran was on active duty on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war. To illustrate, a veteran with 3 years' active duty would be entitled to the full educational benefits for a period of 4 years. The maximum period of education or training is 4 years. The veterans' work must be satisfactory according to the standards of the institution he selects.

2. The course must be started not later than 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later, and must be completed within 9 years of the termination of the war. There is no longer any age qualification nor is it necessary for certain veterans to show that their education was interrupted, impeded, or delayed by entering the service.

3. The Administrator will pay tuition costs, laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and similar fees, and may pay for books, supplies, and like equipment. Payments are limited to $500 for an ordinary school year, and in almost every case this sum should adequately cover all of the above charges. In the unusual case where the charges are in excess of $500, the veteran may elect to have the Administrator pay the excess sum, in which event it is charged against the veterans' period of subsequent eligibility. In other words, if the charges ran to $1,000 a year, the Government will pay them, but the veteran will be charged for 2 years of his eligibility period.

4. In addition, subsistence allowances will be paid during the period of education. This has been increased to $65 per month for a veteran without a dependent, and $90 per month for a veteran with one or more dependents. There is no law or regulation that prevents the veteran from taking part-time employment to increase his income.

5. In the event that a veteran desires to complete his education on a part-time basis, he may do so and receive a period of instruction equivalent to his eligibility on a full-time basis.

A new feature of the law is that correspondence courses may be selected, but in this case no subsistence allowances are paid. However, the veteran is only charged for one-fourth of the actual elapsed time, with the result that his period of eligibility is materially extended. The cost of the correspondence course or courses may not exceed $500.

In addition, short, intensive postgraduate or training courses of less than 30 weeks have been included among the benefits available. These should be especially valuable to business or professional men whose education is substantially completed. The only restriction is that no such course shall cost more than $500.

6. To facilitate application for the education desired, the Veterans' Administration has prepared a form called Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation Form 1950. This can be obtained from the Veterans' Administration in Washington, or any of its regional offices, from veterans' organizations, from the office of your Congressman. This form may be filed with the Veterans' Administration or with the school or college which the veteran wishes to attend.

LOANS

Much of the red tape has been eliminated from the law governing loans to veterans, and it is no longer necessary in most cases to obtain approval from the Administrator before closing the loan. In addition the time limit for obtainng a loan has been increased from 2 years to 10 years after termination of the war.

1. As the law stands today, a veteran may negotiate a loan with an ordinary lending agency, such as a bank, insurance company, mortgage and loan company, or building and loan association, and—provided it is for an approved purpose—50 percent of the loan will be automatically guaranteed by the Government, up to $4,000 in the case of real-estate loans and $2,000 in all other types of loans. If the loan is made from a private individual, prior approval of the Administrator is still required.

2. Certain conditions must be met. The interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent. Real-estate loans shall be fully payable within 25 years, except in the case of farm realty, where the period is 40 years. The maturity of a non-real-estate loan shall not exceed 10 years. However, the Administrator will pay to the lender 4 percent of the amount originally guaranteed, which is tantamount to the Government paying the first year's interest on the guaranteed sum.

3. The specified purposes for which loans can be made are: (a) The purchase or construction of homes, or repairing, altering, or improving same; (b) the purchase or repair of farms and farm equipment, the purchase of livestock, equipment, machinery, and the like, or for working capital as required; (c) the purchase of a business, business property and equipment, inventories, stock in trade, repairs to business property, and working capital; (d) the refinancing of certain existing indebtedness, including delinquent taxes on homes and businesses; (e) to finance secondary loans for the above purposes where the principal loan has been obtained from another governmental agency. In such a case the Administrator may guarantee the full amount of the balance of the purchase price or cost, provided the second loan shall not exceed 20 percent of the purchase price or cost.

Certain reasonable conditions are imposed, of course. The proceeds must be used for the purpose requested. The ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such business or occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will succeed. The price paid shall not exceed a reasonable value as determined by a proper appraisal. In the case of homes, the veteran's present and anticipated income is taken into consideration.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is of vital importance to every veteran with a service-connected disability. It authorizes the Administrator to provide necessary vocational training for such veterans to fit them for employment consistent with the degree of disability. Recent amendments have liberalized many of the provisions. If more than 4 years' training is required, the Administrator may approve an extension of the period. The time within which such training may be furnished has been extended from 6 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Most important of all is the increased financial assistance provided. While pursuing training and 2 months after his employability is determined, each eligible veteran is not only entitled to his full disability pension, but also to the subsistence allowances of the GI bill of rights. To protect the veterans with a low pension, the combined minimum monthly payments have been fixed at $105 for a veteran without dependents, $115 with a dependent, and $10 per month for a child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for a dependent parent. Heretofore the minimum was $92.50 per month.

NOTE.—If a veteran is about to commence courses of vocational rehabilitation, is in need of some ready cash, the Administrator is authorized to advance $100 without interest, repayments to be made by installments from a future payments of pension or retirement pay.

EMPLOYMENT

The reemployment provisions are substantially the same as those now in effect. A veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran, is attached to the United States Employment Service in each State. He will help to get jobs, give information, and so forth. This is substantially what Bill Ilgenfritz is now doing so well in Pennsylvania at present. The veteran has other employment rights under the Selective Service Act and other laws.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

1. Eligible veterans who are unemployed are entitled to receive under certain conditions unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week for a maximum of 52 weeks within a 5-year period following the termination of hostilities. The unemployment must begin within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later. A proportionate amount may be paid to the partially employed who receive less than the $20 allowance per week given by the act plus $3; that is, $23.

The allowance for a week will be $20 less that part of the wages payable to the partially unemployed for such week which is in excess of $3—figured to the nearest highest multiple of $1. Thus, if the veteran is earning $10, you subtract $3 from the $10, leaving $7. You then subtract the $7 from the $20, and his weekly payment for readjustment would be $13. Stated conversely, it is $23 per week less the amount earned in partial employment during the week.

2. A claimant will be disqualified if he or she leaves suitable work voluntarily or is discharged for misconduct; if he or she fails to accept suitable work when offered or refuses to attend an available free training course; and also in certain cases where work stoppages are caused by labor disputes, but only if he or she is participating therein.

3. Provision is made for self-employed veterans engaged in a trade, business, profession, etc. If his net earnings have been less than $100 in the previous calendar month, he can receive the difference between $100 and his net earnings for such month. This provision, so far as I know, is an innovation in our law. It should enable enterprising veterans to become self-employed.

4. Those unemployed prior to September 4, 1944, are not eligible for any payments. On and after September 4 those who are either unemployed or partially unemployed can make application at the State employment office, or, if he is a railroad man, at the railroad employment office. Payment will start shortly.

5. Where a claimant receives other Federal or State benefit, a proportionate adjustment is made in his allowance. Veterans who have rights under two or more different sections of this act can only receive the fair and proportionate amount.

PENALTIES

Anyone receiving any money under this title with intent to defraud shall be punished by a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both. The same penalty applies to anyone making a false statement or misrepresentation. Anyone knowingly acceptaing an allowance to which he is not entitled shall be ineligible to receive any further allowance of any kind under this title. As to other fraudulent claims under this act the general penal statutes will apply.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. A recent change in the law now provides that financial benefits received under the GI bill of rights shall not be deducted from any future bonus that may be authorized.

2. The scope of the act has been broadened to include United States citizens who served in the active military or naval service of an Allied Government if he is not receiving similar benefits from another nation.

3. The educational and loan guaranty provisions have been extended to persons on terminal leave and those undergoing hospitalization pending final discharge. The subsistence allowances are not included while in such a status.

4. This summary includes only the GI bill of rights and Public Law 16, both as amended. The Congress has passed other laws of benefit to veterans. These include muster-out payments, national life insurance, dependency benefits, maternity care, death gratuity, and others.

Anyone in Alexander, Franklin, Jackson, Perry, Pulaski, Randolph, Union, and Williamson Counties can get information on where and how to apply for these benefits by getting in touch with your congressional office.

IMPORTANT

The Selective Service Act gives the veteran certain rights to his old job under certain rules and regulations

Many veterans, or their families, will want additional information. The Veterans' Administration is the source of all authoritative rulings on veterans' laws. If anyone feels that it would be helpful to have me get in touch with the Veterans' Administration in behalf of himself or others, just write your Congressman, C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP, at 1207 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. Your congressional office finds it a real pleasure to do anything possible for the boys and girls in the services, and for veterans who have returned or are returning to civilian life.

Let Canada Replace United States as Lender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the difficulties incurred by the administration in its effort to convince the people of this country that they should at this time further increase and monetize the Federal debt and thus expand the inflationary base, through making a so-called loan to Great Britain, is conclusive evidence that our people have not yet thoroughly comprehended the meaning of this total international program now before us.

The British Empire is, of course, a great force in world affairs. The United States should be a much greater force than it is at the present time. Anyone who is closely watching developments in the United States, and who understands the economic and social unrest among our people, and who can visualize the economic damage which is resulting from the arrested flow of social income, the combinations in restraint of trade and commerce all coming out of the country-wide strikes, can appreciate why so many of our people question the advisability of the United States at this moment advancing $4,000,000,000, more or less, to Britain, and all in accordance with the Vinson-Halifax agreement. When one approaches our people and claims the British proposal is to be a bonafide loan it is difficult to sustain such a contention. The escape clauses in the Vinson-Halifax agreement, the low rate of interest, and the long term involved are all of such a nature as to make it practically impossible for a Member of Congress to stand before an audience and justify the advance as a commercial loan.

Perhaps the road which should have been traveled was one which would have carried this proposition to the people of the United States as an outright gift, or further cash contribution to the war and its aftermath. You can approach a friend or a citizen and suggest to him that he make a contribution and if he does not feel like doing so he can decline, and you can walk away with his goodwill. But if you approach him and attempt to sell him a package as something worth while, and somewhat coerce him into taking action according to your suggestion, it is extremely difficult for you to retain his good-will or his confidence. The thinking people of this country know that based on the terms of the Vinson-Halifax agreement there are many reasons why the proposition should not be considered as a legitimate commercial loan. Furthermore, to the north of us we have the great Canadian Empire, the Canadian people, and their sound thinking and constructive effort. Perhaps it would have been wiser for England to have made the approach through their Canadian associate. Unquestionably there are millions of people in the United States who would make an outright purchase of issues originating in, and handled by our Canadian friends, and all for the benefit of Great Britain. Such a course would make it unnecessary to carry transactions through the general funds of the Federal Treasury.

We have already monetized so many billions of dollars of our present Federal debt, and in that manner we have so greatly contributed to the inflationary base and the potentialities of destructive inflationary forces here in the United States, that the cry is constantly before Congress to give more and greater controls to Federal bureaus for the specific purpose of further controlling the economy of the people of the United States. Such activity moves directly against the exercise of free enterprise, and if we are to continue monetizing the debt and thus expanding the inflationary base, upon what grounds, and by what means can we as consumers ever again enjoy the protection which the free play of economic forces gives to consumers in the way of more goods and services, of a higher quality, and at a lower dollar price? For more than 160 years the people of this country greatly enjoyed the benefits of competitive free enterprise, and under that system we acquired the highest level of individual possessions of any group of people on earth. Shall we now forfeit our standing through further expanding the debt in an inflationary manner?

Mr. R. T. Bowman, Washington correspondent of the Ottawa Evening Citizen, has written a stimulating editorial entitled "Let Canada Replace United States as Lender," which I now submit for the RECORD:

The Congress of the United States is now getting ready to discuss a $3,750,000,000 loan for Britain. The proposel is meeting with strong opposition, and there is a good chance that it will be defeated. Yet the Americans who negotiated the terms of the loan with British economists, after months of intensive study and bargaining, say that Britain must be provided with this credit if the world is not to revert to systems of economic blocs which inevitably lead to war.

Apart from the opposition of the Anglophobes and isolationists, the arguments which may sway more thoughtful Americans against the loan include: "We cannot lend money to foreign nations when we have a national debt of $300,000,000,000; or if we make this loan to Britain we shall have to make similar large grants to Russia, France, and many other nations. We can't afford it."

In some political quarters in Washington it is hinted that if opponents of the loan feel they cannot defeat it, they will introduce "stalling tactics" which will prevent its passage before the general elections in November of this year. This would be disastrous. If Britain is to base her future economy on world trade, instead of "sterling area" trade, she must have a large fund of American and Canadian dollars long before the end of the year. In fact, the international money organizations devised at Bretton Woods will be brought into being on March 8. It is not likely that Britain can go ahead with Bretton Woods commitments unless American and Canadian credits are assured before then.

Surely it is wrong that this uncertainty should continue? Surely this is the time for Canada to step into the situation as a great nation and world leader? The future of world economy depends on a very uncertain loan of $3,750,000,000 from the United States to Britain. Why should not Canada come forward now with the necessary funds? Canadian dollars are as good as American dollars. With the United States facing inflation and high costs of production, Canadian dollars are better because they can buy more.

The British want to spend the $3,750,000,000 in two groups: one-half for American goods including foodstuffs, timber for houses, special machinery for factories and coal cutting, tobacco, cotton, and textiles. The other half of the credit will be spent on purchases in other nations, and those nations in turn will use the dollars to buy things they need from the United States.

Canadian dollars can buy and Canadian production can deliver most of the same things which the British are trying to get from the United States. In 1943 Canadian production, including agriculture, totaled more than $12,000,000,000. This productive capacity is still available, and it can be increased through the addition to the labor force of men returning from overseas.

Factories which turned out goods for war can be converted to the production of goods for peace. The cost would be well worth while with $6,000,000,000 of orders in sight (this figure is 3¾ billion dollars which Britain wants from the United States and 1½ billion dollars now being negotiated with Canada, plus other foreign trade).

By underwriting the entire loan to Britain, Canadian factories and agriculture will be certain of full-time capacity production for the next 5 years, and more. The world will begin to realize that Canada has just as much industrial know-how as the United States, that Canadian products are just as good, and perhaps less expensive. That sort of good will will pay dividends for many years to come.

A natural question is: "How can Canada afford to underwrite a loan of $6,000,000,000?" Here are two suggestions, and Canadian financiers may be able to make others. The loan can be financed through a national credit account created in the Bank of Canada by authority of the federal government. It can be a business loan on the same terms offered by the American negotiators.

If the creation of a national credit account seems too radical to orthodox finance, then the people of Canada can raise the money by victory loan types of subscriptions. The last victory loan brought in nearly $2,000,000,000. Britain intends to spend the proposed American and Canadian credits over a period of 5 years. This is ample time for Canadians to supply the funds, with an incentive at least as important as the victory loans. Further, world-trade loans would be repaid by the people of Britain. Victory loans will have to be repaid eventually by the people of Canada who subscribed to them.

Why allow confused Americans to stall and bicker and say bitter things while deciding

to lend aid to the Ally which saved them? Canada can do the job for Britain and the world just as well, and do it now. Here is a glorious opportunity for our Nation.

Ban on Anti-Russian Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by a very distinguished correspondent of the New York Times, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, appearing in the New York Times, March 11, 1946:

UNITED STATES COLONEL BANS ANTI-RUSSIAN TALK—WARNS GI'S AGAINST SPREADING DISTRUST FRAULEINS VOICE—DECRIES CHURCHILL SPEECH

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

WUERZBURG, GERMANY, March 10.—As a result of a marked rise in subtle German propaganda efforts to divide the victorious Allies by spreading anti-Russian propaganda among the United States troops, a trend that was accelerated immediately upon the publication here of Winston Churchill's recent speech, one of the sharpest orders ever issued to a unit of the United States occupying forces was distributed today throughout the garrison stationed in Wuerzburg and the area surrounding the city.

The order not only emphasized that all troops in the area must continually remember that the Soviet Union is an ally of the United States and that millions of Russians died in the Allied cause but also warned that American tolerance of German frauleins' anti-Russian opinions was leading toward trouble.

The order was issued by the lieutenant colonel commanding the garrison in Wuerzburg and the surrounding area. He is a Regular Army officer and a Texan, who wishes that his name not be published for reasons of modesty.

He warned all soldiers in his command that they must change their attitude immediately and that he intended to put a halt to the present trends.

THREATENS SEVERE PENALTIES

In a personal conversation the colonel told this writer that he was making a strenuous check on his men and that if he received any reports that this order was being violated he intended to submit the offenders to a summary court martial and give the maximum sentence within his scope—6 months in prison.

The order was printed yesterday and distributed today. It stated:

"It has been brought to my attention that the morale of the civilian population of Wuerzburg and vicinity has been greatly raised as the result of a speech in the United States by a British politician relative to our allies, the Russian people.

"I have also learned that a few men from this battalion have expressed agreement with these policies to German frauleins. This practice will stop immediately and you may be sure that I will use great effort on the part of the counterintelligence corps and S–2 personnel to see that it stops right now.

"The Soviet Government is an ally of the United States of America and you are individually and collectively representatives of our Government. I will not tolerate any disparaging remarks against our allies to the German people.

POINTS TO SOLDIER GRAVES

"I do not hate the German people. My policy in regard to dancing and social gatherings should indicate that fact to you. But I cannot forget that the sun can never set upon the grave of some American soldier.

"From Pearl Harbor and Bataan to the Elbe, your buddies are lying dead because of the Nazi Party and the evil machinations of Hitler and his gang.

"If you are a Catholic, stop to remember that the Nazy Party persecuted hundreds of nuns and priests and tried to frame them on immorality charges.

"If you are a Protestant think of Pastor [the Rev. Martin] Niemoeller.

"If you are Jewish * * * just do not let your fraulein's opinion influence yours.

"She has been reared in an atmosphere of hatred and intolerance for all nations of earth except for the master race we have just whipped.

"Millions of Russian soldiers and civilians died to save our skins. Just remember that. If propaganda causes you to hate the Russians, stop and think. They died for you, too.

"If you want to fight again, encouraging these frauleins that we hate Russia is a good way to get things going. Those were the good old days, yes? Standing in the tracks all day in the bitter cold, dirty, hungry, and tired. Firing off the line of departure. Making river crossings. Sweating out barrages. It is cold in Russia. Remember that.

"In case you think I am a Pinko and you want to write a letter to the B-bag [Stars and Stripes letter column], let me forestall you. In political thinking I am a conservative southern Democrat.

"An ancestor of my name was killed in the war of the American Revolution. But the Russians are our allies. They have guts. They kept hordes of Jerries off of us and, by God, I never want to fight again. Think it over. You been warned."

There is no doubt in the mind of this correspondent that other areas than Wuerzburg would benefit from similar orders. Throughout conservative Catholic Bavaria insidious propaganda is working against Allied unity.

One may recall that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's similar warning against anti-British talk in north Africa quickly healed a nasty and developing situation.

Why 4 and 4½ Percent Interest Rates for GI and Farm Loans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the financial page of the February 10 New York Times indicates that the Southern Pacific finances itself at a 2⅞ percent rate of interest, and the Union Pacific at 2.51 percent—the lowest ever recorded in railroad finance. Why does this administration demand 4½ percent interest rate on a farm when the purchaser pays down 25 percent of the purchase price, and 4 percent interest when the purchaser has a 35 percent equity, and provide a 3 percent loan when the purchaser makes no down payment? Why does this administration provide millions for loans to nonveterans at 3 percent interest when the veteran pays 4 percent on GI loans? According to the following article, money is cheap to other groups:

DEPTHS PLUMBED BY INTEREST RATES—GOVERNMENT-PEGGED FINANCIAL STRUCTURE SEEN SHATTERED BY LATEST LOANS—INVESTMENT FUNDS HUGE—COMMERCIAL BANKS AND INSURANCE COMPANIES AFFECTED—FEDERAL POLICY NOT REVEALED

(By Paul Heffernan)

The financial world today is admitting that the wartime, Government-pegged interest structure has been shattered and that the Nation now is standing at the threshold of an era in public and private finance that is without historical precedent or other guide except the babel of conflicting economic theories and the errors of uncharted trial.

When imminent disintegration of the wartime interest structure was predicted publicly last October in the money-market studies of George H. Roberts, vice president of the National City Bank, and by Aubrey Lanston, vice president of the First Boston Corp., the Government had not yet marketed its last issue of long-term 2½-percent bonds—the Victory issue of 1972–67. The Southern Pacific Railroad had just marketed $100,000,000 of long-term bonds at par, and New York City's 3s of 1980 were selling at a yield basis of 2.27 percent in the dealers' market.

By last week, however—within a period of less than 4 months—the prophecies of the New York bankers had been vindicated in a way that was breath-taking, even among the shockproof economic sophisticates of legendary Wall Street. On Monday Southern Pacific refunded at 2⅞ percent a $50,000,000 issue that it had floated in September at 3¾ percent; on Tuesday the competition of 16 leading investment banking houses for a prime-risk utility issue resulted in its being resold publicly to yield 2.39 percent; on Wednesday the Union Pacific Railroad marketed $44,493,000 of unsecured bonds at 2.51 percent, the lowest interest cost ever commanded by railroad finance, and by the week's end New York's 3s of 1980 were selling to yield 2 percent and the Victory loan 2½s were changing hands on a yield basis of 2.24 percent. Thus within 3 months the interest rate on the Government last long-term bond issue had been rendered obsolete; even 2¼ percent as a long-term interest rate was disintegrating.

GOVERNMENT OUTLOOK

At Washington, where the Treasury has a big stake in low interest rates as an instrument of public-debt management, it was reported that Secretary Fred M. Vinson's office would follow, for the indefinite future at least, a hands-off, wait-and-see policy under which maturing Government obligations either would be retired by Treasury cash or refunded into 1-year, seven-eighths percent certificates. This was taken to mean that the pressure of funds seeking prime investment placement would continue to drive bond prices higher and yields and interest rates lower.

Federal Reserve officials gave indications of increasing restiveness at the prospect that the banking system might have to remain dragooned indefinitely in the Government's war finance service at a time when the rest of private business was undergoing reconversion. For commercial bank and insurance investment interests the shrinking interest rate was becoming a matter of grave and immediate concern. Will a turn come? And if so, when and by what means? The financial world does not know the answer.

SHORTAGE OF SECURITIES

However fundamental may be the relationship of Treasury policy to current interest rates, the present market for prime-risk securities furnishes several influences—superficial or not—all tending, by competitive action, to drive bond prices higher and yields lower. Together they spell one phenomenon—an acute market shortage of high-grade, long-term securities which is growing daily.

The volume of savings seeking placement is undiminished and the supply of available, high-grade securities is constantly shrinking as private corporations retire high-interest debt with company cash or with the proceeds of low-cost bank loans or privately placed bonds, and as Government term bonds are paid off in cash or refunded into 1-year certificates. The dwindling residue of long-term public and private securities still enjoying a public market is thus becoming the ever-narrowing object of intense competitive bidding at the expense of investment yields. As the yields fall and fall, the competition for the shrinking supply becomes remorseless. The competitive forces at play have been characterized as constituting a vicious circle, in which the interest rate, like a matchstick caught in the outer eddies of a whirlpool, is being sucked inexorably in narrowing circles toward a center vortex, into which it might well vanish, and with it the remnants of orthodox capitalist finance.

High Lights of Churchill's Fulton, Mo., Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to have an evaluation of America and the place our country has won among the nations of the world together with the appraisal of the outcome of our national effort by a great British statesman presented here:

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American democracy. With primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. As you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done but also feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining, for both our countries. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after time. It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose and the grand simplicity of decision shall guide and rule the conduct of the English-speaking peoples in peace as they did in war. We must and I believe we shall prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.

When American military men approach some serious situation they are wont to write at the head of their directive the words, "Over-all strategic concept." There is wisdom in this as it leads to clarity of thought. What then, is the over-all strategic concept which we should inscribe today? It is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands. And here I speak particularly of the myriad cottage or apartment homes, where the wage earner strives amid the accidents and difficulties of life, to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord or upon ethical conceptions which often play their potent part.

HOMES MUST BE SHIELDED

To give security to these countless homes they must be shielded from the two gaunt marauders—war and tyranny. We all know the frightful disturbance in which the ordinary family is plunged when the curse of war swoops down upon the breadwinner and those for whom he works and contrives. The awful ruin of Europe, with all its vanished glories, and of large parts of Asia, glares in our eyes. When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty states dissolve, over large areas, the frame of civilized society humble folk are confronted with difficulties with which they cannot cope. For them all is distorted, broken, or even ground to pulp.

When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualize what is actually happening to millions now and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. None can compute what has been called "the unestimated sum of human pain." Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. We are all agreed on that.

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist International organization intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits if any to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies.

IRON CURTAIN DESCENDS

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of central and eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in the Soviet sphere and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and increasing measure to control from Moscow.

Athens alone, with its immortal glories, is free to decide its future at an election under British, American, and French observation. The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which were very small in all these eastern states of Europe, have been raised to preeminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

The safety of the world requires a new unity in Europe from which no nation should be permanently outcast.

Twice the United States has had to send millions of its young men to fight a war. Twice we have seen them drawn by irresistible forces in time to secure the victory but only after frightful slaughter and devastation have occurred.

I have felt bound to portray the shadow which, alike in the west and in the east, falls upon the world. I was a minister at the time of the Versailles Treaty and a close friend of Mr. Lloyd George. I did not myself agree with many things that were done, but I have a very vague impression in my mind of that situation, and I find it painful to contrast it with that which prevails now. In those days there were high hopes and unbounded confidence that the wars were over, and that the League of Nations would become all-powerful. I do not see or feel the same confidence or even the same hopes in the haggard world at this time.

THE CONDENSATION OF A RECENT EDITORIAL

If the speech which Winston Churchill has delivered at Westminister College means anything, it means that, in his judgment, the time has come when the United States and Britain should enter into what would amount to a continuing military alliance. His projected alliance—he called it a fraternal association. He also said that he does not believe that Russia wants war, but rather that she wants the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of her power and doctrines.

When one considers the curious setting in which this important and challenging speech was made, plus the fact that President Truman accompanied the former Prime Minister to Fulton, Mo., and there introduced him to his audience, it is reasonable to assume that the President subscribes, at least in substantial part, to the views which Mr. Churchill expounded.

If this be so, then it is an undeniable fact that the time is at hand for the plainest possible speaking in this country. We should face the fact that Mr. Churchill's "fraternal association" could prove to be a tragic liability rather than an asset.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the only remaining member of the old Dies committee who is presently a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities has always been quick to charge Communist affiliation or sympathy against loyal and law-abiding Americans and even against humane or charitable American organizations.

Thus it is that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, February 27, contains one of the gentleman's statements, without any citation of specific facts, which makes the accusation that the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has attempted to bring many persons with Communist records into the United States.

In that connection I have received a letter from the chairman of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee stating the facts. I feel in honor bound to insert Dr. Barsky's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to refute the gentleman's statements. The letter speaks for itself and shows that the statements of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] were unjustifiable and unwarranted:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 8, 1946.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1946, has been brought to my attention. In this RECORD, I note that Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey states in reference to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee that: "They are the ones that have been trying to bring in Communists to this country. We have testimony before our committee within the last few days that every person, every refugee, that this Joint Anti-Fascist Committee has tried to bring into the United States had a Communist record, a Communist record over in Hungary or France or Spain or somewhere else."

I wish to point out that these charges are entirely unfounded. It has never been the

practice of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to bring individuals into the United States. It is a matter of record that within the past 3 years, this committee has been approached only twice to help to bring individuals into the United States.

The first case concerns a Filipino citizen who had been condemned to death by the Franco courts in Madrid. The State Department brought the situation to our attention, inquiring as to whether we would be willing to defray the cost of his passage to the United States with his wife, who was then pregnant, if the American Embassy was able to effect his release. This we consented to do and the couple arrived in the United States in the spring of 1943.

The other case was that of a Hungarian citizen, who fought with the Republican forces in Spain. He was seriously wounded and was in desperate need of medical attention. His brother, who was an American citizen and who was able to finance him, requested our help in bringing him to the United States. We applied for advisory approval on an immigration visa from the Interdepartmental Committee of the Department of State, but in the course of this procedure, he was able to enter another European country, and therefore we dropped the matter. We have no knowledge of the political beliefs or affiliations of the three individuals just described.

A few instances have occurred where we have secured or attempted to secure entry visas for refugees who wish to pass through the United States on their way to a country offering them refuge.

On rare occasions outstanding individuals have been invited to come to the United States from other countries to speak or appear for us for fund-raising purposes, as in the case of Pablo Picasso, whom we invited to come to New York in view of a contemplated showing of his pictures which was being arranged in conjunction with the Museum of Modern Art. However, in none of these cases did we take any steps to secure their entry into the United States.

The only other connection we have had with the immigration problems was when Spanish refugees already in the United States were in difficulties with the immigration authorities and came to ask for help. As part of our relief work we provided legal assistance in straightening out these difficulties with the immigration authorities. Assistance of this nature is considered part of relief work and is provided by other organizations such as National Catholic Welfare Organization, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Greek Welfare Organization, Polish Welfare Organization, and the Salvation Army.

It is obvious from the record we have just set forth at length that Congressman THOMAS' charges are without basis, as the House Committee on Un-American Activities would have realized if the House committee had given me the opportunity to describe the activities of our organization when I appeared before them and requested the opportunity to describe these activities.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has exerted and is exerting all its efforts to bring relief and rehabilitation to the Spanish Republicans in exile who are suffering because of their fight against Franco. The recent publications of our State Department clearly indicate that Franco is a Fascist and has been allied with Hitler and Mussolini. The people we aid are anti-Fascists, and, in assisting them, we are carrying on the true traditions of American democracy.

The work we have been doing warrants the full support of all Americans rather than the harassment we have been subjected to at the hands of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD K. BARSKY, M. D.,
Chairman.

The Strike Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of March 5 contained an article by the political and economic writer, David Lawrence, that I believe should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress. It seems to me that it accurately portrays the situation in the Federal Government at the present time, and it also probably accurately forecasts the future as a result of the chaos that exists in the Federal Government. The article is as follows:

EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT ACTION SEEN AS NEED—WRITER HOLDS STRIKES LEADING TO ECONOMIC CRISIS

(By David Lawrence)

Thirteen years have elapsed since the late President Roosevelt was inaugurated in the midst of an economic crisis that had forced the closing of the banks of the Nation. The American people responded to the drastic steps and cooperated with the Government in the hope that firm leadership could bring order out of chaos.

Today an economic crisis, not so acute in its appearance but equally severe, is in the making. There is no vigorous leadership—in fact, there are major groups demanding that the economic warfare be permitted to go to the point of exhaustion while the rival interests pursue their bitter conflict.

Strikes and work stoppages are blocking reconversion and reconstruction. Quarrels over wages have prevented the national income from achieving the levels that had been expected. Instead of a boom, as predicted, the Nation is slowly drifting into a serious depression.

SOMEONE MUST STEER

Already it seems certain the first-quarter statements of earnings will show a sharp drop and that losses compared to the expected gains will be widespread. It is evident that the anticipated wage increases have already been wiped out by the prolonged work stoppages. Purchasing power is being diminished and the temper of the people is one of widespread dissatisfaction with the failure of economic groups or the Government to provide the necessary leadership to swing the country to a rate of production which it was reasonable to expect this year.

It is easy to blame the labor unions and their leaders, and even easier to blame the managements for failing to surrender their profits—it depends on which point of view one adopts. The truth is the unions faced a critical situation in the decrease of take-home pay for their members and the managements faced uncertainties as to the demand they would have and prices they could charge.

Under such circumstances, when the economic ship seeks to operate without a rudder, someone must supply the steering apparatus. Since labor will not permit management to do the steering, or vice versa, the public interest requires that the Government do it.

SMALL BUSINESS SUFFERS

Small businesses are suffering from the unscientific and unwieldy way wage increases are being forced. Instead of developing a system wherein each industry can work out levels that will take care of the weaker competitors, the rule is to impose wages which only the rich and powerful companies can pay. The Government's wage and price policy hurts small businesses.

Thus the monopolies, or at least those with the largest amount of volume of dollars or production on their books come out better while the smaller competing units face a serious decision. Some may be forced out of business altogether. This is not leadership but careless administration.

President Truman knows he is being widely criticized. But his trouble is that he does not have a set of advisers who know very much about the operations of the economic system. It is all very well to theorize, but the facts of business life often upset many a well-conceived theory. This is because the laws of trade and merchandise are affected by price-fixing, and Government can only adjust the inequities of the price system by recognizing that it is also forcing increases in costs through blanket wage increases.

MAY SPEED DEPRESSION

If it is intended to discourage risk capital and decide arbitrarily what profits shall be earned, incentives to expansion will not emerge. Instead, just as soon as pent-up demands for goods now short are met, the few months' boom that must inevitably follow the present recession will collapse and the real depression will come sooner than expected.

The Republicans were charged with the "Hoover depression of 1929–33" but unless there is a better leadership in Washington, there will be a "Truman depression" in the next 18 months which it will not be possible for the Democrats to blame on their Republican opponents. The executive and legislative branches of the Government are Democratic and the people at the polls next November will have their first opportunity to express themselves on the failure of the Washington Government to act vigorously in relation to strikes and work stoppages.

Resolutions of National Council of American War Dads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I extend resolutions which originated in the office of the national council of American War Dads and which was sent to me by the very worthy and active Hampton Chapter:

DEMOBILIZATION

It is with deep regret that we read of the demonstration on foreign shores of American boys disappointed with the manner in which the armed forces are continually confusing the demobilization program, and as fathers of sons serving in these same forces, we can and do understand the conditions that have brought such action about.

We, the War Dads, in meeting assembled at Kansas City, Mo., do want the boys in service to know we as fathers have not forgotten them and shall not forget them: There be it

Resolved, That we hereby believe that since the matter has been brought to the attention of General Eisenhower, we having full confidence in him, request of General Eisenhower the continued personal observation of his announced program to the end that it may be strictly enforced without fear or favor and further request that all violations of it be dealt with promptly with the full force of his authority.

TAX EXEMPTIONS

Whereas the American War Dads realize the abrupt transition to civilian life by our boys released from the armed forces, which does not give them an opportunity to understand the employment wage deductions pertaining to withholding tax and social security; and

Whereas a situation has arisen and continues to become more serious in that a boy returning from service discovers that after income tax and other deductions, his take-home pay is not in sufficient degree greater than the allowance granted by the Government and results in the decision to accept the Government allowance in order to hopefully seek occupation with greater remuneration: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we American War Dads herewith petition our Representatives and Senators in Congress to amend the income tax law of the Nation by exempting from income tax the first $2,500 of earned salary per year of a veteran of World War II and that such exemption be extended to a period of 3 years from date of said veteran's discharge from the service thereby granting to the veteran the opportunity to rehabilitate himself into civilian life by enabling him to be employed at the prevailing rate of wages and not be compelled to accept remuneration offered by the Government for the 52 weeks under the unemployment section of the GI bill of rights.

MILITARY COURTS MARTIAL

Whereas reports persist that the system of military courts martial in our Army and Navy inflicts many inequities and injustices; and

Whereas the findings and sentences of said courts martial have been modified in an extreme degree after public attention had been centered upon alleged injustices, in certain cases such action constituting virtually an acknowledgment by the military authorities that such decisions had been unduly harsh and perhaps arrived at without due consideration of all factors meriting attention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American War Dads, by action of the national council in regular session held January 18, 19, 20 at Kansas City, Mo., recommends that the appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States examine the system of military courts martial as operated by the Army and Navy, and particularly check into all sentences pronounced since December 7, 1941, condemning men to die or to serve terms of 10 or more years; and if inequities and injustices are found to have been prevalent, then the Congress of the United States enact whatever measures appear necessary to correct the wrong conditions discovered; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairmen of the committees in the Congress handling military and naval affairs; to the White House; and to the War and Navy Departments.

MUSICAL THERAPY

Whereas the medical profession has determined that music is a necessary and essential part of the treatment of some classes of patients suffering from disability due to service in the armed forces of this Government; and

Whereas the Government has listed as surplus property small portable organs or other musical instruments while Government hospitals for veterans are lacking in such equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the proper Government agencies be notified that the War Dads, in meeting assembled, does hereby request that all such organs, musical instruments, or other like equipment available be transferred to such hospitals at once, and further that where a need is known and proper musical equipment not available, that the proper Government agency immediately procure such equipment.

A Night for the Kids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in reading the Eagles magazine for March 1946, I came across an article about what my home aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles was doing in behalf of our youngster in Missoula, Mont. I want to call to the attention of the Congress the real work this outstanding fraternal organization is doing, not only among its own members but in behalf of America's youngsters as well. I am personally acquainted with all the men mentioned in the story—Andy Miller, Chris Anderson, Bill Dobsloff, Bob Kerpies, Irvan Duffan, Neil Fisher, Paul Fonner, Charlie Graves, Paul Cyr, and Melvin Bouch—as well as scores of others in the Missoula aerie who are contributing of their time, energy, and talents in behalf of our youngsters. Not to be forgotten are the wives, sisters, and sweethearts of our members who by their work, advice, and encouragement have made these dances a success.

Not only do I know the men and women who are responsible for this but I know many of the youngsters who attend these dances. They are, because of the interest taken in their welfare by the Eagles, going to be first-class citizens when they grow up. After all, they are America and our future will, in time, rest in their hands. To the youngsters I say God bless you; to the Eagles of Missoula Aerie I say thanks brothers for a job well done.

A NIGHT FOR THE KIDS

(By Clark Gruver)

Having fun is part of the heritage of youth. Unfortunately, though, there are a lot of kids who don't have fun—at least, the right kind of fun.

But if you were a youngster, and if you lived in Missoula, Mont., you'd have the right kind of a good time at the Eagles' hospitable club house.

It's Friday night and we're headed for the Eagles' home. Let's hurry, for we don't want to miss any of the fun.

Isn't that one of the greatest sights you ever saw? Little tots 5 and 6 years old—older ones, too—up to minus 18. There they are, between 175 and 200 of them, out on the floor dancing, or trying to dance, and all of 'em having the time of their young lives.

There's individuality in the style of dancing. Some of the tots do little more than walk sedately to the toe-tapping music. But the older youngsters—the hep cats who are in the groove—devote their energies to rug cutting.

Over on the sidelines are the grown-ups—the mothers who have come to watch their youngsters enjoy themselves wholesomely, and the Aerie officers and members who are keeping an eye on things as well as getting a big kick out of it all.

"You see," says Past Worthy President Andrew W. Miller (he was vice president when the "kid dances" were started), "we figure we are helping to keep the young folks off the streets on Friday nights. The dances keep them out of mischief by giving them something to do. And, as a humanitarian organization, we figure that the cost is very little in proportion to the good we are doing. All you have to do to get your neck in a sling is to mention discontinuing the dances."

Cost? About $2.65 for each dance. That's a mighty small price tag on a big bundle of fun. The Eagles donate the use of the hall; all help, except the orchestra, is donated; and scores of members and their wives have helped at the different parties. General admission is 15 cents; kids whose dads belong to the Aerie get in for a nickel.

The idea man on the kids' dances was Chris Andersen, and if all his ideas are as good as this one, he's a handy man to have around the Aerie. The plan adopted, Worthy President W. H. Dobsloff appointed Chris as chairman of the original planning committee, along with Andy Miller, Bob Kerpies, Irvan Duffin, and Neil Fisher. Later, Paul Fonner was added as vice chairman. Current chairman is Charlie Graves.

Musicians Melvin Bouch and Paul Cyr took over the job of keeping the kids happy jitterbugging to tinkling tunes.

The first dance was held on February 11, 1944. Before long, the Eagles' kid dances were the talk of the town. In fact, a good many men came in and asked to join the Eagles. The reason?

"Any organization that will do what the Eagles of Missoula are doing for the town's youngsters is an organization to be proud of. I want to join and have a part in it."

Many Against British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving letters from localities scattered all over the United State insisting that Congress refuse to appropriate money for the British loan. A typical illustration of the thinking and the reactions of the people is expressed in the following letter from a man who lives at Eufaula, Okla.:

This is the first letter that I have ever written to anyone even remotely connected with the making of our laws or the formation of our foreign policy, but I hope you will at least read it and understand the ideas I am trying to express.

If you have never talked to the ordinary ex-GI, I suggest that you do so. It might give you an insight as to how and what they are thinking. Of course, I speak only for myself, but I have listened a lot and talked a little to more soldiers than I could count, and on an average, they are pretty well set in what they believe.

The European countries are in a sorry condition, we know that for we've had first hand evidence, but; there is also a limit to how much we can do to help ease that condition.

There is also the question as to how much our help is appreciated. A number of the British, French, and Belgians are appreciative and grateful for what we have done. By far a larger part, to my opinion, don't like our

attitude, they don't like anything about us, except our name as being big-hearted and a Santa Claus. As long as we are the donor and they the recipient, everything is fine, but when that stops, the so-called "international brotherhood" stops, too. We can't forget the way we were charged five prices, both on individual purchases and services to the Army, by our allies. Right or wrong, the feeling of nationalism is stronger now than ever before. In plain words, we're sick of the whole damned business; Limeys, Frogs, and Belgiques, as well as the rest.

I have noticed more than once the statement in the papers, both here and abroad, that the British industrial plant is in better shape now than at the start of the war, both as to production and capital. And now they want a loan, one that everyone knows if granted will never be repaid. I have yet to talk to a single person in favor of it. When we loan, or, make it plain, give a sum of money or credits, we are really giving away that much of the resources of this country, materials, and labor; and I'm not in favor of that. We have work to do at home, and to tax ourselves to pay for something from which we can expect no return, either in physical goods, good will, or whatever form it is supposed to be in, is plain silly.

I don't think I am a crackpot, and I know that most of our dealings with foreign nations are too deep for me to understand, but I have tried to give you an idea of what the boys are thinking. If we're wrong, give us something to show where and how we are to be benefited by sending good money after bad. After all, we are ones that will foot the bills, and not Lady Astor.

Again I suggest that it would be well for you to learn the attitude of the future voting majority.

Mr. Speaker, others are just as sanguine as the author of the above letter in their opposition to the policy of giving and lending our substance to foreign governments. The GI's are opposed to it, the veterans are opposed to it and the citizens generally express their opposition. We should heed the advice and wishes of our citizens on this subject before authorizing the appropriation. When I say many are against the British loan, this is putting it altogether too mildly. The opposition is almost universal.

Amvets Should Be Included Among the Veteran Organizations Who Receive Obsolete Rifles for Ceremonial Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter from the vice commander of the Ohio Department of Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—and a reply received from the War Department relative to securing obsolete rifles for ceremonial purposes. Amvets is the largest veterans' organization that has come out of this war. It has over 416 posts organized in 40 States with a membership of more than 50,000 veterans.

I have contacted the War Department and have been advised that a special act of Congress is not necessary to include Amvets among the preferred list of veterans' organizations now obtaining said equipment, and that the situation can be handled through administrative procedure. Therefore it is hoped that the War Department will expedite the request of Amvets in the shortest possible time.

The correspondence follows:

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II (AMVETS),
Lima, Ohio, March 3, 1946.

Mr. JOE LIEB,
National Legislative Officer,
Amvets National Headquarters,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: On January 26, 1946, I, in behalf of the Ohio Department, wrote to the War Department, Chief of Ordnance requesting information regarding the possibility of our posts obtaining some of the rifles which the War Department is now giving to veterans organizations free except for a small charge for packing and handling. I am inclosing the letter I received in reply.

In view of the fact that we should be entitled to these rifles, as well as to anything else of this nature that may be offered in the future, I am of the opinion that some action should be taken at once to have the mentioned acts of Congress amended. What is your thought about this? Can anything be done? This is not only in the interest of the Ohio department, or my local post, but for all Amvet posts, both existing now and in the future.

I am in hopes that something can be done about this now.

Sincerely yours,
F. HAROLD SNYDER,
First Vice Commander,
Ohio Department of Amvets.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1946.

Mr. F. HAROLD SNYDER,
Vice Commander Ohio Department,
Amvets, Memorial Hall, Lima, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter dated January 26, 1946, in which you request the donation of rifles to your organization for ceremonial purposes.

In accordance with the act of May 22, 1896 (29 Stat. 133), amended by act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 773), and act of June 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 491), "The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized in their discretion to loan or give to soldier's monument associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war veterans associations, State museums and incorporated museums operated and maintained for educational purposes only whose charters deny them the right to operate for profit, municipal corporations and posts of the sons of veterans reserve, condemned or obsolete guns, projectiles * * * which may not be needed in the service of either of said Departments. Such loan or gifts shall be made subject to rules and regulations covering the same in each Department and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift."

War veterans' organizations qualifying under this law may be found in title 36 of the United States Code Annotated and are as follows: The American Legion, Grand Army of the Republic, United States Blind Veterans of the World War, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Navy Club of the U. S. A., United States Spanish War Veterans, Marine Corps League, Disabled American Veterans of the World War.

In view of the fact that your organization is not qualified under this law, it is regretted that your request cannot be complied with at this time.

For the chief of ordnance:
Very truly yours,
B. M. CUTCHIN, Jr.,
Major, Ordnance Department, Assistant.

OPA and Deprey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], put an unfinished story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8. What he did not include was an article appearing in the March 4 issue, and an editorial appearing in the March 5 issue, of the Green Bay Press-Gazette, from which publication his original story was taken.

The complete story clearly shows that the OPA does not desire to engage in a program of persecution. The attitude of Mr. Earp, the district director, is to be highly commended.

The rest of the incomplete story follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette of March 4, 1946]

OPA MOVES TO REFUND $25 ON DEPREY SALE

F. L. Earp, district director of the OPA, today reversed the settlement against the Deprey Furniture Co., said it was not a fair sample of OPA enforcement, and initiated action for a refund of the $25 which George Herlache, manager, paid to settle the claim which was caused by a 73-cent overcharge on a rug. Herlache agreed to refund the overcharge.

"This district now embraces 40 counties and a million and a quarter people. From 50 to 80 enforcement actions are handled every week," said Earp.

"This settlement is not a fair sample of OPA enforcement nor OPA policy. It is a too literal interpretation of the letter of the law rather than its spirit. It is a mistake. The purpose of OPA is to hold down the cost of living—not to embarrass businessmen nor collect money for the Government. This settlement cannot be defended and I shall not try to defend it. It is not similar to other actions which have been severely criticized but which are wholly defensible because they threatened higher prices to consumers and invited inflation which always enters in small, not large rises in prices. I refer to our enforcement of 2 and 3 cent overceilings on such things as canned goods. There the 2 cents overceiling may be a 10-percent price rise or even more. It is never on one can of peas or corn. It is on the whole store's turn-over of the item at an overceiling price * * * probably many cases of peas or corn. It is unfair competition. If one store can raise the price so can all stores and since there were more than 750,000,000 cans of peas sold last year it could soon enough mean a $15,000,000 increase in the cost of living if OPA ignored it because it was only 2 cents per can. It is then plainly our sworn duty to stop the overceiling sales and to recover the illegal profit either for the overcharged customers or for all the people—the United States Treasury. That defines our policy on small overceiling sales. In the case of the Deprey

Furniture Co.'s single violation, quite satisfactorily explained it seems to me, by Mr. Herlache, the violation was a technical, unimportant and unintentional one, and since it never would have been approved by this office had the case been reviewed before settlement, it is not approved by me now. The $25 check for the Federal Treasury has already been forwarded, but I have initiated action to recover for Mr. Herlache, and express my regret publicly that the facts were not more thoroughly studied before a technical violation was determined."

(Mr. Herlache's statement to the Press-Gazette covering this transaction referred to a 23 cent overcharge instead of the 73 cent figure used by the OPA. Mr. Herlache arrived at his figure by deducting a 50-cent discount which he claimed was allowed on the sale. However no mention of the discount appeared on the OPA records.)

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette of March 5, 1946]

OPA AND DEPREY

The community was certainly glad to read Mr. Earp's OPA decision to refund the $25 fine laid on Deprey Furniture Co. over an error in figures of 23 cents on a $54 sale. The penalty was offensive to all sense of justice.

The Earp interview meant the destruction of an article composed here that rather smelled of sulfur. It is much more agreeable to write commendations than condemnations.

There is utterly no such thing as operating a business carrying numerous items without making errors. When these mistakes accumulate it is time for OPA to cock its ears. When they are trivial, intermittent, happen on both sides of the fence, or otherwise repel the notion that they are either purposeful or reckless, they must be treated charitably because they are honest.

Mr. Earp's declaration raises the estimate of OPA in the community. His explanation of OPA attitude was lucid and logical. It was in no sense a retreat but an advance.

The Veterans Know What Is Preventing Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the young veterans are beginning to write their Congressmen and tell them why reconversion is being retarded. The propaganda that is being put out is not deceiving these boys. They know that restrictions, regimentation, and bureaucracy is responsible and that this administration will be held responsible unless many of the bureaus are abolished and reconversion be allowed to proceed in the normal way. They know what causes black markets. They know why we are asked to lend billions of dollars to England, Russia, and other countries, while these boys are being neglected. They know that we need production in abundance, rather than scarcity. Bureaucratic controls result in scarcity and black marketing. This means high prices and inflation. The veterans know what is preventing reconversion.

A young veteran has just written me his explanation in the following language:

Is Congress going to play ball with the money lenders and loan $4,000,000,000 to England or pay the serviceman for making the world safe for a minority? Are they going to loan Russia $6,000,000,000 to make war on us in less than 5 years or are they going to let some of their boys sell apples on the street corners?

Right now a serviceman cannot get a decent job. Why, I ask you? I think it is because someone in Washington is playing politics with reconversion. Again trying to win the favor of a minority because they make a loud noise. The administration has fumbled the ball again.

Kindly take me off your list for your Chouteau project. I have a home in Tulsa and a fairly good job. I realize that lots of the boys coming home need places to live, but they also need jobs, so let's spend some time trying to get king labor and queen industry back on production terms that will suit the fancy of the smart planners in Government.

Who runs the black market? Sugar warehouses full everywhere but we still ration it so the black-market operator can gc $25 per hundredweight for it. You can get a new car if you fork over an extra $400. You know these things but what is the answer? It's simple, just one word "production" and then competition will right your prices. I know that this is too easy for the present government to figure out, but there wouldn't be enough red tape attached and it might throw a lot of curly haired planners out of a job. It was true before and is still true.

Since I have been back on my job since the 1st of November, merchandise has been harder to get than at any time during the war, according to my firm. What a utopia we thought that we were coming back to.

The wise boys said we must get higher wages so that we can take more in taxes, that's fine but someone fumbled the ball. So now the boys get no wages and the wise guys get no taxes.

I wanted to make this short, but I am about to get wound up. I just finished a letter to Senator MOORE so you know that I mean business and am fed up with present conditions.

Let's forget politics and pull together and get business to rolling again.

If there is something that we can do to help, we are willing to try. Good night and good luck.

Significant Statement of Congressman Hatton W. Sumners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, announcement made yesterday by our colleague, Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS of Texas, that he would retire from Congress when his present term ends is cause for regret by all people who love America. We have had no abler or more patriotic man in this body than Judge HATTON W. SUMNERS. His retirement from Congress is a great loss to the Nation. The following newspaper item from the Washington Post, Sunday, March 10, 1946, is significant and carries a lesson and a preachment worthy of serious thought by every true American. The newspaper item reads:

TIRED OF TYRANNY—EMBITTERED, REPRESENTATIVE SUMNERS IS QUITTING

Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS, Democrat of Texas, a veteran of 33 years in Congress, yesterday called the Federal Government an "instrumentality of favortism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption" as he announced he would not seek reelection.

SUMNERS, 70 years old, and long-time chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said in a statement:

"I have watched what my own generation, under administration of both parties, has been doing to the greatest system of democratic Government ever evolved through the processes of the ages.

"By ignoring principles and the lessons of history and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people.

"By concentration of governmental power, and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially busted, great piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free."

When he completes his congressional term, SUMNERS expects to speak before civic and patriotic organizations. He said he feels that in that manner he can better serve a great people than by acting as their Representative in Congress.

Under the present state of affairs, he contended, a Congressman has become virtually an errand runner who has little time left to study important legislation or practice statesmanship.

The foregoing newspaper item does not require any elaboration. Our colleague has left nothing to the imagination.

HIS RECORD OF 33 YEARS

It comes to few men to serve their country for the long period of 33 years, and many of those years Judge SUMNERS has spent as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. The cause of constitutional government will lose its leader in the House of Representatives. The enemies of constitutional government will rejoice with the retirement of our friend. I am talking now about those people who render lip service to this Republic and who then do what they can to wreck it in the interests of the Communistic pattern of government. Those who believe in our form of government will do well to hold high the ideals of our neighbor and our friend, Judge SUMNERS.

Aboriginal Rights of Alaska Natives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House a bill to extinguish Indian title to lands in

Alaska. This bill, or at least some bill designed to accomplish the same purpose, is necessary if the native people of Alaska are to receive justice and if the uncertainties and confusion which came into being with the filing of the Indian claims are to be cleared away.

The Tlingit and Haida Tribes of southeastern Alaska made claim to 3,390,000 acres. By administrative determination the Secretary of the Interior in July 1945, held that 267,120 acres or about 8 percent of the total acreage claimed and located adjacent to native villages, was recognized as having been aboriginally occupied, and therefore, the natives of Hydaburg, Klawock, and Kake were entitled to exclusive possession of this land. By modification of the decision dated January 11, 1946, an additional 800 acres was held to be within the scope of aboriginal occupancy. No departmental decision has yet been reached with respect to an additional claim of 2,008,000 acres on Kuiu Island.

There is a general feeling throughout Alaska, and especially southeastern Alaska, that settlement once and for all of these claims by Congress is an absolute necessity if economic development is to proceed in an orderly manner.

If the Indian people of southeastern Alaska are entitled to these lands under the settled theory of aboriginal occupancy, as has been stated by the Secretary of the Interior, then it would appear incumbent upon this Congress to extinguish the Indian title and to make payment in a manner and in a sum to be determined hereafter. Such extinguishment would serve two purposes: First, it would allow the people of the Tlingit and Haida Tribes to recover what is rightfully due them for not having had possession of the lands in the years past; second, it would remove existing doubts as to ownership of lands, doubts that can only serve to impede development.

I firmly believe the almost universal desire is to settle this matter once and for all by extinguishing title. Certainly it may be stated without reservation that the white population of southeastern Alaska desires settlement of this kind. Many officials in Alaska, both Federal and Territorial, have expressed a belief that a proper solution can only be arrived at in this manner. My understanding is that the Department of the Interior itself is not only willing, but is anxious for consideration of the type of bill introduced by me.

And perhaps most important of all, the people most concerned—the native people of southeastern Alaska—share in this view. They have gone on record officially through their own organization, the Alaska Native Brotherhood, as endorsing this legislation. Even more specifically, the bill as introduced is in the form suggested by the Alaska Native Brotherhood.

My good friend, Roy Peratrovich, who retired last November after serving ably as president of the Alaska Native Brotherhood for 5 years, is for legislation of the kind suggested here, and I am informed that the present officers and the overwhelming majority of the membership of the Alaska Native Brotherhood likewise believe this is the most sensible and practical solution.

If settlement is made the Indian people will have funds to provide the improved housing, the improved sanitation and all the other things they so urgently need. The process of adjustment to an industrialized civilization has not been easy for them; in fact, it has been tremendously difficult and the wonder of it is that they have come through as well as they have. With intelligent assistance it will be possible for them to better their economic lot, raise their standard of living, and move forward along the road which, for them, has had so many obstacles.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel:

POSTAL PAY IS INADEQUATE

It is an ironical situation that the national administration, which has professed so much concern for improved wage standards in private industry, remains indifferent to the shockingly inadequate wage standards of Federal postal employees.

The Nation's postal workers are still the most poorly paid group in America, despite the paltry increase given them last July by the Salary Reclassification Act which became effective at that time.

That was the first pay increase they received in 20 years.

Even so, it added only $400 a year to the pay of the individual postal worker which was largely nullified by the increased withholding tax and retirement deductions.

In fact, the only actual increase in take-home pay for the postal worker after his increase in wages was gained from overtime for Saturday work—and he is now deprived of that.

The actual situation with respect to the Nation's thousands of postal workers now—and they constitute one of the most indispensable groups in our national life—is that they are compelled to maintain their homes and families on even less pay proportionately than before the skimpy gesture made by Congress last year.

There has been some recognition of this situation in Congress, Representative BURCH, of Virginia, and Senator MEAD, of New York, having introduced a bill which, if passed, will provide an additional temporary increase of $300 annually.

But why is the proposed new increase temporary?

And why is it such a niggardly sum?

Surely the postal workers of the Nation who perform such a vital service for the country are entitled to adequate pay on a permanent basis.

Indeed, in view of the higher costs of living which now prevail, an annual increase of $500 would be little enough.

It would not put postal workers on a level with even the lowest-paid workers in private industry.

But it would enable them to conduct their homes and raise their families a little closer to the American standard of living than has been possible in the last quarter century.

If the American people as a whole have been under the illusion that the increased postal pay voted by Congress last year entirely discharged the national obligation to these vital workers, they should face some facts.

The joint conference of affiliated postal employees provides some of the pertinent facts.

A married mail handler in the senior grade, with 20 years of service, now has a total take-home pay of $33.64 per week.

A newly appointed married man and war veteran in that same post takes home only $29.10 a week, and if he is single he takes home only $27.27.

Do you think that is adequate pay for a type of public service that means so much to every individual citizen and every business institution in America?

Congress should promptly pass an adequate salary readjustment bill in the interest of postal workers.

The Rosenman Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Congressmen tell me that it is called the Rosenman technique. I do not quite know why. Looking at a photograph of the ubiquitous Sam the Rose in Miami, sunning himself in the leisure of the elite who govern us, I should not have imagined that rushing is his forte.

Yet, I am assured by Members of Congress—Republicans, I must admit—that the device—like so many Presidential speeches—originated in his mind and that Roosevelt used it with the skill of a cormorant, but Truman with the shamblings of the proverbial Missouri mule.

So many accusations and glorifications are hurled at our ruling class that no one can be sure, but I record this one for its historical value.

The technique may be written up as a work study as follows: The Executive—that is, the Office of the President, all the advisers and Executive secretaries included—fill a basket with bills, acts, proposals, speeches, radio broadcasts and other ejaculations and throw them at the Congress, loading that body down so that everybody has too much work to do, hearings are inadequate and no one can study the subject thoroughly or even read the reports of the hearings.

Bills log up so that there is a squabble over the right-of-way.

The country shifts its angry glare from an alibi-manufacturing, error-making, one-foot-tripping-over-the-other Presidency to a Congress that is bogged down by Presidential messages, "musts," proddings, needlings, untruthful speeches concerning congressional ineptitude. And the Nation continues to suffer from inflation and lack of productivity, both in no small measure due to the confusions created by this process.

This technique has been at work these many years. In fact, it operates so success-

fully that vaudevillians turned politicians, night club waiters turned philosophers, sports writers turned Aristotles, when they have nothing better to aggravate their intelligences, let out at the incompetence of Congress, never realizing that that body suffers from the viciousness of an irresponsible Executive deliberately fomenting excessive and humorously devised legislation with fancy slogans and false titles, but always with the objective of keeping Congress in a jam.

As long as Congress seems queer, no one quite notices the absurdities of the Executive.

That is one reason why the American people find themselves stuck with the Yalta secret agreements and why we suddenly discover that we have a ratified treaty granting UNO extraterritoriality in our country.

When these Republican legislators told me that Sam Rosenman was the author of this pixie, I would not believe them. It is the sort of thing that a man with a thin and hungry look might cogitate and propound.

No rotund, round-faced personality, whose cherubic expression denotes an adoration of the higher gustative emotions, could have devised so vile yet workable a scheme.

For mind you, and I say it in self-defense, men of poundage usually produce happy plans of perfection. Vide: Henry VIII or Caligula.

Now Congress cannot pass legislation as speedily as the Presidential Secretariat can write a message or a speech. As one who once earned part of his living as a ghost for unintelligent great men, I am sure that some recent Presidential documents could have been turned out blindfolded in under an hour.

And no professional would have produced so poorly. Yet, these articulations invoke legislation on economic and social problems of such historical magnitude as the wage-and-price structures, the relationship of profits to the total economy of the Nation, determining whether this country shall remain capitalistic or become socialistic by the remote and overlarded subterfuge of destroying private enterprise by taxation, the elimination of opportunity for small business, and production for use at a loss, together with Government loans to new and unwarranted enterprises created to compete with existing and competently managed private enterprises.

These problems involve the most thorough study and analysis, but they are dumped on Congress by an Executive who now goes about the country wailing that nobody passes the laws he asks for.

That, too, is part of what these legislators call the Rosenman technique. That man will go down in history if he really is all they say he is.

Information, Please?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit to my colleagues a timely editorial from the Glenville Democrat, published in Glenville, W. Va. I direct the attention particularly of the majority side of the House because the editor, Mr. C. W. Marsh, is a Democrat, a former State senator, for many years chairman of the Gilmer County Democratic Executive Committee, and was a captain in the World War. This is a thought-provoking editorial, reflects what the people are thinking, and is of special interest at this time when the OPA and the housing bill are up for discussion.

The editorial follows:

INFORMATION, PLEASE?

At the outbreak of the late war the world was amazed at the rapidity which attended the transformation of the United States at peace to the United States at war. Almost overnight airplanes took the place of automobiles and tractors on the assembly lines; where refrigerators, sweepers, and radios were manufactured, guns, shells, and detonators began to stream in an endless line. Our great shipbuilding industry hit its stride as if by magic and in a few months one to three ships were sliding down the ways every 24 hours—battle wagons, cargo carriers, transports, and landing craft to the utter confusion of those who sought to enslave the world in the belief that democracy would not work. Even Hitler and Goering were struck dumb by surprise at the amount of supplies and war-making equipment that was being dispatched to England and Russia and piling up at strategic points in other friendly countries.

All of which gives rise to the $64 question: If the conversion of American industry from a normal peacetime basis to a wartime footing was accomplished in such a short time and on such a gigantic scale, why does it take so long, so very long, to reconvert our industry back to its original status?

With the coming of May 14 the war will have been ended for a whole year. Can one buy a shirt? No. Can one purchase a suit of clothes? No. Can one buy sugar and coffee and butter? Can one purchase an automobile, a tractor, a radio, a refrigerator, a sweeper, a smoothing iron, a flashlight?

Can our farmers buy reapers and harvesters and mowers, hay rakes and hay forks, plows and corn planters? Can a farmer, or anybody else for that matter, buy boards to build a house? Can he buy nails, doors, windows? Can the womenfolk purchase nylon stockings? Yes. They can buy one or two pairs every 7 days between the hours of 10 and 11 o'clock, under police protection, provided they care to stand in line from 1 to 4 hours and run the risk of being told that the last pair was just sold—sold the minute they entered the door.

Who is responsible for this bottleneck, this jam, this confusion, this chaos that holds the country in its grip from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from "fifty-four, forty or fight" to the Gulf of Mexico? With millions idle and everybody clamoring for motor vehicles, hardware, building materials, farm equipment, clothing, furniture, and household appliances, who or what is holding back reconversion?

England is well over the hump and on her way to full employment and prosperity. Russia has announced another 5-year plan on a gigantic scale and France is snapping into the big problem of rebuilding her destroyed cities and her ruined industry. Poland, Holland, Belgium, and Norway are hitting a good healthful stride. And how about us? We seem only to be wallowing in a "slough of despond," with some new makeshift sprung upon the country every morning only to be scrapped for something else before the sun goes down.

It must be patent to everyone that somewhere something must be basically wrong, things are not clicking as they should. Personally, we believe that a two-fisted man of the type of Grover Cleveland would long since have found the means of bringing order out of chaos; we believe that Theodore Roosevelt, the wielder of the "big stick," would have found a remedy for our present ills; we believe the suave and diplomatic Wilson would have gone straight to the heart of this muddled situation and cleared away the deadwood and the debris. All the country is asking is a chance to unlimber. Why doesn't it get it?

Take the case.

New Year Forecast: The Take-Home Pay For Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Washington News, Columnist Peter Edson had the following article:

NEW YEAR FORECAST

(By Peter Edson)

First prediction that it will be necessary to ask Congress to continue OPA price controls and stabilization authority beyond June 30, 1946, is made by John W. Snyder, assistant president and director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Snyder tucked this pleasant little New Year tid-bit way down in the toe of a Christmas sock he sent up to the Senate Small Business Committee just before Congress adjourned. In the preholiday rush it was generally overlooked.

"A feeling has grown up in the country," said Snyder in his report, "that price stabilization will soon be repealed and that regardless of whether it is or not, prices will be forced upward. As we approach the date at present set for its expiration, June 30, 1946, compliance will be more and more difficult to obtain and the inventory scrambles, competitive and withholding of goods will increase.

"All these things would serve to increase the inflationary pressures at a time when production was still not able to cope with demand," Snyder continues. "We can avoid this if the controls are removed singly, as events dictate, instead of all at one time without due consideration for the supply-demand picture."

In building up his argument to this conclusion, Snyder makes a pretty complete analysis of the pressures for higher prices at work today.

1. The rise in stock-market prices is based on expectation that all prices are going to rise.

2. Manufacturers and distributors are holding on to goods in expectation of higher prices.

3. Stocks of goods are being bought up on speculation that they can be resold at higher prices. This simply reduces the supply on the market and increases the demand.

4. Purchasing agents report they must put escape clauses in orders for future delivery, to allow for possible price increases

5. Some contractors are insisting on price cushions to cover possible increased costs of materials.

6. Housing cannot begin to match demand for perhaps 2 years, this being one of the areas in which the inflationary threat is most serious.

7. Savings of individuals are reported at $150,000,000,000—an average of over $1,000 per capita. This unspent money, plus the buying power of millions of discharged veterans, encourages higher prices.

8. Retail store purchases are 10 percent heavier than a year ago, and that tends to keep prices up.

9. In this heavy buying demand the supply of consumers' goods will continue short well beyond the June 30 OPA deadline. That makes price control necessary for a longer time, says Snyder.

10. Food is almost the only important consumer item in which we can foresee an early likelihood of supply balancing demand.

With 9 out of 10 cards thus stacked in favor of inflation, any sudden removal of controls would be disastrous, according to the Government economists. High volume of production is the key to reducing the danger of inflation, Snyder admits. He says the Government strategy is to aid full production of scarce items through priorities, set-aside orders, and price ceilings, until production gets ahead of demand.

One of the pet arguments of OPA's opponents is that if all price ceilings were removed, production would soar. That might be true, but prices would also soar. There might be a boom. But as soon as production caught up with demand, the bottom might well fall out of the market, to make a bust.

The big new year forecast in all this is that everything will probably cost a little more in 1946. Remove OPA price controls one at a time and the shock will be cushioned. Remove controls all in a bunch and everything will cost a lot more in a hurry.

After reading this item one forms some interesting conclusions. Mr. Emil Schram, boss of Wall Street, had a salary raise of $50,000 to $100,000 per year. This, however, was not deemed inflationary I suppose because the rise in stock prices is based on the expectation that all prices are going to rise. According to No. 10 of Mr. Edson's list, food is almost the only important consumer item in which we can foresee an early likelihood of supply balancing demand. Can this really be true?

In addition, the United States Department of Agriculture in recent reports states "food prices are going down"; "farm income is to be reduced by 15 percent"; "net farm income is to be $3,000,000 less in 1946 than it was in 1945." If the prices of all the things the farmer buys is going to increase and if the spokesman for the President of the present administration advocates an increase in the things the farmers buy, how in the name of common sense can he tell the farmer to take a cut of 15 percent? I wish that someone with all the answers would really answer this question.

One fact is apparent—the USDA has the billions of dollars in the Commodity Credit Corporation with which to carry on the price juggling and provide one producer with 130 percent of parity price and another producer with a 60 to 70 percent of parity floor price. They can manipulate these farm prices—there is no argument about it. I think, however, that someone will sometime call the Department of Agriculture's attention to the fact that they are not a law unto themselves and they had better; first, pay closer attention to their commitments to the farmers; second, they are not to take a 15 percent price reduction at the hands of the price jugglers while their fellow price jugglers are encouraging other groups to cause the farmers to pay more for what he buys without at least some commitment.

The OPA will be weakened or its effectiveness reduced before the people are ready for the change and there is no one that will be as much to blame as the OPA and its handmaiden the USDA so far as food is concerned.

It is to be regretted that a member of the President's Cabinet should be so unmindful of his responsibilities that he tries to make political issues of economic problems.

We must remember that in 1944, according to Mr. William Clayton's testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, we imported $1,800,000,000 in agricultural products and exported $2,000,000,000 in agricultural products. But, the imports in dollars are figured on the price at the point of origin and the exports are figured on the declared value in the United States. Lend-lease shipments were 75 percent of the total exports and was added to the exports. The reverse lend-lease was not added to the imports though. Why?

Take butter, for example. In 1942 20,081,000 pounds of butter were imported for a total of $3,250,000, or figured at less than 17 cents per pound. At that time, from March 11, 1942 to January 1, 1943, 17,647,000 pounds were exported and showed $6,885,000 in exports, but this exported butter was figured at 41 cents per pound. In other words we could import twice as much butter in pounds as we exported and still show a favorable dollar trade balance.

Regardless of all the propaganda about producing one-third more food than in some drought or low-price period, it is a question as to whether or not we really did not import more pounds, bushels, and tons of agricultural products in 1944 than were exported in 1944.

A Letter From the Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a deceased former sailor in the United States Navy which appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal:

A LETTER FROM THE DEAD—"I FOUGHT FOR YOU, MOM, DAD"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is a letter from the dead. Written to his parents by an Akron boy who was killed aboard the torpedoed U. S. S. *Houston* in February of 1942, the letter tells simply why he fought and died. Seaman Dick Boorom, 22, asked that the letter be delivered to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Boorom, 2164 16th Street SW., Kenmore district, after all hope that he might be found alive, was gone. The former Kenmore high school football player's letter, written 28 days before the torpedo struck, was received last week, after he was officially declared killed. It will be read at memorial services for him Sunday morning at the South Main Street Methodist Church, where he was a member.)

FEBRUARY 1, 1942.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: It has taken me a long time to sit down and write this letter to you. I have been fumbling with the pencil for several days now, and I do not seem to be able to get started. Not that I have nothing to say, but on the contrary I have so much to say that I do not know where to begin.

For a long time since I have been out here I have been comparatively safe from danger, but lately the spots have become tighter and tighter. One by one smiling faces that I have lived with are gone. But I do not expect to die; none of the boys expects to die. We are all hoping on luck. If mine holds out, you will not receive this letter.

I am deeply alert to what I am fighting for, not so much the cold terms of freedom and democracy which are used so carelessly by people but something deeper and dearer to me than that. Perhaps you expect me to say, Mom dear, my own life. No, it is not that. It is the protection of you and all those whom I love; that is my reason for fighting, and I feel that is the greatest reason in the world. I would rather die a thousand times than to see you suffer the torture that has been inflicted upon the poor souls who have been so unlucky as to fall into the hands of the enemy.

I know that I have one thing for which to be grateful and that is that you are safe from harm, and our home near Kenmore High School where I spent 4 happy years will be safe from harm. Our home will stand in peace when this is all over. I thank you, Mom and Dad, for all of the wonderful things that you have given me; for your kind patience in guiding me to manhood; for the character that you have instilled in me which at this hour of danger gives me courage. I thank you for the great sacrifices that you have made all your life for me. I regret that I will be unable to repay you.

I know that I will be at peace in heaven for my soul is clean and my conscience is clear. I love you, Mom and Dad. You are the greatest and dearest persons in the whole world.

Farewell.

Your loving son,

DICK.

Editorial Favoring Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial that appeared in the Marshall News Messenger, March 7, 1946. It is self-explanatory:

IT ADDS UP TO NOTHING

The GI housing bill may not be the best thing of its kind possible, but it has the merit of at least offering something, instead of offering nothing, by way of solving the country's housing problem.

The special interests which are fighting it tooth and nail so far have offered nothing by way of a substitute except, "Take the bridle off and let 'er buck!"

But because the opposition is organized and represented by strong lobbies which get immediately in the hair of the legislators, and because the homeless are not organized and not doing anything in particular to let their wishes be known, the chance that anything of measurable value will come out of the present legislative muddle seems very remote.

Meantime the house-building situation becomes steadily worse. Values are going beyond all reason. Mister, when five- or six-room houses sell for ten to fifteen thousand dollars, as they are selling in many commu-

nities, the end result can't be anything but bad—bad for the individuals who buy them, bad for the community, bad for whatever agency helps finance the purchase. The end result will be worse than the great bust of 1929.

The pending Patman bill, as noted, may not be the best piece of legislation in the world, but it does come to grips with a problem that is the gravest that confronts this Nation today.

Those who are fighting it will be answerable for its defeat or its gutting by amendments. They will be responsible for any failure that may develop through inaction.

A Congress that is on the verge of another election isn't the bravest and boldest group of men in the world. It is susceptible to pressures, and if the pressure happens to be one-sided, as in the present instance, you don't get an answer to a problem. You get a goose egg.

The GI's are not a pressure group, and they have no desire to be. But as individuals confronted with a problem they can use the mails and the wires to make their wishes known to Congress. They should do so by all means.

The Trip to Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem in memory and honor of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

THE TRIP TO YALTA

Roosevelt told his people
He was headed for the Rhine;
To cross the Great Atlantic
In a big B-29.

"I have a date with Hitler
Because he's done us wrong;
He will be brought to justice—
His triumph won't be long.

"God and our Congress
Have decreed that he must die,
For the way he's treated people
And caused the world to cry.

"Thanks to Adolf Hitler
Ten million martyrs lie
Concealed in sod, at home with God,
'Too young, too brave to die.'"

Franklin talked with Winston;
He talked with Josef too;
They made a plan to kill the man
That everybody knew.

Franklin told the Army
To double "on the run"
For when the smoke is cleared away
Old Hitler will be done.

The job is almost finished;
The war is almost won,
Because old "Patton's" on the job,
And he's our favorite son.

Franklin had a message
From our Lord on high:
"Come home to me in heaven:
And don't you ever sigh."

"You are a master leader
And know just what to do;
I have a higher office—
A newer job for you."

"Harry will take over
As new high command
Because he has new orders
From the Promised Land."

I tell you now, my brothers,
That "right" will always win,
For God, in His great judgment,
Will vanquish war and sin.

USSR Note on Bulgarian Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the Soviet note to the United States regarding the Government of Bulgaria, as carried in the Washington Evening Star of March 9, 1946, together with the identifying explanation by the Associated Press:

LONDON, March 9.—The text of the Soviet note to the United States on the Bulgarian Government, as broadcast by the Moscow radio and recorded here by the Soviet monitor, follows:

"The following statement has been issued by the Peoples' Commissariat of USSR for Foreign Affairs:

"'On February 27, the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs received a note from the American Embassy in Moscow notifying it that on February 22 the State Department presented General Stoichev, the Bulgarian representative in Washington, a memorandum setting forth the American Government's position as regards fulfillment of the decisions of the three ministers conference in Moscow concerning Bulgaria.

"'This memorandum stated that in view of the misunderstanding evidently existing in certain circles in Bulgaria as regards the United States Government's position on the decision reached concerning Bulgaria at the three ministers' conference in Moscow last December, the United States Government wished to have brought to the notice of the Bulgarian Government a statement of its views on these matters which it was communicating to the Soviet and British Governments.

"'INTERPRETATION NOTED

"'The Government of the United States, this statement said, interpreted the Moscow decision to mean that the Bulgarian Government and opposition should be asked to find a mutually acceptable basis for the participation in the Bulgarian Government of two members who would really represent the opposing parties.

"'The United States Government,' the statement went on, 'had never understood this to mean that pressure would be brought to bear on the opposition to put forward two candidates for inclusion in the Government pro forma, regardless of the condition of their joining it.

"'While the Moscow agreement had not specified any conditions for the inclusion of the two opposition representatives, it had provided, in the opinion of the United States Government, that the participation of such representatives should be made on condition mutually acceptable both to the Bulgarian Government and to the opposition.

"'It has been and will still be the sincere hope of the United States Government,' the statement said, 'that, meeting in an atmosphere of mutual conciliation, the representatives of the Bulgarian and opposition would be able to reach agreement and in fact would reach agreement to work together on mutually acceptable basis which would enable two members of the opposition parties really representing these parties to join the government.'"

SOVIET SENDS REPLY

"Novikov, the Soviet chargé d'affaires in the United States, presented to the State Department the Soviet reply note, the text of which now follows:

"'In connection with the memorandum presented by the State Department to the Bulgarian political representative in the United States on February 22, this note says, the Soviet Government has instructed me to communicate the following:

"'The memorandum states that the Moscow agreement provided that the participation of the two opposition representatives should be based on conditions mutually acceptable both to the Bulgarian Government and the opposition.

"'Actually, the decision of the three-minister conference in Moscow in December 1945 stipulated only two conditions. These conditions were that the two representatives of democratic groups to be included additionally in the Bulgarian Government should:

"'A. Really represent the groups of parties not participating in the Government; and

"'B. Really be suitable and work loyally with the Government.

"'No other conditions were stipulated in the Moscow conference decision on Bulgaria.'"

RUSSIAN STATEMENT

"'In view of the above the Soviet Government finds it necessary to state the following:

"'1. The statement made by the United States Government to the Bulgarian Government on February 22 does not conform to the decision reached in Moscow on Bulgaria, since the Moscow Conference decision says nothing about the opposition representative joining the Bulgarian Government on the basis of any 'mutually acceptable condition.'

"'2. The statement made by the United States Government infringes the Moscow decision of the three ministers inasmuch as this statement put forward a new condition for participation of opposition representatives in the Bulgarian Government, a condition not provided in that decision.

"'3. The Soviet Government has before now drawn the attention of the United States Government to the fact that the United States representative in Bulgaria, Mr. Barnes, has systematically instigated the Bulgarian opposition not to act in accordance with the three-minister decision, but to put forward new conditions for joining the Bulgarian Government, conditions not provided for by the Moscow Conference. The statement made by the United States Government to the Bulgarian Government February 22 is actuated by the same purpose as Mr. Barnes' action and is only calculated to encourage the representatives of the Bulgarian opposition to resist the decision of the three-minister conference.'"

BULGARIA INFORMED

"'Thus, far from taking steps to further fulfillment of the decision reached by the Moscow Conference of the three ministers, the Government of the United States by this statement of February 22 impels the opposition to sabotage the decision taken at the Moscow Conference with a United States representative participating.

"'In fact, also to be noticed is that the United States Government made the statement unilaterally, without any attempt at preliminary coordination of this step with the other governments concerned which had been a party to the decision concerning Bulgaria.

" 'The Soviet Government notifies the Government of the United States that it had thought it necessary to inform the Government of Bulgaria of its present statement inasmuch as the United States Government statement of February 22 was brought to the notice of the Bulgarian Government.' "

Judge Edmund K. Jarecki's Plea for the Mentally Ill Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Judge Edmund K. Jarecki of the county court of Chicago, which has supervision over psychiatric cases in the greater Chicago area, stated several months ago that more than 25 percent of the cases in the psychiatric hospital are those of servicemen and women. He assumes that when complete demobilization takes place approximately 50 percent of the cases in that hospital will be men and women who participated in World War II.

For more than a year Judge Jarecki has been endeavoring to secure adequate hospital facilities for mentally sick veterans in the Chicago area. He has appealed to the Veterans' Administration and to the War and Navy Departments in an effort to arrange the necessary facilities which will permit his court to render the highest degree of service to veterans and their families. Up to date he has not had any considerable measure of success. The Cook County district which is served by the county court of Cook County has a population in round numbers of 4,000,000.

The points that Judge Jarecki has been trying to emphasize for more than a year are set forth in an article appearing in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald, stressing the lack of psychiatrists in the United States and the urgency of immediate action by the Veterans' Administration.

The article follows:

LACK OF PSYCHIATRISTS IN UNITED STATES IS DESCRIBED AS FRIGHTENING—SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE TOLD "CONSIDERABLE BLOCK" OF POPULATION IS MENTALLY ILL

(By Edwin Neff)

A Navy captain yesterday told a Senate subcommittee that a "considerable block of America's civil population does not enjoy mental health," while both Army and top civilian psychiatrists disclosed a "frightening" lack of trained psychiatrists everywhere.

Shortly after Gen. Lewis B. Hershey had testified that more men were rejected by Selective Service for mental disorders than for any other single cause, Capt. Francis Braceland, head of the Navy's neuropsychiatric division, stressed that mental disease is not only a service problem but a national problem.

FACILITIES LACKING

Captain Braceland said psychiatrists have long known that mental disease in America is far more common than the means to treat it, but that it took a war to wake the general population.

Every witness who testified yesterday backed up Captain Braceland's general thesis. All, except one, supported the Pepper bill, under study by the subcommittee, which would set up and finance a national neuropsychiatric institute here to coordinate and promote training for psychiatrists throughout the country.

Dr. Lawrence Kubie, psychiatric consultant to the office of scientific research and development, objected to the Pepper measure mainly because he believed it inadequate. "Like shooting at rocket bombs with a pea-shooter," he said.

Captain Braceland said that while mental disorders are common among civilians, they do not show up as quickly as in the armed services. A civilian who does not like his job can change it, he explained, while a serviceman often cannot.

As an example of what one State discovered when it began to investigate mental illness, a Cleveland minister, Dr. D. R. Sharpe, said some of Ohio's mental hospitals are like "concentration camps."

JAILS OVERLOADED

But even so, he said, people will wait 4 or 5 hours in taxis for treatment and county jails in Ohio are "just filled with persons suffering mental disease, because there is no place else for them to go."

Dr. Sharpe, who is chairman of the Ohio Mental Hygiene Association, said his State could raise the money for new mental hospitals, but had learned no amount of money could buy enough trained psychiatrists, "because there just are not enough to go around."

HANDICAPS DESCRIBED

Brig. Gen. William Menninger, director of the Menninger clinic in Topeka, Kans., and head of the Army's neuropsychiatric division, said 39 percent of the men discharged for physical reasons by the Army were psychopathic. He admitted the mental disease probably was bigger than anticipated by the Army, and that trained psychiatrists were recruited "too few and too late."

He described the lack of psychiatric personel as "the greatest handicap to medical services throughout the war," and urged that psychiatry be taught in medical schools as regularly as chemistry and zoology.

Phillip Murray, CIO head, and Dr. Martha Eliot, assistant chief, Children's Bureau, are to testify today before the subcommittee.

Forest Products Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dean Paul M. Dunn, dean of the School of Forestry, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg., from the Timber Operator of December 22, 1945:

FOREST PRODUCTS RESEARCH

(By Dean Paul M. Dunn, School of Forestry, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.)

There are two major groups of forest products: Those which are made directly by physical break-downs in the forest or at adjacent mills, such as ties, pulpwood, poles, piling, lumber, etc., and those which are of a derived nature and are chemical in character. Oregon has been interested in the physical operation since settlement as logging and lumbering have been major industries in respect to State economy. But we are relatively unacquainted with the cellulose forestry.

The forestry industry is a major one in Oregon, contributing normally more than 60 percent of the total economy. The 1943 income from forest products is estimated to be approximately $300,000,000. This involves the cut and partial manufacture of about 8,500,000,000 board feet of logs or timber. We have in the State about 25 percent of the Nation's timber supply and are producing about 20 percent of all the lumber and other forest products. That is somethong to be proud of, but the question is whether we can keep it up.

We talk a lot about sustained-yield management of our forests. That is a fine philosophy and implies that we will not harvest any more than we grow or produce in a given period. At the present rate of cutting, this means that we must prepare for a reduced production; unless we put all the potential forest acreage into a state of satisfactory timber growth (meaning full protection from fire, insects and diseases, and complete restocking of barren areas with young growth.)

ONE-THIRD OF TREE USED

A major factor in this situation is the method of utilization. At present we market or use approximately only 35 percent of the tree. The balance is left as forest waste in the woods or as sawmill waste at the mills. A fuller utilization of the tree would go a long way toward easing the problem of timber cut in the future. However, we must change many of our present practices and accept several new ways of logging, sawmilling, and manufacturing, and include research.

Let us not get the idea that the wood chemist or the researcher is going to save the industry alone. The forester, the logger, and the sawmill man must all practice forestry, good logging practices, and complete utilization. Here is one example: A study area was logged under ordinary current methods and was then relogged. Forty-five thousand board feet of Douglas fir logs were removed from a sample plot of 3½ acres. This averages about 16,000 feet per acre. Material was only taken down to a 9-inch diameter and 10 feet in length. In addition, there is considerable small hemlock and fir on the area suitable for pulpwood. This type of utilization will necessitate the use of different equipment, both for the logging and the milling operations, but the mechanics are feasible. Before long, I believe that we will see a rather widespread use of relogging method and also prelogging. Portable milling units will be taken to the woods. It has been suggested that portable hogs or chippers may be operated at the landings. All of this will save considerable transportation of unusable material.

The tree-farm operator can get into the new scheme by giving high-grade protection to his areas and insuring reproduction on his cut-over lands by leaving seed trees or planting young trees. The millman, by improving methods of manufacture and remanufacture, can find a use for much of the material which formerly traveled to the burner.

RESEARCH STARTING

However, there is no question that with the interest in wood chemistry and the many mechanical and chemical developments that wood is really the chemical engineering raw material. The forest laboratories will point the way to many ingenious ways of fabricating commercial products from wood fiber. In many instances the raw material which will be used is not that which is being used today, but will be forest waste or sawmill waste. Several surveys have shown that there are thousands of tons of available waste wood in certain parts of Oregon, both at the mills and in the woods. By waste I would like to make

it clear that I refer to material which at the present is not economically usable.

Forest products research will aid greatly in pointing the way to commercial use of the present-day wastes. While Oregon is relatively unacquainted with chemical utilization practices, there has been some effort by both public and private agencies. The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has been concerned with fundamental research in wood products for more than 30 years. The Western Pine Association, with its laboratory in Portland, has been functioning for more than 10 years. The Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. has a development laboratory at Longview. The Douglas Fir Plywood Association has a research laboratory at Tacoma. The pulp and paper industry is sponsoring a 5-year study at the University of Washington relating to the solution of the waste sulphite liquor problem.

In general, wood research may be broken down into two major classes: First, improvement in lumber and lumber products; and second, utilization of wastes in the woods and at the mills. The trade associations as a rule are stressing the improvement of lumber quality, such as the West Coast Lumberman's Association with its seasoning, grading, and inspections projects. This group is also interested in the fireproofing of lumber and a study relating to the use of dimetholol urea is expected to increase the hardness of lumber products.

Wood-waste studies have been left largely to public interests, though some private concerns are entering this field of wood research. The general aspects of the whole problem are:

1. Hydrolysis of wood wastes.
2. Distillation of wood.
3. The use of wood sawdust or wood flour.
4. The development of the material for fuel.

STATE INTERESTED

Through the active interest of certain individuals and concerns, Oregon passed a law in 1941 which initiated a State-wide research program dealing chiefly with the waste or unused forest materials. This project, financed by a biennial budget of $25,000, was associated with the State board of forestry and the school of forestry at Oregon State College. The grant was renewed in 1943 and increased in 1945. Considerable progress has been made up to the present time. A definite attempt has been made to avoid duplication of effort and full working relationships have been maintained with the United States Forest Products Laboratory and other public agencies. A certain amount of exploratory work has been necessary, but mainly the projects have been pointed toward the application of research knowledge as it might be associated with present or future industries in Oregon.

This project is operating under the name of the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory on the campus of Oregon State College. An advisory group representing industrial, State, and Federal groups functions as a policy-making body. The West Coast Lumberman's Association, the Willamette Valley Lumbermen's Association, the Western Pine Association, the Oregon Plywood Association, the United States Forest Service, and the School of Forestry are represented, with Governor Snell as chairman and the State forester as secretary.

The program as it has been operating during the past 4½ years has been a cooperative one, attempting to use to the fullest extent the facilities of available personnel and laboratories on the college campus. The departments of wood products, chemistry, chemical engineering, mechanical engineering, and agricultural engineering have all contributed. Graduate students have been used, when available, under the supervision of members of the college staff. The Bonneville Power Administration, the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co., of Eugene, and the Chapman Manufacturing Co., of Corvallis, have made definite contributions in certain studies.

Since effort was pointed toward utilization of the present waste materials, the first projects dealt with possible use of large quantities of sawmill waste. Preliminary surveys indicated that for each 1,000 feet of lumber saved at the mills, a ton or unit of waste accumulated. This material was largely unused in the milling centers outside of Portland, and was made up of sawdust, slabs, edgings, and trims, which in many cases was hogged for possible sale or for the burner. The use of sawdust for making a building plaster or wall covering was considered, and as yet we do not have all of the answers.

The carbonization or destructive distillation of sawdust or hogged wood seems to offer good possibilities. The major product is a fuel for domestic use and also a good prospect for a metallurgical fuel or electro carbon. A pilot plant has been in operation on the campus for approximately 2 years and the results are encouraging. It has been shown that a good grade charcoal can be produced from Douglas-fir sawdust and that a satisfactory briquette can be formed by mixing charcoal with water, and tar from the process as a binder. In computing on the basis of a commercial plant producing 50 tons of charcoal a day, the briquetted charcoal could be placed in Portland at a price of $13 to $14 per ton. This figure does not allow for any return from the gas or the distillate. Preliminary investigations indicate there is considerable value in the tars, much more than first appreciated.

OTHER STUDIES

Other studies receiving attention are the use of Douglas-fir bark for cork and insulating material; the bonding of wood flour or wood fibers into board or sheet materials. One phase of this study has in mind molding cabinets practically all in one operation. The problem of the unused timber species is also of importance. When we consider the 4,000,000,000 feet of hardwood timber and also the vast quantity of lodgepole pine, balsam, firs, junipers, and other varities, we appreciate the amount of this kind of material which is now being used in a very small way. The industrial possibilities in this regard are unlimited.

There is another project which holds promise for Oregon. We have been provided through the aggressive interest of certain lumbermen and the cooperation of the United States Forest Service with the start of an industry which can be of untold value to Oregon, if proper consideration is given to the various aspects of the problem. I refer to the ethyl alcohol plant which is being constructed at Springfield, Oreg. The chance of producing peacetime alcohol, or wood sugar for feeding yeast for livestock and poultry is good. The answer will depend largely on the cost of production, and the use of the byproducts will influence that cost. This one plant will use approximately 200 units of hogged wood daily; producing 1,000–2,000 pounds of wood sugar per unit or ton of wood dry weight which will make about 10,000 gallons of alcohol. The daily accumulation of waste byproducts from this waste wood is 50 tons of lignin, 14 tons of calcium sulphate sludge, and 400,000 gallons of residual liquor containing about 1½ percent sugars.

These byproducts create disposal problems at the moment but also offer challenging opportunities for study and development. Only a meager start has been made on these problems, chiefly due to lack of budget and personnel. Preliminary studies indicate that the lignin offers possibilities for carbonization with use of the material as fuel. The extractives are also very interesting. Lignin should be extremely good for use as an extender in plywood glues, as a conditioner in dusting compounds, as a fertilizer material, and as base in plastics. The other materials are also awaiting study.

Some months ago the Forestry Research Foundation was formed as a nonprofit organization to serve as a connecting link between industry and the laboratory at Corvallis. Funds for project study or income from developments can be deposited for further research. The group is intending to finance the cost of equipment for a 60 foot by 300 foot industrial building which is being planned for the State college campus primarily for wood research.

Considering the picture for Oregon, this No. 1 forest and forest-products-producing State is also the No. 1 waste-producing area. We have more material to work with, both lumber and byproducts. We should be a leader in the attempted solution of the problems connected with complete utilization of our wood material and the forests. Associated industries, the pulp and paper mills, the plywood plants, the sawmills, the loggers and the foresters will all benefit by the development of more ways to use the unused portion of the tree. Forest management, protection, and sustained yield are dependent on the returns from the products of the forest laboratories.

Gerrymander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post, February 16, 1946, indicates one more reason why our large city political manipulators have too much influence in Congress:

GERRYMANDER

The major industrial cities of the country will sustain a severe slash in their congressional representation if the Constitution should be amended to exclude all aliens from the census counts used in apportioning State delegations to the House of Representatives. The census counts now used include all persons save Indians not taxed. And the effect is to give communities such as New York City, Detroit, and Chicago a larger representation in Congress than their voting population or even the numbers of their citizens would warrant. There is much validity to the change in the language of the Constitution which Senator CAPPER of Kansas first urged a quarter century ago and which the Judiciary Committee of the House has now unanimously recommended.

No doubt the rural areas of the country will like the proposal very well indeed. The big cities will understandably resist it. And whatever the logic supporting it, they will be able with some justification to assail it as a form of gerrymandering. Clearly it would entail a transfer of power from town to country. There would be much more merit to Senator CAPPER's proposed amendment, we think, if it went somewhat further and allocated congressional representation on a basis of the number of citizens actually eligible to vote for Members of the House. We have suggested this in the past in connection with the disfranchisement occasioned in some States by poll taxes and other voting qualifications. In point of fact, this would require no constitutional amendment at all; on the contrary, the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution already specifically requires it. It is not impossible, however, that to representatives of the States which so

limit the right to vote, this, too, would seem a form of gerrymandering.

Mr. Speaker, the rural people of America might have some of the social security, minimum wages, and other social legislation if they had proper representation in the Congress.

Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Pearl Harbor investigation was demanded by the Republicans, the Roosevelt haters, the anti-New Dealers, and those who were actually responsible for the delay in our preparedness, who believed they could smear the late President Roosevelt, former Secretary of State, Mr. Hull; former Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson; and the late Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox. That the Republicans serving on the investigating committee actually tried their utmost to make political capital out of the investigation is now recognized by all fair-minded Americans. I feel that an editorial appearing in the March 7 issue of the Chicago Times, which I asked leave to insert, clearly brings home that fact. The editorial is as follows:

PEARL HARBOR—II

When Republican pressure forced Senate Majority Leader ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, to introduce the resolution resulting in the congressional Pearl Harbor inquiry, two individuals were cast as "heavies" for the ensuing drama.

These were Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull.

Mr. Roosevelt, it was charged by such diehard haters as the Chicago Tribune, its associated papers the New York News and the Washington Times-Herald, the Hearst press and various characters such as John T. Flynn, nursing an anti-New Deal hatred, had deliberately coerced Japan into attacking the United States.

Mr. Hull, said these same spokesmen, had given the Japanese an ultimatum, on November 26, 1941, for the sole purpose of provoking the Japanese to war.

These accusations were disproven by the Pearl Harbor hearing.

There is ironic justice in the fact that of all the people "on trial" before the Pearl Harbor committee, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull came through with the least discredit.

That, incidentally, is the only way to phrase the verdict. No one was cleared by the inquiry. In the light of present knowledge it is amazing that no one had the vision to foresee the attack on Hawaii.

But the investigation disclosed that President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull discharged their principal responsibilities with honor, that both of them did everything within their power to prevent war, that nothing in their conduct can reasonably be regarded but as in the best interests of the Nation.

Much to-do was made in prehearing accusations over the fact that Mr. Hull abandoned the modus vivendi formula—a proposition which would have eased the economic sanctions which we had earlier imposed upon Japan—and had substituted a somewhat stiffer proposal. This was called by the Republicans an ultimatum to Japan.

Mr. Hull's own testimony, that of Joseph Clark Grew, 1941 Ambassador to Japan, later Under Secretary of State, and that of former Under Secretary Sumner Welles, made it patently clear that our proposal to Japan was in no sense an "ultimatum."

True, it would have required Japan to recede from the suicidal course upon which she was embarked. But had she accepted it, today she would have been a powerful and prosperous member of the family of nations, instead of a disintegrating wreck. She was offered peace with honor.

Under the terms of the Nine-Power Treaty, of which we were principal instigator as well as a signatory, we were bound to do everything possible to preserve China's political and territorial integrity. When Chiang Kai-shek protested that the "modus vivendi" which we proposed to offer Japan would mean China's defeat and subjugation to Nippon, Mr. Hull had no course which could maintain our pledged word but to act as he did.

Witness after witness was specifically asked whether the President, or any other high official, either civil or military, desired war with Japan or in any way promoted it. Without exception they stated that the opposite was true.

Likewise refuted was the charge that the administration had a secret agreement with Great Britain pledging us to fight if the Japanese attacked British, but not American territory. The Republican Members spent hours in rigorous cross-examination of witnesses trying to prove this point. But the evidence made it clear that no such agreement ever existed.

In the late days of the congressional investigation there was a flurry of excitement over the allegation that the President said to Harry Hopkins, on the night of December 6, when he saw the first 13 points of the famed 14-part message from Japan rejecting our diplomatic proposal, "This means war."

President Roosevelt was not the only person who knew that meant war. So did virtually everyone else who saw it.

The important fact is that he did not know when or where war would strike. Had he known that and concealed his knowledge, Franklin D. Roosevelt would stand condemned. But not one word of the 10,000,000 appearing in evidence before the investigators supports that charge.

The Martin Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Christian Century magazine of March 6, 1946:

PRESIDENT TRIES TO BLOCK MARTIN RESOLUTION

A remarkably revealing thing happened at the White House one day last week. It was the day that Chairman MAY, of the House Military Affairs Committee, announced that hearings on the administration's bill to impose a peacetime draft had been closed. Congressman MAY stated, however, that 2 days of additional hearings would be held on the resolution introduced by Representative MARTIN, of Massachusetts, urging the President to initiate negotiations with other nations looking toward the universal abolition of conscription in time of peace. Reporters asserted that sentiment in the House committee was growing increasingly cool toward the draft bill and increasingly in favor of the Martin resolution. At the White House press conference that afternoon, someone asked Mr. Truman what he thought of the Martin proposal. He dismissed it with a brusque comment to the effect that it is impractical. Why impractical? And what's to be lost by feeling out the other nations on it? Some of them might surprise Mr. Truman. Perhaps he doesn't want to be surprised. Perhaps anything seems impractical to him which would weaken the case for putting every American boy into uniform. Or perhaps anything is impractical which emanates from the Republican side of Congress. It is quite true that the Martin proposal, if carried out by Mr. Truman, would be hopelessly handicapped from the start because of the President's attitude. We trust, however, that Mr. MARTIN will continue to press it, but substituting some other American representative in the negotiations. How about Mr. Stettinius, since he is already the American on the UNO Security Council?

How To Combat World Lawlessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. O. BURGIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Peter Lyne from London to the Christian Science Monitor, appearing in the March 7 issue of that paper, and referring to the farewell statement made by Mr. Ed Murrow on Mr. Murrow's return from England to America.

I have followed Mr. Murrow's broadcasts from London during the time he has been chief of the Columbia Broadcasting Co.'s news analysts in Europe, and, in my opinion, his broadcasting has been uniformly fair, impartial, and highly intelligent. Every American should read and ponder Murrow's estimate of the British people.

HOW TO COMBAT WORLD LAWLESSNESS

THE WIDE HORIZON

(By Peter Lyne)

LONDON.—Over the British radio the other night there came a tribute to Britain which warmed this country's heart. It was a tribute from an American who settled in England 9 years ago, doubting Britain's moral fiber and her future. But when this American came to bid farewell on returning to his own country, he said things which made reserved Englishmen by their firesides blush with pride.

He had found an answer to the question: "What has happened to the soul of Britain?" He called the answer conclusive. His name is Ed Murrow, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who shared Britain's ordeals and experiences as thoroughly as any American during the 6 years of war.

What, in his view, is the most important thing that has happened to Britain in these past 6 years? Not physical courage, which became commonplace. Not Dunkerque nor the Battle of Britain nor El Alamein.

No; he believes it more important that Britain chose to win or lose this war under the established rules of parliamentary pro-

cedure. While London was being bombed in daylight, the House of Commons was devoting 2 days to insuring fair treatment for enemy aliens in the Isle of Man. Even though Britain fell, there were to be no concentration camps here.

"Future generations will discover that British armies retreated from many places, but there was no retreat from principles for which your ancestors fought. The record is massive evidence of the flexibility and toughness of the principles you profess."

That was Ed Murrow saying farewell to Britain. Almost at the same time a voice was being raised in the House of Commons questioning whether those long-standing principles are being fought for today by Britain in its world responsibility. The voice was that of Mr. Kenneth Pickthorn, Cambridge University history tutor and Conservative member of Parliament, speaking in recent debate on foreign policy. He questioned whether the Allies are going the right way about getting the world going again. The present emphasis, he said, was on economic reconstruction, which was expected to lead to constitutional and legalistic arrangements righting themselves.

But, in his view, what is wanted first by a lawless, war-torn world is to have a sense of law back again—law which people can predict and perceive—to know what will happen next on the basis of long-established legal practice. Predictability and enforceability are what hopeless millions in Europe want, he contended.

Mr. Pickthorn questions, for instance, what right in law the Allies had to transfer great masses of population. He doubted the wisdom of starting from scratch with new laws instead of trying to pick up the last line of peace and law and continuing from it and trying to improve it. He thought UNO was too intent on scrubbing out and should be concentrating more on picking up the broken threads.

This may sound reactionary. And yet in his farewell message to Britain, Ed Murrow, who is no reactionary, placed this first among British wartime achievements: That "There was no retreat from principles for which your ancestors fought."

Relief for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call attention to the following resolutions adopted by the delegates of the American Relief for Poland at the annual meeting of the eighth circuit of that organization, held at Polish Union Hall in Buffalo, N. Y., on February 24, 1946:

Resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the delegates representing American Relief for Poland in the eighth circuit, in western New York, held at Polish Union Hall in Buffalo, N. Y., on February 24, 1946

Whereas we now have authentic reports of eyewitnesses and various commissions returning from European war zones to the effect that the need for help to Poland is greater than ever, most urgent, and desperate; and

Whereas 7,000,000 children in Poland have been orphaned at a time when 75 percent of the health and child-care centers were destroyed by the most devastating war in history; and

Whereas other millions of bewildered, displaced persons, suffering from hunger and terror, are being conditioned for becoming an easy prey to unscrupulous dictators while the United Nations Organization is discussing conditions essential to enduring peace; and

Whereas by comparison the United States of America is the only country today which can provide adequately the food, medicine, and clothing out of the abundance with which merciful providence so generously blessed our Nation; and

Whereas the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, in his appeal to the people on February 6, 1946, presented a food-saving program, recognizing the fact that starvation and disease can produce serious political repercussions in the unsettled world affairs today; and

Whereas on October 15, 1945, the United States Post Office opened the way for help to Poland by accepting packages of specified size and weight for delivery to individuals in Poland; and

Whereas we mourn today the sudden and untimely passing of Adam Felerski, of Rochester, N. Y., the vice president of the eighth circuit of American Relief to Poland Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we beseech the President, Harry S. Truman, and the Congress of the United States to lend their assistance in speeding up the delivery of food, medicine, and clothing to Poland in sufficient quantities, so as to sustain the lives of the helpless people starving by the thousands. In evidence of our wholehearted support of the President's food-saving program, we accept willingly any food restrictions at home in order to relieve the desperate need abroad; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to do all in his power to provide devastated Poland with supplies and services to the millions of displaced persons, widows, and orphans ravished by war and ruled by terror; and be it further

Resolved, That we, as individuals, assume the responsibility for increasing the number of packages of food and clothing sent to individuals by means of the United States post-office service; and be it

Resolved, That we extend our sincere sympathy to the family of our vice president and fellow worker, the late Adam Felerski, whose faithful service inspires us to greater effort in our work for America and for Poland; and finally be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to our Representatives in Congress, to the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and to the family of the late Adam Felerski.

STANISLAUS E. CZASTER, *President*.

Message to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "Message to America," written by the Most Reverend Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, founder and head of the Catholic Youth Organization, which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 10, 1946:

MESSAGE TO AMERICA

(The case of the world's hungry people has nowhere been stated with such moving eloquence as in the following message by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago. Bishop Sheil is founder and head of the Catholic Youth Organization. After several weeks spent investigating conditions in France, Germany, and Italy, at the request of the President, he speaks from personal knowledge and his message to America is of first importance. On his return early in February, Bishop Sheil described the conditions he observed and the conclusions he had arrived at with respect to the food situation to Eugene Meyer, editor and publisher of the Post. Mr. Meyer asked Bishop Sheil to record his ideas in writing to be published at the appropriate moment. This is the moment.)

(By Bishop Bernard J. Sheil)

In a world like ours, still reeling from the shocks of war and still fearful of the uncertainties of the future, it is often difficult to chart a moral course. But, now and again, issues become so clear that we find one choice forced upon us, despite the clamor of other interests and the pressure of personal desires. Such an issue is before the American people now. It is the issue of food for the world. And the choice is: Shall America feed the world, or shall America be responsible for the death of millions from hunger? This is no melodramatic question posed in feverish emotion, but a brutal query wrung from the lips of suffering people everywhere.

The issue of feeding the hungry cuts through the jungle of political intrigues and conflicting national aims. It is starkly simple. If America does not feed the hungry of the world, the hungry will die.

And if they die, the ideals for which we fought the war will again be imperiled. We said that we battled for freedom and justice, the foundations of democracy and peace. But freedom is a hollow mockery and justice is a macabre joke to men with empty stomachs. Democracy is an idle speculation to men who watch their families die. Peace is a tantalizing mirage to those who do not eat. Where there is the looming specter of hunger, there is no peace. Where there is the menacing shadow of death, there is no security.

We said that we battled for the liberation of the oppressed and for the vanquishment of the oppressors. We have cut the bonds of the shackled and we have brought justice to the defeated. But for what? Have we done this only to watch them all writhe in despair? Have we made titanic efforts only to watch now the world's disintegration by slow starvation?

America has emerged from this war the most powerful nation on earth. But the obligations of such a nation are as great as its power. One of these obligations is to feed the hungry. There is no question that we Americans can do this, without any hurt to ourselves. There is equally no question that unless we do this, we shall be responsible for the death of millions of human beings throughout the world. Unless we do this, we can never again possess that priceless quality, self-respect.

This is our chance for greatness. It is not a time for vengeance. This is a time for a return to Christ's injunction of feeding the hungry, of giving drink to the thirsty. This is the time for us to drink deep at the wellspring of our common life, the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. This is the time for us to listen once more to Christ, "Blessed are the merciful * * *."

We Americans pride ourselves on our belief in the brotherhood of man. In this spirit of brotherhood, Americans will respond most generously to the pleas of the suffering. Americans have never failed in generosity.

and this is their peculiar greatness. We realize that the union of the brotherhood of man has inviolable obligations. And we realize that if we refuse our duty of feeding the hungry, we shall justly merit the repudiation of history. Then, like Cain, the mark of murder will be upon our brow as we cynically ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Gallup Poll on Continuing Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include the recent Gallup poll on the question of continued price control:

HEAVY MAJORITY OF PUBLIC BACKS PRICE CURB AND OPA

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

Although price ceilings and the OPA have been bitterly criticized by many manufacturers, businessmen, and farm groups, their viewpoint does not seem to be shared by the great majority of the people.

In a coast-to-coast survey, more than 200 interviewers gathered the opinions of voters in all economic levels and found that (1) the majority feel the OPA has done a good job, and (2) there is a heavy vote in favor of continuing the Price Control Act.

Rank-and-file Republicans are 2 to 1, Democrats 3 to 1 in favor of extension of the price ceiling law.

The vote is as follows:

"The present price ceiling law ends in June. Do you think the price ceiling law should be continued or should it end in June?"

	Percent
Continued	73
End in June	21
No opinion	6

The country's views on the OPA itself are shown by the responses to the following question:

"What kind of a job do you think the OPA has done?"

The opinions expressed fall into the following general categories:

	Percent
Excellent job	---
Very good	40
Fair, fairly good	40
Poor job	13
No opinion	7

Polls during the war found the voters in favor of continuing wage control as well as price control—a step which some economists feel is essential to prevent full inflation. In short, the public showed itself willing to accept some sacrifice in the way of curbing wage increases, if the Government showed itself determined to maintain price ceilings.

Opinion on the issue was also tested last August, at the end of the war.

It was then found that 74 percent wanted price controls continued and that 62 percent were also willing to have wage ceilings continued.

All major population groups favor continuing the Price Control Act. White-collar workers vote 5-to-1 for extension; professional and businessmen, 3-to-1; manual workers, 3-to-1; and farmers, 2-to-1.

Today's survey had just been completed when Mr. Bowles left the OPA. Among people who could identify Bowles as head of OPA, three out of four liked the way he handled his job.

Hon. Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, Will Not Seek Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I tender herewith to be printed in the RECORD a statement recently made by me with reference to my intention not to be a candidate for reelection.

I would like my colleagues to understand, as I have tried to make clear in this statement, that I have no purpose to retire from active service with reference to the grave problems which confront the country and with which the Congress has to deal. The contrary is true. I hope to be helpful, as a private citizen, in bringing about a better understanding and better cooperation between the people and their representatives in Congress, and to help to bring about a readjustment of governmental power and responsibility between the Federal Government and the States, in line with our constitutional arrangement, and a renewal of the strength of our democracy. Since a democracy is an association of private persons engaged in the common undertaking of governing themselves, by the nature of democratic government, the strength that renews it and sustains it must come up from the people. As a private citizen, sitting in council with other private citizens, what I have learned here might be of value to them, in effectuating that renewal. With the Federal Government limited to Federal business, as I would try to help our people to agree on, the Members of Congress, no longer exhausted and consumed by the details of matters of local concern, would have time to study national and international problems and to give that degree of research and meditation necessary to develop in Congress the high quality of statesmanship which is indispensable if we are to have safe guidance through the perils of these times.

This has not been an easy matter to decide. Thirty-three years develop habits and strong intimate friendships which weigh heavily in such decisions; but after the most careful examination of possibilities I have not been able to discover any way by which I could find the time to maintain myself in an elective office, discharge the duties of chairmanship of an important committee, attend to matters for a populous and aggressive district, plus general duties, and give to these other matters the time which they would require and which, at the moment, hold first place, perhaps, among the things which must be done if we are to have a chance to win through the maze of great difficulties in which we are now involved.

I am not quitting; I am merely shifting my efforts to the place where I feel I can be most useful, where the nerve center is, where the strength and hope of our democracy resides, the place from which our salvation must come if we are to escape the fate of other peoples no longer free.

This is the statement referred to:

It is with a feeling of deep obligation and of gratitude to my own people and to those of the country at large, and with regret, that I announce though not retiring from their service, I will not be a candidate for reelection. Thirty-four years is a long time to be the Representative in one job of a great people. I am grateful. No words can express and no service can demonstrate the gratitude I feel. I am going to do the best I can, though, to demonstrate my appreciation. I am shifting my activity at the end of this session to a place of great need, where it seems to me my experience and training should fit me to be more useful than I can be as a Member of Congress. The private citizenship seem to be awakening to their danger and their duty and power. While my own people have taken care of the politics of our relationship, I have had opportunity to study our system of government, to watch its machinery at work. I have run our Constitution back through its history to its source, and then have followed it back through the centuries of its development, observing what policies of government tend to give it strength and those which weaken its vitality. I have learned as much about our system of government as a person of my capacity could learn, perfectly circumstanced to study it, stimulated by an intense interest, and held by a realization of opportunity and of duty as compelling, I believe, as ever caused any person to dedicate his life to anything.

I have watched what my own generation, under administration of both parties, has been doing to the greatest system of democratic government ever evolved through the processes of the ages. By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people. By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially "busted," great piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free. The people are coming to realize what has happened, Republicans and Democrats; people of all stations and political faiths. But they are yet too much depending upon the Congress.

The powers of the Congress are not what they used to be. Largely because of this concentration, even the policy-fixing and legislative power, the most basic of the essential powers of the Congress, have largely been shifted to the executive agencies and organized minorities. The time of the Congressman is now taken up largely as go-between for his constituents and these agencies, writing innumerable letters about their matters, with little time left for attending to even the most important legislative matters, and almost no time for the duties of statesmanship at a time when our circumstances require of us the highest type of statesmanship ever required, perhaps, of any people. There is practically no opportunity for the Member of Congress to be home and explain legislation and defend his position. Clearly this is the people's job.

The most important basic thing that we now need is to be rid of mythological tales as to the origin of our Constitution and bring it within the comprehension of the average citizen. That can be done but not by that sort of book writer whose claim for genius rests upon his ability to unsimplify things.

Effective at the expiration of the present Congress, I tender my services to the States for whatever they may be worth, should they be willing to make an effort to regain their sovereignty and reestablish their power, strip the Federal Government down to Federal business so that it may be operated under laws enacted by the Congress instead of largely by directives emanating from an appointed, unsupervised personnel, and the unnecessary expense of the Federal and State Governments working at the same job be eliminated; and also tender my services to organizations and groups of private citizens who are willing to lay aside class consciousness, personal, and party considerations, and instead of pointing the finger of accusation at each other, admit each to the other a common responsibility for our condition, recognize a common danger and a common duty to bring to bear our united strength in a determined effort to save our democracy from destruction by ourselves.

Jurisdictional Cannery Workers' Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. Speaker, the jurisdictional cannery workers' dispute which has effectively closed almost all of the canning and processing plants in California still continues. Farmers' crops are spoiling in the fields and no solution for the problem has been found by Federal authorities. The acute seriousness of the situation is probably best explained by the following communication from the Farmers Emergency Committee and that committee's wire to President Truman.

FARMERS EMERGENCY COMMITTEE,
Stockton, Calif., March 6, 1946.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Yesterday in San Francisco, representatives of every farm group growing fruits and vegetables for canning and freezing organized the Farmers Emergency Committee and empowered its executive committee to take such steps as will be necessary to assure California farmers that their crops will be processed at the plants when they are ready for harvest.

Today, farmers of broccoli and cauliflower are experiencing great difficulty in finding processing facilities for these crops. By the time this letter reaches you, harvest of the spinach crop will have begun. At least 50,000 tons of this commodity must be handled by the canners and freezers within the short period of 30 days. About the 1st of April, the asparagus crop will be ready to move into the canneries and freezing plants. Last year, over 2,500,000 cases of asparagus were handled by the processors. The crop this year will equal or exceed this amount and will have a conservative value of $8,000,000 dollars. Following these crops are the apricots, pears, peaches, tomatoes, and other fruits and vegetables, with a collective value of many more millions of dollars. In total, these crops represent over one-third of the entire Nation-wide pack of canned fruits and vegetables.

Alarmed at the lack of progress in settling the jurisdictional dispute between the unions claiming membership among the cannery workers, our farmers are demanding that their interests—heretofore ignored—now be recognized and that they be given the protection to which they are entitled.

A wire, copy of which is enclosed, was sent to the President yesterday asking for his intervention in this matter. Since this affects all of the people not only in California but throughout the Nation, we are sure that you as a Congressman interested in the public welfare will want to do everything in your power to bring about prompt settlement of this vital issue.

You may or may not recall some of the occurrences in past years when labor trouble developed in the California canneries, but these events are fresh in the memories of our farmers. None of them wants or is looking for repetition of these troubles, and they all hope that violence in the present situation may be averted. On the other hand, they are equally determined that their crops shall not be wasted, regardless of what action may be necessary to assure this.

We are counting on you for vigorous action in Washington to assist the President and his aides in bringing about a prompt and effective settlement of this matter which is so important to the general public welfare.

Yours very truly,

GORDON LYONS,
Chairman, Growers Emergency Committee.

MARCH 6, 1946.

Declaring that any loss of food production at a time when the world is starving would be unthinkable, representatives of every farm group growing canning fruits and vegetables yesterday (Tuesday) appealed to President Truman to intervene in the current CIO-A. F. of L. jurisdictional dispute in the canneries.

Twenty-five representatives of every farmer and grower group in California met at the Palace Hotel, San Francisco, organized a Farmers Emergency Committee, named Gordon Lyons, manager of the Asparagus and Beet Growers Association, Stockton, as chairman, and drafted the following telegram to the President:

"Representatives of every farmer and grower group in California, who jointly produce 26,000,000 cases of fruit and 29,000,000 cases of vegetables, which is more than one-third of the total United States production of canned fruits and vegetables, are faced with irreplaceable loss of the year's crops which are grown for processing unless immediate action is forthcoming settling this jurisdictional labor dispute now tying up California fruit- and vegetable-processing plants.

"We have fulfilled our responsibility of producing food necessary not only for our own people but for other countries that sorely need such canned and processed foods. We feel that at a time when millions of people throughout the world are starving it is unthinkable that our Government should permit any loss of food, particularly when we are being called upon in this country to curtail our own consumption so we can share with others.

"We farmers are determined that our crops shall be harvested and processed without violence.

"We feel that the only solution to the problem of assuring continuous and uninterrupted operation of the processing plants without violence is the immediate intervention by the executive branch of our Government.

"We appeal to you in the interests of the public welfare to take immediate steps to avert unwarranted and unnecessary loss of essential food crops.

"GORDON LYONS,
"Chairman, Growers Emergency Committee."

The Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Legislator, delivered by me at the University of Chicago on February 19 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The legislator is an indispensable guardian of our freedom. It is true that great executives have played a powerful role in the development of civilization, but such leaders appear sporadically, by chance. They do not always appear when they are most needed. The great executives have given inspiration and push to the advancement of human society, but it is the legislator who has given stability and continuity to that slow and painful progress.

The legislator may not often give us the inspired leadership which is necessary in the crises of human affairs, but he does institutionalize, in the form of law, those measures which mark the slow lifting of mankind up from the rule of the tooth and the claw. Like the stop on a jack, the legislator may not elevate our civilization, but he does prevent our slipping back into the tyranny of rule by brute force. Many Americans are impatient at the lack of vision and initiative of the Congress, but they should not forget that it is the Congress that stands between their liberties and the voracious instinct for power of the executive bureaucracy.

Generally speaking, we think of Congress as a lawmaking body, but, at the same time, the people tend to hold Congress responsible for all the ills of Government. Under the Constitution there are several functions assigned to Congress which are important but are not frequently exercised. These functions are: The power to propose amendments to the Constitution; the responsibility for canvassing the vote of the electoral college; and, in case of a failure of any candidate to receive a majority vote, to elect the President and Vice President; the power of the impeachment and trial of certain public officials; and the Senate's duty of passing upon important Presidential appointments; and advising and consenting to treaties. Congress also has the power to declare war, but this power has little significance in these modern times. Pearl Harbor set the pattern of the future, if wars are permitted.

The other duties of Congress may be said to be the making of laws, informing the public about important issues, and supervising or reviewing the actions and policies of the Executive. Congress, under the Constitution, shares the lawmaking function with the Executive, and in practice it shares it with the judiciary and the administrative bureaucracy. In recent years there is a strong tendency for the initiation and formulation of new legislation to become an Executive function, Congress restricting itself to reviewing, discussing, and passing upon proposals which originate in the administrative departments. Sometimes Congress legislates in detail, but quite often it delegates broad powers to the executive agencies to issue rules and regulations.

With the decline of Congress as an original policy-making body, its function as a

forum through which public opinion can be expressed, and the policy and conduct of the Government criticized, has become increasingly important. Congress does not govern the country, but it criticizes the administration that does. The effectiveness of its supervisory function varies greatly from administration to administration, and from war to peacetime. Congress does determine what activities the Government shall engage in, how much money shall be spent, how the money shall be raised, and, to some extent, the organization of the administrative branch.

An important responsibility of the legislature is to provide a check upon the tendency of the executive power of the state to become arbitrary and oppressive. It is not a mere coincidence that Hitler and Mussolini had the greatest contempt for legislatures and politicians. I am not sure that Stalin has a profound respect for his legislature. The legislature elected by the people is an indispensable adjunct of any system of self-government in which the freedom and integrity of the individual are of paramount concern. A state may become powerful under a dictatorship, but the people are oppressed. A properly functioning legislative body restrains the arbitrary power of the state. It permits the development of a climate in which the genius of individual human beings can flourish. For short periods in history benevolent monarchs have fostered the arts and the humanities in small areas of the world, but invariably the power of the state falls into incompetent or tyrannical hands and civilization disintegrates. With an effective legislature, there is a continuity of policy, which may not always be as enlightened as we might wish it to be, but it is never as oppressive as the naked executive power usually becomes.

In considering how to approach the subject assigned, it occurred to me that since you have available in this great institution all the best books on the technical aspects of the Congress and the Government, and since you are quite as able to read and understand them as I am, the most fruitful thing for me to do is to relate to you some of my own impressions of politics and the legislator. I hope that, in so doing, I may to some degree arouse your interest in participating actively in politics. It is especially important for the future of the Republic that men of wide knowledge and trained minds enter the political field. I need not point out to you the complexity and difficulty of the problems which confront our Nation today, and are certain to confront it in the future.

If we are to maintain our system of self-government, it is essential that the best brains, the finest talent we produce, be induced to enter the service of the Government. Americans complain of the ineptness of their Government, but at the same time they are supercilious, if not contemptuous, toward those who devote their energies to its service. Substantial improvement in the quality of the Government is unlikely until this attitude of the people is changed. If we are to maintain our system of self-government, it is essential that we obtain for the National Congress the best talent that we possess in this Nation.

The first thing, obviously, that every legislator has to do is to get himself elected to office. The process of being elected to the Congress, in a predominately rural community in the South, is an experience that is not easy to describe in a few words. Until the summer of 1941, when I left the presidency of the University of Arkansas, I had never participated directly or indirectly, other than to vote, in any political campaign. My activities had been confined to the academic world except for a limited experience in a family business. The process of introducing oneself, and talking to the people informally, in their business places and their homes, was the most interesting and satisfying experience of the campaign. With only a few exceptions, they were interested and friendly, although rarely did they indicate how they would vote. Generally speaking they were more interested in me as a person than in my views about the broad principles of government.

After 3 months of personal visits, with particular attention to those persons known to be interested and influential in political matters, the speaking campaign began. This phase of the campaign is very strenuous and downright hard work. Never having made a political speech, the first few efforts were excruciatingly painful. I have seldom experienced a feeling of more abject despair and humiliation than the first time I spoke on the street corner of a small village with about a dozen curious listeners who apparently were not listening. However, it is amazing how soon one becomes accustomed to the sound of one's voice when forced to repeat a speech five or six times a day. As election day approaches, the size of the crowds grows; they are more responsive and more interested, and one derives a certain exhilaration from that which, only a few weeks before, was intensely painful.

While the candidate himself is carrying on the speaking campaign, a few close friends run what is known as the headquarters. In Arkansas and other Southern States, the Democratic primary is, as a practical matter, the real election. Since all the candidates must be Democrats, the party organization, as such, plays a small part in the campaign. The organization of the campaign is on a personal basis, or centers around groups of citizens with a common interest. In short, the candidate is on his own as to the strategy of the campaign.

I think it is worth while to relate these seemingly trivial events because it should prove to any of you who may have a desire to become a legislator that, given a free electorate, not dominated by an organization, anyone with energy and some understanding of human nature has a good chance of success. It is a very human experience and, even though one might be defeated, I believe it is not without its compensations.

Furthermore, it would be exceedingly difficult to serve effectively, or get reelected, without the intimate knowledge of one's constituents obtained in an active campaign. The ability to compromise and reconcile the differences among people is of the essence of the legislative function, whether it be in the Halls of Congress or in the midst of a heated political campaign.

Upon assuming one's place in the Congress, the first impression is not unlike that of initiation into a college fraternity. The older Members are gracious and helpful in a variety of ways, but you are not allowed to forget that you are, after all, a freshman. Seniority is a custom one does not question lightly in the Congress, but it is one of the few rules one can rely on. Seniority determines very largely one's committee assignments and promotions within the committee. It follows from this practice that those Members with the longest service in the Congress attain the positions of influence. It is wise, therefore, for a constituency to keep its Representatives in continuous service. While there may be some criticism of that practice, from the national point of view, it works to the advantage of those constituencies which are stable in their political habits of thought.

The first year in office is intensely interesting and pleasant. Having heard all my life, as you have, rather sharp criticism of Congress, I was pleasantly surprised to find the majority of the Members conscientious, hard-working, normal individuals. There is infinite variety among them, but on the whole they reflect quite well the faults and virtues of the American people. The effectiveness of a Member depends to a considerable extent upon his ability to gain the respect of his colleagues. In open debate and in committee it is not easy to deceive them and, to a considerable extent except with the most fanatical, they tend to temper the more extreme prejudices of one another. One soon learns that legislation in the Congress is necessarily and rightly a process of compromising the conflicting interests of extremely diverse groups of people.

The legislator's relationship with his constituency is, in most cases, the dominant influence in his political life. It is only natural that his constituents look upon him as their personal representative at the seat of government. It requires a high degree of political maturity and intellectual objectivity for them to regard the man they elected as an officer of the National Government. Many of them are personal friends, and all of them, who voted for the successful candidate, in the heat of the campaign when votes were earnestly and fervently solicited, naturally feel that they deserve some special consideration from the object of their favor. There is nothing reprehensible or unworthy in this attitude, but the fact is that the multitude of requests for minor personal services comes close to destroying the effectiveness of a great many capable representatives. The legislator finds himself in a dilemma. If he refuses to see the constant stream of visitors, or to give personal attention to their requests, they may become offended and withdraw their support. In addition, it is personally gratifying to be able to be of help to one's friends. On the other hand, if he does give his attention to these matters, he literally has no time left for the intelligent study and reflection that sound legislation requires.

One often hears the suggestion that secretaries could attend to the personal business of constituents. It is true that the secretaries do attend to much of it, but, in the first place, secretarial assistance is limited, and in the second place, many of the constituents will not accept the services of the secretary. They feel that they elected the Senator and they are, therefore, entitled to his personal attention. I can see no solution to this dilemma until the constituents learn that, in demanding the personal attention of their representatives in the Congress, they are in a very real sense injuring their own larger interests. They must realize that the popularly elected legislature is the real bulwark of the people against the arbitrary power of the State, and if they hamper its effectiveness, eventually it will be destroyed by the executive bureaucracy. The struggle for power that constantly goes on between the legislature and the executive bureaucracy is an unequal struggle so long as the legislator must give most of his time to the personal affairs of his constituents.

Already I think it is safe to say that the great majority of the bills enacted by the Congress are drafted in the bureaus. For the most part, the legislator simply reviews, criticizes, and amends the bills presented for his consideration by the departments. Even for this task he has too little time to do the job effectively and adequately. The Congress is conscious of this shift in power to the bureaus. The almost continual carping about the bureaucrats is but the outward evidence of the realization that the power of initiating legislation and of determining policy is passing to the departments. These departments, staffed by employees protected by civil-service statutes, are not noticeably responsive to congressional suggestions.

That there is no time to spare for extra-legislative duties, if those duties are properly discharged, is indicated by the enormous volume of measures introduced and acted upon by the two Houses of Congress. During the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, 6,841 bills were introduced (1,730 Senate, 5,111 House), 425 Joint Resolutions, 168 Concurrent Resolutions, and 679 Resolutions. The committees of the two Houses reported on 2,358 measures, 1,017 bills were passed, and more than 300 of the various resolutions were adopted. It took nearly

13,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to record the debate on the floor of the two Houses, exclusive of the Appendix. Such a huge volume of material is entirely beyond the capacity of any man to consider carefully or to understand. A legislator necessarily is forced to concentrate his attention within a restricted field of legislation, if he is to avoid being wholly ineffective in every field. The constituents, however, naturally believe that their particular interest or problem is of fundamental importance, and cannot understand why their representative is not thoroughly familiar with it. In trying to meet the demands of his constituents, to be all things to all men, the legislator often becomes superficial and unable to do constructive thinking on any subject.

If the power and initiative of the Congress is to be maintained, it is indispensable that some means be found to give the individual legislators adequate time to legislate. The La Follette-Monroney Committee report, which should be completed soon, contains many valuable suggestions to improve the efficiency of the machinery of Congress, but there can be no real solution without the understanding and cooperation of the constituents.

In describing the functions of a Member of the Congress, it is very easy to oversimplify. In arriving at final decisions on particular bills, for example, it is easy to say that a Member voted in accordance with the wishes of his constituents, of his party, or of some pressure group. As a matter of fact, all of these considerations enter into decisions on matters of major importance. The extent to which they influence a particular Member's decision varies with each Member and with each measure. Some Members believe that it is their duty to follow closely what they think is the majority opinion of their constituents. This policy may be more pronounced immediately before an election than subsequent thereto. Other Members feel that they should make their decisions without regard for their constituents' wishes in the first instance, and then undertake to educate and convert the constituents. In other words, they seek to lead rather than follow their constituents. Some Members are strong party men and follow blindly the program of the party leaders. The so-called pressure groups, except when they are very powerful in the home constituency, are more of a nuisance than a real influence on the average Member. There is a misapprehension on the part of many citizens that a good dinner and a few drinks will get a bill passed. A mistake that many businessmen make is to think it necessary to employ a high-powered representative to contact legislators. If they have a good case, and are well prepared and able to present it, they can do just as well, if not better, by appearing before the committees themselves. In any large group of human beings there are always a few unorthodox individuals, but in the Congress there are certainly very few to whom illegitimate or dishonest inducements have appeal. It is my belief that the American people have a lower opinion of the integrity of their Congress than they are justified in having. There may be justification for criticism because of provincialism, lack of vision, or pettiness, but not because of dishonesty.

If there is one characteristic of Members of the Congress that stands out above others it is sincerity. With few exceptions, they are deeply concerned over reaching the correct conclusions on every controversial issue. They go through agonies of mental torture in their effort to reconcile the interests of their constituents with the demands of fellow Members and their conception of the national welfare. It is very easy for the citizen back home to have a positive and complete answer for every question. This average citizen sees the issue from the viewpoint of his own business, his own community, and his own private prejudices. He has not heard the other side. The chances are he knows very little about conditions in the 47 other States, not to mention the other nations of the world.

He simply cannot understand why his Representative hesitates and compromises with his colleagues. He usually concludes that he is just a political trimmer, after all. The legislator, on the other hand, finds himself caught between the heavy pressure of the advice from home pushing him in one direction and the pressure from his colleagues pushing him in the opposite direction. The result, necessarily, is a compromise in which the facts and the judgment of the legislator play a large part.

The average legislator, early in his career, discovers that there are certain interests, or prejudices, of his constituents which are dangerous to trifle with. Some of these prejudices may not be of fundamental importance to the welfare of the Nation, in which case he is justified in humoring them, even though he may disapprove. The difficult case is where the prejudice concerns fundamental policy affecting the national welfare. A sound sense of values, the ability to discriminate between that which is of fundamental importance and that which is only superficial is an indispensable qualification of a good legislator. As an example of what I mean, let us take the poll-tax issue and isolationism. Regardless of how persuasive my colleagues or the national press may be about the evils of the poll tax, I do not see its fundamental importance, and I shall follow the views of the people of my State. Although it may be symbolic of conditions which many deplore, it is exceedingly doubtful that its abolition will cure any of our major problems. On the other hand, regardless of how strongly opposed my constituents may prove to be to the creation of, and participation in, an ever stronger United Nations Organization, I could not follow such a policy in that field unless it becomes clearly hopeless. This process of evaluating the significance of an issue is one of the most difficult tasks of the legislator. In many instances the greatest amount of heat is generated by the people and the press over some trifling matter of temporary interest, while at the same time the really significant policies are practically ignored. While I have not computed it, I venture to guess that 10 times as much space in the press and effort in the Senate has been devoted to the Pearl Harbor inquiry as has been devoted to the organization and development of the United Nations Organization.

I have already mentioned the growing power of the executive branch of the Government as compared to the legislative branch. It is, I believe, of first importance that the Congress be strengthened if we are to avoid arbitrary government and the destruction of the freedom of the individual. There are certain organizational reforms that could be helpful in addition to freeing the legislator from the necessity of running errands. Among these, probably the most important is the creation of a more effective method of communication between the Congress and the Executive. One way to approach this would be to set up a Legislative-Executive Cabinet, consisting of leaders of the Congress and the President's Cabinet. This group should consider and advise upon the over-all policy of the administration. This would avoid stalemates such as we have recently had in the Senate. Another difficulty that may confront us again, as it did in the last 2 years of the Wilson and the Hoover administrations, is to have the Congress controlled by the party opposed to the President. This situation virtually destroys the effectiveness of the Government and is exceedingly dangerous in a period such as the present, just as it was in 1918 and 1930. Some means of avoiding such a disaster, by special elections, should be worked out, although it would call for constitutional changes. Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, in his book, Can Representative Government Do the Job, has some interesting suggestions on this subject. Indeed, there are many other suggestions in that book for the improvement of the Congress that are worthy of our attention. Among others, I might mention the Kefauver resolution which provides for a question period in the Congress, in which the heads of the executive departments are given an opportunity on the floor of the legislative bodies to defend their programs and to answer the questions of the Members. This would be an excelent way to reduce the friction between these two branches of the Government.

In the beginning I said that I thought the Members of the Congress reflect quite well the faults and virtues of the American people. By this I do not mean that the Congress is literally a mirror of the Nation, nor do I think it should be. As a representative republic, and not a pure democracy, it is proper that we should strive to send to the Congress the wisest and the most able men and women we have. Simply because we may have a substantial number of illiterates or simpletons in our population is scarcely a good reason for sending them to Congress. A recent pamphlet by the American Political Science Association had this to say about Congressmen:

"The ideal Member of Congress should have a large fund of information about public affairs and understanding of social psychology. He should have a sense of history, a sense of values, and a critical habit of thought. He should know enough about public problems to vote independently and intelligently instead of blindly following the lead of committee chairmen and the party whip. Without being an expert on all questions, he should be able to see their interrelations and ramifications and anticipate how proposed measures will work out in practice. He must be able to take an overall view of a problem and to weigh the long-run benefits of a proposal against its short-run drawbacks. He must be intimately acquainted with his constituents, their needs and aspirations, and with economic and social conditions in his district or State. But where conflicts of interest arise between his district or State, his party and the country as a whole, he must remember that his primary obligation is to the general welfare. He should be a man of intelligence, courage, and zeal, with exceptional qualities of mind and spirit, skilled in the rare art of mediating between the public services and the people, able to exercise foresight and balanced judgment."

To measure up to this standard, a legislator should be a paragon of virtue and wisdom such as one seldom sees in any walk of life. Assuming, however, that such men do exist it is unlikely that many of them would choose, or be chosen for, a political career. Until such time as the esteem with which the office is regarded is more commensurate with the responsibilities involved, competent legislators will be scarce. Improvement in the quality of our legislative bodies is primarily the function of the voter, not the legislator.

The role of the legislator is seldom glorious. The conscientious, competent, and useful Members of the Congress rarely receive the approval of the press or of the public at large. The technique of a good legislator does not attract the attention of the press, but let him act a fool and it is in every paper in the country. For example, it is generally conceded by most of the Members that Senator CARL HAYDEN is an excellent technician and an exceedingly useful legislator, but I venture to guess that very few of this audience know anything about Mr. HAYDEN or his contribution to the public welfare. To obtain agreement upon any measure of importance requires infinite patience and persistence in addition to a thorough knowledge of the subject matter, but such qualities are not newsworthy.

The very fact that the press, and the public, respond so readily to the extravagant and ridiculous in their public figures, is in itself a strong temptation to a man with a forum like the Senate floor. This is especially true if he begins to feel neglected or abused. A legislator, like other people, has an ego that requires expression and recognition if it is to avoid becoming warped and eccentric. Like other human beings, he desires the approval of his fellow men, and if this is denied him he tends to become cynical and disillusioned. It is truly unfortunate that the people do not understand more clearly the real function of the legislator.

In conclusion, I wish to call your attention to the recent resignation of two of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, Mr. Woodrum and Mr. Ramspeck, in order to accept positions in industry. These two men are in the prime of life, with long experience as legislators, and were undoubtedly among the wisest and best men in the Congress. It is a serious indictment of our system, and of the American people, that such men should decide to quit the public service for which they were so well qualified. It was not solely a question of remuneration that caused these men to leave the Government, although the meagerness of their salary certainly influenced the decision; but, of even greater importance, I believe, was the common attitude of the people of this country toward their legislators. As Senator GEORGE wrote in an article not long ago:

"Castigating Congress seems to have developed, of late, into a pernicious national pastime. To my mind, the thoughtless disparagement of Congress is part of the whole pattern of cynicism that many people have adopted toward the legislature. The tendency is alarming. In this totalitarian era, only two major nations—Britain and the United States—still function with legislatures that perform vital roles. Now is the time for Americans to value, rather than to abuse, their democratic heritage."

Honorable men in public life can take the abuse that is heaped upon them by the public only so long and then they succumb to a sense of futility and frustration. It is true that some of the frustration that afflicts the Members of Congress is due to the antique and obsolete organization of the Congress itself, and it should be remedied. But, of far greater influence upon the decision of good men to enter or to remain in politics, is the attitude of those whom they seek to serve.

This attitude will change, and the character and quality of the Congress will improve, only when the people understand and appreciate the function of Congress in the preservation of their freedom and welfare.

Address of Hon. Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina, at the Charleston Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered recently by me at the Charleston Navy Yard.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the first opportunity that I have had to accept an invitation to speak at the Charleston Navy Yard since leaving the governor's office in 1941. During the 4 years of war I had hoped to be with you on several occasion but the pressure of business and the work that we were called upon to carry on for the armed forces in the Congress of the United States denied me this pleasure.

This is a momentous occasion in the history of the Charleston naval shipyard. Today, for the first time since one of the darkest days in the Nation's history—December 7, 1941—the personnel and guests of this shipyard are privileged to witness a peacetime launching.

Many splendid ships have slid down the building ways of this shipyard since that fatal date, ships that made heroic names for themselves in all the theaters of the war, ships which added still greater luster to the already impressive record of the Charleston naval shipyard. Those ships were constructed with the fervent prayer that they would meet the enemy, and defeat him wherever they met him. Today this ship will be launched with an even more fervent prayer that it may never be called upon to meet an enemy of this Nation.

As we gaze upon this huge vessel which has been built by the thousands of skilled workmen here—it seems appropriate to look back for a few minutes and pay tribute to the wartime efforts of the men and women whose skill and patriotism made the yard a symbol for excellent construction.

The contribution to victory which the Charleston naval shipyard made during the past war intensifies my ever-present feeling of pride in being a South Carolinian—because this yard's war record is emblazoned on the pages of history as vivid proof that South Carolina did its part—and did it well.

This shipyard was known during the war as the largest single industry in the State of South Carolina, and many dead Japanese, Germans, and other exponents of tyranny, whose bodies are now resting at the bottom of the seas beside the blasted wreckage of their ships, could, if they were physically able, give eloquent testimony to the effectiveness of the finished products turned out here—and to the heroism and skill of the men who manned them.

In 1940 there were fewer than 6,000 people employed here. In July 1943 there were 26,000. The amount of training, recruiting, skilled supervision, and leadership which was necessary in order to attain that figure is almost inconceivable. Thousands of men and women, with no experience in shipbuilding, were hired and trained on the job, and they were trained well.

Ships had to be built. This shipyard saw to it that they were built. Men who had never even seen a ship before found themselves almost overnight building them. Those people did not know the meaning of the word "impossible" and neither did the Navy and civilian personnel who trained them.

In all—between December 7, 1941, and July 15, 1945—approximately 1,360 United States and Allied naval vessels were either built, commissioned, repaired, overhauled, or serviced here.

This shipyard was responsible for sending 209 new vessels of many different types to swell the fleets of the world's largest and best Navy and those Charleston-built ships took part in every major invasion and campaign.

The efficiency with which this shipyard was managed and the skill of its shipbuilders is illustrated by the flexibility of ship construction demonstrated here.

When the war started the yard was busy turning out destroyers. Then, when the plans for the invasion of north Africa were being made, it was determined that a large number of landing craft would be needed at once. Immediately, and without lost motion, the yard modified its destroyer program and started turning out LST's. The LST proved her worth time and time again during more than 50 successful invasions.

As soon as a sufficient number of LST's had been produced the shipyard resumed its destroyer construction. Some time later, when the submarine menace was at its height, the need for a new type of antisubmarine vessel was felt, and the shipyard again demonstrated its flexibility—stopped building destroyers and began constructing destroyer escorts—and later destroyer transports. As soon as the submarine menace was no longer so pressing, and the United States started her Pacific offensive, the need for a new type of landing craft resulted in an abandonment of the destroyer escort construction and the beginning of the LSM program. And in addition the shipyard found time to construct seaplane derricks, other types of amphibious craft, and two destroyer tenders.

It was this type of flexibility in ship construction, which gave our fleet the types of ships it needed when it needed them, that did so much to give our naval forces supremacy on the seas. And that flexibility, adaptability, know-how, or whatever you want to call it, was nowhere better demonstrated than it was here.

Altogether, in their contribution to the final victory the employees of this shipyard built 20 death-dealing destroyers; 17 sleek destroyer escorts; 9 powerful and speedy destroyer transports; 8 LST's; 121 LSM's (Pacific puddle jumpers, they were called) and rocket firing LSM's, and other miscellaneous types of vessels.

The more than 200 ships built here made newspaper headlines on many occasions. Charleston-built ships were good ships, tough ships, valiant ships. It took direct hits by three Japanese suicide planes plus a direct hit by a bomb to sink the Charleston-built rocket-firing *LSM 190*, just to give you one example.

Many vessels built here were damaged. Few were sunk. That is the proof of real craftsmanship.

This vessel that is to be launched today, the U. S. S. *Bryce Canyon*, a sister ship to the largest vessel ever built here, the *Tidewater*, is a splendid example of the shipbuilder's art.

Even though it may never be called upon to undergo the hazards of combat, it will serve the Nation that built it well and faithfully in the years to come. Its primary mission will be to service and repair the other ships in the fleet, just as that has been, and will continue to be, one of the missions of the men who built it.

The men who will eventually be assigned to this vessel will be secure in the knowledge that they are serving aboard a ship that has been built right, has been built to last; in short, has been built at the Charleston naval shipyard.

I am extremely happy that construction on this vessel was not halted recently when it seemed for a time as though it might be. I am confident that the *Bryce Canyon* will prove to be an asset which our Navy could ill afford to lose.

I know that it has not been an easy task for the men and women of this shipyard consistently to turn out work of the high caliber which went into the *Bryce Canyon* and all of the other ships built and repaired here. We have had many problems during the war years. The fact that those problems were met and either solved or alleviated is a testimonial to the intelligence, foresight, and ingenuity of your personnel.

You worked under the greatest of pressure because it was of paramount importance that the Navy get as many ships as possible in the shortest possible time. Until final victory was achieved you worked day and night 7 days a week. The work load was tremendous. For some, haste and pressure might have been excuse enough to turn out poorly constructed or badly repaired ships. However, you, in spite of that pressure, continued to turn out more and better vessels in less and less time.

The problem of securing adequate housing for the thousands of men and women who came here also faced the shipyard. That was a very real problem, because Charleston's peacetime population had been greatly swollen by the influx of workers from many States who came here.

Other problems, adequate food, recreational facilities, medical care, and school facilities, to mention but a few, were also present.

I am happy, as your Senator, to have worked with you in your interest along these lines. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I was always present and have always presented all requests for necessary funds that were submitted through your commandant and the Secretary of the Navy. Your representatives have also met with me and the Secretary many times to present your requests.

I do not want to miss the opportunity to commend the men who served on the ships you built here. A good ship is no better than the officers and men who serve aboard her—and the fact that so many Charleston-built ships had illustrious war records is due to the personnel that manned them.

Many of those men did not return. I think particularly of the destroyer *Ingraham* built here and manned to a great extent by South Carolina men, which went down early in the war with the loss of nearly all of the crew.

The loss of the *Ingraham* illustrates the great affection which the men and women of Charleston had for the ships built here and the men who manned them. No sooner had the news of the *Ingraham's* loss been received than money was oversubscribed for the construction of a new *Ingraham*.

None appreciated more than the employees here the splendid job that our Navy was doing in both the Atlantic and the Pacific and the necessity, particularly in the Pacific, of maintaining as large a naval force as possible.

There is no more glorious page in naval history than that recorded by our Navy during the Pacific war, a record which this shipyard helped make possible.

The role which our Navy played in helping win the war in the Pacific should prove to any thinking person the importance of sea power to a nation's existence.

May the U. S. S. *Bryce Canyon* have a long and illustrious career in that peacetime navy.

The Full Employment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Francis E. McMahon on the Full Employment Act recently passed by the Congress.

Mr. McMahon points out that notwithstanding the changes in phraseology which were made during the progress of this measure through the Congress, the substance of the original measure remains intact. He further points out that it is not the act itself, but the spirit in which it is administered and implemented which will make the difference between success and failure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN SPEAKING

(By Francis E. McMahon)

Nothing would satisfy the reactionaries more than to have everyone believe that the Full Employment Act, signed by the President last week, is a fruitless piece of legislation.

The enemies of full employment have propagandized that the bill's teeth were drawn in congressional conferences. It is a line unfortunately taken up by some sections of the liberal press. This is all nonsense.

Reactionaries succeeded in changing the wording of some parts of the bill. For "full employment" as an objective they substituted "maximum employment." This was not even a verbal victory. Maximum employment does not necessarily mean less than full employment. It might even conceivably mean a condition where jobs would go begging for workers.

Despite the clever propaganda, the substance of the original measure remains intact. The act declares that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to use "all of its plans, functions and resources" toward "creating and maintaining * * * useful employment opportunities." This is a comprehensive commitment, the most comprehensive ever made by the Government on this question.

It is not the act itself, but the spirit in which it is administered and implemented that will make the difference between success and failure. Here is where the progressive forces of the country must concentrate their efforts.

The act provides for a Council or Economic Advisers, composed of three men to be appointed by the President. Their job would be to assist and advise the President in the preparation of periodic economic reports to Congress. A Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, made up of seven members from each House, would advise methods of carrying out the recommendations.

The composition of the Council is a vitally important matter. The purposes of the act could easily be nullified by purely political appointments. What is needed is a trio of courageous and forward-looking individuals, men of high vision who are backed fully in their efforts by the administration.

No less important will be the character of the congressional committee of 14 who will implement the work of the advisory council. If it is composed of status quo gentlemen, it will be so much labor lost.

But a committee both earnest and progressive will constantly bear in mind that the act provides for the utilization of all the resources of the Government. No committee could ask for anything more. If those resources cannot solve the problem of unemployment, then nothing will.

Some will see a weakness in the act in that it calls for no one particular program. But it is hard to see how any one program could solve the difficulty faced. The battle against unemployment must be won on many fronts and in many ways. It is a merit of the act that it empowers Congress and the Executive to proceed as the circumstances of the moment may dictate.

This does not mean, however, that the major and chronic cause of unemployment was overlooked by the sponsors of the bill.

As Senator MURRAY declared recently in the New Republic, "The only realistic policy is to place major emphasis upon obtaining a better distribution of income." The Murray-Patman Act must be implemented along these lines. Anything other than increasing the purchasing power of the mass of consumers may temporarily relieve, but it will never cure, the evil of unemployment.

Progressives should cease their laments about this legislation. Its merits outshine any possible defects. It constitutes a solid foundation for an effective program. The reactionaries actually lost a battle. Progressives must take immediate advantage of their victory by pressing for enlightened executive and congressional personnel to administer the act.

Francis Cardinal Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, on the occasion of the reception in his honor at the Metropolitan Opera House on March 5, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few hours ago I returned home to America, to my own people of the city and archdiocese I so deeply love. Truly I had not left you, for wherever I go—you are in my thoughts and prayers, and thus you were with me in Rome and there shared with me the honor conferred upon me by our beloved holy father. Even briefly to glimpse Christ's holy vicar is an inspiration exalting and compelling. What, then, can I say of the emotions of my heart, the sentiments of soul, the exhilaration of mind, the flaming of will, as I found myself honored by intimate association with him who so calmly, so courageously and so perfectly portrays in all things the presence of Christ in our midst? I can simply say that I shall pray ever to be true to that cherished relationship.

I would not even be remotely worthy of this honor were it not that I am aware that its greatest glory lies in its opportunity for service. This I have said before, and again I say, that in these days of chaos and crises while mankind is still engulfed in war-heated hatreds and bigotries, honors can be weighed, measured, and considered only in terms of opportunity to serve. And service to the utmost and to the end I shall give. To serve my brother and share with him all honors bestowed upon me, all burdens imposed upon him, is the foundation of my faith and love for my fellow man.

A priest is Christ's envoy on earth that he may, in humility, beseech God's grace and mercy for his people and himself and the plea of the holy father to us is that we lead our people to pastures of eternal truth, feed them with the food of divine grace, and direct them with the example of our lives. These words sounded a

vibrant challenge and a wisehearted warning as he cautioned: "The honor is great but your responsibility is greater." Knowing that many have God upon their lips but little in their hearts, I shall ever pray as the good shepherd of you, my flock, with your help and prayers for me, and mine for you, that we may fear nothing and flee nothing except sin, that together we may live in simple obedience and love, that we may desire only that which is of Christ, and thus live and fulfill our faith.

Yes, the honor is great, but its responsibility greater—and any who in vanity think otherwise must be the scorn of wise men and the slaves of their own folly. But one honor there is, outranking all others—the honor of sacrificing oneself unto danger or death for the good of God or country. That is the honor I hold most precious in my heart—that is the honor you, my bishops, priests, and people, must share with me, as you share the honor bestowed upon me—on us—in Rome; that is the honor with its command imposed upon me with the dignity of the cardinalate when our holy father repeated those momentous words: "By this you are to understand that you must show yourself fearless, even to shedding your blood in making our holy faith respected, in securing peace for Christian people."

In humility, devotion, and gratitude, from every corner of the world we came, to the home of the living God, the citadel of the treasure of truth, to receive this honor and command. Differences of language, custom, or climate did not separate us. No matter which soil we called our own, one common bond we had—our faith, our religion, our God. For our faith, yours and mine, is built upon the rock, and neither the waves of war, the treacheries of our times, nor enemies who never sleep—no man, no thing, can its holiness decay—for its holiness lies in Christ. Faith alone can survive and surmount the ruthless, mutinous passions of pretenders to peace who presume the power and impose it. Peace is the work of justice, and justice cannot yield her ripe fruit of wisdom while freedom is still shackled by the conceits of men, confused and fumbling, oftentimes selfish and small, thus barring peoples and nations from the mutual understanding upon which true peace must be based.

Peace cannot rise in this atomic age of discord and decay where nations, divided against themselves, are prey to leaders' lustborn sins of bigotry, hate, and greed, which, like the swellings of the sea, engulf, overpower and destroy them. In a world where men make mockery of the meaning and majesty of faith, the church, grounded in God, stands as the symbol of truth, eternal, changeless, and divine, secure in the strength of her unity. Yet perverse, stubborn men, though fearful of each morrow, ageless truth that peace can be found in God alone. For only when God lives within the depths of each man's heart will the cruel grow merciful and just, the bigot turn his fierce, foul hates to tolerance and love, the lustful shed his pride and greed, and each shall be friend to all, the foe of none, and humbly live God's plan. Then only will the grandeur of God's peace penetrate the world.

Hunger-ridden peoples throughout this wailing world know not peace—they are but fodder to feed the fires of new conflicts—for they who deliberately cultivate wars know that the core of war is rooted in hunger. Our young dead soldiers bequeathing to us their deaths, plead: "We leave you our deaths, give them, we pray, their meaning."[1] And their meaning is rooted in love of God and country. The cause for which they fiercely fought, suffered, bled, and died was neither new nor novel—the defense of the belief "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by God with unalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Our American sons have always been victorious as again and again they have been called upon to sacrifice themselves in war to preserve our liberties and bring freedom to imperiled peoples of the earth—to make the world itself free. Dare we besmirch our birthright even before our soldier-dead come home to lie within the soil on which they spent their youth, their dreams, their blood, their lives to guard and save? Guilty of their betrayal we shall be, if, still in the wake of war, we do not learn to lean upon our God, follow Him in the Christly ways of life and in His power and ours stop the ungodly gusts of greeds that sweep like scythes across a nation's face—and leave it broken, bloody, bereft of all things human and humane.

"We leave you our deaths, give them their meaning," cry a million faithful fighters whose dauntless selfless service bought for us our victory. From the ramparts of their heavenly homes they beseech us, build of the old, a new and warless world: a world where enemies be friends and each respects God's image in his brother. And I once more profess that every human being is my brother, and in the prayerful hope that everywhere men may be free I pledge myself anew to defend the God-given rights for which our sons have died. I pledge myself anew to love God and to serve Him only, striving ever to emulate Christ's Vicar on earth, unsparingly to spend myself for the spiritual and temporal welfare of you, my people. And to you, my people, I make the plea, adopt the motto-'Follow God,' for in Him and with Him even in defeat and death is victory and life!"

[1] Quotation from Archibald MacLeish's poem, The Young Dead Soldier.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I also ask permission to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with Cardinal Spellman's address, three editorials which appeared in recent issues of the New York Times.

The first editorial, entitled "The New Cardinals," was published on Tuesday, December 25, 1945, at the time of the notification of his elevation to the College of Cardinals.

The second editorial, entitled "Princes of the Church," appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, February 19, 1946, on the occasion of the ceremony at Rome, when Archbishop Spellman, along with 31 other prelates, was elevated to the College of Cardinals.

The third editorial is taken from the March 6, 1946, issue of the Times, and is entitled "The Cardinal Comes Home." This was on the occasion of the return of the eminent Cardinal to his beloved Cathedral of St. Patrick.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 25, 1945]

THE NEW CARDINALS

New Yorkers of all faiths will take warm pleasure in the naming of Archbishop Spellman to the Sacred College of Cardinals. As archbishop of the Catholic archdiocese of New York since 1939 he has inspired affection and admiration for his intellectual and spiritual qualities. He is known as a humble, democratic man. He is also a brilliant scholar. He has walked with danger courageously. As military vicar for the armed forces of the United States he was an unwearying traveler to all parts of the world. In one journey alone he covered 46,000 miles in six months while visiting 34 countries. He knew the tropics and the Aleutians in these missions; he offered mass on a battleship in Tokyo Bay.

Pope Pius XII makes the College of Cardinals a more nearly global body than it has ever been before, with the designation of 32 prelates from 19 countries, and demonstrates anew the universality of his church. For the first time all continents will be represented with cardinals. The United States will have 5; Archbishops Spellman; Mooney of Detroit; Stritch, of Chicago; and Glennon, of St. Louis; and Cardinal Dougherty, of Philadelphia, at present the only living United States member.

It must be observed that the breadth and scope of the new appointments take cognizance of the new world that follows the war. North and South America, now represented by 3 cardinals, will soon have 14. Bishop Thomas Tien will be the first Chinese to sit in the College of Cardinals. Australia, Cuba, and Chile, will also be represented for the first time. Newly named from Canada is Archbishop James Charles McGuigan.

The new appointments bring the Sacred College to its full membership of 70 and reduces what has been an Italian majority to a membership of 40 percent. The young and vigorous democracies gain in representation. In the broadening of the membership in the College of Cardinals we may expect an even more forceful instrument to bring about that "collaboration, good will, and reciprocal trust, among all peoples," that the Pope sees as one of the essential elements for lasting peace throughout the world.

[From the New York Times of February 19, 1946]

PRINCES OF THE CHURCH

Dwelling on the rich tapestry of traditional, churchly ceremony at Rome yesterday in which Pope Pius XII elevated 32 prelates to the College of Cardinals, the mind turns inevitably to the past, to that which is eternal, continuous, and unshakable amid the shifting sands of time. Yet the insistent challenge of present and future must deeply engage the heart and thoughts of the Pope as he proclaims anew that "the church does not belong to one race, to one people, to one nation, but to all peoples of the human family." Thus he emphasizes once again the great universality of the Roman Catholic Church, already witnessed by his naming to the cardinalate representatives of 19 countries, completing a senate from which he may truly draw counsel of broadest wisdom.

Among the four new princes of the church from the United States who received their notification was Cardinal Spellman, whose words expressive of his own code of intention offer us, whether lay or clerical, guidance in what he calls these "challenging, critical times." "I shall not dwell in the past," he says, "save only to profit by the lessons it may offer." He will press forward to his goal, bearing always in mind that "man's need is to return to God."

To see the world whole, with all its peoples; to face the future unafraid, to seek always the spiritual above the material—these are aims to which statesmen as well as the common people of all lands may subscribe to bring about the "real peace" which, as the Pope says, is not yet shining on mankind.

[From the New York Times of March 6, 1946]

THE CARDINAL COMES HOME

Although he is very much a citizen of the world and made his humble beginnings in the Bay State, we also like to think with a perhaps pardonable local pride that he is one of our New York young men who made good. We knew him first as a college lad at Fordham, son of a Whitman, Mass., grocer. He had played shortstop on his high-school baseball team, then football, and been an excellent pitcher of horseshoes. Later he

was to be author, scholar, editor, poet, diplomat, world traveler, and vicar of his Nation's armed forces. Now he is home from Rome with the red hat, honored and liked in every country he stops in, but best of all in his home town, where thousands yesterday paused to greet the man who once spoke of himself as "always a parish priest." We presume to say, as did his 87-year-old father last December when his son Francis had just been designated cardinal, we are "very happy and very proud of the young man" and pleased to have him safely home.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, New Yorkers generally, irrespective of religious belief, were pleased with the selection of Archbishop Spellman for elevation to the College of Cardinals. He is beloved and respected for the splendid leadership he has manifested in the work of the church in his diocese, and for the courageous discharge of his duties as military vicar of the Nation's armed forces.

All of New York's many races and religions turned out to welcome Cardinal Spellman home. As the cardinal stepped from his plane after landing at LaGuardia Field color guards representing Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic veterans' organizations stood at attention. These veterans were proud to show their respect and reverence for the military vicar who throughout his service with our armed forces evidenced a far-reaching interest in the spiritual welfare of all who wore the uniform of our country.

Cardinal Spellman richly deserves the many fine tributes which have been paid to him by the press, by church leaders and Government spokesmen, and by the public generally.

Mr. President I desire also to add my own personal tribute to His Eminence and to wish for him every full measure of success in his future undertakings.

Employment Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the Employment Act of 1946, which was made by the Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace, on Monday, March 4, 1946.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Employment Act of 1946 is the preamble to an economic charter for the American system of free private enterprise—in other words, for American business, American agriculture, and American labor.

In this act the Government of the United States, speaking in the name of the people of the United States, has adopted a declaration of national policy whose essential provisions are as follows:

"It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities * * * for those able, willing, and seeking to work."

This is a sober and responsible utterance It was adopted by an overwhelming majority in both the Senate and House of Representatives. That it is a serious and measured utterance is shown by the carefully written language of the act:

1. In executing this policy the Federal Government is "to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy." In other words the newly stated policy is to harmonize, not conflict, with other great national objectives.

2. Carrying out the stated policy is the responsibility of the Federal Government "with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments." In other words, all the subdivisions of our national life have their special responsibilities toward the national objectives; the task of the Federal Government is to harmonize, complement, and lead—not replace.

3. The Federal Government is to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare." In other words, the American tradition of individual economic liberty is reaffirmed.

4. The objective—useful employment opportunities—includes self-employment. In other words, opportunity is the key word, and it includes opportunity for job makers as well as for job seekers.

5. As an additional policy directive, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government "to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." In other words, full-employment opportunity for those able and willing to work is not enough; we seek also the higher standards of life which we can have through maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power.

This Employment Act of 1946 is a mature document. It was written, debated, and adopted with due deliberation in the light of the long history of boom and bust that mars the record of American growth. Its objective had become the national determination of businessmen, farmers, workers, economists, and political leaders—the determination to eliminate the deadly threat of instability, thereby safeguarding and strengthening the economic freedom and the political freedom which together are the basis for the American way of life.

Believing as we do in the validity of representative government in the American tradition, we must and will take this document at its face value. It is a solemn commitment to which we have mutually pledged ourselves as free citizens.

The task now is to honor this pledge we have made to each other. This will be difficult but it cannot be impossible. There is little time to lose.

The pledge of the Employment Act of 1946 will be honored in the degree to which we are successful in working together. It will be honored in the degree to which industry, agriculture, labor, and the State and local governments cooperate one with the other and with their Federal Government—and in the degree to which the Federal Government is successful in coordinating its own work and in returning the cooperation of its citizens.

The broad outlines of an action program that will carry out the Federal Government's share of this responsibility are fairly clear. Such a program would clarify and coordinate the policies of the Federal Government with respect to taxation; banking, credit, and currency; monopoly and monopolistic practices; wages, hours, and working conditions; foreign trade and investment; agriculture; education; housing; social security; natural resources; the provision of public services, works, and research; and other revenue, investment, expenditure, service, or regulatory activities of the Federal Government. Legislation recommended by the President already includes many elements of such a program.

I do not know how long it will take us to reach a reasonable degree of success. But the difficulties ahead only emphasize the need for getting started and the basic importance of looking ahead.

This country has adopted by the Employment Act of 1946 the principle of looking ahead. We are going to do our best to anticipate—to ward off the foreseeable danger, to grasp the foreseeable opportunity—to stay on the road and stay out of the ditches of inflation and depression on either side. We are not going to wait until the wrecking truck is needed.

Those who are responsible for policy, in business as well as in government, must pool their knowledge and their judgment so that our combined wisdom is directed to the task.

Production and employment in free private enterprise is a management job. There is nothing wrong with our economy that better management cannot cure. It is a matter for adjustment and improvement, not for basic alteration—provided, of course, these adjustments and improvements are made in time. Better management can do the job—better management in business, better management in labor organizations and labor relations, and better management in government.

Business must continue to do the main job. Its responsibility is threefold: (1) To produce and distribute the goods and services the country needs; (2) to provide the buying power for these goods and services; (3) to maintain steady growth and improvement in our productive facilities and in our standard of living.

In this, there is no question but that the United States Government can or should accept its own proper share of the total responsibility. Private business in our private enterprise system can and must carry the main load. But private business cannot shoulder the whole responsibility, for the simple reason that the discharge of that responsibility involves factors over which private business has no control. There is necessarily a considerable area of policy and action where no agency or group is competent short of all of us together. A vital, indispensable part of the task therefore devolves upon our Federal Government, which acts for all of us together.

The Government can help business meet these responsibilities by providing the technical and other services business needs, but cannot well provide for itself, and by working out a consistent and carefully planned program of its own. Occasions will inevitably arise when unfavorable movements in the private sphere must be headed off to prevent a cumulative spiral. These must be anticipated, because prudent action in the early stages is the only way to avoid the extreme measures that would be necessary after the forces of deflation or inflation gathered strength.

The Department of Commerce has definite and major services to render in this task of looking ahead—services to other Federal agencies, including the new Council of Economic Advisers, to State and local governments, and to private organizations.

It offers factual information on the past as one important guide to the future—the basis for the forward look. It offers a medium of exchange, a meeting ground, a clearing house where private and public agencies and organizations may get together to pool their judgment and their facts so that everybody concerned has a clearer idea of

what is coming and so that the effect of present and proposed policies can be intelligently weighed. It offers a channel of communication between government—the umpire, the stabilizer, the representative of all the people—and business, the producer of the goods and jobs.

When business and agriculture and labor and government together have worked out practical and effective programs of specific action, when we have activated these programs with mechanisms and with manpower capable of carrying them out—then we shall have written the economic charter for which the Employment Act of 1946 is but a preamble.

And then we shall have crossed a new economic frontier. America is still a land of unlimited opportunity for men and women who will work together.

Round-Table Discussion on Palestine or Mass Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a round-table discussion broadcast over the Mutual network from the studios of WOR, Saturday, February 23, 1946, on the subject entitled "Palestine or Mass Suicide." Those who took part in the discussion were the Senator from Washington, Mr. Magnuson; former Senator Guy M. Gillette, at the present time president of the American League for a Free Palestine; Mr. Louis Bromfield, author; and Miss Ruth Chatterton, actress.

The sentiments expressed in this broadcast are of concern to the general public for it is about a problem on which the United States today has to take a stand. I expressly wish to point out the interesting remarks made by the Senator from Washington which give his views on the Hebrew problem in Europe and Palestine today.

There being no objection the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALESTINE OR MASS SUICIDE

Miss CHATTERTON. We have no more tears to shed for the 6,000,000 who died in Hitler's murder factories. Our grief is hardly an adequate reward. We here are concerned with the 2,000,000 who are left. Steps should be taken to insure that the survivors do not share the fate of their kinfolk. Yet, while we talk, it seems that the survivors continue to suffer and die. Senator MAGNUSON, have we any authoritative news about what is happening to these people and their future?

Senator MAGNUSON. As far back as last August, President Truman and all of us in Washington were so stirred by Earl Harrison's authoritative report on conditions of American and British zones of occupation that the President immediately demanded the admission into Palestine of 100,000 so-called stateless Jews. Last week another American official investigator, Bartley Crum, told the world from Vienna that the Hebrews housed in concentration camps in Germany are so desperate that unless they are repatriated to Palestine, they will commit mass suicide or fight their way to the Holy Land. In a poll conducted by UNRRA and the Army asking these Hebrew survivors what second preference they had after Palestine, about 50 percent said the crematorium. The problem now is to arouse American public opinion, the most powerful force in the world, to compel the Five Great Powers to act and quit dilly-dallying on this matter before it is too late.

Miss CHATTERTON. Senator Gillette, the shocking condition of these people confirms what you have been saying for a long time, that the thing these people need most is not bread and second-hand clothes, but a permanent status that will raise them to the dignity of human beings.

Mr. GILLETTE. We who have studied this problem have long been aware that they no longer want to be objects of charity. This was brought out months ago, and the President's emissary, Earl Harrison, said that the first and foremost need was recognition of the status of these people. They are not Germans; they are not Hungarians; they are not Rumanians—they are not former enemy nationals. On the contrary, they were the first foes of the Axis. These Hebrews were, in fact, the first of the United Nations. They were attacked as a nation—they fought as a nation—they died as a nation. Now we want, for them, recognition as a nation.

Miss CHATTERTON. When you say "we," whom do you mean, Senator?

Mr. GILLETTE. I mean all those Americans who believe that the Hebrew people deserve this recognition. Thousands of Americans have joined with me in the American League for a Free Palestine which is nonsectarian, nonpartisan, in the American tradition supporting this fight for freedom and independence. We feel that the Hebrew people, just as all our other allies, are entitled to the full support of American citizens.

Mr. BROMFIELD. Senator, I want to interrupt.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes, Mr. Bromfield.

Mr. BROMFIELD. I think we ought to make it clear before we go on that when we speak of the Hebrew people we are referring to those stateless Jews who of their own free will choose to be members of the Hebrew nation, renouncing allegiance to any other national sovereignty. This certainly does not apply to Jews who enjoy full citizenship in free democracies. Obviously, Hebrews are not American Jews.

Miss CHATTERTON. Mr. Bromfield, I think that is a very important distinction.

Mr. BROMFIELD. The American League for a Free Palestine numbers among its members thousands of American Jews who are acting in no other way than as American citizens.

Miss CHATTERTON. I think that it is now necessary to explain what is meant by a "free Palestine," Senator MAGNUSON.

Senator MAGNUSON. We have heard of demands for a Jewish state and a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. Americans cannot go along with such demands because they imply a theocracy, or they will lead to domination of one section of the population by another. The solution lies in establishing a free Palestine, built on democratic lines, where all citizens, regardless of whether they are Moslem, Jew, or Christian, enjoy the same sort of citizenship in their country as we do here. That means free election and a chance for any man, regardless of his origin, to have full opportunities in a Palestine republic.

Miss CHATTERTON. Where do the 2,000,000 so-called stateless Jews of Europe fit into this, Senator GILLETTE?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is just the point—they are not stateless. Exercising the universal right of self-determination, these people have chosen to return to Palestine. Two thousand years of exile and 13 years of intensive suffering and fighting have welded them again into the nation they once were. They are not, as we have said before, nationals of Germany or the other Axis countries. They are displaced Palestinians with as much right to return to their national territory as displaced Yugoslavs or displaced Poles. They want to go home. The quirk here is that while the United Nations are exerting every effort to repatriate displaced Europeans, even to the point of forcing reluctant Poles back to Poland, they seem to bend an equal effort toward keeping Hebrews from going back to Palestine.

Miss CHATTERTON. What alternative are they being offered?

Mr. BROMFIELD. Actually, none. They can stay in concentration camps or go back and try to live again among the people who a short time ago were doing their best to murder them.

Senator MAGNUSON. It seems to me that if these people have shown that they want to go to Palestine they should be given that right, just as any other Allied people are accorded the right to go home. If they are permitted to remain floating around Europe without any status they will ultimately be the cause of tremendous internal conflicts, and we will live to regret that we didn't treat these people with full humanity and decency.

Mr. GILLETTE. I agree with Senator MAGNUSON. The Hebrew nation was the first to be attacked by the Axis; it suffered the greatest number of casualties among the United Nations; among the 51 United Nations its fighting force ranked eighth, though its population was twenty-fifth. And I want to emphasize that these figures do not refer to United Nations soldiers of Jewish extraction fighting in their own armies, but to the Hebrews acting as a national group and fighting in underground resistance movements, in Hebrew units attached to other United Nations armies, to commando outfits, to supply and intelligence groups, and so on.

Senator MAGNUSON. I think that is a remarkable record and they certainly made their first down payment on their right to recognition as a renascent nation. The thing that bothers me is that they still haven't been given that recognition or that they still don't have a seat in the United Nations Organization.

Miss CHATTERTON. How can they have repatriation when some of them are in Palestine and the rest are scattered around Europe?

Mr. BROMFIELD. There is ample historical precedent for giving working recognition to a nation still in the throes of self-liberation. The Allied Powers, after the last war, recognized Czechoslovakia before its government set foot in Prague. Appropriately enough, that government was recognized while still on American soil—in Pittsburgh, Pa. There have been other examples. The most notable being General de Gaulle's French Committee of Liberation, which operated outside of France for 3 years.

Miss CHATTERTON. What this means then is that we must support a provisional government-in-exile for the Hebrew nation and this will ultimately become, or give way to, a government of free Palestine. Of course, a lot of Americans have been led to believe that there is great antagonism between Moslems and Jews in Palestine. I am glad to say that all the evidence I have seen contradicts this.

Senator MAGNUSON. That is true as far as I have been able to learn. I have seen considerable evidence of Jews and Moslems living in complete amity when they are not

incited by external agitators. In the past few months we read of anti-Jewish outbreaks in Arab countries, but there were none in Palestine. There have been clashes in Palestine, but they have been between the population of Palestine, both Moslem and Jewish, and British occupation troops. I don't think the conflict in Palestine is between the Arab and Jew, but between the old colonial order and the new democratic way of life.

Mr. BROMFIELD. Palestine is as much an occupied country as Norway was under Hitler domination. The remarkable development of the country where Hebrews were permitted to resettle and the great economic and social improvement made by Moslems who settled near the Jewish colonies is ample proof that, if left alone, these two great religious groups can live in harmony and form a unified democracy.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that that is precisely what the framers of the mandate foresaw 25 years ago, and if Britain had faithfully carried out its duties under the mandate, we should now see a flourishing community instead of an existing threat to world peace.

Miss CHATTERTON. As I see this question, it's not just a problem for the Jews or the Arabs or the British to decide. I think it is an American problem.

Senator MAGNUSON. The fact is that our peace is in jeopardy as long as the Hebrew people, or any other people, continue to be persecuted in the world. Virtual civil war in Palestine is a threat to the United States. If we learned any lesson from the war, we certainly learned that we cannot stand still and let oppression march across the face of the earth and engulf us. The thing to do is to go out and conquer it. Americans have a stake involved. And I'm sure of one thing, and that is that if we get the Hebrew people recognition as a nation, get them repatriated to Palestine, and allow Palestine to develop as a free republic in accordance with the four freedoms, then we won't pick up the paper each morning and read about pogroms, concentration camps, and starving Jews.

Mr. BROMFIELD. Yes; I think that is entirely possible, Senator MAGNUSON, if we could bring about the program of the American League for a Free Palestine.

Mr. GILLETTE. And it would take less time than you think. The American League wants to encourage an American foreign policy which would recognize the Hebrew nation and encourage a free democratic Palestine. The alternative, as far as we Americans are concerned, is to continue to pour vast sums of public and private funds into European relief, which is certainly no solution. I would like to see a solution brought about by the immediate repatriation to Palestine of all those Hebrews who are now receiving relief or who are in peril—of course, that is if they elect Palestine as their choice, and it seems almost every one of them will do this.

Miss CHATTERTON. It seems that you feel that the answer lies largely in the hands of the American people. I wonder if they realize this?

Mr. BROMFIELD. That is the mission of the League for a Free Palestine. Americans who are generous with relief and open-hearted with sympathy for the displaced persons must be given the facts: That these Hebrews don't want to live on charity, but want to go to their homeland where they can support themselves and live in security. And they can live peacefully with their Arab neighbors. I expect that the most important thing being done at the emergency conference of the American League for a Free Palestine, now being held in New York, is the planning of a Nation-wide educational program, bringing this message home to our citizens. And the emergency conference should propose that $3,000,000 be raised to force open the gates of Palestine.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is right, Mr. Bromfield. It is better to spend $3,000,000 and develop a workable political set-up than to pour hundreds of millions in Europe annually to perpetuate a concentration-camp society.

Senator MAGNUSON. I for one hope that the American people rally quickly to the free-Palestine idea. It will mean that one of these days we'll no longer be involved in keeping Hebrews alive by parcel post, but will be able to recognize them as fellow partners in a greater United Nations.

Miss CHATTERTON. If that happens, then we can really be sure that Hitler is beaten spiritually as well as on the battlefield and that our democracy has met this age-old challenge and won.

Tribute to Dr. Vannevar Bush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, recently a dinner was held to pay honor to Dr. Vannevar Bush on his fifty-sixth birthday anniversary for his distinguished war services. On behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I ask that excerpts from remarks of high officials present be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada:

"I am glad to learn that the American Council on Public Affairs is honoring Dr. Vannevar Bush on his fifty-sixth birthday anniversary on March 11. It is a real pleasure to have the opportunity of joining in the council's expression of greetings and good wishes.

"While the fight for freedom was being waged in all parts of the world, Dr. Bush carried exceptionally onerous responsibilities under conditions of great urgency. He has since persevered in the unending tasks of scientific research. As a discerning and persuasive advocate of the place of science in a free and interdependent world community, Dr. Bush has strong claims upon the appreciation of freedom-loving men and women everywhere.

"I should be grateful if my best of wishes might be conveyed to Dr. Bush for many years of fruitful activity. I hope that in his own experience and in the researches of those associated with him, Dr. Bush may find a rich fulfillment of Pasteur's vision that 'science will have tried by obeying the laws of humanity to extend the frontiers of life'."

Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War:

"Few men of today have attained distinction in as many fields as Dr. Bush. To our war effort, in particular, he contributed, because of his versatility and his wide knowledge of applied science, a unique talent in the solution of many major problems. His service as Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development helped shorten the war and saved American lives. He deserves well of his country and the world."

Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves:

"I share the national enthusiasm for his accomplishments. For three strenuous critical years devoted to the development, production, and use of the atomic bomb, I was in close touch with Dr. Bush and came to know him well.

"The impact of his mind and actions have made a profound and beneficial impression on the scientific and social thought of the Nation and I am sure will continue to do so in the future."

Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University:

"Dr. Vannevar Bush's contributions to the winning of the war have been so great as to overshadow all his other contributions to science and society. On his fifty-sixth birthday, falling in the first year of victory, it is not inappropriate that his countless friends and admirers center their attention on his work of the last 6 years. I say 6 years advisedly for it was early in 1940 when the period of the 'phony war' was still on that Dr. Bush began giving serious attention to the problem of mobilizing the scientific talent of the country for the inevitable war which then lay over the horizon. His outstanding performance as chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics had well equipped him for his task, and indeed through his performance of those duties he was already making an outstanding contribution to the defense program.

"It would require many thousands of words to do justice to Dr. Bush's effective services to the country from 1940 to the end of the war. There would be no point in my listing the positions which he held and tracing the consequences of many of his wise decisions. That the combined efforts of the scientists of the country hastened the day of victory and saved countless lives is generally admitted on all sides. Those of us who worked closely with Dr. Bush realize how much his genius was responsible for the effective utilization of the scientific talent of the country and in how many different ways his keen insight and effective mode of expression accelerated the pace of the application of science to modern warfare.

"The success of the Office of Scientific Research and Development was due to a flexible and adaptable organization, never anxious to overexpand or undertake, tasks which some other group could do better, but always willing to face the responsibilities implicit in the dire needs of the country in time of war. How fortunate the American Nation was to have at the head of this mobilization of its scientific talent from the outset a man of Dr. Bush's imagination and skill in technical and human affairs few people understand. The very flexible and decentralized nature of the undertaking which he headed, as well as his own fine sense of modesty, has allowed the credit to be diffused very widely as it should be, but, at the same time, has tended to obscure in the public mind the debt which the country owes to Dr. Bush for his truly magnificent accomplishment in the days of war."

Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University:

"Every scientist in the country has a sort of proprietary feeling about Dr. Bush. He is not merely the president of the Carnegie Institution or the executive head of OSRD but a thoughtful friend whose thinking and whose friendship have reached out into every laboratory in the country and in every scientific group. There are many great men in science but there are few who can compare with him in generosity of spirit and in unfailing courtesy and helpfulness. He is able to sail the ship on a true course, night or day, whether the skies be cloudy or clear.

"Integrity is the hallmark of a man whose influence and friendship extend so far. But integrity is not enough; to deal successfully with scientists of so many different kinds it is necessary to know one's stuff. Dr. Bush has an extraordinary range of interest and competence. He is one of the scientific statesmen of the period. I need not extol his achievements during the war for they are known to all. They are written on the pages of his writings, but more importantly they are written in the successes of our Army, Navy, and Air Force during the late war."

Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel prize winner and chancelor of Washington University:

"It would be difficult to overestimate the debt that our Nation owes to Dr. Bush because of the remarkable contribution that he has made in connection with the recent war. I believe it is fair to say that the scientific activities of our Nation made the difference between a very prolonged and, perhaps, inconclusive war as compared with the relatively short and decisive fight that won the victory. Our Nation stands out as the one in which the coordination of scientific effort with industry and the armed forces reached the highest level in this war, or in any previous war. To the understanding and administrative skill of Dr. Bush, we owe a major debt for bringing about this effective cooperation of effort.

"Vannevar Bush's unique place in this wartime task was possible because he is at the same time a scientist, an engineer, and a man of wide acquaintance with national affairs. His complete integrity won the confidence of all with whom he had to deal; his courage gave confidence to those who placed in his hands the guidance of our scientific efforts. His tireless effort in behalf of the Nation's welfare is the expression of a heartfelt concern for the welfare of his fellowmen. We who are privileged to know him also as a friend are especially happy to share in the greeting which you are preparing for him on this birthday."

Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution:

"It is a very great satisfaction to me to join in paying tribute to a great American citizen. Dr. Vannevar Bush is a unique combination of scientist, practical engineer, administrator, and statesman. His leadership during the war period in mobilizing the scientific resources of the Nation in the service of Government was of inestimable importance. Continued power to him."

Ross G. Harrison, chairman of the National Research Council:

"Our country is under an everlasting obligation to Vannevar Bush for his vigorous and original thinking and for his ability to organize science to do the team work necessary for the prosecution of the war."

C. F. Kettering:

"I have known Van Bush for many years and have always admired his work and especially his long-range point of view in both education and general scientific work. We owe much to him for the fine way in which he handled his various Government assignments, and on this his fifty-sixth birthday, I want to add my congratulations, along with the thousands of others who will want to thank him for his great services in the past and wish him Godspeed in the years to come."

Robert Millikan:

"In this most terrific crisis in all history through which the world has been passing in World War I and World War II there have been a dozen times when nothing but a miracle saved complete disaster to mankind. In some of these situations there has been no one to thank but Providence. In others one can see that Providence did its work by putting the right man in the right place at the right time.

"One of these situations was in June 1917 when the German submarines were destroying Allied shipping at so stupendous a rate that the few men 'in the know' predicted that nothing short of a miracle could prevent both France and England from going under in less than 8 weeks, after which we, in our completely unprepared condition, would necessarily have followed them to their doom. The miracle came in the idea of the convoy, and British destroyers shepherded to England food to fortify her otherwise starving people and strengthen their war effort, and to the Continent war material and 3,000,000 fighting men practically without loss—and the day was saved.

"A second equally close call came in 1940, after Dunkerque, when God and Winnie together saved the world; but it could not have been saved even by that combination if there had not been another miracle in America, namely, a few of the right men in the right place at the right time. One of those men was Vannevar Bush."

Importance of Columbia River Development to the Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the real importance of Columbia River regional development to the logging and lumber industry and to the worker in that industry is excellently stated in an editorial of the Woodworker. I ask that this editorial from the official publication of the International Woodworkers of America be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial rightly points out that proper river development in the Pacific Northwest will help us utilize wood which is now wasted to provide not only jobs but vitally needed building materials. Needless to say, I believe this proper development is provided by my bill, S. 1716, to create the Columbia Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVER VALLEY AUTHORITIES

(By J. E. Fadling, international president)

Something that means a lot to all the people is the problem of how to get the most good out of our great rivers. This includes woodworkers, who also have several special reasons of their own for wanting to see our rivers developed in the right way.

Rivers are the people's property. Properly developed they yield vast benefits. Water for irrigation is only one of those benefits. Hydro-electric power is only one. Navigation—cheap water transportation—is only one. Recreation is one, fishing is but another. Domestic water supplies for our towns and cities is still another.

Woodworkers have some stake in all these uses of rivers. But they have a special stake in the low-cost electric power and the water transportation which can be developed when a river is properly harnessed. For cheap power and cheap water transportation will stimulate the development of new industries to utilize the vast mountains of wood which are now wasted by the logging and lumber industry. Woodworkers need the jobs which such new wood industries can provide. And the public needs the increased supplies of building materials and other wood products which such industries can produce. That is why woodworkers take a special interest in this problem of river development.

Our record in the United States in developing and managing our rivers for all the benefits which they can be made to yield is not a very good record. Too often the mistake has been made of building an improvement or a system of improvements on a river with only one or two objectives in mind. Some dams have been built for the single purpose of helping to control floods.

Other dams have been built solely in the interest of navigation; others in the interest of irrigation; others for city water supplies; others for hydro-electric power, frequently with no thought for the other benefits and uses of the river. That way we have already messed up a lot of our rivers with poorly planned developments. The people are the losers from this single-tracked planning.

To get the most out of a river and its tributaries, you have to make a master blueprint. Not a power-trust blueprint, not an irrigation engineer's blueprint, not a navigator's blueprint, not a flood-control blueprint, not a fisherman's blueprint, but a multiple-use blueprint. That means a blueprint made by a staff of experts which includes all of these specialists working as a team. The team has to be organized so that the blueprint will get out of the river all of the benefits which the river can produce.

Rivers are different from land. The land can be divided into many individual ownerships, each managed as a separate unit, as a farm, a forest, an industrial or business site, or a home site, but you can't divide up a river. That's why rivers are still public property and always must be. The job of developing and managing our rivers is a public job.

Today there is a controversy going on between those who have some special axe to grind in connection with our rivers and those who see that the only sensible way to handle a river is under one unified plan for each river and its tributaries. The controversy is coming to a head in connection with the proposed Missouri Valley Authority and the proposed Columbia Valley Authority under which those great rivers and their tributaries would be developed and harnessed in the same practical way that was done by the TVA in the Tennessee Valley.

A river valley authority is the only way to get the most good out of a river for the benefit of all the people and all the communities of the river system. The private power trust is leaving no stone unturned to defeat such projects because river authorities cut into the racket through which private power companies have been overcharging the public for too little power distributed to too few people.

The United States Corps of Engineers is lined up with the opposition because they see in valley authorities the end of their pork barrel game of making costly investments for navigation and flood control while neglecting the other important uses of rivers. Some people in the Reclamation Service are fighting valley authority plans because they want to maintain themselves in the job of irrigation without due regard for the other uses of water.

Much misleading publicity has been put out concerning valley authorities by these opponents who are striving only to protect their own selfish vested interests. Now isn't it just good common sense that the rivers—these great public properties—should be developed for all the good that they can yield for all the people? You can only have a unified plan for a river if you make some agency responsible and give it the necessary authority to carry out its responsibility. It's simply in the nature of a river that we must have a unified plan, if we are to get all the benefits which the river can yield. Rivers are made this way. We can't change 'em. They don't stop at State lines. They don't stop at property lines.

The MVA plan and the CVA plan face up to these facts. They set up an agency responsible to all the people and they put that agency as close to the people of the river valley as they can get it, in fact, right out in the valley among the people. Instead of remote control from Washington, D. C., its control of the river is at the place where the river is.

TVA has demonstrated beyond any doubt that this plan works. Cheap power, abundant fertilizer produced with cheap power, good water transportation, flood control, improved fishing, and recreation on the waters and shores of the TVA reservoirs have lifted the standard of living of the whole Tennessee Valley and TVA is paying off in dollars and cents on the money invested in it.

TVA is only a demonstration of what should be done with all our rivers and the IWA-CIO is 100 percent for the MVA, the CVA and for similar authorities for all our rivers. If we want to build a good future for ourselves and our children, one of the things we most need to do is to harness our great rivers under public-river authorities.

United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by George Creel and appearing in Colliers, December 1945, on the subject, United States of Europe. This article contains the most concrete, statesmanlike proposal yet offered for bringing about peace in Europe—that is, the internationalization of the waterways of Europe and their free use by all nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

(By George Creel)

(It is an open secret that President Truman looks with favor on formation of a European federation to lift the Continent out of chaos. Here's what's behind his thinking on the matter.)

"Someday, taking its pattern from the United States, there will be founded a United States of Europe." (George Washington.)

A definite and more constructive European policy for America may be in the making. It is an open secret that President Truman has been giving consideration to the possibilities of a United States of Europe. A frank man, liking counsel, he has made the matter a subject of discussion with intimates, and under no seal of confidence. Although still in the study stage, the basic idea stands fairly clear.

What he is said to have in mind is a federation of European states, based on economic and political co-ordination, that will bring order out of chaos, and offer hope of future stability, peace and prosperity. Not necessarily a duplicate of our form of government, but certainly a common currency, a customs union, a pooling of natural resources and common use of waterways.

A plain hint of his thought was given at Potsdam when he urged the "free and unrestricted navigation" of the Rhine, the Danube, the Black Sea straits, the Kiel Canal and all inland rivers bordering on two or more states. In his report on the conference he stated bluntly that the United States would continue to press the proposal. Equally significant was this paragraph: "A society of self-governing men is more powerful, more enduring, more creative, than any other kind of society, however disciplined, however centralized."

The reasons for the President's new approach to foreign policies are not hard to find. High officials, assigned to European affairs, have made no effort to hide their gloomy apprehensions. Pointed questions have figured largely in every White House visit. With all the good will in the world, how may the United States aid effectively in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Europe until Europe is in a position to make intelligent use of help from the outside? How, they asked, may Europe hope for any real recovery when tariffs, trade restrictions, and currency confusions prevent the exchange of commodities, and wall off industrial districts from agrarian areas? When factory workers starve while farmers go without clothes and furniture? When the abundance of one area is the famine of another?

The Norwegians, for example, desperately needed 400,000 pounds of salt with which to cure their fish; Italians desperately wanted the fish, but the two could not get together. Greece, isolated by the enmities of her neighbors, could not sell her olive oil and tobaccos, while the peoples of other countries hunted feverishly in the gutters for cigar stumps and cigarette stubs. Denmark had a surplus of cattle and dairy products, but lacked the coal and machinery for processing and refrigeration.

There is plenty of coal underground in the Ruhr, the Saar, Silesia, and Teschen, but it cannot be worn or eaten; even as Denmark, the wheat fields of Hungary, and the truck gardens of Holland had the foodstuffs with which to barter for coal, but trade was not possible under existing conditions. Therefore, the Danes, the Hungarians, and the Dutch will freeze this winter while the coal regions will know hunger. The factory chimneys of Europe stay smokeless, lacking the iron ores of Lorraine, and the Lorrainers beg clothes and bread. If things continue as they are, the heads of UNRRA state that at the end of their work in 1946, Europe will not have been either relieved or rehabilitated.

There is still another point that many White House visitors are said to have driven home. Until European countries put by their hates and fears and recognize themselves as members of a family, what more inevitable than armament races? With resources poured into military establishments, where is there any chance of escape from low standards of living, and the mendicancy compelled by mass poverty? Or from the threat of another and more terrible war?

This is the sort of plain talk to which the President has been listening. Compelling enough in itself, but not entirely responsible for his present preoccupation with European unity. A moving factor, according to friends, is his own good Missouri common sense. On various occasions he has been heard to make pointed comparisons between the American system and that of Europe, stressing the chaos that would be precipitated if we adopted the Old World pattern.

If, for example, the Federal Union should be dissolved, and full sovereignty returned to the several States, after which each State would set up its own military establishment, create its own foreign policy, print its own currency, and shut itself off from its neighbors by tariffs, passport requirements, and all sorts of export and import regulations, what more certain than that each would soon regard the other as an enemy to be feared and, if possible, crippled beyond the capacity to harm? Trade dislocations, entailing economic disaster, would be inevitable if the wheat and corn belts were denied equitable exchange of their products with industrial areas; if Illinois, wanting to do business with Ohio, should have to send and receive goods by way of Kentucky or Michigan because of restrictions imposed by Indiana; or if little Delaware lived in sweating fear of absorption by Pennsylvania or New York. Yet that has been the European system for centuries, and will continue unless courageous statesmanship puts an end to Bedlam and Babel.

AN IDEA DATING BACK TO CAESAR

Undoubtedly, Harry Truman's reading has had large influence on his thought. Far from being new, the idea of a unified Europe is as old as Caesar or Charlemagne, and each succeeding century has had its brave movement for unity.

The Roman and the Carlovingian, statesmen as well as conquerors, ended the tribal divisions that made the Continent a battleground, and gave the distracted area its only periods of tranquillity. Weaker hands permitted a return of anarchy but the idea persisted and never lost its hold. A united Europe was Napoleon's dream, and defeat worked no change. "The nations of Europe," he wrote from St. Helena, "have every reason to put an end to wars, and to bind themselves together in a union. Europe is only a province of the world, and every war between Europeans is a civil war."

The Holy Alliance subscribed to Napoleon's views, and Lord Castlereagh, speaking for England, urged the unification of the Continent under terms that would guarantee territorial settlements and pledge war against aggressors. Metternich, however, fearful of liberalism, insisted on a league of rulers, and the Alliance fell of its own stupid weight. The revolutions that swept the Continent in 1848 were openly committed to the unification of Europe. The masses of France, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Hungary, sick of wars that had no other cause than the quarrels of kings, rose in their might, and were crushed only after savage struggle.

Mazzini, that great Italian, now took up the torch, preaching the gospel of union as Europe's salvation. Garibaldi and Crispi caught his fire, as did Victor Hugo, Comte, Renan, and other leaders of public opinion. They saw Europe as a family, inheritors of a common culture and common traditions, and cried out against the disunity that made for incessant warfare in which even the victors lost.

What shattered the movement was the rising menace of Prussian megalomania. When the shot at Sarajevo plunged all Europe into a blood bath, the campaign for unification sank down into limbo.

CRUSADERS FOR PAN-EUROPE

In 1922, however, a man arose to lift the idea from its pit. Aristide Briand, looking out over an impoverished, hopeless Europe, called the warning, "Unite to live and prosper." And to his side came Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, the son of an Austrian aristocrat and Japanese mother, dedicating his life and fortune to the work of federation. Tireless and brilliant, he raced from country to country, fanning old enthusiasms into a new blaze. By 1926 the movement had progressed to a point where a pan-Europa congress assembled in Vienna. This was the clarion that brought 2,000 representatives from every European country:

"Anarchy is indeed the only appropriate description for a society of 34 states without law, without organization, without common organs or authorities, without a court of justice, without a police force, and without solidarity; a society the members of which are in perpetual strife with one another and pile up murderous weapons against one another; a society in which might takes precedence over right, and in which the normal methods of negotiation are threats and blackmail; a society in which the members

are ruled by club law, as were states and castles in the darkest days of the Middle Ages."

Out of the deliberations of the Congress came a pan-European union, and without dissent this specific statement of principles was adopted:

"European solidarity, based on a common currency, a customs union, common waterways, and unified military and foreign policies.

"Effective guaranties to all the federated states of their independence, integrity, security, and equality, and the maintenance of their national character.

"Sacred pledges, regardless of differences in the form of government, to respect the rights of religious and ethnic minorities, and to safeguard them against oppression and denationalization.

"The peaceful settlement of all disputes by a court of justice, having at its disposal both the material and moral means to enforce respect for its decisions.

"Full collaboration with any other group, or groups of nations, within the framework of an international order."

A second Congress met in Berlin in 1930, a third in Basle in 1932, and with M. Briand, Premier of France, as the Union's honorary president, the movement gained strength and sweep. It was no mob of impractical idealists, for these men of distinction and large authority were enthusiastic in support: Dr. Seipel, chancellor of Austria; Benes and Hodza, heads of government in Czechoslovakia; Venizelos and Politis, the Greeks; Joseph Wirth, former chancellor of the German Republic; Korosec, Prime Minister of Yugoslavia; Alexander Lednicka, speaking for Marshal Pilsudski; Albert Thomas, director of the International Labor Office; Tibor Eckhardt, the Hungarian; Titulescu, the Rumanian; Pusta, Foreign Secretary of Estonia; Carlo Sforza, representing Italy's liberals; and Leon Blum, Paul-Boncour, Delbos, Loucheur, Caillaux, and Daladier, accredited leaders of French opinion.

Warm and encouraging words also came from London. "The conception of a United States of Europe," wrote Winston Churchill, "is right. Every step to that end, which makes easier the traffic and reciprocal services of Europe—which encourages nations to lay aside their precautionary panoply—is good in itself, is good for them, and good for all."

Equally powerful voices spoke in opposition, for Pan-Europe was poison to those who profited by disunion. In the forefront of the attack were the armament manufacturers, the politicians who held office by appeals to narrow, hate-filled nationalism, and the international financiers who made millions by the manipulation of tariffs. It is significant, however, that never once was the idea itself attacked. All hailed it as a noble conception, and then proceeded to damn it as utopian. How could so vast a stretch, with so many different peoples and tongues and religions, ever be welded into a working whole? Possibly in a century or two, but certainly not in any immediate future.

The advocates of Pan-Europe fought back both on the platform and in print. Every forward movement in history, they pointed out, had been derided and resisted as Utopian. Full admission was made of difficulties, but facts and figures proved that they were not insuperable. Did not the record show that every European state had traveled a rocky road on the way to unification?

How about Italy, and the long years when Sardinia, Savoy, Sicily, Piedmont, Lombardy, Venice, Rome, Naples, the Trentino, and Trieste fought like dogs over bones? Yet Mazzini's utopianism brought about union. And the centuries during which German kingdoms, principalities, and palatinates drained one another's life blood in ceaseless struggle for trade and power? And what more Utopian than the United States of America? Where a more perfect example, both of the difficulties of union and its tremendous benefits?

The question of size and population was also met head on by comparison with other unions. Against the Continent, with its 2,092,664 square miles, the pan-Europeans matched the 3,022,387 square miles of the United States of America, excluding Territories. Also, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, sprawled over an area twice as large as that of Europe. As for population, did the Continent's 402,800,000 offer any greater difficulties than the 450,000,000 of China, on their way to union in spite of scores of different dialects and the almost utter lack of railroads, telegraphs, and highways?

SWISS SOLVE MANY PROBLEMS

Switzerland, however, was put forward as "pan-Europe in miniature." The Swiss differ religiously, racially, politically, socially, industrially and linguistically, yet the 25 cantons are welded into a federation with a common economic, foreign, and military policy, and without loss of essential sovereignty, or the sacrifice of culture or traditions.

Four different tongues—French, German, Italian, and Romansh—are recognized as national languages. Small Fribourg, solidly Catholic, lives happily side by side with Bern and Vaud, both solidly Protestant, and synagogues are found in every canton.

"Every so-called canton," says pan-European literature, "is a real state, with its own government and parliament, its own laws and taxes, its own traditions and symbols, and its own local patriotism. The federation governs only foreign affairs, monetary affairs, foreign trade and duties, and insures the constitutional rights of the individual and the canton. Military affairs are partly cantonal and partly federal, as the transport and law, while all educational problems are cantonal."

With the best brains in Europe supporting the movement, and all criticism refuted by unanswerable argument, the Pan-European Union seemed certain of success. Twenty-six governments approved the plan, and Europe's principal political parties gave support—even the Social Democrats of Germany. Aristide Briand, however, died in 1932, and in 1933 Adolf Hitler proclaimed the Third Reich. Six years later, his armies rolled from country to country, attemptfng his own brand of unification in the name of the master race, and again the real movement disappeared.

Not until March 22, 1943, was there any sign of resuscitation. Then Winston Churchill called it back to life by affirmation of his faith in the necessity of a unified Europe, with "all the main branches of the European family" as partners. He asked for a "council of Europe," with a "high court to adjust disputes," and sufficient power to enforce its decisions "and prevent renewed aggression and the preparation of future wars." And at the end he expressed an "earnest hope" for the achievement of "the largest common measure of integrated life that is possible without destroying the individual character and traditions of the many ancient and historic races."

Today the Pan-European Union is again a going concern. No Aristide Briand has yet arisen to spearhead the new drive, but with winter at hand, and the grim certainty that millions will be blown here and there on the icy winds of misery, more and more leaders of public opinion in every country are rallying to the banner raised by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi.

PRUSSIANISM NO LONGER A MENACE

The defeat and disintegration of the Third Reich, moreover, gives the movement a brighter promise than it has ever known. Prussianism, so long a barrier to union by reason of its continual threat to peace, is now a beaten, broken thing. As they demonstrate capacity for self-government, the several German provinces could be brought into the union, either singly or in groups.

There is now also a clearer view of the shape that pan-Europe must take. Adherents talk hopefully of Churchill's "Council of Europe," to be composed of the foreign secretaries of the member states, or else the pick of their public men. A capital, of course, for there must be a fixed point of assembly; and as soon as possible a common currency, the common use of waterways and the pooling of resources for the development of great power projects, similar to our TVA; a customs union to remove trade barriers, and an end to the restrictions that now bar free travel.

With coal, iron ores, foodstuffs, tobaccos, and factory products rolling smoothly over rails and highways, and floating down inland waters, Europe has every hope of climbing up out of the pit dug deep by centuries of division and two devastating wars.

While the Union's statement of principles still stands in all-important particulars, some revisions are compelled by changed conditions. The present plan, as announced by leaders, provides for a purely family arrangement, with unification confined to Europe. The inclusion of Russia would carry Europe to the Pacific, and the vastly superior size and strength of the USSR would throw the system completely out of balance. Great Britain, with a commonwealth of her own, must also be excluded.

Both powers, moreover, must abandon all thought of puppet states and spheres of influence. Federation is possible only when the members are free agents, their governments expressing the will of the peoples. The friendship of Russia and Britain is regarded as essential to the creation and success of pan-Europe, but it must be without any expectation of return other than the assurance of decent, industrious, peace-loving neighbors.

What more to their advantage? Pan-Europe, its adherents claim, could not possibly entertain imperialistic ambitions or wage an offensive war, for its military potentialities would be strictly limited to defense. Russia's avowed fear of a "Western bloc" inimical to the USSR, could be calmed still further by having the constitution of the new union outlaw fascism and provide guarantees of strict neutrality. With Pan-Europe as a buffer, precluding any probability of a cordon sanitaire, Russia would be relieved of worry about her western borders, and could give full time to the development of her amazing resources.

The argument applies equally to Britain. No longer compelled to guard against a Europe under German or Russian dominance, full attention could be devoted to the tangled affairs of empire. The benefit to the United States of America is no less demonstrable: An end to the wars into which we are drawn inevitably and, above all, a self-respecting, self-supporting Europe that can be helped with the confidence that our money and materials will go into the building of firm foundations.

President Truman knows his Caesar, his Charlemagne, and his Napoleon, and is equally familiar with the Pan-European movement from its inception. While he would be the last in the world to claim possession of an "international mind," history, by his own admisison, has always been a passion of his. Essentially a realist, and profoundly convinced that the American form of government is the best in the world, the Pan-European arguments are bound to have had powerful appeal for him. The proposal to internationalize European waterways, with Rotterdam as the chief port of entry, rather than Hamburg, may have been a first approach to the United States of Europe, but nothing is safer than the prophecy that it will not be his last.

I'd Rather Be Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Grafton from the New York Post of Monday, March 11, 1946:

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT

(By Samuel Grafton)

Don't look now, but something very peculiar is going on in our Congress. The bi-partisan bloc of Republicans and southern Democrats is becoming a formal organization. Seventy-five Representatives, of both parties, sat down together last Wednesday morning, at what might be called a formal informal meeting, to decide on how to curtail price control; and about 25 additional Representatives sent sweet messages, asking to be considered present in the spirit. The meeting then set up a committee of seven, with a Republican chairman, to draft a "price control" program, and there is nobody in Washington fool enough to doubt that this committee has more power than any regular standing congressional committee with a majority party, or Democratic, chairman. That noise you hear is the moaning of an elderly gentleman in a wing collar, who can remember way back to when we had a two-party system in this country.

OF BITS AND PIECES

Something quite ominous is happening; coalition government (the mere mention of which, up to a few years ago, was enough to make the typical American politician foul his sparkplugs) is taking over. Conservative opinion has pieced out one of those French-type coalitions, made up of bits and pieces of parties, enough to give it working control, and it is using it. And while at first the bi-partisan bloc was only a state of mind, now it is a self-conscious organization.

And like whispers sighing among the bare branches of the winter-ridden trees, one hears echoes of the speeches of long ago, when we used to sit at the feet of our elders, and hear them tell us again how America had become great because it had developed a system of party responsibility, and had avoided dubious foreign tricks like putting together unstable parliamentary coalitions, to rule without formal public sanction or official accountability.

WHO'S WHO IN THE HOUSE

For this coalition rules the Congress; if Congress rules the country, it rules the country. Mr. HARTLEY, Republican, of New Jersey, becomes the most important man in the House, as head of the bloc's drafting committee on price control; you may forget about your Mister Speakers and your majority leaders; Mr. HARTLEY is the works.

Our contemplation of his awful power is made even more tingling by a study of the particular "price control" measure which he is reported to favor. Mr. HARTLEY'S plan would set ceilings at levels which would give to producers, wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers, all along the line, their full costs plus their normal peacetime percentage profits, per unit. This proposal is the exact opposite of price control; it would put our price levels on a kind of cost-plus basis, removing incentive to reduce costs, or to increase volume, or to be a smart trader, since, with the percentage mark-up protected by law, the higher one's costs rose, the higher one's unit profits would rise also. All this has about as much place in an anti-inflation program as would a proposal to give away free confetti during a keep-your-city-clean week.

GIVE IT A NAME

But more important than any one issue is the permanent fact of the existence of the bi-partisan coalition, that curious niche in which conservative opinion has ensconced itself, so snugly, so safely. From this vantage point it can fight Mr. Truman; but if inflation results, the blame will fall on the administration, and so we have here an outstanding case of power without responsibility. One answer might be for the public to begin to refer to the men involved as members of the conservative bloc, leaving off party labels in the cases of men who have dropped away from old-fashioned doctrines of party responsibility. Perhaps we can fight the drift from party government to coalition government by treating the coalition as a party.

Let its members run, in the North, and, especially, in the South, as what they are; so that a candidate who intends to serve as the wick of a firecracker may not pass himself off before the voters as an innocent piece of string.

Argument To Take Prices Off Crude Oil Presented to Banking and Currency Committee of the House by the Honorable James V. Allred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1946, the Honorable James V. Allred appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee which is considering the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act, and presented a strong argument in favor of removing crude oil from price control. Governor Allred served two terms as governor of our State and two terms as attorney general of Texas. He also served as United States district judge for several years until he resigned. He is now a practicing attorney of Houston, Tex. His clients are independent oil producers. He does not represent any of the large integrated companies. His testimony is very interesting and was as follows:

In my opinion, Congress, in any extension of the Price Control Act, should, in the public interest, deny to OPA the power to fix prices on crude oil, for the following reasons:

First, because there is no shortage of crude oil, present or prospective. On the contrary, there is an oversupply of both crude petroleum and gasoline.

Second, because crude-oil price ceilings enrich the large integrated oil companies at the expense of land and royalty owners, including, in Texas, the public-school system.

Third, because OPA ceilings on crude oil tend to promote monopoly, and, unless they are lifted soon, monopoly will be complete.

CRUDE-OIL PRODUCTION—SUPPLY AGAINST DEMAND

According to the press, Mr. Bowles, the present Economic Stabilizer, said last week before this same committee: "It is, of course, expanding production which will bring us to the point where price * * * controls can be dropped."

Crude-oil production has reached that expanded point. There is no shortage of crude oil. On the contrary, there is an overproduction and supply of crude oil and gasoline, when balanced against consumer demand. Crude-oil stocks have increased approximately 20,000,000 barrels since VJ-day, according to the Bureau of Mines. At the present time we have approximately 230,000,000 barrels of crude-oil stocks above ground. In addition, stocks of gasoline—motor fuel—have approached an all-time high—in excess of 100,000,000 barrels.

Because of this oversupply, State regulatory commissions are reducing allowable production. In Texas substantial reductions have been made from month to month since VJ-day, and on March 1 Texas production was ordered decreased approximately 350,000 barrels daily under what it was in February. At that time the Texas Railroad Commission recommended proportionate cuts to the regulatory agencies of all other oil-producing States.

So, there being no shortage of crude oil or gasoline, the test of "expanding production," laid down by Mr. Bowles, has been met. Therefore, crude-oil price ceilings should be removed.

EFFECT OF CRUDE-OIL PRICE CEILINGS ON LAND AND ROYALTY OWNERS AND THE PUBLIC GENERALLY

An erroneous impression has been created, Mr. Chairman, that the great oil companies would be the beneficiaries of a crude-oil price increase. The exact opposite is true. Price ceilings on crude oil have brought incalculable profits to the integrated companies and have penalized not only independent producers but hundreds of thousands of land and royalty owners including, in my State, the public schools and State university.

Royalties are paid upon the selling price of crude oil at the well. The royalty owner gets a certain percentage of the well-head sale price of each barrel of oil. The integrated companies produce or buy the oil which they transport through their own outlets, and it is to their advantage to keep the ceiling price on crude oil at the well as low as possible because:

(a) The royalty they pay the land owners, including the State and Federal Governments, is less;

(b) Severance taxes which, in some of the States, is based upon a percentage of the well-head sale price, are reduced; and

(c) A low crude ceiling price reduces competition in production by independent producers and in purchases by independent refineries.

Thus, the lower the price ceiling at the well, the greater is the profit to an integrated company both in refining and marketing, since they must give the royalty owners a percentage of the well-head price, but all the profit is theirs on the final value of the products, without having to divide the profit with the land or royalty owner.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it will be disputed that the profits of the integrated companies have been disproportionately greater than those of the independent oil producers during the war years. The independent producer had been told that he could not have a price increase because he has been allowed to produce more oil, therefore, his profits have increased. But the integrated refinery has been allowed to refine more oil—its through-put has been practically 100 percent—so it has had an increased income from greater volume also. Yet the refinery has been granted increases on its products by OPA which at the same time consistently denied an increase to the independent producer.

That these profits of the integrated refineries are out of proportion to the selling price for crude is evidenced by the fact that independent refiners have been willing, in many

instances, to pay higher prices for crude, without an increase in the end price of their products, except for OPA ceilings on crude. To illustrate, one of my clients—an independent producer—filed with OPA in June of last year, an application with letters from independent refiners in the Middle West, who stated that they were willing to pay an increased price and absorb it without an increase in the ceiling price of their products. This application has been pending for 8 months and no action has been taken. I submit that granting it would not have been inflation, would not have cost the consumer a cent. True, it would have resulted in additional income to an independent producer but it would also have benefited the royalty owners by dividing with them part of the profits of a refiner who was willing to do so in order to get the oil and compete with the integrated companies.

There are approximately 300,000 royalty owners in Texas, in addition to the public schools and the State university. I have no means of knowing how many royalty and land owners there are in the other oil producing States, but there must be hundreds of thousands of them. In addition, the Federal Government is a royalty owner. If, without a ceiling price on crude, a greater sum would have been paid at the well, there is no estimating, Mr. Chairman, the sums of money which these land and royalty owners have been penalized under present crude oil ceilings and price policies of the OPA. There is no estimating the amount of State taxes which have been affected by these ceilings. There is no estimating the profits which the integrated companies have made by reason of low ceiling price for crude oil while at the same time such companies were making usual profits on their pipe line monopoly and their unusual profits in the refining and marketing end of the game.

Not only this, but the price of oil at the well in Texas and many other States affects ad valorem values for the purposes of taxation. In my State, the ad valorem values of producing properties are based upon ultimate pay-out which, in turn, is controlled by the price at the well. In addition, the well price affects the potential mineral values of all lands within the States. So that, if in fact, the ceiling price of crude oil at the well is less than what it should fairly be, the State's economy is affected by reduced taxes, reduced values, reduced operations, reduced bonuses and rentals paid to landowners and by the further fact that the income of land and royalty owners for circulation and investment within the State is reduced while the profits go into the coffers of the integrated oil companies.

So that, Mr. Chairman, the integrated companies would not be the beneficiaries of an increased ceiling price for oil. True, it would benefit the independent producer as well as the land and royalty owners and States and local subdivisions of Government generally. But, in fairness, to the independent producer, he has been placed in an unfair competitive position with the integrated companies which I shall touch upon more fully under the next subdivision of discussion. Suffice to say that the large integrated companies do not want an increased ceiling on crude. They want a ceiling as low as they can get it. And the only ones who would benefit from lifting crude ceilings are the land and royalty owners, the State and Federal Governments, the school children of Texas (and perhaps other States), and the independent producer who has no pipe line, no refinery, and no filling stations.

Since the foregoing was prepared, on Tuesday, March 5 of this week, OPA has announced that crude-oil ceilings will be raised 10 cents a barrel late this month, and that this increase will be absorbed for the time being by the refiners. To my mind, this is a belated confession that crude ceilings have been too low and have not borne a true relationship to the over-all picture.

In its announcement, OPA says a further study will be made and if the 10-cent increase is inadequate, further relief is promised. What further study is needed to meet the test of "expanding production" enunciated by Mr. Bowles, when even the Wall Street Journal says, in its issue of March 6, that "it has also been said (in industry) that since the end of the war, supply of crude has exceeded demand and that there is no prospective shortage"?

To my mind it is significant that this 10-cent announcement comes at a time when tank-wagon prices of gasoline are being reduced (which could not be done if crude ceilings were not too low); and also when independent operators and representatives of royalty owners, as well as Members of Congress, were demanding action by OPA before the act under consideration is extended. This inadequate increase cannot justify continued ceilings on crude oil when there is no shortage. It does not deal with the fundamental question involved, "expanding production," which calls for dropping ceilings on products of which there is an abundant supply.

MONOPOLY

It seems clear to me that the OPA ceiling price on crude has not had a reasonable relationship to the profits which have been made by the large integrated companies out of transportation, refining and marketing. But if further proof be needed, I cite you the sale of 75 wells in the East Texas field last year by a firm of independent producers to the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, at approximately $80,000 per well. That price cannot be justified on the basis of pay-out, which is the basis generally used. The present allowable, if no further cuts are made on those 80 wells, is approximately 400 barrels per well each month. The well-head price is $1.25 per barrel, which, when reduced by taxes and royalty payments and by a minimum lifting cost, will leave a net operating income of less than $400 a month on an $80,000 investment. An 18-year pay-out. No producer could pay such a price—only a refiner or integrated operator who expects a "take" or excessive profits from other segments of the industry.

Again, there is evidence of this disproportionate relationship of crude ceilings to profits from other branches of the industry in the fact that recently one integrated company reduced tank-wagon prices on gasoline in the Gulf Coast five-eighths of a cent per gallon without a corresponding reduction to the consuming public. An eighth of a cent difference in tank-wagon prices is supposed to reflect 5 cents a barrel difference in the price of crude. So that this integrated company could not have made that reduction in tank-wagon prices if the ceiling price on crude had not been as low as it is and has been under OPA.

Gentlemen, the sale of independent properties in Texas has been repeated many times during the past 4 years. There has been an alarming trend toward monopoly in repeated acquisitions of independent oil properties by integrated companies, reflected by their increasing percentages of the Nation's production. While I have shown beyond dispute the transcendent interest of land and royalty owners and the schools of Texas in an increased crude ceiling, I also espouse the cause of the independent producer who has been compelled, under war conditions, to wage an unequal contest with the powerful integrated companies whose profits come, not from production, but from pipe lines, refineries and marketing. What a producer makes in net earnings depends on how much he can invest back in the business to maintain or increase his position in the industry. Such information as I have indicates that the independent producer, under OPA crude ceilings, has not only not maintained his position in the industry—he has lost it. His percentage of production has steadily decreased. His proportionate percentage of reserves has correspondingly decreased and all the time his costs have gone up.

Gentlemen, this definitely is leading to monopoly. In my opinion, unless the trend is checked, it will result in complete control by the integrated companies. It is something that challenges the attention of Congress. Once the integrated companies have made their control secure and consumer ceilings are gone—as they must ultimately go—then the people will be at the mercy of the oil monopoly. The answer to monopoly is competition. Once ceilings are taken off the independent producer's crude, land and royalty owners will receive their fair share of profits and the consuming public will be protected by the independent's competition, since there is no shortage of oil or gasoline.

This is not a problem that the Office of Price Administration, or any group of statisticians and economists, should take under advisement for a long study. We have had 3 or 4 years of economic study by these same people and so-called industry committees without results, until the 10-cent increase just announced.

During the war it was on their recommendation that the refiners were granted price increases; but they said the producers did not need an increase because they were being allowed to produce more oil each day, consequently their income was up sufficiently to offset increased costs. Very well. Now the allowables have been reduced and an independent's income has been reduced but their costs go on, thus further reducing the amounts they can put back into the business of exploration and finding oil, and drilling wells, furnishing employment, leasing land, paying rentals and royalties. The independent is losing his place in the picture, his position in an industry that must be kept competitive.

Removal of crude-oil ceilings, thus placing it on a competitive basis, will do more, in my opinion, to insure the continued operation of independent refineries than any other single act. In open competition independent refineries can make their contracts so as to be assured of a continued source of supply. It is my observation that an independent refinery will pay more for oil than an integrated refinery. It is unimportant whether this is due to less through-put costs or because of willingness to accept a smaller margin of profit. The important thing is that it is true.

So, if crude ceilings are removed, it will benefit the land and royalty owner, the independent producer, the general economy, and the public generally. Through competition, it will promote the general welfare and the free enterprise to which the integrated companies profess to be so devoted.

Failure to remove crude ceilings will benefit only the integrated companies. It will not benefit the consumer, the royalty owner, the economy of the State and Nation. Crude can be produced in the United States in sufficient quantities, without waste, more than sufficient to supply consumptive demand. Therefore, crude-oil price ceilings are no longer needed even though refinery product ceilings are retained. This will insure that the integrated companies cannot continue to fill up their storage at the expense of the landowner, the school children of Texas, and the independent producer under an umbrella of Government protection.

I do not advocate the removal of all price controls. I do not oppose extension of the Price Control Act. But I do earnestly urge Congress, in extending that act, to deny to OPA the power to fix crude-oil price ceilings, as the first and necessary step in the direction all of us say we want to go—to free

from price control a commodity of which there is no shortage, free it from the injustices which somehow OPA has been unable to see.

Hull Appeals to Major Powers To Cooperate for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, even though it has, of course, appeared verbatim in the press of the Nation, I consider it quite worth while for the RECORD to carry the text of a statement of that great American, able statesman, outstanding Secretary of State, and charming gentleman, who has frequently been referred to as the father of the United Nations. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I predict that history will record Cordell Hull as the father of this great organization, on the success of which so much depends. As I have repeatedly said on the floor and elsewhere, science has progressed to such a state of efficiency that civilization simply cannot survive the shock and destruction of another world war. In the success of the United Nations Organization, toward which I believe it behooves all of us to diligently strive, lies our main hope of avoiding one.

While inserting the statement, it occurs to me to include above it the reference to it in this morning's Washington Post under the headline "Hull Appeals to Major Powers to Cooperate for World Peace":

Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, noting a current "spirit of impatience" in the world, appealed yesterday for cooperation among nations as the only means of preserving the peace.

In a prepared statement, Hull said that success of the United Nations depends on a spirit of cooperation which "rests fundamentally upon the attitude of each of the individual nations in the world community."

"There can be no place in that community for a suspicious and mistrusting attitude," he said.

WARNS OF DISASTER

Hull stressed the importance of relations among the Big Five Nations—Great Britain, United States, France, China, Russia—and asserted that "unspeakable disaster" would result if those countries failed to recognize their common interest.

Text of the former Secretary's statement follows:

"As an American citizen I desire to join in welcoming the United Nations Organization as its temporary headquarters are being established in New York and the appropriate officials meet there on March 21.

"The successful launching of the United Nations on its primary function of maintaining international peace and security, which took place in London during the first 6 weeks of this year, was an event of the most crucial importance to the conduct of relations among nations at this time and for the years ahead. The United Nations has arisen out of the utterly disastrous experience of two world wars in one generation, as well as from all mankind's age-long experience in striving for peace. It has come into existence because of the world's indispensable need for international machinery through which nations may reconcile their differences in unified efforts to maintain security and advance the welfare of all peace-loving peoples."

CAREFULLY WORKED OUT

"Its chief processes were carefully worked out over a period of years, first by experts after long study and investigation, and further by the four major powers represented at Dumbarton Oaks. The general plan and the basic principles of the Organization were determined there as the outside maximum of agreement that might be expected at this time, especially on the part of the more powerful nations. Thereafter, 50 nations agreed at San Francisco upon its main features, formulated its Charter, and accepted it unanimously as the beginning of what ultimately would be developed into a great, solid world structure of peace able to defy any and all forces or influences calculated to weaken or undermine it. No one has suggested any other mutually acceptable plan that was as good, much less better.

"But no one ever expected the United Nations to perform a miracle. As I said after the San Francisco Conference, the Charter which sets its course is a human instrument, not a perfect one. For this very reason, the ultimate success of the organization depends upon a spirit of cooperation among nations which, in turn, rests fundamentally upon the attitude of each of the individual nations in the world community. There can be no place in that community for a suspicious and mistrusting attitude. Such a national frame of mind will inevitably breed international discontent."

MUST PROVE FAITH

"If any nation—including our own—would merit the cooperation and trust of other nations, it must prove its good faith by offering them its cooperation and trust. Thus alone can a man aid in creating peace and good will among men. Thus alone can a nation aid in creating peace and good will among nations.

"Especially is this true of the relations among the major powers. The structure of the Organization gives special recognition to this fact. Only through continued cooperation among the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and France can there be evolved that essential understanding and unity of action so necessary if the peace is to be kept, by armed force if necessary. Unspeakable disaster would result through failure on the part of each and all of these nations to recognize their common interests and to harmonize their action in support of those interests. No international machinery as such can produce that essential harmony and unity. It can only provide the procedures which will facilitate its attainment.

"The United Nations is now fully embarked upon its all-important task. It is but natural that it should meet with trials and tribulations from time to time, especially as it gets under way. All friends of peace and humanity should, therefore, exert themselves to the utmost to support the Organization, particularly over the present most critical stage of its growth."

IMPATIENCE NOTED

"There is in the world today a spirit of impatience, which is a natural outgrowth of war fatigue. This spirit must be overcome by willingness of all to examine with sympathy and patience the views of others, to ascertain the true facts, to avoid the assumption of adamant positions and to refrain from exaggerating and overemphasizing one's own claims and from making an appeal to prejudice. The United Nations is the natural center wherein this spirit of understanding can be given most fruitful expression, through frequent friendly conferences among the top officials of nations and through the type of action made possible by the provisions of its Charter. Its success requires that such conferences and such action be grounded on the broad patriotism of world peace and human progress. It requires also that there be an informed, alert, organized public opinion in all countries, especially in all those countries where the people have a voice in government. Time and patience and mutual respect are necessary to hold the nations fast to this course and this objective.

"Our Nation, and every nation, must bring to the international effort to achieve and maintain enduring peace an abiding faith in the ultimate goodness and greatness of men, in the ideals of freedom and liberty, and in a world order under law with justice and equality for all nations and all men. With that faith expressed in action the United Nations can serve the human race as it has never been served before. I am confident that all member nations alike will make their contribution to this end.

"As the Organization moves forward it is freighted with the most precious of all human interests—the hopes and aspirations of every intelligent human being for security and peace. We who are living now must not allow the human race to commit suicide through lack of vision or through selfishness, impatience, or provocation."

Russia and Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith a very timely editorial from the Washington Daily News on the subject Russia and Churchill:

RUSSIA AND CHURCHILL

Moscow's bitter attacks on Winston Churchill for proposing closer Anglo-American fraternal association come with bad grace from the Russians, of all people. They seem to forget that they have a 20-year military alliance with Britain, and an offer of one for 50 years. And they have military alliances with other nations. Those in glass houses should not throw stones.

The reason an Anglo-American treaty of alliance is not in the picture has nothing to do with Russian feelings. Certainly Washington would not recognize Moscow's right or good faith in offering objections to the United States following the Russian precedent.

Actually, however, American tradition is against peacetime military alliances of an exclusive nature. That tradition is not apt to be changed.

Moscow knows this. She also knows that treaties of alliance are not worth much, as her own experience shows.

What counts in the relations of nations are common purposes and mutual interests—or conflicting purposes and interests. The Anglo-American conflict of interests is minor compared with the basic purposes and standards shared by the two peoples. The fraternal association which Churchill mentioned—he did not propose a treaty of alliance—already exists and has existed for a long time. Repeatedly it has held Britain and America together in times of grave crisis. It is stronger today than ever.

That does not mean the United States underwrites all British imperial policy, or that England always agrees with us. It does mean that on the larger issues of world peace, and defense against aggression, the United States and the British Commonwealth are united.

This is not a menace to any peaceful nation, not a threat to any freedom. It is the best hope of the United Nations, and is so recognized by most members.

It will not be used for aggression against Russia. Whether it is ever used in defense against Russian aggression will depend on Moscow. Certainly the democracies and Soviet Russia can exist peacefully in the same world—but not if Russian-directed communism tries to overthrow our democracies. Certainly there is no legitimate territorial conflict between the United States and Russia—but Russia can create conflict if she is determined on expansion at the expense of her neighbors.

If Russia will live up to her United Nations pledges, she will have the United States and Britain as enduring friends in that alliance for peace. But if she continues to violate her peace agreements—as she is doing today in Manchuria and Iran and elsewhere—no power on earth can make others trust her. Unless Russia learns that before it is too late, the future is dark.

How Much Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Inflation?" which appeared in the February 15, 1946, issue of the Daily Times published in Mamaroneck, N. Y.:

HOW MUCH INFLATION?

Experienced observers of the national scene are of the opinion that it will be impossible to hold the line in all commodities against inflation. Here and there must come a little "give" if we are to get into full production. For manufacturers and distributors are obviously not going to work without profit, and in some lines profits vanish as wage scales push the costs of manufactured articles closer and closer to OPA ceiling prices.

The question becomes, then, one of how much inflation is to be permitted and in what commodities. That is the fight which is now going on beneath the surface in Washington, with powerful influences at work upon administration leaders. In return for agreement that OPA price control is to continue, after the scheduled termination on June 30, these insist that production cannot be guaranteed in many lines without higher prices.

Chester Bowles will bow to the inevitable in some cases; in others he will compromise; and in still others he will be adamant and will win out. That appears to be the consensus in best-informed circles.

What will be the results? Increased prices which will offset wage raises in many instances.

A still higher cost of living for many families, perhaps as much as 10 percent. A continued wrangle from those who have not been permitted to raise prices, or who have not been allowed to raise them as much as they ask.

But there is a brighter side. Gradually, in practically all forms of manufacture, we shall get increased production. Gradually, the shelves will fill and shortages will disappear. And gradually the enhanced purchasing power of the Nation will be absorbed through this ability to find desired articles. Then there will be a return to the natural law of supply and demand, and wherever there develops a surplus in production there will be a consequent drop in prices.

Perhaps, in view of these circumstances, our greatest need is for patience. We didn't convert to war overnight and we should not be expected to reconvert to peace in a fortnight. In time, we are confident, these economic tangles will disappear.

Don't ever sell America short.

Russian Cotton-Producing Republics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the position in the cotton world occupied by the cotton South of the United States for decades was unquestioned.

Then came the New Deal with its scarcity program, acreage controls, and reciprocal trade agreements.

It is a matter of record of how the production of cotton in the United States through Government planning has been reduced. The increase of cotton production in the other parts of the world has been startling.

The cotton industry of the United States is now at the crossroads. While we have a great many bales of cotton on hand, the quality of this excess cotton is low grade. As other cotton-producing areas in foreign lands come into operation, the cotton South will be placed in a more embarrassing position.

For the record, I submit the February 27 statement of Robert Moore & Co., 60 Beaver Street, New York City, because it contains important information with respect to the production of cotton in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

COTTON COMMENTS FROM ROBERT MOORE & CO., 60 BEAVER STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1946.

LAND AND CLIMATE OF RUSSIAN COTTON-PRODUCING REPUBLICS

The central Asian Republics of Uzbek S. S. R., Tajik S. S. R., and Turkmen S. S. R., coupled with the trans-Caucasian Republic of Azerbaijan S. S. R., are responsible for the major portion of cotton production in the U. S. S. R. "Land of the Soviets" gives the following description of these lands:

Uzbek: In this land of foothills there are more irrigated fields than in all other republics of central Asia together. This republic produces nearly two-thirds of the cotton produced in the Soviet Union. It has an area of 146,000 square miles, which exceeds that of Italy. The people of this land are masters of the art of irrigated agriculture. The area under cotton in Uzbek has doubled and the average yield has increased from 703 pounds per acre in 1934 to 1,460 pounds per acre in 1938 as a result of the agricultural technical methods. Yields of 4,400 to 8,800 pounds per acre are no longer exceptional. Indeed, some advanced collective farmers achieved a hitherto unparalleled figure in 1937 of 12,460 pounds per acre.

In general the climate of Tashkent (41°19′ N.; 71°16′ E.) is typical of the entire plain of central Asia. Precipitation is low, amounting to 13.7 inches during the year. The summer is practically rainless, cloudless, and very hot, with an average July temperature of 81.3° F. It is like the Tropics, but far less oppressive due to cool nights. Winter is wet with mild frosts that do not last long. Average January temperature is 32.5° F.

Azerbaijan: In this republic the winters are comparatively mild (the average temperature for January is 38.3° F. The summers are hot (average temperature for July is 78.2° F.) Precipitation is scant, 7.1 inches per year. Baku, focal point of the cotton-producing area of Azerbaijan occupies a geographical location of 42°21′ N.; 49°40′ E.

Recent Soviet releases have the following to say about the above cotton-producing republics: "Uzbek S. S. R. is the largest cotton region in the U. S. S. R., producing 60 percent of the total cotton crop. Here, cotton plantations cover over 250,000,000 acres, and the crop in 1938 exceeded 1,500,000 tons—3 times as large as the annual crop produced under the Tsarist regime. Old cotton ginning mills have been extended and modernized and huge new textile mills have been built."

"Tien-Shan in the Tajik S. S. R., is now the principal Egyptian cotton-growing center in the U. S. S. R. Even until 1929 the average yield of the cotton crop was about 1.5 metric tons per acre, but at the present time, 1945, it ranges between 4 and 4.5 metric tons.

"In the Turkmen S. S. R. new irrigation canals have been built, and this has given great impetus to the cultivation of cotton. In 1937, at least 375,000 acres—120 percent more than before 1914—were planted with this crop. In 1939, the total crop amounted to 240,000 tons, almost 4.6 times more than before 1914. A large area is planted with Egyption long-fiber cotton."

Azerbaijan is the second largest cotton-producing region in the U. S. S. R. and the largest long-fiber Egyptian cotton region."

Colored cotton: According to an official just returned from Russia, experiments with colored cotton have not come up to expectations. Although an advance has been made, the Russians have been unable to get uniform shades of the colored lint. The brown shades ranged from light to dark in the same fields, indicating that, despite uniformity of seed, the lint could not yet be produced with a uniform color.

ROBERT MOORE & CO.

One Strike Law That Would Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker under permission granted by the House, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the February 15 edition of the Standard-Star, published in New Rochelle, N. Y., entitled "One Strike Law That Would Work":

ONE STRIKE LAW THAT WOULD WORK

Out of the welter of confused and occasionally self-contradictory advice which has been poured upon Congress by rival interests of labor-management difficulties, there is one simple recommendation which we consider

exceedingly sound and simple of enforcement if enacted into law.

This is the absolute prohibition of jurisdictional strikes, that is, strikes between rival unions. Under these, the employer suffers as much as if the strike were directed at him, since production ceases just the same. The public suffers since it fails to get the goods. And the employees suffer because they lost their wages.

If an emphatic ban on jurisdictional strikes is enacted by Congress, with teeth in the law, it would work. Picketing by either rival union should be prohibited and the full force of the law thrown behind those who desired to continue to work. Upon that arrangement, one union would think several times before pulling out its members, knowing the rival union would immediately recruit others to take their places.

Some way would be found by rival unions to settle their differences other than by a strike. And it might even be that in this solution would rise eventually a recipe for other types of strikes as well.

Bear in mind that when John L. Lewis, back in the A. F. of L., begins his crusade to take away unions from the CIO, trouble is going to break hard and fast. Let's be prepared for it.

Resolution of Oklahoma Livestock Marketing Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Be it resolved by the stockholders of the Oklahoma Livestock Marketing Association, in annual meeting assembled, as follows:

1. We express our appreciation to the officers and directors of this association for the able and efficient manner in which they have guided the affairs of the association during the difficult and trying days of the war, and thus far through the period of transition from wartime economy to a peacetime footing.

2. We believe that our Nation is at the crossroads of its national destiny, and that the period immediately ahead of us will, to a large degree, determine whether we are to continue along the pathway of individual incentive and opportunity charted for us by our forefathers, or whether we will depart from this well-blazed trail which has led us to our present national greatness, and go astray on the dangerous bypaths of communism or national socialism in search of a panacea for all of our real or imaginary national ills, or a national utopia, which exists only in the minds of visionaries or fools.

3. We are opposed to the domination and control of our Government by any one class or group; we believe in equal rights to all and special privileges to none; we believe that all classes and groups of our citizens should stand equal before the law and be equally amenable to the law; and, believing this, we are unalterably opposed to "class legislation," such as the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which deliberately seeks to further the interests of one class or group of our people at the expense of another, and confer upon the favored class privileges and immunities denied to other citizens.

We denounce such legislation as "un-American" and calculated to needlessly array one group against another, which can lead only to irreparable injury and damage to the Nation as a whole.

4. We are unalterably opposed to the domination and control of the Nation by so-called big business in any form, corporate or otherwise. When the great corporations began to threaten the best interests of the people as a whole, drastic legislation, such as the Sherman antitrust laws and the Clayton Act, were enacted to curb their activities.

Labor unions, under the special privileges and immunities conferred by the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and the favoritism shown to them by the national administration, with their millions of members and their tens of millions of dollars of treasure, have become big business—the biggest and most dominant and self-seeking business in the Nation, and we now call on Congress to enact appropriate legislation to make them likewise amenable to the same laws that regulate and control other predatory interests.

5. We believe that the seemingly interminable list of strikes called by the highest paid workers in the land—men in most instances making many times the income of the average farmer—are resulting not only in great injury, damage, and loss to those residing upon the farms of the Nation, but that over and beyond that, they are injuring the Nation as a whole by retarding reconversion to a peacetime footing and the reemployment in civil life of our returning veterans, and we therefore endorse and approve the recent action of the National House of Representatives in passing legislation calculated to regulate and control, at least to some extent, what is rapidly becoming a national menace.

We congratulate the gentlemen who had the courage to vote for such legislation, and thereby place the interests of the Nation above and beyond their own selfish personal interests.

"THE POWER TO TAX IS THE POWER TO DESTROY"

6. Today our citizens are paying, in the form of a Federal income tax alone, from 23 to 93 percent of their entire net income. The man with even a medium income must earn $2 for the Government for each $1 he can earn for himself and apply on his own personal indebtedness, and this, to pay a tax that did not even exist in the United States until 1916.

Our forefathers sought to create a government to serve them, but through this power of taxation, it has now developed into a government which we serve, and much of this burden of taxation has been created through extravagances in every department of the Government, both National and State.

We therefore appeal to those in authority to reduce expenditures and to economize in the handling of our governmental affairs to the end that there may be at least some relief from this staggering burden of taxation.

7. The livestock industry is opposed both to the policy of subsidies and to the policy of attempted price controls as practiced by the national administration. We believe both to be un-American and inconsistent with the American system of free enterprise.

We think that both subsidies and price controls on livestock and other farm products should be discontinued, but that they should be removed simultaneously. We are opposed to discontinuing subsidies so long as price controls on our products remain in effect.

8. We believe that there is too much Government in business and too little business in Government.

We subscribe to the principle that the best-governed people are the least-governed people, and we believe that when we surrender to the Government the right to continue wartime regulations in times of peace, and otherwise direct the most intimate affairs of our daily lives, we surrender the most sacred rights and privileges of Americans; those rights and privileges which have hitherto distinguished Americans from the regimented slaves of Hitler, Mussolini, and others of their ilk; and we therefore call upon the Government to relinquish all wartime controls at the earliest possible moment, consistent with the best interests of the Nation.

9. We approve and commend the policy of President Truman in appointing to his Cabinet, and to other high positions, men from other sections of the United States than the extreme East.

Too long have these high positions been filled by men who do not know or understand the problems of the West and South. Therefore, those sections of the country have been without proper representation in the councils of state.

This change in policy should prove beneficial to all sections of the Nation.

10. We believe that the future welfare of the Nation rests, to a greater extent with the farmers of the Nation than with any other class of our people, and if the boys and girls of this, and coming generations, are to be kept on the farms, farm life must be made more attractive.

So long as life in the cities continues to offer greater pleasures and a more pleasant mode of life, the trend will be away from the farms, and to the cities.

We therefore commend the policy of the Government in attempting to make life on the farms more comfortable and attractive through the building of good roads, rural electrification, and similar projects. This policy will inure to the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

11. That these resolutions be recorded in the minutes of this meeting and that copies thereof be mailed to the President of the United States, to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress and to the Governor of the State of Oklahoma.

Memphis Press-Scimitar Endorses La Follette-Monroney Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the report of the La Follette-Monroney Committee on the Reorganization of Congress continues to draw commendation from American editors. Almost every recommendation of the committee is endorsed by students of the problems of legislative procedure.

On March 4 the Memphis Press-Scimitar, in referring with approval to the report, stated:

The American people have been increasingly concerned over the evident inability of Congress to play, with maximum effectiveness, its proper role in our form of government. Their concern was reflected in a flood of suggestions to the committee. To all, the committee applied this simple test: "Will they strengthen Congress and enable it to do a better job?" Congress will gain strength and ability to do an immensely better job if it adopts the La Follette-Monroney proposals.

The editorial specifically urged the adoption of committee recommendations

with reference to reducing the number of standing committees and quoted approvingly the following paragraph from the report:

No adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous work load that present-day governmental problems place upon it.

The La Follette-Monroney committee has rendered a great public service in directing attention to the need for modernizing our committee organization and there is ample evidence that the people would applaud the adoption of these proposed changes.

Freedom of the Soldiers' Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I would like to call attention to an editorial appearing in the March 5, 1946, edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal, published in Louisville, Ky. Since the editorial bears upon the question of an investigation of the attitude of those in charge of our soldiers' publications toward a free press, I believe it deserves the serious consideration of every Member.

I have already asked our War Department to review the situation and to investigate not only the removal of two loyal soldier editors and writers from the staff of the Pacific Stars and Stripes, but the question of whether or not our GI's are to enjoy the freedom to have their own press, or whether it shall be only a press expressing the views of the officers in charge and the War Department?

We are all interested in Army morale. Nothing can destroy it quicker in peacetime than for our people's Army to be denied a people's press. The excellent editorial from this highly respected newspaper follows:

A CONFUSION OF UNCLE SAM WITH MR. HEARST

For whom are the GI's who run the service newspaper Stars and Stripes working? We had assumed that they, like all other servicemen, are employed by the people of the United States, whom they represent as defenders of our national welfare. True, they have little to say about conditions of employment, length of service, or rate of pay, but as American citizens they are making this personal contribution to the vital interests of their Nation.

Quite a different view seems lodged in certain military minds, however. It has found interesting expression in the remarks put forth by Brig. Gen. Charles T. Lanham, Director of the War Department's Information and Education Service, apropos of free expression of opinion in the soldier press.

Averring that the service papers are entitled to "the same freedom of the press enjoyed by the Hearst chain or the Scripps-Howard chain," General Lanham points out that "a reporter on the Hearst papers is not at liberty to attack Mr. Hearst or the Hearst policy. Why then should the staff of a soldier publication feel that it is entitled to attack the War Department, War Department policies, and the high officers who are responsible for the formulation of policies?"

This extraordinary view presents the War Department as the direct counterpart of a newspaper tycoon, with the right to hire and fire men to handle news according to his personal predilections. It admits no further responsibility than Mr. Hearst might feel toward an employee. The GI with a billet on a service paper thus becomes a chattel of the War Department, with all the disadvantages of working for a highly opinionated civilian publisher, but without the precious civilian right of being able to resign from his job.

The trouble in the Tokyo office of Stars and Stripes, which gave rise to the Lanham statement of doctrine, has implications which deserve careful examination. The editor and featured columnist who were transferred to other military duty because they "flavored" their copy with "Communist thought" have now been joined by four other staff members who have asked voluntarily for transfer on the grounds that the Army is muzzling the service press. It is difficult to believe that all these men are fellow travelers, and that the Tokyo officer of the paper was a virtual Communist cell.

The freedom of expression allowed in the columns of the service papers during the war was considered revolutionary in some military circles, but it provided an invaluable safety valve for millions of civilians in uniform. It would be an ironic blunder if the Army, which under General Eisenhower's personal sponsorship carried out this successful democratic experiment in wartime, should relapse into military dictatorship in time of peace. Representatve DE LACY of Washington is performing a service in demanding an investigation to reveal just what the Army is doing in this direction.

We Seek Peace in UNO, Not in Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by John S. Knight from the Chicago Daily News of March 9, 1946:

WE SEEK PEACE IN UNO, NOT IN ALLIANCE

Winston Churchill's plea for a virtual military alliance between the United States and Great Britain came as no surprise to those of us who have had the privilege of discussing international affairs with the former Prime Minister during his stay in Florida.

On Saturday, February 23, this paragraph appeared in the Publisher's Notebook:

"It is as plain as a pikestaff that Britain lives in mortal terror of Russia and she is striving desperately to forge a moral alliance with the United States that will guarantee her future security and preserve her zones of influence throughout the far-flung empire."

The conclusion was based upon several talks with Churchill and interviews with Lady Astor and Leslie Hore-Belisha which appeared in the Miami Herald.

Churchill made no secret of his desire for common citizenship between our two countries. With characteristic frankness, Lady Astor observed that "the best way to get to Russia is for the United States and Britain to get together." Hore-Belisha favors a "declaration of interdependence" as a fitting substitute for the Declaration of Independence.

FEAR

Fear of Russia is in the heart of every visiting Britisher I have met and it may be added that the fear complex is rapidly invading the minds of normally self-sufficient Americans.

Churchill's advocacy of joint use of all naval and air bases of either the United States or the United Kingdom "all over the world" and "intimate" relationships between Anglo-American military advisers, common study of "potential dangers," similar weapons and manuals of instruction and "interchange of officers and cadets at colleges" is offered as vital support for the UNO and the best means of maintaining the peace.

Without any desire to contradict Britain's great wartime leader, I suggest most respectfully that Mr. Churchill sees in such an alliance as he proposes a guaranty that American arms will be used to safeguard and protect the British Empire.

It is a proposal that will be rejected by all straight-thinking Americans. Our reasons are these:

1. A military alliance between the United States and Great Britain would negate every principle of the United Nations Organization.

2. It would involve us in disputes between England and other nations which were not of our making.

3. It would, in effect, serve notice upon Russia that the two English-speaking peoples had banded together for the purpose of showing their muscles to the rest of the world and thus perpetuate the age-old game of European power politics which has started two World Wars within our time.

4. It would put "on paper" and attempt to enforce by treaty the time-tested bond of blood and friendship which already exists between two great nations speaking the same language.

Mr. Churchill's distress over Russia's attitude since the end of the war is justifiable and understandable. We find it equally repugnant here in the United States.

RUSSIA

Secretary Byrnes' sharp warning to Russia that the United States vigorously opposes Soviet policies of aggrandizement in various parts of the world is a clear indication that the White House, as well as No. 10 Downing Street, is alarmed.

As Wallace R. Deuel of our Washington staff said in his dispatch on the Byrnes speech, "It was one of the most outspoken ever delivered by a Secretary of State, long and hardy though the American tradition of shirt-sleeve diplomacy is."

Russia has been literally waging a war of nerves to achieve strategic ends.

We have every right to be concerned over what Deuel calls a one-sided gnawing at the balance of power, contrary to Moscow's obligations under the United Nations Charter.

But to effect a military alliance with Great Britain at this critical moment would not only dash our hopes for a more friendly relationship with Russia, but it would place us in precisely the same untenable position in which we now find the Soviet Government.

POLICY

Mr. Churchill need have no fears as to America's course of action in case England is under attack by Russia. As was said in these columns of February 23, "When the chips are down, when war and imminent collapse threaten our own security, the United States is always found at Britain's side."

The bond between the two nations is too close and the threat to our own security too great ever to permit military conquest of England by a powerful aggressor.

However, it is unlikely that the American people are in any mood to go to war over Indonesia, India, or the Middle East. With the growing nationalism that is reflected by returned veterans, it will be many, many years before the United States will plunge into another global conflict over the rape of a modern Poland.

The United Nations Organization is our one hope of future peace. Despite all of the acrimonious conflicts that have arisen in its councils, it can and must be made to work.

This is the final test of whether the nations of the world can work together for the cause of an enduring peaceful civilization.

Bilateral alliances such as the one suggested by Mr. Churchill are not to be considered until, God forbid, the United Nations Organization falls into total collapse.

In such a sad eventuality, self-preservation will dictate exactly what Mr. Churchill recommends so lugubriously at this time.

Mr. Churchill's speech reveals disillusionment and fear. It is an indication of his disbelief in the ability of the great powers to work together in the winning of the peace.

It is much too early for us to concede that he is right.

SECRET

The former prime minister was on sounder ground when he said that it would be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret of the atomic bomb to a UNO still in its infancy and that it would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this agitated and ununited world.

To the scientists who contend that the secret of the atomic bomb is known to all, the reply can be made that the United States is still the one Nation that is producing them in any effective quantity.

The UNO is a promising lad who, after his share of youthful fist fights and backyard quarrels, is likely to fulfill our hopes by developing maturity, balance, and a respect for the right.

But it is not quite the part of wisdom to entrust him with lethal weapons while he is still in short pants.

Churchill was entirely correct when he said that American custodianship of the atomic bomb had not caused sleepless nights anywhere.

"I do not believe," he emphasized, "that we should all have slept so soundly had the positions been reversed and some Communist or neo-Fascist state monopolized, for the time being, these dread agencies."

With this reasoning, there can be little disagreement.

YALTA

In reflection, one wonders just what sort of statesmanship was exercised by the late President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Secretary Byrnes at Yalta.

We now learn of secret agreements awarding the Kuriles to Russia and permitting the Soviet to remove heavy industries from Manchuria, although the latter rumor has since been denied by Secretary Byrnes.

We confess bewilderment over the ease with which Marshal Stalin won virtually every point at the Big Three conferences and the subsequent roars against the Russsians that have been growing in intensity ever since Japan was crushed.

Quite possibly, the United States and Great Britain might stand in better relationship to Russia today if they had stood firmly for principle and international justice at the Big Three conferences.

Secretary Byrnes' recent warning to Russia that America will use force against Soviet policies of aggrandizement if they are carried too far is a tardy and belated admonition.

George Weller, of the Daily News foreign service, reports that American foreign policy is touching a new all-time low in the Far East. Writing from Peiping, China, Weller says that "speculation here centers around the question of when, if ever, the American people will fully appreciate what writing off Manchuria means in the struggle for far eastern power. State Department comments that America still retains a stake in the Manchurian industry, which was moved out by the Soviets, are considered legally well grounded, but about 9 months late and totally ineffective."

According to Weller, wrist slaps from Washington have not prevented the Soviets from moving 60 percent of Manchuria's productive power into Russia. The seizure of Manchuria as a whole undoubtedly will be delayed, says Weller, and, read this carefully: "Until the United States, through UNRRA and other such agencies, resupplies machinery deficiencies."

Weller concludes his dispatch by saying that "it must be pointed out that Russia's sack of Manchuria is not done in any anti-American spirit. Russian troops are simply indifferent to the United States. Their sentiments are pro-Chinese Communist, anti-Chinese Nationalist, tolerance of the Japanese, and disinterest in the United States. The Americans are paying the bills, as they did in the Balkans and Iran, are asking nothing, and this admirably suits the Russian inclinations."

APPEASEMENT

All along the line we seem to have made the mistake of appeasing Russia instead of demanding that she make her position clear.

The Soviet Government should recognize that if she has valid claims, there is nothing to be lost by putting all of the cards on the table.

If a good case can be made for access to the Dardanelles or Iranian oil, Russia's cause will be best served by telling the world of her legitimate needs rather than conducting a war of nerves against smaller nations.

We heard repeatedly in Presidential campaigns that Franklin D. Roosevelt was the only man who could "talk turkey" to Churchill and Stalin.

If that be true, perhaps someone will arise and explain why Stalin got the breast, Churchill the neck, and Harry Truman was left with a cold smell of the part that was last seen disappearing over the fence.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit today to my colleagues an editorial from the Huntington Herald-Advertiser, published in Huntington, W. Va., and edited by Mr. H. R. Pinckard.

In view of the discussion of the President's housing proposal, I think you will find the editorial very interesting.

The editorial follows:

SHARE THE QUARTERS, OR SHARE THE BLAME

We sympathize deeply with the Marshall College Veterans' Association, which has expressed its impatience with the local housing situation and in a telegram to the West Virginia congressional delegation demanded that a veterans' emergency housing program be expedited immediately. These men, back from 2 to 4 years of military service and anxious to complete their college courses and get to work, are understandably fretful as they look around them.

Apartments are unobtainable. Houses are not being offered for rent and prices on those offered for sale are so inflated that they will rarely qualify for a 100 percent loan under the terms of the GI bill. Everywhere the returned veteran looks, he sees what appears to be new evidence that the country for which he made such heavy sacrifices is determined to repay him with gold bricks and the old "T. S. slips" with which he became so familiar in the service.

The fact that Huntington's housing problems are typical of practically every community in the Nation does not console these men or their families; nor does it comfort them to know that their plight is even less desperate than that of innumerable family groups in older age brackets whose problems are complicated by children and other dependents. They don't want lengthy explanations—they want solutions.

It seems to us that in appealing to Congressmen for quick action they are turning in the wrong direction for help. If President Truman's housing program were enacted tomorrow, and if it proved to be all that its sponsors proclaim, it would not relieve the immediate housing shortage. It would take time to get scarce materials into full production and more time to build the houses which are so badly needed. Even the most optimistic observers say it would be 6 to 8 months (and more likely a year) before enough units could be constructed to make even a dent in the situation.

This is the kind of problem which every community should try to solve on the basis of its own needs and its own resources. The tendency to wait for the Government to do something about it—a trait acquired by the American people in the last 12 years and which threatens to become permanent and ingrained—must be overcome. We may not be able to build houses by full community cooperation, but we can at least make better use of the facilities at hand.

Realtors and chamber of commerce representatives have just completed a survey of Huntington's housing needs. They know with reasonable accuracy how many apartments, how many houses, how many single rooms and other types of living quarters are needed to satisfy the immediate demands. But if these figures are not to be put to some practical use, the survey was a waste of time.

How could this data be better employed than as the basis for a house-to-house canvass by volunteer solicitors whose job it would be to sell Huntingtonians on the proposition of sharing their quarters? Less than a third of the homes of Huntington are filled to capacity. In most of them there are vacant rooms and in others vacancies could be created by exercise of a little ingenuity. If the people could be persuaded to make these spaces available, the housing crisis could be weathered without assistance from the Federal Government or any other outside authority.

Let the people view this critical period as akin to those of 1937 and before, when the Ohio River was free to wash over the city's lowlands and emergency quarters had to be found for hundreds of homeless families. Let this campaign to share-the-quarters feed on those same springs of neighborliness and community loyalty which in the past have made us strong and self-reliant. Let every empty building be examined for its possibilities, and emergency construction crews be recruited to make it habitable.

It will be easier, of course, to take the complacent view—less likely to cause us some effort and inconvenience if we procrastinate and continue to look for a miracle from Washington. But in the meantime restiveness and resentment are growing, and the problems which now could be solved by a little concerted action become daily more complicated. Let us resolve to add our

weight to this project today—while there is still time and our own consciences are the only spur—which tomorrow we will be forced to undertake amidst tensions a hundred times as critical.

H. R. P.

Worse Than Locusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Josephus Daniels, president of the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., wrote an interesting editorial recently concerning the lobby against the veterans' emergency housing bill. It was headed, "Worse Than Locusts," and was as follows:

Congressman PATMAN, leader for a needed housing bill, declares that "lobbyists and their employers are organizing a campaign built on deliberate falsehood and innuendo to profiteer out of the misery of the American people who cannot find a place to live."

Lobbyists are worse pests than the locusts of Egypt, and ought to be banished as corruptors of good government. When Wilson was urging an end of favors to campaign contributors, as the Underwood-Simmons tariff measure was in the making, these lobby harpies descended on Washington. With the help of Tom Pence, Raleigh newspaper correspondent, Wilson got their names and drove them out of the National Capital. Result: The best tariff bill in half a century became a law.

That driving out of harpies from Washington should be repeated.

Make Real the Symbol of the Statue of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial in the February 26, 1946, edition of the Washington Post. It speaks so eloquently on the question of immigration quotas, I need add no further comment. The editorial follows:

IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

It is strange to see the persistence, in a country founded and fostered by immigration, of the fallacy that immigrants are a burden. The fallacy found expression the other day in a recommendation to Congress, joined in by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that immigration quotas be sharply reduced for the next decade. "Why intensify our problems," said a spokesman for the VFW, "by permitting in the critical postwar years a continual flow of immigrants across our borders?"

There are several obvious answers to this rhetorical question—including what should be most obvious of all, that it is based on an altogether false premise. Immigrants do not, as the veterans' representatives indicated, take jobs away from Americans. They create jobs. They are consumers as well as workers. The food they eat, the houses they live in, the clothes they wear, the movies they attend, the radios they buy, all serve to swell the volume of American production, to keep the tractors on our farms and wheels of our factories in motion. Immigration is an expansion of the American market, a revitalization of the American economic frontier. Our periods of greatest prosperity in the past have been directly related to the influx of newcomers from abroad.

There are, moreover, formidable reasons for liberalizing rather than restricting immigration to the United States at this particular time. The most compelling reason is that the need is now particularly great among those overseas who have been uprooted by the war. To many Europeans, persecuted politically and unwanted in the lands of their birth, America is a symbol of salvation and promise. It has always been such a symbol—from the earliest days when it first offered asylum to religious protestants, through the years when Swedes and Poles and Germans and Italians and Irishmen and others from abroad were building our railroads, mining our coal, forging our steel and making real the American dream of boundless opportunity. We cannot take all of them; we cannot give refuge to all who seek to come here and start life anew by working in freedom. But we can play a more generous part than we have played. We can keep alive the great tradition symbolized by the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. In doing so, we shall enrich our national life and the institutions through which we have grown to greatness.

Bretton Woods and the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, if the news report from Savannah, Ga., which I insert as part of my remarks, is true, then it clearly indicates that the participation of foreign countries in the Bretton Woods International Monetary Fund is predicated upon these countries getting a loan from the United States. This is the very condition about which many Members of the House were concerned when the Bretton Woods agreement was under consideration by this body.

If the United States must furnish all the money for the Bretton Woods International Fund, and then not have control over the use of this fund, it would seem most unwise that we should make these loans to foreign countries, or even to keep our own commitments to the Bretton Woods agreement. The article from the Daily Press follows:

BRITISH SAY THEIR PARTICIPATION IN BRETTON WOODS DEPENDS ON LOAN FROM UNITED STATES—RUSSIA MAY STAY OUT

(By Vermont Royster)

SAVANNAH, GA.—Great Britain served notice on the United States that she could not participate in the Bretton Woods International Monetary Fund and the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development being organized in international conference here, unless the United States advances the requested three and three-fourths billion dollar loan.

In view of the fact that Russia's participation is likewise being tied to a United States loan, the Bank is faced with eventual loss of two of its five largest contributors before it and the fund have even begun to operate.

The only apparent solution is for the United States, in addition to underwriting a total of five and nine-tenths billion dollars for the Bank and the Fund, to also approve side loans amounting to three and three-fourths billion dollars for Great Britain and $1,000,000,000 for Russia.

The Bank can operate successfully without Russia, and indeed may do so, but its position would be tremendously weakened without the United Kingdom.

KEYNES STATES THE POSITION

Lord Keynes, economic adviser to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and chief of the United Kingdom delegation, stated that should the loan bill before Congress be defeated, "we shall certainly have to look at things again." His statement was elaborated by another high British official who said that this view "cannot be stated too strongly."

The British, in the meantime, are cooperating with Treasury Secretary Vinson on the assumption that Congress will approve the loan.

Prospects that Russia may join the monetary institutions dwindled as the diplomatic break between the United States and the Soviet widened over such far-flung problems as Manchuria and Bulgaria.

Late Saturday the Russian observers absented themselves from the conference and cabled Moscow, apparently asking for instructions.

CAN RUSSIA GET BACK IN?

United States officials say they are now undecided on whether they will move to readmit Russia on the original Bretton Woods terms. It had been generally understood the United States would make such a motion. Some observers here have gone so far as to write off Russia completely from the bank and fund; but the Kremlin is unpredictable.

Russia's original subscription to the bank at Bretton Woods was $1,200,000,000 and a like amount to the fund. No decision has been made on how to replace this loss if the U. S. S. R. does not join.

Meanwhile support has grown for a proposal to have permanent headquarters of the bank and fund in New York City. The British delegation has committed itself in favor of New York and most of representatives of Latin-American Republics have concurred. The United States delegation favors Washington.

Free Prices and Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give my colleagues and the public generally, the benefit of the thinking of Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill on the subject of free prices and full employment. I quote the following article by Mr. Pettengill:

The difference between free prices and prices dictated by government is not hard to state.

Which gives a maximum of prosperity? That is the thing we are interested in.

The answer is: Free prices. Why?

Here is the reason.

Producers always try to sell dear. Consumers always try to buy cheap.

This fundamental law of man's nature has not changed in thousands of years.

For example: Every working man (producer) tries to sell his labor at the highest price.

Every working man's wife (consumer) tries to buy the products of other working men at the lowest price.

Do you find any fault with that statement? If not, read on.

When prices go down, that stimulates consumption, but discourages production.

When prices go up, that stimulates production, but discourages consumption.

For example: If new automobiles were priced by government at $1 each, everyone would rush to buy, but no one would produce the automobiles for that price. But with none produced, depression follows.

If, on the other hand, new autos were priced by government at $10,000 each, there would be a rush to produce them, but hardly anyone would buy them, and with few bought, few would be produced—also depression.

Now at what point would the most cars be both made and bought? If we find that point, we have the point of highest continuous prosperity and the most steady, well-paying jobs. The economists call this the point of equilibrium.

Buyers rush toward low prices (bargain counters); sellers rush toward high prices. In other words, consumption rises as prices fall, but falls as prices rise. Production increases as prices rise, but decreases as prices fall.

For every commodity and for each day of the year, there is just one point where the production line and the consumption line freely cross each other and people freely trade, as at a public auction. Just one. It is where goods (let us say a kitchen stove) are both made and sold, at a price producer and consumer both agree on, let us say at $50 per stove. That is the point determined from day to day on a free market by the free choice and decision of thousands or millions of buyers and sellers, consumers and producers. It is at that point, and there only, that maximum production meshes in with maximum consumption—and jobs. This is economic democracy.

Whenever and wherever Government, or industrial monopolies, or labor monopolies fix prices, rents, dividends, or wages, above or below that free market point, you have either a shortage of consumption or a surplus of production. You dam up the maximum flow of goods from producer to consumer, and you prevent full employment.

It must be self-evident that the millions of people themselves in a free market will judge more wisely than any Government bureaucrat what they will buy or make and how much and at what price. If this were not true, then it would follow that one man or a few men in a far-off Government office are wiser than you as to what you will buy (or not buy) and at what price. You know what you want and can afford. No one else in the whole world knows that. Everyone else guesses.

Suppose Government put a floor under the price of a kitchen stove, say at $75 a stove. Stove makers would, for a while, tend to make more stoves for the greater profit per stove, but people would hesitate to buy and would make the old stove do and soon the warehouses and stores would be full of unsold stoves, and men would be laid off at the factory.

On the other hand, suppose Government puts a ceiling price over stoves, at $25 a stove. People would rush to buy, but the stove makers would lose money and so would soon stop making stoves. Again, men would be laid off at the factory.

Dictated prices always create either a surplus which consumers will not buy or a shortage which producers will not supply. It is just that simple.

When Government attempts to force consumers to pay more than they freely would do, they will buy less. The consumers quit buying.

When Government attempts to force producers to sell at a lower price than they freely would do, they will produce less. The producers quit making.

The penalties for Government interference with the free market are absolutely inexorable, either in the field of economics, prosperity and jobs, or in the field of human liberty and happiness. The only alternative is iron control over every aspect of a nation's life enforced by the gestapo and the concentration camp.

It is plain that at a free public auction everything will be sold—no surplus.

In a free industrial market it must be plain also that someone will try to produce goods to satisfy every demand—no shortage.

If one producer charges too much and buying falls off, his competitor will charge less, or offer a better product, and take the market away from him.

A free market place is the most democratic thing free people can have. It is a continuous town meeting where every citizen votes every day with his or her dollars. His dollars are always looking for the best bargains; that is, a larger quantity or a better quality; in short, the most and best for least. This forces producers to offer the most or the best for the least or go out of business to their competitors who do. This results in an ever-rising standard of living.

A free market employs the maximum number of workingmen, and satisfies the maximum number of workingmen's wives, or farmers, miners, butchers, bakers, or candlestick makers.

Let us restore a free market and have a free and prosperous country.

Election in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in the Baltimore Sun of Sunday, March 10, entitled "Election Without Precipitating Internal Strife Is Polish Problem":

ELECTION WITHOUT PRECIPITATING INTERNAL STRIFE IS POLISH PROBLEM

WARSAW, POLAND, March 9.—One of the biggest headaches of the Polish provisional government today is how to bring security to the nation's 23,000,000 people and arrange general elections without precipitating serious internal strife.

Although Stanislaw Radkiewicz, Minister for Public Security, has placed an estimated 75,000 to 100,000 persons in prison, his job of weeding out what he terms "subversive elements" seems to be getting tougher than ever.

Killings, sporadic shootings, robberies, and holdups are a nightly occurrence in most urban centers.

TWO THOUSAND ASSASSINATED

Since the provisional government came in last year, 2,000 Polish politicians have been assassinated, along with scores of Jews and peasants. Whole towns and villages have been wiped out by fire and livestock carried off. Trains, banks, state institutions, and warehouses have been robbed.

Radkiewicz blames bands which he says are financed and armed from abroad by Gen. Wladyslaw Anders and others formerly associated with the old "London government." "There is a strong penetration of elements organizing fifth-column work," he says.

Within the last few weeks, units whose membership is reputed to include soldiers who served in the insurrection army in Warsaw in the fall of 1944, remnants of the division organized by the Russian General Vlassov to fight alongside the Germans, and Polish Army deserters have carried the torch of terror all the way from northeastern to southeastern Poland.

SLEEP WITH CLOTHES ON

Many inhabitants no longer undress at night. Valuables are hidden. Special alarm signals have been arranged to warn of the approach of raiders.

No one seems to know the strength of these opposition organizations. Estimates range from 50,000 to 100,000. They frequent the snow-covered forests, now are concentrated mostly in the east near the Soviet border

The government has sent two divisions to the Bialystok area. These are reported to be supplemented by a division of Russians, whose aid was asked by provincial authorities. Marshal Michal Rola-Zymierski, Minister of Defense, recently also announced several divisions of militia had been sent into the Prezemsyl district.

PLAY ROBIN HOOD ROLE

The bands around Bialystok often played a sort of Robin Hood role, leaving part of their loot at schools and hospitals for poor children. They also appeared to be disposed favorably toward peasants but warned them not to turn over foodstuffs to provincial authorities.

In that latter connection, after a raid in which five villages were burned and more than 100 persons shot, survivors found this placard nailed to a tree: "You have been punished because you paid taxes in kind."

"Taxes in kind" is the farm produce the peasants must deliver regularly to the government.

All this adds up to the type of lawlessness which has contributed to what persons like Zbigniew Stypulkowski term "political, economic, and financial chaos." Stypulkowski, one of the Poles tried in Moscow last summer for alleged diversionist activity against Russia (he pleaded innocent and was released) also has charged that the present Polish Government was not willing to risk free elections except upon the condition that there be a single list of candidates.

PEASANT PARTY OPPOSED

All parties in Poland have agreed to a single bloc with the exception of the Polish Peasant Party, headed by Vice Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, and the Labor Party, of which Karol Popiel is president.

Strong pressure, however, is being exerted upon Mikolajczyk, who claims to represent 60 percent of all the Polish people.

The single ticket would mean that all of the political parties would agree in advance what their representation in the Sejm, parliament, would be, and draw up a list of candidates accordingly. Opponents say: "If that happens, why vote?"

Political leaders such as fiery Vice Premier Wladyslaw Gomulka, head of the Communist-backed Polish Workers Party, and Premier Edward Osubka-Morawski of the Polish Socialist Party, bluntly have told Mikolajczyk that opposition to the single bloc would be liquidated.

FEARS TROUBLE

Right now, Mikolajczyk is reported reliably to fear what might be serious trouble

if there is a free election with more than one ticket in the field.

Uncertainty has caused many Poles to go slow in resuming business. Government decrees, too, such as the nationalization of basic industries and the expropriation of big estates have disturbed that cross-section of Polish economy that once was rich, powerful and aggressive.

Poles are worried, too, because their money buys so little.

The government permits payment of 100 zlotys for each American dollar sent in to aid Poles. At that rate, the average Polish worker gets around $15 to $20 a month. Railway workers and school teachers get as little as $7 per month. The average laborer receives 8 cents an hour.

BREAD 30 CENTS A LOAF

As to living costs, bread is 18 to 30 cents a loaf; a single egg costs 14 cents; a pound of potatoes, 8 cents; and meats such as steaks, chops, and roasts, around $2 a pound. The cheapest meal in a restaurant runs from $3.50 to $6.

The Government appears to be following the policy of the late General Pilsudski, who decided during the prewar depression years that Poland would hold the line on zloty exchange. Then it was officially 5.3 zlotys to each United States dollar. It still is.

But when Poles hear rumors that the zloty is going to be devalued, they offer as much as 400 to 500 per dollar.

On another side of the present-day Polish picture, the Warsaw regime works closely with that of Soviet Russia.

RUSSIAN INFLUENCE

The Russian influence often has been detected in governmental decrees and in such organizations as the giant agricultural and semiindustrial monopoly, Spolem, which has announced its intention to take over eventually 100 percent of the peasants' production and distribute it through cooperatives after leaving the peasants a share.

Poland's Ministry of Public Security has adopted many of the ways of the Russian NKVD in the operation of its secret police. NKVD agents have instructed Polish police. A highly competent source says that there are now a half dozen high NKVD officers who see that Radkiewicz's orders are properly and efficiently executed.

Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, General Spaatz, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, delivered an address in the city of Washington in which he commended the spirit and the service of the Civil Air Patrol, a unique organization of patriotic citizens who, in 1941 in person as private citizens met the challenge of the German submarines with their own private planes, and helped effectively to drive them from our waters.

An organization of the participants in that service has been formed with these commendable objectives:

First. To provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy, and to encourage and develop by example the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare.

Second. To provide aviation education and training, especially to its senior and cadet members; to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities, and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies.

This is what General Spaatz said of this organization and its service:

CIVIL AIR PATROL

The Civil Air Patrol embodies the spirit which made America great among nations, the spirit of community-inspired devotion to self-imposed tasks.

There was a time, before the advent of fire engines, when the citizens of American towns were their own firemen. In event of fire, the church bell would ring, and the townfolk would form bucket lines to the river or pond, and put out the flames with water thrown by hand. Every public-minded citizen kept his own firebucket (with his name on it) in constant readiness. That was the volunteer spirit of the frontier.

There was also a time, not long ago, when America was in danger of something worse than fire. The Air Force was not prepared to meet that danger, not equipped for adequate defense of the country, much less for offense overseas. It was then, 1941, that the Civil Air Patrol was founded, somewhat as a firebucket project. That, too, was the volunteer spirit.

So long as America keeps alive this volunteer principle our political democracy will be defended, and peoples from other lands, where compulsion is the rule rather than the exception, will seek to become American citizens. The volunteer spirit is the essence of political freedom.

For adding fresh luster and new meaning to this traditional spirit of America, we give special and lasting honor to the Civil Air Patrol.

1. C. A. P. IN THE WAR

At the time of its inception, the CAP was not expected to give much more than incidental service. Soon, however, we recognized its immediate value to relieve the Air Force of many home-front duties, so we could concentrate more effectively on training air crews and other preparations for battle overseas.

We came to rely on these civilian airmen to fill the empty places in our line of defense.

They kept constant watch for submarines far out at sea; they patrolled the borders; they acted as couriers; they located our missing aircraft; they even towed targets for our training command, and so on.

They also carried on a continuous recruiting campaign; they brought tens of thousands of young Americans into the Air Force, and gave them preinduction training in their home towns.

From small beginnings the organization grew in size in responsibilities, and in intensity of effort, to become a highly effective component of the system whereby we insured delivery of troops and supplies to the various theaters of war.

In other words, the Civil Air Patrol became a unique institution, a civilian arm of America's expanding air power, and an indispensable auxiliary to the Army Air Forces. It sprang into being when the country was in danger because of inadequate air preparations. It contributed intelligent energy, and Nation-wide, organized support to the work of building an air force with sufficient striking power for the all-out assault.

To all members of the Civil Air Patrol we of the Army Air Forces wish to express warm appreciation for their timely assistance when the going was hard, for their unfailing cooperation in solving Air Force problems, and for their demonstration of the progressive air-minded spirit, which is the heart of America. Their performance was top grade for the record. With them we are glad to share the victory.

2. C. A. P. IN PEACE

As the CAP was indispensable to take up the slack during the war years, so it is also essential to the immediate and long-range plans for America's air power.

One of our problems in the aftermath of the war is the return to civil life of our Air Force veterans. We have a moral obligation to these young men—an obligation to help make their readjustment as happy as local conditions permit. To that end we have called on the CAP, as the organization with specific concern for air veterans, and with members on the spot to cooperate with local established agencies, to help place our former gunners, mechanics, and so on, in jobs for which they are best fitted.

The CAP has responded with its usual energy and enthusiasm. The task of the moment was once to turn young men into soldiers; it now is to convert them back into the ways of the citizens. Both of these civic duties are highly congenial to the CAP and in the highest interest of our country. We may expect its usual excellent performance.

Another general problem is our air consciousness, which we envisage as a vast pool of Americans with a knowledge and love of the air. Historically, it was the nations most experienced in the handling of ships which attained the highest degree of national security when the strategic emphasis shifted to the sea and sea power. The same will be true of modern nations and airplanes.

In this last war air power came of age; it has a future which is measureless in scope, and limitless in time. Man has taken to the air; he will never retreat from the new freedom, new mobility, and new flexibility permitted by his conquest of the third dimension above and beyond the earth. That conquest, in time, will inspire him with new political concepts, new answers to old riddles in society—a new dispensation.

Meanwhile, society as a whole must be educated up to the use of air power. Given the technical superiority of America, and the mechanical aptitude of our youth, it is logical to expect that Americans will fly airplanes with the same skill and zest they show in driving automobiles. To prepare for that day we must constantly enlarge our air consciousness. We must pass on our air experience not only in the Air Forces, but in every section of the country.

In helping to build the national air consciousness we again call on the CAP, this time to help organize America's enthusiasm for the air through its cadet program. Our great Air Forces of the war, which required 4½ years to build up for the all-out assault, have melted away under the hot breath of hasty demobilization. We are now in an interim period, during which political considerations trouble us all. Eventually we will be reoriented on a volunteer basis. It will still take a long time to train pilots, navigators, and to whip air crews together for our projected 70 groups. An air force does not spring into being overnight in peace any more than in war.

The cadet program of the CAP is a means to channelize the passing on of experience from the war veterans of the air to the young recruits in our towns and villages. Like everything else done by the CAP, its basis is the volunteer spirit and carries no military obligation. It serves the selective process, singling out the cadets with the physical, mental, and moral characteristics necessary to make good airmen. The program includes projects to establish aviation courses in schools, and to enlist the cooperation of churches, civic groups, and other local agencies.

In other words, the CAP will help bear the torch of air power in American civil life. It is, however, not a youth movement. It is a liaison between the planners of our air strength and our pilots, navigators, and airmen of tomorrow. It moves with us upward and outward toward a new horizon—America's air power as the leader in the prevention of war, and the creation of new means to preserve world peace. Through knowledge and love of the air Americans will advance with their destiny to be the true air people of the earth, and lead the way into a new era of civilization.

Industry Is Quitting the Unequal Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by C. C. Crow from Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest for December 15, 1945:

INDUSTRY IS QUITTING THE UNEQUAL BATTLE

(By C. C. Crow)

This week Mr. Frank Ransom, president of the Eastern & Western Lumber Co., of Portland, announced that within the next few days they will close for all time. This is one of the top sawmills of the Northwest, that has been in operation for 45 years and at its peak produced over a long period an average of 110,000,000 feet of lumber annually.

Only a comparatively short time ago numerous other well-known sawmill concerns took the same steps as the Eastern & Western Lumber Co. To name a few, there have been the Clark & Wilson Lumber Co., with its three big plants on the Columbia River; Pacific National Lumber Co., Tacoma, Wash.; Silver Falls Timber Co., Silverton, Oreg.; Westport Lumber Co., Westport, Oreg.; and the big Bellingham division of Bloedel-Donovan Lumber Co.

Keep in mind that, with possibly one exception, all of these mills have or had standing timber of their own when they closed. Keep in mind that all of these concerns were in a good financial position and enjoyed the prestige of long-established connections with the very best trade both domestic and foreign who had come to know that they were capably managed and well equipped and their product of dependable, high-class uniformity.

Why have these mills quit? No one who knows the conditions under which they have been operating can criticize them.

Some would have you believe they closed because of the inability to get timber. That has been a small factor only. In former years all of these concerns brought timber from greater distances than they did in the last days of their sawing. During the peak of Columbia River production, logs were being towed at snail's pace up the river against the current from the very mouth of this stream 100 miles from Portland. Plenty of timber is available today in the opposite direction from Portland up the Willamette Valley at shorter distances and it all moves down grade to the mills. True, it is not on the average as good Douglas fir as was harvested on the lower Columbia River, but it does make excellent lumber even though carrying a smaller percentage of clears.

While the managers of these liquidated mills have never openly made such an admission, it has not been the inability to get logs that has been the major reason for their quitting. They have tired of fighting Government bureaus. They have tired of constantly struggling for elbow room from the never-ending stream of red tape turned out and wrapped around them by Government crackpots. They have tired of spending half of each day arguing with Government-backed, Red labor racketeers. They have tired of waiting for months for the OPA to make decisions that should not take them more than a few days, as that Bureau fails utterly to make urgently needed and clearly deserved adjustments to regulations and prices to meet the changing conditions while production costs mount. They have tired of having the worst radical element in their organizations preach and teach contempt for the employer. They have tired of having these same Reds first encouraging and later demanding of loyal employees that they hold to a minimum the personal effort which they expend as they did during the war when lumber was so indispensable, and the output per man, per hour, dropped to a ruinously low level. They have tired of labor demands for more and more concessions while their efficiency continues to drop. They have tired of having Government-employed, labor troublemakers constantly circulating amongst their employees, figuring out ways to make satisfied men dissatisfied. They have tired of the constant threat of unauthorized quickie strikes and the progressive infringements upon the authority to direct their own businesses, a result of the insolent and overbearing Government-schooled policy of organized labor.

The facts are, these excellent, well-equipped mills, capable of employing thousands of men and turning out millions of feet of lumber each day, which is urgently needed, have sickened of studied dictation imposed upon them by a Government administered by a spineless Congress of self-seeking politicians led by an accidental President, a weakling, the impotent spawn of ward-heeling, gangster politics who is satisfied to do the only thing he is capable of doing and that is to drift along with the New-Deal flotsam on which he was born politically.

The liquidation of sawmills has only started. The OPA and numerous other bureaus, with their dilatory tactics and impractical hamstringing of all industry, are making it necessary for a businessman to become a crook if he stays in business and remains solvent. More good mills have been sold for a song during the past year than in any 10 years previously. This has also been liquidation. Sawmill operators, who have put in a lifetime building up such organizations as those already mentioned, have with full justification come to realize that it is futile and certainly not worth while to continue in the one-sided battle against merged subversion of entrenched Federal parlor pinks and the soap-box radicals they are forced to employ.

What is true of the lumber industry in the Northwest is true of other industries in all sections of the United States. Any man who with hard work and close application has built up a business is not going to continue it, lose what he has, and shorten his own life by trying to do the impossible just to keep grasping politicians in office to test out the theories of a lot of academic nit-wits who could not run a peanut stand and come out whole even if furnished free of charge the necessary equipment and materials.

It will take someone bigger than a group of demagogs headed by a necktie salesman to keep this country from losing its indispensable industry leadership, without which it is destined to sacrifice the democracy and free enterprise with which we at one time became the greatest nation in the world and the hope and ambition of oppressed people the world over.

California Conservation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, by proclamation California's Governor Earl Warren has designated this week California Conservation Week, and has called upon the schools, colleges, clubs, and associations and all of the people to cooperate with various private organizations, Federal and State departments in studying the problems involved in the maintenance, upbuilding, and wise use of all our natural resources to the end that they may long serve the needs of the people through the peaceful years to come.

To those not entirely familiar with the glorious and romantic history and resources of the great State of California, the following is submitted for their edification:

CALIFORNIA'S GREATNESS

California was admitted to the Union as the thirty-first State on September 9, 1850, after the territory of which it was a part had been relinquished to the United States by Mexico in February of 1848 as the result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

The first California Legislature was assembled at San Jose in December of 1849, shortly after a constitutional convention, called by the military governor, Gen. Bennett Riley, in June, had completed its work at Monterey.

CALIFORNIA'S CAPITAL

After meeting in San Jose and for brief periods at Vallejo and Benicia, the legislature moved to Sacramento, which was established as the State Capital in 1854.

However, the recorded history of California goes back 400 years to September 28, 1542, when Cabrillo discovered San Diego Bay and explored the coast as far north as Point Reyes. In 1579 Sir Francis Drake landed probably at Drake's Bay, naming the territory New Albion, and claiming it for England. In 1602 Sebastian Viscaíno again explored the coast but it was not until 1769 that Spanish colonization started with the arrival at San Diego of the expeditions led by Gaspar de Portolá.

MISSIONS ESTABLISHED

Before the English colonists on the Atlantic coast started the American Revolution, the Spaniards had already established Franciscan missions along the California coast. The pastoral civilization, however, which developed in California remained isolated from both the Old and the New Worlds for more than 50 years, except for the occasional visits of foreign vessels, chiefly engaged in the sea-otter trade.

GOLD DISCOVERED

The period of Mexican rule which began in California in 1822 was soon followed by the influx of more traders and pioneer American settlers, but it was not until after the American acquisition of the territory that news of James Marshall's discovery of gold in the tail race of Sutter's lumber mill at Coloma on January 24, 1848, started the great gold rush that led to the rapid development of the northern part of the State.

POPULATION CLIMBS

California has shown a constant growth in population and by 1945 it reached an estimated 8,650,000. In 1850 the population was less than 100,000.

This population extends from the border of Mexico nearly 1,000 miles northward along the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

COVERS LARGE AREA

The State of California embraces three-fifths of the western coast line of the United States and if transposed to comparable latitudes along the Atlantic coast, its shore line would extend from Boston, Mass., to approximately Charleston, S. C. The average width of California is 150 to 200 miles.

The land area of the State is 156,803 square miles, and therein exist nearly every combination and every contrasting extreme of topography, climate, soil and mineral, plant and animal life which can be found in the United States, as well as some which are unique to California.

BRITISH ISLES SMALLER

California is larger in area and has a greater diversity of natural economic resources than some of the principal European nations. Its land area is larger than the British Isles.

About one-fourth of this land area is level and most of the valley lands are between sea level and 500 feet in elevation. They comprise the principal agricultural areas of the State. The warm belts—most characteristic of California, and where most of her people reside—are below the 2,000-foot elevation.

MOUNT WHITNEY HIGHEST

Three-quarters of California's area is in rolling hills, foothills, and rugged mountain areas, which range in elevation from 500 feet to over 14,000 feet. Mount Whitney, in California, and the highest peak in the United States outside of Alaska, reaches an elevation of 14,496 feet. Death Valley, 60 miles east of Mount Whitney in the Sierras, is 276 feet below sea level. This is not only the lowest spot in the United States but also the hottest.

Approximately one-half of California's land area, or 49,897,574 acres, is publicly owned, of which 23,822,359 acres are in national forests and national parks and monuments.

NUMEROUS PARKS

There are 18 national forests in the State. The State park system is composed of 70 parks and historic monuments totaling 313,816 acres in area, and preserving ocean beaches, lakes, streams, redwood groves, and desert recreation areas for public use.

ANNUAL RAINFALL

Annual average rainfall varies from 3 inches or less in the southeast corner of the State to over 100 inches in the northwestern section. In most of the highly developed agricultural sections of the State the precipitation varies from 5 to 30 inches yearly, and it is largely concentrated in the winter months from November to March. Consequently, supplemental irrigation during the summer months is necessary for most vegetable and fruit crops.

DIVERSITY

California has a sufficient diversity of the great natural economic resources to enable its people to sustain themselves as an isolated empire if necessary, but, without trade, it would be on a lower scale than now enjoyed.

Every agricultural product of the temperate zone is produced in California, as well as many subtropical crops not grown elsewhere in the United States.

All staple foods and textile materials from cotton to wool are produced. Although silk is not produced commercially, experiments have demonstrated its possibility. The guayule plant for production of rubber is being grown extensively.

FARMING AND TIMBER

California has some 133,000 farms which include in area 30,500,000 acres, with 7,000,000 acres used or available for crop production and 5,000,000 acres under irrigation.

Commercial timber resources of California include 39,000,000,000 board-feet of redwood and 177,000,000,000 board-feet of pine, fir, and other species.

Mineral resources include nearly all the basic materials used in the chemical, structural material, and metal-working industries. Some of these such as iron ore, chromite, and manganese are now being developed for expansion of the iron and steel industries, due to war demands.

GOLD STARTED IT

Gold was the economic resource which led to California's first development. Since 1849 California's gold mines have yielded more than $2,000,000,000 in treasure.

Petroleum has far outstripped gold as a source of new wealth from mineral production in California. Since the discovery of oil in this State over 6,000,000,000 barrels, with average value of $1 per barrel, have been produced in California.

MISCELLANEOUS

San Bernardino County is the largest county in the United States, San Francisco Bay is the largest landlocked harbor in the world, and Los Angeles has the largest area of any city in the world. Mount Lassen is the only active volcano in the United States, and the California redwoods are the largest and oldest of living things to be found anywhere.

California leads the Nation in the production of motion pictures.

Value of farm products produced in California during 1944 totaled $1,680,000,000—second highest in the Nation.

The value of mineral products produced in 1944 was $451,553,000.

All wage and salary payments during 1944 amounted to nearly $13,000,000,000.

The dollar volume of retail trade in California during 1944 was approximately $6,000,000,000.

Cumulative war contracts—June 30, 1940, through 1944—were $19,783,289,000 (including project orders to navy yards, etc.) or $18,772,780,000 of private contracts. Of this $16,439,826,000 was supply contracts for aircraft, ships, ordnance, and other war supplies, and $2,332,954,000 was facility projects including $1,321,008,000 military facilities and $1,011,946,000 Government investment in industrial plants.

Stevenson Bill Provides Fund for Scientific Research Seeking Cause and Cure for Dreaded Diseases

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in response to urgent requests from all parts of the United States, I have introduced bill H. R. 5715, which will enlist the full development of the Nation's scientific and technical resources for the purpose of initiating, conducting, and supporting research for the cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, rheumatic fever, and rheumatic heart disease, nephritis (Bright's disease), arthritis, encephalitis (brain fever), aplastic anemia, leukemia (excess of white corpuscles in the blood), hay fever, asthma, and arteriosclerosis (hardening of the arteries). If my bill provides the means of discovering the cure for one or more of the above-mentioned dread diseases, it will mean the alleviation of untold suffering and anguish. The cost of such research cannot be compared to the lives saved and the suffering eliminated by the discovery of a cure for these diseases. My bill provides for the establishment of an independent National Medical Research Foundation whose powers and duties shall be exercised by a governing board consisting of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, the president of the American Medical Association, and the president of the American Cancer Society. It has received the commendation of such public institutions as the Department of Public Health of the City of New York, the American Heart Society, and the department of cardiology of the Wisconsin General Hospital.

I am including two letters received from the deputy commissioner of health of the city of New York and from the head of the department of cardiology of the State of Wisconsin General Hospital relative to my bill:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
STATE OF WISCONSIN
GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Madison.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: Rev. O. J. Bernhardt recently wrote to me concerning your proposed bill for the appropriation of a sum of money to be spent for research in cancer and infantile paralysis. There is no question but that these are two very worthy causes, but I would like to call your attention to the fact that rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease is at present the leading cause of death among children between the ages of 5 and 15, and that it causes 50 times as many cripples (cardiac cripples) and deaths as does infantile paralysis. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is already supplying large sums of money for research and has a considerable surplus which is not being used at the present time. On the other hand, there is no organized national program for rheumatic fever research. The Children's Bureau has limited sums of money available for promoting and encouraging State programs for the control of rheumatic fever, but no money for the purpose of research. Since rheumatic heart disease (which causes 35 percent of all the heart disease in the northern half of the United States) is due to an infectious disease, rheumatic fever, there is every reason to believe that this could be completely brought under control if funds could be made available for research. The specific cause of the disease is not yet known, and when found may be expected to point the way to the cure and prevention of this disease which makes invalids of our children and kills off our young adults at a time when they should be at the height of their productivity.

Two years ago we started a rheumatic fever program in Wisconsin and have been struggling along on a $25,000-a-year allotment from the Federal Government, but all it does is to permit us to operate one convalescent home near Madison and provides for no research. We have in this State a live group of doctors interested in heart disease who have incorporated themselves into the Wisconsin Heart Association for the specific purpose of sponsoring and directing the rheumatic fever program. Funds are badly needed for the establishment of more convalescent homes at various medical centers throughout the State and also for the purpose of instituting scientific research into the cause, cure, and prevention of this disease.

Anything you can do to assist this program will represent a great service to the children of Wisconsin and the public health of the State.

Respectfully,

CHESTER M. KURTZ, M. D.,
Associate Professor of Medicine,
Head of Department of Cardiology.

CITY OF NEW YORK,
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF HEALTH,
New York, N. Y.

Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with our conversation of a few days ago, I am attaching a copy of that portion of my testimony which concerns rheumatic fever and which was presented before a subcommittee of the Senate.

The information attached indicates without question, I believe, the importance of this disease as a public-health problem and the fact that little or no attention is being paid to it. Funds are even less available for this disease than those which are available for the two diseases in which you are particularly interested. I trust you will find it possible to include rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease in the important bill which you are presenting concerning the need for research in the two particular medical fields which you have chosen.

If there is any further information which you need or any further assistance which I can give you concerning this problem, please do not hesitate to call upon me. I can also assure you that the American Heart Association and the American Council on Rheumatic Fever of the American Heart Association would be very pleased to be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID D. RUTSTEIN, M. D.,
Deputy Commissioner.

Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, although VE-day occurred nearly a year ago, and VJ-day was on August 14, the American people are still being regimented and pushed around. Reconversion is being held back by governmental bureaucracy and control which took the place of private enterprise during the war. I think the Members of this House would be interested in a letter which I have received from a long-suffering citizen of my district, Mr. Fred H. Madison. His letter undoubtedly expresses the views of millions who are weary of the governmental protection which is being forced upon them, and reads as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *March 2, 1946.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The newspapers these days are full of items tending to show that Government controls are very necessary and even should be extended if we are to realize the bright, new world we were promised after the war. All we hear from the commentators on the radio is propaganda along this line. Apparently a great effort has been made for the left-wing officials and Johnnie-come-lately industrialists to express their views to the end of having controls extended. So many intense that it causes any thinking person to try to look behind the scenes and try to get the facts.

It seems to me that those who want controls extended are those whose jobs and publicity would be endangered if controls were taken off and those whose businesses would suffer without the Government protection. You no doubt receive hundreds of letters from businessmen who have been established for years and who are honest and upright citizens who have lost their livelihood to black market operators and Government corporations simply because of the controls established upon the plea of war emergency. Many of the controls seem to have been purposely drawn to put the honest man out of business.

The propaganda theme which is worked the hardest and which to me is the most dishonest is that one trying to draw a parallel between the inflation which is rampant in Europe and which might take place here unless controls are retained and tightened. Europe has been devastated by war. Production is impossible because facilities and raw materials are not available. Here in this country we have more factories, trained workers, credit, raw materials, and knowing how than we had before the war; also more ill-advised controls which are keeping us from saying those things we have.

I'm one of the little guys the officials are trying to protect and I'm sick of the protection they are trying to give me. Sure I like to buy shirts for $1.98 but I'd rather pay $2.19 and get a shirt than have them priced at $1.98 and none available. The same thing is true on many items. I'll gladly pay a few cents more to actually get goods and if the price gets out of reason I'll stop buying. I'm sick of crawling into stores on my hands and knees and kissing someone's posterior to get a can of paper, pound of beans, roll of toilet paper, box of kleenex, pound of coffee, and a thousand other items.

I say take off the controls right now and in 6 months' time we'll be way down the road to recovery. If we don't the left-wingers will drag out the recovery period for years just as they did the depression.

Yours very truly,

FRED H. MADISON.

The people do not believe this regimentation is necessary and no one has adequately explained to them why it should be continued. The feeble excuses for its continuation do not make sense to the American people. Governmental agencies have seen fit to complicate the already confused situation, whereas simplification is the only common sense approach to reconversion. Unsupported and untried theories have no place in reconversion plans, yet it would appear that governmental agencies favor plans of inexperienced theorists rather than the sound, proven methods which have been the basis of the growth of our unparalleled American industry.

Pensions for Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the obviously unconstitutional bill to provide pensions for Members of Congress, which is to be considered today, passes, I shall not participate in the plan.

I am a Member of this body by virtue of a contract with my constituents and the citizens of the Nation. They vested in me a public trust, for a limited time, to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Besides the high honor accorded me, the agreement provides that I shall be paid $10,000 per year. No mention is made in the contract of any pension. Therefore, I am not entitled to any pension. For me to take a pension would be to break my part of the contract.

Any Congressman having served 5 years or more, by paying in $2,500, would be entitled to a pension at the age of 55. He could draw a net pension of $5,618.

As I mentioned before, by retiring at the end of this term I could draw a net amount of $12,815.

Total net pension for certain Congressmen if they retire this year, 1946, may run up to $56,872.

The $2,500 paid in by Congressmen would not be a real contribution. This would be returned to them with interest, or in case of death any unpaid portion would be paid to their heirs.

Indications are that some Members are seeking to prevent a roll-call vote on the pension bill. To decide this vital issue without a record vote would be, in my judgment, a calamity. We owe it to our constituents to stand up and be counted.

So long as I remain in Congress I intend to retain my independence and be free to serve the interests of my constituents and the public in general. I am not concerned with any class legislation, for that is what is destroying America. One of my duties is to protect the United States Treasury.

A Valuable Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, during the 10 years I have been a Member of Congress I have come to know fairly well most of the Members of Congress, and to know quite well some of the Members. In these days of rubber-stamp Congressmen, men who have wishbones where their backbones ought to be, it is both encouraging and refreshing to know and to team up with a man like the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN. HOFFMAN calls his shots as he sees them; votes his convictions regardless of consequences; and does not hesitate to speak his mind at all times. Because he is fearless, positive, and outspoken, he is a man after my own heart, a man to ride the river with. We need more men like HOFFMAN in Congress.

Tributes to men in public life these days are altogether too scarce. For that reason I pay a deserved tribute to CLARE HOFFMAN, a man who wears no man's

collar, and I do it by inserting in the RECORD an editorial taken from the Herald Press, St. Joseph, Mich., Thursday, February 28, 1946, one of the leading papers in Congressman HOFFMAN'S district.

NO BROADSWORD, NO ARMOR

Sometimes we think Congressman HOFFMAN was born in the wrong century, meaning no offense to this district's belligerent Representative. Given a suit of shining armor, a broadsword, and a lance, the Allegan lawmaker would be a knight of old, plumped down into the middle of the twentieth century.

As a matter of fact, Representative HOFFMAN isn't living in the wrong age for his talents. He may even be the reincarnation of some stalwart yeoman of olden times and his lack of a spear, crossbow, and shield is no handicap in the rough-and-tumble battles in the Halls of Congress or on the speaker's platforms of his home district. Mr. HOFFMAN has a mighty arsenal of verbal shafts which he aims with ofttimes devastating effect upon his foes. He is a sort of blithe spirit loose in a world where caution and discretion are regarded as the better part of valor when it comes to statecraft and politics. Like his prototype who hurled challenges at foes ensconced in their casements, Representative HOFFMAN, the individualist, taunts his adversaries and more often than not takes them on single-handed in verbal jousts.

You could scarcely say Representative HOFFMAN is a conformist. Neither is he a straddler. He has been called about everything in the nomenclature of his enemies, principally "isolationist" with a double hiss, but he goes on his way unperturbed.

Mr. HOFFMAN'S Republicanism has never been open to the slightest shadow of doubt, but if anybody believed that he holds the party in awe they were disillusioned this week by his blast at the Republican State committee. In short, Representative HOFFMAN has served warning on the GOP "brass hats" not to meddle in Michigan's primaries, that being his answer to obvious maneuvers on the part of certain Republican elements to pry the Allegan Congressman loose from his grip on the Fourth District realm. He likewise took occasion to make a few pretty sharp passes at supporters of Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, for President in 1948.

Stassen is the fair-haired boy of the more internationally minded wing of the Republican Party, and Mr. HOFFMAN wants no part of him as the party's standard-bearer. We aren't now concerned with Mr. HOFFMAN'S presidential preferences, we're just intrigued by his apparently insatiable fondness for a fight. Gadzooks, that man is a warrior!

Mr. Speaker, the Nation would be better off if we had more men like CLARE HOFFMAN in Congress.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, which appeared in Harper's Magazine and was reproduced in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 10. I commend Mr. Stimson's statement to the Members of this Congress and to the American people as worthy of careful consideration. As one of our elder statesmen who has served his Government and his country in various capacities, I feel that his temperate words of advice at this critical time should be carefully pondered by all of us.

The statement follows:

WE HAVE THE BOMB—SO, THE OPPORTUNITY

(By Henry L. Stimson)

The advent of the atomic bomb has created a profound impression in all quarters of the globe. Bidden or unbidden, the atomic bomb sits in on all the councils of nations; in its light all other problems of international relations are dwarfed. This is so not because these other problems are no longer important in themselves, but because the question of the control of the atomic bomb towers above all else. No other problem has been so constantly in my thoughts as this one.

If the atomic bomb were merely another—though more devastating—military weapon, which could be assimilated into the customary pattern of international relations, conceivably we could then follow the old pattern of secrecy and sole reliance upon national military superiority, and depend upon international caution to stay the future use of the weapon. But, to my view, the recent unlocking of atomic energy constitutes a first step—and only a first step—in a new control by man over the primal forces of nature too revolutionary and dangerous to fit into the old patterns.

The military application of this discovery underscores most sharply the divergence between man's growing technical power for destructiveness and his psychological power of self-control and group control—his moral power. If this is so, how this problem is approached in the sphere of the relations among the nations is a question of the most vital importance in the evolution of human progress.

The chief lesson I have learned in a long life is that the only way to make a man trustworthy is to trust him; and the surest way to make him untrustworthy is to distrust him and show your distrust. And it is from this lesson that I draw the conviction that only a direct and open dealing with other nations on this, the most pressing problem of our time, can bring us enduring cooperation and an effective community of purpose among the nations of the earth. It is the first step on the path of unreserved cooperation among nations which is the most important. Once the course of national conviction and action is set in this direction by the example of the major powers of the world, petty differences will be recognized for what they are, and the way toward a real fraternity of nations will be open.

We must not delay. The poisons of the past are persistent and cannot be purged by timid treatment.

By its sole possession of the bomb, at least for the present, the United States finds itself in a position of world leadership. But this solitary possession is most certainly very transient. It must recognize this and act swiftly. It must take the lead by holding out an open hand to other nations in a spirit of genuine trust and with a real desire for a thoroughgoing cooperative effort in meeting and solving this problem. Truly this is a time for greatness of heart and of purpose, and, unless we demonstrate these qualities now, other nations cannot be expected to do so.

The development of atomic energy holds great, but as yet unexploited, promise for the well-being of civilization. Whether this promise will be realized depends on whether the danger of swift and unprecedented destruction can be removed from the earth. Whether it is removed depends on whether we and other nations move firmly, quickly, and with frank transparency of purpose toward the goal of uniting all men of good will against the appalling threat to man's very existence. The focus of the problem does not lie in the atom; it resides in the hearts of men.

Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I add to the hope of many that Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, and Representative FRITZ G. LANHAM, of Texas, may reconsider their resolve to quit Congress for the reason that Mr. SUMNERS gave, that the Federal Government had become an instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption.

As in war, so our job in peace is to clear away the debris of a structure that was built on the sands and rebuild our new structure of freedom. We need their help desperately.

I am introducing a bill today to bring the United States Office of Education back to its lawful function. It is typical of the very thing that Mr. SUMNERS complains about. Here is bureaucracy gone mad. More and more control over education, more money and patronage for the United States Office of Education is sought by propaganda in this expanding self-perpetuating office. The time has come to stop the evils of education from Washington. It can be done. The people want it done. We need the help of Mr. SUMNERS and Mr. LANHAM now more than ever because of their clear heads and excellent judgment, their years of experience, and the confidence of the Members in their leadership.

My bill, I have been assured by the Committee on Education, will receive prompt and thorough hearings. The Congress and the Nation will be astonished when some of the results of our investigation have been revealed on what goes on in our own United States Office of Education.

Salvaging Europe's Pitiful Orphans—Disease-Ridden, Undernourished Victims of War Given First Priority as UNRRA Brings Food and Medical Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I wish to include the following article by Robert Bruskin, which appeared on the editorial page of the Sunday Star of March 10, 1946:

SALVAGING EUROPE'S PITIFUL ORPHANS—DISEASE-RIDDEN, UNDERNOURISHED VICTIMS OF WAR GIVEN FIRST PRIORITY AS UNRRA BRINGS FOOD AND MEDICAL RELIEF

(By Robert Bruskin)

Europe's stunted generation, its disease-ridden and undernourished children, is being given first priority for relief and rehabilitation in salvage operations surpassing in scope any yet witnessed by this war-scarred planet.

While their elders hurled the most scientifically advanced methods of slaughter upon each other, children perished from wounds, disease, famine. Those who survived to repopulate the rubble are suffering from malnutrition, tuberculosis, and a multitude of ailments, both physical and mental. Many are orphaned and homeless. Many are too young to remember their names or even the country from which they were uprooted.

Typical of the wrongs inflicted on these innocent bystanders was one case reported by Mrs. Cecilia Davidson, a welfare worker from New York City, who worked for 8 months in France among children liberated from Germany.

"One little girl carried in what we thought was a baby about 17 months old," she said. "His little arms and legs had not developed, and he was tiny in size. You can imagine how eerie it was to have this baby turn around and talk to us like an old man. He was over 5 years of age and he could not walk."

RECORDS FULL OF CASES

Records of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Washington are filled with the stories of these waifs who are tired old men before having reached childhood, who are dwarfed from years of malnutrition.

For UNRRA, humanitarian agency of the United Nations, salvation of the children is a first priority task among many. Over 4,000,000 long tons of supplies have been poured onto the Continent, two-thirds of which is food. Added to these supplies are the victory food collections now under way in all American communities. These have emphasized the need for milk and baby food. But the supply of food is not sufficient to still the ache of hunger, although mass starvation has been stopped in Europe.

It was for this that President Truman appealed to Americans to tighten their belts, to eat less bread—the dietary mainstay of most Europeans.

Soap is high on the list of necessities. Scabies are prevalent among the children because soap was one of the scarcest commodities on the Continent during the occupation by the Germans. As soap supplies increase, scabies and other skin diseases born of dirt will abate.

TUBERCULOSIS WORST OF ALL

The most serious scourge for the children is tuberculosis. Reports back to UNRRA's headquarters at 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW indicated it borders on epidemic proportions. Scant food and clothing, life in cellars and bombed-out hovels have made millions of youngsters easy prey to this disease.

One test made of 70,000 children in Prague showed 40 percent had lung disorders. Utilizing miniature X-ray units provided by UNRRA, similar studies were made in Greece and Italy and the unit formerly in Italy has been sent to Yugoslavia.

In Greece, the disease incidence was found to have increased four and a half times during the war years; in Yugoslavia the case rate and death rate doubled, and in Italy the death rate rose two and one-half times. Many of the children who survived will be crippled for life by tuberculosis of bones and joints.

Strenuous efforts are being made by UNRRA and the local governments to rehabilitate sanitoria for children and to establish others.

One of the most desperate problems is Europe's millions of homeless children. Poland estimates that more than 500,000 are orphans or half orphans; Yugoslavia also sets its figure at a half million; Greece has between 50,000 and 60,000; tiny Albania has 4,000; while Czechoslovakia has found more than 50,000 in the ravaged "black belt" of eastern Slovakia alone.

In many cases parents died that their children might live—died of starvation while the children ate the miserable ration, or were killed while protecting them with their own bodies from shell fire. Others were orphaned by mass executions—or their parents simply disappeared into the fog of war.

Many are in institutions which are receiving basic supplies of food, clothing, shoes, beds, blankets, and cooking utensils. Some of the supplies are going to unorganized groups or individuals attempting to care for homeless children. One Greek girl gathered over 20 waifs in a windowless house in Piraeus where they were found by welfare workers sleeping on the floor, in rags, without heat. All the food they could obtain was cooked in a single large pot.

In Warsaw, a 17-year-old orphan girl, Wladyslawa Gac, who was an inmate of the infamous death camp at Belsen, has become known as the little mother from Belsen because of her gentle, patient care for the younger children of her orphanage.

MOST OF CHILDREN BRANDED

Frank Weisl, of 2720 Wisconsin Avenue NW, one of the first relief officials in Poland, declared upon his return:

"Most of the children had been in German concentration camps. All their little arms bore their branded numbers, and though after these months of care they are now healthier looking—they seem strangely adult at times and then quickly change over to purely childish behavior in a rather disturbing way. Most of them have no memory of parents at all, and the younger ones call every man 'father.'"

Many orphaned children throughout Europe, however, are still running wild, fed by one family or another. Children taken into a family circle are kept as long as there is food, and then, when there isn't any, they are turned out to shift for themselves.

The various countries are making herculean efforts to care for their homeless and hungry children. Albania, occupied by both Italy and Germany during the war, has turned Littoria, which was built by the Italians, into an orphan town. The government hopes to bring most of its 4,000 orphans to this almost new and clean town.

The 5,000 destitute children from eastern Czechoslovakia, most of them orphans who have been living in the rubble of their former homes, are being evacuated to reception homes in other parts of the country more accessible to shipments of food and supplies.

GREEK PROGRAM MOST EXTENSIVE

The Yugoslav Government has also completed a mass movement of its homeless children. During the war years more than 14,000 were sent from the constant battlegrounds in Bosnia and Montenegro to Bulgaria. These children have been brought back to their own country and have been placed in institutions and foster homes.

Greece probably has the most extensive program for children. Of its 60,000 orphans or half orphans, 11,000 are in 103 state and state-subsidized orphanages throughout the country. UNRRA is helping the Government in its program to give financial assistance to mothers or relatives so that the child can be kept in a family group. More than 55,000 weak and undernourished children were sent to the mountains and seashore for 3 weeks of special feeding and treatment last summer, with the assistance of UNRRA, the Greek War Relief, and Near East Foundation.

A mammoth problem was posed by the 6,000,000 displaced persons found in Germany. One million remain today, chiefly those reluctant to go home, or stateless persons. But there was an amazingly small proportion of children among them, only 10 percent of the reception center refugees. There was a reason.

Despite the German's legendary kindness to "kinder," it was found that the Nazis had made a practice of killing any slave labor too young to work, especially little girls.

SIGHT OF CHILDREN BRINGS TEARS

This story was told by a returned welfare worker:

"A woman arrived at a displaced persons center with two little girls, one of the labor slaves whom the Germans had rounded up in France. She had been sent to one slave labor camp, and her husband to another. She had no knowledge of his fate. She was tired and hungry and knew that dinner was being served to a large group of displaced persons so we took her and her daughters to the mess hall at once.

"As soon as the little girls appeared in that room the displaced persons dropped their food and stared. There was a terrible moment of silence, then a few women burst into uncontrollable tears and ran out of the mess hall. The women had seen their own little daughters slaughtered."

Welfare workers reported that when children first came into centers in Germany they were frightened, timid, possessive. They rarely ate all the food served them at a meal, but secreted part of it in their sleeves and pockets, unable to grasp the idea that there would be more for them in a few hours.

In one center, the children clung to one another quietly the first few hours after they arrived, following the adults around with large inquiring eyes.

Finally, one of the children asked:

"What are we allowed to do?"

"Anything you want. This is your place," they were told.

"Will you smack us if we scream?"

"No. You may shout as much as you like."

SCREAM IT OUT

The children started screaming and shouting and kept it up for 2 days. They did nothing but give vent to their pent-up misery. By the third day they had had enough and settled down to play like other children.

Dr. Martha Branscombe, child-welfare specialist loaned by the Children's Bureau of the Labor Department, and who made several trips to Europe, summarized UNRRA's relation to the children of the war-weary countries:

"The fine spirit of cooperation and the humanitarian feelings which motivate the creation of UNRRA offered great promises to the children of liberated areas. To the extent that the resources are made available and that the countries themselves recognize the needs of their children, we will fulfill those promises.

"At the same time it must be remembered that UNRRA is limited to emergency relief. Vast numbers of children will require continued care and specialized services for long periods. We cannot, therefore, forget today that our common interests not only call for common action in these first emergency stages, but extend beyond and into the future."

Chaos in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Baltimore Sun of Sunday, March 10, entitled "Chaos Found in Poland":

CHAOS FOUND IN POLAND—POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND FINANCIAL SITUATION DESCRIBED

ROME, March 9.—Poland today is described by Zbigniew Stypulkowski, National Democratic Party leader who recently arrived in Italy, as a land of "political, economic, financial chaos," where a revulsion against the present Government would occur if free elections were held.

"Such elections," said the 41-year-old Warsaw attorney, who is 1 of 15 underground government leaders tried in Moscow last year, "will not be held."

"The ruling people of Poland today," he said, "are not willing to risk elections except upon the condition that there be a single list of candidates."

LEADERS BEING ARRESTED

Vice Premier Mikolajczyk, leader of the Peasant Party, is being urged to accept such a list as an indication of his democratic spirit. But other leaders and members of the National Democratic and Socialist Parties, who together in the past had a numerical superiority, are being arrested, said Stypulkowski, who himself was a member of Polish Parliament in 1930 and 1935.

[In Washington, Government officials described Stypulkowski as a prominent member of an extreme right-wing organization within his party.]

"Free elections in Poland after experiences of the past 9 months would," he said, "be tantamount to a political revolution."

Against this background of political unrest, people are dispirited, many of them wandering eastward and westward searching for work and renewal of their economic life, everywhere uprooted, he added.

"Destruction of industrial means of production has been terrible," he said. "In the agrarian reforms, land was paced off and given to peasants without tools, buildings, or stock."

FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY

"There is a complementary financial mess best indicated by the fact that the zloty, worth 5.3 to the dollar before the war and 120 last July, today stands at more than 500 to the dollar. Without outside help," he said, "the Russian-sponsored government is unable to improve the situation. Once Russia spoke of shouldering half the cost of rebuilding Warsaw, but no more is heard of this."

[On the same day that Stypulkowski was talking, dispatches from Warsaw said Russia had reiterated her intention of sharing this cost.]

Conditions upon which the United States offered a billion-dollar loan to Poland, he said, "could easily be met if the present government were not Russian influenced." The conditions, Stypulkowski said, were "return to private enterprise, release of political prisoners, freedom of press and elections, and evacuation of Russian troops and secret police."

Both Polish and United States authorities at Washington say that Poland never has asked nor been offered a loan of anything like $1,000,000,000. Export-import bank officials said the only such project was a Polish request for railroad rolling stock and equipment which Warsaw said would approximate $500,000,000, but on which no figure was fixed by American officials since they expected to meet the request out of surplus equipment in Europe. Government officials said the United States never had laid down any such conditions for a loan to Poland as described by Stypulkowski.

CENTRAL AUTHORITY

The central authority in Poland is vested in the Ministry of Security, taken over last June by the Poles, but, said Stypulkowski, "at all levels and in key positions there are still Russians who make final decisions."

Arrests and deportations eastward continued until last June; but after that date arrests were made by the Ministry of Security and those arrested held within Poland. These arrests, he said, reached mass proportions last November.

Those arrested, he said, include members of the National Democratic Party, Socialists and youth leaders, who, with the reopening of schools, are beginning to reorganize student movements. "But," said Stypulkowski, "no one in Poland is free from the fear of arrest."

General opinion is that 40,000 have been arrested—these comprising only civilian arrests. In addition, he said, many of the underground army have been arrested, especially in eastern Poland.

Some Poles are continuing to drift into Italy—most recent among them the daughter of Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, commander of 100,000 Polish troops who still are here as part of the Allied forces of occupation. Polish civilians, most of them displaced persons, total 60,000 in Italy.

End the OPA and Its Iniquities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1945, I introduced a House joint resolution to put Chester Bowles out as Administrator of the OPA, and to discontinue all price controls except controls on rents, and I provided that these controls should be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Speaker, for 3 years I have called to the attention of this House the iniquitous administration of the OPA and that Chester Bowles, the Administrator, did not follow the letter and spirit of the law and the intent of the Congress. Recently Bowles undertook to control profits in industry; now, in another bureaucratic position Bowles is undertaking to control margins on the dealings on the cotton exchanges of the country, which is entirely beyond the scope of his authority. I think it is time for the Congress to do something about the matter.

With the end of the war, it was my opinion that, except for rent control, no further extension of price controls was necessary, as I believe that the situation will be taken care of by the law of supply and demand. As an example, during the war most of the cigarettes manufactured were sent to the armed forces and few were available for civilians. After the war was ended a normal flow of cigarettes was available for all and are now available.

It is my further opinion that with the continuation of the OPA under Bowles, with his machinations and maladministration, more has been done to wreck the orderly reconversion of this country and the economy of this country than any other single factor.

Mr. Speaker, it now seems that others are beginning to take the same view about the OPA which I have expressed, for in the newspapers I read where Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, advocates the discontinuance of all OPA controls except on rents and sugar, and Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma has advised the cotton exchanges of the country to disregard Mr. Bowles ukases.

Cars for War Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

WAR AMPUTEES CAR COMMITTEE,
WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1946.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A large number of amputees, as a result of our service-inflicted injuries, have come to realize the importance of having a car. We cannot live on an equal basis with the able-bodied without it. The hazards and difficulties of day-to-day existence, snow, crowded transportation, faulty artificial legs, and rough terrain—all this has imposed on us the necessity of having a car.

To this end some 350 amputees of this hospital have signed their names to a petition stating that they be supplied with an automobile by the Government.

We, the committee representing these men, feel that if a meeting could be arranged with you, with the object of soliciting your interest and advice, it would help considerably in advancing the cause of the disabled who have lost their legs.

Sincerely,

FRANK W. MONICO,
Chairman.

WAR AMPUTEES CAR COMMITTEE,
WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C.

The Army has given us a prosthesis to prepare us for civilian life. We however, feel that this hasn't proven adequate to place us on an equal basis with the able-bodied, because of—

1. Weather hazards (snow and mud).
2. Public crowds (pushing and shoving).
3. Prosthesis break-down.
4. Terrain (difficulty in climbing hills).
5. Transportation difficulties (subways, busses, etc).

AIM

Therefore the aim of this committee is to press for legislation for the Government to supply an automobile for every veteran who, because of war inflicted injuries, is seriously hampered in walking.

Pfc FRANK W. MONICO,
Chairman.
Staff Sgt. JOHN GEORGOPULOS,
Secretary.
Staff Sgt. MILTON KORNFELD,
Pfc RALPH BROITMAN,
Pfc NORMAN RAINES,
T/5g MICHAEL MACDONAGH,
Members.

USES Reports Only 57 Percent Veterans Are Employed Locally—These Figures From Industrial Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the USES office at Long Beach, Calif., released the following statement March 7. Its figures quoted are significant and speak for themselves as to the local veterans returning.

The startling figures given by George Toll, the able and long-time manager there, as to veterans from other parts of the country are figures I call your special attention to.

You will note he says that between 22,000 and 36,000 have filed intention notices that they intend to locate in Long Beach from other parts of the country.

These figures are but one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I, as Representative in Congress from Long Beach and the rest of the great Eighteenth District, and all the other Representatives from California, keep calling to the attention of this House that the housing simply must be there and available for these distinguished sons of ours.

As I said the other day in connection with the housing debate, let us make a mistake in favor of the veterans, in favor of speed, and low price, and priority. The men with money know that the purpose of the Wyatt building program is primarily for houses—now—low-priced, for veterans.

Think of at least 22,000 out-of-State veterans coming to my home city to live and work—and no homes for them. Nor will inflation or speculation get the homes for them, either.

If a mistake is to be made in any way, let us make it in favor of the veterans.

Here is the article I refer to. It appeared in a Long Beach paper March 7, 1946:

ALMOST HALF OF LONG BEACH VETERANS JOBLESS

Only 57 percent of the 14,000 Long Beach servicemen who have been discharged from active duty are employed, George Toll, local USES manager, revealed today.

"When Long Beach has absorbed into suitable jobs of her own 5,000 unemployed veterans, she merely will have made a start in the right direction. The problem will not be solved until jobs are found for 8,500 more Long Beach servicemen who still are in uniform, and for between 22,000 and 36,000 veterans from other parts of the country who have filed notice of intention of locating in Long Beach."

About 50 percent of the 8,500 Long Beach men and women who haven't yet been released from military service may return to their former employment if they so desire.

"A wisely planned, long-range program for which every citizen of Long Beach must assume responsibility is necessary if we are to supply jobs for these men and women. We musn't forget their heroic deeds simply because they have ceased to make banner headlines," Toll cautioned.

It won't be necessary for employers and the USES to find jobs for all of these veterans, but surveys indicate that throughout the Nation, 63 out of every 100 expect to work for employers. According to Toll, it has been conservatively estimated that when demobilization has been completed, 3 out of every 10 workers will be veterans.

Distribution of Food to Distressed Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are wholly in accord with our national plan and purpose to make such sacrifices as are necessary to help feed the peoples of the world who are underfed and starving. They have always shown a generous liberality in aiding the distress of other peoples whenever it may occur and will do so in the present distressing world situation.

However, they will insist that when making the sacrifices the administration use intelligence to a reasonable degree, by supplying this food where it is needed and not squander it with reckless prodigality. They will also insist that the administration, if it insists on controlling food production and supply in the United States, that this shall be done with at least a moderate degree of intelligence. I think it may safely be said that the administration at the present time and for years back has failed to do its part in these objectives.

This morning's newspapers carry the following story:

PARIS, March 11.—The Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced today that Russia had agreed to supply the understocked wheat reserves of France with 500,000 tons. The deal was described as a purchase and not a gift. * * * Announcement of the deal recalled the fact that the French Communist Party has been making political capital of Russian willingness to assist France.

Now we have, of course, no objection to Russia supplying France with wheat, and it is none of our affair whether it is being supplied in a sale or in a gift. Nor are we interested in whether it is done for political purposes to propagandize communism or not.

However, by comparison, we want to call attention to testimony given last November when the United States made her second contribution of $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA. At that time the American representative, Will Clayton, testified that of this amount $250,000,000 would go to Russia as a gift; that this arrangement had been made without knowing whether Russia had sufficient food reserves, gold reserves, or purchasing power. Not only that, but he said he considered it a good trade inasmuch as Russia had asked for $700,000,000, and UNRRA was doing very well, in fact was making a good trade in compromising on $250,000,000. He could not explain what we got in the trade. It must be emphasized that this is a gift to Russia, and that we will probably contribute over 90 percent of this gift. Now, will anyone tell me why we should be giving $250,000,000 in relief to Russia when Russia has 500,000 tons of wheat to sell to France? I do not wish to as much as dwell on the ineptitude of our administration leaders as traders or as businessmen. The point I wish to emphasize is that this $250,000,000 should have been distributed amongst those who are starving instead of to those who have wheat to sell.

It is this ineptitude permeating our entire administration which is responsible for our present deplorable food-supply situation, and will have to assume the responsibility for our failure to give more relief to the millions upon millions who it is said will suffer in the coming 6 months.

As early as September of 1942, or nearly 4 years ago, I began making speeches on the floor of this House insisting on placing our food production and distribution under a single head.

I then said:

If we are going to win the war, we must put first things first and under such a policy to get the required production of necessary farm products we can do it only by placing this problem in the hands of a competent administrator with power to act. I make these observations with the consciousness that some of them may be founded on overcautiousness, but with Mr. Baruch I still say, "Better be safe than sorry" with a competent administrator, with a proper organization invested with over-all power and responsibility to insure that our food problem does not meet with the same negligent disaster that overtook our rubber problem.

Mr. Speaker, that step of investing the Secretary of Agriculture with power and responsibility to regulate and control our supply and distribution of food is even more necessary today than it was at that time, and should be given immediate consideration by both the President and the Congress.

I repeat as I said at the outset, the American people are willing to make generous contributions and sacrifices to help the less fortunate peoples of the world, but they will not tolerate the diversion of the food stuffs they deny themselves for unneeded objectives or waste and dissipation by the inefficiencies of the administration.

Alliance Unpopular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., recently:

ALLIANCE UNPOPULAR

Recently the American people have been viewing with growing concern the expansion policies that Russia has been pushing since the close of the war with almost complete disregard for the ideas and interests of the major Allies who made it possible for the Communist nation to be on the victorious side in the global conflict. They feel that its moves may be sowing the seeds and setting the stage for a possible third world war and consequently they approved and applauded the strongly worded protests against unrestricted Soviet expansion that were voiced by United States Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and Federal Secretary of State James F. Byrnes in recent speeches. However, it is questionable if they are willing to go as far as to sanction the virtual military alliance between the United States and Great Britain to curb Russia that was advocated by Winston Churchill in his historic address Tuesday at Fulton, Mo.

Americans recognize and admire Churchill as one of the great international figures of all time, but they also have come to feel that he is seeking to protect British interests over and above everybody and everything else at all times and that consequently his proposals for American aid for world benefit always should be given the closest scrutiny before being accepted.

They recall that in urging the cash-and-carry policy in the early days of the war when Britain was fighting the Axis alone Churchill only asked the United States, "Give us the tools and we'll finish the job." Having gained that point, though, his next plea was, "When I said to give us the tools and we would finish the job, I meant to put them in our hands." When America not only was delivering war materials to England but also later had entered the conflict, the then British Premier smugly boasted in another radio address that the thing he had hoped, prayed, and worked for had come to pass, and that the great democracy of the west was fighting alongside his country as a full-fledged partner in the common cause against the Axis. In short order and until the end of the conflict, though, the United States was carrying the bulk of the burden on all fronts, notably in the invasion of Western Europe, where we furnished 60 or more percent of the troops and suffered a corresponding proportion of the casualties, chiefly because of Churchill's contention that Britain should be permitted to conserve its manpower to maintain population and carry on the Empire after the war.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that the immediate reported reaction of many Members of Congress to Churchill's proposal for a British-American military alliance was unfavorable. All thinking Americans appreciate fully the seriousness of the situation created by Russia's recent attitude and are in complete agreement that a future world crisis probably can be averted now if the United States and Great Britain unite in stern, nonappeasement measures toward the Soviet nation, just as Hitler doubtlessly could have been stopped in 1935 if England had joined with France in suggested restrictive steps. However, it is doubtful if a majority of them are willing to go to the extent of favoring an outright military alliance, because conceivably it could lead ultimately to American armed forces being sent to the distant lands of friendly people entitled to work out their own destiny, there to aid in the enforcement of British colonial and imperial policies with which large numbers of Americans are not in sympathy.

A Congressman Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

MATERNAL AND CHILD-HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, parents have manifested a keen interest in the bill now pending before Congress providing for the health and welfare of mothers and children, and for Federal aid to crippled children, to be administered under the supervision of the health agencies in the various States and paid for by the States and the Federal Government jointly. This will insure every mother and child the services of the physician and care in the hospital or clinic selected by the mother. The bill also provides for services and faciilties for the care and treatment of crippled children and children otherwise physically handicapped, and for children who are suffering from conditions leading to physical handicaps. A poll of the Members of Congress indicates this legislation will be passed when it comes before the House. I have received hundreds of letters from people in La Crosse and other parts of my district expressing their enthusiastic support of this bill.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM FAVORED BY THE HOUSE

The school-lunch program was passed by a large majority in the House. Federal aid for school lunches has been in effect for the past 10 years. It has proven of exceptional benefit to the children as well as to the schools taking advantage of the program. Surveys taken in various schools throughout the Nation show that where school lunches have been in effect, the general health and well-being of the Nation's youth have improved considerably. Schools taking advantage of the program have shown an advance of 10 percent in scholastic attainment, a gain of nearly 15 percent in daily attendance records, and an increase in weight of pupils in the grades ranging from 25 percent to more than 100 percent. In many instances the pupils doubled their weight as a result of the nourishing lunches served them in the schools. The Surgeon General of the United States has stated that 70 percent of the young men rejected by the Selective Service were rejected because of poor nutrition during their grade-school age. More than 3,000 children in my home city of La Crosse have benefited by this program. I was glad to lend my support to this humanitarian legislation.

STEVENSON BILL PROVIDES FUND FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH SEEKING CAUSE AND CURE OF DREADED DISEASES

In response to urgent requests from all parts of the United States, I have introduced bill H. R. 5715, which will enlist the full development of the Nation's scientific and technical resources for the purpose of initiating, conducting, and supporting research for the cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, rheumatic fever, and rheumatic heart disease, nephritis—Bright's disease—arthritis, encephalitis—brain fever—aplastic anemia, leukemia—excess of white corpuscles in the blood—hay fever, asthma, and arteriosclerosis—hardening of the arteries.

If my bill provides the means of discovering the cure for one or more of the above mentioned dread diseases, it will mean the alleviation of untold suffering and anguish. The cost of such research cannot be compared to the lives saved and the suffering eliminated by the discovery of a cure for these diseases. My bill provides for the establishment of an independent National Medical Research Foundation whose powers and duties shall be exercised by a governing Board consisting of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, the president of the American Medical Association, and the president of the American Cancer Society. It has received the commendation of such public institutions as the department of public health of the city of New York, the American Heart Society, and the department of Cardiology of the Wisconsin General Hospital.

MILLIONS OF SHIRTS AND SHORTS, TROUSERS, AND JACKETS AVAILABLE SOON

More than 11,000,000 shirts and 5,000,000 shorts in all sizes will soon be on the market. This is not all. Millions of pairs of twill jackets, twill trousers, work gloves, rubber arctics and rain coats will soon be on the haberdashers' shelves due to congressional investigation. These articles of men's wear have been discovered in Navy storage warehouses after being declared surplus. At the request of your Congressman, the Small Business Committee of the House, of which I am a member, has registered a protest to the Navy Department and demanded that these articles be released to the public at once. Those of you who are short on shorts and shirts can look for these articles on the dealer's shelves in the very near future.

Transportation and Its Relation to the Marketing of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an address delivered by C. W. Kitchen, Assistant Administrator, Production and

Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, before the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association at Chicago, Ill., on January 23, 1946:

I should like to make a brief comment on transportation. It is the largest single item of expense in the marketing of farm products. Transportation charges, therefore, are a very significant part of the price spread between what the producer gets and what the consumer pays. Such costs have an important bearing on the ability of farmers to reach certain markets with their products. It is of great importance, therefore, that transportation charges be kept as low as possible consistent with revenue needs of the carriers; that satisfactory services be available; and that the rate structure be equitable as between production areas and markets and as between commodities. An unreasonable freight rate to a given market acts in much the same way as a tariff barrier.

Many of you know of the work started by the Department in this field about 5 years ago. This work was done by the Transportation Rates and Services Division of the Marketing Facilities Branch. With a total expenditure of less than $400,000 during that 5-year period a small group of transportation specialists in the Department have initiated or participated in actions which have brought savings of about $640,000,000 in the cost of transporting farm products. This is a good illustration of taking one phase of the marketing process, determining what should be done to make it more efficient from the standpoint of agriculture, and then taking action to bring about the desired results. Your association has been most helpful and cooperative in this work. Until this year our work on freight charges was restricted to rail transportation, but this year a small additional fund became available to begin work on water transportation. As yet nothing is being done on truck transportation charges, although that method of transport is of tremendous importance to farmers and to the fresh fruit and vegetable industry.

Red Cross Continues Necessary—Facts About Red Cross Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had loved ones in this war in far-away corners of Mother Earth have a sort of corner in our heart for Red Cross. How well I recall how heartily my own son used to tell me, when he was alive, of the blessing and God-send the Red Cross was in the Alaskan-Aleutian area to him and his pals.

So, having done a share already during this time of raising money, I bespeak that every American have the joy of sharing by becoming a partner in Red Cross. Let us all give something. Too, many families of sons in this war have great cause for gratitude to Red Cross. I know some who do.

Here is an announcement I just received which tells graphically some pertinent facts:

To the Members of Congress:

The attached list of questions and answers prepared by the American Red Cross may be helpful to you in dealing with inquiries from your constituents on the subject of dependency discharges from the United States Navy.

If we can be of further service to you in answering questions on this subject, or if you would like to have additional copies of the fact sheet, please communicate with Home Service, National Headquarters, Washington, D. C., Republic 8300, extension 955 or 956.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL
RED CROSS.

FACTS ABOUT AMERICAN RED CROSS SERVICES

DEPENDENCY DISCHARGES FROM THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Question. What is the present policy regarding dependency discharges?

Answer. In addition to discharges granted under current demobilization plans, naval personnel may be released upon their request when they establish to the satisfaction of the Navy that continued service would result in unwarranted hardship for persons dependent upon them.

Question. What steps should a family take when discharge because of dependency or hardship is needed?

Answer. Navy regulations require that the serviceman make his own application for discharge. His family is expected to send him a communication stating the situation at home and asking that he request discharge. Affidavits, statements, or recommendations from individuals in the community should be obtained by the family and sent to the serviceman to attach to his application.

Question. Does the Red Cross chapter forward the affidavits and statements?

Answer. No. Affidavits and statements must be sent by the family direct to the serviceman.

Question. How can Red Cross chapters help families when discharge is needed?

Answer. If the family has been unable to obtain the necessary affidavits and statements through its own efforts, the chapter will help to obtain them.

Question. When is a Red Cross report needed?

Answer. Navy regulations designate the American Red Cross as the agency which will, at the request of the Navy Department, obtain reports on home conditions for information needed in considering applications for discharge on dependency grounds.

Question. Does the Navy Department wish Red Cross reports to be made at the request of the man, his family, or other interested persons?

Answer. No. Only Red Cross reports giving the specific information requested by the Bureau of Naval Personnel are desired. Many applications are acted upon in which no additional information is needed.

Question. Does a Red Cross chapter recommend that the application for discharge be approved or disapproved?

Answer. No. Red Cross submits only factual reports regarding the family circumstances. It makes no recommendations.

Atomic Bomb Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 307, which has just been considered by the House, is a resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels. This resolution became necessary because of the tremendous influence exerted in the latter part of World War II by the atomic bomb, which left in its wake devastation and destruction. Before the Naval Affairs Committee or the Military Affairs Committee can plan fully and completely the postwar Army and Navy, it becomes especially important to know the effect of the atomic bomb and atomic power upon Army and Navy weapons and facilities.

The purpose of House Joint Resolution 307 is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, to employ naval vessels as targets in conducting tests and experiments to determine the effect of the atomic bomb upon ships. At the present time there is in existence no accurate information obtained by exact or scientific means as to the effect which an explosion of an atomic bomb would produce upon a ship, a submarine, or other water-borne vessels. It is necessary that such information be obtained by test.

In order that the test may be of convincing value, it must consist of an actual explosion of a bomb in the vicinity of a target consisting of ships of many types placed at various distances from the point of explosion of the bomb. Such a test will be costly and will involve many highly technical problems.

The Navy Department, jointly with the War Department, is arranging to perform the test. Vice Adm. W. H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, has been ordered to command the task force. He has organized a staff to assist him in accomplishing his mission. The staff consists of Army officers, Army Air Force officers, and civilian scientists, as well as naval officers.

Under existing law, the Secretary of the Navy is restricted in the use of naval vessels as targets for the proposed test, and in order that the atomic test may be realistic and valuable, some ships of fairly modern construction must be used; for that reason, it is necessary that the Congress enact this legislation authorizing the use of naval vessels for the atomic experiment.

Most of the vessels used in the experiment have been in the Navy for some considerable time, but, naturally, some of the later constructed naval vessels are used, in order to study the effect of the atomic bomb upon the later naval ships of modern construction. The battleships used are old and of no further naval value. Even though they were not used in this test, they would never again have taken their places in a battle line.

The Japanese battleship *Nagato* is the only mobile enemy battleship remaining afloat, and that is to be used in the test. Our carrier, *Saratoga*, is in good condition, but advances in carrier design have outmoded her. The light carrier *Independence* is a carrier-type built upon a light-cruiser hull. It is a fairly modern ship but of an emergency or compromise design. The Japanese light-cruiser *Sakawa* is a modern enemy ship, and is the only one of that type available to the United States Navy. The two oldest United States heavy cruisers, *Pensacola* and *Salt Lake City*, are the oldest of their type. The German *Prinz Eugen* is the only enemy ship of the type available. The destroyers to be used, although of

recent date, have been outmoded by the developing of later destroyer types. A large number of assault-type cargo ships and transports will be used in the test. The effects observed from these ships will indicate the effect of the bomb upon merchant-type construction.

In order to make this test as complete as possible, various designs of naval vessels will be used so that the experts will be able to determine the effect of the atomic bomb upon the newer and the older types of naval construction.

The Naval Affairs Committee has been advised that the proposed tests will be three in number; the first, a bomb dropped on the target by the Army Air Force in May; the second, a bomb placed on the surface approximately 6 weeks after the first test; and the third, a bomb exploded deep under the surface about a year after the second test. This last test is delayed because of the technical difficulties encountered in exploding an atomic bomb under water.

There will be some who will criticize this test as a woeful waste of money. Nevertheless, our postwar Army and Navy must be predicated in a great degree upon the effectiveness and destructive power of the atomic bomb. Now is the time to determine that power. The United States must always maintain an efficient and effective Army and Navy. To perfect that Army and Navy, with all its implements of war, can be better done with full knowledge of the devastating force of the atomic bomb. For the reasons above stated, this resolution should pass.

Inauguration Prayer by George Washington—Behooves Us To Be Humble Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as I sat in the House on February 22 and heard our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] read the Farewell Address by the Father of our Country, I was again struck, I was awed, by the frequency with which he referred to God.

As I read more of the lives and purposes of these predecessors in interest of ours, it makes me increasingly conscious of the fact that the then great men were not too big or important in their own opinion of themselves to pause in sincere prayer and reverence. No doubt this humility entered into the consciousness of the entire spiritual fabric of our Nation as of that day.

Hearing the words of Washington read again, as I have stated, I sought out the inaugural prayer which he himself wrote and uttered.

Methinks we could well emulate George Washington, and in our day be big enough, to be humble enough, to know our own failings and dependence upon the Divine. Doing this will do for us as it has done for really great men who have preceded us in seeking to do their fullest duty by their Nation. As you read this prayer written by Washington notice how he uses the words "humility" and "humble."

INAUGURATION PRAYER

Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And finally that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice to love mercy and to demean ourselves with charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind, which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

G. WASHINGTON.

Employers Demand Action by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, many individuals have written me with reference to the strikes and labor troubles which we are experiencing in this country. They are not inclined to believe that it is the employees' fault. They are rather inclined to believe and say that it is the fault of those who head the labor organizations and determine their policies. They are convinced that it has developed into a racket, and they are not slow to express their opinions throughout my part of the country.

Employers as well as the rank and file of the citizens of the Middle West, express themselves as impatient because Congress has not taken any definite action, and the national administration has not prevented nor satisfactorily settled strikes and labor disputes. Employers, in many instances, are confronted with the necessity of closing their places of business unless conditions are improved. The public is the chief party in interest, and that party is demanding definite action on the part of Congress.

I am just in receipt of a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Dairy Products Institute, Inc., with its principal office at Oklahoma City, which reads as follows:

Whereas there is general economic disturbances throughout the entire United States; and

Whereas there are gross inequities in the laws of our land affecting labor and management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this body recommend to the National Congress and to our State legislature the enactment into the labor laws of the following:

1. Impose upon labor unions a legal responsibility for carrying out the provisions of labor contracts by making unions liable in civil damages. Unions that strike in violation of their contracts should be denied the right of collective bargaining for a specified period.

2. Labor unions and labor union executives should be made subject to the antitrust laws and Federal anti-racketeering laws applicable to other citizens and corporations.

3. Outlaw the closed shop and union shop, and prohibit the check-off unless pursuant to the separately given consent in writing of each employee affected.

4. Require union elections and public audits at stated intervals. Elections should be conducted in accordance with prescribed procedure that would insure free elections and auditing firms. A reasonable publication should be required and a copy filed with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

5. Expenditure of money on behalf of any candidate, directly or indirectly, in either a primary or general election or for other political activity, by any labor union, affiliated or sponsored organization, should be prohibited.

6. Collective bargaining should be confined to the smallest employee bargaining unit practicable, but in no event larger than the employee group of any separate plant, shop, or other establishment.

7. Unemployment compensation to which any Federal contribution is made should be denied to any individual on strike.

8. Jurisdiction of the courts should be enlarged sufficiently to permit review of findings of fact by the Labor Board and review of remedies prescribed by the Board. Equity jurisdiction should be restored to the courts to grant injunctive relief against improper labor activities; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each United States Senator and Congressman and each Oklahoma senator and legislator.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a statement issued by the National Emergency Committee for Price Control and a list of the prominent organizations which are supporting the activities of this committee. This statement shows that the people of this Nation clearly realize the dangers of inflation and are wholeheartedly behind the price-control program. I trust that the Members of this body will think of this Nation-wide call for the continuance of price control, when the Office of Price Administration bill comes before us in a week or two. The Nation needs price control and the people want price control.

Aroused by current congressional lobby pressures to weaken price and rent controls, 10 nationally prominent civic leaders today announced the formation of a national emergency committee for price control and called upon citizens to organize a strong front in support of the stabilization program.

In a letter inviting to membership on the emergency committee more than one hundred leaders of civic, church, consumer, labor, farm, veteran, and welfare groups, leading economists and prominent businessmen, they

declared, "The legislative campaign to extend price and rent control needs the leadership of a broadly representative citizens' committee. Powerful groups are opposing price control. Organizations representing the masses of the people are supporting it. The ordinary citizen knows that if price control breaks down his savings will go; he will be unable to keep up with the rising cost of living; he will face disaster."

The letter was signed by Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, Miss Elisabeth Christman, Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, Mr. Willard E. Givens, Mr. Lester B. Granger, Dr. Kathryn McHale, Miss Lelia Massey, Mr. Clyde Murray, Miss Anna Lord Strauss, Mr. Colston Warne.

Meantime, these and other leaders of consumer organizations voiced grave alarm over recent congressional action which cut appropriations for the Office of Price Administration and the Civilian Production Administration, and emasculated the emergency housing program.

"Inflation is the worst enemy of the country's millions of citizens dependent on salaries or other fixed incomes," declared Mrs. William A. Hastings, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. If price and rent controls are dropped, our 3,000,000 members, like millions of other families, stand to lose lifetime savings, face lowered standards of living, and destruction of their hopes for the education of their children. Every possible step must be taken to prevent such a catastrophe.

The National League of Women Voters, according to Miss Anna Lord Strauss, its president, is working vigorously for prompt extension of the Price Control Act and in support of the Wyatt housing program, including passage of the Patman housing bill. "We intend to use every bit of our strength to urge immediate congressional action," she said. "Congress must heed the people it represents. It cannot allow minority pressure groups concerned only with selfish interests to defeat the measures needed for economic stabilization."

Dr. Kathryn McHale, representing the American Association of University Women, declared, "It is fantastic that there should be any question about taking necessary steps to extend price control and make it more effective during this critical period."

Speaking for the General Federation of Women's Clubs with a Nation-wide membership of 2,500,000, Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, said that "women all over the country are looking toward a prosperous period of full production and full employment. They are looking to Congress to establish a stable economy which will safeguard the future of their families."

Mr. Lester Granger, executive secretary of the National Urban League, pointed out that "immediate extension of the Price Control Act and provision of housing are absolutely essential to the well-being of our people. If we have another inflation-deflation period such as we experienced after the last war, Negro people will be one of the groups hardest hit. We must all work together to save this legislation."

OUR TASK IS CLEAR

We must let every Congressman know that we, the people, all of us, want:

Price and rent control for another year.

Immediate extension of the Price Control Act.

No weakening amendments.

Adequate appropriations for the big job of holding the line against inflation.

Helen C. White, president, American Association of University Women; Ralph E. Hemstead, general secretary, American Association of University Professors; Lelia Massey, executive secretary, American Home Economics Association; Jack W. Hardy, national commander, American Veterans of World War II (Amvets); Faye Stephenson, president, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries, CIO; Ray Gibbons, executive secretary, Council for Social Action of Congregational Churches; Colston E. Warne, president, Consumers Union of United States; Mae Wright Downs, president, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority; Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Joe Davidson, chairman, Independent Citizens Committee for Arts, Sciences, Professions; Katharine Armatage, president, League of Women Shoppers; Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, president, Methodist Federation for Social Service; Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, president, National Board, Young Women's Christian Association; Mrs. William A. Hastings, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Cecie P. Henry, president, National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers; Alice Hamilton, president, National Consumers League; Ruth Craven, executive secretary, National Council of Catholic Women; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, president, National Council of Jewish Women; Mary McLeod Bethune, president, National Council of Negro Women; Willard E. Givens, executive secretary, National Education Association; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Clyde B. Murray, president, National Federation of Settlements; Anna Lord Strauss, president, National League of Women Voters; Lester B. Granger, executive secretary, National Urban League; Rose Schneiderman, president, National Women's Trade Union League; George C. Hatch, president, New Council of American Business; Thomasina Johnson, legislative representative, Non-Partisan Council, A. K. A. Sorority; Clark Foreman, president, Southern Conference for Human Welfare; Reinhold Neibuhr, chairman, Union for Democratic Action; Mrs. Herman Lowe, president, Women's Auxiliaries of Labor, A. F. of L.; Thelma Stevens, executive secretary, Woman's Division of Methodist Church.

Extension of Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Mayor William O'Dwyer, of New York, before the House Banking and Currency Committee on the OPA bill:

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

We have as our witness this afternoon General O'Dwyer, mayor of the great city of New York.

Mr. Mayor, I know the members of the committee, at least on this side, desire to congratulate you on your splendid victory. I know I speak their sentiments when I say that we hope you may have a most happy and prosperous administration.

The city of New York has as one of its Representatives here Mr. WILLIAM BARRY. The committee has been honored by having him become a member of this committee. He is able, industrious and efficient, and always looking after the interests of his people.

It gives me pleasure to ask him to preside during the presentation of your testimony.

Mr. BARRY, will you take the chair?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for those kind words. I also want to mention that the Bronx is part of that great city, and we have Mr. PETER A. QUINN, one of our colleagues from the Bronx, also on the committee.

Mr. BROWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. I think two among the most outstanding Members of Congress from New York and of the United States happen to be on this committee, and I want to congratulate you, Mr. Mayor, for sending such good men to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Having in mind, Mr. Mayor, the gentleman I have asked to preside, I have not overlooked your other very able Congressman. Mr. QUINN also looks after the interests of his people in a most able and efficient manner. And we are happy to have him on the committee.

Mr. BARRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. BROWN.

Now, Mr. Mayor, it seems to me that ever since you assumed office on the 1st of January as mayor of the great city of New York, you never had a dull moment. There has been one emergency after another, and frequently several emergencies at the same time. And I want to say this—and I say it sincerely—on the whole, the great majority of the citizens of our great city feel that you have handled those emergencies with courage and skill and to their satisfaction.

I read only today that you were coming down here to testify in favor of the continuation of the Office of Price Administration. I have been on this committee for a number of years, and I have seen this act grow from its very birth and have listened to the testimony pro and con about the things it has accomplished. I want to say to you that in appearing here now the citizens of the city of New York, whose food costs have gone up 45.5 percent since 1940 and whose cost of living has gone up 33.9 points since 1940, owe you a great debt of gratitude. In my opinion—and I think it is the opinion of the majority of the people of this country—if we ever break the line and have this inflationary spiral take place, all the other problems you have had to date will be minor ones in comparison. I do not think there is any question about that, because the same thing has happened in most of the countries of Europe and Asia at different times and everyone was affected by the resulting disaster.

You may proceed with your testimony. It is a pleasure to have you here, and I know the entire committee shares that pleasure.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM O'DWYER, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY URGING EXTENSION OF THE EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mayor O'DWYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear here before you today to urge the enactment of legislation extending the Emergency Price Control Act for another year. Whatever we may think of price and rent regulation as a permanent feature of Government control of the national economy—and many people consider that the whole idea of controlling prices and rents is foreign to American ideas and principles except in a period of grave national emergency—the vast majority of the American people acknowledge that price

control was indispensable to military victory. It is a credit to the Congress that it provided the legislation. Mr. Bowles and his OPA organization are to be commended for the difficult and complex job they have administered successfully to control the inflationary pressures upon our wartime economy.

I am no economist, and make no pretense of being one. But I came into contact with rampant inflation during this war, and saw its ravishing effects upon a war-torn people. During part of my Army career, I was Chief of the Economic Section of the Military Government in Italy. I saw an uncontrolled economy in motion. I saw fantastic prices asked and paid for the barest necessities of life. I saw the black market in operation in Italy on so extensive a scale—there was nothing that could be bought in the open market—but trade flourished at astronomical prices in the black market.

Price control is necessary in the transition period if we are to achieve our hope of a prosperous postwar economy. I need not tell you gentlemen that the most punishing blows of war—next to the loss of life—are the devastating effects of inflation. You have probably been furnished by many sources with the statistical history of the inflationary experiences of our country in its earlier wars. I am told, for instance, that after World War I the buying power of the dollar was 40 cents and that at the end of hostilities in World War II it was 76 cents. I have heard no one seriously challenge the assertion that we could not have maintained this high level of purchasing power of the dollar without price and rent controls. In my own city, rent controls were not only necessary but have been effective. The demand for housing has been so acute and continues to be, particularly to meet the needs of our returning veterans, that we have to provide emergency housing facilities. This has been made possible by your appropriation of $160,000,000 under the bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from my own State, Hon. JAMES M. MEAD. Even commercial space, stores and offices, have been in great demand in New York City. We have had to enact State commercial rent-control legislation which limits rent increases to a fixed percentage over the rent at the freeze date. Any relaxation of either of these controls at this time will result in a skyrocketing of rents—in the same way that uncontrolled sales of homes have resulted in sales prices that are shockingly in excess of any reasonable value of the land and buildings. There are many cases in our small-home communities in New York City where homes were built in 1940–41 under FHA financing and sold for $6,000 to $7,000; they are now bringing prices of from $10,000 to $12,000. Our veterans cannot compete for homes at these prices. Our city employees cannot buy them in this price range. That is why it is important for Congress to enact as part of the price and rent control extension program, authority to place reasonable ceilings on the sales of homes—old and new—and to enact without delay the housing program proposed by Wilson Wyatt.

Mr. PATMAN. May I ask you a question there, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor O'DWYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. Does your rent control on commercial buildings work out all right?

Mayor O'DWYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. I have a feeling we will have to do that for the Nation as a whole. So many people are abusing the privileges they have by reason of the fact that no controls are placed on the rentals of commercial buildings, and I think this committee, in the extension of this act, should consider embracing commercial buildings within the act.

Mayor O'DWYER. We have found it effective in our city, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. It is awfully hard on the little man who has a favorite corner, when his lease renewal comes around, when some large concern can outbid him and take the spot away from him that he has spent a lifetime building up.

Mayor O'DWYER. That has been our experience.

The CHAIRMAN. How long has business property control been in effect?

Mayor O'DWYER. Since 1941, I think, sir. I think 1941. I was away at the time, in the Army.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Mayor, is it your opinion that the great majority of returning veterans will be unable to pay the prices, the prevailing prices for old homes?

Mayor O'DWYER. That is right. Well, here is a case of where they jump from the six and seven thousand dollar level up to the ten and twelve thousand dollar level. Without some control over that situation—this is only one phase of our housing that is outside of the means of the average veteran.

Mr. BARRY. And you believe it will get worse, do you, if we do not control it in some way now.

Mayor O'DWYER. It is bound to get worse, because the demand in New York at the present time is the worst I have seen it in my 36 years in the city. The city hall is just flooded with letters from veterans. I had one from a woman yesterday morning, a woman with three children and one expected, living in one single room. Now, you know that is a hard picture.

Mr. BARRY. I quite agree with you. My brother-in-law just got out of service about 3 months ago and he scoured Queens, which is part of our city, then went out to Nassau County and finally bought a small 6-room house in Lynbrook for $14,500. That is the best he could do. And that is way out of reach of 90 percent of the veterans.

Mayor O'DWYER. You will have much worse conditions than that in New York City before this thing is over unless the controls are maintained. Even the 10,000 temporary homes that we were able to get for veterans, thanks to national action here in Congress, even that will only be a drop in the bucket. It will not come anywhere near meeting the need. We know that.

May I continue, sir?

Mr. BARRY. Yes, continue.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. CRAWFORD.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do you know of any proposal before the Congress at the present time, Mr. Mayor, which would affect that price you referred to, on old homes, on the first sale?

Mayor O'DWYER. No, sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, then, we are not considering anything that would alleviate that condition, are we?

Mayor O'DWYER. Well, my suggestion was that, in the Wyatt proposal, that that would control, but I understand that that is not before Congress at the moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; that had to do with the second sale and subsequent sales. It had nothing to do with the proposition you bring up now about old homes now selling for $10,000, said first sale being beyond the reach of the veteran. In other words, the advance in price has already occurred. Now, we have had nothing before our committee which would affect the first sale of the old homes. I understand that is what you are talking about.

Mayor O'DWYER. I would be very happy if they were held right where they are now in the case of old homes.

Mr. BARRY. Well, Mr. Mayor, if I may interject, we had a bill before us and one of the provisions was for a subsidy to keep the prices of new homes down. Now, if the prices of new homes were kept down, and also if the subsidy was an incentive subsidy to encourage the building of homes, would that not create less scarcity and not have a tendency to bring down the price of old homes, provided we kept the ceiling of today on them?

Mayor O'DWYER. I do not believe that, in and of itself, for the next year or two, that it would. I see we are going to have a shortage in New York City. I am speaking about New York City. We are going to have a shortage of homes there for years to come. Our housing program now, public and private, are big projects that are just beginning. We cannot expect to open them for occupancy for at least a year. Once they begin to come through, a year from now, they will come through every month, and we will have some relief from that. But up to that time—and that ought to be a year and a half from now, at least—the skyrocketing of these prices of these houses, where there is no control at all, that is a considerable portion of the salable houses in the city.

After all, when you consider that during the war there was very little building of houses, if any, when you consider that materials are tight at the present time, and it is going to be some time before you have them, there is a picture of old homes—not old in years, but style, to distinguish them from new homes—they are the ones that have been in existence for a long time—that is a considerable portion of our housing. Some control should be placed on prices there. If not, we can expect just one thing: It will be a perfect example of why this act should be passed. It will prove why it should be passed. Because once they get into the market, you can watch the skyrocketing continue, and if they have doubled already, they will double again, in the year and a half.

Mr. BARRY. I agree with you completely, and the same evidence that existed 25 or 22 years ago in the Florida land boom exists all over the country today, and I spent a year in Florida during that period. I saw houses go up within 6 or 8 months to three times their price, out in the West Palm Beach section.

Mayor O'DWYER. That is right.

No less urgently needed are the continuance of the major price controls. We had a recent experience in New York City which exposes the dangers of premature lifting of controls on food. On November 19, citrus fruits were relieved of ceilings. The ceiling price in New York City that day was $5.54 per box wholesale on Indian River Florida oranges—retailing at 9½ cents per pound. As soon as the lid was off, the price rapidly rose $1.36 per box, to 12 cents per pound, an increase of 25 percent. Some time thereafter, OPA had to restore its controls. Today the ceiling price for these oranges is back at 9½ cents per pound.

Shortly before I took office, there were indications that food subsidies, especially subsidies on milk, would be lifted. Whereupon, the producers and dealers immediately petitioned the Department of Agriculture for a price increase which would have inevitably meant a 2 cents to 3 cents per quart increase in the cost of milk to the people of New York City—in all an addition of over $30,000,000 a year to the cost of living. Our underprivileged people could ill afford it, they would have to reduce the consumption of milk, jeopardizing the health of those children who need milk the most. I opposed the application and urged the continuance of the milk subsidy. It seems to me necessary to continue food subsidies to prevent living-cost rises until inflationary pressures begin to abate. I strongly favor eliminating subsidies at the earliest practicable time, but I think it should be done gradually over a period of time, but only when there is no danger of a living-cost increase.

Of course, all controls should be removed if and when the supply of any product comes into balance with the demands for that product, and there will be no inflationary price increase. But, our Government economists and stabilizers tell us that it is difficult to predict in advance, at the moment, when

inflationary pressures on the prices of a particular commodity will end to permit decontrol without price inflation. We should not gamble with the health and living standards of our people—we should play it safe.

As the mayor of the largest city in the country, employing in excess of 175,000 city employees, I have a very special interest in the success of this battle against inflation.

Some incomes, like those of speculators in commodities and black marketeers, rise sky high. Other incomes, like the take-home pay of factory workers, usually do not move up as fast as the cost of living, yet advance more rapidly than those of policemen, firemen, teachers, and other municipal workers. This is equally true of white-collar and professional workers who work on a fixed salary basis. It is these disparities which give rise to the inequities, injustices, and economic dislocations of inflation. Thus, inflation and its aftermath would infinitely complicate the problems and responsibilities of all mayors, including myself. The municipal income—the budget with which I have to run the New York City government and which is now in preparation—does not move upward rapidly when inflation sets in, if at all. Property valuations and tax rates are limited by law.

The income of a great city which is attempting to operate on a balanced budget, may not rise at all while its costs of operation are rising in every section of the budget. No mayor, no matter how great a financial wizard he may be, can solve this problem. With a fixed income you cannot balance a budget if rising costs absorb a slender margin of reserves. You cannot do it, that is, and run the kind of modern, progressive city that every mayor wants to run. A mayor's only recourse is to cut and trim away things which he may be forced to describe as luxuries, but which he knows in his heart are vital to the development of a healthier people in a greater city.

Let's just take one example. If we're going to make this world a better place to live in, we have to have better people in it. And if we are going to have better people we have to start on them when they are children. We have to have more and better education. We have to keep the good teachers and get more good ones. We ought to have more and better parks, recreation, housing, medical care, and community centers. We may sometimes be tempted to call these luxuries when we are faced with the desperate need to trim off costs to fit fixed budgets. But in our less harassed moments, we know that it is upon these things that not only our economic but our cultural and our moral future depend.

But how can we have these things which all of us want if our hopes are squeezed away between an inflation of costs and a fixed budget? How can we keep our best teachers and attract more of them if a rise in their cost of living makes its impossible for them to live decently on fixed salaries? Is it fair to our policemen, our firemen, and hundreds of thousands of other municipal employees to require them to meet increased living costs out of fixed salaries?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Mayor, at that point, I mentioned before that the cost of food had increased, since 1940, 45.5 percent. These figures were given me today by the Labor Department. And the cost of living, from 1940, 32.5 percent. Now, could you tell us what increase in salaries did those 175,000 employees, what average increase, did they receive during that period?

Mayor O'DWYER. They received a bonus of 15 percent. That bonus was taken out of the fund that was set apart to pay those who had gone into the services. Now, that was distributed among those employees who did not go into the Army and Navy.

Now, at this time we do not have that fund any more in New York City, because people have come back from the services. We have to maintain, however, the bonus, and we have to give those who come back their salaries, and the bonus. So that we are faced at the present time in New York City with adding, almost from one extreme to another, one new expense to another, of essential expenses. We are faced with the necessity of providing $80,000,000 in additional funds this year over last year's budget.

Mr. BARRY. That 15-percent bonus was less than half the cost in the rise of living?

Mayor O'DWYER. It was not half. The 15 percent was not half.

Mr. PATMAN. You mentioned paying these returning veterans. Do you pay them back pay for the time they were in service?

Mayor O'DWYER. No, sir; the money that was allocated for their pay, while they were away, that was taken and distributed to provide the 15-percent increase in the form of a bonus to those who did not go away. When they come back now they get their jobs. They get their jobs when they come back, at the original salary and, of course, they participate in an equal amount of bonus.

Mr. BARRY. Are there not other groups in the city besides the 175,000? I mean pensioners and white-collar groups, who have not received more than a 15-percent increase during this period?

Mayor O'DWYER. I doubt if the white-collar groups in private industry got it. I doubt if any of them got that much. I think they are in a bad way, and I think if the cost of living were to shoot up again, as it definitely would if these controls are not maintained, it would just be a hardship that is unbearable. It could not be done.

Mr. BARRY. I agree with you. Take a country like Queens, where probably 85 percent—the county has a population of about a million and a quarter or so—of it is one-family homes. That is the great white-collar class which carry those homes with the rising cost of living, and still trying to meet their mortgage payments.

Mayor O'DWYER. That borough is predominantly in civil service. The residents are predominantly civil service or white collar, and that 85 percent definitely would be faced with an impossible situation if you do not maintain these controls. That is true.

Mr. BARRY. I can say to you that I am getting a very good supply of letters from my county, which is Queens, advocating continuance of the Price Administration Act, and I want to say very frankly that a few years ago some were complaining about it. These same people. But they realize now what would happen to them if we did not have it. I think that prevails throughout the country.

Mayor O'DWYER. Well, New York City is very much aware of the need for controls. We are in a different position than the average city because we have so many of the white-collar and civil-service employees, and if you take the controls away now, I would not know what they would do. Of course, the day will come—and it may not be too far off, but no one seems to know when that day will be—when the shelves will bring the price level down and stabilize it, by a natural process. When that time comes, of course, I would not come down here and suggest governmental control.

Mr. BARRY. I think we would concur with you on that. We all feel that way. When the supply and demand reach some kind of a balance, we are all in favor of taking off controls.

Mayor O'DWYER. What you have today is demand. You have no supply, and you are not likely to have it, at least for the year for which the extension of this control is asked, and within that year it would be a tragedy if price control was not maintained.

Mr. BARRY. You may continue, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor O'DWYER. I am about to finish, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Mayor, I want to explain something. Those bells that rang were calling for a roll call. That is why some of these Members have absented themselves.

Mayor O'DWYER. Thank you.

I am confident that the answers to these questions are matters of as deep concern to you as they are to me, and to others who find themselves in the same situation.

Your approval of the proposal to extend these prices and rent controls for another year will give us the assurance that we will not face the dislocations and the hardships that may be otherwise in store for us.

Mr. PATMAN. A very fine statement, Mr. Mayor, I must congratulate you.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Mayor, we are very grateful to you for your statement, and I know the members of the Committee present at this time wholeheartedly agree with you. As I explained, the other members left because of the quorum call.

Do you have any questions?

The CHAIRMAN. You have made a very convincing statement, Mr. Mayor, and we were very glad to have you here.

Mayor O'DWYER. Thank you very much.

Investigating the Power Trust Lobby and the Securities and Exchange Commission

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as one Member who has fought for more than 20 years to protect the American people against exorbitant electric light and power rates, I want to point out now what is wrong.

If you are going to make an investigation, then investigate the Securities and Exchange Commission and find out why they have not enforced the Holding Company Act. If they had done so, you would not have these representatives of the vast holding companies lobbying around Washington.

Not only that, but the representatives of the individual operating companies would be at home looking after the affairs of their respective companies instead of following the dictation of these holding companies to the detriment of all concerned. I have pointed out time and time again that these useless holding companies are simply bleeding the operating companies and bleeding the consumers of electricity in every State in the Union, literally sapping the life blood out of them for their own aggrandizement.

So if you are going to investigate anybody, begin at the source and demand that the Holding Company Act be enforced. Then you will get somewhere in protecting the electric light and power consumers of this country from the exorbitant overcharges they are now compelled to pay.

I do not have the latest figures compiled yet, but if any of you want to know how much the people of your State had to pay in overcharges for electricity in 1944, here are the figures:

In 1944 we had 33,033,900 consumers of all classes. They purchased and used 196,425,236,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid $3,254,000,000. Under the TVA rates, they would have paid $1,919,000,000, or $1,335,000,000 less; under the Tacoma, Wash., rates they would have saved $1,769,000,000; under the Bonneville rates they would have saved $1,305,000,000; and under the Ontario rates they would have saved $1,559,000,000.

More than a billion dollars in overcharge are paid by the electric consumers of this country every year.

Here is the table showing those overcharges by States:

Total electric sales, 1944

State	Estimated sales data for 1944			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	375,207	5,315,441,000	$46,365,671	$32,541,377	$13,824,294	$23,948,009	$22,417,662	$32,547,660	$13,818,011	$29,197,161	$17,168,510
Arizona	118,186	968,961,000	14,909,097	6,915,517	7,993,580	5,459,682	9,449,415	7,094,926	7,814,171	6,121,924	8,787,173
Arkansas	227,164	1,321,408,000	24,153,655	13,067,518	11,086,137	9,934,014	14,219,641	13,233,140	10,920,515	11,155,857	12,997,798
California	2,599,073	16,195,525,000	246,276,631	192,361,223	53,915,408	145,015,082	101,261,549	194,643,613	51,633,018	172,861,314	73,415,317
Colorado	283,443	940,080,000	23,496,348	12,740,912	10,755,436	10,172,320	13,324,028	13,059,694	10,436,654	11,151,645	12,344,703
Connecticut	555,058	2,664,939,000	58,298,676	31,698,558	26,600,118	24,662,288	33,636,388	32,171,664	26,127,012	27,838,200	30,460,476
Delaware	73,567	426,135,000	8,059,658	4,456,822	3,602,836	3,419,028	4,640,630	4,501,746	3,557,912	3,935,326	4,124,332
District of Columbia	81,818	1,658,185,000	19,676,225	15,076,769	4,599,456	11,743,656	7,932,569	15,373,206	4,303,019	13,372,052	6,304,173
Florida	456,340	1,822,715,000	49,516,447	21,773,850	27,742,597	17,696,161	31,819,486	22,465,642	27,050,805	18,946,433	30,570,014
Georgia	462,606	3,034,214,000	48,013,676	29,186,998	18,826,678	22,885,014	25,128,662	29,769,530	18,244,146	25,721,670	22,292,006
Idaho	137,507	970,573,000	12,933,776	7,897,615	5,036,161	6,299,646	6,634,130	8,062,813	4,870,963	6,857,689	6,076,087
Illinois	2,238,427	12,716,274,000	229,569,577	126,934,166	102,635,411	98,554,423	131,015,154	128,887,834	100,681,743	111,847,392	117,722,185
Indiana	979,986	5,645,664,000	101,004,609	58,695,383	42,309,226	45,064,392	55,940,217	59,346,979	41,657,630	51,845,021	49,159,588
Iowa	625,757	2,149,422,000	50,219,659	27,766,961	22,452,698	22,210,434	28,009,225	28,597,847	21,621,812	24,437,167	25,782,492
Kansas	435,190	1,613,156,000	35,815,823	19,951,748	15,864,675	15,899,406	19,916,417	20,475,929	15,339,894	17,530,451	18,285,372
Kentucky	433,874	2,381,185,000	38,698,587	23,836,238	14,862,349	18,280,447	20,418,140	24,068,531	14,630,056	21,034,679	17,663,917
Louisiana	359,442	2,618,082,000	39,713,870	20,915,891	18,797,979	16,093,305	23,620,565	21,237,961	18,475,909	18,583,255	21,130,615
Maine	237,597	1,026,124,000	19,339,170	10,407,826	8,931,344	8,071,019	11,268,151	10,536,485	8,802,685	9,133,121	10,206,049
Maryland	592,334	2,847,755,000	50,847,874	29,767,157	21,080,717	22,894,886	27,952,988	30,242,357	20,605,517	26,503,027	24,344,847
Massachusetts	1,344,391	4,818,118,000	122,063,156	61,683,933	60,379,223	47,937,130	74,126,026	62,560,198	59,502,958	54,231,903	67,831,253
Michigan	1,574,066	9,031,646,000	159,670,543	91,097,473	68,573,070	72,168,307	87,502,236	92,968,988	66,701,555	77,664,216	82,006,327
Minnesota	689,053	2,413,081,000	58,979,218	32,939,199	26,040,019	26,394,281	32,584,937	33,781,428	25,197,790	28,724,132	30,255,086
Mississippi	202,125	865,264,000	17,322,406	9,426,518	7,895,888	7,355,868	9,966,538	9,606,049	7,716,357	8,323,074	8,999,332
Missouri	880,625	4,097,638,000	80,299,053	49,325,355	30,973,698	38,155,202	42,143,851	50,092,264	30,206,789	43,637,939	36,661,114
Montana	123,790	1,852,868,000	16,223,289	11,059,019	5,164,270	8,099,740	8,123,549	11,064,812	5,158,477	9,965,906	6,257,383
Nebraska	289,813	925,354,000	22,390,736	12,832,318	9,558,418	10,359,849	12,030,887	13,193,330	9,197,406	11,179,336	11,211,400
Nevada	31,777	168,775,000	3,525,411	1,779,775	1,745,636	1,452,907	2,072,504	1,846,382	1,679,029	1,560,239	1,965,172
New Hampshire	153,897	516,121,000	13,264,986	7,095,552	6,169,434	5,477,021	7,787,965	7,172,340	6,092,646	6,241,587	7,023,399
New Jersey	1,348,769	6,237,145,000	131,097,419	64,786,251	66,311,168	50,490,317	80,607,102	65,820,952	65,276,467	56,984,044	74,113,375
New Mexico	75,920	213,951,000	7,256,115	2,908,663	4,347,452	2,405,820	4,850,295	3,047,668	4,208,447	2,564,118	4,691,997
New York	4,163,867	21,575,955,000	398,198,982	195,940,373	202,258,609	155,120,719	243,078,263	200,586,473	197,612,509	172,744,548	225,454,434
North Carolina	524,098	3,564,484,000	55,322,826	36,390,960	18,931,866	27,760,335	27,562,491	36,834,954	18,487,872	32,383,840	22,938,986
North Dakota	99,020	199,722,000	7,644,613	3,516,570	4,128,043	2,952,556	4,692,057	3,669,234	3,975,379	3,030,588	4,614,025
Ohio	2,046,801	14,933,102,000	221,580,109	138,446,669	83,133,440	106,073,264	115,506,845	139,875,317	81,704,792	122,460,990	99,119,119
Oklahoma	392,249	1,710,415,000	35,093,450	19,033,508	16,059,942	14,733,113	20,360,337	19,332,260	15,761,190	16,804,880	18,288,570
Oregon	344,050	3,268,237,000	30,980,972	23,059,455	7,921,517	18,136,905	12,844,067	23,473,129	7,507,843	20,168,629	10,812,343
Pennsylvania	2,622,565	18,092,482,000	277,500,054	173,170,337	104,329,717	130,449,470	147,050,584	174,062,267	103,437,787	153,946,345	123,553,709
Rhode Island	217,219	879,985,000	21,622,903	11,283,841	10,339,062	8,564,312	13,058,591	11,366,029	10,256,874	9,999,370	11,623,533
South Carolina	253,575	1,716,232,000	25,205,304	16,680,043	8,525,261	12,744,084	12,461,220	16,876,442	8,328,862	14,820,128	10,385,176
South Dakota	102,150	252,084,000	8,418,186	3,930,091	4,488,095	3,202,954	5,215,232	4,065,618	4,352,568	3,430,212	4,987,974
Tennessee	465,871	5,791,806,000	44,264,408	37,299,815	6,964,593	28,259,315	16,005,093	37,574,434	6,689,974	33,127,915	11,136,493
Texas	1,194,124	6,297,873,000	113,084,375	63,249,349	49,835,026	49,254,969	63,829,406	64,529,577	48,554,798	56,073,816	57,010,559
Utah	163,715	1,270,796,000	16,850,563	8,537,486	8,313,077	7,168,308	9,682,255	8,984,768	7,865,795	7,513,010	9,337,553
Vermont	94,257	321,156,000	8,840,055	4,853,429	3,986,626	3,769,432	5,070,623	4,915,631	3,924,424	4,258,585	4,581,470
Virginia	507,059	2,690,612,000	50,730,387	29,146,418	21,583,969	22,978,770	27,751,617	29,738,908	20,991,479	25,596,443	25,133,944
Washington	606,179	8,712,401,000	61,967,978	48,329,058	13,638,920	37,597,625	24,370,353	49,180,653	12,837,325	42,615,018	19,352,960
West Virginia	342,514	3,355,173,000	43,474,456	27,068,229	16,406,227	19,762,352	23,712,104	27,015,475	16,458,981	24,368,214	19,106,242
Wisconsin	855,245	4,179,790,000	79,798,382	45,947,782	33,850,600	35,695,172	44,103,210	46,764,413	33,033,969	40,635,864	39,162,518
Wyoming	52,540	157,102,000	4,574,946	2,191,733	2,383,213	1,779,040	2,795,906	2,290,093	2,284,853	1,915,930	2,659,016
United States	33,033,900	196,425,236,000	3,254,154,310	1,919,001,731	1,335,152,579	1,484,603,149	1,769,551,161	1,948,557,643	1,305,596,667	1,695,044,194	1,559,110,116

Status of School-Lunch Project in California—California Will Be Short $407,000—1,035 Schools To Stop Lunches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, to clarify the situation and to get the down-to-date facts as to the status of the school-lunch program in my own native State of California, I asked the United States Department of Agriculture to tell me in writing.

You will notice that the letter states that 1,035 schools in California have been notified that Federal aid will terminate on April 30, next month.

This $407,000 necessary to continue this balanced diet for the future citizens must be had. Why not? Is not the physical well-being of our children a matter of vital national concern? The advocates of compulsory military training advocate it as a means to build bodies. But, Mr. Speaker, if we neglect their bodies at the ages of 2, 3, 4, 6 years of age, how much more expensive and difficult will it be to rebuild them through military training at 17 and 18 years of age? Let us be consistent in our reasoning.

And I have heard some distinguished Members of this House object to the school-lunch program on the grounds that it was the Federal Government entering too much into the affairs of the family or parental obligations or State obligations. Well, compulsory military training would be 10,000 times more so. I only use this as a comparison and not as an argument, either for or against military training.

Here is the letter I received in answer to my request:

FIELD SERVICE BRANCH,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Berkeley, Calif., March 4, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: This will reply to your letter of February 26 which acknowledges our letter of February 19 concerning the school-lunch program in California. You asked for every bit of material we have as to how this lack of funds relates to California. We submit the following pertinent figures:

Total number of schools under contract in California, including public, parochial, and other nonprofit private: 1,035.

Total school-lunch funds allocated to California for the 1945–46 fiscal year: $1,771,022.

Date on which all school-lunch contracts in California must be canceled because $1,771,022 will be exhausted: April 30, 1946.

Number of schools which have been declined Federal aid since January 1, 1946, due to lack of funds: 83.

Approximate amount of daily Federal expenditure for the school-lunch program in California: $12,900.

Estimated amount of additional funds required to carry existing school-lunch contracts from April 30 to the respective closing date of each school prior to June 30, 1946: $407,000.

This gives a terse picture of the school-lunch situation. The 1,035 schools in California, now under school-lunch contracts, have been officially notified that Federal aid will terminate on April 30. In order to continue the existing agreements to the closing date of each school (from April 30 to its closing date on or before June 30) we estimate that $407,000 is required.

Some confusion seems to exist in connection with H. R. 3370, which passed the House on February 21. H. R. 3370 provides school-lunch funds for use subsequent to the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946. This in no way relieves the $407,000 shortage which is required for the balance of the current fiscal year, after April 30, if the present school-lunch program in California is carried to the respective closing dates of all schools under contract, at the present rates of indemnity.

We are taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to other congressional representatives from California who have corresponded with us on the school-lunch program.

Very truly yours,

DAVE DAVIDSON,
State Director, Field Service Branch.

Sale of Surplus Government Property

REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter I just received from Victor Candlin Post, No. 18, of the American Legion, Greeley, Colo., dated March 7, with certain enclosures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a resolution passed by that organization and also to certain affidavits. We have had more than 6 months' time to watch the workings and, shall I say, the underhanded methods used in connection with the sale of surplus Government property. I hope every Member of the House will read these affidavits.

The American veterans are not having any success in obtaining Government surplus property. It seems to me that the organization that has charge of the sale of surplus property is using every means at hand to see that our veterans shall not receive an opportunity to bid on these supplies.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution and affidavits follow:

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has enacted laws governing the disposition and disposal of surplus properties, one of the express provisions of which was the establishment of priorities in favor of returned war veterans for the purchase of those surplus war materials which are necessary or advantageous to the pursuit of their businesses, professions, or agriculture, and this provision of the law is now being circumvented by administrative practice apparently not in conformity with the interest of the law; and

Whereas under current procedure the War Assets Administration is not receiving the available surplus properties for disposal to veterans who have applications on file due to the practice of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Army, and the Navy of circumventing the intent of the law by selling by direct sales to private interests or to the high bidder in lots in excess of the needs or resources of individual veterans, those surplus properties which are in demand for which thousands of veteran applications are on file without first giving said veterans an opportunity to purchase said property in reasonable lots at a fair unit price; and

Whereas the lack of a simple and definite procedure and dearth of comprehensive information and direction has resulted in the expenditure of time and money by veterans who desired to exercise their lawful rights under the law far in excess of the benefits received or to be received; and

Whereas the inability of veterans to derive or realize any benefits from predischarge promises of the Congress has created a distrust in the sincerity of those promises and inspired disgust on the part of veterans; and the sale of those surplus war materials which are desired by veterans, to powerful nonveteran agencies has indicated that special privileges are being shown, which in turn incites a feeling that malfeasance or corruption may exist; and

Whereas specific instances are at hand where members of Victor Candlin Post, No. 18, American Legion, Department of Colorado, have been deprived of their lawful rights under the law in their endeavor to establish projects requiring surplus war materials, which projects would be advantageous to the community welfare, private businesses, professions, and agriculture. Sworn statements are attached hereto: It is hereby

Resolved, That Victor Candlin Post, No. 18, American Legion, Department of Colorado, express to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Colorado its unqualified disapproval of the current practices and methods now used in the administration of the surplus property laws; and it is further

Resolved, That the United States Senators and Congressmen from Colorado, be and they are hereby importuned to initiate those steps necessary to insure that in future sales of surplus war materials the following are established:

1. Unqualified priorities to veterans for an adequate period of time, that they may purchase through the War Assets Administration as the sole disposal agency for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Army and the Navy, of any and all surplus war materials that are necessary or advantageous to the pursuit of their business, profession, or agriculture in reasonable lots at a fair fixed unit price.

2. Dissemination to points readily accessible to veterans of the information on specifications, location, and price of all items declared to be surplus war materials.

3. Simple and direct procedures for veterans to apply for such purchase and unbiased and expeditious processing of such applications; it is further

Resolved, That it is the opinion of Victor Candlin Post No. 18, American Legion, Department of Colorado, that if specific benefits to veterans under the surplus property laws were not intended, or if they are not to be made available to veterans by proper administration practices, the law should be repealed together with any other legislation containing insincere implications of acknowledgement of rights of veterans to aid and assistance in re-establishing themselves as an integral part of their community life; that all veteran legislation should be debunked, fumigated, and then simplified; and veterans should be advised of the exact practical facts pertaining to their transition from military to civilian status.

VICTOR CANDLIN POST, NO. 18,
AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF COLORADO,
ARTHUR C. BAIRD, *Commander.*
GEORGE KIMBALL, *Adjutant.*

Committee authorized to draw the resolution:

KENNETH LILLY,
W. L. SHAFER,
RALPH E. WALDO, Jr.

STATE OF COLORADO,
County of Weld, ss:

Ralph E. Waldo, Jr., being first duly sworn upon oath deposes and says:

I am a veteran of World War II. I was released to inactive duty on terminal leave on September 18, 1945, and completed my terminal leave on October 28, 1945.

On October 5, 1945, I went to Denver and made application with the Smaller War Plants Corporation for surplus war materials, which included the following: Executive type office desk, office chairs, filing cabinet and automobile.

I was told that they would make search for these materials and notify me when they found them. I went home satisfied that before long I would receive a letter or a call telling me to come to Denver and buy what I needed.

On October 23, 1945, my veterans' preference slips were made out giving me case number 9-A-876, and I received them in the mail without any further instructions as to what I should do with them. I thought that was fine, that they had confirmed my application.

I had opened my law office on October 1, 1945, using make-shift furniture and borrowed materials, and it was very unsatisfactory. About the first week in November, having heard no further word from Denver, I went to Denver a second time to inquire about my application. I was sent to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the Commonwealth Building where a representative of the SWPC informed me I could get office furniture and referred me to a Mr. Wood of the RFC. Mr. Wood referred me to his assistant. I told the assistant the story. That I was desperately in need of office furniture and that I had heard that there was available office furniture in warehouse in Denver, I was told that they had disposed of the last available furniture just before I came in, but there would be plenty more coming in and they could take care of me later. I then asked this assistant to check and see if I was on the list. Upon checking we found that my case number was down the list about 100 cases. I told the man just what I wanted and he said he would get me a matched set. I gave him my phone number and name which he entered on the list beside my case number. He showed me some desks in that office and told me that they sold for around $10. I left and went back to Greeley feeling very happy.

I waited and waited for notification to come and pay for my office furniture. In the meantime I inquired around and found there was a warehouse at 1775 Sherman Street, in Denver, where surplus property was stored. I had become disgusted and written to President Truman, the Colorado Senators, and my Representative. They were all told upon checking into the matter that if I would just follow the procedure that I would get my materials. As a matter of fact I had followed the procedure set out 6 weeks prior. Finally Senator JOHNSON wrote me if I would contact Mr. Ross L. Hudson, manager of the RFC in Denver, he would aid me. I immediately contacted Mr. Hudson by telephone

and told him my troubles. I waited several days and nothing happened. I then went to Denver and went out to the Government warehouse, at 1775 Sherman Street, where I found articles of surplus furniture. I found a sale was being advertised for some 51 items of surplus furniture. The sale was advertised as follows: "Santa's Clean Sweep—Everything Goes—United States Government Warehouse Clearance—All Government Surplus Goods in RFC Denver Warehouse, 1775 Sherman Street, Offered to Dealers and Wholesalers for Resale Only, December 17, 18, 19, 20—Inspection Daily 9 a. m. to 4 p. m. (Except Saturdays and Sundays), December 3 Through Dates of Sale—RFC Office of Surplus Property, Consumers Goods Division, 728 Fifteenth Street, Denver, Colo."

I went in and selected the articles of surplus property I desired and took down the numbers for each item. I then went to the RFC in the Commonwealth Building, in Denver, to make my purchase, as I had been told I had preference to make these purchases and I had my preference slips with me and the cash to pay for the goods. There I was again referred to Mr. Wood, who in turn referred me to his assistant, Mr. Vermillion. I informed them I had looked the property over at the warehouse and wished to make my purchase. I presented my preference slips and was told that I would have to go to the Mining Exchange Building and have Mr. Baker sign my slips. The time previous, when I spoke to the RFC, they had not mentioned having my preference slips signed. I then asked if they could sell me the furniture I wanted, and I was told that that furniture was on sale to the dealers. I asked them why I hadn't been notified since my application had been filed and they had a list of the items I wanted a month earlier. I was told they could have sold this furniture to me if I had come in a few days earlier. They told me it was all the SWPC fault. They said they didn't know there were any orders from veterans, and they had to clear this warehouse out by the first of the year; yet they were advertising the sale from December 3, 1945, through December 20, 1945.

I then went to the Mining Exchange Building and saw Mr. Baker. Mr. Baker did all he could for me. I gave him the numbers of the furniture I needed and he said he would try and get it. The next day I called Ross L. Hudson and told him what I had done and that Mr. Baker might need some help in getting the furniture I wanted. A few days later I was able to get some furniture through the efforts of Mr. Baker, but when I went to the RFC to pay for the furniture Mr. Vermillion told me that they would have a lot better furniture in shortly and tried to get me to wait for it so they wouldn't have to take one desk off the sale. I told him that my clients were getting tired of sitting on the floor and I had to have furniture.

About the 1st of February 1946, I made application for a few more items of furniture. I again went to Denver and looked at the furniture in the Government surplus property warehouse at 915 South Logan Street, Denver, Colo. I picked out the furniture I wanted there, but when I arrived at the War Assets Administration and inquired of them, they called the RFC and were informed this property had not been placed on file with them as yet. The War Assets Administration informed me that they would have the property I had selected earmarked for me. I am still waiting to hear from them.

On February 11, 1946, I was in Denver and learned the Army was conducting a sale of furniture at 900 South Broadway, Denver, Colo. I found this address to be headquarters of the Eight Hundred and Thirty-seventh Army Air Forces Specialized Depot. They were holding a sale of office furniture. The furniture was divided into units of three desks, three chairs, a filing cabinet and a few other small items, and the sale was for cash to the highest bidder, thus depriving the veteran of his right to buy this furniture in quantities as needed at a set unit price. I had no use for all the furniture contained in two lots, but I was forced to bid on it to try and get one or two pieces which I needed badly. I was evidently too low in my bid, although I bid three times the amount the same furniture would be sold for through the War Assets Administration. I have heard nothing further and the bids were to close February 15, 1946.

I got the furniture I have thus far received by getting antagonistic and fighting mad. Such moods are very unbecoming of an American citizen and such actions should not be necessary to take advantage of what is a legal and lawful right under the law. I am still trying to get a few more items of office furniture which I need. I hope I don't have to go through the original process to get them.

RALPH E. WALDO, Jr.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of March A. D. 1946.

[SEAL] ARTHUR G. WEIGLE,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 22, 1946.

STATE OF COLORADO,
County of Weld, ss.:

W. L. Shaffer, being first duly sworn upon oath desposes and says:

I am a veteran of World War II with 3 years 6 months and 17 days honorable service, my active service having terminated November 21, 1945.

In October 1945, while on terminal leave, I contacted the Veterans' Application Section of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, Denver, Colo., office regarding purchase of surplus war property for use on a farm being purchased by me near Greeley, Colo. At this interview I was advised that I was eligible to make such purchase and could apply for any available surplus-war material necessary for or advantagecus to farming activities engaged in by me. I was given an application blank and instructed to prepare in detail the specifications of items desired to be purchased.

Later in the month of October 1945, I returned to the office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in Denver with application blanks accomplished. Items listed on the form consisted of truck, tractor, fencing, and deep-freezing unit, all of which were necessary or advantageous to my agricultural activities. I was advised that procedures had been changed, a new application form was in process of preparation, my name and address were filed and I was advised I would have the new form mailed within a few days.

About the 1st of November 1945 I obtained, from a lumber dealer of this vicinity, a list of building materials advertised for sale as surplus war materials in Denver and Colorado Springs, Colo. Items of this list were identical with items I had been attempting, without success, to purchase from building material firms in this and other areas in northern Colorado and were essential for construction and repair of farm buildings to house and care for livestock already acquired or proposed in connection with my farm activities. A desired list of these materials was prepared by me and taken to the office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in Denver together with the list previously submitted on the form now obsolete. A copy of the new form, which I had not received by mail, was requested. I was advised that, due to further changes in agencies and procedures, forms were not yet available. I pressed the urgency of my need for building and fencing materials only to be told that the Smaller War Plants would be unable to certify a priority for veterans to purchase these items due to their not being listed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as available to veterans. I then contacted the Denver office of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and was advised that my application for these items would only be given consideration after application from Federal agencies, State agencies, other governmental agencies, and dealers were filled. Due to the acute shortage of these items in the hands of dealers, consideration at such time was meaningless.

In December 1945 I received the new form promised in October on which to apply for purchase of surplus war materials. This form was never accomplished as I had concluded from my previous experience and from the reported experience of other veterans, that any further effort to obtain veteran benefits under the surplus property laws was futile expenditure of time, money, and effort, and, further, that the predischarge promises to veterans of such benefits were farcical under current administrative practices.

During all the period I was in negotiation with agencies for the purchase of surplus war material I was able and willing to tender cash for any purchase which I desired to make. My farm activities have been handicapped by failure of administrative agencies to make possible the exercise of my rights under the subject law.

W. L. SHAFFER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of March A. D. 1946.

[SEAL] ARTHUR G. WEIGLE,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 22, 1946.

STATE OF COLORADO.
County of Weld, ss:

Kenneth Lilly, being first duly sworn upon oath deposes and says:

I am a veteran of World War II.

On or about August 21, 1945, I made a contract with the veterans' adviser at Colorado State College of Education and at the Greeley Veterans' Administration with regard to the possibility of getting an ambulance for our firm. The application was predicated on (a) essential use by a veteran in business and (b) desperate need in the community served, it being the only regular ambulance service for approximately 50,000 persons within a radius of 50 miles involving over two emergency trips per day. The business was assured by contracts with Weld County for service and by agreements with other groups. The essence of success was the procurement of proper equipment. I was advised to contact Smaller War Plants Corporation in Denver and did so on or about August 25, 1945. After unsatisfactory results by letter, I called about September 5, and was advised I must secure a dealer to bid for me, as veterans were not considered directly. On or about September 7, I contacted a dealer. On or about September 8, I was informed by SWPC that by directive change veterans could apply directly to RFC. Calling off the dealer, I wrote RFC on or about September 15 stating my request and the great need in the community. A week later a letter from RFC requested more specific information as to the type of equipment. I had discovered that an ambulance of the type desired was en route from Jefferson Barracks to Denver for disposal. I obtained an exact description and called this information into Denver. I then mailed a description of the type of equipment needed to RFC on or about September 25. I quote the description, "No Army box types desired—want low mileage, regular civilian type with professional body style similar to those widely used in Army and Navy air installations and at ordnance plants."

I subsequently called Denver twice to ascertain the whereabouts of the ambulance from Jefferson Barracks. On the second call I was informed that this ambulance was not in evidence though no explanation could be made. It was suggested I go to Heart Mountain, Wyo., to bid on two ambulances there.

Investigation proved these to be exactly not as specified and mechanically unsound.

On or about June 20, 1945, the Des Moines ordnance plant at Des Moines, Iowa, was shut down. They had two little-used ambulances of the type desired. I obtained exact descriptions and on or about October 10, 1945, I called this information to Surplus Property Disposal in Denver. They advised there was nothing they could do and asked me to send in my discharge and they would return to me a veteran's priority certificate, and that I should attempt to get this equipment directly. This was done and the veteran's preference certificate received, case No. 9–A–1389; so after 2 months I now had a piece of paper to show for my efforts.

After checking in Des Moines I found that on or about October 25 the ambulance in question there had been certified by the Army personnel in charge as surplus and was advised to contact the Seventh Transportation Zone, Omaha, Nebr. A letter there was ineffective. A telephone call directly raised an assistant to an assistant, and I was advised nothing was known of the ambulance, and to check again at Des Moines. Checking back at Des Moines on or about November 15, it was discovered that the former officer in charge was now dismissed and that RFC had taken over; that the car (idle since June 1945, was still gathering rust and dust in the garage); and that disposal could be made when certified by Omaha Surplus Property Disposal.

In December I had information from Des Moines that the car was certified for disposal and prepared to go back to finish the details. Then a letter from my representative there informed me that there was a change in agencies and that the ambulance must clear through Kansas City, Mo., in the War Assets Corporation. During all of this period it was represented that the car would be momentarily ready for disposal and that I would have the first opportunity. Meanwhile the matter was called to the attention, by letter and by personal representative of an Iowa Congressman, who seemed completely unable to do anything or to explain how to get anything done. He wrote: "The disposal of surplus property is the greatest muddle we have to contend with here" (referring to Washington). "The rules of procedure are changed almost daily and authority is shifted from one agency to another on various commodities." During this period the matter was brought to the attention of an executive official of SWPC at Denver by a veterans' representative. On December 17 I received a reply stating my request was "so specific it might be called a custom job." This in spite of the fact that positive examples of the equipment desired was at hand. However, using typical language of all persons associated with surplus property, he stated: "You may rest assured we are very anxious to fill every application and will do everything in our power to be of assistance to the veterans."

Through the remainder of December, the month of January 1946, and February 1946, contacts were made by telephone and personal appearances to the Des Moines office of the RFC. My representative describes this period of activity as follows: "On December 15, 1945, I was told by the executive officer for RFC, Mr. Sam Kohn, that the RFC would take over January 1, 1946, and that something would be done. Beginning January 1, 1946, I was told that a Mr. Peterson would be in Des Moines and that he would have full charge. Finally, I contacted this man and his answer was that he would have something definite January 15, and that I should write at once for your certificate for veterans' preference. This I did, and received it at once. I called Mr. Peterson and informed him that I had your certificate and he told me to keep it until the RFC was ready. On January 18, I called again and was told that disposal would be made on or about February 1. Subsequently, contacts were made on February 1, February 10, February 15, February 18, and February 25. I went to Mr. Peterson's office. He informed me that the inventory had never left the ordnance plant as yet to go to Chicago. This after 6 months of delay and after former representations that the ambulance was momentarily available for disposal.

"At this time, February 25, the future procedure was outlined as follows: When the inventory reaches the Chicago office it will be booked and filed, then sent to the Kansas City office to be booked and filed, then to the Des Moines office to be booked and filed. Then a list of everything of a surplus nature will be sent from the Chicago office to all Federal, State, and municipal offices to let them pick it all over and see if they would want any part of it. After they are all through with it, then the balance is to be sent to the Kansas City office and booked again and then returned to Des Moines to be booked and filed. Now, you as a veteran can apply to the Kansas City office and if there is anything left and providing you are the first on file with your certificate, you will then be directed to the Des Moines office. The Des Moines office will show you the article. However, they cannot sell it to you, but you are referred to the Kansas City office, which is authorized to make sales. Then the sale slips are returned to the Des Moines office, which can deliver the article to you. The whole thing is simplicity.

"If you are still living when this gets to all the different offices and you at last get the ambulance it will likely have rusted to pieces and the car will be so obsolete that the manufacturers will have discontinued making repairs for so old a model.

"I am herewith returning your veterans preference certificate to do with as you like. So far, it has not been worth the paper it is written on.

"I now find that the purchasing agent for the State of Iowa has been trying to get the same ambulance for one of the State institutions for over 4 months and he has gone about as far as I have and has just as much and no more accomplished. You can see that if and when the ambulance is made available the State will buy it ahead of you. I am forgetting the whole thing and suggest you do likewise."

The Kansas City office of RFC has not to date authorized the sale of any item at a plant which has been shut down since July 1945, and through the tenure of three different officials at the plant. So after a period of 6 months and 5 days, being served by the SWPC, RFC, War Assets Corporation, and War Assets Administration making contacts with officials in Greeley, Colo.; Denver, Colo.; Omaha, Nebr.; Des Moines, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Washington, D. C., through all forms, and regulations, miles of correspondence, innumerable telephone calls, and billions of words together with an expenditure of a considerable sum of money; and in spite of the fact that two specific ambulances were identified for officials (one of which ambulances disappeared from the lists and one of which has been completely idle to this moment at the Des Moines ordnance plant since July 1945) and that cash has been available to purchase; and that opportunity to purchase in the open market based on priority of application to manufacturers has been lost relying on promises and statements of officials that I could have this piece of equipment: I have achieved at the moment of writing the following results:

(a) A piece of paper stating my veteran priority status.

(b) A sizable quantity of deceptions, broken promises and fantastic excuses.

(c) Much exercise in applying to new agencies.

(d) A lesson in geography.

(e) A healthy, well-nourished disrespect for all phases of the present administration of surplus property and the predischarge promises made to veterans.

KENNETH LILLY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of March, A. D. 1946.

[SEAL] ARTHUR G. WEIGLE,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 22, 1946.

Investigation of Lobbyist Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of satisfaction that I read in the past 2 days that the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the Rules Committee had given public recognition to the necessity to investigate the activities of lobbyists and lobbies that have been, and are, as at no other time before, bringing great pressure on the Congress of the United States.

Yes; it is most gratifying that they share the same concern that I expressed nearly 4 months ago on November 26, 1945, when I introduced House Resolution 416 to create a select committee to make such an investigation. I also introduced H. R. 4773 a bill to require the registration of legislative counsel and lobbyists.

Now the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has introduced House Resolution 557 as of yesterday calling for the creation of a committee to make such an investigation—exactly the same thing that I did 4 months ago.

But I am puzzled that the Rules Committee, of which the gentleman from Illinois is chairman, has failed to take any action on my resolution, House Resolution 416, which has been before it for nearly 4 months and which proposes exactly the same thing that that committee's chairman proposed with his resolution of yesterday.

My resolution, House Resolution 416, is as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the techniques, practices, and methods of legislative counsel, lobbyists, lobbies, and pressure groups, in proposing, supporting, preventing, opposing, influencing, or attempting to prevent or influence, legislation by the Congress of the United States.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel,

to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Lobbyists

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, while lobbyists are now being discussed and since a recent RECORD—March 11, 1946—carried a speech by the Speaker, and since there are now before the House two resolutions calling for an investigation of the lobbyists I want to make clear a few of my own observations.

Before I came to Congress I was under the impression, as apparently most people back in the districts are, that Washington was overrun by lobbyists, who were continually applying pressure to Members of Congress to enact legislation which would generally satisfy the selfish interests of the many groups represented.

I had the idea that a lobbyist was a person who should be avoided by every person interested in good government. But, how mistaken I was to find that the term "lobbyist," as used here by certain politicians, was and is simply a smoke screen behind which to hide while shirking responsibility.

When the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SABATH, declared certain lobbyists spent $2,000,000 here in the Capitol, he should be in a position to say how that money was spent and who got the money. I have seen men of all classes and of various groups around the Capitol and throughout the office buildings and before committees wanting and demanding about everything under the sun. But I have never seen the men with the money bags. During my years of service in the State legislature as well as during my years here in the Capitol, I have never known a single dollar to be used to put legislation across, and I do think that when Mr. SABATH made the charge he owed it to the House to tell who got the money.

Now, the facts are, any person or persons who come to Washington in order to present their interests or the interests of their community to the legislators, or who go before committees to present their case, or the views of the people back home, are lobbyists.

There is also such a thing known as a mail-bag lobby.

Congress has always invited the public to bring its views before it. That is why the various committees hold public hearings to get a cross section of views. And generally, when the country's views are expressed in this fashion it is done by a single representative citizen, or a small group of a few people who are delegated with authority to present the peoples' views.

The worst and most persistent lobbying comes from the various bureaus within the Government in their effort to perpetuate themselves. For example, when an executive from a governmental bureau appears before a congressional committee he is usually accompanied by as many as 20 "experts", attorneys, and what have you, who are on the Federal pay roll. Their one objective is not only to perpetuate themselves but generally to expand. I recall the time when Mr. Ickes, as the Secretary of Interior, appeared before the Insular Affairs Committee. He was surrounded by 19 lieutenants, and I know this to be a fact because they stood to be counted.

Talking of the mail-bag lobby I now have on my desk, as has every House Member, a statement by Chester Bowles containing 135 pages defending the actions of the OPA and trying to convince House Members that OPA should be continued "as is," as well as trying to prove they have held the line.

There are certain single agencies in the Government which send more material to our desks than any 10 corporations in the country.

It might be well for Mr. SABATH to explain about the pressure put on the membership here recently when the House adjourned for the week end in order to postpone a vote on certain legislation until the following Monday morning. Over the week end pressure was brought to bear on certain Members to the extent that Democratic Chairman Hannegan sent a commanding telegram to the Democratic membership of the House warning them to be in their places and vote right on Monday.

The concern over present lobbying practices is due to the fact that the wrong bull is being gored. I can heartily sanction outside interests presenting their cause, but certainly for political leaders to apply the lash is wrong, and I am happy to say few Congressmen yield to either.

Polish Soldiers Should Be Given Special Consideration for Entry Into United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have had brought to my attention the unfortunate situation of at least five Polish soldiers who wish to enter the United States. Some of them served as pilots in the Polish Air Forces and others in the Polish Infantry. These men took part in the bloody fighting at Mount Cassino and other battlefields in Italy as well as on other fronts. They fought shoulder to shoulder with our American forces and they deserve sympathetic consideration at our hands.

Their country first resisted the Nazi invader. Yet, although Poland is one of the outstanding members of the United Nations, it today is dominated by a more powerful member of our allied group. These Polish soldiers in Italy believe that it would be dangerous not only to themselves but to other members of their families if they were to return to Poland.

In some instances, these Polish soldiers have close relatives in the United States. Others have no relatives but friends who are interested in their welfare. The State Department has advised me that so long as they are soldiers in the Polish Army they cannot secure visas to enter the United States. However, I also understand that if the men comply with our requirements for visas it will be possible for them to secure the necessary discharges from the Polish Army and any other documents required by our consuls. They are faced, however, with a limited quota for about 6,500 Polish nationals to enter the United States annually. During the next few years there will undoubtedly be considerable demand by Polish civilians who, in many instances, will be members of families in the United States composed of American citizens. These civilians are entitled to consideration also as they have suffered tremendously during the present war.

I, therefore, would suggest that this House, through its Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and later by its own action, should consider legislation to permit Polish nationals to make use of quotas which have not been entirely used up during the war or else that we provide for a reasonable number of visas to be granted to members of the Polish Army above the existing national quota, provided they comply with all other requirements of our Government with reference to their entry for permanent residence in the United States. By their active participation with our soldiers in the fighting in Italy they have earned a measure of consideration at our hands. Many of them are, in effect, stranded in Italy and they deserve affirmative action on our part.

Stop Inflating!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 11, 1946:

STOP INFLATING!

When destruction of materials and goods in battle, or destruction of crops by bad weather, cause natural shortages, we have temporarily a condition in which prices go up because we have more money than goods, more well-heeled buyers than sellers.

But if the supply of money is kept constant, the natural price rise caused by natural scarcity will stimulate production and stop inflation of prices.

But if more money is printed or more bank credit is created by issuing more Government bonds, we have shortages created by the excess of money over goods that will never be corrected by natural price movements until the manufacture of more money and credit is stopped.

Institution of price controls only retards temporarily the creation of inflation-made shortages, with the ultimate result of more shortages and worse shortages. Price controls also cause hoarding because people are led to anticipate higher prices or future scarcity.

These man-made shortages raise prices and inevitably inspire demands for higher wages. That leads to strikes and strike-caused shortages.

But the worker who finds that his pay buys fewer goods would be less than human did he not seek more pay. And when he feels that money is becoming slippery he naturally fears for his future and seeks to fortify it by wage increases.

Every wage increase granted unsettles relations between the wages paid to various groups of workers. That unbalance leads to new demands to redress what the workers judge to be discriminations.

Thus demands for higher pay, of themselves, become another vicious spiral, quickening the original vicious spiral of pay trying to overtake rising prices.

Rising costs and increasing strikes and shop friction, meanwhile, retard the production that otherwise could break prices and stop inflation.

As inflation causes the shortages that in turn cause more inflation, there is only one way to stop the evil procession. That is to stop inflating.

The only way to stop inflating is for the Government to quit spending more money than it takes in. Until Government does that, it is compelled to keep on inflating money and credit to pay its bills.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Attorney Harry J. Meleski, of Worcester, Mass., on justice for Poland, Sunday, March 3, 1946:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful and appreciative of this opportunity to address the many friends of Poland. It is a privilege which can be exercised freely only in a great Republic such as these United States. It is a high privilege, because when pleading for justice for Poland I, in effect, plead for justice for all the nations of the world.

This afternoon I should like to tell you something of the chemical warfare service of the Polish Army. They made a tremendously important contribution to the winning of World War II. It is an inspiring story.

In 1939 Polish scientists, working with this service, discovered heretofore unknown toxic qualities of certain chemicals. These chemicals were produced in sufficient quantity for experimentation. The experiments in turn evolved a light, powdery substance which was found to possess an amazing poisonous potentiality. So powerful was this substance that an amount equal to one-millionth of the weight of certain rodents was sufficient to kill the animal. Soon it was also learned in handling this product that an amount measured in grains was fatal to mankind.

Here was an engine of destruction as terrible in its possibilities as anything ever discovered. To this very day no workable antidote for this poison has been found. But even if there should be such an antidote would be of no real use because it would probably come too late to be effective, so quickly does this chemical kill.

According to the disclosures made by the United States Department of Interior, experiments at the Wildlife Service at Denver, Colo., which were made with certain chemicals related chemically to this discovery, this terrible power to kill was proven beyond any question. The chemical is said to be colorless, odorless, and highly soluble in water.

Despite Nazi blitz war methods, the Polish Army succeeded in taking out of Poland this secret weapon and delivering the formulas to the British at London.

At the time, it seemed inconceivable that the Germans with their secret police, infiltration of gestapo agents, espionage, and related activity in Poland, could not have learned in some manner of the secret. The Allies were sure that the Germans had discovered the secret and prepared accordingly. All during the Near East and African campaigns, the Allies were constantly on the lock-out for the appearance of this lethal instrument of war. Considering the brutality and inhumanity of their foe, it was expected that if any knowledge of this discovery had fallen into Nazi hands, that it would be used. Wells, rivers, and water supply of every nature were carefully inspected because they would have been rendered poisonous and fatal to any human being that might have used the same. A very small amount, relatively speaking, could have wiped out entire armies.

You know how well the Poles succeeded in keeping the secret, because this did not happen.

The Nazis were unable through their blitz, their tortures at Oswiecim, nor their monstrous acts at Majdanek, to ferret out even a hint of this weapon. It remained an Allied secret throughout the war.

Now, since the cessation of hostilities, there has been an adaptation of this great Polish discovery. A sensational new rodent killer, especially effective against rats, has been perfected. It promises to be of as great a benefit to mankind as DDT. Doubtless you have read of this chemical, referred to as 1080, in the releases made by the United States Department of the Interior, Wildlife Service.

So by the perseverance, the sacrifice and suffering and by their abiding faith in the cause of human freedom, this frightful means of destruction remains in the hands of England and this country. How different it might have been but for this heroic action of the chemical warfare branch of the Polish Army. How tragic the recompense for so great a contribution to the cause of freedom and the well-being of the world.

This brief story scarcely describes the catastrophe that might have befallen the world except for the grim, steadfast fight of this nation, ever glorious in world history. It is but another unpaid account owed to Poland by the world. How such an account is settled will determine in large measure whether world peace shall be maintained.

This is the natural concern of everyone. Though most Polish-Americans are disturbed about the future of Poland, their primary interest is in the United States of America. This is their country. The principles of this Republic are their principles. As a people, they believe in liberty—they always have. Together with the founders of this Republic, they struggled to establish this Nation as the home of the free and the land of the brave. They continue to believe that the world cannot exist part free and part oppressed, to some just, to others unjust.

So believing, whenever they speak of justice for Poland, they likewise speak for Yugoslavia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Greece, and all liberty-loving peoples of the world too numerous to mention. It should follow without saying that unless all such people can be free, the world itself cannot be free. It should follow that world security can be based only on the rule of genuine international law and justice. That is why it is insisted that the cause of Poland is the cause of world peace. That is why the cause of Poland is a live, substantial, and vital subject for discussion by Americans everywhere.

The spirit of Poland and of her gallant dead joins the voice of her present dying and must be heard. It behooves us as Americans to take heed—Poland is not yet lost nor can any nation or people be lost who have the will to live. Poland has demonstrated that will.

And we must take heed because the problem involved is no longer just Poland. I can say nothing that will touch those who at this late date remain insensible to the palpable injustice and betrayal of Poland by her allies. But to the thinking Americans who will seek to understand, I know this message will make them realize that the moral integrity of our own country is involved. They will recognize that it will not do to blame Poland for her own misfortunes. No amount of diplomatic double-talk can alter to them the facts of the years since 1939. They will remember. Unlike all other neighbors of Nazi Germany, Poland refused to yield, even when offered rich rewards for collaboration and pro-German alliances. Poland still refuses to yield. It stands as the symbol of all the ideals and of all the human hopes that were aroused the world over by this war.

It exemplifies the hopes proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter, the four freedoms, and the passionate oratory of our own leaders. Officially, perhaps, the Polish problem may have been marked "settled." But it is only settled in the sense that the problem of Czechoslovakia was settled at Munich. In the eyes of the unbiased, and of those who would see, there has been no settlement.

The same ideals with which millions of American boys without question entered into our armed forces; the same spirit in which they shared the obligations of their American citizenship; the same realization that we all had, that liberty is in fact worth fighting for, is as powerful today as it ever was. The fight for freedom, for justice, for opportunity, and for political and social self-respect, is still with us. As we seek the realization of these ideals and the fulfillment of these dreams, here in these United States, we know full well that they cannot be secured and preserved to us while baneful injustice, virtual bondage, and treachery persists in the world.

No matter how much Americans hate war, they have always hated oppression even more. That is America—that is why I am so proud to be able to speak as an American for justice for Poland. As we contemplate our part in Poland's quest for justice, may we do so with the same sincerity and hope that prompted the immortal words of our great emancipator.

"It is for us the living, rather to be dedicated * * * to the unfinished work which they who fought * * * have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we

take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted by the national defense committee at the national conference of the American Legion held in Washington on March 3, 1946, with reference to the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps:

Whereas the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, established in 1938, has made and is making a noteworthy contribution to the national defense of the Nation; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of the merchant marine committee that consideration is being given by appropriate authority to the reduction of facilities of said United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps; and

Whereas the said merchant marine committee has studied and considered the past and present accomplishments and future potentialities of said United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the merchant marine committee recommend to and urge upon the national defense committee of the American Legion the approval and submission to appropriate authority, through prescribed channels, the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its academy at Kings Point, N. Y., shall be continued without suspension of its cadet schools at San Mateo, Calif., and Pass Christian, Miss., and that in view of the splendid work accomplished by the Naval Reserve officers assigned to the cadet corps, the key officers of the cadet corps shall be Naval Reserve officers on active-duty status; and further

"*Resolved*, That the cadet corps shall maintain a sufficient complement of cadet-midshipmen enrolled in the United States Naval Reserve as midshipmen to graduate one-third of the officers needed each year as replacements in the merchant marine."

Proposal to Fix Prices on Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of Fort Worth, Tex., contained an interesting editorial on February 23, in support of the proposal to fix prices on existing homes. It is as follows:

HOME PRICE CONTROLS

The Patman emergency housing bill is scheduled for consideration by the House in a few days and is expected to touch off a spirited debate on the subject of ceiling prices for homes. Before reporting the bill favorably the House Committee on Banking and Currency struck from it a provision for ceiling prices on existing homes but allowed to remain the section providing for control of prices on new homes.

Inasmuch as one of the main purposes of the bill is to prevent further inflation in the prices of homes, it is difficult to understand why the committee approved price control for houses in one category but opposed them for others. To exclude houses in either group, it would seem, would be to nullify the measure and render meaningless its passage.

Representative PATMAN, of Texas, sponsor of the bill, probably was correct when he said the other day that opposition to price control on existing housing is due to misunderstanding. An erroneous impression is abroad that Federal appraisers would go out and place a ceiling price on every home in the land. Nothing of the sort is proposed.

If the Patman bill becomes a law the present owner of any home can sell it for any price he can get, twice or 10 times its actual value, and without regard to its original cost or the price the present owner paid for it. But the price in the first sale after the law becomes effective would be the maximum price at which that house could be sold for the next 2 years.

That's all there is to the proposal for control of prices on existing homes. It is obvious that speculators would be against such a provision, but it is hard to see why anyone else would be, unless they are opposed to any form of price control in peacetime.

Without some such control on the price of existing houses, ceiling prices for new homes would be a mockery, regardless of how high or low the ceiling might be set. A new home becomes an existing home after it is completed and has been lived in for even 1 day.

President Truman's 39-Point Plan To Save Food for Hungry Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article in the Washington Times-Herald of March 12, 1946, setting forth President Truman's 39-point plan to save food for hungry abroad.

I was alarmed when I read President Truman's 39-point plan to save food for hungry abroad. This program smacks just a little too much of the tactics that are being used by the Government to regiment our people. All of us are willing to do what we possibly can to feed the hungry and starving in Europe and elsewhere. That is one thing, but it can and will be something else should the Government use the charitableness of our people as a means for political exploitation. I do not say that the Government intends to so use this 39-point plan. I contend, however, that it is possible for it to so use it and therefore fear it will.

Here is provided a splendid device for tying foreign relief in with OPA and other bureaucratic measures, which can and, I am afraid, will be used to intensify rationing, price control, and regimentation in general, in the guise of feeding the starving, with further consequent disorganization of production and increased scarcity of goods.

The article follows:

TRUMAN'S 39-POINT PLAN TO SAVE FOOD FOR HUNGRY ABROAD

The 39 ways suggested by President Truman's famine emergency committee by which Americans can save food for the hungry abroad include:

For hotels, restaurants, dining cars, institutions, and other public-feeding places:

1. Discontinue during the emergency abroad the use of toast as a garniture with meat, poultry, eggs, and other entrees.

2. Discontinue the practice of placing baskets of rolls and bread on dining-room tables. A single roll or slice of bread should be served with the entree, and later as requested.

NO TOAST TRIMMING

3. Eliminate the custom of trimming toast and sandwich crust.

4. Substitute open sandwiches for many closed or two-bread slice sandwiches in hotels.

5. Use potatoes in place of certain wheat and rice garnitures.

6. Use single-crust or open pies in place of two-crust pies whenever practicable.

7. Serve corn and buckwheat cakes in place of wheat cakes where possible.

8. Serve oatmeal bread, cakes, and cookies as alternates for products made from wheat.

REDUCE BREAD SIZE

9. The size of rolls and the thickness of toast and bread should be reduced. Bread size could be reduced by not filling the pans as deeply as at present.

10. Substitute fruits and other desserts for pastries and cakes whenever practicable.

11. Limit the number of crackers in individual packages or served with soups, cheeses, and so forth.

12. Eliminate three-layer cakes.

13. Whenever possible induce customers to order only what is needed. Wherever side dishes are included in a meal the customer should request those side dishes and salads which he will eat.

14. Use boiled dressings instead of oil dressings on salads wherever possible.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES

15. Use alternatives for wheat cereal wherever possible.

16. Encourage reuse of food fats and grease salvage.

17. Develop methods for saving and use of bread ends, many of which are wasted at present time.

18. Carry back all economies to employees' meals. Employees should cooperate to the same extent customers are asked to cooperate.

19. Boil or broil rather than fry fish so as to save fats.

20. Eliminate serving of extra dressing on salads already prepared with oil or dressing.

BAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for the baking industry:

1. Reduce by at least 10 percent the weight of bread and bakery products.

2. Whenever practicable bakers should feature smaller weight and size loaves.

3. Bread should be sliced thinner to provide more slices per loaf.

4. Partial loaves of bread should be offered for sale as a waste-preventing measure.

5. Save flour and fats and oils by avoiding spoilage and waste.

ASKED TO GIVE RECIPES

Recommendations to food distributors and manufacturers:

1. Promote the use of alternate and more plentiful foods in the diet, such as, currently, potatoes, fish, eggs, poultry, citrus fruits, and seasonal vegetables.

2. Assist customers by providing recipes using the more plentiful foods.

3. Adopt measures for great conservation and prevention of waste in food distribution channels.

4. Encourage consumers to conserve and prevent waste of food and to reuse food fats and salvage waste fats.

5. In the manufacture of food items use alternate ingredients wherever possible in lieu of ingredients in short supply.

HINTS FOR CONSUMERS

Recommendations to consumers:

1. Prevent waste of bread. It is estimated that 5 percent or one slice out of every loaf baked every day goes into garbage.

2. Use less bread at each meal. Use potatoes, for example, as alternates for bread. One small serving of potatoes replaces a slice of bread, nutritionally. Use oats more often. A serving of oatmeal equals two slices of bread in food value. Use fruits and other desserts for pastries and cakes.

3. Use less wheat cereals and other wheat products.

HOW TO SAVE FATS

Suggested ways for saving fats and oils at home included:

1. Make better use of meat drippings for cooking and seasoning food.

2. Serve fewer fried foods.

3. Save and reuse fats and oils for cooking purposes.

4. Render excess fats on meats and save bacon grease for cooking purposes.

5 Salvage all fats that cannot be reused and turn them in to your butcher or grocer.

6. Go easy on oils and salad dressings. A teaspoon of fat a day saved by every person in the United States will mean a total saving of at least 1,000,000 pounds of fat daily.

Hon. Leslie L. Biffle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a marvelous accomplishment to rise from page boy in this House to Secretary of the Senate of the United States Yet, it is not uncommon in America that a man through his own efforts starts at the bottom and advances to the topmost rungs of the ladder. Leslie Biffle came to Washington as a page boy in the House of Representatives at a tender age from Boydsville, Clay County, Ark., in my district. He returned to Arkansas for additional schooling. In 1909 he came back to Washington as secretary to Hon. Bruce Macon, who represented the First Arkansas District. Afterward, he worked in the folding room in the Senate for a time. At the recommendation of Senator Joe T. Robinson, majority leader, he was selected as secretary to the majority in the Senate. He held this position until he was unanimously chosen Secretary of the Senate in 1945. Coronet magazine in the current issue for February carries a very good story on Leslie Biffle. In my opinion, it is good reading and I commend it to you. I do trust that we will keep America the land of opportunity, where a young man can start out at the bottom and—through his initiative, application, and energy—advance to the highest place of trust and responsibility. That is the American way. We, in Arkansas, are proud of our native son and rejoice at his accomplishments. His life, character, and service is an inspiration to the American youth. I include the full text of the article, Meet the Man Who Runs the Senate, by Tris Coffin, which appeared in the February 1946 issue of Coronet magazine:

MEET THE MAN WHO RUNS THE SENATE—PRESIDENTS, CABINET MEMBERS, AND CONGRESSMEN SEEK THE ADVICE OF LESLIE BIFFLE, THE MAN BEHIND THE SCENES ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Tris Coffin)

A slim, curly-haired man with the fascinating name of Leslie Biffle runs the United States Senate. He does it in such a patient, ingratiating way that no one objects to his benevolent tyranny, even if aware of it.

This alert Arkansan, at 56, is proof of the Washington adage that if you want to know what is happening in Congress, don't ask a Congressman. Congressmen may make speeches, but the nonelected personnel behind the scenes sees that the jobs get done.

The man who runs the Senate is known variously as "Les," "Bif," or "Mr. Biffle," depending on how well you know him. He has never run for office. He doesn't have to, for his job as Secretary of the Senate is an appointive one.

Biffle is a small man who goes in for bow ties, tailored suits, and two-tone shoes. He has keen eyes and slim, nervous hands. He never appears completely relaxed. Even when he is sitting down and chatting, you have the feeling that he is coiled and ready to spring into action at the snap of a finger.

Bif is a constant source of wonder to his Senate colleagues. According to that veteran chronicler of Congress, John Crockett, the Senate's Chief Clerk: "He is the most marvelous fellow I've ever seen. I've never known his life for energy and tact. He's never done a dirty trick. I'm glad to be able to serve with him." To appreciate Crockett's comment, you have to know that John is a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, while Les is a southern Democrat.

Biffle came up from Arkansas to be a page boy, and the first taste of Capitol Hill whetted the youth's appetite. After going back South to attend business school, Bif returned to Washington as a Congressman's secretary in 1909. He has been on Capitol Hill ever since.

Early in his career Biffle was given some sound advice by the late Senator Joe Robinson, Democratic leader in the Upper House. Senator Joe told Les: "Keep your eyes and ears open and your mouth shut." Les has never forgotten those realistic words, for he has developed an unusual talent for observation and for keeping secrets. Presidents, Cabinet members, and Senators come to him for advice, but Les has the reputation of never violating a confidence. The press gallery is unable to pry anything out of him, and he's as publicity shy as his charges are the reverse.

The White House has long recognized Biffle's peculiar talents. Franklin Roosevelt used to call Bif to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, put on his famous smile and say, "All right, I want to hear about it. What is really happening in Congress?"

Les never offered advice unless asked for it, but once requested, he would talk straight from the shoulder. Sometimes Roosevelt would not like it and would frown impatiently, yet the President always knew that Biffle could not be far wrong.

Bif has a benign influence on the Senate. Without his soothing spirit and his gift for subtle compromise, the Senate might battle for weeks in a deadlock. Les knows the measure of each Senator, how far he will go. He also knows each Senator intimately—his middle name, his favorite drink, and how he is likely to vote.

The story is told that on one important ballot Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, was absent. Les knew that TYDINGS wanted his vote recorded, so he did not hesitate to "pair" TYDINGS with another absent Senator, which meant that the votes canceled each other.

When TYDINGS returned he was miffed. He hunted up Bif and inquired, "How did you know where I wanted to stand on that bill?" Les replied calmly, "I have known you for a long time, Senator, and I know your electorate. That's my job." As usual, Bif was right. In his next campaign TYDINGS emphasized that he was paired on the bill.

Bif has the kind of political detachment that permits all factions to come to him and, in the words of one Senator, "pick his brains." Biffle gives his advice freely, humbly, and impartially. If the liberals want to know how to get a bill through, they talk to Les. The next day the conservatives may ask him how to stop their opponents' program. Les will discuss that too.

The late Senator McNary, of Oregon, Republican floor leader, used to come regularly to Bif for counsel. At the time, Biffle was secretary to the Democratic majority. When Les was nominated for the job of Senate Secretary, the two top Republicans, VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and WHITE, of Maine, delivered orations in his behalf. There was not a single vote cast against him.

When Jimmy Byrnes was Roosevelt's "assistant president," a direct phone line ran from his office to Biffle's. Today that phone has been switched to President Truman's desk. Harry Truman has a warm spot for Les Biffle, who gave him sound advice in the Senate. He knows today that Bif will never voice a soft answer just because the former Missouri Senator happens to be President.

Biffle is the most successful host in Washington. Invitations to his lunches in the Senate's famous "Gods' Room" are always sought after. "Gods' Room" is really Les' office, right off the Senate floor, but it enjoys the name because of the great who wander in—Truman, General Marshall, Secretary of State Byrnes, and other Cabinet members, and Congressmen.

In the first confused days after the death of Roosevelt, the new President was lonely in the White House. So one morning he picked up the phone. "Bif," he said in his fresh, midwestern twang, "get some of the boys together. I'm coming up for lunch." This has happened regularly since Truman moved downtown.

Biffle has been holding these lunches ever since the early days of the New Deal, primarily because he has a great faith in people, He believes that if you can get the executives in downtown Washington together with the men on the Hill in a friendly atmosphere, they can either reach agreement or come away respecting one another. Whether it is a tribute to Bif's soothing personality or his philosophy, his lunches usually work out that way.

As you may gather, there is quite a trick to being a congressional employee. You don't earn much money. Les Biffle makes $8,000 a year, which is less—when you count overtime—than the pay received by publicity men for the big agencies in downtown Washington. And Bif is the top salaried employee on Capitol Hill.

Leslie Biffle, however, doesn't seem to be much interested in money. What counts with him is his job, and that he does superbly, while at the same time occupying a grandstand seat at the greatest show in history. He knows that with Harry Truman in the White House his own quiet influence will carry as much weight as that of Cabinet members. He also knows that in this administration the bills to safeguard our national welfare are going to be written on the Hill, not downtown.

Don't Scuttle Our Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the February edition of the American Legion Magazine published an article prepared by our very distinguished colleague, the Honorable CARL VINSON, with reference to our Navy. It is a very excellent and timely article, and it is my pleasure to call it to the attention of the House of Representatives:

DON'T SCUTTLE OUR NAVY
(By CARL VINSON)

The United States emerged from World War II with the most powerful and balanced fleet that ever rode the seven seas. It is the expressed purpose of the American Congress to maintain a naval strength forever equal to our peacetime responsibilities and to any future emergency such as that which exploded at Pearl Harbor.

This program, which our committee embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 80, and which was approved by the House by unanimous vote, constitutes no threat of aggression to any other nation. It is a significant historical fact that our Navy was associated, though remotely, with the outbreak of only two of our wars, and in each instance our warships were the casualties rather than the causes of aggression. I refer to the destruction of the *Maine* in Habana and the Japs' sneak attack on our Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor.

Indeed, a key reason for the maintenance of a strong Navy lies in whatever final commitments for the preservation of world peace which the United States undertakes as a major member of the United Nations Organization. The noble intentions of international charters and treaties must be vitalized and underwritten by the maintenance of a Navy able to keep inviolate both world and national security.

The Navy is the major component and assurance of that strength, for the key to victory and to the freedom of this country will lie in the control of the ocean and the air above. Because geography has surrounded our country with oceans, we cannot attack or be attacked without crossing on, over, or under those waters.

It is the particular mission of the United States Navy to own control at all times of these oceans and the skies above them.

Some people have expressed the opinion that the Navy is the principal casualty of the atomic bomb. They maintain that cosmic energy and rocket explosives have so devastated space that we no longer need a far-flung fleet. I disagree.

I do not mean to be dogmatic, for nobody living knows the ultimate effect of these new weapons. Any current conclusion is no more than nebulous speculation. But I do know this: The mission of the United States Navy is to control the seas essential to our national security by whatever weapons are most effective, and as yet there has been offered no proof that control of the seas can be effected with atomic and rocket bombs—to the exclusion of the Navy. Most assuredly the missile that wiped out Hiroshima and Nagasaki does not destroy immediately the usefulness of all navies now in existence. The atomic bomb, as of today and perhaps for many future years, requires land- or carrier-based planes to deliver it over the target, whether it be Hiroshima or New York City.

The best offensive against the atomic bomb now known is intercepting air power. If we were to give away or scuttle our fleet today, and rely wholly upon this new weapon, we should lose control of those intercepting areas. Therefore, there can be no doubt of the need for keeping a modern, all-purpose Navy, with its carrier forces, its surface and submarine units and its amphibious arm capable of taking and holding enemy beachheads.

Until it is proved that the atomic bomb is effective against our modern ships, we cannot scuttle the Navy. Instead, we must maintain intact the world's most powerful armada. To do otherwise would be to make this country so vulnerable as to invite attack.

There is another consideration of vast social and economic significance: Simply because the atomic bomb can level cities, we should not become slaves of fear, stop building our cities and go underground with civilization in reverse. The American people know too well the rewards of industry and the arts to slip back to caveman days.

As a matter of fact, the view that the destructive power of the atomic bomb actually necessitates more ships and offshore bases, to avoid "putting all our eggs in one basket," is no more extreme than the theory that it calls for scuttling of the Navy.

In future years there will be no need to keep our Naval Establishment at its special peak, in view of the defeat of the Axis and the hope of permanent world peace under the aegis of the United Nations Organization. It is our solemn duty to prune the size, maintenance and operation costs to the safest minimum, but not to a degree of false economy that jeopardizes our national security. Accordingly, the resolution which the House adopted unanimously calls for a reduction of the present fleet from 1,304 combatant vessels to 1,082, as follows: 18 battleships, 3 large cruisers, 31 heavy cruisers, 48 light cruisers, 3 large aircraft carriers, 24 aircraft carriers, 10 light aircraft carriers, 79 escort aircraft carriers, 367 destroyers, 300 destroyer escorts, 199 submarines.

We have not provided for any specific force of auxiliary craft such as mine, patrol, landing, district vessels, and drydocks. We have asked for whatever number and types as will be "sufficient" for the proposed fleet. However, present plans call for 50 percent reduction of such vessels—from 10,292 to 5,002.

The annual cost of this establishment is estimated at $3,525,000,000. That is a substantial figure, I realize. But when it is measured in terms of our recent victory over the Axis—thousands of lives, domestic and economic sacrifice and $300,000,000,000 in cold cash—it is very cheap insurance for national security and, perhaps, permanent world peace.

Obviously, the Navy's peacetime assignment will not require that the reduced fleet of 6,084 ships—1,082 combat and 5,002 auxiliary vessels—be kept in commission. On the other hand, we may need to muster our full naval strength overnight in some future emergency. So, present plans divide the postwar Navy into three components: (1) An active fleet, (2) a ready reserve, and (3) a laid-up reserve.

Our resolution fixing the postwar strength of the Navy speaks only of "sufficient aircraft" to support the surface and underwater units. The determination of the number of planes that will be needed does not lend itself easily to a definite ceiling, in view of rapid changes and technological advances in this arm. However, we estimate that 12,000 planes—about 8,000 in full, active service—will be necessary for an adequate postwar Navy. Provision has also been made for the required production and training facilities and centers.

We have planned for 40 off-shore postwar naval bases, although final determination of this question will rest with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the State Department, and the United Nations Security Council. Roughly, we favor an outer defense ring in the Pacific that extends from the Aleutians to the Philippines, thence to the island of Truk and back to the Panama Canal. Within that broad expanse we contemplate the establishment of many major, secondary, and caretaker units on the islands and atolls which we took from Japan.

In the Atlantic we recommend the retention of outlying points that will give the United States a naval and aerial rampart ranging from Newfoundland through Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Bermuda, with its southern buttress based at Georgetown in British Guiana. Such advance outposts, properly manned and equipped with sharp-shooting naval and aerial units, should make our shores impregnable. It will provide the most effective screen now known or feasible against hostile atomic bomb attacks.

This postwar Navy will require approximately 500,000 enlisted men and 58,000 officers, of which 40,000 will be line and 18,000 staff and warrant. In discussing the question of personnel, I want to emphasize that the future fleet will be a distinctly democratic organization in which a man's merit, rather than his social or financial or academic status, will be the only test.

House bill 4421, which my committee has reported, insures that opportunities for promotion will be open to more newcomers and not restricted to Annapolis graduates. It also provides that the selection boards which pass on a man's qualification for advancement shall have a membership proportionate to the percentage of officers who have joined the Navy by different routes. Thus, if the officer corps consists of 20 percent from Annapolis, 20 percent from ROTC and aviation cadet schools, and 60 percent from the Reserve, the selection boards will be organized on the same proportionate basis.

The same legislation also provides that an enlisted man can become an ensign (1) after 4 years of active service, (2) upon the recommendation of his commanding officer, and (3) provided he can pass the necessary examinations.

Thus, under all these provisions any able and qualified gob now swabbing the decks or tending the boilers below can become a King or a Nimitz or a Halsey, provided that he has the stuff it takes.

Some Issues Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the one thing that stands out in America in a way that has no counterpart anywhere else in the world is the Congress of the United States—the Senate with Mem-

bers holding a term of office for 6 years, and the House of Representatives with Members elected every 2 years. While Governors may appoint a man to the Senate to fill a vacancy, that cannot be done in the case of a vacancy in the House of Representatives. Every Member of this body must face the ballot box, and here in America the ballot box means something. Under our form of government those who possess voting qualifications go to the polls, cast their ballots, and elect a man to represent them in the Nation's Capitol. There are no soldiers to dictate the exercise of this privilege, no dictators to punish the men and women who cast their ballots. This is free America. In no other country do we find the rights of the electorate so fully extended.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Among the controversial questions, one of many that will soon claim the attention of Congress, is the proposed loan of about $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain. We get correspondence on this subject and conflicting views are presented to Members of Congress for consideration. As an example, here is an extract from a letter that I received from the Minnesota League of Women Voters, which reads in part:

The members of the Minnesota League of Women Voters respectfully urge you to give your strong support to the granting of the British loan which is now being considered by the House Banking Committee.

As everybody knows, this group of earnest-minded women take a very active interest in public matters and have opinions on every subject, making it a point to discuss these problems with Members of the House of Representatives.

CIO FAVORS BRITISH LOAN

Another group which is very active and which is referred to as a pressure group is the CIO, which has gone on record in favor of the proposed loan to Great Britain. The following item occurs in Minnesota Labor, a CIO publication with offices at 724 Fourth Avenue, South, Minneapolis 15, Minn. In the March 8, 1946, issue of Minnesota Labor is the following news item:

PHIL MURRAY FAVORS LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

WASHINGTON.—Full support of the CIO for the proposed $3,000,000,000 loan to Great Britain was expressed February 28 by President Philip Murray in a statement setting out the views of his organization. Murray said the United States has clear-cut obligations to make the loan to Britain because of that nation's wartime expenditure of resources in common battle and that the loan amounts to economic first aid, that is an essential first step on an expanding world trade.

We may expect the familiar technique of mimeographed propaganda letters from many sources during the next few weeks. All of them will be prepared in Washington and sent back to the different congressional districts with instructions to have them signed and sent to the Members of Congress.

THE AVERAGE CITIZEN SPEAKS

In connection with this proposed loan or gift or hand-out of $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain, under our form of government the average citizen, Mr. John Q. Public, also likes to have something to say. I am getting considerable correspondence from a great many laboring people in my district, a great many business people and a great many earnest minded and representative and patriotic women, all of whom very strongly oppose the proposed British loan. They disagree, not only with the Minnesota League of Women Voters but also with the political leaders like Phil Murray. They feel that we are selling America down the river when we continue to pour out our treasure and our resources to foreign countries and keep on piling up an enormous debt against our own people. This issue is clear-cut and on this controversial question it is my intention to vote against this proposed loan unless some arguments are presented which have not as yet been given to the American people. As I have said on other occasions, America must protect herself against her friends, real or otherwise. We are going to get a lot of arguments on this proposed loan problem. Back last fall the newspapers carried the headlines: "British plead poverty, asking more United States help—raw materials and food."

All of us like to be generous but it seems to me that charity ought to begin at home at this time. This goes for all foreign countries. There are many, many matters that concern the welfare of America which ought to have the attention of Congress.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

One such proposal is the legislation to ratify the agreement between the United States and Canada for the deepening of the St. Lawrence River in one or two places from a depth of 14 feet to a depth of 27 feet, so that ocean vessels can enter the Great Lakes. This would thereby make ocean ports out of Duluth, Minn., Detroit, Mich., Milwaukee, Wis., and Chicago, Ill. We all know that powerful sectional interests are blocking this improvement and that they are doing a real injury to America. Some time ago I urged the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations to act favorably on this legislation, and at that time I said, in part:

One of the big objections to this project is the cost. I was figuring that this $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain, if divided by $285,000,000, would build our share of the St. Lawrence project 14 times over.

There will be two objections with which they will try to fool you. One of them is the treaty-making powers, which you Senators pass on, and the other is the cost. In World War I, as I recall, there were $26,000,000,000 that we loaned these foreign countries and that loan is still unpaid and, you know, if you want to fool the American taxpayer, tell him it is going to cost him something. So I am serving notice in advance on the American taxpayer that from the standpoint of relativity, and thinking of the atomic bomb—I don't change my mind about that either—this project is of such great value that the cost is infinitesimal, compared with which we are asked to do for foreign countries.

Bowles Promises Early Suspension of Ceiling Prices on Crude Oil—Refined Products Also To Be Exempted—Action Seen as Boon to Small Producers and Refiners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, oil men—especially the 19,000 small producers of crude petroleum—should view with hearty approval information I have just received from Economic Stabilization Director Bowles promising an early suspension of ceiling prices on not only crude oil but refined products as well.

On February 25 I wrote to Mr. Bowles calling his attention to reports that production and demand for crude oil were once again in balance and expressed the hope that his office and the Office of Price Administration could find it advisable at an early date to either suspend or eliminate entirely price ceilings on this item. It was, therefore, particularly gratifying to me this morning to receive a reply from Mr. Bowles indicating that this can be done, possibly prior to June 30, and will cover refined products also.

It is gratifying to note that he feels that refined products may also be included in this decontrol program. The recently announced increase of 10 cents per barrel in crude oil prices, although offering relief to small producers whose exploratory, drilling, and lifting costs, have advanced tremendously during wartime, would work a hardship on many of the small refining companies who do not possess the profitable sidelines that the major companies operate. Therefore, it is eminently just, in my view, that refiners be given this exemption privilege also because so many of them apparently cannot absorb the proposed crude increase for long.

The House Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has been deeply concerned during the war period at the position of the smaller oil producers. Several committee hearings were held on this subject and two interim reports were issued to the House in this connection. Our committee took the position that price ceilings on crude oil and refined products were sufficiently attractive to the major companies with their integrated production and distribution and refining operations. The smaller producers, however, whose operations were limited solely to oil production, were held by us to be operating at prices insufficient to justify their engaging in new exploration work, thus jeopardizing the continuity of their operations as small businessmen. We expressed our alarm in no uncertain terms at the acquisition policies of the major companies which were able to buy up these smaller operations during the war period for these reasons.

The National Crude Oil Industry Advisory Committee, whose report is referred to in Mr. Bowles' letter just received, was established by OPA at the request of the Small Business Committee. That advisory committee, in my opinion, has performed a very constructive service in analyzing and reporting to OPA on the results of that agency's recent price study which was also initiated at the request of our committee.

In announcing this first price decontrol action covering the production of one of the Nation's major industries, I feel that Mr. Bowles has made it clear that the policy of this Administration is to eliminate war-imposed governmental controls as quickly as supply conditions permit. By his action he has confirmed that which critics so often deny—that the present Administration wishes to open the gate to trading at prices set by industry itself as soon as an examination of cold statistics shows that the interests of the consumer will not be placed in jeopardy, and that inflation will not follow the proposed action.

It is therefore with considerable personal satisfaction that I include herewith for the benefit of all those interested in this important subject the full text of Mr. Bowles' letter just received today:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1946.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: Many thanks for your letter of February 25 calling my attention to the Crude Oil Industry Advisory Committee's analysis of the OPA survey of crude oil costs. Since you wrote to me, the OPA has announced its intention to increase price ceilings on crude oil by 10 cents per barrel, effective the latter part of this month.

In your letter you asked what steps are being planned to remove crude oil from price control, and also what my personal thoughts are in connection with the possible lifting of crude-oil ceilings. I have been informed by the Price Administrator that the OPA believes a successful suspension program can be worked out for the oil industry within 6 months, and possibly prior to June 30 of this year. It is my understanding that OPA plans to include in this decontrol action not only crude oil but refined products as well. I was glad to hear that conditions in this field are such as to permit suspension of control. I sincerely hope that the conditions for successful decontrol, including a supply adequate to meet the demand, will continue to exist after the suspension so that it will not be necessary to reinstitute control.

If it should prove possible to go through with this program, we shall not need any of the funds which we are requesting for the continuation of the stripper-well subsidy. We have nevertheless requested Congress to continue the authorization to pay this subsidy, as a form of insurance to cover the possibility that suspension of control cannot be made effective prior to June 30, 1946, and to cover the further possibility that, after trying suspension, controls would have to be reinstituted should the behavior of prices require it.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Director.

Can OPA Be Made To Work Successfully?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is a certainty that every thoughtful person realizes that in the present financial situation that prices must be controlled. But if our country is to be successful in passing through the existing emergency we must guard against the mistakes of the past. In this connection it is my privilege to submit an informative treatise on inflation and price control by a noted Austrian economist, Ludwig von Mises, which I submit for the consideration of my colleagues:

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCES WITH PRICE CONTROL
(By Ludwig von Mises)

I

Under socialism production is entirely directed by the orders of the central board of production management. The whole nation is an "industrial army" (a term used by Karl Marx in the Communist Manifesto) and each citizen is bound to obey his superior's orders. Everybody has to contribute his share to the execution of the over-all plan adopted by the government.

In the free economy no production czar tells a man what he should do. Everybody plans and acts for himself. The coordination of the various individuals' activities, and their integration into a harmonious system for supplying the consumers with the goods and services they demand, is brought about by the market process and the price structure it generates.

The market steers the capitalistic economy. It directs each individual's activities into those channels in which he best serves the wants of his fellow men. The market alone puts the whole social system of private ownership of the means of production and free enterprise in order and provides it with sense and meaning.

There is nothing automatic or mysterious in the operation of the market. The only forces determining the continually fluctuating state of the market are the value judgments of the various individuals and their actions as directed by these value judgments The ultimate factor in the market is the striving of each man to satisfy his needs and wants in the best possible way. Supremacy of the market is tantamount to the supremacy of the consumers. By their buying, and by their abstention from buying, the consumers determine not only the price structure, but no less what should be produced and in what quantity and quality and by whom. They determine each entrepreneur's profit or loss, and thereby who should own the capital and run the plants. They make poor men rich and rich men poor. The profit system is essentially production for use, as profits can be earned only by success in supplying consumers in the best and cheapest way with the commodities they want to use.

From this it becomes clear what Government tampering with the price structure of the market means. It diverts production from those channels into which the consumers want to direct it, into other lines. Under a market not manipulated by Government interference, there prevails a tendency to expand the production of each article to the point at which a further expansion would not pay because the price realized would not exceed costs. If the Government fixes a maximum price for certain commodities below the level which the unhampered market would have determined for them and makes it illegal to sell at the potential market price, production involves a loss for the marginal producers. Those producing with the highest costs go out of the business and employ their production facilities for the production of other commodities, not affected by price ceilings. The Government's interference with the price of a commodity restricts the supply available for consumption. This outcome is contrary to the intentions which motivated the price ceiling. The Government wanted to make it easier for people to obtain the article concerned. But its intervention results in shrinking of the supply produced and offered for sale.

If this unpleasant experience does not teach the authorities that price control is futile and that the best policy would be to refrain from many endeavors to control prices, it becomes necessary to add to the first measure, restricting merely the price of one or of several consumers' goods, further measures. It becomes necessary to fix the prices of the factors of production required for the production of the consumers' goods concerned. Then the same story repeats itself on a remoter plane. The supply of these factors of production whose prices have been limited shrinks. Then again the Government must expand the sphere of its price ceilings. It must fix the prices of the secondary factors of production required for the production of those primary factors. Thus the Government must go farther and farther. It must fix the prices of all consumers' goods and of all factors of production, both material factors and labor, and it must force every entrepreneur and every worker to continue production at these prices and wage rates. No branch of production must be omitted from this all-round fixing of prices and wages and this general order to continue production. If some branches were to be left free, the result would be a shifting of capital and labor to them and a corresponding fall in the supply of the goods whose prices the Government has fixed. However, it is precisely these goods which the Government considers as especially important for the satisfaction of the needs of the masses.

But when such a state of all-round control of business is achieved, the market economy has been replaced by a system of centralized planning by socialism. It is no longer the consumers, but the Government who decides what should be produced and in what quantity and quality. The entrepreneurs are no longer entrepreneurs. They have been reduced to the status of shop managers—or Betriebsfeuhrer, as the Nazis said—and are bound to obey the orders issued by the Government's central board of production management. The workers are bound to work in the plants to whom the authorities have assigned them; their wages are determined by authoritarian decrees. The Government is supreme. It determines each citizen's income and standard of living. It is totalitarian.

Price control is contrary to purpose if it is limited to some commodities only. It cannot work satisfactorily within a market economy. The endeavors to make it work must needs enlarge the sphere of the commodities subject to price control until the prices of all commodities and services are regulated by authoritarian decree and the market ceases the work.

Either production can be directed by the prices fixed on the market by the buying or the abstention from buying on the part of the public; or it can be directed by the

Government's offices. There is no third solution available. Government control of a part of prices only results in a state of affairs which, without any exception, everybody considers as absurd and contrary to purpose. Its inevitable result is chaos and social unrest.

II

Price control in Germany

It has been asserted again and again that German experience has proved that price control is feasible and can attain the ends sought by the Government resorting to it. Nothing can be more erroneous.

When the First World War broke out, the German Reich immediately adopted a policy of inflation. To prevent the inevitable outcome of inflation, a general rise in prices, it resorted simultaneously to price control. The much-glorified efficiency of the German police succeeded rather well in enforcing these price ceilings. There were no black markets. But the supply of the commodities subject to price control quickly fell. Prices did not rise. But the public was no longer in a position to purchase food, clothes and shoes. Rationing was a failure. Although the Government reduced more and more the rations allotted to each individual, only a few people were fortunate enough to get all that the ration card entitled them to. In their endeavors to make the price control system work, the authorities expanded step by step the sphere of the commodities subject to price control. One branch of business after the other was centralized and put under the management of a government commissary. The Government obtained full control of all vital branches of production. But even this was not enough as long as other branches of industry were left free. Thus the Government decided to go still further. The Hindenburg program aimed at all-around planning of all production. The idea was to entrust the direction of all business activities to the authorities. If the Hindenburg program had been executed, it would have transformed Germany into a purely totalitarian commonwealth. It would have realized the ideal of Othmar Spann, the champion of German socialism, to make Germany a country in which private property exists only in a formal and legal sense, while in fact there is public ownership only.

However, the Hindenburg program had not yet been completely put into effect when the Reich collapsed. The disintegration of the imperial bureaucracy brushed away the whole apparatus of price control and of war socialism. But the nationalist authors continued to extol the merits of the Zwangswirtschaft, the compulsory economy. It was, they said, the most perfect method for the realization of socialism in a predominantly industrial country like Germany. They triumphed when Chancelor Bruning in 1931 went back to the essential provisions of the Hindenburg program and when later the Nazis enforced these decrees with the utmost brutality.

The Nazis did not, as their foreign admirers contend, enforce price control within a market economy. With them price control was only one device within the frame of an all-round system of central planning. In the Nazi economy there was no question of private initiative and free enterprise. All production activities were directed by the Reichswirtschaftsministerium. No enterprise was free to deviate in the conduct of its operations from the orders issued by the Government. Price control was only a minor device in the complex of innumerable decrees and orders regulating the minutest details of every business activity and precisely fixing every individual's tasks on the one hand and his income and standard of living on the other.

What made it difficult for many people to grasp the very nature of the Nazi economic system was the fact that the Nazis did not expropriate the entrepreneurs and capitalists openly and that they did not adopt the principle of income equality which the Bolshevists espoused in the first years of Soviet rule and discarded only later. Yet the Nazis removed the bourgeois completely from control. The entrepreneurs who were neither Jewish nor suspect of liberal and pacifist leanings retained their positions in the managerial structure. But they were virtually merely salaried civil servants bound to comply unconditionally with the orders of their superiors, the bureaucrats of the Reich and the Nazi Party. The capitalists got their (sharply reduced) dividends. But like other citizens, they were not free to spend more of their incomes than the party deemed as adequate to their status and rank in the hierarchy of graduated leadership. The surplus had to be invested in exact compliance with the orders of the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

The experience of Nazi Germany certainly does not disprove the statement that price control is doomed to failure within an economy not completely socialized. Those advocates of price control who pretend that they aim at preserving the system of private initiative and free enterprise are badly mistaken. What they really do is to paralyze the operation of the steering device of this system. One does not preserve a system by destroying its vital nerve; one kills it.

III

Current inflation fallacies

Inflation is the process of a great increase in the quantity of money in circulation. Its foremost vehicle in continental Europe is the issue of nonredeemable legal tender banknotes. In this country inflation consists mainly in Government borrowing from the commercial banks and also in an increase in the quantity of paper money of various types and of token coins. The Government finances its deficit spending by inflation.

Inflation must result in a general tendency toward rising prices. Those into whose pockets the additional quantity of currency flows are in a position to expand their demand for vendable goods and services. An additional demand must, other things being equal, raise prices. No sophistry and no syllogisms can conjure away this inextricable consequence of inflation.

The semantic revolution which is one of the characteristic features of our day has obscured and confused this fact. The term "inflation" is used with a new connotation. What people today call inflation is not inflation, that is, the increase in the quantity of money and money substitutes, but the general rise in commodity prices and wage rates which is the inevitable consequence of inflation. This semantic innovation is by no means harmless.

First of all there is no longer any term available to signify what inflation used to signify. It is impossible to fight an evil which you cannot name. Statesmen and politicians no longer have the opportunity to resort to a terminology accepted and understood by the public when they want to describe the financial policy they are opposed to. They must enter into a detailed analysis and description of this policy with full particulars and minute accounts whenever they want to refer to it, and they must repeat this bothersome procedure in every sentence in which they deal with this subject. As you cannot name the policy increasing the quantity of the circulating medium, it goes on luxuriantly. Not every government is so careless in this regard as that of France which issues every day about a billion francs of newly printed banknotes. But even the most reasonable governments are firmly committed to the policy which only a few years ago was called a policy of inflation.

The second mischief is that those engaged in futile and hopeless attempts to fight the inevitable consequences of inflation—the rise in prices—are masquerading their endeavors as a fight against inflation. While fighting the symptoms, they pretend to fight the root causes of the evil. And because they do not comprehend the causal relation between the increase in money in circulation and credit expansion on the one hand and the rise in prices on the other, they practically make things worse.

The best example is provided by the subsidies. As has been pointed out, price ceilings reduce supply because production involves a loss for the marginal producers. To prevent this outcome the Government grants subsidies to the farmers operating with the highest costs. These subsidies are financed out of additional credit expansion. Thus they result in increasing the inflationary pressure. If the consumers were to pay higher prices for the products concerned, no further inflationary effect would emerge. The consumers would have to use for such surplus payments only money which had been already put into circulation. Thus the allegedly brilliant idea to fight inflation by subsidies in fact brings about more inflation.

IV

Fallacies must not be imported

There is practically no need today to enter into a discussion of the comparatively slight and harmless inflation that under a gold standard can be brought about by a great increase in gold production. The problems the world must face today are those of runaway inflation. Such an inflation is always the outcome of a deliberate Government policy. The Government is on the one hand not prepared to restirct its expenditure. On the other hand it does not want to balance its budget by taxes levied or by loans from the public. It chooses inflation because it considers it as the minor evil. It goes on expanding credit and increasing the quantity of money in circulation because it does not see what the inevitable consequences of such a policy must be.

There is no cause to be too much alarmed about the extent to which inflation has gone already in this country. Although it has gone very far and has done much harm, it has certainly not created an irreparable disaster. There is no doubt that the United States is still free to change its methods of financing and to return to a sound money policy.

The real danger does not consist in what has happened already, but in the spurious doctrines from which these events have sprung. The superstition that it is possible for the Government to eschew the inextricable consequences of inflation by price control is the main peril. For this doctrine diverts the public's attention from the core of the problem. While the authorities are engaged in a useless fight against the attendant phenomena, only few people are attacking the source of the evil, the Treasury's methods of providing for the enormous expenditures. While the OPA makes headlines with its activities, the statistical figures concerning the increase in the Nation's currency are relegated to an inconspicuous place in the newspapers' financial pages.

Here again the example of Germany may stand as a warning. The tremendous German inflation which reduced in 1923 the purchasing power of the mark to one billionth of its prewar value was not an act of God. It would have been possible to balance Germany's postwar budget without resorting to the Reichbank's printing press. The proof is that the Reich's budget was easily balanced as soon as the break-down of the old Reichsbank forced the Government to abandon its inflationary policy. But before this happened all German would-be experts stubbornly denied that the rise in commodity prices. wage rates, and foreign-exchange rates

had anything to do with the Government's method of reckless spending. In their eyes only profiteering was to blame. They advocated thoroughgoing enforcement of price control as the panacea and called those recommending a change in financial methods "deflationists."

The German nationalists were defeated in the two most terrific wars of history. But the economic fallacies which pushed Germany into its nefarious aggressions unfortunately survive. The monetary errors developed by German professors, such as Lexis and Knapp, and put into effect by Havenstein, the Reichsbank's president in the critical years of its great inflation, are today the official doctrine of France and of many other European countries. There is no need for the United States to import these absurdities.

Chaplains Rendered Meritorious Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that I voice the sentiments of every Member of the House when I pay brief tribute today particularly to one group of our returning servicemen who have never received their just dues in publicity. I refer to the Army chaplains who are now coming home from service and are taking up again the generally unexciting work of ministering to their people.

The latest report of Brig. Gen. Luther D. Miller, Chief of Army Chaplains, reveals that 3,660 chaplains have been released from Army service since last September 1. Of these, 2,709 were Protestants, 853 were Catholics, and 98 were Jewish. There still remain more than 4,400 chaplains on duty in the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say that no group of men have rendered more meritorious and distinguished service than the chaplains of all branches of the service. General Miller's report shows that, thus far, 1,383 chaplains have received 1,826 decorations. Only one chaplain received the Congressional Medal of Honor for services in the late war—he was a heroic Catholic naval chaplain—but I am sure that I speak the sentiments of many soldiers when I say that undoubtedly there were many unobserved examples of heroism without parallel among chaplains of all races, creeds, and branches of service.

The report of General Miller reveals that 77 Army chaplains gave their lives in action in World War II, including 12 lost in the sinking of Japanese prison ships by our forces and 1 killed during the bombing of Germany. Nonbattle deaths among chaplains numbered 76, lost in the sinking of Japanese prison camps, while 246 were wounded in action. If we bear in mind that chaplains go unarmed, we must recognize their remarkable bravery as revealed by these figures.

Let us never forget what these returning chaplains have done for our boys while away fro mhome—and let us appreciate the worth of the experience they bring home with them.

How American Newspapers Viewed the Churchill Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to all honest-to-God Americans that American newspapers were not misled by the shrewd efforts of Britain's Winston Churchill in his Fulton speech to inveigle America into saving England's tottering empire as we have saved her national existence twice already.

Churchill's proposals would demolish the fresh foundations of the United Nations Organization before the footing can become hardened into permanence for insuring world peace. It would destroy that unity of the great powers which won the desperate struggle against world aggression just ended, and which alone can insure the peace. It would lead us to repudiate the advice of Washington, who warned us in his Farewell Address to avoid permanent military alliances.

The Churchill speech was a bold bid to America to devote our strength, our industrial wealth, and our manhood to maintaining the world-wide colonial system of Great Britain, to throttle the impulse toward freedom of her subject people. Great Britain's vast empire embraces not only a fourth of the earth's area; she holds in bondage more than a fourth of the world's population. Whitaker's Almanac, published in London, gives 539,000,000 as the total population of all British dominions and possessions. Churchill callously invites us to maintain the British yoke on their necks, while England lords it over Russia and the rest of Europe, to our own disadvantage.

Churchill is still the leader of the Tories. Though repudiated by the English masses, he is still the British Tory who declared in 1942:

> We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

Presumably he hopes to avoid that liquidation with our help.

Reading the Fulton speech in the light of contemporary events gives rise to the suspicion that Churchill, with a cynicism not even his magnificent record of war leadership makes forgivable, was willing to risk absolute defeat of the British loan, on the theory that if, miraculously, the loan is approved in spite of the speech he can claim the credit, and if it is defeated, as now seems inevitable, the Labor government called to power by the English people will be discredited.

From comment in the American press it would not appear that Churchill's speech aided or strengthened the United Nations; many editorial writers and commentators believe, in fact, he was prepared to scuttle the whole structure of world cooperation for the sake of preserving British domination of her vast colonial empire and her spheres of influence.

A London dispatch records the motion signed by 102 Members of Parliament criticizing the speech as "inimical to the cause of world peace." Another London dispatch says that Prime Minister Attlee carefully dissociated the British Labor government from the sentiments expressed by Churchill, and Edd Johnson, of the Chicago Sun foreign service, reported that a petition is being circulated among GI's on foreign duty in Germany, and especially in Berlin, criticizing the speech and other public statements calculated to negate the United Nations' efforts to maintain peace. Johnson carefully specifies that no Russians attended the songfest at which the petition was initiated.

Lowell Mellett, of the Washington Star, said:

> Russia is causing us plenty of concern; has become one of our delicate and dangerous problems. We are seeking to handle the problem with all the wisdom we possess. We want to reduce, not expand it. We don't want war. Yet no surer way of bringing ourselves—and the British—into a head-on clash with Russia could be devised, perhaps, than this all-out alliance suggested by our welcome, but provocative guest. To put it bluntly, many Americans are disposed to feel that the speech at Fulton might have been properly concluded with Churchill's own historic words: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

Carleton Kent, well-informed chief of the Chicago Times' Washington bureau, did not regard the effect of the speech as likely to be world-shaking. Samuel Grafton, principal columnist of the New York Post, said the speech was not helpful to world understanding.

Rather than consume time by continuing my own digest of newspaper opinion, Mr. Speaker, I now insert the digest from the New York Post of Thursday, March 7, which gives a wide cross section; I have eliminated comment not pertinent to the speech:

> The Times today turns attention to the simpler days when we were merely fighting the Nazis.
>
> The day happens to be a double anniversary—10 years since Hitler marched into the Rhineland, 1 since the first Americans crossed the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen, at the same time a Russian army was crossing the Oder, to meet 7 weeks later in the historic juncture on the Elbe.
>
> "This double anniversary gives perspective," says the Times. "Ten years saw the rise and the total obliteration of the military power of Nazi Germany," the collapse of Italy and Japan. "But the 10 months since the surrender of Germany * * * have produced in many quarters an atmosphere so mournful and foreboding that a hermit unacquainted with the facts might think this country and its allies had suffered a disastrous defeat." Unlike Remagen, "we stand on the banks of a wide river, we see no bridge, and some of us are afraid."
>
> For itself, seeing hope in "a mutual appraisal of necessities," the Times feels it is folly to talk of an "ultimate" war. While holding to principles, we must make it plain

that "we think it practicable for the two great world systems to exist without conflict side by side. The river is wide, but a bridge can be built."

The Herald Tribune has the impression the Churchill effort "miscarried" here, in Britain, and certainly in Moscow. "So far from stampeding this country (or Britain, either, for that matter) * * * it seems rather to have awakened real questions as to just what are the bases of Anglo-American cooperation." The Tribune doubts that "the Churchill-Truman exploit" has made Mr. Byrnes' task any easier.

But it did drive home the need of "a real Big Three understanding," says the Tribune, which appears to look favorably on a new Truman-Attlee-Stalin meeting; "indeed, it is even now hard to see what fundamental issues * * * could not be adjusted in full and frank discussion." However, "vituperation," even when "clothed in the splendors of Mr. Churchill's prose style," is seen as hardly the right start.

Walter Lippmann (Herald Tribune) notes that, while Mr. Churchill made clear why an alliance would reinforce the British position, he avoided examining just what it would mean to America. Permanent defense agreements with the British commonwealths would offer no difficulty, says Lippmann; the real problem concerns "those countries, either under British rule or within the British sphere of influence, which are not English-speaking countries and do not have this joint inheritance of freedom." In these regions, for all the consultation, the British would run the show; "only the responsibility in case of trouble would be joint." And Churchill is reminded that Americans are of "the conviction that empire is at best a necessary evil, to be liquidated as soon as possible."

The Chicago Sun (Field) says Mr. Churchill at Fulton was "fighting for his world"—a world that no longer exists in reality. "To follow his standard, raised by this great but blinded aristocrat, would be to march to the world's most ghastly war."

The Chicago Daily News (Knight) points out that it has not been the American way to enter formally into military alliances, and there are strong reasons to doubt whether the world's peace would be served at this juncture by making such an alliance, "but to Russia and many other countries, considering the atom bomb, it might seem as if in essence the alliance already exists."

The Detroit News (Scripps) says the Churchill military alliance "would assure an armaments competition with the Russians far more likely to lead to war than to anything else." Russia fears us and we fear Russia, says the News, and "the way to peace lies through allaying those fears, not through feeding them." It thinks this can be achieved best "through universal disarmament and the actual foreswearing of war as national policy."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch feels "it is impossible to ignore the warnings and suggestions of a man of Mr. Churchill's stature," but wonders whether his measures wouldn't "aggravate the admittedly serious situation." It thinks Mr. Byrnes answered Churchill in advance when he said "we will gang up against no state."

The St. Louis Star-Times observes that Churchill "has never disguised or repudiated his Tory imperialism. One wonders, however, how the people of Missouri would have answered that invitation [to a 'fraternal association'] had they been asked to ponder it on the spot."

Max Lerner (PM) thinks the Russians "are aiming at limited expansion," rather than conquest. A questioner asked him: "Isn't that like saying a girl is just a little bit pregnant?" "No," says Lerner, "the whole Russian record in the past has indicated desire to obtain security, since the Russians don't have to expand their already enormous economy."

Eleanor Roosevelt (World-Telegram) verbally spanks Churchill for his speech advocating power politics, which "led sooner or later to war." We know that "the old way" didn't work, so we should try the new way of UNO. "I don't wonder that the elder statesmen think this is a revolutionary move * * *," she says dryly.

The Toronto (Canada) Star says that "as oratory it was a fine effort, but in its advocacy of a close military alliance of Britain and the United States against Russia, it cannot be described as a contribution to the continuance of the Big Three entente. On the contrary, it is such a proposal as might be made on the eve of war, and Mr. Churchill admits that Russia does not want war, that war is not imminent."

Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a statement by William F. Montavon, director, legal department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, before the Committee on Ways and Means, March 6, 1946:

It is my understanding that today our discussion deals only with title II of the Social Security Act which provides Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits and with section 1426 (b) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code which exempts certain organizations from the payment of taxes imposed under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (title VIII of the Social Security Act).

The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code are the following:

"SEC. 1410. In addition to other taxes, every employer shall pay an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ."

The rate is fixed by the statute and is intended to increase progressively until it is 3 percent of the wages paid by the employer.

Section 1426 (a) defines wages and section 1426 (b) defines employment as follows:

"The term 'employment' means any service * * * except."

There are 10 classes of service exempt under this exception.

Among these excepted services is:

"(8) Services performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

This exception by definition has the effect of exempting a large number of organizations and their employees from the payment of tax under section 1410 and their employees from the payment of tax under section 1400.

This exception results further in the exclusion of the employees in these excepted employments from the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance.

A considerable number, probably a majority, of these employers do not desire to have their employees thus excluded.

These employers frequently are closely related to the church.

I cannot speak for all of these church-related organizations.

I can speak only on behalf of the thousands of voluntary organizations including hospitals, charitable and educational institutions throughout the country that are affiliated with the Catholic Church.

These Catholic organizations have not looked with favor on any provision of law which denies to their employees any benefit provided by law for employees in general.

This problem has been apparent to the National Catholic Welfare Conference from the time in 1934 when the Committee on Economic Security was discussing social insurance in preparation for its report submitted to the President on January 15, 1935. The Committee on Economic Security was not willing to discuss the problem of the tax-exempt organizations at that time but did recommend that in legislation to be enacted provision be made for annuity bonds for the benefit of persons excluded from old-age and survivors insurance benefits. That recommendation was not looked upon with favor by this Committee in 1935 when the report of the Committee on Economic Security was made the basis of the Social Security Act.

I accompanied a committee representing three national hospital associations which appealed in 1935 to this committee to give consideration to the tax-exempt status of voluntary hospitals.

Appearing before this committee, the chairman of the Social Security Board, a gentleman with whom I have always had most cordial relations, recommended only 10 days ago that old-age and survivors insurance be extended to all gainful employment including "employees of nonprofit institutions."

He said at that time:

"No administrative problems are involved in covering nonprofit employees."

The exclusion of the employees of these institutions has not been based on any thought that to include them might occasion any administrative problems.

The exclusion of these employees, unfair though it is, is traceable to the failure of this committee to develop a formula under which provision would be made to extend to these employees the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance but which, in extending benefits, would give sincere and full recognition to the fact that traditionally these church-related activities have been generally exempt from taxation. Attention is called to the fact that this exaction is a "tax with respect to having individuals in his employ."

This exclusion of a large number of employees and the resulting shifting by employees from covered to noncovered employment has resulted in serious administrative problems and, I might say, inequities.

The uncertain cost of social insurance, which tends to expand, as well as the fact that the traditional tax-exempt status would be jeopardized, have deterred voluntary tax-exempt organizations from demanding that their employees be not denied by law the right to share in the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance. The income of these organizations and, particularly the church-related organizations, for whom I speak, comes in great measure from donations and from economy in administration. That income is not easily predictable. It does not justify the incurring of long-term obligations, the amount of which is not easy to calculate beforehand.

In both Houses of Congress legislative bills have been introduced which, it has been the hope of the proponents, would meet this condition.

The Federal Insurance Contributions Act of 1939 was a step in the right direction, but it was only a step. It did not extend the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance to the employees of nonprofit employers, although these employees need those benefits in as great or greater degree than do the employees of profit organizations.

There can be no doubt as to the social value of the services rendered by these church connected nonprofit organizations through thousands of health, charitable and educational institutions.

To levy a tax with respect to having individuals in his employ on these organizations would be a marked departure from the customary attitude toward these organizations. I believe that the difficulty thus stated is worthy of your earnest consideration.

By its nature a tax is compulsory.

It is this compulsory nature which disturbs most of these organizations.

My correspondence over the years justifies the belief that a great majority of the excluded agencies would willingly accept the present cost of social insurance to the extent of their ability to meet that cost if it were not for this compulsory nature of the contributions.

The problem here posed is not wholly unlike that which arises out of the proposal that employees of State and local governmental agencies be made eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Your committee has before it a bill which would extend social insurance to these governmental agencies under a compact freely entered into and terminable on 2 years notice.

A similar formula, it is my opinion, might be adopted to extend old-age and survivors insurance to the individuals in the employ of the agencies now excluded from these benefits.

Speaking for the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is the voice of the Catholic bishops of the United States, I earnestly recommend to the favorable consideration of this committee at this time the following proposals that—

1. The lay employees of nonprofit agencies be fully covered by old-age and survivors insurance under a plan which would provide optional entrance on the part of the employers;

2. That when this voluntary acceptance of coverage has been effected there shall be full contribution to the trust fund by employer and employee;

3. That the law embody a statement of policy which would adequately safeguard the customary and traditional tax-exempt status;

4. That the voluntary acceptance have reference solely to lay employees, excluding the clergy and members of religious orders; and

5. That provision be made for the withdrawal, under defined conditions, by any nonprofit organization.

Comparative Summary of Celler Bill, H. R. 5230, With Senate Bills for Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF CELLER BILL, H. R. 5230, WITH SENATE BILLS FOR CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY [1]

1. CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Celler bill empowers and directs the Atomic Energy Authority "to control all plants, materials, patents, or other property useful in the development and utilization of atomic energy which belong to the United States, and to regulate the importation and exportation of all such plants, materials, patents, or other property, public or private" (sec. 3c). It also directs the Authority "to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, such plants, materials, patents, or other property not now owned by the United States as may be useful in the development and utilization of atomic energy: *Provided*, That compensation therefor, whether fixed by negotiation or by court decree, shall not exceed actual cost" (sec. 3d).

In this respect the Celler bill follows the McMahon bill (S. 1717) as against the Johnson and Ball bills (S. 1463 and S. 1557, respectively). Neither of the latter specifies the nature or extent or standards of Government control. Specific provision for Government control is needed if we are to guard against administration of atomic energy matters either in a haphazard fashion or, worse still, in a manner intended to permit eventual dissipation of control. The Celler bill goes even further than the McMahon bill in protecting the public interest in condemnation proceedings by assuring that compensation may not exceed actual cost.

Under the Celler bill the Authority is empowered and directed "to develop, control, supervise, and license the industrial use of materials, patents, or apparatus under the control of the Authority, and to enter into agreements with municipal, cooperative, or other nonprofit associations for the industrial utilization of such energy under such conditions as will prevent exploitation of the consuming public or of labor employed in such projects, guarantee priority of reemployment rights to workers displaced from existing industries by the advance of technology, and otherwise safeguard the national welfare" (sec. 3b). In this respect the Celler bill is significantly different from the other bills under discussion, all of which permit licensing of atomic energy devices for private use. The Celler bill goes further than this; it affirmatively seeks to direct atomic energy uses toward socially desirable ends.

2. STIMULATION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Celler bill empowers and directs the Authority "to conduct and cause to be conducted experimentation, studies, and investigation, here and abroad, in the production and utilization of atomic energy and to analyze and forecast the economic and social consequences of the utilization of such energy; and to publish the results of such investigation and analysis, without regard to any statutory or administrative limitations on Government publications" (sec. 3a). This encouragement to do research work differs considerably from the relevant provisions of the Johnson and Ball bills, both of which require specific permission from the agencies set up under them before any research may be undertaken. It is stronger than the similar provision in the McMahon bill in that it authorizes publication of reports without regard to the usual governmental limitations upon the distribution and content of its publications. Under present laws, for instance, it is not legal for a person not a Member of Congress to purchase more than one copy of a governmental publication. Under such conditions initiative in research and development cannot be expected.

In addition to the above, the Celler bill specifically provides (sec. 5) that it may not be interpreted to prohibit or impair freedom of scientific research or of scientific expression, freedom of access to scientific materials and apparatus, or freedom of American citizens to leave the United States unless they have previously agreed not to do so as a condition of securing employment in connection with atomic-energy projects or as a condition of securing confidential information. Similar scientific freedom provisions exist, although in quite limited form (being limited to what is called fundamental research) in the Ball bill.

3. INTEGRATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

The Celler bill (sec. 7) requires the Authority, under direction of the President, to prepare and submit to Congress for its approval, a draft agreement to be effective upon ratification by at least two-thirds of the nations representing two-thirds of the population of the earth. Under this agreement the United States would give the United Nations Organization, or other international agency established for the purpose, all available information concerning production and use of atomic energy, under three conditions. The conditions prescribed would provide that signatories agree as follows: (a) To grant each other free access to and right of inspection of all facilities relating to manufacture of munitions and atomic energy; (b) to outlaw future military use of atomic energy and other means of warfare which cannot be used in a manner that discriminates between combatant and noncombatant personnel; and (c) to participate in joint nonmilitary measures for common protection, after ratification of the agreement, in the event of any nation's refusal to abide by the agreement.

None of the other bills before the Senate provide for positive international action in this field. The McMahon bill has a negative provision prohibiting research in military uses of atomic energy contrary to international agreements. The Johnson bill does not even limit production of atomic bombs, and the Ball bill actually gives the armed forces power to produce unlimited quantities of these bombs. Such unilateral action on the part of the United States cannot be expected to establish mutual trust among nations, many of which can be expected to have bombs of their own in the near future.

4. ORGANIZATION

The Celler bill establishes an Atomic Energy Authority consisting of a chairman, six Cabinet members, and four full-time public members. The latter are to be chosen from a roster of nominees submitted by organizations of scientists, physicians, labor unions, and philanthropic bodies (sec. 2). The purpose of having Cabinet members on the Authority is to provide for a maximum of coordination and a minimum of duplication of effort between the Authority, on one hand, and the State, War, Navy, Interior, Commerce, and Labor Departments on the other hand. All of the latter are vitally concerned with the activities of the Authority and will be expected to carry out many of its decisions. In this respect the Celler bill is superior to the McMahon bill, which establishes an independent five-man commission which would have to spend a great deal of its time and effort convincing the other departments of the need for cooperation.

The purpose of having public members serve on a full-time basis is to assure the maximum operating efficiency of the organization together with a minimum of conflict between the public and private economic interests of the members themselves. The Ball bill, providing for an agency simi-

[1] For purposes of convenient comparison this document follows the general outline used in the Senate Atomic Energy Committee's chart, Comparative Summary of Key Senate Bills for Domestic Control of Atomic Energy.

lar to that of the Celler bill, has the disadvantage of providing for part-time public members.

Members of the Authority are selected, under the Celler bill, in a manner which assures civilian control of the agency. In this respect it is superior to the Johnson bill, which provides for the appointment of Commission members, all of whom may be members of the armed forces.

One additional advantage of the Celler bill is the provision it contains permitting the Authority to bring into this country, without regard to immigration laws, scientists it may want to employ, and to coopt the services of scientific personnel from the armed forces, by agreement with such persons (sec. 3f). This provision guarantees the continued availability of top-flight personnel for work on atomic-energy development and will assure continued United States leadership in this field.

Short Corn Supply Was Obvious Last Fall—Crisis Would Result Only From Incompetence — Constructive Action Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, early last summer Midwest weather conditions indicated a short corn crop. Later favorable weather conditions seemed to push the crop along rapidly, and apparently Washington experts decided that we had a bumper corn crop again.

Nevertheless early frosts cut down the production of quality corn. This fact may have been recognized in the final Government estimate of 3,018,000,000 bushels of corn.

However, the Government tardily announced that this fast-maturing crop was of generally inferior quality. Belatedly the Department of Agriculture did admit that their 3,018,000,000 bushel crop had a quality value of only 2,700,000,000 bushels.

However, even that estimate was apparently almost wishful optimism. Feeders advised months ago that it took about 4 bushels of 1945 corn to do what 3 bushels of good corn did normally.

If this is true generally, then in actual feeding value our 1945 corn crop amounted to less than 2,400,000,000 bushels, instead of over 3,000,000,000 bushels. A crop of this size is far below average and is smaller than any on record since the near-famine year of 1936.

So a small corn supply was obvious early last fall. Despite this short crop, the administration deliberately neglected the corn-price structure, in which corn's cash price was about 25 percent below its value for livestock feeding.

By this abortive price relationship, the administration constrained farmers from selling their corn for cash and added to the short-supply situation. This policy has encouraged barter, black markets, and outlaw practices in corn on a gigantic scale.

The supply situation was further aggravated when the administration gave steel workers a 15-percent increase in wages, but sought to soothe farmers ste leworkers a 15-percent increase in only cash grain crops.

If the administration is to get farm cooperation in 1946, constructive moves seem immediately in order. The following suggestions are offered:

First. An end to pussyfooting with and coddling of left-wing labor leaders. Their paralysis of normal manufacturing is making it impossible for the farmer to exchange the dollars from his products for the industrial goods he has long needed. The farmer is delivering his goods, but he cannot secure industrial goods—cars, tractors, machinery—in exchange.

Second. Readjustment of corn prices to:

(a) Realistically reflect its use value.

(b) Give the farmer a dollar return proportionate to the prices he must pay.

Unless such constructive moves are made promptly serious consequences seem probable. If a crisis in corn supplies arrives, the old administration cry of "unforeseen emergency" should be recognized and nailed as a fraud. It will be a prearranged crisis.

It will prove to the farmers and the people of America that either:

First. The administration saw a short supply in corn and arranged a crisis; or

Second. This administration with 86,000 Department of Agriculture employees, plus thousands of alleged economic experts, plus billions of dollars, was blind to obvious conditions.

In either event only one conclusion will be justified—that the Truman administration is incompetent to handle the food problems of the people of America, to say nothing of the more difficult responsibility of contributing to the nutrition of the world.

A new and constructive approach to this situation quickly would seem vital to alleviate this situation and to secure farmer cooperation for meeting 1946 food production requirements.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Capital Press, of Salem, Oreg.:

CONSCRIPTION

"JOE MARTIN, Massachusetts Congressman and minority leader, proposes that we sidetrack the bill for universal conscription while we get other nations to agree to ban it. Generalissimo Stalin has already given the world his answer. The U. S. S. R. seems to be going in for bigger and better armies." (Statesman.)

All honor to Mr. MARTIN for a constructive and necessary suggestion. It is the first in that category to come from a leading Republican, most of them being busy throwing rocks through the windows of the poorly guarded temple of peace. But where does the Statesman get the foundation for its nasty insinuation that Russia would not be agreeable to such a proposal? After the First World War Russia repeatedly proposed world disarmament but was turned down by the other nations—the United States, England, Italy, and Japan. They all had their heads together, even at the Geneva Conference, planning to wipe Russia off of the map by an attack on all sides. They haven't changed their desires even yet, and Russia knows it. Under such conditions Russia has no choice but to maintain big armies; but if the other nations will sincerely start a peace and nonconscription movement, Russia will be found in the forefront of it. No other nation so sincerely desires world peace. Most of them, like the United States, merely talk about it while hoping and predicting the opposite and slyly reaching for the knife under their coattails.

Mirrors of Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a recent article prepared by one of Texas' very able newspapermen, Paul Bolton, who writes a column titled "Mirrors of Austin."

One of the most difficult problems of Congressmen is that of sympathetic understanding of the problems of sections of the United States far removed from their own, geographically, economically, and politically.

This article, which contains a letter, very vividly portrays the plight of an average farm wife, and I feel sure it will be helpful to those Members of Congress seeking to understand the people of America and their problems:

MIRRORS OF AUSTIN

(By Paul Bolton)

For sheer intensity and dramatic effectiveness, no professional writer can ever equal the force of a nonprofessional, writing out of his own deep experiences.

Recently in this column appeared a summary of the status of farm organizations in Texas. There was no intention to portray those agencies as powerful pressure groups; but one headline writer used the word "powerful" in putting a headline on the piece. It brought down the wrath of a farm wife, a highly literate farm wife. She did not want her letter published, she said; but what she says so articulately, states the case for farm wives everywhere that publication—minus her name—seems in the public interest.

"It is a mystery how these powerful, small, and fairly weak unions have managed to operate so quietly that the average farmer, whom I believe now longs to become a member of such an organization, doese not even know of their existence. I think a logical answer would be that they are extremely weak and new. * * *

"We farmers know that these groups are vitally interested in gaining for farmers economic equality with other groups. They

have labored prodigiously in their efforts, but what have they accomplished? Farmers are still dirt poor. How, for pity sakes, are they using that tremendous power that you columnists speak of so glibly? There are a lot of people who fight for organized labor's aims (and this despite the fact that organized labor knows how to take care of itself) who fear any improvement in the lot of unorganized farmers. This attitude, of course, is not caused by antagonism toward the farmers as such, but is caused by a desire on the part of all other groups to keep the cost of living down and thereby continue to enjoy that high standard of living famed throughout the world, but never enjoyed by the farmers of this country.

"For 16 years I have been a farmer's wife. Before that I was a small-town banker's daughter and enjoyed financial security so complete that I had a small contempt for people who had to struggle overmuch. I honestly believed failure to accumulate a moderate amount of this world's earthly goods was due to lack of thrift, effort, or failure to exercise reasonably good judgment. I didn't know then, as a lot of people don't seem to know, that there are groups that society (notice that I did not say government) desires to keep poor, so that the remainder may maintain a high standard and in some cases that other groups, equally unfortunate, may have subsistence. Every one of those 16 years has been a terrific financial struggle. Financial struggle for a farmer's wife means considerably more than the sleepless nights and material sacrifices that it means to her city sister. It means a bent back, rheumatic fingers, an irregular heart, and at least one hernia. But more tragic than those things, it means a frustrated home life.

"A mother cannot be tired 365 days out of the year and remain kind and understanding. Every farmer's wife, who has never had city-earned money or an inheritance or an oil well or gravel pit, does a full-time job in performing duties aimed at increasing the family income, in addition to those pertaining to making a home. As a consequence she is a drab creature, but no more so than the other members of her family. They drudge, too. I don't think city people ever take into account the fact that all members of a farm family contribute to the earnings through necessity. It would seem only fair that the sum total should be larger than groups offering no more essential services or products where only one earns and the others enjoy leisure for cultural pursuits which in turn make them feel superior.

"Farm children shuck corn, gather eggs, and bring up the cows while their city cousins take piano and dancing lessons and play baseball or put in extra time on their home work. That extra time becomes, over the years, a factor in that apparent superiority of mental equipment that the average city dweller thinks he has over the farm person. Every person who understands farmers knows that the accumulated tiredness of his body prevents his staying awake at meetings and prevents his reading a book. When dusk comes he, like the rock a-settin' on the hill, just wants to rest himself, by gosh—and that includes his mind as well as his bones, because he is tired all over.

"During the day he has been an orchardist, a poultryman, a dairyman, a veterinarian, a cultivator, sower, reaper, mechanic, carpenter, etc., and I'll be jiggered if he hasn't had to become a bookkeeper, a soil conservationist, and a mineralogist in the last few years. * * *

"Now, please be careful of my blood pressure and never, never speak of powerful farm unions. 'Taint so, you know."

John Joseph Cardinal Glennon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me I include as part of my remarks an editorial published in the Washington Star, Monday, March 11, concerning John Joseph Cardinal Glennon, archbishop of the city of St. Louis for 42 years, who died last week near the place of his birth in Ireland, while he was on his way home from Rome. It follows:

There was something infinitely pathetic in the sudden death of John Cardinal Glennon a short fortnight after his elevation to the highest ecclesiastical circle of his church. At 83, he was the senior member of the group of 32 prelates summoned to receive red hats from Pope Pius XII on February 21. The journey to Rome and the exhausting ceremonies there weakened a frame already weary with the troubles and the labors of the times. Death came to the saintly old priest at the home of the President of his native Ireland. His body, after lying in state in the diocese where he was born in 1862, is to be brought home by plane for funeral services in the beautiful cathedral which he built.

The city of St. Louis always will remember Archbishop Glennon as it knew him for 42 years. He was the first citizen of that metropolitan community during most, if not all, of that span. Not only the members of his particular flock acknowledged his leadership: he likewise was a mentor, guide, and kindly friends to hundreds of people who possessed no religious ties of their own.

St. Louis, certainly, held a lofty place among American towns when the archbishop was transferred there from two decades of work at Kansas City; but his vision raised it further. The whole area of the Middle West seemed to him to need development in spiritual and cultural directions. It was to that task that he applied his constructive talents. And he was granted length of days to witness the fulfillment of his dreams. No churchman of his generation left more memorable monuments, Kenrick Seminary not least among the number.

But it should be stressed that Archbishop Glennon was a builder of human lives much more than mere cathedrals and schools of stone and brick and multicolored glass. On the sixtieth anniversary of his ordination, it was said of him that he had administered the sacrament of holy orders to seventeen hundred candidates. These were his sons in the Kingdom of God, servants like himself of the Most High but also servants, as he was, to the world at large. His work therefore goes on.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Boston Herald:

[From the Boston Herald]

"FORGOTTEN ALREADY," SAY VETERANS

(By Paul Giguere)

Most of the 1,000 veterans polled by the Herald say, in effect, "We were first in war, but now we are last in peace, last in the hearts of our countrymen." The welcome-home banners are called a mockery of the truth. The veterans believe "we are forgotten already." In answer to the question, "Is the postwar world as pleasant as you thought it would be?" three out of every four replied "No." And asked if they thought the general nonveteran public was inclined to forget the veteran, 96 percent gave one of three answers, "Yes." * * * "It's already happened." * * * "Are you kidding?"

Behind these sentiments are the following points of discontent: First, and most frequently mentioned gripe of all, is that they say they can't find a decent job; second, is the lack of home space—the great majority who said they were living with in-laws reported that the arrangement wasn't working out well—and then followed shortages in clothing and food, high cost of living, strikes, problems in resuming schooling, and Federal policies on the veterans.

MULTITUDE OF GRIPES

Complaints run like this: "Prices are too high, people have changed, vets are considered bums." * * * "No nothing." * * * "I think the GI loan is a farce; we can only get a loan if we have money in the bank, and if we had the money in the bank we wouldn't want a loan." * * * "Everyone is out for himself and doesn't give the veteran a second thought." * * * "Jobs, clothing, people." * * * "Patronizing attitude." * * * "Boston is the most backward city." * * * "Slowness of various veterans' bureaus." * * * "Neglect of city upkeep and filthy politics."

There was a general feeling that, though some programs have been bungled or not extended enough, the Government means well and is trying to do the best it can. Opinion on conditions in the home community were less restrained, for here the veterans could, in many cases, point to communities which have not bothered to set up any guidance centers at all, or else they could mention aid centers operate by half-baked workers who have a nil-minus idea of the veteran and his problems.

More than one job-seeking veteran suggested that "women should be sent home from work now that the vets are back. Give the boys a break so they can live like they used to. Right now, the women are working and the vets are home without work."

DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE

Several of the discharged servicemen looked at the veteran and his problems from a different perspective. Typical among the comments from these veterans was this one: "The nonveteran public is inclined to forget the needs of the veterans; but the fault is mutual. Veterans are not thinking of the common good in the pursuit of what they naturally consider their rights. Any benefits for us should be considered also in the light of what good will develop for the country as a whole. Otherwise, veterans' organizations will become another of the many lobbies for selfish interests."

Another veteran took to task "a minority of the veterans who take the attitude that they are veterans and therefore the world owes them a living" and he expressed conviction "that this class of veteran will eventually cause bad feeling on the part of the nonveteran public which really got no material reward from victory." However, not one veteran interviewed said he wanted pay without

having to work for it; and the gripe of the veterans was one that no one could dispute, involving the specific right of any American to maintain his self-respect in having a home for his family and a job to support it.

On the issue of how large a bonus they think the Federal Government should give them, a great number suggested that the bonus matter be forgotten and that they be given opportunities for jobs, instead. "The Government can keep its bonus," said a vet. "All we want is a good job with a decent pay scale." Quite a number specifying their idea of a proper bonus, however, urged that it be based on the number of days in service; and the rate most often mentioned for this method was $1 to $2 for each day. Those asking a flat sum more often mentioned one over $1,000 than under. The figure most frequently listed was $2,000.

An indication that the veterans of the last war may repeat what has been true of veterans of past wars, and form their own veterans' organization rather than gravitate to one already established, might be construed from results of the Herald survey. For more than 81 percent said they favored joining a World War II organization.

[From the Boston Herald of March 12, 1946]

TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND OVERFLOW SEEN FROM VETS' HOSPITALS

Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, acting chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration, said last night that the potential number of veterans requiring medical care and the inability to obtain sufficient doctors made it impossible to care for veterans exclusively in Veterans' Administration hospitals and that the Government would have to contract for beds in private hospitals.

Hospital associations, he told members of the New England Hospital Assembly at their twenty-third annual meeting at the Hotel Statler, must "insure that the veterans get the type of care the Government wants them to have."

"Veterans of the First World War," he said, "complained that the Government paid for their care as private patients after that war and that the hospitals gave them a character of service given to charity patients, that they were neglected and poorly fed. It is important that these charges must never again be justified."

Recognizing that "terrific opposition" has been met from World War I veterans and American Legion officials against the contract plan for beds in private hospitals, he maintained, "The Veterans' Administration has only one principle that it will never violate—the principle that the veteran must be given the highest type of medical and hospital care."

"At the end of World War II," he explained, "we shall need 150,000 hospital beds to care for all veterans applying for hospitalization. The Veterans' Administration's present building program contemplates 125,000 beds which means that the excess of 25,000 must be cared for in other Federal, State, or private hospitals; 20 of 25 years in the future, if the veterans of World War II require as much hospitalization as their predecessors, we shall need more than 250,000 hospital beds."

NEED 12,000 DOCTORS

He pointed out that to provide these beds exclusively in Veterans' Administration hospitals would require more than 12,000 doctors, about 40,000 nurses and 150,000 other employees.

"I do not believe it possible to obtain a staff of 12,000 doctors in the Veterans' Administration at any salaries that the Government now offers or is likely to offer," he claimed, "No group knows better than this group the difficulty of maintaining a staff of 40,000 full-time nurses."

He charged that prior to the appointment of General Bradley as Administrator the Veterans' Administration had never considered the magnitude of this problem and the impossibility of its solution with a completely full-time medical service.

For the Attention of Secretary of State Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of Congress will be interested in this petition from outstanding citizens in my district, which I am transmitting to the Secretary of State:

CUMBERLAND, MD., *March 11, 1946.*
Hon. J. GLENN BEALL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, as voters of Allegany County demand that as our elected Representative in the Congress of the United States you openly express our protest to the Secretary of State of the United States against the partisan interference of the United States Government in the domestic and elective affairs of the sovereign state of Spain while ignoring the dictatorships of Stalin, Tito, and Peron, and the aggressive violation of the national sovereignty by Russia in the several Balkan States, Poland, Finland, Korea, and China. We further protest against the lack of a straightforward policy toward Russian communism.

Regis X. Brinker, Mary L. Minke, Joseph U. Wempe, Mary A. Wempe, Frederick L. Wempe, Betty P. Wempe, Marguerite Spicer, Mrs. C. E. Spicer, Charles E. Spicer, Jr., Charles E. Spicer, Sr., C. K. Wheeler, C. B. Wheeler, F. B. Tewell, Helen L. Tewell, Elizabeth Ruppenkamp, Matilda Ruppenkamp, Francis Ruppenkamp, John G. Ruppenkamp, Frank E. Spicer, Mary Louise Spicer, Angela Schultz, Nora E. Brinker, Joseph H. Brinker, Francis E. Brinker, Jonas S. Martin, Mrs. Louise Brinker Martin, Agatha M. Keech, John C. Brinker, Philip A. Murphy, Augustine T. Will, Charles H. Imes, Mrs. Fred Brinker, Roger Pisaneschi, Louise Pisaneschi, Thomas E. Danohy, Joseph M. Weber, Richard N. Mantheiy, Clarence J. Williams, Bernard H. Doll, A. E. Chenowitt, G. A. Beal, Charles P. Hinea, Walter G. Bell, all of Cumberland, Md.; E. E. Boyle, Roy T. Richardson, Francis T. Kelly Frostburg, Md.; E. M. Pueschel, Cumberland, Md.; William H. Sullivan, Alex Conrad, Lee R. Durst, Frostburg, Md.; Richard J. Brabenstein, H. C. Kesler, J. Joseph Carney, Jr., F. L. Mantheny, Cumberland, Md.; James T. Brannon, Mount Savage, Md.; Joseph R. Mantheny, J. James Eirich, Hom Donohoe, Peter J. Decker, R. M. Englebach, Aloysius I. Smith, W. J. Milburn, Patrick Coyle, Alphonsus L. Wilt, Floyd M. Hout, Cumberland, Md.

Losing a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very complimentary item that appeared in the Washington Post March 12, 1946, concerning our very genial and lovable colleague, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas. I know that each and every Member, including myself, of the Committee on the Judiciary, share the views of the writer of this article. I know of no chairman under whom I have served who has been so sincere, considerate, and thoughtful, not only of the feelings of the members of the committee, but also of those persons who appear before the committee on matters of national importance. Congressman SUMNERS has been a tireless worker and a most conscientious chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and due to his years and wealth of experience as a Member of the Congress of the United States, it will be most difficult to fill his place in the Halls of Congress. I personally join with the editorial writer of the Post in extending to him our sincere and best wishes for the future.

The article follows:

LOSING A FRIEND

It is regrettable that HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has decided not to seek reelection this fall.

Mr. SUMNERS, who has represented his Texas district in the House since 1913, has been an effective and fearless champion of the causes in which he believes, and it is safe to say that no man in either branch of Congress has fought harder against the steady growth of Federal power at the expense of the States and the individual.

As far back as 1939, Mr. SUMNERS was warning that democracy in this country had only a "50–50 chance of surviving." At that time, however, he expressed confidence that "we are going to win." In 1943 he said that the States had been "all but reduced to governmental vassals." And in 1944 he warned that "we in America are drifting away from our democratic form of Government toward some kind of totalitarian government, and doing it with great rapidity."

When he announced last week his decision to retire, he made it clear that his views on this subject had not changed. Asserting that the Federal Government had become "an instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption," he said that he was leaving the House so he could devote all of his time to speaking before civic and patriotic groups in an effort to check the trend toward centralization of power. Whether this can be done is doubtful, for the pattern of big government has become deeply impressed on this country. But if anyone is well qualified by experience and conviction to make the fight, that person is Mr. SUMNERS.

His departure from Congress will constitute a particularly heavy loss to the people of Washington, for Mr. SUMNERS, with Senator CAPPER, has devoted a great deal of his time and energy to the effort to secure suffrage for the disfranchised residents of the

National Capital. So far, this effort has failed. But thanks to the untiring work of Mr. SUMNERS and his associate in the Senate, the justness of the District's appeal has been firmly established, and there is good reason to believe that, in time, the pioneering work which has been done will bear fruit.

Price Control Viewed by a Manufacturer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have heard much about the so-called merits and demerits of the Office of Price Administration. OPA has been praised beyond all reason and has been condemned most bitterly. We have heard the pros and cons from people from almost every walk of life. I want to present a witness from the field of manufacture and a great producer in the Middle West. He has been in business for many years and understands our economy and what it takes to make the world go around.

The following is a letter which I received from a man in Oklahoma a few days ago giving his version of what the OPA has done, is doing, and will do. I am pleased to quote from this well-informed and experienced businessman as follows:

There is quite a varied opinion as to the effectiveness of OPA. The supporters are principally those who are enjoying a profitable operation under OPA's regulations—a few retailers with high ceilings, a few manufacturers with high ceilings, and all the black-market operators. The majority of manufacturers and industry, jobbers, wholesalers, and retailers are suffering greatly by the present administration of OPA regulations.

It is true that certain price fronts have been held; it is also true there are many price fronts that have not been held, resulting in the cost to the producer of the low ceiling commodities being greatly increased so that profitable operations are impossible. Therefore, production has been curtailed, if not stopped.

Rent controls: The present rent-control policy is such that no new rental units are being constructed or will be constructed, and after all a great percent of our people live in rental property. The property that is now under rent ceilings is deteriorating rapidly, as the cost of maintenance, repairs, etc., is so great that the income would be mostly absorbed in keeping the property in proper shape if the owners were financially able to put all of their income into the required maintenance and repairs. Would it not be better to have a higher rent with available space for GI Joe and the workingman, than low rent and no space? My vote is for higher rent and an abundance of accomodations.

Clothing: There is a very drastic scarcity of wearing apparel which the average American citizen needs badly. The price is cheap enough but the articles are not to be had, so what have we accomplished?

On automobiles, refrigerators, radios, clocks, electrical appliances of all descriptions, the prices are low enough, the money is plentiful, but the merchandise is not obtainable.

The list could be continued to cover several letterheads and to include the complete steel category, with which I am very familiar, but it would only increase the voluminousness of the record, so I will go no further into the details, except to express to you the thought that our nation started to develop many years ago upon the foundation of capitalistic, free, competitive enterprise, and on this foundation has been built the leading nation of the world with the highest standard of living for its people of any nation in the world. The sooner Congress repeals all of the wartime restrictions and the New Deal restrictions enacted since 1932, the sooner we are going to get back to full production and prosperity. If there is too long a delay, deflation is bound to come soon.

Tribute to Hatton W. Sumners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the RECORD a striking editorial from the Indianapolis Star presenting some interesting views on the retirement of our distinguished colleague, Judge HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, as follows:

HATTON SUMNERS SOUNDS ALARM

HATTON W. SUMNERS, who has served Texas 34 years as a Representative in Congress, sounds a warning that should awaken the citizens of this country to the serious state of our Nation. He is a Democrat, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and one of the most influential lawmakers in Washington. He is also a loyal American and a serious student of government. It is his intention to retire and devote his time and effort to an appeal to the people to save our Republic.

"I have watched what my own generation under administration of both parties has been doing to the greatest system of democratic government ever evolved through the processes of the ages," he declared. "By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people."

We have gone far afield from the basic theories of representative government, he pointed out. "By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have a financially 'busted,' great, piled-up mass of governmental confusion, beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free."

Mr. SUMNERS says that under the present state of affairs a Congressman has become virtually an errand runner who has no time to study important legislation and statesmanship. He believes he can serve his country better on the outside than he can in Congress, and proposes to try. The hope for a brighter future, he is convinced, lies in recognition by the people of a "common danger and common duty."

The Texan is not alone in recognizing the direction in which we are drifting. But he proposes to do his utmost to stem the tide. A joint congressional committee is at work on a plan to cut the regular committees of the two Houses from 81 to 34 in order to get rid of some of the duplication of effort, the confusion, and waste of time. That will help but does not go to the roots of the evil.

Congressman SUMNERS has no illusion as to what is happening. We have abandoned basic principles. Our Government was intended to govern. Now it is trying to do all manner of things. We have bureaus, authorities, and agencies, some among them answerable to no one, carrying on and burdening the taxpayers for activities alien to our theory of government.

The departure from the landmarks set by the founding fathers was slow at first but has been speeded up in recent years. Now we are plunging headlong into ventures and expenditures. The result is appalling confusion that leads to an early and certain disaster.

More power to Mr. SUMNERS. His should be a voice crying in the wilderness in this crisis in the affairs of our country.

Establishment of Teacher Training Centers in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution passed by the Council of Administration of Kansas Educators assembled in regular session at Emporia, Kans., in reference to the training of German teachers in the zone of occupation, as follows:

The Council of Administration of Kansas Educators, assembled in regular session at Emporia, Kans., instructed the secretary to send the following resolution to the Honorable Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes; Chief of Staff, Dwight D. Eisenhower; President Harry Truman; and to each Congressman and Senator from Kansas:

"Being informed by Dr. Gregor Ziemer, former headmaster of the American Colony School in Berlin, that the present German schools in the American zone of occupation have as yet failed to teach the democratic principles for which we fought, and since we feel that we can best promote these democratic principles by first enlightening the German teachers who are responsible for the German youth; be it

"*Resolved*, That we strongly urge the United States Government to establish at least four teaching training centers, one at Heidelberg, one at Munich, one at Nuremberg, and one at Frankfurt, where American educators, with full backing of the American Government, shall instill the tenets of democracy into the present and future German teachers and imbue them with the realization that Germany can live more profitably in peace with the world; that German teachers be acquainted with the American method of teaching; that German teachers not willing to follow the plan of teaching as outlined in these schools be barred from teaching in Germany. We, as educators, feel strongly that the prestige of the American flag in Europe depends on the work we do with German children; and that the question of education of the next generation of Germans is most vital and urgent.

Cowbells and Bull Rings Off OPA List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, someone has said at the peak OPA had under its control and price-fixing approximately 8,000,000 items. I do not know how many more, but there were certainly too many. Grudgingly OPA has been releasing some of the items that under no theory should have been included on their price ceiling list. To emphasize the truthfulness of this statement, there appeared in the press of the country, under Washington date line of March 6, an Associated Press release as follows:

OPA today lifted price controls from electric-light bulbs and all musical instruments except radios and phonographs.

It also discontinued price ceilings on snowshoes, cowbells, bull rings, gas masks, cocktail shakers, unglazed flower pots, and scores of other items, including baseball and football uniforms, except shoes.

The exemption order on musical instruments also covers all phonograph records and albums.

Next Monday, OPA added, rental ceilings on bicycles will be dropped.

Such releases make bad matters worse. They further irritate the public. When the OPA releases its control over the pricing of snow shoes, cowbells, bull rings, gas masks, cocktail shakers, unglazed flower pots, and such items, it only serves to remind the people of how foolish it was to have had such regulations and no telling how many people write them and force our citizens to answer correspondence in reference to regulations covering this class of items in comparatively limited use, which with perhaps millions of other items should never have been under the Office of Price Administration. It does not improve the temper of the people nor popularize OPA for OPA to announce that cowbells and bull rings are off the OPA control list. It only convinces the public the more firmly of how nonsensical these regulations must have been and how unnecessary part of the work of this bureau was.

But there was a movement on foot to control what we eat, wear, and where we live and our almost every activity of life. This is bureaucracy in action. It has stifled production, put many small businessmen and concerns out of business, and has done comparatively little good for anybody. It caused the Federal Government to borrow more money to pay subsidies, to furnish inferior items of merchandise to the public at inflated prices, under which the theory was that prices to the consumer were being held down to a low level and inflation was being prevented. Price controls will not produce abundance; they always produce scarcity. Scarcity makes high prices. Abundance makes lower prices. Scarcity, restricted production, and prevention of reconversion are responsible for black markets and inflation. Abundant production will wipe out black markets and reduce prices.

Whoever got the idea that OPA ceilings on snow shoes, cowbells, bull rings, gas masks, cocktail shakers, and unglazed flower pots would prevent inflation? Or that we would have inflation if these items had not been vigorously controlled by OPA? It does not make sense. These releases of price controls over such nonessential, inconsequential items affecting so few of our people does not show any speed on the part of OPA in allowing the American people to get back to normalcy.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would grant increased compensation, pension, and retirement payments to veterans and their dependents.

I consider this legislation most necessary and urgent and it should be speedily adopted by Congress. We all recognize the fact that because of the present economic trend in the United States, there is being experienced a rapid increase in wages, prices and the cost of living. This situation is creating hardships in many cases among those of our citizens with fixed incomes. Particularly it is bringing hardships to the disabled and aged veterans of our Nation and their families. Certainly it is against the will of Congress and the American people that these ex-servicemen and those dependent upon them be penalized by the present day conditions over which they have no control.

The measure I have offered provides that all monthly rates of compensation, pension, or retirement pay payable to veterans of World War I and World War II and dependents of such veterans, which are payable under any laws or regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, be increased by 20 percent.

I believe this measure should be expedited with all possible speed, in order to relieve further widespread want and suffering among those who have sacrificed so much in the service of their country. This increase in benefits is both a matter of common justice and absolute necessity. We must not fail those who need our help so badly now and who gave their help so generously and loyally when their country needed them.

Let Us Take Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I read recently that a Member of Congress who has served 33 years, and who now has decided not to ask for reelection, say that the Government is an "instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption," and so forth.

If I, when I retire from Congress, shall have an estimate of my Government so low as that I shall hide my face in shame, for I should then feel that the time I devoted to lawmaking had been spent in vain. In fact, I should feel that I had contributed to the condition described by my colleague as "favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption." I pray that when I retire I may do so with the conviction that the Government is still serving the people, that Congress is composed in the main of conscientious men and women, who are actuated by a sincere desire to serve their country and to promote its welfare.

I pray that I may retire with faith in the Government and with a firm belief that those who administer the laws are imbued with an honest desire to do that which is best for the country.

I do not feel that my colleague is justified in making his gloomy and discouraging statement.

I note that he plans to travel throughout the length and breadth of the land to speak to whatever groups are willing to listen to him dispensing the gloom expressed in his declaration. He contends that in doing so he will be serving his country better than he could in Congress.

I deplore the fact that he feels that by sowing seeds of discord, by undermining the faith of American citizens in their government, he is rendering a service to his country.

He seems to feel that everything is wrong, that any act of government that brings about changes, that deviate from the customs and practices of the past are wrong. Indeed, it seems to me that he is against new methods simply because they are new. I do not mean to say that new methods are right because they are new, but I insist that neither are they wrong because they are new.

I am reminded that once upon a time the prophet Elijah thought he was the only one left who was true to the God of Israel. God rebuked the prophet and declared, "I have left Me 7,000 in Israel who have not bowed the knee to Baal."

Even so, perhaps there is more of good in the Government than my colleague imagines.

I have heard our Speaker say that from the days of Jefferson progressives in government have been accused of ruining the country. I want to say to him that the practice he refers to dates back

much further. Men hated Jesus because He advocated progressive measures. He did not conform to established customs, but advocated ideas for the betterment of the human race, more especially was He interested in the common man. He insisted that the age that was actuated by the motto "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" must come to an end. Instead, He instituted the age of the golden rule, "whatsoever ye would that men would do to you, do ye even so to them."

He taught that all men are brothers. He called attention to the forgotten commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," and insisted that neighborhood is world-wide, and that the brotherhood of man extends throughout the earth. Because of these progressive ideas He was accused of attempting to overthrow the existing government. So He was persecuted. Yes, He was crucified. But did that end His influence? No. His influence is still abroad, showing humanity the right way.

So in all time those who promulgated progressive ideas have been accused of ruining business and the Government. I recall that back in 1901, when the Pennsylvania Legislature voted on a labor measure known as the employers' liability bill, the then president of the Reading Railroad warned me that if that bill ever became law, it would ruin every railroad and every manufacturing establishment in Pennsylvania. Well, the employers' liability bill did not become law. However, since then Pennsylvania has placed on the statute books legislation favorable to labor far more drastic, but the Reading Railroad and Pennsylvania factories are still running strong.

So, it will not do for us to become alarmed when men shout calamity, when they condemn everyone and every measure with whom and with which they do not agree.

Right now, men feel that the many strikes are the forerunners of the ruination of the country. I do not condone strikes. I feel that there are too many of them. However, the reason back of them is not onesided—the employers too have sins. The old adage that it "takes two to fight" is still true.

I do not deny that these are dark days, that many perplexing questions remain to be solved. But I want to call attention to the fact that America has seen other dark days. Such darkness prevailed immediately after the Revolutionary War came to an end, when each State wanted to go its own way. How our forefathers struggled in that day. With what trepidation they launched the Constitution. How miraculous were the circumstances surrounding its ratification by the 13 States. But it was ratified and the darkness disappeared. The Union was established.

How dark were the days when it appeared that the Union was to be torn asunder. If ever there was a time when men had a reason to despair, it was then. But the Union was preserved. The darkness disappeared. Another miracle.

Our country has weathered depression after depression. Each time the darkness was dispelled. Now our country has won the Second World War. Darkness has again enveloped us. The clouds are still lowering but methinks I see glimmers of light. Miracles are again happening.

There are those who are very much exercised because of the dangers surrounding the atomic bomb. One of my correspondents insists that it will be the means of destroying the world. Well, if it is God's will that our world should be thus destroyed, so be it. However, I have a different conception of the result of harnessing atomic energy. I believe that scientists will find a way of putting that energy to work. I believe it will be used to perform many tasks that man now finds laborious and irksome. I believe that it will lift burdens from men's shoulders and will make life easier and more agreeable. Thus will this dangerous weapon be made to serve mankind.

I predict that soon these troubles will be over and then the ship of state will right itself and will sail out on an even keel.

Men complain that mistakes have been made in our foreign policy, that we have appeased Russia too much, or that we are now too firm with her. These same men feel that the United Nations Organization will collapse and that as a consequence, the peace will be lost. I do not belong to this class. Rather, I belong to those who realize that we are living in an age of miracles. Who would have thought a decade ago that it would be possible to get the representatives of a half a hundred nations to gather in a conference and agree to anything? Yet that was what happened at Bretton Woods and elsewhere and at San Francisco where was framed the United Nations Charter.

The United Nations Organization has held one session in London. Other sessions are planned. Some measures have been agreed upon. Others are held in abeyance.

I have great faith in this organization. I believe that it will frame a real workable peace for all the world. I am not alarmed about the fact that Russia seems to want to make trouble. Russia is trying to recover from the awful effects of war. She feels that she is entitled to certain considerations. Perhaps she is. But no one can make me believe that she wants war any more than does England, France or America.

The miracle of bringing the nations together has happened, and I feel confident that the miracle of keeping them together will also be realized.

I know that not all is perfection. It never has been, never will be, but I call upon my countrymen to guard their faith. Do not permit the gloom chasers to undermine it. I want to hold on to my faith in God, faith in my Government, faith in the other nations of the world, faith in mankind, faith in myself.

As my country has weathered other storms, so she will weather this one. There may be trials and tribulations ahead but my steadfast faith in the destiny of my country prompts me to believe that the finest, the brightest, the greatest days for America and for the world lie in the not distant future.

Extension of the War Powers Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, last night, four Members of the House of Representatives, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, the Honorable JOHN VORYS, and myself, appeared on the American Forum of the Air, discussing the subject, Should the War Powers Act Be Continued? I ask permission to insert my opening statement in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include some remarks on the extension of the War Powers Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Control Act, the War Powers Act, and the Stabilization Act were war powers, conceived, born, and dedicated to an emergency brought on by the war. They were never intended for peacetime. It seems to me that it is very dangerous for powers granted under exceptional circumstances to continue when that reason no longer exists. It is very much like a man parading under an assumed name.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress shortly will be considering a bill reported out by the Rules Committee which has for its purpose the extension of certain wartime controls until June 1947. There are some wartime controls which may need extension, such as those that facilitate bringing our soldiers back from other countries, and which give them a priority to get reestablished in business.

I do feel that all wartime controls should be examined on their own merits and the people exercising these powers should justify their continuance. There has been all manner of interpretations, priority orders, and allocations, which have brought our economy to a grinding halt at a time when it should be going full speed ahead. Under these war powers, 7 months after the shooting has stopped, bureaucracy runs wild, and is trampling on individual freedoms, making mockery of our Constitution.

We cannot stop needless waste and extravagance of Government unless this huge bureaucratic machine is dismantled. There are nearly three million on the Federal pay roll today. Many of them took their jobs for the duration plus 6 months. Before the war, there were less than one million on the Federal pay roll.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that restraints, necessary in wartime, become shackles when their removal is neglected and delayed in peacetime. If we are to continue emergency after emergency, which means more controls, when they are not needed, it is to accept bureauc-

racy and militarism, the very things we shed blood for, gave lives, and spent billions of dollars to whip abroad.

It is always easy for the administration to continue controls. It is the same old story. As one shortage or bottleneck is licked, another one crops up. This administration can always create emergencies and shortages and ask for a continuation of unneeded authority.

Unneeded war controls transfer individual reliance and resourcefulness to Government. It encourages Government to go into business. People rely upon Government instead of their own initiative to get materials and to produce. These unnecessary rigid wartime controls kill free competitive enterprise. They retard reconversion, prevent production, restrict opportunites for full employment, and will actually raise the cost of living.

We have had the War Powers Act for several years and it has not stopped widespread hoarding of materials and finished goods. When strict rationing, price control, and allocations were in effect upon meat and other foods, we found black markets and hoarding flourishing. The wartime controls upon the dairy industry has caused butter to practically disappear for the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the continuance of these wartime controls that are not needed. They will shackle our people with rules and regulations. It places in the Chief Executive unlimited power.

In my humble opinion our economic problems should be settled in the open market instead of behind the closed doors of blind economists and bureaucrats, who seek to protect their manipulations by wartime statutes.

There is a great deal of Washington left-wing political pressure to maintain all bureaucratic controls in peacetime. These people want to make America over, with these economic panaceas, under the guise of war.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, if the Congress will take the shackles off of business that the American people, in their American way of doing business, can find a way of getting things done, without resorting to questionable wartime controls.

My statement of March 12, 1946, on the American Forum of the Air entitled, "Should the War Powers Act Be Continued?" follows:

We should explode the myth that the war is still going on, by prompt legislation. There are some 229 laws and directives tied to the ending of the war. They end at 39 different dates.

My colleague, Mr. HOLIFIELD, states the War Powers Act, should be extended for a short time. This Congress did extend it until June 30, 1946, and the administration is now asking for another year's extension. After the last World War, it took nearly 3 years before the Congress and a new administration, which was Republican, to declare that the war was over.

Wartime controls, as now exercised, limits the producer and processor of raw materials and kills competition.

The only antidote to inflation, black markets and hoarding, is full production. This cannot be had by a rigid adherence to outmoded, war-emergency controls. Controls create emergencies and emergencies create controls.

Our soldiers had a solemn contract with their Government. They enlisted or were drafted, for the duration, plus 6 months. Is our Government, now, to welch on that promise and break faith with the American boy in uniform, by the legal trick of continuing the war?

Thoughtless and ill-considered continuance of wartime controls, in our present economy, even if successful, may prove equally disastrous. My colleague, Congressman CELLER, has rightfully said that our Nation is sick. It is economically ill and I am certain that if we continue these ill-advised wartime regulations much longer, he may be able to say, "The operation was a success, but the patient died."

A Businessman's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, businessmen, especially those who have attained success as a result of their own persistent efforts along praiseworthy lines of endeavor, are most seriously concerned about conditions which prevail in our country today.

The men who have become successful in business by industry and honest methods, are most apprehensive of the manner in which our national administration is now, and has been for the past 12 or 13 years, appeasing labor leaders, and particularly those who have made a racket out of their labor organization leadership position.

I am sure that such businessmen of my district feel very keenly the difficulties we are now facing, and they look with distrust and apprehension upon what the future holds in store for them. It is not only for these businessmen themselves that they are thinking. They are trying to think what is going to happen to the employees who have been deluded, misguided, and are now being led toward the very precipice of the abyss.

Listen to a businessman's viewpoint on this subject. I quote the following from one of the foremost and most dependable businessmen of Tulsa, Okla., who has written me under date of March 9, 1946:

A feeling of deep-seated and sincere apprehension prompts my writing you at this time.

My brothers and I, through sheer hard work, sweat, and sleepless night, have over the past 40 years built up a small business which today is a going concern, providing employment for upward of 500 people.

The satisfactory continuance of our business and the continued employment of our loyal and valued employees today hangs in the balance, jeopardized by the present demoralizing and monopolistic practices of the leaders of organized labor.

Let me say that we have no quarrel with the original and intended concepts of labor. We recognize the American right and privilege of a worker to joint a labor union if he so chooses. We think for the most part collective bargaining can be made to function advantageously to both capital and labor.

We are deeply concerned by the tremendous power of labor garnered during the war years at the expense of Government and industry. We clearly see danger to our entire Amrican way of life through the frequent vicious, monopolistic, and dictatorial practices of the Nation's leaders of labor.

The practice of industry-wide bargaining, which has been the goal of labor during recent months, which we must assume has received the blessing of Government, is both vicious and confiscatory. It can, in my opinion, result in only one thing—a labor monopoly which will become so powerful as to affect the lives of every citizen of these United States—and coincident with this development will be sure to come the creation of business monopoly to the degree that independent enterprise and small business generally cannot possibly survive the disaster such a development would bring about.

We look to you as our elected representative to do everything within your power to protect our interests in this matter. Unless they are protected, and soon, our American way of life is most certainly headed for a change which I fear none of us will like, including the rank and file of labor. To accomplish the desired end, we feel certain definite legislation must be enacted on the following points:

1. Place on labor unions the same restrictions regarding political contributions as are now in effect on corporations. Take labor out of politics from a financial point of view.

2. Make closed-shop agreements illegal. Require that union-security and maintenance-of-membership agreements contain an escape clause. In other words, if we be a free people, we should not condone instruments which in any way require citizens to join a union and remain a member in order to secure or hold a job.

3. We urge the incorporation of unions to the end that they be subject to antitrust laws to the same extent as business, and require unions to report financial condition and membership to a specified governmental agency.

4. If and when picketing in indulged in during labor disputes, law should require it to be orderly with strict prohibition of violence to prevent people from being maimed and murdered, should they desire to work.

5. Pass union responsibility legislation to require labor organizations to live up to contracts entered into as a result of collective bargaining.

The general public as well as business is being made to suffer untold hardships by virtue of Government's labor-appeasement program. Something must be done, else in addition to the present chaotic condition brought about by strikes, industry-wide wage demands, and general indications of labor's monopolistic and dictatorial practices, we shall be faced with an even more dangerous specter, uncontrolled inflation brought about through unwarranted wage increases and corresponding increases in the goods labor produces.

On the one hand, labor threatens the very existence of our business today; while, on the other and coincidental therewith, inflation rears its ugly head to wipe out our life savings and that of the rest of the people of our great country.

The time has come to act, and act we must if we are to retain our American way of life, which thus far has been good enough to make us the strongest nation, with a standard of living second to none in this world.

We like our American way of life. Our sons and daughters have fought and died to preserve it. What a sad commentary if we should permit a handful of greedy, powermad labor leaders to usurp and destroy this glorious tradition.

Can the United Nations Organization Succeed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on Saturday, March 9, 1946, from the National Republican Club, New York, N. Y.:

It is difficult, if not impossible, fairly and fully to evaluate the United Nations Organization in the present universal climate of political tension, economic uncertainties, nervous exhaustion, spiritual depression, moral torpor, and mental confusion. Nevertheless, even when viewed against this somber and discouraging world background, I firmly believe that what was achieved at the San Francisco Conference constitutes a moral miracle and is our one best hope for world peace and security.

As the flames of war devoured the accumulated wealth of the ages; as, everywhere, men and women and children suffered and died; as political, economic, and social systems were shaken to their foundations; as constructive statesmanship became bankrupt and freedom seemed to fade from the earth, there was born in the anguished hearts and minds of civilized peoples a common purpose to create for themselves, and for future generations, a new world civilization, based upon law, justice, and freedom rather than upon tyranny imposed upon its unwilling victims by brute force.

As an initial and practical step in accomplishing this purpose, official representatives of 51 nations met in San Francisco in April 1945 to write the Charter for a United Nations Organization, based in part upon principles previously agreed upon at Dumbarton Oaks by the Great Powers.

These delegates and their advisers represented what, on the surface, looked like an irreconcilable diversity of racial, religious, social, economic, and political concepts and conditions. But they were inspired by, and found unity in, their common purpose to set up a world organization which, within the limitations of human wisdom and foresight, should insure permanent peace and security for all peoples.

After eight strenuous weeks of full, frank, and sometimes heated discussion, complete unanimity was achieved and a comprehensive Charter was adopted and signed by all the Nations represented.

If there is intelligence and character enough left among the distracted peoples of the world to carry out its provisions and purposes, this Charter will rank among the most hopeful and important documents in the history of civilization.

The primary purpose of the London session of the United Nations, convened in January, and which lasted 37 days, was to set up and get under way the organization as provided for in the Charter.

In his informative report upon this first session, in which he played so notable a part, Senator VANDENBERG lists the following accomplishments:

1. Successful organization.
2. Creation of an International Atomic Energy Commission.
3. Backed UNRRA in its efforts against famine.
4. Offered new hope to dependent peoples.
5. Refused to sanction involuntary repatriation of war refugees.
6. Pledged to encourage a world-wide free press.
7. Implemented the dynamic article XIV of the Charter under which the General Assembly can recommend peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin which it deems likely to impair the general welfare.

Agreement upon a budget of $21,500,000 to finance operating expenditures in 1946, and decision to locate the temporary and permanent headquarters of the United Nations in this country will insure the permanent interest of all our people.

What was done during the 37 fateful days of the first session of the United Nations was important. What was revealed of the spiritual stature of men and nations, and of the secret forces which determine their various ways of life, personal and material, was infinitely more important.

Already congenital prophets of evil are proclaiming that the Charter is nothing more than the record of a pious dream; that it provides no workable means by which war can be prevented; that its declared objective of world peace and security, based upon universal fraternity and freedom are contrary to the nature of things and especially contrary to human nature and the objectives of power politics; that civilization must now resign itself to the self-annihilation which science has made not only possible, but inevitable.

Whether we elect to sit with those unbelievers upon the mourners' bench, or to join the hallelujah chorus of faith and hope, we have got to face and find an answer for certain questions raised at the London session of the United Nations, and for the time being left unanswered.

First, what about Russia?

Second, what about the United States and Great Britain?

By military and political action in various parts of the world, and, equally, by the official statements of her Government, Russia has made herself the supreme question mark of the future. Her actions and her words in the international field are all a matter of public record and stand naked and unashamed before the bar of world public judgment.

By armed force, Russia has invaded the sovereignty of Finland; she has absorbed the three Baltic States. She has taken almost half of Poland and dominates what is left of that unhappy country. She has assumed control of Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. She has demanded a strategic slice of Turkish territory bordering the Black Sea, along with free access to and use of the Dardanelles. She demands sole control of the African area of Tripolitania. She proposes to establish naval bases in the Dodecanese Islands. In cynical violation of her solemn treaty agreement of 1942, she maintains her armed forces in Iran and refuses to move out of the Province of Azerbaijan, which she helped to set up as an independent and autonomous republic against the will of the soverign state of Iran, to which it belongs.

In the east, Russia has established her Communist ideology over a substantial area of China, and in violation of her solemn treaty with that afflicted country has assumed virtual control of Manchuria, from which she has removed for her own use, quantities of heavy machinery sorely needed in the shattered Chinese economy.

She has turned the free port of Darien into a Russian stronghold and has entrencher herself in the string of islands which parallels her coast for some 200 miles north of Japan.

She has taken over the north half of Korea which is its industrial and mining section, and so far has hermetically sealed it against our American representatives who are in temporary control of the agricultural south half of that country.

The brilliant, aggressive, and disruptive tactics followed by her representatives at the London session amounted to fair notice to all other members of the United Nations that Russia does not propose to permit either the Assembly or the Security Council to deflect her from carrying out her policy of world-wide penetration, leadership, and control.

There is no doubt that this role of world domination, either alone or through control of the United Nations, is a settled policy and program decided upon by the Moscow government.

Mr. Stalin's speech of February 9 places responsibility for the two world wars equally upon the capitalistic countries. And his whole appeal is for a rapid development of all Russian economic resources in order adequately to supply and support the great Russian military establishment, which is to be continued in full force and vigor "against any eventuality."

So we face our second question. What about the United States and Great Britain?

The answer to this question transcends in urgency and importance all other questions now facing not only our people and Government, but the British Commonwealth of Nations and all other capitalistic, free enterprise, and free self-governing societies.

It would be the acme of folly for the two great English-speaking nations to treat lightly the common menace of the Russian policy and program. We, as a people and Government, earnestly desire to maintain friendly and cooperative relations with the Russian Government and peoples as we do with the rest of the world. But for our own safety we cannot permit Russia to weaken and finally destroy Great Britain as a world power. The only assurance of safety for our two countries and for all other free self-governing capitalistic countries is our continuing unity in peace as in war. If we are to keep our pledged word in the United Nations Charter, America and Great Britain must cooperate completely in the speedy recovery of our war-shattered domestic economies; in the development of a prosperous and mutually profitable world trade, and in a common foreign policy.

In such a common foreign policy we shall keep our two countries strong in productive capacity and in military preparedness, so that if necessity arises we can unitedly oppose all forms of aggression, whether by great or small powers. And we shall exhaust the resources of our common statesmanship in helping to lay the permanent foundation of a new world civilization, as envisioned in the United Nations Charter, which shall insure peace and security based upon freedom and justice to all nations, great and small.

New Hampshire Town Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of New Hampshire attended town meeting. In 224 such little republics the people in traditional manner elected their town officers, straightened out their financial affairs for the ensuing year, and then discussed together their local problems and came to solutions in a real community of interest.

Although confined largely to discussions of local significance, a broader in-

terest in recent years has made itself evident with a tendency of many meetings to devote some time to the more important affairs of State and Nation. A year ago, the town meetings of New Hampshire approved overwhelmingly the participation of our country in an organization of united nations. Yesterday many of them reaffirmed their belief in such an organization.

It is significant that people in small communities meeting together to discuss their own down-to-earth problems should feel that questions dealing with law and order in a peaceful world should be likewise considered in a New England town meeting. I include herewith a telegram which I have received from one such meeting which indicates how vitally important the question of world peace and security is held by the people back home:

WINCHESTER, N. H., *March 12, 1946.*

Hon. SHERMAN ADAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Be it resolved, That we, the voters of Winchester, N. H., at this annual town meeting do hereby reaffirm our faith in the spirit and letter of our Declaration of Independence and also reaffirm our support of the proposal made at this meeting last year that the United States become an independent member of a democratic United Nations Organization for the purpose of achieving world peace and security.

THE TOWN OF WINCHESTER, N. H.

Progress in Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address which I delivered at the fourth annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Buffalo, N. Y., on March 5, 1946:

I appreciate having the opportunity to attend the annual meeting of this great organization of farmers created for the purpose of making farm production more efficient and of bringing to the farm home more of the conveniences and pleasures of modern life. I believe in organization. That's the way we get things done in this country. I know something of the activities of this organization along legislative lines and appreciate that this is only one phase of the service which you are rendering in the praiseworthy effort to bring electricity to every farm home in America.

Since your last meeting many things have happened. A great war has ended. It ended with an overwhelming victory for ourselves and our allies. The war has been won but its great objective of a just and lasting peace is not yet in sight. We are concerned, and rightly so, because of differences of opinion which have arisen between ourselves and our allies. In spite of the fact that organized fighting is over there is trouble or potential trouble in almost every quarter of the globe. The specter of want and starvation is hovering over a great part of the world. Only the Western Hemisphere is free from that threat. All of us had fond hopes that the end of the war would bring real peace, that it would mean the beginning of a new world, based upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Such is not now in sight but there has been set up a world organization which, if it functions properly, will provide the machinery for adjusting international disputes. All of us, I think, are realistic enough to know that unless this Nation and other nations can cooperate and adjust their differences in an orderly way, we are not only likely to lose the fruits of victory, but we run the risk of finding ourselves engaged in a third world war, fought with weapons even more terrible and destructive than the present-day atom bomb.

Not only is there strife and turmoil and destruction and starvation abroad in the world, but here in our own country, with all our advantages, we are torn with industrial strife and find our ability to reconvert from war to peace sadly handicapped by disputes between capital and labor. Industry's war job is finished. What we need now is cooperation between industry and labor in the production of badly needed civilian goods.

The agricultural problem is different. For the farmer the time for reconversion has not yet arrived. Hungry people the world over make it necessary for the farmers of America to continue to produce at as great or greater rate than they did during the war. That is asking a great deal because what the American farmer did then is unrivaled in all history. Workers in other fields might strike. They might slow down their production. They might haggle over wages and hours to the detriment of production, but the record of the American farmer is clear and clean. No strikes, no slow-downs, but every day just like the other—hard at work in rain or sunshine, producing food and fiber to be used by ourselves and our allies in carrying on the war and supplying the civilian population at home. There was no 40- or 50- or even 60-hour week for the American farmer. Out in Kansas farmers joked about their 8-hour day—8 hours in the forenoon and 8 hours in the afternoon. It is noteworthy, also, that with so many young farmers in the armed service, much of the burden was carried by older men and women, who normally, would have been entitled to rest and retirement.

As a result of hard work and good management, as well as long hours on the part of himself and every member of his family, the American farmer in the war years performed the greatest feat of production in all the history of agriculture. If the Nation had given the same recognition to agricultural achievement that it did to industrial achievement, millions of American farmers would have received the equivalent of an E award. If extraordinary service in agriculture had received the same recognition as the Army and Navy gave under similar circumstances, many American farmers would have been presented with Distinguished Service Medals. As it is, without medals and without awards, the American farmer can have that inner satisfaction which comes from the knowledge of a job well done.

And yet, great as were his wartime achievements, it appears that the American farmer has a bigger job cut out for him in 1946 than he had during the war years. There has never been a time in history when the world and its hungry people were so dependent upon the American farmer as they are today. As these words were being written, a group of distinguished Americans, headed by former President Hoover, were meeting in the White House with President Truman in an effort to determine how America can make a further contribution toward the feeding of a starving world. We must not only use what we have to the best advantage, but we must produce more. The farmers of America will respond to this challenge. For another year they will carry on as courageously and effectively as they did during the war. It means another year of long hours and another year of working with inadequate equipment, and with a shortage of labor. But farmers are going to go through with it. There will be no strikes, no slow-downs, no lost time. No farmer is going to quit work because he feels that the compensation is not commensurate with his efforts, notwithstanding the fact that the break in the price line under the new wage-price policy is going to mean higher costs for every farmer.

Rural electrification contributed much to the record made by farmers during the war years. It enabled many farmers to meet their goals who could not have done so otherwise. Had rural electrification been more widely extended the contribution would have been even greater. The general recognition of the great part played by rural electrification in production is shown by the action of the War Production Board last year in releasing critical materials for construction under certain conditions.

The war could not help but interrupt the growth of rural electrification. And yet, some progress was made even during these years. By the end of 1945, 45 percent of rural Americans enjoyed electric service. Now that the war is over, I want to see the rural-electrification program make up for lost time. The additional burden in the way of production placed upon the farmer at this time makes it necessary for him to get every bit of the help he can through the use of electric energy.

Now that a new era of rural electric expansion is opening up, it is perhaps a good time to check and see where we are and what lies ahead. I do not need to recount to you men who have been serving on the firing line all of the details of what has been accomplished. Although we had some farm electrification in favored areas before 1935, we all know that as a national program it had its beginning that year. The next year the passage of the Rural Electrification Act definitely committed the Federal Government to a permanent and comprehensive policy. Since then progress has been rapid. The jump from a 10 percent electrification of our rural homes to 45 percent in the last 10 years would have been considered a substantial growth even if the war had not intervened. We should make greater progress from now on. Yet we must remember that the next 45 percent is going to be more difficult than the first. In many ways the cream has been skimmed off. Balanced against this, however, is the fact that much has been learned in 10 years of experience, both in the way of construction and management. Also, we must not overlook the fact that the success of the program so far has given it an impetus which will help expand and carry it on. Moreover, there is great advantage in the fact that the American people as a whole are now back of rural electrification. That fact is reflected in the attitude of Congress in its support of legislation and appropriations.

I am glad to have this opportunity as a Member of Congress to report to the farmers of America on the legislative progress which has been made. I have already mentioned the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. It was a great achievement in agricultural and social legislation. It outlined a sound basis for a rural electrification program. Experience, however, under the act demonstrated that certain changes and improvements ought to be made, and so when, in September 1944, Congress passed the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, known as the Pace bill, there were included some very important provisions dealing with rural electrification. I am proud to have been a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture which, under the able leadership of STEVE PACE, wrote that legislation. It was presented to the full Committee on Agriculture, which approved it and reported

it favorably to the House. I feel that the Pace bill made a very definite and helpful contribution to the progress of rural electrification. The reduction of the interest rate to 2 percent and the provision for the amortization of major loans over a 35-year period contributed immensely to the objective of full-area coverage. Coming at the time it did, it will, undoubtedly, result in stepping up progress to a great degree and will make rural electric service available in many areas where it would not have been possible to make loans under the 1936 act.

You are all familiar with the Poage bill. Its present status is not so satisfactory. After long hearings the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has substituted the Harris bill and has reported that bill to the full committee. The Harris bill contains some of the provisions of the Poage bill but contains others which will hinder and handicap the rural electrification program.

I am sure that what Congress has done in recent weeks in the way of REA appropriations has been heartening to all of you. Both the House and Senate have passed a deficiency bill containing an item of $100,000,000 for REA loans. The bill is now in conference but the REA appropriation is not in question and should soon become available. The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the 1947 fiscal year is under consideration this week in the House of Representatives. It carries an item of $250,000,000 for REA loans and there is every reason to believe that when the bill becomes a law the item will be not less than it is now. It can be seen, I think, from the foregoing that Congress is strongly behind the REA program and will implement it with whatever legislation and appropriations are necessary to carry it through to a successful conclusion.

Rural electrification has now reached a stage where two principles, which have been widely discussed, are more important than ever. One is the matter of area coverage which has long been the policy of the Rural Electrification Administration, and the other is the planning policy set out in the Poage bill. The two go together. There is no way by which substantially all of rural America can be electrified except by adopting the principle of area coverage and from now on, at least, if we are to have effective area coverage, it must be made as the result of studies, surveys, and planning. In the present stage of rural electrification development there will be few opportunities to secure full area coverage except through REA cooperatives. I want to see every possible agency used to expedite the program. I want private companies to participate in it if they can but in most cases private corporations are not going to be in a position to carry out area coverage. They are operating for profit. They have stockholders to consider. While I know they want to furnish the best service possible, yet from their standpoint it will often be more profitable and less risky to serve only part of an area. In other words, they do not have the incentive to work out the plans and programs which are necessary if an entire area is to be covered.

It is a matter of chagrin to Americans that this country is behind many foreign countries in rural electrification. There are good reasons for this in some instances, one being that in many foreign countries farmers live in rural villages, which greatly reduces the cost of construction and service. Even in those countries where farmers occupy individual farms, the distances are not so great as in our country.

In every foreign country with which I am familiar advances in rural electrification have been made in part because of definite government assistance. In some countries electrification has been subsidized in one form or another. In this country we have followed a sound policy. There has been no loss to the Government. There have been no subsidies, but we have made the credit resources of the Federal Government available on a fair basis. Without such assistance our present program would not be possible.

I do not know of anything which the Federal Government can do which contributes as much to farm life as rural electrification. Today we consider electricity as absolutely essential in our towns and cities. Yet, in many ways it is much more essential in the country. It will do more to relieve drudgery on the farm, especially for the housewife, than anything else which could be done. It will bring about more leisure and, by making farm life more attractive, will enable us to keep the cream of our young people there. It will not only build up rural homes but rural communities and rural community life. That is why I want to see the job of rural electrification completed as quickly as possible. That is why I have supported and shall continue to support legislation in Congress to bring about this great objective.

Education in a Rapidly Changing Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very thoughtful and excellent address delivered by Mr. Holt McPherson, managing editor of the Shelby Daily Star, at the commencement exercises at Brevard College in February 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING AGE

(By Holt McPherson)

It is a high privilege for one who has maintained an interest in your institution and its efforts toward the cultivation of our amazing resources—and intelligence of its people is the greatest resource of a nation—to come here and participate with you this morning in your midwinter commencement exercises. It is not only a privilege, but also it is a privilege coupled with a responsibility to talk to young people about to embark upon life's way at this vital moment of human history.

Now the good old days of commencement addresses are gone with the snows of yesteryears. There was a time when haranguing a bevy of young graduates was the softest of soft snaps, for all the speaker had to do was to remind his helpless young audience that ours is a land of equal opportunity and that success comes through hard work. Then after reciting a few well-chosen quotations and incidents from the lives of George Washington, Ben Franklin, and Calvin Coolidge, he could resume his seat with knowledge of a job well done.

Nowadays it is different, quite different. Success still comes through hard work, of course, and opportunity is still equal, although that might be a hard one to attempt to prove to some of the splendid boys returning from the services and even more difficult to convince any of those making even slower progress toward getting out and back to civilian life. What happened to the Fords and Edisons when this country was young and expanding may not have much bearing on the problems of youth afloat in a Nation finding it harder to secure a peace than to win a war.

EFFECT OF ATOMIC BOMB

Yours is one of the first graduating classes to emerge into an atomic world—since the graduating classes of last June we have been thrust into an atomic age, though many of us don't seem to realize it. This new age began officially the day the first atomic bomb was dropped upon and razed the Japanese city of Hiroshima when 306,545 casualties, of which 78,150 were killed, resulted in the emergence of new concepts of power, power that can be constructive or destructive.

That atomic bomb brought with it a host of questions, questions that will have to be answered in the near future. They are not merely technical questions, they are political and social questions, and the answers we find for them will affect mankind for generations. The moment that bomb fell on Hiroshima, and its companion on Nagasaki a few days later, merely confirmed it. Thoughtful men and women in this Nation and throughout the world recognized that former values would have to be revised and will never again be what they were. It has brought us to a point in human history where war and peace are no longer phases of the same civilization—we must talk now of the life or death of civilization, and every nation must love peace when the alternative is destruction.

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, the brilliant president of Chicago University, says there is only one subject of really fundamental importance now, and that is the atomic bomb. It has the possibilities of setting off a chain reaction that could blow up the globe, but if we do not survive there is no use of our discussing what we are going to do with our lives. I prefer to think that atomic force is potentially a power for good, that it can be harnessed for constructive purposes as it has been for destructive—that the choice rests solely with man.

LIFE MAY BE LENGTHENED

You are, too, the first class to be graduated since announcement of the development of that remarkable antiage serum ACS which Russian scientists have produced and which they claim will enable us to live a normal life span of 120 to 150 years instead of the present 60 to 70 years. Now, if that's going to be the case, we've got to learn to live safely, soberly, and securely in a world in which brains and courage and grit will enable you as youngsters of 60 to see Halley's comet sail back in 1986 and enable you to set down now dates a full 100 years hence in the knowledge there is a probability you can keep them if the world keeps its head and averts self-destruction.

So I can tell you it's a queer sort of world you are going into and I can't honestly tell you it's going to be an easy one in which to live and operate. It is the kind of world that has developed machine upon machine until now we have the power to blow up the universe, but happily at the same time we have the faith to go on developing the facilities for extending the span of human life in face of all that. It may be, and this depends upon you and others of your generation, that to cure the ills of the most awesome war of all time that we should set to preparing for a still greater and more disastrous war—God forbid!

Altogether, you are graduating into a world that is an enigma, but the very fact that it is cockeyed is your big chance. It isn't going to stay in its present state of confusion; there are going to be great changes and in those changes young folks like you are going to have to play the leading role. This old world, I'm confident, is going to find the way to avert the horrible carnage and destruction of war—unlike Othello, we take no stock in the "pride, pomp, and circumstances of glorious war"; it is going to find the

way for men to live in freedom and for trade to flow past the artificial boundaries and differences that have in the past fed wars and it is going to find the way to feed and clothe and house and enable to live in comfort and security the peoples of all the globe, sharing the things that are abundant but in distribution of which we have yet to master the problems that in the past caused resort to arms by men who in the past may not have wanted war but who put up with it, under duress, in self-defense, or in the hope of retrieving something out of a patently bad situation. War never settled anything, for nothing is really settled until settled rightly.

WORLD CITIZENSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

But you do not have to tackle a world problem with that atomic spirit. Your mental horizons have no barriers and I greet each of you like St. Paul, as a citizen of the world. I would admonish you, however, that world citizenship carries graver responsibility now than ever before. But first I would tell you that you and this institution are in the midst of challenging opportunity. This splendid college, itself a jewel in a gorgeous setting, has suddenly been lifted from an outpost position into the very show window of a Nation whose millions of citizens plan to enjoy their new-found leisure and prosperity by pouring into these western hills as soon as automobiles are available and facilities are provided to accommodate the tourists who will make this area one of America's favorite playgrounds. After 4 years of war, America is returning to its country byways and city dwellings with new ideas of living. And yet, when we look back upon the history of our country and into the lives of its great sons, we find that America is in reality returning to its familiar pattern—simplicity of living and homespun hospitality. Where is there a more unspoiled symbol of simplicity of living and homespun hospitality than will be found in this part of North Carolina?

I keep under the glass top of my desk these lines by George Henry Jessop entitled "Even Today," which express the power and simplicity of living in these highlands:

"What if the bridge men build goes down?
What if the torrent sweeps the town?
The hills are safe, the hills remain,
The hills are happy in the rain!
If I can climb the hills and find
A lonely and a cleanly house
With shelves too bare to tempt a mouse,
Whatever years remain to me
I shall live out in dignity."

WNC OUTLOOK IS BRIGHT

It was Herodotus, one of the early historians, who remarked that before his time nothing much of importance happened. We, too, are less concerned today with what has gone before in this institution's development—years of significant accomplishment under the magnificent leadership of your able president, Dr. E. J. Coltrane, and his associates, in the operation and extension of this institution dedicated to serving an area rich in potentiality and whose future continued development industrially, commercially, and educationally is assumed. We hear much talk these days about a high-level economy, and God put western Carolina on intimate terms with it. Our mountain area stands to suffer less and prosper more with reconversion than do other sections of the State and Nation. There are no war-born industries to close, no populations to move. Industries that were operating before the war have expanded and prospered and are ready for that further growth needed of them to meet their post-war challenge.

Heretofore western North Carolina has striven for industrial expansion in competition with existing industries in other regions. Beginning now, and for the next several years, I think I can with safety assure you young graduates, the people of these hills can strive for industrial expansion as a major collaborator in a Nation-wide movement feeding the high-level economy which is being counted upon to carry the Nation and its people as a whole to greater wealth, accomplishment, and leisure. In this collaborative expansion, our section can seek industries with a base in agriculture—meat packing, food canning, freezing, preserving, cheese and butter making, leather and leather products, wool processing, spinning, weaving, finishing. We can expand industries based on our forests—paper and paper products, plywood, veneer; we can seek to fabricate our mineral resources into agricultural implements, chemicals, pottery and the like; we can extend the processing of "gray goods" into clothing of all kinds, we can enter into the woolen field and carry the sheared wool through to the finished products. Western North Carolina's water-power could manufacture, if properly used, many times the electricity the section is using today. Indeed, we might take a leaf from the book of Scotland—and I am fond of Scotland and Scots, delighted they have exported so many from their own country for the world in general which is benefited thereby even if Scotland is not—which is seeking through development of water power to bring the highlands a new prosperity.

But those examples mentioned represent only some of the sound possibilities for, in varying degree, the use of replaceable, nonwasting resources in which would be added high ratio of value compared to raw materials; there is a proximity of consumer and producer markets to raw materials and there would be a substantial use of manpower in relation to other factors of production. The opportunities open to you in these lines will create jobs, wages, business activity, and profits. Nor should you lose sight of the fact that in the lines of teaching, preaching, and newspapering there is opportunity, too. They do not, I think that I should admonish you, propose a satisfaction measured wholly in cash. Teaching offers a challenging opportunity, certain social advantages, long vacations, and the joy of seeing young minds develop. Preaching offers some of the same type of satisfactions as teaching, with the added sense of spiritual service. And newspapering gives its votaries a constant stimulation, a lack of routine, a possibility for friendships which neither of its competitors gives. The kind of college man or woman who is not centering his mind wholly on material things will think of these things as well as the salary scale. That there are plenty of college men and women who have avoided the materialism of the age is proved by the steady procession of graduates into these three callings, all underpaid on a purely mercenary basis. They are still going in, and on a steadily improving basis, as I can testify from my altogether pleasant experience serving on the American Council on Education for Journalism. There are more college men and women in journalism than there were two decades ago when I started into the business. They are not ignorant of the facts; every newspaperman they have met has warned them about it, but like the man or woman in love, they are unsusceptible to argument. And perhaps they are right. For, after all, a life whose satisfactions are all commercial never quite hits on all cylinders.

I think without exception the plants and the tourist industry of western North Carolina look to greater prosperity than ever before. In mid-November, 5,000 tourists tried to buy souvenirs from the Cherokee Indians on top of the Great Smokies, and equally as many left the area because there were no places open for them to eat and get lodging. The Great Smoky Mountains National Park will channel a flood of an estimated 10,000,000 tourists into North Carolina. Completion of the Blue Ridge Parkway will connect the Great Smoky with the Shenandoah National Park; contract is to be let this spring for the final link from Craggy Gardens to Mount Mitchell to complete that marvelous 500 miles of roadway with an average elevation of 3,000 feet, a veritable skyway affording the most gorgeous scenery to be found anywhere in this atom-conscious world.

All of this means, of course, that Brevard College is challenged to keep pace with that development just as each of you is challenged to take the well-rounded training you have had here—it is far better than any advice I can give you—and dedicate it to the years of usefulness that God has in store for you. You have been trained in one of the splendid schools of the Methodist church, a school dedicated to the high purpose of equipping boys and girls for lives of service and useful living—I like to think of it in the same way we regard that remarkably flourishing Baptist junior college, Gardner-Webb, near Shelby, whose slogan is "Serving all who want her service, blessing all with outstretched hands."

BREVARD COLLEGE PRAISED

This institution, child of the Western North Carolina Conference which is one of Southern Methodism's richest and most outstanding, has wrought wonderfully with what it has had in the way of physical facilities through the years of its emergence to a front-line position educationally in a West that is unlikely to have any large schools but which needs have the best and the strongest institutions apace of the growing needs of an area moving forward more rapidly than any other section of the country. Brevard College is the one Methodist college west of High Point; it has been operated thus far on the concept that education is good business, and I think all of us will agree that it is the best business, because education combined with natural resources and native ability—of those we have the finest, you know—makes an unbeatable triumvirate. With all the changing concepts since Hiroshima's razing there has been no alteration of the fact that education and morality constitute the force and character of free government. Nor has there been any change in the fact that young people have got to be more hardheaded in assessing the facts of their world, more imaginative in changing those facts to conform more nearly to a decent world. I don't know whether this world suffers more from prejudice and ignorance or from inability to conceive anything better. In any event, the time is right, I am convinced, to emphasize anew that courage, vision, and hope are necessary if we are to get a new perspective upon the opportunities that abound close at home but which must be preserved in a nation willing to cling to priciples of justice upon which it was founded and which must live in a world that can have no peace in these mountains if there is no peace in Asia, or the Balkans or China. We must never lose sight of the fact that ours is a duty to build a peace, for without it there will be no civilization worth fighting for. Let it not be said by numb and horror-stricken cave dwellers of a succeeding age, after future atomic wars, that ours was a civilization possessed of great technological power and accomplishment—that would be after most of mankind had been vaporized in a flame of reddish nitrogen—but that when we came to living together we were a bunch of idiots. Let us in the blinding clear light of nuclear physics do what we can to dispel the doctrines of bigotry, discrimination, and prejudice, for, after all, education's principal purpose is, as one of my old professors drilled into us, to teach us the art of living together happily, successfully. It's as simple as that, my young friends.

Western North Carolina is in the midst of undergoing change; it is peopled by men

and women who have kept their eyes on new horizons, who were thankful for land, the opportunity to develop it and for the blessings that surround them. This section was built by pluck, patience, and perseverance, and here in the West we have an abundance of material to stimulate our planning for its greatest development and usefulness. What has happened, the giant industries bringing employment and utilizing our resources, the huge power developments, the roads and the millions being attracted by our scenic grandeur, are but a preview of what is to come to make this section an even more flourishing and well-rounded center of industry and agriculture, together with simple but gracious hospitality that will bring into our midst a cosmopolite people interested mostly in health, happiness, and heaven, three things that money can't buy but in development of which we in western Carolina truly specialize.

SMALL COLLEGES IMPORTANT

Just as I hope that each of you will set your hand to the important task of helping to build the structure that challenges our great section, I hope this college will never go in for bigness. I think there is too much confusion in higher learning in America and the ending of the confusion can best be achieved by institutions such as this offering a sound general education, dedicated to keeping the area it serves abreast of the educational challenge by gearing its program to the functional needs of the general community which in the case of Brevard is sufficiently broad and challenging to occupy and command the finest efforts within the power of this school.

There is too much tendency today for public men to state a problem and think merely by stating it that it will work itself out. Would that our problems were met successfully as easily as that. You young men and young women and we of the generation preceding you who are still sticking around in hope of landing a State distributorship for that antiage serum are destined to take significant places in the business and professional life of the communities in which you settle. I would caution you to keep in mind ever that it is a responsibility of good citizenship and good conscience to see that spiritual and moral progress keep apace of the material growth of any community in which you live and operate.

"AMERICANISM" IS THE BEST

Now almost every day you will meet some fellow who claims that our American way of life is all wrong. The pulling and tearing incident to industrial and social strife feed that talk, and we are pelted with fancy statistics that injustice abounds, that this or another ism would be better than our own Americanism.

Such fellows cause me to think of that hot-tempered collegian who awoke late one morning and found his expensive alarm clock had betrayed him. In a fit of anger he dashed it against the wall. The result was that he had two problems—the alarm clock was now completely ruined and a hole in the plaster had to be repaired.

I have never seen a thinking man or woman who thought that America is perfect. But the truth is that our system has worked a lot better than any other, and one thing that caused it to work and is essential to its continued working is the power of force of educated men and women who refuse to surrender to unsound and unworthy men and women who are more interested in getting than giving, who are less interested in the fairness than the advantage to be had from a situation, but rather are interested in elevating to authority men who are dedicated to improving the American system rather than scrapping it.

I have a friend who, to protect himself against detractors of the American system, carries this clipping and I commend it to you:

"Scarcely 7 percent of the world's population lives in the United States. Yet in this country we have produced one-half of the wealth of the globe. We have more material comforts, more culture and more leisure than any other country. We have achieved this highly desirable state in about 150 years of national existence."

Now the job of holding the gains that have been made, of extending the horizons and the frontiers of a section, a nation, and a world that is of necessity one world and one brotherhood of men and nations, in which the power of human understanding is the really effective force that will harness atomic force and so put it constructively to work that life will be worth living those 120 to 150 years is sufficient to warrant your sincerest effort, your highest devotion to duty, and all the brains and courage you can muster. You look as if you have what it takes; good luck to you, but I cannot conclude without sending you on your way ringing in your ears Dr. Joseph Fort Newton's definition of when a man or woman is educated:

"When he can look out upon the universe, now lucid and lovely, now dark and terrible, with a sense of his own littleness in the great scheme of things, and yet have faith and courage. When he knows how to make friends and keep them, and, above all, when he can keep friends with himself. When he loves flowers, can hunt the birds without a gun, and feels the stir of a forgotten joy in the laugh of a child. When star-crowned trees and the glint of sunlight on flowing waters subdue him like the memory of one much loved and long dead. When he can be happy alone, and high-minded amid the meaner drudgeries of life. When he can look into a wayside puddle and see something besides mud, and into the face of the most forlorn mortal and see something beyond sin. When he knows how to live, how to love, how to hope, how to pray—glad to live and not afraid to die, in his hands a sword for evil, in his heart a bit of a song."

The Political Philosophy of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Political Philosophy of Abraham Lincoln," published in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of Friday, February 8, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

We are approaching the season when many speeches will be made about the life and services of Abraham Lincoln. It is altogether fitting that the date of his birth should be celebrated. He was one of the outstanding figures in American history. He sprang from the common people, and his life was devoted to the defense of the oppressed and the enslaved. A reading of his speeches and writings reveals how completely his thoughts and efforts were absorbed in the battle to prevent the extension of human slavery.

"The Lord must have loved the common people or he would not have made so many of them."

No leader in the public life of the Nation had a better understanding of the desires and the aspirations of the common man. He was a product of the prairies and the soil of the Middle West. He knew the life of the pioneers, because his life was shared with them. There is a good deal of evidence to show that he was the choice of destiny to guide this Nation through the most crucial period of its history.

His life in the prairie years taught him much about people and human nature. He was a politician who understood the motives of men and the wellsprings of their actions. The letters he wrote to his political colleagues abound with shrewd observations, and astute knowledge of political situations. He had an acute appreciation of public opinion and its effect on the determination of the issues under consideration This is shown in his famous statement:

"You can fool some of the people all of the time, you can fool some of them part of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

Just now when we are having strikes and labor agitation it should be informative to survey the Lincoln record on labor in his time.

His opposition to slave labor was uncompromising. He believed that such labor violated the principles of the Declaration of Independence and debased the slave owners and undermined free labor. In his debates with Douglas he never failed to espouse the rights of the common masses and to denounce the evils of slavery. His whole public career was built around his antagonism to the slave-owning aristocracy.

His political descendants are not so vigorous in their opposition to the economic royalists who inherit the spirit and attitude of the old slave regime. If Abraham Lincoln should be looking from his ivory tower above, we wonder what he would think of the coalition in Congress between a group of southern reactionaries and northern Republicans who are fighting against greater freedom and justice for the masses especially in the South.

Specifically we have in mind, the poll-tax device, full employment, discrimination in employment, minimum wage requirements, and oppressive labor legislation.

In some notes for a speech he was preparing when he was a Member of Congress we find the following statement:

"Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things by right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all ages of the world, that some have labored and others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as is possible, is a worthy object of any good government."

This is the doctrine enunciated by the great founder of the Republican Party. There is a simplicity and directness in these words that make his ideas clear as crystal. His party has wandered far from such conceptions. It would in fact be party mutiny to expound these ideas of Lincoln to their logical conclusion at a dinner in his honor today.

Lincoln had no formal education, but he had remarkable intellectual development from the time he ran for Congress until he was elected President. This covered a period of 20 years, and included a term in Congress, the debates with Douglas, and the campaign for the Presidency. In that time he gradually developed a definite political philosophy which was summarized in a speech at Alton, Ill., in 1858. He said:

"That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in the country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles, right and wrong, throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other, the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says 'You toil and work and earn bread and I will eat it.'

"No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle."

Students say this is the essence of the Lincoln political philosophy. Its application is just and eternal in the relations of men. Lincoln was the implacable adversary of oppression and injustice. The Lincoln anniversary this year provides a golden opportunity for the discussion of human rights and political freedom. It would be inspiring if the orators would take their texts from the sayings of Lincoln, and confine themselves to an analysis and interpretation of his political creed.

OPA Milk Policy and the Milk Famine in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a critical situation existing in my district in the State of Oregon with reference to the supply of milk and other dairy products. Urgent appeals have been made to OPA to provide for a solution of the problem, but my advices to date are that nothing has been done. I have appealed to Mr. Paul Porter, OPA Administrator, to give immediate attention to this emergency and provide for the continuation of the milk industry in the Portland area, which comprises my district.

The milk producers have likewise appealed to OPA, urging that immediate steps be taken to prevent the complete shutting off of all milk supplies to the area which comprises approximately one-third of the population of the State of Oregon. I am informed that butter has completely disappeared from the market and the dairy associations have informed OPA that it will be necessary for them to discontinue milk deliveries on March 15 unless a solution is found for the problem. At the present time, according to the report of the retail milk associations, the prices permitted for milk sales are insufficient to cover the cost of production and delivery.

The critical situation is set forth in detail in a full-page statement by these associations which appeared in local newspapers in Portland. I include as part of these remarks the following statement which appeared in the Oregon Journal on Wednesday, March 6, 1946:

SHALL OPA PRICE MILK OFF THE MARKET AS THEY HAVE BUTTER?—OPA PRICE POLICY MEANS MILK FAMINE FOR OREGON

Fresh bottled milk will soon be as rare as butter—unless the OPA is curbed. This is no exaggeration. The Government's price policy on dairy products during the past 4 years has disillusioned American dairy farmers. Dairymen cannot continue to produce milk at present prices because of increasing costs of labor, feed, and equipment. They are selling their cows. They are turning to other crops. The entire dairy industry and your daily supply of milk will soon disappear unless the bungling price policy of OPA is corrected. The milk problem is your responsibility. Study the reasons for today's serious milk shortage.

MILK PRICES FROZEN EARLY

Early in 1942 war conditions with higher labor and feed costs started a decline in A grade production. Producing dairy groups feeling the pinch, petitioned the then State milk-control board for an increase in price to offset increased costs.

While the State milk-control board was holding a hearing to raise prices both to the consumers and producer, the OPA general freeze order on consumers' prices was made effective April 28, 1942, at 14 cents per quart. The producer ceiling was frozen at 87 cents per pound butterfat effective February 13, 1943.

Had OPA allowed the adjustment contemplated by the State milk-control board in April 1942, many believe A grade milk production could have been maintained, especially in view of the increase in producers' price to 95 cents, allowed by OPA July 1, 1943, made possible by the saving in every other day delivery. This with the feed subsidy payments to producers might have saved A grade production.

GRADE A MILK PRODUCTION DECREASED

Farm labor was drained into high pay industrial jobs and sons of farmers enlisted or were drafted into the armed forces.

While A grade production decreased 23 percent from December 1941 to December 1945, total production of milk increased in 1943 and 1944. How was this accomplished?

Dairymen, their wives and children worked 10 to 16 hours a day, every day in the year with subsistence pay and no overtime as their contribution toward the winning of the war. Many who were sending cream only to the market and feeding the skim milk to livestock changed to sending in whole milk.

MILK CONSUMPTION INCREASED GREATLY

The low ceiling price on milk with the higher income of the average consumer has resulted in a 25 percent per capita increase in consumption of fresh fluid milk throughout the country, which has more than absorbed the increase in production of 1943 and 1944, thus draining milk into fresh fluid channels that were formerly used in the manufacture of butter, skim-milk powder, and other dairy products.

During the war dairymen in this area diverted milk from manufacturing channels into the fresh bottle milk trade at lower returns to themselves. This was done for the reason that in normal times the fresh-milk market makes greatest returns to producers and they wished to keep that trade.

ALARMING DROP IN PRODUCTION

Oregon disposed of unusually large numbers of dairy cows in 1945, according to annual livestock survey of Crop Reporting Service. "January 1, 1946, there were 8 percent less dairy cows 2 years and over than January 1945, and 10,000 less than the 10-year average. Number of heifers January 1, 1946, intended for milk cows was 11,000 less than January 1, 1945." The same trend exists throughout the United States and liquidation of dairy herds has been greatly increased since January 1, 1946.

RELIEF EXPECTED AFTER WAR

Dairymen believed, when the war was over, price ceilings would be off and normal price relationships of dairy products would be restored in the market place. However, it now appears that price controls will be on indefinitely.

Now that the war is over, dairymen do not feel obligated longer to endanger the health of themselves and their families by long hours of labor and at the same time mortgage their farms, herds, and homes that the consumers may continue to get milk and dairy products at less than cost.

Returning veterans are not interested in dairy production. It is estimated that the average age of dairymen in this area is 58 years. Many carried on during the war so that their herds could be turned over to sons returning from the war. Most are not returning to the dairy farms. They can see no future in a 7-day 80-or-more-hour week at subsistence pay.

OPA DEAF TO REASON AND COMMON SENSE

OPA officials say: "Manufacturing milk prices are too high." If this is so why the greatest shortage of butter, cheese, and powdered skim milk in the history of our country—all these come from manufacturing milk?

OPA and some consumers say, "Low-income families cannot buy what milk they need if price goes up." Can they buy butter? The price is low, so low there isn't any butter. Do we want milk to disappear as has butter? Is the burden of caring for the low-income families the exclusive obligation of the dairy farmer?

OPA pricing policy based on what low-income families can pay will decrease production and bankrupt the Nation.

Over the past 3 years, reasoning and common sense have not been effective with OPA in getting price and adjustments for dairymen or in getting equitable adjustments between adjacent markets. Any adjustments made have been accomplished only when a community was in danger of losing its milk supply.

DAIRYMEN'S REPLY TO OPA

The State department of agriculture, milk-control division, has now been in operation 11 years, beginning in March 1934, and have the daily, monthly, and yearly records of production and distribution on this and other markets of the State, including audits of distributors' records for cost of distribution and records with charts showing trends of production in relation to prices all these years.

The records are available to OPA and have been all during the war period. They have not availed themselves of these records until the current request of producers reached them.

If full use is made of these records and the personal knowledge of the staff of the State department of agriculture, milk-control division, we firmly believe that a satisfactory application and recommendation can be made and returns received from the OPA office in Washington within the time requested in our application.

DAIRYMEN ASK ONLY MINIMUM NEEDED TO MAINTAIN PRODUCTION

The dairymen request 20 cents per pound butterfat increase over the present 95-cent price which would make $1.15 per pound butterfat or a 30-cent differential over the going factory milk price of 85 cents being

paid by condenseries and others in this area. This is an increase to the producer of 80 cents per 100 pounds of 4 percent milk or approximately 1¾ cents per quart for a family of four people; this would be an increase of approximately $1.05 per month or 26 cents per person. It is estimated that this price will stimulate A grade production of those still on the market, cause some factory milk producers to qualify for grade A and encourage dairymen whose farms are equipped for grade A but have been idle during the war to again stock dairy cattle. This program, we believe, will eventually return to Portland and outlying communities the same high quality milk supply built up over a number of years at great expense to dairymen and hard work on their part as well as city health authorities and public-spirited citizens.

LOCAL OPA ESTIMATES 10 WEEKS NECESSARY

Dairymen supplying over 81 percent of Portland's milk on February 11 filed a formal application with OPA requesting an increase in price from the present 95 cents to $1.15 per pound butterfat in milk with necessary increases to consumers to enable distributors to pay the production increase. February 28 was suggested as the deadline for action.

To make study of cost of production of 20 to 25 dairy farmers and 10 distributors—4 weeks beginning February 18. To tabulate field data and combine with other data—2 weeks. Estimated time from submission of data to Washington until reply may be received—3 weeks. Thus making an estimated 10 weeks from February 11, the date of our application.

DAIRYMEN OFFER OPA A REASONABLE PLAN

Recognizing the OPA's capacity for stalling and still believing OPA could act within the original time limit, the dairymen have voluntarily extended the time limit to March 15.

Oregon dairymen cannot brook further delay. If it is not possible to get action through common-sense reasoning or public demand, then the dairymen must consider turning to other crops in order to earn a living. The responsibility is squarely upon OPA which now stands between the consumer and a continued supply of fresh milk. Dairymen are ready and anxious to produce milk at a fair price. The OPA, in a few hours' time, can grant a slight increase which will prevent a serious milk famine in Oregon.

PORTLAND INDEPENDENT MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION.
BATTLEGROUND DAIRYMEN'S CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.
FARMERS' DAIRY ASSOCIATION.
DAIRY COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely urge, on behalf of the thousands of families living in this great metropolitan area, that an immediate solution of the problem be found and that OPA, in response to the urgent appeals by citizens of this area, will adopt the necessary regulations which will permit this industry, so vital to public health, to continue operating.

British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in July 1941 the RFC made a loan of $390,000,000 to the British Government. At that time the British were desperately in need of dollar exchange in the United States. In order to secure the loan the British Government expropriated securities, owned by British citizens and nationals, in American industries, and thus became a substantial owner, if not in many cases the controlling owner of stocks of American companies.

If Great Britain could acquire ownership to such a large proportion of our industries and business establishments for $390,000,000, think how much more she can acquire with a gift or loan of $3,700,000,000 as the New Deal administration advocates. I insert, by unanimous consent, a list of the securities Great Britain obtained with the loan of $390,000,000 from the RFC in 1941:

British holdings in United States industry

Name of company	Stock or security	Number of shares— Originally pledged	Number of shares— Held on Oct. 31, 1945
Allied Stores Corp	Cumulative preferred	35,000	None
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	Common	19,000	19,000
Amerada Petroleum Corp	do	133,000	133,000
American & Foreign Power	$7 first cumulative preferred	100,000	100,000
American Locomotive	Cumulative preferred	4,800	4,800
Do	Common		8,400
American News Co	Capital	10,000	10,000
American Rolling Mills	Common	133,000	133,000
American Smelting & Refining Co	do	56,000	56,000
American Sugar Refining Co	Cumulative preferred	4,000	4,000
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	Capital	70,000	70,000
American Tobacco Co	Nonvoting common B	34,000	34,000
Arkansas Power & Light	$7 cumulative preferred	6,000	3,975
Barnsdall Oil Co	Common	50,000	50,000
Briggs Manufacturing Co	Capital	34,800	34,800
Chrysler Corp	Common	36,000	36,000
Columbia Gas & Electric Co	6 percent cumulative preferred, series A.	19,000	19,000
Commercial Investment Trust Financial Corp	Common	59,000	59,000
Commonwealth & Southern	$6 cumulative preferred	50,000	50,000
Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power of Baltimore.	Common	11,000	11,000
Continental Baking Co	8 percent cumulative preferred	12,000	None
Eastman Kodak Co	Common	57,000	57,000
Electric Power & Light Corp	$6 cumulative preferred	15,000	15,000
Flintkote Co	Common	27,000	27,000
First National Bank of City of New York	Capital	1,300	1,300
General American Transportation	Common	10,000	10,000
General Motors Corp	do	434,000	434,000
Gillette Safety Razor Co	$5 dividend cumulative convertible preferred.	30,000	30,000
W. T. Grant Co	Common	11,800	23,600
Great Northern Ry. Co	$6 preferred	44,000	44,000
Ingersoll-Rand Co	Common	54,000	54,000
Loews, Inc	do	34,000	102,000
P. Lorillard Co	do	12,500	12,500
Marlin-Rockwell Corp	Common, capital	7,000	7,000
McGraw Electric Co	Common	20,700	20,700
Monsanto Chemical Co	do	53,000	53,000
National Biscuit Co	do	60,000	60,000
New York Air Brake Co	do	8,500	8,500
Oxford Paper Co	$5 cumulative preferred	25,000	25,000
Public Service Corp. of New Jersey	Common	24,000	24,000
Radio Corp. of America	do	177,000	177,000
Do	$3.50 cumulative convertible preferred.	8,000	8,000
St. Joseph Lead Co	Common	10,000	10,000
Sears, Roebuck & Co	Capital	47,000	47,000
Servel, Inc	Common	30,000	30,000
Shell Union Oil Co	do	900,000	900,000
Simmons Co	do	17,500	17,500
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	Capital	130,000	130,000
Standard Brands	Common	170,000	170,000
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	Capital	315,000	315,000
Sterling Drug, Inc	Common	36,000	72,000
Timken Roller Bearing Co	do	19,000	19,000
Tri-Continental Corp	$6 cumulative preferred	30,000	30,000
United Shoe Machinery Co	Common	15,000	15,000
United States Steel Corp	Cumulative preferred	21,000	21,000
Vick Chemical Co	Capital	10,000	10,000
Westinghouse Air Brake Co	do	40,000	40,000
Wheeling Steel Corp	$5 cumulative convertible prior preferred.	7,000	7,000
F. W. Woolworth Co	Capital	247,000	247,000
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co	Common	75,000	75,000
Celanese Corp. of America	7 percent cumulative prior preferred	52,519	None
Do	7 percent cumulative second preferred	45,783	45,783
Do	Common	321,135	335,096
Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co	$3 cumulative convertible preferred	32,978	32,978
Climax Molybdenum Co	Common	89,995	89,995
Congoleum-Nairn, Inc	do	299,181	299,181
Dividend Shares, Inc	Capital	3,655,550	3,655,550
W. R. Grace & Co	8 percent A cumulative preferred	4,700	3,676
Do	8 percent noncumulative B preferred	4,100	3,667
Do	6 percent cumulative preferred	3,400	2,885
Do	Common	26,400	52,452
Great Northern Iron Ore	Trustee certificates of beneficial interest.	79,132	79,132
International Paper Co	5 percent cumulative convertible preferred.	53,334	53,334
John Morrell & Co	Capital	57,000	51,294
Pure Oil Co	5 percent cumulative convertible preferred.	8,693	8,693
Singer Manufacturing Co	Capital	74,173	73,701
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	do	198,002	198,002
Consolidated Natural Gas Co	do		19,800
United States and International	$5 cumulative first preferred	29,998	29,488

British holdings in United States industry—Continued

SECURITIES OTHER THAN STOCK

Name of company	Stock or security	Number of shares— Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
American & Foreign Power	5 percent gold debentures	$2,750,000	$2,750,000
Cities Service Power & Light Co	5½ percent gold debentures due 1952	350,000	None
Cities Service	5 percent convertible gold debentures	1,237,600	1,237,600
Virginian Corp	Collateral trust 5 percent serial note, series M.	1,974,000	1,974,000

UNLISTED STOCKS AND SECURITIES IN WHICH THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT IS A SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING OWNER

		Shares	*Shares*
United States Potash	6 percent preferred	615	None
Do	Common	202,480	162,480
Delta & Pine Land Co	Capital	2,976	2,976
Delta Planning Co	Common	3,434	None
Linen Thread Co	Capital	90,000	90,000
Yardley of London	4½ percent preferred	30,595	30,595
Do	Common	87,247	130,870
Harry Ferguson, Inc	A, common	6,000	6,000
Do	B, common	1,500	1,500
R. T. French Co	Capital	35,000	35,000
Atlantis Sales Corp	do	50	50
Oldbury Electro-Chemical Co	do	8,400	8,400
Lea & Perrins, Inc	A, common	2,107	2,107
Do	B, common	5	5
Arkwright Finishing Co	Capital	7,000	7,000
Interlaken Mills	do	19,969	19,969
Distillers Co., Ltd	do	850,250	850,250
Morganite Brush Co., Inc	do	7,500	7,500
B. Priestly & Co., Inc	do	2,500	2,500
Firth Sterling Steel Co	7 percent cumulative preferred	2,532	None
Firth Sterling Co	Common	40,752	None
Keasby & Mattison	Capital	20,140	20,140
Funch Edye & Co	do	12,000	12,000
Twenty-Five Broadway Corp	do	11,300	11,300
Baker Perkins Co., Inc	7 percent cumulative preferred	1,049	None
Do	Capital	64,696	64,696
Pacific Molasses Co., Ltd	do	3,750	37,500
A. J. White, Ltd	do	500	500
Menley & James, Ltd	do	1,550	1,550
Hecht, Levis & Kahn, Inc	do	4,000	4,000
Crown Mills, Inc	7 percent cumulative preferred	5,000	None
Do	Capital	100	100
American Association, Inc	do	151,844	151,844
Mica Insulator Co	do	5,359	5,359
C. Tenant Sons & Co. of New York	do	7,164	2,129
American Thread Co	5 percent cumulative preferred	427,477	381,674
Do	Common	1,197,375	1,197,375
Joseph Tetley & Co., Inc	8 percent cumulative preferred	4,580	4,580
Do	Common	4,000	4,000
Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co	8 percent cumulative first preferred	610	610
Do	8 percent noncumulative preferred	31,600	31,600
Do	Common	197,334	197,334
J. & P. Coates (Rhode Island), Inc	Capital	144,991	144,991
Clark Thread Co	do	179,991	179,991
Clark Thread Co. of Georgia	do	18,605	18,605
North Georgia Processing Co., Inc	do	800	800
Stowell-MacGregor Corp	Common	4,399	4,399
Spool Cotton Co., Inc	Capital	2,491	2,491
Jonas Brook & Bros. (U. S. A.)	do	92	92
Dentist Supply Co. of New York	Common	100,765	100,765
F. W. Cook Co	Capital	1,005	1,005
Norma Hoffman Bearings Corp	6 percent cumulative preferred	7,029	7,029
Do	Common	90,000	90,000
Ensign-Bickford Co	do	10,779	10,779
Okonite-Callender Cable	6 percent noncumulative preferred	1,000	1,000
Do	Common capital	7,495	7,495
Pembroke Chemical Corp	Capital	255	255
Josiah Wedgwood & Sons	B, capital	440	440
Do	A, capital	300	300

British Government-owned stock and securities in American industries

Name of company	Stock or security	Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
Delta & Pine Land Co	First mortgage bonds	$3,000,000	$2,687,633.10
Do	Demand note	1,800,000	1,689,731.00
American Association, Inc	5 percent second mortgage B income debentures.	1,420,250	1,420,250.00
Assignment of Fine Cotton Spinners and Doublers Association, of money due from Delta & Pine Land Co. of Mississippi.		1,926,000	1,926,000.00
Assignment from Dunlop Tire & Rubber Corp		26,347,350	26,097,350.40
Okonite-Callender Cable Co	First mortgage, 5-percent debentures	275,000	75,000.00
Total		34,768,600	33,895,964.50

British-owned shares in United States insurance companies

Name of company	Originally pledged (shares)	Held Oct. 31, 1945 (shares)
Central Union Insurance Co	4,955	4,955
Provident Fire Insurance Co	18,200	18,200
Manhattan Fire & Marine Insurance Co	2,425	2,425
Seaboard Fire & Marine Insurance Co	39,394	39,394
Yorkshire Indemnity Co	4,500	4,500
Eagle Fire Co. of New York	99,325.84	99,325.84
Norwich Union Indemnity Co	5,000	5,000
Albany Insurance Co	16,870	16,870
Prudential Insurance Co. of Great Britain, in New York	5,926	5,926
Caledonian-American Insurance Co	2,955	2,955
Total shares	199,550.84	199,550.84

Great Britain owes the United States prior to World War II, as follows:

Principal unpaid	$4,368,000,000.00
Interest postponed and payable under moratorium	131,520,000.00
Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium	1,916,144,782.58
Total owing United States before World War II	6,415,664,782.58
Proposed loan of	3,750,000,000.00
Surplus property and lend-lease materials	650,000,000.00
Total owing to United States by Britain if proposed loan is made	10,815,664,782.58

The interest on this amount alone at the low figure of 2 percent will be $216,300,000 annually—alone.

The record shows what happened to their previous obligation to us.

Have we any reason to believe they will do different with the present?

BRITISH HOLDINGS

According to most reliable information the original authorization was for	$425,000,000
Actually received by British from RFC	390,000,000
Balance due on loan after crediting accumulated reserve income	242,925,058
Value of listed securities at time of loan	205,000,000
Value of unlisted securities at time of loan	115,000,000
Value of insurance stocks at time of loan	180,000,000
Total value of securities at time of loan	500,000,000
Value of listed securities as of Nov. 22, 1945 (as stated by RFC)	350,000,000
Value of unlisted securities as of Nov. 22, 1945	185,000,000
Value of insurance stocks as of Nov. 22, 1945	225,000,000
Total value of securities as of Nov. 22, 1945	760,000,000
Increase in value since time of loan	260,000,000

Removal of Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Zenas L. Potter, special assistant to the Price Administrator, before National Marketing Conference of the United States Chamber of Commerce February 25, 1946:

Not long since I was a speaker at a meeting in a southern city at which Gene Kelly, the moving picture actor, also was to make an address. I finally got word in my hotel room that they were ready to take me to the auditorium. I entered the elevator, unaware of any special circumstance, but when the door was opened after the descent the hotel lobby was crowded with bobby-soxers ready to scream, then swoon upon the expected appearance of Gene Kelly. When I emerged they said instead, "Oh-h-h-h."

I am sure that tonight you also feel like saying "Oh-h-h-h." I am as disappointing a substitute for Chester Bowles as I was for Gene Kelly.

Mr. Bowles, however, has had placed upon his shoulders an even greater responsibility than that which rested upon them when your invitation was extended to him. He has the task of making a livable pattern out of the broken pieces of the Government's previous wage-price policy. The President outlined the new policy, but the details as to when and how wage increases may be reflected in price increases depend upon Mr. Bowles' program. Many labor controversies remain unsettled awaiting his pronouncement. Under these circumstances, I am sure you are glad Mr. Bowles has remained in Washington and sent me in his stead.

As you know, Mr. Bowles has asked Congress to extend price-control legislation for another year beyond June 30. If any of you think that desire to hold their jobs has led OPA executives to join in this recommendation, I want to assure you that you are mistaken. One of our most difficult tasks is to persuade our top men to stay on the job until their work is done. Almost all of them made far more money before the war than they receive from the Government. And, as Mr. Bowles said last week, working conditions in Washington are not too good. He had just been facing one of his periodic intergovernmental difficulties. As he emerged from the White House, a reporter asked him if he still was with the Government. "Yes," he replied, "I am still with the Government. The pay is good but working conditions are lousy."

The last thing any top executive at OPA wants is to make his present job his life work.

From time to time we hear also that there are men in OPA who, because of their social philosophy, want price control to become permanent. On that issue I am certain that a vote among top OPA executives would be as unanimous as a vote on the subject taken here tonight. There would be no votes for permanence.

On one issue, and only one issue, might we be in disagreement; that is as to the time when controls should be removed.

The very powerful National Association of Manufacturers last November voted for removal of all controls by February 15—that was a week ago last Friday. The association is now spending a sum reported by Drew Pearson to be $2,000,000, trying to persuade the American people, through advertising, that it is in their interest that price controls be ended at once. I am very certain that if their fund amounted to $20,000,000, their advertising campaign would be a failure. In a quarter of a century spent in advertising, I learned one important thing: to advertise successfully you have to have something that will serve the public well if it is purchased. The N. A. M. does not have a salable product. The American people are not in the market for economic tragedy.

If economic history teaches us anything, it makes crystal clear that inflationary pressures do not end when war ends. In World War I, without price control, living costs rose 62 percent; but after the armistice, in spite of the unrestricted inflation that had taken place during the war, consumer prices went on up until in April 1920 they were 108.5 percent above prewar levels. Forty-three percent of the total inflation came after the armistice.

Businessmen were extremely well satisfied during the rise. In addition to making operating profits, they got inventory profits that made their operating profits hardly worth looking at. Imagine having your inventories grow 40 to 50 percent in value in a year and a half. All you needed to get rich was a big inventory.

When prices rise on war's inflationary pressures, however, they never stay up. And in May 1920, they collapsed, bringing our whole economic structure down about our ears. Prices fell over 40 percent in 13 short months. And what a cost the American people paid for the postwar inflation.

Corporation profits of six billion four hundred million in 1919 turned to losses of fifty-five million in 1921, and in the next 5 years, 106,000 businesses failed—40 percent more than had failed in the last 5 years before the war. Business bankruptcies were at the rate of 20,000 a year. By way of contrast, I may say that in 1945, amid the widespread hardships created by OPA, just 810 businesses failed. If you doubt these figures, consult Dun and Bradstreet. It is they who keep the records of business fatalities.

Economic suffering, however, was not confined to business. Factory employment dropped 31 percent; factory pay rolls shrank 44 percent. And unemployment increased by 5,624,000, just when the Nation needed to absorb discharged veterans in civilian jobs.

Building cost rose 145 percent in 2 years, resulting in a buyer's strike and the postwar building boom lasted only 1 year. Over 400,000 families in the meantime had bought or built new homes at highly inflated prices, and great numbers lost their homes, and with them their wartime savings, through mortgage foreclosures.

Farmers, however, were hit hardest of all. Farm prices collapsed. Potatoes, for example, that sold for $6 a bushel in May 1920 sold for $1.25 a bushel 1 year later. Cotton, that sold for 37½ cents a pound, 1 year later sold for 9½ cents. Average farm incomes dropped from $1,360 in 1919 to $460 in 1921.

In the heyday of the inflation farmers were next door to heaven. As money rolled in they built the extra rooms on their houses they had wanted so long, or erected new silos or barns. Many reached out and enlarged their acreage. With money flowing in it would take only a few years to pay off the mortgages they placed on their farms to get the needed cash.

Result: In the next 5 years 453,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures.

If these were just statistics it would not matter, but wrapped up in them was stark tragedy for millions of Americans. Imagine the sleepless nights of worry spent by the 106,000 businessmen who failed, and by the hundreds of thousands of others whose profits turned to losses; by the 5,600,000 extra unemployed; by the workers who kept their jobs but saw their incomes shrink 44 percent; by the 453,000 farmers and their families who saw not only their homes but their jobs go out of the window, because of forces over which they had not the slightest control.

No thank you, Mr. Wason, of the NAM, the American people would not buy your bill of goods if you had a hundred million to spend for advertising. You never could convince the American people that it would be to their advantage to go through that kind of a wringer again.

Would we go through a wringer again if we followed Mr. Wason's advice? Let us examine the probabilities.

The war that put the American people through the wringer in 1919, 1920, and 1921 cost a total of $32,000,000,000. The recent war cost $301,000,000,000—almost 10 times as much. The truth is that our military expenditure in the first year after VJ-day will total $41,000,000,000, or $9,000,000,000 more than the total cost of World War I. And yet some people tell us the war is over and we can with blithe spirits throw off the shackles of controlled prices and return to normalcy.

Normalcy—remember that word? Remember what happened when we returned to it last time!

During World War I currency in circulation, under the stimulus of war financing, rose from $3,100,000,000 to $4,900,000,000—a total rise of $1,800,000,000. During the recent war currency in circulation rose from $7,200,000,000 to $28,200,000,000—a total rise of $21,000,000,000, or more than 11 times the rise of World War I.

Balances in checking accounts in banks—the foundation of our other form of money—rose in World War I from $10,100,000,000 to $14,800,000,000, a total rise of $4,700,000,000. In World War II they rose from $27,400,000,000 to $80,500,000,000—a total rise of $53,100,000,000—or almost 12 times as much as in World War I.

The public's spendable income in the last 6 months of 1945 was at the rate of $132,000,000 a year, up 91 percent from $69,000,000,000 in 1939.

In the last war the public saved a total of $27,000,000,000. This money, hanging over the market, was an important factor in forcing prices still higher, when consumers became convinced that inflation had not ended with the war's end and set out to buy for future needs in advance of anticipated price rises. By way of comparison, I may say that in World War II savings of the public totaled $145,000,000,000, or almost four and one-half times as much as in World War I.

Finally, let me tell you this: World War I took only 25 percent of total production for war. World War II took 46 percent. Obviously, the task of reconversion this time has been far more difficult and time consuming.

I am sure there is not a man in this room who can view these facts and not agree that postwar inflationary pressures this time are far more menacing than those that brought disaster to the American people in 1919, 1920, and 1921. To stick our heads in the sands of unreasoned confidence and deny the existence of these pressures would be the height of folly. Indeed, should the American people be misled by the advertisements of the National Manufacturers' Association and join the leaders of the NAM whose heads are in the sand they never would forgive the NAM for the disaster that would follow. It would be a blow to public confidence in business leadership which it would take years to wipe out. Fortunately, the American people show no signs of following such blind leadership.

If now is not the time to get rid of controls, when can we get rid of them? It is difficult to give this question a calendar-date answer. Our economy never was in so fluid a state as at present. Economic forecasting never involved so many hazards.

Almost every businessman, public official, and economist predicted that after VJ-day

strong deflationary forces would be set in motion. Unemployment was supposed to reach a total of from four to six million, which would spread a sense of economic insecurity and make the public timid about buying. Retail sales would fall; prices would drop below ceilings. We could get rid of subsidies without raising the cost of living and by rapid decontrol bring wartime price regulation to an end.

Production of raw metals, for example, had expanded largely during the war. It was believed that we could get out of most raw-metals controls before the end of 1945. Ceilings were removed on most forms of aluminum and magnesium and on stainless steel. But that was as far as we could go. Business Week reported toward the end of last year, "Without any question the lid would blow" on materials and parts prices "but for OPA restraints."

That still is true.

Production of foods rose 27 percent during the war. When the Government canceled many war contracts and public buying power declined, it was anticipated that most food price ceilings could be suspended and later removed. Rapid decontrol was predicted for the first 6 months of 1946. Actually public demand for food has stayed at a very high level.

In the face of an all-time peak crop of white potatoes, we were able to remove ceilings without serious difficulty. But when, in the face of another bumper crop, we suspended ceilings on citrus fruits, prices shot upward. Ceilings had to be restored. With automobiles, radios, refrigerators, washing machines, etc., still not available in substantial quantities, the public's buying power has proved too great for removal of many food ceilings without price inflation.

Unemployment did not, as anticipated, rise from four to six millions after VJ-day. Employment instead stayed 2,000,000 above 1941 levels, six and one-half millions above 1939 levels. The public's spendable income stayed 31 percent above 1941 levels, 91 percent above those of 1939. Instead of showing timidity in spending, the public at holiday time went into the greatest spending spree in history and stripped the stores almost bare of merchandise. Department store sales in December were 12 percent above those of 1944; 94 percent above those of 1939.

These developments put an entirely new aspect on the problem of decontrol. They made it clear that the demand we must balance to get rid of controls without inflation is not the demand of 1939, but demand on a new and much higher level.

If all we had to do was to balance the 1939 demand for goods, we would be out of many controls by now, for in November 1945—4 months after VJ-day—we produced goods at a greater rate than ever was reached when the Nation was not actively at war. The rate of output was 1 percent above that of 1941, 51 percent above that of 1939, our last real prewar year. In those four brief months, according to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, we performed the production miracle of increasing the rate of output of civilian goods by $20,000,000,000 a year.

Producers of reconversion goods such as automobiles, radios, refrigerators, etc., still have their difficulties. Widespread labor disputes have crippled their operations. Materials and parts supplies have been distressingly irregular, because of varying rates of reconversion and need for filling empty pipe lines. If a single part for a machine is missing, you have no machine.

Producers of some other goods are having trouble, notably those in the lumber and textile industries. These industries paid generally low wages before the war. They have been reluctant to raise them, even though their profits were more than adequate to permit increases. As a result they lost workers steadily to war plants and shipyards during the war.

Let us examine the lumber situation, as an example. In an endeavor to increase lumber production OPA, on the recommendation of WPB and later CPA, increased lumber prices 66 percent. This was the greatest price increase given on any basic commodity. Unfortunately, however, it did not increase lumber production, which actually fell 9½ percent below the 1939 level. Why? Because workers employed in lumber production declined 22 percent.

Question may be raised if price increases granted were sufficient to permit the lumber industry to pay wages high enough not only to retain its workers but to increase them. The answer is that profits on gross lumber sales rose from 3 percent in 1936–39, to over 12 percent in 1944, the last year for which we have adequate profit figures. Clearly OPA price increases were used by the companies to add to their profits; not to raise wages to attract more workers and solve the production problem. I may say that the profits of textile mills also rose far above prewar levels; yet they kept on losing workers because of relatively low wage scales.

Workers are now drifting back into these industries but it will take some time to lift their output to the levels required to balance demand under the public's greatly enlarged buying power.

It is now becoming increasingly clear that public buying power will not return to the prewar basis. The Government is supporting at high levels the incomes of farmers, which rose more than 170 percent during the war. Labor's wartime gain of 75.5 percent in take-home pay fell when overtime was for the most part eliminated and downgrading set in. Now the loss is being partially restored by wage adjustments.

Total business profits for 1946 will probably fall below wartime peaks reached in 1944 and 1945; but with excess-profits taxes eliminated, profits after taxes will remain at a very high level; may top all previous records.

Our task obviously is not to produce goods enough to balance 1939 demand. We must instead enlarge our output to meet a new high level of buying power. This obviously will take time. Obviously, also, enemies of price control will charge in the meantime that production failure due to price control is responsible for shortages.

I would not be realistic if I did not admit that for limited periods in restricted areas price regulations have hampered production by certain companies producing certain kinds of goods. Drawing the fine line between price increases that are needlessly inflationary and those required to maintain production is not always an easy task. Since VJ-day, however, OPA has amended procedures in 12 basic ways; most of the changes being designed to aid production. A total of 459 industry-wide price increases, and of 4,957 individual firm price increases have been granted. Incidentally, a total of 192,673 rent increases were granted on landlord petitions in 1945. These hardly reflect the inflexibility of policy which some persons attribute to OPA.

Most of the charges that OPA is interfering with production are based upon misinformation. For example, the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce hired a firm of industrial engineers to study the effect of price control upon Bridgeport industries. Mr. Robert Wason, president of NAM, advertised the results. The first finding, reported last November, was that if price controls were not abandoned or radically altered by February 15 (that was a week ago last Friday), 8,700 persons would be thrown out of work in Bridgeport. We do not yet have figures for February 15, but by January 15 the United States Labor Department reports, 4,800 workers had been added by Bridgeport industries.

In spite, however, of the fact that hampering of production by price regulations affects only a few companies and products for brief periods and is negligible in the whole production picture, and in spite of the fact that the rate of reconversion is extraordinary and the level of production before the flurry of labor disputes struck was phenomenal, it will take some time before production of all goods can balance the new high level of demand and we can get rid of controls without inflation.

We in OPA see three stages ahead, which I shall take time to describe briefly.

Stage 1 is the period of labor, material and parts shortages through which we now are passing; the most critical 6 months in price-control history. Due to labor disputes and the above shortages, our very conspicuous reconversion industries have a hard time getting under way. They experience high "bulge" costs before workers settle efficiently into their new jobs; before production lines get to flowing without interruptions and while overhead is piled onto low output. Inevitably these delays are blamed upon OPA, and these temporary high costs are cited as evidence that ceiling prices must be raised.

During this stage OPA is being called upon for many price adjustments due to rising labor and materials costs. When conditions warrant, these are being made; but on a basis which business considers tight, i. e., no adjustments are made so long as industries are earning their prewar dollar profits. We regret that at this stage more liberal adjustments cannot be made; but if the Nation is to avoid an inflationary spiral that will wreck our economy and menace our free institutions, business must go along with us during this period of peak inflationary pressures.

Fortunately profits in most industries and trades are far above prewar levels and will remain so.

Already goods with annual sales of $5,500,000,000 have been decontrolled, but through stage I decontrol will proceed at a very slow pace.

Stage II will come upon us rather suddenly. Wage readjustments will come to an end and costs will become stabilized; workers will increase in efficiency; production will increase, cutting unit overhead costs. Appeals for price adjustments will dwindle. Toward the end of the period, price competition will begin to reappear.

OPA operations during this period will undergo two changes:

1. Pricing policies will gradually be adjusted to erase transition to a new economic era, by assuring earnings appropriate to a sustained high volume of production.

2. Decontrol will proceed at a steadily accelerating rate.

Stage III will be a period of capacity production, full employment, and stable costs. Public buying power will be at a very high level but the gigantic production of which our new economy is capable will wipe out one shortage after another. Pressures will disappear first on materials and parts, then on consumer goods.

During stage III, production will have taken advantage of the materials, design, and technological advances made during the war. Costs will go down as output and the serviceability of goods goes up.

With continuation of price adjustments to assure earnings appropriate to a sustained high level of production and with rapid acceleration of decontrol, OPA may attain with business in stage III the popularity it now enjoys with the people, who on all opinion polls, voted 80 to 90 percent for continuation of price controls.

Pressures on rents and on building materials will be most persistent. Those on rents will continue long after June 1947, for the housing shortage we face is not due to war curtailed construction only. Its cause goes back through the 1930's, when for 10 years our population increased much faster than our housing.

This look into the future is based upon the assumption that Congress will extend effective legislation and that no other influences will prevent price control from being successful. We are not good enough prophets to forecast the duration of these stages or the date when, if the OPA Act is extended, we can decontrol ourselves out of existence. We anticipate, however, that all controls but rents can be eliminated in 1947. Rent control can then appropriately be transferred to other agencies or to the States.

Whatever path we follow, the Nation clearly is in for an era of great prosperity. With vastly enlarged buying power, with war accumulated shortages and with a productive capacity vastly expanded nothing can prevent our entering upon such a period.

Only one question remains to be decided: Whether the era will be a stable and long-lasting period of full employment and production, or whether we shall, as we did after World War I, go through the usual postwar period of inflation, collapse, and depression.

Because I like our system of free enterprise and want to see it preserved in a world where we are its last bulwark, I very much hope we will not now in the name of free enterprise decide for a postwar inflation and collapse that more than anything else will put our free institutions in jeopardy.

The question is, will we prove to be a juvenile nation, moved by whims and passing prejudices of the moment, and led by visionless groups with selfish interests to serve; or will we prove to be a grown-up nation, capable of learning from history and fixing policies in the interest of the whole Nation?

With such issues in the balance, it is to me a matter of great regret that the United States Chamber of Commerce sits on the fence and does not throw its influence on the side of the happiness and enduring prosperity of our Nation and its people. To sit on the fence when so grave an issue confronts the Nation is almost as bad as betting on the wrong horse.

The Fight Against Inflation Must Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks a radio talk by Hon. Chester Bowles, Stabilization Director, on Saturday, March 2, 1946. It follows:

Last week, when I told you about my new job as Stabilization Director, I said I was confident that the Nation's new all-out attack against inflation will succeed, provided all of us—business people, farmers, workers, people in industry—pull together.

I don't think I'd have been willing to take on my new assignment if I didn't believe you people were all as deeply aware as I am that this is a crisis I think you fully understand that some drastic methods may be necessary if we're going to keep prices and rents from going higher. And I know I can count on you for support.

The American people all realize that this new fight must be settled now or never. And it has to be settled the right way because the whole future of our economy is at stake.

But if you have listened to some of the wiseacres in Wall Street and elsewhere you might have the impression there's no sense at all in making a fresh start. Inflation's already here, they say. Why try to combat it any further!

You'll hear a lot of this dangerous, irresponsible talk during the next few weeks. Why? Because the Price Control Act is now before Congress for action. The Price Control Act which gives your Government authority to set ceilings on the prices and rents you pay expires on June 30 and is up for renewal now. The lobbyists and pressure groups and speculators want to defeat that law. They'd like to get you to throw up the sponge, remove the controls, and start pushing prices and rents higher and higher. Their tactics are designed to send millions of people into the market to buy and hoard goods—to break our stabilization controls and push rents and prices up. Then the profiteers hope to get rich and get out before the crash comes.

Now, all this talk is part of a studied campaign to deprive you of the protections that have served us all so well thus far—protections which are more necessary than ever today. To me the issue is very plain. Many pressure groups are in effect conspiring against the American people. And I, for one, am determined that the pressure groups aren't going to win.

Let's apply the yardstick of common sense and see what the facts are behind all this pumped-up propaganda.

I think I can show you that thus far inflation has been kept in check, certainly far better than in any previous war period in our history. I'm going to run right through a list of items that go into everyone's cost of living. Let's take up each one in turn and see what's what.

Let's start with rents.

If you're like millions of other families in this country, 17 cents out of every dollar you spend goes to pay rent for the house you live in. Has there been any inflation in that large part of your cost of living? You know the answer to that as well as I do.

If you live in an area that's under rent control—and 90 percent of the people in this country do—the chances are 20 to 1 that the rent you're paying today is the same as it was more than 3 years ago.

That certainly doesn't sound like inflation to me, particularly when you remember that many rents doubled and tripled in the 2 years immediately after the last war. The people who scream that inflation is already here certainly can't be thinking about the record of the last 3 years on rents for housing.

Of course, we all recognize that rents for offices and stores and commercial properties such as stores and office space have gone up outrageously in many communities. Although I've asked for authority to check these rises in commercial rents many times, Congress has never authorized anyone to put on controls. They're entirely outside the field of rent control. But the inflation in business rents proves what would happen to the rent in your housing if no controls were removed or unchecked.

But perhaps the boom and bust boys who tell you inflation's already here are thinking about food prices Forty percent—almost half—of most families' living expenses go for food. Now what has happened to food prices?

Well, in the early days of the war food prices began to rise rapidly. When we did get them under price control, our machinery wasn't entirely effective. The whole idea of controlling food prices in an emergency was new, and we didn't have the experience and the know-how to do a really good job.

But about 3 years ago we got a strong grip on rising food prices. We did it, in part, by using a weapon against inflation called subsidies. Most of you know that subsidies are special payments—by the Government—to farmers and meat packers, and others who produce and pack your food. When the costs of producing food are unavoidably increased, subsidies cover the additional costs and make it possible to keep down the prices you pay in the store.

Subsidies kept down the prices you paid for butter, cheese, milk, bread and canned goods during the war, and made all meat cuts just about 10 percent cheaper.

Now, what's happened to food prices since we got that strong grip on them in May 1943?

Well, the Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us that food prices have actually gone down about 1 percent in the last 2½ years. But if you are anything like me, you're a little leery of statistics. You want the good, hard facts as you get them from the grocery stores or from your own food bills.

So, today I brought along some big full-page food advertisements from some of our Washington newspapers. One set of ads was printed during the latter part of May 1943, almost 3 years ago. The others were published just the other day. Let's compare a few food prices.

In May 1943 meat prices were actually a little higher than they are now. Here's pork sausage for example. It was 37 cents a pound 34 months ago. It's 33 cents today. The statistics say that canned goods are about the same now as they were in May 1943. And my ads show that canned green beans—just to pick one item—were 13 cents then and are 12 cents today. Grade A milk was two quarts for 23 cents. The price is the same today.

I could go on right down a long list. Cereals, for instance, are about the same. A pound of oatmeal was 9 cents then. It's 10 cents today. Bread was 8 cents a loaf in 1943. It's 8 cents today. Waffle mix, 20 cents a package then and 20 cents today.

Now these are Washington, D. C., prices. Your home town prices may vary a penny or two one way or the other. You can check what's happened to prices where you live by going to a newspaper office and looking at their files or compare the food ads of May 1943 with those of today. Do that and I think you'll agree that, anyway you carve it, the propagandists are barking up the wrong tree when they try to tell America's housewives that food prices have not been held.

Of course, you may occasionally run into some chiseler who charges you over the ceiling price for food. And if you like fancy, imported olives and other high-priced foods, your total food expenses may be a little higher. But the story on most basic foods is that they're about the same as 3 years ago.

Compare that with the first year after the 1918 armistice when food prices more than doubled. We haven't let anything like that happen this time, and we're not going to.

Food prices have been held, but only as a result of hard, persistent fighting to keep food prices down. We've hung on and hung on. Can we continue? I assure you that we can if we get the price-control law renewed in its present form, and if Congress gives us the authority to keep food subsidies on. Without food subsidies food prices would go up about 8 percent overnight. You can't be for price control and against subsidies. They belong together if we're going to keep prices down.

Well, it's pretty plain that we haven't got inflation in food and house rents. But what's the situation in things like fuel, electricity, and ice? Let's take a few more of the prices Washington people pay. A hundred gallons of fuel oil cost $10.30 in May of 1943. A Washington householder pays $8.80 for the same amount today. That's nearly $2 under the price in 1943. Chestnut coal costs a few cents more a ton. And kerosene is a little higher. But electricity and gas prices are about the same as they were 3 years ago.

You've heard a lot about price increases for steel. What's really happened then? Steel

has increased only 11 percent in price since 1940, whereas steel prices almost tripled after the last war. And the things you buy that are made out of metal don't represent a large part of the average family's cost of living—actually only about 9 percent—and that includes goods made out of copper and aluminum as well as steel.

I can assure you that most metal appliances are coming out at or near 1942 prices. If there are any necessary price increases they will be small.

I wish I could report that clothing prices had been held as well as prices for food and rents and other cost-of-living items. Over and over again I've pointed out that this was the poorest job that both Government and industry have done during the war period. The veteran who goes out to trade his uniform for civilian clothes notices it particularly, because he usually wants to buy several items all at once. Let's take just a moment to see what caused the trouble.

In the first place, the job of trying to set prices on thousands of different clothing items in hundreds of different styles and qualities would be staggering at any time. In wartime, with 40 percent of our fabrics going into uniforms and tents and tarpaulins it was worse. Because more people had more money to spend and were ready to buy just about anything, the demand for clothing of all kinds was never so high. At the same time some manufacturers who usually made plain white cloth for shirts or house dresses shifted to making fancy print cloth on which they could make a higher profit. Others shifted from making low-priced garments to higher-priced things for the same reason. That's why some of you ladies have had trouble finding a good $5.95 dress, or low-priced, good-quality play clothes for the children.

But the fact remains that the clothing end of the job was bungled.

Now, however, I think we've got a better grip on the clothing problem. Last week I told you we were going to go back to some of the wartime methods of control on clothing, to the methods we used to make sure that the Army and Navy would get the uniforms they needed. Textile mills will be required to make definite quantities of certain essential materials that are needed for men's white shirts, inexpensive house dresses, sheets, pillow cases, and items of that sort. And we will use a system of priorities to see that the manufacturers of the more essential kinds of clothing get first chance to buy these materials. And OPA price controls will see that the garments made under the new program come to you at prices you can afford to pay.

Bad as the clothing situation has been, it is going to get better. I have heard more and more often during the past few weeks that there is a lot of improvement. The stores are selling more and more inexpensive, well-made items. And remember, we also have this consolation. Clothing prices have not tripled as they did after the last war.

Now, let's take a minute or two to sum up all this talk about inflation. In the first place, there's no inflation in house rents. There's no inflation in the kind of food items most people buy every day. We are doing all right on our fuel and electricity. Clothing is not so good, but it's getting better. These are the items that make up about 75 percent of your cost of living. Then where is this full-blown inflation the propagandists are screaming about?

Well, for one thing, it's in the 75-cent haircuts that used to be 40 cents. Why? Because we haven't any control over such prices, although I've pointed out repeatedly that there should be controls.

It's in the 90-cent movie admission, and the $25 permanent waves. Why? Because here again we have no authority to set price ceilings, though we've often asked for it.

It's true that there's a wild inflation in the stock market. Why? Again because there has been no lid to hold down the inflation.

Real-estate prices and rents for stores and office space, too, have soared like a rocket ship, right out of this world. Why? Again the story is—no controls. More than once up in Congress I've pleaded for legislation that would give protection to you people who have to buy homes now by putting ceilings on the prices of homes—both old and new. But the Government as yet has no authority to stop these wildly inflated sales. There's a bill before Congress now that would effectively squelch this reckless trading in urgently needed homes. The passage of that bill, in my opinion, is a "must" requirement right now.

These fields where prices are zooming because there are no controls point up one lesson very plainly. It doesn't take a college professor to see what would happen if the price ceilings on your food and clothing and the other basic items in your cost of living were ripped off now—as the Association of National Manufacturers and others have proposed—or if the profiteers who are itching for higher prices and higher rents could have their way.

Don't listen to these greedy pied pipers who are trying to turn America into one gigantic auction block with their frantic cries that prices are going up. Don't be stampeded into buying something you don't need. And don't let the pressure groups and the propagandists tell you that higher prices and higher rents are bound to come. Inflation can be stopped—it has been stopped—it will be stopped. It's going to take guts and determination on the part of all of us, but as long as there's adequate authority to do the job your rent, food, clothing, and other prices will be kept in hand.

The Anglo-American Petroleum Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able address entitled "The Anglo-American Petroleum Agreement," delivered by former Governor Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, before the Kansas Oil Men's Association annual meeting at Wichita, Kans., on March 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The orderly development of crude petroleum is impressed with national interest. The oil industry for many years was almost criminally negligent in the waste of this vital and irreplaceable natural resource. I led the fight in Kansas that resulted in our first petroleum conservancy legislation. In 1933 I was the only Governor that responded to the invitation of President Roosevelt to attend a conference in Washington of the chief executives of the oil States in an attempt to draft national legislation that would bring about a more orderly development of our oil resources from a conservancy point of view.

I accepted the proposed national legislation and supported it. When it failed in the Congress the States resorted to a comparatively unused section of our Constitution and brought about an orderly program in the development and production of oil by a compact between the oil States. Kansas was the first to ratify that compact. It has worked very satisfactorily and 17 States are now a party to it.

Even those who were primarily opposed to State regulation are now convinced from the record that is has resulted in the preventing of waste in this vital natural resource by the conservation of an enormous amount of oil, that would not have otherwise been saved, except through the control of the different State commissions created at the instance of the Interstate Compact Commission.

While I supported the national legislation proposed in 1933 I am very glad that it did not pass. Had it been enacted into law, the oil industry would have suffered even worse than it already has, from the heavy hand of Federal admisitrative laws which some of us refer to as bureaucracy.

Prior to 1933 the Congress was careful to set out definite conditions and limitations upon the powers of the administrative boards it created. Business and industry knew that when, and only when, their activities fell within these limitations, would they be subject to the jurisdiction of the administrative board. An additional safeguard was the provision in the laws providing for administrative regulation that the business affected might resort to the courts.

Neither of these safeguards have been included in most of the acts of Congress, providing for regulation of business, since 1933. Coupled with these two important changes in the policy of the Congress, has been a noticeable tendency on the part of practically all the boards and commissions to expand their authority far beyond what even the Congress had intended.

As a result, for the last 15 years we have had what is known as administrative laws by bureaucratic decree touching every branch of American enterprise. No man knoweth how to proceed in his own business affairs. There are no landmarks, either by interpretation of courts or by the practices of administrative bodies by which he can be guided. Orders are frequently made without either hearings or notice and are changed almost overnight on matters of vital importance affecting many businesses. Business, labor, and agriculture has been hamstrung by the confusion of different Federal bureaus handling the same subject and ofttimes at cross purposes.

The steady encroachment of that kind of government on business freedom and efficiency throws the burden of proof that we are not following in the same footprints, on the advocates of the Anglo-American oil agreement, now submitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification.

In that agreement we find the same loose wording—the same ambiguity—the same vagueness in determining the rights and obligations of the contracting parties—that has characterized so much of our Federal legislation in recent years. Also we must take into consideration the tremendous reach of the treaty-making power. Therefore in no conceivable circumstances should a treaty contemplating the gigantic objectives of this agreement contain arbitrary authority under conditions or terms ambiguously or vaguely defined.

A careful study of this proposed agreement will leave anyone uncertain as to the obligations assumed by the United States Government.

Like so much of the legislation which has characterized the growth and development of administrative law in America in the last 13 years, this agreement appears to be somewhat innocuous, but concealed in its terms are provisions which, interpreted as the regulatory measures of the New Deal have been interpreted, contain a grave threat of placing control of the oil industry in the United States in an international commission.

The preliminary agreement now before the Senate for ratification contemplates a second convention, among all the nations of the earth, through which the oil resources of the world are pooled and the obligations and rights of every nation, whether producing oil or consuming it and the derivatives thereof, would be determined by the edicts of the International Commission.

Therefore, the American petroleum industry is faced with a situation, in view of the broad provisions of our Federal Constitution with reference to treaties with foreign countries, where it can have no idea of conditions, in addition to the ordinary vicissitudes of business, with which it must cope in the future.

Treaties become the supreme law of the land and strike down State rights or private rights in conflict with them.

The point I make is that in pursuance of the preliminary agreement now pending before the Senate for ratification, a multilateral international petroleum agreement, to be entered into between all producing and consuming nations, is to be consummated at an early date. That can only mean that an International Petroleum Commission will take complete supervision of the American petroleum industry and neither the Interstate Compact Commission nor the conservation acts of any States could be invoked against international edicts. We will see in a moment that these can easily include fixing the price of every gallon of gas used by the American consumer.

Take the two subdivisions of article I as an example of the indefinite character of the language employed in drafting the instrument. Subdivision (a) of article I provides:

"That adequate supplies of petroleum, which shall in this agreement mean crude petroleum and its derivatives, should be accessible in international trade to the nationals of all countries on a competitive and nondiscriminatory basis."

It is said by advocates of the Anglo-American agreement that it is necessary, among other reasons, to protect the interests of Americans in British territories—and to secure for Americans access to other signatory countries—to explore petroleum resources on a competitive and nondiscriminatory basis. Yet all nations may produce oil freely in our country.

I believe our great country is powerful enough to obtain equitable treatment for its citizens by vigorous insistence on our traditional open-door policy. I believe we should have that question settled before we make any financial loan or gift to any country.

Furthermore, this is the third attempt to line us up with the British in the highly explosive area of the Near East. In that seething area we must give serious consideration as to where that would lead us.

Of course, the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations Organization already has power to initiate procedures by which our foreign investments in backward or other countries could be approved by the UNO as well as by the countries in which such investments are to be made, and if and when so approved could be guaranteed protection by the UNO upon such terms as that body might prescribe.

But let's go back to the loose wording of subdivision (a) of Article I. "That adequate supplies of petroleum, which shall in this agreement mean crude petroleum and its derivatives, should be accessible in international trade to the nationals of all countries on a competitive and nondiscriminatory basis."

"Should" can be construed as implying a duty. "Duty" is almost construed as implying an obligation. On the other hand the word "should" can be discretionary and not mandatory.

Therefore, if this clause is necessary to protect American interests abroad, "should" ought to read "shall," so that there is no vestige of doubt as to what is intended.

I assume that the word "competitive" was employed to insure each producing nation a part of the market in each consuming nation, but I am at a loss to gather the meaning of the term "nondiscriminatory basis." Does that term imply only availability of supplies among all the consumer nations, or does it include the price factor as well? Every word in a document of this kind either has a meaning or will be given one, in the future, by the International Petroleum Council. Therefore, I suggest for your consideration the thought that a consumer nation will not be content with an adequate supply of petroleum. But the question of price will necessarily be raised. It is entirely conceivable that if the end, contemplated by this document, is to be attained, the multilateral international agreement will include price fixing in its terms.

That may be far away from the minds of the men who signed and advocate the ratification of this agreement. The cold fact is that they have not safeguarded it from such an interpretation.

Subdivision (b) of article I reads: "That in making supplies of petroleum thus accessible in international trade, the interests of producing countries should be safeguarded with a view to their economic advancement."

What does this mean? Here again we have the use of "should"—doubtful in the meaning. Is it intended to protect the nations of so-called backward countries in a fair price for their products, or does this clause involve the general economic advancement or welfare of the particular producing nation?

Articles III, IV, V, and VI set up the machinery through which a temporary International Petroleum Commission, representing the signatory powers only, shall be created. An International Petroleum Conference to be participated in by both producing and consuming nations is set up. It was evidently the hope of the signatory powers that an international petroleum agreement, embracing all or at least the most important nations would come into being. The powers imposed upon the temporary International Petroleum Commission are not especially burdensome, and are cause for concern only when one looks to the consummation of the International Petroleum Agreement. That means, if it means anything, placing American producers and the American petroleum industry under the control of the contemplated International Petroleum Council.

Coming now to article II, no objection may be made to subuivision (a), which simply protects the vested rights of the nationals of the signatory powers.

Then we encounter vagueness when we look into subdivision (b), which reads:

"That with regard to the acquisition of exploration and development rights the principle of equal opportunity shall be respected";

While primarily this clause involves only the signatory powers, it clearly contemplates the insertion of a similar clause in the final international agreement. When so construed, what power, other than the International Petroleum Council, shall determine the meaning of the principle of equal opportunity in acquiring new rights, and by what standard will the concept "the principle of equal opportunity" be determined?

Subdivision (c) really represents the guts of the agreement. It provides:

"That the exploration for and development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of petroleum, shall not be hampered by restrictions inconsistent with the purposes of this agreement."

Here it is that every facility of the worldwide petroleum industry specifically is brought within the provisions of the agreement. When it is stated that such control is not to be hampered by restrictions inconsistent with the purposes of the agreement—when we remember that the basic purpose of the agreement is to pool and allocate the world's supply of petroleum—the far-reaching character of the instrument becomes alarming. Plainly we are setting up another bureau, which, according to bureaucratic custom, will assume its authority as all embracing.

At a glance, subdivision (a) of article VII, would seem to protect the domestic petroleum industry of each of the signatory powers. It reads:

"That the general purpose of this agreement is to facilitate the orderly development of the international trade, and that no provision of this agreement, with the exception of article II, is to be construed as applying to the operation of the domestic petroleum industry within the country of either Government."

What does the word "domestic" mean? We used to think of domestic affairs as State affairs beyond the reach of the Federal Government and as being protected by our traditional conception of State rights. But within the last 13 years we have seen the definition of interstate commerce expanded until almost every step we take in private and business life is regulated and controlled by the Federal Government as being a part of interstate commerce. Now the power of the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce and foreign commerce is granted by the same clause and sentence of the Constitution of the United States. A similar construction under any oil treaty that might be entered into would be the supreme law of the land.

Furthermore, the exception specified in article VII just noted, deprives this particular clause of its entire meaning. Because of its tremendous importance, it is worth reading again subdivision (c) of article II:

"That the exploration for and the development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of petroleum, shall not be hampered by restrictions inconsistent with the purposes of this agreement."

Remembering always that if the agreement becomes a treaty, it shall be the supreme law of the land that the purposes are eventually to pool the oil supplies of the world—for the benefit of all countries admitted to the cartel—involving the possibility, at least, of price fixing, the so-called saving clause of article VII, which seems to protect the domestic petroleum industry, possesses no value whatever.

The British Foreign Secretary said in a report to the British Parliament 10 days ago, "I would be quite willing if the Soviet would join Britain and America in an international oil agreement which would solve this conflict for oil as between great allies."

There is no thinking man who does not desire to bring about international cooperation. We must bear in mind in solving this problem of the sharing the oil resources of the world between the "have's" and the "have not's" that first is the need for oil and secondly the price.

The argument that possession of oil is a source of strife loses its force in the face of the technological advance that has been made in the manufacture of synthetics.

But granting that the orderly development of the oil resources of the world and their availability to all nations is an important factor in international relations, I submit that in order to have any possible chance of success in solving the question of the division of oil resources between the "have's" and "have not's" there must be a clear exposition of the exact terms under which the nations must live to accept international cooperation.

Secrecy and weasel words are the great weakness of our foreign policy today. The full implication of many grave and burdensome obligations in the international field have been concealed in their preliminary stages from the American people by those in charge of our international affairs.

Therefore, whatever we do on this proposed Anglo-American petroleum agreement, we must realize what it means to us. As submitted to the Congress, it is like a tricky insurance policy. Its heart is subdivision (c) of article II. If we want to delegate the power to fix the price of gasoline for the Kansas farmer to an international petroleum commission, let's know what we are doing and how we are doing it.

As far as I am concerned, I am opposed to the ratification of the Anglo-American agreement.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject Housing Subsidies from the New York Times of Friday, March 8.

This editorial clearly shows that the $600,000,000 subsidy will not accomplish the objective for veterans which every right-thinking American wishes to see accomplished.

What the veterans want is action in producing, with the least delay, housing facilities. The veterans are not interested in subsidies that only sound well and produce little.

I also ask consent to have printed an article which appeared in the Palm Beach Post, Palm Beach, Fla., on Saturday, March 2, which points out that many Members in Congress seem to be more concerned about veterans' votes than actually getting houses for veterans.

The regular American stimulant for the building of houses, with some Government priority on materials for veterans' housing, are the things that will actually produce the houses.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 8, 1946]

HOUSING SUBSIDIES

During the war subsidies were paid on food and other products to hold down prices. Under wartime conditions a strong case could be made for subsidies on a limited scale. Unfortunately, despite the many pledges to discontinue subsidies after hostilities ceased, we find today not only a continuation of the wartime program but recommendations to expand it. Housing Expediter Wyatt followed this plan in his proposed housing program. After the House voted against housing subsidies Mr. Truman described this action as "a blow at the heart of the veterans' emergency housing program." The bill has now been passed by the House—minus its subsidy provisions—and on this issue we believe that the House is on sounder ground than the administration.

Under the proposed housing program the taxpayer was asked to subsidize all home builders to the extent of $600,000,000 or more. To justify this huge expenditure, the program was described as a veterans' housing program. However, there was nothing in the program to prevent nonveterans, including many people who have accumulated large wartime savings, from acquiring building materials for homes they desire to purchase. Certainly these people should not be subsidized when they acquire new homes. If the objective is to hold down the cost of new homes to the veteran, there is no reason why some special financial provision cannot be made which applies to that group alone.

Additional subsidies would further unbalance the Federal budget and increase the inflationary pressures which Mr. Wyatt proposed to counteract by the payment of subsidies. If the present price level is to be maintained, the inevitable result would be more and more subsidies. This is particularly true since it was proposed that wage increases for building workers should be financed in part by subsidy payments. To the extent that a subsidy program succeeded in holding down the prices of homes, it would aggravate the present difficulties in another way. The shortage of housing is measured by the difference between the demand for new homes and the supply that can be made available. At lower prices the magnitude of the shortage would inevitably be greater than at higher prices. The lower prices would encourage a continuation of the large demand for new homes, even by persons who now have adequate housing. At the same time there is no assurance that subsidy payments would stimulate supplies as much as anticipated by Mr. Wyatt. Thus, the payment of subsidies would not correct the present shortage.

It would be much more realistic to permit a price increase for building materials. Such an increase would act to stimulate the output of the required materials and would cut off some of the less necessitous demands. It would also permit a return toward a free economy rather than the further extension of Government control which would accompany subsidy payments.

[From the Palm Beach Post of March 2, 1946]

STUFF AND NONSENSE

(By Bud Harvey)

I have just completed an exhausting, 15-minute study of the housing log jam and I have come to the conclusion that our Congressmen are more concerned about veterans' votes than veterans' houses.

The professional hurrah shouters in Washington have managed to foul up the situation beyond all recognition. By salvaging that obnoxious word "priority" from the war production scrap heap and applying it to postwar home construction, they have succeeded in dropping the boom on all building activity.

According to the more or less unintelligible phrases of the Reconversion Housing Program Manual, all veterans must get first shot at building materials. Which is a lovely sentiment—if you like lovely sentiments. As it works out, the veteran simply doesn't have the dough to build himself anything larger than a birdhouse.

By actual count (as far as I can learn) there have been exactly two building permits granted to ex-GI's in this city who are prepared to take advantage of rating HH (on form CPA-4386 under regulation 33 of part 944, as amended—see footnote). Meanwhile, building-supply houses are holding in dead storage sheathing, copper piping, and bathtubs, while contractors go quietly mad and stream to the nearest druggist for quantities of phenobarbital.

Most of these contractors have a backlog of orders for houses from home-hungry people who have the bank account to support their folly. But they have to turn them away, or else resort to stealing lumber from under other people's front porches. And the equally home-hungry veteran continues to plod up and down the streets, looking for shelter and pausing at every intersection to count his dwindling pennies.

Naturally, the veteran could go ahead and order the architect to make with the pencil and paper if he had the wherewithal. And so the star-spangled do-gooders dreamed up something called the GI loan to provide him with financial backing. But, like every idea that gets kicked around from roll call to roll call, this one was only good for the laughs before it even reached the Government Printing Office.

By limiting the interest rate on these loans to 4 percent, the lawmakers provoked a hearty chuckle from the bankers who were plying a brisk trade at 6 percent. And by requiring the applicant to produce evidence of his credit rating, they coaxed a sour smile from the ex-GI who, in most cases, either went into service straight from the campus or the submarginal depression-day job. The only credit rating he ever established was in a penny-ante poker game.

Again, by actual count, there has been a grand total of exactly one GI loan issued in this city—and I have to stretch the boundaries beyond Lake Worth to include that one.

I'm told that some of the more important builders, those with heavy overheads, are thinking seriously of closing their doors and going fishing. They can't build—and the day-to-day expenses of running the office are turning their bookkeepers into nothing more than deficit tabulators.

Now, I won't vouch for that statement. Personally, I'm inclined to raise one eyebrow slightly whenever I hear of selfless individuals who are running a business at a loss. But I do know this much—

As a veteran who is looking for a house he can't afford, nothing would please me more than to see homes mushrooming up on every vacant lot in the city. I don't care whose homes they are. And I know I speak for every other house-hungry and purse-poor veteran when I say that. Let them "as has" have their new homes. Just let me have their old addresses when they're ready to move.

The answer to the housing shortage is houses. And all the bold programs mapped out in Washington aren't going to produce them. At least they haven't as yet. Nor will the export of 900,000,000 board feet of lumber to Europe this year solve the housing shortage in America.

I can be just as unhappy as the next fellow about the plight of Europe's homeless. But, by an odd quirk of human nature, I'm somewhat more concerned about my own homelessness at the moment. And when that particular problem is solved, I expect to devote most of my sympathies to the miserable 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 Americans who have always lived in tar-paper shacks. If we're going in for this one world business on a lavish scale I'd like to see them included * * * starting within 10 miles of West Palm Beach.

Editorial Comment on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the Youngstown Vindicator, the Toledo Blade, the Detroit News and the Milwaukee Journal, all relating to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of February 19, 1946]

SEAWAY AND LAKE-TO-RIVER CANAL

The railroads which send their agents up and down the country stirring up opposition to the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River canal, are using the same tactics to prevent construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Word is constantly coming in of cities drawing up resolutions against the canal, although they are so far away that they could have no possible interest in it. The only reason for their action is that the railroads bring pressure on their employees in those cities, and the employees ask their councilmen to help them out. Neither the rail workers nor the city officials take the trouble to find out what it is all about.

Now, in the hearing which opened yesterday in Washington, the railroads are again trying to prevent construction of the seaway. It would deprive them of business, they say, and reduce their earning power by driving freight traffic from the rail lines to shipping.

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson met this objection by citing a 1941 survey which showed that the natural growth of the northeastern part of the country is such that the railroads cannot handle the traffic and that the seaway is an "absolute necessity."

Mr. Acheson might have cited the freight traffic jams during the war when the eastern railroads proved their inability to meet the country's needs. The war would have been shortened and easterners spared many hardships if the seaway had been in operation. The same is true of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. This, too, is a national necessity. The coal that could be transported over it would be of great value to the Northwest by reason of the reduction of $1 a ton in the cost of hauling. The Northeast would have the same benefit. The use of soft coal might not be practical there in ordinary times because of the long haul, but it would be of great help in emergencies, such as New England had to endure during the war. New Englanders then c 'led for the construction of both the seaway and the lake-to-river canal.

Opponents of the two projects do not count on the country's growth. Mr. Acheson answered them by pointing out that the seaway would provide additional means of bringing in raw materials from abroad, thereby promoting industry on the Great Lakes, and would also give this region another means of transportation as it expands during the next 30 years.

The lake-to-river canal is a logical part of this development. The seaway and the canal together would provide inland water transportation from the Atlantic through the St. Lawrence and the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf of Mexico. Half the Nation would be benefited by the cheaper transportation they would provide, and the whole country would be safer by the strengthening of what one witness yesterday termed the weakest part of our national defense.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of February 20, 1946]

THE SEAWAY OBJECTIONS

As the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee conducts hearings on the perennial Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project, the opponents of the plan will indirectly offer as many arguments in its favor as its proponents. For in one way or another, they will all point out that this highway to the sea would be bad for their own particular special interests and, therefore, they must be good for the bulk of the American people.

The opposition of the electric power industry, now reported less extreme than it used to be, is based largely on the fact that the project would make possible the production of 12,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year at one mill per kilowatt. Though this might cut into the business of the electric power industry, it would give the American people a vast amount of cheaper electricity.

The opposition of the Atlantic ports, such as New York, is naturally but purely selfish. They make a good thing of transferring cargoes from oceangoing ships to railroad cars for reshipment to the rest of the nation, and they want to hang on to the profitable business. But the money paid for the cumbersome process of transferring cargo in the Atlantic ports comes out of the pockets of consumers in the interior who would be saved huge sums by the development of the seaway.

The opposition of the railroads falls into the same pattern. They can charge more for moving goods by rails than it would cost to transport them on a water route, and they want to keep the business. But again the difference between the two forms of transportation comes out of the pockets of consumers in the interior.

And so it goes all down the line. No witness is going to testify that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway would be bad for the country as a whole or for the people of the great Middle West in particular. One and all they will be arguing, no matter how they disguise it, that their own special interests should be safeguarded at the expense of the general public.

And their special interests consist entirely of charging consumers more for rendering services in a more cumbersome rather than in the more economic way.

[From Detroit (Mich.) News of February 20, 1946]

SEAWAY PROSPECTS BETTER

Hearings have been opened by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a new attempt to secure authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

This proposed improvement of the St. Lawrence for the twin purpose of developing the tremendous latent power of the rapids and of admitting deep-draft ocean ships to the Great Lakes is an old story, yet one ever new.

The advantages promised to Detroit and the whole Great Lakes Basin are as freshly inviting as when the project first was broached over a generation ago.

The character of the opposition to it also has not changed, nor has the fact that the relentlessness of this opposition constitutes the project's best endorsement. Billions have been spent in the meanwhile on less meritorious power and navigation projects. Only the seaway has so aroused the enmity of rival trade and other interests that its adoption again and again has been blocked in Congress. No other public improvement project promises, even remotely, the contribution the seaway will make, when built, to national efficiency.

The renewed attempt to enact it is begun under circumstances reportedly more favorable to its adoption than at any time in the past. We sincerely hope that is so.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of February 19, 1946]

MILWAUKEE—THIS TIME THE SEAWAY PROJECT MUST NOT BE BLOCKED

Not alone a better national defense but industrial progress in the Middle West will follow completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, according to Dean Acheson, testifying before a Senate committee at Washington.

Mr. Acheson is right when he thus puts the State Department, of which he is Under Secretary, squarely behind the St. Lawrence project.

The Nation would thereby make its great inland seas available for major shipbuilding, including the construction of almost any type of fighting unit needed by the Navy. And the ships built could be navigated out without all the makeshift that was used during the war.

Canada and New York State would share in the 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity produced.

The Lake States, of course, would receive an open waterway for deep-draft vessels, 2,700 miles long and extending from Superior and Duluth—and, incidentally, Green Bay, Manitowoc, Two Rivers, Sheboygan, Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, Chicago, Gary, and other places—direct to the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. Acheson was backed in his views by Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and by the Federal Power Commission.

Acheson made clear, we think, that the seaway project can be authorized by a congressional resolution under the commerce powers and therefore does not need to entail a treaty requiring a two-thirds Senate vote.

Wisconsin and other States are in the heart of the great agricultural and industrial area that most needs the waterway. They no longer can afford to exploit only their own resources or sell all their production in nearby markets. They need to import raw materials, pulpwood, as only one example, and they need to export surplus farm products and manufactured goods.

This time the St. Lawrence project must not be blocked by selfish minorities.

Conditions in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter to the President of the United States from Henry C. Luckey, formerly a Member of Congress from Nebraska, and one of our most respected citizens. The letter is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

LINCOLN, NEBR., *January 30, 1946.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is written in the most sincere spirit of helpfulness, realizing the tremendous responsibilities you are facing.

You undoubtedly have received hundreds of thousands of letters asking what can be done to correct famine conditions and mass starvation and economic confusion in central Europe.

According to the Morgenthau-Potsdam Conference, the German people are made responsible for their own welfare. How can this be done with their cities in rubble, their railroads and factories destroyed and stripped, with only 5 to 10 or 20 percent of their industries operating and their fields bare or taken from them? So far there is no semblance of a workable plan for the reconstruction of an European economic entity.

It is not necessary to go into details for these conditions are too well known. Ger-

many has been turned into one great concentration camp the like of which the world has never seen before. By our policies and our apparent approval of this atrocious program of mass starvation we have become responsible for the conditions there now prevailing. By our course we are sabotaging every tenet on which Christianity is founded and we are destroying every basis on which a just and lasting peace can and must be built. Did we lie in 1943 when we promised that "the people of the Axis need not fear unconditional surrender to the United Nations—we shall bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick"?

As true as there is a just God in heaven these atrocities, we now are a party to, will some day rebound against us. A spirit of hate and vengeance cannot build a lasting peace. Only by reestablishing moral norms and on their basis can world order and world peace be builded and maintained. If this war results only in vengeance, power politics, spheres of influence, and a renewed impetus to imperialism we have lost the peace and our efforts in World War II have been in vain.

If utter chaos is to be avoided in Europe—which may well engulf the whole world—we must stop deliberate mass starvation and bring about conditions by which these distraught peoples can again rehabilitate themselves, both economically and morally in order to become respectable members of the families of nations.

To aid along these lines the ban on sending relief supplies—food, clothing, and medicines—to the American Zone of Occupation in Germany must be lifted. Communication by mail must be reestablished. Americans with next of kin in Germany have a right to communicate with their relatives. American religious organizations must be permitted to cooperate with and aid similar organizations in Germany in order to rehabilitate the churches and Christian life. Only the Christian concept can save the world. If this fails nothing is left but force and the atomic bomb—the fruits of a materialistic age.

Mr. President, the evils arising out of the Morgenthau-Potsdam policy can be corrected, although much irreparable damage has already been done. You, Mr. President, as the highest authority in the land, have the power to bring about changes for the better. This, in the name of humanity, we urge you to do and to this end you have our full support.

Most sincerely,

HENRY C. LUCKEY,
Member of Congress in Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

Ten-Year Lumber Shortage Seen—OPA Blamed

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the remarks that have just been made by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], relating to lumber, I wish to call attention to an article which was published in the Times-Herald of Wednesday, March 13, captioned, "Ten-Year Lumber Shortage Seen—OPA Blamed":

TEN-YEAR LUMBER SHORTAGE SEEN—OPA ASSAILED

Edward C. Crafts, Forestry Service official, said yesterday the United States' problem of short lumber supplies likely "is going to be one of long duration."

Crafts, chief of the agency's division of forest economics, told a Senate Agriculture subcommittee the Forestry Service estimates that annual production of lumber will not rise above 33,000,000 board feet in any year in the next decade.

It expects demand will climb to 40,000,000,000 feet in about 3 years, he said, leaving "a discrepancy of 7,000,000,000 feet" between demand and supply.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator KNOWLAND (Republican), of California, is investigating the shortage of lumber.

Crafts said the Forest Service saw "no prospects" for a material increase in imports of lumber, although some additional might be obtained from Brazil.

Earlier, witnesses from the lumber industry contended that declining lumber production was due chiefly to OPA's price schedules.

From Leo Heer, speaking for the furniture trade, the committee heard the plaint that furniture manufacture is declining because of the industry's inability to get hardwoods.

Unless it gets more hardwood lumber, he said, the 2,700,000 homes the Government hopes to get built in the next 2 years will not get needed furniture.

National Air Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, in view of the extraordinary air weapons developed by the Germans during the war, some doubts have been expressed concerning the scientific quality of the research and development program pursued by the military. On March 12 Gen. Carl Spaatz made public a statement outlining the proposed peacetime policies of the Army Air Forces. In that statement General Spaatz emphasized the vital importance of scientific research and industrial planning for the military application of air power.

I should like to make this additional point: No matter how efficient and farseeing the research undertaken by the Air Forces, that program will come to naught unless the United States has an over-all national air policy. Military air power depends upon the future of the aircraft industry as a whole. Without a vigorous and flourishing industry, scientific progress will be retarded. We must decide quickly what should be done with our war-built plant facilities and what part the aircraft industry should be called upon to play in the peacetime economy. In order that these decisions may be made by qualified and representative persons having in mind the best interests of the whole country, I have proposed the establishment of a temporary National Air Policy Board. This proposal is embodied in S. 1639.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement by General Spaatz, Chief of the Air Corps, entitled "The Future of the Army Air Forces."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY AIR FORCES
(By Gen. Carl Spaatz)

Throughout World War II, the Army Air Forces faced an inherently difficult and complex task. Its primary goal always was to assemble, organize, train, equip, transport, and maintain in far-distant theaters of action Air Forces strong enough to apply the American doctrine of military air power against powerful and well-prepared opponents. The grim exigencies of war constantly interfered with and delayed the orderly attainment of that primary goal. Necessity dictated that air units be committed to battle in piecemeal fashion almost as soon as they arrived in the theaters. The losses in men and matériel which naturally accompanied such commitments resulted in considerable dissipation of strength. The necessity for sharing American production and training facilities with the Allies further complicated and delayed the task of building up Air Forces in the theaters strong enough to execute properly the tactical and strategical responsibilities of the Air Forces.

Under the inspiring and dynamic leadership of General Arnold, the Army Air Forces rose to magnificent heights in the successful accomplishment of its greatest wartime mission. The exceptional devotion to duty, the unselfish sacrifice, and the high courage in battle demonstrated by Air Force personnel of all grades and ranks, reinforced by the wholehearted support of the men and women on the home front made it possible for the Army Air Forces to meet successfully its greatest test.

INTERIM PHASE

The Army Air Forces now is engaged in a program of transition from a temporary wartime basis to its permanent peacetime basis. During this interim phase, this period of reorientation, it must withdraw its major combat forces from overseas, screen its personnel, reduce the number of its units on a planned schedule, and redeploy its forces in accordance with current strategical requirements. This interim phase will end with the establishment of the stabilized peacetime Army Air Forces.

MISSION

The mission of the Army Air Forces in peacetime is to develop and to maintain a military air force capable of immediate, sustained, and expanding application of the accepted American doctrine of military air power. It must cooperate fully and be geared to work in close harmony with the Nation's ground and naval services in discharging the joint responsibility for supporting American foreign policy and for maintaining the peace.

AIR FORCE-IN-BEING

The Army Air Forces can accomplish its mission only if it maintains an air force-in-being of adequate size and proper composition, strategically deployed, and in a high and constant state of readiness. It must be supported by a well-balanced, forward-looking program of research and technical development, by an alert, readily expendable aeronautical industry, and by an informed and enlightened public opinion. It is extremely unlikely that the United States ever again will have time to prepare for war after war actually begins. The initial attack of World War II came without warning and from the air. Any future attack almost certainly will come from the air. The best insurance against unannounced aerial attack is an adequate, alert air force-in-being.

COEQUAL STATUS

The Army Air Forces can discharge its responsibilities to the people of the United States most effectively if, and only if, it is granted full parity and coequal status with

the ground and naval services. The air arm is unique in that it possesses to a very high degree the military characteristics of mobility, speed, range, flexibility of employment, surprise, and fire power. World War II proved that air power can fatally weaken the enemy's power and will to resist by destroying systematically his military and economic potential. The attributes and advantages of air power can be exploited to the fullest extent only by men fully cognizant of those attributes and advantages, that is to say, by airmen. The best interests of the Nation demand for air power an equal place and voice in the councils of war.

The Army Air Forces are in unanimous agreement with the view that a single department of national defense in which the Air Force attains parity with the other armed services under a unified command is definitely desirable. No one has stated this position more clearly than did the President in his message to the Congress on December 19, 1945, when he said: "Air power has been developed to a point where its responsibilities are equal to those of land and sea power, and its contribution to our strategic planning is as great. Parity for air power can be achieved in one department or in three, but not in two. As between one department and three, the former is infinitely to be preferred."

REORGANIZATION

The Army Air Forces must have the type of internal organization that is best suited to the accomplishment of its mission. Studies now under way will produce a plan for reorganization that will permit the maximum efficiency of operation and the greatest flexibility of employment. This plan will be implemented by an orderly process of evolution.

PROGRAM

The peacetime manpower requirements of the Army Air Forces have been submitted to and approved by the War Department. They now await the completion of studies to effect their integration with the over-all manpower needs of the armed forces, after which they will be submitted to the President for final approval.

AIR RESERVE AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Air Reserve and the Air National Guard will form an integral part of the air-defense structure of the United States. The mission of the Air National Guard is to provide a reserve component of the Air Forces capable of rapid expansion to war strength. The Air Reserve will provide, in an emergency, additional trained officers and men for replacements in and for expansion of the Air Forces, as well as units organized and trained in time of peace for rapid mobilization, expansion, and deployment in time of war. These reserve units will be of the types and numbers which will best supplement the Regular Air Forces and the Air National Guard to round out a balanced air force.

DEPLOYMENT

The deployment of air-combat units must be consistent with the concept that the Air Forces must be prepared to meet, at points well beyond the continental limits of the United States, any attack aimed at the national security. The consequent disposition of the Air Forces necessitates bases on which, as circumstances demand, offensive forces can be poised well within reach of the war potential of any possible enemy. The number of units held on overseas bases will be kept to the minimum in order to prevent dissipation of strength. A strong air striking force must be readily available for rapid concentration and employment. While a certain number of combat groups may have their primary stations in advanced strategic areas, a program of rotation will insure the presence of a strong, mobile air striking force in continental United States. The units based in the United States will serve to meet tactical requirements and will form the bulk of a mobile striking force quickly available to reinforce and to complement units in forward areas.

ORGANIZATION

The Army Air Forces must contain a number of components within that fundamental unity which characterizes its singleness of design and purpose for the fulfillment of its mission. In the new organization there will be three major combat commands and five supporting commands operating under Headquarters, Army Air Forces. No more than eight individuals will report directly to the commanding general, thereby insuring simplicity of structure. The three combat commands will be: (1) The Strategic Air Command, which will embody the combat groups of the long-range striking forces; (2) the Air Defense Command, which will be responsible for the air defense of the continental United States and for the coordination of the continental air units, including the Air National Guard and Air Reserve, into effective fighting forces; and (3) the Tactical Air Command, which will be charged with cooperative missions with the surface forces. Immediately under these commands will be the numbered air forces.

In addition to the three combat commands, there will be (1) the Air Matériel Command, which will perform normal maintenance and supply functions as well as research and development; (2) the Training Command, which will provide all phases of individual training except the higher education carried on in the Air University and the unit training conducted in the three combat commands; (3) the Air Transport Command, which will provide the global systems, including military air transport, air signal communications, flight service, weather, rescue, flying safety, and aeronautical chart service; and, finally, (4) and (5) the Air University and the Air Force Proving Ground Command, two agencies whose functions will be to crystallize and to disseminate the latest Air Force doctrine through training programs and through tactical experimentation.

The commanding general of the Army Air Forces ordinarily will exercise only administrative, training, and tactical supervision over the air units assigned to a theater. Under certain conditions of employment of units of the Strategic Air Command, however, his function may be extended to the exercise of complete command control, as was the case originally with the Twentieth Air Force. The objective of the Army Air Forces organization is, in the final analysis, to form the most effective military machine possible.

EFFICIENCY

A strong Air Force which daily demonstrates high efficiency of operation is a most powerful instrument for the defense of the national security and for the prevention of war. The development, procurement, and operation of high-performance aircraft cost money. The rate of obsolescence is high compared to other types of weapons. Their operation requires highly skilled crews and technicians whose training is exacting and requires considerable time as well as heavy expenditure of funds. These factors challenge every member of the Air Forces. An effective, hard-hitting Air Force must be built with maximum economy of manpower and public funds.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The American Military Establishment, however strong it may be internally, must be supported by means outside itself. It cannot function efficiently unless and until it receives the wholehearted support of the American people. The degree of support given the Air Force depends upon the extent to which the public is informed. The American people provide the men, the money, and the machines; the military must guarantee the security of the Nation. The Army Air Forces must have a broad, strong, progressive, intelligent, and continuing policy of public relations and information service. The public has the right to be informed on the capabilities of the Army Air Forces and its state of readiness. At the same time it must be made continually aware of its responsibility to supply the Air Forces with the means to accomplish its mission.

COOPERATION WITH THE SURFACE FORCES

World War II clearly and conclusively demonstrated the fundamental soundness of the American conception of the function and potentialities of strategic air offense. The atomic bomb has provided a weapon which tremendously increases the effectiveness of air power. From this it follows that any future conflict will begin with air action, and may well be concluded by it; but, despite this possibility, the Air Forces must be able to participate with the surface forces in coordinated action. The Air Force must fulfill its role in these joint tasks with the same high degree of efficiency which characterizes its ability to accomplish a purely strategic air mission. To this end, the tactical air command will be equipped and trained to perform joint air-surface training and field exercises with the surface forces, to perform demonstrations at service schools, to carry out tests of new procedures of joint air-surface operations, and to develop techniques of tactical air operation. Each commander is enjoined to hold uppermost in his mind the thesis that regardless of the soundness of any organization which may be created, cooperation will not be achieved unless the will to cooperate is present. Cooperation is assured only when Air Force commanders maintain close personal relationships with the commanders and staffs of the other services.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

During the war, civilians constituted a large and important segment of the Air Forces personnel. In the performance of their tasks they contributed heavily to the achievement of victory. The services of civilians will continue to be required throughout the postwar period to free military personnel for exclusively military duties. Both soldiers and civilians are needed to solve the problems immediately ahead and Air Force commanders in the field will stress the desirability of employing veterans as civilian personnel, in accordance with existing laws and usages.

RECRUITING

A vigorous recruiting campaign for the rapid procurement of the greatest possible number of 3-year enlistments will provide the chief source of Air Force military personnel. This campaign is of the utmost importance to the future of the Air Forces.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

The advance of air power depends peculiarly on scientific progress. Research must be continued in order to derive from new scientific developments their military application. Recognition of the commanding importance of science is indicated by the designation of a Deputy Chief of Air Staff whose sole duty will be to guide and control a program of research and development, and to maintain close liaison with Government research agencies. To further the education of technical personnel, selected young officers must be given the opportunity to take advanced technological courses, at both military and civilian institutions. There must be no stinting of expenditures in the field of research and scientific development. Military doctrines must be continually altered to conform to and to take full advantage of scientific discoveries and developments.

INDUSTRIAL PLANNING

Industrial planning is similarly important. To insure a maximum production of weapons

in a minimum of time, production to meet any contingency must be planned in advance. This is especially true for military aircraft and related components, which cannot be stock-piled because they become obsolete quickly in this era of rapid technical advancement.

The high operational mobility of the Air Forces must be matched always by a corresponding logistical mobility. Unless an organization attains logistical mobility, its attainment of operational mobility is nullified. Operational plans and programs will be evolved, therefore, with close reference to logistical plans and programs. Means, methods, and techniques for the distribution of personnel and matériel must be constantly improved to attain maximum mobility.

Army Air Forces personnel policies and plans are many and varied. Only a few may be mentioned there. The betterment of the situation of the enlisted man is one of our primary objectives. Good results already are apparent. Plans have been prepared to offer opportunities to enlisted personnel to secure not only training in technical skills, but also to earn degrees in civilian educational institutions. This subject will continue to receive careful attention.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR TECHNICAL SPECIALISTS

The functions of research, procurement, production, supply, maintenance, and related activities call for the services of trained technical specialists who are not rated as flying personnel. In order to insure that such specialists are given the rewards they merit, it will be the policy of the Air Forces to provide them with opportunities for promotion comparable to those enjoyed by flying personnel. There are many important stations and commands available in the Air Forces which will supply a suitable career incentive to nonrated officers.

COMMAND ASSIGNMENTS TO NONRATED OFFICERS AND REGULAR OFFICER STRENGTH

The future Air Forces will include a greatly increased proportion of nonrated officers who, it is anticipated, will be eligible for both command and staff positions. It is thought, too, that the present Air Forces strength of 3,200 Regular Air Corps officers will be greatly increased. Congress already has authorized an increment of 4,100 additional Regular Air Corps commissions. This expansion, which reflects the immensely increased stature of air power, points out a new opportunity for young men of America to establish themselves in a career of honorable service.

SCHOOL SYSTEM

Education is of prime importance to the furtherance of air power. The establishment and maintenance of an educational system to assure high standards of professional education for military personnel will be a significant contribution toward the establishment of an Air Force trained and equipped to meet any eventuality. To that end, the Air Forces already has begun to formulate a complete educational system, the Air University. The Air University will function directly under the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, and will be concerned with the formal schooling of all Air Force officers. The courses offered will include graded professional training in subjects above the level of those studied by the officer in the acquisition of his primary military specialty or rating.

The prototype of the Air University is the Army Air Forces School at Maxwell Field, Ala., which will begin an air command and staff course in September 1946. A course in basic tactical training and a course in advanced strategy and logistics are planned. The Air Force Institute of Technology has been established at Wright Field, Ohio, under the Air Matériel Command. This will be integrated into the AAF school system on the command and staff course level to meet the need for officers trained in technology and research. The complete Air Forces plan calls for progressive training in three main phases, each phase adjusted to the responsibility and experience level of the individual officer as he moves upward in his career.

PERSONAL CONDUCT

Military history clearly demonstrates that when military personnel depart from the highest standards of conduct, the force which they comprise experiences a corresponding decline in strength because of the resultant weakening of discipline and the general undermining of authority. Discipline must flow from within and must be controlled from without. Individuals of the Army Air Forces must, therefore, observe the rules of discipline and dress, and the customs of the service in a manner consistent with the high standards which have been established.

Although the Air Forces is the youngest of the armed services, it has a tradition and a glory of its own, stemming from its heroic accomplishments in the air battles of two World Wars. Its officers and men, its component air forces, wings, groups, and squadrons, have added new bright chapters to the glorious history of mankind. From this tradition of galantry springs the esprit de corps which give powerful coherence and unity to the Air Force. From this pride in achievement springs confidence that the Air Forces will continue to fulfill its mission with distinction.

The officers and men of the Army Air Forces will continue to work with the zeal and energy shown in the past, to the end that the history of their day-to-day efforts will contribute immeasurably to the advancement of American air power.

Congress and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on the 11th of January of this year to the annual convention of the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation on the subject Congress and the Farmer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am greatly complimented by the invitation which enables me to participate in your program and by your kindness in arranging your program to accommodate my engagements.

You have asked me to discuss the subject Congress and the Farmer. I am happy to do this, though I would not claim the right or the ability to say the last word either for Congress or for the farmer. But we all recognize now that there is an inseparable connection between agriculture and he legislative acts of Congress which makes such a subject appropriate in view of our present agricultural and economic situation.

After the First World War came an inflationary "boom" followed by a crackup which produced a substantial depression in 1921. Farm prices rose to great heights after the last war but they dropped 41 percent in just 1 year, from 1920 to 1921, falling to a level 25 percent below parity. A great plowup of new acreage also took place after the First World War, resulting in the destruction of huge quantities of soil. Farmers did not recover from the 1921 depression and farm prices remained below parity even during the so-called boom years of the 1920's. The only major agricultural legislation enacted in this period consisted of two McNary-Haugen measures which were vetoed by President Coolidge. In 1929 President Hoover appointed a Federal Farm Board in an attempt to cope with the mounting agricultural surpluses for which there were no markets either at home or abroad. In the end the Federal Farm Board gave up, declaring that it was powerless to cope with these surpluses and recommending crop curtailment, including the plowing up of every third row of cotton. Meanwhile, especially during the depression which began in 1929, farm debt was piling up and hundreds of thousands of farmers were losing their homes through foreclosures. In 1932 farm income and agricultural conditions generally fell to the lowest point in our history.

Immediately after President Roosevelt's inauguration in 1933 there came a period of sweeping agricultural legislation to meet the greatest farm crisis of all time. Conferences of farmers and farm leaders—grass-roots conferences, regional conferences, and national conferences—were called to plan the legislation which followed.

BASIC ADJUSTMENTS

One set of basic measures had to do with the adjustment of farm production and markets. Because action had not been taken soon enough following the First World War to provide adequate markets for agricultural commodities, by 1933 farmers had been wasting their soil, labor, and money to produce huge surpluses which were depressing farm prices. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 established the parity standard and set up machinery for bringing agricultural production and markets into balance. It was supplemented by the Jones-Connally Cattle Act of 1934, the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, the Kerr Tobacco Act of 1934, the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934, and the DeRouen Rice Act of 1935. In January 1936 the Supreme Court invalidated the processing tax which had been used to finance the adjustment program. In less than 2 months Congress enacted the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, which provided for soil-conservation payments and linked up the problems of adjustment with conservation of the soil. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provided for acreage allotments, marketing quotas, parity payments, and commodity loans on basic crops. Actually, loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation had begun in 1933 but the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 made them a basic part of the adjustment program.

Thus by the time Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 the United States had a complete ever-normal granary program which supported the prices of basic crops and maintained stable reserves which later played an essential role in the production of food for war. The tremendous increases in meat, dairy, and egg production of wartime would not have been possible without the reserve of feed grains established by the ever-normal granary.

From 1933 through 1945 commodity loans and purchases totaling about $17,500,000,000 were made by the Commodity Credit Corporation—supporting farm prices during the 1930's and speeding up agricultural production during the war.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Closely related legislation in the 1930's established two kinds of soil-conservation programs. The Soil Erosion Act of 1935 provided for extensive research and surveys, and also the establishment of soil-conservation

districts under State laws. In this program the Soil Conservation Service has provided technical aid to farmers adopting complete soil-conservation plans for their farms.

By the end of 1945 over 420,000 farmers had worked out such soil-conservation plans for a total of about 140,000,000 acres. Recognizing that financial assistance was necessary to give impetus to the adoption of soil conservation measures, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 and also the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provided for soil-conservation payments. Improved farming methods are thus being encouraged on farms covering 338,000,000 acres, or 73 percent of the Nation's cropland. It fostered such practices as the use of fertilzers, pasture improvement, strip cropping and contour plowing, the growing of green manure and cover crops, and the harvesting of hay seed and legume seed.

FARM CREDIT

Another type of legislation which came to the aid of farmers beginning in 1933 dealt with the liberalization of farm credit. In 1933 associations of the Farm Credit Administration were authorized to make loans for refinancing of farm mortgage debt. Interest rates were reduced on farm credit loans. Production credit associations and banks for cooperatives were established. In January 1937 Congress authorized emergency crop and feed loans to meet a situation created by the drought. From May 1, 1933, through June 30, 1945, loans made under the programs of the Farm Credit Administration totaled $16,868,539,301 to farmers, production credit loans totaled $3,961,122,239 and loans by banks for cooperatives amounted to $1,918,111,636.

FARM SECURITY

Special aid has been given to low-income farmers since 1935, with the establishment of the Resettlement Administration, which was changed to the Farm Security Administration in 1937. The legislative basis for the Farm Security Administration program is the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, authorizing loans for tenant purchase and also loans and emergency grants for rural rehabilitation. Besides providing financial aid, the Farm Security Administration assists farmers by working out farm and home management plans to help assure successful operations over a period of years. From the beginning of the program through June 30, 1945, rehabilitation loans have been made to 860,000 low-income farm families unable to obtain credit on reasonable terms anywhere else. From the time of the Bankhead-Jones Act through June 30, 1945, loans have been made for the purchase of family-type farms to 38,089 farm tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers. During the period of time indicated, rehabilitation loans totaled $921,418,558 and tenant purchase loans $228,336,146.

PURCHASE OPERATIONS

In 1935 Congress enacted the famous section 32 of Public Law No. 320 providing for the use of funds each year, equal to 30 percent of customs receipts, to encourage the domestic consumption and export of agricultural commodities. Followed up by substantial appropriations from year to year, this enactment has been a tremendous source of price support of particular benefit to producers of fruits, vegetables, dairy products and other commodities which are not classified as basic. Before the war, large-scale purchases were made with the dual effect of supporting farm prices and providing food for such uses as the food-stamp plan, the school-lunch program, direct relief distribution, the diversion of agricultural commodities into new uses or new markets. During the war period, this purchasing mechanism was used for the purpose of buying agricultural commodities for lend-lease and military use, as well as for the support of farm prices as needed.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The Rural Electrification Act of 1938 established the Rural Electrification Administration program of loans to bring electrical power to rural areas not otherwise supplied. Through 1945 about $450,000,000 had been advanced as loans to more than 900 borrowers, mostly farmer cooperatives. REA loans have been used to construct about 440,000 miles of distribution lines serving 1,400,000 rural consumers. Since the beginning of the REA program, the proportion of farms having electric service has risen from about 10 percent to more than 45 percent.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

The Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 set up a system of crop insurance for wheat, which was extended to cover cotton by an amendment in 1941. After the 1943 cotton and wheat crops had been insured, the program was temporarily suspended, but this year it will be in operation for cotton, wheat, and flax and on a trial basis for corn and tobacco. In the 5-year period from 1938 through 1943, crop insurance covered about 49,000,000 acres of wheat and 5,600,000 acres of cotton.

MARKETING AGREEMENTS

Legislation adopted in 1937 laid a foundation for various kinds of marketing agreements and regulations which have been used to support the prices and stabilize marketing particularly for fluid milk, fruits, and vegetables of various kinds. This legislation likewise determined the base periods and formulas for parity or comparable prices on such commodities.

WATER FACILITIES AND FLOOD CONTROL

Improvement of water facilities and control of floods were provided for by legislation in the latter half of the 1930's. As a result of the Flood Control Act of 1936 with subsequent amendments, comprehensive surveys and reports have paved the way for extensive improvements in watersheds, including measures to retard water run-off and to prevent soil erosion. The Water Facilities Act of 1937 provided facilities for water storage and use in arid and semiarid regions of the West. The Wheeler-Case Act of 1939 provided for extensive irrigation and water conservation projects in the Great Plains and other arid regions.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Agricultural research and education to improve the efficiency of farming operations has been greatly advanced since the early 1930's. An act of Congress in 1935 launched a greatly expanded research program on the part of the Department of Agriculture and agricultural experiment stations, increased the support of land grant colleges, and enlarged the cooperative agricultural extension work. Another important step, initiated by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, was the establishment of four regional research laboratories to find new uses and markets for agricultural products. Agricultural research has resulted in rapid technological strides which made it possible during the war to produce one-half more than in the last war, with 4,000,000 fewer farmers and very little increase in acreage. Examples of achievements in agricultural science include hybrid seed corn, dehydrated foods, the insecticide DDT, and the famous drug penicillin.

PRICE-SUPPORTS

As farmers enter their first year of postwar production, they have the assurance of an unprecedented price support pledge enacted by Congress even before Pearl Harbor. This is the so-called Steagall amendment which became law on July 1, 1941, and was extended by later enactments, including provisions in the Stabilization Act of 1942. This legislation requires the support of prices for basic commodities and also the so-called Steagall commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity for a period at least 2 years following the January 1 after the war is officially declared to be over. Since the official proclamation of the end of hostilities has not been issued, this support pledge extends at least until January 1, 1949. It applies to the basic commodities, corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts for nuts. It also applies to the Steagall commodities, those for which wartime production expansion was officially requested by proclamation, soybeans, flaxseed, peanuts for oil, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, American-Egyptian cotton, hogs, eggs, chickens, turkeys, milk, and butterfat. For all other commodities not included among the basic commodities and the Steagall commodities, Congress has directed that a fair parity relationship shall be maintained.

Congress enacted this price support legislation early in the war so that farmers would be encouraged to expand their output and make production shifts to meet war needs with assurance that they would not be let down after wartime demands stopped.

During the reconversion years ahead, three principal measures are available to maintain the price support which has been enacted into law:

1. Commodity loans, primarily on commodities that can be stored, such as cotton and the grains. The very knowledge that farmers can get the loan price tends to keep the Nation-wide price of the commodity at least up to the loan rate.

2. Purchases, especially important for dairy products, eggs, potatoes, fruits and vegetables—many of these commodities being perishable. Purchase of only a fraction of the commodity marketed, if made at the right time and in sufficient volume, tends to keep the national price up to the support level. Products purchased are used for feeding liberated peoples, for school lunches, and many other necessary purposes.

3. Payments, making up the difference between the market price and the return which the farmer needs to reach the support level. Payments of this type are currently being made on milk and butterfat.

By a combination of loans, purchases and payments, the Government is prepared to maintain a floor below which the farmers' average return is not allowed to fall.

WARTIME RECORD

The farm programs of the 1930's and the price support operations which they made possible had a great deal to do with the amazing wartime production records established by American farmers. During the years we were at war, agricultural production averaged nearly a third above prewar years. Each year, beginning in 1941, production goals were established to guide farmers as to the nation's food needs. Incentives were established and prices supported in such a way as to encourage farmers to produce more of the things needed most urgently. Farmers went over the top on most wartime production goals, often changing their customary farming patterns in order to supply the things needed for war. As a result, our armed forces were the best fed and clothed in the world, civilians on the home front maintained better diets through the war years than ever before, and we were able to provide up to one-fourth of our food for such direct war uses as lend-lease and military requirements.

AGRICULTURE TODAY

At present American farmers are generally in the best financial position they have ever enjoyed. Net income of farmers in 1945 reached the all-time record of about $13,000,000,000, compared with less than five billion just before the war and less than two

billion in 1932. Net income per farm operator averaged well over $2,000 annually during the war, and this compares favorably with the average annual earnings of the city worker. Farm prices in 1945 averaged about 15 percent above parity, twice as high as the average for prewar years and nearly triple the prices of agriculture's worst depression year, namely, 1932. During the war farm-mortgage debts dropped steadily from $6,500,000,000 at about the time of Pearl Harbor to roughly $5,000,000,000 at present. Farmers now have financial assets totaling about $18,000,000,000—such as cash, bank deposits, war bonds, and warehouse receipts. This $18,000,000,000 in financial assets compares with $5,000,000,000 on January 1, 1940.

The war is, of course, the main reason why farmers are in a good financial position, but that is not the only reason.

The upswing in American agriculture did not start at the beginning of the war, but in about March of 1933 when farmers were in the worst situation of all time.

Beginning with 1933, farm income increased, farm prices improved, farmers' debts were reduced, and agriculture generally was put in the kind of shape which enabled us to come through the war with flying colors.

For instance, our soil-conservation programs of the 1930's built up the fertility of the Nation's farms so that wartime production could be increased by one-third without ruining the land for future use.

The ever-normal granary of the late 1930's built up a reserve of feed grains which enabled us to break all records for the production of milk, eggs, and meat during the war.

Farm credit and farm-security programs during the 1930's rescued hundreds of thousands of farmers from bankruptcy and aided literally millions to get their farming on a paying basis. These farmers made far greater contributions to war production than would have been possible without the credit aids and planning assistance provided for them.

Rural electrification loans brought electric power to over a million rural consumers, thus enabling these farms to boost their war production as well as improve their own living conditions.

Extensive purchase programs were developed during the 1930's to support farm prices and at the same time provide food for school lunches, relief feeding, and other domestic purposes. These purchasing operations enabled the Department of Agriculture to move swiftly to meet the needs of lend-lease and military requirements which during the war took as much as one-fourth of our food.

Research conducted by the Department of Agriculture and cooperating experiment stations was a great factor in supplying food and fiber for war.

In the years ahead farmers will have the advantage of the same programs which brought agriculture out of the depression and saw us through the war.

Besides price-supporting loans and purchases and payments, there will be our soil-conservation programs, our ever-normal granary, our farm-credit aids, our farm-security assistance, our rural electrification loans, and our efficient programs of research and extension education.

Scientific research is responsible for better crops, better livestock, better machinery, better fertilizers and better ways of using them, better soil-management practices, better feeding, better disease and insect control, and better methods of handling and processing many agricultural products.

As we move into the peace-conversion period, one of our greatest assets is our long experience in agricultural legislation and administrative action. Many of our farm-program provisions were enacted under emergency conditions. Some have been changed to meet new situations. Further changes will, of course, be essential to meet the new problems of a new kind of world. Having provided for a long period of price supports, and having ahead of us a period when the demand for farm products will continue to be high, we now have an excellent opportunity to think about the long-time improvements which we want to make in agriculture.

The outlook for 1946 is almost as good as the high wartime demand which we have had in the past few years. Foreign needs for American food are great, and the buying power of American consumers is high. This year we will not have as much of some agricultural products as we and our export customers could use—particularly sugar, fats and oils, meats and dairy products. Price supports will still be required in 1946 on some commodities as incentives for high levels of production. On other commodities price supports will be needed to bolster the market. By and large we will not have any great surplus problems in 1946.

THE FUTURE

For the years beginning in 1947, we will face problems that are different from those of 1946, or the war period, or prewar. In broad terms, we will be confronted with the related problems of improving the land and establishing new patterns of production to meet new peacetime conditions. These problems are related because one of the main features of the new pattern for agriculture will need to be more widespread conservation farming. For many years we have been using up soil resources faster than we have been able to replace them. During the war we did not waste our soil resources in the way that we did during and after the First World War, but we did use up soil fertility at a faster rate than in the late 1930's. Measures that are required to improve the soil fit in very well with the pattern of demand which we can expect. For example, there will be less demand for intertilled crops such as cotton which tend to exhaust the soil, and there will be more immediate demand for dairy and livestock products which require improved pastures and grasslands.

We face a difficult question as to whether the desired pattern of agriculture can be accomplished under the price support program as it now stands. We know, for example, that 90 percent of parity in 1946 will give us too many eggs and not enough dairy products. The time is ripe for a complete reexamination of our parity formulas for the long pull ahead to make sure that farmers will get a fair share of the national income and provide the basis for a production pattern that will fit our needs.

One of the question marks in our present price support legislation is that it provides an opportunity for price and production to go in only one direction, namely, upward. Agriculture's future largely depends on what happens to purchasing power and employment, industry and business and labor, in our towns and cities.

There are at least a half a dozen kinds of farm programs which will be required even if American prosperity rises to the highest level imaginable:

1. Agricultural research and education to improve the efficiency of farming and agricultural marketing, and to develop new uses for farm products.

2. Marketing improvements, including establishment of better facilities, and commodity loans that will stabilize prices throughout the year.

3. Expansion of foreign trade.

4. Various kinds of actions to cope with the fact that the distribution of income, even in time of greatest prosperity, is drastically unequal both for farmers and for city people. For low-income farmers, come what may, there will be a need for assistance to establish units that will provide an adequate living. For city people as well as farmers, there will be need for measures such as school lunches which have the effect of improving standards of nutrition, especially for the needy.

5. Measures to create better facilities for improving living standards in agriculture; including REA, health programs, housing programs, housing projects, road building, and educational facilities.

6. Credit assistance for the farmers—such as the programs of the Farm Credit Administration as well as FSA and REA.

Perhaps we would never need any large scale agricultural program with the exception of the six kinds of assistance mentioned if we could be sure that foreign and domestic demand for agricultural products would always be sufficient to absorb everything farmers produced. But if farm producton again begins to outstrip effective market demand, and it easily could for crops such as cotton and wheat, we may need to adopt additional measures—measures that will arouse greater controversy. If great unmarketable farm surpluses threaten to appear, there are roughly four basic lines of action to choose from:

1. Increasing consumption in the United States: Lower prices of commodities produced in surplus would bring greater consumption but would necessitate payments to farmers for the difference between what they get and what they are entitled to. In addition, it is possible to increase the diets of school children by lunch programs and to raise food consumption of low-income groups by Government distribution programs.

2. Increasing foreign consumption of American agricultural products: Sound tariff policies and foreign loans, such as the proposed British loan, are two means of increasing exports. It has often been necessary to resort to an export subsidy in order to move large quantities of surplus export crops.

3. Direct aid to farmers: Various kinds of loans, grants, and payments can be made to farmers to help them finance their operations.

4. Production control to support farm prices—brought about through acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and other control measures.

We have used all four of these types of measures, but never in peacetime to the extent required to reach our two gaols:

1. Adequate income and good living standards for all farmers; and

2. Adequate food and fiber for all consumers.

If we are again confronted with huge farm surpluses, we shall have to choose some workable combination of these four kinds of measures in sufficient volume so as to reach these two objectives.

In thinking about these four types of measures, it is important to consider "who gets what":

1. Increasing United States food and fiber consumption benefits both farmers and consumers.

2. Increasing foreign consumption of United States farm products benefits foreign consumers plus the producers of the principal export crops.

3. Loans, payments, and grants to farmers of course benefit farmers, can be operated to aid low-income farmers especially, but do not by themselves solve basic problems.

4. Production control to maintain prices benefits mainly the large-scale agricultural producers, the upper third on the farm income scale, which produce about 85 percent of the farm products sold.

Programs that are financed with Federal funds—such as payments for farmers, school-lunch programs, stamp plans and export subsidies are ultimately paid out of Federal

taxes, most of which are levied on the basis of ability to pay. Programs that are financed in the market place—such as production controls to maintain higher prices—do not contribute to an economy of abundance.

With these considerations in mind, it would seem desirable—if we are confronted with surplus problems—to place our first emphasis on programs that increase the consumption of food and fiber within this country.

One of the acute problems that faces the producers of one of Kentucky's greatest products, tobacco, is involved in the current price reduction for Burley tobacco and the current proposal to enact legislation making possible a 20 percent reduction in the crop for 1946.

I have received many letters and telegrams from County Farm Bureaus recommending that this step be taken in order to avoid the possibility of a surplus of this crop produced in the year 1946 that would still further depress the price to the farmer.

While I am not in a position to predict what Congress will do or whether agreement can be reached among all the tobacco interests, governmental as well as private, in regard to a program of this kind, I desire to say that in the absence of a better remedy, this proposal is entitled to every possible consideration. We have committeed ourselves in the past to legislation permitting the adoption of quotas and restriction of acreage in order to avoid surpluses and to maintain stabilized prices. Of course, this is always based upon the overwhelming consent of the producers themselves.

In connection with this immediate problem, it occurs to me that consideration will have to be given to the question of whether such reduced acreage can apply to all competitive types of tobacco in the same category, or in the same general field, as that occupied by burley tobacco. In other words, consideration must be given to the question of whether a decrease in acreage of burley tobacco would be absorbed by flue-cured or some other type that may not be suffering from the current reduction because of outlets in the foreign market, and whether the absorption of the reduced acreage in other competitive categories would prevent the beneficial effects growing out of the reduction in the acreage of burley tobacco.

I am not announcing any decision with reference to it so far as I am concerned, but I am offering it to you as a suggestion which will have to be considered when the question of applying a reduced acreage to burley alone may be under consideration. In any event, it is desirable, if not essential, that such adjustments and arrangements within the competitive areas shall be worked out as will not bring about another overproduction resulting in a depression of the prices, such as we have experienced in the past.

We are all aware of the fact that the end of the war and the demobilization of our Army and Navy may have an inevitable effect upon the price structure, not only for tobacco but for other farm commodities. But we will be short-sighted indeed if we are not able to work out and to put into effect a sound plan which will protect the agricultural producers of this country from disastrous reductions in the prices of their products, which would be doubly harmful in view of the increased cost of production which is involved in every agricultural product of which I have any knowledge.

I have heretofore stated, and I now repeat, that I am ready to work with and cooperate with the agencies of the Government and the agencies of the growers and all legitimate interests involved in the tobacco situation in an effort to be helpful and constructive in the solution of this tremendously important program of the farmers of our State and many other States.

Address by Carl Lynch Before Furuseth Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Carl Lynch, at the Furuseth Club, on March 12, 1946, in New York City, on the ninety-second anniversary of the birthday of the late Andrew Furuseth.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ninety-two years ago in the little town of Romedal, on the coast of Norway, a man was born; they called him Andrew Furuseth.

Peter B. Kyne, the novelist, has called him St. Andrew the Sailor. In the early days of this century, powerful interests called him a dangerous radical and a menace to the American form of government.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him and working with him, called him "Andy," or "the Old Man." Andy was neither a saint nor a menace to the American way of life. He was a fighter in the cause of human freedom.

He isn't with us any more. On January 24, 1938, he departed on that lonely voyage into the great unknown that all men must take. But his work, his spirit, his ideals live on. Although he was truly a great man, Andy is little known to the general public. Older seamen know of him and of his great work but many of the younger fellows have never heard of him. They take their rights for granted today, unaware of that grand and lonely figure who fought and won for the seamen of all the world the precious privilege of freedom.

The Friends of Andrew Fursueth Legislative Association is an organization dedicated to the perpetuation of his memory and the guardianship, if need be, of the rights of seamen established through the work of Andrew Furuseth.

They have asked me tonight to talk about the "old man" for I knew him, admired him and was proud to serve him. A tall, gaunt figure, well over 6 feet, with long flowing hair and the high cheek bones and piercing eyes of an Indian chief, Andy feared no man.

He was an absolutely honest labor leader. His whole life—every minute of his day was devoted to the interests of his boys, the seamen. He told me once that the only man who can ever do anything for his fellowman is the man who has nothing and wants nothing for himself. That statement was an accurate description of his own character.

Let us glance briefly at what we know of his early life. Born into a poor family, Andy was apprenticed as a boy to a farmer some distance from his own home where he was to receive his board and schooling in return for his labor. One summer day he stopped work to get a drink of water. Enraged, the farmer beat him. Andy told me that that beating was the worst he ever received. He carried the memory of it all his life. He left the farm and took to the sea—an ordinary Norwegian youth before the mast. Conditions in those days of sail were unhuman and almost unbearable—but the youth, having no other trade, stuck to the sea.

Once, when he was about 19 or 20, he was stricken with fever in the Indian Ocean. A brutal mate forced him to continue work day after weary day though he could scarcely stand.

It is difficult for us today, blessed with freedom as we are, to realize that only half a century ago seamen were slaves. Even American seamen, born in the country which fought a terrible civil war to end slavery, were regarded as slaves under the law. Flogging and branding were common, and a brutal mate or captain could and indeed often did work men until they dropped dead.

Finally, exhausted, Andy was given a slight respite. He crawled into his bunk in the filthy crowded foc'sle determined that he would not turn out again until he was feeling better. He lay facing the shipside with a sharp knife clasped in his hand. He told me that he was determined to kill the mate should he lay hands on him to drag him back on deck. Fortunately, the mate did not attempt to rouse him, and after a long period of delirium, Andy recovered. Then came reaction. He kept thinking of what his parents would say, how ashamed they would have been had he killed the mate and the news had finally gone back to Remedal that Andrew Furuseth had been hanged to the yardarm for the murder.

Why, he reasoned, should this have happened to him? What had caused him to almost become a murderer? On long, wheel watches he pondered the problem. Why didn't seamen band together to end these intolerable conditions?

Then came decision. He would strike the blow for freedom. The next question was, Where could the fight be carried on? Never one to do things on a picayune scale, Andy envisioned freedom for all the seamen of all the world—not just the seafaring sons of Norway. He told me that he chose the United States because this was the first country in history of the world that dared to declare a political document "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

So Andy came to this country and lived to become one of the finest Americans of all time. He was beloved and respected on the docks and on the ships as he was in the Halls of Congress and at the White House. It was not an easy fight. A lesser man would have abandoned it many times. Andy saw heartbreak, discouragement, near starvation, and bitter disappointment before, in 1915, President Woodrow Wilson signed the Seamen's Act, the American law which did result in freedom for all the seamen of the world.

It is noteworthy in these troubled times to recall that the fight was won without bloodshed. It was won in the American way, through legal and legislative channels.

Andy settled in San Francisco where he became a member of the Coast Seamen's Union, which later became the Sailors' Union of the Pacific. He first educated himself. Old timers recall the light which he used to burn far into the night in his little room on East Street. He was a deep student, a profound thinker. He familiarized himself with the laws and conditions governing seamen from the days of early Greece and Carthage up to the age of steam. He became secretary of the union and began his fight. It was a long, bitter struggle. The crimps, the boarding house masters, the shipmasters, the shipowners, stockholders, yes, even the public, were against any improvement in the wretched conditions endured by seamen.

Andy allied himself with liberal thinkers. He soon determined that it was necessary to have friends in Washington, if the seamen were ever to win their fight. One morning in December 1909, Andy for the first time

went to see Senator Robert M. La Follette. He said to the Senator that he wanted to interest him in the cause of the American sailor, and he added that he wanted to "be free." The Senator did not know what he meant, and questioned him further saying surely there were no slaves under the American flag, that Lincoln had changed all of that. Furuseth replied, "Yes; but not for the sailor." Senator La Follette took an immediate interest in the struggle. It was he who sponsored the La Follette bill known today as the Seaman's Act.

The Honorable James H. Ralston and the Honorable James G. Maguire (later a Member of Congress who sponsored the Maguire Act to abolish corporal punishment of seamen), and Henry W. Hutton of San Francisco; B. A. Green, of Portland, Oreg., and Silas Blake Axtell, of New York, tossed aside promises of lucrative careers to devote their legal training to the almost penniless cause.

Test after test was carried to the United States Supreme Court. The Court ruled against the seamen, holding that the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution was intended to free Negro slaves and that seamen remained bondmen under the law.

The Sailor's Union of the Pacific devoted its slender treasury to the fight. With the opening of the Panama Canal, however, the Pacific union merged with the Atlantic and Gulf Coast and Great Lakes organizations to found the International Seamen's Union of America, and seamen of the entire Nation backed the fight. They made Andy president of the international and their legislative representative in Washington. La Follette and others worked tirelessly. Finally, in 1912, the act was passed and with freedom in their grasp the seamen were jubilant. But President William Howard Taft refused to sign it.

Followed another black time for Andy and his boys. The delayed day of emancipation came at last when President Wilson affixed his signature and the act became a law. It has since been amended and strengthened by the Jones Act of 1928, and the recent merchant marine laws enacted during the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Andy never married. Though his warm heart burned for the oppressed and the downtrodden, he was essentially a lonely figure. He used to say that he wanted to make it possible "for a seaman to have a wife and a home and a couple of kids," but he denied himself this privilege.

With passage of the Seamen's Act, he opened a crusade for safety of life at sea. Here his interest was not only in the seamen but in the traveling public. He took his fight to the League of Nations in Geneva, and it was largely through his work and that of the union he represented that international laws for safety of life at sea were promulgated.

He freed the seamen. He saw wages go up and living conditions on ships improve. As conditions on American vessels became better foreign nations in competition with American-flag vessels were forced to improve the conditions of their seamen. The man at sea who enjoys a living wage today, who enjoys the right to quit his vessel should be wish, who eats in a clean mess compartment and sleeps on bedding provided by the ship owner, who has the same rights as those of any other worker, owes a great debt to Andrew Furuseth.

As the years roll on his true greatness will emerge. I predict that the time will come when the work of this grand old man will be studied in the public schools, and he will stand enshrined in the hearts of all free peoples alongside of that other great and lonely leader—Abraham Lincoln. For Andy now "belongs to the ages." His ashes float on the wastes of the North Atlantic, where they were scattered, in accordance with his own wish, but his work and his soul and his crusade live on. Generations of seamen, yet unborn, will rise to hail him as the gallant fighter in the cause of human freedom that he was.

In his recent book "A Nation of Nations", Louis Adamic, writing of Furuseth, said: "Freedom was Andy's religion. Seamen in those days (the days before he won his great fight) were virtual slaves, and slaves are incapable of creative effort," argued their champion before congressional committees and elsewhere. They are incapable of responsibility. Seapower is in the seamen; ships are tools. Seamen must be free to quit, to work like other people. No calling demands a higher mental and physical standard in the men employed. No calling has any right to higher consideration or greater honor."

The United Nations today can thank Andy in great measure for the victory over Axis aggression. Is there any reasonable man or woman who will dare to say that the merchant seamen of the United States did not make a major contribution to the victory? They dared, and they died, but they carried the vitally needed tools of victory overseas through submarine packs and under bombing attack. They did the job because they were free men. Full citizens of a free country, fighting for the freedom of the people of all nations just as the "old man" fought for the freedom of all the seamen of all of the world.

Largely because of Andy's life and work, it is among the seafarers of the world today that we find the greatest approach to fraternity and brotherhood among nations.

Those long range thinkers among us today, who advocate the formation of a federal world government, might do well to study the principles advocated by Andrew Furuseth. In seeking to free the people of the world from fear of future war, and from fear of enslavement by militarists, they face no tougher fight, no greater odds, than did Andrew Furuseth 50 years ago.

The seamen of the United States today are free. On this, his ninety-second birthday, we could pay Andrew Furuseth no finer tribute than to dedicate ourselves to the perpetuation of the democratic ideal throughout the world. We can do him no greater honor than to keep in our hearts those words and the principle behind those words which he so greatly loved:

"All men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these are—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Palestine and the UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Palestine and the UNO" delivered by Hon. Guy M. Gillette, president of the American League for a Free Palestine, at the opening of the special emergency conference on Palestine, in New York City on February 23, 1946.

Former Senator Gillette's frank and illuminating case against the British handling of the Palestinian problem, which he brilliantly presents in his "14 points," should make it clear to all my colleagues that unless we wish to become a party to one of the greatest scandals of our time, America must demand justice for Palestine and for the million and a half Hebrews in Europe today who are living only for the day of their repatriation to Palestine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The tragic and desperate plight of the remnant of the Hebrew people in Europe who have escaped the Hitler sentence of annihilation has focused the attention and challenged the concern of people of good will everywhere, regardless of race or creed.

We are gathered here today in emergency session to work out a practical means by which we can achieve a sound and equitable solution to Palestine's problems and those of the Hebrew people in Europe. As Americans we cannot be content merely to sympathize with, or offer charity to, the people who fought Hitler longest and suffered the greatest number of casualties of any nation, excepting one, in the battle against Nazi-fascism.

This Conference of the American League for a Free Palestine has drawn together distinguished public officials, Members of Congress, scholars, and experts in international affairs. We are dedicating ourselves to devising a plan of action which will bring to a happy conclusion this historic problem. We do this as Americans, because we are people of good will; we do this as realists, because the existence of this problem is a threat to our security and to peace everywhere.

Should every Hebrew survivor of Nazi cruelty be removed from the concentration camps today to various havens of refuge throughout the world, the fundamental problem would remain unsolved. Millions of human beings would still be denied the basic rights which the civilized world recognizes as of universal application. Freedom of religious worship, freedom from fear, freedom from want, above all, freedom of democratic political expression, because this can secure all others. Somewhere in the world another Hitler, another Julius Streicher, another "Beast of Belsen" might at any moment arise to exploit discrimination and fan the latent flames of prejudice into another holocaust of human agony, misery, and destruction.

It is essential then that in conjunction with immediate material aid for the Hebrews in Europe, there must be considered the long-range solution of the entire question of the Hebrew people in and out of Palestine, which is a responsibility of the world's nations united for world advancement and world security. It is a question which must rank high on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

In considering this problem, it must be understood that millions of persons of Jewish faith and of Hebrew descent enjoy the privilege and fulfill the obligations of citizenship in various free countries all over the world. Excepting as local anti-Semitism might touch them, their personal problem is solved. They wish to be, and are, part and parcel of the fabric of their chosen countries. Our concern is with the hundreds of thousands of others of Hebrew descent who are presently considered to be stateless, who wish to return to the ancient homeland of their people and are denied that right; or who, having already established themselves there, are subjected to abuse and denied the freedoms of which we spoke.

Who denies them these basic rights? The British Government, under usurped authority over and above its obligations as a designated agent of the nations of the world.

I realize that the statement I have just made is a severe stricture, and should not be made unless fully substantiated by incontrovertible facts. These are the facts:

What is Palestine? It is the name given to the areas lying on both sides of the Jordan River which for countless ages were the home of the children of Israel, dating from their nomadic tribal days, and known historically as Canaan, Galilee, Judea, Moab, Samaria, Gilead, and so on. It is bounded roughly by Lebanon and Syria to the north, Saudi Arabia to the east and south, the Mediterranean and the Sinai Peninsula to the west. In size it is less than 60,000 square miles, a tiny segment of the vast Middle Eastern lands inhabited by Arabic speaking peoples. It is part of the area which came under the suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire about the 15th century A. D. and continued as part that empire until the conclusion of World War I. In the treaty of peace with Turkey, made at Sevres, and remade at Lausanne, the boundaries of Turkey, as at present constituted, were established; by article 16 of the treaty, Turkey expressly renounced all rights and title whatsoever to the territories outside the frontiers, laid down in the treaty. Thus Palestine, as part of the excluded area, came under the authority and control of the principal Allied and Associated Powers. They in turn transferred this authority to the League of Nations.

Subsection 4 of article 22 of the League Covenant, dated London, July 24, 1922, recognized the independence of these former portions of the Turkish Empire subject to the League's supervision and control. This in turn was exercised temporarily through designated members acting as mandatory powers and agents of the League.

At her own request, and that of the Hebrew delegates, Britain has, since September 1923, been the Mandatory for Palestine. Under the mandate, her obligations have been precisely defined. She has betrayed the trust that was imposed in her.

In another notable instance, Britain wantonly abused her powers of government over a people under her care. We here are deeply concerned in the result of that earlier abuse. From it evolved a document so trenchant and so immortal that we can do no better than to reiterate its preamble before reciting the record of her recent abuses:

"When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal stations to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That when any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

We submit these facts:

1. Under article 22 of the League of Nations covenant, Palestine was provisionally recognized as an independent state, subject only to administrative advice and assistance by the designated mandatory power on a temporary basis, and this covenant specifically assested the well-being of the people, in and out of Palestine, and the development of the country to form a sacred trust of civilization. Great Britain, acting as designated mandatory, has usurped, however, absolute control over Palestine under a system of colonial subjugation.

2. Britain has repeatedly flouted the provisions of the mandate and the Anglo-American Convention on Palestine which specifically define her authority and those which provide that no modification of terms should be made without the consent of the Council of the League of Nations and the United States. She has persisted in these violations even after refusal of consent by the League Council.

3. Britain has grossly violated the express injunctions of premable 2 and article II of the mandate to place Palestine under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as to secure the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Hebrew people.

4. Great Britain has violated the obligation placed on her by article VI of the mandate to facilitate Hebrew repatriation to Palestine and to encourage settlement by Hebrews on the land.

5. In direct contravention of the spirit and the letter of the mandate, Britain has by force prevented the return of Hebrews to Palestine and has imposed ruinous discriminatory laws relative to their acquisition, use, and disposal of land and the produce of land.

6. Notwithstanding the express provisions of article II relative to the development of self-government in Palestine, Great Britain not only has failed to give the requisite advice and aid to the organization of the constitutional machinery for self-government in Palestine during the more than a quarter of a century of her mandatory authority, but has consistently opposed the attempts of the citizens of Palestine to establish their own machinery of self-government. She has endeavored to promote mutual distrust among sections of the population and has sought to incite one against the other.

7. In clear violation of article V of the mandate, Great Britain has arbitrarily divided the terrtory of Palestine and has officially announced the impending creation out of an integral portion of Palestine of a purportedly independent country under the control of an alien ruler.

8. The mandatory has grossly violated the provisions of article XV that no person should be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of religious belief.

9. The mandatory has imposed inequitable rates and taxes on citizens of Palestine without their consent and has diverted revenues so raised to purposes outside the expressed mandate provisions and authority.

10. The mandatory has repeatedly violated security of person and property against unlawful search and seizures.

11. The mandatory has repeatedly deprived Palestinian citizens of liberty and property without due process and his imprisoned persons for extended periods without informing them of charges or granting them an opportunity to be heard in their defense.

12. The mandatory has recently announced as a principle in the administration of criminal statutes that Palestinian citizens charged with crimes and misdemeanors are to be presumed guilty until they prove themselves innocent. This principle not only contravenes the centuries-old principles of English law, but is in direct violation of the accepted principles of enlightened civilization.

13. The mandatory has denied the right of habeas corpus to citizens of Palestine, or has forcibly transported them to other areas under British control to support a specious claim of lack of jurisdiction.

14. The mandatory, far beyond the authority of section 17 of the mandate, has mobilized huge armed British and mercenary alien forces in and near Palestine in gross violation of the spirit and purpose of the mandate to threaten and endanger the inhabitants of Palestine and to encourage other peoples inimical to those of Palestine and the Hebrew Nation.

The mandatory by these and other ultra vires acts has thus thwarted the purposes, the policies, the injunctions, the spirit, and the express provisions of the mandate which is the source of its legal authority. So far from furnishing the advice and guidance requisite to enable Palestine to change the provisional status of its independence as recognized by the nations of the world in the League Covenant, it has insistently, persistently, and forcibly continued to administer Palestine as a colony of the British Empire. This in violation of law, in violation of the recognized responsibility of civilization to the Hebrew Nation, in violation of treaty provisions, and in violation of the basic principles to which all enlightened nations have subscribed.

Therefore, we, the American League for a Free Palestine, have convened this emergency conference. You have heard the facts. We must develop our program on the basis of a realistic appraisal of the forces which have prevented the citizens of Palestine, whether on its soil or striving to return to it, from estabilshing themselves as an independent republic.

We are submitting this record not in the form of an indictment but as an objective statement of the current situation which this conference must consider in working toward a creative solution. If we determine that Palestine ought to be a free and independent state, and if we pledge our aid to all citizens of Palestine, then we must devise the means, the steps to be taken, the strategy and tactics by which this goal can be achieved. That is the task of this emergency conference.

Our good will and fine sentiments are meaningless if we do not draw the blueprint for machinery which will carry us to our goal.

A notable leader of Britain recently asserted to the world that he did not become his King's First Minister to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire. We as citizens of the United States assert to the world that we did not sacrifice a quarter-million of our dearest and best, we did not deliver the resources of the people of the United States, our reserves and our income for generations yet to come, for the purpose of underwriting imperial aggrandizement or the exploitation of any people, strong or weak, by any power.

Article by John O'Donnell on Winston Churchill's Fulton, Mo., Address

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell, printed in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning,

commenting on the recent speech made by Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Britain's distinguished Winston Churchill, with President Truman pulling a political boner by sitting by his side on an applauding Midwest platform, has politically done his best to stamp on the paws of the Russian bear that walks like a man—a dictatorial and land-hungry man.

And to buck the bear, Churchill has suggested that we get together in a "fraternal association"—a brotherly alliance sort of deal, in which we divvy up our weapons for use against a common enemy. (In the words of Churchill the enemy is Russia—none other is mentioned.)

So-o-o—hold your hats, boys—we're off again, hell-bent for a nice rough and tumble with all the 1938–39 build-up by which Roosevelt and Churchill suckered their nations into war against Germany for strictly economic and cash ends while dishing out to the cash customers the somewhat tawdry, down-at-the-heels argument about a crusade for humanity, "four freedoms" everywhere in our time, and a general up-chucking of oratorial garbage designed to make the names go ringing down the corridors of time.

Big point in Washington at present is that Churchill has scared hell out of Jimmy Byrnes in the State Department and the distinguished heavy-thinkers on Capitol Hill, and driven home the idea that unless this Nation comes across with that loan to Britain we all go to pot and Russia picks up the blue chips.

At stake, for the moment, are the strategic spots in the Mediterranean—nice pieces of real estate now belonging to Turkey, Iran, etc., which the Kremlin proposes to foreclose on, thereby taking a resounding sock—a sock which has been poised for centuries—at the Mediterranean-Suez Canal life line of the British Empire.

Now comes the plea for the fraternal association, the swap of military information, the diplomatic gesture by which we waved our toughest fist, sending our great battleship *Missouri* into Turkish waters at this critical moment, and all leading up to a simple objective—getting through Congress the proposal to loan 3,750,000,000 good old American bucks to Britain.

The boys haven't yet said we've got to have union now, or that Americans will just naturally curl up and die if we're not supported by a healthy group of London financiers, shipping and insurance agents, but that seems to be the rough idea.

Boston, Jersey City, Chicago, the State of Missouri, and the Pacific coast, according to the gush poured out here in the Capital, aren't worth a hoot in hell if London, Manchester, and Birmingham aren't doing business on the old stands.

Perhaps these current observations and high-pressure blasts of oratory may be true. We suggest the meditation of some of the lawmakers on these words—ancient, it is true, but at their critical time in the Republic carefully studied and in fact endorsed by a group of important Americans. We quote:

"I have heard it asserted by some that as America has flourished under her former connection with Great Britain, the same connection is necessary toward her future happiness. * * * Nothing can be more fallacious than this kind of argument. We may as well assert that because a child has thrived upon milk, that it is never to have meat. * * *

"I answer roundly that America would have flourished as much and probably much more, had any European power nothing to do with her.

"But she [Britain] has protected us, say some * * * and defended the Continent at our expense, as well as her own, is admitted. She would have defended Turkey for the same motives—for the sake of trade and dominion.

"Alas!

"We have been long led away by ancient prejudices, and made large sacrifices to superstition. We have boasted the protection of Great Britain, without considering that her motives were interest—not attachment. * * * She did not protect us from our enemies on our account but from her enemies on her own account, from those who had no quarrel with us on any other account and who [now] will always be our enemies on the same account. Let Britain waive her pretension to the Continent [of Europe] or the Continent throw off the dependence [on Britain].

"I challenge the warmest advocate * * * to show a single advantage this continent can reap by being connected with Great Britain. I repeat the challenge. Not a single advantage is derived.

"But the injuries and disadvantages that we sustain by that connection [with Great Britain] are without number. * * * Our duty to mankind at large, as well as to ourselves, instructs us to renounce the alliance. Because any submission to or dependence on Great Britain tends directly to involve this [American] continent in European wars and quarrels, and sets us at variance with nations who would otherwise seek our friendship and against whom we have neither anger nor complaint.

"It is the true interest of America to steer clear of European contention—which she never can do while by her dependence on Britain she is the make-weight in the scale of European politics."

True words, and sound today, even if they were first placed before this young Republic of ours back in July 1776, by a budding columnist by the name of Thomas Paine.

The Food Situation Is Getting Worse and Worse

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the food situation is getting worse and worse and this is in spite of Chester Bowles and his boasting that he is holding the line. When President Truman called on Herbert Hoover and Chester Davis to come in and straighten out the food mess that was an acknowledgment that he had nobody in his administration who was able to do it.

President Truman is to be complimented for his good sense in calling the best men available to this difficult task.

Already these two gentlemen have taken the position that the best way to relieve this situation is to use common sense and not tyrannical and ruthless threats and force.

Already they show conclusively that what is needed is to encourage production and more production and not to arrest and harass the patriotic American and thereby continue the most gigantic black market this country has ever seen.

Already they have shown that all food activities should be centralized in the Department of Agriculture under one administrator. This is exactly what the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has advocated for more than 3 years. The position of this committee on this subject has been supported by practically all the Democrats in Congress who know the food problem.

In 1943, by direction of the committee, I introduced a bill to provide for this centralization. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, Mr. FULMER, a prominent Democrat from South Carolina, favored the purposes of my bill and introduced a very similar measure. The committee by a very large majority recommended the passage of Mr. FULMER'S bill. There is no doubt that the sentiment of the people is the same today.

I have today introduced a bill identical with the Fulmer bill. This bill should pass. This would take food out from under the old Leon Henderson crowd and put it under the Department of Agriculture, which will better serve the people and better enable Chester Davis and Mr. Hoover to do a good job. That would end the black market and would let the people know why they cannot get butter, sugar, and beef.

The coming crop season is the most important we have faced since the war started. Our reserves are lower than they have been for years, in spite of 8 successive years of bountiful crops. We must depend almost entirely on this year's crops for the food we expect to eat and to share with the world.

The United States is the greatest food-producing Nation in the world and we must produce this year as never before.

The Proposed British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles bearing on the British loan, one from the Wall Street Journal and one from the New York Herald Tribune.

I also ask consent to have printed an article from the New York Herald Tribune relating to the amount of money, payable in this country, that will be required for the purchase of securities to support the British loan.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 11, 1946]

BRITISH SAY THEIR PARTICIPATION IN BRETTON WOODS DEPENDS ON LOAN FROM UNITED STATES—RUSSIA MAY STAY OUT

(By Vermont Royster, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal)

SAVANNAH, GA.—Great Britain served notice on the United States that she could not participate in the Bretton Woods International Monetary Fund and the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, being organized in international conference here, unless the United States advances the requested $3,750,000,000 loan.

In view of the fact that Russia's participation is likewise being tied to a United States loan, the bank is faced with eventual loss of two of its five largest contributors before it and the fund have even begun to operate.

The only apparent solution is for the United States, in addition to underwriting a total of $5,900,000,000 for the bank and the fund, to also approve side loans amounting to $3,750,000,000 for Great Britain and $1,000,000,000 for Russia.

The bank can operate successfully without Russia, and indeed may do so, but its position would be tremendously weakened without the United Kingdom.

KEYNES STATES THE POSITION

Lord Keynes, economic adviser to the Chancelor of the Exchequer and chief of the United Kingdom delegation, stated that should the loan bill before Congress be defeated, "We shall certainly have to look at things again." His statement was elaborated by another high British official, who said that this view "cannot be stated too strongly."

The British, in the meantime, are cooperating with Treasury Secretary Vinson on the assumption that Congress will approve the loan.

Prospects that Russia may join the monetary institutions dwindled as the diplomatic break between the United States and the Soviet widened over such far-flung problems as Manchuria and Bulgaria.

Late Saturday the Russian observers absented themselves from the conference and cabled Moscow, apparently asking for instructions.

CAN RUSSIA GET BACK IN?

United States officials say they are now "undecided" on whether they will move to readmit Russia on the original Bretton Woods terms. It had been generally understood the United States would make such a motion. Some observers here have gone so far as to write off Russia completely from the bank and fund; but the Kremlin is unpredictable.

Russia's original subscription to the bank at Bretton Woods was $1,200,000,000 and a like amount to the fund. No decision has been made on how to replace this loss if the U. S. S. R. does not join.

Meanwhile support has grown for a proposal to have permanent headquarters of the Bank and Fund in New York City, The British delegation has committed itself in favor of New York and most representatives of Latin-American Republics have concurred. The United States delegation favors Washington.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 11, 1946]

THE WEEK OF FINANCE

(By Edward H. Collins)

THE GOVERNMENT PRESENTS THE FACTS—IV

In the issue of February 16, 1945, the Wall Street Journal carried in its column of Washington Notes the following item:

"Public opinion experts are gaining power in Federal agencies. Poll takers and poll watchers are replacing brain trusters in behind-the-scenes operations.

"Ostensibly, these Federal opinion sounders want to find out what people are thinking. Actually, a bigger job is to make people think what the Government believes they should."

Since that item was published a year ago information has accumulated, bit by bit, which, when pieced together, adds up to a picture that can be contemplated by thoughtful persons only with the most serious misgivings. It is the picture of an efficiently organized government machine operating on a permanent basis, 24 hours a day, in the domain of "mass education"—debrutalized synonym for the grim business of breaking down, by one or another of a myriad of techniques, any public opposition that may exist to policies advocated by the administration.

In mobilizing for a given legislative project, we are told in a highly circumstantial account by the Wall Street Journal, the opinion-manufacturing resources of the top five Government agencies are pooled. Part of the campaign is carried out publicly, but of at least equal importance are the behind-scenes activities. In discussing the case history of the Government's Bretton Woods campaign the writer has already touched on the Treasury's public activities, such as the disseminating of literature, providing pro-Bretton Woods speakers, and ghost-writing speeches.

The key to the Treasury's subsurface, as distinct from its public activities, was the process known as indoctrination. Broadly speaking, this took two major forms: (1) Selling Bretton Woods to persons in key positions with respect to influencing public opinion; and (2) obtaining testimonials from groups of national prominence, many of which had their own news value and their own public relations organizations. Business men, club women, labor and farm leaders and hundreds of miscellaneous groups were rounded up by Treasury representatives and induced to adopt resolutions, usually prepared in advance by its own professional ghost writers.

Much of this campaign was highly personalized and no one, however exalted, was exempt from duty. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the then Secretary of the Treasury, threw all the vast prestige of his office behind the drive. In addition to dignifying local chamber of commerce meetings with his presence, he is reported to have made a practice of sending warmly friendly letters to Congressmen whose support for Bretton Woods was in doubt and otherwise to have ingratiated himself in those places where it was calculated to do the most good.

A typical example of Mr. Morgenthau's (not always too adroit) use of the behind-scenes technique was a luncheon given March 7, last year, for a group of radio commentators and newspaper columnists. * * * Such comment as it produced publicly by members of this group served to corroborate private accounts of many other meetings of the same kind, to the effect that when not talking for the record Treasury experts consistently sought to impugn the motives of banker critics of the fund.

Apparently as part of the same campaign in which it sought to line up this group of opinion makers, the Treasury was simultaneously working through the Writers' War Board, a highly influential "name group," representative of the press, the radio, and stage. From this group there suddenly emerged at the same moment two news releases—one prepared by the Board, the other by the PAC affiliate, Press Research, Inc.—an urgent appeal to "urge all who hear or read your words to wire their Congressman * * * demanding passage of Bretton Woods as it stands." The columnar response to this appeal was, from a purely intellectual standpoint, at once fervent and pathetic, as commentators who not long before had confined themselves to the doing of cafe society or life in Hollywood, as one observer put it, "assumed the airs of global statesmen." But the long-term implications of this incident are by no means humerous. Government propaganda becomes many times more dangerous when offered to the public as the considered and disinterested view of commentators with large personal followings.

One of the most disturbing incidents of the Bretton Woods indoctrination program came last April when the Treasury invited the clergymen of four Protestant denominations to Washington for an educational course in the highly controversial and technical subject of Bretton Woods. Many of these guests returned to their pulpits, it was reported, filled with ardor for the project and eager to preach the gospel of Bretton Woods to their parishioners.

But, if we are to take the word of one Washington correspondent, the Treasury, working through the League of Women Voters, came perhaps even near totalitarian perfection in the issuance of a primer for children. "It (the primer) started off," relates that correspondent, "by explaining that the world was anxious to trade, but the United States remained aloof." "We have so many things already," the United States is supposed to have said, in effect, "that we don't need yours. Besides, we don't want to spend our pile of gold dollars." The other countries, unable to get over the American tariff wall, "became poorer, and poorer." That made the Germans mad, and soon there was a war. With Bretton Woods adopted this could not happen again.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 11, 1946]

TYPES OF ISSUES OF WORLD BANK STUDIED HERE—BROAD MARKET BELIEVED SURE IF INSTITUTION STARTS ON A SUCCESSFUL FOUNDATION

(By George Wanders)

Types and terms of securities to be sold in the American capital market by the $10,000,000,000 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which is now in the organization stage at the Savannah conference of governors, are unde close study and debate by dealers, banks, investment bankers, insurance companies, and savings banks in New York. A broad market for the issues is certain to develop if the bank comes into successful operation. This question, it is realized, depends upon approval by Congress of the proposed loan to Great Britain, which is tied in with the Bretton Woods program.

The bank is authorized to make direct loans out of its own funds, but such advances are likely to be relatively modest. The major lending activities are seen as centering around flotations of its own securities and the guaranteeing of loans made through usual channels. The guaranty method still is somewhat nebulous, but discussions of the bank's own emissions tend toward the concrete. It is indicative that a leading dealer in United States Treasury obligations, William E. Pollock & Co., issued a factual study last week of the Bretton Woods institution and their functions.

VARIETY IS EXPECTED

In the market discussions of the bank's issues it is assumed that short, medium, and long maturities of obligations all will be floated in response to varying needs of borrowers. Thus, a devastated municipality in Poland, France, or Czechoslovakia might want a long-term advance for reconstruction, whereas a private corporation in England, facing a reconstruction problem, might apply

through the Bank of England for a medium- or short-term loan.

Since it is recognized that most of the flotations are sure to be in the United States, because of the demand for American products and dollars, the requirements of our money market are necessary guides to borrowings that the bank will have to do in turn. In general, it is held that our market will require on relatively sound flotations an interest return about ½ percent above that prevalent on comparable maturities of United States Government obligations.

FOUR-PERCENT CHARGE IS LIKELY

The Victory loan 2½'s, due 1972, callable 1967, currently afford a yield of about 2.20 percent, and if the calculation works out, a similar loan by the bank would require a coupon of perhaps 2¾ percent. The bank will add its authorized charge of between 1 and 1½ percent, and the interest charge to the ultimate borrower thus is likely to be around 4 percent. It might be higher if such intermediary institutions as the Bank of England also make charges to ultimate borrowers for services rendered. Amortization usually is calculated at about 3½ percent annually.

Some commercial banks are pressing for a dealer status respecting the obligations of the bank, such as they now enjoy on United States Treasury, State, and municipal securities. This would widen the market for the securities decidedly. Authority for such a dealer status probably will be requested, and it may be coupled with a request for permitted holdings of the bank's securities beyond limitations now imposed which would permit absorption by commercial banks of only about $600,000,000 obligations of the International Bank.

It is accepted that the securities of the bank must be registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission, as our laws now stand. Efforts may develop to lift this requirement through suitable amendments, for the bank's activities in the United States will be under the special supervision of a National Advisory Council, composed of the Secretaries of the Treasury, State, and Commerce, and the Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board and the Export-Import Bank. That imposing array of officials would seem to make the regulatory supervision of the SEC a quite needless addendum.

Comparison Between Operations of Large Meat Packers and Small Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative letter I have received from Mr. C. B. Heineman, secretary of the National Independent Meat Packers Association. This letter should be especially interesting at this time. It points out, among other things, the difference between large and small meat packers, and how small meat packers have been discriminated against by Government agencies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1946.

The Honorable TOM STEWART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STEWART: I have your letter of the 20th instant and will be glad to outline the essential differences in the operations of large meat packers versus small firms. This is furnished as information, and not in support of, or in opposition to, any pending legislation. Legislative matters, in which the association is interested, are handled by our president and general counsel.

In the meat-packing industry we have become accustomed to group the firms into those commonly referred to as big packers, medium packers, and small packers. There is no clear line of cleavage, and the small packer of today may become a medium packer tomorrow. A further descriptive classification is made between national packers, or those having national distribution of their products, and local packers, or those whose distribution is generally limited to a relatively small area. Other descriptive classifications have been used by Government agencies, e. g., the United States Department of Agriculture listed last year the following numbers as of the fourth quarter of 1944:

Federally inspected slaughterers, firms	375
Commercial slaughterers, firms	362
Local slaughterers, firms	4,059
Butcher slaughterers, firms	22,051
Farm slaughterers, persons	1,200,000

Under the American system of free enterprise, the participants were constantly striving to improve their status from year to year.

Regardless of the size of the firm or the volume of its business, there are certain elementary operations common to all. These are as follows:

1. The purchase of the live animals.
2. Their removal to holding pens convenient to the killing floors.
3. Movement of the animals into the respective facilities on the killing floor for each where movement under their own motive power ceases.
4. The actual killing of each species, each of which is subject to its own method of knocking, shocking, sticking, or bleeding.
5. The shackling and hanging of the carcasses of each species, by chain or wheel.
6. The scalding or depilating of hogs, the skinning of cattle or calves, the hog dressing of some calves (dressing without removing skin), and the removal of pelts from sheep and lambs.
7. The evisceration of the carcasses of each species.
8. The completion of the cleaning and/or washing of the carcasses as they move along their respective rails.
9. The primary splitting of cattle and hog carcasses.
10. The shrouding of the better grades of beef.
11. The movement of carcasses of each species into their respective coolers where they hang while the animal heat is being drawn.
12. The handling of the viscera in completing the killing-floor operations on each species for the purpose of separating those parts such as hearts, livers, etc., used as food, from those parts such as casings, weasands, etc., used in various operations.
13. The AA, A, B, and C grades of beef and veal carcasses which may be sold in the form of sides, quarters, or primary wholesale cuts.
14. The sale of sheep and lambs, hog-dressed calves, and of whole-dressed hogs.
15. The sale or transfer to boners of some C and all D grades of beef and veal carcasses and/or parts.
16. The cutting up into standard wholesale cuts of the chilled hog carcasses to be either sold to outsiders or sent to cure in the appropriate department of the packing house.
17. The transfer of edible trimmings from all good carcasses to some other department such as sausage or canning, or for sale to outside buyers.
18. The transfer of edible fats to the edible rendering departments.
19. The transfer of inedible fats and carcass parts to the inedible or tank departments.
20. The transfer of cattle and calf hides and sheep pelts to the hide cellars for packing down, or, in some cases, they are sold to outside hide buyers.
21. The salvaging and removal of hog hair to be either dried and processed by the packer or another outside buyer, or in some cases to remove it and dispose of it as a waste product.

STEPS BEYOND THE 21 OPERATIONS

The operations beyond the 21 operations described open a completely new field, and they, too, are subject to OPA control; e. g., all trimmings or meats delivered to the sausage room may be charged to the sausage room at no more than the established OPA ceiling prices. Those prices would be the same if the trimmings were sold to an outside buyer for use in his plant.

When the packer makes these items into sausage the finished product is sold to the trade at another OPA ceiling price. Since the operation beyond the 21 listed operations would have to stand on its own, the OPA could readily determine what, if any, adjustments would need to be made so as to limit their profit to a reasonable margin.

What we have said would apply to every other operation on any part of the animal whether processed by the slaughtering packer or by some outside purchaser. The following list covers some, but by no means all, of these outside operations:

1. Making of tankage for feeding and/or fertilizer.
2. Drying of blood and use as fertilizer, bleach, etc.
3. Processing of bones into fertilizers, case-hardening bones, etc.
4. Extraction of material for making glue.
5. Extraction of material for making gelatin.
6. Processing of hair for brushes, binder, felt, curled hair for upholstering, etc.
7. Extraction of lanolin from wool of pelts.
8. Extraction of albumin.
9. Extraction of oil for certain lubrication, flames, etc.
10. Making "isinglass."
11. Benzoinating lard as beauty cream or ointment base.
12. Making lard and oleo stearine for stiffening body of oils.
13. Extraction of edible and inedible tallow.
14. Preparation of sausage casings.
15. Making gold-beater's skin, bottle caps, tennis strings, clock cords, drum heads, musical strings, surgical ligatures, etc.
16. Making combs, buttons, hair pins, umbrella handles, napkin rings, tobacco boxes, buckles, crochet needles, knife handles, dice, chessmen, electrical bushings, washings, artificial teeth, bone rings for nursing bottles, and soap grease from bones.
17. Making of soap and cleanser.
18. Making of glycerine.
19. Making of neatsfoot oil.
20. Making of oleomargarine.
21. The making of a constantly growing list of pharmaceuticals such as these:

(a) Gland extracts from the thyroid, pituitary (anterior and posterior) adrenals (cortex and medula), pineal, thymus, testes, ovaries, corpus luteum, parathyroids, pancreas, the greatest of all glands, the liver, spleen, prostate, placenta, and mammary.

(b) Pepsin, rennin, diastase, lipose, and trypsin.

(c) Lecithin.

(d) Thromboplastin.

(e) Red bone marrow.

22. Salvaging of chitterlings.

23. Salvaging of liver, kidneys, tail, tripe, melt, heart, ears, brain, snout, cheeks, tongue, feet, etc.

24. Salvaging of gall and gallstones.

25. Use of horns for cattle.

26. Use of hoofs from all animals.

27. Making of sandpaper and emery paper by use of packer glue. (One packer makes many miles of this in 1 day.)

28. Use of cracklings from rendering tanks.

No small packer is able to handle all or any substantial part of this list of byproducts. Very few medium-sized packers undertake to handle any except those easy to handle with a minimum of control and investment.

The large packers represented by about 12 companies handle these on a very large scale. Some frequently boast that they can handle their edible meats without profit, or even at a loss, and still show a satisfactory profit in their over-all operations.

To the extent that all other conditions are comparable, any price-control regulation beginning with No. 1, and teminating within the limit of the 21 operations, should reflect equal treatment to all. However, it is impossible to establish industry-wide over-all prices either on the live animals or the products derived therefrom without the effect therefrom unduly injuring some and/or unduly benefiting others.

In one of the yearbooks of a large packer, published in 1934, they list the four points of information which their buyers of livestock must have before buying. These were:

1. Quantity of livestock available.

2. Amount that is being realized from the sale of the various kinds of meat at wholesale.

3. The current value of byproducts.

4. The cost of handling an animal through the packing plant.

Points 1, 2, and 4 are common to all packers, but the inclusion or exclusion of byproduct values makes a substantial difference between firms. That is in this same yearbook it shows that an increase in hide values was equivalent to 60 cents per hundredweight on the live steer, and an increase in the value of pulled wool was equivalent to an addition of $1.20 per hundredweight in the value of live lambs.

Obviously, any profit from the processing of any product will directly benefit the packer to which it goes. That profit may be, and is, used as an aid in buying livestock, as well as in the sale of meat products in normal times. Where livestock prices are ceiled by OPA orders, the packer may not exceed the ceiling price, but this benefit may be reflected in a margin on meat sales which would not be available to his competitor.

From the beginning of price control on meats, the smaller packers have suffered because of the failure of OPA to make proper adjustments to compensate for this condition. It is not to be considered as an equalization of efficiency and inefficiency, because huge investments quite beyond the reach of small concerns are required to handle these byproducts. The harm arises directly from an attempt to use elements of costs and profits from primary operations 1 to 21 and from secondary operations 1 to 28 in arriving at fair prices at the beginning and end. This is impossible because the two wholly separate types of operation cannot be used as a common denominator without injustice to those not using both.

Yours very truly,

C. B. HEINEMAN,
Secretary.

Report of Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, under the permission granted me today I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorials to which I referred relating to the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

(The editorials submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE are as follows:)

[From the Washington Post of March 5, 1946]

CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

Hope for continuation of virile democracy in American took a spurt upward yesterday with the release of the report of the La Follette-Monroney committee on the organization of Congress. In our opinion, it is one of the best reports ever brought out by a congressional committee. With broad strokes of statesmanship, it sketches a bold and progressive plan for the restoration of Congress as an efficient and responsible policymaking body for the Nation. Citizens aware of the need for buttressing our democratic system at this vital point will read the document with a mingled sense of surprise and thanksgiving.

The feeling of surprise will spring from the fact that six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House have been able to agree unanimously, with only occasional personal dissents on minor points, on such a sweeping program of reform. Students of Congress on the outside have recommended most of the improvements contained in the committee's report. But this call upon Congress to set its house in order comes from within. It reflects a new awareness in Congress of its loss of prestige and power because of its own obsolete methods and organization. It is an omen of the happiest sort for the restoration of Congress to the position of authority, respect and importance that it should always occupy.

The sense of thankfulness will spring from the very large measure of the committee's achievement. It is no mere shuffling of offices or boost in expenses that the La Follette-Monroney committee suggests. Rather it is a comprehensive adjustment of our democratic system to the age in which we are living. "We have been guided," the report accurately says, "by what Justice Holmes called 'the felt necessities of the time.'" The committee properly addressed itself to "a grave constitutional crisis * * * in which the fate of representative government itself is at stake."

The first of the "felt necessities" which it proposes to meet is the demand for a new committee system. Following the suggestions of Senator LA FOLLETTE, the committee suggests reduction of the heterogeneous conglomeration of 33 Senate committees to 16 streamlined legislative study groups with well-defined jurisdiction. The tangle of 48 House committees would be reduced, in accord with Representative WADSWORTH'S plan, to 18. Committee assignments for each legislator would thus be reduced; overlapping would be eliminated; expert assistance would be provided; special committees would be eliminated and supervisory and investigative functions would be assigned to each regular committee within its own field. Regular meeting days would be fixed; testimony would be digested to save time, and Members of Congress would be given a chance to explain their bills instead of having most of them go directly into the discard.

No less important are the proposed policy committees which are intended to take the place of existing steering committees which "seldom meet and never steer." Majority and minority policy committees would be elected at the beginning of each new Congress by the majority and minority conferences. Their purpose would be to bring cohesion and leadership into the legislative picture. The majority policy committees would constitute a formal council to meet regularly with the President for the formulation of national policies to be enacted into legislation. This is, as we have frequently urged in recent years, a sensible method of making our system of divided powers function more smoothly. It is so eminently desirable in these days of rapidly moving events and momentous national issues that we can scarcely imagine any responsible opposition to it.

Additional plans are concerned with strengthening fiscal controls, registration of lobbyists, increasing congressional salaries to $15,000 a year, opening of the Federal retirement system to Congressmen, and making more efficient use of Congressmen's time. In this latter connection there is a strong recommendation for self-government for the District of Columbia which should warm the hearts of local suffrage advocates. Only a few of the more urgent reforms, such as reorientation of the House Rules Committee, are left out. Even in this instance the proposed policy committee could be expected to put the rules tyrants in their place.

The report as a whole is an inspiring call to Congress to rise to the larger challenge thrust upon it both by our grave world responsibilities and by the new tempo of events. In our opinion, it becomes an essential chart of the pattern that American Government must follow if the best in our way of life is to be preserved.

[From the Washington Star of March 6, 1946]

"STREAMLINING" CONGRESS

Considering the difficult nature of the task to which it was assigned, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has produced a commendably forthright report which, although it skirts around several important issues, provides a generally comprehensive formula for "streamlining" and strengthening the National Legislature. The need for such a modernization of Congress has long been felt, but, as the committee indicated in its report, the urgency of the problem has become more and more apparent with the rise of Executive power and the subordination of legislative functions during the depression and war years through which the Nation so lately has passed. At least one of the reasons given for the bypassing of Congress in many of the emergency moves made by Executive order was the notorious sluggishness of the ponderous legislative machinery.

The committee exhibited no small degree of courage when it gave No. 1 position to its recommendation that the existing House and Senate committees be reorganized and consolidated to eliminate overlapping jurisdictions and duplication of efforts in sundry fields. The suggestion was made that the House's 48 standing committees be reduced to 19 and the Senate's 33 standing committees to 16. There is certain to be controversy over any proposal that would cut the number of coveted chairmanships, and especially will there be controversy over the committee's recommendation that the Military and Naval Affairs Committees be combined into an armed services group for each Chamber. There are many persons in and out of Congress who will argue that the Army and the Navy are so large and their problems so diverse as to warrant their being served by separate committees.

The report recommended measures to restrict deficit financing through a periodic check designed to balance revenues and expenditures, to require registration of lobbyists, to relieve legislators of onerous nonlegislative burdens through appointment of $8,000-a-year administrative assistants, to raise Members' salaries from the present $10,000 a year to $15,000 a year, to watch administration of legislation after passage and to effect numerous other changes in procedure and facilities. A noteworthy proposal was that majority and minority policy committees be established in both houses to consider over-all legislative policy of the two principal parties, in the interest of facilitating party decisions and actions.

Among issues upon which the joint committee failed to agree in drawing up recommendations were the much-criticized seniority system of selecting committee chairmen and the question of restricting authority of the all-powerful House Rules Committee. The seniority system has resulted in the occasional appointment of misfits to vital chairmanships, while arbitrary action by the Rules Committee can block consideration of important legislation. Both issues should be frankly met, however, if Congress is determined to operate at full efficiency and to fulfill its heavy obligations under the Constitution.

[From the Washington News of March 4, 1946]

BRING CONGRESS UP TO DATE

The La Follette-Monroney committee, created last year to study the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements, came out today with an admirable report.

The American people have been increasingly concerned over the evident inability of Congress to play, with maximum effectiveness, its proper role in our form of government. Their concern was reflected in a flood of suggestions to the committee. To all, the committee applied this simple test: "Will they strengthen Congress and enable it to do a better job?"

Congress will gain strength and ability to do an immensely better job if it adopts the La Follette-Monroney proposals. Here are some of the changes that would be made:

The unwieldy committees, with their overlappings and conflicts, would be greatly simplified. The Senate would have only 16 standing committees instead of 33; the House only 18 instead of 48. Each committee's jurisdiction would be clearly defined. Each would have a small, well-qualified staff of research experts, and no longer would have to depend on inevitably biased departments and bureaus of the executive branch for fact-and-figure information.

The Legislative Reference Service would be enlarged and strengthened to give skilled research assistance to individual Congressmen.

Each Senator and Representative would have an able, well-paid administrative assistant to look after the errand running and other nonlegislative work that now absorbs a huge part of the average Member's energy and time.

Congress could no longer approve appropriations without regard to Federal income. It would be required to keep the total of appropriations within anticipated revenue or, by record vote, to express itself in favor of increasing the public debt.

Congressional time would be used more effectively. A heavy burden of petty, detail work would be lifted—for instance, by giving the District of Columbia self-rule instead of requiring Congress to serve as Washington's city council.

Organized groups exerting pressure on Congress would be required to register themselves and their agents, and to report lobbying expenditures.

The $10,000 salaries of Senators and Representatives would be raised to $15,000 a year.

Most Members of Congress will be enthusiastic about the proposals for higher pay, pensions and more help for themselves. But there will be bitter opposition to other suggestions—especially those for reforming the committee systems and reducing their size. That would mean reducing the number of committee chairmen, and Senators and Representatives who have risen to these positions of power by long service do not, naturally, want to give them up. But the La Follette-Monroney report states a compelling reason:

"No adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous work load that present-day governmental problems place upon it."

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of March 5, 1946]

LEGISLATIVE REFORM

One of the most important documents to be issued in Washington in a long time is the report of the La Follette-Monroney Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.

It proposes changes in congressional procedure and in the organization of committees which are designed to lift Congress decisively out of the groove which has so often made it a rubber stamp for the executive arm of the Government. If this plan were adopted, its proponents believe that it would enable the legislative branch to become a really strong and efficient part of the Federal establishment, dealing with the Executive on equal terms.

The need for such a reform of Congress is indicated in certain passages in the committee's report. Those passages call attention to the remarkable growth of the administrative agencies of the Government during the recent past. Because of the failure of Congress to adapt itself to this administrative expansion, the administrative agencies tend more and more to run themselves, without legislative supervision or check. Congress simply does not have the machinery to keep up with them.

There is much to be said for this diagnosis, and also for the reorganization plans by which the committee proposes to effect a cure. That plan centers around two main proposals. One looks to the reorganization of committees. There are now 33 standing committees in the Senate and 48 in the House. It is proposed that the number to be reduced to 16 and 18, respectively, and that these be set up in a way that will enable them easily to deal with the executive departments and bureaus.

A second basic proposal contemplates the employment of qualified research workers to provide Congressional committees with expert advice. A beginning has already been made in this undertaking, but the report suggests something far more comprehensive than anything yet attempted.

Both proposals are well worth while, but the committee reorganization will meet with a tremendous opposition. The chairman of existing committees may be expected to provide most of the resistance. Under the rules every chairman is more or less a law to himself. Unless his committee is very unruly he can report bills or smother them without much regard for the wishes of the Chamber at large. He has certain prerogatives as to offices clerical assistance that are dear to the hearts of legislators.

To ask those in such positions to surrender their privileges is almost like asking water to run up hill. The job can only be done with a strong pipe line and a tremendous application of pressure.

Perhaps the fear of this opposition led the committee to refrain from any attack on the system of choosing the chairmen of standing committees by seniority. The seniority rule is open to grave objection. A Congress modernized along the line of this report will find itself handicapped by having as leaders of the reorganized committees men whose only virtue is their ability to get reelected. A more effective set-up might be worked out if committee chairmen were chosen by appointment or by election.

But this defect may help to soften opposition to other features of the plan. Besides the two main reforms listed above it embraces a number of miscellaneous proposals many of which are entitled to favorable consideration. The great question it raises is whether Congress has courage enough to grapple with the reorganization of its own antiquated machinery.

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 7, 1946]

A PLAN TO STRENGTHEN CONGRESS FOR ITS CONSTITUTIONAL FUNCTION

The report of the special joint committee on reorganizing Congress rests on a disquieting premise and proposes urgent reforms. The general premise is that the rise of the administrative agencies now threatens the paramountcy of Congress itself in the legislative and policy-making field. The reforms, manifold in number, all look to the restoration of Congress to that commanding place in the constitutional framework envisaged by the Constitution makers.

The way in which the administrative agencies—some of them—threaten the authority of Congress is clear enough. They must deal from day to day with the myriad individual issues raised in the conduct of some broad policy of control. Congress cannot possibly foresee each and every one of these small issues in all their detail. It must speak in terms of general principle and general policy. It must trust that faithful administrative officers will make their detailed applications in the light of and in consonance with the congressional policy.

That, however, again and again does not happen. Again and again the administrators make bold extensions in or restrictions on the rather obvious congressional intent. And, what is worse, these administrative decisions are likely to be supported, on appeal, by the new courts. Since 1933 the Supreme Court has worked up an almost ironclad rule against questioning the judgment of administrative agencies on issues of fact. But, as every experienced observer knows, questions of fact are sometimes inextricably intermingled with questions of law; and the new Supreme Court is sometimes willing to interpret the facts so broadly that administrative revision of the basic law is the actual result.

The whole aim of the new joint report is to invigorate and sharpen the Congress as against the new administrative reach for power. The reformers propose to reorganize the committee system so as to cut down duplication and release Members for greater attention to broad legislative policy. They ask for generous research assistance to the Members so that Congress can be as well equipped for fact-finding as the executive and administrative and private agencies which try to put their ideas over on Congress. They want Congress to adopt improved methods of policing administrative agencies and private pressure lobbies. They want Congress to resume that historic control of the purse which present practices have so greatly frittered away to other hands. These are large and urgent questions to which Congress must give every attention in defense not merely of its own institutional integrity but of the integrity of our constitutional way of doing things.

[From the New York Times of March 10, 1946]

RIP VAN WINKLE WAKES UP

The La Follette-Monroney committee on reorganization laid on the Capitol Hill desks last week some helpful suggestions for bringing our stagecoach congressional procedures into closer harmony with the airplane age. In general these proposals fall into two categories. The first category aims to relieve Senators and Representatives of the needless detail work which, in all seriousness, wears them out and cripples their legislative efficiency. They would be given executive assistants at $8,000 a year, a summer recess would be provided for, a system of three full days of sessions and three of committee hearings would save them a tedious running back and forth, nontechnical digests of bills would be given them and they would no longer be required to spend valuable time playing uncle to the District of Columbia. For their greater economic security their pay would be raised to $15,000 and for their personal comfort the two Chambers would be modernized to provide better lighting and acoustics. Better or at least more contented House and Senate employees would be secured by a 50-percent wage increase.

There should be little opposition to these proposals either on Capitol Hill or off it. At present the usual Member of Congress lives in a harassing clutter of detail. The more conscientious he is the less able he is to do the legislative job for which in theory he was sent to Washington. If he is merely intent on holding the job he gives himself up to answering letters and running errands for constituents and becomes a legislative cipher voting as he is told on issues he hasn't had time to study.

The other category of recommendations contains more matter for controversy because it deals with the actual functioning of Congress. Common sense has long called for a reduction in the number of committees, many of them intricately overlapping, but it will not be easy to dislodge 17 of the Senate's 33 chairmen and 30 of the House's 48 chairmen, as the La Follette-Monroney report advises. A chairman is an important man, and even the most high-minded legislators like to be important. Improved organization to formulate majority and minority policy and better channels between the Capitol and the White House ought to work for the general good. Members of Congress are plagued by lobbyists and pressure groups. Unless these gentry have them completely terrorized they should readily vote for the proposal to register them individually and as groups with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate.

The committee could not agree on a better criterion than seniority for standing committee chairmanships. This is unfortunate, for the seniority system produces some astounding and deplorable results. On the whole, however, one can feel cheered up by these recommendations.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 8, 1946]

WHERE STREAMLINING CONGRESS STOPS SHORT

When the Joint Committee on Reorganizing Congress was appointed it was expected to do a thoroughgoing job. Now, in presenting its report, after a year's labors, it does recommend some rather sweeping changes, but neatly sidesteps urging other most important reforms.

Not a word is said about abolishing the seniority—some call it the senility—system for choosing committee chairmen. Under this scheme a chairman rises to his position because of his ability to get reelected to Congress over a term of years.

Under this arrangement it is largely a matter of chance whether a chairman is the best man, or even a fairly competent man, for the job.

The failure to propose clipping the arbitrary power of the House Rules Committee to block legislation will also be criticized, although it may claim that the terms of its assignment precluded such recommendation.

But on the credit side there is the excellent proposal to reduce the number of committees now cluttering up the work of Congress. In place of the 48 standing committees, there would be 18, while the number of Senate committees would be cut from 33 to 16.

A Senator or Representative would then have to serve on only one or two committees instead of on a dozen or more of these bodies. But the greatest gain would come from consolidating committees and removing present overlappings and duplications.

It is absurd for Congress to have eight different committees dealing with war and national defense and four committees concerned with governmental finance, two busily do the spending while the others try to find ways to foot the bill.

Less spectacular but of prime importance is the plan to coordinate the raising and the spending of money by Congress and to try to bring them within balance. This would end the working at cross purposes which has been largely responsible for the Government's financial ills. But unfortunately, as has been said, retention of the House Rules Committee's powers may block these imperatively needed reforms.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 7, 1946]

SPEEDING CONGRESS WORK

Plans of a joint committee for accelerating the work of Congress strike at the very heart of some of the worst delays, and suggest other steps that would recapture for the lawmakers some of the power which in the depression and war years was delegated to the administrative branch.

Court of Claims disposal of thousands of small claims would relieve Congress of much of its work; technical advisers for committees—which would be reduced in number—probably would keep a continuing watch on need for legislative changes and administration of agencies, and divorce of committee hearings and hours for full-dress sessions would prevent much absenteeism.

With changes such as these there can be no quarrel. They are long overdue. With the proposal to raise salaries of members 50 percent there will be less public agreement, but more than one Congressman has resigned because of the heavy financial demands made upon him.

On the whole, the program would be an improvement, and there seems no doubt that in addition to facilitating lawmaking, it would also permit the Members to serve their constituents better on the multitude of time-consuming requests for service off the floor.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 7, 1946]

NOT A CLEAN SWEEP

It is regrettable that "lack of agreement" among members of the Senate-House committee prevented recommendations on two items hitherto considered musts in any overhauling of congressional machinery. Failure to recommend means whereby fitness rather than seniority would govern the selection of committee chairmen, failure also to suggest reduction of the House Rules Committee's power weaken the La Follette-Monroney report. These conspicuous areas of disagreement tend to prejudice other findings, however good. Thus the benefit to be gained by the consolidation of standing committees is lessened by the fact that chairmanship of those consolidated committees will as heretofore depend more upon chance than upon merit. And undoubtedly the public, only beginning to be convinced that Congress is justified raising its own pay, would find that recommendation more acceptable were it clear that Congress is at the same time willing to relinquish outmoded prerogatives.

However, the joint committee has made many good recommendations to expedite and insure more intelligent handling of Congress' business. The recommendation for better salaries and for retirement benefits is essential to attract to public life men of ability and character. Unquestionably hard-working and sincere legislators are handicapped by lack of adequate assistance and research facilities—a lack which the committee would correct. The reduction in the number of committees, the elimination of overlapping functions, the establishment of over-all policy committees—all these are good. Excellent, too, are proposals to restrict deficit financing. These would require an advance estimate of receipts and expenditures, to be followed by conclusive action either to authorize increased borrowing or reduce expenditures to meet an approved Budget figure. They would eliminate secret hearings on appropriation bills, ban riders not germane, and require that there be time for study of committee-approved bills. They would require yearly audits of each Government agency by the General Accounting Office. Last, but not least, the La Follette-Monroney report would require the registration of lobbies so that lawmakers may not fail to recognize the source of pressures for and against bills.

The committee dared to grasp firmly so many thorny issues, it seems a pity that it should have sidestepped such fundamental reform as the selection of committee personnel. An unusual oportunity for a clean sweep of hampering procedures has been passed by.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 5, 1946]

FOR A MODERN CONGRESS

The congressional reorganization bill which the La Follette-Monroney committee presented to both Houses Monday is the minimum necessary to prevent the highest deliberative body of our Union from becoming, in the words of George B. Galloway, chairman of the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association, "a relic of the ox-cart era in the age of the rocket ship."

The absence of provisions which would strike down the seniority rule—or, as it is sometimes called with bitterness and good reason, the senility rule—and which would bring within bounds the presently excessive

power of the House Rules Committee, is important. In the long run, these omissions would be fatal to the modernizing and democratizing of Congress. In the short run, they may be justified on tactical grounds.

It will be difficult enough to get through Congress the minimum program of the La Follette-Monroney committee, since most of the provisions will have to run the gamut of the House Rules Committee and 45 committee chairmen—"petty barons," Woodrow Wilson called them—would have to agree to give up their perquisites, a thing which no one becomes either petty or a baron by doing.

If, as a starter, the La Follette-Monroney program can be achieved, it will make much easier the achievement of all that will remain to be done. It will prove that a congressional machine dated 1893 can be overhauled so that it is fit to be dated 1946. Capable and energetic younger men will be more attracted to service. There will be more vigor in Congress and, with the right sort of leadership, it can be channeled into a demand to finish the task which the present program will have started.

Filibuster, that antidemocratic instrument of minority rule which sometimes renders Congress powerless at the hands of a few who are not ashamed to prostitute the greatest deliberative body in the world, is not removed by the La Follette-Monroney program.

There are, moreover, a few actual weaknesses in the plan. The proposal to abandon special investigating committees is immoderate; their number can be kept within reasonable limits, but special investigating committees have done too much fine and indispensable work for the device to be scrapped. The proviso that if appropriations exceed the approved budget all must be scaled down by the same percentage is also too broad a proposal; a percentage cut that would be absorbed without too great damage by one agency of the Government might wreck another. Mostly, however, the program is sound.

The outstanding achievements would be to make the individual Member of Congress more efficient, to give feasibility to the outlandish Congress within a Congress which the committees (transacting some 90 percent of the business) have become, to enable the plenary Congress to function more effectively and to establish party responsibility in national affairs.

The individual Representative or Senator would find his efficiency improved by expanded legal and reference service, by a technical information service to be established within Congress, by the aid of an administrative assistant to relieve him of the individual services to constituents which now take up most of his time, and by being limited to one or two committee appointments instead of anywhere between 5 and 23, as at present.

He would be better able to represent his electorate by virtue of having a recess period of 2 or 3 months every year during which he could go home and learn the opinions of his constituents. He would find his effectiveness enhanced also by the relief from financial worries which would come with an increase in his $10,000 salary, usually inadequate, to $15,000, and eligibility to join the Federal retirement system.

The effectiveness of the voter, above all, would be enhanced by these changes, and those still to come. He may some day be able to look on the promises of political candidates as something more than dramatic displays of rhetoric—as statements of intentions to legislate, not merely statements of intentions to get votes. The voter could look on a modernized Congress with the pride which should be inherent in the mighty right arm of representative government.

American Legion Endorses Hays Bill for a Land Purchase Program for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the bill to provide priority for the purchase of rural rehabilitation lands by World War veterans—H. R. 2501—favorably reported by the Committee of Agriculture, will be considered by the House next week. I am sure that the membership will be interested in the statement of the national legislative committee of the American Legion endorsing this measure and under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter from the director, John Thomas Taylor:

MARCH 11, 1946.

The American Legion, by resolution from its 1944 national convention, endorses the bill, H. R. 2501, introduced by Representative BROOKS HAYS, which is now pending before the House of Representatives and which is expected to be taken up for consideration this week.

The primary purpose of the proposal is to partially suspend for a reasonable period after the official termination of the present war a requirement which is contained in the current Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act. This requirement directed the Department to liquidate expeditiously the resettlement and the rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes. We of the Legion are anxious that there be some delay in the operation of this directive so as to permit the sale of this property to World War II veterans in family-size farm units. The bill before you would accomplish this.

It is the understanding of our organization that Army surveys show more than several hundred thousand returning veterans expect to farm; that the majority of them want to own their own farms; and that they are hopeful of acquiring family-size farms. We all know that suitable farms for economic family type operations are difficult to obtain. In addition, the great majority of these farms are inflated in value. If these farms are acquired under present-day conditions, it would make sound operation most difficult, if not hazardous. It seems, therefore, that the interest of the returning veteran would be served better if these Government-owned lands could be reserved and developed for sale to the war veteran. This would afford him the opportunity to rehabilitate himself and his family. The bill provides that the land would be sold at its estimated earning capacity value to qualified veterans. This latter would appear to enable a greater number of veterans to acquire their own farms on a sound basis.

Originally, the liquidation program involved approximately 1,860,688 acres of land. As of June 30, 1945, there remained unsold approximately 989,611 acres of land. The liquidation of the property is presently progressing at the rate of about 60,000 acres per month. Some of this land is not susceptible of subdivision into economic family-size farm units. A considerable portion of this land, however, can be utilized for the purposes of the bill only by the addition of certain fixtures and improvements, including the repair and construction of farm buildings. Section 3 would authorize the appropriation and expenditure of funds not now available, for the purpose of developing such land into suitable economic farm units to effectuate the purposes of the act.

We of the American Legion are hopeful the House will adopt H. R. 2501.

Must We Fight To Obtain Oil for Britain?—Both Iraq and Iran Are Rich in Oil—Iran Is the World's Fourth Largest Producer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, while we in this country are wasting our precious oil resources by every scheme human ingenuity can invent, wasting precious energy by the needless burning of oil to generate steam and the heating of homes, the maneuvers between England and Russia for the rich oil stores in what used to be Persia goes merrily on. It would be merry if this struggle between England and the Standard Oil on one side and Russia on the other did not have such serious import for us.

History seems to repeat. Back at the turn of the century when it was found that the simple-minded Boers had unwittingly settled on the greatest "treasure house" on God's footstool, the diamond fields of Kimberly and the gold veins of the Rand, England was quick to recognize the potentials of these vast untapped reservoirs of purchasing power and moved in on a relentless and successful campaign to take over these vast stores of natural wealth which, it appears, has changed the course of empires.

Now Russia, emerging from a great war where the use of oil has been the deciding factor, recognizing the potentials of these reservoirs of energy lying just outside her border, proceeds to move in just as England did in South Africa, with the difference that instead of being pitted against the brave but helpless Boers she is pitted against the financial forces of England and the Standard Oil with all its powerful influence in this country.

Time and war-weary sentiment seems to play on the side of Russia, a factor that the Kremlin has evidently taken into consideration in making this drive for the sinews of military power. It may be the American people can be cajoled into being the force, with the fighting ability of American manhood, to war against Russia in deciding this issue. Propaganda, when artfully employed, has been demonstrated to be irresistible in this country. Let us fervently hope it will fail now.

Current press reports give a clear insight into the real issue between Russia,

England, and our big oil companies and are submitted here.

(By Joseph Goodwin, Associated Press foreign correspondent)

TEHERAN, IRAN, March 13.—Russian combat troops in full campaign kit were declared by British and other official sources today to have closed within 20 miles of this capital and to be moving southwest across northern Iran close to the borders of Turkey and Iraq.

The reports caused Secretary of State Byrnes to announce in Washington last night the dispatch of another note to Moscow demanding an explanation.

This correspondent flew over Karaj, 20 miles from Tehran, and counted 14 Sherman tanks, a score of other vehicles, and saw half a dozen Red fighter planes at Kazvin to the north.

NO AGREEMENTS IN MOSCOW

Premier Ahmed Qavam Es Saltaneh, just returned from inconclusive negotiations in Moscow over the continued presence of Russian troops in Iran, declared today that no agreements were reached.

Reports reaching this troubled capital told of Russian combat troops entering the towns of Mianeh, Maraghen and Miyanduab, close to the southern end of Lake Urima near the Turkish and Iraq borders.

Russian troops were obligated by international agreement to have withdrawn by March 2. Instead, there were reports of large Red army reinforcements moving into Iran.

Both Iraq and Iran are rich in oil. Iran is the world's fourth largest producer.

GRAVITY OF SITUATION WORSE

In London a British Foreign Office spokesman said the British Government had received reports of "considerable" Russian troop movements toward the Iranian capital of Tehran and as a result the gravity of a tense situation had been increased.

The spokesman said, however, that Britain's major consideration still was the continued presence of Red Army troops in Iran, in what he called a breach of the Anglo-Soviet-Iranian treaty of 1942.

MOVEMENTS UNEXPLAINED

Although Iraq, a former British mandate, was recognized as independent in 1922, Britain has special interests there and a British-Iraq treaty of alliance was made in 1932.

The spokesman said these troop movements still were unexplained by the Russian Government, but Britain was "pressing for a reply" to the British demand for an explanation of the continued presence of Red Army forces in the country.

NO NEGOTIATIONS UNDER WAY

Premier Ahmed Qavam said in an interview with foreign correspondents that no negotiations are now under way with the Russians.

Qavam described as "ridiculous" reports circulated during his visit to Moscow that he agreed to six Soviet demands which were reported to have included the incorporation of Azerbaijan into the Soviet Union, granting of oil concessions to Russia.

GRAVE CONCERN CAUSED IN WASHINGTON OVER RED MOVES IN IRAN—STATE DEPARTMENT ASKS MOSCOW TO GIVE REASON FOR TROOPS' ADVANCES

(By Garnett D. Horner)

Fresh movement by Soviet combat troops into Iran toward Turkey and Iraq raised grave new concern here today about what Russia is up to in that area.

The State Department said last night it had received reports of the troop movements and asked Moscow if they were true "and if so the reasons therefor."

The Department said its information was to the effect that "during the last week additional Soviet armed forces and heavy military combat equipment have been moving southward from the direction of the Soviet frontier through Tabriz toward Teheran and toward the western border of Iran."

THREAT TO TURKEY SEEN

Movement toward Iran's western border means toward Turkey and oil-rich Iraq.

Three possible reasons for the Red Army movements are seen in unofficial speculation here:

1. To win territorial concessions and control of the Dardanelles from Turkey through threat of force. In this connection, it is recalled that Russia is maintaining a large combat army in Bulgaria, a potential threat to Turkey.

2. To seek the Mosul oil fields of Iraq, which would bring Russia into direct conflict with British interests.

3. To force a pro-Soviet government on Iran, where the Soviet long has sought oil concessions.

The United States is not a party to the agreement setting the March 2 date for withdrawal of the allied troops which were stationed in Iran during the war to facilitate movement of supplies to Russia. American forces were pulled out by January 1. The situation put added significance on Mr. Byrnes' declaration in his recent New York radio speech that "veto or no veto" the United States intends to back up its responsibilities under the United Nations Charter, with force if necessary. Russia could be expected to veto any proposal for strong UNO action on either Iran or Turkey.

Soldier's Makeshift Home Burns—Father and Two Children Killed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if we in Washington fully understand the daily tragedies that are taking place over the Nation as a result of this housing shortage. I received a letter today from a New Yorker which asked the question, "Do you suppose those hard, cold legislators who are under the thumb of the unholy real-estate lobby care for one moment what happens to veterans and their families?"

Answering this writer's question, I am quite sure that we do care about the veterans and their families, and that we will vote to provide our servicemen with housing once we fully understand the tragedy of the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include this letter and an article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, describing the facts of this case:

NEW YORK, *March 4, 1946.*

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am enclosing clipping of a dreadful tragedy which took place in Morristown, N. J. Do you suppose those hard, cold legislators who are under the thumb of the unholy real-estate lobby care for one moment what happens to veterans and their families? (Never mind the civilians.)

More power to you and other Congressmen who are being stymied at every turn by men to whom huge profits and gold is of greater value than mere human life.

Yours very truly,

ANNA WEMSTER.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, 1946]

MORRISTOWN, N. J., March 3.—Trapped while they slept in their makeshift apartment above a garage, a 58-year-old man was burned to death and his two grandchildren were suffocated here last night.

The victims, father and only children of Pvt. James Stewart, 27, were John Stewart; James, Jr., 5, and Gail, 3. The family had been living above the four-car garage behind 30 Franklin Place for almost a year. It was the only home in town the children's mother, Mrs. Virginia Stewart, could obtain while her husband was overseas.

FIRE DISCOVERED AT 11 P. M.

The fire, of unknown origin, was discovered at 11 p. m. by Muriel Arden, of 28 Franklin Place. She noticed flames inside the garage. By the time she had telephoned an alarm the flames had burst through the slanted roof of the wooden structure with a brilliance which could be seen for miles.

Firemen and police rushed to the scene and found an inner staircase leading to the upper floor in flames. Fireman Henry Mellinger ran up a ladder, groped his way to the children's bedroom, and passed both of them out of a window to Fireman Robert Geary. Killed by heat suffocation and slightly burned, the children were given artificial respiration for an hour in a vain attempt to revive them. Their grandfather had been wakened by the fire and died while trying to reach the children, Fire Chief John J. Cullinan reported.

FATHER AND MOTHER OUT

Home on furlough from Fort Monmouth, N. J., for the last month after a year's service with the Sixty-eighth Medical Depot Company in the Philippines, Private Stewart decided last night to take his wife to visit friends in Madison, N. J. They left about 9 p. m. and returned at 1 a. m. to find their home destroyed and their family gone.

The broken-hearted couple identified their children and Mr. Stewart at Memorial Hospital and then wandered away from officials. Mrs. Stewart told police she had rented the garage apartment for $18 a month after the Morristown Red Cross had prevailed on the owner, Mrs. Alice Hill, 30 Franklin Place, to reconvert it. She described the home as one large room, separated by beaverboard partitions into a kitchen and a nursery for the children.

This afternoon Mr. and Mrs. Stewart appeared at Lanterman & Hughson Funeral Home, 150 Speedwell Avenue, and made arrangements for a triple funeral. A solemn requiem mass will be celebrated at 9:30 a. m. Wednesday at the Roman Catholic Church of the Assumption here. The children and their grandfather will be buried in Holy Cross Cemetery, Bernardsville, N. J.

Want a Better Road Past Your Farm?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Farm Journal, of January 1946, carried the following article:

WANT A BETTER ROAD PAST YOUR FARM?

START NOW IF YOU ARE GOING TO GET IT FIXED UP UNDER FEDERAL PROGRAM

What are you doing about the road by your farm? If you don't have an all-weather road, have your county commissioners designate your road to be included in the new Federal-aid secondary and feeder road system.

If you can get them to do so, you've taken the first step in getting your share of the $150,000,000 that the Federal Government is going to spend each year for 3 years to improve farm roads throughout the country.

The second step is to get your State highway department to give your road a priority for work that will be done with the Federal money. That will mean getting your county commissioners to fight for you at the State capital, and backing them up with your own efforts.

If you don't get your road fixed this year, don't give up the fight. Public Roads Administration officials in Washington, D. C., think of the secondary and farm-to-market road-improvement program as a 10- or 15-year campaign. They believe that in that time an additional 20 percent of the 3,000,000 miles of roads in the United States can be improved. The appropriations authorized for the next 3 years are only the beginning.

This year's $150,000,000 has been allocated on this basis: One-third on the area, one-third on the rural population, and one-third on the RFD route mileage of each State, compared to the national figures.

No State, however, will receive less than $731,250 each year. Delaware, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont fall in the minimum group. Texas gets the most—$10,000,000 a year.

Forty-four State legislatures, which met last winter, enacted 124 bills relating to their cooperation with the Federal-aid road program. To get the Federal money each State must match it, dollar for dollar. Four States—Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, and Oklahoma—increased their gasoline taxes to raise money for matching, and to maintain the new roads.

This program aims at putting good roads where there are the most homes.

It is taking a long time to get decent roads for the rural people. They still have 2,500,000 miles of dirt roads to travel.

It did not take long to provide the billion-dollar appropriation to allow 1 to 2 percent of the people an opportunity to travel by air, but the country dirt roads will be with us for many years to come.

Table Talk Preferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 12, 1946:

TABLE TALK PREFERRED

The United Nations Security Council adjourned its London meeting on February 16, a day after the UNO Assembly adjourned.

Since then, the principal nations have been extremely busy writing notes to each other and making speeches at each other.

This was natural, since the occasions for the note writing and speech making rose after the session had wound up its business. It was after that time that the Russians decided to withdraw from only part of Persia; that they deferred their withdrawal from Manchuria; that Americans finally got evidence of the extent of their industrial seizures in that country.

Hence United States and British protests on all these subjects; hence a counternote from Russia complaining that we had been irregular about party representation in Bulgaria; hence speeches and more speeches, editorials, and counter editorials.

The chief hope of the UNO to preserve peace in the world is that it may substitute table talk for note writing and oratory as a means of settling the hard questions in international relations. To be sure, the London meeting had its oratory, too, giving rise to Churchill's question as to whether UNO would evolve into a true temple of peace or serve only as a cockpit in the Tower of Babel. Still, there was opportunity for the foreign ministers and delegates to chat with each other.

We renew a suggestion we made a week ago.

Let's hold some of the notes, some of the speeches, until the Security Council convenes again on March 21 in New York. That's only 9 days distant.

Particularly let the governments of the Big Three nations refrain from transmitting any communications that sound like ultimatums until their representatives get their feet back under the table.

Conversation is flexible and easily subject to amendment. A note transmitted by an ambassador in striped pants is not.

OPA Destroys the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the OPA, through its stupid regulations, has struck a disastrous blow at the dairy industry in the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent. This desolating bureaucratic scourge is becoming Nation-wide, as the article states which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, March 14, 1946, which I am inserting under unanimous consent as a part of my remarks:

MILK PRODUCTS DRY UP AS FARMERS ABANDON NONPAYING BUSINESS—SLUMP IN MILK OUTPUT SEEN SHARPEST ON RECORD—BIG ICE-CREAM DEARTH DUE—OPA PRICE CEILINGS BLAMED

(By Joseph M. Guilfoyle)

The shortage of dairy products, already a problem for butter and cheese eaters, will get worse in the months ahead.

From such far-apart areas as New York, Texas, and the State of Washington come reports that farmers are quitting the dairy business for more profitable fields. They say they can't make money out of milk.

In one section around Seattle, more than 1,000 milk cows have been sold in recent months. In Chattanooga, 100 fully equipped dairy barns stand idle today. Detroit reports the number of farms supplying it with milk declined by 218 in January.

In the Gulf coast section of Texas and Louisiana, half the dairymen have quit producing milk to raise the more profitable peanuts and rice.

These examples, according to representatives of milk-farm groups, are typical of what is happening throughout the dairy industry.

SHARPEST MILK DECLINE

They predict that milk production this year will show one of the sharpest declines on record, falling far below the 123,000,000,000 pounds produced last year. That the decline is already under way is evident from the fact that 3 percent less milk was produced in January than a year ago. February is estimated to have shown a similar decline.

This comes at a time when consumer demand for dairy products is greater than ever before.

Consequently, here is what American consumers can expect in the way of milk and dairy products this year, say dairy men.

1. Fluid milk: There will be enough for essential needs, but milk drinkers probably won't get all they'd like to have.

2. Ice cream: The present mild shortage will become a drought this summer when demand reaches its peak, particularly in large cities. There will be long periods between deliveries when neighborhood drug and candy stores will display "sold out" signs.

3. Cheese: The peak milk production months of May and June will see some improvement in the supply, but it won't last long. Cheese makers will be unable to build up sufficient supplies to carry them through the remainder of the year.

4. Butter: The present extreme shortage will get worse. Dairymen see no improvement in the critical butter picture for at least another year.

PRICE SYSTEM HURT BUTTER

A major reason for the dismal butter outlook is the price system which has grown up in the industry over the years. Under it milk sold to butter makers brings the farmer the lowest prices. Fluid milk, on the other hand, brings the highest price, followed by table cream, ice cream, evaporated milk, and cheese, in that order.

In normal times, the supply of milk is large enough to take care of all these needs. But now, with demand at peak levels and production decreasing, farmers sell their milk where it brings the highest prices.

Another factor affecting butter production is the low price ceiling. Butter men say they can't pay 75 cents to $1 a pound for butterfat and sell butter for 46 cents a pound, the wholesale price ceiling. It takes eight-tenths of a pound of butterfat to make a pound of butter.

Several factors are responsible for the present plight of the dairy business, but the most important, dairymen say, are Office of Price Administration price ceilings on dairy products.

There are no ceilings on milk sold by farmers. But the fluid-milk dealers and makers of ice cream and other dairy products, whose prices are under ceilings, say they cannot pay any more to the farmer under present ceilings and still make a profit.

PROFIT MARGINS SLASHED

Both the small dealer handling only drinking milk and the big dairy companies turning out a full line of products complain of rising wages and increasing milk prices. As a result, they say their profit margins have been pared to the point where any further increases must be accompanied by higher ceilings.

They explain that even now they're losing money on evaporated milk because of a too low ceiling price. As further evidence that they can't pay the farmer any more, milk companies supplying the New York market state that their rate of return for the last 5 years averaged about one-half cent a quart.

What happens when milk companies are faced with higher prices without an adjustment in their ceiling prices was illustrated early this month in Hazleton, Pa. On March 1, 13 distributors there shut their doors when

farmers increased milk prices 55 cents a hundred pounds, or slightly more than a cent a quart.

Coming on top of a wage increase, which had already added a cent a quart to their costs, the dealers stated they had no alternative but to close since they were losing 2 cents on every quart of milk sold. A week later the OPA lifted their ceiling prices and the dealers resumed operations.

FEED SHORTAGE HURTS

In support of their demands for higher prices dairy farmers point to the increasing cost of producing milk. They have trouble getting corn and other high-protein cow rations, which result in more and better milk. Here again, it's a question of ceiling prices.

The midwestern farmers who raise the corn find it more profitable to feed to their hogs and other meat animals than sell it at ceiling prices to dairymen.

But even when they can get the feed, dairymen pay a lot for it. In January, for instance, the average price paid for dairy ration was $63.40 a ton, in 1943 this same ration cost only $48.80 a ton, and in 1940 it was about $35 a ton.

Adding further to their problems is the acute shortage of labor. Howard W. Selby, manager of the United Farmers Cooperative Creamery Association of Boston, reports that "Of some 29,000 New England farm boys recently demobilized, only 250 have gone back to the farms." Why should they go back, he asks, when they can get better pay and shorter hours working in industry?

It's the same in other sections. W. J. Swayer, president of Chicago's Pure Milk Association, says that very few veterans are on farms in the Chicago area.

LABOR SCARCE AND COSTLY

When they can get labor, its price is high. Henry Hagg, director of the Dairy Cooperative Association of Portland, Oreg., reports that offers of $175 a month, plus a house and living accessories, have failed to attract any new hands in his territory.

In other parts of the country, farmers pay anywhere from $90 to $120 a month plus board, for hired hands. In addition, they also have to throw in a lot of extra privileges, such as a garden, fuel for the tenant's house, and even use of the family car on week ends. In 1940 these farmers were paying an average of $31 to $40 a month for help.

Another expense factor, dairymen say, is the higher cost of things they buy as a result of the wage increases being granted by industry. They estimate, for instance, that the recent increase in steel prices means they'll pay about 25 percent more for equipment from now on.

COW POPULATION SLUMPS

However, even if farmers succeed in getting higher prices, it appears doubtful now that they'll be able to produce enough milk to meet the demand. This is because of the drastic drop in the country's cow population during the past year.

During 1945, dairy cows were withdrawn from production at a rate that was exceeded only in the drought year of 1934. From every thousand milk cows on farms at the beginning of 1945, 255 were culled out or died during the year. This compares with a 25-year average rate of 190. In fact, in only five other years of the past quarter century have more than 200 cows per thousand been eliminated.

The large number of farmers leaving the dairy business points away from any quick reversal of the present downward trend in milk production. Typical are conditions in the New York area where there were 2,000 less dairy farms last December than a year ago, and 15,000 fewer than in 1940.

Whether this trend is accelerated or halted, say dairymen, depends entirely on what happens to milk and dairy-product prices in coming months.

Milk is the farmer's largest cash crop. It brings him more income than hogs, or wheat and cotton combined. In 1944, dairy farmers were paid $2,969,000,000 for their milk.

Shortage of Livestock and Poultry Feeds in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein resolutions adopted at a recent meeting of Worcester County farmers, feed dealers, and agricultural leaders at Worcester, Mass.

These resolutions were prompted by the highly critical situation confronting New England livestock and poultry producers because of lack of adequate feed.

For some time past I have been urging appropriate Government officials to carry out certain of the recommendations contained herein. It is clear that unless New England can receive additional feed supplies in the near future, livestock and poultry flocks will be jeopardized and vitally necessary dairy products curtailed. I hope that the Government agencies concerned will harken to these appeals before it is too late; before more New England farmers are forced to sell their farms; before milk supplies so urgently needed are diminished to the danger point, and before all our poultry flocks are dissipated.

Resolution adopted at meeting of Worcester County farmer, feed dealers, and agricultural leaders of Massachusetts and Worcester County, at Elks Home, Worcester, March 1, 1946

Whereas New England livestock and poultry producers must have feed at once, and

Whereas our New England citizens are largely dependent upon regional production of milk, eggs, and poultry for food: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the 200 representatives assembled here, consisting of farmers, feed dealers, and other agricultural officials of Worcester County, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts recommend:

1. That the Government adjust the ceiling price of corn so that it is at least as profitable for corn producers to sell corn to regular trade channels as to feed it to livestock;

2. That we support Secretary Anderson's request for increase in acreage of feed, grain, and oil-seed crops, and urge that price controls make it at least as profitable to grow oil-seed crops as to grow corn;

3. That Congress immediately establish its policy in regard to price control for the next fiscal year;

4. That all feeder and trucker differentials unfavorable to the movement of carload shipments of grain through normal trade channels be eliminated immediately;

5. That the Government adjust the ceiling prices of hogs to encourage marketing at lighter weights;

6. That Congress complete its study of the parity formula in the light of present conditions to the end that a balance between livestock and livestock product production and feed supplies may result;

7. That the Government adjust the ceiling price of all byproducts feeds to an equitable relationship with grain prices.

8. We request His Excellency, Governor Tobin, to urge the immediate adoption of the resolutions of the committee on agriculture of the Massachusetts Legislature and the appropriation of adequate funds for a thorough investigation into the cause of the present shortage of feed supplies for the production of eggs, milk, and poultry products.

ARTHUR CUNNINGHAM, *Oxford, Chairman,*
DONALD CROOKS, *North Brookfield,*
VERNON MUDGETT, *Sterling,*
JOHN SIBLEY, *Spencer,*
GEORGE DAVIS, *Sterling,*
GEORGE TREADWELL, *Spencer,*
Resolutions Committee.

Wisconsin Is Always in There Pitching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the University of Wisconsin, together with its agricultural college, has been one of the leading educational institutions of the Nation for many years.

The following article from the New York Times is one more indication of this:

ATOM SMASHER IS BACK—MACHINE WAS LENT TO UNITED STATES BY WISCONSIN UNIVERSITY IN WAR

Another now-it-can-be-told story has been disclosed with the return recently to the University of Wisconsin of its 4,000,000-volt atom-smashing machine, which was borrowed by the Government during the war and taken to Los Alamos, N. Mex., for atomic-bomb research.

The machine, known as the Herb pressure electrostatic generator, was moved from the university with much secrecy in April 1943, along with a 2,000,000-ton "twin." At the atomic-bomb research laboratories in Los Alamos they were used in developing much of the data that made the bomb possible.

The generator was designed in 1934 by Prof. R. G. Herb, and it is said to be of particular value because the high voltages it generates can be maintained for long periods. A new underground laboratory at the University of Wisconsin will be built to house the generator. The 2,000,000-volt smasher has been purchased from the university by the Government.

The University of Wisconsin has also developed a new process for making nitrate using the nitrogen of the air. I wrote to the institution for particulars and am advised that the process is being perfected. This process includes raising the temperature of the air to 4,200°, according to an article in the Farm Journal. It is claimed that nitrate fertilizer can be produced in plants costing from $25,000 to $50,000 instead of the usual plants costing many times as much. It is also claimed that nitrate fertilizer can be produced at one-half the present cost. TVA may be the yardstick for the Nation, but maybe the University of Wisconsin wil be the yardstick for the TVA.

UREA

The College of Agriculture at Wisconsin University has also carried on considerable experimental work with urea. This is a protein feed made from the nitrogen of the air. While the Du Ponts have produced considerable quantities of the product, it has been used for war purposes only. It is possible that if cheap enough coke can be obtained, a new and abundant source of protein feed for commercial animal feeding will be obtained.

In these days, when so many groups are exerting every effort to divide up the material things of life, it is inspiring to see a university keep on the beam and make greater and greater effort to perfect discoveries which will add benefits to all mankind.

Needless to say, I am more proud every day of the fact that I had the honor to worship at the feet of some of these scientific men. "The greatest good for the greatest number" and "scientific facts know no politics" are two Wisconsin axioms which, if followed, would add materially to the happiness of the world.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald of March 9, 1946:

FORGOTTEN MEN

All during the years the men who "carry the mail," those who sort it in the post offices, the clerks, the carriers, all the rest of them make certain that our mail reaches us daily and that the mail we send out goes on its way to its proper destination.

During the war these postal employees worked harder than usual. They put in long hours of overtime. It is the spirit of the postal service that they shall be loyal to their trust; that they shall merit the respect and confidence of the public.

Postal employees never have been known to strike or even to threaten to strike. They work on and on performing their tasks on what pay and during whatever hours are granted and demanded of them.

They can't go to the boss and demand more wages. They have no boss as other workers have. If they get an increase in pay, it must come through an act of the Congress. A bill is now before the Congress providing for a small increase in postal employees' wages.

Just once in the last 20 years have they been granted an increase in pay. That was when they were given a 16-percent boost. In those 20 years, as everybody knows, the cost of living has mounted to present unprecedented heights. During the war they were able to keep somewhat abreast of these rising costs because of their overtime pay.

They're back to 40 hours a week now. The base pay doesn't begin to provide the living each of them desires and earns. Their pay at best is nothing about which to boast. Their work is hard and exacting, must be done in all sorts of weather and under all sorts of conditions.

The bill now before the Congress provides for an increase of $300 a year, or between 11 and 12 percent.

The postal employees hope a pending amendment to the bill granting them a greater raise will be accepted. It should be. They have earned it. They are entitled to it. Moreover, they need it.

Communistic Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the conduct of American Communists and fellow travelers has reached a new low—if that is possible. It must be obvious to all of our people that this group is not interested in the welfare of mankind, but only in the cause of world revolution. It will supplant the American way of life for the Russian form of dictatorship, if it can.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of people are dying of starvation in Europe and Asia. This Nation has a responsibility to reduce that suffering by furnishing food and other necessities. The problem is a gigantic one and requires expert handling. All credit must go to President Truman in his selection of Herbert Hoover as honorary chairman for this important work. Mr. Hoover's selection has caused the Communist element in the CIO, the Communist Party, and the PAC's to protest. In an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of March 11, 1946, it is pointed out that this reckless attack upon Mr. Hoover is without justification.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I wish to insert said editorial:

FAMINE AND POLITICS

Certain elements within the Congress of Industrial Organizations seem more intent upon making political capital out of the appointment of Herbert Hoover to the honorary chairmanship of the President's Famine Emergency Committee than in doing anything to help feed the starving people of Europe.

The National Citizens' Political Action Committee says that "there is every reason to believe * * * that Herbert Hoover will use the selective giving of food as a weapon against democratic forces in Europe." This is a shocking irresponsible and unsupportable statement. It will meet with a popular reception in that fringe of Communists and extreme left wingers who do business with the PAC, but it will come as something of an affront to many millions of Americans who, whatever their political affiliations, have confidence in Mr. Hoover's integrity. Certainly, President Truman is not going to remove Mr. Hoover from the famine committee at the behest of the character assassins in the PAC, and the latter must know that this is the case. Consequently, it is reasonable to conclude that the attacks on Mr. Hoover are inspired by the shabbiest sort of political considerations, and that they are being pressed in disregard of the fact that, if they have any effect, it will be to create disunity in this country at the expense of the people in Europe who need our help.

Another reckless attack has come from Donald Henderson, president of the CIO Food, Tobacco, Agriculture, and Allied Workers of America. He says that after World War I "millions of European and Asian people died of starvation because Hoover did not approve of their desires for independent, democratic political action." And he adds that Mr. Hoover's appointment to the World War II committee "cannot inspire anything but mistrust, not only among our own people, but also among the people abroad."

So far, there has been no evidence of this "mistrust," if one discounts the enthusiastic endorsement of Mr. Henderson's statement which has come from the Communist Daily Worker. But if Mr. Henderson and those allied with him in this shameful campaign can have their way, they will stir it up.

Critical Housing Shortage Disclosed by Mayor LaGuardia—Warns Both Democrats and Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the national radio broadcast of the Honorable F. H. LaGuardia, former mayor of the city of New York and former Member of Congress, on March 10, 1946, he stated the following relative to the housing shortage:

Yes; we have plenty of everything; and if we use our hearts and heads there will be plenty for everyone in our country, including houses. The housing bill as passed by the House is most disappointing. Two vital provisions have been stricken from the bill: (1) Authorization to use $600,000,000 in premium payments to expand production of building materials, and (2) means to curb further inflation in the prices of existing homes and building lots through halting speculative resales.

The bill as it stands does this: It extends priorities and allocations of materials; it provides for price ceilings on new-home construction through priorities. It gives veterans preference in the purchase and rental of priority-built homes. Authorizes insurance of home mortgages under FHA to the extent of $1,000,000,000, and continues the powers of the National Housing Expediter to issue directives to other agencies, in speeding the veterans' emergency-housing program.

All very good and helpful. But, unless the Senate restores the two essential provisions defeated in the House, the veterans' program will be tragically cut down. I asked Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the able Housing Expediter, what he thought about it. This is what Mr. Wyatt said: "Without premium payments, we cannot hope to get the unprecedented amount of materials we will need to build the 2,700,000 moderately priced homes called for in the veterans' emergency housing program. We also need means to halt the upward spiral of real-estate prices, which hits home-seeking veterans hardest. Unless we get the necessary tools to work with, the veterans' emergency housing program cannot succeed.

That from Mr. Wyatt direct.

As I see the score, it is a victory for the heartless speculators against the American home. I have more to say on that, suppose

you take it now, but come back to me, won't you, please?

ANNOUNCER. All right, I will, Mr. LaGuardia.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Veterans' families are living doubled up, living with strangers, relatives, in-laws; living in barracks and shacks, and Quonset huts, living in makeshift, drafty, dismal, dilapidated shacks.

In North Dakota a veteran moved into a hamburger stand. Last week in New Jersey two children and the father of a veteran were killed by fire. Why? Because the veteran lived in a makeshift apartment, over a firetrap garage. These are just samples.

You Republicans and Democrats who opposed the best features of the President's housing bill, and you smug fellows who never built and would not have others build—the misery of these good American people, the blood of this old man and the two children are on your hands. Every day delayed action means added danger, more discomfort, jeopardizing the health and life of fine young American families. You who listen to real-estate lobbyists, the money sharks, the home speculators, who want to keep housing down, and prices up—think it over.

Are you sleeping nights? I wonder! Get next to yourselves, and do something.

Government Regulations Increase Difficulties of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, as one reads the newspapers from all sections of the country he is struck by the shortages of food and clothing throughout the Nation. The articles indicate time and time again that price ceilings or other bureaucratic regulations or restrictions are the cause of the trouble.

As indicated in the following news articles from the Springfield Union of March 9, 1946, housewives in Springfield are making their own butter at home from heavy cream, as a result of the improper distribution of our dairy products. Our families are paying twice as much for this home-made butter as the ceiling prices for commercial butter. The butter situation is so badly handled that in Springfield alone more than 1,000 families are making their own butter.

We are told that there are more cattle, more hogs, and other meat supplies in the United States today than are required to furnish stores with adequate supplies of meat, if properly distributed. There is some fresh pork, but no pork chops; no roast beef, but cheaper cuts. There are shortages of sugar, of hosiery, and of many other items which are essential to the American family.

Perhaps the OPA and the Department of Agriculture are operating successfully, but there are thousands upon thousands of Americans throughout the entire country who are in daily contact with situations such as those outlined in the two following press releases.

I believe that even under the stress of present-day conditions in the United States, our people are entitled to more consideration than they are receiving from our Government. These conditions can only be due to inefficiency, negligence, and incompetence. Perhaps a little less regulation and a lot more cooperation between Government officials and storekeepers would improve existing conditions tremendously.

The articles follow:

THOUSANDS MAKE BUTTER AT HOME—CREAM DEMANDS RISE; ARMY OF HOUSEWIVES CHURNS

From 1,000 to 3,000 families in Springfield are now making their own butter and the number of city housewives rapidly becoming expert in this skill, formerly known only to farm dwellers, is steadily on the increase.

The estimate of how many families have turned to butter making is based on a survey of eight of the large cream distributors whose heavily increased sales in heavy cream range from 3 to 10 percent during the past 6 weeks since butter literally vanished from the markets. The majority of the dairies estimate the increase in the 5 to 20 percent range.

CREAM DEMAND JUMPS

Steadily increased demands for heavy cream in quart lots along all retail routes instead of the ordinary half-pint bottle can be interpreted in no other way than that butter making has become a regular household duty in many hundreds of homes. At the present time, wholesalers say there is no other answer for the use of such quantities of cream.

Were the spring season further advanced, a portion of the increased cream sales might be attributed for use with strawberries and other fruit but right now there is no food item on the market whose use is accompanied by cream on the home tables.

Not only has cream along milk routes been showing a steady growth in demand for the past 6 weeks, but the far heavier sales of cream in retail stores where only half-pint bottles are supplied, point to the same conclusion. The cream is being bought to manufacture the coveted butter without which the American home refuses to function.

SOUR CREAM SCARCE

While ordinarily there are "returns" from the retail stores of cream not sold each day, now practically no returns are brought back to the dairies. Demand for sour cream at the dairies is constant and insistent but there is no sour cream to sell.

As one dealer put it "If I had a hundred times the volume of cream returns that come back at present, it wouldn't begin to fill the demands for it." Heavy cream sells at 97 cents a quart making the price of home-made butter nearly double the commercial butter.

Housewives, if they could get the sour cream they are seeking so avidly, would have to pay only from 45 to 50 cents a quart and could make their butter as cheaply as they could buy it at the store, or even a little cheaper.

One cream distributor said that since the butter shortage developed early in the war, cream returned to his dairy had been churned there and the resulting butter made available to employees. In the past month not enough cream has been returned to make it worth while to churn.

VARIOUS DEVICES USED

Housewives and, in many instances, the man of the house who has a fancy for butter making, use all sorts of devices to churn. Most popular is the power beater which used to function for whipping cream, mixing cakes, mashing potatoes, and such culinary chores. With the power beater butter "comes" within a matter of minutes and without physical exertion by the butter maker.

Homes without power beaters, make butter by the more laborious method of the hand beater which takes a considerable time. In other households, butter is produced merely by energetic shaking of the cream in a mason or milk jar. Scores of homes are now equipped with small commercial churns which can be purchased for as little as a dollar and consist of a glass jar and wooden paddles.

Despite the increasing demand for heavy cream, dealers say the supply is adequate to meet the needs of the new home-made butter industry. One dealer said he had made special inquiries into future prospects because his cream sales had advanced so rapidly and was assured by this supplier that there is no prospect of heavy cream running short in the immediate future, at least.

NO PORK CHOPS THIS SUNDAY—THOUSANDS MILL AGAIN AROUND GROCERY AND MEAT COUNTERS GRABBING SUPPLIES

There were no hosiery lines, no shirt lines, and no butter lines in Springfield today though many thousands of men and women thronged the business section from opening until closing hours of the stores, worriedly rushing up and down Main Street to detect signs that any such lines might develop. Short items in food and clothing were so acutely short that there were no supplies, whatever, to meet the week end demand.

In food markets, smart new signs appeared. "No butter or oleo today," with emphasis on the final word. Meat counters, vegetable counters, and counters where packaged goods are sold, were several deep with customers and long queues stemmed from cashiers windows while the men and women behind the counters volunteered information it was the toughest trading day since the end of the war. The warm, springlike weather had obviously been responsible for bringing uncounted thousands into the shopping center.

Meat supplies were plentiful but far from choice. There were few roasts to be seen and lamb in the form of chops and stewing pieces was in greatest abundance. Every store had heaping platters of lamb or mutton chops which were being constantly replenished.

Shoppers were seeking corned beef with little success, its place in meat counters having been taken by corned tongue. Nowhere nearly as much fresh pork was in evidence as on any Saturday in the past 2 months and nowhere was a pork chop glimpsed in midmorning round of the larger markets. One market had slices of ham for sale briefly and bacon could once more be purchased at most stores.

Equally crowded with the meat departments were the vegetable stalls, where over 40 varieties could be counted in some instances from cauliflower to eggplant, a half dozen kinds of greens from which to choose, avocados and artichokes for the epicures and the entire range of familiar offerings.

Shortages in home sugar supplies were testified to in mob scenes before bakery counters where doughnuts, cakes, cookies, and pies were being bought avidly by housewives who have had to abandon home cooking of pastries.

In packaged-food departments, shoppers were still unable to obtain packaged puddings, soap powder, or gelatine desserts. The familiar enriched white flour, however, was plentiful in bags containing from 1 to 25 pounds.

Millions of Homes Urgently Needed—Veterans Sleeping in Parks—Inflation Threatens Economy of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following syndicated article which was recently published by Business News Service in various magazines and newspapers over the country calling attention to the need for veterans' homes:

MILLIONS OF HOMES URGENTLY NEEDED

(By WRIGHT PATMAN, Member of Congress)

One of the strangest aspects of America's postwar outlook is that our country, richest and with the highest standard of living in the world, faces a startling shortage in one of the basic needs of life—adequate shelter for its people.

How did it happen? That's a question many bewildered people are asking.

LITTLE CONSTRUCTION FOR 16 YEARS

The explanation goes back to the mid-thirties. The late President Roosevelt warned then that one-third of the Nation was ill-housed. But few had the money to build homes during the rigorous depression years. Existing structures steadily decayed while the population increased.

The years 1938 and 1939 brought a spurt to the building industry, but it was stopped by war. Defense factories needed all the brick. Lumber became critical as millions of feet of it went into ammunition boxes and similar needs. Home building dwindled to the lowest point in a decade, except for emergency housing for war workers. Meanwhile old homes continued to deteriorate. The need for more homes piled up.

With war in the headlines and the Nation concentrated on the drive for victory, few people took note of the growing menace in the housing shortage. It was a secondary problem, to be dealt with in some way in the vague postwar future.

Then suddenly the war was over and our armies were streaming home from the far corners of the world. These returning veterans had but two thoughts—getting a job and a home. Their arrival touched off a housing situation already of explosive proportions, and the crisis was here. Today, nearly 25,000 veterans a day pour ashore from transports, adding to the demand for homes—and there are no homes.

VETERANS SLEEPING IN PARKS

So in a matter of a few months, housing has become our most critical national problem. To our shame, soldiers sleep in the parks, thousands still are separated from their families, and there is a just and growing tide of indignation sweeping the country as it demands drastic action.

But accompanying the demand for shelter is the menacing danger to our postwar economy in the skyrocketing prices of homes. Home prices have increased on an average of 50 percent since 1941. But lower-priced homes have increased more than 100 percent and still are going up. This is happening in a $7,000,000,000 industry, fourth largest in the Nation.

INFLATION MENACES ENTIRE ECONOMY

Uncontrolled inflation in an industry of that size threatens to bring on a boom-bust period that could wreck our postwar prosperity. All the elements needed are inherent in the housing crisis: a tremendous shortage of homes, unprecedented purchasing power in the hands of the people, and uncontrolled speculation in the real-estate market.

We had such a boom following World War I. Prices went so high that buyers stopped purchasing. Building slowed, the market collapsed and thousands of foreclosures followed. Economists now know that the building collapse was a major cause of the 1929 economic crash and the depression of the 1930's. The pressures inherent in the present crisis are estimated to be 10 times greater than in 1919, in terms of purchasing power and scarcity.

Oddly, finished houses and real estate are the only two major items in the American economy which were not placed under price control during this war. It is the biggest inflationary loophole in our price control line, and unless such controls are established now, we face a greater catastrophe than that which struck us in 1929.

Last October, I repeatedly warned the country of the danger in the housing shortage and the consequent skyrocketing prices. Finally the matter was investigated. The figures uncovered on the shortage were staggering. We need 12,000,000 new homes in the next decade, more than a million a year. Shelter must be found immediately for nearly 1,800,000 veterans.

BUILDING INDUSTRY LACKS CAPACITY

Against this demand, the total capacity of the Nation's building industry is only around 400,000 houses a year in normal times—less than half of that needed.

Even so, we do not have the material for capacity production. Lumber is in shorter supply than during the war. Manpower has been drained away from mills and brick plants into higher-paid jobs in other industries. There have been other causes: Labor-management disputes existed in logging; inequities in the price-control program. Materials needed for homes is going into bowling alleys, theaters, and other commercial structures.

Drastic action was and is essential. In November I introduced legislation to provide for the maximum production of homes at a reasonable price, with first priority going to veterans.

I felt the problem should be attacked with the same imagination and energy we used to attack similar problems during the war, such as the rubber shortage. I asked for the appointment of a housing expediter, with full authority to cut governmental red tape, break production bottlenecks, and carry out a sustained industry-governmental attack on the problem.

The bill which is before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House provides for ceiling prices on homes for the duration of the housing emergency. To attack the problem, the first step obviously must be to break the log jam on materials and almost double normal production. To accomplish this, the Housing Expediter, Wilson Wyatt, already appointed, will be given the power to pay subsidies and take all other steps necessary to bring up production of lumber, brick, tile, cast-iron pipe, and other scarce materials to meet the need.

However, the greatest urgency is a drastic change in the approach of both the industry and the Government toward building.

USING ANTIQUATED METHODS

We still use horse-and-buggy methods of building homes in this age of atomic power. To properly meet the housing crisis, construction methods of the 1920's must be brought up to date. Labor and management must work together to utilize war-developed mass production techniques and materials. One of the finest steps forward in this direction was the recent action of a New York union in aiding the construction of prefabricated homes on a veterans' project.

It is only through such cooperation, through the use of all types of building, prefabrication, mass building, that we can hope to meet the demand.

The construction industry today faces the brightest future of any segment of American enterprise. We have an unprecedented demand for modern homes. The people have more money than ever before with which to buy them.

If the industry enters the new era with ingenuity and broad vision, adopts modern methods, it can produce homes by the millions instead of by thousands. Jobs would be provided for thousands of additional workers; Americans will have sufficient homes, and the new era will be a golden one for builders.

Shackle on Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Kansas City Star of March 10, 1946:

SHACKLE ON GRAIN—PERIOD OF TIGHTEST GOVERNMENT CONTROL IN HISTORY NOW UNDER WAY—CCC IS IN THE SADDLE—NEW SET-UP PROVIDES CONTROL FROM FARMER TO CONSUMER—TRADE IN A HAZE

The grain industry, veteran through peace and war of more than 13 years of Government interference and control, yesterday found itself backed farther into a corner than ever before.

The revised wheat-conservation order, the impending coarse grain control edict, the new millfeed regulation, with all their strict and far-reaching provisions, erased what faint semblance of a free market the industry previously had enjoyed.

The firm grip of the CCC embraced the wheat, flour, and millfeed sectors of the trade, while the AAA, it was reported, was to be given the screws to enforce the feed-grain order covering corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghums, an order embracing operations of farmers, truckers, feeders, and all others handling coarse grains.

NOTHING MORE BEYOND

And so the grain trade looked back over its shoulder yesterday at the long period of increasing Government supervision, considered the present controls which surpass anything before held expedient even in wartime, and came to the decision the end of the line had been reached.

Voicing this widespread trade sentiment early last week was Robert E. Sterling, editor of the Northwestern Miller. "Today," Sterling declared, "there is no place else to go short of the Government itself, which is expanding the CCC into sole buyer, seller, storer and distributor of all grains and their flour feed and other commercial products."

Confusion in the industry has grown during all these years of changing "programs" and "goals" to such a point, Sterling writes, that no one—not even those who wrote the innumerable orders—can say today what will happen tomorrow. Indeed, the majority of grainmen confess they are not sure what is happening at the moment.

A glimpse of the trading floor here yesterday, where grain experts with decades of experience labored more or less in vain to fathom the Government's revised wheat order, was enough to prove the trade's utter confusion at its present position.

A RULE FOR EVERYTHING

"So, today," Sterling declares, "no man is free to buy and sell, to process or merchandise as a free agent any grain for ultimate use as food for men or beasts without taking counsel from endless rules and regulations difficult of understanding in the first instance and almost impossible to comply with in the second, third, tenth and last."

The Government's obvious defense is that widespread hunger and starvation in Europe and elsewhere justify any sacrifice on the part of this Nation. With this, the grain trade seems to agree in principle. But most branches of the industry are not at all sure the current orders with all their attendant restrictions will achieve the desired results.

For their only comfort, grainmen must look to the far horizon, for times will change as they always have. Abundant crops soon will be harvested and food shortages throughout the world will be alleviated. Price floors someday will supplant ceilings, and surpluses will replace shortages as the Nation's prime worry. Times will change, and in that fact there is always hope.

The Tragic Fate of the Steamship "Yukon"

REMARKS

OF

HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 the Nation was shocked to learn that the steamship *Yukon* with 495 human lives aboard was wrecked and in great peril in Johnstone Bay, 48 miles east of Seward, Alaska.

The *Yukon* was bound for Seattle with a large number of her passenger list being servicemen returning to the United States for discharge after many weary months overseas. In addition there were many women and children aboard. Newspaper reports of the tragedy described the cause as being due to "gale winds and towering waves" with the result that the liner broke in two, its forward part remaining fast aground in Johnstone Bay while the after part, according to officers of the Coast Guard cutter *Onondaga*, "rolled to starboard and rendered rescue efforts difficult, due to icy water and high waves."

The War Department in releasing information concerning the steamship *Yukon* reveals that it was built in 1899 and was owned by the Alaskan Steamship Co., Inc., Pier 2, Seattle, Wash. Continuing, the report states:

The ship was privately owned and operated and has been used by the War Department in transporting military and civilian personnel along with regular passengers between Seattle and Alaskan points. When it is expeditious, small groups of military personnel are customarily transported to their destinations on private ships such as the *Yukon*. Escort was furnished the *Yukon* during the war when known enemy activity warranted such security measures.

Since release of the report of the War Department six soldiers have been declared officially dead and among this number is one of the finest young men in my congressional district, the late Sgt. Lester S. March, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ellis March, prominent and highly respected citizens of Altoona, Pa.

The revelations of Mr. Phillip W. Moss are a shock to Mr. and Mrs. Ellis March, parents of the late Sgt. Lester March, and are, in addition, of sufficient import to demand a thorough investigation of the facts surrounding the loss of the ill-fated *Yukon*. Mr. Moss' letter indicates gross criminal negligence and, while it is impossible to replace the precious lives that have been sacrificed in this tragedy of the sea, it would be wanton neglect to remain silent in the face of Mr. Moss' disclosures.

My heartfelt sympathy is extended to the parents of the late Sgt. Lester S. March and to the loved ones of those who with this gallant young American were forced to relinquish their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness through the alleged neglect of persons responsible for the health and safety of human lives aboard the steamship *Yukon*.

As a further testimonial to the sterling character and spotless reputation of the late Sgt. Lester S. March, I wish to read the following editorial from a recent issue of the Altoona Mirror, a daily newspaper of wide circulation in the city of Altoona and Blair County, Pa.:

SGT. LESTER S. MARCH

Official confirmation of the tragic death of Sgt. Lester S. March in the wrecking of the liner *Yukon* in Alaskan waters has been made by the War Department and his name must be sorrowfully added to the long list of our heroic Altoona and Blair County boys, who have made the supreme sacrifice in the Nation's cause.

Sergeant March can be described as one of the finest examples of the civilian turned soldier in the service of his country. He was a young man of exceptional qualities and attainments, his duties in war serving to bring into sharper emphasis the sterling attributes of character and mind which made him a useful citizen in civil life, and popular among all who shared his acquaintance.

A member of one of Altoona's pioneer families, Sergeant March had made a thorough preparation for a career of usefulness in the community. Nevertheless, he responded in the early stages of the war to his country's call and his service during the war revealed him as an exemplar of all that is best in the soldier, fearless, inspiring to others and demonstrating at all times those heroic qualities that made possible the winning of the war.

The Altoona Mirror joins all the many friends in expressing sympathy to the parents and others in the family in the grievous loss they have suffered. Cut down at the close of his duty to his country, it is tragic that his life could not have been spared for the career of usefulness in the life of the community which he would have adorned.

The grief-stricken parents have added sorrow in their bereavement since Sergeant March's body has not yet been recovered and in desperation they have written to officials of the War Department in an effort to secure information as to the reason for utilizing a ship that it is not felt was seaworthy since it failed to withstand the gale winds and towering waves.

The parents of the late Sergeant March have received a letter from a companion of their son who gives a graphic description of the tragedy. At this point I wish to read the following letter received from the father of the late Sergeant March and also the letter written to the grief-stricken parents:

ALTOONA, PA., *March 8, 1946.*

Hon. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am herewith enclosing to you a copy of a letter that I received yesterday from Phillip W. Moss, now discharged from the Army, who wrote this letter from his home at 100 West Hull Street, Denison, Tex. This particular boy was a companion of my son, Lester, and was aboard the steamship *Yukon* that met with disaster.

The contents of the letter will show you that the crew of this ship was drunk and that is the reason they got off the course and caused this disaster. He also states that none of the crew, with the exception of 10 or 12, offered assistance to the passengers in this wreck, and that the boat had no equipment for any emergency. All these things make one feel all the more bitter, because this is nothing but criminal negligence on the part of the Alaska Steamship Co. There should be at no time any ship allowed to leave with precious souls aboard with a drunken crew to man the ship, and the law should be such that the Government requires all ship personnel to be sober.

I am sending you a copy of this letter because I know you are interested. As for my son Lester, I pray to God that they recover him somewhere. As yet he is still missing and has been pronounced killed.

Any attention given to this letter will be appreciated, and I shall appreciate your reply.

Very truly,

ELLIS MARCH.

DENISON, TEX., *March 5, 1946.*

DEAR MR. AND MRS. MARCH: I arrived home today and found your letter had gotten here ahead of me. I was asked by Captain Gribble if I would write you when I arrived home, and told him I would attempt to tell you about what happened. So I'll try and I hope I can help in some small way.

Lester and I got acquainted when he transferred from Adak to Anchorage. I spent most of my time hanging around the kitchen and we were together quite a bit. He was one of the happiest boys I have ever seen when his name appeared on orders to return home. On several occasions we went into Anchorage together hunting gifts to bring home. I don't know what happened to his baggage but expect it went down with the rest of it. I know I never saw my boy after noon Monday. I talked to him Monday morning in my room and he said he had taken the pin for his mother out of his bag and had it in his pocket. One thing I remember was a fur set consisting of cap, mittens, and neckpiece he bought for a niece. It was to have been sent by the store he bought it from. I hope it wasn't included on the mail on the *Yukon* but am afraid that it was. If possible I would like to know if it has been received or not. I worked in squadron headquarters and Lester had asked me to cancel his insurance. I told him he had kept it 3 years and another month wouldn't hurt. He mentioned this while we were on the boat and told me how happy he was that I had been too lazy to fill out the papers. Up to the last time I saw him and talked to him he was very cheerful. There were five of us standing on the foredeck together and another boy and I decided to go to the lounge on the upper deck. The others

decided to stay out in the open in case the remainder of the boat overturned. Before we got to the upper deck a 50-foot wave hit us and washed 20 persons overboard.

At once we returned to check and see if any of our buddies were among them. There was so much oil on the water it was impossible to recognize anyone in it. We found that Lester and another boy was gone. Some were washed ashore, others washed against rocks and didn't have a chance. We saw two wash around a point of land, never having a chance to get to shore or close to the boat. The crew would do nothing at all to help those in the water. In fact, they were not equipped for any kind of emergency. It was 32 hours before a line was put ashore and a soldier had to do it then. We were 7 miles off course and had only made 39 miles in 12 hours. I have newspaper accounts of it from the Anchorage papers and will forward them to you in the near future. Also some snapshots taken by one of the boys. I am trying to have copies of them made, and if I am unable to do so will send my pictures to you. The newspapers give a rather poor account of it. The sea was rough, but it wasn't such a storm that would put us in the position we were in. That was my first boat trip, but I do not believe there could have been a lot more done by the crew. At no time was any instructions or orders ever given. The passengers were just left to do the best they could. Up until 9 or 10 o'clock the morning we went on the rocks, the ranking crew members were so drunk that they could hardly get around. However, a few of them, I would say about 10 or 12, were doing what they could. After returning to Seward we checked all incoming lists, local hospital, and Red Cross to see if Lester and the other boy had been picked up. Two days later the Red Cross at Anchorage called and told me Lester was in the hospital there on the field. I was hoping, but I couldn't see how it could happen, so I went out to the hospital to check for myself. As I feared, there had been a mistake.

I wish to offer my sympathy, and if I can be of assistance in any way, at any time, please don't hesitate to ask it.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP W. MOSS.

Newspaper Exposes Real Estate Lobby—Describes Quarter-Million-Dollar Slush Fund—Names Men Opposing Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of the Washington lobbyists who have been directing the fight against the President's program to provide homes for veterans have remained hidden behind the scenes. In view of the tremendous pressure which this selfish group has been attempting to bring on Congress during recent weeks, I think it is high time that we name names and expose some of the amounts of money which the National Association of Real Estate Boards openly admits it is spending in Washington.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a news story published on March 8 by the New York newspaper PM. In this story I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that this organization is spending a quarter of a million dollars a year for its national offices. It spends nearly $50,000 a year on its publication, Headlines, which was the vehicle that was used to dupe and mislead many legitimate and honest real estate men over the country on the President's housing program.

I should also like to call the attention of the House to some of the reactionary and selfish objectives which this group favors. I think the Members should know something about the headquarters and personnel of this organization.

The article follows:

HIGH-PRESSURE STAFF DIRECTS REALTY LOBBY'S ATTACKS ON ADMINISTRATION

(By Gordon H. Cole)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Washington's most triumphant lobby today is the National Association of Real Estate Boards, whose leaders played a major role in the congressional defeat just handed the veterans' emergency housing program.

The antiprice control pressure of Herbert U. Nelson, NAREB's executive vice president, and Walton Onslow, its editor and press agent appeared to have a greater effect on the majority in Congress than the appeals of President Truman, Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles, and Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt.

Nelson and his NAREB were not alone in the fight against the housing program, but their part was important enough to win them national recognition as a force in Washington.

Nelson, who looks like an established economics professor—complete with umbrella—has directed the affairs of his realtors—the association owns that name for the last 22 years.

But it wasn't until 1942 when Nelson moved his offices to Washington and lured Onslow from Harold Ickes's information staff at the Interior Department that the NAREB grew up. In the last 3 years, the association has almost doubled its membership.

Onslow claims that the 29,321 realtors on the association's rolls represent 90 percent of the established real-estate firms in the United States of America and 25 percent of the licensed real-estate agents.

There is little doubt that Nelson speaks for the real-estate brokers and dealers who put up the $261,000 annual budget on which the association operates its national offices.

The office is anything but the sumptuous quarters a powerful Washington lobby might be expected to occupy. The glass-bricked entrance at 1737 K Street disguises a once fashionable residence that has completed the transition from town house, to boarding house, to office building.

The landlord, a real-estate agency, occupies the fancy ground floor. Upstairs, a touch of the boarding-house days still clings to the rooms into which the 25 staff members are crowded.

Nelson himself lives in a two-room suite in the building and works at a small, kidney desk in his comfortable living room. It is the only room that has a piano or a carpet.

The only well-appointed office at NAREB headquarters is occupied by a round, energetic young man named Calvin Snyder. Snyder is secretary of the 30-man realtors' Washington committee which last month visited Congress in a body to talk against price controls and subsidies in the Patman housing bill.

Snyder is the association's official lobbyist, the contact man for Congress and for OPA, where he has served as secretary of the Industry Advisory Committee that kibitzes on rent controls. This young man, who came up through the association's subsidiary Society of Industrial Realtors, has a $75,000 budget and the job of keeping the attitude of real-estate men before Congress. Those attitudes are no secret. The association is:

Opposed to ceiling prices on real estate—like the plague.

Opposed to public housing as "socialistic."

Opposed to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill (which it calls the "wet" bill) for the same reason.

Opposed to extension of the Federal tax structure on the ground that too much of the burden of local taxation is placed on real estate.

Favorable to extension of price control if the act is amended to permit a 10-percent increase in rents where a landlord can show increased costs.

Favorable to legislation to break restrictive practice by local unions and others which increase building costs.

Snyder also gathers information of interest to realtors which normally goes out through the NAREB's weekly newsletter, Headlines, for which $43,120 has been budgeted this year.

Nelson, Onslow, and Snyder, with Lowell Baker, who holds down the Chicago office, make up the national staff of the association. This staff is financed by a $10 per capita annual assessment on the membership of the local real-estate boards, plus contributions for special purposes.

Staff activities are supervised by a real-estate broker who serves for 1 year, by a 10-man executive committee, a 48-man board which meets three times a year, and by the association's annual convention.

This year's president is Boyd T. Barnard, of Jackson Cross Co., Philadelphia. Barnard, and Harry A. Taylor, of Frank H. Taylor & Son, East Orange, N. J., the treasurer, are members of the executive committee.

Other members on the committee are:

Morgan L. Fitch, of Charles Ringer & Co., Chicago.

Matthew G. Ely, of Horace S. Ely & Co., New York City.

Maurice G. Read, of Mason-McDuffie Co., Berkeley, Calif.

Jay L. Hearin, of Jay Hearin, realtors, Tampa, Fla.

Ward C. Gifford, of Ward C. Gifford Realty Co., Kansas City, Mo.

E. L. Ostendorf, of Ostendorf-Morris Co., Cleveland.

Van Holt Garrett, of Garrett-Bromfield & Co., Denver.

These are the men who fix the policies and arrange the financing of the Washington real estate lobby.

Recently, this committee approved plans to build an auxiliary, the National Real Estate Foundation, which, with a reputed $5,000,000 organizing fund, they hope to use to reinforce their influence in Congress.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the President has appealed to the American farmer to raise more food in 1946; he has also appealed to the American people to eat less food in order that we may give substantial aid to the starving millions in other and less fortunate lands. The appeal for less food consumption will be met wholeheartedly, but the matter of increasing production of food rests largely in the hands of the President himself.

If he would increase production of food he must issue orders immediately to stop the drafting of farm boys in order to relieve as speedily as possible the serious labor shortage on the American farm. Also, he must throw the great power of his office into speeding up production of farm machinery of which there is serious shortage. Another thing that the President must do to secure maximum production is to put an end to all the needless, meddlesome restrictions on prices and production that have been imposed by OPA. Once these changes have been made the American farmer will do his part.

The following letter from a prominent Minnesota farmer, written me several days ago, explains the situation more fully than I can hope to do. The letter follows. I commend its reading to my colleagues:

MARCH 11, 1946.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNUTSON: While listening to the radio, and reading the newspapers, I cannot help but write you a few lines. With all kinds of strikes going on and now the President's order to save wheat for the starving nations; to raise more this year so there be food enough to go around. All of these things just don't add up.

Selective Service still drafting all farm boys that are on the farms (the few that are left) even the IV-F's, or whatever there is left. How in the name of common sense can they expect the farmers to produce more without help. Some of the help now are asking 50 cents per hour and at 15 hours per day amounts to $7.50 per day plus room and board. How can farmers profitably operate a farm any longer? Last fall we had to pay $1 per hour to operate corn pickers. Now they want to hold farm prices down; if this does not come to a stop farmers will strike, then we will see what will happen because every farmer I have talked to is in an uproar. Farmers cannot get farm implements because labor strikes every time they feel like it.

There will be many acres of land that will not be put into crop this year, not because the farmer doesn't want to, but because they are forced to do so through no help, too high wages, no implements, and too low an income for farm produce and products. Many a milking herd has been shipped to market because there was no one to milk them, also very few hogs will be raised for there is no one to feed and take care of them.

Selective Service fellows try to make the people believe that the men they discharge shall replace the ones they take, but this is all bunk. The men that come back do not go back on the farm, they want easier jobs, or they take the $20 per week for a year to stay unemployed. Why should they work at that rate? The farm help this summer will be far worse than last year.

If we had had full uninterrupted production we would not be in this mess, and I know what I am talking about. I will cite you my son's case, who operates a 320-acre farm. He has not had a farm hand since December 1, last. He and his wife, with a 1-year-old child, take care of 25 milk cows, and 35 beef cattle, 75 hogs, and 200 chickens. There are thousands like them, but they think they are darn fools to keep up that pace to work from 5 a. m. to 9 p. m., while the other fellow works but 40 hours a week.

If some labor union heads want to try it, let them; we can replace them with better horse sense.

I have given you some of the thoughts of the farmers around here, now I would like to see you pass some of these thoughts along to the men in Congress, and show them what they may expect for 1946. They had better change their thinking in a hurry and get better farm prices, and people to work in agriculture because the farm is still the backbone of the Nation, yet are far underpaid. They are organizing fast for their own interests, which is the situation they are forced to face.

Respectfully yours.

The Story of Warsaw

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, in the March 11, 1946, edition of the CIO News, a weekly publication of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, there appeared an article by Mr. Leo Krzycki entitled "Mission to Poland." This article purports to present the high spots of a report to CIO members on a recent 5-month tour of Europe undertaken by Leo Krzycki, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and president of the American Slav Congress. The author of that report visited Poland shortly after the members of a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I was a member, had been in Poland. A full report of that subcommittee had been presented sometime ago to the full committee, but, unfortunately, due to some delay, the printed report has not as yet been made available.

In order that all Members may have an adequate opportunity to compare the observations made in Mr. Krzycki's report with some of the material presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I include as part of my remarks my own report on Poland entitled "The Story of Warsaw":

THE STORY OF WARSAW

This is the story of Warsaw. As it is unfolded it is also the story of Poland, for Warsaw is the heart of Poland and, not unlike the human heart, it has for 6 long years felt and still today feels the terrible pains and agonizing tortures of all its people, cities, towns, and villages. Today that heart still lives and beats within the battered body of Poland as firmly and determinedly as ever, not only to survive but to secure for all its people the blessings of liberty.

If I err in telling you what I saw and heard, it is because I shall have minimized the actual terrible situation as I saw it and as it was told to me. There are so many things that challenge human ability of vocal picturization that words lose their usual capacity for expression and their sound returns to mock the speaker who realizes that they have failed in their purpose.

I had my first foretaste of what Poland was like in Paris. The original itinerary provided for our visiting Poland some 4 or 5 days after we had reached Paris. We left Washington on August 12, were scheduled to leave Paris for Berlin on August 15, spend 2 days in Berlin, proceed then to Prague, remain in Prague for 1 day and then to proceed to Warsaw, arriving there on August 18. However, we did not actually arrive in Warsaw until August 26. Our whole schedule was completely disrupted and we were forced to improvise day-to-day schedules while we waited until Moscow had cleared our passage into Poland. Our entry into free and independent Poland depended upon clearance from Moscow. For almost two whole weeks the State Department officials attached to our party wired consistently to procure clearance without any answer. Finally a response was received that a Soviet plane would take us into Poland. This offer was flatly rejected by our group and a wire was dispatched that we insisted upon clearance of our own plane into Poland. During this interval, some of our time was spent talking to displaced Polish nationals at Wiesbaden, Germany, and former inmates of the concentration camp at Dachau. During this interval we traveled to London and there when we attempted to contact responsible Polish leaders in London we were warned by a high American authority that as these leaders were being watched by Soviet agents that if we attempted to talk with any of them our chances of getting into Poland would be seriously jeopardized.

In Paris we met several Polish fliers and a Polish war correspondent who told us tales of horror brought back by people who recently returned from Poland. At Wiesbaden I talked to a group of 50 displaced persons of Polish nationality. These were determined never to return to Poland so long as the present Warsaw Government remained in power. One of them had recently returned from Poland and informed his colleagues of what he had experienced. At Dachau, where there were over 9,000 Polish prisoners on the day of liberation of the camp on April 29, 1945, I met with a committee of three, a clergyman from Poznan, a lawyer from Krakow, and a prominent political leader from Poland who represented the Polish prisoners who were still there and maintained frequent contact with their fellow countrymen scattered by the thousands in horror camps in Germany. They, too, know fully and well the conditions existing in Poland today. They told me, however, that 80 percent of the Poles there and in the other camps are longing so strongly to return to Poland that they are willing to take any risk just to see their homeland again and to spend their last days there. Their longing has so overpowered their reasoning that they care not what awaits them. They want to return to their homes even if it be for a short period of time and to sacrifice their frail bodies and waning strength but stout hearts toward regaining and rebuilding a free Poland. They felt bitter toward us because they say that they have been deserted. They feel bitter toward the American Poles because they have not sent a bit of aid, clothing, food, or medicine to relieve their suffering. This bitterness is characteristic of most of the displaced Poles with whom I have spoken. They point with pride to the courage of the Polish-American soldier who first entered the Dachau concentration camp. I was unable to find out his name but here is the official version of his entry and of the liberation as set down in the publication entitled "Dachau" issued by the Seventh United States Army.

"Sunday, just after the noon meal, the air was unusually still. The big field outside the compound was deserted. Suddenly someone began running toward the gate at the other side of the field. Others followed. The word was shouted through the mass of gray, tired prisoners, Americans. That word repeated, yelled over the shoulders in throaty Polish, in Italian, in Russian, and Dutch, and in the familiar ring of French. The first internee was shot down as he rushed toward the gate by the guard. Yet they kept running and shouting through eager lips and unbelieving eyes, Americans! And at the gate in front of the hysterical mob of men were not the regiments or the tanks

they had expected, but one dark-complexioned, calm American soldier, an American Pole, pistol in hand, looking casually about him; up at the towers were the SS guards who watched apparently frozen; behind him two or three other American boys about a hundred yards away; and into the flushed wet faces of those thousands surging about in front of him.

"A few shots were fired from behind the wall, the guards in the first tower came down, hands above their heads. A white blanket was hung out from another tower, and they came down, but one of them had a pistol in his hand which he held behind his back, and the dark-complexioned soldier shot him down. At the far side of the compound, the guards were taken care of from the outside.

"Then a jeep arrived. Where were the regiments and tanks? The first American was hoisted into the air and two others, a 19-year-old farmer from the West, and a 19-year-old university student, were dragged out of the jeep and carried around the grounds on the internees' shoulders. A blond journalist in uniform was also in the jeep, and she climbed the tower by the gate with a young officer.

"Suddenly the prisoners produced flags and colors which had been buried under barracks or hidden in rafters. These flags and colors were improvised from sheets and scraps of colored cloth. It was a mardi-gras. Over the loud-speaker system the blond journalist said 'We are just as glad to see you as you are to see us.' And then a chaplain in broken German asked them to join him in the Lord's Prayer. And for a few minutes in powerful earnest unison and with bowed revered heads and clasped hands, they prayed. The words echoed through the compound and through the hearts of the thousands still incredulous at the dark-complexioned American Pole, the 19-year-old farm boy from the West, and the student, and at the regiments and tanks that never came."

"When we returned from London on August 24 our group was advised that the long awaited clearances had finally been granted and that the committee would be allowed to travel to Poland in its own plane. On the morning of August 26, we left Paris on our way to Warsaw via Berlin. We arrived in Warsaw in the early afternoon of the same day. On our way over from Berlin and before we had reached Poznan, with powerful Navy binoculars I scanned the countryside covering the area to be ceded to Poland in compensation for the lands that had been taken over by the Soviet, east of the so-called Curzon Line. Few people were noticeable in the fields and the whole countryside was devoid of any cattle or horses. Occasionally large herds of cattle and horses could be seen going east. The preponderance of traffic was east. Soon the city of Poznan appeared and some portions of it lay in ruins. From Poznan to Warsaw more herds of cattle and horses could be seen on its way east and in many instances these herds were interspersed between large convoys of horse-driven wagons piled high with materials. Here and there large encampments of wagons could be seen not far off the roads. After about an hour and a half our plane circled over the city of Warsaw divided by the Vistula River with its four bridges destroyed.

Parallel to and very near one of the destroyed bridges was a complete wooden span jammed with trucks, wagons, and cars, and flanked with jammed people all moving in either direction. Down below appeared the airfield and as we gradually descended we saw that the concrete landing strip was pot-marked with craters and could not be used. Some apprehension overtook me as I realized that any landing would have to be made on a field overgrown high with weeds and grass. But before I had finished my "Hail Mary," Gregory, our pilot had already brought down the plane and to the accompaniment of seven or eight bumps which raised us up to the full play of our safety belts, brought the plane to a stop. This was the Okencie Airport situated about 5 miles from Warsaw. On the field were a score of planes marked with the red and white Polish emblem and several Russian planes. As we alighted we were met by two military officers one in Russian uniform and one in uniform of Polish military whose grey cornered cap, the front angle of which was raised high over the visor by a tarnished Polish eagle seemed to hide most of his face. This lad in Polish uniform was no more than 18 and spoke better Russian than Polish. After they had carefully scrutinized our passports representatives of the American Embassy arrived on the field and we started our short journey into the city. For about 15 minutes we drove through a double lane highway divided by a double set of trolley tracks which had once served the city. The destruction on both sides of the street gradually unfolded before us. Here and there still standing on the tracks or lying on their sides were burned-out trolley cars. On both sides of the highway appeared overturned rusted half tracks, armored vehicles and tanks. Large homes and what once were apartment dwellings lay in ruins. In some of the apartment houses the first and second stories still remained standing and tired, wan, sad faces looked through gaping holes that once were windows. Soon we were on the Aleje Jerozolimskie, one of the main thoroughfares leading into the center of the city. Ruins and huge piles of rubble held back by neatly erected walls made of loose brick lined both sides of the streets. Our autos came to a stop before a large building that stood out ironically amidst the destruction practically untouched by the war. It was the Hotel Polonia and it owed its present undamaged condition due to the fact that it served as the headquarters of the German Gestapo. As soon as our cars had come to a stop the huge milling throng, noticeably attracted by the American flags fluttering in the brisk breeze, surrounded us before we had even alighted. As each car discharged its passengers, the throng grew larger and larger and blocked off any path to the entrance of the hotel.

With each passing moment more people gathered, and those immediately near us could be heard to whisper, "Amerikanie, Amerikanie." Soon the whisper was taken up by those farther away and grew louder and louder. As we made our way they pushed back voluntarily to open up a passageway to the hotel. Most of them were poorly clad, some were ragged, some were barefooted. Some had their shoes thrown over their shoulders. They all seemed destitute, tired, and visibly affected by the ordeals that they had experienced. Some were emaciated, most far from healthy. On each was an expression hard to understand and difficult to describe. It was a stern, determined look. As we passed through, their faces lit up with an expression that seemed to say, "Welcome." Others maintained an expression which betrayed their inner feelings, a sort of half-hidden smile of satisfaction that something to their liking had taken place or would soon occur. Something which they had waited for. We entered the hotel with the quiet voices "To sa Amerikanie" following us into the hotel.

From the offices of Ambassador Lane, situated in the hotel, we looked out upon Warsaw—Warsaw that had been ravished not once or twice, but four times—now supposedly liberated, but held firmly by Soviet might. There stretching before us as far as we could see was the complete destruction of the city through whose broad streets once gaily promenaded more than 1,000,000 inhabitants. There today still live 400,000 people, whose brothers, children, parents, and relatives still lie underneath the wreckage and ruins. To the left could be heard a deafening rumble, and a cloud of dust rose high into the brilliantly sunlit skies. The morning papers would soon announce that another partially devastated apartment block had collapesd and 30 or 40 more bodies were added to the 75,000 that are yet to be uncovered. In front of us stood what remained of the most beautiful railroad station in Europe, a twisted mass of steel sunk deep into a huge ravine which was now being filled in to enlarge the temporary plaza which serves as the central station for the straw-covered horse-driven farm wagons which constitute the transportation system of Warsaw. A ride anywhere in Warsaw can be had for 20 zlotys. Now when I speak of zlotys bear in mind that the official rate of exchange was 5 zlotys to $1; so that a ride in one of these cars costs you $4.

Here and there at definite intervals were small wooden shacks in front of which elderly women displayed for sale strings of dried sausage, stacks of black bread, vegetables, pickled meats, dried mushrooms, potatoes, tomatoes, and other garden vegetables. At each intersection stood a girl in Polish uniform directing traffic. Machine guns were hung over their backs. Up and down the Aleje Jerozolimskie slowly passing up and down the street were soldiers in Russian and Polish uniforms with pistols in their holsters and machine guns over their shoulders. Wherever your eyes wandered the destruction was virtually complete. Here that dream of complete destruction born in a perverted German mind some place in the dim recesses of a beer house in Munich saw its complete realization.

Soon we left the hotel and drove down the Ulica Marszalkowska. Amidst rubble piled 20 and 30 feet high we drove into the old city—stare miasto. Everything was gone. The Cathedral of St. John, the world famous Fukiers wine cellars, the buildings with their beautiful hand-painted facades, the work of famous artists, were a mass of bricks, dirt and tin. Few walls were left standing. Occasionally a painted facade appeared amidst the rubble. The destruction challenges verbal discription. You actually distrust your own eyes. Here among this wreckage women emerge and call to their children who quickly gather around you wherever you go.

Wherever there was a small area of land free from rubble there you were sure to find a white wooden cross. The larger the area the more the crosses. These are the crosses of Poland. Underneath each a hero lies buried. Each grave is covered with fresh-cut flowers and bears the name of a fallen hero. People come and go, each stopping for a minute to kneel and whisper in almost audible tones their prayers for the dead. On the Ulica Pieracka is the Zamojski Palace. In the rear is a huge garden filled with crosses. On each cross a name. Kazimierz Zawadski, Tadeusz Helinski. Tacked to some crosses are written permissions to the next of kin to remove the body to a family lot in some nearby cemetery. Wherever you turn you see more crosses. Even in the downtown area wherever a wall of building is still standing there are painted black crosses marking the execution place of those shot by the Germans. Flowers are piled high on the sidewalks and mingle their fragrance with the stench of decaying flesh of bodies not yet recovered beneath nearby debris.

We wanted to continue, but as it was already dark we had to return to the hotel for dinner. We had also been warned not to stay out too late as there was still shooting going on in the streets and it was not too healthy to be out in the evening.

That evening in the most devastated city in Europe we had the best supper in all our travels. Caviar, smoked salmon, baked ham, wines, tenderloin steak, vegetables of all kinds, vodka, ice cream. People danced and gaily sang. An orchestra tried its best with American hits of 3 or 4 years ago. The contrast between what we saw in the early part of the day and that which we now were witnessing was terrific. After 2 hours of this

we finally called for the rachunek—the bill. It, too, was terrific. Our party of 12 had just spent $1,200. We went to bed that night thinking just what we could have done with the $100, and to add to our discomfort our sleep was constantly interrupted by gunfire outside.

The following morning we visited the ghetto. The only possible description that I can think of which would adequately portray the complete destruction of the ghetto is the Biblical narration of the razing of Jerusalem, "Not a stone was left standing upon a stone." This is literally true of the ghetto. The only remains are stone walls built out in the center of the street, 6 and 8 feet high, topped with large pieces of jagged glass frozen solidly into the concrete. Some street signs are still standing enabling one to identify that this once was Nalewki Street, here Ulica Bielanska, here Ulica Dzika. Unexploded shells are neatly piled up on the streets to be taken away by the workmen. Old women are digging in the ruins for particles of coal to sell on the black market in order to earn some money with which to buy some food. Rusted German tanks knocked out by bottles of gasoline are being dismantled and carted away. Here once 400,000 Jews were crowded and completely wiped out during the insurrection. Numerous stories of German treachery are told by the occupants of the nearby apartment homes. Originally the area covered an extensive part of the city but every day the Germans demanded gold threatening to contract the area by removing one of the streets from the ghetto itself. With each payment new demands were made and the area constantly became smaller until but a few streets remained in the ghetto area.

As we left the ghetto we drove to the Square of Our Savior and our passage was impeded by a huge herd of cattle being driven by Russian soldiers. We inquired and were told that this was cattle being taken away from Germany and was on its way to Russia. We stood on the walk for several minutes and inquired of others. We were told that herds of cattle can be seen at all times of the day of almost every day in the week. Whispering voices confided: "This is our cattle and it is being requisitioned by the Russians and is on its way east." Still fresh in my memory is the sight of the Teatr Wielki, the Ratusz, the City Hall, the Zamek Krolewski and the Royal Palace. The Nazi hordes even desecrated the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. At the entrance to the Ogrod Saski, the Saxon Gardens, was erected Poland's tribute to the unknown soldier. It was completely destroyed. The heavy plaque with the inscription was smashed into scores of pieces. Today each piece has been found and pieced together in jigsaw fashion. The innumerable statues bordering the walks through the gardens still stand mute witnesses of Nazi beastiality. No matter where you go all you see are ruins. Whether it be on the Aleje-Ujazdowskie, the Ulica Sucha, Koszykowa or Chmielna few walls and hollow shells are still standing. The Nazis made certain and paid particular attention to the destruction of all that could be connected with Polish culture. The National Museum, the Library of the Zamojskis, the Library of the Przezdzieckis, the Raczynskis collection fell prey to German fire. The greater portion of the Krasinski Museum was devastated. What remained of the precious objects of art was pilfered and packed into crates and shipped into Germany. The Nazis looted what was saved from fire and sent these objects home as gifts or souvenirs. Even Egyptian mummies standing in the National Museum were smashed to pieces in the search for supposedly hidden treasures. Praga, the suburb of Warsaw, across the Vistula escaped in some measure German fury. Though many of its larger apartment buildings were destroyed, the majority of them can be reconstructed. Many of the habitable dwellings have been requisitioned by the Soviet Army. This deprivation of the still inhabitable dwellings has greatly contributed to the desperate lack of housing for much of the populace in Warsaw.

Now linked only by a temporary bridge with Warsaw it faces complete isolation with the coming of winter. It is openly admitted that the bridge will not withstand the ravages of winter. Thus the people who work in Warsaw will be unable to get to work and will be cut off from all means of livelihood. The large cooperative homes situated on the outskirts of Warsaw are being hastily rebuilt and though even now each apartment is occupied by two or more families, tens of thousands of inhabitants of Warsaw must find shelter in the ruins and cellars of destroyed buildings. With the coming of winter, these people cannot survive and little as yet has been done to provide shelter for them. This is but a fragmentary picture of the destruction of Warsaw. We were told that 25 percent of the destruction occurred in September of 1939 and the rest was destroyed during and after the insurrection of 1944. Then the Nazis went from house to house, from building to building, street by street and mined and fired what still remained. This methodic scheme of destruction was aptly shown to us when we visited the Lazienki Palaces situated in the rear of the government house known as Belvedere. There holes were drilled in a straight line 6 inches apart in every room and corridor, then filled with dynamite and set off. Before I leave the physical destruction of Warsaw, let me give you some figures of the over-all picture which were procured from the Warsaw Reconstruction Office. Of the total amount of 17,000 buildings in Warsaw proper, that is that part of Warsaw situated on the left side of the Vistula River, 9,100, or 55 percent, are completely destroyed. Three thousand, or 18 percent, are partially destroyed, and 4,200, or 26 percent, are slightly destroyed. In the suburb of Praga, that is that part of Warsaw on the right side of the Vistula River, of a total of 8,500 buildings, 1,400, or 16 percent, are completely destroyed, 900, or 11 percent, partially destroyed, and 6,100, or 73 percent, slightly destroyed. In Warsaw 70 percent of the destruction was by fire, and in Praga 54 percent was by fire. The latter two figures illustrate that Warsaw and Praga were burned away with methodical, hateful design to realize the German threat that before the Nazi armed forces will retreat, they will leave nothing behind.

The unforgettable days of the defense of Warsaw under Stefan the Stubborn were equalled if not surpassed by the insurrection of Warsaw in 1944. A majority of those who witnessed both are now dead but their heroic deeds still remain the topics of conversation wherever we went. As if a constant reminder of the epic of the insurrection were the tanks still standing in the streets of Warsaw to which the Germans had tied young Polish girls hoping that this would prevent the insurrectionists from shooting at them. A good number of these girls were rescued and the tanks knocked out with bottles filled with gasoline. Those in power in the present provisional government have treated the insurrection as a great national catastrophe.

Through the press, radio and commemorative assemblies the whole undertaking is attempted to be portrayed as a vain sacrifice of Polish courage to the selfish purposes of the London Group, and numerous tactical reasons assigned for the failure of the Red Army to carry through, but all such explanations fall upon deaf ears as the people know and tell you that the Red Army was just beyond the river. Everyone recalls with pride in their hearts, the indomitable courage of the people of Warsaw and no amount of propaganda can persuade them that their sacrifices had been in vain. Practically all took part at one time or another in the 9 weeks of action. Men and women alike fought side by side. While the men fought on the hastily erected ramparts, the women were responsible for the food and care of the children and the care of the wounded. They organized the children as messengers and carried food, ammunition, and water through sewers and tunnels to the men. During the short periods of rest, the men were relieved during the watch by women and children. One little boy of eight was one day 2 hours late for his watch. A young woman was forced to extend her watch the additional 2 hours. When the lad returned, she rebuked him for his tardiness and he merely answered, "Yes, I know I'm late and I'm very sorry." She instructed him concerning his watch and entered the barricaded house. There she saw a box of hand grenades which weighed three times as much as the boy. Then she suddenly realized that the lad had brought in the grenades and said nothing of them to her. She felt very keenly for having rebuked the boy and returned to apologize to him. "Oh, it doesn't matter," the little boy said. She then drew out of him how he had gone into the German lines and one by one stole the grenades then found a box and dragged them several hundred yards through cellars, sewers, and tunnels. During the whole period women tied wounded men to their backs and through the slime and filth of sewers made their way to the underground hospitals to treat their wounds as best they could without the aid of any anesthetics or bangages. Some day the whole terrible story of the insurrection will be told and when it will be told it will surpass by far anything that as yet the world has heard.

In contrast with other devastated countries in Europe is the apparent abundance of food on the streets of Warsaw. Every street has at least one or two stands where there is an abundance of breads, dried meat, and vegetables. Yet when you talk to the people living in the ruins, sitting in the streets, or casually as you stop them, very few are able to procure enough beyond a bare subsistence level. Food is rationed in accordance with the type of work done and hence the class of food card obtainable. But the official rations are not enough and must be supplemented by what can be procured through other means. The monthly rations for these holding a No. 1 food card, hard laborers, is 1 kilogram of fats, 10 kilograms of bread, 800 grams of sugar, 1 kilogram of canned meat, plus some additional food at the place of employment. The prices for these are somewhat controlled but as the allowance is manifestly insufficient a flourishing black market exists throughout Warsaw.

Butter is 220 zlotys per kilogram.
Bread is 35 zlotys per kilogram.
Meat is 120 zlotys per kilogram.
Sugar is 300 zlotys per kilogram.
Bacon is 300 zlotys per kilogram.

These prices are beyond the reach of any, even those who are comparatively gainfully employed in the Government offices. A fair suit of clothes costs 5,000 zlotys, a pair of shoes 500 to 750 zlotys. These prices might as well be 10 times as much as the vast majority of people have no money. The Soviets substituted Moscow printed zlotys for the marks that had been previously used. The total exchange limitation was 500 zlotys. This impoverished practically every inhabitant. Barter has hence been substituted and cigarettes especially have become the best medium of exchange. I've witnessed, one package of American cigarettes being exchanged for a beautifully embroidered linen tablecloth easily worth $50 in the United States. Those more fortunate, who had been able to secrete their jewelry from the Nazis are rapidly pauperizing themselves in order to procure the bare necessities of life. Even the peasants who had supposedly benefited through the distribution of lands must live from day to day because of the severe "Lon-

tigent" that has been imposed. Under the present system they can save nothing to tide them over during the coming winter months. We paid a visit to one of the larger estates that had been confiscated and parceled out to the peasants. Each pheasant in the area had received 8 nectares of land. They till the soil with primitive means as there are no modern machinery or even horses to assist in the plowing. Eighty percent of what they produce is taken over by the government and 20 percent they are allowed to retain. Out of the 20 percent they must pay for the seed and fertilizer, feed themselves and their families, and sell what is left to buy clothing and other necessities. Of the 16 families, 1 family has 1 pig which they are constantly hiding beneath straw from the Russians.

After I had convinced them that I wasn't a Communist nor a secret agent they were willing to show me the hiding place. This suspicion is manifested toward anyone who is seen decently attired and well fed and after they are convinced, they open up their hearts and speak freely. Our movements during the entire stay in Warsaw were unhampered. Though at times interpreters, guides and officials from the foreign office accompanied us, these could be dismissed with ease whenever anyone felt that their presence interfered or retarded the people from frankly discussing anything. On many occasions the members of our party wandered off by themselves and could freely talk with the people. Of course, their suspicions concerning our indentity had to be allayed but after the first 2 days practically all in the immediate vicinity of the hotel knew who we were. We quickly became known to hundreds of people who were eager and willing to share all their sorrows with us. On one of my side trips, I asked many Poles why they shunned talking with soldiers and purposely avoided them when they passed by. "Are not these your soldiers?" "Isn't this your army?" I asked them. "Oh, no, Panie Poszle—Mr. Congressman. This is not our army. They are not our soldiers. If they were they would not treat us so cruelly. Our army and our soldiers have not as yet returned. They are still in Italy, England, and Scotland, and scattered all over the world. But someday, they will return and then things will be different." And yet General Anders is the No. 1 war criminal on the list of the Provisional Government. I asked another group about their government. "Our government," they shot back. "This isn't our government, we have yet to choose our government and then things will be different." I asked others about Mikolajczyk. "Yes, Mikolajczyk is doing all he can but what can he do among so many. Soon he may not be among us. Already two attempts had been made on his life. But if he can only hold out, soon things will be different." Things will soon be different are the words that constantly repeat themselves. Each time these words are said, they are so said as to ring with hope whenever one hears them. But how much more can they stand, how much further can they suffer, you ask yourself, and the answer is supplied when you are told that "death is sweeter than life." They have suffered so long and so much that they mean not to surrender now. Never will such people acept communism in any of its forms. They shall not rest until they shall have a government of their own choosing. They realize that their only weapons are their indomitable courage and unconquerable will. For centuries these were their only weapons and again today they realize that these are their only means. But they have succeeded before and will succeed again and soon things will be different again.

One afternoon we were received by President Beirut at the Belvedere. We asked him when the elections would be held. He told us that he anticipated that the elections would be held in the near future but that it all depends upon two factors:

First. The complete evacuation of the Russian Army, and

Second. The return of the displaced Poles and the return of the soldiers.

These same factors were stressed by Osobka Morawski, the president of the council of ministers, when we talked to him the following evening at a reception given by our Ambassador. Yet at the seventh meeting of the national council we read in the Warsaw papers that another element, previously unmentioned to us, will more than anything contribute to the determination of the time of the elections. Each had stated that the elections will be held when the new territorial boundaries are definitely settled. Of course, these will not be definitely determined until the Peace Conference which may not take place for some time, perhaps a few years. The other members of the government, those representing the democratic Poles from within and without Poland, are pressing for early elections as they are confident that the people of Poland will never accept the presently imposed set-up nor will they vote to retain any Communists in office. With all the propaganda that is being disseminated through the government controlled press and radio, with all the grand promises that are being made to the people, the ordinary man remains unshaken in his grim determination for freedom. He rather judges by actions not by words. He has witnessed daily wholesale raping of women, suffered the loss of all he possessed, heard of the constant deportation of his friends, the pillaging of homes, factories, and shops and himself was many times beaten for failure to yield immediate obedience. This he does not forget and only smiles inwardly when the promises of a new, brighter and better future are blasted over the loudspeakers on the corner of Ulica Marszalkowska and Aleje Jerozolimskie.

Of the four freedoms announced to the world as the great goal of mankind everywhere, only a superficial semblance of one remains. The freedom of religion still remains. But even this freedom has been curtailed. Religious instructions have been drastically curtailed and human concupiscence appealed to in the establishment of new matrimonial laws. The very foundation of the family is being undermined through the abolition of church marriages. The clergy must be superabundantly discreet lest anything they say may be misconstrued. In Poland today, its people exist for the state and not the state for the people. Freedom of speech is unknown. All means of information are controlled by the state. The radio and press are instruments of the government. The existing four legalized political parties are tools of the government and each is subservient to the government, and controlled by the government. Lately a fifth party has been legalized, a combination of the Christian-Democratic Party, and its make-up is yet to be ascertained. The old political leaders actually are deprived of all authority and the real power has been usurped by those favorable to the present government who constantly are calling rump conventions which pass resolutions condemning the old leaders. All government officials, from the highest to the lowest, from the larger cities to the smallest village are appointed by the government and must take an oath of allegiance to the government and to Soviet Russia. Each man, woman, and child lives in daily fear of want. Disease is rampant, tuberculosis unchecked, and syphilis and gonorrhea will soon decimate the remaining people of Poland. The coming winter will reap a grim harvest. Though the mining of coal has reached more than 50 percent of the prewar production, there is no coal for the Poles. Her industries are stripped and her harbors denuded of all facilities. The great promise of territories, rich in mineral resources, lying east of the Oder are a poor consolation for the loss of the land east of the so-called Curzon line with its great cities and rich oil fields. There, in this new promised land, there is little hope for the immediate future. Boastfully, one Soviet official remarked that since Polish claims to these areas dated back to the time of Boleslaus of the Crooked Mouth, these lands will be left in the same condition as they were at that time centuries ago. Even if the coal were left, there remains the problem of transportation. The whole transportation system is in a chaotic condition, locomotives and railroad cars have been destroyed or taken away, and the few trucks requisitioned by the Soviet military.

Freedom from fear—a mockery, a beautifully sounding phrase, empty words—a dream perhaps when things are different. As the Red Army is demobilized in Poland some of its soldiers are assimilated into the Polish Army—some are given Polish citizenship—and some are left to make their way home—plundering, raping, and living off the country as he makes his way home. As the number of the Soviet soldiers diminish, their places are quickly filled by secret agents of the NKVD. The government by the military is being replaced by a government of secret police whose conduct and actions differ in nowise from the German gestapo.

Anxiously we awaited an opportunity to talk with Mr. Mikolajczyk and had anticipated his attendance at the reception given by the Ambassador but we were told that he was detained in Poznan and could not arrive in time to be present. So we sought out those who followed him from London. We asked what they hoped to accomplish in the face of these difficult conditions. Why did Mikolajczyk come back? Did he not realize that in the face of such terrible obstacles his task would be impossible? What hope was there for a free and independent Poland? To these questions there came the answer, that the hope of Poland is in the courage and unbroken will of the people. In him all Poland has confidence. He is the rallying point of the people. If he fails, history may ascribe to him the role of a traitor. If he succeeds, Poland can yet be free. All have unbounded confidence that the people if given the opportunity to declare themselves in a free and unfettered election will completely reject communism and declare themselves for a truly democratic form of government. More than food, more than clothing, more than life itself the Polish people want their freedom and they mean to have their freedom. This grim determination can best be portrayed by telling you in closing of a few joyful minutes that we spent in Foggs Kawiarnia—it's a little cafe situated on Ulica Marszakowska in the still standing ground floor of an otherwise destroyed building. There to the tune of the Song of Warsaw, the people rise to join in the last chorus to tell in song the Warsaw that will yet arise. There we heard:

"I know that you're not now the same,
That dark blood has washed all your streets.
I'm proud that you know no shame,
Though now you have caused me to weep,
And now though you're low in the mud,
I'll build with my own sweat and blood,
So Warsaw shall rise once again to her might,
I swear on my heart and my life."

Then as curfew time approaches, they filled the air with the Polish National anthem, Poland Is Not Yet Lost. Instantaneously, we understood what we were told was the hope of Poland, its people and its will for freedom and liberty. I left Warsaw the following morning a better American than I ever was, more appreciative of the blessings of liberty and freedom and eternally grateful to all who made my America possible.

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 8, 1946:

DEFICIT SPENDING

How badly does Britain need the $3,750,000,000 50-year credit she is asking from us? Her spokesmen say she needs it desperately. What has become of the British Empire with its 550,000,000 people, made up of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Burma, and the British West Indies? What of the valuable British oil holdings in the Middle East? Why cannot Britain finance herself?

The Washington Advisory Council and President Truman now contemplate loans, credits, and capital advances of roundly fourteen billion dollars. Most of this will go out of the country. The Export-Import Bank has authority to lend $4,750,000,000. We are expected to contribute $2,570,000,000 of the working capital of the monetary fund and $3,175,000,000 of the capital of the international bank. Then there is the contribution of one billion to the UNRRA. We have already written off the British lend-lease account of some twenty-one billions.

We have been doing a lot of deficit spending for more than 10 years. Our national debt is now some two hundred and seventy billions. How long do we expect to keep this up? Britain, too, has a national debt not half as much as ours. But the British Government believes in keeping faith with its own lenders. And rather than borrow from them three or four billions which she now claims to need so desperately, she prefers to borrow from us. Are we as solicitous of the welfare of those from whom we have borrowed money as Britain is of her own lenders?

Sometime ago there was talk of a Russian loan from us. Do we have to finance the world? Britain borrowed from us in World War I, but she still owes us over $4,000,000,000 on that account. France owes us even more. Russia repudiated her debt to us. Germany went broke and Mussolini used the funds Italy owed us to build up his army and navy.

We don't like this kind of banking, even if there is a promise to spend with us the money loaned. We cannot produce enough now to take care of our own market. But in a few years when the supply meets the domestic demand Britain, Russia, and other countries will have recovered sufficiently to seek world markets.

These lending proposals are disturbing. We will have to raise some thirty-six billions this year by taxation. These taxes bear heavily on 48,000,000 American people and 450,000 American corporations. We will not balance our budget by several million dollars.

To predicate those foreign grants on world peace is intriguing. Internationally there is no such thing as gratitude. We advanced Russia some $9,000,000,000 worth of material in lend-lease without which she would have lost the war. Now she is using much of this material to transport to Russia industries from Germany and other countries.

The United States is about the only country on earth which tries to make a virtue of deficit spending. It is not good business. It is not good banking. And unless it is stopped it will end in a crash the size of which the world never saw.

Chester Bowles Is Peeved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has long been a fine old practice in this country to respect the opinions of those with whom we do not agree. This is especially true of people who are in public life. There is no unanimity of opinion on public matters in this House yet, even within the respective parties.

We do, however, respect the opinions and positions of those who oppose us.

Mr. Speaker, the public has been shocked in recent weeks by the conduct of Chester Bowles, a public servant high in the ranks of the New Deal. He has taken to calling names; he charges ulterior motives against those who challenge his position; he is proving to be "the little man who is not there."

The New York Times, Mr. Speaker, has called the turn on Mr. Bowles, in an editorial of March 7, 1946. Under permission previously granted, I insert said editorial as a part of my remarks:

MOTIVES AND PRICES

In recent weeks Chester Bowles, the Director of Economic Stabilization, has taken frequently to attacking the motives of those who venture to disagree with him on the subject of price control. A few weeks ago he called it outrageous that Henry Ford 2d should have asked OPA for a certain price on his cars last summer, and OPA accused Mr. Ford of having united with "the few selfish groups that have worked continuously to undermine the American people's bulwark against inflation." This week in a speech at Topeka before the Farmers Union Mr. Bowles made a sweeping denunciation of what he alleged to be "irresponsible, reckless, greedy" lobbies who were out to "eliminate or wreck the only controls between our people and inflation." Among such lobbies he included the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the packers, the textile manufacturers and "those speculators in Wall Street who time and again have played the American people for suckers." This leaves the implication that practically everyone who ventures to question any price fixed by OPA does so for a selfish motive.

There is a rule in both Houses of Congress that no Representative or Senator shall in debate impute unworthy motives to another. The reason for this rule is clear; its neglect by high public officials in their own public statements must lower the whole level of discussion, which ought to be on the merits of the question at issue.

That Washington today is full of lobbyists representing special interests is not surprising. Indeed, when Government agencies have such sweeping powers that a particular firm or a whole industry can be either built up, injured, or destroyed by the particular decision that one of these agencies makes, Washington lobbies grow inevitably. It is natural for people to object to being thrown out of business, or even to being treated in a way that they regard, rightly or wrongly, as unfair. Even if their argument is purely selfish in its motivation, it is at least entitled to be judged on its merits. Certainly no industry ought to be condemned merely because it puts forward any argument at all. The business lobbies have certainly shown no more power in recent years than the farm lobbies and the labor lobbies.

A special interest, we should also keep in mind, may correspond to a large extent with the general interest. It is wrong, for example, to talk as if the interests of producers and consumers were opposed. For a short period, no doubt, the interests of consumers may seem to be served by holding down the price of an article below the level at which it can be profitably produced; but the article will soon grow scarce, and, regardless of its legal price tag, it may soon be unobtainable at that price. In such a case consumers are obviously not benefited. Moreover, as nearly every consuming family depends on the income of its producing members, it is not benefited if the industries to which those members belong are not profitable enough to operate at full capacity.

There are people who are sincerely convinced that since the end of the war price control, except on special items, has ceased to be a major weapon for dealing with inflation. The two real causes of inflation, as these people see it, are the falling value of money, because of the continuous increase in its amount, and the shortage of goods. To deal with anything else, they feel, is to deal merely with the symptoms. This argument cannot be brushed aside as selfish. It must be met.

Utopia in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Indianapolis Star of March 11, 1946:

UTOPIA IN REVERSE

The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce calls attention to the fact that social security and other phases of public welfare are costing Hoosiers $100,000,000 a year. A little more than a decade ago the expense of maintaining our State benevolent institutions was $5,000,000 a year and now other forms of public welfare and social security require an added $95,000,000. That showing lends emphasis to the experience of the Uruguayans, which we would do well to ponder.

That South America Republic is one of the most progressive in Latin America. It has fertile soil and fine climate. The people are largely engaged in agriculture. They are well-to-do and undertook to make a Utopia of their country. They were pioneers in the cradle-to-grave theories of protection to everyone.

Provision was made to give free medical care to the low-paid workers. Pensions were to be available even to the farm laborer and domestic servants. Everybody would get a 2-week vacation with pay each year. Uruguay was hailed by welfare and social-security advocates as showing the way to what should and could be done for the people.

Now the whole program down there is about to collapse of its own weight. Maurice Early, who was in Uruguay with the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce tourists, disclosed in his report to the Star from Montevideo that there are 30,000 on the eligible pension list who are getting nothing, because there is no money to pay them. The government is about to go broke under the burden of its social-security obligations.

That 30,000 may not seem to be a large number, but on a population basis it would mean 50,000 in Indiana and more than 2,000,000 in the United States. We may not be near the limit of our capacity to pay, but we should not forget there is a limit beyond which we cannot go with safety.

Ours is a great State and a wealthy Nation. The Indiana Chamber of Commerce reports that Hoosiers are paying in local, State, and Federal taxes more than $1,215,000,000 a year. That is more than the Federal Government spent a few years ago.

We have a gross national debt in excess of $278,000,000,000. That means an interest item of about $6,000,000,000 a year which is more than the Government ever spent in any peace year prior to 1934. It is more than the Government ever took in from taxes in any peace year before 1941.

That interest item must be paid, if the Government is to remain solvent. Our problem is to know how much more than that $6,000,000,000 Uncle Sam can afford to spend in all other ways. There is a limit beyond which industry and national income cannot afford to go.

Food Wastage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the waste of food, or that which contributes to the waste of food, is indefensible but food wastage at this time is positively immoral.

During my public life I have consistently supported the cause of labor because I believe that through the activities of organized labor the condition of the little fellow—the common man—has been made immeasurably better. His standards of living have been raised. He has benefited by higher standards in the field of education so essential in the preservation of democracy.

There is a tie-up in certain food processing plants in California to a jurisdictional labor dispute. Unless steps are taken to get those involved back to work, essential food crops will rot and spoil.

The sentiments of the people of California are best expressed in editorials that have appeared in San Francisco papers recently.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks editorials appearing in the San Francisco News under date of March 5, and in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin under date of March 11, 1946:

[From the San Francisco News of March 5, 1946]

UNCONSCIONABLE BOYCOTT

If, as now seems likely, the AFL teamsters union, in support of its affiliated cannery workers' union, causes waste of the asparagus and spinach crops by refusing to haul them to the canneries, that will be an inexcusable assault upon the public interest, and at a time when many parts of the world are faced by famine, that most insidious of the Four Horsemen.

We would not speak thus feelingly if cannery workers and cannery owners were locked in a justifiable conflict over hours, wages, and working conditions, although even that would be a poor excuse for wasting food in such a crisis as now confronts a large section of humanity. But the teamsters' boycott is purely in support of a jurisdictional battle between the AFL and the CIO cannery workers' organizations over which has the right to represent cannery employees in collective bargaining with management for a new contract.

An election to determine which group has a majority has been ordered by the National Labor Relations Board. Human justice dictates that until that election is held both unions continue to do their work and fulfill their obligation to the public by packing the vegetable and fruit crops as they are harvested.

In a recent editorial the News proposed that the two unions form a joint committee to deal on an interim basis with management pending result of the forthcoming election. That idea still seems humane, just, and reasonable to us. It would assure that no food shall be wasted, that hungry mouths in war devastated countries shall not go empty because of any act of either an AFL or a CIO union in California. This assurance seems to us to be superior to any consideration whatever as to which union shall have bargaining rights.

Granted that the NLRB in Washington messed things up by invalidating the results of the former election and ordering a new election at an indefinite future date. Granted that the AFL group had a majority before. Grant all the claims on both sides. Do any or all of those claims give cause for wasting precious foodstuff in a time like this?

We believe the only answer to that question is a resounding no, and we here record it as our protest to the short-sighted and ill-advised decision of the teamsters' union to refuse to haul produce to the canneries unless the jurisdictional squabble is settled.

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of March 11, 1946]

IT'S UP TO LABOR—INTERNAL SQUABBLE SHUTS DOWN LOCAL CANNERIES WHILE FOOD ROTS AND FAMINE STALKS ABROAD

We were warned by the President of the United States that we must tighten our belts and do with less food this year so that millions in Europe and Asia may not actually starve.

This was unpleasant news but news that decent Americans would bear up under in the face of the consequences of our failure to do our part.

Every crop will be short of the need, every bit of wastage will mean less food for us this year.

In the face of these obvious statements, the San Francisco bay area is letting precious foodstuffs rot because our local cannery industry, which supplies every area of the United States and foreign countries, is shut down by a labor dispute.

Not a labor dispute between labor and the employers. Oh, no. There is no quarrel over wages or hours.

Not, for a change, a quarrel with the Government over WLB edicts.

No. The quarrel is between two factions of labor itself—what is known as a jurisdictional dispute.

The cannery workers are not involved either. It is a teamster dispute, which ties up incoming and outgoing materials, raw foods, canned foods, items necessary in processing.

And will the AFL teamsters agree to meet the CIO unionists with a view to making an interim agreement? Not on your life. Let the food rot. Let the people of the world starve. What do these labor leaders care in the light of their jurisdictional squabble within the ranks of labor itself?

If labor cannot put its own house in order, if these jurisdictional fights long continue, an enraged public and Congress will be forced to take harsh steps.

Why cannot the imaginative and resourceful leaders of labor see that organized labor itself will be the eventual sufferer, not only in this case from a dearth of food but in the long run by punitive legislation?

This is an internal matter with labor. Labor must solve it, and solve it quickly, or have governmental force do it for them.

Do they want governmental controls and bureaucracy and regimentation? Surely, history points to the inescapable fact that in all such regimes, labor has been ruthlessly treated and reduced in earning power, prestige, and voice in affairs.

Surely, the intelligent leaders of San Francisco labor should see the handwriting on the wall—and read it.

Labor and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most thoughtful editorial that appeared in the editorial column of the Chelsea Evening Record of Chelsea, Mass., which I feel warrants the attention of the Members of Congress. It follows:

LABOR AND BUSINESS

More and more business organizations, such as chambers of commerce and boards of trade, are finding places for labor in their councils. That is well.

The trend of the last few years has proved that labor has earned itself a permanent seat about the common economic table. It is not a question of whether labor will have a voice in business, but how large a voice.

We know that many businessmen, storekeepers and professional men, among others, whose own earnings are dependent on labor's prosperity, mistrust the unions and union leadership. By the same token, we know many labor leaders mistrust business associations and wonder what matters are discussed behind closed doors. It is well that recognition of their common problems is bringing business and labor together with an eventual break-down of mutual suspicion.

Another factor worth considering is the quality of the labor leaders. No union president ever gets to the top without a hard and sometimes bitter fight in his own realm. He has to be tough and usually he has to have brains. Sometimes the survival of the fittest for elevation to labor leadership actually gives the unions an advantage in dealing with representatives of management. Too many times business leaders are selected because they control the most stockholders' proxies, or because of inheritance. Often as not they have to hire specially qualified personnel men as their spokesmen during negotiations with labor. As often as not the hired personnel men do not have the fire, loyalty and confidence possessed by a labor leader who has pulled himself up by his own bootstraps.

Because such new blood can be valuable to a business association, if but for the purpose of breaking down mistrust, labor should be represented.

An Appraisal of the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, since becoming one of the people's Representatives, many bitter, abusive letters have been received charging stupidity, ignorance, a lack of humanity, of patriotism, and integrity, because of my vigorous opposition to New Deal policies, the refusal to vote for unsound schemes and appropriations of billions for the benefit of other countries, of warmongers, of members of certain groups.

Having, as have three-fourths of the Members of Congress, earned my livelihood, being what is called old-fashioned in the sense that experience tells me that work, thrift, honesty, and fair dealing are the most enduring foundations upon which to build either as an individual or a Nation, it is no pleasure but it is a source of satisfaction to find the fallacies of the New Deal pointed out in no unmistakable terms by one who has been a lifelong member of the party, in whose house the New Dealers, the left-wingers, and the Communists have operated all too successfully in their efforts to change our form of government.

Upon a platform which promised adherence to sound, economic policies and constitutional processes, President Roosevelt rode into power through the votes of people who accepted his campaign promises as covenants to be faithfully carried out but who, because of the hardships which inevitably followed World War I, and the subsequent boom and depression, desired relief.

Unfortunately, the new administration was no more than fairly established when it repudiated its promises. The New Dealers and planners seized control of the Democratic Party machinery, repudiated its political philosophy, and, with glittering promises of wealth and a life of ease for all, combined with a vicious and unfair attack upon all who through their own efforts had accumulated and retained more than an average share of wealth, who furnished jobs and met pay rolls, won three subsequent elections.

To the best of my ability and consistently, step by step, day in and day out, the New Deal fallacies have been opposed by me because of the firm conviction that, if carried out, they would destroy our economic structure, the liberty and the prosperity of our people, shorten the life of our Nation as a Republic.

It is no pleasure to be a member of a minority party. There is far less comfort in being a member of the minority in a minority party, but sometimes the sincere, conscientious individual, if true to his convictions, must with complacency accept what comes and find strength in his knowledge that he has used his best judgment, shirked no duty, been true to his convictions. My fear of the goal toward which the New Deal was leading the Nation has been, is, the reason for my bitter opposition.

That the danger on the road which the administration was following was not overdrawn by me is shown by a statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, a Representative from Texas, an able lawyer and judge, a life-long Democrat, who today is serving his thirty-fourth year in Congress. The gentleman's statement deliberately made and placed in the RECORD is as follows:

By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people. By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially "busted," great piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tryranny, oppression, and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance, and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free.

The foregoing is an unpalatable statement of fact but coming from a member of the majority party who is voluntarily retiring from Congress because he believes in some other forum, he may put our feet on the right road. His statement cannot be brushed aside, disregarded.

Often these days we hear the trite statement that "America is at the crossroads." In truth we have left the crossroads far behind us and the decision now before the people is whether we shall turn back from that broad and easy way which has lead us so far on the road to the destruction of our national existence, seek the straight and narrow, even though it be the hard way which will once more, if followed, take us individually to a greater degree of freedom, prosperity and security; nationally to a strong, independent, peaceful future.

The Nail Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from the Portland Oregonian of March 8, 1946:

NAILS NEEDED, WORK HALTED—HOMES OF VETS NOW AT STANDSTILL

SALEM, March 7.—Inability of a contractor to obtain 25 kegs of nails will result Friday in the layoff of more than 100 carpenters engaged in the erection of homes for 142 veterans, 130 in Portland and 12 in Hillsboro, Gov. Earl Snell was advised Thursday.

Knowledge of the impending work stoppage came with an appeal from an official of the National Housing Administration for help. He asked whether or not some State department or institution had a supply of nails on hand which would bridge the emergency.

NO NAILS HERE

Governor Snell, after a personal telephone survey, declared that the State is no better off, so far as nails are concerned, than the contractor. The Governor also was advised that unless nails are found immediately repair operations at the State fairgrounds here will have to stop within a day or two.

"It is little less than tragic," Governor Snell declared, "that with the housing for veterans critical as it is, that construction cannot proceed because of a lack of nails. This is but another evidence of how our snarled economy is impeding reconversion and postwar prosperity."

OFFERS INVITED

Governor Snell said that if any individual or corporation will telephone his office that he can supply nails, he will provide the name of the contractor and his address.

"This would be a service not only to veterans but to the carpenters and the State," Governor Snell said.

The Beef Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Scioto Provision Co., of Newark, Ohio:

BEEF SHORTAGE GROWS WORSE—HERE ARE THE FACTS—EFFECTIVE TODAY, WE ARE FORCED TO DISCONTINUE OUR BEEF OPERATIONS—THE REASON?

We can no longer comply with ceilings on live cattle, as established by OPA. In plain words, we cannot buy cattle today at or under ceiling prices. To exceed live ceiling prices is a serious violation. We operate a legitimate meat-packing business and have no desire or intention to violate laws, absurd as they may be in some instances.

Obviously we were faced with a difficult decision. All during the war years and since we have slaughtered cattle, for the most part at a loss, in order to supply this community and adjacent areas with a fair share of beef. Estimated figures indicate that Scioto Provision Co. has supplied more than half of the beef sold in Newark stores. Translated into actual figures, we have delivered weekly to local retailers from 30,000 to 40,000 pounds of top grades of beef at ceiling prices.

Our decision to quit rather than violate OPA regulations is going to work a hardship on our retail customers, as well as consumers. We deeply regret the absolute necessity for such action. We recognize that our company has a responsibility to furnish beef and other meats to this community and we have made every effort to discharge this responsibility during these trying times.

We hope that soon OPA will realize that complicated, confusing, and theoretical regulations cannot put meat on your table. Until that occurs we are forced to discontinue our beef operations. Our plant will remain in business to slaughter and process pork to the extent that hogs are available.

So please bear with us, and be patient with your butcher. He cannot sell you meat he is unable to buy unless he turns to black-market sources.

SCIOTO PROVISION CO.,
Newark, Ohio.

A Message to a Homeless Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the February 1946 Practical Builder, entitled "A Message to a Homeless Veteran." I commend this article to every person who is interested in acquiring a home. It will serve to correct much of the misinformation and misrepresentation that has been fed to the people concerning the matter of housing. Those of us who are sincerely interested in helping the veteran to acquire a home want to approach the problem from a practical and common-sense standpoint by removing the bottlenecks with a minimum of governmental control.

If you think the quick and economical way to get a new home is to turn the responsibility over to a Government bureau, just ask the man back from service how he has been faring in his efforts to secure benefits under the GI bill, or to buy material or equipment out of Federal surplus stocks. Or just examine one of the Government-built houses for war workers, which incidentally cost two to five times what they should have cost, or would have cost if built by private capital, and are of such flimsy construction that you probably would not want one of them as a permanent home at any price. There is no magical way by which we can create 3,000,000 homes out of thin air overnight. And there is no wizard in Washington with a substitute. The first and most important need is tremendous production of everything that goes into a house. We cannot buy building materials now, as the article explains, because they are just not being produced. And the producers almost to a man can prove that production is stymied by unreasonable price and production controls. No matter how Mr. Bowles or Mr. Wyatt and the bureaucrats preach, there is no way to force American industry to produce at a loss. What the country needs, in solving the housing shortage, and a hundred other problems in connection with our peacetime reconversion, is not more Government control, but less.

A MESSAGE TO A HOMELESS VETERAN

FEBRUARY 1, 1946.

You are home from the wars. You fought for your country and now you want the things that every American wants—a job and a good home.

You should have that home. You are entitled to it, but there just aren't enough homes to go around. Maybe you're wondering why somebody doesn't do something.

What we have to say to you isn't going to be easy. Nor is it going to be easy for you to take. We believe, however, that you would rather have it "straight" than to be kidded.

So here it is, straight from the shoulder: There is no way by which the building business, the Government, the President, the Congress of the United States, or anyone else can provide this year all the homes you and the other people of this country want. No amount of money appropriated by Congress can do it.

Several hundred thousand homes are going to be built, of course. Maybe you'll be one of the lucky ones to get one. The building industry, working with the Government, will do everything in its power to supply veterans' needs first. Even so, a lot of you boys are going to be disappointed.

"But why?" you ask. "Why can't we build a million homes this year? Let's get the assembly lines going again, prefabricate them, use the wartime airplane plants. Whatever you need to do, let's do it. But let's build homes quick."

We wish it were that easy. We already have a lot of prefabricating plants making homes and they're no better off than any other home builder because they, too, can't get toilet bowls, bathtubs, lumber, and so forth.

If you do not get your new home this year, it will be for the same reason that a lot of you will not be able to buy a refrigerator, or an automobile, or nylon hose, or white shirts, or a suit of clothes. There aren't enough materials coming out of the factories.

Remember, the manufacturers of building materials and equipment went through the same war that the automobile people did. For 3½ years, while you were fighting on the shooting front, the building industry, along with other industries, was working with might and main to build and maintain the huge war plant on the home front. We found out with automobiles, nylons, and refrigerators, it takes time to reconvert. The building industry was not allowed to start reconversion until after the Japanese war was over. We've had our share of strikes and labor troubles, too.

The war ended in August but home building restrictions were not lifted until October 15, 1945, less than 4 months ago. Yet home builders did their part; in the first 60 days they started over 125,000 homes. Many of them are not completed yet because we can't get materials, equipment, and labor enough. Yes, the builders did their part, but they couldn't compete with the military. Don't let anybody tell you we fell down on the job. Good as you were as a fighting man, the best in the world, even the Japs had you tied down until you got the materials.

But once you got the stuff, Germans, Japs, and nobody else could stop you. Same way with the building industry. Gradually we're clearing away the bottlenecks, giving home builders the green light. Gradually we're getting more and more stuff every day, and more and more homes are being completed, more and more are being started. By the end of this year we'll be going at a million-a-year clip, and you'll have your home.

We in the building industry foresaw that this crisis would happen. We urged the Government long before the end of the war to let us get our plants and plans in shape. We knew you would want a home when you got back. The Government said "No."

Well, maybe that was all right. You were fighting a tough war and you needed the stuff. But it meant the building industry could not be ready for you when you got home. We'll see that you get a home faster than anybody else can get it for you.

But what you and we should really be afraid of is that the amateur tampering with so complex a thing as the building business may prolong the home shortage unnecessarily. This could easily happen if, instead of putting all our energies on breaking the real bottleneck, we allow ourselves to be stampeded into impractical visionary schemes to produce houses by the million when there won't be materials and equipment enough to produce more than half that many this year, unless obstacles are removed.

Some of the ideas that are being advocated by well meaning men are so dangerous that they might upset our entire economy for years to come and delay home building indefinitely.

You don't want this to happen, because it would hurt you and all the rest of the people of the United States, and it wouldn't get you the home you want.

You can help prevent it if you will remember that housing, like a lot of other things, is a war casualty, and that only common sense and an all-out attack on the real bottlenecks will cure it.

What are the bottlenecks?

We've already mentioned a shortage of materials. But much of this shortage is due to OPA. We're not suggesting that all price control be removed. We are suggesting that OPA stop standing in the way of production of more materials and equipment. We are suggesting that OPA stop thinking in terms of war, reconvert, and start thinking in terms of peace and production.

One of the most serious shortages we have is in sanitary ware, plumbing supplies, radiators, and the like. OPA for some time has had dozens of applications for price adjustment in this industry alone. They haven't done anything at all about them. In the meantime manufacturers cannot get labor, because they can't afford to pay enough.

You've heard about the lumber shortage. Lumber mills are producing lots of lumber, but not much of the kind that's used in homes. Why not? Largely because OPA is still operating on a wartime basis, allowing higher prices on nonhome lumber and on lumber for export. These are just two of many examples.

Right there is bottleneck No. 1.

Bottleneck No. 2 is labor in the field. As you know, the boys were slow in coming back and those that did often went on other than home-building jobs. We've done something about that by giving home builders priorities on materials for veterans' homes. This will mean less general construction and so more labor will be available to build homes.

When these two bottlenecks—production and labor—are cleared away, homes will go up fast.

When we read daily about the unhappiness of thousands of veterans who can't find a home of their own, our emotions are apt to run away with us. The President says there are 5,000,000 homes needed immediately; Wilson Wyatt, our new housing chief, says 2,500,000. Thoughtful studies by economists of the Producers' Council (manufacturers) put the figure at about 850,000.

No one really knows what's correct. But just 5 years ago the building industry could find customers for only 450,000 homes. Is it reasonable to suppose we desperately need 5,000,000?

It is important to the welfare of the people of the whole Nation that you and we do some very straight thinking on this problem.

There are 6,000,000 people dependent on the building industry for a living. Perhaps you are one of them, or your brother, your father, your uncle. It is the second largest industry in the country. Let's be very careful how we monkey with the machinery that makes it run, lest our monkey wrench slip and we find we've wrecked the machinery that provides jobs for 6,000,000 people.

THAT WOULDN'T DO YOU ANY GOOD

Suppose we set up assembly lines all over the country to produce houses by the million. It wouldn't help you now because the real bottleneck isn't home-building capacity, it's materials and equipment. And there is very assurance that, if we did produce millions of homes in this way, they would not be the kind of homes you want, and that they would cost more. There is this fact, however:

Hundreds of thousands of carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers, electricians, and other workmen, all of whom now earn their living building homes, would not have jobs. In the meantime, thousands of other workmen would have to be recruited from the already scarce ranks of labor in this country, trained and taught new skills and new techniques to build house panels in Government factories. Maybe you've forgotten how long it took to

work out assembly-line techniques for airplanes and tanks, and that was in wartime when nobody cared how much it cost and how much sacrifice it entailed. It would take years to build a new giant industry to produce the millions of factory-made homes everyone so glibly talks about.

In the meantime, we have ready at hand, anxious to get going, a home-building industry capable of producing a million—yes, a million and a half—homes a year. We built 937,000 in 1 year, as far back as 1925, and did $5,000,000,000 of other building besides. The labor and materials that went into this $5,000,000,000 of nonresidential building was the equivalent of another 900,000 homes.

You don't have to wait for a new giant industry to be created from scratch.

You don't have to risk wrecking our existing economy while waiting for a new type of industry.

You won't have to live in a "housing project," which is not the American ideal of a home.

The building industry, working with the Government, is clearing away the wartime bottlenecks as fast as possible. By fall we can be building at a million-home-a-year pace or better.

You'll have your new home as fast as you'll have your new car.

PRACTICAL BUILDER,
Chicago.

Services of American Merchant Seamen in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries several bills designed to accord to our merchant seamen some appropriate recognition of reward for their meritorious and heroic service in World War II. In the New York Journal-American, and possibly in other papers, there appeared a column by Westbrook Pegler in which he expresses his disapproval of any recognition such as the bill proposes.

One of the most comprehensive and devastating replies to Mr. Pegler's article which I have read anywhere is contained in a letter written to Mr. Pegler by David B. Morgan, Jr., whose home is in Paterson, N. J.

Mr. Morgan graduated from Paterson Central High School in June 1940 and entered Bucknell University. He studied electrical engineering and had a minor in education. While at college he belonged to Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity and was active in the Christian Association and the glee club. After leaving college in August 1942, he worked as an engineering draftsman with the Curtiss Propeller Corp., of Caldwell, N. J., while awaiting appointment to the United States Merchant Cadet Corps. He received appointment in February 1943 and graduated in August 1944. While serving in the cadet corps he was awarded the Atlantic and Mediterranean zone bars and the combat bar for action in the Atlantic and north Africa. From September 1944 to October 1945, Mr. Morgan sailed as a merchant marine officer in the capacity of junior third mate, third mate, and second mate aboard the steamship *Sea Nymph*, the steamship *Emory Victory*, and the German prize of the war the motorship *Caribia*. In November 1945 he accepted appointment as an instructor with the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, in the grade of lieutenant junior grade at Pass Christian, Miss.

Mr. Morgan is well qualified to reply to Mr. Pegler's article and he has done so in a most dignified and courteous letter, which I desire to insert at this point.

Mr. Morgan's letter follows:

Mr. WESTBROOK PEGLER,
New York Journal-American,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PEGLER: After reading the article in your column under the heading "The Navy man and the merchant sailor" Tuesday, February 5, 1946, I was greatly surprised to see that your dislike for the American merchant marine took on such a definite and exasperating tone. I have read this article over several times and after giving a great deal of thought to it, I have decided to write to you. In writing I realize that little good comes of such things and in most instances little, if anything, is accomplished. However, after taking this into full account, I was still compelled to write to you and state a few facts with the hope and aim in mind of having you as an individual look into what I have to say and draw your own conclusion.

Speaking generally, I do not think you have put much thought in composing such an article and there is certainly little research behind it. The purpose of this letter is not to ridicule but merely to state the facts as I see them. Who am I, then, to suggest such things to a columnist? Well, I'm an interested person who sees a great injustice being done to a group of men who are in little position to give any kind of a reply to these charges.

I believe throughout your article you have misrepresented the facts as they stand today and also have tried to lead the public or reader at least to accept your viewpoint by merely presenting one side of the situation in question. Being extremely interested and understanding fully about the situation through experience, I was quick to see the flaws. I believe you have made a mistake in saying that the United States merchant marine is demanding that it be regarded as a "forgotten and underprivileged hero." This might make a good starting line and be sensational enough to hold one's interest, as far as journalism is concerned, but it deeply hurts those who have participated and know what you are talking about. I believe you based the majority of your article on a bill which is pending in Congress. The purpose of this bill is not to grant the merchant seamen equal rights with those that the GI possesses under his bill of rights, but instead, if enacted, it would allow men like myself to return to college and finish their education which was interrupted when a call was sent out to "enlist" in the merchant marine. You see, sir, most of us are now out of the merchant marine and would like to complete our education, but we find that we do not have the gold mines which you speak of nor do we have an equal opportunity to get a job due to the GI bill of rights. The reason for this lack of funds is not because of lavish spending but due merely to the fact that such conditions which you described never existed for us.

It seems, Mr. Pegler, that you are a little confused as to the characteristics and background that our average merchant seaman possesses. I believe that in your past you have had some unpleasant experience with the American merchant marine and it appears that your conclusions then have been handed down to the present. Those conclusions seem to be that the majority of merchant seamen are "ship jumpers," drunkards, and thieves. Let me inform you that they are not. I believe I am in a position to know since I sailed with the American merchant marine. I do not consider myself a hero and I believe my shipmates do not either, so that naturally throws us into this other radically spoken category, namely, bums, drunkards, etc. Sir, I have sailed with college graduates, high-school graduates, rich and poor alike, young men with good families and bright pasts, but I fear you have done them a great injustice. If someone had told this to me, instead of reading it, I would have demanded an apology.

Mr. Pegler, there is a new merchant marine coming out of this war. Not bums, drunks, etc., but young men with an ideal and a hope for the future. However, they are working against overwhelming odds when articles like this are written on top of the fact that few people know the real truth about our merchant marine. Things like this tend to discourage the effort to build something good. I am speaking now of the graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy—men who go to school 4 years—to later man our merchant ships. It is these men to whom you have done the greatest injustice, for they sailed during the war also and have a grand memorial at Kings Points (USMMA) of their dead to tell of the job they have done. I sincerely ask you to visit this school and then read your article to these cadet-midshipmen in training who have set their aim as a career at sea. Also look into this school closely, not for sensational facts about it but for the over-all good and great need of it.

Mr. Pegler, I challenge your remark to the effect that merchant seamen pick this service so they could take time off between trips, pick ships and voyages, etc. You see 90 percent of the men did not know that they were allowed 30 days leave per year (same as Navy men but without pay) when they enlisted in the merchant marine. As far as voyages are concerned, no one, not even the master, knew where the ships were going. I suggest that you look into naval leaves for armed guard. It seems that they had a definite period of time ashore which closely corresponded to that of the merchant service. The minimum of $175 per month which you stated seems a bit wrong to me. You see, I've sailed and know it is wrong. Several studies have been made on the comparison of wages between merchant seamen and Navy seamen, which you may request by writing to the newly chosen head of the United States Maritime Commission. It might be well to state that we were paid directly by the United States Government (WSA), not by labor unions.

Sir, you mentioned the very large bonuses that the merchant sailor received during the most dangerous days of the war while the bluejacket received neither bonus nor overtime. It so happened that at those times there were no bluejackets around and merchant ships sailed out into a shooting gallery with no protection. The result of this is underrated by the figures which state that the merchant marine lost more men on a percentage basis than any of the armed services. This data may also be obtained from the Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.

Sir, we do not mind your attacking communistic unions, but we do resent being attacked as the American merchant sailors You see a sailor is an officer or a member of the crew. We're all sailors. It also includes the United States Maritime Service, a Government service, much the same as the Army and Navy but without the power to fulfill its aims, due largely to the interference by other groups and lobbies in Washington with selfish interests. We are not Communists or radical union members but rather America's youth who enlisted in the

merchant marine while others are seeking to get their old jobs back or returning to school. We, too, have to make a new start. We do not mind being handicapped with the GI bill of rights as long as insult is not piled upon injury.

The bill before Congress now is not to grant merchant seamen the same benefits as the GI. We merely want an equal chance to return to school, and also we would like to have the families of merchant seamen who have gone down with their ships cared for, and those who will be crippled for life to receive some Government help. Is this too much to ask? Is it communistic to suggest this?

I say again, I do not know whether this will accomplish any good. I am not a critic and I hope that I have not sounded as such. I feel deeply hurt, and my folks do, also, upon reading your article. I believe there are many more that have had much the same reaction.

Will you be interested enough to look into this situation? Will you acknowledge this letter in your column or by personal letter? Hoping that you will, I am,

Sincerely,

DAVID B. MORGAN, Jr.

The Late Sgt. William O'Toole, of Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very beautiful poem written in memory of my recently departed and much lamented friend, Sgt. William O'Toole, of Clinton, Mass., who saw distinguished service in both World Wars.

This touching and eloquent tribute, which recently appeared in the Clinton Daily Item, was written by Patrick Joyce, special correspondent of the Clinton Daily Item and well-known and outstanding correspondent for International News Service:

Our good friend, Sgt. Bill O'Toole, died since we left town. We don't know many persons we will miss more than big, laughing, good-natured Bill. We thought we would dedicate this verse to him as final tribute.

To Sgt. William O'Toole, United States Marine Corps, World War I, United States Army, World War II:

Blow softly, bugler.
He lies there,
A soldier resting from all care.
Blow softly.

Shall we no longer hear him call
"All's well," and feel his firm hand fall
In friendship, and his strong laugh ring,
All gloom and sorrow banishing?

Blow softly, bugler.
Not alone
We stand who knew him as our own.
Blow softly.

Somewhere beyond where brave men are,
There is a new and buoyant star.
There is a voice that we can hear:
"Courage, my comrades, I am near."

A Medal for Benny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Mr. Art McMahon, of the Passaic Herald-News.

I am certain that all of my colleagues in the House will read this column with interest and will profit from the reading.

It was written by a resident of New Jersey's Ninth District, which I have the honor to represent, and it is the work of a former Navy officer who writes and speaks from personal experience and not from hearsay. Mr. McMahon saw plenty of action and plenty of unrewarded heroism. Like many another veteran who has been "in the thick of it," he is moved to lament the fact that many of the real heroes of the lately concluded war are, and will forever be, unsung. The presentation of a medal, accompanied by an extravagant citation, to a Mickey Rooney, or to a press-relations man who contributed little or nothing to the actual fighting, goes against the grain of many a man who saw comrades, richly deserving of such recognition, fall in battle.

The article follows:

THE SPORTSMAN'S CORNER
(By Art McMahon)
A MEDAL FOR BENNY

Well, it seems the only guys who weren't heroes in the late and lamented war were the poor suckers who hit the beach at Salerno, Normandy, Guadalcanal, Leyte, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and assorted way stations. All they did was win the war in a loud, undignified way, lots of them leaving their blood and their guts on the nice, soft sand, and the pretty, hard coral.

They have eloquently worded certificates expressing their Government's thanks for their services. And even those who didn't come back weren't forgotten. Their next of kin can show you scrolls testifying to a Nation's appreciation for their willingness to make the supreme sacrifice.

But the guy who crawled on his belly to a symphony of shrapnel isn't getting any medals. He and his brothers make up too much of any army for special consideration. In isolated instances a bronze star or a silver star has come his way, but he had to be doing the right thing at the right time in view of the right person to be officially recognized.

It must make the common, ordinary run-of-the-mill soldier, sailor, or marine very happy to learn that Mickey Rooney of the movies is back in this country wearing a bronze star for meritorious service in entertaining troops. All of 15 months he was overseas, clowning around no matter how tired he was just to keep the minds of his buddies off that nasty war.

And the seamen first class who made the Murmansk run and froze in horror in the Pacific when the "divine wind" crashed into their ships will be elated to learn that a newspaperman friend of mine was awarded the Navy commendation ribbon for the excellent manner in which he publicized Navy Day last year.

Not to be outdone in niceties, the Army last week awarded the Legion of Merit to another newspaperman who fought the war as a public-relations officer at an ammunition depot in upper New Jersey, rough duty when you consider the unpleasantness of the winter season in the lake regions.

ANY EXCUSE FOR AN AWARD

This belated enthusiasm for awarding fruit salad has made for some interesting situations, even among the men who were in combat and could accept a medal without blushing.

One skipper of a ship opened his official mail one day to read that he was getting a medal for his "heroic performance of duty in the face of heavy opposition in the Nikiniki operation." He had never been to Nikiniki and to this day doesn't know where the place is. All he remembers is that he went where he was told and carefully avoided getting killed or losing his ship.

Another commanding officer was bemedaled for "excellent and determined fire control during a heavy enemy air attack at Okinawa." During this particular period, when the kamikaze boys were bouncing off the hulls of our ships, his vessel had not fired a single shot.

In one Pacific operation a gunner on the ship on which I served went haywire and jumped over the side. Another man on watch saw him go over and leaped in to save him, despite the fact that the convoy was in enemy waters and ships were not permitted to stop to pick up men overboard.

A busy little destroyer, protecting the brood, raced back to fish both men out of the water.

It was proposed that the man who had jumped in to save his shipmate be presented with a lifesaving medal or a commendation. The recommendation was passed up to the high brass.

"That is ridiculous," scoffed the brass. "That man disobeyed all orders by jumping into the ocean after the other fellow. Tell him he is lucky he isn't being court-martialed."

I guess he was lucky at that.

Price Controls on Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have received from a lumber dealer in my district relative to ceiling prices and Government subsidies for building materials:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 2, 1946.*
Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BOLTON: In my travels I talk to a lot of retail lumber dealers and industries. The concensus of opinion among retail dealers and building contractors is that ceiling prices should be removed from lumber and removed at once. As long as ceilings remain we will have reduced production, black market, and lumber which can be made into flooring, siding, and other items needed in home construction will be manufactured into freight-car siding and roofing or shipped export, where a better price can be realized.

This $600,000,000 Government subsidy is all wrong. The rank and file of lumber manufacturers are opposed to it. It would

require at least $200,000,000 to administer and police this subsidy. The upshot would be that professional promoters like Henry J. Kaiser would get most of it.

Do away with price controls on lumber, and every little crossroads coffeepot sawmill in the country would start running 24 hours a day. Soon there would be an abundance of lumber, and the supply and demand would push prices below today's levels. I saw it take place in 1919 and 1920 after the last war.

Very truly yours,

KEMPER LUMBER CO.,
E. S. KEMPER, *Owner.*

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the CIO cost-of-living committee, of which John Thornton is chairman pro tempore, has sent the following statement to its locals on the fight for price control. Because I believe it is important for the general public to have these facts before them, together with the testimony of James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, at hearings on renewal of the Price Control Act, and under unanimous consent, I insert them in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, THE CIO
COST OF LIVING COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

THE FIGHT FOR PRICE CONTROL

Nothing that was done to weaken price control during the war was as important and as vicious as the drive that is now being made to raise prices and increase the profits of already very profitable businesses of the country. The drive, however, is before the public because of two things that are happening at this time:

1. The debate which is going on in Congress over the renewal of the Price Control Act.

2. The wage increases which labor is getting.

Both of these are, of course, of great interest to labor. But what is also of importance is the attempt which is being made to pin the blame for the price increases on labor and on the wage increases which labor is getting.

Let us look at these points in order.

1. THE RENEWAL OF THE ACT

There is very little likelihood that any group or political party will take the responsibility for killing off price control at this time. However, there are a great many groups that want special concessions so that they may get more money. If Congress yields to any of these groups, prices will go up. But they will go up only to increase somebody's profits, and you will pay the bill.

Since not even one amendment is being considered at this time to strengthen price control, we must oppose all amendments to the renewal of the price control law.

Every amendment which is adopted will weaken the hold on prices, and the standard of living of the American worker will suffer accordingly. Even though the amendments aren't adopted, the attempt to put them over may cost you plenty. Here's the way it works: To buy off the people who want a weakening amendment passed, OPA will often make an off-the-record deal which gives the pressure group at least part of what it wants. So, while the amendment is killed, the price may go up anyway.

That's why every anti-price-control speech and every attempt by a Congressman to get an amendment passed, is a move hostile to price control. You must be concerned about it, even if it looks as though the particular amendment has no chance of passing. It is part of a scheme to make OPA give an industry what it wants.

You may not know what the deal is; you won't know what the cost is until the prices really go up. But you can know what deal is liable to be made if you watch the debate in Congress. Make it a rule every time you see a Congressman establishing his nuisance value by lambasting OPA and price control to add your voice to the pressure against what he is trying to do. The only exception there can be to this rule is the liberal Congressman who is demanding more and tighter price control, instead of less price control, or "more flexible" price control.

2. OUR WAGE INCREASES

We have had wage increases coming for a long time. We didn't get them because of the wage stabilization program, but we had them coming just the same. We had them coming out of the huge profits which are still being earned at the full production levels that prevail now and will prevail for some time to come.

When we finally moved in to claim our increases, what happened? The Government immediately began raising prices so that the wage increases would come out of our own pockets instead of out of the greatly increased profits of the employers.

Take the steel wage increase, for example. It does not come out of the profits of the steel industry. The $5 price increase brings the steel industry an additional profit of $100,000,000.

In the case of meat, the fact-finding panel recommended that the industry pay 5 cents of the wage increase out of profits. Actually, the figures show that all of the increase could have been paid out of profits. But the Government has now decided to give the packers a price increase based on the whole wage increase.

3. BLAMING LABOR FOR PRICE INCREASES

Let's look at what is happening in other price-control situations at the same time:

(a) For many months the Department of Agriculture has been working to get ceilings raised, or removed entirely so that prices would go up. Some prices have already gone up because of the Department of Agriculture pressure, and more will be going up if the Department has its way. Beside this general campaign for inflation, the Department is taking off food subsidies. When a subsidy goes off, the price goes up. That means more price increases.

(b) OPA has been taking off price ceilings for a long time. Recently OPA admitted having removed the ceilings from 1,300 types of items. The program will probably go on, greater and faster as the weeks go by. In most cases where a ceiling is removed, the price goes up; often it doubles. That means more price increases.

(c) As part of its reconversion program, OPA has been letting many manufacturers figure their own price ceilings. Now OPA is going to extend this kind of pricing. OPA will have no real control over what these manufacturers do; it won't even know what they are doing. That means more price increases.

(d) The price line has been weakening even where the line is being maintained. Between VE-day and the 1st of February of this year, OPA made 459 industry-wide price increases. More are being made all of the time.

(e) Congress has just cut in half a request by OPA for money to operate until the end of June. Less money means less price control; less price control means more price increases.

This is not a complete list of everything that is being done to raise prices. But now that wages are going up, labor will be made to pay these higher prices which result from these actions. All of the increases will be added together, and the blame for all of them will be put on labor.

The situation is serious. That means that labor must not throw up its hands and stop fighting. We must not take this conspiracy lying down. The heat must be put on everybody involved, so that as much as possible may be saved from the disgraceful drive to turn inflation loose on America. Labor must engage in an intensive and active campaign to get the above facts known to the American people and to get them down before the administration.

These are the basic facts. We will try to get more of them, and the details, to you. The important question is, What can you do with them?

How many people can you get to listen to them? And do something about them? Before how many unions and other community groups can you get these facts told (or this statement read)? Into how many papers can you get them? Over how many radio stations can you get them?

How many letters can you get sent to your Congressman, to the President, to Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, Robert Hannegan, John Snyder?

On the answers to these questions will depend what we are able to do to protect ourselves, our country, and our children from the inflation that will otherwise engulf us.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES B. CAREY, SECRETARY-TREASURER OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, AT HEARINGS ON RENEWAL OF THE PRICE CONTROL ACT, MARCH 8, 1946

On February 25, Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, sent to Mr. Chester Bowles, Director of Economic Stabilization, a letter in which appeared the following statements:

"In its struggle for a decent living wage for its members, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has not at any time abandoned its firm support of effective and vigorous price control. It reaffirms its support at this time. Its record in the fight against inflation is untarnished by retreat or compromise.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations reaffirms its support of price control and pledges to you its wholehearted cooperation in the fight for the renewal of the Price Control Act."

In the absence of Mr. Murray, it is to amplify these statements which he made that the CIO has asked permission to testify before this committee.

Each year since the war began, the CIO has appeared here on the Hill to support price-control legislation. Each time we have taken great pains to make it clear that we were for more than just the passage of a price-control law. We have tried to make it clear that strong price control means setting up an agency committed to administering the law in the strictest possible sense. The price-control agency must be protected against pressure from selfish, private-interest groups so that it may administer the law in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Strong price control requires also that the administration provide such additional control programs as may be necessary to permit prices to be kept down. I am, of course, referring to subsidies, to rent control, and to production controls.

In appearing here this year to urge that the administration protect this Nation against further inflation, we are conscious of the fact that price control must now be considered in the special circumstances brought about by the end of the war.

The CIO has never regarded price control as a wartime measure in the sense that its necessity began on Pearl Harbor day and ended on VJ-day. We believe that price control was made necessary by the special economic conditions which the war brought on. Since those economic conditions still exist, it is clear in our minds that the need for price control still exists. As a matter of fact, the evidence already on hand makes it absolutely clear that inflationary pressures today are greater than they were at any time during the war, and that therefore the need for price control is greater than ever. In order to make clearer what the situation is, I would like to refer to a few of the specific inflationary problems which face us.

Let me refer first of all to the housing situation. Here we have the existence of a tremendous housing need and the existence of a tremendous amount of money available for speculation. What the result of this combination has meant in increases in the prices of homes and real estate is so well known that there is no need of my going into it further.

Then there is the hoarding which is being done in consumer-goods industries. You have undoubtedly seen the reports in the daily press. I understand that over 4,000,000 shirts are being withheld from the market in anticipation of the end of price control, or at least of the issuance of a new price-control regulation by the OPA. This is only one example of the area in which sharp increases in price can be expected immediately unless price control is maintained with a firm hand. How high these prices would go if ceilings were entirely removed is anybody's guess. Once such inflation gets under way there is no one who can say where it will end.

I mention these facts not because I anticipate that this Congress may decide to end price control at this time. There are few, if any, groups in this country so illiterate economically as to want to see price control terminated now.

There are a great many organizations in the country, however, which are willing to gamble with our economic welfare to gain additional profits at the expense of the whole Nation. This committee is certain to be asked at one time or another to consider a number of proposals, each of which would have the effect of adding more dollars to the profits of some particular industry or business group.

I understand that the National Retail Dry Goods Association wants Congress to insure the retailer a profit on each item he sells regardless of how large his over-all profits may be. The association also wants to be allowed to maintain the same percentage margin of profit no matter how high prices go and regardless of the volume of business.

The National Automobile Dealers Association is also wedded to the idea that margins must be maintained regardless of prices and volume of business.

The National Association of Retail Grocers believes that no violation of a price ceiling should be prosecuted unless it is more than 2½ percent above the ceiling. Obviously the adoption of their proposal would mean an immediate increase of 2½ cents on grocery store prices.

The American Wool Council and other organizations wants OPA's "maximum average price plan" to be eliminated. If they are successful, the lower ends of even the present price ranges will disappear immediately.

The National Cotton Council is determined that there shall be no ceiling price placed on cott n regardless of the price increases which are taking place.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards wants an across-the-board increase in rent ceilings.

The producers of building materials, and most of the organizations which sell them, want more generous treatment in spite of their already phenomenal profits.

Most of these groups which I have just named are on the list specifically mentioned by Chester Bowles in his speech on Tuesday, March 5, as being "out to eliminate or wreck the only controls which stand between our people and inflation."

These proposals would obviously increase profits, which is all their advocates seem to be interested in. Obviously, the total inflation which would result from the enactment of these proposals would be at the expense of the entire Nation.

Perhaps it is wrong to say that the cost of inflation would be borne by the entire Nation. I am conscious of the fact that there are speculative groups in this country which would benefit from an inflation even though inflation now would add to the burden of the deflation which will come later. If these groups join hands with the monopolists who would benefit from depression, we may come out of the present discussion with the kind of price control which will be absolutely unbearable as far as the Nation is concerned.

It is this total over-all picture that I urge this committee to keep in mind as the various proposals to weaken the price-control program are laid before you. It seems to me that the answer to all of them must be a flat "no." There must be no further weakening amendments attached to the present price-control law.

Let me emphasize what I said before about the necessity for a strong price-control agency as well as for a strong price-control law. It has been the observation of the CIO Cost of Living Committee, which has been following price control carefully since it first began, that the agency can be weakened as effectively by administrative inhibitions within OPA as by amendments to the law. The CIO feels, therefore, that it is the responsibility of this committee and of Congress to protect OPA against the kind of congressional pressure which results in off-the-record deals, bargains, and promises to be reasonable.

This responsibility to protect OPA against the necessity for making behind-the-scene deals is even greater than the responsibility for protecting the price-control law. The public will know if the law is amended. It does not and cannot know when price control is emasculated by these vicious and undemocratic concessions achieved by holding a legislative pistol at OPA's head.

Our views about the dangers which confront price control are based on our knowledge of what has already been happening to price control and to prices in the past few months. You may perhaps know that OPA has been taking the ceilings off a good many items and commodities which have been under control during the war. Recently OPA issued a report called Facts about the charge that price control is interfering with production. In this report OPA admitted that between VE-day and February of this year price ceilings were taken off 1,300 types of items.

The facts, to show what happened in each case after decontrol, are not available. For at least a few of them, however, the facts are available. You may recall what happened to the prices of citrus fruits in the holiday season between Thanksgiving and Christmas of last year as a result of the removal by OPA of ceilings on these items. Within a few days, prices nearly doubled. Within 2 or 3 days after the removal of the ceilings, the prices of some grades of oranges in some areas jumped 96 percent. Three or 4 weeks went by before ceilings could be reinstituted. By the time the prices were again brought under control, on January 3, 1946, the consumer had been charged a very significant sum of money to help prove to the Government that price control was still needed.

When ceiling prices were removed on that very important household commodity, clothespins, in some areas prices jumped from 5 cents to 20 cents per dozen. You may be familiar with the price increase on coconuts, an increase of 400 percent, which took place when OPA removed the ceiling price on that item.

These are only examples of the situation as a whole. The situation was characterized by Richard V. Gilbert, Economic Adviser to the Office of Price Administration, on December 1, 1945, in the following language: "Commodity prices clear across the board, many of which on the basis of nonspeculative demand and supply factors should now be decreasing, are jumping up hard against the ceiling. In some cases, where, because of the adequacy of supply, we have suspended or exempted commodities from price control, prices have been bid upward speculatively. Some of them doubled overnight."

Yet the pressures for further decontrol continue. OPA continues to exempt commodities from price control, and it is my understanding that there is a proposal before Congress to require OPA to eliminate price ceilings even faster than it is being done under its already too hasty program.

When your committee comes to consider the proposal which I understand is before you—that OPA be required to remove ceilings as soon as a commodity reaches some normal level of production—I hope that you will remember this statement by Dr. Gilbert. Let me repeat part of it: "Commodity prices clear across the board, many of which on the basis of nonspeculative demand and supply factors should now be decreasing, are jumping up hard against the ceiling."

Even where price ceilings are being kept on the tendency is clearly toward relaxation of price control. The OPA report referred to above, which showed the elimination of ceilings from 1,300 types of items, also reported that between VE-day and the 1st of February OPA made 459 industry-wide price increases.

If there is anything in the profit figures of American corporations to show that these price increases are dictated by necessity we have not been able to find it. The CIO cost-of-living committee, which has followed many of these increases on a case-by-case basis, has discovered again and again that the increases are being made to maintain uneconomic wartime profits and even to increase such profits. Meanwhile, the cost of living continues to go up.

Right within the Government there have been official agencies and spokesmen pressuring for higher prices. I have observed that the Department of Agriculture speaks for the Government with the voice of those who want inflation. Much of the pressure to eliminate subsidies has come from the Department of Agriculture, even though the taxpayers of this country whom the Department is supposed to serve will suffer as a result of the elimination of subsidies. I think I need only remind you of the increase in the price of butter which took place recently as a result of the elimination of the butter subsidy to illustrate what I mean. If the Department had been successful in carrying out its original proposal, the price of butter would have moved up an additional 12 cents per pound.

When I have asked the reason for some of this desire by the Department to get prices up, it has been explained to me that the Department is trying to save the taxpayer money. I understand that the Dapartment of Agriculture is committed to support the prices of some agricultural commodities which may go down before the end of the current crop year. If the drop is great enough to bring the average price for that commodity to below the support level, the Department of Agriculture may be required to spend some money in supporting that price. On the other hand, if the price can be permitted to rise now, the average price

for the commodity during the crop year may be maintained at a point so high that no expenditure by the Department will be required.

Of course, the general public will foot the bill for these higher prices. The ordinary consumer, already be-deviled by higher prices, will find himself further be-deviled by more price increases. The average worker who finds his take-home pay falling, while the cost of living continues to rise, will be put under a greater squeeze than ever before.

Gentlemen, if decontrol, industry-wide price increases, and manufactured inflation by the Department of Agriculture are to be the economic program of this country in the months ahead, then we will have no one to blame but ourselves for the chaos which is bound to follow.

The CIO has continuously pointed out that the economic prosperity of this country depends on our maintaining an increasingly higher level of purchasing power. We have pointed out as an organization, and our cost-of-living committee has pointed out to OPA, that at the beginning of the war purchasing power in this country was too low to support full employment and full production. During the war the cost of living went up. New and more modern plants were built. New and more efficient methods of production were developed. The wage increases which took place have not been enough to keep up with these increases in the price and the volume of goods which will be available when full peacetime production is resumed. In other words, purchasing power was behind in the race when the war began—during the war it fell even further behind.

The measure of our inability to provide the buying power which will be needed if the product of full production is to be sold is to be found in the hoarded reserves of industry. These are greater today than ever before in the history of this Nation, and no unbiased, competent economist can be found to say what will be done with all of the money. Neither can anyone say what will be done with the full amount of the profits which are currently being earned at present prices and present wages.

This situation, as applies to profits, prices, and wages, spells economic disaster for this Nation in the near future. Yet in spite of this fact, every possible excuse is being taken for raising prices. Now when labor is about to obtain a part of the wage increases which are due us as a result of the disparity between prices and wages, these wage increases themselves are used as the excuse for another round of price increases.

One example of how our price policy is operating in this respect is the increase being made in the price of meat. The meat packers are sharing in the general profit prosperity which industry experienced during the war. Packing-house employees in both the CIO and AFL requested wage increases at the end of the war. As you know, the President appointed a fact-finding panel to hear the case. The panel recommended that the wage increase be limited to 16 cents per hour. This recommendation is being put into effect.

However, the panel was so impressed with the profit situation of the industry that it felt impelled to recommend that 5 of the 16 cents be absorbed out of the profits of the industry. It is my opinion, and the opinion of our packinghouse union, that this recommendation was most generous from the point of view of industry. Profits in this industry have been so great that far more than 5 cents of the wage increase could have been absorbed out of profits. Nevertheless, somewhere between the recommendation of the fact-finding board and the price order issued by OPA, this recommendation of the panel has been lost. The price increase in meat has required no absorption out of the profits of the industry.

Again, these are only examples of what is happening. This pattern is being repeated, and will be repeated, in industry after industry as our workers are given the wage increases they waited so long to get. Not only is our weak price-control policy permitting our efforts to increase purchasing power to be wasted; the wage increases are being used as the excuse to throw additional windfalls of millions of dollars into corporate treasuries that are already far too bloated for the health of the country.

In addition, every inflationist in the country is now trying to hide behind the wage increases which are being made, and to blame labor for the price increases that he has been able to wheedle or bludgeon out of OPA.

We refuse to be the whipping boy for this crime. We refuse to be blamed for the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to get the prices up. We refuse to be blamed for the fact that the Civilian Production Administration refuses to use its powers to help get low-priced production out of the plants, to prevent hoarding, and to stop black markets. All of these things spell inflation. They have been going on for a long time. It is up to Congress to see that a change is made.

We want an adequate subsidy program. We refuse to be blamed or the higher prices which result from the elimination of subsidies. We want Congress to assume the responsibility for that, too.

OPA's program of removing price ceilings is bringing about higher prices. OPA is permitting large numbers of manufacturers to figure their own ceilings. OPA is making hundreds of industry-wide price increases and thousands of individual price increases. These have been completely apart from the wage-price drive.

To the extent that this results from congressional pressure, Congress is responsible. To the extent that this results from insufficient appropriations, Congress is responsible. To the extent that it results from industry pressure backed up by the influence of individual Members of Congress, Congress is responsible.

These are all matters for Congress to consider seriously and with the maximum of responsibility in the next few days.

To the extent that labor's drive to increase purchasing power by getting wage raises out of profits is frustrated by Government action to the extent that our accomplishments are being turned inside out and changed into price increases, somebody other than labor is responsible. I think Congress must go into this matter thoroughly and arrive at a decision as to what shall be done about it.

Gentlemen, this country must have price stabilization. We are forgetting entirely that the greatest deflationary crisis in history is already in the making. The greater inflation is allowed to become from here, the greater will be the price we pay for it in the deflation which will follow. The deflation is being built primarily out of two failures in economic statesmanship: First, the failure to realize that purchasing power must be built up in the hands of the common man, the man who can be expected to buy the new avalanche of consumer goods which will come from our plant and equipment. Second, the failure to realize that what is being done to build up our purchasing power through the creation of new minimum wage and through wage increases is being completely offset, and perhaps more than offset, by the wild price increases which are being both permitted and engineered in the Federal Government today.

I repeat that it is the responsibility of this committee and of this Congress to completely reverse the pattern which is being followed. The price-control law must be passed. It must obviously be passed without weakening amendments, but also without hidden, weakening deals with OPA. The Office of Price Administration must be given clear and sharp instructions to keep ceilings on and to keep those ceilings as tight as the earnings of industry permit, and the economic welfare of the Nation requires. The pressure group conglomeration of Congressmen on the Hill which is purely a rump committee and which spends it time harrying the agency people who really believe in price stabilization, must be given clear notice that it is the intent of the people of this country, and of Congress, to hold whatever is left of the price line. OPA must be provided with the funds which are necessary to carry out a vigorous price-control program. The subsidy program must be reactivated so that whenever subsidy assistance is needed to hold the price line, it will be available and forthcoming.

In addition to subsidies, the Department of Agriculture must be told that stabilization of the price line is in the public interest and that the functions of the Department must be dictated to serving that interest. The other Government agencies, particularly the CPA, must be told that stabilization of the price line and full production within this line are not alone the functions of OPA but are the responsibility of the entire Government administration. All of the powers available to these agencies must be thrown into the fight so that further inflation can be avoided and at least that part of deflation be prevented.

The CIO will continue to do what it can to inform its members and whatever additional segments of the American people it can reach that these issues are vital and essential to their welfare, and that the measure of economic statesmanship of this Nation and of the Congress which represents it will be found in the action taken here in the next few days.

Do OPA Policies Lead to Further Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the type of bureaucrat who is strangling reconversion is still in control notwithstanding the shift in the official window-dressing of the OPA in an attempt to placate public indignation against the totalitarian OPA technique. Under unanimous consent to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks, an article by Harold Fleming which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, as follows:

DO OPA POLICIES LEAD TO FURTHER CONTROLS?

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK.—Some businessmen here are reluctantly inclined to accept a rather unhappy explanation of the current impasse in price control.

They have concluded that it is a product of deliberate policy on the part of the OPA bureaucracy.

They see the problem not as a question of whether to continue price control or abolish it, nor even as a question of whether Chester Bowles is sincere or is merely playing to the political galleries. They see it as the product of an effort to force all American business through the spinneret of a Government department which is actually run by men who do not like businessmen, do not believe in the system of private enterprise, and would not be greatly disturbed if their conduct produced an economic crisis which

might then seem to call for more Government intervention, controls, and directions.

To most businessmen it seems unfortunate that the public has no knowledge of how OPA policies are affecting business. These businessmen seem to have the same feelings at the moment as those of the atomic-bomb scientists who wish that the public "only knew" how serious is the implication of recent developments.

CURRENT POLICIES ALMOST UNBELIEVABLY INEPT

This is because some of the current OPA policies seem almost unbelievably inept and obstructive.

One of these is the pricing policy which squeezes old manufacturers out of certain lines, only to turn around and give manufacturing novices in the same lines higher ceilings which permit them to step in (at higher prices) where the older manufacturer has to step out.

Another is the policy of refusing price relief to a manufacturer on a product where costs has risen above his ceiling, in case his over-all profit on all his products is equal to his prewar rate of profit. So he drops his unprofitable lines, and his customers—including other industries which depend on them—have to go without.

And a third is the incredible delays encountered by manufacturers seeking price relief.

Some businessmen profess that they can no longer believe that these and other policies and their fantastic results can be the product of mere bureaucratic stupidity. They have met enough members of the OPA staff to say that the boys are not stupid—in fact, some of them are very bright, indeed, as well as fast talkers.

Moreover OPA administration adds up to too many mistakes and obstructions to be merely an accident. It seems more like one of those mysteries like the mystery to the polar bear in the zoo of why there are bars in front of him no matter which way he turns, or the mystery to the amateur speculator in the stock market of why he can't ever seem to make any money.

This conclusion seems in some degree confirmed by the actual situation inside the walls of OPA.

STAFF DEFENSE AGAINST MEMBERS' REMOVAL

The present staff is pretty largely the staff installed by Leon Henderson. When Henderson was pushed out and Prentiss Brown put in, Brown made a few passes at a housecleaning but gave up shortly. His adjutant Lou Maxon went in swinging but was promptly boxed into a corner and pushed out.

Chester Bowles made a few tries at changing personnel but accomplished little. The staff is protected by civil service. About the only way to get a man out is to reorganize his section or department and cut his job from under him. But any serious moves in this direction are met by the threat of wholesale resignations. The staff has a lively morale in defending its members against removal.

Each commodity section has attached to it (1) a business adviser; (2) an economic adviser; and (3) a lawyer.

The business advisers are mostly ineffective; businessmen during the war were either too busy to go down to Washington or didn't like the pay or didn't like the "lousy working conditions," to borrow the phrase from Chester Bowles himself.

INDOCTRINATED WITH LEFT-WING IDEAS

The "economic advisers" are mostly young men fresh out of college or business school, unfamiliar with business, "indoctrinated (as businessmen put it) with left-wing ideas," and reeking with fancy ideas of "statistical methodology." Even their language is an idiom of its own, full of words like "conceptually," "administrative definition," "coordinated action," "operating level," and so on.

But the real works for the businessman who goes hat in hand to OPA is prepared for him by the OPA lawyers. Also young, doctrinaire, and intellectual, they used to be responsible not to the section head but to the head of the legal department. Congress cut this formal line of authority last year but it still operates informally. These young men interpret the law and write the regulations. The results are noteworthy.

Like the man who said, "I care not who writes the laws of a nation if I can write the songs," they can say in effect, "We care not who writes the law on price control, so long as we write the regulations and interpretations." Until last summer the businessman had no appeal except to a higher board inside OPA; even now he has practically no appeal.

Exportation of Lumber

REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, our production of lumber during the year 1935 was 27,500,000,000 board feet. Something under 400,000,000 of that was exported, and this represents a percentage less than 1.4 percent of the production of lumber in the United States during that year—1945.

Mr. Speaker, normally our imports of lumber offset our exports of lumber. I just received a letter from the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, explaining the situation, and I ask unanimous consent to extend this letter in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MARCH 11, 1946.

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BROOKS: Your letter of February 26, 1946, enclosing a letter dated February 22, 1946, from Mr. W. C. Yancey, of Shreveport, La., concerning the export of lumber, has been received.

The Department feels competent to answer only that portion of the letter regarding shipments of lumber to foreign countries. It is suggested that you contact the Civilian Production Administration regarding the request for assistance in obtaining materials and the Office of Price Administration with respect to price increases.

As a general policy the Department does not look with favor on restrictions or other artificial impediments to the free flow of international commerce.

Exports of lumber have been restricted since the beginning of World War II because of the need for it in this country. All proposed shipments are screened thoroughly by the Civilian Production Administration and the Department of Commerce, and export licenses are granted only after this screening. The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has asked that this screening be continued through 1946. Exports of lumber will be permitted in the minimum amounts absolutely necessary for the essential rehabilitation of the war-devastated countries, which is in accordance with the President's announced policy of assisting these areas, and for purposes which will result in a direct benefit to our domestic economy.

According to information received from the Department of Commerce, exports (including lend-lease shipments) of lumber during 1945 amounted to only 375,000,000 board feet, or less than 1.4 percent of the total lumber production in the United States, which totalled approximately 27½ billion board feet. Only 35 percent of the lumber exported in 1945 was of the type which could be used in housing, factory, commercial building, or millwork construction.

United States imports of lumber in 1945 were approximately 1,000,000,000 board feet, and only since the war began have imports been consistently twice as large as exports. Substantially more than half of the imports in 1945 consisted of types required for home construction. Canada is the largest source of imports and one of the principal countries of destination for exports.

The Department has been greatly concerned over the critical shortage of construction lumber, but it is convinced that in light of the foregoing, the current shortage is not caused by exports. Moreover, it appears that any further curtailment in lumber exports might bring retaliation from other countries, and this could result in decreased imports into the United States of lumber grades urgently required for housing construction.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES,

Industry's Stake in Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article which appeared on February 15, 1946, in the magazine known as Modern Industry. The article is entitled "Industry's Stake in Our Merchant Marine." The article is comprehensive and should be read by all who are interested in the future of America. A few days after the article was written the House of Representatives wrote finis to a ship-sales bill which had been nearly 2 years in the making. I wish that every citizen of this Republic could read this excellent, well-thought-out, and thought-provoking article:

INDUSTRY'S STAKE IN OUR MERCHANT MARINE

The United States now has the largest merchant marine in the history of the world.

Will we keep it?

Should we keep it?

Is it important to industry?

These questions will be answered in the coming months and years by decisions of the Congress, administration officials, shipowners, maritime labor unions, shippers, and the public.

England is working assiduously to regain supremacy of the seas. Norway, Greece, and other traditional maritime nations are planning come-backs. Russia, China, Brazil seek a slice of the world's shipping business. Even Switzerland has a merchant marine.

But today we have no definitely accepted, consistently followed maritime policy.

Our shipping men think our goal should be to carry about half our import and export

trade in American bottoms. Our State Department and some top officials in other Government agencies are against this. They believe foreign ships should carry our trade so foreign countries can earn more dollars to buy American goods.

The Navy wants to retain a big merchant fleet, both active and reserve, and a virile shipbuilding industry, as a national defense measure.

The average citizen likes to see the Stars and Stripes flying from ships in every port, but wonders if it isn't an expensive luxury.

While industry wants to shop as cheaply as possible, it also wants efficient, dependable service that will open foreign markets and sources of raw materials.

In 1936 the Congress declared for a merchant marine sufficient to carry a substantial portion of our foreign trade and to provide service on all essential routes. For whatever it's worth, this is still our official policy.

PLENTY OF CARGO, BUT—

Our imports and exports are due for a big expansion in the next few years. This expansion probably will come whether the trade is carried in United States or foreign vessels.

Most foreigners make it almost a religion to ship and travel in vessels flying their flags. Americans have never done this.

Our 1936 Merchant Marine Act states that we should have a merchant fleet capable of carrying a "substantial portion" of our international commerce. Not since the Civil War have we carried as much as 50 percent of our foreign trade in our own ships (see charts, p. 156).

In World War I and II we spent billions and sweat blood to build cargo fleets and transports. But between wars our ships rotted at anchor and our shipyards were virtually idle.

Obviously, a large merchant marine is a strong bulwark of national defense, worth considerable expense for this reason alone.

There are real advantages beyond pride and patriotism, however, in having American ships carry the goods of American manufacturers. Every ship line has agents here and abroad soliciting freight, drumming up trade, promoting imports and exports, encouraging passenger travel, finding new markets, assisting shippers in countless ways.

These representatives of American ship lines naturally will promote American trade.

American ships can give more direct and dependable service than foreign ships. For many years the only way American shippers could reach the east coast of South America was in foreign ships via European ports. This caused delays which severely handicapped them in competition with European firms. Even on the heavily traveled ship lanes, foreign vessels arrange schedules to suit the convenience of their own nationals.

American ships employ American seamen, buy American supplies, seek repair in American ports. A single line, with four passenger and a dozen cargo ships, spent $30,000,000 in a normal prewar year for wages, supplies, maintenance, and repair.

These ships buy virtually every type of American product, from light bulbs and bed sheets to cables and pumps. American shipyards, too, are big customers of American industry when they have ships to build and repair.

If it's a big merchant marine we want, why worry? We've got it. We have lots of ships, more than 5,000 of them, aggregating some 60,000,000 deadweight (cargo capacity) tons—bigger than the prewar fleets of Norway, Germany, and Japan combined. Two-thirds of the world's merchant tonnage is American-owned.

WORLD IS HUNGRY FOR SHIPS

All other nations, with the possible exception of England, now have a shipping shortage.

But it takes more than ships to make a shipping line. It also requires cargo and the ability to compete with other carriers.

Cargo to keep most of the world's shipping busy for a couple of years should be ample. But there is also plenty of competition, and more to come.

We had a big fleet after World War I; most of it, though, didn't stay on the seas long. Operating costs of United States lines have always been much higher than foreign lines because of our higher wage standards. Before the war wages of American seamen were 50 percent to 100 percent higher than foreign, and the spread is greater now. The same is true in ship-repair yards.

This means that much of our shipping will have to have an operating subsidy—really a parity payment to American workers—if it is to stay in business.

Furthermore, much of our war-built shipping is not well suited to commercial use. Half of our 5,000 new ships are Libertys, too slow to be economical on the average run. Most of our others were built for general cargo or war.

The most economical ship is one designed for certain cargo, such as cattle, ore, fruit, or meat; with speed, size, and draft suitable to the oceans and harbors it is to ply; and equipped with the right type of hatches and booms. Foreign countries, while anxious to acquire some of our surplus ships, are all building or planning specialized, efficient ships.

This competitive edge, plus lower foreign construction and operating wages, plus the obsession of foreigners to ship in their own vessels, adds up to stiff competition for American shipping lines a year or two from now, even though immediate prospects are fairly bright.

We can do several things to meet this rivalry. Of first importance are subsidies authorized by the 1936 act to offset wage differential.

SUBSIDIES VERSUS FREEDOM

Most American passenger and many freight lines took these subsidies, which before the war amounted to about 50 percent of operating costs. With the subsidies go many restrictions. The vessels must maintain certain operating standards; keep to specified routes; maintain a definite sailing schedule, whether or not they have full cargoes; submit their accounts for audit; and pay excess profits to the Maritime Commission.

On the basis of 1938 operations (the first full peacetime year of the subsidies), over a 10-year period this recapture provision, it was estimated, would pay back to the Government about two-thirds of the subsidy payments. This would suggest that American operators can compete, except, perhaps, in the luxury-passenger trade, if the Government takes part of the financial risk in building up new shipping routes and services.

Many American ship operators never applied for a subsidy, preferring freedom of operation to the rules and restrictions which accompany Government aid.

LABOR COSTS SOARED

On the other hand, labor costs have gone way up during the war. Seamen's wages, which averaged 50 percent above foreign before the war, have risen 77 percent since 1941, and maritime unions are talking about another 30-percent raise and a 40-hour workweek.

Dockside costs are up 40 percent since 1941, and longshoremen's unions have imposed restrictions on man-hour output.

Repair, conversion, and maintenance costs are far above foreign shipyard charges. Ship-operating subsidies may have to be far higher than before the war if our merchant marine is to remain large and vigorous.

Aside from its direct construction subsidy, the Maritime Commission has various trade-in, charter, and conversion provisions under which old vessels and war-built ships can be modernized and adapted to special services.

This program will give much work to many American shipyards. It will also give the right kinds of ships to meet foreign competition at investment costs not far out of line with anticipated foreign construction costs.

Domestic trade—coastwise, intercoastal, and with United States territories—has always been restricted to vessels of American registry, so no foreign competition exists here.

Before the war this trade occupied about 70 percent of United States shipping—some 8,000,000 dead-weight tons of the 11,000,000 tons of oceangoing vessels under the American flag.

Except for the territorial trade and coastwise tankers and colliers, this business has disappeared almost entirely. Ships taken by the Government for other service have been lost, converted, or worn out; hence, substantial new investment is required for vessels adapted to this type of trade.

Railroads and trucks are now handling the freight. Coastal ship lines, which weren't very prosperous before the war, will have to institute major economies to lure that business back. Since 1940 the Interstate Commerce Commission has had jurisdiction over coastwise and intercoastal rates and routes.

ICC RULES THE ROOST

The ICC is under instructions from the Congress to maintain competition between all forms of transportation. It remains to be seen whether it will approve rates which will enable ship lines to attract business and make a profit.

Meanwhile, the Maritime Commission, under temporary authority from the ICC, is resuming some intercoastal shipping services, employing private operators as its agents.

Early indications are that war-built ships are inefficient in this service. New or converted vessels might keep out of the red if their capital cost is not too high.

Under these conditions our war-built merchant fleet may be a white elephant. What to do with these ships poses tough problems.

The Government could sell them cheap to induce extensive use. But American lines would then be saddled with obsolete vessels, our shipyards would be idle, and foreigners would build for themselves efficient ships which would soon capture world trade.

This is exactly what happened after World War I, when we sold our "Hog Islanders" for whatever they would bring, which wasn't very much.

HIGHER PRICES, FEWER SALES

Or the Government could put high prices on its ships to recover as much war cost as possible. If this happens, relatively few of our 5,000 ships would be sold, since operators would prefer to have new vessels built for more efficiency.

The new legislation provides that certain ships selected by the Navy and Maritime Commission are to be laid up "in sanctuary" and maintained as a reserve fleet for future emergency. To keep this fleet from hanging over the market as a threat to prices, no vessel can be taken out of sanctuary either for sale or charter without approval by the Congress. All surplus ships unsold or unchartered after 2 years are to be added to the sanctuary or scrapped.

The cost of maintaining these reserve ships in idleness will be considerable, and it is questionable how long the taxpayers will stand for it. Our whole merchant marine and surplus-ship program probably will be reexamined within a few years.

Many economists, including several in the administration, think a big merchant marine either for use or as a defense reserve is a waste of money, a threat to other nations, an obstacle to international trade, and a continuance of an archaic kind of nationalism.

If foreign nations, with their lower construction and operating costs, they argue, are

permitted to carry the world's trade all will benefit, trade will expand, and the ship-owning nations will be able to earn foreign exchange to buy more goods in the United States and elsewhere.

GOOD BALANCE FOR FOREIGNERS

Answering this are figures showing how, in the 20 years between World Wars I and II, foreign countries derived a net favorable balance of about $40,000,000 a year from goods and passengers in the United States seaborne trades—an amount equal to only 1 percent of the average value of our exports in the same period.

Even so, American shipowners argue there is no more reason for sacrificing our merchant marine to help foreigners get dollar exchange than to surrender an export industry for this purpose.

Last fall British shipyards had under construction 209 postwar-design merchant ships totaling 1,732,380 gross tons, and they plan a ship a day during 1946.

The Swedes, with expanded shipyard capacity, have orders for 2 or 3 years ahead. Danes, Norwegians, French, and Dutch are planning to rehabilitate their yards rapidly. They will build fast, specially adapted vessels, more economical to operate than our war-built ships, with construction costs comparable to, and possibly lower than prices of our surplus ships.

ALTERNATIVE: LOWER COSTS

But American ship operators aren't licked yet. They can cut the cost of handling cargo and the length of ship turnaround time in port. Cargo-handling costs are 30 to 50 percent of shipping costs. New efficiencies and technological advances are badly needed.

Perhaps much can be adapted from the Navy's new science of packaging and materials handling, including palletized loading. Large containers instead of a cargo-sling full of small packages offer possibilities, as do experiments with new types of cranes, booms, hatches. Loaded truck trailers handled through side hatches might be feasible in the coastwise trade.

One worry to shipowners is the demand of maritime labor unions, both seafaring and dockside, for higher wages and shorter hours and their "feather bedding" rules.

WANT INTERNATIONAL PACTS

These unions are now seeking international agreements to bring foreign maritime wages up closer to our rates. If this fails, ship operators hope the unions will see that the future of their jobs depends on making American ship labor, particularly in cargo handling, more efficient than foreign.

Less government regulation and red tape would help American ship lines. One line lists 36 government agencies it must deal with.

If American industry wants an American merchant marine it can help a lot by assisting ship operators in reducing cargo-handling costs; supporting government and private programs designed to foster our shipping; and, above all, "Shipping American."

Highly Unionized Sweden Has No Labor Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the echoes of war had hardly ceased their reverberations before the American people were subjected to a bombardment of propaganda from big business. In our newspapers, in our magazines, on the radio, in paid advertising, and in free publicity space, we were told that America could reconvert from war to peace only if we bribed our big corporations, though their purses bulge with war profits, by relieving them of payment of $3,000,000,000 in wartime excess-profits taxes. Otherwise, it was hinted none too subtly, the big corporations would strike.

Mr. Speaker, we passed the law repealing the excess-profits taxes. We generously took from those most able to pay the burden of revenue and transferred it to those less able to carry the burden.

But the bribe was not big enough, or the unspoken agreement that it would be enough was not made in good faith. I do not know which, nor do you. It is an academic question. What concerns me at the moment is that before the President had signed the tax-rescission bill the same newspapers which had been telling us of these poor, poverty-stricken corporations began a new bombardment of propaganda against the unions. The unions, we learned, were too powerful. They had the audacity to ask for a decent living for their members. Even worse, they dared challenge the public statements of corporation spokesmen. The unions were bad. They had to be curbed, broken, discredited. That propaganda even was poured in our ears in this House by a few Members who criticized and assailed organized labor as if they were speaking of our wartime enemies.

The propaganda must have been skillful. A majority of the House, bamboozled by brochures, newspaper ads, articles, "news" stories, reports, dinners, meetings, nylons, telephone calls, letters, personal calls from lobbyists, and floods of propaganda in every medium, were won over, and we passed the Case bill.

It was, therefore, with great interest that I read in the Philadelphia Record of March 1 an article by Ralph H. Turner headlined "Highly unionized Sweden has no labor troubles," which I am inserting in the RECORD for the enlightenment of Members and the industrial czars and their spokesmen, feeling that if they would familiarize themselves with the splendid cooperation there is in Sweden between decent industries and organized labor they might be led to see that such a relationship is helpful and necessary in this age. Few, if any, industrialists really want to go back to the chaotic days of no unions, but a thoughtful reading of this article will suggest, I hope, that strong, unified unions are beneficial to industry.

The most enlightened self-interest would lead us here in America to study thoughtfully the Swedish plan and adapt it to our own economic and social structure.

The article follows:

HIGHLY UNIONIZED SWEDEN HAS NO LABOR TROUBLES

(By Ralph H. Turner)

STOCKHOLM, February 28.—Sweden is one of the most highly unionized nations of the world. The Swedish Trade Union Federation claims the largest labor membership in the world, in relation to population. About 90 percent of all industrial workers are organized. The federation represents about one-third of all Swedes who work for compensation.

Yet Sweden is virtually free of labor troubles. Its industry entered the postwar period unhampered by strikes or controversy. Ninety-nine percent of the wage agreements in Sweden are settled without strikes.

This record has been marred only once in recent years. The metalworkers' union struck for 5 months last year. However, this was a political strike, promoted by Communists. Neither the trade union federation, the employers, nor the Government wanted the Communists to get a toehold in Swedish industry, so they let the strike wear itself out. The metalworkers, who had asked a 10-percent wage increase, settled for 2 percent.

ONLY ONE UNION GROUP

How does Sweden achieve its labor peace? Can the United States learn anything from Sweden?

The country has only one national trade union body. Its officers think this makes for stability with employers. They imply that two competing union groups such as the A. F. of L. and CIO, impede stable labor relations.

The Swedish employers also are organized in one group, the Swedish Employers' Association. The two combinations have learned to get along without much trouble.

The trade union federation directs labor policy, the employers' association forms management policy. This arrangement makes for clear-cut positions on both sides. Then the Swedes are a homogeneous, closely knit people with a total population less than that of New York City. The total membership of their trade union federation, 1,100,000, isn't much greater than that claimed by one union in the United States, the United Automobile Workers. That makes their problem simpler.

THREE FACTORS STAND OUT

However, three factors stand out in the Swedish labor situation which may be of special interest to America:

1. The strong discipline which the Trade Union Federation exerts over its members.

2. The Swedish Labor Court.

3. The great emphasis which the Trade Union Federation places upon increased industrial production.

The Trade Union Federation is the parent body of 45 national unions organized on both a craft and an industry basis. These national unions, in turn, have their locals. But the top federation controls the activities and decisions of its member unions. It applies a much greater authority over its units than is usually the case in America.

The governing union body, for instance, may conclude an agreement with employers without the approval of the subsidiary union if negotiations become deadlocked and such action seems desirable. It did so in the metal workers' strike when it decided the union was unreasonable in rejecting the employers' terms.

NO WILDCAT STRIKES

If a proposed strike involves more than 3 percent of a union's membership, the decision to strike must be submitted to the national federation for approval. The federation may refer the question to a vote of the union's members or call a special conference for its consideration. This machinery retards hasty strike action. The wildcat strike is unheard of in Sweden.

Moreover, it is provided under Swedish law that a person "directly involved in a labor dispute" forfeits his claim to unemployment benefits.

The various industries which are members of the employers' association also conform to certain regulations set up by the governing body. A group of employers may not conclude a collective union agreement until it has been approved by the association.

Swedish labor relations are marked by moderation on both sides, by respect for law, and for an established system of settling differences. Both labor and management recognize it is simply good business to avoid strife. Their national organizations have attained a stability and an equality of status which promotes discipline and mutual understanding.

They are aided, however, by the existing machinery for settling differences and by a common desire to produce more goods.

Human Aspects of Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report of the National Committee on the Human Aspects of Reconversion, together with a letter to the President from Clarence King, chairman of the committee.

There being no objection, the report and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On October 6, 1945, we wrote you outlining the study which this committee was undertaking. On October 11 you replied requesting us to submit our report to you when it was completed. We therefore transmit herewith a brief summary of the evidence we have collected.

WHY AND HOW THE EVIDENCE WAS SECURED

During the month of October 1945, we sent the following communication to leading officials of social-service organizations in Baltimore, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Fort Worth, Greensboro (N. C.), Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Montgomery, New Haven, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Pittsburgh, Portland (Oreg.), Trenton, Wichita, and Washington, D. C.:

"This past summer a group of social work and religious leaders formed the National Committee on the Human Aspects of Reconversion. We were motivated by a concern over actual and anticipated difficulties families and individuals would face in a period of cut-backs and unemployment. We felt that our experience and professional knowledge allowed us, and other individuals in these and related fields, to bring human problems arising from reconversion to the attention of the administration, Congress, and the public. This was our particular avenue of making a contribution toward achieving a constructive reconversion program.

"Statistics on the number of people employed, the number of people seeking unemployment benefits, and the areas of greatest cut-backs are available. But the significant data that must arise from a direct concern with human values and needs has not yet been publicized. We plan to present such data to President Truman and to make it public. We ask you and 50 other social and religious leaders to help us formulate this kind of testimony by letting us know what you would like to tell the White House about the human side of reconversion in your community.

"We would like to tell the President and the public how people in your community are being affected by cut-backs. Are they seeking unemployment benefits, and if not what are their plans during this period? Are benefits in your State adequate; is increased Federal unemployment aid needed to help those without jobs manage without depressing their standards of living? What will happen to the unemployed after benefits run out, and if they must seek relief, what is the prevalent attitude about such help? What are relief standards in your community; would Federal relief aid be necessary if higher standards are to be achieved, or is your community itself planning to meet the need? How have problems of reconversion touched the returning veteran, the aged, youth, women, middle-class families? Have these problems intensified or modified conflicts around race relations and problems of minority groups?

"These are some possible questions which you might want to answer. Your community situation may prompt you to pose others. We are interested, too, in your suggestions for meeting these problems, and an expression of your opinions about the reconversion situation."

PERSONS WHO REPLIED

The replies were from social-work executives and church workers who have been in contact with the families of workers most vitally affected by the delays in reconversion, for example:

Mr. C. W. Pfeiffer, executive, Los Angeles Welfare Council.

Mr. George Thomas, race relations department, Portland (Oreg.) Council of Churches.

Miss Loula Dunn, State commissioner of public welfare, Alabama.

Miss Vilona Cutler, executive, Oklahoma City YWCA.

Mr. Thomas H. Wright, mayor's committee on race relations, Chicago.

Prof. Marion Hathway, University of Pittsburgh.

Miss Ruth Altman, executive, Jewish Social Service Association, Milwaukee.

Mrs. Isabel Burns Lindsay, director, Howard University School of Social Work, Washington, D. C.

Mr. A. F. Carlyle, executive, Goodwill Industries, Minneapolis.

Miss Dorette Rothschild, Seattle YWCA.

Mrs. Robert D. Feild, New Orleans Council of Social Agencies.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT COOPERATED

Our committee is composed of leading officials in over 25 national organizations in the fields of social service and church work. For purposes of speed we serve as a committee of individuals rather than official delegates who must report back to their agencies for approval. However, most of these organizations gave us their active cooperation, gathering information for us and putting us in touch with their local representatives. Among those most active in this regard were:

Community Chests and Councils, Inc.

National Urban League.

National Board, YWCA.

National Council, YMCA.

National Social Service Committee, UOPWA.

National Methodist Federation for Social Service.

Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches.

Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

Family Welfare Association of America.

Understanding your concern in this matter, we are privileged to lay this report before you, knowing that you will find ways of using it in support of your program. We hope that this will also suggest resources that social agencies and church groups throughout the country have for you in providing first-hand information about human needs.

Respectfully submitted.

CLARENCE KING, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE HUMAN ASPECTS OF RECONVERSION

The National Committee on the Human Aspects of Reconversion requested community leaders and agencies to report the problems faced in their localities by the end of war production and the current status of reconversion. The replies, from 19 cities, indicate confusion and tension throughout the Nation, with anticipation of an increasingly grave situation a few months from now. We have selected a few trenchant quotations from these reports to illustrate what we see as the major emphasis made by those who replied. It is our feeling that the positions of those from whom we requested reports, and the added fact that most of them before replying consulted a variety of social agencies (public and private), makes the respondents qualified to appraise their local situation accurately.

I. MANY CITIES ARE ALREADY FACING AN UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM DUE TO ABANDONMENT OF WAR PLANTS AND CUT-BACKS IN WAR EXPANDED INDUSTRIES

Chiefly affected thus far are:

A. Aged

Wichita: "The suddenness of VJ-day stunned them, and large numbers of persons did not work another hour. * * * Some of those (applying for old-age assistance) were crowded out of their marginal jobs by persons freed from the aircraft factories, and some had been cared for by relatives, but because of the loss of jobs the relatives felt that they could no longer support them."

Trenton: "I understand the X company in Camden, N. J., is not hiring older people. I believe the same may be true of Y company in New Jersey. In fact, it is said that Y company in New Jersey was in the past prone to lay off older workers to keep them from being eligible for pensions. Men over 55 were fired. One of the referees on compensation said recently that what must be done is to get the Government to reduce the age to 50 for old-age benefits. There will no doubt be the tendency to push the older workers out of the jobs."

Portland, Oreg.: "More and more we see newspaper ads: 'White, male, under 40.'"

Milwaukee: "The aged are, frankly, the first to be let out of jobs, and are considered the major problem here by the unemployment office. Little hope is held out for their future employment."

B. Negroes and other national minorities

New Haven: "A large factory found it necessary to recruit colored help from the deep South in order to perform heavy manual and disagreeable jobs. With the cessation of hostilities these individuals were immediately laid off and the company has had no sense of responsibility for their future. * * * They are trying to obtain any type of work but are not familiar with the discriminatory practices with respect to employment prevalent in New Haven. They are consequently living on their savings, if any, and in a very short time will present a direct-relief problem in the city of New Haven."

Oklahoma City: "Negroes, one-tenth of the population, find serious discrimination (in employment) at every point."

Portland, Oreg.: "USES officials will tell you in whispers that the situation is bad for the Negro. When Negro applicants are sent to employers not stating a preference, the

Negroes are more often than not refused for employment. * * * A well-informed Chinese resident told me recently that it is beginning to be more and more difficult for a Chinese person to find employment. * * * American-Japanese workers meet the same resistance confronting Negroes."

C. Women

Oklahoma City: "With the sudden closing of plants there was removed a means of livelihood for women who were the main support of their families."

Montgomery, Ala.: "Three groups have been particularly hard hit by the war's ending—the aged, the handicapped * * * and the unskilled women whose war jobs have been terminated and for whom there are no other employment openings at the present time."

Detroit: "Women are being fired from jobs on the basis of any minor infraction."

Milwaukee: "Three-fourths of the unemployed in this city are women. However, only one-quarter of the available jobs are for women. The newspapers here are trying to create the impression that women are happy to be released from work and to return to the kitchen. Nevertheless, their interviews with women seem to indicate the contrary. Now that women have found it interesting and often necessary to work, they would like to have further opportunities."

Wichita: "I have been informed by workers in permanent employment here in Wichita that their employers are trying to rid themselves of their women workers, and in some instances men over 33 years of age."

Washington, D. C.: "The largest District of Columbia industry is government which has no unemployment benefits. Thousands of Government workers jobs are being terminated such as WPB, 2,500 on September 30, 1,800 more on October 1."

II. GREATER ACUTENESS WILL BE FELT IN A FEW MONTHS WHEN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND SAVINGS ARE EXHAUSTED, AND AS VETERANS RETURN.

Pittsburgh: "It is estimated that there will be one-half million unemployed in Pennsylvania in 1946. For the next 6 months labor shortages and unemployment will exist side by side, inasmuch as the job openings require the type of worker who is not yet available."

Dallas: "When savings have been depleted and benefits have been exhausted, workers will either have to leave the county, accept the few marginal jobs that are available, or remain unemployed. With over 3,000 veterans returning each month, the size of the unemployment problem will grow accordingly unless there is extensive out-migration. . . . Plants built here during the war and owned by the Government, viz: North American Aviation, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Continental Motors, and so forth, are closing down, and as far as can be noted there are no conversion plans."

Wichita: "It is generally felt here that there will be no measurable pick-up in employment until spring, and some of the workers have only 14 more weekly payments coming."

Portland, Oreg.: "The principal war industry was shipbuilding. The shipyards were thrown up in a temporary fashion to serve war production purposes, and are not adaptable to conversion to other types of manufacture. The two main prewar industries are lumber and agriculture. This means that Oregon, if it is to escape a devastating period of depression, is going to have to encourage new industries."

Detroit: "250,000 Detroit veterans are still in the Army with about 100,000 expected home within the next 4 or 5 months. They are coming to a city wholly unprepared to meet them, and at the same time keep the non-veteran in his job and in his home. In other words, either the veteran can expect no job and no house, or someone is going to be pushed out."

New Haven: "The veteran is returning to a city that faces a great deal of unemployment, and it is extremely difficult to understand how the veteran is going to obtain work unless he accepts * * * low-price jobs."

Milwaukee: "Immediately after VJ-day, 1,500 (Negroes) lost their jobs. One thousand Negroes are expected back from the armed services and will also be looking for jobs."

Trenton: "Veterans have come back to non-existent jobs."

III. IN-MIGRANTS CREATE A SPECIAL PROBLEM

Los Angeles: "It is my opinion that a desperate situation will develop in California if unemployment becomes a major problem, due to the fact that such a large number of people will be excluded from public assistance because of our 3-year (residence) law. Private agencies would not be able to relieve the situation even to a minor degree. Most of the social workers of the State favor the extension of social security so as to provide a fourth category of general relief."

Portland, Oreg.: "A large proportion of the workers who came in the latter half of 1944 and early 1945 are remaining in this area through choice or because of lack of sufficient funds to move elsewhere. * * * Many have come from fields of employment not covered by unemployment insurance and * * * were employed for a very short period in a covered class."

Dallas: "(Before the war) the county had only 26,000, or less than 17 percent of its total employment * * * in manufacturing industries. * * * When total war production * * * Dallas was flooded with in-migrants. * * * Manufacturing employment had soared to 85,000, accounting for 40 percent of total employment. On October 1, less than 5,000 workers were engaged in war employment. * * * Manufacturing employment had decreased to 34,000. * * * Workers and their families are hanging on with the hope that some * * * manufacturer will buy and convert the sprawling North American plant to civilian production."

Wichita: "It has been suggested that this community is attempting to get the idea across to the majority of these people (in-migrants) that there is no place for them in the future picture here. There most certainly is none in their former homes. And under the settlement laws of Kansas, this county is charged with their care when they have been here 1 year or more, and they will not be welcomed in many instances if they attempt to return to their former homes."

Baltimore: "Maryland's population (particularly Baltimore) has increased greatly since the war. * * * It is beginning to look as if the majority (of the newcomers) will choose to remain here."

New Haven: "The average employer feels he has no responsibility for bringing these individuals into New Haven and leaving them high and dry at the present time. It is very common to hear on the streets about these people, and there seems to be growing resentment among the unthinking class toward these rather helpless individuals, hence, the powder keg we are sitting on."

IV. JOBS AVAILABLE ARE SUBSTANDARD

New Orleans: "Jobs are available in numbers and variety * * * but wage rates vary from 40 cents to $1.20 an hour. Industry, by and large, is trying to force a return to pre-war wages which tended, even prewar to be substandard, and which now for take-home pay are so low in the face of increased living costs during the past 5 years, that workers are refusing jobs as long as they can possibly hold out and live."

Pittsburgh: "The openings for men at the present time are on 'hot, dirty jobs' and pay about $32 a week. Job openings for women today are in laundries, paying 40 cents an hour. In spite of reduced earnings retail prices are expected to continue at the present level and the worker will be required to reduce expenditures by lowering his standards of consumption."

Milwaukee: "Fifty percent of the jobs available here are said to pay 50 cents an hour or less."

Fort Worth: "A large number of the 3,395 job openings listed September 9, 1945, offered salaries from 50 cents to 85 cents an hour."

Baltimore: "The UAW office tells of cases of people who are being denied compensation because they refuse jobs in our low-wage canneries, where wages are often less than $20 a week."

Denver: "There is a trend already evident that businessmen are trying to cut back to prewar or salary levels in office, industry, sales, and service jobs. Denver had a low salary scale before the war."

New Orleans: "Of 4,793 job openings, 1,000 offered 50 cents an hour or less; 2,677 offered 50 to 74 cents an hour, over 2,000 of these jobs being for unskilled workers."

Minneapolis: "United States Employment Service reports that since VJ-day 11,000 registrations and requests for unemployment compensation have been made. Of this number, only 2,200 people have drawn unemployment compensation * * * there are now about 5,000 openings with shorter hours and smaller pay."

V. IF THESE PEOPLE FALL ON LOCAL RELIEF FUNDS, LOCALITIES FEEL THEY CANNOT ADEQUATELY MEET THE PROBLEM—IN SOME CASES NOT AT ALL; IN OTHERS, AT MINIMAL LEVEL

Baltimore: "At present the relief situation here is extremely grave, since neither the State nor the Baltimore Department of Welfare have any funds which can be used for an employable man or his family when the man cannot find employment."

Greensboro, N. C.: "Relief funds are at present not adequate to meet the need of any great number of unemployed persons because our funds are available primarily to those who are unemployable."

New Haven: "There is no hope for increased standards in my community and neighboring communities. * * * Federal aid would be necessary if higher standards are to be achieved, but it is the hope of every progressive individual * * * that a well-planned public-works program be instituted instead of the old FERA."

Wichita: "Kansas relief grants are at or below the national average. I do not know how this community can meet the need. * * * We can issue no bonds with the exception of a special election, and we are allowed to issue only approximately $50,000 'no-fund' warrants, so this community will not be able, by any stretch of the imagination, to take up the slack when unemployment compensation stops."

Denver: "The relief standards are not high; also there is a bad clause in the unemployment compensation legislation of the State which bases the authority for decision on willingness of the client to accept a 'suitable job.' * * * The only plan for postwar government jobs is in road building. It is, therefore, evident that Federal help will be needed."

New Orleans: "In Louisiana and Mississippi it is probable that 200,000 to 500,000 less people will be able to get their livelihood from the farm in 1950 than in 1940. * * * If the competition of these surplus workers for jobs is not to drive down wage scales and lower the buying power of the area, a large public-works program will be necessary, and the financial condition of the State and local governments gives little hope that it can be handled without substantial Federal aid."

VI. TENSIONS ALREADY EXIST

Los Angeles: "The problems of interracial tensions seem to be increasing. It is estimated that our Negro population is now about 100 percent greater than it was in 1940, amounting in the county to close to 150,000 people. The housing problem is particularly acute for this group. There is now a steady flow of Japanese people back to this community, which is increasing the pressure in those areas of the city where there are no restrictive covenants, which is where the Negroes live. In addition to unfavorable attitudes of the dominant group toward the various minorities, we get reports of friction between these minority groups. * * * It is highly important that they be given access to employment in the change-over to peacetime occupation."

Detroit: "The keynote of people in Detroit is fear. People are waiting. They are not leaving town. They are not going to spend too much money. They are fearful of unemployment and of lower take-home pay."

Milwaukee: "A State FEPC has just been established here; * * * but the law has no teeth, as no penalties are provided. * * * There have been instances where Negroes felt that the USES has sent them to jobs they would be sure to refuse and thus forfeit their claims to compensation. * * * Among the Japanese who have settled in Milwaukee during the war there is a feeling of fearfulness as unemployment increases. So far the Japanese have been considered unusually well received here. * * * While there is a great deal of anti-Semitism in this community, there have been no open attacks recently related to the reconversion situation."

Dallas: "We are finding that people are experiencing some difficulty in adjusting to lower salaries and harder working conditions than they enjoyed during the war. The more stable people are handling this situation without undue conflict, but even they sometimes find it impossible to meet living expenses, which are still as high as they were during the war, on a salary which is considerably lower. As was predicted, many of the hasty war marriages are culminating in desertion and divorce, as the tension and strain of reconversion becomes more pressing."

Oklahoma City: "Race relations have deteriorated seriously as overcrowding and unemployment have aggravated a chronic social ill. * * * The public conscience seems very dull to inequalities that could easily be corrected."

Pittsburgh: "There is evidence of strain in the Pittsburgh community, though up to the present time open conflict has not appeared. * * * Apparent in the situation is the reappearance of discriminatory practices on the part of employers."

Denver: "The effects on youth show restlessness, delinquency on the increase. * * * The head of the USES said: 'Already the conflicts around race relations and the problems of minority groups have been intensified.'"

Trenton: "The resentment by Negroes and other minority groups over the return of discriminatory practices is being intensified. Those employed after June 1943 may not get reemployment. Of course, the Negroes were hired after June 1943."

Portland, Oreg.: "Hundreds of Negroes are seeking work in this area today. The abruptness these people meet when contacting employers and labor-union officials is creating an attitude of resentment and causing increased racial tensions. There is some apprehension over the move to place the USES under state control. When this happens the one hope of reasonably fair treatment will be removed, and the Negroes as well as those workers of other minorities will be subjected to a State and city administration that has yet to show interest in the various racial minorities in Oregon. * * * Here on the west coast we have the oriental problem as well as those issues involving the Negro * * *.

"The United States Government should delay passing all its controls over to the States before it has definitely determined that the States are equipped to handle the job with the same efficiency and fairness that the Federal Government exercises. * * * It would be a mistake to lift Federal control of employment and housing before the States have developed a well-geared postwar program covering all the people within their borders."

Therefore we urge:

1. Immediate action for Federal responsibility for full employment.
2. Extension of Federal social-security measures to include a category of general relief and special relief for transients.
3. Liberalization of unemployment-insurance benefits including travel allowance for displaced war workers.
4. Federalization of USES.
5. A permanent national FEPC.
6. Amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase minimum wages.

Amvets Seek President Truman's Aid for Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include copies of a telegram that was sent to President Truman by Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—and a letter sent to the White House by a committee of amputees stationed at Walter Reed Hospital representing more than 350 disabled veterans, also a statement issued by Henry Ford Co. pledging assistance to all amputees who desire to operate automobiles. The documents follow:

MARCH 8, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

A committee representing 350 amputees at Walter Reed have requested an appointment with you relative to securing special made automobiles for these disabled veterans. Please advise.

J. H. LEIB,
National Legislative Director, Amvets.

WAR AMPUTEES CAR COMMITTEE,
WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1946.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A large number of amputees, as a result of our service-inflicted injuries, have come to realize the importance of having a car. We cannot live on an equal basis with the able-bodied without it. The hazards and difficulties of day to day existence now, crowded transportation, faulty artificial legs, and a rough terrain—all this has imposed on us the necessity of having a car.

To this end some 350 amputees of this hospital have signed their names to a petition stating that they be supplied with an automobile by the Government.

We, the committee representing these men, feel that if a meeting could be arranged with you, with the object of soliciting your interest and advice it would help considerably in advancing the cause of the disabled who have lost their legs.

Sincerely,
FRANK M. MONICO, *Chairman.*

[From Ford News Bureau]

DEARBORN, MICH.—Henry Ford has stated that "no man who lost a limb in the armed services of our country in this war is going to have to pay anything extra to drive a Ford automobile."

The Ford Motor Co. will provide free, special automobile driving equipment for veterans who have lost arms or legs in the war.

This equipment can be installed in any Ford automobile, including Mercurys, and in new or prewar models. Variations have been developed to compensate for every known combination of amputations, and they will not interfere with normal operation of the car.

"The least we can do for these men," Mr. Ford said, "is to be sure that they get an even break with men who come back without major disabilities, and we do not want any profit incentive to enter into this picture."

Mr. Ford's statement followed an announcement in Washington recently by the Office of the Surgeon General to the effect that while automotive engineers have made it possible for armless and legless men to drive automobiles, the extra charge "in many cases" may be considerable.

The Surgeon General's Office asked the Society of Automotive Engineers to work on devising appliances so that men with amputations could drive automobiles. The SAE, in turn, called upon the Ford Motor Co. and other automobile manufacturers to work as a committee on this.

The Outlook for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Outlook for Peace, delivered by me to the Canadian Club, in Ottawa, Canada, on March 5 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I consider it a real privilege to have this opportunity to speak to, and to visit with, the members of the Canadian Club of Ottawa. It is scarcely necessary for me to tell you of the admiration and profound respect which the people of my country entertain for the people of Canada. The fact is that we feel so close to you that it rarely occurs to us even to think about international or foreign relations with Canada. As friends and neighbors, we don't think of you as foreign at all. In casual conversation with some of your citizens, I find you have many of the internal characteristics of my country—States' rights and sectionalism.

In spite of our familiarity with some of your products, it is amazing how little our people in the United States know about Canada. Many still think you are an oppressed colony of King George—they are not sure whether it is the III or the VI.

It was suggested that I discuss today some aspect of international relations. All that I shall attempt today is to make a few observations about international affairs which I think appropriate for the consideration of those gentlemen in government who determine policy on the highest level.

Under our system the Senate can merely advise—cannot control our foreign policy directly. It may not be amiss to remind you that we do not have a parliamentary system such as you have, and our Chief Executive is not directly subject to the control of our Congress, although under our Constitution Senators do have a right to offer advice to the President. Sometimes we even offer advice to diplomats.

When a great struggle is over, there is always some measure of disillusionment, a let-down, a taste of ashes in the mouth. Peace seems, to some, a pale, undramatic disappointing thing when the ghastly exhilaration of war fades into the past. It is then that unity falls away like a husk and divisions deepen. It is then that with unseemly haste we seek to forget the war; to forget the sacrifices of those young men, for whom subconsciously we all feel a responsibility. It was in just such an atmosphere that 25 years ago we made the decisions which resulted in the recent catastrophe to our civilization. It is when it appears that we are unable to learn the lesson of those two wars that sometimes I think the human race is determined to commit suicide.

I may be unduly pessimistic, but it is difficult for me to see the pattern of a happy future in the atomic bomb, jet-propelled airplanes, Mr. Stalin's latest 5-year plan, and our own vacillation on critical issues. This morning's paper didn't add anything to my confidence. It is true that we survived the first meeting of the UNO without drawing pistols or knives, although at times it looked as if that might happen. I confess that to me the future is not an open book, and it is with a profound feeling of inadequacy that I offer any suggestions about international policy. The only premise that I feel certain about in these remarks is that if we follow a policy now, similar to that which we followed after the last war, the result is likely to be the same. In other words, what I really am suggesting is that something different be attempted. We have had alliances before, we have had leagues of nations, and treaties of peace; I should like something new. If it is impossible on a universal level, then on a more restricted basis.

Relative to the communities of peoples of Europe and Asia, we in the New World are young, but that does not necessarily mean that we have nothing to offer that old and despairing world. It may well be that our very inexperience, our unawareness of the futility of former efforts to prevent war, will permit us to have the boldness and originality essential to the creation of a world of peace and decency. It could be that our detachment from the strife and misery of Europeans will enable us to see the lesson of history more clearly and objectively than those bewildered people, and from that lesson to formulate a solution to the problem that confronts us. Perhaps we may be like the young man Fuller wrote about when he said:

"History maketh a young man to be old without wrinkles or grey hairs: privileging him with the experience of age, without either the infirmities or inconveniences thereof. * * * Old actions return again, furbished over with some new and different circumstances."

It is my hope that we can furnish something new to our present circumstances.

My own thoughts about something different center around the first principle of the San Francisco Charter which states that "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members." If this principle means that the first concern of the Organization is the preservation of absolute national sovereignty, as that term is traditionally understood, then it is difficult for me to believe that anything new or different has been added. If all our future conferences and treaties are to be restricted to the development of agreements for which there are no sanctions other than the immediate national interests of each sovereign state, as interpreted by officials temporarily occupying positions of power, I can see little reason to hope that nationalism will not again erupt into war. And if the atomic scientists have not misled us, an atomic war is scarcely designed to invigorate our civilization. I can see no reason to believe that, if nations are left free, as they have been in the past, to act in accord with what they conceive to be their immediate self-interest, in each instance, they will not drift into another war and probably a little sooner than they used to. As Secretary Byrnes put it, "We do not want to stumble and stagger into situations where no power intends war, but no power will be able to avert war."

Statesmen, or perhaps I should say officials, often speak glibly of outlawing this or that practice among sovereign nations, as if such a statement had some profound meaning. Law as among sovereigns is a misnomer. By law I mean those rules that apply to people rather than states. It is, I submit, the sovereignty that must give way to law if anything different is to come out of the UNO.

The fundamental principle upon which all successful communities of peoples have been founded is law. Law in the early family and tribe, just as it is in this Nation today, merely meant rules of conduct to which all were subject, and which were enforceable by the collective might of the community. Without these rules of conduct, there was chaos; every man against every other man. Without these rules there could be no commerce, no security of the person, no peace, no opportunity for progress or decency of any kind. Without these rules of conduct we were similar to, if not worse than, the animals in the forest.

If it be true that there can be no lasting peace among men, without law, then our policy should be clear. Rules of conduct can be established over peoples in two ways; either by force or by agreement. To do it by force means persistent and successful warfare until one nation imposes its will on all others. For you Canadians, or for us in the United States, this policy is unwise. It is contrary to our traditions, it has little chance of success, as the Germans have shown us twice, and it is abhorrent to most of us. To do it by agreement is in accord with our traditional beliefs and practices. If I should select one outstanding characteristic of English-speaking peoples, it would be their ability to create, and to abide by, rules of conduct based upon justice. In view of our long and successful experience in the art of government by law, it seems to me to be our particular responsibility to assume the leadership and to exert all our influence toward the creation of rules of conduct applicable to all peoples. The logical subject matter for a beginning is armaments, including the atomic bomb. The machinery to begin with may be created by relatively simple amendments to the Charter of the United Nations. The modification of the veto provisions and the delegation of certain rule-making powers to the UNO would go far toward the accomplishment of our purpose.

I quite agree with what I am sure is in the minds of many of you, that it is all very well to talk of rules of conduct, but under the present unsettled conditions in the world it is not very practicable, or hopeful of immediate accomplishment. That view has new emphasis from your own recent experiences. My point is that granted that we are unable to obtain law at the moment, I think it is highly important, nevertheless, that we recognize that law is our ultimate goal. I object to the first principle of the UNO because it denies in effect the goal which I believe constitutes the principal hope for lasting peace. I object to the principle because it reaffirms and approves the doctrine of national sovereignty which is inconsistent with binding rules of conduct and a denial of the principle of the fraternity of the human family. If I could feel confident that we are agreed that our ultimate purpose is the establishment of universal rules binding upon the peoples of the earth, then I should have much more enthusiasm for the solution of the immediate problems which confront us.

On last Wednesday, in the Senate of the United States, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, one of the powerful advocates of the United Nations, delivered a most admirable speech in defense of the first meeting of the Organization in London. On the following Thursday evening Secretary of State Byrnes made a notable statement to the Overseas Press Club in New York. Both of these speeches reaffirmed our allegiance to, and our belief in, the United Nations Organization. Both speeches have been interpreted as being tactful, but firm, warnings to Russia not to go too far in the expansion of her power over neighboring states. As a result of Russia's unilateral action in Iran, in Manchuria, and eastern Europe the notion has grown that we must be more firm, some say tough, in our attitude toward Russia.

This reaction is quite natural and I suppose is in accord with the traditional concepts of international diplomacy. The trouble with it is that it is too much like our traditional diplomacy. There is nothing new in it. It merely emphasizes the fact that the world is made up of dynamic units called sovereignties which have no rules to control their chaotic and conflicting impulses. A short time before the initial meeting of the UNO Prime Minister King of Canada, Mr. Ernest Bevin, and Mr. Anthony Eden had on different occasions alluded to the question of sovereignty and suggested that the time has arrived to consider the abrogation of national sovereignty. These three statesmen recognized that some modification of extreme nationalism is essential if we are to establish any effective rules applicable to all peoples.

It was disappointing to me that at the meeting in London this enlightened suggestion was not pursued further. So far as I know, no further mention was made of it. Nevertheless, in Mr. Byrnes' speech on last Thursday night at several points he referred to law, I quote:

"Unless the great powers are prepared to act in the defense of law the United Nations cannot prevent war."

At another point he said:

"Our power thus maintained cannot and will not be used for aggressive purposes. Our tradition as a peace-loving, law-abiding, democratic people should be an assurance that our force will not be used except in the defense of law."

And a third time he said:

"Great powers as well as small powers have agreed under the United Nations Charter not to use force or the threat of force except in defense of law and the purposes of the Charter."

I have puzzled my brain at some length trying to determine just exactly what the Secretary meant when he used the word "law." In the absence of any previous expression on the part of my Government, that it has seriously contemplated any abrogation of its classical sovereignty, I have concluded that he referred to the obligations under the United Nations which are subject to the veto of the interested parties, and are not subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of any court. Regardless of his meaning, it is apparent that he did not intend in this off-hand way, to introduce anything new or revolutionary into the theory of international politics. I wish that he had.

In spite of this disappointment, I think Mr. Byrnes' speech had merit to it. He recognized plainly the necessity for maintaining a proper balance of power among the great nations, and by implication he pledged the United States to maintain that balance. One of the most significant statements was as follows:

"The present power relationships of the great states preclude the domination of the world by any one of them. Those power relationships cannot be substantially altered by the unilateral action of any one great state without profoundly disturbing the whole structure of the United Nations."

In a later passage he referred to the source of our most profound anxiety in these words:

"Though the status quo is not sacred and unchangeable, we cannot overlook a unilateral gnawing away at the status quo. The Charter forbids aggression and we cannot allow aggression to be accomplished by coercion or pressure or by subterfuges such as political infiltration."

These are rather strong words and are completely apposite to the situation in the Middle East and also in eastern Europe. I think it is obvious that until this gnawing away is stopped and the world has a breathing spell in which to gather its strength and get its bearings, it is futile to think of creating any genuine law among nations. And yet until we are able to agree upon rules governing at least the production of atomic bombs, there can be little confidence in our security.

With the first meeting of the UNO past, and these two expressions from responsible leaders in my country, it is my hope that the great powers will now proceed to the settlement of the most pressing problems confronting us. The first and foremost problem that must be settled, if the balance of power is not to be irreparably upset, is the rehabilitation of western Europe. If western civilization is to play its proper role in the world of the future, it is essential that it be stabilized politically and revitalized economically. The political decisions about Germany and the Ruhr should be concluded without further delay. The final determination of Italy's fate should likewise be settled. While I hope wise decisions may be made in these questions, still the uncertainty and confusion in these countries are so great that it may well be that more harm will result from delay than from a bad decision. It is only natural that from continuing confusion there should develop some form of dictatorship or communism rather than government by the people themselves.

The same observation may be made regarding the Middle East and the Far East. Authoritarian control of these areas by determined minorities is the probable result of a prolonged period of uncertainty. No arrangements for orderly trade or commerce can be made under such conditions and government by the peoples concerned can scarcely be expected to develop. The balance of power between the democratic west and the Communist east is exceedingly difficult to maintain if some order is not brought into these areas. It is in these areas that I should like to see greater responsibility given the UNO. If an intelligent use of the trusteeship machinery could be made it should answer the mutual fear and suspicion of contending parties. If a solution is sought by each party acting alone, it is inevitable that each should think the other is gnawing away at the status quo. The settlement of the critical points of conflict should be on a multilateral basis instead of the traditional formula of every nation for itself.

If I may be permitted one further observation about Secretary Byrnes' speech, there is one passage which, if concurred in by the other members, may prove to be significant. That passage concerned the action of Britain and France after the Russian veto of the American resolution on Syria and Lebanon in which he said:

"This indicates that the mere legal veto by one of the permanent members of the council does not, in fact, relieve any state, large or small, of its moral obligation to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter."

Thus in a few words the Secretary seems to say that, in spite of the absence of law in the technical, legal sense, there is a moral law superior to the sovereignty of the constituent national States, and that he considers the nations bound to act in accordance therewith. If the conscience of mankind is sufficiently sensitive to this challenge, then there is, indeed, hope for a better day. But it is difficult to believe that our conscience is this sensitive until we give better evidence of our willingness to make real sacrifices for the accomplishment of our principles. We in the United States especially since the end of the fighting have not demonstrated a willingness to bear the burdens of leadership. We cannot go back to business as usual while the world is starving. There is a lack of substance to our fine words when everyone knows that we have demobilized haphazardly and so rapidly that we have little available power to back up those words. Power without principles of justice is tyranny. Principles without power is futility. If we are to lead this world along the path of peace and justice, we must couple power with principle within the framework of a living vital United Nations.

In the hard world of practical politics many people are inclined to think that everything that is not for the immediate, tangible advantage of one's own people is idealistic and impractical. Those of us who advocate establishment of law applicable to peoples rather than nations are usually said to be dreamers and do-gooders. I believe the truth is exactly the opposite—law is the most practical, hard-headed, realistic solution.

In conclusion may I say that I am in thorough agreement with Senator VANDENBERG and Secretary Byrnes that the world's best hope is in making the UNO work. I believe it can be made to work, but it will not work of itself. There are several very good reasons why Canada and the United States should take the lead in making it work, especially by bringing to it the traditions and practices which we have developed through many years of self-government. We are really the favored nations of this earth. We are the heirs of all that is best of western civilization. We have suffered relatively less than any of the major combatants in this war. We have more to lose from continuing chaos or from another war than any people on earth. In short, we have the power and we have every reason to exercise a determined and effective leadership in the creation of a new order on this earth, an order based upon law and justice. The real question for us is, Do we have the will to pull ourselves together and do it?

Justice to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an outstanding speech made over Station WORC, Worcester, Mass., on February 24, 1946, by the Honorable Robert F. Bradford, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, under the auspices of the Polish American Congress, Inc., western Massachusetts branch:

It has been said that history is the life of nations, and life is the history of humanity. The passing centuries have witnessed the rise and fall of many countries, just as in the uneven life of man, successes and failures mark his path. A country—a nation which loses its independence, its freedom, is like a man who has lost his soul. And those bearing the grave responsibility for causing this loss, whether designing groups or coldly calculating nations, have been guilty of a supreme crime against humanity. Looking backward we have seen in the past a world of power politics. That world motivated by alternating currents of fear, power, and dominion could never peaceably endure. And so it bore the punishment of war, famine, pestilence, and death. The horror of violent conflict became more destructive as time went on, but the dread lesson was never learned, even at frightful cost to the cause of civilization.

Today the thunder of warfare still echoes in our ears. The most recent fighting is over. That fighting took courage for there were dark days indeed. Now we are in desperate need of something more than raw courage—we must have wisdom as well. And we must live in peace together as our fellow men and women died together to make that peace possible.

Abraham Lincoln said, "No nation can live half slave and half free." We know today that no world can live half slave and half free. If there is to be security throughout the globe, there can be no festering spot, no country or nation diseased by the intolerance of others, or the abuse of its own freedom.

Can there be justice for Poland and not for every other nation? Can there be justice for other nations and not for Poland? The answer to both questions is "No." All nations, great and small alike, are built about the men, women, and children who compose them. To appropriate these lives, to disregard their culture and religious beliefs, to impose upon them an alien economic order is to sow again, as the world has sown many times before, the seeds of new conflict.

If the world grants simple justice to Poland, it will be doing justice to all nations and fulfilling an obligation to one whose contribution to the civilization, culture, sciences, and arts of mankind has far more than paid its way.

From the tenth century until the tragedy of the first partitioning in the latter part of the eighteenth century, Poland was an enormous country. Only Russia, among all the nations of Europe, possessed greater territory. That vast area of 272,000 square miles was as large as the German Empire, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark together.

The Poland of that day was nonaggressive and tolerant of others. By her very constitution, offensive warfare was prohibited. A republic with an elected king, before each King of Poland was chosen, he was made to swear that he would tolerate all sects and religious beliefs. The Constitution of Poland scrupulously adhered to the principle of Christian morality. As early as the latter part of the fourteenth century, Poland had a senate and a house of representatives—that was the beginning of the representative democracy in action.

It has been said that Polish independence came to a virtual end in 1696, 100 years before the tragedy of the partitions. This because the four kings who succeeded John Sobieski were imposed on their electors by foreign powers. No longer was it possible to proceed with the reforms that were so vitally needed in the country. And the foreign

powers lent their weight to this fatal condition because of their ultimate plans to partition the country and destroy its entity.

In 1795 the third partition erased Poland from the map of Europe. The despoilation of a great country was accomplished. But in the hour of humiliation, the greatness of a great people was established. The patriots of Poland were one day to witness the decline and fall of the very empires who had preyed upon them.

The Napoleonic wars gave birth to a new hope of freedom which endured the most trying vicissitudes. The century which followed was the unhappiest in all of Poland's history. Endless blood was shed in heroic but futile atempts to regain freedom. But through all those long terrible years the flaming Polish spirit remained unquenchable. In 1914 a new struggle was launched. Its surging force would not be denied. At long last it culminated in Poland's resurrection as a republic, after more than a century of political oblivion.

It was on the 8th day of January 1918, that President Wilson devoted the thirteenth of his famous fourteen points to the necesity of creating an independent Polish state.

And 1 year before that President Wilson in an address to the United States Senate on January 22, 1917, said, and I quote: "Statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent, and autonomous Poland," and that "industrial and social development should be guaranteed to all peoples who lived hitherto under the power of governments devoted to a faith and purpose hostile to their own; that no nation should seek to extend its policy over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid."

Those ideals so earnestly expressed seem single truths today. When Wilson said, "No right anywhere exists to hand people about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property," he spoke for the spirits of those undying souls through the centuries who had sacrificed everything that Poland might live.

After the First World War Poland immediately proceeded with her rehabilitation. It is so tragic that all of the supreme sacrifices were to gain for her so few years of peace. Who could foresee that only 20 years would pass before the holocaust was to strike once again at her very heart?

The shadow of coming events was foretold when Germany gobbled Czechoslovakia in March of 1939. Undaunted, Poland entered into an alliance with France and England within 3 weeks. Then came the blow of the Soviet-German pact in August. The last barrier to invasion had been overcome. And invasion came but 1 week later.

Alone, Poland fought with Germany with incredible fury and fanaticism for 35 days. Unfortunately, human strength and endurance could stand just so much. Out of it all the epic defense of defiant Warsaw is one of sheer heroism that will never be forgotten. There the world saw an almost unbelievable willingness to die for ideals—that alone should inspire the world to do justice to Poland.

With the fall of their country, thousands made their way to France, England and Belgium and begged the opportunity to carry on the fight. They did, on the battlefields of France. There the Polish First Division lost almost half of its combat strength and every unit of the Second Division was decorated with the French Croix de Guerre. A second Polish Army was formed in England. Its aviators in the immortal Battle of Britain rose to the defense of freedom. Poles fought in the snow of Norway and the blistering heat of the African deserts. Wherever allied arms took up the fight alongside were warriors from Polish soil. For these things the world owes justice to Poland.

The indestructible spirit of the Polish brigade was outstanding in the terrible battles at Cassino and Ancona. It was their heroic charge that contributed so much to the break-through at Cassino that changed the tide of Allied fortunes in Italy. For that the world owes justice to Poland.

The Polish underground movement that forced the Nazis to maintain 19 divisions in Poland in addition to thousands of guards, police and S. S. men was a vital contribution. Trainloads of resisting civilians were moved about as cattle. Tens of thousands disappeared into the maw of Germany. In their memory, the world owes justice to Poland, and the duty to consummate it.

What happens to freedom in Poland, happens to freedom everywhere. If Poland is to be free and secure, it must be economically strong.

President Truman in a Navy Day speech said, "We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." If words have meaning, those words mean Poland. From the very birth of our great country, Poland has been friendly to our cause. From our revolution, through the growth of our Nation, and through two world wars, Poland has been unequivocally on the side of justice and right, alongside democracy.

Simple justice will obtain a free and secure Poland, strong enough to play the role destiny has thrust upon it. The Poles are not a homeless people for whom a country must be found. They have occupied the lands within their frontiers for centuries.

Four million of her sons and daughters have come to our shores and have taken a distinctive place in the industry, professions, and government of our country. For that we owe justice to Poland. It can be done and must be done. It is the American way. With God's will, let it be done.

Public-Opinion Polls in Thirtieth Pennsylvania District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months I have conducted two extensive polls of public opinion in my district on a number of vital legislative issues.

I represent the Thirtieth Pennsylvania District, which includes four wards of the city of Pittsburgh and all of the boroughs and townships of northern Allegheny County. The district contains an important number of mills and coal mines, numerous farms, and many residential districts. Economically it varies all the way from areas of extreme wealth to areas of extreme poverty. The voters in the district are almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. How definitely it is a marginal district is illustrated by the fact that only one Congressman from the district has been reelected to a second successive term since 1930. These facts indicate that the Thirtieth District of Pennsylvania may be regarded as being as much an average district as it is possible to find.

In determining the prevailing opinion of the people there we selected from the lists of registered voters an equal number of Republicans and Democrats in each voting precinct. To them we mailed a questionnaire containing 10 questions. We attempted to so word the questions that they would in no way influence the answers. The first poll resulted in more than 2,500 signed replies. The results are here listed without comment:

	For	Against
1. Do you favor peacetime compulsory military training?	*Percent* 69	*Percent* 31
2. Do you favor unemployment compensation of $25 per week for 26 weeks?	40	60
3. Should the Federal Government assume responsibility for full employment?	33	67
4. Should the Federal tax on oleomargarine be abolished?	88	12
5. Should incomes under $1,500 be tax exempt?	74	26
6. Should the Presidency be limited to 2 terms?	83	17
7. Do you favor socialized medicine?	38	62
8. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	68	32
9. Do you favor President Truman's suggestion to raise judicial and congressional salaries? (There were 53 more votes for the proposal than against.)	50	50
10. Should the Speaker of the House supplant the Secretary of State in the order of Presidential succession?	60	40

The second poll which has just been completed resulted in more than 8,000 signed replies. A greater number of questionaires were sent out and excellent newspaper and radio publicity resulted in greater public interest. Again we found some composite public viewpoints that were startling. Here are the final percentages:

	For	Against
1. Do you favor the continuation of price controls for another year?	*Percent* 83.0	*Percent* 17.0
2. Do you favor a national minimum wage of 65 cents per hour?	74.0	26.0
3. Do you favor Truman's prepaid (health insurance) medical-care program?	56.0	44.0
4. Should a 30-day cooling-off period be required before a strike?	88.0	12.0
5. Should fact-finding bodies be given free access to company records?	50.7	49.3
6. Should unemployment compensation be paid at a maximum of $25 a week for 26 weeks?	59.0	41.0
7. Do you believe the Selective Service Act should be renewed after May 15?	61.0	39.0
8. Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training?	68.0	32.0
9. Do you favor the proposed loan to Great Britain?	24.0	76.0
10. Do you think demobilization has been fast enough?	82.0	18.0

A few observations may be helpful. The constancy of public support for peacetime military training is most interesting in view of the widespread discussion of the subject. The change of opinion on Federal unemployment compensation—question 2 on the first questionnaire and question 6 on the second—is accounted for by omission of the word "maximum" in the first poll, by increased fear of unemployment, and by better understanding of the proposal.

Question 7 of the first poll and question 3 of the second, call for special attention. The answers indicated clearly

that most of the people differentiate between socialized medicine and public health insurance.

I have here presented these findings to my colleagues without any unnecessary comment in order that they may study them for what they are worth and draw their own conclusions. I am compelled, however, to recommend the procedure to all Members of Congress. Obviously many of the pictures of public opinion on given issues which I had believed to be true were found to be very false. I had been judging opinion on the basis of unsolicited letters and telephone calls from constituents. Like many others I tended to believe on a majority of questions that those who wrote, wired or telephoned reflected typical opinion. They simply did not do so in most cases. Rather, they generally represented vocal minorities. Organized pressure groups and individuals have long since learned all the tricks on how to give Members of Congress a false picture of public sentiment. There is one easy corrective—solicit opinion on a scale large enough to eliminate the possibility of error.

Unjust Treatment of Poland

REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, all during this session of Congress I have felt it my duty to bring to the attention of this honorable body the situation as it has existed in Poland vis-à-vis Russia. I have been hoping against hope that at this late date some sign of improvement would be clear insofar as the attitude of the Allied Powers is concerned—that finally a glaring injustice inflicted on the good people of Poland would be corrected. Before the bar of justice of the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, Russia and the Polish puppet government stand charged and indicted of conspiracy to violate the high ideals of the four freedoms, the Atlantic Charter, the San Francisco Conference, and the United Nations agreements. When I hear and read the statements made by the official mouthpieces of Moscow and the Warsaw Quislings I can only say "a pox on both your houses."

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend at this time to address myself further to the Polish-Russian-United Nations equation. It is my purpose to address the House in the near future at some length on this whole subject. To that end I have caused to be made considerable research, and I have made some careful study and analysis of the facts. Despite the fact that in a short while I will speak again of the betrayal of the common people of Poland—a loyal, friendly, allied people who were the "first to fight" the Nazi horde, the matter of the disbanding of the Allied Polish Army is such a gross injustice that I cannot refrain from righteous, indignant, and vehement protest.

Most people feel that the Yalta agreements affect the safety of the United States of America, and because of that circumstance declare that we are to a considerable degree responsible for the situation as it exists, unhappy being an understatement, as regards Poland.

In this tragic country with a long history of freedom, great pride in itself as a people and a nation and a record of bravery second to none, those in authority are the obedient agents of the Soviet Union who have been characterized by our own United States Government as common murderers. Why beat around the bush any longer—this gruesome scene in the play of world events calls for plain speaking and, Mr. Speaker, it will never be said in this House that I do not speak plainly. The fact is that Poland is an occupied country—occupied by Russia. To that country the Allied Polish Army, after 6 years of bloody fighting with our common enemy all over the world, refuses to return. We cannot avoid our share of responsibility for giving rise to a state of things which amounts to a single conclusion—the only possible conclusion—the brave Polish soldier, unlike all the other brave Allied boys—has no free homeland to which he can return. It is beyond my poor powers to describe the stark naked tragedy, the sorrow, and the yearning that must be in the hearts of these men and their loved ones. We cannot lightly escape our part of the concern of the world for the fate of the Allied Polish Army.

The Quislings of Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics seize on this troubled moment in the year of 1946 to demand—demand mind you—that this army be perfunctorily mustered out of service and its soldier-members compelled — compelled mind you—to return to Soviet-occupied Poland. What do you think would happen to these patriots if they returned. I allow you one guess only—this is too easy to be a $64 question. The answer: Imprisonment and death. Thousands of more victims of police murders, countless more offerings on the altar of liberty and freedom.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, that the Government of the United States did not at Yalta give recognition, in the sense of the word as it is used among governments, to the haphazard Polish set-up as a de jure and permanent government. Quite the contrary. The only view stated was that the status at best was temporary. I need not remind you that the situation in Europe is far from a final settlement; the peace treaties remote from signing and even farther from United States Senate ratification. The liquidation by the Allied Powers of the Allied Polish Army would be a complete acceptance of the status quo in Poland and this the Yalta pact itself did not do.

In the calm light and fortunate chance of a second try at solution of the Polish problem, and do not forget there was no "Polish problem" until we helped to create one, I appeal to this House, as the last great forum of democracy left in the world not to add to the mistakes made by accepting any part of the responsibility for the totally uncalled-for elimination of the Allied Polish Army. We must reject without equivocation the demand — demand mind you—of this discredited provisional government of Bierut, a government charged with murder, is making in an ill-concealed effort to break the solid ranks of the western democracies.

Mr. Speaker, "Let there be justice, though the heavens fall."

Hon. Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared on March 3 in the Knoxville Journal published at Knoxville, Tenn. I am sure that this splendid editorial will find interest among the long-time friends and admirers of Senator MCKELLAR, President pro tempore of the Senate. Many are in the House who served with my senior Senator when he was a Member of this body. Still others admire, respect, and esteem him by more recent acquaintance and by having official dealings with him as legislation is considered in conference.

No one who has any information at all about the Tennessee Valley Authority can deny the fine service he has rendered to the cause of public power and especially in his devotion to the cause of this particular Authority. As this editorial so well sets out, it has been Senator MCKELLAR who has supported or initiated every appropriation for TVA that has been made since 1933 and in a few cases he has asked for and obtained appropriations that actually were opposed by the TVA directorate.

Hon. E. H. Crump, who served in the House of Representatives for two terms and who left the House on his own accord, has fought year in and year out for cheap electricity. It was he who kept the fires burning many years ago when many of its proponents became weak-hearted and of little faith. No man in the world is prouder of the accomplishments of TVA than Mr. Crump and he has and is now supporting Senator MCKELLAR who has worked diligently to foster the dream of public power in the Tennessee Valley which has paid such tremendous dividends in money, convenience, and happiness to so many people.

The Knoxville Journal is not a Democratic paper. The expressions in this writing, however, are fair to a distinguished Senator and a tremendously useful public servant.

The editorial follows:

IF CARMACK IS SERIOUS ABOUT MAKING RACE FOR SENATE, HE SHOULD SELECT DIFFERENT PLATFORM FOR ATTEMPT

The people of Tennessee were yesterday advised in a formal statement from Edward W. Carmack, a native of Columbia, that he would make the primary race against Senator

KENNETH D. MCKELLAR. This is the announcement which Representative ESTES KEFAUVER forecast some weeks ago, at the time he counted himself out of the same race. It is assumed that Mr. Carmack will run with Representative KEFAUVER's blessing.

Mr. Carmack enters the present primary with certain definite assets, his name as son of a former great Senator from Tennessee and such familiarity as the voters of the State have acquired with that name in his previous attempts to obtain his party's nomination. It is unfortunate that he has been made to believe that an opportunity exists for his nomination, however, at this time, because somewhat later fine use might have been made of his prospects.

Mr. Carmack has been unfortunately advised, too, in the choice of planks for his platform. He says, first, that he is impelled to run against Senator MCKELLAR because he believes TVA must have a friend and champion in Congress.

This is absurd, as everybody who has studied the record knows. Senator MCKELLAR has supported or initiated every appropriation for TVA that has been made since 1933; in a few cases he has asked for and obtained appropriations that actually were opposed by the TVA directorate.

This is not to say that the Senator has gotten along well with Chairman David Lilienthal, for he hasn't. Mr. Carmack must not confuse, or attempt to confuse the people, with the notion that Mr. Lilienthal, able man though he has proven himself, is the TVA. As we see the matter, one may be for TVA, as MCKELLAR unquestionably has been, and yet be hostile to its Chairman. If Mr. Carmack intends to run as Mr. Lilienthal's personal champion, then of course that is an entirely different matter, but he should be accurate in stating his intentions.

Mr. Carmack's second point is that he is the bitter enemy of the Crump machine, and we do not fall out with him there. We have honorable political scars ourselves, from battling that machine and the tentacles it has in the State, reaching out as far as Polk County.

* * * * *

Tennesseans generally have come to recognize that, in the second most powerful post in the National Government, they have an asset in Senator MCKELLAR's continued tenure for which the election of a half dozen Carmacks would not compensate.

Commissioner Durr, of Federal Communications Commission, Questions Sales Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article appearing in Labor under date of March 16, 1946, as follows:

DURR AGAIN MAKES SCORCHING PROTEST ON RULING BY FCC—STATIONS WORTH $148,000 SOLD FOR $1,900,000; OLD SCANDAL IS RECALLED

Even the scandalous career of the Federal Communications Commission has seldom furnished anything so shocking as a ruling against which one member of the Commission published a scorching protest this week.

The dissenting member was Clifford J. Durr, who almost single-handed has been battling against FCC approval of some peculiar deals.

"When broadcast facilities having a total book value of only $148,000 sell for $1,900,000, and when a relatively small 1-kilowatt station earns over $300,000 net profits in one year," Durr said, "two questions present themselves:

SOLD PUBLIC AIR WAVES

"1. Is the purchaser buying only the seller's properties, or is it principally buying a license to use radio channels which are public property?

"2. What effect will the high price have upon the operations in the public interest? The higher the investment, the greater will be the pressure toward excessive commercialization of broadcast time."

Durr was talking about the Commission's approval of the sale of WFIL, a standard broadcasting station, and WFIL-FM, one of the new FM stations, both at Philadelphia.

PRICE 12 TIMES VALUE

They were sold by the WFIL Broadcasting Co. to the Triangle Publications, Inc.

As Durr pointed out, the sale price was more than 12 times the book value of all the property owned by both stations, and the annual profit was more than twice the book value.

He also pointed out that the purchaser is the publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer, the New York Morning Telegraph, and the Daily Racing Form.

RECALLS BIG SCANDAL

The names of those newspapers and that racing tip sheet recall the big scandal a few years ago, when their publisher, the late Moe Annenberg, was imprisoned for dodging income taxes on a huge scale, and was exposed as the operator of a Nation-wide illegal horse-race gambling system.

Annenberg continued to run his newspapers while in prison, and now his company has acquired two radio stations with the blessing of the FCC.

The Commission also O. K.'d the $1,900,000 price, though it obviously violates the Communications Act ban on sale of the air waves which are supposed to belong to the American people.

Pacific Veteran Charges Real-Estate Speculators With Racketeering—Asks Why Congress Is Indifferent to Veterans' Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a letter from a veteran marine who was one of those who stormed the beaches of Iwo Jima and other Pacific islands.

He was decorated for heroism. He was discharged in November of 1945, and still has been unable to find a place for his family to live. The real-estate men tell him that it is just too bad that he is a veteran.

This letter speaks for itself, and I am making it public for the edification of those Members who have more concern for the real-estate speculators than they have for the veterans.

The letter follows:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *February 18, 1946.*
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter in desperation, because I see by the newspapers that you are leading the fight for the veterans to put price ceilings on existing homes. I am also sending a copy of this letter to Representative JESSE WOLCOTT, who is quoted by the papers as leading the fight against such price controls, and I ask you to read this letter to Congress if Representative WOLCOTT decides not to.

I am a veteran of Iwo Jima. Was with the Third Marine Division in the Solomons, Guam, and Iwo. I was decorated for heroism against the Japanese enemy. I was discharged in Washington, D. C., in November 1945. Because I wrote some magazine articles and two books about the marines, I was fortunate enough to get a job almost immediately writing movies here. But my job means nothing to me because I am still separated from my family. My wife and daughter are still in Washington, waiting for me to find them a place to live. My little daughter is 2½. She was born while I was away. I hardly know her. When I was discharged, I said I'd find a place for us to live, and we'd finally be together again. But for 2 months I've been living out here in someone else's home. My plight isn't unusual. I don't mean to complain, because there are many better guys still worse off than I am.

But I happen to have about $2,500 in the bank that I would gladly use to buy a home—if I could buy a decent place for that. But do you know what's happened out here? There has been such terrific speculation that I can't find a decent home where I don't have to put down at least $5,000 cash. And I can't raise the other $2,500 because the lending agencies tell me that homes are so unreasonably priced that they're bad buys. The real-estate people, meanwhile, are scaring me by telling me that prices are going to continue to go up, month by month, for two more years. They all admit that there's a wild inflation. They tell you readily that people are buying and selling homes, not to live in them, but to make quick killings. They complain about non-real-estate people going into the real-estate business because profits are so easy to make. They admit that the lack of price ceilings are keeping thousands of homes and apartments off the rental market and are helping to drive up construction costs on new homes. And their attitude through all this is that it's too bad for us veterans, but what can they do. Everyone else is making money, so why shouldn't they? I will be glad, incidentally, to send you the names of real-estate men who have talked to me like that, although I'm sure there's no need or use in reducing this to personalities.

But I am a member of both the American Veterans' Committee and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in our meetings I can see that my experiences are typical of what's happening to everyone else. At the VFW the other night, one of the fellows made a speech wondering why you people in Congress seem so insensitive to the really dreadful unhappiness through which so many of us are going. We gave up homes to go in the service. Why can't we get them back now? Why must we be penalized because we fought for our country? I know that there is a strong real-estate lobby in Washington, wealthy men with lots of power, who can talk to you personally and get you to listen to them. But is there no one left who will tell them that they're making enough money and are well enough off for the moment—and please to

let you do something to stop the misery of the little people? Please do some lobbying for us, if you have to. Show this letter around to other Congressmen, and write me if I'm wrong or if I'm asking for too much. I'll be glad to read your reply at the AVC and VFW. That's all we guys have left—our organizations. We'd like to hear from you.

Meanwhile if the real-estate lobby thinks a letter like this is mistaken, I'd be glad to get other veterans to supply case histories, showing how their members around Los Angeles are engaging in out-and-out rackets which are victimizing us and milking us of the money we were able to put in war bonds during the war. I'll send canceled checks the American Veterans' Committee has collected on several members of the Los Angeles real estate board who have taken bonuses of from $200 to $750 for steering desperate families of veterans to miserable flats renting at $85 a month and more. I'll send the sworn testimony of a fellow in Santa Monica who is being evicted right now by a landlord who objects to the fact that he took in three children, the orphans of a buddy killed in action. And I'll send the names of landlords who wouldn't rent me an apartment because I had a little girl. As I believe you'll agree, the situation is in many ways disgusting. But I don't want to indulge in recriminations or a fight. This letter was written in behalf of price ceilings on already-existing homes. I hope, sir, that I've made my point.

Very truly yours,

ALVIN M. JOSEPHY, Jr.,
Ex-Sergeant, Twenty-first Marines, Second Marine Division.

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a speech which I made on Sunday, March 10, 1946, over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., under the auspices of the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress, Inc. It was a very real privilege to participate with so many others in the outstanding work of the Polish-American Congress, which has been informing the American people vigorously and effectively of the conditions in Poland:

It is one of the fundamental principles of democracy that constitutional, representative government is the servant of the people. It ceases to be such a government when it flouts the will of the people. This principle has been expressed by Abraham Lincoln in the words "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

We repeatedly stated that we were fighting the bloodiest war history has known for the survival of this theory of government. As a matter of fact, we proclaimed that we fought both World Wars "to make the world safe for democracy" using President Wilson's words.

Now let us look to Poland, the most faithful of our allies in the war, and see how this declaration made by us at the outset of the war, the promise which was repeated again and again and again during the war, was kept.

It is not necessary to emphasize that Poland was the first nation to oppose with arms the German bid for world domination. Poland fought at a time when other powers were not only signing pacts with Hitler, but at a time when some of the powers were actively supporting him. In spite of this, Poland never had any misgivings in her faithfulness to her allies and in the crucial days of 1940 she stood by the side of Great Britain in her lonely fight. Had Poland capitulated in 1939 without a fight, or had she become a German satellite and had she not rejected repeated German openings and suggestions of a joint attack upon the Soviet Union, the freedom of the peoples of Europe would have been now a thing of the past.

However, when our common struggle triumphantly reached its victorious end, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, without having consulted the constitutional Government of Poland which led the fight of Poland's sons and daughters for over 5 years, took upon themselves to solve in their own way the problem of giving Poland a government. A proud nation, which suffered terribly in the war, was presented at Yalta with a hand-picked group of puppets sponsored and directed by a foreign power, and this group was given the name of a Polish provisional government of national unity, thus adding insult to injury.

I say this frankly because it is obvious by now that the rulers of Poland were neither chosen by the people, nor were they of the people, nor are they working for the people of Poland.

The year which elapsed since these decisions were reached at Yalta amply proves that the group picked by one foreign power, and approved by two others, finds itself in disagreement with the will of the Polish people because it failed to defend the independence of Poland, it failed to defend the integrity of Poland's territory, and it failed to prevent the introduction of a foreign-inspired revolution into Poland.

After a period of complete black-out imposed upon Poland by its present rulers, some of our courageous newspapermen, and quite recently some of my colleagues from the House of Representatives, were able to lift partially the iron curtain with which the Soviet armed forces and secret police screened entire eastern Europe from the eyes of the western world. Thanks to the efforts of those Congressmen and newspapermen we were able to secure some authentic information about conditions prevailing in Poland and we were able to draw a very comprehensive picture of how this Allied country was made "safe for democracy."

There is no liberty in Poland—neither the nation nor the individual is free. Both our own Secretary of State, Mr. James F. Byrnes, and the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, Mr. Ernest Bevin, spoke publicly only a few weeks ago about a "wave of political murders in which the secret police is involved." Millions of Russian troops pass across the territory of Poland committing outrages and pillage. Today a considerable part of these Russian military forces is occupying the country without any legal or military justification and in flagrant contradiction of the Moscow Declaration. It is obvious that under the protection of the huge military forces occupying Poland the dreaded Soviet secret police is active everywhere and is able to commit those political murders of which Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Bevin complained but, unfortunately, to no avail.

Authentic reports which reached us within the last few months clearly show that all sections of Polish political life, all political parties, the foreign-appointed government itself, the local administration, and social organizations are thoroughly penetrated by Communists hiding behind assumed names, but always obedient to Moscow's will, as every Communist always is all over the world. A terrible economic chaos prevails throughout Poland and is being used to facilitate the sovietization of the country completely exhausted after 5 years of cruel German occupation. There is no freedom of the press, no freedom of religion, and no freedom of assembly, and, to use the words of an eyewitness, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, Democratic Representative from Illinois, "The Soviet Ambassador in Warsaw is the supreme ruler of contemporary Poland."

We are being told that Poland is now to expect salvation from the "free and unfettered elections" which were promised to the Polish people at Yalta.

I earnestly hope that our American Government will never recognize as a valid expression of the will of the people this electoral mockery which is now being prepared in Poland under Russian occupation by the Soviet secret police working hand in hand with local and imported Communists. Every day dispatches in the press tell us that Soviet Russia has decided to have in Poland elections as "free and unfettered" as the elections which were held not so long ago in Yugoslavia under that other Soviet puppet Tito.

Everyone in America will recall that when the late President Roosevelt defended what he called the Yalta compromise he promised that elections in Poland would be carried out under international supervision. Last fall the then Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Joseph C. Grew, publicly reiterated this assurance of Mr. Roosevelt in a letter to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, a letter which is on public record because it was released to the press.

Now, however, we hear no more about Allied or international supervision of the elections to be held in Poland. You will recall that Soviet Russia did not agree to take part in the control of elections to be held in Greece stating that it would hurt the sovereignty of Greece if the elections were to be supervised by foreign, however friendly, powers. This Russian nonparticipation in the supervision of the Greek elections prepared the way for denying to us and the British control of the elections in Poland. And anticipating a new Soviet rebuke, neither our Government nor the British has insisted on the right to send our controlling missions into Poland. Thus, we face the paradoxical situation in which Soviet Russia, which has created the modern method of undermining the independence of other states, now comes forward and in the name of sovereignty opposes the American-British suggestions of participation in the control of elections in order to guarantee that they are being conducted honestly.

By renouncing their rights internationally to control the forthcoming elections in Poland, our Government and the British Government will make themselves guilty of breaking one more pledge given to Poland.

After having acquiesced in the loss of one-half of Poland's territory, after having saddled an allied nation with a government imposed by a foreign power, after tacitly witnessing the liquidation of every vestige of Poland's independence and of its people's freedom, we are about to commit one more crime of injustice to Poland by preparing the way to recognition of faked and manipulated elections conducted under the pressure of a foreign power using every method of terror and coercion in order to achieve its aims.

American and Polish blood has flowed freely in defense of freedom on every front in this war—at sea, on land, and in the air. It was for freedom we fought, and it was for freedom that we have made the greatest sacrifices in blood and property.

I think that every American, reading and listening to the news from Poland, must clearly answer the question for himself or herself—"What have you done to Poland?"

In his Navy Day speech, President Truman said, "We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any power. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the

world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

Every American recognized and approved that as a declaration of pure justice, as a solemn promise to those who share our devotion to constitutional, representative government. We can and we must keep that promise.

Aid for Spanish Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the following letter which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, March 13. This letter, written by the executive director of the Unitarian Service Committee, emphasizes the crying need for help to be given to those brave men and women who first fought against fascism. It is significant that this cry for help from the Unitarian Service Committee comes at a time when the efforts of the Spanish refugee appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee are hampered by the investigatory tactics of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This organization is licensed and approved by the President's War Control Board, and has been doing yeoman service in providing help for the victims of Franco's revenge—help that has been given to these unfortunate men and women through such organizations as the Quakers and the Unitarian Service Committee.

The letter follows:

SPANISH REFUGEES NEED AID—UNOFFICIAL CENSUS INDICATES MANY ARE STILL IN FRANCE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I have read with great interest the dispatch by Harold Callender of March 5 to the New York Times about the Spanish Republicans now in France and their present condition. Some of the facts given by Mr. Callender seem to me to be somewhat inaccurate and the total impression of the dispatch is misleading.

I have just returned from 9 months in Europe, observing conditions there and supervising the work of the Unitarian Service Committee, which is one of the agencies expending large sums of money for the aid of the Spanish Republican refugees. I studied the problem of these refugees with great care while in France and feel that I can speak with some assurance about their condition.

Mr. Callender reports that the official French estimate is that there remain in France of the 550,000 political refugees who swarmed across the French frontier in 1939 about 65,000 individuals. Anyone who knows the problem of the Spanish refugees in France knows that any official estimate as to their number is meaningless.

FEAR RETURN TO SPAIN

The Spaniards, living under constant fear of some agreement by which they shall be returned to Spain, have refused to cooperate with any census made by French authorities. They do not want to give their names, the number in their families, their antecedents. They have deliberately endeavored to avoid the census and where unavoidable they have given inaccurate and confusing information. The Spanish Republican Aid Committee of the Unitarian Service Committee in France is probably the best qualified of any organization to estimate the number of the Spaniards. The chairman of this committee is the distinguished artist, Pablo Picasso.

The committee has made careful inquiries and estimates that there are at least 100,000 adults still in France with an undeterminable number of children. Anyone who is familiar with Spanish families knows that children are numerous. It is certainly not an overestimate to say that there are at least 200,000 Spanish refugees still in France, counting both adults and children.

INCREASED HELP NEEDED

I do not think that Mr. Callender has taken into consideration that when he made the study many of the Spaniards happened to be no problem, because they were being supported by funds sent generously to France by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and administered by our committee there. To these funds have been added funds of our own committee and of other similar committees, some assistance from the French Government and some assistance from the Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees.

In spite of that, the miserable condition of these unfortunate expatriates still persists. Thousands of them are existing, we are informed by a cable received March 1, under very miserable conditions, lacking food, clothing, and medical attention. Many of them are wounded and ill as a result of the help which they gave in the liberation of France. The help given by America must be greatly increased, we are told, if we are to reach additional urgent cases.

Today it has been my heart-rending duty to cable to our office in Paris that the help we have up to this point been giving to these friends of democracy must after April 1 be cut by two-thirds as the result of the failure of America to respond to this cry of distress.

CHARLES R. JOY,
Executive Director, Unitarian Service Committee.
BOSTON, *March 8, 1946.*

How We Can Prevent Progressive Inflation by Increased Housing Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Postwar Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., March 15–16, 1946:

During the war and in the period through which we are now passing, progressive inflation has, in a measure, been held back by the artificial means of price control. Although highly controversial in its present application, price control is intended to stand between us and the miseries and brutalities of another kind of war—the war between postwar supply, always hamepered and curtailed, and postwar demand, both domestic and foreign, always swollen and desperate. There is a growing suspicion and struggle in the Congress, brought to a head by the administration's veterans' emergency-housing program, over whether price control in its present application is helping or hindering reconversion to peacetime production. Unless and until a workable production program can be gotten under way, price control can only play a losing game, for it treats the symptoms and not the disease. It levels down the fever chart and avoids some suffering, but the cure must react on the disorder itself, and the only satisfactory treatment for demand is supply—that is the ABC of our economic system. The limitations of price control are daily coming to light in the countless instances of production stymied because of price ceilings or lack of parts. Once these problems are solved and channels are cleared, an avalanche of goods will flow to the consumer.

However, the imperative need for increased housing facilities is fundamentally different from that of most end products. Housing was a sick industry even before the complication of wartime curtailment attacked it. The machine age passed it by. A man, whether in or out of the Army, eats food and wears clothes; mess hall or corner grocery, uniform or a neat pin-stripe job are roughly comparable in the over-all supply picture, for as the civilian demand increases military requirements subside in direct proportion. It is a matter of redistribution and reconversion. Housing comes in a different category altogether. There is almost no military housing to reconvert and civilian construction was cut to the bone. There have been about 6,000,000 marriages since Pearl Harbor. It does not take too much imagination to suppose that these figures will be more than doubled as unmarried soldiers return to civilian life. These myriad new families increase the need for housing far beyond the proportions indicated by the increase in population, which is in itself considerable.

We may obtain a stable economy in every other field, but until the granddaddy of them all, this basic requirement for American living, is filled, we cannot eliminate the threat of the inflationary spiral. Where the need and desire for homes far outstrips the available supply competition for the scarce product becomes fierce. In that we have the ingredients for inflation.

Mr. Wilson Wyatt, Housing Administrator, has outlined a bold plan which, while controversial in some aspects, can be successful and demonstrate again the world-famed ingenuity and power of American industry engaged in free enterprise under a democratic form of government. There are a great variety of ways by which this vital building program can be expedited. Neither Mr. Wyatt nor the construction industry as it exists today can do the job alone. It is essential that aid be given freely from all quarters.

The Federal Government can contribute its share by the passage of expediting legislation to provide workable machinery and financial assistance. The need for control of resale prices on existing as well as new homes is indicated. Rent ceilings at present are operating in the face of unchecked selling prices. A rent ceiling is small comfort to a tenent after his landlord has sold his house at a fat profit, and he finds himself with a 90-day eviction notice. Unlike other commodities, there will be a long, hard pull for several years. Each new high in price level increasingly hampers the production effort in this field. New housing alone cannot materially check prices of existing homes until the supply reaches a point where competition can have its effect.

Vital cooperation must be given by local governments. One requirement is the passage of legislation enabling the resubdivision and redevelopment of the more than 15,000,000 vacant subdivided lots now existing in outlying areas of cities in this country today. Many individual ownerships and accumulated tax delinquencies make it impossible for a private developer to reassemble

these properties. Empowered by statute, the locality or its agency may prepare this land for reuse.

Restrictive provisions in local building codes must be examined for undue severity in dealing with new materials and methods of construction, requirements which, in many cases, exceed nationally developed standards. Codes must be so drawn as to permit flexibility in construction or in the choice of material so long as the completed structure meets recognized standards of safety and health. Some codes fail to permit full realization of the strength of a material—for example, they may not permit stresses in structural steel as large as those permitted in nationally developed standards. Some codes require greater thickness of masonry walls than is specified in nationally developed standards—for instance, some require 12-inch brick walls when 8-inch walls are accepted generally. Many local building codes limit acceptable materials to a few specified kinds rather than permit any material that will do the particular job involved—for example, they may call for fireproofing around columns of 4 inches of brickwork or 3 inches of concrete instead of specifying the fire-resistance rating desired.

These are typical examples illustrating a crying need for a new approach in the drafting of building codes. It would be a grave mistake to assume that all desirable changes should reduce requirements, for some codes are deficient and should be strengthened, but this is only one more reason for a series of performance standards to be developed nationally to provide a basis for comparison of specific code requirements. For any departure, the burden of proof should be upon the provision that is questioned.

The building industry is not now organized to pursue scientific industrial research as do modern mass production industries. The independent builder cannot begin to conduct the comprehensive research and development of more efficient materials and methods necessary to improve the quality of houses and at the same time reduce their cost, as the automotive industry, for example, has improved the automobile and brought it within the reach of most pocketbooks.

Prefabrication is a new and scary word, but actually this has long been practiced in the industry. Millwork, such as doors and window frames, have proven the practicality of factory-built parts to be assembled on the job. Architects and engineers must be commissioned to develop extension of the millwork principle to roofs, floors, walls, and other units. Materials such as concrete, metal, and glass can be handled in new and war-developed ways to fulfill every requirement of, for instance, an exterior wall, but which could be molded by factory methods into wall sections, eliminating the present slow and costly construction of many layers of plaster, lumber, paint, building paper, insulating material, and the like.

Labor practices which require that construction be carried on in a traditional manner or without the use of labor-saving equipment may be revised without hardship, with the present prospect of scarce labor and a big job ahead.

Manufacturers and dealers in materials often require that material be handled through a retailer. Wherever it is found to be cheaper and more efficient, shipment should be permitted direct from manufacturer to contractor.

The pattern of housing construction and price levels following World War I may well point a warning and serve as a guide in our present crisis. History repeats itself only with considerable variation, and while American history shows that commodity prices have soared after every war, only to collapse after each demobilization, this collapse did not occur until 1½ years after the armistice was signed in 1918. When peace came in that year, however, the general expectation was that high wartime prices would decline immediately, and both producer and consumer delayed their purchases for a more favorable market. This voluntary restraint resulted in a deceptively unstrained price level even after the removal of wartime controls. But the pent-up domestic demand was tremendous, Federal expenditures were still at a high level, demand for exports was unprecedented, and in March 1919—in the spring, significantly associated with the sound of steam shovel, of hammer on nail, and of saw on wood—the storm broke.

Today we have the advantage of hindsight. Our Government fully recognizes that the danger of inflation did not end with the cancellation of war contracts. The wounds of war, physical or economic, cannot be disposed of along with the confetti and ticker tape we sweep off the streets after the victory parade. Producer and consumer alike can plainly see high price levels stretching solidly ahead, and there is little tendency toward the voluntary restraint observed after World War I.

These homeless families, and particularly the veterans' families, with their children and the yet unborn, not only deserve a decent home but the fate of America herself depends upon the nurture of her future citizens. They must have room to be born in. We cannot afford to lose a generation while our bypassed building industry, unaided, struggles to produce by out-dated methods a maximum of 9,000,000 houses in the next 10 years, when our minimum need is for 12,000,000 and our maximum need is for 16,000,000 new homes.

Postwar Relief Provisions of the Excess-Profits Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the relief from taxes that has come to some corporations by reason of carry-backs has been subject to considerable criticism in recent weeks. It shall be my purpose to discuss this matter briefly.

In 1940 Congress levied an excess-profits tax upon corporations at rates which took practically all corporate income above a level measured by prewar earnings. The tax produced about forty billions of dollars of revenue between 1940 and 1946. This came from about 70,000 corporations.

When the excess-profits tax law was being written it was recognized that because of its necessary severity it was very probable that most corporations would not be able to accumulate postwar reserves unless the law would carry some relief provisions. As a result three relief provisions were adopted to anticipate postwar needs and to make certain that corporations could return to their prewar activities. These three provisions are as follows:

First. The carry-back and carry-forward of what was termed the unused excess-profits credit.

Second. A 10-percent postwar excess-profits tax credit.

Third. The recomputation of depretion—amortization—deductions.

Although the revenue act approved November 1945 repealed the excess-profits tax, the machinery for computing the tax, including these three relief provisions, was retained. Consequently excess-profits taxpayers in 1946 will be entitled to carry back any unused excess profits credit based upon 1946 earnings. The 10 percent postwar credit, of course, in 1946 will be inoperative and the amortization of emergency facilities also will not apply for 1946, because the amortization period was terminated upon issuance of a proclamation by the President terminating the emergency for this purpose. Such proclamation was issued September 29, 1945.

All three of these relief provisions, as was expected, have operated to produce refunds to some excess-profits taxpayers. These refunds belong to the taxpaying corporations because the same law that called for the collection of a 95-percent tax provided for the refund after the war.

It is reported that these refunds will amount to some $20,000,000,000 and that the Government is thereby financing these business corporations to that amount.

It is further claimed that this law was secretly slipped through Congress, and that these refunds and credits are wholly tax free.

These charges are not well founded. The Treasury Department estimated that probably not much more than $5,000,000,000 would be refunded to excess-profits taxpayers as a result of these three relief provisions.

There can be no doubt that the plan to encourage business to reconvert quickly was for the best interest of the worker as well as for the best interest of the business.

In the third place the law was passed by Congress in accordance with the regular parliamentary procedure governing that body.

The excess-profits-tax law was first enacted in 1940. This law provided a device for segregating normal profits from excessive profits. In 1942 the excess-profits credit carry-back was added to the law. This provided a method of guaranteeing cash balances for the payment of reconversion expenses and expenses incident to the planning for postwar production.

The war needs of the Government took priority over the post-war needs of industry and a 95 percent tax on excess profits was accordingly imposed. At the same time Congress realized the importance of rapid reconversion after the war and legislated accordingly.

The problem of segregating normal profits from excess profits, was solved by establishment of a credit to be used in computing the amount of excess-profits-tax liability. This credit known as the excess-profits credit represents about 95 percent of the prewar normal earnings between 1935 and 1940. The law provided two methods for computing the amount of the credit, which, when computed was applied against total earnings for each taxable year during the war period. The remaining balance then be-

came subject to the excess-profits tax after making certain other adjustments.

Whenever this credit exceeds the amount of total income the excess portion is termed the "unused excess-profits credit," and under the law could be carried back to the two preceding taxable years, but not beyond 1941 and if not entirely consumed in those years, carried forward to the two succeeding taxable years. In this way, the amount of income subject to the excess-profits tax in a prior year was reduced giving rise to the possibility of a refund.

AMORTIZATION DEDUCTIONS AND THE PERCENT POSTWAR CREDIT

Refunds also will arise under the wartime amortization provisions of the law whereby property acquired to produce income during the war period could be depreciated over a 5-year period beginning after 1940. Subsequently this period was reduced to a period ending with the proclaimed termination of the war emergency. Such a proclamation was issued by the President September 29, 1945. Taxpayers, including individuals thereupon were allowed to terminate the depreciation period as of October 1, 1945. As a result, the amount of deduction taken for depreciation in a previous year was increased, the resulting excess-profits tax reduced and a refund made possible. The corporations receiving their refunds had taken great risks when they changed the character of their operations in order to increase production of essential war materials. They would not have assumed these risks if the Government had not agreed to protect them. They did their part and it was only right for the Government to do its part for the result was that these corporations would then be able to reconvert and to again give employment to their men.

The 10-percent postwar credit will not produce refunds in the strict sense of the word and is therefore distinguishable from the carry-back of unused excess profits credits and the amortization of war investments. The postwar credit is a tax credit originally payable in bonds and later allowed to be taken currently against excess-profits tax liability. Although a taxpayer paid the full amount of his excess-profits tax, the postwar credit was a guaranty that he would eventually receive back 10 percent of the tax paid.

It is important to bear in mind that the credit carry-backs increase normal tax and surtax liabilities. For example if a taxpayer in 1946 had an unused excess-profit credit of $10.000 which he carried back to 1944, approximately 40 percent of $10,000 would be recovered through the normal tax and surtax. This is not true in the case of increased deductions resulting from adjusted-depreciation schedules. Increasing these deductions in a prior year, will produce a smaller normal tax, surtax and excess profits tax liability for such year.

It is also significant that all corporations whose combined liability for normal tax, surtax, and excess-profits tax in 1944 and 1945 exceed the 80-percent limitation or ceiling—80 percent of surtax net income—placed upon such aggregate liability, will lose money by virtue of the credit carry backs. The reason is that, while their liability will remain the same for those years, the reduction in their excess-profits-tax liability will produce a corresponding decrease in their postwar credits, the proceeds of which meanwhile may have been spent. The taxpayer will therefore be out of pocket for the amount of such reduction.

Windfalls and other unwarranted refunds or rebates are conceivably possible in the operation of the three postwar relief provisions. In the drafting and administration of the excess-profits-tax laws the problem of preventing abuses was acute because of the multiplicity of accounting practices encountered. Taxing authorities should carefully scrutinize all these claims for refund and protect the Government against any illegal claims.

The act of September 1945, which provides for the repeal of the excess-profits tax, also provides for the removal of all income taxes from about 12,000,000 low-income taxpayers. Congress was moved to this action by a desire to be fair to the workers as well as to the corporations. Congress had in mind preparing the way for a rapid reconversion which at that time appeared to be well on its way. When the law was first passed the only complaints against its passage were from people who were opposed to the reduction of any taxes because they insisted that high taxes were needed to meet the tremendous expenses of government and to apply toward the interest on the heavy national debt.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star of March 12, 1946:

ENTIRE PARK COUNTY PRICE CONTROL BOARD RESIGNS ON TUESDAY

LIVINGSTON, March 12.—Resignation of the entire Park County price control board in protest against orders from State OPA officials instituting a system of quota punishment of price violations was announced today by Chairman R. A. Thornton. Thornton said the board had been told to find 15 merchants guilty of price violations each month and that this was a must.

"We were advised," Thornton's letter to the State director asserted, "that in all cases where it was the second offense the files were to be sent to Helena and that any recommendations we might make would be subject to overruling, in other words that the panel's decision did not mean anything.

"You are sending out discourteous letters assessing fines without allowing any defense, which seems to us entirely contrary to our American process of law.

"We, the panel, have decided that we cannot act under these conditions and we are submitting our resignations to take effect at once."

In a statement the members of the board declared that they have protested against the policy of the OPA in sending inspectors into this county who assess fines against merchants without a hearing and with no opportunity for presentation of a defense before the board. These fines, Thornton said, are requested in the form of donations to the United States Treasury in order to avoid legal procedure.

The board also protested against the policy of the State OPA office in requiring a fine on every second offense, even though the first offense might have been on a technicality or an error on the part of the merchant.

"Representatives of the State OPA office threatened to send a price officer to attend every one of our sessions in an attempt to force us to follow regulations which we consider unfair," Thornton said. "We were also told that if we resigned the State office could secure another price panel in 5 minutes."

Members of the panel, in addition to Thornton, are E. H. Newell, Edwin F. Parriott, Frank Adams, F. W. Fuher, Don Cowles, W. H. Sparr, Joe Parriott, George Bryan, J. T. Skyes, and John P. O'Neil.

Congressional Secretaries Make Good Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the House had considerable discussion as to the value and efficiency of congressional secretaries in connection with a bill which had for its purpose the increasing of the allowance to each Member for clerical hire.

In that discussion it developed that a number of former secretaries are now Members of the House. Their training as secretaries must have fitted them for the job of Congressman as the mention of the names of some of them will indicate to any Member. Among Members who were former secretaries I mention the gentleman from North Carolina, HERBERT C. BONNER; the gentleman from Minnesota, HAROLD C. HAGEN; the gentleman from New Jersey, GORDON CANFIELD; the gentlewoman from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH; the gentleman from Alabama, CARTER MANASCO; the gentleman from Missouri, CLARENCE CANNON; the gentleman from Missouri, JOHN J. COCHRAN; and the gentleman from Rhode Island, AIME J. FORAND.

A good secretary must know the district of his Congressman. More and more constituents look to Washington for various kinds of help from their Congressman. Congressional secretarial experience would probably be the best training and background a Congressman could have.

Our colleague CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, recently declared her intention not to run for reelection. Her penetrating and courageous mind will be missed in the Eightieth Congress. Her announced retirement brought forth an editorial in the Bridgeport Post which prompted

me to inquire about present Congressmen who were former Members.

The editorial follows:

FROM SECRETARY TO CONGRESSMAN

The firmly announced intention of Congresswoman CLARE BOOTHE LUCE neither to seek another nomination nor to permit herself to be drafted, leaves Fairfield County Republicans on a still-hunt for a candidate to succeed her.

One of the first ideas which comes to mind is that the party might well consider the abilities of Albert P. Morano who has been congressional secretary not only to Mrs. LUCE but to Congressman Austin before her.

If the county wants a faithful servant who understands its problems and has had a background of experience which no other candidate can duplicate in this particular field, it might very well take Mr. Morano.

There would also be something unique and refreshing in seeing one of the work horses of Congress getting a promotion based upon performance. Other congressional secretaries might then aspire to become Congressmen in their own right, at some future time.

For each time that a Member of Congress is called upon to debate, he is called upon a hundred times to make decisions affecting the welfare of firms, industries, or individuals in his district. These decisions must be based upon a sound knowledge of the whole relationship between the district and the various departments of Government and the special problems of the industries in each town and city. Then there are innumerable civic problems and (in the case of a congressional district which fronts upon salt water, as ours does) the intricate matter of harbors and harbor lines, the dredging of channels, etc., all of which must be handled under Federal auspices.

We don't suppose that Secretary Morano has a great personal following in the county because he has never had the inclination or the opportunity to create one. But he must be a good secretary, for his employer, Mrs. LUCE, says so most emphatically, and the working newspapermen at the National Capitol voted him the best of the lot, to their knowledge.

It is interesting to reflect that most Congressmen require young men aspiring to go to West Point or Annapolis, to take competitive examinations for the appointments. If we picked our Congressmen by competitive examination in the first place instead of voting for them, it stands to reason that the secretaryships would furnish the great training school from which most of the successful candidates would come.

Exchanging Information Between Countries and House Committees

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I did not hear all of the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, but I did catch the gist of it; and I want to say for his information and for the information of the House—and I have a very high regard for the gentleman—that Mr. Harriman appeared before the Rules Committee in executive session at my suggestion and at my request. We thought it would be highly desirable and advisable to have Mr. Harriman's opinion and to have the facts about that case. Certainly no reflection was intended on the Foreign Affairs Committee. On the contrary, we wondered why the Foreign Affairs Committee had not had Mr. Harriman appear before them, for he is the one man who knows more about that situation than anybody else.

Promotion of International Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Better Currency Than Gold," from the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday, March 14, 1946, in regard to Senate bill 1636, authorizing use of credits established through the sale of surplus properties abroad for the promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science.

I also ask consent to have printed an editorial on the same subject which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 2, 1946, entitled "Changing Cannons to Cultural Currency."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 14, 1946]

BETTER CURRENCY THAN GOLD

The Fulbright plan for using surplus-property credits abroad for an exchange of students has received very substantial backing in hearings before a special Senate committee. Senator FULBRIGHT would amend the Surplus Property Act, placing disposal of surpluses in the hands of the State Department and eliminating the requirement that payment be made in dollars or gold. His bill would establish credits in the purchasing country, part of which could be used to pay the way of American students in its universities. Americans' interest in foreign study is attested by more than a thousand GI requests to the Veterans' Administration. Under the bill such credits could also be used to pay for transportation of foreign students to the United States or to American institutions abroad. The bill may be amended to include provision for their educational support as well. Or it may be broadened, as William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, suggests, to include maintenance of libraries and corollary educational activities abroad.

The more one thinks on the possibilities of this plan in promoting understanding between nations, now when that understanding is recognized as a goal of paramount importance, the more exciting the prospect becomes. The value of student exchanges has been well exemplified. The use of the Boxer Rebellion indemnity turned back to China for the education of Chinese students in this country has had an incalculable influence in turning the thoughts of Chinese men of learning westward. Former President Hoover cites the influence of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation. That organization utilized funds from the liquidation of Belgian relief surpluses after the last war to bring Belgian students here, send Americans to Belgium. The result, Mr. Hoover says, is that there is no country in Europe "where the ideals and purposes of the American people are so well understood and respected as they are in Belgium." The Rhodes scholarships have made for better understanding between this Nation and Great Britain. The Fulbright plan would put such student exchanges on a far wider basis, sending Americans into England, France, Italy, Australia, and China, possibly to Norway, India, New Zealand, and Russia, and, if the plan is made a two-way one, receiving their students here.

An oblique but practical argument for the plan is that unless we exchange the surpluses for some such purpose they may not be utilized at all. The would-be purchasers have not the dollars with which to buy even such needed goods as trucks and tractors, locomotives and bulldozers, most of which will, nevertheless, not be shipped back. William N. Nichols, editor of This Week, has suggested that we will be converting these otherwise indisposable goods into "cultural currency." It is a happy term in connection with this plan to turn the wastage of war into opportunities for better mutual understanding among nations.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 2, 1946]

CHANGING CANNONS TO CULTURAL CURRENCY—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Congress has a proposal to turn some of the value of American military surplus dumped around the world in foreign countries to aid in the mutual exchange of students.

The proposal would in effect transform cannons into cultural currency. It would do for the postwar world what the system of Rhodes scholars has done to foster English-speaking understanding, and what the Boxer indemnity funds have done to draw China closer to the United States. It is a bold scheme, stimulating to the imagination, capable of realization, and tremendous in possibilities. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Democrat), of Arkansas, has introduced such a bill, on which hearings have just been completed before a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee. Another bill, not directly based on the disposal of war surplus, is in the House, introduced by Representative SOL BLOOM (Democrat), of New York, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

William Philip Simms, distinguished writer on foreign affairs, discussing the Fulbright bill, recalls how the United States returned most of its share of the $333,000,000 Boxer indemnity levied against China by the great powers, and how China, in gratitude, decided to use the funds to educate students in America. Few deeds of grace in this sorry world have had such profound results. The Chinese students educated in the United States have been the seed corn of a new era; it is hard to think of any other single act that has returned such rich dividends in good will, understanding—yes; and trade.

China set up Tsing Hua College at Peking where, until the war intervened, a group of about 400 students, picked competitively, were prepared for entrance to American universities. Over 100 Chinese were graduated in the United States annually to return home carrying an American viewpoint. The United States made a gesture of sympathy that hardly affected its pocketbook; the result was a river of good will that never dried up, and that watered the whole Orient.

America has surplus war material scattered all over the world. In most cases it is too costly to bring home, the native countries

can't afford to pay much for it, and the alternative is to let it rot. The reason American troops are today in India is to guard surplus goods there. The cost of supporting the troops is eating up the potential value of the goods; the Indians don't like to have the troops there; the United States soldiers want to come home. This is typical of many areas.

Testifying for the Fulbright bill, William I. Nichols, magazine editor and also a former Rhodes scholar, explained the program; he would dispose of the surplus for a certain amount of cash, or for goods needed in the United States. But he would also accept in payment a new kind of currency, endowment funds that would provide for regular exchange visits between students and citizens of the two lands. The word "students" would be broadly interpreted; it would include journalists, teachers, representatives of all kinds. The expense would be borne in whole or in large part by the country receiving surplus goods.

Under the Fulbright plan, a limit of $2,500,000 for any country in any one year would be imposed, and only surplus material outside the American continental area and possessions would be available. If the world has indeed reached an idealogical contest between democratic capitalism and collectivism, it would seem a shrewd move, both for sentimental and educational reasons, to invite plenty of impressionable young foreign students over here as guests, to see how America works, while giving plenty of Americans a chance to go abroad to see for themselves what kind of world they are living in.

Mr. BLOOM's program notes the world's present acute shortage of dollar exchange, which threatens to cut off foreign students from the United States. He would extend to European countries such facilities for exchanging scholars, students, and technicians as are now maintained in relation to Latin America and to China.

The Fulbright and Bloom bills are companion or supplementary measures. They both take the same view, that educational bread thrown on the waters today may bring in whole shiploads of good will in the years to come, while helping to make a better world.

Federal World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the very unsettled political relations between the great world powers, in my opinion, is having a serious impact on the people of this country. The effect of this impact on our people has been emphatically called to my attention by a resolution recently adopted by the Ogden Rotary Club, of Ogden, Utah. This resolution so clearly and concisely points out what this great civic organization of my State thinks should be done in world affairs that I think it worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The news item covering the adoption of this resolution appearing in the Ogden Standard Examiner, a newspaper of Ogden, Utah, dated February 22, 1946, also contains some interesting sidelights which should accompany the resolution.

The resolution was mailed to me by Paul Thatcher, a very prominent young lawyer of Ogden, who is devoting much of his time to the subject of international affairs and world government. With his letter he also enclosed a copy of a telegram dated December 17, 1945, and addressed to the resolutions committee of the American Bar Association. The subject of this telegram is Federal World Government. The telegram is signed by Justice James H. Wolfe and Justice Roger I. McDonough, of the Utah Supreme Court, two of the ablest and most scholarly jurists in our country. It is also signed by Utah's distinguished and able attorney general, Grover A. Giles, and by 31 of Utah's very prominent and active lawyers.

I ask, Mr. President, that the news item, the resolution of the Rotary Club, and the telegram, including the names of the signers thereof, all be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the news item, including the resolution, and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OGDEN ROTARY CLUB PASSES RESOLUTION ASKING UNITED STATES TO BACK WORLD REPUBLIC

Ogden Rotary Club Wednesday passed a resolution respectfully and urgently requesting the United States Government and its officers immediately to initiate the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution under which all willing peoples may unite in a federal world republic. By the resolution the club called upon the Rotary International to give immediate consideration to the matter and to take appropriate and vigorous action to promote the early establishment of a world federation.

It is understood that the club intends to act only through Rotary International, and with its approval.

The international service committee, under chairmanship of Dr. H. Aldous Dixon, president of Weber College, prepared and submitted the resolution to the club. President Dixon expressed deep pleasure on the adoption of the resolution.

SERVICE TO MANKIND

The action of Ogden Rotary is in keeping with its object of service to mankind," he said. "Today the war system threatens the cherished traditions and ways of life of all peoples. Having studied the problem and become convinced that only by world federal government can world anarchy and war be replaced with a system of order and security under law, and that only under order and security can we be safe in our American tradition of the right of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we felt our duty as citizens required us to advise our Government of our wishes. It is our hope that many other organizations will adopt our resolution.

"We have city and county government for local affairs, State government for State affairs, and national Government for national affairs—but we have no world government for world affairs. The system needs completing. With the addition of a world government responsible directly to the people, making and administering laws to govern individual activity in world affairs we may hope for peace. Of course, regulation of national matters will be reserved to the people's national governments. Only power to regulate purely international or war-breeding matters need be delegated to the world government."

CLUB'S ATTITUDE

Asked about the club's attitude toward the UNO, Dr. Dixon said, "The UNO is, of course, a league of governments rather than a government of peoples. It is not responsible to the people, nor has it any authority over them. It has no police power, only the prospect of military force. It cannot enact law; it can only make recommendations and threaten war to prevent war. No league of governments has ever established or maintained peace. But the UNO is all we have now. A league is better than nothing at all. Until a world government is in existence and ready to function we should support the UNO and squeeze out of it all the good we can. We are told it is a 'first step.' When it's raining atom bombs we better not pitch camp at the end of the first step. Better run on home out of the rain. The government is the 'home' of any peace-loving people."

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

Following is the text of the resolution:

"Peace is the most urgent need of man. Without peace neither man's civilization nor man himself can hope long to survive in our interdependent world.

"We recognize that there can be no peace without justice, no justice without law, and no law without government to make, interpret, and enforce law.

"History discloses only one successful method of establishing law and justice among people of separate states, each with needs peculiar to it, but all with a common need. That method is the federal system of government.

"In the federal system there is an agreed division of authority between the central government and the governments of the member states. Both central and local governments are supreme, each within its own limited jurisdiction. Both are responsible to and enforce their laws directly upon their common citizens. The common need is served. Local autonomy is preserved.

"It is under such a federal system that the United States of America has become a united Nation of separate States which were originally and still are in the nature of separate nations.

"However the nations of the world differ in their local needs, whatever their doubts and fears, their peoples are today united in the supreme need for peace, transcending all other needs. As the people of the States which form the United States of America created a central government to serve their common needs and still preserved their local rights, so must the people of the nations of the world today create a new central government to serve that greatest common need, preserving still their local rights. To their public servants in the central and in the local governments the world's people may delegate the exercise of such portions of their sovereign power of government as they deem necessary for the fulfillment of their great common need.

"Just as checks and balances were deemed necessary by the designers of the Federal system, and are still as necessary as they were at the beginning, so the world government must maintain checks upon those to whom its citizens delegate that portion of their sovereignty necessary to preserve the peace of the world, lest tyranny and injustice arise to provoke man to destroy his only hope of survival.

"Under such a system, the apparent barriers of nationality, race, culture, and religion have been and can be surmounted. Under such a system, peace may be attained. No such system has ever failed. Nothing less has ever succeeded.

"Today man controls the ultimate force of destruction. Only through government can man hope to establish any system of order and security under law. Only such a system assures peace. Any other is a mirage enticing man to his destruction. Today man must create a world federal republic with power to establish world order and security under law, or he must sacrifice the

blood of his children upon the alter of war. He has no third choice. Tomorrow he may have no choice: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Rotary Club of Ogden, Utah, in harmony with one of the objects of Rotary International, to advance international understanding and peace through world fellowship, That the Government of the United States of America and each of the officers thereof are respectfully and urgently requested immediately to initiate the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution under which all willing peoples may unite in a federal world republic; and be it further

"Resolved, That Rotary International is respectfully urged to give immediate consideration to the matters declared in the preamble of this resolution and to take appropriate and vigorous action to promote the early establisment of a world federation, and if Rotary International approves thereof, that copies of this resolution be sent to every Rotary Club in the world."

OGDEN, UTAH, *December 17, 1945.*

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
American Bar Association,
Netherland Plaza Hotel,
Cincinnati, Ohio:

We respectfully urge a favorable report on Fyke Farmer's proposed resolution approving Federal world government. We believe it clear that such government is the immediately essential second step in our struggle for world order and security under law.

George H. Lowe, Leroy B. Young, James A. Howell, Roy D. Thatcher, Wade M. Johnson, Neil R. Olmstead, Ira A. Huggins, John A. Hendricks, Lewis A. Wallace, Charles G. Cowley, Paul Thatcher, Joseph E. Evans, I. E. Brockbank, George S. Ballif, A. Sherman Christensen, Melvin C. Harris, S. P. Dobbs.

NOTE.—An identical telegram was sent from Salt Lake City with the following signers: Justice James H. Wolfe, Justice Roger I. McDonough, Bryan P. Leverich, Otto Weisley, A. W. Sandack, Wallace D. Hurd, James Ingebretsen, B. R. Parkinson, Calvin W. Rawlins, Llewellyn O. Thomas, Beverly S. Clendenin, Grover A. Giles, Robert B. Porter, Jr., J. Arthur Bailey, D. M. Draper, Paul H. Ray, and W. W. Ray.

Control of Atomic Energy

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President in a press interview yesterday restated his position regarding the control of atomic energy. For the second time he has emphatically stated that such control should rest in the hands of a civilian commission. The control of atomic energy is the most important problem that faces the world today. Upon the legislative disposal of this problem may well rest the fate of mankind.

ARMY AND THE ATOM

The Senate Atomic Energy Committee has chosen to compromise on an issue which is fundamental to the character of our society. From the very beginning of the American experiment, subordination of military authority to civilian authority has been recognized as a cornerstone of freedom. Yet the Senate group entrusted with the task of providing for social control of the most momentous scientific development of our time has approved what amounts to a review by the armed forces of all decisions affecting the utilization of atomic energy. The military has not yet been enthroned; but it has been proposed by a Senate committee to let it share with civilians in the shaping of national policy.

As long ago as 1870, Congress enacted a statute providing that "no officer of the Army on the active list shall hold any civil office, whether by election or appointment." This was merely statutory recognition of a tradition which has had the force of unwritten constitutional law for a century and a half. It is in response to this tradition that we have always had civilians heading the War and Navy Departments. The Army and the Navy are merely agents for the execution of policies determined by Congress and directed by the executive branch of the Government. President Truman made this point unmistakably clear at his press conference yesterday. The Army itself ought never to be entrusted with the making of policy. History is replete with tragic instances of the seizure of control by military authorities who have been granted independent power.

Under an amendment to the atomic energy bill, sponsored by Senator VANDENBERG, a military liaison committee would be given broad power to review decisions of a Civilian Atomic Energy Commission. This military committee could, on its own initiative, submit recommendations to the Commission on any question that in its opinion affects national defense—which, judging from the recent behavior of General Groves, means any question at all—and if the Commission disagreed, the military could take its case to the President for settlement.

The granting of final authority to the President is a saving feature. But to allow the military to veto the Civilian Commission even in this degree is to leave the Commission emasculated—with formal responsibility but without real control. Its every action toward promoting the development of atomic energy for industrial uses would be subject to negation. Its decisions respecting the exchange of scientific information would be liable to rejection by military officers without any scientific understanding. It is proper, of course, that the War and Navy Departments be represented on the Commission by their civilian secretaries. But the officers of the United States Army and Navy, as such, have no legitimate place in a policy-making body.

The recommendation of the Atomic Energy Committee will be looked upon, no doubt, as a victory for the Army and Navy. In point of fact, it is no such thing. It is a victory only for the ghosts of the Canadian spy scare, for the ghosts conjured up by the House Military Affairs Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee, for the ghosts into which General Groves strove to inject some substance. It will inhibit rather than promote the advancement of atomic energy. It will put American nuclear scientists in such a strait-jacket at a time when they need the utmost freedom for experimentation and research. It will be, as the Federation of Atomic Scientists called it, "a clear declaration to the world that the people of the United States will put their faith only in military might." And it will give the military a power over our lives which must make them forever suspect and forever feared.

Jackson's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is Jackson's birthday.

Andrew Jackson does not belong to the Democrats alone or Republicans. He is America's hero. We should celebrate on his birthday Jackson's great contribution to economic freedcm. He is the only President that paid off the national debt. His record is an inspiring one. He destroyed almost single-handed the greatest banking monopoly the Nation has ever known, Biddle's Bank of the United States. When Biddle and four members of Jackson's own Cabinet threatened him with political destruction if he did not sign the bank recharter bill, Old Hickory boldly replied, "Gentlemen, if the bank has that much power, if it can threaten the Government of the United States, then by the Eternal, I will destroy it." And he did destroy it.

Only in the past decade or two has the Nation begun to appreciate Jackson. Claude Bowers, with his Party Battles of the Jackson Period, showed his statesmanship. Then came Hugh Russell Fraser's Democracy in the Making, and finally the greatest of them all, Arthur Schlesinger's recent Age of Jackson.

It is grievous to see Jackson's name rarely, if ever, spoken on his birthday, but on any old convenient date used to sell dinners at a thousand dollars to $10 a plate to help fasten one-party, centralized, compulsory government on the people. Why, gentlemen, if Old Hickory knew what was going on, he would turn over in his grave.

Hon. Ellis E. Patterson, of California, Outlines California's Butter and Feed Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, our California farmers are carrying forward the high level of production which characterized their enterprise during the war years. I have been told that a number of crops will even exceed those of 1945. Nevertheless, the California farmer does have reconversion problems now and upon their solution depends the continued health of our people. The farmers, poultry raisers, and dairymen are feeling these problems through the shortage of feed and proteins. The people of California are feeling keenly the shortage of butter and meats.

How are we trying to meet these problems here in the Congress? Regarding butter, since the Government has no quotas for regional distribution of butter but simply allocates it either for military or civilian use, California's butter shortage cannot be solved solely on a regional basis. I have talked with many representatives of the dairy industry and have taken up this matter with the OPA and the Department of Agriculture, repeatedly urging a coordinated program to relieve the milk-products situation. Recently a congressional investigating committee made known its recommendations for equitable price adjustments and a gradual lowering of subsidies. It seems to me that this plus a clearly coordinated program of production, prices, and distribution must be carried out in order to solve this urgent problem.

Another critical situation is the shortage of alfalfa and hay, and other grains and proteins. Despite the plentitude of truck and fruit crops, California has always had to import grains. Now, because of pricing and importing restrictions and foreign commitments, stocks of grains are very low and production of protein meals dangerously curtailed.

I have made repeated appeals to the Department of Agriculture for relief of this situation and, along with the California delegation, am now pressing for at least 85,000 tons of grain a month to be earmarked for California from the Pacific Northwest. Because of its critical need, California has been granted 85 percent of its previous grain requirements, whereas other sections have been ordered cut to 40 percent. We are also seeking to increase import shipments of copra from the Philippine Islands and have petitioned the State Department to assist in adjusting restrictions on such imports. We have also taken up with the Department of Agriculture the need for careful control at the processor level to insure equitable distribution. By taking the steps recommended by myself and other members of the delegation, I am confident that both the milk products, grains, and proteins situations can be straightened out.

Russia—What Goes On Inside

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1945, the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, the dean of Canterbury, at the American-Soviet friendship meeting at Madison Square Garden, extolled the blessings of Russian communism. The dean had just spent 3 months in Russia. He saw Stalin and Molotov. Then he came all the way from England to tell the United States what they told him about Russia.

But how can Americans believe anything they hear about Russia until the Russians say to us, "Come on in, Americans, see for yourselves how communism works." Just now, not a single American, not even our Ambassador to Russia, can see for himself what goes on in Russia.

If we are to copy any of the ways of Russia, as some enthusiasts advise us to do, then we ought not to copy blindfoldedly, but only after careful scrutiny, comparing their achievements to our own.

If Russia has good news to share with us, like news of full employment and food for everybody, her natural impulse toward us should lead her to invite us into her house and share with us this good news. If the compulsory state and its planned economy have achieved full employment, and if the compulsory state's allotment of food and shelter in payment for labor and services adds up to more food, clothing, shelter, theater, health and general well-being, than they had under the Czars, or if it adds up to more than a system of freedom provides, that is startling news that no one would wish to suppress.

If her control of thought, speech, press, and radio makes for less crime and violence and tyranny than they had under the Czars, all the world ought to know it.

Until we can witness these alleged truths with our own eyes, would it not seem the reasonable course for Americans to keep their faith in freedom under God and the self-imposed discipline of His Commandments as a foundation for self-government?

However, since some people in our midst would adopt communism on blind faith without actually knowing how it works in the only nation remaining that pretends to work it, it then becomes a national concern to know the truth, not in theory, but in practice from direct observation.

Fortunately, a few American soldiers did get a glimpse over the wall into Russia. They are now coming home and warning us not to be saps and wishful thinkers about what goes on in Russia. Engineers sent over under lend-lease to help Russia build planes, rubber, and oil plants, are returning mystified by the child-like attitude of home folk toward Russia and her forcing on other nations her ideas of what the good life should be for them.

Our boys confirm prior estimates of 20,000,000 political opponents or suspects actually murdered outright or deliberately starved in work or prison camps, and approximately 15,000,000 more still alive but uncertain of what the outcome of their present lot as virtual prisoners or slave laborers will be. Our boys are mystified at the suggestion that we share our military bomb secrets with a government that murders its old friends, as well as millions of its own citizens, and still assume it would not drop bombs on strangers like us if it had them.

Russia is one great enclosed and darkened prison. Even our Ambassador and staff in our Embassy in Moscow have been strictly confined to a 45-mile zone around the Russian capital; they have little information of what goes on. It seems an established policy of the Moscow rules to prevent any foreign representatives to behold the glory of the socialist paradise.

We have no other American office in all Russia, except in Vladivostok, where our consul, Mr. Clubb, lives. Every night he has to go to sleep under a glaring searchlight which is focused on every part of his house. This light prevents anyone from coming in or going out without the consent of that freedom-loving organization called the Russian secret police. Indeed, no one comes in or goes out who is suspected of being able to reveal the truth to anyone outside of Russia or even to the next town inside Russia.

There are less than 30 Americans, all told, outside of the American Embassy, in the whole of Russia. Yet, as of date, more than a thousand skilled, highly trained members of the Communist Party have entered the United States and are copying from our laboratories, our factories, our agriculture, our technical and scientific laboratories the secrets of the invention and discoveries and production technique created by our American system of freedom. All they thus learn they send back to Russia, not with any idea of spreading freedom but for use in strengthening the party machinery in the suppression of the people and the entrenchment of the party members in the exercise of their tyranny.

They admire our gadgets which free men alone invent. They copy and adopt them. But they despise freedom itself, partly because of our own weak and vacillating faith in freedom, and partly because it stands in direct opposition to the party member's selfish philosophy of continuing the blessings of tyranny for the governing classes in Russia. If the Russian people should learn of the benefits of freedom, they would rise up against their oppressors. But they do not know these benefits; they do not rise because they are enslaved by history's most cruel and most completely organized tyranny, a tyranny where even missionaries of God cannot enter.

Recently Congressman CRAWFORD, of Michigan, called, without being announced, on the director of the Russian news office in the Press Building in Washington. When the Congressman extended, in good, hearty, western style, his hand of fellowship to an erstwhile ally, this director quickly stood at attention, refused his hand, and in a haughty manner notified the Congressman that he was treading on what amounted to Russian soil. He was requested to remove himself from the premises.

No; we Americans cannot understand it. But we must understand what goes on in the mind of a nation that was so recently an ally. It appears that the director was afraid that one of his own party members might be a secret police watching to see if there was any sign of friendship with the Congressman. If any Russian suspects another of being contaminated with American ideas, he is certain to be called home and dealt with. He may be shot or sent to Siberia. If he refuses to return home on demand, members of his family will be punished instead.

The girls in Russia were warned not to marry Americans nor to converse with them and so be contaminated by their ideas. However, 11 Russian girls married Americans during the war. With

all the power of the American Army and Navy, and the direct appeals of the Secretary of State, we have been unable thus far to get one of those wives out of Russia. They are now in constant fear for their lives.

The father of one of these girls was a noted engineer sent to another country to copy engineering ideas and buy machinery for Russia. When he returned home he was suspected of comparing unfavorably conditions at home with those abroad, and was shot without trial. The mother of this girl was sent to a concentration camp, where she is slowly perishing. The girl, now the wife of an American, is resigned to suicide rather than a concentration camp.

Dean Johnson says: "Unemployment is unknown in Russia." Yes, everyone must work or be denied food and room and clothing-ration cards. Such cards determine whether you eat or live at all. Their issuance depends on how much work the party managers, masters, inspectors, supervisors, or bosses can compel the workers under them to do.

Food cards are good not for a month or a year, but from week to week, day by day. Whether a worker eats lunch in the factories depends on the party manager. If there are, for example, 14 workers in a factory department, the supervisor must request of the manager not more than 12 lunch cards. Two of the 14 must go without lunch as a punishment for the 2 poorest showings in production for that morning. Its distinctive feature is its nation-wide thoroughness by which to enforce slave labor.

With cards for food and shelter and clothing and oil and fats in their hands, how easily a military type of organization controls the people. And the rewards to the various classes in the hierarchy of the party are enormous. The generals grow rich if they bear down on the colonels; the colonels improve their positions, wealth, and privileges by bearing down on the captains; the captains on the lieutenants—and the lieutenants ride the workers and farmers within an inch of their lives.

They are all paid in the coin of food, living space, clothing, and other cards. Punishment is immediate and frightening if those cards are withheld for a day. When you grow old or sick and unable to work, your food cards are cut arbitrarily in half. That means starvation for them unless they can find some way to pay tribute to their superior commissar or to beg.

Trials of persons suspected of being political enemies of the party are a waste of time. The mystery of the wholesale confessions in the purges we used to hear about are now revealed. Enemies of the state are so tortured and their nerves so destroyed by drugs that the poor victims prefer to confess and end it all rather than live.

There are 33 classes of people and privileges in Russia. The first-class privileges go to the writers, actors, and dramatists. They are the most prized, because they are the most useful to, and the greatest propagandists for, the tyranny which supports them lavishly. They have space cards for the best hotels and apartments, food cards for plenty at well-stocked stores, where they alone trade. A watchman inside each store excludes all other lower classes. This special treatment in Russia may explain much of what we read and see in some of the American press and theaters. Our fellow travelers apparently want the treatment communism provides this especially favored class.

The second class includes the professors, the philosophers, and the scientists. They hold cards for their own exclusive stores. No one else enters.

Next come such as the factory engineers, the production and distribution commissars.

So on down, until the stores and eating places and service centers of the ordinary worker and farmer and clerk are dismal, dirty places occupied by indifferent storekeepers. Clean windows and merchandise displays, light, and color would not improve their business, for all customers of each store are compelled to buy at that store.

You can imagine the lot of the farmers. Each farmer is handed a quota he must produce for the state. The state takes his production in exchange for food and supply cards. If a farmer exceeds the quota this year, up goes the quota for next year, so that the whole capacity of the farmer can be taken. Thus, the farmer resorts to stealing and hiding or corrupting the inspector. In that way the inspector further enriches himself. The farmer keeps back something from the state. And so, from top to bottom, corruption is rampant.

Honesty is gone. The spirit of religion is banished from government. The disciples of God are gone and untaught. The disciplines of one man without God over other men are substituted. The even scales of justice are thrown down. The people do not participate in making laws because the arbitrary force of organized tyranny prevails.

That is planned economy, planned lives by mere men on the grand scale, in Russia. It would be so in England and in the United States, or any place it might be tried.

We Americans are still a patient and good-natured people without an organized group tough enough to seize power over us at home. Abroad, especially in Europe, we are looked upon as defenseless babes in the international woods. The Communist bosses in Moscow must laugh at our simplicity and will to believe the best. The United States must be the nicest assignment any GPU agent can get from the NKVD. We are such open and friendly souls. Our homes, our hotels, our factories, our universities, our Government offices all have the welcome sign out.

We do not like to do business on any other basis. We have a long tradition of friendliness and we give any man our hand of fellowship. It is so hard for us to believe that any nation can harbor malice of heart or treason of purpose in what professes to be good relations.

Remember Pearl Harbor. Remember that eternal vigilance is the price of security. No nation is left in doubt that we Americans desire peace; peace at home and throughout the world. There is no black-out of good will in America. But let us tell Russia's handful of self-appointed leaders that if they insist on the expansion of their Red tyranny in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, and in the Americas, we will bend every effort to defend liberty, truth, and peace.

Surely, it would seem impossible for desolated and ruined Russia to start any war, anywhere, at this time. Then let her stop bluffing. Let her open her doors. She will find that Americans are not going to take advantage of her change to a new policy of decency, cooperation, and honest human relations. We have heard a lot these last months about a new world or one world. The obstacles we have met in making world peace work have shown us that only a moral agreement among all nations can lay the foundation of peace. If Russia persists in tyrannical methods, all decent, peace-loving nations, great and small, must serve notice on her that such methods place her outside international good will and cooperation. The world can have peace only if Russia changes her spirit and ways. Then only will contracts be kept.

When that happens, our diplomats will become not prisoners, but welcome guests. Our mutual relations will become firmly established on moral integrity. And the shadows of war will disappear in the light of honest friendship.

However, Moscow must be told that if she chooses to continue her uncalled-for war of nerves, we Americans have excellent nerves. Neither are we to be deceived about her ways being better than the ways of freedom under moral law.

OPA Penalizes Veterans for Lack of Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the Congress has passed legislation to assist the war veteran to return to civil life, to help him back to his place in the community, assist him in employment and business, it seems that every Bureau does its utmost to deter and stop the veteran from getting back to his place in his own community. This includes lack of clothing and shelter, caused by the abortive acts of the various bureaus, creating shortage of materials.

And now comes the Office of Price Administration and says to a war veteran that it will not give him a quota of sugar to carry on a small business because of the fact he does not have sufficient money to purchase the equipment outright. He is able to lease the store equipment, but the Office of Price Administration says he can have no sugar to operate his business because he does not own the store

equipment. I am quoting his letter, as follows:

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Member of Congress, House
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEICHEL: I have a chance to lease an ice-cream store at Huron, Ohio, for 1 year for $1,200. This includes all of the equipment, except for the glassware, silverware, and milk-shake mixers and containers, which I will have to purchase myself. This business would mean an income for me, as I have been unable to secure employment of any satisfaction.

In order to do business and accept the lease, I must have a ration of at least 150 pounds of sugar per week. I need sugar for flavoring, which will be used for sodas, sundaes, and so forth.

I went to the Office of Price Administration at Cleveland, Ohio. I discussed the situation with a Mr. ———, and he advised that I would have to be principal owner of the equipment inside the store, before I could receive any sugar.

Under Mr. ——— condition, I will not be able to accept the lease, as sugar is needed for this business.

Therefore, I would appreciate your kind assistance in this matter.

Enclosed is a photostat copy of my discharge.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. SLYKER,
Veteran.

Mr. Speaker, how long must the people of this country and the returning war veteran be hobbled and prevented from earning a living, after he has fought to preserve this country.

This is just a specimen of the hundreds of injustices imposed upon the returning war veteran by those who sit at shiny desks. I am demanding that the war veteran be given his right to live as against the Office of Price Administration.

Speech of Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, that there is a rising tide of indignation, throughout the country against the proposal contained in a recent speech at Fulton, Mo., by former Prime Minister Winston Churchill suggesting an Anglo-American alliance, is evidenced by the action taken some days ago by the West Virginia League for Political Action.

The league's statement calling upon our Government to reassert its policy of Big Three and United Nations collaboration as the best policy to guarantee a lasting peace follows:

THE ISSUE IS CLEAR

"Winston Churchill, whose Tory Party was repudiated by the British people, has taken advantage of our hospitality to call for an Anglo-American military alliance against Russia."

So declared the West Virginia League for Political Education which issued a nonpartisan appeal last week-end to all peace-minded West Virginians to raise the alarm against this proposal and the entire campaign to split the Big Three completely and undo the United Nations Organization.

The league pointed out that the UNO transcends political partisanship and that both Democrats and Republicans are denouncing Churchill's cynical proposition. The issue is the Churchill road to war or the UNO and world peace, the league declared, and urged West Virginians to call upon the Government to:

1. Reassert the United States policy of Big Three and UNO collaboration as the best guaranty of lasting peace.

2. Denounce the Churchill plea for an Anglo-American military coalition against the Soviet Union, whose people bore the brunt in the defeat of the Nazi war machine.

3. Spurn the Churchill suggestion that we associate ourselves with British imperialism in its pretense of bringing its great principles of freedom and the rights of man to the oppressed peoples of Indonesia, India, Egypt, and other areas now undergoing "pacification" by British bomb and bayonet.

4. Reject the warmed-over Red-menace technique of Hitler, which is now being used to prevent the complete eradication of nazism and fascism as pledged in the Potsdam and Yalta agreements.

5. Reject Churchill's implied call for a holy war. Such a war, though begun as the castigation of words, as warned by the Federal Council of Churches at Columbia last week, would soon descend to physical force and the clash of arms.

The league, representing religion, education, social welfare, business, labor, and other groups, urged West Virginians to write their Congressmen and President Truman against this sinister campaign which, if implemented by a military axis against our ally in World War II, would lead straight to a suicidal third world war.

Pacific War Surplus Property Problem of Care and Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of March 14, 1946:

PACIFIC WAR SURPLUS PROPERTY PROBLEM OF CARE AND DISPOSAL—SHIPMENT TO UNITED STATES UNECONOMIC AND PERSONNEL IS LACKING FOR PROPER MAINTENANCE IN TROPICS

(By B. M. McKelway)

Had there been a carefully conceived policy of what to do, when the war ended, with the vast stores of war matériel assembled on Pacific island bases to support the final assault on Japan, there still would have been tremendous and unavoidable waste. This waste would merely be another form of the waste that is war, from beginning to end.

But the war's end caught us as unprepared on this problem as we were for the war's beginning. And the problem has been complicated to an extent not generally realized here at home by the feverish haste to demobilize. For no matter what we may intend eventually to do with some of the property that still may be profitably used, it is impossible to maintain the property in a tropical climate if the men are not available to maintain it.

Because it is more or less typical of the conditions found in Hawaii, Saipan, Tinian, and Luzon, in the Philippines, one might select as an example a tremendous B–29 storage depot and airfield on Guam. Last July this place was one of the busiest spots in the world, representing one of the most remarkable of all the feats of transportation and construction performed by American initiative and ability in fighting the war.

Today it is a ghost town, the jungle already is beginning to recapture the miles of concrete runways carved from its depths, the weather already is staining a rusty brown the mountainous piles of crated B–29 engines, radar equipment, and the other highly expensive material needed to maintain the bombers as they dropped their daily dose of 1,193 tons on Japan.

A dejected and weary colonel drove us around the place. The value of the property piled there was estimated in the neighborhood of $900,000,000. Four months ago there were 14,000 men on this field. When we were there a few weeks ago there were a thousand. Today there may be half that number.

The colonel's dilemma is faced by his brethren on many other such spots in the Pacific. What can he do to preserve this property? Much of it was covered with tarpaulins. Much of it was exposed, though crated, to the weather. But it is going to ruin there before his eyes. What could he do with it even if he had the men to do something with it? Now that the war is over, what useful purpose can be served by a B–29 engine in a crate, when B–29's with engines are already a drug on the market? What can anybody do with radar equipment designed for use only in a B–29? The colonel did not know. I haven't been able to find anybody who does.

Guam has become picturesquely notable for its supply of belly tanks. These fine aluminum, tear-shaped tanks were manufactured, I was told, at a cost of about $300 apiece. Great quantities of them are piled in their original shipping boxes along some of Guam's fine highways. And every native family on Guam has acquired at least one of them and proudly given it a place of honor among less spectacular household articles displayed beneath thatched roofs.

STYER HAS BIG SURPLUS JOB

Cut in half, longitudinally, they make canoes, even sailboats. But except for the natives on Guam, who prize them for their shiny beauty or for use as water cisterns and canoes, how is such property to find a market—or the transportation to bring it to a market? Not merely the belly tanks. The airplanes that carried them now sit dejectedly with folded wings on the runways of deserted depots, waiting for somebody to say what is to be done with them—and who is to do it.

Lt. Gen. Wilhelm D. Styer in Manila has had one of the biggest of all surplus jobs on his hands. As of February 15, 3,316,800 tons, with a value of $1,450,000,000, had been declared excess in his command. Of this amount, 1,396,000 tons have been sent back as military supplies to the armed forces in the United States. About 868,000 tons have been declared surplus and turned over to the Foreign Liquidation Commission for disposal—outside the United States. There remain some 824,000 tons to be returned to the United States or declared surplus for FLC's disposal.

Some of this surplus rolling stock includes 8,000 quarter-ton trucks, 9,500 two-and-a-half-ton trucks, 1,000 dump trucks and 13,600 vehicles, weapon carriers and personnel carriers. There have been made available to the Filipinos, for rehabilitation of their roads, such material as 2,200 bulldozers, 51 cranes, 524 road rollers, 1,100 scrapers, and 4,000,000 linear feet of culvert piping. The FLC is understood to have disposed of much of this equipment to the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines on a credit basis, against the money which the Filipinos

hope eventually will be forthcoming from Congress as just compensation for some of their war losses.

UNABLE TO CARE FOR EQUIPMENT

While the Army and the Navy can declare material surplus and turn it over for dispcsal to the Foreign Liquidation Commission, the military authorities are still responsible for its upkeep until the FLC can find a market for what it hopes to sell. This, in view of demobilization, is what gives the military authorities one of their worst headaches. They lack the men to take care of the equipment. General Styer—who is in a position to do it—is now employing 200,000 civilians on surplus property in the Philippines, 99 percent of them being Filipinos. The arrangement is not altogether satisfactory. One of the big tasks in turning over surplus to the FLC is to fill out the forms describing the surplus property in all technical detail. It is difficult to find Filipinos with the technical knowledge required—difficult, in fact, to find anybody with the technical knowledge required to prepare these inventories and accurately to describe the property.

There are purchasing agents from Australia and China in Manila looking over the surplus market. But the problem of what to do, say, with a truck for which no purchaser is found is illustrated by the mathematical calculations which show that it would cost more to ship the truck back to the United States and sell it than to burn it up or dump it in the ocean. A lot of other war material falls in the same category.

As a taxpayer, would you prefer that the Government lose $50 more by selling a truck than by dumping it in the ocean?

Make up your mind, because the cheapest thing to do with a lot of surplus war material is to dump it overboard and forget about it.

Price and Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Illinois League of Women Voters and an article that appeared in the Chicago Sun of March 12.

In view of the alarming situation that is growing worse and worse in this country as to price and rent controls, I think these comments are very timely.

ILLINOIS LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Chicago, Ill., March 12, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: Organizations in the Chicago metropolitan area and other parts of Illinois are mobilized for the immediate extension of price and rent controls, until the end of June 1947, without crippling amendments; also for the extension or enactment of other controls necessary for this purpose, including farm subsidies and the Second War Powers Act.

At a meeting held under the auspices of the Illinois League of Women Voters, the delegates which were invited from more than 90 city, State, and national organizations voted unanimously for the following resolution:

"Whereas inflation is one of the greatest dangers now facing every American citizen, whether businessman, laborer, farmer, or housewife, and

"Whereas unprecedented spending power in the face of acute shortages which will inevitably continue for many months constitute a grave inflationary threat, and

"Whereas mounting attacks on price control daily increase inflationary pressures, and

"Whereas delay and uncertainty with reference to price policy dangerously retard production: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That to prevent the disastrous spiraling of prices, the undersigned demand the immediate extension of price and rent controls until June 30, 1947, without crippling amendments, and such related measures as are necessary."

The enclosed clipping from the Chicago Sun, March 12, 1946, is self-explanatory and descriptive of the meeting.

You will note that a citizens' committee to press further for the extension of price and rent controls was called for. This committee is now being formed and will act to coordinate the already widespread efforts being made. Delegates at our meeting yesterday were not confined to consumer groups, but included representatives of labor, agriculture, business, professional and white-collar, veterans', religious, social-welfare, fraternal, and other organizations. It is intended that the new citizens' committee will also represent this wide cross section of the population.

We urge that you give immediate consideration to this request for action made by so wide and representative a group of citizens.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. WALTER T. FISHER,
President.

[From the Chicago Sun of March 12, 1946]

NINETY GROUPS DEMAND PRICE RULE STAY—COMMITTEE IS SLATED TO CONTINUE FIGHT FOR EXTENSION OF ACT

(By Rosemary Redding)

Representatives of 90 of the city's civic, social, and welfare groups yesterday demanded immediate extension of the Price and Rent Control Act and laid plans for the formation of a citizens' committee to work toward that end.

The action was taken at a meeting sponsored by the Illinois League of Women Voters at its headquarters at 225 North Michigan Avenue and attended by delegates from organizations representing thousands of consumers in the Chicago area.

EXTENSION TO JUNE 30 ASKED

The resolution, adopted unanimously by the group, asked extension of the act until June 30, 1947, "without crippling amendments and with such related measures as are necessary" to prevent the disastrous spiraling of prices.

Delegates to the meeting named Mrs. Mark Massel, of the league's economic welfare committee, to head a committee which will investigate action by citizens in other cities and from a citizens' committee similar to those working for the extension of the Price and Rent Control Act in New York and Los Angeles.

PETITIONS ARE DISTRIBUTED

Petitions asking extension of the act were distributed by the Chicago Federation of Consumers at the meeting and representatives of that organization said hundreds of them already were being circulated in the city.

The federation petition also asks establishment of ceiling prices on new and old housing and the continuation of food subsidies necessary to hold down the cost of living.

OPA PROGRAM DISCUSSED

The action by the group yesterday followed a spirited discussion of the Office of Price Administration's program by G. Owen Fairweather, Jr., an attorney speaking for business; Donald Kirkpatrick, general counsel for the American Farm Bureau Federation; Samuel Jacobs, of Washington, D. C., a member of the labor advisory committee to the OPA, and Harry Lyford, a representative of the OPA's Chicago office.

Among representatives of groups which signed the resolution asking immediate extension of the act without crippling amendments were those from the League of Women Voters, Chicago Federation of Consumers, Independent Voters of Illinois, American Association of University Women, Illinois Home Economic Association, Chicago Area Council of the American Veterans Committee, Central States Co-operatives, Inc., White Collar Congress, Chicago Urban League.

OTHER GROUPS LISTED

Other groups represented were the Public Housing Association, Association of Chicago Teachers, Chicago Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Houses, National Council of Jewish Women, Women's Trade Union League, American Dietic Association, Chicago Action Council, Auxiliary to the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts, Lithuanian Committee, Chase House and International Workers Order 59.

Copies of the resolution will be sent to President Truman and to other Government officials and heads of House and Senate committees concerned with the price and rent control program.

Coalition Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent which appeared in the Baltimore Sun:

COALITION JUSTIFIED

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—That in House and Senate most of the Southern Democrats and most of the Republicans have formed a coalition strong enough to defeat or enact parts of the administration program appears to annoy excessively some of our leading publicists and politicians—particularly those whose tendencies are toward the left.

These work themselves almost into a state of fury over the fact. They denounce the coalition as though it were unpatriotic and degraded. They picture it as wickedly conceived by the most sinister of men whose sole purpose is to frustrate the great humanitarian efforts of the true liberals. Of course, it is nothing of the kind. Actually, the coalition is a natural and logical joining together for effective action of men who think and feel alike on most domestic issues.

They do happen to be, relatively, conservatives; but, as yet, there is nothing criminal about that. As to the moral right of men who think alike (but, for election purposes, happen to wear different party labels) to consult and act together in Congress, it is absurd to have that questioned by the exceedingly voluble radical groups who for the past 10 years have been part of perhaps the strangest and most incongruous political coalition in American history.

The Roosevelt coalition was composed of former Republicans, former Socialists, labor-union leaders, southern Democrats and northern Negroes, Communists, crackpots,

the big-city bosses, the so-called intelligentsia along with all the reds, yellows, and pinks in the country. This was no natural coalition. This was no combination of men who think alike. It was an unnatural combination of men fundamentally far apart but welded together on election day by the cementing power of the party label and the cohesive quality of selfish interests. Despite his immense prestige, Mr. Roosevelt could not hold it together between elections and had lost control of Congress before the war came on.

Compared with that coalition, the present coalition is honest and straightforward. There was neither honesty nor candor about the other. So, far from being inimical to the national interest, the present coalition, in some ways at least, will be beneficial. It is by no means ideal. It will make mistakes and probably it will do some damage and the men in it are not all noble and unselfish.

But the chances are it will do more good than harm. For example, without this coalition no regulatory labor legislation would have passed the House, and without this coalition no bill opposed by the labor lobby would stand a chance of passing the Senate. Without it, the pro-CIO chairmen of the Labor Committees in House and Senate could continue with impunity to smother bills which a majority of Congress and of the people favor, just as the Senate Judiciary Committee continues to smother the Hobbs anti-racketeering bill, twice passed by the House. The only hope of getting such bills through lies in this combination of Republicans and southern Democrats.

So, too, the only hope of curtailing governmental waste, instituting real economy, and approaching an actual budget balance, rests upon this coalition of conservatives. It is true it has blocked—and will block—some of the administration programs. It may unwisely hamstring the OPA. But, aside from that, some of the administration program should be blocked. For example, a national service was performed when this coalition emasculated the foolish so-called full-employment bill, which would have opened the door to vast new public expenditures and taken a great stride away from the private-enterprise system.

And it will be right if in the Senate it lines up against the $65,000,000 Federal school-lunch expansion program and against a number of other administration-backed bills which call for increased expenditures for nonessential projects. The plain truth is that whatever is obtained at this session in the way of reduction in the size and cost of the Federal bureaucracy will come through this coalition. And what, if anything, in the way of legislation is enacted to place responsibility upon labor unions, to curb their excesses and diminish strikes, will be because of the coalition, not because of the administration. In brief, the administration, left to itself, will carry out the Roosevelt policies. This would mean no labor legislation not sanctioned by the CIO and a continuation of unrestrained spending.

There is no intention here to indorse everything this coalition does. Undoubtedly, it will commit sins both of omission and commission. Through unwise leadership it may defeat sound proposals behind which the President has put his weight. Nevertheless, it appears the only instrument by which some genuinely bad propositions can be blocked and some really good ones put through. Some of the best men in the two parties are among its members. And the idea that it is malignant is not cherished by the unprejudiced and informed.

Elimination of Pauper Clause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to provide a very necessary correction in the handling of cases of veterans needing hospitalization furnished by the Government. I have offered a bill to eliminate the so-called pauper clause from the Veterans' Administration forms used in applying for hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

This pauper clause should have been eliminated long ago. It requires applicants to state if they are financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care. There is no need for such a provision and it is unjust to the veteran to require this information. The allowance or disallowance of a service-connected disability is not contingent upon the financial status of the claimant. Therefore, the present requirement for such a statement under the pauper clause is impertinent and not necessary for admittance to a hospital.

I trust that Congress will give speedy approval to this measure in order to avoid further inconvenience and annoyance to the veterans in need of treatment. While the pauper clause could be eliminated administratively by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and it has been suggested for some time that this be done, no action has been taken and I have therefore decided to seek this relief through legislative channels.

Strategic Minerals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington Post for February 11 entitled "Strategic Minerals." For some time now I have been concerned about the natural resources of our country and have authored two bills which are presently pending before the House Committee on Public Lands. They are H. R. 2852, introduced on April 5, 1945, and later enlarged and perfected into H. R. 4955, introduced on December 11, 1945. The latter bill, among other things, provides for the establishment of a national natural resources policy, a natural resources inventory, and the creation of a Natural Resources Council. I do not believe that the need for such legislation can be questioned by anyone, and trust that the House will act thereon at the earliest possible moment.

The article follows:

STRATEGIC MINERALS

The rich mineral resources which have been among the foundations of this country's wartime strength and peacetime prosperity are in a state of serious depletion. In a letter to the President accompanying his annual report, Secretary of the Interior Ickes calls attention to this extremely serious development and sets forth several specific remedies. We spent our resources during the war, he notes, "with wanton prodigality." We had to. Now, "our known usable reserves of 22 essential minerals have dwindled to a 35-year supply or less." But there is one offsetting benefit which came to us, as the Secretary observes, out of the very prodigality with which we expended our treasure. "The danger of defeat," he notes, "sped our improvement of new methods of exploring for mineral deposits, and for processing ores."

Mr. Ickes wants this sort of improvement to be continued. He urges that we intensify our experiments in extracting metals from low-grade ores by means of new and improved processes. If we do this, we may be able in many instances to make use of ores which it is not now commercially feasible to extract or refine. In the case of manganese, for example, our present needs are met almost entirely by imports; but mining experts know that there is enough low-grade manganese ore within the United States to supply us for more than a century—if we could develop more efficient techniques for utilizing it. We have successfully done this sort of thing before. Due to cheaper and better methods of mining and treatment, we now meet a goodly portion of our copper needs from low-grade ore in Utah.

We need to make an exhaustive study of the mineral potentialities of the United States. Mr. Ickes believes that the discovery of new sources of strategic materials or of new means of developing those known to exist will be one of the great benefits of a program of regional valley developments. And very properly, we think, he places great stress upon the potentialities of the continental shelf, title to which was recently asserted by President Truman in behalf of the United States. "If we discount the obvious fact it is uninhabited and uninhabitable," says Mr. Ickes, "the continental shelf ranks with the land which we acquired by the Louisiana Purchase, or by the opening of the West, or by the purchase of Alaska."

Mr. Ickes strongly urges also, of course, the importation of strategic materials which we need and the establishment of stock piles for future use. This is one obvious remedy for our depletion of resources which ought to be undertaken without delay. Although the Senate passed a stock-piling bill just prior to its Christmas recess, the House has not yet taken any action on it. The time is now peculiarly opportune. For we can utilize some of our lend-lease balances abroad to pay for minerals which other countries possess in abundance. It would seem mere elementary common sense to do this on the broadest possible scale.

Address of Hon. Paul V. McNutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of

Hon. Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, before the National Press Club, March 14, 1946:

I think I can speak to most of you as old and good friends. I have been around Washington a long time. So have most of you. I don't think polite introductory remarks are necessary. I need only say that it is good to see so many familiar faces which have been missing from Washington during most of the war years. Many of you have come back from what we used to call strange and distant places. Those places are still strange but they are no longer so distant. It took me 3 days to cross the 10,000 miles from the Philippines. I stopped for most of a day in both Honolulu and San Francisco. Manila is no further from Washington today than Omaha, Nebr., was 20 or 30 years ago.

But while we have built wonderful machines which have destroyed the ancient concepts of space and time, while we have made it possible for Washington and Manila to be within 2 days' flying time of each other, and within split seconds of communication by radio, we have not yet swept away the barriers which lack of information has raised between us and our neighbors.

I am constantly amazed here by the lack of factual information regarding people and events 2 days away, and by the absence of understanding here of the issues we face on our western horizon. I recognize as a fact of life that most Americans are more interested in the chances of the Brooklyn Dodgers to win the pennant this year than in the chances of the Philippine people to survive as an independent nation. Incidentally, from what I read, don't bet on the Dodgers. They have a shaky infield.

But I don't think I am exaggerating the importance of our mission in the Philippines when I say that the broad interests of the United States are at stake in the islands today, and that should we fail to realize that fact, and act on that realization, we will have failed to profit from a credit which we have built up in the Orient by 48 years of work, and which we have recently protected with an unstinted expenditure of billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives.

Many Americans are still inclined today to think of the Philippines as a distant land which we acquired by a blunder, lost to the Japanese by treachery, and liberated by our own main strength. According to this illusory viewpoint, we have now restored the Philippines to the Filipinos, we are going to give them their independence, plus some friendly advice and our best wishes, and then, having unselfishly removed ourselves from the scene, we will return our attention to our labor troubles, the housing situation, and spring training.

The short-sighted Americans holding this view would have us say, "We wish the Philippines Godspeed. If they can't make a go of it, well, that's too bad. They asked for it. It's none of our business any more. We have problems of our own."

I say to you with all the power I can muster that if this is the American attitude—and happily it isn't—we ought to pull in our armies and navies, recall our ambassadors and ministers, and ask the Germans and Japanese—or others who might be interested—to hurry up and take over. Such an attitude would indicate that we are too busy battling the weeds in our own front lawn to see the plight of a neighbor and dependent relative whose own small house was razed in the struggle to preserve ours.

As most of you know, I was in the Philippines between 1937 and 1939 as United States High Commissioner. In those 2 years I developed a deep affection for the people and a tremendous attachment to the places and persons I found and met there. As any of you who have ever been in the prewar Philippines can testify, this land and its people have a quality whose memory does not easily fade.

It was with a heavy heart that I read, through the war years, of what was going on in the Philippines. I thought of friends and of favorite places under the cruel control of the enemy. Then came the liberation. I saw pictures and newsreels of the carnage and destruction. I felt as if my own home State were being ravaged and devastated.

But I was not prepared for what I had to see when I arrived in Manila last August on a special mission for the President. No pictures were sufficiently graphic, no words colorful or brutal enough, to tell me what had taken place. When I returned to Manila in November as High Commissioner again, I saw more scenes of destruction. Even after 4 months in the islands every day is a new heartbreak as I see more vacant and shattered places, hear of more old friends dead or maimed.

Manila today is a city of missing places and missing faces. Vast stretches of the city, once crowded with houses and shops, are flattened and bare, with only rude scars of brick and stone to recall the stately and simple buildings which had once made of Manila the "pearl of the Orient." There are districts where the drum-fire of our own artillery has left only ghastly heaps of columns and hanging cornices, scarecrows of buildings, skeletons of buildings. There are also those sections which the Japanese, in their savage fury and bitterness, born of defeat, wantonly burned out, destroyed and obliterated. It is not like a city wiped out of existence, as Hiroshima and Nagasaki were. It is not like Tokyo, almost neatly destroyed in part by air bombing. It reflects in even superficial appearance the titanic, desperate struggle of two peoples for inches of ground, for individual houses, for individual rooms and cellars. Stark violence is stamped indelibly on the face of every street, every corner, every building. They look as if they had been literally torn apart by the claws of men, rather than by their machines of destruction.

But everywhere, like the jungle which quickly reclaims the abandoned tropical clearing, the flotsam of humanity has swept back into ruined Manila and taken root, huddled in blowzy shelters of rusted roof iron and tobacco, unbelievably crowded in unimaginable squalor. Shattered shops with newspapers substituting for windows shelter entire family clans. Cemetery crypts and vaults are homes for hundreds. I shudder to think what an epidemic, if it came, would do to Manila today.

In place of the Escolta, once resplendent with fine department stores and bustling with buyers, there are today only naked ruin and devastation, overgrown with humanity. Honky-tonks and kootch palaces, catering to the GI's, stretch along Rizal Avenue and Quezon Boulevard, once the show streets of the city. The Legislative Building, the Palace of Justice, the Agriculture Building, the Finance Building, the residence and Office of the United States High Commissioner, all the famous cathedrals and churches of church-filled Manila are shell-shattered hulks or are obliterated completely.

I merely describe Manila in this detail because it is the city that most of you who have been in the Philippines know. It is the same in Cebu, in Zamboanga, in Iloilo, in Domaguete, in Legaspi, in Baguio, in all the once-thriving cities of the Philippines.

The countryside is not much better off. Most of the prewar roads and highways are ruined beyond repair. Traveling over the rutted roads—from some of which the Japanese simply shaved off the concrete mile by mile for use on air fields—you come across villages and barrios burned completely to the ground, some deserted, some crowded, like Manila, with renascent, rudely sheltered humanity. Farms and plantations by the mile lie fallow, untended and uncultivated, monuments to the economic planning of the Japanese who thought they could turn sugar lands into cotton and tobacco lands into rubber, with the Filipinos as slave partners in the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere. I needn't tell you how completely that attempt failed.

There is little transportation besides that afforded by the Army vehicles. Farm-to-market transport is just beginning to be built up from our surplus Army and Navy stocks, but the prices charged the farmers for that transport is in most cases prohibitive. The Japanese took trucks, wagons, carts, and even baby buggies to carry their military supplies. They took the carabaos, the native beast of burden, out of the fields, those the Filipinos didn't hide, or eat to keep the Japanese from getting them. And let me tell you, carabao is mighty tough eating.

That is a rough and very inadequate description of the physical appearance of the Philippines. I have seen most of the war-torn areas of the world—Japan, China, France, Belgium, and Italy. The Philippines are as badly destroyed as any and worse than most. As a country, as an economic and geographic unit the Philippines, as far as my experience and observations go, is the most devastated land in the world.

Now what about the people and their economy? What has happened to them during the past 4 years? In the first place, in the Philippines the people are the economy. They are the economy in the sense that almost all work output is hand work. In the two agricultural pursuits which occupy by far the bulk of the population, rice and coconut production, hands perform the work of machines. They must be skilled hands. They must be willing hands.

But these people today are confused, uncertain, and puzzled. The national price structure is topsy-turvy. The price of goods which they must buy—clothes, household utensils, and fertilizer—has risen out of all proportion to the price offered them for their agricultural produce. For most of the major export crops, coconuts, sugar and tobacco, there is no assurance of a market beyond July 4 of this year. Hence, there is virtually no production.

To a simple people, who gaze at their devastated and prostrate land with bewilderment and incomprehension, the facts of world economy carry little understanding or conviction. The physical war wounds of these people are deep. But aside from them, the people cannot understand what has paralyzed the national economy, suspended it at dead center, and rendered it incapable of motion. Today they are grasping at straws, awkwardly inspecting all sorts of ideological panaceas, and wondering, with increasing impatience, why the United States hasn't provided the necessary assistance. They look to the United States because they have looked to the United States for leadership for almost 50 years. They look to the United States because it was the United States that liberated them from the enemy, it was the United States, and the Commonwealth, for whom the people struggled and died. It was the United States that during the war promised them economic rehabilitation.

So far our promises have been largely unredeemed. We liberated them, it is true. In the early days of the liberation, we gave them foodstuffs, and clothed many of them in khaki. Now we sell them foodstuffs and make some clothing available for sale at healthy prices. We have restored most of the essential utilities, utilities which were essential to our armed forces. We have kept those who escaped the holocaust of war alive, but not comfortable. But although the date of independence approaches, we have done little about their national economy, little to insure their ability to survive economically as an independent nation. We have given them promises, we have introduced in our Congress legislation for economic rehabili-

tation. But to date it is all "unfinished business."

We promised their fighting men, those who fought and died on Bataan, and those who resisted the Japanese through the dark years of the occupation, that they would be rewarded, that their widows and orphans would be cared for, that those who were disabled would be looked after. So far no pensions have been paid. Congress recently withdrew the GI bill of rights' benefits from Philippine Commonwealth Army veterans after the promise had been made that the benefits would be given. Emergency money, printed and issued by the guerrillas in support of their military operations, is still unredeemed.

I must say, in all good conscience, that there are good legal reasons for most of the delays. There have been practical difficulties in the way of implementing our glowing promises to the Philippines. Since my return to the States, we have been able to overcome some of those obstacles. Some of our promises, I believe, are on the road to redemption. But as of today, they are unredeemed. A great and heroic people are still held fast in the quicksands of confusion, largely because we haven't been able to deliver on our obligations. We have our own domestic troubles, to be sure. They have occupied our attention and must continue to. But it is hard for Filipinos who have suffered beyond belief and description from participation in our war to understand that it takes months to straighten out legal definitions and obtain departmental clearances on legislation which to the Filipinos is of the essence of life itself.

Today the Philippines, a year after liberation, still have virtually no economy. Imports are flowing in, some money is still being made in service trades catering to the GI's, goods are being sold and resold. Money is fairly plentiful among merchants and middlemen, but the common people of the Philippines as yet have no sustained means of livelihood.

Rice is being raised for local consumption, although far from enough. But an entire people do not know today what their source of revenue will be tomorrow. The government has no idea where it will get the money to support even the bare essentials of independent government functions. Those Filipinos who have been working on Army and Navy installations, as jeep drivers, in night clubs and juke joints do not know what jobs they will find tomorrow when the Army and Navy have been reduced to peacetime size.

These people once worked on sugar plantations, in coconut groves, in mills, mines, and fields. Those establishments are all idle today. And with the land laid waste, transportation gone, with families dispersed, with chaos supreme, there has been no start on economic reconstruction or rehabilitation. And why not? I've already answered the question in part. I will try to spell it out a little.

For 41 years following our acquisition of the Philippines from Spain we trained the Philippines to be dependent on the American duty-free market. We fastened on that country a four-product economy—sugar, coconuts, tobacco, and hemp. We needed those products. We couldn't get them elsewhere. Except for rice and fish, which are wholly consumed in the Philippines, 95 percent of the total national prewar production of the Philippines was for export, and export almost entirely to the United States. The export products were those I have enumerated. The cultivation, marketing, and processing of those commodities occupied the bulk of the national energy. But most of those commodities are low-margin profit products. They cannot come in over our tariff walls. On July 4 of this year those tariff walls will be raised against the Philippines just as they are raised against any foreign country unless the legislation now pending on Capitol Hill is passed. There is no question that it will be passed. I know of no congressional opinion against it. But until it is passed capital will not flow into the Philippines to rehabilitate those industries. There would be no point in rebuilding coconut processing plants without an assurance that copra will be able to come into the American market duty free for some time to come.

There was no foreknowledge in the minds of those who framed the Philippine Independence Act in 1933 that war would strike the Philippines down in 1941. No one knew then that when independence day came the Philippines would be prostrate and in shambles. Yet we are going ahead with the independence program, because it is to our interest to do so, as well as because the Filipinos desire it so. It is implicit in our grant of independence to the Philippines that we will go ahead with our program of economic assistance, and that we accept the necessity of regarding the Philippines not as just another foreign nation, but as a nation whose sovereignty we will have created, and whose survival it is our unshakeable obligation to guarantee. The people of the Philippines have earned that guarantee, with all its implications, in the past 4 years.

I have heard it said in some quarters that the United States, in 1776, also started out its existence in the face of grave difficulties, and that there was no great neighbor then to guarantee our survival. Why shouldn't the Filipinos try it alone as we did? I will answer that question. When the 13 States started their dangerous experiment in self-government, the productive areas of the new Nation were largely unscarred by war. The very country which had unwillingly given up its sovereign claim to these States was a willing buyer of all its commodities. The spindles of the mills of England were hungry for the cotton from our Southern States. There were ready buyers for our timbers, our resins, our indigo, our tobacco. Our merchant clippers were already sailing the seven seas. There was no question of sustenance, of personal survival. There were no powerful neighbors, except across the distant seas. As soon as Britain had recognized our independence, her fleet guaranteed our security from enemies across the Atlantic. British and French capital crowded across the ocean to invest in our infant industries, in shipping, in agriculture. The great powers of Europe courted us for our economic favors. The wonders of the industrial revolution took place simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic.

What a different present the Philippines face! Here is a nation whose exports can be bought only in the United States. China cannot buy. Neither can Japan. Perhaps Russia can, I do not know. The world is bitterly competitive. Except for the United States, the world is stripped of capital. Goods and commodities are wanted, but on credit.

There is no capital in the Philippines to buy the machinery for reconstruction, not to speak of outright reconversion of the national economy. There is no transport. The Philippines must wait long and work diligently before she can catch up with her neighbors in industrial and mechanical potential. She can borrow no private capital, because private capital demands assurance of profit. She can float no internal loans, because her people lack the money to invest. She cannot barter, because the only commodities she can readily produce can be sold only in the American duty-free market.

It is true that there are rich mineral deposits in the Philippines—gold, chromium, iron, and manganese. But the mines are flooded. It will take time and money to pump out the mines, reset the timbers, buy, transport, and set in place the necessary machinery. Moreover, a mining economy cannot prosper in the midst of the ruins of an agricultural economy.

That is the picture today. It is a dark picture, but far from a hopeless picture. The people are there—18,000,000 of them. The soil is fruitful and good. The ground is rich in mineral wealth. They need only the capital, the counsel, and the markets to start their economy going again. We can and must provide the capital, the markets, and the counsel.

Most of you know the broad legislative program the administration has proposed for the Philippines. There is first of all a trade bill, providing 8 years of free trade, and 20 years of gradually increasing tariffs or gradually decreasing quotas, giving an incentive for adjustment to independence of the free American market. There is another measure providing roughly $500,000,000 of war damage payments to the Commonwealth government and to individual properly owners, trusts, partnerships and corporations, Americans and Filipinos. There is attached a provision that all money paid out in war damages must be reinvested in the Philippines or used for the reconstruction and repair of damaged structures. With this money, which will pay for about half of the damage done, the mills, mines and processing plants can be repaired or rebuilt; the farms can be re-tilled; ships, boats and motor transport can be replaced. The products of reconstructed enterprises will be assured of a market in the United States. The government will be assured of some revenue. The Philippine Government, possibly with the aid of a loan, can begin to plan not only the reconstruction of the war-damaged economy, but also the mechanization of some phases of agriculture, the diversification of the economy, the industrialization of some parts of the Islands, the exploitation of the mineral and timber resources, and the solution of the many internal problems which face this troubled people.

That is our formula, the administration's formula for aid to the Philippines. It is long overdue. Our slowness in providing that aid, whatever the justification for the delays, is already a black mark on our record in the Orient. We can erase that black mark. I hope we will.

I know it is difficult for Americans to comprehend how important to us are the Philippines, a collection of 7,000 islands 7,000 miles off our western shore. We are sovereign there and accept the fact of that sovereignty with the same naiveté with which we accept the fact that there are mosquitos in New Jersey. It just isn't very important in the grand scale of things.

But other countries don't think so. I was amazed when I visited China last December to find what a tremendous interest the Chinese have in what Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek called the great Philippine experiment. The peoples of the Far East are looking at the progress of the Philippines toward nationhood with awe, envy, and respect. It is a fact of vital interest in their daily lives. The great western powers are also interested—Great Britain, France, and Russia. Their news agencies are well represented in the Islands. I am told that they file a much more voluminous report on the significant social and economic developments in the Philippines than our own news agencies.

It is well to remember, first of all, that the Philippines include 7,100 islands which extend for 1,000 miles across the outer rim of the China Sea. From the northernmost islet, on a clear day, one can see the mountains of Formosa to the north, and from the southernmost island of the Philippines, British North Borneo can easily be seen on any day. From Mindanao it is a few hours' journey by ship to the Netherlands Indies and just a little farther to the China coast. Within a radius of 2,500 miles of Manila lives nearly a third of the world's population.

These oriental peoples, who are now our friends and can one day become our best customers, will know us by our actions in the

Philippines. They know that we are granting to a dependent people, whose land we purchased from Spain, complete political independence. It took no armed revolt to win that independence. We said, way back in 1900, that our objective was to prepare and educate these people for self-rule. We are keeping our word. And when the American flag is hauled down in Manila on July 4 of this year, and I hope many of you will be present on that day in Manila, our flag will be flying higher in the minds and hearts of the Philippine people, and of the peoples throughout the Orient than ever before in our history.

But the act of granting independence will be a savage mockery unless we implement our political generosity with real and effective economic assistance. We will derive great international credit from our act of enlightened self-interest, unless the experiment fails. When the Philippines become independent on July 4, democracy will be on trial in the Orient—western, American democracy. If that trial fails, it will not be to the discredit of the Philippine people. It will be in large part, our failure, and will be branded by the world as such. It will be our form of government, our kind of constitution, our type of national institutions which will have failed. That is what the Filipinos have today. It is what they are starting out with. We must not let them fail.

The "isms" of the twentieth century—communism, facism, militarism, and narrow nationalism—are not held back by oceans or distance. They travel with the speed of radio waves. They strike with the power of the atom bomb. There are partisans of all those "isms" in the Philippines, as there are everywhere in the world today. There are potential victims of those "isms" on every hillside, in every village, in every city in the Philippines. They are potential victims because they are poor, because they are underprivileged, because they are distraught and confused. If the way of life which we have given them does not meet their wants, they will turn in the end to other ways of life, to alien creeds and codes.

It is my great wonder that the people of the Philippines still hold so firmly to democracy today. The fact that this people maintained their faith in democracy, and fought for it, through the dark years of disaster and Japanese domination is a miracle which has confirmed in my mind, more than any other evidence I know, the validity and intrinsic appeal of the democratic philosophy.

These people had few of the substantial fruits of democracy even before the war. Many millions neither owned the land they tilled nor the houses in which they lived. Perpetually in debt to landlord and loan shark, they have been patient, as only orientals can be patient, in the hope that the democratic way would lead them to the better, fuller life. When the Japanese came and stole their democracy, ravaged it, stamped on it, denounced it, these simple people rose from the fields and the villages, from the cities and the mountainsides, and unleashed upon the enemy such a fury as he had never known. Their savage struggle against the enemy who had stolen their commonwealth and their democracy reached heights which have made me humble in my own faith.

The Japanese were so impressed by the depth of feeling for democracy in the Philippines that when the puppet leaders of the islands submitted a constitution for the Japanese-sponsored Philippine Republic, that constitution copied not Japanese institutions but American ones.

Here then are a people who have proved their devotion to the same ideals which we hold dear. They struggled and died for the identical symbols which led us on to victory. They had faith in the United States, in the Nation which gave them their institutions and taught them to love democracy. They knew in their hearts that this great mother nation of theirs would not desert them, but would come back in all its power to free them from the enemy. We did not fail them in that.

Today we still have the opportunity to transform that faith into conviction. We have a chance to perform a miracle in the Pacific, to help establish and nurture a republic of our own kind, an offshoot of our own idealism and teaching. We have the opportunity to spread democracy not by the sword, but by example. We have drenched the world in blood, including our own, to defend democracy and preserve it. Here is our chance to insure its preservation in a land peopled by millions of men and women who for 48 years have been under our flag and share our every principle and belief. It is my earnest conviction that we can earn more for our democratic creed by insuring a successful and prosperous Philippine Nation than by any other single undertaking today, even in our own country—and certainly we can support democracy more substantially in the Philippines than we can by gestures in the Balkans and protests in the Middle East, as desirable as they may be.

We have invested $360,000,000,000 and a hundred thousand American lives in our faith in the democratic way of life. Here we have a chance to protect the validity of that investment on the rim of the Asiatic world, where more than a billion people are watching what we do.

It is true that the Philippines need more from us, and from their own leadership, than merely trade preferences with the United States and war-damage payments, as vital as those things are. They need to settle the problem of their collaborationists, who were weak in their democratic faith. They need to solve the disproportionate distribution of land, and to emancipate the great masses of tenant farmers from their bondage to landlord and loan shark. In the solution of these problems, too we are committed to assist with advice and guidance.

We have the obligation of caring for the widows and orphans of those who died in battle in our cause, and of helping the veterans resume their places in the civilian society.

We must help the Philippines manage and direct their national economy to a point where it will be independent of trade preferences in the American market. Long-range undertakings on the part of the Philippine Government must look to the development of water power and the expansion of many undeveloped areas of enterprise.

These are a few of the essential tasks which face the people of the Philippines. It is their future, but we are involved in it. As long as we wish to remain a power in the Far East, a power in the world, as long as we wish to retain the friendship and the respect of the eastern world, we must remain committed in the Philippines, and must hold the friendship and the confidence of that heroic people.

Our policy toward the Philippines has been, in recent months, one of shameful neglect. A gentle Philippine philosopher once said, "The greatest deeds are done in years, not in days." Perhaps he was right.

Address of Hon. Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the address of the Honorable Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General, honoring His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman on the occasion of his homecoming Tuesday evening, March 5, 1946, at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City:

Your Eminence Cardinal Spellman, Governor Dewey, Mayor O'Dwyer, distinguished clergy of New York, and friends, there is more than gratitude and gladness in our hearts tonight. A great city—a great State—a great Nation welcome home a great man. I bring to you the greetings of President Truman on your safe return, and I know I voice the thanks and good wishes of our Nation's leaders—in and out of government—that you have come home to take up your new work among our people. Our loyalty and respect for you is without party label or religious denomination.

In these days of new plans and new decisions to meet the world coming up, we know that our future can be an age of sanity—or an age of stupidity. These days hold a challenge for civilization that will realize many of the deepest hopes of the human family—or it will produce a time of suspicion toward our fellow man when the best energies of our people will be nullified and corroded by petty hatreds and intolerance.

We look upon this returning soldier of Christ as a leader of the freedom-loving—as a liberator of the downtrodden—as a stimulator of men's hope to build a better world.

The war just behind us has not left a victory over the conflicts in men's minds. It has not purged our communities of overcrowded slums and crowded prisons. It has not provided any magic formula to cure the crisis we still face in our industrial life. The headlines today are inflamed with the intrigues and connivings of nations seeking their own place in the sun. All over the world the wreckage of war may be added up in the billions of dollars that have been spent in destruction. But we cannot add up the miseries and desolation that now afflict millions of lives.

In this valley of transition into the peace, millions are facing starvation. To them, death may come as a happy release. To them, the thin threads of hope that bind their lives may snap at any moment. Hunger is the worst Fascist terror. Hunger has no moral law. Hunger is no respecter of persons. But hunger is the maker of revolt—the prime producer of unrest—the most active traitor and despoiler of a just peace. Everywhere the hungers of the body have created even greater hungers of the soul.

In every land today men are groping and searching for answers to the new world we face. Atomic energy can write a new record of progress or an obituary for humanity. Man has at last discovered the way to wholly reconstruct or to wholly destroy his life. You and I are now facing responsibilities that must meet this last and best challenge of civilization, or you and I shall retreat from those responsibilities—both moral and material—and let the world go back to an economic and social jungle.

One thing we know more than anything else: we cannot cure wars by more wars, but we can cure democracy by more democracy. That is the message that Cardinal Spellman has been preaching and living from his early life. He has moved among peoples and governments in all parts of the world. He has sought constantly, first to understand them, and second to lift them up. He has brought a hopeful heart and healing hands to the oppressed in every part of the world. He knows that power politics and spheres of influence can create an international jungle where men separate rather than unite—where men postpone rather than fulfill—where men seek to liquidate their enemies rather than enlighten them. These areas of conflict, of hunger, of padlocked opportunity Cardinal Spellman has

visited. He knows them as he knows America.

He knows that their first security must be spiritual or all the others are unavailing. He knows that their first discipline must be moral, that their first courage must be of the heart, that their first hopes must spring from religious impulses. He knows that our basic human yearnings must be fortified by prayer to achieve anything.

As a Nation—as a people—we cannot swagger or bully our way into the peace. There are dozens of political sore spots throughout the world today that won't be healed by each nation concerned wanting everything and giving nothing. We cannot be enlightened in economics and reactionary in politics. We cannot be forward looking in science and backward in our social conscience. We cannot underwrite the peace with declarations of liberty for all and undermine that peace by acts of intolerance toward any group or any nation. We cannot elect to defend a system of free enterprise and force other countries into the selection of our system as the only solution of their national well-being and livelihood.

We believe that national security and personal liberty can survive and prosper in our democracy, but we have no right to impose a quarantine on any other nation that doesn't see it that way. The search for freedom doesn't have a single or simple solution. Our first responsibility is to understand others in the way we want them to understand us.

Cardinal Spellman has the know-how and the tell-how in all this. Cardinal Spellman can reason, and justly, that where we have been to the world a symbol of political liberty, we cannot now be a symbol of political obstruction. We can be neither vengeful nor stupid as we accept our destiny of world leadership in the peace. We cannot point out the harmful tariffs, trade restrictions, and chaotic currencies of other nations without looking into the international mirror of world trade ourselves.

We cannot project the future of electronics, atomic energy and television and hold that we have a monopoly on their enjoyment and use. We cannot permit political tensions and suspicions to mount abroad. We cannot denounce the enslavement and denials of other peoples in other lands—and by our own acts here at home sanction a second- or third-class citizenship for our own people.

Cardinal Spellman knows so well that there is no escape from the terrifying aspects of the scientific world of tomorrow. He knows that indifference in our kind of a democracy is the twilight sleep that produces tyranny. He knows that there is no weapon to solve the moral problems we face except a sound faith—and a sound spiritual allegiance to our cause. He knows that there is no arsenal of a permanent peace and a worthy democracy without prayer and good works. He knows that seeds of dictatorship are planted by the delays of Government leadership to translate the will of the people into action. He knows that tryanny has only to wait when democracy lays down on the job. He has seen democracy go by default because men had eyes but did not see, because men had ears but did not hear, because men had voices but did not speak out.

The faith we need is the faith of our pioneers. The courage we need is the courage of those in the early days who knew our land and did not play percentages with liberty. The understanding we need is the understanding of those who put the profits of the human family—good health, decent housing, and equal opportunity—above and beyond the profits of material wealth.

If we must return to anything in our democracy—it is to God. On the top of our agenda of action is the upbuilding of our spiritual resources first—the relighting of the flame of faith in the hearts of man—the removal of pettiness and hatred and selfishness from our political and economic dealings. Everyone in our land—need a spiritual awakening. The contagion of religion can be a healing epidemic for all mankind. A revival of faith—a return to the spiritual—can and will be the new discovery of ours—the new frontier of freedom. Men like Cardinal Spellman can and will show the way. To him and to all like him in our Nation, we can say with fullest heart, with impregnable faith and unwavering hope, "Lead—we follow."

Welcome back, Cardinal Spellman, to your new destiny. Welcome back to the new labors that will test your heart and mind and soul. Welcome back to a great future which we know—"the world will forever praise and God will forever bless."

Housing for War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, every mail brings to my desk new evidence that the critical shortage of housing for war veterans is not being relieved in any appreciable degree. In fact, there is general complaint from my district that OPA price policies on building materials are actually discouraging and retarding construction of new homes.

Figures published recently by the Department of Commerce show that our United States lumber production now is at the lowest level in 10 years; while costs of construction materials are the highest in 25 years.

By fixing ceiling prices which do not cover today's actual cost of production, OPA is literally squeezing the life out of construction—precisely when, according to official Government figures, we are faced with an immediate demand for 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 new dwelling units.

It is bad enough when returning veterans learn that they cannot buy civilian clothes to replace their military uniforms. But when they discover also that they cannot purchase homes to shelter their families, they are justified in demanding prompt action to call out increased production of building materials.

The building season is now at hand. It will serve no purpose to get materials flowing next September or October. Veterans need homes now.

If the managed-economy bureaucrats in Washington will but take the shackles of regimentation off the construction industry, American enterprise would soon be building new houses at the rate of 1,000,000 units a year. Why will not the Washington housing bureaucracy give private enterprise a chance?

Mr. Speaker, I present for inclusion, as a part of my remarks in the RECORD, an editorial from the March 8 issue of the Labor Beacon, of Michigan City, Ind. It is written by State Representative Henry Kreft, a member of the La Porte County building trades. It describes vividly the impact of the critical housing shortage on the whole fabric of family life throughout northern Indiana. Much of the blame for present deplorable conditions rests at the door of OPA, says Mr. Kreft.

A GUEST EDITORIAL

(By Henry Kreft, State representative and member of La Porte County building trades)

If there isn't an increase of building materials made available within the next 30 days, in Michigan City alone 300 building-trades workers are liable to find themselves out of work. And there is no chance of such an increase happening within that time.

In Michigan City, to use it as an example again, it would be possible to have 400 homes under construction this summer if materials were available. Yet in spite of this, and in spite of all the agitation for homes for veterans, it is doubtful if 10 percent of these potential homes are built this summer.

The State of Indiana has appropriated millions of dollars to build additions to its institutions. They are needed. The children's mental hospital at Fort Wayne has a waiting list of 500 who need its care. The State prison at Michigan City is going to become a danger unless needed additions are built there. A mental hospital in northern Indiana is being held up due to lack of materials. The funds, plans, and workers are ready. Materials aren't.

So not only homes but the community's health and safety are threatened.

There must be immediate action relative to the setup in building materials even if it is going to cost more, it must be done. We can't make people return to the stone age or live in tents or shacks as housing and health substitutes. Something is wrong with our economic system when it creates shortages instead of plenty.

The remedy is an increase in prices for raw materials. The OPA must up those ceilings. The producers of raw material can't operate while they are losing money. American workers want raises, but they can't get them if prices remain at prewar levels. Price raises must accompany wage raises. To those who object to this: What's the use of a raise if you can't work, anyway? You can get all the raises in the world and they'll do no good if you can't find anything to do because of a bottleneck in production.

During the war the Federal Government could find ways and means to furnish anything for war equipment. It should be able to find ways for people to live, or it is missing the mark. The present situation, in my opinion, bears all the earmarks of a drive to discourage private industry.

If it means work for thousands, and health and happiness for millions, the thing to do is up price ceilings on raw materials and equipment and get things under way. Health and morale are worth a lot more than a few bucks stuck in a bank somewhere.

We Must Be as Generous With Our Bread as We Were With Our Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished commentator, Quentin Reynolds, is one of the great leaders of our people. He has made great contributions to the hopes of people everywhere. His big mind and big heart have done much for America.

His timely address last Sunday evening, March 10, should awaken and stimulate all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the full address:

A year ago our Army was making its final drive toward the heart of Germany. As the Army advanced it met groups of Allies—Allies who had never stopped fighting. The Belgians and the Dutch who had been fighting underground now emerged and they took the guns which we gave them and they fought alongside our men. The French Maquis joined in the final assault. The combined efforts of these men and women of countries which had for so long lived under the Nazi yoke undoubtedly shortened the war and thereby saved many American lives. We were grateful to them then; General Eisenhower himself paid glowing tributes to their courage and skill.

A year ago they were pleading for guns—and we gave them guns. Today these same people are pleading for bread, and up to now we have not been nearly as generous with bread as we were with guns when we needed their help. Tonight people are starving in France and in Belgium and Holland; people all over Europe are starving; people who fought with us a year ago. During the next 6 months thousands and thousands will die of starvation unless we can fill the empty bread basket of Europe. We cannot feed the world—no one expects us to—but without depriving ourselves we can save the lives of thousands. There are two great shortages in Europe at the moment—wheat and fats. We have both in abundance. We have so much that what we waste would feed the hungry people of Europe. Mind you, the proud nations of Europe are not forming any bread line and asking us for hand-outs. On the contrary, nearly all the European nations have dollar credits in this country. They do not want charity; they want to buy our leftovers—our waste.

But, of course, our wants come first and that's why today we can, within reason, buy all the bread we want, all the food fats we want. The trouble is that we're buying not what we need—but what we want. If we only bought what we needed there would be surplus enough to help our starving neighbors in Europe. I suppose legally Congress could say that a food emergency exists and pass laws giving the Government power to bring rationing back. But happily that isn't the American way. We want no more regulation from our Government than is absolutely necessary. But an appeal to the heart of America has never gone unheard—and this is such an appeal.

Let's look at the food situation in Europe. Today we in America are eating at the rate of about 3,360 calories a day. In half of Europe the population exists on less than 2,000 calories a day, and millions have to subsist, if they can, on less than 1,500 calories a day. I was in Paris a few months ago. I had heard about the frightful increase in baby mortality, especially in the cities. I checked and found that deaths among the very young had risen 100 percent over the prewar figures. I assumed that this was chiefly due to lack of heating for there is very little heat in Paris or Marseille or Le Havre—but I was wrong. Thousands of these newly born were dying simply of starvation. They are dying of starvation today. In dozens of European cities one child in five has tuberculosis due to inadequate feeding. There has been a prolonged and severe drought in Europe this past year. That, plus the devastation of war, has reduced food production by 25 percent. North Africa was normally a food surplus area supplying huge amounts of food in Europe. There the drought has reduced production to less than half the prewar level.

In South Africa, normally a fertile wheat-producing section, the drought came to scorch the earth. Starvation never rides alone. Her twin sister, disease, always accompanies her and today these two scourges are riding unchecked across Europe. We Americans are the only ones in the world who can stop them from ravaging a tired sickly Europe.

Well, what can we do about it? Our Government is trying to do something about it but this is not, strictly speaking, a governmental function. We, as individuals, are the ones who have to do something about it. President Truman established the Famine Emergency Committee to investigate the situation and to suggest ways and means of helping to feed Europe. Ex-President Herbert Hoover accepted the post of honorary chairman. The committee went right to work. It immediately asked the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a specific program of voluntary food conservation. Last Monday Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson sent telegrams to the heads of 40 important organizations which deal with food, asking them to confer with him on Thursday, asking their expert advice. They came, conferred with Secretary Anderson, and they presented their ideas. If we followed their recommendations we would save enough food to keep thousands alive who will otherwise die. They made down-to-earth suggestions that the housewife can follow easily enough. One suggestion was that we do away with the three-layer cake. It won't hurt us to deny ourselves that third layer. Another was that we bake only open-faced pies; that is using pastry only on the bottom. The food experts present agreed with Secretary Anderson who after a tour of Washington restaurants declared that twice as much toast is wasted as is eaten.

We have promised to ship a million tons of wheat abroad each month. So far we have not lived up to this promise, but we've wasted that much.

We have promised to ship 30,000 tons of fats and oils abroad, but we haven't kept that promise, either. What can the housewife do about that? Well, she can serve salad dressings that do not require oil; she can increase her efforts to save cooking fats. This doesn't mean that anyone will have to eat less; it only means that everyone will have to waste less.

We might take a lesson from England, a country which, because of necessity, became expert in conserving food. This morning I phoned London and talked to Richard Collett, managing director of the famed Savoy Hotel and a number of subsidiary hotels. I asked him, "What are your hotels doing to stop food waste?" He said rather sadly that London doesn't have much food to waste. He reminded me that in England a person is allowed 3 ounces of butter a week, 3 ounces of margarine, and 1 ounce of lard and suet—a total of 7 ounces a week. We usually waste more than 7 ounces of fat a week per person. As far as meat is concerned, each person is allowed 22 cents' worth per week. No; there isn't much room for waste, and waste is against the law. It is a crime to waste food, and food inspectors examine the contents of garbage pails left by housewives, and if there is eatable food there the housewife is liable to fine or imprisonment.

If a farmer tosses even the stalest bread to his chickens, this is considered waste and he can be fined. Mr. Collett, whose hotels feed perhaps 6,000 people a day, said that within the near future all hotels and restaurants were to start something new which they felt would save a great deal of wheat. At present bread is served as a matter of course as it is here. But under the new plan, no one will be given bread in hotels or restaurants unless he asks for it. Suppose the hotels and restaurants of this country adopted that plan. No one would be deprived of bread but thousands of tons of wheat would be saved. Why don't restaurant keepers put a notice on their menus saying that bread will be given only to those who request it. That would immediately stop waste of bread, and Mr. Collett said that in England there was virtually no waste of fats. Foods using a great deal of fats have disappeared from the menus. For instance, you can't order French-fried potatoes in London. They must be cooked in deep fat. Fried Dover sole has for generations been the pride of London restaurants. Today no fried fish is served at all. The famous peddlers who sold fish and chips (fried fish and fried potatoes) have disappeared from the London streets, Mr. Collett said. Suppose we here gave up fried potatoes and fried fish. We'd have that 30,000 tons a month of fats the people abroad need and we wouldn't be depriving ourselves of anything. If the people of London can do it, and do it over a long, long period, we should be able to do it for a few months.

It would mean so little to us to save a little, and it would help so much. If, for instance, every man, woman, and child in the United States were to save one slice of bread a day, that would mean 6,000,000 loaves of bread per day that would not be wasted.

In Italy, where the stable and often only food is bread, it would mean a day's bread ration for 12,000,000 people. Suppose everyone in this country saved one teaspoonful of fat each day—that would be a million pounds of fat saved each day.

There are thousands in the country who already are aware of the frightful conditions among our neighbors in Europe. There are many who have already volunteered to help, to save, to stop waste. A letter came into the office of Secretary Anderson the other day. I don't know the man who wrote it, neither does Secretary Anderson, but I know that a real American wrote it and I can't help but read it in part. It is from a farmer who lives in Bloomfield, Nebr. He writes:

"DEAR MR. ANDERSON: In my local organizations I have long since argued for feeding the suffering of the world in the name of humanity and in the interests of a just and lasting peace. During this war, I have gotten out of debt on my farm and I feel I am now obligated only to my country and the world to act unselfishly in favor of world peace. I will gladly give a thousand bushels of corn and sell the hogs that would consume it if you will accept it and assure me that it will be used for saving as many human lives as possible somewhere. I am not well-to-do but feel I now have an opportunity of obligation which may never again present itself.

"Most sincerely yours,

"CLAUDE CANADY."

I salute Mr. Claude Canady, farmer of Bloomfield, Nebr. He's willing to make a real sacrifice. If a few million of us would only make one-hundredth the sacrifice that he is prepared to make, we could fill the empty larder of Europe very quickly. This is the season of sacrifice—the season of giving up something. Lent began 3 days ago.

Since the seventh century most of the Christian churches have observed the Lenten season. It is traditionally a season of sacrifice, a preparation for the feast of Easter. It is a season when we humble ourselves by giving up something; it is a symbol of our faith. During this season of Lent, we could sacrifice not only as a symbol of our faith in God but as a symbol of our faith in humanity. Every sacrifice we make, every bit of waste we eliminate, every bit of food we save, will go to save the lives of people who are starving today. The spirit of Lent could have no better practical application than that.

British Policies in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions adopted by the committee on international law of the American League for a Free Palestine at the emergency conference of that league held at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, on February 24, 1946, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1—VIOLATION OF MANDATE AND ANGLO-AMERICAN CONVENTION

Whereas Great Britain solemnly assumed a specific trust on behalf of the Hebrew people under the terms of the Palestine mandate and the American-British convention on Palestine of December 3, 1924, whereby Great Britain undertook to facilitate the establishment of a national home for the Hebrew people in their ancient land of Palestine, by assisting the provisionally recognized sovereign Hebrew nation through the rendition of administrative advice and assistance; and

Whereas Great Britain has repeatedly violated the provisions of the mandate and the American-British convention, including the provisions which require that no modification of the terms should be made without the consent of the Council of the League of Nations and the United States; and

Whereas Great Britain has specifically violated her obligation under the mandate and the convention to facilitate Hebrew repatriation to Palestine and to encourage close settlement by Hebrews on the land; and

Whereas in violation of the mandate and the convention, Great Britain has adopted arbitrary practices relative to taxation, imposts, industrial development, the acquisition, use, transfer and disposal of land and its produce, and public works and community services, which discriminate against the Hebrew people and are designed to frustrate the purposes of the mandate; and

Whereas these discriminatory practices have been applied to American citizens solely because they are Jews; and

Whereas in specific violation of the mandate and the convention Great Britain has arbitrarily divided the territory of Palestine and has officially announced the impending creation, out of an integral portion of Palestine, of Trans-Jordan as a separate state; and

Whereas the United Nations Organization is succeeding the League of Nations in the supervision of mandates; and

Whereas appropriate measures must be taken to secure the rights of the Hebrew people in and out of Palestine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American League for a Free Palestine convened at a national conference at the Hotel Biltmore on the 24th day of February 1946, as follows:

1. That the President and the Congress of the United States express their disapproval of the illegal course of conduct followed by Great Britain in connection with the Palestine mandate and notify Great Britain that by unilaterally altering the terms of the Palestine mandate it has violated the American-British convention of December 3, 1924.

2. That the President of the United States take all possible measures to present the matter of the past and present abuses of the powers by Great Britain under the mandate to the United Nations Organization, including the proposal to separate Trans-Jordan from the remainder of Palestine; and to press for the immediate recognition of the sovereignty of the Hebrew nation as preliminary to the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic republic in which all citizens will enjoy full equality without regard to descent or creed.

3. That should the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization fail to take appropriate action, then the United States press the submission of the matter for a hearing before the International Court of Justice with adequate provision for representatives of the Hebrew people to have their long-awaited day in court.

RESOLUTION 2—ARIEH BEN-ELIEZER

Whereas a national and citizen of Palestine, Arieh Ben-Eliezer, has for almost 2 years been imprisoned by the official representatives of the Government of Great Britain without a charge or trial or an opportunity to defend himself; and

Whereas such imprisonment without process of law, is a violation of the fundamental, legal, and moral principles of the civilized world; and

Whereas the said Arieh Ben-Eliezer, pursuant to the principles of the common law and the established common-law procedure of the British and American Constitutions, has sought release from his illegal detention by petition for a writ of habeas corpus; and

Whereas the said petitioner has been denied justice guaranteed under the principles of the common law and the British Constitution; and

Whereas this case is but one example of how Great Britain has repeatedly deprived Palestinian citizens of liberty and property without due process and has imprisoned persons for extended periods without informing them of charges or granting them an opportunity to defend themselves: Be it

Resolved by the American League for a Free Palestine convened at a national conference at the Hotel Biltmore on the 24th day of February 1946, That the American League for a Free Palestine hereby pledges itself to provide every and all necessary assistance, financial and otherwise, to assist the said Arieh Ben-Eliezer in the prosecution of his appeal to the privy council to the end that the civil liberties of all citizens of the Hebrew nation and the rights of free citizens throughout the world may be vindicated.

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY DR. N. MORTON FYBISH FROM THE FLOOR AND ADOPTED

Resolved, That in view of the patriotic services rendered by Arieh Ben-Eliezer (one of the original pioneering Palestinian contingent in the United States of America), to the cause of Hebrew nationhood, and in view of his present imprisonment in Eritrea by the British imperium, the American League for a Free Palestine immediately send a copy of these resolutions to Arieh Ben-Eliezer by registered mail and by available diplomatic channels, available to him, as a political prisoner.

AMENDMENT FOR THE ASSISTING AND DRAFTING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF PALESTINE—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY ROSE KEANE FROM FLOOR AND ADOPTED

Whereas it is the consensus of this conference that a constitution should be devised as soon as possible which will present the broad outlines of the structure of the government of a unified Palestinian republic, containing the guaranties necessary for a democratic society modeled in the American tradition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American League for a Free Palestine undertake to assemble the best available experts including jurists, statesmen, scientists, economists, and others who will dedicate themselves as an advisory body to the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation in the drafting of a provisional constitution, for the Republic of Palestine, for submission to the people of that country.

RESOLUTION 3—TRANS-JORDAN

Whereas Great Britain in the face of incontrovertible evidence that Palestine, if properly developed as a whole, can support a population of many million people in fruitful industry and on a high standard of living, has arbitrarily divided the territory of Palestine in violation of the Palestine Mandate and the American-British Convention on Palestine of December 3, 1924, and has officially announced the impending creation, out of an integral portion of Palestine, of Trans-Jordan as a separate state; and

Whereas this proposal to separate Trans-Jordan permanently from the remainder of Palestine, thereby withdrawing it from the scope of operation of the Palestine Mandate and the Convention, is a unilateral denunciation of an international treaty by one party thereto and as such, strikes a blow at the very fundamentals of international security and is a direct challenge to the new world order founded on the United Nations Charter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American League for a Free Palestine convened at a national conference at the Hotel Biltmore on the 24th day of February 1946, That the President of the United States formally notify Great Britain immediately that if Great Britain should purport to establish Trans-Jordan as an independent state, the United States will not recognize its status as such and continue to regard it as part of Palestine, subject to the terms of the mandate and the convention, the violation of which it will present to the United Nations Organization.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PALESTINE

It is the sense of this conference that the United Nations, and each of them, should recognize the fundamental right of all Hebrews who are still in exile from Palestine and who are either stateless or who choose to renounce allegiance to all other governments and pledge allegiance to Palestine, to be deemed nationals of Palestine and to be repatriated there; that such nations should further recognize that Palestine, as defined in the mandate of the League of Nations, is entitled to self-government and that such nations should assume responsibility for the immediate administration of the country to that end, pending early elections and the early establishment of an independent government, based on universal suffrage, without regard to descent or creed; that the said government should forthwith assume responsibility for the diplomatic representation of all such nationals; that it make provision for the early promulgation of a constitution for Palestine, embodying the principles of the Bill of Rights in the American Constitution.

Communist Influence in Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Mr. Frank C. Waldrop which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 15, 1946:

THE RISK

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

This is a free country and it always has been our proudest boast that nobody is to be persecuted here for his religious or political beliefs. But is that to be a cloak for treason?

Does it include giving jobs in our Government to people who are openly and completely pledged to the destruction of the very Government by which they are paid?

These are not just theoretical issues that can be shoved aside until they come up again with names attached. The names are attached.

For years Washington has been hiding within itself Communists who not only have personal opportunity to know what our Government's secrets are but also to use as their tools the fools and fellow travelers who roam through every bureau and governmental branch.

Is that O. K.? Is it wise? Before you undertake to answer, perhaps you might review again the meaning and purpose of communism.

And before you do that, you may be interested to know that the details which follow here are from a brief prepared by Francis Biddle as Attorney General of the United States.

Biddle, while he was Attorney General, went about as far to the left as any man can go and still not be impeached. But there were some issues he had to face, and one of them was the laying down of a rule concerning what communism is and aims at. So, let's take his as the most lenient report we could hope to expect, and see what it says:

"The Communist Party of the United States, a section of the so-called Third International, was founded in 1919; and after its name was changed several times, finally became the Communist Party of the United States of America in 1929.

"The Third International advocated the class struggle, which was described as entering the phase of civil war in America.

"Illegal methods were also advocated, where necessary, to carry on its work; systematic agitation in the Army; the renouncing of patriotism, and the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. * * *

"The Communist Party teaches the violent overthrow of existing governments, including the United States."

Well, there it is, and right pretty, too, isn't it?

You don't need much imagination to see whether those are just idle words, or whether they work out in action. Biddle goes on:

"The party writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising such overthrow (of the United States).

"Penetration into trade unions was strongly emphasized in Communist literature and conversions of their members by constant agitation and propaganda. Reforms in the labor movement should be expected as screens behind which revolutionary activities could be carried on.

"Testimony on front organizations showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective, but actually used by the Communist Party to carry on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution."

Finally, a restatement that the Communist Party of the United States of America, from time of its inception in 1919 to the present time (May 28, 1942), is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

There it is all wrapped up in one paragraph, and if you think it's a joke, you just aren't living with the times.

Since that opinion was handed down by the Attorney General the Communists have gone through a number of window-dressing reorganizations and title shufflings.

They have fired Earl Browder as their boss because he got too cozy with the New Deal and put in a blood-sweating old character by the name of William Z. Foster, who has never stopped proclaiming the inevitable purpose of communism—violence.

Now that there is no Germany to deal with the Russians are swinging their weight farther and wider around Europe, and Communists over here are reflecting their belligerence, too, as the Foster example signifies.

So maybe it is worth your while to think about this matter a little if you care what happens to the United States of America.

Chairman MAY, of the House Committee on Military Affairs, yesterday called on the State Department to get rid of its Communists and Communist-infected employees. He's late, but still right, and he doesn't go far enough.

The risk of having these people around is something that cannot be exaggerated. The House Committee on Un-American Activities should get going, too, and run the whole bunch out of their jobs all over town. That's only a minimum precaution against treason.

Application of Our Democratic Principles to Defeated Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, following is my address before the Lutheran Laymen's League of Greater St. Louis, at Kiel Auditorium, on Sunday, March 3, 1946:

My fellow citizens, this great meeting of Lutheran Laymen is notable in that it espouses and supports a most worthy Christian purposes. While charity begins most humanly at home, it must never be confined to suffering and deprivation which exists only within the scope of our vision. Christian charity knows no limitations of creed, race, or national boundaries. Peace can come only to the world through cooperation developed in political understanding, faith in the future, hope for human improvement, and charity of the mind and hand.

America is struggling to regain her normal peacetime strength and tranquillity, both domestic and international, without losing the energy demonstrated during the war. During the war some very contradicting ideologies were advanced. Our concern this evening recalls the proclamations by our Government demanding the world-wide establishment of democratic governments for the various peoples of the earth. In fact we were told that the war was fought to preserve our democracy and to extend self-government and to destroy fascism. This was our belief and our determination.

In our midst were those who proclaimed the need for permanent revenge upon the peoples of the world who were our mortal enemies at war.

In our midst were those who advocated a system of reeducation so that the people who lived under the dictator's heel might learn to respect and cherish the blessings of representative democracy.

None of us will advocate or sanction the escape or release of a single international criminal of first or secondary importance.

This does not mean that we—the American people—hope to teach our system of self-government to other people by extermination, either outright or by degree.

The continuance of caution can be a very definite contribution to the peace and happiness of all peoples of the world. The continuance of hate is the very fertile seed of a new despotism and surely as the sun sets after rising, a new war. Hatred and war are the Siamese Twins of World ruin.

The responsibility for proper leadership in the world and especially in the defeated nations is that of the United States of America. We cannot allow hatred to be a part of that spirit of leadership if we hope to succeed.

Religious tolerance and charity is the principal food of freedom. When coupled with freedom of thought and speech and economic opportunity, it stands as the only successful weapon against the cancerous growth of godless despotic communism, which is the spiritual starvation of the people.

The Christian peoples of the world, regardless of sect or denomination must unite to provide this spiritual food. All other God-loving people, who would build for freedom and happiness must unite with Christians in a comity of action. We must have no false fronts, but instead purity of heart and determination of hand. Intolerance is a despicable ideology which has never been successfully combated by counterintolerance.

It is not with pride that we admit our failure to recognize our responsibility as victors to both ally and vanquished. In our wartime preparation for the invaded countries the United Nations created the agency known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or UNRRA. Through this funnel 47 nations have provided relief for the downtrodden invaded countries. It is true that there has been much dollar waste and maladministration by this agency, but the fact remains that 47 nations were mindful of this need. These nations during the natural period of extreme wartime hate gave little thought and no preparation to the needs of the vanquished whom we hoped to reform and reeducate into the ways of democratic life. Surely, we never believed that we, as a Christian nation, would advocate the extermination of the common people of the enemy nations. It was always our duty to recognize the obligation upon the part of the victor nations to heal the world's wounds, to heal the twisted minds, to heal the diseased bodies, and to healthfully feed the bellies of the conquered.

The American conscience has been shocked by the report of suffering and death. The policy of our Government with its prohibition against the voluntary shipment of food and clothing, and medicinal aid into the defeated European nations, even into the American zone of occupation, has not contributed to reform in ideology. Such action was unlike America and certainly unChristian.

Last October, a respectable national fraternal organization asked me to arrange an appointment with the executive office of our Government for the purpose of obtaining permission to gather clothing and, if necessary, food for the destitute people of the defeated Axis countries. The request contemplated voluntary contribution by the American people and distribution through Government outlets. They were not granted the interview but, instead, were instructed to see the Administrator of UNRRA whom, they were told, had authority over such matters. Of course they and I knew that UNRRA had not assumed the responsibility for aid to people of the enemy nations. In their interview with the Administrator of UNRRA, they were immediately told that no such authority existed. In fact, there was general amazement that the executive office had paid so

little attention to the subject. At long last, in February of this year, came an acknowledgment of the seriousness of the situation. I am happy that this past week the White House has given full recognition to the problem and called a well-chosen conference.

More can be done to expedite the cause by the full use of UNRRA. UNRRA is a council of 47 nations (Allied) bound together by an agreement to give aid and relief by the United Nations and associated governments. This agreement was dated November 9, 1943. It was approved by the Congress of the United States. The resolution of the Congress embodied the approval of the following purposes:

"Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services."

The Council of UNRRA has in its discretion the policy and administration of its program. It has determined that no relief would be extended to the people of Germany or of Japan. It has authorized and given relief to the people of Italy. It must be understood that Italy, after invasion, became an ally. Recently the Council of UNRRA has authorized relief to Austria, though to date no such relief has been delivered. This governing council of UNRRA meets in Atlantic City on March 15, this month.

There is no prohibition in the resolution, or agreements, creating the organization, which prohibits the application of their aid to distress in the defeated countries. It is worthy of recommendation that UNRRA's Council, which already has cognizance of this destitution, encourage voluntary contributions and, so far as is humanly possible, distribute of their own means for and to the people of these nations.

If democracy is to grow where despotism grew before—if the seeds of peace are to be nourished, and bring forth the realization of our hope in international affairs—if Americans and the citizens of the other United Nations are to make their full contribution to the future peace—then all of us should give aid in order to teach our former enemies to be our future allies for the peace and happiness and well-being of the world.

The Postwar Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee now has under consideration the amount of funds to be available for our postwar Navy. Unfortunate circumstances attend the initial consideration of the measure by this, the constitutional body whose duty it is "to provide and maintain a Navy"; for the 1947 Budget, now under consideration, did not emanate from the recommendation of those charged with the active responsibility of our naval arm, but from a bureau neither created for nor equipped to make intelligent decisions in matters of national defense and security.

The Budget, as it came to Congress, is not a plan for a Navy; instead, it is a huge sum of money, a sum of money arbitrarily decided upon as the proper amount of expenditures—or at least the limit of our willingness to secure national defense and maintain world peace, "navally" speaking. It has been authoritatively charged that the Navy itself had nothing to do with the $4,000,000,000 figure now under consideration, and that plans for America's future Navy have been "drastically rewritten by a bookkeeper's pencil" and that "Navy Secretary Forrestal went to the White House to personally request that the United States, in these troublous times, not be forced to rely upon a bookkeeper's Navy."

I repeat, sir, that this is most unfortunate, for it is natural for men to indulge in fond hope in the bloody and shattering wake of the late armed conflict, and to shut their eyes to the painful and practical realities that we must remain strong and constantly must maintain an effective, if expensive, naval arm.

This cannot be accomplished by the arbitrary appropriation of a huge sum of money and subsequent "cutting of the customer to fit the suit." It must and can only result from careful planning by men whose training and experience, whose patriotism, loyalty, and sense of duty have qualified them to know the minimum naval requirements of the United States in a world of today's confusion.

I am conscious that hundreds of millions have been expended during the war, that taxes are burdensome, that the national debt is staggering, that the world desires peace and security from want; but I am also conscious that the purchase price of our new-found peace included hundreds of thousands of American lives and the lives of millions of decent people of other lands. It is in no sense a lack of faith in the ability of nations to unite for peace that I say that the success or failure of such a venture may well depend upon the armed strength of this country and its ability to immediately strike down any aggressor who threatens the peace of the world and, consequently, of this country.

I am not qualified, and I believe no Member of Congress is qualified upon his own, to state the minimum requirements of a strong and effective naval organization, or to estimate its cost. To whom then can we turn for information which will assist us in intelligently discharging our constitutional responsibility? I find no answer but the Navy. Therefore, I think it fitting that our initial consideration of the funds necessary for the Navy budget for the coming year should be based upon the recommendations of the Navy.

War is a horrible thing, destructive, disillusioning, demoralizing, and all of the other dirty, nasty things it can be called, but there is one thing, perhaps, that is worse—and that is fear of war, fear of the aggressor.

Decent people all over the world offer their prayers constantly that war and its ugly shadow, the fear of war, may be banished from the lives of future generations. These prayers can be answered with forthright thinking, speaking, and dealing backed up with the ability to forcefully put down and destroy those who challenge peace.

OPA—A Blessing or a Curse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

WORDS VERSUS ACTIONS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman says, "Our chief worry still is inflation," yet the whole trend of his policy continues to be inflationary. He proposes a Federal peacetime budget for next year four times as large as the prewar budget and seven times as large as the prewar total income of the Government—which means continued deficit spending. He also advocates a 20 percent increase in pay for the 3,100,000 Federal employees. This would add $1,600,000,000 to the present $8,000,000,000 Federal pay roll. In addition to this, the President approved and announced the present wage bulge which will further increase purchasing power, one of the chief factors in inflation. The President's words do not square with his actions. One of our economists in commenting on the situation asks: "Is it an accident that the American Government today is following further inflation policies at a time of inflation? Or is it because a government when it once assumes a direct responsibility for economic conditions, finds itself driven to inflation and more inflation?"

THE RIGHT WAY

Mr. Speaker, many persons in high Government positions do not realize the extent that Government policies are retarding the reconversion program and preventing production. Mr. Bowles of OPA is an outstanding example of this fact. He denies that OPA has retarded or is retarding production. No one questions Mr. Bowles' sincerity, but most people question his conclusions. Mr. Bowles has closed his eyes to facts that are widely known in industry, and prefers to base his decisions upon general statistics that are meaningless when applied to present-day conditions. Thousands of specific instances can be given where OPA policies have retarded or blocked badly needed production. Mr. Bowles would do well to forget his peeve against the National Association of Manufacturers and personally travel the highways and byways of the Nation, visiting with our small manufacturers, and seeing with his own eyes the havoc OPA has brought about. If he would do this we feel sure he would reverse his attitude and would do everything he could to encourage production instead of hindering it. Increased production is the only way to hold down prices.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent already granted, I include the following editorial taken from the Saturday Evening Post of March 16, 1946:

IS OPA AGAINST INFLATION OR FOR IT?

The feverish debate on the OPA's methods of price control, reinforced by what the ordinary citizen can see by looking round him, demonstrates at least two things. The first is that some form of control over rents—at least of existing houses—and the prices of most foods and other necessities in short supply—items, that is, whose production cannot be quickly stimulated by price increases—should be retained as long as necessary. The second is that the OPA bureaucracy has worked itself up into the mood of Saint George killing the dragon and rescuing the beautiful princess, so that OPA officials and economists never bother to ask themselves how a free economy actually works or what are the causes of the inflation which they are trying with such commendable zeal to throttle.

The following paragraph from Mr. Henry Ford 2d's reply to Chester Bowles is an editorial in itself on the futility of "holding the line" at one point and selling the pass at a dozen other points:

"Another supplier had been making small but vital truck parts for us for 50 cents each. His material prices had gone up so much after VJ-day that he asked OPA for permission to charge 61 cents. OPA said, 'No.' They were willing to go as high as 54 cents. But the supplier could not produce parts at that figure, and so he stopped manufacture. After considerable delay, we finally found two new suppliers. One is now furnishing us with the necessary parts at 82 cents, and one at 84 cents, both with OPA approval."

What line does Mr. Bowles think is being held by a policy of forbidding an established manufacturer to include his actual costs in the price of his product while permitting new and untried producers to enter the same field at higher prices? Mr. Bowles has been reluctant to debate this phase of his bureau's conception of price control. He prefers to denounce manufacturers as rascals for presuming to mention increased production costs at all. Not until the "new number" device for escaping inadequate ceilings had become a national scandal and the wage increase in the steel industry set up its inevitable chain reaction did OPA make a half-hearted effort to remove this barrier to production. Even then there was no admission that OPA doctrinaires had contributed to the inflation they were supposed to be curbing.

In other words, the OPA economists have not defined inflation or understood the conditions which produce it. Inflation occurs when the supply of money rises and the supply of goods remains stationary or falls. Through enforced wage increases, deficit financing and other devices, the Government has seen to it that the supply of money has risen. Through much of its administrative interpretation of price control, it has seen to it that production was curtailed. No wonder there was a crisis which Mr. Bowles was forced to recognize.

To this simple explanation, the OPA reply is only that the profiteers are out to make a killing. Suppose it were true; or suppose that the established producers who are unable to produce under OPA ceilings were more nefarious than the new producers who have OPA's permission to produce the same or inferior goods at still higher prices. What then? How long could Mr. Ford, who so annoyed Mr. Bowles by estimating his increase in costs at 55 percent, get a price for his product above what the public would accept? Certainly not for long, because, as the New York Times succinctly expressed it, "in a free competitive market the most effective control over the price of Ford cars is the price of General Motors, Chrysler, and other cars, and vice versa." Certainly no manufacturer will willingly price himself out of the market or at a time of scarcity set his price so high as to imperil his good will when the competitive race becomes hotter. As for the consumer, may he not be allowed to decide whether he prefers a refrigerator in his kitchen at $160 or a refrigerator in his mind's eye at $147.80?

We just caught ourselves using the expression "the market." That is another thing OPA has forgotten about—the function of the market in establishing competitive prices of things people want without depending on guesses by OPA, or arbitrary regulations seemingly designed to protect bad guessers rather than encourage the production of goods. The effort to apply to a potentially expanding production the same techniques that had to be used to hold down prices on goods whose production was restricted cannot succeed—unless the objective is a controlled economy in which prices do not reflect a relation between demand and supply, but only the arbitrary opinion of a price administrator.

The British Application of the Four Freedoms—A Convincing Argument for the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, when war and oppression engulfed the world our hopes and the hopes of humanity were stirred and inspired in all lands by the declaration of the principles of the four freedoms as embodied in the Atlantic Charter, solemnly proclaimed by the head of our Government and the head of the Government of England.

Now that our sacrifices have been made and the war has been won, it is with heavy hearts and in the depth of despair that we read the current press reports printed here:

BRITISH TANK COLUMN RELIEVES BELEAGUERED SUPPLY UNIT IN JAVA

BATAVIA, March 13.—A beleaguered British column, stalled by 3 days of sharp fighting between Buitenzorg and Bandoeng, has been joined by a tank column which followed it from Buitenzorg and is making slow progress between Soekaboemi and Bandoeng, a British communique said today.

It was reported that the convoy was expected to reach Bandoeng some time tomorrow. Operations against the Indonesians involved three battalions, plus tanks and artillery, totaling more than 3,000 men, the British said.

FIGHTERS STRAFE ROADS

The convoy moved through the village of Sarampat, beyond Soekaboemi, after Thunderbolt fighter planes made four strafing runs over crosscroads where Indonesian snipers were posted, the announcement said.

A revised casualty list placed the dead at 10 and the wounded at 59 for the 3-day skirmish.

The armored relief column from Bandoeng had been drawn back to protect a threatened bridge, the British said. A second relief column of Gurkhas was moving to Bandoeng today.

Indonesian Republican Army authorities in the Soekaboemi area were reported trying to reach the commander of the Indonesians in order to halt the fighting, but without success due to communications difficulties.

Personal Explanation

REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON H. WEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, at about 1:30 o'clock, there was a quorum call, No. 53. Many members of the Texas delegation did not answer that quorum call by reason of the fact that at that time they were attending a luncheon given in honor of that great Texan and great American, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, commander of the fleet. He was explaining to the delegation the needs of the future fleet of the United States. For that reason the following Members did not feel they should leave that meeting in order to answer a quorum call——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to raise the point, but the gentleman is not proceeding in order. I hope he will not start a procedure which will return to plague us in the future. All of us understand that no Member of the Texas delegation would fail to answer roll call unless he were fully warranted in being absent.

Mr. WEST. The gentleman is very charitable; very Christlike.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand just what is going on. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute. It is the understanding of the Chair that he did not intend to announce how any Member voted. He was simply stating why some Members of the Texas delegation did not answer a quorum call about 1 o'clock.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I reluctantly raise the point of order.

Mr. WEST. I know he is very reluctant. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would set a precedent for resuming an objectionable custom which has long since been discontinued.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes that the gentleman from Texas, being authorized by the Members whose names he is about to call, would be allowed to state why they were not on the floor to answer a roll call. The Chair knows of no rule of the House that is being violated by that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to object.

Mr. WEST. I see the tears running down your cheeks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. It is very necessary that some reports from the Committee on Rules be filed this afternoon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the point of order.

Price Control Declared Unworkable as Dry Law by NAM Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star, of date March 14, 1946, by the Associated Press, as follows:

PRICE CONTROL DECLARED UNWORKABLE AS DRY LAW BY NAM OFFICIAL

RICHMOND, VA., March 14.—Arthur Walsh, vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, today termed price control as "unworkable as the Volstead Act and just as detrimental in the long run to individual freedom as was prohibition."

The former Democratic Senator from New Jersey said that although people think of price control in "terms of holding down prices and are for it," in reality, price control becomes "entangled and bound up in the fantastically interwoven economic life of our country."

In an address before a regional meeting of the NAM, the executive vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J., asserted that the OPA was managed to "create a formidable public acceptance of the necessity for the continuation of price control" by playing on the "public credulity with a skilled and active propaganda establishment."

Mr. Walsh contended that unless Congress terminates the OPA or provides for its modification, "production will continue to lag and scarcities and their companion, black markets, to increase."

He said the danger to "free enterprise, as we know it," was very real, and contended that "a good many people in this country—and some of them in high places—feel that this country would be better off with a managed economy."

He described "free enterprise" as the "retention of basic freedoms of decision and choice, of action and initiative, and of work and rest." He added "in production, trade, commerce, and whatever you wish to call it, basic freedoms are as inherently fundamental as the 'four freedoms' held out as a goal to the world during the war."

Mr. Walsh warned that this Nation was in a transition state which easily could result in a "situation which will end in a controlled economy, a managed economy." He contended that economic controls mean political controls and "the two together mean regimentation."

Editorial Comment on the Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, of which I am a member, is receiving a remarkable press. Editorials in newspapers throughout the Nation have enthusiastically endorsed the committee's recommendations and urged Congress to adopt them. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include recent editorials on congressional reorganization from the Wall Street Journal, the Wilmington News, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Washington Post, and the Washington News, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 6, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

A joint committee of Congress of which Senator LA FOLLETTE is chairman, and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, is vice chairman, has made a report suggesting methods for reorganization of Congress so that it may better cope with its work. In our opinion it is one of the most clearly worded and altogether sensible documents which has come from any Washington source in a long time.

There are many good suggestions in the report and it would be hard to find sound reason for major disagreement with any of them. One of them seems to us fundamental and we quote it from the report:

"That by joint action the Revenue and Appropriations Committees of both Houses submit to the Congress within 60 days after each session opens (or by April 15) a concurrent resolution setting over-all Federal receipts and expenditures (estimated) for the coming fiscal year. If total expenditures recommended exceed estimated income, Congress should be required by record vote to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess. All appropriations, excepting those of a permanent nature, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions and benefits, trust expenditures, and public-debt retirement, would be reduced by a uniform percentage in case total appropriations exceeded the amount of the approved budget figure."

The greatest single power of Congress is the power of the purse, to lay taxes and spend money. It has been done in the dark. The taxing hand knows not what the appropriating hand is doing and the people who pay the bills are given no clear integrated picture of what either is doing. Here is a proposal for correction. It is a sound proposal. It interferes with no prerogatives of committees or Members. It says that the Government shall do what any businessman or individual must do, which is to look at the money available to him and guide his expenditures accordingly.

We wish there were space to give to the many other recommendations the praise they deserve. The consolidation of committees so that the number will be fewer and the strengthening of committees' prestige is good. The recommendation that both committees and individual members should have more trained assistants is essential to continued functioning of parliamentary government.

The whole report can be quickly read and it is worth reading. Anyone interested in his government would do well to secure a copy from his Congressman or from the Government Printing Office. Its formal title is "Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress."

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of March 5, 1946]

BLUEPRINT FOR CONGRESS

For the past year the La Follette-Monroney committee has been studying the problem of bringing the legislative machinery of Congress up to date. Its conclusions have now been presented in a 35-page report. For its own sake, as well as for the sake of the Nation, Congress would do well to take recommendations contained in this report to heart. For it has become abundantly clear that the House and Senate can no longer play their proper role in government effectively and efficiently with their present antiquated setup.

The key recommendation which the committee makes, and the one it will be most difficult to persuade Congress to accept, is a suggestion for drastic simplification of the unwieldy committee system. The Senate's 33 standing committees and the House's 48 overlap at many points and are a heavy drain on the legislators' time. Under the committee's proposal for 16 standing committees in the Senate and 18 in the House, each with its own staff of qualified research experts, the same amount of business could be handled far more competently.

We are also strongly in favor of the suggestion that Congress be barred from approving appropriations without regard for Federal income. Under this proposal Congress would be required to keep expenditures within anticipated revenue or, by record vote, express itself in favor of increasing the public debt. This would provide an automatic check on the deficit financing in which the Government has been indulging for so many years.

The committee would also like to see each Member provided with a high-caliber administrative assistant at an annual salary of $8,000, a raise in congressional pay to $15,000 a year, and provision for the retirement of legislators on the same terms as civil-service workers. These are all sound suggestions and we trust they will be adopted. But, as the report says, the reorganization of the obsolete and overlapping committee structure is the first and most important task. Unless this is done there can be no adequate improvement in the congressional machinery.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of March 5, 1946]

FOR A STREAMLINED CONGRESS

Plans to streamline Congress and get it out of the rut of "quill pen bookkeeping," have been discussed for a long time, but at last a concrete program is now before the members for consideration. It is the effort of a joint Senate-House committee of which Senator LA FOLLETTE and Representative MONRONEY are cochairmen. It represents a compromise—not as much as has been proposed by the National Planning Council and more than Congress conservatives desire. Therefore, it will not be adopted in a hurry, if at all, but it does represent a step toward modernization and reorganization of the legislative branch which is long overdue.

There can be little quarrel with the proposed reduction of standing committees and

with the limitation of the number of committees on which any Member can serve. As the situation is now a Member may be required to serve on as many as 10 committees. Obviously he can't do justice to any of them. It is also desirable that the jurisdiction of each committee be properly defined and that it be given subpena authority in special investigations. Provision for the registration of lobbyists and pressure groups is a step in the right direction, as also is the plan for regular congressional recesses and assignment to the Court of Claims of the numerous claims against the Government which now take the time of Congress.

It can be expected that the proposed $5,000 increase to legislative Members will be approached cautiously. Congress had its hands burned on such a proposal some time ago, but then it was introduced "through the back door" and was unfavorably received by the public. The proposed increase is not as much as the $25,000 annual salary proposed by President Truman. The recent departure from Congress of several members who said they couldn't afford to hold the job at the present wage, prompts serious consideration of a salary increase.

The La Follette-Monroney bill did not go into the controversial issue of seniority on congressional committees, but this may emerge later as an amendment to the present bill. Seniority, which elevates to the chairmanship a member simply because of his years in Congress, is an outmoded practice. It should be discarded, but we believe the suggestion will have rough going.

[From the Washington Post of March 14, 1946]

FISCAL CONTROLS

Among the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress is a proposal for strengthening fiscal controls. The proposal will recommend itself to many critics of the present haphazard system of voting appropriations without setting over-all limits to expenditures and without relating contemplated total expenditures to revenues. Under the present divided authority, with appropriations being considered by numerous subcommittees of both House and Senate and responsibility for revenue-raising similarly shared by multiple committees, Congress cannot have a general fiscal policy or undertake to follow any general policy.

It is recommended, therefore, that the Revenue and Appropriations Committees of both Houses be required to submit to Congress by April 15 estimates of over-all receipts and expenditures for the coming fiscal year. If it turns out that prospective outlays are greater than estimated total receipts, Congress would then be required to approve the creation of additional Federal debt to cover the deficit. In case total appropriations later exceeded the Budget figure approved by Congress, it is further recommended that appropriations, exclusive of certain fixed and permanent obligations, be reduced by a uniform percentage to bring them within the over-all limit.

Valid objections can be raised, we think to any cut-and-dried formula for uniform percentage cuts in appropriations, as suggested. But there is a crying need for a comprehensive survey of the kind proposed to enable Congress to control expenditures effectively and relate them to income. A preview of this sort would not only serve to check extravagance, but it would result in a better balanced spending program. The existing system of divided authority makes it much easier for departments, agencies, and special interest groups successfully to press their claims for funds in disregard of the demands that are being urged by other groups. If all such spending proposals were brought together and subjected to scrutiny, the chances for an equitable apportionment of funds would be greatly improved.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 11, 1946]

ALL IN ONE PACKAGE

An almost unanimous chorus of praise has greeted the La Follette-Monroney report proposing steps to strengthen and equip Congress to do a better job.

This enthusiasm reflects a profound public feeling—shared, we believe, by most Senators and Representatives—that Congress has fallen dangerously behind the times.

In an age of jet planes and split atoms Congress is still struggling to do business by methods that antedate the automobile and the electric light. Its organization is cumbersome. Its operations are bumbling. Its sources of unbiased fact-and-figure information are inadequate. Its Members are overburdened with petty tasks that leave them too little time for important legislative work.

As a result, we have a constant growth of bureaucracy—ever-expanding volume of administrative rules and regulations—an alarming trend toward government by men instead of government by law. If this trend is to be halted and reversed, Congress must bring itself up to date.

But the general recognition of that fact, by Members of Congress as well as by the public, does not automatically insure that the wise La Follette-Monroney program will be adopted.

Part of that program proposes higher salaries, more help, retirement pensions for Senators and Representatives. Congress probably will need no urging to adopt that part. But the chief recommendation of the other part calls for a merging of standing committees and a reduction of their number, in order to eliminate the present overlapping, duplication, and conflicts of effort. That would displace 17 of the 33 present committee chairmen in the Senate, and 30 of the 48 present committee chairmen in the House. So there is likely to be some powerful opposition to that part of the program.

We hope, however, that the whole program will be wrapped up together and enacted in one bill, the bitter medicine for some committee chairmen along with the sweet benefits for all Senators and Representatives. A committee reorganization enabling Congress to do a genuinely better job would justify salary raises, pensions, and additional help.

Wage and Price Adjustments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, following is copy of letter I have received from Mr. G. B. Logan, member of firm Cobbs, Logan, Roos & Armstrong, St. Louis, Mo., addressed to the Honorable Chester Bowles, Director of Economic Stabilization, under date of March 12, 1946:

MARCH 12, 1946.

HON. CHESTER BOWLES,
Director of Economic Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of the text of title 32, National Defense, chapter XVIII, Office of Economic Stabilization, part 4001, Stabilization of Wages and Prices, Supplementary Wage and Salary Regulations.

In preliminary statement we find this paragraph:

"Industry needs and is entitled to firm assurance that it will get speedy decisions on wage and price adjustments where they are needed, and that it can move ahead without fear of losing money."

In section 309 we find the following:

"SEC. 309. Agreements for conditional wage or salary increases: No wage or salary stabilization agency shall consider or act upon an application for approval of any wage or salary increase which appears to be conditioned in whole or in part upon the granting of an increase in price or rent ceilings. This provision, however, shall not be a bar to consideration of an increase which is conditioned upon approval by the appropriate wage or salary stabilization agency not of an increase which is not to be put into effect until a determination has been made by the Office of Price Administration as to whether an increase in price or rent ceilings is required."

In section 402 we find the following:

"SEC. 402. Prohibition against adjustment of price or rent ceilings before approved increase has been put into effect or agreed to: Except to the extent permitted in section 403, the Price Administrator shall not, in the absence of specific approval by the Economic Stabilization Director, authorize any increase in price or rent ceilings or make any commitment to authorize any such increase on the basis of any increase in wages or salaries unless such wage or salary increase has been put into effect or a firm agreement exists to put it into effect. However, in order to expedite adjustment of ceilings after approved increases have been put into effect the Price Administrator may, while an application for approval of a wage or salary increase is pending, receive applications for increased ceilings based on the wage or salary increase for which approval is being sought."

We represent a manufacturer here who processes steel. The basic and almost the entirely exclusive raw material used is steel. The recent increase granted to United States Steel Co. in the price of its products has so increased the price of our raw material as to practically wipe out the margin between cost and selling price.

We have just received a demand for a 30-percent increase in wages. (Previous increases, all approved by the National War Labor Board, have far exceeded the 33-percent cost of living increase.)

Section 309 and section 402 quoted above seem to prohibit precisely the thing which was done in the United States Steel wage dispute and, consequently, seems to deny the firm assurance referred to in the preliminary statement.

Are we to understand from the above regulations that we must either refuse to grant a wage increase, or take our chances of getting sufficient price increase?

We gather that we can make a binding contract to pay increased wages, say in 60 days from date, and apply to your agency for increase based upon that firm commitment. But we know of no way, having made such a commitment, to avoid paying the wage increase if your agency should fail to grant a price increase within the time fixed.

Our contract would be binding. A failure to pay the wage increase would be a breach of contract. Closing down of the plant to prevent ruinous loss would probably be an unfair labor practice.

Any explanation or light that can be thrown on this problem or any suggestions made by your agency would be sincerely appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

COBBS, LOGAN, ROOS, & ARMSTRONG,
By G. B. LOGAN.

Communism in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with considerable alarm the great expansion of communism in Europe. It is apparent that communism has spread from Russia until it has almost enveloped the Continent of Europe. France today is practically controlled by the Communists. Poland has been absorbed, as has most other countries in western Europe south of Sweden, with the exception of Spain, Portugal, and possibly Italy.

The Communists are making a hard drive to take over Greece and are threatening Turkey and the Near East.

Mr. Speaker, it is more disturbing to note that our Government, through its State Department, recently joined in an effort with other nations in taking a position which gave aid and comfort to the Communists in Spain which could well encourage an effort on their part to overthrow the Government, plunging that nation into a civil war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President and the State Department will cease and desist from joining in any effort to overthrow this, one of the few Christian nations, remaining on the continent of Europe. Certainly, Spain, at the present time does not offer a threat to world peace. It would be the height of folly with the strained conditions now existing between Russia, England, and this country for us to be foolish enough to lend our support in toppling over the Christian Government of Spain which is desired by and which springs from communistic Russia.

Should we help to destroy that Government and enthrone communism there, it would be a great threat to the United States and her Allies who are working for world peace, because the western entrance to the Mediterranean, Gibraltar, would doubtless fall into the hands of communistic Spain backed by communistic Russia.

The leaders of our Government certainly know by now that even though we and our allies were not fully pleased with the action of Spain during the war, yet if we are to exert any influence now, it should be for encouraging the retention of the present Government of Spain as a wise strategic present military move.

Aside from the military benefit, it is not our province to suggest the overthrow of other governments or meddle in the affairs of other stable governments. The State Department and our national leaders have erred recently in their approach to this question. It is to be hoped that they will reverse their position in the interest of international peace and in an effort to prevent the power of this country being used for the further spread of communism on the European Continent.

Mr. Speaker, from a moral and Christian viewpoint, this Nation cannot become a party in helping to strike down the Christian nation of Spain, turning it over to communism, anarchy, plunder, the destruction of churches, the murder and liquidation of the clergy and Christian leaders of that nation, which has been the plan and purpose of Russia as declared by Lenin, who founded the communistic government in Russia. We cannot afford to lend the influence of the United States which would help to bring about such a reign of terror and destruction against Spain or any nation.

The Military Occupation of Germany—An Example of the Weakness of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first half of a speech on the military occupation of Germany—an example of the weakness of our foreign policy, delivered by Col. Bernard Bernstein, formerly Director of the Finance Division and Director of the Division of Investigation of Cartels and External Assets, Office of Military Government, United States—Germany—before a dinner of the National Citizens Political Action Committee at the Commodore Hotel, New York, on January 31, 1946:

The people of the United States and elsewhere in the world are becoming increasingly alarmed about the unsettled state of postwar international relations and the repeated crises in these relationships. There are ample grounds for concern about our own ineffectiveness in dealing with postwar international problems. Why has not the United States, the strongest power in the world today, been more successful in bringing about settlements abroad? The policies and practices which have been followed by our Government with respect to Germany provide at least a clue to the answer to this question.

By the middle of 1944 the Allied Forces, under the command of General Eisenhower, had completed and begun to put into operation a thoroughgoing plan for the military defeat of Germany from the west. The scope and magnitude of that plan are now well known. It involved the staggering details required to deploy millions of fighting men and scores of millions of tons of supplies. The plan covered all foreseeable contingencies, including the possibility that Germany might collapse before the actual attack or shortly thereafter. So well thought out was the military plan, that provision had even been made for an air lift from England to Berlin and other designated places in Germany, an air lift that would place military units, including military government units, in the selected places within a few days after the collapse. The resounding success of the Allied military plan is now well known and a matter of historical record.

But in contrast to the military plans, by July 1944, at what stage were we in our planning for the occupation of Germany from a political and economic point of view? At the very highest levels of the American and British Governments there was no agreement. The top American officials had given little thought to the matter. And in the lower governmental levels, American thinking and planning with respect to the occupation of Germany were strikingly unimaginative and routine. For example, CCS 551, the directive from the top Allied command in Washington to General Eisenhower, issued in the spring of 1944, was largely a word-for-word repetition of the Combined Chiefs of Staff directive to General Eisenhower for the military government of Sicily. Incredible as it may seem to us now, the fact is that as late as July 1944 the American and British officials charged with preparing the directives for the military government of Germany thought that the goals of our military occupation of Germany were basically the same as for Sicily. Many Americans and British officials still think so.

Under CCS 551 the goals of our military occupation of Germany were merely to aid military operations; destroy nazism and fascism, maintain law and order, and restore normal conditions among the civilian population as soon as possible. Germany had been the principal force of aggression in the world. CCS 551 ignored that fact. Germany had catapulted the world into World War II and into prior wars. CCS 551 ignored that fact. The peace and security of the world could never be attained unless the German capacity and inclination to wage war were destroyed. CCS 551 ignored that fact.

Instead, this directive from the Combined Chiefs of Staff directed the establishment of a most complete and paternalistic control over the German economy with a view to effecting stability, eliminating unemployment, converting Germany's war production facilities to peacetime production, and integrating a readjusted German economy into the European and world economies. In short, CCS 551 charged General Eisenhower and his military government staff with the impossible task of administering every phase of German economic and financial life, without even mentioning the destruction of Germany's war-making potential.

On the basis of CCS 551, and without questioning its wisdom, SHAEF prepared a handbook for the military government of Germany. In August 1944, when this handbook was nearing completion, it came to the attention of President Roosevelt. He wrote a letter to the Secretary of War which was blisteringly critical. He said, "This so-called handbook is pretty bad." The President disapproved the program of trying to restore Germany. He disapproved of trying to do for Germany what we might want to see done for the Netherlands or Belgium. He disapproved of bringing the people of Germany back as quickly as possible to their prewar estate. He disapproved of doing for Germany what our Government did for Americans in 1933 when they were flat on their backs. He saw no reason for the Army of Occupation starting a WPA, PWA, or a CCC for Germany.

In 1943, 1944, and the first half of 1945 there were gathered together in Britain and on the European continent over 2,000 American officers of all ranks to be trained for the military government of Germany. These officers were largely trained on the basis of CCS 551, and the handbook for Germany which President Roosevelt had so strongly criticized. These officers were being taught in the greatest detail what had been our program and practices in the military occupation of Sicily and the mainland of Italy, with a view to following a comparable course in Germany. This large body of officers were not effectively taught the real significance of nazism, junkerism, and Prussian militarism, German big business, and pan-Germanism, and the measures that were necessary to destroy those forces and to prevent Germany from again becoming a threat to the peace of the world. For a variety of reasons most of these officers had a

sense of wasting their time and talents, became very resentful at the way they were treated, and made every effort to get themselves redeployed to the United States regardless of the state of the military occupation of Germany.

Following the President's letter criticizing the German handbook, the top officials in our own Government began to give serious and extended thought to our own purposes and policies in the occupation of Germany. As is now well known, a profound cleavage of thinking developed in the Cabinet and in the technical staffs working on the matter.

At their Quebec meeting in September 1944, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill signed a memorandum of understanding to the effect that the metallurgical, chemical, and electric industries in the Ruhr and the Saar were to be transferred as reparations or destroyed in order to prevent renewed armament by Germany and with a view to making Germany more of an agricultural country.

Thereafter, for eight long and crucial months top officials in our own Government and their technical staffs struggled over the formulation of a policy for the occupation of Germany that would embody the views expressed by President Roosevelt. Various drafts were sent to General Eisenhower's headquarters in the latter part of 1944 and the early part of 1945. Each of these drafts met with bitter opposition from some of the American political and military government officers and unanimous opposition from the British side of General Eisenhower's combined staff. Efforts to embody into the SHAEF military government handbook for Germany the program being developed in Washington by the American authorities were frequently opposed with success by our own personnel as well as by the British, on the ground that directives from Washington had no validity at a combined headquarters unless they came through the channel of the Combined Chiefs of Staff—this, notwithstanding the fact that the British side of SHAEF was in daily personal and telephone contact with various departments of the British Government. These British officers were able, in a very adroit and effective manner, frequently with support from our own personnel, and under the SHAEF banner, to carry out the instructions of the British Government with respect to the policies and purposes of the military occupation of Germany, even though the British purposes were in conflict with the views expressed by the President of the United States.

Not until the end of April 1945 were the top officials in our own Government finally able to agree on the directive, known as JCS 1067. At that late date, JCS 1067 was issued to the commander in chief of the United States forces of occupation, to govern our policies in the military government of Germany.

JCS 1067, which reflected the combined efforts of the State, War, and Treasury Departments and of other agencies of the United States Government, was endorsed by both President Roosevelt and President Truman. This directive from the American high command stated very briefly:

"The principal Allied objective is to prevent Germany from ever again becoming a threat to the peace of the world. Essential steps in the accomplishment of this objective are the elimination of nazism and militarism in all their forms, the immediate apprehension of war criminals for punishment, the industrial disarmament and demilitarization of Germany, with continued control over Germany's capacity to make war, and the preparation for an eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis."

JCS 1067 required that to the fullest extent practicable the Germans be made to administer the controls over Germany in order to relieve the burden on the occupying armies and in order to "bring home to the German people that the responsibility for the administration of such controls and for any break-down in those controls will rest with themselves and German authorities."

And in connection with the removals from public and private office under the denazification program, JCS 1067 stated that no person was to be retained "because of administrative necessity, convenience, or expediency."

These were seemingly clear and unambiguous directives. Under any fair reading their meaning was plain. But what happened? Key personnel and important forces in the American Government, in both Washington and on the American side of General Eisenhower's staff at SHAEF, continued to oppose JCS 1067, to delay its enforcement, and deliberately to misconstrue its clear meaning and purpose. At the same time, and until SHAEF was dissolved in July 1945, the British personnel in SHAEF were doing their best, acting in league wiht the American personnel who disagreed with JCS 1067, to prevent the carrying out of JCS 1067, even in the areas occupied by American troops. As a result lower echelons of American military government personnel in Germany received confusing and conflicting instructions as to the American policy respecting Germany. In fact, they frequently and honestly did not know what the American policy was.

In August 1945, Britain, the U. S. S. R., and the United States agreed upon and set forth in the Potsdam agreement their joint political and economic principles for the occupation of Germany. That agreement said flatly and unequivocably:

"German militarism and nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world."

The Potsdam agreement also provided for the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industries that could be used for military production. It provided for the decentralization of the German economy, for the purpose of eliminating the excessive concentrations of economic power, exemplified by cartels and other monopolistic arrangements. It provided that the German economy was to be reorganized, with primary emphasis placed on the development of agricultural and peaceful domestic industries.

The political and economic principles embodied in the Potsdam agreement are generally regarded as basically the same as those of JCS 1067. Many of the same key American officials, both from Washington and from General Eisenhower's staff, who had always opposed what they termed the harsh provisions of JCS 1067, were present at the Potsdam meeting. They joined the British in fearing Russia and communism, and in wishing to see Germany left strong enough to be an important member of a bloc of powers that could oppose the USSR. That fear increased as a result of the struggle that took place at Potsdam on the subject of reparations. These American officials made great but unsuccessful efforts to prevent the embodiment in the Potsdam agreement of the basic principles of JCS 1067. And, after the Potsdam agreement was signed, these same American officials continued their same prior activities to impede, delay, and change those principles and to secure a soft peace for Germany.

Thus, for the American side of the military government in Germany, we had written directives, embodied in JCS 1067 and in the Potsdam agreement, which constituted a comprehensive and formally agreed-upon program for the military occupancy of Germany. And at the same time, we had key officials, charged with the responsibility of carrying out those directives, who frequently stated their bitter opposition to those directives, who urged the necessity for their revision, and who continued to delay and impede their execution. It is incorrect to say that the American military authorities in Germany were not furnished with a clear and complete directive. The difficulty lies in our authorities functioning as though they had two inconsistent directives.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter addressed to Hon. CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, relative to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, by Mr. Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.:

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE
INSTITUTE, INC.,
New York, February 26, 1946.

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: The American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., a trade association whose members own and operate the major portion of the American-flag merchant fleet engaged in foreign and domestic deep-sea trade, desires to record its vigorous opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 104, providing for an agreement between the United States and Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The navigational aspects of the project are open to grave questioning and would result in a great disservice to all Atlantic and Gulf seaports by a diversion of trade through the construction of a seaway. The American-flag steamship companies which comprise the institute are in the business of transporting cargo and passengers and will extend services where sufficient traffic exists to justify such services providing:

1. It is to the best interest of our country.
2. It will not imperil a strong and adequate merchant marine.

However, the institute feels that the proposed seaway, instead of being a benefit to the American merchant marine, constitutes actual discrimination against this Nation's existing merchant fleet. Furthermore, as designed, the seaway would decidedly favor foreign-flag shipping. In this latter respect the seaway would be contrary to the wishes of Congress which has repeatedly expressed its policy of fostering an American merchant marine.

The proponents of the project have described the seaway as a deep-water channel; but so far as shipping is concerned it is of extremely shallow draft. The present plan provides for a 27-foot channel from Montreal to Lake Ontario. But this does not mean that vessels of 27-foot draft may pass from the ocean to the Great Lakes. Due to the lesser density of fresh water, a vessel will draw 6 inches more than in salt water. Then again, a vessel in motion tends to ride much lower in the water than when at rest. Proper allowances must be made for bottom clearance to achieve propulsive efficiency. In recognition of this factor, the port rules of Montreal require 2 feet 6 inch bottom clearance for the issuance of a sailing permit.

It is presumed that a similar rule for safe navigation would apply to the proposed seaway. The net result is that only vessels drawing 24-feet or less in salt water could use the seaway.

The United States Maritime Commission has prepared current statistics on merchant vessels with a draft of 25-feet or less. The percentage of ships in the 24-foot draft range is not available. These official figures show that only 8.7 percent of the gross tonnage of the great American merchant marine, much of it constructed during the war period at considerable expense, would ever be able to use the seaway properly. The same statistics indicate that 18.7 percent of the world's gross tonnage have the required draft, thus raising further doubt as to the practicality of the proposed depth of the channel.

The claims of the proponents who glowingly vision busy inland ports teeming with deep-sea shipping of all types have been fantastically exaggerated since 91.3 percent of the American merchant marine and 81.3 percent of the world's tonnage would be automatically barred from using the seaway.

The Maritime Commission, in its figures, states that there are 763 American vessels of 3,490,770 gross tons in the 25-foot draft range. The entire American-flag fleet consists of 5,529 vessels of 40,080,002 gross tons. No breakdown of the type or age of the vessels involved is available. However, a summary of the ocean-going merchant ship construction in the United States during the war period from September 1939 to December 31, 1945, shows that 5,025 American merchant vessels of various types were built. Obviously, this constitutes our newest and most modern tonnage and presumably the fleet that would be expected to use a seaway.

A table showing the type of vessel, number constructed, and draft follows:

Oceangoing merchant vessels constructed by Maritime Commission and private owners between Sept. 1, 1939, and Dec. 31, 1945

Type	Number constructed	Draft
		Ft. In.
Liberty	2,710	27 9
Victory	531	28 6
C-1 A	65	23 6
C-1 B	95	27 6
C-1 MAV	209	21 0
C-2 cargo	256	25 9
C-2 combination-passenger	9	25 9
C-3 cargo	181	27 3
C-3 combination-passenger	20	27 3
C-4	92	32 0
America	1	32 0
P-2 passenger	19	29 0
Reefers	28	26 0
T-2 tankers	108	29 11
Private tankers	71	31 7
Coastal tankers (T-1)	35	12 10
Coastal cargo (N3 SAL)	95	17 11
Total	5,025	

Source: Construction—American Bureau of Shipping. Draft—U. S. Maritime Commission.

It will be noted that of the many types only 4 of a total of 404 vessels have the required draft of 24 feet or less. Thus the finest ships of our merchant fleet could never traverse the Great Lakes. Furthermore, no construction now under contract for this year has been designed with an eye toward operation on the seaway.

It has been frequently asked why American operators cannot build shallow-draft vessels suitable for the depth of the proposed channel. This cannot be done because of the enormously higher labor costs of American shipbuilding and operation. A small vessel requires almost the same size crew as a large vessel, yet can carry perhaps one-third the cargo and earn one-third the revenue. The construction cost of a smaller vessel is disproportionately high per ton.

Well-meaning proponents of the seaway have suggested that American operators could use the seaway by adopting the practice of only partially loading their vessels instead of bringing them down to their legal load marks. Frequently, ships are required, by reason of schedules, to sail although they are not fully loaded. However, no operator, American or foreign, would find it economically feasible to be forced to accept the fact that all his ships would sail all the time only partially loaded. The Maritime Commission on many occasions has stated that it should be the aim of all American operators to sail their ships "full and down."

American shipping, which already has such competitive disadvantages as higher wages, higher construction and maintenance costs, and higher standards of living and working conditions on its vessels, cannot be saddled with another handicap such as sailing with ships only partially loaded. The situation is further heightened in that American ships would have to compete against small but fully loaded foreign-flag ships.

Although the United States now possesses 60 percent of the world's tonnage, the great preponderance of the vessels that could ply the seaway would be foreign-flag. According to the Maritime Commission's figures, of the 12,283,912 gross tons in the 25-foot draft range, 72 percent is foreign-flag owned. With the bulk of American shipping virtually barred from the seaway because of economic and navigational conditions, it becomes evident that the St. Lawrence waterway would be used almost exclusively by foreign ships. The ocean traffic that would move over the proposed seaway would move in foreign tramp ships at the expense of the regularly operated American lines on the seaboard.

As the Institute pointed out to the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941, when this matter was again before Congress, too little attention has been paid to the high insurance rates that will prevail on vessels traversing the seaway. Narrow channels, currents, and the passing of vessels in them greatly increase the usual hazards encountered in all canals. A slight deviation from the channels will bring about serious damage as most of them are to be blasted out of solid rock. The increased cost of insurance will be a substantial item that will be passed on to the shipper in the form of higher freight rates. We believe this element should be given closer study by those who maintain that the seaway will provide cheaper transportation than existing means.

In conclusion, the American Merchant Marine Institute believes that the construction of this seaway would be highly detrimental to the best interests of the American merchant marine and urges that your committee report unfavorably on Senate Joint Resolution 104. We respectfully request that this letter be made part of the record of the hearings.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. TAYLOR,
President.

Statement of Department of Electricity, Clarksville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore obtained, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point, a recent statement of the Clarksville (Tenn.) Department of Electricity, which sets out a record of accomplishment so outstanding that I think it should be called to the attention of the membership of the House and the country generally:

To the Citizens and Taxpayers of Clarksville, Tenn.:

It is with much pleasure and considerable satisfaction that we announce a substantial reduction in your electric rate, effective with your May 1 billing.

This reduction brings the cost of electricity to the consumers of Clarksville down to a basis of approximately 20 percent lower than that enjoyed by the larger cities of this State. In fact lower than any town in Tennessee except one or two small municipalities.

As a concrete example of how this reduction will effect the consumers in Clarksville we submit the following comparisons:

	25-kilowatt-hours		100-kilowatt-hours		250-kilowatt-hours	
	Bill	Per kilowatt-hour	Bill	Per kilowatt-hour	Bill	Per kilowatt-hour
		Cents		*Cents*		*Cents*
United States average	$1.42	5.68	$4.01	4.01	$7.33	2.93
Clarksville:						
1945 rate	.75	3.00	2.50	2.50	5.00	2.00
New rate	.75	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.50	1.40

When your electric plant was purchased by the city of Clarksville the rates at that time were reduced approximately 60 percent. A surcharge was retained for a short period of time and later eliminated entirely. This present reduction brings your cost of electricity down to among the lowest in the Nation.

The original cost of your properties was $250,000.00
Since purchasing we have spent in improvements an additional sum of 274,794.99

Making a total plant investment of 524,794.99

In addition your electric department owns Government bonds in the sum of $157,700. This department has in bank $29,734.75 in cash for operating capital and $12,256.71 invested in material and supplies. All of our bonds and materials on hand are paid for.

The city of Clarksville issued bonds in the sum of $250,000 for the initial purchase of this property. The entire bonded indebtedness against the plant has been retired a good many years in advance of the due date of the bonds. The bond retirement and all improvements and expansion have been from the earnings of the property.

Your electric department has paid a total of taxes into the city treasury of $92,373.28, which amount exceeds by $61,000 what would have been paid by the utilities in taxes had they retained ownership during this same period of operation.

Consumption of electricity is increasing so rapidly that it is with difficulty we are able to provide facilities for this expansion.

When the properties were first purchased Clarksville was consuming a monthly average of 511,765 kilowatt-hours. Last month we consumed 3,158,160 kilowatt-hours which is more than 6 times the amount of current which was being consumed when the city purchased the properties.

Demand is now being made on us for all kind of uses, such as refrigeration, air-conditioning of residences and business houses, and even garages and factories for heating. As consumption increases, extensive additional facilities must be provided for this increased demand.

As soon as materials are available we contemplate placing all down-town lines under

ground. This will be a very progressive step and will be a safeguard against interruptions from fires, freezes, etc., to say nothing of the safety element.

Your board of mayor and aldermen have just approved plans for a very extensive and modern White Way for our city, which will cost approximately $100,000. The cost of this will be paid for from the accumulated earnings of the electric department. These plans call for the latest and finest equipment to be had in street lighting and the installation will be modern in every particular.

When completed the White Way will cover all down-town and near down-town areas and will include Highway 41 from beyond the hospital at the city limits on through town and over to Madison Street and Madison Extended to the city limits. Clarksville will then be one of the best-lighted cities in America.

From an advertising standpoint alone, with people from all over the United States traveling over route 41 to and from Florida and other southern points, the value can hardly be estimated. With this fine white way extending from city limits to city limits, Clarksville will look like a city of 100,000 people.

This magnificent record of accomplishments, which cannot be equaled by any electric department in the entire Tennessee Valley area, is largely due to the intelligent and capable administration of our manager and his corps of fine and loyal workers. They cannot be excelled anywhere. We are justly proud of them and of our electric department.

In conclusion we cannot accord too much credit to the Tennessee Valley Authority and its fine staff of technicians, who have been ever ready to give us the advantage of their technical knowledge. They have cooperated with and helped us at all times.

Clarksville Department of Electricity: E. H. Harrison, Chairman, Power Board; William Orgain, Vice Chairman Power Board; E. B. Dickson, Secretary, Power Board; Garnett Ladd, Henry Merritt, Clarence Carney, W. D. Posey, members, Power Board; William Kleeman, Mayor; Gordon Wolf, Alderman, First Ward; Summey E. Hunter, Alderman, Second Ward; T. G. McKnight, Alderman, Third Ward; Wallace Perkins, Alderman, Fourth Ward; E. O. Bradley, Alderman, Fifth Ward; Wisdom Rudolph, Alderman, Sixth Ward; Everett Moore, Alderman, Seventh Ward; Frank Stafford, Alderman, Eighth Ward; Frank G. Farris, Alderman, Ninth Ward; Richard Winn, Alderman, Tenth Ward; O. T. Rankin, Alderman, Eleventh Ward; Garnett Ladd, Alderman, Twelfth Ward.

It Helps Rather Than Hinders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star, of New Rochelle, N. Y., entitled "It Helps Rather Than Hinders":

IT HELPS RATHER THAN HINDERS

Contrary to the immediate popular interpretation, we are of the opinion that the resignation of Herbert Brownell, Jr., as chairman of the National Republican Committee will aid rather than weaken the chances of Governor Dewey for the GOP Presidential nomination in 1948. Always provided, of course, that Governor Dewey is reelected to another term this fall at Albany.

Brownell has been, naturally enough, a Dewey man. He was put in as national chairman when Mr. Dewey was nominated for the Presidency in 1944. Consequently, anything whatever that Mr. Brownell said or did was considered deliberately conceived to aid Governor Dewey.

Now, with another man at the helm of the GOP National Committee, this question of bias or favoritism will be eliminated and Governor Dewey will be wholly on his own, no favors asked or given. And that, we imagine, is the way the Governor would prefer it. For he likes a good fight, and coming again into the national picture without any intimation that he was helped by friends in high places in the national committee will actually strengthen his campaign with the public.

We make this observation with all seriousness: Don't count Tom Dewey out. He still has a tremendous punch left in the fact that he has made the best Governor the greatest State of the Union has had in many, many years.

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, referring further to my remarks on the floor of the House on Wednesday, March 13, concerning the transfer of a radio frequency to Edward F. Pritchard, father of Edward F. Pritchard, Jr., general counsel for the Democratic National Committee by appointment of Mr. Hannegan, I include at this point in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, a newspaper article appearing in Radio Daily under date of March 14, 1946:

ABC-WLAP PROTESTS FCC GRANT IN KENTUCKY

WASHINGTON.—Hot on the heels of Representative WIGGLESWORTH's blast against the FCC, the Commission yesterday released a petition from ABC's station, WLAP, Lexington, Ky., requesting the grant to the Kentucky Broadcasting Co. be set aside. The Commission's decision to release the report followed WIGGLESWORTH's criticism of the grant by less than 2 hours.

Calling the grant "invalid," ABC in its petition noted that WLAP twice had been refused the frequency granted to the Pritchard Co. without hearing. The petition said that the grant had been made by the Commission acting as a "board," with only Chairman Porter and Commissioners Durr and Walker voting.

"On February 20, 1946," the petition said, "when the board acted, Commissioner Jett also was present in the offices of the Commission, and therefore a quorum of Commissioners of the FCC was present and available for Commission action. There is no statutory warrant for a board consisting of more than one and less than four members of the Commission."

The petition pointed out that WLAP had been twice refused a change of frequency to 1300 kilocycles because of interference with WJDX, Jackson, Miss., and WASH-WOOD, Grand Rapids, Mich. This frequency was finally granted to the Kentucky Broadcasting Co. by Porter and the other two Commissioners.

"Petitioner is not aware of any change which has taken place in the Commission's plan of allocation since it twice denied the frequency to petitioner which would now permit the use of that frequency at Lexington, Ky., under a request identical to the petitioner's former application.

"Petitioner further points out that interference limitations from WOOD (formerly WASH-WOOD) which together with interference from WJDX was determinative in the second hearing of the application, is even greater today than when the application was denied in 1940, WOOD having increased its power since the hearing from 500 watts to 5 kilowatts."

Sources of Inflationary Pressures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, inflation can practically destroy our country. It is the greatest fight before us that must be dealt with effectively and immediately. In the February issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin of 1946, there was an interesting article on sources of inflationary pressures by the Honorable Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. It is as follows:

My personal view of the Board's decision to increase margin requirements to 100 percent may be summed up as follows:

By this action, the Board has used its authority to prevent the further flow of borrowed money into stock-market operations. There is no further recourse left to the Board, so far as restraining speculative activities in listed stocks is concerned, except possibly to order that all existing margin accounts be put on a cash basis and to make some of the administrative provisions applying to banks more rigid. To whatever extent the Board's action will tend to dampen speculative activity, it is desirable, as a preventive step, at this time of strong, inflationary pressures and until such time as inflationary dangers are passed.

As I have frequently sought to emphasize in the past, the primary source of the inflation danger which overhangs the domestic economy on all fronts is the vast accumulation of currency and bank deposits at the disposal of the public as a result of the fact that far too much of the cost of the war was financed through the creation of commercial bank credit and not enough was financed out of taxes and the savings of the public. Credit for stock market as well as other purposes has been curbed all along, but it is a minor and not a major factor in the inflation picture. While credit curbs are justified for such restraint as they may impose on speculative activities in a time of inflationary danger, they cannot reach the real source of danger, which is the huge amount of money already created through bank credit. Price controls, rationing, allocations, etc., are vitally necessary for holding the line until the danger is past, but

they are not designed to prevent the excessive money supply from flowing into speculation in capital assets, such as homes, farms, business properties, and securities.

The most effective way that I know of to curb speculation in capital assets would be to increase substantially the rate of the capital-gains tax, or the holding period, or a combination of both. For a long time I have advocated enactment of legislation to this end as a temporary protective measure applicable to all future purchases. This would not deter the selling of assets held at the time the measure was introduced in Congress, but it would greatly deter buying for speculative rise after that date. It would not affect the purchase of capital assets of any kind which have been or are being bought for personal use or long-term investment rather than for the speculative rise.

In addition, it is important to point out that so long as the public debt continues to be monetized through the purchase of Government securities by the banking system, the supply of money will continue to increase, thus tending further to reduce the interest rate on savings and investment funds. The resultant pressure of an increasing money supply and of lower interest rates is bound to have a further inflationary effect upon all capital assets and to increase the difficulty of holding down the cost of living.

It is, therefore, imperative that the process of further monetizing of the public debt through the banking system be ended so that the rate of return on investments would be stabilized and would reflect the supply of savings and investment funds in relation to the demand instead of reflecting an increasing amount of bank credit. This process needs to be stopped not only by bringing about a balanced budget, but also through measures to check further unnecessary expansion of commercial bank holdings of Government securities.

Only by a vigorous, comprehensive attack along the entire economic front can the battle be successfully waged against inflationary pressures. Credit curbs are at best supplementary and not basic measures for reaching the underlying causes of these pressures.

CIO Political Campaign

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the press for the past 2 or 3 days has been giving considerable space to the political activities of the PAC and the CIO in defeating unfriendly Congressmen in the coming primaries. We note with particular interest that Sidney Hillman states he will go clear through the general election and support friendly Republicans as well as friendly Democrats for Congress. With his position why should we as Democrats accept his leadership as a Democrat here in Congress?

Since we have had the opposition of the PAC and CIO each time we were elected to Congress, we know that the huge campaign fund that is now being raised will find its way into the third district of Oklahoma. Already a representative is reported to have gone into my district making inquiry and contacting all buyable individuals to oppose me in the coming primaries.

Oklahoma knows real CIO and PAC mouthpieces have lived off of the old folks, the State, and a few politicians who pay them for their support before the election and if successful they share in profits in the sale of equipment and merchandise to the State and in the employment of a number of their poison spreaders.

We are not disturbed as to taking the count from their activities; we have had their opposition from the beginning and know we will have it in the July primaries.

To give my colleagues an idea of the appraisal of what it would cost the CIO and the PAC to defeat me, I wish to insert an editorial from the Daily Oklahoman of March 14, 1946, which is as follows:

NONE TOO MUCH

Now the CIO planners propose to spend a million dollars in a campaign to defeat a lot of southern Congressmen in the mid-summer primaries. Considering the chosen objective and the stage of action we would say that a million dollars is not one penny too much. A CIO champion would need most of the million just to take PAUL STEWART in the Third Oklahoma District.

Stalin's Reply to Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert editorials from the New York Times of March 13 and 14 and the Washington News of March 14, 1946.

These three editorials should be read in connection with Josef Stalin's reply in Pravda to Mr. Churchill's speech, in which he repeatedly accused the former Prime Minister of lying, libel, and warmongering, when he suggested that Russia's ambitions are expansionist and that at this moment Russia has done much to endanger a spirit of world cooperation.

[From the New York Times of March 13, 1946]

ANSWERING MR. CHURCHILL

After 6 days of silence the entire Russian propaganda apparatus has now opened up a barrage against Winston Churchill as a warmonger who would disturb the friendship between Russia and the United States and aline us with the British Empire in a war against the Soviets. That is poor recompense for a man who alined himself with Russia the moment Hitler attacked. But this line has a familiar ring from the recent past. There are two things, we believe, that need be said about it.

The first is that if Russia interprets the hesitant reception accorded Mr. Churchill's speech as an opportunity to split the United States and Britain it is making the same grave mistake that others have made before it. To a degree which should give pause to Moscow, the American and the British people are in complete agreement on the causes of the present international tension, as analyzed by Mr. Churchill, and if they differ on the immediate means for meeting this tension it is chiefly because the American people are still more optimistic about Russian reasonableness and the possibility of agreement than either Mr. Churchill or large sections of British opinion appear to be.

The second observation is that both the American and the British people have a clear realization of what is cause and what is effect in the present situation. After going to the limit in tendering Russia both their friendship and their aid, and after making enormous concessions to Russia against the dictates of their own interests, their judgment, and sometimes their consciences, they are now disturbed by the discovery that Russian appetites appear to grow upon what they feed, and that in satisfying these appetites Russia is inclined on occasion to make light of treaties and agreements on whose observance must rest world peace and order.

If Russia really desires to give an effective answer to Mr. Churchill, there is a very simple way of doing this. All Moscow needs to do is to abide by the pledges, agreements, and treaties it has made and the whole international tension will disappear overnight.

[From the New York Times of March 14, 1946]

WHAT DOES RUSSIA WANT?

The world has been startled by reports of additional Russian troop movements in Iran, in violation of treaty obligations. These reports are still indefinite, but they are substantial enough to prompt our Government to send an urgent inquiry to Moscow concerning their accuracy and the purpose of such movements if they are taking place.

The reports come at a moment when all of the official Russian agencies of information and opinion are engaged in a propaganda campaign picturing Russia as being encircled by a hostile and war-breeding monopoly capitalism. This campaign is now reaching an apparent climax in strong protestations that Russia will not yield to anyone or anything, but will continue on her way without turning aside. Yet, the sole argument that runs through the whole propaganda is that Russia must have security, that she must "secure all her frontiers," and that her only purpose is defense against attack.

The rest of the world can well sympathize with the desire for security by a country which has been invaded twice within a generation. But the Russian interpretation of this desire raises inevitable questions. In the name of security, Russia has already annexed during the recent war the following countries and territories:

	Square miles	Population
Lithuania	24,058	3,029,000
Latvia	20,056	1,950,000
Estonia	18,353	1,120,000
Eastern Poland	68,290	10,150,000
Bessarabia and Bukovina	19,360	3,748,000
Moldavia	13,124	2,200,000
Carpatho-Ukraine	4,922	800,000
East Prussia	3,500	400,000
Karelo-Finland	16,173	470,000
Petsamo, Finland	4,087	4,000
Tannu Tuva, Central Asia	64,000	65,000
Southern Sakhalin	14,075	415,000
Kurile Islands	3,949	4,500
Total	273,947	24,355,500

In the name of security Russia has likewise obtained naval bases on the Porkkala Peninsula in Finland and at Port Arthur in China, together with joint ownership and operation of the Manchurian trunk railway lines. In

short, in a war fought under the banner of "no aggrandizement, territorial or other," Russia has already acquired territories equal to the larger part of the eastern United States. Yet all Russian pronouncements make it evident that even this is not enough, and new demands are being made through Russian diplomatic channels and through the press for additional territories. The world is justified in asking: Where does the search for security end and where does expansion begin?

[From the Washington Daily News of March 14, 1946]

GRAVE

American and British officials call the international situation "grave." They do not exaggerate. Russia is breaking treaties and defying the world. Day by day, almost hour by hour, the tension grows more dangerous.

Yesterday Stalin made a belligerent statement calculated to stir the Russians to a war frenzy in the name of "defense." He not only attacked Winston Churchill as a Hitleresque warmonger, but damned all Americans and Britons who object to Russia's treaty violations. He ridiculed the British-Russian treaty and Foreign Secretary Bevin's offer to extend it. He defended his puppet regimes in eastern Europe as more representative than the British Labor Government.

Stalins' acts were even louder than his words.

His troops in Iran, which repeatedly he had sworn to withdraw before March 2, have been reinforced and are moving in battle columns south and west. They are nearing the Iranian capital in one direction and in the other are approaching Iraq and Turkey Where they will stop no non-Russian knows.

In Manchuria—also in violation of Stalin's treaties and repeated pledges—huge Red armies dominate most of the area, after stealing most of the war-production machinery and industrial equipment.

The United States Government has tried many methods to stop Russia's aggression, but all have failed so far. For months it tried to buy Moscow's friendship with unblushing appeasement. But the more Stalin was given, the more he demanded; the more compromises were paid for, the faster he broke the agreements. During the past month, and particularly during the past 10 days, the State Department in a series of sharp notes has challenged Russia's treaty violations. But our diplomatic protests are answered by more Soviet aggressions, as in Iran today.

A show-down is inevitable. The United Nations Security Council meets in New York a week from Monday. Just as Russia faced the San Francisco Conference with an accomplished fact in Poland and the recent London Conference with an accomplished fact in northern Iran, so Stalin now is racing into central Iran—and perhaps into Iraq and Turkey—before the New York Conference meets.

Russia today is threatening the United Nations Security Organization just as Japan in Manchuria, Italy in Africa, and Germany in eastern Europe destroyed the world's treaties and peace machinery before.

We hope President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee will urge Generalissimo Stalin to meet with them as members of the United Nations Security Council, and in the presence of that world organization make a desperate public effort to save Russia from outlawing herself. The only hope is in convincing Russia that the price of her aggression is eventually another world war, which she does not want but which she cannot escape if she defies the world.

The time is fearfully late.

Houses for Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the notion has developed throughout the country that problems can be solved by passing legislation. Problems of production of food, building houses, manufacturing needed products, and all other worth-while activities in the country require something more than resolutions of legislative bodies.

Everyone is agreed that our veterans need houses, and everyone is agreed that they ought to have them. Of all the people in the world who deserve a comfortable place to live, it is the men who have made victory possible, and who have done so much for the rest of us during World War II. On that issue there is no dispute.

The housing bill that recently passed the House of Representatives was a great disappointment to anyone who knows anything about the construction of houses. Our lumber yards are empty, and there is a shortage of soil pipe, bathtubs, and everything else that it takes to make a dwelling. There are two causes for this condition. They are: First, too much and unwise Government controls; and, second, labor trouble and work stoppages.

In meeting these two problems the House of Representatives says we will give you more Government controls. It is not a bill to lessen Government controls. It has been claimed that this bill that passed is a veterans' housing bill, but veterans are only mentioned in the general policy statements throughout the measure. The truth is that it was a bill to place national control over all housing. If this bill becomes a law in its present form, the Housing Expediter will have power to say:

Who shall build a house or other building.

Where he shall build it.

The kind of material to be used in the building.

The total cost.

The price at which it can be sold.

The Expediter will have sole authority over housing development on a geographical basis; he can build one community ahead of another or favor one State or section of the country over another.

The Expediter will have absolute authority over all other agencies and departments of our Government insofar as their operations in any way touch the operations of the housing program. He will have authority over the manufacture and sale of all building materials. He will be able to tell manufacturers what to produce, where to sell it, and at what price it is to be sold. The Expediter will not have any authority over labor.

It is my belief that our veterans constitute a fine group of sound-thinking citizens. They are not going to be fooled. I was greatly impressed with a radio address by Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, made on March 9, 1946. Among other points mentioned about the housing bill, he said:

Opposition leaders pointed out that they were not voting against homes for veterans but rather against unsound methods. Many of those voting against subsidies were World War veterans themselves, with a long record of service to veterans.

Mr. Ketchum had as his guest on this radio program, Mr. H. R. Northup, secretary-manager of the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association. I wish to quote a question directed by Mr. Ketchum and Mr. Northup's reply.

Mr. KETCHUM. What about the present shortage of building materials, Mr. Northup? Will a lumber yard have anything to sell, even though we have a huge building program?

Mr. NORTHUP. That, I should say, Mr. Ketchum, is largely up to the Office of Price Administration. There are plenty of trees and plenty of lumber mills to supply America's needs adequately. The catch lies in the fact that thousands of small mills have been closed by OPA's wartime pricing formulas. In spite of the fact that the war is over, continued price fixing keeps those mills closed. Those in operation now find their only profits in following war-production programs, by cutting timber for uses other than home construction, or for export. National Housing Administrator Wilson Wyatt may call for thousands of homes annually, but until the OPA allows mills and factories to return to a realistic peacetime schedule, America's home building demands cannot be met. The $600,000,000 Federal subsidy which has been proposed to stimulate material production was both unnecessary and unwanted. Less than $200,000,000 in OPA price adjustments would insure an adequate flow of materials for America's homes.

Mr. Speaker, because of the great value of Mr. Ketchum's address and the included discussion with Mr. Northup, I include the entire radio address, as follows:

Mr. KETCHUM. This is Omar B. Ketchum, your veterans' reporter, speaking from the Nation's Capital and bringing you high lights in the world of veterans affairs. Well, it looks as though history is repeating itself and our traditional American kindness and generosity again may be repaid with bloodshed and misery. Tired and worn from recent experiences with our little brown brothers of Japan, to whom we had brought enlightenment, the arts and sciences and scrap iron—only to have it thrown back at us in the form of high explosives and brutality—we now face a crisis with our erstwhile beneficiaries in Soviet Russia. With Red officials making a mockery of United Nations ideals; with American correspondents being chased in the skies by Russian pilots in American lease-lend planes, and prodded in the stomach by lease-lend tommy guns in the hands of Soviet soldiers; with Red generals issuing threatening statements about chopping off interfering hands—forgotten are the dark days when American supplies, delivered at terrific cost, and American air power prevented the Nazi tiger from destroying the clumsy Russian bear. Can it be possible that our recent victory achieved at a terrible cost of lives, limbs, and resources, merely substi-

tuted one world menace for a worse one? There were some who, long ago, predicted this situation but were denounced as prophets of gloom and despair. With our armed forces melting through rapid demobilization, and no plans for future preparedness, only possession of the atom bomb strengthens the hands of our statesmen in their stiffening attitude toward Russia. Those idealists who have been shouting down the need for universal military training may soon change their tune. Sensing the need for American preparedness in a troubled world, leaders, of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans will soon meet in conference to discuss ways and means to persuade the American people and the Congress to approve universal military training.

Meanwhile, internal problems in the form of industrial unrest, strikes, shortages in housing, transportation, and consumer goods, continue to plague the Nation. The House of Representatives, in a growing rebellion against price-control policies, threw a monkey wrench in the administration's emergency housing program by knocking out subsidy payments and price ceilings on existing houses. Opposition leaders pointed out they were not voting against homes for veterans but rather against unsound methods. Many of those voting against subsidies were war veterans themselves, with a long record of service to veterans.

Unemployment among veterans continues to climb. Latest figures from the Veterans' Administration reveal that 1,665,357 World War II veterans are now receiving or have applied for unemployment benefits under the GI bill. Veterans in strike-bound communities, who are denied unemployment benefits because they are on strike, are beginning to demand amendments to the GI bill which will permit payments to strikers. The adoption of such a policy would mean, of course, Government subsidizing of strikes, but it reflects a growing attitude on the part of some veterans.

In a further effort to acquaint veterans with unemployment opportunities in Nation-wide industries, we have here in the studio a top spokesman for one of the largest, most widely spread and strategic lines of business in the Nation. He is Mr. H. R. Northup, secretary-manager of the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, with offices in Washington, D. C. Mr. Northup, as I understand it, your organization represents the retail lumbermen or building material suppliers in the home-building business?

Mr. NORTHUP. That's right, Mr. Ketchum. Our association represents 25,000 retail lumber yards in all sections of the country.

Mr. KETCHUM. What are a veterans' chances in getting a job or starting a business in retail lumber, Mr. Northup?

Mr. NORTHUP. Well, Mr. Ketchum, the retail lumber business is at least 50 percent undermanned right now. This leaves approximately 125,000 jobs open, and the lumber dealers are already on record to hire veterans whenever possible. I'd say job chances are very good.

Mr. KETCHUM. Can you give us an example of this preference for veterans?

Mr. NORTHUP. Yes; in the Forrest lumber yard in Texas, all new employees have been veterans and certain jobs are being held open for disabled veterans only. Actually, the whole industry desires to provide for veterans.

Mr. KETCHUM. From the standpoint of financial ability, how does the retail-lumber business compare with other industries?

Mr. NORTHUP. I'd say it compares very well. In the first place, it is one industry that is tied to the community with a physical plant and material inventory. This means that the retail-lumber dealer has an investment in his yard. As a matter of fact, in the home-building industry the retail lumberman is practically the only man with a stake in his business. You see, a lumberyard really is a building-supply yard. There are about 5,000 items handled by the average yard and only one of them is lumber. In the prefabricated-structure business alone, there are hundreds of different buildings, ranging from hen houses to homes.

Mr. KETCHUM. Well, what are the opportunities for veterans who are not experienced in selling either lumber or appliances, Mr. Northup?

Mr. NORTHUP. Retail lumbermen recognize the need for trained men in the field, and our association has scheduled a meeting this month to map out a comprehensive educational program. This plan will be based on the experience of three major universities which already have provided courses designed to qualify veterans for whatever branches of the business they want to enter. The universities of Iowa, Indiana, and Washington are pioneering these courses. The Washington University's first class recently completed the intensive 30-day course and it was reported a definite success. All phases of retailing lumber were covered, including advertising, selling, and management. Additionally, all specialized phases of the industry, such as job estimates, drafting, and so on, were taught to the men. According to university reports, students ranged from privates to majors, and all but two graduates of the course have been employed in the retail-lumber business.

Mr. KETCHUM. How are these 125,000 job opportunities distributed over the country, Mr. Northup?

Mr. NORTHUP. Every community—no matter how small, has a lumber yard nearby. Fifty percent of the lumber yards in the country are located in towns of 2,500 or less. Thus, a veteran does not need to move to a city to work in the retail lumber industry.

Mr. KETCHUM. Well, tell me, how would our veterans go about getting the best possible job in retail lumbering?

Mr. NORTHUP. The National Retail Lumber Dealers Association in Washington, D. C., will furnish to any veteran on request the name and address of the association secretary in his region. There are 33 member associations scattered over the country and their offices are well informed on job opportunities in lumber retailing.

Mr. KETCHUM. Briefly, what are the various jobs available in your industry, Mr. Northup?

Mr. NORTHUP. Well, to begin with, an average lumber yard employs about 10 men. There are two truck drivers, two or more yard men, a clerk, a bookkeeper, a manager, and two or three specialized salesmen. Of course, every employee of the yard is a potential salesman. Truck drivers, who are in constant contact with the public, are often the best salesmen and consequently have an opportunity to earn substantial commissions. Base wages in all of these jobs are comparable to the same jobs in other industries within the area. Insulation, roofing, and remodeling play an important part in lumber-yard merchandising, and these departments will need sales managers. Normally, 73 percent of the homes in America are built, sold, or financed directly by lumber retailers. At present there are $5,000,000,000 earmarked for urban home repair, maintenance, and remodeling. There are $10,000,000,000 waiting for materials for farm buildings.

Mr. KETCHUM. Well, that's a lot of building and should mean a lot of business, Mr. Northup. What are the chances for a veteran getting into this field on his own through a GI loan?

Mr. NORTHUP. First of all, I would advise an inexperienced man either to go to school or put in at least 2 years with a good lumberyard before starting. Material manufacturers will furnish materials on credit to a man whose ability and experience they respect. I would say that the amount guaranteed under the GI bill might be adequate to start a qualified man in a small way. On the other hand, an unknown or inexperienced man would need between ten and twenty thousand dollars to open a similar yard.

Mr. KETCHUM. What about the present shortage of building materials, Mr. Northup? Will a lumberyard have anything to sell, even though we have a huge building program?

Mr. NORTHUP. That, I should say, Mr. Ketchum, is largely up to the Office of Price Administration. There are plenty of trees and plenty of lumber mills to supply America's need adequately. The catch lies in the fact that thousands of small mills have been closed by OPA's wartime pricing formulas. In spite of the fact that the war is over, continued price fixing keep those mills closed. Those in operation now find their only profits in following war-production programs—by cutting timber for uses other than home construction or for export. National Housing Administrator Wilson Wyatt may call for thousands of homes annually, but until the OPA allows mills and factories to return to a realistic peacetime schedule America's home-building demands cannot be met. The $600,000,000 Federal subsidy which has been proposed to stimulate material production was both unnecessary and unwanted. Less than $200,000,000 in OPA price adjustments would insure an adequate flow of materials for America's homes.

Mr. KETCHUM. With housing shortages as critical as they are today, how do lumber retailers look upon prefabrication as a solution?

Mr. NORTHUP. Lumber retailers, who in many cases are themselves prefabricators, recognize the value of this method of construction. However, perhaps Mr. Wyatt is a little too optimistic in naming prefabrication as the answer to housing demands. A prefabricated home, in order to pass local and FHA building specifications, must contain the same materials necessary for an on-site built home. Add to this the fact that a prefabricated home cannot be transported profitably more than 200 miles, and we get a slightly less rosy picture. Besides that, if man-made bottlenecks slow down materials, it will be as difficult to build a prefabricated home as any other type.

Mr. KETCHUM. Just one more question, Mr. Northup. How many persons are employed in the entire building industry?

Mr. NORTHUP. Well, Mr. Ketchum, counting those employed in manufacturing and distributing materials and those employed in actual construction, it would take about 8,500,000 persons to man the construction industry, which is the second largest industry in the country.

Mr. KETCHUM. Thank you, Mr. H. R. Northup and the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association for your contribution to this program. Well, that's all for now, but I'll be back next week at the same time. Until then, this is Omar B. Ketchum saying, so long!

Collectivism Versus Individualism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by me to the Investors' League, Buffalo, N. Y.:

Congress is an unusual institution in which is epitomized the character and characteristics of our total people. Congress is the "Uncle Sam" we cartoon into a personality. It embodies all our diversity of interests, our variety of sentiments, and our collective personality. It is in Congress that the majority voice of the people is heard, and if Congress thwarts the majority will or acts contrary to the general welfare, it is promptly changed in its complexion. This is not true of the coordinate branches of our Government. If you do or don't approve of the acts of your Congressman, you can do something about it soon and often. If you don't approve of a decision of the Supreme Court, what can you do about it? If you don't approve of the decrees of a bureau head or any of the millions of executive officials what can you do about it?

The frequent possibility of your halting or altering the actions of Congress makes it safe for you to delegate great power to the Congress and unsafe for you to delegate great power to executive officials. Any executive officer who exercises any choice in enforcing the law becomes a lawmaker.

That is why the citizen makes a mistake when he directs his attacks against Congress as an institution when his injury rests on the acts of an executive bureau or an executive official. The bureau or official thus goes free of censure and is free to fortify its position while the public wages its war on the wrong party. It reminds me of three boys where one hits another from behind, then shoves the third in between and watches his victim take it out on the one who is not party to the injury. Executive officials have so long practiced this method of avoiding responsibility for their acts that Congress has become recognized as whipping boy.

In the present tense many of the ablest individuals of Congress are voluntarily leaving the job because it is too arduous and too thankless.

A Congressman's constituency expects him to possess the wisdom of Solomon and the patience of Job; to see all, to know all, to do all, and to be well satisfied with being seldom praised, frequently damned, and always harrassed by oposition.

To the individual Member, Congress is the battleground of endeavor where they lower the flag if he dies in action as a signal that he's to be remembered, then rather promptly raise it again as a signal that he's to be forgotten.

I come to you not as a stone of the structure or institution—Congress. I am no more that than you are. I come as an individual and my views today are individual. An individual soldier is not an army. An army is institutional. Its character and characteristics are institutional. The soldier in it is just an individual.

Unless you have the courage to face facts then you will not like what I have to say. I am not here to interpret dreams but to examine realities.

COLLECTIVISM VERSUS INDIVIDUALISM

Even after this war's experience, can we look forward to a wiser and a safer world?

Has the public opinion of the world salidified into convictions that will relegate self-interest to its proper sphere?

We want to trust Russia. Can we?

All the world knows that America will wage unprovoked aggressive war on no one. Does all the world know that about Russia? Can you believe it—try, sincerely try, and see if you can believe it.

Is Bolivia afraid of us?

Is Cuba afraid of us, or is Canada?

Is Austria afraid of Russia?

Is Poland afraid of Russia or is China?

France has perfect confidence that every American soldier will depart and so is it in Italy, in Austria, in Belgium, even in Germany. Can Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslovia, Rumania, even China have confidence that the Russian soldiers will ever voluntarily depart?

There are too many people with alien allegiance in America, too many folks with us that are not for us.

Facts are tools and tools are to be used. Let each and every man that loves America put his hand to these tools and do something about it.

If we turn our eyes from distant horizons to the areas near at hand we find within our country that we have civil war of exactly the same kind and character as that war that had the territorial limits of the world as its boundaries.

Not long since we found the principles of law and order broken down on an international scale by small but highly organized minorities of the world's people under ruthless dictatorial leadership. Our world civilization is so complicated we could not be unaffected though the nominal combatants were from us far removed. Our interdependence is so great that what happened in Europe affected Asia and America. What happened to France or Holland or England was felt in the daily lives of everyone in all the national areas of the world. War cannot be confined to those who are supposed to be the belligerent powers. It is an attack on the world's social order.

Now we in America find the principles of law and order broken down on a national scale by small but highly organized minorities of the Nation's people under ruthless dictatorial leadership. Our national civilization is so complicated we cannot be unaffected though the nominal combatants are from us far removed. Our interdependence is so great that what happens in Pennsylvania affects Florida and California, what happens in the automobile factories of Michigan affects the daily lives of everyone in all the local areas of the Nation. Industrial war cannot be confined to those who are supposed to be the belligerent parties. It is an attack on the Nation's social order.

In the World's War we did not act until the war had reached proportions that put us in a desperate situation. Then we moved to defend the fundamental principles of international law and fought in the interest of the whole of mankind.

In this civil industrial war we have not acted until now industrial war has reached proportions that has us in a desperate situation. We have done too little but it is not too late to defend the fundamental principles of our Government and act in the interest of the whole American people.

I saw nations without adequate light or heat or clothes or transportation or communication because of Hitler and Mussolini and the Mikado, and I saw cripples, and undernourished children and waste and barren fields because of them.

Today I see areas without adequate light or heat or clothes or transportation or communication because of Philip Murray and Petrillo and others. And I see crippled industry and empty stores and idle factories and waste and barren fields because of them.

No matter what Hitler, Mussolini, or the Mikado said—the World War was not a war of underprivileged and downtrodden nations against the nations of a preferred class. It was a war between the highly organized minorities and the whole people of the world.

And no matter what the CIO-PAC, or others may claim we must realize clearly that this civil war is not a war of an underprivileged and downtrodden class against a preferred class. It is not a class war at all. It is a war between highly organized minorities and the whole people of America.

This industrial civil war must end. The whole people of America must act jointly and affirmatively.

I have chosen to address myself to the extremely important struggle of collectivism versus individualism.

It is the biggest struggle within our borders since the Civil War and it is a life and death struggle; one must die. It is a fight on the basis of kill or be killed.

All of these minority movements that I have already mentioned take on a form of collectivism that recognizes no importance in the individual. The individual doesn't count; millions of individuals—all the individuals—don't count except as they may be a part of the organized minority and have their interests served thereby—and even then their identity as individuals is lost. Their individual or personal rights, interest, or welfare cease to have any identity. All are subjugated in the collectivist doctrine that tramples out all individuality, usurps all the individual's rights and powers, and recognizes no individual's interest, liberty, need, or circumstance.

The cardinal principle of the American way of life is the recognition of the importance of the individual in a nation. The rights, the privileges, and the powers of the individual count in the American system.

In a collectivist state a man's house, his job—nothing—can he call his own. He has no individual power and no personal property, not even his life and hardly his soul is his own.

All the rights in the Bill of Rights are individual rights. Every individual is guaranteed the protection of his life and his property, his freedom. The guaranty of a trial by jury is a guaranty to the individual. All these are guaranteed to each individual and to every individual.

The common welfare is directed to an equality of interest in the welfare of the individuals in this Nation and most fundamental of all, each and every individual governed exercises a power over his Government. His Government derives all its power from his consent.

Collectivism does not hold that all just powers of government are derived from consent of the governed but subjugates the individual to the group in a way that ignores individual rights and conditions, the individual's welfare, and the individual's will to the whimsy of the group.

In my opinion, the most fundamental problem that America faces in the maintenance of the American system is to decide the question of individual enterprise and its importance in our system. Presently collectivism is endowed in some instances with government subsidy, is favored by tax exemption, and other privileges. If that person who has no conclusion of his own as to which is best, collectivism or individual enterprise, is to be given a fair chance to make a sensible decision, collectivism must at least be held to the basis of equal opportunity with individual enterprise.

If individual enterprise must compete with collectivism, it should at least be permitted to do so on like conditions and on terms of equality.

Let them play the game by the same rules. If one man is put out on a caught foul, let the other be. If one gets a double for knocking the ball over the fence, don't give the other a home run for the same.

Our generation has forgotten that the system of private property is the most important guaranty of freedom. It is only because the control of the means of production is divided among many people acting independently that we as individuals have any freedom as to what we do with ourselves. Whenever all the means of production are vested in a single hand, whether it be nominally that of a group, of "society" as a whole, or a dictator—whoever exercises this control has complete power over us. In the hands of private individuals economic power can be an instrument of coercion, but can never control the whole life of a person, but when economic power is collectivized into an instrument of political power, it creates a de-

gree of dependency scarcely distinguishable from slavery.

While GI Joes struggle for a foothold in the United States economic world, union (not labor) leaders struggle for a stranglehold.

Individualism in contrast to collectivism, socialism, and all the other forms of totalitarianism is based on the philosophy that individuals so differ in gifts, and talents, and wants, etc., that it is desirable that individuals should be free to develop their own individual gifts, etc., instead of putting all pegs, square or round, in one kind of hole.

It is also based on Christianity's respect for the individual man.

That a man may have some power over his own fate and develop his own talents is in principle the cause of civilization. From the individual who invented the wheel, to Edison, to all the men of science, all progress was made by individual effort at its own risk.

No collectivist enterprise can operate without coercive or arbitrary intervention of authority. Only individual enterprise in free competition can so operate.

We must clearly and frankly understand that democracy stands in irreconcilable conflict with collectivism. Democracy attaches all possible value to each man. Collectivism makes each man a mere agent, a mere number.

Democracy and collectivism have nothing in common but one word—equality. However democracy maintains equality in liberty. Collectivism maintains equality in restraint and servitude.

The drum tap of an invader rouses the heaviest sleepers. We are alert as to foreign foes, but we are a dull and indifferent people as to internal assaults upon the integrity and purity of public administration.

The forces of good citizenship have no outposts. The whole Army is generally on furlough. Corrupting and destructive forces can invade the realms of good government only when indifference on the part of the people as a whole yields without combat.

Public abuses are the direct and necessary results of public indifference. The plunderers step over sleeping sentinels and take by stealth the citadels they could never carry by assault. The people at large, on the other hand, are without strategy. The assault in force is their only war resource to combat the powers that invade their rights. Surely, a working plan can be devised to maintain from day to day effective, watchful interest amongst the body of our citizens. We must not accept the humiliating conclusion that bad things cannot be discarded or made good. The disposal of filth and waste from a great city cannot be left to a sudden flood from a river, but must have a constant supply of water for daily sanitation. And so it is when applying a flood from the river of popular indignation to cleanliness in the administration of government. What government really needs is a constant supply of the water of watchfulness for its daily sanitation.

Today in America the collectivist has control of many of the Nation's industries through its collectivist labor movements known as unions. Their power is ever growing. A certain union leader recently said in a speech that he had to spread his wings. He must be a bat, because a bat is the only rat that has wings. Such union drivers as that particular one remind me of some New York taxicab drivers that I have seen. In their jurisdictional strikes they are just like the taxicab driver who tries to crowd out or jump ahead of the driver that should have the right-of-way.

Every morning we Americans pick up the daily paper to see to what extent industrial warfare has spread. It is a morbid curiosity, like pulling a bandage off to see an infection you know has spread, but, of course, the little people of America who are so disastrously affected hope each day that the union drivers have gone as far as they expect to go and that maybe they will cut off the motor and stop running people down.

The best known union leaders think life is a race track where the only rules are a fight for the rail and the elbow on the turn.

If the unions are not overambitious, at least their leadership is. Many times in life I have had a ringside seat where a man's ambition and his conscience were in a wrestling match. A strong ambition in a man or a group with weak character is a danger and an evident threat to society. I do not condemn labor. Labor must rescue its ship. That's all. At present it is steered by crackpots and adventurers. Real Americans must get hold of the wheel and steer it back to the port of sanity.

I wish every American could live on a farm long enough to learn how plenty depends upon production. The more of anything people produce the more of it they have. Good living depends on work.

There's a difference between abundance and prosperity; production is only one ingredient, but an essential ingredient. Idleness and scarcity lead directly to poverty and want. It is true of a man. It is true of a nation.

I saw a picture in a paper the other day where the owners of a plant were being pushed around by pickets. That's an inequity. They were pushed around free, but if you go down to the boardwalk at Atlantic City, you have to pay to be pushed around. In the same paper there was an article quoting first name salutations between the President of the United States and the president of the CIO. The article indicated that on a personal plane, the two were the best of friends. I hope not. I like the President of the United States, and I wouldn't wish on my worst enemy such a best friend. Of course, I know that the CIO war party will try to take my scalp in the coming election as they did in the last one. Probably all the men in Congress who voted for the Case bill will be on the CIO-PAC purge list in the election this year, but as far as I am personally concerned, that is all right. I am built like a boomerang—you know, the harder you throw me the faster I come back. Let us make no mistake on the conflict ahead in the elections. This is a struggle for power between alien-minded left and all-American right. Old and respected party banners still scream the struggle from the clear vision of the many people but they will see it before this year is out, I think, and not as through a glass darkly.

Recently we passed a bill in the House to curb the lawless activities of one of the worst of the labor racketeers. One of the men on the committee condemned the practices in terms of hate and then conceded in the discussion that all the practices were embodied in the personality of Petrillo. I admonished him, however, not to try to hate him. I said, "You would just develop a great sense of frustration from being unable to hate such as him as much as they deserve." Now, I hold no hate for such as he or Harry Bridges in any sense more than can reasonably be expected from any American when he thinks of them or Hitler or Mussolini.

The solution to industrial warfare cannot be found alone in extending the power of government over labor unions. We must tear down the power of labor unions over government.

It is not alone in the labor activities that the collectivist movement is on the march. Those who believe in the Russian communal ownership of property plan have led all their kind and many thousands of other Americans deceived into traveling the Russian road by false guideposts that point the direction.

The collective ownership of all public utilities is being rapidly accomplished by the persuasion of the false mathematics of arithmetical prestidigitators and with the help of Government subsidy of partisans in the bureaus and commissions and by numerous privileges and by complete exemption from the sharing of the whole people's burden of taxation.

The gins and cotton mills of the Southland are going into collective ownership. The grain elevators and grain mills of the Northland are going into collective ownership. Even lumber mills and ice plants and filling stations and agricultural lands are being taken over into collective ownership and all the time the individual and his enterprise is paying the tax and other burdens essential to the cost of operating a government in peace and in war, while these collective enterprises through nonprofit corporation and corporative device are evading any participation in meeting the obligations of the Nation. On this score I could give you endless detail and could show you that the opportunists in the Wall Street world of finance like the opportunists of fallen France are selling out and entering league with the collectivist forces, the sincere collectivist justifying this alliance on the basis that any means to the end is acceptable and the big financial interests entering such alliance only because it offers opportunity for plunder.

It is as clear as a children's primer that when two filling stations operate side by side, one by individual enterprise in the arena of competition, paying taxes and meeting all the other obligations of service and production, while next door is a filling station collectively owned, exempt from taxes, freed from the cost of service comparable or competitive and in many other ways accorded advantages, there can be no conclusion but one. The filling station operated by the individual that pays taxes, etc., has had its death warrant as an enterprise signed and with these forces in the vast number and fields of endeavor, I tell you today the death warrant of individual enterprise in America is signed. We only have a stay of execution, and in the period of that stay we must escape the hold that the collectivists have on us and must meet and defeat them which we most certainly can do in any field of fair competition. All that individual enterprise can or ought to ask is that the competitors play the game by the same set of rules, pay equal taxes, have equal privileges, etc.

Obviously, the United States has not gone as far on the collectivist road as Russia or Germany or Italy, but there is a point on the road beyond which if we go we cannot take our freedom with us. In America we are near the corner round which if we go we can never come back—can never return as self-respecting free men. If we could find the cause of communism, it would be great for civilization, like finding the cause of cancer. If we don't find the cause and do something about the cure of it, our children or our children's children will be living under somebody's booted heel. We have won a war to save the world and we ought now to devote ourselves to saving our own country.

Did you ever consider the fact that Russia as a nation has today amongst other nations no friends? It hasn't demonstrated the capacity for friendship. If Russia would have friends she must be a friend. Under Russia's present policy all it can ever have is enemies and stooges. And so it is with minorities within our country that organize themselves into forces to compel the whole people to yield to their press for advantage. The threat of these forces alien to our philosophy of government was no greater from the outside at our worst point in World War II than it is today from the inside.

Today in America the collectivist has control of a large percent of our capacity for production.

To the extent that that control exists, to that extent we have here at home the serfdom of socialism—communism, nazism, fascism, or collectivism—all are forms of totalitarianism. Any of these forms of totalitarianism means regimenting the lives of the individual citizen and reducing the individual to a mere agent, a mere number, a pawn.

The issue bluntly stated is: This Nation cannot remain half collectivist and half individualist in its enterprise. It cannot be half slave and half free.

It is all going one way or the other. Which side are you on? Stand up and be counted.

Facts the Papers Do Not Print

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the great Scotch poet, Robert Burns, so aptly said: "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." The people of this country have been human and have made a shining record for magnanimity and forbearance in dealing with the subdued peoples in the wars this Nation has waged in the past. General Grant told the southern soldiers at Appomattox to keep their horses and take them home to till their farms.

After the Spanish War we gave Spain $20,000,000 for the land we took in the Philippines. After the Boxer Rebellion we told the Chinese to use our share of the indemnity to build schools to educate their youth.

What a contrast to the course we are following today in Germany.

There is submitted here for thoughtful consideration an article appearing in the American weekly, Human Events:

Much of the disaster now overtaking Germany and Europe is the inevitable result of war. More widespread disaster, however, is resulting from Allied peace policies.

"The next few months * * * will determine whether the American Government, in its first large-scale attempt at governing a conquered people, is to succeed or fail, or abandon the effort." Thus concludes Mr. Byron Price, experienced newspaper executive and former Director of Censorship, reporting to President Truman on his mission of inquiry in post-Potsdam Germany.

Millions of people in Germany today are facing death by starvation, principally because at the Potsdam Conference 25 percent of the country's arable land was awarded to Russia and Poland. The 10,000,000 inhabitants of these areas and an additional three and one-half million Sudeten Germans are being expelled from their homes and driven westward. Thus the Allied authorities responsible for governing rump Germany have fewer food resources to draw on; more mouths to feed. Demands now made on American food resources by the military authorities in Germany are therefore not the result of the Nazi's war, but of the Potsdam peace.

The recent report of the Colmer committee of the House of Representatives stated that the official ration of 1,550 calories a day actually "now runs in some cities as low as 800 to 1,300 calories per person." Mr. Byron Price reports:

"The approved medical ration to prevent starvation is 2,000 calories, and there is no likelihood that such a ration would permit the bombed-out, freezing, pedestrian Germans to live anything like as well as the European average."

Allied authorities are also finding the German housing problem wholly unmanageable, because the millions made homeless by bombing have been doubled by the 14,000,000 deportees from the east. The deficit of dwelling units has thus been raised to over 8,000,000, and the homeless are facing death from exposure and diseases. Influenza and tuberculosis respect no frontier lines and no Allied uniforms.

All Europe this winter is desperately short of coal, because Germany's mines are producing only a fraction of their former output, especially in the Russian and French zones. The Ruhr, in the British zone, and better off, has now reached a coal production 30 percent of pre-war average. Further improvement can come only when the transportation system and industries servicing the mines have been restored.

II

In the midst of Europe's greatest production crisis all wheels are blocked in the Continent's greatest workshop. This is not the result of the war, for the principal casualties of bombing were residential units. At the height of the air blitz, in February 1945, only 8 percent of German locomotives were in repair shops, as against 70 percent today. When the Allied armies overran Germany the industries of that country were still working at approximately 75 percent of capacity. Today, according to General Eisenhower's current report, the figure is from 5 to 7 percent of capacity. The industrial machine and the transportation system of Germany have been brought to a standstill by Allied policies since surrender.

These policies are based on a confusion between demilitarization and deindustrialization, two wholly different matters. Allied military authorities in Germany are not only hamstrung by directives written under the influence of the vindictive school, but are also reluctant to treat issues on their merits for fear of being attacked by commentators and editorial writers at home.

As a result, no factories are permitted to reopen which might conceivably be converted to war purposes—a policy which would mean shutdown for at least 80 percent of the industrial plant of any country—notwithstanding the fact that a group of American generals has stated that Germany, even under the most favorable circumstances, would be unable to wage war for a century.

If industrial production is not immediately raised far beyond its present levels, inflation—the result of acute disparity between goods available and money in circulation—will become uncontrollable. Inflation, in turn, would tremendously aggravate the food problem. Farmers in all countries refuse, even under penalty of death, to sell their produce for valueless currency. If this condition develops in Germany, American food shipments will have to be unnecessarily increased, even further.

Both the Colmer and the Price reports recommend a revision and slowing down of the denazification policies. Denazification would be better served if the Allies would at once reopen the mail service to Germany. To facilitate an exchange of ideas with members of a free society is more constructive than to discharge the village postman because he was once a perfunctory member of the Nazi Party.

III

The break-up of German economy does not concern that country alone. The German economy is not an isolated unit, but part of an organic whole, of European and world economy. In normal prewar years, Germany was America's third best customer, surpassed only by Great Britain and Canada. Even in 1939, Germany was Great Britain's second best market outside the Empire.

A loan to Britain of several billion dollars is under consideration at this moment. The primary object is to restore the British export trade, so that the English can again afford to import. It makes little sense to loan Britain money with one hand and to destroy one of her best markets with the other.

On the Continent of Europe the results of Potsdam are even more catastrophic, since Germany is the heart of the European economy. In 1929, the last year in which world trade was really free and normal, Germany was the best customer of Italy and Switzerland; the second best customer of Holland, Denmark, and Sweden; the third best customer of France. The destruction of Germany can only mean the permanent impoverishment of all these countries and the economic ruin of Europe.

IV

If Europe is to recover from the war, Germany's industrial production must be encouraged by all available means and geared primarily to the restoration of transport, mining, utilities, and housing throughout the Continent.

Food shipments to all zones of Germany must be increased so that rations can be raised to the level where men can work efficiently. These shipments must be calculated so as to save at least the strongest of the 14,000,000 deportees from the east, at present being rapidly liquidated by hunger and cold. If this planned massacre proceeds, the political atmosphere of Europe will be poisoned beyond hope.

To keep food shipments within American capacity, however, negotiations should be started at once with Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia with a view to stopping further mass expulsion. There is ample evidence that a revision of this most objectionable feature of the Potsdam agreement would be highly popular in Britain.

Reparation policies also must be radically revised in the light of Germany's capacity to pay, as outlined in the Colmer report. In the case of Italy, which suffered little damage compared with Germany, the United States Government has taken the stand that reparations paid from Rome would ultimately be borne by the American taxpayer. There is no reason to expect otherwise in the case of Germany.

Immediate opening of mail service with Germany would contribute to the reeducation program, and also enable Christians in this country to aid the Allied authorities in Germany to maintain the minimum food standards laid down by the Army. There seems no good reason why experienced, nonpolitical relief workers, such as the Quakers, should continue to be barred from Germany.

Increasingly, Americans of good will are realizing how gravely the moral position of their country is being compromised. Frank E. Mason reported in the New York Times of November 26 the bitter remark of an American combat general in Germany who told him: "My friend, we fought the Revolutionary War to establish the rights of man. We fought the Civil War to free the slaves. We fought this war to lose for humanity what we won in the other two wars."

Address of Dr. B. C. Forbes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following talk by Dr. B. C. Forbes, publisher of Forbes magazine, and president of the Investors League, at Forum on Free Enterprise, held in Buffalo on February 28, under auspices of the Investors League:

Trying to organize investors to protect their own interests has been an intensely uphill job.

I have been alarmed for the last dozen years or more over the way the people in this country, who exercised self-denial in order to accumulate savings, have been treated.

Twelve years ago savings banks were paying anywhere from 3 to 4½ percent on deposits. Today they are paying 1 to 1½ percent—and only on limited amounts.

The whole trend has been to make savings less valuable. Not only so, but, as I see it, the policy at Washington has been to give no consideration to the people who, in past years, were regarded as the backbone of any nation, namely, individuals and families who practiced frugality and were thus able to invest their savings in employment-providing enterprises.

The reason for what has happened is that at Washington the majority of officeholders, elected Representatives, are concerned primarily with being reelected—with attracting votes. When labor leaders go to Washington and shake their fingers at our Senators and Representatives, they sit up and take notice. Also they sit up and take notice when the heads of agricultural organizations come along and proclaim what they are for or against.

But investors have had no medium for expressing their wishes at Washington. Heretofore they have had no organization whatsoever, with the result that Senators and Representatives tell you very frankly, when you get to know them: "We don't give a hoot about investors. They are not organized and can't and don't swing large blocks of votes. That is why we listen to organized groups, namely, labor unions and farmers."

I don't want to stress the treatment farmers have received. Although born and raised a farm boy, I don't pretend to pass judgment on them. But I do have definite ideas on how organized labor has been treated at Washington in the last decade and more. As I see it, they have been kowtowed to so much, coddled so much, and so much lopsided legislation has been passed in their favor that a number of their leaders have become just as arrogant, dictatorial, unreasonable as many leaders of high finance and big business became in the early part of this century.

At that time, it was clear to anyone who studied social-economic conditions that, the way things were going, public opinion would inevitably rise up and rebel against high finance and big business.

Well, we know what happened after 1929. I am just as sure of what is going to happen regarding labor leaders in the next year or two as I was when I repeatedly warned these big shots just what was waiting for them.

The Petrillos, the John L. Lewises, and other gentlemen of that stripe are inevitably riding for as heavy and severe a fall as did the nabobs of high finance and big business.

The United States Supreme Court had to admit, not so very long ago, when the case of certain racketeers was brought before them, on the complaint that trucks trying to enter New York from another State were stopped outside the city by union strong-arm men and the truck drivers either had to pay anywhere from $7 to $10 to be allowed to bring their trucks into New York, or the driver was pulled off the truck and he had to go back where he came from—the judges had to admit that there was no legislation on the statute books under which this could be stopped. Such were the labor laws that Congress had passed. Our legislators, under the lash of huge, powerful organizations, have not enacted one statute that would stop flagrant lawlessness of that kind—organized labor has been exempt from all antilegislation.

It is somewhat encouraging that, at long last, Congress apparently is going to clip the wings of Mr. Caesar Petrillo. That is significant. Also, I think it is significant and encouraging that Congress is apparently giving serious consideration to remedying our country's lopsided labor laws.

Imagine a lot of strikers arrogating to themselves the right to say to the owner of a plant, "Thou shalt not enter your own plant." That has happened all over the country.

These are samples of how the inherent constitutional rights of the owners—you and I who have saved money and invested it to provide employment—have been flouted by Washington.

I am hopeful and confident that the pendulum which was pushed so far to the left during the last dozen years is beginning to swing back, and that within the next year or two conditions will be substantially righted at Washington.

The feeling, I think, is multiplying that labor leaders have gone too far, that they have been concerned solely with their own privileges and demands, and have been putting themselves first and the welfare of the country last.

What has enabled this great and glorious country of ours to attain world leadership, our excellent educational system, our incomparable standards of living? It was the dollars that our fathers and you and I saved and invested.

It has been estimated that it takes $7,000 to provide the wherewithal for buildings, tools, machinery, etc., to furnish one industrial job.

If your fathers and mothers and we older folk hadn't saved and invested our money, we would not have had a country as powerful, as well off in every respect as it became.

If Americans had not supplied the money to provide employment, we would not have been the world's leader among nations today.

We must have ideals, but unless idealism is blended with realism, you can't get anywhere.

Investors—including stockholders, life-insurance policyholders, savings-bank depositors, home owners, small businessmen—must have sense and gumption enought to match the sense and gumption of labor and farm organizations, so that they will get something approaching a square deal from Washington.

The Investors League has tried to bring home to managements that it is up to them to use every legitimate means to organize their stockholders. Managements of corporations today are our economic generals. The Petrillos and John L. Lewises and Reuthers are the generals of labor. They are fighting their battles with many soldiers. Our economic generals, managers of corporations, don't seem to realize that without an army behind them they are powerless.

Where would John L. Lewis and other labor leaders be with no army behind them? The Investors League is trying to open the eyes of managements that they, as generals, must start in earnest to organize an army behind them—or they will continue to get the kind of deal they have been getting.

If this situation is not remedied, the Government will continue to encroach more and more into private enterprise.

I am reminded of the prehistoric dinosaurs, those enormous animals who roamed the world and were so large that they could not function efficiently. I, for one, am afraid that our Federal Government has got into the dinosaur class, and that it is time for us to call a halt on feeding and feeding into its capacious and rapacious maw more and more of our private enterprises and industries. I don't think they are making such an extremely splendid job of doing the work they have already arrogated to themselves.

I have no more personal, no more selfish interest in this movement than any one of you. I am old enough, and I have been frugal enough, so that I don't need to worry. But I have four sons coming along. I believe in Americanism. I believe in free enterprise. I would hate to see this country turned into something not American. That is one reason I am giving half of my time to this cause, without one penny of remuneration.

I would like to see each and every one of you here give thought to the situation and ask yourself "What can I do about it?"

Profiteer's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a bit of verse recently composed by W. F. Farrell, of Dallas, Tex.

In my opinion it very pithily and pointedly expresses the legislative platform of those who are so diligently attempting to wreck our Nation's economy to line their own pockets with a few dollars:

PROFITEER'S PRAYER

(By W. F. Farrell)

Oh, let me live to see the day
When we'll be rid of the OPA.
Make sure that prices go up, not down—
Boy, will I really go to town!

Increase foodstuffs a hundred percent,
Take all restriction off our rent,
Double the price of clothing and fuel—
To hell with the public, let profit rule.

Drive an automobile? Well, we'll double the price.
We care not for others, just give us our slice.
You fought in the war? Well, what do we care?
That war is over and we're on a tear.

Live and let live? Say, son, that's a joke.
We'll rake it in till the country goes broke.
You may be my brother but I'm not your keeper—
Let's make the spiral go steeper and steeper.

So, off with controls and let me get mine,
Bring back the old days of twenty-nine.
I'll try to forget, and I hope you will too,
Of the hard days that followed in thirty-two.

Mabel Boardman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of March 18, 1946:

CLARA BARTON'S SUCCESSOR, MABEL BOARDMAN, DIES AT 85—RED CROSS LEADER 46 YEARS—CORONARY THROMBOSIS CAUSES DEATH OF FAMED HUMANITARIAN

Miss Mabel Thorp Boardman, whose efforts as a founder and leader of the American Red Cross lifted her to an honored place among the world's great humanitarians, died at her home last night of coronary thrombosis. She was 85 years old.

Miss Boardman suffered a heart attack Friday at her home at 1801 P Street NW. A second attack yesterday afternoon caused her death at 8:30 o'clock last night. A sister, Mrs. Florence Keep, was at her bedside.

For 46 years Miss Boardman devoted her life to aiding those whose plight bound the people of the world together.

Miss Boardman was a member of the central committee of the Red Cross for 40 years. In all these years of Red Cross work, she was decorated by the Kings of Sweden and Italy, the Emperor of Japan, and the Governments of France, Portugal, Serbia, and Chile.

Her vitality even after she passed 70 was such that she kept four secretaries busy daily. Her enthusiasm for the Red Cross was unbounded.

Born in Cleveland, Ohio, October 12, 1860, Miss Boardman was a descendant of Gen. John Mason, a famous Indian fighter, a great-granddaughter of Elijah Boardman, a Senator from Connecticut, and a granddaughter of the founder of Yale University's Sheffield School, Joseph Earl Sheffield. Her father was a wealthy Cleveland businessman, William P. Boardman.

As a young woman she visited in Germany, where an uncle, W. W. Phelps, was United States Minister. On her return she became interested in the work of the Cleveland Children's Day Nursery and in Washington's Children's Hospital.

In 1900 Miss Boardman started work to shape into an international body the small, still loosely knit group organized as the American Red Cross by Miss Clara Barton.

Miss Boardman was named to the board of incorporators of the Red Cross in 1900 after friends submitted her name for the post without her knowledge. Three years later her driving, energetic work had aroused interest of several leaders in Washington to reorganize the group.

With aid from John W. Foster, former Secretary of State, and of William Howard Taft, then Secretary of War, she drafted the outlines of the charter granted by Congress in 1904.

The office building of the new national organization—on Seventeenth between D and E Streets NW.—was built with a fund of $1,000,000 which Miss Boardman raised through a Federal appropriation and through private subscription.

This building was dedicated as "a memorial to the heroic women of the Civil War."

When members of the fund committee objected to buying all the land for the national headquarters, Miss Boardman said:

"If we ever have a war, we'll need that space for additional quarters."

FORESIGHT VINDICATED

The statesmen laughed, but within 5 years there were four large and several small buildings on the site around the main building. They proved to be hardly sufficient.

In 1919, Miss Boardman became national secretary of the Red Cross. She was a United States delegate to the eighth international Red Cross conference, in London; to the ninth conference, held in Washington; to the fifteenth and the sixteenth, held in Tokyo and London, respectively.

She turned down at least one bid to become national chairman. When President Taft asked her to take the job, she declined.

"The public has more confidence in men executives," she said.

Honors were showered on her at every turn. She held honorary degrees from Yale, Western Reserve, Smith College, George Washington University, and Converse College.

Appointed a District Commissioner in 1920 by President Wilson, Miss Boardman served for nearly 3 years. She knew nearly every President since Taft, and Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt had commended her work.

On January 1, 1944, almost a thousand Washingtonians attended a testimonial luncheon held for her at the Statler. Eleven months later she was awarded the Red Cross distinguished-service gold medal.

The citation accompanying this award commended her for being a "leader of men and women in the vision of the Red Cross as a national and international instrumentality of service."

In 1942 she was also awarded the Cosmopolitan Club's distinguished-service medal for 1941 for "outstanding and unselfish service to her community."

Through the years, Miss Boardman kept office hours and accepted no salary. To study Red Cross groups in Europe, she paid her own expenses.

She raised personally more than $2,000,000 for the Red Cross, and watched it grow from a single room into stately marble structures, for which she drew interior plans.

Over all kinds of objections, she put Red Cross workers in uniform. Following a suggestion of Miss Emily Bissell, Miss Boardman initiated the Red Cross Christmas-seal sales to aid tubercular persons.

Red Cross nursing service, first-aid-training programs, and life-saving instructions and service were Miss Boardman's creations.

Soon after Charles Evans Hughes became Chief Justice, he remarked to Miss Boardman at a dinner party about a disastrous cyclone which struck three Southern States the day before.

He said he had read about the storm in a newspaper which carried pictures of Red Cross rescue work. He asked:

"How did you get there so fast?"

"The Red Cross doesn't have to get there any more," she smiled in reply, "it is there."

Miss Boardman was an Episcopalian. She was a member of the Chevy Chase Club and the Sulgrave Club in Washington; the Colony Club, New York City; and the Murray Bay Club, of Murray Bay, Canada.

Her account of her experiences in the first years of World War I was published in 1915 in her book Under the Red Cross Flag.

In addition to Mrs. Keep, Miss Boardman leaves another sister, Mrs. Murray Crane, of Dalton, Mass., who was reported on her way to Washington last night.

MISS BOARDMAN'S LOSS IS CALLED "IRREPARABLE"

Miss Boardman's death was termed "an irreparable" loss by J. Clifford Folger, District Red Cross chairman.

"She was the founder and most active member of the District chapter. Its first meeting was held in her house on Dupont Circle in 1905," he said. "Under her inspiring leadership it grew from less than a dozen members to nearly half a million.

"Within the past few days she spoke at Constitution Hall and there made awards to heads of service with moving words. For nearly half a century she had taken the lead in both national and local affairs of the Red Cross. Her life has been the living symbol of the humanitarian spirit underlying the organization of which she was so much a part.

"Her name is known throughout the world wherever the name of the Red Cross is known. No one in this country has played a greater role or has done more to promote its healing influence."

Letter of Committee on Atomic Peace, Neptune High School, Ocean Grove, N. J.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in our busy lives we are sometimes interrupted by a still, clear voice, ringing with truth and insistent in its appeal. Such a thing happened to me when I received a letter from a committee of school boys and girls of the Neptune High School, in Ocean Grove, N. J., calling themselves the committee on atomic peace.

In this letter, which is included as part of my remarks, these young people appeal to "our statesmen and our leaders so to govern and protect us, that we will never need to fear the use of atomic energy for any but peaceful purposes." That appeal commands respect and attention and it places on our shoulders the crushing responsibility to so shape the policies of this great Nation that this force will be directed to the protection and conservation of humanity and not for its destruction. We must seek peace for the world with unselfishness and sincerity. American boys and girls demand it.

NEPTUNE HIGH SCHOOL,
Ocean Grove, N. J., March 13, 1946.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the students of Neptune High School, Ocean Grove, N. J., would like to tell you what we think about the effect of the atomic bomb on our lives. We consider it not only our duty to the world, but especially to ourselves, to speak at this time.

Our fathers and our brothers have just brought a great war to a successful end. To do this, they devised and perfected a gigantic weapon, using atomic power. This bomb saved many lives by being used when it was, but now the struggle is over, the nations have given up war, the warriors have returned to their homes. What now? The scientists who made this bomb fear its future power. We share that fear.

We have lived through a war. Although it was remote from our communities, it was fought by our brothers and our fathers. They have told us how horrible war is, and we believe them. We also believe our scientists when they tell us that another war, with atomic weapons, would cause immeasurably greater destruction.

Another war! Why do we speak of another war? We do, because our elders do; some with dread in their hearts, and some, we are horrified to see, almost with hope. We, the youth, do not want another war. We have been told that VJ-day was the beginning of an unending peace. We want that peace. We do not want to leave our homes and loved ones to die on the quickly forming battlefields of tomorrow. We are generous, and we want to see other people live in peace to enjoy what is rightfully theirs. Despite what power politics might gain for a few of our leaders, we, the youth, the potential cannon fodder of tomorrow, do not want war.

And yet, we ourselves can do nothing to prevent this war of tomorrow in which our

blood will be the prime ingredient. It is you, our leaders, who must draw the blueprints of our destinies—and you are doing it today. Whether or not the United Nations Organization can find a firm foothold, whether or not Russia, Great Britain, and the United States can learn to work together for the common good without putting their individual interests first, these are prime factors in determining the fate of your sons and daughters in high schools and universities.

Is it strange, then, that we should worry when we see people indignant over the possibility of the UNO being in their backyard, when we read about Iran and Manchuria, or when we hear trusted leaders telling us the United States and Great Britain must stick together if Russia tries anything? If the Second World War has taught us nothing else, we had hoped it would prove to us the truth of Benjamin Franklin's words: "We must all hang together, or we shall all hang separately."

This is the talk we have heard from our elders, and when we add it to our knowledge of the atom bomb's destructive power, our fears of another world conflict are doubled.

Our only hope is in you, our statesmen and our leaders. We firmly believe that the complete success of the United Nations Organization and the setting up of some form of international control for the atomic bomb are absolute necessities, if world peace is to be insured. We are confident that our statesmen will do their utmost to achieve these ends when the people say they must. Therefore, we wish to join our elders in a mandate to the Government of the United States, so to govern and protect us, that we will never need to fear the use of atomic energy for any but peaceful purposes.

For the sake of those who have never known a peaceful spring, with buds instead of bombshells, and flowers instead of famine, whose lives have never before been free from fear—for them we ask it.

COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC PEACE,
DAN COLE, *Chairman.*
TYLER BILLS,
ALBERT SCHNEIDER,
Neptune High School, Ocean Grove, N. J.

An Indictment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the indictment by Miss Dorothy Thompson of the technique of the New Dealers and their communistic collaborators in the conduct of our foreign affairs is none too severe. The New Dealers are so determined to remain in political power that their leaders dare not deviate from the path along which their communistic comrades have led them. The pay-off is supposed to be through the PAC and all affiliated communistic organizations in the approaching elections. If the New Deal can win at the coming elections by such means, there is little hope of retaining the fundamentals of free government under our Federal Constitution.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting an article by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., March 15, 1946:

ON THE RECORD
(By Dorothy Thompson)

Let us not blame the Soviets for taking advantage of the opportunities which British and American agreements placed in their hands. One must admire, however fearfully, clarity of aim and consistency of intellectual process. Indignation is not a substitute for understanding and profits us nothing. If the drama we are currently observing on the world stage climaxes to a tragic outcome for the civilization of the West, the protagonists who contribute to that outcome cannot be absolved of collaborating for their own ruin. The essence of tragedy is that Oedipus, Hamlet, and Lear encompass their own downfall.

We cannot, after all, blame the Soviets for betrayals of our domestic faith which never has been theirs. They had their way in Poland, but they did not betray their own aims or their Polish supporters. Neither did they betray their agent in Yugoslavia. It was we who betrayed our promises to Poland and Yugoslavia. The Soviet does not betray the anti-Nazi Germans who decisively cast their lot with the Soviet Union and did not quail even before the Russo-German pact. It is we who betray the German martyrs who staked and lost their lives for our avowed principles, and whom we have branded as a "little clique of defeatist generals"—a faithless lie.

No one will ever understand the Soviets who has not known Communists. It is not a breach of Communist principle to lie, cheat, deceive, forge, make fools of "rotten liberals," betray friendships, make "united fronts" only to subvert them, or indulge in any means whatsoever to defeat non-Communist policies. Communist principle embraces mortal struggle. Its object is to win against all odds and by any means for the sake of an idea that has for them the force of a crusading religion bolstered by conviction of total millennial triumph.

In the eyes of a Communist believer the individual is nothing, and personal scruples but remnants of a "sickly," "bourgeois" morrality. Thus the Communist believer is ready to render not only his life, but his immortal soul, in sincere faith that the end of his way is the redemption of mankind.

If necessary, through blood and slime—the exploitation of every vice, the assassination of every opponent, the wily deception of the tolerant, the mobilization of every passion of envy, frustration and hatred; the exacerbation of every injustice; the promise of every utopia; the temporary flattering of capitalist; the harsh disciplining of the worker; the debunking of the traditional heroes; the subversion of the law—through all these the Communist faithful press toward the great redemption, in a generation or in a century, but with unswerving conviction of the final unconditional surrender of their enemies, whether of the right or the left, for thus it is written in the infallible law of human societies as laid down by St. Marx, St. Lenin, and St. Stalin. The personal life, fate, and morality of every believer thus appear as but links in the chain leading to the enthronement of heaven on earth.

No one contemplating the phenomenon of the Communist believer can deny him a morality. His is the supreme other-morality. But Lucifer also was an angel, and Communist believers are governed in their practice of amoral methods by faith in a new morality through total victory. And their morale has supported thousands of them through unconscionable persecutions.

It is the morality of our own civilization which is in question: The morality that warns us that the means invariably determine the end; that as men are, and do, so is the outcome of their strivings; which asserts that good can never be promoted by evil; which demands that victory be, at every step, the overcoming of evil by good.

Where was Christian principle at Potsdam? Where is the promise of the "four freedoms"? For whom, among our statesmen, are the Ten Commandments, the thirteenth chapter of Corinthians, the declaration of Jefferson, the second inaugural address of Lincoln, still living expressions and imperatives of our personal and social morality?

We are being undone, not by the triumph of Communist principles, but by the capitulation of our own.

The Soviets and their international supporters have led us, step by step, as John Foster Dulles confesses, because they know where they are going, and we do not. Having abandoned the guide posts of principle, we have followed blindly. We have produced no impregnable virtue to oppose to their virtues, which embrace all vices. On the contrary, we have rushed in to share in the viciousness, out of which we, unlike them, cannot possibly make a virtue. Thus it is we have followed blindly. We have produced crises, divided characters, and fear.

Their consciences are clear. For conscience, regarding means and methods, is no part of their morality at all.

Postwar Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I again desire to focus attention upon the postwar Navy.

As of VJ-day the United States had built the largest and most powerful Navy in the history of the world. That Navy was built for and has been used only in the interest of peace. A hundred thousand ships were dedicated to the destruction of the forces of oppression and evil, and when the surrender documents were signed aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri*, I am sure that all Americans felt that our investment had paid the highest possible dividends.

How much of that Navy shall we keep and how much shall we junk? The answer to that question is a responsibility that the least of us in this great body share.

I am disturbed at this time, Mr. Speaker, because of recent circumstances which have justified the press in printing such statements as: "Nimitz and the Naval Committee will have the next round in the fight for a Navy not designed by a bookkeeper."

I believe that I share the desire of each Member of this House to report to his constituency that he has helped in reducing the cost of government. I do not believe this can be accomplished, however, by assuming to appropriate a large and arbitrary sum of money with the admonition to the Navy to "Take this and build what you can out of it."

I am informed that under the proposed budget, as it came to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, that the

air arm of the Navy will be drastically limited in the acquisition of new airplanes, including jet-propelled, jet-assisted take-off, and more powerful aircraft, and that experimentation and research will be hampered to the extent of one-third of that originally deemed necessary.

It appears basic to me that the future strength of this country, from a military standpoint, depends upon scientific development through experimentation and research at least equal to that of any other country in the world, and the superior ability to employ the use of the fruits of the scientific advancement. This means a strong air arm.

It will be of interest to you, I am sure, to glance briefly at excerpts from an article describing the Navy's fight in the Pacific.

September 9–10, 1944: Fast carrier force of the Third Fleet makes first strike upon Philippines at Mindanao.

Octboer 20, 1944: Constant carrier attacks by the Third Fleet upon the Philippines, beginning September 9, are followed by an amphibious attack upon Leyte.

November 5–25, 1944: Third Fleet continues to soften the Japs' hold on the Philippines by air strikes on Luzon and Ormoc Bay, the west coast of Leyte.

January 3–4, 1945: Fast carrier force planes of the Third Fleet pound Formosa off the China mainland and Okinawa in the Nansei Shoto (or Ryukyu) Islands below Japan.

February 16–17, 1945: Fifth Fleet makes first carrier strike on Tokyo and adjacent targets.

March 18–19, 1945: Fast carrier force attacks Kyushu on the Inland Sea.

April 7, 1945: Carrier aircraft sink the Yamato, Japs' most powerful remaining ship and other fleet units.

July 10, 1945: Over a thousand fleet carrier planes hit Tokyo and Honshu coast.

July 14, 1945: A thousand carrier aircraft pound Hokkaido in northern Japan.

Where would we have been then without a strong air arm?

How much Navy shall we keep? I do not know, and Admiral Nimitz states that no man living knows. I do know, however, that we can rely upon the recommendations of great men like Admiral Nimitz, upon the recommendations of those who know through training and experience the requirements of modern warfare. Even you and I know that if we are called upon to engage in another conflict we will have to get where we are going fast and have something destructive to leave when we get there. Our experience in the past and our outlook for the future most assuredly do not warrant an arbitrary slash in air power.

Report of La Follette-Monroney Committee Lauded by Press of the Nation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the painstaking work and courageous report of the La Follette-Monroney committee on the organization of Congress has received a most favorable reaction. Practically every newspaper in the country has carried laudatory editorials on the work of this committee. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include four editorials from leadings newspapers which are typical of the editorial comment:

[From the Washington Post of March 12, 1946]

MAKE IT ONE PACKAGE

Considering the remarkable achievements of the committee on the organization of Congress, we are not inclined to carp about its failure to bring in a plan to abolish the seniority rule or clip the wings of the arbitrary Rules Committee in the House. We recall that Congress did not give the committee an absolutely free hand. It forbade the committee to bring in recommendations "with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House." The surprising thing is that in these circumstances the committee has done as much as it has. In our opinion, accordingly, the public interest can best be served by concentrating full attention upon the progressive and intelligent reforms it has proposed by almost unanimous agreement, and forgetting for the time being about any inevitable sins of omission.

The next step, as we see it, is to embody all of the committee's proposals in a bill for early enactment. The unfortunate aspect of the situation is that the La Follette-Monroney committee itself was not permitted to draft the necessary legislation and submit it to the House and Senate. It is understood that Senator LA FOLLETTE intended to ask unanimous consent for such procedure, but in his absence from the city the report was referred to the Senate Rules Committee. If this misstep cannot be corrected, we hope at least that the Rules Committee will call upon the legislators and experts who outlined this constructive program to work closely with it in formulating the implementing legislation.

It is of the utmost importance, we think, to deal with the proposals as a whole. Some Members of Congress may be inclined to single out specially favored items, such as the proposed increase in congressional salaries and the hiring of more experts, for hasty approval To do so, of course, would be to endanger the more fundamental changes designed to help Congress work more effectively. Public opinion might react sharply against such distortion of the plan for rehabilitation of Congress and thus defeat the basic aim of strengthening our national legislative machinery.

Let the entire program, as one committee member said the other day, be wrapped up in a single package. Taken as a whole, it emanates the spirit of progressive, twentieth-century democracy. It is probably the most comprehensive plan that has ever been devised to make our system of divided powers function smoothly in an era of colossal governmental responsibilities. We think the public will expect Congress to make a clean-cut choice of moving forward in full accord with this efficiency chart, and great will be the disappointment if it should fail to do so.

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of March 8, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Unless Congress takes the opportunity offered it in the report of the La Follette-Monroney committee to recover its constitutional place in our Government, the decline of that body—so obvious to political scientists—is certain to produce more and graver crises as the responsibilities of government mount.

In view of the growing party irresponsibility, particularism, and negativism manifesting themselves in the Seventy-ninth Congress to the extent of reducing administration leadership almost to the point of frustration, the sweeping reforms proposed by the 12-member joint committee are exceedingly timely.

The committee has not adopted the perfectionist attitude. It left out many needed reforms. In proposing a drastic reduction in the number of committees, it did not go all the way and molest the sacred cow of seniority. It was silent on the question of filibusters. It made no proposals to end the tyranny of the House Rules Committee. It laid down only the minimum reforms decreed by the "necessitousness of time" to enable Congress to cope with its responsibilities. If the present National Legislature fails to adopt these—one and all—it will sacrifice the opportunity to arrest the declining popular confidence in the ability of Congress to voice the national will and implement it.

One of the most significant of the reforms recommended by the committee has to do with the reconstitution of party responsibility in Congress. The founding fathers did not envision party government at all and American individualism would never allow the European system of bloc voting. Nevertheless, the evolution of party government in America does involve a reasonable harmonizing of party responsibility and independent political judgment. Through our unwritten constitution the President has become the conscience of the Nation, the enunciator of policies. Without effective cooperation between the executive and the party majority in Congress an "administration" program is impossible.

During the current Congress, party leadership has badly disintegrated, due mainly to the willingness of Deep South conservatives to join hands with the Republicans against the President's entire program. The creation of majority policy committees in both Houses and of a formal joint council of these committees to confer regularly with the President in formulating legislative programs and steering them through Congress, as proposed by the La Follette-Monroney committee, would go a long way toward making party responsibility the useful instrument which the times require.

Likewise, the creation of minority policy committees holds forth the possibility of reform among the "loyal opposition" and of compelling the minority party to pursue the constructive role which its leading progressive spokesman, Mr. Stassen, declares is its duty.

If modern big government is to be efficient, the gulf between the White House and Capitol Hill must be more effectively bridged. Congress—and only Congress—can do it by adopting the reforms proposed by its own committee.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 5, 1946]

FOR A BETTER CONGRESS

Although it falls considerably short of the comprehensive plan drawn up last year for the National Planning Association by Robert Heller, of Cleveland, the proposal for the reorganization of Congress made yesterday by a special Senate-House committee would, if adopted, vastly improve the Nation's legislative machinery and should go far toward restoring Congress to the position of influence in the Government contemplated by the Constitution.

The committee was unanimous in its recommendation except on two points. Congressman EUGENE E. COX, one of the two men who virtually control the powerful House Rules Committee, refused to go along on the proposal to reduce the Senate's standing committees from 33 to 16 and those of the House from 48 to 18, and he refused to acquiesce in the recommendation for the establishment of majority and minority

policy committees which would chart Democratic and Republican strategy on all legislation.

These two recommendations are the core of the plan, designed to make Congress more efficient in its operations and to restore a semblance of party responsibility. The Cox opposition suggests that southern Members of Congress will see in the plan a serious threat to their position as wielders of the balance of power between northern Republicans and Democrats.

Thus there is grave danger that this important attempt to restore to Congress a degree of the authority which it has been losing more or less steadily to the executive branch since the administration of George Washington will be blocked by the very group which has pretended to be the most fearful of executive government.

Since its plan was bound to arouse opposition from the southerners anyway, it is too bad the joint committee did not go all the way in its proposed reform and include recommendations for getting rid of the enervating seniority rule and the Senate filibuster, for clipping the authority of the powerful and often irresponsible House Rules Committee, and for bringing the heads of Government departments before Congress for questioning in open session. As General Washington advised the delegates of the Constitutional Convention, if a plan has little chance of being accepted anyway, those drawing it up had as well make it just as good as they possibly can. In the case of the Constitution, the product proved to be so good that the seemingly impossible was realized and it was accepted.

Nevertheless Congress should have the support of public opinion for acceptance of the joint committee's recommendation, since it marks a definite step forward. Congress will need that opinion especially since the plan involves a 50-percent increase in congressional salaries and provision for the employment of additional assistants by Members of Congress to relieve the latter of much of the nonlegislative work in which they must now engage. The Heller plan called for a 250-percent increase in salaries and for a much more liberal outlay for administrative assistants than that recommended by the joint committee.

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of March 5, 1946]

PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF

The fate of the proposed reforms in Congress made public yesterday by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress rests in the hands of the conservative Democrat-Republican coalition which has largely dominated the Seventy-ninth Congress by virtue of its control of committees. For this reason, the possibility that the National Legislature will go far toward modernizing itself are not bright.

Now, there are reforms which will make the coalition Members, as well as the others, smack their lips. Not many will be averse to boosting their pay from $10,000 to $15,000 or to having an administrative executive at $8,000 in each office to help them keep their political fences in repair—that is, if they think they can get by with it with the folks at home.

From the viewpoint of political science, these reforms are badly needed. The Congressmen do not have the time under the present set-up to devote the needed attention to legislative matters. Executive assistants to take many of their burdens off them logically should free them for the purpose for which they were sent to Washington.

Equally important, however, is the proposal that the number of committees in the Senate be cut from 33 to 16 and in the House from 48 to 18. This reform would return the power from the committee to the House and Senate proper, where it belongs. It would establish responsibility. It would free the Members from onerous committee burdens on a half dozen committees to devote more time to a single committee and to legislating. It would improve legislative efficiency.

But this is the rock which can sink the whole program to streamline Congress. The 81 chairmen of the present committees and the next-in-line by reason of seniority who are waiting for the shoes of the present chairmen will not likely vote themselves out of choice plums. Committee appointments carry prestige in Washington and at home. Government agencies have to kowtow to the gentlemen who preside over their destinies. Committee staffs can be used to do things for chairmen outside committee duties.

Committees properly controlled can be used by conservative gentlemen to stymie the will of a more progressive majority and the multiplicity of committees serves this purpose ideally. For example, if the House Labor Committee happens to be liberal—as it is—a labor bill can be sent to the Military Affairs Committee, where the reactionaries are firmly entrenched. Even an obscure committee, such as the Executive Expenditures Committee, can choke off or drastically alter so fundamental a piece of legislation as the full-employment bill.

But if these are reasons why it will be difficult to get a genuine committee reform at this time, they are also reasons why it is a matter of prime importance that the congressional machinery be revamped.

In the American Tradition America Grew Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 18, 1946:

TWEEDLEDUM AND TWEEDLEDEE

This newspaper has printed two previous editorials under the above caption. One appeared June 25, 1941, and the other July 2, 1941. The two editorials compared the Nazi dictatorship of Adolf Hitler and the Communist dictatorship of Joseph Stalin. We said that we could find little difference between them in philosophy or method. We earnestly attempted to argue that America could not defeat dictatorship by combining with one dictator against another dictator; that it could only entrench the dictator it helped to make victorious.

We think it would be interesting to reproduce the editorials now. That printed June 25, 1941, shortly after Germany attacked Russia, follows in part:

"In an adjoining column on this page, Mr. Frank Kent comes to the conclusion, after some argument with himself, that we should aid the Russians in any way we can but not let that lessen our distaste for nor our distrust of the whole Communist outfit."

Mr. Sumner Welles, Acting Secretary of State, also stresses his dislike of communism, but he also seems to think that we might help Russia. Mr. Welles speaks of Adolf Hitler's plans for conquest of the world, and, by inference, leaves the impression that Joseph Stalin is innocent of any such plans.

What does Mr. Welles think the Stalin regime has been doing in China? The Russian aid to China, the organization of Communist armies there, has not sprung out of the goodness of Mr. Stalin's heart or from his sympathy for the Chinese. What Mr. Stalin is doing, and what he was doing long before the Japanese invasion of China, is to attempt to organize China on Communist lines and to bring that huge nation into alliance with Russia.

Did the help that Stalin offered in Spain have nothing to do with ideas of conquest? Who was it that turned the economy of France topsy turvy and made that nation easy pickings for the armies of Hitler? Who has been spreading propaganda and fomenting strikes in the United States and what is the purpose of that? Who attacked Finland, seized half of Poland, the Baltic nations, and a slice of Rumanian territory? If all of that does not add up to conquest, what is it?

Suppose we aid Russia and Russia conquers Hitler. Who then will dominate the continent of Europe? What will be the results of that domination? Will Mr. Stalin be a kindly master or will an entire continent be bathed in blood?

Imagine, if you can, an American delegation going into a peace conference and saying to a victorious Stalin, "You know we promised the world the four freedoms and in the peace settlement that must be kept in mind." If you can imagine that, then it is not too hard to imagine Mr. Stalin laughing long and loud.

The American people know that the principal difference between Mr. Hitler and Mr. Stalin is the size of their respective mustaches. An alliance with either would be at the price of national self-respect.

The editorial of July 2, 1941, follows:

"We are hearing the not so faint beginnings of a build-up for the character of Mr. Joseph Stalin and his Communist regime. Through the spoken and written word it is intimated that his gobbling up of smaller neighbors was not really aggression, but only measures of self-protection. The story goes further that he is innocent of ideas of world conquest. Later we will undoubtedly hear glib explanations of his mass blood purges. It may even be contended his early career as a bandit was just in the spirit of good clean boyish fun.

"So it may not be untimely to review just what Mr. Stalin has been doing.

"In the summer of 1939, while the French and British were negotiating for an alliance with Mr. Stalin's Russia, it was suddenly announced that he had concluded an alliance with Hitler's Nazi Germany. Thus assured, Germany proceeded to attack Poland and the present war was under way. When the Germans had scattered the Polish armies, Russia came in for her share of that poor country. Next, Russia gobbled up three little Baltic countries. Finland refused to be gobbled, fought, and was beaten. During this war, the British revealed that in their negotiations with Russia, the Russians demanded as a price of their cooperation the right to overrun these little nations without fear of outside interference. There are some other details, but those are the high spots of what Mr. Stalin's regime has been doing. And we are being asked to believe that the nation which did this and which was in possession of probably the largest and certainly the second best-equipped army in the world was 'protecting' itself.

"And then we hear that the Communist dictatorship and philosophy is not as great a danger to us as is the Nazi dictatorship and philosophy. Dr. James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard University, is quoted as voicing this theory and adding:

" 'This is simply because the Communist ideology has never been combined with a

military force which could threaten this hemisphere. It seems inconceivable that the present Russian forces could directly menace this country.'

"Of course the Communist ideology has been combined with a military force. Taking Dr. Conant on his own ground as to whether it could threaten this hemisphere, we will merely point out that Russia is some thousands of miles closer to this hemisphere than is any nation with a comparable military force. And what warrant has Dr. Conant for believing that a triumphant Stalin might not try to cross the Bering Straits to seize Alaska, on which are based American naval facilities for our defense in the Pacific?

"However, this paper believes that there is little danger of any European military power attacking this country so long as we have the means of defense. Some might like to, but the simple fact is that such an attack against the strongest nation in the world, prepared to fight, would be too great a risk.

"But aggression need not be accompanied by machine guns and battleships. There is the aggression of ideas. Neither Hitler nor Stalin have left us in any doubt about their intentions on this score. Both of them mean to spread by subtlety, trickery, and bribery, their grisly philosophy which denies every concept of freedom and decency. What use is it to talk of Stalin being innocent of aggression when some of his stooges in this country are in jail and at this minute more of them are on trial for activities which were admittedly aimed at creating revolution? Just as would Mr. Hitler, Stalin in control of Europe would multiply these activities many times over.

"What we want in this country is to see the totalitarian philosophy and its perpetrators discredited.

"We are not likely to discredit it if we support one of its protagonists against the other, while we fool ourselves about what it is we are doing.

"The theory that the end justifies the means has always been bad morals. In addition it is right now the low in unintelligent tactics."

The editorials brought some abusive letters. None questioned the facts; they denounced us for stating the facts. And so it has been for 4 years.

There has been a steady stream of sophistry designed to convince that Stalin and his system were something other than what the American people instinctively knew them to be. That started before this country went to war. It continued throughout the war to a degree greater than was justified by the mere preservation of good relations with an ally. Since the end of fighting the propaganda increasingly has permeated our press, our literature, and our pulpits.

The propagandists became the victims of their own propaganda. They built for themselves the illusion that a ruthless dictator meant to do something less than he had clearly said he would do. On that illusion they built a foreign policy.

Now the illusion is shattered. The policy is shattered. The policy-makers know not what to do. They wobble from firmness at London to Slavish compromise at Moscow back to firmness in the UNO meeting at London and once again back to pleas for a Big Three meeting which is the signal for a new surrender.

In their blind, frantic gropings these men will, except for the greatest of good luck, stumble into a war; force is the final refuge of the intellectually and morally bankrupt.

We whipped one dictator and the booty from that war was the adoption of much of Hitler's philosophy and many of his methods. We can perhaps whip another dictator, but the terrible cost to us and all the world will be the death of the American tradition. There will have perished the society that rested on the assertion that men are endowed with the natural right to "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness," that a man, because he is a man, is entitled to the utmost freedom in his spiritual and intellectual development, and to the widest possible economic opportunity without which the spiritual growth is stunted. That will perish and be replaced by the philosophy that man is a functional being, the cog in a machine, the beast in the field—and just as expendable.

In the American tradition America grew great. Over the world American example emboldened men to resist tyranny and to drive tyrants into exile.

That will happen again if we assert the tradition. Without destruction of cities, the slaughter of innocents, without the smelly deals of secret diplomacy, it will conquer again as it has in the past. And what a pitiable farce it is that, confronted by a tyrant, an American government can only mumble.

The American tradition lives. To flourish it needs but a transfusion of faith.

But the time runs short.

American People Favor Statehood for Hawaii 3 to 1, Gallup Poll Shows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following result of a Gallup poll on the question of statehood for Hawaii:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII APPROVED THREE TO ONE IN POLL OF UNITED STATES VOTES—SENTIMENT HAS INCREASED SHARPLY AS RESULT OF WAR, GALLUP POLL OF MAINLAND SHOWS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 14.—By a vote of approximately 3 to 1 the American people favor admitting Hawaii into the Union as the forty-ninth State.

The move for statehood, recommended by President Truman in a message to Congress in January, is approved by uniformly large majorities in all geographical sections of the country and by the rank and file of both Democratic and Republican voters polled in a coast-to-coast survey by the institute.

Two hundred and twenty field reporters questioned a true cross-section of the 48 States on the issue, conducting the survey by exactly the same methods as were used in forecasting the 1944 Presidential election with an error amounting to less than 2 percentage points.

National opinion was sounded on this question:

"Would you favor or oppose having Hawaii admitted as the forty-ninth State in the Union?"

The vote:	*Percent*
Favor	60
Oppose	19
No opinion	21

Sentiment for statehood has increased since before the war. A similar poll conducted in January 1941 by the institute showed 48 percent in favor, 23 percent opposed, and 29 percent expressing no opinion.

All geographical areas of the country indicate approval, as follows:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
New England and Mid-Atlantic	*Percent* 62	*Percent* 20	*Percent* 18
East and West Central	59	20	21
South	55	16	29
Far West	66	15	19
Pacific coast only	68	18	14

Mainland sentiment on the question compares closely with the desires of the people of Hawaii. In an official plebiscite at the general election of November 5, 1940, the islands voted 67 percent in favor of statehood, 33 percent opposed.

Today's survey found no important differences of sentiment between mainland Republicans and Democrats:

	Democrats	Republicans
	Percent	*Percent*
Favor statehood	61	61
Opposed	17	21
No opinion	22	18

Mainlanders from Maine to California were also quizzed in the institute's survey to determine how well informed they are about the social and business structure of the Hawaiian Islands.

The questioning reveals three pertinent facts:

1. The average American thinks that the population of the Hawaiian Islands is about twice as large as it actually is.

2. Most mainlanders overestimate the extent of the population of Chinese ancestry and underestimate the number of islanders of Japanese ancestry.

3. A general impression prevails that pineapples are the main industry rather than sugar.

Following are the information quiz questions put to a cross section of the American public:

The first question asked what the population of Hawaii is.

The correct figure, according to a report by a House committee which went to the islands to investigate the question of statehood, was 502,122 in 1945.

How far off the average American is in his guess can be seen from the table below. Note that people who have had some college education tend to overestimate the figure more than any other group.

"Just your best guess—how many people do you think live in the Hawaiian Islands?"

	Persons who attended—			Total
	Grammar or no school	High school	College	
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Under 100,000	12	14	7	12
100,000 to 199,000	5	5	8	5
200,000 to 299,000	2	3	3	3
300,000 to 399,000	2	1	3	2
400,000 to 499,000	1	1	4	2
500,000 to 599,000	4	6	10	6
600,000 to 999,999	3	3	3	3
1 to 1.9 million	9	14	21	13
2 to 5.9 million	13	15	19	15
6,000,000 and over	2	11	10	7
Miscellaneous	4	3	-------	3
Don't know	43	24	12	29

Median of total—1,000,000.

The next question dealt with the racial origins of the population. The public was asked:

"What countries did most of the people who live in Hawaii come from?"

	Persons who attended—			Total
	Grammar or no school	High school	College	
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
China	15	29	43	27
United States	13	22	28	20
Japan	15	27	11	20
Philippines	5	15	13	11
Spain and Portugal	6	12	9	9
Hawaii	6	5	6	6
South America and Cuba	2	8	4	5
England	3	2	2	3
Other oriental countries	9	5	22	10
Other Pacific sources	4	9	6	7
Other European countries	2	4	7	4
Africa	-------	2	4	1
Miscellaneous	4	3	2	3
Don't know	42	18	9	25

Columns total more than 100 percent because some people named more than 1 country.

The correct proportions by ancestry, according to latest available statistics, are as follows:

Ancestry	Number	Percent
Caucasian	172,583	34.4
Japanese	163,300	32.5
Hawaiian and part Hawaiian	72,410	14.4
Chinese	30,005	6.0
Filipino	46,464	9.3
Others	17,360	3.4

The final question was:

"Will you tell me what some of the main businesses or industries of Hawaii are?"

The answers given by mainlanders:

	Persons who attended—			Total
	Grammar or no school	High school	College	
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Pineapple	26	51	58	44
Sugar	15	39	56	34
Fruit	12	19	17	17
Agriculture and farming	10	6	21	10
Tourists	-------	7	6	4
Fishing	2	3	10	4
Canning	-------	3	8	3
Bananas	4	2	-------	2
Rubber	1	3	4	2
Coconuts	2	3	2	2
Rice	-------	3	2	2
Hemp	-------	2	6	2
Shipping and commerce	-------	2	2	1
Tobacco	-------	2	4	1
Miscellaneous	5	8	2	7
Don't know	48	15	2	25

Columns total more than 100 percent because some people named more than 1 thing.

America Must Stop Boring From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply perturbed by the increasingly militant attitude of Soviet Russia. I pointed out recently that while Stalin advocated an ever-increasing Red army and an ever-increasing build-up of Russian heavy industry "for any eventuality," the American Communists have sought to demobilize the United States militarily, industrially, and spiritually to the third-class military power that we were during the 1930's. More recently I have pointed out to the House that we have a right to know what our State Department is doing in the matter of foreign relations. Last week the newspapers carried a story of how members of the House Military Affairs Committee took up with the Secretary of State the matter of pro-Russian attitudes of many State Department personnel.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform Members of this House who may not be familiar with the whole record some reasons why the newly announced Stalin "tough" attitude, and the equally "tough" activities of the Red armies in the Middle East, vitally affect each and every American.

William Z. Foster, present head of the Communist Party in America, has frequently been quoted for this remark—but I believe it can well stand repeating:

The Communist International is a world party, based upon mass parties in the respective countries. It works out its policies by the mass principles of these parties in all its deliberations. * * * The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag and that is the red flag.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee I am particularly interested in this statement from chapter VI, part 2, of the program of the Communist International:

Communists must not limit themselves merely to issuing appeals to struggle for proletarian dictatorship, but must show the masses what they are to do today to defend themselves against capitalist plunder and Fascist barbarity. They must strive through the joint action of the labor organization to mobilize the masses around a program of demands that are calculated really to shift the burden of the consequences to the shoulders of the ruling classes—of demands, the fight for whose realization will disorganize fascism, hamper the preparations for imperialist war, weaken the bourgeoisie and strengthen the positions of the proletariat.

To the Communist, all men and women who are not Communists are Fascists. Under the program outlined above the Communists would weaken our American system of free-enterprise production to a point where it could not produce the materials needed for defense in a national emergency. The Communists, in World War II, did not disorganize industry—because we were an ally of Communist Russia and were pouring untold billions of dollars' worth of the matériel for war into Russia. Now, with Red imperialism, Red fascism, international communism on the march in the Middle East and the Far East, with a rash of strikes constantly threatening industry, we remember the recent speeches of Stalin that Russia's Red Army and Red heavy industry must be made increasingly strong "for any eventuality."

The program of the Communist International also states:

The Communist Parties in imperialistic countries, while supporting the struggle * * * must carry on a campaign in their own countries for the withdrawal of imperialistic troops, conduct propaganda in the Army and Navy in defense of oppressed countries fighting for their liberation, mobilize the masses to refuse to transport troops and munitions, and in connection with this, organize strikes and other forms of mass protest.

Let us look at the record in connection with that paragraph.

Joseph Curran's CIO Maritime Union tied up ships within the last few months, except for the bringing of our troops back to the United States from zones of occupation where our military leaders still considered occupation necessary. We have seen communistic press and Communist front organizations protesting about the Dutch in Java, the British in Indonesia—against every action of an Allied power to reestablish law and order and normal reconversion. At the same time, we have seen Red Fascist Russian troops spreading into the Middle East, into Manchuria and Korea and backing up puppet governments on every Russian border.

Paragraph 4 of an old circular of general instructions issued by the Government of Soviet Russia directs:

In the military sphere: (a) Carry on intensive propaganda among the troops. Cause misunderstandings between officers and soldiers. Unite the soldiers to assassination of higher officers. (b) Blow up arsenals, bridges, tracks, powder magazines. Prevent the delivery of raw materials to factories and mills.

Thus the complete destruction of the army will be accomplished and the soldiers will adopt the program of the social democratic workers.

That quotation is from The Russian Soviet Regime, Document No. 3 of the Committee of the Soviet Government of Russia, page 296. Another quote from the Twenty-one Conditions of Admission into the Communist International, says in Condition No. 4:

The duty of spreading communistic ideas includes the special obligation to carry on a vigorous and systematic propaganda in the Army. Where this agitation is prohibited by exceptional laws it is to be carried on illegally. Renunciation of such activities would be the same as treason to revolutionary duty and would be incompatible with membership in the Third International.

Way back in 1929 the Daily Worker, July 27, page 4, declared:

Special attention must be paid to organizing the soldiers for the protection of their own interests, in alliance with the revolutionary proletariat prior to their being called up for service, during the period of military service, and after the conclusion of military services.

It must be the special task of the trade unions to help form the above-mentioned organizations. The conditions for revolutionary work in armies differ. Revolutionary work in the army must be linked up with the general revolutionary movement of the masses and the poor peasantry.

As far back as 1928 the War Department came to know of this effort to infiltrate Communists and communistic doctrines into the Army. It was scotched, and remained scotched until this war.

But the Daily Worker of July 27, 1929, urged Communists working into the military defenses of non-Communist armies to encourage these demands:

Increased pay for soldiers.

Improved maintenance.

The reestablishment of stores committees composed of soldiers' representatives.

Abolition of disciplinary punishments.

The right to be absent from barracks every day.

Furlough, and extra pay while on furlough.

The right to organize in trade unions.

Many of these demands ring strangely parallel with the demands made at home and abroad since the shooting phase of World War II ended and the Communists around the world have again resumed the class struggle in which communism is arraigned against all other forms of government.

The sixth world congress of the Communist International listed other demands which soldiers and sailors should be encouraged to make. They paralleled those listed above.

And Earl Browder flatly stated that "there are more than 13,000 Communists in the United States Army—and of course we have officers who are Communists."

I could cite other instances, for hours, of the determined efforts of Communists to undermine our national defense, to make us weak while Russia is building to unparalleled military and economic strength.

Because many of these long-range policies of international communism date back some years, our attitude has been to ignore them. I make this statement in frank alarm that while we have been winning a war against Hitlerism and nazism, we have been criminally asleep in keeping fully aware, as a nation, to the critical boring from within that has taken place in the last 5 years while more than 10,000,000 of our best men—and women—were in the armed forces.

In that 5 years the Communists, Communist-fronters, parlor pinks, do-gooders, and crackpot ideologists have been manipulated, hoodwinked, and steered along a carefully planned path which leaves the United States this very minute in a most dangerous situation.

We prate of the power of our atom bomb, our self-propelled weapons, but the industry to produce those weapons is, according to our best sources, in a sad state of distintegration. Our trained military and naval manpower has been sloughed away to a point where, if called upon to defend America, we cannot man the ships of the sea, the planes of the air, or the weapons on the ground which would make us strong. We have not the trained technicians in uniform to produce or to handle these secret weapons of which we boast in sufficient quantity to be safe.

I say, Mr. Speaker, let us, if it is not now too late, examine our situation as it is now. Not our situation as it was on VE-day, or on VJ-day, but our situation now.

Let us be guided, not by induced propaganda or agents of any force which wants us weak, but by the yardstick, "Is it best for the United States of America?"

Let us examine the extent to which Communists, or Nazis, or any other group which would push us into World War III can use our waning wealth, our depleted resources, our American manpower, as pawns to protect other than our interests. Our interests are those of peace, but a free peace instead of a peace under totalitarian rule of foreign genesis.

We have more than 3,000,000 Government pay-roll employees, at home and abroad. Are all of them loyal? Are there among them Communists, or others whose loyalty is to another government or type of government?

As far as the military personnel is concerned, I am certain our military leaders recognize the danger and will act if given authority by the Congress.

These American military leaders have never lost a war for us.

Seldom have we ever won a peace after a successful war.

The War and Navy Departments handle the wars. The State Department and the executive branch do everything except put the final stamp of approval on the terms of peace.

Let there be an end of hysterical rubber stamping of the proposals of pressure groups representing the proletariat. Let there be, from this day on, an evaluation of the intent of proposals put before this House for action, particularly when those proposals affect security.

One Department or Three Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article appearing in the March issue of Naval Affairs:

ONE DEPARTMENT OR THREE DEPARTMENTS

The armed forces exist only to preserve our national security and their organizational structure should be the most efficient and the most economical which will enable them to accomplish their mission. The proposal now before the Congress to merge the Army and Navy into a single department of the Government will either strengthen or weaken the structure of our national security, and it should be judged from just that angle; if its merits can be proved by presentation of real evidence it should be adopted, but if its alleged advantages are based upon unsubstantiated and shadowy claims which will not bear close scrutiny it should be rejected.

As members of the armed forces, either active or retired, shipmates of the Fleet Reserve will find the merger question of vital interest. Its importance is such that it merits the best thought and study of every citizen, whether in uniform or civilian clothing. The President has indicated that he wishes the best possible solution and to that end desires that everyone express his or her personal views on the question, subject only to the requirement that individuals now in uniform make it clear that they are expressing their personal views and not those of the administration. This attitude on the part of the President resulted in the cancellation of ALNAV 447, which restricted public discussion of the merger question, and gives each of us ample latitude to discuss the pros and cons of this vital issue.

There is nothing new in the proposal to merge the Army and Navy into a single department. Such action has been advocated in both England and the United States at various times throughout the past century. The proponents of the merger have never been able to produce sufficiently concrete evidence of the advantages to make the step seem profitable and the Army and Navy have retained their identities in both countries. That both the British Empire and the United States have engaged successfully in several wars with the separate departments is not by any means conclusive proof that this system is best, but it does seem significant that in the Napoleonic Wars, the First World War, and the Second World War, the English-speaking nations, with their separate armies and navies, were pitted against nations whose military strategy was in the hands of one man or dictated by a general staff dominated by one service. In fact, it may be pertinent to say that after any contest the tactics and strategy of the victor are entitled to some prestige and credit for having won, * * * but at the moment we have a quaint theory, backed by extravagant claims, that our recent victory would have been won more cheaply and more quickly if we had had our armed forces organized like those of our vanquished foes.

By no means should such a statement be interpreted to mean that the existing structure of our armed forces should not be scrutinized closely in light of the lessons of the past war. Such action should be taken and every remedial measure adopted to plug the leaks and improve the over-all efficiency of our fighting forces by consolidating, reorganizing, and unifying wherever such action is necessary. However, it is most essential that our analysis be as critical in retaining and improving the worth-while elements of our Army and Navy as in discarding those which have proved weak and outmoded. Which is but another way of saying that any change in the organization structure should be based upon careful and considered study, and not upon broad and sweeping claims which promise to abolish all waste and duplication by the mere act of bringing together two huge and complex organizations under one departmental roof.

One of the most important lessons of the war, and one upon which there is no disagreement in any quarter, is that of unity of command in a theater of operation. The complexity of modern warfare with its sea, land, air, amphibious, and submarine components require a supreme command to bring all its strength to bear against an enemy in any specific sphere or zone; and when that specific area becomes too vast in size for one commander to handle efficiently the geographical limits of his authority can be redefined to keep the assigned task within his power of accomplishment. For the theater commander acts to accomplish a task which has been assigned by the high commanders of the armies, navies, and air forces at the seat of the central government, and the particular task assigned each theater commander is a result of their strategic decisions as to the conduct of the war.

While full and complete authority in the hands of the supreme commander in a theater of operations is essential to that officer in using all the armed forces to carry out an assigned task, the strategic decisions as to the conduct of global war are beyond the capacity of any one man, even when assisted by a brilliant and competent staff. This statement is not based upon any alleged inability of great military leaders to arrive at decisions, but on the inherent human characteristic of fallibility. Decisions which determine the success or failure of the strategic direction of global war must be determined by a meeting of coequal minds, each of which contributes its own specialized knowledge but also serves as a balance and check on the others. This is the system

which has worked so well in the democracies, the Committee of Imperial Defense in the British Empire and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in this country, and it is a safeguard against the mistakes which can be made by one man. General Marshall once stated that of seven vital strategic decisions made during the war, four were correct ones made by the Joint Chiefs and three were incorrect, one made by Hitler.

Strategic decisions which direct the conduct of war require deliberation and consultation; they can be reached only after careful investigation of the capabilities and limitations of the intricate structure of national economy; they are dependent upon tangibles and intangibles such as resources of manpower and matériel, political and industrial conditions, and maximum production of the sinews of war while still maintaining an acceptable minimum of production for the ordinary needs of life within the Nation. All of these complex factors must be considered and debated among equals at the conference table until the acceptable decision is reached; then, and only then, the decision can be broken down into tasks and allotted to the supreme commanders in the various theaters of operation who have the required unity of command within their areas for implementation.

As far as can be learned at this time the subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee presently engaged in drafting legislation to establish a single Department of National Defense is disposed to accept and incorporate many of the features of the Navy plan for national security. Indeed, many of the recommendations contained in the Navy plan are now being implemented by coordinated action of the War and Navy Departments where such action does not require legislative sanction, and an intelligence agency under the State Department has been established by Executive Order. These measures are steps in the right direction and are indicative of a mutual desire to cooperate on the parts of the War and Navy Departments, but agreement on details must not lead public opinion to believe that the Collins plan, which is being used by the Senate subcommittee as a basis for their work, and the Navy plan have been welded into one acceptable document.

Regardless of the harmony attained with regard to coordinating agencies and interrelation with other governmental departments there remains the basic difference of one department headed by a single secretary in the Cabinet and one Chief of Staff of the armed forces with complete authority over the entire military establishment of the Nation as advocated by the Collins plan, as opposed to three departments with three secretaries in the Cabinet, and a Joint Chiefs of Staff as now organized, with coequal status in their association, for the determination of military strategy, and authority within their own services to implement their collective decisions. The principle of the Navy plan may be boiled down to its essence and stated as requiring consultation and coordination on the policy and planning and unity of command on the executive level.

This same line of reasoning applies to the question of one Secretary versus three Secretaries. Each of the branches of the Military Establishment is large in time of peace and gigantic in time of war. Numerous statements by Secretaries of War and Navy attest the burdens they have carried in the administration of such huge establishments. If those burdens have been heavy in the past with separate departments it is difficult to picture the stature of one human being who can singly shoulder and discharge their responsibilities in time of war. The whole question again reaches the issue of one man versus three men * * * the necessity of checks and counterchecks to guard against the mistakes which can and have been made throughout history when the destinies of nations have been placed in the hands of one man. Civilian control of the military is a fundamental of our Government, yet understanding of the military is essential to the efficient exercise of that control. With the complexity of modern warfare and the specialized weapons of the various service components, appreciation and understanding of the role of each service in order to insure an adequate balance in the Nation's total effective strength is more necessary than ever before; and that understanding must be in the minds of men in the Cabinet of the President. It may be said further that the President, the Cabinet, and the people of the United States are entitled to full and complete presentations of the views and needs of each individual service by a civilian head on cabinet level rather than to a presentation which has already been passed upon and stamped with the approval of one man, a single Cabinet Member representing all the armed forces.

One argument advanced by proponents of the Collins plan is that a single department and a single Chief of Staff for the armed forces will relieve the President of many responsibilities and lighten his burden. This same point is used in criticism of the Navy plan which advocates the President as chairman of the National Security Council. It appears that the requirements of the Collins plan in lightening the presidential burden can be met and the place of the National Security Council in the organizational structure can be maintained by providing for a chairman or coordinator to head the National Security Council; the position to be filled at the discretion of the President. Such an official, when appointed, should be an ex-officio member of the Cabinet and would guide the decisions and recommendations of the National Security Council through the Cabinet where he would have the support of the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Air. Such an organization would permit the President to maintain close and active liaison through his deputy, or coordinator, with the National Security Council in time of peace when his time is more than occupied by the many functions of the Chief Executive and, if he so desired, to assume chairmanship of the National Security Council and full direction of the national effort in his constitutional role as Commander in Chief of the armed forces in time of war.

The name of the philosopher, or he may have been a crossroads sage, who said, "Some people grow older and smarter * * * and some just grow older," appears to have been lost in antiquity. That some quip applies to nations as well as to individuals. History is replete with the failure of one man to accomplish tasks beyond the capacity of one human intellect; the one-man governments which have appeared throughout the world have fallen, sooner or later, because of the mistakes made by one man. The democracies of the world have developed and improved because of their reliance upon a system of checks and counter-checks to insure the best common good of all their people; representation and consideration of the interests and needs of all groups whether large or small, before determination of the best policy for the Nation as a whole. Any Fascist can talk for hours upon the beneficial results of absolute authority in government and point out the increased economy and efficiency of absolute and immediate decision, elimination of waste by having only one political party, national harmony by elimination of discordant citizens, and so on ad infinitum. Despite its alleged inefficiency the democracies have followed a two-party political system, embroidered by varying numbers of smaller parties from time to time, and their system of government have endured while the one-party, one-man governments have gone by the board. If this multi-party system is wise and proper in our Government to insure the best interests of our people, is it not equally true that the organization of our armed forces, upon whose success or failure rests the whole fate of the Nation in time of war, must be safeguarded by having the specialized services share equal representation on the level of the Cabinet? Let it ever be said of this Nation, "It grew older and smarter."

Ship Sales Bill and Surplus Property Sales Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1945, when the so-called ship sales bill was under consideration on the floor of the House, and again on February 26, when the conference report was considered, I recorded specific objections to the legislation in the form recommended to the House.

In this connection and under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include at this point in the RECORD copy of a letter addressed to the President of the United States under date of March 7, 1946, together with copy of the reply received from the President under date of March 11, 1946.

Attention is called to the fact that the President indicates that the bill is not ideal, that in his opinion for some reason or other the committee in charge of the bill could never reach an agreement on the sort of bill necessary to be passed, and that under the circumstances he has felt that all we can do is to try to make the bill work, just as we tried to make an impossible surplus property sales bill work.

The letters follow:

MARCH 7, 1946.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the vital importance of economy in Federal expenditure with the danger of severe inflation, I venture to comment briefly on the so-called ship-sales legislation now before you for consideration.

It seems to me that the bill in its present form is still open to important objections.

1. Under the provisions of section 802 and section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, it is specifically provided that the Government in time of national emergency may acquire any vessel on which a construction subsidy has been paid at a price not to exceed the depreciated cost to the owner of the vessel. I find no such provision in the pending legislation although it would seem that the equivalent of a construction subsidy, and more, is to be allowed in respect to vessels sold. If my interpretation is correct, it would appear that this omission might cost the Government many hundreds of millions of dollars in the event of another national emergency.

2. For years it has been charged that many millions, perhaps hundreds of millions, of dollars have been paid by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration in excessive purchases, charter hire, and insurance to ship operators, including presumably, some of those concerns who are to

benefit by the liberal provisions of the pending legislation. No provision is made in the pending bill for the adjustment of wartime transactions as a condition precedent to purchases under the pending bill.

3. A number of vessels constructed under the 1936 act have been sold in recent years to various purchasers. The pending legislation proposes to adjust the sales prices on these vessels downward to an extent which will involve further contributions on the part of the taxpayers estimated at some $89,000,000.

4. What the proposed allowance in respect to tankers will amount to, I do not know. I have seen estimates running into a great many millions of dollars. I understand that the prospective purchasers plan to operate the tankers in domestic service carrying their own products.

The maximum trade-in allowance provided by the bill is also, I believe, a very liberal one. If the maximum in this respect is to become the minimum in practice, a further contribution by the people, running into a great many millions of dollars, would follow.

Other objections to the proposed legislation have been included in the remarks which I have made on the floor of the House in connection with the original bill and the conference report. It is impossible, I think, to read the proposed provisions in regard to putting vessels in class in regard to supplying desirable features, in regard to normal depreciation, in regard to excessive wear and tear, and in regard to tax adjustment and trade-in allowance, without reaching the conclusion that returns to the Treasury, at best, from the sales of ships will be relatively meager. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1, 1945, and February 26, 1946.)

You, of course, appreciate that under the Surplus Property Act the Maritime Commission now has full authority to dispose of surplus ships to the highest competitive bidder.

You also, I am sure, are aware of the disclosures which have been recently made in reference to the past financial operations of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, including the finding by the Comptroller General of the United States to the effect that over $5,822,000,000 had been improperly accounted for by the agencies as of June 30, 1943.

In my opinion, the situation has been so bad as to call imperatively for a thorough accounting and audit by the Comptroller General and for thorough internal reorganization. I believe this action should be undertaken at the earliest possible moment.

Respectfully,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 11, 1946.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIGGLESWORTH: I appreciate very highly your letter of the seventh in regard to the ship sales bill, which I signed on Friday.

The legislation, of course, has provisions that maybe are not ideal but this bill has been so long delayed and the necessity for the disposal of our surplus merchant marine equipment in some manner is so great that I felt it was better to sign the bill than to wait probably another year to get a better one.

This legislation should have been on the law book previous to VE-day but for some reason or other the committee never could reach an agreement on the sort of a bill necessary to be passed. I regret this very much but it seems under present conditions all we can do is to take the best we can get and try to make it work, just as we tried to make an impossible surplus property sales bill work.

I do appreciate, however, your interest in this matter and your views on the situation.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY. O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio addresses recently delivered by me on the subject of the British loan:

THE BRITISH LOAN—PART 1

You may have been wondering about the real story behind the British loan. Much has been said on this subject, but so far the facts presented to the American people have been so glossed over and so twisted about that it is doubtful if any American citizen really has a grasp of all the factors involved.

A matter involving $4,500,000,000 which must come out of the earnings of American families is not a subject which should be treated lightly. I, therefore, have made a very careful research of this entire question. The facts revealed by this study are so startling and so different from the generalities heretofore published about the British loan that I feel it my duty to present them to you in full.

The pro-loan propagandists tell us that one of the chief purposes of this British loan is the betterment of Anglo-American relations. If this is one of the objectives, the British loan will go down in history as one of the most outstanding failures of American diplomacy. We can only judge the British attitude toward this loan by what the British say about it, and their attitude toward us following previous loans to them. Here is what the London Times had to say in an editorial published in its issues of December 12, 1945. I quote:

"By any computation the bargain is hard. A labor amendment asks the House of Parliament to refuse its consent to a dollar credit which disregards the principle of mutual aid on which the war effort was based, which must deprive this country—Britain—of effective control over its own currency and trade"—I am still quoting from this British editorial—"and under which the nation"—that is the British nation—"will be committed to undertakings impossible of fulfillment."

"Sir Hubert Henderson," this British editorial goes on to say, "even contends that the conditions attached to the loan are 'calculated to insure default.'

"Calculated to insure default," says Sir Hubert Henderson. In other words, Sir Hubert says he does not feel the British can possibly repay this loan. But, to make it plainer, this same editorial in the London Times in another place gives us this unequivocal statement. I quote:

"The proposed payment of over £35,000,000 a year for half a century is frankly a concession to the 'business principles' of the American Congress—and is no more likely to run its full course unaltered than the elaborate schedules of the Dawes and Young plans."

So, you see, in this London Times editorial, a clear indication of the British intention to treat this loan exactly as they treated the loan we extended to them following the first World War, when, after meeting her modest payments for a few short years, Britain led all other debtor nations—except little Finland—in their repudiation of their debts to us. These nations still owe us $15,000,000,000 on that account. In view of these facts it is amazing that anyone should have the presumption to expect the American Congress to approve such an agreement. How can the American Congress, in all conscience, lightly give away four and one-half billions of American taxpayers' money? Giving away this money in the form of a loan, which the borrower does not expect to repay, is giving away money which will take food from the tables of American families, clothes from their backs, and in a hundred other ways lower their standards of living.

The American Congress could justify the imposition of these sacrifices only on the grounds that the American people would receive something in return.

One of the supposed benefits to our American people has been described as the opening up of markets for American agricultural and industrial products. As you know, the British Empire has controlled the access to its markets by a system of protective tariffs, which they term "imperial preferences." These imperial preferences are simply high tariffs imposed on American or other products sold in British Empire markets to which different segments of the Empire are not subjected. Naturally, the cost of the American products plus the tariff imposed upon it makes the price of American products in British Empire markets much higher than those of British origin.

The proponents of the British loan claimed to have achieved concessions from the British Government in regard to these tariffs—concessions by which the tariffs would be lowered so that American products could flow into these markets and thereby yield increased income for the American people.

I have in my possession statements by Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the British Board of Trade, and the Right Honorable Ernest Bevin, Minister of Foreign Affairs. These statements are official. They were made in the House of Commons during the official debates on the subject of this loan. The statements of these two honorable gentlemen are rather technical and like all such technical statements too dull and too difficult to follow in a brief talk like this. Nevertheless, the gist of their statements is that the supposed concessions the United States is to receive from the British Government will be based, in the words of Mr. Bevin, "On trade for trade on the merits of trade," and in the words of Sir Stafford Cripps, "the initiation of a process of argument which might lead to the elimination of preferences and the reduction of tariffs." Sir Stafford likewise says that, before granting concessions to the United States, the British Government might "want 26 countries to reduce their tariffs before they—the British—were prepared to drop a preference." In other words, the United States would have to stand in line, hat in hand, and wait for the reduction of British preferences and the opening of British markets and then would receive these concessions only if the British received everything they asked from us in return.

The statements of these two men prove to me conclusively that the agreement to negotiate for the elimination of the special privileges for Britain is not worth the paper it is written on. To the United States it means exactly nothing, except this: That, unless we open our markets in the United States to free and unrestricted trade by the British; unless we place all her products on our free list, Britain, through her system of imperial preferences and her control of exchange through the so-called "sterling bloc" will be

able to drive us from the markets of the world.

Now let's see what we have established so far. First, we have seen that the British say this loan is a hard bargain, and they do not believe they can repay it. Second, we have seen that the supposed advantages for the United States in obtaining new markets and, therefore, new income, are illusory.

Now let me show you another aspect of this loan. Sir J. Anderson stated in the Parliamentary debates, according to the London Times, that "he had seen a statement to the effect that (the British) position (in respect to agriculture) was fully protected, but it seemed to him that the right of the participating government to impose restrictions for the purpose of protecting home agriculture had been very considerably restricted.

This is a fact of vital interest to the farmers of America. Here is a member of the British Parliament whose views are given wide publicity in the London Times, who believes there is a possible interpretation in the loan agreement which gravely restricts the powers of the participating governments to protect domestic agriculture. Now we begin to see that, instead of receiving benefits, the American farmer may be threatened. In other words, from the standpoint of the American farmer, the Congress is asked to take money out of the farmers' pockets and turn it over to Britain in the form of a gift-loan, which will not be repaid, and at the same time making this gift-loan under conditions which may threaten these farmers' very livelihood.

Does this strike you as good business for the American farmer? Is this honest treatment accorded to him?

Now we have three points. First, the British say it is a hard bargain, and they do not believe they can repay the loan. Second, the agreements on tariffs and preferences which supposedly would open British markets to us are illusory. Third, there is very serious danger that the American farmer will be hurt.

Let us carry the investigation further. Perhaps, in making this gift, for it is a gift, of four and one-half billions to Britain, the American people will receive in return the benefit of British good will—something to be prized in this disordered world.

I now quote the Right Honorable Ernest Bevin, whose following remarks appear on page 725 of the Official Record of Parliamentary Debates on this subject. Mr. Bevin said:

"I know the task of facing this loan leaves a good many people with a sense of discomfort. I do not know anybody whoever came away from a money lender's office and calculated the repayment whoever felt comfortable."

So you see Mr. Bevin makes no attempt to characterize America as a kind, generous friend. He associates America with a money lender's office—in effect, a pawnbroker, a hard and ruthless dealer taking advantage of the miseries and misfortunes of others. This in the face of our preparations to forgive, cancel, write off $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease, which we extended to them.

After the last war, when America sought repayment of loans advanced to Great Britain and others, the United States was referred to as Uncle Shylock. We then wrote off the billions we loaned during that war. Great Britain's debt to us from the First World War alone was for postwar loans, and now amounts to $6,500,000,000 in round figures. We were called Uncle Shylock for attempting to recover, under a clear and solemn contract, this enormous sum.

We are now called a money lender—with all its connotations of ruthless dealing—before this new loan is even approved by the American Congress. We gave—gave, mind you—twenty-five billions and more in this war to Britain via lend-lease. We are now asked to give four and one-half billions more. It is a poor kind of money lender who makes unrecoverable loans and outright gifts far outweighing even the faintest hope of repayment, friendship, or service.

Yet a money lender, a usurer, an Uncle Shylock is what the leaders of the British Government call this Nation.

Is this kind of good will worth four and one-half billions of dollars more? It does not seem so to me, and I feel sure it does not seem so to you.

So we see this British loan is considered by the British themselves as a hard bargain, which they will be unable to fulfill; the concessions in British markets have little tangible value to the United States; the livelihood of American farmers and workers will unquestionably be endangered; we can expect history to repeat itself and with nothing but abuse from the British as our reward.

These are startling considerations. Yet I have only begun to give you the full results of my investigation. Next Sunday I will give you additional information which is even more startling, because I believe you want the truth and the whole truth about this proposed loan, which will so vitally affect the living standards of every American family.

I shall continue this discussion in my next week's broadcast.

BRITISH LOAN—PART 2

Last Sunday I revealed to you some of the startling facts which my investigation of the proposed British loan brought forth. Today I offer you other startling considerations and facts in which I am sure you will be most interested.

Last week we saw that the proposed British loan of four and one-half billions is a loan which the British doubt they can repay; that the supposed concessions given to the United States in opening up British markets for the sale of our products is primarily a fiction; that the livelihood of American farmers and workers may be endangered by this proposal; that far from obtaining the good will of the British, we can expect nothing but abuse, if we grant this loan.

I will begin our discussions today by reading a quotation from the British Economist, the foremost journal of its kind published in England and one reflecting the feeling of British business circles quite accurately. Here is what the Economist says: "It is aggravating to find that our (that is the British) reward for losing a quarter of our national wealth in the common cause is to pay tribute for half a century to those who have been enriched by the war."

The reference to those "who have been enriched by the war" is to the United States of course. The British attitude is that we have emerged from this war far richer than when we entered it.

The Economist states that Britain lost a quarter of her national wealth in the late war. Let me compare that with our loss.

The estimated national wealth of the United States in 1938 was some $309,000,000,000. The total debt of the United States according to the most recent official figures, including Federal, State, local, and private debts, reaches the stupendous sum of $455,000,000,000. This does not include our contingent debts which amount to many billions more.

Now let me call your attention again to our national wealth in 1938. That figure was three hundred and nine billions. In view of the fact that since 1938 we have devoted ourselves to the war effort and depleted our mines, stripped our forests, drained our oil fields, burned up the fertility of our soil, and suffered incalculable losses of war material, and manpower, it is obvious that our national wealth today could not possibly exceed that of the year 1938. So, therefore, it seems valid to use the 1938 figure for our national wealth.

Now we owe $455,000,000,000. Our wealth is $309,000,000,000. The difference between our assets and our liabilities is more than $145,000,000,000—that is billions, not mere millions—and on the wrong side of the ledger. We are in debt by one hundred and forty-five billions over and above our total national wealth.

This one hundred and forty-five billions is 47 percent of our total national wealth, so that our debt is one and one-half times our national assets.

That is how rich this war has made the United States. We have been impoverished by this war, and what is more we have poured out the priceless lifeblood of our nearest and dearest to save what is, by and large, an unappreciative British Empire.

Let me carry this inquiry of our alleged enrichment one step further. From December 1941 to October 1945 the gold reserve of the United States declined by $2,701,000,000. That is a strange form of enrichment. It is just the reverse of enrichment. It is part of the story of our national impoverishment.

Now let us take a look at British assets in the world of international finance.

Admittedly the British Empire is insolvent, and there is no probability that this so-called loan of $4,400,000,000 will ever be repaid, but at the same time the British Empire has assets, and there are some very strange things to which I direct your attention in connection with those assets.

In April 1941 Great Britain's reserve of gold and dollars had fallen to the equivalent of some $12,000,000. About 4 years later, in October 1945, Britain's net gold and dollar reserves had risen to the respectable total of $1,800,000,000. This was the result—a wholly unexpected result—of the lend-lease agreement. This lend-lease agreement has cost us $25,000,000,000 in aid to Great Britain alone. While we were pouring out these billions Great Britain increased her gold and dollar reserves—which is like saying her cash—by approximately $1,800,000,000. Is it fair to say that the United States might not have a fair claim to this substantial sum which Great Britain gained during the war?

Now permit me to take you down another path. The President of the United States has pointed out the danger of inflation. On this basis he feels it necessary to call upon the Congress to reimpose wartime wage and price controls. Let me show you how this British loan is related to inflation in this country.

In this year 1946 and in the year 1947 when domestic goods are in such urgent demand at home, the granting of this large credit to Britain will automatically stimulate an additional demand from abroad. In other words, the inflation which now stems in large measure from the lack of goods and products would be promoted even further by this additional demand from Britain. Prices, despite the OPA, have gone up. The cost of living has gone up. It has gone up because so many American families need so many different products and there are so few products to buy. Now it is proposed to add to the demand of American families the demands of the British families, and thus to increase the total demand for goods which are already in short supply. Can we keep inflation down this way? Or will the demand for stockings, and shirts, and suits, and all the other things be so increased that prices—legally or otherwise—will break through the restraints upon them and the cost of living rise sky high?

Here is another consideration connected with this same demand. While the British loan may create a demand for American products at the very time we do not want demands from outside made upon us for

our limited supply of goods, when American manufacturers have satisfied the demands of the American consumer and look for markets elsewhere, then the British demand will have fallen off and America will face cut-throat competition from foreign industry. Let me quote from an article in the Wall Street Journal on this aspect of the loan:

"Then is likely to come a new crisis. When foreign folk run out of American loans to buy American goods, will American world trade collapse?

"The experts think it will, with disastrous consequences to our domestic economy, unless one or both of two possibilities occurs. First, imports might be bolstered still further by a change in United States' buying habits. Second, lending abroad might be followed by investing abroad. It is suggested that the reconstruction type of loan (that is the kind of loan we are now discussing) be succeeded indefinitely by private or governmental investment in productive foreign enterprises, especially in economically backward lands."

Here, my friends, is the beginning of the very kind of policy which paved the way for the disastrous crash of 1929. During the period before 1929 the bonds of foreign countries were sold to the American people. The high-pressure artists of the time sold these bonds on the basis of blue-sky promises which ended in repudiation and ultimate loss to many American citizens. It was purely a private matter, of course, and, although the Federal Government at the time may have committed the sin of omission in not regulating this traffic, it at least was left to the discretion of the individual American investor to decide for himself whether or not he wished to invest in these foreign securities.

Now, however, there is a different technique. The idea of this administration is to give you no choice. The idea is to tax you, to dip right into your savings and your earnings and, whether you like it or not, hand the money over to foreign governments.

As surely as I am talking to you today, you will find that this British loan, if passed, will be only the forerunner of a series of huge loans. First they will be made for reconstruction purposes; then, when those funds run out, this administration will seek to make other loans for the purpose of building up industry in various foreign countries. What will happen to the United States seems to be of no concern. The administration apparently will go blithely on planning to give away wealth which we actually do not possess. I have shown you that this Nation owes almost half again as much money as the value of the entire Nation and all its assets. If we sold the United States and everything in it at a liquidation sale, we would still be $145,000,000,000 short of our debt. To meet our obligations we would need assets one and one-half times all the assets we now possess.

The myth that the United States is a great reservoir of unlimited wealth is a dangerous and downright falsehood.

I ask you to consider the British loan, and other prospective loans, and other costly proposals of this administration in that light. If you feel any sense of responsibility to yourself, to your family, and to the future welfare of your children, then let me urge upon you the realization that the United States, your country, in not an overflowing cornucopia from which wealth, riches, and abundance can pour out in an endless stream.

You and I, of course, must realize that all things in this world are not measurable in terms of money. Therefore, we should not neglect to appraise the value of world good will. We should consider this British loan in terms of the good will and comradeship it might develop and make permanent between the people of the United States and the people of Great Britain. Yet, my friends, I have shown you that the British themselves do not appreciate this generous gesture on our part.

Recently, Mr. Mallory Browne, representative of the New York Times in London, had this to say about British reaction to the loan which Congress is now asked to approve:

"Not for many years, not since the British defaulted on the last war loan and perhaps not even than, has there been so much resentment, such widespread bitterness, against the United States as one finds expressed in Parliament, in the press, and by the general public in Britain today."

That, my friends, is a fair description of British reaction to American generosity. I ask you to think twice before you give your approval to the British loan.

I shall continue this discussion in my next week's broadcast.

THE BRITISH LOAN—PART 3

As the tide of popular opposition mounts higher and higher against the proposed gift loan of what really will be about four and a half billion dollars to Great Britain, and as tired taxpayers and exploited Americans generally more and more loudly voice their opposition to this procedure, we see a new technique being brought forward. It is a technique very reminiscent of the earlier days of the New Deal when the administration always had a sly approach to propositions which it knew it dared not put up to the people bluntly, frankly, openly, and honestly. This new administration technique now is to say that this is to be a loan unique in history, the first and last of its kind that Mr. Truman will agree to. That all sounds simple—much too simple, as I shall explain to you in a few minutes. While that propaganda technique is being built up—and it is getting under full pressure now—another plan is also in the making. That plan will be for the administration to get behind tremendous appropriations to the Export-Import Bank and then, through that bank, and without the necessity of consulting the taxpayers at all—or the Congress either, for that matter—take care of other loans to other countries which will follow in a procession for handouts. The trick will be that the propaganda boys will impress upon you folks that these bank loans, to be made by the Export-Import Bank, will be on a strict business basis, under strict business usage, and will be sternly collected when the time comes.

Of course, all that will be just so much argument intended to fool you folks whose dollars—whose billions of dollars—are to be handed out so lavishly to all and sundry who come to our Treasury with their hats in their hands.

How many of you folks believe for a minute that after we have given Britain more than $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease materials, and after her repudiation of the six and a half billion dollar debt to us growing out of the First World War, and that, if on top of all that, we give her approximately four and a half billions more under the terms I have outlined to you in previous talks—terms which mean, in simple language, that the British never intend to repay us a dime of either the principal or the interest—after we have done all that, don't you believe every other nation in the world will be knocking at our Treasury doors for more billions of your tax dollars? Of course you do—you couldn't conclude otherwise.

So, then, while those strange Americans, whose creed seems to be to give away to everybody else all the American wealth they can persuade you to part with, plan this new unique technique, let's look at some perfectly plain facts in connection with this matter.

First, this money that these give-away boys are so eager to bestow upon other nations is your money, not theirs. You are going to have to work and sweat down the years in the beet fields and down the corn rows on your own farms. You are going to have to labor under the broiling sun. You are going to have to toil at lathe, in the mill, at the loom, in the fields, in your own businesses to redeem these wildly scattered billions of dollars in goods and services—for redeemed in goods and services—your goods and services—they must be redeemed some day. And you and your children and your grandchildren must toil to pay for the billions and the scores of billions of dollars' worth of lend-lease materials, the UNRRA materials, and the stabilization exchange fund, and the Reconstruction Bank, and, heaven help us, every other kind of fund the State Department striped-pants boys could devise and give away.

It will be one of the strange chapters of world history that in this era—as after the last war—every time anybody anywhere in the world thinks of a Samaritan he just naturally thinks instantly of Uncle Samar-i-tan. Apparently nobody ever thinks of helping himself until after he has first tried out the touch on the American people.

Now let's look at this new plan that is going to be trotted out to fool you folks if possible, and at the same time to keep from your knowledge the vast amounts of your money the striped-pants boys intend later to give away.

In the first place, whether the United States lends these billions through an act of Congress direct, or through the Export-Import Bank, after the Congress has voted that institution your billions of dollars to fling around, do you believe for a minute that any of these other countries will be satisfied with less than the treatment accorded Britain? Of course not. And why should they? Now what did we do when Britain led the procession of the defaults of the First World War postwar loans? Did we send the sheriff to take possession of British assets, and the assets of other defaulting nations? No; you can't do that with governments. To attempts it would cost many times the amount of the loans. We had one choice. If we had insisted on repayment, we would have had to threaten war—and the seizure of lands—territories—to recoup our losses. That would have meant nothing less than war. We didn't do that, so Britain and France and the other defaulters piled up their gold reserves and their bond holdings in the banks in this country—and thumbed their noses at us. Now you may not know that those defaulted First World War loans were all postwar loans. They were. We wrote off all the money we loaned them during the war because they insisted that we should consider that our share of the costs of a war which they fought for us—if you please.

They go one step further. Now they not only say we should write off all the billions and multiplied billions of lend-lease materials we furnished our allies during the war, but that we should now begin to pay Britain, and those other nations, for getting into the war at all. You see, they claim they all rushed in to defend the United States of America. Were they in no danger? Could they have stayed out?

Every day now the Communists sing the theme song that we owe Soviet Russia a great debt of gratitude for getting into the war to save democracy. The blunt truth is Russia didn't get into the European war until Hitler's hordes invaded her, and if we hadn't gone to her rescue, she would have been a desolated, defeated country today. Not one of our allies raised a hand to help us out with the war against Japan but they are rushing forward now—particularly Russia—demanding their huge slices of the victory on the ground, I suppose, that they kept Japan from defeating us.

Now, there is another strange—and not altogether frank—phase about this giving away of your dollars. The State Department denied most strenuously for 6 months that

the Russians had ever mentioned getting a loan from us. Then, suddenly, and with tongue in cheek, they have some obscure clerk stumble onto the document among the files where it had gotten "lost," so they say. Somewhat like that Yalta agreement, which didn't get lost in the State Department; that got lost instead in the White House.

Now if your business, your Government, and your dollars are being handled so carelessly that a billion-dollar-loan request can get lost in the State Department files for 6 months, I think we need a new State Department, don't you?

The plain truth about this whole mess of intrigue, folks, is that a lot of our own misguided governmental officials have some strange ideas of our responsibilities and obligations to other nations. If the world is as bad off as all these give-away boys insist that it is, do you think the United States can save it, and support it, and fight its wars, and patch up its bruises, and rebuild its shattered countries, world-without-end?

Just the other day in debates in the House of Commons between Prime Minister Attlee and Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, a member, it was brought out and stated that the condition of Britain's export trade is such that this American gift-loan, if made, will be exhausted within 18 months. Think of that, 18 months, and the interest on the debt would not begin until 1950! Did any of you folks ever try to pay for a dead horse? You know Britain would never repay a penny of the principal or the interest, and her spokesmen have said so bluntly, brazenly, frankly, and repeatedly.

Sometimes I almost believe they really have persuaded themselves, all these peoples over the seas, that this was our war; that we started it; that we got them into it; that we were responsible for it; and that we really ought to pay for it.

Now, of course, there will be terrible starvation across the seas. There is always starvation after every war. That is an inevitable part of the horrible fruits of war. Of course, we want to help alleviate that suffering as much as we can. But look at our own awful national debt; look at the billions in lend-lease for which we had to borrow the money and which we still owe and must pay interest on down the years. Look at our own toll in blood, shattered lives, and dead men and women; look at UNRRA; look at the fund for currency stabilization; look at the International Bank for Reconstruction; look at our Red Cross; look at a myriad other relief measures of one sort and another. Of course, we want to help—but we face a question which will always stand there: How far can we help without sinking with the rest of the countries of the world instead of helping hold them afloat? That question we must always ponder.

And the worst feature of this whole business is the deceit, the trickery, the subterfuge, the falsification which have been and are being imposed upon you folks. At least, in our efforts to help save the rest of the world, we are entitled to honest facts and fair treatment. Any proposition as bound around and shot through as this proposed loan with trickery and sharp dealing ought not to be put over on the American people by their Congress—and won't be if you folks and the other millions of Americans make known to your Representatives how you feel about the matter.

Sometime ago, when it was announced that Winston Churchill was to sojourn in Florida for a few weeks, many people recalled the fact that this would be his first prolonged visit to that section of the world. Those of us on Capitol Hill, knowing the astute gentleman, realized that there was a purpose to be served thereby. We who have been actively interested in stopping further drains from our Treasury to other nations, believed that purpose was to help in putting over the British loan. The gentleman's speech at Fulton, Mo., the past week, however, disclosed another and far more serious purpose. Mr. Churchill aims high. He is the world's greatest gambler. In fact, he would make us a party to the permanent preservation of the British Empire. He lends every encouragement to keeping our Treasury pipe line open to British financial requirements. It is too early to know just what we are being let in for in this latest British proposal. I hope to discuss this question with you later. One thing is clear and that is that the President and our State Department were fully informed as to what the distinguished Britisher would say and had approved his remarks. Will this episode prove to be a highly tragic blunder of the Truman administration? It behooves America carefully to stop, look, and listen.

John Joseph Cardinal Glennon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, John Joseph Cardinal Glennon was laid to rest in the Catholic Cathedral in St. Louis, the construction of which he was responsible, on Saturday morning, 1 week after he had died in Ireland close to the home of his birth.

The sermon was delivered by Bishop Christopher E. Byrne of the Galveston (Tex.) diocese.

Under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the following article from the St. Louis Star-Times. It follows:

"'I have glorified Thee on earth; I have finished the work Thou gavest me to do,' are words that well become the life of His Eminence John Cardinal Glennon."

Bishop Christopher E. Byrne, of Galveston, Tex., said these words in his sermon today at Cardinal Glennon's funeral in the St. Louis Cathedral.

"He is the third archbishop of St. Louis; in more than a century, this See has had only four rulers," the bishop reminded his great congregation.

Bishop Byrne, a former St. Louisan and lifelong friend of the late prelate, praised Cardinal Glennon for his humility and forgetfulness of himself, as a great builder, a scholar, for the charm of his genial and amiable manners, and for his oratory.

The great cardinal archbishop of St. Louis has gone away from the scenes of a long and busy ministry, the bishop said, in which the blind and the lame, and the deaf and the dumb, the sick and the orphan and the old had been cared for, the poor of the city slums, and of the scattered country settlements had the Gospel preached to them.

Bishop Byrnes' sermon follows in part:

"Nearly 16 years ago Archbishop Glennon stood here to preach the funeral sermon of the Very Rev. Dr. Ryan, president of Kendrick Seminary. On that occasion he said: 'I did not come up to this pulpit this morning to preach a eulogy. Indeed, holy church tells us that it is inadvisable, except on extraordinary occasions to have eulogies spoken over the dead, and I think so too, because really, when one leads a good life and passes on, well, no eulogy is needed.'"

"I SHALL ALSO COPY HIM," SAYS BISHOP

"Standing in his place today, I shall respect that conviction. But I shall also copy him. For on that day, he further said, 'At some obsequies it might be well to voice some thoughts that will help us in the journey of life, some thoughts that come from the life of him, who is now on his last journey.'

"The archbishop did not intend to repudiate all eulogy, for after all, the little lives of the saints in the breviary, found daily in the hands of every priest, are a recital of their good deeds, their patient sufferings, that these may be for our encouragement and our edification; and that seeing the joy of saintly living we might draw also close to God.

"In a brief way we shall try to do this for the life of the great prelate whose remains lie here. But, as he for Dr. Ryan, so do I for him plead, 'Pray for the soul of the dead, our deceased friend.'"

GAINED NEW DIGNITY, HONOR AND POWER

"He joined with other Johns, and the James and the Philips and the Nathaniels around the Vicar of Christ who called them to the episcopate. A feast was celebrated, an oft-repeated Patch. New dignity and honor and power was given to him, and those chosen with him. Before he left you he said, they were not for him, but for many, for his diocese, for his city. Had be brought all the gifts and benedictions of Rome back to you, had be joined in all the celebrations you planned; had he received your plaudits and congratulations, it would not have been permitted him to say with the finality of Calvary, 'It is finished.'"

"For he had a passion for Ireland, the land of his birth, the place of that early education which unfolded his mind so rapidly that he completed preparation for the priesthood before age would permit his ordination. He had a love for Kinnegad, the blessed home of his parents and kin. These, too, should be given like Mary was given, and we beg the privilege to take them as our own from the hour of his peaceful death. They have our sympathy and our prayers, brother, and sisters, and relatives all, God bless and console them.

"The first archbishop spent 50 years in the episcopacy here. He rose like a mountain in the plane of pioneer days here, and built a city of God in the heights that radiated religious influence as far as the Continental Divide of the Rockies. The old cathedral (not built by him, but where for long years he kept his chair) standing alone, and apart in its strength and majesty typifies an enduring Kenrick greatness. Forthright, outspoken, ardent Achbishop Kain followed, and in his shorter reign gave new vigor and life to this Rome of the West."

THREE NAMES SENT TO HOLY FATHER

"Then came here our lamented Cardinal Glennon. The discipline of those days required the bishops of the province to offer three names to Rome, and the diocesan consultors and irremovable pastors offered three more names, from which the holy father might select a prelate for a diocese. Of that historic meeting held at Kenrick Seminary, then on Cass Avenue, there lives today only the distinguished pastor of Ste. Genevieve and myself. The name of John J. Glennon headed our list, as it did that of the bishops.

"The coadjutor bishop came down quietly from Kansas City and found his way alone to 3810 Lindell Boulevard. That humility and forgetfulness of himself was characteristic of his whole life. For himself nothing, for the splendor of religion, for the glory of God, all that the world can give. Time and again I have seen him on confirmation tours in far-away country places, where comforts were few and often crude, but never a word or sign of displeasure or complaint.

"He felt that if as a bishop he had sent a priest, in obedience, to live in such surroundings, it would have been highly scandalous on his part to find fault for 1 day of discomfort. He was never more cheerful and agreeable than when on a tour in the country parts of the diocese.

"His first consideration of others was, perhaps, the secret of his plan of ruling. The requirements of the canon law, and the demands of liturgy were never overlooked nor neglected, but, in the government of the diocese, he had very little of the spirit of the 'man subject to authority,' who could say, 'to one "go" and he goeth, and to another "come," and he cometh, and to my servant "do this" and he doeth it.'

"He rather lived up to the prayer of the ordination Mass, in which it is said, 'I will no longer call you servants but friends.' His dignity never sagged; his authority never suffered, in a well-knit diocese he held the unswerving loyalty and respect of both clergy and laity."

GREAT BUILDER, BUT NEVER GREAT BORROWER

"His Eminence was a great builder, but never a great borrower. Had he accomplished no more than this magnificent cathedral where today his blessed body rests (and in its shelter it will stay till resurrection), he would deserve that title, 'maxima cum laude,' because here was spent millions of dollars to glorify the mass, and never a dollar borrowed. The power of the man, in material things, with his priests and people, needs no other telling, the very stones would proclaim him builder over any silence about it.

"His idea of 'first things first' was always, if it is God's, give it to God wholly. How often was he not heard to say, at a church dedication where money was borrowed for the erection, 'beautiful but not yet God's while a bank holds a mortgage.' His insistence to 'pay our debt' has given this diocese a Gibraltar-strength foundation; and it has made the people generous and open-handed, for they always knew where the money went.

"It is easy to have fine churches, schools, institutions of charity in St. Louis. He had no monopoly on building. His zeal for the glory of God opened up this diocese to all the religious orders and communities that wished to come. There are convents here where the archbishop for 40 years never missed the annual profession of vows; there are schools where he never failed to grace the graduation.

"Through the work of the religious in their own schools and laboring in the parish and diocesan schools, he has built up an educational system that is abundant and efficient. There is now, under his initiation, a project in operation to build five or six district high schools, and the money is on hand to pay for them."

CARDINAL HIMSELF WAS A SCHOLAR

"The archbishop was a scholar, and he wanted scholarly men and women, lay and clerical associated with him. Nor was this a vanity. He built the seminaries of this diocese so spacious that many surrounding bishops find profit in sending their seminarians to Kenrick. This has given opportunity to one of the unique honors of His Eminence John Cardinal Glennon.

"His blessed folded hands will no more lift up the golden cup of Christ's blood in the holy sacrifice, but, all over this land, and in the foreign missions, more than 1,500 priests will pray for him as they raise up, in clean oblation, the chalice he first put into their newly consecrated hands. I doubt if there is a bishop in the land to match him in this. Five times in the last 27 years he crowned the heads of his own priests with the mitre, and for twice as many more, did he speak the Accipe Spiritum Sanctum that made them bishops. He fulfilled well the duty given by St. Paul to Titus, 'to set in order the things that were wanting, and to ordain priests in every city.'

"Except for the charm of his genial and amiable manners, perhaps no other quality of his eminence received more praise than his oratory. To be an orator one must have deep love for all that concerns the dignity of men, their rights, their duties, and their decent living. When our Lord sat down on the mountainside and, opening His mouth, He taught them, saying, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven,' and from that beatitude of hope to the end of His longest recorded sermon He solaced His hearers; encouraged them to let their light shine before men; maintained the authority and the easy keeping of the law; urged sacrifice, even to doing good to one's enemies, demanded respect for women, and the purity of wedded life; denounced hypocrisy and injustice; counseled prudence and wisdom, and beautifully appealed to the birds of the air that neither sow nor reap, and to the lilies of the field that labor not neither do they spin; so He left His hearers, abiding in faith and confidence, at the foot of God's throne, lisping like trusting children, 'Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name.'

"The pattern of the Sermon on the Mount can be found in all the sermons and discourses of his eminence. There was always the great God, and man, for whose redemption God became Man, and all the wonderful supernatural and natural things God's power provided for men, their homes, their children especially, and everlasting life."

WHO CANNOT SEE HIM NEAR YONDER THRONE

"Indeed, his body lies coffined there; but who that ever attended mass in this great cathedral cannot even now see him standing near yonder throne, in splendid height, in graceful pose, his eyes alight with the fire of his love, his face aflame with the brilliance of his thoughts, his clear, distinct, rythmic voice calling to you to 'lay up to yourselves treasures in heaven; where neither the rust nor the moth doth consume, and where thieves do not break through, nor steal.'

"They hear him, too, in Mullingar Cathedral, where generous Irish hands bore him to his glorious Irish requiem. And what did he say? Was there prophecy in his hesitating words:

" 'While I know that Irish country is willing to tolerate the stranger, may I hope that the title would be modified to read not a stranger but only an exile, home, returning to chant with you St. Mary's Magnificat. He scarcely can be a stranger who had the good fortune to be born in the ancient parish of Clonard, under whose sacred soil his parents today lie sleeping and where, perhaps when his time comes, he also. But why delay with such contingencies? Only the good God may know where an exile will find his last resting place.'

"They hear him at Budapest, above the sighs of their war sorrows and the groanings of their present needs. They hear him in Dublin, not far from the stately home of President O'Kelly, of Erie, who was host to his peaceful death.

"Let us pause at that hallowed spot and listen. Nearly a million people stand in rapt attention. Would that the world heeded his words of 1942:

"The spirit of hatred and suspicion is rampant everywhere. The nations sit in council seeking an accord on which the fate of Christendom depends, but fear and suspicion and age-long hate thwart their efforts. Our Christian civilization hangs on their agreement; yet they temporize, they falter, they fail. When will our broken world come to realize that only out of the alembic of divine charity will come a solution of those tremendous questions that vex the world? That only in the Sacred Heart of Jesus will the hearts of men be united."

THEY HEAR HIM IN BUENOS AIRES

"They hear him in Buenos Aires where the Master from His mountain-top shrine looks down in benediction. Above all the bombings of the late cruel war, the air lines of the world carried his voice speaking the glories of Joan d'Arc fighting for king and country and peace; and telling again of St. Louis, his See city's saint, fighting against injustice and tyranny and hatred of Christ. The richness of his voice made the poor rich, for he never tired pleading their cause with the zeal of a St. Vincent de Paul.

"John Cardinal Glennon, little did the Vicar of Christ think that there was foreboding in the symbolic act of closing your mouth during the ceremonies in Rome, or that the red hat he gave you would so soon hang from the roof tree of your cathedral. The Master knew that you had done the work, and well, that He gave you to do; He watched your fidelity and steadfastness while you saw only darkly through a glass, He wanted you to see face to face; He wanted you to hear the voice of the Last Supper.

"And so in obedience to God's will we take our leave of you. Our hearts always will love and admire you; they shall be filled and overflowing with gratitude for your kindness, your blessing, your zeal, and your example.

"In the name of Jesus Christ, who came to earth so often as your own, and the bidding of hundreds of priests you ordained, we bid you adieu, sorrowing, like the disciples on Olivet."

Black Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Arnold Spencer from the Advocate-Republican, of Audubon, Iowa:

BLACK BREAD

Black markets have brought us to black bread. We wonder how long it will take our Congress to see how the insane program of the OPA is heading the Nation toward economic ruin.

Gestapo raids on minor violators will never accomplish anything. Idiotic regulations taking into no account the true economics of costs and the natural laws of trade reveal the incompetent imagination of the political misfits who administer it.

Wheat is rotting on the ground for lack of transportation, but we must eat black bread to provide more wheat. No trucks, no tires, no steel for railroad cars—but we must have more wheat.

Regardless of regulations that may come from Washington, there is nothing that will force production at a loss. We need homes for millions, but sawmills cannot operate under a deficit like the Government is doing. We need clothing, but we are not going to get it when it must be sold below cost.

This week we are mailing butter to some of our poor relatives—poor because the OPA has made them so. All they have is money—and there is an old story, "You can't take it with you," to which may we add that "You're going soon if you don't eat."

Never have we made a direct request to our Congressman, but we now do so. Please, BEN, do something to the best of your ability about the OPA. We don't want to see price control entirely abandoned, but, for God's sake, try to beat some brains into them.

ARNOLD SPENCER.

The Wearing of the Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the "wearing of the green" by many Irish—and some not so Irish—Members of the House in celebration of St. Patrick's Day last week, I insert herewith some facts and data appearing in the Shamrock Texan.

Each year my home town of Shamrock stages a gala St. Patrick's Day celebration which is attended by thousands of people regardless of their extraction and a right good time is had by all. This is the only Shamrock growing on Texas soil and it gives me pleasure to extend an invitation to all the Members of the House to visit this fair Irish city when the St. Patrick's Day celebration is resumed next March 17 and enjoy genuine Texas-Irish hospitality.

QUOTING SOME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FIGURES WHICH PROVE SHAMROCK PRETTY NICE PLACE, AFTER ALL

Sometimes residents of a small city like Shamrock are prone to forget what a fine community it is in which they live, as well as the business and social opportunities afforded by such a place.

Bob Clark, recently hired secretary-manager of the chamber of commerce, has received several inquiries of late from industries, officials of which state they are interested in establishing in a town like Shamrock. Having asked for various statistics of the town, Clark has compiled figures which most of us know but just haven't taken the time to think about during the war years just past.

Some of them will prove interesting.

In the first place, Shamrock is a growing city. In 1940 the population was 3,073. At the present time a conservative estimate would be 4,000. This estimate is based on the utilities connections, the number of new houses moved here, and the crowded conditions of hotels and tourist courts.

The city water department has 964 connections, the West Texas Utilities Co. reports 1,030, and the Shamrock Gas Co. 1,051. In January 1940 there were 530 telephones in use in Shamrock. In January of this year there were 740 connections.

Shamrock is served by two railroads, the Rock Island and the Fort Worth & Denver, and two bus lines, the Greyhound and the Cap Rock, furnish service in all directions. The city is located at the intersection of Highway 66 and Highway 83.

The city's industries are listed by Clark as natural gas, oil, cattle, cotton, feed, transportation, and trucking.

There are 396 producing oil wells in the Shamrock area, with a daily allowable of 6,277 barrels. The gas field, the largest in the world, is composed of 308 wells with a daily potential of 3,375,568,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

Shamrock's water supply is adequate. The wells and springs located north of town, will produce 1,050 gallons of water per minute, or 1,500,000 gallons per day.

Shamrock has churches of practically every denomination and its schools are modern, aggressive, and adequate. Clubs include Rotary, Boosters, American Legion, American War Dads, and Chamber of Commerce. The city has more than a dozen women's clubs; and fraternal organizations include: Masonic Lodge, Odd Fellows, Eastern Star, Rebekah, Woodmen of the World, Woodman Circle, Royal Neighbors.

The city has a post-office building constructed in recent years at an expenditure of $105,000. The 12 employees of this Federal branch give adequate service, including downtown and residential delivery service. Receipts from this office jumped from $18,500 in 1940 to $29,000 in 1945.

Bank deposits have increased more than $3,000,000 during the past 5 years, the combined deposits of the two local institutions at the time of the last quarterly statement being $4,479,538.49.

Shamrock's volunteer fire department is up-to-date and serves in a commendable manner.

The city's amusements consist of two moving-picture shows, a swimming pool, and parks. Two tennis courts are now under construction.

The city covers an area of one and one-half square miles. The bonded indebtedness is $366,000. The tax valuation of real and personal property is $1,835,699.99. City taxes, based on $1.50 per $100 valuation, amounted to $27,535.48 in 1945. The county tax rate is $1 per $100 valuation; State tax, 61 cents; and school tax, $1.35.

Ticking or No Mattresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for the past year or more the manufacturers of mattresses have been hard put. Apparently OPA has not considered it necessary for this type of industry to succeed or perhaps, even to survive. Perhaps they do not think that mattresses are essential. Perhaps the situation is that they have found it impossible to control prices, artificially fixed prices, in one place without throwing us out of gear in another. It is undoubtedly true that whenever we tinker with the laws of supply and demand, by arbitrarily planning our economy at some point, it unavoidably upsets our economy somewhere else along the line.

A number of people engaged in the business of making mattresses and upholstery have written me and I dare say have written other Members of Congress, complaining about the injustices that they have suffered as a result of price fixing and other regulations of the OPA. Hence I have come to the conclusion that it is ticking or no mattresses for the people.

I am pleased to quote the following letter from an Oklahoma mattress manufacturer on this subject:

We are writing to tell you that we are still finding it very difficult to get any mattress ticking, with which to supply our customers, the mattress manufacturers. In 1945 we received less than 40 percent of what we received in 1944. We had hoped that when the war was over our difficulties would be over, but conditions are getting worse. Many of the mattress factories are now closed down. Many of them have been forced to go out of business, and those that are running are running only part time.

This situation has been very bad for the past 18 months. We wrote you on June 28, 1945 and again on September 12, 1945. Do you recall just what you did about it at that time? Perhaps it was due to your efforts that in early December the mills were given an advance of approximately 17 percent on tickings, and the net result of this has been that we are getting fewer tickings now than we have at any time. In the last year cotton prices have increased 3¾ cents, which is about 17 percent. Perhaps this will explain why the mills do not find tickings attractive, even at the new prices. Wages and other costs have gone up. We had a letter from one mill, saying that they are not making any tickings because the 17-percent increase does not even cover the increase in the cost of raw materials. Another mill writes us that they have discontinued the making of tickings, without giving any reason. The mill's ceiling prices were set in 1942.

Not questioning that the OPA was necessary during the war, it is our belief that if restrictions were removed at this time, the mills would soon be making plenty of ticking, and that competition among the mills would prevent any excessive price rises. Of if the OPA was fully aware of the hardships confronting the mattress manufacturers, they would promptly do something about it. The machinery which has been available for making ample supplies of ticking for the armed services is available now to make tickings for civilian use, and the mills have more help now than they had then.

More UNO "Bunk"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of March 15, 1946:

MORE UNO "BUNK"

Can't anyone in the White House circle talk sense about the UNO? Is there some mysterious force which leads everyone in high Democratic position to assume that whatever he says will be accepted on faith by the public, regardless of its absurdity?

The American people are seriously disturbed by international developments dating back many months. Their trust in the New Deal approach was shaken when it was revealed that the Atlantic Charter was a myth, and that the United States had sold out to Russia in the Crimean Conference.

Widespread uneasiness exists. Nothing is more urgently needed than frank talk.

Instead there has been a string of deceptive and fraudulent discussions of foreign problems, most of which made no pretense whatever of dealing with realities. These messages were adorned with little white lies that on their face were false.

Bluff, good-natured TOM CONNALLY, Texas Senator, and loyal White House errand boy, has just added to the series.

Senator CONNALLY was in an excellent position to give the public just what is needed—a candid explanation of what the skirmishing is about. He is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization which recently met at London.

But he uttered an absurd and misleading talk, quite in keeping with the deceptions already put on the records by such figures as Byrnes and Stettinius.

The opening remarks of Senator CONNALLY set the pace for the rest of his address. Said he:

"It was significant that the first General Assembly was convened in England—that fortress of democracy."

This sounds good, and presumably he put it that way because he liked the phrase. The trouble with the remark is that it is not true. England is no "fortress of democracy," and anyone who opens a discussion of world affairs on such an erroneous assumption may reach some striking conclusions—but they will have no relation to truth and facts.

England is not a democracy. She has officially and formally embraced national socialism, which is the same political creed that Russian Communists say they believe in, and was the philosophy of Hitler and Mussolini. It is the antithesis of democracy.

Later in his talk he speaks of the British Parliament as though that body was still in command of England. He knows perfectly well that Parliament has abdicated; it took a 5-year recess when it extended the war powers for that period, and if England's government is to be defined at all in a single phrase, the definition is neither "democracy" nor "parliamentarianism," but "labor dictatorship."

Under the operations of the war powers act, every one of the British assurances of liberty, dating back to and including the Magna Carta, has been suspended. No longer in England is "every man's home his castle," no longer is it true that "the most fundamental of so-called human rights is that of owning property."

Property rights have been suspended in England. Those who hold private property which the Government wants are forced to surrender it in return for bonds which, in view of the Britons' own statements about their national finances, cannot be worth the paper they are printed on unless the United States underwrites them through the British loan.

The UNO, according to Senator CONNALLY, already is "an outstanding success—an unqualified success."

The same newspapers which printed stories about Senator CONNALLY'S talk also printed the fact that Russia has sent an army into Iran to seize by force what UNO was afraid to say she could or could not have. Everywhere, except to Senator CONNALLY, this was accepted as being a withdrawal by Russia from the UNO—a move that may blow the entire UNO program higher than a kite.

So far as UNO took a position at all on the Iranian matter, it was that Russia ought to withdraw her troops. Instead, the news reports are that military columns there, heavily armed with tanks and other equipment furnished by the United States under lend-lease, are building up rapidly.

Is this success—"outstanding success, unqualified success"?

Senator CONNALLY happily says it is; that "mutual understanding and cooperation with Russia are not insuperable." He also says "the United States will resist aggression by arms."

The contradictions and evasions ran throughout the Senator's talk. With the world threatened with a new war that UNO is admittedly unable to halt, with Russia committed to a program which in his own words is "disquieting and disturbing," Senator CONNALLY still demands that we rely on UNO as "the road to peace."

His illogic is shown in another phase of his comments on Russia. In more places than one in his address, he expressed his sympathy for Russia's "devastated lands" and "piles of ruins" and "graves where sleep hundreds of thousands of gallant Russians"—building a picture of a ruined, desolate and impotent land incapable of causing harm to her neighbors.

Yet this is the same Russia (though one would hardly recognize it from his description) which he says by implication is exerting "tremendous economic or political pressure to subordinate other nations to its will."

The Senator, of course, is embarrased to remember that his associates in the national administration showered the weapons of war so abundantly and with such little judgment upon the Russian Nation during the war that she now has the largest and possibly the best-equipped army in the world—and is preparing to use it ruthlessly against her former allies, if they get in her way.

The Citizen's Role in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an NBC network broadcast from Boston, Mass., the fifty-seventh in a University of the Air series entitled "Our Foreign Policy."

ANNOUNCER. Here is news from Boston: Congresswoman EDITH ROGERS, of Massachusetts, says State Department should take more initiative in getting the facts about foreign affairs to Congress and to the people.

Congressman RYTER, of Connecticut, advocates periodic reports by the State Department to congressional committees.

Francis Russell, of the State Department, says public opinion has an important influence on our foreign policy; advocates community efforts to stimulate discussion of world affairs.

This is the weekly NBC University of the Air program Our Foreign Policy. This time we present a special broadcast from the New England Conference on Radio Education, in Boston, where several hundred of New England's leading educators are gathered. "The Citizen's Role in Foreign Policy" will be discussed by Representatives EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts and JOSEPH F. RYTER of Connecticut, both Members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; and Mr. Francis H. Russell, acting director of the Office of Public Affairs of the State Department. Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air, will be chairman of the discussion. Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. It is quite appropriate that Our Foreign Policy should visit Boston, since Massachusetts is one of the States where this series is used as the basis for an extension course by the State Department of Education. The University of the Air is very proud of this. * * * Now, for more than a year we have been dealing with our foreign policy in operation. But we have never answered this basic question: What can the average citizen do to help formulate and carry out our Nation's foreign policy? Here is a query that crops up frequently in our mailbag, and this is an excellent occasion to deal with it—before a conference of educators. * * * But first, Congressman RYTER, let me ask you: Just how important is popular understanding of our foreign policy?

Mr. RYTER. Popular understanding of what goes on in the world is more important today than ever before—not only here in America, but in Europe, and everywhere in the world.

Mr. FISHER. Why?

Mr. RYTER. Because in a shrinking world such as we live in, we must have mutual understanding among nations if we are to avoid war.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Russell, do you think the people understand the importance of keeping in touch with foreign affairs?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do. Judging from the amount of mail that comes into the State Department, the people are concerned with our foreign relations as never before. They no longer think of foreign policy as being like Mark Twain's conception of the weather—something that everybody complains about, but nobody does anything about. They want to do something about foreign policy. They want a voice in it. As a former resident of this State I know that the Massachusetts law provides for popular referendums on matters of public interest, including foreign affairs. Through this device, the people have expressed their approval of the World Court and World Federation.

Mrs. ROGERS. I've seen interest in world problems growing in my own district in recent years. There is a great deal more discussion of foreign affairs than ever before.

Mr. FISHER. Why do you suppose that is, Congresswoman ROGERS?

Mrs. ROGERS. Well, the war, of course, and especially the influence of the men who have come back from overseas. As time goes on more and more of them will become leaders in their communities. They will want a strong America and a strong, consistent foreign policy. They won't be satisfied with platitudes.

Mr. RYTER. One question people often ask is, Do we have a foreign policy?

Mr. FISHER. Well, Congressman RYTER, do we?

Mr. RYTER. I think we have a basic policy in the Atlantic Charter, although I'm not always sure that we follow through on it.

Mr. FISHER. Congresswoman ROGERS, you are one of the senior Members of Congress. You are the second-ranking Republican in the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking Republican on the Veterans' Committee. You have traveled abroad a great deal studying foreign affairs. Do you think we have a foreign policy?

Mrs. ROGERS. I think we have certain objectives, but we do not always follow them. And we have a number of policies, such as solidarity of the Americas, the open door in Asia, and so on.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe President Truman's Navy Day speech of last October was an excellent summary of the general principles that govern our foreign policy.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Russell, can you summarize that summary for us?

Mr. RUSSELL. The President started by saying that our policy is based on friendly partnership with all peaceful nations, and full support for the United Nations Organization. Then he listed 12 points. The gist of them was about as follows: No territorial expansion for the United States, or for any country unless it accords with the wishes of the peo-

ple concerned; self-government for all people, including eventually those of colonial areas and enemy countries; freedom of expression and religion for all peoples; freedom of the sea and freedom of access to raw materials for all peaceful nations; world-wide economic cooperation to build world trade; and the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. RYTER. Those are general principles. But very often we improvise ways of carrying them out, and hope for the best. We compromise too often.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree, Mr. RYTER, that a set of general principles cannot be regarded as a foreign policy. They are only a point of departure. They indicate the direction in which we want to go. It might be said that our policy toward Argentina and Spain has changed—stiffened—since the end of the war. But our basic objectives have remained the same—to promote peace and self-government and prosperity throughout the world.

Mrs. ROGERS. Let me add one point to the list of objectives you cited, Mr. Russell. We need to look out for our own military and economic security. We have not always done that.

Mr. FISHER. But what about the citizen's role in all this? He's the central figure in this broadcast—Representative RYTER, do you think your constituents are well informed about our foreign relations?

Mr. RYTER. Not as well as they should be. One sign of that is the very general tendency to call people who disagree with you either Fascists or Communists. People are too much inclined to sound off on any issue without even examining the facts.

Mr. FISHER. Can you cite an example, Mr. RYTER?

Mr. RYTER. The British loan—or rather agreement, since it's more than a loan—is one example. There is too much of a tendency to be for or "agin" it right off the bat—to reach a hasty conclusion which we may regret later, at our leisure.

Mr. FISHER. No; Congresswoman ROGERS, let me ask you this: Do you think the State Department has done as much as it should to in Belmont, Mass.?

Mrs. ROGERS. No, Mr. Fisher, I do not. The State Department could do a great deal more than it has to get the facts to the people—and to their Representatives in Congress. I believe its officials should take more initiative than they have to keep Congress well informed. And the House of Representatives should get just as much information as the Senate. We may not ratify treaties, but after all we are very close to the people.

Mr. RYTER. That's right—the State Department has often neglected to give congressional committees the information they need to act intelligently.

Mr. FISHER. But, Congressman RYTER, what bearing does this have on Bill Johnson, our average citizen?

Mr. RYTER. Plenty, Mr. Fisher. If Members of Congress are well informed, they will discuss the issues more intelligently on the floor. Committee members will be better able to answer questions on pending legislation. And don't forget, the average Congressman broadcasts to his home district every 2 or 3 weeks, and sends material to the newspapers in his district on these things. So you can get information to the people through their representatives on the Hill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Russell, can you speak for the State Department on this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly agree with Congresswoman ROGERS and Congressman RYTER that the Department should do everything possible to give Members of Congress and the American people all the information possible. I think that great steps have been taken in both of these directions in recent years. Some of the top officers in the Department, including the Secretary, spend a substantial part of their time on the Hill. Assistant Secretaries have been known to appear before three or four committees in a single day.

Mr. FISHER. It's a wonder they have time to get their work done in the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. You have to remember that during the last 2 years the State Department has had the heaviest legislative program of any Government agency in history. Both Congress and the Department, as well as the American people, have taken historic strides forward in formulating and implementing a new foreign policy. We answer many requests from Congressmen for information or for an expression of the Department's policies every week. And the Department makes an annual report to Congress, when the budget is being considered.

Mr. RYTER. Nevertheless, I think that in the House of Representatives we hear from the State Department altogether too infrequently between budget hearings. I think we should have more frequent and regular reports to appropriate committees on various aspects of the Department's work.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the State Department has regular liaison with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and leading members of that committee and of your own House Foreign Affairs Committee have been sent to various international conferences—at Mexico City, San Francisco, London. You were at Mexico City, I believe, Mrs. ROGERS.

Mrs. ROGERS. That's right. But I'd like to add this: Our Foreign Affairs Committee doesn't hold enough hearings to keep in touch with the Department's work. In 1941, just before the war, we held only two hearings in a 5-month period, except for those that I forced by introducing resolutions of inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I'm sure that the State Department would be glad to send people up to discuss its work with your committee as often as you wish to invite them. Of course, the Department has to be careful that it is not accused of lobbying when it tries to make this information available to Congress. At least a half dozen departments and agencies in Washington have been accused of that. Nevertheless, I agree that some way should be found for bringing about as close a relationship as possible between the Department and Congress. An effective foreign policy requires it.

Mr. FISHER. Now, I don't like to keep bringing this up, but how about Bill Johnson, the average citizen? Mr. Russell, what is the State Department doing for him?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that's a key question. I agree it's very desirable to convey a maximum of information to Congress—but that isn't enough. We have to do what we can to meet the popular demand for information on foreign policy more directly. We use such means as publication of basic materials, press conferences, conferences with representatives of labor, business, farm groups, religious groups, women's groups, and foreign policy groups; and participation in this and other radio programs, as well as occasional talks by officers of the Department at the invitation of private organizations. I hasten to add, however, that we are able to handle about 1 out of every 25 requests that are received for talks.

Mr. FISHER. Do you think, Mr. Russell, that this sort of program reaches a very large part of the American public?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; over a period of time. The public debate over the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the United Nations Charter was a good example. We sent out hundreds of thousands of copies of these documents to people who requested them. The press, radio, and even the movies told the story of Dumbarton Oaks. The great majority of people in America become familiar with the proposals in a general way. At San Francisco, representatives of 42 leading national and civic organizations actually suggested several clauses which were incorporated into the United Nations Charter. Similar steps have been taken to secure public participation in the formulation of the UNESCO Charter, the International Trade Organization proposals, and others.

Mr. FISHER. Congressman RYTER, is the State Department doing its information job to your satisfaction?

Mr. RYTER. Well, Mr. Fisher, I think the information work of the State Department is valuable. But it has its dangers, too. People are apt to think that information put out by a Government department is propaganda. That's partly because the information released is so highly selected.

Mrs. ROGERS. I don't believe the State Department does as much as it should to get all the facts to the people. If the public had had all the facts in the years preceding the war, it's my firm belief that war would have been averted. The neutrality legislation, which the administration asked for and which I opposed, lulled America to sleep. As a result, we were very weak in a military way. Of course, I realize, Mr. Russell, that you have to use a certain amount of discretion in dealing with questions involving our security, in order not to aggravate a troubled situation. But let's have full information, and not rely on the atom bomb to keep the peace, as America relied on the Neutrality Act before.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mrs. ROGERS, you and Mr. RYTER have just expressed very neatly a dilemma which the State Department faces, and perhaps always will. If we release information, we're called propagandists; if we don't release it, we're accused of secrecy. According to a recent opinion poll, 45 percent of the American people feel that too much information about foreign affairs is kept secret. We get criticized either way—but we keep trying to steer the middle course.

Mr. FISHER. It seems to me there is a tendency toward more frankness, toward releasing more complete information, in recent months. I'm thinking of the State Department's exposure of Nazi influences in Argentina and Spain.

Mr. RYTER. Even there, Mr. Fisher, the long delay in publishing the facts made it seem as if the purpose were to justify our policy, rather than to enlighten the public.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can say this, Congressman: The State Department's policy is to release as much information as possible, and as quickly as possible, insofar as it does not interfere with the attainment of the basic objectives of our foreign policy.

Mr. RYTER. But a maximum of information should be made available to Members of Congress, even if it can't all be made public.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree.

Mr. FISHER. Now to get down to our main question: What can the average citizen do about all this? First of all, Congresswoman ROGERS, how do you recommend that he inform himself about international affairs, so he can act intelligently?

Mrs. ROGERS. Well, Mr. Fisher, since this broadcast originates at a meeting of educators, let me say that teachers have a great responsibility in this regard. Surely they ought to be better equipped to sift the facts about international affairs than most people. I believe they should try very hard to present an unprejudiced picture of foreign affairs to their students.

Mr. RUSSELL. By so doing, they will bring about an interest in foreign affairs not only among the children but among their parents. My young son brings a good many new ideas home from school, and our whole family enjoys discussing them. To a very large extent the subject matter of the conversation at the

dinner table is dictated by the children. I know that's true in my family.

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, Mr. Russell; parents are always interested in the activities of their children. But the teacher's responsibilities go even further. He, or she, should take an active part in the intellectual life of his community. Teachers have a lot to contribute, on both international and domestic affairs, and I'm convinced that their teaching would be improved by more of an exchange of ideas with other sections of the community.

Mr. RYTER. The matter of where teachers—and other citizens—get their information on foreign affairs is also important. They ought to rely not only on Government handouts, but also on the press, radio, magazines, and the like—independent sources that are, like Caesar's wife, "beyond suspicion." Or should be, if they're not.

Mrs. ROGERS. That is essential, Mr. RYTER. If you're going to arrive at the truth, you have to check all these sources against each other.

Mr. RYTER. No one should accept Government releases as gospel truth. That's the road to totalitarianism. The citizen should read and listen to everything he can lay his hands on, talk it over, and make up his own mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. That's exactly what the State Department tries to encourage, Congressman RYTER. We make information available when it's requested or when we think it's needed, but we certainly want people to get facts from other sources as well. And we want to see free discussion of world issues, because we believe that if this occurs, the cream of the opinion will rise to the top. It's pretty obvious today that foreign affairs are everybody's business. If everyone doesn't take part in shaping our foreign policy, democracy will suffer.

Mr. FISHER. Congresswoman ROGERS, you mentioned that our communities need a better understanding of international affairs. Can you give us an example of how that can be brought about?

Mrs. ROGERS. Why, yes, Mr. Fisher—right here in Massachusetts. About a year ago the city of Worcester ran a very successful project called "Worcester and the World." For several months a leading member of the United Nations was honored each week.

Mr. FISHER. That started, incidentally, with the program manager of the local radio station, who got the cooperation of the mayor.

Mrs. ROGERS. That's right, but the whole town took it up. In fact, they were very enthusiastic about it. Each Monday, Mayor William Bennett would proclaim that it was Australia Week, or Netherlands Week, or Norway Week, and the flag of the country that was honored was raised over the city hall. The radio carried special programs, ranging from recipes to folk music, the papers carried special articles, and the libraries and stores held special exhibits on the nation that was being honored. The ministers frequently related their sermons to the country under discussion. Prominent representatives of the nation were invited to visit Worcester during the week, to speak to civic groups and deliver a public lecture at Clark University. Often shortwave broadcasts were arranged by the local station during the week, on which Worcester's civic leaders exchanged greetings and information with people in the other countries. Before the week was over, the people of Worcester felt much closer to the people of an allied country than ever before. Mayor Bennett put it this way: "We must somehow understand the Chinese, the American, the Pole, and the South African are alike human beings, with a common desire to live in peace and security. Lack of understanding breeds distrust, suspicion, and ultimately hatred and warfare."

Mr. FISHER. That was a very ambitious program.

Mrs. ROGERS. But very much worthwhile, Mr. Fisher, and one that other cities and towns could very well copy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Congressman RYTER, I had a very interesting experience in your State only 2 weeks ago. I was invited to New Caanan, Conn., to talk to several civic groups about this very subject—the citizen's role in foreign policy. I found the people very much interested in these matters. All that's required is for someone, or some group, to start the ball rolling.

Mr. RYTER. I think that interest is typical of most towns in my State, Mr. Russell. And I know that the schools, in Hartford and other places, are constantly conducting studies and projects on other countries. The social sciences, in particular, do a good job of this.

Mr. RUSSELL. And interest usually continues, once it is aroused. In New Canaan, a permanent committee has been set up.

Mr. FISHER. Which brings us to our $64 question, Mr. Russell. What can Bill Johnson do to influence foreign policy? Will that committee in New Canaan take action to influence our policy on specific issues?

Mr. RUSSELL. The function of that particular committee will not be to pass resolutions or promote particular points of view. Its job will be merely to make sure that there is as much information and discussion about foreign affairs as possible in New Canaan; to coordinate the activities of the schools, libraries, clubs, churches, and other organizations; to make sure that the old New England habit of town meeting discussions and cracker barrel sessions flourishes as actively as possible in new forms. The other groups with which that committee will work may, of course—and many of them will—take positions one way or another on various issues.

Mr. FISHER. What kind of action?

Mr. RUSSELL. The individual can act in many ways. He can write letters to the State Department and to his congressional representatives in Washington or to the newspapers. He can support organizations that are committed to the things for which he stands, and get them to pass resolutions. He can get his community to carry out a program such as the ones in Worcester and New Canaan.

Mr. RYTER. Aside from electing Senators and Congressmen who reflect their views, Mr. Fisher, the most effective means the average citizen has of influencing national policy is by expressing his views in letters and resolutions.

Mr. RUSSELL. This sort of activity is just as important as voting and paying taxes, in my opinion.

Mr. FISHER. Tell me, Congressman RYTER, what is your reaction to letters from your constituents on questions of foreign policy? Do you take them seriously?

Mr. RYTER. I certainly do. All Congressmen take their mail seriously.

Mr. FISHER. Do the letters you receive influence your opinions?

Mr. RYTER. Of course you usually have an opinion on any public issue to begin with. But thoughtful letters from constituents often modify that opinion.

Mr. FISHER. What do you mean by "thoughtful letters"?

Mr. RYTER. Well, you soon learn to evaluate letters. The ones that I take most seriously are from people who take the trouble to tell why they hold certain views. Letters should also be reasonably short, so they don't take too much time to read. Unfortunately, most of the mail we get is from people who just say they're for or against something, and who are highly emotional about it. Some of them run on for many pages without giving you a single well-reasoned argument to support their views.

Mr. FISHER. How do you feel about organized letter-writing campaigns?

Mr. RYTER. Well, when some group bombards you with cards or letters, all saying the same thing, of course you don't pay so much attention to them. We discount this sort of mail heavily. And you soon learn to recognize the "repeaters"—people who write you two or three times a week, on the slightest provocation. Letters from people who write only occasionally, on issues they are really interested in, are the ones I read most carefully. I pay least attention of all to anonymous letters, or letters with a signature but no address.

Mr. FISHER. Do you get many of those?

Mr. RYTER. Quite a few. You see, as Congressman-at-large from Connecticut, I get all those addressed simply to "Congress" from my State.

Mr. FISHER. Well, that provides real insight into the congressional mailbag. Congresswoman ROGERS, does your experience check with Mr. RYTER's?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, except that I rarely get anonymous letters. I receive a great deal of mail—all that my staff and I can handle, and sometimes more than we can answer. I especially appreciate letters from persons thoughtful enough to say, "We know you're busy, so don't bother to answer." I read those with special care, because I know they write to give me certain information, rather than just to get a reply.

Mr. FISHER. How about mail addressed to the Foreign Affairs Committee—what happens to that?

Mrs. ROGERS. It goes to the chairman of the committee, and some of it is made available to committee members. Sometimes a letter or resolution which represents an important segment of opinion is included in our hearings, in the printed record.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Russell, how many letters do you get at the State Department every day?

Mr. RUSSELL. About 400 on the average, including those which are sent over from the White House for reply. But the number has gone as high as 6,000 a day. That happened during the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. FISHER. What happens to all those letters?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are carefully read, classified, and answered by a special section in the Office of Public Affairs. Outstanding letters are sent to the top officers in the Department for reply.

Mr. FISHER. But does public opinion actually influence State Department policy?

Mr. RUSSELL. The best answer to that is we can't have an effective foreign policy without strong public backing. We know this. Our office studies the opinion polls, reads and analyzes some 200 newspapers and numerous magazines and radio commentaries, studies trends in the mail we get, and sends regular reports covering these matters to top officials in the Department. Our policy is definitely influenced by all this. As former Secretary of State Cordell Hull once said, "Foreign policy is not a mysterious game carried on by diplomats," but "the task of focusing and giving effect in the world * * * to the will of 135,000,000 people through the constitutional processes which govern our democracy."

Mr. FISHER. The average citizen has a voice in foreign policy, then—if he cares to use it.

Mr. RUSSELL. He certainly does; and there is another thing the citizen can do to make our leadership in world affairs more effective: That is, to help keep our own house in order—to help demonstrate that democracy really works.

Mr. FISHER. How do you mean, Mr. Russell?

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean this: When we combat racial discrimination, abolish slums, assure a wider distribution of medical services, or otherwise enrich the lives of our own people, we show the strength of our democratic system and thereby gain prestige and influence in other countries.

Mr. RYTER. Keeping our own house in order is the best way to combat foreign ideologies.

Mrs. ROGERS. In Springfield, Mass., for several years there has been an educational campaign for racial and religious tolerance. It started in the schools, but adult education spread the idea to other groups. The idea was to show what each of the various racial and national groups in the city's population had contributed to the Nation's culture. It had a fine effect, both in the minority groups and among the others.

Mr. FISHER. What about other Massachusetts cities?

Mrs. ROGERS. In the high schools of Lowell, there are more Poles, Lithuanians, Greeks, and children of other recent immigrant groups than old-line Americans. But there is no friction. We practice democracy in all our schools.

Mr. FISHER. Congressman RYTER, what about Connecticut?

Mr. RYTER. I think some of the best work in my State has been done by interfaith councils—local organizations of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. They have carried on a very effective campaign for better understanding and religious tolerance, on the radio, in the press, and even on billboards.

Mr. RUSSELL. Along this same line, the average citizen can help to cement international friendship by welcoming visitors from other countries.

Mrs. ROGERS. That is very important, Mr. Russell. We can start by welcoming the war brides that our veterans have brought to America. We can take pleasure in showing them our way of doing things, and we can learn some things from them as well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Mrs. ROGERS; and American communities can very well take the initiative in inviting people from other countries to visit us. The Newspaper Publishers' Association of Virginia plans to invite editors and reporters from several countries to live and work with the editors of Virginia papers for 3 months during the coming year.

Mrs. ROGERS. I think that sort of thing is splendid.

Mr. RUSSELL. The State Department wants to promote these contacts—exchanges of teachers, librarians, doctors, technicians of all sorts. We can furnish American organizations with the names of corresponding groups in other countries and help to arrange exchanges. We believe we've got to learn to say, "Hi, neighbor," to Juan, Jean, Johan and Hans as well as plain John Smith.

Mr. RYTER. There's nothing like personal contacts to build up international understanding.

Mr. FISHER. Congressman, I suppose travel is one of the best ways.

Mr. RYTER. It would be, if more people here and abroad could afford to travel.

Mrs. ROGERS. And if when they did travel, they could stay long enough to meet and know the people. Too many Americans stay 3 days in a country and then come home and try to write a book.

Mr. RYTER. I think a large-scale exchange of students with other countries will do more than anything else, in the long run.

Mr. FISHER. Now, I'd like to try to add up what you have said. You all agree that popular understanding of our foreign policy is very important. The Congressmen feel that the State Department is not doing all it should to supply the facts the public needs——

Mr. RYTER. And Congress needs.

Mr. FISHER. You all agree that the citizen can make a real contribution to foreign policy, not only at election time but between elections. He can do it by letting his Government and his representatives in Washington know how he feels, and why, on specific issues. He can also contribute by helping to arouse interest in world affairs in his own community. And he can show the world that democracy works by cleaning up his own back yard.

Mrs. ROGERS. And by giving a warm welcome to foreign visitors in his community. And, let me add one thing, Mr. Fisher: The most practical day-to-day contribution every American can make is to save food. Every bit of grain we save will help prevent starvation abroad, and that certainly will help to bring about peace.

Mr. RYTER. Prevention of starvation is certainly part of our foreign policy.

Mrs. ROGERS. And when you do it voluntarily, it's fun to see how much you can save.

United Nations Organization Gives Appropriate Recognition to 85,000,000 Cooperators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to include with my remarks a portion of the news release of the Cooperative League News Service dated February 21, 1946, which tells about the action of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization in voting to include the International Cooperative Alliance as one of three organizations given permanent consultative status by this world body.

It is indeed appropriate that this should be done, for the cooperative movement is indeed the largest voluntary popular movement in the entire world today.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF UNO VOTES CONSULTATIVE STATUS TO WORLD COOPERATIVES INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ALLIANCE GIVEN PERMANENT PLACE IN ECONOMIC COUNCIL

NEW YORK.—The General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, at its final session in London, February 14, confirmed the action of the Political and Security Committee recommending permanent consultative status for the International Cooperative Alliance in the Economic and Social Council.

Final action came after days of heated debate about the status to be granted to the World Federation of Trade Unions and the American Federation of Labor. On motion of the United States Delegation equal status was given to all three organizations with the door left open for affiliation later of other nongovernmental organizations. The recommendation from the committee had been on a vote of 25 to 8. In the General Assembly meeting, the Soviet Union and Ukranian delegations again submitted amendments which would give permanent consultative status only to the WFTU. These amendments were voted down 26 to 12.

The International Cooperative Alliance is a world federation of cooperatives composed of the national cooperative organizations of 37 countries with a total membership of 85,000,000 families. It is the largest voluntary economic organization in the world and includes both rural and urban cooperatives throughout the world. Two additional national organizations, the Cooperative Federation of Australia and the Cooperative League of China were added to membership in the ICA since the first application for consultative status in the Economic and Social Council was presented to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations. The proposal, drafted by the ICA, was presented in San Francisco by Howard A. Cowden, chairman of the International Cooperative Committee of the Cooperative League, Wallace J. Campbell, assistant secretary of the League, and Stanley Sindelka of the Consumers Cooperative Association, who represented the consumer-purchasing cooperatives in San Francisco.

Why Small Farms Go Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor of the Bennington Banner of Bennington, Vt., Rob Jepson, of Stamford, points out very plainly why small farms go out of business in New England. It is a letter which deserves careful reading by everybody interested in the aggravating problems with which the so-called small farmer has to contend. Under unanimous consent I am including the letter as an extension of my remarks:

WHY SMALL FARMS GO OUT OF BUSINESS

EDITOR OF THE BANNER:

I don't know but I can imagine why small farms are going out of business. Stamford depends on North Adams for its market. I can remember when Stamford's small farms kept from two to forty cows. Look at them now. The places start on the east road. The Brown girls live on the Stroud farm, no cows; Cameron, no cows; Anna Hammond, no cows; Hill farm, no cows; Fitch farm, no cows—they used to keep forty or fifty; Gangemi farm, no cows; Jillson, no cows. Now start on the main road: Millard farm, no cows; Cutler, no cows; Bishop farm, no cows; Phelps, no cows; J. O. Sanford, no cows; M. Sanford, no cows; Paradise farm, two cows; Warren Clough, no cows. And so on. Look at those farms now, nice lawn and flower gardens. Pretty, I admit. The hill farms have most all quit. They are covered with brush and goldenrod now.

Years ago anybody if he had 10 quarts of raw milk could sell anywhere he wished, but now he has got to have it pasteurized. Some farmers can't afford to put in a plant of their own. If he gets the big fellow to do it for him he has to pay 2 cents a quart. But he has got to sell his milk at the same price as the big fellow. Pasteurizing is good of course but why make the farmer pay for it. The milk control board says to keep milk prices down to the 1941 level. Pittsfield gets more for milk than North Adams.

Compare the prices the farmers pay for grain and labor now and before the war. Farm labor has almost doubled. Grain the same. The Government gave me 35 cents for a hundred pounds of milk last summer. Now they pay 70 cents a hundred. I don't blame the men for refusing to work on the farm. They can get big pay for 40 hours in the factory. On the farm they work 70 or 80 hours. Some people think the farmer works 8 hours a day. He does. Eight hours before dinner and 8 hours after dinner. A farmer has to be a jack of all trades, plumber, butcher, carpenter, veterinary, and so forth.

Speaking of veterinary, I remember one case. I was invited out to a swell party. Before going to it I went out to the barn and I saw that I was going to have a confinement case on my hands. The cow did not act right. I tried to get a "vet." but I

guess they were all out of town. I don't remember. So I had to take over. I came in the house at midnight that night. My wife said, "How is your patient getting along?" Fine and dandy, I says. Baby is nursing. Mother is doing as well as can be expected. Well that was once I saved a cow.

We sent representatives to the legislature to make laws. They passed one bill where all farmers "shall have their cows tested." That was a good bill. No farmer wants to keep a cow that is not OK. They appropriated a large sum of money to have it done. Where did the money go? Most of it to the white-collar help in the office. To end up the bill the farmer shall have to pay for the testing. Then they appropriated a large sum of money to help the farmer. Use lots of lime and sulphur phosphate either on meadows or pasture. How much of that money ended up on the farm? The white-collar man got a lot. Well, it makes a lot more white-collar jobs, anyway.

I was at one of the AAA meetings. In the morning one big shot got up and outlined the meeting. In the afternoon another big shot explained what and how they would deal with this and that material, lime and sulphate, etc. One farmer got up and said that after he got his fall plowing done in 1945 he knew how much lime he would use on his farm. So he got the lime and spread it. So what we call the big shot said, "The by-laws say that nobody can use any of this lime until January 1946." A lot of good farmers are going to get out of waiting that long. The lime will rot by the roadside until it can be used. The man that spread his lime before time, if he got anything from the Government, he has got to lie. If he lies he goes to jail. I guess he is just as well off. Shorter hours, three meals a day. How many people didn't lie a little when rationing began. I heard one fellow say rationing made liars out of all of us. Thanks to our county agent, though. He stood up for the farmer.

The New England farmer is up against it in lots of ways. One farmer I heard say, has a pasture that is so stony he has to shorten his cows' noses so that they can eat grass between the stones. He would like to fence it off for sugaring maples but he can't get no fencing.

Now about the grain. Gosh, it's awful. We can't blame the local grain dealer. He is rationed, too. I know one week I was out of grain. My dealer was out of his regular grain. He sent me a substitute. I looked at the label. It read: 100 pounds dairy feed, a complete dairy ration for better milk; 18 percent protein, ingredients so and so, so much ground rock, so much meat scraps, etc. I want my cows to give milk, not lay eggs. That grain was for hens. The cows would not be classed with hens and would not eat it. That grain was mixed and bagged in the west and sent east. No ceiling price, thus someone made good on that scrap. Compare the price of a quart of milk to a quart of beer. Milk, 15 cents; beer, 25 cents. How many kids' health is ruined by drinking too much milk? Not many. But a lot of big kids' health and home is ruined by too much beer. Don't it take sugar and grain to make beer? You don't see beer rationed.

Now here is a little case about funny laws a farmer has to put up with. Years ago we wanted to remodel our milk room. We had the local barn inspector come up and advise us what to do to abide by the Massachusetts laws for selling and disposing of our milk. Mr. Hyde, the local inspector at the time, was only too glad to give his advice. Things went all right until the State inspector came along. He couldn't find any fault with the barn so he began on the milk room. Had to seal up the milk room. I suppose if the germs got in they could not get out. He said I could not sell any of my milk until I sealed up the room. I tried to reason with him. I said I had a lot of hay down, it was nice weather and I wanted to get it in. He told me he and his wife were going up on a little trip in Vermont over the week end. "If the milk room is not sealed up, sides and bottom, when I come back you can't sell milk in Massachusetts. You had better let the haying go and fix up your milk room."

Well, he kept his word. He was back when he said he would. He had his wife with him. I suppose it was his wife, a darn good looker. He didn't introduce her to me. He said, "You did a darn good job, Rob." I said, "You done a good job on my hay, too. It rained yesterday and the hay is still out." "Too bad," was all he said, but when the cows ate that hay the next winter if they could have talked they would have damned that man worse than I did.

Now talk about butter. Who is going to put 8 to 10 quarts of milk into a pound of butter and sell it for the ceiling price? Yes, that is nice. Instead of working in a factory the farmer can go in his field in the summer, watch the deer eat salt with the cows, watch the gray bob rabbit eat the beet tops in the garden, watch the crows pull his corn. I tried to get some bullets one day and the clerk told me he was going to keep his bullets for the sports fans. I don't know as I blame him, those boys are tied up in that mill for 40 hours a week. They ought to have some recreation and a chance to get some fresh air shooting at some good-for-nothing target.

Look at the apple question. Some people thought I should get rich on my apple orchard. If I could have sold the apple blossoms I might have. Every tree was plumb filled, but a big snowstorm came in May and froze all blossoms and broke down a good many trees. Some years ago, I had a good crop. I spent a lot of time pruning, lots of time spraying. I started for the country store one morning. The storekeeper showed me a paper (the law of Vermont). Nobody could sell any apples unless they were graded. Well, I had no grader. Big fish eat little ones. I guess the only way to get rid of apples and abide by the law is to make cider and then drink the cider. I tried that before I went on the water wagon. I found it did not pay. True, the farmer can get his meat by killing his animals, but who wants to live on a dead hog, or on beefsteak, all the time?

I've been tied to a cow's tail ever since I was a kid big enough to sit on a stool. I am ready to quit. I am going to try that 40 hours a week working for somebody else and if I can keep my farmer ambition up I'll use the other 40 hours raising a lot of my favorite stuff to live on.

I think you will see the small New England farmer keep going out of business until somebody in Washington changes the ceiling prices on corn, and ships more wheat east and less across. Some people say if the small farmer sells his cows some other farmer will buy them for milk cows. I have seen a lot of nice young cows that ought to be bred again being kept over and just milked through their flush period and then slaughtered. Yes, the farmer has all the cream and butter and beef, and all that stuff, say the city folk, but let them try to come up and raise it. I'll swap jobs with them any day.

Labor Paper Writes Editorial on Capital and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Labor News is a weekly paper published at Long Beach, Calif. The editor thereof is a distinguished member of the Assembly of the California State Legislature, Carl Fletcher.

As it presents a point in another different and refreshing fashion, I am pleased to have unanimous consent to have it printed. It appeared February 22, 1946, as follows:

CAPITAL AND LABOR

The current wave of strikes throughout the Nation is often referred to as a struggle between capital and labor. But, the fact is that in America it is a pretty difficult thing to draw a line between the two since, in many respects, they are identical.

The man who spends less than he earns and puts his savings into United States Savings bonds or a bank savings account, or a share of stock, creates capital. So, while he may be a laborer he is also a capitalist.

Obviously, then, capital is not composed exclusively of wealthy or well-to-do investors who do not have to work for a living. True, there are many wealthy individuals in the capitalistic group, but in it there are many more persons of modest means.

If there is a stigma attached to capital or to being a capitalist—and it would seem that some elements in the country seek to create that impression—then that stigma is on the great mass of Americans who are wise and careful enough with their incomes to keep ahead financially.

The American economic system is a capitalistic system and there is no reason to be apologetic because of it. In the higher wages, better products, lower prices, and generally superior living conditions it has created, it is without parallel in the world.

Capital is not a curse, it's a benefit. And in the final analysis, the interests of capital and labor are not divergent, they are very much the same.

Increase in National Minimum Wage Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Assembly of the California Legislature adopted assembly joint resolution 18 on February 14, 1946. Four days later, on February 18, 1946, the resolution was adopted in the Senate of the State of California.

The title of this resolution is "Relative to Memoralizing Congress to Provide for an Increase in the National Minimum Wage Structure."

Under unanimous consent, I insert this resolution in the RECORD at this point so the House may know the official action taken by the Legislature of the State of California.

The resolution reads as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 18

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to provide for an increase in the national minimum-wage structure

Whereas legislation is pending before the United States Congress to increase the minimum wage prescribed under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; and

Whereas since 1938 the purchasing power of the dollar has declined sharply along with

an increase in prices and cost of living, all of which has resulted in an actual decrease in the amount of real wages represented by the minimum wage of the Fair Labor Standards Act; and

Whereas the need of protecting the national purchasing power and maintaining a minimum standard of living necessary for the health, efficiency, and well-being of wage earners may be at least partially achieved by increasing the present minimum wage; and

Whereas in view of the demonstrated capacity of our country to produce far beyond prewar levels and the need of attaining an economy of full production and abundance, the raising of the minimum standard is a reasonable beginning to this ultimate goal: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation at the earliest possible date to provide for an increase in the national minimum wage structure; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Stay of Execution of Political Prisoners in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, following press reports that they had been condemned to death for political offenses against the present Spanish Government, a joint cablegram asking a stay of execution for Maria Teresa Toral, Mercedes Gomez, and Isabel Saenz, was sent to the Spanish Chief of State, Generalissimo Francisco Franco, by myself and Congresswomen EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, and CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the following reply from Generalissimo Franco's secretary as reported in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post is called to the attention of Members and of the public:

FRANCO INFORMS MRS. LUCE WOMEN REBELS WILL LIVE

(By Oscar Hume)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—Representative CLARE BOOTH LUCE today revealed she has received optimistic assurances from Generalissimo Franco's headquarters concerning the fate of three women, one of them said to be a famous scientist, whose impending execution by the Spanish Government had been reported.

The report occasioned an official protest to Franco and Secretary of State Byrnes, signed by Mrs. LUCE, Representative CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, and three other women Members of Congress.

WOMEN WON'T FACE DEATH

The reply, signed by Franco's secretary, said the women in question were in no danger of capital punishment, that political crimes are not punished in Spain with the death penalty, and that in all cases of women sentenced to capital punishment, Franco grants amnesty.

Secretary Byrnes replied he did not have the facts in the matter but would investigate through the embassy in Madrid. Mrs. LUCE expressed hope this investigation would bear out the statements of Franco's secretary.

The reply from Franco's headquarters was sent in Spanish and was translated in Mrs. LUCE's office by her secretary, Albert P. Morano, who said he studied the language 6 months in high school and continued to learn it because he likes it.

GOOD FAITH MISLED

The communication, as translated by Morano, said:

"Your good faith has been misled by an insidious campaign. In Spain irreparable punishment is not imposed for political crimes. The woman referred to in your cablegram is under trial for terroristic activities, and capital punishment has not been requested. Punishment is always less in the case of feminine delinquents, who always enjoy the fruits of maximum benevolence meted out by the chief of state, who grants amnesty in cases of capital punishment."

Secretary Byrnes said he would inform Mrs. LUCE further as soon as reports have been received from the United States Embassy.

The women, whose reported fate occasioned the exchange of communications, are Mercedes Gomez, Isabella Sanz, and Maria Teresa Toral, said to be well-known in the scientific world.

Pay Increase for Postal Employees Has Public Approval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the public in general favors an increase in pay for postal employees. No group of Federal employees over a long period of years have been so poorly provided for in salary increases.

Several days ago I appeared before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in support of the proposed legislation to give these deserving servants of the public an annual increase of $500. Even this amount, I personally feel, is not adequate to allow the men and women who are operating our postal service to cope with the rising cost of living.

In this connection, under leave to do so, I herewith include an editorial on this subject from the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of March 11, 1946, because the views as expressed by Publisher Robert L. Kern are identical to my own. The editorial follows:

Last July the Nation's postal employees got their first raise in 20 years.

Last October a Federal Post Office Department order, eliminating overtime pay in post offices, had the effect of more than wiping out this $400 yearly increase, since it reduced take-home pay some 35 percent.

After deductions for pensions and taxes, a large number of postal workers are today receiving smaller checks than they did in 1925.

In view of the present cost of living it is not surprising that many of their families are reported to be in actual want.

Congress is trying to do something about it.

Last week the congressional committee in charge of a bill granting a $300-a-year boost began a discussion of the measure.

The amount proposed seems hardly adequate, particularly for the vast majority of postal employees whose yearly wage ranges from $1,700 to $2,000.

An amendment raising this increase to $500, urged by the postal workers, is more in keeping with the recent wage formulas that have come out of Washington.

It is none too much when one considers that the only raise postal employees have had in two decades has fallen short of bringing them up to the living standard they enjoyed in the middle twenties.

America's Responsibility in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me recently at Birmingham, Ala.:

We have just gone through one of the most fateful years in the history of the world; 1945 saw the most devastating war that was ever visited on civilization come to a successful conclusion. It saw the utter destruction of two world powers and the destruction, for all time, I hope, of aggression and hate.

Today the United States is in a most enviable position. Our capacity to produce goods and wares for the needs of mankind was increased during the war period, while the capacity of all other great manufacturing nations was greatly reduced by the ravages of war. We also came out of the war the undisputed leader in international affairs. Our position is not an easy one. Whether or not we ever have another war, a war that in all probability would end civilization, largely depends upon how we handle the trust that has been thrust upon us by victory.

In 1919 we were in somewhat of a similar position. All lovers of freedom looked to America for leadership. We had an opportunity to imprint the love of liberty and freedom in the hearts of all mankind; we had an opportunity to take our place with other great powers in a cooperative movement to outlaw war and unfair international trade practices. We shirked that duty; and our action was partially responsible for the international economic collapse of 1929 which, in turn, made it possible for the demagogic Mussolini and the demoniacal Hitler to rise to power and shake the very foundations of civilization.

America must make a choice now—a choice that will chart the course of history. This choice will be made by the Congress of the United States. It will reflect the expressed majority will of the American people. Public opinion, when properly crystallized, always influences the decisions of Congress. If we fail to cooperate with other great powers in an effort to eliminate for all time the possibilities of another war, the responsibility will rest directly on the shoulders of the individual American. It is up to you as individuals to use your sound judgment and to express your views to your elected

representatives on the question of international cooperation.

Today, there are many grave threats to international cooperation. Many of these threats can be removed if concerted efforts are made by all the great powers. We Americans are peculiar people. No nation in the world loves peace more than we do, but no nation in the world becomes unified more quickly when war is visited upon us than we do. Yet the threatening seeds that grow into wars are usually entirely ignored by Americans. In the time we should use to cooperate with other nations to prevent wars, we are usually too busy trying to make money or enjoying life to take the trouble to eliminate the then impotent evil forces that will eventually grow into a global war. We have dearly paid for the folly of isolationism. After becoming embroiled in two world wars within the last 25 years, I hope the costly victory bought with the blood and labor of our country will cause us to steer the ship of state on the right course. Victory has brought us many other responsibilities.

Some few thoughtless Americans criticise us for appropriating huge sums of money to feed, clothe and help rehabilitate the peoples of other countries. I, of course, hope that this drain on our Treasury can be stopped at an early date. I hope that all nations in the world will, in the near future, become self-supporting. Most of the European countries have been devastated as a result of the recent war; their livestock killed; their transportation system paralyzed; their seed for crops destroyed. Hungry people, when banded together in sufficient numbers, can cause revolutions; revolutions give rise to dictatorships, and dictatorships give rise to aggression; aggression results in war. For selfish reasons, we cannot afford to let others starve. International trade, if abused by us or any other nation, can also give rise to war. With our present undisputable superiority in the capacity to produce, we are enabled to capture a large percentage of world trade. If we so desired, we could ruthlessly destroy all competition for the time being; but sooner or later other nations, in order to survive, would have to raise trade barriers, which would directly contribute to another world wide economic collapse.

These are a few of the responsibilities our Nation is faced with today. We have many domestic responsibilities. Of paramount importance today is the rehabilitation of over twelve million members of the armed forces who have been, and are now being, discharged. These men who made victory possible, must be given job opportunities commensurate with their skills and intelligence; those who have been maimed in mind and body must be adequately cared for, and housing must be furnished immediately for returning veterans. We must have a well-balanced economy and prevent the recurrence of the extremes of privilege and want. We must bridge the chasm that now exists between management and labor, without destroying the rights of labor and without destroying private enterprise, but we must not overlook the public interest in all our deliberations.

Congress has not been derelict in its duties in an effort to speed the transition from war to peace. Congress over a year ago passed laws to accelerate war contract terminations and the speedy removal of Government-owned machines and raw materials, enabling factories to reconvert to peacetime production more rapidly than the most optimistic dream, thereby avoiding the mass layoffs of employees that was so widely predicted last year. It also passed laws authorizing vast backlogs of public works, such as highways, flood control, river and harbor improvement, etc. The Export-Import Bank was established, to enable American manufacturers to immediately start production of wares and goods for export, which would result in giving thousands of American workers jobs and, at the same time, assist in the rehabilitation of the war-torn world. Taxes were reduced to enable industry to expand and to improve their plant facilities which, in turn, will give more jobs. Veterans' benefits were increased; loan provisions of the GI bill liberalized. Other beneficial legislation, too numerous to mention in this brief time, has already been enacted, or is in the process of enactment.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman, has been one of the busiest committees in the House for the past 18 months. Our committee handled the Surplus Property Act, and is now preparing amendments to the act to correct weakness and expedite the equitable distribution of huge war surpluses. We handled the bill to bring Government corporations with over $27,000,000,000 in resources under congressional control. We handled the bill giving the President power to reorganize the executive agencies, a bill that President Truman said was the best reorganization bill ever passed by Congress. Under the provisions of the reorganization bill, the President will be able to streamline our sprawling Government agencies and bring them under closer supervision and control resulting in increased efficiency and a great saving to the overburdened taxpayers.

Our committee also handled the misnamed full employment bill and passed a substitute that will give the President and the Congress needed machinery to make studies and recommendations to prevent serious economic dislocations and widespread unemployment. Our committee also has charge of the bill to merge the Army and Navy; also the bill creating a separate air force. We have many other important administration bills that will keep our committee busy for the rest of the session. In 1946 it can truly be said that we have a rendezvous with destiny. The problems facing Congress are many and complex. Many history-making issues will be considered, and we must all, citizens and legislators alike, approach the problems with intelligence, tolerance, and energy. Organized pressure groups will undertake to gain selfish advantages; we will be called upon to make decisions that will be highly controversial and packed with political dynamite.

Alabama has an important place in the postwar world. Our State was blessed by the divine Creator of the universe with an abundance of natural resources. We have an ample quantity of coil, iron, limestone, marble, timber, and other materials and minerals. We have an ideal climate. We have an abundant supply of hydroelectricity. Our land will produce crops above the average. We can and must conserve our land and other natural resources.

Timber is now one of our highest-paying crops We can make timber our highest-paying crop, by keeping the fire hazard down and by a system of selective cutting. When we complete the development of our waterways system on the Coosa-Alabama and the Tennessee-Tom Bigbee, Ala., we will have more navigable streams than any other State in the Union. Our streams are a sportsman's paradise. We have many historic sites in Alabama and much beautiful scenery. We should encourage more tourist trade.

We can and must give the children of our State better educational advantages. Our State must produce sufficient food to feed our own citizens. Many industrial opportunities are open to investors in Alabama, who have vision. With an adequate supply of raw materials and trained workers, we should establish furniture factories, factories to manufacture all kinds of building materials, machinery, tools, and expand our textile facilities.

We should be able to export dairy products, beef, and other staple commodities. We have the soil, labor, and climate to become the leading agricultural State in the Union.

Studies by the Southern Research Institute will be of great value to every individual Alabamian.

I pledge to you that I will use my best judgment in meeting the grave responsibilities that lie ahead. I will make mistakes, but they will be mistakes in judgment and not of the heart. United we won in war; united we can and must win in peace.

Europe's Food Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is much publicity given at the moment regarding the very great shortage of food in many European, and occupied countries. That situation is not new at all. For approximately 1 year that situation has been known to both the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. Judge Rosenman was named a special emissary to make an investigation of the food situation in Europe and after he had made a thorough canvass of the existing situation and the probable future situation, he made his report to the President on April 26, 1945, and that report was published as a document in September 1945. Therefore, it is apparent that both the President and the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator had the full knowledge of the pending food shortage in Europe after that report was made. However, may I say that absolutely nothing was done at that time with respect to that situation and the matter was permited to drag along until the very recent appointment of Hon. Herbert Hoover as a special food emissary to make another investigation upon this same subject. Of course, this is merely a duplication of that same effort and while the facts were known, approximately 1 year ago, the question I wish to propound is simply this: "Why did the President and the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator wait almost one full year before they did anything about it?" Much time was wasted because of that delay and many people were deprived of the needed food during that long period of time which elapsed between the time the President and his Department heads knew of the pending danger. This is merely another bit of evidence of the bungling that has occurred and which is occurring daily in the many and various departments of our Government. The newspaper article upon this subject appearing in the Washington Star of date March 17, 1946, is very enlightening upon this subject.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my own remarks upon this subject and include a newspaper article upon this same subject:

[From the Washington Star of March 17, 1946]

EUROPE'S FOOD NEEDS KNOWN IN UNITED STATES YEAR AGO, WRITERS SAY

(By Walter T. Ridder and Gustaf Nordin)

The recent precipitous actions of the White House and the Agriculture Department in

the matter of European food relief gave the impression that Europe's desperate need for food came as a surprise to the American Government.

In reality, President Truman and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson were belatedly putting into effect recommendations made almost a year ago. The Government knew then, it knew after VE-day, it knew after VJ-day, and it knew during the past fall that the specter of famine hung threateningly over Europe. Food shortages in all European countries, liberated and defeated, had been constantly reported for well over a year. If the administration didn't believe news reports then, at least it had the report of a special Presidential investigator to guide it in formulating plans to help Europeans.

On January 20, 1945, the late President Roosevelt appointed Judge Samuel I. Rosenman as his personal representative, with the rank of minister, to study the civilian requirements for liberated portions of Europe. Judge Rosenman undertook the mission in the winter and spring of 1945. His report to the President was made on April 26, 1945, and published as a document in September 1945.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT

The following excerpts from the Rosenman report show the judge was fully aware of what the United States would be called upon to do. Without taking into consideration what our responsibilities toward Germany might be, the judge arrived at these conclusions:

"A dangerously low level of nutrition exists generally in these liberated countries except in rural, food-raising areas.

"From the point of view of our own United States economy, it is obvious that unless northwest Europe again resumes its place in the international exchange of goods and services, the American economy will be deeply affected. Furthermore, a chaotic and hungry Europe is not fertile ground in which stable, democratic, and friendly governments can be reared.

"Just as the United States has been the largest producer of the United Nations in wartime, so will it be looked to as the principal source of civilian supplies for these countries. * * * Any realistic appraisal of the situation would indicate that the responsibility for providing a substantial share of most civilian supplies will rest on the United States.

"Since allocation of civilian supplies to liberated countries in all probability will cut into the ration of the American consumer, a widespread official and public campaign should be undertaken to inform the American people of the gravity of the needs of our allies in liberated Europe.

ACTION ONLY NOW BEING TAKEN

The publicity committee recommended by Judge Rosenman is only now being organized here.

The Rosenman report was in the hands of President Truman before VE-day. It was sent for study to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. As late as September 10, 1945, Leo T. Crowley, head of the Foreign Economic Administration, called it "a clear and accurate picture of conditions in northwest Europe."

With the Rosenman report on file, with a full knowledge of the European food situation to be gleaned from representatives of interested countries, UNRRA, the Army, and newspaper reports, the Government proceeded, immediately after VJ-day, on the assumption that American agriculture could easily supply the demands made on it. Again as late as December 1945, the Agriculture Department painted rosy pictures of the American consumer getting all he needed or wanted in the way of food supplies, although European conditions were known not to be getting any better.

SWAYED BY PUBLIC CLAMOR

Fundamentally, the desire of the Government and the American people to lay aside the restraints of war and return to the ways of peace is responsible for the emergency action now being taken. Fearful of being accused of wanting to prolong war agencies in order to solve domestic problems, the administration was unwilling to take steps which might have allowed a less hectic method of dealing with foreign food relief.

Careful planning, stock-piling, and preparation could have been accomplished in the fall and winter of last year, but it would have entailed cutting into the consumption of the American eater, probably through continuation of food rationing. Partisan politics and the public clamor for return to a peacetime basis made the administration hesitant to follow such a drastic course, although public-opinion polls showed Americans perfectly willing to send their rations abroad.

In a food report dated April 30, 1945, issued by the Interagency Committee on Foreign Shipments, appointed by James F. Byrnes, then director of war mobilization and reconversion, Mr. Crowley said: "It was agreed that the people of the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada are fully prepared to make necessary sacrifices to prevent widespread starvation in the countries liberated from Nazi domination."

At all times during the past year, administration officials have been fully aware of Europe's deteriorating food situation and of the United States consequent responsibilities. It was not, however, until February 1946 that the Government took decisive steps to meet those moral obligations. Now, with the advent of "Truman bread," the appointment of former President Herbert Hoover to head a relief committee and the establishment of a publicity committee to convince Americans they should cut down on their own consumption the Government has hastily set about to put into effect recommendations made almost a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, when those in command in this country knew of this great shortage of food in Europe and were advised that there would be starvation and chaos resulting that was the time to begin to do something about it. Some limitations could have been started at that time instead of awaiting until the present moment when a hasty and a greatly magnified limitation is presented to our people, and which will be keenly and reluctantly received. One year is certainly a long time in which to consider such a tremendous problem—and that is a long time when hunger, want, and starvation threatens a vast number of people, and which fact was reported, according to the press reports, on April 26, 1945. The President knew of this terrible threat, the Secretary of Agriculture knew of it, and undoubtedly the War Food Administration knew of it. Why did they not act then? Why wait for 1 year before any action is taken?

Grain for Human Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have received from Mr. James C. Green of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, Madison, Wis.:

MARCH 14, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HENRY: The Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation wishes to call to your attention its approval of the administration policy of diverting more grain to human consumption in war-torn and occupied countries of Europe.

This policy, as sound as we know it to be, creates a definite problem among livestock producers since feed supplies are ever growing more scarce. In view of this, the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation earnestly recommends that consideration be given to a Nation-wide program to alleviate the problem which exists. The program is as follows:

Encourage farmers to cull dairy herds, beef herds, poultry flocks, and to market hogs at a lighter weight.

There are 3,000,000 dairy herds in the United States averaging 10 cows per herd. If an average of one marginal producer could be culled from each herd on a test-production basis a great deal of additional feed would be available, efficiency of production would be promoted, and a very small, if any, decrease in production would be shown as a result. This same procedure could be used effectively in beef herds and poultry flocks.

Such a program at the present time would not only alleviate the present shortage of feed, but would make available additional meat supplies for consumption at home and abroad.

The program if carried through at the present time would be favorable to farm people in general because:

1. It is now an economical time to cull.
2. The salvage price is high.
3. Feed costs on marginal animals are excessive.

We strongly recommend that Congress and the administration take the initiative in promoting this program immediately.

Yours truly,

WISCONSIN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
JAMES C. GREEN,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

The Businessman's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the businessmen in this country are beginning to think as they never have thought in the past. Since the bureaucrats have become so arrogant and at last have shown their hands in the direction in which they are trying to lead the American people, business has been slowed down and the average businessman has had more time to think and to try to deterine where we are headed. Everyone knows there is something wrong. We all want to know just why we got into this terrible mess. Who caused it? Who is responsible for it? Many businessmen have stopped to think the thing through. They have attempted to analyze the situation and determine where the fault lies. But most important of all, they have tried to point the way to us Congressmen, to relieve

the American people of this new "dealirium." The disease is spreading like a contagion throughout the country and it is not as easy to eradicate as one might think at first blush. When the people are flattered, threatened, or bribed into surrendering some of their liberties and privileges, they find it very difficult to retrieve their losses. But after so long a time they become desperate. They get mad, as we sometimes say. There are instances in which they have even taken authority into their own hands, which is always a dangerous thing. May it never happen in this coutnry. But beware, Mr. New Dealocrat. The people are beginning to think for themselves; they are beginning to reason the whole situation through. They are beginning to see how they have been misled, misdirected, and misgoverned. They are coming to their senses more rapidly than you realize. That is the reason they are writing Congressmen so frankly and so emphatically demanding that we get rid of these unnecessary bureaus, and particularly OPA. They are asking that the heavy hand of government be lifted from their backs, and they are demanding that they be permitted in this country again to enjoy the freedom and liberties of the past and there is no reason why we should not come back to the American way of life.

As an example of the many letters I have received, I am pleased to quote from a prominent Oklahoma businessman, who got his start in the hard way. Hence I quote from his letter and give a businessman's views:

I am only a small-business man, but I have been working hard at it for the past 35 years. I do not know a great deal about anything except the construction industry, more especially the steel fabricating industry, and such knowledge as I have gained through contact with others, but it does not seem to me that it would take a very smart man to sit down and analyze the things that have happened in the past and thereby gain sufficient knowledge to do a fair job of projecting a short way into the future.

I am still of the opinion that the world owes every man a living, but like any other debit, it is necessary for the individual to go out and collect, through initiative and hard work, the standard of living he desires.

Industry, with capitalistic management of free enterprise has built in these United States the greatest nation on the globe, has given its people the highest standard of living of any nation on the globe, and yet for the past several years there has been an ever-growing power attempting to overthrow this progress. In Europe and Asia we have seen the great United Kingdom deteriorate pitifully low; we have seen the Fascists in Italy, the Nazis in Germany, the Socialists of France, and the Communists of Russia all crumble and disintegrate, except Russia; they seem to be more aggressive than ever before, with our aid, and we are dangerously close to being taken over by them due to our egotistical ideology that we are the superman, the supernation, and Santa Claus to the world.

Our labor policies are so unstable that even the union leaders are becoming worried. The Wagner Act was a master stroke against industry. Legal picketing, without a definition, has developed into gangster and mob rule supreme. The War Labor Board sits as judge, jury, prosecutor, and defender, constantly rendering judgment for the plaintiff. Our Department of Justice, with its socialistic leaders, pounces upon industry at every turn. The familiar phrase of coercion and intimidation used earlier by labor leaders has been so aptly used against industry and so supported by a packed Supreme Court that industry is afraid to assert itself.

Price controls, keeping prices to a substandard, will curtail production until our national economy will be ruined. Instead of the dreaded inflation, we are headed pellmell for deflation.

Such ballyhoo artists as Mr. Kaiser gets the front page of the newspapers and the headlines of the radio commentators, but such leaders as Mr. Wilson of General Motors, Mr. Fairless of U. S. Steel, and Mr. Wilson of General Electric are branded as traitors, nincompoops, and what have you, although they are bearing the torch for the continuation of our democracy, or capitalistic free enterprise.

Washington seems to feel we have unlimited resources and can finance the world, not merely through loans but through gifts shrouded with the cloak of a loan that Washington knows full well there is never any intention of repaying.

Such a curb on initiative is going to have a terrible reaction to our general economy. Only quick action by our Congress will avert an era of deflation such as we have never experienced in the past.

Set your ceilings on rental property. What is the result? No upkeep, no improvements, with the property quickly going to pot. No new investments to build rental property—the very place the workingman must live, the very man Congress is trying to protect is the one that is being kicked right in the face.

Subsidies are a great joke, always have been and always will be. Who ever heard of a man pulling himself out of a mudhole by the boot straps? Giving someone something for nothing never pays dividends except in the wrong way. Our AAA program in the past, where we destroyed cotton, corn, wheat, cattle, hogs, creating a shortage, did just the opposite of what it was intended to do. The same with price control and all subsidies.

The Wagner Act gives labor organizations a lot of power which they have badly misused and will continue so to do as long as Congress is too weak to amend the act sufficiently to stabilize the injustice brought on by the Wagner Act and its maladministration, affirmed by a packed United States Supreme Court. Maybe we can chop down the old tree that is perfectly healthy and still growing, that has protected us from the sun and the rain, and replace it with a young seedling that will do a better job, but I don't think so, as the old tree grew in a different age with different surroundings and different hazards. We are living in a fast age, a new age. Maybe we will visit the moon within a few months and we may be disappointed at which we find on the moon. Maybe the college professors, politicians, economists, and advertising genii (Bowles) can do a better job of running the Nation's industries than experienced management has done in the past and is now doing. I don't think so.

When the National Association of Manufacturers, comprising the leaders of all industrial United States, says that price control should be abolished at once, believe you me, that is the thing to do.

When the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce plead with Congress to balance the budget and reduce Government expenditures, that is the very thing Congress should do.

When 75 percent of all manufacturers tell you the Wagner Act is unworkable and a monstrosity, you must believe them.

Why do labor leaders so insist that industry guarantee to the unions payment of union members' dues through the check-off and union security by such check-off? That is the only way a very small minority can control the union movement and keep it alive. Are you to believe and trust Messrs. Bowles, Hillman, Murray, Green, and Lewis, who have no financial or legal responsibilities, in preference to all industrial management that is fully responsible legally, financially and morally? Just how do you think the supply can ever catch up with the demand with such tight brakes so firmly set against production?

Minnesota Poultrymen Make Some Pertinent Observations of Bungling by OPA Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, never in all the history of the Republic has there been such a tremendous demand for everything and never was the market less able to fill the demand. During the war we could understand the reason for these shortages, but now that the war has been over for 6 months, or more, and the spread between supply and demand is daily growing wider, the American people are beginning to demand that something be done to speed up production. Our people are beginning to realize that OPA is largely responsible for the shortage in lumber and all building material, household gadgets, farm machinery, food, clothing, and just about everything we use and eat. For months OPA has clung to the idea that wages can be increased without necessarily increasing the price of labor's products, hence the shortages and the chaos that exist everywhere.

The administration's remedy for all evils and shortcomings seems to be more bureaus and more people on the Federal pay roll. The administration goes on the theory that if anything goes wrong merely create a new bureau to deal with it. The number of bureaus has increased about 2,000 percent since the New Deal came into power, and the number of Federal employees has increased by 300 percent. If bureaus and padded pay rolls can bring production up to demand, we would have had a surplus of everything long ago. Unfortunately, it works the other way: The more bureaus the greater the confusion and the greater the confusion the smaller is production. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert two letters recently received from men who have made a success in the poultry business. I am prompted to insert these letters because they deal with an aspect of our food situation that has received very little attention.

Some years ago the late President Roosevelt said, "We planned it that way." Unfortunately for the country, the New Dealers are yet in complete control of all branches of the Government and yet planning. I am fearful that the American people cannot hope for much improvement until we get a change. Everything now indicates that this change will come in November, when a new Congress is to be elected. The letters follow:

MY DEAR HAROLD: For some time past I have contemplated writing to you regarding the confusion and bungling imminent in the Agriculture Department in Washington, dealing with poultry and turkeys and the feed situation in general.

To tell you just what is wrong, I should perhaps relate a little of the background. I believe that the records will reveal that we have as much feed on hand today per livestock unit as we had in 1943. But, due to the meddling and disregard for facts, the control section of the Department of Agriculture, under the disguise of emergencies, has bungled the whole deal so badly that if pursued further nothing short of tragedy can develop. To try to enumerate all of the errors which have been committed since the end of the war would require voluminous documentary evidence which I do not have time to prepare in this letter.

However, there are several matters that I do want to call to your attention and, no doubt, you have heard considerably about them. One matter is the so-called overexpanded poultry business. I am certain, however, if you will again examine the records you will find that chicks hatched and sold last season here in the Grain Belt or Central States did not exceed the previous year and, moreover, these checks went to our regular poultry raisers as replacement stock for layers or egg producers in 1946.

This situation was quite different in some of the commercial sections of the country, such as the New England seaboard States and some of the Southern States, where the production of chicks for broiler purposes largely went up in the same season of 1945 from 100 to 150 percent—which was way out of proportion.

Naturally, those folks would like to bring some pressure on Washington to help them maintain that high level of production if they can get, by some order, a larger portion of grain from this section of the country, which is commonly known as the Grain Belt, and do it at the expense of our regular established poultry producer who, consequently, would have to reduce his flock to meet the unwarranted reduction of grains which would be transferred to the strictly commercial producing sections.

And, for some unknown reason, the powers that be in Washington have disregarded the facts and figures and have instituted orders and regulations until now it is so greatly out of balance that a great injustice is bound to overbalance a normal and natural poultry-raising program in this section of the country.

Worst of all, I understand that these same powers that be are formulating a more drastic order than all previous ones. Honestly, Harold, don't you believe that if the day has come when we, the people, have to be saved from ourselves the day of free enterprise is doomed? The farmers who are in possession of this grain are smart operators. They are watching this mismanagement, meddling, and bungling that is going on in Washington with as much disgust and bewilderment as we who are in the service business, with our life earnings and investments, not knowing when Washington will set out on some new drastic order or regulation which would result in untold losses and confusion—not only to me but to the folks who are legitimately in the business of raising and producing this poultry, turkeys, and eggs. I am reasonably certain that if this new order or regulation creates a greater amount of disruption to the poultry and turkey producers here in Minnesota and this section of the United States there will be an uproar of which you will hear plenty.

I fully realize, Harold, that in passing my thoughts and opinions on to you that you are familiar and sympathetic to our cause. I only hope that there are enough men like you in Washington to keep the bunglers completely out of control.

I wish that I could write something more pleasant at this time to you, but I must get this off my chest as it has been troubling me for some time.

DEAR HAROLD: Just what is going on in Washington? We notice an article which states that Herbert Hoover has been appointed chairman of an emergency committee, which is to outline a detailed pattern for consumers to use less food.

We can't see the sense of anything like this when there is today a surplus of turkeys and poultry in storage, and an anticipated surplus of egg production, so much so that the Government is considering reducing the quantity of feeds that can be manufactured for the specific purpose to reduce the production of eggs, poultry, and turkeys.

If 75 percent of the world is on a starving basis, as we are led to believe, why aren't we working out deals to export our surpluses of turkeys, poultry, and eggs, in large enough quantities to support this market, and support it on a basis where we can keep our people producing?

These foreign countries need food and need it badly, and just a few eggs, a few turkeys, and a few chickens taken off the market would strengthen markets to such an extent that producers, and dealers as well, could maintain themselves on a profitable basis.

We have spent $275,000,000,000 or more producing implements of war designed to kill people. It would seem to me another few billions could be spent to send food to the starving nations, or to loan them money so they could buy food. It might do more to preserve peace than have the billions which we have spent to destroy.

We should like to have your thoughts on this matter.

Tulsa Chamber of Commerce Requests Congress To Eliminate Deficit Spending by Reducing Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following letter from the president of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce addressed to me:

Our board of directors, at their meeting on Tuesday, adopted the attached resolution which was recommended to them for their approval by our national legislation committee. This action was prompted by a study which our committee made of reports of the Citizens National Committee, Inc.

My transmittal of the resolution to you is in accordance with the instructions of the board of directors, as reflected in the body of the resolution.

Very truly yours,

N. R. PATTERSON,
President.

The resolution referred to in President Patterson's letter, adopted by the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce on March 12, 1946, follows:

Whereas the 1947 Federal Budget calls for expenditures of $35,100,000,000, with estimated revenues of only $31,500,000,000, leaving an estimated deficit of $3,600,000,000, this being the sixteenth consecutive year of deficit spending by the Federal Government; and

Whereas proposed 1947 expenditures are approximately four times those proposed for the prewar year of 1939, and represents by far the largest spending program for peacetime purposes ever proposed in the Nation's history, thus continuing the era of huge deficit spending inaugurated during the early 1930's, when there was far more justification for public works than there is today; and

Whereas the 1947 Federal Budget continues in operation many agencies created for strictly war purposes, and provides an increase in expenditures over 1946 for every regular civil department of the Federal Government; and

Whereas prudent management of the Nation's financial affairs requires that a start should be made in 1947 toward retirement of the huge Federal debt, while tax rates and revenues remain high; and

Whereas the greatest contribution the Federal Government could make, both in combating inflation, in restoring production and economic stability, and in assuring the confidence of the American people in the solvency of their Government and its financial obligations, would be to demonstrate a capacity to operate within revenues levied at rates of tax which the people can bear without depriving them of the incentive to produce and earn: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, That the Federal Government should, and it is hereby called upon to, operate on a balanced budget beginning with the 1947 fiscal year, and that it make an honest effort to reduce expenditures for its numerous agencies to a sane and reasonable level, which will be within the ability of the people to pay for; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be mailed to all Members of Congress from Oklahoma, to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; and to each chamber of commerce within the State of Oklahoma, with a strong appeal that each chamber use its full influence to help bring about a balanced Federal Budget in 1947 and for each year thereafter.

Dated at Tulsa, Okla., this 12th day of March 1946.

N. R. PATTERSON,
President.
C. A. BORDERS,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I think the above resolution and the ideas expressed therein are so timely that they are worthy of the serious consideration of all Members of Congress and all good citizens of this country. There is no way to balance the Budget except to curtail expenditures, or increase revenues. No one wants to increase revenues by raising taxes higher than their present level. Everyone would like to see taxes reduced. It is almost certain that the Federal revenue is likely to fall off rather than to be increased. Hence, the only way to stop deficit financing and deficit spending, is to reduce expenditures, stop appropriating large and unnecessary amounts of money for public improvements and increasing the Federal pay roll. We were told that a lot of these expenditures were wartime emergency expenditures. But it seems to be difficult to get rid of the bureaus and the millions of people on the Federal pay rolls. It seems that about as fast as we get rid of a war emergency bureau, the administration sees fit to create a peacetime emergency bureau and shift the

functions and personnel into the new organization. In many instances, these are the old group merely operating under a new name. Of course, they promulgate new regulations, and they assume to operate now under peacetime programs instead of wartime programs.

The American people are fed up on emergency excuses which means emergency appropriations, emergency expenditures, and emergency bureaus and deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, I have replied to the letter of President Patterson and the resolution of the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce by letter of this date, in the following language:

Mr. N. R. PATTERSON,
President, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla.

DEAR NATE: I have your letter of the fourteenth instant enclosing resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce March 12, 1946, requesting Congress to reduce expenditures, which means hold appropriations down, to the point that they will not exceed income, and beginning with the year 1947, to operate on that basis and cease deficit spending.

I want to congratulate your board of directors for their bold and timely stand on this subject. In fact, I think it is so much in keeping with my ideas and what I have been advocating and the way I have been voting here in Congress, and so completely consistent with my objections to spending large sums of money for public works that are not immediately necessary, which generally are boondoggling and affording jobs for a lot of people who should be out producing something worth while, that I have decided to introduce it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and shall do so today.

I trust that as time goes on, and when you and your chamber hear of wild schemes being suggested, that your group will back me in my opposition to large public expenditures. There will be many instances when Members of Congress and the administration here will advance programs which entail the expenditure of millions and billions of dollars by the Federal Government, which expenditures should be delayed until such time as the income of the Federal Government will justify appropriations for such purposes. In many instances, time will prove that such expenditures were not necessary and unjustifiable.

When someone tries to capitalize on the idea of public expenditures in order to give employment, etc., then we see almost every section of the country trying to hatch up some scheme to get what it considers its portion of such expenditures. This augments the expenditures and offers aid and assistance to such propaganda. Instead, we need to lift the heavy hand of Government from business and the backs of the people, to eliminate these bureaus and a large part of the approximately 3,000,000 people now on the pay roll of the Federal Government and give the people an opportunity to engage in private enterprise and do for themselves. In that way our revenues will increase and our expenditures proportionately will decrease. Then we can have a balanced Budget and not until then. Then we will not have deficit spending.

Again assuring you of my appreciation of the attitude of the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce and of your having sent me this resolution, and bespeaking your cooperation in the future in my endeavors to curtail and eliminate public expenditures and extravagant appropriations, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. SCHWABE.

Profit Sharing in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with House Resolution 481, to study profit-sharing systems, the resolution which I introduced on January 14, 1946, I ask permission to insert the following article by Thomas K. Ford which appeared in the Washington Star on March 9, 1946:

PROFIT-SHARING IDEA GROWING IN INDUSTRY—WRITER REVIEWS VARYING SUCCESS OF PLANS IN THE PAST

(By Thomas K. Ford)

Interest in various methods of sharing profits with employees tends to grow in periods of good business and bad industrial relations. This happened during and after World War I and in the recovery years of the 1930s. At the present time the House of Representatives has before it a resolution by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Republican, Connecticut, to investigate profit sharing and see if the Government should encourage it through tax abatements or by other means.

Employer interest in profit sharing springs from a desire to give workers at once a greater portion of the income from production and a greater stake in the success of the enterprise. Organized labor, while naturally anxious to have a larger share of the profits, has generally looked askance at profit sharing as a device to hold down basic wage rates.

The United Automobile Workers' demand upon General Motors for use of the corporation "ability to pay" as the measure of an increase in the wage rates of its employes is certainly a demand for a share in profits—past and prospective. But it does not call for "profit sharing" as that term has been understood in the past. The UAW has argued, with some apparent support in statements by the President, that the profit of an industry can and should be taken into account in the adjustment of wage rates. General Motors has maintained that "profits have no relationship to wages," but the President said, December 20, that "ability to pay is always one of the facts relevant to the issue of an increase in wages."

DEFINITION OF TERM

Narrowly defined, profit sharing is "an agreement freely entered into by which the employees receive a share, fixed in advance, of the profits." In this sense, the share of profits allotted to employees must vary in direct ratio to the amount of profit earned. A very broad interpretation holds that any distribution of funds which would otherwise go to stockholders, including even a straight wage increase, constitutes profit sharing.

The surge of interest in profit sharing during and after World War I was short-lived. None of the several surveys conducted between 1925 and 1935 reported more than a couple of hundred profit-sharing plans in actual operation. However, a Senate committee which investigated profit sharing in 1938–39 issued an enthusiastic report praising it as a method of preserving industrial peace. Senator VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, said sharing the profits was "essential to the ultimate maintenance of the capitalistic system."

NOT ALWAYS LASTING

While profit-sharing plans have in many instances succeeded very well and lasted over long periods of years, the larger number of plans established in the past have been discontinued for one reason or another. No general rules appear to explain these successes and failures, but experience indicates that profit sharing is most likely to be abandoned in periods when there are no profits to share.

Among the long-established plans some of the best known are those of Sears, Roebuck & Co., the Gannett newspapers, and the Eastman Kodak Co. The first, in operation since 1916, is one in which the employes contribute cut of wages and the company out of profits to a pension system. The Gannett papers make annual cash distributions equal to 15 percent of profits, and the Eastman Co. measures its profit payments to employes in proportion to the dividend payments to stockholders.

While the bonuses of such war producers as the Jack & Heintz Co. and the production bonus agreement signed between the UAW and the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. have attracted wide attention, they are not true profit-sharing plans. That recently announced by Eric Johnston, however, is not only a profit-sharing but also a management-sharing plan, designed, according to Johnston, to "bring industrial democracy to America."

Long Beach Airport Great Commercial and Military Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., is one of the airports proven by location to be of the most available for commercial and military purposes.

Under the guidance of a very able director for the city, together with the aid of the city council aviation committee and the chamber of commerce aviation committee, the airport itself has the utmost regard and support of the citizenry generally.

The following news item from the Press Telegram of Long Beach for January 29, 1946, gives indicative figures which speak louder than phrases. And please remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was from this airport that several world significant flights have recently been started. There must be a reason. I will mention but two of them—world record-making tests and flights from the West to the East—which saw light of day from the Long Beach Airport: First, the flight of the *Mixmaster*; second, the flight of the jet-propelled planes about which I spoke in this House at the time.

Following is the comment of the newspaper I refer to:

FIGURES SHOW ACTIVITY AT LOCAL AIRPORT—COMMERCIAL AVIATION AT MUNICIPAL FIELD IN MARKED GROWTH

Growth of commercial aviation at the municipal airport, despite the fact that all operations other than military and airlines were canceled during the war, is shown in figures released yesterday by City Director of Aeronautics Earle A. Lloyd.

In 1940, the year prior to the war, there were 56 commercial aircraft based at the local field, while at the present, although

commercial flying has been authorized only for the past 2 or 3 months, there are now approximately 70 licensed and unlicensed aircraft at the port.

The 1940 airport figures show that 234 aircraft made scheduled landings at the field. Air mail received totaled 26,032 pounds and air mail dispatched totaled 45,286 pounds. There were 40,146 radio transmissions from the old wooden control tower on the Spring Street side of the field.

Lloyd's figures for 1945 show that incoming air mail totaled 145,890 pounds, with outgoing mail reaching the 258,941-pound mark. Air express received here totaled 51,828 pounds, while 8,430 pounds were shipped.

Airline passenger traffic showed a sharp increase with 13,837 passengers disembarking here. Outbound passengers numbered 7,379

Figures for the past year showed that 4,476 civil aircraft either landed or took off from Daugherty Field, and that there were 36,229 military landings and take-offs.

A. F. of L. Demands Removal of Controls On Wages, Prices After 1 Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me, I wish to include under this caption a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star of date March 15, 1946, by the Associated Press entitled "A. F. of L. Demands Removal of Controls After 1 Year." The article follows:

A. F. of L. DEMANDS REMOVAL OF CONTROLS ON WAGES, PRICES AFTER 1 YEAR

CARBONDALE, PA., March 15.—The American Federation of Labor last night demanded that President Truman scrap what it called his "crazy-quilt stabilization program" for a new policy designed to remove all wage-price controls after one year.

Labor, industry and agriculture representatives would assist in drafting the new policy under the A. F. of L. plan.

The program was announced officially by William Green, A. F. of L. president, in a speech before the annual dinner meeting of the Carbondale Central Labor Union.

Criticizing Mr. Truman on the ground that he listened to "incompetent advisers who concocted a magic formula" for settling labor-management disputes. Mr. Green declared that revision of the Government's wage-price policy last month was a "grave mistake" and added:

"I propose, first, that the present crazy-quilt stabilization program be scrapped and that the President invite representatives of labor, industry, and agriculture to confer with him on the drafting of an entirely new one which will be fair and just to the entire Nation.

URGES LIMIT OF YEAR

"Secondly, I recommend that this new policy be adopted for the duration of not more than 1 year, with the unequivocal commitment that at the expiration of that time all Government controls on wages and prices be dropped.

"Finally, I urge with all the emphasis at my command that the Government eliminate itself from the sphere of labor-management relations except for offering a strengthened conciliation service to both parties, and allow labor and industry to work out their problems through the proper methods of collective bargaining and voluntary arbitration."

Mr. Green contended that neither labor nor industry could plan future activity under the Government's present policy, that employers are afraid to make commitments, and that production is "stalled."

LABOR IN STRAIT-JACKET

"The new stabilization policy places labor in an inescapable strait-jacket by requiring prior approval from the Wage Stabilization Board of any wage increase which will be used by an employer as a basis for application for higher price ceilings," the A. F. of L. president argued.

He declared that the Nation's greatest danger is the possibility of fostering a regimented economy under strict Government controls and asserted that wartime "Government encroachment upon the economic freedom of our people * * * must be stopped."

Mr. Green said he is convinced Mr. Truman "approached the Nation's postwar problems in the right spirit and with every determination to restore a normal economy as promptly as the necessary changes could be safely effected."

FOLLOWED WRONG ADVICE

"He told me so," Mr. Green added, "I believed him and I still believe in his sincerity. But the tragic truth is that he received and listened to the wrong advice."

"It is universally recognized that President Truman has been under severe pressure," Mr. Green said. "However, he could have insisted that all labor disputes be settled by collective bargaining and voluntary arbitration without Government intervention."

Long Beach Editor Spells It Out: America's Need—Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, representing the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, and all of which district is in Los Angeles County with the crowded, thriving metropolitan city of Long Beach as its hub, makes it further clear why I supported strongly the President's home-building program for homes for veterans. For Long Beach—and every town and hamlet in Los Angeles County—is entirely inadequate with housing facilities for families—even without considering the already returned veterans, and those sure to come.

Mr. Speaker, I have said before and I say again, if this House is fearful of making a mistake as to what theory to follow—let us make the mistake deliberately in favor of the veterans getting their deserved homes at the earliest possible date.

Here is another timely editorial from the Long Beach Press-Telegram, dated February 10, 1946:

AMERICA'S NEED—HOMES

No section of the United States is in greater need of housing than southern California.

Southern Californians are very conscious of this acute need without the statistical confirmation given in the report and program of proposed action to provide additional housing submitted by Wilson Wyatt, Housing Administrator, and approved by President Truman.

Southern Californians know of the extreme need of housing by experience and direct observation. While servicemen were at war, available housing was taken up by war industry workers and their families, many of whom were brought here from other parts of the country by the opportunity to obtain jobs in war industries.

Most of the war-industry workers stayed here when the war was over, and the veterans are rapidly returning, so there is no mystery about the crowded housing conditions here.

The underlying cause of a shortage of dwellings throughout the United States is that building has been subnormal a decade and a half, first because of industrial depression and then because of the war.

Figures cited in the Housing Administrator's report tell the story: In October 1945, 1,200,000 American families were living doubled up with other families. "At that time the situation was critical. It is rapidly becoming worse," says the Housing Administrator.

Married veterans who will need homes by December 1946, 2,900,000; others who will marry and need homes by the end of this year, 560,000; vacancies by the end of the year because of dissolution of families, 945,000; net additional homes needed by the end of 1946, 2,515,000; total need by the end of 1947, 3,195,000.

The objective of the proposed housing campaign is to start the building of 1,200,000 homes and apartments this year and 2,700,000 by the end of 1947. Even then at least 1,200,000 families still will be doubled up with others.

No account is taken in the proposed building campaign of the 10,500,000 housing units which are substandard and should be replaced.

Moreover, 200,000 housing units drop into the substandard class or are destroyed each year, and there are approximately 400,000 additional families each year.

The magnitude of the plan to build 2,700,000 new homes this year and next is shown by comparisons: In 1941, the last year before United States entry into the war, 715,000 housing units were built; in 1925, the banner year of home building in the Nation's history, 937,000 units were built; without emergency action, it is estimated that construction this year would be between 400,000 and 500,000 housing units.

A blueprint, unfortunately, is not a house, and another recommendation by President Truman is no guaranty of legislation. His housing program may go on the congressional shelf with the score or more already resting there; but at least he and his housing administrator have presented a clear picture of America's greatest emergency since the war—housing.

St. Patrick's Day Address by the Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on Saturday last, March 16, the Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, delivered a notable address before the Society of

the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Americans realize that the victory over the Axis was not an American victory alone. The victory was won by the peoples of many countries welded together in a powerful alliance. But as Americans we are proud that we contributed mightily to the defeat of the Fascists and Nazis in Europe and that we played the major part in the defeat of Japan.

Irish-Americans in turn are aware that the blows struck by America were struck by Americans of every race and faith. But we of Irish blood take honest pride in the number of Kellys and Burkes and Sheas whose names appear in the war's roll of honor.

These Irish lads came from the cities and the farms, from the factories and the fields. They came to the decks of our ships, to the cockpits of our planes, and to the turrets of our tanks. They came to the landing barges and to the fox holes. And when their guns and the guns of their comrades began to sound, it became certain that victory would be ours.

Tonight time does not permit me to recite to you Friendly Sons of St. Patrick the names and deeds of these Irish heroes. But their names and deeds will not soon be forgotten and there will be many an opportunity for more gifted Irish tongues to tell the tales of their gallantry.

I know that in these troubled days you are more anxious to look to the future than to the past—to consider what we must do now in order to insure that the sacrifices of these men have not been in vain.

Consequently, I desire to return to a subject to which I referred 2 weeks ago, the military strength of the United States.

We Americans love peace. We are a Nation of civilians, not soldiers. It is fundamental to our system of government that military authority be subordinate to civilian authority.

Even in the midst of total war, we have maintained this principle. The American soldiers and sailors who made military history from New Caledonia to Tokyo and from North Africa to Berlin were not professional soldiers and sailors. They were civilians in uniform.

This is a fine tradition. Having preserved it in war, we should not relinquish it in peace.

The problem is how to reconcile our civilian traditions with the necessity to maintain our military strength at a level to match our responsibilities in the world.

No nation is more willing than the United States to participate in any reasonable plan for the general reduction of armaments. But while other nations remain armed, the United States, in the interest of world peace, cannot disarm.

Between 1918 and 1941 there grew up in this country an important body of pacifist sentiment. The dominant theme of this movement was that the way to end war is not to prepare for war. It was argued that plain men the world over hated war and that there would be no more war if all these plain men simply refused ever to fight again.

If the United States were to scrap all its armaments and completely demobilize its Army and Navy, it was said, the force of its example would compel the rest of the world to follow suit. The peaceful instinct which underlay this point of view is an admirable one. The trouble with the idea is that it does not work.

Without consciously deciding to do so, we actually tried it. By the time the Nazis attacked Poland in 1939 we had permitted our armed strength to dwindle to token proportions. When the war came and the realization slowly grew upon us that we would not be spared, we regretted that we were not prepared. The political parties then indicted each other for the lack of preparedness. The argument was no substitute for weapons.

We learned that the example of weakness set by the United States did not compel Italy and Japan and Germany to follow suit. On the contrary, our weakness incited them to ever bolder aggressions. Only the accidents of history gave us 2 years in which to prepare before the blow fell at Pearl Harbor.

Those 2 years were not enough to repair the damage. We were not ready on December 7, 1941, and the consequence was that brave men died to regain the ground we could not hold in the first weeks of war.

This tragic experience makes us realize that weakness invites aggression. Weakness causes others to act as they would not act if they thought that our words were backed by strength.

Today there is grave danger that the sense of relief which accompanies the end of the war may cause us once again to do unwittingly what we would never do consciously.

No one in or out of Government desires to extend for a single day more than is necessary the enforced separation of men from their families and from their peacetime business or employment.

But those who bear the responsibility for the security and welfare of the Nation are alarmed at the possibility that sufficient numbers of physically fit men will not be available to replace those who have earned the right to return to their homes.

This is true now while the Selective Service Act is still in effect. If the act is permitted to expire on May 15 of this year, the situation will become critical. It is imperative that the act be extended at least for the period in which the Army and the Navy have the multiple responsibility for the occupation of Germany and Japan, for the protection of our surpluses overseas, for the continuing defense of the United States, and for the fulfillment of our commitments under the Charter.

It is even more important, in the long run, that we have at all times a reserve of trained men who can be called upon in case of need.

A number of methods have been proposed for obtaining this trained reserve. As Secretary of State, I desire to emphasize my wholehearted and unequivocal endorsement of the proposal for universal military training.

It may be that the system proposed can be improved upon with experience in its administration. It is probable that as the years go by the system can be adapted to the demands of education and civilian employment in ways which will minimize friction and disruption in private lives. The important thing, however, is to get started with the plan, and to get started now.

An intelligently organized and administered system of universal military training will not undermine the American tradition of the subordination of military authority to civilian authority.

As for the effect of the training upon the boys, I can see no cause for alarm. It is not realistic to say, as some do, that a period of military training will turn our spirited and independent young men into unthinking brutes.

If we are to take the word of the old-timers among the master sergeants and chief petty officers, American recruits have always displayed a phenomenal capacity to withstand education in the military way of doing things.

If we need fear anything about the effects upon our boys of a brief period of military training, it is that they will learn too little about being soldiers and sailors rather than too much.

If we are agreed that it is necessary for the United States to preserve an adequate degree of strength, it is well to remember that the only real alternative to universal military training is the maintenance of a large professional standing Army and Navy. This is an alternative which experience has shown to be a threat to civilian government. It is an alternative which we should accept only as a last resort.

A system of universal training will keep our armed forces from becoming fixed in their ways and habits. Teachers frequently learn from their pupils. Youngsters will not readily respond to training in methods which they know to be outmoded. Our defense in the modern world depends upon the mobility and flexibility of our armed forces and their ability to make use of and keep up with the advance of science.

It must be acknowledged that universal military training involves a major change in our society. Consequently, the people of the United States have a right to know the purposes to which this reserve military strength might some day be put. This is a fair question. It deserves a fair answer.

The answer is simple. The United States is committed to the support of the Charter of the United Nations. Should the occasion arise, our military strength will be used to support the purposes and principles of the Charter.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the United States looks to the United Nations as the path to enduring peace.

We do not propose to seek security in an alliance with the Soviet Union against Great Britain or in an alliance with Great Britain against the Soviet Union.

We propose to stand with the United Nations in our efforts to secure equal justice for all nations and special privilege for no nation.

We must maintain our strength, therefore, for the primary purpose of preserving and using our influence in support of the Charter of the United Nations. We will not use our strength for aggressive purposes. Neither will we use it to support tyranny or special privilege.

I do not desire to conclude on a somber note. I firmly believe that the difficulties confronting the world, although they are serious, can be solved if all of us approach those difficulties in a spirit of conciliation and good will.

There are powerful currents loose in the world today. But the currents of life cannot be stopped in their courses. We live in a moving and changing world.

There is no reason to fear an open and vigorous contest between our conception of democracy and other political faiths. The voice of democracy is as thrilling today as it was yesterday. In a conflict of ideas we can be supremely confident of victory.

The important thing to remember is that a war of ideas is not won by armies. In international life there can be progress without war if reason and force is recognized as the test of progress.

The basic purpose of the United Nations is to make force the servant and not the master of reason and to reject the ancient and discredited doctrine that might makes right.

After every great war there comes a period of anticlimax and disillusionment. Those who fight together expect, when the fighting is over, too much from one another and are inclined to give too little to one another.

Those who have won the victory expect the millennium and feel that they should have the fruits of victory without further effort.

They forget that victory in war can only give the opportunity that would otherwise be denied, to live and work for the fruits of peace and freedom.

Having been forced to fight for military victory, they sometimes think that whatever they want should be taken by force instead of making their claims the basis for peaceful negotiation.

It takes time to pass from the psychology of war to the psychology of peace. We must have patience, as well as firmness. We must

keep our feet on the ground. We cannot afford to lose our tempers.

I am deeply convinced that the peoples who fought together for freedom want to live together in peace. I am deeply convinced that the peoples of the United Nations are sincerely committed to the Charter.

There are always some of little faith; some who still believe that they cannot get their due except by force. There are others who still believe that ancient privilege will yield to nothing but force of arms.

But with firmness in the right not as we alone see it, but as the aggregate sentiments of mankind see it, and with patience and understanding we must and shall achieve a just and enduring peace for ourselves and all nations.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement which I have submitted to the House Committee on Ways and Means relative to the use of the gross-income tax as a means of broadening the social-security system:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, for many years, I have been deeply interested in the general subject of social security and, in particular, the improvement of the living conditions of our senior citizens. When I first became interested in their plight and began to devise ways and means in my mind for correcting the abuses to which they are subjected, I considered various programs, including what was known as the Townsend plan as well as the present so-called social security. The result of the operations of social security in its present form has not met with the success I had hoped for it. It has proven inadequate, and it has not met the urgent needs of this aged class of our citizens which represents about 10 percent of our total population or, in round numbers, about thirteen and one-half millions. The present social-security old-assistance division, with its Federal contribution which must be matched by State funds in equal amount, provides on the average approximately $30 per individual. It is obvious that this amount of money in these days of high living costs would not even provide the necessities of life. It has been my belief that this situation should be corrected and that these elderly citizens should be granted a living as a matter of right and not predicated on need.

In order to do this, it may be necessary to change our taxing system. I submit for your consideration the gross-income tax as a means of correcting the inadequacies of our present tax system. I recommend that the Ways and Means Committee investigate the gross-income tax as it has operated in the Territory of Hawaii and, to a limited extent, in the State of Indiana. The estimated revenue that would obtain from this system of taxation would enable the Government to meet the old-age pension situation in a humane and decent way.

In the due course of events, we may reasonably look forward to a great deal of unemployment as we regain our normal peacetime condition and it is well that we recognize the problem at this time and begin to make plans to meet the issues of unemployment in order to prevent a repetition of the depression of the 1920's. Labor experts are now predicting that the latter half of 1946 will show an unemployment of some five to six million men and women. This may be reduced considerably in 1947, but, according to their estimates, from 1948 on through 1950, there will be as many as ten or twelve million unemployed. A situation of this kind will be very hard to meet and keep our form of Government intact. This is especially true when we recognize the subversive influences that are at work in our society today. It is my conviction that one of the most stabilizing influences that we could develop at this time would be the retirement of our seniors on a sound economic basis providing them with an income sufficient to provide the necessities of life and some of the luxuries. In doing so, they will consume the products of factories and farms; they will tend to circulate money and will provide purchasing power necessary to sustain our economy and preserve our system of free enterprise. Certainly no one would object to a security system which will take care of the needs of the average individual after he has passed his productive years. Of the total number of those who are past 60 years of age, approximately 90 percent are dependent upon someone else either in part or totally for their subsistence.

If we have been able to provide hundreds of billions of dollars for war purposes, and loans to foreign countries, certainly we are able to provide a decent living, in old age, for those people who made our present prosperity possible.

I feel this is one of the outstanding domestic problems that confronts us today. Let us do away with the needs test and adopt an old-age security system that is just and recognizes human rights.

Man's True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Washington Sunday Star, March 10, 1946, on man's true security, by Arthur J. Todd, of the Christian Science Committee on Publication for the District of Columbia:

MAN'S TRUE SECURITY

(By Arthur J. Todd, Christian Science Committee on Publication for the District of Columbia)

The whole world is seeking desperately for some road to security; for some formula, some organization, national and international, which will safeguard it against the devastation, poverty, and misery of recent years. New Deal, social security, Beveridge plan, planned society, Atlantic Charter, UNO, all signify attempts to crystallize human thinking and organize human effort to this great end. Our National Capital is a strategic focus for attempts to implement the "four freedoms" and any others which may be proposed. Every one of these attempts reduces finally to some form of insurance, whether against poverty, ignorance, intolerance, sickness, or war.

The basic essentials of Christianity emphasize security. But much of current social philosophy, political activity, and even religious pronouncement focuses on insecurity. Let me go right to the heart of this business and declare in no uncertain terms that insecurity is atheism, whether it expresses itself as insecure health, insecure grip on life, insecure job, insecure income, insecure domestic relations. Atheism is disbelief in, or denial of, the existence of God, or supreme intelligent Being (Webster). Insecurity denies God as Mind and presents Him as unable to comprehend His own universe or to govern it. It denies that He is all-knowing, all-seeing, all-acting. It denies God as Spirit, inexhaustible energy, power, and substance. It denies God as Principle, the dependable One, the orderer and sustainer of His universe. It denies God as Life and makes existence contingent on matter. It denies God as Love and makes Him not the all-loving friend but the dangerous enemy of His own children. It denies God as Truth, for it questions whether there is any actuality except in human knowledge, human planning, human government.

The vast systems of so-called social insurance or social security can be traced to such denials or such atheism. The quest for security is age-old. Indeed, the whole history of mankind could be written in terms of this search. Unfortunately, it has been too largely a search along the road of matter. It is right and good to search, but that quest must be intelligent and rational. Otherwise it will end in futility, frustration, disappointment. As the discoverer and founder of Christian Science, Mary Baker Eddy, points out in her book Science and Health With Key to the Scriptures, "* * * man, left to the hypotheses of material sense unexplained by science, is as the wandering comet or the desolate star—'a weary searcher for a viewless home.'" (Science and Health, p. 121: 14–16.)

Belief in matter is the source of all fear and insecurity. Hence the necessity for rising above that belief to a spiritual understanding of God and of man dwelling secure in a perfect universe of God's creating. Insurance and security organizations derive from a belief of risk and represent the attempt to socialize risk. Christianity declares that he risks nothing who obeys God's law. In other words, man's essential unity with God gives him security and the ability to reflect God's affluence in plentiful supply for every human need. The best insurance against evil chance and insecurity is the knowledge and certainty of what is, namely, divine principle, God's allness, power, and goodness. The first chapter of the first book of the Bible is the epitome of every man's charter of divine security. We shudder sometimes at the staggering debt of the United States and of other nations involved in global war, and we may well wonder whether any kind of insurance policy, private or public, can be counted upon to yield security against poverty, unemployment, age, sickness, or accident. But Christian Science teaches that: "Soul (God) has infinite resources with which to bless mankind." (Science and Health, p. 60: 29.)

In order to prove God's goodness and enjoy the security which derives from it, we must be receptive to divine truth, accept it, obey it, and put it into practice. Ultimately we must come to complete trust in God as our security. Can you ask for any greater guaranty of security than divine omnipotence? Who will be so bold as to say that he will regard the state as superior in power, in resources, and in benevolence to the omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent God, the Father of man, in whose perfect image and likeness man was created and is sustained? Show me the human insurance policy, governmental or private, which can compare in stability, coverage, or surety, with such divine policies as were announced, say, in the twenty-third or thirty-seventh or ninety-first Psalms.

There is danger in man-made, hand-tailored plans for security. They may lead to complacency, ease in manner, self-satisfaction, laziness, drifting. Since to stand still

is to degenerate, anything that removes incentive to progress is dangerous. True self-confidence, the faith born of understanding that man is veritably the son of God, a confidence that places God first, is our best security. Remember Ruskin's challenge, "He who offers God a second place, offers him no place."

The prophet Isaiah vividly describes the contrast between leaning on materiality and on spiritual understanding. The Lord of Hosts is depicted as removing every (material) prop and stay from Judah and Jerusalem, soldier and warrior, governor, prophet, seer, official, authorities, councilors, expert magicians, and enchanters. Then we are reminded that "instruction comes from Sion" and urged to "live by the light of the Eternal." Security, then, rests in this light of the Eternal.

To sum up, God's infinity is man's security. Even a slight understanding of this truth can begin to destroy fear and yield everlasting security.

Hon. Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman's Political Quarterback," written by Rufus Jarman and published in the Saturday Evening Post of March 2, 1946. The article deals with Mr. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General, and chairman of the Democratic National Committee. An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the article will occupy 2⅔ pages of the RECORD and that the cost of printing will be $160.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S POLITICAL QUARTERBACK

(By Rufus Jarman)

BOB HANNEGAN, ONE-TIME PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL STAR, NOW CALLS THE SIGNALS FOR THE FORMIDABLE AGGREGATION THAT JIM FARLEY RECRUITED

The State of Missouri, which, up to recently, never amounted to very much in national politics, is now having its day in Washington, and the gentleman mainly responsible for the current phenomena on the Potomac—including the presence of Harry S. Truman in the White House—is Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan, the former Democratic boss of St. Louis. Hannegan is a 42-year-old, 6-foot-1, 200-pound Irishman with a square jaw and dark stubby hair, who looks like, and used to be, a football fullback.

Since 2 years ago, when he became head coach, signal caller, and cheer leader for the Democratic Party as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, political organization work has blossomed and blossomed, and the party is now enjoying a greater degree of prestige and influence than it has known since the days of James A. Farley. Hannegan's influence has been gaining right along with the committee's. He is President Truman's chief adviser on patronage, and is regarded as a sort of grand vizier. Some observers rate him as the most powerful man in the Government. He is in and out of the White House constantly, and between times confers with the Chief Executive by telephone, concerning appointments to jobs ranging from the Cabinet and Supreme Court on down to postmaster.

In many ways Hannegan is not so suave and urbane as some of the party chairmen who have preceded him. Sartorially, he is immaculate, with a fancy for blue and brown suits with shirt, ties, and handkerchiefs of matching hues. His personal habits are of the best. He is a tremendous worker and he neither drinks nor smokes, although he is proficient at throwing flaming words around when he becomes excited. He likes to read when he has time for it, and has a fondness for historical novels. But politically he is still a bucking fullback, who prefers to smash through the center of the line rather than execute fancy runs around end.

He uses the meat ax instead of the rapier and he is still a lot closer to the smoke-filled back room than he is to sedate drawing rooms and elaborate hotel suites, where some of the more polished party chieftains of the past have largely operated.

"Bob is a good guy and a good chairman," one eminent Democrat remarked recently, "but he has still got a lot of St. Louis in his hair."

The Hannegan concept of politics is simple and straightforward. "All you have to do to win elections," he says, "is go in there and organize and get that vote out. I get tired of some of these people who call themselves liberals—'crying liberals,' I call them—because they are always wanting to issue a statement about something. I regard myself as a practical liberal."

A political headquarters, Hannegan believes, should be bright, cheerful, and efficient, but there should not be too many people around. "That's an unhealthy sign," he says. "There are a lot of guys I call 'headquarters Johnnies.' They like to hang around headquarters and be seen there, but they are not worth a damn in winning elections. Headquarters is a clearinghouse only. You can't get out votes by sitting at a desk."

The Hannegan theory of vote-getting was illustrated during the Presidential campaign by his remarks to a stately gentleman in a Homburg hat who had come to New York from a midwestern city to help ornament the Hotel Biltmore headquarters. "See here, Hannegan," the gentleman said; "I control a lot of votes around the country, and I think I can do you a lot of good here at headquarters. I'll need a large office, at least two secretaries, and plenty of personal stationery. I want to write a lot of letters."

The chairman asked the gentleman whether he lived in an apartment house or in a private residence. The man said he lived in an apartment. "Well, you have got a couple of elevator starters or so and maybe a dozen and a half elevator operators," Hannegan said. "Do you know whether they are registered and how they are going to vote?"

The man said no, he didn't.

"You have got a bunch of chambermaids, two or three janitors, an electrician or so, and a manager. Do you know how any of them are going to vote?"

The man said he didn't know that, either.

"You've got maybe 90 families living in your building. Do you know how any of them are going to vote?"

The man said no.

"Well, I'll tell you what you do. You go back home, and 30 days from now come back to see me, and see if you can tell me who in your building are registered and how they feel about the candidates. If you do that, you'll be a greater leader than anybody here at headquarters."

As party chairman, Hannegan has made his job recommendations to the White House with the idea of pleasing the most possible Democrats around the country. He calls himself "an old team man," and believes that before a man from some section is given an appointment, his local Democratic leaders should be consulted; it makes them feel better and helps party harmony. On an average day the chairman chats about patronage with probably half a dozen governors, 8 or 10 mayors, and perhaps a dozen Senators and Congressmen. These conversations are usually by telephone.

The chairman's efforts are constantly aimed at cementing party unity, which suffered in 1944, when the liberal wing of the party was not pleased about the convention's failure to renominate Henry A. Wallace for Vice President. Hannegan, who had opposed Wallace at the convention, nevertheless helped secure Wallace's confirmation as Secretary of Commerce last winter, in spite of Senate opposition. His probable reason was to prevent the liberals from making a martyr of Wallace. Not long ago Hannegan managed the appointment, as a member of the United States Maritime Commission, of Raymond S. McKeough, of Illinois, western director of the CIO Political Action Committee, although a congressional committee had reported adversely on McKeough. More recently, he backed the appointment of Irvin C. Mollison, Chicago Negro lawyer, who became a member of the United States Customs Court in New York.

THERE'S ALWAYS A DESERVING DEMOCRAT

Probably his greatest contribution to the party to date, however, has been his program of revitalizing the Democratic National Committee, which began to go into a decline late in the second Roosevelt administration, when it became apparent that Chairman Farley would be a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1940. Edward J. Flynn, who succeeded Farley as chairman, was more interested in political affairs of the Bronx than in the national committee, and seldom got down to headquarters. Flynn thought the Farley system of keeping in close touch with county chairmen was hokum, and abandoned the practice. Frank C. Walker, who succeeded Flynn, never wanted to be chairman in the first place.

As a result, when Hannegan became chairman, in January 1944, he found conditions at headquarters in a state that he regarded as appalling. Headquarters—a big, rambling suite in Washington's Mayflower Hotel—had been growing duller ever since the departure of Farley. The suite was occupied mainly by Charley Michelson, publicity director for 15 years, and several typewriters that were seldom used. "It was awful," Hannegan recalls with horror. "There was thick dust on the chairs and tables because nobody had sat on them for so long." There was no office for Hannegan, and not even a mailing list of county chairmen. Patronage was out of hand. The national committee was never consulted about appointments, and the administration was even appointing some Republicans to office—a condition that Hannegan considers unspeakable.

"Don't get me wrong," he sometimes remarks in discussing this condition. "People say that I think anybody who is a Democrat is capable of holding office. That isn't what I believe at all. I think a man's qualifications come first, but I haven't run into any jobs yet that you couldn't find a good, qualified Democrat to fill."

Hannegan has revised patronage disposal and shot some life-giving elixir into headquarters, which is busy laying plans for winning the 1946 congressional elections. The committee's power is further enhanced because of the close friendship between the chairman and the President, who is a strict party-organization man himself, with apparent faith in Hannegan methods. This is natural because Hannegan saved Truman's political life at least once back in Missouri, and is probably more responsible than anybody else is for placing Truman in line to succeed

to the Presidency. It has been said that Mr. Truman's career is based on the most amazing group of ifs and buts in the history of American politics, which may be true, but some hard practical politics also figured in his rise to power.

To understand why Harry S. Truman is President of the United States, a person ought to know the background of his good friend. Robert Emmet Hannegan got his political start in the old twenty-first ward in northwest St. Louis, where the houses have sooty chimney pots and it hasn't been long since old-fashioned gas lamps used to burn there in a noxious atmosphere composed of fog from the big river, smoke from the East St. Louis smelters, and aromas from stockyards and from hops soaking in the neighboring breweries. Hannegan was born there on June 30, 1903, a son of an Irish Catholic policeman, who, Hannegan still believes, was probably one of the greatest policemen in the world—or at least in St. Louis.

Probably Hannegan's deep regard for his father is one reason for his devotion to the Democratic Party. The Democrats elevated his father to chief of detectives, and then the Republicans came along and demoted him to a mere captain. There were three Hannegan boys, built like young blacksmiths, who distinguished themselves at football, baseball, basketball, and swimming at Yeatman High School and in the municipal leagues. At St. Louis University, Hannegan won letters in all the sports played there, and was graduated in law in 1925. He later played professional football and baseball, and by the time he had settled down to be a lawyer, he was considered the chief sports authority and hero in northwest St. Louis.

This had its debilitating effects on his chosen calling, as people were always wanting to talk to him about sports instead of about law. To offset this, Hannegan once spent a year without attending a single sport event, and when people asked him what he thought about the Cardinals' chances or similar matters, he would reply, "I don't know a thing about it. When are you going to send me a case?" He got his law practice that way, and became about as well known around the courthouse as in the stadium.

This combination of successes influenced the Democrats of his ward to elect him to the party's city central committee in 1933. The old leaders said they needed new blood, which was understandable because the twenty-first had not gone Democratic in the memory of man. Hannegan changed this, and the ward voted Democratic 3 months after he took charge. A month after the election he was named chairman of the city central committee, and for almost 9 years thereafter he was co-boss of St. Louis with the Democratic mayor, Bernard F. Dickmann.

The Truman-Hannegan friendship began in 1934, when the St. Louis machine opposed Truman in a bitter senatorial primary fight, but when Truman won it, Hannegan and Dickmann went all out for him in the general election. Hannegan's greatest contribution to Truman in Missouri was in the 1940 senatorial primaries, when Truman was regarded as a dead political duck. The Tom Pendergast machine of Kansas City, which had sponsored him, was out of power, and Pendergast himself was under sentence for income-tax evasion. Truman was talking unhappily about going down with the ship, and St. Louis was expected to present a 100,000-vote majority to the favorite candidate, Gov. Lloyd C. Stark, who was running for the Democratic nomination for Senator. The newspapers, the reform element, and most of the city's articulate forces were back of Stark, that is, all but the Democratic committee and Chairman Hannegan. Hannegan chose to ignore Truman in his public utterances and to discuss Stark.

He would ask how in the world Stark could be expected to lose, and he even proposed him as a candidate for Vice President—a bit of strategy intended to confuse the issue and give the idea that Stark was a candidate for everything. The anti-Truman forces in St. Louis were thus lulled into a sense of false security, and no real attack was made on Truman in the city during the campaign's critical phases.

Then, the night before the primary, the candidate choices of the Hannegan-Dickmann machine were distributed. There were sample ballots for each ward, bearing the names of all candidates. The candidate chosen by the machine's organization in each ward was printed in large capitals. There are 28 wards in St. Louis, and the machine backed Truman in 22 of them. The opposition gave a bellow of rage, but it was too late. Truman carried the city by about 8,000 votes, and, thus aided, was able to carry the State by a bare 7,000 votes.

Truman, with the help of the St. Louis machine, won in the general election, but the Hannegan-Dickmann Democratic candidate for governor lost the election to a Republican. This infuriated St. Louis Democrats, who resolved to contest the election, an ill-advised and badly executed move that Hannegan says he did not approve. The contest dragged through the general assembly and the State supreme court, and became known as the infamous governorship steal. The Republican nominee was seated eventually, but the newspapers continued to shout about the infamy of the Democrats, and laid most of the blame on Hannegan. One newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, put a staff of reporters to work on the exclusive job of finding something crooked in Hannegan's past. The investigation went on for weeks, but the reporters found nothing dishonest, and he continued as city Democratic chairman.

The newspapers had been so eloquent in their condemnations, however, that when Mayor Dickmann ran for a third term he was crushed at the polls. The matter of the "governorship steal" might have ended after that if the post of collector of internal revenue at St. Louis had not become vacant early in 1942. Hannegan, as Democratic chairman, wrote letters to Senators Truman and Bennett Champ Clark in behalf of several aspirants for the job. The Senators could agree on none of them, and finally decided that Hannegan was the man for the job. The Post-Dispatch got wind of this, and let out an editorial scream the like of which has been seldom heard in the windy halls of journalism. The Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat fit into Hannegan with renewed vigor, and the "governship steal" was again paraded before the public.

If it had not been for these blasts, Hannegan would probably still be practicing law in St. Louis, unknown politically outside of Missouri, and Mr. Truman would probably still be in the Senate. Hannegan had no notion of taking the collector's job, which carried an annual salary of $6,500. He was making about $40,000 a year as a lawyer. But he got mad when the Post-Dispatch called the idea of his being collector "an affront to thousands," and the Globe-Democrat termed him "the most discredited boss of a discredited party." He said he would be collector in spite of his loss of income and in spite of the newspapers and, furthermore, he would be the best damned collector in the history of St. Louis.

"I never quit under fire," he added. At this point, Senator Truman spoke up from Washington as follows: "Hannegan carried St. Louis three times for the President and for me. If he is not nominated, there will be no collector at St. Louis." A short while later President Roosevelt appointed Hannegan to the job.

Hannegan threw himself into his new work with a fury seldom seen in Government circles. He was the first one at the collector's office in the morning and the last to leave in the evening. He went to night school and read all the books he could find on Government taxation. He eliminated lines of waiting taxpayers by scattering deputy collectors about the city; said he wanted to make tax-paying as painless as possible. He held "pep" meetings, and so inspired the employees of his department that they worked at night and on Sundays for no extra pay. Hannegan taught his men that efficiency and courtesy were the most important parts of their job. The new income-tax law, which added about 50,000,000 new taxpayers to the rolls, went into effect that year, and the St. Louis office was the first large one in the country to report. Hannegan worked so hard that his wife became alarmed about his health. "I guess you are killing yourself just to fool the Post-Dispatch," she remarked.

At the end of 1942, when Hannegan had been in office 8 months, the rating of the office in St. Louis had been changed from the worst in the Nation to the best, from the standpoint of efficiency and performance. A few months later, when the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue in Washington became vacant, heads of the Treasury Department voted unanimously that Hannegan was the Nation's outstanding collector, and recommended his appointment as Commissioner. He took over that job in the fall of 1943.

The new Commissioner said the department was suffering from hardening of the arteries, and started in to modernize the whole set-up. He gave his customary "pep" meetings and lectures on courtesy, and managed to visit with the department's employees in the 16 largest States during his 3 months as Commissioner. His Commissioner's career was short because Democratic leaders, who were casting about for a new party chairman to direct the 1944 elections, were impressed by Hannegan's enthusiasm and organizing ability in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and they recommended him to President Roosevelt for party chairman. The President, who didn't know Hannegan, looked him over twice under the guise of talking taxes, and liked him. When the national committee met the following January, the understanding was that Hannegan was Roosevelt's choice, and his election to the chairmanship was automatic.

"Anything I do, I have to do all out," Hannegan says frequently, and that is the way he has operated as chairman. The day after his election he started visiting, and by April he had traveled some 12,000 miles into most of the States. He was convinced that Democratic leaders about the land were sore about patronage, that they had long wanted to raise thunder with somebody, but in the past there had been nobody to absorb their criticism, Hannegan went out and let them hurl brickbats at him. He preferred to hold his meetings in shabby political halls instead of in ballrooms, and he addressed hundreds of precinct workers who had never before seen a national chairman. He talked a lot about how he, too, had been a precinct worker.

"I'm just a regular, 100-percent organization, strictly partisan Democrat," he told them. "I'm a practical politician and I know your problems." He would then allow the disgruntled leaders to get the ire off their chests, but he says that most of them ended up on his team.

During his travels Hannegan kept an ear to the ground to learn whom the leaders liked for Vice President. Wallace was believed at the time to have the best chance, but Hannegan did not want Wallace as a candidate, and told him so. He found that a lot of States had favorite sons they wanted to run, but he was able to get out of most of the leaders a few favorable words about Truman, who was known for his work as chairman of the Truman committee. Hannegan brought back enthusiastic reports about Truman's popularity to the President, and said the Missouri

Senator was the only possible running mate for Roosevelt who would not lose the ticket votes. He said that Wallace was considered too much of an idealist and was not popular in the South, and that there were various sectional dislikes for the other aspirants. The chairman said Truman had the plain, homely sort of American characteristics that would inspire confidence in wartime, and that Truman, with a war record dating back to 1918, was popular with the veterans.

At the same time Hannegan was putting up a series of pep talks to Truman himself, who was reluctant about the whole thing. Truman was afraid that Roosevelt did not want him as a running mate because he and his committee had been critical of some phases of the war effort. He also feared that the opposition would confront him with his former connection with the old Pendergast machine in Kansas City, and embarrass his family. Hannegan finally persuaded Truman not to do anything rash, like saying publicly that he would reject the nomination.

When the Democratic National Convention was preparing to meet in Chicago in July to renominate President Roosevelt and select a candidate for Vice President, Hannegan saw to it that Truman arrived in town quietly, with no fanfare. He figured that somebody at the head of the parade of Vice Presidential aspirants was going to get killed off, and he did not want his man in a vulnerable position. Wallace had some 400 of the convention's 1,176 votes pledged to his cause. Truman was considered a poor eighth or tenth.

This was pleasing to Hannegan, who did not want Truman brought into the limelight until the proper moment. It was pleasing also to Truman, who still did not believe Mr. Roosevelt wanted him. He regarded his poor showing in preconvention talk as an indication that he would not be put in an embarrassing spot, but he followed Hannegan's advice and kept pretty much to his suite in the Stevens Hotel.

Two or three nights before the convention was to open, President Roosevelt, en route to San Diego, stopped at Chicago, and Hannegan visited him in the railroad yards. He has never revealed what was said, but apparently he got the President's definite approval of Truman as a running mate. Hannegan then began quietly lining up the States behind Truman, assuring the leaders that he was the Roosevelt choice. Several of the big-city bosses are also believed to have helped turn the President against Wallace.

Wallace, who had a mild endorsement from the President and who had intended to remain in Washington, now left the Capital for Chicago with great speed to make a personal fight for renomination. Wallace arrived in Chicago during the convention's first day, amid considerable tumult and shouting, and was acclaimed at the railroad station and later at his hotel and on the convention floor. He said he was there for a fight to the finish. Hannegan responded to this by announcing that he had a letter from President Roosevelt stating he would "be pleased" to have either Truman or Justice Douglas as a running mate.

A rumor spread quickly that Hannegan had no such letter, and was bluffing to salvage Truman's chances. The chairman did not deny this, and it has since come to be believed that he spread the bluffing rumor among tipsters for certain columnists, who demanded indignantly that Hannegan produce the letter. Hannegan waited until the following day, when the tension had become so great that his press conference was packed, and the writers shouted angry questions at him. He then exhibited the letter. His reason for delaying that long was to build up suspense so that the letter, when he produced it, would get the maximum publicity—a technique that Hannegan calls timing.

In spite of the telling effects of Hannegan's letter, the Wallace forces, which included the CIO-PAC, planned their great effort for the second night of the convention, in the hope of stampeding the delegates for Wallace. The Chicago Stadium looked more like a Wallace rally than a Democratic convention, with Wallace-Roosevelt banners all over the place and the galleries packed with Wallace supporters. It has since been charged that many of them got in on fake tickets. President Roosevelt addressed the convention by radio, responding to his fourth-term nomination.

After he had finished, the Wallace demonstration began, first in the galleries, then spreading to the convention floor, where State delegations grabbed standards and joined in the parade. The Times reported that not a majority of the State votes were represented in the Wallace demonstration, but the atmosphere of stampede was heavy in the air. This looked dangerous to Hannegan, who didn't want his plans upset by hysteria.

The Wallace demonstration was just getting into swing when something strange happened. People who ought to know say that what happened was that Hannegan had all the outer doors of the stadium opened, and the general public stormed in, causing the Wallace demonstration to get completely out of hand. The hubbub became so great that the demonstration broke up in confusion, with a great fainting of women and trampling of sore feet. The convention chairman was forced to adjourn the session for the night, before anybody was offered for the Vice Presidential nomination.

The next day, with things more settled, the nominations for Vice President proceeded. On the first ballot Wallace led with 429½ votes, Truman was second with 319½, and the remaining votes were split between 14 candidates. As soon as the tabulation was announced, two delegations spoke up and said they wanted to change their votes from favorite sons to Truman.

They were out of order, but they had achieved what Hannegan was hoping for. They put the convention in a Truman frame of mind, and he won on the second ballot, 1,031 to 105 for Wallace, who was runner-up.

Ever since the Democratic ticket won in 1944, and particularly since Truman succeeded to the Presidency, there have been rumors that Hannegan, having helped make his man President, intends to resign soon as Postmaster General and Democratic chairman, and return to his law practice in St. Louis. Hannegan says that would probably be the best thing in the world for his family and himself, but he shows no signs of intending to leave Washington any time soon. His friends say that Hannegan feels he has an obligation to help Mr. Truman all he can, and that he will remain in Washington until after the 1948 elections anyway. The Hannegan home in St. Louis has been sold, and he has bought a large stone one in Washington's exclusive Glenbrook Road section, where he lives with his boyhood sweetheart, the former Irma Protzmann, whom he married in 1929, and their four children, Patricia, 14; Robert, Jr., 11; William, 10; and Sally, 6.

Hannegan is a devoted family man, and enjoys playing games with his children, such as the card game of Old Maid, but he doesn't get to see very much of his family these days, since he has set about, with characteristic enthusiasm, to reform the Post Office Department. He now works 10 or 11 hours a day in the huge paneled Postmaster General's office, and spends a good portion of his Sundays holding conferences around town. One postal reform Hannegan is sponsoring is the abolition of the air-mail stamp. He says that all letters should be sent by air for the price of a 3-cent stamp, and to do this he proposes the use of transport planes similar to those used during the war by the Army. The planes would be operated by private air lines.

"Our Department is the biggest business in the world," Hannegan says. "We do a $16,000,000,000 business a year, and any business that large ought to be the most efficient in the world. If we are as efficient and up-to-date as we should be, it is incumbent on us to send letters the fastest way possible, which is by air, and not charge extra for doing it."

Another of Hannegan's ideas is to provide his Department with modern, streamlined equipment in the way of postal trucks and letter boxes, and he has been conferring with tailors and garment designers about a new type of uniform for letter carriers. He doesn't think the present uniforms of drab gray are sufficiently exotic for his Department, and it may not be long before the Nation's postmen will be strutting around their routes, in resplendent outfits suggestive of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Perhaps the most far-reaching of the proposed Hannegan postal reforms concerns the small country post offices, which often occupy a remote corner of some general-merchandise store, where postal business is carried on in an atmosphere of the potbellied stove, tobacco juice, the cracker barrel, and the aroma of dill pickles. Hannegan not only intends to improve the service in these post offices, which he says is often lackadaisical, but intends to back legislation appropriating funds for the Government to buy these country stores and erect modern, attractive buildings of a sleek and streamlined nature.

"I want to give the people in small villages post offices that they will be proud of," Hannegan says. "After all, the post office is Uncle Sam to the people in small places, and Uncle Sam ought to look handsome and efficient wherever he is represented."

Of all the post offices in the land, however, Hannegan intends to establish one that will be the acme, the climax, and the culmination of all that is excellent in postal service, and that will be the one in St. Louis, which he regards as a sort of mecca of urban civilization. In spite of his successes in national politics, Hannegan is still a home-town boy.

Farm-Land Prices Are Not Too High in Northern and Northwestern Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a letter on the subject of land values written by Mr. Albert Anderson, a constituent of mine from Clearbrook, Minn., was recently brought to my attention. Mr. Anderson is a farmer and a county commissioner of Clearwater County.

There has been a considerable amount of information put out by various Government agencies designed to prevent speculators and others from starting a land boom.

Although the intentions back of such a program are good, it has had a somewhat adverse effect on the sale of good farm lands in my district in particular, and perhaps throughout the Nation in general.

What Mr. Anderson has to say about this subject is very interesting and I feel that the arguments he sets forth should come to the notice of my colleagues and also the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His analysis of the farm-land situation, particularly in northern and northwestern Minnesota, follows:

Agriculturists, or owners of producing farms, throughout the United States are being treated to a cheek-slapping program never witnessed before in this land. They are made the objects of inflation propaganda by Government agencies and organizations which claim to be working for the best interest of agriculture.

These agencies, working through our press—National, State, and local—are continually croaking, bullfrog fashion, that farm-land prices are too high, and practically advising men and women who are looking for farm homes not to buy farms.

It may be that farm prices in certain sections, located near industrial centers, are being inflated. Be that as it may, such a nightmare is no reason why farm-minded people, in agricultural States like Minnesota, and closer home right here in Clearwater County, should be made the object of these prophets of ignorance, who are not acquainted with the true agricultural land prices, conditions, and locations.

Agricultural farm-land prices at $500, $400, $300 per acre, yes, even $200 per acre, are excessive at any time or place, unless you are buying and paying for palaces and inflated improvements built by men with money to throw away. Let the rich play that game, but do not classify good honest farms in that agency. Our common farm people are not looking for that kind of farms.

Minnesota offers men and women looking for choice farm homes the opportunity of a lifetime today. Thousands of farms can be purchased for $100 per acre, and in this territory from $50 to $60 per acre, well improved.

Today it will cost you at least $75 per acre to clear timber lands for the plow. When you buy open farm lands at the above prices, you are getting a bargain, with cooperative and profitable market prices, organization, and modern farm implements, which make farming a pleasure in place of drudgery.

We are not going to tell anyone what vocation you are to choose in life. You know and understand your sphere of ability.

Professional men do not make good farmers. Neither do farmers make good professional men. There is a limit of operation to each class.

But, there is no profession on earth which gives you the liberty and independence of a farmer, especially the American farmer, who is king of the universe, if he doesn't let the politicians farm him out of house and home, especially now by advising farmers not to buy farms at inflation prices. Guess they want our farmers in the picket lines in our over-populated cities.

Inflation prices have not, and will not reach this territory. When you buy a farm, buy black soil with clay subsoil, in proven farm territory, and you cannot go wrong.

Give the professional political pessimist a kick in the pants.

ALBERT ANDERSON,
County Commissioner Fourth District, Clearwater County, Clearbrook, Minn.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered yesterday on the subject Who Should Control Atomic Energy in This Country? The address was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When a Senator finds himself out-voted 10 to 1 on a vital issue, he should, with humility, reexamine his position carefully and objectively. After he has done so, he should either recognize his error, or he should speak out to the American people for that which he believes to be right.

The vital issue is: Are we going to have military domination or civilian development of atomic energy in this country?

During the past week, the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate has been working to put into final form, for presentation to the full Senate, legislation for the control of atomic energy. The deliberations of the committee were centered upon the bill which I proposed many weeks ago and which has become generally known as the McMahon bill. The basic scheme of this bill is the placement of the development of atomic energy in the hands of civilians, i. e., in the hands of a five-man commission made up of men of unquestioned patriotism, of men of recognized superlative ability in their chosen pursuits, and men of truly extraordinary breadth of vision—in short, of men of such caliber that their usefulness would well-nigh be destroyed by imposing upon them a subserviency to any group having a narrow outlook on this most momentous problem.

In the course of the committee deliberations, Senator VANDENBERG proposed an amendment to the McMahon bill. The effect of this amendment—if indeed not its very purpose, as I demonstrate more fully later—would be to so throttle the action of the civilian commission as to amount to the abandonment of all actual control to the military.

The committee voted 10 to 1 in favor of the Vandenberg amendment. Mine was the lone voice in opposition.

It is the issue presented by the Vandenberg amendment and the action of the committee thereon which impels me to talk to you tonight.

Now, let's get one thing straight.

There is no one in this country who has a keener admiration for our military leaders, and particularly for that fine body of reserve officers and men who have so magnificently delivered the goods in the last war. Their deeds in the war on the battlefields need no praise from me. They speak for themselves. But, also, I associate myself with the overwhelming majority of them in devotion to one of our most fundamental concepts of democratic government which is woven into the fabric of our history. I refer to the tradition that this country's affairs are in war and peace managed by, and its top decisions of policy made by, civilians and not by uniformed soldiers.

This country became great under the vibrant, virile leadership of civilians, and it will cease to be a republic when it substitutes that leadership for a militaristic oligarchy.

You will remember that in October 1945, a bill was introduced in the House and Senate which had been written by a War Department committee and which became known as the May-Johnson bill. It immediately raised a storm of protest among our people. These protests were rightly laid because the bill made it possible for military personnel to take over the management of atomic energy in this country.

Note carefully that it didn't compel the President to appoint military men to administer the bill. It merely made it possible for him to do so by providing that our time-honored law prohibiting military men from serving in civilian jobs should be repealed as far as atomic energy is concerned. There were many other features of the May-Johnson bill that were repugnant.

After the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy had studied the problem for 5 weeks, I drew and introduced a bill. Hearings have been held on this bill and practically every national organization in this country which has studied the matter has evidenced its support of it.

On one point, I felt that our people were united—we did not want the military to control atomic energy.

Now, my friends, the committee has, by a vote of 10 to 1, voted that degree of military supervision, participation, and right of suspension in the operation of this development which would engraft on our democratic processes a concept foreign to our best traditions. It also would tend to lessen and not enhance our national security.

I am not ready to turn this Government over to the generals and the admirals, and I here and now serve notice that as far as I am concerned, I shall endeavor to prevent any encroachment by the military on what are civilian matters and affairs. I emphasize that this is not because I dislike generals and admirals. I number some of them as warm friends. But this is a matter of principle that transcends personalities. Our founding fathers did not just guess their way into founding a government to be operated by civilians. They knew that military supremacy led to military despotism. There would be no Caesars or Napoleons in this Republic if they could help it.

But it is now proposed that a military liaison board shall have the power to hold up for review, and take to the President for decision, every proposed action of the civilian commission. This would exalt the military to a position of authority in our national affairs unprecedented in our history, repugnant to our traditions, and destructive to our principles.

Why not station a deputy chief of staff in the Attorney General's office, in the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, in fact, in the Securities and Exchange Commission, and finally in the Secretary of State's office, so that whatever they propose to do shall be reviewed by a military man on the ground that it affects the national defense. Once admit this right to the military and our Government as we know it is not long for this world.

I said a few minutes ago that such a proposal for a military board to have all the powers of a civilian commission without any of its responsibilities would lessen our security, and not advance it, as is claimed by the proponents of the proposal.

My friends, when I want my appendix cut out, I don't send for my lawyer, and when I make my will, I don't go to a doctor.

Military men are supposed to be expert in the use of weapons, but they are not expert in the invention of them.

The atomic bomb was invented by civilian scientists and produced by civilian engineers and industrialists. The Army's contribution lay in procuring the materials necessary and the furnishing of protection against espionage—both functions entrusted to it for no other reason than that it took the huge Army organization to conceal it during hostilities and to get the money for it.

The Army's operation of secrecy restrictions, it is true, kept the American people and the world from knowing of the work, but also, the scientists say, delayed the completion of the bomb. This, because the work was unnecessarily carried on in little secret compartments, and the enrichment of discovery and invention was slowed down by the silence clamps put on the scientists working a few feet from one another on the same basic problem.

If we get into another war, and God forbid. I want the biggest and most efficient atomic

weapons that can be devised. You won't get them from the military. They just don't produce scientific advances. The submarine came from Lake, a civilian; the airplane from the Wright brothers, civilians; the basic ideas of an atomic bomb, from about 100 civilians, and most of them foreigners, at that.

Creative people, people who invent things, don't wake on reveille and retire on taps. Shakespeare couldn't write a sonnet chaperoned by a top sergeant. The scientists have left the Manhattan project because they won't, with the emergency passed, work under Army supervision and domination. Oil and water won't mix here any more than anywhere else.

But, you may say, should not the military be informed and consulted on atomic weapons since they must use the weapons if they are to be used? Of course they should. I believe that there should be the closest coordination between the atomic energy commission and the War and Navy Departments.

I proposed that the Secretaries of War and the Navy be included as members of the commission. My bill would permit the military full rights to do research upon the development of new weapons, utilizing atomic energy. My bill provides full consultation with the military regarding the military uses of atomic energy. In view of this full protection of the military interest, the Vandenberg amendment, unless it is superfluous, can only have for its purpose the giving of dominating power to the military. But my bill, written for a nation of civilians, gives control of its affairs to civilians.

Now, listen for a moment to what is proposed by the committee for the administration of this tremendous adventure.

First, the committee proposes to let my proposal for a five-man commission to be composed of civilians stand. But then, the Vandenberg amendment proposes to set up a military board which shall censor everything the commission proposes to do.

Third, the committee proposes that the President appoint a nine-man civilian board as advisers to the commission. These gentlemen, unlike the military, haven't got the right of appeal or review. They simply advise.

Then, not satisfied with this, it is proposed to set up a joint congressional committee to make a continued study of the commission's activities, and to make the commission report continuously to it on what it is doing.

I think you can imagine, as well as I can, how much is going to be accomplished with this Jerry-built administrative contraption. It is a well-recognized principle of good administration that authority must go hand-in-hand with responsibility bu this proposal gives authority to the military board while leaving the responsibility with a civilian commission. This is obviously an impossible arrangement.

Where do you suppose we are going to get the kind of outstanding Americans, whom we so desperately need to operate this commission, if they are going to be checked and double-checked every time they try to make a move? Do you suppose that we would be able to get five Americans of the stature that is needed if we are to give them no final authority? How do you suppose a man such as Charles Evans Hughes would take to serving as chairman of such a commission (and he is the type of man, if he were 20 years younger, whom I would certainly hope to get) if he would have to answer to some military officer on every detail of his work?

Enact such an administrative set-up and there will be little progress in the science of atomic energy. There will be a slowing down in the dividends to the American people on their two and one-half billion dollar investment. Other countries may well be encouraged to believe that with a single-ness of purpose and effort, they will advance at a faster rate than we will. We must stay ahead in this field whether it is to be internationally controlled or whether it isn't, and the way to do it is to put it in the hands of civilians.

Is the East Unfair to the West and South?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following American Magazine poll of experts conducted by Arthur Kornhauser, Ph. D., bureau of applied social research, Columbia University:

IS THE EAST UNFAIR TO THE WEST AND SOUTH?

HOW THE EXPERTS VOTED

Have the actions of eastern big business and of the Federal Government tended to hold back the industrial development of our West and South?

	Percent
Yes; with important effects	66
Yes; but effects unimportant	20
No	14

Whole regions of this country feel left out of the industrial expansion and growing wealth of the Nation. Large parts of the South and West have failed to share the prosperity of the industrial East. And they resent it. More and more vigorously they demand a new deal.

They are particularly disturbed right now, with millions of their veterans coming back and with the impending shut-down of the many great war plants in their areas that gave them a brief chance to show their stuff, industrially.

Do these regions have a case? Are they right in charging that they have been mistreated? If so, what can be done to correct the situation? We put those issues to a group of leading authorities. * * * The experts are men who have studied the problems of regional economic development for many years. They include specialists in economic history, economic geography, industrial production and markets, agriculture and transport, natural resources and power. They come from all sections of the country, from private business, Government, universities, and research bureaus.

Nine out of ten agree that the South and the West have definitely been left behind in the industrial expansion of our country. They further believe that expansion in those areas is urgent, not only for their own sake, but for the Nation's welfare as a whole. A backward region, they declare, is a drag on the entire national economy.

Some add the further thought that broadening the location of our industries will help our military security. It is essential, says one, "to avoid extinction by atomic bombs."

The next question is whether the experts support the charge that eastern business interests and the Federal Government are partly to blame for conditions in the less prosperous regions. Seven out of eight state that the charge has some basis, and two-thirds of the experts say these influences have important effects in holding the regions back.

The matters which most seriously call for change, they state, are:

Unfair freight rates, which mean higher charges for industries in the less developed regions, to the benefit of established manufacturing business in the Northeast. A recent decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission is in the right direction, they believe, but this decision, now held up in the courts, goes only part of the way, and further changes are needed.

Monopolistic eastern corporations have controlled their prices and sales practices, so that new companies in the West and South are placed in a bad competitive position.

Bankers and industrial corporations in the East have been unwilling to make loans or to set up new companies or branch plants in undeveloped regions, because these might interfere with their investments in the old centers.

The practice of big eastern corporations in sitting on important patents needed by any competing industries that might be established in the West or South.

Several authorities suggest that such actions are not deliberately carried out against the regions, but are simply the efforts of older business in the East to retain its entrenched centralized position.

The experts were also critical of the Federal Government. They charged the Government with tolerating the business practices cited above. They said the Government had failed to give sufficient aid to small business and local developments in the region. And they contended that the Government's high tariff policy of the past had operated to the advantage of the manufacturing East.

But the most general charge is that both Government and big business interests have lacked positive plans and action in support of economically sound projects for developing the South and West. They have tried to carry on in the old ways.

What can be done? First of all, we asked about the future role of the Government in developing such regions. Ninety-five percent of the experts declare that the Federal Government should act to remove the blocks interfering with the development of the less developed regions and promote their industrial growth.

How? These, in gist, were their recommendations:

Reform still further the system of freight rates, and enforce fair treatment for all sections.

Enforce antitrust laws that prevent throttling regional development, and, where necessary, enact stricter laws to prevent the misuse of patents and discriminatory pricing practices.

Provide more positive aid for small business firms—first, by granting loans at low interest rates for promising enterprises, and, second, by sponsoring a great increase in research and information services for regional officials and businessmen.

See that the great, new war plants are turned over to companies that will operate them to the region's advantage. Three quarters of our experts definitely favor such action, though they point out that many of the plants cannot be put to use and that each case must be decided on its own merits.

Improve the health and education in the poorer sections of the Nation, not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because it will provide energetic, alert, skilled working people in these regions and a population which will demand more and better goods.

Take vigorous action in developing the land, forests, water power, and other resources of underdeveloped areas. Large-scale regional planning is called for. TVA (the Tennessee Valley Authority) is pointed to by many of the experts as a great example of what can be done along these lines. Three-quarters of all the experts specifically approved the idea of setting up new regional authorities like TVA.

When we asked why they favored such projects they pointed out that this type of set-up

helps to develop an entire area, with the actual work in the hands of people in the locality. There is no dictation from Washington, no bureaucratic control.

What has the TVA accomplished? They offer a long list of concrete achievements. It has improved the waterways and conserved the soil—controlled floods—furnished cheap electric power to homes and industries—supplied valuable technical help to farmers and small businessmen—encouraged new private enterprises—and has given the people better houses, schools, and communities.

Those in the minority, who disapprove of new TVA's, argue that all the results are doubtful—that they conflict with private enterprise and with States' rights—that it makes taxpayers of the entire Nation pay for projects that benefit only a few—and that it would be better to rely on cooperation between the regular old Federal and State agencies.

Most of the experts reject these charges, however. They believe TVA has done a valuable job, and they suggest that similar arrangements will be give equally good results elsewhere. But a number of them warn against following the TVA pattern slavishly. Each area has its own special problems and must adopt solutions that fit its special needs.

But, with or without Federal help, what can the regions do to help themselves? Nine out of 10 of our experts believe the regions can do a good deal, themselves. Here are the lines of action they recommended that the regions follow:

Abandon the petty rivalries between the various economic groups and localities within the regions and the bickering between the States, as when they set up interstate trade barriers against one another.

Create local organizations to carry on surveys and experiments to discover what new industries and types of agriculture can flourish in the area, and how its raw materials can best be utilized.

Obtain more money for industrial expansion. A higher proportion of local savings should go into home-area enterprises. Investment pools and insurance of loans are suggested to help reduce the risks of the small investors. More important, local and State governments should make conditions attractive for new business. Each area should attract new enterprises by giving out full, accurate information about its opportunities. "Just honest sales work is needed," one expert declared. If good profits can be expected, the money will appear—and quickly.

Take action to hold the able young people and keep them from leaving their home areas to seek greener fields elsewhere. This can be done by creating good labor conditions, high wage policy, improved health and living standards—and constant effort to build new industries. One expert estimates that the less prosperous regions have been losing $3,000,000,000 worth of human capacity each year because of these migrations of young people away from underdeveloped regions. The figure would represent how much it cost the regions to care for these young people early in life, educate them, take care of their health, and then have them go elsewhere as soon as they come to their productive age.

In all these directions the experts insist that what is needed is Federal-local teamwork. Action by Washington can achieve little by itself. The initiative and cooperation of States and communities are indispensable. In short, the individual citizens of the regions must support the fight to win economic equality for themselves.

The experts in this poll include: Bushrod W. Allin, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; Governor Ellis Arnall, Atlanta, Ga.; O. E. Baker, Unversity of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Louis H. Bean, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.; E. L. Bogart, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; Ralph Budd, president, Burlington Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; Herman H. Chapman, University of Alabama, University, Ala.; E. J. Coil, National Planning Association, Washington, D. C.; Charles C. Colby, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Morris L. Cooke, Consulting Engineer, Washington, D. C.; David Cushman Coyle, Washington, D. C.; Daniel Creamer, Washington, D. C.; Mordecai Ezekiel, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; John P. Ferris, Knoxville, Tenn.; Ralph E. Flanders, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Boston, Mass.; Morris E. Garnsey, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; E. T. Grether, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Louis M. Hacker, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Alvin H. Hansen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Dudley Harmon, New England Council, Boston, Mass.; P. Hetherton, San Francisco, Calif.; Calvin B. Hoover, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Edgar M. Hoover, Department of State, Washington, D. C.; Malcolm Keir, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Charles E. Landon, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; David E. Lilienthal, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn; D. Philip Locklin, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; James G. Maddox, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; J. R. Mahoney, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah; Glenn E. McLaughlin, Office of Surplus Property, Reconstruction Finance Corp., Washington, D. C.; John Miller, National Planning Association, Washington, D. C.; Peter Molyneaux, Southwest Economic Bureau, Dallas, Tex.; Arthur E. Morgan, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Lewis Mumford, Hanover, N. H.; Howard W. Odum, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; H. F. Otte, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Anderson Pace, Illinois Central Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; J. H. Parmelee, Association of American Railroads, Washington, D. C.; James G. Patton, president, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Washington, D. C.; James P. Pope, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn.; Stephen Raushenbush, Division of Power, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; Paul J. Raver, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oreg.; George Smith, president, St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, St. Louis, Mo.; J. Russell Smith, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Van Beuren Stanbery, California State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission, Sacramento, Calif.; George W. Stocking, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Conrad Taeuber, Washington, D. C.; Rupert B. Vance, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; T. W. Van Metre, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; John V. Van Sickle, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; Walter Prescott Webb, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Wilford White, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; Charles P. Wood, Lockwood-Green & Co., New York, N. Y.; Baldwin M. Woods, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; T. J. Woofter, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.; Erich W. Zimmerman, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

The Huntington Plan

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I bring to the attention of my colleagues a housing plan which has developed in my home town, Huntington, W. Va. The Huntington plan, as far as I know, was the outcome of a meeting of veterans at Marshall College which inspired an editorial by Mr. H. R. Pinckard in the Herald-Advertiser on the housing situation. The editorial is in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A1301.

The Member who fails to assist in inaugurating the Huntington plan in his district will lose the greatest opportunity he has to render a real service in the housing of veterans.

The campaign slogan is "Open your heart and home to a veteran." We all know that under the most favorable conditions new construction cannot be available in any material degree within 8 or 12 months.

A committee of 100 citizens went to work in Huntington Monday morning, March 11, selling the people the idea of sharing their home with a veteran. The sponsorship for the campaign can be a chamber of commerce, veterans' organization, or any other strong civic body. It is my firm conviction that 1,000,000 veterans can be sheltered within a month by a diligent prosecution of the Huntington plan.

I have today wired the national and State commanders of veterans' organizations, bringing this plan to their attention in the hope that they will take the lead in promoting the idea in their respective jurisdictions.

To give you some details of what is taking place I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from Mr. P. O. Duncan, chairman of the Huntington housing committee, another editorial by Mr. Pinckard in the Herald-Advertiser of March 17, and a news item from the Herald-Advertiser concerning the same subject.

The letter, editorial, and news item are as follows:

DUNCAN BOX & LUMBER CO.,
Huntington, W. Va., March 14, 1946.

The Honorable HUBERT S. ELLIS,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: Just noted the March 12 issue of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1373, in which you inserted an editorial written by Punk Pinckard, regarding the housing situation in Huntington. You may or may not know that the writer is chairman of the Huntington housing committee, which committee is composed of representatives of practically every line of business and every profession in the city. We are now engaged in making a survey of the homes in Huntington, in an effort to induce families to share their homes with veterans, and/or civilians if they prefer to take in civilians. At the same time we are making an attempt to persuade owners of large homes, not now fully occupied, to convert such homes into apartments where restrictions do not prohibit such conversion. In other words, we are attempting to exhaust all local resources in order to properly house veterans, with particular emphasis on the 700 veterans now attending Marshall College—this number is expected to double in the next year. There is a tremendous demand for new housing in this city and likewise ample desire on the part of builders to relieve the situation, without Government aid or Government housing, provided the necessary materials for the construction of homes can be secured.

* * * * *

Thought you might be interested in the above information and with best personal regards, I am

Yours very truly,

P. O. DUNCAN.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Advertiser of March 17, 1946]

GOOD WORK

Congratulations are due the Huntington housing committee and the many volunteer solicitors who begun last week to cope realistically with the city's housing shortage. Recognizing that an adequate new-home program is too far in the future to be considered as an answer to immediate needs, the committee has begun a house-to-house "share the quarters" selling campaign.

Results have topped the most optimistic predictions. Not only are residents of the city opening their homes to veterans and others caught in the housing jam, but solicitors are turning up numerous dwelling units which owners have been anxious to convert into duplexes or multiple apartments. These will be given top priority by Huntington dealers in building materials, on the ground that they can be converted far more quickly than new units could be erected.

Best of all, in this community-wide effort to solve the housing problem at the local level instead of appealing to the Government for aid, is the spirit of cooperation which is powering it. Not since the fortunates with dry homes opened them to flood victims in 1937 has such a wave of good-neighborliness been noted. There is a rising determination to "do this job ourselves" until materials and manpower scarcities have been overcome.

This is as we hoped and believed it would be. Let us keep this tide of community good will flowing. Let us demonstrate that it is possible—in defiance of an old and honorable proverb—to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps. The job's well started; let's finish it!

H. R. P.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Advertiser]

ONE HUNDRED SOLICITORS WILL ASK CITY TO SHARE HOMES

(By Hugh Maxwell)

Have you opened your heart and home to a veteran?

That is the question 100 or more civic-minded volunteers will ask Huntington's 20,000 or more householders tomorow and every day for the next 2 weeks until, it is hoped, emergency housing is found for the needy.

The 14-day "share house" survey will be conducted by representatives of the Huntington Housing Committee, the board of realtors, the chamber of commerce and the junior chamber of commerce to uncover the estimated 15,000 local homes with space for more occupants.

P. O. Duncan, chairman of the housing committee, and President Frank O. Renshaw of the board of realtors, said that less than one-third of the homes in Huntington are filled to capacity.

Owners of homes and apartments with unused rooms will be asked, as a patriotic duty to the veterans who fought for their country in World War II, to share their quarters.

The emergency housing scheme is intended, according to Mr. Duncan, Mr. Renshaw, and others associated with the project, to serve as a stop-gap until the housing committee can get going with large-scale housing projects now in the mill.

Unwilling to keep the shelterless veterans and their wives and babies waiting while red tape is unsnarled to get construction of homes going, the groups sponsoring the survey agreed to carry an appeal direct to homeowners.

Quick results were gained in one veteran's case yesterday. Last night he sat at his own fireside with his family, one of the happiest men in Huntington.

Pro and Con Re Loan to England—Congressional Library States Both Sides for Hon. Clyde Doyle, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, because I knew the matter of the proposed loan to England would soon be brought to my attention on the floor of this great legislative body and I desired to obtain all the apparent arguments both for and against the same, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to put them on paper for me.

In calling this analysis to the attention of a few Members, they all appeared so pleased to know of it that it was suggested I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all the Members—also so that the other readers of the RECORD could also have it to help them in the thinking on this important matter:

V. ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THE LOAN

A. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

The principal arguments so far advanced for and against the proposed loan may be summarized as falling into three categories: (1) Arguments against the advisability of the loan itself; (2) arguments against specific terms of the loan; (3) arguments against agreements attached to the loan.

Critics in the United States have raised questions as to whether the loan will be repaid; whether it is of mutual benefit to both Nations; and whether the interest rate is too low and the waiver provision too favorable to Great Britain. British critics, on the other hand, consider the terms too harsh and feel that the loan should have been interest-free, that the sum should have been larger, and that the time given to Britain in which to adjust her economy is too short.

A parallel summary of some of these arguments is given below:

1. Arguments addressed to the advisability of the loan itself

Criticisms	Answers
The loan is an undue burden on already overburdened American taxpayers. If the United States is not prosperous she will not be able to purchase from other countries in the desired volume. Also, we have very heavy domestic obligations to meet, such as pensions for veterans. We also have a national debt of nearly $300,000,000,000.	The United States economy will be aided through purchases by Great Britain which will help the United States maintain full employment and production. This in turn will render us more easily able to meet the slight additional tax burden resulting from the loan. Expansion of multilateral trade will also help our exporters.
The loan is unsound because it is unsecured. It is, in reality, a gift disguised as a loan.	The degree of risk will depend largely on whether we make it possible for Great Britain to pay by lowering our tariffs and other trade barriers. Even if we lost the whole principal and interest of the loan, this would amount to only about 2 percent of our national debt.
Britain will not be able to repay the loan. She will not be able to produce enough exports quickly enough. Even if she did, we would not be willing to take them since her goods would compete with our domestic production to the detriment of our workers. If the loan is not paid, loss will result to the United States through loss of capital assets. Evidence that Britain will either not be able or willing to pay is the fact that she has not paid her World War I debt to us.	The loan will be used to help Britain get her productive capacity back on its feet and so put her in a position to repay. The loan differs from that following World War I in that (a) the former loan was to be repaid in cash from reparations. Other countries failed in their reparations payments to Britain; (b) the former loan was used to pay for past damage, not future production; (c) the United States raised her tariffs to an extremely high level thus making repayment impossible. Britain will be able to repay this loan if world prosperity remains high.
The British do not want the loan and we are forcing it upon them. It will further increase her foreign debt and thus weaken her economy in the long run.	Britain must import or die because of her lack of food and other essential raw materials. If Britain is to pay for imports of the things she needs, she must expand her exports very considerably. Her export trade was sacrificed during the war; her shipping (which brought a substantial prewar income in foreign exchange), and her foreign investments—from the earnings of which she paid for many imports—also were sacrificed during the war. Britain must have temporary financial help during the transition to peace because these sources of foreign exchange have been sacrified.
The loan should be privately financed. Why should our taxpayers foot the bill and bear the risk? A special 2-percent bond issue should be floated.	A private loan would not give Britain a transition period in which to recover her economic position since it would require a higher rate of interest to be attractive to investors, and interest from the start of the loan. It would also afford no bargaining power to gain trade concessions for the United States.
The loan would strengthen Britain as our competitor without corresponding benefits to our own trade.	American exporters can compete successfully if trade restrictions are removed. United States consumers will benefit through a greater flow of imports. American exporters will benefit because Britain was formerly our best customer.

Criticisms	Answers
The loan would be used to finance socialism in Great Britain through a broad program of reconstruction and nationalization of industry, to the detriment of our system of free enterprise. British political leaders voice harsh criticisms of our system.	The loan will strengthen the free enterprise system, since a strong Britain will be an important factor in the maintenance of a free stable world society. Also as prosperity increases in Britain controls will diminish and the urge toward socialization will become less. The loan cannot be used to pay for nationalization of British industry since such payments will be made in pounds or British securities, not dollars.
The loan will be a detriment to the cause of world peace because it will bolster British imperialism in the Far East.	A strong Britain is a bulwark to United States security, and hence to world peace.
This loan will serve as a precedent for loans to other countries. We should not make the loan until we review all demands. To refuse loans to others would generate ill-will toward the United States.	Britain and the United States together dominate world trade. Help to Britain should be immediate in order to promote world stability (and to assist Britain to meet the expected deficit in her balance of payments during the next 6 years).

2. Arguments addressed to the terms of the loan

Criticisms	Answers
The interest rate is too low. It is in reality about 1.62 percent since payments do not begin until the end of 1951. It is lower than the rate charged to our veterans for loans.	The British and some United States spokesmen feel the loan should be interest free. Mr. Churchill has pointed out that the sum involved is a negligible factor in our economy and that its principal effect is to restrain American exports.
The waiver clause allows Britain to default on interest payments at her own discretion.	Britain is bound by specific commitments and has made the loan in good faith. Moreover it will be to her own advantage to reduce her indebtedness as rapidly as possible.
The 50-year period allowed for repayment is unduly long. World economic and political conditions cannot be foreseen so far ahead.	Britain must have time in which to earn foreign exchange with which to repay the loan. The time given Britain in which to adjust her economy from a preferential to a multilateral trade basis is too short. This is especially true of the requirement that she abandon the sterling bloc within a year.
There should be provisions for United States acquisition of air bases and other rights.	The bargaining power of the loan was used to secure trade concessions and could not be pushed too far.
The sum agreed upon in settlement of lend-lease, the surplus, and war claims is unduly small. Administration spokesmen formerly claimed it would be repaid.	The terms of the lend-lease agreement allow the President to exercise discretion in reaching a settlement. Expense of shipping surplus back to the United States would be too great, and if sold only a fraction of its cost would be recovered. Aso much of it will rapidly deteriorate.
Britain still owns considerable assets in the United States and other countries. These should have been pledged as security for the loan.	Britain needs these assets to enable her to be in a position to repay the loan. Compelling the British Government to take control of them might push Great Britain further in the direction of a completely controlled economy.

3. Arguments addressed to the conditions attached to the loan

Criticisms	Answers
Britain will refuse to lower her trade barriers after receiving the loan. She gets the loan and the United States gets an I O U.	The loan contains express commitments regarding unfreezing of sterling area exchange and blocked sterling balances. Great Britain also promises to discuss reduction of preferential tariffs at an international conference.
Bretton Woods reintroduces the gold standard through the back door. The undue rigidity of the gold standard hampered expansion of foreign trade.	The Bretton Woods agreements are not the gold standard. Moreover through Bretton Woods and the contemplated international trade organization, Britain will be in a position to embark on a program of expansion of multilateral trade.
Provision of the Bretton Woods agreements and the International Bank for reconstruction and development obviate the need for a loan.	Ratification of the Bretton Woods agreements and adoption of the proposals for world trade and employment will lead to a greater volume of world trade through convertibility of currencies. This will promote world peace and prosperity.
Britain has prospered under a system of sterling-area control and imperial preference. It would not be to her advantage nor to the advantage of world prosperity for her to abandon it.	The loan is only a first step in a wider program leading toward world prosperity. Britain's needs are special because of her great impact on the world economy and her dependence on imports.
The sterling bloc could not have held together in postwar conditions in any case, since sterling-bloc countries would insist on buying where their demand could be supplied.	Free convertibility of currencies will enable the sterling-bloc countries to satisfy their demand for United States products.
If Britain is unable to pay the loan the loss will fall not only on the United States but on the world which depends so greatly upon American prosperity.	An economic war between the United States and Great Britain detrimental to both countries and to the world will be averted.

Jackson Day Address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on the 18th of March a very able and scholarly address was delivered by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], in Syracuse, N. Y., at a dinner under the auspices of the Onondaga County Democratic Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As representatives and devotees of the oldest political party on earth, tonight we have met around this festive board to check on our leadership, measure the stormclouds ahead, and rededicate ourselves to the herculean task which fate has bestowed upon us. In this confused hour we must neither overestimate our own capabilities, nor understate the job which is ours to do. In this fateful circumstance it is well that our party was reared on adversity and schooled in the college of hard knocks. It is well that we have supreme confidence in our ability and unflagging faith in our will to master the impossible, for the acid test is at hand. It is well that we are an experienced and well-grounded political party, deeply rooted in imperishable principles; for otherwise we might be swept off our feet by the exigencies of these times.

War has its sorrows and its problems, but peace has its problems, too. Praise be to God, the slaughter has ended; but following a long, exhaustive war, reconversion is no Sunday-school picnic! Empty shelves and a frenzied demand for goods; no place to live and a virtual famine of building material; management snarling at labor and labor snapping at management; demobilization and heart-breaking readjustments; pitiful cries for help from war-torn Europe and Asia and extreme shortages of food; everything topsy-turvy; everyone behind the eight ball; everywhere a pent-up spirit of reckless irresponsibility; truly, the aftermath of war teems with headaches for us all.

This is a time when the church, the educational institution, the fraternity, and the political party must appeal to reason and strive for stability. This is a time when America needs judicious, religious, intellectual, industrial, social, and political leadership. The ordinary garden variety will not do. Today the call is for superhuman and inspired leadership. If there were no religious problem there would be no church; if there were no political problem there would be no political party. The question is: Are we, as churchmen, as educators, as politicians, equal to the call? The answer to that question will be written in the happiness, or in the sorrow of our people, in their prosperity, or in their misery. Tojo failed, and heavy burdens break the backs of his people. Mussolini failed, and haggard faces depict the misery of the souls of his followers. Hitler failed, and his self-styled supermen are groping in rags and ashes, stunned and bewildered. There must be no failure here. A way must be found out of this blinding

wilderness of chaos, into the bright, clear sunshine of a better day.

And so, I say, it is well for our party to take stock of itself, and on this Jackson Day when we celebrate the birth of the inspired founder of our party and one of the great characters of history, the time seems especially appropriate for that purpose. There is nothing wrong with the sound principles of our party, nor with its doctrines. To gild the lily is futile, and I would not suggest a single change. These doctrines and these principles are ingrained deeply in the hearts of men, and, therefore, they are as imperishable as granite and as pure as the Holy Writ. Human well-being is their great purpose; political service which will bring forth an ever-higher degree of human happiness is their objective, and an equal opportunity for the most humble of God's children is their passion. Good principles and sound doctrines, however, are not enough. These things are not automatic. Before they become effective, they must be implemented by men of ability and goodwill; and that, my friends, is the test which our party must face.

The people of this great Nation should be forever grateful for America's political party system. It is a competitive system in which the several political parties attempt to consolidate and crystallize political objectives into tangible form to gain the approval of the voter. Here political parties try to rationalize and give substance to nebulous political theories. Our party, being a strong party with abiding faith in its works and in its ability to serve well, welcomes competition. The stronger the opposition the better the Democratic Party will be. What a pitiful thing it is that millions of the citizens of a totalitarian state march to the polls under the supervision of armed guards with but one ticket and one set of candidates to approve. The most precious freedom in all the world is the freedom of free choice. There can be no political progress without it.

In a democracy where a majority of the voters rule the roost through their own free choice, a political party has no other function than to give expression to the collective will of the people. May we go now from the abstract to the concrete to illustrate the point I am trying to make.

The Democratic Party is the majority party in the Nation today because in 1932 it dared to boldly champion the cause of little people and emphatically demand equal opportunities for all, including the most miserable and humble. President Roosevelt had the vision to combine the idealism of Jefferson with the courage of the militant Jackson in a war against the forces of greed and special privilege. He made the Democratic Party the servant of all the people, and forgotten men rallied to the support of that party in election after election. The combination of virile and courageous leadership with good principles pays handsome dividends at the polls.

Our party must ever remain steadfast to the principles it espouses. I know of no human relationship where a good name means more than it does in the realm of politics. The party that runs to cover or sheds its principles like a coat when the heat is turned on will not click with the voters. "Me-tooing" is very bad, especially when you don't mean it. A party devoted to the goddess of special privilege with no real sympathy for the oppressed will not for very long be entrusted with the responsibilities of government, regardless of how carefully they guard their real motives. Voters have been known to make mistakes, but it isn't safe to assume that they can be deceived year after year. It is much better to stick to sound policies without deviation and without attempting for temporary gain to be all things to all men. It is better to remember that in this enlightened Nation voters are smart and that they intend to exercise their free choice. New issues constantly appear and must be met. Old issues, worn threadbare, take their exit; but the fundamental spiritual things upon which our party was founded must go go on and on.

Economic changes have been coming upon us in recent years with jet-propelled speed. Evolution has almost become revolution. America is no longer an agricultural Nation; it is today a highly developed industrial empire. Your great-grandmothers, with a handloom and spinning-wheel, made the clothing for the family, and your great-grandfathers produced the food and made it ready for the oven on his own farm. In his day 75 percent of Americans lived on farms. Today but 22 percent are agricultural workers. When hard times visited grandfather he took another hitch in his belt, passed up a few luxuries, and went about his tasks with supreme confidence. He had security in his land. That was the source of his confidence. Persons losing their jobs in our present economy and unable to locate others have the three magnificient choices of begging, stealing or starving. They have no security in land or otherwise, unless they live in a state having substantial unemployment compensation. Proud as we are of his history, it is not fair to believe that all thrift, enterprise, and self-reliance died with grandfather's generation. Times have changed. Industrial progress has gone forward and left in its wake forgotten men.

We justifiably take great pride in recalling the adventures of the strong, sturdy, independent, picturesque, and sometimes heroic characters who pioneered this continent. We see them now dressed in fur cap, moccasins, and leather clothing; in one hand a rifle and over a broad shoulder a bulky bundle of animal skins. Theirs was in many respects the ideal life. They were beholden to no one, paid no taxes, their only obligation being to themselves and their immediate families; they neither asked nor received assistance from any source other than the bountiful hand of nature. Such problems as they had were local and personal and their highest law the law of the jungle. Under that system a very few men could enjoy an ideal existence in this vast, rich wilderness. These early-day pioneers were the real rugged individualists. Such primitive life has great attraction for Americans whose forebears came to these shores because they had a passion for liberty and independence and hated restraints of every character.

The loyal opposition loves to exalt rugged individualism, but when they speak longingly of rugged individualism, they do not refer to the life of Daniel Boone and his contemporaries. They realize that it requires great forests and millions of acres of vacant land for that mode of life. They are not thinking of trappers and hunters and frontiersmen; they are thinking of another kind of rugged individualism. The want an uncontrolled and unregulated capitalistic system with all restrictions and restraints and responsibilities removed; and they themselves want to run that system. They will not ask you good people to move out and turn the State over to them; they will be satisfied if you just turn the State over. You may stay, in fact they will want you to stay, because they do not plan to skin wild animals they plan to skin you.

Admiration for the pleasant mirage of rugged individualism presupposes an elegant hideout for escaping social responsibilities and provides an excellent basis for an argument against taxation and regulation. That's what old-line Republicans have in mind when they prate about rugged individualism and private enterprise. There are many intriguing impulses pulling us toward individualism, but it cannot be. The aristocracy directing industry in the horse-and-buggy days of our economy enjoyed all the privileges, liberties, and freedom of the early-day trapper in his enchanted realm. Henceforth, they must exist only in the memory and dreams of the malefactors of great wealth. Henceforth, we shall read about them in story books and see them in the museums of history along with the Daniel Boones and the Davey Crocketts. We could not, if we would, return to the happy romantic days of the early pioneers; and we would not, if we could, return to the ruthless, irresponsible days when industry was run for the benefit of a fortunate few. The majority of American voters who have the right to decide such matters will not permit America to return to the old deal of uncontrolled and unregulated capitalism. We have adopted a policy of shared undertakings, shared responsibilities, shared interests, and shared natural advantages. Too much of everybody for himself with no regard for others has departed forever in America.

If there were governmental protection of property without governmental restraints and regulation, the rich would constantly decrease in numbers but grow richer and richer, while the poor would increase in numbers but become poorer and poorer. The Democratic Party has never advocated dividing the wealth of America. That is a very silly proposal and would need to be done over and over almost day by day until there was nothing to divide; but our party has from the days of Jefferson advocated the equalization of opportunity, which is quite a different thing. Encouraging and fostering private enterprise and security of every kind for corporations and persons does not mean that our party will ever permit unregulated and uncontrolled accumulations of wealth and economic power to deny opportunity to the most humble.

Industrialists whom I know want to give their employees full opportunities for every good thing of life, but competition is so exacting that few industrialists by themselves can do so. Only government is powerful enough to make it possible for all business to give all workers security and the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and happiness. I regret that government should be given so great a task, but if we are to have social stability, government must assume that duty. If government would preserve industry and make democracy work well, it must compel industry to assume the cost of protecting its employees with reasonable security. Private thrift and private enterprise should be encouraged and fostered in high places and low, but neither of these objectives can be guaranteed to the little people in this industrial age unless an opportunity to practice the art of thrift and the accumulation of savings be assured them by the strong arm of government. Unless government acts, men must be born in poverty and die in poverty.

As I have said, party doctrines and party principles and pious expositions are not enough. These things are not self-propelled. It requires capable men to carry out noble party aspirations—men who believe and practice the belief that "public office is a public trust." The Democratic Party today has such leadership. We like to speak of the intellectual giants of the early-day Congress but I do not believe that, in the entire history of our Nation, any party has had better leadership than we have at this historic hour in both Houses of Congress. Senators BARKLEY and MCKELLAR and Speaker RAYBURN and Congressman MCCORMACK are not supermen, but they are honest, earnest, fearless, intelligent, capable men who know where they are going and why. The chairmen of the many standing committees in the House and the Senate are all Democrats and without an exception they are worthy of their assignments and their splendid services as committee chairmen reflect great credit upon their beloved Republic.

The grand old State of New York has given the Senate two of her most worthy sons. Senator WAGNER is known and loved in every

community in this Nation and JIM MEAD, to whom I am personally devoted, is a leader in the never-ending fight for a better opportunity for all mankind. When Harry Truman was elected Vice President, JIM MEAD was the unanimous choice of the Senate to take over the chairmanship of the most vital committee in the Senate—the so-called Truman Investigation Committee on War Expenditures. JIM MEAD has made a national name for himself in the conduct of this committee.

When President Roosevelt was stricken, fate laid a heavy burden upon the shoulders of Harry Truman. It was a burden which he did not seek but which he did not shirk. In all the history of our country no man has been given a more difficult task. He has accepted it in humility and with a fervent prayer on his lips. On the day he took high office, when his former senatorial colleagues gathered about him wishing him well, he turned to them with tears in his eyes and said, "If you men know how to pray, please pray for me now."

He has gathered about him a strong Cabinet of devoted men—devoted to him and to the lofty principles of the Democratic Party and to the Republic. As a consequence every department in the vast network of governmental operations is functioning with great credit to all concerned. On the whole, and in the trying circumstances, a good job is being done.

Congress is suffering some from election jitters, which is a chronic, 2-year-recurring disease of well-known symptoms; but it will work itself out if given a little time and a little patience.

The veteran load is heavy and with each succeeding month it mushrooms until its size is monstrous. Before the year is ended a million veterans will be back in school and other hundreds of thousands will be in trade schools as student apprentices. Still others will be back on their old jobs with their seniority rights protected. They are being rehabilitated and readjusted at a rapid rate. The Democratic Party has not failed them.

The housing program has been slow due to the unprecedented shortage of all building materials, but the Nation that built 80,000 planes a year and filled the seas with ships, and supplied the world with arms, food, and fuel, will not fail on the housing front. The healthiest trend in this country is the universal urge on the part of the American people to own a home of their own. Nothing very bad is going to happen to a nation of homeowners.

Wilson Wyatt, "the Kentucky ball of fire" and the Nation's Housing Administrator, has his plans all drawn up for his goal of 2,700,000 houses by the end of 1947. I have every faith that he will exceed that goal. Congress has been a little balky, but Congress will get its bearings soon, and then the sawmills will be humming and the dirt flying.

The foreign situation is very disappointing and disquieting. The lessons which this war should have taught seem to have been forgotten already. With cool heads and an abundance of common sense in high places, the present insurmountable problems will smooth out. Our foreign policy is sound and constructive and is based on justice and equality, and we have no selfish axes to grind or selfish purposes to serve. We refuse to make an alliance, military or otherwise, with any power. Our commitment is to the UNO and we are pledged to back the UNO, if need be, with our lives, our treasure, and our sacred honor. When the other powers fully comprehend these facts, faith will emerge from the sewers of suspicion and the world will move forward. Faith and good will toward men are the keys to world understanding and peace.

America is deeply indebted to the Democratic Party for long, faithful, and devoted service, and the Democratic Party is deeply indebted to the voters of the Republic for entrusting leadership to us through its darkest hours. All over this Nation, in almost every city, on this historic and significant anniversary Democrats are pledging anew to fight the good fight for a better Nation and a better world. As a party, we pledge upon our sacred honor never to forsake our rendezvous with destiny, nor shirk any duty imposed, however difficult.

St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled "Hub Scene of First Celebration of St. Patrick's Day in America," by Herbert Hollander, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, March 17, 1946."

HUB SCENE OF FIRST CELEBRATION OF ST. PATRICK'S DAY IN AMERICA

(By Herbert Hollander)

This is St. Patrick's Day and throughout the United States and many other lands the name of Ireland's patron saint will be venerated and good wishes will be exchanged upon an occasion appropriately symbolized by the greenery which adds its glowing color to the scene.

Each year St. Patrick's Day is more widely marked; yet it also is true that many facts about the holiday and the remarkable man who inspired it are little known.

St. Patrick was born about 387 A. D., and while the place of his birth has been subject to considerable question, the best authority seems to indicate it was near Dumbarton, in Scotland. He was brought up in the Christian faith, and church accounts show that his early education was definitely of a Christian character, although he himself is set forth as saying that in his boyhood he was somewhat deficient in his duties.

The vicissitudes of life in that early era did not pass St. Patrick by, and he, with many thousands of others, was captured by Irish pirates and consigned to slavery. At 16 years of age he is to be found at Slemish, Ireland, tending his master's cattle. It was at this time that he became fired with a Christian zeal, and as he says, "I felt no evil, nor was there any laziness in me, because as I now see, the spirit was burning within me."

CALL TO IRISH MISSION

Some years later, after varying fortunes of which little is known authentically, St. Patrick is found back in Britain. In his dreams he hears the call to an Irish mission, and he was filled with a desire to go to those "who never had any knowledge of God, and worshipped only idols and abominations." He returned to Gaul for preparation, was made a deacon, and finally consecrated a bishop for the Irish.

St. Patrick's mission was eminently successful. He founded churches, schools, and monasteries. He converted the kings of Munster, Dublin, and Connaught to the faith. But he had no easy time of it. Those were rough and ready days; men were fierce and were loath to give up old customs.

"It is not true that all Ireland was brought tranquilly under the influence of the gospel," says Littell. "St. Patrick's life was often threatened and often in danger. On one occasion his charioteer was slain in mistake for himself. When going into Connaught, he took the precaution of providing himself with an escort, and narrowly escaped the efforts of the Druids to destroy him.

"His ecclesiastical establishments were surrounded by fortifications, for the protection of the inmates; and many of the most celebrated of them like Armagh, Cashel, Downpatrick, Clogher, and others, were built in situations possessing natural advantages for defense, or near the already fortified habitations of the ancient chieftains. There were many districts and tribes of Ireland where the teaching of St. Patrick was rejected. The Hi Garchon are particularly mentioned as having resisted both Palladius and Patrick."

However, the work of St. Patrick in Ireland was ineradicable, and the movements he started were picked up and carried on virtually without interruption. To have wrought so mightily under such adverse circumstances is regarded as striking proof of the tremendous qualities of the man who was destined to canonization.

Among the stories which cling so closely about the name of St. Patrick is the one which tells of his banishment of toads and reptiles from Ireland. Legend or truth, it is an important part of the St. Patrick chronicle. As a matter of fact, however, eminent church historians have stated that there is no mention of this miracle in the early authentic lives of the saint; while another commentator points out that "we are told by an early explorer of the time before St. Patrick lived, that even then Ireland was free from reptiles, and the cause he alleges is the climate.

"There only remains for us," says this writer, "the poetry of it; for in preaching the Gospel and founding the churches, St. Patrick drove the evil out from the hearts of men."

The shamrock is said to have been associated with St. Patrick's name about the year 1600, when it was asserted that the saint used it as a symbol of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—the God who is one. It seems, however, that St. Patrick's actual use of the shamrock is open to question.

Throughout his mission St. Patrick was imbued with an undying love for his people and for the land which has come to be known as his own. This he showed in bidding farewell to his flock in Munster. His beautiful blessing, spoken from the hills of Tipperary, is in part as follows:

"A blessing on the Munster people—
Men, youths and women;
A blessing on the land
That yields them fruit.

"Like the sand of the sea under their ships,
Be the number of their hearts;
On slopes, on plains,
On mountains, on hills, a blessing."

St. Patrick died at Dawn, in Ulster, about 493 A. D. In 1185 his body was discovered buried in a part of the church, removed, and reburied.

HONORED IN UNITED STATES

The first celebration of St. Patrick's Day in America, of which there is record, was, according to Crimmins, "but 8 years before the battle of Fontenoy, where the Irish brigade saved the fortunes of France." A group of Irish "gentlemen and merchants met convivially" in Boston on March 17, 1737, and founded a benevolent society "with quaint officials bearing silver keys."

This organization, the Charitable Irish Society, has flourished from that day to this and still celebrates St. Patrick's Day with a banquet and speeches by leaders of the city, State, and Nation.

In 1757 one finds that St. Patrick was honored among Irish soldiers in the British camp at Fort William Henry on Lake George. The saint was similarly honored at Fort Pitt, now Pittsburgh, in 1763.

At Morristown, N. J., in 1780, Gen. George Washington gave orders for the day in honor of St. Patrick. Later he is to be found dining with the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and paying tribute to Ireland's patron and guardian.

The day of St. Patrick was observed enthusiastically in the American Army during the whole of the Revolution. In 1778, at Valley Forge, as that dreadful winter was drawing to a close, the holiday was heartily celebrated. It was on this occasion that Washington said, "I, too, am a lover of St. Patrick's Day," and he ordered an extra round of grog to be issued.

The list of songs and snatches, poems, odes, and the like, which have come forth from year to year for St. Patrick's Day is almost endless. All, however, are in a merry, vigorous tone, in a gay mood, when they do not echo sentiments resentful of all forms of oppression.

For many reasons, therefore, there is a very special universality about the celebration of St. Patrick's Day, and Americans of many diverse creeds and faith will be among those who today will be "wearin' o' the green."

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my broadcast of this week put on the air over Station WSCO, Sault Ste. Marie; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WBDC, Escanaba, Mich.:

Last week end about 30 of us flew down to Old Point Comfort Friday evening and then on Saturday morning the Army took us out in a little ferryboat over to Norfolk where we looked over some captured German Diesel engines and other transportation equipment, and then brought us back to Old Point Comfort—which as you probably know from history is the site of Fortress Monroe—and there they showed us a bunch of captured German railway equipment. It was said to be the finest railway equipment in Europe. Well, that may be, but it would look decidedly poor on a milk train up on the Soo Line or any place else in northern Michigan. Of course, I assumed that the Germans had to design their equipment based on the raw materials on hand and based on what the immediate needs were; but certainly all of the equipment I saw was inferior to anything that we have to offer of a comparable nature in this country. That is, all but for one exhibit which I am going to dwell on in a few minutes. In the captured German equipment there are several freight locomotives and one super-duper passenger locomotive which was said to be the greatest thing on the continent. It was a steam locomotive, streamlined with a bunch of very light metal and we were told it operated the Berlin to Hamburg express—the finest train on the Continent for several years before the war and during the war, and finally, it was so heavily strafed by our American fighter planes that it was totally wrecked. Our own American Army boys have rebuilt it completely and brought it back here for study. It was said to possess a speed of 110 miles an hour and on the face of it that seems like really something but it could only haul about six small cars at that high speed and it reminded me that on my recent trip to the far West when I was stuck in a snowdrift that our heavier steam-propelled locomotives and certainly our Diesel locomotives on transcontinental trips haul 12, 13, and 14 cars at around 130 miles an hour, so I was not too impressed by this supposedly gigantic, super-duper German passenger locomotive.

One thing they did show us, however, was of considerable interest to me inasmuch as I am always interested in anything that floats on water. They had brought over a captured German mine sweeper 135 feet in length, 20 foot beam, draft 6 feet, only 3 feet of freeboard, and which had taken 32 days to cross the Atlantic. However, it was beyond my comprehension how it did get over here. Believe me, that thing can move fast, but it was of relatively light wooden construction, and I was told that the 18-man German crew and the American lieutenant and sergeant who serves as the armed guard frequently wondered themselves whether or not they would succeed in crossing the North Atlantic at this season of the year. The little craft was powered by two light-weight German Diesels which had been designed originally for use in the Zeppelins and which were later used in the submarines. They developed about 900 horsepower each at a relatively low weight per horsepower ratio. The most novel feature about the craft, however, was the very unique arrangement whereby the propeller blades were vertical and by a series of levers and cam arrangements these blades could be twisted in different directions so that this gave the directive force to the vessel without any additional rudder being needed as on our conventional motor boats or even steamships. This little ship was a twin-screw vessel and when the pilot wanted to go directly ahead he simply shoved the clutch forward as we would do on our motorboats—and when he wanted to back up he would simply pull it astern—and when he wanted to change direction he used a seemingly conventional steering wheel. Each of these different movements, however, affected the angle of the vertical propeller blades and its relation to the centerline of the boat. The net result was that this little craft—which I would judge had a speed of about 22 miles an hour—could turn around literally in her own length at full speed; could even be pulled directly sideways; could to all practical purposes be instantly reversed from full speed ahead to full speed astern—and really put on quite a show of maneuverability for us.

The interesting part about all of this craft, however, is the fact that the original inventor of the vertical directional propeller was an American college professor who found very little interest in this country and it was seemingly later perfected by the Germans. I believe that our vessel operators in this country—both small craft and large craft—will find they have something to learn from this German perfection and it strikes me that especially for harbor tug work where maneuverability is very important we may find this new directional propeller finding increasing usage in America.

The interesting thing about the entire exhibit is the fact that the Army has adopted a very sound principle. They have invited not only Members of Congress—but engineers from all sections of interested American industry—to see the exhibit and then, in turn, have invited American industry to take these various German pieces of transportation equipment, test them out fully, wear them to destruction if desirable, and then report back to the Army the result of their investigations. In other words, we want to find out just how close the Germans came to being as skilled in the production of transportation equipment as we are.

I had another very interesting experience recently in previewing a new technicolor motion picture which has been produced by the Army Air Force and which I understand will shortly be released to the general public. It is called The Last Bomb. It showed the real reason that Japan finally had to say "thumbs up" and sue for peace. The atom bomb was not the sole answer and in my humble opinion it was absurd that we ever used the atom bomb when certainly those in command of our fighting forces in the Pacific knew that the Japs could not much longer stand the bombardment we were giving them from the air. This picture illustrated graphically why it was good military policy for us to undergo the tortures and losses incident to the capture of Japanese held Pacific Islands as for instance at Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Iwo Jima. The picture showed how we went about the final aerial destruction of Tokyo and other Japanese cities. It showed how a mass bombing raid was planned and executed. In the particular raid in question it showed approximately 300 of our B-29 superfortresses taking the air from our airports constructed on Guam after its capture—at one-minute intervals. As they approached Saipan and Tinian, in turn, they were joined by roughly 100 more superfortresses from each island; then as they passed Iwo Jima they were joined by a fighter escort of some 300 planes.

As they approached Japan proper all of these various units rendezvoused in the most perfect formation imaginable and despite weather conditions which appeared formidable as they actually got to the target, the overcast cleared just as our accurate weather information had predicted and then the bombers having come through the antiaircraft flak squared away for their target and it was amazing to see the extremely interesting and accurate motion pictures taken of the intensely accurate dropping of the bombs themselves and the resulting damage therefrom. You can see these tremendous bomb loads leaving the bomb bays, watch them all the way down until they hit the ground or explode above ground and then the follow-up planes photographed the exact extent of the damage. Meanwhile, of course, the Japanese fighter planes were brought into action and the picture was replete with literally dozens of extremely interesting action pictures of aerial dog fights. It was easy to see the tremendous superiority that our fighter pilots maintained over the Japanese charging by the dozen and the planes literally exploding in the air as our boys closed in for the final attack. Then, as the heavy bombers pulled away, their mission accomplished, so did the fighter escort but their job was not yet done. On the way home they strafed every imaginable target that you can think of. The Japanese had sought to diversify their industry by setting up little plants out in the countryside; they sought to transport their munitions by coastal ships; they had sought to spread their home guard army camps out through the countryside; they had sought again to transport materials by their railway service and by their truck convoys—but in each instance on the way back from these bombing raids our fighters swooped low and with their cannon, their machine guns, and, above all, their rockets, believe me, they raised a veritable hades with all of these various Japanese outfits.

And then the picture went on to show the basic reason behind the need for fighter support for which we had expended the lives of thousands of Marines in taking the Pacific Islands, such as Iwo Jimo, Okinawa, and many more. These heavy bombers had a

total round trip of about 15 hours for their 30 seconds over Tokyo and in order to carry heavier bomb loads they had to carry less gasoline and stop at Iwo Jima on the way home. Most of them made it successfully but occasionally Iwo Jima is afflicted with a bad ground fog with the result that one of the planes in this particular flight had to make a belly landing out at sea. Of course, the plane was lost but fortunately the crew was saved—thanks to their Mae West life jackets and their rubber lifeboats. Others, however, coming into Iwo Jima after their splendid raid over Tokyo were not quite so fortunate. One ship found the runway apparently rough—or perhaps they blew a tire or something—in any event, there was a bad crash and then the ship immediately caught fire and was a total loss but fortunately in that case all 11 members of the crew came out alive. The wreck of another Fortress landing at Guam was not so successful. They ground looped on landing and crashed and despite the immediate valiant efforts of the fire-fighting crew, only 1 man was pulled out alive although he was horribly burned.

This entire picture carried me back to my memories of seeing those thousands of English blockbusters weighing 11 tons—or 22,000 pounds each—down in Pueblo, Colo., at our Army Ordnance base a few weeks previously. I was told that the explosive contained therein was three times as powerful as our famous TNT—and then I recalled my experience a few weeks ago of spending several hours on top of the famous Empire State Building in New York City 1,000 feet above the ground. Looking back over that city of its teeming millions and thousands of sky scrapers I thought if this is an example of what American aerial might in its infancy at that time could do to a relatively lowly city like Tokyo—what in heaven's name would happen to New York City should 500 superforts or 500 rockets or 500 robot planes of the future attack it. It makes one shudder.

I am not so worried about all this unrest about the atomic bomb. I cannot for the life of me see why we turned it loose on Hiroshima or Nagasaki—and incidentally this motion picture entitled "The Last Bomb" which I have just described to you also shows the dropping of the atom bomb on Nagasaki and the damage resulting therefrom. The atom bomb damage is unspeakable but we are not going to be able to control it. Folks write in to me saying they want it outlawed—that we should stop other nations from getting the secret of it. I agree with that. Surely we want to control all the secrets of the atom bomb that we can possibly control but I fear that is a forlorn hope. We might outlaw it by international agreement—just as gas was outlawed and not used in the past war—but it still does not eliminate for 1 minute the fact that war is hell and even though control of the atom bomb is secured modern science will develop other weapons just as devilish, just as destructive and when all-out war comes you are going to have just that—all-out war and everyone is going to suffer. It just simply means that somehow, some way, some time world statesmen must find some way to curb human greed; some way to put an end to fighting; and an end to the desire for expansion, for imperialism—some way to avoid destruction of other peoples' lives and property. Seemingly we in America have not yet done that—we are trying to do it, but unfortunately we are now awakening to the fact that our erstwhile allies—Britain and Russia—are making it unmistakably clear to the world that they have no such sincere desires and we had better watch our p's and q's very carefully and make sure that we do not choose sides in their personal struggle and get caught in the middle.

Tributes to the Late Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, Author of In His Steps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress magazine, and general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, has an able editorial in the March 1946 issue in honor of the late Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, of Kansas, author of the world's best seller, In His Steps.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, as well as Dr. Sheldon's memorial hymn and a tribute by me, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM—DR. CHARLES M. SHELDON, KANSAS, 1857–1946

Dr. Charles M. "In His Steps" Sheldon, of Topeka, Kans., has joined the ransomed throng to be with Him whose he was and whom he served through 89 years of consecrated and victorious Christian life. Outside of the writers of the Holy Bible no other author in the history of the world was so widely read. Thirty-eight books came from his prolific pen. In His Steps gave him fame around the world. Translated into every written language, it is estimated that 25,000,000 copies were sold and doubtless double that number read, the bulk of them in America and England, without paying a dollar of royalty to the author because of his desire to keep the price within reach of the multitude.

We must assume that every reader of Progress has read In His Steps. It was the most gripping story of my youth, and 1 hour before his death on Sunday, February 24, we listened to the serial broadcast which is now, after 40 years, on the air on Sunday night, if anything more challenging by spoken voice than when it was first read. Communist Russia barred his book for reasons not difficult to fathom. Since the ban has been lifted, and again in Europe and America, In His Steps is a best seller.

LIFE STORY IN BRIEF

Born at Wellsville, N. Y., in 1857, he spent his boyhood of hard knocks on farms in Michigan, Missouri, and South Dakota. Graduated from Andover Academy, Brown University, and Andover Theological Seminary, he was called to the pastorate of the Central Congregational Church at Topeka, Kans., in 1888, with a membership of 57 and remained as pastor for 31 years, in the spacious church which was thereafter built and where the writer has preached. The evening service was lightly attended until he began to imitate the Master and preach in parables, when it was filled to overflowing with young people, his Christian Endeavor Society, which he organized, attending in a body. Thus began his most famous book, "In His Steps," which he preached chapter by chapter first in Topeka, and then in England, Australia, New Zealand, and Aukland.

THE CHRISTIAN EDITOR

His most famous exploit was the publication of the Topeka Daily Capital, as he believed Jesus would run a newspaper. At that time the daily circulation was 15,000 copies. By the end of the week it had reached a circulation of 367,000 paid subscriptions, which poured in from all over the globe. The printing presses of Kansas City, Chicago, New York, and London were engaged for reproductions.

The Capital under his management carried no liquor, tobacco, patent medicine or personal ads, deleted stories of crime, prize fights, scandal, and advocated the abolition of the liquor traffic, economic strife, and war. By invitation, two of his contributing editors were connected with the International Reform Federation. On the front page of the paper, republished by the Capital, February 25, first column, is an article on Sunday observance by Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, founder and first superintendent of the Federation, and on the editorial page a column devoted to the extinction of the liquor traffic by a constitutional amendment, by Clinton N. Howard, Dr. Crafts' successor. The date of the paper was March 14, 1900, 46 years ago. Subsequently Dr. Sheldon became editor of the Christian Herald, New York, for a period of 5 years.

LONG-TIME FRIENDS

My personal acquaintance with Dr. Sheldon began soon after the publication of his famous book. Though he was 12 years my senior we met soon thereafter at a world Christian Endeavor convention at Detroit, where we were both on the program in the great tent meetings, and were quartered in adjoining rooms at the same hotel. We continued friends through the succeeding years, and I read a message from him at the fellowship breakfast in the Capitol, January 18, 1946, replying to our invitation that he be our surprise guest as his ninetieth birthday would fall 1 month later. You may recall his reply, saying, "I wish I might meet the guests that will be there, but travel is out of the question at my age. I send greetings and best wishes in the hope and prayer that we may live to see a warless world, and believe with the great Apostle "that God hath made of one blood all the nations."

Let us remind our readers that 30 years before Wendell Willkie discovered his One World, Dr. Charles M. Sheldon had written a book of 400 pages entitled "One Blood," in which he pointed out that the acceptance of that divine truth would make us one world. "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?"

HISTORIC TEMPERANCE CAMPAIGN

Beginning September 3d, 1914, we spoke in a different city twice every day until June 6, 1915, from coast to coast, in 235 cities, without a date made being missed. To tell the story in detail with all its incidents would fill a book. The outstanding events, with copies of the speeches, repeated from day to day filled a volume of 410 pages. The entire campaign was financed from the offerings taken and the speeches and pictures sold. Dr. Daniel A. Poling and Dr. Ella A. Boole, are the only other survivors of that continental campaign.

The last time we met in a continuous campaign brought on by the wets to repeal the State-wide prohibition law in Kansas, added as an amendment to the Constitution in 1880. This attempt was made in 1934, and resulted in the retention of the prohibition law by 100,000 majority. At several points Senator CAPPER, Dr. Sheldon, and the editor spoke from the same platform. When Carrie Nation exploded against the liquor outlaws in Kansas, Dr. Sheldon openly commended what he called her "hatchitation," when others were silent.

I was the first one to engage him to speak in a temperance campaign in the East, at Rochester, N. Y., to great throngs afternoon and evening in the mammoth Fitzhugh

Hall. He declined to accept the proffered check for the time and service rendered, taking only the cost of travel from Topeka, his hotel, and return. His last letter written from Topeka a few days before the cerebral hemorrhage struck him down, told of another edition of In His Steps, and asking for a display ad in Progress with cost saying, "The book is still going and I have had a letter from the Secretary of the Students' Christian Association of South Africa, that he has sold several thousand copies in the African language." I replied that we did not accept ads but would give him an article at no cost in return for an article, to follow, which he had written for Progress. The answer was a message announcing his sudden death, shortly after we had listened to an In His Steps broadcast last Sunday night, February 24. In His Steps has been read and sung around the world.

HIS MEMORIAL HYMN

(L. H. Edmunds, London)

How beautiful to follow the steps of the Saviour
Walking in the light, walking in the light.
How beautiful to follow the steps of the Saviour
Led in paths of right.
Walking by faith in the steps of the Saviour,
Upward still upward we will follow our Guide,
When we shall see Him, the King in His beauty,
Happy, how happy, to be at His side.

CHORUS

Trying to walk in the steps of the Saviour
Trying to follow our Saviour and King
Shaping our lives by His blessed example
Happy how happy the songs that we bring.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR CAPPER

Any man who can write a book that holds the record as the best seller over a 50-year period is an outstanding national character. That is the record of Dr. Charles M. Sheldon's In His Steps. A recent compilation shows more than 25,000,000 copies were published and sold.

But to me Dr. Charles M. Sheldon lives with those who knew him far beyond the time of his passing as one of the truly great men of our time. I have known and loved him for more than a half-century. His passing leaves me conscious of a deep personal loss; and a sense that something we have known long and loved well in Kansas is missing.

Dr. Sheldon not only wrote and taught well and effectively; he also lived up to what he wrote and taught. He did not live in any ivory tower, but took part in the affairs of everyday folks, in the day by day happenings of Topeka. The influence of his life, teachings and character will live long after those of us who listened to him, read him, and followed him, have passed on to the land toward which his footsteps have led him.

OUR DEBT TO KANSAS

In his address at the Fellowship Breakfast in the Senate dining room on the fiftieth anniversary of our federation, Senator CAPPER, the dean of the breakfast, gave the names of more than a score of Kansas immortals, without mentioning himself. The editor put his name in as an amendment.

However, there is a shorter list from our point of view which might be called the Kansas big four, the names of those who would be first mentioned if the question were asked, "Can any good thing come out of Kansas?" names that have won a permanent place in history beyond the confines of the State.

Here they are, the big four of Kansas: John Brown, Carrie Nation, Charles Sheldon, ARTHUR CAPPER, the first two alike in kind and character, the last two alike in kind and character, and both entirely unlike each other. The first two, like Elijah, calling down fire upon the ungodly; the last two, quiet, modest, self-effacing, and effective. We would compare them to Peter and John, Peter with the sword, John with the pen.

PERSONAL FRIENDS

The editor dare speak of them, because the last three he knew personally, intimately, and over a long period of time, and knows how to evaluate their work and influence upon their day and generation. It is true that Dr. Sheldon's book holds the world's record for sale and circulation, but that was a single edition, while CAPPER'S 10 publications, with over 4,000,000 circulation, are repeated daily, weekly, and monthly year by year for more than a quarter of a century, with an accumulated circulation far exceeding all of Dr. Sheldon's books. Also, Senator CAPPER'S weekly broadcasts reaches approximately every rural home in the Nation, and countless urban homes as well, over a Nation-wide hook-up for years and years.

FIRST OF BIG FOUR

Of John Brown, Wendell Phillips said on the day of his burial with a great boulder for his headstone, at his request: "Marvelous old man. He has abolished slavery in the land that slew him. History will date emancipation from his execution." That was on December 2, 1859. Eleven months later Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States; 3 years later the Emancipation Proclamation was issued; 8 months after the assassination of Lincoln, the Thirteenth Amendment forever abolishing slavery within the United States was proclaimed as a part of the Constitution.

Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, on March 14 Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, made an address at the Jackson Day dinner held in Wilmington, Del. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

During my years in politics I have attended many dinners in honor of great Americans. We Americans, you know, have a weakness for giving dinners for the people we like. In England, when a subject accomplishes an outstanding achievement, he is brought before the King, touched with a sword, and proclaimed from that time on a member of the peerage. In France his colleagues dress him up with a wide sash across his shirtfront, kiss him on both cheeks, and elect him to the Academy. In Russia, his comrades nominate him to the Supreme Soviet, and the one-party system does the rest. Here in American, we say, "Thank you very much"—and eat.

I was especially eager to come to this Jackson Day dinner in Wilmington, not only to meet old friends again, but even more for the opportunity it gives me to pay a tribute to your State's small but outstanding Democratic delegation to Congress.

For me, this dinner is above all else a chance to express the gratitude that all Democrats must feel, here in Delaware and throughout the country, to two courageous fighters in the cause of a better America, two faithful soldiers of democracy—the Honorable JAMES M. TUNNELL, Member of the United States Senate, and the Honorable PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, Member of the House of Representatives.

Tonight, as I think of the splendid record of these men, as I recall how many times JIM TUNNELL has gallantly taken up the fight for the administration, for our working people, for our war veterans, for all progressive causes, I am reminded of another Democrat who could always be counted on by the people.

His name was Andrew Jackson. When the well-being of his people and his country were at stake, he, like your Senator, was not afraid to get into the kind of controversy that is best described as a "slugging match."

When the people needed him, he was always there. Back in the year 1807, our young Government was facing critical times. The first Democratic administration was in office. Thomas Jefferson, founder of our party, was President. And then, as now, the well-being of both the party and the Nation were being threatened by an opposition which was making a reckless and irresponsible bid for power.

In a letter to General Wilkinson at that time, Jefferson said: "Be assured that Tennessee, and particularly General Jackson, are faithful."

Tonight I feel that Jefferson's report bears paraphrasing. I feel that in Washington we can say, "Be assured that Delaware, and particularly JIM TUNNELL, are faithful."

And so to you, Senator TUNNELL, and to you, Congressman TRAYNOR, on behalf of the national committee, I want to say, "Thank you very much. Keep up the good work."

We have, in the Congress, many Democrats who have likewise proved themselves faithful soldiers of democracy. The great majority of our party has earned that description. By it, we mean men and women with a sense of loyalty and party obligation—loyalty to the President, party obligation to the electorate.

We shall have more of these "good and faithful soldiers" in public office after November of this year. We have seen the need of them, our Nation has felt that need, and our people have recognized it. They have witnessed the performance of a democratic administration which deserves wholehearted support of its program—better support than it has received—and they are determined that it shall be given that better support.

We have, in the office of the Chief Executive, a steadfast fighter who sets a magnificent example for us all—President Harry S. Truman. In him we have a man who, above all others, has shown the great gift of a sense of duty to his country. In his eyes, loyalty to the ideals of his party and the sense of obligation to his country are one and the same thing. Party and government, as he conceives them, serve the same masters—the people of the United States.

Through the years of world crisis, the Democratic Party has performed that service well—so well that four times the people gave their direct endorsement by voting into office the administration of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The reason is simple. Roosevelt gave the people what they wanted. His administra-

tion set a course for America—not a new course, but a reawakening of the democracy that our forefathers founded and intended for this Nation. It was reorientation on the road to fulfillment of the "four freedoms." It was what American means to the world.

In this great advance, Truman participated. He served as one of Roosevelt's most faithful assistants. And when, 11 months ago, the hand of fate struck suddenly, taking away the greatest leader of his time, Harry Truman shouldered the full burden, resolved in his heart to carry on with the job that Roosevelt had begun, and moved forward with firm step.

The responsibilities are tremendous. After 6 years of a great war, the world is still heavy with "time's dark events, charging like ceaseless clouds across the sky."

Harry Truman has accepted the responsibilities and carried them out valiantly. Not once has he faltered. Not once has he given ground before the terrific pressure for reaction which has tried to move in on our Government since the day Franklin D. Roosevelt died.

Again we have a Democratic administration which is resolved to give the people what they want.

First, the war against Germany and Japan was brought to a swift and victorious end for America and her allies.

Second, the basis was formulated for world peace—a base so solid that even under the strains placed on it today we retain our faith in its ability to stand.

Third, a program was set forth to ensure prosperity at home and full employment for our people.

These were things the American people wanted. These were things the Democratic Party, in its election platform of 1944, had promised them. And these were things that the administration of Harry S. Truman was—and is—resolved to bring about.

Last September, in fulfillment of that resolve, President Truman set forth his 21-point program for a prosperous post-war economy.

That program, though it was viciously attacked by the Republicans in Congress, was approved by the great majority of the American people. The Man in the Street wanted it. The average American citizen wanted it.

But a minority of Republican legislators, representing a small minority of citizens, set out to block the enactments necessary to put the program into effect. By combining force with another small minority—a minority of dissenting Democrats—they found a temporary means of obstruction.

When this happened, a Nation-wide poll of public opinion was taken last November, and on the 25th of that month it was announced that our people, by a vote of 2 to 1, wanted the President to bring pressure on Congress for the enactments which it was refusing to make.

On January 11, a Nation-wide poll on 6 of President Truman's 21 points showed that the people wanted every one of them.

To the 21 points, the President has added further recommendations to Congress to carry forward his postwar program. He has recommended health legislation. He has advocated a strong armed force to defend the country, and pointed the way to build up and maintain such a force. He has outlined a housing program to meet a critical need of our people, and he has appointed an able and dynamic administrator to drive through on this tremendous undertaking.

All these measures for the safety, the well-being and the prosperity of the American people have been put forward, and the fight goes on. It goes on because the Democratic Party was pledged in its 1944 platform to carry out such a program, and that pledge was accepted and endorsed by the people of America.

Now, I have continually reminded my fellow Democrats, wherever I have met them, of that party pledge.

At the risk of being monotonous, I have kept hammering at the importance of keeping that promise by working, working, working—not only at election time, but every day between elections, working to support the objectives of the Democratic Party as the great progressive force in America.

If we Democrats keep the promise of our party alive in our hearts, if we go on working in fulfillment of it, then I say not only will we win the congressional elections of next November, but we shall make our greatest contribution to the job that Harry Truman is doing to win for America, today and tomorrow and next week, the job of getting his vital postwar program enacted into legislation.

We are prepared for a hard, up-hill fight. I have mentioned an opposition which is making a reckless and irresponsible bid for power. I have said that the well-being of our country is being threatened today by that recklessness and that irresponsibility. I do not use these words lightly.

When an organized effort is made in the United States Congress to torpedo price control, which would result in plunging this Nation into the ruinous spiral of inflation, I call that effort reckless, and I mean recklessness to the point of irresponsibility.

Today, the opposition to price control is going to just such an extreme. The opposition in Congress, under Republican leadership and with the solid vote of the Republican Party, has joined forces to sow the seeds of a whirlwind.

They want, they say, "to put the OPA to sleep." That is another way of saying they invite a runaway economy. Prices are already high. Greed and opportunity are combined to create tremendous pressures for sending them still higher. And it is at this moment that the opposition in Congress chooses to strike!

In doing so, they are gambling with the salaries and wages that other men earn. They are gambling with the very livelihood, the necessities of life, of one-third of the American people. They are gambling with the meager earnings and allowances to the families of men in our armed forces.

And it is a gamble against long odds. Throughout the world, the demand for goods is great, the supply small. We are oversupplied with money, and we are undersupplied in even the bare needs of life. And it is in such a market that we are urged to make the gamble for low prices without control.

I call that gamble economically reckless and socially irresponsible. I call it reckless to invite an abnormal economy which penalizes thrift, which puts a premium on speculation, and which threatens ruin to millions of Americans, both employers and employees.

I call is socially irresponsible to endanger every American family with loss of purchasing power and loss of savings.

Now, what does this opposition argue against price control? Price control, they tell us, hinders production. Remove price controls, and we shall get production. Production keeps prices down, and everybody will then be happy.

In other words, unlock the door, let the horse be stolen—and he will find his own way back.

And this is the argument of men who, in the past, have professed great admiration for the practical, hard-headed business mind.

Every housewife in America knows better. She knows that if price ceilings are taken off tomorrow, clothes, rent, food—necessities and luxuries alike—will skyrocket.

She knows that even in better times, when supply and demand were more nearly in balance, unlimited production was never allowed to drive prices down. On the contrary, all too often production has been limited deliberately to prevent low prices.

The American housewife, who has never met a pay roll, is not deceived by the specious, wholly unhistorical argument of the Congressmen who oppose price control.

A recent Nation-wide poll of public opinion showed that 73 percent of the American people want price control continued. Only 21 percent want it to end next June, when the present law expires.

Yet when the House of Representatives voted recently on an amendment to strike out a deficiency appropriation for OPA, 105 Republican Congressmen voted to starve OPA out of existence by denying it funds. The Democratic majority, voting almost solidly, saved OPA from this attempt to wreck it.

But the fight on OPA—the crucial battle for price control—is still ahead of us. We have seen the lines forming. Under Republican Party leadership, and with an almost solid Republican vote in prospect, those economic wreckers still hope to recruit enough dissenting Democrats to cut the heart out of price control.

I do not minimize the danger. I would be less than candid with you if I were to feel and show any complacency toward this combination in Congress. Already it has demonstrated the damage it can do. Already it has had its way in temporarily blocking other postwar measures which the great majority of the American people want.

I hold such a combination politically irresponsible. I hold irresponsible any group in the United States Congress which, elected by fewer than half the people of the Nation, combines forces and by common agreement—by class compact—acts to defeat the will of three-fourths of the people of the Nation.

That is precisely the function which the opposition to President Truman's policies, under Republican leadership, and with an almost solid Republican vote behind it, has set for itself in the United States Congress.

Other parts of the program of President Truman, favored by the great majority of Americans, have been defeated or blocked by the same means.

Our people are overwhelmingly in favor of the administration's program for housing. Not only are they in favor; they are demanding it. While the Republicans in Congress block that program and substitute platitudes, the people want houses. Yet the main feature of the legislation that will insure houses for them—the subsidy program—was voted down in the House of Representatives by a solid Republican opposition and a minority of dissident Democrats. Together, these legislators, representing a minority of the American people, again defeated the will of the great majority.

The Nation-wide poll taken in January showed that 80 percent of the people approved of President Truman's fact-finding program for settling labor disputes. Only 12 percent were against it. Eighty percent of the white-collar workers approved, 83 percent of the farmers approved, and 80 percent of the businessmen approved.

Yet here again, the Republican totality, plus a Democratic minority, formed an opposition which defeated this plan in Congress. And 80 Americans must therefore abide by the will of 12 Americans, throughout the land.

When this happens, when public opinion demands a program and Congress moves against that demand, it is time for America to take political stock of herself. It becomes apparent that something more than price control, or housing, or labor fact-finding, is involved. It is time for us to realize that democracy in America is at stake.

That is why the congressional elections of next November are so important. That is why they are not to be considered as just another set of off-year election returns.

Unless the Democratic Party can increase its majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, democracy itself—the democratic principle of majority rule—may be laid on the shelf in America.

I have dwelt at some length on the darker side of the picture. I can also report on its brighter side.

In the first place, with the Republican performance what it is, many a rank-and-file Republican has been frightened by the prospect of control of the Congress by his own party, for the same reason that any thoughtful American might well be frightened.

In November, our party will have good men on its ticket in the contested States, a good program, a sound administration.

With this weight of evidence on our side, and with enough work on the part of party members in the precinct, I know we can win. I know that we can build up a truly democratic majority next November, big enough to give the people of America what they want.

But we do not have to wait for that. I also believe that the will of the people will make itself known before the November election. I believe the need is so urgent—the need for price control, the need for housing, the need for a new minimum wage—that all these objectives of the administration of President Truman will win out over any minority devices which the Republican leadership can think up to defeat them.

The answer is work. Work in support of the program and work for the men in Congress who will support it. By working now, we can defeat government by class compact even in the months between now and election.

Your Democratic Senator and your Congressman know that you support the administration on price control and on housing. Let your Republican Senator know. Let your neighbors know, the people who elected that Republican. Let them know how he votes on these issues. If we Democrats keep busy doing that in every State, there will be fewer Republicans in Congress voting as they have up to now.

The legislative program is of large proportions—necessarily so in order to cover the postwar adjustments that must be made in a great Nation. We expect that legislation to take time. But we also know that we shall have to meet the obstructive tactics of the Republican opposition at every step of the way, and to meet those tactics will take more than time. That will take active, loyal support of Democrats in Congress, and it will take an active expression of the will of the American people.

I believe we are now getting that expression. I believe as a result of it, we shall win the battle to provide our returning soldiers with decent housing, built in time for their use and priced within their reach.

I believe we shall win the crucial battle for price control. If our people let the men in Congress know how they feel about this issue, we are certain to win. The will of America is a mighty force. Once it is given expression, no congressional maneuverings, no attempt to replace majority rule with government by class compact, can prevail against it.

In the campaign ahead of us, in the fight to send more men to Congress like JIM TUNNELL and PHIL TRAYNOR, and in the day-to-day fight for legislation to realize the ideals and objectives of our party, we shall work and go forward. It is up to us to bring out a true expression of the American will. It is up to us to make America speak out.

When you hear America speak out, then you will know—the Democrats are in.

Democratic Self-Determination Is Real in Czechoslovakia; Russia Seeks Security, Not War, Says Dr. Benes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD from the New York Times of March 10, written by John MacCormac, well-known foreign correspondent, a report of an interview with Edourd Benes, President of Czechoslovakia, who, as Mr. MacCormac points out, has had a longer and more intimate experience in European politics than any living statesman.

Dr. Benes is well known in the United States. He has visited here frequently, in the course of his world-wide travels. With his help Tomas Garrigue Masaryk, first President of the Czechoslovakian Republic, fashioned in my own native land a true democracy more closely patterned on that of the United States than any other European country. Czechoslovakia under Masaryk and Benes was truly free; it prospered and grew strong, and developed trade, manufacturing, industry, arts, and sciences; and maintained a friendly relationship with all the western powers on a basis of equality. The crushing betrayal of Munich did not dampen his enthusiasm for democracy; but it indubitably implanted a strong suspicion of some of the governments called democratic.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Benes' assurance that Russia seeks security, not land; that Czechoslovakia is not dominated by Russia. Remember that Czechoslovakia set the pattern of postwar development of a democratic government in the last war. The western powers did not protect the small countries, struggling for self-sufficiency, against Nazi aggression; it is not to be wondered at if they tend to turn to Russia now for assurance against exploitation again, and to offer in turn some assurances of future aid. I know, though, that the devotion of the small Middle European countries to the United Nations is sincere and whole-hearted.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and I believe that the conditions in Czechoslovakia, as explained and described in the interview granted by President Benes, will apply shortly to Poland; that Poland, too, will soon be absolutely free and independent, and will rebuild her factories and farms and colleges and become a progressive, independent, democratic nation; and that Russia will carry out her pledges and assurances to Poland and a real friendship will be attained.

BENES SEES NO WAR BUT NOTES SPHERES—CZECHOSLOVAK PRESIDENT FEARS EAST-WEST ISOLATION—SAYS RUSSIA DOES NOT COVET LAND

(By John MacCormac)

PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, March 9.—A confident belief that Russia was seeking not territory but only security in southeastern Europe was expressed today in an interview by President Eduard Benes, of Czechoslovakia, who signed a treaty of alliance with the Soviet Union while still in exile in London.

Hardly any living statesman has longer or more intimate experience in European politics than Dr. Benes, architect of the Little Entente and close friend of France, he was long the leading link between his country and the West. Munich disillusioned him. When he again sought assurances of security it was from the East.

Western influence, however, is still strong in Czechoslovakia. Of all the countries that have proclaimed their desire to act as a bridge between the East and West, Czechoslovakia is best fitted for the role. In these days of friction between Moscow, London, and Washington it is not an easy role to play.

Dr. Benes expressed his confidence that the situation would eventually resolve itself, however. "I don't believe for a moment that it will ever come to a conflict between England and the United States on one side and Russia on the other," he said, "though the situation might result in their lasting isolation from each other.

"There will be differences, but there won't be war. There can be no World War today which would not be followed by revolution—a greater revolution than has taken place this time. Undoubtedly there are people who would like to see war between the East and West, but the revolution which would follow such a conflict would defeat the very ends for which they wished it. More and more people realize this."

In talking with other Prague politicians I frequently heard resentment expressed that the United States and Britain had agreed at the Tehran conference of the Big Three—without consulting Czechoslovakia—that Czechoslovakia should be in the Soviet sphere of influence. President Benes did not go so far, and when asked about recent Russian moves in Hungary and Austria he commented:

"I don't believe Rusisa wants eastern Austria or even Hungary. If she had entertained territorial ambitions of this kind she could have taken Czechoslovakia. But she did not. She took her troops out of our country because she felt confident that she would not have in Prague a government unfriendly to her."

In eastern Austria and Hungary, Dr. Benes continued, Russia's chief aim, "as it was here, is to assure herself that elements hostile to her do not again get the upper hand. I am convinced that when she has satisfied herself of this she will be ready to retire."

"Russia's whole foreign policy, as I see it, is founded on a desire for security," the Czechoslovak President went on. "She wants time to develop her own territory and friendly countries on her border. Nothing can be so important for her as a chance to settle her own internal problems.

"As for Czechoslovakia, her policy is clear. Above all, we want no trouble between the east and west. So, although it is an ambitious policy for a small country, we shall do everything in our power to try to interpret them to each other."

The Catholic Church in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include an article that appeared in the March issue of the Cantian magazine of St. Louis, Mo., by its editor, Rev. John S. Mix, C. R., entitled "The Catholic Church in Poland":

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN POLAND

(By John S. Mix, C. R.)

Poland, with her cities and churches destroyed, her priests and religious decimated; her monasteries and convents desecrated; the patrimony of her (the Catholic) Church confiscated and sequestrated first by the Germans and later by the Russians; her seminaries, the residences of the bishops and the archives of many dioceses pillaged by the invaders; her beautiful and ancient churches stripped of priceless pieces of art; her Catholic Press totally destroyed; Poland, after so many centuries passed in the service of the church, finds herself confronted by an almost impossible and insuperable task of reconstruction, of returning to normal Catholic life. It will take many years to restore what was so ruthlessly destroyed during the Second World War.

Cardinal Hlond in his report to the Holy Father (1939), in his final observations bemoaned the wanton destruction of human life and the planned annihilation of the church in Poland. "Hitlerism aims at this systematic and total destruction of the Catholic Church in the rich and extensive territories of Poland, which have been 'incorporated' in the Reich, in the face of all right and justice, because of their metallurgical and textile industries, the abundance of their fine quality coal, and the fertility of their soil and their beautiful forest. In many districts the life of the church has been completely crushed, the clergy having been almost all expelled; the Catholic churches and cemeteries are in the hands of the invaders. Everything has been deliberately planned with the aim of completely destroying the church and its vitality in one of the most religious countries of the whole world."

In her 1,000-year history of faithful service to the Catholic Church, Poland had never been contaminated by any major defection from the Church of Christ. In her long period of fidelity to that church, she had gone through many a religious storm only to become more adamant and sincere in her adherence to the Bark of Peter. As early as 1034 there arose a strong feeling against Christianity and its teachers; many even relapsed into paganism from which the Nation was converted in 966. Priests and bishops were massacred, and the Catholics of Gnesen and Posen were destroyed. That upsurge was short-lived and under Casimir I (1040–58) respect for Christianity and the clergy was restored. By 1079 Poland counted 15 bishops. The Catholic Church grew rapidly in every way in spite of wars that raged for almost 200 years throughout Poland.

During the thirteenth century, Poland realized the almost complete development of a native clergy. Until then she was dependent upon her neighbor to the west.

In 1924 the Hussites from Bohemia made their entrance into Poland. Any Pole who dared to join this sect was adjudged guilty of heresy and high treason. The inquisition became active against the Hussites.

In 1550 the Protestant preachers returned to Poland and though they never succeeded in converting the Poles to their religious beliefs, small in number as they were, they were there to stay. Poland by this time had become a haven for other nationalities and their religious tenets were respected.

In 1596, at the Union of Brest, the Ruthenian Church which was formerly affiliated with the Schismatic Church was united to Rome. That church, however, retained the Slavic liturgy. Churches of the Armenian rite also were once again united with Rome. These two rites continued to exercise their influence over their respective faithful to such an extent and remained steadfast in their faith that the Holy See deemed it wise to establish three archbishoprics in the city of Lwow, perhaps the only city to have the distinction of possessing three sees: of the Latin rite, the Green-Ruthenian, and the Armenian.

From 1648 to 1772 the Catholic Church made great and constant strides in the development of distinct Catholic western culture. Just about that latter date, however, Freemasonry began to spread, especially in the higher circles of society where French literature had done its work of corruption. Atheism was preached openly and acknowledged.

Perhaps one of the greatest acts of loyalty toward the Catholic Church was King John Sobieski's defense of Vienna in 1683. When the grand vizier, Kora Mustofa, at the head of about 200,000 men, had crossed the German frontier and was besieging Vienna, Sobieski, at the urgent plea of Pope Innocent XI to save Christianity from destruction, with a small contingent of the Polish Army hastened to its relief. Reinforced by the (German) emperor's forces he utterly defeated the Turks. This was the beginning of the final downfall of Turkish might and superiority.

The real Calvary for the Catholic Church in Poland started with the three partitions of that country (1773, 1793, 1795). The condition of the Catholic Church was indeed precarious. If the Catholic Church had its troubles in a united Poland we can readily understand what her troubles were and how they increased when that unfortunate country lay prostrate at the mercy of her three greedy neighbors. Russia and Prussia joined then, as they did years later again, in persecuting the Catholic Church.

The Russian Government was ever mindful of the return of the Uniates (the Ruthenians) to the Church of Rome and now that a great portion of central and eastern Poland came under her domination, she promptly took measures to bring them back into the orthodox fold. The government strove to extirpate not only the Polish nationality but also the Catholic Church. On from 1831 until the early years of the nineteenth century the Catholic faith was tried in the crucible of persecution. After the insurrection of 1831 the Uniates were forced into apostasy (that same condition prevails today with the Ukaranian Catholics being forced into orthodoxy); convents were suppressed and churches closed. Again after another unsuccessful attempt at freedom, in 1863 the church suffered once more. By order of the cabinet in 1864, the property of the church was confiscated, the convents still in existence suppressed; the clergy was placed under the authority of a commission at St. Petersburg, without any regard for the wishes of the Apostolic See. The liturgical books and devotions of the schismatics were forcibly introduced into the churches of the Uniates. Peasants who tried to prevent the schismatical popes (priests) from entering the churches were simply shot down; the baptism of children in the Catholic church and the solemnization of matrimony in Catholic churches were forbidden.

The treatment of the Catholic church was just as bad under the Prussian rule. The Catholic clergy was subordinated to the temporal power. The properties of the Catholic bishops and priests were confiscated. The church was not free to exercise her power as regards the administration of the sacraments, especially that of marriage. The Polish language was barred from schools and the German tongue was introduced; the intention was not only to Germanize the people but also to make instruction in religion more difficult. Some of these stringent rules were later relaxed but the German language continued to be imposed on the people.

In Austrian Poland the Catholic Church suffered least. Catholicism was recognized as the dominant religion. Nevertheless, the church was subject to the control of the state. The government assumed the supervision and control of seminaries for the training of priests, and prescribed the character and method of instruction in theology. In the early years of Austrian occupation convents of the contemplative orders in Poland were suppressed and their property converted to the fund for religious purposes. Toward the end of the last century, however, and with the beginning of the current century the church was freed from state restrictions in the Polish provinces and as a result Catholicism made great progress.

With the resurrection of Poland in 1918, the Catholic Church took a new lease on life. The Poles were once more free to exercise their religion according to the dictates of their conscience. The new Polish Constitution guaranteed absolute religious tolerance to all creeds. It declared that the Roman Catholic faith being the religion of the great majority of the nation was to occupy a leading position in the state among other religions—all of which, however, were to enjoy equal rights. The relation of the state to the Catholic Church was determined by a concordat with the Holy See in 1925. The Church of the Latin Rite was organized in 20 dioceses, the Greek Catholic Church was organized in 3 dioceses, and the Armenian Catholic Church in 1.

According to a pamphlet by Msgr. Walerian Meysztowicz entitled "L'Eglise Catholique en Pologne Entre les Deux Guerres (1919–1939)" and published by the Vatican in 1944, there were in Poland, before the outbreak of the war in 1939: 45 bishops, including 1 cardinal (about 26 Catholic dioceses in all); 7,713 parishes, 12,940 secular priests, and 1,863 priests of various religious orders and congregations. There were (according to All About Poland by J. H. Retinger), in Poland at that time 341 Catholic monasteries for men with 6,430 monks (counting lay brothers and priests), and 1,686 convents with 16,820 nuns. These were distributed throughout the 5 ecclesiastical provinces in Poland, namely, Poznan-Gniezno, Warsaw, Wilno, Lwow, and Cracow. The number of Catholics in prewar Poland was about 25,000,000.

When Hitler decided to strike at Poland and actually attacked her on September 1, 1939, he was doing that with the understanding of Moscow that Russia would join Germany at the opportune moment. It was agreed by a pact signed by both parties in Berlin in August 1939, that "the bastard child of the Treaty of Versailles," to use Molotov's own words, would be completely destroyed, that Poland would cease to exist as a nation. After a most heroic defense Poland gave up the fighting ghost at the end of the month of September 1939, and the two greedy thieves divided the spoils between themselves. What they had determined to do was done with lightning rapidity. Anything that stood in the way of the triumphant Nazi and Soviet Armies was promptly removed or to use their own coined word "liquidated." And so it happened that the intellectuals, that is, the priests and professional laymen—doctors, lawyers, teachers—were first hunted down and rounded up to be sent to the concentration camps. The situation of the Catholic Church became truly desperate. The same conditions prevailed under both the Soviet and Nazi occupation. Within a period of 1 year most of the sees were without bishops, 7 bishops were deported or imprisoned, priests in great numbers had been liquidated, many thousands being imprisoned or executed, church property was confiscated and destroyed, seminaries were closed, religious

teaching was prohibited in the schools, nuns were evicted from their convents and brutally attacked, the Catholic press was dismantled and religious associations and publications were forbidden. Catholic life went underground and there it was to continue its mission as did the Christians of the early centuries in the catacombs of Rome.

With the war over Poland emerged from it once more a partitioned country; she had lost her true identity. From a population of about 35,000,000 there remain some 23,000,000 people. An estimated 7,000,000 were killed in the war counting civilians as well as men in the armed forces. About 2,000,000 Poles are still to be found in Germany, and at least a million and a half were herded into Siberia and the northernmost territories of Soviet Russia. Of the 45 bishops 9 died and others were interned; of the more than 14,000 priests, 1,000 were killed outright, and some five thousand were imprisoned by the Nazis, of which only about 1,200 survived torture, starvation, and enforced labor. There are no available figures as to the loss suffered by the church at the hands of the Soviets. However, in 1939 some 1,500,000 Poles were deported from the eastern provinces to Siberia, and with them went 1,000 priests. What happened to them nobody knows.

His Eminence, Cardinal Hlond, upon his return to Poland made an estimate of losses sustained at the hands of the Germans. The Nazis stole 1,000 chalices, 800 pyxes, 500 monstrances, 8,000 chasubles and copes, various liturgical articles and linens. All this was taken from about 1,000 churches and chapels. From the diocese alone 400 priests were put to death either outright or in concentration camps.

Today the Catholic Church in Poland stands at her tenth station on the way to Calvary. Stripped of her faithful, of her bishops and priests, her religious sisters, nuns, and brothers, of her churches and convents, or her chalices and vestments, she stands with outstretched arms helpless and forsaken, as though to cry out "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

Under the present Communist-dominated regime the Catholic Church is enjoying some measure of freedom. As late as February 1945, however, the Soviet authorities in Poland refused cooperation with the church authorities and in one instance forced Archbishop Sapieha of Cracow to discontinue his work for the relief of the war-stricken people of his see city.

In Warsaw, the most destroyed city in Europe, where the people crowd the underground of what is left of the church buildings to worship, an effort is being made to rebuild some of the city's churches. It must be remembered that not one church was spared in the Second Battle of Warsaw in August 1944. The spirit, however, in which freedom is given to the Catholic Church is not one of good will and friendliness. The Communists favor the priests, enticing them with better foods and lodging, only to point out to the poor, starving people of Warsaw that the priests are living like capitalists. There were a few priests who took advantage of the offer—they had starved long enough to refuse food that was due them—but the majority of them refused to be duped and remained steadfast in their determination to starve with their people rather than to betray their trust.

Little is known of what is going on behind the scenes in Warsaw. Only a few days ago Washington received the startling information from overseas correspondents that on July 3, 1945, the entire membership of the Redemptorist Fathers Community, thirty in all, was killed and their bodies cremated. The details of the gruesome tale are not given.

Cardinal Hlond, who left Rome for his home country on July 8, 1945, by way of France, Germany, and Prague, Czechoslovakia, where he received a visa from the Warsaw government, arrived in his see city of Poznan in the first week of August. Upon his return to Poland he was not able to carry on any communication with the Vatican.

In November 1945 new laws governing marriages were established. The new Polish marriage law which came into effect January 1, 1946, requires that all marriages must be performed by civil magistrates or registrars. It also states that church ceremonies may be performed but have "no legal value." This runs counter to Catholic principles and was promptly protested by the Polish bishops.

In spite of the above sad picture of the church in Poland, there is every hope that after the usual uphill fight the church will be victorious. Plans are being constantly devised by the Polish hierarchy to bring about as hurried a reconstruction of Catholic life in all Poland as possible. At a meeting in Czestochowa, October 3–4, 1945, the Polish hierarchy called upon Polish Catholics "to make utmost efforts to ensure that the rebuilding of the Polish state would be based on Christian principles." And to give the people living in former German areas now under Polish rule, someone to whom they might have recourse, someone to administrate the government of the church, Cardinal Hlond appointed Apostolic Administrators vested with full jurisdiction of ordinaries. There remains a tremendous shortage of priests in Poland, and it is feared that this condition will continue until a government without any outside pressure be chosen, until a free and unfettered election be held. Priests, soldiers, and people alike more than 2,500,000 of them in Germany alone, await with anxiety their return to Poland but until they are assured of freedom from fear, freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion and the right to live, they prefer to remain exiles in a foreign land and place their hope and confidence in the ever-paternal Providence of God.

Secretary for the West—Wisconsin's Krug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger from the Progressive of March 18, 1946:

SECRETARY FOR THE WEST—WISCONSIN'S KRUG

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

No other branch of the Federal Government is as exclusively concerned with the problems of a single region as the Department of the Interior is concerned with the Far West. Indeed, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, once suggested that the Secretary of the Interior be officially known as "Secretary for the Far West." Many people considered his proposal most logical.

Under the Interior Department are such bureaus as the National Park Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, the Grazing Service, the Public Land Office, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Fully 90 percent of the responsibilities of these important agencies is concentrated in the 11 States of the far West.

Nearly half the area of vast and far-flung States is under the sovereignty of the Secretary of the Interior—California, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico. The West is the special and particular province of the Interior Department. In addition, the Interior Department controls and supervises practically all of Alaska, that immense Arctic outpost of the Pacific Northwest States.

For these reasons the Nation took it for granted that President Truman would appoint a westerner to succeed Harold L. Ickes. Five possibilities were prominently mentioned, all from the far West; Oscar L. Chapman, of Colorado; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Justice William O. Douglas, of Oregon; Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington; and Lewis B. Schwellenbach, also of Washington.

None of these men landed the secretaryship, although the President was said to have tendered it to Douglas. Instead Mr. Truman selected a 38-year-old engineer from Madison, Wis., Julius Albert Krug. Although confirmation was assured from the start, western Senators were amazed. Their reaction was symbolized by the statement of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, who said Krug would be "all right if he had on his staff people who know western power projects, reclamation, and the like."

What sort of man is Julius Albert Krug, the rotund middle westerner who becomes the first new occupant of the Interior secretaryship in more than 13 years? What is the background of this former football player who is now, in effect, the Federal administrator for the immense area between the Continental Divide and the Pacific Ocean?

Krug is chiefly known to the Nation as the Navy lieutenant commander whom the late President Roosevelt summoned to head the War Production Board after Donald Nelson passed from the governmental scene. Behind this episode were 10 years spent by Krug in public affairs. At the early age of 28, he was summoned by the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the long-distance telephone rates charged by the A. T. & T.

Julius Albert Krug has a nickname. It is "Cap." Most individuals presume it stems from the time when he captained his football team at Madison Central High. It doesn't. It dates from November 23, 1907, the day he was born. The doctor who performed the delivery called him Captain Kidd, because he was such a bouncing baby; the nickname has stuck all through his life.

Krug was the son of a patrolman on the Madison police force. All four of his grandparents were German Protestants who had left the Reich during Bismarck's chancellorship. He worked his way through school and college pumping gas at a filling station; during the summer he delivered ice, drove a truck, and clerked at a Milwaukee line roundhouse.

Krug studied engineering; his particular interests were economics and public-utility regulation. He took a master's degree in public-utilities management. After leaving the university, he worked several years for the Wisconsin Telephone Co. as an operations analyst. Krug then joined the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, where he worked to prove that lower electric rates would both benefit the public and stimulate business for the power companies.

A thorough researcher, Krug was so meticulous and persistent that his fame spread. Albert B. (Happy) Chandler, now high commissioner of baseball but then Governor of Kentucky, called him to help clean up a utilities

row in that State. Krug did so complete a job that in 1937 he went to the Tennessee Valley Authority as chief power engineer; later he became manager of power.

This was Krug's toughest assignment. It also was the job which made his reputation. TVA was involved in a bitter battle with the Commonwealth & Southern properties headed by the late Wendell L. Willkie. Controversy piled on controversy. Krug was before a congressional investigating committee for 7 days straight, defending the TVA power operations. He helped handle the negotiations by which the TVA paid $80,000,000 for Commonwealth & Southern in the region.

Dispute still rages over which side got the better of this deal. Some men claim that Willkie completely outsmarted the TVA negotiators. Others insist that Chairman Dave Lilienthal of TVA, with Krug at his side, proved the superior bargainer. In any case, the entire situation helped establish Krug as a national figure in the amphitheater of the utilities struggle.

Krug's first war role found him in charge of the Power Division of the War Production Board. Several times he tangled with the New Dealers led by Harold L. Ickes. They claimed that some of Krug's decisions favored the private power companies. But by and large, Krug remained clear of the bitter factional disputes which constantly rocked the WPB.

In 1944 his local draft board classified him I-A. Krug expressed a desire for combat service, but the Navy commissioned him a lieutenant commander and sent him to Europe to work with the Army in restoring electric power service in the shattered cities of France and Italy. Krug is a man of action and this was a natural assignment. He came into communities devastated by air raids and weeks of street fighting, and in a few days power was again humming through the wires.

He returned to Washington, D. C., and was about to sail for the South Pacific when the War Production Board exploded with a bang. The long-smoldering feud between Donald Nelson and Charles E. Wilson had finally boiled over. President Roosevelt summoned Krug to the White House. The next day Krug traded his two-and-a-half stripes in the Navy for the chairmanship of the WPB.

Krug stayed in this job until the war ended and the WPB folded up for keeps. He then went to New York to form his own engineering firm; there were many rumors that he was to join Eric Johnston in the old Will Hays movie office. These reports were still in the evanescent stage when President Truman by-passed the far West and appointed Krug to be Secretary of the Interior.

Krug is the exact opposite in many ways of the man he succeeds. He is less than half Ickes' age. Ickes is irritable and cantankerous. Krug is placid and calm. He holds no grudges; Ickes never forgets a slight. Krug is democratic and friendly in personal behavior. He never insults people or questions their motives. Ickes is as suspicious as a lynx.

Indication of Krug's objectivity in many controversies is the fact that his appointment as Secretary of the Interior was hailed enthusiastically by both sides of the power fight. The Wall Street Journal reported that many private utility executives looked favorably on the selection. On the other hand, Krug's accession was heralded by Dr. Paul J. Rover and C. Girard (Jebbie) Davidson, administrator and general counsel, respectively, of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Davidson, who knew Krug when they were associates in the Tennessee Valley Authority, praised him as an able man and a genuine liberal. On the other hand, some Wall Street sources said Krug was expected to take the conservative side in the public-power struggle.

This division of opinion over the 230-pound Interior Secretary was emphasized when Krug himself testified before the United States Senate Committee on Public Lands. Chief point of interest was his stand on regional authorities, an issue now involving the valley of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers.

Krug admitted his enthusiasm for the TVA and recalled his previous experience as TVA's power manager and chief engineer. Authority advocates on the Senate committee leaned forward hopefully. But, Krug added, he was not convinced that the authority set-up was the soundest way to develop the waterways of every section of America.

This left both proponents and foes of MVA and CVA completely undecided as to the attitude on those projects of the new Secretary of the Interior. The Senate committee unanimously approved Krug's nomination, however, with the men on both sides of the authority question voting to confirm him for the Cabinet.

In some quarters Krug's appointment has been received with great jubilation—not because Krug is liked more but because Ickes was liked less. EDWARD L. (BOB) BARTLETT, a New Deal Democrat who represents Alaska in Congress, said that the day of Ickes' resignation was the most memorable day in Alaskan history. He said that Ickes' passing from the national scene gave Alaska a chance to develop, and he charged the retiring Secretary with holding back Alaska all during his long tenure in the Interior Department.

At the age of 38 Julius Albert (Cap) Krug has traveled a long way. He is the youngest member of the Truman Cabinet; in fact, he is one of the youngest Cabinet members in history. He has made considerable progress in the 12 years since he was pumping gas at a filling station in downtown Madison, at the corner of King, Wilson, and Butler Streets. The entire Krug family believes that its huge and enterprising offspring has broken the bank in a large way.

Whether a young man from Madison can administer a Department concerned almost exclusively with the States of the far West remains to be seen. Like Missouri, the West waits to be shown.

Consumer Credit Controls Retard Full Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable mail relative to the remarks I made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 14, 1945, in connection with the abolishment of consumer credit controls.

It is becoming more evident that increased production is necessary for prosperity in America. Controls of one kind or another have definitely retarded production to a degree that black-market operations are becoming more and more numerous.

Consumer credit controls have contributed their share to this situation. Many industries are fearful of continued governmental interference in business and are hesitant about increasing their operations for that reason.

The following article, reproduced in the February issue of Consumer Credit, which has a monthly circulation of over 40,000, should be of interest to my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is published by the Consumer Banking Institute of Washington, D. C.:

REGULATION W RESTRICTIONS NOT TO BE EASED EVEN TO AID VETERANS

This publication has always maintained the position that the first problem of reconversion is that of replacing the huge war markets with consumer markets. If our factories, farms and mines are to keep up full-scale production and employment, they must be able to sell what they produce. Our service and distributive business can provide jobs and income only if large-scale markets can be maintained.

Now that the Government has stopped buying all kinds of things which it needed for the war, markets can be maintained only if consumers can buy in large quantities and keep on buying. Just as the large wartime markets were made possible by Government credit, large consumer markets can also be opened up only by the use of consumer credit.

But the consumer market is nothing more than the aggregate purchases of all of us as individuals or consumers. Any restriction or regulation (such as regulation W) which limits individual buying must also limit the total market. Realistic appraisals of the regulation must thus be in terms of individuals and their buying needs and abilities. Public policies based upon an over-all surplus of cash buying power will fall short of their goal to the extent that each individual consumer is different from the over-all average.

Because total consumer markets are the result of many individual markets, that total must be computed from the bottom up—that is by adding together the amounts which each individual can and will buy. Market estimates computed from the top down—that is by reference to total income or wealth—are not adequate, because they assume a leveling or averaging of individual consumers which never actually occurs. It results in allocating markets to some individuals who will not buy, because they do not have the money; and to others who have the money, but who will not buy because they do not need the goods or do not want them.

A recent study by the New Jersey Department of Economic Development shows that about 23 percent of New Jersey families planning to buy household appliances plan to buy them on the installment plan. About 49 percent of New Jersey families planning to buy new automobiles and 56 percent of those planning to buy used cars plan to use installment credit. As shown in table I, many more New Jersey families also plan to finance purchases of these items by cash from income which probably means in large measure some form of open credit. Elimination of these credit purchasers from the New Jersey market will greatly reduce the potential for this important industrial State.

TABLE I.—*Expected method of financing purchases in New Jersey*

HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES AND EQUIPMENT

Total number of family units expecting to buy one or more household appliance or equipment items listed, 889,994.

Method of financing	Family units	Percent of total
By cash from income	362,106	40.7
By use of savings or investments	210,889	23.7
By installment plan	204,112	22.9
Don't know	112,887	12.7

NEW AUTOMOBILES

Total number of family units expecting to purchase new automobiles ---------- 314,647

Method of financing	Family units	Percent of total
By cash from income	62,440	19.8
By use of savings or investments	58,052	18.5
By installment plan	153,046	48.6
Don't know	41,109	13.1

USED AUTOMOBILES

Total number of family units expecting to purchase used automobiles ---------- 116,611

Method of financing	Family units	Percent of total
By cash from income	18,724	16.1
By use of savings or investments	17,721	15.2
By installment plan	64,943	55.7
Don't know	15,223	13.0

Source: New Jersey State Department of Economic Development Review of New Jersey Business, vol. 1, No. 4 (January 1946), p. 5.

Along this same line, Advertising Age (January 14, 1946) recently observed:

"Although nearly 100,000,000 Americans are holding war bonds, Government financial experts are convinced that the bulk of $150,000,000,000 in individual liquid assets built up since 1939 rests in relatively few hands.

"They are also confident, on the basis of their studies, that the great bulk of these accumulated savings is being held for permanent purposes, and is not going to be used extensively in purchasing consumer durables and luxury items.

"These assumptions have been seriously questioned in recent weeks, as dollars flowed freely in the holiday shopping rush, but the economists feel that unless there has been a significant change of heart, the war bonds and the bank balances will be held for such things as a new home or a rainy day, and the durables will be financed through use of consumer credit."

This means that the large potential consumer market indicated by our accumulation of savings and our years of doing without will never be realized unless each individual consumer can buy according to his needs and abilities. Limitation of markets to individuals who can pay cash or meet restricted-credit requirements will mean that manufacturers can produce no more than enough to meet those markets and full production and employment will not be achieved. In the face of these conditions, artificial limitation of markets is more than an anti-inflationary measure—is is an antiproduction measure. Because production is the best antidote to inflation, such a policy encourages inflation by discouraging production and employment.

But aside from its serious economic aspects, the continuation of regulation W as a method to limit consumer markets results in discrimination among individuals. In so discriminating, it creates individual hardships which are as unnecessary as they are unjustified. Returning veterans who need credit to reestablish themselves in civilian life find it denied them because they cannot meet the requirements of regulation W. Displaced war workers find they cannot use their credit resources to make sound adjustments to peacetime activities.

In a letter to the editor of Consumer Credit Mr. Harry B. Weaver, president of the Davenport Morris Plan Co., cites two examples where regulation W prevented the sound use of credit by deserving individuals. The first of these examples involved an ex-serviceman who was an acceptable credit risk, but was prevented from buying a new gas stove because he did not have a $33 down payment required by regulation W. The second example was a man who found it impossible to accept a good selling job because he did not have the required down payment for an automobile.

Because it is so pertinent to the problems of individual consumers under regulation W, Mr. Weaver's letter was forwarded to the Federal Reserve Board for its comment. Both the letter and the reply of Mr. Bray Hammond, assistant secretary to the Federal Reserve Board, appear on the last page of this issue of Consumer Credit. Examination of the two letters indicates—

1. Mr. Weaver's interpretation of regulation W and its effect in the two examples cited were correct.

2. The Board attributes the primary cause of the difficulties to "the war and its after effects."

3. The Board defends regulation W as an aid to all individuals by holding back inflation.

4. The Board thinks regulation W cannot be relaxed for the benefit of veterans without nullifying it.

5. The Board thinks that regulation W, together with other measures, will bring about a fairer distribution of the limited supply now available at prices the veterans can afford.

6. Fundamentally, the solution can come only with large-scale production.

From this exchange of correspondence, it appears that the basic conflict of thought is as between considering consumers as individuals or considering them over-all. The Federal Reserve Board agrees that some hardships may occur, but justifies the regulation upon the basis of helping all groups overall by holding down purchases and preventing price increases.

This publication has pointed out on many occasions the undesirable effects of regulation W. It does not seem realistic to contend that undesirable effects are justified by any attempt to hold back inflation in a $160,000,000 economy by restricting $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 of consumer credit.

Address of Hon. John L. Sullivan Before the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent address delivered by Hon. John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, at the annual meeting of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on March 16, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and gentlemen, it is with deep humility I rise tonight to address you in the presence of the President of the United States. One hundred and sixty-five years ago the first President of the United States became an adopted member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. Tonight, on the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of this society, the thirty-third President confers upon us the same honor. Most of the 31 in between were good men—but they didn't have the votes.

I'm proud tonight to speak for Americans of Irish blood. I hope that in my lifetime I may prove worthy of the rich heritage of faith, hope, courage, enthusiasm, and optimism passed on to me by my forebearers.

Mr. President, we gather here tonight as, all over the world for 1,500 years, Irishmen, their descendants and their friends, have gathered to pay tribute to the birthland of a great ideal, the homeland of an indomitable spirit.

Tonight—wherever they may be, Irish and those like you and me—their kin in race or sentiment—pause to pay their ancient tribute to the blood that flows in their veins and to Patrick, the patron saint, and the inspiration of that great land of saints, scholars, and pioneers. Tonight once again we are reminded that Ireland, often bankrupt in everything else, is rich in the love and loyalty of her children and her admirers at home and abroad. Proudly we remember that for centuries she has commanded a respect, a loyalty, and an affection that any other nation in the world well might envy.

Usually upon such an occasion, the speakers of the evening talk about the role of Irishmen in the birth of this Republic—as though we had to prove our birthright. They speak of Smith, Taylor, Thornton, and Rutledge, Carroll, McKean, Read, and Lynch—who signed the Declaration of Independence. They talk of Long, Fitzsimmons, Duane, Carroll, Burke, and the others who were Members of the Continental Congress. They tell you of James Moore, Governor of Carolina in 1700—and of Dobbs, Rowan, and Burke, who were governors in the next 80 years—all Irishmen. They talk of John Barry, the father of our Navy. They remind you that in the Revolutionary War there were 327 Connors, 500 Murphys, 695 Kellys.

Now we all know the extent to which men of Irish descent have participated in every war this country has fought. But tonight one might be supposed to talk about Americans of Irish blood in this war. I acknowledge a temptation to talk about Admiral Dan Callaghan, heroic Father Joe O'Callaghan, the Sullivan brothers, and many other heroes with Irish names and blood. Tonight I resist that temptation. The participation by men of Irish blood is too obvious to require elaboration. There is still another reason.

It is hard to remember that 10 months ago we were still fighting Germany and that 7 months ago we were still fighting Japan.

But one thing is easy to remember, and must never be forgotten. In these two wars, America proved that American fighting men are second to none.

Our victory was a triumph for all arms. The Army—its Ground Forces, Air Forces, and Service Forces—met and mastered terrific obstacles. From its high-ranking generals to its buck privates, the American Army proved itself worthy of America's greatest military traditions. The Navy is proud of its great partner in these two wars.

I am one of those who think that the Coast Guard, the Marines and the Navy also did a great job. The war in the Pacific was a seapower struggle, waged over jungle islands, through typhoons and across the vast water spaces of the world. Victory in the end rested with the country that possessed not only the world's most intelligent and best equipped Army, but also the world's greatest Navy—greatest in numbers of ships, greatest in the fighting qualities of its officers and men, and greatest in its ability to defend its country and preserve the peace—the biggest and best concentration of air-sea power the world has ever known—the United States Navy.

Our Army and our Navy were led by brilliant men whose names will live as long as America. Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Arnold and Vandegrift; Admirals

King, Nimitz, Leahy, Halsey and Waesche—these are but a few of the thousands of fine American Army and naval officers without whose professional attainments and personal gallantry neither war could ever have been won. But I suppose that if those gentlemen were here with us tonight, they would be the first to disclaim that they had won either war.

I think they would tell you that despite the great contributions science made to American arms and military proficiency, neither radar nor influence fuse, nor even the atomic bomb, was America's secret weapon. I am confident that they would agree with me when I say to you that the secret weapon with which America won these two wars was 15,000,000 of the finest young men this world has ever known. Those kids won this war for us—those kids gave us one more chance to make this world a sane, fit place in which to live. And it is my guess that if peace endures it will be largely because those 15,000,000 superb youngsters will work as hard and as intelligently to help preserve the peace as they did to win the war.

Yes; there were thousands of Kellys and Murphys and Sweeneys in every type of uniform American fighting men wore in these wars. But we must remember that there were an equal number of Browns and Joneses. And a lot of Bernsteins and Cohens.

So, tonight, rather than narrate the long and honorable roll of contributions to the war effort by men and women of Irish blood—both in and out of uniform—I prefer to speak more generally of all Americans of Irish blood and their hopes for America in the years to come.

Mr. President, this society did not elect you to membership because of the position you hold, but because of the ideals to which you hold. They watched you as you so suddenly took over the affairs of government at a crucial, tragic time. They marveled at the way this country, under your guidance, pursued its steady march to victory without losing a step. They applauded your straightforwardness and your courage. They liked your unaffected loyalties. They acquired a confidence in your motives—they found you to be fair to all men. I think that most of all they respected you for certain spiritual qualities and convictions they admire in men of all faiths.

Now, this is by no means by way of assuring you the Irish will always be with you. Occasionally the Irish enjoy a difference of opinion—once in a great while they even disagree among themselves. But even without the action of this society tonight, it is abundantly evident that you possess those qualities so much admired by us of Irish blood.

As for us—we know we owe as much to America as any other group, and probably much more than some. Nowhere in the land can you find more devotion to America than in this group. We're proud that we have been able over the last 170 years to give more than we've taken. We hope it will always be so. We have our faults and we know them. But we think we possess some qualities of the heart and some eternal principles of humane justice and charity that America and the world need.

Our forebears were men and women of simple and abiding faith. They came to America full of hope, and for them and for their children's children their faith and their hopes have been justified and fulfilled. They had courage and enthusiasm and optimism. To the Irish, tomorrow is the greatest day of all. And to them, tomorrow doesn't mean just the coming 24 hours—but all that's left here on earth, and after that, eternity.

It is with this background and heritage of faith, hope, courage, optimism, and enthusiasm that we of Irish blood contemplate the international and domestic problems that beset the President and people of the United States tonight.

To us, the peace so recently won is beyond all price. Without peace, we know that neither we nor any other people in the world can enjoy those fruits of victory you, President Truman, so well described to the Federal Council of Church of Christ in America as "the right of every human being to live in dignity and freedom, the right to worship God in his own way, the right to fix his own relationship to his fellowmen and to his Creator."

We know full well, Mr. President that without a just and enduring peace the horizons and the boundaries of the human spirit will shrink ever inward, and that neither America nor any other nation will achieve its destiny. We are convinced that peace is not an accident that just happens, but rather an objective requiring and deserving the same effort and unity that is required to win a war. We know, too, that there is a price for peace—but it is characteristic of the Irish never to count the cost.

And so it is that tonight, with vibrant hopes for the success of the United Nations Organization, we assure you of our desire to cooperate with men of good will all over the world to protect this all-embracing family of nations. We are not unmindful of the suspicions and rumors that caused you on Thursday to reaffirm your conviction that practical, peaceful solutions are possible and will be attained. We share that conviction. As you move forward to solve these problems, we join you in prayer for a new world founded upon faith rather than bounded by fears—a world in which mutual respect and confidence can beget that universality of man which must be God's will. To achieve that, no effort is too great—few experiments too dangerous.

For we know, oh so well, that in this modern world no man can ever again be an island of himself. Henceforth, whenever forces of aggression seek to abridge liberty and disrupt the peace in however remote a corner of the globe, no one will need ask for whom the bell tolls. We will know it tolls for us all, unless America's influence, backed by America's might, and acting in concert with the other peace- and liberty-loving members of the United Nations Organization, proceeds at once to halt that aggression.

On the home front, as is the case with every nation that has just concluded a long war, America faces many domestic problems. Though of far less importance than the establishment of enduring peace, they impinge upon the happiness and welfare of every man, woman, and child. I suspect that because they are so involved and complicated they look more difficult than they really are. None of them appear insoluble to the Irish.

To the Irish, America always has been, and always will be, the land of ever-increasing opportunity. The first of them to come here were Americans in spirit even before they landed. Once here, they never ceased to wonder at the American system, which to them represents the finest instrumentality of government the mind of man has yet devised. They have never wavered in their obligations as Americans because they know the heart of America is sound. They know that here in America can be had everything the body and the soul require to create a full and happy and useful life. To the Irish, coming from a land where there was so little, the freedom, the resources, and the chances for growth and improvement stamped America as the land of opportunity.

That view has never changed—as it has with some others. Temporary dislocations have never obscured to the Irish the broad, cheery panorama that is America.

We can all recall during the late 1930's the atmosphere being created by certain supposedly advanced economic thinkers. We were told that America had reached and receded from her maximum development. We were told that the country had been built, that the frontiers had disappeared. We were warned that since the economy of America had matured we must begin to pull back into our shell and resort to these adjustments and rear-guard stratagems with which waning nations seek to delay their decline.

Americans of Irish blood never fell for that. They believed that these spokesmen of futility and despair were not only lacking in faith, but shockingly bad at arithmetic. It is our view that today, and for as far ahead as can reasonably be foreseen, America still offers unbounded opportunity for all who seek to grasp it.

We still hear references to America's 130,000,000 people, and we wonder if therein cannot be found the secret to the apathy with which some people treat the needs of the day. It seems plausible that they may regard some of America's wants and needs as merely temporary wartime phenomena.

Now the fact of the matter is that we are not a nation of 130,000,000 people but of 140,000,000. By 1950 we will be a nation 145,000,000 strong. In the last 3½ years of war our population increased more than 5,000,000. Our present rate of growth is at a rate of about one and one-half million per year.

Now what does this mean in terms of development, in terms of opportunity for our people? Would it indicate that current shortages of housing, foods, transportation, communication, and 1,001 other services, are merely wartime phenomena? Or would it suggest that to satisfy these permanent and increasing wants we must embark upon a prolonged period of industrial activity the like of which the world has never seen. Superimpose upon this the pent-up demands for goods of all sorts and descriptions—add to it all those new boons to civilization science is prepared to give us, and you have the perfect prescription for a situation in which opportunity must exceed the wildest dreams of those who seek it. Surely, if this is a correct appraisal of our present prospects, then we have no domestic problems that cannot be solved by liberal applications of industry and faith.

Mr. President, we know something of the inventory of America's spiritual and material resources. We know something of the measure of the faith and the courage of the American people. We know that here in America there is, there always can be, more than enough for every one. We feel that in 1946 America, victorious and resurgent, stands on the threshold of her most glorious era.

We applaud your faith and your confidence. Tonight, meeting in honor of Patrick, the patron saint, whose inspiration sustained the Irish through centuries of trying problems, Americans of Irish blood extend to you warm encouragement and sincere best wishes in the tasks you have so courageously undertaken. May God help you to help us make this world a peaceful one, and America, civilization's everlasting shrine.

Jackson Day Speech of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a first-page

editorial from the Springfield, Ill., State Register of March 4, 1946:

LUCAS' JACKSON DAY SPEECH

The 1,000 or more Democrats who heard United States Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS' opening gun of the congressional campaign at the St. Nicholas Hotel Saturday night agree that the Senator's impersonation of Andrew Jackson was a great success.

His keynote speech was a ringing endorsement of the leadership of President Truman who Senator Lucas said is meeting a multiplicity of domestic and international problems with Jacksonian and Rooseveltian courage and ability.

It required courage for the Senator to speak as plainly as he did about labor and management, but he has Jacksonian courage. These words of warning which he uttered are reverberating across the Nation today:

"Unless industrial and labor strife reaches a satisfactory settlement soon, labor and management both—and I say both, with emphasis—may receive a legislative jolt more severe than the Case bill." (That measure provides for compulsory arbitration.)

It was significant that the burst of applause which greeted that statement was followed by an even greater demonstration of approval when Senator LUCAS said:

"All the people of America have basic rights in these disputes. The public interest is involved, and Congress cannot long neglect it."

There you have a definite Jacksonian keynote which none can misunderstand.

We must have peace and prosperity at home if we are to have peace throughout the world.

Second only to the transcendent appeal for industrial peace was Senator LUCAS' brilliant and fearless denunciation of and challenge to isolationists who continue to obstruct international amity as they did during the perilous period when the late President Roosevelt sought to avert war by preparedness based upon national unity.

Roundly denouncing the Gerald Nyes, the Hamilton Fishes and other "America-Firsters," Senator LUCAS warned that those same elements of hate are trying to destroy the peace structure right now to satisfy political prejudice and desire for self-aggrandizement.

The Senator said those elements of hate continue to fight Franklin Roosevelt in death as they did when he was leading the world to a righteous peace.

A hush fell over the great audience and was followed by a tremendous tribute of applause for the speaker and the late President Roosevelt when Senator LUCAS said in measured tones and with a dramatic gesture:

"Franklin D. Roosevelt need have no fear for his place in history. He withstood their attacks for 12 long years. He shattered American precedents by defeating them four times in succession, and, if they continue in their scurrilous attacks upon the memory of this man, his ghost will walk in the coming elections. He will defeat them again."

A Jacksonian keynote, indeed.

Well may every candidate for county, district, or State office echo and reecho it. It is the rallying cry of democracy—the battle cry of victory.

Should OPA Be Continued?

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are receiving literally thousands of messages from constituents concerning the continuation of the OPA. I have had very few, if any, letters from the District urging that OPA in its entirety be eliminated. Most writers, however, want the part of OPA that affects them repealed at once.

The mammoth Willow Run Ford bomber plant was located at Ypsilanti, Mich. During the reconversion period the Kaiser-Frazer Co. has taken over the Willow Run factory. This is a typical war-defense area and a place where reconverting from wartime economy to peacetime activities means much, especially to the retailer.

I have this day received a letter from the Board of Commerce of Ypsilanti which expresses the general view of the citizens of that community. This letter is typical and suggests, among other things, "We do advocate the continuance of some form of OPA control, but with a much more flexible administrative policy."

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given to me, I include the letter, which reads:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHENER: I can well imagine how weary you may be from all of the discussion concerning the OPA. Nevertheless I know you are intensely interested in this vital issue and will not object to getting a few concrete facts based on local experience.

We do advocate the continuation of some form of OPA control but with a much more flexible administrative policy. OPA officials should realize that retail costs are steadily rising and that there is a limit to the amount of price absorption that retailers can take. Here are a few observations:

1. While total retail volume may be holding up, in many lines it is from 10 percent to 35 percent under the wartime peak. This is due to merchandise shortages and conservatism on the part of the consumer.

2. The cost of doing business is steadily mounting with wages and rents the two important factors. Very few merchants outside of food dealers can get their overhead below 25 percent.

3. Preticketed items are increasing right along with the result that some wearing apparel merchants anticipate that 50 percent of their volume during this present year will ultimately be made up of very closely priced preticketed items. For instance the margin of profit allowed on a certain preticketed item is 32 percent on cost whereas the normal mark-up for many years on that same item has been 40 percent or more. Some preticketed items allow a mark-up of from only 25 percent to 28 percent on cost.

4. Financial statements of retailers for the year 1945 generally reveal three things: (a) A reduction in the gross profit on sales; (b) an increase in the cost of doing business; (c) a reduction in net profit. The outlook for 1946 is an acceleration of this trend.

It is true that retailers have been doing good business in recent years, but it is also true that a man can do a terrific amount of business and still not do it profitably. Any merchant can take a close mark-up on occasional items, perhaps even a loss, but he can't do this on any substantial number of items.

We also favor the passage of the Guinn Bill H. R. 2788 limiting the time in which OPA can take court action to 1 year. We feel that the businessman is entitled to this much protection against Government legal action which now may be brought against him years after an alleged violation.

We appreciate the tremendous problems which confront you Congressmen and we are confident that it is your purpose to take such action as will achieve the greatest good for the greatest number. We only ask that price control be administered with the greatest possible degree of fairness and equality.

Respectfully,

RETAIL COMMITTEE,
PAUL UNGRODT,
Secretary.

Russian Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is much speculation in this country concerning the gold reserves and the gold resources of Russia. A loan to Russia in light of our past experience and the record of international dealings with Russia would be a speculation that this country cannot afford to make under present conditions. There is submitted for consideration an article from the well known pen of a prominent financial writer, Mr. N. M. Bratten, formerly with the Department of Commerce, taken from Nations Business for March:

RUSSIAN GOLD

When Representative COLMER and his colleagues asked Stalin how Russia expected to pay back $6,000,000,000 Stalin is reported to have answered:

"How will China pay back its American loans?"

What about Russia's capacity to repay a large American loan? This, of course, depends on the loan's amount, maturity date, and repayment terms, all related to the U. S. S. R.'s prospective export ability. Two important facts in this connection are Russia's ability to deliver gold and America's present ability and willingness to accept it in unlimited amounts and indefinitely. We may have no need or use for more gold, but so long as we are willing to export goods in exchange for it and so long as Russia can produce large amounts of gold, the U. S. S. R. can maintain considerable debt service with the product of the Siberian gold fields.

Official Washington thinks the U. S. S. R. holds much gold and can mine very substantial amounts. How much gold Russia now has on hand and how much it can produce each year are, for the present, Russian secrets, although they have a direct bearing on the question of a loan. Rumor has it that Russia's gold-mining potentialities developed during the war are now very sizable. Gold is not something the Russian people care for or can afford to use internally as money; but if gold will buy needed American goods, the Soviet Government may be expected to direct the necessary manpower to Siberia.

The most recent Federal Reserve Board estimates place Russia's monetary gold reserve at $839,000,000 as of September 1935 and Russia's production of gold in 1938 at $180,000,000. No later Federal Reserve estimates are obtainable but some Washingtonians think Russia now holds $2,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 of gold reserves, and mines about $250,000,000 of the metal annually. The gold reserves originally designed as a war chest did not have to be used because of lend-lease.

Students of the Russian mind think that the Soviet's secretiveness about its gold posi-

tion is due to the fear that the disclosure that Russia holds large amounts of gold in the official reserves and in the ground might frighten the U. S. A. into abandoning its gold-buying statutes.

GOLD WOULD NOT HELP US

E. C. Ropes, the United States Commerce Department's Russian expert, holds that gold for goods is not acceptable payment to the United States or England. Certainly it is not the ideal form of payment from our viewpoint but it is legally acceptable to the Treasury Department. Therefore, Russia as a large gold producer is in a much better position to service an American loan than most other borrowing countries.

To the extent that it is not met in gold, Russia's loan service will have to be met primarily out of the proceeds of Russian commodity exports to us or the rest of the world. The more commodities we buy from Russia, the more we can help Russia pay off this loan. Our prewar trade with the USSR, however, does not suggest that, without gold, Russian exports to the United States of America will suffice to service a loan of several billion dollars. Quite the contrary. But advocates of a loan to Russia hope that through the multilateral system of international trade settlements, which is the keystone of our commercial policy, Russia will be able to meet any financial obligations to this country which she undertakes and which she cannot meet with gold.

This country's commodity imports from Russia totaled only $21,400,000 in 1936; $27,200,000 in 1937, and $23,500,000 in 1938. At current prices, those figures would be somewhat larger. If Congress adopts the administration's present stock-piling bill we could, for a limited time, greatly expand our imports of certain strategic and critical materials obtainable in Russia.

Our chief imports from Russia in 1938, apart from gold, were:

Furs, skins, and other animal products	$14,500,000
Manganese and other metals and manufactures	3,600,000
Textile fibers and manufactures	1,600,000
Nonmetallic minerals	1,400,000
All other imports	2,400,000

These are not magnitudes to conjure with, when looking for ways to multiply direct imports from the U. S. S. R.

EXPORTS COULD SERVICE DEBT

Some Government officials believe, however, that Russia's total commodity exports in the years ahead will be adequate to service a loan of the dimensions being discussed.

Mr. Ropes, in an article privately published in 1944, stated:

"Noting the fact that the Soviet Union, while building up its economy by modernizing its industry, expanding its transport, and mechanizing its agriculture, exported goods each year, on an average from 1929 to 1938 to a value of $517,604,000, it is possible to estimate, with some assurance, that the capacity of the country to export, on an average, each year for 10 years after normal conditions of life are restored, will be at least $400,000,000 to $500,000,000. There will be variations in different years but, by and large, these figures are conservative, omitting as they do gold and precious metals and some industrial products sold regularly before the war to the Soviet Union's eastern neighbors, but now required by the country itself for its own rehabilitation and progress."

Compared with official figures, Mr. Ropes' optimism seems to be exaggerated.

Russia's export figures as published officially by the United States Department of Commerce show a less optimistic picture: Her exports to the world at large before the war measured in dollars totaled only $160,500,000 in 1936; $204,200,000 in 1937; and $157,300,000 in 1938.

The U. S. S. R.'s chief export commodities in 1938 were wood and wood products, grains, petroleum products, furs, and cotton fabrics. In the Soviet's best trade year, 1930, its exports to the world totaled $533,700,000. For Russia to maintain her exports to free-exchange countries on a large volume and on a sustained basis, with a view to accumulating dollars for loan service, would entail a major effort and no little sacrifice by the Russian people, at least during the earlier loan-service years.

The British loan agreement of last December requires no repayments for the first 6 years. After the sixth year, annual payments on account of principal repayments and interest at 1.62 percent—unless the latter is skipped—are to be $31,823,000 for each $1,000,000,000 of the credit drawn.

REPAYMENTS ON EASY TERMS

Were Russia to obtain a line of credit here on the same noncommercial and subsidized terms as Britain, annual Russian payments to us would have to be:

On a loan of—	Annually for 50 years, beginning Dec. 31, 1951	Or during 50 years a total of—
$1,000,000,000	[1]$31,823,000	$1,591,150,000
$2,000,000,000	63,646,000	3,182,300,000
$3,000,000,000	95,469,000	4,773,450,000
$4,000,000,000	127,292,000	6,364,600,000
$5,000,000,000	159,115,000	7,955,750,000
$6,000,000,000	190,938,000	9,546,900,000

[1] The fiftieth installment would be $31,840,737.

For a loan of even half of Marshal Stalin's $6,000,000,000 figure this would mean that, for 50 successive years Russia would be called upon to pay us more than it paid us for its prewar imports, without getting in return anything but a receipt. The goods representing the Russian debt to us presumably would have been imported before the first of the 50 annual payments started. For any American goods Russia might want to import in 1952 or afterwards, additional dollars would have to be found somehow.

Russia will not find it easy to raise its exports to the level these payments will make necessary. Despite the country's vast natural and human resources its ability to repay a large dollar loan in goods will depend on the world's demand for Russian products.

As for loan servicing through American imports of Russian commodities, while an increase over the prewar volume in lumber—and, for a time, in those strategic and critical materials obtainable in Russia, is possible, the prospects are not unlimited. Military stock-pile commodities which Russia is in a position to supply include, chiefly, chromite, copper, manganese, nickel, platinum, and fluorspar. Stock-pile experts estimate the amount of such commodities we could so use at $225,000,000, a sum which would have to be spread over several years because of the time required for mining.

Stalin's February speech announcing military power as Russia's first objective in the next 5 years seems to rule out the possibility that Russia might develop a large export balance of trade with other countries.

Producers in the countries concerned may reasonably set up their own objections if the U. S. S. R. offers competitive products at low prices.

However, a triangular trade course, even if not otherwise impeded somewhere along the line, could work satisfactorily only if the United States, by and large, during the long period of the loan's repayment maintained a negative trade balance, an excess of imports over exports.

So long as we continue on balance to export surpluses, there will be an insurmountable transfer problem for the countries which have borrowed here and our loans to them, in the aggregate, will be uncollectible, excepting insofar as they can pay in gold.

BUSINESS MIGHT MAKE LOANS

Another and very practical question deserves to be considered in this study: How far can private American business and banking meet the U. S. S. R.'s credit needs?

Some United States officials have recognized that a considerable part of Russia's legitimate needs can be met in this manner perhaps with help from the Export-Import Bank. In 1944, Mr. Ropes wrote:

"Ample funds are available in American banks and corporation treasuries to finance a large aggregate of orders over the first 5 years of intensive manufacture and shipment and there should be no need for assistance from the Government to help private sellers and bankers carry the load, such as was provided in countries that in prewar years sought Soviet business on a credit basis."

Apart from private American sources, Russia may obtain substantial amounts of credit from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. That Bank, an outgrowth of the Bretton Woods Conference of 1944, will have substantial gold and dollar resources. Indeed, Russia's exacting demands at Bretton Woods caused the text of the agreements to be modified in various respects and resulted in the United States delegation, as a placating concession, putting into the bank $300,000,000 more than the $2,875,000,000 quota previously envisaged for this country.

The Bretton Woods agreements were formally ratified last December by more than 30 countries, but the U. S. S. R. was not among them, to the surprise and disappointment of many people in the United States Government.

If we make Russia a loan, Congress and American business are likely to demand that a Russian credit be accompanied by some nonfinancial quid pro quo. If we are to export billions of dollars' worth of goods to Russia on credit, would it be amiss to ask Russia to export some "international cooperation"? Some countries have used trade as a form of economic warfare and, under the Russian system imports and exports can be adjusted at the will of a few men in Moscow. Russia's capacity to produce and to export being Moscow-controlled, Russia's ability to pay loan service is itself within the control of the Kremlin. Loan service may be just another chip for an inscrutable international poker player.

Again quoting Mr. Ropes, "the monopoly of trade—in Russia—however, can also be used as an economic or political weapon and has been employed in both capacities either to rectify a trade situation unsatisfactory to the Soviet Union or to punish a country that for its own reasons broke relations with the Soviet Union. The possibility of similar action after the war is inherent in the state control over export and import movements."

POLITICAL TERMS FOR A LOAN

Some assurance against such maneuvers might well be a part of the loan agreement. Access to more information about Russia might be another stipulation. Not only the American loan negotiators but Congress and the public want this.

In addition to considerations related to the U. S. S. R., many Members of Congress feel that a loan to Russia ought not be decided by itself but only in connection with the total of the outside world's desire for financial aid from us. Heretofore Congress has approved various foreign lending programs totaling billions, without too much attention to the possible inflationary effects of large foreign buying here in the period ahead. Also some, like Bernard Baruch and

Secretary of the Interior Ickes, point out that we are now a "have not" rather than a "have" Nation, which implies that we should examine loan proposals from the standpoint of our ability to take the risks.

Piecemeal Government lending abroad has now reached such a volume as to suggest the wisdom of thorough Government investigation of foreign borrowing needs and American lending capacity.

World Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the full texts of the addresses on world famine by Mr. Herbert Hoover and myself over the ABC network at 7:15 p. m., on Saturday, March 16, 1946:

MR. HOOVER'S PLEA TO HALT FAMINE

Two weeks ago I was asked by President Truman and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson to advise upon what measures and what sort of organization should be set up to cope with the famine which now stretches over 500,000,000 people abroad. I advised upon the essential organization and the methods adapted to this emergency. My recommendations were fully stated in the press on February 26. I do not need to repeat that outline.

I am glad to say these recommendations have all been adopted with one exception, that related to the transfer of powers to Secretary Anderson which would make him a real food administrator capable of stopping the human food now being consumed by livestock.

I wish to dispel at once one misunderstanding. I have no administrative authority or responsibility. I am acting in an advisory capacity.

The Emergency Food Administration is in good hands. The new organization is under the able direction of Secretary Anderson, Mr. Chester Davis and the Emergency Famine Committee. They are making rapid progress. Secretary Anderson has selected Mr. Walter Straub as central Director in Washington and he has appointed a food administrator in each State and county from department officials. A program of voluntary rationing has been approved for householders, public eating places and the trades. Committees in the trades have been set up to see that it works.

The emergency will extend over 4 months until the next harvest in July. There should be a breathing spell after that.

The voluntary rules for conservation have been reduced to great simplicity and have been reduced to only wheat products and fats. We have faith in the voluntary action of the American people. Housewives are asked to make three loaves of wheat bread do the work of five and that their purchases of fats be reduced 20 percent. Public eating places have been asked to limit their purchases of wheat flour or its equivalent to two pounds a week for the average number of their customers and that they reduce their consumption of fats 20 percent. That is not starvation for the American people because it can be made up by other abundant foods and saving waste. This amount of denial would alone save the health or lives of at least 35,000,000 additional women and children.

There are some matters which I hope our people understand.

1. I fear it is now too late to save all the starving people. Our purpose is to save the last one possible.

2. The number of lives that we can save depends upon the extent to which the American people will comply with the Emergency Committee's appeal.

3. It also depends upon the extent of measures by the Washington administration to reduce livestock consumption of bread grains and to increase the available fats.

4. It further depends upon the extent to which Latin-American states will cooperate by reducing their consumption and waste of breadstuffs and fats, to the end that they also export the last pound and that they import the very least amount.

5. Even with success in these measures we have insufficient food for all the millions of people, and every atom of increase means life and hope somewhere.

I could discuss at length the repeated warnings and recommendations that I have made during the past 5 years—that effective organization and preparation of world supplies should be made against this inevitable after-war famine. But this is a time for cooperation and not controversy. Our duty is to serve starving people.

Now that the work of the Emergency Food Administration has been started, President Truman has asked me to go on a mission to the countries where there is danger of famine. I leave tomorrow morning by plane. I am accompanied by a number of men who were associated with me in relief and rehabilitation during and after the First World War. Our purpose is to study means and methods of making the available food supplies in the world save the maximum number of lives and to present the situation as clearly as we can to the President and to the American people together with such advice as we can give.

And I would like, in leaving my country, to repeat to this different audience part of what I said a few nights ago:

This is an issue of religious faith and morals which affects our country as a whole and each individual. Saving of human life is a moral and spiritual duty. If your neighbors and their children were hungry you would instantly invite them to a seat at your table. These starving women and children are in foreign countries, yet they are hungry human beings—and they are also your neighbors. Could you not imagine one of these helpless women or children as an invisible guest at your table? By following the voluntary rules for saving food you give life to that starving person just as surely as if he sat at your table.

To whatever extent we succeed in this task we shall have given that much health, courage, and faith to a despondent and discouraged world.

I ca. only appeal to your pity and your mercy. I know that the heart of the American people will respond with kindliness to suffering. Will you not take to your table an invisible guest?

I now wish to introduce to this radio audience an American woman who has herself visited these starving countries abroad, and I may add that her public service in the United States Congress and her moral and her spiritual concepts and the lift of her emotion entitle her to speak on these matters.

I present Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

MRS. LUCE'S PLEA TO AMERICAN WOMEN

I am going to ask you who listen to Mr. Hoover and me tonight to ask yourself one question. Yes, ask yourself, and the next person you talk to on the telephone, or meet on the way to work tomorrow, this question, "Did you ever see, with your very own eyes, an American child dying of actual starvation? Did you ever see an American mother with her baby in her arms, drop dead of plain downright hunger? Did you ever see an American father scavanging the dump piles or the garbage pails of your city for any scrap of swill that the rats or roaches hadn't eaten? The answer will be no. For these are things, thank God, no Americans have witnessed in America. And yet these melancholy sights are almost the rule all around the rest of the world today. One hundred million people will be starving in Europe this year. Several million may die of starvation in Europe. In China thousands die by the roadside every day. We are so very fortunate, so very blessed by God, in our abundance.

I think we all know, in our hearts, that if we are to deserve our good fortune, we must begin to share it: We must be good Samaritans. But now. Because there is no time to lose.

We all knew, of course, that things would be bad in Europe and Asia with the war's end. But we didn't know how really bad they were until a little while ago. Crop failures and droughts in Europe and Asia have made things worse than anyone could have imagined. If millions are not to starve to death in the next crucial 3 or 4 months, we Americans will have to feed them.

That's why President Truman formed the Famine Emergency Committee, with former President Hoover as its honorary chairman, and Chester C. Davis as its chairman, to formulate a program of voluntary methods by which we can all help.

There are many things every one of us, particularly the women, can do voluntarily which will help to put food at once into the hungry little mouths of the children over there. I do not have time to tell you all of them tonight. But the most useful thing we can do is to cut down a little on everything we eat, and everything we waste, especially bread.

America still throws away the richest garbage in the world. Some demon estimator has figured that 5 percent of our breadstuffs, or one slice out of every loaf of bread baked every day goes into the housewife's garbage pail.

We can economize on the use of all wheat products, such as bread, macaroni, spaghetti, breakfast cereals, pies, cookies, cakes. The best way to begin, is to buy 40 percent less of these commodities. Then use up every scrap you buy. Save on bread by keeping it cool and moistureproof. If bread gets hard, use it for toast or puddings. Wherever you can, use potatoes. One small serving of potatoes replaces a slice of bread, nutritionally. Instead of cakes, cookies, and pies—use other desserts, such as fruits.

If every American housewife would undertake to save two slices of bread a day, that would be enough to give 20,000,000 starving people their daily bread for the next 6 months.

Fats and oils are also desperately needed abroad. They're needed for food to maintain a minimum level of health—and they're needed for soap to fight diseases now rampant throughout Europe and Asia. Here's what all of us can do:

We can buy less fats and oils. We can make use of every possible ounce of "used" fats (extra fat on meat, bacon drippings, etc.). Then, if there is any left which cannot be used in the home, we can turn it in to the butcher or grocer.

A teaspoon of fat a day saved by every man, woman, and school child in the United States will mean a total saving of at least 1,000,000 pounds of fat a day—and oh, how many little lives!

In the end, it may be more important for the cause of peace, to control our appetities—in order to feed Europe—than to control the atomic bomb.

At the last war's end, President Woodrow Wilson said, "Hunger does not breed reform; it breeds madness and all ugly distempers that make an ordered life impossible." The man he gave the job of defeating hunger in Europe was Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover did that job nobly then. Let us all help him to do it again, for it has become a far greater and a far more crucial task at this war's end.

Once more, we just cannot afford to let the great human cry from across the waters go unheeded. If we do, if we fail humanity, we will certainly lose the peace we fought for. There can be no peace in a hungry world. In the words of the President's Famine Emergency Committee: "To avert hunger, we cannot fail to meet this call. If we fail, we shall see a world of disorders which will paralyze every effort at recovery and peace. We shall see the death of millions of fellow human beings."

Guns speak the first word of victory, but only food can speak the last word.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I discussed the British loan before our Columbus town meeting, which is broadcast over Station WBNS, Columbus, Ohio, with our colleague the able and distinguished gentleman from Alabama, my friend, the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN. I cannot, of course, reproduce our entire discussion, but in my opening statement I gave my general views on the British loan, and I wish to give these views to the House.

I think Congress should not approve the proposed British loan. Remember, we are not discussing whether we should make some sort of loan to Britain, nor whether we should aid or cooperate with Britain. A specific agreement was signed by British and American officials on December 6, 1945. The British Parliament has approved it. The bills before Congress are solely to authorize our Secretary of the Treasury to carry out this December 6 agreement with $3,750,000,000. Congress is asked to take it or leave it. After considerable study, I think Congress should leave it.

THE UNITED STATES AND RECONSTRUCTION

The United States has a duty not only to help but to lead in postwar world reconstruction. Performing this duty is also a wonderful business opportunity for our country, if we go at it wisely. In fact, we owe it to the rest of the world, as well as to ourselves, to make world economic reconstruction sound business for us, as well as other countries, in order to make it work.

THE LOAN IS NOT SOUND BUSINESS

The British loan cannot be defended as a business deal for us. We settle a balance of seventeen billions of lend-lease for $650,000,000 payable over 50 years; we lend three billion seven hundred and fifty million without collateral or security to be repaid over 50 years with interest at less than 2 percent, and no interest at all when the British have not made the money they used to make on exporting, and that may be most of the time from now on. This is not a business loan at all. Our former Ambassador to Britain, Joseph P. Kennedy, who is supporting it, says, "The truth is that financial aid to the United Kingdom, whatever name is applied to it, is and should be an outright gift." That is what Lord Keynes wanted. That is what Churchill said he could have gotten. That is what our six billion First World War loans turned out to be. To hear our Secretary Vinson call this proposal a loan makes you want to laugh—or to cry.

THE THREAT OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

What do we get for it? Well, the British agree to give up, not now, but a year from the time they know the funds are available, some practices that are called by them and by us, "economic warfare," blocked sterling, and so forth. Britain agrees to attend world-trade conferences, to discuss giving up other kinds of "economic warfare."

What if we don't give them the money? Well, Britain threatens to go at this "economic warfare" harder than ever. Think of it. Both, our leaders and theirs say that these practices are warfare, vicious, unsound, bad for all concerned, but Britain says she will not swear off unless she gets this money. Over a century ago, the Barbary pirates practiced a system of economic warfare against this infant Republic unless we made certain annual payments. Finally, we took the same position we took with the French in 1798, when they threatened economic warfare, "Millions for defense; not 1 cent for tribute." We need a little of that spirit today, in the face of requests or demands, coupled with threats.

THE LOAN IS NOT SOUND DEFENSE

But the propaganda for the British loan says, "It is for defense; for defense of the United States. We must keep Britain strong so they can fight for us." Winston Churchill, who never mentioned the loan, made the best speeches yet for it at Westminster College, in Missouri, and last Friday night. Of course, there is nothing in the published agreement that says Britain will fight for us, but if we get into war on the same side together again, and that is quite possible, the British know that we will furnish the tools, the money, and the men and will finish the job. In the meantime, to subsidize their peacetime economy with the hope that they will be strong and ready and willing and able to fight for us is an extravagant and contemptible form of national defense.

GEORGE WASHINGTON ON THE FAVORITE NATION THEORY

France wants a loan. China wants one. Russia wants one. If we are going in for buying off threats, a Russian loan might be a good one. President Truman has said that the British loan is a special case, and has proposed that we lend to all of the rest of the world a half billion less than we make available to Britain, up to June 30, 1947. George Washington in his Farewell Address, said:

> A passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity.

These 150-year-old words of George Washington are worth considering today.

WE CAN DO BUSINESS WITH BRITAIN

The English-speaking people of the world face a parting of ways. Either we must come together far more closely than we have in the past, in formal, definite arrangements which are mutually satisfactory and profitable, or we must become more separate and independent than we have been in the past quarter of a century or so. Instead of diplomatic or military alliances, where all must agree, or the vote is 6 to 1 in favor of the 6 British commonwealths, we ought to have an organization controlled according to the voting population. There are about 70,000,000 citizens in the British commonwealths comparable to our 140,000,000. I would like to see the foreign policies, the military commitments, of 210,000,000 English-speaking peoples determined by representatives elected by some proportionate basis, rather than by 6 Prime Ministers and 1 President. In the meantime, we can do business with them. They have things we want and we have things they want, to be exchanged on a mutually profitable basis. At present, however, they do not want a business loan, and we do not want to make another gift, and therefore the so-called British loan should not be approved.

OPA Blamed Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I request that the following article, published in the Washington Evening Star of March 16, 1946, signed "A. Benjamin," entitled "OPA Blamed Again," be printed as follows:

OPA BLAMED AGAIN

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The butter situation sums up the whole jumble of bureaucratic stubbornness and incapacity that is OPA. We lately have had a record production of milk in this country. Everybody who knows anything about it knows that we could just as well have butter as not.

What is required is a few cents of price readjustment as between butter and certain other daily products. This fact has been testified to by numerous qualified men from Secretary Anderson down.

The spectacle of 27,000,000 families butterless in this land of 27,000,000 dairy cows is simply preposterous. Someone should jar OPA—and hard.

A. BENJAMIN.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a portion of an article that appeared in the Detroit News concerning the formation of a new group in Detroit, the Interorganization Committee for the Retention of Price Control:

Asserting that powerful special-interest groups are leaving no stone unturned to kill price controls, a new Detroit committee has been formed to urge public support of a campaign to retain the existing price-control law.

The Interorganization Committee for the Retention of Price Control was formed to facilitate and channel group action, the chairman, Prof. Edward W. McFarland, of Wayne University, announced.

"It is vitally necessary that every organized community group throw its full weight now into the battle to hold the price line," a committee statement said.

I am in hearty accord with the objectives of this committee, and am therefore including the text of a telegram sent to me. You will note from the titles of the various groups represented that the committee is composed of some of the most prominent and important organizations in our community:

DETROIT, MICH., *March 5, 1946.*

Hon. LOUIS RABAUT,
Washington, D. C.:

Undersigned organizations representing hundreds of thousands of citizens desperately fearing inflation demand continuation of price-control law with no weakening and no modification. Shocked at action of Senate in slashing deficiency appropriation, appropriations should be increased rather than decreased. Americans everywhere are looking to representatives in Congress to protect interests of the people against selfish pressure groups in this crucial period. Urge you use your influence to continue price-control law in present form with ample appropriations for enforcement.

Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor; Wayne County Council of CIO; Michigan Citizens Committee; American Legion, Detroit Districts Association; League of Women Voters; Detroit Council of Churches; Detroit Lawyers Guild; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Detroit Federation of Teachers; Highland Park Community Council; Consumers League of Michigan; Detroit Association of Women's Clubs; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Americans United for World Organization; Detroit Council of Applied Religion; National Negro Congress; American Jewish Congress, Women's Division; American Jewish Congress, Detroit Section; Detroit Literary Club; American Women's Volunteer Service, Consumers Division; American Association of University Women; Council of Mothers Clubs; Jewish Community Center; Herman Gardens Coop; National Maritime Union; Jewish Women's Council; Mechanics Education Association of America; Detroit Council of Negro Women; Booker T. Washington Trade Association; Detroit Council of Parent Teachers Association; League of Catholic Women; Jewish Community Council; Michigan Association of Women's Clubs; The Detroit Council of Catholic Women.

Evening Star Pays Tribute to Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star, March 18, containing a well-deserved tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]:

MERITED AWARD

The selection of Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, to receive the annual Field and Stream award for the outstanding conservation accomplishment in 1945 brings well-deserved recognition to a man who has played a prominent and effective part in the continuing struggle to conserve this country's fish, game and other natural resources.

Mr. ROBERTSON is one of that company of sportsmen whose skill with rod and gun is matched by their persistent and effective efforts to prevent thoughtless, wasteful depletion of our wildlife resources. As a member of the Virginia State Senate in 1916 he sponsored the bill which set up that State's game department and warden force. Ten years later he was appointed chairman of the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, serving in that post until elected to the House in 1932.

After coming to Congress he introduced a resolution creating the House Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, and has served continuously at its chairman. Later he helped to draft the Duck Stamp Act and the Coordination Act of 1934. Mr. ROBERTSON also is well known as cosponsor of the Pittman-Robertson Grants-in-Aid to States Act, which is financed, so far as the Federal contribution is concerned, by an amendment which he had inserted in the Internal Revenue Act levying a 10 percent excise tax on guns and ammunition, thereby requiring all hunters to contribute something to the cost of conservation.

Since entering Congress, Mr. ROBERTSON has devoted much, if not most, of his time to his work as a member of the important Ways and Means Committee. As the Field and Stream award testifies, however, he has found, and will continue to find, time for his conservation activities, the real importance of which generally is not appreciated.

Rev. Thomas J. Brennan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article on Rev. Thomas J. Brennan, pastor, Immaculate Conception Church, Revere, Mass., by Bill McMorrow, which appeared in the Pilot, Boston Mass., on Saturday, March 16, 1946:

MEET YOUR PASTOR

(By Bill McMorrow)

In answer to many requests from varied sections of our archdiocese, we present the story of Rev. Thomas J. Brennan, Pastor of the Immaculate Conception parish in Revere, where Catholic action and spirit go hand in hand under the able direction of the very friendly and cordial leader who seems so profoundly happy in his present pastorate.

Father Brennan was born in New York and was educated at Boston Latin School, '09, Boston College, class of 1913, the first class to graduate at University Heights, and St. John's Seminary in Brighton. Ordained on March 22, 1918, at the Cathedral by Cardinal O'Connell, he was assigned to St. Mary's parish in Ayer and remained for 3 years until his transfer to St. Mary, Star of the Sea parish in East Boston. Six years later he moved on to St. Vincent's in South Boston for a 3-year stay, and then became Superintendent of Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Brighton, where, for the next 8 years he devoted himself to the gigantic task of directing the activities of this large suburban institution. In August of 1939 he was assigned as pastor of Immaculate Conception parish, Revere, and it is apparent that his every wish for happiness has been fulfilled in this busy section of our diocese.

Immaculate Conception Parish, you know, is the one so widely known for its beautiful grounds, judged by many authorities as perhaps the most beautiful in the entire city of Revere during the summer months chiefly because of the unusual display of flowers and shrubs on the parish property, a direct result of Father Brennan's love and knowledge of flowers. Between the church and the rectory stands the most magnificent grotto, dedicated to Our Lady and landscaped beyond compare, with plants, flowers, and a carefully groomed lawn all laid out to best honor the Mother of God, and here the annual May procession always concludes with the Crowning of the Blessed Virgin at the Grotto, amid surroundings carefully prepared for the occasion.

NOTED ORGANIZER

A capable organizer, Father Brennan, aided by his curates, Rev. Jeremiah O'Neill, Rev. John Fogarty, and Rev. Edward Cowhig, the former Boston College football star of the Frank Leahy era, directs a very active ladies' sodality for both married and single women, a live-wire Holy Name Society, the popular CYO, St. Mary's Catholic Club in the high school, and an enthusiastic St. Vincent de Paul Conference which by and large plays an important role in the parish, and each of these groups is well attended and very popular with all parishioners.

The school system at Immaculate Conception parish is known far and wide for its high standards, and is considered just about "tops" in Revere. Supervised by the Sisters of St. Joseph, the many advantages of parochial education are stressed, and each week Father Brennan and his curates lend a hand teaching all high-school classes in religion, devoting 4 hours a week to each grade, freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior. An excellent visual-educational program is just another innovation here, and the school has recently purchased a talking-movie machine with stereopticon slide films which are used to good advantage covering many subjects, all of which presents a bird's-eye-view of Father Brennan's ideas along the educational lines.

A firm believer in the old adage "It matters little if you have won or lost—but how you played the game," Father Brennan reinstituted the athletic program so popular in Revere, and Immaculate Conception boys are members of the Catholic League in basketball, football, and baseball. Keenly interested in their activities, the pastor attends their games when parish duties will permit, and he is indeed proud of the sportsmanship shown by his boys, win, lose, or draw. The expansion of the football program has met with popular approval, and to give the lads the benefit of excellent coaching, last season "Tony Comerford" the immortal "Eagle" of the Iron-Major Cavanaugh day, was engaged as coach.

INTEREST IN YOUTH

The doings of the youngsters always command Father Brennan's attention, and he is actively interested in the monthly dance sponsored jointly by the CYO and St. Mary's Catholic Club, conducted in the Revere City Hall. Here the boys and girls enjoy a real old fashioned good time properly supervised and in the very best of taste, all to the delight of the pastor who loves them so much. Last year Father Brennan purchased the local Hibernian Hall for the youth of the parish and renamed it Father Tierney Hall in memory of a former pastor known throughout the district for his intense love of the little ones. And then, too, the annual Christmas party held in the Revere Theater is just another "regular" in the life of Immaculate Conception parish.

Genuinely interested in civic affairs, Father Brennan is chairman of the board of trustees of the Revere Public Library, and is chaplain of the Guild of St. Appollonia, the Catholic Dentists Guild which cares for and supervises the dental work on the children of the parochial schools.

The spirit expressed and the interest in current parish functions of all sorts is a source of great satisfaction to Father Brennan, and he is particularly delighted with the keen interest in the athletic program shown by the Alumni Association. "In fact," Father Brennan pointed out, "this interest is parish-wide and everybody seems to be sincere in their efforts to keep the ball a-rolling."

The church itself is simply grand, and simplicity is the outstanding feature. The main altar is a delight to view, and the side altars dedicated to the Sacred Heart and to Our Lady are equally beautiful. During your reporter's visit the statue of St. Francis Xavier commanded immediate attention, banked as it was with fresh cut flowers in honor of the patron saint of the novena of grace then being conducted, "and which," Father Brennan said, "was very well attended."

After a visit with Father Brennan and a quick peek into the record, the reason for the tremendous interest in Immaculate Conception Parish and its devoted pastor is indeed evident, and could best be summed up as the results of a broad program of Catholic action, carefully executed over the years by capable organizers in behalf of an unusually fine group of parishioners who really seem to care.

Russia's Reaction to Winston Churchill's Fulton, Mo., Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Star of last Sunday by Constantine Brown.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORRIED KREMLIN WEIGHS EFFECT OF CHURCHILL TALK—SPEECH AT FULTON AFTER INTRODUCTION BY TRUMAN URGED COMMON FRONT BY ENGLISH-SPEAKING NATIONS, ROUSING RUSSIAN CONCERN

(By Constantine Brown)

The Russian Government, through the medium of Izvestia, its official newspaper, has sounded the alarm that if Winston Churchill's suggestion, contained in his speech at Fulton, Mo., urging, in effect, an American-British common front, is taken seriously, the United Nations Organization and world peace might be jeopardized.

The fact that Izvestia lashed out only a week after Mr. Churchill spoke is taken as an indication that he has worried the Kremlin. As a rule, when something unpleasant is said about Russia, the counterattack is quick and short.

The delay in making an indignant answer to Mr. Churchill's speech is regarded in Washington as proof that the Soviet policy framers carefully discussed its implications. They replied only after all the facts leading to the speech and its repercussions in the world had reached Moscow. No one can pretend that the British statesman made just another of his famous "oratorical diatribes."

While there is nothing definite to prove that he had informed the British Cabinet of what he was going to say in America, or that he had come to these shores for the exclusive purpose of warning the people of this country of the dangers ahead, if we let Britain down, there is not the slightest doubt President Truman and his principal advisers were fully conversant with Mr. Churchill's ideas. The former Prime Minister came to Washington February 10 from Miami for the express purpose of visiting the President. On February 11 the White House issued a statement saying that Mr. Truman, Mr. Churchill, and Admiral William D. Leahy, the President's personal chief of staff, had been in conference in the President's study at the White House from 8:30 p. m. to 1 a. m., and that the conversation dealt "almost exclusively" with a discussion of plans for Mr. Churchill's speech at Fulton on March 5.

CALLED A SPADE A SPADE

It can now be said that during these 4½ hours of conversation the wartime British Prime Minister expounded at length on his views about the world situation and told President Truman that unless the two English-speaking nations, which still possess the greatest potential air and naval power in the world, stood together against any aggressions or further territorial encroachments by Russia, the world would be in a sad plight and the UNO would become merely a pious wish.

During the talk many factual matters are said to have been discussed and the British leader felt free to call a spade a spade.

It is true that Mr. Churchill came to the United States as a private citizen and spoke as such. But there is no question that if Mr. Truman had had the slightest objection to what he intended to say at Fulton he could have warned him that it would have been embarrassing to him to introduce him to the public and to be on the same platform. Under such circumstances, Mr. Churchill would have had ample time—3 full weeks—to draft an inocuous speech on the close culture and language ties which bind the United States and Britain.

Most political quarters in Washington have concluded that Mr. Truman knew the tenor of the former Prime Minister's speech and considered it a good thing for him to say it at this time.

Some day, in the distant future, when the State Department will be in a position to reveal many of the secret documents it possesses, it will become clear that had Britain wanted to crush Russia, it would have done so easily in the summer of 1941 when Hitler turned against Stalin, his erstwhile ally. If we come down to fundamentals it will be discovered that Britain fought the war to maintain her empire, without which she must be relegated to a second-rate nation.

Germany was fighting for the domination of Europe. She was particularly anxious to bring under the Nazi totalitarianism the Balkans and particularly the enormously wealthy Ukrainian and White Russian lands, together with the oil-rich Caucasus. There would have been no difficulty in the Germans and the British getting together in such a highway robbery.

BACKED REDS COMPLETELY

Mr. Churchill, who was then the paramount figure in the British Government, did not hesitate to throw the full weight of the British Empire behind Russia. Within 24 hours after Hitler's stab at Stalin, he placed all Britain's resources at Russia's disposal without asking questions as to what the U. S. S. R. government would do in the future.

The strife between Russia and Britain for the domination of the Near East and India is nearly 100 years old. The two powers long have been suspecting and growling at each other over those juicy morsels called Iran and India. The British government, headed by Mr. Churchill, did not require any diplomatic assurances from Moscow when the German hordes invaded Soviet territory. America soon followed suit, principally because by helping Russia President Roosevelt figured he was helping Britain, "America's bastion in the Atlantic." These are historical facts which are all on record.

We ended the war with a great military victory. There is no question that the stand of the Russian armies against the Nazi legions and their powerful counterattacks hastened the victory in Europe. But it is equally true that without our pouring out an enormous amount of war material and without the threat of an offensive on the western front from the combined American and British armies, the Russian resistance would have been doomed. Throughout the war, after 1942, the Germans had to keep on the western and southern fronts upward of 125 divisions which was just the difference between saving or destroying the U. S. S. R.

Throughout the war, while the American and British governments spoke to each other firmly in many instances, they both humored and cajoled the Russian government. None of the territorial demands of Premier Stalin since the Tehran Conference was denied. He dominated countries which we had promised to return to full independence and territorial integrity. Russia became the spoiled child of the American and British governments not only because the military advisers of both countries figured that without her the war might become more protracted but

because President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill believed that the future peace of the world must be guaranteed by a close cooperation among the Three Powers.

When the war ended there was immediate demobilization in both English-speaking countries. We went much further than the British because our people believed that a military victory against the Axis ended all dangers to peace. We ended the war as the most formidable military power in the world. Today we have disintegrated our land and air forces to such an extent that it would take between 9 and 12 months to get them in shape for fighting.

Britain was a lesser military power. But today she, too, has hardly more than a police force under arms.

Both the United States and Great Britain have only one aim—world peace—for which they are prepared to sacrifice almost anything.

BRITAIN TIRED AND WORN

Our own people, who are less internationally minded than the British, want to get back to work and put the house in order after the tempest which lasted for 4 years. The American fighting men are sick and fed up with wars. The lamentable figures shown by the Army in its enlistment campaign speak more clearly than any speeches or statements to the contrary.

Britain is tired and worn out. The British Government is aware that another war in the near future might be fatal to the United Kingdom and the Empire. Far from desiring to pin-prick Russia into another fight, the British Government is doing its utmost to placate the vast empire in the east. She is now keenly aware that Russia is after Britain's scalp, but alone she can do nothing unless she wishes to choose an honorable death.

The bitter exchange of words between Foreign Minister Bevin and Deputy Commissar Vishinsky during the debate about Iran were not a show for the public while behind the scenes agreements had already been made. There have been many such instances in the history of international gatherings. Both Mr. Bevin and Mr. Vishinsky were in dead earnest.

UNITED STATES WANTS UNO TO WORK

Mr. Bevin was sure that Russia intended to encroach further into Iran and move eastward toward India. He looks apprehensively at the massing of an enormous Russian army on the eastern and western borders of Turkey and realizes that Russia's demands for bases in the eastern Mediterranean and the Red Sea are intended to squeeze Britain out of her Empire. He feels that the chances of Britain surviving depend entirely on America's attitude, and it is quite probable that Mr. Churchill expressed at Fulton not only his private view, but also those of his majesty's government. A private individual who happens to be at the same time the leader of the opposition in his own country has much more freedom of speech than a member of the government who, regardless of what he thinks, must watch his diplomatic P's and Q's.

It was only in the last 4 weeks that the American Government realized that the policy of appeasement at any price was not yielding the desirable results. President Truman and his chief advisers have only one aim in the domain of foreign politics: To make the UNO a real instrument for the preservation of peace. But they realize now that the UNO may become a farce as gigantic as the defunct League of Nations unless all its members agree wholeheartedly to live up to the letter and spirit of the organization.

So far, Russia has been guilty of trampling under her feet only the various agreements signed by the Big Three or their representatives since the Teheran days. And this is a bad beginning which, however, could be overlooked if our former war associates show any definite indications that they do not intend to go further in their aims to insure Russia's "strategic frontiers" which now extend much further than Stalin himself ever believed possible a few years ago.

OMINOUS INDICATIONS

But there are ominous indications that Russia intends to go even further. In spite of the "official denials" in which people have now learned to place little credence, there is an unquestionable massing of Russian forces on the borders of Turkey—a member of the UNO. Reports from the best American sources in eastern Europe and in the Middle East not only confirm these "speculations" but add that a powerful fifth column with headquarters in Moscow and Baku is "working" all over the globe.

The purpose of this fifth column is to disrupt the countries internally and thus make easier the task of the Red warriors. Russia has not demobilized a single man without replacing him. Its armed forces are conservatively estimated at between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 men, fully armed. The fair question put directly and officially to Moscow as to why the U. S. S. R. needs such an overwhelming land force when all the other nations are rapidly reducing their own, is said to have remained unanswered. Any neighbor who has a covetous eye on the other's property in a lawless country is naturally suspected when he keeps an arsenal in his own house when the other has nothing more than a carving knife and a pistol.

Puerto Rico's Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial which was published in the New York Times of March 11, 1946, followed by a letter of mine addressed to the editor commenting on the magnificent and timely editorial:

PUERTO RICO'S STATUS

The present controversy between Governor Tugwell of Puerto Rico and the insular legislature over the expressed desire of the Puerto Ricans to have a voice in the selection of Mr. Tugwell's successor and their demand for a plebiscite on their future political status call attention anew to the colonial problem facing the United States. In this problem Congress seems to take only a cursory interest. Yet it is one we cannot dodge indefinitely if we are to live up to our best traditions, and if we are to do justice to the peoples who became our wards during our imperialist days at the close of the last century and who now seek the opportunity to decide their own destinies.

Governor Tugwell's position in vetoing the two bills—both of which probably will be passed over his veto—is that the Puerto Ricans are only antagonizing Congress and jeopardizing their chances for congressional action in taking such positive action to call attention to their aspirations. This appears to be a realistic and accurate evaluation of the situation. If it is, then it is equally an indictment of Congress.

The late President Roosevelt and President Truman both have addressed special messages to Congress over the last 3 years urging passage of legislation to give the Puerto Ricans greater home rule. In his message of last October 16, Mr. Truman suggested that they be allowed to indicate in a plebiscite not only whether they preferred a different status but what one of four they preferred. When such a preference had been voted, he said that we should be prepared to grant whichever of the four alternatives—home rule, statehood, independence or dominion status—the Puerto Ricans selected. Three years ago in his special message urging enactment of a bill granting a larger measure of home rule—a bill which the Senate passed but the House shelved—Mr. Roosevelt said that there was no question "of the Puerto Ricans' ability now to administer their own affairs."

The question of what we shall do with our colonial empire must seem remote to the average citizen. But if we ourselves are not aware of it, we may be sure the rest of the world is. We cannot ask other nations to grant independence or autonomy to their colonies if our own Congress is insensitive to the aspiration of the people of our possessions. Even a benign rule such as ours has been generally in the Philippines, in Puerto Rico, in Guam and in Samoa is not good enough if it denies to the peoples of our colonies that right to decide their own destinies to which the great majority of the people of this country are whole-heartedly dedicated. If more of our citizens became interested in the problem perhaps Congress might be stimulated to do more than just send delegations on sightseeing tours. With Governor Tugwell retiring, this would be an excellent time to study the problem of Puerto Rico and produce a solution that does credit to the ideals of the American people.

MARCH 12, 1946.

To the EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of Monday, March 11, 1946, on Puerto Rico's Status, turned the spotlight once more again on the desire of 2,000,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico for a voice in the selection of their governor and other public officials, and in the determination of their permanent future political status.

You say that the question of what we Americans shall do with our colonial empire must seem remote to the average citizen. Puerto Ricans understand that; they know that Americans living in Nevada are perhaps just as unaware of conditions in Vermont as citizens in Tennessee are of conditions in South Dakota. But they are puzzled by the continued protestations of our Government in Washington against the failure of other governments elsewhere situated in the world to give dependent peoples a voice in the selection of their governing officials, when despite the long sustained demands of Puerto Rican leaders, they as American citizens must accept as their Chief Executive a man appointed by the President and confirmed by the United States Senate.

Puerto Ricans do not vote for President; they have no representation in the Senate; they have a Resident Commissioner in the House, elected by popular vote, who has a voice but no vote in Congress. Thus, although no Puerto Rican would contradict your statement that ours is a benign rule, we in Puerto Rico know that we are denied the right to decide our own destinies.

More than 60,000 of our young men fought in the war against Germany and Japan. Some were killed, others wounded—many were decorated for their contributions to our victory. When men were being drafted elsewhere, volunteers were filling Puerto Rico's quota under the Selective Service Act. That act, incidentally, applied to Puerto Rican men, but no elected representative of the people had a voice or vote in its enactment in Congress. I am certain that had there been Puerto Rican representatives in Congress, with the right to speak and act for the people, they would have voted to send

Puerto Ricans into battle with their fellow Americans and our allies.

Under the Organic Act, an act of Congress which is the Puerto Rican constitution and which no Puerto Rican had a voice in accepting or rejecting, the President appoints our Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, and Commissioner of Education. Our bicameral legislature, elected by popular vote, can pass laws which are subject to three forms of veto: first, the Presidentially appointed Governor can veto our laws; second, the legislature then can pass them over his veto by a two-thirds vote, but the Governor can appeal to the President, who can kill any bill; and, third, if a law on the books should be displeasing to any Member of Congress, that Member can work for its repeal by the Congress—without any voting representative of the Puerto Rican people to oppose such action. Presidential appointments, with United States Senate confirmation, make up, also, our insular Supreme Court.

Puerto Rican leaders long have been united in the purpose of achieving for the Puerto Rican people the right by plebiscite to express their desires in the highest traditions of democratic procedure as Americans practice it; a popular election of government officials, and a poll, by secret ballot, to determine the majority wish on three alternatives—statehood, independence, or dominion status.

The late President Roosevelt asked Congress that we be given that right; President Truman last October in a special message to Congress urged that action be taken to settle our status problem. In his state of the Union address, Mr. Truman repeated that request; again recently, in a message to the Caribbean Conference he reiterated his hope that Congress would act.

I agree with your editorial when you say that "if more of our citizens become interested in the problem perhaps Congress might be stimulated" to take some sort of action. I thank you for your clear exposition of our problem and I feel confident that the majority of my people join me in expressing our gratitude.

Sincerely,

J. T. PIÑERO,
Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

Relief for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has yielded to public appeal and removed the barrier to the shipment of food and medicine and clothing to the starving people in central Europe. Here is a victory for public opinion and it is believed that these necessary items will reach those who suffer in greater quantities in the next few months. The people of the United States will respond if given the opportunity. They are pleased that the President has reconsidered this matter and acted favorably.

Mr. Speaker, under previous order, I am offering a timely editorial on this subject that appeared in the Christian Century for March 6, 1946:

THE PRESIDENT RELENTS

Too little and almost too late, President Truman has relented. He has partially removed the official barrier which for 9 months has prevented the churches and other private agencies from sending food, clothing, and medicine to the people of Germany. His order permitting the shipment of 2,000 tons a month of relief supplies constitutes an admission of the truth of the charge, repeatedly made in these columns, that the principal obstacle to the extension of such aid has been the President. At the end, even the American military government in Germany and the Department of State were publicly alined with the agencies of mercy against the President. Both had issued statements saying they saw no further reason why private bodies might not send relief supplies. Only the President barred the way.

Now the White House has yielded to the pressure of outraged public opinion, which was placed in the false position of having to prove that it was not callous and vindictive. Eleven groups have been organized into the Council for Relief Agencies Licensed for Operation in Germany. The body through which most of the churches of Protestantism will work is the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10. It is an affiliate of both the Federal Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. This committee maintains the church relief warehouse at New Windsor, Md., to which all materials intended for Germany should be shipped. The Friends, Brethren, Mennonite, Unitarian, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic relief organizations are also members of the committee, since each is prepared to send workers and supplies into Germany. Both the A. F. of L. and the CIO are likewise members.

Church people throughout America will hail with satisfaction the end of the presidential ban on relief to our former foes. They were the first to protest against the Potsdam policy when it was announced 6 months ago. Since that time they have unceasingly cried out against the administration of that policy, which went beyond the announced goal of keeping the available food down to the minimum necessary to prevent "disease and unrest." Representatives of the Federal Council of Churches and of various denominations have repeatedly gone to Washington to urge the relaxation of the ban on private relief. They were subjected to the usual "run-around" which always appears when officials seek to confuse and circumvent the will of the people. But the churchmen persisted and finally carried their concern to the President, with whom the responsibility lay all along.

Thus, once more, the church has a right to claim that it has not been recreant to its obligation. Despite the fact that there were a few church leaders who declared their readiness to accept official assurances that all was well, the churches at large were not deceived. They spoke for humanity. They raised their voices against revenge and ruthlessness, and the people of America have given them their support.

But now we must do more than speak. We must act. We must make sure that every ounce of supplies permitted under the present regulation is promptly dispatched. We have now reached the bitterest point in the worst winter of suffering humanity has ever known. As the Christian community in this well-fed country enters Lent, it cannot turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction to (1) give the equivalent of one meal a week to the relief funds of the churches above any gift previously planned; (2) give up some customary expenditure for that period and turn it to relief; and (3) give something from savings that would constitute a truly sacrificial gift. "For Christians at this Lenten and Easter period, the suffering of humanity must be the suffering of our Lord. It is into that suffering that Christians try to enter especially at this season of our Lord's passion, his crucifixion and resurrection. In this year above all others, we can offer a moving demonstration of our allegiance to Christ by fulfilling his teaching for the Good Samaritan for those who sit in darkness in our time."

We must continue to speak for humanity until all limitations are lifted on the amount of supplies that may be sent. Who are these people in Washington who would set arbitrary limits on the exercise of Christian charity? By what authority do they determine that 2,000 tons a month adequately represents the compassion of American Christianity? The churches were compelled during the war to submit to the dictates of the state, which for the first time, so far as this country was concerned, adopted starvation as an instrument of policy. But the war is over. Only the fiction of its continuance gives the President the thin legalism through which he assumes to speak on this matter. We must cut through this fiction. We must not rest until all limits are removed, until individuals are permitted to send assistance to individuals in Germany as well as in other countries, until the mails are opened. Not until this happens can the churches and the labor unions do their work of reconciliation.

The end of the war marked the end of slaughter by bullets and bombs. But it marked the beginning of large-scale extermination by starvation and cold. The knowledge that this killing was continuing could not be concealed, although efforts were made to keep the facts from the public. This knowledge lies like a heavy weight on the conscience of our Nation. The churches speak for that conscience. They demand that war-imposed shackles on human decency be broken. They do it in the knowledge that the only real sacrifices which anybody will make to alleviate the world's agony will be made by people in the churches and the labor unions who voluntarily share their food and clothing. They know that if the Government ships every ounce of food it says it intends to ship, the people of the United States will still consume per capita more meat, more wheat flour, more eggs, and more milk than they did before the war. They are revolted by the thought that in this hour of humanity's tragedy, nobody in this land is allowed to share his bounty in any way that makes a real difference.

But the churches are concerned not only with the relief of suffering but also with the restoration of community. If eventually the people of the former enemy countries are to be restored to full participation in world affairs, that process must have a beginning now. It can begin only on a person-to-person basis. When a churchman gives a little milk to a starving German child, his act says to that child and to his parents and to all who know about it that the human race is one and that the bonds of brotherhood, broken everywhere else, still hold in the Church of Christ. When an American Christian comes with clothing for people who are freezing in the ruins of their shattered homes, he not only warms bodies but stirs up a spark of hope in hearts that have yielded to despair. His act of humanity is the first step toward the reconstruction of civilized world community.

Beyond that is the task defined by the Potsdam policy of complete deindustrialization of Germany. In its essence, this policy means that 70,000,000 people are compelled to live in an area that never produced food for more than 30,000,000 and live on the products of farming and what has been called "a cuckoo-clock economy." Even if agricultural production in this area is doubled, 10,000,000 people are doomed eventually to die. Farm production can be increased, but it cannot be doubled. The only possible hope that millions of people can attain even self-support rests in the establishment of industries and in freedom to exchange their products for food and clothing. The President's decision permitting civilian agencies to send in a little relief represents the first significant break in the wall of death with which

Potsdam surrounded this nation in the heart of Europe. The breach must be widened. Other breaches must be made until the whole wall is razed to the ground. That will take time—more time than the advancing chaos of Europe will allow. But a beginning has been made and the forces of decency have only begun to fight.

God and the Soldier—We Remember Them Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of March 19, 1946:

GOD AND THE SOLDIER—WE REMEMBER THEM NOW

"God and the soldier we adore
In time of danger, not before;
The danger passed, and all things righted,
God is forgotten and the soldier slighted."

This little verse is a couple of hundred years old. It is attributed to a veteran who served under the Duke of Marlborough, one of Winston Churchill's ancestors.

We Americans are fast forgetters.

It has taken the dispute over Soviet expansion, widespread fear in the hearts of our people of a Russian attempt to dominate the world, to make us realize how much we have forgotten.

That's why the Record urges Congress—

1. To extend selective service for the rest of 1946.

2. To vote universal military training.

3. To increase the badly cut Army and Navy appropriations.

Seven months ago Uncle Sam had the world's finest Army. What we have now, General Eisenhower says, is an Army which would require a year to make it as good as our Army was in 1940.

Seven months ago the United States Air Force was second to none. Today it isn't even sufficient to meet our peacetime commitments, according to General Spaatz.

Seven months ago ours was a four-ocean Navy. Today it has dwindled until it is again a poor second to Britain's.

Seven months ago there was no such widespread fear in American hearts that the Gallup poll shows exists there today; nor was there fear in the hearts of other peoples.

It may be asked, Whom will we be preparing to fight?

The answer is that we will be preparing for our own protection.

The United States has no wish for war with any nation.

Best possible proof of that is the pell-mell speed of our demobilization.

The United States certainly has no wish for war with Russia.

Best proof of that is the long succession of appeasements, from the Baltic to the Adriatic.

The issue with Russia today is not Iran:

The issue is whether Russia is going to continue to grab whatever land, wherever situated, whenever she wants to.

American armies since VJ-day have crossed no borders. They have intimidated no foreign governments. They have occupied no provinces of a sovereign, independent nation.

Nor has Uncle Sam torn up any treaties.

Instead, a further cut of $2,000,000,000 in the Navy appropriation is before Congress. With it, a cut of $7,000,000,000 for the Army.

Now we find that our demobilization is being misunderstood in the world. Our will for peace is being taken for weakness.

As Secretary of State Byrnes said, in his St. Patrick's Day speech:

"Our weakness incited [Germany and Italy] to ever bolder aggressions. This tragic experience makes us realize that weakness invites aggression."

We learn that our voice does not command the same respect in world affairs that it did 7 months ago.

So we've got to get back into shape.

Yes; there will be opposition, scorn, and sneers.

Remember the people who laughed at President Roosevelt's preparedness program in 1939 and 1940?

Hitler wiped those laughs off in 1941.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Evening Star of March 16, 1946:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Russia's attitude regarding the Near East and Middle East is due, among other things, to a thorough misunderstanding of the psychology of the English-speaking people. This belief, which has been lingering in the minds of some of our policy framers, has been further confirmed by reports from high American observers who are keeping Washington posted on the situation.

These officials believe that if by some firm action the Moscow government could be convinced that the American people would not hesitate to allow their Government to throw the whole weight of America's strength on the side of right and justice, as expressed in the UNO Charter, there might be a change in the attitude of the Soviet Government.

The rapid and heedless demobilization of America's military machine, accompanied by troubles in the various theaters, has made a deeper impression on the Moscow rulers than was actually justified by facts.

Russia has a most perfect and complete intelligence service in the Western Hemisphere from Brazil to Canada. Her agents, however, are employees of a totalitarian state who are reporting to their chiefs facts colored in a way to please them. Otherwise, the enormous expenditure of secret funds could not be justified.

According to the badly depleted American security services, some of the demonstrations of our homesick soldiers have been instigated by subversive agents who can be found in many units of the Army. The success of the demonstrations is said to have been exploited by agents of the Russian NKVD (secret service) in the United States as a definite indication that America has become powerless so far as its military machine is concerned.

The Soviet agents are able to cite examples of how strong the Russian influence is in this country.

There is a small number of extreme leftist publications in this country which, while not attempting to spread Communist ideologies, are following Moscow's line of policy as faithfully as Izvestia or Pravda. While their circulations are limited, they are far more vociferous than the other American newspapers and have adopted the attitude that the "King can do no wrong." To these publications must be added a number of radio commentators who have taken the same line by bitterly attacking anyone who regards Russia's present aggressive methods as interfering with the peace of the world.

All this is reported back to Moscow and strengthens the belief of Russia's general staff and policy-framers that there is nothing that can stand up to the Soviet drive for territorial and political aggrandizement.

Even the appeasement policies followed by the American Government since 1943 are misunderstood in Moscow. Instead of being interpreted in their true light as a desperate attempt to secure a lasting peace after the havoc created by the war—they are looked on as a sign of weakness and helplessness of a decadent pluto-democracy.

Hitler made the same mistake in regard to the United States. He, too, had a formidable fifth column in this country and was convinced that whatever the American Government's plans for an intervention might be, the American people's hatred of war, supported by an extravagant propaganda and by tens of thousands of would-be saboteurs, could paralyze the American military effort. The widespread discontent expressed in this country over the first draft bill and the fact that our young soldiers had to be trained with wooden machine guns and make-believe tanks, was regarded as a sign that America's war effort could never be any more than a token.

It is sincerely hoped by all those who wish to preserve world peace and see Russia become a useful and constructive adjunct in the family of nations that Moscow will not fall in the same error as Berlin.

Unnecessary Cruelty to Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday, March 11, issue, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph ran an editorial entitled "Unnecessary Cruelty." The editorial is worth reading.

If we are to avoid war, cruelty, and brutality in the future, we should practice humanity at home. We should not unnecessarily torture dumb animals, or brutally and cruelly maim and destroy them unless there is a real necessity.

The editorial is as follows:

UNNECESSARY CRUELTY

The intention of Navy authorities to place live animals on the warships that will serve as targets of atom bombs next May in the Pacific has drawn a vigorous protest from the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of Victoria, British Columbia.

In telegrams to President Truman and the American Humane Society, our Canadian neighbors condemn such use of animals as ghastly cruelty, demand that this phase of the plan be abandoned, and urge the American society to oppose with all its strength the perpetration of this ghastly cruelty.

The Victoria society is absolutely right.

There is no need to subject animals to this experiment under the pretext of finding out

what might happen to human beings when exposed to atom explosion.

We already know what can and does happen.

Human beings are killed by the blast or burned to death by the intense heat; they develop internal disorders that result either in a quick or a slow death.

If the experimenters are anxious to find out this, they already have thousands of actual cases to examine among the human dead and the human survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

There is already an extensive research on the subject by Japanese and American observers.

Why, then, indulge in the macabre and ghoulish extreme of subjecting dogs, goats, pigs, and other beasts to the atomic inferno?

What earthly good is it to prove that the atom bomb will kill a goat?

And if an animal should survive the blast, and if the body should be recovered, will the findings demonstrate at all what might happen to human tissue?

It is absurd to argue a scientific reason for this slaughter. As our friends from Victoria say to President Truman, this proposed test on living animals is merely "cruel, barbarous and a serious reflection on your national character."

That is the core of the issue, just as it is the core of the case against the established practice of vivisection: The moral fiber of the people who indulge in pseudo-scientific sadism, and of those who condone it, is damaged, weakened and eventually lost.

This danger could conceivably be risked if the gain in knowledge should compensate, if the benefits to humanity should be so great or unique that for the moment the end might appear to justify the means.

But such is not the case, either in the proposed experiment or in the systematic butchering of vivisection.

Let us by all means experiment with our new weapon, but let us leave animals out of it. They are helpless and innocent.

Their suffering or death will add not one iota to our learning, resolve no question concerning the endurance or frailty of human flesh.

Let us not shame our own humanity by stooping to this barbarity.

It would indeed be a serious reflection on our character, and actually run contrary to our true character which is one of enlightened and compassionate respect for life.

The Military Occupation of Germany—An Example of the Weakness of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the second half of a speech on the military occupation of Germany—an example of the weakness of our foreign policy, delivered by Col. Bernard Bernstein, formerly Director of the Finance Division and Director of the Division of Investigation of Cartels and External Assets, Office of Military Government, United States-Germany, before a dinner of the National Citizens Political Action Committee at the Commodore Hotel, New York, on January 31, 1946:

What has happened in Germany during the six months that have elapsed since Potsdam?

Russia's main concern is to insure that Germany can never again, either alone or in combination with other powers, threaten the peace and security of the U. S. S. R. Russia and its military government personnel are not torn by clashes of policy or practice. The U. S. S. R. was sympathetic to the Potsdam agreement. Although in many respects information coming from the Soviet zone of Germany is not as complete as one would like, a recent visit into the Soviet zone by American press correspondents confirms other evidence that the Russians proceeded unhesitatingly to carry out the Potsdam agreement, that the Russians are doing a competent job in administering their zone, and that they have far surpassed both the British and our own officials in carrying out the objectives of the Potsdam agreement for the demilitarization, denazification, decentralization, and industrial disarmament of Germany. In their zone the Russians have broken the back of the military and Junker classes by widespread arrests and by the division of the Junker estates into small 12½-acre land holdings, which have been given to the German peasants; Nazis and leading German industrialists and financiers either fled that zone before the arrival of the Russians or were arrested after the Russians' arrival; substantial amounts of industrial properties have been removed from that zone; and the highly centralized industrial and financial controls that formerly characterized all Germany have been effectively destroyed in the Russian zone of Germany. The Russians strongly support an effective and mandatory law for the destruction of cartels. They have encouraged agricultural production. They have encouraged production in the industrial plants permitted to remain in their zone. Actual industrial production from those plants has revived more quickly than in the American zone. The Russians have demonstrated that the Potsdam program for Germany was not a policy of lunacy or of complete destruction as some British and Americans have insisted. The Russians have shown that it was possible to reduce enormously Germany's war-making capacity and still have a productive economy sufficient to maintain a decent and orderly life.

The British authorities have also understood the true import of the Potsdam Agreement. Though the British hand approved the Agreement, the British heart and mind opposed it. The British policy as to Germany is of a piece with the British policy and practice throughout the world. Britain is determined to maintain itself as a substantial equal of the United States and of Russia. Britain believes that to do this, she must become the dominant power of a bloc of countries and colonies throughout the world. Britain wants western Europe as a part of this bloc. She wants Germany, or at least the western zone of Germany, as part of that bloc. Britain is also following its traditional policy of balance of power in Europe. To that end she needs a Germany strong enough to serve as a counterweight to Russia. Both British Tory and Labor Governments have sought to build up rather than to reduce Germany's industrial strength. Britain seeks to cloak its true program in Germany by talking about humanitarian treatment of the Germans and Europe's needs for Germany's production. Britain also expects to profit from Germany's industrial production, particularly if Britain continues in control of the Ruhr, which is at present in the British zone. The so-called effective administration of military government in the British zone must be viewed against this background. Britain has made even less progress than have we in taking the measures required under the Potsdam Agreement for the demilitarization, denazification, decentralization, and deindustrialization of Germany. Britain has thus far successfully opposed effective destruction of German cartels. Britain is now opposing the Russian, French, and American proposal for the reduction of Germany's steel-production capacity. Moreover, in the British zone there has been unanimity among all officials as to what was sound British policy.

France occupies the least important of the four zones. France has lacked a well-trained organization to discharge its military government responsibilities. However, France has supported those provisions of the Potsdam Agreement which it regards as effectively weakening Germany's capacity to threaten the future peace and security of the world. France believes that the Potsdam Agreement, in failing to settle the western boundaries of Germany, does not adequately protect France against future German aggression. To secure such protection, France has requested that the Allied Powers agree to the internationalization of the Ruhr and the western Rhineland. France refuses to proceed with programs dealing with Germany as an economic unit until France gets the protection she feels she requires. Secretary Byrnes refused to accept earlier proposals made by the French. However, there is an increasing body of support in this country for internationalizing the Ruhr and the Rhineland, provided that it is done on a sufficiently broad basis to insure that these areas will not be returned to Germany or form part of a western bloc, and provided that the industrial disarmament provisions of the Potsdam agreement are applied to the Ruhr and Rhineland.

In the American zone in Germany the internal struggles which stem from conflicting views as to sound policy have resulted in only half-hearted efforts to carry out Potsdam and JCS 1067. And in many important instances even these half-hearted efforts occurred only because the American press had exposed prior failures.

For example, last August our political division, which was charged with coordinating the denazification program in the American zone, stated in a report that the denazification program was substantially complete in the American zone. In September and October the American press reported the lack of sympathy for the denazification program on the part of many American officials in Germany and their failure to carry out the denazification program. Thereafter, the denazification program in the American zone was somewhat more effectively enforced. Even today the official report of General Clay's staff admits that the denazification program is far from completed. Nevertheless, many of the officials responsible for its enforcement continue to be unsympathetic to the program. Although some of these officials and others have voiced the fear that the United States denazification program might cause a break-down of civil administration and of the economic structure in the United States zone, an official report by General McNarney says that no sound basis for such opinions has materialized.

The security of the world requires the obliteration of the German general military staff. The number of individuals involved is not more than seven or eight thousand. At a minimum such persons should be exiled from Germany or be placed in prison outside of Germany so that they could not possibly assist in reconstituting a military force in Germany. Key American military occupation officials have argued that most of the German general staff should merely be disenfranchised and placed on parole in Germany. But, if the German general staff is to be permanently destroyed, if that general staff is to be permanently prevented from assisting in reconstituting Germany as a

military force, how can we stop short of exiling from Germany all the members of the German general staff who are not given more summary punishment as war criminals?

Despite the explicit provisions of Potsdam and 1067, the Americans have for more than 8 months debated, but have taken no effective action to break up the large estates in the American Zone and destroy the reactionary influence of the large landholders.

The directives from Washington explicitly ordered that the top German industrial and financial leaders be arrested and held for trial. Our investigation of German industries and banks confirmed beyond doubt that the top German bankers and industrialists were essential conspirators in the German war of aggression. These bankers and industrialists worked to bring Nazism to power because they feared the German working class and democracy; and after Nazism came to power, they collaborated with Nazism to build the power of the Third Reich, to scheme for war, and to conduct war. These industrialists and financiers derived enormous profits from Germany's aggression. In many instances these industrial and financial leaders never actually joined the Nazi Party because they did not have to take on the more obvious symbols of the Party. They were active partners of the Nazis nonetheless. Despite this record, many of these top industrial and financial leaders in the American Zone have not as yet been even arrested.

American authorities took the initiative in securing the adoption of a law taking over I. G. Farben. But American officials have done almost nothing to carry out that law. Another proposed law, which requires the destruction of all German cartels and which has been strongly opposed by the British, has to a considerable extent been opposed under cover by certain elements in the Economics Division of the American military authorities in Germany.

Despite Potsdam and JCS 1067, the economics division of American military government has been more concerned with maintaining Germany's standard of living and getting German industry going than with working out a program for the reduction of Germany's industrial capacity and making industrial machinery and plants available as reparations in accordance with the Potsdam agreement. Key people in the economics division, who in considerable measure come from American big industry and finance, have constantly opposed the deindustrialization policy of Potsdam and JCS 1067. They have joined with the British authorities in opposing Germany's industrial disarmament. In fact, the British willingness to take so strong a position opposing the industrial disarmament of Germany may in large measure have been based on their knowledge that, despite Potsdam, such disarmament would not be supported by many key figures among the American authorities in Germany and in Washington.

It is interesting to note that at a very recent meeting of the National Republican Club, a resolution was adopted declaring that Germany should be permitted to rebuild her industrial and transport facilities to sustain life in Germany and to support the economic systems of other European nations. All of the arguments advanced in connection with the resolution were critical of the Russian policy in Europe.

The American public must realize that Germany's war-making industrial capacity was not destroyed by the bombing or shelling in the war. Unless action is taken to carry out the industrial disarmament provisions of Potsdam and JCS 1067, Germany will within a few years have the industrial capacity to wage war either alone or in concert with other powers. The fact that we are in an atomic age only emphasizes our danger.

The American public must also realize that if nazism is to be destroyed the world over, we must effectively destroy it at its core. Pro-Nazi societies in the United States are again coming to the forefront. Fascism is on the increase elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere. These things are due in large measure to the fact that nazism has not been destroyed in Germany and that as yet Germany's power to make war can be quickly revived.

Our experience in Germany has revealed two fundamental failures.

The first is a failure in administration. Too many of the people in our military government organization are either unqualified or untrained, or both, to deal with German problems in the manner necessary to carry out the Potsdam program. And even more important, administrative failure is inevitable if, after the Government has issued a policy directive, personnel, competent or otherwise, dissipate their time and energies in a struggle over what our policy should be. Insufficient steps were taken to remove personnel who were unsympathetic to the Potsdam program and who failed effectively to carry out that program.

The second and more important error in substantive. Our Government's policy with respect to Germany has swung like a pendulum. At some periods our Government viewed the German problems as primarily one of insuring that Germany would never again be able to threaten the security of the world. At such times, we were concerned with taking all measures necessary to that end. On other occasions our Government borrowed glasses, furnished to it by the British, and saw our policy toward Germany as one requiring the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe. At such times, we are tilting with the threatened spectre of the spread of the power of Russia and of communism.

The American public, and particularly the progressive element of the American public, has failed to take sufficient interest in our policy toward Germany and in our administration of that policy.

We must see more clearly the essential interrelationship between our foreign policies and our domestic policies. We cannot hope to have progressive principles dominate our domestic policies if in our foreign relations we fail to destroy nazism, fascism, and their reactionary allies and sympathizers. We cannot hope to raise standards of living in the United States for any extended period if we fail to achieve world security.

Now that the war is over, Russia and Britain are revealing more clearly their fundamental clashes of interests. Our Government must decide whether its foreign policy in Germany and elsewhere in the world will be based on the maintenance of Britain as an equal power with Russia and the United States and on support of Britain's concept of the balance of power in Europe; or whether American foreign policy will not regard such premises as touchstones in determining what measures are in the interest of the peace and security of the world.

The progressive forces in our social order must insist that the Government formulate a coherent consistent, and continuous foreign policy and that such a policy be administered by men who are both competent and sympathetic in their support of the policy.

Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Oregonian of March 13, 1946, and the Oregon Daily Journal of the same date:

[From the Portland Oregonian of March 13, 1946]

MILK

The public and this page have had occasion in the past to condemn those who called strikes or lockouts before exhausting the processes of negotiation based on presentation of all pertinent facts. Neither Portland area milk producers nor the OPA may expect to escape public censure if the producers fulfill their threat to withdraw 81 percent of Portland's fluid milk supply Friday if the OPA by that time has not granted a ceiling price increase for grade A milk of 20 cents a butterfat pound.

All the facts in this critical situation have not been assembled and critically examined. The producers charge that OPA has been dilatory, since the request for a price increase was filed February 11 and the producers have extended their deadline from February 28 to March 15. The OPA avers that its employes have been working days, nights, and week ends to make profit and loss surveys of representative producers, examine the records of the State board of agriculture, study the problems of distributors and consumers, and assemble the data.

The regional office of OPA is expected to ask for another extension. In view of the grave threat to public health and welfare, the embattled producers would be well advised to grant a reasonable extension if OPA declines to make a decision on the incomplete evidence at hand. The interests of the public and the future of the dairy industry in Oregon are involved. A decision in the Portland case must include consideration of petitions from other Oregon milk-producing areas, some of which were filed before the dairy cooperative and three smaller producers' groups made their demands.

If OPA asks the Portland producers to extend the time for a reply and the strike is called regardless, OPA will be prevented by existing policy from granting an increase while milk is being diverted. This deadlock occurred in Phoenix, Ariz., recently, and the situation became critical. Whether or not OPA's policy is defensible in all situations is debatable, but it was adopted to discourage stoppages of production which would have the nature of a gun at OPA's head, rendering fair decisions difficult.

Under the hit-and-miss system of price control used by the Federal Government, the differential between prices paid to producers for fluid milk for the bottle and can trade and for lower quality milk for manufacturing has tended to disappear. The OPA has established ceiling prices for fluid milk, and since 1939 has granted increases to producers from 55 cents to 95 cents a butterfat pound. The producers ask an additional increase to $1.15 a pound.

But the Agriculture Department consistently has refused to place ceiling prices on factory milk. Prices to producers for this type have increased from a prewar 33 cents to around 90 cents. It is reported, however, that a producer selling milk to the co-op to be converted to powdered milk actually receives about $1.05, the additional amount being in dividends or ownership interest in the factory. If grade A prices are increased, at an estimated cost to a family of four persons of $1.05 a month, there is no assurance that competitive and uncontrolled factory milk prices will not be raised proportionately and again wipe out the differential.

If all the milk of dairy co-op members now going to the fluid milk trade is diverted, and present prices are maintained, the co-op contends that these members will realize about 10 cents a butterfat pound more than they are receiving. This estimate is said to

take into account the Government feed subsidy of 17 cents a butterfat pound to grade A producers.

The milk industry has tremendous problems of increased demand and increased costs. Milk and its products comprise more than a quarter of the average American's food consumption. Production of milk on American farms during the war increased 4,000,000,000 quarts and the cash income to dairy farmers is greater than to farmers who raise cattle or hogs, twice that from cotton, wheat or eggs. In each area the problems of costs and distribution vary, and there is no national uniformity of milk prices.

Dilly-dalling by the OPA in a case like this is inexcusable. But neither will the public submit to an outburst of temper on the part of the producers. We believe the procedure of the producers has sufficiently aroused the public. Now let's have the deadline removed and the matter worked out so quickly as it can be under this new public pressure.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., of March 13, 1946]

LET THE OPA ANSWER

That a disaster may not come upon Portland and other communities affected, it is to be hoped that the OPA will have an answer ready for the dairymen on Friday and that authority will be granted for the small increase in the price of fluid milk that the producers ask.

The dairymen, although they are proceeding with great regret, are unmistakably preparing to divert from Portland on Saturday the larger part of the fluid milk supply unless their application pending before OPA is granted.

Their plans contemplate an allowance for hospitals, orphanages, and homes with babies dependent upon milk, but not a supply to stores and doors as usual, although the retail grocers have by resolution asked to be made an exception.

The explanation the dairymen gave is that costs of production have reached a point where increased returns alone will permit them to continue serving the fluid milk markets. Their purpose is to divert fluid milk to the manufacturers of powdered whole milk, this constituting under present ruling conditions actually a more profitable outlet.

The dairymen should, we repeat, get their favorable answer. They should feel the backing of public opinion. The OPA, we believe, was not created to stand in the way of an essential service and an essential food. Furthermore, public opinion should register with the dairymen not only a willingness to pay the cost of production plus a fair margin, but to return to the A-grade basis of quality and purity which in prewar days distinguished the Portland milk supply.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the subject, I wish to include in these remarks a newspaper article by the United Press, under date of March 18, 1946, from Philadelphia, Pa., with the title "Nylons Shipped to Mexico Bring $50 a Pair." The article follows:

NYLONS SHIPPED TO MEXICO BRING $50 A PAIR

PHILADELPHIA, March 18.—Those nylons you can't get are being shipped to Mexico where they bring prices ranging up to $50 a pair, with at least 648,000 pairs going in during the last 2 weeks, it was reported.

Officials at the Southwest Philadelphia Airport said 68 cartons of the hose were flown from there Saturday and at least 12 cartons, containing 2,160 pairs each, have been shipped directly into Mexico.

An air-line employee at Dallas told the United Press that 1,200 pounds of nylons were flown to Corpus Christi yesterday. They were destined for sale in Mexico, he said, and another 2,200 pounds were at the terminal awaiting shipment.

One shipment was brought from New York by three men in an automobile, they said, and the name of the shipper was the same as the one which appeared on a large consignment sent to Texas cities from Cleveland.

Another consignment of 50 cases arrived in Philadelphia from a New York candy company, employees said, but it was not shipped because it had not been properly processed through an express agency.

Shipping the nylons across the border where there are no price ceilings is perfectly legal, it was pointed out. Authorities at Brownsville, Tex., said they could pass border inspection as long as the proper duties were paid on them.

Enlisted Men Entitled to Terminal Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of simple justice and to correct a discrimination, enlisted men should receive terminal-leave pay the same as officers. An officer of the Army may accumulate as much as 4 months' leave. During the war many officers and many enlisted men had no leaves, or very meager ones. The result was that officers accumulated leave time and when an officer was separated from the service he would receive the accumulated leave. The officer goes to the separation center and all the data concerning is taken down and he is put on inactive duty for the period of his accumulated leave, not exceeding 4 months. Then later at the termination of his leave period he received his honorable discharge as of that date, providing he has not been guilty of misconduct during that time.

Also, while on this inactive status, which is the same as if he were actually discharged, he receives all his pay and allowances.

Not so with the enlisted man. He reports to the separation center and is paid up to the day he is discharged. No accumulated leave is added to his time.

Obviously, this is a discrimination. Congress certainly never intended any such result. Through some quirk in Army regulations the officers receive this extra pay. It may be an equitable provision in peacetimes, but it has worked out unjustly and unfairly during the war. A squadron commander may come back and he will receive accumulated leave. The very men he flew with on his missions, who do not happen to be commissioned, will not get paid for the same period of time, although they all may have exactly the same number of days of actual service.

A number of bills were introduced to correct this inequity. There may be some difficulties in administration if a bill to provide terminal leave pay for enlisted men is passed.

A subcommittee of the House Military Committee under the leadership of our colleague ROBERT L. SIKES, of Florida, has held extensive hearings on this problem. The committee is for the proposition and have redrafted the bills into a workable proposal. Through the able leadership of Mr. SIKES as well as through his dogged insistence that this injustice be corrected the bill is now before the whole Committee on Military Affairs for action. I predict the committee will approve it and the matter will come to the floor of the House for action.

My own son, who has been both an enlisted man and is now a commissioned officer, called my attention to this matter over 2 years ago. We now believe the matter will be corrected by Congress as every Member, who understands the problem, hopes it will be.

Veterans and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of March 17, 1946:

VETERANS AND EMPLOYMENT

Figures just released by the Veterans' Administration throw light on two interesting facts concerning the veterans' reemployment problem. One of these facts is that the average former serviceman finds a job within 5 or 6 weeks after he has registered for unemployment compensation. The other is that there is no apparent desire on the part of the average veteran to "ride the rolls" for even a day longer than is necessary—despite fears to the contrary that had been expressed in some quarters.

Ray R. Adams, Director of the Veterans' Administration Readjustment Allowance Service, disclosed that one out of every four veterans has applied for unemployment compensation. There were more than a million discharged servicemen on the benefit list at the outset of this month, but this total was less than the number who had received relief for a short time and then left the compensation pay roll to accept jobs in industry. Mr. Adams contends that the veterans have evidenced an overwhelming desire to get on their own as rapidly as possible after putting their uniforms in moth balls.

This does not mean, however, that the veterans are unappreciative of the helping hand which their Government extends to them during their period of readjustment. The extent of this aid is indicated in the announcement that through February 23 a total of $288,004,667 was paid to unemployed veterans in allowances under the GI Bill of

Rights. The Veterans' Administration expects that the high point of unemployment payments will be reached in about a month, after which claims will begin to diminish in number because of decline in discharges and improvement in employment conditions throughout most of the country. Approximately 230,000 claims are being filed each week.

Not all the withdrawals from the unemployment compensation rolls are the result of the finding of jobs, however. Some of the veterans have abandoned their claims in favor of going to school under the GI program of extending educational benefits to those whose schooling was interrupted by the war. Whether he cancels his claim because of obtaining employment or in order to resume his education, the evidence clearly shows that the average veteran is bent on becoming a self-supporting member of the community at the earliest possible moment.

Rise of Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on March 18, 1946:

RISE OF MILITARISM

In his speech in New York Secretary of State Byrnes revealed something of the national policy which seems to indicate that the trial balloons sent up on the question of Anglo-American alliance against the Soviet Union failed to evoke the desired response.

While Secretary Byrnes' outline of our slowly evolving foreign policy was far from explicit he did declare, without equivocation, that we do not propose to seek a security alliance with the Soviet Union against Great Britain, or an alliance with Great Britain against the Soviet Union.

The price we must pay for staying in the forefront of the nations of the earth and preserving the leadership gained at such immense cost has again been stated without adornment by a responsible Cabinet member—and it is universal military training, or militarism.

His acknowledgment that universal military training for American youth involves a major change in our society poses a question which will henceforward, until May 15, when the selective service law terminates, occupy the attention of the Congress and the people.

There is room for radical disagreement with our Secretary of State when he asserts that the tensions now present in the international situation are an aftermath of a victory and a result of allies expecting too much of one another. It appears to be more a problem of rising militarism.

It is not too much for a people to expect that their immense sacrifices, their extraordinary production of war material, their large financial sacrifice, their unselfish expenditure of lives and treasure should be rewarded at least by recognition of the fact that this Nation sought no enrichment, no territorial expansion, nothing, in fact, except a free world. The suspicion, dour ill will, and snide trickery developed in the course of the few short months since the end of the war in Europe have tried the forbearance of the vast majority of the American people. We wanted peace, and we are getting saber rattling.

Now or later the question of universal military training as the price of peace will run head-on into a subsidiary question of the rise of militarism in the Unted States and the ascendancy of military influence in government. Military authority in the United States has always been subservient to civilian authority. This is a basic requirement in democracy.

There is a real fear that the subtle indoctrination of young men under a compulsory military service may diminish and abrogate these restraints upon the military authority and that all the hideous results of rampant militarism will poison the blessings of the Republic.

No middle road has been found which will avert militarism and still guarantee the sinews of national strength. The sad tale of militarism in Europe is too fresh in our minds, and all our thinking on compulsory military training is colored by the disasters to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness caused by universal military training in Europe.

Victorious generals and admirals are able to present a convincing case for universal military service, and, at the present moment, they are sparing no pains to present a grim picture of a future without huge standing armies and overwhelming navies.

As outlined by Secretary Byrnes our national policy offers no alternatives. It is either universal military service or a surrender to the disruptive forces endangering the peace of the world. There are other roads and other approaches, but none of them has been explored.

It would seem that Americans, who are trail blazers, had suddenly become timorous and had turned to the rutted, well-marked road—the road to war, the road to the sunset of freedom.

Administration of Forest Service Grazing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. P. J. Singer, Jr., of Florissant, Colo., to the Record Stockman, of Denver, Colo. Mr. Singer is a producer of livestock who feels that the Department of Agriculture, through the Forest Service, has not been administering the Forest Service Grazing Act in the best possible manner. While the Department of Agriculture has set up through the Forest Service a board of directors supposedly to make decisions in the regulations of the ranges, many of the stockmen feel that their suggestions and their ideas in the control and direction of these ranges have not been receiving proper consideration by the Forest Service.

The letter follows:

The Forest Service today stands indicted in the court of public opinion for its maladministration and betrayal of a sacred public trust. In order to rectify this situation Forest Service officials have turned their full wrath upon the stockman, hoping to pin upon him in the eyes of the public the willful and overt act causing these conditions; hoping to so confuse the real issues and disorganize the entire populace of the West that they can sneak through our Congress legislation which will further entrench them in their offices, and make absolutely secure their future; give them absolute jurisdiction over their domain with responsibility to no one and authority over all.

In attempting to do this they have advanced a group of seemingly formidable arguments cleverly designed to array the city dweller against the stockman. These spurious arguments were conceived in falsehoods, nurtured on ambiguity, and are dedicated to the proposition that the people and their lands shall be made subservient to the rule of a few bureau officials.

Foremost among these is the argument for watershed management and its attendant implications. The smokescreen of watershed management rapidly dissipates in the light, clear atmosphere of fact. Let us examine the facts. The forest officials contend that 62 permittees residing in the Pike National Forest must be removed because the watersheds of Colorado Springs and Denver are in grave danger of eroding away if subjected to continued use of these stockmen. In attempting to get confirmation for this decision the forest officials sought out the advice and opinion of men well qualified to advise on this subject. These men examined the territory in question and the entire committee concurred in the subsequent findings.

The findings were: That the range was neither overstocked nor overgrazed; that the erosion occurred on steep slopes and was beyond the control of man; and, lastly, that the use of these lands by livestock did not contribute in any appreciable degree to the erosion there. The Department of Agriculture subsequently verified the veracity of this report in its fall range report.

I dare say if the committee's report had been in accordance with the wishes of a few high forest officials it would have received wide publicity, but it was smothered as far as the Forest Service was concerned and lost in the labyrinth of the undesirable in the Forest Service offices. It is well to note here that neither the engineers of Colorado Springs nor of Denver are aware of this great danger which the Forest Service says threatens the water supplies of these two cities. In fact, Denver has made some inquiry into grazing fees and may lease to stockmen the grass land around her Eleven Mile Lake. These facts then give rise to the speculation that there is much subterfuge in the proposition advanced by the Forest Service.

I was particularly amused by the statement made by Mr. Spencer in the Record Stockman in which he says the ranchers in the Pike who will have to move will be given a fair price for their holdings. Contrasted with his statement of last fall in Grand Junction, Colo., in which he advocated a policy of attrition against these 62 permittees it is difficult for one to believe the Forest Service is sincere. We fought a war of attrition against Germany for a long time—blockade starvation, the gradual wearing down by friction. His statements along with the known allotment requested for the purchase of these ranches leads one to question the veracity of their proposed fair price. The allotment is $10,000 a year to be used in purchasing these lands. If the 62 ranches were worth only $5,000 each it would take the Forest Service 31 years to buy up all this property and embark upon the erosion control program.

I submit that if conditions are as bad as they would lead everyone to believe, Pikes Peak will have washed down the streams to the Gulf of Mexico before they are even in shape to begin their revolutionary new program of conservation. If the Pike were to receive a million dollars to purchase these lands, it would be fair to assume that the statements made about a fair price were the

honest intentions of those in the Forest Service, but such an assumption is not tantamount with common sense under the foregoing facts. Mr. Spencer's assurances that the Pike is the only forest involved in these drastic cuts remind me of an assurance given at Munich a few years ago, "After this I have no more territorial demands to make in Europe."

Reports coming in from all the forests give lie to the statements that there is not a program of general reduction under way. Just as any sane person could not accept as true the statement made at Munich, so also we cannot accept the statement of the Forest Service officials, "that they have no more territorial demands to make in the national forests."

The real reason for this proposed annexation is as yet unknown to the stockmen. Recent developments around our own State game and fish commission cause much speculation. Th apparent success of a movie, the greater portion of which was made in the national forests, gives rise to a great meditation. The implications are many and vast.

There is a lot of the Pike Forest in Teller County. For years the county attempted through a diligent and resourceful program to control prairie dogs and other rodents long recognized as the greatest spoilers of the soil. Hundreds of dollars were spent in this campaign but no cooperation could be obtained from the Forest Service. As soon as the prairie dogs were killed on the deeded land new ones came over from the forest land. Finally the county gave up in despair. Had the Forest Service not been a Federal agency, it would probably have been sued for the trespass of its animals, or had the shoe been on the other foot so to speak, the Forest Service would have found ways and means of forcing the adjacent owners to cooperate with them. But such was not the case. Let the prairie dogs run rampant, sell off all the people's timber, watch the hills wash away, and when finally taken to task for their laxity, blame it on the stockmen.

The thoroughly democratic processes spoken of by Mr. Spencer exist only in the figment of his imagination and to prove my point I can cite upon request a good number of trespass cases which give lie to this statement. The Forest Service is probably the only bureau in our entire Government that performs all three of the functions of the Government within itself. It combines the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary all under one system. The Forest Service makes its own rules and regulations, it administers them, and it tries its own cases, and in absolute violation of the Constitution. In a simple trespass case the defendant is tried and convicted before he is ever aware of the extent or the completeness of the charges. The bureau in other words hands down the indictment and the decision at the same time. The witnesses are questioned separately, privately, and no cross-examination is accorded to the defendant. In the blackest days of the Third Reich no parallel for this sacrilege against democracy can be found.

The day may not be far distant when the "six gun" will become the law of the range if the present feelings of the permittees on the Pike are any indication of the future. Several well-known jurists have recently accepted the theory of taking the law in one's own hands when in the defense of his home, his loved ones, and his business. While I cannot condone such action as yet, there is strong argument abroad in the world today for the survival of the fit and the strong. This, however, is not the American way of handling such things. A portion of the responsibility for allowing a bureau to become so strong falls squarely upon our shoulders.

Let us go forward with an intelligent and constructive program, facing the facts squarely and letting the chips fall where they may. Let us rally together and strengthen our organizations and associations. Let us through publicity take our fight to the people. Let us combine our organizations for the fight in the days to come and put forth diligent effort in the defense of our homes. True, many stockmen have not yet been affected by this new program of the Forest Service, but if we fail our brothers in arms now we can expect no consideration when the ax of bureaucracy descends upon us at a later date. Let us dedicate ourselves and our resources to a strong West—a unified West, a West glorifying its tradition and heritage, and worthy of its destiny.

P. J. SINGER, Jr.

While Millions Beg for Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Virginia Irwin, a special writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, spent several years in Europe as a correspondent of that paper during the period of the war. When Germany decided to surrender and our representatives were in Berlin conferring with representatives of the German Government, Miss Irwin, along with another American correspondent, Andrew Tully, were the first American newspaper representatives to enter the German capital.

Miss Irwin has just written a very interesting article on the food situation, that was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sunday, and under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

Over most of Europe there is illness, misery, and hunger.

Austria: A UNRRA official has reported that the food situation, particularly in Vienna, is "very near the famine level."

Bulgaria: The head of Bulgaria's economic council describes the nation's food problem as "very serious," not only for the people but also for the livestock, which are dying of starvation as the after-effect of severe drought.

Finland: Bread reasonably plentiful; price of eggs (unrationed) lower; tea, coffee, and sweets only on black market; daily milk ration of one-fifth pint cannot be distributed regularly; monthly meat ration under 9 ounces; fats—half margarine—limited to slightly over half pound a month.

Hungary: Living mainly on bread; fats and meats unobtainable, but thought able to hold out reasonably well until next summer's crops.

Germany: Germans in American zone gaining weight but British spokesman says up to 2,000,000 tons of food will have to be imported into British zone this year.

Poland: Receiving rationed diet of 2,400 calories a day.

France: Food situation worse than French had expected; black bread rationed to less than 11 ounces daily; meat 5 ounces a week when available; fats about a pound and a quarter a month; cheese to a mere weekly sliver.

Italy: Newspaper headlines screech of hunger; bread rationed to about 10 ounces a day; death rate from tuberculosis climbing because of malnutrition.

Czechoslovakia: No starvation, but all food rationed. Milk reserved for children and expectant mothers. Meat allowance less than 20 cents per week per person.

Portugal: Flour sales held at little over half pound per person weekly; meat scarce; peasants feel keenly shortages of corn, wheat, rice, and olive oil.

While 500,000,000 people in all parts of the world walk down hunger lane, and stare into the face of that favorite among war's camp-followers, famine, American garbage pails bulge at the seams and spill over at the top. While children in Europe and Asia beg for bread, America wastes one-fifth as much food as she eats and dines in comparative gluttony on 3,300 calories a day.

What right have we to waste while our friends and allies over the world perish from hunger? What right have we to three-layer cakes, two-crust pies and crust-trimmed toast while the world faces famine among a half-billion people? Is it anything but selfishness that has caused consternation among some housewives over the request by President Truman's famine emergency committee that we of America cut our wheat consumption 40 percent and eat 20 percent less fats?

Although the President's committee has no legal powers to enforce its recommendations, it is to be hoped that the housewives of America realize their moral obligation to cooperate. It is they who set the tables of America; they who can guard against waste. Their sons won this war. It is now in their hands to help insure the peace. By feeding the people of starving nations we can bind them to us with a single tie stronger than a hundred treaties.

Nobody is suggesting that the United States go hungry to feed the people of Europe. We can do the job by an imperceptible tightening of the belt, accompanied by an all-out war against waste. According to the United States Secretary of Agriculture, edible food tossed into American garbage pails each day would provide three square meals for more than 25,000,000 people among the starving of foreign lands.

How well we can afford to cut our consumption of fats, for instance, is illustrated by the following facts. To maintain health and strength, an individual requires 20 pounds of fat per year, according to the best nutritutional experts. The people of the United States now consume 44 pounds per person a year. The peoples of western Europe are getting only 8 to 10 pounds a year. That means that they are getting less than half the minimum requirement, while we literally swim in the fat of more than twice enough.

When I came home to the United States after 2 years abroad during the war, my deepest impression was that here, indeed, was a land of plenty. I was glad that my family and friends had not had to feel the pinch of want, but remembering the bedrock bottom and monotonous diet of my British friends, the pitifully meager meals of families with whom I lived in France or the starving poor of the city of Brussels, I was a little embarrassed. It seemed, if you will pardon me, a little vulgar. I was reminded of those old-time cartoons showing a bulging-bellied multimillionaire dining from a sumptuous board, while a starving waif peered hungrily through a window.

Speaking of the appalling waste in this country while hunger rampages through Europe, Howard E. Kershner, vice chairman of the Save the Children Federation, recently said: "Think of not bothering to gather up the crumbs that fall from our tables, in order that our allies and friends, yes, even our Christian brethren, may live. How do you suppose that looks to our friends in England and Europe? They cannot understand. If only we could see ourselves as we appear to our friends, how shocked we would be. Oh, I know we have done much for Europe and Asia, and we will do more, but never to the

point of sacrifice. Even during the war we only played at rationing ourselves. We never went hungry or tightened our belts. In fact, most of us lengthen them a little every year."

In my first year abroad, I lived for the better part of the time in London and to this day I have but to close my eyes and see before me a plateful of brussels sprouts. I had a civilian billet and a civilian ration card the same as any subject of His Majesty. I can remember going weekly to the market to collect my 2 ounces of cooking fat and the 23 cents worth of meat I was allowed every 7 days. There was so little of everything except brussels sprouts.

I can remember the pathetic eagerness with which English children accepted little gifts of chocolate candy sent me so generously from the United States. I can remember the eyes of a little English girl when I gave her an orange I carried off from an American officers' mess at which I was a guest. It was the first orange she had ever seen. I remember well how an English friend of mine taught me to take with me to the market each week a little box stuffed with cotton just in case our one-a-month egg ration happened to come through that week. There was something pitiful in the sight of women carrying their precious eggs home wrapped in cotton wool.

In the United States all rationing was discontinued last November with the exception of sugar, but England has only recently had to further draw in her belt. Here are the February figures on what an adult received each week on his ration card: Bacon, 3 ounces; butter, 2 ounces 1 week and 4 ounces the next, alternating with similar amounts of margarine; cheese, 3 ounces per week; cooking fats, 2 ounces; eggs, one a month (when available); meat, 23 cents' worth per week; milk, 2 pints per week; powdered milk, 8 ounces per week; preserves, ½ pound per month; tea, 2½ ounces; candy, ¾ pound per month.

Imagine the American housewife confronted with the problem of being allowed to buy only 23 cents worth of meat a week for each member of her family. Imagine the American housewife confronted with a cooking-fat ration of 2 ounces a week per individual member of her family—which would mean only 6½ pounds per person per year. And yet the English not only did it through six long years of war but continue to do it.

Anti-British sentiment in this country has come to make it distinctly unfashionable to champion too loudly the people of Great Britain and yet thinking people cannot but admire their sense of responsibility, their capacity for self-discipline. Kershner of the Save the Children Foundation pointed out that around Christmas time there was talk of an extra allowance of 4 ounces of candy on an English ration card for the holiday month.

"Many people," he said, "were demanding that the Government permit them to send this mite to the children on the Continent. The Government had also planned to give the people an extra ration of one-third of a pound of fat as a Christmas present in December. Many British people were pointing out that this would require 7,000 tons of the most precious of all food materials for the children of newly liberated Europe. They showed how much could be accomplished with it and begged that it be sent to the children in the liberated countries."

In the town of Nancy, in France, I lived for some time with a French family who had steadfastly refused to billet German officers in their home and had had to pay the penalty of being almost starved to death. Their two little girls, Francoise and Nicole, were typical of so many of the children of France with great sores around their mouths and with teeth that were but snags and stumps. I used to steal white army bread and sugar when the mess sergeant's back was turned and take it home to them. I have often wondered how they have fared since the war. Even today the people of France are receiving the near-starvation number of only 2,000 calories per day.

It was on the outskirts of Paris that I saw the starving of that once world's gayest capital clawing each other to get at a pile of rotten potatoes dumped from a French army supply truck.

It was in Paris that I ate cat meat without knowing it. In December of 1944, the French food supply was pitifully meager. What food there was in Paris was largely in the hands of black-marketeers and being sold at prices which only the wealthy who had collaborated with the Germans could afford. The poor of Paris were literally starving, until the solution turned up in cat-meat stew. Ninety thousand cats disappeared in Paris in one month.

In Brussels I saw children starving while food was more or less normal on the farms and in the smaller cities. But there was no transportation. And then I came home and found we were whizzing about in automobiles, with all the unrationed gasoline and tires our purses could afford.

If only every American could see and hear—and even smell—just one starving child staring into space with that dumb stare of hunger, that cut of 40 percent consumption of wheat and 20 percent consumption of fats would be an accomplished fact almost over night. After all it is so easy—little things like buckwheat cakes instead of wheatcakes, broiling fish, rather than frying it, to save fats, using bread ends in puddings, substitution of fruits and other desserts for pastries, substitution of potatoes for bread, saving and re-using fats and oils, eating boiled potatoes instead of French fries, eating our sandwich crusts instead of trimming them off into the garbage pail.

While America maintains the richest garbage bucket in the world, a half-billion people in other lands starve. Brother, can you do with a half-loaf less of bread?

Air Service to Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee:

Whereas the applications of the United Airlines, American, Chicago and Southern, and Eastern Airlines, also the Midwest Airways, Incorporated, of Milwaukee, as well as other feeder lines, for routes to Milwaukee have been rejected by the Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner, much to our regret and surprise; and

Whereas the Examiner's recommendations would deny Milwaukee what it is rightfully entitled to, that is, the right to give and have air service throughout the Nation, as well as transcontinental service; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board will rule upon the findings of the Examiner, we believe every effort should be made to give Milwaukee (which is the thirteenth largest city in the Nation) such service as it deserves and that we should petition this board to give us favorable consideration; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee does hereby petition the Civil Aeronautics Board to set aside the recommendations of the Examiner, Mr. F. Merritt Ruhlen, and urges the Board to give its approval of the applications of the United Airlines, Chicago and Southern, American, and Eastern Airlines, also the Midwest Airways, Incorporated, of Milwaukee, to serve Milwaukee as well as other Wisconsin feeder routes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Common Council offers its wholehearted support to the County of Milwaukee and the Milwaukee Association of Commerce in making this appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board for favorable action and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, the County Board, and to our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Federal Aid for School Lunches—Veterans' Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to include in the extension of my remarks a letter from the Honorable CLIFF CLEVENGER, representing the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio, addressed to the members of the Lincoln Club, Defiance, Ohio.

The facts are above question, the reasoning and analysis of Representative CLEVENGER is so logical, and the position he takes is so wholesomely good for the long-range interest of the veterans, I, as one of the Representatives who voted against recent New Deal bills, am proud to bring the letter to the attention of the Nation so that they may know the position of an able Member of Congress.

The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MEMBERS OF THE LINCOLN CLUB,
Defiance, Ohio.

DEAR FRIENDS: Inasmuch as it will not be possible for me to attend your meeting, I want to take this opportunity of sending my best wishes and to express myself on a few New Deal measures that are now pending in Congress.

One of these, the school-lunch bill, proposes to set up another permanent Federal agency as the first step toward Government control of our schools. The House bill, which I voted against, calls for an expenditure by the Federal Government of $50,000,000 the first year, while the Senate bill proposes $115,000,000 to begin with.

No one is more interested in our school system than I and I am not opposed to free school lunches, but there is no good reason why a bankrupt Federal Government with a deficit approaching $300,000,000,000 and a budget of $36,000,000,000 for 1946, which is more than it cost to run the Government from 1921 to 1933, and approximately $60 per month for each gainfully employed person, should inject itself into the public-school system.

We cannot deny that what the Federal Government subsidizes, it controls; that has already been decided by the United States Supreme Court in the wheat penalty case.

It should also be remembered that every State in the Union has a surplus in its State treasury, with the possible exception of one or two.

For every dollar Ohio gets back in the way of Federal aid for school lunches, her taxpayers will pay approximately $3 in Federal taxes. In other words, Ohio taxpayers must pay 33 cents for each 11-cent lunch.

Almost all of these New Deal Federal spending schemes are wrapped in "do good" language, but it must be remembered that every new Federal bureau extends centralized regulations and controls and takes away from local and State supervision.

We would not be sincere if we were to oppose bureaucracy on the one hand and then give our support to the very foundation on which bureaucracy thrives.

Second. May I refer briefly to the so-called veterans' housing bill, another New Deal measure with a misleading title, which proposes to saddle on the backs of returning soldiers and future generations a $600,000,000 experimental subsidy scheme and an increase of $1,000,000,000 by another bureau in Government-guaranteed mortgages.

I recently voted for legislation to authorize the appropriation of $410,000,000 to salvage lumber and other housing material owned by the Government for homes for veterans.

I have supported and shall continue to support every worth-while measure that is of proper interest and benefit to our returning veterans but I do not intend by my vote to permit this New Deal bureaucracy to use the veterans to extend their socialistic schemes, when we all know that the Patman bill will not produce a single additional home in the Fifth District.

If hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies are to be added to the Federal tax burdens, let us give it to the veterans direct—not to a bureau in Washington—to apply on the purchase of a home of their choice, or to build on the lot of their choice without the necessity of endless red tape in getting the consent of some bureaucrat here in Washington who never had any previous experience before he became a dictator on houses.

Those who favor this New Deal scheme in the name of the veterans would do well to inquire of the lumber and other home supply dealers as to just how extensive this plan will be in making material available. They will find that another—not too popular agent—the OPA has discouraged production in everything except inflationary subsidies, shortages, exorbitant black market prices, and dishonesty.

Many of our returning veterans want to go into business for themselves. They have been taking orders from someone else for a long time and they now want to run their own show and I don't believe they will welcome the numerous obstacles placed in their way, which their fathers have had to buck in trying to carry on in the hope of some relief after the fighting ended.

I greatly appreciate the letters I have received from veterans who are not being deceived by this latest New Deal scheme that is being advanced in their name, and which should better be called "a bill to prevent the building of houses."

With kind personal regards and cordial good wishes to all, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Stalin's Tirade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 16, 1946:

STALIN'S TIRADE

The vast ideological gulf separating Russia from the western democracies was never more clearly brought out than in one extraordinary passage in Generalissimo Stalin's tirade against Winston Churchill. That was the passage in which the Soviet dictator contrasted the political situation in Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania with that in Great Britain. In his Fulton speech, Churchill said that everywhere in eastern Europe, with the sole exception of Czechoslovakia, police governments are the rule, and there is no true democracy. He also said that the entire region from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic lies in the Soviet sphere with all the nations there subject, in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and in some cases increasing measure of control from Moscow.

Stalin's riposte is that Great Britain is not a true democracy at all, since in Great Britain one party rules the country—the Labor Party. The rest of the parties are barred from the government of the country. By way of contrast, Stalin points to the situation in eastern Europe, where governments are composed of from four to six parties. "And besides," Stalin added, "the opposition, if it is loyal, is guaranteed the right to participate in the government." In other words, Stalin would have us believe that the Tories and the Liberals in Great Britain are really oppressed minorities under the tyrannical rule of Messrs. Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison. This, of course, is the crassest kind of nonsense, but since Stalin is not exactly an ignorant man, though his knowledge of the outside world is limited, and though he has never lived in a democracy or permitted his people to practice it, we can only assume that he is engaged in raising a dialectical smoke screen intended to confuse the issue.

Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1946

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current discussion of the pending legislation to set up a national-health program I believe the Members will be interested in the following editorial in the February 23 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association:

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION HEALTH PROGRAM AND PREPAYMENT SICKNESS INSURANCE PLANS

At the annual session of the American Medical Association in Chicago in December the house of delegates adopted a resolution instructing "the board of trustees and the council on medical service and public relations to proceed as promptly as possible with the development of a specific national health program, with emphasis on the Nation-wide organization of locally administered prepayment medical plans sponsored by medical societies."

At a series of meetings held in Chicago beginning February 13, the board of trustees and the ccuncil on medical service completed considerations which made possible a long step toward protecting the American people against the costs of sickness.

The fundamental step in the development of this plan was the establishment of standards of acceptance for medical care plans which have the approval of the council on medical service of the American Medical Association. Any plan which meets the standards of the council will be entitled to display the seal of acceptance of the American Medical Association on its policies and on all of its announcements and promotional material. In order to qualify for acceptance the prepayment plan must have the approval of the State or county medical society in the area in which it operates. The medical profession in the area must assume responsibility for the medical services included in the benefits. Plans must provide free choice of a qualified doctor of medicine and maintain the personal, confidential relationship between patient and physician. The plans must be organized and operated to provide the greatest possible benefits in medical care to the subscriber.

Medical care plans may be in terms of either cash indemnity or service units, with the understanding that benefits paid in cash are to be used to assist in paying the costs incurred for medical service. The standards also include provisions relative to the actuarial data that are required, systems of accounting, supervision by appropriate State authorities and periodic checking and reporting of the progress of the plan to the council.

Coincidentally with the announcement of these standards of acceptance there was organized, as a voluntary federation, an organization known as Associated Medical Care Plans, Inc. This independent association will include as members all plans that meet the minimum standard of the council on medical service of the American Medical Association. The Associated Medical Care Plans will undertake to establish coordination and reciprocity among all of these plans to permit transference of subscribers from one plan to another and use of the benefits in any State in which a subscriber happens to be located. Under this method great industrial organizations with plants in various portions of the United States will be able to secure coverage for all their employees. Moreover, it will be possible for the Veterans' Administration, welfare and industrial groups and Government agencies to provide coverage for the people in any given area through a system of national enrollment. In addition the Associated Medical Care Plans, Inc., will undertake research and the compilation of statistics on medical care, provide consultation and information services based on the records of existing plans and engage in a great campaign of public education as to the medical service plan movement under the auspices of State and county medical societies.

The board of trustees of the American Medical Association also announced establishment of a division of prepayment medical care plans with a director and a staff who will administer the activities related to the promotion and development of medical care plans in all the States.

In announcing these proposals for a Nation-wide provision of sickness insurance on a mutual nonprofit basis, the board also presented a complete health program with 10 points, which include the development of services in the field of preventive medicine, maternal and child health, voluntary prepayment plans for protection against the costs of sickness, compensation for loss of wages due to illness, the care of the veteran, and the development of a high standard of housing, nutrition, clothing, and recreation.

The American Medical Association last June through its board of trustees and council on medical service announced a 14-point program to improve the health and medical care situation in the United States. In October 1945 the interpretation of these 14 points and methods of implementation were adopted by the council on medical service. In December 1945 the house of delegates approved the whole program, suggested its rearrangement, and directed the board of

trustees to keep the program constantly up to date so that it will stay at least even with and, if possible, a step ahead of the needs of the public.

With this in mind the board of trustees has adopted a restatement of the 14-point program, which clarifies still further the position of the American Medical Association on some of these points and brings into the program more definitely maternal and child welfare, medical research, the medical care of the veteran, and the part to be played by the voluntary health agencies.

This restatement follows:

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

1. The American Medical Association urges a minimum standard of nutrition, housing, clothing, and recreation as fundamental to good health and as an objective to be achieved in any suitable health program. The responsibility for attainment of this standard should be placed as far as possible on the individual, but the application of community effort, compatible with the maintenance of free enterprise, should be encouraged with governmental aid where needed.

2. The provision of preventive medical services through professionally competent health departments with sufficient staff and equipment to meet community needs is recognized as essential in a health program. The principle of Federal aid through provision of funds or personnel is recognized with the understanding that local areas shall control their own agencies as has been established in the field of education. Health departments should not assume the care of the sick as a function, since administration of medical care under such auspices tends to a deterioration in the quality of the service rendered. Medical care to those unable to provide for themselves is best administered by local and private agencies with the aid of public funds when needed. This program for national health should include the administration of medical care, including hospitalization to all those needing it but unable to pay, such medical care to be provided preferably by a physician of the patient's choice with funds provided by local agencies with the assistance of Federal funds when necessary.

3. The procedures established by modern medicine for advice to the prospective mother and for adequate care in childbirth should be made available to all at a price that they can afford to pay. When local funds are lacking for the care of those unable to pay, Federal aid should be supplied with the funds administered through local or State agencies.

4. The child should have throughout infancy proper attention, including scientific nutrition, immunization against preventable disease and other services included in infant welfare. Such services are best supplied by personal contact between the mother and the individual physician but may be provided through child care and infant welfare stations administered under local auspices with support by tax funds whenever the need can be shown.

5. The provision of health and diagnostic centers and hospitals necessary to community needs is an essential of good medical care. Such facilities are preferably supplied by local agencies, including the community, church, and trade agencies which have been responsible for the fine development of facilities for medical care in most American communities up to this time. Where such facilities are unavailable and cannot be supplied through local or State agencies, the Federal Government may aid, preferably under a plan which requires that the need be shown and that the community prove its ability to maintain such institutions once they are established (Hill-Burton bill).

6. A program for medical care within the American system of individual initiative and freedom of enterprise includes the establishment of voluntary nonprofit prepayment plans for the costs of hospitalization (such as the Blue Cross plans) and voluntary nonprofit prepayment plans for medical care (such as those developed by many State and county medical societies). The principles of such insurance contracts should be acceptable to the Council on Medical Service of the American Medical Association and to the authoritative bodies of State medical associations. The evolution of voluntary prepayment insurance against the costs of sickness admits also the utilization of private sickness insurance plans which comply with State regulatory statutes and meet the standards of the Council on Medical Service of the American Medical Association.

7. A program for national health should include the administration of medical care, including hospitalization, to all veterans, such medical care to be provided preferably by a physician of the veteran's choice, with payment by the Veterans' Administration through a plan mutually agreed on between the State medical association and the Veterans' Administration.

8. Research for the advancement of medical science is fundamental in any national health program. The inclusion of medical research in a National Science Foundation, such as proposed in pending Federal legislation, is endorsed.

9. The services rendered by volunteer philanthropic health agencies such as the American Cancer Society, the National Tuberculosis Association, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Inc., and by philanthropic agencies such as the Commonwealth Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation and similar bodies have been of vast benefit to the American people and are a natural outgrowth of the system of free enterprise and democracy that prevail in the United States. Their participation in a national health program should be encouraged, and the growth of such agencies when properly administered should be commended.

10. Fundamental to the promotion of the public health and alleviation of illness are widespread education in the field of health and the widest possible dissemination of information regarding the prevention of disease and its treatment by authoritative agencies. Health education should be considered a necessary function of all departments of public health, medical associations and school authorities.

During the coming weeks the Council on Medical Service will announce the activities that will be followed toward promoting the prepayment medical care plan and also the standards of acceptance that have been developed for such plans. The division of prepayment medical care plans in the headquarters office will soon be active in aiding the development of plans in areas which do not now have them and in coordinating existing plans.

The policies of the Association as expressed in the national health program may well suggest to legislators in the Senate and in the House the point of view of the medical profession as to the part that the Federal Government can play in extending necessary medical services to those who do not now have them.

Merchant Marine Cadet Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of merchant marine cadet schools, I insert in my remarks a copy of a letter written by a lady whose son is in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps. This letter is written by one who evidently has had opportunity to judge the operations of these schools at first hand and particularly the school at Pass Christian, Miss., and I think that the letter is a fine contribution to the importance at this time of these schools, a strong argument against reduction in appropriations for these schools, and a fine testimonial of the work these schools are doing in which I am sure all of us concur and especially those who are intimately acquainted with their work.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *February 15, 1946.*

Hon. GEORGE MAHON,

House Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAHON: A letter received today from my sister contains a clipping from a Kansas paper entitled "U. S. Merchant Marine Schools Facing Closing." The writer makes a plea that our Congressmen and Senators be written asking them to act, if possible, against such action.

As our son is in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, my sister knew we would be greatly interested and would want to do anything possible to save from closing the fine school at Pass Christian, Miss., so beautifully located where our son received his basic training as well as the school at San Mateo, Calif.

The need of our United States merchant marine at this time in the world's history is so well known that I do not stress that; but it is for the continuance of these two schools of basic training for the boys of the South and West for which I plead.

May I mention Pass Christian? It is in that school that I have especial interest but the same or similar things can be said of San Mateo. Our son went to Pass Christian in December. During his period of training from then through April, the climate of Pass Christian was ideal for all their water and out-of-door activities. The boys at Kings Point were not having those advantages which climate alone can give. To give up such an ideally located school for such training would not in the long run be economy.

Too, the boys who enter the cadet corps are young and with the three schools each on a different coast, means the first period of training will not be as far distant from home for any as if there was only the one basic school at Kings Point. For beginners it has always seemed to me that a small school class is better than a larger one. The effect upon the youth is better and results obtained by the instructors are doubtless more gratifying.

Figures show that the merchant marine cadet's 4 years of training costs less than 54 percent of the cost of training a West Point cadet and less than 58 percent of what it costs to train a student at Annapolis, so the cost is not excessive.

With the training as conducted—basic school training, sea training, and then the Academy—the plan is so ideal. The completion of each period is a goal in itself with the final goal achieved upon graduation from Kings Point. All so much more appealing to the adventurous spirit which must be innate in all cadets than to be sent at first to Kings Point, a large school, where one becomes a lower classman which does not lend to the highest of self-respect and dignity. I feel the plan as it now is is so democratic and I like it that way.

The East has West Point, it has Annapolis, it has Kings Point. Cannot the South and the West have Pass Christian and San Mateo? It is doubtless because I know the West and truly love it that I am of a somewhat biased opinion, but I can see no good reason for so much concentration on the east coast. I had even hoped to see the world's peace city

built near the entrance of Glacier National Park.

If our son is 1 of the 800 cadets selected this spring from the 2,600 now at sea for continuing his training at Kings Point, my interest in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps will ever be on the increase; but even if he is not 1 of those 800 I shall always be deeply interested in Pass Christian and in San Mateo and hope they are continued as merchant marine basic training schools for the cadets from the South and West.

I hope, Mr. MAHON, you feel about these schools the way I do.

Yours very sincerely,

HILAH G. MANDERSON.

An Appropriate Reply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of March 17, 1946:

AN APPROPRIATE REPLY

Winston Churchill had nothing especially new to offer in his address at the public dinner given in his honor Friday evening in New York City. In its main aspects the speech was a reiteration of what he had said 10 days earlier at Fulton, Mo., the talk which has provoked a storm of criticism, but with respect to which he does not wish "to withdraw or modify a single word."

Mr. Churchill did not mention Marshal Stalin by name, nor did he allude specifically to the vitriolic and distorted personal attack made on him by the Soviet leader. Nevertheless, Britain's former Prime Minister, in his New York appearance, was making an effective and an appropriately dignified reply—not only to Mr. Stalin but also to the group of CIO and Communist demonstrators who had gathered outside his hotel to protest his appearance, apparently in line with their "liberal" theory that persons whose views differ from their own are not entitled to be heard in this land of free speech.

The even-tempered yet candid quality of Mr. Churchill's remarks is to be commended, for there can be no hope of a solution of the critical problems facing the world in an atmosphere that would either suppress frank discussion or encourage intemperate debate.

As Mr. Churchill said—and he has said the same thing before—the decision as to the course of future events rests primarily with the "handful of able men" who formulate the policies of the Soviet Union. The Russians disclaim any ambitions inconsistent with the principles of international cooperation upon which rests the United Nations Organization. But the fact remains that they are the instigators of the "swiftly moving events which no one can measure at the present," but which promise nevertheless to subject the UNO and its Security Council to a stern test when the latter agency meets this month.

If the Russians should prove unwilling to submit disputed matters in which they are involved to the jurisdiction of the Security Council, or if they should fail to respect such decisions as the Council might make, then it seems almost inevitable that the United States and Britain should move toward something in the nature of the "fraternal association" which Mr. Churchill advocates. Perhaps such a development would tend to be destructive of the UNO, as the Russians say. But if the UNO is to be maintained as an effectively functioning agency, it must rest on the solid foundation of good faith—not only the good faith of some of the member nations, but of all of them, including the Soviet Union.

Lobbyists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the script of a radio program, Congressional Record of the Air, on the subject of lobbyists. The program was broadcast over the Mutual network, Station WHN, New York City, at 8:30 p. m., and Station WOL, in Washington, at 11:30 p. m., March 18:

Mr. STUDNEY. From the Nation's Capital you are about to hear the one hundred and thirty-eighth broadcast of Congressional RECORD of the Air. This well-known public service feature brings you each week a Member of Congress in a discussion and interview on a subject of national interest. Tonight, our guest is a Member of the House of Representatives. He will be introduced to you now by Billy Repaid, noted news commentator.

Mr. REPAID. Thank you, Ed Studney, and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. On March 4, 1789, the first session of the United States Congress convened in New York City. We are not sure that history records the fact, but it is probably safe to assume that gathered around the Halls of Congress on that distant day were numerous citizens of the new country seeking to influence the Members of the new Congress in some respect or other. Today, we would call those people lobbyists, and from that humble lobby acorn a great oak indeed has grown, for lobbying, as we know it in this year of 1946, provides a luxurious livelihood to thousands of Americans. The term "lobbyist" has, in the popular mind, a sinister connotation, that is, we are prone to think of lobbyists as people who are necessarily promoting selfish and vested interests, and there are those in the United States Congress today who subscribe to that theory. Some months ago Congresswoman MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, introduced a resolution in the House to appoint a committee to investigate lobbies and lobbyists. Just a few days ago Congressman SABATH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, introduced a similar resolution. On this broadcast of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Air, we are going to examine this question in considerable detail. We think it is timely and we know it is important, because it affects so many of us. Representing one school of thought on the question of lobbying and lobbyists is Congressman CHESTER H. GROSS, of Pennsylvania, a public spirited, progressive Member of Congress, who has some highly interesting opinions on the question and has agreed to pass them on to you at this time. He will address you briefly following which he will answer some of our questions, and now it is with pleasure indeed that we introduce Congressman GROSS.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you, Mr. Repaid. Before I came to Congress I was under the impression, as apparently most people back in the districts are, that Washington was overrun by lobbyists, who were continually applying pressure to Members of Congress to enact legislation which would generally satisfy the selfish interests of the many groups represented.

I had the idea that a lobbyist was a person who should be avoided by every person interested in good government. But, how mistaken I was to find that the term "lobbyist," as used here by certain politicians, was and is simply something to shout about when the going is tough.

When the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SABATH, declared certain lobbyists spent $2,000,000 here in the Capitol, he should be in a position to say how that money was spent and who got the money. I have seen men of all classes and of various groups around the Capitol and throughout the office buildings and before committees wanting and demanding about everything under the sun. But I have never seen the men with the money bags. During my years of service in the State legislature as well as during my years in the Capitol, I have never known a single dollar to be used to put legislation across, and I do think that when Mr. SABATH made the charge he owed it to the House to tell who got the money.

Now, the facts are, any person or persons who come to Washington in order to present their interests or the interests of their community to the legislators, or who go before committees to present their case, or the views of the people back home, are lobbyists.

There is also such a thing known as a mail-bag lobby.

Congress has always invited the public to bring its views before it. That is why the various committees hold public hearings to get a cross section of views. And generally, when the country's views are expressed in this fashion it is done by a single representative citizen or a small group of a few people who are delegated with authority to present the peoples' views.

The worst and most persistent lobbying comes from the various bureaus within the Government in their effort to perpetuate themselves. For example, when an executive from a governmental bureau appears before a congressional committee he is usually accompanied by as many as 20 "experts," attorneys, and what have you, who are on the Federal pay roll. Their one objective is not only to perpetuate themselves but generally to expand. I recall the time when Mr. Ickes, as the Secretary of the Interior, appeared before the Insular Affairs Committee. He was surrounded by 19 lieutenants, and I know this to be a fact, because they stood to be counted.

Recently when a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on extension of the War Powers Act no one appeared as a representative of the public to use their influence or make their recommendations to the committee. The country trusted the sound judgment of the committee members, but the various bureaucrats in Government, whose positions or appropriations would be affected, surely let themselves be heard. At this hearing 23 Government executives appeared to plead their cause, and no one came single-handed. It is a well-established fact that many of these bureaus create conditions to justify their continued existence.

Speaking of the mail-bag lobby, I now have on my desk, as has every House Member, a statement by Chester Bowles containing 135 pages defending the actions of the OPA and trying to convince House Members that OPA should be continued "as is," as well as trying to prove they have held the line.

Immediately following this comes a 31-page statement by the new OPA Administrator, Paul A. Porter, entitled "National Retail Dry Goods Association Horror Exhibit." This was prompted by an exhibit placed in the House Office Building by the dry-goods

industry to show the public just what OPA regulations have inflicted upon them. The display, referred to by Mr. Porter as a horror exhibit, is designed to prove to Congress that OPA regulations are interfering with production of low-priced good-quality merchandise; while higher prices are given to new producers of poor-quality merchandise.

There are certain single agencies in the Government which send more material across our desks than any 10 corporations in the country combined.

The present agitation concerning lobbying comes from within the administration and is caused by the fact that the wrong bull is being gored. So long as the administration was riding high, wide, and handsome, we heard nothing about lobbying. But now that the country is fed up and the people are asserting themselves, this smoke screen is being dragged out.

The Democratic leaders here who are crying out against pressure should explain to the country why the House adjourned recently on a Friday evening to postpone a vote on important legislation until the following Monday morning in order to bring pressure to bear on certain Members. Over the week end Democratic National Chairman Hannegan sent a commanding telegram to the Democratic membership of the House warning them to be in their places and vote right on Monday.

Democratic State Chairman Dave Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, took similar action on the Democrats from Pennsylvania. Now I can heartily sanction outside interests presenting their cause, but certainly for political leaders to apply the lash as it is being done is wrong, and I am happy to say few Congressmen yield to either.

Mr. REPAID. Thank you, Congressman GROSS, you certainly have a refreshing slant on this subject of lobbying, and if you don't mind, sir, we would like to delve further into the matter at this time, with a few questions which we know are in the minds of our listeners. First of all, how would you define a lobbyist?

Mr. GROSS. Well, as I have stated, anyone coming to Washington interested in any particular legislation is a lobbyist. But, the lobbyists that are causing the agitation around Capitol Hill are mostly lawyers, defeated Congressmen, or fellows who have come to Washington and like it here. They succeed in selling the idea to groups or corporations in the country that they have tremendous influence. In other words, that they can "pull strings" around the Capitol, and thus get themselves a job.

But you ask who are they. Well, the Constitution says Congress shall make the laws, but when the President cannot control Congress as has recently happened, and takes to the air and urges the people to turn the heat on Congress, then in that case the President and the few who do his bidding are lobbyists.

In almost every Government department or executive agency full-time legislative divisions are maintained under the direction of highly paid "legislative counsels," whose duty it is to prepare and send to the Congress for enactment bills for the specific interest of the agency. These people prepare testimony for department heads who appear before congressional committees and often the counsel will appear himself. These lobbies are paid for by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. REPAID. Of late we have been hearing quite a bit about pressure groups. Do you make any distinction between pressure groups and lobbyists?

Mr. GROSS. Certain pressure groups invade the Capitol without notice, feeling that they are taking over for the time. In other words, take the place by storm, thinking only of their own selfish interests, and oftentimes threatening Members with defeat unless they get theirs. But the lobbyist takes things a bit easier. He circulates around the Capitol selling his wares as best he can. His is a fulltime job.

Mr. REPAID. In addition to the recent resolution, Congresswoman SMITH of Maine introduced H. R. 4773, a bill to require the registration of counsels and lobbyists. Now, what do you think, Congressman GROSS, would be the result if this bill were to become law?

Mr. GROSS. Well, if they are to be registered, some agency would have to do the registering. No doubt it will call for another Government agency, meaning more jobs. People coming in from the country would be put to this bother and expense, which would serve no purpose. Then, too, they and the regular lobbyists would have to produce their credentials at every turn in the road. This would be extremely embarrassing to people coming to Washington on errands of this kind, and it would be terribly embarrassing to Representatives to be seen in the presence of a registered lobbyist, who in all probability, would have to wear a large badge of identification. After all, when we begin registering lobbyists we will first have to have a court decision defining a lobbyist.

Mr. REPAID. Do you think, sir, Congress and Congressmen are particularly influenced by lobbying or pressure groups?

Mr. GROSS. Frankly, I think their influence is nil. I think Congressmen are much more impressed by letters from individuals from their own districts expressing their viewpoints on legislative matters.

Mr. REPAID. We gather from your remarks, Congressman GROSS, that you feel that there are good lobbies as well as bad. Now, are we to assume from that that you think there is a definite place for lobbying in our legislative government?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, very definitely. We like to have people come in and discuss legislation under consideration. It is really part of our system. That is why legislative committees hold public hearings. Thus, we get the outside viewpoint.

Mr. REPAID. The charge has been booted about Congress recently that some lobbies are spending vast sums of money in the Capital and if these charges are true and huge sums are being spent here, how is this money being spent, and is it doing any good?

Mr. GROSS. Well, as I have said, I have never seen the men with the money bags, and can truthfully say that I have never known of a dollar changing hands to influence legislation. I have attended many dinners that were given for groups of Congressmen by certain interests, but I have never seen or heard of any undue influence being used or pressure applied at those times, and have always gone home feeling that it was a get-together in order to become better acquainted. After all, if the outside interests want to bring their viewpoint to the attention of Congress, some one has to do it, so maybe the lobbyists are a necessary evil. But I believe the average lobbyist oversells himself.

Mr. REPAID. It seems that this question of lobbying comes under critical scrutiny by Congress every other year or so—and I wonder, Congressman GROSS, if you have any explanation for the current flood of resolutions calling for its investigation.

Mr. GROSS. I believe this agitation is due to the fact that the tide of public opinion is turning. There is a wave of public resentment in the Nation, and apparently the bureaucrats are on the defensive.

Mr. REPAID. Getting back to your remarks, again, you mention Government lobbies. A week or so ago Mr. Bowles, Stabilization Director, and Mr. Wyatt, head of our housing program, blasted pressure groups attempting to influence the policies of their organizations. Now, in line with that, to what extent do you think lobbies influence Government agencies in their decisions?

Mr. GROSS. I don't think they have been influenced at all. If they had been influenced from the outside most of them would lock up and go home. That Washington today is full of lobbyists representing special interests is not surprising. Indeed, when Government agencies have such sweeping powers that a particular firm or a whole industry can be either built up, injured, or destroyed by the particular decision that one of these agencies makes, Washington lobbies grow inevitably. It is natural for people to object to being thrown out of business, or even being treated in a way that they regard, rightly or wrongly, as unfair. And if they yielded to the voice of the people it would not be necessary for the unity dinners which the Democratic powers are now scheduling for its members to bring these straying members back into their places and vote right.

Mr. REPAID. Congressman GROSS, that winds up our time for this evening, and we certainly want to thank you for being with us, and for our part, we find your remarks and answers to our questions highly informative and to the point—and now back to our announcer, Ed Studney.

Mr. STUDNEY. Next week at this same time Congressional Record on the Air will bring you another outstanding Member of Congress in a discussion and interview on a subject of vital interest to all Americans. Be sure to listen. Congressional Record of the Air is produced by Leo J. Paulin and associates, Washington radio producers.

Amvets Urge Adoption of Emergency Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks the following statement by the Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—relative to the pending legislation in Congress on the housing crisis.

Amvets is the largest veterans' organization born of this war. It has over 50,000 members and more than 420 posts scattered in 41 States of the Union. The document follows:

AMVETS URGES ADOPTION OF EMERGENCY HOUSING PROGRAM

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

Amvets—the American Veterans of World War II—are vitally concerned about the national housing crisis. Amvets have played a trail-blazing role in attempting to awaken America of the urgency for more homes for returning veterans.

Editorial comment in the Washington Post on December 22, 1945, bears out this statement which I quote as follows:

"Homeless veterans throughout the country are anxiously awaiting the outcome of Amvets' proposal, which, even should it fail, has served to focus public and official attention on the national housing emergency."

It is officially estimated that 2,900,000 married veterans are desperately searching for a roof over their heads. Besides this 1,200,000 families live doubled up with other families.

It is obvious, therefore, that some drastic step must be taken by the Government to speed up production in order to break up existing bottlenecks and red tape.

In this connection Wilson W. Wyatt, National Housing Expediter, has come forward with a program that deserves respectful con-

sideration and study. Those who oppose his program have offered nothing substantial in way of a workable substitute.

Wyatt's advocacy of premium payments has been tried before, and in many cases, it has worked satisfactory. Like so many other things, it can be overdone and misused. But in view of the emergency the plan ought to be given a chance. Wyatt is seeking to stimulate as well as to encourage new type of production or production of conventional materials above existing levels. What he suggests is in reality an incentive bonus or payment that will be borne exclusively by the Government and it is claimed will have no ill effect upon the normal profit system.

He proposes to use premium rewards only to discontinue bottlenecks within the building industry or manufactures, and to withdraw such payment when conditions become normal again.

Wyatt's opponents, it appears, would like to see a universal increase and price rise in all building materials in addition to the already high cost of production. These greedy souls see a great opportunity to reap huge fortunes.

The cost of homes as it stands today is far beyond the reach of the average GI. War Department statistics show that 84 percent of the veterans cannot afford to pay more than $6,000 or a $50 monthly rental for a home.

It is obvious to all well-meaning persons that some control is vitally necessary to prevent inflationary rises in the price of much-needed homes—already beyond the reach of the average citizen, but Amvets is not in favor of the Government or bureaucrats arbitrarily fixing a price at which one may sell his home.

In this connection Wyatt has assured AMVETS that under his plan a person may sell his home at whatever price he can get in the open market—but after that house has once been sold—the price obtained becomes the highest price one can openly receive for that particular dwelling should it be up for resale.

Such a restriction would be beneficial to those who seek a home as a lifetime proposition and it would stop speculators from grabbing up dwellings to be loaded off on veterans at huge profits to themselves.

In this statement I would like also to include a recent story that appeared in the newspapers, to wit:

[From the Washington Post of March 16, 1946]

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

ANTIHOUSING LOBBY

Most powerful lobby since the war, threw itself into the battle to defeat the Wyatt housing program for veterans. Every Congressman received wires, phone calls, letters from builders, lumber dealers, real-estate men.

Many telegrams were phony, as several Congressmen discovered when they tried to answer them. Others were signed with the names of people who latter assured Members of Congress that they had not seen or sent the wires. These tactics, of course, have been used before.

The prize telegram, however, was one sent to all Congressmen from St. Paul-Minneapolis area by the Northwestern Flooring & Lumber Co., of which V. H. Alberts is president.

After urging that the veterans' housing program be defeated, the lumber company had the gall to add:

"Please also exert your efforts to oppose a standing vote on these issues."

In other words, the Northwestern Flooring & Lumber Co., not only urged its Congressmen to vote against the veterans but also opposed a vote which would let the public know how each Congressman voted.

Note 1. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars did not go to bat for the veterans' housing bill. Some veterans charge that this was because of the real estate interest in the hierarchy of the two organizations. The AMVETS, on the other hand, went to bat vigorously.

Note 2. One Congressman who was deluged with telegrams from about every real estate and lumber company in his State was JOHN MURDOCK, of Arizona, who nevertheless vigorously supported the veterans.

Eugene Stone III, of Greenville, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I insert as a part of my remarks in the RECORD this morning a newspaper article with reference to the accomplishments of a young man in my home town of Greenville, S. C. In this day of keen competition and the ever-readiness on the part of so many people to expect and depend upon some sort of Government aid, it is very encouraging to know of instances like that referred to in the following article.

I am privileged to represent a district in which more cotton is consumed than in any other congressional district in the country. For a good many years it has been the custom of our southern mills to spin and weave the cloth and ship it elsewhere to be finished and finally manufactured into garments. Finishing plants have now been located in our section and various and sundry manufacturers are now making clothing for the peoples of this troubled world.

Eugene Stone III is a native of Greenville, a very modest, unassuming young man who, with his associates, as he chooses to call them, has built an extremely important industry. It has been my privilege to go through the plant with Mr. Stone and to see and hear him greet his fellow workers as members of his own family.

We should be profoundly thankful for a country in which opportunities are still available, like that to which reference is herein made. The example of Eugene Stone and his fellow workers should be an encouragement to others.

WE CAN HELP OURSELVES—STONE DID, AND NOW LEADS WORLD IN MAKING SUN SUITS

(By David A. Tillinghast)

The sun never sets on sun suits made by the Stone Manufacturing Co., 25 East Court Street, Greenville. Not quite 16 years old, this industry, which features low-priced garments, mostly for children, is now looking forward to the day coming soon when it can celebrate the making of its one hundred millionth garment. It is already the largest maker of sun suits in the world.

A we-can-help-ourselves industry in every sense, Stone's is a concern which has doubled its output five times in its brief history.

The story of this young industry, vibrant and virile, recounts like a dream as it reveals an expansion of one-hundred-fold from the small beginning when five machine operators constituted the force and quarters on the second floor of a building on River Street required considerably less than 7,000 square feet of space available.

That was in the latter half of 1933 and children's dresses were the sole product. Today Stone Manufacturing Co., with Eugene Stone 3d as president, employs 500 people, almost all of them women, turns out some eight type garments in tremendous volume, sells them not only the length and breadth of the United States but also across both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

"Our policy," says President Stone, "is to produce low-priced garments and to make them well. Our price is based on actual cost plus a reasonable profit. There has been no change in our prices since before the war."

Under the trade names Stone's Wear Products and Colorglo Creations garments by the thousands today flow from the Court Street plant, sold by a force of 12 salesmen operating in the United States. A New York office is maintained in 1350 Broadway. And a Chinese salesman represents the company in Hawaii, where sun suits and pajamas are a very popular item.

Markets abroad include Africa, Central and South America, and the European Continent. Before the war, shipments were made to the Dutch Indies in the southwest Pacific. One shipment of sun suits reached Batavia, Java, just in time to be seized by the Japanese, who probably have little use for them now that the Rising Sun is in such complete and permanent eclipse.

Recently 50,000 women's slips were sold by a New York department store in 2 hours, bringing an urgent call for more, a plea which at the moment could not be cared for.

Founded July 9, 1943, and incorporated late in 1945, the Stone Manufacturing Co. spent 2 rugged years in establishing a firm foundation. It was depression time and the thought was still fresh on many minds and pocketbooks.

The original capital was less than $10,000.

But the will was present, the determination to carry on regardless, and by 1935 the little plant was over the hump and on the way to spectacular growth.

The year 1934 had seen production reach a steady flow with an increase in the operating force to 60 by the end of the second year.

This brought the need for the entire building.

From 1935 to 1943, the narrative of Stone Manufacturing Co. is one of repeated doubling up.

Sales in 1935 were twice those of 1934; they doubled again in 1936; it was ditto for 1937. By 1941 the volume again increased 100 percent. And 1942 recorded another double in sales. War conditions and restrictions and handicaps that have developed since have held production to the 1942 high since.

Today production limits are controlled by the supply of raw cloth material, which has been short.

All made of cotton goods, today's line of Stone products includes sun suits, pajamas, slips, panties, dresses, and pinafores for children, slips for women, and aprons in variety for nurses or maids.

Designing is also a home product, being done at the plant often by Mr. Stone himself. Patterns are generally stable.

The move to the present quarters on East Court Street, where the concern is now housed in a four-story building, replete with conveniences for employees, as well as sufficient room for comfortable working conditions, was made in 1942.

A regular production-line system is maintained as skilled operators sit at latest-type stitching machines and speed through garments at a rapid pace.

Such machines as those which make buttonholes in the twinkle of an eye or sew on buttons in like time border in the miraculous as their speed and intricacy of movement intrigue the layman's eye.

Operators of machines must be skilled and fast. In order to keep the force at full strength, a training program is a part of the Stone policy. Before the war classes were conducted at Parker High School with Stone furnishing the machines. It is hoped to resume this training shortly.

Employees figure high in the Stone Manufacturing Co.'s set-up.

"We prefer to treat them as associates rather than employees," says Mr. Stone. "We pay the highest wages in this type industry. We give vacations with pay and for 4 years have paid bonuses to all. We have other things in store for them."

The Stone organization is on the "one happy family" order. Mrs. Juanita Young, who was the first employee placed on the pay roll in 1933, when President Stone, then just past his twenty-first year, began laying the foundations, is still the "first employee" as head supervisor of both plants.

Mrs. Gertrude Skelton, also one of the original five employees, is in charge of the No. 2 plant. The other three, all women, left the concern in favor of matrimony.

Ten employees have been with Stone's since 1934, including Grim Wood, in charge of patterns and costs; Mrs. Janie Cannada, floor lady in charge of shipping; and Misses Lucille Barron, Neva Boiter, Effie Thackston, Addie Fennell, Leila Harris, Ora McCauley, Emma McCarter, and Kate Taylor.

Four members of the "family" since 1934 are Quincy Coggins, assistant supervisor of both plants; Miss Robbie Nell Cox, personal secretary to Mr. Stone; and Misses Evelyn Brock and Pearl Hill.

During the war Stone Manufacturing Co. made available its production facilities to the Government and as a result shipped hundreds of thousands of garments to the Army Quartermaster in Philadelphia and to the Lend-Lease Division of the United States Treasury.

Everything from GI mattress covers to underwear for Ethiopia, WAC aprons to clothes for native children in Africa, was made up and supplied Government agencies for use in prosecution of the war. Lend-lease goods were utilized in the north African theater as a means of winning natives over to friendly roles as America took its first major offensive step to thwart and later help destroy Hitler.

Though the Stone Manufacturing Co. has doubled production five times in its 13 years, it still looks to future expansion.

A new plant site on the New Buncombe Road, the Furman property of 55 acres, has been purchased. Also the Hudson property of 32 acres almost adjoining on the Paris Mountain Road.

Construction of a new home for the industry, providing 100,000 square feet of space, will be undertaken just as soon as the supply of cloth, needed by the millions of yards in stepped-up production, is available.

The Hudson property was secured for division into home sites. The company will make them available to employees at cost and will assist in the financing of new homes, according to present plans.

A model plant and a community of homes for employees, built to their own taste and requirements—that is the dream of Eugene Stone III.

Russia Uber Alles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans I am disturbed and surprised at some recent developments which directly concern the attitude of Russia. The other day newspaper headlines carried a story, United States To Force United Nations Showdown on Iran. This story then goes on to say that when the United Nations Security Council meets in New York in a few days, it will be asked to reopen Iranian charges filed against Russia, unless Iran itself takes such action.

THE MENACE OF RUSSIA

There have been other newspaper items and headlines which charge that Russia has broken her pledge to withdraw her troops from Iran in accordance with an Anglo-Russian-American agreement with Iran. I do not here clutter up the RECORD with countless other headlines which all indicate that Russia is advancing toward the Turkish frontier and that she has designs on Turkey.

Then I noticed in another newspaper some time ago a headline, "China raps Soviet for breaking pact." The news item then goes on to say that the Chinese press opened a vehement attack on Soviet Russia, declaring that the Red Army actions in Manchuria had violated the treaty, and so forth. Then we have read several times where Russia had warned the United States not to meddle with her plans. To make a long story short, we have reached a point where the world may face greater trouble than was its share when World War II started. The responsibility for this present situation rests squarely upon Russia.

It is well at this time for the United States to take note of what is going on and to give thought to the proper course of procedure. The cold facts of history tell us the story of World War I. It was a war in which the United States made its entry to make the world "safe for democracy." Whatever the purpose, the developments of that gigantic struggle are undisputed. American wealth and American lives were sacrificed on the battlefields of Europe to wipe out German imperialism, thereby saving some countries in the Old World that otherwise might have been obliterated. This country sought no territory, and the only thing that it acquired following World War I was the ill will and hatred of the people of the world who had benefited most from the blood of our soldiers and sailors and the wealth of our citizens.

I do not here discuss the events that have led up to our entry into World War II. Neither do I discuss whether or not entry into that war could have been avoided or whether or not our entry should have been avoided.

THE BACKGROUND OF WORLD WAR II

Looking back we will recall that Germany marched into Poland on September 1, 1939, for the purpose of plunder, despoilment, and the robbery of territory. This led France and Great Britain to declare war on September 3, 1939. At the same time, on September 29, 1939, Germany and Russia signed a friendship treaty, providing for a division of Poland. In this connection we should note that on November 30, 1939, Soviet Russia started its attack on Finland. I do not here recount the facts of the heroic defense that this little republic waged against the tyrannical and cowardly efforts of Russia to conquer it. Back when that attack was going on, I was the only man in Congress who made a speech calling upon the United States to break off diplomatic relations with Russia as a protest against this effort to trample on the rights of a small nation and to reduce the Finns to a state of slavery by the Russian hordes.

It is also significant to note that on March 13, 1941, the so-called lend-lease bill became a law, and so far as weapons of warfare were concerned, this country was producing them for Great Britain and other nations who were fighting the imperial might of Germany. Another significant date to remember is June 22, 1941, when Hitler moved his German hordes into Soviet Russia. Then followed the attack by Japan on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and on the next day, December 8, this country declared war on Japan, and on December 9 declared war on Germany and Italy.

It is sufficient to say that the might of German tyranny was again seeking to conquer the Old World. Great Britain had been caught unprepared to face the military might of Nazi Germany; France and other countries had been overrun and conquered in 1940 with very little opposition.

When Hitler's armies moved into Soviet Russia, his military success is a matter of record and was so tremendous that on October 16, 1941, Russia moved the capital from Moscow to Kuibyshev, while most of the rich Ukraine had been lost to Hitler's German armies. Russia, as well as Great Britain, faced her hour of trial and her hour of peril.

AMERICA'S PART IN THE WAR

The genius of American industrial leadership was expended for the purpose of developing a war machine here that could conquer the might of the Axis nations. Thereupon also the might of American labor was mobilized to produce the guns, ammunition, and other weapons of war that were so desperately needed by Great Britain and Russia. There were also created by America the greatest Army, Navy, and Air Force ever known.

So, over a given period of time not only Great Britain but Russia came rapping at our door for lend-lease materials, for guns and ammunition and airplanes and ships, war supplies and food spelled in terms of billions of dollars. These vast masses of materials under the fiction of lend-lease went to these countries as America's contribution to helping save Russia from the iron heel of Hitler, as well as other countries. The platitudes and the expressions of friendship from Joe Stalin filled our sound waves and our newspapers like the gentle ripple of water on a moonlit sea. This country was a great country while it was helping save somebody else. Hand in hand with this program was the mobilization of our fighting men. Our country reached into every home, took the farm boys from the homestead and left the aged people to struggle along and produce food.

Our country reached into the cities and took married men who left wives and small children behind to enter the Army. No one of draft age was permitted to escape the decree of our Government

that they must serve in the armed forces. The mayors of our cities, the members of our state legislatures, and the young men who were in Congress, and Government employes, all faced the requirement. For what? In order that they might serve side by side, if you want to put it that way, with the Russian soldiers, who needed help in their hour of desperate need, when the best military machine that had ever been developed up to that time was overrunning Joe Stalin's Russian Empire. Let us not forget that while the Russian soldiers were defending themselves desperately on one front, General Patton's army and other American armies were laying waste to the German armies on other fronts and that they eventually crossed the Rhine River. Even a child can understand that this divided the German war machine and made it possible for success to crown the efforts of the Allies.

If I understand the purpose of those who led our Republic in those days, their object was to do away with tyranny and imperialism. They sought no territory. They sought no advantage of the peoples of any nation. For pure idealism, their purpose and their program, the contribution of America has no counterpart in the history of civilization.

THE STORY OF RUSSIAN INGRATITUDE AFTER THE WAR

Perhaps the best brief summary of the Russian attitude at this time is contained in an article by George E. Sokolsky, and I quote from the Washington Times-Herald of March 17, 1946, as follows:

Does Soviet Russia have to conquer the whole of Europe and Asia to provide safety for her borders?

Already Russia has seized Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, much of Germany, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, northern Iran, possibly Sinkiang, Mongolia, half of Manchuria, half of Korea, the Kuriles.

She is marching on Turkey and Iraq. Where will Russia stop?

This war started on September 1, 1939, to preserve the territorial and administrative integrity of Poland. Hitler's crime was the anschluss with Austria and the seizure of Czechoslovakia. He had outraged world public opinion at Munich.

When he attacked Poland the civilized world turned on him as though he were a mad dog. I say the civilized world, for at that moment Russia was his partner.

But at no stage, short of the actual World War II, did Hitler's infamy reach that of Soviet Russia at the present moment.

Using American tanks and American arms, benefiting by American lend-lease and American perfidy at Teheran, Yalta, Moscow, and Potsdam, Russia bestrides the world, a synthetic colossus, incapable of putting a brake upon its predatory momentum and shouting that small, defenseless, harmless nations imperil its safety.

The newest cry is that Russia cannot permit preparations for war on its boundaries. Where are those boundaries?

Believing that Great Britain cannot fight for 5 years and that the United States has been weakened by Communist-fomented strikes, encouraged by the weakness and vacillation of American foreign policy, not having learned yet that this country in a just cause becomes united whatever our internal differences may be, the Russian accepts this as the right time to prevent a peace, to intimidate the smaller countries, to pursue a century-old plan of destroying the British Empire, and for pursuing the Leninist-Stalinist program for the conquest of the whole of mankind by means of the world revolution.

This is what America faces. And those who are so myopic as not to realize the truth, who are so narcotized by propagandistic opiates as not to believe the truth, will one day suffer the shock of glaring into an ugly, bitter, miserable fact close at home—the fact of war again—war costing American blood and American wealth.

The only way to prevent that war is to recognize immediately and fully that Stalin has succeeded to Hitler's mad dreams of world conquest, to recognize immediately that this country can only safeguard itself by insisting that, except for Germany and Japan, the boundaries of September 1, 1939, are the only ones this country will recognize, and that we shall not permit, by whatever means are at our disposal, any further conquests by anybody.

This seems drastic and harsh. Shall the United States face a situation less drastic and harsh when we become an island facing a Communist Europe and a Communist Asia?

Did you not notice that Toledano, the leader of Mexican communism, is a candidate for the Mexican Presidency? Do we need to wait until it is too late to wait and too late to act?

A Communist is a Russian agent. Whether a soldier or a civilian, he is a Russian agent. In every country, the Communists act as Russian fifth columnists.

In the United States, the American Communists, taking order from Duclos, a French Communist, reorganized their party, threw out Earl Browder, elevated Eugene Dennis, and readopted the revolutionary line.

Immediately the United States broke out into a rash of strikes. Even worse, Joe Curran, who had cooperated with the Communists, in control of our merchant marine during the war, is being thrown out because his left-wingism is not sufficiently orthodox.

The Communist press in this country, as in all the world, acts as a Russian propaganda vehicle. Russia conducts two wars at once, a war by arms, a war by communistic organization and propaganda.

The UNO is fussily organizing for world peace, and Senator CONNALLY proposes that the Big Three meet again. Every time the Big Three met, a tragedy was born. UNO seems to be a hope but not much of a hope.

How long will the American people be blind to what is happening to them, to their ideals, to their way of life, their principles? How long?

RUSSIA'S UNFRIENDLY ATTITUDE

Mr. Sokolsky is not alone in this statement of facts about Russia. One of our famous columnists, Ray Tucker, recently said:

The White House and the State Department are aggrieved and shocked by the Los Angeles statement of Assistant Secretary of State William Benton that the United States intends to penetrate the "iron curtain of Russia" with American propaganda.

Moscow has told us and the British quite frankly that they do not want or appreciate our broadcasts.

Any radio program from the United States or Britain, if truthful, will stir discontent among Stalin's 190,000,000 people.

It may sell the Soviet population on the idea that capitalism provides more comforts and decencies for the average man than communism does.

THE DANGER OF COMMUNISM

And so as we emerge from World War II we face the cold facts of having helped obliterate one menace to the freedom of the world, namely, Germany, in order to encounter the overmastering ambitions of another leader, Joe Stalin, who would ask to dominate the affairs of the world by force of arms on the theory that might makes right and that nothing must stand in the way of his imperialistic aims.

There were some of us who hoped when lend-lease started that those who were in a position of leadership and power in America would obtain promises from the countries to be benefited by lend-lease to the effect that in return for help from America those countries would, when the war ended with the might of our arms and the blood of our men, behave themselves, observe rules of decency and morality in their intercourse with the Governments of the world. I say rather sadly that in my opinion no such commitments were obtained. They could have been obtained, they should have been obtained when Russia and others like her were down on their knees begging the President of the United States for help against the hordes of evil.

I think it fair at this time, Mr. Speaker, to restate a doctrine that has been somewhat out of date.

OUR AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

I refer to the doctrine of Americanism. It is time that the leadership of this country cease having a divided opinion on this subject. Our American way of life, our American form of government, and our country long since should have been of primary concern. We want no part or parcel in those foreign "isms" which run counter to the doctrines I have announced. I refer specifically to the Russian theory of government and way of life. It is communism. I am familiar with the oft-repeated statement that we should not try to impress upon the Russian people our theories of government and that we should permit them to run their own affairs without interference from us. But I think it high time—long overdue—when the despots of Russia should be told that we do not welcome their interference in the affairs of America. They should be told that they have broken faith with every small country of the world where they have established their rulership and their ways of life, by subterfuge or otherwise, over those small countries.

DANGERS AT HOME

It is well known that the political leaders of the CIO have Russian and communistic leanings. Last summer they went to Moscow. For what? Was it to get their orders from Joe Stalin? Were they taking a vacation after their hard labors and toil and sweat in the production lines in our industrial plants? I let Mr. Average American answer the question. I quote in part from a newspaper clipping from the Washington Post for March 17, so that I cannot be charged with any error as to the facts:

CIO OFFICIALS URGE CLOSER SOVIET ACCORD

Eleven union officials who visited Russia appealed in a report made public by CIO yesterday for "closer understanding and cooperation" between the American and Russian peoples.

The delegation spent 8 days in Moscow and Leningrad last October. It was headed by James B. Carey, CIO secretary-treasurer. The Americans were guests of the Soviet Trade Unions, which previously had sent a delegation to this country as guests of the CIO.

The report includes quotations from speeches by two of the CIO men at a union meeting in Leningrad.

Albert Fitzgerald, president of the CIO Electrical Workers Union, told the Soviet workers:

"You have gained friends who are going to insist that our Government do everything in its power to aid you. We've seen the price you have paid to establish freedom for all peoples of the world. We in America are determined that no force within or without is ever going to turn us against your people again."

WERE WARMLY RECEIVED

The delegation's report says that Reid Robinson, president of the CIO Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, "paid high tribute to the democratic ideal" in his speech. It quotes Robinson as saying:

"We must break down the propaganda that you have no democracy as we have."

Besides Carey, Fitzgerald, and Robinson, the CIO visitors were Allan S. Haywood, Joseph Curran, John Green, Emil Rieve, Lee Pressman, John Abt, Len deCaux, and Vincent Sweeney.

RUSSIA DOMINATES CIO

I think the foregoing quotations clearly indicate that the political leaders of CIO are dominated by Russia, Russian politicians, and Russian ideals. I know that the rank and file of the members of all labor groups are honest, industrious, and patriotic Americans. It is my hope that they will not be misled by propaganda that comes from men like Joseph Curran and others of his type, whose communistic leanings are undeniable. I am not alone in this belief. Just the other day a distinguished spiritual leader said in part that as the world shakes the debris of destruction from bruised shoulders and wipes blood from her clotted eyes, she sees eastern Europe totally dominated by atheistic Russia.

MINNESOTA'S ATTITUDE

Where does Minnesota stand? It is a fair question to ask how the people of Minnesota feel on this question. They are entitled to know how I feel about it. Every one is entitled to his or her opinion and the great thing about America is the fact that we can disagree. We can love Russia, and even get in bed with Joe Stalin, if we feel like it, without being sent to jail. You cannot do that in other countries in the world, with very rare exceptions. If you do, you disappear.

I have been interested recently in a series of speeches made by a young State official from the Eighth Congressional District. He is also a former Army officer. Inasmuch as no one has questioned his pronouncements about Russia, and inasmuch as it is not possible for me to depart from my official duties in Washington, I want to take issue with this young man, who has a future ahead of him, because, if reports are correct, he has been making speeches indicating a particular fondness for Russia.

A STATE SENATOR'S VIEWS

I refer to State Senator John Anton Blatnik. I would not stress his views except for the fact that he is at the present time a State official of the State of Minnesota. Mr. Blatnik was elected to the State senate in 1940, was reelected to the State senate in November 1942. At that time he was in training at the Army Air Force base at Miami Beach, Fla. The War Department issued a ruling that he could run for reelection to the State senate. He was commissioned a lieutenant in the United States Army and in February 1943 he obtained a leave of absence for the purpose of attending the session of the State senate at St. Paul, Minn. While attending that session, Senator Blatnik was called back to duty at Fort Lincoln, Nebr. He was relieved from active duty as captain in the Army of the United States on January 22, 1946. I mention these facts because a man who has been a former Army officer and who is now a member of the State legislative body speaks with some authority and people might imply that he talked with the implied approbation of the United States Army, having been one of its officers, or that his words carry some official significance as a member of the State senate of the State of Minnesota. Of course, everyone in his private capacity has the privilege of his own opinions.

NEWSPAPER COMMENT

However, newspaper articles feature the fact that Mr. Blatnik has had legislative experience and Army experience. Some time ago, according to Minnesota Labor, a CIO paper, Senator Blatnik made a speech in Minneapolis in which he said:

Blatnik told of the incredible heroism of the Yugoslav Partisans during the war and praised the Communist Party as the moving force in organizing the resistance that foiled taking over of the country by Hitler.

Some time ago in another address Mr. Blatnik said:

The speaker urged that suspicion be dropped; that we learn to trust the Russians and thus bring about a closer and mutual understanding between the United States and its ally.

The speaker said there were many indications to prove that Russia kept her word and pledges. He said that Russia and the United States emerged from this war the greatest of world powers, and it behooved both of them to understand each other and retain confidence in the programs they plan.

My attention was called the other day to an address before members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce just recently in which Mr. Blatnik said:

"There is too much suspicion and distrust between Anglo-American interests and Russia," Senator Blatnik said. "The Russians are just afraid and suspicious of us as we are of them and they have good reason to be."

THE SENATOR OVERLOOKS SMALL NATIONS

I give these quotations because they are a clear indication that Senator Blatnik has very definite international views, and I want to take issue with him in connection with his stand along the lines indicated in these speeches that he has been making. I do not believe that he realizes the dangers in having America subordinate to views and position in world affairs of Russian communism. If we are going to pursue a policy of approbation for what Joe Stalin is doing, then we are in effect condoning Mr. Stalin's miserable and infamous treatment of the small countries of Europe, Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, and many others where Mr. Stalin has sought to dominate their governments to his own ends. These small countries have a right to live their own lives in their own way. America should firmly insist on their protection and their rights.

AMERICA

Further, America should insist that the purposes for which this country entered World War II be not disregarded and forgotten to serve the convenience of another World Power. I do not like Senator Blatnik's statement that "the Russians are suspicious of us and they have good reason to be." He may not know it, but he is following the communistic technique in making that sort of a statement. Russia has known and now knows that this country has no designs upon Russia. I hope that the red Russian philosophy, which would destroy the home, the school, the church, and the system of free enterprise that we enjoy, may never be given a foothold on the shores of this country. The issue is clear-cut. Some want "Russia uber Alles." As for me, I will take America, to which I pledge my loyalty and undivided allegiance.

Thirty-second Division Comes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin have always been proud of the veteran Thirty-second—Red Arrow—Division. It covered itself with glory during the First World War when it was nicknamed by the French "Les Terribles." Its glorious tradition, dating back to the Marne, Oisne-Aisne, and Meuse-Argonne offensives, was carried forward in the jungle of Buna, Saidor, Aitape, New Guinea, Morotai, Netherlands East Indies, and the mountains of Leyte and Luzon. Credited with 654 days in action during World War II, it returns home with the gratitude of the entire Nation. We in Wisconsin are proud and grateful that henceforth the home of the Red Arrow Division will be the great State of Wisconsin.

I believe the following editorial by Mark R. Byers, appearing in the Manitowoc Herald-Times of March 16, 1946, gives expression to the feelings of the people of my State:

The Drifter has just received a little brochure that sketches, in miniature, the history of the Thirty-second Division, the Red Arrow outfit of two world wars whose proud boast for a quarter of a century is that it never failed to pierce every enemy line that blocked its progress.

I find this brochure most interesting because, since VJ-day, the Red Arrow Division has become the exclusive possession of the State of Wisconsin. I am sure it is Wisconsin's proudest possession, too. Deactivated by the United States Army, the Thirty-second has been returned to our State for re-

organization as the Wisconsin National Guard. At the start of World War I and of the second global conflict, as well, the Thirty-second was comprised of the Guard outfits in Michigan and Wisconsin. Now it is to be exclusively a Badger outfit.

Reorganization of the Wisconsin National Guard hasn't been started yet, but it should be soon. It can't be too soon for those who have followed the division in two world wars. It never was a glory-hunting outfit, and for some strange reason was never featured in the headlines like some others which saw less service and gave a smaller account of themselves. But those who know the record know that the Thirty-second, in both wars, was the equal of any, to say the least. To Wisconsin veterans of the famous old outfit it stands out above all—and the Drifter will string along with their opinion.

Of course the division which was deactivated at Fukuoka, Japan, the 13th of last month, was not the same in personnel as that which went to Camp Douglas in the fall of 1940. It was, in fact, almost 100 percent different. General McBride, its commander, in his farewell to the division noted that only five men were left in its ranks at the finish who were with it in its first baptism of fire, at Buna in Papua. War's attrition had scattered the original outfit—some to jungle graves, some to hospitals for wounds or tropical disease, some sent home by reason of long service.

"Long service" is the right word. Few Wisconsin people, I think, realize that the Thirty-second is the premier combat division of all our armies from the standpoint of days of battle and length of service. No other division was given such grueling service. It was steadily at the front or in reserve for 40 months and 5 days. It was in actual combat more than half of that time—in the fox holes and on the mountain trails—a total of 654 days of fighting.

Perhaps because of its redoubtable record in World War I, when the Thirty-second was dubbed "Les Terribles" by the French and loaded with decorations for its services at Soissons and in the Argonne and Ardennes, MacArthur chose the Thirty-second as the spearhead of his first campaign against the Japs—the first stage on "the way back," in which the Japs were stopped at Buna by green citizen troops, never before under fire, who wiped out the entire Japanese garrison of 5,000 in a 117-day struggle. That campaign included the terrific march across the Owen Stanley Range to find the entrenched Japs, and the first air-borne offensive of the war in the Pacific.

Boys from Wausau and Milwaukee and Manitowoc and Superior, our own kids and the youngsters down the block, did that against the best of the Japanese imperial armies. And they kept right on doing it, for three long and bloody years. Their ranks were thinned and emptied and refilled by replacements time and again during those years. But the Thirty-second somehow always retained its identity, and never once fell behind the great example set its men by their fathers in World War I.

It was the Thirty-second that MacArthur relied upon in his famous "bypassing campaign" in which he leapfrogged over Japanese troops across the northern coast of New Guinea by a series of giant hops which left thousands of stranded Japs to wither on the vine. Saidor, Aitape, Finschhafen—in all these major actions the Thirty-second was in there, taking the Japs by surprise and holding them entrapped.

Then came Leyte and Luzon, and the dogged slugging of the Villa Villa trail, at the end of which the Thirty-second cornered Yamashita, and Company I of the One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Infantry received the surrender of this Butcher of Bataan, imperial commander in chief of the Philippines.

The division claimed six Congressional Medals of Honor, 153 Distinguished Service Crosses, 49 Legion of Merits, 845 Silver Stars, 1,954 Bronze Stars, 98 Air Medals, 78 Soldier's Medals, and 11,500 Purple Hearts. It holds a Distinguished Unit Badge, and its every regiment has been singled out for decoration.

The Thirty-second was the first American division sent overseas in World War II as a division. It was the first in action against the Japs. It made the first beach landing of any Army troops. It made the first air-borne attack; it carried out the first air-drop supply of a division in actual battle. Its record is filled with firsts. It was a pioneer outfit that throughout the war showed the way.

Wisconsin is glad to take again to its heart the Thirty-second, now all ours. We shall cherish its traditions, and glory in the fame that it has won.

But more than that, it is to be hoped, we will put ourselves behind the reorganization of the Red Arrow outfit in its new status as our own Wisconsin National Guard. The revival of its famous units should be undertaken at once, with all the will and spirit that the State can muster.

As soon as military policy has been made clear, let's get in behind the Thirty-second and rebuild it to its former status as the crack Guard outfit of the United States—a title honorably won in battle.

I give you the Thirty-second—first to fight and last to go home.

Spoken Words of House Members on Floor Resound Around the World—We Need To Weigh Our Words Carefully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the emergency of the recent World War is neither over in theory or in fact, for both in domestic and in foreign relations and problems we are still far from over the period of reconversion, either in matters of people or of property. Perhaps the problem of the psychological change-over of millions of men and women who have been prepared to die or to kill other humans, if necessary, to live and save their country—this mental transition has not and will not be accomplished for a long time to come.

And what obtains in our own great Nation, obtains and exists in the other countries of the world, too; only more so in the countries wherein battles have occurred.

Mentally the world is still "touchy"; it is still nervous, high strung, in high tension. It is not yet far along on the path of settling down to settle up. It is not yet around the fatal curve from world war to an assured world peace.

Confidence begets confidence. Good faith inspires and begets good faith; willingness to cooperate and seek to understand finds reciprocity. A spirit of brotherhood and friendship finds response of brotherhood and friendship in the realm of real men.

So often I have heard Members speak with a tinge of intolerance and harsh criticism against some other peoples of the world who were but recently our battlefield allies. Necessarily, their words, stated as facts, were founded mostly on hearsay, rumor, newspaper reports, or opinions. Yet, these incompetent, irrelevant items too frequently become the basis of words either for or against other common people of the world; either against their religion or government or leaders.

My point is that too often Members state as facts matters they only hear about, through rumors; inaccurate, incomplete reports; and clearly erroneous reports. Why not wait until we know what the fact is before we speak out words which sound around the world?

What we as House Members say should be so carefully weighed and verified before we say it that no person will be misled or misguided because of what we have here said.

We have a peculiar responsibility for uttering words which should only sound in terms of accuracy in fact and law.

Granting that we have, and must have, certain privileges of speech as Members of Congress, the careless or thoughtless use of this may well result in an abuse of it—if it results in misinformation to the people of our own great Nation or of the world. I do not insinuate that any Member would knowingly mislead or misstate—but, if Members state as facts those things which are not just as stated, then the result of making report, based on rumor, hearsay, gossip, ill will, or intolerance, is weakening rather than strengthening to our national sinews. The dissemination as a fact of that which is not already verified to be in fact and truth is starting a chain of report throughout the Nation which cannot but weaken our democratic processes.

What is the truth about it? What are the basic facts? Even if we do not make a 1-minute talk the first time a newspaper or a radio commentator reports this or that, it would be safer for our international relationships if we did not so promptly condemn or castigate other nations, when an opinion given is based on first, an incomplete report, or rumor, or partisanship, or other factor which should cause us to pause and carefully consider before we utter words which can never be recalled.

What is said on the floor of this House makes toward the attitude of other nations and of their governments toward us as a nation. And, toward our President and our Senate and our Department administrators, and our Cabinet officers.

What do you suppose the thinking of foreign peoples is about the sincerity and efficiency of our two-party system of government, if they base their opinions upon the harshly spoken, ill-considered words frequently uttered against the efficiency and in condemnation of the so-called bureaucracy of our Government?

In heat of debate, condemnation, unjust criticism, unfounded attack, unwarranted accusations, are said to often

be made. Should we not seek to weigh our words most carefully, bearing in mind that what we say about the functioning of our own political parties and about our own form of government is heard around the world?

These few words of mine are offered in the hope that some of them may be accepted in the kindly spirit and intent with which they are given. I am so proud of my beloved Nation, and of its achievements in the short years of its total life, that it makes me fearful of results, if anything but the actual facts and the absolute truth about it and its functioning and its people and purposes are spoken of on this floor at all times. What we say here resounds around the world, about our own great Nation and about the other peoples and governments of this world.

Ours is now an atomic world. It is a world neighborhood in which we are compelled to live. Scientific research, transportation, and communication have catapulted us into a neighborhood of nations.

There is a great Book which admonishes to not speak ill of our neighbors.

Resolution by City of Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., on March 13, 1946:

Whereas the people of the United States have been asked not only for directive rationing, but also voluntary rationing on the eating of bread; and

Whereas it has been rumored, not without foundation, that wheat and corn shipped to European countries have been diverted to the making of beer and ale and other brews; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that there will be a shortage of white bread in our country: Now

Therefore, the Federal authorities are requested to examine with extreme caution the destination of said wheat and corn from this country, ostensibly for the relief of stricken Europe.

Nothing in this resolution is to be construed that the intent is to curtail the utmost in our power to save the innocent civilian population of Europe from starvation brought on by the sadist, Fascist-Nazi regime.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Acting President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Senators Walsh and Saltonstall, Congressman Lane, Director Herbert Lehman, Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

JAMES A. HANLON.

In board of aldermen, March 11, 1946, adopted.

Approved, March 13, 1946.

BERNARD L. SULLIVAN,
Mayor.

A true copy.
Attest:

JOSEPH A. TYRRELL,
City Clerk.

Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. James M. Mead, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day dinner address which I delivered at the Arlington Hotel, Binghamton, N. Y., on March 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is indeed a year of decision, as President Truman has warned us. Momentous events are in the making. We are at the cross roads. The decisions we make this year will determine not only the future destiny of our own Nation, but of civilization itself.

We have it in our hands to go forward as the most powerful and progressive Nation in the world; or to go backward as we unfortunately did under Republican administrations following the last war—into isolationism, into a period of wild stock-market speculation, and finally into one of the worst depressions in our history.

The Republican slogan at that hour of decision was: "Back to normalcy." The Republican slogan today is "Back to old-fashioned conservatism." This is another name for reaction and retrogression.

Thanks to the brilliant leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic Party succeeded in pulling our country out of the morass and quagmire into which we were led by the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations.

Let's take a look at that record:

Now it can be told: Franklin Delano Roosevelt saved our capitalist system from utter collapse. The fate of our banks, our insurance companies, our railroads, and our industries hung in the balance. The Democratic Party in that critical hour produced constructive reforms which not only saved our private enterprise system but put us back on the high road to recovery and sanity. That industrial and agricultural recovery prepared the Nation to meet victoriously the battle conflict which was thrust upon us by the Axis dictators.

Fortunate it was for our country and for civilization that our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had the vision to see the handwriting on the wall at the very time when his Republican Party adversaries in Congress attempted to prevent this Nation from being prepared for the inevitable conflict. It is truly a remarkable fact that during the dark hours of the thirties the Democratic Party not only put the Nation back on the road to recovery but simultaneously marked out a new course in our national life. Here the record is clear. The New Deal program has brought into American life a large measure of security for all sections of our Nation.

Agriculture was given a new lease on life by assuring the farmers a fair price for farm products. There was placed into the hands of the workers of the Nation the right of collective bargaining, by which, through their own efforts, they can protect their interests and contribute very substantially in raising the standard of living. For those who are less fortunate and unable to use the weapon of collective bargaining, laws were enacted guaranteeing a higher minimum wage throughout the land. The Democratic Party placed upon the statute books a Nation-wide system of unemployment insurance which has protected, and will continue to protect, many millions of our workers who may be so unfortunate as to be unemployed. Finally, this security program has now provided old-age benefits for 40,000,000 citizens.

We have emerged from this great war not only as victors on the battlefield, but also as the most powerful economic organization in all history. We have greatly expanded our industrial production facilities; we have expanded our agricultural production; we have developed new techniques which make for efficiency and leadership in world commerce; we have learned how to increase our national income to unprecedented heights. We have done all these things within the pattern of our American way of life.

THE CHALLENGE IN 1946

We Democrats are indeed proud of our record. But we do not intend to stand still. We hope and expect to finish the job begun so nobly and executed so successfully since 1933.

Our present standard bearer has given the country a program on which the Nation can go forward. In his message to Congress last January, President Truman outlined a 21-point program. It is a platform of specific reforms still to be achieved. It is not a flag-waving statement. It is not for vote-catching purposes. It is vital to our future well-being.

President Truman has carried forward in the Roosevelt tradition. He has called upon Congress to enact legislation for the general welfare and not for the special interest of the privileged few. His program calls for these important measures:

1. The creation of voluntary machinery for the prevention of stoppage of work.
2. Maximum employment as provided in the Employment Act of 1946, which was signed by the President last month.
3. For a liberalization of unemployment-insurance benefits as well as extension of this system to groups not now covered.
4. The adoption of a permanent fair employment practice act.
5. Raising the amount of minimum wages now provided by law.
6. Providing for a health and medical care program.
7. An adequate salary scale for all Government employees.
8. The liberalization of unemployment allowances for veterans.
9. Extension of social-security coverage for veterans for their period of military service.
10. The extension of the period of the price control act to prevent inflation.
11. Enactment of a national-housing program to take care of the critical housing shortage in communities and colleges all over the country.
12. Encouragement by the Government of small-business enterprise.

To help carry through the President's forward-looking program it is essential, of course, to keep his party in control of Congress. It would be unfortunate to let our Nation slide backward into reaction by the election of a Republican House or Senate. President Truman needs the support of the people through the election of a Democratic Congress this fall.

It is inconceivable that the American people would turn their backs on the party that has demonstrated its capacity to govern wisely since 1933. To elect at this critical time the backward-looking Republican would indeed be unfortunate. You don't have to take my word for it. Listen to what a liberal-minded Republican Senator from the State of Oregon has said: "Senator TAFT in his radio tirade against bipartisan sponsored progressive legislation demonstrated in a frightening manner why the common men and women of

America cannot look to the reactionary Republicans, who are seeking to control the Republican Party, to protect and improve their standard of living." Those strong and truthful words came not from a Democrat but a Republican United States Senator.

Make no mistake about it: The Republican Party is still in grip of the Old Guard. The elected representatives in Congress of this Old Guard have produced nothing constructive since they were driven from power in 1932. They offer the American people only opposition and obstruction. In lieu of a constructive program they offer only platitudes.

The proof of their bankruptcy is found in the joint party statement released by the Republican group in Chicago recently. They have no concrete, practical, workable program. Faced by the most tremendous problems in our history, a Republican leader recently declared that what this country needs is merely old-fashioned conservatism. Mind you this, in an atomic age.

No, my friends, we cannot turn backward. We must march forward on the road of progress. To higher living standards—with the Democratic Party.

The Challenge to Civilians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, every Thursday night at 10:30 o'clock Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, the reform temple in the District of Columbia, brings to the microphone of radio station WMAL a message of advice and comment on the passing scene as Msgr. Sheen does at an earlier hour. His comments are pungent and timely, and I wish every Member of this House could hear them. Since that is impossible, I am inserting in the RECORD a condensation of his broadcast of March 7, in which he offered a challenge to the complacency of civilian thought, so that gentlemen of the House can read and appreciate his wise and able observations:

THE CHALLENGE TO THE CIVILIAN

(Condensation of broadcast of Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington Hebrew Congregation, over WMAL, Washington, Thursday, March 7, at 10:30 p. m.)

A few weeks ago great and humble bowed in tribute at a funeral service for a distinguished American. Generals, admirals, ambassadors shared pews with the humblest at the funeral of Harry Hopkins, devoted servant of a great President. He had labored mightily for more than a decade for the good of our land, from the dark years of economic depression, through years of war mobilization, and in a war of coalition, the hardest kind of war to administer. In failing health he traveled across the face of the globe, even as he worked selflessly in this city, to be sure we would have allies. He devised ingeniously that we could buy time for the interval that must elapse before our land could become the arsenal for the struggle against axis tyranny.

This man, through those dark and difficult years, in the face of an almost demoralizing partisan blindness within, went forward in his devoted service in time of greatest crisis. Even as any GI on the field of battle, Harry Hopkins, by the sacrifices that led to his early death, fulfilled his moral mission.

The day after the Hopkins funeral I heard a report from the lips of a man who had just returned from Europe, one of the most trusted and responsible of men—a report he already had made to the President—that greatly disturbed me. He said four things:

First. The report of the public-opinion poll among our GI's in occupied Germany was absolutely true. That poll, as you remember, indicated that 12 percent believed there were superior races; 19 percent believed Germany was justified in starting the war; 22 percent believed the Germans had good reason for persecuting the Jews; 30 percent preferred the Germans to the English and the French; 51 percent believed Hitler had done the German Reich a great deal of good.

Second. Our men in occupied Germany, especially officers, were easily influenced by their new mistresses; frauleins were so much cleaner and healthier than other women they had met in the Old World, not stopping to consider these mistresses were healthier because the food had been robbed from innocent women and children of Europe and fed to the German people, cleaner not only because the Germans had taken all the soap but had made tons of soap out of the very flesh of millions murdered by the Nazis in their death chambers. This man went on to say many were completely beguiled by the recent prodemocratic verbiage of former Nazis who had only to give some kind of lip homage to democracy to satisfy uncritical Army administrators. Finally, this same man said the Germans actually were better off than our allies and the victims, under the present rationing system. Many German miners loafed, for they could always fall back on the gullible Americans; if anyone is to starve, the Germans will starve last.

As I listened to this trusted authority speak I realized with a growing horror that we had won the war; but we may be losing the peace. The American Army had failed to educate homesick GI's as to why we were fighting this war, and as to the primary significance of the immediate future to assure the fruits of victory for humanity; and because we had failed to educate our men effectively in terms of these deeper issues there was a vacuum which the Nazi propaganda of seductive females could easily fill. In a broadcast from Nuremburg, Justice Jackson said that not one Nazi arms maker had been brought to trial, and he felt none would be. Of the diabolical bankers and streamlined totalitarian organizers of the economic machine that built up Hitler, not one had been brought to trial up to that time. We had done nothing about Nazi property and agents we knew were in Franco Spain and Fascist Argentina. The Nazis had planned to be able to survive, even in military defeat, in the Latin-American world, for new opportunity of evil power. When I thought of the Continent where we had just carried on the struggle, and our virtual policy there, all I could say was, "God help the poor surviving victims!"

After years of being robbed, starved, their dear ones murdered, liberation for many may mean that they will survive as impoverished, disease-ridden, demoralized pariahs at the mercy of the healthy criminals who inflicted the tragedy. These innocent victims were being strangled in red tape, for many were now technical aliens where they were left stranded by the black tides of war's misery; others were broken creatures facing a helpless future.

These creatures, because of some wretched connivery of the diplomats, could not flee to the refuge of Palestine, pledged by all the nations of the world for decades, but the British were admitting the henchmen of the Grand Mufti, who had conspired with the Nazis to make Iraq revolt, to try to set the Mideast on fire against the free nations at the very time the Axis armies had been at the doors of the Nile and the Volga, ready to close the pincers of tyranny in the Mideast that would have joined with the devil worshipers of the rising sun in a wall of steel somewhere in the Punjab of India or the Red Sea. These conspirators were being allowed to return as freemen to Palestine; but the innocent were barred from finding refuge there.

This is far more than the failure of our military administrators. It is the civilian who controlled our civilization. Deeper than the failure of the military is our civilian failure. That failure is a matter of decades and of great segments of our people. We refused to give heed to the need of responsible planning for the problems that faced us after the last war, until, in the name of business as usual, we headed for the go-getter-dammerung of the business gods that brought hunger and the fear of revolution to every American community, where the same ilk that captured power to the right and left of the Old World stood with itching fingers on the weapons of power ready to take over in the impending chaos of social hysteria and political paralysis. Then, after the great figure of Roosevelt loomed on the horizon to rally the noblest and the best and the soundest of this blessed land, to salvage what one could for an immediate interim program and as soon as the imminent dangers seemed to pass, there were pressures from some of the most influential to break down all controls and go back to the very pattern that had brought its doom. Our civilian community has all kinds of dominant individuals and institutions who resent any kind of social planning.

We could see it in the blindness of many who echoed the hollow men, some of them mouthing the Nazi line that Hitler was the wave of the future and we should do business with the Nazis, even repeating privately a great deal of the divisive falsehoods the Nazis had used in their march toward power and terror. The names of many of these men will undoubtedly be found in the microfilm now being translated for Senator KILGORE'S subcommittee from the German secret files, of Americans the Nazis rated as dependable. It was only the moral strength, and under our Constitution, the legal power of the Chief Executive of this land that saved the day to gather enough of our people for the emergency a degenerating world had precipitated and rallied the strength we needed to survive. It was the mistakes of the enemy, rather than the strength of purpose of many of our freemen, that gave us the last opportunity to salvage the hope for the future. We can see that same lack of moral insight and discipline among the men who are hell-bent to smash all price controls and catapult America into an awful inflation; and the same passive suicidal drift on the part of many who repeat the slogans that would lead to an awful fate that would destroy them as its first victims. We can see that same lack of discipline in the pressure on our draft boards so that they have not been able to draft enough replacements to return many of the homesick GI's who ought to go home at this time to their kin. We can see it in the failure to adequately finance at this time the intelligence division of our own State Department that must have the fullest information within and without this land to make it possible for them to be the instruments of the peace for which we pray. We can see it in the irresponsible way in which we have hastened to whitewash some of the most subversive characters in our past, who almost paralyzed America in her darkest hour. We can see it in the herronvolk ideology, exactly like the Nazis, which during the war had to go underground. We can see it in the failure of some of our politicians, one of whose leading figures opened

the first shot of the new political campaign by attacking the administration as being too severe with the Germans—yes; too severe—and adding that all this was due to the horrible Morgenthau plan. It is obvious that the name Morgenthau was used, only to stoop to the same religious bigotry to give sanction to their falsehood to win the next election, even though it may mean the loss of coming generations.

We are collapsing into postwar normalcy in the same way we did after the last war. We are heading toward World War III because we have not the vision of the peace, of the nature of the evil, and of the sacrifices we must make for the good we wish to achieve.

There were two messages by leading statesmen in the past few days that highlight that moral judgment. Winston Churchill, the heroic figure of wartime England, one of the most able and courageous men of western civilization, spoke his mind as a private citizen in far-off Missouri. I agree with nearly everything that Mr. Churchill has said but regret the things he left unsaid that render his statement one of the most deplorable half-truths of our time. If he meant a close military alliance of the Dominions in the British Commonwealth—no one could possibly object; as long as he affirms at the same time the framework of the United Nations. But he overlooks the undemocratic and vicious implications of the rest of the British Empire, held under police governments that are just as deplorable to the conscience of freemen in this land. When Churchill says "There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated great areas of the globe," he forgets to mention that Germany and Japan were armed by the aid of strong forces of the western nations so that the Soviet Union was led to feel that powerful forces in the west were trying to make a two-front war against her, which only her doublecross could divert so that Russia would not have to fight alone. Churchill ignores the Chamberlains who made the deal with Hitler after they had helped him become powerful by what they had done and failed to do. Churchill ignores the policies and forces in the nondemocratic imperial aspect of the British system that were responsible for the growth of the evil that led to the last war.

The men whom Churchill warned were imperialists of England whose policies helped to lead to the last war and whose moral failures could just as easily lead us to the next war. For us to have a military alliance with the democratic dominions of the Commonwealth is one thing; but for us to underwrite the blind imperialism of another side of England that has spawned the evils of our time would be the most abysmal blindness. We once fought against taxation without representation. It would be even more ridiculous for us to underwrite the military commitments of an empire over whose policy we have no control, and whose denial of the liberties we affirm is dragging the world toward a new gloom. If there is any reason for fearing the advance of Russia into Asia it is because British colonial policy has virtually driven hundreds of millions of people into the belief that Russia is their best defense against England, whose yoke they wish to throw off, as the instrument behind the feudal system that has been riveted upon them.

Further, one should ask Churchill: "What about the Middle East?" Could anything be clearer? It is not a wrestle between Russia and Iran but between imperial British interests and the Soviet Union. Who has bolstered up the new Arab confederacy, composed of the most feudal type of old world reactionaries, even giving lend-lease weapons to ibn-Saud, to men who never have and never will affirm the law of liberty for the individual? Who is responsible for the paralysis at present in relation to the settlement of refugees in Palestine, in the land pledged to them by the Allies, who had wrested its sovereignty from the Turks after the last war, and with the wholehearted consent or the Arab spokesman and the nations of the world pledged this land as refuge for the homeless of Israel? Who is responsible for denying the development of a democratic Palestine a large influx of refugees could easily have created? If the Soviet Union will sweep throughout Asia in the coming years it will be into the vacuum which British imperialism, that has made every effort to prevent democracy, has left behind. The best friend of an aggressive communism is a decadent British imperialism.

If America is to be able to build the peace certainly we must be ready to use our armed forces against aggression; but we dare not grant our force to patch up a blind British colonialism that, on the one hand, is making things easy for the advance of the Soviet Union, and, on the other hand, would drag us in again to save them from the retribution of their present policy. There are undoubtedly power-mad Russians who behind their "iron curtain," would feed the suspicious of their people and gather their strength for a world crusade for communism; but these men are made strong only because we have weakened the forces in the neighboring lands that would have provided the natural resistance. America has a responsibility to the peace of the morrow and that responsibility will not be understood or achieved by merely a military alliance with the British system. We must grant the loan to open the sterling bloc to our free commerce; but we must create new policy in relation to the factors that have made the sterling bloc. We are the friends of the freedom of England, but we are not her junior partner. We are the friends of the freedom-loving all over the world; and our first duty is in those areas that neighbor Russia across Eurasia; to the downtrodden and the weak, to the oppressed and the forlorn, to the men and women who cannot be stopped from the leadership of the future. It was our generous brotherliness that saved China for the war against totalitarianism and it is by the same brotherliness, not as an associate in British colonialism, that we will have the confidence of these teeming, rising millions thoughout the earth, who will by God's grace inherit God's freedom on this earth.

A British system that stood on the side of the pledged word of the rights of the innocent to refuge in Palestine, a British system that would be ready to permit the forces of democracy to grow in the non-Dominion phases of her empire, that kind of Britain would be virtually a part of a greater American Union, based on the Bill of Rights of the American Constitution, but not the kind of unrepentant imperial England we who know the facts recognize as the deliberate policy of many of her benighted feudalists, who wrapped in the Union Jack would take the name of human freedom in vain.

This is all the more pathetic because it was the great and eloquent Churchill himself who once said that the test of a nation is what it will do when it is tired. This is a tired world, and the test of whether we are to have God's blessing depends on whether we have the moral courage to resist the forces of chaos in free lands that had led and can easily lead again to world conflagration. That is why I read with great pleasure the message of President Truman at the sessions of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. He appealed for support from the churches to oppose those civilians within our land blinded by the greed for gold, who would refuse to accept the burdens of discipline, the duties that will give meaning to our rights, so that we can face new needs with greater self-sacrifice, for the sake of the freedoms we have treasured. He appeals for the influence of the churches in the homes to build the faith and the ethical standards that can serve as a dyke to the forces of selfish chaos in our own hearts.

As I look around this land and this awful world I am led to the conclusion that now, more than ever, our most urgent tool for the peace is the influence of a free pulpit in a free church in a free state. It is the duty of the pulpit to turn the spotlight on the lies and blindness of men who would slander and betray their neighbors of any creed. It is the duty of the pulpit to speak, not for, but to the people. It is the duty of religion, as the sages of the Talmud said, to damn not the sinners but the sins, to free men from the idolatry that would in the name of traditional respectabilities permit the world to drift into new death chambers of the future. It is the duty of religion to quicken the conscience of our civilians so that they will rescue the innocent from the red tape that would strangle them, provide the rehabilitation that will rebuild them, and the opportunity for voluntary migration that would save them. It is the duty of religion to sharpen the insight of our civilians so that they will give the power of compulsory jurisdiction to the International Court of Justice so that no nation can stand in the way of the Bill of Rights of the individual and no people can behind a facade of pseudodemocratic verbiage become the nest of new depravity. It is the duty of religion to tell our people, in words that will lift up the morally weak, that it is not enough to weep over our public servants who have fallen, nor to sob when we hear the Battle Hymn of the Republic. Now is the time "when our eyes must see the glory of the coming of the Lord," see His covenant of new duty across the heavens, so that with God's help "the sun of righteousness shall now arise with healing on its wings." Amen.

The OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me in the March 1946 issue of the Washington News Digest. The article is entitled "What's Wrong With OPA?" The Washington News Digest is edited by former Representative John J. O'Connor, who served in the House for 16 years and was chairman of the House Rules Committee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH OPA?

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

The answer to that question is: Far too many things. Indeed, there are so many things wrong with OPA that nothing, short of a thorough house cleaning in OPA policy, program, and personnel will satisfy the aroused American people now.

This is the consensus of opinion of numerous distressed businessmen from many States who speak, write, and wire their pleas for relief from OPA's ruinous orders.

These businessmen recognize that some Government controls must be temporarily retained until present inflationary pressures

have been forced back; that there has been accumulating in our citizens' hands, $170,000,000,000 in savings. These vast savings represent a demand which the present supply of goods, because of rampant strikes, is totally inadequate to satisfy.

The conclusion is inescapable, then, that OPA or some other agency or agencies, must do a constructive price-control job at this time.

The key word is "constructive" and it is a word which is foreign to the OPA hierarchy. Never in our history have we been given such an object lesson to prove that the power of government to regulate is the power to destroy. Every day the news is full of items about OPA stymying and destroying the plans of American businesses for expansion, for creation of new jobs, for the development of new products and the improvement of old ones.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the precise objections to OPA today:

1. Personnel

There is no single agency which has created so many despotic czars out of pipsqueak juveniles who have no understanding of the functions of a public servant.

This situation demands that there be a 50-percent reduction in OPA personnel, consisting of those persons in high authority—in the district offices and in Washington—who have never met a pay roll and who are patently square pegs in round holes.

2. Organization

The OPA set-up has needless layer upon layer of bureaucratic superstructure. There is no apparent justification for its regional offices.

The local, unpaid committees, which, with few exceptions have done a praiseworthy job should be given greater freedom for the exercise of their discretion and judgment.

3. Directives

One need not be told that the OPA orders and regulations are confusing and confounding, full of incomprehensible abstractions and verbosity.

It is obvious that the directives must be strictly reduced in number, simplified, and clarified.

4. Enforcement

The gestapo-like tactics and hirelings of the OPA enforcement staff have infuriated and provoked the American people, often to resort to the black market. Instead of bringing out the best which is inherent within American business and our American people, the OPA inquisitors have brought out the worst in many folks. The OPA has tormented, spied upon and violated the constitutional rights of countless American citizens.

The remedy is apparent—reduce the enforcement staff and rid it of those individuals who indicate, by their thoughts and deeds, that they consider enforcement a criminal-catching job rather than an educational one, to help the great mass of honest businessmen and citizens.

5. Policy

The most fundamental of OPA's shortcomings is its guiding policy—a blind, obstinate insistence on slashing profits to the bone, supposedly to hold down prices. The OPA program for "cost absorption" has forced many companies to operate at a loss or at a negligible profit. As a result, this policy has been responsible for the ruinous cut in production. Yet, production is the greatest factor in preventing inflation.

As a remedy, let OPA, in justifiable cases, grant price increases which will be sufficient to encourage private enterprise to maximum production. The resultant Niagara of goods produced will then more than offset the insignificant effect of the price increases.

This then is a prescription for OPA to mend its ways. If it fails to do so, if it continues to fail to protect the American system of private enterprise and profit and instead keeps on abusing it, OPA will leave little alternative to Congress, when the OPA appropriation comes up for consideration, and when the extension of the price control powers is reviewed.

The Views of United States Maritime Commission on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 18, my able friend from Virginia, Hon. SCHUYLER BLAND, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD extension of remarks consisting of a letter from the president of the American Merchant Marine Institute to Hon. CARL A. HATCH, chairman of the Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on Senate Joint Resolution 104. This letter purports to represent the views of the majority of ship operators against the desirability and economic feasibility of establishing cheap water navigation from the Atlantic Ocean to the Great Lakes through deepening the channels of the St. Lawrence River. This letter also criticizes the views expressed by the United States Maritime Commission in support of the project. The Acting Chairman of the Maritime Commission, Hon. Edward Macauley, personally appeared before Senator HATCH'S subcommittee, on behalf of the whole Maritime Commission. The Commission considered the legislation now before the Senate and the House to construct the seaway en banc, and after a thorough study by the technical staff came to the conclusion that from both commercial and national security angles the seaway would provide larger opportunities for the utilization of the expanded American-flag merchant marine. The Maritime Commission and its joint organization, the War Shipping Administration, as everyone knows, have performed miracles in both the construction and the operation of the largest merchant fleet ever put into use by any nation in the world. Its views therefore deserve careful consideration by Congress. In order to present a fair and adequate picture of the other side of this argument, I extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the following text of Mr. Macauley's statement before the subcommittee:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1946.
Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman, Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: You have by letter of February 6, 1946, requested the views of the Commission with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 104, a joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties, authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes.

The resolution provides that the agreement between the United States and Canada pertaining to the St. Lawrence River, dated March 19, 1941, be approved with the exception of articles VII and IX thereof, and that the President be authorized to fulfill the undertakings in said agreement on behalf of the United States with the exception of articles VII and IX after approval by Canada.

The resolution states that it is the sense of Congress that the President negotiate a treaty with reference to the matters contained in the above-mentioned articles VII and IX, including provisions for perpetual navigation rights on the Great Lakes and on the connecting channels and canals and in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River, and that the provisions of the treaty of 1909 regarding the diversion of waters at Niagara River be amended by a treaty for submission to the Senate.

The President is authorized through the Department of State to investigate the possibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating by imposing tolls on the foreign commerce of the United States and Canada and report the findings to Congress.

The resolution further authorizes the President to arrange with the State of New York for the transfer to the State of the power facilities on the United States side of the Rapids constructed pursuant to the resolution, under arrangements to be consistent with the laws of the United States and approved by Congress and the legislature of New York.

Article VIII referred to in the resolution provides that the rights of navigation under existing treaties between the United States and His Majesty shall be maintained notwithstanding provisions for termination contained in such treaties.

Article IX referred to in the resolution provides for the preservation and use of Niagara Falls and River. This would include plans for the control of waters of the Niagara River, for the permission on completion of the work for each country to authorize an additional diversion for power, and for the best use of the waters of the Niagara River with reference to the preservation of the beauty of the Falls.

The vital importance of merchant shipping to the United States in wartime has been demonstrated on a grand scale in the interval since United States Maritime Commission addressed a letter on August 6, 1941, to Congressman MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, favoring the enactment of H. R. 4927, a proposal for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. Today United States Maritime Commission reaffirms the position taken in the letter to Congressman MANSFIELD. In so doing it is only emphasizing again the Commission's determination to foster and maintain our merchant marine for the preservation of peace, for national security purposes in time of emergency, and the sound economic development of industry and commerce.

The arguments in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway have been heightened in the past 4½ years by the enormous increase in the number of American merchant ships which must be put to the effective use in the national interest. The question naturally arises: How many ships are likely to be employed in and out of the Great Lakes if the St. Lawrence seaway program is carried out?

It has been estimated by the St. Lawrence survey, part III, of the Department of Commerce, that if that waterway had been rebuilt in 1939, the potential traffic would have been something in excess of 4,600,000

tons of cargo, foreign and domestic combined. The ship requirements, United States and foreign, to carry this cargo can only be approximated in the absence of detailed information as to its world distribution, and so forth. Roughly, however, such an amount of cargo, with northern Europe as the principal area of interest on the foreign end, would have required in the neighborhood of 192 ships. On the basis which the Maritime Commission has been proceeding, namely, that a substantial portion of the foreign trade of the United States would be carried in American bottoms, there can be no question but that enough ships would be available in the list of war-built ships as is shown in a table attached or that they could be built in the several years' interval before the construction of the canal, locks, and other works could be completed.

The military considerations are second to none in evaluating the importance of the peacetime use of American ships on this projected seaway. From preliminary estimates of ships likely to be used post-war for foreign, domestic (coastal, and so forth) and Great Lakes, it seems certain that the total now in sight will be none too large for estimated minimum wartime shipping requirements. The expansion and strengthening of new commercial sources for constructing and utilizing merchant ships such as the St. Lawrence seaway proposal is most important.

Then again as a natural concomitant, the psychological effect of large oceangoing ships flying the United States flag, touching at Lake ports, should be stressed in dramatizing world shipping and trade in the Midwest.

It is desirable here to bring up to date another feature of the letter of August 6, 1941, which the United States Maritime Commission addressed to Congressman MANSFIELD, namely, the answer to the question, What share of the United States Fleet and of the world's fleet could traverse the proposed 27-foot channel? Whereas vessels having a maximum loaded draft of 25 feet would be able to carry full dead-weight capacity through the waterway, vessels having a maximum loaded draft of more than 25 feet would have to proceed on less than full draft. For the latter vessels, an allowance has been made. It has been estimated that the preponderance of vessels transiting the Panama Canal normally have been composed of vessels loaded only to two-thirds of capacity. With an allowance of an additional 8 or 9 percent of the total dead-weight capacity for fuel, water, and supplies, a load of 75 percent of dead-weight capacity would appear to be typical of vessels which would transit such waterways as the St. Lawrence seaway. Of the ships of greater than 27-foot draft, the Victory and Liberty are of special interest. Victorys could go through the Canal loaded to 79 percent, and the Liberty to 85 percent of total dead-weight carrying capacity.

With these considerations in mind it becomes apparent that there are many vessels in the United States Fleet and in the world fleets that are capable of navigating the proposed waterway.

An analysis of the fleets of 30 of the principal countries of the world (and the British colonies), as of September 30, 1945, shows that, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over, there were 3,354 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 5,191 vessels within the 27-foot draft range. The aggregate gross tonnages of these vessels were 12,283,972 and 24,592,103 tons, respectively. Freighters predominated, but there were also substantial representations of tankers and combination passenger and cargo vessels. If there are added Libertys and Victorys, which have drafts of 27 feet 9¼ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 8,015 and the gross tonnage, 45,031,682.

A somewhat corresponding situation is revealed by an analysis of the United States fleet of similar vessels. This shows that as of the same date there were 763 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 1,173 vessels within the 27-foot range, having aggregate gross tonnages of 3,490,770 and 6,232,356, respectively. As in the case of the world fleet, the United States vessels consisted largely of freighters but with some tankers and combination passenger and cargo ships. If there are added Libertys and Victorys which have drafts of 27' 9¼" and 28' 6¾", respectively, the number reaches 3,997 and the tonnage, 26,671,935.

A further reason for building the seaway is the need for every possible shipyard facility in time of war. On two occasions within a period of 25 years the very life of the Nation has depended upon our ability to build ships in unprecedented numbers and with the greatest of speed. During the late war, the Great Lakes area was seriously impeded in its contribution to the Nation's shipbuilding effort by the difficulty of getting sizable ships out of the Lakes and into the sea through the restricted channels. Thus, the production on the Lakes was confined to the smaller types and was substantially less than it might have been had there been a 27-foot waterway.

The position which the Maritime Commission has taken is that the St. Lawrence seaway channel is a requisite to the realization of the full maritime potentials of the Nation. The economic commercial advantage which the Nation has enjoyed because it has had three seaboards has never been questioned. We have in the series of inland seas known as the Great Lakes a potential fourth seaboard. As illustrated by the Panama Canal, the potential of any seaboard is enhanced by direct water connection with another.

It, therefore, is not sound to consider the economic importance of the St. Lawrence seaway channel project apart from the entire maritime resources of the Nation. It is the benefit which is probable and possible to the maritime interest of the country as a whole from the standpoint of both national defense and commercial growth that is of concern to the Maritime Commission and which is vital to the Nation. The coastwise, intercoastal, and foreign services, which can now be envisaged as probabilities in the near future, cannot be taken as a complete evaluation of the importance of the project.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD MACAULEY,
Acting Chairman.

United States and world merchant vessels with maximum loaded drafts of 25 feet or less [1]

Type of vessel	Total number	Total gross tons	Vessels of 25-foot draft or less	Percent of total vessels	Gross tons, 25-foot draft or less	Percent of tonnage
WORLD FLEET (SEPT. 30, 1945)						
Freighters	7,605	45,001,047	2,640	34.7	9,343,948	20.8
Combination passenger and freight	764	6,264,225	438	57.3	1,972,875	31.5
Tankers	1,806	14,593,932	276	15.3	967,149	6.6
Total	10,175	65,859,204	3,354	33.0	12,283,972	18.7
UNITED STATES FLEET (SEPT. 30, 1945)						
Freighters	4,432	29,922,751	646	14.6	2,813,825	9.4
Combination passenger and freight	148	1,498,392	66	44.6	480,191	32.1
Tankers	949	8,658,859	51	5.4	195,954	2.3
Total	5,529	40,080,002	763	13.8	3,490,770	8.7

[1] Covering 30 principal countries and the British Colonies, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over.
Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Division of Economics and Statistics, Feb. 12, 1946.

United States and world merchant vessels, with maximum loaded drafts of 27 feet or less, also Libertys and Victorys with corresponding drafts of 27 feet 9¼ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively [1]

Type of vessel	Total number	Total gross tons	Vessels of 27-foot draft or less; also Libertys and Victorys	Percent of total vessels	Gross tons, 27-foot draft	Percent of tonnage
WORLD FLEET (SEPT. 30, 1945)						
Freighters (excluding Libertys and Victorys)	7,605	45,001,047	3,976	52.3	18,003,917	40.0
Libertys [2]	2,419	17,358,744	2,419	100.0	17,358,744	100.0
Victorys [2]	405	3,080,835	405	100.0	3,080,835	100.0
Combination passenger and freight	764	6,264,225	552	72.3	2,922,698	46.7
Tankers	1,806	14,593,932	663	36.7	3,665,488	25.1
Total	12,999	86,298,783	8,015	61.7	45,031,682	52.2
UNITED STATES FLEET (SEPT. 30, 1945)						
Freighters (excluding Libertys and Victorys)	4,432	29,992,751	915	20.6	4,532,223	15.1
Libertys	2,419	17,358,744	2,419	100.0	17,358,744	100.0
Victorys	405	3,080,835	405	100.0	3,080,835	100.0
Combination passenger and freight	148	1,498,392	95	64.2	750,775	50.1
Tankers	949	8,658,859	163	17.2	949,358	11.0
Total	8,353	60,589,581	3,997	47.9	26,671,935	44.0

[1] Covering 30 principal countries and the British Colonies, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons.
[2] Includes only United States vessels.

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Division of Economics and Statistics, Feb. 18, 1946.

Designation of Bernard M. Baruch to Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in last evening's Washington Star entitled "New Assignment." It deals with the appointment by the President of the United States of Hon. Bernard M. Baruch to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ASSIGNMENT

In designating Bernard M. Baruch as the American representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, the President has chosen for this all-important task a man who will take with him to his new assignment the full confidence of the people of this country.

Mr. Baruch is in the front rank of our elder statesmen. Over the span of two great wars, he has rendered distinguished and disinterested service to his country, and now, at the age of 75, he embarks upon a new undertaking, the success of which is of unparalled importance to the United States and to the world at large.

The function of the Atomic Energy Commission is to work out a program for directing the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. If this effort should fail, we may be assured that this terrible new force will be employed, not for the advancement of mankind, but for the destruction of men. Mr. Baruch and the able assistants he has selected have the necessary qualifications for this task. But they and their associates will need, and must have, the unqualified support of every American and of men and women throughout the world.

Churchill and Glass Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Times of March 17 relating to the British-Russian differences. While the editorial does not, in its relatively short compass, cover all the factors that enter into this ancient rivalry, it does clearly point out that nothing in dispute at the present time justifies either war between Russia and England, or a British-American alliance which would make a mockery of the United Nations Organization; and the editorial urges the United Nations as the real guaranty of world peace.

The editorial follows:

CHURCHILL AND GLASS HOUSES

At New York Winston Churchill chose not to modify a "single" word of his Fulton blast at Soviet Russia, but his speech Friday night was more tempered.

He showed more of an appreciation for the old maxim that people who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones.

He conceded that if there is any stone throwing to be done, the safest place that the nations have found for that purpose to date is under the roof of the United Nations Organization.

Thus, Churchill took his position alongside other world leaders who, from the first appearance of storm clouds over the postwar world, have insisted that the world can solve its problems only through the UNO, and not in speeches in Missouri towns or in the Waldorf-Astoria in New York.

Although Churchill concedes that such matters as the refusal of Russia to withdraw troops from Iran is "one of those cases for which the United Nations Security Council was especially devised," the tone of his recent talks, including the one Friday night, indicates that he sees the eventual hope of peace, not in the United Nations, but in a British-American fraternal association.

Thus, Churchill makes it clear that he believes peace can be preserved not by the Big Five, nor the Big Three, but only by the Big Two.

ROOSEVELT WOULD DISAGREE

With this concept, we have no doubt, Churchill's one-time admirer and friend, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, would seriously disagree. His spoken words called for postwar allied unity, not simply British-American fraternalism.

Roosevelt, we are certain, would be concerned about Russia's apparently irresponsible attitude toward its pledge to get its troops out of Iran and its policy toward Turkey. Roosevelt, no doubt, would remind the world of Stalin's declaration of November 6, 1941: "We have not and cannot have any such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories and the subjugation of foreign peoples."

But, we believe, Roosevelt, like President Truman today, would put his faith first in the United Nations. He would not presume, as Churchill seems to, that the UNO will fail to keep the peace unless America sides with England against all comers.

The Russian concept of the UNO is not exactly that of the United States it's true. Foreign Commissar Molotov at San Francisco made it plain that he believed the world organization would consist of the Big Five—realistically, the Big Three—as a quintet around which other peace-loving nations are willing to rally.

RUSS CONCEPT OF WORLD ORDER

That conception of the new order, he said, was the issue to be solved at San Francisco. Unless the nations can rally around the Big Five and the Big Five can stick together, as Roosevelt recommended, the Russians obviously are not going to put faith in the practical use of the Organization to meet the realities of complex world problems.

The Russian appetite for buffer states and access through the Dardanelles to the sea may seem out of date to some observers. Churchill revealed that the Russians want a fortress inside the Straits. This insistence, in an atomic bomb era of supersonic airplane speeds, appears based on a Napoleonic concept of war strategy. Russia may think the psychological effect of such a fortress would be reassuring to her own people, but the proposal has a profoundly disturbing effect on the rest of the world.

Bigger suspicions are raised because of the tones of voice that are being used as much as the words employed. Churchill's tone shows a contempt and ridicule for the Soviet system of government. He says he doesn't believe Russian leaders want war "at the present time." Stalin's speeches to his people, especially the one February 9, blame the capitalistic form of government for war itself. Both men think they're right. As in all such disagreements, the truth probably lies somewhere between. But the statements encourage no concord between the peoples of the nations who want peace.

CAUSES OF WAR

Certainly, if war is caused, as Stalin says, by the maldistribution of the world's goods because of capitalistic systems, it is also caused as Churchill says, by the refusal of nations to abide by their pledged words written into treaties, such as the one Russia now violates by keeping its military forces in Iran.

The words of Cordell Hull should be written high in the sky over New York, as the UNO security council convenes there a week from tomorrow:

"We who are living now must not allow the human race to commit suicide through lack of vision or through selfishness, impatience, or provocation."

The world should be thankful that there is a UNO to fall back on during the painful period in which it is still in the early stage of creation.

Let's Modernize Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article on the modernization of Congress, written by Richard Lee Strout, member of the Washington staff of the Christian Science Monitor. The article was published in March 18 edition of the New Republic.

Mr. Strout, during the 20 years he has been in Washington, as a correspondent, has made a thorough study of congressional methods, and he has written many articles on this subject. The article is as follows:

Congress has been slipping for years. It is losing power to the Executive simply because it won't put its own two Houses in order. Now a joint, bipartisan congressional committee, after a years' study, proposes an elaborate scheme of modernization, the first since 1893. It reports the plan unanimously, with some minor exceptions in footnotes. The plan could go much further than it does. But as it stands it would constitute a tremendous reform.

It is easy to show the antiquated nature of congressional procedure. Congress is overworked and understaffed. For example, the House has 435 Members, yet it employs only 5 attorneys to help them draft and prepare legislation. It is so niggardly that the cost of running Congress is half the cost of the Indian Bureau in the executive branch. It creates committees but won't kill them; the Senate set up a Committee on Interoceanic Canals around the turn of the century, but although the Panama Canal is finished and the Spanish-American War (by all accounts)

over, the committee still functions, with a staff of four clerks drawing $10,500 a year.

Committees overlap. The House has three duplicating Committees on Pensions. It also has a Flood Control Committee as well as a Rivers and Harbors Committee. There are so many Senate committees and so few Senators that many Members serve on from 6 to 10. Senator Maloney at the start of the present hearings complained that he was overworked, with 23 agencies to attend to. Seven weeks later he died of a heart attack.

It takes 45 minutes to call the House roll. The equivalent of 42 legislative days was spent in the last Congress just in roll calls. An electric recording device would reduce this to a matter of minutes. Donald Nelson, while Chairman of the War Production Board, estimated that he spent one-third of his time giving testimony to duplicating committees.

Today Congressmen have bigger problems to meet than ever before, yet they must still spend most of their time on petty drudgery for constituents instead of thinking nationally; they must still deal with private claims; they must still run the District of Columbia, a city of 900,000, instead of letting it govern itself.

These anomalies are shocking and incredible. When the Washington correspondent has lived with them for almost a quarter of a century, as I have, and seen their effect in hamstringing action, neutralizing progress, creating chronic stalemates with the Executive and opening the way to pressure-group control, he comes finally to gnawing, tragic doubts as to whether American democracy can really meet the tests of the times we live in.

There are much deeper problems than the ones I mention, reforms so fundamental that it is doubtful whether Congress will accept the report of its own committee, although it has been baited with tidbits for the individual Congressman. His salary would be increased from $10,000 to $15,000; he would be given an $8,000-a-year "assistant congressman" to handle the drudgery of nonlegislative duties; expert staff and clerical help would be vastly increased; there would be longer, regular recesses; the amount of committee work would be cut down and systematized; Congressmen would be put under the Federal retirement system; a great amount of detail and worry would be lifted from their shoulders; they would sleep better and live longer. But unless there is a tremendous drive from the public, Congressmen may take the increased privileges and refuse additional obligations. Senator LA FOLLETTE wants to wrap the program into one package, believing there is a better chance to get through the basic reforms if they are tied to personal benfits. It is doubtful that Congress will allow this procedure; it is likely to prefer to take the matter up piecemeal.

Congress has deep, vested interests in its own inefficiency. Each committee chairman is a little czar. The La Follette-Monroney report would make a clean, swift cut in the number of committees, reducing 33 in the Senate to 16; 48 House committees to 18. This reduction is basic—the test of whether Congress will really try to reform itself or just pretend, for there will be tremendous opposition to reducing their number. Chairmanships are coveted. The chairman can largely control legislation; he gets special patronage, power, and prestige. Chairmanships are distributed on the basis of seniority rather than ability; the seniority system is so ingrained that even the daring La Follette-Monroney group did not think it wise to endanger other proposals by recommending its elimination. Some chairmen have spent a lifetime waiting for their posts. Furthermore, all the older Members have lined up for years waiting for the present chairman to be defeated or die. Now it is proposed to abolish half the committees. How would the prospective heirs feel?

A second center of opposition lies among lobbies and the executive bureaucracy. In Washington everybody has a friend on a committee. The web of friendship has been spun for years. Some pressure group, for example, has finally landed Representative JONES on flood control; now it learns that this, and three other closely related committees, may be merged. Furthermore, it discovers that lobbyists may be registered and made to give financial accounts. Naturally it will fight the reform.

In addition to a number of institutional modernizations, the La Follette-Monroney program carries three proposals so fundamental that, if adopted, they would practically revolutionize the American legislative structure. First, and most obvious, is the one by which Congress would put its own fiscal house in order. Both Chambers have committees dealing with raising money (taxes), both have committees dealing with spending money (appropriations), but they don't work together. Their wheels don't mesh. America is probably the only big country with no genuine budget. The new program would have Congress adopt a tentative budget, balancing expenditures and revenues, within 60 days of the opening of each session, and would then require embarrassing public-record votes from Members—specifically authorizing the creation of additional public debt—if Congress decided to spend beyond its income. The proposal is intelligent and it is hard to see how any reasonable man could oppose it.

The second major proposal is more nebulous and possibly more important. It is deliberately designed to strengthen the party structure in America. Unless one has followed the literature of political scientists on this subject, including Thomas K. Finletter's Can Representative Government Do the Job? the significance of this, as well as the third proposal, may be missed.

Provisions of the new report would seek to strengthen party responsibility and accountability by creating formal, seven-man policy committees for majority and minority parties, in both Houses. Under the plan the seven Senators and seven Representatives of the Democratic Party, for instance, would meet jointly at frequent intervals to formulate over-all legislative policy. It is proposed that the decisions of these committees be formally announced. An individual Member would not be required to follow such party policy, but the record of his action, in support of or in defiance of his party, would be available to the public as a means of holding both party and individual to account. This device is designed to replace the present steering committees which, the report rightly observes, seldom meet, and never steer.

The third proposal is the most provocative and potentially important. Without mentioning its sources, it incorporates recent suggestions of political scientists for the creation of what has come to be called a joint executive-legislative cabinet. This is an effort to bridge the dangerous and widening gulf between President and Congress which produces that chronic institutional antagonism that distinguishes American democracy from parliamentary governments. While the founding fathers deliberately set out to give America a weak executive, they hardly intended, as the report points out, to have the two branches go separate ways, in opposite directions.

The report would meet this problem in two ways. I have already mentioned the proposed policy committees to be established by either party to strengthen party responsibility. The report proposes that the 14-man policy committee of the majority be formally recognized as a council, to meet regularly with the President and leaders of his executive departments. In other words, they would become the President's legislative cabinet. While keeping executive and legislative branches separate, the procedure might do wonders in improving teamwork. The report dubs the new body the Joint Legislative-Executive Council.

The second method of achieving teamwork is implied rather than directly stated. Analysis of the proposed new committee structure shows that each committee is planned to coincide with an opposite number in the other House, and with a major department in the executive branch. These committees might meet jointly, and it is recommended that the Cabinet member having the subject in hand should appear regularly before his committee. Thus, while the report does not go into the controversial matter of giving Cabinet members seats for questioning in Congress, it does, in effect, recommend that they have seats in their respective legislative committees.

There is an infinite possibility of good in this closer relationship, in breaking down the system that has kept the two great divisions of the American Government at sword's point almost since the Constitution was written.

The opportunities for reform in the great new report are incalculable. Whether it is adopted depends on the Legislature. One thing is as true now as ever: Only Congress can reform Congress.

Food Situation in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, when Bishop Bernard J. Sheil returned from a trip abroad where he visited a number of countries and investigated, at the request of the President, conditions in France, Germany, and Italy, he was asked by Mr. Eugene Meyer, publisher of the Washington Post, to report his views in writing for the purpose of being published in the Washington Post at an appropriate moment. His views were published in the form of an article on March 10 last. The article is entitled "Message to America." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE TO AMERICA

(The case of the world's hungry people has nowhere been stated with such moving eloquence as in the following message by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago. Bishop Sheil is founder and head of the Catholic Youth Organization. After several weeks spent investigating conditions in France, Germany, and Italy, at the request of the President, he speaks from personal knowledge, and his message to America is of first importance. On his return early in February, Bishop Sheil described the conditions he observed and the conclusions he had arrived at with respect to the food situation to Eugene Meyer, editor and publisher of the Post. Mr. Meyer asked Bishop Sheil to record his ideas in writing to be published at the appropriate moment. This is the moment.)

(By Bishop Bernard J. Sheil)

In a world like ours, still reeling from the shocks of war and still fearful of the uncer-

tainties of the future, it is often difficult to chart a moral course. But, now and again, issues become so clear that we find one choice forced upon us, despite the clamor of other interests and the pressure of personal desires. Such an issue is before the American people now. It is the issue of food for the world. And the choice is: Shall America feed the world, or shall America be responsible for the death of millions from hunger? This is no melodramatic question posed in feverish emotion, but a brutal query wrung from the lips of suffering people everywhere.

The issue of feeding the hungry cuts through the jungle of political intrigues and conflicting national aims. It is starkly simple. If America does not feed the hungry of the world, the hungry will die.

And if they die, the ideals for which we fought the war will again be imperiled. We said that we battled for freedom and justice, the foundations of democracy and peace. But freedom is a hollow mockery and justice is a macaber joke to men with empty stomachs. Democracy is an idle speculation to men who watch their families die. Peace is a tantalizing mirage to those who do not eat. Where there is the looming specter of hunger, there is no peace. Where there is the menacing shadow of death, there is no security.

We said that we battled for the liberation of the oppressed and for the vanquishment of the oppressors. We have cut the bonds of the shackled and we have brought justice to the defeated. But for what? Have we done this only to watch them all writhe in despair? Have we made titanic efforts only to watch now the world's disintegration by slow starvation?

America has emerged from this war the most powerful Nation on earth. But the obligations of such a Nation are as great as its power. One of these obligations is to feed the hungry. There is no question that we Americans can do this, without any hurt to ourselves. There is equally no question that unless we do this we shall be responsible for the death of millions of human beings throughout the world. Unless we do this we can never again possess that priceless quality, self-respect.

This is our chance for greatness. It is not a time for vengeance. This is a time for a return to Christ's injunction of feeding the hungry, of giving drink to the thirsty. This is the time for us to drink deep at the well-spring of our common life, the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. This is the time for us to listen once more to Christ, "'Blessed are the merciful——"

We Americans pride ourselves on our belief in the brotherhood of man. In this spirit of brotherhood, Americans will respond most generously to the pleas of the suffering. Americans have never failed in generosity, and this is their peculiar greatness. We realize that the union of the brotherhood of man has inviolable obligations. And we realize that if we refuse our duty of feeding the hungry we shall justly merit the repudiation of history. Then, like Cain, the mark of murder will be upon our brow as we cynically ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

American Political Philosophies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address delivered by Chester V. Salomon, of Milwaukee, before the Second Ward Republican Club of Milwaukee on March 14, 1946.

This address deals with certain aspects of American political philosophy which, as Mr. Salomon says, affect the very fundamentals upon which this Nation is built.

I commend it to the thoughtful reader.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, friends and neighbors, I will deal tonight with certain aspects of American political philosophies which affect the very fundamentals upon which this Nation was built. During the past decade or so many otherwise well-meaning Americans have been led to flatter their altruistic and intellectual instincts by erroneously trying to define their political liberty—forgetting that freedom and liberty is so priceless that when a yardstick is used to measure or define it, its usefulness is destroyed.

No greater evidence of this is obtainable than by an actual review of the present political reign in Washington where liberalism has been used to cover up every conceivable type of political felony—just stop and ask yourself this question, How much freedom have these so-called liberals given you and I during these past years? Rather, have they not thrown principle to the winds in an effort to cram their own selfish theories down the throats of freedom-loving America.

Down through the ages the evolution of political philosophies have been manifold. Out of the best in the past and with a sense of values for future years our founding fathers wrought forth a representative form of constitutional government, the cornerstone of which is the Federal Constitution, whose principal feature is that the ultimate sovereignty rest with the whole people who, through suffrage, elect representatives to exercise the affairs of state. This form of government became known as Republican—wise old Ben Franklin once said, "This is a Republic if we can keep it," and section 4 of article 4 of the Constitution states "United States shall guarantee every State in the Union a Republican form of government."

However, in recent years a change has come over the public vocabulary. Prompted by long-haired intellectuals, the word democracy—a word studiously avoided heretofore but now sprinkled like attic salt on every oratorical dish, has come into use—and usage does something to popularize words and phrases. The dictionary defines democracy in the United States as the Democratic Party and its principles—and democratic and democratical is defined as pertaining to democracy.

This language clearly implies that democrat, democratic, democratical and democracy are defined synonymously. The encyclopedia explains further that fundamentally a democracy is that form of popular government wherein sovereignty or power to govern is retained by the people and exercised by them direct. The practical application of such a form of government is adaptable to only very small countries. In democracies the tenure of office is seldom limited to stated intervals and a strong central government is the practice.

The Germany of Hitler and the Italy of Mussolini are examples of modern democracy where a strong central government was in control, and autocratic tyrants, who were once elected by the people, held control until they were removed by death or physical force. Pure democracy is tyranny in its worst form. Ancient Greece, the so-called cradle or citadel of democracy, is the historical example. There on the Acropolis or high town democracy was dominated by the aristocrats who had turned tyrants and abused the common people and the minorities.

Aristotle, the famous disciple of Plato, despised democracy. Socrates was forced to drink the fatal cup of hemlock and forfeited his life on the vote of his aristocratic fellow citizens—and what was his offense—corruption of the youth by teaching them that there was only one God, for under the democracy of Greece there was no freedom of speech or even of religious worship. Thomas Carlisle 20 centuries later dismissed democratic forms of government with a contemptuous sneer and grunted—"Democracy! A form of government in which the vote of Judas is as good as that of Jesus." Alcibiades, one of the best examples of an aristocrat gone democratic, said that democracy was the perversion of that form of desirable government which one might call constitutional.

Democracies are necessarily small and immutable natural laws and physical conditions make it impossible for a fundamental democracy to ever become a great nation; and so our forefathers with wisdom aforethought planned for a great nation and planning well they made it a republic.

Here in America a great hew and cry has arisen for democracy with collectivists, radicals, and soap-box liberals wanting more unrestrained power and the abolition of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, which guarantees our American freedom. Because it is politically expedient and psychologically artful the Democratic Party has encouraged the use of the word "democracy." And unfortunately, after 13 long years many unthinking Americans have permitted this "weasel" word to become a part of their vocabulary.

Possibly more detrimental and unbecoming has been the academic use of democracy in our educational institutions; where with its infiltration of long-haired liberalized instructors, who have been warping the minds of our adolescent youth with anti-American indoctrination, this phrase has been readily adopted. This has led many of the youth to accept democracy as a means of less restraint and a radical liberalism without respect for the Constitution. Out of a created necessity service in all branches of the armed forces established a form of regimentation for our youth. This, and the ever-present slogan, that they were democratizing the world to free it from oppression has left many of them in confusion. This has also left those upon whose shoulders will fall the responsibility of preserving this Republic with little factual or basic conception of the principles on which this Nation was founded.

And in like manner many Republicans have adopted this parlance of the street—without thinking that they are giving lip service to the Democratic Party and aiding them psychologically. No wonder the Democrats chant "All that the Republicans can say is, 'Me, too.'" It is a plain charge that Republicans are without principle. It is not uncommon to hear Republican candidates when on the platform promising to give a democratic administration under democracy. No wonder so many of them are unsuccessful candidates. Is it any wonder that that great cause for freedom and liberty has experienced dormancy when those who seek to politically administer it do not espouse republicanism?

Neither the Constitution or the Bill of Rights mentions democracy. When you pledge allegiance to the flag you pledge with your heart, "to the Republic for which it stands." The founding fathers from Washington all down the list refer to this Nation as a republic. The two patron saints of the Democratic Party refer to this Nation as a republic. Jefferson said: "Let us then with courage and confidence pursue our own Federal and Republican principles"; but he called himself a democratic Republican. Fiery Andrew Jackson, whom the Democrats honor

with an annual dinner said, "The eyes of all nations are fixed on our Republic." Such famous Democrats as Van Buren, Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan also called this a republic.

No, my friends and neighbors, this is not a democracy, this is a republic with a representative form of government wherein sovereignty, though retained by the people is not exercised by them directly but through representatives elected by them at stated intervals, with a definite concern for the abuses of a centralized government and an ever close contact with the representation. These are the definite tenents of republicanism—any Republican candidate who abuses them is guilty of political delinquency and any member of the Republican Party who does not adhere to them is sacrificing the freedom of representative constitutional government for a tyranny that has deprived men of liberty down through the recorded pages of history.

Our ancestors starved and deprived themselves of all luxuries and even gave their lives in creating a nation where liberty and freedom could be preserved for themselves and we, their descendants; and so that we all could enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from confiscation of property and the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Why then with these principles to guide us must be subscribe by word, deed, or act to an arbitrary political rule. It is time that we meditate on the cause and effect of false political philosophies and return to the faith our fathers had in this our Republic. In closing I know of no better way to meditate than to pledge allegiance to the flag in unison:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands—one Nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

Waste in Government

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have several times called to the attention of the House instances of waste and destruction of Government property by Federal bureaus and agencies.

Usually these are very difficult to pin down. However, I have just read in the Long Island Daily Press of an instance where the Navy itself apparently is about to prove that it is destroying valuable property.

This article says that a civilian worker at the Maspeth naval supply depot faces Federal indictment because he did not have the heart to burn a poncho and took it home instead. This man's job is to destroy used clothing and other articles no longer deemed worth saving. He has been charged with the theft of Government property of the value of $34. The defendant, when arraigned, said: "'It breaks my heart to see some of the things they throw away."

Now, if this poncho is worth $34 today, as the Navy alleges, why is not it and the other material being destroyed sold and the proceeds credited to the Federal Treasury to help pay off the national debt of $2,000 per person?

If this material is worthless, this defendant should never have been indicted.

It would certainly appear that in this instance the Navy is impaled on the horns of the proverbial dilemma.

It is time that waste of Government property is brought to a halt by this administration. If it does not do so, we are very likely to see a taxpayers' revolt and a wholesale cashing in of war bonds.

The article follows:

ASTORIAN SEIZED FOR FAILING TO BURN NAVY COAT

A civilian worker at the Maspeth Naval Supply Depot today faces Federal indictment because he didn't have the heart to burn a poncho, and took it home instead. Peter V. Lanzaro, 37, of 31-29 Thirty-fifth Street, Astoria, works at the Maspeth depot and his job is to destroy used clothing and other articles no longer deemed worth saving.

He was arraigned yesterday before United States Commissioner Edward E. Fay in Brooklyn, charged with theft of Government property.

Commissioner Fay held Lanzaro for the grand jury, but at the suggestion of assistant Federal Attorney H. H. Goldstein he released him in his own cognizance.

Lanzaro also is accused of taking home a pair of galoshes and a small ax.

Goldstein said outside of court that Lanzaro told him:

"It breaks my heart to see some of the things they throw away."

Lanzaro was about to toss the poncho and other items into the fire in which the discards are disposed of when he suddenly decided to hold them out and take them home.

According to Goldstein, Lanzaro explained: "I could use that poncho to go fishing in."

The articles were valued altogether at $34.

Goldstein said an investigation would be conducted. He indicated he felt some of the discharged supplies might be salvaged at a time when the world is in need of clothing.

The Solution of the Silver Price Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there are so many conflicting reports concerning the price of Government-owned silver that I have checked the matter carefully with the OPA and the Treasury and have prepared the following report at the request of a colleague. This letter is submitted for the information of the Members:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Reference is made to the inquiry of your constituent concerning the purchase of silver for commercial use, the subject of your March 14 letter. On making inquiry of the Office of Price Administration, it develops the OPA has fixed the ceiling on silver at 71.11 cents per ounce and that no silver is available at that price.

I am informed by the Treasury that standard silver dollars can be secured in exchange for silver certificates now in circulation. The silver obtained and melted down by this method would be at the monetary value of $1.29 per ounce and would contain an alloy of 10 percent copper. The existing law provides; that is, the Silver Purchase Act of 1934:

"SEC. 4. Whenever and so long as the market price of silver exceeds its monetary value or the monetary value of the stocks of silver is greater than 25 percent of the monetary value of the stocks of gold and silver, the Secretary of the Treasury may, with the approval of the President and subject to the provisions of section 5, sell any silver acquired under the authority of this act, at home or abroad, for present or future delivery, at such rates, at such times, and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem reasonable and most advantageous to the public interest."

As we find the price of silver well above $1 per ounce in many parts of the world, it appears that in order for the industrial silver users to obtain relief and get all the silver needed, it will be necessary to make a market by offering the Treasury a price at or in excess of $1.29 per ounce and at the same time secure an increase in the ceiling price by the OPA to the same figure.

Trusting this answers your inquiry, I am

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Indianapolis Times Suggests a Revised Plan for the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1946, the Indianapolis Times printed an editorial which contains a tremendous amount of food for thought in reference to the proposed loan to Britain. The editorial points to defaults on foreign loans after World War I and suggests that, instead of negotiating a loan based on repayment in dollars, we set up the dollar credits which Britain needs and agree to accept payment in raw materials of all kinds—rubber, copper, tin, manganese, and so forth—which we need now and will continue to need in the future. In this way, the editorial points out, we would be sure of repayment, as the raw materials will be delivered on the credit which we extend to Britain. Under this arrangement Britain could get dollars only by selling goods for dollars.

This editorial is a notable contribution to the discussion of this important subject, and I think it ought to be read and evaluated by all of our people. I have therefore obtained unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

THEY NEED DOLLARS; WE, MATERIALS

Our friends, the British, need a few billion dollars credit, to buy food for their hungry stomachs, to start modernizing their obsolete industrial plants, to begin a revival of the world trade upon which the prosperity of their people depends.

Our friends, the French, are in similar circumstances. Our friends, the Russians, want dollars too. So do many others.

The first major postwar foreign credit proposal—$3,750,000,000 for Britain—is now before a Senate committee. It's a loan at a low interest rate, to be amortized over a 50-year

period, with escape clauses that make allowances for any years when the British might not have a favorable balance of trade large enough to meet the dollar payment.

British and American negotiators spent months working up this deal. Apparently they never talked business except in terms of a dollar loan to be repaid in dollars. Yet, obviously, dollar repayments can be only on a when-and-as-possible basis. We should have learned that from the defaults on foreign loans after World War I. Britain can get dollars only by selling goods for dollars. In the end we have to take goods in payent, if we are paid at all. Why, then, wouldn't a buyer-seller deal be better than a lender-borrower arrangement? Why not set up the dollar credits which Britain needs, and agree to accept payment in raw materials of all kinds which we need now and will continue to need in the future?

Just because the negotiators failed to explore that alternative is no reason why Congress shouldn't do it.

We talk a lot about stock-piling. We swore we wouldn't get caught short again. But stock-piling legislation languishes in Congress, and we're dangerously short of a wide variety of critical materials. Many of those materials are available in large quantities in British possessions, colonies and dominions. True, they don't belong to the British Government. Neither do the American dollars belong to the American Government. Britain can buy those materials with pounds sterling and balance off payment in manufactured goods she sells to her dominions and colonies.

Let's mention a few minerals which we are short of and which we can afford to buy in almost unlimited quantity for stock-piling, for the next war, or better still to prevent a next war: Antimony, mercury, nickel, and platinum in Canada. Asbestos in Canada and South Africa. Copper in Canada, Rhodesia, and South Africa. Lead in Canada, Australia, and Burma. Tin in Malaya and Nigeria. Bauxite in British Guiana and the Gold Coast. Chromite in India and South Africa. Corundum in South Africa. Manganese in India, South Africa, and the Gold Coast. Mica in India. Tungsten in Burma, Malaya, Rhodesia, and Australia. Vanadium in Rhodesia and South Africa. Zinc in Australia, Canada, Burma, Rhodesia.

We need large amounts of those minerals right now, and we can take delivery of still larger quantities over a period of years. We need other strategic materials besides minerals—such as rubber. And not only things in the strategic category—we need raw materials of all kinds.

A happy aspect of this alternative of buying, instead of lending, is that whatever deal we make with the British, we can also make with the French and Russians and Chinese and others—without discrimination. We hope Congress will at least consider it.

Need for Federal Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio statement entitled "Is Federal Labor Legislation Needed?" made by me on March 19, 1946. The statement sets forth the affirmative side of the question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS FEDERAL LABOR LEGISLATION NEEDED?

For more indusrial peace we need Federal legislation of two types. First, we need stronger machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and a requirement that management and labor use it. Second, we should impose on unions legal responsibilities commensurate with their vast power.

Recent months have made it clear that not only labor and management, but all of us lose, and lose heavily, when there is widespread industrial strife. The National Labor Relations Act was passed on the announced theory that Federal encouragement and legal protection of union organization and collective bargaining would bring industrial peace. To that end it imposed many legal obligations and restrictions on employers, although none on unions or employees. But organization and collective bargaining alone have not brought industrial peace. One obvious next step is to strengthen mediation machinery and require both parties to use it before resorting to strike or lockout. That is what we propose to do in the pending Senate version of the Case bill passed by the House.

The present conciliation service in the Department of Labor is directed by the Secretary, who is required by law to be a partisan of labor. The Secretary's partisanship tends to destroy employer confidence in the impartiality of the service and lessen its usefulness. We propose to expand the conciliation service and place it under an independent mediation board of five members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This board would direct all Federal efforts to settle labor disputes peacefully, including the promotion of voluntary arbitration. Both unions and employers in serious disputes should be required to withhold any strike or lockout action for a reasonable time while the board and its agents try to work out a peaceful settlement.

Although it sounds simple stated thus briefly, working out the language of the mediation sections of the Senate bill so as to cover the various and complicated situations that might arise took much time and effort. But it was still easy compared to the task of drafting legislation to make unions responsible without endangering their legitimate activities.

The need for such legislation is urgent. Supreme Court interpretations of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act and the Clayton Act, for all practical purposes, have placed union activites above and beyond the law, no matter how wrong and harmful to society their actions might be. Let me cite just two instances disclosed in our Senate Labor Committee hearings.

In New York City, Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers conspired with a group of employers with whom it had closed-shop contracts to create a monopoly on electrical equipment going into new buildings in the New York area. The union had contracts with employers manufacturing equipment and with contractors installing it. The union enforced the monopoly by refusing to work on any equipment not manufactured by the employers with whom the New York local had contracts. The practical result was that no electrical manufacturer outside New York could sell equipment there and prices under the monopoly increased tremendously. The Supreme Court dissolved the conspiracy with the employers, but specifically held that the union by itself could go on making it effective by refusing to install outside equipment. This procedure is called a secondary boycott, and the union is continuing it.

In the second instance, the teamsters union wanted to organize nine employees in the Los Angeles warehouse of an Ohio company. The employer arranged a meeting of the employees with the union organizer. None of the employees would join the union. The teamsters then demand that the employer sign a closed-shop contract, forcing his employees to join the union. That would have been a violation of the Wagner Act for the employer, and he refused. The union then picketed the warehouse and boycotted deliveries in and out. The California Supreme Court recently ruled in a similar case that the union was not violating the law and that neither the employer nor his employees had any legal redress. The boycott cost the employer an estimated $18,000.

Such instances of unions using a secondary boycott to achieve undesirable objectives could be multiplied by the hundred. This irresponsible use of economic power not only injures employers and the public, but tramples roughshod over the rights of individual workers. It is high time to make secondary boycotts which restrain commerce or restrict competition unlawful and subject to legal restraint under the Sherman antitrust laws, just as monopoly practices by individuals and corporations are now. An amendment to accomplish this will be offered in the Senate.

Theoretically today a collective-bargaining agreement is a binding contract, enforceable on both parties. Practically, it is enforceable on the employer, who can either be haled before the National Labor Relations Board or sued in State or Federal courts. Unions can and do violate such agreements with virtual impunity, by slow-downs, by quickie strikes and by wildcat stoppages, and the employer has no practical redress. In States where unions can be sued, there are so many restrictions, often a requirement that every individual member be served with summons that it is impractical. A provision making unions suable in Federal court as legal entities for breach of contract will be offered on the Senate floor. Outlawing of secondary boycotts and making unions suable for breach of contract will go far toward making them more responsible.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the very excellent statement in support of the British loan made by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on March 13 last.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Farm Bureau Federation, of which I am president, favors congressional approval of the British loan as set forth in the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom. The American Farm Bureau Federation represents approximately 1,000,000 farm families in 45 States. The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that it is good business, not only for the American farmer but for the entire Nation, to make this proposed loan to Britain. Our organization has vigorously supported efforts toward world cooperation. We believe that our interests can be served best under a system of expanding world trade. Not only is cooperation and an expanding trade important

from an economic standpoint but also from the standpoint of the over-all goal of peace among nations.

In this connection I should like to quote from our resolutions on international cooperation and leadership, and on international trade, which were adopted at the American Farm Bureau Federation annual meeting in December 1945:

"If this Nation is to make its maximum contribution in maintaining world peace and security, we must have a realistic foreign trade policy designed to expand the volume of international trade. Not only is foreign trade necessary for sound international relationship, but it is also essential in order to maintain a higher level of industrial activity and employment here at home. * * *

"We favor long-term capital loans to other nations of the world as a means of increasing the productive and consumptive capacities of the countries involved. Experience indicates that the countries with the higher standards of living are the best customers for American trade. Increased living standards through increased production in many countries of the world offer vast potential markets and opportunities for capital investment, to say nothing of the humanitarian aspects. We believe that in the main these loans should be on a sound business basis, and, to the largest practical extent, by private capital with Government supplementing only when private capital is not available. The lending of surplus capital to foreign nations can be a sound investment which not only promotes domestic business but also fulfills our position as a world monetary center. In addition to private business loans, we believe there are conditions, such as the present loan to England, under which the long-time interest of this Nation in promoting world trade, maintaining desirable forms of government, and promoting our best international interest can be furthered by making direct governmental loans."

On March 7, 1946, our board of directors, which is comprised of 22 agricultural leaders from all over the United States, again went on record favoring this loan to the United Kingdom.

I realize that many well-qualified witnesses have preceded me, so in my testimony today I am going to confine my remarks principally to why this loan to Britain is good business for the American farmer.

FOREIGN TRADE IS ESSENTIAL TO THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

If we are to prosper in this Nation, we must have foreign trade. During the war we expanded our agricultural and industrial production to record levels. Very soon we must face a grave domestic problem, namely, what we are to do with the expanded industrial plant which produced some ninety billion dollars' worth of goods annually for war. It must be obvious to everyone that we now have the capacity to produce far more of certain goods than the home market can possibly absorb. It is quite certain that much of our added plant capacity must lie idle unless we can develop new markets to replace the limitless markets which war activities created. (See statistical appendix.)

A very important consideration, often disregarded, is that the welfare of agriculture depends not only upon the opportunity to export our farm surpluses, but also upon the opportunity for American industry to export a substantial part of its production. That opportunity means additional jobs in manufacturing, and additional jobs in manufacturing means better domestic markets for meat and milk, fruits and vegetables, and countless other farm products. Many of us were astonished during the war by the volume of food that American workmen consumed as a result of higher standards of living which were made possible by higher wages and full employment. Many of the additional jobs created by war demands were filled by people from the farms. Those people, for the most part, will not go back to the farms. If they do not find opportunity for continued employment in industrial activities they will become a serious problem to the cities in which they live and to the Nation itself. Anything we can do to increase the number of industrial jobs will be in the long-time interest of agriculture. There is no question about it, we need the additional outlets for goods and commodities which will be possible under a policy which encourages the expansion of international trade.

Since the beginning of this Nation agricultural exports have flowed from this Nation to the United Kingdom and the nations of western Europe. Whenever this flow of agricultural products has been interfered with or checked, serious repercussions upon American agriculture and upon our entire economy resulted. This was clearly illustrated in the interwar period when loss of foreign markets contributed to a depressed agriculture which eventually affected our entire economy.

A serious contraction of trade with the United Kingdom and the sterling-area nations would result in the necessity of a sharp adjustment in the production and export pattern of certain major agricultural commodities in this country, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat. A reduction in the trade with the sterling-area countries would likewise necessitate a readjustment in the output of our manufactured products. This Nation has taken a positive position against world cartels and undue trade restrictions. This loan to Britain is essential as a forward step in eliminating these undesirable practices. (See statistical appendix.)

It is realized that our most important market is our market here at home. Nevertheless it must also be realized that the foreign market is basic to agriculture. In the decade before the war we exported 50 percent of our cotton, 31 percent of our tobacco, 18 percent of our lard, 16 percent of our rice, and 9 percent of our wheat. Millions of American farmers produce these products. Agriculture must have foreign outlets. (See statistical appendix.)

BRITAIN IS OUR BEST CUSTOMER FOR AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

In 1938 approximately 35 percent of our agricultural exports went to the United Kingdom. The last year before the war Britain bought the following proportion of our exports: 18 percent of our raw cotton, 21 percent of our corn, 31 percent of our wheat, 62 percent of our lard, 72 percent of our tobacco, 84 percent of our canned fruits, and 85 percent of our hams and shoulders. In light of this evidence I need not impress further upon you gentlemen that American agriculture has a very vital stake in seeing that Britain remains a good customer. As we all know, the British Isles is a deficit food-producing area. They must import food. During the years 1936–38, 27 percent of our total exports to all nations were made up of agricultural products. During this same period, 54 percent of our total exports to the United Kingdom were agricultural products. Thus, our exports to the United Kingdom were weighted twice as heavily of agricultural products as they were for the world at large. (See statistical appendix.)

Agriculture is vitally interested in world trade and all the contributions it can make to a sounder world economy. It is apparent, however, that if agriculture is to participate equitably in this expanded world trade, we must have access to the British market.

The sterling area during the prewar years accounted for approximately 40 percent of the international trade. Putting restrictions upon trade between this group of nations and ourselves would have significant repercussions upon our economy. Unless credit is advanced to the United Kingdom, Britain's only alternative is the placing of certain limitations upon trade with the nonsterling area. American agriculture cannot afford to have these restrictions on trade. (See statistical appendix.)

ONCE THE PATTERN OF TRADE IS SET UP IT IS DIFFICULT TO CHANGE

If we refuse to grant the loan to the United Kingdom and force Britain to turn to the sterling area for rehabilitation of her foreign-credit structure, we will likewise decrease our ability to trade freely with this group of nations. Once markets are established and production adjusted to these markets between nations it is more difficult to change the pattern. Therefore it is important that we work out a financial relationship which allows us to trade freely with this group, representing a large segment of the world's commerce, while postwar trade policies are still in the formulative stage.

We all know the difficulties experienced in trying to adjust trade barriers once they are established. We all know what happened following World War I when nation after nation erected unreasonable barriers to trade. These barriers brought stresses and strains which were undoubtedly one of the contributing factors to the horrible war we have just experienced. We have made untold efforts to lessen these barriers in order to promote a freer exchange of goods among the nations of the world. Certainly we are justified in making a loan which will lessen the likelihood of the creation of additional barriers and give an opportunity to bring about some basic changes desirable for the improvement of foreign trade.

What are some of the things that Britain agrees to do if this loan is made? Britain agrees to abolish the sterling-area dollar pool within 1 year after this loan is made. That means that the exporters of this Nation will have direct access to all the markets in the British Empire. They can trade directly with any of the countries where a market for their product can be found. It means that the purchase of products in this country will not be confined to certain commodities. This loan means that Britain can assume leadership with the United States in a program of expanding the volume of world trade. Such a program is of vital importance to every citizen of this Nation. It means that England can turn from the course of a restricted trade economy to more nearly her traditional position of free and competitive trade relationships. Under the terms of this loan, Britain agrees to administer her import quotas so as not to discriminate against imports from this Nation. It seems to me the fact that the loan places Britain in a position to cooperate with us in an expanded world economy and to assume due responsibility in bringing this about cannot be overestimated, especially since it is estimated that in the postwar world about three-fourths of the volume of world trade will be in dollars and pounds. This united leadership is imperative.

LEADERSHIP AS A FINANCIAL CENTER

This Nation finds itself in a position of world leadership as a monetary and financial center. If we are going to fulfill this position and obtain the greatest benefit from it, we must act accordingly. No one would argue but that New York City has benefited from being the financial center of this Nation. Likewise, there is no reason to argue that if we conduct our affairs properly, this Nation cannot benefit from being the financial center

of the world. A banker that won't loan money on a sound business basis cannot be a banker very long. Someone who will loan money will supplant him. If we are going to be the banker nation of the world, then we must be willing to make loans.

This Nation was developed by the aid of risk capital. May of our great railroads and industries were partially developed with capital furnished by foreign investors. Much of it came from Britain. Some of the investments were not successful, but in total they were and benefited both this Nation and the foreign investor.

One of the most prosperous and peaceful periods in English history occurred when England was making heavy foreign investments and operating under a relatively unrestricted trade policy. We now have the opportunity to fulfill a similar role in the development of capital-deficit countries. The supplying of this development capital, under proper leadership, can be of great benefit to ourselves and to the welfare of the people in the entire world.

In supporting this loan I would like to make it clear that it is not the intent of our organization that this Nation should grant loans to all who seek them. Each should be evaluated on the basis of its merits. There may be some loans that are clearly a good business proposition upon which a financial return on a strictly business basis can be expected. We believe that wherever possible loans should be made by private individuals and only supplemented by Government credit when private loans are not available. Likewise, we believe that in this particular case the Government is justified in making this loan to Britain, due to the extenuating circumstances involved and the many benefits to be had other than those involved in a strictly financial transaction. If the United States assumes its leadership, there is no reason why it is not in position to do what England did over a century ago in the way of becoming a world monetary center and a leader in world commerce. We have the greatest productive capacity of any nation of the world.

I would like to point out as forcibly as I know how that if this loan is to be repaid and if we are going to get anywhere or accomplish anything in expanding the volume of world trade, we must be willing to import goods into this country. The only sound way that we can export is to import. The only way that other nations of the world can buy goods from us is either by our extending them credit or by their sending us products in return. If we extend credit and then refuse to accept their products, naturally they cannot repay their loan. It is therefore essential that we develop a positive foreign trade program in respect to imports. The war clearly demonstrated that we needed imports. Imports, if properly handled, can contribute to our standard of living. There are too few people who realize that, after all, the standard of living of a nation is dependent upon the amount of goods available for distribution among its citizens. In the final analysis, the standard of living in the United States will be measured by the total production, minus what we export, plus what we import.

THE UNITED KINGDOM IS IN DESPERATE NEED OF CREDIT

The United Kingdom must have credit in order to rehabilitate her trade. During six long years of war Britain decreased her exports and increased her imports. This resulted in large obligations to the sterling-area countries. In 1944, British exports fell to 30 percent of those of prewar. In order that Britain may increase her exports again she must first import. In order to import, she must obtain credit. If the credit is obtained entirely within the sterling area, she must then export and import largely within this group. This rules out the full importation of products from this Nation.

Today, the United States finds itself in the position of a wholesaler whose best customer has had a fire. In this country, under such circumstances, it is not uncommon for the wholesaler to extend reasonable credit to his retail customer, in order to permit the customer to get on his feet and again become a good outlet for merchandise. This is what we are doing in this loan to Britain.

Gentlemen, we must not overlook Britain's role in the war: the period when she stood practically alone against the enemy, the longer period which she was at war compared to us, the proportion of her economy devoted totally to war production, and the loss of her homes and factories from bombing. She truly has been through the fire of war. We did not hesitate giving her lend-lease aid when our Nation's life was in jeopardy. Britain does not want dollars merely for the sake of having dollars. She wants dollars in order that she can buy food and other products she vitally needs in restoring her economy so that she can again produce exports with which to pay for the products she needs to import.

ALTERNATIVES IF LOAN IS NOT GRANTED

If this loan is not granted it does not mean the downfall of the British Empire, but it does mean great difficulties in the restoration of a desirable pattern of foreign trade. In order to buy from this Nation Britain must have dollar exchange. The only way she can obtain dollar exchange is either by selling us goods and services or by obtaining a loan. At the present time, due to the war she is not in position to furnish us goods and services to any extent. Therefore without the loan she will be short of dollars with which to buy our products. This will force her to freeze or ration the available dollar exchange. This means that she must continue the dollar pool instigated during the war as a means to control purchases from this Nation, in order to be sure of obtaining the most needed materials. It also means that she must expand the Empire-preference system which greatly handicapped our foreign trade, especially in agricultural products prior to the war. She must also establish agreements among various nations in order to expand her needed imports, even though these nations may not be the most economical source of supply. It is not a question of choice or what Britain wants to do if the loan is not made. It is simply a matter of necessity—of what she must do.

AMERICA MUST CHOOSE

We have just fought the most costly war in history—costly in terms of human lives, costly in terms of money, costly in terms of disruption to our economy and to our ways of life, to say nothing of the heartaches. The biggest advantage of winning a war is that it gives the victors an opportunity to shape the course of events. If we fail to shape them wisely, then perhaps in the final analysis we may actually have lost the war. The United States, this great Nation of ours, finds itself in a position of world leadership. We dare not default this leadership. We all desire world peace. We all want an expanding economy with an increasing standard of living, not only for ourselves but for all peoples of the world.

Our position of world leadership and the responsibilities of victory are very grave, and force us to make momentous decisions. We cannot overlook the long historic contribution of England to our Christian civilization. If this loan is not made it will greatly enhance the chances of trading blocs, frozen exchanges, cartels, trade restrictions, and the whole category of things that have in the past and will in the future lead to distrust, stifling of trade, and the lowering of living standards for many, many people. I view this loan to Britain as one of the necessary stepping stones in developing a brighter world of tomorrow.

Volume of agricultural production in the United States, 1909–45

[Index 1935-39=100]

Year	Total food products	Total agricultural products [1]
1909	76	79
1910	75	79
1911	78	83
1912	80	85
1913	78	81
1914	81	86
1915	84	86
1916	81	83
1917	82	86
1918	90	90
1919	90	91
1920	87	92
1921	84	83
1922	92	91
1923	95	94
1924	97	98
1925	93	97
1926	97	100
1927	97	98
1928	100	102
1929	97	99
1930	98	98
1931	100	102
1932	96	96
1933	97	96
1934	100	93
1935	93	91
1936	97	94
1937	101	106
1938	103	103
1939	106	106
1940	111	110
1941	115	113
1942	125	124
1943	132	128
1944	138	136
1945 [2]	135	130

[1] Includes in addition, other feed grains, hay, cotton, tobacco, hops, soybeans, flaxseed, wool, and mohair.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The National Food Situation, October 1942 and January 1946.

The total volume of agricultural production in 1945 was 30 percent above the prewar average and over 44 percent greater than the 1918 production. Favorable growing weather, improved farming methods, and hard work on the part of farm families have resulted in the greatest volume of agricultural production in our history.

Comparison of agricultural and industrial production and income during the depression

[1924–29=100]

Year	Industrial production [1]	Income from manufacturing [2]	Agricultural production [3]	Cash farm income [3]
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1924	86	90	99	94
1925	95	95	98	102
1926	101	100	101	98
1927	100	100	99	99
1928	104	104	103	102
1929	116	111	100	104
1930	96	98	99	83
1931	79	76	103	59
1932	61	53	97	44
1933	73	52	97	49
1934	79	64	94	59
1935	92	72	92	66
1936	108	87	95	77
1937	119	100	107	82
1938	94	73	104	71
1939	115	96	107	73
1940	132	111	111	77

[1] Federal Reserve Board index.
[2] Industrial Conference Board data.
[3] U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

In 1932 industrial production was 39 percent below the predepression average. Agricultural production was only 3 percent below. The incomes of each group were reduced very materially. For the 4-year period 1931–34, industrial production averaged 27 percent below the 1924–29 average, compared with only 2 percent below for agriculture.

Percentage of total United States production of wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, pork, and lard exported, by 10-year periods, 1900–1939

Period	Percent domestic exports are of total production of—					
	Wheat	Cotton	Tobacco	Rice	Pork [1]	Lard
1900–1909	21.9	67.1	35.4	7.4	10.0	34.8
1910–19	24.2	58.3	37.0	16.5	11.4	30.9
1920–29	26.1	56.6	38.8	27.2	6.9	34.8
1930–39	9.1	50.0	31.4	16.2	1.6	18.5
40-year average	20.6	57.6	35.6	18.4	7.2	29.8

[1] Excludes lard.

Source: Weighted averages for 10-year periods, calculated from Agricultural Statistics, 1942.

During the 1930's, approximately 50 percent of our cotton production, 9 percent of our wheat crop, and 31 percent of our tobacco was exported. For these three crops, a smaller proportion was exported than during any of the preceding decades. Wheat exports dropped from 26 to 9 percent of our production between the 1920's and the 1930's. At the beginning of the century, we exported nearly two-thirds of our cotton production.

Distribution of domestic agricultural exports of the United States, 1938

Country	Value	Percent of total
	Thousands of dollars	
United Kingdom	289,865	35
Canada	93,664	11
Japan	56,483	7
Netherlands	43,944	5
France	38,970	5
Germany and Austria	36,419	4
Belgium	33,239	4
Ireland	23,685	3
Italy	21,829	3
Cuba	20,999	3
Czechoslovakia	13,777	2
All other countries	154,672	18
Total, all countries	827,546	100

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1938, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Proportion of various domestic agricultural exports which went to the United Kingdom, 1938

Commodity:	*Percent*
Hams and shoulders	85
Canned fruits	84
Unmanufactured tobacco	72
Lard, including neutral	62
Fresh apples	38
Fresh oranges	35
Wheat (grain)	31
Corn (grain)	21
Unmanufactured cotton	18
All agricultural exports	35

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1938, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Distribution of total exports of the United States, 1936–38 average

Country or area	Value, 1936–38 average	Percent of total
United States exports, including reexports, total	*Mill. of dol.* 2,967	*Percent* 100.0
To—		
United Kingdom [1]	515	17.4
Canada [2]	462	15.6
U. S. S. R.	49	1.6
Near East and Africa	158	5.3
Far East, excluding Japan	316	10.7
Continental Europe, excluding U. S. S. R.	678	22.9
Japan	244	8.2
Latin America, including European colonies and Canal Zone	544	18.3
British Empire and Egypt	1,255	42.3

[1] Includes Ireland and Iceland.
[2] Includes Newfoundland and Labrador, Miquelon and St. Pierre Islands, and Greenland.

Source: Summary of Foreign Trade of the United States, Calendar Year 1941, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce, May 1944.

Jewish Homeland in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and scholarly address on the subject of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, delivered over radio station WOL by Hon. J. Howard McGrath on March 5, 1946. In the address will be found a summation of the legal rights of the Jewish race for a homeland in Palestine. It is a very splendid argument on the subject, and I recommend it very highly to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the cause of a Jewish homeland in Palestine:

I am speaking to you tonight from the studios of WOL in the Nation's Capital. It is with great regret that official duties arising at a late hour prevent me from being personally present at your great meeting in Madison Square Garden.

As the Solicitor General, I naturally like to look at the great problems of the world from the point of view of the legal rights and wrongs involved. Certainly the question of the resettlement of the Jewish race in Palestine is one of the greatest questions of the day and I propose to discuss it from the legal viewpoint.

From 1517 A. D. until World War I, Palestine was part of the Ottoman, or Turkish, Empire. On November 2, 1917, the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the British Government, Mr. Balfour, issued a declaration which has since come to be known as the Balfour Declaration: "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object." King Feisel, representing Arabia, concurred with this declaration and professed racial kinship with the Jews. He further promised, and I quote: "All necessary measures shall be taken to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale, and as quickly as possible, to settle Jewish emigrants on land through close settlement and intensive cultivation of the soil."

On September 21, 1922, the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States provided: "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

From 1917 to 1920 the Palestine area was under occupation and administered by the British military.

The peace conference in Paris in 1918 made the final status of Palestine a subject of Allied discussion in which the United States participated and evolved the theory of a mandatory system. The mandate, as understood by the Allied delegations at Paris and later drafted and adopted by the League of Nations and approved by the League Council and ultimately accepted by Great Britain, reads: "His Britannic Majesty has accepted the mandate in respect of Palestine and undertaken to exercise it on behalf of the League of Nations in conformity with the provisions thereof."

"Article Two: The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine irrespective of race and religion."

On July 24, 1923, a treaty of peace with Turkey was signed by nations which had been at war with her, including Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. Four other nations were asked to participate in the drafting of the treaty agreement. Included in these four nations was the United States of America, which was represented by Richard Washburn Child, the Honorable Joseph C. Grew, and Admiral Mark Bristol. This treaty provided in article 16:

"Turkey hereby renounces all rights and title whatsoever over or respecting the territories situated outside of frontiers laid down in the present treaty and the islands other than those over which her sovereignty is recognized by the said treaty, the future of these territories and islands being settled, or to be settled, by the parties concerned."

In a bilateral convention between the United States and Great Britain, signed at London on December 3, 1924, and ratified by both nations in 1925, we read:

"Whereas by the treaty of peace concluded with the Allied Powers Turkey renounces all her rights and titles over Palestine; and

"Whereas the principal Allied Powers have agreed to entrust a mandate for Palestine to His Britannic Majesty; and

"Whereas the terms of said mandate have been defined by the Council of the League of Nations, the Government of Great Britain and said powers favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

Article 7 of the Anglo-American convention states: "Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification unless the same shall have been assented to by the United States."

The foremost authorities on international law pointed out, as early as 1891, that since

the Jews never relinquished their title to Palestine, the general "law of dereliction" could not be applied to their case for they never abandoned the land. They made no treaty, they didn't even surrender. They simply succumbed, after the most desperate conflict, to the overwhelming power of the Romans, and were captured or enslaved. Since then they have disputed the possession of the land by continued protests. The forcible manner by which the Jewish nation has been kept out of the land with no means of redress is equivalent in principle to a continued state of war. As is evident from all international agreements, treaties, and conventions, Jewish title to Palestine was legally sound, and so attested by the Great Powers.

However, irrespective of all stipulations, international obligations, and agreements, the British Colonial Office has accepted a course of action which violates even the basic principles of human rights, let alone her solemn commitments, particularly in view of the recent most infamous carnage, which claimed one-third of the Jewish people.

We, the American people, should not abdicate our responsibility in accordance with the Anglo-American convention and other stipulations which I have cited earlier.

All of us in and out of government must do all that is in our power to help facilitate the needs of Jewry and the resurrection of the Jewish state within Palestine's historical boundaries. We are determined to erase the blot on our conscience left by the callous massacre of 6,000,000 Jews which could have been at least partially averted had Palestine not been hermetically sealed to escaping Jews.

It must be remembered that Palestine is a mandatory country, with Great Britain as the trustee, to further "the development of self-government" according to the mandate. Well, the Jewish nation has reached maturity. The gas factories of Europe, the crematories of Germany and Poland, plus 2,000 years of bondage, matured the survivors of this ancient people.

The time has come for the Jewish nation to reclaim Palestine.

Minimum Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *March 17, 1946.*
The Honorable FRANK HOOK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I should like to request a copy of the current minimum wage bill introduced into Congress by you and Senator PEPPER.

At the same time I should like to offer my strongest support of the measure. As a soldier I am well aware of the flood of stories, some true, some untrue, which reached us about high wages during the war. But it took a great many of us only a short while after returning to realize that, true or not true during the war, high wages are certainly not the average today. In fact, even a living wage is more rare than we ever supposed.

On the basis of a 40-hour week the average national wage of 40 cents per hour (from Drew Pearson's newspaper column of March 17, 1946), the average worker has a monthly income of $64; that is just $1 less than the monthly allotment of veterans returning to school under the GI bill of rights. Yet I know of no veteran here in school who even tries to live on the allotment alone. Alongside of this, it seems impossible for a worker to raise a family decently under current wage levels. Certainly it is high time for minimum wage legislation.

Along with this I should like also to support the continuance of the OPA with sufficient funds to work effectively to continue its fight against inflation. Once again Members of Congress would do well to deafen themselves to the pressure groups abounding in Washington and listen to the voting public to learn the real national sentiment about the OPA.

Very truly yours,
REX C. WILDER,
Benton Harbor, Mich.,
Member, American Veterans Committee.

Danger Ahead for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, an article by way of an editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star of recent date, entitled "Danger Ahead for United States," which I herewith submit for the approval of the Members and the people. Hon. Lindsay C. Warren is an outstanding public servant. He studies our position well, and he expresses his views without restraint. He is working for the very best interest of the people of our Nation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include with my remarks the editorial to which I referred, all of which may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to which I refer all Members and all of the people who desire to read the same. Said editorial is as follows:

DANGER AHEAD FOR UNITED STATES

It is reassuring to know that the Comptroller General of the United States is not asleep. The office was created in 1921 to provide an official "watch dog" of the Treasury. The Comptroller General checks the income and outgo of all departments and agencies and is accountable to Congress. He serves 15 years and is not eligible for reappointment.

Lindsay C. Warren, of North Carolina, incumbent, took over in November 1940. He has seen a lot of waste and extravagance and we have not heard much from him. War's emergencies, no doubt, stilled the demonstration that might have been expected from an alert "watch dog."

He realizes the time has come to growl and he explained, in an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Asheville, N. C., that he means business. It is fortunate that he is in earnest, is on the job, and appreciates what must be done, for he is in a position to do much.

The Comptroller General told his listeners he carries in his pocket this recipe: "Annual income 20 pounds, annual expenditure £19 19s. 6d., result happiness. Annual income 20 pounds, annual expenditures £20 0s. 6d., result misery."

"That homely truism Mr. Micawber gave David Copperfield nearly 100 years ago is just as appropriate today as it was then," Mr. Warren observed. "That recipe must be applied to the Nation."

He suggested five avenues as leading out of the financial morass in which the Nation finds itself. First, the Government must trim its sails and cut out waste. It must balance outgo with income. The Government must get 100 cents in value for every dollar it spends. Congress must exercise greater care in guarding against unusual grants of authority and expenditures.

And, lastly, Comptroller General Warren urges it is time to get back to State rights. Let the States assume the responsibilities and functions that should be theirs.

Danger is ahead if we continue as we are going. "The history of nations tends to show that when all power and authority have been concentrated in the central government the nation is ripe for regimentation and dictatorship," he warned. Mr. Warren started as a New Deal appointee. He has been in a key position to judge what is happening to us. When he sounds an alarm it is high time to stop, look, and listen.

California Newspaper Editor Praises Work of House Committee on Un-American Activities Under Chairman Wood, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have been interested and intrigued by the frequent attacks made upon our committee by Members of Congress from the west coast. I had almost come to believe that for some strange reason a substantial element among the better citizens of the Far West had decided that it was impossible for either fascism or communism, or any other form of subversive activity, to establish beachheads in America and that consequently it was just a waste of money to maintain eternal vigilance. I know now I was about to reach too hasty a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best edited and reliable newspapers in California is the Santa Maria Courier, the official newspaper of Santa Barbara County. In a recent edition of that paper which has come to my desk, I observed the following editorial which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point so that Members may know that California is not quite the "cuckoo land" which a prominent American magazine once described it as being.

Not everyone on the west coast believes that the best way to prevent fascism, communism, nazism, and other forms of un-Americanisms is to keep the shades down and the room dark so that nobody can find out what is going on inside. The Santa Maria Courier, among other papers, believes that the

Wood committee has done a commendable job in turning the spotlight on off-color organizations and in cooperating with the FBI and other Government intelligence agencies to prevent infiltration from becoming an invasion in this Republic.

I believe Members of Congress, generally, will find it refreshing and reassuring to read the following editorial from the Santa Maria Courier, of California:

THE LIGHT OF DAY

Two organizations in Washington which have been repeatedly smeared with pitch every time some of the arch-enemies of honest Americanism have turned around the last 10 or 12 years are the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee.

No law-abiding citizen dislikes or belittles an officer of the law. He knows a police officer is his friend and is there to protect his property and his personal safety.

Just put it down in your little old pipe and smoke it, that every time you hear someone trying to besmirch the FBI or the Un-American Activities Committee, they are either being led around by the nose by some ultra-liberal politican, or they are just not fully acquainted with the true work being done by these organizations.

The woods in the United States of America are full of sabotagers of our American way of living. They would have you think that the Nazi or the "Commie" mode for government is the only solution of all our troubles, and they would wreck everything we have in this country to put that program across.

In the end you would have anarchy, race and class hatreds, which might lead to even worse sadistic, insane, bestial slaughtering of innocent peoples than the horrible Jewish purge by Hitler. We want none of this type of philosophy in America.

Every time and place this raises its head, the Un-American Activities Committee takes a swat at it, like it would at a rattlesnake or cobra. Then the pink, punk, and Red Congressmen howl. You can spot every one of them with your eyes shut.

For years the FBI was hamstrung from lack of funds by unsympathetic administration officials. There was a persistent bloc in Congress which consistently endeavored to discredit the work of the FBI. They didn't like it and the things that were uncovered. They were afraid of it. It was not their friend, because it rattled the bones of skeletons in their closets.

During the war it was a little more unpopular to smear the FBI because of so-called patriotic reasons, but the honeymoon is over again.

In addition to their regular crime detection duties, the FBI agents from January 8, 1942, to the present recovered from the homes and businesses of aliens 307,506 rounds of ammunition and 4,626 firearms and related items.

In addition to the supplies of buckshot, shell caps, and reloading devices, the FBI seized 2,340 sticks of dynamite, over 2,800 dynamite caps, 3,787 feet of dynamite fuse, and over 1,700 pieces of other explosives.

More than 3,000 enemy-owned contraband shortwave radio receiving sets were uncovered, along with code books, hydrographic, navigation, and aeronautical maps of all sections of the United States coasts and Panama.

Next time you hear a Congressman or Senator smearing the FBI or the Un-American Activites Committee cock your head to one side and try to figure out just what they would personally like to keep covered up, that wouldn't stand the light of day.

It is certainly encouraging to learn that following a frothy attack on the Un-American Activities Committee by Communists, parlor pinks, alien agitators, fellow travelers, and giddy joiners of thinly disguised liberal-labeled organizations with subversive officials and purposes they received a definite set-back on their haunches within the past 2 weeks. It is said to have left their 10 or 15 spokesmen in the House and their congressional apologists decidedly red-faced, sullen, and defeated.

The Un-American Activities Committee was sustained in Congress by the overwhelming vote of 102 to 249.

Every California citizen and voter should make it a point to find out just how their Congressman voted on this matter.

It is the label by which their leaning can be determined.

OPA Official Answers Editorial Against Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial from a Henderson, Tex., newspaper and an answer to it by Mr. R. D. McCrum, of the district OPA office at Dallas, Tex. The editorial and the reply thereto discuss timely and important subjects, so I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOW HOME SHORTAGE KEPT ACUTE BY OPA

If there is one problem confronting Henderson, as well as the rest of the Nation today, it is that of homes. Everybody wants to build or make repairs, but no one apparently is able to make any substantial progress. Why? Local lumber dealers, members of the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, in a page advertisement in the Henderson Daily News Sunday, told some of the reasons in a frank discussion of the question.

In Washington, where OPA has had the misfortune to gather a lot of theorists without the fundamental knowledge of what is needed in the emergency confronting the building industry, certain regulations that retard rather than help home building are being enforced. No regard for the growing demand for homes is apparent in actions by these theorists, who seem to know as much about the needs of the hour as a 2-year-old knows about atomic energy.

Materials that are needed for supplying builders are blocked by OPA regulations. Manufacturers are finding it more profitable to export lumber to foreign countries than produce lumber for home consumption. The public no doubt would like to know why this is so. The lumber dealers want to help provide material for American homes but they find their hands tied.

What we as citizens can do is write or wire our Congressmen and Senators, urging that they start action to remedy this condition of affairs. We have the word of the National Lumber Dealers that they can supply material if OPA regulations are modified. Let's try and get these regulations modified.

We naturally know that in war days certain drastic steps were necessary. But the war is over. Regulations that were good for the war emergency do not fit the present-day demand. Whatever is blocking the free flow of materials from lumber dealers to the public should be removed, promptly and without red tape. Somebody, somewhere, must be given the authority. You get busy with your Congressman and your Senators.

Our local dealers are men of integrity and we can accept as correct the information they have given us. They want to help—we need their help.

DISTRICT INFORMATION BUILDING,
Dallas, Tex., March 13, 1946.

Mr. T. N. MCCARTY,
Business Manager, Henderson Daily News, Henderson, Tex.

DEAR MR. MCCARTY: I have read with much interest the editorial in the Henderson Daily News of March 10, titled "How Home Shortage Kept Acute by OPA." It is not often that a paper editorially endorses one of its paid advertisements; and it's still more rare for a paper to take issue with such revenue. The fact that the Nashville Tennesseean took the latter action in reference to one of these paid attacks by NAM probably balances the score.

Your editorial writer follows the lumber dealers' line with no regard whatever for the accuracy of the statements made. He states positively that the export of lumber to foreign countries is a large factor in shortage of lumber for home building. Since this presumably has reference to Henderson and its trade territory, it may be pertinent to ask how much east Texas lumber is going to foreign countries. Also, and still more pertinent, the vice president of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association was quoted in an AP dispatch on February 27 as saying any curtailment of lumber exports would not materially help home construction in the United States but would result only in unemployment for workers of tidewater mills of the Pacific Northwest. He also said criticism of these exports was not based on knowledge of the industry.

Here are the official production estimates for 1945:

	Board feet
United States production in 1945	27,000,000,000
Exports in 1945	375,000,000
	Percent
Percentage, export of production	1.36

While we were exporting 1.36 percent of our total production in 1945, imports into this country during the first 9 months, from such producing countries as Canada, were the equivalent of 3.37 percent of total 1945 domestic production. Less than one-half of 1 percent of construction sizes and grades of lumber is exported by the United States.

Your writer states that materials for building are blocked by OPA regulations. What regulations? Do you advocate abolishing ceiling prices on all building materials? If so, you should check on the many price increases granted on these materials; and you should also check on the promises of material producers to really produce if given price incentives. And when you have done that, check up on how these promises have been kept. I think you might consider the position of the Dallas Home Builders' Association, which promised that if all allocation restrictions were lifted houses would be built in record number and the housing shortage solved in 6 months. These restrictions were lifted last October, and the DHBA now admits that it was a mistake and is supporting the reimposition of those controls.

I have before me as I write a copy of the advertisement in question. The one unquestionable truth in it is that homes cannot be built without materials. But the statement that lifting price ceilings would immediately produce a flood of building materials is simply not true. You can examine the record for yourself. The price of many items of lumber has been more than doubled. If the lumber dealer's contention is correct, why is there any shortage of these items?

Of course, your dealers are men of integrity. No one disputes it. One of our local papers came to the defense of all retail dealers in challenging OPA to take action against

black marketeers who deprive the legitimate dealer of his materials by selling direct, at prices far above OPA ceilings. Yet, when OPA filed suit for more than $80,000 against one of the worst of the black marketeers neither of our papers would print a line of it.

The answer, Mr. McCarty, to the building material shortage is not as simple as your editorial and the lumber dealers would have the public believe. OPA is not the sole villain of the piece. On the contrary we who are very proud of OPA's battle for a stable economy would welcome any solution, even the abolition of price controls. I cannot believe you really agree that further inflation of home prices would be a good thing.

One other thing. The statement about OPA theorists who know nothing about the problems with which they deal is wearing a little thin. Your writer evidently does not know that men dealing with these problems are required to have experience in the business concerned. Specifically as to building materials, the man in this district charged with the responsibility of setting prices is John R. Darnell, 51 years old, whose entire business life has been in building materials. He was with the Burton Lumber Corporation for 25 years, in positions from bookkeeper to vice president. The law and our regulations provide that these prices are set only after conference with members of the industry; and this has been and is being followed to the letter and the spirit. These comments could apply, in general, to every person in OPA dealing with building-material pricing.

The retail lumber dealer has been hit hard, I know. It's not because OPA's pricing policies are "blind" or unrealistic. I also know that these policies are something less than perfect, but they are adjustable and are being adjusted wherever necessary. And, for the American people, I am convinced, such adjustments are far more desirable than the adjustments we took in 1921 and again in 1929.

Sincerely yours,

R. D. McCRUM,
District Information Executive.

Obstacles to Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am including an open letter to the President from the National Farmers Guild which was recently published by the Dayton Independent. I am also including short resolutions by the same organization:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HARRY TRUMAN,
President of the United States.

I see in today's paper that you are asking the citizens to eat less in order that we can give the hungry in Europe more, to prevent them from starving. A most humane idea, and it has the approval of all the members of the United Farmers of Illinois.

But on looking over the names of those you invited to attend your conference, I did not see a person's name who was a farmer, yet it is the farmers who feed the world.

What does Sheldon Clark of the Sinclair Oil Co. know about producing food? Nor do I think Justin Miller of the broadcasting company; George Gallup, who conducts polls, or Mrs. Anna Lord Strass, of the League of Women Voters, know much about this subject, and practically all the rest you have listed.

Do you remember that it was you and your party who had us dumb farmers kill 6,000,000 little pigs, 184,000 pregnant brood sows and had us plow under corn and cotton and fined us farmers for growing wheat? In case you have forgotten, call in your Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Henry Wallace; he may not have forgotten it.

If I am reading the facts, in the daily press, when the steel workers asked for more pay, you approved, and then permitted the steel corporation to increase the cost of steel $5 per ton, which will increase our cost of production, as this will be reflected in the price of every machine we buy to produce more food.

I note the packing-house workers asked for an increase, and you took over then the plants and granted the increase and then permitted the big packers to increase the price of meat 1½ cents per pound, which will increase the cost of living and help raise prices and produce inflation, if it is prices that cause inflation.

Of course I understand it is the extra $25,000,000,000 of the privately owned Federal Reserve bank notes that has been put into circulation, as a result of high Government spending that is what is causing us to have inflation and if I am correct, these Federal Reserve bank notes are in violation of the Constitution of these United States, which reads: That Congress shall have the right to coin money and regulate its value. Being a former Senator, you will no doubt correct me, if I am in error.

Your OPA has definitely stated, according to the press reports, that farm prices must not nor will they be permitted to be increased. Who then is going to absorb the increased costs for us farmers? The OPA has also threatened to roll back the cost of cotton from 24 to 20 cents that the farmer is receiving, while his cost of production is increasing. The cotton farmer is only now receiving 24 cents an hour for his labor, yet you have written upon the statutes that 60 cents shall be a minimum price labor shall receive and you are recommending that it should be increased to 75 cents per hour, but your OPA wants to lower the cotton farmers wages to 20 cents per hour.

Our organization met with the Farmers Vigilante Committee of Nebraska recently and we are considering taking a leaf from the notebook of labor and industry and also strike for more money. We are also considering of cutting production—like you taught us, with the pig killing and wheat fines, until we produce only enough food for our own consumption, until you and Congress see to it that we get a price that will cover our cost of production plus a little profit.

I hope your action will not drive us to do the things we would much rather not do, but self-preservation is the first law of nature.

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR H. BOOTH,
Secretary-Treasurer, United Farmers of Illinois, Sandoval, Ill.

WHAT SOME FARMERS THINK

The following resolutions were passed and the following telegram was sent to Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, by the United Farmers of Illinois:

"Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON:

"We, the farmers of Illinois, in response to the demand for more food to feed the hungry, realizing the need thereof for this laudable enterprise and a desire to assist, yet as long as our prices are below our cost of production, the more we produce, the lower becomes our own economic status. Until we have an opportunity to secure adequate equipment and receive a price, that will enable us to pay a comparable wage with industry, in order to secure the needed labor to accomplish the task, we find it necessary in self preservation, to consider costs rather than volume.

"LOUIS KLENKE,
"President.
"EDWARDSVILLE, ILL.
"ARTHUR H. BOOTH,
"Secretary.
"SANDOVAL, ILL."

"We demand that the Congress stop any further appropriations for the continuation of the OPA. That Congress also recapture its constitutional prerogative to coin money and regulate its value, thus ending the issuance of money by the privately-owned Federal Reserve Banking System as a violation of the Constitution, and the cause of our present inflation.

"We condemn the so-called Roland plan which has for its purpose, regimentation of agriculture by an excise tax of 30 percent on all farm products sold.

"We demand that Congress stop any further increase in the public debt, by curtailing appropriations, as now there is a mortgage of over $21,000.00 levied upon the average farm family in the Nation.

"We condemn the present Illinois Soil Conservation Act, as un-American and socialized farming, such as practiced in Germany, Russia and Japan.

"We also demand that our Representatives in Congress, use their good office to pass the Pace bill and the Lemke Cost of Production bill now pending before it.

"Did this 12th day of March 1946, at Nameoki, Ill.

"ARTHUR H. BOOTH,
"Secretary-Treasurer.
"SANDOVAL, ILL."

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorials:

[From the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., of March 11, 1946]

"STREAMLINING" CONGRESS

In recent weeks, the country has been bombarded with many suggestions all adding up to the opinion that our Federal Congress, in form and function, is weatherbeaten, worn, obsolete, and therefore needs repairs.

The device intended to be applied has been referred to as "streamlining." The inference to be drawn is that, with this bit of reconstruction attended to, all will be well, and procedures thereafter will be sound, wholesome and thoroughly American. In short, heaven-bound.

What Congress primarily needs is a decisive majority membership that knows congressional prerogatives and functions within the framework of an ample Federal Constitution, and will exercise them as Congressmen, not rubber stamps.

"Streamline" advocates would reduce the number of standing committees, abolishing all seniority rights. They could "load" such committees as are left with members deliberately committed to the dictates of minority pressure groups.

Some 25 years ago, a number of House committees were merged into a single appropriations committee. This committee

has become under the New Deal, the most gigantic spender in all human history.

There is no doubt that the existing structure needs reemphasis of appropriations and personnel allocations. For instance, a much larger staff or research experts is needed to keep the committees supplied with information gleaned elsewhere than the columns of the Washington morning dailies, or via the breakfast table commentator.

Big business and big labor have more extensive survey facilities than Congress, which is called upon to dispense the public funds. It is apparent that dispensations would not often be so large if Congressmen were supplied with all the facts rather than selected facts thrust upon them by special-interest groups pleading a case.

It is apparent, too, that an eventual saving would be effected in our Government by increasing the salaries of Congressmen. A man cannot spend a life wholly in promoting the public good when he finds it necessary to spend part of his time running a private job to keep his two residences and many expenses under control. Congressmen have no social security, and often retire or die broke.

In these important instances lie the chief weaknesses of our Congress today. Radical revision of committee structures is of secondary consideration.

Let Congress, for the first time since 1932, begin to behave itself as a Congress should. Let it legislate for all the people, not the segments. Let it quit abdicating to a grasping executive branch, only to discover its impotency when moved to restore those lost powers by a veto-overriding two-thirds vote.

Let it find out in advance what our foreign commitments are, instead of groping like Alice in Wonderland, only to wake up with a shock when it discovers that the President had made a deal which only Congress had the right to do. Let it bring back, then everlastingly safeguard, its constitutional right to declare war and establish peace, once a war is won.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal of March 5, 1946]

FOR AN EFFICIENT CONGRESS

The La Follette-Monroney report for streamlining Congress is a truly admirable survey of the mechanical troubles besetting our national legislative body along with recommendations for their correction. It is a sad commentary that nobody, within or without Congress, expects the proposals to be adopted.

Certain features of the report, of course, will meet with instant approval on Capitol Hill. Salaries would be raised from $10,000 to $15,000, and an administrative executive would be provided for each Congressman at $8,000 a year. This latter would free the Congressman of much of the detail work with which he now is burdened.

Congressional research staffs would be enlarged and strengthened to make Congress less dependent upon the naturally biased reports of administrative agencies. And Congressmen would be permitted to join in the Federal retirement system by contributing part of their pay to the fund.

But the entire program might founder on recommendations that the committee system—worst bottleneck and biggest handicap to efficient action—be modified. The report urges that the 33 standing committees in the Senate be reduced to 16, and 48 in the House to 18. Moreover, it suggests that each Congressman be limited to membership on two committees; some Senators now serve on 10, and Representatives on 6. Obviously, no person can keep alert to so many matters at the same time.

A sinner always finds it hard to reform when the wages of sin are not death, but power and influence. A committee chairman wields considerable influence not only over legislation, but also in the executive branch of the Government. What head of an executive agency can afford to say "no" to favors asked by the chairman of a committee which will pass on legislation dear to the heart of the agency?

Also, the voters back home are impressed when their Senator or Representative holds a chairmanship. And, although there are only 81 chairmen of standing committees in Congress, there are 162 other Members, or even 243, who see a chairmanship not far ahead of them in the future, if the gods and the voters are kind.

It is to the credit of the La Follette-Monroney committee that while it did not seek out unpopular causes in its report—seniority and the filibuster were mentioned without comment—it did take issue with the most important problem faced in renovating Congress. For the report states unequivocally, "No adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganized its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure."

Cut Spending, Not Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of March 18, 1946:

CUT SPENDING, NOT TAXES

Most of us who have to pay Federal income taxes did some grousing during the paperwork period that ended Friday. But most of us, according to the Gallup poll, don't believe we got soaked too hard.

Dr. Gallup's agents have been sampling opinion among income-tax payers. They report that 62 percent of those with opinions on the subject think the present tax rates are fair. However, they say sentiment has shifted decidedly since the war ended. Two years ago, 90 percent of the taxpayers thought the rates were fair; a year ago, 85 percent.

This change, the doctor observes, is likely to mean that Congress will be under greater pressure for further tax reduction this year than in any recent year, and that the issue will get hot in the November congressional elections. We don't doubt it. Tax cutting is a time-tested method of corralling votes.

But we hope Congress will not yield to such pressure.

An honestly balanced Federal budget, and a real start toward trimming our gigantic national debt, would be wiser and better for all of us than another reduction in our income-tax rates. In the not-so-long run, it would save money for all of us. It would begin immediately to remove one of the most dangerous causes of inflation—the Government's deficit spending, which is priming an over-primed pump.

This is no time to cut Government revenues.

But it is the time to cut Government spending for nonessential activities much more deeply than President Truman has proposed. It is the time to hold down and prune back the growth of departments and agencies. It is the time to give income-tax payers firm assurance that their money will not be squandered.

If that is done, we believe most of them will continue to think the present tax rates are fair.

Editor Urges Senate To Restore Premium Payments to Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said pro and con about the necessity for using premium payments to secure increased production of building materials we must have if we are to provide adequate houses for veterans. The March 5 issue of the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot contains as clear an explanation of this premium-payment plan as has been published. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include the editorial from this progressive newspaper for the information of the Members of Congress:

HOUSING SUBSIDIES

The administration's housing program suffered a severe blow yesterday when the House rejected the section of the Patman housing bill calling for $600,000,000 of what Housing Expeditor Wyatt calls premiums, another name for subsidies, to producers of construction materials. President Truman sent a special letter supporting the subsidy plan to the Speaker of the House last week. In a Sunday statement Mr. Wyatt asserted that it is the "heart of the whole housing program." Without it, he warned, there will be a failure to produce "anything like the volume" of materials required to reach the housing goal.

Critics of the premiums proposal can make out a strong case in principle. Subsidies are in general a form of economic opiate by which the Government temporarily "cures" economic ills—at a deferred heavy cost to the taxpayer. The administration has developed a habit of turning to them as an easy way out of pressing difficulties—as it currently is doing in regard to food prices, using subsidies to hold down prices while permitting wage increases which boost costs. But the subsidies Mr. Wyatt and President Truman are urging are of a somewhat different type and are justified under conditions in the housing field.

Mr. Wyatt and President Truman are talking about subsidies to be paid, not to all producers of the materials now in shortage but to the high-cost producers who cannot operate effectively under existing price ceilings. These are the marginal producers who, if there were no shortages, would be pushed out of the markets by the more efficient producers. It is a question, as Representative MONRONEY has put it, of paying them sufficient subsidies to give them a profit margin to get additional production in a period of acute need for just that. The proposed premiums, in brief, are comparable to those paid during the war to high-cost producers of strategic metals like copper.

The alternative is to give way on the price line for all the producers—which would mean that the low-cost manufacturers would get unduly large profits and the prices that would have to be charged for all new housing units would rise. The subsidy plan offers a means of giving both the subsidized and nonsubsidized producers a normal rate of profit while price ceilings are maintained. If the House does not reconsider its hasty action yesterday, put over by a Republican-southern Democrat coalition, it will be the duty of the Senate to restore the key subsidy plan to the bid as a whole.

Ship Sales Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Journal of Commerce for March 20, 1946:

PRESIDENT DEFENDS SHIP DISPOSAL ACT—ADMITS FLAWS BUT SAYS SITUATION CALLED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

WASHINGTON, March 19.—President Truman was aware of the flaws in the ship sales bill as he signed the measure but under present conditions he reasons that "all we can do is to take the best we can get and try to make it work, just as we tried to make an impossible surplus property sales bill work."

The President's views on the Merchant Ship Sales Act were made known to Representative WIGGLESWORTH (Republican, Massachusetts), a critic of the legislation. In inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of correspondence with the President, the Massachusetts Republican called attention to the specific objections to the legislation which he voiced in the House prior to its passage.

FEARED YEAR'S DELAY

Expressing appreciation for Representative WIGGLESWORTH'S comments on the legislation in a letter dated March 7, the President in a reply, dated March 11, said in part:

"The legislation, of course, has provisions that maybe are not ideal, but this bill has been so long delayed and the necessity for the disposal of our surplus merchant marine equipment in some manner is so great that I felt it was better to sign the bill than to wait probably another year to get a better one.

"This legislation should have been on the law book previous to VE-day but for some reason or other the committee never could reach an agreement on the sort of a bill necessary to be passed. I regret this very much but it seems under present conditions all we can do is to take the best we can get and try to make it work, just as we tried to make an impossible surplus property sales bill work."

Chairman WIGGLESWORTH had called attention to the recent finding by the Comptroller General that over $5,822,000,000 had been improperly accounted for by WSA and the Maritime Commission. He added that the situation has been "so bad as to call imperatively for a thorough accounting and audit by the Comptroller General and for thorough internal reorganization."

Nathaniel Leverone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago a Member of the House made reference to a certain group called the National Association for Christian Leadership and spoke rather ungenerously of one of the leaders of this organization, namely, Mr. Nathaniel Leverone, of Chicago.

I have had some acquaintance with the work of this association and have attended a number of its meetings. The observations which were made on the floor of the House a few weeks ago prompted me to look even more closely at this organization and its objectives and I became even more deeply impressed with its work and with its purposes.

It is composed principally of businessmen and men in public life. It embraces people of every faith and creed. It is a group that has sought to appraise the problems of the world and of our own country impartially and unselfishly and to seek a remedy for the ferment, the unrest, the bewilderment that exists in the world today. It is devoting itself to a return to religion, to a revitalization of faith, to the application of spiritual values to our problems, and to a recapture of those values which are so indispensable to a reordering of the world and the achievement of peace both in the world and at home. Never has there been a need for such unselfish service as that to which the National Association for Christian Leadership has been devoting its efforts and resources.

One of the leaders of this group is Mr. Nathaniel Leverone, of Chicago. He is an outstanding businessman who is held in highest esteem in his community, his State, and in the Nation. For years Mr. Leverone has given so freely of his time, his vast talent, and his resources to this work and to a host of other philanthropic endeavors. He served so long and faithfully as president of the Goodwill Industries in the interest of the underprivileged. He served as president of a group known as Common Ground and in that capacity became so well and widely known for his philanthropies.

Even in the field of unselfish and unrewarded public service his name stands high. During the war he headed the Conservation Division of the War Production Board for the State of Illinois and under his skillful direction the conservation drives for materials of all kinds that were so essential to the war effort achieved a monumental success. He served as a member of the State Appeal Board under the Selective Service System and performed a notable work. He was also designated as the head of the Air Corps Recruiting Division for Illinois and the results achieved speak so eloquently of his labors in this field.

I have known Nathaniel Leverone intimately for a great many years and can testify not only to his patriotic and unselfish devotion to his country and his interest in the well-being of his fellow men but also to the high esteem in which he is universally held. This Nation can in truth and in fact be grateful for men like Nathaniel Leverone who so clearly perceive the problems of the day and then so willingly and unselfishly devote themselves to those spiritual and moral endeavors wherein we may find the only true and enduring remedy for our difficulties. Because of this I felt quite distressed over the thoughtless and unwarranted observations which were made some weeks ago on the floor of this body by one of our colleagues.

Helena (Mont.) Aerie No. 16 Accords Recognition to Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me by the House, I am happy to include with my remarks a copy of a resolution passed by the Helena Aerie No. 16 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. This great organization is to be commended for its foresight in according recognition to an outstanding leader and also for the principles which both he and it believed in. This resolution gives due cognizance to a great President, a man who believed in the people and who showed by his administration that the welfare of the people was always uppermost in his mind. A magnificent leader is gone but a great people and a great fraternal organization, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, will always remember him and his accomplishments.

"FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES,
"HELENA AERIE NO. 16,
"Helena, Mont.

"Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States from March 4, 1933, until his untimely death on April 12, 1945, having been elected to four successive terms, and having become the first American President honored by his fellow citizens with more than the traditional two terms; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt assumed office during the depression, one of the great domestic crises in the Nation's history, and by wise, courageous, and humanitarian leadership restored confidence and faith in America; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt championed the cause of the workingmen of America and ushered in a new era of consideration for the rights of labor and the common man; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt espoused and signed the National Social Security Act, generally recognized as the greatest social measure in American history, climaxing a 14-year educational campaign by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in behalf of State and Federal old-age-security legislation; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt awakened our Nation to the menace of fascism to our free institutions and our very existence as a free people, and led America and its allies, the United Nations, in the mightiest world struggle for human freedom, culminating in the unconditional surrender of Germany and in decisive victories over Japan; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt charted a course for preventing future wars, by means of a permanent world peace organization, economic cooperation, and international good will, thereby embodying during the most critical period in modern history the hopes, the aspirations, and the ideals of his fellow

countrymen, and the oppressed peoples of the entire world; and

"Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt is assured an immortal place in world history, and will earn the gratitude of American generations yet to come, and the esteem and affection of free peoples in all lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Helena Aerie, No. 16, Fraternal Order of Eagles, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate January 30, the birth date of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday.

"Respectfully submitted.

"FRANK MURRAY,
"MURDOCK F. MCRAE,
"HENRY LOBLE,
"Resolution Committee, Helena Aerie, No. 16."

The above is a true copy of resolution adopted by Helena Aerie, No. 16, Fraternal Order of Eagles, at their regular meeting, the 8th day of March 1946.

Attest:

E. J. NEVILL, *Secretary.*

Editorial Says Congressional Action Only Hope in Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the grass roots of the country there is coming an increasing demand that Congress do something creative toward supplying the need for veterans' housing.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include an editorial. It is typical of the expression of the people. It comes from one of the able newspapers of the Midwest, the Hamilton (Ohio) Journal-News:

EMERGENCY HOUSING

The emergency housing bill fostered by Congressman PATMAN, which is now before Congress, represents the hope of the American people for low-cost housing. It also represents the answer of the American people to the returning veterans who can find no suitable places to live in a price range they can afford to pay.

Opposition has developed to the placing of ceilings on all housing, new and old. Opposition to this proposal has come from all kinds of special-interest groups. But if ceilings are not placed on housing, there will be no need to increase production of housing. The prices will be far beyond the amount of money the average individual can pay.

Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt has placed great emphasis upon the passage of this legislation. The President in his letter to Speaker RAYBURN made a special plea for subsidies and price ceilings on all houses. If Congressman PATMAN'S bill fails to be passed in its entirety, the shortage of low-cost housing will continue unabated.

If, as JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, says, "all of us want more houses, but there is a difference of opinion as to how we should go about it," it would be wise for the Representatives to resolve their differences of opinion and do something creative toward supplying these wants. A substitute bill which would eliminate both price ceilings and subsidies certainly is not the answer.

Congress Asked To Face Housing Issue Squarely—Boston Herald Urges Speed in Passage of Patman Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 15, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, legislation designed to speed the President's housing program has now been before the Congress since November 20, 1945. Full and extended hearings have been held on it, but the House saw fit to eliminate two of its most important provisions: One to hold down speculation in real estate, and the other to spur production of sorely needed building materials. Newspapers over the country are becoming restive over the fact that the legislation is still going through legislative channels.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include an editorial from one of the most responsible newspapers of New England—the Boston, Mass., Herald—which points up this problem in strong terms:

HOUSING A NECESSITY

To every veteran and nonveteran who has tried to rent an apartment or a house in the last year or two, or, if he is even bolder, attempted to build a new home, the housing problem is at least as important as the nylon scarcity. Doubling up, to which many families and their in-laws have been compelled to resort, is harmless as a temporary device. But one dislikes to think what the effect of its indefinite continuance will be on young married couples and their hopes for children and an independent family life. Thus Congress must realize that it is dealing with no theoretical problem, but with a factual situation of immediate concern to many of our people.

The basic point at issue is how two or three million new homes can be built without inflating their prices beyond the reach of most young veterans. In its housing bill the administration undertook to do this through the authorization of a $600,000,000 subsidy, to be paid to building material manufacturers and others in lieu of raising OPA ceilings. This, in President Truman's opinion, was the heart of the bill. It was also the most questionable part of it, for it extended the dangerous subsidy principle into another section of our economy.

The House of Representatives, through a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans, removed the subsidy and in its stead gave the Housing Expediter, Mr. Wyatt, authority to set prices on building materials through the OPA. Opponents of the original bill maintain that Mr. Wyatt can raise prices to levels sufficient to induce greater production of lumber and other needed materials, and then hold the line. Priorities by Presidential order would restrict allocation of such materials to residential building. The amended bill would also place ceiling prices on all houses built under the program, to prevent speculation in their sale and resale.

Neither the subsidy scheme nor the lifted-ceiling plan is ideal. Both are admittedly expediencies, with possibly injurious results unless rigidly controlled. But the essential thing is that the Senate and House agree on the matter as soon as possible and get the actual building under way. Representative PATMAN, of Texas, who sponsored the bill in the House and who stubbornly fought the many changes made in it before it was passed, regards the House measure as at least "a long and substantial step in the right direction." The Senate should take the remaining steps quickly. There are people waiting, virtually on the doorsteps, of these new houses now.

Amvets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call to the attention of the Congress an article that appeared in an Army newspaper, concerning the Amvets—American Veterans of World War II.

Amvets is the largest veterans organization that has come out of this war. Here is their program aims and achievements:

[From Service Stripe, Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C., of March 16, 1946]

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II BACK IDEAS WITH ACTION

American Veterans of World War II, tabbed as Amvets, unequivocally believes in the American way. It backs its convictions with a challenge and perpetuates its ideas with action.

Established at a meeting in Kansas City, Mo., on December 9–10, 1944, through the merger of independent veterans groups from every section of the Nation, Amvets derived its first nucleus from a united will to preserve the rights for which its members had fought on the battlefields of the world.

Inspired by youthful and courageous leaders, the group held its first official Amvet convention in October of 1945, and there elected to its command Jack W. Hardy, a Los Angeles attorney, and set forth through a constitution its resolve to preserve the rights of free men in a free society and to enhance the possibility of postwar success by reiterating in its preamble the basic truths which 170 years ago were held to be inalienable and self-evident.

At the 1945 convention the delegates unanimously proclaimed they would "safeguard the principles of freedom, liberty, and justice for all" and would "promote the cause of perpetual peace and good will among nations" and would "maintain inviolate the freedom of our country" and pledged "to dedicate ourselves to the cause of mutual assistance."

The record stands:

1. National leaders of the Amvets first suggested that a GI delegate sit on the United States committee appointed to attend the San Francisco United Nations Conference. The State Department followed with the subsequent appointment of Comdr. Harold Stassen and the statement that: Commander Stassen "will fully represent the point of view of men who have been serving overseas."

2. Following charges by an Amvet leader, corporations and individuals representing 75 percent of the total volume of business in the artificial-limb industry were indicted by a District grand jury for conspiracy to fix high and unreasonable prices for the sale

of artificial limbs to veterans. The indictment charged violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

3. Consequential to an Amvet official's penwaged fight through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Gen. Omar Bradley, chief of the Veterans' Administration, won a "new deal" in medical care for veterans. The victory was consummated when President Truman signed a bill authorizing an independent, nonmilitary medical corps for the Veterans' Administration.

4. The legislative representative of Amvets led the battle to provide mail courses and hospital schooling for tubercular and other World War II veterans hospitalized for protracted periods of time.

5. As a result of pressure brought to bear through congressional channels by the Amvet's legislative representative, J. H. Leib, the application form for hospital treatment or domiciliary care for veterans was cut from four pages to one and one-quarter pages. Throughout, the form was streamlined, giving the veteran a better deal.

6. It was following a vigorous and scorching campaign by an Amvet leader that General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, was removed and the appointment of General Bradley brought about.

7. An Amvet leader started the long argument which resulted in the proposed change of the Navy uniform. His investigation revealed that the black neckerchief which sailors drape about their necks represented a continuous mourning for Lord Nelson, hero of the British Navy. The 13 trouser buttons commemorate the Thirteen Original Colonies, while the three white collar stripes were for the three sea victories of Lord Nelson.

8. The efforts of an Amvet leader launched the campaign to pay lump insurance sums. General Bradley is now in back of the plan and legislation is now being initiated.

9. Amvet posts throughout the Nation have backed campaigns to give veterans a chance to buy surplus Government housing property. In Washington, D. C., the organization's national headquarters site, an Amvet group has submitted a bid for McLean Gardens, an $11,000,000 Government tract.

10. The national legislative director of Amvets started the initial discussion and action advocating the building of a veterans' medical center in the capital. Following a letter the national legislative director had sent to President Truman, General Bradley endorsed the plan and the Veterans' Administration is now conducting site surveys.

And the record continues as evidence of the vigilance of leaders of an organization determined to abide by its slogan, "We fought together, now let us build together."

Culminating a 2-day national executive committee and State commanders' session in the National Capital February 23–24, 1946, the body again faced the current issues at hand and resolved to continue to wage its home-front campaign to preserve the democratic function and democratic rights of man and to stand stalwartly against fascism and communism.

The committee pledged to continue its insistence that bona fide World War II combat veterans be appointed to the United States United Nations delegation; to ask for the maintenance of price controls until such a time as supply meets demand, and to ask the State Department to make its foreign policy clear to the Nation.

Amvets, in cadence with the times, has as its third vice commander a woman Marine Corps veteran, and is organizing auxiliary posts in every State.

Each of the many hundreds of Amvet posts throughout the Nation is a rampart of the way of life to which American soldiers were dedicated during World War II and is pledged to a course neither prolabor nor antilabor—but proveteran.

Answering Attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a radio address which I expect to deliver tonight over Station WMAL answering attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The matter referred to follows:

My fellow Americans, in obedience to what I consider a duty to my country, I have come tonight to speak to you in terms you can all understand on some of the most vital questions that ever affected our national welfare. Questions that rise high above the scramble for party vantage or the noisy clamor of men for place and power. Questions that vitally affect the welfare of every individual under the American flag. Questions that will affect the welfare of our children for generations to come.

For fear that you did not get my name, I repeat it. This is JOHN RANKIN, a Member of Congress from Mississippi, chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and the ranking member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the man you have heard maligned, misrepresented, and abused in broken English for the last several years. I am speaking to you from the Nation's Capital at Washington.

I will not take time to answer those smear attacks that have been made on me over this network, or elsewhere. There is no other man in public life today who has been smeared, misrepresented, and abused by the enemies of our country and their fellow-travelers more than I have over the radio, in the press, magazines, books, and cartoons. Why is this? Why do these subversive elements and individuals center their attacks on me? I'll tell you why. It is because I have stood my ground, refused to be intimidated by them, and continued to expose their subversive designs. As I said, I'll not attempt to answer those personal attacks on me at this time. Most of them are so flagrant that they answer themselves. The American people are getting wise to the loathsome tactics of these enemies within our gates.

But I do propose to answer some of the attacks that are now being made against the Committee on Un-American Activities, a standing committee of the American Congress on which I have the honor to serve.

On the opening day of the present Congress, I secured the adoption of an amendment to the rules of the House of Representatives creating the Committee on Un-American Activities, with the power to investigate, subpena witnesses and administer oaths, as well as the power to report legislation. Why did I take such a step? I did it for the safety of my country, which was being betrayed by its enemies at home while our brave young men were fighting and dying all over the world to protect it from our enemies abroad.

That committee is the watch dog of American institutions. It is the sentinel on the housetop, if you please, endeavoring to protect our country from destruction at the hands of the disloyal elements within our gates.

It has been very careful, and its investigators have been very careful not to trespass upon the rights of patriotic Americans, or anyone else who is not engaged in subversive activities. Let me say now, with all the emphasis at my command, that no patriotic American need fear the Committee on Un-American Activities; and I might add, that no patriotic American need fear the FBI, or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And, in my opinion, no well-informed patriotic American does fear them.

But there is an element in this country, many of whom have flooded in here in violation of our immigration laws, who are scheming in every possible way to undermine and destroy our form of government, as well as our American way of life, who do fear both this Committee on Un-American Activities and the FBI; and their fears are well founded, for we are on their trails. That is the reason for these attacks on us.

They are aided and abetted by a few native Communists, crackpots, parlor pinks, foreign spies, fifth columnists, and fellow travelers who parade as real Americans, but whose activities will not stand the light of honest investigation. They want the Committee on Un-American Activities abolished and the FBI destroyed.

Why? Why do they object to having their activities investigated? In the words of Holy Writ they prefer darkness to light "because their deeds are evil."

Did you ever hear of a time when the burglars, the bootleggers, the thieves, and other outlaws and their sympathizers did not want the grand jury abolished? Well, this Committee on Un-American Activities is the grand jury of the United States, and those un-American elements, that use mysterious ways their perfidy to perform, are anxious to see it abolished. It is being attacked by every Fascist element and every Communist front organization in America. Remember that fascism or nazism and communism are merely symptoms of the same disease. One is the fever and the other is the chill of a dying civilization. They are all out to overthrow this Government.

The head of the Communist Party in testifying before the Committee on Un-American Activities recently admitted on oath to making the following statement—listen to this—here is what he said:

"No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads a government of the United States (and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises), that government will not be a capitalistic government, but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

What do they mean by a capitalistic government? What do they mean when they say they are out to destroy capitalism?

What they mean by the capitalistic system is our economic system, that enables a man to own his home, his farm, his store, his factory, or his filling station. In other words, these Communists want to destroy our system of free enterprise and to set up in its place a Soviet system where everyone would simply be a slave of the state, or the servant of a set of self-appointed commissars.

They want to destroy our form of government, our system of free enterprise, our individual freedom and set up a system of slavery, the like of which this country has never seen. Remember it was our system of free enterprise that provided the materials to win this war; and it was the courage and daring of our American boys that brought about the victory.

Communism is based upon hatred for Christianity. The two can never live together in the same atmosphere. The conflict is now on, testing whether our Christian civilization is to survive, or whether atheistic communism is to sweep us back into the dark ages of the pre-Christian era, and wipe out

the most glorious civilization mankind has ever known.

Do not deceive yourselves. We must take our choice between those two ideologies.

My choice is already made. I prefer our Christian civilization with its system of free government, human liberty, and hope of a hereafter.

These are the things the Communists are out to destroy.

When you get after them they either whine anti-Semitism or cry persecution or racial bias; yet they have their agents and fellow travelers going all over the country stirring up race trouble between the white and colored people. Look what they are doing today in Columbia, Tenn. They did the same thing in Detroit, Mich. They are the worst enemies the Negro ever had. What do they care how many Negroes, or how many white Americans, get killed if it will help them to stir up trouble and promote their efforts to change this country from a free Christian republic to an atheistic Karl Marx dictatorship? I have before me a booklet they are circulating, entitled "The Negro in Soviet America." They are telling the Negroes that they are going to set up a Negro soviet in the Southern States. They are urging the passage of laws to make every citizen register his firearms or turn them in, so they will know what to expect when they start trouble.

One of the top-flight employees in the State Department, in discussing communism or what he called people with "strong pro-soviet leanings," said:

"I can conceive of no American in his right mind who would want to live under, or see perpetuated or extended to additional countries, a system of government which maintains itself by police methods and terrorism, which suppresses every right and liberty that we regard as essential to our community life, and which in its international relations employs fraud and duplicity as everyday methods."

I wish everyone else in a key position on the Federal pay roll felt that way about it, and would help us clean house.

If these people are not engaged in subversive activities, why do they object to the FBI, or the investigators of the Committee on Un-American Activities, seeing their books.

They also want to get rid of the National Guard in the various States. Why? Simply because that would render the peoples of the various States helpless in case of trouble.

These subversive elements are organizing these Communist front organizations with laudable pretenses and high-sounding, or innocent-sounding names, in order to delude innocent people into joining them, or contributing to their support, while they extend their plans for revolution by stirring up strife and race-hatred and undermining American institutions. They are aided and abetted, as I said, by these foreign spies, fifth columnists, parlor pinks, and fellow travelers, many of whom, I am sorry to say, are on the Federal pay roll.

Let me give you an example. At one time we had the finest counter-intelligence system in the world, to investigate every individual who was placed in anything like a key position in connection with our armed forces. In March of 1943 certain officials in the counter-intelligence service were informed that the Communists had started a campaign for complete destruction of the counter-intelligence in the American Army. Over the protest of many of us, including Mr. Dies, the then chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, that group succeeded, and today our counter-intelligence system in the War Department is but a sad memory; and Communists have been commissioned in that department, and placed in positions to furnish all the information these foreign spies are now trying to secure.

We have just won a great war, and we do not want another one. Germany, Italy, and Japan are at our feet, and we are meting out punishment to those individuals deemed responsible for that conflict and its inhuman cruelties. While that is going on, these subversive elements here at home are boring from within, and planting the dynamite of destruction under the very foundations of that Government which America's brave and generous sons poured out their life's blood to defend.

My party is in power, and I call upon every official of this Government, from the President on down, to join us in our efforts to clean house, drive these subversive elements from the Federal pay roll, and from the country, restore our counter-intelligence system, and put patriotic Americans, preferably war veterans, in those positions now occupied by people whose loyalty is not to America but to a foreign power.

I call upon the American people to join us in shutting the doors of immigration, stopping this flood that has been unloading upon our shores, untold thousands and hundreds of thousands of these undesirable individuals, many of whom have brought with them atheism, anarchy, infidelity, and hatred of our form of government.

Let us reverse the trend, and ship these people back to the countries from which they came.

These elements are trying to seize power in this country by getting hold of the radio, the press, and the moving-picture industry in order to more effectively undermine and destroy this, the greatest Government, the greatest country, with the greatest system of religious and political freedom, the world has ever known.

I call upon all patriotic Americans, who put loyalty to their country first, to join us in this fight to protect this Nation from these subversive elements and help us to save America for Americans.

Agricultural Program of the National Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it should be generally recognized that one of the most serious problems confronting the Nation is that of making agriculture a satisfactory and remunerative way of life. The great farm organizations have all devoted much attention to this problem. They disagree in many ways on how it can best be met. That is only natural, for the many phases of the farm problem will have to be met in many diverse ways.

One of the farm organizations, the National Farmers Union, held its fortieth national convention in Topeka, Kans., on March 4 to 6 of this year. The convention adopted a national economic policy for agriculture. While this policy is quite far reaching, it does contain so much food for thought, particularly with reference to the problem of low-income farmers and other persons, that I ask consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I wish it to be understood that my request for the insertion of this program in the RECORD does not imply that I am in favor of everything it contains, but that I believe that the remedies it proposes for farm ills should be carefully considered along with remedies proposed by the other great farm organizations.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The next decade may be the most crucial for farmers in American history. Widespread mechanization of agriculture is in prospect, as are great changes in most production and demand factors. Among the facts that must be faced for the next decade is the fact that farmers and Government must cooperate to solve the agricultural problems that these changes will bring. After many years of seeking vainly to achieve their ends otherwise, farmers have learned that they need to use the instrument of Government to gain many of their objectives.

For the next 3 or 4 years Government will have the duty of supporting prices of farm products under the pledge given in the Steagall amendment to the Price Control Act. When farm prices sag and land values decline, the necessity for making use of governmental devices will become even more pronounced. A central immediate issue ahead for farmers, therefore, is how to humanize and localize Federal agencies and programs, make them more responsive to needs of people, and enable farmers to take part more effectively in them. Existing farmer committees have demonstrated in many areas the great benefits of citizen participation, and their work now makes it possible to move toward greater participation. For this reason, the first recommendations of the National Farmers Union in the agricultural phases of its 1946–47 program deal with ways of doing just that.

In other words, we deal first with ways of using democracy more effectively. To that end we recommend the following measures:

1. A new general agricultural program should be adopted by Congress, based on the following principles:

(a) In every rural county, or for every two or three counties in sparsely settled areas, there shall be established a county agricultural committee, composed of farmers, freely elected under safeguards such as those contained in the National Labor Relations Act, supplemented where desirable by township committees similarly constituted. Such an election shall be void unless at least 50 percent of the eligible farmers in the committee's area vote in the election, in which case, the county committee shall be appointed by a State agricultural committee, described further in this program. To the county committee shall be submitted annually a plan for each farm in its area. It shall be the duty of this committee to cooperate with the farmers and with the representatives of the Government in its area in obtaining the use of farm plans that will protect the interest both of local farmers and of society at large in a healthy agriculture. The committee shall have final authority as to the justice and wisdom of each farm plan drawn for farms within its jurisdiction. The committee also shall have the duty of advising the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the effectiveness of national farm programs as they operate in the committee's area, and as to needed adjustments, both short- and long-range. The committee's jurisdiction shall extend to all national farm programs.

(b) For each such committee there shall be designated a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, whose function it shall be to represent the Department of Agriculture in all its dealings with the county committee. This official need not supersede existing agency arrangements, but shall be the channel through which farmers can work with all agencies. It is to be hoped, however, that the entire administrative set-up of the Department will be revised to make it function as a

single program when it reaches the individual farm. The Secretary shall complement the farmer committee system proposed here with appropriate State and regional officers to insure uniform administration in order to accomplish the objectives of the program.

(c) The members of the county agricultural committees annually shall elect the members of a State agricultural committee composed of enough members to insure the representation of all principal agricultural interests and areas in the State. The State committee shall have the functions of relating individual county committee work to national policies and programs, of converting national production goals into county production goals, of advising national authorities on price policies within the State, and of advising the Secretary as to present and prospective effectiveness of national policies and programs within the State.

(d) Members of the county committee shall elect every 2 years the members of a national farm price committee, which shall be the bargaining agent of all farmers in negotiating with the Federal Government. As the agent for consumers, there shall be established a consumers protection agency, the function of which shall be to give continuous, comprehensive attention to costs, prices, and availability of all products, both agricultural and nonagricultural. A major function of this agency shall be to negotiate with the national committee of farm producers for the establishment of support prices fair to both producer and consumer, and of production goals adequate both to supply the needs of the Nation and to yield farmers, in conjunction with other measures, a fair income. Membership of the national committee shall be made up of 2 members each from the 10 major producing regions of the United States. They shall be elected not as representatives of farm commodity groups, but as representatives of all agricultural producing interests of their regions. Election of the members of the national committee shall be by members of the county committees voting in elections conducted under safeguards similar to those contained in the National Labor Relations Act. The national committee shall negotiate with the Federal Government annually the support prices to be guaranteed through the coming year, but shall be authorized to provide for differentials and for seasonal price changes, if desirable.

(e) Just as the national committee shall negotiate annual support prices, so the individual farmer and the county representative of the Secretary shall negotiate annually the provisions of a farm plan for the farmer's farm. This farm plan shall include all phases of operation of the farm affected by national-farm programs, and shall take equal account of the interest of the farmer and of the Nation as a whole in the production and conservation patterns of the farm, and shall relate that farm's production and conservation pattern to that of the Nation. The objective of such farm plans shall be to place all farms ultimately on an economic-size, family-farm basis.

(f) The national farm program embodied in such farm plans shall provide opportunity to all farmers for full-time, year-round, remunerative employment. An important requirement in such a program is the establishment of a continuous, year-round, Nation-wide conservation-works program, including soil, forest, timber-farming, and water conservation, which shall offer socially productive work to those farmers who are underemployed. Such a program will give all farmers a chance to earn a minimum decent living, will afford them a transition from agriculture to industry if they desire to make such a change, and will preserve soil resources for all time. It shall not be the aim of this program, however, to maintain permanent operation of uneconomic farm units. Through the use of the individual farm plans, it should promote the eventual establishment of an agriculture composed wholly of economic family farms. The conservation works program also shall have as its ultimate objective, the establishment of a national pattern of land use, in which all the Nation's land shall be put to those uses for which they are best adapted.

Each farmer shall be entitled to compensation for conservation work done on his own farm, where such work is of long-range benefit to society, and yet is too costly or not immediately profitable enough for the farmer to undertake it on his own. In all such work, on or off the farm, the statutory minimum wage for industrial labor shall apply to his labor.

2. In addition to the above, for the specific promotion of family-type farming as the predominant pattern of American agriculture, we propose a national land policy aimed at the adjustment, over a period of time, of all farm land into sound economic units operated by individual farm families, or cooperating farm families. In order to promote such a land policy, we urge the following action:

(a) The initiation now of a program of government acquisition of large farms for subdivision into economic family-farm units and resale to family farmers, and of acquisition of too-small farm units for resale in order to complete economic-size family farms.

Such a program need not involve drastic action of the kind taken in other countries to insure equitable distribution of land. It could be highly effective over a period of years if it simply involved purchase of large, or too-small farms as they came on the market, their subdivision, and their improvement. While land prices are high and many corporate holders of land have disposed of their holdings in recent years, nevertheless, the time will come when such land again will become available for purchase.

The Federal Government now should set up policies and administrative procedures that will enable it to push forward as rapidly as possible with this program.

(b) A farm-enlargement loan program of large scale is needed at once. A major problem of family farmers is their lack of sufficient land. Many thousands of farms fall just short of the amount of land required to yield a decent livelihood, and the operators do not receive a large enough income to enable them to acquire the needed additional land. The provision of such credit, which should be based upon the character and ability of the operator plus a reasonable estimate of the long-time earning power of the enlarged farm, ought to be a major concern of government.

(c) The farm ownership and rural-rehabilitation-loan programs of the Department of Agriculture should be greatly expanded. Nearly two-thirds of American farmers need the kind of credit that these programs provide. They should be expanded to meet that need, and they should be freed from arbitrary loan limitations that in the past have handicapped them. Such credit ought to be the basic type of agricultural credit, and should cover every farmer who needs it.

(d) Meantime, while a real program to give opportunity for farmers to acquire ownership of their own farms is being carried out, much of the farming of America will be continued on a tenant-landlord basis. Much can be done to improve tenure conditions on these farms. We urge the enactment of legislation to improve rental contracts and land-tenure policies, including:

a. Compensation for unexhausted improvements.

b. Automatic renewal of leases.

c. Minimum standards of housing and improvements on leased farms.

(e) Technical assistance to farmers should be greatly expanded, with special emphasis on the needs of middle- and low-income farmers (not now aided by any of the educational, advisory, or technical agencies of Government). The extension services and land-grant colleges ought to pioneer in doing this, instead, as now, of all too often limiting their help to upper-bracket farmers; and the services provided by Federal agencies ought to be greatly expanded.

(f) Proposed national science legislation should emphasize and find means to remedy the serious failure of the land-grant colleges to provide, through the extension services and experiment stations, research dedicated to the needs of family farmers and means of bringing such knowledge to family farmers. Future Federal and State Government research should be dedicated to discovery of devices and processes that will specifically help family-farm operators, and the educational agencies set up to aid farmers ought to direct their efforts to bringing the results of this research to all family farms.

(g) We again call upon Congress to enact legislation establishing a minimum wage for agricultural labor no lower than that set for labor in other industries. The subsidization by cheap labor of large farms is perhaps the most active economic threat to family farmers. If agricultural employers of large numbers of workers were forced to pay a minimum wage, then the vaunted "efficiency" of the factory farm could be realistically tested, instead of being blindly accepted by some economists, business interests, and even so-called farm leaders. Moreover, cheap hired labor cheapens the value of the labor of the self-employed who must compete with it, and payment of substandard wages depresses buying power for farm products when paid in rural areas as well as in industrial. The right to engage freely in collectively bargaining and to join organizations of their own choice should be insured for agricultural labor equally with industrial labor.

3. A truly well-rounded national farm program must include provision for consumption and dietary needs of the whole people, as well as provision for production needs of farmers. We, therefore, recommend the following steps:

(a) Just as we have advocated the use of subsidies during the war to control inflation, so we advocate the use of subsidies where they are necessary to give every American, including farmers, a minimum decent standard of living. We believe firmly in the principle of taxing wealth where it is, so that needs can be met where they are.

(b) Congress should enact at the earliest possible date legislation underwriting a minimum diet for all American families. Such principles are embodied in the Aiken food allotment bill.

(c) We strongly endorse the school-lunch and other disposal programs that assure the use by people who need them of those agricultural products that cannot be absorbed in the market place, and we urge that where necessary such programs be maintained at an adequate level, even if it is necessary to expand them beyond the point of absorbing unsold stocks.

4. We propose the following general national policies for agriculture:

(a) The basic principle in the pricing of agricultural products should be the establishment of prices that consider the best interests of both producers and consumer.

(b) Where income from sale of farm products is not high enough to return a fair livelihood to the producer because society requires low-cost products, it is the responsibility of society as a whole to afford to the producer, through direct Government payments the additional income he needs for such a livelihood.

(c) Prices should be set ahead of growing seasons and should take account of changing demand and need conditions as between crops.

(d) Setting of national production goals should be continued, and the goals should seek always for abundant production, with acreage controls invoked only to assure changes in kinds of production or to assure conservation of the soil. Greater production by family-type farmers should be promoted through adoption of a conscious and deliberate policy of assigning progressively larger shares of needed production goals.

(e) The ever-normal granary should be continued as a means of assuring adequate levels of domestic supplies and of management of temporary surpluses of farm products. The granary should include, when desirable, all farm products, should be expanded beyond present levels to guard against domestic shortages, and should be related to an international program for expanded world trade.

(f) All benefit payments, adjustment or conversion payments, or other compensation should be graduated so as to favor family farmers, and at the same time, through the farm plans and other devices described herein, opportunity should be afforded outside agriculture for those displaced from agriculture, so that steady progress is made toward an American agriculture composed wholly of economic-size, family-type farms.

(g) Universal, level-premium insurance against all production hazards ought to be an integral part of a national-farm program, with automatic participation by all farmers sharing in the benefits of such program. The costs of such insurance should be borne equally by participating farmers and by society as a whole.

(h) The commitment of the Government to support postwar prices of farm products as embodied in the Steagall amendment should not be impaired by the maintenance simply of national average prices or by the imposition of acreage quotas simply to reduce the cost of supporting prices to the Government. Each farmer is entitled individually to such prices as are specified in the Steagall amendment, and no family farmer's income should be cut by imposition of acreage quotas not balanced by other allocations.

Penalty of Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 18, 1946:

PENALTY OF WEAKNESS

Secretary of State Byrnes had a number of extremely important things to say in his address to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York Saturday night.

He stated in emphatic terms that this country looks to the United Nations as the path to enduring peace, that it is committed to the support of the Charter of the UNO, and that, should the occasion arise, "our military strength will be used to support the purposes and principles of the Charter." Obviously, within the framework of this policy there is no room for "an alliance with the Soviet Union against Great Britain" or "an alliance with Great Britain against the Soviet Union."

But it is hardly less obvious that this policy would fall to the ground if any of the great powers should embark upon a course of action which threatened the peace of the world and our own security. In such an eventuality the UNO would not be an effective instrument, for a great power, if bent upon aggression, could block action in the Security Council by exercising its right of veto. The sequel to that would be war—a war in which we would have to ally ourselves with any nation willing to fight the aggressor.

Our real hope, for the present at least, lies in the maintenance of a degree of military power which would make the risks of aggression too great for any nation to take. Mr. Churchill would do this through a fraternal association of the United States and Britain. Mr. Byrnes rejects an alliance—which Mr. Churchill says he is not advocating—but he hopes to achieve the same end by maintaining our own military strength.

His remarks on this point constitute the most important phase of his address, and they should be taken to heart in this country. Recalling the penalty exacted from us for our military weakness prior to Pearl Harbor, Mr. Byrnes declared: "This tragic experience makes us realize that weakness invites aggression. Weakness causes others to act as they would not act if they thought that our words were backed by strength."

This latter statement is profoundly true, and no one knows it better than Mr. Byrnes. As Secretary of State, he has been criticized for not dealing more firmly with the Russians. But Mr. Byrnes' hands are tied, not by an unwillingness on his part to be firm, but by the fact that firm words fall on indifferent ears when they are not supported by power.

As Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes calls in the strongest terms for continuation of the draft and the adoption of universal military training. He does not say it in so many words, but the implication is clear that the attainment of our primary diplomatic objective—the maintenance of peace—will be jeopardized if we discontinue the draft and reject universal training. If we intend to be strong, as an aid to peace, we need these things. And we also need to remember that the alternative to strength is weakness, and that the penalty of weakness has been, and probably will continue to be, war.

Russian Aims in Middle East?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post:

RUSSIAN AIMS IN MIDDLE EAST ARE REVEALED BY OLD EVENTS

(By Maj. John R. Walsh)

NEW YORK, March 17.—The currently oft-heard question, "What is Russia up to now?" must be more rhetorical than it is a sincere expression of curiosity when asked by presumably well-informed statesmen.

Certainly it is not difficult of answer by those aware of Imperial Russia's southward drive to implement Peter the Great's alleged testament, and by the many who witnessed Soviet Russia's preparatory moves to strike through the Middle East across Britain's sensitive and vulnerable lifeline of empire.

In this subcontinent of southwestern Asia are the trade routes, the waterways, railways, and airways which afford communication and commerce between the great populations and markets of Europe and Asia.

HISTORICAL BATTLEGROUND

Here for thousands of years has been the battleground of empire.

Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Chaldeans, Jews, Iranians (ancient Persia), Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Islam all sought domination, covering desert and mountains with civilian as well as soldier blood.

From the late tenth to early fifteenth centuries a succession of nomadic waves poured out of Central Asia, pressed on by the widening barrenness of the Asiatic heartland, conquering and destroying, looting and raping, egged always onward by the spirit of conquest and the lush gossip of ancient caravan routes.

The Ottomans, having achieved domination of Asia Minor but beset by the Byzantines and Crusaders around the Mediterranean's edges, had seen their predecessor Seljuk Turks unable to withstand a two-front war against Genghis Khan's mongols while at their backs were warlike Christians. They faced Tamourlane's fourteenth century onslaught from central Asia, and foresaw others.

To prevent espionage and communication between eastern and western enemies they closed the old trade routes. This forced the discovery of the long water passage around Africa and indirectly led to the discovery of America.

These historic events accelerated development of water-borne commerce and the newer and richer areas of discovery. It was not until the last century, with the opening of the Suez Canal and the building of Russian railways, that the Middle East was fully restored to its ancient strategic importance.

Among the waterways the Dardanelles was already an object of Russian territorial ambition, Britain and France having joined the Ottomans in the Crimean War to withhold these narrow straits from Czarist clutches.

Even before World War I the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea had become British lakes important in the cohesion of empire and Suez was as necessary to England as the Panama Canal is to the United States.

World War II placed emphasis on oil, tended to exhaust reserves in friendly hands. The war's huge cost brings extreme necessity for Britain to hold and enlarge markets. Tensions within the Empire, and with commerce-producing and politically related countries increase the value of waterways, rails, and airways as cohesive factors holding British territories together.

In several places the Middle East's oil bubbles to the surface and has been burning for centuries. If unrelated to complex economic, political, and religious factors—of which mention will be made in subsequent articles—the great oil reserves already tapped or known to exist within the strategic land mass would of themselves likely not kindle another world-wide conflagration.

The cost per barrel would be thus too great for practical statesmen. It would be more clearly in the interest of their countries to assign areas, as has in effect been done around the Persian Gulf, or to deal in consortium, as has been done in northern Iraq and as has been proposed in Iran.

PRODUCING FIELDS

Producing oil fields are American on Bahrein Island and on the nearby mainland of Saudi Arabia; British-French-American in Iraq (with a small private interest owned by a Caucasian); and British in southwestern Iran, where their pipe lines run to the Abadan Island refinery.

The Mosul and Kirkuk fields in northern Iraq send oil to the Mediterranean via pipe lines crossing Syria, Transjordania, and Palestine. The proposed pipe line from Amer-

ican fields in Saudi Arabia and on Baherin would also traverse Transjordan and Palestine.

Future development is planned in several locations, past surveys having indicated large potential reserves. American companies sought development concessions in Iran in 1943 and 1944, showing principal interest in the eastern part of that country. British companies also negotiated.

We whose business it was to keep informed of what went on had already heard that the Soviets weren't bothered by trifles such as negotiated concessions. They had already surveyed and drilled in their occupied provinces across the north of Iran.

Not so much to repulse American or British companies who were willing to negotiate as if the oil belonged to the Iranian people and would subscribe to and operate under Iranian law, the little country decided in autumn, 1944, to reject all proposals until foreign troops have withdrawn.

Iran is an historic wedge land in all this. For over 200 years her history has evolved ("clarified," as the Soviets now say) around the rivalry of Britain and Russia. At her east lies India, Britain's "jewel of empire." At her extreme northwestern corner is the Kars Plateau, now demanded from Turkey by the Soviets.

Thence a military aggressor can look down into the Anatolian plains of Turkey; into Kurdistan, which comprises Kurd-inhabited areas in western Iran, southeastern Turkey and northern Iraq's oil territory, and into the Iranian plateau.

What power possesses Iran's highland plateau, basing bomber aircraft behind the ramparts of the lofty Zagros Mountains, can hold at its mercy all of the Middle East's currently developed oil areas.

Soviet demands for Eritrea bear district relation, for thence Italian bombers flew to Bahrein.

From this former Italian colony two or three Red bomber squadrons might surprise-raid every Middle East oil installation some morning and that afternoon land in Soviet home territory. Easier thus with Eritrea, but feasible also if in possession of Iran.

Americans know that oil lubricates commerce, drives steam vessels, flies aircraft. They best understand tangible and mechanical things.

We must not underestimate other weighty middle eastern factors by overemphasis about oil, so in the next article we will examine some economic and political frictions.

Milwaukee's Grand Old Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukee's grand old man, William George Bruce, celebrated his ninetieth birthday on March 17, 1946. The life story of Mr. Bruce reads almost like an Horatio Alger book, and I wish to bring this matter to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because in the life of William George Bruce we find a combination of citizenship so very American in every respect.

A native of Milwaukee, Mr. Bruce in his youth had to overcome ill health and poverty, and even today is a small, frail gentleman who walks with a decided limp. But he did not permit these obstacles to hinder his progress in becoming a leading churchman, business, and civic leader. Today at 90 years he is in his office several days a week and has a boyish, enthusiastic look in his eyes. His physical energy astonishes all who know him and he is truly representative of the old saying that a "man is as old as he feels."

Mr. Bruce started in life as a cigar maker and later became a newspaper man, and today he is one of the nation's leading publishers in the field of education. This grand old man has appeared many times before committees of the Congress on various measures, particularly the St. Lawrence seaway, and is well known and highly respected by all. Milwaukee is indeed fortunate to have among her citizens a man like William George Bruce who offers a pattern and model for all Americans to emulate.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to incorporate in my remarks an article written by Kirk Bates which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of March 17 under the title of "Milwaukee's Grand Old Man":

MILWAUKEE'S GRAND OLD MAN—WILLIAM GEORGE BRUCE, WHO OVERCAME ILL HEALTH AND POVERTY TO BECOME BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADER, CELEBRATES NINETIETH BIRTHDAY TODAY

If Milwaukeeans of eighty-odd years ago had been asked to nominate the youngster of the town least likely to live in 1946, undoubtedly a good many of them would have selected an emaciated little crippled boy, undersized and frail, who lived, bedridden, in a humble home on Water Street.

Some Milwaukeeans, if they had bothered to take a second look, might have noticed that the little fellow had bright eyes, an alert and eager look. But, even so, who would have cared to predict much of a future for the lad? A future? He couldn't even walk. He would never have more than a few months in school. So who would have thought that such a boy would half a century later be a nationally known authority on education?

And who would have thought that this little chap, who looked so frail and helpless there in bed, would have the vigor to found a publishing house that would become the largest of its kind in America? Or that he would find time to become an honored civic leader, not of a village of a few hundred, but of a city that counted its population by the hundreds of thousands? Or that he would grow up to be one of the most distinguished lay members of his church, honored by the Pope with the title of Knight of St. Gregory?

William George Bruce was born 90 years ago today—a St. Patrick's Day bundle left in a German home—in a little house that stood within the shadow of Milwaukee's present city hall. Meet him now and you can understand why he has lived such a tremendous life.

He is still small, still frail, still walks with a limp, although for the last 75 years he had got around very well. But notice, especially, his eyes. They are still bright. And he still—at 90—has that alert and eager look.

Talk with him of the past in Milwaukee. He can step quickly back—50 years, 70, 80. He describes events of half a century ago as clearly as if he were talking of something that happened yesterday.

Then talk to him of the future in Milwaukee—and watch his eyes. It is when he talks of the future that they are really bright. His enthusiasm grows as he warms to his subject, "Milwaukee will have a million population in 10 or 20 years—a million people in a much finer city."

TURNED HANDICAP INTO ADVANTAGE

This man who can remember so vividly so much of the past is still much more interested in what is to come than in what has gone. And that, he thinks, is tremendously important. As he explains it:

"The secret of getting on, I've found—if there is any secret—is in one's viewpoint. You can't do sums on a slate cluttered up with the figures of old problems."

All his life William George Bruce has been turning handicaps, the tough breaks—and he has had his full share of them—into advantages, climbing over the top of misfortune to reach something better.

He is firmly convinced that being crippled, having to spend 4 years in bed, was actually advantageous to his later career. But he says, regretfully, "I was cheated out of the pleasures of childhood."

He adds, "I matured much more rapidly than most children. Having nothing to do but lie and think, I took a more adult view of things. Being unable to go to school, I became much more eager to learn than most children. In fact, my lifelong interest in education started right back there in my old home when I was forced to lie in bed and struggle to learn to read from a newspaper, with now and then some help from my mother, or my younger brothers and sisters who went to school."

Young William's health improved so that when he was 11 he could hobble around on a pair of homemade crutches. It was then time to go to work. Soon he was an apprentice in a cigar factory, and there he kept up his "schooling" studying his newspaper at home and during his lunchtime.

Bruce was a good cigarmaker—he was paid $14 a week. He took a night course in business college, a few weeks, and that and a part term in school before he was stricken at 7 was all the formal instruction he ever had. On his teacher's recommendation he was offered $6 a week as bookkeeper by the Milwaukee News.

"I was," he recalls, "the happiest boy in Milwaukee." His father thought he was crazy to quit a $14 job for a $6 job, but his mother insisted that he take it, telling him, "It's your big chance." And it was. He loved the newspaper. Not only did he keep books but the editor let him cub around at night as a reporter, taking assignments no one else wanted.

CIGARMAKER AND NEWSPAPER MAN

Such happiness was not to last. After a few months, business was bad and he was fired. In addition, his hip was getting worse again. Sadly he went back to the factory. He worked for a time in Mineral Point and Louisville, Ky., then returned—a homesick kid—to Milwaukee. His hip improved, and he went back to his cigarmaker's bench. Shortly he was happy once more: He got back his newspaper job—still at $6 a week. He had risen to $16 in the factory.

But it was a wise choice, for out of it came an offer of $20 a week as assistant business manager of the Sentinel. On that salary he married and started a family. His ambition was to be business manager of the paper, and he was terribly hurt when he was twice passed over when the place was vacant.

Outside the office things were going much better. Bruce had been appointed to the Milwaukee School Board. At last he had a chance to do something in education—a field in which he had been passionately interested since he had been forced to his bed. He sought to learn as much about it as possible. He was disappointed that in all America there was not a single journal devoted to school administration.

Bruce thought of founding such a paper. But he lacked the courage to give up his job. In his mind he worked out the editorial matter for an entire edition. He planned to sell ads to school-equipment concerns.

RECALLS EARLY STRUGGLE TO START MAGAZINE

When his boss told him the reason he hadn't been promoted at the Sentinel was because he was an excellent man to do jobs, but that he didn't "start things," Bruce decided to start something—for himself. He quit and founded the American School Board Journal.

Subscriptions rolled in; educators liked the idea of a magazine on school administration problems. But the advertisers didn't. Bruce's life savings of $600 melted. He would go to Chicago to call on advertisers and argue that his magazine reached the people who bought school supplies and equipment. On the road his food budget was 50 cents a day. Trip after trip he failed. After one particularly disheartening day he returned to Milwaukee, went to the lake shore, and gloomily thought over his life.

"I stood there for a long time dragging up the past," he said. "I saw myself as down in pain while other boys played. I saw myself going to work on crutches when I was 11. I recalled the recurrence of my illness upon losing my job with the News, my failure with the Sentinel, and every other bitter incident of my life. I thought how easy it would be to end the whole business by jumping into the lake.

"And I kept right on pitying myself until I was fully ready to jump. Then I woke up—horrified. For the first time in my life I wondered if there wasn't something wrong with me. I began to analyze myself, not pityingly, but critically. And I soon found the trouble: Instead of looking for reasons to succeed, I had been building up an alibi to excuse failure."

When Mr. Bruce turned from the lake that evening and went to his office—desk room in a job printer's shop—he found in his mail an order for an advertisement he had been trying for weeks to sell—and a check to pay for it. Everything looked different from then on. He went back to Chicago—and he sold the advertisers who had put him off so many times before. He celebrated with a 50-cent dinner. The American School Board Journal was successfully launched. It remains the leader in its field.

LEADER OF MANY CIVIC ACTIVITIES

Other magazines were started, proved profitable, built the Bruce Publishing Co. into a good-sized concern.

In 1905 he was a member of a committee that planned the Milwaukee Auditorium. He is still on the board, actively planning an addition to double its size. He has served on the harbor commission since 1912; now he heads both the harbor commission and the auditorium board.

His efforts on behalf of Great Lakes navigation and commerce have made Mr. Bruce a national figure in this field. He was one of the most effective leaders in the fight for the St. Lawrence waterway, was an organizer of the St. Lawrence Tidewater Association. He took a leading part in the fight to stop the Chicago water steal.

Besides serving on the school board and as tax commissioner, Mr. Bruce was long active in Democratic politics. He ran for mayor of Milwaukee and for United States Senator. For most of his life he has been a leader in Catholic activities. For decades he has been a leader in the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

So at 90 this man who has seen so much, done so much, and been so much, still keeps his slate clean of old problems and still looks eagerly ahead.

KIRK BATES.

Loose Talk and Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herein an editorial taken from the State Journal of Lansing under date of March 17, 1946, entitled "Loose Talk and Thought."

In my judgment, this editorial is a very wise, timely, and thoughtful one which should engage the earnest attention of every thinking American. There has been so much loose talk in this country with particular reference to foreign affairs and our participation therein that it would be advisable for all of us to think a little clearer before we talk, in the weeks and months that lie ahead.

LOOSE TALK AND THOUGHT

The British, on the whole, have two glaring traits. Depending upon the impression they wish to create, they are adept at the science of either understatement of facts or deliberate overstatement of facts.

In America, it can be said, however, that we worship at the altar of overexaggeration, so perhaps our national faults are almost as obnoxious as those of the British.

That is why we now hear on every side alarmed expressions from ordinarily thoughtful citizens, to the effect that "sooner or later we are going to have to fight the Russians."

Nothing could be more absurd.

This country, neither now nor in the future, will ever find it either necessary or possible to resort to a clash of arms with Russia.

The current crop of thoughtless remarks aimed so petulantly at Moscow's government are but the national reflection of the ill-advised attack so recently made by Britain's former Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, during the course of an address at Fulton, Mo.

In that internationally recorded discussion of world affairs, Mr. Churchill, who is almost universally beloved by Americans, declared flatly that Russia is a menace to world peace and that the hope of future civilization rests upon a strong military alliance between Great Britain and the United States.

Now, we have the greatest respect for Mr. Churchill, the statesman, but Mr. Churchill is now a private British citizen. He is not able and cannot, of course, speak for his Government. That seems to be a point that many Americans have overlooked. Had he been his King's first minister, when he appeared at Fulton, Mo., Churchill would have exerted his usual statesmanship. He would have resorted to understatement, if anything, in his discussion of Anglo-Russian relations. But he was not hampered by the knowledge that what he said was said in the name of the British Government. So his overstatement was permitted.

The fear of Russia on the part of such an outstanding Englishman as Mr. Churchill is easily understandable. At the moment, whether we wish to admit it or not, the ambitions of the British Government in Europe, and those of the Soviet Union of Russia, are at loggerheads. Russia has emerged from the war as the greatest power on the continent. There is no denying that, and if she intends to reach out from her borders and spear prizes that Britain has always considered her own then there is going to be little anyone can do about it. Certainly Great Britain is in no military position to force Russia to stay within her bounds—and certainly the United States is in no position to back up Great Britain's demands on Russia with military might, even though this country were so inclined.

Americans can do themselves and their country no greater service at the moment than that of keeping an open mind, and a stilled tongue. The mountainous troubles that seem to be taking form between the British and the Russians on one hand, and the Americans and the Russians on the other hand—are not insoluble. These are problems of national concern to each of the Big Three, and they will be solved in due good time, but they will be solved without resort to arms.

One thing that has escaped many Americans, as they have attempted to understand the seeming clashes of national interests on the part of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, is the traditional and historic background of friendship that has existed between the people of North America and those of Russia and Siberia.

Both countries are self-sufficient because of natural resources so plentifully distributed in their respective territories or zones of influence. And both countries can and will benefit greatly by continued and future commercial intercourse and the exchange of scientific and artistic knowledge. There is no conflict between Russia, in her zone, and America in hers.

Throughout the history of the United States, Russia alone of all the great powers of the earth has never been involved in armed warfare with this Nation. That is something, when it is realized that at times while this Republic struggled toward its present high position in world affairs, that most other major nations have sought to conquer it by force of arms alone.

Is it forgotten that military forces of the United States have at one time or another fought against Great Britain, Spain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan? Is it forgotten that no Russian mercenaries in all the wars in which United States forces have found themselves involved, have ever been pitted with aggressor nations against the people of America?

But it is true, Russians have not fought Americans—which is more than can be said for any of the other major powers enumerated above.

Why then this present fear of Russia on the part of Americans?

Perhaps it stems from the natural distrust of one great and powerful nation for another just as great and powerful nation.

But it is childish distrust. It is absurd distrust. It is needless distrust.

America may again, some time in the future, have to fight for her independence and her continued way of life—but she will find her enemies among those nations she has been obliged to whip before, not among the people who occupy the soil of Russia.

Let us think a little clearer before we talk, in the weeks and months that lie just ahead. It will help us to peace and it will be good for our souls.

Postwar Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, fortunately the human mind has a tendency to throw

off and forget disagreeable experiences and turn instead toward the pursuit of that which is pleasant. So it is that we Americans, ever a peace-loving people, are impatient with reminders of the dark war years, are demanding more and more speed in demobilization, the lifting of all restrictions and the reduction of taxes, and are fretful and restless for the immediate return of every evidence of a normal, peacetime way of life.

It is not always well, however, that we so indulge ourselves. In 1919 we were weary of war and we turned away from an unfinished task, a task we were forced to resume on December 8, 1941. Throughout the ensuing years, until August of 1945, we were solidly united in the strong resolution that never again would we so fail.

Less than a year ago the Congress was considering a $24,000,000,000 appropriation for the Navy. Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King had previously reported to the Committee on Naval Affairs that—

> Whether we look toward Europe or to Asia, I am sure we all appreciate the fact that much still remains to be done before the war is won and a semblance of normal world-wide conditions are restored. * * * In the Pacific, which is now the Navy's principal theater of operations, we are now within the Japanese inner line of defenses. Our experience in Iwo Jima is indicative of the kind of fighting that faces us in the future. * * * We dare not let ourselves be lulled into any false impression of Japanese naval and air impotency by their apparent light reaction to our air strikes on the homeland. It will be a different story when we approach their shores to land our Army and marines.

The war was much with us last April. Some part of nearly every family circle was in that proud Navy, greater than the combined navies of all of the rest of the world. We had no doubts then of the need for maintaining naval strength if we were to ultimately win the peace, and I am sure that we have no real doubts now that the success of international agreements to keep the peace will rest on world-wide recognition of the fact that we propose to use the necessary force to keep it.

Soon again we will have before us for consideration a Navy appropriations bill. Does the 1947 Navy budget, which is now before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, take into full consideration those lessons we learned during the first bitter years of the war?

Plans for America's seven-fleet postwar Navy were based on an estimated $6,300,000,000. That figure has been slashed by something over $2,000,000,000 by the Bureau of the Budget.

And what does that $2,000,000,000 saving cost us? It means reduction of combat ships past the mark considered safe by the Navy Department; the halting of construction on all ships not 50 percent complete and the junking of them. It means sharp reduction in the addition of new aircraft, and reduction in number and functions of bases, outposts, and overseas flying fields—those all-important Pacific bases which were taken at so great a cost. It means the stoppage of new construction ashore, including that at Guam, which still has only temporary installations. It will also mean that there can be no provisions made for systematic purchase of new and experimental equipment after next year.

Today, due to the epochal developments in the last stages of the war, we are not considering an appropriation with which to build a fighting navy. No longer need we fear the bloody price of landing operations on the shores of Japan. We recognize that instead we are planning a postwar navy which is an integral part of the peace and of the maintenance of the peace, and as such it must be considered.

None of us fails to recognize that an aggressive war is nothing more or less than international thievery and robbery and murder and rape, and none of us fails to recognize that a scientifically trained, well-equipped police force is the best deterrent for crime.

Mr. Speaker, once before we let our Navy grow weak and it cost us more than $120,000,000,000 to make it strong. The amount of money we used and that we wasted in our haste to mobilize would have provided a $6,000,000,000 budget for every year since the end of World War I.

Wherein lies the economy?

Junk or Jobs?—Jobs for Pilots—World War II Pilots' Headquarters at Long Beach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the above captions appeared over a very significant editorial on the editorial page of the Los Angeles Examiner, January 31, 1946.

At the top of the editorial appeared very appropriate and clever cartoons. One was a heavy bomber standing idle in an airport and a sign upon it saying, "This idle ship cost America several hundred thousand dollars." Beside the bomber, looking longingly at her, stood an American war pilot in uniform with his war ribbons and medals upon his breast. On a sign attached to his coat it read, "An idle pilot whose war training cost $100,000." On the high wire fence enclosing this bomber and other flying craft was a sign, "Keep out; no jobs in the field of aviation."

Below the above discouraging cartoon was another of happier view. A huge, warm bomber was speeding through the air with this same pilot in command and a smile on his countenance. Upon a sign by this plane we read, "The ship and the pilot."

Mr. Speaker, my home city of Long Beach, Calif., is headquarters for a group of about 1,000 members of the Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists. When I was home a few days this Christmas time I met about 200 of them at our great municipal airport at Long Beach. Some were still on terminal leave, but all itching and hungry to fly. Ambitious to use their talents trained into them for war, now available for pursuits of peace. That 200 has grown within about 2½ months to about 1,000 members from several different States. A distinguished pilot, Chick Logan, is their president and is now in Washington, D. C., telling the story of the vision of these pilots for their Nation in the field of aviation.

I believe we will hear far more about them and from them. Their purpose is employment for aviators and aviation specialists, and progress for their Nation in the air.

I present the editorial above referred to:

JUNK OR JOBS?—JOBS FOR PILOTS

Several hundred former pilots and aviation specialists, formerly with the armed forces of the United States and veterans of the recent war, have formed a postwar organization with a most worthy purpose.

It is called the Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists, and has its headquarters in Long Beach, Calif.

It is not a very big organization as yet, but it is dealing with a problem of national scope and significance, and it hopes to arouse national interest in its proposed solution of this problem.

The problem of these hundreds of aviation veterans, and of hundreds of thousands of aviation veterans like them, is very simple—and very serious.

They have returned to civilian life with thorough training in aviation, hoping and expecting to make civilian aviation their life work—but all but a very few of them have been sorely disappointed.

There just are not enough jobs in civilian aviation to go around.

So we have the strange picture in the United States of these hundreds of thousands of disillusioned and bewildered and embittered American boys, the most thoroughly trained aviation experts and specialists in the world, begging futilely for a chance to do the kind of work they are best fitted to do and that they so earnestly and anxiously want to do.

It is to be wondered if the American people fully realize the tremendous investment they have in these trained but idle aviation experts and specialists.

It cost the American people up to $100,000 for the average pilot's education during the war.

We trained hundreds of thousands of pilots, most of whom are now idle or about to become idle unless they seek and find permanent employment outside the field of aviation.

The education of navigators, radio men, mechanics, and the experts and specialists in the many other vocations related to aviation caused the expenditure of vast sums of the people's money.

We gave this education to millions of men, most of whom are compelled upon discharge from the armed forces to seek employment outside the field of aviation.

The boys themselves don't think this makes good sense.

In forming their new associations at Long Beach, hoping to make it Nation-wide in its ultimate scope, they think they have an answer to the problem that does make good sense.

They say there is one great undeveloped field in American commercial aviation—that of air express and air freight—and they would like to have a go at it.

They say the Government has put thousands of aircraft in storage, planes readily suited for the carrying of commercial cargo.

Let us service and fly these ships, say these boys, "and we will find the kind of employment we want and at the same time create one of the greatest peacetime transportation systems the world has ever seen."

Perhaps this would, indeed, be a very good way and the very best way, as these patriotic and ambitious American boys propose, to make it possible and profitable for them "to further serve our country in peace by salvaging this great investment of the people's money."

It is clearly in the interests of these veterans that they be encouraged in their new association, and it is surely in the national interest that they be sympathetically and actively supported.

The American people should not forget the great moral and patriotic obligation they have to these boys.

The American Nation cannot afford to waste their great talents and skills by not employing them in a field where they can be a great asset to the progress and prosperity of the country.

Your Opportunity To Do Something for the GI Joes: Sign Petition No. 23

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of complaint and dissatisfaction among returning veterans because of a discrimination between commissioned officers and enlisted men with reference to compensation for "earned leave" when they are discharged. Certainly the time is here and is ripe when Congress should do something to correct this evil. Equality of treatment to the privates and non-commissioned officers will help to break down the "caste" system and will foster respect of the veterans who have served their country most nobly.

The Members of Congress who are interested in fair treatment to all the veterans have an opportunity to help them by signing Petition No. 23 for consideration of H. R. 4051, granting terminal leave pay to the GI Joes. Won't you sign this petition so that Congress may pass on the merits of this bill? No Member of Congress can return to his district and say that he had no opportunity to vote on this measure and since it is fair, honest, and just, and since the boys deserve this consideration, it seems to me that there is no valid excuse, reason, or explanation for our failure to act.

I want to congratulate the American Legion and the American Veterans Committee for their endorsement and their help and assistance in seeking to obtain action on this measure. The letter of the American Legion, dated March 19, 1946, is most appealing for this measure and is most convincing and is unanswerable. The only answer to this appeal is affirmative action in the passage of the measure. I include herewith a letter of the American Legion, signed by John Thomas Taylor, Director of National Legislative Committee, as a part of my remarks and urgently request that each Member of Congress read this message from the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Nothing has caused more dissent and dissatisfaction among veterans in and out of the armed forces than the condition whereby enlisted men are discriminated against to the extent that they are deprived of compensation for earned leave when they are discharged, while commissioned officers are given full pay and allowances for such leave as they earn.

Army and Navy regulations provide for annual leave for both officers and enlisted men, and for years officers and men in the military services have been granted leave for which they were paid, so long as they remained in the service. Certainly the two Departments must have considered that they had legal authority to provide this annual leave. However, for reasons which neither veterans nor anyone else can understand, it has long been the practice of the Army and Navy to have a dual system for handling earned leave of men leaving those services. They use the authority of a statute more than a century old to pay officers leaving the service their full pay and allowances for all accumulated leave, but no matter how long an enlisted man may have served, or how much leave he may have accumulated, upon discharge he is immediately taken off the pay roll and is deprived of what is justly his.

Naturally, this inequitable practice has made enlisted men feel that they are unfairly discriminated against, that they are victims of unwarranted class distinction, or a caste system, and creates a lack of respect on the part of veterans and the general public for those in authority who are responsible for such undemocratic treatment of men and women who served their country well. I want to emphasize that this practice is not only condemned by enlisted men but by most men who served as officers, as well as the general public.

Employees of Federal, State, and local governments, as well as employees of private institutions, receive full compensation for all leave earned at the time of separation from their positions. Hundreds of thousands of employees of Federal agencies during the war have been and will be paid for all unused leave. All of these Federal employee payments have no doubt had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Nor has the Bureau offered any objection, so far as we know, to granting full terminal leave to commissioned officers of the armed forces. It is impossible for us to reconcile the Bureau's attitude so far as all of these people are concerned with the unfavorable report we understand the Bureau has filed against reimbursing enlisted men for earned leave, or what has been called terminal leave. We consider such a report from an agency of the Federal Government as an inexcusable insult to the millions of men and women who served in the armed forces.

Numerous bills have been introduced in both branches of Congress, to grant enlisted men terminal leave payments, the same as have been and are being given to commissioned officers. Some time ago a subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee held hearings and agreed on a bill which they were ready to present to the full Committee when Congress reconvened on January 14, last. At these hearings representatives of the War and Navy departments appeared and stated they had no objection to the passage of the legislation. It was also suggested at the hearings that the mustering-out pay was probably intended to take care of accumulated leave, but this argument could not be properly made against terminal leave for enlisted men because all officers to and including the rank of Captain in the Army and Senior Lieutenant in the Navy receive mustering-out pay on the same basis as enlisted men. So far the Military Affairs Committee has not reported to the House.

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida, has placed on the desk of the Clerk of the House petition No. 23, to bring his bill granting terminal leave to enlisted men before the House for consideration. There are some signatures on the petition but as yet there are not sufficient signatures to make the petition effective.

The American Legion, by resolution of its National Convention, unanimously endorsed this proposed legislation and directed its national legislative committee to advocate prompt action by Congress. If you have not already done so, we strongly urge that you sign petition No. 23 promptly and lend your influence toward securing immediate passage of this important legislation.

Favorable action by Congress on legislation granting enlisted men the same terminal leave benefits as are given to commissioned officers will assure veterans and the public that Congress does not favor and will not tolerate unfair class discrimination against those millions of men and women who served their country so well in World War II.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

The Federal Reserve Bulletin's Figures Indicate Production Is Increasing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose altogether the extension of price control for another year contend, among other things, that price controls have inhibited and will continue to inhibit production of peacetime goods. They argue that the restraints placed on production by price control artificially create high prices and contribute to the inflation which price control seeks to prevent. In the light of this argument a statement in the current Federal Reserve Bulletin should be highly interesting and informative. The statement reads as follows:

Production in the whole economy, including agricultural as well as nonagricultural types of activity, is now above the level of any previous peacetime period and substantially above the average for the years 1935 to 1939.

Total industrial production in January was 159 percent of the 1935–39 average, February production is estimated at 155 percent. These figures come from the same article in the Bulletin.

The statement continues:

Output of most goods and services is close to the capacity of the country's resources under present conditions. While there will be increases in capacity as additional veterans enter the labor market, as the organization of the work improves, and as the flow of materials and finished products assumes more normal relationships, these developments take time.

Even so, March industrial production is expected to advance above the November level of 168 percent of the 1935–39 average. This advance will reflect the end of major work stoppages and the continuance of present increases in output of building materials, most nondurable goods, and minerals.

The appraisal of the production situation by the Federal Reserve Bulletin is full of significance at this time. According to the Bulletin the process of expansion would not be facilitated and might be delayed by a general advance in the level of prices although selective price adjustments will be required.

While it must be conceded that some specific situations require prompt adjustment the facts as gathered and interpreted by the Federal Reserve Board, indicate how little the Nation's production is hindered by price control.

Soviet Radio Station in the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article from the Washington Times-Herald of March 19, 1946. It is apparent that this calls for an investigation of the State Department by the Foreign Affairs Committee. We must see that the State Department protects the interests of the United States.

RED RADIO STATION IN PENTAGON GRANTED 3-MONTH EXTENSION

(By Walter Trohan)

The Soviet radio station in the Pentagon has been granted a 3-month extension of life, it was learned yesterday.

The 3-band transmitter, which daily transmits thousands upon thousands of coded words between Washington and Moscow, was secured by Russia as a war aid. The White House reportedly gave the Soviets permission to use the facilities over the protest of General Marshall, then Chief of Staff of the Army.

Although the war is over, Under Secretary of State Acheson is said to have prevailed upon the War Department to grant a 90-day extension for use of the station.

There has been heavy opposition within the War Department to the station, particularly since the disclosure of Soviet spy operations in Canada.

The Pentagon Washington-Moscow transmitter is operated by this Government. The Reds send their messages free. There are commercial facilities which could handle the Soviet volume of business. At times the daily Red report has exceeded 100,000 words.

This Government also gave freely to the British in the facilitation of communications. Early in the war this Government built a superradiotelephone at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars for communication with General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz, Pacific commanders.

The British asked for this device, which so scrambled messages that unscrambling is impossible without its secret equipment, which fills a large room. Again over the objection of the high command, the White House gave the equipment to the British. President Roosevelt and former Prime Minister Churchill are said to have used it for their frequent phone conversations.

A Toast to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable William Curran, attorney general of the State of Maryland, and an article from the Baltimore Sun of March 17, 1946:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM CURRAN, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, friends, I must thank your very jovial and amiable president for his invitation to respond to the toast, Ireland, a toast that gives me a freedom to roam over many years and much of the earth's surface for though Ireland is a small country, it is an old country and the Irish are found, to put it in an Irish way, in every corner of the globe.

Your toastmaster has wisely set a time limit on the speeches. My task is to confine myself to a 5-minute talk. I thought I would hold myself to the Ireland of today.

What of Ireland's present political relations? To state it simply—Ireland has achieved independent status. In its domestic affairs, it's far more free of the London government than the free State of Maryland is of the Washington government. This is true even in matters such as those we formerly classed as purely intrastate transactions. In foreign relations, Ireland is well nigh completely independent. London can be at war and Dublin remain at peace. With the British Empire at war, Dublin received and maintained in residence the ministers of Hitler and had its Irish ministers at Berlin.

Oftentimes in the course of history the biography of one's life is the history of his country. Such is the case of the Ireland of our times. It is fair to say that Ireland's history is a statement of the attitudes of De Valera. His dominance in Ireland approached and surpassed the dominance that was Roosevelt's in America.

De Valera is always completely self-assured and always convinced that the course determined on by him is the only right course. As men go, this type is common enough. But there's more to De Valera. He has courage, determination, foresight, prudence. He is passionately devoted to Irish independence. A man of personal integrity and unimpeachable honesty. Irritating to others as his insistence on Ireland's rights may at times be, there is a compensation in the ascetic and out-of-the-world nature of the man. He's so different that irritation gives way to a charm that pronouncedly is De Valera's.

A rigid, a mystic insistence on an adherence to the doctrine of a free Ireland, his determined and consistent assertion of her rights as a free country have ridden out all the storms. Bit by bit, it has enabled him to whittle down tie after tie that bound Ireland to England. The need to submit to the British Crown for approval of the acts of the Irish Parliament is gone. The right of the Crown to be represented at Dublin as it is at Ottawa, Canada, by a Governor General is gone. The right to collect the land annuities reserved in the settlement is no longer recognized. The provision for the use by England in time of war of the five Irish ports, its abrogation having been assented to by Chamberlain, was not restored by De Valera though hard pressed by Churchill and Roosevelt in the dire days of the Atlantic battle.

Yet Ireland does not ask a complete divorcement from England. Something in the nature of Dominion status is what De Valera seems to gravitate to. All ties are not sundered. Nebulous as are the ties that bind England and Ireland, the wisdom of De Valera and the prudence of England don't want to see those ties completely shattered. There is a distinct advantage to each of the two countries in the union, loose as it is.

In advance of the war, De Valera had set for Ireland the policy of full and complete neutrality. Come what would, that was to be Ireland's policy and that policy had to remain and did remain. Ireland was not at war with Germany or Japan. Therefore, it was right, as De Valera saw the right, for him to withstand the entreaties and threats of Churchill and Roosevelt when they demanded of him that he send home the German and Japanese ministers stationed in Dublin. It did not concern De Valera that Roosevelt feared these officials were spying on the movements of American troops in Northern Ireland. De Valera decried his fears and answered would it not be unneutral for him to send home the Axis ministers, for was not Ireland at peace with Germany and Japan.

The question has been hotly debated. Was De Valera's insistence on neutrality born of a hatred of England and a hope for its destruction, or was it prompted by his fetish for consistency? If the full record of Ireland's part in the war is looked at, then it must be fairly said that the De Valera policy of neutrality was not born of hatred of England or the hope for its destruction.

Neutrality kept Ireland out of the war. Civil strife among its people was thus avoided. Since Ireland was at peace with the world, it was entirely consistent with the principle of neutrality for De Valera to permit its people to travel where they cared to. Some one hundred to two hundred thousand of the youth of Southern Ireland found their way to England to join up with the armed forces of the British Empire. In numbers, the Irish volunteers approached Maryland's contribution to the armed forces of the United States. Ireland's population does not greatly exceed Maryland's.

Another hundred thousand or more found their way into the factories of northern Ireland and England to help fashion the munitions of war. Ireland's farmers and cattle growers filled the desperate need of a starving England when the low countries were overrun. All this was freely permitted by De Valera, because it was not in violation of the laws of neutrality. Whatever the settled rules of international law permitted England to receive from Ireland, England received.

Churchill at the conclusion of the war, while rather sharp in his criticism of De Valera's obstinacy, did pay generous tribute to the people of southern Ireland who had come to the defense of freedom, and he did cite in generous language the Irish soldiers whose valor had won for themselves and their people so many marks of distinction in the services of the Empire.

When the balance sheet is struck, a good case can be made out for the proposition that—Ireland at peace served the cause of humanity more than could have had an

Ireland if at war. The cynic may deny that De Valera acted on high principle; so too may a cynic urge that Churchill's forbearance with Ireland was motivated by a realization that a neutral Ireland was of more value to England than Ireland as an ally.

There is one possible loss sustained by the world in the failure of De Valera to take Ireland into the war. Ireland's participation in the war might have entitled De Valera to a voice in the peace. It is difficult to see how, had he taken his country into war to guarantee the integrity of Poland, he could have brought himself to being a party to its dismemberment. Perhaps England and America have a greater need for a De Valera as an ally in the peace than they had need for him as an ally in the war.

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 17, 1946]

HIBERNIANS HONOR ST. PATRICK, HEAR EIRE'S NEUTRALITY UPHELD

Baltimore's Irish, as represented by the 143-year-old Hibernian Society, heard Eire's neutrality in the last war defended as they gathered last night in annual tribute to the Emerald Isle's patron, St. Patrick.

The defender was William Curran, attorney general, who, in response to a toast to Ireland, asserted that "if the full record of Ireland's part in the war is looked at, then it must be fairly said that the De Valera policy of neutrality was not born of hatred of England or the hope for its destruction."

MORE THAN 500 ATTEND

More than 500 attended the dinner, one of the most elaborate of its kind held in the recent history of Baltimore.

For more than an hour and a half before the dinner, assembling guests refreshed themselves on the Emerson Hotel mezzanine at lighted fountains which spurted Manhattan and Martini cocktails, or with highballs at several bars, and sampled appetizers from a huge bank of hors d'oeuvres surmounted by a shamrock carved from a block of ice.

ALL FOR $12.50 A PLATE

Wine accompanied each course of the meal, built around diamond-back terrapin a la Maryland and breast of guinea hen.

The assessment was $12.50 a plate.

James J. Lacy, reelected at an afternoon meeting for another year's term as president of the society, presided. Senator TYDINGS was toastmaster.

Maj. Gen. M. S. Eddy, commanding general of the Third Service Command, responded to the toast, "The President of the United States."

Governor O'Conor responded to the State of Maryland and Mayor McKeldin to the city of Baltimore.

The Very Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., president of Fordham University, was scheduled to respond to the toast, The Day We Celebrate, but owing to a throat infection contracted several weeks ago in Rome, merely introduced Brother Thomas, president of Manhattan College, New York, who substituted for him.

Guests included representatives of the St. Andrew's (Scotch), St. David's (Welsh), St. George's (English) and the German societies of Baltimore.

Peacetime Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, for some time it has been apparent to many Members of Congress that more information is required concerning the need for the continuation of Selective Service and, more particularly, a program of peacetime military conscription. While every Congressman is intensely interested in supporting any plan that is conducive to world peace and security, unbiased and accurate information concerning the requirements of the present and postwar military and naval establishment is necessary to sound decisions concerning the details of such programs. In order to make this information available, a resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] providing not only for the determination of a policy with reference to the occupation of conquered territory but for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate and report on the requirements of this country for armed forces generally. In joining in the sponsorship of this resolution I believe that its adoption will result in making available the information so necessary to an understanding of our responsibilities.

A great many communications come to members of Congress concerning this subject. Included herewith is a letter which I received from a thoughtful, constructive, substantial citizen, which is typical of the desire of all thinking people to contribute suggestions that are worth while in the consideration of these problems:

MARCH 12, 1946.

Hon. SHERMAN ADAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: I have been thinking about one problem which is in your collective hands, and I thought I would take this time to write my first letter to a Congressman.

I have in mind the continuation of the drafting of 18-year-olds for a peacetime Army. No one can object to a draft during wartime, but it is so asinine to take 18-year-olds regardless of their capabilities and put them in the armed forces in time of peace, that I can think of nothing that would justify the stupidity of continuing the present draft arrangement.

No one has any quarrel with a sensible military training program—a program in which a boy can continue his studies and preparation for college or actual college work. It seems so simple to us laymen that a program could be devised which would satisfy our foreign commitments, at the same time provide a sensible approach to the problem, that we are wondering why it isn't done.

In the first place, a regular army should be created by paying the soldiers and sailors enough money to live on and support a family with a provision that they could have their family at the post even though the post was in a foreign country. They should pay a private from $75 to $100 a month with all allowances necessary to effect this end. This certainly would be cheaper than having a war every 20 years.

Second, an intelligent plan should be adopted for continuing and expanding the National Guard so that training can be provided for men between the ages of 18 and 30 who are working, holding down regular jobs, but do not have to leave the community to get this training. This could be under the direct supervision of Regular Army officers if necessary. They should be paid at least $25 a month for belonging to this organization plus full pay for a month or 6 weeks' maneuvers every summer for further training. There isn't any businessman that I know of who wouldn't gladly pay the difference between what the Government pays the soldiers and what the company pays them during the month or 6 weeks' maneuvers each summer. This could and should be required by law.

Third, a comprehensive program of Reserve officers' training in the colleges should be continued and increased under Regular Army and Navy supervision so that officer material would be available in time of war and the graduate officers should be required to join the National Militia for a stated period of years after they have their training and take the summer maneuvers for a certain length of time. If necessary, the student should be paid part of his college expenses to take the ROTC course.

All of these things are vastly cheaper than a war every 20 years, which we have had twice in our generation.

I think everyone realizes that we are committed to a large army for foreign service possibly over the next 10 years. Let's build a professional army to handle that situation. What good are 18-year-old kids policing the streets of Tokyo and Berlin?

As I said before, this is my first letter to a Congressman, but I think that a program of this kind would have universal appeal to all classes of citizens.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY J. NEWCOMER.

A Letter of Commendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from the Housing Legislation Information Service.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this letter for it expresses the appreciation of a large cross section of our people who believe that housing and economic stabilization are among the most important domestic problems facing the Nation, and most urgently needed by the returning veteran and his family.

HOUSING LEGISLATION
INFORMATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1946.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RABAUT: We are writing to commend you for voting for an effective emergency housing bill.

During the past week, we have watched with dismay the action of the majority in Congress in plain disregard of the two most urgent needs of the American people—housing and economic stabilization. In the face of a stampede to discard what Mr. Wyatt has described as the heart of the emergency housing program and to keep the door open to speculation and inflation, you have stood firm. For this you deserve the thanks of all the people.

The struggle to provide housing and to protect the Nation against ruinous inflation will continue when the bill for a comprehensive housing program, S. 1592, and the bill to extend price control come before the House. We count on you to show the same understanding of the issues and the same devotion to the public interest on these

measures as you have in the emergency housing fight.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Francis Brown, American Council on Education; Mr. Colston E. Warne, Consumers' Union; Miss Anna Lord Strauss, President, National League of Women Voters; Mr. Reginald Johnson, National Urban League; Mr. Leslie Perry, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers; Miss Elizabeth Christman, Secretary, National Women's Trade Union League; Mrs. William A. Hastings, President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Mr. Clark Foreman, President, Southern Conference for Human Welfare; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities; Mr. Bleecker Marquette, Better Housing League of Cincinnati; Mr. Lee F. Johnson, Executive Vice President, National Public Housing Conference; Miss Kathryn McHale, General Director, American Association of University Women; Miss Lelia Massey, Executive Secretary, American Home Economics Association; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, National President, National Council of Jewish Women; Mr. Earl N. Parker, Assistant General Director, Family Welfare Association of America; Mr. R. J. Thomas, Chairman, Housing Committee, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Eloise F. Noble, for Housing Legislation Information Service.

Shades of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the conversation between the shades of two great statesmen, one, George Washington, the father of our great Republic, the other, Abraham Lincoln, its savior, may be read by those who are interested in the preservation of the liberties which these two great men made possible, and that it will strike a responsive chord in the hearts of all true Americans.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article entitled "Past and Present":

PAST AND PRESENT

Shades of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln conversing on the porch at Mount Vernon, overlooking the Potomac.

Washington: "Sit over here, Abe, in the armchair where you can get a better view."

Lincoln: "George, I'm worried."

Washington: "What's the matter, Abe?"

Lincoln: "Well, you know, last month the folks commemorated our birthdays, made a lot of speeches, draped our pictures with bunting, and sang our national anthem, but, as I look down the Potomac and think of this vast country with its nearly 140,000,000 people, I have a distinct feeling of uneasiness despite all the speeches, songs, and celebrations. It seems to me that our people have gone soft since you and I lived on earth. You know, when your brother built this house and the nearby city of Alexandria came into being, people really worked and were independent, they didn't ask the Government to spend the tax money collected from other people to build Mount Vernon or the homes and business blocks in Alexandria. Nope; they just went ahead and built on their own initiative and did a fine job, too. Why, they never even asked any planners to come and lay out the work or tell them how or what kind of houses and buildings to construct. And look at Alexandria and Mount Vernon today. The buildings are still in use, sound as a dollar, and a testimonial to the ruggedness and skill of those substantial citizens. And another thing, you know back in Kentucky and Illinois, my people and their neighbors didn't ask any Government help when they built their cabins in the wilderness. They just got out their axes and saws and went to work and today look at the prosperous communities and cities that followed the results of their efforts.

"I don't know, George, what the answer is, but when I look around this Nation, that you fought to establish and I strove to preserve, and find people asking the Government to build their homes and feed and clothe and doctor their families, I wonder if the old American spirit has become a thing of the past.

Washington: "Abe, you have voiced what has long disturbed me, I had hoped in my 45 years of public service to lay a foundation of independence of thought and action, but now I see our people submitting to regimentation, planning by a lot of theories and depending on the Federal Government to provide for them from the cradle to the grave; it makes me wonder whether our hard work and sacrifices were worth while. You know, Abe, we advocated freedom of opportunity but what do we find on our return? Restrictions, edicts, orders, directives, forms and more forms to fill out if they want to sell a bolt of dress goods, build a house, or raise a crop. Why, Abe, they even tell people what kind of bread they shall eat, what kind and how much of corn, wheat and oats they shall plant, and what they can charge for everything they sell. Abe, this would be funny if it were not so tragic—a short while ago they made farmers plow under every third row of corn and kill off and bury millions of little pigs. Figure that one out if you can. You know, Abe, I have a great wish. I hardly dare hope, but I do wish that when our birthdays roll around next year we will find a return of the old spirit that made our people great for 150 years. I would like to see the fetters stricken off of the business and lives of our people, an abundance of production, and a return to our old philosophy of hard work, initiative, and independence."

Lincoln: "George, I'm with you all the way in that wish. I hope that when the politicians mouth resounding phrases in our honor that they will remember that we believed in deeds, not talk; in work, not idleness; in self-reliance, not dependency. I also wish that our men in government would look at the needs and good of the nation rather than the ballot box; that they would work for the spirit of true Americanism which guided us, rather than the votes they hope to garner at the next election."

Washington: "Abe, we must keep our eye on things and report to the people from time to time. In the meantime all we can do is wish, hope and pray. Let's walk down to the river."

C. W. H.

Congressional Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Herald, Boston, Mass., under date of March 6, 1946:

CONGRESSIONAL COMPLEX

One of the reforms proposed by the La Follette committee on the "streamlining" of Congress is the compulsory registration of lobbyists, those representatives of pressure groups who now so importantly influence legislation, both in Washington and in the State capitals. In a way, this proposal is almost suicidal. For if some nonpartisan pressure group like, possibly, the League of Women Voters, does not get behind the reorganization plan and push hard, it will probably die a-bornin'. Despite its chocolate-coated bait for the favor of Congressmen, in the form of salary increases and more secretarial assistance, the plan contains other items which it will be hard for many of them to swallow. One, for instance, is to reduce the House's 48 overlapping committees to a mere 18, and the Senate's 33 to 16. Every southern Democrat who, by right of seniority, occupies one of these comfortable committee chairmanships, will cry to heaven against this latest Yankee plot.

On the seniority rule itself the La Follette committee is discreetly silent. But on almost evry other phase of congressional machinery it is direct and specific. It even boldly suggests modernizing the almost sacrosanct CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Its main purpose, however, is to provide the average Senator or Representative with facilities to keep better informed on the huge and complicated system which our Federal Government now is. As the committee says, "Public affairs are now handled by a host of administrative agencies headed by nonelected officials, with only casual oversight by Congress." It would concentrate the responsibility of supervising these agencies in a few congressional committees, provide these committees with technical, administrative, and research assistants, and in effect set up permanent investigative agencies above the agencies themselves. Then Congress, when it wanted information about a certain Government activity, would no longer be dependent, as is sometimes now the case, on a hand-out from the activity itself.

The change is almost equally desirable from a psychological angle. It is no exaggeration to say that many a Congressman now has an inferiority complex in regard to Government bureaucrats. He steps into a committee hearing, preoccupied with a hundred petty personal problems, and is confronted with a highly technical conundrum in, let us say, governmental finance. The men who represent the Treasury are usually doctors of philosophy in economics who have steeped themselves for months in the problem at hand. They speak the jargon of their profession fluently, perhaps a little snobbishly. The Congressman, who may have run a drug store or a country paper before being elected, reacts in one of two ways. He either resignedly accepts whatever the experts tell him, or becoming annoyed by their mannerisms, rejects their advice completely. In either case, the result is likely to be bad for the people.

Obviously no Senator or Congressman can be an expert on every subject on which he votes. The one practical alternative is to provide within Congress, through a small group of standing committees with staffs of technical advisers, places where the perplexed Congressman can obtain accurate, disinterested information. He could then go to a hearing confident that he has a few questions which will stump the experts, and what is more important, bring into focus the really vital issues at stake.

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN Jr., of Massachusetts, at the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner in Philadelphia, Pa., March 18, 1946:

This honorable society of which you may proudly call yourself a member has great and inspiring antecedents. Great Americans like George Washington and Commodore John Barry were notable associates. Your society was in at the birth of independence.

Upon this continent was formed the revolutionary concept of the inner and eternal independence of each individual man beyond the purview of the state and subject only to God. This recognition of the soul and spirit of man was the basis for the description of inalienable individual rights in the Declaration of Independence and the guarantee of those rights in the organic law of the Constitution of the United States.

This is the month of March 1946. Just short of 175 years ago here in Philadelphia, this idea of the prime sanctity of the individual burst like a star shell over the darkened and oppressed masses of mankind. Here was expressed in political philosophy the fundamental tenet of faith taught by the Son of Man 1,900 years ago. Here was something worth fighting for; to die for, if necessary. The great philosophers who founded this Republic saw in the soul of man not the temporary tenant of a house of misery, but the bright possessor of an inner domain, separate and apart from government. In this concept the state becomes the servant, not the master and the guaranties of individual rights automatically place restrictions upon the prerogatives and authority of government.

Men are best qualified to deal with those things with which they have had direct experience. The wisdom of our forefathers was gained from knowledge of tyranny. They who wrote the guaranties of liberty into the organic law of this Republic knew at firsthand the meaning of its loss—knew at firsthand the meaning of a monarch's whim, the intrigue of the palace, the inevitable injustice and corruption of absolute power. Those statesmen whose memory we revere were only the best representatives of a generation that knew fear, that knew violence, that suffered tyranny in their own time.

Subsequently, Americans in each succeeding generation moved further and further away from this direct experience. Living under the guaranties of liberty and amid the blessings of freedom, freedom lost some of its meaning for us in the mere possession of it. Thus rising generations of men thought more and more of the pursuits of business and less and less of the philosophy of government. As we have progressively and continuously moved away from the original experience of the founding fathers, the principles which they formed in their knowledge of human suffering seemed to have less and less force and application in modern life.

We know now that freedom is not free enterprise alone, nor a free economy alone, nor a free government alone. Freedom is the broadest guaranty of the inner sanctity of the individual.

The guaranties of freedom in this Nation have in a short 150 years enabled America to outstrip the achievements of the whole world in 6,000 years of recorded history. It has freed the creative and productive spirit of men in such wise that working in voluntary associations with each other they have combined their faculties and their energies to create new industries where none existed before. They have built great dams, erected great cities, poured out streams of countless products, have contrived new and uplifting services; and poured forth upon the people of this land and the peoples of many other lands the rich bounty of this Nation's generosity and wealth. Believing in the inner sanctity of man, we have recognized in war the violation of the rights of the individual.

We have foresworn wars of aggression; we have always denied and opposed the aggressor. While other nations of the world sought to enrich themselves on plunder and pillage through violence, we have sought to enrich ourselves through creation. What we did not have we built; what others could not imagine, we conceived. Where some saw wealth only in the possessions of others, we have seen wealth in opportunity. Give us the seed and we will grow the crop. Give me the need and we will contrive to fill it. Give us the blueprint and we will make real the hope

So in countless ways and innumerable combinations and through a multiplicity of transactions beyond the comprehension of any single man the driving energy of this free people has brought forth boundless wealth and made ingenious and incredible additions to the original bounty of the earth.

The living standards of American wage-earners have been the marvel of the world. By comparison the Russian has been living on a standard which we enjoyed in 1790; the Italian in a manner which we gave up in 1812; the German had comforts we surpassed in 1860 and the prewar Briton had reached the mark we made in 1870.

Express our achievements another way. In this recent and terrible war we faced a combination of strong enemies. We allowed ourselves only three short years to prepare for them. Yet in those three short years we surpassed the combined efforts of the Germans who had prepared for 10 years; the Italians who had prepared for 20 years; and the Japanese who had prepared for 40 years.

Thus we can say to ourselves that a free economy and the free productive enterprise of America has proven itself to be the greatest creative miracle of all time. Nevertheless, with new vision we must confirm that a free economy is only one manifestation of freedom and that freedom itself is a broad and dynamic principle to which we all must subscribe. You cannot have a free society in which some are slaves. You cannot have free management and slave labor; you cannot have free labor and slave management. You cannot have a free economy under a tyrannical government; you cannot have a free government without a free citizenry.

Fasten the yoke upon labor and you will find management in its compass. Place the yoke on management and there you will yoke labor, too.

Only a few short months ago America was at the pinnacle of its opportunity to influence the world. The shining light of its freedom and the brilliance of its genius lit the minds of men all over the earth and seemed to light the ways of future generations into a new era of promise and of hope. The world was ready and anxious to follow our leadership. But we procrastinated; we tried appeasement. Now it is evident we have erred and must have a more dynamic policy based on the ideals of the Atlantic Charter. Unafraid, boldly, courageously we move forward to the great destiny which must be ours.

Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, this is a time which cries out for independent and sturdy men. Men with clear vision and determined character can stand firm for the principles of freedom and turn back the attacks of those who would destroy the American way of life.

It is no longer a question of who is conservative and who is liberal. It is no longer an issue between labor and management, between north or south, or east or west. The challenge is to free men and women of America. The question is: Shall we keep this country true to the ideals which have made it the most powerful, the most prosperous, and most progressive Nation in all history?

The time has come for plain talk. More important than party or any narrow interest is the necessity for tackling national problems with clear minds and vigorous spirits. We must not let the golden-winged words of the propagandist crawl on the windows of the intellect and buzz our wits away. And we must look carefully into the tons of propaganda that pour into the newspapers and over the air. More than $51,000,000 of the people's money is spend annually to paint the glory of the bureaucrats and their plans.

It is our need and the urgent necessity of future generations of Americans to place the affairs of this Nation in order. There are many things to do. I have time only for a few.

First, I say, balance the budget. Let us face the fact. The most insidious and disruptive influence in this country today is the threat of inflation against war bondholders, the holders of insurance policies, industrial bonds, and wage earners. Government spending—continued Government deficit spending—is a prime source of this inflation. The bonds and savings of a thrifty people will be destroyed unless we stop reckless, extravagant, and inefficient spending.

In addition, the staggering national debt has placed upon every family in the United States a burden of $8,000. How long do you think it will take to pay it off? How many days must the farmer and his son work to pay off $8,000 over and above his living and operating expenses? How many days must the mill hand punch his time? How can the housewife scrimp and save enough in a normal lifetime to accumulate $8,000? These present stubborn facts we cannot dismiss with a shrug and say we owe it to ourselves.

We are a great humanitarian people. We would respond to the warm throbbing appeals of all who would take the people's money to cure every sorrow and banish every human risk. But stern facts remind us that we as a nation cannot meet every request any more than can an individual, no matter how large his income may be, respond to every charitable appeal. A bankrupt, impoverished nation would be forced to forego many long-established national needs. We must make sure we do not reach this condition.

Federal assumption of many suggested worth-while projects would mean the transfer from local communities to Washington of many activities to the detriment of those who receive the aid. It is still true that the further the administration of governmental affairs is removed from the people, the more autocratic and inefficient it becomes.

Experts have figured out that under the present administration budget, the Government will spend $130,000,000 every day in the fiscal year of 1947. To the wage earner with

a wife and two children, to the farmer with a wife and two children, that means the administration is planning to spend $4 every single day for each family—$4 a day of the workingman's wage—$4 a day of the farmer's income.

Here is the age-old collar of serfdom. This is the yoke of slavery. When the dead hand of government closes around the earnings of the workman, snatching the clothes from his back and the food from his table, then freedom is only a dim and flickering candle and the shadow of servitude begins to fall. Excessively high taxes destroy initiative and lower the standards of living of the average man.

The bright light of freedom is fed by a practical substance. It may be measured in dollars as well as words and no people can be free whose resources and whose earnings are not free for their use and enjoyment.

Balance the Budget, I say, as the first practical step to restoring the value of our savings and the building of a foundation upon which we can create a better America.

The financial condition of our Government and our citizens is directly related to the people's freedom. This is equally true of the form of our Government and its daily practices. Much has been said about constitutional principle, of the wisdom of the founding fathers in establishing a balance of power between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Philosophers of every generation have explored the principle and given it their endorsement. It has been the subject of Fourth of July orations and the inspiration of flaming words and sweeping generalities.

Yet in practice, Americans sometimes overlook the application of it. In the heat and steam of lesser issues we forget the cool logic of the principle itself. I have pointed out that the founders of this society, as well as the founders of the Constitution of the United States, were men who knew tyranny at first hand. They knew the workings of it. They lived under it each day and daily suffered under its abuses and restrictions. Now we who have seen tyranny at work in its most violent extreme in other nations must be alert for symptoms of it here at home.

It was the intention of the authors of the Constitution to have the Congress write the laws under which you, as citizens, must live. We know the principle. We know the theory. The Congress, being responsible to the people, would in the people's interest establish those rules of national behavior to which we all subscribe. Knowing the rules, men could conduct themselves accordingly, make their plans, and contrive their projects in conformance with the law, with some certainty the law would not be changed. We would thus establish the rules of the game and each player exert his best efforts within them.

Now we operate not under a set of rules but a series of decisions. The daily conduct of the Government of the United States is based no longer upon statutory law. It is conducted on the basis of administrative regulations which are given the force of law. So long as the laws for the government of the people were made by the Congress, the people's liberties were safe. Now bureaucrats, never standing for election, but hiding far back into the recesses of government, can make the law to suit themselves. Our lives are subject not to rules of our own making, but to the decisions of individual men in no way responsible to us. Thus bureaus and commissions may be prosecutor, judge, and jury. The personal whims, the broad or petty biases, the political friendships, and the political hatreds of a single man may change the course and hamper the freedom of our daily lives. This is dangerous government.

This is not liberty. This is not independence. This is the same old hand of tyranny which fastened its grasp upon our ancestors 170 years ago. It is the same government by personal whim which caused our forefathers to revolt.

We must return to a government based on law and not bureaucratic edicts.

We must rise as Americans and as men to assert our constitutional independence, and now is the time to do it.

Now liberty requires another condition. Liberty cannot flourish unless opportunity is there to nourish it. Men must have the chance to rise, to better themselves. Rob men of their hope for advancement and you will see a citizenry sullen, violent, despairing—incapable of putting forth their true creative energies and erecting those edifices of commerce and industry which ultimately serve all mankind. As this Nation has advanced through the creation of great industrial organizations, so has it advanced in the past by leaps and bounds through the creative efforts of the small businesses of America. In them has reposed the spirit of American enterprise—the spirit which cleared the forest and created the great communities of which we are so proud. In the small businesses of America you may see one of the great differences between this Nation and all other nations, another way in which America is unique in its greatness.

Look around you. Compare the spirited and independent small businessman of America with the so-called middle classes in other parts of the world. In some nations such men do not exist at all. There are either the great and powerful few or the poor and the downtrodden many. There is no middle ground. To be an ordinary man is to eke out a bare existence, and the price of admittance to higher status is the price of ruthlessness or privilege.

The small businessmen of America—and I include farmers in that category—are the true backbone of this Nation. They stiffen it. They keep it strong. Their efforts in war and in peace contribute largely to the general good.

Here lie the broadest opportunities for youth. Here the young man could traditionally say he would make his way in life and so the restlessly creative men of every generation have started, first in a small way and then with energy and devotion built great industries from small beginnings.

Shall we keep the portals of opportunity open? Shall we thus call forth the energies and enthusiasms of each generation and reap the harvest with them? Or shall we close these portals? Shall we so restrict and restrain the operations of small business as to smother this great creative force in a mass of bureaucratic red tape?

This Nation cannot remain free, we cannot encompass the promises of a great future, unless we free the small businesses of America. We must give small business a chance for fair competition and an opportunity to grow and prosper, and in so doing, we will continue to make America a land of opportunity.

In its final essence, liberty and impartiality go hand in hand. The cornerstone of freedom itself is equal justice. We do not have equal justice under a system of government which permits an administrative agency like the OPA to force an established manufacturer of an established product to sell that product at one fixed price and then allow a new manufacturer to come into the market with a comparable product at a higher price. You do not have equal justice under a system of government which graduates bureaucrats into a class of men who deal in government favor, who serve their employers by influencing the personal decisions of government officials in whose power the interests of the people have been placed. This is not a rule of law. This is not equal justice. And under this system, the little man and woman perishes.

America will not be free until the daily conduct of this Government in every phase of its being is based upon the rule of law, the principles of honesty, and upon the grounds of equal justice to all.

Within recent months it is becoming increasingly clear the Second World War did not end the conflict of ideologies. Fascism was defeated, but there still are two ideologies bulking large in the world—the communism of Russia and the free enterprise system which we have come to know as the American way of life.

For the last 4 years we have cooperated fully with Russia. We were comrades banded together in a common cause. We still want to be friends and only stupidity can prevent us from working together in the UNO to advance the cause of peace and to make this a happier and better world.

While we must and should cooperate with Russia, that does not mean we shall be afraid to fight against the spread of communism in this country. This does not mean we should be afraid to speak out boldly for justice and for the cause of small nations. We must be true to ourselves and our ideals if we are to command the respect and confidence of the world.

We realize there is a definite danger of communism in America. We do not intend it shall supplant our way of life. That is why there is a vigorous demand on our Government that in the State, War, Navy, and the other departments of Government we shall have only employees whose full loyalty is to the American ideology.

We are not unfriendly to Russia in defending our own system of Government and our way of life. Russia has a right to embrace communism, and we have no right to complain. By the same reasoning, we have a right to fight for the preservation of our system which has brought so much happiness, prosperity, and progress to our people, and we shall make that fight.

These matters which I call to your attention do not circumscribe the full dimensions of our problems, but I believe they are outstanding. There is a definite challenge to the people of America. We must meet that challenge firmly and roll back the enemies of freedom.

Members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, as citizens of a great country, these problems demand your attention. You must rise to meet them with all the strength of Christian men. Far above the heavy questions of party or of politics, this challenge to Americanism stands out as the one great issue of the present day. The issue is between attitudes of mind. The issue is whether men in positions of public or private trust shall approach the problems of the day with the intention to solve those problems within the framework of a free society or whether they shall scheme to use those very problems as instruments to destroy freedom.

Here in this Nation the principles of freedom have carried men on golden wings to the pinnacles of science and invention. The choice now is clear between the continuance of further hope and greater progress in a free society or the sudden and tragic subjection of this great people to the dark cruelties of the master state.

Under the master state the great creative genius and multiple energies of this people shall be bilked and thwarted. Future generations of America will walk the ways of ignorance and of fear. Hate, suspicion, and violence shall become the policies of a ruthless state of which man is no longer the master, but the slave. The petty restrictions which we have endured under the urgencies of war are only a slight foretaste of the rigors and controls to which future generations would be subjected. Then the fertility and the creative power of America would be stifled under the black shroud of tyranny.

Meet this issue now, turn back the elements who would destroy our American system and way of life. Strengthen the bulwarks of freedom now and an era of ever-expanding promise and of hope will be built upon its strong foundation.

We have seen new marvels of science spring from the laboratories and the factories of America in this past war. Atomic energy alone provides for the entire human race a manifold promise of heretofore undreamed-of riches. Within the compass of the imagination are great projects and brilliant advancements of the traffic and the condition of mankind. New marvelous planes may circle the earth in 24 hours. The venturesome may yet accomplish trips to the moon. Artificial suns may be contrived to nourish the growth of new and special crops where nothing grew before. In research alone atomic fission may hasten the advancement of knowledge in the fields of biochemistry. The yet unknown reaches of this fertile science may now be explored for the benefit of the human race. In the field of medicine it may touch the lives of the diseased and the infirm and bring them health. In industry it can provide new sources of power. This power can be made available to backward areas, and thus the abundance of industrial production pour out to the peoples of the desert and the sub-Arctic regions.

Finally, we can foresee within the most narrow limits of prediction the definite promise of abundance of food for all. It has been one of the degradations of the human race to permit starvation and hunger in a world which could abound in plenty. New methods of production, great advances in farm chemurgy, new and modern implements of agriculture, and all the broad advances of science and of industry have placed within the power of man the ability to feed the human race.

The free spirit of man stimulated by the hope of both achievement and reward can make these promises a practical reality. Allow the extremist to stifle that spirit and the long shadow of reactionary despotism will stretch out down the generations and blight both the hope and the progress of America in its withering darkness.

Members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, let us rise as one to meet and turn back those who would destroy our way of life. Let us here in this City of Brotherly Love, this city of precious memories and noble inspiration, make a firm resolve. Let us keep America—American.

Construction of Dam at Boswell, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the Lions Club of Atoka, Okla., in pursuance of an extensive survey and study by a number of its members acting as a committee, has passed a resolution unalterably opposed to the building of the Boswell Dam on the Boggy River unless it is reduced in size and the acre-feet reduction in the Boswell Dam be impounded in a dam located at Tupelo, Okla., which is known in the interim report as the Tupelo Dam.

Mr. Speaker, heretofore I have inserted editorial and newspaper articles opposing the construction of the Boswell Dam coming from Hugo, Okla.

The general opinion of the average citizen of this area is that this dam along with other dams will inundate more fertile acres than it will save in the Red River Valley, and there is considerable reason for this school of thought.

It is my thought that opposition to any public improvements should be given widespread publicity, and I know of no publication that is more generally read by our public officials than is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are no more public-spirited people upon the face of the earth than the group of men who make up the Atoka Lions Club, and their good judgment is worthy of sound consideration before any adverse action should be taken. I know furthermore, the Lions Club of Atoka reflect the views of the citizenship of Atoka County, and I ask of my colleagues to read the following resolution passed by the Atoka Lions Club.

Whereas it came to the attention of the Atako Lions Club that by the interim report of the United States Army engineers that one-purpose dams, and that is dams for flood control only, have been tentatively located in Choctaw County, Okla., at Boswell; and

Whereas the undersigned members of the Atoka Lions Club were appointed a committee for the purpose of investigating the benefits and damages to be derived and sustained by construction of said dam as located; and

Whereas meetings have been held in Atoka in which the members of this committee have participated in the discussion; and

Whereas this committee has given careful consideration to the benefits and damages which will be sustained by the building of said dam at Boswell, Okla., we find that in the interim report a proposed location of a dam at Tupelo, Okla., which dam would benefit Atoka County materially and that the building of the Boswell Dam would damage some land in Atoka County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Atoka Lions Club, located at Atoka, Okla., with due regard for all of the advantages and benefits to be derived from flood control in general, and particularly in the Red River Valley, go on record as being unalterably opposed to the building of the Boswell Dam unless it is reduced in size, and that the acre-feet reduction in the Boswell Dam shall be impounded in a dam located at Tupelo, Okla., known in the interim report as the Tupelo Dam: Be it further

Resolved, That we favor the building of a dam at Tupelo, Okla., and that we also favor the Boswell Dam reduced in size whatever amount of acre-feet of water that can be impounded in the Tupelo Dam: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this report be sent to Mr. Don McBride, chairman, Oklahoma State Planning Board; Mr. Edward C. Burris, secretary-treasurer of the Red River Valley Improvement Association; Paul Stewart, Member of Congress, Elmer Thomas, United States Senator, Ed Moore, United States Senator; and to General Wheeler, Chief Engineer, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; Maj. Gen. R. W. Crawford, division engineer, United States engineers, Lower Mississippi Valley Division, Vicksburg, Miss.; Col. F. J. Wilson, district United States engineer, Tulsa, Okla.

Submitted.

WYLIE KEITH.

Reforming Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Courant, Hartford, Conn., under date of March 7, 1946:

REFORMING CONGRESS

Connecticut has a peculiar interest in the report of the Special Senate-House Committee on the Organization of Congress. The late Senator Francis T. Maloney was the first chairman of this group, and he gave much time and study to the subject along with conscientious application to his other duties in the Senate. The committee, now headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE, the Wisconsin Progressive, has submitted a report containing five major recommendations.

Congressional procedure has not been revamped for more than 50 years. General agreement prevails that something ought to be done to streamline the law-making assembly line. Yet Congressmen are loath to accept reforms that might cause them loss of committee places or party rank.

The major proposals are, on the whole, meritorious. The committee would attempt to eliminate the hodgepodge of making appropriations without relation to expected revenue by providing for a ceiling on appropriations and a floor under revenues through a concurrent resolution. This device, perhaps somewhat cumbersome and subject to the whims of politicians, would nevertheless focus attention on the fact that if the national solvency is to be protected, the relation between appropriations and income cannot be overemphasized.

The proposals to provide every Congressman with a capable administrative assistant and to increase congressional salaries by $5,000 might well be grouped together as designed to improve the quality of services rendered by Congress. The ever-increasing complexities before Congress demand better Congressmen and high-caliber assistance for them.

Most commendable is the recommendation that the Senate reduce its standing committees from thirty-three to sixteen, and the House from forty-eight to eighteen. Many of these "little legislatures," as committees have been accurately called, are superfluous, affording little besides opportunities for chairmanships and memberships to please the vanity of legislators. Congress might well consider the advisability of reducing the number of places on the committees, especially in the Senate. Many committees are so large that they include one-fourth of the Senators.

The proposal that majority and minority policy committees be established to lay down formal party policy deserves short shift. Adoption of this plan might soon lead to something like the undemocratic unit rule of the Democratic Party conventions, where the minority of a delegation is practically disfranchised. France's Constitutional Convention has adopted a strict party provision eliminating the independence of the individual deputies and senators. Party position can be established by caucuses. In essence what position a party may take on an issue is of no concern to Congress, the legislative body of the Federal Government.

This reorganization committee has been a long time making its report. Numerous experts on government have testified. By and large the many proposals submitted have been well-sifted. The responsibility for reform now rests on Congress. Senators and Representatives should realize that with the legislative process under heavy fire from more than one quarter, they would serve well the cause of representative government by prompt action to reform their own ways.

Private Enterprise—A Bulwark of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. P. CARVILLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Private Enterprise—A Bulwark of Peace, delivered by C. J. Henderson on the Pacific Round Table program at Honolulu on March 6, 1946. C. J. Henderson is the son of ex-Senator Charles B. Henderson, who is now Chairman of the Board of Directors of the RFC.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject assigned me today, Private Enterprise—A Bulwark of Peace, is a big order but one that involves the future security of the world and one that goes to the very roots of our society. In my opinion world peace hinges on one decision among others which faces us—will there be a return to private enterprise and a greater degree of responsibility or are we to continue our present socialistic road which, I feel, can lead only to a totalitarian system and state, nourished by war.

Private enterprise means to me the maximum amount of individual freedom of action consistent with safeguards to the personal rights of all segments of society. These safeguards include certain of the progressive pieces of national and State legislation of the past decade and these should not be abandoned.

Let us keep in mind throughout this discussion that private or free enterprise concerns, in the largest sense the common man, the laborer, the peanut vendor, the small merchant, the professional man or woman, the school teacher, the union agent—in short every individual and not just the large industrial concerns.

However, retention of private enterprise calls for a reversal of the evident trend toward state planning of all activity, private and public, commercial and social. It is my intention this evening to detail the dangers this trend offers to the peace of the world, and I will try to show that the safe road is the free road of personal responsibility and private enterprise.

To dispose of it early, let us dismiss the argument that elements of private enterprise—the so-called merchants of death—are going to promote any more wars. The profit motive and the potential of profiteering out of a war at one time could not be dismissed lightly. But the experience gained from the controls imposed during this last war as contrasted to World War I gives the answer. Taxation of war profits to a point where, even with greatly increased business, less profit results than in peacetime is the effective answer and one which diverts the private or free enterprise system to the exclusive cause of peace.

The dangers now lie along the other road through the valley of socialism with its state planning and control to the desert of totalitarianism. We must not be misled by the very magnitude of the outrages committed by the National Socialists in Germany and so gain false assurance that a totalitarian system cannot happen here.

There are many signposts which 15 years ago were lettered only in German or Italian now emerging here in America. More and more are springing up. They read, "veneration for the state," "state care," "central control," and "state planning."

In the democracies at present many who sincerely hate all of nazism's manifestations are unknowingly working for ideals whose realizations would lead straight to the abhorred tyranny. Many people whose views profoundly influence developments are in some measure Socialists. They believe that our economic life should be planned and directed, that economic planning should be substituted for the private enterprise system. Yet is there a greater tragedy imaginable than that in our endeavor consciously to shape our future in accordance with these high ideals we should, in fact, unwittingly produce the very opposite of what we have been striving for?

It is no accident that the Nazis and the Fascists both called themselves Socialist parties—they started out that way.

In order to achieve their ends planners must create power. This is fundamental to their objectives. Power over men wielded by other men—of a magnitude never before known. Their success depends upon the extent to which they achieve this power.

Many Socialists and others of similar intellectual leanings have the tragic illusion that by depriving private individuals of the power they possess in a private and free enterprise system and transferring this power to society they thereby extinguish power. What they overlook is that by concentrating power so that it can be used in the service of a single or state-controlled plan, power is not extinguished but infinitely strengthened.

By concentrating and uniting in the hands of some single body power formerly exercised independently by many, a new power is created, infinitely greater than any that existed before and infinitely much more far reaching. It is entirely fallacious to argue that the great power exercised by a central planning board would be not greater than the power exercised by individual boards of directors in a private and free enterprise system. There is in a competitive society nobody who can exercise even a fraction of the power which a state planning board would possess. To decentralize power not only reduces the power of any individual but also reduces the total amount of power exercised. The private and free enterprise system of personal responsibility is the only system designed to date in the history of the world to minimize the power exercised by man over man.

In every sense your common laborer in this country has more freedom to shape his life and the destinies of his country than an employer of men in Germany under the National Socialists.

Personal responsibility in the private enterprise system, in contrast to socialism and all the forms of totalitarianism, is based on a democratic respect for the individual man and the tolerant belief that it is desirable for men to be free to develop their own individual gifts and bents.

Perhaps the greatest result of this philosophy has been the marvelous growth of science in America. Only since real intellectual and industrial freedom opened the path to the free use of new knowledge has science made its greatest strides. The resulting growth has surpassed all expectations. Wherever the barriers to the free exercise of human ingenuity were removed man became rapidly able to satisfy ever-widening ranges of desire. The effect of this was to create among Americans a new sense of power over their own fate and a belief in the unbounded possibilities of improving their own lot.

It is no coincidence that independent American scientists aided by German refugees rather than the state-controlled Nazi researchers won the atomic energy race. Yet, there is a growing body of opinion in America which would curtail the spontaneous forces found in a free society. Dispense with these spontaneous forces it says and replace them by collective, centralized, and controlled planning.

Remember that before the rise of the Nazis and Fascists their predecessors—the German and Italian Socialists—were using these very arguments and other techniques which the totalitarians later made so effective. The idea of a political party which employs all activities of the individual from the cradle to the grave, which claims to guide his views on everything was first put into practice by the Socialists. It was not the Fascists but the Socialists who began to collect children into political organizations better to direct their thinking. It was not the Fascists but the Socialists who first thought of organizing sports and games, football and hiking in party clubs where members would not be infected by other views.

To many who have watched the transition from socialism to fascism at close quarters, the connection between the two systems became increasingly obvious as the pattern developed.

Planning seems in part to owe its popularity to the fact that everybody desires that we should handle our common problems with as much foresight as possible. It is important on the other hand not to confuse opposition to planning as a dogmatic laissez faire attitude. The argument for free enterprise does not necessarily advocate leaving all things just as they are. It does favor on the other hand making the best possible uses of the forces of competition. The argument is based on the conviction that where effective competition can be created it is a better way of guiding individual efforts than by central controlled planning.

Liberalism, private, free enterprise, and the sense of personal responsibility are opposed, however, to supplanting competition by inferior methods of guiding economic activity which do not take advantage of these great democratic forces. Competition results not only in efficient production but provides the only means of guiding our destiny which does not require coercion and the arbitrary intervention of central authority.

On the other hand, successful operation of private and free enterprise does not preclude some types of Government interference and authority. For instance, regulations to limit working hours and other working conditions to safeguard the basic rights of individuals, to require certain sanitary arrangements, to provide an extensive system of social services. These are fully compatible with the private and free enterprise system. The harmful effects of deforestation or the smoke of factory cannot be left as matters to be regulated by the owner of the property alone. Measures to prevent fraud and deception, to break up monopolies and other restraints provide a wide and a necessary field for state authority.

It should be recognized clearly, however, that planning and private and free enterprise

can be combined only by planning for competition and not by planning against it.

Nobody saw more clearly than a great political thinker of the last century that democracy stands in an irrevocable conflict with socialism, state control, and central planning. I quote: "Democracy extends the sphere of individual freedom. Democracy attaches all possible value to each man while socialism makes each man a mere agent, a mere number. Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word—equality. But notice the difference: While democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude."

What is promised to us by the planners as the road to freedom is in fact the high-road to servitude. It is not difficult to see what must be the consequences when democracy embarks upon a course of planning. The goal of planning is described by some such vague term as the "general welfare." There can be no real agreement as to the ends to be attained. The effect is as though a group of people were to commit themselves to take a journey together without agreeing where they want to go, with the result that they may all have to make a journey which most of them do not want at all.

Democratic assemblies cannot effectively function as over-all and complete planning agencies. Even if Congress could proceed step by step through compromise to agree on some scheme it would certainly satisfy nobody.

To draw up an economic plan in this fashion is even less possible than successfully to plan a military campaign by democratic procedure. As in strategy it would become inevitable to delegate the task to experts and even if by this expedient a democracy should succeed in planning every sector of economic activity it would still have to face the problem of integrating these separate plans into a whole. There would be a stronger and stronger demand that some board or single individual should be given powers to act on their own responsibility. The cry for an economic dictator would be inevitable.

Central state planning inevitably lends to dictatorship because dictatorship is the most effective instrument of execution and as such is essential if central state planning on a large and complete scale is to be possible.

Individual freedom cannot be reconciled with the supremacy of the single purpose to which the whole of society is permanently subordinated. To a limited extent we experienced this fact in wartime when subordination of almost everything to the immediate and pressing need was the price at which we preserved our freedom in the long run. We here in Hawaii saw these principles operate under the military governor. The phrases about doing for the purposes of peace what we have learned to do for the purposes of war are completely misleading. It is sensible temporarily to sacrifice freedom in order to make it secure for the future but it is quite a different thing to sacrifice freedom and liberty in the interests of a planned economy.

Let us now analyze for a moment some of the aspects of a totalitarian state, the outcome of socialism and central planning. There are strong reasons for believing that the worst features of the totalitarian systems are phenomena which totalitarianism is certain sooner or later to produce.

Just as the democratic statesman who sets out to plan economic life will soon be confronted with the alternative of either assuming dictatorial powers or abandoning his plans, so the totalitarian leader would soon have to choose between disregard of ordinary morals and failure. It is for this reason that the unscrupulous are likely to be more successful in a society tending toward totalitarianism. Who does not see this has not yet grasped the full width of the gulf which separates totalitarianism from the essentially individualist western civilization.

The totalitarian leader must collect around him a group which is prepared voluntarily to submit to that discipline which they are to impose by force upon the rest of the people. That socialism can be put into practice only by methods which most Socialists disapprove, is, of course, a lesson learned by many social reformers in the past. The old Socialist Parties were inhibited by their democratic ideals; they did not possess the ruthlessness required for the performance of their chosen task. They still hoped for the miracle of a majority's agreeing on a particular plan for the organization of the whole society.

Others had already learned the lesson that in a planned society the question can no longer be on what do a majority of the people agree but what the largest single group is whose members agree sufficiently to make unified direction of all affairs possible.

There are three main reasons why such a numerous group, with fairly similar views, is not likely to be formed by the best but rather by the worst elements of any society.

First, the higher the education and intelligence of individuals become the more their tastes and views are differentiated. If we wish to find a high degree of uniformity in outlook we have to descend to the regions of lower moral and intellectual standards where the more primitive instincts prevail. This does not mean that the majority of people have low moral standards; it merely means that the largest group of people whose values are very similar are the people with low standards.

Second, since this group is not large enough to give sufficient weight to the leader's endeavors, he will have to increase their numbers by converting more to the same simple creed. He must gain the support of the docile and gullible, who have no strong convictions of their own but are ready to accept a ready-made system of values if it is only drummed into their ears sufficiently loudly and frequently. It will be those whose vague and imperfectly formed ideas are easily swayed and whose passions and emotions are readily aroused who will thus swell the ranks of the totalitarian party.

Any competent analyst will tell you that today it is the people who say "I don't know" in Gallup polls who ultimately swing elections.

Third, to weld together a closely coherent body of supporters, the leader must appeal to a common human weakness. It seems to be easier for people to agree on a negative program—on a hatred of an enemy, on the envy of those better off—than on any positive task.

The contrast between the "we" and the "they" is consequently always employed by those who seek the allegiance of huge masses. The enemy may be internal, like the Jew in Germany or he may be external. In any case, this technique has the great advantage of leaving the leader greater freedom of action than would almost any positive program.

Advancement within a totalitarian group or party depends largely on a willingness to do immoral things. The principle that the end justifies the means, which in individualist ethics is regarded as the denial of all morals, in collectivist ethics becomes necessarily the supreme rule. There is literally nothing which the consistent collectivist must not be prepared to do if it serves the good of the whole, because that is to him the only criterion of what ought to be done.

Once you admit that the individual is merely a means to serve the ends of the higher entity called society or the nation, most of those features of totalitarianism which horrify us follow of necessity. From the collectivist standpoint intolerance and brutal suppression of dissent, deception, and spying, the complete disregard of the life and happiness of the individual are essential and unavoidable. Acts which revolt all our feelings, such as the shooting of hostages or the killing of the old or sick, are treated as mere matters of expediency; the compulsory uprooting and transportation of hundreds of thousands becomes an instrument of policy approved by almost everybody except the victims.

To be a useful assistant in the running of a totalitarian state, therefore, a man must be prepared to break every moral rule he has ever known if this seems necessary to achieve the end set for him. In the totalitarian machine there will be special opportunities for the ruthless and unscrupulous. Neither the gestapo nor the administration of a concentration camp, neither the Ministry of Propaganda nor the SA or SS are suitable places for the exercise of humanitarian feelings. Yet it is through such positions that one advances in the totalitarian state.

There is one aspect of the change in moral values brought about by the advance of collectivism which provides special food for thought. It is that the virtues which are held less and less in esteem in America are precisely those on which Anglo-Saxons justly prided themselves and in which they were generally recognized to excell. These virtues were independence and self-reliance, personal initiative and local responsibility, the successful reliance on voluntary activity, noninterference with one's neighbor and tolerance of the different, and a healthy suspicion of power and authority.

It was this healthy suspicion of power and authority and a high regard for the liberties of the people which led George Washington and the other fathers of our country to establish a balance between the legislative branch of our Government and the executive branch. The authors of the Constitution wanted the Congress to have the power to make laws.

And they wanted the President, as the country's chief executive, to enforce the laws. But they wanted each to be a check upon the other. They wanted a form of government which would not only prevent a President from becoming a king or dictator, but which would also prevent the people, through their Congress, from "running wild" and passing foolish laws which would endanger their liberties.

It seemed to the authors of the Constitution impossible, or at any rate improbable, that Congress and the President would ever "run wild" at the same time. But to make sure that this would not happen, they set up a Supreme Court. This tribunal was to have the last word in determining whether the laws passed by Congress and signed by the President were in accord with the Constitution, and also whether acts of the executive department squared with the fundamental law of the land.

As a result, the Supreme Court became the final guarantor of the liberties of the people under the Constitution.

We had a local illustration of this Supreme Court function as recently as February 25, when the Court denounced martial law in Hawaii as unconstitutional. The majority opinion included these passages reaffirming the basic principles on which our system of government and our way of life were based:

"The courts and their procedural safeguards are indispensable to our system of government. They were set up by our founders to protect the liberty they valued.

"Our system of government is clearly the antithesis of total military rule. * * *

"They (the founders) were opposed to governments that placed in the hands of one man the power to make, interpret, and enforce laws. For that reason, we have maintained legislatures chosen by citizens or their representatives, and courts and juries to try those who violate legislative enforcements."

In setting up this system of checks and balances, the founding fathers did more than

protect us from dictatorship. In safeguarding the freedom and the dignity of the individual they also set free the greatest outburst of productive effort the world has ever seen. They cracked the atom of human energy, releasing a power for economic improvement fully as potent in its way as the physical power of the atomic bomb. A government by law and not by the whim of a dictator; human freedom—these were the tools used to crack the atom of human energy. Totalitarianism denies the use of these tools.

The accomplishments of the free American economy are too familiar to need recounting. But the so-called common man in America has advanced farther up the economic scale since the Constitution was written in 1787—159 years ago—than in all the previous hundreds of years since the Dark Ages. Thomas Jefferson, founder of Jeffersonian democracy, had the interests of the average citizen in mind when he counseled, "That nation is governed best that is governed least."

Let's consider for a moment what our system of free enterprise means today to the man running the service station down the street. Many of the pleas for government planning have been mistakenly made in his behalf. He is the small businessman for whose protection some of our restrictive laws have been passed. Government planning with its concentration of power could fall short of actual dictatorship and still mean that he could expand his services to the community only by permission of someone in the government. No one in or out of government should have such power over any individual. Protected from government planning and allowed to compete in a free economy, the service-station operator may serve the community more efficiently and be rewarded by expansion and greater financial success and security. Or, if he fails, he should be free to try, and try again, in the service station or some other business until he finds the best use for his talents. And, so long as his activities do not harm society, he should be free to work or to build a business without direction from the state.

The same principle applies to any business entity whether it is a service-station operator or the large corporation which supplies him his products. Companies as well as individuals should be given the privilege of private enterprise.

Almost all the traditions and institutions which have molded the national character and the whole moral climate of America are those which the progress of collectivism and its centralistic tendencies are progressively destroying.

I have the firm conviction that totalitarianism cannot happen here if we decide to encourage home ownership over housing projects, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts over youth movements.

In arguing for the system of private and free enterprise and personal responsibility it is not my purpose to say that this way leads to certain peace. Under the private-enterprise system we will have always to guard against greed, a withdrawal from internationalism and the clash of empire builders. But I do argue that the planned economy is certain to bring us state socialism followed by totalitarianism—and totalitarianism can only perpetuate itself through war.

Private enterprise and a sense of personal responsibility offer as the alternative the only pattern within which a world peace can be shaped.

Private, free enterprise is constructive and productive. It builds not only the airplane and plastic industries but the moral fiber of men. Socialism and totalitarianism produce the ersatz—slogans instead of goods, like Hitler's famed Volkswaggon or "people's car" that hardly passed the mock-up stage. And in the course of all the ballyhoo, the national character is degraded.

A sense of personal responsibility leads men to pay their debts—to society as well as their creditors. Socialist and totalitarian states soon become peopled by agnostics, who honor illegitimacy and take pride in black-market profits.

One set of moral values—the planner, Socialist, totalitarian values—are directly incompatible with what we know as good citizenship. The others—the values of private enterprise and personal responsibility—are the earmark of good character. Our chance for world peace rests in building a world of good citizens. Let us start at home by adopting the standards and ethics of private enterprise and personal responsibility.

Petition by Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association for Amendment of Maximum Price Regulation No. 289

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of petition for amendment of Maximum Price Regulation No. 289, filed by the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association with the OPA on yesterday.

This association is made up of cheese makers who own and operate more than a thousand cheese factories in the State of Wisconsin. They represent both the independently owned and the cooperative factories. They have been engaged so long in this controversy with the OPA that I feel that this petition is of sufficient interest to warrant its printing in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have an estimate that the printing will cost $200.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION FOR AMENDMENT OF MAXIMUM PRICE REGULATION NO. 289, ISSUED DECEMBER 24, 1942, BY WISCONSIN CHEESE MAKERS' ASSOCIATION, PLYMOUTH, WIS.

This petition is prepared by the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, Inc., on behalf of its members who own and operate over 1,000 cheese factories.

The petitioner was incorporated under the laws of the State of Wisconsin in 1898. Its membership includes both the privately and cooperatively owned factories.

REMOVAL OF PRICE CONTROLS

We repeat and renew our request for the removal of all price controls over dairy products, thereby joining the Nation-wide support for that relief, and the apparent unanimity of opinion which believes the current production will meet all national requirements, and that the law of supply and demand will bring a proper balance of production and price relationship without any inflationary results.

AMENDMENTS TO MPR 289

Pending removal of price controls we request immediate correction of existing inequities, by price adjustments.

We therefore petition for amendments—

1. Increasing the ceiling price of cheese one cent per pound to compensate for the reduced "recovery value of whey" used in the pricing formula;

2. Increasing the ceiling price of "small styles" of Cheddar cheese one-half cent per pound to effect an increase in their production approximating the prewar relationship between "large" and "small" styles; and

3. Correcting the unfair and discriminatory provision of MPR 289, which subjects all Wisconsin cheese to a price penalty, by increasing present Wisconsin ceiling prices one-half cent per pound, or granting a minimum tranportation factor of one-half cent to equalize the present price break at the Wisconsin State line.

RECOMMENDED BY OPA CHEESE INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The above three requested amendments were approved and recommended for adoption by the official Office of Price Administration Cheese Industry Committee at its last meeting in Washington, D. C., on November 14, 1945.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Postponement of the removal of price controls should expedite the removal of inequities in present price orders. Their continuance explains the shortage in the production of some dairy products and the overproduction of others. Reference to "overproduction" is directed at some new, fancy-named, and war-born cheeses, now thriving at the expense of the nationally established and historic types which are under specific dollar-and-cent ceilings.

The law of supply and demand is ignored and proper price relationship impossible under present orders—yet the Nation's milk production is daily exceeding the prewar levels.

Therefore, we request immediate consideration of amendments correcting and removing those provisions which unnecessarily interfere with, and prevent a return to, a normal and balanced production of dairy products.

Fear of inflationary results is negatived by the continued production of milk above prewar levels.

This petition, although dealing with cheese, does not request any relief which would cause hardship to any other branch of the industry. This petition deals only with present orders and prices.

We submit additional information and data in support of each of the above three requested amendments in their respective order.

I. CHEESE—WHEY VALUE—PRICE ADJUSTMENT

Included in the factors employed in the price formula by OPA is the recovery value of whey.

The declared recovery value of whey is found in the statement of considerations issued in connection with cheese price orders and amendments, and the same value is used in each. We quote that part from the statement pertaining to the value of whey:

"Careful studies were also made and due weight given to recoveries, including value of butterfat (50 cents per pound) recovered, value of whey (15 cents per 100 pounds of milk) returned to the milk producer or sold on his behalf to manufacturing plants."

This is not a correct statement of the recovery value of whey, but is nearly 10 cents per 100 pounds of milk above the actual recovery value, or in cheese equivalent about 1 cent per pound above actual recovery value. Because several factors enter into a full and complete study of whey value, we submit the following analysis of the whey prices.

Cheese production under price ceilings

The production of American whole-milk cheese under price ceilings began in the last quarter of 1942. The first full year of cheese production under price ceilings was 1943 and production has been under price ceilings each year since that time.

For the United States as a whole in the years 1943, 1944, and 1945, prices were adequate to hold cheese production in line with the total milk supply. Table I shows that the proportion of total milk used in cheese increased slightly over these years. Account should be taken of the fact that in some areas equipment was not available to process skim-milk surplus from the production of butter. In such areas where only butterfat from milk could be utilized, cheese offered a better outlet for milk. In such areas there has been a shift from the production of butter to the production of cheese. In point are most of the Southern States as well as Iowa and Minnesota. In New York with many alternative opportunities for utilization of milk cheese production was reduced.

When calculated on the basis of Wisconsin alone as indicated in table II, the percentage of total milk used in the manufacture of American cheese has declined slightly during the last 3 years. In most of Wisconsin processing equipment is available to utilize skim milk or whole milk in one or more manufactured products. Prices for American cheese were not sufficiently high to equalize milk prices in competition with other manufactured dairy products.

Whey prices lower, relatively small percentage utilized

During the early part of 1944 the demand for dried whey for poultry feeding supported a relatively high price for whey. In late 1944, however, the demand for dried whey for chicken feed declined, and, consequently, the prices of dried whey and raw whey were reduced. At the close of 1945, therefore whey was generally valued in the neighborhood of 10 cents per hundred pounds.

Cheese production varies from season to season, and consequently the quantity of whey available for sale varies. A manufacturer who has purchased sufficient whey to operate his facilities at the desired capacity during the months of low production cannot utilize all the whey available at the flush. There are several alternatives. Such a manufacturer may choose during the flush to purchase whey only from those factories who supply him with the best quality, or from factories located strategically with reference to costs. He may attempt to keep all of the factories delivering whey to him on the basis of a quota which represents his capacity, and leave the whey above quota with the cheese makers for other disposal. The disposition of whey, however, represents a disposal problem for the cheese maker. Whey cannot be freely dumped in the rivers, streams, or sewers because of restrictions imposed by the various States and local authorities.

Another basis for purchasing whey is represented in table III where the total output of a factory is divided as to base and surplus. Base and surplus may be calculated by various procedures. In table III the base is assumed to be either 100, or 110, or 120 percent of output in November. It may, in fact, be any one of these or a combination of them or some other quantity.

Table III also assumes that the price for base whey will be 10 cents per 100 pounds and the surplus whey will be valued at 1 cent per hundred pounds. These prices were closely in line with values early in 1946 but were subject to change.

The value of whey per hundred pounds using each of the base calculations of table III is shown as follows:

[Base=100 percent of November]

Total base, 30,345 hundred pounds times 10 cents equals $3,034.50.

Surplus, 12,772 hundred pounds times 1 cent equals $127.72.

Total, 43,117 hundred pounds, $3,162.22.

Weighted average

Seven and three-tenths cents per 100 pounds of whey.

Six and two-tenths cents per 100 pounds of whole milk.

[Base=110 percent of November]

Total base, 32,385 hundred pounds times 10 cents equals $3,238.50.

Surplus, 10,732 hundred pounds times 1 cent equals $107.32.

Total, 43,117 hundred pounds, $3,345.82.

Weighted average

Seven and seven-tenths cents per 100 pounds of whey.

Six and five-tenths cents per 100 pounds of whole milk.

[Base=120 percent of November]

Total base, 34,399 hundred pounds times 10 cents equals $3,439.90.

Surplus, 8,718 hundred pounds times 1 cent equals $87.18.

Total, 43,117 hundred pounds, $3,527.08.

Weighted average

Eight and two-tenths cents per 100 pounds of whey.

Six and nine-tenths cents per 100 pounds of whole milk.

Use of whey values in calculating ceiling prices

The validity of the use of whey values in calculating ceiling prices for cheese is open to serious question because relatively few cheese producers have an opportunity to sell whey. Whey is a byproduct of several kinds of dairy manufacture. It is a byproduct of the production of skim-milk cheeses. It is a byproduct of the production of casein and of the production of various types of whole-milk cheeses. The value of the whey recovered from the various types of manufactured products differs widely. Whey recovered from casein has the highest yield and the whey solids are most easily recovered. In the production of the various types of cheese acidity develops quickly because of fermentation resulting from the action of bacteria on the sugar in milk. Sugar constitutes approximately 5 of the 6 pounds of solids in the whey. If fermentation has consumed part of the sugar in the whey, the solids recovered in manufacturing are reduced and those remaining are rendered more difficult to process.

It is estimated that over 12,000,000,000 pounds of whey are available from various sources in a normal year with production at the level of the war years. Cheese production from whole milk has exceeded 1,000,000,000 pounds per year. The yield of whey is approximately 9 pounds per 1 pound of cheese, or 85 pounds per hundred pounds of whole milk. Consequently, the byproduct whey would be in excess of 9,000,000,000 pounds.

The production of casein during the war years has been about 15,000,000 pounds per year. At 35 pounds of whey for each pound of casein the whey byproduct would exceed 500,000,000 pounds.

Approximately 13 pounds of whey are byproduct from each pound of skim-milk cheese produced. With production at about 230,000,000 pounds of cheese per year, the whey byproduct will approximate 3,000,000,000 pounds. The total whey byproduct from all sources is, therefore, in excess of 12,500,000,000 pounds per year.

Only a small proportion of the whey produced is utilized in manufacturing. Little statistical evidence is available to indicate the number of pounds of products manufactured from whey, on the basis of which total whey utilization could be estimated. The production of animal feed from whey probably approximates 120,000,000 pounds per year. If this were manufactured from whole whey and if these feeds included all of the solids in whey, it would be estimated that 15 pounds of whey were required to manufacture 1 pound of whey solids, in which case approximately 1,800,000,000 pounds of whey would be represented.

Whey is condensed for animal feed, and no information is available to indicate the extent of this use, although it is known to be small relative to total whey production.

Whey is used in very limited quantities for the manufacture of cheese products. It is quite unlikely that the quantity of whey used for this purpose would exceed 500,000,000 pounds per year. The total utilization of whey in the manufacture of all whey products therefore probably does not exceed 2,500,000,000 pounds per year. The utilization of whey for manufacturing, therefore, is only 20 to 25 percent of the total whey available. Approximately 75 to 80 percent of the total available whey does not yield any cash income from which the cheese maker can receive cash to apply competitively in purchasing milk.

There is at present no very reliable basis of estimating the value of raw whey for animal feeding. The value is limited by the quantity of raw whey that any given animal can consume, since there are only approximately 6 pounds of solids in 100 pounds of whey. When the acid in whey rises because of bacterial action on the sugar the solid content of the whey is reduced and the farm livestock often get little more than water.

It will probably be impossible to utilize the total quantity of whey in manufacturing. The small quantity of solids in whey makes assembly of large quantities of raw whey necessary for efficient operation. There are relatively few places where the production of cheese is concentrated enough to make assembling of large quantities of raw whey feasible.

Since so small a portion of total whey produces cash income and since the value of whey per pound of cheese is very small, it seems inequitable and unnecessary that whey values should be included in the ceiling calculations for cheese.

TABLE I.—*Milk produced on farms in United States and estimated percentage utilized for production of American cheese*

Year	Milk produced on farms	American cheese produced [1]	Estimated milk utilized for American cheese [2]	Percentage of milk used for production of American cheese
	Mil. lb.	*Thous. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	
1941	115,498	753,122	7,155	6.2
1942	119,240	816,850	8,710	7.3
1943	118,140	765,249	7,271	6.1
1944	119,003	805,485	7,652	6.4
1945	123,411	775,248	8,521	6.9

[1] Cheese from whole milk.
[2] 9.5 pounds of milk per pound of cheese.

TABLE II.—*Milk produced on farms in Wisconsin and estimated percentage utilized for production of American cheese*

Year	Milk produced on farms	American cheese produced [1]	Estimated milk utilized for American cheese [2]	Percentage of milk used for production of American cheese
	Mil. lb.	*Thous. lb.*	*Mil. b.*	
1941	13,625	371,611	3,530	25.7
1942	14,239	417,414	3,967	27.8
1943	14,334	383,350	3,641	25.4
1944	14,643	369,044	3,508	23.9
1945	15,816	391,566	3,720	23.5

[1] Cheese from whole milk.
[2] 9.5 pounds of milk per pound of cheese.

TABLE III.—*Base and surplus whey: Monthly estimated value using various percentages for calculation of surplus*

Month	Whole milk used monthly as a percent of whole milk used in November [1]	Whole milk received [2]	Whey available for disposition [3]	Monthly base as 100 percent of November	Monthly base as 110 percent of November	Monthly base as 120 percent of November
	Pct.	*Thous. lbs.*	*Thous. lbs.*	*Thous. lbs.*	*Thous. lbs.*	*Thous. lbs.*
Jan.	96	288	244.8	244.8	244.8	244.8
Feb.	96	288	244.8	244.8	244.8	244.8
Mar.	119	357	303.4	255.0	280.5	303.4
Apr.	141	423	359.5	255.0	280.5	306.0
May	193	579	492.1	255.0	280.5	306.0
June	215	645	548.2	255.0	280.5	306.0
July	188	564	479.4	255.0	280.5	306.0
Aug.	167	501	425.8	255.0	280.5	306.0
Sept.	147	441	374.8	255.0	280.5	306.0
Oct.	131	393	334.0	255.0	280.5	306.0
Nov.	100	300	255.0	255.0	255.0	255.0
Dec.	98	294	249.9	249.9	249.9	249.9
Total		5,073	4,311.7	3,034.5	3,238.5	3,439.9

[1] Estimated from 10-year average of American cheese production.
[2] Based on assumption of 1 cheese factory with receipts of 10,000 pounds of milk per day in November.
[3] 85 pounds of whey per 100 pounds of milk.

Therefore, we respectfully submit that the ceiling price of cheese should be increased 1 cent per pound to compensate for the erroneously high whey value used in determining cheese prices.

II. SMALL STYLES—PRICE INCREASE

American or Cheddar type cheese has always been manufactured in various shapes and sizes and identified by the trade and industry as large and small styles.

The large styles, commonly known as flats, Cheddar, mammoth, etc., have usually been used in the manufacture of process cheese. The small styles, commonly known as daisies, long horns, squares, etc., usually reach the retail stores for direct sale to consumers as natural cheese.

Prior to the establishment of ceiling prices on the various styles of Cheddar type cheese, the Nation was producing about 65 percent in the form of large styles, and 35 percent as small styles.

To increase the production of large styles required to meet the war food program, ceiling prices denied to small styles a sufficient differential over large styles to meet the increased cost of manufacture.

As a result, the manufacture of small styles dropped from 35 percent to 6 percent of total Cheddar production within 6 months. In 1944 a one-quarter cent per pound increase was granted small styles for the purpose of increasing production, but without any result.

In 1945, another one-quarter cent per pound increase was granted small styles for the same reason. In the fall of 1945 the production of small styles did increase to about 9 percent of total Cheddar production, and at the present time are about 11 percent of total Cheddar production. (Sources of information USDA reports.)

The granted increases mentioned above were in response to industry requests for greater increases, claiming that one-half cent would not bring the desired shift in production. Time has borne out that prediction.

We submit below the present differential in manufacturing costs between the large and small styles:

So as to simplify the amount of information necessary to support an increased differential I have eliminated from consideration all items of a fixed or general nature which remain constant and do not vary with the style of Cheddar manufactured; in other words, I have only used those items where manufacturing costs will vary when you shift from large to small styles.

The information below includes the number of items of a variable nature used in the manufacture of 300,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese set up on a comparative basis showing the amount of supplies needed if that amount of cheese was manufactured into (a) single daisies or (b) twins.

Single daisy

15,000 bandages, 13½ by 6½, A grade, $24.10 per thousand	$361.50
30,000 circles, 12½, $10 per thousand	300.00
1,500 press cloths, 14 inches, $29.95 per thousand	44.93
4,690 boxes, 24 cents each	3,600.00
30 bundles, 14-inch scale boards, $5.50 per bundle	165.00
Total	4,471.43

Twins

9,380 bandages, 14½ by 8½, A grade, $31.71 per thousand	$297.44
18,760 circles, 13½ inches, $11.58 per thousand	217.24
1,500 press cloths, 14 inches, $29.95 per thousand	44.93
4,690 boxes, 36 cents each	1,688.40
9½ bundles, 14-inch scale boards, $5.70 per bundle	54.15
Total	2,302.16

The difference in total cost between the single daisies and twins is $2,169.27 for the 300,000 pounds of cheese or showing the daisy manufacturing cost to be .0072, about three-fourths cent per pound more than the cost of twins. The increased cost of labor in manufacturing daisies as compared with large styles is generally contended to be approximately one-quarter cent per pound.

Twins of 37 percent moisture sold on the moisture basis have a ceiling of 27.89 and of 36 percent, 28.33.

Daisies manufactured for curing usually run 37 percent moisture and during the period of aging or curing are subject to shrink which would reduce their moisture content to about 36 percent. Twins containing 36 percent moisture have a ceiling price of 28.33 while the daisies with the same moisture content have a ceiling of only 28.25—the manufacturing cost of daisies is approximately 1 cent above large styles.

The information contained in the above analysis is to justify an increase in the ceiling price of small style Cheddar-type cheese of one-half cent per pound above present prices.

Had we made a comparison between manufacturing costs of daisies as compared to cheddar style the difference would be more than in the comparison with twins.

Increasing the present maximum price of small styles one-half cent per pound will not affect the production of other dairy products, but will accomplish the intended and hoped-for increase in the production of small styles of Cheddar cheese.

Therefore, we request an increase of one-half cent per pound for all styles of Cheddar cheese weighing less than 25 pounds, for two reasons:

1. The increase is justified by the increased cost of manufacturing small styles as shown above; and

2. The previous increases during the past 2 years have failed to effect the desired increase in the production of small styles.

III. PLYMOUTH PLUS—REMOVE DISCRIMINATION

For the past 3 years, and more, numerous briefs and written statements have been filed with the Office of Price Administration and other Federal officials protesting the method of pricing cheese as being discriminatory in its application to the industry in the State of Wisconsin. The same charges have been made in conferences and hearings called, scheduled, or attended by OPA officials.

The charge of unfair discrimination against Wisconsin by OPA's Plymouth-plus (transportation factor) method of pricing cheese has been made on the floor of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. That charge has been carried in all trade papers and the daily press of the Nation.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, attending a conference with OPA officials in 1945, after hearing a presentation of these charges and praying for their correction, asked the official representing OPA, C. H. Beakes, Chief, Pricing Division of Dairy and Poultry Products, to show a flaw in the presentation of facts charging unfair discrimination against Wisconsin in the Plymouth-plus basis of pricing cheese. That challenge is still unanswered. Senator LA FOLLETTE also requested the OPA representative to convey to the Administrator the following request:

"With apparently no flow in the claim for correction of the Plymouth plus, I demand affirmative justification for continued control, or its immediate correction." This was confirmed by letter to the Administrator by the Senator. Repeated promises of study, consideration, and correction of the Plymouth-plus inequity have been made by officials of OPA. Never have they denied the charge of unfair discrimination.

We know of no State, dairy group, or individual who has opposed correction of this inequity. The requested removal of the inequitable features and discriminatory provision does not adversely affect any other State or dairy group. This is conclusively proven by the approval of the official OPA Cheese Industry Advisory Committee which represents all States and all factors of the industry.

Before submitting detailed data a few general claims or statements may better serve to illustrate the charge of unfair discrimination against Wisconsin cheese under the Plymouth-plus provision in effect since December 31, 1942.

1. Wisconsin cheese, without regard to quality, is one-half cent per pound below cheese manufactured just across the State line, and that differential over Wisconsin increasing with increasing distance from Plymouth, Wis. (See exhibit A.)

2. Wisconsin cheese factories have a lower ceiling price on cheese than the factories of any other State in the Union. No other dairy product is so priced.

3. Any wholesale buyer of cheese in the United States can buy Wisconsin cheese, delivered his city, for less than he can buy the cheese produced in any other State.

4. By the same token, any wholesale buyer of cheese in the United States makes a greater profit on the Wisconsin cheese than he does on the cheese he purchases in any other State.

5. This presents the unfortunate category of prewar cheese prices in reverse. (Source DPMA paying prices prior to price ceilings, exhibit B.)

6. The Plymouth plus in practice is actually Wisconsin minus. Wisconsin gets less than any other State in the Union for its cheese.

7. The price over Wisconsin paid for cheese in other States did not bring greater returns to the producers in those States. The Government paid the ceiling over Wisconsin but the producers received less; except in one or two States. (See schedule of DPMA prices attached, exhibit C.)

8. The reasons given by OPA for the pricing of cheese on the Plymouth-plus basis was to move cheese from a surplus producing area to deficit areas.

That argument falls in face of the pricing plan which permits an assembler of cheese in Wisconsin and Oregon to furnish all of set-aside requirements from Oregon to the Government, none from Wisconsin, and ship Wisconsin cheese to Oregon for his use.

And more important, not only to the industry, but, to the taxpayers, the set-aside total

was sold the Government from Oregon; paying the Plymouth plus there, and then shipped the cheese to New York for export. This cheese landed in New York costing the Government 4 cents per pound more than the Wisconsin cheese would have cost.

Why should we be now required to again repeat the many presentations in support of the removal of this admitted inequitable, unfair, and discriminatory provision. The one-half cent per pound increase only raises Wisconsin to the level of a zone reaching a few miles into adjoining States.

No one has given more time to its merits and demerits than the official OPA Cheese Industry Advisory Committee and it recommends correction.

With the inequity admitted, only its removal remains. That can be accomplished by one of two methods:

1. Grant Wisconsin one-half cent per pound increase in cheese price ceilings; or

2. Allow a minimum of one-half cent per pound transportation factor on all cheese in the Nation.

The following give additional support to that request:

(a) The OPA Cheese Industry Advisory Committee recommends it.

(b) After 3 years of petitioning no State or dairy group has opposed it.

(c) OPA has admitted its unfairness. (U. S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, see Capital Times, July 24–25, 1945, exhibit D.)

(d) OPA has promised correction. (Beakes to Kopitzke and exhibit D.)

Therefore, the cheese industry now asks immediate correction of this continued unfair discriminatory provision by increasing the ceiling price of Wisconsin one-half cent per pound, or, under present orders, granting all cheese a minimum transportation factor of one-half cent per pound at the factory.

This correction will not violate any of the prohibitory rules of reconversion, all of which permit the removal of inequities and none of which tolerate continuance of a discriminatory provision.

The three foregoing requested amendments to remove inequities are generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and Executive Orders Nos. 9250 and 9328.

Respectfully submitted by:

WISCONSIN CHEESE MAKERS' ASSOCIATION,
LEN KOPITZKE, *President.*
GEO. L. MOONEY, *Executive Secretary.*

EXHIBIT A

TABLE OF PRICES PAID F. O. B. CHEESE FACTORY OR SHIPPING POINT BY DPMA AUGUST 1943

Under present OPA ceiling prices, Cheddar cheese is 23¼ cents per pound, to which is added a transportation factor commonly known as Plymouth plus which is 115 percent of the carlot freight rate from Plymouth, Wis., to the point of sale. The following table sets out the price per pound over Wisconsin (base price 23¼ cents) as paid by the Dairy Products Marketing Association.

	Cents per pound over Wisconsin
Wisconsin: All points	0.00
Minnesota: Pine Island	0.54
South Dakota: Milbank	.87
Montana: Missoula	2.19
Idaho: Pocatello	2.19
Oregon:	
Portland	2.19
Tillamook	2.34
Washington: Seattle	2.19
California: Oakland	2.19
Iowa:	
Cedar Rapids	.53
Des Moines	.65
Illinois:	
Petersburg	.47
Valley City	.52
Missouri:	
Springfield	$0.65
Aurora	.90
Koskonong	1.12
Kansas: Wichita	1.00
Arkansas: Bentonville	1.04
Texas:	
Round Rock	1.46
Alice	1.70
Michigan:	
Escanaba	.43
Detroit	.55
Indiana: Warsaw	.50
Ohio:	
Belle Center	.60
Bremen	.66
New York: Lowville	.80
Tennessee: Nashville	.91
Mississippi: Columbus	1.16
Georgia: Atlanta	1.25

EXHIBIT B

	Price paid f. o. b.			
	By AMA May 1942, 20¼-cent market	By DPMA August 1943, 23¼-cent ceiling	Over Wisconsin	Price
	Cts.	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*
Wisconsin, all points	20.25	23.25	0	23.25
STATES ADJOINING WISCONSIN				
Minnesota, Pine Island	20.25	23.25	0.54	23.79
Iowa:				
Cedar Rapids	------	23.25	.53	23.78
Des Moines	------	23.25	.65	23.90
Illinois:				
Petersburg	20.25	23.25	.47	23.72
Valley City	20.25	23.25	.52	23.77
Michigan:				
Escanaba	20.25	23.25	.43	23.68
Detroit	------	23.25	.55	23.80
OTHER STATES				
Arkansas, Bentonville	20.25	23.25	1.04	24.29
California:				
Two Rock	20.25	------	------	------
Oakland	------	23.25	2.19	25.44
Georgia, Atlanta	------	23.25	1.25	24.50
Idaho, Pocatello	------	23.25	2.19	25.44
Indiana, Warsaw	20.25	23.25	.50	23.75
Kansas, Wichita	20.25	23.25	1.00	24.25
Mississippi, Columbus	------	23.25	1.16	24.41
Missouri:				
Springfield	20.25	23.25	.65	23.90
Aurora	20.25	23.25	.90	24.15
Koskonong	20.25	23.25	1.12	24.37
Montana, Missoula	------	23.25	2.19	25.44
New York, Lowville	21.25	23.25	.80	24.05
Ohio:				
Belle Center	20.50	23.25	.60	23.65
Bremen	20.25	23.25	.66	23.91
Oregon:				
Portland	20.25	23.25	2.19	25.44
Tillamook	------	23.25	2.34	25.59
South Dakota, Milbank	20.25	23.25	.87	24.12
Tennessee, Nashville	20.25	23.25	.91	24.16
Texas:				
Round Rock	20.25	23.25	1.46	24.71
Alice	20.25	23.25	1.70	24.95
Washington, Seattle	20.25	23.25	2.19	25.44

EXHIBIT C

DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING ASSOCIATION, INC., CHICAGO, ILL.

Average prices paid by cheese manufacturers, exclusive of subsidy, per pound of butter fat during the month of December 1944, by States

Alabama	$0.567
Arkansas	.578
California	.615
Colorado	.615
Idaho	.611
Illinois	.595
Indiana	.625
Iowa	$0.600
Kansas	.602
Kentucky	.556
Michigan	.601
Mississippi	.587
Minnesota	.627
Missouri	.592
Montana	.530
Nebraska	.543
New Mexico	.640
New York	.575
North Carolina	.610
Ohio	.609
Oklahoma	.588
Oregon	.658
Pennsylvania	.590
South Dakota	.573
Tennessee	.595
Texas	.568
Utah	.602
Washington	.640
West Virginia	.510
Wisconsin	.623

The national average outside of Wisconsin is $0.593.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of July 24, 1945]

CAPITAL TIMES SURVEY SHOWS CHEESE POLICIES CHANGED BY THE OPA

(By Miles McMillin)

It has been established by the Capital Times that recent revisions of cheese-pricing regulations by the Office of Price Administration are due in large part to recommendations made to the OPA by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The Capital Times has just concluded an investigation of this subject.

The Division's recommendations, it has been learned, were made in the course of and as part of its regular activity in connection with antimonopoly cases. The Division studies showed that regulations, as originally drafted by the Cheese, Butter, and Egg Division of the OPA, operated to strengthen monopoly control of the dairy industry and endangered the existence of independent cheese manufacturers.

Following receipt of information from Washington that the Antitrust Division had had a hand in the price-control changes, a Capital Times staff member called on Antitrust officials in Chicago and obtained confirmation of the Washington report.

The Capital Times was informed that a study of the effect of OPA regulations on the cheese industry had been made and a list of 10 recommendations were drawn up aimed at preventing further strengthening of monopoly control.

These recommendations were submitted to Wendell Berge, Chief of the Antitrust Division, by the Chicago office and were transmitted by him to OPA officials in Washington last year, officials said.

"The OPA has followed some of the recommendations in making certain changes and we are informed that consideration is being given to other changes," George Haddock, head of the Chicago office told the Capital Times. He added that the price-control agency had been cooperative in considering the recommendations.

Officials refused to comment when asked whether a change in OPA personnel might have been responsible for the sympathetic reception given to the Division's recommendation. Bitter complaints have been heard that price-control regulations have, up until recently, been in the hands of representatives of large cheese distributors such as Kraft and Borden, and that price policies reflected this tie-up.

Here are some of the men who helped draft the original price-control regulations of OPA which the Antitrust Division charges aided in extending monopoly control:

A. W. Sigmund, bulk cheese sales manager for the central division of the Kraft Cheese Co.

Neil Waterstreet, an economist with the Borden Co., who was loaned to OPA and who drafted the controversial Plymouth-plus provisions relating to transportation costs.

G. T. Lorfeld, manager of the Pabst-Ett Corp., a Kraft subsidiary.

Arnold J. Burke, who had connections with private dairy products distributors and who acted for a time as Chief of the Dairy Products Division of OPA. He has since obtained employment with a subsidiary of a large dairy products distributor.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of July 25, 1945]

ANTITRUST OFFICIALS SCAN AID GIVEN BIG PROCESSORS BY THE OPA

(By Miles J. McMillin)

The interests of the officials of the Chicago office of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice in the effect of price regulations on the expansion of monopoly in the cheese industry was particularly heightened by complaints heard from interested parties in Wisconsin.

Criticisms of OPA policies were heard from farmers' cooperatives, independent dealers, the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, and particularly from the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture. The cooperation of William Kirsch, of the State Department, who is devoting considerable attention to the problem of dairy monopoly and who originally brought the subject to the attention of the Antitrust Division, was of great assistance, Antitrust officials said.

The Division's studies showed that the OPA regulations handicapped the production and sale of natural cheese to the advantage of processed cheeses and cheese foods; that the regulations favored the processing and distributive functions of the large integrated firms to the disadvantage of the small independent producers and distributors. Following are some of the specific allegations made by Antitrust officials:

1. Price differentials between large and small styles of natural Cheddar cheese were inadequate. The price structure discouraged the manufacture of small styles and independent plants were obliged to suspend this operation. Cheddar was forced into the larger styles to the advantage of the processors and to the detriment of distributors seeking to retail natural Cheddar cheese.

OPA conceded the correctness of this allegation after investigation and increased ceiling prices on small styles by one-quarter cent a pound.

2. By not allowing a margin to cover the cost of aging natural Cheddar cheese the regulations discouraged its manufacture. Since the demand for natural cheese depends upon aging, the fresh cheese was forced into the hands of the cheese processors.

OPA found this charge substantiated and ordered an increase of 2¼ cents per pound to cover the cost of aging natural American cheese 6 months.

3. Specially cured brick cheeses, which competed with the highly flavored processed cheeses sold by the big distributors, were forced off the market because margins were not allowed for special production and curing costs.

OPA investigation showed this allegation to be substantially correct. Consideration is now being given to price alteration providing a margin to cover the curing costs.

4. A single price established for Swiss cheese regardless of quality operated to reduce the production of high-grade Swiss, resulting in a shift by consumers to processed cheeses. Moreover these regulations had little or no effect on the operations of Kraft and Borden which were engaged in a program of leasing a large number of Swiss cheese factories. By this leasing arrangement Kraft and Borden avoided the regulations by purchasing milk, which is not subject to price-control regulations, and making it into Swiss to be converted into processed cheese.

Admitting the substantial accuracy of this allegation OPA has nevertheless declined to act upon it until more complete industry support can be obtained for a system of grading. The Capital Times has learned from reliable sources in Washington that the principal opposition to the grading system comes from the big cheese distributors.

The Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association is also opposing the grading system on the plea that it involves Federal supervision and Federal-State cooperation. On the other hand, meetings held in the foreign cheese territory of the State revealed that farmers are definitely in favor of the grading system as is the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and the Swiss and Limburger Cheese Cooperative organization.

5. The Plymouth plus system of determining transportation costs, which are considered in the determination of the price ceilings, benefits the processors who manufacture cheese principally outside of the State of Wisconsin. The benefits arise from the fact their transportation costs are based on the fiction that they ship from Plymouth, Wis.

OPA found this allegation of discrimination partially correct and granted the faults of the Plymouth plus formula, but believes it better than any alternative so far proposed. The question is still under consideration.

In addition to these charges, the Antitrust Division alleged that allowances for the assembling of American cheese were inadequate; that regulations discriminated against intermediate distributors; that factory distributors were being discouraged; that penalties on substandard foreign-type cheeses were unreasonable.

Of the 10 allegations made, the OPA is said to have admitted that 7 were wholly or partially substantiated and to have pledged action to remove the faults as quickly as possible.

The Division's report is reported to have embodied a vigorous protest against the program of leasing independent cheese factories by the big distributors. It was emphasized that such a program not only strengthens their influence in the cheese industry but in effect constitutes an evasion of price-control regulations.

Efforts to curtail this practice by legislative action were made in the recent session of the Wisconsin Legislature. They were strongly opposed by the big companies and a bill specifically prohibiting a continuation of the program was killed in the senate in the late days of the session.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me in Columbus, Ohio:

Shall we approve the proposed loan to Britain? My answer is an unequivocal yes.

The loan agreement proposes a line of credit of $3,750,000,000 which can be drawn upon until December 31, 1951. It also sets up a schedule for amortizing the lend-lease and surplus property settlement of $650,000,000 to be paid by Britain to the United States.

The interest rate is to be 2 percent commencing in 1951. The debt is to be repaid over 50 years, the payment annually to be $120,000,000 on the line of credit and $20,000,000 on the lend-lease, surplus property settlement, or a total annual payment of $140,000,000.

One thing to keep in mind is that this is a loan and not a gift, although I say very frankly that I believe that it would be worth while on our part even if it were an outright gift.

If considered from an investment standpoint, based only on the monetary return of interest paid, it might not be good. However, it is not to be so considered. The benefits reckoned to accrue to us go far beyond such interest payments.

I believe that events before, during, and since the recent war amply demonstrate that the United States and Britain must work together if we are to have a peaceful world. For a long time war in a military sense between the United States and Britain has been unthinkable. The same should be true in the field of economics and trade. And yet under conditions as they exist today the only alternative to such an economic war is help to Britain.

For 6 years England used up the vast part of her resources in carrying on the war. She used up her foreign credits, incurring debts to other countries amounting to $13,000,000,000. These debts are held in blocked balances of English currency, making it necessary for England to place strict limitations on the use of her money in the markets of the world. These are debts owing to foreign countries that must be paid with money acceptable in those countries.

The only way England can get back into shape to start paying those debts is by starting once again selling her manufactured articles to other countries. To get the necessary raw materials for her factories she must buy from other nations, and particularly from the United States. But she has no money with which to buy in this country. She needs money or credit to start the process of purchase, manufacture, and sale that we must have to form world trade. We are all interested in seeing that process started. Economic recovery throughout the world will not be possible until it is started. Giving England the line of credit proposed over the next 5 years will be a great factor in starting it.

If England does not get this kind of help, she will have to continue and even extend the rigid wartime controls over trade and exchange. In such events her trade will be confined to the so-called sterling bloc of countries and trade with the rest of the world, of which we are a part, will be held to a minimum. The inevitable result will be two great economic blocs, one bloc headed by England, the other by the United States, engaged in a trade war that will be constantly disrupting to friendly relations and may, indeed, disturb the peace of the world. In the interest of a peaceful world we simply cannot let this happen.

It will mean much to us to have England back on her feet economically. Before the war she was our best customer. With this line of credit we can expect her to become so again.

As a part of the agreement England has promised to remove the restrictions on trade which war conditions made imperative. Open trade with all of the Empire will be possible, goods can move freely, and impetus will be given to that tremendous production

we must have in this country if we are to have the national income needed to keep us on an even keel financially and to enable us to start an orderly reduction of our national debt.

Probably the most serious objection made against this loan has been that it would open the floodgates for loans to all of the countries of the world. President Truman has given us positive assurance against this. On March 1, 1946, he sent to the Congress, with his wholehearted endorsement, the statement of the National Advisory Council on our country's foreign-loan policy. The very first recommendation was: "That the proposed British loan totaling $3,750,000,000 will be treated as a unique case and by no means will set a precedent for an avalanche of major credits to other countries."

Certainly no other nation can make out so good a case. The financial stability of no other country, however desirable it may be, can mean so much to our own country. To help set in order the economic household of the world and to open up the trade channels that mean so much to us we should approve the British loan.

Address by Hon. Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, at Conference of the Wisconsin Progressive Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which I delivered at the conference of the Wisconsin Progressive Party at Portage, Wis., on March 17 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been thrilled by this genuine demonstration of democracy at work. I know that each and every true Progressive in this hall must take pride in the manner in which this meeting has been conducted. We have carefully listened for many hours to the free and untrammeled expression of sincere opinion which has come from the lips of the many men and women who have participated in this discussion. All factions have had an opportunity to express their viewpoints in full.

It had been my intention to withhold my own opinion until after a vote had been taken. However with this invitation I feel that I must abandon that intention. I feel compelled to give my personal views on what I think should be done.

No man or woman has labored longer or harder than I have to advance the cause of the Progressive Party in this State and Nation. I exercised great vigor in public speeches in 1940, 1942, and 1944 against even the consideration of the possibility of abandoning the Progressive Party as a political entity. But when the election returns came in after the 1944 election I came to the conclusion that no man was justified in attempting to make the decision for those who had worked in this movement through the years. I concluded that at the proper time we should have a representative gathering to discuss and determine what the future course of the Progressive Party should be. Today we are having such a meeting. I have purposely remained in the background so that all could more freely and fully enter the discussion.

IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPLES

These discussions and the decision are highly important. But it is more important to make clear that nothing said or done today will deter us in carrying on with renewed vigor and determination the fight for the principles and ideals of the Progressive movement.

The Progressive movement is more than a form of political organization. It is a vital moving force that transcends personalities, politics, and parties. It is based on equality and justice for all. It is based on the fundamental principle that the will of the people shall be the law of the land. I venture to say that when the historian of tomorrow writes his chapters on the social and economic progress of the twentieth century, the Progressive movement will be recognized as a dominant force.

Historically, the mechanics of organization and the shape of the movement have changed from time to time, just as specific issues have changed. The underlying philosophy has remained the same. The zealous crusading for liberalism and reform is the same. Organizations are merely the instruments through which social and political ideals must be implemented. The form or organization through which we can work most effectively may change from time to time. But whatever organization we work through our ideals remain the same and we are doing the same big job.

We believe strongly in our principles. But we are not impractical dreamers. We are practical idealists. The statute books of the last half century contain many laws that we have succeeded in putting there. We have doggedly stood by policies and principles when it was not popular to do so. At times we have been stymied in the Congress, in the legislature, or in the courts. But again and again we have taken our case to the public and won. Those of us who have been through many a tough political campaign know that we are practical idealists, not naive visionaries. Good intentions and fine principles are meaningless if they are never put into effect.

On the other hand, we all know that it is equally bad to compromise principles on the basis of rationalized expediency. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the decision made here today will not compromise our position on any of the fundamental issues for which we stand.

HISTORY OF PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT

The Progressive movement in Wisconsin is more than 50 years old. It was born just before the turn of the last century, when machine politics dominated the Government, and candidates for public office ran with the consent of the bosses or they were not elected.

The philosophy of the movement evolved from the bitter struggles with the machine politics controlled by corporate wealth. Both parties were dominated by ruthless men who were concerned only with maintaining their own control. Election to public office and the enactment of public laws consisted primarily in the consummation of endless private political deals.

It was a gigantic game of poker played by the bosses with the people's money. The people had very little to say about either their money or government. The censorship of those days differed little from that of the special-privilege propagandists of today: Withhold the truth, if possible; in any event, color it to the best possible advantage. The party politicians at that time had the additional advantage that communication services were poor by present standards and news sources more easily controlled.

My father and others who dared to rebel against this entrenched political system which strangled both parties realized clearly that only under two conditions could a successful fight be made against those in power. First, the people must be informed of the truth—the whole truth—concerning public issues. Second, public interest in good government must be aroused.

He accomplished the first part—giving the people the facts—by hitching his horse to a borrowed buggy and talking with most of the people in Dane County. In campaign after campaign he and others were able to succeed when they got the facts to the people and aroused them in support of Progressive principles.

It is significant that the entire Progressive movement thereafter has been built around this same framework: (1) Give the people the facts, and (2) set up a political platform of principles and sound objectives around which the people can rally their support. The mechanics of putting the platform into effect come after the objectives have been laid down.

PROGRESS WITHIN REPUBLICAN PARTY

Working within the framework of the Republican Party with the effective cooperation of "fair-minded" progressive Democrats, the movement gradually gained strength. Wisconsin became a laboratory in political science. Wisconsin pointed the way to political and economic reform. Primary election laws and the Corrupt Practices Acts gave the government back to the people. Railroad and other corrupt corporate empires were curbed. Sound tax laws based on ability to pay and equality among taxpayers were formulated. A merit system replaced the spoils system in government employment.

The movement reached beyond Wisconsin. Wisconsin Progressives urged their platforms on national Republican conventions. They seemed to be hopelessly in the minority and were greeted with jeers when their platforms were submitted. But the powerful tactics of reading the record to the people brought results. For example, 12 years after the 1908 minority platform was submitted, 11 of the 13 planks had become Federal law. Eight years after the 1912 minority platform was submitted, 15 of its 18 planks were enacted into law.

These remarkable accomplishments were not achieved easily. There were many setbacks and many discouragements. Some were dissatisfied with remaining in the Republican Party and wanted to organize a reform party. In his autobiography discussing this point, my father made the observation: "Many of my close advisers believed that we should break from the Republican organization. * * * The bosses would have been pleased had I bolted. * * * Considered as a State problem, I have never questioned the wisdom of our course in remaining within the Republican Party."

The important fact to be noted in connection with this bit of history is not that the elder La Follette believed in staying in the Republican Party. The significant fact is that it was possible for the Progressive movement to make progress and it did make progress within the framework of the Republican Party at a time when reactionary forces were frequently in control and when the cause sometimes looked almost hopeless.

But in 1924 and 1934, when the Progressives carefully weighed the situation and came to the conclusion that the balance for effective work was in favor of independent organization, they boldly made that choice and carried on the same movement within a new framework. The point I wish to make is that consistency in purposes and objectives does not necessarily mean unchanging methods or political framework. We need make apologies to no one for whatever political party we choose as the medium to carry on the fight for our principles, so long as our methods are honorable.

VENTURES INTO NATIONAL ORGANIZATION

The Progressive movement had its first venture into national organization in 1911.

The reactionary trends in the Taft administration had caused much concern among liberals in Congress. It prompted the formation of the National Progressive Republican League to promote progressive legislation in Congress and in the States. The league was organized on January 21, 1911, by Senators La Follette, Bristow, Bourne, Norris, and others. Typical of the Progressive movement, the league adopted a declaration of principles and a platform which were put before the people. The declaration embodied a clear-cut reaffirmation of popular representative government, as opposed to caucus and special-interest control.

It proposed numerous political reforms, including direct primaries, election of United States Senators by direct vote, direct election of delegates to Presidential conventions, amendments to State constitutions to provide for the political instruments of initiative, referendum, and recall, and a thoroughgoing corrupt practices act. It also proposed numerous economic reforms, including legislation to deal more effectively with problems of monopoly, banking, conservation, tariffs, and railroads.

Obviously, the leadership and organization came from a national level. It was projected back to the various State and local organizations by congressional "insurgents," who came from those areas. The formation of State and local organizations to promote the new movement was encouraging, and capably accomplished in many areas. The issues were brought directly to the people and extraordinary enthusiasm was engendered when LA FOLLETTE made a tour through Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana in behalf of the organization, and later in his 200-speech coast-to-coast campaign trip.

Judged by his failure to obtain the Presidential nomination, this was regarded as a set-back. But look again at the specific principles that prompted this vigorous fight in 1911 and 1912. Every one of the specific recommendations in the declaration of principles of January 21, 1911, has since become Federal law, or has become embodied in the laws of many of the States.

Look at the record of some of the legislation that was ultimately forced through Congress by the Progressives and those who were won over to that cause. The sixteenth and seventeenth amendments to the Constitution, providing respectively for a Federal income tax and the direct election of Senators, can be linked to this upsurge of liberalism. It was only 8 months after the January 1911 declaration that Congress passed a statute requiring the listing of congressional campaign expenditures and placing certain limitations thereon. Under a statute of March 1, 1913, the Interstate Commerce Commission was authorized to obtain a general railroad evaluation. The Seamen's Act was passed. The Sherman Act was amended against discriminating freight agreements, interlocking directorates, and holding corporations. The Federal Trade Commission was created. Child labor statutes were enacted. The Smith-Hughes vocational education act was passed.

The Progressive movement can take credit for much of this constructive achievement. It did not elect its candidate President. It did not supply the majority of votes that passed this legislation. But it had provided the leadership and thinking that raised the issues, brought them to the people, and created a public opinion that forced their adoption. Whether in actual control or not, the Progressive movement has been a powerful force ever since its inception.

In 1924, the Progressives made another venture into national politics. After the Republican National Convention, meeting in Cleveland in June 1924, had flatly rejected a Progressive platform, a convention for Progressive political action was convened a few days later on July 4, 1924. Farm, labor, and other groups joined in a comprehensive national platform.

Many of you who are here today participated in that campaign. It was during that campaign that Progressives realized the difficulties of building a third party from the top down. Handicapped by innumerable electoral disadvantages in the various States, the Progressives nevertheless made a magnificent campaign, and rolled up the largest third-party vote that has ever been had in American history.

After the campaign, the Progressives once more returned to make their fight within the Republican Party. Nationally, they fought the short-sighted policies that brought us the boom of the twenties and the economic collapse of the thirties. They blazed the trail for national and State action to meet the problems of the depression—unemployment relief, public works, social security, farm relief, rural electrification, and other vital issues. State-wide, they had a continuous fight with reactionary Republicans and Democrats who were blocking progress in the State.

ORGANIZATION OF NEW PARTY

On May 19, 1934, when the economic structure was crumbling all around us, we met in Fond du Lac and organized the Progressive Party. The party platform declared allegiance to six fundamental principles. I want to take the time to reread those principles to you now, because, as I see it, regardless of what political instrument we use, these fundamental principles will still be our guide:

First. The right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; to express his opinion through a free press and free assemblage; and to have an effective voice in his political and economic life.

Second. The right of every man on the farm and in the city to earn his living by useful work and to receive for this work an income which the full productive capacity of society can afford.

Third. The right of American youth to develop their talents through public education adequately supported, and to find a place in the life and work of their country.

Fourth. The right of men and women whose industry has helped to build the Nation to face their declining years free from fear and want.

Fifth. The right of every citizen to join with his fellows in cooperative efforts, and to bargain collectively through representatives of his own choosing.

Sixth. The right of every American to live under a government strong enough to suppress the lawless, wise enough to see beyond the selfish desires of the moment, and just enough to consider the welfare of the people as a whole.

In the dark depression years, the Progressive Party became a symbol of hope for the people of Wisconsin, as against the abject defeatism of the Old-Guard Republican and Democratic Parties in the State. The party was successful in the 1934 and 1936 elections. Its leadership helped bring Wisconsin back up the economic ladder.

But the problems of the great depression were not confined to any one State. The economic problems were national in scope and required a national program. True to the spirit of the progressive movement, the Progressive Party gave full cooperation to the national Democratic administration when that administration sponsored sound progressive legislation.

The Progressive Party in Wisconsin was the result of dissatisfaction with the old party alinements. Other States had similar experiences about the same time: The Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota, the Non-Partisan League in North Dakota, and other factional realinements in California, Nebraska, and Iowa. They drew to their support progressives from both the Republican and Democratic Parties. These movements were no political accidents. They were expressions of a need for both economic and social reform.

The New Deal supplied some of that reform in its early years, and almost universally received the support of the various minor parties who held comparable views to the Progressive Party.

There were signs prior to 1938 that the national Democratic Party had lost its zeal for liberalism. The city bosses and southern Democrats were anxious to put the brakes on further liberal legislation. Much had been done since 1933, but there were still millions of unemployed; the farmer's income was below cost of production; labor's rights were in jeopardy; millions had insufficient and inadequate diets, housing, and medical care; big business and finance had a stranglehold monopoly on small enterprise.

Was this the time to quit? The Progressive Party said "No." It laid plans to carry on. This time it was proposed to build a national organization, State by State. It was recognized this would take much time, but a better organization was necessary—one that had ground roots in every locality.

DECLINE OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

The program never had a chance to get under way. The defeat suffered by the party in Wisconsin in 1938 was a mortal blow to the proposed national organization. A temporary come-back in the State was made with the successful gubernatorial candidacy of Orland S. Loomis in 1942, but even that was doomed with his untimely death. The war, which eclipsed all domestic and State issues, snuffed out the last hope for a national progressive party at this time. It enveloped both old parties with an impenetrable smoke screen. All pending and unsolved problems were displaced with new war issues. The record of failures and broken promises was, for the moment, forgotten.

The spirit of national unity that prevailed during the war was desirable and essential to the winning of the war. However, it also had the effect of weakening the political structure of all the minority parties that normally exert powerful influences in a peacetime democracy. It was partially a matter of restraint on the part of the minority groups, but primarily the fact that all issues, no matter how important, become secondary when a country fights for its national existence on the battlefield.

The two major parties survive such a crisis because our political structure is so organized that it gives a tremendous advantage to a two-party system. Third parties can exist only when they have exceptional emotional appeal which overcomes the technical handicaps they encounter in the election laws and machinery in the State and local governments, as well as organizational problems they encounter in the State legislatures and the Congress. If not on a national basis, they suffer the additional disadvantage that they must either join with a major party on national issues, or else have no voice in national affairs.

This is all very evident in recent years, with the general decline of minority parties. In the Seventy-fifth Congress there were 17 minority-party Members. Now there are only 3—2 of them Progressives. All the minority parties together cast only about 400,000 votes in the 1944 Presidential election.

These are only a few of the facts that we must face. And I want to emphasize that we are here today to deal with facts, not theories.

STATE PROBLEMS

We have always been hard pressed to build full tickets for the Progressive Party in all of Wisconsin's 71 counties. Although county officers are the local backbone of a political organization, we have never had full local tickets. County officers know that no principle or philosophy is at stake in the performance of their duties as coroner, sheriff,

or clerk of court. They are reluctant to upset local voting alinements. We were aware of this difficulty when the party was founded in 1934. We hoped we could find a solution. Instead, we have continually run into the stubborn fact that county offices are nonpartisan and not easily susceptible to a political realinement despite concurrence of the officers in Progressive principles.

This weakness on the county and local levels was translated to the State organization. It resulted in a constant deterioration. The turning away from the idea of a third and independent party in Wisconsin began in the localities. It culminated in a situation where we had local tickets in less than a dozen counties in 1944.

Yet, it is a fact that in county after county we have progressive-minded men and women serving in county offices. Most of them are serving as Republicans.

Thus, fellow Progressives, we are here to recognize a situation, not to create one. Most of you know that I have strongly resisted this trend away from independent, third-party action. However, the situation has now become so self-evident that I am reluctantly but decisively reconciled to facing the facts.

Where, then, do we go from here?

ALTERNATIVE COURSES

We have been deluged with political invitations. True, we have had no invitations from the self-appointed boss of the Wisconsin Republican Party or from the Communist Party. But Progressives would be insulted if they received invitations to join up with either Colemanism or communism.

If I read the press correctly, the Democrats have been especially vocal in their desire to have us join their ranks. What is the outlook for liberalism and progressivism in the Democratic Party?

I can assure you that the Democratic Party contains able, liberal men—men with whom I have been proud to fight shoulder to shoulder on many occasions during my 20 years in the United States Senate.

In my opinion, the Democratic Party is now stalled on dead center. Although it is the party in power, with a clear majority in both Houses of Congress, it has been unable to act with sufficient unity of purpose to meet the urgent problems of today. The Democratic Party has become so enmeshed in bureaucratic control and intraparty wrangling that some of its leaders are resigning in disgust.

The political genius of President Roosevelt welded together a coalition of many diverse elements, every shade of political opinion from out-and-out Communists to reactionary political bosses. His emphasis was on issues and principles, but the party emphasis today is more concerned with maintaining political control than with fighting for liberal legislation and progressive principles. The unmistakable signs of dissolution and disintegration are evident.

Fundamental divergences of opinion with the present administration, for example, have been expressed recently by men like Harold Ickes, Philip Murray, Hatton Sumners, R. J. Thomas, James Patton, of the Farmers' Union, and many another leader and organization, once the bulwark of support for the Democratic Party when it was the party of the New Deal and the common man.

Let your mind run over the history of recent legislation in Congress. In almost every vital field—full employment, labor legislation, housing, rural electrification, unemployment compensation, and many other critical issues—legislation has been killed, emasculated, or frozen in committee, and this despite the fact that Democrats have control of both Houses and every committee of the Congress.

But, we are told, the Democratic Party contains many liberal members. Of course it does. But were they able to beat the machine at Chicago in 1944? You know the sordid record of that convention.

What of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin? I am well aware that it numbers able, sincere liberals in its ranks. But these liberals are not the Democratic Party in Wisconsin. The Democratic Party in this State is a machine-minded organization without principle or program. Look at its record in the State legislature.

Most of its State senators and assemblymen have lined up time and time again with the reactionary Republicans in opposing Governor Goodland, just as they lined up again and again with reactionary Republicans in opposing the liberal program of Progressive governors. For your answer, look at the roll calls prepared by the Madison Capital Times or those prepared by other liberal groups.

As I have said before, we are here to recognize a situation—not to create one. The fact is written in past election returns that the Progressive Party in the present condition cannot serve as a vehicle for the advancement of progressive principles. It is also clear from the record that the Democratic Party is not our hope for a liberal instrument for political action.

PROSPECTS IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

What is our alternative? I have no illusion about some of the elements of the Republican Party. I have fought them tooth and nail. I have worked against reaction in the Republican Party ever since I was old enough to carry my father's briefcase. My record is full of detailed denunciations of the old guard in the Republican Party.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that the Republican Party of Wisconsin offers us the best opportunity for the advancement of Progressive principles. I do not mean for a moment that the Republican Party of Wisconsin, as presently bossed and controlled, is a liberal vehicle. Far from it. But I am convinced we have a better chance of putting our Progressive ideals on the lawbooks if we go into the Republican Party.

Wisconsin has always been a Republican State—and by this I don't mean a reactionary State. Some of the most far-seeing legislation ever enacted anywhere in America was enacted in our State when Progressives were in the Republican Party. Only once in 50 years have the Democrats succeeded to power in this State. A party that can succeed only once in half a century doesn't offer much opportunity to translate progressive principles into law.

Of one thing we can be certain. Our return to the Republican Party offers no comfort to the die-hard Tory bosses of the Republican Party. Anyone who has read a Wisconsin paper during the last year knows what cries of anguish have been coming from the citadels of Republican bossism in Wisconsin at the prospect of the return of the Progressives. We can be equally certain that our return will bring cheer and encouragement to those Republicans who have been battling the reactionaries.

I want to make it as clear as I can that this change of political framework will not in one iota change our stand on the basic issues of our time. I said in 1934 when we were considering the formation of a new party: "It is not important, I have observed, whether a man calls himself a Republican, a Democrat, or a Progressive. The public record teaches the voter how to test the fidelity of his Representative." I stand by that statement today.

By going into the Republican Party, we Progressives do not propose to be bound to support reactionary candidates or reactionary principles any more than my father or his associates were, or we were in the period before 1934.

I repeat, I have no illusions about some elements of the Republican Party. But I do discern a rising liberal movement within the Republican ranks. In the Senate, for example, I have frequently joined with men like Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, in sponsoring liberal legislation.

THE FUTURE OUTLOOK

No one can predict with certainty what the political alinement in the future will be. My opinion is that for the present the Progressives of Wisconsin can advance their cause most effectively within the Republican Party. The Progressive movement will not compromise its principles nor surrender its fighting spirit. It will continue to be a vital force in the State and Nation.

We have recently participated in a World War which smashed the totalitarian governments of our enemies. But democracy is still under attack at home and abroad. Every citizen who sincerely believes that men can have both economic opportunity and individual liberty must rally to defend and preserve the democratic way of life.

Progressives are steeped in the democratic tradition expressed in the Constitution, its Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence. They are experienced in the techniques of making these ideals realities in the lives of the American people. Progressives are schooled in the constant vigilance that the maintenance of individual freedom and liberty demands. Progressives will redouble their efforts to prove that even in an atomic age man can have economic security without yielding fundamental individual liberties to a totalitarian state.

Our task is great. Our cause is greater.

Whatever decision you make here today, I want you to know that so far as I am concerned, I am with you in this fight to the end.

It's Getting To Be a Habit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House on March 14, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which apeared in the Standard-Star published at New Rochelle, N. Y., titled "It's Getting To Be a Habit":

IT'S GETTING TO BE A HABIT

The Dunn Survey of Greenwich, which has been disappointingly accurate in its predictions of Democratic successes at the polls in recent years, looks ahead to the fall and asserts that the Democratic Party will increase their number of seats in the House of Representatives by 50.

It was this same survey which reported before the 1944 election that with 3,000,000 Federal employees, Roosevelt would win by "about 400 electoral votes." He actually got 432 that year.

The Dunn prediction is that this same "bought" vote will control in 1946 as it did in 1944. And in this connection it points out that where there were just before the 1942 congressional elections 986,000 Federal employes in the 9 key political States of the Union, there are now in those same States, 1,177,000 Federal employes, a gain of 20 percent.

So, says the survey, since there appears to be no GOP effort to meet this pay-roll vote, 1946 will be the same thing all over again.

We hope the prediction is wrong but fear it may be right.

Address by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen Before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at the Hotel Astor, in New York City, on March 16, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May it please Your Eminence, Mr. President, your Excellencies, Mr. Secretary, Friends, I am not so sure that my return here tonight for the fifth time is the proof of my popularity. It may be a proof of the fact that a criminal often returns to the scene of his crime. [Laughter.]

It was very good of the president to say something about my being an orator. I really believe that I am. Honestly I do [laughter], because I always notice that when I finish speaking there is a great awakening [laughter].

This is a marvelous manifestation of unity. Everyone tonight is Irish. During the Notre Dame-Army game everybody in New York is an alumnus of Notre Dame, and it seems here tonight that we are very happy to incorporate under the name of Ireland and the Irish everyone who has charity and love in his heart. The way we get together on this night and the unity we find here reminds me of Duffy in Ireland who had a circus in which was a wild tiger that everyone loved to see. But, unfortunately, the tiger died. Duffy was rather forlorn at the loss of this beast which had made him so much money, and he confided his loss to Pat, who said, "Don't be downhearted, Duffy," he said, "Give me a few good drinks of Irish whisky, skin the tiger, let me get inside of the tiger's skin, put me into the cage, and I will be as wild a tiger as anyone ever saw in Duffy's circus."

Accordingly, Pat took a few drinks, got into the tiger's skin, got into the cage, and those who came to the circus agreed that it was as wild a tiger as anyone had ever seen. But as he was cavorting about the cage, he looked out of the corner of his eye, and there, over in the other end of it was a lion, and all of that primitive fury and anger that the lion seems to bear against the tiger seemed to be shining in the lion's eyes, and Pat moved over cautiously toward the door, and finally he stood erect and he shouted out, "Faith, let me out," and with that the lion pounced on poor Pat. He fell prone upon the ground and as he felt the weight of the great beast upon him, there came from inside of the lion's mouth. "'Tis all right, Pat, I am from Cork, too." [Laughter.]

First of all a word about the Irish and then about Ireland. I want to talk about a couple of paradoxes of the Irish character. One is the paradox of their democracy and their aristocracy. The two seem to be rather exclusive, but they fit together in the Irish for some peculiar reason or other.

Have you ever noticed how very different the Irish are about their own as contrasted with other peoples? When, for example, a young Jewish boy makes a success of himself, everybody points up to him. They lift him up as "one of our boys." When an Irishman gets up, everybody pulls him down. [Laughter.] I wonder why that is. It probably is because of a fundamental instinct for democracy inside of the Irish. They want everybody to be absolutely equal. [Laughter.] Just as soon as one head gets above the other, he is immediately tapped upon the head and downed to the level of the others.

Now, why are the Irish so very democratic in that way? I think the reason is to be found in the fact that they are all aristocrats. Every Irishman thinks that he is a descendant of the king, and nobody can be better than a king. [Laughter.] That is why they pull him down to the level of kingship. [Laughter.]

That, too, accounts probably for the Irish tendency to deflate others if they get a chance, and sometimes to inflate themselves. I will speak of that in a moment. [Laughter.]

I recall not very long ago I was working with someone in Washington whom I tried to get to take the pledge. He was constantly getting into a state of amiable incandescence. [Laughter.] I use good English before the Friendly Sons. [Laughter.] You notice, too, how Mr. Secretary skirted that subject with fine language.

And I was passing by a saloon the other night, and out came Hank. I said, "Hank, I thought I told you that liquor was your worst enemy." He said, "I heard you preach, 'Love your enemies.'" [Laughter.] I said, "I did, but I didn't say swallow them." [Laughter.]

But there is the nature of the Irish for democracy; deflate somebody if you get a chance.

I was once preaching in an Irish community, and a woman got up with her crying child to take the child out of the church. I thought I would relieve her embarrassment, and I said, "It is quite all right, madam, the child isn't bothering me." She said, "I know, but you are bothering the child." [Laughter.]

Then, too, on the aristocratic side, the Irish always like to get ahead of everyone else in an argument. Have you ever noticed that? [Laughter.] The gypsy likes to get ahead of you in a trade, but the Irishman in an argument. I am not beyond that myself. [Laughter.]

Some time ago I was on my way up to Boston, and when I got on the train here at the Grand Central Station, I sat alongside of an Episcopalian clergyman. We got into a theological argument concerning the validity of Anglican orders. He contended that he had divine powers and that he could consecrate, that he could forgive sins, etc. I contended he could not.

It is not to the point of the story to tell you how we argued. We argued all the way from New York to Hartford. He got off at Hartford. [Laughter.]

There must have been something of the feminine in him, because he wanted the last word. So did I. [Laughter.] And just as he was getting off, as if to assure himself of the argument, he turned to me and said to me, "Remember Father Sheen, there isn't anything that you can do that I can't do." I said, "Oh, yes, there is. I can kiss your wife, but you can't kiss mine." [Laughter.]

Then, I will never forget how I was deflated in my turn-out in Cleveland not so long ago. I was to give a talk there in the auditorium of the Hotel Cleveland, and I arrived rather late. I had had no dinner, and I went up to my room and put on my purple cassock, and I said to the five members of the committee that I had had nothing to eat, and would they be good enough to go down to the dining room with me while I ordered a glass of milk and some graham crackers before the lecture.

We went into the dining room, and there were no men waiters. There was just a flippant young thing in the early "flirties" taking the orders. [Laughter.] One of those things that is all vogue on the outside and all vague on the inside. [Laughter.]

She took the orders of the five men. I hope Their Excellencies and His Eminence will pardon me for this. She took the orders of the five men, and then looked at me, and said, "Well, Cock Robin, what will you have?" [Laughter.]

Here is another peculiar paradox about the Irish. We are called the fighting Irish. I think I gave you a talk some years ago on the fighting Irish.

As I remember it, I developed the idea that a man does not fight because he hates. He fights because he loves, and since an Irishman loves more than anyone else, he fights more than anyone else. [Laughter.] But one of the peculiar paradoxes that is now coming out is that this fighting race was not in this war. [Applause.] And, more than that, they are not even a member of the peace organization. You know, chapter II of the United Nations Charter states that the organization is open to peace-loving nations, [laughter] which is not a very good standard, because it is purely subjective.

I think we all agree that it ought to be open to law-abiding nations. [Applause.] Article I of chapter 2 states that the original members are all those who declared war, so now we have the terrible paradox of the fighting Irish not being in a peace organization because they did not go to war. [Laughter.]

But though we were not in the war officially, let me tell you that there is one country that was in this war that has fifteen times the population of Ireland, and it gave only one-twentieth the number of soldiers. Ireland during the war shipped over 2,000 cattle a day to England and at one time all they got back was a little bull. [Laughter.]

There were 250,000 Irishmen fighting in this war on our side [applause], and it is worth recording that the two greatest heroes of Great Britain were Irishmen, Montgomery and Pat Finucane.

But though the Irishman is always interested in getting the better of an argument, there is one time when he is very humble, and that is when his soul is at stake. Not very long ago, there was a plane coming into LaGuardia Field. It was out about 15 minutes, and it radioed into LaGuardia Field, "Colonel Ginsberg landing at LaGuardia Field with 50 gallons of gasoline and one atomic bomb."

No answer came back. A few minutes later, another message came in, "Colonel Ginsberg landing in LaGuardia Field, 15 gallons of gasoline and one atomic bomb."

No answer.

Then, in came the next message, "Colonel Ginsberg landing LaGuardia Field, 1 gallon of gas and one atomic bomb," and immediately there came back the answer, "Colonel Riley speaking to Colonel Ginsberg. Repeat after me these words: 'Oh, my God, I am heartily sorry'." [Laughter.]

Apropos of this basic humility of the Irish when the spirit is at stake, after all, who of us shall ever forget the greatest American of them all who used to grace this dais, "God rest his soul," Al Smith. [Applause.]

He was the kind of an American and the kind of an Irishman and the kind of a Catholic who, when he was dying, called in all of his political enemies, really not enemies, just opposition, and said, "If there is anything that I have ever done in my life to have hurt you, I ask your forgiveness."

And when the pastor came a few days before he died, Al had already been absolved, and Al said again, "Father, give me absolution." He pulled himself up in the bed, and the priest said, "All right, lean back." Al said, "No, I want to take it standing."

Continuing that same spirit, there was a policeman here in New York who di-

rected traffic up around Fifty-ninth Street and Fifth Avenue. It was Good Friday, and an out-of-town car hit him and knocked him into the gutter. He arose, as best he could, stumbled over to the car, and he was immediately about to reprimand the driver, and then he said, "Oh, this is Good Friday. This is the day the Lord forgave his enemies. It is now 12 o'clock, and so, I forgive you," and with that he dropped dead.

With all the inflation of the Irish, and all of their aristocracy, that is their basic humility.

That brings us to the larger view of Ireland. Almighty God in His providential ordering of this world has set two bastions and fortresses on either side of Europe, Ireland on the one side and Poland on the other.

Ireland is like a child that has come dripping out of the baptismal waters of the great Atlantic, and Poland is like a sword that was driven into the eastern half of Europe to shut out the heresies of the East. Both of these countries have exactly the same vocation in the world, to preserve the heritage of Christianity, democracy and human rights in all Europe.

Both of them have been the source of considerable political foment, and, basically, because of this vocation. Poland in the east and Ireland in an empire.

Their courses have run very much the same. But now there is a slight difference, and it is only temporary, please God.

Ireland, in its history, and let us not forget it, was the one country that preserved culture and civilization in Europe when the barbarians overran it. They swept down from the north and knocked at the gates of Rome, and when those gates would not open for them, they pushed them in, and Rome fell just as Satan fell from heaven. Then there came the Franks into Gaul, and the Jutes and the Angles and the Saxons into Great Britain. Just as certain peoples in Europe are now being pushed westward into our zone, so, too, the scholars and the culture and the civilization of Europe was pushed back and back and back to the west until, finally they concentrated in the only land that the barbarians did not conquer, namely, the land of Ireland.

So full was Ireland in those days of scholars from all over Europe that Armagh was populated by one-third foreigners, and Dr. Johnson is quoted by Boswell as saying that Ireland became "the school of the west" during the Dark Ages.

Finally, when Ireland had educated these people, and the barbarians themselves began to receive the faith, what did Ireland do? She sent back all of the culture and civilization again into Europe. For example, Columbkill went into England, practically recivilizing England so that in the year 602 every bishop in England was an Irishman except one, and he was a Frenchman educated in Ireland.

Columbanus went through Burgundy and went through Italy, so that even today in 20 towns in Italy there are 120 churches that are named after Irish saints, if you please.

Finally this great missionary came to Gregory the Great. He was a tiny little man, and he prostrated himself before the Holy Father, and Gregory raised his hands and said, "I thank Almighty God that such strength should be given to a little man." Then out came that aristocracy of the Irish, even in those days, and Columbanus arose and said, "He who depreciates the worker depreciates the Divine Author." [Laughter.]

Then when Charlemagne opened his schools, it was the Irish scholars who were the foremost teachers.

What Ireland was doing for civilization in those days, Poland has done traditionally in the East. It kept the civilization of Europe safe, when the Turks, the Moslems, and the Mohammedans would have swept over Europe, and even in our own times, it kept Europe safe. For in 1920 when Tukhachevsky boasted of the fact that he would lead the first Godless army throughout the world and came into Poland, the ranks of the Polish Army were broken and spent. As the army marched on toward Warsaw, every single diplomat in Warsaw left, save one, a certain Monsignor Ratti, who belonged to the staff of the Vatican.

The people came to him and said, "Only your prayers, Monsignor, can save us." This army came on toward Warsaw as Monsignor Ratti organized a novena in honor of Our Blessed Lady. It began on the 6th of August, which was the Feast of the Transfiguration, and was to continue until the 15th of August. Three days before that ended Tukhachevsky was within 12 miles of Warsaw; 2 days before they were within 9 miles of Warsaw; and the day before they were within 6.

Monsignor Ratti addressed a group of schoolboys in Warsaw, reminding them of the mission of Poland, the mission to save the civilization and the democracy and the rights and the heritage that had come from Divinity. General Pilsudski gathered together an army from these boys and attacked directly in front, and, at the same time the boys and other parts of the army made a flank attack. The enemy broke in what was called the nineteenth greatest battle of the world, the Battle of the Vistula. Poland's civilization was saved.

The man who inspired Poland in that dark hour was Monsignor Ratti, who afterward became Pius XI.

Poland fulfilled a mission exactly the same as Ireland's mission, namely, to save Europe.

And now look upon poor Poland. Poor Poland is now suffering. Originally crucified, divided, it now has a million or more refugees in a foreign land. A Polish bishop ordained two deacons in order that they might administer to the refugees, and the next morning they were taken out and shot. Hundreds of them are loaded into boxcars. One particular group remains on a siding for 48 days, and then finally when they arrive at their destination, 32 of them are frozen to death.

In the midset of all this suffering, there is one nation that can speak, Ireland. Ireland, speak to Poland, and say to Poland, "We understand your sorrow and your cross. Once upon a time there was a £4 bounty upon the head of every priest. The Mass-rock in Ireland testifies to our allegiance to a faith. Our hedge schools bear witness to the days when we taught despite the foreigners in our land. We say to you, "O Poland, be strong.' In the language of St. Paul, 'We have fought the good fight. We have kept the faith.' "

Poland and Ireland are perhaps like James and John, those Apostles who asked to be seated on the right- and the left-hand side of the Saviour of the Kingdom. The Saviour asked these two boys if they could drink the chalice of His suffering, and so, too, you, Poland, and we of Ireland, have been asked to drink of that chalice.

We have finished drinking it. You are drinking it now, but be brave and strong in that faith, O Poland.

We are the only nation in the world that can teach you to be steadfast among such sorrows and such trials and such woes, and we pray God with you that a day may come when both of us will stretch our hands across all Europe in a day of peace, and form upon the breast of Europe the august embrace of the Cross of Christ.

[Rising applause.]

Tribute to Thomas A. Edison by Dr. Lester H. Clee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on February 13 last, at the Kiwanis Club of New York, Dr. Lester H. Clee, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Newark, N. J., one of our outstanding New Jersey citizens, made a notable address on the life and influence of the late Thomas A. Edison.

Thomas Edison of course was a world citizen and an outstanding American, but to us in New Jersey it was a matter of special pride that he was our neighbor. This eulogy of Mr. Edison is so timely and so splendid in its vision and scope that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nothing measures individual worth like a man's conception of what it is to be a man. The contrast between man's old ox-cart and his new Packard is not so striking as the contrast between the ancient idea of manhood and the new idea of manhood. The man universally admired in ancient times is now an object of scorn and derision.

These changing conceptions of the measure of greatness are the true milestones of progress in the early ages. The hero of the village was the youthful Hercules or Samson—mere brute force. And then the man most admired was the one who stood nearest to Apollo's physical strength and beauty, and after the race, was crowned with laurel. When a long time had passed the Romans thought that the man was most to be admired who never worked, who carried about an atmosphere of elegant leisure and perfumed luxury, who wore snow white robes, made his arms white with powder, and covered his hands with rings.

In the Middle Ages the idea of a real man began to be humanized. In that era of chivalry it was every man's ambition to be called a hero, not for skill in battle, nor the art of eloquence, nor power with the sceptre, but to have a reputation for chivalry, risking life to free some captive maiden or knight.

Since that time new ideals have been added and the conception has been made more and more perfect. Perhaps the ideal man will never be described in exact language. We can only say among his qualities are the iron will, the strong intellect, the pure mind, the gentle heart. The man we honor this noon-hour had as his priceless possession all four.

There are three measures of greatness based on a true conception of man. First, a man is great when his objective is noble. The most important thing about an individual is not that he is on his way, it is his destination. Thomas A. Edison knew where he was going. He had one objective—to make the world a better place for his fellowman to live in—and he gave of his God-given genius to this noble end.

John Burroughs expressed it in simple but profound language: "His first and leading thought has been, What can I do to make life easier and more enjoyable for my fellow-

man?" The hand of Edison is present in more phases of everyday life than that of any other scientist. There is practically no phase of ordinary activity that does not touch in some way the result of the genius' handwork. The electric system that may ring your alarm clock derives from him, as does the transmitter of your telephone. The tubes in your radio are the outgrowth of one of his inventions, and at night when you go to bed you may echo the words of Joseph H. Choate, one-time Ambassador to Great Britain, who told the inventor, "I never turn out the light but that I bless the name of Edison."

It takes an iron will and a strong intellect, a pure mind and a gentle heart to hold fast to such a noble objective—to make the world a better place for his fellow man to live in. Truly, when we use this measuring rod, Thomas A. Edison was great.

Second. A man is great when he produces. We judge land by the amount of corn, cotton, oranges, or apples it can produce. We kill hens when they cease producing. We slaughter cows when they do not give milk. We dismiss salesmen when they do not sell goods. Production is the test. The only disgrace is to produce nothing. Greatness is indicated by what a man's life produces. When you measure the life of Thomas A Edison on the basis of what his life produced, greatness is an inadequate word. No man has made a greater contribution to modern scientific progress than Thomas Edison. The list of his inventions would occupy several pages of a book.

For more than a generation he had no serious competitor as an inventor. The accomplishments of this man's mind and heart are staggering and overwhelm the imaginations of ordinary man. He made over 1,150 contributions to his fellowmen and caused the employment of one out of every nine persons in industry.

Just listen to but a few of his productions! His first machine, a vote recorder, a printing stock ticker. Improved the first typewriter into a practical machine. Invented the carbon transmitter which made the new Bell telephone a commercial success. Invented the phonograph. Perhaps the greatest of Edison's inventions and triumph over colossal obstacles was the incandescent lamp; and next to the incandescent lamp in its value to public life was his development of what is the present moving picture system.

All of this and more was made possible by enormous labor day and night, a physical frame that needed little sleep, ceaseless study, and experiment that spared no money or drudgery of apparently hopeless repetition. He himself said that genius is one-tenth inspiration and nine-tenths perspiration.

No name among inventors stands higher. This record of production demanded an iron will, a strong intellect, a pure mind, and a gentle heart. Truly when we use this measuring rod of productiveness, Thomas A. Edison was great.

Third, a man is great when he has the priceless sense of humility. Edison's scientific mind could not conceive of a universe so mathematically accurate without a guiding force, or captain on the bridge of the ship. The planets in their courses through the millions of years, the wonders of the earth with its multitudinous forms of life, the marvels of botany, geology, biology, all proved to him there was a supreme and ruling intelligence behind it. George Parsons Lathrop once asked Edison, "Do you believe in an intelligent Creator?" The answer was, "Certainly. The existence of such a God can, to my mind, almost be proved from chemistry." A humble man, honored by the great of America and by the great of many lands. When we use this measuring rod of humility, Thomas A. Edison was great.

We do well to pause in these uncertain and baffling postwar days to pay honor to such a man. He takes his place in this month of February alongside two of our greatest men of nobility and character—Washington and Lincoln. We are reminded as we study his life that diligence, honesty, selflessness, humility, and love build men whom we honor and adore. It reminds us that in these days thefe is something, perhaps a little something, but a something, each one of us can do for our fellowmen, for our country, and for our world.

Thomas A. Edison speaks today to all men. You are great only in the measure of your effort to benefit the world and give the best you have. Sir Oliver Lodge paid him a high tribute. May I make it mine: "One of the greatest beings of this world."

Quentin Reynolds Terms Veterans America's Displaced Persons—Describes Housing Plan in National Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Quentin Reynolds, the world famous war correspondent, was commentator last Sunday night on a Nation-wide broadcast called Let's Talk It Over, which went on the air at 6:45 p. m. over the Mutual network.

With the good reporter's objectivity and accuracy, for which he has long been noted, Mr. Reynolds described congressional action on the President's housing program. He called the attention of the American people to the activities of the lobbyists, who exerted such tremendous pressure on the House of Representatives, and told of the need to provide housing for veterans at a price they could pay.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include his commentary, for the benefit of the Members.

The saddest sight in Europe these days is that of thousands and thousands of what we call displaced persons coming back to their home towns. For years these men and women have lived in concentration camps or prison camps. Only their dreams kept them alive; dreams that some day the war and horror and hunger would be over and they could again go home. Well the war did end but the hunger and horror didn't. And when they went back to their homes they found heaps of rubble, so once more they went to camps, this time the huge displaced-persons camps we have established. I saw many such camps in Germany and France and mingling with the families in them you could feel the despair and hopelessness they felt. Oh they were fed all right and they were no longer behind barbed wire but they were homeless and a family without a home is an unhappy family. Looking at them I thought of our own good luck. No Americans came under the head of displaced persons.

Then I came home and soon began to realize how wrong I had been. We do have displaced persons here at home, thousands and thousands of them. They are all American war veterans. They are the displaced persons of the United States. They aren't living in huge uncomfortable camps—not yet—but neither are they living in their own homes. And a family without a home is an unhappy family.

FEW HOUSES BUILT DURING WAR

During the past 5 years there has been virtually no building of new homes or apartment houses in this country except for war workers. But during that 5 years our population has increased 8,000,000. We didn't notice any shortage because millions of our men were out of the country. Now they're back and they're looking for places to live. But there are no places to live. They didn't mind this too much at first. After all it was nobody's fault that we didn't build enough new houses during the war. The labor and the material was needed for war production. But the war has been over now about 6 months and very very few new homes are being built. Today there are more new families than there are new homes. It's enough to make a veteran pretty mad.

I can hear veterans say, "During the war, nothing was too good for us. You gave us the best guns and aircraft and ships. Expense didn't matter as long as we were fighting. You gave us the best food and the best uniforms and the warmest socks and coats. Expense didn't matter as long as we were fighting. Now? Now we only ask a place to live, a place where our kids can grow up and we can't find such places. What's with us anyhow? We were good enough to fight out of the country; aren't we good enough to live in the country?

WHO IS TO BLAME?

I've heard veterans talk like that. So have you. Well, let's find out what the score is. Somebody must be to blame. Suppose we start at the beginning. A few months ago it became very obvious that a gigantic housing program would have to be put into effect. Veterans by the thousand were streaming into their old home towns. A lot of them had been married during the war. They had children. While they were away their wives had been living with their parents.

Well no soldier went into this war just so he could live with his mother-in-law after it was over. There were thousands and thousands of new families and no new homes. President Truman knew this and be appointed a man to act as National Housing Expediter. He picked a man named Wilson W. Wyatt, former mayor of Louisville, Ky.

Wilson Wyatt is a hunk of dynamite. He's young and he's tough and like most America he thinks the veteran is getting a bum deal in housing. He went over the whole problem and came up with a lot of facts. They were facts that could be checked too.

He said quite bluntly that by the end of this year there would be 2,900,000 married veterans looking for homes and an additional 560,000 nonveterans. A survey made by the National Housing Agency disclosed the fact that already 1,200,000 families are living doubled up with other families. He said, quite bluntly, that by the end of 1947 production of 2,700,000 houses should be under way; that was the only possible solution. He drew up a plan, the veterans emergency housing program, which outlined how this enormous amount of building could be done.

It couldn't be done, he said, by business-as-usual methods anymore than the terrific hopped-up war production of planes and guns could have bee ndone by business-as-usual methods. It would require drastic steps but he added this was an emergency and drastic steps were necessary. Now Wyatt kept in mind the fact that veterans aren's loaded with money. What good would a lot of new houses be if they were price so high that the veteran couldn't afford to buy them.

PREMIUM PAYMENTS

Wyatt said that the Government should assume some of the expense. He suggested what he calls premium payments. That's about the same as the cost-plus contracts

used to stimulate war production. Let me give you an example of how these premium payments would work. Suppose a producer is producing at top speed right now, putting out a respectable quantity of materials. He's working at full capacity. Suppose, however, instead of working one shift of men he could work two or maybe three shifts with plenty of overtime. He could produce twice the amount of materials. He says, and says quite frankly and rightly, "That's O. K. with me but I can't afford to pay overtime, without raising the price of my materials." Wyatt says, "We can't give you price increases which will add to the price of the finished house because if we do it will be out of the reach of the veteran's pocket but we'll pay that extra overtime for you. Then you won't have new increased prices."

In short, these premium payments would not be given for the normal production that's going on now but for the expanded production, for extra production that the emergency calls for. Wyatt says that this would cost the Government just $600,000,000. Wyatt says that we must consider this as part of the cost of the war and he's right. We didn't care what we spent during the war if it helped. This $600,000,000 is exactly one-fifth of 1 percent of what the war cost us. We spent $300,000,000,000 to win the war. Six hundred million isn't much to spend for living quarters for the men who won the war for us. Besides, that $600,000,000 comes out of taxes; it's money given to the Government by you and me. It's money paid in part by the 3,000,000 veterans who will profit by the program. This money will enable nearly 3,000,000 war veterans and their families to start a normal life again. Is this a communistic scheme or a socialistic scheme, as some Congressmen say? Of course not. It's an American scheme.

NO SPECULATION

What else did Wyatt propose? You could sum it up in one sentence. In effect he said, "Let's not have any more speculation in the prices of existing houses which are sold to veterans." That's all. It's so simple you wonder why no one thought of it before. Here's what it means in a practical way. There's a house for sale in your neighborhood. You go to the man who owns it and agree on a price; a price that suits you both. Say you buy the house for $6,000 or $10,000. That price would then become the ceiling price for the duration of the emergency—perhaps 2 years. Well, that's all right with you. You're a veteran with a family. You want to live in the house. If after a year or so you get a job in another city and have to move you'll have to sell your house for that same $6,000, plus a real estate commission. That's still all right with you—you've lived in it a year and you break even on the deal.

But a lot of people don't like that idea at all. You see, they don't want to live in the houses they buy. They want to buy the house as a speculation, hold it a while and then sell it at a big increase. The man who buys it may be a speculator who will want to sell it at a higher price, too. Then after a while you or another vet comes along looking for a house to live in but can't buy this house—by now the price is sky high. That's the kind of speculation Wyatt wants to stop. Is that communistic? Is it socialistic? Is it a crackpot scheme? It doesn't sound like it to me. It sounds like Wyatt is just figuring out a way to keep veterans from being gypped.

After Wyatt had drawn up this program and the President had approved it a hundred percent, it had to go to Congress in the form of a bill. No one thought there'd be any opposition to it. How could there be? This wasn't a political question. It was a sound, decent, honest attempt to get houses built for veterans and to see that the veterans got a fair shake on the price.

LOBBYISTS NAMED

Congressman PATMAN, of Texas, introduced the bill and men like Congressman MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, made eloquent pleas that it be passed. Now the wolves moved in. Two powerful lobbies with plenty of money and plenty of influence went to work on Congress. Let's name them. They were the Producers Council, a group of building materials manufacturers, and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. They wanted business as usual—plus more profits. They wanted housing left alone. This was their baby and they wanted no one else to touch it. This was the time for a killing. Big demand—small supply. That's when the speculators get rich. They didn't care about the displaced persons of America. They put plenty of heat on individual Congressmen. They bombarded them with telegrams and letters. I've seen the telegrams and letters. And Congress listened.

A lot of Congressmen made speeches about our brave boys who won the war for us and then they began to murder the Patman bill. They wouldn't give the veterans homes but they'd give the veterans plenty of speeches. I listened to some of those speeches. It was pretty sickening. No one came up with any honest, constructive criticism of the bill. Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, moved that the entire bill be killed. Well, that was in character, all right. Congresswoman JESSIE SUMNER, of Illinois, shouted, "The building industry is up in arms against this communistic bill." Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, a large real-estate holder; said, "I couldn't build a single house under this bill."

Smiling, complacent men sat in the visitors gallery. These were the lobbyists and they knew now that they had done their work well. Congressmen of both parties got up to throw knives into the bill. In vain men like MIKE MONRONEY argued for the veterans. It did no good. The lobbyists wanted price ceilings lifted altogether. They wanted to cut a melon; they wanted the good old days back, the good old days when you could get rich quick, overnight, if you didn't have a conscience; the good old days of the depression when a million homes were foreclosed.

THE HOUSING VOTE

Most of the leaders of American business were heartily in favor of the bill. One of them, Russell G. Creviston, of the Crane Co. of Chicago, and a former president of the Producers Council, was so disgusted that he immediately withdrew himself and his company from membership in the council. But the House of Representatives refused to listen. They cut the heart out of the bill. By a vote of 161 to 92 they smashed the subsidy proposals. Not one Republican voted for the bill and 33 Democrats joined the Republicans in killing it. Where were the liberal Republican Congressmen we've all come to admire so much lately? They were absent. Where were the liberal Democrats? More than a hundred of them stayed away when it came time to vote. They didn't want to vote against the high-powered real estate and building material lobbies and they didn't want to go on record as voting against a bill designed to aid veterans. These are the people you and I send to Congress. We voted them in, these miserable cowards of both parties who didn't have the guts to stand up and be counted. Let's remember their names when it comes time for reelection. And let's remember the Producers Council and the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Now the bill is in the Senate. The same lobbies are operating there that operated last week in the House. Maybe the Senate is not intimidated so easily. That remains to be seen. I repeat this isn't a partisan political bill at all. If it were I wouldn't waste your time talking about it. This is a fight, not between political parties; it's a fight between private enterprise and free enterprise.

When a man runs a gambling house—that's private enterprise. He's in it just for his own profit without regard to the rights or privileges of his neighbors or his fellow Americans. Free enterprise—that's something different. That's the American way of operating with full regard for the rights and privileges of others. It's up to the Senate now to decide under which system the housing program will come. We might let our Senators know how we feel. This man Wilson Wyatt needs some help. He's the kind of man who deserves our help.

A year ago there were millions of Americans walking the muddy roads of Europe and the Pacific islands, looking for shelter. They accepted that all right. That's part of war. Today these same Americans are walking the streets of America looking for shelter for themselves and their families. They refuse to accept that. That's not the peace they fought for.

Memorial Address on the Late President Roosevelt by John T. Welsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial address eulogizing our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The address was delivered by Mr. John T. Welsh at South Bend, Wash., on April 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Honor, Judge O'Phelan, and friends, this morning the American flag is waving at half mast. The American people are in grief and sorrow. A tragedy has befallen us. Our beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is dead.

How true it is that—

"The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
Await alike the inevitable hour,
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

In the Douay version of Holy scriptures, there is found the following tribute to great and worthy men:

"Let us now praise famous men,
And our fathers that begat us,
The Lord hath wrought great glory by them
Through his great power from the beginning,
Such as did bear rule in their Kingdoms,
Men renowned for their power,
Giving counsel for their understanding,
And declaring prophecies,—
Such as found out musical tunes,
And recited verses in writing,
Rich men furnished with ability,
Living peaceably in their habitations,
All those were honored in their generations,
And were the glory of their times,
Their seed shall remain forever,
And their glory shall not be blotted out.
Their bodies are buried in peace,
But their name liveth forevermore."

I believe that the above-quoted words of the inspired writer are, in many respects, applicable to the life and career of our deceased President.

We do not respect any man who maligns the dead. On this solemn occasion to dis-

cuss partisan political issues would be out of place and be a grievous sin. At the time of the death of the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, it will be admitted by all, that he was not only the best beloved man in America, but also in every civilized nation in the world. It is not my purpose to eulogize him now, when his voice is silenced by death, but that fact does not prohibit me from speaking the truth of him, as I conceive it to be.

God was kind and liberal to Franklin D. Roosevelt, for He endowed him with wisdom, and superior intellectual capacity, and adorned him with moral greatness—three preeminent and heavenly gifts.

He was born to wealth, reared in luxury, and educated at Harvard. His youth and early manhood were alike spent in the environment of the aristocracy of wealth. Yet, his conscience and his nobility of character never permitted him to lose his sympathies with, nor his love for the common people, the people who labor daily for their sustenance, with their hands or with their brains. The toilers of America, their wives and their children will always gratefully remember his herculean efforts in their behalf, and his great name and his fame.

In addition to his other great talents, he possessed a magnetic presence, a charm of manner, a keen sense of humor, and an ardent love for his country's welfare.

Thus equipped, he was elected by the people for four successive terms to the highest office in the gift of this great Republic, an honor which was never bestowed on any other man. The Congress of the United States gave President Roosevelt more powers and greater authority than were ever granted any other Chief Executive. Did he abuse such trust? As to how he made use of these special prerogatives, the American people have answered and proclaimed:

"This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased."

The illustrious Charlesmagne used his sword to subdue, civilize, and Christianize the barbarians who threatened his empire. The lamented Roosevelt used his legal authority to outlaw war, and give permanent peace to a distracted world.

He was the soul of altruism; and he devoted his time and energy to the alleviation of down-trodden men, irrespective of party, race, color or creed; and in this holy cause he won an imperial crown of glory, in which there were precious jewels, symbolizing civil liberty, justice, equality, toleration, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.

Because of his great efforts and earnest endeavors for the establishment and maintenance of these natural rights of man, he is entitled to everlasting renown.

When President Roosevelt beheld savage and inhuman monsters invade, despoil, and rob Denmark, Norway, Finland, Poland, Belgium, Holland, and France, each and all inoffensive, peace-loving Christian nations, his sympathetic heart bled. When he witnessed his own country and her people treacherously assaulted at Pearl Harbor by the savage Japanese barbarians, he asked the Congress of the United States to declare war, and war was immediately declared on the enemies of civilized mankind. There was no other alternative. To crush and subdue the plunderers and despoilers of civilization; to restore peace and civil liberty to the human race, the sword must be used.

It may seem strange, but it is true, that our merciful God sanctions the use of the sword and the saber to stop the enslavement of men, women, and children, and to save the whole world from chaos.

Our late President was well versed in Greek history and literature, and he knew that the Greeks are lovers of justice, and of those liberal arts which elevate human life. Therefore, when they were recently brutally attacked by despots, his sense of justice was aroused, and he was sorely grieved, and he pitied, and had compassion for the kind people of the Kingdom of Greece, that little nation which gave birth to such great men as Aristotle, Pericles, Homer, and Demosthenes.

His love for his fellow-man, and his sympathy for the oppressed was so ardent, that it greatly disturbed him to see men, women, and children in any place or country held in bondage or be under the cruel sway of oppression.

Over men, the rich and the poor, the learned and the unlearned, men in all walks, conditions and vocations in life, our late President had a wonderful moral personal influence.

Whenever in governmental affairs, he advocated the enactment of a law, or the passage of a resolution, any congressional opposition to either, however powerful, was doomed to defeat; but, my friends, remember that our late President always acted for what he believed to be best for his country's welfare, and not for his own glory or selfish ends, and do not forget that at the polls the American people sustained him.

I believe that future historians will say of him: That he was an inherently great man, a just man and a man free from race hatred, and religious intolerance.

The turbulent waters of Europe are about to become calm; and the Goddess of Justice is moving rapidly toward her seat on the throne of righteousness. The peoples of the nations now enslaved by merciless tyrants are hopeful, for they see in the heavens the angel of peace and liberty flying toward them, to rescue them and set them free. Why is all this? The answer is: The American soldiers and their Allies on the field, on the waters and in the air, are now on the verge of complete and final victory, a victory which means equality, toleration, civil liberty, and peace forever among the nations of the earth, and death to tyranny and despotism.

It is a pity that our late President, that noble knight of liberty, he, who had constantly advocated that peace and righteousness prevail among all the nations of our terrestial sphere, did not live at least long enough to enjoy and partake of the fruits of that victory for which he so long and strenuously struggled, but God otherwise willed, and we humbly bow in submission to the decree of our Divine Creator.

Harry S. Truman is now the President of this Republic. He is an experienced soldier and a tried and true statesman; and a man whom the American people honor and respect. The American people, one and all, irrespective of political party or creed, will support him, for we are confident that as master of the American ship of state, he will prudently and wisely sail it, avoiding rocks and shoals, on the oceans of the world, and on our inland seas, and safely land it, with all of its royal majesty and magnificent splendors, unharmed.

We hope, we trust, that when our President, Harry S. Truman, has closed his public career, whenever that may be, that he can truthfully say to his people—the American people—what the patriot Pericles, when death approached him, said to his countrymen, namely:

"No Athenian through my fault was ever clothed in the black garb of mourning."

The United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, our only hope for a just and lasting peace lies in the successful functioning of the United Nations Organization. Consequently, every American has a most vital interest in the charter which prescribes the principles for the operation of this great Organization. The most lucid explanation of these principles is found in an article entitled "What the United Nations Charter Means," which recently appeared in the Ladies' Home Journal. The author of this article is one of my constituents, the Honorable Charles W. Tillett, of Charlotte, N. C., a fine lawyer and an excellent citizen. By permission of the publication in which this article originally appeared and by leave given me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I here insert this article in the RECORD:

WHAT THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER MEANS

Man has been working at the job of learning how to govern himself for a good many thousands of years. During that time he has discovered a number of successful techniques: sure-fire devices which keep the ship of state on the track. Americans are thoroughly familiar with these techniques as utilized in city, county and State governments. They can easily understand the United Nations Charter because about 90 percent of what the delegates did in San Francisco when they set about drafting this Charter several weeks ago was to draw from the universal kit of governmental tools a few of the simplest principles of successful government and apply them to the problems of the government of nations.

1. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Take the matter of the General Assembly. There is hardly a county in America where, at some time or other each month in the year, the commissioners, or governing body by whatever name called, don't hold an open session and allow the citizenship an opportunity to complain about the county government or make suggestions about it, or discuss it. Complaints are not always heeded; suggestions are not always adopted; discussions are not always enjoyed; but the people can come to the courthouse and get off their chests whatever is on them. And so they don't go to war either with the government or one another. But it is as certain as can be that if this forum of public opinion were not always kept open, there would be trouble, real trouble. In terms used by the constitutional lawyer, this privilege that the men and women of the county have is known as the right of assembly and petition. It is an old constitutional principle in English law. Its soundness as a device for keeping the peace in the city, county and State can't be questioned. So it came about at San Francisco that every delegate there—certainly the delegates from the democracies—knew that there must be some place, some forum of public opinion where matters of international concern could be discussed. The result is the provision that in the General Assembly every nation that is a member of the United Nations organization will be represented; and, in the Assembly, every matter of international concern that is within the scope of the Charter can be discussed completely and freely.

2. SECURITY COUNCIL

Take the matter of law and order. All this talk about the complete abolition of force in a world at peace is amateurish. One of the main troubles with the League of Nations was that it hush-hushed the fact that behind every law there must be force. In a community where law and order prevail, force is not abolished; but the use of force is monopolized by the state. No one has the right to use force on his own hook (bona fide self-defense excepted); it can legally be used only by the state. For example, we see two

men in a scuffle, A and B. A hits B with a stick of wood. No matter how justly A is aggrieved at B (assuming he is not acting in self-defense), his conduct is illegal if he is a private citizen. But if A is a policeman and B is a rough gangster violently resisting arrest, the use of force is legal.

Taking this leaf from the notebook of world-wide social behavior—adopting a principle that has long been recognized by every system of law—the artisans of the United Nations Charter have provided not for the abolition of force, but for its monopoly by the Organization and its centralization in the Security Council. The Security Council is the repository of the use of force and it, and it alone, shall have control of the use of force, excepting only action bona fide in self-defense, or actions carrying out the surrender terms of this war.

3. INTERNATIONAL COURT

Another tool of civilization is the court. Of all political institutions, it came first. The courts of England were in existence long before Parliament. The people probably have more confidence in the court than in any other of their institutions. It is significant in support of this statement that President Roosevelt, when he was at the peak of his power, could not get anywhere with his Supreme Court proposals when the public—whether rightly or wrongly I do not say—got the idea that he was trying to "do something" to the Court. As a practicing lawyer I have had many mad clients; mad enough to fight. But usually a client, no matter how mad, given a fair trial, a day in court, will not fight even though he loses his case.

Take the case of two farmers and their respective rights to the use of water in a running stream. If the lower riparian owner gets the idea that the upper owner is taking too much water, there is going to be a fight unless there is a fair trial. Take the case of Belgium and Holland. The Meuse River serves both of them. When Belgium built the Albert Canal and Holland built the Juliana Canal, each thought the other was withdrawing too much water from this river. While in this particular instance, and under the circumstances out of which this controversy arose, it would hardly be fair to say that a war between these nations was imminent, it is clear that elsewhere and under other circumstances such a controversy could produce a war if there was no way to adjudicate the rights of the parties. Everybody knows that large wars from little controversies grow. In this particular instance Belgium and Holland took their dispute to the World Court and judgment was entered which, while it did not satisfy both parties 100 percent, settled the controversy and has enabled these nations to live together in reasonable peace and harmony ever since.

Naturally, then, no one would think of drafting a charter for an organization to keep the peace without including a provision for an international court.

4. SECRETARIAT

Now consider the continuing Secretariat. This is a high-sounding name for a very familiar thing. Let's come back to our country government. Many, many times it occurs that as the result of a political turn-over the embattled citizens of a county will clean house by electing an entirely new board. Why doesn't the county government go to pot? Because, even though there is a brand new board, the clerk to the old board remains, and his stenographer, that girl who knows all about the files and the records, keeps her job. The probate judge, the register of deeds, the tax collector, the sheriff (certainly some of them) continue in office. By means of the continuance in office of this administrative personnel, the accumulated experience of how to run the practical affairs of the county is retained and the new board, whether it admits it publicly or not, makes ample use of what the office crowd knows. The Secretariat of the United Nations are, in a manner of speaking, the county clerk, sheriff, and so forth, dressed in morning coats and wearing spats. And the charter is so written that, barring a cataclysmic world political revolution, the turn-overs with the Secretariat will not coincide with changes in the personnel of the delegates.

5. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Every good police officer knows that you can't make and keep a community law-abiding by means of a strong police department alone. The solution of the problem of crime requires that the criminal be dealt with firmly, but, even more than that, it requires the elimination of the sources from which arise the inclination to commit crime. In other words, the problem of crime is the problem of crime prevention; and the problem of crime prevention, in large part, is the problem of how to deal with men and circumstances so as to keep the child from becoming antisocial. Hence, the best adjunct any police department can have for the long pull is decent housing, good schools, a well-supported park and recreational program, a decent wage, and all that sort of thing.

This being so, it is not difficult to see why those in charge of constructing the United Nations Charter, war being the counterpart internationally of crime locally, included a social and economic council whose duty it will be to study world conditions and try to get the jump on the wars of tomorrow by spotting their causes today and recommending measures that will eliminate them.

6. TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Now for the trusteeship commission. There is in domestic law a well-settled doctrine to the effect that the state is parens patriae. In the law dictionary it says that this Latin phrase means: The state is the parent of the country; has the power of guardianship over persons under disabilities. It is a useful and much-used doctrine. For example, when a person under 21 comes into the ownership of property and its management is not otherwise taken care of, organized society, acting through its probate court, appoints a guardian whose duty it is to manage the minor's property until he becomes 21. In other words, domestically we recognize the need that immaturity and inexperience in the affairs of the world have for help. That's what they did at San Francisco in regard to territories inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world. Strong nations will be appointed to handle the affairs of these people, subject to the supervision of the trusteeship council. The announced objective of the work of the trusteeship council and its trustee nations is to bring the peoples of the trusteed territories to a point where they will be self-governing and ultimately independent—that is to say, as independent as any people can be in a world where the essential interdependence of all people everywhere has been demonstrated.

SUMMARY

When a surveyor engineers a complicated piece of land he establishes bench marks which he uses as reference points. Whenever he gets into difficulties he takes a sight back at one of these points and his situation becomes clarified. That is the way it is about understanding the United Nations Charter. Its six great organs are: General Assembly, Security Council, International Court, Secretariat, Social and Economic Council, Trusteeship Council. Know what they are set up to do, and pretty nearly ever matter of importance can be understood about the charter. For example, take the snarl that they got into at San Francisco about trusteeships and strategic areas in trusteed territories. That was settled by placing all trusteeships under the Trusteeship Council, which itself was under the General Assembly, except the trusteeships of strategic areas which are to come under the Security Council. This is logical and understandable, because strategic areas have to do with the use of force, and the Security Council is the repository of the use of force.

Take the matter of the international bill of rights that will ultimately be worked out. Wisely they did not try to work it out while the Conference was going on. They want it, when written, to represent the ideas of basic liberty and decency that are common to the right-thinking people of all countries. That is not going to be so easy when you consider the different social systems, environments, and traditions of the nations that make up our world. When written, there will be no teeth in the international bill of rights. But it will be reported to the General Assembly, the forum of public opinion, as a recommendation, will there be discussed, and in time will likely be accepted by member nations that do not have bills of rights as parts of their systems of law, as our own American Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution.

These are only a few of the illustrations that could be given to show that the functions of the Charter's six great organs as they are above described constitute about 90 percent of the substance of the document.

One final word. We must not be gadget-minded about world peace or this Charter. It is not something that, when wound up, can be left to itself to do the job which we go off and attend to our personal affairs. The American Constitution was not such a gadget for the colonies. It was the Constitution, plus the earnest endeavors of George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, the Members of the Congress and the voters that made of the new United States the Nation that was strong enough to fight and win the War of Secession that was fought to test the strength of the Union, that made this country the great successful Nation that it is today.

Selfishness and greed have not been abolished at San Francisco. But there has been written a document which, if ratified and supported with earnestness and zeal, can keep the peace when the inevitable threats of war arise again in the future.

Let Them Know the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Standard-Star of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N. Y., has published an editorial entitled "Let Them Know the Truth." I asked permission of the House last week for its insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LET THEM KNOW THE TRUTH

If we are to have world peace permanently we can find no better basis for mutual understanding and tolerance among the nations of the world than complete freedom of the press and an absolutely free hand in the collection and distribution of accurate news to all people.

That is why we are especially interested in a resolution recently adopted by the New York State Publishers Association following an address by Wilbur Forrest, of the New York Herald Tribune, chairman of a special committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, which girdled the globe in a

survey of the need for an untrammeled press.

Stressing Mr. Forrest's plea for "a true and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government," as contended for by the State Department in its extremely valuable world-covering broadcasts and news distribution, the State publishers adopted unanimously this resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the New York State Publishers Association go on record as endorsing this program, as being an essential part of our foreign policy and in our opinion one of the most constructive steps that can be taken in modern-day diplomacy."

But over and beyond the value to America that we should let other nations know what we are and what we seek, there is the inherent need for countries less enlightened to know themselves. A particularly good example of what we mean by this can be found in the commendable efforts by the Columbia University School of Journalism in establishment in 1943 of the Chinese Post-Graduate School of Journalism in Chungking.

Under trying war conditions, traveling without convoy protection by freighter for 50 days, over the "hump" without guns, brave Americans flew to establish in far-off China this little branch of a great American university. And in its 2 years the school has already processed 63 young Chinese men and women in the art of objective reporting, dedicated to the principle that where people know the truth they will find liberty. Difficulties were almost prohibitive; even the small school newspaper published in English was hand-set by compositors who could neither read nor write English. There was the native Chinese shyness, both upon the part of students and public officials, to overcome; there was the age-old inability to understand that truth must be ungarnished to be really palatable.

If we can establish such an institution in China we can do it in Iraq and in Indonesia and in Ecuador and anywhere else that modern journalism is lacking. By so doing, we are confident, there will come not only a better understanding of America and its unselfish missionary spirit, but also a far more valuable contribution to the people of these nations. And from it all will in time arise the only sound base upon which permanent peace can rest, better understanding and a more tolerant attitude toward those who now seem foreign.

We Have One Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, our relationship with Russia have been hand-made for those who wish to continuously discuss the next war.

There is, of course, between ourselves and the great nation of Central Europe and Asia vast chasms. We do not speak the same language. Our economics are vastly different. In many ways our racial stocks differ. Russia is at least 60 percent oriental-minded while we are occidental. We have vastly different religions and ethical convictions.

Certainly now is the time for us to be firm and insist upon the building of the United Nations into a functioning body.

In this connection, I am including an editorial from the Wenatchee Daily World, Wenatchee, Wash., which indicates the direction in which some of our thinking is going:

WE HAVE ONE CHANCE

Any day for the past 2 months you would have had to be deaf not to hear the talk about a war with Russia. We should not pass this talk off lightly because it represents public opinion, but we should try to set ourselves straight on at least a few basic points.

Some people say that England is "again" trying to involve us in trouble which is not really our business. These people believe the Russian attempt to cut the British lifeline in the Middle East is a strictly Russian-British matter; and that, since the British Commonwealth came out of this war as a rather shaky affair anyhow, it is not even very interesting which power is going to apply the coup de grace.

This is faulty and dangerous reasoning. One need not even go back to Willkie's One World concept to understand how faulty it is. If Russia cuts the British lifeline in the Middle East, the Commonwealth will disappear as a first rate power. Only two of the current Big Three will remain.

Considering the history of the last 2,000 years, one need not be a prophet to predict that the survivors will start trading blows sooner or later, probably sooner, to establish which one will run the world. This is particularly likely in the case of powers like the United States and the U. S. S. R., since they are bound to get into each other's hair, not only for political but on ideological grounds.

All considered, the United States stands to lose such a war.

About 75 percent of the earth's surface is water. The greater part of the remaining 25 percent, four-fifths in actual fact, consists of the continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The great geographer Halford MacKinder called it the "world island." Russia already sits astride the largest contiguous land area on the world island. With the British Commonwealth out of the running, Russia would soon dominate all of it. The trouble is now, that compared with the world island, the American continents are not much more than satellite islands, islands that could be outproduced and outfought by an organized world island with comparative ease.

What does that mean? It means simply that the United States, facing one giant competitor in the fight for survival, would have to start amassing power. It would probably begin by trying to organize all American Nations into one bloc, from Canada to southernmost South America, and that would in turn revive the cry of Yank imperialism and set off a first-rate batch of little wars. As the consolidation of the Americas would be only a first step, it easly follows that we would soon be on the way to a conflagration in which we would be not only a party, but the most important party.

All of which must show that we have a definite stake in the security of Britain, whether we like it or not.

There is another problem, however. Supposing we went to war with Russia—now. And let us assume that we defeat Russia. What then?

A defeated Russia is still an existing Russia, a giant of 180,000,000 people with a majority of fanatic nationalists who would never forget their defeat by powers which they have been told for 30 years have always been anxious to cut Russia's throat. And Allied military government over this great land mass and these people, people of whom only those over 40 know anything but communism?

Our military government is not even successful over tiny Bavaria!

Surely, we could cut Russia down to its original size, but in that case we would face the identical situation we are now confronted with, a second time in 20 years.

In short, a war with Russia would not settle anything. It would be the most futile war ever waged and the most costly.

Where then is the out?

There is only one way. No people on earth want further war, at least not until they have recovered from that holocaust just ended. That could mean five more years of peace, of a peace resembling a mad dance on a volcano, but a peace of sorts, nevertheless. These 5 years are our chance, humanity's chance. They might be sufficient to build the United Nations Organization into a workable, functioning body.

Admittedly this is a slim chance. But it is the only one we have.

REA's Contribution to the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer a very interesting and informative address delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, at the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Buffalo, N. Y., Tuesday, March 5, 1946.

The address, well worth reading, is as follows:

I am most happy to attend this, the first peacetime convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. It affords an opportunity to demonstrate that united action for service to the Nation is possible in peace as in war.

I want to congratulate you on the high purposes which are being served by the fine program you have arranged for this convention. Each of us will draw inspiration and encouragement from our association here. I am confident that we will return to our daily tasks strengthened in our determination that no obstacles shall be allowed to stand between us and the major objectives of the rural electrification program, and of insuring that the program shall make its maximum contribution to the national welfare.

It would be splendid if it were possible for all of us in the Washington office of REA to become personally acquainted with you people who have the responsibility of carrying on the work of the REA cooperatives. I know we would have a much better understanding of your problems. We would more deeply appreciate the sacrifices you have made in order that your cooperative might better serve your consumers and those who will become your consumers. I have heard many cooperative officials tell of the joyful expressions on the faces of rural people, and of the outpourings of gratitude, when the REA lines are first energized. Many of you have told me that gratification over the knowledge that you are helping to bring greater happiness into the lives of rural people compensates for your personal sacrifices and the disappointment you feel because of your inability to extend REA service as rapidly as it is needed and wanted. There is no question in my mind but that we in the

Washington office would be even more impressed with the great good the REA program is doing if we could personally visit with you more often, and get to see rural electrification through your eyes.

You will note that I said "even more impressed." I said that advisedly, because I have never worked with a group of people who had a better esprit de corps or more devotion to their work than has the REA personnel in the Washington office. I wonder whether there is a harder working group in or out of the Government. I was especially impressed by the way the entire staff worked to keep the program going during the recent move from St. Louis to Washington, despite personal inconveniences and even hardships. Incidentally, I want to say that we in REA received fullest cooperation from the Department of Agriculture at the time of our move from St. Louis and that we are now happily situated in the Department. As I become better acquainted with the REA personnel I realize that such devotion to a program can only spring from a conviction that worth-while things are being accomplished daily and that much more good remains to be done. I consider it a great privilege and a great honor to be at the head of such a fine organization.

Comprehension of the broader aspects of rural electrification, in terms of its benefits to the whole nation as well as to agriculture and the rural community, cannot fail to generate enthusiasm among those who have a hand in it. I think this is the explanation of what has been called the REA spirit. I wish to discuss some of these things briefly today.

I don't believe anyone who is acquainted with the facts will dispute my statement that electricity is doing more to make rural homes happier than anything else. I also believe it is doing more than anything else to take the drudgery out of rural homes and out of the lives of farm people, particularly farm wives whose lot has been notoriously bad. More profitable farming methods are made possible by use of electrical equipment at various farm tasks. Electricity is making rural life healthier by providing better year-round diets through food preservation and more sanitary handling of food products on the farm. I need not describe to you how electricity is essential in the modernization of rural churches and schools and other community centers, and in attracting to rural areas small industries which offer a means of supplementing incomes of rural people.

I do not want anyone to get the idea that I think electricity will cure all the ills of agriculture. But I know of no single force which is more powerful in promoting the right kind of farming, in keeping the Nation's agriculture on a sound basis and in restoring the rural community as a good place in which to live and enjoy life. This conviction grows out of my lifetime experience in agriculture as a dirt farmer, as an organizer of rural cooperatives, as one who was denied central-station electric service for years and who now has REA service by choice, and as one who has served in several positions in agriculture.

A sound agriculture and a happy rural people can be powerful factors in stabilizing the Nation economically, socially, and politically. A declining agriculture presages a decadent nation. That has been demonstrated over and over again in the world's history. George Washington knew it. So did Thomas Jefferson. The latter believed that this Nation's future was wholly dependent on a happy and progressive rural people. He was responsible for many better farming methods in this country. What great use he would have made of electricity as we know it.

The entire Nation benefits when agriculture is prosperous. As a matter of fact, it is impossible for the rest of the Nation to enjoy prosperity for a prolonged period unless agriculture has buying power. The consumers of the city gain every time a farmer finds a more efficient method of production or a way of placing a better product on the market.

It is a well-known sociological fact that the great cities of any nation constantly draw upon the rural population for new blood and new vigor. For this reason our great urban centers benefit when rural communities are composed of happy, healthy, progressive, and vigorous people. Such a rural population is the best mainstay I know for domestic tranquillity and the preservation of our democratic form of government. Rural electrification offers the greatest aid toward that kind of rural population.

I have no fear for the future of our program so long as we keep before us and before the nation this picture of rural America being lifted to new heights of happiness and security by rural electrification. It is important that we measure our accomplishments in terms of miles of lines built, number of consumers connected, number of kilowatt hours consumed, and number of dollars paid on indebtedness. I do not for a minute want to minimize such measures of accomplishments. But they are important only because they denote progress toward making rural life happier and more prosperous and our Nation stronger and more secure.

This brings me to some of the things which I believe must now receive our undivided attention if we are to attain our major objectives. We are coming into a period when all members of the REA family will need to draw upon one another for inspiration, courage and vitality. The demands of a new day are upon us. Six million rural families are still awaiting the benefits of our program. Since most of them live in the less densely settled sections of the country, the hardest part of the rural electrification job lies ahead of us.

We are facing a bolder and perhaps a more desperate opposition from private utilities at this time than REA has ever before experienced. This opposition extends from cream-skimming spite lines activities in areas laid out for development by cooperatives to the maintaining of a strong lobby in Washington. A Nation-wide advertising campaign in the weekly and daily press, in nationally circulated magazines and on the radio networks is being carried out. State legislatures and regulatory bodies, as well as the National Congress, are being flooded with utility proposals for various restrictive measures to be applied to the REA program.

We in the REA have only one recourse in combating the destructive efforts of the utilities. We cannot use their unfair tactics. We must rely on our true friends in Congress and in farm organizations. But we can only be assured of this support if we first assure ourselves of the overwhelming support of rural people. We have got to get down to grass-roots planning and organizing if our program is to go forward.

The first necessary step is to plan for complete area coverage. We cannot afford to lull ourselves into complacent disregard of the needs and rights of the people who want REA service. The cooperative that cannot offer specific proposals for extending service into thinner territories will be at a distinct disadvantage in marshaling public opinion in support of its program, as opposed to power company cream-skimming. Prospective consumers who have not been signed up by a cooperative, and given every assurance that it will build lines to reach them as quickly as possible, may be persuaded to take service from a power company spite line which would wreck the cooperative's program. In some sections of the country, signed-up members of cooperatives have already been won over by power companies because of the failure of the cooperatives to give them this assurance. Rural people who are tempted to yield to any kind of power company offer which would disrupt a cooperative's plans for area coverage service should be kept constantly aware of the fact that by so doing they may be responsible for making it impossible for many of their neighbors to get electricity.

I must tell you that some REA supporters in Congress are becoming critical of some REA cooperative officials who are unwilling to help extend to others the benefits of the REA program which they themselves enjoy. Some cooperative officials may think that area coverage and sound financial policy are incompatible. I do not think this is true if full advantage is taken of the more favorable loan terms, the lower power costs and the increased kw.-hr. consumption per user. I am afraid our cooperatives would have to look pretty hard for an excuse that would justify them, in the eyes of some of our supporters in Congress, in sentencing people entitled to REA service to remain in darkness. It is unthinkable that areas which can be served should become dark spots in our rural economy, both literally and figuratively.

More of the cooperatives may expect power company offers to purchase their properties if spite-line activities are not successful in wrecking them. This kind of activity will be especially pronounced wherever there are prospects of low-cost public power for distribution, unless the power companies can get control of the power at its source through control of transmission facilities.

The power company seeking to buy out a cooperative, or to stage a spite-line raid on its unserved membership, usualy has a lot of deceptive arguments and tricks. Sometimes they hold out the bait of cheaper rates or lower minimums. Sometimes they frighten people about their going into debt. They erect a few lines in strategic places by the way of proving they can serve people immediately. But they neglect to say they are in business for just one purpose, and that is to obtain profits from consumers' power bills.

Above all, we have to show rural people that the REA cooperative is not just another public utility, but that it is a nonprofit organization created for the purpose of providing the best possible service at the lowest cost. The right to obtain service from an organization of that kind should be valued highly by any informed and reasonable person. Cooperative members should be persuaded to weigh its value against any temporary benefits which might be offered them by a power company that allows its customers no voice whatever in the fixing of rates and other matters.

We are faced with the absolute necessity of carrying the REA message to rural people, to businessmen, and to public-spirited groups everywhere. Every cooperative should make a special effort to get its own story across in its own territory—the story of its successes, its services to the community, its problems. This in turn would help us to repel the attacks on our program along the national front.

For example, I believe fewer people would be misled by power-company agitation for a prohibition against REA generating and transmission loans if the needs and the meaning of our program were more widely understood.

There are two prime requirements for a rural electrification program which will be of most benefit to rural people, which will make the maximum contribution to the entire Nation. First, lines must be built to reach every potential consumer. Second, our distribution cooperatives must be able to supply power in sufficient quantities and at low enough rates to encourage maximum consumption. Just turning on the lights is not rural electrification. The farm family must be encouraged to use every piece of electrical equipment that can possibly add to efficiency of production and greater farm profits. This can be done only if the cooperative can offer rates its consumers can afford to pay for such services.

REA is not interested in making generating and transmission loans merely for the sake of adding to our investment. We are interested only in helping the cooperatives gain access to all the power they need at reasonable rates. We can prove by the record that the savings to rural people on power costs as a direct result of such loans will ultimately exceed many times over the amounts loaned by REA for generating and transmission facilities. They have proved a very sound type of investment in the returns already yielded. I firmly believe that rural people should have the right to use any fair and honest means of getting the power they need at reasonable rates. Excessive power costs in any locality seriously retard the beneficent effects of rural electrification.

May I repeat to you the last two sentences of a talk I made at Grand Forks, N. Dak., last November 7: "There is one thing of which I am positive—one thing which I hope is realized by every REA consumer, every prospective REA consumer, and, in addition, every rural consumer of private utility power—and that is that we, in REA, must never be deprived of the authority to finance cooperative generating and transmission facilities for the benefit of rural people. If rural people lose this opportunity they will lose their most potent defense weapon against those who in the past have always charged for electricity all that the traffic would bear."

The fight that we are in now, the battles that are ahead, the problems that must be solved, the great objectives yet to be reached, call for more courage, more determination, more hard work and more unselfish cooperation on the part of every one of us.

The REA program offers a new and unique approach to the objective of making the Government of maximum aid to its citizens with a minimum of direct supervision. As I see it, through the REA the Government is lending money for an enterprise which is of the greatest importance to the welfare of its people. In order to see that the loan is repaid and that the people get the maximum benefit from the program the Government, through the REA, extends certain technical assistance. But the business management and the policies of the operating organization are governed by the users of its service. To my way of thinking this is democracy at its best. You and I want it to be more and more successful and more and more satisfying. It is our ambition to be of the greatest aid to you in your heavy responsibilities with the least participation in the management of your affairs. We pledge to you our efforts to cooperate in any way necessary to insure that the REA program will make its maximum contribution to the national welfare.

When the Floodgates Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, last week permission was granted by the House for the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the editorial entitled "When the Floodgates Open," published in the New Rochelle (N. Y.) Standard-Star:

WHEN THE FLOODGATES OPEN

Chester Bowles, Director of Economic Stabilization, has predicted in the most optimistic vein he has displayed in many months, that there will shortly be "the greatest flood of goods this great Nation has ever seen." We assume that he means the greatest peacetime flow of commodities, for certainly we expect no such output as marked our war effort in industry.

There will be some citizens who will credit this flood of production to the administration's wage-price policy; there will be many others who will believe staunchly and argumentatively that this production has been reached in spite of the policies laid down by Mr. Bowles and President Truman.

We doubt if there is any great purpose to be served in searching for the cause of this good fortune ahead. For our part, if we were asked who should get the credit, we would be strongly of the opinion it should go to American industry itself, to the leaders who have planned wisely despite discouragement and handicaps from Washington, and to the workers who have not struck, because of their knowledge that production must come before we can defeat inflation and higher prices.

Proof of this contention lies in the very nature of the bulge-in-the-line policy to which the administration was finally driven. Against their earlier fixed policies, the administration's reconversion leaders have been forced to give way in so many instances that the exception now becomes the rule. Production simply could not be guaranteed until prices were lifted sufficiently to offset the higher costs brought about by increased wages and prices of materials.

But who or what or why isn't so important now; what is paramount is that the floodgates of production are about to open wide.

A New Dark Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was much impressed with the column by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday of this week. It is a pessimistic article, but there is much in it to provoke thought among those who feel that we Americans should be taking an active lead in promoting a lasting peace.

Certainly, our heritage should give us the capacity for doing this, and I commend reading of this article to every thoughtful person:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

One of my colleagues inquired wonderingly in a column the other day, "Is it possible that we may be drifting into a new Dark Ages?"

I suppose the people around the year 400 were asking the same question, for it is characteristic that we cannot read the meaning of our times until it affects us, intimately and personally.

We are in a new Dark Ages. We are in it up to the neck. The question is whether there are sufficient remnants of civilization left to re-create order and security or whether the anarchy that has swallowed most of civilization already will become universal, to the point where the whole world is given over to armed gangs, and no man's property or life is safe anywhere on the globe.

Technology is not civilization, nor is science necessarily its handmaid. Automobiles, gadgets, and atom bombs are not civilization. The night of the twentieth century Dark Ages is noisy with the whirrings of machines; human ingenuity has reached a Himalaya peak of achievement. But mankind is in the depths of horror and despair, and every new invention glares at him with the terrifying visage of a Frankenstein destroyer.

Civilization is social integration; it is a system of rights and obligations so universally accepted that men take it for granted. It is a complex of codes and standards, written or unwritten, within which persons are conscious of a continuity with the past and a prospect of the future; a condition in which men know what they may legitimately expect as the result of certain actions and on what support they may legitimately depend. Civilization is the rule of law, and law is but the codification of standards. To live in civilization is to live in a society where actions are referred to standards. The absence of standards is barbarism, and barbarism is the description of our world—in greater or less degree of every part of it.

We have just gone through a world war in which, for the first time in centuries, no limits were placed on its objectives or upon the manner of waging it. Unquestioned even was the very concept of total war. During it the prospective victors made a series of agreements, the chief characteristic of which was the total absence of any justification whatsoever in reason.

A frontier is drawn here according to ethnographical principles and there in defiance of all ethnographical principles; reparations are collected from ally and conquered enemy alike, and in the form of pure and simple loot, of individual persons, and even by and for individual persons and firms. Not only nations but whole social classes are hunted as Fascists without the slightest regard to their individual allegiances; millions are forcibly uprooted from ancestral homes and lands, and jammed in concentration camps or set wandering without sustenance or destination.

Governments are created by leaders of armed gangs, and are thereafter maintained by private armies; like the Landsknechte of the Middle Ages; diplomacy takes the form of expletives hurled from public platforms or through the private press of self-appointed fuehrers governing the bodies and souls of men by pure whim.

Strikes are called, entailing cruel deprivations for tens of thousands and suddenly ended because its leaders become suspicious of each other's ambitions; a labor-leader member of a city government threatens to paralyze a metropolis to achieve a political decision; organized mobs seek to influence the most important policies by chanting slogans in the streets.

A traitor to his oath of citizenship claims a higher loyalty to another state; a labor leader sentenced for contempt of court is hailed as a martyr and poses for his photograph; great companies plant networks of agents within our Government to work for private ends. A world organization is launched in the atmosphere of a night club, and greeted with rapture, although it contains neither the ingredients for creating, adjudicating, or enforcing equal law.

Great armies are disbanded in response to public clamor before the aims for which the dead perished are even in sight.

At the end of a people's war it is proposed to hold a peace conference in secret, presumably because the negotiations could not bear the light of day.

In a barbarous world the barbaric are best fitted to survive, as the savage alone can survive in the jungle. Civilization has already capituated to barbarism by default of its own standards. It will capitulate further, for it has lost its morale, i. e., its morality. That the morality and the civilization survive in millions of individual persons is beside the point. It is they who are the outcasts of the age, not its directors, and even they are without the will to responsibility and control.

As in that other Dark Ages, they are fleeing into ivory towers, feeling themselves helpless to be more than chroniclers and observers of the disintegrating age.

Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Dr. Raphael Lemkin appearing in the March 1946 edition of the American Scholar entitled "Genocide."

Dr. Raphael Lemkin, eminent Polish scholar, and author of many books and articles published in several languages, is adviser on foreign affairs to the War Department. In his recent book, Axis Rule in Occupied Europe, Dr. Lemkin originated concepts included in the indictment of German war criminals at the Nuremberg trials, where he served on the staff of the United States Chief of Counsel for Prosecution of Criminality.

GENOCIDE

(By Raphael Lemkin)

The last war has focused our attention on the phenomenon of the destruction of whole populations—of national, racial, and religious groups—both biologically and culturally. The German practices, especially in the course of occupation, are too well known. Their general plan was to win the peace though the war be lost, and that goal could have been achieved through successfully changing the political and demographic interrelationships in Europe in favor of Germany. The population not destroyed was to be integrated in the German cultural, political, and economic pattern. In this way a mass obliteration of nationhoods had been planned throughout occupied Europe. The Nazi leaders had stated very bluntly their intent to wipe out the Poles, the Russians; to destroy demographically and culturally the French element in Alsace-Lorraine, the Slavonians in Carniola and Carinthia. They almost achieved their goal in exterminating the Jews and gypsies in Europe. Obviously, the German experience is the most striking and the most deliberate and thorough, but history has provided us with other examples of the destruction of entire nations, and ethnic and religious groups. There are, for example, the destruction of Carthage; that of religious groups in the wars of Islam and the Crusades; the massacres of the Albigenses and the Waldenses; and more recently, the massacre of the Armenians.

While society sought protection against individual crimes, or rather crimes directed against individuals, there has been no serious endeavor hitherto to prevent and punish the murder and destruction of millions. Apparently, there was not even an adequate name for such a phenomenon. Referring to the Nazi butchery in the present war, Winston Churchill said in his broadcast of August, 1941, "We are in the presence of a crime without a name."

II

Would mass murder be an adequate name for such a phenomenon? We think not, since it does not connote the motivation of the crime, especially when the motivation is based upon racial, national, or religious considerations. An attempt to destroy a nation and obliterate its cultural personality was hitherto called denationalization. This term seems to be inadequate, since it does not connote biological destruction. On the other hand, this term is mostly used for conveying or for defining an act of deprivation of citizenship. Many authors, instead of using a generic term, use terms connoting only some functional aspect of the main generic notion of the destruction of nations and races. Thus, the terms "Germanization," "Italianization," "Magyarization" are used often to connote the imposition by a stronger nation (Germany, Italy, Hungary) of its national pattern upon the national group controlled by it. These terms are also inadequate since they do not convey biological destruction, and they cannot be used as a generic term. In the case of Germany, it would be ridiculous to speak about the Germanization of the Jews or Poles in western Poland, since the Germans wanted these groups eradicated entirely.

Hitler stated many times that Germanization could only be carried out with the soil, never with men. These considerations led the author of this article to the necessity of coining a new term for this particular concept: "genocide." This word is made from the ancient Greek word "genos" (race, clan) and the Latin suffix "cide" (killing). Thus, "genocide" in its formation would correspond to such words as "tyrannicide," "homicide," "patricide."

III

Genocide is the crime of destroying national, racial, or religious groups. The problem now arises as to whether it is a crime of only national importance, or a crime in which international society as such should be vitally interested. Many reasons speak for the second alternative. It would be impractical to treat genocide as a national crime, since by its very nature it is committed by the state or by powerful groups which have the backing of the state. A state would never prosecute a crime instigated or backed by itself.

By its very legal, moral, and humanitarian nature, it must be considered an international crime. The conscience of mankind has been shocked by this type of mass barbarity. There have been many instances of states expressing their concern about another state's treatment of its citizens. The United States rebuked the Government of Czarist Russia as well as that of Rumania for the ghastly pogroms they instigated or tolerated. There was also diplomatic action in behalf of the Greeks and Armenians when they were being massacred by the Turks. States have even entered into international treaties by which they assumed specific obligations in the treatment of their own nationals. We may, in this respect, refer to the treaty entered into between the United States and Spain in 1898, in which the free exercise of religion was assured by the United States to the inhabitants of the territories which were ceded to her.

Another classical example of international concern in the treatment of citizens of other states by their governments is provided by the minority treaties under the auspices of the League of Nations which were signed by a number of European countries after the First World War. Again, the declaration of the Eighth International Conference of American States provides that any persecution on account of racial or religious motives which makes it impossible for a group of human beings to live decently is contrary to the political and judicial systems of America. The Charter of the United Nations Organization also provides for the international protection of human rights, indicating that the denial of such rights by any state is a matter of concern to all mankind.

Cultural considerations speak for international protection of national, religious, and racial groups. Our whole cultural heritage is a product of the contributions of all nations. We can best understand this when we realize how impoverished our culture would be if the peoples doomed by Germany, such as the Jews, had not been permitted to create the Bible, or to give birth to an Einstein, a Spinoza; if the Poles had not had the opportunity to give to the world a Copernicus, a Chopin, a Curie; the Czechs, a Huss, a Dvorak; the Greeks, a Plato, and a Socrates; the Russians, a Tolstoy and a Shostakovich.

There are also practical considerations. Expulsions of law-abiding residents from Germany before this war created frictions with the neighboring countries to which these peoples were expelled. Mass persecutions forced mass flight. Thus, the normal migration between countries assumes pathological dimensions.

Again, international trade depends upon confidence in the ability of the individuals participating in the interchange of goods to fulfill their obligations. The arbitrary and wholesale confiscations of the properties of whole groups of citizens of one state for racial or other reasons deprives them of their capacity to discharge their obligations to citizens of other states. Many American citizens were deprived of the possibility of claiming debts incurred by German importers after these importers were destroyed by the Hitler regime.

Finally, genocide in time of peace creates international tensions and leads to war. It was used by the Nazi regime to strengthen the alleged unity and totalitarian control of the German people as a preparation for war.

IV

Once we have recognized the international implications of genocidal practices, we must create the legal framework for the recognition of genocide as an international crime. The significant feature of international crime is a recognition that because of its international importance is must be punished and punishable through international cooperation. The establishment of international machinery for such punishment is essential.

Thus, it has been recognized by the law of nations and by the criminal codes of many nations that crimes which affect the common good of mankind—as, for example, piracy, unlawful production and trade in narcotics, forgery of money, trade in women and children, trades in slaves—all these are international crimes (delicta juric gentium). For such crimes, the principle of universal repression has been adopted: namely, the culprit can be punished not only before the courts of the country where the crime has been perpetrated, but also by courts of the country where the culprit can be apprehended if he escaped justice in his own country. For example, a currency forger who committed his crime in Paris and escaped to Prague can be punished validly in the latter city.

In 1933, at the Fifth International Conference for the Unification of Criminal Law (under the auspices of the Fifth Committee of the League of Nations) the author of the present article introduced a proposal providing for this type of jurisdiction for acts of persecution amounting to what is now called genocide. Unfortunately, at that time, his proposal was not adopted. Had this principle been adopted at that time by international treaty, we would not now have all the discussions about ex post facto law, in relation to crimes committed by the German Government against its own citizens prior to this war.

V

A ruthless regime finds it easiest to commit genocide in time of war. It then becomes a problem of the treatment, or, rather, mistreatment, of a civilian population by an occupant. The Fourth Hague Convention establishes a rule of law in the protection of civilian populations which an occupant must respect. Within the purview of this law comes the protection of the honor, liberty, life, family rights, and property rights of the population in the occupied country.

Genocide can be carried out through acts against individuals, when the ultimate intent is to annihilate the entire group composed of these individuals; every specific act of genocide as directed against individuals as members of a national or racial group is illegal under the Hague Convention. If the killing of one Jew or one Pole is a crime, the

killing of all the Jews and all the Poles is not a lesser crime. Moreover, the criminal intent to kill or destroy all the members of such a group shows premeditation and deliberation and a state of systematic criminality which is only an aggravated circumstance for the punishment.

Genocide has been included in the indictment of the major war criminals for the use of the Nuremberg trials. It reads as follows:

"They (the defendants) conducted deliberate and systematic genocide—viz, the extermination of racial and national groups—against the civilian populations of certain occupied territories in order to destroy particular races and classes of people, and national, racial, or religious groups, particularly Jews, Poles, gypsies, and others."

By including genocide in the indictment, the enormity of the Nazi crimes has been more accurately described. Moreover, as in the case of homicide, the natural right of existence for individuals is implied: by the formulation of genocide as a crime, the principle that every national, racial, and religious group has a natural right of existence is proclaimed. Attacks upon such groups are in violation of that right to exist and to develop within an international community as free members of international society. Thus, genocide is not only a crime against the rules of war, but also a crime against humanity.

Only after the cessation of hostilities could the whole gruesome picture of genocide committed in the occupied countries be reviewed. During the military occupation unconfirmed rumors about genocide leaked out from behind the iron curtains covering enslaved Europe. The International Red Cross was precluded from visiting occupied countries and gathering information about the mistreatment of the civilian populations. It so happened because the Geneva Convention gave to the International Red Cross the right to supervise and control only the treatment of prisoners of war. A paradoxical situation was created: men who went into the battlefield with a considerable expectancy of death survived, while their families, left behind in supposed security, were annihilated. The author of the present article has proposed in his book Axis Rule in Occupied Europe that international law be changed so that in time of war the treatment of civilian populations will also be under supervisory control of an international body like the International Red Cross. The Swedish newspaper, Dagens Nyheter, of November 2, 1945, announced that the chairman of the Swedish Red Cross, Count Bernadotte, referred to the author's proposal as acceptable for consideration at a future conference of the International Red Cross, and declared that the Swedish Red Cross would support it. While the writer is gratified by this development, he hopes that other governments will support the proposal to change international law.

VI

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, the author proposes that the United Nations as they are now organized, together with other invited nations, enter into an international treaty which would formulate genocide as an international crime, providing for its prevention and punishment in time of peace and war. This treaty, basically, should include, among other things, the following principles:

1. The crime of genocide should be recognized therein as a conspiracy to exterminate national, religious, or racial groups. The overt acts of such a conspiracy may consist of attacks against life, liberty, or property of members of such groups merely because of their affiliation with such groups. The formulation of the crime may be as follows: "Whoever, while participating in a conspiracy to destroy a national, racial, or religious group, undertakes an attack against life, liberty, or property of members of such groups is guilty of the crime of genocide." The crime so formulated should be incorporated in every national criminal code of the signatories.

2. The defendants should be liable not only before the courts of the country where the crime was committed, but in case of escape shall be liable, as well, before the courts of the country where they are apprehended.

3. Persons accused of genocide should not be treated as political criminals for purposes of extradition. Extradition should not be granted except in cases where sufficient evidence exists to indicate that the requesting country will earnestly prosecute the culprits.

4. The liability for genocide should rest on those who gave and executed the orders, as well as on those who incited to the commission of the crime by whatever means, including formulation and teaching of the criminal philosophy of genocide. Members of governments and political bodies which organized or tolerated genocide will be equally responsible.

5. Independently of the responsibility of individuals for genocide, states in which such a policy obtains should be held accountable before the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. The council may request the International Court of Justice to deliver an advisory opinion to determine whether a state of genocide exists within a given country before invoking, among other things, sanctions to be leveled against the offending country. The Security Council may act either on its own initiative or on the basis of petitions submitted by members of interested national, religious or racial groups residing either within or without the accused country.

6. The Hague convention and other pertinent treaties should be changed to the effect that in case of war, an international body (such as the International Red Cross) should have the right to supervise the treatment of civilian populations by occupants in time of war in order to ascertain whether genocide is being practiced by such occupant.

7. A multilateral treaty for the prevention and punishment of genocide should not preclude two or more countries from entering into bilateral or regional treaties for more extensive protection against genocide. In this connection it is well to note that the Allied Governments in accordance with the Moscow agreements of December, 1945, have decided to enter into formal treaties of peace with the Axis satellite countries, Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania, which practiced genocide in this war according to the German pattern. It is of impelling importance that antigenocide clauses be included in these treaties.

Gloom, but Not of Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission granted by the House on March 14 the attached editorial from the Reporter Dispatch published in White Plains, N. Y., titled: "Gloom, but Not of Night," with which I agree wholeheartedly but I think the proposed increase in the salary of employees in the postal service should be $500 instead of the $300 provided in the Mead bill:

GLOOM, BUT NOT OF NIGHT

Readers of this newspaper are aware that we hold strenuously to the theory that employees in public utilities, and especially governmental employees, should not be permitted to leave their responsible tasks in any dispute over wages or conditions.

We are just as insistent that because of the absence of the strike weapon, such employees should have prompt consideration given any just claims. If we take away the right to strike, we must replace it with understanding and a willingness to arbitrate without undue delay.

It is in this connection that we present the plight of the poorest-paid public employees of any large governmental agency—the mail carriers. True, they got a small increase last July, but that was immediately absorbed by the increased living costs and increased withholding tax.

Here are some examples: A married mail handler, in the senior grade, with 20 years of experience behind him, now has a total take-home pay of $33.64 a week. A newly appointed married man, a war veteran, in the same post office, takes home $29.10 a week, and if he were single, that take-home pay would be $27.27.

We submit that this is neither adequate nor honorable treatment to this group, among the most faithful of all public servants. A postal employee must obtain his job through competition, must keep himself well educated, must be at all times courteous to the public, must maintain a heavy schedule with frequently a heavy load.

If we are to expect that neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stops these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds, let us see to it, also, that they do not carry to their little homes the gloom that lack of proper recognition and honest recompense would cause.

Here is a case where Congress should act promptly and with gratitude.

Unity Needed in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unity Needed in Washington," appearing in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., the issue of Sunday, March 17. I invite my colleagues to read this editorial, and I hope the wisdom of it may penetrate to higher sources than even this Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator does not mean to intimate that there are very many higher sources than the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We usually recognize the Presidency of the United States as being a position higher than that of United States Senator. I hope the editorial comes to the attention of President Truman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITY NEEDED IN WASHINGTON

The Nation faces grave perils abroad. Our safety will be greater if we meet them with a strong front in Washington, if the President and a decisive majority of Congress are in

agreement. The danger is increased when, as now, the President and Congress are in conflict, when even many influential members of his own party oppose him on major points of his program.

Unity on foreign issues is not enough. There is a fair amount of that between the President and Congress. But they are divided on many domestic matters. This can easily enough lead a foreign power that opposes us to think that our unity on world issues is shallow, and will break if enough pressure is applied. Others nations do not yet realize how we can wrangle up to the point of a crisis and then drop our differences and close ranks if worse comes to worst.

The President, as the head of the Nation, should take earnest stock of this dangerous situation. He has tried to persuade Congress to accept his program. He has lectured Congress and scolded it. He has appealed to the Nation to force Congress into writing his program into law.

But Congress has balked. It has listened to the people, who have become wholesomely aroused over the continual increase of a bossing, meddling Federal bureaucracy, and the huge Federal debt, with its necessity of severe taxes.

The President has asked Congress for more of this overlording bureaucracy and reckless spending. He asked for it in his fantastic jobs-for-all proposal, which Congress toned sharply down; in bigger- and longer-paid unemployment benefits, which Congress has thus far refused to enact; in a vast compulsory health-insurance program, which Congress has done nothing about; and in other such requests, which Congress has more or less ignored.

Now there is a coalition bloc of southern Democrats and northern Republicans in Congress, committed to defeating portions of his program. There is a bipartisan group of Representatives and Senators, joined by the entire Arkansas delegation, which is demanding a balanced budget at a lower spending level.

The President should heed this revolt. He should cease trying to warp Congress around to his views, and line himself up with Congress. The Nation's security urges this course. It will heal party divisions, which, if they fester on, could mean a Democratic defeat at the polls.

After all, Congress is the voice of the people. The Constitution makes it that, confers far-reaching powers on Congress, including the power to override the President's veto—and even, in an extremity, to remove him from office.

President Truman can show the stuff of a great man, can add much to our national strength in this grim hour, can win the people's gratitude by joining with Congress in its stand against socialism, more bureaucracy, and needless spending.

Construction of Garage Apartments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am extending in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a building materials dealer in Huntington, W. Va., in which he asks the Housing Division of the Civilian Production Administration an interesting and pertinent question pertaining to the construction of garage apartments.

This type of construction would supply living quarters at a more rapid rate than other types of construction because they could be quickly built. In all cases the land and utilities are at hand, which would greatly reduce initial costs. Notwithstanding that materials such as concrete and cinder blocks used in constructing the foundations and garage section are not scarce materials, this type of construction is not permitted by the Civilian Production Administration.

The boy referred to in the postscript of the letter submitted is a veteran who wanted to build a garage apartment in the rear of his father's home and the land and the utilities would have cost him nothing. This is just another of the unexplainable situations that is preventing the construction of housing.

MARCH 18, 1946.

HOUSING DIVISION,
CIVILIAN PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We are advised by the Director of the Federal Housing Administration, Charleston, W. Va., Mr. Guy Ash, that garage apartments, which require materials for the garage portion or the garage foundation, are not eligible for HH ratings under the present regulations of the Civilian Production Administration.

It is the writer's opinion that this type construction, i. e., garage apartments, constitutes one of the quickest, least expensive, and practical means of relieving the housing shortage for a great number of married veterans or those having small families.

1. Many people have available space on their lots for the construction of this type of building without the purchase of additional ground.

2. In the residential portion of this city, as well as most cities, there are restrictions in the deed prohibiting the construction of another residence on any one lot, but generally garage apartments for the use of servants are excluded from these restrictions. Garage apartments can therefore be built in restricted areas.

3. In this area, at least, there is no shortage of cinder block or concrete block or other masonry items for the construction of that portion of building which constitutes the garage or the foundation of the apartments.

4. This type of construction being small and compact requires a minimum amount of materials and is a means of quick relief of deficit housing.

5. Would your office give consideration to modifying present regulations permitting garage apartments, without extending a rating for that portion under the floor joists of the apartment itself?

In other words, if the owner could secure the materials without HH ratings being extended for that portion of the buildings not to be used for living quarters?

As above stated, there is no shortage of foundation materials in this city and we believe the same thing applies to a large area in West Virginia, particularly along river cities where sand and gravel are readily available.

Your prompt consideration and reply would be most appreciated.

Yours very truly,
DUNCAN BOX & LUMBER CO.,
P. O. DUNCAN, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

DEAR HUBERT: The Federal Housing Administration, Charleston, turned down the boy to whom we were talking with in my office March 16 and this letter is written in a rather forlorn hope that something can be done with it. I am sending this letter to Senators CHAPMAN REVERCOMB and HARLEY KILGORE.

P. O. DUNCAN.

Fight Russia? Nix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, all over the Nation the subject of our relationships with Russia and Russia's relationships with all the world are being talked about.

The following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald gives another slant on the subject:

FIGHT RUSSIA? NIX

The American Society for Russian Relief threw a big banquet in New York night before last for W. Averill Harriman, recently returned to this country after a job well done as United States Ambassador to Russia.

Yep, the Russian relief outfit is still going strong, though some unpleasant people wonder why we should be called on to relieve Russia when Russia can offer to sell 500,000 tons of grain to France. But then, we were called on to relieve everybody—everybody, that is, except our own taxpayers and beer drinkers.

WALLACE AGAINST HARRIMAN

Anyway, at this banquet, Mr. Harriman and Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace expressed differing views on Russia's hard-boiled goings-on since VJ-day.

Harriman said frankly that Russia has failed to carry out certain agreements, at least in the way Americans understand the carrying out of agreements. In these disputes, Harriman said: "I stand squarely back of the American position."

He hoped that United States-Russian friendship could and would continue, but he admitted that he did feel a bit squeamish about joining in the Russian relief appeal for $25,000,000 worth of supplies for Russia in 1946 as long as Stalin & Co. persist in welshing on agreements with us.

Wallace, as usual, defended Russia on all counts. The Russians, he said, fear "capitalist encirclement," which is why they are grabbing everything they can and treating supposedly solemn commitments like lovers' vows, made to be broken.

What nations, capitalist or otherwise, can circle Russia, we do not know. Russia stretches from the Baltic to the Pacific, and far into Europe. It has some 190,000,000 people, and one-sixth of the earth's land area.

Wallace, however, can always see some threat to Mother Russia, and can almost always be counted on to spring to Russia's defense against the world, including Wallace's own United States. We can only thank the great Jehovah for having denied Wallace the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination in 1944. If Wallace had got that nomination, he would be President today.

But how about the United States-Russian war which many people consider inevitable?

Winston Churchill, during his visit to this country, made several speeches designed to warm Americans up to the idea that it is a life-and-death necessity for us to stand by Great Britain in its efforts to keep Russia from getting a warm-water port somewhere. This has been British policy for some 100 years, and the Crimean War of 1854–56 was fought to make that policy stick.

That policy is no business of ours. What is it to us if Russia does get a warm-water port on the Mediterranean or the Persian Gulf or in the Dardanelles or on the Aegean? We haven't any ports in those parts, and don't want any.

THE BUSINESS OF STOPPING RUSSIA

The proposition that we should make ready to send millions of our best young men to a war to block Russia's warm-water ambitions is preposterous and perilous—perilous because so many Americans at the moment are falling for it, and preposterous because Russia's warm-water ambitions cut across our interests in no way.

On the records of Napoleon Bonaparte and Adolf Hitler, United States attackers of Russia would get licked anyhow.

We should indeed stop Russia in our own country.

The Russian fifth column is extremely active here. It is made up of the American Communists and of the less dreamy and idealistic, more practical and hard-headed of the Communists' fellow travelers. These people's aim is to overthrow our Government; no more, no less.

Meanwhile, Russia's spy system in Britain, Canada, and the United States is obviously doing its best to buy, steal, or otherwise obtain every last secret of the technics of making atom bombs.

Our Department of Justice, Secret Service, FBI., and so forth, should keep close tabs on the domestic Reds and their more virulent fellow travelers, and those against whom sufficient evidence can be rounded up should be prosecuted to the limit of the law.

There is no sense in resenting Russian agents' efforts to get the atom bomb secrets. The sensible things to do are to grab such agents when we can, and to build up a far-reaching and well-financed spy system of our own.

But as for going to war against Russia in the interests of Great Britain, or in anybody's interest but our own, that would be idiotic and it might be suicidal. This country shouldn't have another war for 25 years, at least; and 50 years would be better than 25; and 100 years would be much better than 50.

Soldier Returning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, already World War II is beginning to have decided influence upon our literature. One of the most excellent poems finding its inspiration in the recent world conflict is one entitled "Soldier Returning" by Arthur M. Sampley.

Soldier Returning won the Aline B. Carter award of $50 for the best poem on the subject of peace offered by Mrs. Aline B. Carter, of San Antonio, Tex., through the Poetry Society of Texas.

The author of the poem is Arthur M. Sampley, librarian of North Texas State College, of Denton, Tex. Mr. Sampley has won various other prizes, including an award of the Poetry Society of Texas for the best poem on democracy and the Maxwell Anderson award in verse drama offered by Stanford University. Mr. Sampley is the author of a volume of poems, This Is Our Time, published in 1943. He served during the war as first lieutenant in the Army Air Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I have the permission of Lieutenant Sampley and of the Poetry Society of Texas to place the soul-stirring verses of Soldier Returning herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOLDIER RETURNING

(By Arthur M. Sampley)

I

Sometimes, he said, I think there is no peace
While there are yet in me the unbalmed pain
And the slow insult of the hours that drain
The mind of calm and comfort and release.
For I shall be remembering blood and grease
On iron rails and the loading of a train
With dangling forms who heard the midnight rain
Begin, but who would never hear it cease.

I shall not leave those nights so soon behind
Nor the bleared hours in which I ground ahead
In some malignant dream of fire and haze.
Living so long among the sightless dead,
I too shall know the slow pain of the blind
And falter in the old familiar ways.

II

From quiet words in one unquiet place
Of a weary man who wore his own dark stains
Welling upon his sleeves from corded veins
And somehow put a smile across his face,
From corpsmen searching through the hostile space
For friend and foe between two narrow lanes
Of sharp-eyed men, and from some casual strains
Mingling by night with faint, ironic grace—

Out of these mercies, small and immature,
I have more auguries of peace to bring
Than from the councils and the halls of state,
For not forever shall the world endure
To throne dictator, emperor, and king
While these small, patient men must bleed and wait.

Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said in reference to the operation of the Maritime Commission that I took it upon myself to ask Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General, what would be his recommendation in reference to the United States Maritime Commission in connection with the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Warren has had considerable experience with the Maritime Commission and has made several reports to the Congress. It was for that reason that I called upon him for an expression of views. I have just received a communication from him and under the permission granted me I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: I have your letter of March 4, 1946, expressing your interest, in view of my experience in Congress and in my present position, in any suggestions I may have as to what should be done with the United States Maritime Commission in connection with the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

As you know, I was vitally interested in the passage of the Reorganization Act of 1945 and in reducing exemptions from reorganization plans thereunder to an absolute minimum in order that the President might have a free hand in the reorganization of the executive branch. My interest in this subject is of long standing and I am sure you will recall it was through your courtesy that I was in charge in the House of that part of the original bill which became the Reorganization Act of 1939. I am familiar, too, with the successful efforts of yourself and other members of the Expenditures Committee to keep the Maritime Commission from being exempted from the Reorganization Act of 1945.

Under such Reorganization Act of 1945, the responsibility for proposing reorganization plans is upon the President. I have not been consulted as to any such plans, and it would not be proper for me to inject myself into the picture in the development of reorganization plans generally. However, the General Accounting Office, because of the character of the audit made of the Maritime Commission under section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—which includes a voucher audit as well as an examination of the Commission's books and records—and the investigation of its financial transactions, has had a peculiar opportunity to observe the internal workings and particularly the financial administration of the Commission. Several reports have been made to the Congress concerning financial transactions of the Commission and the War Shipping Administration. Our investigations of these transactions have convinced me that because of the administrative situation and the vast sums involved, the Commission should be the first agency to be reorganized, and that the Commission itself should be placed under a Cabinet officer, subject to the provisions of section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act relative to quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative functions. The President's approval of the Ship Sales Act, referred to in your letter, emphasizes the need for speed in effecting needed changes before the Commission embarks upon the disposition of vessels costing billions of dollars. Also, I believe that the War Shipping Administration should be abolished without delay and that any of its functions which it is found necessary and proper to carry on thereafter should be transferred to the Maritime Commission.

In considering which executive department could most effectively administer the affairs of the Commission, the Commerce Department probably will occur to you immediately. While I realize that one of the purposes of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was to establish the Maritime Commission as an independent agency, in contrast to the subordinate position of the former Shipping Board bureau in the Department of Commerce, such independence, in my opinion, has not worked to the best interests of the Government as a whole. Placing the Commission under the Commerce Department would permit coordination of its functions with other functions of the Department relating to commerce.

I have already advised Chairman BLAND of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of my convictions in these matters. Such convictions have only been strengthened by the audits of the financial transactions of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year 1943, recently completed by the General Accounting Office after much difficulty due to the incomplete state of the accounts. Following the publication of the audit reports, the three members of the

Maritime Commission then in office—Capt. Edward Macauley, acting chairman, Hon. John M. Carmody, and Hon. Raymond S. McKeough—called upon me at my office and offered their full cooperation with the General Accounting Office in its suggestions for improvement of the accounting procedures and practices of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration and in its efforts to protect the expenditure of public funds under contracts within the administrative control of those agencies. Captain Macauley has elsewhere expressed the determined purpose of the Commission as now constituted to institute a system of accounting which will be entirely acceptable, and some changes in personnel have already taken place within the Commission. I was much impressed by the earnestness of purpose of the Commission members who visited me. However, I feel, and I so advised those members, that the only way to insure a permanent improvement in the organization and activities of the Commission is through a thoroughgoing reorganization pursuant to the Reorganization Act.

I trust the foregoing will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Platoon Sgt. James Francis Dowd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of a citation that was recently issued to Platoon Sgt. James Francis Dowd, of the United States Marine Corps, who resides at 10 Boxford Street, Lawrence, Mass. Sergeant Dowd enlisted in the United States Marines in January 1942 and after a short period of training was shipped overseas to the Pacific area. Due to his initiative, his forcefulness, and his ability he was promoted within a comparatively short period of service to the rank of platoon sergeant.

On June 16, 1945, Sergeant Dowd while serving with a Marine infantry battalion in combat action with Japanese forces in Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, during an attack on the enemy performed a deed of gallantry and bravery. Sergeant Dowd with complete disregard for his own personal safety and acting on his own volition crawled beyond his own lines to an open and exposed area under heavy enemy fire to render first aid to one of his comrades who was badly wounded. Although he succeeded in removing his comrade back to his own lines, he himself received most serious wounds from enemy fire. As a result of his own devotion to duty and his own act of courage and bravery, the wounded comrade was safely evacuated and has now fully recovered from his injuries received in line of duty. However, Platoon Sgt. James Francis Dowd since June 16, 1945, has been a patient in various hospitals within and outside continental United States. At the present time our young hero is a patient in the United States Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., confined to his bed with a complete paralysis not only of his two limbs but the lower part of his body. I sincerely hope that we in the Congress of the United States and the people of this entire country will not for one moment, although hostilities have ceased many months, forget the heroic acts of these members of the armed forces and especially those boys who are still confined to our hospitals suffering the agonies brought upon them by the terrible ordeal of war. To our servicemen like Platoon Sgt. James Francis Dowd we extend our deepest admiration and our grateful thanks and appreciation for the services they have faithfully rendered to the American people.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
HEADQUATERS, FIRST MARINE DIVISION,
FLEET MARINE FORCE,
Care of Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.

In the name of the President of the United States, the Commanding General, First Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force, takes pleasure in awarding the Bronze Star Medal to Platoon Sergeant James Francis Dowd, United States Marine Corps Reserve for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For heroic achievement while serving with a marine infantry battalion in action against enemy Japanese forces on Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, on 16 June 1945. Platoon Sergeant Dowd was acting as a gunnery sergeant in a rifle company during an attack on strongly held enemy fortified positions. On his own initiative and with complete disregard for personal safety, he crawled forward of friendly lines to an exposed area which was under heavy enemy small arms fire to administer first aid to a badly wounded marine. After administering first aid he lifted the wounded marine onto a stretcher and dragged him approximately 50 yards over the same fire swept area to a covered draw from where the patient could be safely evacuated. Platoon Sergeant Dowd's courageous actions and unselfish devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

D. PECK,
Major General,
United States Marine Corps.

UNITED STATES NAVAL HOSPITAL,
Bethesda, Md., March 15, 1946.

To: Platoon Sgt. JAMES FRANCIS DOWD, United States Marine Corps Reserve:

1. The wearing of the V upon the service ribbon and the suspension ribbon of the Bronze Star Medal is authorized.

R. E. DUNCAN,
Captain (MC) USN, Commanding.

This Isn't News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, permission was granted me last week by the House to insert the following editorial published in the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THIS ISN'T NEWS

The charge by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, that Chester Bowles, Stabilization Director, favors the CIO in all economic matters coming within his province should not be surprising. In fact, we were of the opinion that so well known was the fact that to have newspapers headline it constitutes the real surprise.

It was the CIO-PAC which elected and reelected Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was the CIO, through its local units, which went all out for the retention of the New Deal in Washington, term after term.

Why, then, should there be any expression of amazement when the New Deal pays back the debt?

That is what is known as practical politics, and it exists in every branch of the Federal Government where the CIO wants favors. Let's not be so naive as not to recognize it.

St. Patrick's Day Address of Most Rev. Lawrence J. Shehan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the St. Patrick's Day address of Most Rev. Lawrence J. Shehan, auxiliary bishop of Baltimore and Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I consider him as profound a thinker on Christian statesmanship as we have in America today.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1946

Since last we met to observe St. Patrick's Day things of the utmost importance have happened. In the first place, we have won the greatest war in history—a war which was fought not only to preserve our independent existence but also to save our western civilization. Secondly, with the explosion of the atomic bomb over the New Mexican desert last summer we entered upon a new phase of our modern era—or, as some say, a completely new era of our existence—in which for his weal or his woe man has at his command a source of physical energy hereto undreamed of. In this new era we are confident that, in spite of obvious difficulties and in the face of all pessimistic prophecies, our own country will remain true to her best traditions and that she will use her new found power and influence to lead the way to a better world—a world of peace and justice. This evening, however, our thoughts are not so much concerned with the future role of our own country, but rather with that of the land of St. Patrick, the dear island to which so many of us owe our ancestry and our faith.

Although so many of us in this country are of Irish heritage, Ireland has never had here, it seems to me, a particularly favorable press. This has been true especially since the outbreak of the late war. It has been said that Ireland, in remaining neutral and in insisting on her rights as a neutral nation, actually favored the Axis and impeded the cause of the United Nations. At a time when our western civilization was in danger no nation, it is claimed, had a right to remain neutral. And now that the war is over the failure of Ireland to join with the United Nations has deprived her, for the present at least, of a voice in the council of nations. Iran and Afghanistan, Idonesia, and Yugoslavia, and countries of which up to now we have known little or nothing, daily appear in the headlines of our papers. Rarely does the name of Ireland receive even a cursory mention in newspaper dispatches.

Those, however, who are so ready to criticize Ireland should remember that, up to

the time when our own country was attacked, our official position was precisely that which remained Ireland's until the end of the war. Ireland was not attacked, nor did any nation declare war upon her. She, therefore, did not have our reason for abandoning her position of neutrality. Moreover, thousands of her citizens joined the armies of the United Nations and, so far as I am aware, no attempt was made to prevent them. On the other hand, I have never heard of any of her men joining the Axis forces. Moreover, there was little that Ireland could contribute.

If Ireland had entered the war and had laid herself open to attack, she might have brought only destruction to her own people and additional embarrassment and danger to the United Nations. As time goes on the wisdom and propriety of Ireland's course, I feel confident, will be recognized. The fact that she did not cravenly enter the fray when the issues of war had already been settled will argue for the sincerity of her stand and will give dignity to her position. Nor is it necessarily to her ultimate disadvantage that at the present time she is not caught in the rivalry and bitterness of current negotiations. In the long run we cannot doubt that Ireland will play her proper role in world affairs, for Ireland can make a real contribution to what the world most needs for the solution of its deeper problems.

The world in the present time needs many things. All Europe has been devastated. Her cities lie in ruins; her industry has been destroyed; her fertile fields have been laid waste; millions of people have been killed; other millions have been uprooted, impoverished, scattered far and wide. She literally faces starvation. Europe then (and with her the greater part of Asia) has many most obvious needs. She needs food above all things else at the present time. She needs raw materials in great quantities. She needs the machines of industry and the implements of agriculture. And of all these things Ireland has little to offer. But Europe and the world have other needs which are not so obvious to the eye—needs which are deeper and more lasting. These are needs of the spirit and these Ireland can help to supply.

The great calamities which now afflict the world have not resulted from blind inexorable forces over which man has no control. They have arisen from the voluntary blindness and the deliberate perversion of the human spirit. For the past four centuries western man has been in the process of jettisoning the beliefs, the traditions, the principles on which our Christian civilization had been built. Meanwhile, he has been developing at an astounding rate his knowledge of material science and his skill in constructing and using material instruments. In science and in the implements developed by science, man had come to believe that he had attained to all he needed for a full and happy life here. He had come to care for nothing else.

Just where the combination of science and materialism was leading him should have become evident in the First World War. That war may have caused him to pause for a moment, but it did not stop him or divert him from his way. He came to look upon even it as simply another step in the course of natural evolution. It was a lesson man had to learn as a preparation for further progress. In the years between the two great wars man reached what seemed like the summit of material knowledge and the depth of spiritual negation. The result was of course that man was plunged finally into the greatest, the most deadly, the most costly and the most destructive war in the whole history of the human race.

Now man stands at a point where he must once more build his civilization. Will he attempt to erect it completely anew according to the specifications of scientific materialism and the new paganism? These were the things which led him into the great modern catastrophes. If he attempts to guide himself by them once more what can he expect but even greater disasters or, as a worse alternative, complete slavery under an absolute world-state whose only principles and policy will be dictated by brute force.

Or will man attempt to rebuild his world on those Christian principles which formed the foundation of our western civilization—those principles which so evidently must form the foundation of any true peace worthy of rational beings? If man attempts the latter then he will need the faith, for all modern history gives proof of the fact that the Christian faith alone can serve as a foundation and a safeguard of the universal moral code on which true peace depends and Ireland has the faith—she has it to a degree surpassing perhaps any other people in the world today. Therefore it seems to me she has an important role to play in the future development of the civilized world.

For more than four centuries the people of Ireland have fought for their faith as their most treasured possession. And they have fought for their freedom as a means of preserving their faith. The battle for freedom had indeed gone on for centuries before the Reformation. But after Henry VIII broke with the Holy See that battle took on all the bitterness and intensity, first of religious warfare and later of religious persecution. At the end of Henry's reign the rule of the enemy was firmly established; by the end of the reign of Elizabeth, Ireland seemed completely crushed. Her leaders had been exterminated; her people had been dispossessed; her trade had been utterly destroyed. "With every generation" says one historian of Ireland, "the struggle was renewed through centuries of willful ruin, till of the flourishing markets and fair towns of the Irish nothing was left but a starving village, a dim tradition, a crumbling wall or the name of a silent meadow, while the ports lay empty and the rivers and lakes deserted."

But this was not enough. Though her leaders had been destroyed or had capitulated, the Irish people had retained their faith. That faith had to be systematically destroyed. And so in the confidence of complete victory the conquerors instituted their penal laws. What resulted was a hundred years of the most terrible legal tyranny under which a nation groaned.

Although the penal laws in some ways affected the Dissenters, they were aimed primarily against Catholics. They were cleverly devised to win or to force the people away from their faith. The number of priests was at first strictly limited, and bishops who might ordain successors to them were banished. The Irish Catholic was excluded from the vote, from municipal and parliamentary offices, from even sitting in the gallery of Parliament. He was not permitted to become a barrister or a solicitor, a sheriff or a constable. He was prohibited from residing in either Limerick or Galway. He was compelled to pay special and extra taxes. He was not allowed to carry arms, make or sell them, or join the army. He was forbidden to print books or newspapers, to take more than two apprentices in any trade except linen manufacture, or to become an apprentice in any trade to a Protestant.

He was forbidden to teach school or to attend Catholic school or college, or to send his children abroad to school or college. He was forbidden to leave his land to his eldest son, but his eldest son could inherit all the land by turning Protestant.

Any child who turned Protestant could escape his parents' custody and obtain an allowance. Any eldest son who turned Protestant could immediately become the proprietor of the family estate, making his father a life tenant.

There is no need here to retell all that Ireland suffered under the penal laws. For a hundred years they were in force. They reduced the Catholic people of Ireland to pauperism, but they only served to strengthen the faith in their hearts; nor did the suffering of Ireland cease with the repeal of the penal laws. Her trials were prolonged down to our own times, but her faith has likewise endured.

No people on earth has resisted persecution so long and so successfully. The result has been that there is no other people on earth whose faith is stronger and, with God's grace, so secure, and so, when the people of Ireland finally wrested a measure of freedom and independence, they began the constitution of their government by invoking the name of the Holy Trinity and they made as the basis of their own law the law of God and the teachings of our Saviour.

Ireland then has the faith—the faith which the world needs so much today. With that small group of Catholic countries which at the present time are forced to remain apart from the turmoil of nations, she stands shoulder to shoulder with the Holy See, supporting the foundation of our western civilization and upholding the beacon of Christian faith. We are confident that God in His own good time and in His own mysterious ways will let the light of the torch they hold shine upon and enlighten the confused and darkened world.

There was a time many centuries ago when the barbarianism of the north and east threatened to extinguish the light of civilization throughout Europe. Ireland then was the western home of faith and culture from which missionaries went forth to relight the flame of Christian civilization on the continent of Europe. May we not hope that once more she will be permitted to serve as at least one of the instruments chosen by God to restore man in this modern age to his most precious heritage?

And we, my dear friends, American sons of St. Patrick, have a role of similar importance to play here in our own country. Our most treasured civic traditions, those things which have made our country truly great, are founded on the basic truths of the Christian faith. The freedom of the individual and his essential diginity and value, the sacredness of the family, the equality of all individuals and nations, before the law—these true doctrines of democracy have their roots in Christian faith. To keep our country safe and to enable it to play its proper role of leading the world forward to a just and lasting peace, we can render no more effective service than to preserve within ourselves and to bring to our fellow citizens that faith which under God we owe to Ireland's patron, St. Patrick.

Civilian Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a group of national organizations, an emergency conference for civilian control of atomic energy was called in the caucus room of the House Office Building on March 21. This conference was called under the sponsorship of the following Members of the House: Congressman WALTER JUDD, Minnesota; Congressman CHARLES LAFOLLETTE, Indiana; Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, California, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, California.

Representative HOLIFIELD acted as chairman of the meeting. Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, and Doctor Hogness of the Chicago University were the principal speakers.

Several Members of Congress spoke briefly.

Fifty-nine organizations were represented by over 200 delegates. Most of these organizations were national organizations.

The purpose of the meeting was to call attention to the necessity for concerted action on the part of the people of America, toward the end that pending atomic-energy legislation be so written as to guarantee civilian control. The unamimous and enthusiastic support of this principle indicated that today's meeting will give impetus to the fight against military control and will rally civilian organizations of all types throughout the length and breadth of America to the fight for civilian control of atomic-energy legislation.

Under unanimous consent to extend, I include the names of the associations represented at this morning's meeting in the RECORD:

New Council of American Business.
National League of Women Voters.
Southern Conference of Human Welfare.
Federation of American Scientists.
Independent Citizens Committee, Arts, Sciences, Professions.
Council for Social Action of Congregational Churches.
Union for Democratic Action.
Americans United for World Government.
United Council of Church Women.
National Farmers Union.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
American Unitarian Association.
Americans Veterans Committee.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
National Citizens Political Action Committee.
National Lawyers Guild.
American Federation of Labor.
Chevy Chase Woman's Club.
American Council of Learned Societies.
Massachusetts Citizens Political Action Committee.
American Association of University Women.
United Mine Workers of America.
Arlington-Alexandria League of Women Voters.
American Psychological Association.
United Nations Council of Philadelphia.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Woman's Trade Union League.
Association of Oak Ridge Scientists.
National Council of Catholic Men.
National League of Women Shoppers.
National Council of Negro Women.
Kiwanis International.
Unitarian Social Action Committee.
Altrusa International.
American Association of Scientific Workers.
Women's Auxiliary, CIO.
District of Columbia League of Women Voters.
Maryland D. C. Industrial Union Council, CIO.
Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
B'nai B'rith.
Fairmont (W. Va.) League of Women Voters.
Fairmont Women's Club.
Actors Equity.
United Nations Association.
National Council for Prevention of War.
United Steelworkers of America, CIO.
Methodist Federation for Social Services.
Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom.
United Christian Youth.
Military Order of the Purple Heart.
National Education Association.
American Jewish Committee.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
National Jewish Welfare Board.
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.
National Council of Scientific Societies.
American Bar Association.
Women's Action Committee.
American Association for the United Nations.
Committee for Economic Development.
Washington Association of Scientists.
American Association of University Professors.
American Federation of Teachers.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Farmer, Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, last week we passed the appropriation bill for Agriculture. I found myself generally in accord with the provisions of the bill. It carried increased appropriations for rural electrification and for soil conservation.

I am hoping now that the war is over, that the industries manufacturing the articles and materials which are necessary for the extension of the rural electrification lines, may be able to find sufficient material and may be able to employ steadily without further interruptions of work, sufficient men to produce materials needed for the extension of rural electrification.

I have supported this program on every occasion and will continue to do so until all of the farm homes in the Nation which want the benefit of electric lines and electric power may secure that benefit.

And, may I say, I hope the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, will find it possible to push as rapidly as they can the construction of farm-to-market roads. With other Members of the Congress, I recall several months ago that a number of us by coordinating our efforts were able to secure a greater allocation of funds to be expended for farm-to-market roads than the original bill had provided. I think it was $150,000,000 that was further allocated to farm-to-market roads by reason of our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also carries substantial appropriations for the continuation of the soil-conservation program. Nothing in a material way is more important to all of the people of the United States than maintaining the fertility of the soil. That is the purpose of soil conservation. The food the people must eat, now, in the future, and for generations, depends upon maintaining the fertility of the soil. It is just as important to the countless millions of people living in the great cities as it is to the farmers themselves because if our soil is depleted constantly the people in the cities and all over the Nation will go hungry. The greatest horde of wealth and the most important material wealth in the Nation is in the soil.

Agriculture and the success of the farmer is the foundation of the wealth and a successful economy for the Nation. The farmer produces the new wealth which constantly flows into the economic bloodstream of the country. All of our new money or wealth comes from the farm, from the mines, minerals, the timbers, and the fisheries of our Nation. The men who engage in these pursuits, the millions of farmers who toil long hours for less money on the average than any other segment of our population produce the new wealth annually which keeps our economy strong and dynamic.

The farmer who produces the poultry, the cattle, sheep, hogs, livestock of all kinds, and who plants the millions of acres of our soil and who reaps the billions of bushels of wheat, oats, corn, and the millions of dollars of other produce of the farm; those are the people who produce the new wealth that makes this Nation strong financially.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to show how wealth is produced and who produces it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to present some figures from the Department of Agriculture which clearly prove that if we any longer are looking for what was referred to a few years ago as the forgotten man, we need not search for him any more—he is the farmer.

Following are the figures, and I believe I can prove that statement.

The farm population of the United States in 1944, according to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, represented 19 percent of the total population. Due to the long hours the farmer works on the farm, I believe it would be reasonable to concede that he is entitled to have 19 percent of the total income or wealth produced during 1944. He got only 8½ percent of the national income in 1944.

Going a little further with some figures all of which statistics I got today from the Department of Agriculture, you may be interested to learn that there are 25,521,000 people located on the farm; that there are 111,847,000 people who do not live on the farm and that these 25,521,000 people who live on the farm received an income of $13,631,000,000 out of a total national income of $160,907,000,000. In other words, the farm group, who worked the longest hours and who made the greatest sacrifice to produce the wealth of the Nation get a little less than one-half of the share to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, if any one doubts who is the "forgotten man" let us go back to the conference called late last year by the President which sought to adopt policies to settle labor disputes which affected about 25,000,000 organized laboring men and which affected the farm group of 25,000,000 plus some 80,000,000 of the general public. No one was there to represent the farmer and I must say that the

public, including the farmer and the other 80,000,000 had no representation whatsoever.

They were supposed to be represented by two Cabinet officers, Mr. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor and Mr. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, both of whom, during the conference and every day, week, and month since the conference by every act, and public statement and move they made, show conclusively that they represented only the cause of labor.

Let me point out another instance. A few weeks ago the President established a new wage policy and a new price-line policy. No one at the present seems to be able to understand what the price-line policy is, but there are some facts that all of us can understand about this new move. We know that the average wage raise set for steel and the General Electric automobile workers, and so forth gave them an increase of about 18½ cents an hour. In order to grant this raise we know that the President and his OPA officials decided to allow the big steel companies to raise the price of steel $5 a ton. Of course, in the different grades of steel, with the different processing companies, that price will raise probably to $25 a ton in many instances.

We also know that the President found it necessary, in order to settle the meat packers' strike, to grant an increase of some 16 cents an hour and thinks he can get the extra money to pay this increase in wages by raising the price of meat for the packers about 2 cents a pound. It will, of course, be more to the consumers. We know that the best economists in the Nation believe that the cost of living due to these recent moves of the President, will raise the cost of living on a general level of about 10 percent. We know, as many economists throughout the Nation know, that this breaking of the price line by the President is an inflationary move and will greatly add to the danger of inflation at the present time.

Now, the point I want to make is this, that in all of these negotiations and in the setting up of this new price line the interest of the farmer was never mentioned one time. I got curious about this yesterday and called the Department of Agriculture to ask them, now that they had made this move in raising the price of meat by the packers, if they anticipated any rise in the price of livestock. I was assured by the official who answered me that it was not thought necessary to make any change in existing prices due to this change and that none were contemplated.

Now, let us return to the farmer for a minute and examine his position. When war was declared his new farm implements were almost entirely shut off. The next year he was allowed 20 percent of former supplies and the next year about 40 percent of what he would have been able to have bought before the war. The next year only a dribble of new farm machinery and this year, when the war is over and when he has struggled along and worked his farm machinery day and night in many instances, in order to produce the food to win the war and feed the people, this year, in 1946, with the war having been over for many months, he thought he would certainly be able to get the long waited for and much needed new machinery. But he cannot get it.

Mr. Speaker, the reason he cannot get it is because practically all of the big concerns, including International Harvester Co., the J. I. Case Co., and the Allis-Chalmers Co., employing thousands of men, are shut down because of strikes. For instance, the Secretary of Labor told me today over the phone that there are 24,000 employees on strike, shutting down the International Harvester Co. works at Chicago, Rock Island, East Moline, and Rock Falls, and that there are 6,000 employees on strike covering the three plants of the J. I. Case Co. at Racine, Wis., Burlington, Iowa, and Rockford, Ill. These are only a few of the plants throughout the Nation which are shut down today preventing the farmers from getting new farm machinery to feed this Nation and to help feed the starving people of the world. While the Secretary of Agriculture and the present administration holds world food conferences and are now urging the people to organize in every city, county, and State to save a little on bread, fats, oils, and to save a little food in every way possible, and while the President has issued a proclamation urging that the people "tighten their belts," this same administration has handled the disputes between capital and labor so badly that they cannot keep their own farm-implement plants open to produce the farm implements, which the farmers are anxious to buy, to produce the food that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are begging for at the present time.

Such failure in governmental management, and the lack of courage of those who are supposed to give guidance and direction to the affairs of the Nation is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the farmer, if he ever gets the machinery after the strikes are settled and the wage increases are granted, he, the farmer, will have to pay more for his machinery as he is paying more for his labor today and as he is paying more for everything he has to buy.

Some prosperity has come to the farmer while we have been spending due to the war billions of dollars, but what little prosperity he has been able to salvage has been because he has been willing to put in generally 2 hours of work at a price he should have been able to get for 1 hour in national income. The farmers are the one group that never failed on any request of the Government during the war. He has accumulated some money in many instances because he could not spend it for farm implements, for lumber, yes, and for proper clothing for himself and family because he could not get such material. In fact, I see nothing evil or dangerous if some farmers do have a little money in their pockets and in the banks. To listen to some big city people you would think that it is a catastrophe for a farmer to have a little money. The reason is that the farmer generally has never been accorded anything more than a bare living. Naturally, some people find themselves a little surprised to learn that the farmers now, at least some of them, seem pretty well fixed.

Prices for livestock at present seem reasonably high, but because of the added expense the farmer is under, it does not necessarily mean that all these prices show a profit. Time will only permit me to give one illustration.

SHEEP SHOW A LOSS

The farmers have been losing money on sheep throughout the Nation for the past 3 years. The Tariff Commission recently issued a report stating that the present price for wool in the United States caused the farmers a loss of 10.8 cents per each pound of wool produced.

The results are that Government statistics show the farmers are quitting the sheep business.

We had in this country in January 1943, 49,000,000 head of breeding-stock sheep.

By January 1944 the number dropped to 45,000,000 head.

By January 1945 the number dropped to 41,000,000 head.

And, it is estimated that as of January 1, 1946, the breeding stock in sheep in the United States will be down to 38,000,000 head. There are various other illustrations where the price granted the farmers today is less than the cost of production.

In addition to higher wages for farm help and higher prices for everything the farmer buys, he as well as others is penalized with higher taxes. There is one thing the present administration could do which would reduce our annual tax load by $3,000,000,000 a year, and that is to reduce the Federal pay roll now standing at around 3,000,000 people.

Some months ago, and again day before yesterday, I spoke on this subject urging the reduction of Federal pay rolls by one and one-half million people, pointing out that it could be done without affecting the efficiency of governmental operation.

I am sorry to again have to point out to the House that rather than the reduction of Federal bureaucracy as promised by the President some months ago, some 34,569 more employees were added to the old line bureaucratic departments of Government during the past January than were released.

Since last August the bureaucratic employee pay roll has gone up by 140,000 people. These figures are correct and official as given out by the Byrd Committee on Economy and Efficiency in Government.

The Federal pay roll today, for employees, costs the taxpayers almost $7,000,000,000 a year. If the Chief Executive, who is the only one who has the power to deflate this bureau, would reduce the pay roll by 1,500,000, we could save the taxpayers $3,000,000,000 a year.

Those handling the propaganda for the administration continue to berate the Congress, promote over the air and through the press the proposition to grant a gift or loan of $4,000,000,000 to England and loans and grants to other nations. They try to keep the minds of the people off of the real domestic problems of government, apparently to

cover up the continual waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to close my remarks without referring to the policies of this administration as to subsidies. I want to give a few figures that will show the American people that the OPA has not held the line against the high cost of living as it so often contends it has. Of course, anyone who buys any commodities today, if he is able to get them, knows that there has been considerable rise in the cost of most commodities. He knows that in addition to the rise in price that generally there has been a great cut in the quality of the articles as well.

I want to compliment the agricultural leaders of our country and particularly the individual farmers in their effort to remain freemen. They, as no other group, have opposed the policies of subsidies which I desire to refer to. If the administration had listened to the farmers and stayed away from consumer subsidies, we would have had more food today with no rise in price. All the farmers wanted was a fair price without any Government middleman doling out to him a subsidy check, but the past administration and the present one declared otherwise.

In checking with the Department today I have the figures on food subsidies alone covering dairy products, flour, meat, showing that we have authorized and will expend in these subsidies alone for this year, about $1,500,000,000. This subsidy was paid to the processors in order to keep down, they say, the price of dairy products, butter, and meat. This billion and a half dollars in money was added to the national debt. The taxpayers will have to pay it.

Two years ago when food subsidies were before the House I argued that the American people receiving the highest wages and the greatest income they had ever known ought to be able to pay their own grocery bill without charging it on the books for the servicemen to help pay after they came back from fighting a war at from $50 a month and up. They will have to help pay this and the other billions in waste expended while they were gone.

Mr. Speaker, I have personally engaged in farming and have taken a keen interest in agriculture since becoming a Member of this body in the hope of helping to make the Nation stronger and more prosperous by starting at the very foundation in providing conditions for agriculture that would make the farmer more prosperous. The success of our Nation from an economic standpoint, I still contend, depends more upon the success of the farmer than on any other segment of our people. I hope in the future that we, from the agricultural States, can coordinate and combine our efforts to see to it that agriculture is brought up to a parity with labor and the other business interests of the Nation.

We will not be able to keep the factories running and men employed, we will not be able to keep the national income high enough from which to collect taxes to continue to operate our Government and to keep bonds at par unless we give more attention to the success of the farmer and agriculture. He is the one who produces the new wealth and if you reduce his net income or pinch it down year after year, you will finally run into another depression which may wreck the financial structure of this Government. If the Chief Executive and the Congress will balance the Budget, cut down every possible expense, and take a million and a half people off the pay roll who are deadwood in Government service, if we can bring harmony and an honest solution to the problems that are causing the strikes throughout this land, we may be able to maintain our financial solvency and our representative form of government which for 150 years has maintained for us the freedom of the American people.

We must insist on a balanced budget, vote for and insist on more rigid economy than we have ever known in Government. Labor wil have to produce more goods per man-hour than ever before to help produce the income that is necessary to carry on this Government during the financial crisis that faces us now with our tremendous war debt and which will face us in the future.

We shall have to produce more and more goods, with work and more work, to bring the cost of living down which will benefit labor, the farmer, and everyone. We shall have to produce more goods and get them onto the market more quickly if we are to prevent ruinous inflation in this country.

The farmer has demonstrated his ability to work and produce. Some increases in price have been and are now necessary on farm commodities. All he wants is fair treatment with relation to others. He needs the encouragement of the Secretary of Agriculture rather than the discouragement in the statements which the Secretary of Agriculture has been giving to the press.

Last week in Denver the Secretary of Agriculture said:

> If the Pace bill providing for all cost of farm production was enacted, it would cause ruinous inflation.

Secretary Anderson has testified for wage raises several times recently and has never once said they would be inflationary even though prices were raised to meet them, yet, when something is offered to benefit the farmer he immediately denounces it and shouts inflation.

The Secretary is fast losing the confidence of the farmers notwithstanding he is at the head of the Department of Agriculture. A change in his attitude would be helpful and would give the farmers the encouragement that is so much needed.

Food Conservation for Relief of Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the most effective force for good in the world today is the aroused conscience of a Christian people. The following letter from a group of my constituents of the Baptist faith is a noble example of voluntary cooperation of American citizens in the great humanitarian effort of preventing a disastrous famine overseas which is now being headed up, at President Truman's request, by former President Hoover.

It would be a fine thing indeed if other church groups throughout the United States of America would follow the fine leadership of these Stratford citizens.

THE STRATFORD BAPTIST CHURCH,
Stratford, Conn., March 13, 1946.

In response to the President's request to help prevent starvation overseas, I voluntarily pledge to conserve food and to buy less, bake less, waste less—bread, cake, and wheat products. I will conscientiously attempt to conserve during the next 6 months, or while the emergency exists, about a quarter of the wheat products our household is accustomed to use:

Theodore N. Johnson, Elna M. Spongberg, Stratford, Conn.; Mrs. Maud Tilton, Bridgeport, Conn.; Mrs. T. N. Johnson, Mrs. Eugenie Hug, Mrs. Everett Jersey, Mrs. E. S. Kokel, Mrs. George B. Cuzner, Mrs. Solly Solomonson, Mrs. Walter Oates, Mrs. L. Van Sleet, Mrs. Carl E. Berg, Stratford, Conn.; Mrs. Noble Reynolds, Bridgeport 4, Conn.; Mrs. M. Hallsworth, Mrs. A. Hudson, Solly Solomonson, Mrs. A. D. Barrett, Mrs. E. J. McCallum, Mrs. A. Dubord, Floyd Jones, R. A. Beers, Mrs. B. Russell, Stratford, Conn.; Harlan G. Heath, Mrs. Harlan G. Heath, Devon, Conn.; Shannon Bartgis, Mrs. Shannon Bartgis, M. Gilbert Andrews, Mrs. M. G. Andrews, E. J. McCallum, Jr., Clinton Kennedy, Carl E. Berg, Mrs. E. Haley, Doris M. Taylor, Marjorie L. Berg, Ethel A. Bennett, Alice Haley, Mrs. Redfield, Bradford M. Parsons, Mrs. Bradford Parsons, Charles R. Singley, Mrs. C. R. Singley, Joseph Graham, Mrs. Joseph Graham, Ellery B. Keath, Mrs. E. B. Keith, Stratford, Conn.

The Aluminum Industry of the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, because of the confidence in the future of the light metals industry of the Pacific Northwest expressed in certain letters and telegrams addressed to me in regard to the operation of aluminum plants in Washington State, I ask that the communications be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HENRY J. KAISER CO.,
New York City, March 16, 1946.

Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: I want you to know how deeply we appreciate the tireless efforts you have expended on the vision, which we share with you, of the Northwest as a great industrial center producing in

great abundance the materials and products of the new age.

Your diligent investigation of the facts in the hearings held by your committee and your wise judgment of the possibilities of a competitive future have hastened the day on which the aluminum industry of the Northwest will come into production. You have well served the interests of your community and of the West, and you deserve the commendation of those whom you represent.

As a third company in the basic aluminum field, we are determined to provide that competition for which you have so energetically worked. Thereby, we are confident we shall contribute to the productive employment of the great human and material resources of the Northwest.

We look forward to working with you in the years to come on the great task of making the vision a reality.

Very sincerely,

HENRY J. KAISER.

SPOKANE, WASH., *March 7, 1946.*

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Washington, D. C.:

We the aluminum workers of Spokane and the Inland Empire wish at this time to express our deep appreciation of your untiring efforts to secure the reopening of the Spokane plants. All we can say is thanks from the bottom of our hearts. Rest assured that your work will not go unrewarded.

JACK QUINN,
Recording Secretary, CIO Local, No. 338, USWA.

PULLMAN, WASH., *February 8, 1946.*

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senator:

Congratulations on outcome of your long efforts for disposal of aluminum plants in State of Washington. You and the Governor must have and the State of Washington will have much satisfaction in having these plants in such enterprising hands.

WILSON COMPTON,
President, Washington State College.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 8, 1946.*

Senator H. B. MITCHELL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on lease of aluminum plant in Northwest to Henry Kaiser. Your efforts in this regard are deserving sincere compliment as this action commensurate with fuller employment and prosperity to Pacific Northwest.

R. H. POWELL,
Acting President, Aeronautical Mechanics Lodge, No. 751.

REYNOLDS METALS CO.,
Richmond, Va., March 7, 1946.

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: Your efforts in assisting our young and eager corporation to secure the McCook Aluminum Sheet Plant in Chicago is deeply appreciated.

This action, on the part of our Government, will enable us quickly to carry out our dream of homes for the great 95 percent. Aluminum belongs to the masses. It is God's answer against fire, moisture, termites, excess heat in the summer and excess cold in the winter. Bauxite is abundant. Now, with competition, we expect to give aluminum to the world at the price it should pay.

Our first efforts will be to house our returned soldiers in better protected homes than millionaires now enjoy.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

R. S. REYNOLDS, *President.*

SPOKANE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Spokane, Wash, February 21, 1946.

Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your telegram which just came in today saying the War Assets Corporation accepted Henry J. Kaiser's bid for our two aluminum plants.

I have just been talking to Mr. Kaiser on the telephone and assured him of our desire to do everything we can and prepare any advance material he would like that would assist him in getting the plants into quick operation.

This is great news to us here in Spokane—that these plants are finally going to be in operation soon.

Thank you for the big fight you have made on this, Senator, and congratulations to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. FORD,
Managing Secretary.

WESTERN STATES COUNCIL,
February 23, 1946.

HUGH MITCHELL,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUGH: I wish to congratulate you upon the successful outcome of negotiations between the War Assets Corporation and the Kaiser interests in connection with the lease by the latter of the rolling mill and reduction plant in Spokane. I am aware of your continued interest and effective work in that connection, and wish to thank you for it.

I have called a meeting of our board of directors in the council at Butte for March 17 and 18. I would be glad to have you write me a letter here before that time, outlining your successful efforts to integrate the light metals industry in the Pacific Northwest. This will give me an opportunity to see that you receive the credit with our crowd that is so deservedly yours.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTY THOMAS, *President.*

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address delivered by me on March 10, 1946, over Station WORC, in Worcester, Mass., and on March 17, 1946, over Station WSPR in Springfield, Mass. Both of these radio programs are weekly features of Justice for Poland, a program sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress:

Several months ago, as a member of a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee I had the opportunity of visiting Poland. During these short minutes, let me tell you very briefly something of the spirit of Warsaw. Warsaw, the capital, is the heart of Poland and, like the human heart, for six long years has felt and still today feels the terrible pains and agonizing tortures of all its people, cities, towns, and villages. Today that heart still lives and beats within the battered body of Poland as firmly and determinedly as ever, not only to survive but to secure for all its people the blessings and fruits of liberty. It is the most devastated city in the world. Its buildings, public and private, have been blasted into ruin and what remained after the shelling and bombardment had been burned into ashes. Wherever your eyes may wander the destruction is virtually complete. Here was the realization of the dream of complete destruction which was born in the perverted German mind somewhere in the dim recesses of a beer house in Munich. Here among this wreckage today live 500,000 people. These are the mothers, daughters, and sons of the stalwart defenders of liberty who today lie buried in shallow graves in every part of their once happy and beloved metropolis. Graves fill every garden, square, park, and courtyard, and upon each, reverent hands have erected simple, little wooden white crosses. Each day loving hands carefully arrange clusters of fresh flowers whose fragrance mingles with the stench of the decaying flesh of tens of thousands of corpses not yet recovered from the ruins and rubble of Warsaw. Starved, emaciated, ragged, diseased are these survivors who escaped the sword of the conquering Germanic hordes. Today the Nazi invader has been crushed and yet the joy of victory has not come. Only a new master has arrived, as cruel and ruthless as the one that has fallen. Is this what we and you have fought for, the people ask? But these soldiers, you reply, many of them are your own kind. Look at their uniforms. Are they not Poles? Oh, no, sir. This is not our army. They are not our soldiers. If they were they would not treat us so cruelly.

Our Army and our soldiers have not as yet returned. They are still in Italy, England, and Scotland, and scattered all over the world, but, someday, they will return and then things will be different. I asked others about their government. "Our government," they shot back. "This isn't our government; we have yet to choose our government and then things will be different." I asked others about Mikolajczyk. "Yes; Mikolajczyk is doing all he can, but what can he do among so many? Soon he may not be among us. Already two attempts have been made on his life. But if he can only hold out soon things will be different." "Things will soon be different" are the words that constantly repeat themselves. Each time these words are said they are so said as to ring with hope whenever one hears them. But how much more can they stand, how much further can they suffer, you ask yourself, and the answer is supplied when you are told that "Death is sweeter than life." They have suffered so long and so much that they mean not to surrender now. Never will such people accept communism in any of its forms. They shall not rest until they shall have a government of their own choosing. They realize that their only weapons are their indomitable courage and unconquerable will. For centuries these were their only weapons and again today they realize that these are their only means. But they have succeeded before and will succeed again and soon things will be different again.

A few members of the government—those representing the democratic Poles from within and outside Poland—are pressing for early elections as they are confident that the people of Poland will never accept the presently imposed set-up, nor will they vote to retain any Communists in office. With all the propaganda that is being disseminated through the government-controlled press and radio, with all the grand promises that are being made to the people, the ordinary man remains unshaken in his grim determination for freedom. He rather judges by actions, not by words. He has witnessed daily raping of women, suffered the loss of all he possessed, heard of the constant deportation of his friends, the pillaging of homes, factories, and shops, and himself was many times beaten for failure to yield immediate obedience. This he does not forget and

only smiles inwardly when the promises of a new, brighter, and better future are blasted over the loudspeakers on the corner of Marszalkowska Street and Jeruzalem Avenue.

Of the "four freedoms," announced to the world as the great goal of mankind everywhere, only a superficial semblance of one remains. Something of the freedom of religion still remains, but is greatly curtailed. Religious instructions have been drastically restricted and human concupiscence appealed to in the establishment of new matrimonial laws. The very foundation of the family is being undermined through the abolition of church marriages. The clergy must be superabundantly discreet lest anything they say may be misconstrued. In Poland today, its people exist for the state and not the state for the people. Freedom of speech is unknown. All means of information are controlled by the state. The radio and press are instruments of the government. The existing legalized political parties are tools of the government and each is subservient to the government, and controlled by the government. The old political leaders actually are deprived of all authority and the real power has been usurped by those favorable to the present government who constantly are calling rump conventions which pass resolutions condemning the old leaders. All government officials from the highest to the lowest, from the larger cities to the smallest village, are appointed by the government and must take an oath of allegiance to the government and to Soviet Russia. Each man, woman, and child lives in daily fear of want. Disease is rampant, tuberculosis unchecked, and syphilis and gonorrhea will soon decimate the remaining people of Poland. This winter will reap a grim harvest. Though the mining of coal has reached more than 50 percent of the prewar production, there is no coal for the Poles. Her industries are stripped and her harbors denuded of all facilities. The great promise of territories, rich in mineral resources, lying east of the Oder are a poor consolation for the loss of the land east of the so-called Curzon Line with its great cities and rich oil fields. There, in this new promised land, there is little hope for the immediate future.

Freedom from fear a mockery—a beautifully sounding phrase—empty words, a dream perhaps when things are different. As the Red Army is demobilized in Poland some of its soldiers are assimilated into the Polish Army, some are given Polish citizenships, and some are left to make their way home, plundering, raping, and living off the country as he makes his way home. As the number of the Soviet soldiers diminish, their places are quickly filled by secret agents of the NKVD. The government by the military is being replaced by a government of secret police whose conduct and actions differ in nowise from the German Gestapo.

Anxiously I awaited an opportunity to talk with Mr. Mikolajczyk, but I was told that he was detained in Poznan. So I sought out those who followed him from London. I asked others what they hoped to accomplish in the face of these difficult conditions. Why did Mikolajczyk come back? Did he not realize that in the face of such terrible obstacles his task would be impossible? What hope was there for a free and independent Poland? To these questions there came the answer, that the hope of Poland is in the courage and unbroken will of the people. In him all Poland has confidence. He is the rallying point of the people. If he fails, history may ascribe to him the role of a traitor. If he succeeds, Poland can yet be free. All have unbounded confidence that the people, if given the opportunity to declare themselves in a free and unfettered election, will completely reject communism and declare themselves for a truly democratic form of government. More than food, more than clothing, more than life itself, the Polish people want their freedom and they mean to have their freedom. This grim determination can best be portrayed by telling you in closing of a few joyful minutes that we spent in Foggs Kawiarnia. It's a little cafe situated on Marszakowska Street, in the still standing ground floor of an otherwise destroyed building. There, to the tune of the Song of Warsaw, the people rise to join in the last chorus to tell in song the Warsaw that will yet arise. There I heard:

"I know that you're not now the same,
That dark blood has washed all your streets.
I'm proud that you know no shame,
Though now you have caused me to weep,
And now, though you're low in the mud,
I'll build with my own sweat and blood,
So Warsaw shall rise once again to her might,
I swear on my heart and my life."

Then as curfew time approaches they filled the air with the Polish national anthem, Poland Is Not Yet Lost. Instantaneously, I understood what I was told was the hope of Poland, its people, and its will for freedom and liberty. I left Warsaw the following morning a better American than I ever was, more appreciative of the blessings of liberty and freedom and eternally grateful to all who made my America possible.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, March 10, 1946:

OPA SAYS ONE THING BUT DOES ANOTHER

Perhaps one of the reasons the administration is having to fight so desperately for extension of the Price Control Act beyond its present statutory limit of June 30 is that there are those in Congress and out who have begun to doubt the sincerity and motives of some of its advocates.

Their doubts are not based on the propaganda of congenital opponents of any and all government controls, but upon evidence being supplied by administrators of the control program themselves that they prefer indefinite continuation of the controls to the surrender of their wartime power to direct the Nation's economy.

Having had a taste of power, they found it a sweet morsel very much to their liking. They are loath to give it up.

Administration spokesmen have said repeatedly that they favor continuance of price control only until such time as production can be brought into approximate balance with demand and the inflationary pressure thus relieved.

Director Snyder, of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, explained recently that the continuation of heavy general inflationary pressures made the retention of most price ceilings necessary to the maintenance of a stable economy, but he followed this explanation with the unqualified pledge that "they will be lifted as quickly as supply approaches balance with demand."

Economic Stabilization Director Bowles has said on more than one occasion that price control should and must be removed as rapidly as supply conditions permit.

In a recent speech, while he was still OPA Administrator, Mr. Bowles predicted that, barring continued labor-management difficulties, the current year would find supply and demand coming into balance. "As that occurs," he said, "I assure you that your Government will move promptly to eliminate the last vestige of price restrictions in those industries."

President Truman's most recent Executive order on the administration's wage-price policy spoke only of Government controls over scarce materials and facilities. The inference is clear that the official policy of the Government is not to continue controls over those materials and facilities which no longer are scarce.

That is what the top officials who make and administer the Government's economic policies have said. It sounds good. It is a program which most Americans doubtless would support. The difficulty of the situation, the thing that is creating doubts in the minds of many, is that the officials say one thing but do another. And actions today, as always, speak louder than words.

Conclusive evidence that this is the case is to be found in the fact that crude oil is still subject to price control, although production far exceeds demand, and has ever since the cessation of hostilities 7 months ago.

Official admission that the crude supply was adequate was implied in the action of OPA in ending gasoline rationing shortly after VJ-day. If the supply of gasoline was sufficient to warrant the end of rationing, and evidently it was, it follows logically that the production of crude oil is at least equal to demand and therefore should be released from further Government price control.

That the administration has not followed its announced policy of relaxing controls when production meets or exceeds demand in the case of crude oil is ample warrant for doubt that the announced policy would be followed in other industries.

Domestic production of crude oil now is averaging 4,746,250 barrels daily, according to the American Petroleum Institute. The United States Bureau of Mines estimated last Thursday that only 4,450,000 barrels of domestic crude a day would be required to meet the demand during March. These figures show that oil production currently is about 300,000 barrels a day in excess of demand. And production could be stepped up appreciably if demand were to increase, as the daily output now is considerably below the peak reached during the war.

That crude oil production exceeds demand is not denied by officials of OPA. Instead, they seek to justify continuation of controls on the grounds that there is a shortage of fuel oils. It may be that there is a temporary shortage of fuel oils in some isolated areas, but if there is it is due to OPA's disruption of the normal laws of supply and demand, and not because of any lack of crude oil or refining capacity.

OPA ceiling prices apparently have made it more profitable for refiners to produce gasoline, for which there is a strong domestic and export demand, than fuel oils, the demand for which is both sectional and seasonal.

Removal of price controls, permitting the petroleum industry to function in a normal manner, doubtless would quickly correct whatever fuel oil shortages there may be. It is significant that there were no shortages of any petroleum products anywhere in the United States before OPA took a hand. It follows logically that there would be none if price controls were removed.

No group or industry in the country has been dealt with by OPA more unfairly and unjustly than have oil producers. The agency declined all through the war to recognize the fact that crude oil prices were in a depressed condition when they were frozen on October 1, 1941. Unrestricted production in Illinois had resulted in a price cut of 20 cents a barrel throughout the Mid-Continent area in 1938. Only a part of this cut had been restored when prices were frozen.

While oil prices remained fixed throughout the war, except for nominal spot adjustments permitted in some fields, prices of all other essential raw materials have been allowed to increase until they exceeded parity with the 1926 price level. According to the United States Department of Labor, the wholesale price of all commodities in February of this year was 105.9 in comparison with 1926 prices of 100. But for the same month the same agency reports that the wholesale price of petroleum products was only 62.1.

Meanwhile, in common with all other industries, the cost of drilling and operating oil wells has gone up and up. Deeper drilling, substantially higher labor costs, increased cost of materials and supplies and heavier local, State, and Federal taxes all have contributed to the burden of oil producers. Their increased costs in the face of fixed, below-parity prices for their oil has meant that many of them have had to sell their assets at less than their replacement value. Many of the small independent producers, the very backbone of the industry, cannot continue to exist under these conditions.

Despite this array of facts and a recommendation by its own crude oil advisory committee that a minimum increase of 35 cents a barrel is needed immediately to avoid further damage to the industry, OPA has announced it will authorize a 10-cent increase around March 15.

The first over-all price increase authorized in 4½ years, and it is one thin, puny, insignificant dime! It reminds one of a vaudeville performer tossing a trained seal a piece of fish in the hope that he will keep quiet and get on with the act. But American oil producers are not trained seals and a dime increase will not keep them quiet nor prevent them from pressing their plea for justice and fair prices. They are a patient and long-suffering lot and have shown commendable restraint in characterizing the 10-cent increase as merely ridiculous. They would have been justified in using much stronger terms, and certainly they are fully warranted in the effort which they are to make to obtain congressional relief from the oppression and tyranny of OPA.

The public need have no fear that if the needed relief is obtained and the strangling hand of OPA is removed from the throat of the petroleum industry that the prices of crude oil and gasoline would skyrocket. Supply and demand always has maintained correct prices in this as in all industries and normal competitive conditions may be relied upon to protect consumers adequately.

Small Watercourse Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill designed to make available the Government assistance needed to correct the widespread difficulties created in our agricultural areas by the small streams that flow unchecked through much of the country's best farm land. We who live in, or who are acquainted with, rural areas can each point to a watercourse with which we are familiar and recount many instances where the seemingly harmless minor stream surges out of its banks during periods of excess rain, inundates growing crops and valuable pasture, sweeps away fences, barns and farm machinery, destroys livestock, erodes away many acres of valuable agricultural land, and carries the eroded soil down into the main streams and their larger tributaries to fill reservoirs, channels, and ditches, or to obstruct navigation, highways, railroads, or other channels of commerce. The Congress has in the past provided for the application of remedies for conditions both above and below the area or zone at which this act is directed.

We have on the books legislation which authorizes the Department of Agriculture to work and assist with work on the watershed lands that drain into these small streams. We also have legislation which authorizes the War Department to install works in and along channels once they have developed into main streams or major tributaries of navigable waters. We have, however, made no provision for carrying out the public responsibility in the no-man's land that lies between the larger stream channels and the farmers' fields which can be terraced or strip-cropped or reforested.

This no-man's land consists of innumerable fingerling streams that flow across a few farms before entering main watercourses. During some seasons of the year many of them are dry, but at other times they flow to an excess which plagues the farmer trying to make a living in their vicinity or create wash-outs or sterile sand deposits not only on the farm land but in downstream areas. Some of them meander aimlessly back and forth across valuable lands while others have gradients that allow the swamping of adjacent areas by waters brought down during periods of abnormal flow. Their destruction and damage is frequent but not spectacular. The fact that one or several of these small streams have gone on a rampage of short duration after a summer thunderstorm gets no notice in the press, nor does it bring into action any organized disaster relief. It is the unadvertised cross of the farmer who must struggle to recover after each occurrence.

While the adverse conditions created locally and contributed to nationally by the action of the small watercourses escapes the headlines, it has been estimated by competent authority that in the aggregate the annual cost to the public occasioned by the actions of the Nation's small watercourses that are not subject to control under existing legislation exceeds the damage for which we spend millions annually to reduce.

It is also true that the remedy does not require the inauguration of a great public-works activity with its elaborate plans and costly construction. The remedy can best be obtained by providing public assistance, in the form of the know how, machinery, and materials which the individual or group of farmers does not possess or cannot afford to obtain, and by helping the local people to do the necessary work. It is work that the majority of our farmers who are affected would gladly do if they could, but to be successful it must be done right and must include what is needed all along the small streams. The individual cannot correct the problems along the small streams by his own action on his own land. The projects must be planned and executed from their headwaters to their outlets into a larger watercourse and involve the lands of more than one individual. It therefore becomes a community problem and one in which the general public has a major interest. It is in the main a problem to be solved on agricultural land with the cooperation of groups of farmers through whose farms these watercourses flow and cause damage that carries beyond their immediate vicinity.

This bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the responsibility for Federal cooperation and assistance in carrying out surveys and projects to remedy conditions along small tributary streams. The Secretary will engage in remedial works only after a responsible local group or organization has recommended that something be done in a particular community and has given assurances to the Secretary that the necessary rights of way will be furnished at no cost to the Government, and that the local people will contribute to the cost of the construction and will maintain whatever work is installed.

In connection with the possibility of work on streams which might be considered for improvement by the War Department under other legislation the Secretary of Agriculture will consult with the Secretary of War in order that no conflict of jurisdiction or duplication of effort will develop between this agricultural program and the public works program of the Corps of Engineers.

The nature of the problem the bill aims to remedy is such, and the area and people affected and who must cooperate in any undertaking under the bill indicate that the administration of the Federal interest in this type of program should be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture. It has been amply demonstrated that the type of cooperation between the Department and the farmer or groups of farmers throughout the country in attacking the great problem of soil erosion can be carried into this allied field and made to work as successfully as our conservation program.

The National Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of a letter written by Chester Bowles, while OPA Administrator, to the Honorable Wilson Wyatt, Federal Housing Expediter, under date of January 11, 1946, dealing with the national housing situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1946.

Hon. WILSON WYATT,
Federal Housing Expediter, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILSON: In staking out what I think must be done on the housing front, let me begin by saying how deeply encouraged I am by the way you are taking on this critically important job. As you know, I have been deeply disturbed by the housing situation for many months and I am delighted to see you placed in charge of the development and execution of a program to overcome it.

We face an emergency situation the danger in which can scarcely be exaggerated. It is difficult to realize how dangerous it is, not only in terms of the welfare of a large segment of our people and in terms of the social consequence of bitterly disappointing millions of returning veterans, but in terms of the damage to our economy that could easily result. There is no sector of the economy in which inflationary pressures are more evident than in the real estate market, and no sector in which greater or longer lasting damage is threatened. That is the lesson of our past experience with real estate and housing booms and we shall neglect that lesson at our peril.

In this emergency, reliance upon traditional methods is out. We need 3,000,000 dwelling units. We need them desperately and we need them now. No one believes for a moment that we can get this housing by giving the construction industry its head. Anyone who argues for reliance upon the industry and upon traditional methods is arguing that we ignore the problem we face. And in tackling that problem we must keep our longer-run needs strictly in the background. We all agree, I believe, that a 10-year program is needed to meet the appalling deficiency of housing in this country, but the immediate need is overriding. While the emergency program can contribute to solving the long-run problem, we simply must not sacrifice the immediate need to the longer-range requirement. This is basic if the 3,000,000 units are to be built during the next 12 to 18 months.

If we are going to achieve our goal, I believe we shall have to abandon traditional methods just as we abandoned them during the war and stake out a program big enough and bold enough to do the job. In the war we stepped up shipbuilding from half a million tons to 20,000,000 tons a year, five times the peak ever before attained. And that's the way I believe the Government should tackle housebuilding.

The way we tackled these problems during the war was to set our target, then to work out what that target required in terms of materials, in terms of manpower, and in terms of facilities needed to combine the materials and the manpower to get the scheduled production. All that meant central planning to gear everything into an integrated program that would hit the target. That was the logical way to do it and it was the way that paid off in ships and guns and planes. I am confident that that's the way and the only way to get the housing we must have.

We have our target—3,000,000 dwelling units by the end of 1947. We have our central authority to plan and organize the program and to push it through to completion—that is in your hands. Let me, then, outline what I believe to be the requirements of the program with respect to materials, manpower, and related matters.

1. MATERIALS

The same techniques are called for here as were used so successfully during the war. First, the material requirements for 3,000,000 units must be staked out. Then these tested techniques should be applied to the problem of getting those materials in the necessary quantities at the right time.

(a) The Government should encourage the construction of new plants for the production of building materials. Instead of 5 years, as was provided in the emergency war provisions, I suggest a 3-year period for complete amortization of the new investment.

(b) The supply of new types of materials for use in construction will expand very slowly if left to normal processes. What is called for is a Government program to take the risk out of immediate expansion of production in these new lines. Large orders should be placed at generous prices, so that any costs of experimentation and of mistakes on initial development may be fully covered. The supplies thus acquired by the Government should be resold at prices in line with those of similar materials. If this entails some loss to the Government, it will be a cheap price to pay for underwriting the risk in order to get this output promptly.

(c) A target for production of standard building materials should be assigned each plant or firm. This target should be in line with normal demonstrated capacity and a premium price should be paid for production in excess of target. Here, too, in particular instances the placing of large Government orders may be called for.

(d) Finally, wherever local building codes require the use of excessive amounts of materials, these codes must be modified or be overridden by special emergency authority.

2. MANPOWER

The dimensions of manpower needs for the 3,000,000-units program are subject to some dispute. I believe the first step should be to determine in what trades shortages exist and how great the numbers are. Again, the next step should be to put into operation the same techniques that got results during the war.

(a) Every effort should be made to comb out trained workers from the armed services.

(b) A big training program should be launched at once. There will be some resistance to this from the unions, but that will disappear if the goal of the entire program is big enough.

(c) "Featherbedding" labor practices must be tackled head on. This is a very tough assignment but the emergency provides us a clearer case than we shall have at any future time. Furthermore, once the scope of the program is made clear and the Government's determination to meet its full responsibility on the housing front becomes apparent, the fear that workers have of working themselves out of jobs will disappear, and with it the insistence on these practices. In this same connection, any provisions in building codes which require or encourage "featherbedding" should be removed.

3. PUTTING MEN AND MATERIALS TOGETHER TO GET HOUSING

We are dealing with an industry that is poorly organized. In the emergency the Government must supply drive and direction to get the results we need. The following points are a brief outline of some of the necessary steps.

(a) The municipal authorities should be asked to determine their needs for houses. These should then be reviewed by the control-housing authority to see to it that the total number of houses throughout the country adds up to the three-million target that has been established.

(b) The materials that will be forthcoming under the program indicated above should be allocated geographically to match the housing targets which are finally determined upon. The allocations will, of course, have to be worked out so that the materials will flow to the right spots at the right time.

(c) Once the targets have been set and the materials allocated, the local authorities should make every effort to get the houses put up by local builders. If, however, it proves impossible in view of the disorganized State of the industry to get the target number of houses produced in the time allotted, the local authorities should be encouraged to undertake construction on their own, placing the work out on contract. In this connection, it will, of course, be necessary to assemble the land sites and to provide the necessary utilities. Given the assurance, however, that the materials and the manpower will be available, there should be no serious difficulty in the exercise of the right of eminent domain to secure the necessary sites. It may be that the Federal Government will have to intervene in this matter on its own.

(d) If we are to have 3,000,000 houses considerable reliance will have to be placed on prefabrication. The Federal Government must move vigorously in this direction. We have today a large number of plants, notably the airplane plants, which are suited for the construction of prefabricated houses; and we have, too, men of vision and boldness and drive, such as Henry Kaiser and many others, who have demonstrated that they can develop the methods which are required for speedy production. We know, however, that the development of new techniques is extremely costly and hazardous. If private enterprise is required to assume these costs and these risks it must spell delay. I therefore suggest that the Federal Government in this field, as it did in other fields during the war, assume the risks and the costs by placing large and continuing contracts for prefabricated houses at prices which will assure the producers in this field a generous profit. If our experience during the war teaches us anything, it teaches us that the technological advance of a generation and the production of costs that flows from it can be rolled into the period of a year or two if Government will undertake to cover the developmental costs. If this program is adopted it will, of course, be necessary to see to it that an adequate flow of materials is assured prefabricators through the allocation device.

(e) The traditional builder will also need every aid and encouragement if he is to make his maximum contribution to the program. In addition to reduction of cost of materials and labor suggested above, it will be necessary to provide capital on extremely generous terms. This can be done by using the techniques of title VL financing that were developed and tested during the war.

(f) Finally, conversions, even though they prolong the life of structures, such as of New York cold-water flats, that should be ultimately torn down, should be carried out. Phil Klutznick has pointed out rightly the difficulties which existed in the wartime public-conversion program, especially where evictions were necessary. These can be avoided by concentrating on structures where vacancies are high and tenants may be shifted. In New York City vacancies are still substantially concentrated in the substandard units.

4. WHAT PRICE HOUSES?

Anyone who has studied this problem knows that the need for houses on the part of veterans is in the range of $6,000 and under. That is true for the general public also. The present program, which sets a ceiling on construction at $10,000 with a pious hope that a reasonable proportion of the houses built will fall under $6,000, is totally inadequate. I feel that program should be revised to insure the production of houses at $6,000 or under. This means that 90 percent of the materials available for housing must be allocated to this type of housing. It means, furthermore, the choking off of commercial and other types of construction, wherever that is required in order to free the materials for the construction of homes. In many cases it will be possible to expand commercial and other types

of construction on the basis of substitute materials, just as good for those types of construction, and not retard the construction of homes. Every effort must be made to step up production of this type of materials and to see to it that it is channelled into the fields indicated.

A very large proportion of the veterans, as of the general population, is not in a position to buy houses. If their housing requirements are to be met, a program designed to see to it that there is an adequate supply of housing for rental must be worked out. The technique that we developed during the war was to set aside a proportion of the new construction for rental purposes. That technique must be relied upon during the emergency period. During the war about one-third of the new housing was set aside for rental. That was clearly insufficient. Two-thirds or more would be a better figure.

In this connection a rental restriction of $50 per month should be set up. Even so, there will be many families which will be in difficulties. The Army separation figures indicate that only 10 percent of the returned veterans who need homes can pay $50 or more a month for rental. It will therefore be necessary to step up the Government's rental subsidy program to make it possible for the great bulk of veterans to get the housing they need. This should be done through the tested techniques developed by the USHA. It may very well turn out that the development of prefabricated houses which I have suggested will meet the need of the veterans for low price and low rental housing, but this is not something upon which we can gamble. We have got to be sure that the veteran gets decent housing at prices he can afford to pay. If we can't do it one way, I believe we should do it another.

5. LEGISLATION

I have indicated the program that seems to me essential if we are to meet the housing shortage crisis. For the most part I think there is sufficient authority already available to put the better part of this program into operation. Where additional legislation is needed, I think it should be asked for at once. There are a number of bills pending on the Hill. Some of these are designed to meet the emergency situation; others are designed to meet the longer-term housing problem. This legislation should now be carefully reviewed to see to it that it provides all the authority that is necessary to meet the emergency situation now before us. I understand that some work is being done in this direction by the agencies involved. It should be speeded up to the limit of our capacity.

There are many other problems which will need to be solved before we are safely on our way. Particularly, it will be important to strengthen the price control of materials, to strengthen rent control, and to develop new controls over the prices of real estate now rapidly going through the roof. The latter is true not only in regard to the prices of houses themselves but of land prices also. In recent months land sites have been increasing in value so rapidly that if continued, it will choke off all the economies of construction that we can put into effect and make it quite impossible to get the construction we must have in the price ranges at which we must have it. In my judgment—the Patman bill will need to be modified to grant authority for the control of land prices as well as the prices of existing homes.

Housing, in my opinion, is the most important single issue that faces the administration at this time. If we muff it, it will snow us under. On the other hand, if we meet it and meet it successfully we shall not only make good on the basic responsibility of government to the returned veteran, we shall give a lift to the administration's entire program which should prove invaluable. As I said at the outset, I am deeply encouraged by the way you are taking hold of this critically important job. You can count on me and my agency to help in any way that we can. Don't hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES, *Administrator.*

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House of Representatives passed, and sent to the other side of the Capitol, a bill hopefully advertised by its politically minded proponents as a "veterans' housing bill." The fact that it was referred to openly by more cynically minded Members as the "housing prevention bill" may give some idea of what others thought of it.

There was nothing which the bill purported to do, to secure housing construction, that could not be done now by the OPA; there were no powers which have not been established, or could not be conferred by the President, under laws already passed by the Congress.

At the moment, great efforts are evidently being made to have the people think that Members who, quite honestly, voted against that bill, were voting against the interests of the veterans. Personally I have very great confidence in the veterans; I am one myself, from World War I, and I happen to have five of them, from World War II, in my immediate family. I have felt that eventually the truth will prevail, in spite of the propaganda of the CIO-PAC, or of the Democratic National Committee.

I am encouraged, by the accompanying poem, to think I may not have so long to wait. It was written by a veteran of this war, and came to me a few days ago, in the mail. Under permission given to me to extend my remarks, I now include the poem with these few comments:

THOUGHTS INSPIRED BY THE SO-CALLED FEDERAL HOUSING BILL

I

A soldier who had lots of points was sailing o'er the foam.
His weary bones were joyous for he was going home.
With eager longing he'd repeat, as his ship sped through the sea,
"A little house, a little house, just for my girl and me."

II

There was a weary lumberman, whose step was weak and slow.
Once he was strong and full of pep, but this was long ago;
In times when good equipment could be bought on any day,
Without an act of Congress, and there was no OPA,
Adding turmoil and confusion to other troubles such
As unions pushing wages up for doing not as much.

III

The soldier said, "My little house, it need be nothing fine;
Just a cozy little dwelling of redwood, fir, or pine.
For rafters and the studding I'll need some two by fours,
Some shingles to put on the roof, some siding, floors, and doors."

IV

Then spoke the weary lumberman, "There is no pine or fir,
Nor any redwood either for this house for you and her.
It may be that our industry has lost its true perspectives,
But the only stocks we have on hand are OPA directives.
We have no boards with knotholes; we haven't even holes,
To sell as per directions of Mr. Chester Bowles."

V

The soldier and the lumberman, they bought an evening paper;
They saw a headline in the same which made their sad hearts caper.
It said that in the Congress a law was introduced,
Whereby all needed houses could be right away produced.

VI

The soldier and the lumberman began to read the bill,
The first line chilled their beaming smiles, the next line made them ill.
With growing apprehension, they read the next lines quicker,
And every line that each one read made each one feel still sicker.

VII

The bill had no provisions for providing two by fours;
No word was there of shingles, foundations, sides, or floors.
It provided a director, with a salary and fees,
And an occupation largely of employing employees;
Thus not assuring houses, or boards, or strips, or slats,
But another several thousand of unwanted bureaucrats.

VIII

The soldier to the lumberman, he said, "I sadly fear
This is another bunch of stuff that we are handed here.
As directors make directives and each bureaucrat cavorts,
You'll be answering subpenas and filling in reports,
And I'll make applications, turning sadly and perplexed,
From a simple soul at one desk to a moron at the next.
And when I am too old and weak from desk to desk to roam,
I'll dig my girl a fox hole and call it home, sweet home."

Karl Myers, West Virginia Poet, Writes of the Return of Spring—Busy and Burdened People Need To Catch Again Its Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this is the first day of spring in the first year

after the end of World War II. People in America, and throughout the world, are restless and seeking for understanding and peace of spirit. In my congressional district at Parsons lives a man who is a cripple and who cannot walk. His name is Karl Myers and he was a former poet laureate of West Virginia. He has written many truly beautiful poems. It would be good if those who are more fortunate in physical powers than Mr. Myers could catch the spirit of his poem Return of Spring.

There is something satisfying to the human soul with the advent of this season of the year. I often think that those persons who dwell in California or Florida miss the changing moods of the year. It is warming to watch the mantle of green which nature covers over every blossoming tree. The trembling soil is painted when March and April unlock the flowers. The fragrant air seems to hold a new strength which is stimulating to tired hearts, frayed minds, and taut nerves.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, allow me to turn your thoughts, for a brief moment, from the rather brittle legislative tasks to which we are chained. Let us realize that:

Once more the Heavenly Power
Makes all things new,
And domes the red-plough'd hills
With loving blue;
The blackbirds have their wills,
The throstles too.

—*Tennyson*

Soon we shall have again the spring rains. Not only does the earth need cleansing but there is a greater need for the cleansing of humans who still plan for power and cause unnecessary strife in the world. It is with this thought that I include the poem of Mr. Myers, as follows:

RETURN OF SPRING

Over the still-sick earth steals the first spring of peace
In years drawn out, through grief, to span of centuries;
Years when the marching seasons of the sun
Lost their identities, were merged in one
Dark, vicious treadmill of a dream,
A nightmare, through whose smoky skies could gleam
Only stars dim and dun.

Even as we ourselves became
Creatures no more of face and name,
But only numbered parts,
Monotonously molding death in the crucible of our hearts,
Grinding out death, canning it, tons upon myriad tons,
Shipping it east and west,
Out of the great machine whose oil was the blood of our sons,
Our brothers, strongest and best;
All for the mad spark fanned in the mind of the paperhanging clown,
That took the sweat and gore and tears
Of two scared hemispheres
To drown.

O Spring, O Exiled Queen upon your throne again—
Let your reviving rain
Wash the dead ashes of the holocaust
Clean from the convalescing earth,
As your long-silent pipes blow back the lost,
Sweet notes of melody and mirth,
And, plagued no more by thunder-making things
That race the tortured sky on rigid wings,
The birds resume their ancient realm.

* * * * *

When the bullfrogs bellow in the bottomlands
And the catfish rise hungrily at the Big Bend in the rain,
Ernest of the robust guffaw and Tom of the measuring eye,
They will not be there.
When the white balls streak across the net
Or bounce along the sod in center field,
Woodrow of the reckless grace and Phil of the shy, slow smile,
They will miss the game.

This was to have been their spring.
They had promised it to themselves, they had seen it for so long
Shining through the twisted shadows of the crazy, springless time.
But they died so casually for a botched and butchered world.

Strong mountains, restless rivers in the spring,
Did you ever think of yourselves as a sacrifice?
An offering? Well, you are.
You were sacrificed to a sadistic mountebank's day of power,
Relinquished by these young lives forever;
And all the adulation in marble and in bronze,
All the eulogies from pulpit and speaker's stand
Cannot make it right with them. * * *

Rather shall we, the remainder, the redeemed,
Justify the gift by shouting Alleluia to the sun;
Own our debt by doubly prizing these dear things of which they dreamed.
As you bring back, O Spring, their visions, one by one.

Bring back the romance, the gleam to your palace of purple and gold:
Bring back the wild passion of youth to its own as of old.
All your bright fairyland flock that had wandered astray
In the springs that were desolate, gray,
Stripped and deflowered, ravished and heartsick and cold:
Bring them all back to the fold.

—*Karl Myers.*

Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second of a series of six articles on Russia's movements in the Middle East, written by the former chief of military intelligence of the United States Persian Gulf Command, Maj. John Walsh, from the Washington Post of March 19, 1946:

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS RECALLS KARL MARX—FATHER OF COMMUNISM POSED THE THESIS THAT WARS SPRING FROM ECONOMIC CAUSES

NEW YORK, March 18.—Karl Marx—father of communism—posed the thesis that all wars may be traced to fundamental economic causes; that clashes of ideologies and national or racial pride were but propaganda overtones purposely urged to rationalize conflicts and arouse blood-giving and life-taking spirit among peoples.

It is very revealing to examine that Marxian thesis against the background of the present crisis in the Middle East.

There, a power, fortified materially by lend-lease aid and psychologically by lavish battlefield use of its youth, and which claims to live and die by the Socialist bible, seeks territorial domination by continual play upon the many rivalries, jealousies, and maladjustments in the Middle East.

DESIGNS IN MIDDLE EAST

Soviet Russia has emphatic designs on the Middle East and apparently a politico-economic blueprint of exactly what she aims to achieve in that area for her own aggrandizement.

Immediately following the Red revolution in Russia, the efforts of the Comintern, though heavily committed in various European countries, did not overlook the Middle East.

But the Soviets had many homefront problems, so for a time they reduced aggressiveness—arranging treaties and making other declarations calculated to deny interest in former Czarist territory-grabbing policies.

OUTLETS AND MARKETS

Before many years, however, they were busy making moves obviously akin to Imperial Russian objectives. Today they are exerting greater pressure than ever before to find southerly outlets and markets.

With such a large part of Europe in its grip and the trade of many European satellites now being meshed with U. S. S. R.'s economy, Russia is eyeing the Dardanelles, a channel for shipping Balkan cargoes into the Mediterranean. But Russia is seeking not merely a passage there. She is seeking political and military control as well.

Russia is exerting great pressure on Turkey to surrender control of this important water passage and upon the United Nations for the former Italian colonies of Eritrea, east of Suez, and Tripolitania, west of Suez toward Gibraltar.

RUSSIA'S IRON CURTAIN

This projected extension of Russia's iron curtain across the Middle East to colonial footholds in Africa would represent a north-and-south severance of Britain's east-and-west highroad of empire.

Such a severance of the British life line at Suez would force a drastic realinement in world affairs, affecting not only British but American interests in the Middle East as well.

Measured by American standards the Middle East is poor land. Its populations, preoccupied almost continually about food supply, subsist normally, even in good times, upon a diet which would be scorned by most of our citizens.

VICTIMS OF INSECURITY

For centuries ravaged by external invasion, their laboriously built civilization three-fourths destroyed by northern nomads, their peoples put to the sword, they became overly aware of life's great insecurity.

Survivors lived under the bloody tradition of anarchy which precedes and follows wars and quests of power.

Thus it is not surprising that middle eastern leaders, be they subsheiks or princes, be they literate or not, disregard any false idea of ideology.

In their realistic concept there is little ideological choice between the systems by which a bejeweled peeress may ride in a carriage about a Scottish estate, a well-fed wife of a New York merchant may loll on the sands at Miami, or the equally well-fed wife of a Moscow commissar may make a comfortable pilgrimage to the Crimea.

ENTIRE AREA RETARDED

Americans live in a rich land and find much difficulty in understanding how quickly the Middle East translates the slightest political sequence into economic significance.

By proximity and trade practice the Middle East's general economy is complementary to, rather than competitive with, that of Europe.

During the two-century span symbolized by the modern industrialization of the more progressive European countries, this entire area was retarded by political circumstance and rivalry between powerful European nations.

Another generation of uninterrupted peace in Europe, however, would greatly have broadened the Middle East's production of secondary products, as by 1939 it was well under way.

UNITED STATES TRADE WITH EAST

Then came the inflationary impact of mobilizations, foreign troop occupations, preclusive buying, preemption of factory output for war, and the disruption of trade and supply sources.

Before 1939 the United States had about $100,000,000 in commercial trade with the Middle East. Private and official hope has been to double this.

Granted political stability and release from financial and political controls (free trade), a large market exists for machine tools, heavy goods, engineering talents, and industrial skills. Our trade would be welcomed.

Dr. Schacht's exchange control plan, or "barter system" hurdled many barriers for German trade, already heavily favored by the Danubian route and by Ottoman railway construction in the Balkans and Asia Minor.

Sixty percent of Turkey's external commerce was with Central Europe. A Turk once said, "You see, lebensraum works both ways. Germany needed our products. We needed hers. It was automatic that we traded together."

The Soviets now control most of central Europe, all of eastern Europe, and the Balkans above Greece. The lebensraum principle remains valid as before, but now the Soviets are using it and the old trade routes are bent toward Russia.

If they choose—and they apparently do—the Soviets can prevent so much as 1 ton of goods going to or from their dominated areas to Turkey. Thus they possess economic compulsions, as well as armed might poised along Turkish borders with Iran and Bulgaria.

Americans like to think of capturing markets by reason of quality, price, terms, and service. They resent political and diplomatic restraints on their commerce, and cartels, blocs, monopolies, and military pressures.

The Soviet method is monopolistic in their internal markets, as well as those they come to dominate.

Venture capital is acquired by "sovietization."

Management and ownership become transformed into bureaucratic administration.

Thus those who wish "two conflicting ideologies to live side by side in a peaceful world" must give serious thought to the extent of Soviet expansion.

Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the real live questions in the section from which I come is that of housing—housing for everybody, but with emphasis on housing for the veterans. Everybody wants to do something about the housing problem, but they are not agreed as to what action will accomplish the most good. However, all concede that production is the key. My attention has been called to a notice appearing in the Jackson Citizen-Patriot presenting the position of the lumber dealers generally in Michigan. The statement is concise and factual so far as the retail lumber dealers are concerned and, pursuant to the privilege granted me, I am including it in these remarks:

THE TRUTH ABOUT HOME BUILDING IN 1946

IT'S TIME VETERANS AND ALL CITIZENS WERE TOLD THE TRUTH ABOUT THE HOME-BUILDING SITUATION

The main bottleneck to home construction is production of materials and equipment.

No legislation, Presidential announcement, Government control plan, or system can produce a single additional home until production of materials is speeded up.

Lumber dealers and the building industry are eager to build homes for veterans and all citizens who need them. The reason few homes are being built is because materials are not being produced.

WHY?

1. Governed by OPA's wartime pricing formulas, it is still more profitable for lumber mills to make items for export—and the items formerly required for war use, than it is to make lumber usable in home construction.

2. OPA's wartime pricing formulas are still keeping thousands of small mills out of production.

3. OPA's enforcement policies have allowed the creation of a large black market in lumber which is moving outside of regular channels of trade.

4. OPA's slowness in adjusting mill ceiling prices on hardwood flooring, siding, millwork, and plywood has contributed to the difficulties mills are having in securing necessary manpower.

With 400 brick and tile plants closed, it took 6 months for OPA to adjust prices. Now an additional 125 plants have opened and production is up 35 percent.

Clay sewer pipe, cast-iron soil pipe, and gypsum board manufacturers have experienced a similar OPA delay in the granting of price adjustments to make increased production possible.

No amount of juggling with an insufficient supply will produce a single home more than can be built with material available.

The OPA can hardly hold present price ceilings when it has no control over volume of employment, labor wage rates, cashing of Government bonds, and installment or credit expansion—but the OPA can act as a block to reconversion by clinging to unrealistic wartime price ceilings.

Unblock the production of material caused by unrealistic wartime price controls and the building industry will build enough homes for veterans and all Americans.

Any Government program that does not first remove the obstacles blocking production of materials will simply add additional difficulties to the problem facing the building industry.

Time To Give Spain a Square Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which will appear in the April edition of the Columbia, the largest Catholic magazine in the world:

TIME TO GIVE SPAIN A SQUARE DEAL

If you have been unable to make sense of the official attitude of the Government of the United States toward the Government of Spain, be at ease; there just isn't any sense in it.

Our State Department has undertaken formally but in mealy-mouthed fashion, to meddle in the internal affairs of Spain—a country with which we are at peace and which gave substantial aid to our military success in the war.

We have bracketed ourselves with the Governments of France and Britain in a statement expressing the hope that the Spanish people will overthrow their Government because we don't like Franco. It would be interesting to observe the reaction here to a statement issued by three foreign powers calling upon the American people to throw out the administration in Washington because they didn't like Truman.

Insolence is no more attractive in large nations than in small. We have concluded, we prayerfully hope, a war in support of the basic proposition that might does not make right. If Spaniards resent the ill-considered and unjustifiable expressions by our State Department and by highly placed officials of our Government, we don't blame them. Fair-minded Americans, who value the honorable American tradition of fair play, have reason to be ashamed of the corner-bully campaign of abuse directed against Spain.

Let us look, briefly, at the facts—facts that can be checked by anyone able to read. Let us consider the facts only as they affect this question: Do they, or do they not, justify intervention by the Government of the United States in the internal affairs of Spain? That is the point at issue, not who likes Franco or who doesn't.

Here is the background, necessarily much compressed. There was an election in Spain early in 1936. The so-called Popular Front lost the election. Instead of moving out, as the Democrats do here when the Republicans win, and vice versa, the so-called Popular Front incited riot and a reign of terror in Spain. We won't go into the details of the slaughter of bishops, priests, and nuns, or the desecration and burning of churches by the Communist "friends of democracy."

So there was civil war in Spain. General Franco came in on the side of the victims of the so-called Popular Front, which had refused to accept the election result. Russia sent aid to the Communists of the Popular Front. Not much is said about that. Germany and Italy helped Franco. A great deal is said about that. Franco won—and he has never been forgiven for that. In a bloody rough-and-tumble, he crushed the Communist bid to take over in Spain. He is, therefore, a nasty man—or so we are told by the radio seers, the keyhole columnists, and the one-cylinder "ideologists," some of whom seem to have oozed into the State Department.

Among the neutrals in World War II were Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Erie, Portugal, and Spain. The persistent failure of Spain to join the Axis Powers annoyed General Franco's critics no end; they still consider it a personal affront that he did not, at the very least, assassinate General Eisenhower and storm Gibraltar.

Before, during, and since the war, the sniping and hacking at Spain continued. How the State Department of the United States got into—or was jockeyed into—the game, we frankly admit we do not know. We would like to believe that the State Department is above taking direction from the professional Franco haters.

On March 5, however, the State Department issued an appeal to the Spanish people to overthrow their government. This unprecedented affront to a peaceful and friendly nation was accompanied by publication of

a batch of documents purporting to prove that General Franco had been friendly with Hitler and Mussolini. It looked like quite a case for the prosecution—until you looked at it closely. Then it folded up.

With a single exception, the supposedly damning documents were dated in 1940 and 1941—a period during which the policies of the United States and Spain were identical: we, as did Spain, insisted upon our neutrality, maintained our right to help either side, or both, and declared our intention of keeping out of war.

Let it be conceded that Franco spoke kindly to Hitler and Mussolini. After all, he wasn't in Union Square, or on an upper floor of the Waldorf Towers, or even in the Mayflower bar—locations where Hitler and Mussolini were boldly, and safely, defied. So Franco, with a gun at his head, spoke softly to the Nazis; but not so softly as Stalin, in 1939, when he made the cynical deal that sent the world into war.

The State Department, however, had readily available other information—information about General Franco's actions, more important than his words—which it chose not to publish for the reason, immediately obvious, that it would destroy the thoroughly "phoney" case against Spain it was endeavoring to present.

This other information is contained in the report of our war-time ambassador to Spain, Carlton J. H. Hayes. Here are some of his observations on Spain's assistance to us:

The Spanish Government not only placed no obstacle in the way of our landings and military operations in north Africa and southern Italy but gave us significant facilities, such as de facto recognition of the French Committee of National Liberation at Algiers and of its official representatives in Spain.

The Spanish Government provided free transit through Spain for more than 25,000 volunteers (chiefly French) for active service with our armed forces in North Africa.

The Spanish Government not only did not intern several hundreds of our downed military airmen, but evacuated them through Gibraltar.

The Spanish Government made immediate delivery to us, quite uncompromised, of secret equipment found on planes forced down.

The Spanish Government afforded us freedom and full opportunity to carry on economic warfare with the Axis on Spanish territory by means of preemptive buying of wolfram, mercury, fluorspar, skins, woolen goods, and so forth.

The Spanish Government arranged for the escape to Spain of a considerable number of Jews from Hungary, Germany and the Low Countries.

The Spanish Government tolerated, even to the point of abetting, the very important clandestine activities of our secret espionage services directed toward obtaining from across the Pyrenees invaluable military information about German troop movements and dispositions in France.

The Spanish Government, against Germany's vehement opposition, embargoed all shipments of wolfram to the Axis from February to May 1944, and agreed thereafter to allow only token shipments (which stopped altogether after our June 1944, landing in France).

From July 1944, the Spanish Government repeatedly indicated, by word and deed, that its policy toward us was one of "benevolent neutrality." It authorized our use of Barcelona as a free port of entry for supplies for France and other liberated areas. It expelled, or interned, several hundred German agents. It assured us it would not harbor persons adjudged by competent Allied tribunals to be war criminals.

So there we are: the State Department's documented case against Spain demolished by our wartime Ambassador to Spain. And here is the "topper." In a note to France, March 11 (only a week after its "throw out Franco" statement), our State Department says:

"On the basis of its present analysis of all the facts in its possession concerning the Spanish situation, including those mentioned in the note from the French Government of February 27, 1946, the Government of the United States does not believe that a situation exists, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

So what's all the shooting for, and all the unfurling of captured documents in an attempt to smear a small nation that is a threat to no one and wants to be left to work out its problems in peace? Americans, who don't like to see Uncle Sam in the role of bully, have much to be concerned about.—J. D.

FRIENDSHIP DECLARED

President Roosevelt wrote General Franco, November 8, 1942:

"It is because your nation and mine are friends in the best sense of the word and because you and I are sincerely desirous of the continuation of that friendship for our mutual good that I want very simply to tell you of the compelling reasons that have forced me to send a powerful American military force to the assistance of the French possessions in north Africa. * * *

"I hope you will accept my assurance that these moves are in no shape, manner or form directed against the Government or people of Spain or Spanish Morocco or Spanish territories—metropolitan or overseas. I believe the Spanish Government and the Spanish people wish to maintain neutrality and to remain outside the war. Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations.

"I am, my dear General, your sincere friend.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

Communists Are Very Active

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are awakening to the activities of American Communists. Until quite recently there has been a tendency to discount the work of this group. Since the exposé of the Russian spy ring in Canada comment on the radio and in the press has greatly increased.

Mr. Speaker, a timely editorial on this subject appeared in the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., on March 18. It warns of this menace to our institutions. It points out the subtle manner in which the Communists and fellow travelers operate. In many instances these people are highly considered in their communities. They are, however, Mr. Speaker, wolves in sheeps' clothing, to use a trite phrase.

I include as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the editorial referred to, and written by one of our fine young editors in Wisconsin:

COMMUNIST SPY A WARNING TO UNITED STATES

The only Communist ever elected to the Canadian House of Commons is accused of being the Russian spy who transmitted secrets of the atomic bomb to the Soviet. That fact in itself should serve as a warning to Americans that Communists have no place in our Government, that they are ruthless and dangerous to democracy in any of its forms.

Communists in this country, directed by Moscow to incite riot and revolution by gaining control of leaders of large groups like labor unions and religious and peace associations, are as dangerous to the American system as Nazis. Yet they manage to gain apologists. Except for a very few they invariably renounce communism and deny membership in the party, for they can work more effectively under cover than in the open.

They have been more successful than the average American would believe. They have established Reds of various shades in our universities and colleges, in the pulpits, and their strategy of controlling a few labor leaders is constantly fomenting labor unrest.

The Communists don't have to convert the rank and file if they control the leadership and through pressure tactics manage to bluff their way through, to coerce and intimidate the membership or the listeners. Their one purpose is to create dissatisfaction, to feed upon minor issues, to keep the great mass of the public disgruntled with management, with government, with their economic and social status, and to do something about it—that something being revolt.

In Canada, where democracy is as basic in life's pattern as in the United States, it seemed, as it has seemed here, that Communists were in such a minority as to be of no importance. What if one Communist was elected?

But it happens that all Communists are alike in their strategy to obtain the one end and aim which the party desires—revolution. The people cannot easily be incited to revolt against their government unless they are suffering, unless they are unhappy, disgruntled, sore from what they are told is rank injustice.

The tragedy of strikes is that the strikers and their families, reduced in circumstances by idleness, and worried about their condition, are more suscepitible to the poison of Communist doctrine.

Canada has had a bitter taste of the diabolic ruthlessness of communism. The United States is the most logical garden for the Communist cutworm. He works from behind and underneath. His design is to eliminate all opposition by coercion, by fear of reprisal, by threat of violence, but he must have control of a few of the top leaders.

We have been too complacent, shrugging off the suggestion that communism is a threat.

How does one recognize a Communist? He doesn't wear a red shirt nor wave a red flag. Indeed, he pretends to be what Americans want to be—true Americans. He denies that he is a Communist or has any trucking with Communists. He dodges, he vacillates—if doing so will help him to gain his end, overthrow of the United States Government and reduction of all to socialism.

But the Communist follows the party line. And the party line is revealed in the attitude of the official Communist paper, the Daily Worker, published in New York. If the suspect acts and talks along the party line you can be sure he is a Communist regardless of what he professes to be.

Communism is fatal to the United States Constitution, to liberty, and to democracy in this country. It cannot survive with true freedom of the individual. It must first eliminate the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech, of the press, of religion.

Is not the Canadian experience with communism warning enough to all Americans?

Radio Program—St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the printed program of the National Broadcasting Co. for March 9, 1946, which program includes a debate between Congressman WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Minnesota, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(A presentation of the NBC University of the Air, March 9, 1946)

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

(Broadcast as a public service each Saturday 7:00–7:30 p. m. by the independent radio stations affiliated with the NBC network, and the National Broadcasting Co.)

ANNOUNCER. Here is news from Washington:

Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, says St. Lawrence seaway and power project would injure New England's ports, trade, and industry, taking jobs away from its citizens.

Congressman PITTENGER, of Minnesota, says seaway would increase American export trade by giving Chicago, Detroit, Duluth, and other Great Lakes cities deep-sea shipping facilities; says this would benefit country as a whole.

This is the fifty-sixth of a series of broadcasts entitled "Our Foreign Policy," presented by the NBC University of the Air. This time the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project will be discussed by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Minnesota. Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air, will be chairman of the discussion. Mr. Fisher:

Mr. FISHER. Many conflicting statements have been made about the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Our job is to try to get at the truth of the matter. For the past 3 weeks, a special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings on a joint resolution which would approve the project. But let me ask you this: Why should I be interested in the St. Lawrence seaway? You see, I come from Texas. The interest you two gentlemen have is obvious—the seaway will directly affect New England and the Midwest. But, Senator SALTONSTALL, why should I be concerned about it? And why should that mythical listener of ours, Bill Johnson, who lives in Omaha or Seattle or Mobile, be interested in it?

Senator SALTONSTALL. For one thing, Mr. Fisher, you and Bill Johnson are going to have to help pay for the seaway project. And for another thing, it will affect Americans wherever they live, to some extent. They may find themselves in the position of paying for something that will actually harm their interests—and paying not only the original cost, but a substantial annual upkeep.

Mr. FISHER. Representative PITTENGER, what do you say?

Representative PITTENGER. The St. Lawrence seaway and power project will affect every man, woman, and child in America, because it will add to our national wealth by helping to develop our resources. It will open up the heart of the continent to deep-sea trade. And not only that, it will also harness one of the greatest potential sources of cheap electric power in this continent—the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. FISHER. All right. You've stated the issues very clearly. They boil down to these two questions: Will the development of the St. Lawrence project be beneficial to the American people? And, if so, will the benefits be great enough to justify the expense involved? But first, Senator SALTONSTALL, you might begin by telling us just what the St. Lawrence project is.

Senator SALTONSTALL. The proposed seaway and power project is designed to connect the Great Lakes with the St. Lawrence River. By an intricate system of canals and locks it would supposedly enable oceangoing vessels to go directly to Detroit, Chicago, and other Great Lakes ports. But fully loaded Liberty and Victory ships couldn't get through the 27-foot channel.

Mr. FISHER. Let's come back to that question later, Senator. But now, what about the power part of the project?

Senator SALTONSTALL. It proposes building a huge dam across the St. Lawrence at the International Rapids, where the river is the boundary between Ontario, Canada, and New York State. It would produce more electric power than any single dam in the world except Grand Coulee, and this power would be divided equally between Canada and the United States.

Mr. FISHER. It's easy to see why the St. Lawrence project has caught the imagination of a great many people—its sheer magnitude makes it dramatic. Congressman PITTENGER, you've been advocating this project for a good many years, haven't you?

Representative PITTENGER. Yes, Mr. Fisher—ever since 1912. That's the year I settled in Duluth.

Mr. FISHER. How about telling us a little of its history?

Representative PITTENGER. Well, it has had quite a career. It has had the backing of seven different Presidents, of both political parties. It has been surveyed and resurveyed, and found to be eminently practical—the last time by a seven-volume study made by the Department of Commerce in 1941. All that is needed is the construction of canals around a series of rapids, 48 miles of them scattered over a 113-mile stretch, between Montreal and Lake Ontario, where existing canals are absolete and too small for most vessels. Then we'd have an inland seaway stretching almost 2,400 miles—from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to the western end of Lake Superior—which would accommodate deep-sea ships.

Mr. FISHER. Why, then, has Congress never approved it?

Representative PITTENGER. The Senate very nearly did approve it back in 1934, when it came up in the form of a treaty. After a long debate, the vote was 46 to 42 for ratification—but it failed nevertheless for lack of a two-thirds vote. It came up again in 1941, in its present form—an agreement requiring a simple majority vote of approval by both Senate and House—but before it could come to a vote, the war forced postponement of all long-range projects.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And don't forget it came up a third time in 1944, in the form of an amendment to another bill. That time, the Senate turned it down by a vote of 56 to 25.

Representative PITTENGER. Yes, that was Senator AIKEN'S amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Senator SALTONSTALL, you testified against the St. Lawrence project at last week's hearings. Why do you oppose it?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Very briefly, Mr. Fisher, because I feel it would be injurious to the ports, the trade, the industry, and particularly, the workers of New England. We are in the far northeastern section of our country. We need transportation by land, sea, and air in order to do business. We import much of our raw materials and some of our food. We are going to have a tough fight to keep our industries from being removed to other sections of the country. We have the men who have the skill and the managers who have the know-how. We want no favors, but we do want a fair break to compete with other sections of the country without Government interference and Government help to those other sections. If we cannot compete, then naturally the business will go elsewhere. But we should not have to compete with Government as well as with business competitors.

Representative PITTENGER. With due respect to the Senator, whom I greatly admire, I must point out that this is a sectional viewpoint. I think we should look at the question from the viewpoint of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. FISHER. That's the key question, of course, Congressman, Will it benefit the country as a whole? But of course the country is made up of various regions.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And what affects one affects them all, Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. So let's try first to pin down the effects on New England. Senator SALTONSTALL, can you be a little more specific on the damages you think would result to your region from the St. Lawrence project

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, the most immediate effect of the seaway would be on the transportation system. Once ships started to go up the St. Lawrence, this would cut off part of the trade that now goes through New England. That would affect our railroads—particularly the Boston and Maine and the Boston and Albany.

Representative PITTENGER. I don't think that will necessarily follow, Senator. If our total export trade is increased by the development of cheaper transportation we can have increased trade through the seaway without any real effect on the railroads. The seaway will make it possible to export products which can't be shipped out profitably by rail. Very little rail traffic would be diverted to the seaway.

Senator SALTONSTALL. It seems to me to be perfectly obvious that if materials which formerly had to go by rail and deep ocean transport were to go directly by ocean transport, the ports must be seriously affected. Incidentally, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is spending more than $65,000,000 to develop Boston harbor and the Boston airport. While we are spending this, you ask us to spend more millions to bypass ourselves.

Representative PITTENGER. Former President Hoover himself testified last month that he did not—quote—"Consider the construction of the waterway will injure the existing American transportation system or ports." And he said, "I have no hesitation in my belief as to the economic value of the project."

Senator SALTONSTALL. I have great admiration for Mr. Hoover, but I don't know how he reaches such a complete over-all statement. I repeat what I have just said—the interests of the port of Boston do not agree with him.

Representative PITTENGER. Senator, the opposition of the American railroads to this agreement—and they are the main opposition force—reminds me of the way the stage coach companies and private toll roads opposed the first railroads. They tried to convince the farmers that the railroad would destroy the market for their horses and their oats. The campaign against the St. Lawrence is just about as futile as that, in the long run.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Massachusetts brains, energy, and money helped to open up the stage-coach routes to the West, and were largely responsible for opening up the railroad routes across the country. I cannot see this same combination of brains, energy,

initiative, and money agreeing to back the St. Lawrence waterway to its own detriment.

Mr. FISHER. What about the other half of the project, Senator SALTONSTALL—the power development? Wouldn't that mean cheaper power in the whole northeastern section?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. Fisher, I know very little about the power development connected with this project, but I do know this—that it is to be entirely under the control of the State of New York, which is putting up some $90,000,000 for the privilege. If a power project is to be developed, we should consider developing it entirely with Federal money, for I believe that such power should be available to everyone on equal terms, and not monopolized by the interests of one State.

Representative PITTENGER. Under the agreement, Senator, the Federal Government would be pledged to insure the fair distribution of power to other States, including New England. The St. Lawrence, incidentally, will produce cheaper power by far than any steam plant in existence. It can be delivered 250 miles—which would reach well into Massachusetts—for only 2½ mills a kilowatt-hour.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But there is general agreement in New England that this additional power is not needed today.

Representative PITTENGER. Senator, I want to point this out: In 1923, a group of 30 New England leaders appointed by President Coolidge, studied the St. Lawrence seaway and approved the entire project. And in 1929 Mr. Henry I. Harriman, then president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, made a similar study. He issued a report, concluding with these words: "I am convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway is of as great importance to New England as to the Middle West, and that New England should unitedly, heartily, and enthusiastically support the project." Even today, many New England leaders support this view—Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, for example.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am well aware that Mr. Harriman made such a study, but I would like to inform you that today the Boston Chamber of Commerce is unanimously against this project, that the New England Council, which is composed of New England businessmen, is against it; that the Associated Industries of Massachusetts is against it, and to the best of my knowledge the study which was made at that time has almost unanimously been repudiated as of the present date.

Mr. FISHER. I think we'd better get off the regional question and on to our main question: How will the seaway project affect the country as a whole? Senator SALTONSTALL, is it a practical venture?

Senator SALTONSTALL. From a purely physical viewpoint, Mr. Fisher, there are two things wrong with the seaway project. One is that it will be frozen up 5 months out of the year; the other is that it will not be practical for most ocean-going vessels to traverse it.

Mr. FISHER. Let's take those questions up one at a time. Mr. PITTENGER, what about the freeze-over period?

Representative PITTENGER. The same thing is true of the Great Lakes, and yet they are the greatest inland seaway in the world. Most of the heavy shipments of grain would go out before the December 1 freeze.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In effect, you would use cheap water transportation 7 months in the year, and expect the railroads to take the loss. Then during the winter you would expect the railroads to carry an extra load of traffic while the seaway is frozen over.

Representative PITTENGER. Not at all, Senator. During the peak period of grain shipments, around October, the seaway would relieve the railroads of the necessity of building extra box cars for seasonal use only. As for the winter traffic, that is the lowest freight season of the year anyhow for the railroads. They could easily handle the traffic.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Right at the moment we have a very acute shortage of grain in New England. The biggest bottleneck at the moment is box cars. Suppose the railroads gave up keeping so many box cars. What a nice predicament this would leave New England in during the winter months when it must feed its cattle and poultry.

Mr. FISHER. On your second point, Senator SALTONSTALL—is it true that large ships won't be able to get through the seaway?

Senator SALTONSTALL. No ship drawing more than 23 feet of water can safely go through a 27-foot channel. You have to allow an extra foot when a deep-sea vessel enters fresh water; it settles that much because of the lower density of the water. And you need at least 2 or 3 feet of clearance for safety.

Mr. FISHER. It seems to me that the practicability of the St. Lawrence Seaway hinges to a great extent on this point. Mr. PITTENGER, would most of our huge wartime merchant fleet be unable to get up in the Great Lakes?

Representative PITTENGER. Of course they could get through, Mr. Fisher. The United States Maritime Commission has stated that the great bulk of our merchant fleet could use the seaway—in fact the Commission argues that we will need the seaway to make maximum use of our merchant marine. The engineers have stated that ships drawing 24½ feet of water can pass through safely.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Most of our ships are Liberty or Victory ships. The Victory draws 28 feet, 3 inches loaded, and the Liberty only 6 inches less. A careful study by the Port of Boston Authority states: "The vision of great ships sailing up and down the St. Lawrence vanishes into thin air and in its place emerges the more practical picture of a small freighter drawing not over 23 feet." The Victories and Liberties might get into the Great Lakes unloaded, but they'd run aground coming out.

Representative PITTENGER. It's true that these two types of ships couldn't get through fully loaded. But according to the Maritime Commission, the Victory ships could go through 79 percent loaded and the Liberty ships 85 percent loaded. Most of the ships that pass through the Panama Canal, after all, are only about two-thirds loaded.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And another thing: If you open the seaway to all comers our tremendously efficient Great Lakes fleet may conceivably be injured.

Representative PITTENGER. No one can compete with those ships in Great Lakes traffic, Senator STALTONSTALL, because they're built for that specific purpose. They carry up to 15,000 tons, and they are built for rapid loading and unloading. And seven-eighths of the cargo they carry is iron, limestone, coal, and other products used for making steel. That's purely domestic trade—no foreign ships could compete there.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But in the export trade, foreign ships would presumably load at the source, and would deprive the lake carriers of some of their cargo. And I suspect that very few of our deep-sea vessels would be able to compete with the lower wages and costs on foreign ships.

Representative PITTENGER. That wouldn't be any more true in the Great Lakes than it is in Boston Harbor, Senator, All the seaway would do would be to put the Great Lakes cities on a par with Boston as far as access to world trade is concerned.

Senator SALTONSTALL. It seems to me, Representative, that by your answer you have directly admitted that this seaway would take business away from Boston.

Mr. FISHER. Congressman PITTENGER, how much traffic do you think would pass through the Seaway?

Representative PITTENGER. The canal would have a capacity of about 10,000,000 tons of cargo during the open season. Of this, an estimated 4,000,000 tons would be export trade, and the rest domestic.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I think those figures are very dubious. Especially the latter one. Whether the seaway will carry any such volume of traffic depends on whether such trade is profitable—which is certainly open to question. We have the testimony of the Port of New York Maritime Association, and of the President of the American Merchant Marine Institute, which includes practically all American shipping interests, that they do not want to send their ships up the St. Lawrence.

Representative PITTENGER. The ships would use it, all right. Government surveys have shown that. Some of the domestic traffic, Senator, would be with your own New England. We would ship farm products to you via the waterway, and you would send back manufactured products to us.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You assume that cost of shipping is the only factor, Congressman. You forget that speed and convenience are important, too. We can get automobiles from Detroit by railroad in 3 days, and over the road in 2 days. It would take much longer to send them by water—it is over twice as far, and ships are slow. Food, especially, must be sent to market fast, or it deteriorates.

Congressman PITTENGER. Senator, is not there a basic inconsistency there? First you argued that the seaway would hurt the railroads; but now you argue that it could not compete with them in speed or good service.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am looking at it from both angles. If extensive traffic does not develop, the St. Lawrence project will be a waste of money. If it does develop, then it will be competing with the railroads and the lake boats that need the trade.

Congressman PITTENGER. The seaway would be a great national asset, from the point of view of the American people—all of them. Look at the benefits they would get.

Mr. FISHER. Such as what, Mr. Pittenger?

Congressman PITTENGER. Well, the farmers of the Middle West and Northwest would be able to save a great deal of money in shipping costs.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You might be right, Congressman, but figures shown to me do not call for any such statement, to say nothing of the fact that all figures are based on theory. Again may I quote the Boston Port Authority? They state: "Consequently the elaborate tables of the Survey must be regarded as merely interesting numerical exercises representing at best what an unknown accountant has described as 'a mathematical photograph of a statistician's sense of justice'."

Representative PITTENGER. I think it's pretty well established that farmers earn more if their transportation costs are low. The National Grange and the National Farmers' Union are backing the St. Lawrence project for that reason. But there are other benefits, too. We could ship automobiles abroad more cheaply, and sell more of them in the world market.

Senator SALTONSTALL. We can sell all the cars that people have money to buy, as soon as they are available. We don't have to compete in this field—we already produce the cheapest cars in the world. And as for wheat, the farmer wouldn't necessarily get all the savings. The middlemen would get a large share.

Representative PITTENGER. Another thing: We could bring certain essential raw materials in to the industrial heart of America by using the seaway, and save our own resources.

Mr. FISHER. Which resources, Congressman?

Representative PITTENGER. Wood pulp and iron ore from Quebec, for example. Some

experts say that in another 15 years the high-grade ore deposits in Minnesota's iron range will be exhausted. They say we'll need to draw on deposits that have been discovered in Quebec, or find ways of using our low-grade ore. This is not too soon to start planning for that emergency—after all, it will take several years to build the seaway.

Senator SALTONSTALL. If what you say is so, I am very sure there is plenty of transportation available today to meet the situation and we need not develop a tremendous seaway which will cost so much money, simply as a conservation project.

Mr. FISHER. How much money would it cost, Senator SALTONSTALL?

Senator SALTONSTALL. The whole St. Lawrence project—including both the seaway and the power plant—is officially supposed to cost $619,000,000. But other estimates have run to over a billion dollars. Judging from the experience we had with the Panama Canal and with Grand Coulee Dam, we'd be lucky if the St. Lawrence project didn't cost more than a billion dollars.

Representative PITTENGER. Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of the Army Engineering Corps, is responsible for that estimate of $619,000,000. He should know how much it will cost. But Canada is putting up almost half of the money; and by the time New York State's $90,000,000 contribution to the dam and power plant is subtracted, our share would be only about $200,000,000. A year ago we were spending more than that on the war every day.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That's still a lot of money, Congressman, by my lights. Especially when we are asked to help pay for a project that stands to harm us, or some of us. It's like having to pay for widening a street that abuts on your property, when the so-called improvement impairs the value of that property. And that's what you are asking New England to do.

Mr. FISHER. Let me break in here for a moment. These technical matters may be a bit confusing to Bill Johnson, our average listener. Let me bring up a new question here: We've been talking about the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as if it were simply an American project. But as I understand it, Canada has as much of a stake in it as we do. Is that right, Senator SALTONSTALL?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Yes, Mr. Fisher; Canada has already signed this agreement. And I'd like to point this out: Although Canada pays less toward the cost of the project than we do, she stands to gain more from it.

Mr. FISHER. In what way, Senator?

Senator SALTONSTALL. For one thing, 90 percent of the St. Lawrence River is in exclusively Canadian territory.

Mr. FISHER. But the main centers of population on the Great Lakes which the seaway would serve are American cities—Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That's true, but as far as wheat and grains are concerned, I'm told that the great bulk of United States grain exports originate in the Southwest and move through Gulf ports. The majority of the export grain moving over the Lakes to the seaports comes from Canada. The Canadian farmer will get most of the benefits from wheat exports via the seaway.

Representative PITTENGER. Of course, Senator, Canada has already spent a good deal of money on her part of the seaway, in the belief that we would join forces with her in completing it.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Most of the work that has been done by Canada was on the Welland Canal, between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. That enabled Canada to ship grain from the west end of Lake Superior, all the way to Prescott, at the head of the International Rapids in the St. Lawrence. But let me point out that the Welland Canal must be deepened and broadened to let ocean-going vessels through.

Representative PITTENGER. Nevertheless, Canada has already spent $133,000,000 on the project. She has gone ahead of us, and we have an obligation to join her, and pay our share.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I don't think that should be a serious consideration, Congressman. Canada acted on her own, and for her own reasons, in making these improvements. We have spent some money, too, in building the MacArthur lock at Sault Ste. Marie, and that would be deducted from our share. But we did it because we needed that lock.

Mr. FISHER. Congressman PITTENGER, what about the military value of the St. Lawrence seaway? Would it have been useful in the war, if it had been in operation then?

Representative PITTENGER. There's no doubt of that, Mr. Fisher. It would have been a godsend. It would have relieved our overburdened railroads and docking facilities, and the saving in transportation costs would have been enormous. We could also have built more big ships in the Great Lakes area.

Senator SALTONSTALL. No doubt more ships might have been built in the Great Lakes, but here again we in New England are proud of our heritage of shipbuilding. We built all of the ships asked of us during the war and we had plenty of room on our shores to build more. These ships consisted of aircraft carriers, battleships, and cruisers, among others—ships that could never go through a 27-foot channel, loaded or unloaded.

Representative PITTENGER. We could have built many smaller warships. In this war we were fortunate that our own shores never came under direct attack. If our seaports had been bombed, we would have needed the St. Lawrence seaway very badly. We would have needed the added protection of inland seaports. The next war, if there is another, may be different.

Senator SALTONSTALL. If our shores had been under attack, I question whether the seaway would have helped very much. It would have been quite vulnerable. After all, only a few well-placed bombs would have been required to put the locks out of commission, bottling up our Great Lakes shipping. But all this is beside the point. The next war, if one comes, won't be fought with the same weapons as the past one. I don't know what the weapons will be, but I certainly know atomic energy in some form is going to play a very great part.

Mr. FISHER. What do you say to that, Congressman PITTENGER?

Representative PITTENGER. Well, Mr. Fisher, I think Secretary of War Patterson is the best authority on these matters. He has quoted a survey by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as saying that we need the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to protect the Nation's security in the event of a national emergency, for three reasons: first, the additional shipbuilding and repair facilities the project would make possible, in a relatively secure area; second, the additional line of transportation to ease the strain on railroads and port facilities; and, third, the large supply of cheap, dependable power it would make available. The Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the St. Lawrence project "would have distinct military advantages and would materially increase the industrial and transportation potential of the United States."

Senator SALTONSTALL. If this project is to be purely a military one, that is an entirely different question from what I have been discussing.

Mr. FISHER. Let's see where we come out on this. You both agree, I take it, that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is feasible, from an engineering viewpoint. You differ on whether the depth of the seaway, and the fact that it will be closed during the five winter months, will be serious handicaps. You also disagree on whether it will have an adverse effect on railroads, shipping facilities, and industry in New England.

Representative PITTENGER. There is bound to be some dislocation, Mr. Fisher. There always is, wherever progress is made in any field. I only say that the benefits will far outweigh any temporary dislocation, in the country as a whole and in every region, including New England. Wherever you expand the country's resources, you create new employment and new wealth. Why, in building the project alone, the Commerce Department estimates that 25,000 men will be employed directly, and as many indirectly, over a 4-year period. We may need those jobs by the time construction is ready to start.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Those jobs won't count for much if in the long run you displace thousands of other workers. I understand that's why the Railway Brotherhoods and the United Mine Workers' Union oppose the project.

Representative PITTENGER. That's a short-sighted view for them to take. In the first place, the seaway will make more jobs by increasing the total amount of our trade. In any case there will be plenty of demand for coal and railroad facilities for as far ahead as we can see. And incidentally, many labor unions, both A. F. of L. and CIO, are supporting the project.

Mr. FISHER. You believe, then, Congressman PITTENGER, that the seaway and power project will provide new jobs and better prices for farm products and greater prosperity for all.

Representative PITTENGER. That's right, Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. And Senator SALTONSTALL, you oppose the project mainly on the ground that New England interests might be harmed.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That's my main reason. But I am not convinced that the project will come anywhere near achieving many of the things its sponsors claim. And let me add this: We in New England are not asking help from anyone. We have the skilled workers with the know-how. We have capable management. For generations we have pulled together. With increasing competition throughout the country we have got to fight just as hard as we can to keep and, if possible, increase our production. I am confident we can do this if government does not set up obstacles which ever make it increasingly difficult.

Mr. FISHER. Well, thank you, gentlemen. It's up to us to draw our own conclusions from the facts and the arguments pro and con that you have so ably presented.

ANNOUNCER. That was Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air. He has been discussing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project with Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts and Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER of Minnesota. The discussion was adapted for radio by Selden Menefee.

Next week we shall present a special broadcast from Boston, Mass. Francis Russell, Director of the Office of Public Affairs of the State Department, will discuss "The citizen's part in foreign policy" with Sterling Fisher, at a conference of educators from the six New England States.

This has been the fifty-sixth in a series of broadcasts entitled "Our Foreign Policy" presented by the NBC University of the Air and transmitted to our service men and women overseas through the facilities of the Armed Forces Radio Service. You can obtain printed copies of these broadcasts at 10 cents each in coin. If you would like to receive copies of 13 consecutive reprints, send $1 to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Address your orders to the NBC University of the Air, New York 20, N. Y. Special rates are available for large orders.

Thirty-second Division in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride that I call attention to the remarkable record of the famous Thirty-second Division in World War II. I do so for the reason that it was my very great privilege to have served as a member of that division in the First World War.

Mr. Speaker, the original components for that division were recruited from the States of Michigan and Wisconsin. Many of these men were grandsons and great grandsons who served with distinction in the Civil War. These States have always responded to the call of country in times of national emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of these remarks an editorial from the Monroe Times, of Monroe, Wis. This article tells the story of the Red Arrow Division, the Thirty-second, and it should be of interest to the Members of this House:

THE RED ARROW

Now that the Red Arrow, or Thirty-second, Division is about to wind up its affairs for World War II at its ultimate objective (first sighted when it was the first into action in the southwest Pacific), it is fitting to review the achievements of the great division.

The division is well aware of the fact that it took a solidly acting Nation to win the war, but the Red Arrow, nevertheless, through all its fighting men, is extremely proud of its record.

It had 654 days of combat, 15,696 hours of action, more than any other division; 6 major engagements in 4 campaigns; killed 35,000 Japanese, and spent 41 months overseas, more than 21 in combat.

The Red Arrow won 9 Congressional Medals of Honor, 159 Distinguished Service Crosses, 49 Legion of Merits, 888 Silver Stars, 2,349 Bronze Stars, 122 Air Medals, 78 Soldier Medals, and 11,500 Purple Hearts.

It was first to:

Oppose the Japanese in the southwest Pacific.

Make a beach landing in the New Guinea campaign.

Employ General MacArthur's bypass strategy.

Embark for overseas service in one convoy after December 7, 1941.

Supply four infantry battalions in combat in one action completely by air drop.

Supply four infantry battalions for two consecutive days from artillery liaison Cub planes.

Go into action at the foot of the road back and still fighting when the cease fire order was given August 15, 1945.

Publish an American serviceman's letterpress newspaper in the southwest Pacific.

And the division elements were among those chosen for the first American occupation troops in Japan.

It is 2,600 air-line miles from Port Moresby, New Guinea, to northern Luzon. It's a lot longer the way the Thirty-second went. It didn't measure the distance in miles, either. It measured the distance in time—and in dead Japanese.

The Red Arrow patch was authorized during World War I. It signifies the division pierced every line it faced, all the way from the Hindenburg line in World War I to the various Yamashita lines in World War II.

Some of the Thirty-second's regiments have histories which go back to the Civil War, but the division itself was not constituted until October 15, 1917. Several of the regiments were Wisconsin outfits and won 4 battle streamers in France—Aisne-Marne, Meuse-Argonne, Champaigne and Aisne-Oisne engagements. All regiments won the Croix de Guerre with palm. The French called the division Les Terribles, now seldom used, although it has been worked into the various regimental crests.

Exactly 23 years to the day after being first constituted, the Red Arrow was called into service in World War II. Between wars it continued as the Wisconsin-Michigan National Guard Division. It went first to Camp Beauregard, La., and then Camp Livingston, La. Selectees, principally from Wisconsin and Michigan, filled the ranks. After 3 months in Louisiana and 2 months in the Carolinas, it was converted into a modern triangular (3-regiment) division. The division was in training December 7, 1941. By mid-February 1942, it was sent to Fort Devens, Mass., and slated for shipment to England. Then orders changed and in April the division was en route to the Pacific. The division docked May 14 at Adelaide, far in the south of Australia.

The soldiers liked Australia. Some of them married Australian girls.

Then came the rush of war and the long push across the central and south Pacific area. They scaled 8,000-foot high Papuan peaks to attain their early objectives. Tokyo Rose paid tribute by calling the Red Arrows Butchers of Buna.

Always the Thirty-second, with its reputation going ahead of it, met the best the Japs could muster. Even after reaching Philippine soil, the Thirty-second found tough going. But the result never changed.

Wresting Villa Verde from General Yamashita was a prime accomplishment. The Thirty-second used every weapon in the book and it won. The Tiger of Malaya had to surrender.

More dangers lay ahead but it was mostly denouement.

The Red Arrow has a right to be mightily proud of its record.

And because so many Monroe and Green County youths served with so much distinction in the Thirty-second they have a right to be proud of that wonderful record.

Uncle Sam's Land Owned by Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I find that in a book entitled "America's Stake in International Investments," by Cleona Lewis, assisted by Karl T. Schlotterbeck, and published by the Brookings Institution, of Washington, D. C., there is listed the number of acres owned by aliens in 1909. This raises a question as to how many acres of land are now owned by aliens—individuals and corporations—at the present time. Perhaps the gift of $3,750,000,000 in taxpayers' dollars will help Great Britain to acquire further interests in our farming areas. This situation raises a series of very intricate and delicate problems, especially when we consider the large number of corporations here partly or already controlled by British interests.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a list of the number of acres owned by aliens in 1909:

UNCLE SAM'S LAND OWNED BY ALIENS[1]

MILLIONS OF ACRES IN THE UNITED STATES THE PROPERTY OF FOREIGNERS

To the EDITOR OF THE BULLETIN:

SIR: I give below as complete a list of foreign individuals and corporations who own land in the United States, with the amount of their holdings, as I have been able to gather with the means at my command.

	Number of acres
Holland Land Co. (in New Mexico)	4,500,000
The Texas Land Union (composed of the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, Earl Cadogan, Fitzroy Somerset, William Alexander, Lochiel Stephenson, Douglas Hamilton, U. J. Kay-Shuttleworth, and Ethel Cadogan, maid in waiting to the Queen)	3,000,000
The Scully Estate (in Illinois, Missouri, and Kansas)	2,000,000
Sir Edward Reid & Co. (in Florida)	2,000,000
German syndicate	2,000,000
Marquis of Tweedale	1,750,000
Marquis of Sutherland	425,000
Marquis of Aylesbury	55,051
Duke of Beaufort	55,085
Duke of Bedford	87,507
Earl of Brownlow	67,799
Earl of Carlisle	68,540
Earl of Cawdor	51,538
Earl of Derby	56,698
Earl of Lonsdale	67,950
Earl of Bowys	46,095
Earl of Yarborough	55,370
Duke of Cleveland	106,650
Duke of Devonshire	148,629
Duke of Northumberland	191,480
Duke of Portland	55,259
Duke of Rutland	70,039
Lord Leconfield	60,101
Lord Londesborough	52,655
Lady Willoughby	59,912
Sir W. W. Winn	91,032
Lord Dunmore	120,000
Lord Houghton (in Florida)	60,000
Lord Dunraven (in Colorado)	60,000
Philips, Marshall & Co. of London	1,300,000
English Syndicate, No. 4 (in Mississippi)	1,800,000
British Land Co. (in Kansas)	320,000
Missouri Land Co. of Scotland (in Missouri)	300,000
Dundee Land Co. of Scotland	247,000
German Syndicate (in Mississippi)	1,100,000
Anglo-American Syndicate of London	750,000
English Syndicate No. 6 of London (in Wisconsin)	110,000
Scotch Syndicate (in Florida)	500,000
Byron N. Evans of London	700,000
W. Whaley, M. P. for Peterboro	310,000
Robert Tennant, of London	530,000
Benjamin Neugas, of Liverpool	100,000
Sir J. L. Kay, of Yorkshire	5,000
A. Peel, M. P. for Leicestershire	10,000
Alexander Grant, of London (in Kansas)	35,000
M. Ellerhausen (in West Virginia)	600,000
A. Boysen, Danish Consul at Milwaukee	50,000
Richard Syke and Mr. Hughes (in North Dakota)	85,000
C. M. Beach, of London	10,000
Finlay Dun & Co	25,000
Estate of Marquis Demores	15,000
Close Bros., of London	270,000

[1] The Philadelphia Bulletin, Dec. 6, 1909, p. 11 of the "postscript" edition.

	Number of acres
English Land Co. (in Arkansas and Florida)	100,000
T. F. French and W. C. Kelley (in Florida)	70,000
Total	26,704,390

Here are 54 foreign corporations and individuals owning enough land in this country to make 166,940 farms of 160 acres each, or an amount greater by 5,385 square miles than is comprised in the State of Indiana; or 2,455 square miles more than there is in the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Delaware, with their estimated population of 8,359,000.

It may safely be assumed that if a complete list of alien landowners could be obtained, it would largely increase the number given above, and swell the aggregate of the holdings by many millions of acres.

It should be remembered that in no case do the holdings shown above include the thousands of farms taken in by foreign loan companies on foreclosure proceedings in the United States Courts, which would probably aggregate as many acres as the above large holdings. It was stated a few years ago by a reliable newspaper in Kansas that 2,700 farms in northern Kansas had passed into the hands of foreign loan companies during a period of 18 months under foreclosure of mortgage.

Nor have I taken into consideration the enormous land values in mines, railroad stocks, and the stocks and bonds of a vast number of private and public service corporations in the United States to pay dividends and interest on which require millions upon millions of dollars every year, which are sent abroad in the products of our farms, mines, and factories, to the impoverishment of our own people.

JOHN W. DIX.

A Lieutenant Disappointed With the GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby enclose a letter which I have received from a citizen of Arizona, addressed to all Members of Congress. The letter is as follows:

GENTLEMEN: I am writing you to express my opinion on what is called the GI bill of rights.

After spending 4 years in the service, 3 of these as a commissioned officer, I got fed up with the way I was kept hanging on the ropes and being kept in the dark, so I got a discharge in January of this year.

I planned to get a part-time job and go to school part of the time in order to learn a profession. Then I discovered that I'd have no time for outside work if I took enough schooling to qualify me for the allowance given to veterans going to school. Of course, these conditions are in small print at the bottom of the page. They aren't advertised when you tell of how much you're doing for the veterans.

So instead I bought a small business and have been running it since I got my release. Last month my books showed a $6 loss. I expected as much, for there are extra expenses when one first starts a business.

Since I had a loss for the month, I figured I'd put in for the $100 allowance entitled me under the GI bill. What a sad idea that was.

When I started to make out the papers they wouldn't let me count half my expenses. Anything I had purchased to fix up the shop and attract business couldn't be entered. Nor could the bus fare to and from work. I had purchased paper bags, so they asked me how many I had used for that month. Also how many pencils I had used out of the ones I'd purchased.

After 4 years of Army life I have learned to take a lot, and I do not feel that anyone owes me a living, but it sure burns me up that you men down there make such a big spill about what you're doing for us and then find out (from the small printing at the bottom of the page) just how things really are.

And that bonus I was promised for each year of active duty (I'm in the ORC) still hasn't shown up. My loan comes due on the 14th of this month, but it doesn't look like my $1,500 bonus will be here to meet it.

I don't suppose this letter will ever reach any of your ears, but I know votes do, so I'll be doing my shouting with votes.

Very disappointed,

CHARLES W. RUFFNER,
Former First Lieutenant,
Pilot, O733992, A. C.

P. S.—Seems to me if you can give England all that money (and I hope that loan to her doesn't go through) you could do a little better for the people of this country.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

Postwar Relief Provisions of the Excess-Profits Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under the Second Revenue Act of 1940 Congress levied an excess-profits tax on business corporations for the purpose of taking the profits out of war. Along with other profit-deterrent measures it cut deeply into the disposable income of some 70,000 corporations, virtually confiscating all income above an arbitrary and theoretical level measured by prewar normal earnings. It produced, however, about $40,000,000,000 of much-needed revenue.

The multiplicity of accounting problems involved, in applying the tax, as well as the diversity of capital structures encountered and the intricate maze of contractual relationships, eliminated any possibility of reaching absolute equity or uniformity in its administration. But a measure of uniformity, and of equity, was attained by including in the law certain so-called relief provisions.

THE PROBLEM OF WAR-INDUCED EXPENSES

One of the most difficult problems confronting the Congress in drafting the excess-profits tax law was the matter of reconciling the Government's tremendous need for war revenues with the admitted need for aiding business to reconvert plants, products, and organizations in the unpredictable period of immediately following hostilities. The problem was further aggravated by the fact that no one could predict with certainty the pattern of the transition period. It was agreed, however, that aid to business would be needed and that such aid would have to be given promptly when war production ceased. These two assumed facts formed the basic assumptions underlying the original excess-profits tax law in 1940 and subsequent amendments relating to the reconversion period. The conflicting needs of the Government and business finally were adjusted through certain provisions which permitted immediate use of part of the excess-profits tax by the Government, but with the assurance that upon termination of the war such part would be promptly returned to the taxpayer. In effect, therefore, postwar reserves were created for reconversion purposes but at the same time were made immediately available to the Government.

The relief thus provided took the form of, first, the carry-back and carry-forward of operating losses and unused excess-profits credits; second, a postwar credit of 10 percent of the amount of excess-profits tax paid; and, third, the recomputation of amortization deductions, or depreciation of emergency investments in plant or equipment facilities in a greatly shortened depreciation period.

CARRY-BACKS AND CARRY-FORWARDS

In the operation of the income-tax laws certain averaging devices are frequently employed to average out taxable income over a period of years. This is done in recognition of the fact that a single taxable year is far from an ideal basis for computing tax liability. Averaging the taxable base is accomplished by, first, the allowance of carry-backs and carry-forwards of losses, and, second, in the case of the excess-profits tax, the unused excess-profits credit. In this way losses or unused excess-profits credits arising in a current taxable year may be applied in recomputing liability first for the two preceding years, and then for the 2 years following the current year. When losses are involved, the taxpayer simply recomputes his taxable income for the earlier years by applying the amount of the loss as an additional deduction. He may then find he owes a smaller tax, or no tax at all, and is entitled to a refund.

Prior to 1942 averaging was accomplished by carry-forwards only. In the Revenue Act of 1942, however, carry-backs were added to the Internal Revenue Code, including the carry-back of unused excess-profits credits. Under the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 enacted after the defeat of Germany, provision was made for the speeding up of refunds resulting from these sources, including the privilege of estimating anticipated losses and deducting the estimated refund from current tax liabilities. Ordinarily it would take 2 or 3 years to receive payment of refunds.

As an aid to prompt reconversion Congress accordingly authorized administrative short cuts which would place sorely needed cash in the hands of most employers both among corporations and individuals. The Revenue Act of 1945

repealed the excess-profits tax but expressly continued through 1946 the machinery for computing the tax. As a result, the averaging principal was continued in determining excess-profits-tax liability for the entire period.

EXCESS-PROFITS CREDIT CARRY-BACKS

Since we are concerned here with the operation of the excess-profits tax law, particularly in 1946, further reference to carry-backs and carry-forwards of losses can be dispensed with. They are not, essentially, a part of the excess-profits tax structure. The excess-profits credit, on the other hand, is exclusively identified with the excess-profits tax law and has recently become the target for severe criticisms along with the postwar 10-percent credit and the speeded-up method of depreciating emergency facilities.

To understand the nature and operation of the excess-profits credit, it is necessary to keep in mind the basic concept of normal profits. In drafting the original excess-profits tax law it was necessary to include a device for measuring normal profits and for segregating them from the excess profits which were to be taxed. Various technical means were, therefore, adopted to determine the amount of normal profits which would be exempt from the excess-profits tax and the segregation was accomplished by means of a corresponding credit to be used in computing excess-profits tax liability. Because of the nature of the formulas adopted for computing the amount of such credit, the taxpayer, in each taxable year, was required to check his previous computations in order to determine whether his credit would be greater or less than it was before.

Two methods are provided in the law for computing the amount of the excess-profits credit, the average income method and the invested capital method. Either may be chosen by the taxpayer, but in all cases the amount of the credit is subject to normal tax and surtax. Under the average income method, a formula is provided for ascertaining average net income in the 4-year base period—1936 through 1939. When this figure is computed in the manner prescribed, the credit is fixed at 95 percent of such average income, plus 8 percent of capital additions after 1939, less 6 percent of capital reductions after 1939. If changes in the capital structure occur, therefore, the credit may be recomputed each year.

Under the invested capital method the credit is based upon a percentage of invested capital, a defined term, and the credit is based upon a sliding scale of percentages ranging from 8 percent on the first $5,000,000 of such capital, to $700,000 plus 5 percent of amounts of such capital in excess of $10,000,000. Since accumulated earnings, as well as new capital, are included in invested capital, the credit determined under this method will fluctuate in succeeding taxable years with fluctuations in the capital structure.

By this system of credit adjustments, the law thus attempts, more or less arbitrarily, to separate normal and excessive profits with the result that a corporation is generally allowed at least 95 percent of its base-period earnings free of excess-profits tax liability. It is interesting to note that Great Britain allowed a corporation up to approximately 111 percent of its base-period earnings free of excess-profits tax liability, while the Canadian law permitted an exemption of roughly 155 percent of the normal base-period income.

CARRY-BACKS ALLOW AVERAGING OF INCOME

Prior to the Revenue Act of 1942, the law permitted use of an excess credit only in the two succeeding years. The Revenue Act of 1942 amended this procedure by allowing the unused portion of the credit to be carried back to the two preceding taxable years (but not beyond 1941, 710 (c) (4)) and then carried forward 2 years. In either case, thereafter, the unused credit operated as an averaging device over a 5-year period in a manner similar to the loss carry-backs and loss carry-forwards.

This was done upon the express recommendations of the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the whole procedure carefully explained in the report of the Senate Finance Committee on the Revenue Act of 1942.

Under such procedure the entire return for the year to which the unused credit is carried, accordingly is reopened and the liability recomputed. This naturally results in a larger credit for that year, and a smaller excess-profits net income. Since the excess-profits net income is deducted in computing normal tax and surtax liability, this deduction becomes smaller resulting in an increased liability for normal tax and surtax. At the same time, the excess-profits tax liability having been reduced, the original 10-percent postwar credit is automatically reduced proportionately.

For example, Corporation A, in order to benefit by the continuance of the carry-back rule in 1946, will compute its excess-profits tax liability for 1946 as if the tax had not been repealed. Upon so doing, it finds, let us say, an excess-profits net income of $40,000 with an excess-profits credit of $50,000. The unused credit ($10,000) will be carried back to 1944. In that year it reported excess-profits subject to the excess-profits tax of $15,000. Upon recomputing its 1944 liability the result is an adjusted excess-profits net income of only $5,000. The corporation having paid an excess-profits tax of approximately $14,250 (95 percent of $15,000) now has an adjusted liability of $4,750 (95 percent of $5,000), or a reduction in its excess-profits tax of $9,500 ($14,250 minus $4,750) and a reduction in its postwar credit of $950.

This is not the final result, however, because the credit carried back automatically becomes additional normal tax net income upon which an additional normal tax and surtax must be paid. The normal tax and surtax liability are accordingly increased by 40 percent of $10,000 which is $4,000. This sum is therefore subtracted from the reduction in excess-profits tax ($9,500) leaving $5,500 as the net refund. Counting the loss of $950 in the postwar credit the taxpayer's net yield is $4,550.

In some cases the operation of credit carry-backs can result in a higher net, over-all tax for a prior year than was actually paid. This is shown in the following table:

Carry-back of unused excess-profits credit from 1946 to 1944 (taxpayer subject to 80 percent limitation)

1. Excess-profits net income (taxable year 1944)	$100,000
2. Specific exemption	10,000
3. Excess-profits credit	10,000
	20,000
4. Adjusted excess-profits net income	80,000
5. Tentative excess-profits tax at 95 percent of item 4	76,000
6. Income subject to normal tax and surtax (item 1 minus item 4)	20,000
7. Normal tax and surtax on $20,000	5,300
8. Limit of 80 percent on total tax liability (80 percent of taxable income, i. e., item 1)	80,000
9. Normal tax and surtax payable (item 7)	5,300
10. Excess-profits tax payable (item 5)	74,700
11. Postwar credit (10 percent of item 10 after adjustment, i. e., 10 percent of $74,700	7,470
12. Net total tax after deducting item 11	72,530
EFFECT OF THE CARRY-BACK OF AN UNUSED CREDIT OF $10,000	
13. Original adjusted excess-profits net income	80,000
14. Less carry-back of unused excess-profits credit	10,000
15. Revised adjusted excess-profits net income	70,000
16. Income subject to normal tax and surtax ($100,000 minus $70,000. Compare with item 6)	30,000
17. Limit of 80 percent	80,000
18. Revised normal tax and surtax (compare with item 7)	9,400
19. Revised excess-profits tax (item 18 minus item 17)	70,600
20. Revised postwar credit (compare with item 11)	7,060
21. Revised net total tax (compare with item 12)	72,940

In this case the taxpayer paid an excess-profits tax, in 1944, of $74,700 minus a 10-percent postwar credit of $7,470 or a net aggregate tax of $72,530 including normal tax and surtax payments. (See item 12). In 1946 he had an unused excess-profits credit of $10,000 which was carried back to 1944. As a result his excess-profits tax liability for 1944 was reduced to $70,600 (item 19), his postwar credit was reduced to $7,060 (item 20), but his net total liability increased over his original 1944 liability by $410 to $72,940 (item 21).

It is not true, therefore, that continuance of the credit carry-back provisions will always result in a lower tax for a prior year. The reason is that the reduction in the 10-percent postwar credit represents a loss of assests that will not always be offset by gains from reduced tax liabilities. In the illustration above both computations for 1944 show an aggregate tax liability for excess-profits tax, normal tax, and surtax of $80,000 but the shifts in liability among these three taxes, upon recomputation do not overcome the loss of $410 in the postwar credit.

Since this lost credit will be represented by bonds already issued and probably already cashed, the taxpayer will be out of pocket to the extent of such loss. But because he is subject to the 80-percent ceiling he will owe the same amount of aggregate tax after recomputing his liability. Instead of getting a refund, therefore, some taxpayers will pay additional money into the Treasury. Apparently this cannot be avoided. The taxpayer cannot refuse to recompute the excess-profits tax for a prior year because the law is now regarded as mandatory in requiring the unused credit to be carried back. The law provides that an unused excess-profits credit shall be a carry-back to the two preceding years.

If the Treasury Department should be willing not to apply the carry-back unless the taxpayer makes a claim for a refund of excess-profits tax, this difficulty could be avoided. If the Treasury Department does not find it possible to ignore the apparently mandatory provisions of the law, almost all taxpayers whose aggregate total tax liabilities exceed the 80-percent limit will experience a hardship in carrying back unused credits. They will derive no benefits from continuance of the carry-back rule and will probably suffer distinct disadvantages from its application. Unfortunately a great many smaller corporations will be found in this category. Corporations not subject to the 80-percent limitation, on the other hand, will benefit by the carry-back of any unused credits to 1944 and 1945.

THE 10-PERCENT POSTWAR CREDIT

Unlike the excess-profits credit which is a credit against excess-profits net income, the 10-percent postwar credit is applied against the excess-profits tax itself and is in the nature of a refund automatically payable at a certain time after the war. In effect it reduces the ultimate amount of tax liability, permitting the Government, meanwhile, to use the money it represents. In other words, for every dollar of excess-profits tax paid into the Treasury, the taxpayer is guaranteed the return of 10 cents.

This provision was added to the excess-profits tax law by the Revenue Act of 1942 "to encourage efficient and economical corporate management under the stress of war economy and to provide a fund that will be available for the conversion of production facilities after the war to peacetime demands." (Senate report on H. R. 7378, 77th Cong., 2d sess., October 2, 1942, Rept. No. 1631, p. 30.) Under that act it was provided that the credits would take the form of non-interest-bearing bonds, not negotiable until after the war, redeemable at face value at successive dates beginning two calendar years after cessation of hostilities. Provision was also made in the act for the current use of so much of the postwar credit as does not exceed 40 percent of payments in retirement of indebtedness.

The Revenue Act of 1943 amended provisions relating to the issuance of postwar credit bonds and further amendments were made under the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945. With respect to 1944 and 1945 liabilities bonds are no longer issued and the 10-percent credit is taken currently by deducting it from the liability shown on the return, leaving the balance to be paid. This rule is subject to certain exceptions with respect to payment of 1943 liabilities after July 1, 1945.

Prior to 1945 the full excess-profits tax liability as shown was paid without regard to the credit. The collector then certified the return to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in Washington, who computed the amount of credit and prepared a schedule indicating that the taxpayer was entitled to receive postwar refund bonds to an amount equal to his credit. This schedule was then forwarded to the Public Debt Service of the Treasury Department where the bonds were accordingly issued.

Subsequent changes in the amount of excess-profits tax liability result in corresponding changes in the amount of the postwar credit. As a general rule these changes are adjusted currently. If the credit is reduced, the amount of reduction is deducted from any refunds that may be due. If it is increased, it may be added to the deficiency assessed against the taxpayer. For 1946, of course, the postwar credit will not be effective.

AMORTIZATION OF EMERGENCY FACILITIES

Section 23 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code authorizes a deduction for income-tax purposes of a reasonable amount for depreciation of property used in a trade or business or held for the production of income. The theory of such a deduction is that in each taxable year a certain portion of the value of the property is consumed in business operations and since income taxes are levied on income and not on the property used in producing such income such loss of value must not be taxed under income-tax laws.

With the advent of war it became imperative to erect essential new plants and additions to old plants to meet the huge demand for war-production facilities. Their use would obviously be required only for a relatively short period of time yet they would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. If section 23 (l) were to govern the amount of deductions attributable to the depreciation on such emergeny facilities, their cost could not have been written off except over a period of many years measured, in most cases, by the useful life of the property, not the period of its actual use.

In framing the Excess-Profits Tax Act (Second Revenue Act of 1940) it became apparent that sufficient private capital could not be attracted for erection of war plants unless assurances were given that owners of such facilities could deduct the amount of capital assets consumed in their use, over a greatly shortened period. This problem was carefully studied by the Committee on Ways and Means and by the Senate Finance Committee in 1940 with the result that a provision was incorporated in the Excess-Profits Tax Act of that year allowing a deduction for income and excess-profits tax purposes on account of depreciation of war-production facilities over a 5-year period. Use of such deductions was restricted to emergency facilities certified as such by the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy or Chairman of the War Production Board or the duly authorized representative of each.

The deduction was allowed only to holders of "certificates of necessity" and applied only to land, buildings, machinery and equipment, or parts thereof, acquired or completed after July 10, 1940, or contracted for before the termination of the emergency period as defined in the act. It was further provided that the taxpayer could elect to discontinue the deduction and to use the deduction provided for in section 23 (l) in certain cases. In addition it was provided that if the President declared the emergency ended before expiration of the 5-year period, or if the facility was certified to be no longer necessary, the taxpayer could recompute the deduction on the basis of the shorter period.

The Revenue Act of 1942 amended the original amortization provisions by (1) extending their operation to individuals as well as to corporations, (2) by broadening the coverage to facilities completed or acquired after December 31, 1939, and before June 11, 1942, and (3) by extending the period of election to take the deduction to 6 months after enactment of the 1942 act. A minor amendment was made with respect to termination of the emergency period within the 5-year period. The Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 added two new provisions to the amortization rule whereby credits or refunds resulting from the recomputation of the deduction, based upon a shortened period, could be speeded up under a "tentative adjustment" made within 90 days after filing claim for such credit or refund. If this had not been done refunds would probably have been delayed several years. Existing law was not changed by the Tax Adjustment Act but only supplemented by the new provision.

REFUNDS RESULTING FROM AMORTIZATION DEDUCTIONS

In actual operation the amortization of emergency facilities is basically identical with computation of deductions on account of depreciation under section 23 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code. The former is accompanied by certain specific limitations and definitions of terms not found in section 23 (l) and the procedure is somewhat more elaborate, but the same principles apply in both. If the basis of the emergency facility—that is to say, its value for purposes of the depreciation allowance—was $1,000,000, for example, the taxpayer would simply deduct $200,000 each year in computing his normal and surtax liability along with other deductions allowed by law over a 5-year period. The theory of such a deduction is that in each year one-fifth of the value of the property is consumed, or extinguished, amounting to a loss to the taxpayer.

Refunds on account of such deductions will result only when an election has been made to shorten the 5-year period. The law permits this to be done if by Presidential proclamation the emergency is terminated before expiration of the 5-year period, or if the facility is certified to be no longer necessary for war production.

President Truman issued a proclamation, as of September 29, 1945, terminating the war-emergency period. As a result, a taxpayer whose 60-month period began, let us say, January 1, 1943, will be

permitted to recompute the deductions. This means he will have an amortization period running from January 1, 1943, to September 29, 1945—a period of 33 months rather than his original period of 60 months. His taxable income for 1943, 1944, and 1945 will, therefore, be reduced because his allowable deduction for amortization increases for those years. This may produce a refund for overpayment of taxes.

On property valued at $10,000, for example, the result will be as follows:

Taxable year	Original amortization allowance	Adjusted amortization allowance
1943	$2,000	$3,636
1944	2,000	3,636
1945	2,000	2,728
1946	2,000	
1947	2,000	
Total	10,000	10,000

ABUSES RESULTING FROM RELIEF PROVISIONS

No law, and particularly no tax law, can be written which will do absolute justice to every taxpayer in the light of his own peculiar circumstances. Similarly no tax law can be written to operate in a field as complicated and intricate as the field covered by the excess-profit tax law which is not subject to abuse. This is particularly true with respect to credit carry-backs and to a lesser degree the amortization privileges. The 10-percent postwar credit, while it operates to reduce the ultimate excess-profits tax liability, is not subject to the degree of control possible under carry-backs or to the optional treatment of amortization deductions.

For this reason credit carry-backs have been the chief target of criticism, and the abuses resulting from them are due almost entirely to the fact that the amount of the credit and hence the amount of refunds can, to a certain extent, be controlled by the taxpayer. The taxpayer, can, for example, "bunch" his expenditures in 1946 contrary to the normal practice of spreading them over a period of years. He may launch broad, experimental and promotional schemes and claim them as war-induced or reconversion expenses. Or he may maintain a mere skeleton organization with no peacetime business except the collection of refunds from credit carry-backs. Mr. Roy Blough, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury has pointed this out in saying:

> Many concerns using this credit will not only receive free from excess-profits tax much larger profits than they earned before the war, and perhaps ever received, but in effect will have their profits level artificially maintained by the carry-backs in the postwar years.

Unlike special reserves for particular expenses, credit carry-backs do not necessarily permit all war-induced reconversion costs to be charged directly against wartime income, nor are they limited solely to these costs. There is no requirement that war-induced expenditures made in 1946 and off-set through the credit carry-backs, shall be segregated from other current expenditures. This constitutes a serious weakness of credit carry-backs, because it permits refunds under circumstances quite different from those which Congress contemplated since reductions in current earnings, not resulting from war-induced expenses, may operate to produce an excess-profits-tax refund.

Types of war-induced expenses contemplated at the time credit carry-backs were authorized are: First, dismissal compensation; second, plant reconversion and retooling; third, reestablishment of marketing facilities; fourth, deferred maintenance; fifth, inventory losses.

These defects render the credit carry-backs vulnerable to a certain extent and perhaps they should be corrected if it is possible to correct them. On this question, however, the answer must await completion of studies now under way by the technical staffs of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department. As a matter of fact the Committee on Ways and Means and the Finance Committee of the Senate are on record as saying that such abuses will receive early attention with a view to their elimination.

Meanwhile, it is important to bear in mind, that while amortization privileges and credit carry-backs will produce exceptionally large refunds in some cases, which may or may not be needed, there are no facts at hand that establish the scope of such generosity or its actual character.

RECENT CRITICISMS NOT WHOLLY JUSTIFIED

The fact that large refunds will result, in some cases, from postwar relief provisions in the excess-profits tax law has prompted recent criticisms of these provisions of the law. It is claimed, for example, that some $20,000,000,000 will be returned to corporate taxpayers enabling some companies to show larger net profits for 1946 than they earned before the war, and that such refunds will be tax free, that these provisions were placed in the law at the behest of large corporations and secretly slipped through Congress. It is also said that such refunds will not be needed because of the accumulation of reserves during the war period and in general, operate to restore wartime profits that were supposd to have been captured by the excess-profits tax.

Additional criticism is founded on the fact that the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 afforded an undetermined amount of relief to corporate and individual taxpayers in 1945 in the form of refunds based upon estimates of probable operating losses with such refunds being payable subject to later revision.

While to some extent these criticisms are valid, they cannot be wholly justified. It is grossly misleading, for example, to level a sweeping indictment against carry-backs, credits and amortization deductions because of a certain few abuses that may arise in particular cases. The basic truth is, that they guarantee adherence to sound and long-accepted principles of taxation and more particularly, guarantee that taxation of war profits will be confined to the actual war period from 1941 through 1945 and not simply to a part of that period.

In contrast to predictions of a wholesale disgorgment of tax revenues.

The present value of the 10-percent postwar credit to former excess-profits taxpayers, according to estimates of the Treasury Department is approximately $2,700,000,000, the value of credit carry-backs not more than $500,000,000 and of the amortization deductions approximately $2,100,000,000, making a total potential return of approximately $5,300,000,000, or a little more than 10 percent of excess-profits tax receipts.

In view of the fact that our excess-profits tax cut deeper into corporate revenues than the laws of Britain and Canada, and that even the Treasury Department entertained serious doubts as to whether the profits subject to the tax were genuinely excessive profits, the return of part of the collections cannot be regarded as an unwarranted postwar gift to excess-profits taxpayers. Furthermore, no one yet has proven, by competent evidence, that any particular refund may not be justified. If the relief provisions of the law will produce a tidal wave of cash refunds for a selected few companies who do not need them, immediate steps should be taken to prevent it, but not in the absence of clear proof that such an evil actually exists.

The whole theory of postwar excess-profits tax relief provisions was that American industry should be fortified with available cash in order to met unusual, reconversion expenses attributable to wartime operations, and at the same time should be assured that war profits and only war profits earned in the war period would be subject to the excess-profits tax, on an average annual basis or as close to that basis as possible.

If conditions have so changed that original assumptions regarding the need for reconversion protection were erroneous, making it unwise or unnecessary to continue through 1946 the credit carry-backs we should know in what particular conditions have changed and precisely how reconversion will be affected if the privilege of credit carry-backs is terminated. We do not have a similar problem with respect to the 10-percent postwar credit, or the amortization allowance, but if these provisions can be proven to be unjustified, they too should be investigated.

On the strength of known facts, however, it does not appear that continuance of any of these postwar relief provisions through 1946 will either render the Federal Treasury insolvent or result in any undue or extensive favoritism among taxpayers. Reconversion, while it may be nearly complete in certain lines of industry is not complete in others, yet excess-profits-tax payers are found in all lines of industry. Of course, if American businessmen have lost all their honor, and are bereft of all sense of fitness and propriety, abuses resulting from postwar excess-profits tax relief provisions will be magnified in proportion, otherwise they will not seriously threaten the solvency of the country.

In effect the postwar relief provisions furnished necessary reserves for reconversion purposes, but allowed the Government to use the funds for war expenditures. In other words, the Government obtained the use of some $5,000,000,000 interest free, upon the

assurance that excess-profits-tax payers would receive this sum back after the war.

No evidence has been submitted to the Congress that any particular refunds heretofore made or scheduled for payment, as a result of these provisions, are either too large or unnecessary. In the absence of clear proof to the contrary, it is obviously out of order to condemn the relief provisions of the excess-profits-tax law with blanket charges that are obviously intended, not to inform, but to mislead and confuse the public.

A Farmer's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a great many messages from constituents who own or operate farms in my district, expressing the difficulties which farmers are encountering on account of lack of farm help, lack of machinery, shortage of lumber for repairs and construction, and the farm program as it has been set up and as it has operated in their experience.

The following letter is rather typical of the contents of many of the letters I have received, and I feel that what he sets forth should come to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HON. JOSEPH O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: What in hell is the matter with Congress? Is this country being run by a constitutional form of government or by a horde of incompetent crackpots?

First I want to introduce myself as a real dirt farmer, I being one of the many that have in the last 5 years put in many long hours to produce food for this useless war that we have won. We were short of help as our boys were taken for war, and more short of machinery to replace them. And now we are asked to produce more food to stave off starvation in Europe and Asia. But we are forced with worn-out machinery and can't get new machinery, and now our boys that have been deferred for farm work are drafted, which leaves us farmers only one alternative—that is to produce only what our families need, as we cannot secure any farm help. The boys that have returned from war shun farm work, only at an exorbitant wage of $150 per month plus board and room, 40-hour workweek, and only machine work. Our prices are pegged but when we can find a new machine the price asked for it is doubled since before the war. I had to pay $458 for a single-row corn binder last fall. That machine can never earn its cost before it is worn out. And the cost of producing food by having to purchase machinery is not deducted from income taxes. Nor are new buildings which we so badly need to store grain and house livestock. And material isn't available, not even to repair broken-down buildings.

I know these strikes that we have are bad but if things don't change pretty soon this Nation will face a farm strike that will rock it to its very foundation. This is not a threat, but the rumblings are there.

We farmers are so bewildered by orders and directives from those crackpots in Washington on how, when, and where to operate a farm. Don't they know farming cannot be controlled from day to day? We have to plan at least 6 months ahead, and a year for livestock. Cut out that damn subsidy and give us the cost of production and leave our needed farm boys on the farms and we'll feed the world. But the way those shysters in Washington have our production of farms laid out it means chaos. My wife and I are both past 60 years—we have one son in the Navy and the other slated to go soon. Two old people on 240 acres, all tillable, is a nice place for those Washington farm planners to spend their vacation any time of the year. Send them out—I can use them. As long as I have to pay for their keep and their useless advice I may as well get some work out of them. We farmers are not fooled by their juggled figures. And we are sick of their orders and directives and promises which don't mean anything. Our only alternative is to do what we can for our own need with what we have. What has become of democracy? Who and what are we to believe?

This letter is the sentiment of a lot of farmers. We are all in the same boat. We don't want to be barnacles clinging to the ship of state. We want what we are entitled to.

Dairy Situation in Bristol County, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Charles W. Harris, Jr., county agricultural agent for Bristol County, Mass., presenting a graphic description of the plight of the dairy farmer in this area.

Obviously, if the people are to get milk, conditions cannot be allowed to drift along as at present. Mr. Harris' letter follows:

MARCH 18, 1946.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: Last week I called a meeting of dairy farmers, milk dealers, managers of milk producers associations, and grain dealers to consider ways and means of stimulating more milk production in Bristol County. We considered every angle, using statistical data covering a period of 5 to 10 years. The biggest reason why there isn't more milk produced in this area is the price.

Here are some facts which I presented to this group. I am offering them to you for use as you may see fit.

In the Fall River milkshed the number of farmers producing milk has decreased from 344 to 262 since 1940, a decrease of 82 farms. In the New Bedford milkshed the decrease has been from 300 to 233 or a decrease of 67 farms.

Since dairy feed payments were started in 1943 the number of dairy farmers receiving payments has dropped from 756 to 677 in December 1945, a decrease of 79 herds in 26 months on a country-wide basis. These herds represented about 2,200 milking cows. This happened while the Government was paying a subsidy to the producer to keep down the price of milk to the consumer.

The weighted yearly average price per hundredweight of all milk produced locally in the Fall River and New Bedford milksheds since 1942 is as follows:

	Per hundredweight
For the year 1943:	
New Bedford	$4.40
Fall River	4.25
For the year 1944:	
New Bedford	4.41
Fall River	4.30
For the year 1945:	
New Bedford	4.43
Fall River	4.32

A study of the cost of production factors made on some 300 dairy farms in Massachusetts by the Massachusetts State College Farm Management Department for the period May 1, 1943, to April 30, 1944, indicates that the average cost of producing 100 pounds of milk on 47 farms in Bristol County was $4.95 per hundredweight. This was 2 years ago when the labor costs were two-thirds of today's wages. The wages earned were, in this study, 41 cents per hour, which is very low when compared to war-work wages. Feed costs have increased another third since 1943. During this period the dairy subsidy payment was, from October 1, 1943, to April 30, 1944, 55.7 cents per hundredweight. Milk producers were just breaking even then. The subsidy payment averaged from May 1, 1944, to December 31, 1944, 61½ cents per hundredweight, and in 1945 was 73 cents per hundredweight. Since May 1944 there is hardly a milk producer who has got his costs back in producing a quart of milk. This is the reason for the decrease in the number of farmers producing milk.

We believe that today only the efficient dairy producer is in business and even then he is not getting back a new dollar for each dollar spent to produce milk. Our milk production on the farms studied in the survey in Bristol County averaged more than 7,300 pounds per cow; the silage corn yields were 12 tons per acre; hay yields were 2½ to 3 tons per acre. Nearly every farm has improved its pasture with new seedings and fertilization and averages to obtain 120 days of pasturage. These farmers have hit the top in farm production and still can hardly break even.

You may use this information as you see fit and if there is any more information you may need I will try to find it for you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HARRIS, Jr.,
County Agricultural Agent.

South Africa and the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to have a report printed in a South African newspaper on the facts concerning the resources of the British Empire presented to the Congress in the House of Representatives. A press report taken from the Johannesburg Times is presented here:

[From the Johannesburg, Transvaal, Sunday Times of February 10, 1946]

BRITISH EMPIRE IS "RICH ENOUGH," SAYS AMERICAN

WASHINGTON, Saturday.—Mr. COMPTON WHITE, a Democrat Representative from Idaho, will insist, when the British loan debate starts, that all Empire resources be taken

under the congressional microscope, with particular emphasis on South Africa's gold and diamond reserves.

In a statement which he recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. WHITE said: "How much must a nation of 130,000,000 people give to an empire of 540,000,000 with all the vast land and water resources, rubber, petroleum, timber, mineral, and precious metals found in this Empire on which the sun never sets?"

Mr. WHITE'S statement comes at a time when members of the Truman administration most directly concerned with the loan to Britain—high representatives of the Treasury and State Departments—have formally confessed to British officials in Washington their anxiety about the fate in Congress of the loan.

Mr. WHITE said: "The American people, in considering the loan, should take into consideration the record of our dealings with the Empire, to say nothing of the sacrifices we have made to make good Mr. Churchill's proposition that the British Empire is not to be dismembered."

Lease-lend to South Africa totaled £58,300,000 up to June 30, 1945. He said this represented the value of goods shipped, to which must be added charges for services, cost of shipping, and so forth. He added that reverse lease-lend from the empire was delivered at exorbitant prices.

Mr. WHITE stressed that the figures were not his own but were supplied by the State Department.

UNMINED GOLD

He then quoted figures for measured unmined gold reserves which he said were supplied by the United States Treasury Department.

"The total commercial reserves—the total ores economically workable—in the British Empire are estimated to be about 700,000,000 fine ounces. This is based on the assumption that South Africa has enough ore to continue its present rate of production of about 12,000,000 ounces for 40 years.

"The estimate of gold reserves in South Africa alone, obtained from the Department of the Interior at the time the first lease-lend bill was under consideration, placed South African unmined gold reserves at well over 400,000,000 ounces."

Mr. WHITE commented: "The amount of gold reserves of the Government of Britain and its dependencies as well as dollar holdings of the British family of nations is a deep, dark secret. But we know that during the war period the British have been permitted to make heavy withdrawals of monetary gold stocks from the United States Treasury and transfer it to British ownership.

"One reason, given off the record, is that in making British purchases during the war, United States currency was not acceptable in some quarters of the Empire. United States gold was demanded, and given."

DIAMOND RESERVES

Mr. WHITE said he was "unable to obtain any estimates of unmined British diamond reserves," but he quoted verbatim a letter addressed to him from the United States Department of Justice saying: "The diamond reserves of the Empire, according to an estimate made by Edward Bliss, of the American Embassy in London, are 43,847,000 carats."

Mr. WHITE'S comment on this estimate is: "In making a conservative estimate of British diamond reserves at £50 a carat, it appears the British have reserves amounting to about £2,200,000,000."

He then examined what he called British foreign investments. He said the British Empire section of the United States Commerce Department had supplied him with these figures:

The distribution of British investments in Canada was about £500,000,000, in South Africa and Rhodesia £2,050,000,000, in Australia and New Zealand £650,000,000.

He said those figures were based on 1938 estimates, and at the end of 1944 the estimated British investments in the world totaled over £3,000,000,000.

Mr. WHITE intends to have a full-scale debate in the House of Representatives on the resources of the Empire before a vote is taken on the Britsh loan.—Sapa.

Tribute to the Late President Roosevelt by Hon. James M. Mead, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last night at Syracuse, N. Y., our colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] delivered a very able address. The occasion was a Jackson Day dinner, under the auspices of the Onondaga County Democratic Committee, with the principal feature commemoration of a very great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, our late beloved President. The Senator from New York paid an eloquent tribute to President Roosevelt's memory. In my humble opinion the address merits a permanent place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore ask permission that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEW YORK, AT THE JACKSON DAY DINNER HELD IN THE ONANDAGA HOTEL AT SYRACUSE, N. Y., ON MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1946

Mr. Chairman, honored distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, ladies and gentlemen, I commend you for the splendid turnout honoring the memory of our late beloved President.

It is now almost a year since our great leader passed on. It has been an eventful year, one which has seen this Nation emerge from the black clouds of war into the sunshine of peace. But it also has been a year which has brought its full measure of problems, some the inevitable result of the terrible struggle through which we have just passed, some brought on by selfish and short-sighted men.

During these past months, we have grievously missed the wisdom, the foresight and the inspired leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. With his death, business lost a wise counsellor, agriculture a genuine benefactor, labor a staunch champion, the Democratic party a great leader, and the people of the United States a devoted servant and friend.

But Franklin Roosevelt has not really left us. His deeds remain; the record of his presence is written large on the pages of history. The statute books of this State and this Nation bear eloquent testimony to his great heart and his farsighted wisdom. Collective bargaining, social security, unemployment insurance—these are among the concepts, vital to the welfare of us all, which will forever be associated with his name.

Today, we are fortunate in having as our standard bearer a true disciple and faithful advocate of the ideals to which Franklin Roosevelt dedicated his life, President Harry S. Truman. He has pledged his support to the principles for which his predecessor stood and, against the bitter opposition of selfish and thoughtless men, has been carrying forward the bright torch of liberalism.

In his message to the Congress on September 6, 1945, President Truman presented a comprehensive and constructive program to the American people. Later, on January 4, 1946, he expanded on this program in a Nation-wide radio address. The President's program envisages the great possibilities that lie ahead for the citizens of the United States if it is carried into effect by the elected representatives of the people.

President Truman's program is one designed to make America strong and prosperous. It is a program which provides direction and leadership for the attainment of full employment, increased production, high purchasing power, and decent wage levels for all. It is a program that provides for broader social security, for improved public service in the field of health and education, for crop insurance and agricultural betterment, for the protection of small business and all others endangered by the destructive effects of monopoly. It is a progressive, dynamic, forward-looking program. It is a program whose enactment into law will launch this Nation on an era of continuing prosperity never before equalled in all history.

To take care of workers temporarily unemployed during the reconversion period, we have the unemployment compensation bill. The President has asked the Congress immediately to supplement State unemployment insurance by extending its benefits to employees of small businesses and small industrial establishments; to the officers and men of our gallant merchant marine, to Federal Government employees, and to other groups not now covered. The President has also asked the Congress to extend the period and raise the standard of present unemployment benefits, so that every eligible worker would be entitled to 26 weeks of unemployment benefit in any one year, at a rate of not less than $25 per week.

As far back as September 20, 1945, a bill putting these very recommendations into effect passed the Senate. It has been pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means ever since. A petition to discharge the committee, which in my opinion has been holding the bill far too long, is now being circulated. How can anyone doubt the urgent need for such legislation to tide us over the reconversion period? How can anyone be so callous as to deny this assistance to our workers, who labored so mightily in the cause of the United Nations, when through no fault of their own they are unable to secure gainful employment?

The President's program also deals with minimum wages. Because of the pitifully inadequate minimum wages provided for under existing law, President Truman has asked the Congress for a substantial increase to a level which would eliminate substandards of living and assure the maintenance of the health, the efficiency, and the general well-being of all workers. A bill putting these recommendations into effect has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and is now on the Senate Calendar awaiting a vote.

While the war was in progress, a Fair Employment Practices Committee was set up to protect minority groups against discrimination in employment based upon race, religion, and color. Now, President Truman has asked the Congress to place this committee on a permanent basis. But as you all know, the legislation was frustrated by a filibuster. To my mind this set-back is only temporary. Surely, we and our gallant allies have fought too hard and sacrificed too much to revert to the practices of our vanquished enemies.

There is no room in this Nation, indeed, there is no room in the entire world, for prejudice, whether it be based on race, color, religion, or economic position.

Our own Senator WAGNER is sponsoring a bill to enlarge and extend the benefits under the present Social Security Act. It gives assurance to all our people of a secure and tranquil old age, free from the constant nagging fear of poverty—surely this is an objective worthy of the highest American ideals and our best efforts.

Finally, there is the problem of full employment. The President asked the Congress to declare as a national policy that every American citizen able and willing to work has a right to work; that it is the duty of the Government to use its own resources to provide the jobs if all other methods should fail to prevent prolonged unemployment. He asked that such full-employment legislation be speedily enacted to provide these vital assurances. The Full Employment Act, marking substantial progress toward that goal, was signed by the President on February 29, 1946.

These measures to which I have referred relate only to a part of the 21-point program which President Truman has presented to the Congress and to the country for approval. The President's program embraces America's foreign policy as well as its domestic policy; its domestic program includes programs for agriculture, for business as well as for labor. I have discussed only those portions of the program which apply directly to the welfare of our wage earners. Unemployment compensation, minimum wages, fair employment practices, social security, full employment. A veritable charter of economic rights for the working men and women of America.

This is a Democratic charter, the charter of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the charter of President Truman; but it also is much more. It is the charter of progressive and forward looking men and women. It is difficult to conceive of any who would not subscribe to its principles in this enlightened age.

Unfortunately, however, such persons do exist. They are the politicos who are wooing the people with the siren song of "back to normalcy." They are the economic primitives who would have us go back to the corrupt days of Harding, the do-nothing days of Coolidge, the tragic days of Hoover. Some of these men are only thoughtless. Dazzled by the mirage of immediate profits, they would again lead us blindly to our doom. Others, and these are more dangerous, are deliberately attempting to sabotage all forward-looking and progressive legislation. These are the greedy fishers in troubled waters, who hope, to gain a few undeserved advantages for themselves. These are the short-sighted spokesmen of privilege, who see in economic chaos an opportunity to gnaw at and destroy the rights of labor, or, as they cynically boast, "to put labor in its place."

I wish I could tell you that these spokesmen are powerless. I wish I could say that they constitute no threat to the program of the Democratic Party. Unfortunately, such is not the case. Many essential parts of President Truman's 21-point program are being blocked by a powerful lobby. In committees and on the floor of Congress, the Republicans, aided by a few reactionary members of our own party, are fighting tooth and nail to prevent the passage of President Truman's liberal legislation.

The Republican Party, like its famous symbol, the elephant, never forgets. But unlike that worthy animal, it never learns anything new, especially when it would benefit the worker, the farmer, or the small businessman. Even when a man of vision arises in its own ranks and points out the error of its ways, the reactionary party leadership turns a deaf ear.

The Republicans have no program of their own to offer. They are unable to present any constructive contribution. They have descended to a campaign of smearing, sniping, and obstructing. They load their little popguns with charges of "communism," of "labor domination," of "waste of public funds," and shoot them off in reckless disregard of the facts. Senator TAFT, the leader of the Republican Steering Committee of the Senate, has charged that the idea of full employment is taken directly out of the Soviet constitution. Well, it certainly wasn't taken from the Hoover platform. A decade ago that omission alone was enough to lead the Republicans to attack any forward-looking measure as communistic. That's how they originally tried to defeat the social-security legislation, and measure after measure in the New Deal program. After these reforms were accomplished the GOP embraced them as their own. They are for reforms where they become popular.

The American people with good common sense have not been taken in by these professional "viewers with alarm," or by their fellow popgun artists. The American people have known that these measures would serve their best interests, and in due course they became a permanent part of the law in the land. The American people have chosen brave, courageous deeds and legislation in preference to popgun propaganda.

Yes, under the leadership of the Democratic Party we have come a long way on the path to permanent prosperity for all; but let's face it—there is still a long way to go. In this battle to achieve fundamental human rights there can be no standing still. It is not possible to say, "All right, we've done pretty well. Let's take it easy for awhile." That way lies complacency; and complacency leads in turn to inevitable stagnation and decay. No, that was not the way of Franklin D. Roosevelt; that is not the way of President Truman; it is not the way of the Democratic Party as long as we have a single underpaid, undernourished, or underclothed American. Rather we shall push ahead, secure in the knowledge that our fight is the good fight, the fight fully to achieve the great charter of economic rights which President Truman so clearly stated in his message to Congress. We may suffer temporary set-backs, even partial defeats; but the American people are with us; they have repeatedly expressed their confidence in us; and with their support we will carry on to full and ultimate victory in the tradition of our late beloved leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Proposed Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials in endorsement of the proposal for the reorganization of Congress submitted recently on behalf of his committee by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register of March 5, 1946]

REORGANIZATION PLAN FOR CONGRESS

The reorganization plan recommended for Congress yesterday by its streamlining committee, which began work about a year ago, contains 37 specific points.

Some of these proposals undoubtedly will be popular on Capitol Hill. It is suggested, for instance, that Members of Congress, now paid $10,000 a year, should receive $15,000, an increase of $5,000. There is much feeling even outside Congress that salaries of the Nation's lawmakers are too low.

Still other recommendations, such as the idea of providing an $8,000-a-year administrative assistant for each Member to handle office routine, may be expected to find favor among many lawmakers, all of whom spend much time on nonlegislative matters.

But one recommendation, at least, is going to fall far short of unanimous enthusiasm. Others may encounter similar experience, but this one in particular—that of eliminating more than half of the congressional standing committees—is in for quite a bit of coolness.

The streamlining committee would reduce the Senate committees from 33 to 16 and the House committees from 48 to 18. It suggested that each Senator should hold membership on no more than two committees and that each Representative should be limited to one major committee assignment.

The report named the present committee system as the No. 1 problem in attempting to reorganize Congress. The system as now existing was held to be obsolete and overlapping. In the Senate, especially, the committee load is heavy. Some Members serve on as many as 10 standing and special committees. The situation in the House does not equal that, but some Members of that branch serve on as many as a half dozen committees.

But when it comes to doing away with 17 Senate committees and 30 House committees, opposition can be expected from some of those who hold or have ambitions to hold committee chairmanships.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of March 10, 1946]

A PROMISING BEGINNING

"A new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. * * * The time is ripe for Congress to reconsider its role in the American scheme of government and to modernize its organization and procedures."

These are not the words of a hostile critic or an iconoclastic outsider. They are the conclusion of a joint committee of the Congress itself which has just discharged the duty assigned to it by resolution of the body. This committee was headed by the veteran Wisconsin Progressive, Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., and the young Oklahoman, Representative MIKE MONRONEY. Among the members were two Georgians, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and Representative E. E. COX. Among the recommendations made after a year's study are these:

That the Senate's 33 standing committees be consolidated into 16, the House's 48 to 18, and that Congress cease creating special investigating committees.

That the reconstituted committees be staffed with specialists and experts, and that Members' offices be provided with such assistants.

That majority and minority policy committees be formed in both branches to formulate the over-all legislative policies of the two parties.

That Congress be relieved of much of the Members' work load by giving self-rule to the District of Columbia and by shifting from Congress to the Federal courts and the Court of Claims the settlement of the innumerable private claims filed against the Government every year.

That the pay of Members be raised to $15,000 a year and that they be given retirement benefits.

Also proposed was an intricate program for the formulation of the annual budget, a

matter so involved that it cannot be summarized and characterized in a few words. But the proposal is so far from becoming an accomplished fact and will be the subject of so much debate that editorial consideration of it may well be postponed until the matter reaches the floor.

The important thing is that Congress generally realizes there is pressing need for streamlining the legislative branch of the Government, and has made a good start toward that end.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of March 11, 1946]

NOW UP TO CONGRESS TO STREAMLINE ITSELF

Because it directly affects the structure and the procedure of Congress, the report submitted last week by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress constitutes one of the most important documents to be presented to the national legislature since it was first established.

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., of Wisconsin, was chairman, and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, was vice chairman of the committee. The group held 39 public hearings and 4 executive sessions between March 13 and June 29, 1945. The testimony of 102 witnesses was taken, 45 of whom were Members of Congress. A mass of written statements was presented the committee.

The report makes this introductory note:

"A review of all the testimony received reveals a wide area of agreement among the witnesses with respect both to the conditions that handicap Congress in the efficient performance of its proper functions and as to many appropriate remedies for these defects. In evaluating the suggestions, we have been guided by what Justice Holmes called 'the felt necessities of the time.' To all these proposals we have applied the simple test: Will they strengthen Congress and enable it to do a better job?"

The whole tenor of the report, together with its detailed recommendations, attests to the clarity of judgment, the measured study, and the practicability of the "felt necessities" that characterize it.

At least insofar as it points to the causes of the snail-like pace with which Capitol Hill so frequently moves, the report is the answer to the much-heard and oft-repeated question: "What's the matter with Congress?"

The committee promptly named at the outset the dominant weakness in the congressional set-up:

"Your committee believes that no adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous work load that present-day governmental problems place upon it."

The framers of the report in so many words told Congress that no organization reform would be worthy the name that failed to rid the Legislature of its creaking committee machinery.

Capitol Hill, doubtless, will take the rest of the report more or less in stride. Toward some of it, Members will smack their lips in agreement. As to committee changes, that's something else.

Congressmen will relish the proposed increase in their pay from $10,000 to $15,000 a year. They'll like an administrative executive in each Member's office at the titdy stipendium of $8,000 a year. They will greet with approval a "stenographic pool" to help out Members swamped with mail. They will appreciate, too, the proposed bigger and better staffs for committees.

But reforms suggested in the report that cut in congressional personal power and influence may prove to be stumbling blocks to effective organization.

Members are not going to like the recommendation reducing the number of committees from 33 to 16 in the Senate and from 48 to 18 in the House and an end to special investigating committees. That is socking members where it hurts. Unfortunately many will think about their personal loss rather than in terms of the committee's test, "Will it strengthen Congress and enable it to do a better job?"

A committee chairman wields considerable influence, not only over legislation but also in the executive branch of Government. What head of an executive agency would have the temerity to say "No" to favors asked by the chairman of a committee which will pass on legislation sought by that agency?

Moreover, each committee has a large clerical staff. In the nature of things that staff performs work for the chairman outside of his committee duties. Then, too, the voters back home are impressed when their Senator or Representative holds down a committee chairmanship. Although there are but 81 chairmen of standing committees in Congress, there are 162 other Members, or even 243, who see a chairmanship not far ahead of them in the future—if the election gods are propitious and the voters kind, for chairmanships go by seniority.

There are many other recommendations proposed in the report that reveal the need for reforms here and changes there to speed up congressional work and efficiency.

As an American citizen, frequently disgusted at the dilatory tactics of certain Congressmen, you will be interested in this comment of the report:

"A high percentage of congressional time is devoted to matters of purely local or petty importance. * * * Private claims bills and inconsequential legislation dealing with local affairs and matters only slightly related to national policy take an excessive amount of congressional time from consideration of national affairs. Because of lack of congressional time, many matters of policy nature are decided by executive departments and bureaus."

Request your Senator or Representative to send you a copy of the report. It is a lesson in government. Then ask yourself how are the reforms to be achieved.

That's up to Congress. It is not going to be easy for the peculator to abandon the primrose path which has been so long, so pleasant, and so fruitful.

Russia's Claims and Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Russia's Claims and Plans" published in the Shreveport (La.) Times of March 19, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S CLAIMS AND PLANS

Spokesmen for the Soviet Government have about quit trying to pretend that Russia has no intention of controlling, directly or indirectly, vast areas never before considered of any legitimate interest to Russia. The contention in Moscow now is a smugly projected inference that in grabbing whatever she thinks she could grab Russia simply is "doing what the Americans and the British did years ago."

It might be mentioned that, if Russia's contention were true, there still would be the very important point that World Wars I and II were fought with the idea of doing away with a lot of things that were done decades or even years ago, especially unwarranted and unprovoked aggression by the strong against the weak. But the real point is that Russia's contention that she is "doing what the Americans and British did years ago" simply is no more true than about 90 percent of the other statements coming out of Moscow these days concerning international property rights.

No one could question that the British Empire was created on a foundation of what today would be called imperialism. But no one can look at the British Empire today with open eyes and fail to realize that those subjected to imperialism in the past are far above it, or rising above it very rapidly, in the present.

The British Dominions are tied by blood and interests to Mother England, but they do pretty well what they wish governmentally and in world affairs. England today, for example, is an economic dependent on Canada, having just arranged to borrow a great many hundreds of millions of dollars from that Dominion. Canada, and other British Dominions, naturally side quickly with England in war, but special laws have to be passed before Canada, for example, can send fighting forces beyond the Canadian border. And Canada determinates all of her own economic affairs, as well as political affairs, as was very clearly shown during the war—and right now, too—by Canada's refusal to go to the same extent in rationing to help her motherland, England, as the United States in helping the nation we defeated in war to gain our own independence.

Eire has made itself fully independent and free of all British influence. India has been offered dominion status and could have it or even independence in time if the Indians—the Moslems and the Hindus—could agree among themselves. The great problem of India is far more internal than external.

As for the United States, everything worth while that we have acquired in the way of territory since the Revolution came through negotiation with other nations—extension to the Mississippi, the vast Louisiana Purchase, the Floridas, the Oregon country. Texas, California, and other territory in the West did come as part of the ending of the Mexican War, but Mexico's authority over these areas long before had disintegrated and annexation was by full consent of those concerned. We took the Philippines from Spain, but Spain was the aggressor in starting the war and our whole period of authority over the Philippines has been one of turning them to full independence, and the same principle applies to Puerto Rico. They were not integral parts of another nation, as are the parts of Iran, Turkey, and China, which Russia is attempting to grab.

The whole difference is that the United States expanded without violating the rights of any other nation, whereas Russia seeks territorial expansion to great extent through deliberate, uncalled-for aggression—the violation by force, or threat of force, of the rights of nations innocent of wrong to Russia.

Everyone can understand Russia's desire for security, her desire to make it impossible for another aggressor to ravish her lands and people as Germany did. All nations want such security. But where is the border line between justified security and unjustified aggression? Here, for example, is what Russia

already has acquired, or taken in the name of security during or since World War II:

	Square Miles	Population
Lithuania	24,058	3,029,000
Latvia	20,056	1,950,000
Estonia	18,353	1,120,000
Eastern Poland	62,290	10,150,000
Bessarabia and Bukovinia	19,360	3,748,000
Moldavia	13,124	2,200,000
Carpatho-Ukraine	4,922	800,000
East Prussia	3,500	400,000
Karelo-Finland	16,173	470,000
Petsamo, Finland	4,087	4,000
Tanna Tuva, Central Asia	64,000	65,000
Southern Sakhalin	14,075	415,000
Kurile Islands	3,949	4,500
Total	273,947	24,355,500

Perhaps a good argument, from the Russian side, could be made to justify much of the above. But Russia has not stopped there. She also has obtained naval bases in Finland, and in China (Port Arthur), and has acquired joint ownership of the Manchurian railroad, and used that ownership to take and transport huge quantities of supplies, industrial and otherwise, from Manchuria.

The Soviet already has acquired, as the New York Times points out, territory equal to a great portion of the entire eastern United States. Yet she seeks more—a zone in north Africa that will be convenient to the Atlantic area jumping-off places for South America and North America across that ocean, while already being within 3 or 4 miles of Alaska from the other side of the globe. She seeks dominating influence, or actual territory control, at the western end of the Mediterranean and at the eastern end, in the Dardanelles area and elsewhere.

All of this has come after a war fought by Russia as well as by Great Britain and the United States under a banner of "no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise." And, the more Russia takes or is granted, the more she seeks.

Of course, it would be very easy to have real and lasting peace with Russia, to put an end to all disagreements, misunderstandings, et cetera. All that is necessary is for Great Britain and the United States to surrender, physically and in toto, the people as well as the land, to Russia as conquered countries. That definitely would prevent World War III, and after such surrender Russia would have little trouble with South America, the British dominions, and such areas. She'd just send the United States Navy and air forces and the British land forces into action to grab the rest of the world for her, while Stalin et al. sat comfortably at home sipping vodka.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Cornelius H. Callaghan, executive vice president of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on February 28, 1946.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CORNELIUS H. CALLAGHAN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, THE MARITIME ASSOCIATION OF THE PORT OF NEW YORK, IN OPPOSITION TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT (S. J. RES. 104) BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FEBRUARY 26, 1946

My name is Cornelius H. Callaghan. I am the executive vice president of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, organized in 1873.

Embraced within the membership of 1,350 persons are the steamship lines, coastwise, intercoastal, and foreign; steamship owners; agents and operators; oil and tanker companies; chartering brokers; canal and harbor transportation; shipbuilders and ship repairers; drydocks; coal companies; railroads; freight forwarders and customs brokers; warehouses and terminals; towing, lighterage, and wrecking companies. Also included are shipping interests in the ports of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts providing employment to hundreds of thousands of workers afloat and ashore, not only in the port of New York but in all other parts of the United States.

As president of my own companies, I chartered and handled many ships in world trades and operated Shipping Board vessels. I maintained an agency at Norfolk and handled at that port many hundreds of ships for Shipping Board operators and other interests. As president of the Erie Basin Breakwater Lumber Terminal, handled many ships discharging from Puget Sound and British Columbia. Also represented an intercoastal line for many years, operating between North Atlantic ports and the Pacific coast. Was agent and cable and chartering broker for foreign steamshipowners and handled ships to all parts of the world.

I have been a member of the Maritime Exchange for more than 40 years, serving as vice president and director and chairman of many of its important committees, including rivers, harbor, and piers committee and as president of the bureau for the suppression of theft and pilferage. Was agent and chartered many ships with grain from Montreal to the Continent and Mediterranean. I terminated my business career in 1933, taking charge of the affairs of the Maritime Association as manager and in May 1945 was appointed executive vice president which position I now hold.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

The canalization of the St. Lawrence River has been fully discussed before the American people for the past decade. The overwhelming mass of testimony and facts presented in opposition to this project in 1934 and again in 1941 clearly showed the injury that would be inflicted on labor and the transportation systems of the United States, and the destruction of property value in the great seaports on the Atlantic and Gulf and the Great Lakes.

This project which holds such harmful possibility to the greater part of the United States and which is of doubtful value to those States advocating the measure, is not an improvement that would be helpful to the country at large. I shall discuss the transportation and navigation features and the demoralizing effect on shipping and commerce and the economical life of our country.

THE FUTILITY OF THE WATERWAY

A summary of the more economic factors conclusively demonstrates the futility of the St. Lawrence waterway for the following reasons:

Commercially and economically unsound.

Imposition of inordinate tax burdens without corresponding benefits.

Diversion of traffic from railroads, steamship lines, and inland waterways.

Permanent detrimental effect upon banking, industry, employment, and purchasing power.

Impairments of property and rental values resulting in diminution of tax returns to the Federal Government, States, and cities.

Dangers of navigating the proposed waterway.

Cost underestimated.

Will increase unemployment, affecting a vast army of railroad employees. miners, seamen, longshoremen, and labor in many industries.

Will impair the fulfillment of the policy of Congress to foster the development and maintenance of a merchant marine for the transportation of the commerce of the United States on essential trade routes.

TIME LIMIT TO 7 MONTHS' OPERATION

There can be little justification for this proposed facility that would only provide transportation facilities for about 7 months of a year. The crucial factor in the consideration of the navigation feature of the proposed St. Lawrence development is the time that safe navigation is permitted. If the waterway were available for 12 months operation, the same as the Panama, Suez, and other canals, it would present a different picture.

No prudent shipowner will violate the time of trading in North American waters contrary to the restrictions in charter parties or insurance policies. The produce form of time charter definitely stipulated that trading in the St. Lawrence River between October 31 and May 15 is excluded.

Norwegian hull policies stipulated that vessels must not pass Cape Rosier, Gaspe Peninsula (the entrance into the Gulf of St. Lawrence) later than November 25, and must leave Quebec November 30. If vessels leave after these dates, they are subject to an indefinite extra insurance premium. Vessels may not enter earlier than April 25.

Under the North American agreement (British American Institute warranties), the summer season for insurance on hulls dates from May 15 to November 15 and the winter season from November 16 to May 14. During the latter period the insurance rate on hulls is twice as high as in the summer season. During the month of March, as many as five ice breakers are employed in the St. Lawrence breaking ice which drifts down to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Ice has been found in these waters during May and is a hindrance and danger to navigation.

DANGER OF NAVIGATION OF THE CANALIZED SECTION

Attached to this statement (for the record) are extracts from a report to the Montreal Board of Trade by eminent engineers describing the dangerous character of certain places in the proposed canal that would make navigation extremely hazardous with crews (even with a pilot aboard) of ocean-going steamers who are not familiar with prevailing conditions.

THE SAFE MAXIMUM DRAFT A VESSEL SHOULD DRAW TO NAVIGATE THE CANALIZED SECTIONS

Proponents have testified that United States flag ships could navigate the 27-foot channel, drawing 25 feet. The Port Warden regulations in Montreal for ocean-going ships require draft clearance of 2 feet 6 inches for ships of 8,500 tons dead weight; 3 feet for 10,500 tons dead weight; 3 feet 6 inches for 12,000 tons dead weight. Our Liberty and Victory ships, loaded drafts, are 27 feet 9¼ inches and 28 feet 3¾ inches, respectively.

One of the chief commodities to be moved from American and Canadian Lake ports is grain. Heavy grain will usually load a vessel down to full dead-weight capacity. On such a commodity or other dead-weight

cargo such as iron, steel, etc., usually carried at the lowest possible level of freight rates, it would not be economical to load an American ship, in competition with foreign-flag ships, two or three thousand tons or more short of full dead-weight capacity.

It is unlikely that any prudent ship operator would attempt to load a ship deeper than 24 feet because of the dangerous and tortuous channels in fog, etc., as due allowance must be made for the 2½-foot clearance at Montreal, squat and variation of the fresh water.

It is safe to predict that very few United States-flag ships would operate in the Great Lakes. The largest ships are too deep draft, the smaller ships could not compete in the overseas trades on account of the higher cost of operation. We do not hesitate to predict that if the waterway is constructed, it will be used mostly by foreign-flag ships, especially the light-draft Scandinavian motorized ships which will carry full cargoes on 18 to 24 feet.

THE GREAT LAKES FLEET

World War I was won and was dependent in great part, the same as World War II, on iron ore. The Lakes fleet lifted some 90,000,000 tons of iron ore yearly. This fleet, on this one commodity, was indispensable in the national defense and security.

To exist in peacetimes, this fleet is dependent on the movement of iron ore, coal, and grain. If grain is moved directly through the waterway by foreign-flag ships and if foreign coals are delivered in American lake ports by foreign-flag ships on a ballast-rate basis, such a condition must inevitably result in ultimate scrapping of the Great Lakes fleet and the throwing out of employment of the vast number of seamen employed in manning this fleet, shore and shipyard workers, miners, and other classes of labor. The loss to shipyards and ship-repair plants located in the Great Lakes by the elimination of the Great Lakes fleet would tend to offset any predicted gain in shipbuilding.

In emphasizing the importance of the Great Lakes fleet in the transportation of iron ore during Wars I and II, it would be well to remember that owing to submarine activity, the importation of iron ore from foreign ports was prevented. If the Great Lakes fleet is destroyed by foreign competition as outlined, and War III should occur, and the importation of foreign iron ores is prevented due to enemy activity, the railroads are unable to handle the vast tonnage required, then the very life of this country would be imperiled.

An able and conservative engineer has stated, "As long as the iron mines on Lake Superior and the coal mines last, and as long as wars are still a possibility, the transportation system built around water carriers on the Great Lakes will be one of the greatest elements of military and naval strength."

THE EFFECT ON THE GREAT LAKES EXPORTER AND IMPORTER

The proponents have consistently emphasized the great saving in freight rates to the exporter in the Great Lakes area which, for various reasons, may not materialize.

Prior to the war, the shipper or exporter enjoyed frequency of steamship services from the seaboards—in fact, in some cases daily sailings were available from New York to Europe and, in all cases, for 12 months of the year. On the other hand, the great diversion of traffic from the seaboards to foreign-flag ships mostly operating from the Great Lakes, will cause demoralization of rate structures and berth operations both on United States and foreign-flag steamships. We have had in normal times over 30 steamship lines operating from New York to the United Kingdom, Continent, and Mediterranean and if the claims of the proponents are true in whole or in part that such an enormous traffic would be developed in the Great Lakes, we do not hesitate to predict that many steamship owners would be compelled to reduce or abandon sailings from the seaboards to avoid bankruptcy.

The importer should realize that for a long period to come, with millions of persons starving in Europe and the East, there can be little doubt that labor conditions in these deteriorated and devastated countries will be at an extremely low ebb. If the St. Lawrence is opened to foreign ships, the low-priced, pauperized labor products of the world will enter into direct competition with the mines, the forests, the fields, and the factories of those Midwest States who are seeking this facility and who, by their very distance from the seaboards, are enjoying a degree of protection against the dumping of the world's cheaply produced commodities.

It is obvious that the United States importer, paying a high price for labor today, would be at a serious disadvantage with the cheaper products that would be landed directly in the ports of the Great Lakes. In accordance with our reciprocal trade policy with many countries, we cannot consistently deny the right of the foreign shipper to market his goods in the United States. If, on the other hand, the foreign shipper, desiring to market his products in the Great Lakes area, was to ship via the seaboard, paying the rail rates would lessen the advantage to said shipper than if he delivered his merchandise directly by foreign steamers in Great Lakes ports.

During the closed season of navigation, 5 months or more, no alleged gain in saving in freight rates could compensate for the impairment of steamship services from the seaboards, nor could these shippers expect the same freight rates as they otherwise would enjoy.

During the open season of navigation when a large amount of traffic would be diverted from the railroads, impairing income, the railroads would still be expected to maintain roadbeds and equipment in a high state of efficiency in order to handle all available traffic in the event of an emergency that would make the use of the waterway impracticable, and also during the closed season of navigation when the cost of operation to the railroads on account of cold, snow, and ice is greatly increased over that during the open period of navigation.

POTENTIAL TRAFFIC

The survey report admits a large diversion of import and export traffic from New York but asserts that this loss would be more than compensated by new business via the waterway between the Lakes and New York. The report states that this loss, import and export traffic, would amount on the average to about 1,800,000 tons of traffic a year. The report further states "since diversion of coastwise traffic from New York Harbor will be more than compensated by new traffic, the only net diversion one needs to evaluate is in foreign commerce." There will be a loss of import and export traffic from New York and Atlantic and Gulf seaboards if the claims of the proponents are true. The serious injury to ports, shipping, commerce, industries, railroads, and labor by the diversion of a considerable amount of the present traffic via the waterway, of foreign commerce, is a matter of concern to the interests affected.

We cannot attempt to analyze the specious reasonings that would suggest a steamship service from, say, Chicago to New York, a distance of 2,800 miles subject to the usual delays and risks attending ocean operation, including higher insurance, as against the safe and existing facilities of the New York State Canal System which is less than one-half the distance via Buffalo and Oswego.

The proponents have testified, based on the St. Lawrence Survey Report, part III, a potential traffic in excess of 4,600,000 tons of cargo, foreign and domestic combined. It is fair to assume that such a large amount of traffic would presumably be at the expense of the railroads and the ocean carrier operating to and from New York and other seaports along the Atlantic and the Gulf coasts.

BANANAS

Time does not permit an analysis of the potential traffic of the commodities contained in the survey report, part III. It will suffice, as an example, to discuss at least one of the commodities mentioned therein—bananas. The unwarranted conclusion of 200,000 tons of bananas as potential traffic is apparently predicated on three assumptions and is, to say the least, theoretical, fantastic, and erroneous.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Presently, we have under the United States flag, approximately 5,500 vessels which is over one-half the total of all other flag vessels. The disposal of most of this fleet has engaged the attention of Congress for many months. The experience of War II has taught us that the American merchant marine is an integral part of our national defense, fully as necessary as the Army, Navy, or air strength. Almost of equal importance to the maintenance of an adequate merchant marine is the steamship owner and operator who should be encouraged to develop their organizations with trained personnel, etc.

It is a difficult problem to solve and should not in any way be complicated by the menace and threat of the opening of the Great Lakes to deeper draft ships that would come in direct competition with the regularly established foreign freight services (both United States and foreign flags) from New York.

During such times as heavy grain movements may be available directly from ports at the head of the Lakes, tramp steamers seeking such grain will take part or full cargoes at any port in the world at very low nonconference rates, or on a charter party basis bearing no relationship to established berth rates, thereby weakening the rate structures on homeward cargoes and curtailing liner services.

If essential trade routes are to be maintained and employment provided for the large fleet of ships, it is absolutely necessary that all the traffic should be concentrated for these services from the Atlantic and Gulf ports for a continuous 12 months' operation.

The United States Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, and other branches of the Government are not vitally interested in the development of essential trade routes to world ports. Our off-shore lines, in competition with foreign lines, it has been said, will need Government support and to some extent Government subsidy. American shipping interests consider that a fair share of our export and import trade for American flag ships is on a basis of about 50 percent of the total traffic. It is obviously necessary for the economical operation of such trade routes to maintain as near as possible a two-way trade.

The threat of the St. Lawrence project will be a vital hazard to the investment of substantial sums of private capital in the purchase of United States flag ships. It is probable that steamship operators when purchasing vessel tonnage might find it necessary to request the Government to make some contingent provision for protection against the consummation of the St. Lawrence waterway.

THE STATE AND CITY OF NEW YORK

The State of New York has never opposed essential improvements in any harbor or waterway in the United States notwithstanding that this State contributes more than any other State to the total Federal expense and if the project is consummated, would be called upon to pay proportionately a larger share of maintenance and other charges.

If the diversion of traffic from Buffalo, Albany, New York City, and other cities of the State would be as great as represented, it is estimated that the welfare of 500,000 people would be seriously affected. The port of New York during the past 5 years dispatched some 40,000 ships through its gateway and the facilities of this great port have served the entire Nation. To weaken and destroy these facilities by the diversion of a goodly part of its traffic to foreign vessels operating in the heart of the continent through the Great Lakes would be detrimental to the best interests of the country.

THE PROPOSED DEEPER WATERWAY—ITS VULNERABILITY—AND THE MENACE TO NATIONAL SECURITY

The contention that the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway would be an important contribution to our national defense is vulnerable to attack.

I quote extracts from a warning by Richard W. Lawrence before the convention of the New York State Waterways Association at the Maritime Exchange, October 20, 1939:

"Let us suppose that the earlier opposition to the St. Lawrence development had failed and that the waterway had been constructed and was in operation. What would be its international status today with Canada, as a dominion of Great Britain, at war with a nation with which the United States is at peace? Would Canada permit the United States to ship commodities through the waterway to a country which was at war with Great Britain or to any other country though it suspected the exports would find their way to an enemy nation?

"Or let us assume that the United States was at war with a nation with which Canada was at peace. Would the general principle of international law, prohibiting belligerents from shipping through neutral territory, prevent our use of the waterway? Would the same principle operate against Canada using the waterway if she were fighting a nation with which the United States was friendly?

"Assuming further that both the United States and Canada had completed the proposed power development along the St. Lawrence and that Canada was at war, as she is today (1939), her power plants would be potential objects of air attacks and, with the mistakes all too frequently made in the selection of targets, the process of destruction could easily involve United States power properties or power interests.

"Despite the treaty of 1871, which provides that navigation on the St. Lawrence forever shall be free to citizens of the United States, it is not difficult to imagine situations arising in time of international crisis where our good neighbor on the other side of the river might feel forced by the exigencies of war or otherwise find it expedient to prohibit American vessels from using that part of the waterway which is wholly within Canadian territory.

"Regardless of what, I hope, is the improbability of such complications ever arising, I feel nevertheless that it would be most unwise for the United States to make a tremendous expenditure of public funds to deepen the St. Lawrence when its only outlet to the sea is entirely within a foreign jurisdiction. Many of you will remember the warning on this phase of the project sounded by that distinguished statesman, the late Henry Cabot Lodge, father of the present junior United States Senator from Massachusetts. He said: 'We ought to think long before we join with another country to make a waterway which we cannot control. The people who control the mouth of a river control the river. We are taking some risk when we put control of a large portion of our most important commerce in the hands of another country.'

"That was sound advice then. It is even sounder advice today, when time has swept away the flimsy claims on which the St. Lawrence waterway first made its bid for recognition as an undertaking which would be of vast benefit to the Nation.

"Let us hope that if the United States Senate again should be asked to approve the treaty which would force us into this ill-conceived undertaking, it will be defeated so overwhelmingly that no group will have the temerity to revive it again."

Due to the friendly relationship between the United States and Canada, fortifications have been unnecessary. The operation of foreign vessels in the Great Lakes has been confined to a few small craft on account of the limited 14-foot channel.

The vulnerability of the St. Lawrence is apparent when one act of sabotage, either in the locks or the canalized section, would be sufficient to close the entrance from the sea, and, furthermore, the scuttling of one ship or more, athwart the 500-foot channel, would well bottle up the St. Lawrence River.

If the canalization of the canal is consummated, it would seem essential that it be heavily fortified from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the head of the Great Lakes. This may necessitate the acquisition of reservations suitable for defense installations and their maintenance; also, a sufficient number of air bases may be necessary.

The St. Lawrence project should be considered as a treaty and not as an agreement. We respectfully urge your distinguished committee to report the proposed St. Lawrence development unfavorably as detrimental to the welfare of the Nation.

Oil States Cannot Afford to Reduce Allowables if Price Control Is Taken Off, Since Importation of Oil Would Be Permitted in That Event

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the best authorities on oil in the entire world is the Honorable Ernest O. Thompson, long time a railroad commissioner in Texas. I have just received a telegram from him to the effect that the prices should be taken off oil and petroleum products. In addition to bringing this telegram to the attention of the House Committee on Banking and Currency that is now considering the extension of the Office of Price Administration for another year, I am inserting the telegram in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Our commission is of the opinion that OPA price controls are no longer necessary in the oil- and petroleum-products line. There are huge surpluses of crude in storage and top-heavy surpluses of gasoline. The only shortage is in fuel and heating oils and this shortage is due to OPA policy of hitherto unprofitable operating price on these products which I understand they are correcting so the refiners will turn out those products as needed. There need be no fear of State regulatory authorities reducing production allowables below consumptive demand. Congress took proper care of that when the law approving the interstate oil compact was passed by providing that the President might permit an increase in imports of crude oil any time the State regulatory authorities refused to supply the needs.

Naturally the oil-producing States would never cut themselves out of the oil-producing business by inviting imports. Today finished gasoline is running over the tanks and piling up wastefully. I should be glad to come up there and testify before the O'Mahoney committee, if you will arrange it and let me know. We are all grateful to you for your splendid work on oil.

ERNEST O. THOMPSON.

President Truman's Address at Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Truman at the Jackson Day dinner in Washington on March 23, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats everywhere, throughout America this evening, we of the Democratic Party are gathered to reaffirm our faith in the ideals of democracy. We are assembled in some 300 cities and towns to pledge ourselves again to the oldest and most practical principle in the history of men and nations—the democratic ideal in which America was conceived 170 years ago.

On this occasion we pay honor to the memory of a great American leader and a soldier of democracy—Andrew Jackson.

It was Andrew Jackson who led the good fight for social advancement and political progress against the forces of reaction. As the standard bearer of our party, Jackson made a living reality of the high democratic doctrines for which our men and our Nation fought and died—the extension of basic rights to all men. Down through the years, these doctrines have remained as guiding principles for the Democratic Party.

More recently there appeared another champion of social justice to revive and revitalize these principles—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

If that great humanitarian were among us today he would bring us a message of courage and faith. He would bring us a challenge to improve the lot of mankind everywhere. He would say, "Fight on!"

MUST MEET THE CHALLENGE

We of the Democratic Party must meet that challenge. Even though tremendous progress has been made, we must continue to fight on to attain our basic objectives—human freedom and human security. This is one fight which we must and will win.

Our Democratic Party became a great and powerful progressive party—one pioneering in new social fields and determined to abolish the tragic inequities of the past.

To hold our leadership, and the support of the American people, we must continually advance toward higher goals in keeping with our liberal heritage.

Political parties are the instruments through which democracy works. Our party system remains as one of the massive foundations of our liberty. Only the free play of political opposition can guarantee the survival of civil freedom.

Therefore, upon all of us rests a solemn responsibility to preserve our party system on a sound and wholesome basis. To achieve this, the leadership of all political parties must face the urgent issues frankly and act solely in accordance with our national welfare.

The Democratic Party has a long and proud record of achievement. But for continued success, we must live in the present and work for the future. As we seek to improve the social order, our policies must remain dynamic, ever sensitive to the impact of changing conditions.

FREE ENTERPRISE HAILED

The domestic program of this administration has been a program to make the system of free enterprise work. The Democratic administration has been quick to seek out the danger spots which threaten the system of free enterprise—and remove them. In a very practical sense, it has made enterprise free where it was not free before, and it has encouraged private competition where there was only monopoly.

We are seeking to establish higher standards of living—a new health program, a new education and social-security program, an increased minimum wage, adequate housing, a further development of our natural resources, and, above all, a strong and progressive America now and for all time.

Today America is in a period of transition. The aftermath of the war has brought new and pressing problems.

Without question, one of the most serious of these problems is the danger of a disastrous inflation and subsequent depression in our country.

Unless we can keep prices and rents under control until we have normal production flowing from our factories, our economic stability is in peril. But we Americans have every right to be confident of our ability to check inflation and to get production going full blast. During the war, in spite of the greatest inflationary pressures in our history, we learned that the cost of living could be kept in line. We must do as well in time of peace.

STRIKES AT SELFISHNESS

Our progress toward that goal has been delayed by technical bottlenecks that must be expected in reconverting our gigantic industrial machine from war to peacetime production.

But it is also being delayed, even more seriously, by doubt, fear and, in some cases, just plain selfishness.

To break both the technical and psychological bottlenecks, your administration announced last month a new policy concerning wages and prices. That plan is now going into operation. I am confident that it will pave the way for the greatest outpouring of consumer goods that the world has ever seen. It gives all of us—businessmen, workers, and farmers—assurance that wage and price adjustments will be made quickly when needed.

With the knowledge that all groups in this country are assured a fair and equitable return, we can expedite our vast production job, and still hold the line against runaway rents, soaring prices and prohibitive business costs.

Whenever conflicts between selfish and national interests arise, our country must come first. We will never permit our national welfare to be wrecked upon the rock of special privilege. Only by dedicating ourselves to the principle of national unity can we keep America strong and free.

And this same basic principle applies to the Democratic Party. As in the Nation at large, there is diversity of opinion among us, but the fundamental principles of the Democratic Party bind us together in a unity of purpose—an inflexible determination that our party shall advance to new and greater achievements.

PLEADS FOR UNITY OF PARTY

In order to accomplish this, we must keep faith with the American people. They have given us grave responsibilities. And we Democrats must continue to merit the confidence of our people. This administration will not be found wanting.

Under our party system, political responsibility must rest with the President and with the majority of Congress. To meet this responsibility, all our Members in the Congress must cooperate wholeheartedly and help carry out our party platform. Unless this is done, the party program is delayed. I cannot make too strong my plea for party unity and party responsibility.

Under our Democratic leadership we have set a goal of 2,700,000 new homes by the end of 1947—the greatest home-construction program in the history of this or any other country.

We have proposed legislation for this task. That legislation is now before the Congress. I have strongly urged its prompt enactment. In this connection, there are two proposed amendments to the pending housing measure which also are of vital importance: One to provide premium payments for expanded production of materials, and the other to prevent further speculation in existing housing.

There is constant pressure for an increase in the price of building materials. No one questions that some adjustments—both up and down—are needed, if we are to complete our building program at full speed. But price increases all along the line are clearly out of the question. The price of homes is already too high.

We must stimulate home building by methods which will not send prices skyrocketing far beyond the means of the average citizen. That is the reason for premium payments, which would be used to break bottlenecks.

The price controls we advocate are aimed specifically at halting further inflation in real estate. We urge that the future sale price of any home be made the ceiling price on that home for the duration of the emergency. Under this plan any home owner could sell his property in a free and open market. Howeyer, such property could not then be resold by a speculator for a higher price resulting in a quick and unearned profit.

The veterans returning from the battle fronts all over the world deserve the opportunity to obtain homes—and at reasonable prices. They must not become the victims of speculators. I am satisfied that the American people intend to give them a fair break. I am convinced that the veterans' emergency housing program can and will succeed.

My friends in Congress have got to make a choice. They have got to make up their minds whether they're for the veterans' rights or whether they are going to bow to the real-estate lobby.

This problem of reconversion involves much more than a physical change-over to the production of civilian goods. Our financial policies are also being adapted to meet our new peacetime needs. These policies will help greatly in maintaining high levels of production, employment, and national income.

We are on our way to a balanced budget and further reduction in the public debt. Full production, maximum employment, and a high national income will make this sound program possible. In the end, that is the only way to meet the Government's financial obligations and at the same time lessen the taxpayer's burden.

No phase of economic life has been so completely disrupted as our international economic relations. During the war, the bulk of foreign trade was done by or for governments. Here, too, there must be reconversion. World trade must be restored—and it must be returned to private enterprise.

We need a world in which all countries can do business with each other, and with us. That means giving other countries a chance to reconstruct their war-shattered lands. It also means maintaining orderly exchange arrangements through the cooperation of the United Nations. Already we have made substantial progress. Only a few days ago, at Savannah, Ga., the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund, created at Bretton Woods, became organized institutions.

The financial policies we are following are adapted to the needs of our time. I feel confident that they will help make this a strong and sound country in a free and progressive world.

WORLD LEADERSHIP STRESSED

The United States of America has achieved world leadership. For that result the Democratic Party, as the party of enlightened internationalism, is primarily responsible. We must maintain that leadership. And the Democratic Party must continue to lead the way.

A tremendous price has been paid for the peace and security we Americans enjoy tonight. Payment began long ago by our brave allies, who first bore the brunt of all-out aggression. At that time, our isolationists were still debating, and almost defeating, most efforts of Democratic leaders to improve the national defenses.

I say, without any partisan rancor, the cold record clearly reveals that our political opponents voted overwhelmingly against the most essential defense measures. Of course, when subsequent events proved beyond question their shortsightedness, most of our opponents changed their policy.

Yet many Republicans, of all people, then charged the Democratic administration with failure to prepare more adequately for events which they themselves said would never occur.

Do you remember back there when the Republicans called it a phony war?

LET US BE TOLERANT

Let us be tolerant, however, of the inconsistencies of man. Let us rather concentrate upon the urgent problems before us.

America must lead the way to a better world order. We seek increasingly close friendship with all nations. And we shall strengthen the foundations of the United Nations. Surely, we shall never retreat merely because of dangers along the road to peace and progress. Despite opposition and all difficulties, we shall attain our goal—a prosperous and peaceful world.

At home every one of us should subordinate the differences of the past to expedite the progress of the future. Let us devote ourselves to the important problems of peace, and to the promotion of the general welfare. They go hand in hand.

For without lasting peace in the world, prosperity and security at home become temporary illusions. And a repetition of such a tragedy as another war must not occur.

The solution of the tremendous social problems of our day should not be a partisan affair. No one class, group, or party can hope to solve all the complicated problems facing America. Their solution requires the wholehearted cooperation of every element within our great country. And America will reach its high destiny only if we remain strongly united in the endless quest for justice.

Above and beyond all political considerations, Americans deeply yearn for a sound and lasting peace. Not merely the future of our political parties is at stake in the coming peace settlements. The future welfare of our country is at stake. The happiness and the lives of your children and mine are at stake. For their sake, for America, and for all humanity, let us rededicate ourselves to the noble cause of peace.

As in Jackson's time, we Americans must continue to live courageously. We should emulate the valor and the determination of our forefathers—those brave men who conquered the physical frontiers of this vast continent.

The modern economic, political, and social frontiers, which still confront all of us, offer an even greater challenge to our moral stamina and to our intellectual integrity. This challenge also must be met. This victory must be won, I am confident that, with divine guidance, no problem on earth exists that will not yield to the intelligence, courage, and eternal faith of freemen.

Jackson Day Address of Hon. Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Secretary Wallace at the Jackson Day dinner on March 23, 1946:

Mr. President and fellow Democrats, the plain folks first marched into Washington when Andrew Jackson came to the White House. Ever since, Jackson Day has been the people's day—because Jackson, like Jefferson, stood for people first and property second.

Thomas Jefferson gave the Democratic Party its philosophy and spirit—the determination that our democratic system must provide both political and economic freedom. But it was Jackson who was able to make the first great strides in putting that belief into practice.

After Jackson, the Democratic Party became fat and lazy. Property became more important than people—and the plain folks looked elsewhere for leadership. Lincoln was put into the White House by the spiritual descendants of Andrew Jackson because he, like Jackson, put people first and property second.

Only one other Republican President followed Jacksonian principles. That man was Theodore Roosevelt. The reactionary leadership of the Republican Party has long been determined never to make that mistake again. They are true to their big stockholders. To them, property always must come first.

In their blind adherence to their reactionary tradition, they would never knowingly nominate a real progressive—even for the purposes of winning an election. They lost out to Wendell Willkie—and to this very day, the reactionary Republican leadership fills the air with imprecations and maledictions every time the name of Wendell Willkie is mentioned.

EPITAPH OF A JACKSONIAN

The greatest disciple of Andrew Jackson was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Speaking of Andrew Jackson, Franklin Roosevelt once said:

"They loved him for the enemies he made. An overwhelming proportion of the material power of the Nation was arrayed against him. The great media for the dissemination of information, and the molding of public opinion, fought him. Haughty and sterile intellectualism opposed him. Hollow and outworn traditionalism shook a trembling finger at him. It seemed sometimes that all were against him—all but the people of the United States."

Those were Roosevelt's words about the immortal Jackson. But history, in repeating itself, also writes these words as an epitaph to the immortal Roosevelt.

It was just a year ago, lacking 3 weeks, that Franklin Roosevelt was taken from us. Our memories of him are fresh and alive. And we here tonight must resolve to keep fresh and alive the heritage he left us.

The most precious things in this heritage are the people's fight for real political and economic democracy—and the people's fight for a strong United Nations Organization to provide and maintain a peace of abundance.

These two fights have been carried on unceasingly by Franklin Roosevelt's successor—Harry Truman.

I know that at times he has felt as Roosevelt felt—that they are all against him. And as the fight becomes more intense, he will feel this more and more. But Harry Truman can find courage as well as comfort in the knowledge that he is fighting in the brave and goodly company of Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt.

HEEDING VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

No President can hit hard in the people's cause without being reviled. But now is the time when hard blows must be struck. Now is the time for us to earn the bitter opposition of selfish men of special interests.

And, Mr. President, I know that you will forgive me, here, for taking a little glance ahead at Tuesday, November 5. We can stand the reviling, the insults—yes, even the lies—if we deserve and get the people's votes on that day.

The people believe as you do, Mr. President, that atomic energy must be under civilian control so that it may be a great blessing and not a curse. The people dislike all this talk of inevitable war. And the people don't want industrial strife.

The people want jobs that provide a decent annual income—jobs that produce a fair return to those who own the tools of production. They rejoice with you, Mr. President, that so many of the strikes have been fruitfully settled so that we, as a Nation, can now go to work on the biggest job of all—that of assuring full production and full employment.

Those who put property before people naturally decry the words—full production and full employment. They say these words are merely the catch phrases of demagogues. But the great voice of the people says differently. And as Jefferson and Jackson and Roosevelt knew and understood so well, that great voice speaks true and rings true.

DEDICATION TO WINNING PEACE

Also, Mr. President, the people rejoice in your forthright statement that the policy of your administration is steadfastly to avert even the causes that make for war. The people do not want to fight another war either with or against England or Russia or with or against any combination of nations.

They seek the open door of good neighborliness; they seek a well-founded and mutual confidence; they seek only peace, and they want to make the United Nations Organization a workable instrument to achieve these ends.

Peoples elsewhere throughout the world will demand the same from their leaders. They will demand this with a tremendous voice that arises from their combined sacrifice and suffering.

But to win this peace of continuous full profitable production and full gainful employment here at home, to win the peace of world cooperation based upon mutual confidence, to win the people's peace of abundance for all, we, as Democrats, must give effective and determined and fighting leadership.

We know that we cannot trust the reactionary Republican leadership to lead the Nation in this postwar period. We know what sins this leadership has committed upon the people in the name of Republican normalcy. This is the normalcy that gave us the senseless Republican tariff policies of the twenties and early thirties—and we know that the reactionary Republicans, like the Bourbons, never forget.

We know that a Republican congressional victory next fall would have a gravely disturbing effect on the whole international situation, for the traditional Republican isolationist policies would inevitably lead to world disaster. We know, finally, that this brand of normalcy will lead, as always, to boom, bust, and chaos.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE PARTY

But if we Democrats seek to continue to lead, we must be worthy as leaders. We must be the party of progress in a real two-party system, the party that offers hope of progress for all the people, regardless of color or creed.

Into this party we must welcome all independent Republicans—all independent Progressives everywhere—who seek progress and cannot find it elsewhere.

In our own party, we have been done great harm by those who have joined in a coalition against progress, by those who wrap themselves with the traditions of Jefferson and Jackson, but whose actions belie their pretensions.

So to keep our own party on the side of progress, we must call upon those Democrats who have been harmful to our cause to return to the way of Jefferson and Jackson and to honor our side of the fence with their "mugs" as well as their "wumps."

I say this without rancor because I spent some years on the mugwump fence myself, one of those seeking progress and who found a door to opportunity—and the door was labeled "the Democratic Party."

The Democratic Party must welcome every American, white and black, who believes in the rights of man. And to continue its national leadership, it must be irrevocably committed to the ideals and the down-to-earth practicality of Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt.

Then the Democratic Party can face the future unafraid, secure in the people's support. Then, we as a Nation can turn over to our children an abundant America in an abundant world, dedicated to continuous progress and to lasting peace.

The Failure of the OPA

REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are all agreed that if OPA can prevent profiteering and gouging on prices during this reconversion scarcity, it will be rendering a real service. They are also aware that OPA must at the same time stimulate and increase production by price ceilings which reflect the cost of current production plus a reasonable profit and no more. The objective here is to gradually bring supply into approximation with demand, and eliminate scarcity and the consequent necessity of war controls in our economic life as soon as possible. If OPA could and would bring about these results, it would have the support of the whole American public.

Unless OPA accomplishes to a reasonable degree both of these objectives, it has no right of existence, and should be abolished. In fact, it is a menace.

If the American people knew the facts, they would know that not only is OPA failing to accomplish these objectives, but is accomplishing diametrically the opposite of both objectives in theory and in practice.

In theory OPA is a receivership, and the Price Administrator is a liquidator of war controls. These controls were adopted only for the duration of the war and to meet war scarcity of commodities. Nevertheless, the present Price Administrator, Paul A. Porter, in his declaration of policy upon succeeding Chester A. Bowles, stated that OPA was not a receivership, and he was not a liquidator, but OPA on the contrary was a going concern. Now, of course, if OPA is a going concern, it seeks continued and perpetual existence. It can hope for this only on the objective of a continuous control of prices and a controlled economy. It absolutely negates the objective of bringing supply in balance with demand so that OPA can be discontinued.

In plain words, the OPA theory is the Russian ideology, where three to five million members of the Communist Party are despoiling and living off the other 170,000,000 under a controlled economy. In the same way OPA seeks to despoil and live off the American economy, sucking away its lifeblood. So much for the perversion of its objective in theory.

Now as to the practical side of OPA operations. It is known to everyone that surplus of money and purchasing power versus scarcity of goods constitutes the threat of inflation. OPA poses as the only savior from this threat, but as have indicated above, is really a wolf in sheep's clothing. That OPA is causing inflation, undue increase in the cost of living, in other words profiteering by interfering with, hindering, stifling, and strangling production, is evident to everyone; that is to say, to everyone who will stop and think, instead of letting OPA, with its control of publicity, fill his head with erroneous facts and so do his thinking for him. For it is this mass thinking, created and controlled by OPA, creating the fear, or fear of fear of inflation, which supplies the fuel to the continued perversion of OPA and its objectives.

We have only to call attention to the dollar which is worth less than 60 cents in the white market as compared with its prewar purchasing power; to the cost of black markets; to the cost of shoddy and inferior merchandise; to the tremendous cost of time to the consumer from standing in queues or running from place to place to secure unobtainable necessities of life; to the cost of the $150,000,000 tax load of OPA itself, and numerous other burdens, to realize that all these are not only the symptoms, but the reality of tremendous inflation already upon us. It could not be much worse. OPA is not only the major cause of this inflation, but is constantly increasing the peril principally by throwing monkey wrenches into our productive machinery. This OPA must do it if is to be a going concern, and its personnel is to fatten on a controlled economy. OPA must keep prices down to be a success, and it has made many people believe that it is successful even though it destroys production and prevents the public from buying what is or can be produced.

This may seem strange, but I want to cite as an example the following copy of a complaint letter received from one of my constituents. This letter positively shows that OPA not only encourages, but creates and fosters scarcity, high prices, and profiteering. This is not an isolated case, or one of a few cases. It is multiplied by thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of cases all over the United States in varying forms.

This complaining letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Consumers Goods Branch,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On March 6, 1946, the Cleveland regional office of the Office of Price Administration, issued order No. G-13 under Revised Supplementay order No. 119, adjusting maximum prices of resellers of products manufactured by our company.

Paragraph "b" of this order states, "All resellers of the products manufactured by the Peerless Novelty Co. of Grand Haven, Mich., are hereby authorized to increase by 30 percent the maximum prices which they had in effect prior to October 19, 1945."

When passing this information to our customers we have been advised by them not to ship any more of our merchandise, as our competitor in the East has received a 50-percent increase, issued to them by the Boston office of the OPA, which has been passed on to their resellers. This means that our line of white enameled bathroom fixtures would retail at 13 cents, while the competitor's line, which is substantially the same as ours, will retail for 15 cents, showing a greater margin of profit for the reseller.

We would, therefore, request that our case be reviewed immediately, and our resellers prices on our line of white enameled bathroom fixtures be adjusted to 15 cents; otherwise we will be forced to discontinue the manufacture of this line, which has always been our greatest sales volume. At the present time we have a large inventory ready to ship, but our customers will not accept them due to the facts as mentioned above.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, and trusting we may receive an early reply, we are,

Yours very truly,
PEERLESS NOVELTY CO.

As I said before, this is not an isolated instance. I have complaints from other manufacturers in my district of a higher price ceiling for plumbing fixtures allowed eastern manufacturers than is accorded to the manufacturer in my district. In addition to this, it must be remembered that not only are there hundreds of thousands of manufacturers but each of them produces various articles, all of which must have their prices fixed not only for the producer, but also for the retailer or seller, as above indicated.

When we bear in mind that last week Chester Bowles, according to the newspapers, stated that in the average department store OPA undertakes to regulate the prices of as many as 150,000 individual items, it does not take much imagination to realize the chaos and confusion created in production and distribution by the regulation of the prices of millions upon millions of individual items produced and sold on the principles enumerated in the above letter.

Here we have a firm which is given a price for the production of bathroom fixtures, and apparently is able to produce them in volume at that price. But the dictatorial OPA says we will not only dictate your price but also the price of your retailer or reseller, which must be 13 cents. In other words, the home builder, be he a veteran or a civilian, can secure these white enameled bathroom fixtures at 13 cents.

But it immediately throws a monkey wrench by saying to an eastern manufacturer, we will give you a price at which you can produce substantially the same white enameled bathroom fixtures, and we will allow your retailer or reseller a price of 15 cents which is an increase of almost 20 percent to the eastern manuafcturer and his reseller as against the Peerless Novelty Co. Isn't it perfectly natural that the reseller customers of the Peerless Novelty Co. will say, we can't afford to put your product on the market because we can make a bigger profit by pushing the product of the eastern manufacturer?

The home builder, whether veteran or civilian, would naturally prefer the same article from the Peerless Novelty Co. at a lower price. But OPA, the eastern manufacturer, as well as the retailer make him pay the higher price and prevent him from securing these bathroom fixtures. So, the Peerless Novelty Co., as they say in their letter, have a large inventory ready to ship out to their customers and resellers, but these are denied the veteran and the civilian builder at the lower price, while he is forced to buy the product of the eastern manufacturer at nearly a 20 percent higher price. If this is not gouging and profiteering on the consumer, then I do not know what is profiteering. If this is not stifling low-cost production the antidote for inflation, and actually encouraging and creating high-cost production and inflation, I miss my guess entirely. And therefore I say that OPA inherently fosters profiteering.

And yet this kind of confusion and chaos is the natural result of seeking to impose an artificial, one-man control on our economy. Power breeds power, and if OPA, instead of considering itself a receivership, seeks to function as a going concern, it of course must keep prices down, and keeping prices down must stifle production; and in stifling production, it must bring on inflation, especially with the tremendous accumulation of purchasing power which the American people now possess. Thus OPA can assure itself of perpetual power and jobs.

This purchasing power is like the accumulation of a great body of water which is constantly growing in volume behind a dam which is neither reinforced nor possesses sufficient sluices gradually to release a portion of and reduce the pressure of this volume of water. The pressure, of course, is tremendous and grows more and more so until these waters either find a way around and break loose or break the dam. So, in our economy, this tremendous purchasing power is already finding its way around the dam of restricted production and price control through the black market

in great volume, and unless production takes care of this pressure it will destroy the whole system and result in communism and continued and intensified dictatorship.

Even if OPA had the right conception of its functioning, it would be incapable, notwithstanding its 60,000 employees, to regulate our economic system from Washington.

For over 300 years we have been building a free economy in this country which, because of its productive and distributive capacity, has been the envy and wonder of the world. True, it was still far from perfect when the war came upon us, but it was so far ahead in affording our people a greater freedom of action, a higher standard of living, and more of the good things of life to a greater number, than that of any other country in the world, that there could be no comparison.

This free economy, with all its faults, was up to the time of the war the most efficient economic machinery ever devised for promoting the greatest welfare of the greatest number of people. It was complex, intricate, delicate, but, nevertheless, resilient and adapted to meeting the varying demands of people in various circumstances over a wide expanse of country.

This free enterprise had its beginning in an agricultural economy where industrial production was insignificant. The tremendous industrial economy, a result of the coming of the machine age, began with a small and comprehensible beginning, gradually overshadowing the agricultural activity. While in a few ways it may be considered to have have "just growed" like Topsy, in most ways it was subject to intelligent and careful development.

It began with the small manufacturer, the small retailer; them came the wholesaler, the jobber; then came the larger manufacturer, the transportation system, the communications system, the financial system, larger producers and retailers, trade associations, trade newspapers, markets, and many other elements, as well as their innumerable service agencies in collections, advertising, engineering, and so forth.

Not only did all these industries and their auxiliaries multiply tremendously in number, but hundreds of thousands of units, if successful, expanded tremendously, the whole number, great and small, forming a great, yet immeasurable reciprocation of production, prices, and trading methods which clicked all over the country, all of them constantly subject to the inexorable law of supply and demand, as well as real prices fixed in the open market under that law of supply and demand.

It is a system under which, though we may have a higher scale of wages with consequent higher cost of living in the larger cities, this is balanced by the higher real wages with reference to cost of living in the smaller cities and rural communities. It is a system under which capital is constantly withdrawn from the larger to the smaller cities to take advantage of this real wage element, thereby keeping even this difference in a state of flux. It is a system under which the efficient, low-cost producer is afforded the opportunity for serving the largest number of people as well as himself; and the inefficient, high-cost producer, who serves only himself, if any, is eliminated in the open market. It is a system in which the common laborer of today can become the industrial manager of tomorrow.

Our peacetime free economy, free enterprise, and free price system is one which, whether or not it was foreseen by our Revolutionary builders, was the kind of system they intended, built, and maintained by the people themselves. The energy and intelligence of 130,000,000 people can never be supplanted by 1 man, 60,000 men or even 6,000,000 men in the OPA in anticipating and supplying the wants of this great Nation.

We fought a great war; hundreds of thousands of our men laid down their lives, many more were crippled, and we spent hundreds of billions of money for what? For this very freedom, freedom of individual initiative and free enterprise. Shall we then sacrifice it now for fear of temporary inflation? To paraphrase the words of Patrick Henry "Is life so dear and security so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

Furthermore, do we have grounds to fear substantial inflation from our producers? Is Ford, Chrysler, or General Motors going to risk the chance of losing its customers by temporary gouging? While there may be 10 or 15 percent in general production and distribution who will take advantage of temporary opportunity for high prices, do the American people believe that the 85 or 90 percent of the other producers would risk their future business for such methods? And anyway, the 10 or 15 percent are now in the black market, both buyers and sellers, and at worst, these would be changing from one sphere of inflation to another.

It would seem that the abolishment of OPA is the best remedy. A second consideration would be the transfer of a few items to other agencies such as the Department of Agriculture. This would eliminate or ease all of our present evils of inflation—including housing—in from 3 to 6 months insofar as they stem from underproduction.

Although we have been discussing the industrial side of this chaotic, confused sabotage of our economy, we have only to mention meat, butter, beans, and so forth, to realize that the same forces have been hamstringing agriculture, restraining production of certain crops and promoting others so farm production is constantly out of balance.

From the foregoing considerations I think we are already experiencing a worse inflation than would have occurred in a free market. Only a continuance of OPA, causing further strangulation of our production, can make it much worse.

It is my belief, therefore, that the life of OPA should not be extended beyond June 30 next; but if it is extended, its jurisdiction should be curtailed to a minimum of a very few commodities.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. A. Tomlinson, from the Williamsport (Pa.) Gazette and Bulletin for July 13, 1945:

URGES SUPPORT OF BYRD, RICH IN CAMPAIGN TO CUT FEDERAL SPENDING PROGRAM

(By C. A. Tomlinson)

For more than 12 long years the spenders have been in the saddle at Washington. During this period, on many occasions, we have heard two voices raised in protest against waste and spending—HARRY FLOOD BYRD, United States Senator, from Virginia, and our own ROBERT F. RICH, of the House of Representatives, from Pennsylvania. They have raised their voices against wanton waste and reckless spending, when it was not popular so to do under the New Deal regime. The voices of these patriots have been voices crying in the wilderness. The echoes of their voices resounded throughout the Halls of Congress, but they brought no action.

These stalwart men were scorned and scoffed at for having the courage to even speak of economy. There was never a place in the vocabulary of the New Deal for economy. Again we hear the voices of these servants of the people pleading with their colleagues to wipe out bureaus and cut expenses by dismissing unneeded personnel. Will their voices be heard and heeded by the new administration?

A Chief Executive of our land has never heretofore had a greater opportunity to economize in the administration of government and restore our sanity. Useless bureaus, wanton waste, and riotous spending can, with the aid of our Chief Executive, be eliminated. The New Dealers are certainly in a doubtful position if they are not relegated to the doghouse.

Now is the accepted time to make a drive for national economy. I trust that the voices raised in the Halls of Congress, soon may reach a crescendo. Every voice in and out of Congress should be lifted in this cause. It should resound from the housetops. Economy is vital to every citizen who dwells under the starry banner of freedom. The salvaging of lend-lease equipment, the disposal of surplus war property, the elimination of bureaus, and reconversion to peacetime pursuits should be placed in the hands of able men who believe in economy.

After being prodigal in Government administration for so many years the time is now here to turn about face and meet the situation like the prodigal son who wasted his substance in riotous living. We must face the issue before us and take the long road back. The spenders, after their wild orgy of spending, have at last come to the place of reckoning. The prodigal sons have been at the helm of the good ship of state too long. Prodigal waste always brings remorse to the individual and commonwealths and nations alike. Yes, let these public servants continue to cry out against wanton, willful waste in government activities. If they cry long and loud enough their voices will demand that economy in government our Nation. As their voices resound throughout the land they will attract followers who

will demand that economy in government must be attained.

Even a voice crying out in the wilderness of extravagance cannot fail to be heard by those who have ears to hear. Why speak of economy in Government, we are told, because only talk and no action results. The talk, say the wise ones, is only to please constituents back home who are economy-minded. We need not question the voices of these two stalwart men who have cried out against spending and waste. We know how sincere they both are. These men are unafraid and uncompromising. They have proved themselves down through the years to be valuable public servants.

The time is here to silence the voices of the New Deal forever. Their philosophy of opportunists who want to get their hands in the feed bag while there is yet left something to grab. An individual of a nation can go prodigal for a time, but sanity and sound reasoning must return if progress is to be made. The prodigal son got to the place where he examined himself and found himself to be hungry, ragged, and a failure. He then made an about-face. That time is now here in our national Government. The unprecedented spending for war purposes, coupled with the waste of our substance during a world-wide depression, has put us in an unenviable position. The spending for war forced upon us we cannot help, but there is no excuse for the wasteful spending previous to the outbreak of war. The citizens have responded nobly in all of the war-loan drives, but I am quite sure they desire that every dollar raised should be made to count. The voice of the Master was a lone voice, but out of that voice has come that doctrine known as Christianity, which has meant and will continue to mean more to mankind than any other doctrine ever propounded.

Economy in Government may start with a trickle of water like the little rivulet, but it can become a mighty river through its tributaries. Likewise, these voices persistent in pleading for less waste in Government may be joined by others who will cry out with them for a change of pace in spending.

It will take time to destory this false doctrine of spending but the tide is bound to turn. One cycle cannot last forever. When things become intolerable then it is time for a change. We have been fortunate in the United States, since its founding. We have taken at times the wrong road but we, like the pordigal son, have returned and executed a right about face. The time is here to use common sense in Government matters, which relate to keeping our national house in order, so far as waste and prodigal spending are factors. Ruthless waste makes for woeful want. This is still a sound doctrine.

Waste and wasteful spending can only bring remorse and destruction to individuals and nations alike. A spending orgy may endure for a night, but remorse cometh in the morning. Under the new administration we are all hoping for the dawning of a new day. A new broom should sweep clean.

There is certainly a lot of house-cleaning needs to be done in Washington. It is too early to appraise the new administration, but we seem to be going down a different road under a pilot who knows the way. He has the opportunity to guide the Ship of State in the right direction and anchor it to a solid rock. Never has a Chief Executive faced so great a task; and never has a leader had a greater opportunity.

We do not want an "I" Government; but we do want a "we" Government, with teamwork. We citizens should rally to the cause of HARRY FLOOD BYRD and ROBERT F. RICH. With the citizenry behind them they shall be able to accomplish their purpose and desire of economy in Government.

One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Independence of Greece

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of Greek independence. Her gallant fight to be free of Turkish rule commenced with the raising of the cross in the Morea in 1821 by Archbishop Germanos. Her struggle for national liberty continued with the recognition of Greece as an independent kingdom by the powers in the convention in London in 1832. The battles fought in the early years of the eighteenth century by the Greeks were inspired by the same valiant courage of the people of that nation which thrilled the world in the early years of World War II. The revolt of Greece in 1821 captured the imagination of Europe. The resistance of Greece to the continued power of the Axis in the early hours of the world holocaust which has just ended gave idealistic inspiration to the Allied nations of the world. Greece from the earliest dawn of civilization has fought in the vanguard of the true seekers of liberty and justice. Greece has ever battled against forces of barbarism. The cause of Greece in her victorious fight for independence was the cause of Christendom.

The sacrifices endured by the people of Greece against Nazi and Fascist aggressors were inspired by a desire for independence as deep rooted and heroic as the courage and valor of Marathon and Thermopylae. Confronted in 1940 with but one alternative, submit to tryranny or die in the cause of freedom Greece never hesitated. This great small nation stood side by side with Britain in defense of a common cause against overwhelming odds. Her epic defense of nationality and the principles of democracy and the right of man to live in peace, with full knowledge of the cruel fate which was to destroy the flower of her youth and leave her bleeding but unconquered, is known to all mankind. The terrible impact of the war on Greece was met with ceaseless resistance. Her industry destroyed by the forces of brutality and atrocity, her agriculture devastated, her people subjected to unspeakable horrors, the miracle of the Hellenic spirit is the answer of Greece to the forces of totalitarianism and the ideology of the pagan.

The world owes a debt to ancient Greece. Modern civilization—literature, art, philosophy, and architecture—bear the indelible imprint of the standards of intelligence and beauty which ever impel her people. The world owes a debt to modern Greece. Throughout the 125 years of her independence, this ancient but glorious nation has been a bulwark of peace and stability. Her contribution to the cause of humanity has ever merited the admiration of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The long, dark night of war has ended. Once again the tyrant has been repelled from her land. But the struggle has left her wounded and in pain. Greece paid the price of her torture with starvation and disease. Today, still dazed from the assaults upon her national integrity and unity, Greece faces a stupendous task. The indomitable will of her great people can accomplish her ultimate ideals, but a starving hungry nation needs more than courage to recover unity and stability under a strong, virile government. America will help.

In proportion, the Allied nations of the world will render aid. The great American, our inspired leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, echoed the thoughts and desires of the American people when he wrote:

> I am glad to have the opportunity to reassure my friends of Greek origin and Greek birth everywhere that it is the desire of the American Government to help Greece to the utmost of its capabilities. It is the further desire of our Government that the Greek people, who have fought so valiantly for democratic ideals, will be able to exercise, as soon as possible, the rights of all democratic people and choose freely for themselves the form of government under which they will live.

The people of Greece have risen triumphant from the ashes of every tyrannical fire. The glory of Greece needs no words of commemoration. The qualities of the soul of Greece have earned for her kingdom the designation "the birthplace of democracy." Today Greece once again carries high the torch of liberty and freedom to light the pathway of civilization that men, working side by side in brotherhood, may find their way to world peace. With her independence, never lost but again rewon, the people of Greece will continue to offer to the nations of the world the inspirational ideal of the nobility of freemen under God.

Detroit Takes the Farm Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Bartlett from the February 1946 issue of Country Gentleman:

DETROIT TAKES THE FARM ROAD—RESEARCH-MINDED EXECUTIVES POOL TALENTS TO HELP FARMERS WITH THEIR TOUGHEST PROBLEMS; OBJECT—PROSPERITY FROM THE GROUND UP

(By Arthur Bartlett)

A new economic religion is sweeping the top-bracket areas of Detroit—new, that is, to Detroit and to most of industrial America. Its gospel runs like this: Prosperity begins on the farm. Unless the farmer is prosperous, industry cannot be prosperous, labor cannot be prosperous, nobody can be prosperous.

Farmers have heard it before, of course—from their organization leaders, from farm State politicians, occasionally from less partisan thinkers. To have it suddenly emanating from within the shadows of high office buildings and within the sound of clanking assembly lines, however, is something else again. And it could mean a tremendous new force behind the push for a greater, more rewarding agriculture.

Detroit believes it will mean just that, and intends to see to it that it does. I have just spent a week in that motor capital, talking with research-minded executives, and I speak deliberately when I say that this farm doctrine is taking hold. Busy executives hustle through their knotty management conferences so they can rush downtown to sit for hours in meetings discussing ways and means to help make agriculture a better business. Wherever the men of motordom gather, conversations run to agriculture almost as much as to automobiles. The board of commerce, official sponsor and fountainhead of the movement, has appointed committees covering virtually every phase of agriculture, and the members' names constitute a veritable who's who of Detroit.

Even before the farm gospel hit the town a surprisingly large number of Detroit's top industrialists were farm-minded, in a personal sense. That is to say, they owned farms. To many of them farming was just an expensive but satisfying hobby. But that is not the kind of farming they are talking about when they plump for farm prosperity. They are talking about the honest-to-goodness farmer who has to make a living out of the soil. He is the man, they have decided, who must prosper—or else.

It all started around a luncheon table at the Detroit Athletic Club about a year ago. Half a dozen industrialists were having one of the inevitable discussions about prosperity and how to hang on to it.

Let Europeans Police Europe

REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the British Government announced a decision to discharge the Polish Army which, since the war, has been serving in the British army of occupation in Europe. From now on these unhappy veterans, because they refuse to return to Poland where they would undoubtedly suffer the same martyrdom the Polish underground army suffered, are to have the status of "displaced persons." Since the announcement the communistic Polish Government has requested UNRRA not to give any relief to displaced persons refusing to return home. Thus, these veterans in the Allied cause are condemned to a choice of either going home to be killed or staying away to starve.

Well, justice herself has long since become a "displaced person." The British move, which Mr. Bevin tried to assure us is not appeasement of Russia, is no worse appeasement than the appeasements sponsored by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill. The way Mr. Bevin's government has made starving "displaced persons" out of Polish veterans is no worse than the way Mr. Churchill in a memorable speech during the war eloquently betrayed both Poland and Yugoslavia and helped the Russian agent Tito seize the Government of Yugoslavia and drive the Yugoslavian Army out of the Allied camp and into exile.

Last Saturday evening while the Democratic Party feasted the spirit of Poles, Serbs, Americans, and others who fought and died in vain for a just and durable peace seemed to hover behind the banqueters like Banquo's ghost. A New Deal keynoter boasted of the costly price they had us pay for our present peace and security though, as every careful newspaper reader now knows, our New Deal government officials had thrown away the fruits of victory long before our soldiers had finished winning the victory. Using the President of the United States as their megaphone the New Dealers repeated their usual taunts, falsely and maliciously accusing Republicans of opposing the defense of this Nation, even insinuating that the isolationists were too dumb to see the war coming.

The record shows that Republicans voted for any and every measure reasonably necessary to defend this Nation. Most Republicans in Congress vociferously opposed every step in the program to drag the United States step by step into an unnecessary war, even though the administration fraudulently labeled defense measures the steps to war even including the lend-lease bill which put the United States into the war and gave away American munitions. Though the double-dealing New Deal leader assured American fathers and mothers "again and again and again" he was not going to send their boys to fight in any foreign war, Republican Members of Congress repeatedly warned, and the Pearl Harbor investigation proved, that he was deliberately dragging this Nation step by step into foreign war. I, for one, warned in a radio speech delivered over a Nation-wide hook-up before Pearl Harbor that the President was dragging the United States step by step into war, that he had already issued a "shoot on sight" order, and had already thrown American arms and men into the European war and that the war was certain to become a two-ocean war for which our Nation was not adequately prepared.

Today the New Deal foreign policy is causing this dreadful history to repeat itself. The secretary of State has already publicly delivered an ultimatum proclaiming that the United States will go to war to uphold the "purposes of UNO" whatever that may mean, and that the United States will go to war if Russia, which he does not mention by name, expands any further—though our Government is still financing Russian expansion through lend-lease, Bretton Woods, UNRRA, and other less obvious devices. Perhaps the chief purpose of the attack on Republicans last Saturday evening was to intimidate us and discourage us from warning and opposing the way in which the New Deal foreign policy is involving the United States step by step in a war against Russia.

The scheduled war to preserve the British Empire is a war built up and financed by the United States Government. In that war judging from recent speeches in Parliament, England intends to follow a policy of strict neutrality, letting the United States and Russia bleed each other white. But perversely enough the latest British move furnishes us a chance to try to keep ourselves out of that war, though, of course, the obvious and surest way to keep out of war is to stop supporting the New Deal foreign policy measures which help and finance Russian expansion and British imperialism.

The British having rejected the Polish veterans, the United States Government can and should employ them instead of American soldiers in the American army of occupation in Europe. Not that any American army of occupation is necessary to prevent thoroughly defeated Germany from making war, a corps of intelligence officers would be enough for that. The only apparent reason for keeping an American army in Europe, the army having already dwindled to a mere token army is to chaperone Russia and tempt Russian soldiers to attack our token army, thereby precipitating us into war the same way Pearl Harbor precipitated us into war.

The Polish veterans under their able General Anders constitute a brave and proven army of some 200,000 men. They would be a more efficient army than any army drafted for only a year or so because of their experience fighting the recent war against the Nazis from beginning to end, serving longer than any other Allied army. Being on the spot and without any means of livelihood, they could be hired for as little as the American Government cared to pay them. Staffed with American officers they would relieve American youths of having to be forcibly drafted into the Army.

Of course, the proposed draft Army is not necessary anyway. As many of you know from their own lips, war department experts who dare not say so publicly, consider the proposed draft Army as rather a fraud, providing merely a false sense of security than which nothing is more dangerous. It is like the draft bill put through before World War II which experts at the time said and subsequent events proved would be inadequate, a mere broomstick Army. What the United States really needs, these experts insist with obvious wisdom is one, a skillful intelligence force serving in strategic spots all over the world; two, a reformed reserve training system; three, a program of scientific research for converting the industrial genius and capacity of the United States into striking power; and four, a relatively small airborne Army of professional soldiers. As you will readily perceive, the suggestion of employing Polish veterans fits into this defense program. Though there are only some 200,000 Polish veterans, other European veterans are available, including the once proud army of Mahailovich now reduced to a mere 50,000 displaced persons hiding for their lives in the mountains.

Because Americans have less interest in Europe than Europeans, any policing that

is done should, in all justice, be done by European soldiers. That any responsible Government official under present circumstances should seriously consider conscripting American minors, lifting them out of their homes and schools and transporting them to Europe to do forced labor amidst the disease, the famine and the political intrigue there, only goes to show the depths of deterioration into which our Nation has been hypnotized and propagandized since the time when being an American meant being a free American.

If Russia sincerely wants peace she had better get over the idea that American officials now threatening war are only bluffing though, of course, it looks like a bluff as long as our Government continues to finance and aid Russian aggression and infiltration. Russia should know that the real powers behind the throne for the past 30 years are a group of politically amphibious internationalists. These bipartisans will never be satisfied until they have frightened the American people into giving up their veto in UNO and submitting to rule by an all-powerful world superstate, even though it may take another world war to do it. If Russia sincerely wants peace she had better stop expanding and diet down to a healthy prewar size. Moreover she should be the last to object to this plan to hire European soldiers to replace American soldiers and thus avoid having the United States precipitated into a war against Russia through another Pearl Harbor.

Surely American patriots in and out of Congress will not let themselves be intimidated by the attack on Republicans even though our misguided President himself was the one who read it, thereby giving it an appearance of authenticity. No good can come from another suicidal war. The way to prevent the United States becoming a completely communistic state is to vote against the communistic New Deal measures offered in Congress day after day. The way to prevent Russian domination of the world is to stop voting for the New Deal foreign policy measures which finance and support Russian expansion and finance the selfish arrogant British imperialism which drives despairing British colonists into the arms of communism. The plan suggested will also help prevent war. It is up to every patriotic American to insist that the administration accept it.

Sinking of the "Yukon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Ed Coester and newspaper article from the West Coast Sailor in regard to the sinking of the ship *Yukon* be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Coester's letter is self-explanatory and I am sure that the Congress will desire to have before it this statement of the crew of the *Yukon*.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAILORS' UNION OF THE PACIFIC,
Seattle, Wash., March 18, 1946.

Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: Enclosed please find marked copy of the West Coast Sailor paper, containing a statement from seven deck department members of the *Yukon*. At the present time there is a secret investigation being held by the United States Coast Guard in the port of Seattle to get all the details surrounding the stranding of the *Yukon*. The investigators are, at the present time, not divulging any testimony given by the witnesses.

I feel it is highly unfair and improper that statements surrounding the stranding should at this time be publicized and entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if the crew members who were aboard the *Yukon* are unable to defend themselves.

I hereby request that you enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement from the crew pertaining to the crew operations of the *Yukon* the same as Representative BRUMBAUGH, of Pennsylvania, did. I am sure that when the findings of the hearing are known, that the deck department will be exonerated of any and all charges of misconduct, inefficiency, and drunkenness.

Hoping that I may see you on your next trip to the coast, I remain,

Very truly yours,

ED COESTER,
Seattle Branch Agent.

REPORT OF "YUKON" WRECK BY THE DECK CREW

(A great deal of conflicting stories have been publicized concerning the running aground and the breaking up of the *Yukon*, and the subsequent behavior of its officers and crew. An eyewitness account, submitted by the men who participated, all members of the Sailors Union of the Pacific deck crew on the stricken vessel, is hereby published:)

At approximately 4:20 a. m., Monday, February 4, 1946, the steamship *Yukon* ran aground at Johnstone Bay, Alaska.

Emergency stations was sounded immediately after, and we all made our stations, taking only time to dress, there being a time lapse of 2 to 3 minutes from the time we hit until we were stripping the boats and making ready to swing them out.

The seas were so heavy on the weather side (starboard) that it was impossible to swing the boats or even let go the gripes so the boat crews were instructed to get the passengers either inside or on the lee side, which they proceeded to do. Incidentally, W. Williams, A. B. stationman, had his hand seriously injured during the operation of clearing the weather side of passengers.

After stripping the boats on the lee side and letting go the gripes, an enormous sea hit the ship and she heeled over to port so far that before we had a chance to lower the boats far enough below the boat deck to steady them, they all, with the exception of the Lundeen boats aft, were stove in pretty bad and had several of their keels ripped off.

On orders from the bridge we secured No. 2, 4, 6, and 8 boats, gunwales level with the boat deck and waited for further instructions.

Meanwhile emergency antennaes were rigged as the main and emergency antennaes had been shaken down.

A frequent inspection of the ship was made on instructions from the master and mate, the mate and one of the winch drivers going forward and dropping both anchors. In fact, everything was done to insure the safety of the passengers and crew to whatever extent that was humanly possible under the existing circumstances, the passengers being cooperative without panic during the whole rescue operation.

The seas were running so heavy that it was deemed advisable to wait until daylight to determine the possibility of running a breeches buoy ashore. The Lyle gun and all incidental equipment was readied on the port side of the boat deck, under the wing of the bridge.

On sending out the S O S we got word that help would arrive in about 3 hours; as it turned out it was a little over 8 hours before the first Coast Guard cutter, the *Onondaga*, arrived.

At daylight, boat No. 4 was lowered in the water, manned by the deck gang, with the chief officer in command to try and make the beach and rig up a breeches buoy, but it got swamped before they barely got away from the ship's side, so all had to come back aboard. It is extremely doubtful if any crew could have rowed ashore, but the chance had to be taken, what with the beach covered with huge rocks, the heavy seas even on the lee side and the terrific pull of the undertow.

About this time the wind and seas began to calm slightly and the master thought it advisable to wait until help arrived.

The engine-room crew, on watch at the time we struck, should be commended for their quick thinking in cutting out all fires and taking all other necessary precautions before coming on deck; otherwise we would have had a fire as well to contend with, and that, at that time, with the bottom ripped out and fuel oil all over, would have meant disaster for all passengers and crew.

From the frequent inspections and actions of the ship's hull, it was obvious that the hull was set firmly on a huge rock at a little forward of the midships section, and the bow on sand and rocks at low tide, except when the seas twisted the whole ship in a clockwise direction.

Parts of the wooden deck opened and buckled from the very beginning but the after end did not start to weave around and rip apart until about 1 p. m. Monday.

On seeing this condition, some of the deck gang rushed aft and lowered No. 8 boat into the water, not 10 seconds too soon as the after davit gave way just after the releasing gear had been tripped.

The boat was hauled ahead with the painter to abeam the after part of No. 2 hatch at which time the motor launch from the *Onondaga* came alongside and both the motor launch and ship's boat commenced loading women and children from the *Yukon*.

The seas were running very heavy and both motor launch and ship's boat were very fortunate to get away safely as both passed over rocks on the crest of swells. It would have been impossible to have gotten away on the ebb.

The ship's boat was towed away from the wreck by the motor launch, rowing being entirely out of the question as the seas would have washed us up on the rocks.

We were towed out to the *Onondaga*, about 4 miles out, and were forced to discharge the women and children to a pilot's ladder rigged by her stern. No amount of pleading or cursing on our part could get them to heave us alongside the midship section where there was a net rigged. They insisted that our passengers all come aboard by the stern, which, in itself, was difficult as we were under the counter most of the time.

After we had discharged our load of women and children, we were tied up astern and waited there while the motor launch was hauled aboard and the propeller was cleared

of a line that had gotten fouled there while leaving the *Yukon's* side.

The *Onondaga* got underway in about an hour and we thought we were going in closer but it turned out that we only pulled out farther.

About 2 hours after our arrival alongside the *Onondaga*, the motor launch was launched and we started for the *Yukon* in tow. We might add here that we were so far away from the *Yukon* at that time that we, in the lifeboat, couldn't see the wreck itself.

We were hailed by the United States Navy salvage tug *Curb*, anchored about a half mile from the wreck and saw the impossibility of getting the ship's boat alongside either side of the *Yukon* so we went aboard the *Curb* while the motor launch proceeded to the *Yukon* to see if it could make it. However, it soon returned and reported that it was impossible to even approach the wreck, the lee side being fouled up by the wreckage and debris of the after section and the seas breaking over the weather side clear over the boat deck of the *Yukon*.

The executive officer of the U. S. S. *Curb* asked us if we would go out on the Army power barge that had made one attempt to go alongside the *Yukon* but failed due to heavy weather. We went aboard with gear for the breeches buoy and did manage to rig a line from the gun tub on the *Yukon's* bridge to the power barge's mast but the anchor cable carried away and we had to let go the line.

We went back to the *Curb* and after much consulting, etc., it came to the last desperate effort of using a rubber life raft so we went back aboard the power barge.

An Army tug hooked onto us with her towing cable, got into position, dropped her hook and slacked us in as close to the *Yukon* as possible and we fired a line to the *Yukon*, rigged the raft and commenced to take off passengers at about 2 a. m. Tuesday morning.

We, in no way, wish to be recriminative but we do find it rather strange that with the hundreds of men on the naval and Coast Guard ships standing by we received no help outside of the Navy and Coast Guard motor launch crews and a very few other individuals until 2:30 p. m. Tuesday afternoon. Then a work party of either Navy or Coast Guard men and a work party from the *Cedar* and *Zelinsky* followed, but the same situation prevailed there. Some chief petty officers and two or three individuals helped while the others stood around polishing their thumbs.

What few rations they sent over from the ships were broken into on the power barge by these donkeys before we could get them over to the *Yukon*. We managed to get two milk cans and a breaker of water also.

About 5:00 p. m. Tuesday we got some sandwiches on the power barge and you can guess why—not because the *Yukon* sailors working on the power barge were hungry.

Tuesday afternoon one winch driver and a quartermaster went aboard the *Curb* to splice some rope for them, as the two men who knew how were working the motor launch ferrying passengers from the power barge to the various ships laying to (this is a United States Navy salvage tug we are speaking of).

Late afternoon Tuesday, an Army tug slacked in close to the *Yukon* on her hook and began to take off passengers with a rubber raft also.

About 8:00 p. m. Tuesday the seas got too heavy and the rest of the passengers and crew had to make the beach on the breeches buoy.

About 11:00 p. m. all the passengers and crew were off the wreck with the exception of the master.

Some of us went in the motor launch that was manned by the *Cedar's* crew and tried to fire a line to the ship. However, the motor launch crew from the *Cedar* was green and wouldn't go close enough to make contact so sent crew of *Cedar* and *Yukon* back to the *Curb* and *Cedar* and kept one winch driver and some of the *Zelinsky's* crew by on power barge until the master was finally taken off the *Yukon* by motor launch crew from the *Curb*, and rubber raft, at about 2:30 a. m. Wednesday morning.

On Tuesday afternoon two men off the *Yukon* and one CPO from the *Curb* left the *Curb* in a surf boat and made the beach to organize the fires and gather provisions, and so forth, dropped by the Army planes.

About 9 a. m. Wednesday another power barge rammed the beach and took off the survivors stranded there, transferred them to the *Curb* and proceeded to Seward.

Our sincere thanks to the crews of the Army tugs and power barges; to the crews of the motor launches from the USS *Curb* and the USCG cutter *Onandago;* to the Army planes officers and personnel and others connected with the aid given; to the officers and enlisted personnel who contributed toward the rescue operations (we might say here that the only persons lost were through freak seas and not one life was lost in the rescue operations), and may good fortune be their well-earned lot in future years.

Our sincere condemnation of the powers that be that wouldn't give us any help until the rescue operations were almost over; that forced us to use the same 9-thread line for heaving the raft from *Yukon* to power barge and back for 13 hours before they would jar loose with a coil of 21 thread, and finally giving us a coil of 2-inch line 2 hours from the time we had to knock off and that one being so flattened out and fouled up that we had to cut it in pieces and tie them together in order that we could use it.

Providence must have been watching to hold that first coil together so long.

* * * * *

To the survivors who owe their very lives to the efforts of others, yet found it convenient to place themselves in the limelight by perjury and a deliberate campaign of lies and slander, we ignore them.

* * * * *

Our bitterest wishes to those vermin of the press and radio who felt elated at scoops of any news, however untrue or unfounded, which they found to their taste to publish and broadcast. * * *

That the powers that are responsible that any ship, especially a passenger ship, be sent into such dangerous waters, or as a matter of fact, any waters without the benefit of a fathometer and radar be blamed entirely for the *Yukon* disaster.

All warships have them, then why can't other ships have them as well, or is it perhaps that those GI's and women and children don't mean anything now. Most of the Army personnel had their discharges.

Who has the answer to that one?

And last but not least our sincere thanks to our shipmates and others ashore who had our families and our welfare in mind and worked untiringly in our behalf.

To the people of Seward for their hospitality and unselfish aid and to their Red Cross chapter and other organizations, both civic and fraternal, our deepest thanks. We'll try to repay in some measure sometime.

Our thanks to the crew of the steamship *Alaska* for their kindness and care.

To all crew members in all departments: Thanks, good luck, and good sailing.

S. ARGYR.
A. H. HANSON.
B. SKOG.
IVAN GILL.
AXEL JOHANSON.
G. A. KARLSON.
WILLIAM NEVE.

Pilate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the Right Reverend Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen, of the Catholic University of America, is in the top strata of learned lecturers of our day. Last evening, over the radio network of the National Broadcasting Co., with an ease that comes to one of his wisdom and with an analytical mind that disentangles the work of the confusers, he spoke of two contradictory charges being made against religion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I glory in the privilege to include his timely address, so pertinent to the problems facing the world today. His is a message of warning as well as of hope:

PILATE

Friends, one of the vital subjects of the day is the relation of politics and religion. Those who have their finger on the pulse of contemporary civilization have probably noted that there are two contradictory charges against religion today—the first is that religion is not political enough; the other is that religion is too political. On the one hand the church is blamed for being too divine, and on the other for not being divine enough. It is hated because it is too heavenly, and hated because it is too earthly.

Particularly significant it is that these were the very two charges for which our Lord Himself was condemned — the religious judges Annas and Caiphas found Him too religious; the political judges, Pilate and Herod, found Him too political.

Caiphas, the religious judge, standing before his judgment seat, asked our Lord the question, "I adjure Thee by the living God that Thou tell us if Thou be the Christ, the Son of God" (Matthew 26: 63). As the question rang out through the marble hall and was succeeded by a silence vibrant with emotion, Christ finally raised His eyes to the judge and answered, "Thou hast said it" (Matthew 26: 64).

A gleam of satisfaction lighted the judge's face. At last he had triumphed. But he must not show it, and under the veil of horrified indignation at the insult offered to God's supreme majesty by declaring Himself to be God, he rent his garments from bottom to top, crying out, "He hath blasphemed. * * * He is guilty of death" (Matthew 26: 65–66). Christ is too religious, too heavenly, too infallible, too spiritual, too much interested in souls, too divine.

Because He was too religious, He was not political enough. He was accused of being indifferent to the needs of the people and national well-being. The Romans would not tolerate anyone with such an appeal. He would bring down retribution from Rome. Their armies would come and destroy them. After all, what good is religion, anyway, if it has no part in the political, economic, and social set-up of a country. So Caiphas decided: Better let the one man die rather than the whole nation should perish.

Within a few hours Our Blessed Lord, who was accused of being too disinterested in politics, is charged with being too interested in it. The mob who had their prisoner bound with ropes stopped outside Pilate's door-sill which marked the confines of a Roman house. Pilate, warned of their coming, goes out to

meet the accusers. Jesus and Pilate are face to face. Pilate looked at the Figure before him, silent and unmoved, crimsoned with His own blood, with red livid marks across His face, already the object of gross mistreatment before He had been condemned. Turning to the howling mob, Pilate asked: "What accusation bring you against this man?" (John 18:29.)

If the mob charged that He blasphemed by calling Himself God, Pilate would have only smiled. He had his gods and each day sprinkled incense before them. What cared he about their divinities. But there was one other lie about Christ that could be hurled, and it was the opposite one, namely, that He was too political; that He was not sufficiently divine; that He meddled in national affairs, that He was not patriotic. And in answer to the question of Pilate, there was hurled again the balustrade of Pilate's temple the deafening roar of three charges: "We have found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he is Christ the king" (Luke 23: 2). It was as silly as saying: Christ is a Fascist.

And from that day to this, these two contradictory charges have been leveled against the person of Christ in His body the church. His church is accused of being not political enough when it condemns nazism and fascism; it is accused of being too political when it condemns communism. It is said to be too unpolitical when it does not condemn a political regime which some other political systems dislike but which allows religious freedom; it is said to be too political or Fascist when it condemns a political regime which completely suppresses all religion. Would to heaven that man were forced to give definitions of words. Is the church Fascist? If fascism means, as it does, the supremacy of the state or nation over the individual, with consequent suppression of rights or liberties, then the church is anti-Fascist, as the encyclical against fascism so well proves. If by fascism is meant anti-communism and dislike of a system which suppresses the liberties, then the church is Fascist, but so is every American who loves the democratic way of life. In truth the proper way to handle this confusion of tongues is to speak of all forms of totalitarianism as fascism. This divides them into black, brown, and red. Hence we ought to speak of communism from this time on as red fascism. There is an essential resemblance between fascism, nazism, and communism. Fascism is the subordination of the person to the state, nazism to the race, and communism to the classes. The only difference between these three forms of totalitarianism is the difference between burglary, larceny, and stealing.

It is the second charge that needs specific consideration, namely, that the church is interfering in politics. Is this true? It all depends upon what you mean by politics. If by interference in politics is meant using influence to favor a particular regime, party, or system, which respects the basic rights and freedom of persons which come from God, the answer is emphatically "No." The church does not interfere in politics. If by interference in politics is meant judging or condemning a philosophy of life which makes the party, or the state, or the class, or the race the source of all rights, and which usurps the soul and enthrones party over conscience, the answer is emphatically "Yes." The church does judge such a philosophy. But when it does this, it is not interfering with politics, for such politics is no longer politics but a kind of religion that is antireligious.

So long as politics is politics, the church has nothing to say. It is totally indifferent to any regime. The church adapts itself to all governments on condition that they respect liberty of conscience; it is indifferent as to whether people choose to live under a monarchy, republic, democracy, or even a military dictatorship provided these governments grant the basic freedoms.

A human organism can adapt itself to the torrid heat of the Equator or to the glacial cold of the North, but it cannot live without air. The church in like manner can adapt itself to every form of politics, but it cannot live without the air of freedom. Never before in history has the spiritual been so unprotected against the political; never before has the political so usurped the spiritual. It is not religion that is meddling in politics; it is politics that is meddling in religion. It is Jesus Christ who suffered under Pontius Pilate; it is not Pontius Pilate who suffered under Jesus Christ.

For the first time in Christian history, politics, which began by divorcing itself from morality and religion, has seen that man cannot live by bread alone. So it has attempted to capture his soul, by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of a dictator. For the first time in Western Christian civilization the kingdom of antigod has acquired political form and social substance and stands over against Christianity as a counterchurch with its own dogmas, its own scriptures, its own infallibility, its own hierarchy, its own visible head, its own missionaries, and its own invisible head—too terrible to be named. In certain countries religion today exists only by sufferance of a political dictator; without actively persecuting the church, it usurps its functions, gives bread cards only to those who conspire against religion, attempts to create an ideological uniformity by liquidating anyone who is opposed to that ideology, and by sheer weight of state-inspired propaganda would effect the mass organization of society on an antireligious basis. Culture today is becoming politicized. The dictatorial government is extending dominance over areas outside its province, family, education, and the soul; it is concentrating public opinion in fewer and fewer hands, which becomes the more dangerous because of the mechanical way in which propaganda can be disseminated. The lines are becoming clear and clear cut. The conflict of the future will be between a God religion and a state religion, between Christ and antichrist, but in political disguise.

History attests that religion has not encroached upon the temporal sphere, but rather jealous temporal rulers have invaded the spiritual. Sometimes these rulers were kings and princes, even so-called Catholic defenders of the faith; today they are dictators. But the problem is ever the same: the invasion of the spiritual by the political. If it be objected that religion once made Henry come to Canossa, let it be stated that it was for exactly the same reason that the world made war against Hitler, namely because of his usurpation of spiritual freedom. The difference between Henry's time and Hitler's is that when religion had some influence in the world and kings had consciences, it was possible for the church to inspire them to penance. With that moral authority rejected, now the nations have to spend $523,000,000,000 and millions of lives to impress some of the dictators with the same fact.

Even though Christ Himself would not deliver us from the power of the totalitarian state, as He did not deliver Himself, we must see His purpose in it all. Maybe His children are being persecuted by the world in order that they might withdraw themselves from the world; maybe His most violent enemies may be doing His work negatively, for it could be the mission of totalitarianism to preside over the liquidation of a modern world that became indifferent to God and His moral laws; maybe those of us who did not care whether God exists or not, may yet suffer from those whom we taught through Fuerbach and Hegel, to exile Him altogether. Maybe the very secularism from which we suffer is a reaction against our own spiritual infirmity; and the growth of atheism and totalitarianism, the measure of our want of zeal and piety and the proof of our unfulfilled Christian duties; maybe as diseases grow in dirt, so crimson fascism grows in godlessness.

But whatever be the reason for these trying days, of this we may be certain: The Christ who suffered under Pontius Pilate signed Pilate's death warrant; it was not Pilate who signed Christ's. Christ's church will be attacked, scorned, and ridiculed, but it will never be destroyed. The enemies of God will never be able to dethrone the heavens of God, nor to empty the tabernacles of their Eucharistic Lord, nor to cut off all absolving hands, but they may devastate the earth. The bald fact the enemies of God must face is that modern civilization has conquered the world but in doing so has lost its soul, and in losing its soul it will lose the very world it gained.

Politics has become so all-possessive of life, that by impertinence it thinks that the only philosophy a man can hold is the right or the left. This question puts out all the lights of religion so they can call all the cats gray. It assumes that man lives on a purely horizontal plane, and can move only to the right or the left. Had we eyes less material, we would see that there are two other directions where a man with a soul may look: The vertical direction of up or down. Both figured in the crucifixion of our Lord. Even those cruel men who crucified knew that these were the directions that counted. So they shouted to Him: "Come down," and we will believe. Somehow or other that echo has been caught up and it is being bruited about the world today. "Down with religion!" "Down with capital!" "Down with labor!" "Down with reactionaries!" "Down with progressives!"

Have we not been tearing down long enough? Can one build a world with the word down. Is there no other cry in our vocabulary? Did not the Captain Christ give another: "If I be lifted up, I will draw all things to myself."

Lifted up! Who shall lift us up? Crucifying dictators? Maybe! But where shall we be lifted? To the cross, the prelude of the empty tomb, the cross of Christ our Redeemer. Hear ye that word "up," shout it abroad! "Up from class hatred; up from envy; up from avarice; up from war; up beyond the margent of the world; up beyond the 'troubled gateways of the stars'—up—up—up to God!"

"Reactionary"—One Who Reacts

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a trip to the very heart of this Nation—to Nebraska. It is my duty to report to the House how this trip has affected me.

Feeling the pulse and hearing the heartbeats of the people in the heart of our Republic has strengthened me in my determination to continue to be what I have always been—a reactionary.

Webster defines "reaction" as a "countertendency or contrary movement" and a "reactionary" as one "who favors reaction." This definition has existed for over a century. It has endured while ideas have changed from innovations into traditions. In contrast, the term "lib-

eral"—originally applied in this country to the manner of interpreting the language of the Constitution—has come to mean all things to all men. A "liberal" today may mean one who wishes to maintain our form of government, merely adding to its functions. It may mean the advocacy of government by class or group instead of government by and for all of the people. It may mean one who stands for the overthrow of the American system and the embracing of an alien type of statism. One thing is certain: Nowadays no one can honestly define a "liberal."

So, my short stay among my fellow Nebraskans has convinced me that my place is in the front ranks of what Webster calls "a countertendency or contrary movement." I am against the infiltration of totalitarian ideologies into the United States, no matter what their alien source. I vigorously oppose all attacks on our time-tested check-and-balance system, the relationship which now exists between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. The Constitution must be preserved; and the will of the sovereign people of these United States must be heard by us who serve that people so that we may better use our rightful powers to continue far into the future the American way of being, thinking, and doing—the way for whose perpetuation so many American boys have only too recently given their very lives.

Chester W. Nimitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the President has suggested that some misunderstanding has arisen as to the recent action of the Bureau of the Budget in cutting the 1947 Navy budget. There is, however, one thing about which there positively can be no misunderstanding. That is the ability, the character, the devotion to duty, the patriotism, honesty, and complete sincerity of Chester W. Nimitz, fleet admiral of the United States Navy, who has testified as to the great need for restoring the Navy budget to the original estimated amount. I am sure no one question this. Yet it is well, in view of the necessity for evaluating his recommendations for our postwar Navy, to consider his background and record. We are apt to forget, in peacetime, some of those things upon which we pinned our whole faith in time of war.

Chester W. Nimitz was born in Fredericksburg, Tex., on February 24, 1885, and attended a Kerrville, Tex., high school before his appointment to the United States Naval Academy in 1901. He was graduated with distinction, seventh in a class of 114, in 1905. From that time on, until one day, 40 years later, when he sat at a desk on the deck of the U. S. S. *Missouri*, signing the formal instrument of the Japanese surrender as representative of the United States, Chester W. Nimitz has directed his energies and abilities toward the betterment of that great military organization which constitutes the sea power of this Nation.

And sea power—

Says Fleet Admiral Nimitz—

is not a limited term. It includes many weapons and many techniques. Sea power means more than the combatant ships and aircraft, the amphibious forces, and the merchant marine. It includes also the port facilities of New York and California, the bases in Guam and in Kansas; the factories which are the capital plant of war; and the farms which are the producers of supplies. All these are elements of sea power. Furthermore, sea power is not limited to materials and equipment. It includes the functioning organization which has directed its use in the war. In the Pacific we have been able to use our naval power effectively. It has allowed great flexibility. In each operation we were able to apply our force at the time and place where it would be most damaging to the enemy.

That same flexibility was not noted in the Japanese Fleet in the Pacific, where it was observed that "Japanese sea power was hampered by army control, and Japanese naval officers lacked freedom of initiative so necessary to gain and exercise command of the sea."

No lack of knowledge or experience hampers Fleet Admiral Nimitz in arriving at his conclusions on the Navy's needs. He held his first command in 1907. Subsequently he was given various submarine commands, including the Atlantic submarine flotilla. His training and experience in the early years of his career included duty in connection with the building of Diesel engines and he studied at the Diesel engine plants in Nuremburg, Germany, and Ghent, Belgium.

In the early years of the First World War, he served as aide on the staff of Rear Adm. Samuel S. Robinson, commander of the submarine force of the Atlantic Fleet, and later was appointed chief of staff to Admiral Robinson. He so ably performed these duties that he received a letter of commendation from the Secretary of Navy.

After a tour of duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, when he had additional duty as senior member of the Board of Submarine Design, he again had sea duty, assumed command of the U. S. S. *Chicago* with additional duty in command of a submarine division. Instruction at the Naval War College, a second tour on the staff of Admiral Robison, serving as aide and assistant chief of staff when the latter was commander, Battle Fleet, and when he was commander in chief, United States Fleet, were followed by an assignment to install a Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps at the University of California. From there he was ordered to command a submarine division, and in 1931 he was transferred to command of the U. S. S. *Rigel* and the destroyers out of commission at the Destroyer Base, San Diego.

After more cruises, this time with the Asiatic Fleet, he served as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, and in 1938 assumed command of a cruiser division and later of a battleship division.

He served as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation for 4 years and in 1941 was detached from that assignment to become commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, with the rank of admiral.

For his sound judgment and decision in his employment and disposition of units of the Pacific Fleet during the period immediately following our entry into the war with Japan, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. The citation accompanying the medal records the fact that his conduct of the operations of the Pacific Fleet, resulting in successful actions against the enemy in the Coral Sea, May 1942, and off Midway Islands, June 1942, was characterized by unfailing judgment and sound decision, coupled with skill and vigor. "His exercise of command," the citation reads, "left nothing to be desired."

Congress also saw fit to give recognition to his exceptionally meritorious service and awarded him another Distinguished Service Medal. This citation reminds us that—

At the most critical period of the war in the Pacific, Admiral Nimitz assumed command in that area and, despite the losses at Pearl Harbor and the tragic shortage of vessels, planes, and supplies, organized his forces and carried on defensive warfare which halted the Japanese advance.

Our Navy was not strong then. The ships and the men, the guns and the aircraft, that later in the war made it the greatest navy in world history, had not appeared on the scene of battle. It was the sound and mature judgment which characterizes Fleet Admiral Nimitz which stood between us and the enemy during that dark and doubtful period of World War II.

The citation continues:

As rapidly as ships, personnel, and material became available, he shifted from defensive to offensive warfare and, by his brilliant leadership and outstanding skill as a strategist, enabled the units under his command to defeat the enemy in the Coral Sea, off Midway, and in the Solomon Islands, and to capture and occupy the Gilbert and Marshall Islands. As a result of his sound judgment and masterful conduct of naval warfare in the Pacific, our forces have assumed a position of dominance in this vital area.

Washington paid tribute to his wisdom on October 5 last year, when it observed Nimitz day, and the fleet admiral received a Gold Star in lieu of the third Distinguished Service Medal.

And once again, the soundness of his judgment was cited:

Initiating the final phase in the battle for victory in the Pacific, Fleet Admiral Nimitz attacked the Marianas, invading Saipan, inflicting a decisive defeat on the Japanese Fleet in the First Battle of the Philippines, and capturing Guam and Tinian. In vital continuing operations, his fleet forces isolated the enemy-held bastions of the central and eastern Carolines, and secured, in quick succession, Peleliu, Angaur, and Ulithi. With reconnaissance of the main beaches on Leyte effected, approach channels cleared, and opposition neutralized in joint operations to reoccupy the Philippines, the challenge by powerful task forces of the Japanese Fleet resulted in a historic victory in the three-phased battle for Leyte Gulf, October 24–26, 1944. Accelerating the intensity of aerial offensive by pressure exerted at every hostile strong point, Fleet Admiral Nimitz culminated long-range strategy by successful amphibious assault on Iwa Jima and Okinawa.

A wise, steadfast, and indomitable leader, Fleet Admiral Nimitz, by his daring strategy and his faith in the courage and skill of the officers and men under his command, finally placed representative forces of the United States Navy in the harbor of Tokyo for the formal capitulation of the Japanese Empire. Through his mastery of naval warfare, his strategical skill, his sound judgment, and his inspiring leadership, he demonstrated the highest qualities of a naval officer and rendered services of the greatest distinction to his country.

It will be most unlikely, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress will see fit to discount this man's wisdom and judgment now, or to set aside his recommendations.

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the price-control law has been necessary during the war, and it cannot be doubted that some advantage would follow its reenactment, but in a restricted form, applicable only to a limited number of commodities which are necessary to daily living and should be specifically named in the act, and applicable also to rent control in declared defense areas on residential property with a definite allowance to property owners for increased costs since 1941.

But in the long run the greatest guarantee against exorbitant prices is maximum production. We cannot throw price control out overnight. But we must return to that old law of supply and demand as soon as possible. When the supply is at least as great as the demand on a commodity, we will have reasonable prices forced down by competition.

Therefore, when the proposed extension of the OPA is brought to the floor of the House, I intend to offer the following amendment:

In line 5 on page 1 strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by striking the period after the words 'or offense' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*Provided*, That when there exists a surplus of any commodity, all provisions of this act, and regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate upon the determination by the Price Administrator of such a surplus.' "

This amendment is directed at a natural and automatic demobilization of the OPA and price control. To keep price control as long as it is needed—but not any longer. To replace gradually the price-control law with the old law of supply and demand as the supply of a commodity exceeds the demand—as surpluses of actual necessities become realities instead of dreams.

This amendment offers the orderly way in which to get away gradually and orderly from emergency regulations. It is fair to all concerned. It does not disrupt the OPA, and yet it would avoid any undue delay in the lifting of restrictions that hamper reconversion and maximum production.

In other words, this amendment is an automatic reconversion amendment, pure and simple.

PULPWOOD AMENDMENT

I, also, Mr. Speaker, intend to offer the following amendment to rectify an inequity which has existed far too long:

After line 21 on page 4 add the following section:

"SEC. 5. Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking the period at the end of the subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*Provided*, That no maximum price shall be imposed on pulpwood in any State at a price less than 83 percent of the highest maximum price established for pulpwood derived from trees of the same genus in any other State, zone, or region, except that fair and equitable differentials may be established between peeled and rough pulpwood.' "

It is an inequity against the farmers of the South because their exploitation by huge pulp mills has been perpetuated by the OPA freezing of southern pine pulpwood at prices at prewar levels when the supply was so much greater than the demand. This amendment proposes what is only just—to recognize and give proper allowance for increased costs of cutting, hauling, and land. It proposes only a fair return to the farmer producers of southern pine pulpwood.

The purpose of the amendment is to bring the ceiling on southern pine pulpwood up to the level of the minimum ceiling established for pine pulpwood in other areas. As set forth in the table which I am about to read to you, the ceiling on rough pine pulpwood is $9 per cord in most Southern States, whereas the ceiling prices for pine pulpwood range from $11 to $13.25 per cord in other areas.

Present ceilings per cord for rough pine pulpwood

South	$9.00
Lake States	12.75
Northeast	11.00–13.25

Assuming that the maximum ceiling remained unchanged, at $13.25 per cord, the proposed amendment would require OPA to raise the ceiling on rough southern pine to $11 but would not require any changes in maximum prices for rough pine in other areas.

Specifically, I offer this amendment for the following reason:

First. The ceiling price on rough southern pine pulpwood is $2 per cord lower than the lowest ceiling in effect for rough pine pulpwood in other areas. Until February 20, when the OPA granted an increase of $1.40 per cord in the ceiling price of southern pulpwood, price control regulations were holding southern pine $3.40 per cord below the lowest price of pine pulpwood in other areas.

Second. In setting up its schedules of maximum prices for pulpwood, OPA attempted to freeze prices at the levels prevailing when price control was applied. The effect of this was to freeze southern pulpwood at an unfair price disadvantage growing out of conditions which existed before the war and to prevent natural forces from overcoming this unfair disadvantage as conditions changed.

Third. Prewar pulpwood prices in the South were exploitative prices which permitted pulp mills huge profits, kept cutters and haulers on starvation wages and gave southern farmers almost no return for growing this important natural resource.

Fourth. Pulp production is a comparatively new industry in the South. Wood supplies have been plentiful there and up until the war the mills were able to get pulpwood at prices that were ruinously low for everyone concerned except the mills. This was true for several reasons: (a) General economic distress in the South, (b) an unawareness on the part of many farmers of the real value of their wood, and (c) a lack of competition between mills in many areas which forced farmers to take the price offered by a single mill or else not sell. Under such conditions some mills have made enormous profits and have paid for themselves in an amazingly short time.

Fifth. Costs of cutting and hauling pulpwood have increased tremendously in the South during the war. Stumpage prices have also increased to a limited extent, but in the majority of cases the farmer who grows pulpwood is still getting a woefully inadequate return.

Sixth. Authorities have refuted claims that southern pulp is inferior to pulp made from wood grown in other areas. In view of the fact that they have stated that high-quality products can be made from southern pine, the present OPA price differentials of $2 to $4.25 between southern and northern pine cannot be defended on a quality basis. In fairness to the South, southern producers should be given a maximum price comparable with the maximum price of pulpwood derived from the same kind of trees in other areas. At the very least, southern producers should have a ceiling for rough pine pulpwood as high as the lowest ceiling set on pine in other areas.

Seventh. Ceiling prices should allow farmers a fair return for growing pulpwood taking into account the wartime increases in cutting and hauling costs. And, in determining what is a fair return to farmers, it should be borne in mind that prewar returns were far too low in the South. An allowance should also be made for the substantial increase in timberland prices which has occurred since 1940.

The ceiling price for rough southern pine pulpwood is $9 per cord delivered on board railroad cars throughout most of the South. A slightly higher price appears to be in effect for Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana west of the Mississippi River, but the ceiling for that area includes a dealer's commission so that the farmer's price is the same as in other areas of the South. Ceiling prices for rough pine pulpwood in the Northeastern and Lakes States range from $11 to $13.25 per cord delivered on cars.

Ceiling prices on pulpwood, by areas, in dollars per cord, f. o. b. cars

Area	Pine		Hardwood	
	Rough	Peeled	Rough	Peeled
South:				
Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana (west of Mississippi River)	$9.75	.....	$10.20	.....
Part of North Carolina and western part of Virginia	9.00	$12.20	9.50	$12.70
South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama and Louisiana (east of Mississippi River)	9.00	.....	9.50	12.65
Eastern Virginia and counties of Rockingham, Stokes, and Caswell in North Carolina	9.40	13.65	[1] 9.40	[1] 13.65
Lake States	12.75	15.75	10.00	13.50
Northeast:				
Zone I	12.75	15.25	13.75	16.25
Zone II	13.25	15.75	14.75	17.25
Zone III	13.25	15.75	14.75	17.25
Zone IV	13.25	15.75	13.50	16.00
Zone V	11.00	13.00	11.25	13.75

[1] Hardwoods other than gum wood. The ceilings on gum wood are $9.90 per cord for rough wood and $14.10 for peeled.

A Forest Service study made in the summer of 1934 found that pulpwood cutters averaged about 13 cents per hour at that time in turpentined stands of long leaf pine in the lower coastal plain. Another study reported that cutters were paid 17½ cents per hour in Virginia and the Carolinas in 1936. Stumpage, the price the farmer gets for standing timber, was usually less than a dollar a cord and ranged as low as 25 cents per cord. The Forest Service estimates that southern woodlands are producing pulpwood at an average rate of one-third to one-half cord per acre per year. At prewar stumpage prices farmers were getting returns of only 8 to 50 cents per acre per year on pulpwood land to cover property taxes, fire-protection costs, interest on investment, management, and other expenses such as brushing out roads.

It is sometimes said that southern pulp is inferior to pulp made from wood grown in other areas; however, in many cases southern pulp is successfully used in the same type of products as the supposedly superior pulps from other areas. Concerning newprint, for example, the United States Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis., says:

The suitability of certain species native to different regions for the manufacture of this product is attested by the fact that standard newsprint is being successfully manufactured in these regions. Thus, in Canada and the Northeastern States newsprint is made largely from white spruce and balsam fir; on the west coast it is made from western hemlock, some of the true firs, and the Sitka spruce; in the South it is made from yellow pine.

* * * * *

High-grade kraft wrapping paper and container board are made from both southern and northern pines as well as from western hemlock and Douglas fir. Both southern and northern pines are suitable for white bond and writing paper. A generalization between the properties of northern and southern pines might be made because of a somewhat higher springwood content of the former. Kraft pulp made from pine containing a large proportion of springwood is suitable for papers having smooth surfaces and relatively high bursting strength. Thus it is well adapted to the manufacture of specialties and somewhat finer products than the ordinary brown wrapping paper and shipping container board. Nevertheless, high-quality products are made from both northern and southern pines.

Are We Falling Down on the Job?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, now that the boys are coming home, we must do our part to see to it that the assurances and promises made before they went away are kept.

There is submitted a letter from commander of the DAV Auxiliary chapter for the consideration of my colleagues:

WALLACE, IDAHO, *March 15, 1946.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: Please do not receive this as one of many periodical gripes that you may have received lately. This is not written just to let it be known that we "wrote to our Congressman"; nor was it written to make an impression with our national headquarters. The members of local chapter No. 16, DAV, of Wallace, Idaho, feel, individually, that by bringing this subject to you, an honest effort on your part, as our Representative, will be made to instill some life in the bogged down, literature-laden proposals for adequate housing for veterans.

We do not feel that you can create a beautiful little home with a garden spot at a fair price just by going before the House and saying the people of Idaho want this. We feel that you and your colleagues will start finding out about and exposing bottlenecks that are keeping the inadequate housing condition in existence. We know your duties are many and varied, but what could be more important right now than putting an adequate roof over the heads of those men and women who have slept in tents and fox holes all over the world so we could go on living pretty much of a normal life during the war years.

This letter is not the result of a survey or compiled statistics but a true American feeling of guilt and inadequacy when we know we are falling down on the job.

You, as well as we, share in the same feeling; but we feel you are in a position to do something about it. Sure, all the patriotic organizations have made numerous pledges to such legislation for veterans' benefits; but it is you and the members of your group who are invested with the power and responsibility to do something material about this.

We are all in this race of life together and primarily we are supposed to enjoy each phase of this race equally as much as the other fellow. Those men and women returning now have missed out on one phase of a normal, happy life. Why should we subject them to more of the same medicine they have been taking for these past years?

In all sincerity and humbleness we ask you to double your efforts to help give these returning veterans a feeling that they are wanted again. Make them know that they will not have to sleep in hotel lobbies, freight cars, trailer camps, or any flop house that they may be lucky enough to find.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. A. HAUGNESS,
Commander, Local Chapter, No. 16,
Women's Auxiliary, D. A. V.

A Model Soil-Conservation District Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in calling the attention of my colleagues to the following annual report of the Evergreen Soil-Conservation District in my district in California. I think my colleagues will agree that this is a model that might well be followed by many other soil-conservation districts throughout the country:

ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1945, EVERGREEN SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICT, SAN JOSE, CALIF.

We, the directors of the Evergreen District of Central California wish to report on the condition of this small but important segment of the California government. We shall not refer to many numerical figures, since they do not seem very important to us. For what small value they may have, they can be found in the appendix prepared by the United States Soil Conservation Service.

We believe that this report will be of greatest value to the Soil Conservation Service, and to other agencies or individuals who may read it, if we confine our remarks to the following: (1) The present workability of the existing district arrangement; (2) the growth of cooperation with other agencies; (3) the important obstacles to better land use; and (4) the possibility of achieving our objectives.

1. THE PRESENT WORKABILITY OF THE EXISTING DISTRICT ARRANGEMENT

The existing arrangement is proving to be sound and fairly workable. The fact that all members of this board are congenial and tolerant of one another's ideas has made the expenditure of our time profitable. Meeting together frequently (often twice a month), we have learned a great deal about numerous subjects connected with soil and water management. We have relied upon our own thinking ability in weighing the suggestions of all visiting technicians, and have found their information helpful. By putting their ideas to severe tests of argument, based on our close experience with evergreen operating conditions, we have gradually developed a combination of standard conservation practices which we believe are nearly correct. Some or all of these practices are now being used by 30 cooperating (signed-up) farmers, including ourselves, and also by several other farmers who have come into touch with our efforts. Although we have divided our district into subdistricts, having selected subdirectors to represent them, this attempt at

decentralization has not yet become fully effective. We still think the idea is a good one, and it is expected that under better postwar conditions the system will work better.

Like most farming communities, evergreen is slow in changing from old habits to newer and better ones. For example, the modern belief of minimum cultivation is being accepted quite slowly. We ourselves have argued through many late hours about such things as plowing versus shallow tillage, fertilization of the cover crop instead of feeding the trees directly by means of rings around the trees, and trashy tillage of cover crops versus turning them under. The result has been a definite modification of some of our own ideas about soil management. Not until we convince ourselves of these things can we properly face the doubts of our neighbors by asking them to sign farm plans containing such measures.

We have insisted that our farmers be approached slowly on all new methods, and we have refrained from using any high-pressure tactics in getting them to apply for farm plans or agree to following them. Thanks to having a patient and understanding conservationist, who was anxious to subordinate many of his own ideas to our own ideas of operating this district, we have gradually secured a feeling of confidence on the part of the Evergreen community. None of our applications have been obtained with "double talk." Nearly all applications have been, and still are, made voluntarily through the desire to get some valuable assistance.

One of our methods of operation is to invite prospective cooperators to attend our meetings. In this way, we are able to discuss his problems directly with him, thereby giving him the benefit of what we know as operating farmers and what we have learned from the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies. In some cases, our advice has been turned down as to the best crops for certain types of land, but the farmers in these cases were willing to sign agreements covering the practices they believed in. Our efforts have been solely to help them avoid costly mistakes; but when they have decided against following our advice, we have assured them that we still wanted to help them in any way possible.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the energetic yet diplomatic conservationist who was assigned to assist us in organizing and developing this district. We understand that he is leaving the Soil Conservation Service. It is our hope that the man who takes his place will make himself "one of us" as he did. Looking back to the start of this program, we realize that much of what we now accept firmly, and consider to be our own doing (and thinking), has been due to the unselfish and humble method of presentation of these ideas to us.

It case it may reach the proper source, we wish to advise the higher administration of the Department of Agriculture as follows: You will do more real, lasting good for the farmers of this country by having the right kind of field men than by merely setting up splendid programs without having such men to carry them to the farmers. It takes field men who can translate them from the official form to the form that farmers will understand and accept. When you have men with the ability and the desire to do this, and who are more interested in helping the farmers than in advancing themselves as Government officials, we hope that you will do everything in your power to recognize their worth and make them want to continue in service. One of the best ways to fairly judge such a man is to ask the people he has been working with. This will really tell you more than the occasional impressions he may give to some of the people he has been working for.

2. THE GROWTH OF COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

It has been a source of great satisfaction to us, and a source of real amazement to our farmers, to learn that at least one agency of the Government is trying to help the farmers by teaching them how to help themselves. We believe that the Soil Conservation Service has tried to encourage local self-sufficiency rather than attempt to squeeze itself under our foundations with the motive of becoming a continuously increasing necessity

Our hope is that this district will be able to secure prompt and unpatronizing assistance from certain other agencies. To this end, we have and shall continue to exert unceasing effort to become recognized as a responsible board of directors representing all of our 250 or more farmers. Progress with other agencies has been slow and discouraging, because it appears that they have expected to do things their way and at their convenience instead of in accordance with our local needs and wishes.

Due to the lack of response to direct requests for assistance, we directors have undertaken to strike at the broader and deeper basis of inaction and noncooperation, by associating ourselves with other district boards of directors. We can honestly lay claim to originating the type of organization known as "Association of Soil-Conservation Districts," which was started here in San Jose in the early Spring of 1945. When we were told by the local district attorney that this type of organization was illegal, our president and assemblyman, Mr. John F. Thompson of Evergreen, put a law through the State legislature which makes it legal to have associations of soil-conservation districts. We believe that this is a large stride in the direction of securing better cooperation, not only among the various soil conservation districts but also from local, State, and Federal agencies in a position to help the farmers with soil and water conservation.

Our Mr. Thompson, representing all Californians, became chairman of the legislature's committee to investigate soil and water conservation problems throughout the State. After conducting active hearings in various parts of the State, this committee recommended several bills which were passed. In addition to the bill mentioned above, legislation was passed enlarging the membership of the State soil-conservation commission to include two farmer (district director) members. Other legislation improves the procedure for financing soil conservation districts, and the method of conducting district elections. An appropriation was secured, for the first time, for operation of the State commission. We are proud of the results of our thought and effort in strengthening the soil conservation movement in California.

3. THE IMPORTANT OBSTACLES TO BETTER LAND USE

The slowness of our farmers to accept improved methods has already been mentioned. This is one of the important obstacles to better land use in our district.

The other obstacles are mainly physical limitations such as insufficiency of water for irrigation; the existence of certain blocks of shallow soil, making profitable farming difficult, if not impossible, for the people so located; and the use, by a number of our farmers, of steep land not capable of permanently supporting cultivated crops.

The first obstacle can and will be overcome. At present, however, we are finding it extremely difficult to get many of the farmers to come together in order to become better educated.

The second obstacle—getting more and cheaper water—has been attacked energetically. At the very start of the district, in the summer of 1944, we asked the Soil Conservation Service to make a survey of our water sources and a plan for their maximum development. The response to our request was slower and more restrained than we anticipated; but after a year and a half of study, on which we spent much of our own time and some of our personal funds, we wish to express our appreciation for the cautious attitude taken by the Soil Conservation Service. We are particularly indebted to Mr. Don Williams, who made a most careful study and a most excellent report on our situation. This situation is still as bad as it was, and we believe that our water supplies will get lower as time goes on. But at least we have been prevented from going off half cocked and embarking on an expensive program of water development that could not pay its way.

The third and fourth obstacles consist of soil and slope situations which are unfortunate for the farmers tied to them. It would be foolish for us, or for anyone else, who knows what these people are up against, to recommend changes in land use that would decrease their income. Theoretically, it is simple to suggest that farmers with poor land need more acreage in order that they may follow a program of grazing or other noncultivated use. But we do not work on the basis of imaginary solutions to the problems of our district. We know from experience that a farmer has got to make a living, and that he cannot afford to stop cultivating an orchard—no matter how steep it may be—if doing so deprives him of income.

4. THE POSSIBILITY OF ACHIEVING OUR OBJECTIVES

Our objectives, as stated in our program (1944), are still the same, namely, "The growers of this district have basically but one thought in mind and that being to increase permanently the quantity and quality of our production, which can be done and shall be done either by this organization or by others which shall follow through the efforts of this organization." The purpose of forming the district, as stated in our original work plan (1944), is also still the same, as follows: "The Evergreen Soil Conservation District was formed because of the necessity of community effort in correcting natural deficiencies that exist in the district and to assist in maintaining and improving the soil resources with which this area is so bountifully supplied."

When we started this district, we hoped that some of our greatest needs, such as developing more irrigation water, would be achieved soon. Now we realize that this and other problems, such as rodent control, noxious weed control, and the knowledge of proper fertilizing, will not be quickly solved. We understand a lot more about these problems, and along with this understanding has come the realization that they are more difficult to solve than we once thought. Also has come the conviction, greater than ever, that such an organization as this district is the only means whereby these large and basic needs can ever be fulfilled. We fully recognize that such jobs as these require cooperation, on the part of our farmers and on the part of public agencies having technical information, specialized equipment, and the right materials with which to do the job.

We still believe that we shall reach our objectives. We are agreed, however, that we shall have to continue and intensify our efforts to secure more interest among our own farmers. We accept this responsibility, but in so doing we shall expect all possible assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Extension Service, the State soil conservation commission, and other agencies that can help us in getting our farmers to attend meetings and in enlarging the farmers' knowledge and desire to improve existing conditions. We believe that the Extension Service should, and can, render much valuable aid to us as an organized district, by conducting educational meetings in accordance with our soil and water conservation program.

Our own efforts to develop better and cheaper water supplies will not be discontinued. But we shall also continue to seek advice and practical assistance from all the agencies who can help us. We shall strive to accomplish

this project not only as an individual board of directors, but also as a member of the Santa Clara Valley Association of Districts and as a member of the State Association of Districts. Perhaps the solution will finally come in the form of a large water-development program benefiting all of the bay area.

To control injurious rodents and noxious weeds, we shall continue to request—and if necessary to demand—help from the county supervisors.

To solve the complex problem of proper fertilizing, we shall continue to ask for assistance in developing an adequate course of soil tests, leaf analyses, and fertilizer field trials. Until we know for sure what elements our various crops need under our different soil conditions, we cannot hope to furnish proper fertilizer recommendations to our cooperating farmers.

In the case of certain other phases of soil and water conservation, we believe that substantial progress has already been made, especially with improved irrigation practices, better cover crops, corrected cultivation methods, and more efficient control of runoff by means of these and other special measures. We shall continue to expect friendly and capable assistance from field men of the Soil Conservation Service, in helping us to prepare and follow through with individual farm conservation plans, which we consider to be a very effective approach to some of our objectives.

Respectfully submitted January 23, 1946, by board of directors:

JOHN F. THOMPSON.
ROY SALTALAMACHIA.
E. A. MIRASSOU.
HERMAN B. BAUM.
ELWIN H. WELD.

Statement of Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert the statement made by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch before the Banking and Currency Committee on March 25, 1946:

I feel honored at being requested to appear before you on the important subject of price control.

In these days of speed and emergency it is good practice to put suggestions in a form so that "he who runs may read," and to aid the digestion of his reading I am submitting at the outset certain of my ideas in capsule form. Here they are:

Increase production. This is the law and the prophets—without it the rest of my suggestions are meaningless. So I say again: Increase production.

Stop increasing money supply.

Stop decreasing taxes until budget is balanced.

Stop "bunking" the public by saying wage increases can be granted without increase in price levels.

Do not fear to increase prices or wages where necessary to get and stimulate production.

Continue price controls, subject to indicated modifications, for a year. Allow profit but no profiteering.

Avoid favoritism to any particular group.

Take care of those between the millstones—clerks, Government employees, pensioners, et al.

Make surpluses of goods in military hands available to compensate for shortages.

Stimulate founding and financing small business.

Take stock before blindly lending—make inventories of our goods, our cash, our credit, before we increase the pressure on these.

Cut government costs, including Federal, State, county, and city. In time of deflation we should spend; in time of inflation we should save.

Eliminate all strikes or lock-outs for a year but arrange that hardships are guarded against.

Set up a high court of commerce—a sort of supreme economic counsel which can decide questions involved in the above points and related subjects.

Remember that a soft or rotten spot anywhere in our system spreads and causes an illness everywhere.

Avoid an economic dictatorship. We are still a free society based on the enterprise system. Let us abolish neither without the consent of the people.

And, above all, we should keep in mind that the humanities come before the dollars. It may be trite to say it but it should be said again and again that our first duty runs to man before business, but we must not forget that sometimes the two are interchangeable.

Having finished with an index, I proceed to my content.

There is nothing much I can add to the statement I made before this honorable committee on September 19, 1941. What was applicable then is applicable now—with this difference. Then we were about to fight the bloodiest and most devastating war in all history. There was unanimity of purpose in the country which grew with the war's approach. Now there is a new feeling that comes because the war is over. The race of selfishness is on—each segment of society and each individual seeking an advantage over others. The shooting war may be over but its aftermath—military, economic, and spiritual—is still here. Before the peace terms are set, we are adopting a scuttle-and-run policy on all fronts, eager to get home and back to normal. Pressure groups are on the march.

On September 19, 1941, I said:

"Except for human slaughter and maiming and all that goes with them, inflation is the most destructive of the consequences of war. It might double or more the cost of the war, it imposes the severest hardships on our people, and, through inevitable deflation that follows, burdens the future with a constantly increasing debt and a long period of painful and bitter readjustment destroying the confidence of people in themselves and their Government, leaving them open to all the old and new isms. * * * With pay rolls soaring and shortages developing, more money bidding for less goods, the danger of an inflationary price rise is imminent. If it is not taken firmly in hand in time, it may get beyond the possibility of control."

That can be said again today. Let us stop trying to do a thing but not do it both at the same time. We either must suffer what inflation brings or prevent it.

I have advocated for wartime an over-all price control, including wages, adjusting injustices or hardships where they exist. Price control by itself will not be effective. It must go hand in hand with a sharply defined tax program; the siphoning off of excess savings and earnings by selling Government bonds to individuals instead of banks; by controlling all loans; by not favoring any one segment of society over another; by priority, licensing, and allocation to the greatest needs, and, above all, by increasing production.

I quote again:

"Piecemeal price fixing will not halt inflation. It allows the general price level to run wild, while dealing with a few individual prices. * * *

"As inflation occurs the prices that are fixed soon become out of date and must be adjusted upward. Irregular rises in prices destroy the relationships between various costs, requiring even greater adjustments."

So much for the past. I do not wish to appear as a prophet saying, "I told you so," but, rather, as friend and citizen examining with you our past in order to guide our future.

The price structure is one that has grown through the years by trial and error, with the law of supply and demand, increasing transportation, finding better methods of manufacture and distribution, with each government, community, and individual fitting itself into that structure. You cannot suddenly lay violent hands on it and expect it to function in the way that will give everything that is needed, nor cure all hardships and injustices. One apparently insignificant act, here or there, may change the life of a whole community and upset the lives of many far distant, just as the strike of a few will cripple a city or nation overnight by closing some function that may be as necessary as one of the vital organs of the body.

We cannot be complacent as we are being beguiled with more money, with less purchasing power. The gold dust thrown in all our eyes, by political abracadabra, only confuses, with gain to no one except temporary power to the economic magicians. We must mix brains with our brawn if we would keep our world leadership. We must steady ourselves in these emotional sweeps and keep our heads or the ship of democracy will wallow in this sea of confusion, spring a leak and disintegrate.

Whole segments of society have lost their perspective as to the rights of others. Many have lost their capacity for indignation over their own wrongs and the wrongs inflicted upon others. Many could not make up their minds whether we were going to have inflation or deflation. The wonder to me is that things are not even worse than they are.

Before the report on war and postwar adjustment policies was made in February of 1944, practically everyone predicted between 9,000,000 and 15,000,000 unemployed. That prophecy proved unfounded. This kind of thinking shows how momentary emotion can affect a whole people.

This report recommended certain things of which but one was adopted—contract termination.

Another plan had to do with disposal of surplus property. If this had been worked intelligently and courageously many of the things the public wants and which are available would have been distributed and become useful. Some of the factories which we built could have been put in operation long ago. The surplus problem has been so tied up that it is not yet functioning properly.

Congress has just passed a law which will enable us to sell our ships. This was delayed too long. They should be turned loose on the best terms possible to all nations that can use them for commerce or fishing. They in turn will seek out in every port of the world even small cargoes of materials that can be used, thereby affecting the national and international outlook.

A high light recommended in the report was to put one man in charge of human demobilization for workers and returning veterans. If it had been promptly done, we would have escaped many of our present difficulties among veterans, workers, and civilians.

There was advanced a plea for opening up credits for small business through the Federal Reserve, but nothing definite has been done about that.

The whole world is watching us, amazed at the exhibition of a giant who cannot pull

himself together even to take care of his own needs.

We reduced taxation nearly $6,000,000,000 for the purpose, it was said, of stimulating business which already had orders that it will take years to fill. At the same time that we lessened our income by $6,000,000,000, we asked for new loans. This bond issue was oversubscribed, most of it creating credits that can be turned by the Federal Reserve Bank into printed money. There lies a grave menace—money increase.

We make promises to other nations of loans for purchases generally to be made here. And if not here, then in other places in the world where we compete.

On every side the Federal, State, city, and county governments have rebuilding programs which will increase the demands upon an already limited supply. They can be easily postponed to a later date when they will be needed.

Then, while endeavoring to hold prices, we remove the indirect control over wages by getting rid of the Little Steel formula, which was but a weak substitute for wage control, and grant the 18½-cent increase for steel. This will be followed by increases all along the line, no matter what anybody thinks to the contrary. Call it a bulge, but it is really a break—and a grave one. This was inflationary.

I do not blame labor for wanting to retain their standard of living. For the decrease of $6,000,000,000 in taxes and the throwing over of the Little Steel formula naturally made them feel they should take care of themselves. I would want my take-home pay to remain the same. The corporations and smaller-income groups benefited mostly from the $6,000,000,000 tax reduction. Private owners of business, large and small, were seriously disadvantaged. And so it is with every group. And all of this must be followed by increases in pay or pension to the white-collar brigade, Government workers, firemen, policemen, teachers, professional people, veterans, and the Army and the Navy.

And what becomes of all of the people when we expect Government to pay out more if taxable profits are squeezed? Who gets any advantage if goods are not produced faster than wages are advanced and money printed? We cannot call this holding the line or just a bulge. To make the take-home worth while, more things at lower prices must be produced. That is up to labor more than management. Unless each man produces more than he receives, increases his output, there will be less for him and all the others. Each one will receive more money but have fewer things.

We might as well admit we have made tragic mistakes. The race between prices and the cost of living is going on here and all over the world. Ask the housewife. She knows better than the economists and statisticians.

Let us now face facts. We must have full production. Without it we cannot keep any semblance of modern, civilized economy or even government. We risk inflation. We mute the voice with which we speak for peace in the world. With full production we can escape inflation and have our people reassume their leadership.

In my appeal for legislation in my appearance before this committee in 1941 I said:

"The control of prices is essential for the successful conduct of our national defense, for avoiding social and economic aftermaths of war, for taking the profits out of war, for the maintenance of morale, the stoppage of inflation, and the placing of America in the dominating place at the peace table. As I said before, with such great stakes we cannot afford an ineffective program of price control. Some persons, while admitting that everything I have said is true, have argued that the public is not ready for such drastic measures; that various interests have to be pacified at the expense of others; that the best law that can be had is a stopgap measure with compromises, one which while unable to prevent inflation, will keep prices down somewhat. To them I recommend the words of George Washington to the members of the Constitutional Convention. As you know, the delegates to that Convention originally were supposed merely to patch up the Articles of Confederation. They could have done just that and told themselves we will do more patching later on, and on, and on. Happily the delegates chose to be guided by Washington's advice:

"'It is too probable,' he told them, 'that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God.'"

And so here we are today.

The price structure is out of gear. I never favored subsidies, but they have become a part of this tottering price edifice. I would continue those now in effect. I would give no more.

For 1 year I would extend the present war powers, price fixing, and include wages, with the provision that no raise in prices be made without the approval of OPA, and no increase in wage scales without approval of the Office of Economic Stabilization.

Because of the wage increase, we will be forced to raise prices, but it must be with a firm and wise hand, so as to get the necessary production. Remember, we have not the stimulus and unity that war creates. We will have to depend upon the personal initiative and profit incentive, but that does not mean profiteering. If wages are advanced, the farmers will surely come along because their costs are increased and they have a law which gives them parity, and, therefore, higher prices as the average price levels go up, and then the wages of all civil servants—the white-collar brigade—the recipients of fixed incomes—have to be increased, and, as I say, you will have to increase pensions.

There may be wisdom in reinstating the $6,000,000,000 tax reduction. Certainly I would continue renegotiations on war contracts. These steps might take care of excess profits.

Government expenditures should be cut to the bone.

The strictest allocation should be made of all money so that no loans will be granted or undertaken here by private concerns, or by the Federal Government, States, cities, and counties, unless approved by the Treasury, which must seek the approval of the Office of War Mobilization, which is in charge of production.

I am not opposed to helping foreign nations. But until production warrants it, I am opposed to lending them money or assisting them except for dire needs to make purchases when we know they cannot be made here or elsewhere. At this time that would be to increase demand. It would be cruel to hold out hopes that will not be realized. I would keep the goods necessary to prevent inflation and then allocate the balance, as they come to hand, where it would help the most.

We must stop treading this economic primrose path. There is only one way to stop inflation and that is to get production. What must be done later can be better done now. Whatever is necessary now to do to get that proposition, I would do.

As everyone knows, I have advocated a stricter price control and higher taxes than anyone else. We have made too many makeshifts. We will either have to go back and do it right, or, having accepted the mistakes of the past, increase prices to put everyone on a higher plateau. The only hope we now have is that production will then be so large, inflation will be stopped.

Rising prices have been due to two things:

1. Currency inflation.

2. Great demand being made upon a limited supply. The law of supply and demand will take time to work and it is during this period that we must have controls. As I predicted 2 years ago, I see at least 5 or 7 years of unending demand. How long that will last will depend upon the wisdom we show.

I approve of the set-up whereby Mr. Secretary Anderson has charge of production of agricultural products, with the provision that prices made by the OPA should be subject to his approval.

As all other production is in charge of the Civilian Production Administration under Commodore Small, all prices for that production should meet with his approval.

There should not be any strikes or lockouts for a period of at least 1 year by agreement preferably—otherwise by law. Mr. Bowles' new office can carry this out, taking care that no hardships are involved to the workers—or the employers. But they can shut down and live while the workers would starve.

Any dispute between the agencies involved must be solved without delay by the Office of War Mobilization (Mr. Snyder) to which Congress has given the power to do just that. Of course all can appeal to the President.

To those who paid little attention to the OPA and used the black markets during the war, there have been added many good citizens who are just beginning that practice. If a wise course is not pursued, that practice will be extended. Prices and disrespect for law will mount, and quality of goods and respect for law will decrease.

It cannot be said too often. We must have production to save ourselves and the world. But, if a close-fisted policy squeezes every bit of profit out of industry in order that some segment of society may apparently be advantaged, the Government being the sole judge of this, we will arrive at an economy with our industries nearly all nationalized without a vote of the people—an economic and social revolution of greater proportions than we now realize, one that American labor will rue as much as others.

Any type of control should be directed first toward food, clothing, civilian services, housing, and transportation for everyone. If you will give the American people an opportunity to function, not by fear nor yet by favor, and let every segment of society feel that it is not disfavored to the advantage of another, in a few months you will see an amazing change.

I heard much during the war of an endeavor to protect the little businessman. How can he live under the present schedules? Prices must be set up not for each particular one in the business, but for a whole industry. People will not work without profits.

To the prophets of evil, I would like to say that I have faith in American institutions and the common sense of the American people. We must close our ears to those who try to turn us to statism by indirection. We are good-natured people who can be pushed around but only so much.

A final word:

Do we know what our resources are?

Do we know what our debts are?

Do we know how we stand and what we have with which to help others as well as ourselves?

Do we know how much the others really need?

Many of our difficulties will be solved when we get going. We cannot get going by adopting political instead of economic and human methods. The human equation is the greatest of all—the desire to function—the desire to profit. But those desires must not run wild—they must be limited to fair-

ness. Let us be realistic and recognize that, at the same time getting away from any unjust opposition to any of the factors composing our economic body.

All parts of society because of modern communications have become so entwined that it can only function well as a whole. Sometimes only one, sometimes two or three, missing parts will cause a break-down of the whole machine, or cause it to slow down. Society cannot permit a few men—labor, or management, or farmers, or professionals, or politicians, or members of any group to stop it because of differences in ideas or practices between some parts of society. While we are setting up a machinery to stop wars between nations, we have not solved it within our own gates.

I give you this thought:

There should be a high court of commerce set up to which these disputes can be taken for adjudication in order that we may work out a program on the basis of the principles which made this country great. If this is not done, we shall soon find ourselves in the morass of confusion that will bring us either to fascism or communism; and that Ark of the Covenant of human liberties and dignities, our form of government, will have been lost.

The advance in wages can make true a wish that we all have fathered—that is—if labor and management so will it more and more wealth can be produced—more things made—so that each can share in more and better things at lower prices. Down that path we can safely go to the benefit of all and the disadvantage of none.

This would result in an economy of abundance, which should guarantee a return to free enterprise in a year.

Philippine Commonwealth Stand on Collaboration Endorsed by President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 President Truman issued a statement declaring that he saw no need for changing the policy of the Philippine Government with regard to its treatment of persons accused of collaborating with the enemy during the war.

The President declared:

I have determined that there is no necessity for any change in our established policy of leaving the disposition of civil collaborationists in the Philippines to the civil authorities there.

He said further that:

I have every confidence in the determination of the Philippine people, who have proved beyond all doubt their devotion to democracy and the United States, to punish those who served the enemy against the interests of the Commonwealth and the United States.

President Truman's statement has gone far to correct misunderstandings which had unfortunately been accepted by some people in the United States. Last September, Secretary of the Interior Ickes sent a radiogram to President Osmeña expressing impatience at the alleged delay in bringing collaborationists to trial. This message seems to have been interpreted by some as an expression of American lack of confidence in the manner the issue of collaboration was being handled by the Philippine Commonwealth.

On October 26, President Truman issued a directive to the Attorney General requesting that a study be made of the status of accused collaborationists. This directive, too, was given the same regrettable interpretation.

The facts, of course, are clear. A civil people's court was established last fall, at the recommendation of President Osmeña, for the sole purpose of trying those accused of helping the Japanese and a staff of able prosecutors was also created, led by a Harvard graduate, an efficient, able, and uncompromising solicitor general, the Honorable Lorenzo Tañada. Since that time the legal proceedings have been energetically carried out. The conduct of these proceedings was carefully studied by representatives of the United States—Attorney General, the Secretary of War, and the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines. They returned with a completely favorable report, and out of their recommendations has come President Truman's statement on the subject.

This statement by the President of the United States represents the final obliteration of unwarranted accusations of weakness leveled against the Philippine Commonwealth in its handling of the collaboration issue. It is a vindication of the wise, just policy that has consistently been followed by President Osmeña in this matter. It is an effective indication of American approval of the way the Philippine Commonwealth has handled a delicate problem—and it is further proof, if proof were needed, of the parallel lines along which American and Filipino thinking travel.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the full text of President Truman's statement into the RECORD because it is the answer from the White House itself to the doubts that may have afflicted some of our friends in the United States. The statement follows:

On October 26, 1945, I addressed a directive to the Attorney General requesting that a study be made of the status of those who collaborated with the enemy in the Philippines.

I have received reports from the Attorney General, from the Secretary of War, and from High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, on this subject.

After studying the recommendations submitted to me, I have determined that there is no necessity for any change in our established policy of leaving the disposition of civil collaborationists in the Philippines to the civil authorities there.

Our original policy was formulated late in 1944 on the basis of strong recommendation by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and was initiated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In support of that policy there was formed in the Philippines last year a civil people's court to try collaborationist cases. The study recently made by officials of this Government of the manner in which the collaborationist cases have been handled indicates an earnest and well-directed effort to dispose of these cases as speedily as possible.

There are major obstacles, such as the unavailability of witnesses, disruption of communications, and lack of funds for investigation, transportation, and clerical assistance which make it extremely difficult for the people's court to assure speedy justice. Nevertheless, I have every confidence in the determination of the Philippine people, who have proved beyond all doubt their devotion to democracy and the United States, to punish those who served the enemy against the interests of the Commonwealth and of the United States. The principle is well established in the Philippines that an act of disloyalty to the United States was an act of disloyalty to the Commonwealth and to the Philippine people. The Philippine courts have accepted this principle.

It is noteworthy that we have not been asked by any group in the Philippines to intervene in the trial of the collaborators. It is my judgment that any move to intervene now would meet with instantaneous objection from even our most loyal supporters in the islands. Such intervention would serve notice upon the Philippine people, and upon the many millions of people everywhere who are watching the Philippine experiment, that we do not consider the people of the Philippines capable of bringing these culprits to justice.

The Philippines are scheduled to become an independent republic on July 4 of this year. I am certain that the Philippine people are fully capable of assuming all the duties and obligations of self-government. I believe that these heroic people, out of their own devotion to democratic ideals, will eliminate from their national and political life all those of questionable allegiance to those democratic principles.

In arriving at these conclusions, I am assuring the Philippine people that we have every confidence that they are capable of making their own political decisions without intervention or direction by the United States.

Our Obligations to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Greek Nation played an important role in the early days of the war. They held off the invader from the north, which permitted England and America to upset the plans of the Axis nations. The Greek people are now in the claws of the Russian bear. The Russians are making unusual and unfair claims upon the Greek people. The Russians want trusteeship of Tripolitania, the Straits of Turkey, and bases in the Dodeconesian Islands. This country should, vigorously, oppose these claims, because they have a very deep effect upon the future of Greece and Turkey.

I do not believe the Greek people will ever surrender their freedom, regardless of what comes. The nation may be conquered physically, but never in spirit. The Greek people have made terrific sacrifices and will again resist, with all their

might, this new aggression from Russia. Russia should not be permitted to establish herself in Greek territory. If bases are given to Russia, as they are now demanding, it may well mean complete strangulation of Greece. It will mean that Greece has no living space it can call its own. The sacrifices made by the Greek people should be recognized and they should be entitled to security and freedom.

It should be remembered that during the war, the Greeks rendered a great service to the Russians, the same Russians, who today are alined against Greece, and support her enemies, the Bulgarians and the Albanians. The Bulgarians and the Albanians, during the war, fought against Greece, and thus helped Germany against the Russians. Because of the Greeks' resistance, Hitler was forced to divert many of his divisions which he intended to use against the Russians. He had to do this in order to subdue Greece. These efforts of the Greeks should be taken into consideration when the final boundaries and treaties are settled. Greece is not asking for anything more than that which historically and traditionally belongs to her. Greece is entitled to the Dodecanesian Islands and northern Epirus. This Nation should support Greece, because there is justice in her claims. It appears that the only country which opposes these legitimate claims is Russia. The Russian claim should be resisted. Both the Dodecanese and northern Epirus areas are made up of ancient Greek population and have played a large part in the culture of Greece throughout its history.

The Italians, with the Albanians, in the early 20's began a campaign of repression against the Greek population of northern Epirus. They closed Greek schools and drove large numbers from the country. As a result these Italian actions against Greek population, several of Fascist groups in Italy brought forth the first of the Axis dictators and thus started us on the road to war. There is a definite connection between the sacrifice of Greece at the peace table after World War I and the beginning of World War II.

The present Greek-Albanian boundaries leave Greece with her strategic back door open. Any invader can come in through Albania, as they did, successfully, from the days of the Romans to Mussolini's time, but the mountain ranges of northern Epirus afford an opportunity for defense.

According to the last reliable information, there are 120,000 Greek Catholics and 80,000 Greek Moslems in the 5,000 square kilometer area of northern Epirus. Italian-planned persecution drove more than one-fifth of the Greeks from the country between 1920 and 1940.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that we should recognize these just claims of the Greek Nation. If Greece is to be carved up again, it may mean World War III. We must not settle these claims of small nations on the basis of might. It must be done on the basis of what is right.

The Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the beauty and bounty of the Gem State has inspired the lines that come from one of Idaho's daughters which I take pleasure in presenting to the Members of the House:

CVA

As Bonneville now is, so CVA
Will be by ten times ten—some glorious day;
A monumental work magnificent,
To man's ingeniousness and purpose bent.

Let skeptics splutter warning—asking "how?"
The trend of progress is forever, now.
And man aspiring with his large-scale dreams,
Finds promise in ten million little streams.

—*Jennie Farquhar, Orofino, Idaho.*

Feeding the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman acted wisely in appointing Herbert Hoover as head of the committee authorized to determine the need of the people of other nations for food and to report on how we could best do our part. Perhaps no man has had so wide an experience nor so efficiently aided in feeding a hungry people as has Herbert Hoover.

Throughout our history, in every major world disaster, we have been foremost in contributing to the stricken people. No doubt, that attitude has been due in part to the fact that we as a people have had more of the good things of life than have others; in part, to the fact that here there exists less jealousy toward other peoples than in other parts of the world.

For the second time, our young men, and, in this last war, the young women, have made the sacrifices which have saved the British Empire from destruction. Billions of dollars and millions of tons of supplies made it possible for the British Empire to continue to exist. We were told, and many of our youth believed, that the first war was fought to end all war; that the second was fought to carry the "four freedoms" to every part of the world, to bring a universal, enduring peace. Many have been disillusioned and now know that both wars came about, as have so many in the past, because of the desire of ambitious men to expand trade, procure world markets, extend the territorial limits of their nations, strengthen their military power.

It remains to be seen whether, having fought Hitler, we can now be dragged or coaxed into another war to fight Russia. In the meantime, both Britain and Russia, whose statesmen are glaring at each other and engaging in verbal battles which, if continued long enough, will involve them in war, are seeking loans of billions of dollars from us.

Food to the starving we must aid in supplying, because we have the ability and our nature will not permit us to see innocent women and children die for want of food or freeze for want of clothing. But it does seem to some of us that we should not supply to nations which may be preparing for war the money and material which aid in rearmament, in carrying on war.

And, if we are to play a major part in feeding the world, here at home there must be a more realistic policy. All during the war, young men needed on the farms for the production of the food which our allies and our armed forces required, were drafted. Our factories were engaged in the production of the munitions of war, and supplies of farm machinery were extremely short.

Although the actual fighting has ceased, we are still officially at war, and the Conscription Act is still in force. Notwithstanding the Tydings amendment, which exempted from the draft agricultural laborers who were regularly employed in agriculture and who could not be replaced, such men continue to be drafted. Strikes have curtailed the production of farm machinery. OPA has put its blighting hand upon reconversion and production—the only real remedy for inflation.

Farmers need fertilizer. They need farm machinery. They need lumber and cement and many things, the production of which can be had only if iron and steel are available. Most of all, they need farm workers. Higher wages are taking men from the farms, threatening food production.

If we are to aid in feeding the world, we can do it more efficiently if the administration will set its own house in order; quit drafting essential agricultural labor; adopt a labor policy which will lessen labor disputes and strikes; pound a little common sense and good judgment into OPA; permit farmers and industry to complete the task of reconversion which they had so successfully undertaken when the end of the war became apparent.

First, set our own house in order. Then, when we get the report of Mr. Hoover, we can solve the problem.

Tribute to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States owe an everlasting debt to Greece and we should

rejoice in the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of Greek independence. Practical democracy and regard for the individual had their start in that historic land, and particularly in the city-states which took Athens as their guide. The principles of self-government were practiced by the Greeks in periods of war and of peace, and furnished the setting for the flowering of all the arts, literature, and philosophy.

The two most profound works on political theory, Plato's Republic and Aristotle's Politics have fed the spirit of man for over 2,000 years. The dramas of Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Euripides still fill us with the sense of tragic beauty which underlies all life, while the comedies of Aristophanes continue to make man laugh. Again, the funeral oration of Pericles ranks with the Gettysburg address as the noblest elegy of all time to the young heroes who have given up their lives for liberty, while the Iliad and the Odyssey are the perfect chronicles of men and women in the dangers of war and of personal reconversion. Greek sculpture and architecture, on the other hand, were the expression of perfect beauty. There is indeed little that lives and breathes in modern life that is not Greek in origin.

As a child, I had the privilege of accompanying my sculptor-father to Greece and in Athens I saw the Parthenon, gleaming on the Acropolis in the moonlight. That memory is imperishable for me as it has been for the millions who through the ages have witnessed it.

Last summer I returned again to Greece, this time as a member of a congressional committee charged with studying the work of UNRRA. The Acropolis was just as beautiful, but all about me I saw hungry children and I knew that our opportunity had come at last to help repay the debt which we all owe.

When Greece was striving to regain her independence, the English poet Byron came to help them. While there, he wrote the immortal lines:

The mountains look on Marathon,
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And dreaming there one hour alone
I dreamed that Greece might still be free.

Let us give thanks that she again is free. We, the youngest of the great democracies, meanwhile must show our gratitude to this pioneer, by deeds of friendship and of kindness.

Government Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement from the Round Table, by Wilbur J. Brons.

The administration has frequently asked Congress to pass legislation which would permit them to set up planning boards. These planning boards of bureaucrats would be charged with drawing up blueprints of the future needs of this country. The following article indicates how wrong some of the top men in Government have been when they predicted what the unemployment for the early part of 1946 would be:

THE ROUND TABLE
(By Wilbur J. Brons)

ECONOMIC WIZARDS MAKE POOR SHOWING AT FAVORITE PASTIME

Advocates of the planned economy like to tell you that planning is natural and right—manufacturers, farmers, retailers, professional men, all must plan their affairs to some extent.

This is true, of course. But it is also a typical oversimplification of a tremendously complicated problem. It ignores completely the vital difference between private planning by millions of relatively free men and the schemes and devices of bureaucrats imposed from the top. The plain truth is that no group of men in Government is capable of planning for the entire country.

If you doubt it, simply recall the predictions of Secretary Wallace, Secretary Schwellenbach, Reconversion Director Snyder, and Arthur J. Altmeyer, of the Social Security Board. If President Truman's job budget bill had been adopted in its original form, these men, or their successors, would have provided the composite business forecasts upon which Federal pump priming would have been based.

We place Mr. Wallace first in the list because he is the foremost exponent of employment planning by government. Testifying before the House committee on Federal expenditures, October 30, 1945, the Commerce Secretary said "unemployment would total 8,000,000 in the first quarter of 1946 because our economic machinery simply can't operate quite fast enough to build up peacetime employment as rapidly as demobilizing of war industry and the armed forces will proceed."

On November 7, 1945, Secretary Schwellenbach testified before the House Committee on Executive Department Expenditures: "Our estimate shows from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 unemployed by spring. Then a reduction of that down to 4,000,000 to 6,000,000 in the fall of next year."

On August 30, 1945, Reconversion Director Snyder told the House Ways and Means Committee: "We believe that the total number of jobless workers in this country probably will be 6,000,000 by the end of the year. By early spring the total may be 8,000,000."

On the same day, Mr. Altmeyer told the Ways and Means Committee that the Social Security Board had made several estimates of unemployment during the transition from war to peace. "The low estimate," he said, "is 5,500,000 in December 1945, 6,000,000 in June 1946, 4,500,000 in December 1946, and 4,000,000 by June 1947. For the intermediate figure, we show 6,500,000 unemployed by December 1945, 8,000,000 by June 1946, 6,000,000 by December 1946, and 4,000,000 by June 1947. The high estimate shows 7,600,000 unemployed by December 1945; 10,000,000 by June 1946, 8,500,000 by December 1946, and 6,000,000 by June 1947."

The Bureau of the Census, on the other hand, reported that actual unemployment in December 1945 was 1,950,000. In January this year, the Census Bureau's figure was 2,290,000. The normal core of month-to-month unemployment in the national economy is about 2,500,000. In many industries today there are more jobs than there are workers willing to take them. Over-all production of peacetime goods has been stymied by strikes encouraged by the administration's wage-price policy.

All in all, the soothsayers upon whose estimates economic planning would rest have not turned in a very impressive performance. Nor is there any reason to believe that another group of men or another set of circumstances would produce better guessing.

Martial Law in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 25, 1946.

Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: This is in reply to your recent inquiry in regard to certain radio broadcasts by a commentator on the subject of martial law in Hawaii. I welcome this opportunity to answer the attacks that have been made upon the War Department and certain of its personnel.

From the broadcasts the impression would be gained that the military overthrew the civil government of Hawaii and that thereafter the military abused its power by tyrannical action. The fact is that martial law was proclaimed for Hawaii on the afternoon of Pearl Harbor day by the civilian Governor, who requested the Army to take over and exercise the powers of government. The Governor's declaration of martial law received the prompt approval of the President. The Army did not in any sense oust or overthrow the civil government of the Territory. The civil authorities of the Territory continued for the most part to function as before, their authority supported and assured by martial law. Thus, the Governor retained his office and continued to function as Governor, issuing rules for the civilian population under the powers given him by the Hawaiian Defense Act. The Territorial legislature held its regular session in early 1943 and passed laws for the government of the Territory. Special agencies created by the military authorities for the administration of such matters as food control, labor control, transportation, and civilian defense were directed and almost entirely staffed by civilian inhabitants of the islands. It would be impossible to pay too high a tribute to the civilian population for the time, effort, and sacrifice which its members freely gave to make Hawaii secure.

Hawaii was, of course, exposed to dire peril by the Japanese attack. Actual invasion was expected at any moment. In the opinion of the military and naval commanders on the spot, the necessity for martial rule lasted almost until the war's end. The Battle of Midway in June of 1942 illustrated the peril rather than ended it. The importance of Hawaii as a vital base increased throughout the war, the peril of invasion was real, and there was continual danger that Japanese submarines would land espionage or sabotage parties. These were the necessities which supported the establishment and continuance of martial law.

The Supreme Court, in its decision in the cases of *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku* and *White*

v. *Steer,* on February 25, 1946, decided that military courts could not be empowered to try civilians for offenses against the local laws under the circumstances presented in those two cases. The War Department, of course, accepts as settled law the decision of the Supreme Court in the Duncan and White cases and will follow it with circumspection. In fairness to the War Department, it may be stated at this point, however, that the holding of trials such as those considered by the Supreme Court was not undertaken in an attempt by the military authorities to usurp power. They were convinced that under the circumstances the procedure was authorized by law. That their conviction was a reasonable view to take of a point of law which was not settled until the Duncan and White cases were decided is illustrated by the fact that five circuit court of appeals judges and two United States Court justices concurred in the War Department's view during the course of the Duncan and White litigation.

From time to time, beginning December 16, 1941, the controls incident to martial law were progressively relaxed as the military situation became more favorable. A comprehensive modification occurring on March 10, 1943, restoring certain functions of the ordinary courts and continuing certain functions of the military courts was approved by the President and by the Departments of the Interior and Justice, in addition to the War Department. Within a month or two of the end of enemy resistance on Guadalcanal, the courts had resumed the trial of all civil and criminal cases except those involving members of the armed forces or involving violations of military orders such as the Duncan case involved.

The commentator's remarks concerning the internment of certain American citizens in Hawaii are inaccurate and misleading. Interments were accomplished in accordance with the well-recognized power of preventive detention which exists in times of insurrection or war when martial law is in effect and the writ of habeas corpus has been suspended. (See *Moyer* v. *Peabody* (212 U. S. 78); *Ex Parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2, 125, 126); *Luther* v. *Borden* (7 How. 1, 45, 46); Fairman, The Law of Martial Rule, Chicago, 1943, 209–216.) The principle has been recognized and applied in a case which arose out of this very situation. See *Ex Parte Zimmerman* (132 F. (2d) 442). In this case the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals specifically upheld the legality of the internment of an American citizen of non-Japanese ancestry in Hawaii during the present war. In that case the court said:

"The petition, then, was to be considered in its setting, and its sufficiency gaged in the light of the unprecedented conditions under which present-day warfare is waged. It is common knowledge that the Hawaiian Islands, owing to their position and the inclusion in their population of so large an element presumptively alien in sympathy, are peculiarly exposed to fifth-column activities. In such an exigency, a prime purpose of the suspension of the writ is to enable the executive, as a precautionary measure, to detain without interference persons suspected of harboring designs harmful to the public safety.

"The civil courts are ill adapted to cope with an emergency of this kind. As a rule they proceed only upon formal charges. Their province is to determine questions of guilt or innocence of crimes already committed. In this respect their functions are punitive, not preventive; whereas the purpose of the detention of suspected persons in critical military areas in time of war is to forestall injury and to prevent the commission of acts helpful to the enemy. It is settled that the detention by the military authorities of persons engaged in disloyal conduct or suspected of disloyalty is lawful in areas where conditions warranting martial rule prevail. Measures like these are essential at times if our national life is to be preserved. Where taken in the genuine interest of the public safety they are not without, but within, the framework of the constitution."

The force of these decisions has been in no way affected by the recent decision in the White and Duncan cases, above mentioned. White and Duncan were not internees, but had been sentenced to punitive confinement by the provost courts. The distinction between such cases and those of preventive detention was twice specifically recognized in the majority opinion. In footnote 5, the court said in reference to the restoration of the privilege of habeas corpus:

"We therefore do not pass upon the validity of the order suspending the privilege of habeas corpus or the power of the military to detain persons under other circumstances and conditions."

Further on in its majority opinion the court again said:

"Nor need we here consider the power of the military simply to arrest and detain civilians interfering with a necessary military function at a time of turbulence and danger from insurrection or war."

Immediately after December 7, 1941, a number of aliens and citizens were taken into custody in Hawaii for security reasons. The information upon which they were taken was largely furnished by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which had made an exhaustive study of the security problem in the islands. Subsequently, others were detained upon further information compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and by the military and naval intelligence agencies. Every effort was made in these cases to prevent injustice and to provide all procedural safeguards consistent with security. Each detainee was given a hearing before a hearing board consisting of three substantial local citizens and one Army officer. It was provided that each detainee should be permitted to be present at his hearing, to be represented by counsel, to testify in his own behalf and to call witnesses. Since it was essential that the Government's sources of information should not be disclosed to the enemy it was usually necessary to exclude the detainee and his counsel while the Government agent was testifying, but the detainee was informed of the nature of the charges against him. The reason for the exclusion should be obvious, since any other course would have destroyed our system of counter intelligence. The complete record of the hearing and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board were then referred for recommendation to a joint security board composed of the chiefs or leading representatives of the local branches of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military Intelligence Division, and the Office of Naval Intelligence The entire record was then forwarded to the Office of the Military Governor, by whose order the detainee was either interned, paroled, or released outright.

During the entire period of martial law, 617 citizens were interned in Hawaii at one time or another. Of this number, 570 were citizens of Japanese ancestry (many of these were so-called "dual citizens" of both the United States and Japar), 42 were naturalized citizens of German origin, 2 were naturalized citizens of Italian origin and 3 were native-born Caucasians. All cases were continuously reviewed and, as the military situation improved, most of the internees were either paroled or released. All of the Caucasians (both naturalized and native-born) were discharged in 1942 or 1943. Upon the termination of martial law, only 67 citizens remained in custody. These were all of Japanese ancestry. The disloyalty of these ex-American citizens is demonstrated by the fact that they have voluntarily renounced their American citizenship. They are now in process of being returned to Japan.

Contrary to any intimation, none of the mentioned 617 persons was interned upon an erroneous notion or fraudulent charge that he was an enemy alien. They were held because it was decided that regardless of their citizenship the evidence of their disloyalty was such that it would be dangerous to the security of the United States under the circumstances then existing in Hawaii to permit them to remain at large. Their detention was in no sense punishment, but was ordered simply to prevent their having any opportunity to do harm to the American cause.

The urgent necessity for taking every possible precaution to insure security in a place as confined and strategic as Hawaii under the war emergency which existed there should be obvious to everyone. It can readily be appreciated how valuable the enemy would have found information in regard to the extent of the damage done to the fleet and installations, the number and kinds of troops stationed there, the location of our camouflaged positions, the fact that a task force or convoy had departed, the extent of damage to a naval vessel which had come in for repairs, or a thousand other vital matters. The receipt of such information by the enemy would for a long time after Pearl Harbor have endangered our very hold upon Hawaii and could at any time have compromised our operations and caused thousands of unnecessary casualties. The responsible officers could not predicate their actions on the assumption that no espionage or sabotage would occur. They had to act in the light of conditions as they were and in the light of what might happen, and take measures to prevent the worst. They had to weigh the temporary detention of a few men against the lives of thousands when those lives were actually in the balance.

The further allegation that internees were systematically mistreated and neglected is untrue. Orders issued in regard to internees specifically stated that they were neither prisoners of war nor criminals and were not to be treated as such. While in the confusion following the first attack it is likely that the internees suffered a certain amount of discomfort, this was true of virtually the entire population, and the situation was quickly alleviated. The internees were provided with housing, comforts, and food which were at least the equivalent of those provided our own troops. Their camp was not only constantly inspected by our own officers, but was inspected by Mr. M. J. Seltzer, a Swiss representative of the International Red Cross. His report, dated September 9, 1942, provides an illuminating answer to the charges that the Sand Island detention camp was a concentration camp or a bedbug-ridden jail. It concludes:

"We think that the camp is most excellent from all viewpoints. For the most part the internees appear to agree to this, particularly the white races. We have observed that they were in good mental state, with the exception of some maladies, and they seemed in excellent health. All the internees are unanimous in affirming that the authorities treat them well, and they express only praise and sentiments of respect for the commander of the camp. We wish, also, to stress, again, the cleanliness in the superb sanitary installations and also the beautiful kitchens in the camp."

The commentator has called attention to the cases of three persons who were interned in Hawaii. Two of those persons have spoken before the microphone under the sponsorship of the commentator. The facts in regard to these cases are as follows:

Bowley Hoffman, who appeared on the program of December 12, 1945, and about whose case you have specifically inquired, was one of the three native-born Caucasian internees mentioned above. He was held upon information furnished by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the effect that he was violently pro-Nazi; that he had himself stated that he was a Nazi and had expressed

admiration for Hitler, the conviction that Hitler was right, the desire to go to England in the service of the German Government, and regret that he could not go back and fight for Germany. He was given a hearing in accordance with the usual procedure and was ordered interned. It is understood that Hoffman stated over the radio that he was without counsel at his hearing and that he was asked a lot of questions that made no sense to him. These statements are misleading, at best, since the record clearly shows that Hoffman was advised that he might have counsel if he so desired, and that he called witnesses whom he personally examined in regard to the matters under consideration. He was later given a rehearing before another board, at which he was actively represented by counsel. Although this board and the intelligence agencies recommended continued internment, it was determined on July 2, 1943, that under the military situation which then existed Hoffman could safely be released on the mainland. He sailed for the mainland on July 16, 1943. Hoffman's statement over the radio that he was released on parole is in error, since he was released outright.

In a broadcast on March 11, 1946, there was described the case of an internee named Robert Fleischer, in which it was implied that Fleischer was not allowed to have the assistance of a lawyer at his hearing, that he was not informed of the charges against him, and that he was interned without any basis for suspicion of his loyalty. This internee was afforded full opportunity to have the assistance of counsel. The record of the hearing further shows that the president of the board informed Fleischer that his loyalty was in issue at the hearing and advised him that he might state anything that he desired to say upon that issue. He was also advised of his right to present witnesses in his behalf. The evidence presented to the board by a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported that less than 6 months before Pearl Harbor Fleischer made statements that he was a great admirer of Hitler and his way of life, that on a voyage to South America Fleischer kept a picture of Hitler with him at all times, and that in conversation he had indicated belief in the ideas and ideals of Hitler. An order for his internment was issued. Later, according to the usual practice, a rehearing was accorded Fleischer, and in June of 1943 he was transported to the mainland and released.

In a broadcast on November 14 and 15, 1945, there was discussed the case of Carl Magnus Torsten Armfelt, Jr. According to the comments and a statement which was read with the explanation that it was Armfelt's affidavit, Armfelt was a native-born citizen of the United States who was taken into custody on December 8, 1941, and subsequently interned. It was stated or strongly implied in these broadcasts that Armfelt was interned as an enemy alien; that he was denied counsel at his hearing; and that the only specific charges against him were that his father was Finnish and his mother Swedish, that his mother served in a German medical unit during the First World War, and that he had been a social acquaintance of the Italian consul in Honolulu. As a matter of fact, Armfelt was given full opportunity to be represented by counsel at his hearing. He was not interned as an enemy alien. He was interned upon the basis of information furnished by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the effect, among other matters, that he was a fanatical follower of Hitler, that he was outspokenly contemptuous of the principles of democracy and of the President and Constitution of the United States, and that he was a bitter anti-Semitic, an advocate of nazism for this country, an intimate of Axis diplomats and their families, and a member of the Swedish Nazi Party. His hearing board found that his citizenship was doubtful, that he was disloyal to the United States, and that he was "engaged in subversive activities inimical to the welfare of the United States." The hearing board, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the military and naval intelligence agencies, and the office of military governor all concurred in his internment.

It is regrettable that the commentator has made his broadcasts relating to martial law in Hawaii without request to the War Department for corroboration of the facts. He has made unfounded personal attacks upon the present Judge Advocate General of the Army, Maj. Gen. Thomas H. Green. General Green has been a member of the Massachusetts bar for over 30 years and has had a distinguished career in the Army. He served as an officer in the First World War. He has twice been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal—first, for his services in Hawaii, and later for his service as Deputy Judge Advocate General. In my opinion, both of these awards were well deserved. His activities in Hawaii as executive to the military governor for the first 15 months of martial rule were marked by conscientious devotion to duty and a sincere regard for the rights and welfare of the inhabitants of the islands. The policies carried out in Hawaii by General Green and his superior officer, General Emmons, and their successors were not personal assumptions of authority but were in furtherance of the policies of the War Department. The ability and judgment displayed by these officers in their difficult assignment of administering martial rule for a vital base of war operations deserves the highest praise.

It will be of interest for you to know that on March 3, 1943, on the occasion of the broad resumption of civil functions, the Senate of Hawaii, by resolution, expressed "its gratitude and aloha to Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons and Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Green for their untiring efforts on behalf of the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the Territory." A week later the House of Representatives of Hawaii, in similar action, expressed its appreciation to these officers and to Admiral Nimitz "for their splendid cooperation, their able leadership, and foresight in making the defenses of the Territory second to none, and in so efficiently and thoughtfully protecting and caring for the needs of the civilian population of this Territory during the strenuous period commencing with the Pearl Harbor attack and now ending."

Shortly before this the mayor of the city and county of Honolulu had issued a statement supporting the Army's administration of the Territory under martial law, and the resident bishops of both the Episcopal and Roman Catholic churches wrote warm personal letters to Brigadier General Green expressing their appreciation of his efforts in behalf of the Territory. Subsequently, similar action was taken by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii with regard to the services performed by Lieutenant General Richardson and his executive.

In the interest of brevity, this reply is limited to the essential facts. Should you desire further detailed information, the War Department will be glad to furnish it upon request.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include the following editorials from the Chicago Sun dated March 7, 1946, the Washington News dated March 15, 1946, and the Kalamazoo Gazette dated March 5, 1946, which relate to the recent report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress:

[From the Chicago Sun of March 7, 1946]

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

Has Congress the capacity to reorganize its machinery for present-day needs? The answer may be given in its treatment of the forward-looking La Follette-Monroney plan, formally submitted this week after long study by a joint Senate-House committee.

The report stresses the weaknesses developing in our system—the widening breach between Congress and the executive department, the lack of party responsibility, the multitude of overlapping committtes. To counteract these evils, it suggests that the 81 present standing committees be reduced to 16 in the Senate and 18 in the House, each related directly to an executive agency, the affairs of which the legislators would keep constantly under review. It proposes top policy committees for both majority and minority parties, and a joint legislative-executive council through which majority leaders would meet frequently with the President and the Cabinet. It suggests a greatly expanded congressional research staff, higher pay scales, and administrative assistants.

With such a reorganization, Congress would emerge as a group of well-paid legislators, adequately equipped with fact-finding facilities and having close relationships with executive officials. The reorganization report points out that the committee was created in response to a widespread belief that a grave constitutional crisis is created by present legislative deficiencies. The vested interests of a minority of members and sheer inertia should not perpetuate the crisis.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of March 15, 1946]

REWARDS FOR A BETTER CONGRESS

The House of Representatives has voted, 217 to 116, not to consider a bill which would have admitted Members of Congress to the Federal retirement system.

We believe a large majority of Senators and Representatives favors, as we do, the principle of that bill. The retirement system enables civil-service employees to buy annuities, payable when they grow old and leave their jobs. It would be good business and good government to let Members of Congress do the same. Why, then, did such a large House majority oppose taking up the bill? Because:

1. Many Members were afraid of it. This is an election year. They remember the public outcry against pensions for Congress a few years ago.

2. Many others wanted to wait for a bill embodying the entire program of the La Follette-Monroney committee to strengthen Congress and bring its methods up to date. Admission of Senators and Representatives to the retirement system is one of many proposals in that program. Higher salaries is another.

Both these reasons were sound.

A lot of citizens would have been sore if Congress had voted itself in on retirement benefits at this time, and that issue probably would have helped to defeat quite a few Congressmen.

But there will be no reason to fear the issue if it is made part of a comprehensive measure to enable Congress to do a better job. Adoption of the whole La Follette-Monroney program would convince the public that Members of a better Congress deserve protection against want in old age and are worth better pay.

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette of March 5, 1946]

INCOME AND OUTGO

There is at least one item which stands out with special prominence in the newly published report of the joint Senate-House committee on congressional organization. That is the proposal to recognize, in a really definite and practical way, the inevitable relationship between Government spending and Government income.

The proposal would not have Congress impose any unwieldy or unduly tight restriction on its own power to authorize expenditures. It would, however, establish a rule requiring that proposed expenditures for any one year be considered in the light of that year's revenue prospects. It would have the revenue and appropriations committees of each House act jointly in submitting, within 60 days after the opening of a congressional session, a concurrent resolution setting forth the anticipated receipts of the Government and the estimated expenditures of the Government for the next fiscal year. And if the committees should be unable to bring the expected spending within the Government's expected income, it would require a record vote expressing the policy of Congress to create additional Federal indebtedness in the amount needed.

It will be seen, of course, that this proposal would not provide any absolute guaranty that a fiscal year's appropriations would always be held within expected revenue receipts. But it would at least establish a congressional policy of considering proposed Government expenditures in their relation to estimated Government income. And it certainly does seem that any move designed to link considerations of Government spending with considerations of how much money there will be to spend would be a step in the right direction.

Lest Ye Forget: Honor Thy Father and Thy Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Ways and Means:

Chairman DOUGHTON and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am appearing before your committee to speak in support of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230 and on behalf of many millions of people of this country—those of our senior citizens who have reached threescore years, who are the only group in the United States whose income has remained the same all through the years of the depression and throughout the prosperous period of the war—who now during the present inflationary postwar period are the only group in the United States whose income has practically vanished as far as buying power is concerned.

First of all, I want to call your attention to the astonishing increase of the cost of staple foods and the necessities of life since September 1939, when the World War began in Europe. If you will go back to your own home-town newspapers and make note of the cost of these staples from the ads appearing in your home-town papers in the fall of 1939, and then compare those prices with prices of the same foods and clothing in ads in the same papers today, you will be astounded as I was when I made that comparison. From the advertisements in the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune of September 1, 1939, and October 1, 1945, I found that the cost of food and clothing had risen, not 30 percent, not 50 percent; but to my amazement, the cost of staple foods and clothing had risen 100 percent and more. Here are some of the comparisons as shown by ads taken from the La Crosse Tribune of September 1, 1939, and October 4, 1945:

THEN

Hamburger, 14 cents per pound.
Sirloin steak, 17 cents per pound.
Chuck roast, 15 cents per pound.
Veal chops, 17 cents per pound.
Leg of lamb, 19 cents pe pound.
Pork chops, 18 cents per pound.
Bologna, 14 cents per pound.
Ham, 17 cents and 19 cents per pound.
Slab bacon, 9 cents per pound.
Early Ohio potatoes, 19 cents per peck.
Flour, all standard brands, 49-pound sack, $1.49.
Peanut butter, 11 cents per pound.
Sweetpotatoes, 6 cents per pound.
Carrots, 4 cents per bunch.
Bartlett pears, $1.49 per bushel.
Prunes, 69 cents per box.
Small oranges, 15 cents per dozen.
Ladies' sport coats, $9.50 and $19.50.
Fur-trimmed coats, $16.50 and $37.50.
Snow suits, $3.95.
Men's suits, $22.50 and $27.50 with two trousers and vest—all wool suits, and no black market.

NOW

Hamburger, 25 cents per pound.
Sirloin steak, 40 cents per pound.
Chuck roast, 26 cents per pound.
Veal chops, 33 cents per pound.
Leg of lamb, 35 cents pe pound.
Pork chops, 33 cents per pound.
Bologna, 27 cents per pound.
Wieners, 39 cents per pound.
Slab bacon, 39 cents per pound.
Ohio potatoes, 49 cents and 52 cents per peck.
Same standard brand flour, 49-pound sack, $2.59.
Peanut butter, 20 cents per pound.
Sweetpotatoes, 10 cents and 11 cents per pound.
Carrots, 10 cents per bunch.
Pears, $4.99 per bushel.
Prunes, $3.29 per box.
Oranges same size, 30 cents per dozen.
Ladies' sport coats, $45 and $55.
Fur-trimmed coats, $69 and $135.
Snow suits, $14.95.
Men's suits, $45 and up with only one pair of trousers, and no vest—all wool except the stripes; and plenty of stripes.

I have read ads in Washington newspapers advertising men's sport shirts for $6.50 and $25 each. You canont buy a good white dress shirt in Washington now.

Members of the committee, you also know the average income of our senior citizens, who are dependent on old-age assistance, is only $30 per month throughout the United States; while some of the States are paying old-age assistance of $10 and less per month, other States average $15 and $20 per month. Think of it, $10, $15, $20, and $30 a month, old-age assistance afforded to American citizens, who have given the best of their lives to build up this country. That is a disgrace and a blot on the good name of the United States—the richest nation in the world. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I ask you—how far will the average old-age assistance go toward paying the grocery bill, the meat bill, and the clothing bill of these people today?

We are so rich, we gave away billions to the other nations of the world after the First World War, 11½ billions of which is still due and outstanding. Now we are contemplating giving more billions to these same nations. If we give them all they are asking, we will make gifts to these foreign nations amounting to more than 10 billions more. If we can make gifts of billions and more billions to foreign nations, surely we should be able to set aside funds sufficient to cover the appropriation necessary to carry out the provisions of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230—an appropriation that is infinitesimal in comparison with the loans and the gifts we have made, and now contemplate making, to nations who do not expect ever to repay us for our munificence.

What are we doing for our own people who have reached the age of 65? Under the present system we compel them to sign a pauper's oath If they own their own homes, we compel them to execute a deed turning over their homes to the State. We charge them interest on whatever old-age assistance they receive, whether it is $30, $20, $15, or $10 a month or less; then if they do not pay the interest and the principal of the loan—which the States and the Federal Government wrongfully call old-age assistance—their homes are sold at public auction on foreclosure. I am told that in some States even the life insurance of our senior citizens must be turned over to the State before any so-called old-age assistance is given these American citizens.

It is this unfair and ungrateful treatment of our fathers and mothers on the part of our Government, the richest in the world, that prompts me to appear here before your committee today on behalf of these good deserving folks, whom our Government has apparently forgotten in the mad rush of turning over our money and our substance to everybody else in the whole world.

I feel that the Congress of the United States owes a moral obligation to our senior constituents to insure them a Federal annuity, insurance for all those over 60 who are disabled, so that all who come under the provisions of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230 be paid a monthly allowance that is adequate, decent, and respectable. When we have met this obligation to our American citizens, we can then consider making gifts of money to foreign nations.

The Challenge of Human Engineering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address given by Mr. Henry Ford 2d, president of the Ford Motor Co., before the annual meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers held in the Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Ford's statement concerns the economy of our Nation, and as such deserves our careful attention. Low prices and high production are the cornerstones of our standard of living. Mr. Ford gives an outline as to how this objective may be achieved.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is a great honor to be here as your guest this evening.

What I propose to do is to outline a problem. That may not be very considerate of me, but I take comfort from the fact that problems are the business of the Society of Automotive Engineers, and that you have

never failed to rise to any difficult challenge. The problem, in my opinion, is one of the greatest which confronts American industry, for it concerns human relationships—relationships which can either aid or impede our efforts to achieve greater industrial efficiency. And if you can help to solve it—and I believe it needs the benefit of scientific thinking—you will have done much to increase the well-being and the living standards of America.

The ability of American industry to produce has never had the prestige it enjoys at this particular moment in history. The job of war production has been called a miracle. It confounded our enemies and drew praise from our allies. In a very short time we armed the largest fighting force ever mustered on this continent; we built, armed, and fueled combat ships and planes and tanks in quantities never before imagined; we put billions of dollars of weapons into the hands of our allies all over the world.

The mechanical principles which made possible this war-production record are not new to any of us—standardization of parts, line assembly, the use of large, high-cost machine tools. These are the principles all of us have used for many years in the manufacture of automobiles. They are the principles of mass production, and no group of men deserves a larger share of the credit for the rapid development of the mechanics of mass production than this group here tonight.

Mass production is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. It is a tool.

In war, mass production is a tool for making the weapons of war—as many as possible, as fast as possible. We used the tool better than other nations because we had more practice with it and because we were better equipped to use it efficiently.

In peacetime the use of the tool of mass production thrives best in a highly competitive democratic economy. For mass production is a tool which free people use in peacetime to make more and better products at less and less cost. It is a tool for raising the standard of living.

All of us would agree that a standard of living is not a question of money, but of things and opportunities. People are prosperous and enjoy a high standard of living when great numbers of them can afford a great many things and services—refrigerators, automobiles, radios, homes, good food, education, recreation, and all the rest. Through the peacetime use of the tool of mass production, American industry has already made this country a land with an incomparably high standard of living.

And the use to which we can put mass production to bring millions of things and opportunities within the price range of millions of people has in no way reached its limit. It is obvious, for example, how much better off we would be in this country if it were possible to sell automobiles for half their prewar prices. Millions of people who never owned a car could have one. Families which have one could have two. Tens of thousands of private enterprises serving the automobile industry and the people who drive automobiles would benefit and would expand. Cut the cost of refrigerators in half, cut the cost of radios in half, cut the cost of homes, clothing, and other manufactured articles in half, and the people of America would find themselves vastly better off.

We continually talk about higher incomes, and higher wages, and more money. That is all right. A man should be ambitious. He should try to increase his income. But in our discussion of higher incomes, we must never lose sight of the universal advantages of lower costs—of more and better products brought within the budget of more and more people.

In the face of what peacetime mass production has already accomplished in raising our standard of living, in the face of current world praise of American industry's ability to produce great quantities of things in a short space of time, we may be tempted to think that the potentialities of mass production have been exhausted—that we have come to the end of this road to national well-being. Such a notion is absurd. The mechanics of mass production can still be greatly improved, and they can be more widely adapted.

But there is a whole vast area in which we are only beginning to make significant progress—what we might call the field of human engineering. Machines alone do not give us mass production. Mass production is achieved by both machines and men. And while we have gone a very long way toward perfecting our mechanical operations we have not successfully written into our equations whatever complex factor represents man, the human element.

I am suggesting, therefore, that we try to rewrite the equations to take into account the human factor. If we can solve the problem of human relations in industrial production, I believe we can make as much progress toward lower costs during the next 10 years as we made during the past quarter century through the development of the machinery of mass production.

In approaching the complex problems of human relations I believe that management must take the initiative for developing the relationships between labor and management. Labor has a great opportunity to achieve stature through assuming greater responsibility. But I consider that management is in charge, that management must manage, and that the test of management is whether or not it succeeds.

Mass production did not invent the human equation, but it did alter it in a number of important respects which we may have been slow in taking into account. Under mass production large numbers of people flocked to the assembly line, each to perform a highly specialized routine duty. Mass production produced great concentrations of people—and a problem of communicating with them. And it produced the difficult problem of specialization, where the human being loses sight of the social usefulness of what he does.

How badly we have taken the human factor into account is indicated by many statistics. The Department of Labor shows that a total of 216,000,000 man-days were lost between 1927 and 1941 as a result of strikes alone.

I am not here concerned with the justice of these strikes or their injustice. I am saying that some 216,000,000 man-days of work were lost. This idleness was expensive to the strikers, to the companies, and to the Nation. And that cost was part of the Nation's cost of production. Consider how many thousands of automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and other useful and needed products could have been manufactured with 216,000,000 man-days of labor. Or, to put it in another way, consider how much lower would have been the cost of the things that were manufactured if production had not had to absorb the expense of these work stoppages. Furthermore, when a production line stops, the jobs and purchasing power of hundreds of thousands of people in related businesses all over the country are affected.

We must remember, too, that strikes are by no means the only measure of lost time. That loss, indeed, is only a fraction of the time lost through industrial inefficiency and through mass unemployment. We are all aware of the fact that the man-days lost through unemployment during the same years—1927 to 1941—were of tremendous proportions.

Costs are also closely related to the productivity of the individual American worker. We take pride in this productivity, and as a matter of fact we in America cannot compete in world markets with high wage rates if the American worker does not continue to be productive.

Recent statistics on productivity are confusing because of the factor of war. War necessarily brought into industry a great many less-experienced men and women. The armed forces took away a great many skilled workers.

Other prewar mass-production industries have found, as have we at Ford Motor Co., that even after allowance for these unusual circumstances the recent record of productivity is not encouraging. We keep detailed records of the time it takes to perform various operations. Those I am about to cite are in every way comparable—that is, the operations have not been changed so that more time should be allocated to their performance. Let me give you the number of minutes required in December 1940 compared to July 1945 to perform certain operations.

One group of operations which took 96 minutes in 1940 took 128 minutes 5 years later. Another group which took 1,188 minutes in 1940 took, 5 years later, a total of 1,943 minutes to perform. A third group took 28 minutes in 1940 and 49 minutes 5 years later.

On the whole, productivity per worker in our plants declined more than 34 percent during the war period.

I have already pointed out that some of this was inevitable, a result of the war, and I should like to say that I am emphasizing these figures merely to demonstrate how great is the need for improvement in this field.

As we look at these problems in human relations, we feel that the solution must be found through a closer understanding between management and labor. If we cannot succeed by cooperation, it doesn't seem likely that we can succeed by any exercise of force. We cannot, for example, expect legislation to solve our problems. Laws which seek to force large groups of Americans to do what they believe is unfair and against their best interests are not likely to succeed. In fact, such legislation can lead to exaggeration of the very problem it is designed to solve. And when free men give up the task of trying to get along with each other, and pass the buck to government, they surrender a substantial measure of their freedom.

That, then, is the problem I wanted to lay before you this evening. Let me summarize by stating it more briefly: In a free, competitive democracy, mass production is a tool for raising the standard of living by reducing costs and thereby bringing more and better products within the budgets of more and more people. We have not yet solved the problems of mass production, for our failure in human engineering is creating waste and inefficiency which handicaps the very purpose of mass production—lower costs.

I do not have the answers to this problem. But I am sure that workable solutions can be found if we will only bring to it the same insistent objectivity and willingness to experiment which you and others like you throughout industry have given to the mechanical difficulties in mass production.

In industrial human relations, then, we have a new and relatively unexplored frontier. And beyond this frontier lie opportunities greater, perhaps, than any of us can imagine.

There are many considerations which we must take into account as we work toward a solution of this problem. I can name some that have occurred to me, and you will think of others.

I assume, for example, that all of us agree that labor unions are here to stay. Certainly, we of the Ford Motor Co. have no desire to break the unions, to turn back the clock to days which sometimes look in retrospect much more attractive than they really were. The truth of the matter is that the unions

we deal with rose out of the very problem we are discussing: the human problems inherent in mass production. We do not want to destroy the unions. We want to strengthen their leadership by urging and helping them to assume the responsibilities they must assume if the public interest is to be served.

It is clear, then, that we must look to an improved and increasingly responsible union leadership for help in solving the human equation in mass production. Union leaders today who have the authority to affect industrial production on a vast scale enjoy a social power of enormous proportions. If they are going to be real leaders, they must accept the social obligations that go with leadership.

What is needed today is industrial statesmanship—from both labor and management. Instead, we have a tradition of industrial antagonism. Men who in their private lives would not think of entering into a brawl on the street have in the past found themselves blasting each other in the public press by colorful name calling. This tradition has given rise in some circles to the theory that open conflict is inevitable. I have even heard it said that strikes are helpful in clearing the atmosphere.

With such unhappy theories I do not hold. Modern man, who has done so much to reduce the manpower loss caused by disease, can certainly hope to reduce the manpower loss from industrial conflict. The public interest requires that we find ways to eliminate industrial warfare without impairing or diminishing the rights which both management and labor must continue to enjoy.

We will always have some honest differences of opinion. But we can certainly deal with these controversies more wisely and efficiently. If we are to have industrial-relations programs and labor-relations staffs, and spend as much money on them as we do, we should do it expertly and efficiently, bringing to the task the same technical skill and determination that the engineer brings to mechanical problems. We must act on a more human and professional plane.

There is no reason, for example, why a grievance case should not be handled with the same dispatch as a claim for insurance benefits. There is no reason why a union contract could not be written and agreed upon with the same efficiency and good temper that marks the negotiation of a commercial contract between two companies.

In the meantime, there are day-to-day responsibilities of management toward employees which should fit into the whole pattern of the new relationships we seek. Consider, for example, possibilities for improvement in personnel evaluation. Only recently have we begun to develop and use modern techniques which enable us to fit people to jobs, and fit jobs to people, with some degree of science. Too often we have assumed that if a man is a good sweeper, he is a good sweeper only, if a man is a good assembler, he is a good assembler only. But the results of industrial psychological tests show very clearly that sometimes a good sweeper may also be a good assembler, and an assembler may have qualities of personal leadership that will make him a good foreman. Every company follows a general policy of advancing men in accordance with their capacities. But we can do a more scientific job.

When we have learned to do a reasonably good job of evaluating an employee's capacities at the start of his career, we can do a better job of upgrading. I am not talking now about technical requirements having to do with such things as automatic pay raises and seniority. I mean the development of more opportunities for employees to improve themselves in accordance with their own initiative and desires.

We know that great masses of men work constantly at points below their top capacities, and it is one of our jobs to see that ways and means are provided to help them rise to these opportunities.

Communication between management and employees in large mass-production plants is another important field in which we can work.

In any large group of people working together it is a basic requirement that good lines of communication exist. There will always be plans and estimates, information about new styles and new engineering, and other data, which management must guard closely because they are the very elements on which tough competition is based. But information about company objectives and accomplishments should be made available to all. People want to know what the other people they work with are doing and thinking. They want to know the score.

It is fairly easy for everybody to know the score when there are only 50 employees in a plant. But when thousands of employees work at assembly lines in a single plant they create a problem of communication which has not yet been solved.

In an age in which the world prides itself on speed and efficiency in human communication it is absurd that we should not have been more successful in this field. We have the tools at our disposal—movies, radio, coordination conferences, newspapers, the graphic arts, posters, and all the rest. It is good business to see to it that the members of our industrial teams get information to make them conscious of the fact that they are on the team. This applies all along the line—shop employees, office workers, supervisory and executive personnel.

I think we can lick this job of better communication. Informed employees are more productive than uninformed employees.

I shall not attempt to point out other areas—and there must by many—in which we can work toward better human engineering in mass production. The important thing, it seems to me, is to recognize the problem for the vital one it is and to move forward in hope and confidence and intelligent experimentation toward workable solutions.

As a starting point for continuing efforts in that direction, perhaps management and labor would today agree:

1. That the job of American industry—management and labor—is to make at lower and lower cost more and better products to sell for lower and lower prices.

2. That the only way that job can be done is through understanding and sensible cooperation between management and labor.

3. That the spirit of that cooperation must be a sense of joint responsibility. The public is the "boss," not management or labor. Both labor and management must accept their share of responsibility to the public welfare and live up to their commitments.

4. That mass production has demonstrated its ability to bring high wages, and that higher wages can come only out of greater production and lower costs.

5. That, while no single human institution or industry can promise complete security because of the complexity of modern civilization, management and labor can work toward more certain, more stabilized employment.

6. That American industry should be a place of opportunity—a place in which men and women can grow and develop into better jobs.

If these are our articles of industrial faith, then we are squared away to attack the problem of making mass production more efficient, by giving the same hard-headed attention to human factors that we have given so successfully in the past to mechanical factors. The only approach we can take is to live up to the best industrial statemanship of which we are capable. If we give the best we have, we can hope to get the best in return.

Retirement of Dr. Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the people of the United States will lose, by reason of retirement, one of their most distinguished servants. I refer to Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, who is leaving Federal service next month so he may rest awhile and fish a bit and enjoy, free from the cares of office, all those things that are closest to his heart.

The people of the United States have been particularly fortunate in having in charge of their wildlife resources a man possessed of so much interest and so much knowledge as Dr. Gabrielson. As head of the Biological Survey and in more recent years as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, he has made a tremendously important contribution to a national resource, the value of which cannot be overestimated. The type and quality of his administration and the results of his administration will serve as a model for those who follow him down the years. Distinguished biologist, able writer, lover of nature, humanitarian and good friend and adviser of thousands upon thousands of people "Gabe's" retirement represents more than a loss to a bureau or a department—it represents a loss to the entire country. We in Alaska with whom he came in such close contact as administrator of our enormous fishery and wildlife resources have considered him as an honored friend and as an honorable man. That feeling, I know, spreads throughout the States. Our regret at having him leave Government service is mitigated only by the sure knowledge that talents of such an extraordinary nature will continue to be used for the public good and that "Gabe" will have more time to enjoy those things in life which he loves best.

What his friends in Oregon think of "Gabe" has been well set forth in an editorial written by Richard L. Neuberger appearing in the Portland Oregonian and which I quote here:

THE RETIREMENT OF "GABE"

Men and women who love the American outdoors will always owe a debt of gratitude to Ira Noel Gabrielson. More than three decades ago he entered the Government agencies charged with animal, fish, and bird protection. The nation was developing a conscience over the depredations and reckless slaughter attending the expansion westward across the continent. This conscience gave Dr. Gabrielson the opportunity to stand against those who would send other species to follow the fate of the bison and the passenger pigeon.

Now Gabe is to retire. Thousands of people in Oregon will hope that he returns to the State he has always considered home. As the first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Gabe leaves a rich legacy to the country he has served. America's big-game animals are more numerous than at any time during the past half century. Im-

portant refugees have been established for antelopes, elk, and migratory birds. Fish propagation programs have been instituted on hundreds of lakes and rivers. New standards in conservation and protection have been set for the whole land.

He brought to his job not merely technical training and highly specialized knowledge. He also brought a deep wisdom in the ways of animals and birds, a keen understanding of the outdoors. He could set foot on Alaska's Bogosloff Island and walk across its rocks with murres, kittiwakes, and puffins covering his rotund form. Someone else would put the flocks to flight. Light-footed and active despite his 230 pounds, he could outwalk most of his friends in the wilderness. He still has, at the age of 56, a steady lope which makes forest rangers pant to keep pace with him.

Two men are largely responsible for the establishment of migratory waterfowl refuges in the United States. They are himself and J. N. (Ding) Darling, former head of the old biological survey. They saw that without protected places where ducks and geese could feed and rest, these birds might soon suffer extinction. On the Malheur refuge in eastern Oregon he personally helped band thousands of ducks. From where the bands were picked up, he plotted the flyways of the hemisphere, the unmarked lanes flown by millions of birds between their winter and summer homes. Along the flyways scores of refuges were set aside.

Nor was Gabe satisfied to confine this work to his own country alone. The Pacific flyway extends, for example, from the Arctic Ocean to South America. He roamed the other lands of the hemisphere, persuading governments to establish marshes and swamps and lakes where ducks and greese could feed and breed, safe from the hunter's shotgun and the predator's jaws. He trudged across Mexico with game wardens who spoke only Spanish and camped with mounties on the Canadian plains. Today countless wildfowl nest and feed on the refuges which dot the Pacific, Atlantic, Mississippi, and central flyways.

Gabe's principal preoccupation is with birds. His Birds of Oregon, written in collaboration with Stanley G. Jewett, will always be standard in the field. But he did not restrict his interests. Under his administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Dr. H. H. T. Jackson began the first detailed census of American big game. Because of this thorough study, the country knows almost to the last snout the number of animals in each State, county, and national forest.

The Pacific Northwest owes a special debt to Dr. Gabrielson, for he directed many of the programs designed to save the Chinook salmon runs of the Columbia River. His biologists commenced the fabulous experiment at Grand Coulee, by which the progeny of fish which formerly spawned behind the great dam are artificially propagated in streams entering the Columbia below Grand Coulee. He appeared many times before congressional committees to seek additional appropriations for work directed toward the saving of the Columbia's $10,000,000 salmon industry.

"The conservation battle cannot be a short, sharp engagement but must be grim, tenacious warfare," Dr. Gabrielson declared in 1943. He himself can take great pride from his own role in the struggle. Ever in the front ranks, this jolly big man from Portland has helped to protect the legacy of the next generation of Americans. Perhaps he will come home to us to enjoy the heritage he has saved. Gabe often told audiences that the most magnificent view in North America was the panorama of the Snake and Salmon Rivers from Buckhorn ranger station in the Wallowa Mountains. Let us hope that this spectacle beckons to him now, as he ends his long and honorable career with the Federal Government.

Northern Indiana Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, for almost 2 years I have been apprising the Veterans' Administration of the critical hospital situation in the Calumet industrial region of northwest Indiana.

General Hines, before leaving the Veterans' Administration, recommended a hospital for this area.

General Bradley has assured me that this section of our State will be given veterans' hospital relief. Up to date, the Veterans' Hospital Board has not taken any practical steps to relieve this deplorable hospital neglect to our veterans.

The following resolution adopted by the First District Legion of Indiana reveals facts and statistics on this condition:

Whereas the First District, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, is located in the heart of the steel and oil industries, in the northern part of Indiana, which first district embodies at least four densely populated large cities, which are located approximately 35 to 45 miles of and under the jurisdiction of Hines Hospital at Hines, Ill.; and

Whereas several years prior to World War II, the veterans of World War I, in the First Congressional District of Indiana, were unable to receive adequate hospitalization in Hines Hospital due to the fact that said Hines Hospital was serving the counties of Cook, Du Page, and Lake, State of Illinois, including the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, in addition to northern part of Indiana, without sufficient number of bed capacities at said hospital; and

Whereas the city of Chicago has a population of 3,396,808 and the balance of Cook County has a population of 766,534; Lake County, of the State of Illinois, has a population of 121,094; Du Page County, of the State of Illinois, has a population of 103,480. The First District of Indiana, consists of Lake County, has a population of 293,195 and there are approximately 55,741 veterans of World Wars I and II in said County of Lake, State of Indiana; and

Whereas during and after World War II it was almost impossible to hospitalize veterans in said Hines Hospital from the First District of Indiana, except in extreme emergency cases; and

Whereas we of the First District of Indiana for 10 years last past, have sincerely and honestly petitioned the Veterans' Administration at Washington, D. C., to establish the urgently needed veterans' hospital in the northern part of Indiana to relieve the suffering of the veterans residing in the First District of Indiana, all without success; and

Whereas the deplorable condition in Hines Hospital is greatly increasing and recently we were advised by Hines Hospital that, if we send in a veteran in an ambulance which was not an emergency case, the said facility will return the veteran in the same ambulance, as it has no bed for him there and we were unable to place him in Hines Hospital; therefore the veteran was subjected to suffer at home without hospital care; and

Whereas our hearts bleed when we realize the inadequate treatment the veterans receive through our Government after they have rendered so loyal services to our country; and

Whereas 2 years ago there were 1,200 veterans on the waiting list at Hines Hospital and since that time same has increased: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the First District, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, renew its petition, through this resolution, for the immediate establishment of a veterans' hospital with 1,000 beds in the northern part of Indiana, so that said hospital may render such efficient hospital services to the veterans of the first district of Indiana, as they are entitled and sincerely deserve; be it further

Resolved, That after the passage of this resolution a copy of same be forwarded to the department and to the National American Legion, to the Veterans' Administration at Washington, D. C., to the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, Congressman of the First District of Indiana and to the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART and RAYMOND E. WILLIS, United States Senators from the State of Indiana, with request to support our aim with the Veterans' Administration for the immediate establishment of said veterans' hospital in the northern part of Indiana.

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN LEGION, FIRST DISTRICT OF INDIANA,
NOR N. OPPMAN, *Chairman.*
BYRON E. WAGGONER,
EARL W. JOHNSON,
DANIEL J. REDDING,
HOBART D. WIGGERLY,
Committee Members.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution has been duly presented by the committee, at the regular meeting of the First District of the American Legion of Indiana, on the 6th day of February 1946, and same was unanimously adopted.

RAYMOND PYATT,
Commander, First District.
FLOYD T. HARRIGAN,
Adjutant, First District.

Milk Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, John Hettinger, of Delta, Ohio, mails me the following from the Cooperative Dairyman for March. Fulton County is one of the great milk-producing centers of Ohio and the Nation. Two great condensaries are operated there as well as the liquid-milk industry. It is of vital importance that these men continue to produce. These words should receive the thoughtful consideration of this body:

THE MILK PRODUCERS' LABOR INCOME

No very recent or definite figures with respect to the milk producers' labor income are available to the writer. However, it is reliably announced that the Ohio Monthly Dairy Report, in reporting certain labor milk price ratios, has used the monthly wage of $89.50 for the milk producer. This monthly wage does not include the house rent, etc.

In view of the fact that many milk producers work as much as, or more than, 300 hours per month, we can conclude that the cash income, on the basis of $89.50 per month, is about 30 cents per hour. The producer of sour cream and milk used for manufacturing is probably receiving a total rate of from 35 cents to 40 cents per hour for his labor. This hourly labor rate for the

milk producer is about $1 less than that received in the automobile, steel, electrical, and other industries where strikes and powerful organized efforts of laborers have forced these higher wages.

DOES THE OPA UNDERSTAND ONLY ONE LANGUAGE?

Strikes are winning everywhere almost without exception. Not only labor organizations, but other organized groups are getting results through strikes. The manufacturers of men's clothing have, by withholding several million men's suits, shorts, etc., secured a concession from the OPA which will result in a substantial advance in the price of men's clothing.

Does the OPA recognize only one kind of pressure? Have they eliminated equity and justice from their vocabulary? Are they determined to hold the line regardless of the injustices they may impose on certain groups and regardless of the effect of their orders on production? Does the little fact that millions of farmers engaged in milk production receive 35 to 40 cents per hour for their labor, while striking groups receive $1.35 or $1.40 per hour, perhaps justly, mean nothing to them although dairying is the greatest of all agricultural industries, and dairy products the most important of all foods?

Does the OPA propose to force the American milk producer to use the same methods in getting fair rates as have been used by other groups so successfully? Does the OPA realize that their methods invite lower and lower production? Do they realize that the farmer who labored so hard during the war is growing old and is selling his cows and that returned soldiers are declining to go back to the farm with the present low farm income?

WHY DODGE THE ONLY MEANS THAT WILL BRING ADEQUATE MILK PRODUCTION?

There appears to be much wishful and illogical thinking by folks who wish to keep farm milk prices low. The statements that increasing milk prices will not increase the amount of feed and, therefore, it is futile to increase milk prices for the purpose of increasing production and that the farmer is tired, has some money ahead, and higher prices will not get results, are examples of this wishful thinking.

The inescapable facts appear to be these: If dairy feed is a limiting factor, it will take more feed to produce more milk; it will also take more manpower to produce more feed. Manpower for the farm can only be secured by prices that will attract soldiers and other young men back to the farm. Present milk prices will not attract the necessary manpower and the sooner this fact is faced the better it will be for the Nation as a whole.

THE FARMER'S PRODUCTION QUOTAS

The success with which the American farmer met his production quotas during the war will ever remain a monument to his patriotism and his industry.

There is also a great need for meeting high-production quotas at the present time. A speaker on the Ford Sunday Evening Hour recently quoted statements indicating that if everyone in the world was provided with sufficient food, the present production would not be one-half adequate to meet this demand. While this is a startling condition, and we are sure stirs the sympathy of every farmer, the OPA and other governmental agencies will make a grave mistake if they expect the same devotion to production as occurred during the war period.

The Department of Agriculture, which is responsible for issuing farm quotas and making an appeal to the milk producers to furnish 119,000,000,000 pounds of milk in 1946, would better enlighten the OPA with respect to the effect of their milk-price programs before issuing their quotas to American agriculture.

Millions of the world's population may die of starvation in 1946 because of the failure of American agriculture to reach the highest possible peak of production. This tragedy, if it occurs, may be laid at the door of the OPA and not upon the American farmer.

When the Cherry Blossoms Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

WHEN THE CHERRY BLOSSOMS BLOOM

With the sunrise, dewy-wet,
Comes a joy we can't forget,
  Though a greater glory gathers
When the sun begins to set—
But we turn from these to worship
  Floral beauty and perfume—
During spring's inspiring season—
  When the cherry blossoms bloom.

'Tis a promise, most sublime,
When the rainbow, in its prime,
  Lends a beauty to the heavens,
At the birth of summertime—
But we, overjoyed, however,
  For the rainbow have no room;
But are thrilled to overflowing
  When the cherry blossoms bloom.

When the cherry blossoms bloom—
Prophesying winter's doom—
  Till it seems that for another,
On the trees, there isn't room,
How we hail, with joy and gladness,
  This outburst from Nature's womb—
For we bid farewell to winter
  When the cherry blossoms bloom.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Failure of Appeasement Calls for New Armament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, for the first time in history, an international organization of nations meets in New York to inaugurate what we hope will be a permanent program for future peace.

The welfare of humanity for generations to come rests with the success of the United Nations Organization. Its failure will mean a program for new armament as set out in the following editorial of H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post Tribune. Its success will mean world peace and security:

FAILURE OF APPEASEMENT CALLS FOR NEW ARMAMENT

The outstanding fact in international affairs is the failure of the policy of appeasement. The long effort to appease Hitler not only did not appease but led directly into the Second World War. Had there been no appeasement there could have been no war.

Now we are faced with the failure of the second great effort at appeasement. Despite giving in to Russia on almost every question during the war and since, there is little doubt she intends to walk out on her obligations as a coauthor of world peace.

Owen Lattimore suggests we haven't done too well ourselves with our demands in the Pacific. Max Werner thinks Churchill may be trying to sell us a British political policy under the name of an international crisis.

Even though there can be something in those ideas, the fact remains that Russia has been appeased almost without end and she still demands her pound of flesh. What we must see is Russia's purpose to keep on demanding as long as anything remains within reach. The damage she had done in all eastern Europe is proof enough of her intentions.

Americans have never liked this appeasement policy because from the first it was recognized as the direct opposite of the principles we were fighting for. The only sense anyone could make of them was the price of victory and the peace to come. And now we find there will be no peace if Russia is not stopped.

That is a large order at this hour, but it is not an impossible one if our Government and the American people can be made to realize the box we have got into and the need to break out of it and take a strong stand. Some people are saying it is too late. It is true our armed forces have been disorganized in the mad rush to get home but the process of atomization can be stopped and we can start to rebuild.

The United States is the world's strongest power even though Russia has millions more men under arms. We can and must build a new armed force in the light of the experience of the war. We have found that armed men alone do not win victories and we have won victories because of planning and advanced technology.

The idea of disarmament goes out the window and we must prepare to spend billions in order to have the only sort of strength the Russian leaders respect. Then there will be no war and eventually the Russian people will force their leaders to join in a world peace that will give them a standard of living they have sensed in other countries for the first time.

Russia's attitude will cost us billions of taxes. It will make certain the development of armed might we had hoped to eradicate from the earth. But with Russia on the prowl no other action is left for us to take. Appeasement has failed and this is the end of appeasement.

Any other attitude will endanger our safety and our future.

The Wood-Rankin Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an article printed in Boxoffice, one of the leading publications of the motion-picture world, which deals with a matter that has been of deep concern to those of us who deplore the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities:

"SMEAR" CASE GOES SOUR

The press was quick to front page charges of the Wood-Rankin committee that prominent actors and producers in Hollywood are perpetrators of "one of the most dangerous plots ever instigated to overthrow our Government." Its findings were to be an industry-shaking revelation. Now comes Congressman GERALD LANDIS with the statement that nothing which even vaguely resembles the allegations has been uncovered, and that in the special subcommittee report he is preparing, the committee will have nothing to say about Hollywood.

The damage of the original charges, however, has been done, and it is only fair at this point to expect the newspapers, columnists, and commentators who were so quick to broadcast the ridiculous RANKIN assault to take the smear off an industry they inadvertently helped besmirch. It is only honorable that they so do.

Congressman ELLIS PATTERSON, of California, this week expressed an opinion held by all clear-thinking Americans when he stated that the motion-picture industry has given consistently wholehearted support of American principles, a support which has brought the full resources of filmdom into every national emergency and for all civic ventures. There has been no better proof of the industry's allegiance to all that is good and true in American life than its many patriotic endeavors during the war years—and before—and in the role it has accepted in helping to win the peace.

BEN SHLYEN.

Standardization of Sizes of Bearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, ball and roller bearings are playing an important part in the postwar reconversion world, removing one kind of friction that drags on the Nation's industrial machine.

The range in bearings runs from the pinhead peewees up to giants standing 4 feet high and weighing 9,000 pounds. Eight of these big fellows, costing $10,000 apiece, go into each of the high-speed rolling mills that squeeze out sheet steel and aluminum.

Some of the bearings used in railroad locomotives weigh 400 pounds, which is a far cry from the ones a child is familiar with in roller skates or bicycles, yet their function is precisely the same—to reduce the drag of friction.

Most of this development dates from the time the horseless carriage really became horseless, for while ball and roller bearings were used a century ago in wheelbarrows, grindstones, and so forth, most machines ran at such low speeds that grease and plain bearings could handle the friction problem.

Today every tool of war and peace—every tool used to make those tools—depends on antifriction bearings. There are 50 of them in a turret lathe. Modern machine tools, some turning up to 75,000 revolutions per minute, could not function without these friction antidotes. As for the machines these tools produce—well, when a new rayon plant was built recently, no fewer than 300,000 ball bearings went into its machinery.

For these reasons, production has skyrocketed. Yet you do not skyrocket production by just waving a wand. Making ball and roller bearings is a highly complicated job, involving special machinery, techniques unique in American industry, even specially made steel costing more than twice the price of good grade structural steel.

These are some of the reasons that have prompted SKF Industries, Inc., an outstanding producer in the bearing field, to promote wider understanding of the value of standardizing sizes of bearings.

SKF engineers estimate that such a move would reduce the number of different sizes and makes of ball and roller bearings from 40,000 to some 2,000.

It would give tremendous impetus to production of industrial and consumer goods.

It would permit production of higher quality bearings more economically.

It would aid research and development engineers in solving special problems presented by unusual needs.

It would make the American bearing market more attractive for foreign users.

It would make American machine tools and other mechanical equipment more desirable to foreign users if they can obtain standardized bearings and other parts.

UNRRA and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting as a part of my remarks in the RECORD an article by George E. Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, Sunday, March 24, 1946:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Obviously Governor Lehman resigned from UNRRA in pique over the appointment of Herbert Hoover to discover why UNRRA failed to save Europe from famine.

During the entire course of the war, Mr. Hoover has been warning of famine, and even when Governor Lehman visited him at the Waldorf-Astoria upon his appointment to head UNRRA, Mr. Hoover warned him of the nearness of famine.

The former President is now in Europe representing not a congeries of nations but the people of the United States, the most generous Nation on earth.

But UNRRA is a political agency. It is a compromise among governments and it cannot possibly work because some governments want to use hunger, starvation, distress, and despair politically.

I am sure that Mr. Lehman has all along meant well, but he is not one that fights great names nor for great causes.

He is more the administrative type that respects authority even when it is vile, and dignifies the corrupt of heart by obedience when circumstance demands that he speak out truthfully and courageously no matter whom his words may blast.

Mr. Lehman knows, as he must, that the wheat that Soviet Russia offers France is American wheat to be carried in American ships.

Anyone with even slight political acumen will recognize that this offer was made France so that the hungry French, in their despair, will vote in May for Thorez, the French Communist.

They will vote for anyone for bread, for they are hungry. Wheat is used for politics, not for relief. Hunger is employed to corrupt the spirit as it weakens the body.

Does Mr. Lehman or UNRRA dare to demand that Russia pool her surplus as we and Canada pool ours and as the Argentine would undoubtedly be willing to pool her surplus?

Does he inquire of the wheat of the Ukraine and White Russia and Bessarabia and the Dobruja—granaries of Europe for centuries? Does he ask Russia to pay her full share into UNRRA?

Famine does not wait upon personalities nor politeness. Senator PEPPER may servilely support politeness, but death from starvation is not arrested by the timidity of the Floridian whose heart is sensitive to Moscow.

Until the next harvest is gathered, millions of men, women and children must die of hunger no matter how much is done for them.

What they need most are grains and fats. Rationing the American people will not aid more than voluntary abnegation. But what is absolutely essential is that grain, needed for human consumption, shall not be fed to animals.

Because of OPA's unscientific, impractical ceiling prices, it pays the American farmer to feed grain to hogs rather than to sell the grain for human consumption.

And, again, because of OPA stupidities, it does not pay the packer to trim lard and tallow. The butcher in the store sells the housewife fatty meats, which go into our garbage pails. Those fats are essential to save the European sufferers from famine.

To put the whole problem bluntly, the American garbage pail could save millions of lives. Has Mr. Lehman ever told the American people the truth about that?

Has UNRRA waged a public battle against waste, depending upon the good will and charity of the American housewife rather than upon snooping OPA officials?

Has he ever shown the American people what he must know to be true: that UNRRA might have done an effective job if OPA had not dislocated farm-food prices so that food humans weep for, hogs eat?

It sometimes takes great courage and it is often bad manners to tell the truth. It might even involve a breach of good fellowship with those who pull at the same straw.

So, all that Mr. Lehman can offer to handle a famine is the resumption of rationing in the United States.

That is about as stupid as Henry Wallace's fake report on wages and prices. It is of a piece with all the imitative totalitarianism in our planless, improvised New Deal.

Sniping at Hoover will not help bring anyone a loaf of bread. It will only comfort the Communists who fear the consequences of an honest report to the Nation by a courageous American.

Fight OPA Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press of St. Marys, Pa.:

FIGHT OPA CONTROLS

Many groups in United States are opposed to continuance of OPA controls beyond June 1, the date they automatically expire unless Congress grants an extension of time.

The OPA loudly proclaims it is the only thing that has stood between this Nation and inflation.

What are you paying for a bushel of potatoes? What are you paying for children's garments? What are you paying for most of your groceries?

Are you not paying inflation prices for almost every item in your cost-of-living budget?

If so, to what extent has the OPA staved off inflation?

When men's socks that used to sell for 35 cents a pair are now selling for $1.39, don't you have inflation?

When children's shoes have increased two or three times in price how much good has the OPA been in keeping down living costs?

Yet, the OPA has the gall to say it has kept the cost of living from running away.

Outside of a few items, everything you buy today has been immersurably increased in price.

And the price increase in most instances has not been moderate, but far above that.

Therefore to what extent has OPA been able to justify its continued existence?

Power of Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I addressed the West Virginia Petroleum Association, and in the course of my remarks I discussed the power of propaganda.

Today I have a concrete example of the operation of Government bureaus, and to give the proper background I quote part of my statement:

One of the things that has impressed me most since I have been in Washington is the use and power of propaganda. It is indeed becoming a science. No doubt you will be surprised to learn that all agencies of the Government spend a total of $300,000,000 annually on propaganda in making good things look bad and bad things look good as it suits their fancy, all intending to advance a political philosophy and to perpetuate themselves in office.

* * * * *

The most powerful lobby in this country is that which is commonly referred to as the "Administration lobby." It has more radio commentators, more radio time, more newspaper space, all moving pictures, countless organization publications, and a great organized group corporation, including all Government agencies throughout the country, and is many, many times more powerful than all other combined interests. Consequently, the Congress is constantly handicapped in legislating intelligently by this powerful source of misinformation which operates long and hard from coast to coast.

The following is an editorial from the Jackson Herald, published in Ripley, W. Va., which tells its own story and shows to what extent Government bureaus are interfering with democratic processes:

A GOOD DAY'S WORK

From a Government bureau official in Washington comes a letter this week to the Herald in which we are informed that the Congressman from this district, the Honorable HUBERT ELLIS, has been instrumental in defeating an attempt to add 2,401 more people to the OPA pay roll. This official asks us to inform our readers about what Mr. ELLIS has done because he (the official) thinks that the Congressman has committed a terrible sin by killing off that many more jobs.

Of course, we are mentioning it but we have serious doubts that the situation is as the official thinks it is. Rather we are inclined to believe that if the public knew that Mr. ELLIS had an opportunity to prevent that many more OPA jobs from being created and didn't see to it that they were killed off then they would be very angry with Mr. ELLIS. The way matters stand, he has been instrumental in preventing that many from being created, and we can just hear folks say, "Bravo, HUBERT, you are a good Congressman. Kill off more of those jobs over there every time you get a chance."

Restore the Naval Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a self-explanatory communication from the Reserve officers of the naval services. This thoughtful letter points out the urgent necessity for restoring the drastic reductions that have been made in the naval budget:

RESERVE OFFICERS OF THE
NAVAL SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1946.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Reserve officers of the naval services, organized since VJ-day, is an association of Reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Practically all of the members have now returned to civilian life after participating in World War II. The membership represents a cross-section of the 350,000 Reserve officers of these three services. The RONS executive committee has approved this letter.

As Reserve officers, we are vitally affected by the proposed drastic cut in the naval budget. We supplied about 19 out of every 20 officers in the wartime Navy. We are subject to recall to combat duty. Therefore, we feel that we have a right to insist upon a naval budget that will provide continuous training for all reservists. As reserves, we certainly have a right to a fighting chance for our lives if there is another war. Without proper training, we will not have such a chance.

We believe that the Congress should know that no money is being provided for any training of the Volunteer Reserve which is by far the largest part of the Naval Reserve. In any future emergency, the Navy will, in a large measure, be dependent upon this Reserve for immediate manning of our fleet and shore establishments

Our Volunteer Air Reserve will be an illusion. We just will not have one. No money is provided for any refresher training. A pilot who doesn't fly soon ceases to be a pilot.

Our Reserve for the fleet will be only a token Reserve. The number of ships for Reserve training will have to be reduced from 73, as planned, to only 16.

We feel that we must warn the Congress that the Nation will be resting its security on a paper Reserve that does not and will not actually exist unless adequate funds are provided.

We cannot but ask who or what is responsible for this sudden radical cut in the naval budget in the face of a most critical world situation. It would be hard to understand in a stabilized world; it is incomprehensible to us under the present conditions.

We urge the Congress to provide sufficient funds for a Navy adequate to guarantee our control of the sea-air approaches to our Nation.

Sincerely yours,
EUGENE C. CARUSI,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Oil Industry Should be Released From OPA Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, price control is based upon the theory that whenever the supply of a commodity is insufficient to meet the demands for that commodity, the interests of wartime emergency and of the public at large could best be served by the control and holding down of prices until the supply could catch up with the demand for a given commodity. It was argued that thus inflation could be avoided and prevented. It has also been stated, and repeated times without number by the administration and those determining the policies of price control and our wartime planned economy, that whenever the supply should become sufficient to meet the demands for any given commodity, that commodity should be released from further price control, for there would be no further danger of inflation occurring as to that particular commodity.

Almost immediately after VJ-day the supply of crude oil and petroleum products reached the point where supply approximated demand, and today the supply exceeds the demand. Hence, according to the theory upon which price control is based and the promises that price controls would be released when the

supply would satisfy the demand, the oil industry should now be released from further price control by the Office of Price Administration or any other agency of the Federal Government.

This situation with reference to the oil industry, and the rational conclusions to be drawn that this industry should now be released from further price controls, and if not voluntarily released, Congress should take the necessary steps to force such release, is clearly, cogently, and convincingly set forth in a statement made by Frank M. Porter, president of the General Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, of Tulsa, Okla., before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress on March 21, 1946, in the following language:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Frank M. Porter. I reside in Oklahoma City, Okla., and am engaged in the business of producing oil and gas as an independent operator. I am also engaged in the business of drilling oil and gas wells on contract for others.

I am president of the General Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, with headquarters in Tulsa, Okla. The association has a membership of more than 3,000 independent and major operators engaged in business in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama.

During the war this association, through its officers and membership, has contributed its share to the outstanding record established by the petroleum industry in furnishing the armed forces with an ever-present and adequate supply of petroleum products. Since the application of price control to the oil industry by the OPA in January 1942 the General Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, along with other representative organizations and individuals of the petroleum industry, has pointed out to various congressional committees dealing with the subject and to the OPA the inadequacy of the price of crude oil and its products.

In practically every instance, the position of the industry has been sustained by the report of the congressional committees that have conducted these investigations. The Petroleum Administration for War has at all times sustained the position of the industry and recommended to the OPA that a fair and equitable adjustment of prices should be made in the petroleum industry. The Petroleum Industry War Council, appointed as an advisory group to the Petroleum Administrator for War, has sustained the position of the petroleum industry and recommended an upward adjustment of prices. The National Crude Oil Advisory Committee, appointed by the Price Administrator, has conducted a thorough investigation of the cost of finding, developing and producing crude petroleum, and on February 11, 1946, filed its report with the OPA in which it has concluded that the "existing crude petroleum maximum price ceilings are insufficient to permit the normal exploratory and development operations needed to provide adequate petroleum reserves in this country sufficient at all times to maintain a readily available supply of producible crude petroleum for national security and to meet the indicated military demands and the normal expansion in civilian and industrial requirements for petroleum products."

The report further states, "Supply and demand are now in substantial balance and the reduced volume of crude production required in 1946 is a little smaller than productive capacity within maximum efficient rates."

Although at the termination of the Japanese war the industry was producing an estimated 300,000 barrels a day greater than the potential capacity within maximum efficient rates in order to supply the military demand, the decreased requirements for high octane gasoline were such that at present our domestic producible capacity at established efficient rates exceeds existing demand for crude petroleum. Actual daily production for the 4 weeks ended March 2, 1946, averaged 4,710,100 barrels. Runs to stills on the basis of Bureau of Mines estimates were approximately 4,779,000 barrels per day. Thus, it will be apparent that when any consideration is given to imports, the total daily supply of crude petroleum within the United States exceeds current refinery requirements.

The declaration of purposes as contained in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, makes it clear that the intent and purpose of the law was to assure a supply of any materials necessary for national defense and to stabilize prices in order to eliminate and prevent profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from other abnormal conditions or scarcities caused by or contributed to by the war, in order that an adequate supply of critical materials and commodities may be available for both military and civilian uses at noninflationary prices. The dangers anticipated by the Price Control Act do not now exist with respect to the oil industry because supply and demand for crude petroleum and its products are in balance. Immediately following VJ-day, the administration gave assurance to the public that it would be the policy to withdraw price and rationing controls as fast as the supply in any industry equaled demand. The OPA has failed to act in accordance with the policy insofar as the oil industry is concerned.

It is, therefore, respectfully suggested to your committee that if the Congress shall see fit to extend price control beyond June 30, 1946, an appropriate provision be included in the Extension Act that will impose the mandatory requirement upon the OPA to act in accordance with the policy announced by the administration immediately following VJ-day with respect to withdrawal of price control from individual industries. If such provision had been included in the present statute, the oil industry, for example, would have long since been freed of these controls and would have now been adjusted to a peacetime economy with the forces of supply, demand, and competition in full operation, to the resultant benefit of the American public and the industry.

In our view, it is highly important that the statute be made self-executing in this respect. We, therefore, make the additional suggestion that if and when any industry advisory committee, constituted and appointed as provided by existing law, shall have found and certified to the Administrator that conditions exist in any industry which qualify such industry as being eligible for the withdrawal of price controls under the policy announced by the Administration following VJ-day, the OPA shall forthwith withdraw such controls.

Some concern has been expressed that removal of price controls in the oil industry might result in run-away and inflationary price raises for crude and refined products. Such fear is, however, dissipated by the statistical position prevailing in the industry. With supply equaling and exceeding demand, the increase in storage develops a competitive condition that automatically applies the brakes to any sudden or severe price raises. During the month of February crude storage increased at the rate of approximately 160,000 barrels a day. The Texas Railroad Commission reports storage accumulations since January 1, 1946, in excess of 11,000,000 barrels. Bureau of Mines reports show at the close of the week of March 9, 1946, crude oil storage in the United States totaled in excess of 226,000,000 barrels.

A few days ago, following the filing of the National Crude Oil Industry Advisory Committee's report with the OPA and just ahead of the appearances of petroleum representatives before this committee, the OPA stated they would in the near future issue regulations authorizing or permitting crude-oil purchasers to increase prices across the board 10 cents per barrel. It is the prevailing view in the industry that such increase is wholly inadequate.

According to the February 11 report of the Crude Oil Industry Advisory Committee, the average cost of finding, developing, and producing crude petroleum rose from 70 cents per barrel in the years 1936–39, inclusive, to $1.60 per barrel in 1944. It is further pointed out by the report that during the base period 1936–39, inclusive, the average excess of crude-oil income over replacement cost was 45 cents per barrel, whereas the 1944 finding, developing, and producing cost of $1.60 a barrel was 35 cents greater than the average price for crude petroleum. Two factors contributed to this deficit; first, increased cost of supplies, materials, and labor; second, the increased and deeper drilling necessary for the discovery of new oil.

Recent surveys disclose that in 1938, for each million barrels of new oil discovered, it was necessary to drill 10,000 feet of holes, whereas, in 1944, it was necessary to drill 45,000 feet for each million barrels of new oil discovered, or an increase of 350 percent. It is, therefore, obvious that at least 35 cents a barrel is necessary to bring the price of oil in balance with the average cost of finding, developing, and producing, as disclosed by the National Crude Oil Industry Advisory Committee. In view of the competitive position existing in the industry, there is no reason to believe that crude-oil price increases would exceed the 35 cents a barrel necessary to bring the price in balance with replacement cost at this time. It is, of course, obvious that the oil industry, or no other industry, can be expected to continue to be content with a bare return of operating cost. It is only fair, in the absence of a decrease in the cost of finding, developing, and producing crude petroleum, to say that there will be a natural striving within the industry to increase prices to include the profit factor if and when competitive circumstances permit, which is the only way the American public can be assured of a healthy economic organism that can guarantee a continued supply of petroleum products at reasonable prices.

Refining surveys indicate that such increases in the cost of crude oil would probably justify an increase of a cent a gallon on refined products, but, again, the statistical position of refined products may not permit such increase to immediately materialize. It should be pointed out that there has also been a constant increase of domestic stocks of finished and unfinished gasoline since VJ-day. For the week ended March 2, 1946, American Petroleum Institute estimates show a total of approximately 105,000,000 barrels of finished and unfinished gasoline in storage.

The oil industry has functioned through the war years at a price for its crude production which wholly ignored the factor of reproduction cost. This inequity has rested especially heavy on the stripper-well producer who has labored diligently to keep his small wells alive and thus preserve, as a conservation measure, the stripper reserves for future use. This price condition, of course, was no less burdensome to the larger producer but due to his greater reserves he was in a better position to stand the depletion of his capital inventories below ground. To meet the stripper-well emergency the Congress provided for a stripper subsidy ranging from 25 cents a barrel in the lower

grades of crude to 75 cents a barrel for Pennsylvania-grade oil. It will be suggested that these subsidies must be terminated with withdrawal of price control. The largest subsidy now being received by any stripper-well owner outside of the Pennsylvania-grade producers, is 35 cents a barrel. If we are correct that midcontinent and Gulf-coast crude will advance the 35 cents per barrel necessary to bring the price in balance with reproduction costs, then it may be assumed that Pennsylvania, California, and Rocky Mountain grades will be corresponding increased, and the stripper-well producer will be precisely in the same financial condition with respect to price structure as he was under the subsidy except he will be living in an atmosphere of free and competitive enterprise. He will also be free to take advantage of any special position or circumstance that may exist, such as availability to local refiners or the production of oil having special characteristics which many times are important factors to stripper-well producers.

I have just had an opportunity to see the statement made by Mr. H. M. McClure, of Alma, Mich., president of the National Stripper Well Association and chairman of the State Oil Board of Michigan, before the Special Committee of the Senate Investigating Petroleum Resources. Mr. McClure makes it clear that although subsidies have been a substantial factor in preserving the stripper wells throughout the duration of frozen prices, the stripper-well producers recognize that it is a more healthy economic condition and more in keeping with our form of government when any industry or any segment thereof is assured an adequate price for its production in a free and competitive market.

A further continuation of price controls, particularly within the oil industry, is fraught with certain economic hazards which we cannot escape. Continued oppressive and unfair prices in any major basic industry obviously mean curtailment of production. Curtailment of production in any such industry is reflected in new hardships to the American public and a greater lowering of living standards, because scarcities necessarily develop increased prices which eliminate the ability of the public to use the products produced as the prices increase. In the case of the oil industry, continued price controls at subnormal levels will curtail expansion and finding of new petroleum reserves as a backlog to a continued healthy condition in the industry resulting in weakening the ability of the industry to perform one of its paramount obligations to the public in providing at all times adequate reserves, first, for the national defense, second, for civilian uses, and third, the service of expanding and developing new products for the benefit of the public. With the decrease of production and a further curtailment of searching for and finding new petroleum reserves, shortages of current available supplies will develop. This necessarily will result in inflationary prices. Such is the cost to the public of a controlled economy when controls are carried beyond a great national emergency such as war.

A free economy cannot exist without free prices. They are one and the same. Any argument to the contrary is elusive. To proceed on any other basis will lead us to bottomless pitfalls in the economic structure. Free prices are so definitely the core of a free economy that the statement must be accepted as axiomatic. Prices are the reflections of economic conditions and decisions, and free decisions in the economic world have no other means of expression than through free prices. Economic decisions, like prices, are controlled by the immutable law of supply and demand. All we ask is that industry be permitted again to function within the realm of this economic principle. The history of production and prices in America is such as to warrant the confidence and faith that a system of free and competitive enterprise is the best yet devised.

Inflation or Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared on March 22, 1946, in the Portage Daily Register, Portage, Wis.:

INFLATION OR TYRANNY

Inflation produces widespread hardship and creates grave economic injustice. It is something which we should endeavor to avoid so far as possible.

But tyranny, injustice, and regimentation are also evils, greater evils perhaps than inflation. We've gone through periods of inflation more than once. Every great war has been followed by inflation. The results have been bad, but we recovered, stabilized our economy, and moved forward.

For the first time in our Nation's history we are now making an effort to curb inflation by a system of controls which are all foreign to the traditional American way of conducting business. We have now a powerful Government bureau which can send enforcement agents into almost every business house in the Nation and impose heavy penalties for any infraction of the rules established. We hear reports of heavy fines and adverse publicity imposed upon citizens because of trivial errors.

In one of the recent press releases from this agency we note:

The Blank Motor Co. fined $50 for sale of 42 recapped passenger car tires, each at 20 cents overcharge.

The Blank Restaurant fined $50 for overcharge of 25 cents each on six chicken dinners.

The Blank Grill $50 for overcharge of 35 cents each on 20 porterhouse steaks; 10 cents each on five special T-bone steaks.

The list is devoted almost entirely to petty offenses. A small businessman overcharges by a margin of a few cents. He gets in trouble with the law—gets a lot of adverse publicity—is put in the class with the unpatriotic chiselers who are endeavoring to bring about national disaster.

All OPA methods are in startling contrast to the tactics employed by the Department of Internal Revenue. If you make an error, an honest error, in your income-tax report it will be called to your attention by a representative of that Department and you will have an opportunity to make the necessary correction without an unreasonable penalty and with no bad publicity. If the evidence indicates that you have attempted to defraud the Government, however, the penalty will be severe.

Would it not be possible for the OPA to adopt a similar attitude and a similar policy? Congressmen should go into that little matter before they renew the OPA powers.

To Life and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope those who value personal liberty will read carefully the editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 25, 1946. It is a thought-provoking editorial. Justice Edward S. Dore has made a very valuable contribution to the cause of liberty, its origin, and its significance to free men as against an all-powerful totalitarian state.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the editorial to which I have referred:

TO LIFE AND LIBERTY

We have chosen to print in these columns today excerpts from a notable speech. It was made recently by Associate Justice Edward S. Dore, of the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court, at the Association of the Bar of New York City. Many readers will recognize the kinship of Judge Dore's statements to the writings of the late Thomas F. Woodlock on this page.

Judge Dore asserts the natural law, the self-evident truth that men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights"; that a man, because he is a man, possesses rights of which no other man or men, however powerful, can morally deprive him.

It seems to us that, if that idea is lost or abandoned, there is lost with it the moral basis for resistance to the doctrines of totalitarianism, whether they assail us from without or bore from within; that if that idea is lost, the ideas of the dictators must conquer.

Conversely, it seems to us, that if we retain and live that idea, the grisly teachings of totalitarianism are conquered as quickly and as easily as darkness is conquered when one switches on a light.

"For man is essentially mind. In human affairs it is mind that ultimately matters. Ideas do finally direct human life. All the inventions and technological improvements we possess are in their origin mere ideas about reality. So are governments. It was an idea in the mind of a French corporal that originally produced Napoleon's empire. It was an idea burning almost alone in the mind of a German corporal that helped catapult a modern nation into the monstrosity called nazism. It was an idea in the mind of a few great men in the Colonies that made the priceless thing we call America. For the protection of our lives, our liberties, and our persons America is primarily an idea and secondarily a sector of geography. If the same sector of geography were informed with the ideas of an oriental despotism, it would be just that and cease to be America. * * *

"If there are any who think the idea of natural law has no bearing on everyday life, I should like them to ask themselves a few questions; such as:

" 'What right do I have to life?' or

" 'What right do I have to liberty?'

"I doubt if anyone in this audience would answer by saying:

" 'I have a right to live because the state has not as yet found it expedient to "liquidate" me,' or even

" 'My right to stay out of jail is because my lawyer could get me a writ of habeas corpus.'

"If you accept natural law you have better answers. You know that your right to live was not given you by the Republican administration in Albany or the Democratic administration in Washington, and is not dependent on the mere will of either. Your right to liberty is secured by the writ of habeas corpus, but was not given you by the Habeas Corpus Act. Both rights are given you by a source of law more fundamental than any party or majority as the Declaration, made when the Nation was founded, proclaimed. And government itself is created primarily to secure—not to give—such rights. But if a sufficiently influential number of your fellow citizens can be brought to a frame of mind that denies natural right, the whole fabric of basic rights is in danger.

"In our origins the founding fathers proclaimed the source of our human rights and the basis of our law in a solemn declaration of principles and in an organic law giving effect to those principles. This is what they said in the Declaration:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights * * *. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

"By that solemn declaration the men who made America rooted the ultimate defense of our human rights in a divine endowment. The reference to the 'just' powers of government shows acceptance of natural law limitations proscribing arbitrary power in any form. They thus took their stand on the thought I have outlined that law is ultimately founded not in man's mere subjective ideas but in nature, that the law of nature is from its Author, and that, therefore, man has natural rights which he does not get from the state * * *.

"And experience shows that when law is based on will, and reason is used only as a mere instrument to further power, the lust for power is boundless. There is no limit to its demands.

"The fifth act of Goethe's Faust shows the palace in deep night. Faust, by the sale of his soul for power, has reached the pinnacle of world dominion but is fretted by the little dwelling of two poor old peasants, Baucis and Philemon, and their few linden trees. Faust summons Mephistopheles and says:

"'These old people will have to disappear. I want those linden trees for my estate. Those few trees which do not belong to me spoil for me the possession of the world!

"'My mighty and unbounded will
Is broken on yon sandy hill.'

"The diabolical force then operates—Mephistopheles and his three mighty comrades soon report their work of annihilation * * *.

"Faust has domination of the world, but cannot tolerate two poor, weak, and inoffensive little persons and their few linden trees. So law, divorced from reason and natural right, begets an insatiable appetite for power. The world is no longer the ordered cosmos of the created universe subject to law under God; but chaos, the object of the demonic, unfettered will of men in power. We have seen in our own day, and not in one place only, this living will of aggression, never satisfied with dominion or territory.

"It does not merely mean external aggression against other states, though it does mean that; but also internal aggression against the state's own subjects. The state is no longer the limited, separate, governing thing allowing a large area to liberty; it tends to become coextensive with the community in all its aspects. It possesses man totally. The state is merged with the community and becomes as class, race, or blood the supreme and sole end of all human existence and effort.

"No statutory, legal, or constitutional limits to power are recognized. An independent judiciary and courts are supplanted by mere administrative boards that become weapons for implementing state policy. The sphere of liberty outside the direct control of government becomes less and less. Man must not own; the state will own for him. Man must not think; the state will think for him, and to make sure of this, controls every avenue of information and propaganda. Man must not be free to select his vocation in life. The state will ordain our lives. Man must not worship God; the state is sole absolute. The last and worst consequences reveal themselves inevitably where the idea had its origin, namely, in the intellectual and spiritual life of men. The final end is mass consciousness; a mechanical, inhuman, servile mass organization destructive of human liberty and personal responsibility * * *.

"* * * Now, if law is based ultimately on general will instead of reason, there never can be an unjust law if the lawgiver has the power, i. e., the physical force to carry out his will. This is equally true whether the lawgiver is an individual tyrant, a group, or a majority. If there be no standard of right and wrong binding alike on ruler and ruled, and no limitation on the power of the state itself over the community, law ultimately becomes mere number or physical force. The end desired by the ruler then has value if he has the means, i. e., the force, to put it into effect. That is the teaching of modern instrumentalism. That is the practice of modern tyranny. * * *

"If you revolt, as you do, from acceptance of that or of other legal violence of our time, it is only because, in spite of all that legal realism has said to the contrary, you still accept in the inner recesses of your mind the concept of natural law as the basis of human rights and of positive law. On that concept we have a rational basis for the distinction between lawful political authority and mere tyranny. On the basis of juridical instrumentalism we can make no such distinction.

"Deny natural law and God as its author and in principle the citizens do not essentially differ from the animals in the state experimental farm. If the juridical difference between them is solely of state competence, the state that created the distinction may also abolish it. Experimentally and historically the more a government recedes from reason and natural law the closer it approaches to the idea of men as mere things. Witness, for example, the murder by the Nazi Government of its own people, i. e., those Germans whom the bureaucrat determined to kill because of alleged incurable disease. Where do you stop? * * *

"The idea that man is made for the state can find lodgment in American thought through dominance in the minds of American lawyers and judges and in public opinion of a philosophy of law that denies our intellectual heritage, that despises our American origins, and puts no limit to state power, but makes the ultimate end of man the service of the state. Those supporting that idea are vocal. They are almost fanatically active. Unless those who accept the American idea of law exert themselves in defense of its intellectual foundations, that idea, undefeated by attack from without, may fail for lack of defense from within."

Last Letters Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I read in the Christian Science Monitor an editorial that impressed me with its challenge to us in these postwar times. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial as follows:

LAST LETTERS HOME

Wait a minute, America.

You, there, throwing your money around in night clubs and beach resorts.

And you on the picket line.

And you in the paneled office.

And you in the cozy living room.

This is the story of three men. No; this is the story of 140,000,000 men, women, and children. But three men are putting it together, with their last thoughts; three men are writing it down, in their last wards. They are in Japanese prisons awaiting execution for their part in the Doolittle raid on Tokyo. In a few years America will be going about its business again—its business of making a living, or more, and going to school, and the movies, and church, and downtown, and to the library, the club—and as some regrettable reports in the papers will have to tell, of doing things less admirable than these.

Are you listening, America?

"They have just told me I am liable to execution. * * * I have a heart and didn't ever want anyone to die because of me. * * * I have dreamed of peace ever since the war started and now I can't understand why I am put in such a bad position. * * * I wish the court would reconsider and have a heart for us and try to understand that we have people at home that love us and we them."

That was Lieutenant Hallmark. Are you listening, America?

"Here's wishing Marge, all the family, and Lib a most happy future—please carry on for me—don't let this get you down. Just remember that God will make everything right. * * * We've had some good times together, all of us. Life has treated us well as a whole and we have much to be thankful for. You are, all of you, splendid Christians and knowing you and loving you has meant much in my life. So to you, mother, for through my whole life, sacrificing * * * toward making me, I hope, a fine son; to you, Aunt Marge, for helping me through school and holding up a fine ideal to me; to you, Aunt Mary * * * Aunt Lil * * * Uncle Mac * * * Pie * * * Bess * * * Mimi * * * Ivan * * * Lib * * *. The rest I write especially to mother."

That was Lieutenant Farrow. Are you listening?

"Dad * * * I want you to know I died fighting for my country like a soldier. * * * May God bless you. * * * Say good bye to all my friends. * * * Dad, I want you to know that I loved and may God bless you."

That was Sergeant Spatz.

These are excerpts from letters found in Japanese war-office files. They have been produced in connection with the trial of high Japanese officers charged with the illegal execution of some of General Doolittle's men. But they put us all on trial before the courts of our own consciences. Other letters these

men wrote. They were to friends, recalling good times together, commenting on well-earned blessings that had come to other friends, disclosing mental snapshots—those days at Kelly, Christmas at Pendleton.

We know you're very busy, America—price ceilings, strikes, inflation, housing shortage, and extra flowers to be rushed to suite 42 before the party begins. Do we bore you?

If we do, we don't care. In these three men you can find a million, or ten million. They won the future for us, the happy future Lieutenant Farrow wished his loved ones, to live in peace as Hallmark wanted to, to go on fighting for the country Spatz served like a soldier. They gave everything for the chance the rest of us have today. How many of us would be proud to have them know what our own individual postwar part has been in serving the America they helped save.

Security From Want and Hunger in Old Age Is Desire of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the desire for security from want and hunger in old-age is harbored by all men and women. Yet the attainment of that goal seems the most difficult of all social accomplishments.

Why there should be any hesitancy on anybody's part in the United States to advocate adequate old-age pensions for all citizens, I am at a loss to say. But there is plenty of hesitancy. Yes; even worse, there is plenty of opposition to the idea.

The argument which makes me see red comes from the person who says he would like to see an old-age pension system adopted if we could afford it, but where are we going to get the money?

That makes me laugh. A nation which appropriates billions for the relief of other nations, for world-wide good will, for Government bureaus to spend, for hundreds of other things, can afford providing some system to retire our elderly people.

A man or a woman spends a lifetime working to make the community a better place in which to live, paying taxes, sacrificing for family and friends. Certainly, he or she deserves something better than public welfare or a pittance of a State pension or some other inadequate stipend.

This Government must treat all old people alike. Why should several millions be excluded from social security? Why shouldn't a universal plan be adopted to include everybody?

A lot of people sneer at Dr. Townsend's pension theories. For my part, I believe if his plan were put into effect, we would be able to solve most of our economic ills.

Money in the hands of all Americans, instead of here and there a few, is the secret of real prosperity. If part of our population is in rags and hungry the rest can never be happy.

Therefore, I implore the members of this committee to take a great step forward in bringing about good times here in our country. Extend the Social Security Act to all our people and make possible an era of good living such as the Nation and the world has never seen before.

Wrecking the Ability To Employ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared on March 21, 1946 in the Waukesha Daily Freeman, Waukesha, Wis.:

WRECKING THE ABILITY TO EMPLOY

When the town forum here Sunday night discusses "Should price control, as it is being administered by the OPA, be continued?" the evidence of how badly this control has bogged down our reconversion from war to peace cannot be overlooked. Genuine shortages in civilion goods caused by the war have been transformed into artificial scarcity that is bound to continue until the administration calls a halt to its economic tinkering. In the CIO-United States Steel wage dispute the OPA finally admitted, after months of costly bickering and delay, that wages enter into the price of goods.

Adjustments are now being made on the level of earnings during 1936–39, when 6 out of 10 firms in the Nation were operating at only a fraction of their full capacities. While this plan continues to hold prices in check in many lines, it is slowly choking off the Nation's ability not only to produce but to employ, with the result that 2,500,000 veterans returning from service have already been forced to live on Government subsistence checks rather than on the money they could earn were they gainfully employed. If and when OPA ceilings are removed there will be a rise in prices but such price increases will be reduced by competition producing the goods which are now prevented from coming on the market. Industry will stifle inflation with production when permitted by the administration to do so. Historically, we have never had run-away prices on a rising production trend, nor can this run-away be produced unless the Government starts the presses that print the money.

Chester Bowles himself has clearly acknowledged the necessity of profit incentive to secure adequate production. He did this by advocating subsidies for food and other agricultural products supposedly under price ceilings. The Government has for a long time attempted to fool the public with subsidies by paying producers the difference between what they ought to get for their goods and what they are receiving under the ceiling-price policy. The difference—labeled "subsidy"—goes to the producer not over the counter but through the back door, and is taken from the consumer in the "painless" way—by taxes. Subsidies in billions of dollars are asked to hide the rising costs of living resulting from a wage-price policy that permits wages to rise and prevents the production of goods that can validate them.

Seven months ago the Nation looked forward to the greatest prosperity of its history—jobs and new wealth for 13,000,000 sons and nephews returned from the wars. What do we have today? Hand-outs for the veterans who aren't all back yet by any means. Prosperity has been deferred by a Government agency which was organized to prevent war profiteering. We're still acting as though the war isn't over. There can be no prosperity under government by concession. Must we learn that by bitter experience?

Mr. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press, St. Marys, Pa., for March 20, 1946:

MR. WALLACE

Commerce Secretary Henry A. Wallace has just made the statement in Washington that Republican and Democratic Members of Congress who don't follow party lines on major issues ought to be kicked out of their party, which means there would be no place in government affairs for a man who thought along independent lines.

If the whole thing were carried out as Mr. Wallace suggests he would be one of the first to be banished from the Democratic Party, for in a recent congressional election in New York City to fill a vacancy Mr. Wallace backed the candidacy of Johannes Steele, an American Labor Party candidate, and fought against the Democratic candidate, supported by all Democratic factions, and backed up by Mayor William O'Dwyer.

We know of no man in public life who could size up the "phonies" like the late Al Smith.

Al Smith in taking a crack at Wallace accused him of being a "star gazer" rather than a man having his feet on the ground, and in the years that have come and gone since then we still think Al had Henry sized up correctly.

Wallace is a disappointed man these days, for had the fates picked him at Chicago instead of Truman 2 years ago he would now be President and have the whole Nation at his command on which to work his economic theories that are said by experts to be somewhat on the screwy side.

Rehabilitation of War Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. H. Leib, national legislative director, American Veterans of World War II, and a letter addressed to him from the Veterans' Administration:

CONCERNING THE REHABILITATION OF WAR AMPUTEES

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—have been sponsoring a campaign to se-

cure automobiles for amputees as part of their prosthesis. We have attempted to secure the assistance and approval of the Veterans' Administration. Also, we are now in touch with leading automobile manufacturers in the hope of making arrangements to obtain priorities for these disabled war veterans who have given so much to their country.

On February 28 this writer addressed a letter to General Bradley calling his attention to the cars-for-amputees proposal and requested his views regarding the feasibility of the plan. After three telephonic conversations we received a letter from General Hawley, Chief Medical Director of the VA, on March 16, advising us to contact the members of the newly formed prosthetic advisory committee "in order to give your proposal full consideration so that concerted action can be initiated."

Amvets did exactly as General Hawley suggested, but in today's newspapers Walter Bura, director of VA prosthetic service, rushed into print with a statement that his administration is absolutely opposed to purchase automobiles for amputees.

We wonder why the Veterans' Administration did not notify us how it felt about the proposal instead of referring us to contact its own amputee advisory committee? If this is the way the VA is going to work with its appointed advisers then it might as well abolish these useless committees. Another thing, is Mr. Bura speaking for the Veterans' Administration, or for himself?

There are today 13,489 one-limb amputees, 1,000 two-limb amputees, 9 three-limb amputees.

If our Government can spend billions of dollars in the rehabilitation of Russia and England as well as other foreign nations—then certainly we can spend approximately $16,000,000 to help these amputees.

The question that confronts amputees is mobility. Many of these unfortunate youths could do a day's work provided they could get about. Most of them can walk only a few blocks on their artificial limbs. They can't walk up a hill or in crowded areas. If they had a car to get around—many of them could make their own way in life without further Government assistance. This proposal deserves respectful consideration, and we hope that Congress will look into the matter carefully.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1946,

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,
National Legislative Director, American Veterans of World War II,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Your letter of February 28, 1946, addressed to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator, pertaining to furnishing automobiles for amputees by Government purchase, has been referred to this office for reply.

A prosthetic advisory committee has been formed by the Veterans' Administration to work with the prosthetic applicances on the needs of veterans who use artificial aids. In order to give your proposal full consideration, it is suggested that you contact any of the committee members so that concerted action can be initiated.

For your information, a list of the members of this committee, together with their addresses, is herewith supplied you:

Col. Robert S. Allen (arm amputee, World War II), Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Aaron L. Danzig, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Col. John Haskell, New York Stock Exchange, New York City.

Capt. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Bank Building, Washington, D. C.

Sgt. Harold M. Dixon, 3711 Thirty-sixth Street NW., Mt. Ranier, Md.

Hon. Augustine B. Kelley, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

It is understood that the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Member of Congress, is keenly interested in the furtherance of your proposed program.

Very truly yours,

PAUL R. HAWLEY,
Chief Medical Director.

Washington Cathedral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a vast majority of Americans recognize that the Christian religion in some form is essential to a wholesome civilization, if not to national existence. As individuals they may or may not own allegiance to any particular church but they admit that the national motto In God We Trust is the statement of a simple fact. Religion has been an influence of lasting spiritual and political significance in American history.

The tragedy which has befallen western civilization, laying waste centuries of cultural heritage, may well serve as a warning to all nations, that unless we experience a spiritual rebirth, we are going to face a thoroughly pagan and self-destructive civilization. Cut off from the living fountain of spiritual life, western civilization will fall under the shadow of a choking tyranny. Where God is made an outlaw, men become lawless, undisciplined followers of idolatrous stateism. It happened in fascism, in communism, and in nazism. It can happen to ourselves.

It is often emphasized that the American Constitution separates state from religion and religion from the state. From a purely external point of view, such a statement is correct enough. And yet, Mr. Speaker, a deeper analysis of the separation between state and religion in this country will prove that our founding fathers wisely made this constitutional arrangement just because they believed in the indispensable values of a free, living religion. In fact, a religion so free that the state is prevented by law from interfering with the spiritual worship of the citizens.

The Marxist separation of church and state is based upon contempt for religious life as a poisonous superstitution. Our American constitutional philosophy bids us give unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's.

Mr. Speaker, we in this House deem it our especially high privilege to belong to a legislative body which has kept faith through all these changing years of our history with our constitutional respect for the eternal truth of God.

Now, among the many implications of this national tradition of positive attitude towards religion and religious freedom, there is one which I wish to emphasize. Just as ours is a representative Government, so it seems to me that our National Capital should itself be thoroughly representative of all that is best in American life. Each phase of American life should be symbolized by a building which gives outward expression to a significant inward reality. Thus the Capitol houses Congress and suggests legislative power. Justice is symbolized by the building of the Supreme Court. The White House is the seat of the Executive. Art is enshrined in the National Gallery and science in the Smithsonian Institution. Gratitude for patriotic service is evidenced by the Washington Monument and the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials.

Where in Washington is religion enshrined? Where, in the Nation's Capital, is there a house of God comparable to the great buildings which I have named?

President Washington indeed recognized that a church for national purposes was an essential civic feature and his engineer Major L'Enfant, made provision for it in his plan for the future city. But the realization of the plan has been long delayed, and even today, when various communions are drawing nearer to one another, it is probable that no church could be built which would completely satisfy the aspirations of all Christian people. Tomorrow, we trust, it will be different. Meantime, there should rise in Washington the type of church structure which comes nearest to satisfying the spiritual aspiration of all. Such a structure would itself be a powerful factor in achieving unity. To delay its creation until unity has been achieved is to neglect an important means of attaining the very end which we desire.

Happily a great Washington cathedral is actually in course of construction. Standing on Mount St. Alban, the highest ground in the District, this church will dominate the skyline of the city. Its majestic proportions and the beauty of its design mark it as one of the great churches of the world. Although under existing conditions any such church must be affiliated with some one branch of the church universal—in this case the Episcopal Church—this cathedral in fact radiates a spirit of Christian fellowship which fairly justifies its claim to be a house of prayer for all people.

Appropriately enough, the Congress itself long ago recognized the possibilities of this great undertaking, and in 1893, by special act, granted the charter under which the cathedral operates.

A close—or campus—of some 57 acres has the cathedral as its central feature. Even in its unfinished state its majestic beauty profoundly impresses the crowds of pilgrims who visit it from all parts of the Union and of the world. It houses large congregations of worshipers on great occasions and ministers day after

day and Sunday after Sunday to the religious needs of those who, while in Washington, have no other spiritual home. Ministers and people of various communions participate in these services, and from the cathedral pulpit are heard the voices of many preachers who own primary allegiance to non-Episcopal churches. As a place for the effective rendering of church music, the cathedral is unrivaled. The organ is one of the world's finest instruments, and to hear in the cathedral the choral singing of the music of the masters is an unforgetable experience. In the cathedral hang the flags of each of the 48 States, and a Sunday in each year is set apart for prayer for the well-being of one of the States and its people. Thus the Union of States in Washington Cathedral becomes a fact of deep spiritual significance. Altogether it may fairly be said that the church when finished will go far toward the realization of Washington's ideal.

In order to finish it an organized movement is about to begin. The ultimate cost of completion is estimated at about $13,000,000. An immediate objective will be the completion of the south transept and the nave at a cost of about $7,000,000. These, with the parts already finished, will provide seats for 7,500 people and standing room for over 25,000. An appropriate and impressive part of the structure will be a war memorial in which recognition will be given to the service of the soldiers who are known—just as at Arlington honor is paid to the soldier who is unknown. This memorial will be reared not merely for those who have died but for all who in World War II and earlier wars have placed their lives at the disposal of the Republic. Admirable as are the many civic and municipal memorials which are springing up all over the country, there is, I think, a peculiar appropriateness in a memorial which expresses the religious feelings of those who create it—a memorial which enshrines in the house of God the names of those who counted not their own lives as dear unto themselves.

Around the cathedral are clustered its various auxiliary institutions, also the cathedral garden of unsurpassed beauty and an outdoor amphitheater for great ceremonies like the annual massing of the colors and for congregations too large to be accommodated in the cathedral.

I have chosen to speak thus of the cathedral because I esteem it worthy to stand as an adequate symbol of the place of religion in the life of the Republic. This sanctuary is destined here in Washington to become in time what St. Peter's is to Rome, Notre Dame to Paris, and Westminster Abbey to London. There it stands—and will stand through the ages—a visible witness to the vitality of religion and an outward expression of our inward trust in God. It is worthy of the interest and support of all who may be reached by these words of mine. I want to do my bit in promoting an undertaking which should rank high in our list of patriotic endeavors.

Beach and Shore Erosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association at the Carlton Hotel, March 21, 1946:

Let me express to you my appreciation of this opportunity to talk with you about a common interest—the beaches and shores of our country. Your interest in our beaches has been and is being demonstrated in many ways: By your association itself, by your support of legislation affecting beaches, by your activity in your own communities and States. My interest in beaches is not so well known to you and I welcome this opportunity to tell you of some of the things I have been thinking about.

When, in the course of my duties, I took over my responsibilities as Chief of Engineers I found that one of my jobs was to cause investigations and studies to be made with a view to devising effective means of preventing erosion of the shores of coastal and lake waters. In the act delegating this authority the Congress provided for a board of officers and civilians—the Beach Erosion Board—to advise me in this task. The more I learn of this aspect of my job the more am I impressed by and grateful for the wisdom thus shown by the authors of that legislation. A cynical colleague of mine once defined an advisory board as a group of experts who individually can do nothing but who meet and decide collectively that nothing can be done. I can assure you that this definition certainly does not apply to the Beach Erosion Board.

The record of their accomplishments is well known to you up to the onset of the war. At that time the normal civil works activities of the Corps of Engineers, including those of the Beach Erosion Board, were suspended by Executive order and a necessary censorship of information imposed on Corps of Engineers' activities. With the end of the war and relaxation of controls on information, it is possible to talk about the work done by the Board during the war. I can tell you it played an important part in the achievement of our victory.

Although it had not been contemplated that the Beach Erosion Board organization would participate in the wartime activities of the Corps of Engineers, the nature of the war as it developed made a place for the Board almost immediately. Intelligence agencies were faced with demands for information on where beach landings could be made, what the beach was like, how deep was the water approach to the beach, and similar questions. It was soon discovered that answers to these questions were extremely difficult to find, so—naturally—they were rapidly passed on to the Corps of Engineers. Fortunately the Beach Erosion Board was able to furnish the required data.

From the background of knowledge and experience which had been built up by its study of our own shores and beaches the staff of the Board developed a way to supply data on foreign shores and beaches that were not otherwise available, often not even in the foreign country itself.

In the early stages of the Board's intelligence activities little was known about the data required for beach landings.

The task faced by planners of amphibious operations was formidable, for, aside from the endless detail of organization, there were the physical problems of how to land men and equipment on the beaches and get them over the beach area to roads or other communication lines. The solution of these problems required intimate knowledge of the character of beaches and the land immediately back of the beaches. This was just the information collected by the board during its years of study of beaches and that pool of knowledge proved to be of great value in solving these physical problems. Oddly enough, one of the first problems was to establish a uniform definition of a beach.

The Board's first report on foreign areas published in early 1942 covered the channel beaches of France. As a matter of interest, two of the beaches then intimately described were later selected to be the now famous Omaha and Utah beaches of the Normandy invasion. There followed a demand for accurate, detailed information on foreign coast lines, many of which were then almost unknown. North Africa, Sicily, New Guinea, Celebes, Morotai, Formosa—these were strange names and stranger places when the beach-erosion board was asked months in advance of operations to advise strategic planners on landing possibilities and beach characteristics.

There are many who were convinced that a sort of legerdemain was employed by the board staff to produce reports of the accuracy and completeness achieved. Actually, of course, it was simply a case of technical know-how, combined with a background of knowledge of our own beaches. Research and study had established many basic relations governing the behavior of beaches and it was possible to apply these relations to a small number of facts known about a specific foreign beach and thus deduce a more complete picture.

Research and experimentation on beaches did not stop during the war. Some important developments resulted from tests in the board's wave tank. It will interest you to know, for example, that preliminary tests of the artificial harbor used in the Normandy operation were made in the board's laboratory and later at the Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg. The knowledge of waves and their effect on structures gained from previous study was of great value in this problem.

The determination of the depth of water on coral reefs and a lack of knowledge of the character of the surface of such reefs were constantly troublesome to amphibious operations in the Pacific area. Tests made at the Board resulted in the development of a method of predicting accurately the depth of water on coral reefs. Studies also were made of coral reef surfaces and a publication describing the results found wide use.

One of the latest studies made concerns the formation and position of offshore sand bars. The Board staff has developed a method of predicting the depth and position of these very important obstacles in the approach to a beach.

I have no intention of discussing the technical details of the intelligence work performed by the Board—you heard about that this morning. I do want to emphasize to you the value of the research and study which had been carried on at a limited scale as part of the Board's activity. It can be said, I think without fear af exaggeration, that the policy of the Corps of Engineers to encourage research paid large dividends in this, as in other cases.

The War Department recognizes the necessity and the value to the Nation of knowledge

of shore processes. It supported enactment of Public Law No. 166, approved last July, which grants authority to the Corps of Engineers to engage in general investigations of coastal problems. This I consider a major advance. It constitutes, to my mind, a recognition of the importance to the Nation of our beaches as a valuable natural resource.

With the approval of Public Law No. 166 we are now in a position to attack the study of shore and beach problems on the broad geographic front on which they exist rather than by isolated sorties on specific local areas. This is necessary to insure the best technical and economical solution to beach problems. Good beaches in Florida depend not only on what is happening on the Florida coast but also on what is happening on the whole south and middle Atlantic coast. The beach at Atlantic City reflects not only conditions there but conditions over the entire New Jersey coast as well.

Regardless of the considerable advances in knowledge of beaches made during the last two decades the scientific study of beach erosion and shore protection is still in its infancy. In foreign countries, as well as our own, shore-protection works of some sort have been built for many years—the history of such works on the Belgian, Netherlands, and English coasts goes back for centuries. Yet, too much shore protection still is based on analogy rather than engineering analysis. Sometimes these works are successful but at other times not only are the works of no value, they cause definite damage. We can supplant the analogy process by increasing our knowledge of the forces affecting the stability of our shores and of methods of modifying those forces by structures or in other ways to decrease their destructive effect.

It is, therefore, our purpose, under the authority granted by Public, 166, to explore in detail the field of scientific investigation of shore processes. The history of any shore line is one of continual mobility and change. A beach is a living thing, molded and remolded with every breaking wave. Stability is only relative and observance of the Biblical injunction against building houses on the sand is nowhere more imperative than on the shore front. Where shores are undeveloped or where development has been zoned well back of the shore, variations in the beach are of little importance.

The problem is acute where intense development has crowded the shore and even minor variations assume great importance. Then property holders become aware of the force of nature and a cry for immediate protection is raised.

Wastage of our shore lines and economic methods of preventing such wastage are not matters of concern and receive little attention until the ocean begins to lap at the doors of property owners. It is then too late to collect the fundamental knowledge and develop the experimental methods required to attack the problem in all its complexity and arrive at a sound, economical solution to the specific problem.

This situation is now changed. The authority granted by Public Law 166 and the recognition of the importance of the problem which its passage indicates justify the adoption of a national study, or research, plan for the investigation of coastal erosion problems. The program will be conservative and directed to the procurement of the information necessary to develop and perfect reliable, economical methods of shore and beach protection. Field research and study on the beaches will be an important part of the program. Laboratory experimentation is expected to be useful in the development of theoretical phases of the work as well as in the investigation of idealized situations as preliminary or pilot studies of problems in nature.

Problems of protection and rehabilitation associated with highly developed beach areas, where property values are appreciable, must logically receive first attention. However, it may be desirable to study undeveloped areas for the purpose of formulating the general relations governing the behavior of the shore. As a rule these general investigations will not result in a definition of conditions or a specific plan for the improvement of any particular local area. They will be made for the purpose of developing knowledge, techniques, and procedures which can then be applied to particular locations. The cooperative principle established by the act creating the Beach Erosion Board will be maintained for the study and development of a plan of improvement for specific localities, unless otherwise authorized by Congress. Our plan of operation is to obtain a sufficient background of knowledge and scientific principles to insure the possibility of arriving at a sound, economical method of improving a dangerous erosion condition within a reasonable time and without the necessity of conducting long, difficult studies when an immediate remedy is required.

Important as general investigations of shore-line phenomena are—they represent only one part of the problem. An equally important—and perhaps more difficult—task lies in the continued development of interest in the conservation of our beaches as a national asset. By far the major portion of our shore lines, and certainly, with few exceptions, the presently most desirable beach areas are held in private ownership. Entirely aside from questions of restricted public usage and development associated with private ownership there is the problem of conserving privately owned beaches. You are all familiar with the example of one owner protecting his beach to the detriment of his adjoining neighbors. The best intentions in the world cannot prevent this condition at present. Beaches occur as physical units, not as subdivided lots, and unless and until protection is provided on the physical unit base we shall continue to suffer. It is hoped that some of these evil effects of protection may be alleviated by increased knowledge of how to provide protection, but the final solution probably lies in another direction. I submit to you the thought that private owners should become conscious of the responsibility imposed on them to preserve a national asset. If this responsibility can be recognized the way will be paved for private owners to collaborate in the solution of their erosion problems and benefit themselves and the public by acting collectively rather than individually in providing protective works.

Your association pioneered in awakening public interest in beach problems. Several of the States have recently adopted legislation which gives a prominent place to public interest and provides means of taking positive action to protect and encourage that interest. California, for example, has an excellent program for the acquisition and development of public-beach lands. They have recognized the importance of conservation of their beach resources by providing for a State erosion-control engineer. New York has made similar provision for protection and developing of public-beach lands. Massachusetts and New Jersey have for years engaged in the construction of works to protect their beaches. Ohio has recently devoted much attention to its Lake Erie beaches.

Interest has been awakened but it must be kept alive and expanding if we are to achieve the maximum benefit possible. We can provide technical information gained through our general investigations and studies but there must also be a means for applying the information in the construction of necessary works.

These are a few of the things I have been thinking about that I wanted you to know. I hope I have been able to indicate not only a sympathetic attitude but also a great personal interest in the future progress of development in the conservation of our beach resources. You have my assurance that the Corps of Engineers will do its part by continuing experimental work and study on an expanded scale under the recently granted authority.

Discrimination Against Veterans in Civil Service Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I have included herewith a statement by the legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II, also a clipping from the Washington Daily News, Wednesday, January 20, 1946, and one from the Army Times, March 23, 1946.

These deal with the discrimination complaints between the enlisted men and officers seeking positions in the Government service. These statements should be read by every Member of Congress.

AMVETS PROTEST BUREAUCRATIC DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN ENLISTED MEN AND OFFICERS

(By J. H. Lieb, national legislative director)

Last January 30, Amvets, American Veterans of World War II, addressed a protest to Gen. Omar Bradley, regarding a number of complaints from GI's, which strongly indicated that the Veterans' Administration was permitting its personnel director to discriminate between former enlisted men and officers of the armed forces in job selections.

Then several days ago, on March 19, the Washington Post featured a front-page article charging that the Civil Service Commission apparently was willing to carry the Army caste system over into civilian life by inaugurating a new job questionnaire known as Form 57, which asks sundry questions about military rank. This bureaucratic devised job application has all the earmarks of Heinz' 57 varieties of sour pickles.

Another complaint that has come to the attention of this writer concerns the subtle technique used by Government personnel directors to ascertain whether or not a prospective job seeker was an enlisted man or officer. Here is the way this is done. In the first interview the applicant is asked if he is on terminal leave. The answer is usually sufficient to make a distinction in rank, for enlisted men do not get terminal pay while officers do. If the veteran happens to be a former GI the door to a relatively high-bracket job is slammed in his face without further inquiry into his qualifications or experiences.

It is apparent that the Government should set an example throughout the Nation and

set up ways and means of preventing job discrimination between veterans who may or may not have held rank while in the service of their country. Certainly, everyone must agree that jobs should be given out only on the basis of ability to perform the necessary duties. Everyone knows, or should know, that rank was given to many men who neither deserved the honor nor were they qualified or capable of carrying it with dignity and respect. Therefore, rank should not play a dominant role in job determination.

Regardless of the denials to the contrary it is common knowledge that job discrimination does exist in Government agencies and President Truman should see to it that this unfair practice is discontinued once and for all time. Two apropos newspaper clippings follow:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 30, 1946]

" 'FOR OFFICERS ONLY' SIGN HUNG ON BEST VA JOBS, IS CHARGE

"The American Veterans of World War II today have sent Gen. Omar Bradley, Director of Veterans' Administration, an open letter protesting alleged discrimination against enlisted men in VA pay brackets.

"Charging it has become a practice to channel enlisted personnel into brackets under $3,600, while setting officers up in lusher jobs, Amvets demanded explanation and remedy.

" 'Amvets national headquarters were duly impressed,' said the letter, 'with your recent action in removing the use of military titles by men in the service of Veterans' Administration. It was a move in the right direction.

" 'It has now been brought to our attention that further effort on your part might eliminate a condition equally detrimental. It has been stated that discharged enlisted personnel have no opportunity for jobs in brackets above $3,600 per year. Only previous officer personnel has been held to be eligible for such positions. We take issue with this unfair practice feeling that the basis of employment should be the ability of the applicant and not his previous rank.

" 'We would appreciate any advice you may have as to the existence of this condition and remedies planned.' "

[From Army Times of March 23, 1946]

"EX-GI'S OUTRANKED ON NEW GOVERNMENT JOB FORMS

"WASHINGTON.—This week veteran and labor groups protested to President Truman, Congressmen, and the Civil Service Commission over discrimination against former enlisted men who are now required to state military rank when applying for civil-service jobs.

"Charging that the Army caste system is being carried over into civil life, the various groups claimed that the new form 57, which must be filled out by all those who want Government jobs, is unfair to ex-GI's who will automatically be judged inferior to officer applicants, regardless of their individual qualifications.

"DEMANDS MADE

"The Civil Service Commission has been bombarded with demands that the question of rank on the new form 57 be struck out. Five and a half million copies of these forms have been ordered for use in securing personnel for over a million jobs in the coming year.

"The Commission has issued a statement saying that form 57 'provides every possible opportunity' for veterans to give 'a complete account of the service rendered.

" 'Where experience is a factor in assigning ratings, the Commission gives full credit for all experience acquired by a person serving in the armed forces whether as an enlisted man or as an officer.'

"WIDESPREAD PROTESTS

"Protests against the new forms have come in from many quarters."

One Hundred Film and Radio Performers Cited for Patriotic War Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a list of the names of stage, screen, and radio artists who gave their talents to boost the morale of the armed forces during the war years, and who will receive citations from the War and Navy Departments for their work.

Under the auspices of the Hollywood Victory Committee these artists traveled to all parts of the world to bring cheer and a "little bit of the good old U. S. A." to our boys wherever they were, often in the front line where the enemy could almost hear the show.

I am confident the Members of the House are proud of the services rendered to our soldiers by these troupers and are happy to know they are receiving due recognition for their help in winning the war.

Mass citation to more than 100 film and radio performers who contributed their services during the war years to armed forces radio service for entertainment of GI's overseas has been directed by the War and Navy Departments. Special plaque was awarded to Hollywood Victory Committee, representing the thanks of millions of servicemen. Also paid tribute were networks, recording companies, and talent organizations for their part in the gigantic undertaking of keeping the troops entertained throughout the world. Personalities named in the citation were:

Fred Allen, Elvia Allman, Andrews sisters, Robert Armbruster, Eddie "Rochester" Anderson, Lucille Ball, Edward Barrett, Lionel Barrymore, Jack Benny, Janet Blair, Mel Blanc, Bea Benaderet, M. A. "Ishkabibble" Bogue, Arthur Q. Bryan, Count Basie, Victor Borge, Edgar Bergen, Charles Boyer, Bill Boyd, George Burns and Gracie Allen, Bing Crosby, Bob Crosby, Charles Cantor, Eddie Cantor, Lou Crosby, Jack Carson, Ken Carpenter, Jerry Colonna, Cass Daley, Laraine Day, Bette Davis, Elmer Davis, Jimmy Durante, Andy Devine, Linda Darnell, Joan Davis, Dennis Day, Gloria De Haven, Anita Ellis, Dale Evans, Nelson Eddy, Skinnay Ennis, Helen Forrest, Pat Friday, Ken Fry, Jinx Falkenburg, Judy Garland, Ed Gardner, Paulette Goddard, Kathryn Grayson, Georgia Gibbs, Frank Graham, Betty Grable, Eddie Green, Bonita Granville, June Haver, Harry "The Hipster" Gibson, Jack Haley, Connie Haines, Bob Hope, Lena Horne, Celeste Holm, Walter Huston, Sterling Holloway, George "Gabby" Hayes, Rita Hayworth, Lionel Hampton, Dick Haymes, Marsha Hunt, Jose Iturbi, Gordon Jenkins, Harry James, Spike Jones, Kay Kyser, Danny Kaye, King Sisters, King Cole Trio, Stan Kenton, Peter Lorre, Les Paul Trio, Frances Langford, Lum and Abner, Martha Mears, Lincoln Miller, George Murphy, John Mercer, Fred MacMurray, Herbert Marshall, Garry Moore, Nora Lou Martin, Ella Mae Morse, Butterfly McQueen, Harry Mitchell, Mitchell Boy Choir, Marilyn Maxwell, Lauritz Melchior, Frank Morgan, Bob Nolan and Sons of the Pioneers, Virginia O'Brien, John Ogilvie, Pied Pipers, Edward G. Robinson, Roy Rogers, Andy Russell, Shirley Ross, Lina Romay, Ginny Simms, Frank Sinatra, John Sheehan, Dinah Shore, Jeri Sullivan, Jo Stafford, Verne Smith, Red Skelton, Ransome Sherman, John Scott Trotter, Mel Torme and the Meltones, Arthur Treacher, Martha Tilton, Harry Von Zell, James O. Weldon, Don Wilson, Ernie Whitman, Margaret Whiting, Glenn Wheaton, Duke Wales, Orson Welles, Robert Young, Loretta Young.

Institutions receiving citation follow:

Hollywood Victory Committee, Screen Actors Guild, ASCAP, Local 47 of American Federation of Musicians, American Federation of Radio Artists, American Federation of Musicians, National Association of Broadcasters, Columbia Records, Capitol Records, Decca Records, Victor Records, Radio Recorders, Universal Recording Co., C. P. MacGregor Recording Studios, Allied Record Manufacturing Co., Columbia Recording Corp., RCA Manufacturing Co. (Victor Division), The Langevin Co., Radio Products Sales Co., T-W-T Transmitter Co., Mutual Broadcasting System, National Broadcasting Co., Columbia Broadcasting System, American Broadcasting Co.

Belated Reckoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, while in Honolulu last year with a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, I learned of numerous instances of injustice during the long unnecessary period of military government in Hawaii.

The following editorial of H. B. Snyder of the Gary Post-Tribune sets out some condensed practical things on military government:

BELATED RECKONING

The importance to the average citizen, and to the future of the United States as a democracy, of the Supreme Court's recent ruling denying to military authorities the right, even in wartime, to usurp the functions of civil courts cannot be overestimated.

It reaffirms the unique preeminence in this Nation of what jurists somewhat ambiguously refer to as the rule of law. It holds aloft for all the world to see the fact that America, even in times of greatest peril, remains a government of just and established laws, rather than one of men or of military edicts. It proclaims in unmistakable language the democratic insistence upon civilian superiority over the military. And it serves stern warning upon all uniformed commanders and members of courts martial, present and future, that their acts and decisions, whatever the provocation or the exigency, are in no wise privileged or irrevocable.

The facts that the situation involved occurred in the Territory of Hawaii, rather than in the continental United States, and at a time when that territory was under martial law, but measurably heighten the dramatic effect of the pronouncement.

Unfortunately, the decision was belated—as, under the circumstances, it could not but have been. This redemption cannot restore to the two civilians affected the many long months they suffered in illegal imprisonment. But the reckoning is nonetheless sure for its tardiness.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the need is greater than ever before for enactment of legislation that would assist our old folks. This group has been neglected too long and they should be cared for by passing legislation which would grant them a liberal pension.

Let us give our old folks—all of them—a liberal pension without any strings attached, at little more cost to the taxpayers. Let us do away with the hundreds of thousands of dollars we are spending for useless help on administration and give that money to our old folks instead. Our elders want security and peace. They do not want to be upset every 6 months by a Federal investigation to see whether or not they have gotten rich from their meager allowance during the last 6 months. We must assure our elders a just pension instead of the grossly unfair and unjust assistance they are now receiving.

This country has the natural wealth, the resources, the raw materials, the manpower, the mills, factories, and industrial machinery to give every American family all it needs in the way of food, clothing, education, luxuries, and pleasures. There is enough food to feed every hungry person; there is wool and cotton to clothe every man, woman, and child in the country; there are materials in mines and forests, mills, factories, and warehouses to house every family in America in a modern home; there are raw products and modern machines sufficient to equip these homes with both necessities and luxuries; there are enough railroad engines and freight cars to transport these needs of men to every nook and corner of the country. Are we going to use these to advantage or are we going ahead with the present confused state of affairs?

The United States for years has been conserving forests, lands, wild game, and oil. We guard the flying geese and ducks and we protect the mineral wealth under the ground. I believe it is time to conserve human beings, to make life comfortable for our old folks.

I do not need to remind you of the thousands of underprivileged, ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed people in our country. I am certain that all of you have seen cases similar to this. An old woman, who must depend upon her meager welfare assistance as her only source of income, enters a grocery store and wantonly views the choice high-grade meats, fruits, and so forth, but cannot purchase same because her small allowance will not permit her to do so. Instead, she leaves the store with a loaf of bread and possibly a bottle of milk which probably will serve as the main course of one of her meals.

I am certain that many of you are familiar with many cases similar to this. An old man 80 years old with no living relatives resides in a cheap humble apartment house and pays $2.50 per week rent. He is too old and feeble to do his own cooking, notwithstanding the fact that he does not have the facilities to cook. His small pension will not permit him to buy three meals a day so instead he eats a late breakfast consisting of toast and coffee and his second and last meal for the day is consumed in the late afternoon and usually consists of a vegetable dinner, for he cannot afford meat with his meal.

Conditions such as those just described are a disgrace to our country and they should not be tolerated. It is time that something was done for our old folks.

I noticed in the press not long ago that a coal company was going to retire Old Jack, a mule who spent 19 of his 23 years pulling cars in a coal mine. Old Jack will spend the rest of his days in comfort at company expense. However, I am just wondering what will happen to the old men who are working in the same coal mine when they get too old to work?

When the wage earner has toiled for 40 years or more, he or she should be retired with a pension that will enable them to live in comfort the rest of their days. Our elders should not be relegated to the junk heap the same way we do a worn-out machine.

We now have 15,000,000 people over the age of 60 and 9,000,000 over the age of 65. The labor force over 60 years of age is 5,200,000 and the number on old-age assistance is 2,000,000. Others on retirement pay total 469,000. Only 614,734 over the age of 65 are employed.

We have loaned billions to foreign nations and they never repaid these loans. The New Deal is planning to loan many more billions to foreign countries. It is time to call a halt to these foreign handouts and begin looking after our own people first.

The proponents of these foreign loans contend that the money will come back to America in wider markets, if the plan works. However, if some of this money were distributed to our elders of America, in pensions, both the money and goods would remain in the United States. Our elders must be able to have buying power to purchase the products which farmers and factory workers are capable of producing.

Just think of it, the money they wish to loan Britain would build 500,000 homes at $5,000 each, furnish each home with $1,500 worth of furniture and electrical equipment, and place a $1,500 car in each front yard.

I have submitted this statement to the Ways and Means Committee to be used in connection with hearings on pension legislation and I sincerely and earnestly hope that the members of the Ways and Means Committee will consider this important matter now and report an adequate pension bill to the House floor for vote.

Petitions From Citizens of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make it a matter of record that I have received petitions signed by approximately 12,000 citizens of Chicago asking that Congress adopt the following three measures:

First. The immediate renewal of the rent and price control law until June 1947.

Second. The establishment of ceiling prices on new and old housing.

Third. The continuation of the food subsidies necessary to hold down the cost of living.

These petitions were circulated by the Chicago Federation of Consumers, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago. They are, I believe, a significant expression of public opinion.

Black Marketing in Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the black market is flourishing throughout the country and the Midwest is feeling the brunt of it.

Beef killings in Iowa packing plants during the past few weeks have been cut from 25 percent to 50 percent. During the week ending March 9 alone, out of 25,000 cattle marketed in Sioux City, about 14,000 were shipped on the hoof to out-of-State processors. These outside buyers are offering more for Iowa cattle than a legitimate packer can offer and still remain in business under OPA ceilings. A little money on the side seems to do the trick.

Egg ceilings of $9.20 per case of 30 dozen are disregarded by payments to farmers and country stores of from $1.25 to $1.50 per case over ceiling prices. A premium of from 5 to 10 cents is being paid on butter, which is now selling at 75 cents a pound on the east coast. Lumber on the west coast is selling at from $250 to $300 per car over ceiling prices, which amounts to about $10 per thousand. The lumber dealer in the Midwest gets none. Yellow pine in the South is selling from $10 to $20 per thousand

board feet over ceilings, and the Midwest gets none.

I, for one, would like to know what the OPA is going to do about it.

To show the situation as it relates to black marketing in cattle in our Midwest territory, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial taken from the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal of March 21, 1946, as follows:

REDUCED CATTLE KILLS

Packers in Sioux City, Kansas City, and other livestock centers are reducing their cattle kills and are laying off workers. This means there is to be a beef shortage, and it means further that unemployment for thousands of workers will become a community problem. In addition, it means loss of business not only for the packers but for various other enterprises.

In Sioux City a slowing down of packinghouse activity and stockyards business creates a situation threatening to the entire community. This, for the reason that the packing industry is the largest one in this city, and, therefore, anything that interferes with it or disturbs it is felt by the entire population. The business of packing meats cannot decline, even temporarily, without everybody in the city suffering in consequence in one way or another.

The cattle kills are being reduced of necessity. The beef cattle simply are not available to the packers. They are not coming into the stockyards to be bought and slaughtered and processed. That is to say, they are not available in sufficient numbers to keep the plants operating at anything like capacity. Hence, the necessity of laying off large numbers of workers.

The Sioux City packers and those in other cities of the Middle West have reduced their cattle kills for the reason that the Office of Price Administration has put a ceiling price on the food animals. The packers can pay just so much and no more if they conform to the regulations And they must conform to the regulations or get into trouble with the Federal Government.

Livestock producers are selling to independent packers, to black-market operators, and the beef is going to other sections of the country at higher prices which consumers are willing and eager to pay. Independent packers who dare to operate in the black market are raiding the areas where cattle are conditioned for sale, are paying above the ceiling prices or giving bonuses to make their deals more attractive. Possibly, a good many of these operators who are throwing the packing business into confusion with their raiding operations feel that they are within the law since nothing appears on their books to indicate violation of OPA regulations. However, the hope is that a quiet but thorough Federal investigation under way will reveal just what has been done to disturb the market and that those who have violated regulations will be proceeded against and punished if convicted.

This is a real crisis for the packers and for the consumers of processed meats, especially in the Middle West where cattle are produced and conditioned for the livestock market. It is a crisis for the thousands of packinghouse workers who find themselves out of employment and who must apply for relief in unemployment compensation, thus putting a heavier burden on taxpayers. The crisis also touches the tax lists of communities where packinghouses are operating. Reduced revenue must be considered as going along with increased outlay for relief. By all mean the Federal and State authorities must go through with a complete investigation of what is at the bottom of this development and put an end to it. Only orderly marketing is tolerable to the people as a whole, and if it be proper to maintain OPA regulations for the legitimate packing houses they ought to have all the protection the Government can afford them. This black market is one thing that must be hit as hard as possible. Such operations are detestable Every honest citizen hates a chiseler.

Requirements for Admission to the United State Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill which I am introducing today:

A bill to prescribe additional requirements for admission as a cadet to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be initially admitted as a cadet to the United States Military Academy on and after July 1, 1947, unless prior to such admission he shall have honorably completed at least 9 months of active Federal service as an enlisted man in the Army of the United States, or in any component thereof.

SEC. 2. On and after the date of approval of this act, all persons who are selected as candidates for admission as cadets to the United States Military Academy shall be required to meet all physical and mental requirements for such admission not later than 9 months preceding the time of their admission. Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude such physical examination immediately preceding the admission of such candidates to the academy as cadets as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

3. On and after the date of approval of this act, any enlisted man of the Army of the United States, or of any component thereof, who is selected as a candidate for admission as a cadet to the United States Military Academy or who receives a permit as a candidate for admission as a midshipman to the United States Naval Academy may, after having completed at least 9 months of honorable active Federal service in the Army of the United States, or in any component thereof, upon his request and in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be discharged from the military service.

Air Service to Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 19, 1946:

MILWAUKEE—CITY RIGHT IN ITS PLEA TO BREAK BOTTLENECK AT CHICAGO

When the city of Milwaukee, acting through the association of commerce, recently filed a petition with the civil aeronautics board demanding that the board refuse to permit the creation of an aviation bottleneck at Chicago, it served the best interests not only of this community but of many others.

Milwaukee wants the board to overthrow the findings of its examiner, F. Merritt Ruhlen, who denied the petition of five out of six major air lines to inaugurate direct, one carrier service into and out of Wisconsin's metropolis.

Examiner Ruhlen contended, in large part, that Milwaukee has good train connections with Chicago and therefore its people can go by rail to that center to start their airplane transits.

This would be to repeat in the air what has happened on the ground. Everything from covered wagons to railroads had to find their way around geographical obstacles, so they ultimately arrived at a few so-called transportation centers. Passengers and freight were fed into those centers. Transfers were made there. The centers prospered but hundreds of bypassed communities were stifled thereby.

Airplanes can pass over almost every geographical obstacle. They not only should be permitted to do so, but should be compelled to do so wherever practical.

The Milwaukee petition to the CAB correctly contends that to permit the creation of an aviation bottleneck at Chicago would "invalidate the usefulness of air service," continue Milwaukee's historical transportation isolation, and repeat in aviation all the inconveniences created and time lost by circuitous routing via Chicago.

Milwaukee and the rest of Wisconsin should have no more air service than they can support, but they should have opportunity to demonstrate their capacity. They can do this only as their people no longer are funneled into Chicago but instead have full service of their own.

Hawaii's Admission as Forty-ninth State Endorsed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the admission of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State of the Union is recommended and approved by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce's board of directors.

I submit herewith a letter from Mr. John Costello, general counsel, and a former Member of the House, informing me of this action:

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1946.

Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GORDON: On March 7, 1946, the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce unanimously approved the passage of legislation by Congress to enable Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and thereupon to be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States.

I am enclosing herein the recommendation and information considered by the board of directors at their meeting. In view of the fact that you are a member of the Committee on Territories, you might be interested in having the recommendation of the board of

directors of the chamber introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that their recommendations would be made known to the House.

Assuring you of my every best personal wish, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN M. COSTELLO.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII, RECOMMENDATION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MARCH 7, 1946

The board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, at its meeting on March 7, 1946, unanimously adopted the following report of the chamber's Federal affairs committee recommending statehood for Hawaii:

BACKGROUND STATEMENT

In 1898 the inedependent nation of Hawaii was annexed as a Territory. It appears that Territorial status, rather than full statehood, was accepted by the people of the islands to avoid long delays in annexation. Assurances were given, however, that statehood would be granted. Since that time there have been numerous requests that Hawaii be made a State.

A congressional committee conducted hearings in Hawaii in 1935 upon the question of statehood but concluded that further study should be made before taking this step. A second committee which held hearings in October 1937 reached a similar conclusion.

As the end of the war was approaching, the Territorial house and senate overwhelmingly passed resolutions asking Congress to take immediate action in admitting Hawaii to statehood. In January of this year a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Territories visited the islands, examined approximately 100 local citizens, and obtained a considerable volume of information upon the social, political, and economic conditions of the islands. The subcommittee unanimously recommended immediate consideration of legislation admitting Hawaii to statehood.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce approve the passage of legislation by Congress to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

COMMENT

The attitude of the people of Hawaii toward statehood was indicated by a plebiscite in November 1940 which showed 67 percent for statehood and 33 percent against. A Gallup poll in the United States the following year indicated about the same attitude percentage-wise on the part of the people on the mainland. President Truman and former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes have recommended that Congress provide for Hawaiian statehood. The move has the overwhelming approval of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, the Hawaiian bar, and many other business and civic groups throughout the islands. It has also been approved by the Seattle, San Francisco, and California State Chambers of Commerce. The committee has been informed of no organized opposition to statehood.

Recommendation of House subcommittee: The six-man subcommittee of the House Committee on the Territories which held hearings in Hawaii last January was composed of an equal number of Democrats and Republicans, representing the States of California, Louisiana, New York, Oregon, and the Territory of Hawaii. The committee's recommendations, which were unanimous, are as follows:

1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood; and since

2. The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination, that peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

3. Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

4. The Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

5. The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood:

It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Legislation pending: Section 3, article IV of the Constitution of the United States provides that new States may be admitted by the Congress into the Union. H. R. 3643, introduced by Representative FARRINGTON and S. 1830 by Senator KNOWLAND set forth the manner in which Hawaii would be admitted as a State. Adoption of the above recommendation would be considered as approval of H. R. 3643 and S. 1830.

Contrary arguments: The House subcommittee in the course of its hearings heard some arguments against statehood upon such grounds as fear of the Japanese situation, domination by the so-called Big Five, and a belief that there is not a sufficient understanding of democracy and that statehood, therefore, should be deferred. A careful perusal of newspaper reports covering the hearings and the committee report itself fails to disclose, however, significant volume of opposition to statehood within the islands. These objections, in the judgment of the Federal Affairs Committee, seem to be met adequately in certain of the findings and the conclusions of the House subcommittee which are attached hereto as an appendix.

The Federal Affairs Committee investigated a report, which apparently was without foundation, of opposition on the part of certain organizations in California to statehood upon the grounds that it would lead to increased immigration of Hawaiian-Japanese to California and also that Hawaii, if made a new State, might be dominated by Japanese elements unfriendly to the United States. These objections seem to be disposed of in a telegram from Representative FARRINGTON to Mr. Elvon Musick which appears in the Appendix.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Paul Mallon which appeared in the Jamestown Post-Journal, Jamestown, N. Y., under date of March 15, 1946:

PAUL MALLON SAYS WORLD PLANNERS HAVE ENCOUNTERED FACTS OF LIFE IN FOOD

WASHINGTON.—The official whisper sent to the Senate behind the Hoover appointment to world famine relief played down the job as a mere survey. Inquiring newsmen were told the Republican ex-President and skilled world food handler was only to find out how much food was needed and how much was available—the job of a statistician or economist.

Immediately, however, the reigning world food reliefer, Herbert Lehman, of UNRRA, was announced to be ill, whether from the news of the Hoover appointment or not. He offered his resignation to the World Council of UNRRA opening Friday at Atlantic City.

These dovetailing circumstances lent credence to a natural interpretation that a complete overhaul of our relief efforts is at hand. Mr. Truman had earlier blackened the wheat content of bread, and his action took such swift effect that my baker this week began complaining that his flour had become grossly inferior and that Mr. Truman did not know the severe effects of such an order. The quality of the loaf he gave me of this basic poor man's food certainly furnished evidence of a colossal mistake, or many of them, somewhere.

I thought Messrs. Truman and Hoover, in later announcements, displayed a somewhat different approach to the matter. Mr. Truman asked the people to cut the use of wheat by 40 percent and fats by 20 percent, and Mr. Hoover spoke of setting up "a circuit of helpfulness around the world." Both generally indicated by their words that they would appeal for voluntary cooperation by the people in a truly democratic way. This was in clear contrast to totalitarian methods of requiring conformance by economic tricks and the force-methods so familiar during the war, both of which we borrowed to a considerable degree from the Nazi and Fascist ways. Officially it was said, for instance, we need not have rationing.

Personally, I will say, I will be able to avoid bread entirely, if the flour is to be corrupted to the extent of the last loaf I got. But as I say, bread is the poor man's basic food, the staff of life, and what I would like to see is the maintenance of its full quality for our people, and the feeding of famine victims to whatever extent is necessary.

I do not believe our food should have been—or should be for political purposes, for buying support abroad, unless we have surpluses. Our contribution should be limited to what is required to relieve actual human suffering. Now as to statistics on this subject, I have found from experience that a politically minded person can get nearly any kind he wants, and a careful, sincere man must guard himself to the utmost against being misled into false assumptions by social-reforming statisticians. And, frankly, I do not entirely trust all the statisticians Mr. Truman inherited.

A reasonable and a democratic solution, with public support, seems possible to achieve, and a man of Mr. Hoover's experience should have a chance to work it out with the new Truman famine emergency committee.

Certainly nearly anything could be expected to be an improvement on the Lehman administration of UNRRA. Those Senators and Representatives who have gone abroad the past year or more have returned with astonishing tales of its inefficiency. Mr. Truman tried to help some by giving the Army much of the job, and Congress was ready to cut off UNRRA appropriation. However, the UNRRA planners marshaled their forces and recently got their appropriations in substance, after a fight. But the completeness of UNRRA's failure is fully exposed by the very fact that Mr. Hoover had to be sought out by the President and a new committee created to undertake relief. This is the distance we have progressed toward reality from the initial program of the relief and rehabilitation theories embodied in UNRRA! At the beginning it painted visions of its ability to make the world fat and strong by curing its deficient diets with our surplus

foods. Now we are down to relieving famine—if we can—and taking black bread ourselves.

The world planners have encountered the facts of life in food as they did in foreign policy.

Why Are California Congressmen Unable To Obtain an Interview With President Concerning the Crisis in the California Cannery Industry, Which Might Jeopardize One-third of the Nation's Canned Goods?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for some reason or other a group of California Congressmen, headed by Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, the dean of the California delegation, have been unable to obtain an interview with the President to discuss the critical situation that now exists in California with reference to the canning of fruits and vegetables.

I cannot believe that if the President knew the real situation which is now seriously imperiling the canning of the 1946 crop of California's fruits and vegetables—amounting last year to one and a half billions of cans—that he would deny us an interview. In fact, considering his usual good common sense, if he were appraised of the real situation, I think he would probably call us to the White House to discuss the problem and get our suggestions as to how he could help.

Frankly, I am wondering if he has been correctly advised of the situation as it actually exists in California today. I am hoping that some White House assistant may read this and advise the President how anxious we are to get his help in solving a most critical food problem and how disappointed we are in not being able to discuss the matter with him personally.

In order that those reading this statement may have an understanding of the situation that confronts growers and processors of California fruits and vegetables I shall give a brief résumé of the facts that brought about the situation that may prevent the processing of much of these crops.

In 1946 there were processed about 55,000,000 cases—1,500,000,000 cans—of fruits and vegetables in California. This was about one-third of the Nation's canned fruits and vegetables. Practically every fruit and vegetable raised in the United States is canned in California. The canneries are located in all parts of the State but the bulk of them are located in the area around San Francisco Bay and in the great Central Valley of California. The canneries in this particular area are the ones that now find themselves unable to can the fruits and vegetables that are now ready for processing and which will continue to flow into the canneries steadily from now until the late fall.

The persons concerned are the growers—farmers—who raise the various crops, the processors who operate the canneries, and the laborers who work in the canneries and the public that need the food. The number of laborers varies at different seasons but in the interior of California about 60,000 workers is the maximum that are employed to process these crops. In 1937 or shortly thereafter most of the cannery workers in that area were unionized. I had the pleasure of helping a group in Stockton obtain a union charter. Some of the workers are migratory but most of them are permanent residents and frequently the whole family will work during part of a season to help increase the family income.

For about 10 years the California processors and growers entered into annual agreements providing for the wage scale, working conditions, and so forth. Some of these contracts were with individual canneries and one, at least, was with a large group known as the California processors and growers.

After appropriate steps taken therefor, an election was held in October 1946, in a group of canneries for the purpose of determining who should represent the workers in those canneries, namely, the A. F. of L. or the CIO. At this election a plurality of those voting selected the CIO as their bargaining agent. A number of votes were challenged and not counted.

The A. F. of L. challenged the legality of the election and a hearing on this contest was held before the regional director of the NLRB in San Francisco. After prolonged hearings he decided that the election was legal and that the workers had selected the CIO as their bargaining agent. Thereupon, the A. F. of L. appealed from this decision and the matter was submitted to the NLRB in Washington. The National Board on February 18, 1946, set aside the decision of the regional director and decided that another election should be held at a date to be fixed later by the NLRB.

The American Federation of Labor, by contract, was the bargaining agent for these workers up to March 1, 1946, when the contract terminated. The National Board held that after this date neither the A. F. of L. nor the CIO could be the exclusive bargaining agent in any plant but that each might represent its own members in the plant. The processors consequently could not make a contract with either union as they would not know just what persons the particular union represented, there being conflicting claims as to this. Furthermore, it was publicly announced by one union that no produce would be hauled by its members into any plant where workers belonging to the other union were working. Much of the produce is moved by trucking contractors and consequently this could not be put into the plants.

In brief, because of a fight between two labor groups the growers and the processors are unable to process the fruits and vegetables of California.

Early in January our office began to work on this problem. Other California Congressmen also were working on the problem because we could then see clearly that unless this controversy were adjusted in some way or a truce between the two labor groups entered into that there would be chaos in the canning industry and the fruits and vegetables would not be canned. We also then contemplated, that as a last resort, the Government might have to take over the industry to save this food. That happened in the meat-packing plants and it is a parallel situation. That situation has now arrived.

On February 19, 1946, seven members of the California delegation, including myself, interviewed Secretary of Agriculture Anderson and laid the situation before him. Our discussion at that meeting, in addition to presenting him with the general situation, was to the point that he should commence to gather the facts currently and if an application to take over the plants was made that he would then be prepared to make a quick decision as to whether to recommend the seizure to the President. We naturally assumed that such an important and urgent matter would be discussed with the President by the Secretary.

The day previous to this meeting the California House Members whose areas were affected held a meeting with all interested Government agencies, Conciliation Service, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Labor representatives, and discussed the matter fully.

I am informed the President stated at a press conference that he had no knowledge of the situation and also that he believed it to be a State matter.

As I see it, the Federal Government from the beginning assumed jurisdiction by holding an election to determine who the bargaining agent for the workers should be; by giving hearings concerning the validity of the election by the NLRB; finally voiding the election and stating in its decision of February 18, 1946 that each of the labor groups should represent its own members; 90 percent of the canned goods involved are shipped in interstate commerce.

I am placing in the RECORD copies of letters to Mr. LEA from the White House indicating that communications from Mr. LEA, for the California group in the House who are urging Presidential action, were received.

As I see it, the only alternative now, unless there is to be complete chaos in the canning industry in California is for the Government to seize the plants as was done in the meat-packing industry. This is the only way that this large volume of food can be salvaged. It is the only procedure left that will insure that the canneries will operate. The amount of food involved in dollar value is about $250,000,000.

It is my conviction that a short interview with the President would convince him that he could and should act.

We have heard from many quarters, including the White House, that the conservation of food is imperative to our

country and the world. This is absolutely true. By Government inervention we can prevent tremendous losses in fruits and vegetables in California.

Such a step will help the public, the growers whose crops are involved, the processors who want to can the food, and the workers who want to work but because of a labor dispute are unable to do so.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 13, 1946.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARENCE: I appreciated very much your letter of the eleventh, enclosing me a statement of Members of the California delegation in Congress on jurisdictional strikes.

I am more than happy to have the statement and your letter.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 1, 1946.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEA: Replying to yours of January 30th, regarding the jurisdictional troubles in the fruit and vegetable section of California, jurisdictional strikes, of course, are, in my opinion, unjustified at any time, and, I think, I made a statement of that sort in a message to the Congress.

It seems to have been almost impossible to get any action on measures to meet the present situation. I am wondering if the State of California itself has ever made any effort to meet the situation.

This is strictly a local matter, so far as California is concerned, and, I believe, it is about time the States are assuming some of their responsibilities. Naturally I want to help all I can.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Russian Bear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to do so heretofore granted, I wish to include in my remarks a part of an editorial from the Washington Post of March 14:

RUSSIAN BEAR

The headlines of the state of things on the southern frontiers of Russia, with their suggestion that the Russian bear is again on the march, provide uneasy news. Russian concentrations in Hungary, Russian infiltration into Iran, Russia's threat to Turkey—these bode no harmony in international relations. The tragedy, as we have insisted since we saw Russia in action at San Francisco, is that the Russians, for reasons grounded in experience and in fear, insist upon collecting their own security. No collective security for Russia. East and west she feels tolerably safe; it is in the south that she is uncertain, and there will be nothing but crises of confidence in this region, not to say in the councils of the great powers, till Russia has rounded out her frontiers in a way that will make her feel invulnerable.

The fact is, of course, that even if Russia were to get her wish, she would not have achieved security. New frontiers would in turn have to be protected, meaning that there would have to be an extension of the belt of security and such a process would be endless. Moreover, the exercise of strategic sovereignty by Moscow would breed insecurity by fomenting measures of defense in other countries, and this in turn would provoke new fears to add to old fears in the Russian mind. In this spiral the last state is bound to be worse than the first. The fundamental problem thus boils down to the state of mind prevailing in Russia. Whether it can be cured, whether Russia can ever be won over to collective security—these are questions the answer to which belong to the future. But a dual obligation rests upon the other powers to save Russia from stumbling at some point into an inevitable collision. Fundamental in this obligation is that our posture at home as well as our record in diplomacy must show to Russia that we do not intend to countenance the violation of international engagements. But the other obligation is the duty which falls upon us to give Russia such assurances as may assuage her present fears.

Iran and UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to do so, I include in my remarks an editorial from a recent Washington Star:

IRAN AND UNO

The formal filing of an appeal to the Security Council of UNO by the Iranian Government of its dispute with Soviet Russia is, in itself, a desirable and gratifying move. Reports of intense Russian pressure upon Premier Ahmad Ghavam, culminating in an alleged threat that an appeal to UNO would be considered by Moscow as an unfriendly act, the diplomatic equivalent of an ultimatum followed by war, had cast doubt on Iran's venturing to exercise its Charter right to take the dispute before the Council. In that case, our Government had announced its intention to bring the complaint in Iran's stead. However, the direct approach is preferable as the better way of handling a crucial situation.

For crucial it certainly is in every respect. The Iranian protest, though primarily stressing the "new developments" which have arisen by reason of Russia's failure to honor its commitments under the treaty of June 1942, requiring evacuation of Iranian territory by March 2, 1946, likewise includes the original dispute over Azerbaijan which was remanded by the Council last January for Russo-Iranian negotiation, but which has never been settled. The Iranian note asserts that "these acts are in violation of the aforesaid treaty, and also in violation of the Declaration of Teheran and the Charter of the United Nations." In all probability, another complication will form part of the Council proceedings. This is the setting up of a Russian-sponsored "autonomous Kurdish republic" in northern Iran, whose newly-raised forces are already reportedly clashing with Iranian Government troops. This is, of course, another infringement of Iran's sovereignty and integrity.

There would seem to be nothing that Moscow can do to prevent the Russo-Iranian dispute from coming up before the Council, despite the Soviet request that the Council meeting be postponed from next Monday until April 10. Even though it is possible that this request may be granted and that Russia might in the meantime engineer an overthrow of the existing Teheran Government and set up a puppet regime, it is unlikely that such an obvious Russian creation would be recognized by the Council. As our own Government has made clear, moreover, the United States will press the case should anything of this sort happen.

It is thus as certain as can well be imagined that, in some form or other, the Russo-Iranian dispute will be laid before the Council and acted upon early in its agenda. Then will come the supreme test, not only of UNO but also of the shape of the postwar world.

LET'S NEVER CROSS IT

Walter Lippmann writes that "we are at the dividing line where it is easier to fail than it will be to succeed; where the chances of war are in sober truth greater than the chances of peace."

That is a broad statement which no intelligent and responsible man, certainly not the painstaking Mr. Lippmann, would make under the illusion that he is capable of estimating precisely what are the chances of conflict and the chances of peace. But Mr. Lippmann evidently is so deeply concerned as to the seriousness of the present international situation that he feels justified in expressing a definite opinion as to these chances.

There is certainly no specific issue between Russia and Britain—or China—or the United States—which warrants war now. The United States is not going to war over Iran. Britain is not going to challenge Russia without us. Nor does Turkey or China or any other area present a clash of interests sufficiently important to warrant war. Just what then is the great danger?

Of course, it may not be nearly so great as Mr. Lippmann warns. He feels that the potentialities of present relations are precarious enough to call for a solemn warning. They are. And he makes his very strong. But a better understanding might suddenly be reached as to Iran or Manchuria which would greatly clarify the outlook—and the talk of war might quickly vanish. On the other hand, the undeniable and somewhat subtle danger is that the feeling may grow that present differences cannot be settled by peaceful means, that the UNO cannot be made to work and that it will be increasingly accepted that war offers the only final solution.

In view of the immeasurable catastrophe that another world war would mean for all nations, it would seem that a powerful deterrent against such conflict would continue to prevail—and probably be effective—in all the governments and among all the peoples of the world. Mr. Lippmann himself writes: "This tortured world must be spared another war, a war which, if it once begins, no man will know how it is to be ended. Russia cannot conquer the United States, nor can the United States conquer Russia. But they can become enmeshed in a war which cannot be decided; which will go on and on as a terrible mixture of civil war, famine, and annihilation, and extermination at long range, which no one could have any plan for stopping."

What particular controversy would justify any nation in starting a war like that? It is to be prayerfully hoped that the common sense of the governments and peoples of the world will still stand as an adequate protection against such conflict.

Nevertheless, there is the grave danger that faith in peaceful settlement will sink

so low, that fear will become so acute, that almost imperceptibly the great nations will come to take it for granted that another war cannot be avoided.

If that invisible line of feeling is passed, then of course, as Mr. Lippmann says, the nations will concentrate on getting ready for war. Such preparations, such an atmosphere, eventually would almost certainly bring war.

The great misconception in Mr. Churchill's proposal of a close British-American alliance is in assuming that a great show of force would improve international relations.

On the contrary, it would surely accelerate growth of the belief that eventual war is inevitable. That belief would tend to bring conflict nearer.

The major emphasis of American policy must continue to be on reason, negotiation, the UNO. We must continue to strive to keep Russia and Britain or any other country from becoming hopelessly divided. As former Secretary of State Hull said in the special statement he was moved to make, cooperation among the nations (not threats of force) is the one means of preserving peace.

OPA Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, regardless of what the bureaucrats claim as their motive for establishing price ceilings, which make it impossible for consumers' goods to be produced, it is evident that they are contributing to inflation day by day. There is an old saying that where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise. It would be interesting to know who the astute minds are behind the scenes who are using the powers of the OPA to create conditions, the technique of which has been used by revolutionists at all times, to bring about inflation. It is well known to all persons who have studied the question that revolutionary minds, from Karl Marx down to the present time, have looked upon inflation, whether caused by the printing press or by regulations, as the most effective means of overthrowing the Government. Unless steps are taken to lift the curtain and see who is behind the scene and responsible for this restriction on production, the day is not far distant when the people will pay a terrific price in the loss of liberty for this and other New Deal revolutionary methods.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1946. The testimonies of manufacturers throughout the country is significant and what they say better be heeded by the consumers of the country through their Congressmen:

PEW, OF SUN OIL, SAYS REMOVING OPA CONTROLS WOULD SPUR PRODUCTION, BE BEST BARRIER AGAINST INFLATION

WASHINGTON.—Backing his testimony with evidence from a poll of small manufacturers, J. Howard Pew, president of the Sun Oil Co., charged the Office of Price Administration with denying 100,000,000 consumers the goods they want and need.

Testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Pew urged "on behalf of all business enterprise and the consuming public" that the Price Control Act be ended on June 30, 1946.

The Sun Oil president charged that OPA propagandists have attempted to confuse the issue by putting forth "a specious agrument that price increases cause inflation; that inflation helps none, but hurts everyone; that the OPA keeps prices down, and thus is the only barrier standing between the country and a devastating inflation."

On the contrary, he said, the OPA stands between the people and the goods and services they need, and "price increases no more cause inflation than wet streets cause rain." He asserted that inflation results when there has been an expansion in purchasing power that is not matched by a comparable expansion in the production of real consumer goods and services.

WAYS TO HALT INFLATIONARY TREND

"The best and, I believe, the only effective ways to halt this inflationary trend are to balance the Federal Budget at the earliest possible date, and to stimulate the production of goods," Mr. Pew said. "This last can best be done by removing OPA controls from business."

"All this OPA talk about industry promoting scarcities is bunk," he charged. "The lifeblood of industry is abundant production, and nothing would suit industry better than a peacetime level of production equal to that achieved in war."

The results of the poll conducted by Opinion Research Corp. among manufacturing enterprises employing 1,000 or fewer workers were described by Mr. Pew as "the most damning factual indictment of the harm being done by OPA's price control that has come from any source."

The poll, which he said constitutes an accurate sample of about 250,000 American manufacturing enterprises, showed that:

Thirty-four percent of these manufacturers say they have had to hold up introducing new products on the market because of price ceilings.

Forty-four percent say they have had to stop marketing certain products because of price ceilings.

Fifty-one percent say they have had to curtail production of certain lines because of price ceilings.

Fifty percent say they will be forced to curtail or eliminate products if price ceilings stay where they are.

Thirty-six percent of this last number say they would have to shut down their plants unless they get price relief.

Fifty-seven percent say they are losing money on some item they make.

Thirty-nine percent say that if the OPA were ended tomorrow their output would increase.

Forty-three percent say in such an event they would hire more workers almost immediately.

HALLANAN'S VIEWS

Walter S. Hallanan, president of Plymouth Oil Co. and chairman of a special committee of the American Petroleum Institute, pleaded the cause of the forgotten man of the price-control program, the American oil producer, before the House Banking and Currency Committee which is considering price-control extension.

He predicted that continuation of OPA controls would mean a return to wartime grades of gasoline and a sharp loss of oil production.

Stating that crude-oil prices are lower than costs of finding and producing oil, Mr. Hallanan said price control may save the consumer "as much as 1 cent a gallon on his purchases for perhaps a year."

But he added, "Is it worth it to him to have this country become a have-not nation as regards oil?"

Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), declared removal of price controls will not mean run-away prices. He pointed to a surplus refining capacity of 21,000,000 gallons of petroleum daily as insurance against any such inflation of prices.

He said the frozen price structure of the OPA is keeping new products off the market and is interfering seriously with improved qualities for existing products.

Struggle for Peace—And Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "Struggle for Peace—And Pay," printed in the Army Times, March 9, 1946:

This is an appeal to Congress and public opinion to cast aside tradition, custom, and political corn and act promptly on a variety of proposals to raise the pay and standard of living of the armed forces of the United States.

For a Nation that is disbanding its armed forces there is little comfort to be found in the daily newspapers as the world and American labor writhe in effort to retain their freedom. The struggle for peace is not a fraternal contest. It is a fight for survival.

In time of war, patriotism is the source and solace of armed might. In time of peace, security, self-respect, and decency must replace patriotism as the foundation on which might is built. There is no other way.

The Secretary of War recommended last week that the pay of the armed forces be increased 20 percent. The proposal is not wholly equitable—but it is a starting point. Several Members of Congress have proposed that the pay of the enlisted personnel of the armed forces be doubled. Others, including Army Times, have urged that the pay and dependency allowances of members of the armed forces be increased on an equitable, cost-of-living basis.

Our Army, our Air Forces, our Navy have been depleted beyond belief by the rush of underpaid, underprivileged members to get back into the swim of free enterprise that still marks American civilian life. There is only one way to stem this tide—to turn back into service the flow of youth and might and military experience—and that is by making military service commensurate in self-respect and pay with any other public service.

This can be done in part by raising the pay and general standard of living of Dogface Joe and Willie—by building on such foundations a peacetime military machine that will be marked by self-respect and national affection.

Congress has indicated that action on the pay-raise proposals will be delayed. Pressure of other military matters is cited as one of the reasons. It is fallacious reasoning. Action now on the pay-raise proposals would make more simple favorable action on many of the other military matters which now concern Congress and the people.

There is much too much delay and indecision in government today—in politics, in diplomacy, in economics. A restless world is stretching and yawning in awareness of

awakening to a new destiny. America must be alert to what form the awakened world takes. We must not sacrifice the power that guarantees peace simply because the caste system of our Army, the dilly-dallying of our Congress and the indifference of our people constitute an unholy trinity—a trinity of tragedy.

We must act now.

Mr. Speaker, I know the people of America have been pleased to note the rising tide of sentiment in favor of the very justifiable increase in Army and Navy pay which has been suggested. On January 18, 1946, I wrote a letter to the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY, chairman, House Military Affairs Committee, calling to his attention, prior to its release, a statement which I released to the newspapers on January 20, 1946, calling for increased pay and other advantages for servicemen as a possible solution to the demobilization problem which was so critical at that time and as a possible solution to the problem of maintaining our international commitments without the need for a widespread compulsory military training program.

As far as I know, this statement of January 20 was the first suggestion of this kind offered by a Member of Congress or by an official of the War Department. Since that time this same proposal in various modifications has been supported enthusiastically by many of our colleagues, including the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, of the Naval Affairs Committee, and by the Secretaries of War and Navy. I hope, deeply and strongly, that this support will be consolidated and translated into action.

At this point I would like to call your attention to the statement mentioned below:

STATEMENT REGARDING DEMOBILIZATION BY REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH E. TALBOT, FIFTH DISTRICT, CONNECTICUT, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., ON JANUARY 20, 1946

Recent announcements from the War Department indicating that demobilization will be slowed up because of the lack of replacements add just one more note of confusion to a system which has been studded with examples of indecision and vagueness since its very inception.

Just a short time age we were told that the Army and Navy had far more men than were needed in the European and Pacific theaters and that the only bottleneck to be overcome was the terrific transportation shortage. We were told at that time that the European bottleneck was expected to be relieved by February and the Pacific bottleneck by spring. Now, long before those dates, we are told that we should not be surprised if troop ships come to America from either of those theaters with plenty of room to spare because replacements are not available for the much-needed troops in those areas.

The tragedy of all of this indecision and confusion by the War and Navy Departments is the fact that husbands and sons in the service have been counting on the successful execution of previously announced plans, and wives and mothers back home have held firmly to the hope that their servicemen would be returned on schedule. It is justifiable for these men in the service and their families back home to expect a reasonable knowledge of definite plans by the War and Navy Departments to demobilize these servicemen, and it is justifiable for American citizens to expect the War and Navy Departments to live up to those plans. This the War Department has failed to do.

If, truly, the return of our veterans is now being impeded by a lack of replacements, it is time for America, through the voice of Congress, to act quickly. If the War and Navy Departments can be authorized immediately to increase the pay, advantages, and opportunities of enlistment in the armed forces to a point sufficient to attract the voluntary enlistment of enough men to provide replacements in large numbers, a knotty postwar problem will be solved. Under this plan it would be possible within a reasonably short time to demobilize all members of the armed forces who desire to be discharged, and to retain an Army and Navy of sufficient strength for all occupational and other current duties made up entirely of men to whom employment in the armed services is desirable.

Membership in the armed forces of the United States should not be an undesirable occupation because of low pay, lack of opportunity for advancement, or other disadvantages. This, to my mind, is the sensible method of solving the demobilization problem and, by the same token, increasing the morale of our armed forces to the greatest degree possible.

The House Military Affairs Committee should take immediate action in this direction, and I am today proposing such action to Chairman MAY of that committee.

Black Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragic and very lamentable fact that circumstances exist which could possibly justify such an article as the one from which I quote below so soon following the victory of Allied arms in the most terrible holocaust which has ever engulfed the world. It is horrible and unthinkable for the circumstances to be such that one can consider the chances of war greater than those of peace.

We of the United States do not wish war, nor do the people of Russia, and we simply must not cross the line referred to below and have war. Every American, every Englishman, yes, every Russian, and all other peace-loving people who value the civilization we know, which simply could not survive another war now, must do his part toward preventing it. Let us think along that line. Let us hope along that line. Let us pray for that end. The best thought and most diligent efforts of all are sorely needed. While I shall, of course, contribute my bit as best I can, I wish very much that the circumstances permitted me to constantly so occupy my time in the immediate future. Unfortunately, however, I have opposition and as much as I dislike to be away at all at such a crucial period, you are all well aware of the fact that seniority in this body is so valuable, not only to a member but to his district and his Nation, that there is no way in which we can render greater service, even at such a time as this, than by preserving this seniority for our people, our districts and our Nation.

BLACK WEEK

(By Walter Lippmann)

During this past week we have come to the point where it is no longer a theoretical possibility that we may fail to make peace. We are at the dividing line where it is easier to fail than it will be to succeed, where the chances of war are in sober truth greater than the chances of peace. We are at that line in our relations with the Soviet Union where, though there is as yet no formal diplomatic rupture, the process of diplomatic negotiation is believed in less and less seriously.

Among great powers that is a most critical point. For if once it is passed, if once the conviction becomes fixed that no vital issue can be settled by negotiation, diplomacy after that consists in preparing for war. Diplomacy no longer expects to settle issues but only to postpone them, to gain time, to gain a more advantageous position, to mobilize opinion, to mobilize the wavering and uncertain nations, to mobilize the more powerful coalition.

We are at that line. We have not crossed it. But we are right at it. If we drift across it or are pushed and pulled across it, we shall not have war next week, next month, and very probably not even next year. Nevertheless, the paramount consideration here and abroad, avowed or unavowed, in all policy, domestic as well as diplomatic and military, will be in effect the preparation for war. For we shall be on the slippery downward slope, on which it is increasingly difficult to stop, where at the bottom there is world-wide international and civil war.

It is evident that the United States is not able alone to decide the issue of war or peace. At the best the United States can only control its own actions with a view to influencing the actions of other governments. But the chances of peace, such as they are, now depend primarily upon the capacity of the United States to exert its power and influence at this critical and dangerous point in international affairs. If, for any of many reasons—because of our own inertia and inexperience or because of intervention from abroad—we fail to manage our own participation, there will remain no likelihood of a peaceable settlement. There will then be no peacemaker among the powers, none to which the making of peace transcends in importance the defense or the creation of empire. The mediating and stabilizing influence of the only great power which has no special vested interests in Europe and in Asia will have been discounted, nullified, and dissipated.

Nothing, therefore, is so immediately urgent as to make it certain and manifest in the councils of the nations, in the UN, and alongside of it, that the independent judgment and initiative of this country have not been lost or renounced. If that is not done, the basis of a negotiated settlement between the Soviet Union and the other powers will be gone. To any successfully negotiated settlement of the conflict between the Soviet Union and China, the Soviet Union and the British Empire, the independent presence of the United States is indispensable. If, as Mr. Churchill has proposed, we renounce an independent role and enter a coalition against the Soviet Union, there will not be a negotiated settlement. There will be at best a truce, an armistice before a war, which will last only as long as the race of armaments and the deadly political competition throughout Europe and Asia, which it must and will inaugurate.

Our own role is exceptionally difficult in that we are not dealing only, as Mr. Churchill implied, with the expanding power of the Soviet Union. The real problem for us is not the absolute strength of the Soviet Union

but its strength relative to that of Europe, the Middle East and China. Russia is a big power, of course, but what makes Russia so unmanageably big at this moment are the weakness and division of China, of the British Empire, and of Europe.

We dare not miscalculate the balance of power. There would be no serious problem in Manchuria if China were united, not in a condition of civil war, and able, therefore, with loyal Chinese forces to deal with the Japanese armies and reoccupy Chinese territory. Nor would the position in Iran and Turkey be what it now is if India were a military asset and not a military liability of the British Empire. For what has shaken the British position in the Middle East is that India, which if the empire were a going concern would be the greatest reservoir of imperial power, is in fact an exhausting drain upon the British power. India has some 400,000,000 people, and it is the leading industrial nation, apart from Russia, on the continent of Asia. If India could be counted upon, there would be a wholly different balance of power in Iran and Turkey, there would be no such question of Russia's acting alone and refusing to negotiate.

These are among the great, primary, controlling realities of the world situation, and as they are perfectly evident to the Russians, we shall not be serving our own people loyally if we allow them to become obscured here. To make an anti-Soviet coalition work, to make it so formidable that the Russians must withdraw, the United States would have to make up out of its own resources and military manpower the deficit of force which exists because of the Chinese civil war, the disaffection of India, and the devastation of Europe. That is more than we could do even if our people were persuaded that it ought to be done.

Our strength, actual and potential, is very considerable, and it may be sufficient to bring about peace if it is prudently and astutely employed. It can be sufficient only if it is employed to support us in the role of mediator and peacemaker who persistently and patiently keep intact the process of negotiation, never allowing a final rupture, between Moscow and London and Chungking.

It may be impossible, or we may not have the resolution and wisdom to be the peacemaker, to steer the ship of state through the treacherous waters, between the Scylla of appeasement and the Charybdis of entanglement, into the calm and open sea. But if we are to fail, let us at least have tried for the sake of the dead and of all the multitudes who must suffer so much more terribly if we fail.

This tortured world must be spared another war, a war which, if it once begins, no man will know how it is to be ended. Russia cannot conquer the United States nor can the United States conquer Russia. But they can become enmeshed in a war which cannot be decided, which will go on and on as a terrible mixture of civil war, famine, and annihilation and extermination at long range, which no one could have any plan for stopping.

It's Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's Your Money" published in the Jamestown Post-Journal, Jamestown, N. Y., under date of March 20, 1946:

IT'S YOUR MONEY

One of the more puzzling features of the American system is the great difference in the fiscal policies of the various levels of government.

Generally speaking, the village, the town, the city, and county governments are run on a businesslike basis in that no money is spent until it is in sight, either through a tax levy or a bond issue. Again, generally speaking, State governments have reasonably sound fiscal policies, adhering to the sensible belief that spending beyond income is not good business. However, there is a tendency among the States and the larger cities to deviate from the principles of sound spending that dominate the governments of the smaller cities.

It is when we reach the top, the National Government, that we find fiscal policies which would drive a working credit manager to drink before the ink on his income-tax form could dry.

Smaller governmental units follow the law, custom, and the will of the citizens in spending within their income. Under existing laws, if a city should spend an amount equal to a third or a half of its property valuation the members of the council would be in jail and all taxable property in the city literally would have a first mortgage against it in the form of tax levies to cover the wild spending.

Considering any expenditure, a group of city fathers must consider the source of the funds at the same time. If the money is not in sight it cannot be spent.

Congress, on the other hand, spends with the left hand and taxes with the right and the old "saw" about the right hand not knowing what the left does is entirely inadequate to describe the situation. There is absolutely no connection between Federal spending and taxation. Funds are appropriated whether or not they are available and spending is on the basis of the whims of Congress. Federal taxing is done on a basis of rough estimates of over-all needs for revenue, what the traffic will bear, and the condition of the various Congresmen's political fences. If the revenues fail to measure up to expenditures, and they have not done so in many years, then the deficit is made up by general borrowing. There have been numerous cases in which Congressmen have boasted that they have voted for every appropriation and against every tax measure. And that, we contend, is no way to run a government.

The sad feature of the unbusinesslike conduct of Uncle Sam's financial affairs is that the general public apparently has no real interest in the financial high-jinks of the Federal Government. Too many taxpayers who will argue with their city councilmen over the spending of a few dollars and an attendant increase in tax levies or bonded debt, absolutely ignore the manner in which Congress handles the financial affairs of the Nation. And this despite the fact that the Federal Government now takes a far bigger piece of the tax dollar of the average man than do the local taxing agencies. Acceptance of the New-Deal theory that the Federal Treasury is an inexhaustible fountain of funds and that a balanced budget belongs to the dark ages of the pre-New Deal era seems to have become so general as to be extremely dangerous. Spending by Congress may not leave the same impression on the taxpayer's minds as does spending by the city council, but it hits him in the same place—the pocketbook.

Rural Electrification in the Nation's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Rural Electrification in the Nation's Farm Program" delivered by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Buffalo, N. Y., March 4, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is one of the major agracultural events of the year. It has brought together representatives of REA-financed cooperatives now providing electric service to more than a million farms and other rural establishments in 46 States. As Secretary of Agriculture I have been greatly impressed by the importance of electric power in the improvement of the condition of our farm population and I am glad to have the opportunity to tell you personally how much I appreciate the work your cooperatives are doing.

I shall not presume to offer solutions for the problems with which you may be faced in your efforts to complete the job of electrifying rural America. Instead, I wish to discuss today the relationship between the REA program and some of the other programs of the Department of Agriculture. When the decision was reached last summer that the Rural Electrification Administration should return to Washington from its wartime headquarters in St. Louis, I expressed the hope that closer coordination between REA and other agencies of the Department would be possible under one roof. I should like to tell you something about the kind of coordination I had in mind.

I recognize that administration of REA loan funds authorized by Congress and the planning, building, and operations of rural power systems, call for specialized knowledge and skills. I believe the REA organization and its borrowers are self-sufficient in these respects.

Under the direction of Administrator Wickard, REA now enjoys complete freedom of action in all the powers and responsibilities delegated to the agency by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. The Administrator was appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a 10-year term. His duties are clearly defined by law. Although for administrative purposes REA has been grouped with other lending and action agencies inside the Department, I have no desire as Secretary to impose the authority of my office upon any legally constituted phase of the agency's operations. I feel this way especially about any change in policy which might disturb the presently satisfactory relationships between REA and its borrowers.

I think we should all recognize, however, that getting electricity to the Nation's farms is but the means to an end. I regard the REA program not merely as a power program, but as a potentially far-reaching agrar-

ian program. As such, it should have the close attention and the cooperation of every agency working for the advancement of agriculture and the rural community.

REA has pioneered in encouraging application of electric power to a great variety of farm tasks. Its specialists, working with like-minded men in the cooperatives, have helped to popularize farm electrical equipment which many farmers had never heard of a few years ago. During the war years, the water pumps, small motors, milking machines, electric brooders and other equipment in use on REA-served farms played an important part in maintaining production records which could not have been achieved by hand labor alone.

Farmers with electric service are able to command the efficiencies of the highly mechanized manufacturing industry in the performance of the many chores connected with livestock, poultry and dairy production. This is especially important in making it possible for farmers to diversify their crops on the family-type farm, by spreading the available farm labor over a wider productive area. Not only does farm labor yield higher returns in terms of net income on the electrified farm, but production of various crops can be more readily adapted to changing goals based on potential supply and demand.

Thus, we see electrical equipment encouraging sounder farm production programs on our electrified farms. Since the one-crop system of farming has been the most destructive ally of erosion in many sections of the country, I hope the people engaged in soil-conservation work will learn more about the possibilities in use of electrical equipment to aid in diversification.

Another great need of agriculture today is for the marketing of higher quality agricultural products. Water under pressure, supplied by electric pumps, to improve sanitary conditions around dairy barns, hot water for sterilizing dairy equipment, and electric milk coolers are essential in the marketing of quality whole milk. Electric refrigeration is important in the preservation of fruits, vegetables, and meats on the farm. Other electrical processes make it possible for the farmer to market a larger part of his production in finished or semifinished condition. These things not only add to the market value of farm products, but they also encourage more orderly marketing and help to alleviate periodic price-depressing gluts.

I wish to commend these farm uses of electricity to all who are striving for the betterment of farming conditions. All agencies of the Department need to learn about farm uses of electricity from REA's specialists and the managers, officers, and members of REA cooperatives who have been the pioneers in these great developments. Coordinated effort in this field will not only benefit agriculture directly, but the increased farm consumption of electric energy will strengthen the cooperatives financially for the more difficult part of the farm-electrification job yet to be done.

In addition to the part electric power is playing on individual farms, the broader community services of the REA cooperatives are contributing to the building of a sound rural economy. I am glad to know that more active participation by members in the affairs of their cooperatives is being encouraged as an essential part of the REA program. Rural people need to know that they have the right and the ability to supply themselves efficiently and economically with the essential services which too often in the past have been available to them only on terms too difficult for them to meet.

The experience farmers are now getting through their own cooperatives is strengthening the spirit of self-reliance which throughout our national history has made the rural element of our population a bulwark against attacks on our freedom. The Nation and the world today need the example of freemen working together, in cooperation with a government of their own choice, in undertakings too big for them as individuals.

I regard the farmer-owned, locally controlled cooperative as the most effective agency in equipping the family-type farm to hold its own in our economy of bigness. By means of power, machines, modern mass-production and mass-sales methods, plus great accumulations of capital, massive corporations have come to control or command huge shares of our natural resources, our manufacturing capacity, and our distribution system. This concentration of economic power has moved steadily ahead during this century. It was estimated in 1930 that some 200 corporations controlled half of the industrial wealth of the United States. In 1929 the top 12 percent of the manufacturing enterprises in the country employed nearly half of the wage earners and turned out fully half of our manufactures. The war has accentuated, if anything, the upsweep of the curve toward bigness and concentration. By 1942 the 200 largest manufacturing corporations controlled 44 percent of the total assets of all manufacturing corporations and 58 percent of the net capital assets of such corporations.

I have said before and I wish to repeat that I have nothing against big business organizations just because they are big. It takes great size to produce the remarkable output at low cost achieved by the assembly-line system in our great manufacturing enterprises. Production efficiency has given us in this country a standard of living unequalled in the world, and one that could never have been attained in a handicraft economy. We must find a way to introduce similar efficiencies in agriculture and small business, both to perpetuate our system of individual enterprise and to give the individual enterprisers a fair share of the national income.

It is my hope that through cooperative action, agriculture may achieve parity with other industries in this country without sacrifice of the values which have been invested in individual ownership of family-type farms. By their very nature, farm people are good cooperators. Since pioneer days, they have worked together to overcome hazards with which as individuals they would have been powerless to cope. They have always been able to do this without sacrifice of the individual, freedom and enterprise so highly prized in rural sections of the country.

The success of the cooperatives through which farmers are now massing their strength to serve their common needs is attributable to the fact that rural people are inherently good neighbors. It is important to remember that scientific and businesslike management of farmer-owned cooperatives cannot hold them together unless their members are able to feel at all times that the cooperative is simply an organized expression of the spirit of good neighborliness. It is wholly in the tradition of the common practices among farm people in pioneer days, in joining with their neighbors in such things as swapping work, husking bees and work on the school, church, or public road. The Nation cannot afford to lose this spirit, and it will not be lost as long as the rural people who possess it in abundance are able to find constructive outlets for it.

To be practical, however, we must not forget that farmers will not continue to participate in cooperative enterprises merely for the sake of being cooperative. Farmers will continue investing themselves in their cooperatives only so long as the balance sheet shows tangible profits for the members. Furthermore, the cooperative must serve the general public as well as its members in order to merit the special privileges which have been accorded the cooperative method of enterprise by our National and State governments.

I think we all agree that REA cooperatives have served their members well, and at the same time have lived up to their responsibilities to the Nation. I hope the members will not forget their obligations to their neighbors who do not yet enjoy the benefits made possible by the REA program.

As a Member of Congress I was greatly impressed by the wide support given the REA program, not only by Congressmen from the farm States, but by representatives of the industrial States who were informed of the contributions made to improvement of general business conditions by the REA program, especially in increased sales of electrical equipment for the farms.

In recent months I have seen evidence that your program continues to command the same kind of respect. It is based not only on the success of REA cooperatives in spearheading the tremendous advance of the last decade in farm electrification and in paying off their Government loans, but in their apparent willingness to help others get electric service through REA assistance.

You may recall that just a year ago, a bill was introduced in Congress which would have authorized REA loans of $585,000,000 over a 3-year period. The proposal was based on what the cooperatives have since learned were ultra-conservative estimates. The Congress has had to raise its sights several times before the bill could be brought to a vote.

First, Congress authorized $200,000,000 for REA loans during the present fiscal year. At the end of 6 months REA had committed more than 80 percent of the year's total, and had still on hand or in process of preparation applications for additional loans of more than $220,000,000. The great volume of individual applications registered with the cooperatives by rural people made itself felt in Washington. The President recommended an additional authorization of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending next July 1, and a total of $250,000,000 for fiscal 1947. The amounts already authorized and proposed authorizations taken up by Congress upon the President's recommendation total $550,000,000 for 2 years—or just $35,000,000 short of the original request for these years.

This is evidence that the needs and wants of the rural people in regard to further extension of REA service in unelectrified areas have been very effectively presented in congressional circles. Those needs are considered by congressional committees that understand the programs and objectives of the Department of Agriculture. I believe you will find that the REA cause has not suffered in this respect, either because the agency is a part of the Department or because its offices are now located in Washington in easy reach of Members of Congress who may desire additional information about the program in their States.

I wish to assure you that the service of the Secretary's office will at all times be available to REA when our support is needed.

World Peace

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days there has been some heartening news in the press.

Secretary Byrnes, speaking to the UNO on yesterday, laid down a fundamental principle which, if followed, can give us world peace. It was that no nation, large or small, shall be permitted to gain any advantage for itself by the use of force. The corollary of that principle was brought out a day earlier by a discussion that took place in the UNO about the forces to be organized for the preservation of peace. For out of that could develop a situation in which all nations would make their military policy conform not to their individual will to power but to their collective will to keep the peace. America could do that now.

Mr. Speaker, a great American in 1935 issued a warning which, if heeded, might have avoided World War II. He was Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War. He warned then that if Japan was allowed to take Manchuria by force it would lead to a world war. Today he issues another warning. He tells us:

We must not delay. The poisons of the past are persistent and cannot be purged by timid treatment.

By its sole possession of the atomic bomb, at least for the present, the United States finds itself in a position of world leadership. But this solitary possession is most certainly very transient. It must recognize this and act swiftly. It must take the lead by holding out an open hand to other nations in a spirit of genuine trust and with a real desire for a thoroughgoing cooperative effort in meeting and solving this problem. Truly this is a time for greatness of heart and of purpose, and unless we demonstrate these qualities now other nations cannot be expected to do so.

* * * * *

The development of atomic energy holds great, but as yet unexploited promise for the well-being of civilization. Whether this promise will be realized depends on whether the danger of swift and unprecedented destruction can be removed from the earth. Whether it is removed depends on whether we and other nations move firmly, quickly, and with frank transparency of purpose toward the goal of uniting all men of good will against the appalling threat to man's very existence. The focus of the problem does not lie in the atom; it resides in the hearts of men.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, those are prophetic words.

With the coming of the atomic bomb, the possibility of unilateral military defense of the people of any nation has passed away. These are times in which we must learn that the law of God will prevail despite the will of man. They are times when nothing but the highest statesmanship, seeking world order, world government, if you will, over weapons of mass destruction in every nation can possibly save mankind.

There is risk in such a course. But far less risk than in any other. Let us not fail the great venture to which Mr. Stimson calls us, the venture of binding all nations of good will together for their common safety. Let us do nothing which is out of harmony with such a goal. Decisions lie ahead of us which will perhaps decide the fate of mankind for generations to come.

Food Poses Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Sunday, March 10, 1946, edition of the New York Times:

FOOD POSES DILEMMA—PRICE POLICY AND SUBSIDY SEEN AS BARS TO FEEDING WORLD

(The writers of the following letter are at the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University. Dr. Pearson, professor of prices and statistics, is the author of many books, and coauthor of Food with Mr. Paarlberg.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The decision to emphasize wheat as a means of feeding starving Europe is welcome even if overdue. Two other decisions will have to be made, however, before the present one can be effective. The United States will have to give ground on its policy of upgrading the American diet, and the price policy on wheat and feed grain will have to be reversed.

The simple fact is that with a continuation of present price policy the United States will not have enough wheat to match the need in Europe. This is true in spite of the fact that the 1945 crop was the largest in history. This huge crop is disappearing at a rapid rate. Much of it is being fed to livestock in accordance with an old policy of increasing the output of livestock products in order to give the American consumer a better diet. A corollary of this plan was the program of holding down the price of wheat and feed grains and subsidizing the price of livestock so as to maximize the conversion of corn, oats, and wheat into meat, milk, and eggs. It has been this policy that has steadily depleted our stocks of wheat; this is the reason we are or soon will be scraping the wheat bins. The real competitor for the wheat which might help hungry Europe was not the American consumer by any means—it was the American chicken, hog, and dairy cow.

OTHER FOODS COSTLY

The American consumer cannot reduce his consumption of wheat by any considerable extent. If he did, he would have to substitute other foods for wheat. Most other foods are more expensive and even less plentiful than wheat, the staff of life both in Europe and in the United States.

American livestock, however, can quickly reduce its consumption. Wheat should never be found in the feed trough when there is any likelihood that it will be lacking in the bread box. Livestock is a wasteful means of converting cereal grains into meat. It takes about 7 pounds of cereal grain, including forage and pasture, to produce 1 pound of dry matter in the form of meat.

It has been said that the United States has lacked a policy on relief for Europe. On the contrary, there has been a policy, but it has been poorly adapted to needs. The policy was developed before and during the early stages of the war, when livestock products in the United States were plentiful. The program then developed was to improve the diet of the American people with more livestock products and to provide lend-lease aid to our allies in the form of meat, eggs, and butter.

This program was conceived more as a means of surplus disposal than as an effort to develop an objective policy. Having thoroughly sold ourselves on this program, we have continued it beyond its justification. Four years of price-fixing and policy-making have given this program tremendous administrative inertia. Prices of feed were held low by ceiling prices. Livestock prices were held high by subsidy. With this encouragement, livestock numbers are now high. Feed, including wheat, is disappearing at a rapid rate in this country.

ELEVENTH-HOUR DISCOVERY

At the eleventh hour we have found that we cannot feed any large segment of the hungry world on scarce and expensive livestock products, and must turn to wheat. This decision comes after our wheat stocks, which were the hope of a hungry world, have been poured into the feed troughs to raise the protein intake of the American consumer. Unless we temporarily change our minds about the alleged importance of animal foods in the United States, our solicitude for the livestock will continue, and we will continue to protect their feed supply. We have finally given up our policy of upgrading the diet of the world's needy; these needy now await a second decision—that we temporarily terminate the policy of upgrading our own diet.

The policy of a high-quality diet and high livestock numbers has become enmeshed in the price-fixing program. Unless the artificially low prices of wheat and feed grains are allowed to rise, much of our remaining stocks will be fed regardless of pronouncements about shipping wheat and liquidating livestock.

Livestock are a nation's bank account. Historically, when nations get into difficulty with their feed supply, they reduce the number of livestock, thereby adding to the food supply in two ways. The immediate supply of meat is increased and the cereal grain which the livestock would otherwise have eaten is available for human consumption.

EUROPE SET EXAMPLE

Europe did just this. The reduced consumption of grain on the part of livestock and the increased consumption by man explains how Europe ran a gigantic war without mass starvation. Europe reduced her livestock and conserved her grain. The United States did the reverse. This was done through a low-grain-high-livestock price policy. The recent 3-cent advance permitted in the prices of wheat and corn is sufficient to admit that the frozen price policy is the crux of the situation, but is a long way from being enough to correct it.

If the frozen price mechanism could be thawed out, these adjustments would occur automatically. If the price of wheat were permitted to rise substantially, it would no longer be profitable to feed it to livestock. If prices of feed grains were allowed to rise, thereby reducing the profits in the production of meat, still more livestock would be liquidated, and an increased supply of meat would be available immediately. The obstacles to these changes are our devotion to the idea of maintaining high livestock numbers and our devotion to the idea of maintaining a fixed-price system. It remains to be seen whether these obstacles can be overcome before the sands run out in Europe.

FRANK A. PEARSON,
DON PAARLBERG.

ITHACA, N. Y., *March 6, 1946.*

Mr. Speaker, I would not question for 1 minute the article by these learned gentlemen from Cornell. However, I think there are at least two other angles which should be taken into consideration.

First. The first is that inasmuch as 100 pounds, or any other given amount of

grain for that matter, will produce twice as much human food when fed to a dairy cow as will be produced if fed to any other farm animal, and four times as much human food as will be produced if fed to some farm animals, it is well to consider the desirability of stepping up the production of milk. Powdered skim, for example, contains 35 percent of a most desirable animal protein. The price ceiling is very low—14 to 15 cents per pound—when one considers the food value of the product. United States production of powdered skim has been going downward for several months.

Second. While admitting that the grain will feed more people than the meat or milk for that matter that would be produced by feeding it to animals, there is another situation which must be taken into consideration. It is that millions upon millions of pounds of milk are being produced on land that cannot be used for producing grain. The stony, hilly, rough, untilled land of the cut-over areas of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan produce many billions of pounds of milk. This land would be entirely unsuitable for grain production.

In fact, of the 15,000,000,000 pounds of milk produced in Wisconsin in 1945, my personal opinion is that over 2,000,000,000 pounds and possibly more than twice that amount of milk is produced annually on land that could not be used or is not being used to produce grain or any other appreciable amount of human food. It is easy to believe that a limited amount of grain might be used to advantage to carry cows over the winter months in these areas, so that maximum human food can be obtained or garnered from the hilly or stony or rough or untilled land during the pasture season.

Thousands of tons of cabbage went to waste in 1945. Thousands upon thousands of bushels of Irish potatoes were used for animal feeding when they could have been converted into human food. Why these crops were not diverted to a hungry world is more than I could ever find out. A lack of a correlation in the Federal agencies appears to be the only answer. We have had more committees and less calories. We have more bureaucrats and less butter.

In conclusion, may I say that the wheat situation as presented by the professors cannot be disputed. But why are these situations allowed to develop? Why was the price of rye, with less food value to man or beast, allowed to advance from 65 cents per bushel to $2.15 per bushel when the wheat was bringing the farmer $1.50 to $1.60 per bushel? Why were not the American people given the facts about the corn supplies and the real picture of the soft-corn problem?

Why did the much-publicized Anderson food-study committee ever recommend the 3–4 cents per pound subsidy to the packer and producer for the choice fat cattle? Untold thousands of bushels of grain were diverted to fancy beef during the past year that could have produced double the amount of human food as pork. Why a $39 subsidy on an animal weighing 1,000 pounds? This is a subsidy of 10 cents per pound on the meat. Why were not the spareribs, fat backs, bolognas, and the side pork subsidized if it was necessary to subsidize? The class of people that could best use a subsidy would at least be receiving it. These feed grains will produce four times as much human food when fed to dairy cattle than when fed to beef cattle. These feed grains will produce twice as much human food when fed to hogs or for eggs as the same feed grains would or will produce of beef.

The seriousness of this feed situation was apparent months ago. In 1944 about a quarter of a billion bushels of grain were imported and little exported, while in 1945 our source of imports dried up, but the demand for grain exports increased. I think every American wants to support the right program and wants to support President Truman in the food commitments made at Potsdam. But we should not sit idly by and see some dreamers and schemers put a program into operation which does not accomplish this, nor do we want a program that unnecessarily jeopardizes the future health of the children of America. The man with the price will get his, regardless.

Are We Meeting Our Food Obligations as They Should Be Met?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the March 21, 1946, edition of the Barron County (Wis.) News-Shield is self-explanatory:

FEED TRADE IN PROTEST—CHARGE DIVERSION OF PROTEIN MEALS TO TOBACCO GROWERS

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Recent efforts of tobacco growers to obtain supplies of linseed and soybean meals for fertilizer have provoked unfavorable comment from feed industry sources over the diversion of these products at a time when an over-all protein shortage of feed exists.

The tobacco industry has been given an allocation of 40,000 tons of protein meals for 1946 for fertilizer use by the Department of Agriculture. This amount is the same as was provided last year and represents approximately 60 percent of the tobacco industry's base use.

According to USDA officials the tobacco industry is eligible to receive protein meal from set-aside pool under WFO 9.

Approximately one-third of the total allocation is slated for use in Connecticut and USDA officials state that tobacco growers in this State had obtained more than half of their requirements prior to January 1, 1946.

USDA has justified its allocation of this scarce commodity on grounds that no satisfactory substitute was available if protein supplies were denied to the tobacco producers. Ordinarily tobacco producers prefer cottonseed meal for fertilizer use but in the absence of this product either linseed or soybean meal can be substituted.

Mr. Speaker, when one State receives 10 percent of the fertilizer and produces less than 2 percent of the food of the Nation, no one can state that a very desirable or appropriate food-production program is in operation. Cotton sandwiches and tobacco cocktails are not the need of the day. Does it make sense to subsidize soybeans to be used for providing a fertilizer for a nonfood crop? Does it make sense to subsidize flax and then use the linseed meal as a fertilizer for a nonfood crop?

Testimony in Favor of H. R. 5270, a Bill To Extend the Office of Price Administration Until June 30, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the testimony of Mr. Chat Paterson, national legislative representative of the American Veterans' Committee, in support of the extension of price control:

TESTIMONY OF MR. CHAT PATERSON, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1946

I am presenting this testimony today on behalf of the American Veterans' Committee as its legislative representative in Washington. The AVC is an organization of World War II veterans which is working to achieve a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world. One of the greatest dangers to a prosperous America and a stable world is that of a disastrous inflation. We are already experiencing a measure of inflation and thousands of veterans are having a hard time because of this limited inflation. It is not fair to the veteran during his difficult period of readjustment and initial insecurity for you gentlemen to permit an uncontrolled inflation to take hold of our Nation and shake the monetary foundation upon which so many hopes have been built.

If I were to ask any member of this committee whether he wanted to do all in his power to aid the veteran, I am sure there would be a resounding "Of course." Because of your membership on the Banking and Currency Committee, you are in the unique position of being instrumental in protecting the veteran from a worse inflation and in making sure that his dollars buy the goods and services which he and his family need. In most cases he must buy these goods and services on a very limited income.

There are four simple reasons why the veterans need price control if they are going to be given an even break in getting back to civilian life:

1. Veterans just don't have much money now, and they probably won't have much money for a long while. They have been away from civilian work for several years. It's going to take time to get back into paying

jobs. General Bradley has already stated that approximately 4,000,000 veterans will return with no civilian occupation or training. These veterans, during their period of training and job seeking, will not be able to pay the cost of a decent living if prices go up.

They didn't get much money for fighting the war, and in most cases have no savings upon which they can draw for any length of time. Their $300 mustering-out pay won't buy much food or clothing or pay rent very long. Even a slight increase in prices would mean that they would have poorer food and live in cheaper houses. I don't think any of you want the American way of life to which they return to be one of poverty and increasing bitterness.

2. Veterans want steady jobs. A run-away inflation, such as followed the last war, will create job insecurity and bring on unemployment. There are several members of this committee who served in the last war. After the 1918 armistice you saw prices shoot so high in less than 2 years that fewer and fewer people could pay them. What was called a buyers' strike developed. You must remember how stores cut down their orders. That meant factories slowing down and closing. That meant five and one-half million jobs disappeared. Thousands of your buddies tramped the streets looking for jobs. Do you want the same to happen to the veteran of today? Inflation can do it. Price control can help prevent it.

3. A lot of veterans want to go into business for themselves. With the GI loan and some help from their families and friends, they can start in a small way now. But you gentlemen all know what would happen to these small nest eggs if inflation started operating costs upward. We probably couldn't even start in business, and if we did, most of us would soon lose out to bigger and better-established firms when we went to bid for high-priced materials and labor.

4. And finally, gentlemen, most veterans want families and homes. We gave a lot of thought to that aspect of American life while we were overseas. A lot of us already have wives and children, the rest of us are human and want them. But what are our chances if prices go up and put expenses beyond our reach?

I see a lot of stories in the papers that OPA is causing business to go broke. I remember hearing a lot of these stories when I was in Europe. One day in early 1944, while overseas, I picked up a copy of Business Week which contained a tabulation of profits (after taxes) of the major corporations for 1943. I was astounded at the millions of dollars of profit that these corporations were cleaning up. Upon returning in late 1945 I found the New York Times and the Journal of Commerce printing tabulations of even more immense profits. These things do not look to me as if OPA has bankrupt business. And I would be willing to bet that most of these same corporations expect record production, record sales, and big profits in 1946 even with price control.

We have heard a lot of stories about how price control, during the war, was interferring with production. Most veterans who saw the avalanche of provisions, munitions, and equipment that rolled to our fighting fronts would never believe that price control hurt production. We just don't understand these tall tales being circulated to destroy the price-control program. We saw in Europe and China what inflation means and the misery it brings. Higher prices don't necessarily mean greater production.

There is one point on which the record should be kept absolutely straight. No one wants to perpetuate OPA indefinitely. We do not want red tape or business restrictions continued a day longer than they are necessary, but we do want protection from inflation for our living standards and for our chances to work and maintain our families. OPA must be continued during the coming year and, if necessary, for a longer period of time in fields where production does not come up to demand and where normal competition cannot prevent an inflationary spiral.

Before closing this testimony I would like to pay tribute to Chester Bowles. He is a successful businessman. He has proven in the practical business world that he understands the problems of business. Right now he could be out making a fortune for himself, but he isn't doing that. He is practically donating his time and energy to do a tough job because he knows it means security for millions of American citizens and for hundreds of thousands of businesses. Veterans admire that kind of fight.

The AVC looks to the Members of Congress for help in holding down inflation. The veteran has not been able, during the years of war, to organize and operate lobbies to protect his interests. He has had to rely on you gentlemen. For several sessions of this committee you have been hearing the pleas and complaints of the organized lobbies. I am sure you realize they cannot all have their own way. If they did, the result would be disastrous. I am sure you want to avoid the disillusionment and resentment which will follow inevitably if the veteran finds that, through no fault of his own, the Congressman elected by himself and his fellow citizens chose to give way to inflationary pressures rather than stand up and fight for a price-control act unencumbered by crippling amendments. Don't worry about whether the veterans are behind you in keeping prices down. At present they are very busy finding a place to live and locating a job which will give them initial security in civilian life. You can expect them to react as the vast majority of citizens, overwhelmingly in favor of men who protected their interests and keenly aware who their friends were in protecting them from a disastrous inflation. Inflation is no friend of the veteran and the veteran is no friend of inflation. The veterans' best weapon against inflation is a strong price-control program.

OPA and Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of a telegram which I have received from Mr. S. W. Bowen, of the Woodard Walker, Bowen, Inc., Shreveport, La., as follows:

SHREVEPORT, LA., *March 23, 1946.*

PAUL PORTER,
Price Administrator, Lumber Branch, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.:

Understand large segment legitimate lumber dealers now considering taking matters in own hand and ignore OPA unless prompt relief afforded the lumber industry but in view of fact 30 to 50 percent or more of lumber being produced is going into black market these legitimate dealers can see no other way out of dilemma.

Having dealt with the southwestern lumbermen past 30 years can truthfully say no better class law-abiding men anywhere. However, OPA price policy past 4 years has been injurious to legitimate producers thereby forcing considerable production to close down and unless this production decline is arrested and unless black market eliminated the condition will become chaotic within 60 to 90 days.

Please allow me make following proposal, namely, that for the remainder of duration OPA on lumbe. the price committee of lumber producers be allowed to name a fair price and have OPA apply this price. You need have no fea. this price will either be unreasonable or inflationary. As black-market lumber now selling 30 to 40 percent above OPA ceiling and certainly the producers should be allowed 1 year out of 5 years to set own price.

S. W. BOWEN.

Problems Concerning Automobile Dealers of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, Mr. W. L. Mallon, president of the National Automobile Dealers Association appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency of our body. Among other things, his testimony set forth the inequalities, discriminations, and misunderstandings on the part of the Office of Price Administration of the problems and obstacles confronting the automobile dealers of this Nation. His testimony before that honorable committee was specific and bore witness to the Nation of the total inability of the OPA to comprehend the factors which make it impossible for the automobile dealers of the respective States to function or exist under the nonsensical and unsympathetic attitude of the OPA to this phase of American small business.

I want the Congress to have access to this testimony now being presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I want the permanent archives of the Congress to reflect for future years the unfortunate attitude of bureaucracy as it now exists and its effect upon our American way of life and upon free enterprise.

The uncontroverted facts, as presented by the National Automobile Dealers Association of America, indicate beyond peradventure of doubt the unfortunate trend of our national economy under our present system of regimentation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include therewith the statement of Mr. Mallon, abovementioned, before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House:

SUMMARY OF MR. MALLON'S STATEMENT

1. OPA has advised dealers that they will have to bear the burden of the $80,000,000 annual wage increases won by CIO members in their recent strikes against automobile manufacturers. NADA protests against this plan vigorously, holding that the levy against dealers is unwarranted and not in conformity with the intent of Congress.

2. OPA within recent months has imposed, or announced plans to impose, cuts in the dealer established trade discount totaling 7½ percent, or about one-third of the normal average trade discount of 24 percent. This in the face of former Administrator Bowles' statement to the House Small Business Committee last November that the first cut, of 2½ percent, he then planned would be the last dealers would have to take.

3. OPA has been issuing misleading statements about the national financial condition of retail automobile dealers. Instead of enjoying greater prosperity under OPA control than it experienced prior to the war, the trade has suffered severe reverses. One-fourth of all dealers actively engaged when OPA came into existence have been forced to close their doors. No new cars were received for almost 4 years. Five million cars have been junked since new cars were frozen in January 1942. Gas and tire rationing greatly lowered dealer income. OPA ceiling regulations drove used car sales away from legitimate dealers into the hands of racketeers. Repeated OPA slashes of possible new car income have dealers who were ready to expand their plants and personnel frightened and bewildered.

4. Congress never intended that OPA should be empowered to tamper with established dealer discounts and the law should be amended to effectively prohibit such actions. All cuts heretofore taken from dealers should be canceled so that they may quickly help restore their service to normal.

5. OPA's issuance of arbitrary rulings without consulting advisory committees should be prohibited.

6. All price controls on various lines of goods should automatically cease, without the necessity of obtaining OPA consent, when the advisory committee of the affected lines certifies with evidence that certain percentages of normal production have been reached.

7. Congress must take steps to see that OPA and other Government agencies do not use their powers, granted or assumed, to favor one segment of the national economy at the expense of another. Former Administrator Bowles has been especially guilty of this practice, as witness his vigorously promoting 18½ cents an hour increases for automobile workers and then planning to unload the costs on dealers.

I am W. L. Mallon, a retail automobile dealer of Newark, N. J. I also am president of the National Automobile Dealers Association. Our national headquarters are at 1026 Seventeenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. I and all other officers of the association, except the executive vice president, serve without salary.

Our membership today consists of a vast majority of the 32,000 new car dealers of the United States. They are located in every county and State in the Union.

Before the war there were between 42,000 and 45,000 dealers in the Nation. Because between 1942 and 1946 no new cars were made, old cars were driven into black markets by OPA regulations, help was scarce and business costs sky-rocketed, more than one-fourth of the dealers of the Nation were forced out of business. They either went broke or quit to save expenses. Most of the 32,000 who kept their doors open have existed largely on repair and service work. Here and there a large dealer who had been able to buy substantial stocks of new and used cars before the supply was exhausted made good money during the war. But he was the exception. The little dealer, who constitutes more than 80 percent of our trade, has had rough sledding.

To the credit of your committee and Congress, let me say that our condition would have been worse if you had not come to our rescue. The passage of the Murray-Patman Act, in which this committee played a large role, kept open the doors of three out of four dealers in this country. If it had not been for congressional help in passing that act, most dealer establishments in the United States would be closed and repairs and services for 25,000,000 car owners stymied.

The attitude of NADA toward the price control law is simple and clear. We believed that it was necessary when originally passed and to date we never have advocated immediate termination of the act. We now believe that controls should be lifted as rapidly as possible when goods and supplies become adequate and that certain amendments which will compel OPA to carry out congressional intentions in regard to established trade practices should be adopted.

Most automobile dealers today are filled with uncertainty. At the close of the war they began expanding their plants and personnel under the impression that new cars soon would begin to flow to them in large numbers. They believed statements made last fall by OPA Administrator Bowles and others to the effect that they might soon expect an average annual output of 5,000,000 cars. NADA and other informed automobile groups warned them against overoptimism, but so eager were they to get going that they paid little attention to conservative warnings, often investing their last dollars in expansion programs.

Now they are holding the bag. Strikes came, but new cars did not. Now this large group of small dealers and the 10,000 dealers who were put out of business at the beginning of the war are greatly concerned about their futures. Lack of stocks, increased cost of help, space, etc., and a persistent whittling down of retail automobile trade discounts by OPA have them desperately worried.

In an effort to leave the impression that retail automobile trade of the United States has prospered under OPA regulations, Administrator Bowles has told you here in person, by charts and in widely circulated booklets, that its profits were 200 percent greater in 1943 than they were in 1939. That is a grossly misleading statement.

Primarily, so far as we have been able to learn, there exists nowhere a trade-wide report on automobile dealer incomes for 1943. As to 1939 dealer incomes, they were among the worst of the prewar period. Less than one-half of the corporate dealers reporting to the Bureau of Internal Revenue broke even that year. The total number of dealers reporting averaged only four-tenths of 1 cent profit before taxes on every dollar's worth of gross business done. So, if the OPA statement of a 200-percent gain could be proved, it would only mean that dealers in 1943 earned one and a fifth cents profit on each gross dollar, before taxes. But nowhere can we find proof of the OPA statement.

Prior to appearing here, Mr. Bowles told the House Small Business Committee that the net profit of the 32,000 dealers of the country—and I quote him—"jumped from 1.3 percent in 1939 to 9.3 percent in the first 6 months of 1945." That statement which never has been substantiated by an unquestioned national report appears to have been forgotten by OPA chart drafters when Mr. Bowles appeared here recently.

The truth is that in arriving at both the 1943 and 1945 estimates here quoted, OPA followed its customary method of arriving at national trade income averages. That method, known as "sampling" is one in common use in advertising agencies throughout the Nation when preparing sales campaigns. The agency does not make a complete national survey of the trade or industry in question. Rather, a handful of income reports are studied and from these, national conclusions to prove whatever is desired are drawn.

A good example of how OPA follows this practice was had during hearings by the House Small Business Committee last fall when automobile dealers protested against OPA's first attempt to lower their established trade discount averaging 24 percent. OPA then was contending that dealers could easily absorb a cut of from 11 percent to 13 percent. It further declared that a survey of the industry made by OPA proved it. Pressed by committee members for details of that survey, Mr. Bowles admitted it had covered only 300 dealers out of 32,000 in the Nation, or less than 1 percent of trade. It is on this wholly inadequate survey that OPA still is inflicting profit cuts on dealers. These cuts will total 7½ percent, or an amount equal to about one-third of the average established trade discount.

Common sense and a fair memory for facts will defeat any studied attempt to make it appear that the retail automobile trade nationally is as well or better off then it was before the war.

There is no denying that the war put one-fourth of the dealers out of business and they still are out. In attempting to explain away this incontrovertible figure, Mr. Bowles suggested to the House Small Business Committee that many of these dealers went to war. Some did, but most of them went to the wall. At all odds, they closed their doors, against their wishes, and therefore became business casualties of the war period. Fairness demands that any comparison of average prewar and present incomes for the trade include the operations of these missing men.

Other factors which must be weighed are these: Dealers received no new cars for almost 4 years during the war and before the war new car sales always formed the backbone of dealer income. Used car sales, profitable while a supply of merchandise lasted, faded rapidly in legitimate dealer ranks after OPA ceilings were imposed. After that the bulk of used car transactions were between individuals and private buyers and gyps or black-market racketeers who kept no books and operated in fine disregard of OPA rules. More than 5,000,000 old cars were junked during the war, thus reducing the potential market for repairs, services, and supplies by at least one-sixth. Gas and tire rationing not only cut supply sales for cars in use but put countless thousands of cars into dead storage.

Add all of these indisputable dealer handicaps together and you have a true picture of what the war did to our trade. The mere trickle of new car deliveries since partial production was renewed last July has changed the picture only slightly. Nor will it be changed greatly until new car deliveries are being made to dealers in large volume.

During the last 6 months OPA forecasters have been building up imaginary future profits on unproduced and undelivered new cars and then assessing trade discount cuts against them. The fact that strikes, material and labor shortages, increased costs and acts of God may intervene to overturn OPA estimates apparently means nothing to the agency. It stands by its figures, once they are made.

I am talking now about our experiences with the income forecasting under Mr. Bowles. The same statisticians and advertising agency chart drafters who helped him arrive at his rosy but wrong conclusions about possible dealer incomes up to March 1, 1946, are, I understand, still on the job under Mr. Porter. We hope that Mr. Porter will insist on far broader coverage of our industry than OPA "samplings" to date have shown.

The forecast of new car business for 1945–46 upon which Mr. Bowles built his plan to take from 11 percent to 13 percent from the automobile dealers is a splendid example of OPA miscalculation. It was predicated on the theory that once OPA made an estimate of dealer earnings they were as good as in

the till. I shall show you how widely Mr. Bowles and OPA missed the mark.

When Mr. Bowles appeared before the House Small Business Committee on November 13, 1945, he predicted an average annual new-car production of about 4,000,000 by March 1946. Well, it is now March 1946, and official new-car production reports which we have just obtained from the Civilian Production Administration show that Mr. Bowles' estimate was slightly more than 800 percent too high. During February 1946 new passenger cars were produced at the annual rate of less than 600,000 and not 4,000,000 a year. Furthermore, since new passenger car production started last July up to March 1, last, exactly 190,232 units had been produced. That is an average of 23,779 cars per month, or a rate of less than 300,000 per year.

There were several special reasons for this low production, of course. During the House Small Business Committee hearings we called attention to possible curbs on production. We pointed out that both the automobile and steel-plant strikes would slow up assembly lines. But did OPA back up on its figures? Not for a second. In fact, Mr. Bowles on the witness stand became so enthusiastic over dealer prospects for 1946 that he suggested a 5,000,000-car production average by midsummer.

It is just as impossible today for OPA to forecast future new-car production accurately as it was last fall. Do not think that because the automobile and steel strikes have been designated by the Government as settled that full new-car production is just around the corner. Not all strikes in General Motors are settled. The new back-to-work policy announced by the management today improves the outlook but many plants making vital parts have been unable to resume operations. Trouble is being had in plants of other companies over the failure of workers to produce at reasonable speed. Likewise, there is possibility of a coal strike early in April. If miners strike, all steel plants will be closed down within 2 weeks and the supply of steel for automobile factories shut off.

Dealers everywhere are being importuned for new cars and information as to when normal production will be reached. No one can answer that. The best-informed production men in the Nation today doubt if more than 60 percent of normal production can be reached this year even under the most favorable circumstances.

The national business situation cries for a coordination of planning, not by amateurs or persons interested in only one phase of the subject, but by persons of sufficient scope of economic vision to see the whole picture. It needs the attention of a group which will admit frankly that a plan which is fair to all is the only one which will put the production of the country into high gear. Congress unquestionably must take the leadership in doing this job. Various Government agencies, including OPA, have demonstrated their inability to get results due to the biased methods adopted. The principal reason why these agencies have failed is that they have sought to favor some groups at the expense of others. That, fundamentally, is what is wrong with OPA particularly today. Administrator Bowles, for reasons doubtless regarded by him as sufficient, has persistently encouraged increased labor costs throughout industry, especially where CIO unions were concerned, and then raised his hands in horror at the suggestion that some of these costs be passed along to the public or almost anybody but the retailer.

The retail automobile dealers of the United States have had a striking example of that policy impressed upon them within the last few days.

OPA, unquestionably under the direction of Mr. Bowles, has warned dealers that they may expect to be compelled to pay the entire wage increases won by CIO automobile factory workers in their recent strikes. This will be approximately $80,000,000 a year. That is more money by $5,500,000 than all of the dealers in the United States who pay Federal income taxes netted during 1941, the last full year of new-car production.

Not one penny of these CIO wage increases is to be paid by either manufacturers or the public, dealers have been advised by OPA. Manufacturers cannot afford to meet the increases, OPA says. OPA also vigorously protests against the ability and willingness of the public to pay the increased costs of new cars. The consumer simply must not be permitted to spend his money in this way, OPA insists. It is bad economy for the prosperous buyer to pay such cost, but good economy for the hard-up dealer to do so, we are told.

Nothing was said by Mr. Bowles and others during the strikes about the dealers having to pay these wage increases. Emphasis was laid by the strikers, Secretary Wallace, and other administration leaders on the ability of the automobile manufacturers to pay. When the strike was settled, it was the dealers who got it in the neck.

The first that the dealers knew about the OPA plan to make them pay for the strike came a few hours before the strike was called off officially on March 13. The dealers' advisory committee was called to Chicago and, without any preliminaries, told that the dealers' profit margin would be cut 2 percent to pay the strike bill. No dealer or any member of the advisory committee was consulted in advance about the ability of dealers to pay. OPA officials simply said the dealers would have to take the rap and that was that.

The total 7½ percent in dealer profit reductions which has been taken by OPA under guidance of Mr. Bowles has consisted of three bites.

The first, of 2½ percent, was announced by Mr. Bowles last November, following an interesting hearing before the House Small Business Committee. Mr. Bowles had planned a cost-absorption cut of 5 percent, but he said after the hearing that income and cost figures produced by the dealers had helped convince him that 2½ percent would be sufficient. The fact that more than 400 Members of the House and about 50 Members of the Senate appeared at the hearings and protested against any and all cost-absorption cuts being imposed on automobile dealers may also have influenced Mr. Bowles' decision.

Incidentally, Mr. Bowles at that hearing assured the House committee that the cut in dealer income he then proposed to make would be the last one. His statement to this effect appears on page 1538 of the printed record of the hearing. Representative PLOESER, of Missouri, had asked him the direct question if more cuts of dealer income were to follow the first one then under discussion. Bowles denied there would be other cuts. The testimony:

"Mr. PLOESER. The next question then is this: Is this the end of this or is it just the first mile, and are you going to take another crack at it in another few months?

"Mr. BOWLES. This is the end of it. We are establishing the consumer prices on automobiles and once they are established they are established."

While Mr. Bowles was thus testifying his office was in the process of putting into effect another, but secret, 3-percent cut in dealer earnings. This levy was taken out of the dealer handling charge, a 5-percent allowance which had been recognized in the trade for many years and was approved by an OPA order in 1942 which remained in effect until OPA cut it in the fall of 1945. The fact that this 3 percent was thus taken away from dealers never has been publicized by OPA. For several months after the House hearing, until late in January 1946, OPA even evaded all efforts by NADA to learn what was being done on the vigorous dealer protest against the cut. Finally, Mr. Bowles, in a letter to me, approved the cut and sought to defend it. Parenthetically, we have appealed this decision to Administrator Porter, and he has agreed to give us his findings soon.

Now the present 2-percent strike wage cut brings the three bites up to 7½ percent and makes Mr. Bowles' statement to the House Small Business Committee that the original cut would be the last one sound strange indeed.

We believe that our chief difficulties with OPA rise from our two wholly different interpretations of what Congress intended to say about OPA controls when it wrote the price-fixing law. OPA and NADA opinions divide on these two important points:

1. Dealers believe that Congress intended that trade advisory committees should be consulted by OPA in advance of the issuance of any orders affecting the respective committee's industries and their recommendations should be given weight. OPA customarily ignores our advisory committee except as a channel for announcing decisions already reached.

2. Dealers believe that Congress intended that section 2 (h) of the Pricing Act should prohibit OPA from changing any and all established trade and cost practices. OPA takes an opposite view and has used this section of the law as a vehicle for unloading vast cost-absorption charges on automobile dealers.

Neither of these complaints was applicable to OPA in its formative period. In fact, Mr. Bowles' predecessors, Leon Henderson and Prentiss Brown, in their relations with automobile dealers gave evidence of holding the same views on these two points as do the dealers today.

Mr. Henderson at the outset of his administration assembled a well-trained group of automobile men who earnestly endeavored to cooperate with our advisory committee. Of the greatest importance, Mr. Henderson urged these assistants to adhere strictly to the wording of the law wherein it sought to prohibit the disturbance of standard trade practices.

When Mr. Henderson retired in favor of Mr. Brown one of the most widely experienced automobile men in the Nation, the late former Senator Clyde Herring, of Iowa, was installed as Assistant Administrator and supervisor of automotive matters. Having helped draft the pricing law, he appreciated congressional intent and shared the dealer views in that regard.

With the passing of Administrators Henderson and Brown great changes in the personnel and the interpretation of OPA's duties and powers came.

Trained automobile men disappeared from the organization with marked rapidity. The last man with any extended retail experience, Mr. Jo Roberts, left several months ago. In their stead, to handle the most intricate dealer problems, frequently involving possible losses of hundreds of millions of dollars and grave service disturbances, came men who knew absolutely nothing about the retail motorcar business. The single remaining man at OPA who has had any automobile experience is a former member of the personnel bureau of an auto manufacturing company. He is without retail automotive experience.

The most noticeable changes of all, however, have come in OPA's attitude toward consulting the advisory committee and using section 2 (h) of the law as a means of enforcing severe cost absorptions.

Ignoring our dealer advisory committee has become a commonplace practice. In the beginning OPA officials invited 81 dealers from all parts of the country to come here at intervals and at their own expense to advise the agency. Many of the best dealers of

the country gladly responded, and for a time they were consulted. They did not always agree with OPA's decisions, but at least they had a chance to express their views. With the advent of Mr. Bowles, the situation changed. After that the advisory committee, which now has been reduced to 25 members, usually was not consulted on any major subject, but was simply called in and told what OPA had decided to do to the dealers.

It has been under OPA's interpretation of section 2 (h) of the Pricing Act, that dealers have suffered most. In a manner which dealers regard as wholly contrary to the intent of Congress, OPA during the administration of Mr. Bowles, sought persistently to change the trade practices and lower trade discounts of retail automobile dealers. It is in absolute defiance of this section of the law, as interpreted by dealers and many congressional Members who wrote it, that OPA already has cut dealer profits 5½ percent. OPA now states an additional 2 percent is to be imposed and dealers have no assurance that the end is yet here. They may still be called upon to bear increased steel costs. You will recall that following the study of the incomes of 300 dealers last fall, Mr. Bowles advised the dealers that they might have to accept cuts of from 11 percent to 13 percent in their 24 percent gross trade discount. Dealers have good reason to believe he still has such total cuts in mind.

At the request of congressional leaders, NADA has made every effort to work out its problems with OPA officials administratively. It recognizes the great burdens which Congress is carrying. But congressional leaders have told us repeatedly not to hesitate to come directly to the Hill if we find we cannot work out our problems administratively with OPA. That time has arrived and that is why we are here today. We shall tell our story here and before other committees as it seems necessary and prudent. We dealers believe implicity in the right of the American businessman to come to Congress and speak for himself. Likewise we respect the right of Mr. Bowles and others to disagree with us. We believe that there is nothing sinister or greedy in such frank exchanges of views.

Auto dealers contend that if section 2 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act were interpreted by OPA as Congress intended it should be, the retail automobile dealers of the United States today would be enjoying their normal average trade discount of 24 percent. Under it no more than 75 percent of the income-tax-paying dealers ever made money, so endeavoring to hold that discount scarcely can be termed avaricious.

The section of the law to which I refer reads as follows:

"The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, or changes in established rental practices, except where such action is affirmatively found by the administrator to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

Congress obviously intended that this section should prohibit the Price Administrator from changing trade practices and trade discounts at will. He was authorized to make such changes only when it became necessary to prevent evasion of a pricing order. Not by the wildest stretch of the imagination can anybody conceive of the OPA cuts automobile dealers have had slapped down on them being classified as a result of attempted evasion of the law. These income slashes have been made for other reasons.

Let us suppose for a moment that Mr. Bowles had asked Congress to write into the law definite authority for him to do to the automobile dealers under section 2 (h) what he has done to them. For instance, suppose he had asked for this provision:

"When, in the opinion of the Administrator, the retail automobile dealers can stand a cut of 2½ percent in their new passenger-car prices, he may, without surveying the incomes of more than 1 percent of the dealers of the country and without examining the manufacturing costs of more than one-fourth of the automobile industry inflict a 2½ percent trade discount cut on the said dealers."

Does any member of this committee contend that Congress would have granted Mr. Bowles any such authority? Of course, not. Yet in November 1945 Mr. Bowles imposed on the 32,000 retail automobile dealers of this country just such a cut as suggested and in exactly the manner described.

Again, suppose Mr. Bowles has asked for this sort of a provision in the law:

"When, in the opinion of the Administrator, the OPA approved 5 percent handling charge allowance for dealers should be lowered, he may lower it to 2 percent without consulting either dealers or their advisory committee."

Does anyone say that Congress ever would have granted Mr. Bowles such authority? Of course, not. Yet in the fall of 1945, when it became apparent that dealers were about to oppose Mr. Bowles' initial attempt to cut their trade discount, he quietly cut their handling allowance by 3 percent. He also did this without consulting a single dealer in the United States or any member of the dealer advisory committee.

Finally, suppose Mr. Bowles had asked Congress to approve this amendment:

"If, as a result of strikes, the wages of employees of automobile manufacturing plants of the country are increased, the Administrator shall have the power to impose the full cost of these wage increases upon the retail automobile dealers by lowering their trade discounts. Further, the Administrator may impose the cost of these wage increases of manufacturer employees upon dealers without consulting any dealer or the dealer's advisory committee."

Does anyone suppose that Congress would have written such a provision in the pricing law? Of course not. Yet within the last fortnight, OPA has advised the dealers that they are going to have to pay for the wage increase granted by the manufacturers, and this action was decided upon by OPA without any dealer consultation whatsoever.

Gentlemen of the committee, we automobile dealers feel that the ignoring of advisory committees and slashing of dealer discounts by OPA are clear violations of the intent of Congress. Fortunately, we are not alone in that view. Our position on these matters has been clearly upheld by the chairman of the House Small Business Committee and your colleague on this committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

At the time of our hearings on the first proposed discount cut, last November, Chairman PATMAN directly questioned Mr. Bowles particularly regarding his changing of automobile dealer cost practices. Chairman PATMAN told Mr. Bowles as forcibly as any man could that section 2 (h), which Mr. PATMAN helped write, never was intended to give Mr. Bowles and OPA the power to slash dealer discounts which they had been exercising.

I quote from the official transcript of these hearings. On pages 1515–1516 and 1519 the following interchange between Mr. PATMAN and Mr. Bowles appears:

"The CHAIRMAN. I was one of the authors of the amendment in the Banking and Currency Committee considering price control, and which provided for these advisory committees. It was the judgment that each industry should furnish committees of their own of informed men, to keep you advised of the facts concerning that industry.

"Mr. BOWLES. That is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. In order, possibly, that there may be a minimum of increase made?

"Mr. BOWLES. That is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. I was interested in writing that bill, and as you know, we spent 4 months in that committee writing it; but there was another thing that we wanted to make sure of, and that was that established business practices would not be interfered with. We wanted to make sure that the methods of business were not interfered with, and we wanted to make sure that everything would go along, as far as possible, the same as they did before. I recall now—and I do not say this because you are in the advertising business, because as I understand it, you have sold out your interest in that business; it is not personal at all; but when we brought this question up a lot of people said, 'This is going to destroy all national advertising, it will eliminate every budget on advertising, it will ruin the newspapers and magazines, and it should not be done at all.'

"For those reasons, among others, we were very careful that we wrote into the law something to the effect that we would recognize established trade practices. Do you have a copy of the act there?"

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would turn to section 2 (h). I believe that is the section that was written into the bill relating to this matter. I have a copy of section 2 (h) here, and I will read it:

" 'The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, or changes in established rental practices, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Administrator to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.'

"Now, is not that written into the law?

"Mr. BOWLES. That is right. You have read it correctly.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is the part that disturbed me when this matter came up, because I was rather clear about the object and intention of the people who sat around that committee table, like this one here, writing the original act, and I gave you that advertising example because it is the one that was brought to our attention first. They said, 'You must write something in there that will not change business abruptly; we have to keep business; we have always had it,' and this language was written in there for the purpose of preserving it."

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me that the very intent of the provision of the act that has been quoted here was to stop you from having authority to interfere with and wreck established cost prices, but that your duty is to stop the increases of prices."

I am not a lawyer nor a legislator, but as a plain citizen and a businessman, I believe I know what Congress had in mind when it wrote this pricing law. It wanted to set up a temporary control of prices so as to hold them within reasonable limits until such a time as something near peacetime production would restore the greatest price control agency of all, free competition.

Congress certainly never intended to create OPA or any other agency to harass and financially cripple automobile dealers in every one of the 3,300 counties of the United States. Yet that is what OPA is doing today.

Rather than devoting its energies to finding ways of compelling dealers to pay wage increases to employees of other industrialists, it seems to us that OPA might better be applying itself to evolving methods to help dealers get new cars on the roads and keep used cars in repair. Improved private transportation today is the outstanding need of the Nation. Millions of persons urgently require new automobiles. The currently running 22,000,000 used cars are desperately behind in repairs and service. It is to the retail automobile dealers of the country that

these car users look for aid. At every crossroads, in every village, town and city these 32,000 dealers are actively engaged in rendering service and 10,000 more waiting on the sidelines are eager and anxious to put motor transportation back on its feet.

Selling and servicing cars is the life work and ambition of this army of dealers. You know them. Most of them are located on corners near your homes and look after your car for you and your families. They are alive. They are leaders in your communities. They have been prominent in local war activities. They now are assisting with local postwar plans. They are raring to go. But they are bewildered and perplexed not only by a shortage of goods, but by a succession of confusing orders and severe levies on their future possible earnings by OPA. It seems to them that they are being singled out particularly by OPA for shellackings. The workers get more money with OPA approval, the manufacturers get increased prices with OPA approval, the car buyer gets prices practically on a 1942 basis with OPA approval, and the dealer gets cuts in his future income with enthusiastic OPA approval.

The dealer comes to Congress earnestly asking for help. He does not seek a bonus nor a subsidy. All he wants is an opportunity to conduct his business, at least until he gets back on his feet, under the same trade rules and practices that obtained before war forced the stoppage of his supply of new goods. He believes that Congress originally intended to assure him of that right and still wants him to have it. Maybe all he needs is a little clarification of the present law. He would like you to apply your knowledge and experience in making the law read so that no Government expert can read into it some handicap for retailers which a majority of Congress never intended should be there.

The dealer is not an expert on words or legal phrases, but he thinks some such remedial steps as these would help him:

1. Amend section 2 (h) so that neither OPA nor any other Government may change standard trade practices such as the dealer handling charge and all such changes of this nature previously made by OPA shall be declared null and void.

2. Amend section 2 (h) so that neither OPA nor any other Government agency may change established cost practices and trade discounts, and that all such actions previously taken shall be declared null and void.

3. Amend the existing law so that all price controls in a given industry shall be automatically lifted, without the necessity of obtaining the consent of OPA, upon production in the individual industry reaching 75 percent of the average normal production for the years that may be adopted as the base period. The advisory committee or committees of the respective industry do certify and support by evidence the fact that the required production levels have been reached.

4. Incorporate in the existing law the provision that all OPA-instituted controls and changes whatsoever in normal methods of doing business shall expire with the lifting of price controls in a given industry and that thereafter any attempt to continue such controls shall be illegal.

Cattle on Farms January 1, 1939, and January 1, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following official tables from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate the milk cattle and the nonmilk cattle on farms in the United States on January 1, 1939, and January 1, 1946:

Cattle on farms

JAN. 1, 1939

State	Cows, heifers, heifer calves kept for milk				Other cattle, including cows, heifers, and heifer calves for beef, all bulls and steers	Total, all cattle
	Cows 2 years old and older	Heifers 1 to 2 years	Heifer calves under 1 year	Total milk cows, heifers, and heifer calves, sum of (1), (2), and (3)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Alabama	293,000	108,000	133,000	634,000	345,000	979,000
Arizona	47,000	11,000	13,000	71,000	784,000	855,000
Arkansas	466,000	120,000	154,000	740,000	340,000	1,080,000
California	700,000	180,000	184,000	1,064,000	1,236,000	2,300,000
Colorado	235,000	51,000	56,000	342,000	1,058,000	1,400,000
Connecticut	126,000	20,000	21,000	167,000	9,000	176,000
Delaware	35,000	6,000	6,000	47,000	5,000	52,000
Florida	113,000	39,000	45,000	197,000	623,000	820,000
Georgia	365,000	93,000	106,000	564,000	360,000	924,000
Idaho	206,000	48,000	63,000	317,000	391,000	708,000
Illinois	1,109,000	230,000	305,000	1,644,000	1,055,000	2,699,000
Indiana	742,000	151,000	169,000	1,062,000	541,000	1,603,000
Iowa	1,440,000	278,000	305,000	2,023,000	2,442,000	4,465,000
Kansas	709,000	127,000	149,000	985,000	1,615,000	2,600,000
Kentucky	540,000	98,000	105,000	743,000	452,000	1,195,000
Louisiana	329,000	79,000	101,000	509,000	639,000	1,148,000
Maine	138,000	33,000	37,000	208,000	23,000	231,000
Maryland	194,000	36,000	42,000	272,000	50,000	322,000
Massachusetts	138,000	24,000	26,000	188,000	9,000	197,000
Michigan	923,000	207,000	231,000	1,361,000	314,000	1,675,000
Minnesota	1,688,000	356,000	390,000	2,434,000	874,000	3,308,000
Mississippi	547,000	113,000	134,000	794,000	492,000	1,286,000
Missouri	926,000	170,000	217,000	1,313,000	1,142,000	2,455,000
Montana	151,000	27,000	38,000	216,000	790,000	1,006,000
Nebraska	614,000	138,000	158,000	910,000	1,900,000	2,810,000
Nevada	21,000	6,000	7,000	34,000	338,000	372,000
New Hampshire	78,000	17,000	18,000	113,000	11,000	124,000
New Jersey	143,000	20,000	23,000	186,000	11,000	197,000
New Mexico	78,000	19,000	22,000	119,000	1,144,000	1,263,000
New York	1,387,000	263,000	300,000	1,950,000	129,000	2,079,000
North Carolina	341,000	62,000	79,000	482,000	113,000	595,000
North Dakota	496,000	110,000	130,000	736,000	457,000	1,193,000
Ohio	1,018,000	208,000	237,000	1,463,000	528,000	1,991,000
Oklahoma	734,000	182,000	239,000	1,155,000	1,081,000	2,236,000
Oregon	267,000	60,000	63,000	390,000	529,000	919,000
Pennsylvania	863,000	186,000	216,000	1,265,000	204,000	1,469,000
Rhode Island	23,000	2,000	3,000	28,000	1,000	29,000
South Carolina	170,000	37,000	42,000	249,000	75,000	324,000
South Dakota	482,000	120,000	130,000	732,000	783,000	1,515,000
Tennessee	552,000	100,000	121,000	773,000	385,000	1,158,000
Texas	1,444,000	275,000	291,000	2,010,000	5,018,000	7,028,000
Utah	103,000	26,000	31,000	160,000	268,000	428,000
Vermont	296,000	59,000	61,000	416,000	22,000	438,000
Virginia	405,000	72,000	85,000	562,000	300,000	862,000
Washington	342,000	80,000	88,000	510,000	269,000	779,000
West Virginia	236,000	39,000	46,000	321,000	248,000	569,000
Wisconsin	2,179,000	424,000	466,000	3,069,000	270,000	3,339,000
Wyoming	68,000	12,000	18,000	98,000	730,000	828,000
United States	24,600,000	5,122,000	5,904,000	35,626,000	30,403,000	66,029,000

JAN. 1, 1946

Alabama	452,000	126,000	169,000	747,000	521,000	1,268,000
Arizona	49,000	14,000	15,000	78,000	908,000	986,000
Arkansas	525,000	141,000	166,000	832,000	482,000	1,314,000
California	851,000	215,000	190,000	1,256,000	1,304,000	2,560,000
Colorado	236,000	53,000	63,000	352,000	1,568,000	1,920,000
Connecticut	134,000	19,000	21,000	174,000	11,000	185,000
Delaware	39,000	8,000	7,000	54,000	6,000	60,000
Florida	140,000	43,000	60,000	243,000	962,000	1,205,000
Georgia	407,000	107,000	113,000	627,000	465,000	1,092,000
Idaho	249,000	58,000	73,000	380,000	504,000	884,000
Illinois	1,144,000	277,000	312,000	1,733,000	1,414,000	3,147,000
Indiana	790,000	165,000	182,000	1,137,000	699,000	1,836,000
Iowa	1,438,000	305,000	310,000	2,053,000	3,033,000	5,086,000
Kansas	734,000	150,000	165,000	1,049,000	2,515,000	3,564,000
Kentucky	604,000	94,000	109,000	807,000	559,000	1,366,000
Louisiana	345,000	93,000	116,000	554,000	922,000	1,476,000
Maine	126,000	34,000	35,000	195,000	20,000	215,000
Maryland	222,000	42,000	40,000	304,000	69,000	373,000
Massachusetts	131,000	25,000	23,000	179,000	9,000	188,000
Michigan	1,069,000	250,000	285,000	1,604,000	352,000	1,956,000
Minnesota	1,735,000	382,000	375,000	2,492,000	1,041,000	3,533,000
Mississippi	591,000	133,000	138,000	862,000	641,000	1,503,000
Missouri	1,079,000	196,000	228,000	1,503,000	1,610,000	3,113,000
Montana	152,000	32,000	57,000	241,000	1,569,000	1,810,000
Nebraska	591,000	143,000	165,000	899,000	2,948,000	3,847,000
Nevada	21,000	8,000	11,000	40,000	426,000	466,000
New Hampshire	71,000	16,000	16,000	103,000	11,000	114,000
New Jersey	153,000	23,000	19,000	195,000	15,000	210,000
New Mexico	73,000	14,000	16,000	103,000	1,139,000	1,242,000
New York	1,455,000	282,000	266,000	2,003,000	115,000	2,118,000
North Carolina	386,000	66,000	85,000	537,000	154,000	691,000
North Dakota	531,000	122,000	159,000	812,000	982,000	1,794,000
Ohio	1,149,000	241,000	254,000	1,644,000	571,000	2,215,000
Oklahoma	866,000	203,000	290,000	1,359,000	1,577,000	2,936,000
Oregon	261,000	61,000	78,000	400,000	712,000	1,112,000
Pennsylvania	942,000	221,000	219,000	1,382,000	225,000	1,607,000
Rhode Island	22,000	3,000	3,000	28,000	1,000	29,000
South Carolina	186,000	40,000	52,000	278,000	114,000	392,000

Cattle on farms—Continued

JAN. 1, 1946—continued

State	Cows, heifers, heifer calves kept for milk				Other cattle, including cows, heifers, and heifer calves for beef, all bulls and steers	Total, all cattle
	Cows 2 years old and older	Heifers 1 to 2 years	Heifer calves under 1 year	Total milk cows, heifers, and heifer calves, sum of (1), (2), and (3)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
South Dakota	476,000	129,000	162,000	767,000	1,668,000	2,435,000
Tennessee	639,000	104,000	111,000	854,000	511,000	1,365,000
Texas	1,575,000	267,000	319,000	2,161,000	5,897,000	8,058,000
Utah	123,000	30,000	43,000	196,000	350,000	546,000
Vermont	302,000	62,000	59,000	423,000	22,000	445,000
Virginia	469,000	89,000	93,000	651,000	364,000	1,015,000
Washington	372,000	86,000	105,000	563,000	395,000	958,000
West Virginia	236,000	38,000	43,000	317,000	249,000	566,000
Wisconsin	2,577,000	502,000	519,000	3,598,000	349,000	3,947,000
Wyoming	67,000	14,000	16,000	97,000	946,000	1,043,000
United States	26,785,000	5,726,000	6,355,000	38,866,000	40,925,000	79,791,000

You will note that on January 1, 1939, there were 35,626,000 milk cattle and 30,403,000 other cattle in the United States.

On January 1, 1946, there were 38,866,000 dairy cattle and 40,925,000 other cattle in the United States.

During these years, there has been an increase of 4,000,000 in cattle kept for milk, and an increase of 10,000,000 in the other cattle.

While there may be a downward trend in numbers at this time, it is very evident that the cattle producers—both for milk and for beef—have made a most outstanding contribution to the production of milk and meat needed for the war.

One must take into consideration that 1942 was the first year since the low tariff of 1913, except a short period in World War I, that the United States supplied its own beef. This makes the increase in numbers all the more impressive. Of course huge amounts of feed grains were imported during the war like the quarter billion bushels imported in 1944.

Lumber Exports Amount to Small Percentage of Lumber Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on lumber exports:

John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has made public an interagency report which showed that:

Exports of lumber in 1945 amounted to less than 1.4 percent of total United States lumber production;

Imports of lumber to this country since the war have been consistently twice as large as lumber exports, and more than half the imports for the first 9 months of 1945 were types of lumber normally used for construction;

After careful screening by the Department of Commerce and the Civilian Production Administration, foreign requirements for 1945 were set at 1,000,000,000 board feet, but actual export shipments did not exceed 375,000,000 board feet.

After reviewing the report, Mr. Snyder asked the Department of Commerce and the Civilian Production Administration to continue their careful screening of lumber export requirements in 1946.

Mr. Snyder's letter to the agency heads and text of the report follow:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Members of my staff have just completed a report, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government, on United States lumber production and exports during 1945. The report shows that actual export shipments of lumber during the calendar year 1945 are not expected to exceed 375,000,000 board feet, or 1.36 percent of total United States lumber production for that year. The report further indicates that the small percentage of lumber shipped abroad is used not only for the restoration of war-devastated countries, but is in the interest of our national policy, and that much of the lumber exported is not suitable for housing.

"In the face of its critical shortage of construction lumber, the fact that the United States has been able during 1945 to assist the devastated areas of Europe in some small measure, reflects considerable credit on the care and good judgment of your agency and the other agencies concerned. I am sure that during 1946 your agency will continue to screen lumber requirements for export with the same close attention, in order to make certain that lumber is exported in absolute minimum quantities for purposes of essential rehabilitation of war-torn areas, or to benefit our domestic economy and national interest.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN W. SNYDER.
Director."

UNITED STATES LUMBER EXPORTS: STAFF REPORT TO THE DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Lumber production for the first 9 months of 1945 was 22,000,000,000 board feet. Lumber exports by the United States are subject to export licenses, and were 268,600,000 board feet, representing 1.22 percent of total United States lumber production for the first 9 months of 1945.

For the entire year 1945, lumber production is expected to reach 27,500,000,000 board feet and actual export shipments will not exceed 375,000,000 board feet or 1.36 percent of the total United States lumber production for 1945.

It is apparent from the above figures that the amount of lumber shipped abroad is an exceedingly small percentage of total production.

Of the approximately 375,000,000 board feet shipped in 1945, about 30 percent or approximately 113,000,000 board feet is hardwood. This type of lumber goes into railroad transportation, shipbuilding, furniture, tool handles, and other manufacturing. Little goes into home construction.

An additional 35 percent of the lumber shipped in 1945—approximately 131,000,000 board feet—is in timber size which normally does not go into home building but rather into heavy construction such as docks, railroads, shipbuilding, factory construction, inland waterways—barges and canal locks—mining, petroleum, and repair of war damage. Some of this lumber if retained in the United States might funnel into home construction but the cost of cutting it into required sizes is extremely high.

Some of the United States lumber mills, especially in the Douglas fir region, are only equipped to produce lumber sizes usually demanded for export. Should such exports be frozen, these mills might be forced to curtail or even cease operations entirely since they could not easily produce the domestic grades of lumber.

The remaining 35 percent of the lumber shipped in 1945—approximately 131,000,000 board feet—is lumber which can be used in home construction. Overseas it is used for housing, factory construction, commercial building, and millwork.

The exportation of this lumber is not only in the interest of our national policy to aid in the restoration of war-devastated countries but much of the lumber exported has been for purposes which redound directly to the benefit of our own economy.

Sugar and tin are scarce commodities very urgently required by the United States. Some of our lumber exports are used for sugar production in Cuba and for tin mines in Bolivia.

Lumber shipped to the liberated areas of Europe is used for the rehabilitation of docks and wharves, railroads, bridges, canals, and inland waterways. The rehabilitation of the transportation system of these countries is essential to their economy and permits them to reestablish their exports so as to restore their trade with this country. It contributes to facilitating the redeployment of our troops and supplies from Europe.

A portion of the lumber exported to the Netherlands went into the construction of bins, which the Dutch used for growing early spring vegetables. A large portion of these vegetables goes to our men in the army of occupation in Europe. Another portion of the lumber shipped to Holland was for the repair of dikes to permit early deflooding of agricultural land so that food could once more be grown in those areas.

Lumber for the repair of war-damaged buildings in Europe largely came from the forest sources within the country or from Sweden. However, these supplies were inadequate to meet the most immediate needs and some small quantities of construction lumber were shipped for emergency housing, particularly to the United Kingdom.

If we assume that approximately 8,000 to 10,000 board feet of lumber are used per dwelling unit, the construction lumber shipped overseas would be sufficient for approximately 13,000 to 16,500 homes.

It is interesting to note that since the war began lumber imports to the United States have been consistently twice as large as our exports. For the first 9 months of 1945 our imports amounted to 742,000,000 board feet, as against an export figure of 269,000,000 board feet. Considerably more than half of these imports were of types of lumber normally used for home construction.

For 1946, United States lumber production is expected to be approximately 30,000,000,000 board feet. Of this amount construction

lumber may represent as much as 19,000,000,000 board feet.

If 500,000 housing units are constructed in 1946, this will require 5,000,000,000 board feet of construction lumber (assuming 10,000 board feet per unit), leaving about 4,000,000,000 board feet of domestic construction lumber for all other purposes.

The total amount of all lumber requested by foreign countries for export during 1946 is over 4,000,000,000 board feet. This, however, has been screened to a total requirement of 1,300,000,000 board feet by the Civilian Production Administration and the Department of Commerce, which administer the export controls over lumber. Further screening is still continuing to determine whether additional reductions shall be made. Where any unbalanced situation occurs, either as to types of lumber or in areas from which lumber is exported, CPA and Commerce can take the necessary steps to correct the situation; also, all requirements are not actually shipped. In 1945 screened requirements were set at 1,000,000,000 board feet, while exports will amount to no more than 375,000,000 board feet.

It is apparent that the present shortage of lumber for housing is not due to increased exports, but rather to shortages in production, absence of pipe lines, and maldistribution of available lumber supply. Appropriate actions are being taken by all of the Government agencies concerned toward correcting this situation. Surplus disposal of lumber, price adjustment, recruitment of labor by USES, and channeling of lumber into housing are some of the steps being taken to adjust the lumber shortage.

Fraternalism in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk which I delivered before the Potomac Lodge of Odd Fellows at its annual banquet at Alexandria, Va., on March 22, 1946, on the subject of fraternalism in the atomic age.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be your guest at this first annual banquet of the Potomac Lodge of Odd Fellows since 1941. We are thankful indeed that victory has blessed our cause and that on this spring day of 1946 we can gather together in good fellowship and good cheer to celebrate the triumph of our armed forces and of our industrial and agricultural might.

It is a privilege to address you, good friends, especially you veterans. I am speaking to leaders, to leaders not only in the proud ranks of Odd Fellows, but to leaders in business life, in community life, in spiritual life. I am speaking to men who seek, as I do, more light, more truth, more inspiration so that we may grow beyond the shell of yesterday and make a contribution to our times. It's a great time to be alive. It's a great time to be with you here tonight.

This is by way of a homecoming for me, to be among my brothers and sisters. That brings to mind an incident which occurred some time ago:

A college was having a homecoming, the fiftieth anniversary of its first commencement. It had arranged to have its most prominent son make the speech of the occasion. He began in somewhat this manner:

"It was 50 years ago that our class had its commencement. Those 50 years have flown on eagle's wings. They have been rich in experience. Our country has grown great during that period. Modern invention has transformed it in every field of human activity. Tonight I can sing God Bless America, and the song of my old alma mater.

"The years have been so full of rich experiences, new demands, great challenges, that I have not had the time to indulge in reminiscence. But now, on this occasion, with old friends around me, the hands of the clock are turned back, and I see myself on a moonlight night, sitting out on yonder college wall, the same wall that is out there now.

"And I believe it was the same apple tree which still stands there, like myself now grown a little older, a little sturdier, (in those days I was a spare fellow). This apple tree was in blossom, and that night I sat up there on the wall with a young lady, with the moon full and the apple blossoms overhead. Under the inspiration of the time and place, I kissed that girl. Now, if that young lady, now grown a little older in years, should happen to be in this audience and is no more ashamed of the occasion than I am, I wish she would arise."

And immediately 17 gray-haired women arose!

THE VALUE OF HUMOR

Yes, it is obvious that we all appreciate a good laugh in these troubled times. "A merry heart maketh a cheerful countenance," says the Good Book. "Laugh and the world laughs with you," said Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

Humor has within it the power to release us from taut nerves, from tension, from constricted thinking. Abraham Lincoln knew that, and so he began his Cabinet meetings with a wholesome yarn. Otherwise, if he had not spun a good joke, his Cabinet members, gripped with fear and worry over a desperate war with an indomitable foe would have been no good in such a tense state to him, to themselves, or to their country.

Humor clears away the negative mists from before our eyes. It enables us to use our God-given vision. You remember the words of Job:

"Open up my eyes that I may see the glory of Thy law."

With open eyes, too, we can see the value of fraternalism in this atomic age. And it is this which is my subject tonight. Yes, my good friends, we are going to see the meaning of fraternalism to you and to me in these stirring times.

THE MEANING OF FRATERNALISM

Fraternalism is, indeed, like the atom bomb in its great power. But fraternalism's uses are all constructive. Fraternalism can explode suspicion, hatred, bigotry, and intolerance. It can level man-made barriers of distrust, fear, and worry.

Fraternalism, like atomic energy, can be a greater force for good than men have ever dreamed of. It can bring untold peace and happiness to our own lives and to the lives of our brothers and sisters.

Fraternalism, the creed of the Odd Fellows, is the embodiment of the Golden Rule—doing as we would be done by. This is the injunction of our Master which has come down to us through the ages. This is the injunction which we must all fulfill—now—if we would save this world from a terrible atomic catastrophe. We and the other nations have no choice today but to apply the Golden Rule. The alternative is a horrible conflagration.

The time to apply the Golden Rule is long overdue. It has come. You remember, perhaps, the quotation:

"There is nothing more powerful in the world than an idea whose time has come."

The idea of fraternalism is the most modern, the most dynamic, the most needed idea to apply in our times.

FRATERNALISM IN OUR DAILY LIVES

We can apply this idea in every sphere of human activity. What manifold opportunities there are for you and for me to apply the Golden Rule in our homes, in our businesses, in our communities.

The sympathetic soul, the helping hand, the sincere smile, the generous greeting, the thoughtful token of regard—these are but a few of the more obvious signs of fraternalism. We can often give to others more valuable spiritual "coin" than the minted "coin of the realm." There comes to mind a poem:

"I gave a beggar from my little store of well-earned gold,
He spent the shining ore,
And came again, and yet again,
Still cold and hungry as before.

"I gave a thought, and though that thought was mine,
He found himself a man, supreme, divine,
Bold, clothed, and crowned with blessings, manifold,
And now he begs no more."

Yes; a spiritual contribution to others can be a far better fraternal gift than a material contribution.

The Master said: "Perfect love casteth out fear." He said, "Do good to them that hate you." These are dynamic ideas for you and me to apply.

I recall, too, the words of a prayer which I read to my colleagues in the Senate the day we bade farewell to our envoys who were going to the San Francisco Conference. The prayer was particularly appropriate, because it had been uttered more than seven centuries previous, in the year 1226, by the man for whom the city of San Francisco was named, St. Francis, of Assisi. I should like to read that prayer to you now, my dear friends:

"Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is discord, union; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

"O, Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love, for it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

There, I believe, is a magnificent expression of the fraternal spirit. It is the kind of spirit engendered by the Odd Fellows' organization. It is the spirit so needed in our troubled times.

You gentlemen have that spirit, I am sure. I know this because, as I have sincerely said, you are leaders. You know that man must grow to his highest dignity, to his greatest level of achievement. Growth is the order of life. Development, unfoldment, is the law of the infant bud and it is the law of the human infant and the grown adult.

FRATERNALISM IN WORLD AFFAIRS

You men know that in this atomic age growth is particularly needed in order that we might be adequate to the great challenges before us. We as individuals are challenged to apply the Golden Rule in our daily lives, and we as a nation are challenged to apply it in international relations.

I have said that fraternalism is the long-overdue idea which must be applied in this age. Fraternalism is the spiritual atomic bomb.

But there is another atomic bomb—the real atomic bomb, the one 20,000 times more destructive than TNT which shattered Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This is the bomb which will be tested in Bikini Atoll. This is the material bomb which challenges us to use the spiritual force of fraternalism lest there be another war and the material bomb blow us off the earth.

One cannot speak of the atom bomb without speaking of the mighty power which faces us today across the world. That power is, of course, Russia, the power which, with America, principally controls the destiny of the world.

My friends, I want now to apply the thoughts of fraternalism to the difficult subject of our relations with Russia. I want to present what I humbly believe is the meaning of fraternalism in terms of American-Soviet affairs. This is a crucial subject. It must be approached realistically, frankly, if our approach is to be at all rewarding.

FRATERNALISM IN RUSSIAN RELATIONS

Why must fraternalism be applied between ourselves and Russia? Because America does not want a third world war. And I do not believe that the Russian people want a third world war.

We must learn to live together peacefully in this world. We must learn to understand one another. There can be no fraternalism without understanding. By American-Russian fraternalism, I do not presume that we can be as friendly with Russia as we can for example be with Canada. No; the difference between ourselves and the Soviets are still too enormous, and I am afraid that much of Russian policy is widening those differences.

But at least, we can strive for understanding and fervently urge the Russians to do likewise. We have a right to our way of life and Russia has a right to hers.

We knew that our perspective differs tremendously from Russian perspective. We Americans have lived on a blessed continent with a democratic background, in plenty, and almost continuously in peace. Russia, in Eurasia, to the contrary, has an undemocratic background. She has known centuries of internal and external hatreds, suspicion, and blood conflicts. Her soil is filled with the blood and bones of invaders and of her own people from countless wars.

Not only is there a vast historical gulf between us but language is an obstacle. A different religious approach is another. Different political and social approaches are still others.

Lastly, we two powers and peoples have an entirely different philosophic approach which causes perhaps the widest chasm of all between us. Russia has felt the impact of Karl Marx's philosophy—the materialistic conception of life and history. Here in America that narrow view, I believe, is on its way out. There are still, of course, many so-called leaders here who make a fetish of economic man. They try to construe economic causes as the principal reasons behind everything. They ignore man's mental, spiritual, and religious yearnings.

These, then, are barriers to fraternalism between us—historic, linguistic, religious, political, social, and philosophic.

But there is still another barrier between us—it is Russia's psychological attitude. She is feeling her strength and the great temptation to use that strength to suit her own purposes. She, with her 200,000,000, stands astride one-sixth of the earth. Her 70 nationalities have been amalgamated by war, her military and industrial might has been proven. She recognizes the opportunity to realize her dream of centuries.

Will she use her strength with judgment, or will she violate the conscience of mankind and run berserk? Will she follow the path of Hitler—the path of conquest which will lead only to her own eventual self-destruction, as it did to Hitler's Reich?

I pray that the answer will be that Russia will not take the Hitler road to ruin.

As I was leaving the office tonight, a reporter brought to me the cabled dispatch about Premier Stalin's answers to questions on international policy. His answers—expressing hope in UNO and peace—are the best news to come out of Europe since Senator VANDENBERG reported to the Senate. We assume that Stalin's words and those of the other UNO leaders will be backed up by the will, intent and purpose for a just and lasting peace—for true fraternalism.

A FRATERNAL AMERICAN-SOVIET PROGRAM

Let me respectfully suggest some ways by which Russia can evidence fraternalism and stimulate fraternalism between us. I do not commence with our country in this connection because Russia knows and the world knows that we are peace-loving in spirit and peace-abiding in action.

Let Russia, therefore, take these steps:

1. Let her raise the "iron curtain." It is only natural for us to fear and distrust the unknown, the secretive. Let, therefore, our reporters, our businessmen, our students and others, have access to the Russian people and the Russian mind. I do not believe that under present circumstances our folks will get there the freedom that Russians get here. But let large numbers of our visitors have some semblance of freedom in Russia and in her satellite nations. Let our private publications go into Russia and into her satellite states, as we allow their magazines into America.

2. Let Russia submit her grievances to the United Nations Organization. Let her not attempt to settle her differences with neighboring powers by unilateral action. Let her display the confidence in UNO that our people have displayed.

3. Let not Russia deny to her neighboring peoples, Poland, Lithuania, and the others, the freedom and security for which those peoples' people bled so grievously in the past war. Let not Russia forget her own feelings when foreign invaders sought to control her destiny.

4. Let Russia consider international control of those local territories which she believes vital to her security and commerce. I refer, for example, to the Kars Plateau, to the Dardanelles, the Kiel Canal, the oil fields of Iran, and to points in the Far East which apparently she demands or will demand full control of but which might well be under control of the United Nations Organization instead.

5. Let Russia cease her meddling in American internal affairs. There is no single force in American society which does more damage to Soviet-American fraternalism than the Communist Party. This party and its members would exist in Russia only long enough to put them up against a firing squad no doubt. This abominable group and its open and secret adherents in high and low places is obnoxious enough in itself, even without its ties with the Communist International in Moscow. With those ties it is manifold more obnoxious.

Let Russia repudiate in fact and word all ties with international agitators, if it would seek our friendship. You remember the old Revolutionary War flag showing a coiled rattlesnake with the inscription: "Don't tread on me."

Let no nation tread on us, meddle in our affairs, agitate strikes and discord.

Now what should America do in her own right to encourage fraternalism?

1. We should be temperate in our words regarding Russia.

2. We should seek to understand her point of view, her fears, and anxieties.

3. We should make our Republic work—with full production, harmony, and cooperation on the home front, so as to prove to Russia, her satellites, and the world our strength.

4. We should serve as the good Samaritan with stricken nations abroad, helping them to help themselves, and showing them once again that a free people is a generous people.

5. We should gird our defenses. We must unfortunately be a coiled rattlesnake if we would not be trod upon; a rattlesnake, however, with the "intentions of a dove and the wiles of a serpent."

The world knows we seek nothing but peace. The greatest source for security in the world is the strength of America.

Rather than destroy our atomic bombs and machinery as has been suggested, we should go all-out in atomic defense and aerial and rocket progress.

Moreover, we must develop the finest and most unified intelligence service in the world. We are aware of the fact that Russia already has a hive of spies in this country which would have put the Nazi espionage system to shame.

We have no choice but to be vigilant and prepared against future contingencies. Our weakness invites contempt and aggression.

6. We must maintain our confidence and hope in the United Nations Organization high. We must redouble our efforts for international peace.

CONCLUSIONS

These, then, my dear friends are the ways, as I see them, for fraternalism in the world of today. They are a curious collection of ways to be sure, but I believe that they are adapted to the curious world we are in.

As Lincoln said: "As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our Nation."

In summary, the key of fraternalism is, I believe, the key to the golden kingdom of a just and enduring peace.

It is the key to our personal happiness and the lives of those who are to follow us.

The Golden Rule must be our personal rule and the international rule.

The prayer of St. Francis must be our prayer and our realization.

I know that you, as good Odd Fellows, have been living the Golden Rule. I know that you will try as I will, to live the fullest meaning of this rule with each passing day.

I know that we will so live in days and years to come that when your children and mine review the challenges we faced, they will say:

"They, in their time, were adequate,
Let us, in our time, be adequate too."

Role of United Nations in World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at a civic homecoming in Grand Rapids, Mich., on March 23.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow citizens, I am deeply grateful for this welcome home. It has been far too long since I have had an opportunity to renew my intimate Michigan friendships. But, since Pearl Harbor, the Senate has been in practically continuous session—and I confess that I have found no

way of attending to this job except by staying on it. More particularly, I have been kept away by two vital assignments which are inseverably linked with the hopes and prayers of humankind for permanent peace in this scarred and tortured world. Tonight, I propose to discuss the results of those assignments, up to date.

I have had the precious privilege of being one of eight Americans who wrote and signed the San Francisco Charter, and one of five who sat as American delegates in the first General Assembly of the United Nations. I have seen 51 nations of this earth struggle toward concord and cooperation in behalf of international security. I have seen them strive for a common understanding—despite the handicaps of differing races, religions, languages, traditions, and aspirations. At San Francisco I have seen them unanimously draft a blueprint for the mechanism that shall create peace. At London I have seen them unanimously turn this blueprint into a going concern. I have seen them transmute a dream into a reality.

I have no illusions that the course is not still beset with dangerous rocks and treacherous reefs. The current news is ample proof. I have no illusions that the results—at San Francisco and at London—are a guaranty of automatic peace. But, Mr. Chairman, neither have I any illusions that there is any other way to stop World War No. III before it starts. Therefore, we here confront the supreme challenge of all time; and I, for one, intend to continue in relentless fidelity to every possible human effort to make the United Nations a benediction for humankind.

This sacred enterprise transcends all domestic politics. I remind you that my two assignments came to me from two Democratic Presidents of the United States. I dare to think that the assignments have been scrupulously executed in a reciprocal spirit of undiluted Americanism. Certainly I can testify that not the remotest partisan intimations ever marred the labors of our delegations at San Francisco or at London. We have the right—aye, we all have the duty—to frankly debate our foreign policies among ourselves. But it is more necessary now than ever that our politics, as such, should stop at the water's edge. This will continue to be my attitude no matter how difficult some of my more intemperate political opponents may make it. The national interest must come first in times like these.

If there were no other reasons, Mr. Chairman, why all men of good will, everywhere on earth, should support the United Nations, it is enough that science has plunged us into the atomic age. From now on, wars may be a matter of minutes instead of months, and the first casualty list may be the last. From now on, there can be no security for any of us except collective security which spans the globe with its authority. The oceans are no longer moats around our ramparts. The heavens themselves are areas of potential death. I do not see how any rational mind can ignore these ugly challenges. One atomic bomb has an energy release equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT. Weight for weight, the energy release of uranium is about 3,000,000 times that of TNT. And this awful progress in the black arts of mass destruction is still in its sinister infancy.

There is but one answer. We must successfully outlaw the use of atomic energy for military purposes everywhere on earth. More: we must first establish dependable inspections and controls to make certain that this self-denying mandate is inviolate throughout the earth. Otherwise the peace-loving nations of this world will be the victims of their own humane renunciations. No aggressor of tomorrow can be allowed to thus capitalize his own treachery.

This clearly means that there must be a United Nations to administer this paramount responsibility. The United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom could probably lock up this lethal secret for something like 5 years. But then the secret will have been universally explored. In other words, we have perhaps 5 years of grace in which to drive this dread shadow from the skies. How will you do it, my fellow citizens? How will you do it without a United Nations or its equivalent?

Before I leave this subject, I would say a word about the current controversy in our own land over our own atomic policies. There are, of course, unlimited possibilities for the development of atomic energy in peaceful service to society. In the field of medicine, for example, there are incalculable potentials for the relief of human suffering. Science rightly strains at the leash for full freedoms to explore these blessings. Now that the recent wars are over, there is widespread and wholly justified demand that the existing military monopoly shall give way to civilian controls. The military itself substantially agrees. Certainly I share all of these anxieties to hasten the release of this new phenomenon to its maximum beneficial use. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that until the United Nations has successfully curbed the destructive use of atomic energy everywhere, we can never for an instant forget that national security is our prime concern. Until we know that the United Nations is a dependable, alternative reliance, in this and other particulars, we cannot neglect the maintenance of our own wholly adequate national defense. This implies no lack of confidence in UNO. It simply faces the facts of life.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to draw a conclusive line between military and civilian uses of atomic energy. For example, an atomic-power plant is 75 percent on the way to an atomic-bomb factory—and the rest is comparatively easy. I favor maximum civilian controls. I favor a national Atomic Energy Commission composed exclusively of civilians. But I believe the national interest requires that there shall be a right of consultation for the President and his military authorities who are responsible for the national security, lest civilian authorities unwittingly invite our jeopardy.

A fantastic hysteria has been whipped up across the country by false propaganda attacking the recent action of the Senate committee when it adopted, 10 to 1, my amendment to the Atomic Energy Act to provide for a Military Liaison Committee. But these good people have been misled. This amendment leaves all atomic controls in civilian hands, all votes in civilian hands, all vetoes in civilian hands, all power in civilian hands, and all licenses, even for military use, in civilian hands. It simply permits the President to name his own military advisers who shall be entitled to know what goes on in the civilian commission, and who shall notify both the Commission and the President if they believe any action of the civilian commission is likely to endanger national security. In such event, the President's decision is final. In my view, if we are to consult the national security at all, this is the minimum precaution. So far as I am concerned, I decline to ignore the national security.

I know many of you are puzzled about this business. You are not half as puzzled as I am at the storm of misrepresentation which tore loose even before the full text of the committee's 10-to-1 action had been made public. I simply am unable to find a single fact that warrants the critical intrepretations I have heard, unless you want the Army and the Navy completely divorced from national defense. In that event I am wrong. But also, in that event, the country is helpless. I want to say this, too: It wasn't so very long ago that we were depending upon the Army and the Navy for our lives. I decline to associate myself with any assumption that the Army and the Navy have ceased to possess any elements of patriotism or responsibility. Under our atomic formula, they have been divorced from every policy decision. Under our formula, they are allowed only a right of limited consultation. They are entitled to that—not for their sakes—but for ours. In view of the propaganda, I do not blame many of our people for being conscientiously disturbed. They are just as sound Americans as I hope I am. But neither do I overlook the fact that there are, unfortunately, some people in this country who are more interested in national insecurity than in national security. I cannot make it too plain that I shall continue to fight them to the everlasting finish.

I favor international disarmament. It is our surest international insurance. It must be one of the supreme objectives of the United Nations. But I do not favor unilateral disarmament by the United States alone. We dare not trust our destiny to the unsupported hope that others will voluntarily follow us in making plowshares of their swords.

But this is the supremely important point. The key to this whole situation is a successful United Nations in the pattern prescribed at San Francisco and implemented at London. There lies tomorrow's greatest hope.

Whether you are dealing with atomic bombs or with arms limitations, and no matter what other phase of peace you contemplate, it seems to me as a matter of intelligent self-interest that you do not think in a straight line if you deny the indispensable need for collective, international action in preventing war, in the presence of today's realities.

I can share your disappointments over some phases of the San Francisco Charter and the more recent London record and some still more recent events. I can share your anxieties over the disturbing trends in current international affairs. It would be silly to ignore the hazards. But it would be sillier to ignore vindicated hopes. I shall deal frankly with the hazards. But I intend, first, to deal with the sustaining hopes. And I assert, at the outset, that the amazing thing about the United Nations up to date, is not that there are areas of disagreement but rather that the areas of agreement are so vast and so significant.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at London. Let us look at this first General Assembly of 51 United Nations. On January 10, 1946, we had only a pious aspiration. On February 16, 1946—just 37 days later—we had organized, in working detail, the complete machinery for the General Assembly which can become the organized conscience of the earth and the town meeting of the world. We had organized the Security Council upon which America, Britain, Russia, France, and China are permanent members, and Egypt, Mexico, Netherlands, Australia, Brazil, and Poland, presently occupy the six nonpermanent seats. The Security Council might be called the executive branch of UNO. Upon it depends the ultimate use of sanctions or of force, after all pacific means of settlement have been exhausted.

In addition to the General Assembly and the Security Council, we had organized the new Court of International Justice to which 15 eminent judges were elected, including one from the United States. UNO seeks, above all else, to establish and extend the process of justice under law. Then, too, we organized the Social and Economic Council upon which 18 nations, including America, are represented. Through this instrument we shall explore those basic, social, and economic relationships which too often are the root of friction and of war. In addition, we set up the entire Secretariat of UNO—the working force which will administer all of these tremendous functions.

I can testify, my friends, that it was a gigantic task. For example, I was chairman of

the subcommittee dealing with administration and budgets. We virtually had to create the equivalent of a complete governmental structure. You may be interested in knowing that UNO's total budget for its first fiscal year is $21,500,000 of which our share is 25 percent. In other words, the United States will spend for peace, on this account, far less per year than we spent per hour on war. It is the biggest bargain of the ages if it works.

These things were done in 37 fertile days. With greatest respect for our own American Congress, I am bound to say I think it would have taken us a couple of years to do a comparable job in Washington. In the course of these decisions there was sharp controversy at various points. There were divergent viewpoints to be resolved. There was intense debate. Yet, in all these organizational phases, we wound up in complete and significant unity which would have been impossible without universal good spirit and good faith. I cannot forget this significant fact. I cannot forget that the San Francisco Charter itself was adopted by 51 nations without one dissenting vote. I cannot believe that this was not an omen of rich hope, no matter how difficult the intervening days become. In athletic parlance, the "team" is learning to "play team ball." When the "team" has played together a little longer, I dare to hope it will be invincible.

Nor is this all the General Assembly did—although this organizational labor was supposed to be its sole assignment in this initial session. It established the Atomic Bomb Commission which will immediately seek to create a world-wide system of effective and dependable security arrangements which, in turn, will make it possible to completely outlaw the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes and thus lift the fear of atomic bombs from the hearts of men. Again, it sounded reveille to mobilize the humane forces of the earth against the dire famine which threatens millions of helpless people with extermination. Again, it pledged itself to encourage a world-wide free press—to lift the iron curtains which black out so much of the world and prevent the mutual understandings essential to friendly and tolerant relationships. Again, it offered new hope to dependent peoples everywhere through the expression of our mutual purpose to encourage self-government. Again, it encouraged the hopes of war refugees—these pathetic derelicts of recent conflict—by refusing on a decisive roll-call vote, to sanction their involuntary repatriation.

This is a noble record. It is unmarred by a single untoward event. There was ultimate unity—the Soviets included. I doubt if there were ever 37 more momentous days in human history. It remains for men and nations to carry on in this design. I say once more that I have no illusions that automatic peace awaits the world just because the machinery of the United Nations is in gear. Not at all. This machinery might never turn a wheel unless the peoples and the governments of the United Nations insist that it shall be adequately used. Durable peace can never be just a mechanism. Peace is a state of mind. Peace is a spiritual rather than a mechanical conception. The machinery is necessary. But the purpose and the will for peace are the controlling dynamos. In other words, public opinion—in America and everywhere else—must relentlessly sustain this enterprise. There may be—indeed, there are—incidental discouragements along the way. But the more complex or the more ominous the world's international relations may become, in the same degree the greater will become the critical need that the peace-loving peoples of the earth shall strive to make UNO succeed. If it fails, my fellow citizens, I ask you, where and what will be your reliance? Where, then, will you turn? On January 10 the Charter was a scrap of paper. On February 16 it was a living reality. It must never revert to the status of a scrap of paper again if we can help it by any action within our power. There lies tomorrow's greatest hope.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the rest of the London record. We have been discussing the General Assembly. Let us look at the Security Council. Again I submit that the record is equally significant, although now we shall see illustrated the dangers and the difficulties, as well as the great usefulness, of the United Nations as the stabilizer of world peace and security.

First, let's remember that the Security Council was put to unexpected test just 6 days after it came into being—before it had any of the Charter instruments intended for its use—before it even had any rules for its own procedure. That was like expecting a motor car to run without wheels—and yet this one ran. It was like asking General Eisenhower to invade the continent 20 minutes after we declared war on Germany—yet this adventure was a marked success. I respectfully ask those who are impatient to remember that it took 4 years to win the war; and that we are entitled to at least a few months of grace in the winning of a lasting peace. Even if it took as long as the winning of the war, still it would be a miracle—in the light of man's dismal failures, for 1900 years, to follow in the footsteps of the Prince of Peace.

Four controversies—each involving the presence of foreign troops in lands other than their own—were submitted to the Security Council. In each instance, after full hearing, the four controversies were left, on conciliatory American initiative, to further negotiations between the nations in direct concern. But that qualifying phrase—"after full hearing"—is of paramount importance. After "full hearing," the renewal of direct negotiations is calculated to be quite a different thing than it was before because now these negotiations proceed in the presence of the necessity for an ultimate accounting not only to the Security Council but also to the critical opinions of mankind. In most instances I dare to believe there will be adequate results. The next meeting of the Security Council, opening in New York next Monday, will be the acid test.

Mind you, these were the raw materials out of which wars have sprung in other days. But here the contestants were not meeting on a battlefield. They were meeting at the council table, in the white light of full publicity, in the presence of their peers, under the searching eyes of a watching world, and under the impulse of a solemn pledge to keep the peace. Here words, which would have been fighting words in other days, were the substitutes for guns. Here the frankest imaginable discussions were taking place eye to eye, cheek by jowl. Here the contestants shook hands at the termination of the jousts. Here there was a clear verdict rendered on the facts by the member nations sitting in their judgment seats, as each representative spoke into the record. It was the open diplomacy openly arrived at of which men heretofore have dreamed in vain. It was an epoch in the hopes of humankind.

To be sure, the ultimate disposition of each case, after full hearing, was a reversion to direct negotiation instead of some affirmative act of penalty or of enforced restraint. This may have been a disappointment to some of our more impatient direct actionists who would like a god of peace as militant and relentless as the gods of war. But I remind you that the United Nations Charter does not contemplate the techniques of a meat axe. It is not built to hasten sanctions and the use of force. These things are only a reluctant last resort. It is built to prevent, if possible, the use of sanctions and of force. It is built to stop war; not to make it. It requires the exhaustion of all possibilities of direct negotiation, and of inquiry, and of mediation, and of conciliation, and of arbitration, and of judicial settlement before we turn to grimmer disciplines.

By way of concrete illustration, Mr. Chairman, let me submit a blow-by-blow account of the final contest before the Security Council at London. Within it are found all of our hopes and fears, all of the credits and the liabilities, all of the encouragements and all of the warnings for the future.

Lebanon and Syria were asking the simultaneous withdrawal of French and British troops. I ask you to linger a moment on this unprecedented scene. Two of the newest, smallest, and humblest of governments were challenging two of the five great powers who are permanent members of the Security Council. The difference in might and authority could scarcely approach greater extremes. Yet little Lebanon and little Syria were invited to the council table. There they sat, amid the mightiest of earth, to have their untrammeled day in this court of world opinion. They spoke with perfect freedom. They were heard with complete respect. It was the triumph of a great ideal.

When they had finished, sturdy Ernest Bevin, Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, promptly announced that he would withdraw the British troops at once. Monsieur Bidault, the able Foreign Minister for France, immediately followed with a statement substantially in kind. The controversy gave promise of amicable composition at one sitting of the Council. Our own Ambassador Stettinius offered an American resolution which remanded the case to direct negotiation between the parties in interest, expressing confidence in a swift and happy conclusion. The dove of peace flew in the window. But then something happened—and the dove flew out again.

The brilliant Soviet Commissar Vishinsky intervened. He wanted no such easy climax. Long and bitterly he assailed France and Britain. Instead of being closed, the incident flamed into 2 days of subsequent debate. Then Vishinsky offered amendments to the American resolution which involved stinging and unwarranted rebukes to France and Britain. This was not oil on troubled waters. It was salt in reopened wounds. Finally the chairman of the Security Council called for a vote. Vishinsky objected unless France and Britain abstained, pursuant to a Charter provision requiring that parties to a dispute threatening international peace and security should abstain from voting. Both Bevin and Bidault hotly protested this was no such threat—that they were entitled to vote—and repudiated the Vishinsky implications. But then, for the sake of comity, they offered voluntarily to abstain from voting. Once more the frightened dove of peace looked in the window.

Vishinsky's amendment was voted down with only its author on its side. Thereupon the American resolution was carried with the 7 out of 11 votes required by the Charter. Vishinsky thereupon promptly exercised his veto—since the Charter requires the concurrence of all permanent members of the Council. He was wholly within his rights—but the dove once more fluttered nervously away.

Poor little Lebanon and Syria were right back where they started. But then came the thrilling climax. Bevin for Britain and Bidault for France magnificently asserted that they would voluntarily accept the terms of the resolution and abide its obligations precisely as though it were the law of the Council. And the dove flew in again and came to its contented rest.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I was proud of western democracy that night. It had exemplified the spirit which can make the United Nations invincible in its crusade for peace. On the other hand, I am forced to say that the distinguished Soviet delegate seemed to be less interested in justice for Lebanon and Syria than in baiting France and Britain—less interested in peace than he was in

friction. I am sure it posed the same question in all our minds—the paramount conundrum of modern times—the question which can easily involve the destiny of the United Nations in its present form; the question which, in simple candor, I found it necessary to raise on the floor of the Senate 3 weeks ago—this question: What is Russia up to now?

We ask it in Manchuria. We ask it in eastern Europe and the Dardanelles. We ask it in Italy where Russia, speaking for Yugoslavia, has already initiated hostile attention to the Polish Legions. We ask it in Tripolitania. We ask it in the Baltic and the Balkans. We ask it in Poland. We ask it in the capital of Canada. We ask it in Japan. We ask it frequently even in connection with events in our own United States. We are particularly asking it currently in Iran and Turkey. It is little wonder we asked it in London. It is less wonder that I am still asking it tonight.

So, Mr. Chairman, after having brought you my deeply encouraging report regarding other aspects of the sturdy progress made by the United Nations in behalf of peace with justice in this distraught world, I come now frankly to this great conundrum. Of course the United Nations cannot survive in its present form if the so-called Big Five fall apart. It cannot survive in its present form if the Big Three—Britain, Russia, and the United States—fall apart. Particularly it cannot survive in its present form if the Big Two—Russia and America—fall apart. Hence the vivid importance of Marshal Stalin's statement yesterday in behalf of UNO.

It would be blind folly to blink the fact that two great, rival ideologies—democracy in the west and communism in the east—here find themselves face to face with the need for mutual understanding in seeking common ground upon which to strive for peace for both. In the final analysis this means that the two greatest exponents of these rival ideologies—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States—find themselves face to face with this same need for mutual understanding, both in and out of the United Nations. Indeed, if this does not oversimplify the problem, it may be said that the future of the United Nations in its present form is wrapped up in this equation.

If this be so, I reassert, as I did upon the Senate floor, my own belief that we can live together in reasonable harmony if the United States speaks as plainly upon all occasions as Russia does; if the United States just as vigorously sustains its own purposes and ideals upon all occasions as Russia does; if we abandon the miserable fiction, often encouraged by our own fellow travelers, that we somehow jeopardize the peace if our views are as firmly declared as Russia's always are; and if we assume a moral leadership which we too frequently have allowed to lapse.

The situation calls for patience and good will, but vacillation is impossible. God knows we do not want war. I do not believe the Soviets want war. I think they will continue to press for every advantage they can get, according to their own nationalist lights, short of major war. That is their business. We have encouraged them in it by our secret diplomacy and our surrenders at Yalta and elsewhere when we were under the pressures of the exigencies of war, but now the war is over. It is now our business to be equally firm in the defense of our ideals and what we conceive to be the necessities of peace with justice. In this spirit I believe we can find common ground, within the framework of the United Nations, particularly if we are always as prompt to give Russia the same justice which we ask from her in return. Another war is unthinkable. I dare to believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is unthinkable in Moscow. I specifically decline to make any prophesies upon this score, but I emphatically assert my belief that an honorable way to peace, within the procedures of the United Nations, can and must be found.

I am bound frankly to say that I do not believe this objective is encouraged by some of the implications in the recent speech made in Missouri by the brilliant and always magnificent Winston Churchill. I share all of his brave desires for an everlasting and indispensable friendship between the English-speaking peoples of the earth. I agree with him that persistent Russian expansion—and these everlasting wars of nerves—are intolerable, but I do not approve his suggested recourse to what would amount to a military alliance—though he avoids the words—between Britain and the United States, and which would be aimed—though he avoids the definition—at the Soviets, and which would subordinate the United Nations—though he seeks to disarm this impact. I do not believe that is the way to impress the Soviets that peace and security and friendship await them in the world if they will sustain the faith which they, like the rest of us, have pledged to the San Francisco Charter, and which Marshal Stalin has just reiterated.

The difference between his approach and my own—if I may be forgiven the presumption of such a comparison—is that he implied a military alliance against Russia while I again suggested a treaty of mutual defense with Russia, within the framework of the United Nations, if this could be a substitute for the Soviet's unilateral pursuit of what they describe as their quest for security. It would not be a treaty against any other nation—unless that nation represents the rebirth of Axis aggression in violation of the basic precepts of the Charter.

So, Mr. Chairman, I endorse the new American approach which was voiced in the recent courageous candor of our own Secretary of State Byrnes. I hope it is not too late. I applaud and sustain him in this new vigor. I prefer the approach voiced by our new Ambassador to Russia, Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who recently counseled that both our national temperatures should remain at normal; who asserted that "both nations want nothing so much as peace and security"; who said that the United States is willing to go a long way in meeting its international associates; but who frankly warned that we must be ever watchful of our own vital interests and "hold to the line beyond which compromise cannot go." But we can never expect our alien friends to know where that line is unless we reestablish the traditional American habit of saying only what we mean and meaning every word we say. I have the feeling that this is the dependable way to peace and ultimate concord between us, with its inevitable effect upon the United Nations.

In my view there never need be war between Russia and America—if common sense and realism shall govern our foreign policies in Washington and Moscow. The way to avoid it is for each of us to understand that we are not going to be allowed to trespass upon the legitimate rights of the other, and for each of us to respect these limitations. The way to avoid it is in mutual fair dealing and plain speaking. The way to avoid it is for both of us to give our eternal allegiance to the precepts of the United Nations—and then for the United Nations to insist, with all its available mechanisms, that these precepts of peace with justice shall prevail.

I feel so deeply upon this score, Mr. Chairman, that if you will bear with me I want to briefly analyze just one more situation which bears upon another phase of this jigsaw puzzle in the international relations of a world which found a way to end a fighting war but has not yet found a way to consolidate an equitable peace. I shall now refer to the need that we, as well as others, shall use the forum of the United Nations for the scrupulous defense of international agreements.

Poland is the classic instance—and equally a warning. World War II began as a defense of Polish liberty. Long appeasement elsewhere in Europe had failed to halt Hitler's fury. As will always be the kindred case with an aggressor on the march, appeasement made war or abject surrender inevitable. It was in Poland that the dreadful die was cast. For the time being, Russia became a temporary German ally. Between them, poor, brave, fighting Poland was crushed to the scorched earth. Bloody years rolled over her. Finally the tide—and Russia—turned. The Axis faced defeat. But, tragically, so did traditional Polish liberty as well.

The potential victors met at Yalta. They repartitioned Poland to suit the Soviet pattern—and never was justice quite so blind as then. But, at least, America, Britain, and Russia pledged their honor to new Poland's self-determination. It was solemnly agreed that Poland should have "free and unfettered elections on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot." Later, at Potsdam, this warrant was reaffirmed with added assurance that "all democratic parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates." The Allied obligation stands clear as crystal. So does American responsibility.

Now what has happened? New Poland's provisional government—with our approval I regret to say—is substantially a Soviet satellite. In contemplation of an election, for which no date has yet been set, this provisional government is seeking to drive all democratic parties into one party with one ticket which will guarantee perpetuation for the present Communist regime. Nor is that the worst of it. In British Commons last month, a member asked Foreign Secretary Bevin whether he was aware of repeated murders of opposition party leaders in Poland. Bevin replied, with the blunt candor so typical of him:

"I am seriously concerned at the number of political murders that have been committed in various parts of Poland in recent weeks, in circumstances that in many cases appear to point to the complicity of the Polish Security Police. I regard it as imperative that the Polish Provisional Government should put an immediate stop to these crimes in order that free and unfettered elections may be held as soon as possible in accordance with the Crimea decisions."

That night the American delegation in London sent an urgent request to our own Secretary of State in Washington to pursue the Bevin theme on our own account. Secretary Byrnes acted the next day. Referring to the reports of political murders, he instructed the American Embassy at Warsaw to "inform the Polish Government that we are relying on that government to take the necessary steps to assure the freedom and security which are essential to the successful holding of free elections."

The point I make, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not enough for us to rely upon any other government to vindicate the honor and the pledge of the United States of America. We must rely upon our own initiative. We must rely upon our own moral authority in a world which, in my opinion, craves our moral leadership. Does this mean war? No. Everyone of us—Poland, Russia, Britain, America—all parties to this affair—are bound to the United Nations Charter and to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means," and "to refrain from the threat or use of force." It does not mean war. What does it mean? It means, first, that we must insistently demand prompt and dependable assurances that the Yalta and the Potsdam pledges in behalf of free elections will be effectively fulfilled. It means, in other words, that we shall lift the powerful voice of America in behalf of the inviolable sanctity of international agreements to which we are a party. If this does not suffice, it means, then, that we shall scrupulously collect our facts; draw our relentless indictment if the

facts so justify, and present it in the forum of the United Nations, and demand judgment from the organized conscience of the world. The United Nations is calculated to succeed in proportion as we give it vitality in behalf of human rights. The degree of its success will determine the world's immunity from unspeakable disaster.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored faithfully to report both the credits and the debits on the United Nations' ledgers. I do not for an instant pretend to disguise the anxious fact that international relations are in discouraging friction. I do not minimize their dangers. I make no claim that an untoward incident may not at any moment rekindle dangerous fires. But I reassert that this is all the more reason why the United Nations calls us to maximum fidelity to the only available substitute for war. I have great faith that if this blessed institution has a chance to sink its foundations to the bedrock of the world's conscience it will raise its permanent structure to incalculable strengths against the curse of conflict. It will require change and improvement in the Charter as we progress. The Charter will require progressive amendment and liberalization. Its routines will require refinement. For example, I want the Security Council to meet in continuous session so that it can stop little frictions before they become big crises. I want the Security Council to be a "fire department" instead of a "salvage squad." But we must first learn to live with what we have. Peace must learn to walk before it learns to run.

The encouragements I bring you are that this argosy of peace is well launched upon the seas of time. The startling fact at London—I cannot repeat too often—is not that the ship sometimes trembled in the gale but rather that it so staunchly weathered all the storms.

These were 37 vital days in London. They are freighted with hope—solidly justified hope—in respect to collective security in this atomic age. With unwavering fidelity we must carry on the great adventure. If there be any failure, let not the blood be upon our hands nor the tragedy upon our souls.

And I conclude, my fellow citizens, in the language of my recent speech upon the Senate floor. The United States has no ulterior designs against any of its neighbors anywhere on earth. We can speak with the extraordinary power inherent in this unselfishness. We need but one rule. What is right? Where is justice? There let America take her stand!

Public Opinion Polled—Shows 75 Percent of People Demand Housing Program—Charges Congressional Action Conflicts Sharply With Thinking of People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, probably no more accurate method can be found for determining the opinion of the American public on any subject than the scientific polls which are conducted from time to time by various statistical organizations.

One of the best known of these authorities is the so-called Elmo Roper poll, which samples opinion for Fortune magazine and similar publications. The New York Herald Tribune on March 14 published the results of such an investigation by Mr. Roper on the question of housing.

The survey was very thorough. It showed results by age groups, by economic level, by geographic area, and by size of place. It asked five different types of questions on whether people believed there was a housing shortage and what should be done to meet it.

I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that 75 percent of the people questioned demanded that our scarce supply of building materials be channeled into low- and medium-priced housing until production gets under way. Forty-seven percent declared that private industry, if left alone, could not do the job. A majority demanded that the Government step in with a bold program to whip the problem. One-third of the people went so far as to recommend that people who have more rooms than they really need be required to rent them to those who cannot find homes.

From all sections of the country—North, South, East, and West—came a solid mandate for swift Government action. In the light of the recent action of the House in striking out the most important provisions of the President's housing program, this information should be of considerable value to the Members.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include the results of that poll:

WHAT PEOPLE ARE THINKING

(By Elmo Roper)

CONGRESS AND PEOPLE SPLIT ON HOUSING PLAN

The housing program which had been worked out by Wilson Wyatt, our new housing expediter, took a severe jolting around last week in the House of Representatives. Much of what he had asked Congress to do was refused.

The refusal of Congress to go along with the Wyatt program provides a new and illuminating example of how public opinion and the opinion of the public's representatives often collide; in this case the opinion of Congress on what should be done to relieve the acute and distressing shortage of homes conflicts sharply with the opinion of the public as a whole on that subject.

Two diametrically opposite pictures of that conflict of opinion are sure to be offered. In the one case Congress will be pictured as a group of honest, far-sighted statesmen with a wisdom greater than that of the average constituent and with the courage to maintain the representative form of democracy by refusing to "blindly go along with the voters."

MAY BE CALLED SHORT-SIGHTED

In the other picture Congressmen will be shown as a group of short-sighted, little men, without any clear realization that the present shortage of homes is so acute as actually to constitute a national emergency, and determined to thwart the public will by following the bidding of a powerful, selfish real-estate lobby.

At the core of this sharp difference of opinion between the people and their elected representatives is the whole question of how much and what kind of Government participation is required in order to get an adequate number of new homes quickly. A survey conducted by Fortune magazine—and one on which the interviewing had been done just before the Wyatt program was announced—shows how the people as a whole feel on this point.

"Do you see the present housing shortage as a problem that industry, if left pretty much alone, would be able to work out itself, or as a problem that won't get straightened out until the Government does a lot more than it has?"

	Industry	Government	Don't know	No answer
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Total	38.5	46.7	13.4	1.4
By age groups:				
21 to 34	31.9	52.4	15.5	.2
35 to 49	42.2	46.7	10.5	.6
50 and over	40.8	41.7	14.4	3.1
By economic level:				
Prosperous	63.4	28.6	7.1	.9
Upper middle	55.5	34.6	9.6	.3
Lower middle	38.6	48.9	12.1	.4
Poor	19.0	57.2	19.9	3.9
By geographic area:				
New England and Middle Atlantic	35.0	50.5	12.3	2.2
East North Central	43.0	45.8	10.9	.3
West North Central	42.3	43.6	13.5	.6
South Atlantic and East South Central	34.9	47.9	15.8	1.4
West South Central	29.2	42.5	25.5	2.8
Mountain and Pacific	49.9	42.5	6.8	.8
By size of place:				
Urban	38.0	48.2	12.6	1.2
Rural	40.7	40.7	16.6	2.0

LESS DIVISION ON SPECIAL PLANS

But, if the rather nebulous suggestion that it is essential that "the Government do a lot more than it has" is able to command only a plurality of the voters rather than a clear majority, there is no such nearly equal division of opinion on certain specific proposals:

Here are some steps the Government might take in the housing shortage which have been favored by some people and not by others. Do you think the Government should or should not—

	Should	Should not	Don't know	No answer
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Start building homes on a large scale for sale or rent to the public	48.1	42.1	8.5	1.3
Take off ceiling prices on building materials	24.7	63.3	10.9	1.1
Lend money at very low rates of interest to people who want to build medium-priced homes for their own use	80.0	12.5	6.3	1.2
See to it that building materials are used only for low- and medium-priced houses until the shortage eases up	75.6	16.1	7.0	1.3
Require people who have more rooms than they really need to rent them to people who cannot find homes	33.8	58.9	6.0	1.3

There are some interesting and perhaps politically significant differences in the way certain groups voted on these suggestions, and they will be discussed in this column next week. The over-all figures, however, show how wide is the divergence of opinion between Congress and the people. With a third of the people willing to go so far as to say that the Government should require people who have more rooms than they really need to rent them to people who cannot find homes, it should be plain that people are in no mood to tolerate any housing program which is founded on a belief that, if only left alone, everything will come out all right.

Global Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon entitled "Global Religion," by Rev. Payson Miller, broadcast on the Church of the Air program on Sunday, November 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOBAL RELIGION

"Global" is a word for this day. Global movements of men and matériel, global intercommunication, have awakened nearly all men to the reality of global community. One of our young men wrote his father from the crammed deck of a ship in a Philippine harbor: "I can look at Luzon as a land I know, like my own State, its hills, mountains, rivers, roads, and landmarks. I can tell you where to find Jose Garcia in San Nicholas, Minalin, Pampanga, as easily as I could tell you how to find the home of John Smith on Elm Street, Homefield, Conn. It is a great feeling to know that there is only one home, and that it is the world. There is no fear in you when you can look at a pin point on the map and realize that there you can be at home with people just as great or just as small as the ones you tore from in anguish 5 years ago."

Today the world is in suspense, wondering if this new global sentiment will find expression in adequate organization. The alternative to organization is more and greater destructiveness. Some are in cynical mood. Surely, they say, we can never live under a common government with those dirty, thieving people of colonial lands, or those backward Chinese, those communistic Russians, those plotting English, those war-mongering Germans, those brutal Japanese. We are going to have to live with all the people of the world because the fruits of modern science, flowing from many sources, have made this a world in which there is no isolation. We must choose between living with other peoples in a state of suspicion which magnifies differences, or in a state of good will which resolves differences.

We have been speaking of our day as if it were a new day. We have been speaking of global concepts as if they were new. And for the most part they are. But the call to a global religion is not new. It is a call to fulfillment, in a world equipped to do so, of the insights of prophetic men of all generations. We may turn to the words of St. Paul in the New Testament: "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription: To the unknown God. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshiped with men's hands as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if happily they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from everyone of us; for in Him we live and move, and have our being." In that early day St. Paul saw that by the very order of creation all men are of one blood and that in the true God all are bound together.

Religion is the faith that somehow there is a basis of unity in the world. Religion is that view of the world which seems to be true, and so worthy of unqualified devotion. All religious people believe there is a basic unity in the world; all are devoted to truth as they see it. God to all people at all times has been that which symbolized unity amid the diversities of the world. The trouble has been, the trouble is, that too many people hold circumscribed systems of truth; the trouble has been, the trouble is, that too many people visualize a dogmatic unity which is to be imposed on others, rather than a unity based on natural brotherhood. The gods of too many people still are tribal gods, gods of one race, of one nation, of one political system.

Almost every religious group, from the smallest sect to the world's great religions, expresses devotion to the ideal of world unity based on genuine brotherhood. But a modern prophet looking upon our economic injustices, our racial discriminations, our wars, may truly say that the gods whom we actually worship are gods that divide us. Looking into our avowed places of worship he may hear our lip service to a God who truly unifies. Speaking to us, he might say: As I have flown around the world and looked down upon your lands, I have perceived that in all places you are devoted to systems of belief and to practices which are provincial, narrow, saturated with discrimination and hatred. Everywhere I have heard you say that you believe in brotherhood, that you believe in a God who giveth life and breath to all things, who "hath made of one blood all nations of men." This God whom you ignorantly worship declare I unto you. If you come to worship this God intelligently, you will just naturally stop disliking people because they happen to belong to a social class other than that to which you belong; you will just naturally stop disliking people whose color of skin is different from yours; you will stop having wars. You will find yourself spontaneously drawn to all sorts and conditions of men.

Again we say religion is the faith that there is a basis of unity in the world. Global religion is the faith that unity is somehow inherent in all the diversities of the whole world. It is not content with faith that Americans may come to live together in unity, or that Frenchmen, Englishmen, Germans, Russians, may come to live in unity within their national borders. It is not content with faith that various economic classes may find unity among themselves. It is not content with faith that Jews or Catholics or Protestants may achieve unity within their own groups. It is not content with faith that the black race, the yellow, the white, may each live among themselves as brothers. Global religion is the faith that in the true God lies the basis of unity among all men in all the world.

Reading further in the words of St. Paul we find that he considered his age a critical one. He said: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." No more flitting words could be spoken to our generation. At one time men were excusably ignorant and provincial. They had not discovered the instruments or techniques of advancing knowledge. They had not discovered the means of wide intercommunication. Today there are no such excuses for ignorance and provincialism. The times of our ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth us to repent. Our day, too, is a day of crisis.

The critical character of our day is not fully comprehended. Let us recall what we have just come through. Fourteen million soldiers have died in a global war. Forty-five million soldiers have been wounded or imprisoned. Millions of civilians, men, women, and children, have perished. One in 10 throughout the world has been driven from his home. Untold resources which might have been used for human betterment have been expended in war. And at the end, a small bomb, carried by one plane, demolished nearly a whole city, bequeathing us a troubled peace.

In the days of conflict self-interest aroused in us a global outlook. Self-interest still demands a global outlook. The destructive power of new and projected weapons is unimaginable. It is folly to believe that their manufacture can be confined to one nation or that effective counterweapons may be found. If the nations engage in atomic warfare no home will be spared from destruction and very few lives will be spared. The scientists who created the atomic bomb, and therefore speak with the highest authority, agree upon the need for international cooperation in handling atomic energy. It is literally true now that only a global outlook issuing in a global organization can save us from utter destruction. With sincere penitence we may wonder if self-interest will force us to take seriously our ideals of world brotherhood.

The supreme question for religious people to ask themselves in this hour is whether they shall cling to their little gods, their systems of partial truth, their small patterns of conduct or whether they shall match their faith, and their conduct, with the unity of the world wrought by the inventiveness of head and head. Faith is not powerless. Faith means assurance. Faith is conviction. Global faith is assurance and conviction on a global scale. It applies the Golden Rule on a global scale. Its sympathies, its interpretations, its hopes are global in scope. Global faith says that we can get along with all other people in the world; that we can live at peace with them and put the tremendous possibilities of atomic energy to work for the betterment of all mankind.

The first demand upon us is to accept global religion—a faith in world unity now supported by scientific fact but outreaching fact in the hope of ever more perfect unity. The second demand upon us is to recognize the critical character of our day as created by the release of atomic energy, the absolute necessity for control of this new power by an international authority. The third demand is that we proceed in practical ways to organize the world for peaceful living.

Through a series of preliminary conferences, through the conferences at Dumbarton Oaks, and finally through a conference of the United Nations at San Francisco, a charter for world organization was formulated. Enough nations have now expressed adherence to it to make it operative. There will be many conferences. Some will arrange details of the world's life in hopeful directions. Others will fail in this. The genuinely religious person will not lose hope. He knows it is not easy to arrange life satisfactorily within his family. He knows there are very real problems in community life. He is aware of the complications and almost insoluble problems in national government. He does not expect that the people of the world shall by the waving of a wand or merely by being good order their common life in the most helpful ways. He knows that as in every community, the world community must have laws, it must have impartial interpretation of the laws, and it must have enforcement of the laws. He will accept any arrangement which moves toward those goals, always hoping and striving for something better. Many who supported, who now support, the Charter formulated at San Francisco believe new weapons have outmoded that Charter and we must at once move toward stronger world government than it provides. The genuinely religious person will give all possible thought and

consecration to these problems motivated by the faith that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men."

If a family down your country road or on your city street is in want, you are disturbed. You will share with them anything you have to prevent starvation and other consequences of dire need. The genuinely religious person will in this day be deeply moved by the needs of those who are not neighbors merely in the old sense of living nearby. Rapid intercommunication will make him aware of, and by his faith he will be sensitive to, the wants of neighbors thousands of miles away. He will recognize the world's poverty as his poverty. He will support the organized charities of his community, and those organized efforts of his church and country which reach to all parts of the world. He will remember: God "hath made of one blood all nations of men."

Looking at the city of Athens St. Paul saw by the many altars to various gods that the basic devotions of the people were divided. They had turned to the simple gods of gold and silver wrought by human art and thought. He drew their attention to the unknown God who is the final unity in the world, in whom all live and move and have their being. In doing so he laid for them and for us the groundwork of a faith which can never be outgrown however thorough our knowledge and however widespread the reach of our conduct. If religion is to be a vital force in guiding the world toward the things for which men hope, toward the things which they do not yet fully see, the scope of faith must in this day be nothing less than global. Only global religion can properly inspire and direct global behavior, which, in any case, we shall have in some form.

It is a great feeling to know that there is only one home and that it is the world. There is no fear in you when you can look at a pin point on the map and realize that there you can be at home with people just as great or just as small as those you have intimately known. It is a great feeling to know that all people live and move and have their being in the same God and that all are of one blood.

Home Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Home Building Volume Equals 17-Year Record," from the Indianapolis Star of Friday, March 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME BUILDING VOLUME EQUALS 17-YEAR RECORD

NEW YORK, March 21.—Residential building in 37 States east of the Rocky Mountains totaled $102,079,000 in February, highest peacetime aggregate for that month since 1929, F. W. Dodge Corp., fact-finding organization for the construction industry, reported today.

The total was 14 percent higher than January's 426 percent above the level of February 1945, the company said.

Nonresidential construction increased 1 percent over January and 130 percent over February, 1945, Dodge added.

Total for the first 2 months of 1946 of all construction contracts awarded in the 37 States was reported as $744,900,000, a gain of 159 percent over the same period of 1945.

"The substantial gains in residential building contracts in February, in the face of uncertain conditions in building materials manufacture and distribution," said a statement, "lend emphasis to the point of view that the industry has the capacity to meet the demand for housing."

Our Faith in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Our Faith in America," delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] on Wednesday night, March 20, 1946, before the Sons of the American Revolution in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C.

This is an inspiring and timely address on a subject in which every American has an interest.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, you do me a great honor to invite me to speak and to think with you tonight at this annual meeting of your most worth-while organization. I feel deeply this honor and I hope only that I can rise to the opportunity presented me here.

There are those who, in their ignorance and in their worship only of new philosophies and new doctrines, ridicule the idea of an organization of the Sons of the American Revolution. These mockers talk of the "wave of the future," they make snide remarks about those of us who still look to the American Constitution as the best guide to government in the world, they smile knowingly as they hope for a new revolution—a bloody, red revolution that will divide brother against brother, family against family, class against class. They will say—as they have said in other days—that we patriotic Americans look backward, while, in their judgment, they are looking forward. They prate of economic democracy while failing to help us make representative democracy work.

We here know that tyranny works in a multitude of forms and in all directions—in every age. We know that there are present, now, today, in our society, factors working against our freedom. Under our representative free government, we cannot, indeed, we dare not, prosecute or persecute the men who are taking advantage of these factors to stir up strife and to help kill representative government. If we did, then we would ourselves be a party to tyranny.

But we can be on the alert eternally for the men who would take our liberties. And we can and must work incessantly to eradicate the conditions that make for tyranny—whether from big business or big government—so that we can pass on unimpaired to our children the liberties which were our heritage.

If there are those who doubt that our society today has these factors for tyranny, let me remind them that it was Franklin Roosevelt himself who pointed out that the New Deal has "built up new instruments of public power." This was his quaint way of expressing the fact that, under this present Government, powers have been taken away from the people and put into the hands of executive bureaus.

Let me give you one example of these new instruments. I refer to the Office of Price Administration. Even its most avid supporters recognized from the very first that the OPA could be used as an instrument of favoritism, that it could be used to make new businesses or to break old ones. Everybody recognized this, but such an organization obviously was needed, and so the Congress voted OPA into statutory power.

We Americans could do well to watch the tactics of the men who are behind OPA. They will be reluctant to surrender power; they may be forging chains which we can never cast off.

It might be well for us to look back to our founding fathers today for the broad principles by which to conduct our foreign policy. I can never forget the words of George Washington in his Farewell Address urging America to keep clear of foreign entanglements. The more we have dabbled in the affairs of other nations, the more we have had to, and the more blood and treasure we have lost.

Our Department of State is a danger spot today in our representative government. In this connection I feel like telling my good friend and former colleague in the White House to stop the habit of writing notes to other nations—and to urge his principal assistant, James F. Byrnes, to stop it too.

Grover Cleveland, when he was President, wrote one note—to a foreign country blockading Venezuela. That was all that was necessary.

Woodrow Wilson wrote several notes. The custom became more acceptable. By the time Franklin Roosevelt had been in the White House for three terms he was so used to writing notes to foreign nations that he must have had writer's cramp more than once. Now the habit of writing notes to other nations is becoming as usual as the writing of directives by bureaus or the writing of new interpretations to old law by the Supreme Court.

There is a definite need for our Government to set forth firmly and frankly our position in world affairs. There is as great need that we spell out the principles by which America became a great nation and by which other peoples may gain material prosperity.

We should not threaten war, or employ bluff and bluster tactics, but we should let all nations know that:

First. We stand for justice for all.

Second. We stand for self-determination for the smaller nations as well as for the larger ones.

Third. We stand against imperialism, for ourselves or for others.

Fourth. We do not intend to force our ideals on other peoples, although we gladly make these ideals and the methods by which we have attained freedom and greatness available to all.

Since American-Russian relations are very much in the limelight, it would not be amiss for us to think a moment on the subject. Let us remember several points. Russia is able to carry out these aggressive moves because America furnished her with billions in lend-lease materials without getting a clear agreement in advance. Russia is not nearly so strong as she might seem to be, and our tacit support of many of the things she has done so far has been her biggest single weapon.

If the people of Poland, the people of Czechoslovakia, the people of Korea, indeed, all the peoples Russia is oppressing, knew beyond a doubt that we will stop shipping

Russia any materials and that we are not allied with her in her march of conquest, or do not give approval to her moves, then Russia would have much more opposition. As it is today, the people who love freedom in Poland virtually have given up hope. The people who love freedom in Lithuania, thinking we have all but deserted them, are fast throwing in the towel.

Let's stop sending both notes and goods to Russia. We don't want war with Russia—or any other nation—and we don't want to be found tacitly supporting her, or any other nation, in acts of aggression against free peoples.

But enough of today's problems. In thinking with you tonight, I had an idea it would be good to go back in our minds for a few years and to examine again the bases of our freedom.

I do not know how it is with others, but every time I sit down and reread the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, I get a new thrill. Also there comes to me from out of the distant past a challenge.

Benjamin Franklin, as he came out of the final session of the Constitutional Convention, said:

"We have given you a representative government—if you can keep it."

Yes; that is the challenge to us today—whether or not we can keep the representative republican form of government which was the gift of our forefathers to the world and for which, in every generation, Americans have fought and shed their blood.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," said those forefathers, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of hapipness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

As Alexander Hamilton later wrote in the Federalist Papers, "The fabric of American empire ought to rest on the solid basis of the consent of the people. * * * The streams of national power ought to flow immediately from that pure, original fountain of all legitimate authority."

We do not have to look farther than our afternoon newspapers to learn what happens when governments are not based on the consent of the governed. In Spain, we know, men and women are thrown into prison without hearing or hope of fair trial; in Russia, we know, the dread secret police might be heard tonight at any door, and its hapless victims, who might merely have muttered a curse against their rulers, could be carried away and sentenced to exile or death. In other nations tonight men sleep in fear, because they have no rights of law such as we have in our blessed land.

Is there one in America who would swap the blessings of liberty for the tyrannies of other nations? If so, let him ponder again how uneasy must sleep the millions who have only privileges but have no rights.

"Nothing," said John Jay, "is more indispensable than the necessity of government." Yes, and then he and his colleagues of revolutionary days added a footnote or two. This government should have certain clearly defined powers; this government should be denied certain powers which, hitherto, all governments had claimed as their own. Free travel among the States could not be denied by the Federal Government; the writ of habeas corpus could not be suspended, except in two clearly stated circumstances that might arise; no bill of attainder or ex post facto law could be passed; no title of nobility could be granted by the Federal Government.

After the Constitution was ratified, then the people themselves took a further hand in the new Constitution. Principally because of popular demand, 10 amendments to the Constitution were attached to that masterful document within a comparatively short time. We know the 10 amendments as a Bill of Rights. In these 10 amendments, the people clearly set down and gave to us a heritage of freedom such as no other people ever enjoyed. Congress—the representative of the people—was forbidden forever from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or of abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the right of the people to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The right of the people to keep and bear arms could not be denied.

No soldier could be quartered in private homes without consent of the owner.

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, could not be violated, and no warrants could be issued except upon probable cause, supported by oath and affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

Every one of us could have the right of trial by jury.

We can all have a speedy trial, on demand.

I have not given all the 10 amendments, of course, and some I have abridged for brevvity, but the last of the so-called Bill of Rights, I think, is worthy of repeating in full.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There may be those who would think a rereading, or a reemphasis of these our rights is boring or old-fashioned today. I do not agree. We must keep these rights and we can only keep them by knowing them and watching for infractions by the Congress, or by the Government as a whole.

Freedom of the press? What is it? How much freedom? Can the antitrust laws be applied to the press in such a way as to imperil the freedom of your newspaper?

Freedom of speech? Can men who work for the Federal Government and industrialists who are economically dependent on that Government's price-setting arm for their very living have complete freedom of speech?

You and I know that many things are done today which impinge on both a free press and free speech. Economic pressures are applied subtly in this or that direction to keep down the voice of one group or to raise the cry of another. If we Americans are going to enjoy free speech as our forefathers intended we are going to have to be on guard in the coming months, just as we could never relax our guard in the past.

You and I know that we are not looking back tonight because we live in the past. We are looking back gratefully to our forefathers who made our freedom possible and we are looking forward to abiding by the principles which those forefathers laid down.

Where else could we look the better to find words that will give us strength and courage today than to look back into the early history of our Nation? In what other well-springs of knowledge would the enemies of our form of government have us dip our buckets?

Would they have us go to the Daily Worker, with its regular menu of hate and slime and slush, to find strength and courage for today? Would they have us go to Karl Marx to get comfort and condolence and spiritual help in time of death, or in the face of great physical pain?

You and I know that these are not the places to turn when we decide to cast a glance again at the past. We know that we can turn back to the days of our fathers—the days of the men who lived and wrote and fought during the American Revolution to learn how to live today. Just as the words of Jesus and the prophets are words for every age in the realm of the spiritual, so are the words of our founding fathers apropos for every generation in the realm of government.

Listen to Thomas Paine, as he warns the men of his day to fight tyranny:

"These are the times that try men's souls: The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; 'tis dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to set a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed, if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Listen to Philip Nolan, the man without a country, who was sentenced, you will recall, to life on the ocean without the privilege ever of setting foot again on the soil of the United States. This is his testimony after having been away from America many years:

"If you are ever tempted to say a word or to do a thing that shall put a bar between you and your family, your home, and your country, pray God in his mercy to take you that instant home to his own heaven. Stick by your family, boy; forget you have a self, while you do everything for them. Think of your home, boy; write and send, and talk about it. Let it be nearer and nearer to your thoughts, the farther you have to travel from it; and rush back to it, when you are free, as that poor black slave is doing now. And for your country, boy, and for that flag. Never dream a dream but of serving her as she bids you, though the service carry you through a thousand hells.

"No matter what happens to you, no matter who flatters you or abuses you, never look at another flag. Remember boy, that behind all these men you have to do with, behind officers, and government, and people even, there is the country herself, your country, and that you belong to her, boy, as you belong to your own mother. Stand by her, boy, as you would stand by your mother."

And listen to Theodore Roosevelt, as he writes after his tenure in the highest office in this land:

"No nation can be great unless its sons and daughters have in them the quality to rise level to the needs of heroic days. Yet, this heroic quality is but the apex of a pyramid of which the broad foundation must solidly rest on the performance of duties so ordinary that to impatient minds they seem commonplace. * * * In America today, all our people are summoned to service and sacrifice."

Last of all, listen to Longfellow, as he sings:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee, are all with thee!"

Inaugural Address of Ronald P. Bridges Upon Becoming President of Pacific School of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the inaugural address of my brother, Ronald P. Bridges, on the occasion of his becoming the president of the Pacific School of Religion.

My brother, I believe, is the first layman ever to become president of one of the great theological colleges of the country and the thoughts which he has expressed in his inaugural address I think will be of interest to many.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a time when each of us must show his credentials, must prove that he belongs to the human race. We must prove it by living as sons of God, by making life better and more grateful for all the children of God. It has been the unaccountable fortune of people like us here to be on the executive committee of the human race and we have done well by ourselves. Lately our committee assignment has been threatened and our very membership subject to question. It is an experience that has left us shaken.

We find ourselves standing on the rim of an abyss giddy with the awareness of eternity opened up before us in the fission of a nucleus. In our own day, within a few hours, we have seen the legend of Prometheus the Titan reenacted—this time with no mythological dramatis personae, but with our friends among the characters. There are Titans today—of science—and like their archetype who first grasped the secret of fire, they are suffering the agonies of the damned.

I never understood the story of Prometheus until the great bomb fell. The moral of the legend escaped me utterly. It seemed to me that a fire giver was so obviously a benefactor that the punishment meted him was outright barbarism by which the gods themselves stood convicted. Now I see it differently. Man was not supposed to have fire until he was ready for it, until he had grown in moral stature high enough to use fire as it should be used. Prometheus plucked the secret from the unknown too soon; and man, still cunning and suspicious, burned villages before he learned to cook his food and tempered the sword long before he wrought the plow.

Who commissioned this twentieth century Titan whose success has made man afraid as he has never been afraid before? The mothers and fathers of this land and of all civilized lands who closed their ears to the voice of the prophets and in whose homes the words of thanksgiving and humble petition were no more heard. The elders and teachers and preachers of little faith who allowed one generation after another to turn to the god of success and at last, turning to the god themselves, joined the rout and called it progress. The military and the scientists, the politicians, and the diplomats have done an awful thing to their fellow men. But we commissioned them to do it—and we applauded, too, until at last we saw how terribly they had done.

Somewhere in the Oak Ridge project there were, perhaps, John Wesleys and Alexander Campbells who were diverted to the task because their mothers and fathers took a short view of religion and a long view of electricity. Somewhere in the Manhattan project a Walter Rauschenbusch may have spent his talent when he could have been showing us better than we can now see it our duty to the wretched people of the earth—or a Washington Gladden who might have taught us to sing afresh,

"O, Master let me walk with thee
In lowly paths of service free."

There is more to this than idle speculation. Men of one talent are scarce. Born in season they are tremendous, but coming out of their time they are misfitted eccentrics. Men with an early and compelling sense of vocation are rare, too. Most people have multiple talents and develop that one most favored by the climate of opinion, most readily and richly rewarded by their fellowmen. In this respect Leonardo da Vinci was the ordinary man raised to the nth power of genius. He did many things well and could have done more; but the climate of his time made him first of all an artist.

The climate of our century has favored the businessman and the scientist and has been unfavorable to the teacher and the preacher. A change of climate would not only attract able men otherwise unheeding of these vocations but it would strengthen and prosper the abilities of those already serving in classroom and pulpit. By the honor accorded their pursuits both would proceed with confidence, vigor, and a sense of great purpose difficult to maintain in our generation.

Such a change in climate seems to be taking place. Whether cause or effect I cannot tell, but the change is evident in the deepened conviction I find among the ministry, a rededication of laymen, and a general reconversion by you and me and millions of people like us. A new prestige is coming to men of good will; a new esteem is gathering for those whose lives are consecrated to the work of peace on earth.

"The problem of the future is a theological one," said the general. And that is no forlorn harbinger of spring. Other men have been saying it in other words, before he said it and since. Ten years ago such an utterance would have been met with perplexity. Twenty years ago it would have been hooted at. Today, men hear such things and nod with uncertain but growing approbation.

In a grieving world penitently seeking to redeem itself the theological school is the place for the beginning of a renascence. It is a strategic center somewhat as the stock exchange has been strategic in the world of business and the laboratory in a scientific age. I feel deeply stirred to be in such a place at such a time.

It is no careless disregard of the shortages of food, clothing, machinery, and medicines to say that the most acute shortages of all are religious. Demobilization has been hindering, limiting the church of Christ for the 50 years past. The greatest need in America—in the world—is more and better men in the ministry and priesthood. To that end, we must recruit vigorously for the church through the seminaries. Every denomination in America is undermanned, every church in every city in need of stronger, better leadership. In this I am not speaking as a critical layman but am quoting my wise friends of the clergy who humbly issue the call to the young men of today to do more than they, the older men, have done, be more than they have been.

We can all tell what more means, but what of better? Better students, better trained? Yes—but it is not merely a matter of academics. The seminaries have able professors and good curricula, and the bachelor of divinity degree in most schools calls for work worthy of a doctorate.

The new emphasis is not as tangible as courses, credits, theses. It is on persons, producing leaders who are persons, what the dictionary calls "human beings emphatically distinguished from things and lower animals." A person is not assembled from selected skills, nor is he the climax of a sequence of courses. If a student at this school took all the courses in the catalog—each very valuable in its way—it would take him about 16 years to finish; and he might still not be able to face the first minor crisis in his parish. If he went on through all the nonduplicating courses in two or three other great seminaries he would be 50 years in training. And he still might be unable to warm the heart of a child or ease the pain of a suffering father or fill the hungry people with the message of Jesus Christ.

In a real person there are three elements that piece out his formal education, that illuminate it, convert it, make it live. The old terms have been ill-considered by our generation, but, knowing no up-to-date synonyms, I shall use them. They are grace, mercy, and love.

Physicians acknowledge that in the course of scientific advance they are best equipped to deal with the diseases they are least likely to meet. If sin would only confine itself to the areas we know how to treat scientifically, matters would be simpler. But it doesn't, and in the lonely road a minister has to go, there are chasms to span, enemies to battle, and dark places to enter where he needs all the light and strength of love and mercy and grace.

We need good students, able, intelligent young men and women. Yet they need be no more brilliant than the 12 disciples, and, unless they have strong compensating qualities perhaps they would better not be as bright as Judas Iscariot. He seems to have had the highest intelligence quotient of the 12, and he relied on it too much. I suspect that if the Stanford-Binet test had been given to the covenanters at Pentecost, the experts would have advised against going ahead with the Christian church. We must have well-trained ministers according to the standards of the best modern scholarship. It is not a question whether a minister should speak Aramaic as Jesus did, or English. English is an obvious essential here and now and with other minimum essentials is lumped for convenience under the requirement of a bachelor of arts degree for entry into seminary training. Our scholarly standards for the divinity degrees must be maintained and improved. Practical techniques must be more ingeniously taught. But we must see to it that the graduate is more than a technician, more than a scholar; he must be a person—emphatically a human being, a neighbor, and a son of God.

A theological school is not a set of religious-looking buildings on a hill. It is a focal point in a great action, the greatest enterprise of earth and heaven. Men are drawn from all over America, all over the world to serve as teachers and lecturers. Young men and women come from your town, your church, to grow in wisdom and grace under the guidance of these men. After a time they return to you to share with you their understanding, to work with you in your community, to assist you in the training of your children in the way they should go, and to be taught further by you in the countless ways a man must learn from his friends if he is to learn broadly and truly in the span of his years.

A theological school is composed of alumni, too, who are the witnesses of the school among the churches, the commenders of the school to young people, the advance agents of the school in all its outreach. The churches themselves are a part of the school, in this case, particularly the churches of the Pacific coast serving and being served by the

school—but also churches everywhere that have sent students into our classes, teachers to our platforms, trustees to our board, and funds to secure the business operation of the school.

A theological school is a great company of stewards, people of good will who dedicate a portion of time, talent, and money to the end that the name of Jesus Christ may be spoken among all men and that his mission may be fulfilled in all the earth.

This is no parochial celebration. What we do today at the Pacific School of Religion, tomorrow intimately affects the lives of human beings across the Nation. What we do tomorrow will be felt one day in cities and villages where men speak in different tongues but have the same Father and need to know their brothers that they may live in peace.

When I was trying to decide if I should accept the invitation to be president, I questioned and inquired of many people. One of my friends described the school glowingly and concluded, "It's really a jewel of a place." I find that that figure of speech stays with me as I go about my work. The president of the Pacific School of Religion is no engineer building vastly, nor is he the manager directing a system, nor the promoter of a campaign. Rather he is a person charged simply with gathering scholars and students into a small enterprise with a world mission and charged, too, with securing a program and developing an atmosphere which will make the years spent in our company wholly fruitful and productive. To return to the metaphor, he is, if you will, a lapidary charged with the care and proper use of the jewel. He must keep it clear and true so that it catches the light, and adjust it delicately so that it refracts the light sending its beams straight to the dark places of earth and into the dim recesses of the human heart. And the light? It is carved in stone on our hill, as it was written of old, and as I say to you, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men."

Second Lt. Frank E. Ricks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Second Lt. Frank E. Ricks, the son of former Mayor C. A. "Cappy" Ricks, of Martinez, Calif., a young man who came up in the Army the hard way, has been cited by Maj. Gen. Archer L. Lerch, acting for the Secretary of War, for outstanding performance of duty in the United States military government in Korea.

Lieutenant Ricks is a fine type of American who learned the meaning of democracy and the American way of life from his distinguished father.

I include herewith an article appearing in the Contra Costa County Gazette of Martinez, Calif., outlining this service and the citation he received:

FRANK RICKS DECORATED

Second Lt. Frank E. Ricks, son of City Councilman C. A. (Cappy) Ricks, has been commended for outstanding performance of duty in the United States Army military government in Korea, it was learned here today.

Following is the citation, signed by Maj. Gen. Archer L. Lerch for the Secretary of War:

"I wish to commend you for an outstanding performance of duty in the United States military government in Korea.

"As one of the first three officers assigned to the Office of Korean Civil Service on September 30, 1945, you attacked, with enthusiasm and excellent judgment, the problem of converting the Japanese system of rank and privilege for government employees into democratic system of civil service.

"Unaided, you accomplished the tremendous task of processing the removal of all Japanese employed in the government in Korea, and controlled the appointment of Koreans who replaced them.

"By working late into the night, you prepared the plans for a new system of personnel controls that will improve the standards of those Koreans who must continue this work after you are gone.

"You have exercised rare tact in accomplishing a difficult job, and have contributed immeasurably to the plans for the installation of a new civil service in Korea.

"Under the authority granted me by War Department circular No. 377, 1945, you are hereby authorized to wear the Army commendation ribbon by direction of the Secretary of War.

Secretary Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Dangerous Fascism of Wallace Still Threatens You," from the Palladium Item, of Richmond, Ind., under date of March 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DANGEROUS FASCISM OF WALLACE STILL THREATENS YOU

Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, last Monday night publicly advocated what amounts to Fascist control of the political parties of our country. He was speaking to the Women's Democratic Club at Washington.

Mr. Wallace proposed to give to the leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties the power to expel Senators and Representatives who refuse to vote for measures held to be fundamental party issues. Wallace wants such independent Senators and Representatives to be barred by law from being renominated on their party tickets.

Under a bipartisan deal, this could amount to turning over to the party bosses or the President full dictatorial power over all the Democratic and Republican Senators and Representatives of the Nation. It means the people could not continue to demand that their Representatives in both the Houses of the Congress should fight against measures favored by the bosses or the President but not favored by the people. It means the end of representative government by making the party leaders or the President supreme in legislative matters.

And this is what that great liberal, that great defender of the "common man," Henry Wallace, really favors. A Hitler form of government.

In his address last Monday Mr. Wallace mentioned such issues as the proposed British loan (gift), foreign relations, full employment, and atomic energy as now providing measures concerning which we and our Senators and Representatives should not have independent judgment. On such issues our Senators and Representatives should be compelled to vote as directed by the leadership of their respective political parties. To vote otherwise, under the Wallace Fascist proposal, would cause such independent Senators and Representatives to be denied by law their right to renomination.

There is a difference of opinion throughout the Nation among the people about these issues that were mentioned by Mr. Wallace. Our Senators and Representatives have been listening to our discussions among ourselves about these affairs. They have been reading what is being written and printed about what we think should or should not be done regarding such questions or measures.

That is the American way, the constitutional way, the way of free men and free women.

And Henry Wallace would change this way. He would impose on us the dictation of the political leaders or the President in place of the considered will of the people.

Let us go into the Wallace record a bit.

It was Senator Huey Long, Democrat, Louisiana, who warned the Nation that fascism here would try to capture the country under the leadership of a man who pretended to be fighting fascism.

That description fits Henry Wallace to a "t."

He was Secretary of Agriculture in 1938 when President Franklin Roosevelt proposed an outright Fascist method for controlling the votes of Democratic Senators and Representatives by the President. That was the year in which Mr. Roosevelt urged the voters of the Democratic Party to defeat in their primaries those Democratic Senators and Representatives who had refused the year before to vote to him an absolutely dictatorial power. This was the power for him to pack the Supreme Court with stooge justices who would decide cases as he and not justice and the laws determined. Roosevelt unsuccessfully demanded this subversive power in 1937.

Fortunately, the Democratic voters refused to uphold the President's grab for dictatorial power over Democratic Senators and Representatives. They renominated the Democratic candidates whom Roosevelt named as being fit for the executioner's ax.

Henry Wallace did not oppose President Roosevelt's campaign to pack the Supreme Court with stooges and thus to destroy that great safeguard of the constitutional liberties of all Americans. He was for that Fascist plan of the would-be dictator.

Henry Wallace did not come out in 1938 and say President Roosevelt was terribly wrong in trying to apply a Hitler or Stalin purge to Democratic Senators and Representatives of the people who had opposed his efforts to steal the Supreme Court that belongs to the people.

Henry Wallace was for those Fascist proposals. He was for them because at heart he is a Fascist.

In the Presidential campaign of 1944, Henry Wallace supported Franklin Roosevelt for a fourth term as President. In campaign speeches, Wallace took particular pains to denounce Republicans who were against Roosevelt and a fourth term as being "Fascists."

So here we see this leader of the New Deal-Fascists publicly fighting others by charging that they are Fascist. It was the fulfillment of the prophecy uttered years before by Senator Long. A Fascist leader would try to capture the country by pretending to be fighting fascism.

Henry Wallace is running true to form as a dangerous Fascist. He wants to take away from the people their constitutional right to nominate and elect Senators and Representatives who will represent the people in the Congress. He has stated publicly that he wants Senators and Representatives pro-

hibited by law from being renominated who have refused to vote for measures which party leaders and not necessarily the people favor.

In other words, this man Wallace stands for the "leadership" principle which Adolf Hitler applied in Fascist Germany and which Joe Stalin is applying in Fascist Russia. Leadership and not the people or the people's representatives shall determine what laws shall be passed by the Congress, Wallace demands.

This damnable New Deal-Fascist even demands the power to purge Republican Senators and Representatives who refuse to obey the dictates of their party bosses or the President.

Don't you wish it were constitutional and legally possible to try such an arrogant Fascist power grabber, to convict him, and to punish him adequately?

He is as great a danger to your liberties as can be imagined.

The St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of the St. Lawrence project, delivered by Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Transportation Club of the chamber of commerce, Rochester, N. Y., on March 7, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a preface to my remarks, let me point out that a resolution on the St. Lawrence waterway project was presented to the convention of the American Federation of Labor in 1940. Thereafter the subject involved carefully was inquired into by the Federation's executive council at its winter meeting in 1941. The unanimous decision was reached to oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project. A committee of three was appointed to draft a statement indicating the position of the American Federation of Labor on this subject. The committee, of which I was a member, drafted and, with the unanimous approval of the council, issued the following statement:

"FEBRUARY 20, 1941.

"AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR IS OPPOSED TO ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATEPWAY AND POWER PROJECT

"The American Federation of Labor is opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterway and power project because the country now has transportation facilities adequate to meet all the needs. It is economically wasteful to expand transportation facilities far beyond need.

"The development and operation of these proposed additional transportation facilities will cause diversion of business from existing transportation agencies, with consequent dislocation of businesses and resulting serious hardships to working people now engaged in these services.

"Electrical services, mining, shipping, and all forms of transportation will be adversely affected. The economic consequences will be severe. Employees engaged in the production of electrical energy, coal mining, rail and water transportation, including auxiliary operations, will be thrown out of employment. Under no circumstances should this project be undertaken without adequate provisions to minimize the hardships that will be imposed upon the workers who will be adversely affected."

This statement was subsequently ratified by the following convention of the American Federation of Labor. At the meeting of the executive council held in January of this year this subject was considered again, and the executive council reiterated its former opposition by a unanimous vote. The opposition of the American Federation of Labor is, therefore, not merely a matter of form. It is a studied and considered judgment, predicated upon a most comprehensive survey.

* * * * *

Our consideration of and decision on this project is based, not on sectionalism or provincialism. It is our firm conviction that the whole of the United States should not be saddled with inordinate burdens to confer primary, if not doubtful, benefits to areas tributary to the Great Lakes. This conviction is emphasized when we consider that the terms of the proposed St. Lawrence treaty contemplate that all funds to be supplied by the United States for work to be done in Canadian territory must be used for the employment of Canadian labor, Canadian engineers, and for Canadian materials.

Engineers have estimated that the ultimate cost of the project in Canadian territory may well come above $100,000,000. It has been further estimated that $1 of every $5 spent by this country would be devoted to the employment of Canadian workers and the purchase of Canadian materials. This, to us, seems an unfair discrimination against the workers of our land.

While a vast number of organized workers of Canada are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and while our interests as workers are alike, regardless of national distribution, nevertheless we do consider this proposal unreciprocal in character and wholly unfair to the workers of the United States, which after all constitute a considerable body of our taxpayers.

* * * * *

There are, of course, those who would have us believe that Canada and the United States would bear an equal cost on this project. Such allegations, however, cannot be sustained. It has been estimated, by competent authorities, that for the purposes of a fair comparison the American expenditure would be more than three times the Canadian outlay. Despite the tremendous discrepancy in costs, Canada will utilize the project far more than the United States.

Thus our people are asked to share in an enterprise in which we would bear the greatest financial outlay and yet prove only a meager, if not doubtful, beneficiary.

* * * * *

It is said by some, that this project would provide work in periods of unemployment, and that it presents part of a well planned public works project. Let me make clear, the American Federation of Labor favors public works projects. However, it does not believe that all public works projects are beneficient substitutes for private enterprise. To the contrary, this proposed public works project would result in dislocating present employment and offer no sound substitute for the potential employment of workers by the enhancement and encouragement of our present transportation systems.

As a matter of fact the solution of our employment problem is more fundamental in character. It lies in a steadily expanding national economy, in increased production, and in an intelligent spirit of cooperation between labor and management. In times of crisis, public works help to take up the slack of unemployment and help our economy to ride more or less smoothly over the uneven road of industrial depression. They are of aid in times of crisis but are not a solution in themselves.

* * * * *

Approval by American organized labor of any public works project is therefore contingent upon the following requirements:

1. The project must not be maintained in competition to American private enterprise.
2. The project must be useful socially, and calculated to enrich the national wealth by its existence.
3. It must be beneficial to the American people as a whole, and not detrimental to any section of American labor.
4. The project must be economically sound.

Viewed in the light of these requirements, the St. Lawrence seaway project makes a poor showing indeed.

* * * * *

Viewed more specifically from the standpoint of labor, the development of the proposed St. Lawrence project would affect the lives and well-being of approximately 650,000 coal miners in the United States. For many years Canada has been an important market for American coal. Canadian industry purchases nearly 17,000,000 tons of American coal annually. Even with only a 14-foot channel now available down the St. Lawrence, we have been steadily losing part of the Canadian market for our coal.

The St. Lawrence seaway proposal would provide economically dangerous competition to American miners. If the 27-foot seaway became available, foreign ships, manned by cheap foreign labor, would be able to enter the Great Lakes, transporting Western wheat to the world markets at Liverpool and other European ports. For want of return cargo these same foreign ships would carry still greater cargoes of British coal up the St. Lawrence and into Great Lakes ports at competitive rates dangerously unfair to American coal miners, mine operators, and investors.

If the cost of transporting coal from England and Wales into Canada is so reduced as practically to eliminate costs, our annual Canadian market for even the remaining million tons gradually will disappear. In that way American miners, will suffer along with other sections of American industry.

While on the question of coal it might be well to consider how Russian coal will benefit from the St. Lawrence seaway. Russia requires vast sums of money for reconstruction in her devastated areas. The Russian coal industry, like all industries in the Soviet Union, is a state monopoly. The Soviet Government can fix prices to suit its economic and political interests. Under the St. Lawrence seaway project proposal, millions of tons of Russian coal will become available to Canadian industry at dumped prices, a situation in which the American coal operators and miners alike will be powerless. Canada would then have an unlimited supply of the cheap power with which to build industries on the banks of the proposed seaway. With Canada's immigration laws providing a source of cheap labor, Canadian industrialists would be able to compete most unfairly with American business. By this sort of competition, the whole of our American wage and labor standards would be threatened.

American coal miners are not the only American workers who will suffer directly if the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed and put into operation. Shipment of coal from mines in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky and Illinois, Ohio and other States now are transported to the Canadian market, and Great Lakes ports by rail. This constitutes a substantial source of income for our American railroads, and American railroad workers. If British and Russian coal, mined by workers whose standard of living is far inferior to that of American workers, can be transported as ballast in foreign ships to Canadian ports and

to Great Lakes cities on the American side, it will tend to eliminate a great deal of tonnage now carried by our railroads. In that way employment opportunities for American railroad workers will be greatly lessened. Whatever will detrimentally affect the employment of railroad workers will, to a degree, more or less affect railroad securities.

Then, too, maritime workers are likely to suffer. If this project is carried through, ships flying foreign flags will be free to compete in commerce between all the Great Lakes cities and the ports of Cuba, Mexico, and South America. What chance would American vessels have, paying high American wages and maintaining high standards of living for its seamen, in competition with French, Chinese, British, and Italian ships? Buffalo and other American water fronts soon would become blighted because of this unfair competition.

* * * * *

Our concern regarding this project is reflected not alone in the dangers presented to our miners, transport and maritime workers. Our interests embrace the well-being of all our people. We are concerned in safeguarding and promoting the best interests of our agricultural and industrial enterprises as well as those of labor. Let us then consider briefly general objections to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

First of all, no important project of this type has ever been attempted without the expenses having greatly exceeded the forecasts. It has been estimated, based largely on construction costs in 1926–27, that the total cost ought to be $543,429,000. Back in 1932, proponents of the scheme estimated the cost at 80 percent of this figure.

Hugh Cooper, international engineer, who aided in the building of the Dnieprostroy Dam in Russia, estimated that completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, would cost $1,350,000,000. E. P. Goodrich, internationally famous consulting engineer, estimated that the project would cost over $1,000,000,000. Herbert Hoover, who knows a thing or two about engineering, placed the cost at $800,000,000.

History indicates that in the development of every canal or waterway system estimated costs rise before the job is finished.

For instance, it was found that the Panama Canal was estimated to cost $160,000,000; when the actual cost came to $400,000,000. In the case of the Suez Canal, the original estimate of $30,000,000 pyramided to $80,000,000 before the project was completed. The Chicago drainage canal, estimated to cost $16,000,000 finally cost $53,000,000. Coming close to the site of the proposed seaway, we find that the Welland ship canal, estimated to cost $50,000,000, actually cost $131,000,000. And additional work will have to be done to make it suitable for waterway traffic.

* * * * *

Uncertainty prevails regarding the amount of potential traffic which actually might move by any of the routes, nor has an estimate been made of the total possible savings involved. While it is quite feasible to make an estimate of American traffic which would flow over the waterway in normal times, its volume would not be sufficient to justify the consummation of the project.

It is only for Europe-bound trade that the St. Lawrence project presents a route which may offer advantages, as to distance or otherwise, over other routes already established. Europe alone carries on the kind of traffic with the tributary area for which river service might be established. The tributary area's trade with the Orient, with Latin America, and with the Gulf is too varied as to commodity and destination to be of any service. There is altogether too little balance between exports and imports to encourage the extension of ocean-liner service from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes.

* * * * *

With Europe as the great market for the St. Lawrence traffic, it is obvious that this traffic must consist mostly of grain. In fact, the friends of this project quite willingly admit that whatever benefits might be derived would come chiefly from grain trade. However, our friends overlook, intentionally or otherwise, the long-time trends in our international grain trade. Even with the restoration of normal conditions, the grain available for traffic over the waterway is two-thirds Canadian. Almost four-fifths of the eventual water power would be devoted to Canadian use.

It has been estimated the American taxpayer would be assessed 15 cents for every bushel of grain shipped over the waterway to effect a slight saving to the shipper. Even if our foreign commerce were to double, the project would still involve a loss.

As a matter of fact, the St. Lawrence seaway route is becoming of decreasing importance as an outlet for wheat. In the tributary area itself, the tendency is to migrate farther and farther southwest, toward the Gulf ports. The Atlantic ports will continue to handle the large part of wheat exports at rates which defy competition.

* * * * *

The St. Lawrence waterway can never be a first-class waterway, capable of giving the ports it would serve a position comparable to genuine seaboard cities. According to most favorable estimates, the navigable season is only 7 months of the year. During part of this 7-month season, the dangers of fog and ice are great. As a matter of good business, sea vessels would not be prone to devote themselves to the St. Lawrence during the navigable season, with no other traffic to fill during the winter months. It would be difficult for steamers to combine passenger and freight to operate properly. Neither would passengers be inclined to make the long inland journey by water.

* * * * *

The current belief that waterway transportation on the St. Lawrence would be incomparably cheaper than land traffic draws strength from a primary mistake in estimating costs. Railroad rates cover the roadbed, the terminals, and all other incidents of capital outlay. On the other hand, rates on waterways cover only the cost of the carriers. They ignore the vast sums which people of the United States as a whole spend for the construction and upkeep of the waterways.

The belief of cheaper rates, therefore, has no foundation in fact. At best it distributes the cost to all our citizens for the benefit of a comparative few.

* * * * *

It may be alleged that while competition between rail and water transport may not result in lower transportation rates there is an imperative need for additional water routes to meet the demand for present and future transportation requirements. A careful survey, however, indicates that today and under present circumstances we are not faced with a shortage of transportation facilities. We have just passed through a period of war that severely tried our railways, our airways, our highways, and our waterways. They met the requirements admirably.

Today we find remarkable changes are taking place in science, and in engineering. All this has made it possible for every system of transportation to carry on an ever-increasing volume of freight and passenger traffic. Today the railroads, with modern lightweight equipment, with Diesel electric and steam turbines or electric locomotives, can haul from 20 to 30 percent more traffic than was the case before the war. Our air lines are expanding rapidly. New lines and additional schedules are being added. Our Federal Government constructed thousands of airports during the war and authorized the expenditure of thousands of millions of dollars on new airports to be constructed. New and improved highways with magnificent throughways, as well as four, and even six, lane freight and passenger routes, will become the reality of the future.

The thought presents itself, therefore, it is not advisable, much less desirable under such conditions, to attempt to bring into play additional competition which, at best, is negative; would it not be better for us to give full play and encouragement to a vast expansion and improvement in the systems that now serve our communities and States? Why should we venture into international projects when, as a matter of fact, the opportunity of enhancing our domestic systems and facilities offer the greatest opportunities for service, rewards, and security.

* * * * *

Finally, why should consideration be given to the desirability of our country having its foreign trade moved through the ports of another country? Of course, no one would conceive the possibility of unfriendly relations between the peoples of America and Canada; nevertheless nations have been torn asunder and interminable rivalries frequently have been due to the efforts of land-locked nations to extend their territories to the sea. Blessed, as we are, with thousands of miles of seacoast, why should the United States now seek a course to the sea through the port of a foreign nation? Surely, the right answer must be apparent to every true American.

* * * * *

Perhaps more fundamental and dangerous than all is the method being resorted to to advance an unsound, wasteful, and dangerous project.

This most recent attempt to resuscitate the St. Lawrence seaway and power project at best is predicated on an extremely questionable, if not unconstitutional, procedure.

In this instance a most crafty, if not unconstitutional, procedure is being resorted to to accomplish that which by constitutional procedure has failed heretofore.

Originally, on July 18, 1932, our Government and Canada signed the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway treaty. After exhaustive hearings, the Senate, in March 1934, by a vote of 46 to 42, disapproved the proposed treaty. The proposal was then submitted and considered as a treaty. Under constitutional requirements a two-thirds vote of the Senate is essential to ratify a treaty.

Defeated in foisting this project upon our Nation in the form of a treaty, a so-called executive agreement then was entered into on March 19, 1941, obviously to circumvent constitutional requirements. This alleged agreement or proposal provided for the seaway and power project. No action was taken on this proposal until 1943, when the Commerce Committee of the Senate held extensive hearings. It confined itself primarily to the constitutional issue of whether the alleged agreement proposed should be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent as in the case of a treaty. While no formal report was made, the committee was of the opinion that the matter constituted a treaty, not an agreement, and should therefore be considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee instead of the Commerce Committee. A later effort to bring about the approval of the alleged agreement through an amendment from the floor of the Senate on a pending rivers and harbors bill again failed.

Now again the effort is being made by Senate joint resolution to secure the ap-

proval of the proposal in the form of an agreement, rather than as a treaty, and previously defeated as such. This resolution has now been referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as was previously recommended by the Commerce Committee. The question now arises, Will the Senate Foreign Relations Committee consider and report this alleged agreement as a treaty or will it disregard all previous considerations and decisions on this subject by the Senate as having been predicated upon a false and unconstitutional basis?

Are we now to regard treaties and executive agreements as tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee, or are we still to regard constitutional requirements as binding equally upon Congress and the executive department of our Government in our relations with foreign powers? By such a procedure we will have made a mockery of that section of our Constitution providing for the ratification of treaties by two-thirds vote of the Senate. Certainly if this proposal is not to be considered a treaty, but as an executive agreement, then will the Senate have definitely disassociated itself from an obligation clearly placed upon it by constitutional requirement. By such action the Senate will have unconstitutionally altered and, for all practical purposes have destroyed that constitutional provision relating to treaties under the unwarrantable guise of an executive agreement.

If, perchance, it is desired that constitutional changes be effected in this regard, then such changes should be propounded, considered and be adopted in the manner provided by the Constitution itself, and not by means of circumlocution. Thus a far greater and more fundamental principle is involved in this mad attempt to enter into an illogical, unsound and dangerous international enterprise.

* * * * *

It was in January of 1934 that Senator ROBERT WAGNER, of New York, filed a dissenting opinion to the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the effect that the "economic studies urging the St. Lawrence treaty and the theories of economic relief upon which the project is based have been outmoded by the unparalleled changes in our economic life and thinking since 1929." He supported his dissenting opinion at that time with 13 distinctive and well-grounded points of opposition. What he said was true in 1934 is equally true today; indeed what he said then is emphasized by conditions and developments of today.

Only last week Senator Mead of New York, in an address delivered by him in New York City, emphasized the dangerous potentialities of the proposed seaway, characterizing the project as a threat, and called attention to the existing evidence in the record which indicates the seaway would leave an economic blight among neighboring communities and cripple the shipping interests of the Great Lakes by cheap alien labor. He, too, submitted a number of salient points of opposition to this seaway proposal.

We find the conclusions of Senators Wagner and Mead not only sound but of utmost importance. We are in complete accord with their thinking and expressions on this subject, and as here related—indeed the American Federation of Labor is convinced today more firmly than ever heretofore of the fallibility, the dubiousness, the utter impracticability and unintelligibility of the project and of its harmful and baneful potentialities.

We are irrevocably opposed to this proposal as well as methods resorted to to foist it upon the American people and will exert every effort to defeat this ill-conceived, ill-founded and dangerous meddling with the well-being of our national affairs and relationships.

Thirty!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article on the atomic bomb and the projected atomic bomb tests, by L. Lore Wartes, of Spokane, Wash.

Mr. Wartes is a metallurgist and scientist of note. He is a practicing researcher and consultant in metals. In his article he discusses some of the possibilities which lie ahead of us. They are worthy of thought.

I am also including the atomic-bomb timetable as prepared by Mr. Wartes:

THIRTY!

(By L. Lore Wartes)

The futility of predicting the full effect of nuclear (atomic bomb) explosions is recognized by most engineers and scientists.

Scientist's statements attributed to Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, commander of the project producing the atomic bomb, that should dispell the fear in the minds of any American that the explosion will be completely localized, not only does not dispell fear but to the contrary gives any thinking person cause for alarm and people everywhere reason for hysteria. In talking about atomic bombs a completely localized explosion is perhaps the most ridiculous statement ever made by man. It would be appropriate to add that the bombs may go off with the loudest, absolutely silent noise in the world's history.

Taking the statement as made in the Associated Press dispatch of March 16:

"The explosion of an atomic bomb near the surface, on the surface, or under the surface will only cause local disturbances such as we might expect from an ordinary charge of great magnitude." If the above is true, there is no factual necessity for making the test. Therefore, they are being made either to entertain brass hats or to show the world that the United States has atomic bombs to waste. Continuing the statement: "It is impossible that such an explosion can cause progressive disintegration of the sea water which could result in the explosion of the globe." This statement is undoubtedly following the new definition for "impossible" taken from a World War II phrase, "The difficult we will do now—the impossible will take a little longer." The word "impossible" has lost its meaning in the atomic age.

Continuing the dispatch: "It is known that elements contained in water are also abundant in stars. If the stars had a high rate of chain reaction they would blow up or consume themselves. They don't, so it is deduced that sea water will not." There is small satisfaction indeed to be told that the star chain reaction is so slow that the surface temperature is a mere million degrees unless it is comforting to know that the world will not blow up and that the worst that can happen is that the surface temperature of the earth cannot possibly exceed a million or so degrees. The facts are that some stars do explode. Nova T Coronae Borealis exploded about the 9th of February 1946 and continued through the 10th and 11th of February. The rate of expansion was 2,500 miles per second and was a variety of chain reaction. The star increased in brightness several hundred times. This is almost a perfect duplication of the star's behavior 80 years ago and therefore disproves the above dispatch that a high chain reaction would cause a star to be consumed or dissipated.

It is true that the most probable known nuclear reaction would at 1,000,000 degrees be insufficient to sustain itself, but there is little sense in proving that the most probable reaction will take place. There is no wisdom in the argument and no valid excuse in conducting such tests except to learn which of an infinite number of improbabilities will be the result.

The real danger from the tests is not in a chain reaction which would change the earth to a small low-temperature star, although this possibility exists, but the physical effect and reaction of high-pressure waves and wave reflections acting on the most vulnerable parts of the earth's crust. Professor Bridgemen, of Harvard, has recently shown that under certain conditions of moderately heavy pressure many normally stable substances become unstable and detonate.

Pressure waves from atomic bombs are cushioned and modified by the atmosphere and the earth but the effect of such bombs in water, which, for all practical purposes, is incompressable, will be something different and the result unponderable.

Should the atomic bomb reaction raise the water temperature to 1,000,000 degrees as suggested, the pressure at that point by interpolation should reach millions of tons to the square inch, a fantastic pressure, the seismic resultant on one of the weakest areas in the earth's crust is inestimable.

The earth is largely a molten mass of lava with a very thin skin of rock, earth, and water surrounding it and insulating the surface from the high internal temperatures. It is at all times in precarious balance. Each earthquake and volcano is a minor adjust in the crust. Human life can exist on earth only in times of extreme quiet. In modern times each adjustment in the earth's shell is measured in feet, yet these quakes are often attended with great loss of life and property damage. There have been ages in prehistoric times when shifts have been many miles long with fissures opening in the earth's crust and lava flowing over hundreds of thousands of square miles.

An ice pick makes a very local impression on a cake of ice, yet with a few well-directed blows the cake is split.

However remote the possibility of world destruction from the atomic bomb tests, is there any need for the experiment when the world knows what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Is there any reason to embark on an armed race of atomic bombs? It can only be a race of annihilation.

Should America follow the suicidal course of conducting experiments in destruction it can only expect other nations to do likewise.

America's obsolete battleships should be scrapped and salvaged, not evaporated. The metals used in their construction came largely from American mines, were paid for by American dollars and are now needed as the raw material for consumer goods.

The only possible accomplishment of these tests would be to prove "What fools these mortals be." What more proof than World Wars I and II does America need? Like all the other prophets, sages and scientists I state without fear of successful contradiction that it is impossible for the atomic bomb tests to destroy the world, with full knowledge that nobody will say "I told you so" when uninhibited science becomes "The Sorcerer's Apprentice" on an uninhabited planet.

ATOM BOMB TIMETABLE

1945: New Mexico atom bomb tests successful.

1945: Atom bomb dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. War with Japan ends.

1946: United States atom bomb tests destroy 100 ships in Pacific.

1948: Nuclear explosion in eastern Washington obliterates Hanford; Pasco and Kennewick in ruins. Considerable damage and loss of life in Walla Walla and Pendleton.

1951: Russia conducts atom bomb tests. Results not available.

1952: Argentina conducts atom bomb tests. Observers state bomb 10 times more powerful than United States bomb.

1953: France conducts atom bomb tests. Entire Island of Corsica destroyed. Force of explosion far exceeds estimates of engineers and scientists.

1955: Super atomic bomb discovered by American scientists. One bomb will destroy everything above the ground for a radius of 100 miles and melt the earth's crust to a depth of 8,500 feet. There is no defense for this powerful weapon.

1957: German scientists who have been prohibited from atom research discover light ray that starts chain reaction. Ray thought to be capable of distintegrating iron, aluminum, and magnesium with terrific explosive force.

1957½: Germans again start attempt to gain world domination.

1957⅝: France objects.

1957¾: Frankfort sizzles. Paris disappears.

1957¾ and 1 day: Hamburg fries. Berlin is missing.

Twelve hours later: Normandy obliterated. Krakatoa submerged in mortification.

Three hours later: Poland gone.

One hour later: Alsace Lorraine and Bavaria lost. Vesuvius and Fujiyama rumbling jealously.

Thirty minutes later: All of British Isles dissolved except Southern Ireland. What precision!

Twenty minutes later: United States fires super colossal bomb at Europe, etc., to the end.

1958: Twinkle, twinkle, little star.

Continuance of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, by request, the following statement by the legislative director of the Amvets relative to their endorsement of the continuation of the OPA as an emergency measure:

AMVETS ENDORSES OPA

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

Amvets believes that for the present time Congress should place in the hands of the executive department statutory authority for price controls. Amvets has gone on record both at its national convention in Chicago, Ill., last October and again at its national executive meeting in February in favor of price ceilings and rent stabilization.

Amvets believes that through the continuation of price control further demoralizing inflation can be prevented.

Amvets, however, stanchly opposes price control as an attempt to bring about a so-called planned economy. We are 100 percent in favor of our form of government and the free-enterprise system. Even with all of its apparent defects, abuses, and inadequacies we believe that our form of government is the best yet devised by mankind, and we shall defend it with all our might.

Yet, we fully realize and are cognizant of the fact that the economic condition confronting our Nation today either calls for reasonable price control or else we will experience a run-away inflation that may destroy everything that our veterans fought for.

Our history books give us ample reason to study this matter very carefully. Price control, we know, means regulation of the life of individuals and in some cases might approximate dictatorship. We are in an emergency and we must use emergency measures to protect the public welfare. We realize that the Federal Government is asking that citizens give up certain liberties so that the economy of the Nation may function as normal as possible. All kinds of businesses are being asked to surrender some of their freedom of action and submit to Government guidance in the conduct of their everyday commerce.

This is an unfortunate situation and we trust that it will be a temporary measure.

Amvets believes that the administration of price control has been badly administered and we urge that every precaution be taken along certain lines to avoid these mistakes in the future.

In conclusion we believe that price control to be effective must be all inclusive. It must not only watch over the retail but the wholesale counter as well. It must strive to keep the cost of labor down and prevent profiteering in commodities that are scarce.

Amvets believes in the free fluctuation of prices below a level that may be deemed dangerous. We are absolutely not in favor of cutlawing either free competition, supply or demand and we support certain limitations aimed to protect this Nation from a whirlwind of inflation.

The Worst Enemy You Have

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, most of us have read verile articles from the pen of the great economist, John T. Flynn. Mr. Flynn states in an article on the financial situation that has just come to my attention, which is submitted for the consideration of my colleagues, that the man who tells you there is an easy way to do that—to deal with the national debt—is the worst enemy you have.

[Reprinted from the Reader's Digest of January 1946]

(By John T. Flynn)

I wonder if the American people are yet ready for a dose of the truth. It has to do with two subjects—one very sweet, one very sour, but together as important as any issue we face.

One of these is called Jobs for All, or Full Employment. We all love that. The other is the national debt, and no one wants to talk about that.

First, about Jobs for All. Of course, everybody is for full employment. But there is a group in Washington which seeks to monopolize the idea. This group has a plan and holds that if you oppose its plan you are against full employment. It proposes to have the Government guarantee full employment for everybody. It is based on the proposition that private business cannot provide jobs for all, and therefore the Government must provide millions of jobs to create full employment, and to do this the Government must borrow the necessary billions.

Suppose, however, the Government cannot borrow any more billions. In that case the plan must collapse. This brings us to the second problem—which no one is supposed to talk about—the national debt.

At this moment our Government owes $262,000,000,000. I wonder if you have any idea how much that is. Back in 1929, the most prosperous year in the Nation's history, the total long-term debt of this country—I mean the mortgages on all the farms, homes, buildings, and stores, the bonded debt of all the railroads, utility companies, industrial and commercial corporations, plus the debt of the Federal Government, the 48 States, the 3,600 counties, and the 16,000 incorporated cities and towns and villages—was $116,000,000,000. The present debt of the Federal Government alone is more than twice that.

Even though you do not like to talk about it, you had better face this debt. It is here. We must find a way to deal with it. And the man who tells you there is an easy way to do that is the worst enemy you have.

What did this debt do for us? Our greatest peacetime national income was in 1929—$83,000,000,000. That shrank in the depression, then climbed back to seventy-seven billion in 1940. Government spending of borrowed money built it back. Then came the war. The Government borrowed thirteen billion in the calendar year of 1941; fifty billion in 1942; fifty-seven billion the next year and sixty-four billion in 1944. In 1945 it borrowed thirty-four billion up to November 1. It spent these billions creating armies and weapons and because of these borrowed billions incomes soared—to ninety-five billion in 1941; one hundred and nineteen billion in 1942; one hundred and forty-nine billion in 1943; and perhaps one hundred and sixty billion in 1944. Then the Government taxed these billions which it had created. Taxes soared—seven billion in 1941; sixteen billion the next year; thirty-four billion the next; forty-four billion in 1944 and thirty-seven billion in 1945 up to November 1. Thus it recaptured much of the income it had created and spent it a second time.

Now that the war is over people ask: If the Government could produce all this employment and income during the war, why not in peace? If it can borrow billions to make war goods, why not peace goods? The answer, of course, is that it can. A government can borrow and spend in war or peace just as long as somebody is willing to lend to it. When this Government began borrowing to make work in 1933 the national debt was only twenty-one billion. It then began borrowing four or five billion a year. But when the war came the Government in just 5 years piled its debt up to two hundred and sixty-two billion. And now we are at the end of our rope. We can't do that much longer. Here is the reason.

When the Government began all this borrowing it issued bonds and notes—promises to pay. Now the time for redeeming them begins. In the next 2 years—1946 and 1947—$110,000,000,000 of these promises will be due. That is, the holders will have the right to demand payment. Actually this has already begun.

The largest source of loans from individuals was the savings bonds of the E type, totaling over $46,000,000,000. They are literally payable on demand. Most of them are in the hands of people of small means—working people and little businessmen. Many of these savers from time to time want to turn their bonds into cash. All through the war the Government had to redeem large sums every month. It didn't matter then because the Government sold so much more

than it cashed that there was always a large surplus. But now people are buying fewer and cashing more. This year they cashed an average of $446,000,000 a month. In September and October the Government had to pay out more than it took in. It is obvious that as we draw farther from the war this tendency will grow.

I do not cite these figures to frighten anybody. There is no need to be alarmed as long as we know the facts and are not fooled by those who wish to sell their pet economic theories. The danger lies wholly in permitting ourselves to be fooled.

Each year billions of bonds and notes will fall due. The Government will try to issue new bonds to the holders of the old ones. But many bondholders will want their money. Hence new lenders must be found to take their place. While the Government is trying to find new lenders to pay off old issues, it will have to find still more new lenders to advance more billions for its new enterprises in creating abundance and jobs. If it didn't have to meet the old debts so soon and so often it might squeeze by for a while. But it cannot service the old debts and contract new ones by any sound means of borrowing. I say sound means, because it might conceivably manage for a time by forcing the banks to take its notes—as it has already done upon a serious scale. But this, as Secretary of the Treasury Vinson has said, is a sure road to inflation. Or it might turn to the printing press, which is even a quicker road.

But there is another reason why the Government cannot continue to travel this road. Those who have been telling the people that a Government debt is not a burden like a private debt are about to have a laboratory demonstration of the fallacy of that pleasant theory. I predict that the annual interest on the existing debt will be at least $6,000,000,000 a year. This alone is more than the Government spent in any peace year prior to 1934, more than the Treasury ever received in any peace year prior to 1941.

Where will the Government collect this interest? If I, a private citizen, borrow a million dollars to build a factory, I spend it on buildings, machinery, and materials. This gives work to many people. Each month I pay out wages, cost of materials, and so on. That makes money income in the hands of those who receive it. But also I create wealth—I manufacture goods. The cash I get for them gives me money with which to hire my workers for another month, buy more materials to make more goods, pay the interest on the million I borrowed and put aside something to repay it. Thus this single loan of a million may well enable me to create an institution that, without borrowing more, will go on for years creating wealth and income and providing the means of paying both the interest and the loan itself.

But suppose the Government borrows a million. It may spend the money on very useful and desirable things. But with rare exceptions it creates no enterprise which brings in revenue. The park or school or highway or battleship it may build brings in no cash to pay the workers or to pay the interest on the debt. The countless billions borrowed during the last 5 years to fight the war have created very little. What we have is victory, which, of course, is priceless. But there is nothing as a result which will provide work and bring in money to pay the debt or the interest.

Yet the interest must be paid. To pay it the Government must impose taxes. Where do taxes come from? From the revenues produced by all the big and little enterprises of the country. A corporation of private businessmen must pay taxes out of business revenues. Employees must pay their taxes out of the wages or salaries they receive from their employer. Thus the burden of paying the taxes to pay the Government debt and interest rests on every business concern. A railroad corporation, a store, an apartment house will have resting upon it the mortgage resulting from its own debts and in addition will have the Government debt weighing down on it like a vast mortgage. But the Government burden will be greater than their own mortgages because the Government debt is three times as great as all the private long-term debts in the land.

Take a single instance—a railroad with a heavy outstanding bonded debt. It will have to make enough money to pay the interest on it. Before the war many railroads couldn't do that. Others which did couldn't pay any dividends. Sixty percent of the roads couldn't pay dividends. But now they will have to earn enough to pay the interest on their own debt and enough more to pay their share of the interest on the Government's debt. The latter payments will mean heavier taxes on railroads that had a struggle paying their own interest charges before the war. And although they will have to pay taxes ultimately to service the Nation's debt, they will not own any Government bonds through which they can recapture in interest what they pay in taxes. Railroads cannot afford to own Government bonds. Their funds are needed for running the railroad.

The productive enterprises of the country—the private business concerns—must make enough money to pay the taxes to manage this vast debt. But they will get no benefit from the debt. Business corporations—except banks, insurance companies, and so on—buy public bonds during a war, but will not do so in peacetime save in very small amounts. A public bond with its low interest rate appeals only to that limited number of investors who are interested primarily in security. The business concern needs its funds to operate its business. It is more likely to be a borrower than a lender. The taxes to pay the Government interest come out of the pockets of these enterprises, but very little of the interest payments will go back into them.

The public debt when it was half its present size was a terrific load on our economic system. It is now a mountainous load. Of course if the Government contrives by freak devices to borrow more, it can hire people. But it will not permanently increase the number of employed because, unless we find some means of dealing with the debt as it is, the greatest of job-making institutions will go into progressive decline—that is, the institution of private enterprise which in reality creates all the jobs and pays the wages of all the jobs, including jobs in Government which must be paid for with the taxes from private industry.

Of course, everyone is for a country where every man willing to work can find employment. But we are also for a country where every man who is willing and able to create work by creating a job-giving enterprise can find the opportunity to do it. While we cry out for full employment and jobs for all, we carry on an incessant warfare upon the job-makers, the enterprise builders, the employing industries of the Nation. The plan to create full employment by a Government guaranty backed by Government borrowing is not a plan to make jobs for all, but a plan that will create unemployment because it will bankrupt private industry and ultimately bankrupt the Government itself.

What, then, can we do?

1. We must put a stop to the deficits, and at once.

2. The Government must stop making fantastic promises to the people of this country and of other countries which it cannot fulfill without plunging deeper into debt.

3. We must recognize that we cannot service the present debt unless the dollar income of the Nation is increased. This must be accomplished chiefly by expanding enormously the productive capacity of the Nation, but also partly by recognizing the inevitable price rise and controlling it at an economic level.

4. We must recognize that the Federal Government is soon going to be broke, but that the States have been living on fat supplied by the Federal expenditures. Most States have large surpluses, and the job of caring for the unemployed and the poor should be handed back to them.

5. Most important of all, we must set about at once examining our whole social structure to determine what Government, labor, industry, States, and cities are doing that is crippling the productive energies of the country. This means we must decide now what are the forces which have stopped the flow of private investment in this country for 15 years and remove them. We must unchain private industry and take the Government, the labor restrictionist, and the business monopolist off its back. The principal handicaps are those restraints imposed by Government and by private organizations of labor and capital.

We must choose between capitalism and socialism. We cannot have both. And if we want a system of private ownership under which alone it is possible for men to have freedom, we must do the things that will make that system work.

Additional Appropriation To Provide Additional Housing for Veterans and Their Families

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House joint resolution before us for consideration today appropriates an additional $253,727,000 to provide for approximately 102,000 additional units of temporary housing for veterans of World War II and their immediate families through the use of existing war housing or other surplus facilities and supplies declared to be surplus by other Federal agencies. This sum of money will be available for immediate use in carrying out this additional housing program for the veterans of World War II and their families when it is adopted by the Senate and approved by the President.

On a roll call in the House today this resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the House and it was a genuine pleasure for me to have an opportunity to vote for this additional housing for the veterans and their families. The Congress, in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, appropriated $191,900,000 and also made available an additional $31,900,000, which was approved December 28, 1945. It was my good fortune to support that legislation.

Recently the House passed a bill by a vote of 357 to 24 to provide for the construction of 2,700,000 individual homes and housing units in which the veterans are given preference. This program will cost somewhere between fifteen to twenty

billions of dollars. I was one of the 357 who voted for that bill. It is now in the Senate. It cannot be truthfully said that Congress is not fully alive to the critical housing shortage or to the need of the veterans and their families in this respect. Neither can it be truthfully said that the House of Representatives is not fully aware of the needs of our veterans nor lacking in interest or assistance in meeting these needs. It is well known that the Federal agencies in many cases have fixed such prices on lumber, other supplies and equipment for house construction that thousands and thousands of sawmills and other lumber processing plants, as well as other plants in providing facilities and equipment have been forced out of business, and thereby contributing to the shortage and scarcity of these necessary housing materials and equipment. We must do everything reasonably possible to relieve the housing shortage. To accomplish this there must be the fullest cooperation on the part of those who produce these materials and equipment and the agencies of the Federal Government that are in charge of this housing program. If we all pull together the time is not far distant when there will be housing and shelter for all, and especially for our veterans.

To read the propaganda put out and to hear the rantings of some radio broadcasters one would think that a mere handful of Members of the House and Senate are interested in the veterans and the housing program. There are many unsound, unworkable, radical schemes set forth by some vociferous individuals who claim a monopoly of interest in and sympathy for the veterans. This is a great American problem. It can be and must be solved for our veterans and the American people in a sane, sound, and practical American way, looking always to the welfare of the veterans and their families, and our country.

Resolution of National Association of Teachers of Singing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution passed by the National Association of Teachers of singing at its annual business meeting held in Detroit on February 22, 1946:

Whereas House bill 346, entitled "GI bill of rights," as at present administered in the field of applied musical instruction not only excludes from consideration competent private teachers but also operates to prevent veterans from studying with former instructors or from making free choice of instructors meeting their specific requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Teachers of Singing hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States so to amend said bill that neither the capable private teacher nor the veterans concerned be subjected to this obviously unjust discrimination.

Our Story Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Mr. Ernest Lindley in the Washington Post on the subject of information and foreign policy:

Current trends abroad are crowded with reminders that the need to see that American ideals, aims, and policies are understood by all who can be persuaded to look or listen did not end with the war. This is so obviously so that Members of Congress are showing a renewed and friendlier interest in the State Department's program for maintaining an overseas information service.

It is in behalf of this program that W. Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, among others, has recently appeared before the House Rules Committee and a House Appropriations Subcommittee. For, to carry forward this work, the State Department needs both money—it is asking a basic appropriation of $19,000,000 for next year—and the authorization provided by the Bloom bill which is now in the hands of the Rules Committee. Mr. Harriman's general observations, based on his experiences in Moscow, provided a telling background for the argument for official information services overseas. He is qualified also to give counsel based on his observations in Britain, in most of the nations of Europe, the Middle East, and portions of the Orient, during nearly 5 years of service as Mr. Roosevelt's personal representative and as an ambassador.

Russia is the most difficult nation of all into which to get information which presents accurately our mode of life, our institutions, our ideals, and our purposes. The Russian people see and hear about us only what the Government permits them to see and hear. The picture they get is fragmentary and often distorted. Even the higher Soviet officials know little about us.

The circulation of privately published newspapers and general periodicals is prohibited. The Soviet authorities, however, have permitted the publication by the American Government of a bimonthly illustrated magazine in the Russian language. This has a selected circulation of about 10,000. In addition, the Soviet Government has permitted—or, perhaps, promoted is the word—the importation of American literature on scientific and technical subjects, and to some extent on the arts. The works of a number of American fiction writers have been translated into Russian and some of the other languages of the USSR. The sum is only a thin trickle of information. The American press associations and other private agencies are powerless to enlarge it. The American Government may not be able to enlarge it very much. But it must endeavor to do so, for without better understanding the hope of averting an eventual war is slim.

It may be possible to supplement the present tiny flow into Russia of information about ourselves by short-wave broadcasts in the languages of the USSR. The Soviet authorities might object, and try to jam the broadcasts or punish those who listened. But this additional method may be worth a trial.

In Russian-occupied countries, the American information services overseas have had some limited successes in introducing and spreading accurate information about the United States and its policies and objectives.

In many other countries, information about the United States is more freely circulated. But in very few of them can American private agencies do the whole job, especially in competition with the vigorous propaganda programs of various other nations. The Russians have their official Soviet information services in foreign countries. More important, they have at their disposal the energy and ingenuity of the Communist parties in many lands. Early this year they were using also 35 short-wave transmitters to beam their propaganda abroad.

Peron's victory almost certainly presages an even more active anti-United States campaign by the Argentine Government among our Spanish-speaking neighbors to the south. There are other governments, more favorably disposed toward the United States, which have their own special axes to grind.

These are some of the reasons why almost everybody who has had experience in international affairs favors the maintenance of an alert adequately staffed overseas information service by the State Department. This embraces short-wave broadcasts in foreign languages, the maintenance of libraries of information in foreign countries, and staffs of information men attached to our embassies, the adapting and scoring of educational films, as well as a number of related activities, some of them reaching into the area of cultural exchanges. During the war, such activities proved their worth many times over. They are no less needed now.

Road to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Eric A. Johnston, on March 20, at the Commodore Hotel, in New York City. In these times of unrest I think it is particularly appropriate that the address be printed in the RECORD because the view expressed in Mr. Johnston's address is one that holds hope for continued peace in the world.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have just been struggling through a period of widespread and persistent strikes. We have had a war in industry, a costly war. Perhaps it is not entirely over. We may have more strikes. They may be costly strikes, too. But as of this moment, it seems to me the worst is over. As of the moment, we can look forward to full production by the fall of this year.

This has been a difficult period. In the catch phrase of the day, we've all had a rugged time of it. Its been rough on reconversion; we have lost a lot of ground on the path to full production, but we have learned some things.

Some people were pretty free about predicting an industrial revolution in this country. We haven't had any such thing. The American people were torn at by these strikes, but they were not torn apart. And through all this turbulent transition period since VJ-day we haven't had widespread unemployment in spite of the work tie-ups. Actually, right now, we have little if any unemployment. In fact, if things progress in an orderly way, we may have a near labor shortage by fall.

We have come through thus far in our domestic strife by using our heads. Most of labor has used its head; most of management has used its head. By and large, there has been more of good will than there has been of ill temper. As proof positive of that, let's not forget that all through this war in industry, costly though it was, it ran its course with very, very little violence. Now we are faced with another kind of conflict. We are up against a new crisis. This time it is international, not domestic. In a word, it is the specter of another war. This is on your minds, I know. I know it is, because it is on my own It is on the mind of every American.

The question shouts at us from the headlines; we hear it in the corner drugstore, asked sometimes in anxious whispers; it is repeated every hour on the hour; we ask it in our homes.

This is the question: "Are we going to have trouble with Russia?"

I want to talk to you about Russia. I feel obligated to do so. If I didn't, I would be dodging an issue I am supposed to know something about. Few Americans have had my opportunity to see that land of mystery, ruled by men of mystery. Few Americans have seen as much of Russia as chance afforded me.

I went to Russia in the summer of 1944 for a close-up look at Russia's industrial plant, and to talk to Russians about trade between our countries after we had won the war. I spent 6 weeks there. I traveled 10,000 miles in that vast country. I spent nearly 3 hours with Generalissimo Josef Stalin in his apartment in the Kremlin. We talked largely about postwar economic relations between Russia and the United States.

The time I spent with him, the weeks I roamed around and the miles I traveled are not sufficient to make me an authority on what Russia wants, what Russia intends, or where Russia thinks she's going. Furthermore, what any outsider knows about Russia probably consists of only a few scraps of facts, but that is all we can hope to have about a land which has less contact with the outside world than any other major nation. But there is an old saying that in the land of the blind a one-eyed man is king.

I know very well that no matter what I say about Russia now that I will be accused on the one hand of being a warmonger, and on the other hand of being an appeaser. But those accusations aren't going to trouble me. This is a time for blunt speaking.

In all my talks with Russians, I talked as a capitalist, and I talked bluntly then. The Russians talked as Communists, and they talked bluntly. I broke tradition over there. The Commissar of Foreign Trade gave a dinner for me. We were supposed to toast each other. I gave a talk with my toast. I talked about the difference between our two economic systems. I told the Russians some direct, hard, tough business truths from the viewpoint of an exponent of the capitalist system.

The core of what I said was this: I told them that in economic idealogy and practices, my country was not only just different from theirs. I said it was more different from theirs than any other country in the world. I told them that they were the most state-minded most collective-minded people in existence. And that we, on the other hand, were the most private-minded and the most individual-minded. And I said this, too: "Gentlemen, make no mistake. We are determined to remain so—and even to become more so."

I told them that each of our two countries should be allowed to pursue its own unique economic experiment, unimpeded by the other. I assured them that we weren't going to send capitalist agents into their country to interfere with their system, and I also assured them they would find no profit in sending Communist agents into our country to interfere with our system. As best I could, I tried to make them understand how completely American Communists had been wasting their own time—and Russia's time. Our American Communists then, as now, haven't caught on to that fact. I said to the Russians that American Communists lack originality and realism. That they still follow and imitate what they think is Russia's current policy—the party line of the moment. In fact I said, and I'm quoting myself: "If you take pepper, they sneeze. If you have indigestion, they belch."

I wound up my talk by saying that both of us should resign ourselves to the fact that for a very long time to come the Russians and ourselves are going to live in two different economic days—under two different systems.

My thought then is the same as it is now. The two systems can live side by side. Once we are convinced that Russians feel the same way, we ought to be able to get along with each other very easily.

After that, I saw Stalin.

Two things he told me come forcibly to my mind at this particular time. I'm going to quote them. One was this:

"Foolish Hitler has done one good thing. He has brought the American people and the Russion people together. We must never allow anything to come between us again. We must work together after the war."

And then in a lighter mood, he said: "I like to do business with American businessmen. You fellows know what you want. Your word is good, and best of all, you stay in office a long time—just like we do over here. But a politician is here today and gone tomorrow, and then you have to make arrangements all over with a new set."

I made some jottings in my notebook as the result of Stalin's comments. "Yes," I wrote down, "Stalin was right. War has brought us together. But the sand traps of many difficult problems lie ahead. Will we be able to stay on the fairways of cooperation and friendship after we have crushed the common enemy? The destiny of the world may be at stake in that answer."

Such were my notebook comments almost 2 years ago. They are amazingly fresh to me at this moment. For it is a fact that the destiny of the world does depend on our cooperation. And I refuse to believe that we can't find a way to cooperate.

But we don't cooperate in a vacuum. Cooperation must be based on the mutual trust and mutual acceptance of principles. Sure, there must be give and take but there are basic principles in cooperation between nations, just as there are between individuals, which cannot be violated if cooperation is going to mean anything or work at all.

If a man gives his word that he will do a certain thing on a certain date, he is expected to live up to it.

If a nation gives its word that it will do a certain thing on a certain date, that nation is expected to live up to it.

Russia promised to withdraw her troops from Iran on March 2. She hasn't done it.

And that's why we're worried.

We can't have a world community unless nations keep their word.

The principle of keeping our word is the foundation of American foreign policy. At this very moment, we are heading toward fulfillment of the commitment we have with the Philippines which guarantees them their independence. We are keeping our pledge to the Philippines.

That is principle number one of our foreign policy—keeping our word.

Our second basic principle is the settlement of differences at the conference table. In a magnified way, it is the same principle we employ in disputes in industry, and it is traditional with us like the town meeting, from which, in great degree, it is drawn. The conference table is the setting wherein democratic peoples resolve their disputes.

It is inevitable that misunderstandings should arise among nations, and that is why we have established a new international conference table. That is the United Nations Organization. There will be all sorts of differences and disputes. What one nation may think is necessary for its security, another nation may regard as aggression. Such disputes don't have to lead to war. That's why we and Russia and the other nations created UNO. That's why America gives her full support to UNO. She gives moral and physical support to it.

This is not the time to sell the United Nations short. UNO is young, it needs more ardent, more whole-souled, more enthusiastic support now than it will require when it has proved its strength and when it has become a world habit to regard it as a permanent fixture in the lives of all of us.

If UNO is young, we are all young in international collective bargaining. It takes time to rid ourselves of thinking and acting in terms of spheres of influence and in terms of international power politics.

Perhaps it is relatively easier for us Americans to adopt the new concept. We have never had much to do with spheres of influence and international power politics. We have been able to place our reliance in UNO without any hangover in our thinking from earlier and outmoded practices. We believe in UNO. We believe it will work.

We're going to help make it work.

In fact, we are determined that it shall work, because it is the only hope in sight for a peaceful world.

We here believe that the plain people everywhere share our faith and hope in UNO. The plain people all the world over are weary of war and all the woes of war. They have been told before this that they can look ahead to an era of reconstruction. They have been promised a time of peaceful building. They have been promised a better living. They have been promised a better world.

And that brings me to what I regard as the third pillar of American foreign policy.

We can't have world peace without economic well-being abroad as well as in our own country. If it is true that we can't have a prosperous world without a prosperous America, it is equally true that we can't have a prosperous America with the rest of the world in rags and tatters. We have pledged ourselves to a freer flow of world trade, and we have pledged ourselves to help the undeveloped countries of the world to help themselves. We have learned that where goods flow freely across international boundary lines, the tramp of invading troops is seldom heard. Trade, in other words, is the token of peace. Peace is the inevitable partner of trade.

This, in simple, layman's language, is our policy. These are the principles on which we stand. It is simple, definite, practical. And it is fair.

There can be no appeasement of these principles. Appeasement is weakness, and we are not weak. The spirit of compromise, however, can exist between men of common sense, and ours is a government of common sense. It is only common sense with us that we keep our word, and it is only common sense that we expect other nations to keep theirs.

Naturally, it isn't enough just to have a policy. We've got to effectuate it.

A policy is one thing. Making it work is another. Our Government can originate policy but it will work only if our people support it. Our foreign policy should be fair, friendly, and firm toward all nations. That kind of a policy the American people will support.

Iran today has become a symbol to the American people. Iran is a long way from the American people. But as a symbol, nothing could be closer. It is a test of whether nations, like people, will keep their word.

The American people want the Russian Government to meet that test by withdrawing its troops from Iran. The Russian leaders boast that they always keep their word. Here's a chance to make good on their boast. It may not come again.

When the Russians withdraw their troops from Iran, we should support their request for prompt hearings before the UNO involving any complaints or grievances which Russia may have in the Iranian situation.

We are willing to hear Russia's side of the story. If Russia is right, we ought to see that her rights are protected. The place to put Russia's case is before the UNO. We should tell them that we will demand fair treatment for them as we now demand that they be fair with the rest of the world. This is the force of right and not the right of force. Other nations would never join us in the right of force, but all nations who believe in right and wrong will rally to us in the force of right.

The pages of history are cluttered with ruins of those who thought that might makes right. Nations that have lived and prospered are those who put right above might, and then were able to enforce it. I would suggest that present-day statesmen read history before trying to make it.

We want to be friends with Russia. We hope Russia wants to be friends with us. We don't want Russia to fear us physically any more than we want to fear Russia physically. Democratic America has no designs on anyone.

We want to see a prosperous Russia, developed peacefully with a higher standard of living for her people. Russia needs a long period of peace to produce the consumer goods essential to a high standard of living.

I also want to see a prosperous America, developed peacefully with higher standards of living for her people. America also needs a long period of peace to do this.

I want to see America exert her leadership for peace in the world. To do this it must be prosperous and strong. It is only the strong who lead. A strong foreign policy demands a strong America.

If Russia has a party line, so have we.

Our party line is one on which all Americans can unite. It means an America strong in every sinew. We must be strong scientifically, militarily, and industrially.

Scientifically, we must continue to lead the world. Science is the key to production.

Militarily, we must have a strong Army, a strong Navy, and a strong Air Force. The whole strength of all three must be backed by our inexhaustible capacity to supply them with the most modern equipment.

Industrially we can never be strong without production. American production, which has been the decisive factor in winning two wars, is the best guaranty of peace.

We Americans must show the world that there are no partisan politics in our foreign policy. It has always been true and I hope always will be true that our internal differences end at the water's edge. In our drive for a fair peace throughout the world, a just and lasting peace, there are no Democrats, no Republicans, only Americans.

There is a road back and a road ahead. The road back is paved with threats of force, with weasel words, broken promises, and brutal treatment of the weak and helpless. That road ends in war.

The road ahead is paved with strength, tempered with justice, with honest words and honest dealings—above all—with faith that the plain people of the world want peace. That road ends in peace.

America has chosen the road ahead. It has chosen to be strong: to insist on justice; to speak honestly. It has chosen through UNO to test the principles of all nations by the actions of the men who lead them. If all nations will choose the road ahead there will be no specter of a third world war.

God and the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, a request that the name of God be inserted in the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, has been presented in a resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias parish, of Chicago, Ill. I include the communication I received from the chairman of the resolutions committee of the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias parish and the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 19, 1946.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN, M. C.,
Second District Illinois,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The writer has been requested by our spiritual director, Rev. Vincent J. Cloos, to write you enclosing two resolutions which were passed by the membership of the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias parish.

We would very much appreciate your also taking whatever action you deem advisable to have the theme of our resolutions followed through in both Houses.

You can rest assured that whatever you may be able to do will be very much appreciated by both our society as well as the writer, personally.

Thanking you in advance, I am,

Respectfully yours,

JOHN L. GEORGEN,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Whereas our Western Hemisphere and country were discovered by Christopher Columbus, a Roman Catholic; and

Whereas our country was explored and settled by freedom-loving peoples, both Roman Catholic and Protestant alike; and

Whereas the blood of our priests, nuns, and lay people has run into the soil of our country for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord; and

Whereas the Roman Catholic population in these United States of America, at present, is well over the 20,000,000 mark, not forgetting close to another 60,000,000 communicants of other Christian religious denominations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias Parish, located in the city of Chicago and State of Illinois go on record to have the name of God inserted in the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Henry A. Williams, George Erbach, John W. Kolb, Edwin A. Keene, Frank Bosshart, George J. Noeson, Thomas McNulty, William E. Kane, Herbert J. Modert, J. Karl, Max P. Spitzer, Dr. Langer, Clarence H. Schweim, George Jastian, F. G. Karl, L. Kaefer, R. J. Karl, William P. Laux, Vincent J. Doos, John L. Georgen, Steve Callepp, Ralph E. Wills.

Editor Charges Congress Has Evicted 700,000 Veterans From Their Homes—Demands Reconsideration of Housing Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the able editor of the Camden, N. J., Evening Courier recently published a plain-spoken article describing the tragic effect of the action taken by the House in stripping the administration's housing bill of two of its needed provisions. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this editorial, entitled "Does Congress Really Mean No Homes for Veterans?":

DOES CONGRESS REALLY MEAN NO HOMES FOR VETERANS?

The House of Representatives has just evicted 700,000 veterans from their homes.

The Representatives didn't call a single constable. They didn't pile the veterans' belongings on the street. They didn't tell the veterans' wives and children to scram.

But their action in emasculating the administration emergency housing plan is just as effective in making veterans homeless as forcible eviction.

With the administration's housing plan intact, Wilson W. Wyatt expected private industry to build 1,200,000 new homes this year for veterans and other homeless.

Without the key measures, we can build only 500,000.

Those 700,000 missing homes mean 700,000 homeless veterans.

First the House voted down price ceilings on existing homes and on building lots. Then it refused to extend the time of veterans' preference for new homes.

Finally, on Monday, it removed the keystone of the emergency housing program approved by President Truman and Wyatt: the $600,000,000 for subsidy payments.

The subsidy payments are needed as a shot in the arm to speed up the program.

They are to encourage expansion of plant capacity, to foster production of new and scarce materials, without encouraging inflation. They're exactly like the payments made to farmers for butter and other scarce foods during the war.

The subsidies, it is true, come out of the taxpayer's pocket. But a lot more, in the form of outrageously high prices, will come out of his pocket if we don't have subsidies.

Neither the subsidy payments nor anything else in the Wyatt program interfere with honest private enterprise.

The whole idea of the Truman-Wyatt plan is to encourage private builders to do the job—with Government help only where needed.

Yet speculators, who stand to gain inflated dollars in a dog-eat-dog market, have brought pressure to bear against the bill, sponsored by Representative PATMAN, Democrat, Texas.

Texas Congressmen have received forged telegrams opposing the bill, PATMAN charges. He has asked the FBI to investigate.

Perhaps the coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans who defeated the subsidy provision on Monday didn't need the forged telegrams. They're against progress no matter what.

But we'd like to know why about 100 Democrats and a few liberal Republicans ducked the vote. Total vote was only 253—161 against, 92 for subsidies—out of a total House membership of 430.

The House must reconsider and reconsider fast. The homeless won't be patient forever. Congress will find out in November that Americans want homes for their heroes.

Black Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting article which appeared in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal. It clearly demonstrates what is happening to America under present OPA policies:

SUPPLY, DEMAND HOLD CLANDESTINE MEETINGS MINUS BENEFIT OF OPA—NYLONS SELL FOR $7.50 IN CHICAGO, $5 IN DETROIT BAR; BUTTER BRINGS $1 A POUND—TIE-INS USED IN FOOD FIELD

Supply and demand for scarce items are holding clandestine meetings on a Nation-wide scale these days in the black markets.

Buyers' insistence on goods in scanty supply in the food, clothing, shelter, and auto fields, four major competitors for the public's dollars, is being met through outright overpricing and a myriad of subterfuges, a survey of 10 cities by the Wall Street Journal shows.

If you know the right people almost any scarce commodity is available in Washington. Although Office of Price Administration headquarters in that city says there is no substantial black market in nylons, a reporter bought two pairs through a friend for $3 each. These should retail at an OPA ceiling of $1.40.

If he'd bought the coveted hose at a Chicago night club, the hat-check girl would have asked as high as $7.50. He could have bought them for $5 at a Detroit bar, but would have been asked to purchase three pairs at that price. If rayons were acceptable, he could have them for $2 a pair in Boston.

JUST ASK FOR EDDIE

By asking for Eddie at a Philadelphia bar, three pairs of sheer nylons and a drink on the house were given to a reporter for $10 plus a dollar tip.

A trip to a Philadelphia clothing manufacturer yielded a suit under retail prices but above the maker's ceiling. This was done to help veterans and meet the pay roll until OPA gives us a better price, the wrapper said, while making sure that a $3 tip had changed hands.

White shirts sell for $5 instead of the $2.25 ceiling in one case in Los Angeles, although these and shorts are too scarce there to permit much black-market activity.

Textile deals in New York affect the price of clothing all over the country, says Callman Gottesman, chief enforcement attorney in the OPA's New York office. Fictitious names and addresses on checks and invoices have been used to hide overcharges. Forced purchases of a piece of worthless jewelry or other property to get textiles are among practices used to circumvent the ceilings.

ULTIMATE CONSUMER PAYS

A woman's dress was cited by Mr. Gottesman as an example of how black-market prices on textiles can percolate down to the retail store. Made from material with a ceiling of 14 cents a yard, it should sell to the retailer for $1.80 and to the wearer for $2.95. When this material was sold to a manufacturer at 53 cents a yard, and he violated OPA regulations by including this in his costs, the retail price jumped to $4.50.

The OPA lists the black market in textile piece goods as one of the most serious from a national standpoint, but says the situation is improving.

Putting scarce foods on the dinner table costs the American housewife a pretty penny if she decides black-market prices are worth while.

At what she calls an out and out black market, a New York shopper has paid 85 to 90 cents a pound for bacon with a ceiling of 40 cents. OPA investigators in Cleveland were charged $1.40 for 2 pounds of round steak on which the ceiling was $1.06.

In order to get some meat he wanted, a Boston butcher had to buy pork scraps at 11 cents a pound. The only thing he could do with them was to sell them to the Government's fats drive at 4 cents a pound.

MEAT HOARDERS WATCHED

Poultry dealers who buy up fowls and hold them in cold storage and slaughterers who buy too much meat at the top of their permitted price range are watched by the OPA in San Francisco. It regards these as danger signals of possible black markets to come.

Butter can be secured through a number of methods. One small New York store charged a woman 35 cents for slightly over a quarter-pound of tub butter. That's more than the $1 a pound charged in Los Angeles by certain dealers.

This dairy product is cheaper in the black market in Philadelphia, where it sells at 75 cents a pound. But the sellers complain the supply is so limited they may have to switch to margarine.

One handy man in a Boston tavern adds to his income by buying butter at 75 cents a pound and then selling it for $1. Purchasers in that city are sometimes asked to buy eggs before they are doled out butter, in some instances at more than the ceiling.

Many a pound of unwanted potatoes or other vegetable has been carried home because of the tie-in practice. A woman in midtown New York says she has to buy at least $1 of tomatoes or potatoes to get a pound of onions.

A Philadelphia restaurant operator had to take a basket of parsnips to get 50 pounds of onions. He paid the ceiling prices on both, but left the parsnips. That was part of the arrangement. Then he found he had been shortweighted on the onions.

SUGAR 25 CENTS A POUND

Sweet teeth also are costly to satisfy after the stamps run out. One man in Washington was able to get 5 pounds of sugar without a coupon, but his bill was a dollar instead of 38 cents.

Buyers are urged to take at least 50 pounds of sugar in Philadelphia at 20 to 25 cents a pound. Apparently much of the supply is from a hijacking ring that has stolen large amounts from trucking companies.

The OPA has brought charges against four bakers in Youngstown and Warren, Ohio, alleging they demanded a pound of sugar for each dollar in price of birthday or wedding cakes weighing four pounds or costing more than $2.

To curb violations of food-price regulations, the OPA is using a new weapon in the Boston area by seeking to deprive dealers of their "blanket license" to do business for a year. It has four cases in the State courts and one in Federal court involving this point. In New York, State and city acts which provide jail sentences and fines are used.

Dodges in connection with the sale of used cars are the most prevalent violations of price ceilings in the Cleveland area, according to the OPA office there. The supply is being cut down by cars bought over ceilings and taken to Tennessee, Texas, and Florida for sale.

In an Akron court case, the OPA is charging a dealer with selling a veteran a popular-priced 1940 sedan at the warranty price of $875. In a warranty sale, the dealer guarantees the car to be in good mechanical condition. The veteran found the motor had no power and used 11 quarts of oil in 200 miles. A "shimmy" in the steering mechanism also was an impediment. The OPA says the price should have been $634.

CAR SALE 30 PERCENT BLACK MARKET

Some dealers in Los Angeles believe 30 percent of the trade tries to take "under the table" payments on cars. Some Portland dealers "take all they can get," says James M. Blackford, chief OPA enforcement attorney there. Cars with $1,200 ceilings are bringing $1,800 he admits, saying the black market in autos is going merrily and is hard to stop.

"The black market is not one bit improved, and won't be until we get some production of scarce goods," he believes.

Eating their cake and keeping it too, has been accomplished in auto dealers in New York who sell a car and then charge daily rentals for its use which have totaled $1,000. Other have exacted promises that the cars be sold back to them after a certain period at a lower price.

"Selling" of orders on new cars for cash premiums as high as $300 seems to be common practice in Detroit. Fancy offers are being made to Cleveland dealers for high positions on their waiting lists, with cases of Scotch, diamond rings, and suits reported as bribes.

Persons have placed new car orders with as many as 10 different dealers in this area, one company says. They buy all the cars they can and then sell them, pocketing their profits in cash.

A truck dealer near Washington makes $100 bets with prospective customers that he can get them a truck within a month. Any customer who abstains from taking this wager gets no truck. Nearby passenger car dealers load their new cars with every conceivable type of equipment to squeeze additional profits out of the sale.

HIGHER UPKEEP COSTS

Even the cost of car upkeep has been raised by black-market practices. If a certain V-8 piston ring set is listed at $6.80, one garage man in Los Angeles will insist the work be done in his own shop and sell the rings for $13 by hiding the mark-up in labor costs. A Chevrolet front fender is $14 new, but is obtainable from an auto wrecker for $30.

Nearly everyone in the building material business in the Boston area would go to jail if we could enforce the law, an OPA official there said. The situation is improving slightly, he believes.

Upgrading of lumber has become so prevalent in San Francisco that it's a common saying: "If you can pick up a board by both ends without it breaking in the middle, it's No. 1 select."

Experts have estimated that recent yields of alleged No. 1 from Pacific coast forests

have been 100 percent higher than ever before. Suspected false grading, however, has to be checked before any of the order is used. To stand up in court, it has to be done by an expert grader, and there's only a handful on the west coast.

Nails are $5 a keg in 25-keg lots under ceilings at Los Angeles, but they're selling for double or triple that in the black market. In extreme cases, lumber reaches $100 a thousand board feet above ceiling prices.

WAR SURPLUSES BLACK MARKETED

War surplus materials in demand by builders have been sold above ceilings by Los Angeles dealers. The transaction is for cash, or the materials are billed at the ceiling and then extra currency changes hands. One builder was offered war surplus lumber at $20 to $30 a thousand board feet above the ceiling.

The methods on labor, of course, differ from those on materials. The going rate for carpenters in Detroit is $1.90 an hour. You can't get them for that unless you provide Saturday and Sunday work at double pay.

Over-ceiling prices aren't confined to the cities. The OPA's national office says truckers are buying grain for cash at whatever prices the farmers demand and then selling it for what they can get. And in California, one farmer sold his neighbor a caterpillar tractor for $3,400, or $1,400 over the OPA's figure.

Civilian Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "Should Be Civilian Control," dealing with the control of atomic energy, published in the Manchester (Conn.) Evening Herald, of March 13, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD BE CIVILIAN CONTROL

America is making slow, halting, grudging progress toward the internationalization of atomic energy. So long as we propose to hold it as a monopoly, it is necessary that we devise some system for control and development of atomic energy within our own borders. Toward this end, the Senate Atomic Energy Committee, headed by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON of this State, has been conducting hearings and making studies for many weeks.

From the beginning the committee has been faced with one great controversial question. Should the control and development of atomic energy be guided by civilian minds, who could be expected to place peacetime uses of atomic energy first, and who could be expected to encourage our scientists to work toward that end? Or should such control be vested in the military, who would concentrate on the military side of atomic energy, and who are already giving us a sample of their kind of control by planning and staging the rehearsal of destruction in "Operation Crossroads" this May?

Although atomic energy is certainly a special subject, there is still a fundamental and traditional American issue involved. It is the issue of whether or not the military shall be the servants or the masters of this Nation. Hitherto, we have always kept them in the role of servant.

From the start, military Washington has proposed that atomic energy be given over to a dictatorial military control with more absolute powers than this country has ever delegated to any official or board. This point of view is embodied in the May-Johnson bill, which has already won the approval of the House Military Affairs Committee.

The opposite point of view, advocating civilian control, has been represented by the McMahon bill, which is before the committee which Senator MCMAHON heads. As originally framed, his bill would provide for top civilian control of atomic energy, with the military expressly barred from membership on the control commission. In one of the few instances where President Truman has been right on atomic energy, he endorsed this principle of civilian control.

Lately, however, the military clique at Washington has received some outside help, principally from the Canadian spy case stories. Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, head of Manhattan project, immediately greeted these Canadian stories with warnings about the leakage of American atomic secrets, his object apparently being to frighten Members of Congress into the view that only the military should be trusted to have anything to do with atomic energy.

Early this week, it became apparent that General Groves had frightened enough members of the Atomic Energy Committee to force Senator MCMAHON into a compromise of his original bill. By the compromise he presented to the committee yesterday, there would have been created a military advisory commission, in a subordinate position to the civilian atomic energy commission. This military commission would have had the right to recommend to the main commission on military applications of atomic energy, and could have appealed to the President from the decisions of the civilian board on matters of such military import. This was a fair compromise which still retained the basic principle of civilian control.

Yesterday, however, Senator VANDENBERG, fresh from his own inauguration of the speak-toughly-with-Russia trend of American policy, brought a new bill into the atomic energy committee. The new version was adopted, by a vote of 6 to 1, with Senator MCMAHON, chairman of the committee, the 1 vote against it.

By the Vandenberg proposal, there will still be a civilian-control commission, but there will also be a military committee. And, by Senator VANDENBERG's bill, this military committee has the extraordinary power to challenge and hold up any policy whatsoever of the civilian committee. It can only challenge and hold up civilian committee action until the policy in question goes to the President, who has the final decision. But the practical effect of such an arrangement will obviously be to make it impossible for the civilian commission to function at all unless it chooses to function in complete advance accord with the wishes of the military committee.

The Vandenberg proposal is a negation of the great mass of testimony the McMahon committee has received through its weeks of hearings It is obviously a direct yielding to the Canada spy story hysteria and to our own military's accursed planning for a war with Russia.

The issue is, as Senator MCMAHON expressed it to the Overseas Press Club on the same evening of Secretary of State Byrnes' speech, that "we should now give notice to the world that we regard atomic energy as a force for peace by handing its control over to a civilian agency."

The issue is that the people themselves should control this tremendous power of destruction, so that they shall at least have a chance to avoid having it used for their own destruction.

To the contrary, we are now on the road to giving still further notice to the world that we are dedicating ourselves to the course of preparation for war. To the contrary, atomic energy, which was financed by the American people and which was developed by the genius of American scientists and the scientists of other countries, is now being taken out of the control of the people to whom it belongs and assigned to those who only know how to use it for purposes of destruction.

Unless the full Senate rejects the Vandenberg bill, this country will be taking one more of many steps toward war.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release from the American Legion News Service:

WASHINGTON, March 25.—National Commander John Stelle of the American Legion announced today that he will immediately start a speaking campaign through 20 Southern and New England States in a fight to put over the full Patman housing bill as an aid to veterans.

The commander's Washington headquarters also announced that he and the national legislative committee of the legion had directed National Legislative Director John Thomas Taylor to fight for the Patman bill when hearings on the amended house version of it open before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee tomorrow (Tuesday).

"The American Legion is going to battle with all the force of its 2,600,000 members to restore the premium payment and price ceiling provisions which the House wiped out," Commander Stelle stated.

"Both Wilson W. Wyatt, the housing expediter, and President Truman himself have termed these features the heart of the bill," the commander's statement continued. "Unless they are restored, the hopes of millions of veterans for an early easing of the housing crisis will be dashed.

"During the war, more than a million service men and women married in contemplation of establishing permanent homes when the war was over. The Patman bill, with the regulations that go with it, will give the veteran the house that he wants on a high priority and at a price he can afford. It will launch him on the path toward substantial citizenship at the time he most needs help."

The $600,000,000 premium payments, Commander Stelle explained, represented only 2 days cost of war but would so stimulate production that bottlenecks in the building supply fields would be smashed. The payments, he said, would not be subsidies to producers who already operate at a profit, but would follow the same cost-plus plan which the Government used to get war industries started in a hurry.

Urging restoration of price ceilings, to the Patman bill, the fighting Legion chieftain charged that they had been eliminated through powerful lobbying interests.

"There seem to be some people in this country who would rather have commissions by selling and reselling the same houses at

spiraling prices than to take care of the men who fought the war," Stelle asserted.

Under the Patman bill and the regulations, an owner could sell his property at any price he could get on the open market, and that price would then become the ceiling price for the duration of the emergency.

He said the crisis is not confined to any one part of the country, nor to big cities, but that it exists everywhere.

Newspaper Charges Congress Failed To Meet Its Obligations on Housing Bill—Says House Vote Was "Sorry Performance"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, repercussions over the country are indicating clearly that the Congress did not reflect the wishes of the people when it failed to provide the legislation needed to carry out the President's housing program.

Newspapers from every section of the country are expressing their indignation daily over the results of the vote. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include an editorial from the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of March 8:

SORRY PERFORMANCE ON THE HOUSING BILL

The House has failed to measure up to its obligations as a responsible legislative body with its treatment of the Patman housing bill. As passed yesterday, the bill has been stripped of the major provisions that would enable the administration to move forward vigorously against the most important problems raised by the housing shortage.

Preference for veterans in the purchase of rental of new homes, an increase in lending authority for Government insurance of home mortgages, continuance of controls over the distribution of materials, restrictions on the export of lumber—these are good provisions in themselves and there has been little or no argument about them. But they do not meet the real issues which must be met if the housing program is to succeed.

What those real issues are is plain enough. The serious inflation in housing prices, the speculative boom already well under way, must be halted until the construction of new housing units catches up to some extent with the vast and unprecedented demand. And production of building materials must be stepped up rapidly so that enough new housing units can be built.

The Patman bill quite consistently called ceilings on all housing. The House has decreed that existing houses should be exempt. It has retained only the authority for ceilings on new houses and this in diluted form. It has adopted the ridiculous notion that the way to check real-estate inflation is to control a small fraction of the market, leaving the rest open to all the bidding-up pressures of an extreme shortage situation. Under the circumstances even the new house ceilings lose much of their significance. For a few months after construction a new unit becomes an old one and can be tossed into the speculative spree.

The Patman bill sought to increase production of scarce materials by authorizing subsidies to be paid to high-cost marginal producers who cannot operate under existing price ceilings. The principle is the same as that invoked during the war to expand production of such metals as lead and copper. By aiding the producers who cannot, under normal conditions, meet the competition of the more efficient operators and new companies which would not enter the field because of initial high costs, the Government can expand the over-all production of the needed materials. The bill provided for $600,000,000 to cover subsidies to present and potential producers totaling about a third of those in the whole field. The House killed the subsidy section altogether.

The result is that, if Expediter Wyatt is to obtain the materials supplies required for the program, the Government will have to boost the price ceilings for all the producers. Without subsidies there is no other way of giving the marginal producers the income to cover their high costs. That means, on the basis of the $600,000,000 estimate, a jump in the over-all materials bill of about $1,800,000,000. It means that the efficient producers, able now to make profits, will have those profits sharply increased. It means that the price ceilings to be put on all new houses will have to be raised above the original estimates. It means that the veterans will have to pay more for the houses to be built for them and that the Government will have to go even further into the mortgage guaranteeing business.

The sorry performance of the House is underlined by the behavior of many of its Members. When those vital provisions were up for voting, little more than half of them (253) were on the floor, the others preferring to remain out of sight and avoid taking a stand against the antisubsidy and antiprice control pressure groups. Those who did vote carefully dodged roll-call ballots. Yesterday, when the job of emasculating the bill was complete and all that was required was a routine show of faces on the weak remnant, many more (381) suddenly found themselves able to be present.

The scene shifts now to the Senate, where considerably more resolution and awareness of responsibility must be shown if an effective housing bill is to be enacted.

Strikes at General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America with regard to strikes now taking place at the General Electric Co. and the Westinghouse Corp.

It appears that the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America were charged with interfering with, or delaying the progress in scientific and atomic development. Evidently, the charge was unfounded. The statement which I ask to have printed presents the case of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, and I believe that a refutation by the responsible officers of the union of the serious charges which have been made against the union should be printed in the RECORD.

The facts in the case are set forth in this statement, and while the General Electric Co. and the General Motors Corp. have settled with the union, the Westinghouse Corp. is still negotiating the question involved in the controversy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK.—In a joint statement issued today, representatives of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE-CIO), now conducting a strike of 175,000 General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Corp. employees for $2-a-day increases, branded as "false and misleading" statements that the strike "has caused or is causing a delay in scientific, medical, or atomic research."

The statement was issued jointly by Joseph Dormody and Edward Matthews, UE-CIO international representatives and respectively secretaries of the UE–CIO General Electric and Westinghouse conference boards.

"UE-CIO has made special efforts since January 15 when our strike for a living wage began," the union officials stated, "to guarantee that necessary work on atomic or medical projects be continued. Toward this end our local unions invited local managements in both General Electric and Westinghouse companies to present lists of scientific and medical personnel so that the local unions could prepare proper identification to permit such people through picket lines. But managements in most instances refused to submit such lists.

"These facts were brought to light in court cases in Schenectady, N. Y., and Pittsburgh, Pa., during the past month when UE-CIO presented testimony now on the record that it has made repeated efforts to guarantee that the strike in no way interferes with atomic or medical work in General Electric and Westinghouse plants," the joint statement went on to point out.

"In the instance of the Westinghouse Corp., Dr. J. A. Hutcheson, responsible for the administration of Westinghouse laboratories, admitted before the court of common pleas in Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 30, that he and his associates have been offered identification by the union but have refused it. Instead of accepting union credentials to enter the Westinghouse plant and resume atomic and medical experiments, these scientists in the employ of the company preferred to delay their work and use such a delay as testimony in court against the union."

The UE-CIO statement quotes from court testimony of January 30 as follows:

"Question to Dr. Hutcheson from UE general counsel David Scribner: "I understand you considered going through the picket line was more important than the question of going in to do the work you were actually engaged in.

"Answer by Dr. Hutcheson: The answer to that is, "Yes" I did consider it to be more important.

"In the instance of the General Electric Co., Dr. C. Guy Suits, vice president in charge of the General Electric Research Laboratory, testified before the supreme court of Schenectady on February 13 but failed to make any reference whatsoever to offers of UE-CIO made to permit scientific employees to continue their work.

"However, Walter C. Heckman, assistant works engineer at the General Electric Schenectady plant, under cross-examination by UE attorneys on February 13, revealed the fact that UE-CIO had offered to admit atomic scientists and other such workers into the plant. But the company failed to answer our letter proposing that a number of scientific workers be admitted through the picket lines.

"It is clear that the General Electric and Westinghouse companies adopted a policy since January 15, when the strike began," the UE statement says, "of prefering to halt scientific work rather than deal with their

striking employees and make the necessary arrangements with them which would have resulted in continued atomic and medical work in company plants."

Without Chips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of March 18, 1946:

WITHOUT CHIPS

(By William Philip Simms)

The world situation has become so grave, in view of an increasing number of Congressmen, that they are now demanding a further immediate clarification of this country's position.

Representatives CASE (Republican, New Jersey) and HAYS (Democrat, Arkansas) today introduced a resolution calling for a joint congressional committee to strengthen the Nation's hand. Delay, they feel, might force the United States to dishonor its multiple commitments or even endanger its own security. Some 24 other Members of the House have associated themselves with the project.

The proposed committee would investigate the number and character of the forces necessary to fulfill our international obligations and determine how those forces are to be obtained.

At present several standing committees in each House share jurisdiction over the problems involved. But what is everybody's business is nobody's business. There is overlapping and lost motion. Speed now is of the essence. Sinister events, one after another, are exploding all over the map every day, while, insofar as we are concerned, it is difficult to say which is disintegrating faster—our armed forces or our national prestige.

Next Monday the United Nations Security Council is scheduled to meet in New York. The fate of the new-born league of nations is in doubt. Tremendous issues are certain to be raised and, like it or not, the Council's authority will be no stronger than the might of its members. That fact is specifically recognized in chapter VII of the Charter and by an act of Congress pledging the United States to contribute a major share of the force required to make its authority stick.

Today, however, only the Big Three—Russia, Britain, and the United States—possess any military power to speak of. For the time being, at least, the other members of the Big Five—France and China—can't even defend themselves. Yet, of the Big Three, only Rusisa is a going concern, militarily speaking, and she is on a rampage of self-aggrandizement. The coming Council meeting, therefore, is certain to reflect this tragic situation. Russia is deep in the game of power politics with the cards stacked in her favor. Our ex-Ambassador to Moscow, Averell Harriman, is quoted as saying that she is bluffing. Maybe she is, but her bluff can't be called without chips.

Thus many are coming to feel that it is high time Russia's allies did something to equalize the situation. President Truman, Secretary Byrnes, and others have vowed the United States will not let the United Nations down. But approximately 45 smaller members of that organization are anxiously wondering whether and how it will make good.

Unless Congress does something to expedite matters, either through the Case-Hays measure or in some other way, Uncle Sam soon will be a Samson without his locks.

World leadership imposes obligations in proportion to the glory. The United States, therefore, soon may be called upon to honor its pledges or abdicate. It must implement its diplomacy, and soon, by regaining adequate strength on land, sea, and in the air, or suffer humiliation at the hands of stronger powers.

Constitution Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial on the action of the DAR of the State of Connecticut, which appeared in the Bridgeport Telegram of March 21:

STATE DAR SHOULD ACT

The fifty-third annual State conference of the Connecticut DAR takes place in Torrington today. We hope that before the meeting adjourns it will go on record with a resolution, speaking for all the DAR chapters in Connecticut, calling upon the board of management in Washington to delete the word "white" from the requirements for artists leasing Constitution Hall.

The Daughters of the Revolution need no defense on the score of patriotism. Their record speaks for itself. The DAR was founded as an organization to keep alive the ideals expressed in the American Declaration of Independence, for which our forefathers fought.

Now the DAR finds itself assailed for racial prejudice, an unjust accusation, but one which is predicated upon the fact that the board of management in Washington, conforming as they thought to local custom limited the renting of Constitution Hall to white persons. This has brought Nation-wide repercussions.

It isn't a matter of life and death whether a distinguished artist such as Marian Anderson should be permitted to sing in Constitution Hall, but in the long run it is a matter of life and death for the principles which we profess in this country, if we can permit them to be openly denied without protest.

That is the reason for the widespread feeling that the DAR's national board of management should do something at once about that racial barrier which prevents Negro artists from renting Constitution Hall.

It is unfair to the chapters throughout the Nation and to the rank and file of their membership that any aspersions should be cast upon them through no fault of their own, particularly when they have already built up such a splendid record for patriotic and civic activities.

Later on the same day at Torrington, Conn., the Daughters of the American Revolution adopted a resolution without debate on the subject of Constitution Hall, as follows:

Whereas the third object of the National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution is to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom, to foster the promotion and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the national board of management delete "white artists only" from the ruling governing the use of Constitution Hall, as adopted March 23, 1932, and to substitute the words, "artists of merit of any race."

"Too Little, Too Late" on Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune of March 19, 1946:

FOOD-SAVING PROGRAM "TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE"

Canada has announced a nine-point program to restrict the amount of food available to its citizens and make more food available to the hungry people of Europe and Asia. The program is designed to do what the program of the United States has failed to do—move the wheat off the farms and into the mills and export channels.

The Canadian program will produce wheat to feed the starving without resorting to production of brown bread. It will produce wheat for export in approximately the same way as United States millers proposed that this country provide wheat for export.

Instead of forcing millers to increase their extraction rate to 80 percent and giving consumers brown bread, Canada will cut down the amount of wheat going into mills by 10 percent, provide incentives for sale of wheat now in storage on farms and provide transportation for the stored grain through boxcar priorities.

ACTION COMES TOO LATE

We in the United States will continue to stumble along with the administration's brown-bread order, which does not and will not provide one extra bushel of wheat or one extra sack of flour for the hungry people of the world.

The blunt truth about America's foreign relief feeding commitments is that the administration in Washington failed to take timely measures with the vigor required to make them good.

Not until the time for vigorous action had passed did the administration leap to the rescue of a failing program with a series of shin-plaster measures, most of them of a propaganda nature.

America's commitment was to provide 225,000,000 bushels of wheat for export during the first 6 months of 1946. This commitment was made last autumn. It represented a minimum amount of wheat that would have to come from the United States to maintain subsistence diets in the countries to which it was to be shipped.

As winter came the world food situation worsened. It became increasingly clear the amount of wheat we had pledged to ship abroad would not be enough.

At the same time it became more and more apparent we were not in a position to make good on an inadequate commitment.

The administration knew as early as last September, when reports of the Mediterranean basin grain crop failure were in, that it was imperative that we succeed in providing the breadstuffs we had agreed to provide.

There was not the slightest mystery about where the wheat would have to come from.

Some 190,000,000 bushels was sucked out of the southern part of the American winter wheat area for export up to December 31. Export wheat for the first 6 months of 1946 had to come out of the northern winter wheat and the spring wheat areas.

To get that wheat two kinds of measures had to be taken. Boxcars had to be channeled into the area to get the wheat to ports. Action was required to see to it the wheat was not fed to livestock.

That these measures would be required was known long ago. But they were not ready.

The Department of Agriculture did not make a move to limit feeding of livestock. Indeed, it took a series of steps—elimination of rationing, dairy subsidies, price supports for heavy hogs—that encouraged the feeding of grains, wheat included, to livestock.

The Department failed, even, to keep a reasonable account of the Nation's feed supplies.

Not until the end of January, when the January 1 report of wheat on farms had been compiled, did the Department of Agriculture know that 61,000,000 bushels of wheat it had expected to find on farms was gone.

A workable plan for getting boxcars to country elevators was not ready until early March. Meanwhile the country elevators were plugged with wheat and grain could not move off farms.

In January and February wheat exports declined to a trickle—in the face of the worst world-wide cereal shortage on record. By the end of March it is hoped that 97,000,000 bushels of wheat or its flour equivalent will be in export channels.

A pious hope is expressed that 128,000,000 bushels can be moved in April, May, and June, but the responsible officials—Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson and Dr. D. A. Fitzgerald, of the combined food board—make no secret of their belief that we will fall short of making good.

After permitting 61,000,000 bushels of desperately needed wheat to disappear, mainly as feed, and failing to lay adequate plans to get wheat out of country elevators and to ports, the administration suddenly went berserk in February.

With great fanfare, but without careful consultation with the milling and baking industries, the administration ordered millers to make and Americans to eat light brown flour.

PLAN SOLVES NO PROBLEM

The most optimistic estimates were that this order might free 25,000,000 bushels of wheat for export, or less than half of the exportable wheat that had been permitted to disappear during the autumn.

And this hypothetical saving of wheat was to be dipped out of the country's animal feed supply, which was already painfully short.

It solved neither of the problems that had to be solved to get wheat for export. It sent not a single boxcar to a single plugged country elevator. Instead of discouraging the feeding of wheat to livestock, it increased the demand pressure on all livestock feeds.

Now, as a follow-up to the brown-bread order (which responsible officials have frankly called a propaganda measure), comes a voluntary conservation program. America is asked to accept smaller loaves of bread at the same price; to eat one roll instead of two; to omit the slice of toast under the lamb chop; to eat johnny cake instead of wheat bread.

These voluntary measures should be taken. But it would be well-nigh criminal to attempt to delude American housewives into thinking they can make good the administration's failure to put an effective program into action in good time.

American citizens will make these savings in good heart. But they are entitled to know, when they see pictures of people starving in many parts of the world, that it was "too little and too late," in government, and not their reluctance to sacrifice, that caused their country to fail its pledged word.

Articles of Incorporation of Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists—"Chick" Logan, Their President, Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for your reading a most interesting charter under the laws of my native State of California. It is self-explanatory.

However, I state that the vigorous, far-seeing president of this distinguished group of recent flyers for Uncle Sam was recently here at the Nation's Capital. These lads, eager to continue flying up where the air is clear and pure, are ready and eager to have opportunity for employment in the one field in which they are already trained.

Read these words by "Chick" Logan, their president.

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF ASSOCIATION OF WORLD WAR II PILOTS AND AVIATION SPECIALISTS

Know All Men By These Presents:

That we, the undersigned, being residents of the county of Los Angeles, State of California, are officers and directors in the Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists, an unincorporated nonprofit organization, voluntarily associated to advance the welfare of pilots, air crewmen and aircraft technical specialists of World War II, and to preserve and promote their special knowledge with the thought of adapting it to commercial aviation, and having been duly authorized by the members of this organization to incorporate said association, we do hereby declare:

ARTICLE I. The name of said corporation shall be Association of World War II Pilots & Aviation Specialists.

ART. II. That this corporation does not contemplate pecuniary gain or profit to the members thereof.

ART. III. That the principal office and meeting place of said corporation shall be at 533 First National Bank Building, city of Long Beach, county of Los Angeles, State of California.

ART. IV. That the number of directors of this corporation shall be nine, who shall be the governing body of said corporation, and whose duties shall be to carry on the business of said organization. That the names and addresses of the first who are to act in the capacity of said directors of this corporation until the election of their successors are as follows:

Chauncey P. Logan, Raymah M. Carter, Alton M. Cole, William A. Howe, Maurice A. Rondeau, Jack Schad, Edward O. Du Crest, Guy H. Colby, Covy E. Blackman, Long Beach, Calif.

ART. V The purposes and objects for which said corporation is formed are:

(a) To advance the welfare of pilots, air crewmen, and aircraft technical specialists of World War II;

(b) To encourage the advancement of air freight transportation;

(c) To preserve the technical training of its members;

(d) To advance the technical training of its members;

(e) To serve as a clearing house for information concerning employment of said members in their specialized field;

(f) To from time to time provide various forms of entertainment of every kind and character for raising money to carry on the objects and purposes of this corporation.

In witness whereof, we, the undersigned, have set our hands and seals this 16th day of January 1946.

CHAUNCEY P. LOGAN,
President.
WILLIAM A. HOWE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles, ss:

On this 16th day of January 1946 before me, the undersigned, a notary public in and for the county of Los Angeles, State of California, personally appeared Chauncey P. Logan and William A. Howe, known to me to be the persons named as president and secretary-treasurer respectively in the foregoing instrument, and whose names are subscribed thereto and they severally acknowledged to me that they executed the same.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal in the county of Los Angeles, State of California.

RUTH JACKMAN,
Notary Public in and for the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

AIR FREIGHT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY, PROSPERITY, AND HEALTH

(An address by Chauncey P. Logan, president, Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists)

A person would possess a short memory to forget the year 1941. Hell broke loose and we went to work with sweat on our brow and a prayer in our heart. We prayed: "Give us time to prepare." This meant building aircraft factories, expansion of existing industries, and the training of personnel. We started from scratch and because of time, built the greatest war machine in the history of the world.

Today, 1945, victory is ours. The war machine is breaking up. The United States Army and Naval Air Forces are in the process of virtual disintegration. Thousands of trained pilots and highly specialized and technical men are being released and thousands of aircraft are being stored and weather-beaten into uselessness. Our once indomitable air power is going to seed.

Atomic energy was not perfected in 1941. It is today. If there is another war our prayers will be one short thought. There will be no time. Our country will never be given an opportunity to prepare for war again. We will be the first to be attacked and in a short time our capacity to manufacture and organize will be irreparably destroyed.

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, General Spaatz, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, together with the progressive leaders of our country agree that air superiority is a must for national security. It will require a powerful air force and a backlog of highly specialized men. How are we to accomplish this necessity without forcing members of the air forces to remain in active duty?

PROGRESS

World War II was a struggle between the gangster aggressor and law and order. It was to eliminate forever the forcing of a will and philosophy upon a helpless people through the medium of power and fear. It was for the purpose to live naturally, to establish freedom from want and opportunity to work unmolested in a chosen field. For these inspiring and practical things our warriors fought hard and died easy.

Today, we fight another war, the war of peace and progress. Our greatest enemies are the accepted methods of doing things. If these methods are outdated through the medium of science they are our enemies in peace. They must be defeated but unlike

the aggressors of World War II, will be honored and admired for their contribution to the evolution of progress and civilization.

During World War II billions of dollars were spent by our Government for war. The greatest industrial expansion in the history of the world came into existence. Huge factories became massive and large factories became huge. New industry and enterprise mushroomed in every State. Ours was a war of materials and we won. This great and confederated effort was for war. What type of effort will we exert for security, prosperity, and peace?

POSTWAR JOBS

The Department of Agricultural Research, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., estimates there is approximately 5,000,000,000 ton-miles of fresh fruit and vegetables "earmarked" for air transportation. Oranges, lemons, potatoes, etc., and all fruits and vegetables found within the region of 750 miles from consumption have been eliminated for various reasons.

Commodities eligible to be shipped by air represent the majority of fresh fruits and vegetables available in California and the Southern States. They include grapes, figs, tomatoes—fresh shelled peas, carrots, lettuce, asparagus, celery, broccoli, peppers, strawberries, plums, apricots, peaches, pears, nectarines, cantaloups, crenshaw melons, and other items.

If we may assume that this great tonnage will divert to air transportation in the future, will require 2,490 C–47's (standard air liners) or 1,140 C–54's (super air liners), it is interesting to note we are considering only air transportation for the produce industry. The normal growth of tonnage for air transportation in the future, through the process of education, organization, evolution, and service are not considered.

To keep one C–47 (standard air liner) flying on schedule to the manufacturing centers of the east from the west coast will require a minimum of eight pilots.

The C–54's (super air liners) will require six pilots. In addition to the aircraft's crew, there will be engineers, aircraft mechanics, labor to load and unload, supervisors, weight and balance officers, freight agents, bookkeepers, stenographers, and personnel pertinent to the successful operation of the business. For the sake of simplicity let us assume it will require five nonflying personnel for each aircraft. The total personnel which would be required is as follows:

1. C–47 (standard air liner):	
Pilots	19,920
Nonflying personnel	12,450
Total	32,370
2. C–54 (super air liner):	
Pilots	6,840
Nonflying personnel	5,700
Total	12,540

ATC AND AIR CARGO

During the past 4 years the Air Transport Command of the Army Air Forces has hauled millions of tons of air cargo and flown billions of passenger miles. In a press release of October 1, 1945, the War Department gave the following information:

On June 5, 1941, the Air Transport Command had no airplanes and a personnel of 3—2 officers and 1 civilian. As of August 31, 1945, Air Transport Command's strength was 41,520 officers, 166,026 enlisted men, and 23,752 civilian personnel. They were criss-crossing the earth with airways and flew 6,653,000,000 passenger miles and 2,371,000,000 cargo ton-miles.

The total mileage for the year 1944, was approximately 600,000,000 miles—equivalent to 25,000 trips around the world at the Equator. Their planes cross the Atlantic once every 19 minutes; the Pacific once every 51 minutes. Redeployment operations make it necessary to bridge the Atlantic once every 6 minutes.

The problems pertinent to the development of the Air Transport Command's massive transportation system were evidently many. Each problem was met and eliminated at the time encountered. There will be many problems encountered in the commercial establishment of air freight transportation. These can be successfully eliminated as they arise. There has never been a time in the history of progress of the United States whereby the vision of industry was not equal to the task. The Air Transport Command's accomplishments during the past 4 years is an established reflection of what air freight will accomplish in the future.

AIR FREIGHT AND PRODUCE

Each year in California, there are millions of tons of fresh fruit and vegetables which are thrown away. It is left in the fields, plowed under, or picked to make room for other crops. In addition to this tremendous loss of food there is a normal wastage on all produce that is shipped. It is estimated at about 40 percent. This second loss is brought about because of the time element of shipping long distances, ripening enroute, handling, picking over by the customer, etc.

Most produce is picked green, packed, refrigerated, and shipped by rail. "Ripened-on-the-vine" fruits and vegetables cannot be shipped. Due to weather phenomena there are at times bumper crops. It ripens faster than anticipated, therefore, the crop becomes a loss. Principally because of these reasons, it is a fact that the produce industry is one of the most unstable industries in commerce.

Air transportation for fresh fruits and vegetables seems to be the answer to the produce grower's problems. It would make possible the shipment of produce "ripened on the vine," thus salvaging for public consumption millions of tons of wasted foods and assisting to stabilize one of our important industries.

PRODUCE HAS FLOWN

The groundwork for the launching of this potential air-freight industry is in the process of completion. The Ralph E. Myers Co., Salinas, Calif., published a fresh fruit and vegetable report pertaining to air transportation dated October 26, 1945. This report covered 30 plane loads of fresh fruit and vegetables shipped from the west coast to 12 receivers in 9 terminal markets, New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia, Chicago, Atlanta, Milwaukee, Kansas City, and Denver. Practically all shipments were made between March 1 and October 1, 1945.

In this report there were many problems encountered regarding equipment, airport facilities, carrier performance, packaging, market distribution, etc., which would have to be worked out in order to successfully handle this huge potential market for air transportation. It is gratifying to note that no problem was encountered of such magnitude which would make air freight for perishables prohibitive.

CONCLUSION

Air freight in the future offers the greatest possibilities for our country to provide a massive backlog of supertrained pilots and technical aviation men. To develop this future industry in a commercial manner would breach the gap between a perpetual, military air force and the democratic desire of all people to become and remain a civilian.

Our future progress must be teamed with national security and being prepared. Air-freight transportation embodies each of these important necessities. Air-freight transportation will provide jobs for these pilots who flew their war cargo over Africa, Europe, India, China, and the South Pacific and for those indispensable crews who made these flights possible. It will provide a medium whereby the perpetuation of our leadership in aviation will be secure. It will provide a progressive air freight transportation system for our country and will assist the eastern manufacture to be in the West's backyard. It will provide stabilization to the agriculture of the South and West. It will provide tasty, fresh fruits and vegetables ripened on the vine and with high-vitamin contents for national health. It will provide progress.

OUR HERO, THE CAPTAIN

(By Chauncey "Chick" Logan, president, Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists)

A young captain in uniform stepped out of the office of a national air line. There was an expression of disillusionment, surprise, and toxicity over his features. He acted as if he had been hit on the head with a mallet. On his smart, Air Corps uniform was the familiar shiny wings which identified him as a pilot. Over them were the coveted ribbons of service and distinction—three theater of operations, distinguished flying cross, a mass of oak-leaf clusters, and battle stars; over the opposite pocket was the Presidential citation and a discharge button. He was swallowing the first dregs of civilian life. He had applied for a job.

"What do you know," he said; "I have flown the Atlantic, the Pacific, and 32 missions in combat. Been hit with shrapnel, served as a target for enemy fighters, flown on instrument in formation and in some of the worst weather ever known to man in the process of building up 1,000 hours of flying time and yet, they tell me I am not eligible to submit an application for pilot on their air line." He became a person of anger as he spoke which finally ended with disgust "and to add insult to injury—they told me I was too old."

"There must be some sort of misunderstanding about your qualifications, Captain," I grinned. "Surely, there is something wrong somewhere."

"You can say that again, brother," he flipped back with the dawn of definite understanding. "Brother, you can say that again."

"Captain," I studied his young and clean features—there were lines about his eyes, appropriate to a person who had experienced a lot in a short time, "how old are you?"

"Twenty-six." The words slipped from his lips without thought. "And too old," he added hastily, his teeth biting and clinging to the words "too old."

"Perhaps there is something else," I offered apologetically.

"Hell, what can I do," he shot back viciously. "I have never had a job. I was yanked out of school and qualified for the Air Corps. From then on it was study, study, practice, and study. I mastered flying, transitional flying, meteorology, navigation, engines, engineering, aerodynamics. I learned to fly by instruments, practiced battle tactics, formation flying, and survival if we were shot down. The only business I know is that of serving my country in war. I had thought," he hesitated a moment, wetting his lips and drawing them tight against his teeth, "I was preparing myself for aviation in the future—commercial aviation."

The story of the captain represents the story of the discharged Army and Navy air pilot. What place do they have in the civilization they were instrumental in perpetuating through combat? Are they to be discarded because victory is ours?

Several years ago the Army and Navy Air Forces selected this captain with the greatest care. They were ready to spend from $100,000 up, toward his aviation training. He passed a perfect physical examination and was screened and rescreened. He was watched by trained personnel to determine if he could stand the "gaff"—what made him tick, etc. He was put through vigorous physical and discipline training and if he "stood

up" was assigned to flight training. Records show about one-third of cadet trainees were eliminated in primary flight school. Smaller percentages were eliminated in basic and advance until at last, graduation day represented the "cream of the crop" of American manhood. They had to be good to meet the experienced pilots of our enemies.

Today, in victory, they are still the "cream of the crop" of American manhood and records prove they are the "cream of the crop" of all pilots. Older, of course, but tempered with the fire of experience which makes them even better. Yet, the fact remains, they cannot find jobs in commercial aviation.

Is it possible that our country and private industry is "missing the boat" by not utilizing the skill of the World War II pilot? Will they allow their great investment, and skilled manpower to die a natural death and "go to seed"? I think not. I believe in the progress and vision of the United States of America too much. I believe in justice and the freedom of each individual to pursue the vocation in which he is best fitted and in industry appropriate to happiness and security.

This is the Air Age. Five or six billion tonmiles of fresh fruits and vegetables are waiting to be shipped by air. Billions of tons of sea foods, medicine, tools, parts, consumer packages, are waiting for the operation of a massive air-freight transportation system.

The creation of a air-freight transportation system will provide jobs, not only for the captain, but for his buddies, the ground crews. It will provide and guarantee our country a backlog of superskilled pilots and aviation specialists for national security. It will provide a medium through which the east and west coasts will be drawn into a small community of prosperity and fellowship. And over all, will provide the mechanics whereby earth will be shrunk into a community of nations and assuring the protection against the would-be gangster of the future who would use the unbelievable atomic energy to destroy civilization.

Continuation of OPA Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I desire to insert in the RECORD a short newspaper story from the St. Paul Dispatch for March 22, 1946, that indicates the subtle and unfair manner in which OPA is propagandizing the country in an effort to maintain itself in power. The article follows:

OPA-CONTROL SURVEY HIT AS TRICKERY

Results of a survey of parent-teacher groups indicating their approval of the continuation of OPA controls were attacked today by a Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation leader.

Leland J. Melrose, St. Paul, editor of Farm Bureau News, in a radio address over station WDGY termed the question submitted to PTA members a typical piece of OPA publicity, which draws heavily on trickery in its campaigns for self-perpetuation.

The poll conducted by the Ramsey County League of Women Voters among 850 members of PTA groups in 26 schools resulted in 91 out of 100 members indicating preference for continuation of OPA controls and 94 out of 100 favoring ceiling prices on new and existing housing.

"Despite a Hitler-type 'election,' maneuvered in such a way that unanimous approval could be expected, 76 PTA members voted 'thumbs down' on the question," Melrose pointed out.

"The question asked the group," Melrose said, "was so phrased as to indicate that the OPA was helping to prevent inflation and aiding in fair distribution of scarce articles and materials."

He suggested that the poll question be phrased as follows:

"Do you believe that in view of the greatly increased costs of conducting business, the greatly increased costs of goods and commodities to the consumer, when subsidies are considered, and in view of the critical shortages of everything that contributes to the American standard of living, the OPA should be permitted to continue its present program after June 30, 1946?"

He emphasized that Land O'Lakes and central livestock marketing organizations recently had blasted OPA and that the farm bureau wanted authority over farm commodities placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture as a control over inflation.

"Now that the Secretary has been shorn of the authority farmers insist that he must have, farmers see the need for a complete shakeup, and restoration of authority in informed and capable hands if inflation is to be controlled," he concluded.

Russia's Stand on Food Hard To Explain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in view of the critical food situation the world over, I believe the attitude of Russia in refusing wheat to UNRRA and at the same time in selling wheat to France is very difficult to explain. The situation is made even more unfair and questionable when it is known to the world at large that two states of the Soviet Union applied to UNRRA for $250,000,000 in aid and have received to date more than 100,000 tons of foodstuffs. How can Russia justify refusing wheat to UNRRA while at the same time selling wheat to France and having two of her own states getting aid from UNRRA to the extent of more than 100,000 tons of foodstuffs?

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles from the Washington Post of March 21, 1946, one by Marquis Childs, entitled "Communist Tactics in France"; another entitled "Soviet Deaf to UNRRA, Sells Wheat," by Ruth Montgomery; and the third entitled "Russia Sells France Grain; Silent on Plea From UNRRA."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 21, 1946]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

COMMUNIST TACTICS IN FRANCE

The experts who deal in food reserves around the world thought they had the major sources of surplus supply fairly well ticketed. However, about Russian food resources, as with almost everything else in Russia, they knew next to nothing. They were, to put it mildly, surprised when the U. S. S. R. suddenly offered to make available to France 500,000 tons of wheat and 100,000 tons of barley.

One of the remarkable things about this offer was the way in which it was made. News of it came in a political speech made in France by Maurice Thorez, head of the Communist Party there. The French Foreign Office had never heard of it.

Thorez knew what he was doing. Schooled in Moscow, he is a resourceful politician. He was telling the French that their friends in Russia were willing to make enormous sacrifices to help them. With the French elections coming up in May, you could not have better propaganda.

An ironically humorous footnote to this piece of power politics did not get into the news. There appears to have been considerable doubt that shipping would be available to move the wheat from Black Sea ports. The Communists believed that they could make a cheap gesture.

But strenuous efforts are now being directed from Washington to make sure that at least a part of that wheat is moved. For every ton of Russian wheat that goes to France, a ton of Canadian, United States, or Australian wheat is available for the desperate famine areas in the Far East.

By permitting Thorez to make this gesture as a frank bid for Communist votes in France, the high command of the Politburo in Moscow has shown its hand more openly than at any time in the recent past. It is almost too crude.

The contrast with the other nations that fought the war as allies is too sharp. England, the United States, Canada, and Australia have been putting their surplus food into a common pool. Part of it goes to UNRRA. It is distributed to needy peoples regardless of their politics. It goes to Italy, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Greece.

Two states in the Soviet Union—the Ukraine and White Russia—applied to UNRRA for $250,000,000 of aid. Thus far they have received more than 100,000 tons of foodstuffs, which included no grain.

At the same time that he holds out the promise of Soviet wheat, Thorez denounces the corrupt and decadent capitalist democracies. He accuses them of having imperialist designs on France. The line of the Communists in France is very much like the line that was used by the Nazis to attack the western powers.

Coming from Thorez, it is particularly significant. He is a key figure in world communism, just as the French Communist Party is considered a key to power in western Europe. It was scarcely an accident that the signal for a shift in the United States Communist Party came from France.

We in America have not done too well on this matter of helping to relieve the world's hunger. For too long, the administration ignored what was apparent at least a year ago. This was true even though polls of public opinion indicated a readiness to make sacrifices to help other peoples.

But no responsible official in this country has ever suggested that we use our surplus food for political purposes. That would be contrary to a deep impulse in the American character, which is to help stricken peoples wherever they are without regard to race or creed.

From UNRRA's retiring director, Herbert H. Lehman, comes a sane proposal. In his final report, he suggests a world food board that would deal with all resources on an emergency basis. It would replace the present combined food board made up of representatives of England, Canada, and the United States.

If we are to compete with Russia, then, as Raymond Swing pointed out in a recent broadcast, it is better to compete with wheat than with bombs. We have resources far beyond the U. S. S. R. today.

Five hundred United States engineers and experts, with some machines from this country, could begin a transformation of the Middle East. They could immeasurably expand standards of living which today are appallingly low. This is competition for life, and not for death.

[From the Washington Post of March 21, 1946]

SOVIET DEAF TO UNRRA, SELLS WHEAT

(By Ruth Montgomery)

ATLANTIC CITY, March 20.—Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton today called the world's attention to an UNRRA request for Russian wheat which has gone unanswered while the Soviets privately negotiated to sell France 400,000 tons.

In revealing the UNRRA request made some time ago, Clayton told the UNRRA council that the French sale gives ground for hope that the Soviet Union may be in a position to give a favorable reply to the request and thus align itself with the United States and other supplying countries.

But he hinted that UNRRA's Combined Food Board might materially reduce France's wheat allotment because of the purchase.

PEAK SHIP LOADING

Pointing up the United States contribution, Clayton revealed that we are now loading through Atlantic ports almost twice as many ships as we loaded during the peak of the war.

Since D-day, he said, we have exported more than 10,000,000 tons of coal to war-torn areas, in contrast to our prewar exports of 40,000 tons a year. During January and February, we exported 2,000,000 tons of wheat and flour to deficit areas.

BOARD EXTENDED

But Clayton warned that despite combined efforts there will not be enough grain to permit all countries an average of 2,000 calories per person daily.

Meanwhile the Combined Food Board, under fire from Russia, announced its decision to extend itself through 1946. Presented to the UNRRA council by Clayton, Britain's Philip Noel-Baker and Canada's L. B. Pearson, the report made no direct reference to retiring Director-General Herbert Lehman's recommendation that Russia be included on the board, but it vaguely suggested that consideration will be given to proposals to adapt the organization to changes in the international food situation.

Defending itself against heated criticism from Russia and other UNRRA receiving countries, the board rejected the contention that UNRRA has a right to state total requirements and then suballocate to individual countries.

[From the Washington Post of March 21, 1946]

RUSSIA SELLS FRANCE GRAIN; SILENT ON PLEA FROM UNRRA

ATLANTIC CITY, March 20.—The world food crisis is rapidly crystallizing opinion here, at UNRRA's fourth council meeting, that all world food supplies must be forced into a common pool which nations may share and share alike.

All supplying nations—which may include many Latin Americans and some neutrals, such as Sweden and Switzerland—are being considered, but the USSR is foremost on the list.

In an address before delegates from 47 nations, Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton today disclosed that UNRRA some time ago had asked the Soviet whether Russia could supply any wheat to meet the heavy demands of hungry countries.

"Although I understand that no definite reply has been received to this inquiry," Clayton added, "it was recently announced that the Soviet Union has agreed to sell to France, reportedly for United States dollars 400,000 tons of wheat and 100,000 tons of barley, provided the necessary shipping could be obtained."

"This report gives ground for hope," he added, "that the Soviet Union may be in a position to give a favorable reply to the UNRRA request and thus aline itself with the United States and other supplying countries."

[A French Embassy spokesman last night confirmed to the Post that the transfer of grain from Russia to France would be a sale and not a gift.

[Many persons here had been under the impression that it was a gift. Published reports announcing and relating to the transfer have put the total involved at 500,000 tons of wheat and 100,000 tons of barley.—Editor's note.]

Clayton told the delegates that the United States was happy, at the request of France, to provide the necessary shipping to carry the grain from Russia to France "even at the sacrifice of other cargos for the return trip for which the vessels had been originally scheduled."

Australia suggested "there is no doubt that the combined food board (made up of the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada) would be a better body if Russia were to join and pool information of food supplies."

Russia's chief delegate here, N. I. Feonov, in an interview, said that he has no information on how his government will respond to the discussions. He has, however, criticized the CFB's allotments.

Clayton said the supplying nations would have to cut food shipments to nations which find a "new source of supply" (such as France) in justice to the nations "without access to the new source."

He recalls that the United States had been asked to cut its grain consumption 40 percent, and its fats and oils 20 percent.

Czechoslovakia's Vladimir Hurban told the Council that grain supplies were now so short in his country that flour mills would have to stop grinding by the end of the week.

Nations receiving aid from UNRRA—and several which are doing their own purchasing, such as India—are rapidly being reduced to a 1,200-calorie day. India has said even that low diet cannot be maintained unless it gets 2,000,000 tons of wheat by May.

UNRRA's Director General Herbert Lehman, is seeking here a pledge from the 47 member nations to a rigid food conservation program.

Clayton agreed with an emphatic request that all nations with adequate food—"and all those which could become supplying nations, through emergency measures" make food available.

The combined food boards issued a report yesterday which showed that irritations were mounting here as the search for food becomes more acute.

ASKS FULL AUTHORITY

The CFB insisted in the report that it should have full authority to allocate short food supplies, nation by nation. UNRRA has insisted that it be allotted a total, and given freedom to adjust food shipped to various nations as the rapidly changing needs come up.

The CFB also complained—as Lehman has done on the behalf of UNRRA—that the nations receiving food supplies were not turning in adequate reports.

The council heard from A. N. Baronovsky, of the Ukrainian Soviet, that his people had received only 21 percent of the food they had requested, and that the allotment of fats for 1946 would permit only 4½ pounds per person.

Venezuela again said it is willing to accept immigrants from the pool of 900,000 displaced persons still cared for in UNRRA camps, reserving "the right to pick the persons."

Sir John Boyd Orr, director of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, whose executive committee is in session here, told UNRRA that the organization was preparing to help in the world drive for adequate food.

He said FAO would be the continuing United Nations body dealing with food problems and would consider the advisability of uniting all existing food agencies.

Dutch approval was given to a program for world sharing of food by E. C. Zimmerman, of the Netherlands, who expressed "complete agreement" with Lehman's recommendation for restoration of rigid wartime food controls.

L. B. Pearson, of Canada, said his country had cut the use of grain for beverages by 50 percent and would increase extraction from wheat by 10 percent.

RUSSIA DOESN'T BELONG

Pearson indorsed Lehman's suggestion that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics join the combined food board and said "I favor the membership of all United Nations in all international agencies—and I am thinking of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Bank and Fund, and the Aviation Council."

Russia is not a member of the agencies Pearson named.

China's relief director, T. F. Tsiang, told the Council British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies were getting three times as much rice as China.

"Impression has spread that allocations of food have not been just," Tsiang said.

British Plan Broadcasts to Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Washington Post:

BRITISH PLAN BROADCASTS TO SOVIET UNION

LONDON, March 19.—Beginning next Sunday, the British Broadcasting Corp. will broadcast three 30-minute programs daily in Russian to the Soviet Union, Assistant Postmaster General W. A. Burke announced today in the House of Commons.

Burke's announcement noted that the Moscow radio makes several broadcasts of news and comment daily in English, but he said Britain would not attempt to counter foreign broadcasts.

The Russian-language broadcasts will add to an already extensive European service in many languages by the BBC.

The BBC has not hitherto broadcast in Russian because the Soviet Government impounded civilian receiving sets on the outbreak of war between Germany and the U. S. S. R., and there would have been little point in making such broadcasts," Burke said. But now, he added, "the Soviet authorities have lifted the wartime restrictions on listening in."

A BBC official said at least 15 minutes of each broadcast would be given over to news, including a 5-minute talk similar to those trailing BBC news broadcasts to Europe.

Such talks frequently concern political or diplomatic affairs.

The other half, he said, will present music on some days, and press reviews, talks, and features on other days.

The first program will be broadcast at 4:45 p. m. Sunday (11:45 a. m., eastern standard time) or 7:45 p. m., Moscow time.

The Caste System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column by Carleton Kent on the caste system, which appeared in the Chicago Times:

CASTE SYSTEM

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—There is a former National Guard bugler in town who has a deep-seated hunch that Secretary of War Patterson's naming a committee of former GI's to investigate personnel relations in the Army did not spring forth full-grown from the kindly minds of the West Point Protective Association entrenched in the Pentagon Building.

It is his idea that the original impulse probably came from a Reserve officer of long standing who lives at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Let us be frank. The broken-winded bugler is your obedient servant. The reservist is Harry S. Truman.

Undoubtedly both of us have been annoyed in the past by the (a) supercilious attitude, or (b) magnificent condescension of Army Regulars. I still recall vividly the profane things a Regular Cavalry sergeant bugler said about the way I had just played church call one Sunday morning near Fort Riley, Kans.

The President has not confided to me his experience with the academy superiority complex. But he does not need to. Any court in the land will admit as evidence per se the fact that he has been a Reserve officer for more than 25 years.

Nor do he and I need to get our heads together to realize that Secretary Patterson's committee is going to find out that the Army has a caste system, and that enlisted men and Reserve and National Guard officers don't like it. And the same goes for the Navy, which is going to conduct a similar investigation.

Once the committees have completed their hearings, and rounded out their records by adding Bill Mauldin's wartime cartoons and clippings of the B-bag, Mail Call, and other gripe columns which academy-minded officers keep trying to censor or suppress in service papers, the way will be clear for action toward building a citizens' army of the best type possible.

There are lots of ways of accomplishing this. Eliminate "off limits to enlisted men" signs at bathing beaches, bars, and theaters. Enforce rules that enlisted men and officers are to get the same kind of quarters and chow, and uniforms—except for the insignia of rank.

Equalize furlough and terminal-leave systems and pay. Make it a regulation that a private can dance with the prettiest girl at a party just as often as a captain, if the girl is agreeable.

Make it an order that during wartime in rear or base areas, if there is to be an saluting at all, that the suety desk-bound officers have rear or base areas, if there is to be any saluting at all, that the suety desk-bound officers have to salute combat GI's who are on leave from the front.

Adopt the American veterans' committee and extinct Yank magazine plank—let no man be a commissioned officer unless he has served in the ranks, by all means including West Point and Annapolis graduates.

It's a wonderful opportunity to prove the contention of an overwhelming majority of civilian minds which have recently had contact with the military system that a civilian army can be decently democratic as well as disciplined and efficient.

Army Courts Merit Probe Patterson Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on the floor earlier today I praised the action of Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in creating a board of nine prominent civilian judges to review the procedures of the Army's military courts. The announcement of the action was made through a statement of the American Bar Association, which quoted Secretary Patterson as saying:

> The War Department wants the most efficient and just system of military justice that can be devised in the light of military experience, American conceptions of punitive justice and enlightened penology.

The association's president Willis Smith, of Raleigh, N. C., nominated the committee, which is said to include five former presidents.

The board members will be Dean Arthur T. Vanderbilt, of New York University Law School, chairman; Judge Alexander Holtzoff, of the District of Columbia Federal District Court, secretary; W. T. Joyner, of Raleigh; Joseph W. Henderson, of Philadelphia; Jacob M. Lashly, of St. Louis; Walter P. Armstrong, of Memphis; Federal Circuit Judge Morris A. Soper, of Baltimore; Floyd E. Thompson, of Chicago, former chief justice of Illinois; and Frederick E. Crane, of New York, former chief justice of the New York Court of Appeals.

The board will make its headquarters in the War Department here and is scheduled to hold its first meeting next month. Secretary Patterson promised that the Department will place at its disposal all pertinent information available, and that it will have full freedom of action.

In my earlier remarks, I referred to the findings of Lt. Col. Will G. Robinson, lately released from the Army, who served in the Judge Advocate General's Department during the war and who found that military justice works in strange ways. I am transmitting a copy of his findings and comment to Secretary Patterson, and, under permission heretofore granted, place my letter and the attachment in the RECORD at this time. The matter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY
APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1946.

The Honorable ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War,
Pentagon Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was delighted this morning to read the announcement that you had named a special board of civilian judges to examine the procedure of the Army in courts martial. The need for such a study was brought forcibly to my attention a few days ago when I read the conclusions of a friend who served in the Judge Advocate General's Department during the war, and whose duty it was to review the procedure in some of the courts.

His findings that only 4.2 percent of persons charged with offenses were found not guilty in some 9,200 cases, of which 41.4 percent were cases involving great controversy as to facts and adequacy of proof and that officers were acquitted in 15.4 percent of the cases in general court as against 7.5 percent for enlisted men are abundant evidence of the need for a review of Army courts such as you have directed to be made.

Because of its pertinent content, I enclose a copy of the study to which I have referred. It was made by Will G. Robinson of Pierre, S. Dak., lately a lieutenant colonel on the staff of the Judge Advocate. Again, I commend your action.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative, Second District
of South Dakota.

CHANGE DESIRABLE IN MILITARY JUSTICE

(Statement by Will G. Robinson, Pierre, S. Dak.)

Organizational commanders are responsible for the discipline of their commands. This reaches right down through armies to companies. It's a 24-a-day proposition. The better the commander the less need for discipline. But, in its finality, the court martial is the bulwark of discipline. Against it all discipline must come to rest. Under the present system the man who is responsible for the discipline controls the action of the court martial to too great an extent.

There is no more fundamental difference in the world than the difference between power and right. We say might makes right. Of course, no one from a moral standpoint, believes this to be true. The history of the world is full of the abuse of right by power-drunk dictators. Within his ken, the organizational commander is a little Caesar, a dictator supreme.

To lessen the impact of dictatorship we have established a system of reviews of the judicial acts of these people which actually does accomplish a very great deal in finally insuring justice.

I do not say it is not doing a rather good job of it. I do say that a changed system could do a better job of it.

Where do I acquire any competence to speak on this subject? In the past 2½ years I have personally reviewed to exceed 400 general court-martial records to see that justice was done. The record on these general court-martial cases is rather complete. The courts and law members are fairly well versed in what constitutes justice. If, in reviewing the case, I make an error the next higher echelon has its inning and the present system does obtain a pretty high average of justice.

REVIEW OF 9,200 CASES

During this time I have finally passed on 1,840 special court records and 7,082 summary court records as of this 20th day of June 1945. Every one of these cases has been looked over to ascertain if there has been

a departure from fundamental justice in the course of trial, first by some trained assistant and then, casually, if he believes it in proper order, but with a fine tooth comb and frequently very considerable investigation, outside the record, if he finds anything dubious about the case.

These 9,200 plus cases range right down the line from murder and rape to off-limits cases and like minor delinquencies.

The minor delinquencies accounted for only 35.4 percent a. w. o. l.'s and desertions for 23.2 percent of the totals. This leaves 41.4 percent, or in round number, 3,800 cases where the offense was relatively serious and not the subject of easy proof and frequently involving great controversy as to facts, adequacy of proof and other legal difficulties.

In all of these cases just 391 men, or 4.2 percent, were found not guilty. That from civilian standards is a very low percentage.

It is noteworthy and perhaps here is the crux of the whole matter, comment upon which will be made later in general courts, which are the only ones that can try officers, the percentage of acquittals was 15.4 percent for officers as against 7.5 percent for enlisted men.

GENERAL COURTS MOST CAREFUL

Every safeguard is sought to be erected around persons submitted to general courts for trial. There is a mandatory investigation conducted by an unbiased officer, the whole pretrial record then has to be submitted to an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department, who reviews it and if he deems the evidence sufficient recommends trial to an experienced officer, who as the commander, only can refer it for trial.

Thus it can be seen that the question of probable guilt is reviewed by no less than four persons, including his unit commander, who personally knows the soldier, before the case is even referred for trial to a general court.

Yet in general courts, where the probability of guilt is well substantiated, the percentage of acquittals of officers is four times that for all courts and twice that of enlisted men.

Frequently the enlisted man raises the question as to why he isn't tried by a court of his peers and when the percentage of acquittals of officers is regarded, it is obvious that he feels he has a real grievance and a not wholly unsupported example to accentuate the justice of his complaint. The integrity of the court must be maintained and the enlisted man frequently feels that he gets a different deal than do officers.

It is hard to show what happens in generalities. Let's be specific.

A battalion, perhaps because of over-all inefficiency, perhaps because it has a mission that permits its members to have much idle time, for which the devil proverbially finds much use, perhaps because through administrative action it has become the dumping ground for misfits and rejects from many outfits and probably because of a conjunction of all these elements, has a bad disciplinary record. Some inspector discovers this or some higher commander discovers it through reports, or some peculiarly difficult situation in military law arises, which puts the finger on this outfit.

What happens? Down the echelon of command goes the word, the umpty umph battalion has a miserable disciplinary record. What is the matter? Get busy on this. Correction is necessary.

An the luckless battalion commander is on the spot, as well as his superiors up the chain. It is charged that his discipline is poor; that he is too soft; that he is too hard; that he tries too many men; that he doesn't try enough men. The pressure is on.

This, of course, is not a happy situation so far as military or any other sort of justice is concerned. It's akin to the situation when a new police commissioner decides that every policeman ought to make one or two or three arrests a day. The policeman can't invent crime but he can be overmeticulous in picking up minor crime which perhaps he has been overlooking in his search for real miscreants.

JUDGE, JURY, AND EXECUTIONER

So justice goes to work. The commander, wholly in contravention of the divorcement of the judicial from the executive, as is so fundamentally a part of our national system, decides who shall be tried, selects the court to try them, and then passes on the work of the court. Not infrequently the court is not openly but quietly coerced. This is reprehensible but easily understandable and, of course, thoroughly at variance with the theory of justice.

The commanding officer, well knowing of the predeliction, prejudice, peculiarity of some higher commander, whom he has to face and not infrequently placate in the course of command, may unduly emphasize the gravity of the offense, the necessity of heavy penalty, the probable guilt of the offender. He is not dishonestly actuated in this, for usually he is wholly convinced of all that he emphasizes, but wants to insure results. Yet the court is, to a great extent, his creature. They can be and not infrequently are subjected to the commander's ill humor when the results obtained do not suit him, both in small and great commands. Knowing or sensing this, the court may not be as free and untrammeled in their determinations as an independent court should be.

It is indeed unfortunate that all commanders are not judicially minded. Some most successful administrators and tacticians are not. Some believe that the means justifies the end. They have a good argument frequently, for they in their turn are judged solely by end results. But that is not the thing of which justice is composed. Soldiers, once in the military forces, surrender many rights they as civilians enjoy.

Commanding officers must be entrusted with a vast discretion. It may seem silly to make men wear neckties, never put their hands in their pockets, wear woolens in hot weather or cottons in cold weather. It frequently is silly. But I would be the last to deny that right to the commander who in its finality is responsible that his command perform its mission.

For example, a commander decides that every man, including himself, shall perform all missions involving travel of less than a mile on foot and that he shall double time half of it and quick time at a cadence of 140 a minute the balance. To many that might seem silly. But so long as his orders do not defeat his purpose and contribute to the creation of good soldiers, they must be carried out with faith and loyalty, no matter how repugnant to the soldiers' sense of necessity.

THREE POINTS OF WEAKNESS

However, I do not believe that it is sound to have him (1) select the courts, aside from summary courts for minor delinquency; (2) send the cases to courts of his choosing and then (3) review and frequently criticize their work officially and otherwise.

For example, how can a commander fairly rate the member of a court on his efficiency report whom he fully believes has failed to exercise reasonable judgment? His knowledge of all the facts that actuated the courts-martial determination is ex parte and usually contained in the cold words of a cold record and not infrequently the officer may have been 100 percent in agreement with the commander, but a minority on the court.

If there was no other reason than that for divorcing the courts from command, I believe that alone would suffice as a good and sufficient reason, as we cannot hope to find all commanders Justinians.

Example ofttimes is of more import than any generality.

In a pretrial review of a case which involved an officer who had to a degree comported himself in a manner not entirely in conformity with the idea of "conduct becoming an officer and a gentleman," I had occasion to say: "This is a rather close question and I am of the opinion that a court might not agree with us as to the gravity of this conduct."

The answer, and the man who made it I believe has a reasonably fair sense of justice and a realization of his responsibilities, was, "Don't worry about that, I'll appoint a court of X and Y and Z (mentioning officers by name) and they will know what to do."

That attitude, at best, would be called "packing the court" and, at worst, which it not infrequently is, would merit a far harsher term. And courts are not infrequently "packed" to obtain an opposite result, which is equally if not more reprehensible.

I do not say this in any sense in a disgruntled manner. I have no personal ax to grind and have had the most happy contacts with the officers with whom I have chanced to work. Moreover, I have seen very little evidence of active animus or unreasonability in subordinate commanders.

However, I have in innumerable instances seen commanders of all grades coerced in their behavior by some times unthinking comments made by superiors, whose edict was unfortunately accepted as law by the subordinate who wanted, and not infrequently would submerge his own sense of justice, to obtain the transient good will of his superior.

Because of these things I believe:

FIVE CHANGES PROPOSED

1. Commanders would exercise the functions of command better, with less difficulty, and with no loss of prestige or functional capability, if all courts, except summary courts, were wholly separated from the chain of command, answerable in every aspect only to the commander in chief.

2. That traveling general courts of three members, composed of field officers with long understanding of discipline, military necessity, and military law, should be created, complete with reporters, to travel circuits and try general court cases which would be referred to them by much the same system now prevailing, including investigation, review by a judge advocate, and reference by commanding officers who would have general court jurisdiction to refer cases but not to review them.

This traveling general court should also exercise a reviewing authority's power of suspension and remission, which would be referred to them for study in advance of their arrival on a post.

3. A traveling or fixed special court of one highly qualified officer, depending on the volume of business at any given post and answerable to no one in the command chain, who would try all special court cases referred to by officers having jurisdiction to refer cases and which would be reviewed, for appeal purposes, only by a staff judge advocate of the general court jurisdiction, who could, if he disagreed on the record, require a retrial to a different special court, or allow an appeal on the record to the next general court coming into the command.

4. A staff judge advocate who would function just as he now does as to all summary courts and who would aid both general and special court jurisdictional commanders in determining references an who would in addition review special court determinations as set up in (3) above, and conduct the office of record for all cases, summary, special, and general, insofar as not incompatible with the suggestions above, in essential compliance with existing law.

In my opinion such a system would have a very large number of advantages, including:

1. Relieve the commander of a judicial function that does interfere measurably with his command function.

2. Insure a much more even type of punishment and a far better following out of military law in both general and special courts.

3. Remove one source of great friction in commands where the officers try men with whom they have to work and with whom they have daily contact.

4. Create in the mind of the enlisted man a belief, which many do not have today, that courts are instruments of justice and not merely instruments of military oppression by their superiors, where officers and enlisted men alike were tried.

5. Permit in military courts a sound divorcement of the executive and judicial functions.

6. Reprieve line officers from what, at times, is a great interference with their regular command duties.

While this proposal in some ways appears to be revolutionary in its nature it would involve but minor changes in either the Courts Martial Manual or in the general theories of military justice, and it would, in my opinion, insure a uniformity of justice which the present system cannot possibly achieve, and forever eliminate the enlisted man's commentary that he might as well plead guilty and get it over with because he'll get six and six anyhow.

Mr. Roosevelt's Heirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, March 25:

MR. ROOSEVELT'S HEIRS

A certain thin pall of gloom, if not of foreboding, seemed to lie over the Jackson day oratory as it rumbled through Saturday evening from coast to coast. This was no confident beginning of another march to victory. The President went through the prescribed rites; he duly recounted the Democratic Party's achievements and rededicated it to the spirit of Andrew Jackson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, but somehow neither spirit—neither the fire of Old Hickory nor the subtler trenchancy of Mr. Roosevelt—seemed to be presiding over the dinner tables. Secretary Wallace, for the left wing, was told to beat the old tom-toms about the bourbon Republicans and their blind adherence to their reactionary tradition. Chairman Hannegan, for the right, was assigned the grim duty of telling the party that if it could not make peace between its own bourbons and its radicals it would lose Congress in the November elections. All three and many lesser lights were seriously concerned for party unity, and the uncomfortable fact remains that there is no party unity.

There is no unity, in large measure because there is no program to unite behind. The "principles of Franklin D. Roosevelt," aside from being somewhat elusive quantities in themselves, are no substitute, nearly a year after that stateman's death, for a concrete and practically possible system of measures advanced to meet the practical problems of a time which Mr. Roosevelt was not required to face. President Truman has his proposals, some of them necessary, some of them dubious, some of them in conflict with others. He has lacked the facility to analyze the situation before him, to concentrate on essentials and to dramatize the main lines of policy which he is endeavoring to follow without regard to side issues. His inspirations have been too desultory and often too late. His strike policy seemed too much at variance with his anti-inflation policies; his military policies have seemed to veer too easily with the winds; his social security and minimum-wage demands have seemed to stand too isolated from the general context. In the Jackson Day address he appeared to be trying to focus the effort on price control and on the housing program, but it is late in the day—especially in face of a Congress and a country who have been given too much reason to suspect that next week the whole focus may be a quite different one.

In the result there is no party unity. It is unfortunate for the Democratic party. But it is not too fortunate for the country, either. The coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans now exerting so much power in Congress is effective in opposition; it is not an effective instrument for positive action, and we need defined and positive action very badly. The failure of the Truman administration and its party to provide consistent programs and policies for the reconversion period and to carry them through unquestionably opens a major Republican opportunity. Mr. Hannegan's fears are by no means groundless. But it is still an opportunity only, and to seize it will call for that vigor, soundness, and consistency of view within the Republican ranks which the Nation no longer finds among the heirs to Franklin Roosevelt's long tenure.

Forgotten Annuitants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 24 which rings the bell on the subject:

FORGOTTEN ANNUITANTS

Almost 4 months have passed since the Senate voted to extend the benefits of the amended Civil Service Retirement Act to Federal employees retired prior to January 1942. It remains for the House to act on this pressing legislation to correct a long-standing injustice to a small group of elderly men and women living on meager annuities that are but a fraction of the amounts to which they would be entitled if they had been lucky enough to retire after passage of the measure increasing annuities.

The House Civil Service Committee is expected to report out shortly a bill increasing the basic salaries of classified Federal employees. This seems an appropriate time, therefore, for the committee to speed action on the pending measure to step up the pensions of the neglected men and women who have been the victims of a presumably accidental failure of Congress to include a retroactive clause in the 1942 amendment to the Retirement Act. They have waited during four long years of rising prices for correction of the injustice done them by a legislative oversight, and while they waited their ranks have been steadily thinned by death. The case for redress is all the more appealing because it concerns a small and modest group of individuals neither disposed nor able to make political capital out of their situation.

A typical example of the kind of restrained appeal that should rouse our legislators to action comes from the collector of customs of the port of New York. He says that he has seen the top men of several of the most important divisions of the service retired on reaching the age limit on annuities representing less than 25 percent of their annual salaries. "It was with deep regret," he said in a letter to the chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, "that I saw these men leaving the service, after long years of faithful work, with a pension which in no circumstances was adequate, and I believe the passage of the bill now before your committee would go a long way to correct the injustice to the men who of necessity had to leave the service before the passage of the present retirement bill."

Eisenhower Sees Need for GI Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I took occasion to commend the action of Secretary of War Patterson and Chief of Staff General Dwight D. Eisenhower, for the action they have taken to set up a joint board of officers and enlisted men to investigate the so-called caste system in the Army and to recommend such changes as their investigations may lead them to make.

This action was announced last week, and had special interest for me because on March 15, 1946, I had written General Eisenhower on the subject, enclosing a letter from a soldier at Fort Benning, and relating some observations of GI's with whom I recently had an opportunity to discuss their Army life.

I thought the letter from the soldier, Earl A. Hausle, whose home is in Spearfish, S. Dak., was remarkable for its clarity in presenting the enlisted man's point of view and for its understanding of the Army's problem. I am placing it in the RECORD, under permission granted, for those reasons which impelled me to send it to the Chief of Staff.

And for similar reasons, because of its revelation of the human qualities of the great commander who led the Allied armies to victory in Europe, and his own fine sense of justice and square dealing based upon mutual respect between officers and men, I am placing in the RECORD the reply which I received from General Eisenhower.

One paragraph, alone, from General Eisenhower's letter deserves far wider reading than it will get in my files, and because I think it should be brought to the attention of every soldier, past and present, I am setting it out separately.

While recognizing the need for certain reforms which pressure of battle conditions did not permit instituting, General Eisenhower says:

There is even a greater need for assuring that every man from the highest brass hat to

the lowest private in the ranks clearly understands that while we must make some distinction based upon professional attainment and upon weight of responsibility, these distinctions must never imply nor condone any assumption of human superiority, which is not only un-American and unethical, but is ineffective in developing the kind of unit that is necessary to battle success.

The letter follows:

THE SOLDIER'S LETTER

TANK TRAINING COMPANY, I. T. D. No. 1,
Fort Benning, Ga., February 26, 1946.

DEAR MR. CASE: At the present time it seems that Congress is concerned with legislation which is aimed at getting more men to enlist in the Regular Army.

Only a month ago I would have said that an increase in pay which is now being advocated by the War and Navy Departments and also by Congressman VINSON of Georgia will be sufficient to gain the number of enlisted men deemed necessary by the Chief of Staff. Now I know that an increase in pay alone could not do the job unless it was such an extravagant one that it could hardly be afforded.

In the opinion of most GI's now serving many changes must be made before the Army would begin to be a start of what it now claims to be.

Of all the men I have seen and talked to on the five different posts and camps I have had the misfortune to be on, not one of them who was not a Regular Army man before Pearl Harbor likes it. Not me! Even many of the Regulars find the situation almost unbearable and remain only because they have no civilian occupation.

Does it not seem strange that in the Army of the United States, an army that fought so valiantly and victoriously for freedom and democracy, is a place where there is neither freedom nor democracy?

These men whom the Nation asked to lay down their lives if necessary, and who they are now asking to be the so-called guardians of democracy ask to be treated as men. If we are to serve, it is only fair that we should share in that which we are serving to preserve.

When a man is not busy he should be allowed to relax in his barracks or day-room. Jobs should not be created merely to keep men busy. Promotion should be along the same lines as those of the Navy. All men, regardless of rank, should have the same treatment where Government expenditures are concerned, as far as clubs, recreational facilities are concerned. There should be no distinction between officers and men and first three grades and men of lower rank are concerned.

Courts martial should be changed to resemble regular trials by judge and/or jury; the present system is completely unfair.

Men should be put in jobs that they are best fitted to do and not assigned to an organization merely to fill the table of organization. I, myself, am a good example of this type of thing.

Since 1943, all the work I have done has been along clerical lines and I have had Army training as a clerk. I have done clerical work in the Army and I have had no basic training. All the training I have had in the Army has been clerical, yet when I reported at Fort Benning, Ga., I was put on regular field duty, with a tank company. Our work here is to aid in the instruction and training of officer candidates. You can imagine just how much they would learn from me. I am one of many here, however, and it is a deplorable situation.

It is my firm belief that the only way the necessary number of men can be recruited for duty with the Regular Army is to investigate and reorganize the Army as well as raising the pay.

Many pages more could be written but I think this will give you a general idea of the situation. I hope you will help us.

I have written to you because my home is in Spearfish, S. Dak.

Sincerely,

EARL A. HAUSLE.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1946.

Gen. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Chief of Staff, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL EISENHOWER. I want to hand you a letter I received from Earl A. Hausle, Tank Training Company, I. T. D. No. 1, Fort Benning, Ga., which deals with recruitment of men for the Regular Army. You will note that he says "only a month ago I would have said an increase in pay * * * would be sufficient to gain the number of enlisted men deemed necessary by the General Staff. Now I know that an increase in pay alone could not do the job unless it was such an extravagant one it could hardly be afforded."

And I might say that a few months ago I might have paid less attention to this letter than I do now—but recently I had occasion to drive to South Dakota and back. Going and coming I gave many soldiers a lift. From all of them I got exactly the same point of view—namely, that they are reacting against service in the peacetime Army under the attitudes encountered. Of course I recognize that a remarkable record has been made at that in the recruitment of soldiers. These boys point out, however, than an extraordinarily large number are junior officers or Master Sergeants to whom reenlistment may seem to offer a chance for special privileges which civilian life does not offer. A man who thinks he may be an enlisted man with little or no noncommissioned rank, fears what he calls the "caste system."

One boy cited Mauldin's cartoons as best revealing the spirit of the enlisted man. Another cited a camp order which required any junior officer found guilty of being "out of uniform" to find 10 enlisted men similarly out of uniform before leaves were restored. The enlisted man's reaction was that the first 10 men seen by that officer would be posted.

I have sent you the attached letter frankly because I know your spirit and know that no reprisal will be visited against the boy who very evidently wrote me in the most conscientious of intent and because his letter is thoroughly constructive. He is not complaining—he is simply trying to help answer this real problem that confronts America—the manning of her Army.

The situation which he and the boys who rode with me mentioned is a most difficult thing to get at—but it is basic and I believe the effort is warranted.

With my highest esteem and kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative, Second District of South Dakota.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S REPLY

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1946.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: I thank you sincerely for sending on to me the letter you received from Earl A. Hausle, together with your comments regarding conversations you have had with enlisted men on the subject of their relationships with officers.

There is no question whatsoever that there exists definite grounds for the type of complaint that you have frequently encountered. I worked on this subject throughout the war and have given it an extraordinary amount of attention since the shooting stopped. As is always the case, when abuses of a system come to light, we usually find the cure proposed in terms that are likewise excessive; it is a natural and human reaction.

The Secretary of War and I have agreed upon certain methods of getting this whole subject thoroughly investigated and hope that out of it we may be able to establish methods and doctrines that will eliminate justifiable complaint.

You are probably aware of the fact that 60 percent of the officers we had in this war came directly from the men that were brought into the Army on enlisted status. Only 40 percent came from the original Regular Army, the National Guard, the Organized Reserve, or were commissioned, as specialists, directly from civil life. Moreover, it is this 60 percent that has served most intimately with enlisted men, since in general it was this group that provided the lieutenants and captains for fighting the war.

All these men were young Americans selected from among their enlisted comrades because of demonstrated qualities for leadership, but naturally, due to the press of war, their education and training was highly specialized in the direction of their war tasks only. Broader philosophy and the requirements of the service for a period such as we are now passing through could scarcely be touched upon until after the tactical victory was won.

I have held conversations with many thousands of soldiers in this war. I have been personally responsible for correcting, or in attempting to correct at least, many of the individual instances where I thought complaint was completely justifiable. While I am not prepared, and I do not believe any other person well acquainted with our history and our requirements is prepared, to abandon completely certain distinctions between young officers that must share with their soldiers every danger and vicissitude of battle and at the same time necessarily carry on their shoulders the complete responsibility for the conduct of the group under conditions where instant obedience may mean the difference between life or death and success or failure, yet as I said before, I clearly recognize the need for certain reforms.

There is even a greater need for assuring that every man from the highest brass hat to the lowest private in the ranks clearly understands that while we must make some distinction based upon professional attainment and upon weight of responsibility, these distinctions must never imply nor condone any assumption of human superiority, which is not only un-American and unethical, but is ineffective in developing the kind of unit that is necessary to battle success.

Far from any idea of considering action against your correspondent, I am grateful that he is attempting to think of these matters logically and sensibly and I would have no objection to your sending him a copy of this letter.

Very sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Production of Building Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, judging from committee meetings I have attended and reports received from the indus-

try, I feel that very little is being accomplished toward an increase in production of building materials. Mr. Porter announced some price increases before Senator CHAVEZ's special committee last Saturday morning but after the industry's representatives, who were present, had an opportunity to reply, there was no doubt in my mind that the price changes will not accomplish what we all hope for—more production.

The propaganda flowing out of Washington, that Mr. Wyatt must have the subsidy item to get materials, is perfectly silly. Extensive study shows unmistakably that there is no need to appropriate huge sums to subsidize new or marginal manufacturers. The present capacity is ample, provided that capacity is put to work with the aid of price-ceiling adjustments. Unfortunately some of this loose propaganda tends to make a political issue of it. I want to say now that the Republicans are just as anxious as the Democrats to house our veterans. In fact, we know enough about the building-material business to know there is plenty of venture or risk capital waiting to go into new types of building materials and prefabricating housing projects, without Government aid, once the industry is freed of so much red tape and given the green light. I hope the veterans are not fooled into thinking the subsidies Mr. Wyatt has asked for would give them cheaper homes. Oh, no. But eventually this money would only increase their future tax burden. Another foolish statement is the broadcast that the industry is deliberately opposing the OPA and thus against furnishing lumber for veterans' homes. Mr. Speaker, how silly that statement is. Manufacturing lumber and building materials is their bread and butter, just as delivering lumber and building materials is my bread and butter. Such propaganda just does not make sense.

If the general public only realized the sharp practices and tricky methods being used today to get lumber, they would not stand for the continuance of this agency, the OPA. That also goes for many other commodities too. Because of these ridiculous practices, the consumer is getting the poorest lumber and paying the highest prices in his life. This all adds up to the eventual discredit of lumber as a building material and opens the way for substitutes. Most certainly the retail dealers are opposed to these conditions and naturally would prefer taking their chances with the law of supply and demand. Good reliable mills, as well as good legitimate retail dealers, are losing their customers through these phony sales set-ups and black-market practices. The OPA claims to be protecting the little man, but from all accounts, it is protecting that firm or individual who is willing to take a chance. The reliable manufacturer and dealer would not take such risks while the unscrupulous firm is grasping the lion's share of scarce materials.

Reports indicate that production in the West should step up in the next 2 months. The weather is better and there seems to be an ample supply of labor. If the OPA economists and statisticians here in Washington would just become realistic, accept the recommendations of the industry and practical men in the lumber division, we could go a long way toward meeting Mr. Wyatt's program and according to a report I have recently read, we could have enough building materials left over to encourage the construction of large industrial and commercial projects. Projects that have long been planned to modernize existing industrial and commercial plants should be kept alive. Remember this present housing demand can and will be taken care of, providing labor and industry work together for maximum production. In a few years, housing will be back to normal and then we will need our expanded industrial plants to take on the affected labor.

We, who have had the privilege of knowing and working with Mr. Don Campbell, formerly with the Lumber Division of the WPB, welcome the good news that he has consented to act as an assistant to Mr. Wyatt. Mr. Campbell is a lumber retailer himself and knows what the retailer's problems are. I believe he also knows how discouraging it is to have empty storage sheds and a pay roll to meet on Saturday night. We believe Don Campbell will prove a valuable man to Mr. Wyatt and the lumber industry.

Old-Age Assistance

REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, while we have many problems during this postwar period and the demands are great upon our people, we must not forget the aged people of our Nation. They have played their full part and they have made their splendid contributions to the end that our Nation might go forward and become the greatest Nation upon the face of this ancient and kindly earth. Many of our senior citizens have reached the age at which they are unable to fully support themselves, and those dependent upon them—and this has developed through no fault of theirs. The age limit in plants has become a barrier against their employment, and the strict physical requirements, now almost universally required, has prevented many of our aged people from obtaining employment. While we have the existing social security laws, under which we have operated for several years, yet those laws are in dire need of amendment and revision, and our laws should be revised and improved in the interest of fairness and equity to our senior citizens and our aged people. It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee in the House will promptly take this matter up and work out an improvement in our laws, and the assistance which may be granted thereunder, all to the end that our people who come within that classification may receive proper and adequate assistance in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter today to Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in the House, upon this very subject, and I herewith, with the unanimous consent of the House, include a copy of my letter to my colleague, which is as follows:

MARCH 26, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know I represent the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana and I am advised that 1,039 people have signed a petition which has been presented to your committee urging that action be taken at the very earliest moment on the proposed amendments to Social Security, and for the improvement of old-age assistance. These petitioners all reside in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and they have presented the large petition, hereinbefore referred to, in extreme good faith.

It is my hope that your committee will take such action as is entirely proper in the interest of the aged people of our Nation at an early date. These people are highly respected in their communities, and they are extremely deserving of aid and assistance commensurate with their needs.

I will deeply appreciate any assistance you may render in their behalf.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND S. SPRINGER.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this great committee presided over by Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON, as chairman, will grant the request contained in the petition presented by these good people from the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana, and from many of the districts throughout our Nation.

Address of Hon. Tom C. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Hon. Tom C. Clark, the Attorney General of the United States, at the annual banquet of the Order of the Ahepa, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., March 25, 1946:

Mr. Toastmaster, the great order which you represent, in the almost quarter century of its existence, has amply demonstrated and fulfilled the great expectations envisioned by its founders.

It is significant that we meet here tonight, on the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the successful conclusion of the epic struggle for the restoration of Greek independence.

Despite the stark tragedy of the last few years, when her countryside was laid waste in a program of terror, and her cities echoed with the barbaric tread of the invader, when 10 percent of her population was sacrificed upon the altar of freedom, though weak and prostrate—Greece is free.

She could have taken the easy way when the legions of that would-be Caesar, Mussolini, knocked at her gates and demanded submission.

She chose to fight and brought down upon herself the full might of the Nazi terror.

But neither unequal battle, firing squad, or the noose, nor all of the unspeakable horrors the degraded and bestial mind of the Nazi could envision could bring her to her knees.

The flame of freedom never dies in Greek hearts, and the light to which the world owes so much refused to be quenched.

As Americans of Greek descent I know you glory in that heritage, and you should.

Upon the entry of this country into the struggle your natural patriotism flamed to intensity, and many a cross on many a hard-fought battlefield the world around bears a name that bespeaks the blood of Hellas.

The fearful ordeal is over.

Mussolini dispatched like a mad dog by his own people, his body in death hacked and slashed in an orgy of pent-up hate, while in Germany the arch-fiend takes a coward's way out, in a bunker in Berlin.

Twice now in the lifetime of men has our world been threatened by the mailed fist of aggression.

Once before we solemnly resolved that this should never be again.

We failed.

Again we make the same resolution—however, this time we know that should we fail we shall never have the chance again.

The hour calls for cool heads, for a broad tolerance, and for a persistent and determined effort to find the key to international understanding and good will.

As Americans, we desire only peace, and we are determined this time to keep the peace our arms have won.

We think we have found the means to do that in the United Nations Organization.

It is to be remembered that this is not another League of Nations.

It is an association of states, having as its purpose the creation of a world order, designed to maintain the peace, a universal order under universal law, a law applicable to individuals as well as to states.

This implies no surrender of sovereignty on our part, but a recognition on the part of all the peoples of the world, ourselves included, that this is indeed one world.

We do not expect to achieve Utopia over night.

But we can make the effort, as a matter of fact we must, for the devastating and awful effect of modern weapons of war, which we have seen demonstrated on a small scale, demands that we must, or bring down upon the world horror and destruction, the awful catastrophic fury of which the mind fails utterly to envision, and from which it is doubted, by those who know, we can survive.

This is an alternative, men have never faced since the creation of the world.

It almost seems as though the Author of nature Himself, disgusted with the perversity of men, has finally permitted them to peer for one awful moment into the secrets of the universe, but long enough to glean there the apocalyptic secret of their own destruction.

Your forebears faced the barbaric hosts of destruction at Marathon and Salamis over 2,500 years ago, and triumphed.

Out of that triumph came that civilization we like to call Christian.

We, too, in our time have fought our Marathons and Thermopylaes, but never have men stood before on the threshold of such complete, final, and utter defeat, facing alike both the victor and the vanquished.

Only by : firm purpose to outlaw war and all its concomitant horrors can we avoid this day of final wrath and destruction.

That is the high emprise to which we are called.

It is a call to the last crusade.

It demands, as I have said, cool heads and a recognition of the fundamental fact that we are all members of the same human family and that the peoples of the world, no matter what their creed, their color, or their nationality, can no longer withstand the horror and destruction of another war.

The history of Greece in the last bitter century of her existence demonstrates beyond contradiction the senselessness of power politics, cloak-room diplomacy, and the division of the world into the "haves" and "have nots."

Men, because of the fact that they are men—by virtue of their own inherent origin and destiny—are not to be regarded as the pawns of others who, sitting for a moment in the seats of power, dispose of the fortunes, the happiness, and the lives of millions.

This is the enunciation of no new principle.

It is the expression of the ancient Hellenic ideal transfigured, if you will, by the saving light of that Christian philosophy on which the culture of our western world has been built.

It stands now challenged, as it has before, and it is a challenge that must be met, for, as I have said, if we fail in this great reconstruction, then the blinding flash that cascaded Hiroshima into ash is as a spark to the holocaust we can now discern on the rim of the future.

The road to the achievement of this peace will not be an easy one, for men are not made saints over night.

There will be obstacles in the way; there will be misunderstandings and misgivings; there will be problems presented that will seem almost insoluble; but so long as the will to solve them exists and conscious effort is made to achieve it, they will be solved.

Like the peripatetic philosophers of the land of your forebears, who unlocked the secrets of the human mind and gave us in the realm of the intellect a Plato and an Aristotle, a Solon and a Pericles, and out of plain amorphous marble brought forth the imperishable beauty of an Acropolis and a Parthenon, we, too, must unlock the chambered recesses of the human heart and find there the courage and determination and the desire out of which we must shape and form the peace we have won.

We cannot achieve this alone, as President Truman has repeatedly said.

It calls, as nothing else has ever called before, for cooperation, for unselfishness, for understanding, and for a removal of those artificial barriers of creed, color, and ideas that set men against men, and close the human heart to that understanding and to that sympathy which human beings, because of their common humanity, should have for one another.

Under the leadership of President Truman we can and shall achieve it.

No man epitomizes the yearning for peace in the hearts of men everywhere more than he, for he knows through personal experience of the bitterness and futility of war and he is conscious of the will of the peoples of the world for a just and lasting peace.

This has been the struggle of Greece through the centuries.

Indeed, this has been the struggle of mankind.

Heretofore we have faltered—on occasion we have glimpsed the glory of the far-away horizon and then have lost it.

This time admits of no failure.

We must achieve it or the race of men shall disappear in an orgy of bitterness fashioned of their own hate.

Upon the coinage we inscribe the legend "In God we trust."

This God of battles, who has nerved our arm and sinewed our blows in the great struggle against the hosts of darkness which has just ceased, we must not forget, is also the God of peace.

Let the new peace be His peace.

And should we stumble on the way and—

"If drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe.

* * * * *

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget."

Problems of Scientific Personnel and Science Talent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a group of leading educators and scientists were assembled here in Washington not many days ago to discuss one of the most important questions for our future: How we can discover and do something about the scientific talent of American youth.

This conference was called by Science Service, the nonprofit institution for taking science to the people, now in its twenty-fifth year of service. In 5 years Science Clubs of America has grown to 9,200 clubs, including 200,000 boys and girls. For 5 years Science Service and its Science Clubs of America organization has conducted the national annual science talent search for the Westinghouse science scholarships.

Forty boys and girls are picked each year from the senior classes of the Nation's secondary schools as the potentially most talented young people. One of the residents of my congressional district, David Dill Cudaback, 426 South Jefferson, Napa, Calif., was a winner of the fifth science talent search, during which the educational conference on science talent was held.

At no time in the history of the world has science by and for the people been more important to the welfare of the world. The study and practice of science in clubs of young people in the Nation's schools is one of the most significant educational methods to be developed in the past few years. The search for talent among these young scientists and the support of their studies through scholarships are important for the future of all the people, including industry, labor, and government. This is a solid investment in future peace and prosperity and in protection against future wars.

The principal address of the conference was by Dr. M. H. Trytten, Director, Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Research Council, and was delivered on March 5, 1946, before the Educational Conference of the Scientific Talent Search Institute, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C. The speech follows:

I am sure that anyone who has ever been a teacher can understand my pleasure at being privileged to speak about the brilliant group of scientific "quiz kids" who represent this year's winners of the science talent search. People sometimes wonder what it is that keeps teachers in the profession when

it would be in most cases easy to secure less exacting and more remunerative employment. I think it is wholly the real human satisfaction in helping in the development of minds such as these. There is no thrill quite like that of seeing your students grow into able, useful, and successful working members of their profession. It is the promise of that, I believe, which gives us all joy in these young people today.

I think that at no other time has the science talent search seemed so significant or symbolic. We have just finished a war in which science was not only dominant but decisive. I have often thought how interesting it would be if we could set up some kind of balance sheet to measure in terms of manpower the contributions of science in this war. Let us suppose, for example, that some supernatural being had come to our leaders in 1941 and taken them to a high place from where they could have seen the whole remaining course of the war in clear perspective. Suppose this being had then stated that he was going to remove all the radar developments of the next years from the picture but that he would in recompense grant the equivalent manpower accretion to balance. How many men do you suppose would have been necessary? Take for example the radar fire-control equipment which more than any factor gave us an overpowering advantage in combat. Or the navigation aids which made maneuvering at night at high speeds possible; or the radar antiaircraft equipment; or the plane and ship and submarine locators; or dozens of other instruments which gave us such an astonishing advantage in almost all phases of combat. I think our leaders would have simply said there is no measurable equivalent. Because not only is here the brilliant performance of the present but the rich promise of uncounted years in the future. Hundreds of thousands of men mean little against such power. And then what of the manpower equivalent of the proximity fuze? or DDT? or of anti-malarials? or of the atomic bomb?

The question may seem a bit fantastic, and yet it is not, as the following example will show. In the winter of 1943–44 the Manhattan District project found it necessary to expand its activities enormously to meet the challenge of the race against time. They needed great additions of scientific manpower. It was evident, however, that there was no supply of manpower in reserve. Throughout the war, our policies did not permit of manpower reserves. A man was either indispensable to an essential project at the moment or he was inducted. As a result, there appeared to be no available source of men. However, it happened that in the recruitment throughout the army of candidates for the ASTP a number of highly trained persons had been assigned to it and had thereafter been collected in so-called 9–A pools. There were several hundreds of these who were made available and assigned to the atom-bomb project to work in their laboratories as their military assignment. General Groves has said that "there are men without whom we could not have done this thing." I think it is worth while pointing out that this means that these several hundred men were, according to this statement, the difference between success and failure of this project. Here, then, in several hundred individual decisions, someone did make the mistaken decision that each of these men was of more value as an unassigned soldier than as a scientist. Only good fortune that these men were not sent overseas before being assigned to the Manhattan District project permitted the nullification of these errors of decision and thus assured the acceleration of the atomic-bomb project to success.

No one would seriously attempt to evaluate the worth of the atom-bomb project as less than a few hundred unassigned soldiers. Yet, in fact, that was the accumulated effect of these several hundred individual decisions in the inductions of these men.

There is, however, plenty of evidence that the profound implications of the scientific contributions to our military strength during the war have created a desire in the United States to exploit further the possibilities then opened up. The services are very much alive to the need for sound scientific programs. This is shown in plans for extensive new laboratories and additions to old laboratories. The services are being reorganized to give further scope to scientific work. Extensive training programs are being expedited to create a corps of scientifically trained officers. And the services are planning to support basic science research in the universities and colleges of the land. Industry has sharply increased its role in research. New laboratories have been announced by a number of very large users of science. Most of our companies are either planning increased research activities or are seeking access to established research facilities. Universities and colleges are displaying unprecedented interest in their science departments. And the Government, generally, is quite concerned about its place in the furthering of science. There are for example two bills to be brought out in the Senate—one to create an ambitious science research foundation under Federal auspices and another to set up a Federal atomic energy research program. There seems every evidence that we are alert to expanding our physical facilities and providing the necessary funds.

With regard to scientific manpower, the story is different. There is, and will be for some time, a shortage of such personnel. Throughout the war we began cutting down on training in some fields as early as 1940. From then on progressively the flow of trained manpower in the sciences was reduced. The resulting deficit is large and will be costly. That, of course, is past history and is well known.

The unfortunate aspect of the situation is that no positive recovery measures have been adopted.

The general attitude is that the present great flood of veteran students now on the campuses and about to return to them will quickly fill up the ranks of trainees in the sciences. There are, however, some very obvious limitations here. In the sciences the number of students who can register for advance work is limited to those who have finished the preparatory work. The seniors who are now enrolling must once have been juniors, and the graduate students must once have been seniors. At present in the science graduate schools and in the sophomore, junior, and senior classes in the sciences, the enrollments must be limited to those who left college for the services with unfinished courses, and in view of selective service history which began the pinch on enrollments at the freshman class and progressively rose through the years, there are not as large a number of returnees as is generally supposed. Information in my hands is incomplete, but it indicates that the graduate schools by and large are not full in most sciences in spite of scholarship programs and the release for advanced study of wartime research workers.

In a sampling of 57 universities, for example, the graduate enrollment in chemistry in the first semester was about 50 percent of the average for the immediate prewar years. Even with an additional 7-percent increase due to veteran enrollment, only 57 percent of the prewar average is indicated in the second semester. In the fields such as physics, mathematics, and geology, the graduate schools are similarly not crowded with GI's to judge by returns from a sampling of institutions immediately preceding the end of the first semester. Results showed enrollments in physics as 16 percent, geology as 30 percent, and mathematics as 12 percent of a normal prewar graduate enrollment. The nonveteran enrollment in these graduate schools in these fields was considerably greater, being in physics 83 percent, in geology 30 percent, and in mathematics 100 percent of prewar norms. These higher enrollments are in large part made up of those students who were on war research and are now deferred to finish their training. In the undergraduate classes where no deferments are now granted in general to nonveterans and where the enrollments are therefore confined to veterans and physically disqualified students the enrollments are very low as is indicated by data collected.

A sampling of enrollments of seniors in about 60 institutions at the end of the first semester gives in percentages of normal prewar enrollments the following figures: In physics, veterans 9 percent, nonveterans 28 percent; in geology, veterans 10 percent, nonveterans 20 percent; in mathematics, veterans 11 percent, nonveterans 18 percent. The corresponding junior enrollments are in physics, veterans 12 percent, nonveterans 36 percent; in geology, veterans 25 percent, nonveterans 21 percent; and in mathematics, veterans 13 percent, nonveterans 18 percent. More complete canvasses are needed and will be obtained for the second semester as soon as possible. But the results quoted indicate quite definitely that there is not yet any sufficient flow of science students in the colleges to even approach the prewar numbers. And the existence of wartime deficits should call for even much increased numbers.

To achieve a full program of training in the sciences so as to meet the great unfolding challenge of the future, to provide for our welfare and security and to lead the world to a higher level of comfort and stability through a higher technological standard of living, we should have a program as full and carefully drawn as any on the physical and financial side. It should be designed to bring back to the campuses to complete their training all those whose courses were interrupted, including those not yet discharged from the services, and it should provide for selection and training of our ablest youth. Above all, it should be a well-rounded program which should set as its goal the provision of well-trained and adequate leadership in all fields, not only scientific but also in such fields as the social sciences, the humanities and the fields of social and ethical leadership. America has come face to face with the need to assure higher education for its ablest youth. We need a program of selection and training of our best brains. It will be fatal to avoid the challenge. I am glad the Westinghouse Science Talent Search so ably dramatizes the need for this and points to the method to be used in its realization. I am very happy to have had this small part in this great undertaking.

Higher Pay for Federal Employees and Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the taxpayers of the United States demand more efficient and economical Government. Toward this end we should grant higher pay to Federal employees and executives. One of the surest ways to reduce Government expenditures and achieve better results is to attract and retain the best and ablest administrators.

There are increasing criticisms of waste and duplication. These charges of inefficiency are all too true, but they generally are not due to the incompetence of the individuals on the pay roll, but rather to the way we organize and use them. By and large, there is no finer body of employees than those who work for the Federal Government, and it is gratifying that Congress at long last is taking steps to improve their salaries.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, general wage-rate increases in manufacturing industry averaged 18 percent between January 1941 and October 1945. This figure of 18 percent understates the advance in basic wage rates that actually occurred during this period, because it does not take account of rate increases of a nongeneral character, such as increases in rates in individual occupations or small groups of occupations. When these are included, total increases shown by the Bureau's index of wage rates in manufacturing was 33.7 percent for the period up to October 1945.

Since October 1945, a general wage movement of great significance has gotten under way. The Bureau estimates that since VJ-day approximately 9,000,000 workers have received increases as a result of general wage-rate adjustments. These increases have varied considerably but there has been a noticeable concentration in the area of 15 to 20 percent. The six fact-finding boards that have made wage recommendations up to this time have recommended increases ranging from 14 percent in the case of Greyhound Bus to 20 percent in the case of meat packing. The wage settlement in the steel industry amounted to 17.5 percent. It would be reasonable to assume that wage increases to private employees since October will average at least 17.5 percent. On the basis of the most conservative measure of wage-rate increases to October 1945—namely, 13 percent—a further increase of 17.5 percent will raise average wage rates in manufacturing to 38.6 percent.

I favor, and shall recommend, an increase of 18.5 percent.

According to the Civil Service Commission, Federal employees have received increases in their basic salary rates averaging 15.9 percent since January 1941. If the 1941 relationship between salaries of Federal employees and private employees is to be even partially restored, a further increase to Federal employees of at least 18.5 percent will be necessary. An 18.5-percent increase would raise the level of Federal salaries to a point 47.3 percent above the January 1941 level. This is a differential in favor of private employment over Government workers of 1.3 percent if the 18.5 percent is granted. This increase would not take into account the fact that Federal employees had a basic 39-hour week in January 1941 and a 40-hour week at the present time.

If we want efficiency, we must have capable managers. We have neglected the managers in the Federal business. Down through the years, they have not had their due. In pay bills the short end has been given to those who carry the heaviest load—the Federal executives. When the schedules of compensation were established under the original Classification Act of 1923, it was recognized that in the higher levels the rates fixed for the Government were substantially lower than prevailing rates in private industry. Each time those schedules have been adjusted, large percentages have been given in the lower ranks and smaller increases have been provided for the higher levels. Thus progressively the disparity with private industry was widened. Yet we know that any private business in seeking to cut its costs goes out and secures the most capable managers. If we are to get efficiency of operation, we must reward our Federal managers at least as well as we are prepared to reward our scientists and engineers.

The proposal of salaries of $12,000 and $14,000 for physical scientists doing work essential to the national defense is a step in the right direction, but it is only one step. The evidence pointing up the need for higher pay for scientists brings into the open the whole question of higher pay to those who manage these undertakings. The scientists are the first to insist on having good administrators with whom to work. Both Dr. Vannevar Bush and Dr. E. U. Condon have given strong testimony on this point. The scientists do not work in a vacuum. They must have laboratories and facilities, but more is required. Scientific findings must be put to work in actual operating programs. We do not get national defense just by discoveries—the inventions must be put into effect.

It would be folly indeed to expect these administrators to be paid less than the scientists working in their departments and bureaus. It is not so in industry. It does not make sense in government. Our national defense will be no better than the judgment of the administrators who make the decisions on programs. With the state of the world what it is and our relations to the world what they are, we must have the highest order of administrative competence. The people of America and the peoples of the world are looking to the Government of the United States.

Our international and national defense problems overshadow our other Federal activities. But the day-to-day manner in which the policies of the Congress are applied by our Federal executives in Washington and throughout the country affect the way in which private industry must operate. As never before, full production is tied to Government effectiveness in such matters as wages and prices.

The Federal Government has always been short of management leadership. In times of emergency we have been forced hurriedly to recruit a host of $1-a-year men and others brought in temporarily from private industry. They, for the most part, serve the Government well, but they leave their posts when the immediate crisis is past. Moreover, many of them are limited in doing a good job because they have had no experience with the necessary complexity of government. In difficult times, both in peace and war, the Government is not so well managed as it needs to be. I am convinced that our present rates of executive pay are driving mature men of strength, vision, and imagination out of Government, and are chilling the patriotism and purpose of younger men who might otherwise choose Government as a career.

As long as we continue to underrate our Federal management job, we shall have unnecessary waste and too high costs in Government. If the Congress wants to reduce these costs, to secure economy, to have fewer people on the pay roll, and to gear the Government of the United States to deal with the great tasks before it, we must pay our managers well. The new pay schedules should provide for managers, as well as for scientists and engineers. We shall, indeed, make a sad blunder if we continue to be niggardly toward our Federal administrators. They are the key to sharply lowered costs—in fact, to good government itself.

Water and Concrete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 20, 1946:

WATER AND CONCRETE

Representative ROBERTSON of Virginia has introduced a bill in Congress to give the Fish and Wildlife Service a say in conservation policies. The bill provides that no water-control project shall be constructed by any Federal agency without adequate provision for conserving fish and other aquatic life.

It is high time that biologists were given a greater voice not only in conservation but in other activities of Government. The Nation's timber has been wasted, its mineral resources looted and hundreds of millions of acres of soil impoverished—some literally washed away.

We have made a beginning of saving trees and soil. Here and there, a badly conceived drainage project has been revised or abolished. But water control on the whole is proceeding on the theory that any and all dams are good, that pouring concrete is meritorious in itself, as well as for concrete salesmen.

Plans have been drawn for some $7,000,000,000 worth of navigation, flood control, and hydroelectric works. Some should be constructed. Others are doubtful. Some are pure political pork.

There is an immense appeal in any power project in this power age, but man cannot live by kilowatts alone nor can a nation be nourished on portland cement.

The Robertson bill is a healthy symptom of discriminating thought. Its main support will probably come from fishermen and others interested in the sports of streams, field, and wilderness.

But much more than sport is involved. The biological balance of the continent has been shaken by hasty and ill-conceived engineering. In the drainage of swamps and lakes we have already discovered disastrous mistakes in the Middle West. It is high time that every engineer should be matched

by a competent biologist when plans for permanent changes in water courses are made. And the engineer must be given more freedom from the politician and the contractor.

Farley Fine for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., under date of March 24, 1946. This article was written by Lester Allen:

FARLEY FINE FOR AMERICA—EX-POSTMASTER GENERAL CHOSEN BY CORRESPONDENTS AS TYPIFYING SMART, FRIENDLY YANKS

(By Lester Allen)

A group of foreign correspondents, lounging in the lobby of a Portuguese hotel and exchanging small talk of their craft, got on the subject of American diplomats and their failure to typify Americans in their representation of the United States Government abroad.

From that topic they inevitably drifted into the subject of the typical American and began nominations of various prominent Americans who would be typical of the whole country and not a particular section of the country. They held that what the country needs is an official roving ambassador, and not one versed in the wiles of diplomacy, or high finance, or foreign trade—but in American good will.

FARLEY WALKS IN

The small talk developed into a wrangle. One by one all the leading figures in the public eye were taken up and rejected. The argument went on long and loudly. The lobby was well populated by refugees and expatriates waiting for transportation to America, all trying to escape from Europe, and all watching the American correspondents good-naturedly wrangling over the question of who was a typical American.

At that moment a tall, pink-faced man walked into the lobby, grinned, said, "Hello, fellers," and headed for the elevator. The refugees, as one, turned to watch him. One of them, got up and approached the tall American.

He halted, stuck out his hand and said, "My name's Farley. I used to sell stamps."

In less time than it takes to tell it, a score of refugees had crowded around, and Jim Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, was being introduced all around. There was nothing perfunctory about it. He was genuinely pleased to meet all of them, and they quite obviously felt that he was doing them an honor.

"That is the man," one correspondent said. "That's the typical American."

Considered apart from his political career, James A. Farley, whose breezy greeting, "My name's Farley. I used to sell stamps," is so typically American, that he is practically a new design for the cartoon figure of Uncle Sam.

Possessed of the most extraordinary memory for faces and names—a talent that makes the average city greeter or hotel manager look like an absent-minded mystic—Jim Farley spreads good will for America wherever he goes.

To watch him abroad, in Ireland, France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal, is a real pleasure. Equipped only with English, Farley manages to charm all comers whether they understand English or not. There is something about the way he sticks out his hand, beams down from the height of 6 feet 2 inches, always smiling, that would charm the most disgruntled bird down from a tree.

CHARMING PERSONALITY

When the soft-drink concern chose him as president of its export subsidiary the directors certainly got a great bargain. Even if the people in the export markets didn't like the drink, which they do, they would drink it anyway after Jim Farley had turned his sunny smile in their direction.

It works on all ages and both sexes. It works amid the most formidably correct surroundings—as, for example—the Quirinal palace in Rome, and it works back of the tracks in Limerick.

No hunter for big shots, wherever Farley passed in Europe he was sure to find some lowly GI who would come up to him, remind him that he met him 5 or 6 years ago in Des Moines, or San Francisco, or Houston, and Farley would say, "Come on along to lunch with me. Tell me what you have been doing."

At the Quirinal, for example, at a reception given by Crown Prince Umberto, Governor General of Italy, a scene of staggering magnificence was prepared for the first big reception staged by the Italian royal house since Italy's defeat. There was more glitter and gold lace, more ceremony and more calculated magnificence than Hollywood ever was able to crowd into a superspectacle.

But within 15 minutes it began to be doubtful who was giving the reception, Crown Prince Umberto or Jim Farley. Towering above even the court guards, who are chosen for their imposing appearance, Farley was mobbed by Italian notables and by members of foreign diplomatic missions in Rome.

One member of the Italian royal family stared at the big American for a moment and wanted to know who he was. "An American, no doubt," she said. And she took off to join the throng around Farley.

MY NAME IS YOLANDA

"My name is Farley," he said. "I used to sell stamps."

"My name is Yolanda," she replied. "I used to be a countess."

"There does not seem to be any way we can swap jobs," Farley chuckled.

With Jim Farley meeting people is not a mere formality. He meets them, makes friends of them, and sooner or later corresponds with them. The mails from whatever place he pauses for a day or two are weighted down with missives to his legion of friends.

Many political wiseacres thought that when his long association with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt came to an end that Jim Farley's career as a friend of everyone would come to an end. Actually this circumstance widened his circle of friends.

"I like friends," he explained. "Not acquaintances. Acquaintances are people who don't give a damn about you. Friends stay with you forever."

A great deal of his charm for complete strangers he meets in and out of the United States is the soul-satisfying resemblance he bears to the typical American. He is what the rest of the world would like to believe all Americans are. There is some of the breeziness of the West, some of the courtly dignity of the South, some of the prudence of New England blended into his character.

With Irish antecedents he is not a professional Irishman. He is a professional American in the best sense of the world. When the tide began to set against American popularity abroad it was a grave mistake not to draft Jim Farley for the task of circulating around Europe to mend our fences.

Son of a brick manufacturer in Rockland County, N. Y., Jim Farley's only elective office was town clerk of Stony Point, N. Y. He has always been, throughout his political career, a politician's politician. Now 58 years old, Jim Farley managers to crow into a single day the contacts that would take the average man a year to make.

CAN REALLY SELL

His background of 15 years as a salesman for the United States Gypsum Co. gave him the flair for meeting people and establishing himself in a few minutes' conversation as a man to know. They tell a story about him when he was a salesman which illustrates the point. A lumber dealer in northern New York State was overloaded with gypsum products, so much of an overload, in fact, that the other lines he carried were suffering. Finally he said to Farley, "I'm afraid I'll have to ask you not to call on me for a few months. I've bought too much of your line and I can't sell it."

Farley settled down in the town for 2 weeks, put on an intensive selling campaign for the lumber dealer, and unloaded all the excess and, incidentally, wrote a new order.

Throughout South America, where American popularity is not too good at the present moment, Farley has hundreds of friends, all of them boosters for Farley. He made the friends just being himself. He has the knack of being interested in even the most commonplace things other people say, and he never misses the right felicitous response.

His knowledge of international affairs could never be called profound if analyzed for the special kind of intuition which is demanded of diplomats, but for getting right down to cases and fundamentals he is hard to match.

He believes that we must import goods from foreign countries in order that foreign countries can secure dollar credits to purchase goods from us, and that the sooner we start doing it the better it is going to be for world economy.

One of the common faults of Americans abroad is their habit of apologizing or seeking to explain the shortcomings of American policy, American customs or American thinking. Jim Farley doesn't apologize for anything, or seek to explain anything. He has a personal belief that he is typically American, that foreigners meeting him can take him or leave him—and that explanations are left-handed apologies. He feels we have demonstrated enough good will not to be required to explain or apologize for anything.

Farley is the same man with the same character and the same sincere friendliness whether he is in Buenos Aires, Madrid, Rome, Paris, London, or Dublin. And people who are striving to know more about America recognize him instantly as Mr. America. He is the same man you meet in Tulsa, Okla.; Fort Kent, Me.; Atlanta, Ga.; or New York.

Just plain Farley—"I used to sell stamps."

Pan-American Influence on the Peace Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on the subject Pan-American Influence on the Peace Treaties, at a meeting of the People's Mandate Committee on Peace Settlements at the Shoreham Hotel in this city on March 21.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam President and members of the Peoples Mandate Committee for Inter-American Peace and Cooperation, and friends, I am glad to have the opportunity of meeting this evening with an organization that has given such strong support to the cause of pan-American solidarity. For pan-American solidarity, and all that that significant phrase implies, has a tremendous bearing upon the problem of world peace which is the immediate object of our consideration.

We have learned to recognize as a result of the suffering, sacrifice, and struggle of this last World War the immensity of the task that lies before us in attempting to create the structure of a peace that will endure. It is a task comprising far more than the writing of treaties and the drafting of documents. History books recount the familiar pattern in the past of nations going to war, and then imposing a solution of their disputes in the form of a treaty of peace. Treaties of peace were conceived of as instruments through which peace could actually be established, and normal life could be permitted once more to take its course. How different is our viewpoint today, as we emerge from the most destructive war of history and see before us the awful reality that unless we create a structure of lasting peace, we may expect to be engulfed in an even more deadly holocaust of atomic weapons that will most certainly spell the end of our civilization and sink the world in another dark age of barbarism.

For what we have learned at our terrible cost during the past 20 years is that no peace treaty can amount to more than an armistice between hostilities unless an enduring system of peace is created that attacks the basic causes of war and formulates an effective machinery whereby the rule of law can be firmly enforced in the settlement of disputes between nations.

My remarks are therefore addressed to this larger problem: The influence of the pan-American system on the creation of a structure of world peace.

I do not wish to underestimate the significance of the treaties of peace with our former enemies, the first of which is scheduled to be drawn up this spring. The problems with which these treaties will no doubt deal are of high significance, particularly when problems of the future status and condition of Germany and Japan are tackled. They will perforce involve both corrective and punitive features which will aim at preventing those nations from again achieving sufficient power to repeat the assaults on civilization which they so recently launched. As members of the United Nations all the countries which comprise the pan-American family will become parties to one or more of these treaties. I am confident that their influence will be felt in their devotion to the priciples for which the United Nations fought, their respect for the principles of law, and their sense of fairness along with an appreciation of the necessity for making quite sure that the former enemy countries will rise to eminence again only if they first become respectable and peace-loving members of the world community.

With respect, however, to the larger problem of erecting a framework for world peace, which will prevent a repetition from any source of the aggression which was planned and launched during the 1930's, the members of the pan-American family have an even larger influence, both past and future. The 21 republics of the New World play a dual role in this great and hopeful task.

First, as individual members of the United Nations they exert a direct and significant influence. They comprise 21 out of the 51 members of the General Assembly. Brazil, Mexico, and the United States are initial members of the Security Council. Pan-American problems and experience in the economic and social field are expressed through membership of Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Peru, and the United States on the Economic and Social Council. To the Court of International Justice, the pan-American world brings five justices, reflecting the long juridical heritage of American experience as well as of world-wide international law.

I cite these facts not to indicate or imply that the members of the pan-American system will act as a unit or a bloc in the affairs of the United Nations, for such a tendency, if one exists, would be out of keeping with the basic principle of the United Nations. In the maintenance of peace and security the world is indeed one and its nations must act with full realization of their total interdependence and mutual responsibility. The positions which the pan-American nations hold in the principal agencies of the United Nations emphasize, however, the fact that our 21 countries, drawing from our common background of international cooperation for whatever it may be worth, will have a strong voice, and consequently heavy responsibility, in the decisions that shape the structure of peace.

Their role has already evidenced itself in the contributions of the pan-American countries to the effective work of the San Francisco Conference, the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, and the first meetings of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

It is, perhaps, in less direct ways, however, that the pan-American influence makes itself felt on the peace. Not only as individual countries playing our respective parts in the deliberations of the United Nations will our influence be felt. The pan-American system, with its decades of careful growth, during times of both peace and war, and its principles which have been hammered out on the anvil of experience, has already contributed to the formulation of our peace structure. Its future influence can be large or small according to the success with which it meets future challenges and the leadership it displays in the achievement of peaceful cooperation based upon the acceptance of sound principle.

To all the world the pan-American system has been a demonstration of the fact that nations representing different historical and cultural backgrounds, speaking different languages, and comprising varied races, can solve their differences through peaceful means and coordinate their efforts to advance their social, economic, and cultural welfare through cooperation. The force of the conscience of the pan-American community of nations has proved to be the controlling factor in settling such disputes as have arisen. There is no reason to fear the outbreak of war among the members of the pan-American system so long as they do not permit the development in the New World of centers of Fascist or Nazi influence where the seeds of those condemned and outlawed ideologies can take root and flower anew. The strength of the pan-American system of international cooperation has in large measure arisen from the allegiance of the peoples of our 21 republics to certain basic principles which have guided their international relations.

Among these principles, which have had their influence far beyond the shores of the American continents, we may mention the following:

First, is the principle of nonintervention whereby any state is enjoined from interfering in the affairs of another. Consecrated in the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo in 1933, this principle became the cornerstone of mutual trust and confidence upon which was subsequently erected the more elaborate structure of inter-American cooperation.

Closely linked to this principle is the acceptance of the sovereign equality of nations large and small. In the pan-American world it has now long been recognized that any sovereign state, whether powerful or weak, is endowed with basic rights of sovereignty which may not be infringed upon by another and is entitled to equal respect before the law.

Third is the principle that international disputes must be settled by peaceful means and that any situation which threatens the peace of the American Republics is of concern to all of them. Here we find stated on a regional basis the idea which is now given expression in the basic concept of the United Nations and the indivisiblity of world peace.

Another principle of outstanding importance provides that any matters of mutual concern, particularly those which involve the peace of the member nations, requires mutual consultation so that a community viewpoint and policy may be adopted to meet the problem.

Finally, the pan-American system has adopted the principle that mutual cooperation is required to meet the necessary and legitimate needs of the peoples of all countries. Cooperation in protecting their security, cooperation in the solution of their economic problems, in advancing the living standards of the people, and in promoting a wider understanding of national cultures has proved its worth in the pan-American system. It has emphasized again the interdependence of nations and the futility of isolation.

It is apparent that these principles have found a responsive endorsement in the design of the structure of world peace which we are now erecting. The principles of sovereign equality and nonintervention in domestic affairs are written into the Charter of the United Nations. Essential to the entire organization of the United Nations is the principle that any situation threatening the peace is a matter of concern to all member nations and will be dealt with through specified procedures. A large measure of the effort which the nations of the world will put into their newly formed organization deals with cooperation in economic, social, and cultural lines to help remove the causes of war and create a more favorable environment for the satisfactory progress of human life.

It is clear, therefore, that the influence of the pan-American system on world peace has already been considerable. What of the future? In this respect I shall refer only to a few problems which loom large on the horizon.

One problem of major importance concerns the role of regional groups of nations in the world-wide effort of all countries to maintain the peace. We must recognize first of all that a regional group, such as the pan-American system, which has behind it a long record of successful achievement, can be a source of strength and support for the newer and less tried world organization. We want to conserve and build upon the good that has been achieved, and certainly shall entertain no thought of abandoning a relationship that has proved so highly beneficial.

Yet we must at the same time recognize that the problems of a global approach to peace and security demand a corresponding broadening of our horizon of thought and action, and a revitalization of principles in the light of a rapidly changing world.

Regionalism, no matter how successful in the past, cannot be allowed to assume a form of isolationism. Such a development would represent a stagnation of the underlying forces that have made the pan-American system a living and real contribution to international relationships. It would be false to assume that allegiance to a regional system of collective security could outweigh allegiance to a world system, or to expect that the world structure of peace can stand if its component parts isolate themselves either individually, or in regional blocs, from full and equal participation in the world effort.

If the principles which have motivated pan-American cooperation in the past can be our guide, we can assume, I am confident, that pan-American influence in this respect will be toward a genuine recognition of the global character of the problem of peace, and will materially strengthen the world organization dedicated to that end. This is no wise implies a restriction of the effort of the regional association of nations in their common interest. So vast is the field of international cooperation, and so many the opportunities for constructive endeavor, that the pan-American community may look forward to increasing usefulness in promoting the necessary conditions of peace among its member nations and in creating an increasingly secure region of the world where the curse of war shall no longer be feared. In this type of continued effort lies not only the realization of the pan-American ideal for itself, but the strengthening and support of the world-peace structure, just as the constructive effort of local communities on their own behalf contribute to a strong and secure nation.

A field of special importance in which the pan-American system can make a great contribution is that of perfecting and applying procedures for the peaceful settlement of international controversies. Although the world has become profoundly convinced of the need for effective force to prevent or put down aggression, let us not forget the need that also exists to devise practical methods for the effective and speedy settlement of international differences through peaceful measures such as mediation, conciliation, and arbitration and judical action. In the long run the world must become accustomed to accepting peaceful measures as the normal way of settling international differences. Such a development depends not only upon the knowledge that a resort to force by any one nation will be futile and self-destructive, but also upon the perfection of procedures whereby settlement may be reached fairly, with a minimum of difficulty and with full respect for the equality of both parties before the law. The experience of the pan-American nations in this regard should prove of particular value in the future as they approach the task agreed upon at Mexico City a year ago of drafting a new treaty for the peaceful settlement of disputes as a companion piece to the permanent treaty of mutual assistance called for in the Act of Chapultepec.

Another area in which pan-American influence can contribute leadership concerns the protection and realization of the fundamental rights of man which as the essence of our democracy underlie our philosophy of world peace. We have learned from the grim history of nazism that the first step in the process leading to aggressive warfare is the establishment by a strong and aggressive minority of a strict tyranny over the thoughts and minds of their own people. Sometimes the opportunity for dictatorship is made easy by the hunger, want, and idleness born of economic collapse which renders a people desperate and an easy prey to demagogic appeals. Once dictatorship is in the saddle, the eyes and ears, and therefore the minds, of people can be sealed from the truth, and the lies which form the backbone of Fascist propaganda take their evil effect.

Our democratic faith rests upon the conviction that humanity when free can direct its course along constructive and rewarding lines. So long as men are denied the elemental freedoms, or are subjected to poverty, sickness, and ignorance, we cannot expect to eradicate the causes of war. A major element in the creation of an enduring peace, therefore, is the establishment of a genuine democracy—a democracy that accords to men and women regardless of race or creed the right to a voice in their government and the right to a fair living that will meet the basic needs for food, shelter, health, education, and welfare. If peace is the joint purpose of the community of nations, so too must be the protection of these human rights.

The solution of this problem is no easy one, dealing as it does with peoples and nations of diverse cultural backgrounds and concepts of political organization. But fortunately in the pan-American family we possess a common basis of democratic principle upon which to build. Inherent in the solidarity of the American Republics has been the common devotion to democratic ideals, and to the advancement of conditions of life for the peoples of every nation. How will those ideals be translated into reality?

It is fair to say, I believe, that in pursuing this highly significant and portentous objective the pan-American nations will test the true strength and validity of their association and measure to a large extent the influence which they may exert upon the structure of world peace. The protection of the rights of man goes to the very roots of the problem of ensuring peace.

As has been indicated in the stimulating proposals towards that end put forth by the eminent foreign minister of Uruguay, Dr. Rodrigues Larreta, it requires a reexamination of the traditional concept of nonintervention. The difficulties and hazards in this effort should not be underestimated.

Yet, nowhere else in the world is there a greater demand for the realization of the rights of man and the promotion of the democratic ideal than among the peoples of the Americas. If this force can make itself properly felt, and achieve its objective by united action it will become the binding force of a stronger and more creative pan-American solidarity than has ever existed before.

Pan-American influence on world peace will depend primarily on the future vitality of the pan-American system as an integral part of the world community now united in the effort to establish a peaceful world order. Its basic concepts must be reviewed and clarified to meet the demands of the atomic age. Its principles must be strengthened to form a core around which can be built a genuine solidarity in support of the deeper purposes of the peoples of the Americas, and of the world. To the extent that this challenge is met, will pan-American influence continue to provide its large share of leadership in the creation and preservation of world peace.

Postwar Prosperity Begins in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address entitled "Postwar Prosperity Begins in the West," which I had the honor of delivering before the Colorado Mining Association at Denver, Colo., on January 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel doubly honored tonight to be here at this greatest of all mining dinners at the gracious invitation of your able manager, Bob Palmer, and at the same time to be privileged to extend to you the greetings of the President of the United States.

When President Truman found that he would be unable to attend this meeting himself and learned that I had been invited to talk to you about the stock-piling bill, he asked me not only to express his regret that it is impossible for him to be present in person, but to tell you how confident he is that the mining industry of the United States can make as great a contribution to the winning of a permanent and prosperous peace for our country as it did in the winning of the war.

Mr. Truman's message to you, that he desires to see the mining industry given every opportunity and encouragement, is not a polite and meaningless compliment. It is the message of a man who wants to promote opportunity for all our people and who, in his latest statement of policy to the Congress of the United States, has given tangible evidence of his desire to use the influence of the Federal Government for the development of the mining industry and the utilization of all the resources of the West. The program which he laid before the Congress on Monday, last, has special interest for the entire West and particularly for all who have a stake in mining.

First of all, it calls for the passage as an administration measure of the stock-piling bill. This measure was written in the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, with the collaboration of such outstanding exponents of western mineral development as Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, Senator ED JOHNSON, of Colorado, and Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana. It was passed in the Senate last December without opposition through the effective cooperation of other western members like Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada; Senator MURDOCK, of Utah; Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado; Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona; and Senator WHEELER, of Montana. Indeed, all of the western Senators rallied to its support and made comparatively easy the task of the Senator who happened to be in charge of the bill.

Second, in his recommendations for appropriations for the next fiscal year, the President has asked Congress to make substantial allocations to promote the investigation and development of domestic mineral deposits.

Third, he has given his approval to the most extensive reclamation program that has ever been authorized by Congress, a program upon which he recommends the expenditure of more than $163,000,000. The execution of this program will not only promote the agricultural development of the entire West, but will create the demand for the minerals to the production of which you gentlemen devote your energies and abilities.

The great significance of these Presidential recommendations for increased expenditures for the stimulation of western industries becomes apparent when we recall that the same Budget message containing these items reduces the over-all expenditure of the Federal Government by over $32,000,000,000. Government spending, which in the fiscal year 1946 totalled more than $100,000,000,000 and which was reduced for the fiscal year 1947 to an estimated $67,000,000,000, is now again

reduced by the President's recommendations to $35,000,000,000.

The war has thrown upon the Federal Government new items of expenditure never before incurred, items which cannot by any possibility be evaded or reduced. The war is over, but for many years to come we shall continue to pay the cost. The obligation which we owe as a people to the men and women of the armed forces who carried the burden of the conflict will be faithfully discharged and Congress, without division, will support the President's recommendations to increase the outlay for veteran care from the sixteen million appropriated for the year 1945 to the $130,000,000 recommended in the President's Budget message. Likewise, Congress will give approval to the increase of the amount allocated for veteran pensions from the two billion appropriated in 1945 to the $4,247,000,000 recommended by the President for 1947.

The active prosecution of the war, so successfully waged on every continent and every sea was paid for not only by the unprecedented sums which were raised in taxation, but by the tremendous contributions of the people of America to the purchase of War and Victory bonds. Whatever else is done, all fiscal authorities agree we must raise the sums necessary to pay the interest on the huge public debt and this means for 1947, a total of $5,000,000,000, which is more than three times greater than the entire cost of the Congress, the Federal Courts, the executive offices of the President and all the civilian agencies and departments of the Government.

In addition to these charges for the care of the veterans and interest on the public debt amounting to $10,000,000,000, immeasurably greater than those in the years before the war, there is another billion and three quarters for international obligations, an expenditure which can scarcely be avoided if we hope to prevent the complete collapse of the system of private property throughout the world.

How easy it would have been in the face of these new and extraordinary but inescapable charges, for the Executive to have slashed the expenditures on mineral development and the expansion of reclamation. How easy it would have been to have said, "We shall abandon the building of reclamation projects and public roads and airports. We shall trim the expenditures for the investigation and development of domestic mineral deposits. We shall economize on these public works. We shall cut to the bone and expend not even a nickel that does not have to be expended." But that would have been a short-sighted and a disastrous policy which could result only in economic confusion.

Had the President eliminated these income-producing appropriations for mineral and reclamation development, he would have been talking the language of the great Daniel Webster who, as a Member of the Senate in October 1852, opposed the program for the development of railroads to open up the West.

"Mr. President," he said, "I will never vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer to Boston than it is." How fortunate that the words of Webster fell on deaf ears.

He was speaking of this very area in which we gather tonight when, with his incomparable and moving eloquence, he said:

"What do we want with this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it?"

You and I know that these endless mountain ranges have been the source from which we have drawn the mineral wealth that has helped to raise the standard of living of all Americans and that the worthless area on which Webster was unwilling to spend a penny, has been transformed into prosperous and thriving States, the resources of which still remain to be fully developed. Here in this vast area the opportunity is presented to this generation to create the new productive enterprises which we must have if the national income is to be maintained upon the level that will enable us to carry the national debt and discharge the obligations we owe to those who, in the war just ended, so successfully preserved our national integrity.

The progress of every race is measured by its capacity to use the natural resources with which it is surrounded. Whole peoples have lived and perished without having been able to utilize the resources with which Providence had surrounded them.

The Nation was able to make the amazing record of production which it did in the war because our people have excelled in the capacity to produce. The United States became the wealthiest Nation in the world because it had found the way of making it possible for most of its people to create new wealth by the development of its mineral deposits and its agricultural resources.

When we were confronted with the task of producing the weapons of war necessary to overcome Germany and Japan, we found the way through the cooperation of all elements of our society to produce the materials that were needed and to fashion them into instruments required to overcome the enemy. Now, we are confronted with the most tremendous national debt in history. There is no way to pay that debt except by emulating in peace the productivity of which we demonstrated we were capable in time of war. Never did we need new wealth more than it is needed now, and the primary sources of new wealth are to be found in the mines and in the soil.

Through the Government, we organized the amazing production of the war. We manufactured 300,000 military planes, 70 warships, 86,000 tanks, 315,000 pieces of artillery of various grades and unimaginable amounts of other war material and equipment. This was accomplished because all our people were willing to work together to do the job that had to be done and that job was the preservation of a free system, a system under which our economy as well as our Government shall be free.

The task that confronts us now requires the same inspired cooperation, one with another to organize all our resources to produce for peace. The greatest contribution that we can now make to the nations of the world is not so much by gifts and grants and loans, but by giving them the example how natural resources can be developed by the people themselves to raise the standard of living of all. The program to be initiated by the stock-piling bill and by the expansion of western irrigation will do precisely this.

I need not tell you the extent to which we have contributed from our known reserves of strategic and critical materials to win the war, now how essential it is to make certain that no possible future emergency will find us without adequate supplies of raw materials already on hand as World War II found us. I need not tell you that although the United States can still boast of the existence here of large deposits of the minerals which an industrial nation needs, it was nevertheless necessary to import from more than 53 countries to acquire the materials necessary to wage this war. We had failed to follow the advice of Bernard M. Baruch who had directed the war industries during World War I and who as long ago as December 1919, had urged the immediate acquisition of supplies of raw materials for all future emergencies. At the risk of being overtaken by disaster before the materials had been obtained, we were compelled to import materials at many times the expense that would have been required had we acted with forethought.

This bill of ours is based upon the theory that the United States should not be dependent upon foreign nations for the supplies which experience teaches us are necessary when we are overtaken by emergency. The stock-piling bill, passed in the Senate and now recommended by the President for passage in the House, declares it to be the policy of Congress "to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States." The bill declares this policy, and creates the Stock Piling Board essential to making it effective. Special emphasis, and this I regard to be one of the most important factors in the bill, is laid upon the importance of developing new domestic sources of supply. With respect to those materials of which this Nation may be short, it is essential not only to look for new deposits and to seek for new methods for utilizing low-grade deposits, but it is necessary to develop substitutes so that the United States may be lacking in none of those things essential to industrial progress. We shall leave nothing undone to save the world from future wars, but science has taught us that the arts of industry are also the arts of war. It is a sad fact that mankind seems somehow to wrest more of the secrets from nature for the purpose of destroying man than for the purpose of promoting his progress.

Perhaps after all the suffering and loss of life that men have experienced in the appalling conflict from which we have just emerged, they may have learned the imperative importance of applying their abilities to the resources of the earth for the purpose of preserving and prolonging life rather than for the purpose of destroying it.

So this measure, which means so much to the West for the promotion of its material progress, also carries the possibility of great cultural and spiritual achievement for our people. The provisions of the bill which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct the scientific, technological, and economic investigations necessary to make the best possible use of our mineral and agricultural resources, will make the Government the research agency of the people in a more effective manner than ever before.

In this bill, as in the surplus-property bill and other measures which have been enacted by Congress, the objective is to create broader spheres for the exercise of private initiative. When the surplus-property bill was being drafted, care was taken to direct that all the vast plants and facilities which the Government owns, as well as all the materials which it had accumulated, should be disposed of in a manner to encourage and sustain free competitive enterprise. This is the same policy written into the stock-piling bill. While it authorizes, for example, the purchase of necessary materials abroad, it also directs that these purchases shall be made in accordance with the familiar "buy American" provisions so as to stimulate and encourage domestic activity. It also provides that when the disposal of materials no longer needed must be undertaken, that disposal shall be carried out in a manner which shall not be detrimental to domestic enterprise. If strategic and critical materials for the stock pile are purchased abroad, they, of course, will be admitted to the Government stock pile free of tariff duty, but if at any time thereafter it becomes necessary for the United States to sell such materials, the selling price must include the tariff duty so that domestic industry may not suffer.

Thus it is that the Goverment is made the servant of the people of the United States.

If this bill, passed by the Senate and recommended by the President, is now passed by the House and if the appropriations are made to enable the Bureau of Mines and the Department of Agriculture to carry on the projected experiments and research, if Congress approves the reclamation program and new sources of energy and of enterprise are developed through the intelligent use of our water power, we shall be expanding here in the West to new horizons.

A sound international policy which will enable the nations of the world to live together in amity and which will open to the exploited masses of Asia opportunities to imitate our example of industrial development, will enable the Pacific Ocean to take rank beside the Atlantic as a medium of commerce. The eyes of the people of the Rocky Mountain West will turn to Asia for the development of trade. China and India and Siberia will be modernized and the millions who live there now in abject poverty will become the market for the output of this region. What we do here by producing new minerals and building new industries will be done without in any way injuring those areas of the United States which have heretofore been the principal centers of industrial activity.

Mineral deposits and agricultural crops are, it is true, the chief sources of new wealth, but the people themselves are the greatest resource that any nation can have. People make commerce by what they eat, by what they wear. By what they use for the necessities of life and by what they use for recreation, they create the market for all mining, for all agriculture, for all industry. The first consideration, therefore, of any government which would advance trade and commerce is to advance the living standards of all the people. Ours is the opportunity to achieve this result in that region which less than 100 years ago one of our great statesmen believed to be only a worthless area of great deserts and endless mountain ranges.

It is an objective which can be reached by making government not the master but the agent of our people. There is a partnership between the Government and the citizen by which the Government can make it easier for the citizen to use his initiative. It is through such a partnership that the maximum opportunity can be extended to all. The American ideal of Government cooperation with the people is exemplified in the two measures of which I have been speaking. The stock-piling bill acquires for the Government the supply of materials which experience teaches us is essential for the Government to have, but it provides for the acquisition of this stock pile by stimulating the independent activity of the people themselves.

Likewise, through the reclamation program, the Government creates the opportunity for the people by building the huge reservoirs which private enterprise itself could not construct, but through which the people can create new industries in accordance with the traditional American ideal of a free economy and a free Government.

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, on extension of price control, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, March 26, 1946:

The membership of the American Federation of Labor comprises a major cross section of American people. Through its affiliates, 25,000,000 American consumers have a democratic means for representation of their views on issues vital to them. It is on behalf of this large and representative group of wage earners and members of wage-earners' families that I call upon Congress to extend price control for 1 year beyond June 30, 1946, to retain authorization for subsidies necessary to hold down food prices and to reject all amendments designed to weaken effective price-control administration and enforcement.

The American people are weary of controls. They are tired of far-reaching Government interference with their work, their business, and their private life. They have submitted to wartime regulations and have made an enormous voluntary contribution to their effectiveness. Price control and rationing would have never been effective in the crucial test of wartime stabilization if it had not been for the ready willingness of our workers, farmers, and businessmen to share fully in making the program work.

This was true of all forms of wartime regulation. Wartime manpower controls and wage controls could have never been administered without direct and active participation by representatives of labor and management. Many regulations imposed in wartime proved unfair and inequitable and brought real hardship to those governed by them. Yet the great mass of the people and the overwhelming majority of the wage earners accepted as one of the inescapable burdens of war the injustices and inequities to which they were subjected. In the wartime workshops of the Nation labor has given its full contribution to the all-out effort toward the winning of the war.

It has now been 7 months since the war was won. Americans everywhere wish to regain their free way of life, to reinstitute their peacetime freedom, and to regain the liberties which they believe to be their inalienable right. They long for the freedom of pursuit of their work and their business without governmental interference. And they look forward to the termination of all forms of emergency regulation at the earliest possible date.

The people are tired of emergency and they are tired of controls. But they are also frightened. They are frightened by the brazen display of financial and political pressure exerted upon their Government in a reckless and irresponsible drive to destroy price control and profit from its destruction at the expense of the mass of the people. The people are frightened at the prospect of the feverish run-away price boom which is already close upon them. They are frightened by the specter of the next depression which will follow swiftly and inevitably if we don't prevent the run-away boom now and thus invite the collapse it will precipitate. Their fear does not come from the lack of courage or of confidence. They have limitless determination to make reconversion to full production and full employment a success. But they know that while the war is won the grave postwar emergency of economic readjustment is by no means past.

Every day the American consumer—the breadwinner, the housewife—hears the rising clamor for the immediate and complete abandonment of price controls. They watch the pressures exerted upon their Congress from all sides, the pressures which are gaining the momentum of a stampede to throw overboard the very steering gear which alone can guide the Nation toward stability, prosperity, and lasting freedom. And they say to the Congress that must not be done.

American labor insists that lasting prosperity for all be not traded for the immediate temporary and speculative profit for the few. It is the overwhelming demand of wage earners and of the vast majority of Americans that effective price control and rent control be extended for 1 year as essential to the welfare of postwar America and indispensable to the survival of American institutions in the years ahead.

Americans have not forgotten the experience of a quick boom and sudden collapse which followed the last war. At that time everyone's slogan, from the President down, was "take the harness off." Large profits were made in the boom, but they were paper profits. Wages rose sharply but they, too, were paper gains—real wages actually declined, offset by the more rapid rise in prices. And then came the wave of wholesale bankruptcies and widespread unemployment. The danger we are facing today is the danger of complete disruption of our economic life which would cripple the system of enterprise itself. This danger is many times greater than after the last war—greater than it has ever been before. Labor is aware of this danger. It calls upon Congress to discharge its clear and grave responsibility and avert the certain chaos which the premature abandonment of price control would inevitably bring.

The OPA is being repeatedly charged with interposing price control as a barrier against rising production. The record of the last few months shows that the OPA met the industries' demand for higher prices more than half way. Instead of being rigid and restrictive it has granted a large number of price increases far higher than the facts and the economic conditions had warranted. Since the end of the war in Europe, OPA has issued more than 160 incentive price increases in response to the claim of the manufacturers that these increases were needed to aid production in the reconversion period. There have been a number of instances in which manufacturers combined in an industry-wide demand for a certain price under the threat that they would halt production unless their demand was met on their terms. There are glaring instances also showing that where OPA acted to meet such demands, instead of increased production came renewed pressures for still higher prices under renewed threats of the seller's strike.

Men's clothing has been virtually unobtainable at any reasonable price. Returning veterans, in desperate need of civilian garments, could not obtain them. True, there were textile shortages and production was straining under abnormal conditions. But, as was revealed last month by the Baltimore Sun, some 700,000 men's suits, already produced and ready to wear were held back from the market in order to force a higher price. This was not a question of costs. These garments had already been produced. It was a bold squeeze for more profit at the expense of the consumer and mainly at the expense of the returning veteran. But the profiteers in the trade didn't stop there. In their publicity they tried to hold OPA responsible for their own hoarding of the needed suits, already made, which they held back from the consumers of the Nation. And they eventually succeeded in exacting a price increase, recently granted, which will range up to 20 percent. That is a substantial retreat from the price line and a direct increase in the cost of living.

When shoe rationing was terminated, a rise in the price ceiling was sought by shoe manufacturers. A 4½-percent price increase at the manufacturer's level was granted by the OPA at the end of the year. In the light of all available evidence and in the face of

an unlimited demand for footwear, even that increase provided more than a generous allowance. Yet, renewed pressure is being brought to bear upon the OPA for a further substantial increase in manufacturer's prices of shoes. It is significant that this move is opposed not only by consumers but also by the retailers. The retail shoe trade is keenly aware of the grave danger of missing their historic opportunity to extend the market for medium- and low-priced shoes. These men know that only a mass market for well-made low-priced products will provide a basis for stable increased postwar production and stable postwar sales for the entire trade. That is the road to full employment.

Is the further shoe price increase justifiable or necessary? The record shows that even in the case of the original 4½-percent price increase "many manufacturing organizations have not yet taken advantage of the relief offered, adhering to their old prices." (New York Times, March 10, 1946.) This proves that the need for even the original price adjustment did not extend beyond a few producers and a market-wide price increase was without justification. This shows also that it is very easy for a whole industry, manufacturing an essential cost-of-living commodity, to be caught in the treacherous current of inflation. A further substantial rise in shoe prices will be the first move to price people out of shoes. If we allow ourselves to be priced out of the mass market for consumer goods, consumption will be curtailed, curtailing, in turn, both future production and future employment. That is the road to the next depression.

In the case of southern pine lumber, three consecutive raises in the price ceiling were made on the ground that these were needed to induce increased production. Practically all of these price increases were absorbed by landowners and no substantial increase in the volume of the desperately needed production was brought about. In the case of cast iron soil pipe, OPA raised ceilings four times since VJ-day without a marked effect on production. Expectation of still higher prices is no doubt an important factor in slowing production of a commodity which is vital to a speedy solution of the Nation's housing shortage.

Let us be realistic about the present price control policies of the OPA. It should be remembered that in the case of reconversion items, automatic pricing is now permitted to all small manufacturers and the use of this method is being extended. In the case of larger manufacturers, extremely generous price increases have been permitted. A Plymouth car which sold for $784 in 1941 has been granted a retail list ceiling price of $998—an increase of $214. The average increase in the price of all Plymouth models now in production is between 28 and 30 percent. These increases do not reflect the fact that the Plymouth low-priced model, the Road King, has been completely eliminated.

In only 2 weeks of this month—between March 7 and 21—price increases significant to the consumers' cost of living included an increase up to 10 percent of cotton textile and yarns; an increase up to 10 percent on such articles as radios, fans, and toasters; an increase on all meats, a substantial increase on all canned meats, and an increase in the price of bread (by permitting a decrease in the size of the loaf without a corresponding price decrease).

In many other lines, price control has already been either suspended or exempted. This has frequently led to sharp increases in prices. In the field of textiles, out of six items which have been decontrolled, prices rose in every instance except one. Just one example of the creeping price rise is the narrow fabrics industry which manufactures fabric tape, ribbons, and similar items. After price control was lifted, prices rose nearly 4 percent in October, 8.1 percent in November, and over 9 percent in December. By now the average prices for the industry products are up nearly 25 percent. The same pattern is followed in all other commodities on which price control was lifted for which the demand is great. This covers the whole range of items from wax, which has risen from 25 to 100 percent, to hearing aids, on which most manufacturers have raised prices considerably.

There are many instances in which OPA has been in the wrong, in which its actions have been arbitrary and in which conditions have called for prompt relief. Sometimes, it was exasperatingly slow in recognizing and meeting genuine inequities and real hardship. But in reviewing the entire record, it can be said with certainty that there has been no substantial delay in actual production due to the operation of price control. In virtually every instance where production was actually held up because of price policies, the blame rests squarely on those who have either threatened curtailed production or actually did curtail it as a weapon for gaining price increases.

On the other hand, actual production delays have developed in the areas in which price controls were removed soon after VJ-day. In the case of a number of such items, production and marketing soon became completely demoralized. The fur industry illustrates the point. Prices for controlled fur items increased by leaps and bounds. As the result, the market for them has been paralyzed. Production has sharply fallen off while distributors and retailers have curtailed their orders awaiting for the stabilization of the price level. These and other instances illustrate what destruction upon stable production and expanding trade can be wrought by a wild scramble resulting from premature suspension of price control.

There are whole areas of price-control policy in which the existing regulations and procedures need a thorough review and where the handling of both price control and its enforcement needs to be improved, strengthened, and streamlined. One such area is the maximum average price type of regulation in which the administrative rules have been extremely cumbersome and complex. Under this type of regulation, which was applied generally to the items of wearing apparel, quality deterioration, which results in hidden price increases, has been precipitous and widespread. At the same time, production was concentrated increasingly in the high-priced items at the expense of the low-priced lines. Faced with complete disappearance of low-priced items, the consumer was forced to spend two or three times as much for high-priced substitutes. In this vital area of cost-of-living control a review of the price policy, designed to prevent further runaway price increases is urgently needed.

The American Federation of Labor asks that the Emergency Price Control Act be extended for 1 year from July 1, 1946, without weakening amendments. Under the present law, removal of price control in areas in which prices have begun to recede is feasible and is now being contemplated by the OPA. Many price controls have been removed prematurely, yet in the coming months an increasing number of items will be in sufficient supply to warrant the suspension of price ceilings on these commodities long before July 1947.

It is important that in doing so, utmost care be exercised not to throw orderly reconversion out of balance. If in the same line of products, price control is removed from expensive items of the luxury class and retained on the similar medium-priced and low-priced items, it is not difficult to predict what would happen. Prices of uncontrolled items will rise, it will become more profitable to manufacture them, production will be quickly diverted to the manufacture of luxury goods, at the expense of necessities whose output will be curtailed and scarce materials will be shifted to the least necessary use. Only when the flow of materials and supplies is ample enough to support the output of the entire range of classes of commodities in the same line can price control be safely terminated. It can then be lifted from the entire line of output with good assurance that its removal will be permanent.

There are a few areas in which special problems of price control and cost of living will persist to which special consideration must be given. The most important of such areas is rent control, which must be continued unimpaired for a full year beyond the expiration of the present law and probably for another year after that date. The housing shortage will remain extremely acute during that time. There is already a widespread real-estate boom. Evictions of tenants are already numerous and many are directly traceable to the desire of property owners to cash in on the inflated market. When this happens, the tenant families are thrown completely on the doubtful mercy of the inflated market. They are forced to choose between homelessness and moving into slums. We must not allow the forces of inflation to price American families out of their homes.

Let me make it quite clear that I am not giving a blanket endorsement to the entire economic stabilization program as it now stands. The policy as a whole is made up of a patchwork of conflicting decisions. Careful restudy and rethinking is in order to arrive at a sound revision of the program in its entirety.

In the hope that a realistic approach to all phases of our problem of inflation will be made by Congress, I ask for prompt enactment of the extension of price control until July 1, 1947. It is my belief that a firm commitment by Congress will enable us to look upon that date as a date for termination of the wartime price control for all time. Unless this measure of necessary regulation is provided now, with the view to its gradual elimination, America must face the alternative of even more far-reaching governmental regulation which we will bring upon ourselves if we permit the forces of inflation to bring us to the brink of collapse.

Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the House to a statement appearing in the Jackson Citizen-Patriot, Jackson, Mich., realistically approaching the housing situation. Pursuant to the privilege granted me, I am enclosing another statement from the same source, which is as follows:

LET'S FACE THE FACTS ABOUT HOME BUILDING

In the confusion created about the shortage of homes in America, one point stands out clearly:

You can't build homes without materials.

Lumber and building-material dealers and contractors obviously have a vital interest in obtaining materials for home building.

They report, nevertheless, that such materials are not flowing through the yards; that

they have not been able to get them. Therefore, the Government's HH priorities offered to enable veterans and others to obtain homes are simply home-hunting licenses, for materials in quantity are not available.

As long as OPA continues its wartime control policy rather than a policy of adjustment to aid reconversion, it will neither be able to prevent an inflation or a deflation; it will only be able to prevent reconversion by discouraging production of needed home-building items.

Here, for example, is an instance of OPA action that has resulted in increased production. After 6 months' delay OPA granted a 4-percent to 10-percent price adjustment that allowed 125 of 400 closed brick and tile plants to reopen. This price adjustment allowed these plants and 400 others that had been operating to hire needed labor. As a result, in the next quarter production rose 35 percent.

But in hardwood flooring, siding, plywood, millwork, and construction lumber, OPA clings to its wartime formula. In fact, OPA follows the unrealistic policy of allowing premium prices to mills for producing lumber for such things as export to foreign countries, and for items that were needed in wartime industry.

Today's question is not essentially one of price control—if there were plenty of homes, no price controls would be necessary. The important question is one of production and manpower.

So far, OPA and Government officialdom in general have contented themselves with controls, allocations, and priority systems which at best can do nothing but juggle an insufficient supply of building materials—and at worst, delay and retard production and the employment of manpower.

Homes will not be built in the United States unless the building industry builds them. Whether they are labeled public housing or private homes, the same materials, the same labor, the same building industry will build them.

Production can be unblocked by the removal or adjustment of OPA's wartime policies. But such a realistic approach cannot be attained as long as Government action is based on a philosophy of lack rather than a philosophy of abundant supply for peacetime prosperity.

The lumber dealers, builders, and contractors stand ready to build or rebuild America. But it is up to the people to demand that the way be cleared for the production of materials for homes.

Any Government program that does not first remove the obstacles blocking production of materials will simply add additional difficulties to the problem facing the building industry.

Extension of the Stabilization Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson before the House Banking and Currency Committee on the extension of the Stabilization Act, Wednesday, March 27, 1946:

I am always very pleased to appear before this able committee of the Congress. Before this committee comes some of the most important legislation considered by the Congress. I have ever found your work to be painstaking and thorough and all of the members of the committee have a high devotion to duty and honesty of purpose.

Of all the important subjects you are called upon to consider, none, in my judgment, outranks the prevention of inflation. The extension of the Stabilization Act, without crippling amendments, is the biggest single aspect of our battle against inflation. We won this battle year after year during the war, and I am confident that now we are not going to walk off the field and lose by default.

The battle against inflation was my direct assignment from our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, for nearly 2 years. Later in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion I had a no less vital interest in economic stabilization while William H. Davis was the field general in the Office of Economic Stabilization. At all times both of us had the courageous and able help of Chester Bowles, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration. I should like to report also that Paul Porter was one of my assistants while I was in the Office of Economic Stabilization. He did a fine job for us there, and I have full confidence in his ability to administer with success the Office of Price Administration while Chester Bowles is carrying out the over-all program of economic stabilization. We were all fortunate to be working under a law that gave us full opportunity to accomplish the results that were desired and expected. We had a good team to administer the law. And my brief summary shows that the team, while having some changes, is still intact.

It is, I believe, a part of our common knowledge that war brings powerful inflationary pressures to bear on the economy. This is because a large proportion of the population is removed from its normal tasks of making goods and rendering services for the civilian population, and is placed, instead, in the business of making the goods and rendering the services of war. The product of the persons in the armed forces and in the war industries is not of a type which can be sold to the civilian population; but the persons producing it continue to receive incomes, and these incomes will be spent, in large part, on the products of the persons still in the civilian industries. During war, all of the population is living on the product of only part of it.

An upward pressure on prices is inevitable, therefore, and can only be counteracted by vigorous measures on the part of the Government. In the case of the war which we have just finished, these upward pressures were the most powerful which have yet been generated in the American economy; but the American people, acting through their Government, combatted them so vigorously that the rise in prices during the war which has just ended was less than in any previous major war in which the United States has been engaged.

For a considerable period during World War II, about half of the national product was going for war purposes. This compares with a maximum of only about one-fourth of the national product going for war purposes in World War I—and then for a much shorter period. Yet, retail prices paid by consumers, as measured in each case by the index number of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, advanced only 31 percent between the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1939 and VJ-day, as compared with a rise of 62 percent between the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1914 and Armistice Day.

What were the measures by which prices were thus held down during World War II? They may be grouped into three major classes: taxation, the stimulation of savings; and direct controls over prices and the physical allocation of goods.

All three of these methods were applied also in World War I; yet prices rose much more, although in response to weaker pressures. Why, then, were we so much more successful in World War II?

In the first place, we applied all of the methods in a more vigorous fashion. This was made possible, in large part, because we started sooner. We took our first step toward the wartime level of taxation with the enactment of the first Revenue Act of 1940 in June 1940; we formed the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense in May 1940, and so commenced the organization of the allocation of goods on the physical level; we formed the Defense Savings Staff in March 1941, and so commenced the organization of war savings. In World War I, all of the corresponding steps were taken after we had entered the war.

As a consequence, in part, of starting earlier, we have achieved better results on the fiscal front in World War II. From July 1, 1940, about the beginning of the program of defense finance, to the present time, 44 percent of the expenditures of the Federal Government have been covered by taxation and other nonborrowing receipts. This compares with 33 percent for the World War I period beginning with the outbreak of the war in Europe and continuing to June 30, 1919.

The most important difference between World War I and World War II, however, is the difference in emphasis on the different types of controls. We learned a great deal from experience. In World War I, very little emphasis was placed on direct controls. There was no rationing at the retail level; and no public announcement of fixed prices, even of war goods, until September 1917. Furthermore, such price control and allocation as existed were removed almost immediately after the armistice.

The inflationary pressures generated by a war continue for some time after it has been concluded on the battle fronts. In World War I, retail prices rose 62 percent in the 52 months between the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1914 and Armistice Day. From Armistice Day until June 1920, retail prices rose another 46 points, making a total of 108 percent above the 1914 level. On the other hand, retail prices have risen only 0.5 percent between VJ-day and January 15, 1946.

The problem before us is to prevent a repetition of the experience after World War I. We can prevent it if we try; and one of the most important things to do is to extend the Stabilization Act with as little delay as is possible.

The task ahead of us does not appear so difficult if we remember the work that we have done. During the fight against the armed enemy abroad and the insidious enemy of inflation at home, we had our headaches and our heartaches. There were shortages of raw materials. There were great transfers of manpower from peacetime pursuits to war production, and from the homes to the factories. There were kinks in the production line and in the transportation system. In large part we had to prepare for war after the battle had started. And we were fighting enemies who had prepared for years. Yet we overwhelmed the enemy with our armed might, had more than enough to live on at home, and kept our economy on even keel.

After the shooting stopped we had to change over again, this time from war to the pursuits of peace. Again we have had our problems. By and large, however, the job is done, and we can say it was well done.

Today we can be more optimistic about the future than ever before. It would be pathetic if we muffed this grand opportunity.

We must maintain our controls over inflation a little longer.

In view of the work I have had in the field of stabilization, I have, of course, a strong personal interest in the subject. Of much more importance, however, is the fact that as Secretary of the Treasury I have a vital official interest in the prevention of inflation.

Two of the most important subjects in the Treasury Department are taxes and the management of the public debt. Inflation, or its prevention, has a direct effect on both problems.

At present we are traveling a sound and pleasant road. Our receipts are larger than the estimates made at the time of the President's Budget message. In fact, our net receipts from July 1, 1945, through March 22, 1946, have been only 2 percent less than during the corresponding period of the previous fiscal year. Our revenues have been large because our national income has stayed at a high level. Meanwhile, expenditures are smaller than the estimates made at the time of the Budget message. In fact, our expenditures in February were $3,500,000,000 against the high of $9,700,000,000 last June. This decline of nearly two-thirds in 8 months is because we have all made a wholehearted effort to leave the wartime basis and adopt the peacetime course. The two together mean that we are well on the way to a balanced budget. That has a novel sound, but it is a happy situation which I am glad to report to this committee, to the Congress, and to all the people of the country who have the same problem in their daily lives.

With our current expenditures much lower, the cash balance of the Treasury can be less. Chiefly by this means we have been able to make two substantial reductions in the public debt. That, too, has a novel sound. In fact, they are the first substantial reductions in 16 years.

In spite of this generally good situation, taxes must remain high and the burden of carrying the public debt is still significant. The raising of substantial revenues and the carrying of the public debt can both be done without undue burden to our economy. Can be done, that is, if our economy is maintained at a high level.

The only desirable, sound, long-term solution to the problems of revenue and debt management is high-level production, employment, and national income. With our economy in high gear the burden will be much lighter. The war has demonstrated that we have a $200,000,000,000 Nation.

As Secretary of the Treasury I want a sound and expansive economy. And on that point the prevention of inflation has its all important impact. We cannot have that stable, high-level economy with full production, full employment, and high national income, nor can we meet successfully our revenue and debt management problems, if we have the dislocation of all values and relationships throughout our economy that comes with a bad case of inflation.

We have built up a tremendous demand for most consumer goods. This demand is backed up by large savings. The amount of currency, bank deposits, and United States securities owned by all nonbank investors has increased from about $82,000,000,000 at the end of 1939 to about $300,000,000,000 today. Our wants, fortified by these liquid reserves, can give us the impetus to begin a volume of peacetime production far greater than we have ever seen. Moreover, these savings can be the flywheel for our economy for a long time to come. This can give us the future that all Americans want. It can be the pleasant aftermath of war.

This result, however, is not an inevitable one. We could quickly spend ourselves in the dissipation of spiraling prices and speculative markets. We have the heart and the mind to avoid this catastrophe. Let us have the fortitude and the wit to carry out the decision that we know is right. Our children would look back and consider it the most pathetic thing our generation did, if, after thwarting the inflation ogre all through the war, we gave up just before the job was finished.

Production to meet the demand is the final answer. Some quarters, taking advantage of the appeal of this end, have suggested that the removal of price controls is the best way to stimulate production and is therefore the best way to beat the inflation danger. These people, consciously or unconsciously, overlook the needs of the interim period. Although we are well on our way of peacetime production, we cannot produce enough tomorrow or the next day to meet the demand that has accumulated over months. During that period, the removal of price control would be stimulating—stimulating in a fanciful, dizzy sort of way. In my judgment, there would be so much effort spent in beating the market, in buying and selling materials and inventories, in concentrating on the speculative gain, that we would find total production decreased rather than increased.

I therefore take issue with those who say that removal of price control will stimulate and increase production. This sounds like the 1946 version of the old argument that price control has stifled production. Price control did not stifle production during the war and in spite of the obstacles we have had, the expansion of peacetime production in the period since VJ-day as a whole has been more rapid than in any other period of our history. The present physical level of production in the whole economy is now above the average of the year 1941, despite the tremendous problems which have been presented to industry in the past year by the change-over from a wartime to a peacetime demand. When the pipe lines are full, most types of consumers' goods will be on the market in volume. But the extension of the Stabilization Act is necessary to "hold the line" until supply once more matches demand.

When we are served up tempting departures from our present program, let us remember that the record under price control is remarkably good. Let us recall again and again that the best index of retail prices we have showed an increase in the 72 months of this war of one-half what it did in the 52 months during World War I. Let us recall that after November 11, 1918, prices continued to increase rapidly until June 1920 when they reached a point double what they were at the start of the war. Then came the crash. This time prices have been relatively stable since the end of the war. We are in a good position to avoid an insecure boom followed by a terrible collapse. Let us not undo what we have done. I fully endorse the extension of the Stabilization Act.

Reclamation Program for Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio address which I delivered recently describing the program of the United States Reclamation Service in Wyoming, for which initial appropriations were made in the first deficiency appropriation bill of 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When on December 28 last President Truman attached his signature to the appropriation bill known as the first deficiency of 1946, he gave the signal for what will be the greatest step forward yet achieved in the development of the agricultural and industrial potentialities of Wyoming.

Provision is made in this measure for expenditures by the United States Bureau of Reclamation which will create new settlement opportunities in all parts of the State, provide new sources of electric energy for industrial development, insure the further expansion of rural electrification, and lay the basis of a State-wide construction program which will create opportunities for employment, for business and for agriculture such as the State has never before known.

THOUSANDS OF ACRES FOR VETERANS

Not only is early construction authorized on seven separate units of the over-all Missouri Basin project in Wyoming, but an appropriation is included to complete the plans for the initiation of projects in the southwestern part of the State, in the Green River Basin. Almost 70,000 acres of land will become available during 1946 and 1947 for settlement by veterans on the Kendrick, Riverton, and Shoshone projects with much more to come later. A new 5,000-kilowatt power plant on Heart Mountain will be started, as will also the Kortez power plant on the North Platte River, about 2 miles below the Seminoe Dam. A third power plant capable of developing 12,000 kilowatts will eventually be constructed at the Boysen Dam, work upon which will begin this year under the appropriation carried in this bill.

The funds made available for the Colorado River Basin, which, of course, includes the Green River, will enable the Bureau of Reclamation to submit to the Congress its plans for the Lyman project, the Seedskadee project, as well as three separate units of the Sublette project—the West Side, Daniel, and Elkhorn units—all of which will be recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation for initial construction in the broad program for the Colorado River Basin. Thus the foundation is laid in this bill for the development of water resources in all parts of the State. The units authorized are in fact only the beginning of the most all-inclusive and far-reaching construction program ever undertaken for the benefit of the people of our State.

PRODUCTION FOR PEACE

This work was delayed by the war. The expenditure of appropriations which I sponsored for reclamation in Wyoming several years ago was stopped by the War Production Board, which ruled that neither the labor nor the material necessary to build them should be allocated to the work while the conflict was on. Realizing that the war was drawing to a close, I called upon the Bureau of Reclamation early in 1945 to submit to the Senate estimates for full-scale development. The Bureau of the Budget, not being so optimistic about the end of the war, declined to submit the estimates at the time, but Director Smith promised me that with the end of the war the Bureau of the Budget would withdraw its objection. Thus the estimates were submitted for the deficiency bill which the President signed just after Christmas.

Industrial production for war demonstrated the tremendous energy of our people. I have felt confident that this energy can be used as effectively in peace as in war, and I early made up my mind that if it were at all possible I should seek to foster a program of Wyoming development which would demonstrate how easily it actually is to use our

natural resources to promote a new era of prosperity and high living standards for all our people. It is only necessary for all groups to work together to accomplish this, provided we lay the basis in a sound program for the utilization of our natural resources. When he signed the deficiency bill containing the program upon which I have been working, President Truman gave us in Wyoming an opportunity for future expansion which can be reflected in every corner of the State.

Back in 1940 when the Kendrick project was well on its way I offered in the Senate an appropriation from the Colorado River development fund to make it possible for the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare the initial plans for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River basin, particularly those of the Green River.

PLANS FOR GREEN RIVER BASIN

I felt that the development of this region had been too long delayed. Years ago during the administration of President Hoover the Colorado River Dam was built. Great as this achievement was it was not of immediate benefit to Wyoming or to the upper basin States. Then, too, the Colorado River being an international stream, since it flows into Mexico, required an international agreement in order to stabilize water rights between the two countries. An interstate agreement among Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, the upper basin States, will eventually be needed also.

It did not seem necessary to me, however, that planning the projects in Wyoming should be delayed because the treaty had not been completed and the Bureau of Reclamation was glad to undertake the work as soon as my appropriation was approved. The treaty was ratified this spring after many years of negotiation in which Wyoming State officials effectively participated. Now the Bureau of Reclamation is about ready to make its report.

A year ago, when the flood-control bill was under consideration, authorizing projects on rivers throughout this country, I sought to bring about a final and general legal recognition of the importance of water rights. All of the western Senators united and, in their behalf, I had the privilege of presenting on the floor of the Senate the amendments which not only authorized the development of the Missouri River Basin for irrigation, power, flood control, and navigation, but also recognized the priority of use for irrigation, industrial, mining, and domestic purposes throughout the Western States. These provisions of law, including also the authorization of work on the combined plan of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, were added in the Senate by the united action of all western Senators. They constitute a charter of development for the West, not for Wyoming alone, but for all Western States and the appropriations contained in the new bill will be immediately put to work to start this great program.

BIG HORN BASIN PROJECTS

The Big Horn Basin will be particularly benefited by the new projects authorized in this bill, namely, the Boysen Dam, the Owl Creek unit, the Paintrock unit and so-called Big Horn pumping unit. The Boysen Dam, located 20 miles upstream from Thermopolis, will be about 125 feet high and will form a reservoir with a capacity of 820,000 acre-feet of water for irrigation, power production, the detention of silt, and flood control. This project will require the relocation of about 17 miles of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad and about 11 miles of United States Highway 320. Work will be started upon the relocation of the railway and the road early this spring. This will bring to fruition the efforts of more than 10 years to make possible for either the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation to build a reservoir in the Wind River Canyon. The work will be done by the Reclamation Bureau.

The Owl Creek Reservoir will contain both irrigation and flood control storage, providing a supplemental source of water for agricultural land along Owl Creek which heretofore has not been adequately supplied. The Paintrock unit was designed to provide supplemental water, but as planned it will bring approximately 1,300 acres of undeveloped land under water for the first time. The Big Horn pumping units are designed to embrace approximately 20,000 acres along the Big Horn River, north of Boysen Dam. These projects together with the expansion of the Heart Mountain division of the Shoshone project will mean much for the future growth and prosperity of this area. It is hoped that 127 farms will be opened this year on the Heart Mountain division.

NEW STUDIES AUTHORIZED

In addition to the foregoing, preliminary work will be started on the Glendo Reservoir, which is situated on the North Platte River just above the Guernsey Reservoir. It has a proposed capacity of 150,000 acre-feet. It will operate to conserve flood waters and winter return flows from irrigation uses. Eventually, a 10,000-kilowatt power plant is contemplated for this project, but extensive water supply studies must be made to determine the effect of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Colorado, Nebraska, Wyoming case before actual construction can be undertaken.

Field surveys, some of which have already been initiated under an appropriation made earlier this year, will be carried out along the Powder River and the Tongue River, as well as the Little Missouri, Niobrara, and North Platte Rivers. Approximately $150,000 is carried in the bill for this work.

FARMS ON KENDRICK PROJECT

Storage on the Kendrick project has been accumulating at such a rate that 5,000 acres on this project will be opened to settlement before the end of the year. Former Commissioner of Reclamation Harry Bashore, who resigned only last month, and who for several years was in charge of the Kendrick project, tells me that a 5-year supply of water has already been stored for these 5,000 acres. It thus appears that approximately 40 farms for veterans can be opened on this project before the end of 1946 with every assurance that they will have a permanent and adequate supply of water.

The greatest care is being taken in all planning and development work to make certain that those who settle on new farm units in any of these projects will be protected against future water shortages.

The Riverton project, which was always close to the heart of my predecessor, Senator Kendrick, will be carried much further this year. There are still some 50,000 acres of public land on this project which are susceptible of irrigation. The new appropriation bill carries the funds under which the canals and ditches may be constructed to bring this area under water. It means substantial progress for Fremont County.

SEVENTY-FIVE-MILLION-DOLLAR COST SOUNDLY FINANCED

The total cost of all these projected developments in the Colorado River Basin and in the Missouri River Basin in Wyoming will eventually exceed $75,000,000. Great as this sum is for investment in the future of all parts of Wyoming, it nevertheless can be completely justified on sound fiscal grounds. The appropriation for the Green River Basin comes out of the fund which is being built up by the income of the Boulder Dam. In other words, the entire cost of all the planning for this area is financed not by taxes but by the profits of the operation of the Boulder Dam.

That is not all, however; the royalty receipts from oil leases on the public domain in Wyoming will, it is safe to say, be sufficient themselves to finance all the proposed construction.

In 1943 when I offered my bill, signed by President Roosevelt on Christmas Eve, to provide a flat royalty of 12½ percent for 10 years to all prospectors who should discover new sources of oil on the public domain, I predicted it would result in new discoveries. That prophecy has been fulfilled. Approximately 100,000,000 barrels of new oil reserves have been discovered in Wyoming since that bill became law. My friend, Pierre LaFleiche, State mineral supervisor, recently pointed out that of the 23 Wyoming counties only 5 do not now have producing oil or gas fields within their borders.

I now have pending in the Senate another bill to amend the oil and gas leasing act which, if enacted, as I confidently expect, will undoubtedly result in stimulating new exploration of oil and gas within the boundaries of the State.

Thus we shall use the income from oil development to utilize our land and water resources and to provide new opportunities for the development of mineral resources, many of which have still been untouched. The Green River Basin is particularly blessed in this respect and the development work of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Green River will be the introduction of a new industrial era in southwestern Wyoming.

The deficiency bill of 1946 is the guaranty of a happy new year for Wyoming.

Canadian-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address on Canadian-American relations, delivered by William Flockert Drysdale, former director-general of munitions of Canada, before the Albany County Historical Association, January 30, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My good friends and neighbors, it was not without some misgivings that I accepted the invitation of my old friend, your president, to address you on the subject of Canada and Albany.

The obvious compliment implied was not undervalued but my apprehensions were due to a feeling that a much wiser and happier choice of speaker might have been made. However, the occasion presented an opportunity publicly to pay homage to Canada's great neighbor and associate in two world-shaking conflicts of deadly challenge to the common ideals of civilized democracy and offered the chance, as well, to express my personal acknowledgment of the friendship and hospitality shown us by citizens of this country during long years of intimate association with them.

In the dossier that carries my modest address there are no official or secret compartments.

I come to you as a private citizen of the Dominion to recall, within the range of my powers, the drama in the early days of Canadian-American relations; to rejoice in the amity of the long happy middle years that saw

no other sentinels than honor and good faith posted along 3,000 miles of our common border; and to voice the cherished hope and confidence that in the years ahead new and broader avenues of common usefulness and common purpose and common destiny will bind us ever more closely together.

The history of our respective commonwealths contain a number of interesting parallels and some of these cluster about this very county of Albany which in ancient days extended to the present Canadian border.

In 1604, Samuel de Champlain for France, made the first permanent settlement at Port Royal, now Annapolis, in Nova Scotia. There he engaged in the fur trade. Later he explored the lovely lake that still bears his name. Five years later in 1609, Henry Hudson, an English navigator in the Dutch service, explored the river that still bears his name and landed here at what is now the city of Albany. It, however, was not until 1624 that the first permanent colony by the Dutch was established here.

Both of these colonizations were organized under the aegis of private companies operating under royal sanctions. The Dutch settlements were made by the newly organized Netherlands company called the Dutch West India Co. and the French settlement in Canada was made by a French company, fostered by Richelieu, and called the Company of the West Indies.

Canada early took the name of New France. The areas immediately to the east of New York early took the name of New England after the Dutch surrendered their sovereignty over North American possessions in 1664. From this time forward two great European powers, France and England, cast covetous eyes toward America, each planning for a great new empire beyond the Atlantic. Each country already had a more or less substantial footing in the New World—France mainly in the area to the north and England mainly to the south of the St. Lawrence, including what are now the Great Lakes.

It was inevitable in such a situation that the conflicting claims of the two nations would embroil the American continent, as it had already done in Europe, in armed conflicts. Long lines of communications to the respective homelands caused each of the contending forces to enlist the services of the Indian tribes. The Hurons adopted the French cause; the Iroquois allied themselves with the English. The Hurons operating principally from the north of the St. Lawrence and the Iroquois operating principally from the south of that great watercourse occasioned the earliest known contacts between Canada and Albany County. These contacts unhappily were of a savage and sanguinary nature, and it is possibly not overstating the facts to say that this early alliance between the British Crown and the Iroquois, later extended into a new alliance, during the years immediately preceding and during the tragic days themselves of the American Revolution contributed greatly to England's defeat and the loss of her Original Thirteen Colonies south of the St. Lawrence. During the period of the British occupation of the colony of New York at one time the nebulous boundaries of Albany County were said to extend north to the line of the St. Lawrence and west to the approximate location of Detroit. By the Peace of Paris in 1763 England gained possession of all the former French territory to the north of this line and administered all Indian affairs in the whole of North America under the superintendency of a very remarkable man, Sir William Johnson, who had his headquarters at Johnstown, just west of this city, and within the limits of Albany County, where he had elected to live and die.

It would be trespassing on the patience of this audience to dwell at any length on the career of this warrior and statesman, whose jurisdiction extended over Indian affairs in Canada and whose support of and membership in the epoch-making Albany Congress of 1754, under the guidance and dominance of Benjamin Franklin, envisaged a Federal Union of the Colonies such as later became very much the pattern of a Federal Union of the United States of America. Johnson's son-in-law, Colonel Daniel Claus, became his Canadian deputy for Indian affairs and in these later times of high and enduring comradeship between the gallant sons of the United States and the sons of Canada, it is with a sense of special satisfaction that we recall Johnson's magnanimous treatment of Dieskau after defeating the French at Lake George; even as we recall the high and noble treatment accorded Burgoyne, after his defeat at Saratoga, by your own great general and great gentleman, Philip Schuyler, of Albany.

Johnson's death occurred in 1774. His passing seems to have synchronized with the breaking of an already weakened chain that bound Canada and the Thirteen Colonies into component parts of the British imperialism of that day.

In another year, in 1775, the last links that had held Canada and Albany together in a common polity under an uncommonly obstinate and stupid sovereign were sundered.

A few years ago an incident happened while your president was visiting a mutual friend in Ottawa. As it serves to illustrate contemporary Canadian and, I venture, contemporary British evaluation of British policy at the time of the Revolution, I think it will bear repetition.

Inspecting the Parliament Building, Mr. Woods' attention was directed to a life-sized portrait of a bewigged, beribboned, and begartered personage on the wall of the lobby. Turning to his very charming and witty hostess, he inquired: "And who, may I ask, is that chap?" "Who is that?" the lady repeated. "You ought to know. He's the best friend the United States ever had and the worst gambler England ever produced. That is George III."

The Revolution, by virtue or by vice of the over-all strategy of the British command, emphasized the interdependent importance of Quebec, Montreal, and Albany. Canada, as the nearest British place for organization of personnel and supply—nearest for England and nearest to the revolting and embattled Colonies—loomed large in the plan of campaign. The grand plan was to cut off the New England colonies from Virginia and the southern Colonies. Burgoyne was to descend with his army from Canada. Clinton, with his army, was to march north from captured New York. They were to effect a junction at Albany. That was to end the war.

There is surely small occasion for grief, either American or Canadian, at the miscarriage of that plan. In a larger sense, in the broad and clarifying perspective of the years, there is little occasion for a valid British regret.

The post-Revolutionary relations between Canada and the United States were highlighted by the war of 1812. The major engagements of that struggle were fought along the New York-Canadian border. Albany County soldiers and sailors fought against Canadian and other British forces, now in New York, and now on Quebec and Ontario terrain.

Canada had been drawn in the war of 1812 and had no connection with the origin of the war. Each side was unfortunately suspicious of the other at the start and ended with nothing gained by either side except a mutual respect which has grown continuously for over 130 years.

Among the imponderables present in every problem affecting the relations of separate nations may be cited those reticences and constraints that endure, for a greater or less time, following armed collisions. And so it may be properly considered that the Wars of the Revolution and of 1812 were among the major factors that motivated Canada and the United States to preserve their separate entities. Meanwhile those entities have endured—and doubtless shall endure as a lesson to the world that two nations of self-respecting people can live alongside one another in long peace and close friendship.

Today the giant Republic of the West, with its 140,000,000 people, independent, panoplied in power and wealth and shining in its high and disinterested devotion to the ideals of an exalted consecration to civilization, chooses its own ruler and its own laws.

Today, its friend and neighbor, Canada, with a population of only 12,000,000 people and embracing an area nearly equal to that of the United States, with comparable natural resources and national potentials, chooses and enjoys its own independence and its own laws, levies its own taxes, makes its own treaties, and joins or refrains from wars at its own will. It exchanges with the United States and other nations its own plenipotentiaries and missions. And yet we Canadians, while proud of our independence, combined with loyalty to the Crown, are no less proud of our free allegiance to the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations—proud of its lineage; proud of its traditions, proud of its innate sense of equity and calmness and courage.

In the long midterm of the relations between our two nations it is perhaps only natural that there should, at times, arise states of mind that have somewhat arrested the development of closer reciprocal relations. Many of these have been more shadowy than of substance. In the past we in Canada have been a bit provincial and short-sighted in our apprehensions that the great financial centers of the United States if wooed into too close a liaison with us might dominate the economy and indirectly affect the governmental integrity of the Dominion. We have at different times viewed with alarm the possibility of losses of our youth who might be lured to the States by high wages and greater luxuries of living. We have sometimes feared too great an influx of goods competing with our own products.

Such chimeras, surely, are not conducive to the brave and bold outlook of a pioneer people facing the facts of the future. We in Canada must emancipate ourselves from such misgivings. We must welcome the closest economic liaison between ourselves and your great country. We must exchange thoughts and goods and aspirations and experiences within the framework of a bold and forward-looking program, relying on the good will and good faith of our great neighbor and on the enhanced spiritual and material blessings that are bound to flow, from one to the other, in such an entente of reason and interest and right.

The time is ripe for a high and dynamic and realistic statesmanship, quickly, to establish favorable trade relations with one another; quickly, to exchange mutual educational programs emphasizing the essentially human common factors shared by each of the two great English-speaking nations, to the end that, so informed, candidly and completely without the devices of diplomatic formalism and without the impertinences of pedantry or patronage these two stanch people will be led, and not driven, into so close, so firm, and so powerful a concert of unity and strength that they may long lead the nations along the kind ways of peace.

This was well expressed by General Smuts when, at a banquet given by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London in 1934 he said: "The Dominions have even stronger affiliations toward the United States than Great Britain has. There is a community of outlook, of interests, and perhaps ultimate destiny between the Dominions and

the United States of America which in essence is only the first and the most important of them.

"Through the Dominions, British policy is ultimately tied up with the United States in a more profound sense, which goes much deeper than occasional jars which, perhaps, are more acutely felt at any particular moment. That fundamental affinity, coming from the past, stretching to the future, is, or must be, the real foundation of all British foreign policy. Any policy which ignores it or runs counter to it is calculated to have a disruptive effect on the Commonwealth as a whole. We are here on bedrock, which we ignore at our peril."

An expanded Canada and a rehabilitated England will indubitably prosper the United States. The first will increase the natural demands for increased American production. The second will enable England to arise, Phenix-like, from the ashes and the horrors caused by a fiery rain of Nazi incendiaries and high explosive showered on her for five incredibly brutal years; will enable her to fill up the hideous gaps that point where thousands of her little children and women and men folk loved and labored and lived before the Teutonic scourge came upon them, totally destroying 500,000 of their homes and grievously damaging another 3,500,000 from their total of 13,000,000 homes standing in 1939.

These staggering losses must be replaced if Britain is to continue as a useful ally in the company of enlightened nations.

Between neighbors and allies and comrades in past times of peril that may arise again, there must be no sordid question of the cost of such human and necessary help. There must never again arise, in this new age of infinite threats and dangers to us all, the grim specters of acquittance of debts or forgiveness of debts that so unhappily arose after the First World War.

No specious pleas along these lines are henceforth admissible between courageously honest and realistic minds. Past, present, and future, they are debts of moneys and credits, if you will, of health and safety desperately called for and gallantly provided. They are and remain debts until they are fully acknowledged and liquidated by reciprocal and contractual arrangements for payment, either by permanent cession or by leases of lengthened tenure of present or different lands and bases in or contiguous to the waters of the Western Hemisphere; and/or by such other media of installment payments as are mutually satisfactory.

Only by such a recognition—simple and elemental—can the great heart and intelligence and conscience of the peoples themselves be warmed and enlightened; and the governmental processes adjusted to a rapid implementation of the popular will.

Canada, physically unscathed in the late holocaust, made no mean contribution toward the present victory over evil. Out of a total population of 12,000,000 Canada raised for her Army, Navy, and Air Forces over 1,000,000 men and another million workers were engaged in Canadian arms and munitions plants.

From an expenditure of $8,500,000 in 1939 on defense production, up to December last Canada had expended over $10,500,000,000 of her wealth in production of war goods.

In 1939 Canada produced 1,200 tons of ships; in 1942 she produced 900,000 tons of shipping for the use of the United Nations, and ended the war with a record of having completed in her own yards 349 vessels of 10,000 tons, 43 smaller vessels of 4,700 tons, or a total of merchant vessels with a tonnage of 3,692,100 tons—all tonnages are deadweight carrying capacity.

From her treasure beyond price, in the lives and health of her sons, she gave 37,000 who made the last great sacrifice and some 60,000 of her sons have come home wounded and weary.

She produced 50,000 complete gun units, 110,000,000 heavy shells, 4,628,100,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition, built 545 armed vessels of war. In 1939 she produced 40 airplanes; in 1942 she was employing 75,000 workers in aircraft and producing about 5,000 planes a year, and completed 16,414 aircraft; trained and sent into action 295,000 of her men in the Royal Canadian Air Forces; oversubscribed every war loan; and built 50,761 fighting vehicles.

It was my high privilege, as director general of munitions, to organize the ground work of this vital program of production of munitions, and one of the supreme satisfactions that came to me in this task was the enthusiastic and immediate and invaluable assistance given to us in Canada by the leaders of industrial production in the United States. We shared one another's problems and confidences, and I am proud now to have this opportunity of making my profoundly grateful acknowledgments.

I am proud that after Pearl Harbor, Canada was able to send the United States finished war materials valued at $1,100,000,000 which were manufactured in Canada. This does not include vast quantities of raw materials such as aluminum, lumber, paper, uranium, and nickel.

Five thousand and ninety-six aircraft, including Helldivers for the United States Navy; 43 naval ships; 90 merchant ships; 4,223 army guns; 78,557 gun barrels and forgings, many for the United States Navy; and 7,439 armored fighting vehicles, including reconditioning work; 21,344,000 filled shells; 53,736,000 shell casings; 711,265,000 units of small-arms ammunition; 353,533 machine guns and rifles; 334,000 tons of explosives and chemicals; and 334,000 units of flares and pyrotechnics of various classes.

Our Canadian command in the field gave unstinted praise to your Sherman tanks, largely built at defense plants in neighboring Schenectady. Now that the reasons for security constraints no longer prevail, this opinion, that the Sherman tanks were certainly an outstanding success and a great influence on the outcome of the war in the Mediterranean theater, may provide an interesting sidelight, through Canadian channels, on the value of one of the more widely publicized and controversial tactical weapons of the war.

And now in conclusion:

If any more cogent reason were needed to stress the wisdom and necessity for the closest international relationship between the United States and Great Britain, and even more particularly between the United States and Canada, then one epochal event, still relatively fresh in all of our minds, provides that reason.

The atom bomb is a product of Canadian uranium and of the combined discoveries of American, British, and other scientists and of the engineering productive genius of the American people.

You in your heretofore sheltered States, we in our heretofore sheltered Dominion are really not in a position, fully to comprehend the physical phenomena and the full military and political potentialities of this terrifying discovery that assuredly will require a restatement in the very near future of all heretofore recognized concepts both of strategy, or should we not rather say, of statesmanship in the broadest and best sense; and of tactic. But we are in a position, together, during these tremendously difficult and challenging days of rehabilitations and readjustments, effectively to ward off any external malign threat to the perpetuity of our common ideals of democracy.

Sharing, as partners, this incalculable capital; as partners we must give to each other the fullest measure of our confidence and loyalty and cooperation and thus for ourselves and for the rest of mankind remove the possibility of failure from this high and fateful adventure.

This hour, this place seem altogether fitting to appraise the assets and keep in mind the responsibilities of the high contracting parties; to largely evaluate our good will; to reaffirm our good faith in dealings with one another and with all nations.

The past few days have witnessed a friendly visit to our Capital by your illustrious Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower. At this very time and in this very Albany Institute of History and Art, our consul-general in New York has just attended the inaugural of an American Exhibition of Canadian Art and Culture.

In far-off days, Albany was known as the crossroads of North America. Who shall say notwithstanding the fact that today there are other great American cities neighboring our Dominion that this ancient city has lost any of its importance as the natural funnel between the great centers of the Dominion and the great centers of the United States? I vision the day in the not too far distant future when adequate arterial highways will connect and consolidate, through this and other focal points, the two nations; highways and airways to minister to their common prosperity and to add to their common security.

May these recent evidences of mutual respect and attachment multiply in the days ahead; and our two peoples, enriched and ennobled by an accelerated and greatly enduring concord, march forward in the ways of peace and safety.

The Return of the Native

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including in the RECORD a speech delivered by Dr. Peter H. Odegard, president of Reed College, at Portland, Oreg. As Dr. Odegard is a native Montanan, we of my State join with our other sister States in the Northwest in welcoming him home. We know that under his guidance and leadership Reed College will continue its forward progress, and that what he accomplishes there will, in return, react to the benefit of the Northwest and the Nation as a whole. Welcome home, Dr. Odegard.

The speech follows:

THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE

(By Dr. Peter H. Odegard)

This talk is baptized The Return of the Native, not because I am partial to Thomas Hardy but because it helps describe my own position in Portland. Having been born in Montana and educated—or at least graduated—from the University of Washington, I have some claim to being regarded as a native of the Northwest.

I left this region in 1923 to follow a career as a peripatetic academic. During the 22 years of my absence I have traveled, lived, and gone through the motions of working in every other State with the sole exception of Florida, and in half a dozen different countries in Europe. And now after this long absence we are coming home. To come home and to be so warmly welcomed is reward enough for any man. But to be asked to

speak to the City Club is like receiving some other royal accolade.

As we prepared to leave New England, our friends in Amherst, New York, Boston, and Washington invariably greeted us by saying, "Congratulations on your new job. Reed is a wonderful school and Portland is a nice place. But how can you bear to go so far away from things."

They didn't say what things we'd be far away from and I was reminded of the headlines in a London newspaper when telephone and telegraph communications across the channel were cut off. It read: "Lines down. Continent is isolated."

This business of being near things or being isolated is, I believe, a state of mind; it depends on one's frame of reference. Nevertheless, the remark stuck with me and I resolved to inquire into the substance and shape of things to come in the Northwest—my home.

The Pacific Northwest has been a stage for the reenactment of the whole pageant of America. Here was a vast expanse of virgin territory embracing some 397,000 square miles (an area large enough to contain England, Wales, France, and Italy, and still have room to spare), rich in natural resources and blessed with a variety of topography and climate. The history of the region is like a newsreel digest of the history of civilization. From the primitive culture of the Indians it moved within less than half a century to a highly developed if not urbane civilization.

POPULATION TRENDS IN THE NORTHWEST

The population of the region, like that of the original Colonies, was composed of immigrants from other places.

Few places in the world have shown such meteoric growth. In 1860 there were only 64,000 people in the entire region. Twenty years later this number had increased over fivefold to over 321,000.

With the coming of the railroads after 1883 the stream of migration grew to a flood and by 1930 population of the region exceeded 3,500,000.

Although population continued to increase, the rate of growth had rather sharply declined until the influx of war workers gave it a temporary lift. For the region as a whole the rate of increase by decennial periods was:

	Percent
1860–70	134.9
1870–80	113.7
1880–90	181.5
1890–1900	47.4
1900–10	88.2
1910–20	24.0
1920–30	12.0

The rate of decline has not been uniform and has been more pronounced in Idaho and Montana than in Oregon and Washington, but population in all four States has exhibited the same trend.

Because of factors characteristic of a frontier society, including among other things an excess of males over females, and a large proportion of older people, the growth in population of the Northwest has been due in only a small measure to natural increase. Actually the birth rate of Washington and Oregon put them near the bottom of the list of all the States.

It is unlikely that the rate of natural increase will change substantially within the visible future. It follows, therefore, that if this region is to look forward to any substantial increase in population it will have to rely in the future as in the past upon migration from other States.

As a general rule migration takes place from areas of low standards of living to those where standards are higher. This being true the future of the Northwest will depend upon the opportunities the region offers for a better life than is to be found elsewhere. Present living standards are not strikingly high although they are higher than the average for the Nation as a whole. There is ample room for improvement.

NATURAL RESOURCES OF NORTHWEST

Standards of living depend basically upon physical and cultural resources.

Are the physical resources of the Pacific Northwest sufficient to support a larger population at higher standards of living than now prevail? Let us see how we now stand:

Lands: The land resources of this region are estimated to be 188,000,000 acres. About 52,000,000 acres are in farms of which some 16,000,000 acres are classified as cropland. Since nearly one-third of this cropland is normally unproductive in any given year—the farm economy of the region is really based on approximately 10,000,000 acres—or about 5 percent of the total land resources.

The importance of agriculture in Northwest economy is reflected in the fact that up to 1940 it provided employment for nearly 300,000 workers, more than any other occupation or industry. The value of its ten leading products (wheat, dairy products, hay and forage, cattle, fruits, sheep, poultry, potatoes, hogs, and vegetables) exceeded $400,000,000. Agricultural products accounted for about 45 percent of the value of all commodities shipped from the region.

Directly related to agriculture are the food-processing industries. In 1940 they gave employment to nearly 30,000 workers and supplied nearly 11 percent of the Nation's canned fruits and nearly 8 percent of its canned vegetables.

The production of frozen fruits and vegetables in recent years has had a spectacular increase. In 1941 the Pacific Northwest accounted for nearly 50 percent of the Nation's frozen fruit supply and nearly 42 percent of its frozen vegetables.

Forest and forest products: Second only to agriculture are the region's forests and forest products. Forest lands make up about 36 percent of the entire area of the Northwest—approximately 95,000,000 acres. Standing timber in 1940 was estimated at 902,000,000,000 board-feet of which some 50 percent is owned by the Federal Government.

In 1941 this region produced 13,000,000,000 board-feet of lumber or nearly 40 percent of the national total. In addition it supplied 20 percent of the Nation's wood pulp and practically all of its construction plywood.

Just before the war, forest industries provided employment for nearly 140,000 persons—over 60 percent of all factory workers in the Northwest. The value of forest products exceeded half a billion dollars and accounted for 63 percent of the railroad freight tonnage, 87 percent of inland water tonnage, and 40 percent of the value of all exports.

Minerals: Up to 1941 the four States of the Pacific Northwest had produced over $4,000,000,000 in metals of all kinds including $550,000,000 in gold. In terms of product value the mineral industries of the region rank third in importance. In 1940 the total output was valued at $135,000,000—of which copper, zinc, lead, mercury, gold, and silver accounted for $106,000,000, or 78 percent.

Before World War II the Northwest was producing 35 percent of the Nation's silver, 20 percent of its mercury, 15 percent of its copper, and 7 percent of its gold and zinc.

More extensive exploration will undoubtedly disclose additional mineral resources. We know now of extensive and valuable clay deposits with fairly high alumina content and the Northwest has the largest reserves of magnesite in the United States.

Fisheries: If we include Alaska in the Northwest the fishing industry of the region provides employment for nearly 20,000 persons and has an annual product value of over $75,000,000.

Hydroelectric power: One of the greatest and potentially perhaps the greatest of the physical resources of the Northwest is its water power. Over 40 percent of the Nation's potential water power is said to be in the Columbia and other river systems of the Northwest. In 1943 over 13,500,000,000 kilowatts were generated in Oregon and Washington alone—96 percent of which was hydro. Of the Nation's total installed hydroelectric capacity in 1943 over 23 percent was to be found in Oregon and Washington.

Residential consumption in Washington and Oregon in 1944 averaged nearly 3,000 kilowatt-hours per year per customer against a national average of approximately 1,100 kilowatt-hours.

Western farms use nearly twice as much power as average farms; western housewives own 20 percent more electric ranges and 10 percent more washing machines.

The war has created an unprecedented demand for electric power and the Northwest has supplied a large part of that demand. The industrial potential in our electric power is one of our richest resources. During the war nearly 70 percent of the Bonneville Power Administration's energy went into war production and this is now available for peacetime use.

These then, are our main resources—land, lumber, power, fisheries, and minerals.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

As the Pacific Northwest faces the future, what can be said of its prospects for a rising standard of living for a larger population? Whatever they are they will depend upon an enlarged and more efficient utilization of our land, forest, mineral, fishery, and power resources. This is not the time or the place to present a detailed blueprint for such a program. I hope, however, you will permit me as a native but recently returned to make a few observations.

Of first importance is the conservation of our good earth. Although the Northwest has no dust bowl—erosion, land mining, and abuse have already taken toll of its precious soil. According to John Appleton, of the Northwest Regional Council, "approximately two-fifths of the cropland of the region has, on an average, already lost half of its original mantle of top soil. * * * In the intermountain area at least 60 percent of the cropland has been seriously damaged by erosion. * * * Vegetation has been removed or seriously depleted upon thousands of acres by nonproductive cultivation, overgrazing, and other misuses * * *."

In recent years we have learned the importance of more careful cultivation, of contour plowing, strip cropping, terracing, improved irrigation and drainage, crop rotation, use of fertilizers, and other practices that tend to keep the soil in place and maintain its productivity. We shall have to learn more and apply in practice what we learn.

Reliable estimates indicate that no less than 5,000,000 acres of unproductive land can be brought under cultivation by clearing, drainage, and irrigation. Anyone who has visited the Yakima Valley knows what water can do to make the erstwhile desert bloom. Unless costs prove prohibitive other areas can and will be reclaimed. The Grand Coulee irrigation project alone contemplates the addition of 1,200,000 acres of farm land to the resources of this region. This and other projects, I am told, if carried to completion can provide farms for nearly 40,000 families by 1960. If experience in the Yakima Valley is applicable, this increase should support an additional service population of nearly 165,000 people.

The people of the Northwest have already taken steps, in cooperation with the Federal Government, to check the depletion of forest resources. Much more can and must be done to reduce the annual loss of nearly 3,000,000,000 board feet through fire, insects, and disease—a loss almost as great as the current annual growth of 5,000,000,000 board

feet. Better methods of logging and reforestation are already beginning to pay dividends and will pay a richer return in the future.

There should be great opportunities for increased employment in forest product industries. The rapid development of the plywood and pulp industries is an example of what enterprise and scientific management can accomplish.

INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Never before has the Nation been so research conscious. Yet industrial research has lagged and especially so in the Northwest. The National Research Council in 1938 reported over 44,000 such research workers in the United States of which only 108 were in the Pacific Northwest.

It is significant that among major industries those having to do with paper, nonferrous metals, food and forest products ranked at the bottom in expenditures on industrial research. For example, whereas the rubber industry spent $2.73 on research for every $100 of value added by manufacture, and the agricultural implement industry $2.90, only 7 cents was spent by forest products industries and 19 cents on food products. Yet these are the industries on which the future prosperity of the Northwest will in large measure depend.

POWER—PROSPERITY

I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, and I therefore venture no prediction concerning the future of the great industries, like shipbuilding, aluminum, aircraft, and others, that have been either war born or magnified. One thing seems certain, namely that the industrial future of the Northwest and the standard of living of its people will be intimately related to the power resources which we have in such abundance.

No other country in history and no other section of the country is blessed with such vast power resources. If they can be put to use the future of the Northwest region is bright indeed. Some years ago Professor Magnusson, of the University of Washington, estimated that domestic consumption per customer in the State of Washington would increase from some 1,200 kilowatt-hours to in the neighborhood of 4,000 kilowatt-hours by 1942. The war intervened and cut off the supply of appliances; but in spite of that, average consumption in the region was close to 3,000 kilowatt-hours in 1944. This average will undoubtedly increase now that the war is won, and if space heating and other domestic uses of electricity develop, an average of 5,000 to 8,000 kilowatt-hours per customer is not too much to expect. I need not point up what this would mean in terms of more comfortable living for our people.

The full utilization of our power resources will be possible only if we can also attract or establish here new industries to provide employment for our existing population and for the new migrants who will inevitably come. The retention and development of the aluminum and magnesium industries, shipbuilding, wood products of all kinds, food processing, will depend, of course, upon other factors than power, but power will be important, and in many cases decisive.

It may be that the Northwest, taking a leaf from the experience of the South, will have to make a determined fight for readjustment of freight rates. But transportation rates will become of less importance as the center of the population moves westward and as the population of the West increases. These changes will bring us closer to rich markets for the goods and services we can provide. It may be that unforeseen developments in air transport of freight may also serve to mitigate the disadvantages under which industry in this region now labors.

COLONIAL CULTURE AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The economic prosperity and cultural development of any nation or any region depends not alone on physical resources. Equally important are its human resources and the quality of leadership it develops.

During most of its history the Pacific Northwest has been something of a colonial outpost of the East. It has been looked upon and has regarded itself as a source of raw materials to be shipped to eastern cities for processing or fabrication. This indeed has been a characteristic feature of our national development. At one time or another every State and section has experienced this colonial status. One of the basic causes of the American War for Independence was the resistance of the British Board of Trade to the commercial and industrial development of New England. After the Revolution the region west of the Alleghenies became a sort of colonial appendage of the seaboard. As population moved westward there was concern and fear in New England lest this movement depopulate the older centers of culture and undermine their economic and political dominion.

In extreme cases this concern took the form of bitter resentment against the West. Timothy Dwight, for example, president of Yale, openly declared that the pioneers who went from New England into the Ohio country were little better than anarchists.

"They are," he said, "not fit to live in regular society. They are too idle; too talkative; too passionate; too prodigal, and too shiftless to acquire either property or character. They are impatient at the restraints of law, religion, or morality; discouraged by debt and frustration; and under the pressure of poverty, the fear of a gaol, and the consciousness of public contempt, they leave their native places, and betake themselves to the wilderness."

The sectional character of American party battles reflects this conflict of East and West as the Western States sought to become something more than colonial outposts of the East. It helps to explain the political insurgency of the West from the days of Nathaniel Bacon and to the progressive movement of 1912–32. On the psychological side it lies at the basis of the struggles over currency and credit, tariff and transportation rates, taxation and representation.

Back of the bitter sectional rivalry that brought on the Civil War can be found a similar resentment in the South arising at its colonial dependence on the North.

Nowhere was this given better expression than by Hinton Helper in 1857. In his book, The Impending Crisis of the South and How To Meet It, he said:

"It is a fact well known to every intelligent southerner that we are compelled to go to the North for almost every article of utility and adornment.

"In one way or another we are more or less subservient to the North every day of our lives. In infancy we are swaddled in northern muslin; in childhood we are humored with northern gewgaws; in youth we are instructed out of northern books; at the age of maturity we sow our wild oats on northern soil; * * * in the decline of life we remedy our eyesight with northern spectacles, and support our infirmities with northern canes; in old age we are drugged with northern physic; and finally, when we die, our inanimate bodies, shrouded in northern cambric, are stretched upon the bier, borne to the grave in a northern carriage, entombed with a northern spade, and memorialized with a northern slab."

If one applies a proper discount to this extreme view and changes the word "South" to read "West" or "Northwest" we may have an exaggerated but suggestive description of one of the psychological as well as economic hazards to our own regional development. For the colonial position of any region is often due as much to psychological as to physical factors. The colonial attitude of mind often persists even beyond the period when its physical foundations have crumbled. Until this colonial attitude of cultural dependence changes the full potentialities of any area will not be fully explored and developed. For within the physical limitations set by nature the character of any civilization depends in final analysis upon its cultural resources—upon the ideas in the minds of men and women. No nation can be free or deserves freedom until it has a will to be free, and this will to freedom has its roots in confidence not complacency, in self-respect not self-righteousness, in faith, hope, and intelligence—not in apologetic rationalizations of difficulties encountered and obstacles to be overcome.

Long after the revolution the cultural dependence of the American people persisted. It persisted in the preference given to European and especially English schools and scholars by the rich and the well born. It persisted in the attitude of dispraise and apology toward American authors and artists. A book to receive acclaim had to bear the imprint of a London publisher. American artists, neglected at home, took refuge in Europe, from where their fame spread until finally it reached their own country. The surest road to fame was not through demonstrated excellence at home but through the imprimatur and nihil obstat of a foreign critic.

It was this dependence that Emerson so eloquently deplored in his address on the American scholar to the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge in 1837.

"Perhaps," he said, "the time is already come when sluggard intellect of this continent will look from under its iron lids and fill the postponed expectation of the world with something better than the exertions of mechanical skill. Our day of dependence, our long apprenticeship to the learning of other lands, draws to a close. The millions that around us are rushing into life cannot always be fed on the sere remains of foreign harvests."

THE NORTHWEST—A COLONIAL OUTPOST

This oration, which has been called America's declaration of cultural independence, has, I believe, some relevance for us in the Pacific Northwest today. Our own economic and cultural dependence on the East has followed a course not dissimilar from that of other regions. This dependence had its roots in the physical features of our economy and the cultural heritage of our people. Far from the centers of population, from the major markets of the Nation, without coal and iron, the sinews of an industrial civilization; cruelly handicapped by lack of efficient transportation and communication at equitable rates, the colonial relation of the Northwest to the East was natural and inevitable.

On the cultural side, too, our dependence on the East was not so strange. The tens of thousands of migrants who have settled here had their cultural roots in the East and Middle West. They looked to New England and New York, to Chicago and St. Louis, as home. The economy of the region would not support schools and colleges, museums, and galleries, to compete with the century-old establishments of the Eastern States. It was not strange, therefore, that those who could afford it sent their children to eastern schools, and made periodic pilgrimages to New York and Boston and Chicago to hear good music, see good plays, and visit the richly endowed galleries and museums. It was also not strange that young men and women in nearly every field of endeavor should look to eastern recognition as a goal for their ambitions; that visiting lecturers, artists, and authors from the East should enjoy a higher prestige in the West than their equally talented fellows who made their homes here.

THE NORTHWEST'S COMING OF AGE

I need not tell a city club audience that this attitude is changing and that the colonial period of northwestern history may be coming to a close. The composition of this club testifies not only to the high quality of our own intellectual and civil leadership but also to a realization that our future rests largely in our own hands.

The center of population has steadily moved westward. Instantaneous communication and improved transportation on land and through the air have brought us within easy reach of the major markets of the Nation. We now have here in the Northwest in our Canadian and Alaskan neighbors to the north and our captivating California neighbors to the south, a large and growing market of our own. Moreover, we occupy a strategic position on the Pacific rim where this Nation and the world may have its future rendezvous with destiny. No man can foretell what the future holds as Russia and China and the other vast areas of the Orient move from being primitive agrarian societies to become modern industrialized states. It is our good fortune and our responsibility to be on the crest of that wave of the future.

The rest of the Nation has looked with mingled amazement and admiration at what has been accomplished here during the past 5 years. Production records have been smashed as intelligence was brought to bear on the industrial potentialities of the Pacific Northwest. The Northwest has ceased to be a colonial appendage of the East. Only lack of vision and confidence will keep it from retaining in peace the position of leadership it has won in war. Paul Bunyan has come back—not only with Babe, his big blue ox, but with the power of a billion wild horses in the Columbia Valley, that irregular furrow that Babe cut through the mountains to the sea.

In other respects, too, the Pacific Northwest is coming of age. In literature and art, in history and biography, in music, the record and the resources of the region should be a source of pride and confidence. We need to discover our own cultural heritage and to encourage our own youth to look about in their own backyard to find inspiration and employment for their creative talents. It ought not to be necessary for them to go to New York for recognition or their mede of glory and reward. New York will come to them.

Great authors, artists, musicians, libraries, fine museums—all the signs and symbols of a mature culture are here. We have schools and colleges to equal and in some cases surpass the best in the Nation. At this point I suppose I should put in a plug for Reed. I'll spare you that beyond saying that it has a record unequaled among the colleges of America.

The future of Reed College is bound up with the future of this great region. If we have the vision to see and the daring to do, that future is bright. Having in mind our physical and human resources, our cultural heritage, and our will to believe in ourselves, I feel confident that here in the Northwest—more than in any other State or section—we can realize the full promise of American life.

Do not misunderstand me. I make no plea for cultural or economic independence. I have no use for that form of political and economic madness called autarchy. We are citizens not only of Portland, or Oregon, or the Northwest, but of the American Nation and of the world.

What I do hope for as I return now to my native hearth is that in the life and councils of the Nation and the world—the voice of the Northwest will be heard confident and clear.

The Pearl Harbor Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

THE PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY

The congressional committee investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster has been so bedeviled from the start by partisan wranglings on both sides that it has already seriously undermined public confidence in its fairness and impartiality. But the latest conduct of some of its Republican members in particular can hardly bring comfort or satisfaction to the national leaders of that party.

The Republican Party has provided distinguished leadership to the Nation in the past and aspires to lead it again in the future. But Republican members on the Pearl Harbor committee have not only attempted to impugn the honesty of the American Navy; they are also espousing the cause of Japan against that of their own country. And they are doing so in defiance of all the historic evidence. The country has the right to know, and know now, whether these tactics are merely the result of the strategy of the individual Republicans involved, or whether they are part of the calculated strategy of the Republican congressional leadership. It is up to that leadership either to repudiate the slurs cast upon the American fighting forces and American policy, or to stand convicted of identifying itself with them—if only by silence.

The thesis of some of the Republican members was stated most bluntly by Representative GEARHART, of California, when he declared: "The Japanese were doing everything in their power to get an acceptable agreement and got slapped in the face on November 26. That precipitated the war." Representative GEARHART was referring to the famous American note of November 26, 1941, which those of his persuasion prefer to call by its Japanese designation of the "Hull ultimatum." There was never an excuse for any mistake about that note. There is even less now in view of the evidence before the committee itself. And only deliberate misstatement of the facts can now sustain Representative GEARHART'S charge.

The record speaks for itself. As early as 1931, Japan embarked on a career of conquest as ambitious and as frankly avowed as was that of the Nazis. She first subjugated Manchuria over American protests. In 1936 she concluded the anti-Comintern pact with Germany and with that as a backing invaded China the next year. In 1940, when the western powers were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Hitler, she concluded a hard and fast military alliance with Germany and Italy, and prepared not only to drive the foreign barbarians from the Far East, but also to swallow the whole Orient in her coprosperity sphere as a base for world conquest. As early as January 1941, her war lords began to prepare for war against the United States, including an attack on Pearl Harbor.

Her great opportunity, hailed in Japan as a divine wind, came when Germany invaded Russia on June 22, 1941, thereby securing Japan's northern flank. Ten days later, an imperial conference presided over by the Japanese Emperor adopted a crucial national policy whose nature was revealed in another 10 days by orders for an all-out mobilization for total war. Within 2 weeks, Japan invaded French Indochina, to provide a base for attacks on the Netherlands Indies and Singapore. This was followed by mutual freezing of assets and virtual suspension of trade. By August, the Japanese Fleet began to assemble for war games to rehearse the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the plans for it were completed by September 13. On October 5, the date of the attack was fixed for December 7 our time; General Tojo took over the government October 17, and the fleet sailed on its fateful mission November 25, or 24 hours before the Hull note was even delivered.

True, the Japanese Fleet could have been recalled if a settlement had been reached before December 7. But the only settlement that would have recalled it would have been an American acceptance of the Japanese note of November 20, which was a real ultimatum because, unlike the Hull note, it contained, even if unknown to the American Government, a time limit after which military action was to follow automatically. And that note demanded that the United States end her long-standing policy of supporting China, and not only supply Japan with all she wanted for the prosecution of her war in China, especially oil, but also compel the Netherlands East Indies to do likewise. Had the United States bowed to it, Germany and Japan would now control all Europe and Asia, and this country would stand alone against their might. Great Britain and France did not need such a humiliating ultimatum to declare war on Hitler. The American Government merely replied with a note offering a broad basis of agreement which contained no threat whatever. General Tojo himself has declared that he accepts responsibility for the war. Does Mr. GEARHART wish to relieve him of it?

Delay in Consideration of 65-Cent Minimum Amendment to Wages and Hours Act Is Unwarranted and Unjustifiable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, an amendment to the Wages and Hours Act to fix the minimum hourly wage at 65 cents has been urged and recommended by a tremendous majority of the American people who support President Truman's legislative program. The new wage floor has been endorsed by all major organizations of labor and business. Any further delay in its consideration is unwarranted and unjustifiable, and not only disrupts the administration program but imperils a stable economy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Chicago Sun of March 18, which has a strong bearing on that point:

TIME FOR A 65-CENT MINIMUM WAGE

Early debate on the Pepper minimum-wage bill has revealed the pattern of conflict. The issue is not whether the present 40-cent minimum shall be raised, but whether a Republican-southern Democratic coalition will scale down the increase to protect the low-wage industries.

The majority of the Senate Labor Committee recommends a 65-cent minimum, climbing to 75 cents after 4 years. It presents an abundance of facts to prove that this can be done without harming legitimate business

enterprise and with relatively small adjustments. If the increase above 40 cents seems sharp and sudden, it should be recalled that the cost of living for low-income families has risen at least 40 percent since 1941. On that ground alone a 16-cent increase would be justified.

The majority also points out that fewer than one-fifth of our manufacturing workers are below the 65-cent hourly standard and that the net cost of raising them to this level would represent less than 2 percent of industrial pay rolls. It emphasizes that the 65-cent rate would produce annual earnings of only $1,350—well below the minimum "maintenance" budget for the average family on relief.

A committee minority argues that the present increase should be held to 55 cents, rising later to 60 cents. To justify this position, however, they are compelled to argue that Congress has no business in considering "proper" minimum family income.

The principal low-wage industries are lumber, textiles, apparel, furniture, leather, and tobacco, and their lowest wages are paid in the South. The Republican opponents of the Pepper bill are joined, therefore, by the southern Democrats, Senators ELLENDER and FULBRIGHT, in saying that to consider a "proper" minimum wage is "radical." Surely this is a fantastic denial of the basic purpose of the original 1938 wage-hour law, which was designed to protect the American worker from substandard wages.

No greater favor could be done the Southern people and Southern industry itself than enactment of the Pepper bill intact. An individual southern employer, no matter how humane or enlightened, may find it competitively impossible to raise wages alone. If his competitors are required by law to reach a reasonable minimum, his major problem is eliminated.

There are many southern leaders who recognize that the traditional low-wage standards of their section are a burden and a menace. They are unjustified by alleged differences in living costs, because the differences simply do not exist. And southern industry lacks a market among its own people because the people lack purchasing power.

The 55-cent minimum proposed by the minority isn't enough to equalize the rise in national living costs since 1938. It does nothing to improve a standard which was too low when established and has been voluntarily surpassed by agreement of industry committees in most business establishments. American industry, Senator TUNNELL emphasizes, was never before in so favorable a position to adjust to the 65-cent minimum. Logic and sound national policy dictate the forward step of the Pepper bill.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my recent radio broadcast put on the air over Stations WSCO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WBDC, Escanaba, Mich.:

The big noise in Washington these days is helping to feed the starving peoples of Europe. As usual we in this great land of plenty are being called upon to do the lion's share of the job. Some years ago we joined in the great international experiment of UNRRA, or specifically the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation program, with about 47 other nations and, as usual, we put up about 70 percent of the cash needed for that program. Our total contribution to date is $2,100,000,000 plus $600,000,000 authorized by the Congress but not yet appropriated. UNRRA has been subjected to a great deal of criticism, in which at times I have joined, but it must be remembered that they, too, have been operating under a great many handicaps. For instance, as Congressman JONKMAN, of Grand Rapids, pointed out on one of these broadcasts after his return from an inspection trip of Europe, crops in central Europe were excellent but the trouble in distributing the food was with transportation. The Army was not then able to release to UNRRA sufficient trucks to replace their war-disabled rail and canal transportation facilities. It is to be hoped that that has been somewhat corrected in the meantime. Another insurmountable hurdle that UNRRA has been faced with is the fact that the Russian-dominated countries have not been able to secure their fair share of our bounty due to Russian interference, which is to be regretted but it, nevertheless, exists. However, in the present crisis it is well to remember that this food shortage is said to exist in nations which are not to be serviced by UNRRA. In other words, they are not nations which have been occupied and later liberated.

However, as the picture unfolds down here in Washington, it becomes increasingly evident that this administration is not going to be able to cope with the situation under its present mismanagement. Once again Uncle Sam is being called upon to succor the world. Can we do it, or can we not do it and why are not other nations called upon and required to perform the manifold duties that always seem to fall in Uncle Sam's lap? Down here in Washington we are being asked daily to save bread, wheat, and cereals, eliminate waste, etc. We hear recurring remarks of possible return to food rationing, etc., in order that we can help the world.

On the other hand, the administration continues to shout from the housetops that we must hold the line against inflation and keep the OPA running your lives and mine—and all that sort of eyewash. So what is actually happening? In order to conserve food to feed the starving in Europe and yet maintain the price line, OPA now authorizes the hotels and restaurants in Washington to charge exactly the same prices for meals as previously but—and here is the catch—they can drastically reduce the portions served. I ask you is that not inflation of the first water, which the OPA is charged to prevent? What be the difference, my friends, if I pay $1 for a meal today containing a certain amount of calories and vitamins and tomorrow under OPA permitted reduced portions I have to pay $2 to get the same amount of calories and vitamins. In other words am I in effect to be taxed 100 percent of the cost of my meals in order to feed Europe?

Frankly, I have been under doctor's orders for a year and in that time I have learned something about how much food I am required to consume per day. Believe me, I do not waste it, but when, under the guise of feeding the starving of Europe, the OPA, in order to hold their price line, tells a restaurant they can charge me the same price for half the food I got yesterday, then I say that is inflation because the doctor tells me to eat so much food per day and there is no other answer but that I shall have to buy twice as much food today as I did day before yesterday. But the OPA is never found wanting for excuses to dodge the issue. That is one of the reasons why I never voted for it heretofore and do not intend to start now. But one might say if we are not to cut down on our daily food supply in this country how are we to feed Europe? The answer is that we have to produce more in this country to feed ourselves and the rest of the world, not only under the UNRRA program but under this emergency program which ex-President Hoover is going abroad to set up. And how are we going to do that? Well, the first thing we have to do is increase our farm yield in this country and the first requisite of that as I see it and from the many manifestations that are made to me by farmers in my district, in the Midwest and far West when I was out there recently is that we have to get new farm machinery on the farms—and quickly. The Republicans have been taking the lead in that program for a long time.

On March 17, Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, released the texts of letters to the Secretary of Labor and the Civilian Production Administrator asking their cooperation in ending work stoppages in farm-machinery plants and the granting of wartime priorities to farm-machinery manufacturers. Mr. JENKINS said this:

"With our food reserves lower than at any time during the war, and with the whole world looking to the United States to prevent starvation, we are inviting disaster if we do not provide our farmers with the machinery they need to plant and harvest their crops this year. The farm-machinery situation is critical. But while farmers plead in vain for new implements, the administration permits production to be tied up indefinitely and forces manufacturers of farm machinery to take their turn with everyone else for scarce materials. For 3 years this committee has urged without avail that food production be given priorities in material and labor as a war industry. With the crisis now facing us, it is difficult to understand the administration's continued indifference to this plea."

Under date of March 15, Mr. JENKINS, as chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee sent the following letter to Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Half of this Nation's capacity for production of farm machinery is immobilized today by industrial disputes. Work is stopped in plants of International Harvester, Oliver, and J. I. Case farm implement companies.

"Resumption of production in these plants at the earliest possible moment is of utmost importance. Let me give you some of the background.

"Our animal feed reserves have been used up. The spectacular increase in meat, egg, and milk production during the war was possible only because we had huge reserves of grain and protein feed materials. Now milk production is tapering off and liquidation of poultry flocks is in progress because of reduced feed supplies.

"At the same time, our food reserves are dwindling. Our carry-over of many important food commodities will be smaller this year than at any time during the war. The carry-over of canned goods remaining when the new season comes in, for example, will be 51 percent smaller than in 1941—the lowest since the Department of Commerce started keeping such records.

"This means we are in a position where we must depend almost entirely on this year's crops for next winter's food supplies.

"The course of prudence would be to do everything in our power to assure ourselves of ample food production this year—enough for ourselves and to share with others. Unfortunately, we do not appear to be acting in any such prudent fashion.

"Farmers are tired—physically. They have put in 4 years of the hardest work imaginable, 80 to 100 hours a week. Their machinery is tired. Much of it has squeaked

and wobbled its last possible trip around the field. Rural labor is not returning to the farms.

"From every hand come warnings that unless new machines and equipment are available our production of food—even with the most favorable weather—may be far below our goals. If we should have unfavorable weather conditions, the result is not pleasant to contemplate.

"That, as I see it, is the situation with which we are confronted.

"I urge you, therefore, to use your good offices and every facility at your command to speed the processes of collective bargaining and bring about the earliest possible settlement of labor disputes holding up production of farm machinery, so that vitally needed tools can be placed in the hands of our farmers in time to be of benefit to them and to the whole world during the approaching crop season."

Then Mr. JENKINS, chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee sent a letter to Mr. J. D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, on March 15, pointing out similar facts to those I just read you and ending his letter thus—and I quote:

"To refresh your memory, permit me to review the situation for you:

"1. At no time since the war started has the administration permitted manufacture of sufficient new farm machinery to meet minimum requirements as reflected by increased food demands and the scarcity of farm labor.

"2. During 1943 there was an almost complete halt in production of farm machinery leaving the gap that has never been filled.

"3. The shortage has been cumulative, as far as the farmer is concerned, becoming increasingly worse year by year as tools wore out and replacements or even normal repairs were impossible.

"4. Production of farm machinery in 1945 was less than that regarded by the Department of Agriculture as a satisfactory minimum.

"5. Even under the most favorable conditions, production now contemplated for 1946 can hardly come up to the unsatisfactory output of 1945. Production in January 1946 of several important categories of farm machinery, including tractors, was less than in January 1945 and, according to your own report, all farm machinery production will be down sharply in the February figures.

"6. Shortage of steel, due to the recent steel strike, has seriously curtailed farm machinery production and it will be 1 to 3 months yet before steel again begins to reach manufacturers in sizable quantity.

"7. A shortage of iron castings is also curtailing production and the shortage is most critical in several of the areas in which farm-equipment manufacturers are concentrated.

"8. In spite of all these factors, and in spite of the fact that the CPA has the authority to grant priorities, nothing whatever is being done to give manufacturers of farm machinery any special consideration in obtaining scarce material—although CPA has done so in the case of at least one other industry.

"9. Under present schedules, virtually every piece of new farm machinery manufactured in 1946 will go to war veterans. Under the terms of War Food Order 135, veterans get first chance at all new farm machinery. Up to the end of January, 134,000 preference certificates had been issued and the number is multiplying each month. Certificates issued for tractors during the past few months have exceeded the production during the same period.

"I urge you, therefore, to use the power vested in your agency to give the manufacturers of farm machinery top priorities on all necessary materials, to concentrate production on the machinery and equipment necessary to planting and harvesting our most important food and feed crops, and to do everything in your power to encourage and assist the production of such machinery in time to be of benefit during the coming season."

So recommended the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

Throughout our land during the war years we heard it said, "Food will win the war"—we won on the battlefield. Food also will win the peace—but, under this administration and its tumbleweed methods and tactics are we going to have the food to win the peace? I fear not if conditions as they exist today are permitted to continue.

The Hobbs Antiracketeering Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting statement from Fred Brenckman, an active member of the National Grange, in support of the Hobbs antiracketeering measure. I ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS DEMAND ENACTMENT OF THE HOBBS ANTIRACKETEERING MEASURE—FOES OF THE BILL PASSED BY THE HOUSE BOAST THEY WILL SMOTHER IT IN SENATE AS WAS DONE IN THE LAST CONGRESS

In an effort to correct the evil consequences of the Supreme Court decision in the teamsters' union case of nearly 4 years ago, the House of Representatives on December 12 passed the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, H. R. 32, which has been referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, headed by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada.

Foes of the measure, the labor unions, together with their supporters in Congress, have publicly declared their intention to kill the bill in the Senate, just as they succeeded in preventing action on a similar bill that was passed by the House by a big majority in the last Congress.

SUPREME COURT PROTECTED RACKET

Recalling the circumstances that brought about the introduction of the Hobbs bill, on March 2, 1942, Associate Justice James F. Byrnes handed down a decision of the Supreme Court, in which it was held by the Court that Local 807 of the Teamsters' Union, of New York, together with 26 of its individual members, were not guilty of violating the Antiracketeering Act of 1934.

The evidence presented in the case showed that it was a common practice for members of the teamsters' union to hold up motor trucks at the New York end of the Holland Tunnel and demand a day's wages for a union member to drive the truck to its destination, often only a few squares away.

If the driver of the truck said he did not need any help, he was informed that he would have to pay the fee just the same. This amounted to $9.42 for a large truck, or $8.41 for a small one. Threats, intimidation, and often physical violence, were used to compel the owner or driver of the truck to comply with the demands of the members of the teamsters' union. In one instance, a farmer and two of his sons were attempting to deliver a load of produce to a ship berthed in the Hudson, were thrown into the river and narrowly escaped drowning. A large proportion of the trucks held up were owned or driven by farmers.

When the perpetrators of these outrages were indicted they were found guilty, after a trial of 6 weeks in a United States district court. However, the circuit court of appeals reversed the lower court, whereupon the case was taken to the United States Supreme Court.

GIST OF THE DECISION

In handing down the decision of the Supreme Court, Justice Byrnes, who is now Secretary of State, declared that the Antiracketeering Act was passed "to close gaps in existing Federal laws and to render more difficult the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types," but that the law did not apply to labor unions or their members.

According to the decision, "accepting payments even where services are refused," is a form of union activity beyond the ban of the Antiracketeering Act, and therefore, beyond the reach of present Federal laws. Continuing, the Court, in its decision, said:

"This does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control. Nor does it mean that they need go unpunished. The power of State and local authorities to punish acts of violence is beyond question. It is not diminished or affected by the circumstance that the violence may be the growth of a labor dispute. The use of violence disclosed by this case is plainly subject to the ordinary criminal law."

It is worthy of note that the authorities of New York City, where these outrages were committed, gave no protection whatever to the victims of the racket. Federal action in the case was based on the ground that the racketeers were guilty of obstructing interstate commerce, bringing the matter under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

In a vigorous dissenting opinion to the Supreme Court decision, Chief Justice Stone said that there was evidence in the record to show that the defendants in the case conspired to compel truck drivers or their employers, by force and violence, to pay the sums of money demanded. He further said that the payments were made by the drivers and truck owners to purchase immunity from violence, and that this was the end knowingly sought by members of the union. Justice Stone likewise declared that to sanction such practices would make common law robbery appear as an innocent pastime.

HANCOCK SUMMARIZES NEW BILL

In opening the debate on the Hobbs bill in the House on December 12, Congressman CLARENCE HANCOCK, of Syracuse, N. Y., fittingly said:

"Mr. Chairman, this bill is made necessary by the amazing decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Teamsters' Union 807, 3 years ago. That decision practically nullified the antiracketeering bill of 1934.

"In effect it legalizes in certain labor disputes the use of robbery and extortion, two crimes that are recognized as serious in every State of the Union and in every civilized country, whether made use of by union men, nonunion men, professional racketeers, or plain hoboes. In effect the Supreme Court held that it was the intent of Congress and the meaning of the act that members of Teamsters' Union 807 in New York City were exempt from the provisions of that law, when attempting by the use of force or the threat of violence to obtain wages for a job, whether they rendered any service or not.

"In my judgment that is a gross misinterpretation of the law and a distortion of the intent of Congress. Of course, it never was the intent of Congress to legitimize crime; nevertheless, the decision of the Supreme Court in the teamsters' case will be the supreme law of the land until the Supreme Court reverses itself, which is not likely, because five of the members of the Court who made that astounding decision are still members of the Court; or until Con-

gress acts to correct and supersede the decision and adopts a new law written in clear and unmistakable language.

"This is all the bill does. We think a mistake was made by the Supreme Court; we are attempting to correct it through enacting a new law which will accurately and definitely reflect the attitude of the Congress, the general public, and the honest, law-abiding members of labor unions."

During the course of the debate on the bill, it was claimed by some Members of the House that the abuses which the Hobbs bill aims to correct no longer exist.

MINNESOTA FARMER VICTIMIZED

However, other Members stoutly denied this. Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, submitted an editorial from the Dawson (Minn.) Sentinel, to show the length to which racketeering members of the teamsters' union go in his section of the country. The editorial was as follows:

"Last week a Dawson farmer was sent to Des Moines, Iowa, to pick up some machinery needed to complete the installation of corn driers at the local elevators. The trucker made the trip without mishap or difficulty with Iowa labor groups. He loaded his truck with his shipment and then was told by labor representatives that he not only had to unload the truck and take it back to Dawson 300 miles away, empty, but also that he had to join the local truckers' union and pay dues of $32 before they would permit him to leave with his truck. And this is a free country where free enterprise is encouraged. Any other organization or individual attempting such action would have been promptly jailed and charged with highway robbery, and in addition would probably have to answer charges of threatening, intimidation, and interference with commerce. It is incidents like this which make one wonder just how far some can go with racketeering methods without being made to account for their actions."

SOME EXAMPLES FROM CALIFORNIA

Congressman JACK ANDERSON, of California, who is a farmer, said:

"A lot of our produce is hauled into the city of San Francisco. The man who drives the truck, who hauls our fruit and produce into San Francisco, must belong to the teamsters' organization or he must pick up a member of the teamsters' organization, carry him on the truck to the point of unloading, and pay him for all the time that the truck is in the city of San Francisco.

"The farmers of the four counties I represent have been forced on many occasions, while hauling their own produce in their own trucks, to pick up members of labor organizations at the city limits of San Francisco, carry them on the truck to the point of unloading and back again to the city limits and pay them their wage for that period of time. This must be done in spite of the fact that the man who is thus paid does no work as far as driving or unloading the truck is concerned."

Continuing, Mr. ANDERSON said:

"I recall a time, back about 1938, when milk in the San Francisco milkshed was declared 'hot' and the members of the teamsters' union refused to haul the milk for the dairymen. Because the farmers' milkers declined to join the dairy workers' union, a secondary boycott was declared and the teamsters left the milk to spoil instead of hauling it to the city for processing and bottling. As a result of such high-handed action, the public went without milk and the farmers lost money. This ridiculous policy was carried so far in one instance in southern California that a farmer who fed his cows hay that was declared 'hot' because it was hauled by a nonunion truck driver also had his milk declared 'hot' and the teamsters' union refused to haul the milk."

Not so long ago the Golden Rule Church, of San Jose, Calif., bought a cooperative creamery which had a contract with the teamsters' union. Several members of the congregation were notified that they could not work in the plant unless they joined the union, and this decision was upheld by the National War Labor Board.

A FEW TYPICAL CASES

To show that the racketeering complained of is still being practiced, last summer a fruit grower connected with the Berks-Lehigh Cooperative Fruit Growers, Inc., of Pennsylvania, took a load of 225 bushels of peaches to Philadelphia. Before the driver of the truck was permitted to unload the peaches he was compelled to join the Philadelphia local of the teamsters' union, which cost him $29.

Later a driver for the same organization carried a consignment of peaches to Newark, N. J. In this case the driver was obliged to join the Newark local of the teamsters' union before he could unload. The fee charged in this instance was $51. There have been innumerable instances of this kind.

The Walker-Gordon dairy farm, of Plainsboro, N. J., was outrageously treated by the Newark local of the teamsters' union last year. The union boycotted the milk of this company during January 1945, and in a period of about 2 weeks the owners of the farm lost about $20,000. In the end the company had to agree to let the union organize the 150 workers at its plant, although the majority of the workers had no desire whatever to join the teamsters' union.

During the negotiations in this connection spokesmen for the union boasted that they intended to organize all the big farms first and then the rest would have to fall into line. The argument of the union is that any place that uses a milking machine is no longer a farm, but an industrial dairy establishment. It is interesting to note that there are more than 46,000 milking machines in use on the farms of New York State alone.

HOBBS MARSHALS FACTS

In closing the debate on his bill in the House on December 12 Congressman HOBBS, in answer to the claim that racketeering was no longer being practiced, said:

"May I say that I have had more than 1,000 letters and telegrams from organizations of farmers all over the United States saying that the condition is even worse than it was in 1943, when we passed this bill before, for the simple reason that then they were charging only the price of a day's union wage, $8.41 for a light truck and $9.42 for a heavy truck; whereas now they not only charge those fees for chaperoning farmers on city streets to save their lives but in addition they charge from $30 to $56 as an initiation fee into the union, which the farmers never get the privilege of joining. * * *

"Hon. Joe Eastman, then head of the Office of Defense Transportation, told me that his examiners reported 1,000 trucks a night being held up and robbed in various cities of this Union from Los Angeles to Seattle, across through Milwaukee and Chicago, and through Scranton, Pa., which was another hot spot, Philadelphia and New York, and over 100 a day at the New York end of the Holland Tunnel. He was begging as a witness in 1943, pleading the cause of defense transportation, and called attention to the numbers and numbers of trucks loaded with shells and guns for our Army and Navy, which were held up and robbed by those goons at the mouth of the Holland Tunnel. These authorities prove that racketeering was bad enough in 1943 to cause our faces to be set like flint against it. It is worse now."

Since more than 2 years have elapsed since the hearings were held on the original Hobbs bill, it is possible that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary may apopint a subcommittee to hold new hearings. There could be no legitimate objection to such a procedure. However, the supporters of the Hobbs bill want action this time. They do not want the measure to be smothered by inaction in the Senate, the fate that befell the previous bill.

The National Grange and the other farm groups, together with thousands of unorganized farmers throughout the country, want to see agricultural producers freed of the necessity of paying tribute to the teamsters' union. Every decent American joins in voicing the demand that this brigandage must stop.

Conscription and the West Point Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur E. Morgan, from the American Mercury:

CONSCRIPTION AND THE WEST POINT MIND

(By Arthur E. Morgan [1])

The value of compulsory military training has been ably presented, by high Army, Navy, and Government officials, in the press, on the radio, and before congressional committees. Let us now look at the other side.

Both sides agree upon the importance of the proposed step. Hanson Baldwin, the military critic of the New York Times, and an opponent of conscription, says: "Permanent peacetime conscription—universal military training—will profoundly influence our social, economic, physical, and educational life, as well as our military organization." General Marshall, former Chief of Staff and a vigorous exponent of conscription, states in his recent biennial report: "By this method we would establish, for the generations to come, a national military policy."

When a high ranking military man pleads for universal military training does he express an impartial, objective judgment, or does he repeat the traditional doctrine of the military caste?

Two matters of national importance now in the news illustrate the extent of military bias. The question of uniting Army and Navy Departments into one department of national defense finds Army officialdom unanimously in favor of the union, while the naval high command is arrayed just as solidly against it. Dealing with exactly the same facts, the two services reach opposite conclusions. The attitude of the Army in its united front against the proposed MVA (Missouri Valley Authority), which would somewhat reduce Army civilian powers, is another case in point. Only occasionally do circumstances throw into sharp relief this long-standing bent of mind. The powerful Army and Navy drive for compulsory peacetime training cannot be accepted as representing impartial judgment.

The Army works ceaselessly for more power and prestige. It has disclosed no limits to the craving for power. Hanson Baldwin states in Harper's: "Peacetime conscription would certainly increase the stature and authority of military leaders as against civil

[1] Arthur E. Morgan is a prominent educator, civil engineer, and writer on social and economic issues. Now president of Community Service, Inc., he spent 16 years as president of Antioch College and 5 as chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

leaders. The natural human tendency has resulted sometimes in past history in the establishment of a military dynasty, or a professional hierarchy, which has not only influenced but determined foreign and domestic policies (as in Germany and France)."

The Army attitude does not represent lack of personal integrity. Given his indoctrination and the resulting deeply rooted beliefs, the West Pointer would be lacking integrity if he did not stand up for his convictions. The question is whether we want all America to be indoctrinated with the West Point and Annapolis philosophy.

The authoritarian and dictatorial temper of West Point rules the Army. It is not just a régime for training military men, but a cult, with a deep-rooted tradition and philosophy. Few religions or other cults anywhere put their novices through such intense training. Few Americans realize what medieval, coercive indoctrination of young minds goes on at the Academy.

In peacetime, according to Senate Document 91, June 7, 1939, half the United States Army officers are West Point graduates, and most of the others are developed under its influence. In wartime, controlling functions are necessarily assigned to men from civil life, but most ultimate power remains in West Point hands. If present plans for universal training are adopted, West Point will control that program, and all America will be impregnated with the West Point mind. In many historic cases a national ideology has been made over with far less intensive indoctrination than that program implies.

II

Let us take a look at this process. A distinguished reporter has said, "The West Point man is honest, and a polished gentleman. * * * Honor, though not a curriculum subject, is, in fact, the subject best taught at West Point." So much we must grant, but other traits which the academy breeds are not as admirable. A description of a few years back describes how: "The personal idiosyncrasies and secret pride of the men are hunted down and ridiculed. Few cadets come out of the 'beast' barracks with much pride to do their own thinking. * * * The instinct of alert youth to question has been crushed."

An outstanding, independent-minded graduate and former instructor, Col. T. B. Mott, whose record is in Who's Who, stated 10 years ago: "Every hour of every day in the whole years is prescribed by inflexible rules. * * * The moment a boy enters West Point he receives a salary from the Government out of which all his expenses are paid. * * * He never sees or touches his pay—in fact, he is punished if any money is found in his possession." The ruthless, fantastically minute regimentation of his life cannot be described here in detail. "What they make of him in 4 years is subject to almost no outside influence of any kind, whether family, religious, pecuniary or political. * * * 'But,' it will be easily objected (and this is the usual response of West Point to criticism), 'all that was a very long while ago; things have greatly changed since your time.' I have made careful inquiry * * * no change commensurate with the evil has intervened. * * * Amid all the upheaval in American institutions, West Point has stood unaffected in any of its essential characteristics since 1830."

"There is no other educational institution in the world where the student body is so absolutely in the hands of their teachers to make of them what they choose. * * * All of the instructors and all of the professors (except two or three) are Army officers, almost invariably alumni of the Academy. * * * They have had generally no experience in teaching * * * (aside from technical engineering), as a rule they know little beyond what they learned as cadets. * * * This will explain the changelessness which characterizes the curriculum and method of instruction."

Another writer states: "Nearly all textbooks have been written by West Point men. They are taken as the only and final authority in their fields, and to question their authority is a breach of discipline." For a century no cadet was allowed within library doors, except for very brief periods.

There is rigid, antidemocratic stratification of rank, with no courtesies to inferiors. Under this discipline, according to one who knows, nervous disorder appears more frequently than any other except respiratory trouble. * * *

One graduate, Col. C. L. Hall, writing from West Point, stated: "Initiative is welcomed, as it was in prewar German military instruction, but it must be within the scope of the field of knowledge determined by higher authority. A question of the bases of this knowledge certainly is discouraged." He reaches the conclusion, "No reform is possible."

West Point is Prussian in conception. The revered Captain Thayer, who reorganized the Academy in 1817, brought the pattern back with him from Europe, where military institutions rigidly followed the lines of the antidemocratic European governments. Three factors have helped West Point to perpetuate that pattern: the habit of appointing its own graduates to its teaching staff; the admission of immature and impressionable youth, mostly just out of high school; and the system of extreme isolation. In such an environment, the spirit of the young cadet is broken, and his mind is deeply indoctrinated. Only a few exceptionally strong characters withstand that process. A dean of a great university, who had given pre-West Point training to a large number of young men, wrote me a few months ago:

"I believe that compulsory military training is necessary, but not that of the West Point pattern. My personal contacts with the effects of the West Point 'system' on my former students and my knowledge of what my son has accomplished as an Army officer without West Point training have given me an appreciation of what the Military Academy is doing to our young men and an understanding that much of this is, to say the least, un-American, and is wrecking the lives of some of our finest young men.

"I am sure that the present pattern of training is unnecessary and that it is in most ways harmful to the men themselves and to the country. The bases for my strong feeling are chiefly recent personal experiences. * * * What I learned of the effect upon the boys I knew so well saddened me greatly. I found most of these boys no longer the fine, independent, gracious men I had known. Even so soon the 'hardening' process was evident in their faces. Boys 18 and 19 years old seem to be easily bent, but those 21 years old suffer greatly, though they yield against their will, if they stick it out. * * * My son * * * recently was promoted to ———. Throughout his Army years he has been highly successful in the handling of men, and his methods are not those of West Point. With the right men as officers we can, I believe, have the advantages of military training without the Prussian destruction of all that is human and individual."

A major in the Army writes:

"The problem of the West Point clique is certain to become increasingly important over the next few years. Little has been written about it because those of us in direct contact with it are not in a position to express ourselves, and, as a result, the general public is hardly aware that it exists as a social force.

"It is an alarming fact that the Army caste system is accepted with very little resistance by the enlisted men, and there can be no doubt that it will have a permanent effect on a great many of them. The system is, I believe, an essential part of battlefield psychology, but is very detrimental in all of the phases of war which deal with invention, development, and supply in general."

General MacArthur, as Superintendent of the Academy, tried to modernize the institution, but was opposed and eliminated before his 4-year term was completed.

Here and there officers directly from civilian life have endeavored to depart from the Prussian tradition of the Army and to act in a democratic manner. Some of them have had exceptional loyalty and self-discipline in their units. Yet traditional Army autocracy is so nearly universal that the average American takes it for granted as being in the very nature of things, unaware that an effective Army could exist on any other basis. If we put every American boy of 17 or 18 through that same process, the antidemocratic temper will become a national trait.

The repercussions of permanent conscription cannot be judged from the citizen's army now in process of demobilization; the Military Establishment which won the war bears scant resemblance to the one which the generals now hope to impose upon us. In our present selective-service Army, men from 18 to 38, largely mature persons, serve together as a cross section of American life. With the proposed program we would have a uniformly immature group disciplined and indoctrinated by a disciplined and indoctrinated officer and trainer class.

III

Extension of West Point influence would menace long-time military security. Its regimentation and arbitrary subordination to authority has been deadly to alert creative inquiry. For 75 years West Point men have had charge of the Mississippi. About 1875, deepening the outlet of the river was an issue. James B. Eads proposed a system of jetties, an unconventional method. The Army strenuously opposed the "innovation." Eads eventually won, and now his system is fully accepted by the Army engineers.

About 1874 a board of Army engineers, West Point men, made a plan for controlling Mississippi floods by levees and bank protection. Their estimate of the total cost was somewhat less than 5 percent of what the actual cost by their plan proved to be. Then came revolutionary improvements in materials and machinery for construction, yet through half a century this primitive, inadequate plan was adhered to as sacred dogma. Other methods were denounced and ridiculed.

The annual report of the Army engineers, issued early in 1927, stated categorically that the river was now safe from floods. A few weeks later a flood tore the system to pieces, with vast damage. Only then, with accumulated outside pressure, did the Army retreat from its sacred doctrine. Today the methods it condemned for half a century are fully accepted.

In Europe the use of hydraulic laboratories for studying river control problems on a small scale, before spending vast sums in construction, has long been standard practice. Yet the Army steadily opposed this "innovation." Finally a great American engineer, John R. Freeman, at his own expense published a large volume describing in detail the use of these laboratories in Europe. He campaigned for their adoption in America, and finally overcame Army resistance. Today the national hydraulic laboratory is a basic tool of the Army engineers on the Mississippi. * * *

Everyone remembers the unsuccessful efforts of General Mitchell to get recognition in the Army of the significance of the airplane in war. I am told by an able and well-informed physicist that rudimentary radar equipment was designed, built, and furnished to some of our warships during the First

World War. It was not perfect, and was left unused. The equipment lay on shipboard for about a decade, while no one in the Navy showed enough creative imagination to explore its enormous possibilities.

As for the atomic bomb, Alexander Sachs, who was directly effective in bringing the project to the attention of the President, states that both the Army and the Navy were initially uninterested and for a considerable period remained indifferent. This most powerful of all military forces, therefore, like so many other concepts requiring ranging imagination, would have been lost if the West Point and Annapolis judgments had not been overruled by an imaginative President, with the encouragement of the civilian head of the United States Bureau of Standards, Lyman J. Briggs.

There is reason to believe that military shortsightedness continued to impede the atomic bomb project, and there can be no doubt of its well-nigh disastrous influence on the development of science generally. Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, vice president of the Monsanto Chemical Co., had charge of a critical phase of the project—the chemistry and purification of plutonium. He holds that the Army failed utterly to see the significance of science to the war effort, and insisted on drafting science students vitally needed to sustain our national strength. Dr. Thomas said:

"The present selective service policies may have a profoundly adverse effect on the atomic bomb program, and might even cost the United States its head start in atomic bomb research over other nations. * * *

"Postwar scientific research in the United States has been set back by at least from 2 to 4 years by the draftig of young natural scientists. * * *

"Already it will take until 1955 for the universities of this country to catch up with the need for scientifically trained young men at the rate at which that need was growing before the war. * * *

"In contrast with United States policy, both Great Britain and Russia have been careful to conserve their young natural scientific and research talent."

He stated that 20 percent of his research staff now face induction. More are classed I–A than during the war. "It takes 6 or 7 years from high school to give a young man the necessary training for research work, and the moment he finishes this schooling in college and industry he is right in the middle of the draft. The average age of the natural scientists working on the atomic bomb project at Santa Fe was around 30 years."

A committee of foremost men of science, concerned over this issue, selected Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel prize winner in physics, to carry their message to the country. In the course of a Nation-wide radio statement on January 14, 1945, Dr. Compton stated: "When the Nazis came into power, the study of fundamental science was greatly curtailed and even the technical schools fell to roughly 25 percent of their full enrollment. * * * Yet this did not go as far toward destroying their scientific strength as we have gone in weakening our own science in this war." (The Germans later changed their policy; our Army did not.) "If the war should continue for as long as it has already been fought, our present policy of no advanced scientific and technical training will spell national disaster."

In the field of medicine we find similar concern. In the Saturday Evening Post for January 27, 1945, Dr. Evarts A. Graham, former major in the Army Medical Corps, past president of the American College of Surgeons, and member of a committee appointed by the Secretary of War to study the medical needs of the Army, wrote: "The Army and Navy have adopted policies which have already effectively prevented our medical schools and hospitals from continuing the supply of trained doctors for the armed services. * * * Few would believe that the Army, in need of well-trained surgeons, would destroy the only plan of producing them that has been found to work efficiently. Yet that is what has happened."

Senator La Follette wrote (Congressional Record, November 23, 1945): "It is a well-known fact that most of the startling technical progress of the past war came from outside the armed forces. And many a scientist and engineer will bitterly tell you that his developments and contributions were made in spite of, not with the help of, the services."

IV

Military strength, as Hanson Baldwin has pointed out, is not to be confused with peacetime conscription. In this age of science and rapid technological change, the spirit of active creative inquiry is indispensable to military strength; conscription is not. Rocket ships and atomic bombs make it necessary that we have as many resilient, imaginative minds as possible if we are to avoid chaos. West Point straitjackets the minds of its own. Can we expect that the youth of the Nation will escape the deadening impact of its regimentation under a program of compulsory military training which it dominates?

In addition to paralyzing the inquiring spirit, this Prussianization of youth also threatens democracy itself.

* * * * *

Training manual 2000–25, published by the United States Army in 1928 as an official textbook on citizenship for the citizens' military training camps, attacks labor legislation and efforts to outlaw war. Its definition of democracy is illustrative:

"Democracy. A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meetings or any other form of direct expression. Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

Following public objection, this and some other passages were deleted, but the militaristic, antidemocratic tradition which inspired them was not. It is in the blood and fiber of West Point. Significantly, an official Army textbook has also complained that among "the defects in our [national] policy" is "direction of military operations by a civilian Secretary of War."

One benefit claimed for military training is that it improves health and morals. Under the proposed program about a third of the men, those most needing help, would be rejected and not helped. A civilian program would aim to help those most needing help.

Records of the Army and Navy Surgeons General and of the United States Public Health Service indicate that in 1939 the incidence of syphilis in the general population was 5.1 per 1,000, in the Army 29.6, and in the Navy 85.9. As draftees were inducted the rate in the services fell, but as they took on Army and Navy ways it rose again, the rise being very rapid in 1945..

* * * * *

Hanson Baldwin writes, "No one knowing the Army can describe the standard of morals and habits formed there as uplifting. Quite the contrary." The same, of course, is at least equally true of the Navy.

As to the educational value of conscription, two comments sum up the issue. The first is by the New York State Commission on Education: "The kind of obedience that is fostered by military training is not the kind that lasts. It is a temporary subjection of the will which often leads to greater disobedience when military pressure is removed." The second is from a letter on the subject signed by Presidents Conant, of Harvard, Dodds, of Princeton, Day, of Cornell, Hutchins, of Chicago, Sproul, of California State, and seven others: "Military training offers no real solution to national problems of education, health, or responsible citizenship in a free society. Moreover, we do not favor the control of even a year's education of young men by the Federal Government." As another commentator remarked, forcing a high-school boy into military life "will not bring democracy into militarism; it will bring militarism into civilian life and undermine democracy."

One of the strong arguments for universal training is that it is an alternative to a large standing army. This argument is unsound for three reasons. First, the present plan is to keep about 2,000,000 men in the Army and Navy indefinitely. When in the world's history was this less than a great standing army?

Second, according to Hanson Baldwin, the size of the standing army will be practically independent of the presence or absence of universal training. Third, why not give voluntary enlistment a fair trial? The common soldier has been looked on throughout history as a sort of slave, to be paid little more than subsistence. Treat him as an American citizen and pay him as such, and probably enough young men will join the services.

V

By tradition, outlook, training, and on the basis of its record, the Army is simply not qualified to devise a program which will take account of the total national interest.

What can be done? Four things specifically. First of all, we should postpone action on conscription until the subject has been much more fully investigated. The American Council on Education, which includes all the major organizations in the educational field, recommends that the President appoint a national commission of representative leaders from industry, agriculture, labor, the church, education, and the Congress to survey all aspects of the proposed training program—among them its relationship to other aspects of national defense, to the educational system, and to the program of international peace through world organization.

Second, when a national policy is formulated and adopted, then, if it should include some elements of military training, a somewhat similar commission should have overall control of that program, to insure that such training does not destroy the self-directive freedom which is the genius of America, and the source of its long-time strength. The state is only one aspect of society. A wise state will be modest and restrained in exercising power over its subjects. The American concept of life has included a high regard for personal autonomy. Any program, such as peacetime universal compulsory military training, which would require a boy of 17 or 18 to surrender his life philosophy if he has one, and make himself an uncritical and obedient instrument of imposed authority while being indoctrinated in the philosophy of force, would be a blow to freedom.

Third. At present West Point is an antidemocratic outpost in America, with plans to capture America for the spirit of blind obedience, arbitrary power, and rigid caste stratification. It should be reorganized, making it a graduate school, receiving men of greater maturity, and educational background; and all except the explicitly military members of the faculty should be drawn from other educational institutions, where the American spirit survives and modern scholarship prevails. West Point should be Americanized before it Prussianizes America.

Fourth. America should study most carefully the conditions necessary for peace, and not only the conditions necessary for waging war.

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Pioneer Press, of St. Paul, Minn., of March 4, 1946, dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway; an editorial from the Detroit News of February 25, 1946, entitled "Nearer and Nearer To Having the Seaway," and an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 27, 1946, entitled "Cleveland Would Benefit."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of March 4, 1946]

CONGRESS AND SEAWAY

If Congress studies seriously the relation of the Great Lakes to this country's urgent problems of waging World War II, the St. Lawrence seaway undoubtedly will be approved overwhelmingly and quickly as a national defense measure.

For acute shortages in each of the tremendous facilities that are potentials of the Great Lakes weakened and handicapped this country's powers to wage war and later to help itself and the world to postwar recovery.

The first and most important of these potentials is navigation. The absence of the St. Lawrence seaway meant that an enormous burden of transportation between the war-production centers and the sea, which could have been borne by the seaway, had instead to be thrown upon the railroads. That, so far as they were able, the railroads did a great job of transportation goes without saying. But the burden which might have been readily handled with the help of the seaway proved, without it, too much for them. Even yet the world is crying for more commodities from America than there are railroad facilities to move them.

The second of the Great Lakes potentials which could have been developed far more with the seaway than it was without it is the capacity for shipbuilding. At one stage of the war early in 1943, the outcome of the whole conflict hung precariously for months on the supply of shipping. And the vast fleets of big ships that could have been built on the Great Lakes, and that could have sailed out through a seaway to turn the tide of the war were reduced to such small craft and submarines as could be floated out through the existing shallow channel.

The third of the Great Lakes potentials that might have helped win the war faster and with much less loss of life, if only it had been developed, was hydroelectric power. While this country's war industries were crying for fuel in all forms and while people had to live in cold homes because of heavy demands on fuel, the vast power that could have been developed by the St. Lawrence seaway dams continued to run to waste down the river because it was undeveloped.

In the light of the facts, it is utterly amazing that Congress has any more patience with those selfish interests of the East which have blocked the seaway for decades and now are trying to block it again. Does Congress really think and act in terms of this country's national interests in peace and war? Or, as is often charged, does it think in terms of local and selfish pressures against great developments that are needed nationally? The public soon will find out. For it is not the St. Lawrence waterway that now is on trial in Washington. The case for that has been proved and re-proved so often it is now an axiom. It is Congress, including congressional capacity for dealing with national problems in a broad-gaged way, that now is on trial in Washington.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of February 25, 1946]

NEARER AND NEARER TO HAVING THE SEAWAY

The seaway stands a better chance of authorization by Congress than at any previous time.

That is on the word of W. C. Cowling, executive vice president of the National St. Lawrence Seaway Association, who is in Washington to watch the hearings opened last week before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The tidings presumably stirred every Detroit citizen as practically nothing else could. Yet did they?

Every so often, the News feels prompted to explain again what is this seaway, about which old Detroiters at any rate are capable of such enthusiasm.

The seaway is, and has been for over 35 years, a project for admitting ocean commerce to the Great Lakes by providing a 27-foot channel all the way to tidewater. Oddly enough, in view of a generation's heated controversy about the project, this channel depth already is available over 97 percent of the 1,500-mile route. It remains to be provided only in the section of about 50 miles represented by the St. Lawrence River rapids.

Here deep water can be readily obtained, in chief part by dams, which would develop incidentally the immense latent water power of the rapids, and in other part by short canals. This construction in the rapids section is what is ordinarily referred to as the seaway project.

Seven Presidents, each of those from Taft to Truman, have urgently advocated the seaway for its potential contribution to sheer national efficiency in production and distribution. At the current hearings, the War Department, Navy Department, and State Department again, as in the past, have pleaded for it as essential to national defense.

Until now, all this urging has been in vain. St. Lawrence water continues to rush unharnessed to the sea. The 50-mile barrier of the rapids remains impassable, except by such tiny vessels as can traverse the shallow-draft canal built long ago by Canada.

Cost has not been the obstacle to the seaway's completion. The cost, after deducting Canada's share and the sale value of the waterpower, is under $200,000,000, at 1941 prices. This is less than has been spent through the Tennessee Valley Authority, for example, to provide barge navigation on one tributary of the Mississippi. Neither is there the slightest question as to the project's engineering feasibility, the subject of repeated and exhaustive official surveys.

The obstacle, from the beginning until now, has been solely the opposition the project has engendered in a powerful aggregation of vested interests.

Seaboard and Mississippi River ports, the beneficiaries of vastly greater Federal expenditures, have taken a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward the admission of ocean commerce to the Great Lakes. The electric power industry has opposed the seaway as being a public power project. The railroads have fought it as a competing transportation facility, the coal industry by reason of a tie-up with the railroads as well as with private, steam-generated electric power; and so on.

This unholy alliance for more than a generation has fought the seaway in Congress, successfully but, beyond question, mistakenly as to its own true interests. There can be no real doubt that the project's contribution to over-all national welfare would add to the prosperity of the opposing interests at least as much as it could possibly take away.

What would it mean for a city like Detroit? Here the imagination stands in awe of the possibilities. Detroit is the world's largest center of finished manufacturing, the country's largest originator of finished-goods exports. With the seaway, Detroit will become one of the country's greatest seaports.

It will give us new business, new industry, great new avenue of opportunity and employment. It will lend to our local economy a new and much-to-be-desired stability.

What is the seaway? It is something that all Detroiters, newcomers and old residents alike, should demand, support, and fight for.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of February 27, 1946]

CLEVELAND WOULD BENEFIT

If businessmen from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New Orleans should go to Washington and report that their positions as Atlantic seaports were detrimental to the prosperity and growth of those cities and nearby areas, it would be little more difficult to swallow than the testimony of several Cleveland business and industrial representatives before a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would be economically harmful to Cleveland and the entire Ohio and Great Lakes regions.

The absurdity of Cleveland being afraid of becoming an ocean port, plus the inconsistency of the reasons given by St. Lawrence opponents for their opposition will, we hope, convince the Senate committee that this testimony, however sincerely it may have been given, was not representative of the best and most farsighted thinking on this subject in our community.

The inconsistencies in the statements of the opposition are striking indeed. We are told, on the one hand, that there is no economic justification for the project; that not enough goods would be shipped through the waterway to pay for the investment; that there are not enough ocean freighters with sufficiently shallow drafts to attract much seagoing traffic; that the Department of Commerce figures on expected use of the waterway are highly overoptimistic.

But we are also told that completion of the waterway would mean the displacement of "millions of tons of Ohio-produced coal through the opening up of our markets to imported fuels"; that the cheap foreign goods which would flood the country would reduce the American standard of living; that the only benefits would go to "those shipping interests, mostly foreign, which would carry grain out and coal in."

Since the second set of arguments obviously cancels out the first, let us turn our attention to the second group of complaints—those growing out of an expected use of the waterway in international trade.

The assumption that most of the shipping through the waterway would be in foreign-owned bottoms must have been based on 1939 merchant marine figures. In that year, it is true, the United States owned only 20.5 percent of the world's merchant ship tonnage, not including that which belonged to our late enemies. Today, the United States owns 62 percent, not including what is left of enemy merchant ships. Therefore, if the majority of the freighters coming through a St. Lawrence waterway were not American owned it

would be because something had gone wrong with American enterprise.

As a matter of fact, this argument even if based on accurate assumptions would be in the same class as the fear of a lowered American standard of living through the importation of cheap foreign goods. Both are part and parcel of the same bogeyman that the high tariff proponents drag out and dangle before the eyes of the American people each time there seems to be some chance of putting an end to America's economic isolation and restoring international trade to a healthy level.

We hope the people of the United States have learned at last that there is small chance of continued prosperity here or in the rest of the world or of the maintenance of international peace for any extended time without the free exchange of goods between all nations. And we wish, though less hopefully, that the time may be near when Americans will not be fooled into believing that their standard of living would be lowered if they were able to buy more goods for their money. It is indeed distressing to have such an argument presented by representatives of the very industrialists who are trying on the other hand to combat the false philosophy of the New Deal that we can prosper in an economy of scarcity.

There is, of course, among the Cleveland opponents of the seaway an additional fear: that the seaway would cause dislocations in established transportation lines. The railroads and the Great Lakes ship owners are, in other words, disinclined to take a chance on this new competition.

This fear, we believe, is as unjustified as that of the labor union that new labor-saving machinery means unemployment. We know that technological development over the long run has always meant more instead of fewer jobs, and we ought to know that anything which would increase the traffic on the Great Lakes would in the long run mean more income for every type of business activity in this area, including transportation.

In fact, the recent discoveries of high-grade iron ore in Labrador, coupled with the gradual exhaustion of the higher grades of ore in the Superior regions, are two very good reasons why both the railroads, which depend on the continued prosperity of the steel industry in this area, and the Lake carriers should favor the waterway development.

Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers carry an article, Soviet Officer Seized by FBI on Spy Charge. Yesterday's newspapers carried the article, Agent in Canadian Spy Ring Once Hired by United States Communists. It is interesting to note that the recruiting agent for the Soviet espionage ring in Canada was the subject of testimony before the Dies committee in 1939.

The Dies committee files show, among other things, that this recruiting agent, Sam Carr, had been on the pay roll of the Communist Party of the United States, and thousands of dollars had been paid to Carr by William Weiner, financial secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America. Yet today, 7 years later, we find Sam Carr playing a leading role in an international spy ring.

If the current news prove nothing else, it must definitely prove that the retention of the Dies files by a committee of the House of Representatives has proven to be worth while.

The testimony which was given to the Dies committee in connection with Sam Carr bears out also that you can never trust a Communist. Further, that every Communist in America is a potential spy and saboteur. Therefore it is imperative that not only the Committee on Un-American Activities but every other investigative and police organization in the United States be ever vigilant. For the record I give you the testimony during the Dies committee hearings, pages 4808 and 4837, relating to Sam Carr, who has been characterized over the past few days as the recruiting agent for the Canadian spy ring.

Testimony of William Weiner, financial secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America; questioned by Rhea Whitley, counsel for the committee:

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Sam Carr? Who is he and what is his connection with the party?

Mr. WEINER. Sam Carr? I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know about him? Do you know whether he has had any connection with the financial affairs of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Sam Carr. I think Sam Carr is a Canadian.

Mr. WHITLEY. A Canadian?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. A party member?

Mr. WEINER. Whether he is the same I don't know. I don't know whether his name is Sam.

Mr. WHITLEY. Anyway, you are not able to identify him for us?

Mr. WEINER. I think he is in the Canadian party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he an official or just a member?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You don't know whether he has any functional connection?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you had any dealings with him?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; I met him several times.

Mr. WHITLEY. I mean official dealings?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Financial transactions of any kind?

Mr. WEINER. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not remember?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. If you had had any, would you remember?

Mr. WEINER. I suppose if I had, but I don't know.

Congressman STARNES. Is he a banker?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Congressman STARNES. Does he have any relationship to the bank or in the banking business?

Mr. WEINER. I have no idea.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not sure whether you had any transaction with him?

Mr. WEINER. He did not impress me as a banker. Not this Carr.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know whether you have had financial transactions with him; you do not remember that.

The following was from the testimony of Carl H. Marwig, accountant for the Dies committee, who had been checking the bank account of William Weiner. Marwig read out the checks payable in cash and endorsed by William Weiner. Sam Carr, $1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the record show about Sam Carr?

Mr. MATTHEWS. $1,000 drawn to the order of Sam Carr.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he not testify definitely that he had no financial relations with Sam Carr?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. He was asked that two or three times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The check was drawn on a bank in Montreal, Canada.

A Break for Margarine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most able and enlightening editorial entitled "A Break for Margarine?" from the New England Journal of Medicine for March 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BREAK FOR MARGARINE?

During the war, when food rationing was in existence and the housewives of America were indoctrinated with the idea of marketing in terms of nutritional values, certain foodstuffs became popularized and were eventually accepted as adequate substitutes for more orthodox articles of diet. The soybean, as a complete vegetable protein, became a naturalized citizen; oleomargarine, scorned for decades as a result of skilled propaganda on the part of dairy interests, took its place nearly on a level with butter as a satisfactory table fat.

The Journal, in those sober days so recently left behind us, advocated the cause of margarine,[1] for despite its acceptance by the open-minded representatives of public opinion, this valuable and potentially inexpensive food still labored under the handicap of various discriminatory and thoroughly undemocratic acts of legislation. Our normal balance of supply and demand is gradually righting itself, although the world still has many more mouths to feed than it has food for, and the dislocations due to war appear to be succeeded by the dislocations due to peace; and now the time seems to have come to consider the righting of some of our older wrongs. A cataloging of the penalties under which margarine must seek its market furnishes an amazing exhibit.

On the Federal side there is a tax of 10 cents a pound on colored and one-fourth cent a pound on uncolored margarine. The manufacturer of all margarine must pay an annual Federal license fee of $600. The wholesaler must pay an annual license tax of $480 to handle colored margarine, and one of $200 for uncolored margarine. The retailer of colored margarine must pay an annual license fee of $48, and he who sells uncolored margarine, one of $6. Public eating establishments, hospitals, and charitable, religious, and other institutions that serve margarine that they buy and color themselves must pay the yearly manufacturer's

[1] Editorial: Food Fights for Freedom. New England Journal of Medicine, 230: 745, 1944.

license fee of $600, as well as an excise tax of 10 cents a pound.

So far as State penalties are concerned, nine States, including Connecticut, of the New England group, charge a manufacturer's license fee of $1 to $1,000 yearly. Fourteen States, including Connecticut and Vermont, charge a wholesaler's license fee of $1 to $1,000 yearly. Seven States charge an excise tax on all margarine of from 5 to 15 cents per pound. Twelve States, including Connecticut, Vermont, and Massachusetts, charge a retailer's annual license fee of 50 cents to $400. Twenty-four States, including Connecticut, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine, bar the sale of colored margarine.

This, if you please, is to stifle the distribution of a highly nutritious, fundamentally inexpensive article of food of which all or part of the ingredients are farm products of 44 States and that should require no special legislative oversight except, perhaps, that it be served in public under its own name. Government strangles competition, the life of trade, and the butter boys sit pretty.

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Democrat and Chronicle of Rochester, N. Y., entitled "Needs Broader View"; an editorial from the Republican of Springfield, Mass., entitled "Frightening Canada," and an editorial from the Philadelphia Record entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway Has Waited Long Enough."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester, (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of March 2, 1946]

NEEDS BROADER VIEW

We publish today some brief extracts from the statement of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce in opposition to congressional approval of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The essence of the chamber's view, as we gather it from the complete statement from which these extracts are taken, is that the cost to the Nation and to New York State taxpayers will be more than the immediate benefits to be derived.

The chamber suggests an economic survey to show, in the light of new conditions developed since the project first was proposed, whether it is an economically feasible as its proponents claim it to be.

It suggests that cheap power for any large number of private users is a myth, that only industries which can use the power at the sites developed will benefit. It also denies that as a seaway it can sustain itself, and asserts existing private power companies and transportation facilities will not be harmed by the competition.

The tone of much of the chamber statement looks backward, not forward. It is our belief that the new industries the power development will expand are well suited to the type of manufacture which will be most prominent in the next few years: Specifically cheap aluminum for planes and modern railway trains.

If foreign demands for our goods are to be as large as most of us hope, the availability of direct ocean connection for Great Lakes States and communities will facilitate it, without seriously robbing existing transport means.

And we see no reason why power cannot be sold to existing power companies for transmission, if its production is lower in cost than production by other means. At present the difference does not appear to be great, but this may not continue in the future.

We agree that costs have to be measured against possible benefits. But we suggest that the chamber's estimate of benefits is too narrowly appraised.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of March 10, 1946]

FRIGHTENING CANADA

Prof. Edwin Borchard, of the Yale Law School, has testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is still conducting hearings on the St. Lawrence waterway, that "Canada runs great risks in accepting such an unconstitutional procedure" as is involved in the present proposal to authorize our part in the construction of the seaway by means of a bill passed by a majority in both Houses of Congress instead of by a treaty requiring a two-thirds vote in the Senate alone.

Does Professor Borchard expect the Canadians to bow to his authority as a constitutional lawyer superior to all other constitutional lawyers and to withdraw from their part in the project because he tells them that such a bill would not be binding and that any succeeding Congress might reverse and withdraw the authorization of the seaway which it contains?

The fact is that any succeeding Congress can withdraw or reverse anything, if it is so minded and willing to accept the charge of bad faith. If our part in the seaway were once authorized by the passage of the pending bill and that were followed by the necessary appropriation of funds for work to be done, it would still be possible for succeeding Congresses to refuse further funds. It would also be possible, even if a seaway were authorized in treaty form, for succeeding Congresses to refuse the funds necessary for the work of construction, thus making the treaty ineffective. That is one of the chances which anyone who deals with the United States must take.

It is an elementary fact of our system that authorization and appropriation by Congress involve two separate legislative acts. But how much chance is there that after having authorized the St. Lawrence project and presumably made the initial appropriation for it by a similar majority of the two Houses in the same session of Congress, the two Houses in a later Congress would condemn all the millions previously expended to utter waste by refusing the funds to carry the project on?

Professor Borchard's testimony has a strangely reminiscent sound. Is it meant to frighten the Canadians out of their part in the project? If so, it is on a par with the effort of a New York Congressman named Bennett, who in 1911, when the Canadian Reciprocity Act was pending in Congress under the leadership of President Taft, maliciously introduced a resolution for the annexation of Canada. Mr. Bennett relied on the ignorance of the Canadian people that under our system any Congressman can introduce a resolution for anything, including the annexation of the planet Mars, if he so wishes, but that the mere act of introduction by an individual Member does not necessarily mean anything more than irresponsible mischief.

The unfortunate historical fact is that the Canadian people did get scared as a result of the Bennett resolution and other episodes which were unlike it to the extent of being maladroit rather than malicious. The result was that the Canadian Government was defeated in the next election and the bottom knocked out from under the reciprocity agreement—to which both Houses of Congress had agreed—on that side. But one doubts that the Canadian people are to be so easily frightened this time.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of March 13, 1946]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY HAS WAITED LONG ENOUGH

Nobody questions the worth of the Panama Canal.

Twenty-five years hence there will be similar unanimity of approval for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project—if Congress gives that undertaking its approval.

The proposal, pressed vainly for more than 35 years, has been approved by the last 7 Presidents. It calls for a 27-foot channel depth from Atlantic tidewater west through to the Great Lakes.

In effect it would put Detroit and Chicago on the seaboard. They would be directly accessible to seagoing ships.

Selfish interests were opposed to construction of the Panama Canal. That may seem strange now. But the transcontinental railroads disliked the idea of a coast-to-coast water competition for their rails.

This is the same kind of opposition now arrayed against the St. Lawrence seaway.

It is sectional and industrial. It is narrowly selfish, having in common a fear of competition and a disregard for what is in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

The St. Lawrence project, which would be constructed in co-operation with Canada, would open up new economic markets, provide cheaper transportation of goods for millions in the Great Lakes agricultural and manufacturing areas.

It would provide cheap electricity—costing but a quarter of the rates paid now for power in rural New York State.

The waterway, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have testified, would be of tremendous importance in bolstering the security of the Nation and continent in time of emergency.

They told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

That it provided direct, alternate transportation to key areas and facilities for shipbuilding which would be comparatively safe in wartime.

The St. Lawrence seaway would be constructed for the good of the Nation.

Sectional interests and fearful industries must yield to the common good.

The port officials of the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf, and Mississippi are opposed to the St. Lawrence project.

Among them is Philadelphia.

All these ports, including ours, would suffer some loss in shipping once the St. Lawrence seaway were put in operation.

The railroads would lose some transshipment business. The mining interests fear a loss of coal consumption as result of the water power the project will generate.

But all these losses will be temporary.

The St. Lawrence project would mean in time a more prosperous Nation, a Nation more efficiently utilizing its resources.

And thus it would contribute, in the long run, as much to the sectional interests as it takes away.

The St. Lawrence seaway is national progress. We can't stand still without slipping back—because time presses onward.

Let's put the future of the United States of America first—above our own local interests—our hope other sectional interests will follow our example.

General Romulo Pleads for UNRRA Aid For the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 22, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting two news reports of the UNRRA Conference currently taking place in Atlantic City. These two news reports are taken from the Washington Times-Herald and from the New York Herald Tribune, and they relate how Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, blocked an attempt to sidetrack the Philippine request for $100,000,000 in UNRRA aid.

As one of the Members of this House who voted for the appropriation for UNRRA, I cannot understand why the Philippines has so far received only the meager sum of $3,000,000, while a former enemy nation has already received more than $50,000,000, and is now up for an additional $550,000,000. The Philippines is not only our ally, the Filipino people fought loyally for the United States, and thousands of American lives were saved by the loyalty and the heroism of Filipino guerrillas.

I can well understand the disappointment of the spokesman of the Filipino people in this country, General ROMULO, who, according to news reports, had to have a Philippine presentation night at the Hotel Traymore, at which, with charts and graphs, he demonstrated how badly the Philippines need UNRRA aid. The following is the report from the Washington Times-Herald of March 17, 1946:

ROMULO BLOCKS MOVE TO REDUCE UNRRA AID FUND

(By Ruth Montgomery)

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., March 16.—In a dramatic flare-up at the third plenary session of UNRRA late today, Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Filipino delegate, blocked an attempt to sidetrack a Philippine request for $100,000,000 in UNRRA aid.

Lashing out at the steering committee for a decision not to place the 8-month-old plea on the council agenda, ROMULO cried:

"To eliminate this request is a parliamentary trick of dilatory tactics. Our people have suffered a devastation which few have suffered, and all we've got from UNRRA is a measly $3,000,000."

STAND BACKED BY OBSERVERS

ROMULO accused the committee of burying the claim in committee without giving the Filipino delegate a chance to present his case.

A group of American observers from civic and labor groups loudly applauded ROMULO's victory.

Following is the report from the New York Herald Tribune of March 17, 1946:

ROMULO ATTACKS UNRRA ON PHILIPPINE AID—TELLS COUNCIL HIS COUNTRY HAS BEEN IGNORED; CALLS NEED FOR HELP URGENT

(By Carl Levin)

ATLANTIC CITY, March 16.—A bitter denunciation of dilatory tactics by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, denying 18,000,000 Filipinos urgently needed assistance, was leveled at the organization late this afternoon by Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Islands to the United States.

The fiery general, delegate of his commonwealth to the UNRRA Council meeting now under way here, electrified the previously peaceful deliberations with a flat charge that "We have been ignored." Pleading, he said, for "help, urgent and immediate, for a people who have suffered devastation of war as very few have suffered," he protested vigorously against an effort to keep the Philippine request for aid in committee rather than permit it to be heard on the floor as an item on the Council's agenda.

The request, he reminded the Council, was first made in June 1945. Since then, he said, the Philippines in their quest for help have been "victims of circumstances." For 6 months, he explained, the Army asked the Philippine government to leave relief to the military. As a result, while it was pointed out on the floor that a former enemy nation like Italy has received comparatively vast assistance and is now up for an additional $550,000,000, the Philippines have received only $3,000,000 out of the UNRRA general fund.

The following is General ROMULO's address at the Philippines presentation night at the Hotel Traymore on March 19, 1946:

INTRODUCTION

Ladies and gentlemen, you have seen two films that portray the distress of the Philippines in an emotional way. Now I want to give you the facts and the figures and show you some charts that will round out the story most dispassionately.

Our story is a simple one. Before the war our country, like many of the countries represented here in Atlantic City this week, was built on a firm foundation. It was moving toward ever-greater good for an ever-increasing number of our people. Then the war came, and after it the familiar wake of destruction and suffering. Now we want to get back on our feet. We think—we hope—we know—that ultimately we shall be able to do so. But it will take time. And during that time, we need help. That is why we need the help of UNRRA.

The charts behind me, which I shall uncover one by one in a kind of intellectual strip tease, may be helpful in making our story clear. I will try to depict to you tonight the needs of my people.

Let us look first at some of the basic facts about the prewar Philippines.

I. PREWAR ECONOMY

By the standards of our part of the world the Philippines was a prosperous nation before the war. We had the highest standard of living of any land in the Far East.

This massive pillar that you see here is a simplified conception of the prewar economy of the Philippines. Here at the top is the population of the Philippines. Before the war, according to the last census, there were a little over 16,000,000 Filipinos—hard-working, ambitious, hopeful human beings intent on creating a new country that would soon be independent and would take its rightful place among the family of free nations.

By and large, ours was a sound economy. It was built around the production and export of raw materials—such as sugar, cordage, tobacco, coconut products—and on the importation of finished products. These two blocks in the middle of the pillar of our prewar economy represent, first, the consumption, and second, the production of our country. Much of what we produced before the war was, of course, consumed at home. But we were basically a trading nation, and our import and export trade was essential to our expanding prosperity.

Like all economies, ours was based on physical property here at the foundation of the entire structure. Physical property is something more than land and natural resources. It is a matter of draft animals like our ubiquitous carabao, of warehousing, of equipment of all kinds. It is a matter of mills and factories and commercial establishments. And, for an insular trading nation, it is a matter of transportation. The Philippines is an archipelago, a tightly knit web of islands, bound together, not only by highways and railroads, but more especially by the inter-island shipping and the port facilities without which ships are nearly useless.

Add all these factors together, and you have a solid column that represents the national economy of the Philippines before the war. It covers all of our natural resources, including our greatest natural resource—the people of the Philippines, 19,000,000 today and about 45,000,000 40 years from today. It covers our national wealth, which was producing a national income of $760,000,000. It covers our production and our consumption. It is a picture of a solid structure, complete and expanding.

That is the picture of the Philippines before the war. It is accurate as of December 7, 1941. Then the war came and the enemy invaded our soil. We fought back, alongside our American comrades, but in the end Bataan fell, and Corregidor, and there swept over the land the dark curse of the Japanese occupation. For 3 years the enemy ruled our country. He looted, he stole, he wasted, he exploited. When, at long last, the counterattack came, and the liberation campaign began, our homeland became a shambles, a vast sea of wreckage, an arena of devastation. What was not destroyed in the fighting itself was demolished by the Japanese in a frenzy of frustrated spite. You have seen from the film how great the destruction was. Let me show you how a graph portrays the extent of destruction caused by the war in the Philippines.

II. WAR DESTRUCTION

The destruction of physical property was relatively greater in the Philippines than in perhaps any other country in the world. You have seen how great it was in the film. These were not special shots taken of especially devastated areas. They are not the exception. They are are the rule. In the city of Manila, the most modern and valuable sections—offices and industrial buildings, homes, schools, churches—suffered the greatest damage. Whole sections of the city—over half the developed area—have been wiped out. Sixty-five percent of prewar Manila simply does not exist today. In Cebu, our second largest city, there is not even as much as that. The city is totally destroyed—or let me withdraw that statement so that I shall not be accused of exaggeration. The city of Cebu is only 90 percent destroyed. When cities are destroyed, as ours have been, homes are not the only victims. Our public utilities, our terminals and wharves and factories and warehouses and commercial establishments and public buildings, are victims too—in short, our basic economic system.

In the farm areas there has been devastation, too. Nearly 70 percent of our carabao are gone. So is most other livestock, farm equipment, feed supplies. Rural industry has been virtually wiped out. We had, for example, 162 lumber mills in the Philippines before the war. Today 73 are completely destroyed, and the other 89 are so badly damaged that they cannot operate.

Our shipping, the red blood corpuscles of our inter-island arteries of trade, is 95 percent wiped out.

Here, right before your eyes, is a visualization of what has happened to that solid block

in the first chart. Chopped away from it is 61 percent of our total physical property—excepting only the land, which even the war could not take away from us.

Of all our public property, 55 percent is gone.

Of all our private property, 61 percent is gone.

Of all our shipping, 95 percent is gone.

That is a picture of what is left in the Philippines today. Now let us take a look at what the effects have been.

III. EFFECTS

You see here a whole structure undermined and top-heavy, ready to topple over into the desperate abyss of chaos and everlasting misery.

Our productiveness is gone. Without seed, livestock, factories, mills, highways, shipping, and ports, we cannot produce our normal products, and our export trade is virtually nil. During the first year since liberation, we will have exported less than $1,000,000 worth of goods. We were practically self-sufficient in rice, which is our staple food. Now we are not going to be able to produce even 70 percent of our needs. We were one of the greatest sugar-producing areas of the world. Now we must import sugar for our own domestic consumption.

We have no draft animals. That means that one-third of our arable land will go uncultivated this year. We have no breeding stock. That means we shall not be able to replace our draft animals so that this land may be cultivated next year. In our misery, ladies and gentlemen, we are faced now with famine.

As for our consumption—in the year 1946, at the present rate, we shall have imported about one-half of what we normally imported in a prewar year. Unless some changes are made in our financial situation, we will not be able to keep even that rate going for very long.

And here, at the top of the pillar, we have the people of the Philippines. They have increased in numbers since the last census. According to the best available statistics, there are now about 19,000,000 people living in the Philippines. Most of them have felt the effects of the war. Some of them, especially those who were able to take advantage of the influx of money when American troops arrived in the Philippines in large numbers, have been able to support themselves at least partially. But today the troops are gone, and the money that was circulating so freely in the Philippines is leaving now. Our balance of trade is not merely unfavorable today; it is impossible.

One segment of the population today is not merely suffering. It is faltering, ready to drop out and collapse by the wayside. That segment is the tragic corner of this cube. It represents 1,645,000 human beings who are absolutely destitute: The indigents of the Philippines.

You who are familiar with the work of UNRRA do not need to be told what an indigent looks like. The word itself is not very descriptive. But it stands for the little child with the stomach grotesquely bloated from hunger—for the haggard mother who has nothing to cover her nakedness—for the sick, the disabled, the workless, the homeless.

Look carefully at this chart, and look especially well at the cracked, tragic segment of the destitute. It is for them I plead tonight.

IV. ULTIMATE RECONSTRUCTION

Ultimately, the Philippines will once again be rebuilt. Our people will once again go about their work. Manila will once again be the Pearl of the Orient Sea.

Our entire economic structure will be restored, as public property and private property and shipping are replaced or rebuilt or repaired. And the foundations of our national economy will be solid once again.

In order to achieve this goal, we are looking to the United States for much of the help we must have. There is pending before the United States Congress a Philippine war damage bill that will provide funds to carry out a great portion of the rehabilitation necessary for this purpose. This legislation, once it is passed by the House and Senate, will give us perhaps 60 percent of the money we shall need.

Meanwhile, we also look to ourselves for help. Insofar as an impoverished government can get the wheels of industry and agriculture turning again, our government is trying to do so. We are striving desperately to maintain essential governmental services, and to reestablish national production. Private interests, too, are busy. Businessmen in the Philippines, under our system of free enterprise, are pulling themselves up by their bootstraps. But both our government and our private interests can operate to only a limited extent.

There is a third possible source for ultimate reconstruction in the Philippines—and that is the possibility of reparations from Japan. At the present time, no one can safely predict how much or how soon the Filipino people will be repaid for the ravages of war caused by the rapacious Japanese war machine.

The picture, as you see it, is a hopeful one. But to stop here would be to mislead you.

The plain truth is that it is a picture of a future possibility. The pending legislation has not yet even been passed by the United States Congress. When it is passed, it cannot be put into operation until another piece of pending legislation—the Philippine trade relations bill—is also passed.

And when the war damage bill becomes an act, and when this act is finally put into operation, it will take a year or even a year and a half before its effects will be felt in the Philippines. There has been a good deal of misunderstanding on this point. I want to clear it up right now. There is not a single proposed bill before the United States Congress designed to meet the relief requirements of the Filipino people. There is not a single bill that will help the people who need help now—the 1,645,000 war-created indigents in the Philippines.

And so we have a vacuum of misery between this moment and the time when ultimate reconstruction will really begin to be felt in the Philippines.

V. IMMEDIATE NEEDS

This is not a surrealistic drawing. This is a true picture of an economy that has become rotten because of the war. It is undermined and top-heavy. It must be bolstered now.

The 1,645,000 destitute Filipinos cannot wait for the slow process of economic reconstruction to take effect. The swollen abdomen of the starving child cannot be cured by promises of future redemption. It must be transformed into normal flesh and muscle by food and care. Our children, our women, our jobless men, our sick and hungry, need rescue. They can only survive if they receive direct and immediate relief.

This prop here, which represents the direct relief for which we ask, will temporarily hold up the tottering structure. But it needs a further support beneath it, so that it can be firmly planted, not in midair, but on the ground. That is the support provided by urgent and immediate rehabilitation measures, measures which cannot wait.

There are critical points in agriculture, in industry, in transport, which cannot be delayed for 18 months. If we are ever to produce food for our people, we must have farm animals. If we are ever to set the wheels of industry in motion, and thereby provide jobs for the unemployed, we must make the immediate repairs that will put some, at least, of our production back into operation. That is the reason for the rehabilitation prop which holds up the bottom part of this structure.

We are asking UNRRA to meet these immediate needs in order to prevent the complete collapse of our national economy and the destitution of our entire population.

VI. ONE HUNDRED AND THREE MILLION DOLLARS

Our UNRRA request of this year covers the 12-month period from April 1 to March 31 of next year.

First. We are asking for $821,970 for medical supplies. It is true that the Philippine Government has already established many of our hospitals, clinics, and child-care centers. But, in order to keep those institutions functioning, we must have medical supplies, drugs, equipment. An undernourished people is an unhealthy people. We must check the spread of disease, prevent the danger of epidemic. To do this, we need the help of UNRRA.

Second. We are asking for $4,398,000 for clothing. Before the war the average Filipino required approximately 15 square yards of textiles a year. Today our indigents are virtually naked. During the coming year they will need at least 12 square yards of textiles to clothe themselves. That adds up to 20,740,000 square yards. At 20 cents a square yard, the cost will be $4,148,000. We are asking for another $250,000 for sewing materials—for thread, needles, scissors, and all the other little items that turn textile into clothing.

Third. We are asking for $19,704,000 for food for our indigents. They need rice, corn, root crops, fruits, fish and fish products, meat and meat products, sugar, salt, and other basic foods in order to keep alive. They need 529,871 metric tons of food during the coming 12 months. Our own production can provide 78 percent of what our people need. The other 22 percent must come from abroad. Those who have the money in the Philippines will pay for the food they consume. Those who do not have the money—the indigents—must either be given the food they need or they must die.

Fourth. We are asking for $29,928,000 for shelter. Except for the efforts of bomb and fire victims themselves, almost nothing has been done to meet the emergency shelter problem of the Philippines. In Manila alone, about 100,000 people live in barong-barong shacks made of salvaged tin and lumber, in the ruins of bombed and burned buildings, in packing boxes. They live in conditions that would shock even the most callous social worker. Already the tuberculosis rate has skyrocketed to between three and five times what it was before the war. The same conditions exist in Cebu, Iloilo, Davao, Zamboanga, Tacloban, Baguio, Benguet, Bontoc, San Fernando, and throughout the country. Outside Manila, at least 500,000 people are virtually without shelter. They have one consolation—that there is no harsh winter in the Philippines such as the people of Europe must undergo. But we, too, have our weather. We have rain and storm and typhoon, and we have the hot sun of the Tropics. For the emergency needs of our homeless, we must have help in the erection of shelter camps such as UNRRA has frequently provided in Europe. There is enough material in the Philippines—surplus military stores, products of rehabilitated sawmills, local labor—to build shelter camps such as UNRRA has frequently provided in Europe. There is enough material in the Philippines—surplus military stores, products of rehabilitated sawmills, local labor—to build shelter camps for 100,000 destitute families at a cost of about $200 per family. In addition, these people must have schools, clinics, laundries, toilets, and all the minimum necessities of human life. They must have management and maintenance assistance. The total cost will run to just under $30,000,000. We are asking UNRRA for this money.

These four items—medicine, clothing, food, shelter—are the basic emergency relief requirements of our indigents in the Philippines.

But, unless something further is done, these people will continue to be indigents at the end of the year of help. They will not be able to support themselves unless they receive another kind of relief—the relief provided by emergency rehabilitation.

It is possible for the Philippines, during the coming year, to be much more nearly self-sufficient in food and shelter than it is today. The land and labor are there, and so are the natural resources. Coconut oil for human consumption, coconut cake for animal food, can be produced as soon as we have inter-island shipping. Lumber can be turned out in large quantities as soon as the mills begin to operate. If we have cane sugar points, processing machinery, warehouses, shipping, work animals, and tractors, we can increase our production of rice, sugar, hemp, and tobacco.

So far, we have not been able to do any of this. The Army has only contributed partial repair of highways and bridges, some automotive and engineering equipment, a few ships and small craft. The U. S. Commercial Company has helped to restore trade, but has done little to help restore production. The congressional legislation has not yet been enacted, and will not be felt for a long time. We need to get to work now.

There are some industries of little or no consequence in meeting basic relief needs. We do not ask for assistance in their rehabilitation. There are some industrialists and some farmers who are financially able to reestablish their enterprises through normal commercial credit and purchase channels. Of course, we do not ask UNRRA to aid them. But we do ask assistance for those small farmers, fishermen, processors, and the like who before the war produced most of the rice, corn, raw sugar, and copra. They are now without funds to buy the things necessary to get back in production.

Therefore, we are asking UNRRA to aid that portion of Philippine rehabilitation—and only that portion—which, by accelerating the production of rice, fish, oils, sugar, lumber, and fiber, can assist in meeting urgent relief needs in the Philippines. At the same time this kind of production could also help to meet some of the needs of other countries now receiving aid from UNRRA. In the light of the world's shortage in fats, oils, sugar, and lumber, it would seem good sense to get such a program started fast.

And so we need, first of all, $12,200,000 for transportation and communications. With this money we can break the paralysis of the Philippines. We can restore the railway lines on Luzon, Panay, and Cebu. We can reestablish the privately owned industrial railroads. We can acquire three inter-island ships, of 2,000 tons each, to be used solely for distribution of relief materials among the islands of the Philippines. We can rehabilitate our essential telephone, telegraph, and radio systems.

Second, we need $16,050,000 for immediate industrial rehabilitation and public utilities. For the sugar industry, the coconut industry, the tobacco industry, and others of equal importance, it will cost $10,000,000 merely for emergency repairs and parts and supplies, with which they can start operating. The lumber industry, which suffered tremendous losses as a result of the war, needs at least $2,660,000. The fishing industry needs at least $1,127,500. We need more than half a million dollars to repair the metropolitan water system of the city of Manila and surrounding towns. We need about the same amount to repair some of the units of the Caliraya hydroelectric plant, which supplied electric power to thousands of homes and industries. If we can get this help from UNRRA, we shall be furnishing direct relief to the indigents and to the entire nation, by providing jobs and by the first steps toward normal national production.

Third, and probably most important, we need $20,123,500 for agricultural rehabilitation. Thousands of Filipino farmers have lost all their mechanical equipment, their work animals, their livestock, their farming supplies. On the farm, we have been set back a hundred years. In a land of fertility there is an acute shortage of foodstuffs, stretching even to the rural areas.

We must begin at once to rehabilitate our farms. We must replenish our supply of work animals. Seventy percent of our carabaos are gone because of the war. Unless something is done, and done quickly, between 30 and 40 percent of our arable land cannot be cultivated this year. Our plan is to spend a little over $5,000,000 for 65,000 Cambodian or Siamese carabaos and Australian and Indo-Chinese water buffaloes. These we can use for breeding purposes, and in a short time we will once again have the millions of work animals so essential for our farming. In addition, we must have—right away—farm machinery, trucks and other transportation machinery, fertilizers, insecticides, seeds, dairy equipment, poultry, hatching eggs.

That is the total picture of our immediate needs. We are appealing to UNRRA for help in filling these needs. Once we have filled them, we shall have built the temporary prop which will support the whole structure until the long-range rehabilitation program begins to be felt.

We have the human resources. We have the natural resources. But, because of the war, we have lost the tools of production, and we are burdened with more than a million and a half destitute human beings who cry out to the world for help. We are sending our SOS to UNRRA now. We ask to be rescued.

Report of Joint Mediator in Westinghouse Electric Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report by William H. Davis and Arthur S. Meyer, joint mediators in the Westinghouse Electric dispute. The report is dated March 25, 1946.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
March 25, 1946.

The Honorable LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On January 22, 1946, you appointed us joint mediators in the dispute between Westinghouse Electric Corp. and United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO. That dispute arose out of the union's demand for a wage increase of 25 cents an hour for all Westinghouse employees represented by it. The dispute led to a strike of some 75,000 Westinghouse employees, which began on January 15, 1946, and is still in effect.

On March 19, 1946, 9 weeks after the beginning of the strike and 8 weeks after the appointment of the mediators, the company made to the union its first offer of a wage increase. That offer is attached to this report.

Meanwhile, the union's demand of 25 cents an hour wage increase had been compromised in both the General Electric strike case and the General Motors controversy at 18½ cents an hour, and in the RCA controversy at 17½ cents an hour and six paid holidays. These compromises within the electrical industry followed the general wage pattern reflected in industry-wide settlements in other mass-production industries, including steel, oil, rubber, and automobiles, all of which were settled at or near 18½ cents an hour across the board.

Though the company's proposal of March 19 takes the form of an 18½-cent offer, it is in substance neither an across-the-board offer nor an offer of 18½ cents or 17½ cents an hour in any of the classifications to which it applies. It is subject to the following conditions:

1. The lamp department, containing approximately 10 percent of all employees, is excluded from the general offer. Under its special lamp department offer the company calculates that these 10 percent of its employees will receive a small wage increase, if any.

2. The company proposes to deduct 1 cent per hour from the 18½ cents offered and to use the equivalent of 1 cent per hour across the board toward the elimination of discriminatory sex differentials. The National War Labor Board in case 111–17209–D had recommended the elimination of such differentials in an amount exceeding an average of 1 cent an hour and had made other recommendations as well. Since the company demands that its offer be accepted in full settlement of the issues involved in these War Labor Board recommendations, the 1-cent-an-hour proposal of the company is not a wage offer, but an offer to compromise an existing claim at less than its full amount and less than the union would be willing to accept even if there were no present wage controversy.

3. The company proposes to eliminate the bonus paid to day workers and calculates that this elimination, after crediting substitute hourly wage allowances suggested by the company, involves an average reduction of 7½ cents an hour for the 45 percent of its hourly employees engaged on a day-work basis.

4. The company proposes unilaterally to establish new incentive procedures and techniques. No estimate is given of the reduction involved but it will be substantial for the 55 percent of the company's hourly employees engaged on an incentive basis.

5. Several minor reductions, included in the company's proposal, are too small to need recital here.

The company has calculated its proposal as the equivalent of a 15.1-cent-an-hour wage increase for those to whom it would apply. For the same group the union estimates the wage increase at 9.7 cents an hour. The discrepancy is in part accounted for by the fact that the company has included the 1 cent allowed for the elimination of sex differentials and has excluded the important changes in incentive pay. Giving weight to these factors the company's offer is substantially less than 15 cents an hour, though indeterminate incentive changes and other variables preclude accurate analysis. Furthermore, the company's offer, unlike the settlements made by the union with other companies in the electrical industry, does not cover all employees. It excludes the employees in the lamp department.

On March 20 the union rejected the company's offer and proposed a wage increase of 18½ cents an hour across the board, the return to work of all employees without discrimination, the negotiation of all other items of the 1946–47 contract for a period of

30 days, and the submission of unresolved issues to arbitration. That counterproposal is included in a letter to the company of which a copy is attached.

On March 21 the company rejected the union's counterproposal.

On March 22 the union submitted to the mediators a proposal to proceed immediately with discussion of the incentive system and the day workers' bonus. It expressed a willingness to negotiate all alleged abuses of the incentive system which during the war had caused departures from the basic purpose of that system and had resulted in either excessive or inadequate incentive carnings. Furthermore, the union withdrew objections to the principles of the company's proposal that the day workers' incentive bonus should be replaced by fixed hourly wage allowances, but desired to discuss the amounts of the wage allowances and their relation to the wage structures in the several plants.

The mediators thereupon requested the company to accede to these suggestions of the union, but the company refused to negotiate further or meet with the union unless the union would agree in advance to accept all money terms of the company's offer without change.

The basic position of the company from the beginning was (1) that it should not be called upon to make the general wage increase made by its competitors because, as the company alleged, it was already paying substantially higher wages than those competitors; (2) that during the war its incentive system, based upon time studies, had gotten out of line, resulting in excessive incentive earnings not represented by the intended corresponding increase in production and this must not be carried forward into the conversion period, and (3) that a complete settlement must be made now of all the terms and conditions of the 1946–47 contract.

The union's position was (1) that there must be a general wage increase to the Westinghouse employees the same as or equivalent to the general wage increase granted by the General Motors electrical division, by General Electric, and by RCA; (2) that it was prepared to correct by negotiation any abuses that had grown up in the incentive system, and (3) that upon settlement of the wage issue and return to work, it was prepared to proceed immediately to negotiate all other terms and conditions of the 1946–47 contract, leaving any unsettled issues to arbitration.

Early in the proceedings the company took the position that it would make no wage offer until it had discussed with the union the other changes it desired to make in the contract. The union initially argued that in the interest of both parties the strike could and should be ended by an agreement on wages and that other demands of the company and the union should be left for future negotiations. This is the course that was adopted in the General Electric and General Motors cases. However, since the company refused to change its position on the ground that the requested discussions might affect its wage proposal, the union eventually agreed to proceed with the demanded discussions on the basis of 13 topics which the company had brought forward on February 14. It was following these discussions that the company made its offer of March 19.

The existing contract provides that either party may terminate it on 30 days' notice. The company had given the required notice to terminate the contract on April 1, 1946. All parties, the company, the union, and the mediators, recognized the tragic implications of a termination of the contract before a new agreement had been reached, and the union suggested that this notice be withdrawn, or that the parties agree to a continuation of the terms and conditions of the old contract, after settlement of the wage issue and return to work, for an agreed period of time reasonably sufficient to permit full discussion and negotiation of the new contract provisions. The company refused to accept either of these suggestions.

When, on March 19, the 25-page proposal was finally submitted to the union by the company with an accompanying letter saying that "this proposal expires at midnight March 31, 1946," it seemed clear to the mediators that, unless the company's proposal were to be considered as an ultimatum, the remaining 12 days of the month would not be sufficient for a reasonable negotiation or mediation of the many provisions of the company's proposal. The mediators, therefore, formally requested the company to agree to an extension of the time. This request the company formally refused.

The refusal of the company on March 22 to continue negotiations or meet with the union unless its wage offer was accepted in full together with its refusal to extend the contract for a reasonable period created conditions that made mediation impossible. Accordingly, the mediators withdrew in the afternoon of March 22, and now render this report to you.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM H. DAVIS.
ARTHUR S. MEYER.

Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Hon. E. EUGENE COX, of Georgia, at a Jackson Day dinner held in Mobile, Ala., on March 25, 1946:

My friends, I come as a southern Democrat to speak to southern Democrats which means that I come as a self-respecting and freeman to counsel with self-respecting and free people, all bound alone by conscience and the will to do right.

If my words give offense, either here or elsewhere, then I can but plead that it were better so than that the truth be not told. Truth is something we owe our own characters and is a debt that must be paid. The time has come for Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democrats to stand up and be counted for America. Alien-minded Americans, combined with alien-minded aliens, are trying to drive decent men and women out of the Democratic Party. These aliens, and these alien-minded Americans, have determined to purge from the party of Jefferson and Jackson the men and women in public life who believe in the principles in which Jefferson and Jackson believed. They are determined to appropriate the label of the Democratic Party and then to distort and torture it into a grotesque and utterly dangerous caricature of the old party, and to make of it an instrumentality by which to destroy our American traditions, subjugate this Nation, destroy our constitutional Government, our free economy and our free society. The goal of these political marauders is the complete destruction of the bill of rights. They mean to silence, by force, by fear, by any means they can, every American who loves his country, who loves liberty, who stands for Americanism, who refuses to become the serf and slave of some foreign dictator.

I know it is difficult for you, as it is difficult for me, to conceive what kind of creature an American, born in this, the grandest country in the world, living under this, the grandest Government in the world, enjoying the highest living levels, the greatest degree of personal liberty, receiving the best wages, having comforts never even heard of in Russia and other Old World countries, can be to become so twisted in his or her thinking as to want to exchange all that for slavery and servitude under some alien Asiatic dictator. And yet, strange as it is, there are a large number of Americans so deluded as to want to do that. There are other Americans who simply do not see through the clever propaganda, and who are misled by glowing falsehoods and glittering promises.

It has recently been proposed in high places that men and women, Democrats and Republicans, be required to follow their leaders, obey their leaders, let their leaders do their thinking and their deciding for them on all important issues—or be purged from their respective parties and driven from public office and public life. That, fellow southern Democrats, is the identical leadership principle which Hitler devastated the world trying to establish—with himself and his criminal cohorts to be the leaders and masters. That is the identical principle that has existed in Japan for centuries. It is the identical principle Mussolini set up in Italy, and under which he purged and imprisoned and assassinated until his own outraged people shot him and hung him up by the heels in the public market place.

That is the identical principle which exists in Soviet Russia today where no man dare so much as indicate that he does not agree with the leaders unless he wants to be purged and shot. In Russia a man dare not breathe his own innermost convictions in the bosom of his own family; where the Ogpu is a terror by night and a scourge by day to those who dare in the slightest manner to disagree with the leaders. That is the principle which has been proposed in high places for America and Americans—and the proposal has been made in the last week or two. It is a damnable proposal against which every red-blooded American ought to rise up and must rise up in wrath and beat down.

America has grown great because of our Bill of Rights. America is the strongest, the greatest, and still the most prosperous nation on the globe today because under our American Government, our American laws, and our American traditions each individual citizen has enjoyed the freedom and the privilege of following the leaders just so long as they were right—and of leaving them and their leadership when their policies became wrong. Mr. Jefferson once said:

"The attempt which has been made to restrain the liberty of our citizens * * * interchanging sentiments on what subject they please * * * has come upon us * * * earlier than I expected. To demand the censors of public measures to be given up for punishment is to renew the demand of the wolves in the fable that the sheep should give up their dogs as hostages of the peace and confidence established between them."

To adopt any such policy of leadership as is proposed, to purge men and women from their parties and from public office because they will not take the orders, and follow blindly the policies of self-appointed leaders, would be to insult and degrade every drop of blood ever shed by American men and women patriots for liberty in the past. It would be to betray every drop of blood shed by our heroic men and women in this last long struggle. We sent them out to fight, and to be wounded, and to die if necessary to wipe out in righteous indignation that very leadership principle of Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese war lords which now is proposed here in free America as the pattern which we must follow.

America has grown great, my friends, because the first leader and the final leader of American men and women has been in the case of each, his or her own conscience.

America is not merely a name, a land, a country, a continent; America is a symbol. It is an ideal, the hope of the world.

John Stuart Mill said:

"A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if, by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it."

I want to warn you, my friends, that this communistic agitation in this country is not the haphazard yelpings of half-baked, crackbrained, mentally diseased agitators. If you study all the moves you find a very definite pattern showing itself. It is a cleverly planned, highly organized, thoroughly financed, and skillfully executed pattern. I shall outline this pattern for you.

Abroad, the officials of the Soviet Government make a studied practice of breaking every agreement they have made, secret or public. They have violated every single provision of the much-heralded, nonexistent Atlantic Charter. They have broken solemn agreements made at every conference between the Big Three Powers.

Headlines everywhere converge on Russian aims and Russian deeds. Russia is in Iran when she agreed to be out of Iran by March 2. Russia has demanded control of the Dardenelles. Russia is pressing her absurd claims to Tripolitania. Russia rules Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and Finland. Russia has demanded 67,000 acres of land from starving Austria to supply fresh vegetables, milk, and meat for the Soviet occupation forces. Russia has looted every German factory and every German mine in her zone of occupation. Russia, who fought 8 days in the Pacific war while China fought 14 years, is in possession of the most productive areas of Korea and has pirated both Chinese-owned and Japanese-erected factories in Manchuria. Scripps-Howard commentator William Philip Simms describes present-day Russia as reaching "from Stettin to the Kuriles. Already it includes 250-000,000 people and Soviet expansion is still on the march."

In China they are stirring up a great part of that ancient people to communistic doctrine. They are at work this very hour doing the same thing in Japan, but well down under cover.

That is the pattern abroad. Meanwhile the Soviet officials refuse to permit the nationals of any other country, including those of the United States, to go into Russia or to report conditions there. While demanding help from UNRRA the Soviet officials refuse point blank to let UNRRA officials go into Russia or to supervise the distribution of food there.

In Germany the Russians refuse to permit any American or other Allied military officers within the zones controlled and occupied by the Russian Armies.

Now what about conditions on the American Continent?

Information given to the Canadian House of Commons by Prime Minister Mackenzie King about the espionage activities of Soviet Russia have grave import for our country. On March 18 Prime Minister King told the Canadian House of Commons that Soviet Russia was using Canada as a base of operations for spy activities in Canada and the United States. He further stated that a fifth column is being formed by Soviet Russia in the United States.

Such action as it is now established Russian officials are engaged in certainly are not necessary to peace and friendship. Is this the nation to which we sent nine or ten billions of dollars worth of lend-lease—in other words gift materials—which saved Russia when she was fighting with her back to the wall?

It is time for straight thinking, for a courageous facing of facts, and for plain speaking. Soviet Russian officials are not establishing a fifth column in the United States as an aid to peace between the two nations. The only purpose a Russian fifth column in the United States could serve would be to cripple our industries, sabotage our defense, blow up our water works, and our sanitary systems in our great industrial centers, set off incendiary bombs, atom bombs and, perhaps, germ bombs, in event Russia should go to war with the United States. Every citizen knows the United States will never deliberately go to war with Russia.

The Russian masses of people are not responsible for these actions, or this state of affairs. The Russian people are simply so many slaves in the hands of Joe Stalin and his cohorts. They can do nothing to prevent or to influence any actions their dictator may see fit to take.

Stalin and his colleagues who rule Russia are fully aware that the United States does not want war with Russia. They know the United States does not want any more war with anybody. But the fact remains that certain unmistakable moves are being made which cast the shadow of another war in the near future over the horizon—and Stalin is that shadow. Instead of reducing his armies, Stalin is reported to be determined to keep an army of about four times the United States Army. The Soviet Army is now three times as big as ours.

Stalin was originally the partner of Hitler in a nonaggression pact which permitted Hitler to start World War II. At that time the Communists in the United States picketed the White House; they denounced the war as an imperialistic war. They sabotaged, brought about strikes, and in every other way possible sought to cripple the United States and prevent us from going into the war.

When Hitler invaded Russia and Stalin had to fight—not because he wanted to but because he had to—the Communists and their fellow travelers in the United States suddenly changed their tune and their tactics overnight. They were all for the United States getting into the war. We can still recall that the Daily Worker, the Communist organ in New York, switched its front page to a demand that the United States go into the struggle at once because Russia had been attacked, while on the inside pages of the same edition were articles and editorials denouncing any effort of the United States to get into the war as a scheming plot of the hated "capitalists."

Any such course as this is utterly devoid of honesty, logic, reason, or decency. The Communists who would overthrow this Government by violence and make it subject to Stalin's dictatorial power do not care anything about truth, honesty, logic, or decency. They are intent only upon the overthrow of our Government by violence, hence they are utterly dangerous traitors to America and always have been.

You will recall that the then Attorney General of the United States, Francis Biddle, who was himself an advanced liberal, publicly boasted that the New Deal was a Labor Party headed by an able politician.

Yet Mr. Biddle, when called upon to define the aims of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote that "the Communist Party teaches the violent overthrow of existing governments, including the United States. It writes, circulates, distributes, and displays printed matter advising such overthrow."

Now, what about our national defense? We know the deadly menace of a fifth column in any country. Hitler's fifth columns demonstrated their dangerous character.

The question arises, can and should enemies of our Constitution, or our free government, our free economy, our free agriculture, our free labor, our free industry, our free society, use the Constitution, and alleged rights and privileges under it, to destroy the Constitution? Can these avowed enemies of our Government, our economy, our society, our American traditions, protect themselves under these provisions in the Bill of Rights and render us helpless to prevent them from destroying this Nation and overthrowing our Government and delivering us captives to the dictatorship of Joe Stalin or some other Russian dictator? It is a question that must be decided.

If any Americans or any other nationals were to go half as far in Russia against the Soviet Government as Communists have in the United States against our Government, they would be imprisoned or shot without trial.

How far are we going to permit these pro-Russian Communists to go in preparing to hamstring our defense if, as, and when Stalin might decide to strike at us?

Prime Minister Mackenzie King disclosed in his revelations to the Canadian House of Commons that this Stalin Soviet spy system, I quote, "had been in existence for 3 or 4 years in this country (Canada) before anyone knew anything about the atom bomb." Which means that while Russia was barring all civilian or military officers of her allies from any territory in which she was operating—as she does to this day—she was spying on the countries which were sending her help—billions of dollars' worth of help. That was not the course of action one friendly nation should take toward another.

Now how long can we tolerate Communist saboteurs to operate in this country? How far can we permit them to go in preparing suddenly to hamstring our defense by fires, explosions, acids, emery dust in defense machinery, disease germs, strikes, if Stalin should decide to strike at the United States?

It is a problem which must be solved, and it must be solved without impairment of our Bill of Rights. Freedom of speech, of press, of radio, must not be allowed to become a cover for treacherous, treasonable license. We cannot permit the citizen's rights under the Constitution to become the cloak behind which alien-minded Communists may overthrow our Government, destroy our defense and hand us over—a subjugated people—to Russian Soviet dictators.

We must remember in dealing with Stalin and his cohorts that they are Asiatics; that their concepts are not like ours. That does not alter the fact that Stalin knows if he would propose a reasonable, fair, gradual reduction of armies and armaments that would work fairly for all countries the United States would join with him instantly to make such a movement a world procedure. There can be no doubt that we would do so, and there can be no doubt that Stalin knows it.

We must awaken to this absolute and inescapable fact: Americans only will defend America. We in the United States alone will preserve our American way if it is to be preserved.

Just one thing and only one thing will deter any other nation from attacking us if it suits some ruler's purpose, and that is to have a national defense so scientific, so strong, so sure, and so fast that no enemy would dare strike at us.

Recently I saw some figures which astounded me. I believe they will astound you. They reveal a condition which is causing every man, woman, and child in the

Nation to lose wealth and opportunity. We must find a way to stop it.

Since the day of the Japanese surrender an epidemic of strikes has stalled the reconversion of our domestic industry, big business and small business, from the war effort to peace status. Strikes started to become menacing in September 1945, at which time some 3,650,000 man-days of work were lost because of walk-outs. From that time the strikes have increased, until, in January 1946, the amazing total of 19,200,000 man-days were lost because of strikes in that month alone. The daily wage loss—think of it—the daily wage loss for each working day of that month was $13,500,000, or a total wage loss for the month of $378,000,000. That much in wages never reached the pockets of the workers, and their families. The loss in business caused by these strikes is more than $60,000,000 a day. Of course the loss in national income is impossible to calculate at this time.

There are some developments which have a significance far beyond the immediate factors causing them, and if we look closely we will detect a part of the communistic pattern here. For instance during 2 days, February 11 and 12, all the activities of the 7,000,000 people in New York were interrupted, and business was paralyzed, public health was menaced, public rights were violated, all in total defiance of the Government, and of the interests of their coworkers, by 3,500 tugboat men. Now, regardless of who was right or who was wrong in that strike, nobody—neither tugboat men if they were wrong, nor owners if they were wrong, had any moral right to interfere with the business, the livelihood, the health, the schooling of 7,000,000 other people who were not parties to the dispute and had nothing whatever to do with it.

In Philadelphia 3,000,000 people were denied the right to pursue their various labors because 9,600 transport workers called a strike. Again, regardless of who was to blame, one thing is certain, a few people in one line of work—in this case transportation—have not the moral right to interfere with the welfare of 3,000,000 of their fellow citizens who had no responsibility in the matter. They were simply the victims in between opposing forces.

In the same period some 2,000,000 residents of Pittsburgh were compelled to do without enough electricity because 3,400 powerhouse workers went on strike. Again, regardless of the rights and the wrongs of that dispute, no group of employers or employees has any moral right to penalize 2,000,000 innocent citizens because of a dispute concerning the selfish interests of a small segment of the population.

Millions of families in America are being compelled to do without refrigerators, radios, automobiles, washing machines, homes, clothes by these strikes. Soldiers and sailors who went overseas to fight to keep this Nation free are being deprived of jobs, of homes, of all the comforts they desire because of strikes concerning which they have not the slightest responsibility. They simply are the helpless victims.

Now what are we going to do about this situation? We have seen labor and management deadlocked for weeks because they were unable through any existing agency to compose their differences. The first thing that must be done is for the great American public to rise up and demand that both management and labor register a new sense of obligation to the public welfare. Communist agitators in labor unions must be curbed because they do not have the interest of the working people at heart. They do not want industrial peace and plentiful production. They want industrial strife, sabotage, the wrecking of free enterprise. The moral laws are higher and longer lasting than statutory laws. Wrong is still wrong even though a law has been bludgeoned or sneaked through Congress calling it right. Injustice which victimizes the people does not cease to be unfair and vicious merely because one group or another feel that by making the public suffer enough they can gain their demands regardless of the logic or the equity of the demands. The rights of collective bargaining labor now has does not mean that it is right for labor to bargain away the rights of all the rest of the people in a strike over wages, working conditions, or smoking privileges. If this false concept is not curbed and cured there will be nothing to prevent different groups striking—not against the management, but against the public interest. The wider the public interest outraged and injured under such conditions, the sooner the strikers might hope to win their struggle against management by the public outcry.

Both management and labor would be well advised to remember that the American people are slow to anger, but when they do flame into anger under injustice, abuse, and insolence, they turn and rend—and labor and management can lose all that has been gained when finally the general American public becomes aroused.

No group of managers has any moral right, for instance, to lock out their employees, pull the switches in the powerhouses, leave patients half operated on in hospital operating rooms, trap people between floors in elevator shafts, compel people to walk 6 or 8 or 10 or 20 flights of stairs to get to their homes and beds—many of them to die of overtaxed hearts. And by the same token no group of employees has any right to pull power switches and produce the same calamitous results. Where such widespread public interests are involved both management and labor should be compelled to recognize the public interest and refrain from penalizing thousands or millions of innocent men, women, and children.

The irony of all this is that when one group of people—managers or employees—lock out or strike, they are penalizing their own fellow workers.

Now this does not mean to say labor should not have the right to bargain collectively. But I do not believe labor—or management—should have the right to collective bargaining to the utter exclusion of all rights to life, liberty, property, work, health, education of everybody else.

Certainly the right to legal and orderly picketing does not carry with it the right to beat up innocent citizens, destroy property, or commit murder. Certainly the right of property does not carry with it the right to oppress workers, underpay them, overwork them, endanger their health. But the strange part of all this grotesque picture is that the elevator operators and the tugboat men in New York, the Philadelphia transportation men, the Pittsburgh powerhouse men, in striking for their own increases in wages, or for better working conditions, did not hesitate to stop for the time being the wages of fellow workers, to injure the working conditions, the means of transportation, stop the current to heat the homes and make the breakfast toast of their own fellow workers, members of other unions. When any man pulls a power switch that stops elevators between floors or darkens a hospital operating room he does not know but what the son or daughter or the wife of some one of his neighbors may pay for that pulled switch with life.

The present condition of strikes, of industrial disputes is intolerable. The United States cannot go on with this sort of menace hovering over the lives of all of us. I am for giving labor the last ounce of legal and moral right to protect wages, working hours, and conditions. But I am also for enforcing the law concerning the property rights of industry, of management, of investors, as well as the property rights of working men and women, and men and women on the farms, in their homes, also.

This is not a question of whether labor shall have adequate bargaining rights. It is not a question of whether management shall have proper legal protection in properties and means of production. It is a question of providing those rights of labor and management in such a way and with such due and alert regard for the general public welfare that millions of innocent citizens will not be penalized by a handful of men who decide to have a strike, or a few managers who determine to have a dispute with their employees.

I am addressing myself in this talk to the constitutional, the moral, the legal, and the inalienable rights of the masses of citizens which ought not to be violated by industrial disputes, strikes, and picket lines.

If this sort of thing continues, the limits will keep moving further and further away until chaos will result. We saw in the last war strikes and stoppages which cost lives. That is wrong, and no group of managers or workers has any moral right to condemn their own sons or other men's sons to death or injury for lack of adequate machines or supplies, but that happened in the war just ended.

I am convinced that a fair, equitable way can be found under which to conduct collective bargaining without strikes and lockouts suddenly bringing idleness, cold, lack of food, lack of water, lack of heat to millions of innocent persons.

Samuel Gompers, a great labor statesman, once said: "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, at any time."

The present tension in our foreign relations with Russia brings up a curious illusion which has persisted in this country for many years. Our school children and the public in general are told that Russia is still a communism. It is the belief of a substantial majority of Americans that in Russia everyone is on an equal economic footing and that the Russians are practicing their original communistic doctrine to take from those who have according to their capacity to yield and to give to those who have not according to their need.

It has been established beyond doubt by the unbiased observers who have within the past few years been able to penetrate the Russian shroud of secrecy, including the late Wendell Willkie and William L. White, that the communistic system has long since been dropped in Russia as unworkable. Under the Russian system which has been in vogue for several years, and which has been greatly accelerated in the last few years, the workers are commonly paid on a piece-work basis. Speed-up systems have been adopted which provide that workers who cannot keep up with their quotas are penalized by being paid less per piece than the faster workers. Workers have no freedom of choice in their jobs; they live a prisonlike existence in what we would call barracks. These observers have learned that almost every town has a concentration camp. The secret police are so active that people are afraid to speak freely even to members of their own families. The so-called labor unions are tools of the state and have nothing to say about wage rates or working conditions. For example, skilled laborers are paid 10 times more wages than are paid to unskilled workers. We now know that factory managers, who are party members, live in luxury on their relatively lavish salaries. This all means that the laboring classes in Russia are being exploited by a handful of ruling party members to an extent far worse than has ever occurred under capitalism. Russia, it is reported, is still keeping 12,000,000 men under arms for political purposes. It is absolutely incomprehensible in view of these facts that communism, with its false promises and deceptive doctrines, can be spread as it is spreading among the labor-

ing classes. Of course, labor leaders would be in an advantageous position, because undoubtedly they would be party members under a communistic system, and would, in such case, receive income much higher than now.

The fact is, my friends, that if the truth of the Russian system were generally known in this country, communism would not stand a chance of gaining ground among our working people.

Now let us look at another part of this communistic conquest pattern. The very first step always taken by the Communist exploiters in their campaigns to subjugate free peoples and free countries is to secure control of the labor organizations and bore to the top positions. They organize their goon squads, and their terrorist gangs and such workers as they cannot persuade they terrorize and compel. At the same time these Communist exploiters try to gain control of all political parties.

A writer recently painted a vivid and very accurate picture of this part of this great communistic pattern to subjugate the United States. He pointed out that the more clearly the communistic saturation and control of the CIO is understood, the more shocking seems the conduct of public men who for political purposes of their own have put the Government of the United States into partnership with this union and have given its leaders an authoritativc voice in the Democratic Party. It is a shocking fact, as this writer points out, that the present chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Robert Hannegan, is actually at this very time supporting the CIO in its plans through the PAC to liquidate various Jeffersonian Democratic members of the House and Senate who have had the courage to oppose such CIO-endorsed measures as the Wallace full employment bill, the minimum-wage bill, the housing subsidies; as well as those who voted for the Case bill, denounced by the CIO.

It is a shocking fact that recently Mr. Hannegan made a speech in Wilmington, Del., which could be construed in no other way than as an attack on the men, the Jeffersonian Democrats, if you please, whom the CIO is planning to purge through the use of its recently announced $6,000,000 campaign fund, for which it makes no accounting, either to its members or to the Government, concerning either collections or expenditures.

When the charge is made by such men as Donald Richberg that the CIO is run by Communists who have worked themselves into its key positions, such a charge is not made lightly or without a sound basis.

Mr. Richberg says Philip Murray is not himself a Communist, but that he is a "captive" of the Communists. He states a fact that is obvious to any intelligent person who will study the record of the CIO closely enough to see the consistency with which the CIO follows the Communist line in this country under the direction of Moscow. Of course, the great mass of CIO members are not Communists, but the key officers are. Communist propaganda and CIO propaganda are almost identical, as one writer recently pointed out. On practically every public measure the CIO and the Communists stand together. The list of such instances is long and convincing. Neither denials of dominating Communist influence in the CIO nor the usual denunciation of those who refer to it as "red baiters" and "reactionaries" alters the fact a single bit.

So far as Russia and the Russian people are concerned, if they want to live under a dictatorship that is their privilege and it is no business of the American people. But when so-called Communists who are, in fact, exploiters of peoples, come to the United States and try to take over our Government, our schools, who try to assume control over our wage earners and our farmers, and who, finally, brazenly announce that they intend to destroy our American system of government, economy, and society, and substitute therefor a dictatorship giving allegiance to some foreign dictator, then, fellow southerners, it is time for American citizens to rise up and strike down such insolent and evil plotters. The Government of the United States is the business of the citizens of the United States.

I believe—and I measure my words—I believe that we ought to have stringent laws on the statute books to provide for the apprehension, trial, and conviction of any person, alien or native, who is working to overthrow our American system of government, economy, and society by force.

I have no quarrel with those who want to pursue open, above-board means of trying to persuade the electorate to change their form of government, or their economy, or their free society, by means of the ballot; but I believe it is time for Americans to rise up and crush anybody who plots and advocates the overthrow of our American system by deception, treachery, and bullets.

The Democratic Party needs to be purged, my friends. But it needs to be purged of alien plotters, of alien thinkers, of alien ideologies, and of alien doctrines. The party of Jefferson and of Jackson must be kept the party of Jefferson and of Jackson, and the only way to keep it so is to throw out these alien interlopers and these native exploiters who have no use whatever for the Democratic Party except for what they can get out of wrecking it.

We in the South comprise the purest, the most undiluted element of the Jefferson-Jackson Democratic Party, and I say the conditions of today, this insolent attempt of these alien-minded people to steal the label of the Democratic Party, is a challenge to us which we must meet.

Let us determine now, and dedicate ourselves to the task of keeping the Democratic Party the party of the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson. This is still America—let us determine that, with the help of God, we will keep it American.

What's Wrong With Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 25, 1946:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOUSING?

Confusion in the OPA lumber price ceilings and the wholesale black market lumber operations, both "legal" and illegal, have been discussed as part of what is wrong with housing. There are also other factors in the lumber-housing picture.

Lumber production in this country is way down from last year. Long AFL strikes in lumber and logging cut production immensely. The winter in the western lumber States was one of the worst, with deep snows and floods impeding operations. And there was still a manpower shortage.

But the picture is clearing now. Mill operators and loggers are optimistic. The major strikes are settled. More former mill and logging workers than were expected are returning to their old jobs. The feeling in the industry is that the present shortage will be overcome by June, at least, and that lumber will be available for all the construction the building trades labor can handle.

Meanwhile, Canada is furnishing much lumber, but Canada has a housing and manpower shortage, too, and Canadian law restricts exports to 35 percent of the output. England, with so many houses destroyed, also is receiving some Canadian lumber.

Lumber prices, in some instances, have doubled over 5 years ago. Wages have risen, but not to the same extent. In the lumber business—from mill to yard—the same discouraging drop in productivity that has plagued builders and many other industries is apparent. Men just aren't working as efficiently as they did. As a specific example, a man who formerly installed four overhead-type doors in a day now doesn't finish installing two. Man-hours to unload cars have increased, and it isn't all due to the heavier wet lumber, either.

If we are ever to get lumber prices back in line at all, or even arrest the soaring costs of production, we will have to get a good day's work again for a fair day's pay. Otherwise, the veterans will not get their money's worth in housing.

General Assembly of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System, March 26, 1946:

As the historic Dumbarton Oaks Conference commenced in August 1944, I said in the House:

"Mr. Speaker, today may very well be, and we all sincerely hope it will be, reflected upon throughout the ages of the future as the most momentous one, not only of this generation, but of all history, because, as you know, there commences today in this city a conference looking toward permanent peace. It is true that similar conferences have, unfortunately, failed in the past, but I am convinced that the science of war has progressed to such an efficient and terrible stage that the peoples of the world will this time realize that we must in some way find an avenue of approach to a permanent peace if civilization as we know it is to survive. Therefore, I indulge the hope, which I know is shared by every Member of this body, that as this conference at Dumbarton Oaks opens, a conference so pregnant with possibilities for accomplishment, the most ardent desires, hopes, and ambitions of those who have sponsored it, those who are participating in it, and of all the peoples of the world who eagerly follow its progress, may fade into insignificance by comparison with the actual accomplishments of the conference."

You will recall that the ground work was laid at Dumbarton Oaks for the Charter of the United Nations, which was ratified the following June at San Francisco. The House of Representatives provided for our participation in it by the all but unprecedented majority of 344 to 15.

The General Assembly of the United Nations might be referred to as a stockholders' meeting, but one in which the large and small holders have equal voice. The Security Council could be termed the executive committee or board of directors on which the Big Five only have permanent membership. It has the particular responsibility

of maintaining international peace. In doing so, it, of course, acts for all of the United Nations, not merely for the Council members. However, it can act swiftly and effectively because of its positive and final authority.

The first meeting of the General Assembly and the Security Council occurred in London in January. It was planned for this occasion to be merely a routine organization one. However, the Security Council, to which a nation brings its grievances, was immediately confronted with several problems which were as perplexing and full of possibilities for trouble as they were unexpected. To the great gratification of every peace-loving citizen of the world who shares our sincere hope for the preservation of peace by the success of this Organization, these problems were handled quite satisfactorily, and the progress of the Organization so far is most encouraging. In fact, the mere approach of the New York meeting, the determination not to postpone it, perhaps the new brand of plain-spoken diplomacy and the consequent realization that the Iran matter will be taken up immediately, seems to have considerably cleared the atmosphere during the week end. Whether this is overoptimistic or not, which I sincerely hope and believe is not the case, let us hope, believe, and pray that whatever obstacles lie ahead at New York will be hurdled with success and satisfaction.

At this organization meeting in London the United Nations did our country the honor of selecting it as a location for its headquarters, both temporary and permanent. In expressing gratitude for this signal honor, I would also call the attention of our people to the great responsibility it entails. Let us highly resolve to prove entirely worthy of it.

The General Assembly meets comparatively infrequently, whereas the Security Council is in continuous session. Although it was adjourned in London to meet in New York yesterday, it could have been called into session in the meantime just as a court can.

In welcoming the United Nations to these shores, I wish to repeat with emphasis the hope which I indulged as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference convened. It is also my sincere wish that the members of the Security Council, their deputies, Secretary General Trygve Lie, his Assistant Secretaries, and their associates in this great Organization, which, or something like it, must succeed if civilization is to survive, may find their residence in our country as pleasant as we hope their efforts to preserve permanent peace will prove successful.

Coffee Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 26, 1946:

COFFEE SUBSIDY

Last November a subsidy of 3 cents a pound was announced for coffee. This was supposed to be a temporary subsidy which would end March 31. Now it is announced that this subsidy will be extended until June 30 and that the additional cost will not exceed $30,000,000. This subsidy is designed to prevent a rise in the price of coffee which would otherwise take place because foreign producers have refused to ship coffee to this country at the present prices. It seems probable that if the present policies are continued we will be faced with a further extension of these subsidies after June 30.

In announcing this action Mr. Bowles states that "This measure is expected to forestall any necessity for restricting coffee consumption in this country." It is certain that the continuation of this subsidy will make it possible for the present volume of consumption to be continued. The net effect is to hold down the price of coffee and thus to accentuate the discrepancy between supply and demand at that price unless actions are taken to subsidize larger imports. If the price were permitted to rise moderately, some consumption of coffee would be eliminated, while the higher price would lead to somewhat smaller imports than are now brought in only by the payment of a subsidy. Sooner or later we must return to a situation where supply is brought into balance with demand in a free market. The continuation of subsidies such as this one only tends to delay the arrival of that day and will in the end make it more difficult to eliminate subsidies at all.

Interestingly enough, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the price of coffee is substantially lower than it was in 1926, a year frequently used for long-term comparisons. Although the index of all food prices is now slightly higher than it was in 1926, coffee prices are 39 percent lower. It is difficult to understand how a rise in the price of coffee of 3 or 4 cents a pound will significantly affect the cost of living.

Greek Independence Day Address of Hon. Harold E. Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, at the Greek independence day dinner, the Waldorf-Astoria, March 24, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and fellow citizens, we meet to commemorate the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the independence of Greece. It is well that we do so. Of all the stirring chapters of the valiant struggles of men for freedom from oppression in world history, none is more brilliant in the heroism of its people, the persistence of its efforts, and the glory of its success, than that epic struggle of the men of Greece which resulted in their independence one hundred and twenty-five years ago.

Well might we pause in this year 1946, with all its scientific achievements and its problems, its power and its suffering, to reflect upon the story of ancient Greece, of the new birth of independence a century and a quarter ago, and of its condition today.

At the dawn of the nineteenth century Greece had been subjected to literally centuries of oppression and subjugation. The extremes to which this had been carried is vividly expressed by the ancient head tax which had been imposed by the conqueror on everyone in Greece over the age of 12, the receipt for which read as follows: "The holder hereof may bear his head on his shoulders for 1 year." During these generations of subjugation it is estimated that a half million of Greek children were abducted and enrolled in the vicious army of the Janissaries, tribute children.

Yet with all that, the spirit of the Greeks remained unbroken and with great determination in 1821 they began the struggle which ended 8 years later by the Treaty of Adrianople, in September 1829, under which Greece was acknowledged to be one of the family of nations. It would be extremely interesting to spend our time this evening reviewing the unbelievable heroism of the leaders of that struggle, Alexander Ypsilanti, Georges Karaiskakis, Marco Bozzaris, Constantine Kanaris, and of the heroines who carried on when their men fell, Lascarine and Penelope. But these are times in which we must not only reflect on history but in which we must apply the simple truths of yesterday to the problems of today and the questions of tomorrow.

A wounded Greece, devastated by a cruel invader, is today struggling to rise again. Her success in coming to her feet will depend in greatest measure, as does the success of every nation, upon the devotion and the freedom and the vigilance and the work of her own people. But it does not depend on that alone. It depends also and in large measure upon the help she can obtain from other nations and even more, it depends upon the future peace of the world. Clearly there can be no peace for Greece unless there is peace in the world.

We find our thoughts, then, turning to the prospects in the world for lasting peace and to the efforts of the nations of the world to organize for peace.

We meet on the eve of the convening in this very city of an important session of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. That session should begin with an air of optimism and of pride. The United Nations Organization, of which it is a part, is stronger today than at any time since the Charter was signed. It has received the most significant reaffirmations of support in recent days. It can well be said that it has the overwhelming support of the rank and file of the peoples of all the world. It can well be said that we builded at San Francisco stronger than we knew. Its opening sessions in London have already demonstrated the moral force of world public opinion. We have but to ask, what would have happened around the world if this Organization had not been in existence since VJ-day, to realize its tremendous constructive and steadying effect. The opening of this session and the grave importance of the continued success of the United Nations Organization to the people of the United States of America, to the people of Greece, to the people of the world, well merits our special consideration tonight of the policies of our country toward this Organization and toward the rest of the world.

There is an extreme need that the United States of America recognize, in full, its own greatness and the everlasting power of its moral and spiritual and economic and social and political foundations. And then, it is of even more importance, that the United States of America proceed to act in all humility to fulfill the responsibility of that greatness. This means that we as a nation must seek to cultivate the same qualities of greatness which we admire and approve in the conduct of an individual man among us. We must be calm and confident and courageous. We must not be jittery or cowardly or of little faith. We must be generous and considerate but not careless or extravagant. We must search our own soul for answers that are moral and are just. We must be open and frank and forthright and not duplicitous and evasive. We must be strong and industrious and loyal and not divided or shiftless or disloyal. We must rigidly respect both the letter and the spirit of our agreements and require and inspire our friends to do likewise. We must act deliberately without provoca-

tion and without excitement. We must hold up the light of liberty of men that all might see, and not grow timid before dark shadows.

And what do these things mean in specific terms in the exact problems of tomorrow and of the coming weeks? It means that we should make it very clear that we intend to back up our solemn commitments in the United Nations Charter with all of the resources, economic and military, at our command and that we consider that those obligations on our part are continuing and fundamental and will never be released or voided by the exercise of a veto by anyone. We must definitely state that a veto can never excuse an act of aggression, and neither does a veto excuse the other members from enforcing the solemn obligations of the Charter. Only in this way can that steady strength be given to this organization for peace and can the respect for law and the administration of justice be developed as the hope of mankind. It means that we must press on in the development of the United Nations police forces, then proceed in joint disarmament and in the development of United Nations atomic control and inspection and regulation.

It means that we must promptly present to the United Nations a genuine proposal for the trusteeship of the Pacific islands and for the fulfillment of the letter and the spirit of the trusteeship chapters of the United Nations Charter.

It means that we must act as a member of the family of nations and not as a lone wolf. We must not again act unilaterally with reference to Argentina or of Spain or any other nation, but must take these questions up in accordance with the Charter in the respective pan-American and United Nations bodies. There is grave danger that unless we do, our policies in this hemisphere will soon be looked upon as those of the big neighbor rather than those of the good neighbor.

It means that we must promptly extend credits, under proper terms, to those who seriously need them, which include England and France and Greece and Russia. We can well afford this because the extension of these credits will mean, in essence and basically, a greater demand for the goods we produce, and this remarkable production machine of ours, created by our free economy, can readily meet these added requirements by the internal harmony and devotion to the American system which should and must result from these policies. The result will be increased sources of raw materials around the world, increased jobs and markets and profits for agriculture and business and labor in America in future years. The only price we will really pay for these credits which we, as now the great creditor nation of the world, must extend, will be some slight postponement in the complete filling of our accumulated domestic consumer demand and this slight postponement will actually contribute to the increased long-term economic health of our own country as well as the world. Surely the people of America are intelligent enough and far-sighted enough, regardless of the appeals of the demagogues, to be willing to postpone slightly the complete filling of their own wishes for refrigerators and cars and radios and clothing and even houses, if as a result of that postponement there will be more jobs and better business in America 3 and 5 and 10 years from now, and better conditions for the peoples in other nations, and a better chance of lasting peace. What will it profit this Nation if it follows a narrow, short-sighted, selfish course now and spends its future years struggling with depressions and unemployment and sacrificing the lives of tomorrow's young Americans on the battlefields of a defensive war.

It means that within the Concil of the United Nations Organization we must insist upon complete respect for treaties and agreements in Iran and Manchuria and throughout the world. We must equally insist on the fulfillment of the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter in the Dutch Indies and in Indochina and in Palestine.

It means that we should not tie our foreign policy down to that of any other one nation. And that except insofar as the United Nations Organization of the Pan American Union may duly speak for all its members, no other nation shall speak for the United States of America in world affairs. It means that we will not enter into any combinations against the Soviet Union or any other nation but that we will insist that all abide by the letter and the spirit of the United Nations Charter and their international agreements. It means that we will approve of the consideration by United Nations Social and Economic Council, or Assembly, or Security Council, as the case may appropriately be, of any proper requests for readjustments in international agreements, to obtain fair access to raw materials and to trade. It means that we must vigorously conserve our food and extend rapid assistance to those who hunger.

It means that we should not confuse friendship for other nations of the world with the condoning of treacherous action by our citizens at home. We should make it very clear that any citizen of our country who treasonably and persistently follows the line of any other nation to the exclusion and harm of the freely determined policy of our own nation, whether that line be communistic or imperialistic or Fascist, serves neither mankind nor his country and deserves neither citizenship nor public office nor civic leadership.

We should make it clear that the basic concepts of individual human rights and the freedoms of religion, of speech, of press, of property, have been the root cause of the great strength and resilience and the high standard of living of our country and we should not hesitate to encourage in a friendly manner, the gradual change of other peoples through their own decisions toward the attainment of similar individual rights and freedoms as a means of improving their own standards of living, their own supply of consumer goods, their own stability of government, their own enjoyment of life.

Fellow citizens, let us never take this freedom of ours lightly. Let us guard it with vigilance from any assault from any quarter. Let us not forget that freedom is more precious than life itself. That tyrannically imposed slavery is worse than war. That freedom is not something for one to enjoy and another to be deprived of. That liberty must not be confused with license.

Whenever I speak of freedom I shall always remember an experience at the close of war with Japan in the release of our prisoners of war from Japan. We heard of a large prisoner-of-war camp in the interior on the westward coast of Honshu. The report told of a young officer in this camp who, under unbelievable conditions, deprivation, and suffering, had maintained the morale of the fellow prisoners of this camp and had stood stalwart through the trying days of the surrender period even though the mercy planes had not been able to find his camp, cloud-covered in the mountains. We promptly flew to that area of Japan to complete the arrangements for the evacuation of this camp. Soon this young officer stood before us, lean and drawn. We told him we assumed he had heard that the ships were at Yokohama to take out his men, and that the trains would soon be arranged, and that we wanted to know how many stretchers would be required for those who were seriously ill. He stood looking straight at us, but no reply came. His lips quivered, tears welled in his eyes, and finally, after long moments that seemed like hours, he said, "I'm sorry, commander, but you are the first free men I have seen in 4 years." Freedom is precious. Prisoners of war are not the only kinds of prisoners in the world. There are prisoners of fear. There are prisoners of hunger. There are prisoners of political views. We must realize the strength and preciousness of what it is we have to offer to the peoples of the world. We must not permit a false desire for short-sighted economic gains for ourselves or for our friends to divert or dim our advocacy of the preciousness of human freedom.

Equally we must not be smug. We must constantly look in our national mirror and see our own internal discriminations and shortcomings and infringements on liberty. Equally we must emphasize that our system, built on freedom of individual men, is not a static system. That its great resilience comes from its facility for change and adjustment and correction. These principles of ours are as vibrant as life itself. We must constantly seek those new answers which contribute best to the individual liberties and to the economic and spiritual well-being of the people as a whole. Equally we must emphasize that there can be no lasting freedom, no stable improvement in standards of living, unless there is a respect for law.

The United States of America, peopled by sons and daughters of every nation in the world, is in a unique position. It can contribute much to the world. It can continue to learn much from the rest of the world.

We know full well that men in many lands cannot attain in one short leap what we have been favored to attain in a century and a half of building on unusual beginnings. We shall hail each step of progress in other lands and extend that friendly helping hand that means so much. We shall hold our tongues and refrain from continuous carping criticism of other nations when we do not know their own problems and we have not suffered as they have suffered.

For if we hold fast to fundamentals and demonstrate the vitality of alert, successful adjustment to the new conditions and the advancement of science, we will find that gradually men in other lands, under many forms of government, will be acquiring increased individual liberties and with them improved standards of living.

We, and every other nation, must constantly remind ourselves that we have so much to lose by narrow isolation and by repressive selfishness, so much to lose by war, so much more to lose by subjugation, and so much to gain by broad constructive worldwide economic policies and by greater freedom for all men, and by peace.

President Monroe gave such encouragement to freedom in many lands in his famous declaration of 1822. "The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed, and so long hidden, as it were, from the world, under a gloomy despotism, has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds of ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of these people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should reduce the great excitement and sympathy in their favor, which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence, and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

Extreme is the suffering in Greece today. Her stalwart fight in this last war, recognized in General Marshall's final report, did not prevent in fact added to, the extreme of her devastation. The suffering of her peoples is

one part of the suffering of the peoples of the world. Let us not think of them only as Greeks and Poles and Russians and Frenchmen and Danes and Chinese. Let us think of them as men—yes, as men—and women—and children. Let us think of the basic dignity of the human being. This is a time for greatness. The United States of America must—and will—respond.

Letter of Reserve Officers of the Naval Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers of the Naval Service, known as RONS, organized subsequent to the cessation of hostilities, has already indicated its awareness of legislation affecting the military services and has expressed its interest by sending communications on matters relating to the services to Members of the Congress. Recently I have received such a communication from this organization, which I extend as part of my remarks.

Such organizations as RONS have an opportunity of performing an extremely worthwhile public service, being composed as it is largely of civilian sailors, who have an understanding both of the problems confronting regular naval officers and the viewpoint of civilian taxpayers and citizens. I welcome its continued interest in matters affecting the Navy, feeling fully confident that its efforts and influence will not be devoted to a carping criticism of the Navy Department but rather to a wholesome, constructive, and progressive program for the benefit and improvement of the Navy, as well as the security of our Nation.

The communication follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS OF THE
NAVAL SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1946.

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, organized since VJ-day, is an association of Reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Practically all of the members have now returned to civilian life after participating in World War II. The membership represents a cross section of the 350,000 Reserve officers of these 3 services. The RONS executive committee has approved this letter.

As Reserve officers, we are vitally affected by the proposed drastic cut in the naval budget. We supplied about 19 out of every 20 officers in the wartime Navy. We are subject to recall to combat duty. Therefore, we feel that we have a right to insist upon a naval budget that will provide continuous training for all Reservists. As Reserves, we certainly have a right to a fighting chance for our lives if there is another war. Without proper training, we will not have such a chance.

We believe that the Congress should know that no money is being provided for any training of the Volunteer Reserve which is by far the largest part of the Naval Reserve. In any future emergency, the Navy will, in a large measure, be dependent upon this Reserve for immediate manning of our fleet and shore establishments.

Our Volunteer Air Reserve will be an illusion. We just will not have one. No money is provided for any refresher training. A pilot, who doesn't fly, soon ceases to be a pilot.

Our reserve for the fleet will be only a token reserve. The number of ships for reserve training will have to be reduced from 73, as planned, to only 16.

We feel that we must warn the Congress that the Nation will be resting its security on a paper reserve that does not and will not actually exist unless adequate funds are provided.

We cannot but ask who or what is responsible for this sudden radical cut in the naval budget in the face of a most critical world situation. It would be hard to understand in a stabilized world; it is incomprehensible to us under the present conditions.

We urge the Congress to provide sufficient funds for a Navy adequate to guarantee our control of the sea-air approaches to our Nation.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE C. CARUSI,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles, from the Washington Post:

FOREIGN POLICY

(By Sumner Welles)

THE FIRST LINE OF OUR SECURITY

The controversy raised by Mr. Churchill's speeches has fixed attention on the military aspects of American security. It has led public opinion to concentrate primarily upon our armed strength, and upon the related problems of our defense.

The security of the United States depends upon innumerable factors. It depends in part on our internal unity, on the striking power of our air, naval, and military forces, on our ability to find safeguards for new scientific inventions, on our productive capacity, on the raw materials available to us, and on the strategic position of our territory.

But obviously, the security of the United States will be determined first of all by the policies of other peoples. It depends upon the desire of other peoples to seek their security and their prosperity in the same way in which we seek our own safety and well-being. It depends upon the willingness of other peoples to cooperate with us in creating the kind of peaceful world order to which we are now pledged.

The future safety of the United States will be insured by the success of the United Nations. The success of that organization will be advanced in proportion to our ability to achieve close and friendly understandings with other peoples and convince them, whenever necessary, of the desirability in their own interest of working with us toward that commmon goal.

It is precisely in that field that the Government of the United States has so often failed during the last year.

Wendell Willkie used to speak of the "reservoir of good will" which the United States had available to it throughout other parts of the world. That reservoir, unfortunately, is very rapidly being drained dry.

There has arisen an extraordinary confusion of thought with regard to Mr. Churchill's recent speeches. There has been a concerted effort to make it appear that the former Prime Minister was urging the creation of a military alliance of the English-speaking countries, of an exclusive character, for the purpose of dominating the rest of the world.

Naturally, the United Nations Charter would not be worth the paper it is written on if any member state, or any group of states, were to attempt to dominate all other peoples. Mr. Churchill has made it entirely clear that what he is so eloquently urging is an increasing cooperation or the English-speaking democracies for the purpose of advancing the objectives in which they believe and which are set forth in the United Nations Charter.

We are inclined to overlook the significance to us of the fact that the English-speaking democracies all believe that the establishment of a world order based upon law and justice, rather than upon force and domination, offers the most certain method of furthering their own welfare.

The British Empire—even though Mr. Churchill will not be there to preside over its liquidation—has reached its end. Mr. Attlee, by his pledge of complete independence to India, has proclaimed the termination of the age of imperialism.

But the British Commonwealth of Nations, that federation of English-speaking democracies, will continue to survive as a bulwark for a decent world order, provided the United States collaborates with it, within the framework of the United Nations.

If, because of current misrepresentations and recriminations, we fail so to cooperate, we will thereby lose one of our most effective means of strengthening the first line of our security.

The key problem of our foreign policy has been to establish a friendly working relation with the Soviet Union which would progressively strengthen the UN. In that endeavor we have so far wholly failed.

But in our supplementary policies, which should have been designed to increase our opportunities of obtaining the support of other nations for our objectives, we have failed almost as completely.

Our recent policies in Latin America have been incredibly stupid as well as humiliatingly unsuccessful. Our procedure in western and central Europe and in the Near East has been almost as inept.

American public opinion should be demanding from this Government some coherent program of foreign policy which will refill the reservoir of good will toward the United States.

It should insist on the elimination of all those factors which have been directly responsible for the tragic mistakes which have been committed in so many aspects of our foreign policy, and which have contributed so greatly to the reduction abroad of the influence and former prestige of this country. It should urge the appointment, at this most critical moment, to high diplomatic missions abroad of men who have the knowledge and experience, as well as the ability needed. It should make it clear that it realizes that the safety of this Nation depends upon the foreign policy which is now carried out in the name of the United States, and upon the skill with which that policy is executed in the field.

For it is to its foreign policy that the United States must look for the first line of its security.

Jackson Day Address of Hon. James Forrestal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal delivered more than a political address at the recent Jackson Day dinner in my own New Orleans. He delivered a thought-provoking address, meaty in substance which should have the attention of thinking men and women.

For that reason I have asked the privilege of placing his address in the RECORD at this time, as follows:

New Orleans on Jackson Day may not be the most secure harbor for an advocate of sea power—133 years ago Old Hickory thrashed an amphibious landing made under the guns of the greatest fleet of that era. On the other hand, it is a most appropriate forum for the civilian representative of the United States Navy in view of its long association with American naval and military history.

At the moment New Orleans, as headquarters of the Eighth Naval District, has as commandant one of the naval heroes of the recent war, Admiral Aaron S. Merrill, a native of Biloxi, Miss., a leader who embodies the highest traditions of the naval service. To the boldness of his tactics in night operations in the narrow and difficult waters running from the Solomons to the Admiralties and New Guinea, Admiral Halsey attributes a large measure of our success in clearing the South Pacific waters of Japanese naval power. The bombardments of New Georgia and Kolombangara Islands and the battle of Empress Augusta Bay off Bougainville reflect honor and glory upon the American Navy. High on the list of men who helped to make that record is "Tip" Merrill.

While I am dealing with personalities I should like to acknowledge the debt which the Navy owes to your two Senators, JOHN H. OVERTON and ALLEN J. ELLENDER, and to that able member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, F. EDWARD HÉBERT. Upon the latter, by the way, must rest the responsibility for whatever pain I may inflict upon you tonight.

I am always mindful of the brief spate in which any speaker can hope to be a tenant of the mind of his audience. What I have to say, therefore, will be measured by my appraisal of the limits of your patience. I have been exposed quite frequently myself to the autointoxication and self-hypnosis which is chronic with speakers, and for that reason I am possibly somewhat more sensitive than most of the early arrival of boredom.

I will identify the few ideas which I propose to talk about. I would like to discuss the American Navy and its relation to world affairs; the Democratic Party in particular and politics in general; and, finally, Andrew Jackson, whose birthday provides the occasion for this dinner.

The people of the world are desperately anxious for peace. All men are agreed on that. Doubts and fears relate only to the method by which an enduring peace may be assured.

I do not propose to contribute at length to the many and thoughtful discussions on this subject, especially since it is an area that lies outside of my responsibility. I feel compelled, however, to emphasize the view that any hope for peace must rest upon the success of the United Nations Organization and upon the good will, sincerity, and patience which the governments of the world bring to this vital task.

A forceful insistence upon the principles of international justice is imperative. To this end we shall need an unfaltering national will to implement those principles. To be prepared for our task we must maintain our economic and military power as an essential instrument for peace. In no other way can we effectively discharge our vital responsibility to national and world security.

American policy as enunciated by President Truman and Mr. Byrnes, and British policy as stated by Mr. Attlee and Mr. Bevin, rest upon the success of the United Nations Organization. The Russians, too, have asserted their faith in this new world structure. But if the United Nations Organization is to succeed, the labor that goes into its building must be accompanied by patient acceptance of the fact that the structure cannot be completed and the house made ready to live in overnight. Painstaking efforts will be required. A single stroke, a single speech, no matter how brilliant, or fervent wishes for success will not suffice.

The great commonwealth of States which now constitutes the United States of America took a century in the building. I think it is both dangerous and unwise to assume that the writing of a charter, the statement of objectives, the subscriptions to high ideals—that these alone are capable of producing a viable instrument for the government of the world.

My own allegiance to the Democratic Party was largely sealed 25 years ago by my belief in the concept of the League of Nations. It seemed to me then, as it seems to me now, that the United States had two alternatives: To join and promote with all the vigor at its command an international organization for world security and peace; or, failing that, to maintain such a state of readiness for war as to serve clear notice to any nation planning conquest that American power would inevitably crush the aggressor.

Twenty-five years ago we failed to adopt either alternative. We denied to President Wilson his great objective of incorporating America into a league for world organization. Three years later, having thus put our head in the sand, we proceeded at the Disarmament Conference of 1922 to strip ourselves of our naval strength.

We must not follow this course again. Either we make the United Nations work or we face a world in which we must maintain such overwhelming military power as to make it abundantly clear that future aggressors will eventually suffer the ruinous fate of Japan and Germany.

Until the structure in which the United Nations is to dwell is far more solidly established, we must retain adequate military strength. So long as power is necessary to obtain peace, it must reside with those whose history shows that they have not abused power.

What is the place of the Navy in this retention of power by the United States? The sea-air power of our Navy guarantees for us and other peaceful governments the freedom of the seas, the security of the great ocean lanes over which our commerce flows, and it protects those lanes in case we are again driven to the use of force against any international aggressors.

Our naval power should be the visible evidence of American determination to seek its own security through the preservation of world security. Specifically, I mean that it should be clear to all the world that the American Navy will be free to traverse any of the international sea lanes in the discharge of its duties and in the fulfillment of its historic mission, operating in any climate and under any conditions on the seas, below them or above them.

We shall retain only a part of our tremendous wartime strength in active service, but it is highly important that our ships in the inactive fleet be laid up with great care so that they may be quickly available in an emergency. And it behooves us, above all else, to ensure that naval research is maintained at the same high level which during this war resulted in revolutionary developments such as radar and sonic devices. Through research we gained decisive advantages over our enemies.

This being a political speech, I would like to venture a little into a phase of international politics which I know is in the minds of every thoughtful citizen of this country. Is Russia willing to join in the great effort for the success of the United Nations Organization? As I have said, Russia has asserted its faith in this instrument for world government.

The Russians still believe quite sincerely and with deep intensity in the Marxian dialectic, and that the Soviet society—as Mr. Stalin called it in his speech of a month ago—is the society which provides the greatest hope for the common people and the only society which, internationally applied, can prevent war. Now I disagree with equal intensity with Mr. Stalin's statement, but I do not believe that the difference in our concepts of government, economics, and social organization necessarily means that we have to fight each other to prove the success of either.

Mr. Willkie gained a good deal of attention by his book called One World. I raise the question here tonight whether possibly he and some of the rest of us have not exaggerated the possibilities of creating one world from the viewpoint of government, of politics, and of economics. I believe in personal liberty, in the freedom of men to work as they choose—in other words, it is an understatement to say that I am against a collective society for America and for Americans, but I do not couple that with the assertion that only our form of society is workable. In fact it may reasonably be questioned whether our ideas of self-government, our adherence to the importance of personal freedom, of personal liberty, are applicable overnight or within the forseeable future to all the millions of varied peoples who make up the rest of the globe.

I happen to believe that our society and our Government have offered and continue to offer the greatest assurance to people in search of freedom and of opportunity, not as members of an amorphous mass of human beings but rather as individuals with respect for personality, for personal liberty, for the great freedoms of speech, of worship, and of political action. But I think the best way to convince the rest of the world of the success of our system is not by destroying any other system, but rather by the example of success itself—a success which politically and socially means the continuous and sure extension of increasing opportunity, of increasing education, of an increasing division of the fruits of society among all members of it, without denying to the leaders who make great contributions either in terms of science, of production, of management, or of government, the rewards, be they monetary or honorific, which go with great accomplishments.

I think we should use every means at our command to make clear to the world what we know to be a fact, that this Nation exists to serve and not to exploit, that it does not seek expanded power or territory, but that it always will fight when the apostles of force gather themselves for conquest.

I said I was going to talk about politics and I will do so now.

It is sometimes popular in this country to attack and deride politicians as being of a very low order of humanity. For those who

indulge this view I recommend a most interesting article by a distinguished American journalist and diplomat, Mr. Claude Bowers, in last July's Virginia Quarterly, called "In Defense of Politicians." He pointed out that derogation of politicians and political leaders is usually one of the steps along the road to dictatorship. For the whole business of democratic government is politics. One can no more have democratic government without politics than you have have the flower without the seed.

Having for 6 years been exposed to some of the problems of national administration, I can say with conviction that unless politics is the business of every man and woman in this country the Government which gives us the liberties and privileges we so highly value cannot survive. I pay high tribute to the men and women who labor in either party in the tedious work of primary elections, who run for office and who serve their country either in their State legislatures or in Congress.

It seems to me that this was the great guiding principle of Jackson, the man whom we honor tonight. He recognized that the survival of this Nation, that the success of its Government, depend not upon the leadership of a select few but rather upon the ability of the people to understand what government means and what part they play in directing government.

Jackson, who has been called a political radical, it seems to me, actually was, like many radicals come to power, a conservative in action. Born in the South, identified with the great surge of the West, fiercely devoted to the interest of his own community, he nevertheless had a clear view of the importance of the National Union and he did not fail to act with speed and firmness when he saw that Union in peril.

Let me add this one final thought about politics. From time to time one hears it stated as a deplorable fact that the Democratic and Republican Parties are not constructive media for political action in this country, because both have crosscuts and schisms of political and economic thinking—that in the Democratic Party the South is conservative, the great industrial cities of the North radical; that in the Republican Party the Northeast and the Middle West are conservative and the Northwest traditionally radical.

I question whether this is an evil thing, whether it would necessarily be of great benefit to have two parties, one radical and one conservative. May it not be that the genius of government in this country has been our ability to balance in both parties the radical and conservative, to temper the extreme zealots of what is called the left wing and at the same time so to challenge the complacent inertia of conservatives as to make them see that people must have the sense of constant movement along the road to a good life?

I hold myself to be a liberal, and yet we must remember that it is not always becoming to boast of liberalism, especially since one cannot be exactly sure what the criteria are. Mr. Shaw, you may remember, in Androcles and the Lion, underlined with gentle irony the smugness of one of the early saints who boasted of his humility. Liberalism is neither the special privilege nor the private property of any one group, and many men in many different ways advance the cause of liberty and liberalism—men in business, men in labor, men in the church, and men in the Government.

Finally, I would like to pay a special tribute to our President, Harry Truman. I can say with conviction and deep earnestness that he exemplifies what I have said, that I have had him constantly in mind in these remarks that I have made about politics. He has come up unsullied in the practical field of political action. He came to the Presidency with a long service in the Senate. In the highest office in the land he has displayed a sense of political reality—and by that I mean that Government is the practical expression of political action—and along with that reality there goes a freedom from cynicism, plus positive faith in his fellow citizens, and a deep humility flowing from a consciousness of the tremendous responsibilities that he bears on behalf of the citizens of this country and of the world.

The OPA Should Abdicate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, businessmen can have no confidence in the future under the OPA tyrannous program of a virtual dictatorship.

The process of production requires the laying out of capital, venture capital. What businessman can afford to risk his savings and perchance borrowed money under the uncertain conditions created by the ever-changing regulations brought about by the edicts of OPA? No intelligent man of business will take either short or long risks in the field of business or industry where a bureaucracy is vested with power to ruin an enterprise without even a moment's notice.

The OPA has evidently taken the formula used by Caligula—according to Dio Cassius—who wrote his laws in very small character and hung them upon high pillars, the more effectually to ensnare the people. Without confidence in the future, without trust in the Government, and without assurance that the rules of the game will not be suddenly changed, there cannot be maximum production under a free enterprise system.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal of March 27, 1946:

IT SHOULD ABDICATE

A careful reading of the full text of Mr. Bernard Baruch's statement to the House Banking and Currency Committee certainly leaves no impression that he had any intention of giving unreserved endorsement to the operations of the Office of Price Administration. Most people will not read the full text. Those who "read as they run" will believe that Mr. Baruch plumped for price control and has lined up with that company of which Chester Bowles is the leader—at least the most vociferous. And it is just a little hard to believe that Mr. Baruch meant to lend his great prestige to that group.

We see here another illustration of attempting to compromise with this thing which is called OPA. When one attempts a middle ground he is driven, as was Mr. Baruch, to warn against economic dictatorship and at the same time endorse a system which controls prices, which through price control also controls profits and production and which, as Mr. Baruch said, logically calls for wage control. He is forced to say that this thing is bad and yet we must keep it for a while. He is forced to warn against subsidies, as Mr. Baruch did, all the time knowing that OPA is extending the area of subsidies.

The idea that there can be some selective price control, which will leave business largely free is as fatuous as can be, and the whole course of OPA shows it. Its whole record has been one of gradual extension of its power. When its prices deranged production, it set rules for control of production. When factories were unable to produce under these rules, it began to call harsh names and to instruct its agents to pursue methods that resembled nothing so much as the tactics of the gestapo.

OPA has had three Administrators. The first one gathered about him a staff which included some zealous people, at least one of whom made speeches informing his audience that the system of free enterprise had passed. The second Administrator, a man of utmost fairness, was overwhelmed by the opposition of the staff he had inherited and by the gargantuan proportions of the job he had undertaken. Then came Mr. Bowles, who has replied to criticism with the statement that his failures were caused by a crisis and the crisis in turn resulted from good business and high employment.

Now the hope is held out that under another Administrator OPA will cease to commit absurdities which are holding back production and thus bringing the danger of inflation. That hope is in vain. If the Administrator were a superman of the best of intentions, it would still be vain. As soon as he touches one price, he deranges half a dozen other prices and in adjusting the half dozen he deranges 3 dozen more and so it progresses. Human failure accentuates the absurdities of OPA but the fundamental trouble is that the job is beyond any human capacity.

A fine Christian gentleman once was asked what would be his first act if he were made dictator and he replied, "I'd abdicate." And if we are to have a free economy supporting a democratic society that is just what OPA must do—voluntarily or otherwise.

American Legion Commander Supports Original Wyatt Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, Charles G. Bolte, chairman, American Veterans Committee, in a telegram to John Stelle, national commander, American Legion, has congratulated him on his support of the original Wyatt housing program, which Mr. Bolte described as being "of immeasurable benefit to all veterans." Citing the rallies sponsored by AVC throughout the Nation, the AVC chairman stated, "your support will be helpful in achieving successful passage of the bill." The telegram follows:

Mr. JOHN STELLE,
National Comander, American Legion
Headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind.:

Think it splendid that you have thrown your weight behind the veterans' housing program. The American Veterans Committee feels that your support will be helpful in achieving successful passage of the bill. I hope that we can have the closest association in this fight for decent veterans' housing. AVC has sponsored many rallies throughout

the United States in favor of Mr. Wyatt's program. These same AVC members will aid your posts in every way possible in rallying support for the original Wyatt plan which is of immeasurable benefit to all veterans.

CHARLES G. BOLTE,
Chairman, American Veterans Committee.

Atom Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post entitled "Atom Control":

ATOM CONTROL

Science, which brought about the release of atomic energy, has now proposed a means by which it may be controlled. Only the barest outline of this means, details of which are contained in a report made confidentially to the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, has as yet been revealed to the public. The report as a whole should be published without delay. It was prepared under State Department auspices by a special study group headed by the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. David E. Lilienthal, and including one of the outstanding scientists in the wartime atomic-bomb project, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. Application of the means of control proposed by this committee remains a problem of statesmanship; that is, a political problem. The public, therefore, has every right to know the control potentialities which are available and to judge the efforts made to realize them.

It is possible, according to the State Department group which studied the problem, to "denature" fissionable materials so that they cannot be used as explosives without major modifications of plant and equipment. It is proposed, therefore, that the mining and production of uranium and thorium, the only natural elements which can readily be transformed into atomic explosives, be absolutely controlled by an agency of the United Nations and that this agency license use of them to any country, in a "denatured" state only, for peaceful purposes. This method of control involves a minimum of interference in the internal affairs of participating countries and makes possible genuinely effective surveillance. It should go far toward allaying international distrust. It constitutes, indeed, a richly hopeful contribution to world peace. Here at last is an assurance that, with wise statesmanship, the development of atomic energy can be reserved for the benefit rather than for the destruction of mankind.

The knowledge that such a means of control exists makes more imperative than ever the enactment of sound legislation for atomic energy development in the United States. And it makes more urgent than ever the transfer of authority over this development from military to civilian hands. For atomic energy remains, so far as the military is concerned, simply a weapon. We must begin to think of it and prepare to harness it as motive power for industry, as benevolent heat for our cities, as a healing agent for medicine. And we must make ready, of course, to adapt our own policies respecting atomic energy to the international control without which its benefits can never be realized.

It is obvious that if we are to persuade other nations to embrace the method of control which our scientists have proposed, we must impart to them some of the "secrets" to which we have been clinging too tenaciously. They are mortally dangerous secrets, bound to be discovered in any case. A sharing of them as soon as the system of control now said to be feasible is agreed upon will afford us more security than we could ever enjoy through a precarious exclusivity. We have a fateful choice to make—the old, old choice between isolationism and internationalism. Atomic energy is a force so elementary and so potent that it must knit the world together into unity or blast it asunder.

Philippine Trade Bill, H. R. 5856—An Analysis and Some Suggestions by Mr. Vincente Villamin, Filipino Economist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will take up the Philippine trade bill, H. R. 5856. I wish to insert in the RECORD an analysis of the measure by a Filipino of vast knowledge of Philippine-American economic matters.

The author, Mr. Vicente Villamin, is a lawyer and economist, who has 25 years of experience in economic questions. Mr. Villamin did the unusual thing by stating frankly to the congressional committees which heard the Philippine bills that he spoke only for himself and that he would not benefit personally under the trade bill and, further, that he would not make any claims for his war losses under the rehabilitation bill. Mr. Villamin says that he is actuated solely by a desire to serve the Filipino people in these critical times in their history, adding that without getting into politics he is retiring from private life.

The analysis follows:

THE PHILIPPINE TRADE BILL, H. R. 5856

Congress desires to help the Philippines rebuild herself and make her independence scheduled for July 4, 1946, successful.

WHAT CONGRESS IS DOING

Four bills have been considered by Congress and two of them are already laws. These latter two are an act placing the Philippines within the operation of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and an act turning over to the Philippine government the accumulated internal taxes on certain Philippine products amounting to $73,000,000. The trade bill will be discussed in the House from tomorrow, March 28. The rehabilitation bill, which passed the Senate on December 5 last, is still in a House committee. Congress authorized in 1934, but never appropriated, the payment of about $24,000,000 as the profit of the Philippines based on the dollar-peso ratio from the devaluation of the American dollar, from which operation the American Government made a profit, which was utilized as expendable funds, of around $2,800,000,000.

To appreciate the effects of the trade bill (H. R. 5856) and the rehabilitation bill (S. 1610), an exposition of Philippine conditions is essential.

WAR LOSSES

The War Damage Corporation, an RFC subsidiary, sent three investigators to the Philippines and reported that the approximate total war losses amount to $800,000,000, of which $196,000,000 is public property, $464,000,000 is private, and $139,000,000 are religious properties. The industrial losses may be roughly estimated as follows: Sugar 65 percent, coconut oil 95 percent, tobacco products 95 percent, mining 70 percent, shipping 70 percent, and land transportation 60 percent. The estimate of losses by the Philippine government is over $1,200,000,000, which in point of completeness and present-day replacement values is logically the more nearly correct figure.

The Philippine Government today is spending on the basis of $150,000,000 per annum on an uncertain income of less than $40,000,000. In normal times, the annual budget was balanced at approximately $80,000,000. On the day the Philippines becomes a republic it will be in debt and funds will have to be found to operate it.

FINANCIAL ASSETS

However, there are two financial items that lighten up the somber picture, items which if wisely used could bring about the country's revival from war and which could be the functional base for its future stability, prosperity, and progress. These are (a) the $520,000,000 which Congress will appropriate to meet partially the war damages, and (b) a national nest egg of some $500,000,000 which the Americans spent in the Philippines during and since the war. This grand total of $1,020,000,000 is four times the value of the country's annual production, nine times its yearly exports, and seven times the monetary circulation.

Under the trade bill, if not prevented by administrative regulations, the Philippines will exhaust those two financial assets in 5 to 8 years, precipitating a severe economic depression. Not that the law is not helpful, but rather it is not helpful enough, and in the evaluation of advantages, the United States comes out at the long end and the Philippines the short, presenting the spectacle that it is the United States that is being helped primarily.

PHILIPPINE TRADE

Over 90 percent of Philippine production, outside of the people's two main articles of diet—rice and fish—is exportable surplus. An estimate of the Philippine-American trade in the 5 years following independence should convince Congress to make the trade bill more liberal to the Philippines.

The normal trade between the two countries is roughly $225,000,000 yearly. In the next 5 years the Philippines, by reason of the inherent paucity of rehabilitation, can export to the United States less than one-half of normal, while the United States, precisely on account of the need of rehabilitation, will export about two times the normal amount. There are no quantitative restrictions on American products entering the Philippines, although Philippine products are under quota limitations in the United States.

ELOQUENT FIGURES

Expressed in figures, the average annual exports of the Philippines to the United States, including precious metals, will be about $80,000,000 against imports of approximately $200,000,000, or a balance against the Philippines of $120,000,000. In prewar years, the Philippines was on the debit side of the ledger in the sum of $25,000,000 a year in the exchange of items "invisible items" like freight, insurance, investment returns, handling, financing, remittances, and other expenditures. In the next 5 years, those items will go up to $50,000,000 at least a year.

Thus the total balance against the Philippines will be about $170,000,000 a year, or a grand total of $850,000,000 in 5 years. That wipes out the total appropriation for rehabilitation and leaves only $17,000,000 of the national nest egg, to be wiped out in the following 3 years. After that, the Philippines will begin its exports to the United States on the basis of decreasing quotas or increasing duties, while the United States imports into the Philippines will be only on a decreasing-duty basis, the bill exempting from quantitative restrictions.

FULL WAR DAMAGE AMOUNT NEEDED

Two fundamental suggestions are offered:

1. Let Congress appropriate now the full amount of Philippine war damages. It is now clear, from news coming from Tokyo, that at least $12,000,000,000 worth of reparation assets will be obtainable from Japan. Eventually, therefore, the uncovered portion of the Philippine war damages in the rehabilitation bill of about $500,000,000 will be paid. So since the bill provides for the eventual settlement of 100 percent of the losses out of Japanese reparation assets, it is suggested that Congress advance now by increasing the appropriation the full amount of the losses. It will be in the nature of aid-advance and not a loan-gift.

POST-INDEPENDENCE RELATIONS

2. Let Congress realize the full meaning of its resolution 94 of June 19, 1944, under which an extensive American military establishment will be built on Philippine territory after independence. When the American flag flies over it, the Philippines without benefit of treaty will in effect become an American military protectorate and a political associate, considered as such by foreign nations. In that situation, it is to the vital interest of America to have a strong, prosperous and cooperative Philippines. Therefore, it is but logical that Congress, instead of passing a bill dissolving the Philippine-American economic ties, should consider one strengthening and perpetuating them. It is possible to make the economic relations between the two countries less competitive and overwhelmingly complementary to their mutual benefit.

WHAT BILL DOES

The trade bill (H. R. 5856) is the fifth redrafting of the measure. It is very involved. The Filipinos will have difficulty in understanding it. But they don't have to understand it fully if they want to receive the entire benefits of the rehabilitation bill, for a House amendment to the latter bill states that no payments over $500 shall be made until the Filipinos have accepted the trade bill.

Among the reasons why the bill is so complicated seems to be that an executive agreement is not considered by its author as having the force of law both in the United States and in the Philippines, even after it has been ratified by the Philippine Congress. Additional legislation on both sides is required by provisions of the bill to make the agreement effective.

CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT

The author's contention has been upheld that if the effective date of the bill is to depend on the Philippine Constitution being first amended to make a part thereof a certain section of the bill, it will not be until the next elections in the Philippines 4 years from now, in 1950, when such amendment could be constitutionally effectuated. The integrity of the Philippine Constitution must be upheld, and that could be done without impairing the provision of the bill desired to be made a part of the constitution by referring to article XVI of that constitution, which is a verbatim copy from the "mandatory provisions" of the act of Congress of March 24, 1934, the Philippine Independence Act.

The bill establishes a modified free trade between the United States and the Philippines for 28 years. During the first 8 years there will be no duty on both sides, but from then on there will be increasing duties on both sides, excepting Philippine coconut oil, cigar, scrap tobacco, and pearl buttons, which will all be duty-free, while their quotas will be decreased by 5 percent yearly.

PHILIPPINES WAIVE MORE

Mutual waiver of duties: The Philippines in the first 5 years will waive about $60,000,000 annually on duty-free American goods, while the United States will waive only about $20,000,000 yearly on duty-free Philippine products. In other words, the Philippines will make a sacrifice of $30,000,000 for the privilege of not paying the duty of $20,000,000. The sacrifice will be almost enough to run the Philippine government economically for a year, while the waiver by the American Government can meet its expenses for only a few hours.

Executive agreement (title IV): The trade and other relations will be set forth in a Philippine-American Executive agreement. Instead of the complicated provisions of the bill, it should simply provide that the pertinent provisions of the bill be incorporated in it, with the commitment by the Philippine government that section 341, defining the rights of Americans after independence, shall be made a part of the treaty required by article XVI of the Philippine Constitution, thereby making it the law of the land then and there. If it is still desired to make said section 341 a part of that constitution, although it would be a surplusage and a departure from the present American foreign policy, such could be made a part of the treaty. The ratification by the Philippine Congress of the Executive agreement shall be required within a period definite to be mentioned in the bill.

STATUS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

American immigration: Section 341 drops the clause in section 341 in the committee print (March 15) of the bill which says that Americans shall enjoy "the same rights as to property, residence, and occupation as citizens of the Philippines." If that clause is inserted in the bill, sections 231, 332, and 402 (e) can be deleted because if the Americans have the same right of residence in the Philippines as the Filipinos, it does not make sense to have provisions limiting their entry and residence in the Philippines. The Filipinos welcome as many Americans as are desirous to come to their country, which they helped to build, stay there at their pleasure, and be free to come and go without limitations.

Filipino naturalization: Section 231 places Filipinos under the immigration-law provisions applicable to non-Orientals, but dropped the provision of its predecessor bill, H. R. 5185, section 17, granting Filipinos the right of naturalization. It is suggested that the provision be put back in the bill. The Chinese have been given by Congress the privilege of becoming American citizens, why not the Filipinos, who are "American nationals" under American law until they become aliens on July 4, 1946?

SUGAR-QUOTA REDUCTIONS

Sugar (sec. 211): The original quota of 850,000 long tons is reduced in the bill by about 60,000 long tons. During the first 8 years there will be no duty, but after that period it will pay progressively 5 percent a year until the full 100 percent is reached, and without diminution of the quota. It is suggested that the quota be reduced to 750,000 long tons, but eliminating the duty for the entire period of 28 years. This duty-free position of Philippine sugar even on a reduced amount, considering the 60-percent destruction of the industry, will place it on a more solid and stable basis and make it conform to the agricultural diversification program that the Philippines must work out.

COCONUT QUOTA AND TAX REDUCTIONS (SEE SUPPLEMENTARY MEMO HEREOF)

Coconut oil (secs. 505 and 506): As an exception to the provisions of the bill that each country shall not impose any internal tax on each other's products, the United States is continuing the processing tax of 3 cents a pound on Philippine coconut oil. This tax, amounting to about $18,000,000 a year, was turned over to the Philippine Government, but after independence such will not be done. The tax has proved highly burdensome both to the Philippine producers and the American users of coconut oil. Before the tax the average price was 4.14 cents a pound and after the tax was imposed it was 2.42 cents. So it is suggested that since the tax is not to be returned to the Philippines that it be reduced from 3 cents to 1 cent. The American users will pay 2 cents less and expectedly will be able and willing to pay more for the product.

It is also suggested that the quota be reduced from 200,000 long tons (sec. 214-a-(3) to 150,000 or 125,000 long tons. With the industry 95 percent destroyed and adverse interests ever active, it would be better for the Philippines to place that industry on a more stable basis with a reduced quota. But there must be one quid pro quo: That the quota shall be intact during the entire 28 years.

This principle might be adopted with respect to cigar, scrap tobacco, and pearl buttons. These suggestions contemplate the possibility and probability that there might be a perpetual free-trade arrangement between the United States and the Philippines in harmony with their military and other relations.

Luxury goods: There is no provision in the bill that would enable the Philippines to control or curtail imports of luxury goods to make the rehabilitation program effective and to keep the Philippine dollar balances from being dissipated. If the needful provision is decided upon, as it should, what luxury goods are should be defined.

Simplification: A last appeal is made here to simplify the bill and make it more liberal to the Philippines.

REHABILITATION FEATURES

The following suggestions are offered on the rehabilitation bill, S. 1610:

1. Appropriate the full amount of damages. In line with the idea of staggering the rehabilitation to forestall a depression, there should be a provision in section 104 (d) to permit the recipient of war-damage payments to reinvest them at the proper time to assure a reasonable success of the investment.

2. Since foreigners in the Philippines will receive war-damage payments under section 102 (b-1), the necessary additional appropriation should be made to cover their damages, which are estimated at about $150,000,000, so the amount set aside for Americans and Filipinos is not reduced.

3. Churches should be placed in the same category as other properties and paid for under the same provisions. An increase of total appropriation would be necessary.

JAPANESE REPARATIONS

4. Under section 106 (b) the amount of coins and bullion obtainable from Japan as reparations shall be applied to that part of the Philippine losses not covered by the appropriation. But before a dollar is paid out the bill's total appropriation of $520,000,000 shall first be obtained and turned over to the United States Treasury. In this way Uncle Sam will not be out of pocket under the bill. General MacArthur, as of last December, had in his control Japanese coins and bullion, both gold and silver, valued at about $263,000,000. He had also

159,000 carats of diamonds, 6,200,000 grams of platinum and other rare metals, all roughly valued at $50,000,000, making a total of $313,000,000. Since these assets are inadequate to carry out the bill's provisions, section 106 (b) should be amended to include precious stones, rare metals, and other assets, otherwise the provision will not aid the Philippine war sufferers.

AGRICULTURAL STATIONS—DIVERSIFICATION

5. Lastly, there should be an amendment, with special liberal appropriation, under title III, for the establishment by the United States Department of Agriculture of experiment stations in the Philippines to carry out the program of agricultural diversification and improvement of the yield and quality of existing products. This amendment is indispensable if the Philippines is to be less dependent on American markets and on too few products, and also be able to compete with foreign production. It will also be highly beneficial to the United States. This matter is of the most vital and pressing importance.

THE FILIPINOS FOR UNITED STATES

The Filipinos fought cheerfully with America in the war, with effectiveness, and without the aid of lend-lease.

The two bills should be as least imperfect as possible. They will not go into effect until after July of this year. They will be the expression of America's good will to the Philippines. It is incumbent upon the Filipinos, as a token of appreciation and for their own sake, to do their best to make them work successfully and serve the best interests of the people.

SUPPLEMENTARY MEMO BY MR. VILLAMIN

COCONUT OIL PROCESSING TAX

Problem stated

The Ways and Means Committee has decided to continue the present law on the coconut oil processing tax with one exception, to wit, that the tax collected will not be returned to the Philippine government after independence. The tax amounts to about $18,000,000 a year.

Two questions arise: (1) Is Congress empowered under the Constitution to turn the tax over to the Philippine government after independence; and (2) is there a quid pro quo from the Philippines if the tax is turned over to that government?

American law

The answers to the two questions are in the affirmative.

1. Congress has the right to render financial assistance to a foreign country "in the interest of stable government or for any reason of policy, open or secret." (See brief No. 659 by the United States Government in *Cincinnati Soap Co.* v. *U. S.*, October term, 1936). Among the signers of this brief are the now Justices of the Supreme Court Stanley Reed, then Solicitor General, and Robert H. Jackson, then Assistant Attorney General. The Supreme Court upheld the contention of the Government.

2. There are several quid pro quos from the Philippines for the payment of the tax to the Philippine government, and the principal one, whose monetary value is much greater than the tax payment, is the fact that American goods can enter the Philippines without quantity restrictions while the Philippine products are placed under quantity quotas.

American policy

The Philippine Trade Act (H. R. 5185) is a general give-and-take arrangement between the United States and the Philippines growing out of their close and cooperative association of nearly 50 years. It is reinforced by the fact that after independence there will be close and cooperative military relations between the two countries through the erection of important American military establishments on Philippine territory. The payment of the coconut oil processing tax to the Philippines may be placed in the same category as the import duties waived on Philippine products, in both cases fully compensated for by the Philippines.

Effect of tax on price: Average f. o. b. San Francisco price on coconut oil before enactment of Revenue Act (1921–30)—4.14 cents a pound; after enactment of act (1935–41)—2.45 cents, or a decrease of 1.69 cents.

Americans United for World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell, from the Washington Times-Herald:

CAPITAL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

That ancient mob of Moscow lovers, internationalists, breast-beating do-gooders, save-Europe-and-to-hell-with-America crackpots have hopped on the publicity merry-go-round again and are sweatily and hoarsely doing business on the old stand.

We are speaking of the gurgling little group that have rechristened (if that's the correct term) themselves "Americans United for World Government."

It's a new name but the racket is the old one. The personalities are on parade. Slick come-on boys, the fat cats, the foolish females over 50, the pompous hillbillies with the thin and cracked intellectual veneer burned in by Rhodes scholarship exposure to Oxford empire-thinking by the better classes. These make up the sucker-list.

These are the ancient and honorable front guys that came into public notice way back in 1939–40, howling to high heaven that of course Great Britain should touch off a world war by taking the offensive against Germany and then—in the God-given respite of the phony war—did everything to halt a peace overwhelmingly desired by Britain, France, and Germany.

Well, they got their way, and so did Roosevelt.

Of course, the proof of the pudding for every honest American who has tasted the dish is the question:

"Are you better off today, March 1946, than you were 6 years ago, when Roosevelt and these unofficial self-appointed leaders of public opinion decided they knew better than the elected Congress and pushed this peace-loving Nation down the propaganda road to war?"

"And is the world or Europe better off today than it was before the strictly phony drool was poured out about the now discredited 'four freedoms' and the now nonexistent Atlantic Charter?"

The front boys and gals who have blossomed out as "Americans United for World Government"—howling that we should ditch our No. 1 war weapon, the atom bomb, and cut our potential one-world enemies in on our one weapon to protect our homeland—are beginning to get a bit shop worn and weather beaten from constant exposure.

These are the same little group of war mongers who bred the heady war medicine back before the battle for the Polish Corridor. They came up again as a group which tortured honest interpretation of international law and bedeviled a Congress into betraying the voters by back-tracking on neutrality legislation.

They are the same group that, once the legal monstrosity lend-lease was passed, shifted at once to out-and-out warfare—the "fight for freedom" outfit.

And when Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, came up with a high-pressure, professionally written, full-dress speech in the Senate last week, calling for our destruction of all atom bombs and atom-bomb manufacturing equipment, the boys began to wonder who was doing the Senator's ghost writing.

PEPPER was the pre-Pearl Harbor mouthpiece for F. D. R.'s carefully planned campaign "to condition public opinion for war," and the spokesman for the internationalists who wished to whittle down the sovereign independence of the United States.

It now appears that Florida's CLAUDE was just plugging the ancient line—stooging for the internationalists.

Now the same mob of early days is out again—all of them from the lunatic fringe to the real high-pressure boys behind the international scene whose names never do appear. But some of the names are indeed familiar in recent sad history.

In the new set-up of "Americans United" we note the name of Ulric Bell as "executive vice president." We imagine this is a paying post.

Ulric sunk his teeth into the same sucker pay-list back in the days of "Fight for Freedom" and the William Allen White Committee to Aid the Allies—a committee from which the late Mr. White, may it be said to his credit, resigned when he discovered that his honest isolationism was being used as a front and after he had been told back in the spring of 1940 that he was not wanted after he had declared—to Roosevelt's irritation—"the Yanks are not coming."

Also on this new set-up of ancient meddlers in international affairs the familiar names of Publisher Marshall Field 3d, Publicists William Agar, Robert S. Allen, Russell Davenport, Labor Leader David Dubinski, pal of the late Harry Hopkins, Isador Lubin, self-appointed leaders of public opinion such as detective-yarn author Rex Stout, Playwright Robert Idiot's Delight Sherwood, radio pundits Raymond Gram Swing and Edgar Ansel Mowrer, et al.

All in all, a good list of those who do not like the idea of this Republic being a powerful independent country ready to tell all to go to hell—and powerful enough to make it stick.

America—the Land of Dreams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Henry Mannix, a distinguished member of the New York bar and resident of Brooklyn, at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Brooklyn held at the Columbus Club on March 17:

It's a grand feeling to be among friends. It isn't how often we meet that counts. Rather, it's the feeling we have that "All's right with the world" which comes when we

do meet and greet each other. So for this joy tonight we have to thank a handful of Irishmen who brought the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick into existence almost a hundred years ago. To them this society was a bit of old Ireland transplanted to this country—the land of their hopes and dreams. And through all the years this has been a land of dreams, not only for Irishmen, but for the peoples of all the world.

The other day I was reading a newspaper article about an old man who had just celebrated his one hundred and first birthday. And I was struck by something he said. As expected, the newspaper reporter asked him for the secret of his long and healthful life. And, as expected, the old man replied that he had practiced moderation in all things, especially in liquor. Now that's not the point of my story, because I didn't come here to be disccuraging. Rather, it was something else the old man said that so greatly impressed me. The reporter pointed out to the old man the present unrest and disturbed condition of our country and asked him what he thought of America today. After thinking a while, the old man replied "the trouble with America today is that she has forgotten how to dream. America must learn to dream again."

Now there's a world of wisdom in that statement. "Dream again," said the old man. Then we did dream once? Ah, yes. Never was a Nation more surely dreamed into being than ours, never a Nation more definitely guided in its course by dreams than ours. Dreams that were born of daring and courage, of hardship and oppression, of wars and revolution Dreams that were worth suffering for, fighting for, dying for.

First there was the dream of Columbus that impelled him to take a voyage upon uncharted seas into an unknown world. What vision and what courage that voyage required when the scientists of his day advised him that the world was flat and that eventually he and his men would drop off the edge of the platter into a bottomless abyss.

Then came the dream of religious freedom that led many a daring band to follow in the path of Columbus across perilous seas to face even greater dangers and hardships on land. As time went on men like Washington and Jefferson and Franklin conceived a dream of political freedom, a dream such as no mortal had ever dreamed before, a dream for which those who had everything else, risked everything they had. The pioneers of the West followed in due time the pattern of their dreams and opened up a land of boundless wealth and riches. And then came Lincoln's dream of a single and indivisible Union that would provide racial freedom for all, as well as religious and political freedom.

Ah, yes; these men and many others who helped to make America become the greatest Nation in the world were dreamers of magnificent dreams. And of course, when I talk of dreamers I mean men who not only had vision, but doers of deeds—men who had the courage and energy to make their dreams come true. It was an Irish poet who said "One man with a dream—at his pleasure shall go forth and conquer a crown." Great, indeed, was the crown that was conquered by these dreamers of America.

And now, is it true that America has forgotten how to dream? The past had its dreamers but have we no leaders today who are capable of dreaming great dreams for the future of America? As we look around at home we find our country torn by industrial strife, many of our great factories silent and closed, hundreds of thousands of willing workers idle and unemployed, the clothing, housing, and other needs of our people unsatisfied. And we hear insidious, un-American doctrines preached that would cause the heroes of the past to wonder whether their dreams and deeds had been in vain. In the foreign field, we seem to be guided by decisions of appeasement and expediency and not by principles of right and justice. The small nations of the world, which in the past have regarded America as the champion of liberty and justice for all, have had their faith shaken by decisions like that which ratified the destruction of Poland. Recently we have had a glimmer of hope that our leaders would abandon these false principles and stand firm against the forces of evil. Let us hope that these recent pronouncements are not mere empty words—campaign promises so to speak—to be ignored or lightly tossed aside when it becomes inconvenient to adhere to them. Yes, indeed, we need dreamers of great dreams again today.

The recent World War proved that modern Americans, both young and old, still possess the same stuff from which the great men of the past were made. The crucible of war produced a spirit of unity that enabled our country with the help of God, to accomplish unsurpassed miracles of achievement not only on the field of battle but in the fields of science and industrial production as well. During the war capital and labor submerged their differences for the common good of all and side by side strove together to produce the weapons of war that enabled our military forces to carve out an almost incredible victory.

We do not lack the talent or the materials to fashion the same splendid victory in the peace. Ours is a country of great natural resources. We have the brains and ability to put those resources to work and create prosperity and happiness for all beyond the dreams of the past. To do this, however, our leaders must be men of vision and courage—dreamers of great dreams like those of old—for, as the Bible says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

A shining example must first be set by those who run our Government. They must have the courage to make decisions on the basis of unchangeable principles of right and truth and justice and not merely to catch votes or to cater to organized minorities. Our National Government represents all the people—not merely labor, not merely capital, not the North or the South, the East or the West alone, but the whole United States of America. The Government official who bases his decision on whether he will lose or win votes in an important matter affecting the public interest is like the soldier who leaves his post in time of battle—a traitor to his duty.

I firmly believe that if the leaders of our Government will adhere to these principles, our troubles at home and abroad will certainly diminish, if not largely disappear. In such case, selfish and irresponsible leaders of labor and capital alike will be forced into line by the weight of public opinion, and likewise, the powers of evil abroad will find the common people of the world solidly arrayed against them. Thus, by this means—that is, by the strict adherence of our leaders to true principles—we could hope for the full realization in our own country and throughout the world of the great American dream—liberty and justice for all.

Arkansas Democrat Endorses La Follette-Monroney Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat of March 16, 1946:

We laugh at Britain's slavishness to tradition yet we attempt to operate the most complex Government on earth with a mechanism that was out of date half a century ago.

But at least Congress is beginning to awaken to the fact that many changes are due, as evidenced by the following statement representing the conclusion of a joint committee of its own members: "A new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. * * * The time is ripe for Congress to reconsider its role in the American scheme of government and to modernize its organization and procedures."

Brave words, if only the majority of Congress can be prevailed upon to see it that way. However, after a year's study, the committee made these recommendations:

That the Senate's 33 standing committees be consolidated into 16, the House's 48 to 18, and that Congress cease creating special investigating committees.

That one suggestion alone, if adopted, could bring a tremendous change in Congress. As every constituent of every lawmaker knows, or should know, the entire time of most of the Members could be taken up in attending committee meetings and looking after the "boys up the creek."

But let's continue with the suggestions:

That the reconstituted committees be staffed with specialists and experts, and that Members' offices be provided with such assistants.

That Congress be relieved of much of the Members' work-load by giving self-rule to the District of Columbia and by shifting from Congress to the Federal courts and the Court of Claims the settlement of the innumerable private claims filed against the Government every year.

Also proposed was an intricate program for the formulation of the annual Budget, a big job but one that is possible.

Such needed reforms are obvious.

Temporary Hospital Facilities for the Veterans' Administration in Southeastern Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, urging the Veterans' Administration to acquire the Army's 750-bed hospital at Camp Edwards, Mass., for use as a temporary veterans' hospital pending the completion of the permanent hospital building program. The resolution follows:

Resolution to establish temporary hospital facilities in southeastern Massachusetts by the Veterans' Administration

Whereas there are no existing facilities for the hospitalization of disabled veterans in southeastern Massachusetts; and

Whereas there is now approximately 20,000 service-connected disabled veterans residing in this area who may at any time require

hospitalization, with the peak in number yet to be reached; and

Whereas the building of a new veterans' hospital in Providence, R. I., now under consideration will require approximately 3 years to put into operation, from the time of the survey of a proposed site until the hospital receives its first patient; and

Whereas other Government and private facilities are inadequate to handle the expected load: Be it

Resolved, That the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, in regular executive session assembled, go on record as favoring the retention of 750 beds at Camp Edwards, Mass., by the Veterans' Administration as a temporary measure until the Veterans' Administration has completed its building program; and be it

Resolved, That the Veterans' Administration confer with the War Department for the purpose of the transfer of this fully equipped facility to the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the department adjutant be instructed to communicate with the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in the Congress, and the Administrator of Veterans' Administration for the purpose of accomplishment of this resolve.

Adopted this 9th day of March 1946 at Boston, Mass., by the department executive committee, Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans.

LEON CHASE WAITE,
Department Adjutant.

Attest: FRANCIS J. ROCHE,
Department Commander.

Views of Hon. George E. Brunner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, March 23, the Jackson Day dinner of the New Jersey Democracy was held in the city of Newark, N. J. The dinner attracted the largest crowd that had ever attended any of these annual events. All of the dining facilities of the Robert Treat Hotel and Military Park Hotel in that city were occupied exclusively by Democrats who had come to honor the memory of Andrew Jackson and express their enthusiastic support for the Democratic candidates for office in New Jersey.

Stirring addresses were delivered to audiences in both hotels by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives. Among other speakers at the dinner were Hon. Lewis Hansen, Democratic candidate for Governor of New Jersey, Hon. George E. Brunner, mayor of Camden and Democratic candidate for United States Senator, and myself.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the address delivered on this occasion by Mayor Brunner:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and friends of Andrew Jackson, it is an honor to be here this evening, and to have this opportunity to meet you.

In this distinguished gathering it behooves me to be brief and direct. I propose to be both.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, I am your candidate for the Democratic nomination to the United States Senate. I want to win the election. I want to go to the United States Senate as your representative. I want this because I believe sincerely in the principles and the objectives for which our great party stands.

During the war the people of the United States were united. We had a common purpose and a common determination to beat the enemy. All party differences on national issues were submerged in our common effort. Now the war has been over almost a year. Internal conflicts, as though they had been compressed during the war, have burst forth with a virulence never before known in our history.

We see America, in effect, dividing itself into two camps. There is the group which believes the future of our country can best be served by looking backward; by increasing the power and authority of vested interests; by strengthening the hand of management at the expense of labor; by giving more to those who have and depending upon their largess to pass it on to those who have not; by building the wall of isolation around our country in the hope that we can live alone in the world. This group is represented by the Republican Party.

Opposed to them is the group which believes the interests of our country can best be served by continuing to follow the policies established by Franklin Delano Roosevelt; by being more interested in the many than the few; by attempting to secure a more equitable distribution of the fruits of our economic system; by attempting actively to combat prejudices of every sort and in every phase of our national life; by trying to assume our rightful place in leadership in world affairs. This group is represented by the Democratic Party.

I believe it is of the most tremendous importance that our ideas prevail if our country is to remain strong and progress.

It is because of this conviction that I am anxious our party triumph in the coming elections.

Allow me to be specific in indicating how I believe our philosophy of government affects our party's direct action and how that action affects the future of our country.

One of the major issues facing Congress today is the full employment bill. Conservative thought in America argues employment should be the province of private industry; that the Government oversteps its bounds when it attempts to insure every man in America a job. I say to you I believe this is fallacious thinking, reactionary thinking. I say to you I believe the men who propound this theory of government are interested primarily in a cheap labor market. I say these men are more interested in their own selfish interests than they are in the welfare of our country as a whole.

When Roosevelt drew up the Atlantic Charter, he promised freedom from want, freedom from fear. I can see no better way of assuring these than by guaranteeing every American who wants to work that opportunity. If I go to the United States Senate, I'll do my level best to see a full employment bill that means full employment enacted by law.

There has been before the United States Congress a bill to guarantee fair employment practices. The same group which opposes full employment also opposes this measure, and for much the same basic reasons.

There are those who give lip service to the forces opposing prejudices in this country, but refuse to do anything about it. I do not propose to be one of this group. When I go to the United States Senate I'll fight to have a fair employment practices bill enacted into law, a bill with teeth that means what it says.

During the war our National Government went into debt almost $300,000,000,000. Money was spent to build the implements of war, which were then destroyed. In effect, this created money without creating tangible goods to represent that money. America faced the danger of inflation. We still face that danger.

There are those who scream that the answer to our economic future lies in a laissez faire policy. "Abandon all price controls," they shriek. At the same time they smile benignly and say they are against inflation. That is arrant nonsense. Abandoning price controls would inevitably mean inflation—immediate inflation.

Whom does inflation hurt? It hurts the little fellow, the average man, the fellow Lincoln said God must have liked because he made so many of them. There are those vested interests in America who would welcome inflation. I say to you that, if I go to the United States Senate, I will bend my every effort toward preventing a decrease in the value of our money by whatever methods may be necessary, including the continuance of price control.

Today America faces a critical housing shortage. Thousands, no millions, of veterans have returned to find they have no decent place to live. In the richest country in the world the continuance of such a condition can be nothing but stupidity.

Millions of Americans want homes. They are not interested in philosophic economic discussions or business conflicts. Recognizing this situation, President Truman called in Wilson W. Wyatt. After a thorough study Wyatt proposed a plan which would have resulted in building of homes. I don't know whether the Wyatt plan was the best possible. But it would have meant immediate and fast construction. It would have been a definite attack on the problem. It would have meant an end of talk and a beginning of mass building. Congress failed to pass the necessary legislation.

I say to you that when I go to the United States Senate I'll lend my weight to any legislation which will result in the immediate mass building of homes. The United States has the material and the labor to build all the homes Americans may want. Those people have the money to pay for them. The Government cannot avoid the responsibility if those homes are not built and built immediately.

Ladies and gentlemen, I could go on half the night discussing the multitude of problems facing our country. Time will not permit. I have attempted, by discussion of a few specific problems, to show you my general attitude on some of the major issues facing our country.

We in America have before us the greatest opportunity in world history, "A rendezvous with destiny."

I believe that the principles of the Democratic Party offer the best chance for this country to prosper. As your representative in the United States Senate, I pledge myself to battle for those principles and for the greater good of our country.

Rice Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a newspaper article by Hon. Frank A. Godchaux, chairman, Louisiana State Rice Milling Co., published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of date March 25, 1946, as follows:

BELIEVES RICE SHORTAGE REAL

A LETTER ON THE SUPPLY SITUATION

EDITOR, THE TIMES-PICAYUNE:

Your editorial entitled "Rice Shortage?" seems to imply that someone in the United States is hoarding rice in hopes that it can be sold later at higher prices. Your conclusions seem to be based on your general impression that we have had a large crop and that the Government is taking only a little more than half of the output. Our market letters, however, have shown that in spite of the large crop, there was a very meager amount of good table quality rice left to the domestic trade after the Government set-aside.

These letters pointed out that the Government's price policy on rough rice had resulted in many farmer's delivery into mills rice of such a high moisture content it turned in storage so that it could not be used on the domestic market and had to be exported to markets where they are not so particular about quality.

You reported that some rice statisticians were beginning "to wonder what has become of all rice shipped by our mills out over the country in the last few months." In the first place, we happen to know of considerable rice that was reported by dealers to Washington as sold to the domestic trade when it actually went into export. In the second place, the Government has not told us how much rough rice has been sold to mills in the Dominion of Canada where we know large quantities have been shipped. This may have been a sizable leak in our rough rice supplies. Again, the figure you have quoted of 3,600,000 pockets of southern clean rice remaining undistributed, as of January 31, is exceedingly questionable. There is so much variation in mills' reports to Washington on shipments and warehouse stocks it is impossible to interpret Government reports with any degree of accuracy. We have been trying to tell Washington officials for some time that their figures on available supplies are incorrect.

The comparing of the rice situation to the case of shirts and suits is unfortunate because the two are not comparable. In the case of shirts or suits, additional supplies could become available at any time, while in the case of rice, it is unobtainable until a new crop grows it, around September and October. There is some chance of ceilings being raised on items of apparel while we have seen no indication of any possibility the prices on rice in the retail or wholesale trade might be advanced.

I think you will find later on that the reported rice shortage is very real so far as the domestic trade is concerned. For a long time, the Government would accept only good domestic table quality rice, and they took their large percentage of the total millings in this grade of rice, leaving the below-standard rice in the portion that was allocated for domestic and export trade. Some mills offered and shipped to the domestic trade as rapidly as possible, using all the good rice available and then when so much rice turned bad because of excess moisture in the rough their calculations were upset, and they found themselves overshipped to the domestic trade.

Your editorial states that no one claims that the 3,600,000 pockets are earmarked for the Government, but we think you will find that practically all of it is owed to the Government on the set-aside order.

Your editorial emphasizes that "the shortage is painfully inconvenient to the people in the heavy rice-consuming areas of the South." This is certainly true, but there is something else that is far more important and that is the economic injury to the rice-producing sections of this country, including many thousands of rice farmers. The people of the United States could put up with "inconvenience" in the interest of hungry people in foreign lands, but there are important sections of the South and West where the economy of the people would be seriously impaired if the eating habits of our citizens were changed from rice to some other commodity, thus forcing farmers on land peculiarly adapted to the growing of rice to change to some other crop. If we keep this country prosperous, no one will go hungry, and we will be better able to assist the hungry people in other nations.

FRANK A. GODCHAUX.
Chairman, Louisiana State Rice Milling Co.

Amvets Officially Recognized as Major Veterans' Organization in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. H. Leib, national legislative director, American Veterans of World War II:

AMVETS OFFICIALLY RECOGNIZED AS MAJOR VETERANS' ORGANIZATION IN MICHIGAN

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

On March 22, Gov. Harry F. Kelly appointed John Riley Worden, of Detroit, as the Amvets (American Veterans of World War II) representative on the board of trustees governing Michigan's $50,000,000 veterans' aid fund.

Thus in making this appointment the State of Michigan has officially recognized Amvets as a major veterans' organization, on par with the old-line American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans.

Nationally, Amvets is the largest veterans' group born of World War II. It is organized in 41 States of the Union with 462 Posts. Under the leadership of Claude Morgan, Monte Korn, and Neil Holland, and others, Amvets in Michigan have become a powerful force in veterans' affairs.

Here is the announcement made by Governor Kelly:

[From the Detroit Times of March 22, 1946]

KELLY NAMES SIX VET AID TRUSTEES

LANSING, March 22.—Governor Kelly today appointed six veterans of World War II as members of the board of trustees governing use of Michigan's $50,000,000 veterans' aid fund.

The appointees include:

David J. Gothold, Detroit, and Dunlap C. Clark, Kalamazoo, nominated by the American Legion.

Otha Beaudoin, Detroit, and W. Emerson Scott, Caro, nominated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Boniface Maile, Detroit, nominated by the Disabled American Veterans.

REPRESENTS AMVETS

John Riley Worden, Detroit, nominated by the American Veterans of World War II (Amvets).

Gothold and Scott will serve 3-year terms, Worden and Maile, 2-year terms, and Clark and Beaudoin, 1-year terms.

As original members of the board, these six will have the responsibility of establishing a representative committee of veterans in each Michigan county to administer the allocation of income from the State trust fund locally.

DISTRIBUTE FUNDS

The board of trustee will allocate funds to counties on the basis of veteran population, prescribe rules governing the granting of assistance to veterans and their dependents, and develop administrative procedures.

Establishment of the trust fund plan, modeled after a similar system in Nebraska, was approved at the recent special legislative session.

The Farmers Have the Answer—North, South, East, West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the editorial page of the Christian Science Monitor of March 16 entitled "The Farmers Have the Answer," by Frank L. Perrin:

THE FARMERS HAVE THE ANSWER—NORTH, SOUTH, EAST, WEST

(By Frank L. Perrin)

Already in some parts of the United States, the farmers are preparing to answer the call of distress heard in countries beyond our borders where food cannot be bought at any price. Within a few weeks, everywhere in the land, men determined to do all possible to help will join in the effort to produce even more abundant crops to feed those made helpless by war than were provided for those enlisted in waging war. To those who, even in years long past, had a part in this great seasonal awakening among the people on the farms, the picture of activity is still familiar. In a day, almost, it became certain that soon fields would be ready for the plow and harrow. Even the horses in the barns and feed lots seemed to sense the fact that their days and weeks of comparative leisure were ended. The trout stream beckoned, but to no avail. Sterner things demanded willing and undivided attention.

That, in retrospect, is the picture recalled now as millions of men and boys, women, and girls, enlist in a willing undertaking to feed a hungry world. To many of us, even a faint comprehension of the size and importance of this task is impossible. Have you ever, for instance, looked over a great gathering of people in a crowded auditorium, at a ball park, or along the miles of a parade, and wondered how and where all of them obtained food for three meals a day? Probably not one in a thousand of all the mass was a producer. Not one in a thousand had more than a faint conception of the effort, the consecration, the ingenuity required to produce, transport, and finally to deliver as needed the foods obtained and consumed.

Farmers never strike, and seldom threaten to shirk their part in the grand economy. They sometimes fail because of unfavorable conditions over which they have no control, but they never have been known to insist that those who are dependent upon their labor for food guarantee them a specified yield in bushels of corn or wheat, or an assured number of pounds of meat or poultry or dozens of eggs. Why, it might be asked, would not such a demand of assured prosperity in providing necessary food for the millions be as reasonable as that for an assured standard of wages in industries providing things less essential or less vital in our modern economy?

The answer probably is that the farmer, individually and collectively, is fully conscious of his and his family's independence. He is measurably safeguarded to withstand temporary depressions in the price level, and even of partial crop failure. His philosophy has taught him, rightly or wrongly, that he can afford to let the other fellow do the collective bargaining, and even the political maneuvering when it comes time to elect those supposed to represent him and his neighbors, near or remote, intelligently and honestly. In this respect, the farmer, generous and considerate in the affairs which he believes concern him individually, is inclined to be careless and sometimes indifferent. His duty, his responsibility, is to give to the great communty of which he is a part a share of the intelligent effort in planning and thinking which he is inclined to give only to those things which he believes concern the business in which he is so deeply engaged.

The world's peoples require a proper and regular balance and distribution of food. But our neighbors everywhere, and we here at home, need a better balancing of the power which only individuals can exert and make effective. This power is not best utilized for the common good in collectivism in any of its varied and sometimes alluring disguises.

The balance of voting power in the country as a whole is held by the men and women in farming communities. These voters, as individuals, are not often appealed to by designing and crafty politicians and their champions seeking office. It is sufficient and entirely satisfactory to them if the farm vote fails to swell the totals. Between now and November there is time for the farmer to inquire into the record of those who nominally represent him in making laws, and also into the qualifications of those who might possibly do the job a little better.

Shall This Union of States Be Preserved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by Samuel B. Pettengill, columnist and author and former Member of Congress from Indiana, before the House of Representatives of Missouri Legislature at Jefferson City, Mo., March 27, 1946:

Missouri's share of the Federal debt is twice the assessed value of all your taxable property. Missouri has used its blood and treasure to save the United States from foreign foes. Will Missouri now show an equal resolution to save itself from being swallowed up by the Federal Government?

On our steady progress toward the centralization at Washington of both political and economic power over the lives of men, I ask this question: Between where we are now and where Hitler took the German people, at what point do you propose to stop?

It is very clear that we are moving away from "an indissoluble Union of indestructible States" toward a consolidated bureaucracy—a Europeanized America.

The first great breach in the dike of the American Constitution was the adoption of the sixteenth amendment authorizing the taxation of incomes without limit. The Federal Government, in time of peace, should have no more absolute power over your property than it has over your life or liberty. Many States have constitutional limits upon the power to tax and the power to go into debt. The Federal Government has none. But without such a restriction, then, as Governor Lehman of New York said, "The States may be deprived of the means of financing themselves and their local governments. They would become vassal States and, as units of government, would disappear."

The second great breach in the dike was the Supreme Court decision in the second AAA case giving the "general welfare" clause, for the first time in judicial history, an interpretation which Thomas Jefferson held would remove the essential landmark dividing the Nation from the States. It held that Congress can spend money for purposes not specifically granted in the Constitution.

The purpose of the Constitution was to place limits on governmental power. But we now have vested in the Federal Government the unlimited power to tax and the unlimited power to appropriate. As a result, the Federal Government taxes away from Missouri the wealth created by its citizens, and then by gift, loan, subsidy, and grants-in-aid feeds Missouri money, less the political brokerage, back to Missouri. This makes Missouri and her officials suppliants to Federal power for the right to use the wealth which they create. Missouri now lives by Federal grace and not by ancient right.

The third great breach in the dike came with the fantastic folly that the Federal Government can create purchasing power, or, as stated by Mr. Roosevelt, it should "provide customers for business" by oiling up its printing press. This idea was taken straight from Mussolini and Hitler. With it goes the excuse that debt is of no importance because we owe it to ourselves.

This has given the green light to the "rake's progress" of easy money, the soft way out of difficulty. The degrading effect of this immoral doctrine upon the character of the American citizen is manifest on every hand. It is making America a nation of mocchers and panhandlers. It invites to the Nation's Capitol vast pressure groups which carry on a sort of civil war against each other for this corrupting flood of unearned dollar bills.

This is the moral cancer at the political heart of the Republic. It is destroying the unity of the Nation and the fraternal association of its people. It has led to 16 consecutive years of "charging it on the cuff," with no end in sight, and any end proposed by such men as Senator HARRY BYRD is bitterly opposed. It is leading to inflation and the dilution, if not the destruction, of the savings of the people. It is taking from their hands the power over the purse, the strongest weapon freemen have ever devised to prevent governments from destroying them. It is substituting the "gravy train" in place of the American eagle as our national symbol.

It should be plain to all but rakes and thieves that the Federal Government cannot create wealth, cannot create purchasing power in any honest use of words. If the Government taxes Peter to pay Paul, it simply forces the transfer of wealth from one to the other; it does not create new wealth or enrich the Nation by a dime. The same is true when it sells its bonds to Peter to give the money to Paul. It is equally true when it prints money or sells its bonds to commercial banks. This also transfers wealth by diluting the value of every dollar earned by honest toil and saved by homely thrift.

It is as dishonest as pouring water into milk. Having taken value out of good dollars, as thieving kings once clipped the edges off gold coins, the Federal Government, through OPA, is now trying as desperately to give value to its watered money in order to conceal its fiscal crimes, as when men were guillotined for refusing to give up wheat and wine for the diluted paper currency of the Government of France when it began to issue counterfeit money to pay its bills.

This process not only strengthens the Executive and weakens Congress by making it possible (for a while) to carry on vast socialistic programs without resort to taxation and the brake on spending which taxation always exerts, but it is a sword in the vitals of the States of the Union.

This is so because States and cities are forbidden to print or coin money to pay their debts. They cannot make the money markets their creatures nor depreciate interest rates at their caprice. When States, counties, cities, and towns undertake to borrow money, they have to pay interest rates established in a free market, and must satisfy the lender that the loan is sound. To pay interest and principal of debt, States and municipalities have to get the cash the hard but honest way—by taxing the people. This puts some brake on their borrowings, some resistance to socializing the business of their taxpayers. You see this force at work in every municipal ownership election.

The Federal Government, however, is under none of these restrictions. It can force interest rates down, borrow huge funds cheaply, pay its obligations of interest and principal by converting more of its promises into Federal Reserve notes, or by devaluing its gold and silver hoards—clipping the coins to pay its bills—or by outright greenbacks.

The Federal Government has a printing press; the States do not. This easy-money route promotes the growth of Federal power and subtracts from State and local self-government, which we thought for centuries to be necessary to prevent the return of Caesars, or dictators.

It is high time to recall the words of the great British statesman, William Pitt: "No civilization * * * can be accepted as secure in which expenditure is greater than revenue." It is imperative that the Octopus on the Potomac be told to balance its budget.

There must be no "Missouri compromise" with the principles for which our fathers died.

Jackson Day Address by Hon. Olin D. Johnston of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, on the occasion of Jackson Day, Missouri was honored with a visit by the distinguished

junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and at Kansas City last Saturday night he delivered an inspiring, enlightening, and patriotic address. I ask unanimous consent to have this fine address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am indeed honored tonight in being privileged to address this great Democratic meeting in the home State of our President, which is being held in honor of the memory of that other great President, Andrew Jackson.

Andrew Jackson to most Americans has appropriately become the symbol of certain great ideals. He was a man most Americans understood. He is famed for his passion for justice; for his championship of the cause of the downtrodden and for his deep-seated and ardent patriotism. Jackson was a soldier. He fought many battles, but the battles for which he is most dearly remembered are those contests in which he sought to protect human rights.

Andrew Jackson had an intense faith in the average man. It was his fundamental philosophy that decisions made by the average of the voters would be more enduring for, and more helpful to, the Nation than decisions made by small groups of the voters representing certain special interests.

The Democratic Party under Jackson faced many crises. Its then great leader had the difficult task of creating in the citizenry of the country an interest and understanding of the Nation's vast problems. History is repeating itself today when our great country, having just emerged from the most devastating of all wars, is faced with the almost insurmountable problems of peacetime adjustment. It is opportune at this moment that we invoke the Jacksonian philosophies; that we become inspired with the Jackson zeal; that we renew within ourselves the belief in the greatness of our party. The tasks which lie immediately before us are as arduous as those faced by Jackson in conquering a frontier. We need a double portion of "Old Hickory's" spirit to solve the international, political, and economic disturbances pestering our everyday postwar existence.

The world today is in a chaotic condition. Our Nation faces the greatest crisis in its civilization. Today we stand at the end of a successful and victorious war. We have peace in the world as far as shooting of guns is concerned. But, at the same time, we face one of the most difficult postwar conflicts known to man.

The democratic ideals will be necessary in order to preserve the rights and liberties of this Nation. Our great party has always been the party of the masses. From the very beginning there were two lines of thought—one led by Hamilton and the other by Jefferson. Later the thoughts of Jefferson were carried forward by Jackson.

I like to think of our Government and the laws of the land being made to protect the weak against the strong. This being so, how can we afford to let the Republican Party gain control of our Government when the principles they have practiced from the beginning are unequal rights and privileges to the few.

Jefferson, Jackson, and the Democratic Party have always fought for the rights of the laboring people—and when I say laboring people I mean farmers or anyone else who earns his livelihood by the sweat of his brow.

Let me quote from a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to William Johnson in 1823:

"Still further to constrain the brute force of the people, they (the Tories and reactionaries) deem it necessary to keep them down by hard labor, poverty, and ignorance, and to take from them, as from bees, so much of their earnings as that unremitting labor shall be necessary to obtain a sufficient surplus barely to maintain a scanty and miserable life. * * * And in the convention which formed our Government, they endeavored to draw the cords of power as tight as they could obtain them."

That is Jefferson speaking—not Olin Johnston! Bear in mind that Tories of that day were Republicans and reactionaries—the same as we have today.

Andrew Jackson in his forceful rhetoric summed up his ideas of liberty and justice on July 10, 1832, when he said:

"There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection and, as heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing."

In 1936 the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt at a Jackson Day dinner in Washington, D. C., obviously speaking from his own experience, had this to say:

"Backed not only by his party but by thousands who had belonged to other parties or to no party at all, Andrew Jackson was compelled to fight every inch of the way for the ideals and policies of the democratic republic which was his ideal. An overwhelming proportion of the material power of the Nation was arrayed against him. The great media for the dissemination of information and the molding of public opinion fought him. Haughty and sterile intellectualism opposed him. Musty reaction disapproved of him. Hollow and outworn traditionalism shook a trembling finger at him. It seemed sometimes that all were against—all but the people of the United States."

On every hand today in this year of "crucial decision" President Truman is meeting with opposition in his efforts to put through his vigorous program for the welfare of the American people.

We of the Democratic administration are convinced that the great hope and the only hope of this Nation today lies in President Truman's message to Congress in January and in his 21-point reconversion program.

While each and every Democrat does not agree entirely as to the best method of attaining the ideals and principles of this program, we all are in accord with its general provisions.

On no program that calls for positive, definite action can we achieve complete agreement on the detailed methods of accomplishing it. But we Democrats will not compromise the principles of our program. Following, as he promised to do upon his elevation to office, the policies and the ideals of Mr. Roosevelt, our present great leader has given us a program of action—a liberal, aggressive program.

It is a program we can all understand.

How great is the contrast with the vague platform of the Republican Party. Their party's synthetic program of glittering generalities offers nothing concrete, nothing defiite, nothing constructive.

Yet we all know the Republicans need no platform—no announced program—to inform the American people of their sole aim and purpose for existence. They represent now, as they represented under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, a program of unlimited privilege and protection for the wealthy few at the expense of the masses of the people. The masses have sought no special privileges, but through the magnificent efforts of Jackson, Jefferson, and Roosevelt have had to fight, and, fight vigorously, for the retention of their very rights.

The Democratic program is forward looking. Like Lot's wife, the Republican Party stopped, turned, and looked back. Its eyes and its hearts are frozen on the dead-fixed past. It is still the party of the past—the party of reaction, that seeks the solutions to the problems of the future in the ways of the past. It cannot, or will not, accept the policies which the ways of the present and the developments of the future demand.

The elephant is dead and has that peculiar aroma of the dead.

The high-sounding phrases of the Republican speech makers have the familiar insincere ring of the parson's eulogy at the funeral of a town's most worthless drunkard.

Possibly the greatest problem facing us as a Nation tonight is holding the line against inflation. While the administration earnestly seeks to maintain price controls, the Republicans, in and out of Congress, are fighting to wreck it.

In the face of vigorous Republican opposition, the Democrats brought the country out of a dangerous unemployment crisis once before. In the face of strong Republican opposition we are determined that in the future there shall be work for every man who needs it and wants it. We cannot, as the Republicans advocate, allow matters to drift in the hope that the situation will iron itself out. We must take bold, courageous action now to see that history does not repeat itself.

If we should permit another depression it might well plunge us into the abyss for which we were headed when President Roosevelt assumed command in 1933.

Many millions of our workers still need improved working conditions and increased wages. Maintenance of purchasing power requires not only jobs but jobs at wages that will provide all the necessities and some of the comforts of life. The Democratic administration has proposed to raise the statutory minimum wage to 65 cents immediately.

Our party has presented a dynamic plan for housing construction, which many Republicans are exerting every effort to block in the Congress at this time. The Republicans in the House scuttled the Patman bill. They heralded this action a glorious victory.

The GI bill of rights, which guarantees to our veterans the privileges they are entitled to, was sponsored and passed by a Democratic Congress.

Under President Roosevelt the Democratic Party laid the foundations for a real, lasting world peace through continued cooperation of the world's major powers. Under Democratic leadership we have progressed a great distance in the development of the United Nations Organization as a world organization that can insure peace. This Organization was formed despite the concerted efforts of a bloc of Republican Senators under Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, who sought, through amendments, to emasculate the bill which created it.

Republican leadership in Congress still bears the taint of outmoded isolationism. Because of the overwhelming desire of the American people for international understanding and cooperation, they are too clever to lead with a frontal assault. They seek to undermine, by insidious, sneaking methods, our efforts for world cooperation.

The Nation, under the Democratic administration, today is in good condition generally, although there are many danger signals that are plainly visible. Our national income in 1945 was twice as large as it was in the predepression year in 1929. It is more than four times as large as it was when Hoover left the White House in 1933.

The farmers of the Nation are in better condition than they ever were before. In 1945 the net income of farmers reached an all-time high record of approximately $13,000,000,000, compared with a prewar yearly average of less than $5,000,000,000. During World War II, farmers paid off their debts, whereas during and after World War I they continued to go into debt. At the time of Pearl Harbor, farm-mortgage debts stood at $6,500,000,000. Today it is down to approximately 5 billion.

The assets of the farmers at the present time amount to more than $95,000,000,000, compared with 54 billion on January 1, 1940. The financial assets of the farmers are varied and numerous, such as bonds, cash, bank deposits, and warehouse receipts. These assets amount to more than twice the amount of indebtedness. Just prior to the war the farmers' indebtedness amounted to much more than the assets.

For the years 1944 and 1945, corporations' profits, after taxes, each year amounted to approximately $10,000,000,000. Manufacturing profits, before taxes, in 1944 were 450 percent above the 1936–39 yearly average. Practically all lines of businesses benefited at about the same ratio as these enumerated. This shows that the country is in good financial condition, even though we have an enormous debt of $275,000,000,000.

With our enormous debt we cannot afford to let another depression and its problems of unemployment come upon us. It might be news and a warning to tell you that we had more than 1,000,000 ex-soldiers drawing unemployment compensation in the month of January.

The reports coming in daily show that our field applications for aged assistance are increasing very rapidly. Let me call to your attention that unemployment usually shows itself first among the aged due to the survival of the fittest. The younger people get the jobs and force the old people out. After the older people have been forced out, then the younger people begin likewise to be forced out of employment.

Let this be a warning to us that we must begin immediately to do everything humanly and financially possible to give jobs to people. This is what the Democratic Party stands for.

It must be our fight to see that every man and every woman has a job to do and that every citizen of our Nation will have sufficient food, clothes, shelter, and medical care.

The program of President Truman and the Democratic Party is one designed to realize to the fullest extent the great potentialities that this country possesses.

It is a program that envisages a strong and prosperous America on the only terms that America can be strong and prosperous—full employment and increased production, higher wage levels and increased purchasing power, broader social-security safeguards, improved public services in the fields of health and education, and greater protection for the small businessman and farmer against the ruthless assault of monopoly.

It is a program that takes full cognizance of the many stumbling blocks that lie ahead, and that charts a safe course around them.

It is a forward-looking program—one that rejects the stultifying theory that what was good enough for our fathers and grandfathers will have to be good enough for us and for our sons.

It is a program which advocates frank and whole-hearted collaboration with the other nations of the world in guaranteeing permanent peace.

In November of this year the American people will have an opportunity to place their endorsement upon this enlightened and vigorous program of the Democratic Party. The American people have chosen wisely before. I am confident they will do so again.

In closing, may I leave with you a memorable quotation from the speech of Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered on Christmas Day 1934, but the spirit of which is keenly applicable to our present situation:

"In front of the White House is the monument to a man who will live forever as the embodiment of courage—Andrew Jackson.

"His patriotism was unstained and unafraid. Carved into that monument is his expression of the necessity of union. That message grows in importance with the years.

"In these days it means to me a union not only of the States but a union of the hearts and minds of the people in all the States and their many interests and purposes, devoted with unity to the human welfare of our country."

Farm Machinery

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker. under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to say a few words on the matter of the scarcity of farm machinery. I and several other members of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, and other members of this House, have repeatedly spoken on this floor with reference to the shortage of farm implements. This shortage has contributed mightily to the disadvantage of the producers of food in all parts of the country for the past 3 years. It applies to practically every kind of farm implements both large and small. It applies to tractors, corn pickers, cultivators, plows, trucks, mowers, and dozens of other farm implements.

So great was this inconvenience nearly 3 years ago that the Republican Food Study Committee publicly demanded that the material used in the manufacture of farm machinery be declared to be strategic material necessary for the winning of the war. Had this been done the situation might have been different.

The planting season is now in full swing in the Southern States and it will soon be in full swing in the South Central States, yet many of the manufacturing companies making farm machinery are idle or partly idle. Much of this idleness is due to disputes between the employer and employees. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of these disputes I have taken the matter up with Secretary Schwellenbach suggesting that he take steps toward reconciling these labor disputes. He has responded very kindly and very nicely and I hope very efficiently. I hope the steps he has taken and is about to take will have good results and will produce farm machinery which is so badly needed. In view of the fact that I gave some publicity to the letter that I wrote to Secretary Schwellenbach, I think it is only fair to print herewith his reply. I am also inserting a clipping taken from the New York Journal of Commerce. This shows that this matter of the shortage of farm machinery is a serious matter that affects the commerce of the whole country. The letter and the clipping are as follows:

MARCH 25, 1946.

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENKINS: This is in response to your letter of March 15, concerning the disputes involving the International Harvester Co., the Oliver Farm Equipment Co., and the J. I. Case Co.

The strikes at the plants of the Oliver Farm Equipment Co. have been settled. Additional efforts are now being put forth to bring about a settlement of the dispute involving the International Harvester Co. Thus far, not very much progress has been made in the J. I. Case dispute, though the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor is continuing to explore every possibility of bringing this controversy to a termination.

I recognize fully the importance of a prompt settlement of the strikes in the farm-equipment industry because of their effect on the production of food, and you may rest assured that serious consideration is being given them by the Department.

Yours very truly,

L. B. SCHWELLENBACH.

[From the Journal of Commerce]

FARM MACHINERY PRIORITIES ASKED—GOP FOOD STUDY GROUP ASKS FOR REVIVAL OF WARTIME CONTROLS

WASHINGTON, March 17.—The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee today proposed that wartime priorities be given to manufacturers of farm machinery.

It is the first time that an organized Republican congressional bloc has departed from the party's attitude toward bureaucratic regimentation to call for a reinstatement of wartime controls.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CPA

The committee addressed its recommendations to Civilian Production Administrator John D. Small, contending that unless priorities are granted, farm cutput this year may fall "far below" established goals.

The food group combined its appeal to OPA for special assistance to farm-machinery producers with a letter to Labor Secretary Schwellenbach asking that he use every facility at his command to end the strikes in the farm-machinery industry.

In releasing copies of the letters sent to the two officials, Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, chairman of the food-study group, accused the administration of indifference toward the plight of the farmers.

"With our own food reserves lower than at any time during the war, and with the whole world looking to the United States to prevent starvation, we are inviting disaster if we do not provide our farmers with the machinery they need to plant and harvest their crops this year," Congressman JENKINS said.

SITUATION HELD CRITICAL

"The farm-machinery situation is critical. But while farmers plead in vain for new implements, the Administration permits production to be tied up indefinitely and forces manufacturers of farm machinery to take their turn with everyone else for scarce materials.

"For 3 years this committee has urged without avail that f. o. b. production be given priorities in material and labor as a war industry. With the crisis now facing us, it is difficult to understand the administration's continued indifference to this plea."

In its letter to Mr. Small the congressional committee charged that:

1. At no time since the war started has the administration permitted manufacture of

sufficient new farm machinery to meet minimum requirements as reflected by increased food demands and the scarcity of farm labor.

2. During 1943 there was an almost complete halt in production of farm machinery leaving the gap that has never been filled.

3. The shortage has been cumulative, as far as the farmer is concerned, becoming increasingly worse year by year as tools wore out and replacements or even normal repairs were impossible.

4. Production of farm machinery in 1945 was less than that regarded by the Department of Agriculture as a satisfactory minimum.

5. Even under the most favorable conditions, production now contemplated for 1946 can hardly come up to the unsatisfactory output of 1945. Production in January 1946 of several important categories of farm machinery, including tractors, was less than in January 1945 and, according to your own report, all farm machinery production will be down sharply in the February figures.

STEEL SHORTAGE

6. Shortage of steel, due to the recent steel strike, has seriously curtailed farm machinery production and it will be 1 to 3 months yet before steel again begins to reach manufacturers in sizable quantity.

7. A shortage of iron castings is also curtailing production and the shortage is most critical in several of the areas in which farm-equipment manufacturers are concentrated.

8. In spite of all these factors, and in spite of the fact that the CPA has the authority to grant priorities, nothing whatever is being done to give manufacturers on farm machinery any special consideration in obtaining scarce materials—although CPA has done so in the case of at least one other industry.

9. Under present schedules, virtually every piece of new farm machinery manufactured in 1946 will go to war veterans. Under the terms of War Food Order 135, veterans get first chance at all new farm machinery. Up to the end of January 134,000 preference certificates had been issued and the number is multiplying each month. Certificates issued for tractors during the past few months have exceeded the production during the same period.

Circulation of OPA School Questionnaire in California

REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, Fulton Lewis, Jr., called the attention of the country to a school questionnaire that was being circulated in California by the Office of Price Administration.

It was indicated that this questionnaire was loaded with questions of the propaganda type and that it was being circulated without proper authorization.

When the matter was called to my attention I addressed a communication to Mr. Paul Porter, Administrator of the OPA, requesting that it be immediately investigated and that it be ascertained whether or not the circulation of the questionnaire had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Reports Act.

I have today received a communication from Mr. Porter in which he states that the circulation of the questionnaire was unauthorized, that its further use was stopped as of March 4 by the regional office, and that the national office upholds the action of the regional office in this instance.

I wish to commend Mr. Porter for his very frank reply to my letter and to state that the hindsight of the OPA in this case is much better than its foresight.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following self-explanatory communications:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1946.

The Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: We have investigated the school questionnaire mentioned in your letter of March 18, and I am attaching a memorandum report on the matter, together with a set of the questions and a statement of our policy with respect to the participation of educational institutions and agencies in our public-information program.

You will note that this questionnaire originated in our Los Angeles district office and that the regional office stopped further use of it on March 4. It did not come to our attention here until the time of the regional office action. We fully support the regional office action, not only because the questions had not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Reports Act, but because the questions themselves are loaded and in some instances elicit incorrect answers.

Attached also is a copy of a telegram of March 14, from our Deputy Administrator for Information to the regional information executive, approving regional action in stopping use of the questionnaire.

I appreciate very much your interest in the matter. We shall, of course, continue our efforts to avoid occurrences of this kind.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. PORTER,
Administrator.

MARCH 22, 1946.

Memorandum to: Robert R. R. Brooks, Deputy Administrator for Information.

From: Oliver A. Peterson, Director, Community Service Division.

Subject: Los Angeles school questionnaire.

I am attaching a copy of the questionnaire used in 13 Los Angeles schools last December. As you know, the San Francisco regional office stopped the use of this questionnaire on March 4.

We are informed that the form of the questionnaire was prepared by a staff member of the Los Angeles district information office and was then submitted to the curriculum committee of the Los Angeles School Department, which suggested minor changes in question 6, which were incorporated in the form. Copies were then supplied to the high-school officials desiring to use the form.

It is important to note that the questionnaire was not prepared or even suggested by any member of the national office information staff. It did not come to our attention here until after it had been criticized by a radio commentator.

In addition to the fact that clearance by the Bureau of the Budget (required by the Federal Reports Act) was not obtained for this questionnaire, we do not consider it to be sound educational work and fully support the action of the San Francisco regional office in ordering its use discontinued. While school officials are, of course, free to determine their own educational programs related to the economic stabilization effort, we are doing everything possible to insure wise and effective use of materials bearing on OPA's part in this over-all effort.

The attached statement outlines our policy on work with educational agencies and officials.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT OFFICE,
San Francisco.

Memorandum to high school principals and teachers.

From: William F. Elliot, district information executive.

By: Cyndicy C. Ewart, information panel officer.

Subject: Quiz on price control.

In an attempt to determine the average student's knowledge of price control and its effect, we are asking the cooperation of the principals and teachers in making a survey.

You will find attached a list of six questions with a space provided for the number of children participating, the number who answer "yes", and the number who answer "no." After the survey has been completed in each classroom, the principal will take a total for the entire school, and mail it to Cyndicy C. Ewart, OPA northern California district office, room 305, 1355 Market Street, San Francisco 3, Calif.

While the survey is being conducted we feel that it would be advantageous to conduct a discussion in the classroom to clarify each point.

STUDENTS INTERVIEWED

Name of school_____.

	Yes	*No*
1. Was there price control after World War I?_____	☐	☐
2. Did you know that there were more than 100,000 stores (wholesale and retail) forced out of business by the depression that followed World War I?_____	☐	☐
3. Did you know there were more than 11,000,000 men unemployed during the depression after World War I?_____	☐	☐
4. If all price control were discontinued now as it was after World War I, do you believe we could avoid another depression?_____	☐	☐
5. Do you believe that price control has been helpful to your future?_____	☐	☐
6. Do you think price control should continue until the manufacturers are able to supply adequate goods to meet demand?_____	☐	☐

(NOTE.—Use this form for classroom totals. Principals may use the same questionnaire for school totals to be returned to the OPA Northern California District Office, 1355 Market Street, Room 305, San Francisco, Calif.)

PURPOSE AND POINT OF VIEW OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICE DIVISION IN ITS WORK WITH EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

Widespread public understanding and support are indispensable to an effective postwar economic stabilization program. Without understanding and support, compliance breaks down. And without widespread compliance, enforcement is impossible. The achievement of understanding is an educational job of the first order. A large part of

the responsibility for this educational work rests with the schools and colleges of the Nation. Everywhere, schools and colleges are making contributions.

As a part of its work, the Community Service Division assists educational institutions and agencies in the development of educational programs and materials designed to enlist compliance with price and rent control. In this phase of its operations, therefore, the Division works with and through the United States Office of Education, State deparments of education, local school systems, colleges, teachers associations, and other educational agencies and publications in the development of public understanding of the economic stabilization program. The Division has no formal curriculum or course of study of its own for doing this important job. The State departments of education, local school systems, and individual schools and colleges have the responsibility of developing their own educational programs in accordance with their needs and resources.

There is abundant evidence that schools and colleges are aware of the crucial importance of developing understanding of economic stabilization among the American people. This educational task provides a challenge which the schools and colleges are meeting and will continue to meet if they are provided with the assistance which they need and want to do the job.

MARCH 14, 1946.

TO HOWARD FREEMAN,
Regional Information Executive, OPA, San Francisco:

Re your report of action of March 4, stopping further issuance of quiz on price control sent to high-school principals and teachers, and recalling by telegram those previously issued. Your action is emphatically approved. Field staff has been repeatedly apprised that any identical question asked of 8 or more people must be cleared with the Bureau of the Budget. Please notify all members of your staff that all unapproved surveys must stop and that strict compliance with the Federal Reports Act is required.

ROBERT R. R. BROOKS,
Deputy Administrator for Information, Office of Price Administration.

Jackson Day Speech by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Spokane meeting commemorating the democratic philosophies of President Andrew Jackson.

As a testimony to the belief of the people of this Nation in the ideals of President Jackson, I should like to cite the attendance of 1,033 at this Spokane banquet March 23.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Jackson Day meetings throughout the country our fellow citizens are being reminded of the contributions to the democratic heritage made by a great President. The details of the past are forgotten, the issues change, but the fundamental principle remains. Democratic government is an instrument for the common welfare.

Whenever this principle is seriously threatened—as it was in Jackson's day—and as it was a hundred years later in our day, the mass of the people call for militant champions to protect it.

In this decision lies the genius of the American people; and in the ability to act promptly lies the genius of their elected leaders.

Let us be clear about the principle. It is not a question of more government, or less government; it is a question of whether government benefits more people or less people.

GOVERNMENT FOR THE MANY

Jackson fought the Bank of the United States and the monopoly power of corporations. He fought them, not because he hated banking and business, but because he hated the misuse of the general powers of government for the special purposes of a privileged few.

When in 1836 those privileged persons were thwarted in their purposes, they heaped abuse and vilification upon Jackson's head. They called him a bandit, a dictator, an executive despot. They prophesied horrible consequences for the American way of life. They hired newspaper and magazine men to write their story. They herded people into their camp by using the bank to manufacture a financial panic. They sent deputations to Washington and organized a powerful lobby to influence the Congress. By greedy attempts to satisfy their desires, in Jackson's words, they "arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man against man in a fearful commotion which threatens to shake the foundations of our Union."

In the end Jackson won. He won because he had the support and approval of the mass of the people—the people whom Jackson called the "bone and sinew" of the Nation. These were, to Andrew Jackson, the farmers, mechanics, small businessmen, and laborers—the ordinary people everywhere who, as Jackson said, had neither time nor the means to secure the favors sought by the rich and powerful.

In a farewell address on March 4, 1837, Jackson, old and failing in health, nevertheless spoke to the people. He warned them of the self-seeking lobbies that would always attempt to abuse the Government. He reminded them that it was in their power to shape their own destiny.

PEOPLE CONTROL DESTINY

Jackson said: "The men who profit by the abuses and desire to perpetuate them will continue to besiege the halls of legislation in the general Government as well as in the States, and will seek by every artifice to mislead and deceive the public servants. It is to you yourselves that you must look for safety and the means of guarding and perpetuating your free institutions. In your hands is rightfully placed the sovereignty of the country, and to you everyone placed in authority is ultimately responsible. It is always in your power to see that the wishes of the people are carried into faithful execution, and their will, when once made known, must sooner or later be obeyed."

The pattern of the 1930's, in many ways, resembled that of the 1830's. The American people repudiated the forces of organized greed and privilege that threatened to destroy the foundations of their national existence They insisted that the Government act for the common welfare and not as the handmaiden of special privilege.

But again, as in the 1830's, those whose purposes were thwarted heaped abuse and vilification upon the head of President Roosevelt. They called him a dictator and a despot. They fought his administration with all the power of associated wealth, calling it a threat to the American way of life.

How does it come about that the American people, seeking to save their way of life, are accused of destroying it?

The answer is simple, and Jackson saw it clearly. "It is to be regretted," he said in a veto message on the bank, "that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes." When government refuses to bend for special privilege, it is called tyrannical by the group that thinks government was instituted among men for its private benefit rather than for the benefit of the whole people.

FOURTEEN YEARS IN NATION'S CAPITAL

I have been working for Washington State in the Nation's Capital for 14 years. I have watched at the congressional firing line this process of violent opposition to the will of the people repeated again and again.

Among the first things I saw was one of the mightiest propaganda engines ever developed. It was that wielded by the power lobby against the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

This lobby did not spring up overnight. Throughout the 1920's, private power interests had poured millions of dollars into schools, universities, publications, and other media of education to create sentiment unfavorable to the development of public power. That was only a preliminary. When the Holding Company Act was up before Congress, the main drive opened. The private power lobbyists spent huge sums to suppress or defeat this legislation. They bombarded Congress with telegrams sent without knowledge or consent of the signers. They sent follow-up agents to the halls of Congress. They put their arguments into newspapers and over the radio. They wept for the widows and orphans. And always they pointed to the terrible specter of the death of the democratic government that this legislation would bring.

After the legislation was passed, they swamped the courts with lawsuits, hoping to wreck the Holding Company Act, the TVA, and other measures. It became apparent that the drive against the Holding Company Act was part of a campaign to destroy the New Deal.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT STRONGER

When the smoke of battle cleared away democratic government was stronger, not weaker; and business—conducted on a more honest and efficient basis under the Holding Company Act—was stronger, not weaker.

The court action illuminates the contrasting ways of the Old Deal and the New Deal, both in the 1830's and the 1930's.

The last of the many lawsuits by which the power lobby tried to wreck the TVA was heard by the United States Supreme Court in 1938. The private utilities argued that their franchises gave them a right to be free from the competition of the TVA. These franchises, they said, represented property rights which would be destroyed by competition if the TVA were permitted to sell electricity. They wanted, in other words, an unrestricted monopoly privilege to levy a toll on the consumers in the form of higher prices.

The Supreme Court denied their plea. Among other things, it said that the franchise to exist as a corporation and function as a utility creates no right to be free of competition.

And here is a significant point. The Court was speaking the philosophy of Andrew Jackson. For it cited as authority on this point a case decided 100 years ago by Chief Justice Taney, the friend, Cabinet officer, and Court appointee of Jackson.

That old case had to do with two bridges across the Charles River in Massachusetts.

At one time the State legislature had incorporated a company to build a bridge and take tolls from people crossing it. Years later another company was incorporated to build another bridge, to become a free bridge after a time. The first company argued before the Supreme Court that its franchise conferred a property right that would be destroyed by the free bridge. In other words, it wanted an unrestricted monopoly privilege to levy a toll upon transportation.

COMMUNITY HAS RIGHTS

Chief Justice Taney denied the plea. A franchise of incorporation, he said, as the Court said a century later in the TVA case, does not sanction freedom from competition. "While the rights of private property are sacredly guarded," Taney said, "we must not forget that the community also has rights, and that the happiness and well-being of every citizen depends on their faithful preservation."

This bridge case was a landmark in judicial thinking. The rights of the community were recognized as taking precedence over the profit seeking of a monopoly corporation.

Who can doubt that transportation and commerce were tremendously advanced as a result? And yet, the enemies of Jackson saw in the decision the destruction of democratic government, just as the enemies of the TVA saw in public power the destruction of democratic government.

Had the American people harkened to the counsel of the private power lobbyists, the war might have been lost and democratic government truly destroyed. Without the public power facilities created from our national resources, the vital industries of war could not have been serviced in time.

Today the private power lobby is at work again. With the same old arguments and the same old tactics, it hopes to undo the work of the Holding Company Act. It hopes to stifle legislation for a Columbia Valley Authority. That is in line with its philosophy that the resources owned by the whole people shall lie wasted and unused unless a toll is paid to private corporations. This was the philosophy of Nicholas Biddle and his bank of the United States. It was repudiated by the people in Jackson's time, and the American people will continue to repudiate any economic doctrine which favors the few over the many.

FIGHT FOR VETERANS' HOUSING

The most shameful exhibition of organized greed today is the lobby working for the defeat of veterans' housing legislation. Profiteers and speculators want to levy a toll on the people suffering from lack of housing. They want to profit from scarcity. They shrill a constant refrain that the administration's program to build 3,000,000 houses in the next 2 years is contrary to the American way of life. They try to hide under the cloak of small business and even to justify their speculation and profiteering in the name of the veteran. What a mockery of the desires of veterans who are sleeping in parks, hallways, and overcrowded rooms!

For months the lobby against housing legislation has been bombarding Congress with telegrams. It has been said that some of these telegrams were sent without knowledge of the signers. Knowing the activities of the private power lobby, I would not be surprised to see a repetition of these old tactics.

I know certainly that the national organizations conducting the lobby against housing do not reflect the views of all their members. This is a matter that bears investigation by the Congress and by the organization members themselves.

When men who lived in foxholes are searching frantically for shelter, and when millions of other citizens are joining in the search, I say it is reprehensible for any organization to whip up a froth of lies and propaganda intended to defeat, delay, and ridicule attempts of the Government to find a solution. This is a stab in the back to the veterans. We of the Democratic Party cannot permit this. We must see that houses are built.

WE NEED 12,000,000 HOUSES

Bear in mind that the goal of 3,000,000 houses in the next 2 years is a minimum program. It will take care of emergency needs only. Within the next 10 years we must build 12,000,000 or 13,000,000 new homes to keep pace with the growing population and to overcome accumulated deficits in the building industry.

This is a stupendous job. It cannot be done by housing as usual. The building industry must be renovated. Men must be trained in large numbers and given steady work the year round at good wages. New materials and building methods must be devised to build houses in the volume and speed required, and at a cost low enough to be within the means of the majority. The greatest industrial Nation of all time cannot afford to remain always underhoused. We must build homes for all who need them.

Our veterans will be satisfied with nothing less. They know by first-hand experience in combat the tremendous capabilities of American industry and labor. Can we say to them that American industry and labor are incapable of providing its citizens with the decent homes to which they are entitled?

The home-building industry today is on trial. It stands before the bar of public opinion as defendant, not as complainant. To hear the complaints made by some of its more vociferous spokesmen, you would think otherwise. They want all controls lifted. They are opposed to ceiling prices on homes. They are opposed to incentive payment to encourage new producers and to get more materials provided. They say: "Let us alone and Americans will get all the houses they need."

PRIVATE INITIATIVE NEEDED

The record will not bear them out. The housing needed has never been available to the American people. In the best year of the building boom during the 1920's, less than 1,000,000 houses were built. At no time in the last 50 years has building kept pace with the increase of families. And very few of the houses built were in the price range that most American families could afford.

These families have been forced to take the "hand-me-downs" in housing. The only way they could get moderately priced housing was to wait until structures had deteriorated and become worn out. The slums that blight our cities and rural areas are the only kind of low-cost housing offered to millions of American families.

It is not necessary to cite statistics to demonstrate that the vast majority of veterans will have very modest incomes. The facts are well known to you all. Are we to offer the veterans the "hand-me-downs" in housing? Are we to crowd them into slums? Those who answer "Yes" are the people who want control of prices and materials lifted, so that housing costs will jump beyond the reach of veterans. Those who answer "Yes" are the speculators and profiteers.

This serves to point up the fact that we are living in a time of crisis. It calls for careful, progressive thought. We must go forward, not backward. We live in a world suddenly transformed by the cataclysmic importance of atomic energy.

The new era is symbolized for us in Washington State by the atomic energy plant. Richland should become the center of research on atomic energy development. Proper development will raise the living standards of people throughout the world. The world's leading men of science can work out the facts of atomic energy. In this development we can find world peace and a higher plane of living for all mankind.

WE LOOK FORWARD

From my study of information available, I am confident in saying that in the Richland plutonium plant lies the future of atomic research and development. Even in this infant but fast-moving development, we in the Pacific Northwest can say, as we say in many other fields, that we look forward—not backward.

With the impetus of war production we stand ready to enter the new era wherein atomic energy and light metals will play so important a part.

The problem of human welfare posed by atomic energy are new and complex. In contrast, the problems of housing seem commonplace, more familiar to our everyday life. But I say to you, we cannot let the solution of either rest with the agents of special privilege. They will provide no solution.

The housing crisis that besets us is so catastrophic as to stagger the imagination and shock the sensibilities of the American people. President Truman has mobilized the executive agencies to an all-out effort to meet this crisis. Legislation also has been introduced in the Congress. Committees of the Congress have tried to assemble the facts.

But what have the speculators and the profiteers done? Nothing constructive, nothing cooperative. Misrepresentations are spread about the country even before the Congress and the administration begin. Doubt and confusion are sown in the public mind.

And this is where your responsibility becomes great. This is why these meetings commemorating President Jackson and spotlighting the continued progressive wishes of the Democratic Party are so vitally important.

PEOPLE'S RESPONSIBILITY GREAT

These meetings put those people in the Congress on notice.

In the national legislative halls today there, too, are men who grow uneasy at the mere mention of Government responsibility for the maintenance of full employment. There are men who blind themselves to the simple necessities of workers unable to get even a minimum subsistence unless the legal floor under wages is raised. There are men who insist on excluding large groups of our people from the ordinary benefits of social legislation that have now come to be an accepted fact for many members of industrial society.

I won't take time to catalog all the important bills that lie pigeonholed in committee files. By the mere fact that the legislature has not discharged its responsibilities, your responsibilities as American citizens and the backers of the Democratic Party become the greater. Each of you has a duty to sift the good from the bad, to assess the public good and the special interest that tries to take on the color of the public good. And each of you has a right to demand that the necessary steps be taken to promote the welfare of the whole people.

If there is no concerted demand for the enactment of forward-looking legislation, demagogues will take it upon themselves to speak for the community. They flourish in the barren soil of public cynicism or indifference. Already we see such unwholesome personalities springing up. With much fanfare and spoken nonsense, they try to create a public excitement and turn attention from the important tasks of the day. In the Halls of Congress we have more than our share of them. You need but read about the antics of some of our Republican colleagues in the debates on the full-employment bill. Their

blasts of oratory do violence to the modest aspirations of ordinary people everywhere for a decent living.

Problems of today, simple or complex, national or international, can only be settled if we leave emotion, preconceived conclusions, and outworn practices in the discard. These problems of today can only be settled if we depend wholly on dispassionate facts interpreted by the good sense of the American people.

WE MUST DEPEND ON FACTS

But unfortunately we are not reaching conclusions in this country or in Congress wholly on the basis of the facts. Prejudice plays too big a part. It is fed by the predigested information sent out by pressure groups. The good sense of the American people is besieged from all sides.

I charge that it was prejudice created by these besieging pressure groups which caused a solid bloc of Republicans joined by a small minority of Democrats to kill vital parts of President Truman's housing program. They responded to the appeal of the lobby against housing.

It is this same general group that wants to kill price control; that wants to knock out full employment, smother enlightened tax legislation, prevent increases in minimum wages—that wants, in short, to stifle President Truman's reconversion program. It would rather have a "boom and bust" program.

The "boom and bust" boys want nothing of President Truman's bold and forward-looking legislation. His program isn't designed for special privilege. It is designed to protect the mass of the people, those Jackson so well called the "bone and sinew of the Nation."

You all remember when the newspapers created Truman's honeymoon. It ended when our postwar President moved boldly and effectively to interpret into legislative form the wartime-enunciated Roosevelt economic bill of rights.

The honeymoon ended with a blast as agents of special privilege called Truman's program regimentation and totalitarianism. They blasted because the Truman program was for all of the people. They will continue to blast because the Truman program will always be for all of the people.

Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, last Saturday, at the Jackson Day dinner held in Providence, R. I., our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] made an exceptionally fine address, setting forth Democratic policies in foreign relations and in domestic affairs. There was present a large and enthusiastic audience which tested the capacity of the hotel where the banquet was held, but it seems to me the Senator's address has an appeal to a very much larger audience. His remarks were thoughtful and very much above the average of the usual political address. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Democracy of the great State of Rhode Island, I count it a high privilege to address so many distinguished Roosevelt, Truman, and Jacksonian Democrats. There is no greater honor that can come to one than to be invited to speak in Rhode Island, for, if Pennsylvania holds the shrine of American independence, Rhode Island, the mother of religious tolerance and freedom, made lasting contributions to the permanency of that glorious institution.

Eloquent orators and great patriots, men of independent powers and strong in the power of independent words, have kept the name of Rhode Island in the forefront as the history of our Nation has unrolled.

And so I come to this rostrum inwardly quaking, for I feel in the atmosphere of your State the tradition of such early giants as the immortal Roger Williams, William Coddington, Gen. Nathaniel Green, and many other of your illustrious sons—men whose words and deeds could shake or protect the Nation—leaders who wove into the fabric of life the human attributes of tolerance, forbearance, and understanding.

While visiting your State last summer there was pointed out to me some of its ancient landmarks. I remembered, too, what a record for bold, courageous action lies stamped across the annals of this Commonwealth and how that record is being maintained today by one of the leading constructive and progressive statesmen in the United States Senate, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. It was my privilege and honor to join with Senator GREEN in sponsoring the soldiers' vote bill. It was a legislative battle of many parts, and I am sure he will agree with me that so long as we serve in the Senate we could seldom labor for a more worthy and noble cause.

A similar record of high public service is also being maintained by your other able and distinguished statesman, whose long service to his State and Nation is common knowledge in Rhode Island. I refer, of course, to the Honorable PETER G. GERRY. It is my privilege to serve with Senator GERRY on the important Finance Committee of the United States Senate.

That record is also being maintained today by your eminent Governor, the Honorable John O. Pastore, who shares the honors with Governor Arnall, of Georgia, of being the two youngest governors in the Nation.

The people of Rhode Island are made of that bone, fiber, and sinew which has made America the envy of the world. You and your forebears are steeped in the tradition of those unknown Rhode Island stalwarts who, in 1772, in the dead of night, set fire to the Britisher *Gaspi* when that ship came into port to enforce the unbearable trade and navigation acts. It was that same spirit of independence and farsightedness which prevented the National Government under the Articles of Confederation from strangling this country's internal trade with excise and internal tariffs.

As I pondered over the history of your State, I concluded that Andrew Jackson, whose memory we revere tonight, could easily have been a Rhode Islander, because from the time of Roger Williams until now, your State has produced leaders who possessed the Jacksonian statesmanship, character, tolerance, and boldness.

My friends, this is the kind of a meeting Andrew Jackson would enjoy if he were here tonight. That sincere and resolute character was at home among his friends. He was most persuasive in argument and debate when confronted with vexatious problems. His burning passion for his country was predominant throughout his colorful career. His fidelity to the free institutions of America is strikingly set forth in his farewell address upon retirement from the Presidency on March 4, 1837, when he said, "I thank God that my life has been spent in a land of liberty and that He has given me a heart to love my country with the affection of a son."

My friends, there is an utterance which will live forever. Those words identify a statesman and a patriot. They could well be inscribed over the door in every home, classroom, and business institution in America.

And while I am speaking of an honest patriotic and resolute character, I am delighted to include in that category a true friend of mankind, the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman. Born in humble circumstances, inured to toil from earliest youth, a soldier of courage and leadership during the First World War, Harry Truman comes closest to the Jacksonian ideal of a people's President than any American leader since Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Jackson. The hour is here when all Americans should share the enormous responsibilities bequeathed to him through the death of President Roosevelt.

Notwithstanding the fact that we are passing through one of the most critical and dangerous economic cycles, we find some reactionary Republican leaders for partisan reasons trying to sell the President of the United States down the river. It is the same crude and ugly pattern they followed for 12 years in their unsuccessful attacks upon the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. A party cannot win on a program of negation or name calling, such as was recently given to the country by the Republican National Committee in their meeting in the city of Chicago. Their conclusions represented a masterpiece of evasion, filled with shabby phrases and glittering generalities. It is difficult to display even a modicum of tolerance and charity for the Old Guard, which controls the Republican Party saddle, boots, and breeches, since they are living intellectually in the last century.

There was seldom anything right during the war, and nothing right since the war with this little group of intensely reactionary partisans. In their chronic attacks they grasp a shadow for the form. They gripe about little things. They bluster forth with alarming tirades over the radio. Even when their position is exposed as wholly indefensible, they continue to cry "Wolf, wolf," all of which when carefully analyzed adds up to nothing more or less than a lot of political sound and fury.

My good friends, the Democratic Party welcomes this type of political offensive. The people have no trouble in seeing the transparent lack of statesmanship in such a partisan, selfish, and unrealistic approach. This is particularly true of the veterans returning from World War II. The knowledge of world affairs acquired first hand by our millions of men and women in the armed forces has convinced them that a policy of action instead of negation is the only thing that can make our democracy work. These men who were willing to give their all to save the American way of life are in no mood to follow blind reasoning or listen to a lot of political buffoonery. In the principles of the Democratic Party they foresee the best hope for jobs, homes, success, and happiness. Recently the Gallup poll showed 65 percent of returning veterans supporting the Democratic Party.

My fellow Democrats, I do not intend to convey that everything is perfect in the Democratic Party. We have made mistakes in our complex democracy, and no doubt more will be made by Government officials, who are only human. But we do have a program. It is a progressive one. We still believe in protecting and advancing the rights of the common man. We still believe in giving dignity to human beings, regardless of

race, creed, or color. The American people know that no man since our Government was founded was catapulted overnight into a more difficult assignment than was our present Chief Executive.

The trials and tribulations of Andrew Johnson following the Civil War were child's play compared with what confronts Harry Truman. The economic problems of peacetime reconversion have more ramifications than the economic problems of war.

Throughout the war, the productivity of the American farms and the American industrial plants amazed the world, setting records once believed impossible of accomplishment and contributing directly to victory. American technical skill, American ingenuity, American know-how, American morale, American confidence, American idealism, and, above all, American teamwork—the ability to work together for a common goal—won the war back of the lines as American teamwork won the war on the battle lines. The same teamwork, so essential in time of war, is equally essential in time of peace. Yet, until recently, it has been noticeably absent since VJ-day. However, the President of the United States during this troublesome time has never faltered. His courage, his patience, and his diplomacy in dealing with these tremendous problems are bearing fruit, the ripest plum of all being the part the President played in the settlement of the strikes.

My fellow Americans, I have seen our President dealing with some of these problems. I can testify to that courage, to that patience, and to that diplomacy. At times I have wondered how any human being made of flesh and blood could bear the burden which has fallen on his shoulders. I was a guest of the President on the night the steel strike was settled. I know what he went through. He was indeed a happy man when the agreement was finally reached, because no man in America better understood the evil economic consequences to the American people if these major strikes continued much longer.

Obviously, everyone is happy that the steel strike, the General Motors strike, and the General Electric strike are over. Others should immediately place their houses in order, because, my friends, the economic stability of America cannot long stand an epidemic of strikes without serious inflation and chaotic repercussions. The leaders of labor and management know this. They also know that all the people in America have basic rights in these disputes. Everyone knows that the public interest is involved. It is perfectly obvious that neither the rights of labor nor management would have been seriously impaired if work had continued a reasonable time while the negotiations for settlement of these strikes were in progress.

I have mentioned the team-work of labor and management and government so essential in the successful prosecution of the war. I repeat that it is no less essential at this moment, for the external and internal destiny of America depends upon our ability to maintain that team-work now and in the days to come. This is the equal responsibility of labor, management, Congress, and the executive branch of Government. As a Member of the United States Senate, I propose to meet that responsibility, in any crisis, domestic or foreign, with a determination to do the right as God gives me the power to see the right. It will be done without fear or favor or political cowardice. It will be done in the interest of my America. My political fortunes are secondary to my affections for my country.

We are gradually finding the answers to most of our domestic problems. The world's international problems, however, grow increasingly grave. Hostilities have ceased but the press of foreign problems continue. It was inevitable that delicate questions would arise in the negotiations for the settlement of world problems. Leaders of world opinion know that many, many years must pass before the wounds of total war are healed. That is the basic reason for the creation of the United Nations Charter. It is the prayer of resolute mankind that through this organization the peoples of the earth may forever travel the highway of peace. It is our only hope. The Charter holds the key which can open all the doors to a better understanding of all nations in relation to one another.

On Monday next, the Security Council of the United Nations Organization will call its second meeting—this one to be held in New York City. I anticipate from the temper of world affairs some controversial issues will be presented. Some may be depressing, some perhaps shocking, some repellent, and others pleasant. But, regardless of what is on the agenda, America must become the spearhead in the drafting of plans and procedure for the ultimate settlement of every awkward and vexatious question. Statesmanship of the highest order must be used is dispelling any confusion or uncertainty that may exist between the United States and any other member nation. We must remember that grave international questions cannot be settled in a few days through name calling and a full-dress debate. The development of facts, the application of diplomacy, in a give-and-take spirit, is the procedure which can be used to obtain results. A world laden with distress fervently calls for the maximum amount of common council and common experience.

In the main we are in a position to pursue this course without being misunderstood. They know we blazed the trail in the formation of this great adventure. Our allied friends know we seek no territorial expansion, no material gain nor political advantage. They are aware of the important fact that no nation in all history has attained such world power and leadership. They are expecting us to exercise that leadership with the courage of our convictions, with firmness, fairness, and impartiality as we lay the foundation stones for a better world. They know too that we have commitments and obligations that we cannot forget, if we hope to retain our national honor and world respect. They also should understand from our record in the last war and from our membership in the world organization, we stand ready to implement our diplomacy at any time with an adequate armed force on land or sea or in the air.

But, my friends, this is not a one-way street. The United States expects and will demand that every other member of the United Nations Charter live up to its agreements, treaties, and commitments.

A few days ago it was made crystal clear by the President of the United States as well as the Secretary of State that the United States recognizes the United Nations Organizaion as the sole agency for guidance in the adjustment and settlement of all world problems. My friends, there can be no deviation from that course. This is the backbone of the Charter. I watched its progress at Dumbarton Oaks, through San Francisco, and finally when it was approved by the United States Senate. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I heard the testimony. I participated in the debates on the floor of the Senate. There was never the slightest suggestion that once this Charter was approved by the major powers of the world that any member of the organization could make a military alliance with another member under the terms of the Charter. The mere mention of such an alliance has undermined faith in the United Nations Organization at a time when it is struggling to demonstrate its dignity and strength.

Notwithstanding these early irritations, I am certain that the good judgment, the wisdom and the patience of all nations to the compact will always prevail. A military alliance between two members of the organization at this hour would mean the blasting of the hopes and the yearnings of mankind throughout the world. It seems incredible that such a proposal could have been suggested by a great and respected leader like Winston Churchill. The Churchill strategy will not help the British cause. Neither will it help the cause of world peace.

My fellow Americans, when the Security Council meets in New York next Monday, Russia and all other nations, if necessary, should again be given the sober and reassuring truth of our position under the Charter of the world organization. If there is the slightest doubt or suspicion as to where we stand, it should be removed by another forthright statement upon the part of the President of the United States. If there is any doubt as to where any other member stands, the world is entitled to know that also. There must be no developments or misunderstandings for which a solution cannot be found. However, if it comes to the worst, there is no reason why the Big Three cannot have an early meeting. Through them lies the power to dissipate fears and remove the political fog which some see gathering now on the world horizon.

With all of the emphasis that I possess, I boldly assert that unless Russia, Britain, and the United States place their faith, their trust, their confidence, their all in the Charter, we shall see rampant in every country the kind of nationalism which produced World War I and World War II.

I am one who believes Russia and the United States can live in the same world in peace, although our forms of government are as different as day and night. We fought side by side to a glorious victory in the tragic days of war. No serious question arose to interfere with our complete cooperation. If the world leaders can start with the premise that a victory for everlasting peace is greater than any victory in war, there can be no question about our working together in complete harmony as we reconstruct a tired and sick world. No single ideology has ever been successful in thoroughly indoctrinating a majority of the people of the different nations of the world. No single ideology ever will. The ambitions of would-be world conquerors have always been decisively defeated. Hitler conquered many nations, but utterly failed to subdue the spirit or change the fundamental thinking of those in slavery. He bit off more than he could chew. If there be other military despots or nations in the future seeking world domination they will meet the same tragic fate, notwithstanding the atomic bomb.

I repeat that nothing should be done to disturb the fundamental structure of the United Nations. That becomes more than a rhetorical flurry when we seriously reflect upon the hideous power of destruction that lies in the atomic bomb.

That the members of the organization recognize the awful power of this deadly weapon can be found in the fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations, through request by the Foreign Ministers of Russia, Britain, and the United States, has established a commission for the control of atomic energy. The President appointed and the Senate will confirm the Honorable Bernard Baruch, special adviser to Presidents in the past, as the United States member.

Terms establishing the commission provide that the primary aim of this group is "to control atomic power to the extent necessary to assure its use only for peaceful purposes." In this agency lies the hope for the elimination from national armaments, atomic weapons, and other major weapons of mass destruction. It is a technical, tedious, and difficult assignment. But through this machinery lies humanity's hope for a peaceful and better world.

Never in all history have men been given an assignment with so much responsibility. Their job is to find the answer which will keep atomic power from being exploited for military purposes. Success means the escape from mass destruction of people and property, permitting the world to move forward with progress. Failure means the fall and decline and possibly the end of civilization.

In the face of such a world dilemma, how can this Nation, leader in the peace movement, justify sending ships, planes, and bombs to the Pacific Ocean next May to display atomic power as an instrument of destruction. Surely the nations of the world will look upon this experiment with distrust and suspicion.

Ninety-six ships of all types are to be used in the test. Why is it necessary to have this grandiose display of atomic destruction on a scale which seems wholly unnecessary and unwarranted for the needs of the moment? The question is especially pertinent when you contrast the mass destruction of these ships with the great need for reconstruction activities. The sinking of 96 steel ships in one spectacular experiment possesses not one iota of reconstructive value. Salvage the steel if nothing more. It seems to me a senseless gesture and extremely wasteful. Then again, the psychological effect on Russia and other nations will not increase their confidence in our intentions with regard to peace. I do not want to be understood as saying that experimentation with atomic energy should not continue, both from a military and industrial standpoint, but we need a balance in the conduct of this work. What the world needs at this time is a deep breath of fresh air, a change of climate, if you will, getting completely away from the array of all the misery, tragedy, and destruction that has been spread through global war. Our leadership in the world demands that we promote the instruments of peace, rather than the instruments of war. Those responsible for the bomb-testing program should turn their talents in other directions. Surely the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki should be a sufficient test for this death-dealing device.

I am opposed to this display of atomic power for further reasons. Under no circumstances should we at this hour destroy an American ship, old, new, or obsolete. They could be better used for temporary housing for veterans along the coast. And again, until we know where we are going, they should be kept afloat for our security and national defense. Anchor them away for a future emergency which we all pray will never come. However, should atomic bombs sometime in the future start dropping on our land and in our waters, we will need whatever we have in the way of ships, planes, and other implements of defense to defend our fair land. Remember with what glad tidings Britain received the 50 old destroyers sent by Roosevelt. Remember the Britishers used everything from rowboats to battleships to get their army from Dunkirk across the channel.

In our endeavor to bring to the world an everlasting peace, it is fitting and proper that tonight we remember another Democrat and world leader, the late Woodrow Wilson. We recall the little band of willful men who defeated the League of Nations, an instrumentality of peace which with our guidance and strength might have easily prevented World War II.

We also upon this occasion pay our deep homage and fealty to the memory and the deeds of humanity's champion in peace and in war, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt was the father of the United Nations Organization. There are a few individuals who are continually sniping at this organization. As with the League of Nations, they are unwilling to give it a chance. They still believe we can stick our heads in the sands like the ostrich of old and forget the rest of the world. I sometimes believe their one-time hatred of Franklin D. Roosevelt has left them with warped judgment. Some of these individuals, along with a segment of the press, continue to besmirch the reputation of the Nation's war-time Commander in Chief. Never having been able to defeat him when he was alive, they still try it after he is gone. In spite of all their efforts, the little garden in Hyde Park where our beloved Franklin Roosevelt slumbers forever has become a shrine for the entire world—a symbol of the "four freedoms" for which the war was fought and of that future world of international peace and understanding for which he laid down his life as surely as did any soldier upon the field of battle.

Today Franklin D. Roosevelt must be smiling back at those irresponsibles who still attack him with ghoulish glee. Was there ever such blind and bitter hatred of any President in the history of our Nation? For 12 long years he withstood their malicious assaults. And with it all he took the bitter with the sweet, shattering one American precedent after another. I boldly assert that if these shocking and repulsive attacks upon the memory of this great and good man continue, his ghost will walk in the coming elections of '46 and '48. He will defeat them again.

Martin Van Buren, speaking of Andrew Jackson's deep understanding of the people, said: "They were his blood relations—the only blood relations he had." He believed that "to labor for the good of the masses was a special mission assigned to him by the Creator and no man was ever better disposed to work in his vocation, in season and out of season." Another writer has said: "The people called him and he came, like the great folk heroes, to lead them out of captivity and bondage."

In the great tradition of Andrew Jackson, we have just beheld one of our great folk heroes, the greatest Jacksonian of them all, lead us out of the bondage of the depression and the threatened captivity of military aggression. That man was Franklin D. Roosevelt. Today in Washington, carrying on in the same great tradition of Jackson and Roosevelt, we find in the White House another man of the people carrying on with the same courage and the same inspiration—to fight in the 1940's the ever old, yet ever new, battles against entrenched power and special privilege that Andrew Jackson won in behalf of the people in the 1820's and Franklin D. Roosevelt won in the era that has just come to its triumphant end.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak on the question of veterans' housing, which appears to be a problem of much interest throughout the country. We have had three bills before the House of Representatives upon this particular subject within the period of the past 4 weeks, and I desire—as I know many of the Members desire—the country and the people to know that these measures were universally supported by the Members of the House. I know that I cast my vote for the benefit of the veterans, in each instance. In two of those housing measures, there was but one vote cast against those bills, and that vote was not a vote against the veterans, as such, but it was a vote cast against the method of obtaining these very large and extensive programs, when another and a different approach could have been taken.

May I say that I want every veteran extended the opportunity to obtain a house and home for himself and family, at the earliest possible moment, and at the very least cost at which the same can be obtained. I want all veterans, without delay, to have the opportunity to rehabilitate themselves and their families, and to start forward again in life. My entire sympathy is with the veterans of this war. I was in the service during World War I, and that sympathy is entirely natural, I presume. There is a tie between those who have served in the armed forces of our country which cannot be denied—and that sympathy is continuing throughout the years—and I am convinced that same touch of sympathy exists between every veteran with every other veteran.

Mr. Speaker, the OPA has caused great alarm in this housing program, and that agency is continuing to cause much distress in this program. The price ceilings on all kinds and types of building materials and supplies has caused our mills to cease to operate, because they cannot operate at a loss—and the existing ceilings make losses certain in the processing of lumber and building materials and supplies. Laws will not produce houses for veterans, because the OPA will not permit those essential materials and supplies to become available for such use. Red tape will not produce houses for veterans, but that constant practice, by those in power, has prevented many houses from being constructed for veterans, and for our people.

Evidently the Government has realized this bottleneck, and the impossibility of securing houses for veterans with these OPA regulations respecting prices, because the "stop order" was issued, and put in full force and effect on all new and less-essential construction in order to save building materials and supplies for the emergency veterans' housing program. This curb established becomes effective at once. Under the policy established by the "stop order," permission must be obtained to start any new construction or repairs ranging in cost from $400 for private homes and farms, to $15,000 for certain industries. Construction work which is substantially under way will not be affected by this order. It may be that some specific exemptions, under hardship cases, may be established later in order to relieve people suffering losses by fire, or other elements, which were not contemplated at the time the order was issued.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that this policy will lend much aid to this housing program. I want the use of building material and supplies made available for housing for veterans, and I hope much liberality will be injected into the entire program all to the end that the essential materials for housing will be made available, and at the very earliest moment. Veterans with families, in many communities, are without homes. Today I received several letters from veterans advising that they cannot

rent a house, or an apartment, or even a garage, in which to establish a home for themselves and their families. This is a very serious and critical situation, and there must be action in this matter so these veterans may have the opportunity to either rent, or purchase a home—as they may desire.

Mr. Speaker, in some sections it is reported that some designing persons have erroneously, and entirely falsely, reported that many Members of the House voted against this housing program. Speaking for myself, only, I wish the people, and the veterans, to know that I have voted for every measure in the House which would aid in securing building materials and supplies, of all kinds, for constructing houses and homes, and which would make possible the securing of houses and homes for the veterans, and that I will continue my efforts in their behalf until this fond hope has been fully realized.

I am certain that the Members in the House who have so loyally supported legislation for the veterans in all matters, including the housing program, will continue their fine efforts in this particular, and in all other worth-while items in favor of the veterans.

As we go forward, in this postwar period, let us proceed as Americans—imbued with the same ideals that prompted our boys throughout the late war, and all wars, as they went forward to victory—promoting freedom, liberty, and the American way of life, let us make our Nation the brightest star upon the firmament of nations, where recognition is extended for that valor and fortitude exemplified!

New Deal Discovers Perpetual Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Wisconsin Implement Dealer. This editorial indicates that the New Deal policies are not fooling the American people:

EMERGENCIES CAN BE CREATED FROM NOW UNTIL ETERNITY

The administration representing the party in power has used the ingenious device of an ever-present emergency to keep itself in power for the last 14 years.

We sort of thought that when the late President Roosevelt, who was a genius at creating emergencies, was taken and the war was over, we would achieve a stabilized economy without a stabilizer. Alas, alack, the Re-dealers have created another emergency and a new stabilizer.

We refer to the labor-borne inflation created by the lunatic fringe that has been hanging on at Washington ever since the "double dealers" took over. We of the retail trades are going to be on the short end of the deal unless we show some of the hard-headed sense of which we are capable.

It looks as if the retail implement trade will be asked to absorb the price rise granted to manufacturers as a result of higher labor costs, unless we can prove that dealer profits are less than they were in 1942. This is the Marxian line that we have been expecting.

Had the President learned that 10 percent added to $1 cost requires a selling price of $1.11, it is possible that Missouri would have had one more good haberdasher. We suspect the President has learned that little merchandising fact, but he seems to lack the courage to tell workers the truth.

Were retail traders less patriotic than they are, no goods or services would move until Congress and the President changed their socialistic maneuvering or they confiscated property by direct methods instead of by subterfuge.

Daylight-Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, those who are never satisfied with normal conditions and who constantly demand a change are beginning again to advocate daylight-saving time by turning the clocks forward 1 hour.

Strangely enough, all such requests come from city people who work short hours, and the farmers, who have to work long hours, rightfully have always been against daylight-saving time.

There is no doubt that daylight-saving time, if indulged in again, rather than to produce more food which the Nation so badly needs, will produce less food. Early in the morning, particularly in harvest season, the farmer cannot start harvesting his crop because of the heavy dews; in the afternoon, when he can work until sundown, his hired help, under daylight-saving time, will naturally want to quit 1 hour earlier, leaving crops in the field which should be harvested while the weather is suitable.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter written by one of my constituents who is one of the most successful farmers in my district, who discusses this matter, and also the possibility of the extension of the draft with such sound reasoning and clarity of thought, I am inserting it in the RECORD with the hope that other Members of Congress will have time to read it, because I think it will be well worth your time and consideration:

ALBERS, ILL., *March 25, 1946.*
Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a farmer in Clinton County, operating over 300 acres in cultivation and more than 500 acres in cattle and hog pasture, which is in the bottoms, and most of it in timber.

This winter I have fattened for market 70 head of cattle and each year sell from 200 to 300 fat hogs.

I am writing this letter to you to express my thoughts and wishes concerning the extension of the draft law, and the resumption of daylight-saving time, to both of which myself and practically all farmers in this locality are strictly opposed, and will appreciate your complete opposition to the propositions, should they come up in Congress.

About the draft law, I would say make enlistment attractive enough and an adequate amount of men will be obtained to take care of necessary occupational forces. I believe, anyway, the chief reason why the Army brass-hats want a large standing Army is their unwillingness to step down in rank. Both World Wars have proved, beyond doubt, that the United States can lick any country by a draft law after declaring war, and now that we have the atomic bomb and are undoubtedly making them in considerable numbers, I say keep an adequate air force trained to use them against any nation who gets out of step, or quit making the bombs.

About daylight-saving time, I will say that even during the war it was among food producers of the Nation a curb and hazard to achieve maximum food production, especially where hired labor was employed, in the production of hay and small grain crops, as their harvesting cannot be done efficiently during the early morning hours, and as dances, etc., which modern youth demand to attend from 3 to 5 nights a week, start at 8 p. m., I am sure lots of hay and grain crops have been and will be materially damaged, or completely lost, especially in wet seasons.

In the cities those who want to raise a garden can do so just as well by working their gardens in the morning, when it is cooler to work anyway, with standard time. I am sure daylight-saving time also encourages more loafing, drinking, and carousing in towns and cities, which in itself is all wrong if done excessively, and this indirectly causes a large percentage of the population to complain about the high cost of living with the result being more strikes.

Also please keep in mind that it is harder than ever to hire men on the farm for what a farmer can afford to pay, and in case the draft law should be extended, I would recommend that men who can prove that they are doing an ample amount of production be given deferment with the requirements even made somewhat easier. It seems as if Army life has put ideas into a lot of the boys, that being a hired hand on a farm is below their dignity, so why keep on drafting more boys who are willing to stay on farms now, but if drafted would consider only 8-hour-a-day jobs when they return, and unnecessarily prolong the help problem on farms, for as we all well know the food situation now is as critical or perhaps even more so than it has been for several years.

Assuring you that any of the above opinions which you will deem advisable to support will be very much appreciated by me and a lot of other farmers around here, I am,

Very truly yours,

FRANK K. HEIMANN.

Proposal to Broadcast Proceedings of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shall We Broadcast Congress?" written by Jack H. Pollack and published in Liberty magazine for February 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE BROADCAST CONGRESS?

(By Jack H. Pollack)

The United States Senate was debating the peace treaty. It was November 1919.

Bewhiskered Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, rose to speak.

"Will the Senator allow me to interrupt for just a moment?" he asked.

"Surely."

Measuring his words, the irreconcilable legislator announced, "There will be no adjournment, if I can help it, until we vote on the treaty again. When we vote on it—be under no misapprehension—it is final."

Would world history have taken a different course if the American people had been properly informed of these proceedings? There is a growing belief that had Americans been able to hear with their own ears how the League of Nations was being butchered they would have stopped the butchering.

Today Congress once again is grappling with problems of peace. But most Americans must depend on the often incomplete newspaper and radio reports if they want to know what their elected Representatives are saying and doing. For the first time, many Americans wish they had a direct pipe line to Capitol Hill.

A bill to put Congress on the air was introduced in both Chambers of the Seventy-eighth Congress by two liberal legislators: Florida's silver-tongued CLAUDE PEPPER in the Senate and Washington's JOHN COFFEE in the House of Representatives. It was not acted upon, but it is expected to be reintroduced in the new Congress.

Under the bill any station or network could send congressional proceedings over the air waves, but none would be required to do so. A station could make a live broadcast of Congress in action. Or it could buy a transcript at cost price, since a complete and continuous legislative recording would be made by Uncle Sam. Of course, both Senate and House would retain the right to keep off the air any debate they wished.

Opinion is divided on whether to broadcast Congress. Some scoffers insist that nobody would listen. Advocates, on the other hand, argue that such a program would be popular. They say people would tune in their Congressmen the way they do baseball games, Frank Sinatra's voice, or Jack Benny's jokes. Weren't millions glued to their radios on election night and during the political conventions?

Congressmen themselves have mixed feelings about the proposal. Forward-looking legislators in both parties favor it strongly. But some of their colleagues are terrified at the thought of being put on the air, chiefly because they won't have a chance to amend for the permanent RECORD their inaccurate and sometimes ill-advised extemporaneous remarks. Naturally, a handful of demagogic lawmakers are not overjoyed at the prospect of having constituents hear their inflammatory or asinine oratory. One forthright Senator groaned, "Broadcasting us would make people think we're bigger boobs than we are."

A long prejudice has existed on Capitol Hill against ordinary microphones, let alone broadcasting equipment. Every so often someone suggests that our lawmakers should be made more audible—even to one another. Elderly Senators, such as Johnson of California and CAPPER of Kansas, speak scarcely above a whisper.

Yet many of the people's choices are opposed to all new-fangled talking contraptions. About 15 years ago it was urged that mikes be placed in back of each Senator's desk. This prompted a testy South Carolinian, the late Senator Coleman Blease, to grumble:

"Now they want to put a radio back here, right behind me, so as to broadcast what is going on in the Senate. I do not know anything about radios. I never listened to one of them in my life. I do not know what they might do. They might fill that thing up with gas, some deadly gas, and just about the time the crowd assembled in this Chamber—everybody in control of the United States—some fellow might turn on a machine down here and just gas out the whole business."

And not many years ago, when John Nance Garner was Speaker of the House, a loudspeaker microphone was placed before him. Shortly afterward he was told that a Member wanted to deliver a speech. Forgetting that with the mike the slightest whisper could be heard throughout the Chamber, the plain-spoken Texan roared, "Now what in the —— is that —— —— —— —— going to talk about?" While the Chamber rocked with laughter, Cactus Jack ordered electricians to "get that —— thing out of here."

However, it was later put back, and today the Speaker not only has an ordinary mike in front of him on the rostrum, but he can use a "breast mike" if he wants to move around. When Members address the House, they come to the front and use a mike. Majority and minority leaders also talk through loudspeakers, as do the clerks. All told, the House now has seven microphones plus an operator controlling voice volume from the gallery. Should it be decided to broadcast House proceedings, half the technical job is already done.

The austere Senate, however, has remained suspicious of speaking devices. In fact, Congress generally has viewed with jaundiced eye any departure from it traditions. As a recent example, a movie screen was set up in the Senate Chamber to show Army films. The purpose was to supplement the Senators' knowledge of many of the subjects they debate. When Senate officials got wind of it, they immediately ordered the screen removed.

Those who advocate the broadcasting of legislative sessions contend that it would improve the make-up of Congress. It would expose the stupidity and unfitness of some legislators and strengthen many an able, hard-working Congressman whose words too often reach only the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the sparsely filled Capitol galleries.

Alert New Zealand has improved the quality of its legislative body since it began airing parliamentary proceedings 9 years ago. The Labor Party complained that it was not getting a square deal in the country's press. M. J. Savage, who later became Prime Minister, asserted, "I would sooner put up with the publication of my remarks over the air than with the reports which I read in the newspapers."

So when the Labor Party came into power in 1936, it immediately began to broadcast legislative sessions. To meet objections of those claiming not to be interested in parliamentary broadcasts, it was arranged for a special government station to carry them. At first only the most important debates were aired. But so enthusiastic were listeners that complete proceeding, including the opening prayer, were soon sent over the air waves.

Today New Zealand's most powerful station, 2YA, a 60,000-watt station in Wellington, broadcasts the lawmakers from 2:30 p. m. to 11 p. m., with time out for dinner. Daily newspapers list parliamentary programs with scheduled speakers and topics.

The legislators don't talk directly into a microphone; six mikes are suspended from the ceiling. The debate is lively and extemporaneous because members are not allowed to read speeches while on the air. Most popular listening hours are between 7:30 and 10 p. m.

Seated in a corner "covering" the event is a radio announcer. Whenever a representative rises to speak the announcer switches on the microphone nearest him to control voice volume. During lengthy debates he whispers the names of the speakers for the benefit of late tuners-in. Committee hearings are also broadcast.

The Speaker has great authority. Occasionally a representative will try to "grandstand" for the benefit of the home folks at the dial by prolonging debate. But the Speaker will speedily stop him. Any time he sees fit—say, for reasons of national security—the Speaker can press a button underneath his desk and shut off debate from the air.

After hearing their representatives, New Zealand voters decided to make some changes. Nevertheless many of the nation's poorest orators continue to be reelected, indicating that New Zealanders can be educated without being entranced. Nor has the novelty of listening to their legislators worn off. Thousands of fans follow their favorite voice, and so popular have the broadcasts become that the opposition party has promised to continue them if it is returned to office. And with it all, New Zealand's legislative tradition—faithfully copied from the British House of Commons—has been zealously maintained.

Although New Zealand is the only country in the world now broadcasting legislative sessions, other nations have experimented with the idea. In 1926 Finland, then a liberal-democratic republic, began to air debate of the 200 members of the Finnish Diet. A similar movement was afoot in Germany during the 1920's. Even in imperial Japan the proceedings of the Japanese Diet were aired in 1925.

In March 1926 the question of broadcasting debates arose in the British Parliament. The broadcasting committee urged Prime Minister Baldwin to put Parliament on the air, but Baldwin demurred, as have successive Prime Ministers, despite widespread British interest and the ease with which it could be accomplished under the Government-owned BBC.

Occasionally a municipal station in the United States will broadcast local legislative sessions. Outstanding was the experience of WNYC, which aired New York City Council proceedings for 2 years (1938-40). A howling success, it made blasé New Yorkers vastly more civic-minded. Manhattan cave dwellers found the broadcasts both educational and entertaining—admitting in a survey that they preferred hearing city council to live or canned music. But Gotham's councilmen whimsically voted themselves off the air.

"I wish they would go back on," a listener complained. "Broadcasting them made the councilmen work harder, be on their toes and more apt to do the right thing by us." WNYC's manager agreed that the broadcasting "raised the quality of the discussions * * * the councilmen * * * were more prepared, since a corrected copy or hand-out could not be given to the press."

And how does the radio industry itself feel about broadcasting our national lawmakers? A large segment of it has been cool to the idea, especially the networks. Many a hard-boiled radioman, while admitting it wouldn't be any problem to wire Congress for broadcasting, insists that Congress would be too highbrow and dull for the average listener. Who, such men ask, wants to hear the long-winded reading of a 35-page appropriation bill? One official insists radio would soon find itself "between congressional pressure on the one hand, and audience disinterest on the other." Another protests that "debate would have to be staged and we would be merely putting on a show instead of attending to the business of Congress." A leading radio magazine declares that "if a poll were taken, the public would

vote for less rather than more congressional speechmaking."

And many broadcasters freely admit that they are not overanxious to surrender hours of lucrative time. Under the Pepper-Coffee bill, stations wouldn't be paid for airing Capitol Hill. "Congress on the Air" would be a public-service sustaining program. Stations couldn't very well stop every 15 minutes for a commercial. Of course, Congress might have its own station, but this probably would be regarded by broadcasting officials as drastic Government encroachment on their ether domain.

Nathan Straus, president of independent WMCA and a long-time champion of broadcasting Congress, recently polled radio officials on the question. Of those who answered, 69.2 percent favored the idea, as against 13.5 percent opposed. However, while Straus sent questionnaires to 875 stations, he received only 133 replies. Of these, 26 stations agreed to carry Congress. None were network giants. Most of them were small stations—250-watters. Ten were affiliated with the Mutual and 6 with the Blue Network.

A Georgia radio executive believes the program would result in sending more capable people to Capitol Hill. The owner of a Cleveland station protests, "There's no valid reason why Congress, with nothing to hide, should attempt to block this method of bringing the public more complete knowledge."

Meantime, while waiting for Congress to make up its mind, Straus has done what he considers the next best thing. Each Sunday, between 3:30 and 4 p. m., WMCA now broadcasts a Halls of Congress program in which professional actors portray Washington lawmakers in dramatizations of texts taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the week.

Rural folks are among the most spirited supporters of the proposal. At its latest convention, the Farmers Union strongly urged putting Congress on the air. Paul Sifton, the union's Washington representative, has been one of the most vocal champions of the idea. Small-town editors, lacking access to full press wires, admit that it would benefit them greatly.

Other advocates include the A. F. of L. and CIO locals. Southern Methodist Churchwomen, the Writers War Board, and the Union for Democratic Action. Much of the support stems from the far West and northernmost New England.

Objections, aside from those already mentioned, are many and varied. A common complaint is that Congress would lose its dignity by being open to public inspection. Since the Senate and House are in session simultaneously, which should be broadcast? Wouldn't the daytime audiences be limited to women? Since it isn't possible to broadcast all debate, wouldn't whatever was broadcast be false and misleading? What good would it do to broadcast floor proceedings when the real work is done in committee? Will Congressmen still enjoy "congressional immunity" if their remarks go over the air?

Other critics of congressional broadcasts have been more flippant. One columist thinks the program should include a House vocalist warbling, "When the SOL BLOOM is on the rose in the good old JESSIE SUMNER time." The Washington Post slyly suggests Two Chambers Hath the Heart as a congressional theme song, while Time magazine quotes Congressmen as finding the whole idea "nightmarish."

Proponents of the plan counter all objections with a potent argument. Today, they say, when popular government has collapsed in so many nations, the greater citizenship participation resulting from the broadcasting of legislative sessions would serve to strengthen our democracy. People today, they insist, are Congress-conscious. They are taking the actions of their legislators more seriously, as indicated by their rejection of isolationists in the last election.

These men admit there are operational problems but insist they can be met. They point to the popularity of network-forum programs as evidence that Americans are hungry for scrappy discussion. And they feel that listeners will prefer the oral frailities of their public servants—all the "ers" and the "ahs" and the "hmms"—to the stock-streamlined speeches.

Since the expense is not prohibitive, congressional broadcasting champions propose to give the idea a trial and then measure audience interest. Senator PEPPER warns, 'If we don't broadcast our proceedings and keep step with radio, people are going to begin asking whether we're afraid to let them hear what we're saying. After all, it's their business we're transacting."

In the days to come, Congress will be debating questions touching every American's life: Postwar jobs, social security, taxes, low-cost medical care, compulsory military training, etc. Advocates emphasize that were Congress on the air, American democracy could prove that it is possible for a government to grow huge and complex and yet remain close to its people.

But the most overpowering argument suggested is that broadcasting Congress would give millions of Americans front-line seats in the making of the coming peace. All-outers for Congress on the air hold that radio can render no greater service than this.

Regarding Congressional Seniority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, criticism has been leveled at the long-established custom of advancing individual Members of Congress assigned to membership on the several committees by the rules of seniority. This issue has been raised in a recent letter, which is inserted here, with my reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 8, 1946.*
The Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE,
Chairman, Committee on
Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: The recent report of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress did not make a recommendation as to changes in the system of selecting chairmen of standing committees on the basis of seniority, although testimony was taken on the subject. We think this is an important issue, and would like your views.

We would appreciate your reply to two questions:

1. Is the seniority system satisfactory or unsatisfactory, and why?

2. What alternative plan would you suggest?

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. HALL,
Washington Correspondent,
St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1946.

Mr. GEORGE H. HALL,
Washington Correspondent,
St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALL: Answering your letter of March 8, 12 years' experience in Congress has convinced me that the seniority system of advancing members of congressional committees to the position of chairman is the best plan that can be followed.

Starting at the bottom of the list of majority or minority committee membership, the individual Congressman has the opportunity to learn and become conversant with the class of legislation referred to that committee.

Standing for the election every 2 years, by the process of trial and elimination the better qualified Members are naturally advanced in standing on the list of committee membership so that by the time that the individual Congressman becomes the ranking Member he should be best qualified to discharge the duties of chairman.

As I see it, this is the best plan that can be devised to eliminate political favoritism and the rigging of the legislative machinery.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Address of Gov. Dwight H. Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Gov. Dwight H. Green, at Governors' housing conference, Des Moines, Iowa, March 25, 1946:

I am sure that Governor Blue has done a fine service to the people of Iowa and to the entire Midwest, as well as to all of us Governors, in arranging this meeting to discuss the housing problem. The shortage of homes, particularly as it affects the returning veterans, is the most acute of the many perplexing difficulties which confront America today. I do not expect this conference to produce any panacea which will solve it forthwith. I trust that all here are too level-headed to espouse such dreams.

Yet I do hope most sincerely that from this meeting there may come a fuller understanding of the whole situation and some concrete suggestions as to how State governments may aid in the solution which ultimately must be accomplished by American private enterprise. I do not minimize the responsibility which rests upon all of us in Government, and upon our entire American system, to make adequate living quarters available to the people, and certainly I agree that the boys now returning to us fought for more than the right to live in a trailer. It is now obvious that houses are not built by wishful thinking, by pious speeches, or even by Presidential ukase, or legislative enactment.

In these circumstances the veterans and the other citizens who are seeking homes naturally are impatient. So are many editors—especially those whose professional impatience is augmented by political policy. And we in Government who are called upon to deal with this problem are also impatient and more than a little disappointed at the small progress which has been made. Yet I feel that we have made some very definite progress, at least in getting at the facts and exploding some pet theories which, however nobly conceived, will not provide the homes which are needed.

Although we do not have all the answers, we in Illinois were by no means unprepared for the housing crisis precipitated by the sudden end of the war. In 1941, before Pearl Harbor, a survey of Illinois housing had

been undertaken at my request by a commission of 20 men and women chosen from all sections of the State, representing industry, banking, business, labor, education, real estate, and church and public welfare groups. The results of that survey led to the enactment of legislation by the general assemblies of 1943 and 1945, providing within the limitations of the rigid Illinois State Constitution a practical plan for State aid to Illinois communities in attacking their local housing problems. The essence of the Illinois plan is home rule and cooperation with private enterprise. It is not a public housing program, but a program to stimulate private housing.

The program is administered by the Illinois State Housing Board, consisting of seven citizens who serve without pay, but with a paid administrative staff, and local housing authorities or land clearance commissions which by law are set up by the counties and cities of the State. There are now 31 such local authorities fully organized. Thirty-seven more are in process of organization, and we foresee the time when all of the 102 counties of Illinois and most of the cities with over 25,000 population will have these housing organizations.

Other legislation authorizes cities and villages to engage in slum clearance and issue bonds to finance such programs; provides for private development corporations under redevelopment commissions to rebuild slum areas; and permits building and loan associations and Illinois and out-of-State insurance companies to invest in housing and redevelopment projects.

In addition, the sum of $10,000,000 has been appropriated for grants by the State housing board on a population basis to local housing authorities and land clearance commissions for the acquisition and clearing of slum areas for redevelopment purposes. Land so acquired and cleared may be resold to individuals or corporations for home construction, and the grant, therefore, may act as a revolving fund, excepting that each project for which it is used must meet the approval of the State housing board. The actual administration of this fund has begun, and to date, $4,560,000 has been allocated by the State board to local authorities for approved projects.

Both the State board and the local authorities naturally are concentrating on programs to meet the needs of the veterans; and practically every project approved provides that veterans shall be given preference in the purchase or rental of the new housing to be created. We all realize, however, that the vast majority of our veterans must and should find the homes they desire through the ordinary process of private enterprise in the real estate and construction business. The local housing authorities can assist in Illinois by making surveys of local needs and developing community plans. The State board has attempted a general analysis of the situation and a study of all the factors, including those beyond State or local control, which are preventing an immediate resumption of home building on a large scale.

That study has clarified, if not solved, the veterans' housing problem in Illinois. It has suggested certain things we can do to speed its solution, perhaps the greatest contribution I can make to this conference is to state the picture on veterans' housing as we see it today.

The housing problem is really two problems: One, the provision of immediate shelter for the millions, especially the returning veterans and their families; the other, the provision of adequate permanent homes for them and even a larger number of families to meet a shortage caused by practically a moratorium on home building, not only during the war but during the 10 years of depression which preceded it. The first called for emergency and makeshift arrangements. With proper fervor, communities engaged in a mad rush to obtain the limited supply of portable and demounted housing in the country and to set it up on any public or private ground available. At best, such housing is very expensive and far from satisfactory. It is, however, better than nothing; and it certainly has been fortunate that in Illinois and several other States it has been possible to provide such housing for veterans returning to college under the GI Bill of Rights.

The emergency needs of the veterans are being met mainly by the cooperation of their relatives and friends in sharing available facilities, augmented by community efforts to obtain the fullest use of existing structures. We must frankly face the fact that the only effective way to provide relief from present conditions is to speed the construction of permanent homes for the veterans and for others whose present quarters thus may become available to veterans.

To build a house requires three things—yea, four. The three are the land upon which it shall stand, the materials (lumber, steel, brick, stone, and sand) of which it is constructed, and the skilled labor to do the job. The fourth is the money to pay for it. Important as that last consideration is to the man who wants a home, we have discovered that money alone will not create building materials or train building labor.

There is in many American communities a real shortage of land suitable for home building where homes are needed. Each community has its individual problems along this line, and must work out its own solution. Practically everywhere there is an acute shortage of building materials and of skilled building labor. Those shortages are not a community but a national problem. Let us examine them:

While most of the basic materials needed for home construction are exceedingly scarce, perhaps the most difficult problem is that of the lumber shortage. The lumber industry is a typical example of how our Federal controls failed to effect needed production. Our lumber supplies depend upon the profit motive—profit for the owner of the timber from which it is cut; profit for the company which processes it; and profit for the men who do the labor in the various stages of its production. It was the profit motive which prompted much of that labor to move to other better-paying jobs when low wages in the lumber industry were frozen during the war, just as it is the profit motive which prompts timber owners and processors to produce little lumber under existing price ceilings. Further, low ceiling prices on essential lumber items, such as 2 by 4's and 6-inch boards, intended to protect the consumer, have caused processors to cut the lumber which has been produced into less essential products, upon which they can make a greater return.

Price protection is important, but there is no protection in a policy which stifles production. Indeed, I see little likelihood of the supplies of lumber or any other building material becoming plentiful until free American enterprise can produce them at a profit.

The House of Representatives in Washington has rejected the proposal to give the producers this profit while maintaining present price ceilings by the ruse of Federal production subsidy. The American people are opposed to subsidies, and the danger of such a system would be that it would delay, rather than hasten, the time when we can lift restrictive controls from American business. The lifting of such controls might operate temporarily to increase prices, but it also would stimulate production to a degree where a competitive market would quickly stabilize prices at a reasonable level. The sooner we realize that we cannnot get building materials without paying the fair cost of producing them, the sooner we will be building homes.

State governments cannot control the cost or regulate the production of building materials. We can, however, take a firm stand in support of a sound program to stimulate production, and we also can put the facts on the building materials before the people. The State housing board is undertaking a survey of the available supplies of essential building materials, and proposes to give the people of our State the fullest possible information on the conditions governing these supplies and the time at which increased supplies are likely to be available.

One of the most perplexing phases of the housing shortage is the labor supply. At a time when payments for unemployment compensation are at a peak, men cannot be found to produce vital building materials, and there is an acute shortage in the skilled building trades. It is obvious that the machine workers who have been laid off in the munitions plants and are collecting unemployment insurance could not be transformed overnight into carpenters or bricklayers. But tens of thousands of them might be used in the factories which should be producing building materials. The principle of unemployment compensation is sound, and I hope it has become a permanent part of our American industrial system. But it will not survive if it is used to finance a loafer's strike when the people are crying for production.

Another most urgent need is the recruiting of the building trades of America to full strength. There are in America today far fewer carpenters, bricklayers, masons, etc., than 15 years ago. During the depression years, when jobs in the building trades were scarce, many died, and most of them advised their sons to choose a living more secure than their own. These trades require skill born of long training; they are and should be highly unionized. With the certainty that it will take at least 10 years to produce the buildings now needed in America, the building trades now offer a much more productive future for young Americans. I believe we may expect the cooperation of the unions in establishing trade schools, particularly for returning GI's. I believe that such training schools could qualify under the earn-and-learn provisions of the GI bill of rights. In Illinois we are seeking the cooperation of building labor and building contractors in working out such a program.

Both the material and labor shortages can be met in part by the use of new materials and new processes in home construction. Archaic and monopolistic building codes, written in the name of safety for the protection of special interests, must be speedily revised. The ingenuity of American enterprise for seeking new and better materials and processes must be given its full chance to operate in the housing emergency. The States can make a real contribution by testing new materials and new methods from the point of view of their adaptability to the climate and other conditions in their State, and laying the facts before the people.

In short, the American building industry needs less regulation and more cocperation from Government. We shall get our homes built faster, not by telling the building industry what it can and cannot do, but by rolling up our sleeves and asking the men who know, how we can help them.

We have noted, that the three ingredients of a new home are land, materials, and labor. We have discussed the shortages of materials and labor. There is a land shortage, too, and very often Government can render effective service in remedying that. The home site must have the essential public services of water, sewage, gas, and electric power. It must be convenient to highways and transportation, and relatively close to schools, churches, shopping districts, and the owner's place of employment.

Such places are scarce in many American cities. This is largely because we have not learned to maintain the quality of American neighborhoods, and centers of fine homes in one generation become slums in the next. Such areas cannot be reclaimed by the individual action of separate owners of property therein. It requires public action, backed up by the power of eminent domain, to accomplish that. Slum clearance is a necessary public service, and the Illinois Housing Board is engaged in a slum-clearance program in which $10,000,000 is being distributed to county and municipal authorities for the acquisition and clearing of such sites.

Slum clearance, however, is a slow process. The immediate need is for vacant land for homes. In many cities, both large and small, it is necessary to go outside the city limits to find such land. Yet in most of the cities of Illinois, as a result of the overexpansion of the twenties, there are abandoned subdivisions, which were equipped with streets and underground utilities a score of years ago. The lots are so burdened with back taxes, and the debt of unpaid special assessments, that an individual could not afford to clear title and build on them.

For example, in Chicago it is estimated that out of a total of 19 square miles of vacant land that might be used for home sites, more than 12 square miles are so encumbered. We are studying a plan to use slum clearance funds to purchase such areas, settle the indebtedness on them, where necessary replat them, and then sell them to individuals—veterans preferred—for the immediate erection of homes. Such a program not only will give the people homes close to their work, schools, churches, and shopping centers, it will aid the cities by putting new wealth on the tax rolls, and increasing local revenues. It will convert municipal liabilities into assets, and will help private enterprise build a better community.

We have stressed the fact that money will not build homes until land, material, and labor are available. Yet for the veteran who dreams of owning a home for his family, price is the all-important consideration. He does not want a gift, or a unit in a public housing project; he wants the same chance his father had to buy his home and pay for it.

Government must help the veteran do that. The way to help him is to help the reestablishment of the building industry by private enterprise, to promote the development of new and cheaper materials, and new and more economical processes of fabrication and construction, and to provide him more favorable terms for financing his home purchase.

We must establish sound cooperation between Government and the leaders in private enterprise—the real-estate men, the builders and the bankers, who are as eager as the veterans to see them all reestablished in good jobs and happy homes. That is what America has been working for and sacrificing for during two centuries of freedom and progress. It is our first and most difficult task today. With more work and more sacrifice, under our free American system, we shall achieve that goal.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a radio address made by me over the Mutual network on Wednesday, March 27, 1946, in answer to Upton Close on price control:

Good evening, fellow Americans, how would you like to go to the store tomorrow and find that eggs had gone up from 50 cents to a dollar a dozen? That bacon was up from 40 to 60 cents a pound? That sugar was 5 pounds for $1.35, instead of 5 pounds for 35 cents?

Or, how would you like to get a notice from your landlord that your rent would now be $60 a month instead of $40?

Would you like to pay 35 cents a gallon for gas instead of 20 cents—every time you fill up your tank?

In other words, how would you like to pay two or even three times as much as you do now for every bite you put in your mouth, for every stitch you put on your back, for the rent you pay, and all the other things you must buy to live?

Well, beginning July 1, that's a sample of the kind of prices you will be paying, if we give up our fight against inflation, if we kick out OPA and let prices go the limit.

And when I say sample, that's what I mean.

I haven't picked these prices I've just given, out of thin air. Those are the prices we Americans had to pay in the inflation after the last war. And you don't have to stretch your imagination to guess how much higher prices would go this time—if we take the lid off now.

World War I was hardly more than a scrimmage compared to the global one just ended. Yet inflationary forces were so strong then that food prices more than doubled. So did many rents. Prices of clothes tripled.

How high do you think they'd go this time, when even the conservative figures of the Federal Reserve Board estimate that the forces of inflation today are from 8 to 10 times more powerful than after the last war?

Maybe you weren't paying the grocery bill during that inflation spree of the twenties. But 105,000,000 other Americans were. And nobody who lived through that crazy boom has forgotten it.

Yet the lobbyists are right at it again. They're trying to get us to fall for the sucker game twice. They're jamming every hotel in Washington. They're camping in the very Halls of Congress now that the Price Control Act is up for renewal. "Come on!" they say, "Ditch OPA. Throw price and rental control out the window."

That's the line of reasoning of the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the Real Estate Board, the meat packing, the cotton, and a lot of other lobby boys.

Oh, some, of course, are smoother about it than others. Some hide their aims in high-sounding economic phrases. Others masquerade as great friends of OPA.

"Yes, indeed," these double-talkers say. "We're 100 percent in favor of OPA. By all means, we must keep it going for the necessary while longer."

That's what they say in public. But behind the scenes, they are pulling every trick in the bag to sabotage price and rent control. Already these self-styled "friends" of price control have proposed enough crippling amendments and restrictions to make OPA completely powerless.

You may have heard another false idea these groups are trying to promote. They say, "All this talk about runaway prices and rents is scare talk. The Government is trying to panic us into fear. There's no real danger of inflation."

Well, maybe it's not real enough for them. But it's real enough for me, and it's a whole lot too close.

Look at the prices of real estate today. There's a field where there is no price control. And you know what's going on. Six and eight thousand dollar houses selling for ten, twelve, and fifteen thousand dollars.

Look at commercial rents. No price control there either. If inflation is not real, why are many business rents doubling and even tripling?

Again I say, let's not kid ourselves. Inflation is the most real and the most powerful danger you and I—and every other American—face today.

Those who say inflation is not a real danger had better refresh their memories with a look at what happened to prices after all our wars from the Revolution to World War I. They had better look at where prices are today in China, France, Greece, Japan, and practically every other nation on earth.

Our own veterans can tell us a thing or two about the inflation they saw for themselves—both on the Continent and in the Orient. Fifteen hundred Chinese dollars for a dinner in Shanghai, eight thousand francs for a pair of shoes in Paris, for example.

And let's remember this fact, too. The one reason inflation is not running rampant over our own country today is because the Government is controlling prices. The Congress set up OPA to protect you and your family, and all the other families in our country, from another war-made inflation.

For 4 years now OPA has been doing its job; and, on the whole, it's been doing it mighty well. Do you realize that this is the first time in history that any nation has kept prices and rents almost steady during a war? Not a bad record, is it? Particularly when you consider that this war was on a scale never even approached before.

Well, maybe it was all right to have price control during the war, you hear OPA critics concede. But we're at peace now. We don't need OPA in peace, they say.

The only trouble with that argument is, that we aren't far enough into peace yet to abandon all controls. We tried that once after the last war. We stripped off the few price controls we had almost before the ink was dry on the Armistice. We paid for our haste with one of the most ruinous inflations this country has ever seen.

No, you can't write off a war in a few months. It takes time to get back into peace. And it's during this transition that the danger of inflation is greatest.

If we learned anything from our bitter experience after World War I we learned that. The danger of inflation does not end with the dropping of the last bomb. Almost half of the inflation which wrecked us after the last war came after the shooting stopped.

Can anyone reasonably argue that there is no danger of postwar inflation now simply because the fighting on the war front is over?

Now let's look at the charge that price control is stifling production. Yes, that's the charge the National Association of Manufacturers and other such groups are constantly making. That's the reason why price control must be thrown out now, they say, because it's preventing production.

What are the facts about that? Production today—just 7 months after the war's end—is at an all-time high for peace. So is employment. Almost 52,000,000 men and women are working today. More people are at work than in any previous peacetime year in our history.

Of course, production went down right after VJ-day, when war contracts were canceled. Tractors and refrigerators don't automatically roll out of plants which have been building tanks and planes.

Yet, in spite of time out for retooling and other peacetime adjustments, civilian production began climbing up again as early as

November 1945, less than 3 months after VJ-day.

And right now the Federal Reserve Board reports that we are at the highest production peak ever known in peacetime. You are seeing proof of America's mighty production pick up power every day in your stores.

Of course, it's true that you can't buy everything you want yet. The big items—automobiles, refrigerators, combination radios—these take more time to make. But most small articles—from flashlights to dustpans—are already in pretty good supply. And the situation is getting better every week. You don't have to listen to me—or anyone else—tell you that. You just have to go shopping around yourself.

But do these facts stop the irresponsible charges of the pressure groups? No. They don't give production a minute to start. From the day the war ended they began pointing to empty shelves and display rooms, shouting that stores would continue to stay empty until OPA is abolished or crippled.

They completely ignore the obvious truth that it takes time to fill the pipe lines. Articles have to be made first. Then assembled, packed, and shipped to every part of our Nation. They have to be handled by wholesalers, suppliers, retailers. All this takes time. Yet the critics of price control are trying their best to use that time to discredit OPA.

Well, I leave it to you. If OPA is such a stumbling block why is production now breaking all peacetime records?

No; if you really want to throttle production—take inflation. We tried doing the job with inflation after the last war. The results are on the record. Inflation had free rein then, prices shot higher and higher. Building materials rose 218 percent, steel plate 232 percent, crude petroleum 367 percent, coal 675 percent.

If higher and higher prices are the secret of full production, then we must have set the world's record in those days. But did we? No. Even during the wild boom production could not keep pace with prices. And 26 months after the war was over production actually dropped 25 percent below its February 1920 postwar peak.

And you can see why this happened. How can a man get his business producing at top speed—when he doesn't know from one day to the next what his costs are going to be? When he can't get raw materials because speculators and profiteers are hoarding them for still higher prices? When he has no regular delivery schedules? When he can't make any marketing plans because rising prices are constantly driving more and more of his customers out of the market?

That's what happens when prices and costs go crazy. It's inevitable. No business can operate at top efficiency and speed under such unpredictable conditions.

Do you think for one minute that business today would be going ahead at record rates if the controls our Government has given us were not keeping prices and costs stable?

Would plants be expanding, investing billions of dollars, and taking on more workers? Would new businesses be starting if no one could count on selling the goods he produces and selling them at a profit?

And don't let anybody try to tell you that business isn't operating at a profit under price control!

Estimates based on figures from the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue and the United States Department of Commerce tell the story very clearly. In 1945 all corporation profits—after all taxes were paid—were more than twice as big as they were in 1939. This year—in 1946—with the excess-profits tax removed these profits stand a good chance reaching an all-time peak.

Yet some groups are glibly predicting business failures and bankruptcies. All right, let's look at the record on that.

In 1939 Dun & Bradstreet reported almost 15,000 business failures. In 1940 almost 14,000. In 1944—with price control—there were only 1,200 failures. And during 1945 these failures dropped to an all-time low, with only 810 in the entire United States. That's fewer than in any single month of the boom twenties.

Yet despite this plain record, these small—but noisy—groups who want to get rid of price control, trot out still another argument. Take ceilings off, they say, let competition set prices.

What these fellows don't tell you is, that for many months there can't possibly be any real competition in most fields. The only competition there is today is competition among buyers.

Before our factories have had time to turn out the wealth of goods we are waiting for, how can anybody talk about competition?

With the greatest accumulated demand in our whole history and the greatest cash buying power to back it up, we can't possibly make enough goods to satisfy everybody overnight. Take automobiles alone. Manufacturers estimate that when assembly lines are running at full speed, it will be several years before they can turn out the 16,000,000 passenger cars we Americans are waiting for.

Can you imagine what would happen to the prices of automobiles — vacuum cleaners—nylons or anything else—if ceilings were taken off now?

What the few who want to let competition control prices now do not tell you is how far prices would go up before real competition could adjust them naturally.

We tried doing the job that way after World War I when price pressures were nowhere near as strong as they are today. The record shows all too clearly the results.

For about 2 years prices shot upward. And all too soon they got so high that people had to buy less. Retailers and wholesalers began cutting down and canceling orders, instead of increasing them.

If stores are not buying goods, factories do not need to make them. And when you start cutting down on production you're taking the first step toward depression.

That's exactly what happened after the last war. By mid-1920, less than 2 years after the armistice—depression was on the way. In the 5 years that followed more than a hundred thousand firms went bankrupt. Nearly 500,000 farmers lost their farms. With mortgages foreclosed, they were forced off the very land they had tilled. Other millions had to get out of their homes because they could no longer meet the payments.

Millions of workers lost their jobs. Breadlines formed in every city. Veterans who had brought home victory couldn't even find a job to earn their own living. They stood on street corners selling apples and pencils. They got hand-outs from soup kitchens.

Is that the kind of a postwar world you want again this time for yourself, your family, your serviceman? A brief, wild boom of inflation then a long and ruinous depression bringing untold misery and hardship?

There is only one answer to that question. There can be only one. No; we do not want another boom and crash after this war. We want to keep our emergency brake in working order until we make the last treacherous postwar curve so we can drive into a peace of security, prosperity, and progress.

We want to keep OPA until we regain our normal peacetime balance between supply and demand. We want to keep it as it is, without crippling amendments, so it can continue to protect you and your country until we are really safe from the danger of inflation.

Producing Emergencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those citizens who are the apostles of economic planning by a Federal bureaucracy ought to consider the warning words of wisdom proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson:

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread.

This sage admonition has been disregarded by the New Deal architects of scarcity and ruin, with the result that what Jefferson foretold would happen has occurred.

There is a vast difference where, under a free economy, each sovereign citizen plans to produce and sell some commodity or whether a totalitarian group attempt to plan for the production needs of 139,000,000 people.

If an individual or many individuals make economic plans, the failure to make a proper decision in the economic field, falls principally upon such individuals or individual; but a plan for the whole Nation by a group of New Deal bureaucrats can bring disaster and has brought disaster to our whole country, as the present food shortage, adverse effects of restrictions on production, augmented inflation, and hindrances to reconversion now conclusively show.

There will be no relief from the New Deal epidemic of emergencies while the present revolutionary planners remain in power.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Thursday, March 28, 1946:

PRODUCING EMERGENCIES

It is no longer than 12 months since there was a lively discussion about shelves of blueprints. The details are still fresh. Conversion and demobilization would cause unemployment. Employment must be stimulated. The way to do it was with large public works. So the Federal Government, the States, and the cities were to go on a binge of building things.

In yesterday's issue of this newspaper there was printed the results of a survey. It shows that public works are stalled. Labor and materials are unavailable. Uncertainties are such that many contractors will not bid and those who do bid protect themselves with such high bids that local governmental units cannot afford to accept them.

Another angle of this discussion concerned industrial expansion plans. The general verdict was that they were to be stimulated; indeed there were serious proposals that the tax laws be altered so that there would be an incentive for the undertaking of this class of building.

But in yesterday's issue of this and other newspapers is an order of the Civilian Production Administration which practically prohibits industrial building and channels—at least that is the intent—facilities into low-cost housing with emphasis on the needs of veterans.

Turning to agriculture, the prevalent idea was that there would be a surplus of farm commodities, possibly sufficient to cause a bad break in prices. To meet such a contingency, the Department of Agriculture throughout the war had been perfecting plans for crop control. The actual fact is that there is a dearth of food through the world.

One could go on to show that hardly anything turned out as many people expected. And it is a sad fact that things seldom do. There are a good many reasons why forecasts may prove faulty, but in the cases mentioned one overriding reason is quite clear.

This country had gone through a crisis of unemployment. It had also gone through a period of low agricultural prices, popularly believed to be the result of too much agricultural production. That particular catastrophe was fresh with us, a very poignant recollection, and, as men have always done everywhere, we remembered the latest catastrophe. We let the recollection blot from our consciousness all thought that there might be another form of trouble. We directed all thoughts to measures to avoid the catastrophe we feared most and it is only now impressing itself upon us that those very measures contained the new trouble.

Left to their own devices men in large numbers can let emotion rule their judgment and guess wrong. But as individuals they can modify and reverse the course on which poor foresight has embarked them. When men are directed by some central authority, which is itself the victim of clouded judgment, the wrong measures gather a momentum which carries them on long after their harmful influence becomes clear.

For a considerable period before the war the idea of the managed, centrally directed economy was pretty vigorously propagated in this country. During the war its proponents had a chance to try their hand. The claim for a managed economy is that it averts violent fluctuations and that it keeps affairs running along on an even keel. The real fact, which we are now seeing, is that it subjects all of us to the guesses of a few men and that the only thing that it can be depended upon to produce, and unfailingly, is emergencies.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials commending the report of the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and his committee on streamlining the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times-Picayune of New Orleans (La.), March 6, 1946]

STREAMLINING FOR CONGRESS

It took a long time to get a report from the joint committee on overhauling congressional procedure, but the committee finally has come through. That means Congress has from its own Members a diagnosis of the obstructions standing in the way of efficient, economical procedure, and a prescription for removing them.

Capitol Hill was willing enough to give President Truman authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, but it remains to be seen whether Congress is disposed to clean its own house. The Federal lawgivers like their standing committee memberships for prestige and campaign purposes, and many of them will dislike the recommendation that the 81 standing committees in the 2 Houses should be reduced to 34. Some Members hold places on 8 or 10 committees and may not be able to bring themselves to vote away these jobs they have been telling the people about. Under the joint-committee plan a Member could hold only two committeeships.

Large numbers of Senators and Representatives will find a half a dozen or more unpalatable recommendations in the 37-point program. The suggestion that majority and minority policy committees be established in each House to more clearly establish party responsibility for action of important national legislation will meet opposition for the same reason that the party caucus has about gone out. Many Members do not want their stand on the political and sectional legislation to be made a question of party loyalty. But they will like, of course, the joint committee advocacy of a $5,000 raise in annual salary, and the pension plan.

Congress, however, should see the necessity of favorable action on important aspects of the proposed program. For it is a fact that the more inefficient the legislative branch becomes, the more authority it has to yield to other branches and the less effective it becomes in safeguarding the representative system of government. As the joint committee points out, administrative agencies and nonelective officials are taking over by degrees the direction of public affairs, leaving to Congress only a "casual oversight." Government by administrative agencies is subject to group pressures which overlook the public interest that Congress is duty-bound to protect.

The legislative branch can recapture its original place in the American system of governmental balances and checks only by a reorganization that will permit it to do more and better work in a shorter time. It must provide itself with the time not only to expedite legislation but to review and amend laws that have been distorted to serve purposes never intended. It must provide committees with the assistance required to keep them fully informed on the technical questions now so frequently involved in legislation.

Majorities in both Houses should realize that a tidying up in the legislative branch is fully as urgent as the postwar reorganization of the executive department.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of March 11, 1946]

STREAMLINING PRESTIGE

Our Congress, which in the past 15 years has created a sprawling bureaucracy within the Federal Government, is now considering the adoption of an exactly opposite policy for Congress itself—the streamlining of House and Senate procedures and organization.

The streamlining proposal, drawn up by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, would rip out cumbersome methods of handling legislation. Procedural deadwood which has piled up in the passing decades would be slashed away.

As the proposal moves into the stage of active debate, it will be of interest to see how the legislators respond to specific changes which at first glance would seem harmful to some of the Members.

For example, a survey shows that under the streamlining plan 29 Democrats who now head committees in the House would lose their chairmanships. The total number of House committees would be trimmed from 48 to 19, and in this trimming process the 29 chairmanships would vanish.

Under the seniority rule which dispenses chairmanships to Members of the majority party, some rather drastic jostling of committee power would occur. For example, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, who has been a Member of Congress since 1914, would become chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in which the present Military and Naval Affairs Committees would be merged.

ANDREW JACKSON MAY, of Kentucky, who has headed the Military Affairs Committee for a number of years, became a member of Congress in 1931 and would, thus, lose his chairmanship post in the reshuffling.

There would be many other similar shifts of committee power in the House and Senate. Obviously, if the proposal is judged only on the basis of personalities, of loss or gain in personal prestige arising from the streamlining, the opposition to the program might be strong.

However, up to now the problem has not been approached from that standpoint. Members of Congress are so fully aware of the need for simplified procedure that they have indicated an intention to consider the streamlining plan solely on the basis of merit—that is, according to the service which can be rendered to the Nation through smoother functioning of both Houses.

Certainly this is as it should be. After all, any prestige which any member now holds through a committee chairmanship is but a temporary thing. It is prestige which vanishes with a change of party power, or with the retirement of a Member. From the standpoint of the Nation's welfare, this is of slight consequence when compared with the gains which would be derived by our democracy from a sound streamlining program.

There is reason to hope that if Congress succeeds in establishing its functions on an efficient basis, then the application of the same reforms to the bureaucratic structure will follow as a matter of course. A great work can be done in that field, saving the taxpayers vast sums of money annually and restoring a proper balance between the scope of the Federal Government and the private affairs of the American people.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of March 6, 1946]

REFORMING CONGRESS

The Joint Congressional Committee on Reorganization has produced a report which may in the course of time lead to some of the reforms which it suggests. It is, however, so embracive that there is slight probability that more than portions of it will receive immediate consideration. It contains 37 recommendations made after a year of study. It steps on the toes of many congressional traditions.

The report gives support to the long-existing desire of Members of the Senate and House to increase their salaries. The figure suggested is $15,000, and, in addition, each Member would be given an $8,000-a-year administrative assistant to run the errands which now wear out congressional shoe leather and fray congressional tempers. It would staff congressional committees with much-needed experts. These proposals are close to the heart of every Member of Congress and may be adopted. It will, however, be some time before Congress agrees to reduce the Senate's 33 standing committees to 16 and the 48 of the House to 18, as the report suggests. Every chairman of a committee threatened with extinction will oppose this reform, as will many members who, by length of service, are approaching the top of committee lists. Even the committee itself was unable to suggest any substitute for the

existing seniority system, often attacked but never altered.

The committee made an excellent suggestion designed to place a check on deficit appropriations. It proposed that Congress at the beginning of each year make an estimate of Federal revenue. Any expenditures above the estimated figure would only be authorized when Congress itself provided additional means of revenue to meet the cost. This budgetary system has been employed in some States for years. It prevents deficit financing and places the responsibility for new expenditures definitely upon the legislative branch of Government.

The joint congressional committee lacked the authority to make any legislative recommendations to carry out its program. It is to be hoped that over the years Congress will use the report as a guide for improving the efficiency of a branch of the Government which has needed modernization for a long time.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News of March 6, 1946]

COST OF STATESMANSHIP

It is easy to jest or sneer at the first recommendation by the congressional committee that raising the pay of Members of Congress will improve the efficiency of Congress. Perhaps there is some humor in the situation—and some selfishness in the proposal. But, after all, something ought to be done to raise the dignity and the usefulness of Congressmen. We ought at least to look at what is suggested.

In brief, the plan is to pay Congressmen $15,000 a year and give each Congressman an assistant at $8,000 a year, the assistant to take over the work of running about from one administrative department to another doing errands for constitutents of the Congressman. It is explained that 80 percent of a Congressman's time is now occupied in this messenger-boy service, and that, if relieved of it, the Congressman would have something like his full time to devote to the business of a legislator and statesman.

If Congressmen were further required to remove all members of the family from their paid staff, the $15,000 would not mean as large an addition to the Congressman's pocket as it seems t . And sending some of these nepotistic parasites back home should materially improve the public service in the Capitol and its companion office buildings.

Similarly, if there is any practical way to relieve Congressmen of the necessity of taking most of their time doing favors for their constituents on a bellhop basis, it should be tried out. The trouble is that the constituent wants bellhop service with the pressure of a vote in Congress behind his demand. Paying an assistant $8,000 a year to run these errands will not take all the evil out of the bellhop system. On the whole, however, there is some chance that the proposals will actually be an improvement over the situation as it exists.

Veterans Need Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter received by Members of Congress yesterday from Mr. John Stelle, national commander of the American Legion, concerning the disappointing experiences of veterans in their endeavors to obtain Government surplus property.

The statements in the letter would arouse any Congressman, interested as we are in veterans' affairs. Therefore I immediately brought the complaints as set forth to the attention of Mr. William J. Hays, liaison officer of the War Assets Administration, asking for the facts. Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Administrator of the War Assets Administration, has commented on this situation, and I am also including his letter in order that the House, the country, and the veterans may be informed as to the progress made in the veterans' behalf during recent months. Both letters are self-explanatory:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Legion National Headquarters is daily receiving a flood of letters from veterans citing disappointing experiences in their endeavor to obtain Government surplus property.

Many of these letters are pitiful and appalling. They reveal that the veterans are meeting insurmountable difficulties in their desperate effort to obtain surplus war goods with which to establish or reestablish themselves in a business, occupation, or profession. They cannot understand the blank wall which they come up against; neither can I.

I am certain that your congressional mail is packed with letters similar to those received by the American Legion. To put it baldly, the veteran of World War II is getting little or none of the goods being set out at surplus sales, and that which is offered him is usually shoddy and beyond use or repair while the new goods go elsewhere.

When I speak of surplus property, all types and sorts are referred to. Vehicles have drawn most conversation and in most instances they are essential to the rehabilitation of the veteran back into civilian life.

But these are not all the story. The veteran needs pots, pans, and other kitchen utensils so that he can set up his small restaurant or cafe and shorten the food lines of this Nation; he needs carpenter, plumbing, or electrical tools so that he can help in the housing problems; he needs bulldozers and scrapers so that he can terrace and save his farm from erosion; he needs materials which the Government has possessed for war purposes in a thousand instances.

But the veteran is not getting these from the Government. From the civilian sources the universal reply to him is:

"You are not an old account. We have goods only for our old customers."

It leaves the veteran empty-handed.

The Government had billions of dollars in goods of every kind for the prosecution of the war. If this property is still held by the Government some efficient method of parceling it out to veterans should be established. If this property has already been disposed of, then the American people should know who got it and how.

The situation is such that immediate remedial steps should be taken or the veterans of this Nation are going to become dangerously discontented and they will lose confidence in promises of the Government. America cannot afford that.

We all are aware that meanwhile the surplus property is melting away through various channels. The action I suggest is for Congress by the quickest possible method, perhaps resolution, to freeze temporarily all surplus property until the situation can be surveyed. The veteran should be given improved priority. The not-for-sale signs should be torn down in the huge warehouses where thousands of articles useful to veterans are on display. Information and distribution outlets should be better organized. The percentage of the total supply available to the veterans should be drastically increased, for his reestablishment in civil life is the pressing national problem.

Otherwise, within a few short months the veterans are going to be left empty-handed, disillusioned, and seriously disappointed—with the surplus property gone.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN STELLE,
National Commander.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1946.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RABAUT: Thank you for inviting my comment on the letter addressed to Members of Congress by Mr. John Stelle, national commander, the American Legion, on surplus property disposal as it affects veterans. I know that you share, as I do, Mr. Stelle's contention that the veteran needs and is entitled to all the help we reasonably can give him in the way of surplus property to enable him to find his place in the national economy.

When I took over the general direction of surplus property disposal nearly 2 months ago, it was with the expressed determination that every effort would be made, within the limits of the Surplus Property Act, to foster distribution of surplus goods among veterans to attain that objective.

A source of gratification to me, therefore, are the latest reports on consumer goods sales that have come to my desk. They cover the month of February. They show that sales of such goods to veterans increased 75 percent in February over the January figure. They show that such sales were almost five times as large as they were in December 1945.

It will interest you, and Mr. Stelle as well, I am sure, to learn that automotive sales increased from $7,900,000 in January to $11,100,000 in February, or by 40 percent. Nonautomotive sales jumped from $6,600,000 to $13,900,000, an increase of 110 percent. Track-laying tractors accounted for one-quarter of all nonautomotive sales to veterans in February.

The results of greater efforts to meet veterans' needs are to be seen not only in the increase in total sales to veterans. Records prove that sales to veterans accounted for almost 30 percent of total consumer goods sales in February, as compared with only 9 percent last November.

Let me hasten to say that I am acutely aware that the veteran's preference under the Surplus Property Act is no Aladdin's lamp that needs only to be rubbed with a certificate to materialize anything in surplus which he may need. I am well and even painfully aware that often little or nothing is left for the veterans or other subsequent preference holders after Federal, State, and local Government agencies have been served first, as the law decrees they must be. I personally know, for instance, of cases of doctors coming out of military service who sorely needed certain items to help them pick up the threads of interrupted practice. They couldn't get them from surplus, because the Veterans' Administration needed them, and needed them urgently. We could not legally sell them to any other claimant than the Veterans' Administration, nor could the Veterans' Administration legally buy them anywhere else if they were available in surplus.

The disposal of surplus goods to certain priority claimants is a basic philosophy of the act. We intend to do what the act requires us to do. At the same time, we have got to think in terms of rapid liquidation if we are to fulfill the paramount purpose of the act. It is my considered judgment that

discretion must be used in evaluating the different objectives of the act as they apply to specific situations.

The blunt truth is that we do not have enough of many commodities even to begin to take care of veterans' demand. In the case of motor vehicles, the item in heaviest demand, there is hardly a usable car now in surplus. If there were, the veteran would find two heavy buyers ahead of him; first, Federal agencies; and second, State and local governments and tax-supported institutions.

Nothing would please us more than to be able to sell a car or a truck to every veteran who needs one in his business, but obviously we just can't do it. To a lesser extent the same thing is true of office furniture, business machines, and other commodities in heavy demand and relatively short supply.

But what we can do, and are doing, is to improve constantly our service to the veteran in helping him acquire the things that are available. The War Assets Administration, which is 4 days old today, is far better organized to accomplish this purpose than were any of its predecessors in surplus property disposal administration.

A basic element in our new organization is its Veterans Division, which, as its designation implies, is dedicated solely to the service of the veteran. In each of our regional offices blanketing the country there has been established a special veterans unit, staffed by veterans, which will follow through to final disposition every application that is filed by a veteran. Administrative procedures have been revised and strengthened to the end that he receive the most efficient, expeditious service it is possible to render. That is our goal. We are determined to reach it.

Sincerely yours,

E. B. GREGORY, *Administrator.*

Shrine to St. Patrick, at St. Patrick, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, in Missouri we have an enterprising little community known as St. Patrick. A shrine is being built there today to honor this patron saint. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Kahoka Gazette-Herald which tells of this little community and the fine work being done there.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRIOTISM AND ENDURANCE

From the quiet little parish of St. Patrick some 50 young men left during the past 4 years for the armed forces of our country. In an effort to keep faith with those who made our liberty possible, the people on the home front were determined, as a community, to buy a bond of $1,000 denomination for each absent boy. Apart from individual purchases, often generous, St. Patrick accomplished this program, and in its feeling of satisfaction now pauses to express its gratitude to outside patrons, many of them non-Catholics, who freely helped in this worthy cause. Some may wish to know the ultimate aim or use of this $51,000. It is but the beginning of a program to give reality to the dream of a pioneer generation that now sleeps beneath the tall pines. Settling on these rolling hills, that look down on the majestic grandeur of the Mississippi, they dedicated their little town to the patron saint of the Gael and prayed that it might long remain a sanctuary of faith in a world all too pagan. In this little haven of hope their children strive to erect a church or shrine that will be a fitting monument to those sons of the soil and a lasting inspiration to the generations yet to come. As the bond drives end we thank our friends afar and our non-Catholic neighbors for making our burden a little lighter. Such assistance urges us to continue with even greater efforts, and our confidence in God is our best assurance of final success. (The people of St. Patrick.)

Editor's comment: "The quiet little parish!" Quietly, it is true, the people of that little parish wrought wonders of patriotic support from the inception to the victorious ending of the greatest war of all time.

The inspired leaders of that parish are all too modest to make claims of superendeavor and surpassing accomplishments, but the Gazette-Herald makes bold to challenge the record of all communities or "quiet little parishes" for evidence that no one like community, anywhere, has made an equal record of patriotic endeavor, measured in dollars and cents, the kind of coin that won the war. The resolution to buy a bond of $1,000 for every boy absent in the war was a noble resolve. And it was done.

He possibly will not sanction this (he is equally brave and modest) but we recognize the Reverend Father O'Duignan, in charge of the "quiet little parish," as the major torchbearer in this accomplishment of civilian heroes on the home front.

It was he, speaking the voice of peoples who would be free, who sent up from the site of this quiet parish the clarion call, and through it all, he sounded no bugle call of retreat from support of the embattled front. His every command was "advance" until a $1,000 bond was the tie which bound the affection of the parishioners to each of the 50 boys who had gone to return again, together with those who were "just away."

Thus the glory of this quiet little parish, St. Patrick, is written in the stars while the songs of praise reverberate across the eternal hills of the St. Patrick environs.

Uses of the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Uses of the British Loan," published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 8, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USES OF THE BRITISH LOAN

As the important moment approaches when the question of the loan to Britain must be debated on the floor of Congress, it is clear that there is considerable hostility to the loan and that this will be reflected with eloquence and emotion in the coming debate. So a careful review of the situation to date may be useful.

The granting of the loan has been publicly advocated in the strongest terms by officials of the Department of Commerce and of the Chamber of Commerce, by American bankers, by businessmen concerned with American exports and others who are unequivocally devoted to private enterprise and the competitive system, and finally by the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States.

The publicity has been for the most part casual, often negative and as often confusing. For example, some opponents of the loan have warned against lending to Britain lest she nationalize her industries against the United States. Such statements rally a great deal of uninformed opinion with a false assumption.

Britain needs not one penny of the loan to nationalize industry. But on the contrary, the effect of the loan would be to ease international exchange and trade barriers which concern America quite as much as Britain. In fact, there will be tighter controls and more socialism in Britain without the loan than with it. Is that a reason why the most ardent Socialists like Harold Laski, Jennie Lee, and others are against it? Are they afraid it may spoil their plans?

When your best and biggest customer goes bankrupt through extraordinary efforts in the community cause, if you are a good banker you don't drive him out of business unless you want him to set up a hostile outfit. You help him to get back to a healthy position once more. A financially healthy Britain can mean a billion-dollar customer to America. A financially crippled Britain means economic warfare, rival spheres of influence, closed markets, and inevitable political consequences.

If there is one sound criticism of this loan from the point of view of American world interest, it would seem to be that the scale is not large enough to insure final success. In actual cash it amounts to what America spent on 2 weeks of warfare; surely not an excessive amount to ease the economic barriers and expand multilateral trade, which even the opponents of the loan agree are prime American interests.

Money Without Gold—Money From Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. P. A. Spain, 1401 Bonham Street, Paris, Tex., has given great thought and consideration to the question of money. He is the author of many books, pamphlets, and articles in the subject. Dr. Spain has been complimented by people from every section of the country for the unselfish fight that he is making and has made for many years with reference to this subject.

I am inserting herewith seven articles that he has recently prepared. They are self-explanatory and are as follows:

ARTICLE 1

MONEY WITHOUT GOLD EXPLAINED—BOND ISSUES AND INTEREST

The matter here discussed is important. In fact it is more important than all other questions connected with Government.

The question of issuing bonds (notes) to be swapped for money or credit comes up many times in every community, every city, every county, every District, every State, and every nation.

Every individual knows that when interest is to be paid on those bonds (notes) it becomes necessary for the people to pay the amount of those bonds at least two or three times before final settlement.

Everyone feels that this is unnecessary and unjust and could be avoided if proper governmental action could be gotten; but knowing that no other plan has yet been enacted by our statesmen (?) for securing money for public or private use, we all feel that we are under obligation to vote for the notes (bonds) or get no money when we are in dire need of it.

There is no good reason for opposing bond (note) issues as such. The dishonest part about it is the interest on the bonds (notes) as this makes us pay them twice or more; while the honest way, without interest would make us pay but once.

When people become wise enough to know that money should be gotten without interest feature, then they will demand Congress to make some change in our money laws whereby the necessary money can be gotten without the dishonest and unjust interest tax. Well, you say, how can that be done?

Every thinking Congressman and voter are already convinced that this Government cannot survive if it continues the practice of borrowing all needed money and paying the toll of 15 or 20 billion dollars interest for the use of it each year. Those who are convinced that this is an unjust and destructive process are ready and anxious to change this method, but they are halting and bewildered as to how to do it. They need leadership that is loyal to the people.

ARTICLE 2

NOTES AS MONEY USED BY PRIVATE CITIZENS—THEIR MONEY POWER EXPLAINED

Congress, in 1933, voted the power and privilege to the President for having three billions of money printed to be used in necessary transactions to check the sinking trend of the Union. They called it a stabilization fund. It is said that the President started the printing presses and began turning out the money; but suddenly he called it all off. He shut down the presses and turned right around and continued the old method of borrowing on interest bond issues.

Do you know why he did that? I have never seen it fully explained. It is a matter that should call for congressional investigation. It would be most interesting to see a report of the secret plottings and conferences which probably took place at that time to stop the printing presses from turning out that three billions of money.

Let us have the investigation and the report. But, we were told he was starting out to make money from nothing, and gold owners shouted "Impossible." And they shouted it till many thoughtless ones believed it impossible. But it is not. That has been done every day in the history of the Nation.

When John Smith writes up a note promising to pay $10 to someone, that is John Smith's fiat money, his printing-press money, his credit money. He made it out of nothing except his promise and a piece of paper; and that note, that fiat money, that pen-and-ink money will circulate and pay debts wherever John is known to be good for his promise. Now why do you say that money cannot be made from nothing? His note was only a slip of paper with his promise written upon it. When the note comes back to him, he will allow something for it just like the others did.

Perhaps he takes it back and allows some man to live on his place for a month, thus paying rent. He then destroys it and writes another note and starts it around like he did the first. Thus all Government money can be made. Thus all bank credit money is made; even all bonds are printing-press money made for money lenders to handle. Smith's note was good money, and its value depended on nothing but Smith's ability to redeem or pay the note.

A Government note's value depends on the ability of 130,000,000 of people to redeem the note; hence it is good. But you say, "How is the Government's note, this printing-press money, to be redeemed?" Why just exactly like Smith's money was redeemed. The head Government would first give it out like Smith did for something the Government needs in its business transactions. Smith gave out his note, his promise to pay, and got something for it. The Government can likewise give out its notes, its fiat money, its printing-press money for some service rendered to the Government; and after the note circulates around paying debts and buying goods, it may come back to the head government in the form of taxes paid to the Government by a citizen for the privilege of citizenship and protection in the United States.

ARTICLE 3

TO WHOM UNITED STATES NOTES CAN BE PAID—NO GOVERNMENT SPECULATION—INTERFERENCE WITH FREE ENTERPRISE—WHY NO INTEREST NEED BE CHARGED

The previous articles made it clear how the head government can make money from nothing by issued "promises to pay" in the form of money, and paying them out on salaries to all Government officials in the Nation's Capital and to all officials in all State capitals, and to officials of counties, districts, towns, and any other Government organizations set up for general welfare purpose.

Individuals should be allowed to borrow these notes for purchasing homes and home-building purposes to be paid back in small annual payments without interest.

It should be stated here that just governments cannot be parties to the speculative deals of its private citizens. This would evidently be government suicide.

These notes borrowed by individuals and those notes paid out to officials on salaries and general welfare purposes would go into general circulation supplying all needs for money, and should be taxed back into the Treasury by income and property taxes wherever such notes have been accumulated into overswollen fortunes in any one center. Here is where government should be empowered to interfere with free enterprise. Limitations are necessary here, to put checks on the tendency to inflation locally or generally.

Unlimited enterprise has ruined us. Unlimited free enterprise has produced the hundreds and thousands of corporations and monopolies that are preying upon the defenseless people. Free enterprise has assumed the power of democracy and left the people shouting for democracy while they have little semblance of a democracy. Free enterprise has destroyed the small enterprises of the common people and left them with no business of their own, and with no choice but to hire themselves out to the ruling monopolies around them. Thus we have become a nation of hired hands. This weakens any nation. Free enterprise should not mean that any man or set of men should have no legal limits to their cumulative desires. We should have free enterprise within limits fixed by law.

Thus we are beginning to see how a just and perfect money system can be framed up by the use of "money from nothing," except the Government's promissory notes to be used for the general welfare instead of for the profit of private money lenders.

Someone asks, why should the Government not get interest on the money it pays out to the people just the same as money lenders now collect on all money they pay out? Answer. Just because there is no just reason why the Government should be so dishonest as to demand individuals to pay back more money than was paid out to them. Besides why collect interest on money when the Government can make all it needs and to be honest it cannot speculate on its own people.

ARTICLE 4

BANKS HONOR PRIVATE NOTES AS MONEY—PRIVATE NOTES AS MONEY MEANS SPECULATION—TAXES TO SUPPORT GOVERNMENT ALL WRONG

The erring man claims that money cannot be made from nothing, and yet it has been done every day in the history of the Republic. Men issue their promises as money, and they circulate around in trade. Banks call these promises "money" and base their own credit money on them. They accept them as cash deposits and swap them for other forms of money.

Government bonds and big company bonds are the money and trading stock of brokers and bankers. They are made of nothing but a promise and a piece of paper. This financial set-up on which we have been depending for 100 years has failed, and has now reached the stage of reductio ad absurdum, and its ugly face is now staring at us with such hideous grimaces that all men are becoming appalled.

All but interest takers are convinced that it was a Pandora's box that was turned loose upon humanity and must be destroyed.

The billions of credit money put out in recent war processes will soon pass the channels of exchange and be back into the hands of the same crew that loaned it to the Government at the beginning. That is the deflation process and disaster will follow unless the Government chooses to continue borrowing, and putting out money on other projects instead of war processes.

If Congress chooses to prevent the usual disastrous effects of deflation then another quota of bonds will have to be floated and billions more will have to be borrowed and spent on various internal improvements in order to resupply the people with sufficient medium of exchange with which to continue business at its usual level.

If Congress fails to prevent this usual deflation process they are as criminal as the war lords of Germany.

These bond-sale orgies will have to follow one after another in close succession or else a crash will follow each big issue, and the amount of each issue will have to be increased because the interest demands will be growing bigger each time. If these interest demands are not met then the mortgaged lands and houses will have to be foreclosed, and this will plunge us into one disaster after another.

This financing of a government is always a "put-out and take-back business." But under present interest-collecting methods the "take-back" is always double or treble the "put-out." That is why the people have lost their homes by foreclosures. It is impossible for all borrowers to pay both principal and interest in money, and hence the houses and lands in some cases must be taken to satisfy creditors. This is not simply a theory but the process is being enacted every day all around us. Every man with common sense can see the destructive absurdity of such a method.

How can you stop this toboggan slide that is racing us on to ruin? Stop making money from nothing for the benefit of money lenders and begin making money from nothing for the benefit of the general public. How can we do that? Just quit issuing interest promises to money lenders, and issue simple

promises to the people for their services and products. How can you do that? Read the following and the process will become clear to you.

Collecting money as revenue to pay the expenses of government never should have been thought of, because it means to collect privately issued interest money. Printing promises by the government itself to satisfy all claims against the government is the proper ideal. What claims am I talking about? Claims for money to pay salary of Presidents, Cabinets, Congressmen, and other Government officials everywhere; money to pay bondholders, money to purchase corn, cotton, wheat, and oats in maintaining an ever-normal granary; money for every man who works on any project launched by the Government; money for purchasing land for every family that needs a home.

ARTICLE 5

FORM OF MONEY—WHO MAKES IT GOOD?

How can printed promises be made to satisfy all these just claims against the Government? Just this way: When any service is rendered by Smith for the Government he is giving the service, not to the agents of the Government, but to all the people, and he needs to be paid not by the head government, but by the people. The Treasurer of the Government, by order of Congress, should be instructed to give Smith some evidence that the people owe him.

Whatever form that evidence takes should be called money. The people should first authorize Congress, their head government, to issue some form of scrip, some written or printed document which shows the amount due Smith, and which he can carry out among the people and exchange for what he wants of the peoples' goods or services.

That scrip should be called money. Well, what should be the form of that scrip? Answer: a United States promissory note. Inasmuch as the head government is a qualified agent of the people, then the head government should authorize the Treasurer to have pieces of money printed thus:

"We the citizens of the United States promise to pay the bearer $10 in goods or service for value received wherever presented in trade transactions in the United States. This note is negotiable, transferable, and nondiscountable."

These should be printed in quantities to meet all Government expenses for salaries, homes, general welfare, and all outstanding bonds or notes.

Now then, since the people have promised to pay the bearer as set forth in the scrip in his hand, he takes that promise and goes out among the people and finds things for sale and he says: "Yes; that coat suits me. I'll take it"; and hands the clerk his $10 note. The clerk says, "What is this good for?" He reads it and sees it is the blanket promise of all United States citizens to pay. It is the Government fiat; and he being a loyal citizen proceeds to pay; and he sees further that the note is just as good in his hands as in Smith's hands—good whenever and wherever presented in the United States.

So the clerk, as a loyal citizen, takes the note and gives Smith the coat. Now then, the clerk goes out and presents the note wherever he finds on sale something he wants; and the next man being a loyal citizen, pays just like Smith did. So the $10 note is then in circulation and has become honest money of the United States. A man in any country would take it if he wanted to buy anything from a United States citizen.

ARTICLE 6

POST-OFFICE BANKS

The reader will remember the previous articles explained how and why "United States promises to pay" were the only just and honest money that could be issued as a medium of exchange. Someone asked, would the present banks accept them at par? If they were made legal tender, the banks could do nothing else but accept them at face value. They would not have to be redeemed at Washington because anyone holding such notes could go out and get them redeemed among the people in service or commodities. The notes are cash themselves.

The head government would not need to handle these notes a second time in any way, except as they came in as taxes. Right now the United States Government is laying up its "promises to pay" and calling them cash reserve to be used later in paying Social Security benefits. To issue this kind of money would not directly interfere with the present banking system.

The old private banks could go right on doing business, lending their money, collecting interest and exchange for their services. The change that would be necessary to make, would be for the Government to set up a system of banks of its own through which to pay out its own money, and that would mean that the governing business had been taken out of the hands of private banks and had been assumed by the Government itself, where it belongs. Post offices could easily take on banking facilities. They have already been made to act as savings banks. They could easily be made to answer the purpose of checking centers.

Of course, severe penalties would need to be assessed against discounters and counterfeiters of this honest money of the Government. This would force the old banks to handle Government money in equal favor with any private bank money, and in the course of time all private bank money would be taken up by the Government and the Government money substituted therefor.

The Government bonds which these banks had put up with the Treasury to get Federal Reserve notes could be reclaimed by the banks with either the simple United States notes, or their Federal Reserve notes. If the banks did not wish to redeem such bonds, they could be destroyed and the banks could go on doing business on the money they had already received on the bonds.

Thus all outstanding interest bonds would soon become extinct and all outstanding Reserve notes would soon disappear, and we would then have the one kind of money for all people; namely, legal tender "United States promises to pay." The business of speculating in the people's medium of exchange by the process of interest and discount, and deflations and inflations would thus also be shut off.

ARTICLE 7

STABILIZED DOLLAR—LABOR THE NATURAL MEASURE OF VALUE

One more point needs to be made plain and that is a standard of value. That means a measure by which the price of each article in trade can be calculated. This is very necessary, in order to keep the dollar value from rising and falling as it does along with other values. In other words our dollar should be stabilized, and by this we mean the dollar should be made to buy the same amounts of things today that it bought yesterday, and should remain at that value. When the price of commodities changes that means a change in the price of the dollar has occurred. Hence all sorts of speculative processes are going on all the time under present methods.

We pretend to stabilize the dollar now by pricing gold at $35 an ounce. This is a mere pretense and really means nothing except with gold owners, because prices of everything continue to flop up and down. Well, you say, how can you stabilize the dollar? Anyone with comon sense can see in a moment that you cannot fix the price of the dollar without at the same time fixing the price of basal commodities.

If we fix the market price of basal articles of commerce like corn, wheat, oats, rice, cotton, wool, coal, wood, lumber, you see we will thus fix the price of the dollar in relation to these necessities, but that does not say what shall be a dollar. There is only one honest standard for the dollar, and that is labor. Morally, labor is the human cost of production and labor should be the measure of the dollar, which is our unit for measuring value.

Excellence in any sphere comes from painstaking energy applied.

Some have written much about hitching the dollar to the average price of 700 articles back in 1926. Such a thing would be silly. It would still leave the pricing of things in the hands of commercial exploiters.

Surplus products causing a drop in demand should be taken off the market by Government purchase and warehousing, and not by private speculators. The warehoused products then could be used to fill up the demand in lean years. If by some natural calamity some of the basal commodities mentioned should be made temporarily too scarce to yield a support to families engaged therein, then is the time for Government subsidies to be brought into action.

If there is any one thing that deserves to hold a stable, unchanging price, it is labor or service.

At present 2 hours' common labor should be the equal of $1. Then everything that requires 2 hours' labor to produce should be worth $1. All those basal products just mentioned should be priced by law according to the number of labor hours usually necessary to produce a given amount of each. Example would be: If it takes 2 hours' labor to produce a bushel of wheat then wheat should be $1 per bushel. All other basal commodities should likewise be priced on same principle.

Service: Labor is the only true test for the value of any useful human production, hence 2 hours' service should be the equivalent of $1, or in other words 2 hours' service should be the standard for a stabilized money system.

Some writers say make 1 hour the price of the dollar, but to suddenly boost the price of common labor up to $8 a day seems to be too upsetting to many conditions.

The principles set forth in these articles are not inspired by any special hope that they will be adopted by the Government but are urged solely in the belief that they are right, the best.

The case against the present methods is already made up. They have been tried and found wanting by all normal thinking men and women except gold owners and their agents. These may hold on forever.

It is said that error will finally "die amid her worshipers" and that right will reign through "the eternal years," but we have no assurance when that consummation will appear.

It has also been said by some one "a healthy lie will live forever." Our duty is to see that this does not occur.

OPA at Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph Gazette:

OPA AT CROSSROADS

Price-control procedures of the Office of Price Administration, conceived and put into effect at a time when delaying tactics were generally beneficial, are now proving a definite obstacle to high production by American industry. What the country needs today more than any other one thing in the production picture is an OPA itself reconverted to the requirements of a speed-up in industry.

It would be disastrous for us to drop all controls at this time. But it will not be beneficial if we try to carry on without revamping many OPA policies and practices.

During the war, when both labor and management were largely needed for military production, it made little difference if OPA price schedules held civilian production to a minimum. Then the important thing was that those commodities or products needed to win the war were made in adequate quantities.

But the situation is different now. High production is our prime objective now. Price controls at this time must be exercised with a double purpose: First, to encourage high output; and, second, to prevent inflationary exploitation of the consumer. Since the cessation of hostilities the OPA has too long ignored the first of these two essentials.

Policies and practices of the OPA, carried over from the war period, have penalized established businesses and eased the way of the fly-by-nights. These policies and practices have kept staple goods from the market by encouraging substitution of more profitable luxury lines. The slowness with which price appeals have been handled and the outworn rules by which they have been adjudicated have slowed down recovery perceptibly, by delaying full-swing manufacture or by causing producers to hold back their manufactured goods for a higher market.

The recent OPA declaration on meat and the prediction of Paul Porter, OPA Administrator, that few price increases will be called for this year indicate that holding the line still overshadows encouragement of production in official minds. Unless this emphasis is speedily reversed, the country is in for an inexcusable prolongation of the present period of doubt and confusion.

There is some evidence that OPA sees this necessity for change within itself. The process certainly needs to be hastened.

The Monroe Doctrine Needs To Be Restated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my responsibility recently to address the House in reference to certain influences which I found in Central America working against the United States. In this connection I include the following editorial:

[From the Butte (Mont.) Standard of March 15, 1946]

THE MONROE DOCTRINE NEEDS TO BE RESTATED

The report of Chairman JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, West Virginia, of the House Civil Service Committee, that communistic forces are using Central American countries as a springboard for violent attacks against the United States suggests to many American citizens that the time is ripe for a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine.

The original Monroe Doctrine as promulgated by President Monroe in August of 1823 stated that "the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

President Monroe's famous state document also stated:

"The political system of the European powers is essentially different * * * from that of America.

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere.

"But with the governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Properly understood, this means that the United States is opposed to any non-American action encroaching upon the political independence of American states under any guise.

The modern concept of colonization is somewhat different from that at the time the principle of the Monroe Doctrine was laid down. Colonization projects were preceded at that time and for many years afterward by armed invasion. In more modern times the invasion which precedes colonization takes on an ideological form.

The way is paved by agitators who gain their ends by stealth, agitation, confusion, and infiltration quite often ending in revolution. This is, in particular, the communistic strategy.

The United States has never used the Monroe Doctrine as a policy of aggression. Rather, it has been used as a policy of self-defense. The United States has not interfered with the internal policies or forms of other governments in the American hemisphere unless they endangered the peace and safety of the hemisphere.

The peoples of South and Central America have built their own cultures, indulged in their own political whimsies, without outside interference under the protective wing of the Monroe Doctrine.

Moscow has spoken of its own Monroe Doctrine for Europe. But by its own acts the so-called Russian Monroe Doctrine has gone forward in the spirit of aggression. Nations in the Russian sphere have been under compulsion to adopt governmental policies kindred to the Soviet as well as to submit to Soviet influences in many other fields. In a number of instances outright annexation has taken place.

Russia should understand the Monroe Doctrine well enough because it was largely bebecause of a Russian ukase prohibiting navigation and fishing in a large area off the northwest American coast in 1821 which inspired the doctrine. In July of 1823 State Secretary Adams informed the Russian minister that the United States would contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent.

By the same token, Russia needs to be told today that we will contest the right of Russia to any ideological establishment on this continent. This declaration should apply to the United States and Canada, as well as to South and Central America.

Republican Party Is Antiveteran, Proinflation, Says New York Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the New York Post of March 19 has an editorial which I feel should be read by all Republican Members—yes, and by some of our own Democrats. If they have the interest of the country, and their own interest, at heart, I am sure they will heed; and I am equally sure the voters of the country already know what this editorial says and will act accordingly when they go to the polls.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the editorial of which I speak:

PREVIEW OF A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

The Patman bill, embodying President Truman's veterans' housing program to give us 2,700,000 new moderate and low-cost homes in the next 2 years, has been wrecked by the Republican-Democratic coalition in the House.

The opponents of the Patman housing bill voted against relieving the housing shortage. They also voted against price control and for inflation.

But that is only half the story. In the balloting on the amendments which gutted the Patman bill, the coalition of Republicans and reactionary Democrats, which has dominated Congress and blocked President Truman's reconversion and full employment program throughout his administration, came out into the open.

Scores of Democrats have deserted to the Republicans, and in far more than the narrow sense of a particular floor vote. Their desertion to the Republicans could destroy the Democratic Party's chance of winning an election.

The alliance of Democrats with Republicans is smashing the President's legislative program, which is the Democratic Party program. It is ruining the performance of the Democratic Party in office.

THE REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

One of the political reasons why Democrats can be found sabotaging their own party, and why the political tangle centers around price control, is that we are in one of the most dangerously inflationary periods in our history.

Pressure groups are most numerous, ruthless, and hungry under inflationary conditions. They spend money and spread propaganda in drives for profitsering breakthroughs in the price line. They are succeeding in swinging reactionary Democrats away from the program on which they were elected and into the Republican column, thereby defeating not only the President but also the voters who chose a Democratic Congress.

Because, when Democrats vote with Republicans and against their party measures, Congress is actually opening the way for adoption of Republican proposals.

However, the Republican-Democratic coalition for the Republican Party program has one real value for the voters. It gives them a chance to see, in practice, what the Republicans represent.

Congressional elections come around this fall. Generally, party programs are kept pretty much in the evasive realm of fine talk before an election. For instance, this year

there will be a lot of noble-sounding promises angled to win the veterans' vote.

This time, in dominating the House through a coalition, the Republicans are revealing, in fact and in practice, what they intend to do if they get a congressional majority next fall.

ANTIVETERAN, PROINFLATION

The Republican Party proves to be against veterans and for inflation.

Recently, the Republican-Democratic coalition knifed the veterans in voting to cripple the United States Employment Service by turning it back to its prewar State control. Demobilization is currently pushing veterans' job needs toward the millions.

Then, the Republican-Democratic coalition voted to strip the Patman bill by defeating the provisions for subsidies to stimulate the production of short building materials at reasonable prices, and for price ceilings on old houses to check speculative inflation. That was a vote against the veterans who need millions of low-cost homes, and for the speculators and pressure groups who are profiteering from inflation in real estate.

Now, reactionary Democrats are openly meeting with the Republicans to draft coalition strategy to outflank price control. The plan is to extend the Price Control Act, but to cripple it with amendments which would make it impossible to administer and open the gates wide to inflation and profiteering. The anti-price-control strategy committee is made up of three Democrats and four representatives of the so-called minority Republican Party.

The Democrats are stooging for a Republican program.

When Telephone Talks Are Recorded, Let the Customers Know It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post for March 30, 1946, as follows:

WHEN TELEPHONE TALKS ARE RECORDED, LET THE CUSTOMERS KNOW IT

The telephone companies of the country are wondering what will be the attitude of their subscribers toward the increased use of devices which make it possible to record a telephone conversation so that it can later be played back, perhaps to the embarrassment of one of the participants. The attitude of the companies is that most of their subscribers want to be informed in advance if their conversation is being recorded, and that the obvious legitimate uses of such devices do not dispose of the possibility that they could be used for dubious ends, including blackmail. The companies, which have presented their views to the Federal Communications Commission, strongly suggest that they will oppose the use of such instruments on their lines unless the fact that a conversation is being recorded can be made known to both subscribers.

During the war, recorders were used by the Army and the Navy and to a lesser extent by industries having war contracts. The details of important technical plans or business contracts could be telephoned from New York to Richmond, Calif., and later played slowly while a secretary took them down. Some Government departments used recorders to such an extent that the wise customers with a grievance against a bureaucrat preferred to call the latter at his home rather than at his office. The telephone companies are certainly right in believing that their customers pretty generally regard the recording of conversations without the knowledge of everybody concerned as a sleazy business. Many people, remembering that the Supreme Court has ruled against the admission of evidence procured by tapping telephone wires, believe that recording telephone conversations is against the law. The telephone companies, which have an interest to protect, are naturally against the use of devices which tend to reduce popular confidence in the telephone as a means of communication as private as a conversation in a family living room.

At the moment, recorders are fairly expensive and it is unlikely that their use will become so general that conversations to private houses will be stored up for future use. Nevertheless, this is the age of electronics, and the possibility of cheap recorders is at least strong enough to demand the establishment of some principle to govern their use. Total prohibition would probably be unwise for two reasons: (1) There are many legitimate uses for recorders; and (2) there is no practical way to prevent the use of certain types of recorders which need not be attached physically to the telephone line. But we believe the public will back up the telephone companies in their demand that a telephone subscriber who wants to record conversations should be required to make it plain to the party at the other end of the line that he is doing so.

Disposal of Surplus Army and Navy Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram:

TRYING TO BUY SURPLUS ARMY AND NAVY GOODS PROVES, AT LEAST, AN ADVENTURE—ROVING REPORTER DESCRIBES VISIT TO DAVISVILLE, R. I.—EVEN IF VET FINDS WHAT HE WANTS, THAT IS ONLY BEGINNING

(Several recent news stories have announced new, simple methods to obtain surplus Army and Navy goods. We sent our own roving reporter, a veteran, to buy a German motorcycle as advertised. This, then, is his story.—Editor.)

This story will not be as long as the process it describes because that would be very long indeed. However, let's start at the beginning. The beginning is a visit to the Smaller War Plants Corporation office in Worcester. Here you establish that you are a veteran, explain what you plan to do with the item in your business, and how you aim to pay for it. You also state that you are not buying just to resell.

With this interview completed, you are given certification and placed on the surplus property mailing list. You then go home and wait. In due time the list arrives with dates of sale announced, and the chase is on. The sale inventory gives the name, weight, and, in some cases, the year of the items, without any description whatsoever. With this document clutched in fist we set out for the distant Davisville, R. I., Naval Supply Base, a vast jungle of Quonset huts and gated wire fences.

FROM GATE TO GATE

We applied at the main gate and were told to go to gate No. 1. At gate No. 1 we were simply told that we had to have passes to get in; these had to be obtained at gate No. 40. After long reconnaissance we found that the gate No. 40 operators were having lunch, all eating at once; so all business was, of course, suspended.

Promptly at 12:30 dishes were washed and a sweet young thing inquired blandly, "Do you fellows want passes?" The reply was very affirmative in that quiet room of unlunched people.

Then, "Have you all been to gate No. 1?" Two n'er-do-wells admitted sheepishly that they had come directly to gate No. 40.

"Sorry," was the reply, "I can only give passes to those who came from gate No. 1; you'll have to go back there." The fact that gate No. 1, a mile away, would simply order them to return to No. 40, cast no sunshine into her dreary world.

THAT RUBBER STAMP

There were 14 of us and only 11 pass tags on hand, so the supply office was called and after a few minutes about 50 pounds of extra tags arrived. Without identification, the passes were made out. Then after a cautious look at our eager, bewildered faces, the clerk slowly opened a lower drawer and produced a huge rubber stamp, at least eight inches high. Here at last was the authoritative seal of democracy. This stamping was a two-hand job; with Spartan directness it was imprinted on our passes. We looked quickly for the result. In stern black ink it read "March 20, 1946." That was all.

At last, fully accredited, we were told to wait for a bus at the third telegraph pole outside gate No. 1. The driver was at lunch, too; so we all waited as the day waned. In a little more than an hour the escorted tour of the premises commenced, but it turned out that our driver had never been down to this dump before, so we toured long lines of rusty pipe and abandoned bulldozers, finally ending up in a graveyard of rusty vehicles. This was it; not Army-Navy surplus for the most part, but the surplus of Navy civilian contractors which had been left here to die. (The vehicles, not the contractors.)

JUST A SOUVENIR

The German motorcycle, so jauntily advertised for $35, was actually a souvenir picked up at Normandy by a sailor and taken from him by a thrifty Government as surplus. It had a bullet hole through it and all the wiring, including the magneto was gone. It had been there in the mud, so a caretaker said, since 1944. That was typical, and that was the end of the business end of my personal hegira.

Some of the trucks were without wheels, doors, and even motors. Headlights were a rarity and most of the tires were flat, the prices on our lists being the only thing that was inflated. Obviously they had been assessed from a desk on the book value. Many of the trucks were more than 25 years old. After an hour, 14 weary veterans were summoned back to the bus for the return.

The conversation was a novel mixture of GI and civilian jargon, mostly unprintable. One little paratrooper had seen a rusty truck body he thought he might use. He asked what he should do and was told with complete solemnity to go to Fort Devens, 85 miles away, and tell them he wanted it. "What happens then?" he asked. "Others may want it too, so they will put your name in a hat and notify you in 3 weeks if you win it," was the reply. "But I need it now," was all he said.

FANTASTIC JOKE

As we bounced back to the third telegraph pole where we had boarded the bus, the picture of the little beat-up former motorcycle which I had come so far to see ran through my head. It was all a fantastic joke, but who was the joke on?

When we left the bus, there was a fresh group of veterans waiting to take the tour. Our little paratrooper shouted "Suckers" and everybody laughed. The sun was low now and it had been a long day. I asked an older veteran, who seemed to know the ropes in this Alice-in-Wonderland process, how one finally picked up and paid for his vehicle if he finally was notified that he had won it in the lottery. "Oh, none of us have ever gotten as far as that," he answered.

The Nuremberg Trial and International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished of all international lawyers, Mr. Quincy Wright, is a resident of my own city of Chicago. In the March issue of Changing World, monthly publication of the American Association for the United Nations, Inc., Mr. Wright has a timely and thoughtful discussion of the Nuremberg war-guilt trials in their relationship to the emerging body of international law. Mr. Wright's paper is not a jumble of legalistic phrases; it can be read with equal enjoyment and understanding by the Members who are lawyers and even by laymen.

The basic principle of the Nuremberg Charter of August 1945, now adhered to by most of the United Nations, is that of individual responsibility for crimes against the world community, particularly the crime of planning, preparing, initiating, and waging a war of aggression, and, as Mr. Wright explains, this principle points the way to acceptance of world-wide enforcement of statutes against common-law crimes.

This is clear argument for the prosecution as criminals not only of the military leaders and the chiefs of state of the Axis war criminals, but of all who participated in the world conspiracy of aggressive war; it makes it possible to prosecute the industrial leaders, bankers, and other civilians who devised the economic foundation for the Nazis' war machine, and thus discourage great industrialists from aiding and encouraging and even forcing war upon the world in the future.

THE NUREMBERG TRIAL
(By Quincy Wright)

The Nuremberg trial is important not only because it is realizing a primary war aim of the United Nations proclaimed at the Moscow Conference in 1943, but also because it will provide the public and the historians with an authentic record of what happened in Germany during the past two decades, and because it will provide important precedents for the development of international law. The record and the law may continue to exert educational and political influence long after the particular defendants are forgotten.

Federalists have been demanding that a true federal organization in which the world community acts directly on individuals be substituted for the United Nations Organization. Many of them recognize that such a federation could not be made world-wide, yet support the idea at the risk of dividing the world into two hostile groups. Can progress be made without this serious risk? Can the United Nations Organization be developed effectively to control atomic energy without sacrificing the essential principle of universality? Probably a direct relation should be established between the individual and the world community in this and other matters but the method from precedent to precedent illustrated by the Nuremberg trial may have advantages over the method of a new world conference.

The basic principle of the Nuremberg Charter, negotiated in August 1945, among the four principal powers but now adhered to by many other United Nations, is that of individual responsibility for crimes against the world community, particularly the crime of planning, preparing, initiating, and waging a war of aggression. War crimes and crimes against humanity also involve individual responsibility according to the terms of the charter. This principle points the way to a gradual evolution of world federalism.

While international law has long recognized certain individual "offenses against the law of nations," a term used in the United States Constitution, such offenses have seldom been tried in international tribunals. Furthermore, the rule that the individual could be relieved of responsibility by showing that he acted in the name or under the authority of a government has often been applied in dealing with such cases. This rule has, however, been denied under circumstances in which the state itself was forbidden by international law to make such an authorization. The individual cannot acquire a right from an unlawful act of state. The charter of the tribunal, by recognizing that government position or superior orders cannot excuse the defendant from the guilt of criminal acts, accepts this principle and establishes a direct relation between the individual and international law. It makes the individual a subject of international law and insofar federalizes the international order.

The Nuremberg trial has been conducted with full recognition of the right of the defendants to due process of law. Some Americans have thought persons charged with such atrocious crimes should have been shot at sight, but it must be remembered that an indictment is not a sentence. The United Nations have fought the war for due process of law. They are to be congratulated that they have been willing to apply their principles to persons believed to be their major enemies.

The 21 defendants at Nuremberg who day by day face the bench of eight judges and alternates may or may not be found guilty. Their contribution to the Nazi aggression and atrocities has been as varied as their characters. In the Nazi regime Goering occupied a different position from Schacht. The activities and attitudes of Keitel were very different from those of Streicher. The tribunal in providing rules assuring the defendants their day in court, the counsel of their choice, and the witnesses and documents necessary for their defense has lived up to the best traditions of criminal justice. Not until the evidence is all in and the defendants have had their say will the sentence be pronounced and not until then can one be certain what the sentences will be.

The trial is dramatic. Men who less than a year ago wielded great power over the government and armed forces of Germany are on trial for their lives. But more important than the immediate drama is the principle that crimes against the world community are crimes for which individuals are liable even though they purport to be acts of state. In applying this principle the statesmen of the United Nations have affirmed their faith that in the future the organized world community will prevent or suppress wars of aggression. Were it possible for aggression to succeed the statesmen who made the charter might be putting their heads in the aggressor's noose. The trial is, therefore, an expression of faith that the United Nations will succeed, that if aggression occurs the aggressor nation will be suppressed and its leaders who planned and initiated the aggression will be brought to the bar of justice. The public expression of this faith by the leading statesmen of the United Nations will contribute to the success of their organization.

This is no place to examine the charges which have been made in some sections of the American press that the tribunal is applying ex post facto law and is acting as judge in its own case. A careful examination of international law and comparative criminal law discloses the weakness of this contention in principle. All common law crimes have developed by judicial interpretation and application of accepted principles. All national criminal tribunals are constituted by the same authority that initiated the prosecution. The fair conduct of the trial will do much to support the principle of international jurisdiction in practice.

The Nuremberg trial supplements the United Nations Organization and the Atomic Energy Commission. In this lies its greatest importance for the future. International law cannot function in the modern world as a law which merely seeks to coordinate the interests of sovereign states. It can only function satisfactorily, as Grotius realized three centuries ago, if it is considered the law by which the world community maintains fundamental principles among both states and individuals.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, at all too frequent intervals, rumors arise that organized efforts are being made to force the removal of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the FBI. In these troublous times this Nation needs the courageous services of this outstanding American.

Then, too, almost every day attacks are made upon the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The very existence of this committee is a good thing for this country, and its activities serve to keep Americans alert to the many moves made to undermine the very foundations of this Nation.

That Americans are alert to these moves and oppose them is shown by the following letter:

THE SAINT MARY COLLEGE,
Xavier, Kans., February 27, 1946.

The Honorable ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: It has recently come to my notice that there is a well-organized movement on foot in the United States, with

headquarters in Washington, the purpose of which is to eliminate Mr. J. Edgar Hoover as head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to prevent the renewal of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. As a citizen and at the same time voicing the will of the faculty and student body of the Saint Mary College, I wish to protest against the effort and ask you to use your office and interest against it. The success during the last 22 years of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the leadership of Mr. Hoover, preventing as well as apprehending law breakers, has proved beyond doubt in the minds of thoughtful American citizens the need, not only for the FBI, but for a man of the courage and ability of Mr. Hoover at its head.

There is, as you well realize, in America today a group, small when compared to the whole population, whose interests are opposed to those of the majority. The purpose of this group will be served either by the removal of Mr. Hoover or by the success of this denunciation of the group investigating un-American activities. We only need to recall by comparison the absence of important acts of sabotage during the 4 years of this recent war as against the more violent and numerous acts of World War I to realize the increased efficiency of the FBI.

I, therefore, in the name of the faculty and student body and the majority of their parents, urge you to use your influence to prevent this small group from undermining the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I ask you to recognize the fact that the great mass of people probably unaware of this un-American activity will be less vociferous than the small but organized opposition.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR M. MURPHY,
President.

Mr. Speaker, another letter indicating group interest in these matters is one addressed to me by Dr. Harry W. Klenda, State deputy, Kansas State Council, Knights of Columbus:

KANSAS STATE COUNCIL,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
Wichita, Kans., February 9, 1946.

Congressman ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ERRETT SCRIVNER: At a meeting of the Kansas State Council officers of the Knights of Columbus held at Dodge City, Kans., at the Lora Locke Hotel last Sunday, February 3, 1946, it was called to our attention that efforts are being made to get rid of J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, and to prevent renewal of appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, due to come up for House approval within the next couple of weeks.

Our order represents nearly 13,000 members in Kansas, and it is our sentiment that we want to do everything in our power to keep J. Edgar Hoover and also renew the appropriations to the Committee on Un-American Activities. We feel that even though the war might be won yet it is necessary that we maintain good organization to prevent subversive influence that might interfere with unity and patriotism on our home front in this postwar era.

Your strict attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated and will merit for you greater esteem and approbation than ever before. Please do not hesitate to call on me should you desire any help from our organization.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY M. KLENDA,
State Deputy of Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, the requests contained in these two letters should be heeded.

A Program for 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in the scores of difficulties which we have encountered in the months since the end of the war, many Americans have grown impatient. They have forgotten that we are only a little more than 6 months away from the most horrible war in human history. The reestablishment of a sound peace, the end of all the frictions and suspicions engendered by and accumulated during the war both at home and abroad necessarily must require the lapse of more time than most of us are content to accept.

It is futile under these circumstances to demand extreme solutions for our problems. History demonstrates that the postwar era is always a period of difficult adjustment. It is a time for compromises and concessions. Above all, it is the time when middle-of-the-road policies, above all others, must gain public approval if we are to avoid the dangers of either side of the narrow road. Because it was too extreme and too inclusive in its scope, the program proposed by our President early this year has failed to win popular approval. Yet we must have a policy, clear, simple, and direct, in both domestic and foreign affairs if we are to achieve the victory in peace which our men have fought so hard to win in war.

Many issues have been shunted aside in our preoccupation over immediate issues during these trying months. They must be reinstated in their importance. I have drafted an outline program which I believe Americans of all groups can support in the days directly ahead. I urge its consideration upon all people, irrespective of their political affiliation or economic status.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

First. Full cooperation by the Government of the United States with the United Nations Organization on all matters involving world affairs. Insistence by our representatives on complete and candid discussion of all international issues before the Security Council. Championship of the rights of small nations by the United States.

Second. Immediate announcement by the President of a no-foreign-alliances policy to offset any indication of his approval of the Churchill plan which might be inferred from the President's presence at the Fulton, Mo., address.

Third. Development of a new program in our State Department to attract outstanding personnel to our embassies and ministries overseas, whose job it will be to "sell" the principles of our American Republic to the millions of people abroad whose good will we are in danger of losing through inept and equivocal representation.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Fourth. Immediate termination of the Selective Service Act and its replacement with a new program of voluntary enlistment on a basis attractive to young men seeking a military career marked by adequate pay levels and the prospect of promotion based on merit.

Fifth. Immediate cessation of all nonessential building, modification of all existing pricing and manufacturing regulations affecting building materials, and establishment of a Veterans' Housing Agency authorized to start the construction of veterans' low-cost homes in every community where such a shortage exists.

Sixth. Development of a United States Air Force assuring our Nation of permament air supremacy.

Seventh. Establishment of an Atomic Energy Research Commission headed by scientists and free from military domination.

Eighth. Creation of a national labor policy establishing the principle of a security wage, designed to achieve cost-of-living pay adjustments combined with sufficient savings for normal family security.

Ninth. Temporary extension of price control with the provision that an equitable adjustment panel be created in each OPA regional area to consider promptly all cases of individual grievances which justify correction.

Tenth. The public announcement of an intention to balance the Federal Budget in the next fiscal year.

Realtor Urges Ceiling Prices on Existing Homes, Charges Prices Soaring Out of Proportion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly charged that the real-estate lobbyists in Washington were attempting to dupe and mislead honest real-estate men over the country with falsehoods and half-truths regarding the President's program to provide houses for veterans at prices they can afford to pay.

Recently I have received more and more evidence that many men of integrity in the real-estate business are refusing to accept these lobbyists' statements at face value, and are beginning to do a little careful thinking for themselves. Week before last one of the most prominent real-estate men in Chicago wrote me privately, stating that he had gone through the "boom-bust" that followed World War I, and expressing the fear that the real-estate industry's own leaders were blindly guiding the country into a repetition of that same mistake. I have received more than a score of similar communications.

Today I have with me a letter from a New Jersey realtor who says that prices already are soaring out of proportion to value, and predicting a terrific collapse in the market.

In the light of our experience with the lobbying representatives of the real-es-

tate industry here in Washington, I think it would be interesting to the Members to read for themselves what some of the more responsible men in the real-estate business have to say. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this communication from J. Frank Hanly, of Camden, N. J., together with a letter which he wrote to Harrison Todd, president of the Camden County Real Estate Board:

CAMDEN, N. J., *March 14, 1946.*

Representative PATMAN,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Herewith enclosed you will find a letter which I addressed to the president of the Camden County Board of Realtors, of which I am a former president and now director as well as a member of the State and National Association of Realtors. I make the above statements in order to qualify my position in the real estate field and in the building of homes during the past 30 years, and feel with that background, I have the necessary experience to write on the subject contained in this letter: housing and control of real estate prices of existing homes, as well as building of new homes. I trust my remarks will be helpful and timely; that I may also be constructive.

The letter above referred to was not too enthusiastically received by the board president, but after reading same to the board of directors at the regular monthly meeting, a number of the directors thought well of the content and subject, voted that it be read at a regular weekly meeting of the membership of the Camden County Board of Realtors. I read the letter and had 5 minutes to discuss same, which time did not permit a discussion but only a statement of facts relative to appraising real estate on GI loans at sale prices rather than value. I further made the statement that unless the realtors cleaned their own houses; did something to stop the "inflated price of existing homes being sold, that sooner or later there would be legislation that would limit the price of homes in order to stop the speculators, and it was up to the realtors to do something about it, and such legislation is necessary in order to put a ceiling on existing housing." You can well imagine I did not get very far with that discussion or remark. The publicity man of the board, a news reporter from the local paper, Courier-Post of Camden, asked to see the letter. He wanted to use it and made notes as he said, "I think you have got something there worthwhile, and I am going to print it." But I can assure you he did not have the opportunity to print the story as I gave it to the members at that meeting. The president of the board asked that he "soft pedal" the issue as it was detrimental to our business. He did, however, report the discussion in the papers and the enclosed clipping is proof of the statement.

After the meeting I had a number of members come to me and state that it was about time someone made that statement and spoke on the subject of inflation prices or boom prices, and remarked that prices were soaring out of proportion to value and someday there would be a terrific crash in the market as before. This statement was also made to me by representatives of banking institutions that are financing GI loans, etc., and other officials of various types of mortgage-financing institutions in and around this section of the country. So the subject is timely and important. I congratulate you on your efforts to control or try to control prices of existing homes. "It's a run-away market."

To criticize and not offer constructive thoughts or ideas has no place in this program; therefore, I offer for your consideration the following suggestions:

First: On existing housing. Allow on the last sale price a raise or profit of 10 percent. If, since the sale, the purchaser has made capital improvements which can be proven by affidavit and bills and statements of such capital improvements, then, in that event, the costs of same should be added to the sale price of the house and a profit of 10 percent allowed on the total cost of the original purchase, plus the cost of the capital improvement. This will give the seller a profit on his property and allow a commission to the real estate agent of 5 percent of the sale price without loss to the seller. This would cut out the speculator—and no one buys a home for profit except the speculator—and he should not be allowed to speculate when there is a shortage of homes and a distress market, but let him confine his speculation to commercial property and commercial buildings. Commercial property is a speculative field, but homes in this market should be taken out of the speculator's hands.

To control and check such a program, in order that it cannot be violated or infringed upon, I suggest the following: That the buyer make an affidavit as to the date he purchased the property, the price he paid for same, plus capital improvement costs, if any, and that he certify by affidavit that this is a true statement of fact. There should be a penalty for falsification of fact or statement, if such falsification exists. Also in addition to the seller's statement, the title company, or attorney searching the title, should also make an affidavit as to the amount of revenue stamps on the deed when the property was purchased by the seller. This will tie in closely with the seller's statement and if there is a discrepancy or any chiseling is done by the seller, you have the penalty and can investigate and prosecute. This will keep the prices where they belong, kill speculation in home or residential selling.

I further suggest in order to defeat the speculators or chiselers who are always trying to defeat any kind of legislation that curbs their activities, that a period of resale be inserted in the measure in order to stop a rapid pyramiding of resales of the same property at a 10-percent increase each time, in order to boost the price. Naturally, there are instances where a resale of a legitimate owner should be recognized for good reasons such as moving, death, or any other legitimate reason, but not allow the buying and selling by speculators. This could easily be taken care of by provision.

In order to stimulate building of new housing and also stop the constant rise of existing home prices, a supply of new homes is necessary. To encourage this, I believe it would be wise and a smart move to remove the ceiling on all materials that go into the construction of residential buildings. At first, this may create a high market of materials and high prices for new homes but will level off rapidly as the supply begins to meet the demand. This would also help kill rising prices of existing housing. From my experience, no one wants an old house if he can get a new one at a little higher price in a neighborhood with better future prospect of improvement.

Certainly, I admit you will pay through the nose in the beginning for materials and new housing, but not for long. The bottleneck will be broken quickly, not in the far distant future, but as soon as new housing begins to come on the market. The old-house price will drop and so will the new-house price continue to drop as the supply meets the demand, or relieves the pressure, and relief will come much quicker by this means, than by ceiling prices and no building to speak of.

Another manner in which to encourage new home building; stop the flow of all building materials into commercial buildings such as theaters, race tracks, sports arenas, garages, public buildings, stores, and any kind or type of commercial building project, and direct that this material be used for housing only.

I believe I have given you an outline of facts relative to the housing conditions of today, and the reasons, all of which you know a great deal more about than I, but I am convinced that something has to be done that is drastic; a plan that can and will work, that will solve price ceilings on existing housing. Also that something must be done to stimulate new housing construction, as well as protect lending institutions and the GI's from investing in residential property, either as buyer or lender, at fantastic prices that do not have any relation to value, and if sale prices are allowed to continue to rise, someday will crash. When that day arrives, who will be holding the bag; the Government, the GI, or the lending institution?

I was a victim of the last crash in real estate. I hope I shall not have to witness the distress that will be caused by another such condition, and many are today predicting that the next will be much worse than the last due to the price of existing housing getting out of hand and also due to restrictions, ceilings on materials, thereby holding back the production of materials and the building of new homes.

I trust the thoughts and ideas I have expressed are of value to you and if you do not think well of the plan and ideas, if one idea is helpful, then I feel I have rendered you a service. If you prefer a personal interview on the subject, I will, at your request, personally go over the matter with you more carefully.

Sincerely,

J. FRANK HANLY.

JANUARY 31, 1946.

Mr. HARRISON TODD,
President, Camden County
Real Estate Board,
Camden, N. J.

DEAR HARRISON: For quite some time I have been concerned regarding the appraisals of real estate in and around the city and suburbs of Camden, my fear that the appraisal of real estate by realtors and members of the Residential Society of Appraisers as well as members of the MAI are appraising properties at the sales price rather than at the value of the property; trying to meet the sale and forgetting the value element. I have seen this actually happen and it is happening every day in this area.

I have read the issue of Headlines and also reports of other organizations as well as the daily papers regarding the Patman bill and the WET bill, also other legislation that is in the making, or talk relative to legislation about to be introduced that will limit the prices for which old houses can and will be sold, that will limit the sale of new houses and construction of same, by control of prices, therefore, it is vitally important that the real estate organization, the National Association of Realtors, the Residential Society of Appraisers, and MAI, look into this matter and put their houses in order and do something besides criticize the agencies that are in control or trying to control a runaway market and too great inflation in real estate. Offer something besides talk out of one side of our mouths and out of the other side permit without any action on the part of the above organization controls of appraisals. GI loans are controlled by the appraisers, and the GI Veterans' Administration has set up a system of appointing approved appraisers to protect the GI, and what are we doing; appraising sales prices and not value, meeting the selling price.

No wonder, therefore, that it has become an issue; that legislation is going to be passed that will control this price unless we control it ourselves and offer a better plan of control than mere talk and loose conversation. I believe that you should devote a meeting of the board to the discussion of this matter.

I also believe that it should be brought to the attention of the national association for action, because if we don't act and offer something better than talk and conversation and no specific stopgap, we are going to get legislation that will definitely put the brakes on this highjacking of prices and the fault will not be the legislators' but the realtors' and other organizations that deal in real estate, and then it will be too late.

I offer this suggestion for consideration; it is constructive, timely, and certainly with merit, and of vital importance to all in the real estate, building, appraising, mortgage, and financing, as well as banking interests; and last, but certainly not least, the problem of the realtors.

Sincerely,

J. FRANK HANLY.

Application for Radio Station License by Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and letters:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 27, 1946.—Congressman BOREN charged today that the application of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. in which a number of Government employees are directors and stockholders and which station is, in his opinion, being established for propaganda purposes, was sponsored within the Federal Communications Commission by a Commission employee who was serving his self-interest rather than the public interest, convenience, and necessity as is specified in the act.

Congressman BOREN said Edward M. Brecher, once special assistant to Chairman Fly of the FCC and until very, very recently in the law department of the FCC, handled the application in the Commission while an employee of the Commission, and resigned from the FCC to become manager of the station only after he had accomplished, as an employee of the Commission, this service to his personal interest.

The Congressman further said that "more than one congressional committee will find in the records of its inquiries information about the activities of Edward M. Brecher, and I refer especially to the investigation of the FCC." The Congressman further stated that he had personally solicited the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities to make a prompt inquiry into the affiliations and activities of certain employees of the FCC, especially employees in the law department.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1946.

Hon. JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am advised that a license to establish a radio station has been granted to the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., 900 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., by the FCC.

It appears evident to me that the purpose of this station is strictly to obtain a means of disseminating propaganda.

The stockholders of this station as listed in the records are in many instances subjects of investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities and will be found in your studies, particularly with reference to the studies you made of the PAC. It is interesting also to note that many of these stockholders are Federal Government employees.

I suggest that the Committee on Un-American Activities have a look into this authorization by the Federal Communications Commission.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE H. BOREN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1946.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am advised that you have granted a license, or at least made a conditional grant of license, to the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. to establish a radio station in Washington, D. C.

In view of the fact that many of the stockholders of this station are Federal Government employees, I am inclined to question whether it is the public convenience and necessity that this corporation seeks to serve or if it seeks to create a propaganda outlet for political purposes.

Further, it appears that several of the stockholders of this station as listed in the records have been subjects of investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and that leads me to inquire whether the Commission is granting a license that will be used for the dissemination of propaganda of even more than a political campaign purpose.

Further, it would appear that affiliations of the stockholders as listed indicates a connection with the Political Action Committee of the CIO, which further indicates the probability that this station is being set up for political propaganda purposes, to serve the special interests of organized minorities, rather than on the basis of the criterion in the act, based upon the public convenience and necessity for radio services.

I herewith lodge protest against the approval by the Federal Communications Commission of the establishment of such a station until the Commission has made a thorough study of the questions I have here raised and made a finding of fact that the application does not in any wise depart from the established standards of the act.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE H. BOREN.

Postage on Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, we all agree that we want to do what we can to stave off starvation in Europe. Many people are anxious to make a personal contribution to meet the desperate need, by sending food parcels to their relatives and friends abroad. The high postage rate has been a deterrent, however. When donors must add a dollar or two for stamps to the cost of every parcel they send, they often find it necessary to cut down on the food in order to pay the postage.

An editorial in the Washington Post for March 27 calls attention to this fact, and urges that rates be lowered on food parcels to encourage sending more. I believe this would be a very wise measure, and I ask leave to insert this editorial in the RECORD to call attention to the situation. I have today written to the Postmaster General asking him to take appropriate action.

The giving and receiving of much-needed food parcels will help build international good will, so badly needed in these difficult times. It should be encouraged even though it involves a trifling loss in postal revenue.

The editorial follows:

POSTAGE ON FOOD

The Post Office Department, it seems to us, should make a concession to the millions of hungry people abroad by lowering the postal rates on food parcels to Europe and Asia. The present rates are a formidable barrier, when compared with what it costs to send a similar package to a serviceman overseas. Food parcels to individuals in France, for instance, go at the rate of 14 cents a pound, or $1.54 for the 11-pound maximum. The same parcel could be sent from Washington to an Army or Navy man in France for only 30 cents. The reason is that, as originally set up for security purposes, on packages to servicemen the sender pays postage only to the port of embarkation—New York or San Francisco, as the case may be—and from there mail is handled by Army or fleet post offices. Considering the urgency of the food situation, it seems to us that a similar rate could well be established for food parcels. We urge that the Postmaster General take whatever action is necessary. If a temporary reduction in rates will help reduce starvation by inducing more people to send food packages abroad it will be well worth the cost.

Guaranties Under GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been some question with reference to the guaranties of the Government on GI loans under certain provisions of the act. I have requested a ruling from the Veterans' Administration and I am including the reply of the Veterans' Administration and its ruling referred to in the letter which will materially assist those who are in doubt as to the guaranty provision of the GI bill of rights:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 13, 1946.*

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WEICHEL: Your letter of March 7, 1946, addressed to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, with which you forwarded a letter addressed to you under date of March 4, 1946, by Joseph V. Motsch, Executive Vice-President, Huron County Banking Co., Norwalk, Ohio, has been referred to this office for necessary attention.

Generally speaking, your correspondent's understanding of the provisions of title III, Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended by Public 268, Seventy-ninth Congress, is correct, but the question which apparently his counsel has raised is fully discussed in the attached copy of an opinion of the under-

signed which has been approved by the Administrator and will, in due time, be issued as an administrator's decision.

It is believed that this will be sufficient for your present purposes, but if further information is desired, prompt consideration will be given to any request therefor.

A copy of this letter, together with Mr. Motsch's letter, is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD E. ODOM,
Solicitor.

MARCH 1, 1946.

The ADMINISTRATOR,
The SOLICITOR,

Section 506, Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress—Guarantee or insurance of loans under title III thereof—the relative rights of the Government and of the creditor in the security for such loans:

Incident to the preparation of the regulations pursuant to the provisions of title III, Public Law 268 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the following question has been presented by counsel for certain lenders. It is a basic question, involving construction of the act. Its clarification is necessary for proper functioning in respect to the guaranty of loans as contemplated by the act. Accordingly, the following opinion has been prepared and is submitted for your approval.

The question presented is: "When a claim for guaranty or for insurance has been paid by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to title III, Public Law 268, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, are the rights in the security which are acquired by the United States pursuant to the general right of subrogation, or to the provisions of section 506 of Public Law 268, junior to the rights of the creditor in such security, or on a parity with the rights of such creditor?"

Before discussing the legal principles which it is believed govern, it may be helpful to state a concrete case illustrating the question presented. An eligible veteran borrows $8,000 secured by a first mortgage on realty. One-half of the debt, $4,000, is guaranteed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The veteran pays $1,000 on the principal of the indebtedness, and subsequently defaults. Disregarding for convenience the question of interest, the amount of guaranty payable, and presumably paid, is $3,500 (50 percent of the debt). Thereafter, at a foreclosure sale, the encumbered realty sells for $3,500. Applied to these facts, the question is whether the creditor is entitled to the entire proceeds of such sale or only one-half thereof. If the former, the creditor does not suffer a loss. The Government loses the $3,500 it paid on the guaranty (subject to any possibility of collecting it from the veteran). If the latter, the creditor loses $1,750 and the Government a like amount.

The question must be considered from two separate and distinct points of view: (a) the rights of the respective parties under the applicable general principles of law (equity), involving subrogation, and (b) the change, if any, as to the first-mentioned rights, resulting from the language used in section 506 of the amendatory act.

The same question arose under the original act (Public 346 of the 78th Cong.). It was considered and decided in Administrator's Decision No. 590, dated September 29, 1944. The relevant language of the original act is contained in section 500 (b) thereof, and reads as follows:

"No security for the guaranty of a loan shall be required except the right to be subrogated to the lien rights of the holder of the obligation which is guaranteed."

The comparable language in the amendatory act (Public, 268) is contained in section 506 thereof, as follows:

"In the event of default * * * the holder * * * shall notify the Administrator who shall thereupon pay to such holder the guaranty * * *, and shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty."

The underscored language in the last quotation is the precise language in point here. The quoted language immediately preceding it represents legislative pronouncement in accord with the conclusion reached in Administrator's Decision No. 589, dated September 25, 1944.

The conclusion reached in Administrator's Decision 590 is reflected in section 4043 of the regulations promulgated December 8, 1944. The administration of the act has been in accordance with the conclusion in Administrator's Decision 590 and with said section 4043 of the regulations continuously since December 8, 1944. It is appropriate to here supplement the discussion in Administrator's Decision 590.

Having in mind the somewhat divergent language used in various court opinions, and the confusion that easily can arise in discussing the term "subrogation" in its various meanings, it is understandable that Congress would consider it proper to mention the subject in this act. In the original act it also was appropriate to mention it at the place it was mentioned, because in the same sentence it was provided that no security for the guaranty would be required. If subrogation had not been mentioned someone almost certainly would have argued that the other language was tantamount to an express statutory waiver of the right of subrogation, which otherwise would exist in favor of the Government. In the revised act the statement that no security for the guaranty shall be required, is omitted, because surplusage. Logically, the subrogation provision was mentioned in section 506 because there occurs the affirmative statutory provision as to payment of the guaranty.

Further, it may well be that the provision was carried into section 506 to negative argument that might otherwise have been urged that the Government was waiving its right to subrogation which, of course, Congress would have the power to do.

The language also is appropriate because of general statements frequently found, such as, "the claim of the creditor must be fully satisfied before there can arise any equity of subrogation." (Stearns on the Law of Suretyship, fourth edition, p. 430). Such general statements, out of their context, may easily mislead.

The same author goes on to say that the creditor's rights to the possession of securities "is superior to the equity of the surety or guarantor, and the creditor is not obliged to suffer the inconvenience or risk of parting with any of his resources until the debt is paid in full. * * *

"When his debt has been only partially paid, it would be unreasonable to hold that the third party who made such payment thereby acquired a precedence over him, or was even placed on an equal footing, in reference to the security for the payment of the remainder of his debt" (430–431).

(In *Maryland Casualty Company* v. *Fouts, receiver of the People's National Bank* (11 F. (2d) 71, 46 A. L. R. 852)), it was squarely held by the Fourth Circuit that the surety of the State depository bank (defunct) which had paid the full penal sum of its bond was not entitled to share in liquidating dividends from the bank's assets (which, of course, occupied the position of security for the debt), until the State had been paid in full from some source. It happened that the penal sum of the bond was insufficient to cover the State deposit in the reported case.

The court observed (p. 855): "The very essence of the right of subrogation, by one in the position of the appellant, is that the debt on account of which the indemnity was given, has been paid by the one setting up the equity. As long as the undertaking on account of which the security was given remains unpaid, in whole or in part, the one giving the indemnity cannot invoke the aid of a court of equity to save it from the consequences of having to make payments on account of the obligation it gave, by decreeing to it dividends from the estate of the insolvent bank, and leaving the debts of such institution indemnified against unpaid."

The doctrine announced in the Fouts case was in principle recognized by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *National Surety Company* (254 U. S. 73, 65 Law Ed. 143). In that case the Surety Company sought to assert the Government's right of priority pursuant to Revised Statutes 3466. The bonds were contractor's performance bonds. The contractor had defaulted, resulting in a loss to the Government of about $13,000, of which the surety paid the penalty on its bonds of about $3,000. As Justice Brandeis succinctly observed:

"The priority secured to the United States by section 3466 is priority over all other creditors; * * * This priority the surety obtains upon discharging its obligation. But what the surety asks here is not to enjoy like priority over such other creditors, but equality with the United States,—a creditor whose debt it partly secured. To accord such equality would abridge the priority expressly conferred upon the Government. While the priority given the surety by the statute attaches as soon as the obligation upon the bond is discharged, it cannot ripen into enjoyment unless or until the whole debt due the United States is satisfied. This result is in harmony with a familiar rule of the law of subrogation under which a surety liable only for part of the debt, does not become subrogated to collateral or to remedies available to the creditor unless he pays the whole debt, or it is otherwise satisfied."

In *United States F. and G. Company* v. *Centropolis Bank* (17 F. (2d) 913, 53 A. L. E. 295), the eighth circuit held to the same effect as the above cases as to the right of subrogation, but introduced a deviation with respect to the right asserted by the surety (of a defunct public depository bank) by virtue of an indemnity agreement which the surety took from the bank at the time the bond was originally executed. The court held that by reason of the indemnity agreement (not subrogation) the surety was entitled to share ratably in liquidating dividends. The same question arose in the litigation following the failure of Natonal City Bank of Salt Lake City. One of those cases is reported as *National Surety Company* v. *Salt Lake City, et al.* (5 F. (2d) 34). Another case is reported as *Jenkins* v. *National Surety Company* (18 F. (2d) 707). This case reached the Supreme Court (277 U. S. 258, 72 Law Ed. 874). The Centropolis Bank case, the Foute case, and many others were cited by counsel for the respective parties. A brief was filed by counsel for the Comptroller of the Currency. The same sort of indemnity agreement involved in the Centropolis case was relied on by the Surety Company. The Supreme Court held that the indemnity agreement could not avail the surety in the circumstances and for the purposes sought.

"The established rule that the surety may not claim subrogation against an insolvent debtor until the creditor is paid in full is a recognition of the inconsistency of that position. * * *" (I. e., the surety's position.) "The rule would go for naught if, by claiming indemnity instead of subrogation, the surety could achieve the same result. The same policy against permitting a surety to compete with the creditor for the insolvent debtor's assets requires that the surety be denied subrogation to security given to a creditor for several debts for only one of which the surety is obligated. *National Bank* v. *Rockefeller* (98 C. C. A. 8, 174 Fed. 22). Similar reasoning underlies the requirement of equity that the surety who holds the security of an insolvent debtor must give

the benefit of it to the creditor for whom he is surety, until the debt is fully paid. * * *

"Wherever equitable principles are called in play, as they preeminently are in determining the rights and liabilities of sureties and in the distribution of insolvents' estates, they likewise forbid the surety to secure by independent contract with the debtor indemnity at the expense of the creditor whose claim he has undertaken to secure." (72 Law Ed. 876-877.)

The conclusion seems inevitable that the right of the Government to participate in the security is junior to the right of the creditor and continues to be so until the creditor shall have received his debt in full (from one or more sources), unless the language of section 506 of Public Law 268 modifies the law otherwise applicable.

Turning then to the second question, viz., the change, if any, as to the first mentioned rights as a result of the language used in section 506 of the amendatory act, it is pertinent to consider the purpose which Congress was seeking to accomplish by enacting the amendatory act, and the legislative history.

The question is solely that of construing the statute. It is clear that Congress has the constitutional power to attach such conditions as it sees proper to the Government becoming an accommodation guarantor, or insurer.

It will be noted that the only differences between the language of the original and of the amendatory acts are: (1) The original act refers to "the right to be subrogated," whereas the amendatory act says "shall be subrogated." Manifestly the meaning is the same; and (2) the amendatory act says the Administrator "shall be subrogated * * * to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty." This is the extent, the maximum extent, to which there could be subrogation in any event, without a statute. In some States, and under certain circumstances a doubt might exist as to the application of the doctrine of subrogation at all if the guarantor pays less than all of the debt. The underscored language resolves that borderline question. It also serves a clarifying function, namely, it emphasizes that no more than a pro tanto subrogation is asserted.

Any other construction would defeat the entire purpose and concept of guaranty and would defeat the purpose of the act to make loans more readily obtainable by veterans. It is at once apparent that the only other construction possible would be that upon payment of the guaranty the loss would be shared pro rata by the creditor and the Government.

If the language of the act, construed in the light of its intent, leaves any possible doubt, we are permitted under recognized rules of statutory construction to resort to the legislative history, and this emphasizes the correct construction as above stated. The hearings before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, House of Representatives, disclose that the rulings of this office and the regulations of the Veterans' Administration with respect to this matter were fully discussed. They also reveal considerable discussion as to whether the act should be amended to provide for either insurance or indemnification upon a partial basis. Testimony of representatives of several of the financial institutions was to the effect that loans would not be made upon any such pro rata loss basis. Still further, the Veterans' Administration, in commenting on the specific language contained in section 506 (sec. 505, H. R. 3749), pointed out that if it was intended to provide an indemnification instead of a guaranty, the language should be amended so as to make the subrogation apply to the pro rata part of the net loss. This suggestion was rejected by the committee. This was again brought to the attention of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate (see p. 97, hearings before the said committee on H. R. 3749, October 8-12, 1945), and there was likewise adduced before said committee testimony that loans would not be made on any basis of pro rata sharing of loss. The Senate completely rewrote the House bill, and the two bills went to conference. The differences were there compromised, resulting in the amended act. The report on the conference, Report No. 1449, Seventy-ninth Congress, after pointing out the differences between the two bills, states that—

"The bill as agreed to in conference seeks to combine and integrate the two procedures set out in the House bill and the Senate amendment, respectively. It liberalizes the title substantially in accordance with the Senate provisions."

And that:

"Section 506, relating to procedure on default, is retained substantially as in the House bill."

In connection with this question, however, it is of interest to note that the conference bill added certain features to this section as contained in the House bill, and specifically the following:

"The Administrator may establish the date, not later than the date of judgment and decree of foreclosure or sale, upon which the accrual of interest or charges shall cease."

The purpose of this language was to give an alternative to the House provision. In short, under the section as finally approved, the holder of a defaulted obligation may file his claim immediately and collect the entire amount of the guaranty, or he may elect to postpone the filing of the claim until after foreclosure or sale, in which event the unpaid portion of the obligation may be increased, within certain limitations, by the interim interest, and by other charges, with the result that the amount guaranteed is increased proportionately, not to exceed the original maximum. It nevertheless remains that the appropriate amount of guaranty is payable as a guaranty of the debt, and not a proportionate share of the ultimately determined loss.

The legislative history, as indeed does the language of the amendatory act, makes clear the intent to liberalize the loan guaranty provisions for the purpose of expediting the procedures relative to the guaranty of loans, and to make loans more readily available to veterans. It also makes clear that there was no intent to restrict such loans by substituting a pro rata indemnification of loss for the more liberal guaranty provisions. The circumstances all point to an intent by Congress to liberalize, not restrict.

It is apparent that the purpose of the act would be largely defeated by any other construction. There would be little, if any, inducement to any lender to make the loans if he were not to have the benefit of the mortgage security plus the Government's guaranty. It cannot be assumed Congress was unaware of this. Nor should it be assumed that Congress would create a large and expensive activity which could serve no useful purpose.

In view of the above, it is my opinion that when the Veterans' Administration has paid a claim under a guaranty the Government is at once subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation, but only to the extent of the guaranty paid; and that such right of subrogation is inferior (junior) to the rights of the holder of the obligation until the holder has been paid in full (from one or more sources).

It would seem clear that the conclusion stated is so firmly supported by an array of judicial precedent, by the legislative history of Public Law 268, and by practical considerations, that there is no reasonable probability of any final court decision reaching a different conclusion, even if, as seems improbable, the issue should ever be raised.

EDWARD E. ODOM.

(This is a true copy of the original, approved by the Administrator, March 2, 1946.)

OPA Controls Affecting Livestock and Meat Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of A. Z. Baker, president of the American Stock Yards Association, before the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture, March 27, 1946:

My name is A. Z. Baker and I live in Cleveland, Ohio. For the past 20 years I have been president of the Cleveland Union Stock Yards Co. During my entire business life, extending over a period of more than 30 years, I have been engaged in work in the livestock and meat industry. For the past 3 years I have been president of the American Stock Yards Association, in which capacity I am appearing here.

Mr. Harry Coffee, of Omaha, chairman of our board of directors, regrets that other engagements prevent his attendance.

The American Stock Yards Association is a voluntary association of most of the public stockyards which have been posted by the Secretary of Agriculture as coming within the purview of the Packers and Stockyards Act, passed by the Congress in 1921 to regulate the charges and practices of the operators of market places and the market agencies handling substantially all of the livestock moving in interstate commerce at that time. By the enactment and continuation of this legislation, Congress has indicated its belief that these public markets are impressed with and operated in the public interest.

Stockyards which I represent last year handled 67,063,237 head of livestock.

These market places are in the main of very long standing. Most of them have been in continuous operation for more than 50 years. They are located all over the country from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore in the East to Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles in the West, and from Buffalo, St. Paul, and Spokane in the North to New Orleans, Houston, and San Antonio in the South. The association includes the large markets at Indianapolis, East St. Louis, Cincinnati, Kansas City, Omaha, Sioux City, St. Paul, Denver, Wichita, Oklahoma City, and Fort Worth, along with many smaller ones.

They represent a large investment in physical facilities, with a net worth of some $150,000,000, devoted to the marketing of the farmers' livestock. They derive the major part of their income from charges for stockyard services furnished in connection with such marketing.

Around each of these stockyards has been built up a large packing industry with a much larger investment in plants and equipment. These plants have looked to these markets for all or substantially all, of their livestock supplies; and they still depend upon supplies secured at these public markets for efficient operations. Packers in other sections have also depended upon these markets at a source of a considerable part of their livestock requirements.

They have contributed greatly to the development of the livestock industry; and the prices and conditions established at these markets affect and serve as a yardstick for all the trading in livestock throughout the country.

These hearings are being held to determine the true conditions of the livestock and meat industry. The briefest and most accurate statement I could make is that the condition is utterly confused and chaotic. If this committee determines the true conditions of the industry it will have performed a real service for the whole industry, which now is searching in all directions for the answer. Since receipt of the invitation to present a statement I have canvassed our membership and will include in this statement the substance of the telegrams, letters, and exhibits I have received from them.

The immediate and pressing concern of the livestock industry, and especially the segment I represent, is how to continue for another year under the confusing, unworkable, unenforceable regulations of the Office of Price Administration which were designed to control the prices of livestock. These regulations and their enforcement—or lack of enforcement—have not controlled prices. They have not established or maintained parity or equality among the markets or the slaughterers. They have destroyed the normal and customary flow of livestock and meat. And they have retarded maximum production of meat—food so sorely needed at this time. Their continuance will not contribute to the food needs of this and other countries in the days ahead.

In 1922, the first year after the passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act, and the first year for which figures are available, federally inspected slaughterers obtained about 90 percent of their cattle, calves, and sheep, and 76 percent of their hogs from public stockyards. In 1945 they secured from these public markets 76.8 percent of their cattle, 61 percent of their calves and sheep, and but 37.3 percent of their hogs, this being an alarming drop of 10 percentage points or about one-fifth from the preceding year. A further and more pronounced decline in public-market purchases has been in evidence in recent months.

This recent diversion of livestock from public markets can be attributed to two phases of the OPA price-control program: First, maximum price regulations which discriminate against so-called terminal markets, and second, enforcement of regulations at these markets without equally effective enforcement elsewhere.

The regulations have permitted practices which have destroyed parity of live cost among the packers, who must in each locality sell their products under the same ceiling.

At many of the western markets, local packers are unable to stay within compliance with subsidy requirements, if they pay as much for cattle as eastern packers are willing to pay. Consequently, in recent weeks the purchases of these local slaughterers, large and small, have been reduced to mere dribbles.

Again packers at the principal packing centers are unable to compete on equal terms under the OPA regulations with small country slaughterers, or with those who buy for feeding for more than 30 days and subsequent slaughter; or with those who operate slaughtering establishments in connection with retail stores.

These small slaughtering places have multiplied amazingly in the last few years. For example, in 1940 there were 158 slaughtering establishments in Ohio. At the last count there were 736. In the States of Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi there were less than 50 three years ago, but today 1,864 are reported. There are 300 slaughterers in the State of Minnesota. In the aggregate these small slaughterers consume a large amount of livestock which is diverted from other channels; and the meat products are not available to the people in the large cities. The meat is available to those who are willing to pay the asking price. Little of this meat is available for Government purchase.

It should be remembered that the price regulations on cattle are based on grades of beef, and that many small slaughterers, inconveniently located, are permitted to grade their own beef.

Cattle bought for feeding for more than 30 days are not subject to ceiling restrictions, and some slaughterers have resorted to this practice to obtain supplies of livestock and meat.

Enforcement of regulations at public markets has driven many of the operations to country points where supervision is more difficult, thus cutting off a substantial part of supplies.

The hog price regulations do not provide sufficient differential in the ceiling of public markets over country buying stations to cover transportation, shrinkage, and market expenses. It does not require an economist or an accountant to show that a farmer cannot afford on an immediate dollar-and-cents basis to go to a terminal market with his hogs. Some still go there because of services secured in the past and expected and needed in the future.

Pork packers in the nonproducing East, as well as those adjacent to public markets which no longer can supply their requirements, are going to the country for their livestock. In order to maintain any volume they must go farther and farther away, paying more and more to get their hogs. Many of them are acquiring, or establishing, buying stations the operating expenses of which are not included as a part of the cost of the hogs under the ceilings regulation. Others employ former public market truckers to act as their agents or assemblers of hogs. In many, if not all, cases the aggregate cost of these hogs delivered at the plant is greater than the ceiling prevailing at the point of slaughter. But this is not black market, since it is permitted under OPA regulations. It is nevertheless bad.

I have purposely avoided a discussion of black-market operations, but you can be sure they exist in every section.

The salable receipts of livestock at the 12 leading public markets are indicative of the conditions. In 1945, there was a slight gain of 3 percent in cattle sold compared with 1944. But there was a loss of 6 percent in calves, 10 percent in lambs, and 54 percent in hogs. The total federally inspected slaughter of hogs declined 41 percent and that of the interior Iowa and southern Minnesota packers only 26 percent.

The diversion of livestock from the normal channels of trade is reducing the volume and the revenue of established markets to a point where effective market conditions and efficient stockyard and selling service will no longer be possible; and is impairing the value of facilities built up over many years to serve both the farmer in the sale of his livestock, and the packer in the purchase of his supplies. These properties and their owners are becoming so emaciated that many may not survive. Along with this the disruption of normal movement is reducing the operating efficiency of the slaughtering establishments located at, or depending for supplies upon, these markets, with the consequent destruction of plant values and the necessity for additional facilities at other places for the purchase or slaughter of livestock.

It directly concerns every livestockman, for it places an added burden upon the livestock producer and feeder, who in the long run must bear the expense of the investment in, and the operation of, duplicating facilities and services, through increased marketing charges made necessary by decreasing volume and increasing costs; through concessions in price at nonpublic market places to which livestock may be diverted; decentralization of selling and lower price levels; and through speculative, nonregulated, and often illegal, practices.

Most important of all, it seems to me, the OPA program is jeopardizing the system of public, Government regulated markets which have served the livestock producers of this country so well in the past, and which will be needed again when, and perhaps I should say if, the Government ceases its attempts to control the price determining functions, and allows the livestock to seek its proper market and find its true value under an equality of conditions affected only by fair play of supply and demand.

In the short period of time in which price controls have been felt, much harm has already been done, and we shall emerge from this nightmare with such confusion in the marketing of livestock that it will require the best efforts of the livestock industry and the assistance of this committee and the Congress to restore order out of the chaos, and to protect the livestock producer and feeder in the sale of his livestock.

Farmers, as well as stockyard operators, in many sections are discouraged, dissatisfied and in doubt about the future livestock conditions. Many of them are reducing their operations or going out of the feeding business. There may well be grave concern about the supplies of meat food animals and of meat in the nearby future, if the subsidy and price control program is continued for another year.

It is my considered opinion and the opinion of those I represent that the condition in which the livestock and meat industry finds itself will not be materially improved until these controls are removed.

The Bomb That Fell on America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Hermann Hagedorn:

THE BOMB THAT FELL ON AMERICA
(By Hermann Hagedorn)

I

A bomb fell on Hiroshima.
It wasn't much in size, as bombs go, it wasn't much in weight.
Its charge might have been confined in the red envelope of a child's balloon.
An ordinary bomb that size might have blown out the fronts of two or three houses and killed perhaps a dozen people.
But this was no bomb like other bombs.
It destroyed every house within a radius of 2 miles and killed upward of 100,000 human beings.

Burial-squads picked up 50,000 from the streets, but as many thousands more they never found at all.
They were a part of the cloud of dust and debris that boiled up over the city, 8 miles high,
A part of the black rain that fell 10 century-long minutes after the bomb burst.

The wind that stirs the air from east to west, from north to south, carries on its wings all that remains of them.
They are forever adrift over Hiroshima, as particles of the steel tower, vaporized when the scientists set off a test bomb, are forever adrift over New Mexico.
They did not die as others have died when bombs fell—gory messes to be collected and dumped in carts by mopping-up crews in gas masks.
They did not die as anyone before them has died.
They dissolved, they evaporated.
One second, flesh and bone, sinew and blood and brain; the next, microscopic atoms adrift over Hiroshima.

God be with that in them which no bomb can reach!
God be with that in us which is life and seeks no dividend from death.
In ancient words, lost and forgotten words:
God have mercy on their souls!
God have mercy on ours!

The bomb that fell on Hiroshima fell on America, too.
It fell on no city, no munition plants, no docks.
It erased no church, vaporized no public building, reduced no man to his atomic elements.
But it fell, it fell.
It burst. It shook the land. * * *

When the bomb fell on America, it fell on people.
It didn't dissolve them as it dissolved people in Hiroshima.
It did not even shake them, so they noticed it.
Ask Jack or Jenny out on the street there and they'll tell you that it's all hooey about the bomb dropping in America at all.
But it dropped, sure enough.
It dropped on people.

It did not dissolve their bodies,
But it dissolved something vitally important to the greatest of them, and the least.
What it dissolved were their links with the past and with the future.
There was something new in the world that set them off forever from what had been
Something terrifying and big, beyond any conceivable earthly dimensions,
That stood up between them and the future and had the power to decide whether there were to be any future at all for them or for anyone.
It made the earth, that seemed so solid, Main Street, that seemed so well-paved, a kind of vast jelly, quivering and dividing underfoot.
It was as if the Martians had really come, as many thought they'd come, when the radio pulled that fast one, years ago, and people all over the country got the jitters.

The bomb that fell on Hiroshima fell on America, too.
It fell on people.
Not a few hundred thousand only, but one hundred and thirty-five million.
It did not set them afloat over New York, Kansas City, or Los Angeles.
But it set them afloat on currents of chance which no man may navigate or know the direction of. * * *

The conscience of America speaking:
What have we done, my country, what have we done?
Our fathers knew greatness.
What shall the shrunken soul do to fill out and be itself again?
Our fathers knew mercy.
What shall the wet stick do to burn once more?
A sickness eats at our hearts.
Our bodies have grown fat and our souls thin.

The blinding light that lighted Hiroshima
Lighted, too, the empty caverns of our souls!
We have worshiped what we could see, what we could feel and hear, and what we could smell and taste.
We have worshiped the shell, the mask, the cushion, the club; the mirror, the gong, the cymbal, the top that sings as it spins.
We have thirsted for the clapping of hands as others have thirsted for the face of God.
As others strive for heaven, we have striven for the art which pulls rabbits out of hats and dollars out of thin air.
We have fled greatness and worshiped size, bowed to numbers and ignored the One.

Lord, have mercy upon us!
We are a generation that has rejected bread and meat for the collar on a glass of beer.
Our souls are starved, our spirits atrophied, our eyes blurred.
We have victory without assurance,
Power without direction,
Responsibility without devotion,
Opportunity without vision.

How shall we rise to the challenge of this hour?

Turn your ears to the east wind and the west wind. It is the peoples of the nations speaking:
You have the power to rule us if you desire to rule us.
You have the power to destroy us if you desire to destroy us.
You have the power to lead us to a new day if you have the will and the vision to exercise it.
America, what will you do with your power?

Turn your face to the Great Divide, the shaggy peaks, the primeval pines, the clear springs flowing east and west, the clean winds blowing north and south. It is America replying to the nations:
Have no fear of us.
We shall not destroy.
We are not lone wolves who have to prove to themselves that they are stronger than the pack.
We are no master race. We are no race at all. Just a lot of folks in love with the same idea.
A lot of folks trying, for the good of all concerned, to get along together.
As a nation and as people, life for us is mainly the adventure of getting along together.
We call it team work.
That means me, you, and the other fellow, all working together.
We don't want to boss you, or smash you. We want to be a team with you.

Out of the valleys and the shadowy places, another voice.
This too is America replying to the nations:
Hooey!
Don't ask us how we'll use our power.
How do we know? Anyway, what business is it of yours?
We should worry what happens to you!
All you want is our money.
You mind your own business and we'll mind ours!
Get it?
We ain't suckers. Not always. Stew in your own juice.
The Voice of the mountains:
America is teamwork.
We'll face the new age together!

Lay your ear to the earth and listen to man's confusion:
This is the beginning of international order.
This is the end of western civilization.
This is the dawn of the greatest era in history.
This is the world's all-time high in headaches.

Lay your ear to the ground:
Say, I'm scared.
We got a tiger by the tail and I don't like it.
We can't hang on and we can't let go.
Where am I at?
Where do I go from here?
I'm all mixed up. I don't get it.
I don't know what to think.
I feel kinda lost.
The old landmarks are down.
The old words have lost their meaning.
Rich, poor?
Republican, Democrat?
Catholic, Protestant?
Gentile, Jew?
Fascism, Communism?
White, black?
America, Germany?
America, Japan?
What do they mean now?
What do they mean for me and the wife and kids?
The only words that have any meaning
Are the words life and death.

The conscience of America speaking:
We are like the survivors in Hiroshima.
The dead lie across our hearts and fall in a black rain upon our souls.
Yesterday and Tomorrow are removed from us by a searing flame of unbelievable heat.

Lord, have mercy upon us!
We are children and we must achieve the wisdom of maturity overnight!
We are little people and we must learn overnight to be great!

Lord, have mercy upon us!
Our fathers built a nation on the determination of peoples from many lands to get along together.
We ourselves have dreamed of a world of nations learning to get along together.
And we have made a thing that has opened a chasm deeper and wider than the Grand Canyon between us and all other peoples!

How shall we rise to the challenge of this hour?
We cannot rest on the promise of evolution, or on our ancient, childlike trust in the magic of buildings and bells and books.
Atomic energy will not wait on schools or the process of natural selection.
Opportunity, responsibility, power, will not wait for children jitterbugging in the corner drugstore.

Lord, have mercy upon us!
We are one hundred and thirty-five million people, and we must grow up, overnight, or make the world one final Hiroshima.

II

I went to call on the Lord in His house on the high hill,
My head full of one hundred and thirty-five million, having to grow up overnight.
"If ever a people, Lord, needed a miracle!"
The Lord He looked at me as a mountain might look at a molecule.
"So you want a miracle," said the Lord. "My, my! You want a miracle.
I suppose you mean that you want me to come sliding down a sunbeam and make one hundred and thirty-five million self-willed egotists overnight into one hundred and thirty-five million cooperative angels.
Brother," said the Lord, in a voice that shook the windows, "that isn't the sort of universe you're living in.
And that isn't the sort of God I am."

The room was suddenly vast, with the stars set bright in the ceiling.
"There is only one miracle," said the Lord.
"All else is cause and effect. All else is law."
The thunder withdrew from the Voice, and the words came hushed and clear
Like the first stars in the twilight, each star a newborn glory.
"There is only one miracle, and it is already accomplished.
That miracle is the human soul."

The Lord He lifted His head and the Milky Way was His hair.
"The soul is like the atom," He said. "Wonderfully like the atom.
Consider the atom,
So minute, no lens you can make can enlarge it to a point where your eye can see it, yet there's a whole solar system inside it, whirling round a nucleus like the planets around the sun.
So feeble in its unreleased state, yet actually the greatest force, save one, in creation.
The greatest force in creation, save one."

The Lord strode through His house so the timbers whispered to each other,
"He's thinking of the soul tonight, of the soul of man,
And the power asleep in the soul.
He always shakes the house when He thinks of the power,
The power asleep, asleep in the soul of man."

"I have given you a soul," cried the Lord, "and you ask Me to come down and do a magician's trick!
The people who smashed the atom didn't beg Me to come with a thunderbolt and split the nucleus for them.
They knew that there is power in the atom and they set to work to release it.
They succeeded, and shook not only New Mexico, they shook the world.
All they had to do was to get past the electrons, crack the nucleus, and release the power waiting to be used."

"There is power in the human soul," said the Lord,
"When you break through and set it free.
Like the power of the atom.
More powerful than the atom,
It can control the atom,
The only thing in the world that can.
I told you that the atom is the greatest force in the world, save one.
That one is the human soul."

"But," said the Lord—and the stars in the sky seemed to stand still and listen—
"The power must be released, as the atom-breakers released the power of the atom.
They had to get past the electrons to get at the energy packed in the nucleus.
And I have to get past a deal of ego to release the power that is packed in the soul of man.
I keep shooting My rays toward the nucleus,
And the charged field keeps fending them off.
But now and then one gets by,

The nucleus is split, the power is released, and things begin to happen on a scale that makes men gasp and talk about miracles.
But it isn't a miracle.
It's just the soul of man coming to its own.
It's just the soul of man freed at last to be itself."

The Lord He looked at me and His eyes pierced like hot wires.
"Perhaps," He said, "there's something in you and numerous others that will have to be cracked open, if a hundred and thirty-five million people are going to grow up overnight."
"Something in you," said the Lord, "something, perhaps, in you."
That was a joke, and I laughed. But the Lord wasn't laughing.

The Lord bent over me as a mother bends over a baby.
"You are a child," said the Lord, "and my heart is sick with your childishness.
But you have a soul, and I've found that you just never can tell.
If I could get by your ego and somehow crack open your nucleus—
Something might happpen * * * And there is a world at stake.
You are nobody, and then again you are America.
You are nobody, and you are a hundred and thirty-five million people who have to grow up overnight."

III

Clouds hang over America, and gales are rising.
Lightning strikes across the sky; thunder rolls.
The old gods seem to know what is coming and are fighting for their own.

Hear the voices in the street:
Gimme more pay!
Gimme more profits!
Take off the lid! Reduce taxes!
Let everybody make money!
Inflation? So what?
Make everybody happy!
There's votes in it.
Next month, next year, next generation?
We'll sweep up that mess when we come to it!
Europe?
Forget it!
The starving, the homeless, the broken, the bewildered?
Nuts! We got to be tough!
American prestige?
American leadership?
The hunger of the world for the best America has, and might give?
Gimme a new car!
Gimme a new fur coat!
Gimme speed!
Gimme votes!
Gimme power!
I have been a patriot long enough.
Now's the pay-off and I want to get mine.

Out of the fog and smoke, voices:
What about peace?
What about strikes?
What about Russia?
The Bomb!
Keep the secret or give it away?
I don't know where I'm going.
Nothing makes sense.
Back in the uniform?
Back on the beachhead?
Back in the mud and rain?
Back on the stretcher?
Life or death, life or death?
The only words that have any meaning
Are the words life and death.

Lay your ear to the grass:

It's got into my bones.
There'll be another war and it'll finish everything.
Perhaps it'll finish the planet.
The atom may be the smallest thing in the universe.
But it's too big for man to handle.
We ain't got what it takes!

Over the parapet of heaven, the stars look down, and sigh.
"It is the death-throes of Sister Earth", says one.
"There will be a burst of fire and a ribbon of sparks", says another, "and Sister Earth will cease to be."
"It has happened before", says a third. "It will happen again.
It is sad when a star dies, a star that is so young."

The voice of the wind that blows between the worlds:
Choose ye this day!
Life or death?
Choose, America!
Choose, Europe!
Choose, Africa and Asia!
Choose, choose, choose!

I clutched the Lord, where He sat on the high hill.
"I am afraid", I cried, "afraid for America!"
But the Lord was not afraid.
The Lord rose up with a shout that made the doubting stars scamper, ashamed, to their appointed beats.
"Am I dead?" He cried. "Am I sleeping? Am I senile? Am I paralyzed?
Are you all children, terrified by the wind in the eaves, the cracking of timbers in the dark?"
"I am alive!" cried the Lord. "I stand! I function! I am!
Doubt bone and blood and flesh, doubt rock and water and dust. You have reason. But doubt not me!"

The universe shook with high music, echoing down through space.
"This is not night," cried the Lord. "This is dawn of the dawn!"
"Can you not see? This is daybreak. This is the mother's hand.
"Shaking the sleeping child. 'Wake and get up! It is time.'
"This is the beginning of day, rolling over the edges of the world after the long, long night!"

Softly the still voice spoke to the terrified hearts of men.
"Was there fellowship that slew thousands and destroyed a city?
There shall be a fellowship, releasing life and bringing cities to birth.
Was there a fellowship that, in a midsummer dawn in New Mexico, opened the gates to a new age?
There shall be a fellowship that shall determine the choices of that age. * * *
Out of them, a new kind of revolution, born not of hate but of love!
And a new world, a new world rising out of a million new hearts!"

The Lord looked across the land and murmured, "It is coming. It is coming. * * *

"I see you growing up," said the Lord.
"Me, Lord? What am I?"
"You are nobody, and you are America.
You are nobody, and you are one hundred and thirty-five millions, groping like blind men into the atomic age.
Growing up, growing up,
I see you no longer afraid and hating where you fear.
Growing up, growing up,
I see you burning up your resentments the way you burn up your other rubbish in the back yard.
Growing up, growing up,
I see you making your home a light in the storm, a pinpoint of radium for the healing of your community."
"A light? My home?"

"I see America, in you, taking Me into her life, and growing up, growing up at last,
America growing up into what the oppressed and forsaken of the world have told themselves that she was;
Growing up into what her noblest sons and daughters have hoped that once she might be;
With one hundred and thirty-five million becoming the soil and seed of greatness;
Seeing beyond personal profit to the national gain, beyond national gain to the healing of the world's cankered and failing heart.
America, born to be the dawn-lit forerunner of mankind, and growing up, growing up at last to her destiny!—
Seeing beyond the thrust of justice to the lift of mercy;
Beyond lesser loyalties to the supreme loyalty, beyond human dreams to the supreme reality;
One hundred and thirty-five million lives, bearing witness
To the power of God and the power of the soul that the rays of God have split open."

Exultantly against the dazzling pinnacles of heaven, the voice of the Lord beat, so that light and sound blended and came back singing fire:
"There is power in the human soul," said the Lord,
"When you break through and set it free.
Like the power of the atom.
More powerful than the atom.
It can control the atom,
The only thing in the world that can.
I told you that the atom is the greatest force in the world, save one.
That one is the human soul!"

General Marshall's Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation should be grateful indeed for the extraordinary diplomatic job which Gen. George Marshall has done in China in recent weeks.

The following editorial from the Washington Post of March 27 reflects the opinion of many who have watched the development of events in the Far East with considerable trepidation, but who are vastly reassured by the fruits of General Marshall's statesmanship:

MARSHALL AS GO-BETWEEN

The return of General Marshall to his own country is the occasion for a review of his accomplishments in China. These have exceeded all expectations. When the President, in an inspired moment, appointed him special envoy to Chungking, the extreme hope was that he would be able to arrange a truce between the rival armies owing allegiance respectively to the national government and to the Communists. This he has done. But General Marshall was not content with this achievement. He has brought together the two main elements in distracted and war-weary and inflation-torn China on a plan for the unification of China. The job called for the exercise of those great talents of tact and diplomacy which General Marshall displayed as our wartime Chief of Staff.

The success of General Marshall is the more marked because he had had very little experience of China or the Chinese. To be sure, he was once stationed in Tientsin, but barrack life overseas does not allow of much opportunity to explore the life of the civilization of the surrounding people. Some of these posts are little bits of transplanted America. And Tientsin was not only an Army post; the life around it was foreign-run, since Tientsin was a concessioned area. No, General Marshall's success was not due to experience of China. It was due to a universal quality in Marshall's make-up which makes him at home in a leadership role calling for the amalgamation of contrary points of view.

It so happens, however, that General Marshall's attributes jibe with the requirements of dealing with the Chinese, as neither General Stilwell's nor General Hurley's did. The people of China have such a strong sense of sweet reasonableness that they had no lawyers in their midst till the Westerner brought in his institutions. Instead, the Chinese relied upon go-betweens, who were respected members of the community, capable of judgment and impartiality. With their help the Chinese were able to dispense with the legal fraternity that in our more formal society has been found to be indispensable. General Marshall has been serving as such a go-between. He arrived in China, of course, with a reputation which gave him immediate standing with the Chinese. But this standing assured him only of title as a go-between, and it is his actual work as mediator that in 3 months has put him in a position in China which, in our knowledge and reading is unique in Chinese history.

General Marshall has won the trust of Chiang Kai-shek to such an extent that the generalissimo is impatient to have him back without delay. We hope he will return. He would be the first to say that all he has done is a starter. It is, indeed, only a partial, perhaps even a fragile, foundation for the reconstruction of China, and it still requires his aid to improve upon it. What he can still do in China will be of immeasurable service to the pacification of the Far East, which must always occupy a front place in our foreign policy. Perhaps the Chinese want to give General Marshall more power in Chinese tasks, but we feel that he has the delicacy to know how far he should go in aiding the integration of China under purely Chinese auspices. This characteristic is not the least constituent of his statesmanship. He has the right to ask the administration to help him complete an assignment which has no superior in the President's disposition.

Address Before American Federation of Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker in accordance with my unanimous-consent request, which was granted, I am inserting the following remarks which I made at a meeting of Veterans' Administration Lodge, No. 187, American Federation of Government Employees, Hotel Walton, Philadelphia, Pa., Wednesday evening, March 27, 1946:

We are met at a time when the quality, kind, and form of government is very much in the public eye. People today are much concerned with government for the simple fact that in the relationships of governments, one to the other, largely lies the course of the future, binding up the welfare, well-being, and security of the individual government as an idea and form, as a way of life, as a symbol of the philosophy of a pecple, reflecting their values and attitudes. This is a popular consideration on Main Street today, for the average man is well aware government is management for humanity, even though in various and oftentimes conflicting forms. Burke said the same thing in a much more vivid and succinct way when he declared "government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants."

Today the great challenges to the democratic system are the attractive offers certain kinds of government make to men for an alleged security in exchange for freedom. Although history is replete with examples of how such imagined security is only a variation of slavery, the siren call of totalitarianism woos many followers. Let there be no mistake about the true nature of statism. This philosophy of government vigorously espouses the doctrine that man was made for the state, that the individual has no natural rights, that he is the property of the state and as such his whole being and property are at the service of the state for such use as his masters may wish to make of them. This concept of government, of course, collides violently with the principles upon which our democracy is founded. When the founding fathers were creating our Republic, and after a careful and painstaking study of all the kinds and systems of government in the world up to that time, they wisely and correctly concluded that man had certain inalienable rights given to him by God, of which no temporal power could rob him. It naturally followed that a government so conceived and so dedicated recognized the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It equally followed that all men were equal before the law and were to be accorded equality of opportunity in a government based in justice.

It is important to keep this distinction in mind in these days of fast-moving events when realities, too often grim, belie the protestations of ranking officials of some powers. For the time has come when public opinion in America must give validity to strong, clear policies which are grounded in enduring moral principles, and in effect represent the ideals the young of many lands died for in bloody strife. It was President Garfield who so aptly illustrated the role of public opinion in government when he said: "Real political issues cannot be manufactured by the leaders of parties. They declare themselves, and come out of the depths of that deep which we call public opinion."

That is where you and I come in in exercising an effective and intelligent influence on government—in turn upon the shape of the contemporary world and the future. The plain fact is that you in action represent democracy in force.

Only too frequently do we hear it said about government, "Oh, that's no concern of mine. Let the politicians attend to that." In that connection I think it would not be amiss to remind ourselves of the observation of the sage Cato on this point. Centuries ago he said: "Some have said that it is not the business of private men to meddle with government—a bold and dishonest saying which is fit to come from no mouth but that of a tyrant or a slave. To say that private men have nothing to do with their own government is to say that private men have nothing to do with their own happiness or misery; that people ought not to concern themselves whether they be naked or clothed, fed or starved, deceived or instructed, protected or destroyed."

The necessity of the active interest of the average man in the affairs of government is so apparent, I believe, that there is no need to belabor the point.

Activity in government places certain obligations on the individual. There is the responsibility of individual fitness and preparation. It was Sir Walter Raleigh who appropriately stated: "A man must first govern himself ere he is fit to govern a family—and his family ere he is fit to bear the government of the commonwealth." Carrying this thought one step farther, we can say that all good government must begin in the home, for it has been wisely remarked that it is useless to make good laws for bad people.

Thus we see that sound public morality is the essence of good government, that an enlightened state is the result of justice and an uncorrupted morality. Daniel O'Connell enunciated that proposition in the following memorable words: "Nothing is politically right when it is morally wrong." Another authority on government, Charles Hodges, amplified this thought somewhat in the following words: "When connected with morality and the character of a country, politics is a subject second only to religion in importance."

I have elaborated on this thesis, my friends, so that each of us individually and all of us collectively might perhaps have a higher appreciation of the functions wherein we serve in this governmental scheme of ours. It has been a conviction of mine that for a person to do a good job he must have esteem and respect for the work he's doing—that it must in fact be more than just a job—that it must be a means for the individual to implement his personal philosophy as he integrates his means of livelihood with his plan of life. It is with this in mind that I have approached my subject tonight before this select audience of special interest.

I am a firm believer in a well-organized, trained, efficient Federal staff of civil servants. I believe such a corps, fitted by general abilities as well as specialization, dedicated with fine purpose to their responsible tasks, is an absolute requirement for the successful functioning of a system of representative government. I say such civil servants should be secure from the despoiling hands of partisan politics, that they should be promoted on their merits, and rewarded with salary scales that take into account the vital role they are playing in a workable democracy.

To me it has always been irony to witness our Government exercising its powers in a specific area to protect large numbers of the Nation's working force from the inequities of rising prices and frozen wages and at the same time have the Federal authorities remain blind to the need for salary relief for its loyal army of civil servants. I, for one, and with no thought of pandering popularity of this audience, heartily declare myself in favor of equitable, upward revision of the salary schedules of all our civil servants. I stand for generous, fair treatment for Federal employees, with maximum rewards and protection of their status. In this respect I believe we can learn from Britain, which has long since learned the necessity of able, trained, and tried civil servants. Service with the Government should be made so attractive that we will recruit the best available talent and make it worth their while to warrant careers in civil service.

At a time when our Government has need of the most capable of civil servants, we are losing many of our most competent people to private industry and business. In fact in recent years civil service has become a training school for business and industry, and many of our top-flight men and women have been lured away by offers which take into reckoning their true worth. A condition which thus fails to hold adequate financial returns, reasonable job security, and ample retirement benefits, is one which works to the detriment of the national welfare. In the national interest it should be corrected, and without delay. The efficient functioning of our various bureaus, departments, and agencies is something which is tied in directly and importantly with the confidence the people have in our form of government. To this efficiency and its related confidence all who have the best interests of the Nation at heart should address themselves.

Finally, I should like to say that all of us concerned with Government should not be unaware, even for a moment, of the challenge confronting our democratic values and of the opportunities afforded us to make democracy count most tellingly. We are in one of the most decisive and important eras in the history of mankind. Let us make our worth felt for the most in behalf of those things in which we believe. Each of us can best do this by performing his or her own job better, no matter what it is. Democracy in the last analysis is only our collective idealism translated into daily living. The world looks to America for leadership. Let us embrace this historic opportunity and make the most of it.

Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, VJ-day is now more than 6 months behind us, and we have not yet moved effectively to meet our postwar problems as far as our military forces are concerned. The public generally is dissatisfied with the present situation of drafted men remaining in the military service.

The problem as it seems to me is divided into three major decisions that must be made quickly if we are to still the discontent with our military policy, both at home and in the services. The three phases of the question are: First, we must dispose of the problem of unification of the armed forces; second, we must provide a standing army sufficient to meet our military commitments; and, third, we must return to their homes the men now in service who are there against their own personal wishes.

The first of these, unification of the armed forces, is a policy that I have advocated for the past three Congresses, and have successively introduced a bill which would accomplish this in the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and in the current Congresses. My present bill (H. R. 86), which was introduced January 3, 1945, would establish the Divisions of Air Warfare, the Navy, and the Army as coequal divisions under a Department of National Defense.

This bill is as follows:

A bill to establish Divisions of Air Warfare, the Navy, and the Army as coequal divisions under a Department of National Defense

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the adoption of this act, the War Department of the United States and the Navy Department shall be merged in a new Department which shall be described as the Department of National Defense.

That as coequal divisions of said Department of National Defense, there shall be:

1. Division of Air Warfare.
2. Division of the Navy.
3. Division of the Army.

That the chief executive officer of said Department of National Defense shall be a Secretary of National Defense to be appointed by the President of the United States.

Until we take action on the combination of the armed services we will continue to get two different views on every major national defense policy on which we ask the opinion of the Army and the Navy. It is necessary that this irresolution be replaced by decision. With that decision made, the chiefs of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, true to their deepest traditions, will function with a clear view of what will be the essential organization of our defense forces.

Our whole military manpower situation is bound up by this failure to combine the services. Think what it would mean to have but one discharge policy instead of the three we now have. The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps all are different. How can we get an accurate over-all manpower figure as far as the military is concerned as long as the duplication of effort between the services continues to be a factor in the figures submitted. It is my understanding that over 350 committees, boards, and so forth, on which the Army and Navy each have representatives are still functioning.

Reasons for this combination of armed forces are clear to all. They have been sounded throughout the land by the President and other Government officials. I do not intend here to repeat the reasons for this combination—reasons that run the gamut from economic soundness of a single supply agency, to the efficiency of one intelligence organization—but rather to urge the necessity for immediate action. Upon this cornerstone of combination of the armed forces must be built our entire national defense system at home and abroad.

As to the formation of an armed force to meet our commitments at home and abroad, I believe that it must be a permanent standing army. America traditionally has been opposed to conscription in time of peace. We still dislike conscription in time of peace. American thought has changed, however, from the thinking of a small standing army kept within our shores, and an army that had neither the funds nor the talent for research, maneuvers, or intelligence activities, to thinking in terms of a well-equipped, skilled, informed military force. Some have interpreted this change in thinking to mean that we want universal peacetime conscription; I do not believe so, and am presently opposed to taking men who neither desire military life nor are mentally suited to such life into the military service. Such men will not solve our problem. They will not provide the garrisons abroad. They will only increase the administrative overhead by men who should, by virtue of service in the Regular Army, be serving in more useful capacities.

The young men of this country should not be delayed in their pursuit of learning. If they are taken out of school at the completion of high school the likelihood of their going to college is materially reduced. It should be remembered that they would not in all probability be drawing the subsistence that veterans who are returning to their studies are now getting. Our military policy may best be served by building up our Regular Military Establishment. This should be done by such additional inducements as may be necessary. Among these are: First, increased base pay; second, tax exemptions; third, raising the standing of the soldier in the communities near where they are stationed; fourth, free travel for dependents; fifth, liberalized retirement requirements; sixth, increased pay for overseas service; seventh, better morale programs to include service clubs, opportunities for promotion and opportunities for commissions as officers. If these items plus the inducements already in existence do not produce the required force, then we must raise our contributions in all of the categories until it does produce the number of men needed. Having a good standing army is a goal that we must seek, and must build up like any other Government establishment. It must be a privilege to belong to our military service, not a chore. Let us make it that way.

Our program for military reserves should implement, not replace, our educational system. We should expand our National Guard systems, and lend more assistance and encouragement to our Reserve officer and Naval Reserve training systems. More opportunity should be made for commissions in the Regular Army and Navy for those men who request such assignments based on outstanding performance in the National Guard or Reserve programs.

We must not forget the men who are still remaining in the Army and Navy, although they desire to be discharged. We have the paradoxical situation of men whose induction was delayed because of family responsibilities now the last ones eligible for discharge. They have not been able to pick up any points since VJ-day, although there have been many additions to families since then. Fathers should be discharged immediately, and we have to move toward the goal of discharging all men who are involuntarily in the service. No good army was ever built of disgruntled men. We do not want to let our field commanders down by reducing their forces to a point where they cannot fill their obligations, but we want them to have men who are there by their own choice, and who will constitute a continuing organization.

Let us start at once by unifying the armed forces; then, based on the needs of the combined defense organization, provide a personnel on an enlistment basis by making the service more attractive. We can then eliminate the draft and discharge men who are now in service through the draft.

Municipality of Long Beach, Calif., Spends $22,460,340 on Its Harbor Since 1909

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that some of the Members of Congress and the public at large have an idea that my home city of Long Beach has made all of its world-wide famous harbor improvements with receipts from tideland oil wells, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the following item and report as issued by the city auditor of Long Beach, who has well earned the affectionately applied term of "watchdog of the city treasury." I place it just as the report was recently quoted in the Long Beach Press-Telegram, to wit:

LONG BEACH SPENT $22,460,343 ON HARBOR SINCE 1909

Total cost of Long Beach Harbor improvements since 1909 is $22,460,343.69, according to a summary of capital expenditures for that purpose, filed yesterday with the city council by City Auditor Myrtelle L. Gunsul.

A break-down of that amount revealed that $8,564,846.28 came from harbor bonds, $6,954,220.05 from the harbor revenue fund, and $6,941,277.36 was the interest cost to mature bonds.

The report gave a résumé of projects financed by the four bond issues, voted as follows: 1909, $245,000; 1916, $300,000; 1924, $5,000,000; and 1928, $2,700,000; total, $8,245,000.

An additional $124,552.73 was obtained from premiums on bonds, refunds, and apportionments from the general funds, to bring total receipts debited to the bond funds to $8,564,846.28.

In a letter of transmittal, Miss Gunsul said that the report had been asked for by City Attorney Irving M. Smith in relation to the suit filed by the Federal Government against the State of California, which jeopardizes the Long Beach title to its tidelands, obtained by grant from the State.

The information supplied by the report will be used by the State's attorney general in preparing his answer to the Federal suit to be filed with the United States Supreme Court.

Communists in the Canneries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it becomes more apparent daily that there is more involved in the jurisdictional cannery workers' dispute in California than meets the eye. Increasing evidence of communistic activities are constantly being called to my attention.

As indicated by the following editorial and news article from the AFL Cannery Reporter, the "boring from within" has not only started but has proceeded to a point where it is seriously endangering the orderly harvesting and processing of valuable food crops in California.

The failure on the part of the executive branch of the Government to step into the dispute and seize the canneries is definitely aiding and abetting the Communist element in its attempt to take over the food industry in my State.

The matter referred to follows:

WHY NOT DO SOMETHING ABOUT THIS THREAT?

There seems to be a great deal more behind the present cannery controversy in northern California than meets the eye.

It is becoming more and more evident that forces are, and have been, at work behind the scenes—forces that cannot withstand the light of publicity on their operations or on their objectives.

And it is very evident that these forces, working behind the scenes, are not primarily interested in the union status of the rank and file of cannery workers insofar as the welfare of the workers themselves is concerned, but only are they interested in the group control of these workers to utilize them to achieve an end that isn't quite in line with the precepts of American democratic procedure.

We are publishing in this issue some facts, substantiated by documentary evidence, that connects the program of the Communist Party of California with the program of the FTA-CIO. These facts show that the Communist Party of California had started an organizing campaign inside the FTA-CIO to bring all agricultural workers within the jurisdiction of the FTA-CIO. The facts also show that this organizing campaign, with its base, a spurious farm workers' organizing committee, created by the Communist Party of California, started immediately when the results of the October 1945 NLRB election were announced, and the Communist Party of California, through the FTA-CIO, had its foot in the agricultural door.

The facts also show that the organizing campaign was temporarily halted only when the instigators of the campaign found that, before they could proceed with their program, they had, in some way, to fight the AFL teamsters out of the picture.

There is every indication that the Communist Party of California, with the consent and with the cooperation of the leadership of FTA-CIO, has created and is utilizing the present disrupted state of affairs, to "take over," for its own sinister purpose, the food industry of the State.

The present disorganized condition of California's canning industry has been made an issue at the Washington level. The FTA-CIO has seen fit to call it a jurisdictional dispute. The AFL teamsters have a different viewpoint. The teamsters insist that they are acting to protect legitimate unionism—the sort of AFL unionism that has kept the canneries processing the California crops over a period of 10 years, without conflict, because of mutually beneficial contractual agreements.

It is up to Washington to decide which is right. Washington has decided nothing. The new NLRB order, designed to stop the independent canners from processing the crops and, at the same time, threatening the CP&G if it takes like action and attempts to process the crops, has only added more turmoil to the already swirling situation.

California's Congressmen have been brought into the picture and, in a sincere effort to straighten out the mess, have made several proposals, none of which can be effective.

But there is one way that these Congressmen can proceed. Let them dig down into the guts of this turmoil and dissension, created by FTA-CIO, and investigate thoroughly what connection there is between FTA-CIO and the Communist Party of California, and also what the prime objective of this connection is.

If this sort of an investigation is made, we think that it will be revealed that one of the prime objectives has already been achieved—the creating of disruption by throwing the farmer, the processor, and the worker into a maelstrom of chaos. And we think they will find out that another objective is, through control of the workers, through control of their unions, to get a strangle hold on California's food industry, not for purposes of economic progression but, most definitely, for purposes of economic disintegration.

The California farmers who have much at stake in this issue, the California employers who have equally as much at stake, and the cannery workers, who have their very livelihood and their status as free democratic citizens at stake, should consider this matter very carefully and demand of responsible government a full uncovering of the facts.

The attempt of the Communist Party of California, through a spuriously created farm-workers organizing committee to regiment all agricultural workers in the State under the FTA-CIO, seems to us to be a sinister threat against American democratic economy. We believe that this fact bears immediate and thorough official investigation.

THE EVIDENCE

Here, following, is the evidence of the interassociation and combined action in the agricultural field of the Communist Party of the State of California and the FTA-CIO.

The letter on the stationery of the Communist Party of California confirms the fact that the petition, shown below the letter, was issued by the Communist Party of California. This proves conclusively that the California Farm Workers Committee for Organization, listed in the petition, is a phony set-up conceived by the brains in the Communist Party of California.

The signed affidavit, at the bottom, shows that the petition was given to an FTA-CIO member for circulation. The number 304 on the petition is conclusive evidence that many of these petitions were put into circulation and that many agents were doing the circulating.

The whole business indicates an organized campaign, through FTA-CIO, by the Communist Party of California, to control

agricultural labor in the State through organization of the workers into the FTA-CIO, either cooperating with the Communist Party of California, or controlled by it.

You will notice that the name "Albert Lima," signed to the letter is the name indicated at the left of the letterhead as field organizer for the Communist Party of California.

The suggestion that this whole business means an attempt by the Communist Party to gain control of California's agriculture through the medium of FTA-CIO certainly bears official investigation.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., December 12, 1945.
WILLIAM SCHNEIDERMAN,
State Chairman.
LORETTA STARVUS,
Organizational Secretary.
ALBERT LIMA,
Field Organizer.
ANITA WHITNEY,
Treasurer.

DEAR COMRADE: In regard to the petitions recently sent you by Vance Ambrose, you are requested to hold up the circulation of them until further notice from this office. Please drop me a line and let me know how far you have used them up until now. In case there is any change in this policy I will let you know.

Comradely,

MICKIE LIMA.
Albert "Mickie" Lima.

PETITION 304

The person's name appearing here is duly authorized by the California Farm Workers Committee for Organization to circulate and secure farm workers' names on this petition.

Whereas we farm workers of California are being forced to take wage cuts, and as time goes on we will be compelled to take greater wage cuts that will cause us to have a much lower standard of living than we had during the war years; and

Whereas we farm workers are excluded from social security, State unemployment benefits, and minimum wage laws; and

Whereas we farm workers who help the farmers plow, cultivate, hoe, and harvest the crops have no union to guide us in our daily economic and political life: Be it

Resolved, We the undersigned farm workers hereby petition Mr. Donald Henderson, general president of the Food, Tobacco, and Agricultural Workers Union, CIO, for a charter that will include all farm workers in California; be it further

Resolved, That under this union we hereby agree to do everything in our legal power to organize for the purpose of obtaining a higher standard of living for all farm workers—men and women—of California. Issued by the California Farm Workers Committee for Organization.

Name _____
Mailing address _____
City or town _____

AFFIDAVIT

I, Covie Rodgers, general delivery, Fowler, Calif., received a petition to sign up agricultural workers in FTA-CIO from V. E. Ambrose, who is a member of the Communist Party of San Francisco, Calif., and a few days later received a letter from Meekie Lima, a State organizer of the Communist Party, asking me to hold up petition sent me by V. E. Ambrose until further notice. This letter was typed on a Communist Party letterhead, 701 Garfield Building, 942 Market Street, San Francisco.

COVIE A. RODGERS,
Fowler, Calif.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 11th day of March 1946.

ALICE M. CUTLER,
Notary public in and for the County of Fresno, State of California.

United States Chamber of Commerce Asks End OPA Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to call to the attention of the Congress that on November 14, 1945, I introduced H. R. 275. At that time I stated that my purpose was to displace Mr. Chester Bowles as Administrator of the Office of Price Control, and give authority to the President to transfer to other agencies such controls as were absolutely necessary to other departments, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I also stated at that time that it was my opinion that there was only one control necessary for a limited time and that was rent control. My thought which was announced at that time was that only rent control was necessary in order to protect our returning veterans and migrant workers and others, and that this control should be transferred to the National Housing Agency.

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to me to note that at a meeting of the board of directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce that the chamber adopted resolutions calling for final elimination of all price controls, except rent ceilings, by October 31—just 7 months hence—which is practically the same as suggested by me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include herein the newspaper account of the statement of the United States Chamber of Commerce, as reported by the Associated Press, and published in the Washington Post of date March 28, 1946, which is as follows:

UNITED STATES CHAMBER ASKS END OF OPA CONTROL—BODY WOULD DROP CEILINGS, EXCEPT ON RENTS BY OCTOBER 31

The United States Chamber of Commerce directors called yesterday for final elimination of all price controls, except rent ceilings, by October 31—just 7 months hence.

The chamber issued its statement even as Treasury Sceretary Fred M. Vinson was telling the House Banking Committee "we are well on the way to a balanced budget" and that unless OPA is extended for a year beyond June 30 inflation might spoil the bright economic outlook.

Vinson disclosed that Treasury receipts from taxes "are larger than the estimates," Government expenditures are smaller than expected, and declared:

"Today we can be more optimistic about the future than ever before. It would be pathetic if we muffed this grand opportunity. We must maintain our controls over inflation a little longer. The extension of the Stabilization Act, without crippling amendments, is the biggest single aspect of our battle against inflation."

"TAXES MUST REMAIN HIGH"

Notwithstanding this generally good situation, he said, "taxes must remain high."

The Chamber of Commerce, through a vote of its directors, said price controls should be abolished within 7 months, but that rent ceilings "properly modified" should be continued to March 31, 1947. Moreover, it said that even before October 31 there should be a progressive elimination of price controls in various lines.

"The Budget should be overbalanced and debt retired," the chamber directors declared.

"Costs of Government must be drastically reduced. Deficit financing must be terminated. Every proposal for new governmental expenditures should be coupled with definite methods for raising the required revenues."

Operations of the OPA were criticized in a chamber committee report as "seriously distorting the production pattern. Only when the individual customer is free to express his wants in an unfettered market will he be able to guide production along the lines desired by the consumers."

MORE LENIENT THAN NAM

The chamber was a little more lenient on OPA than the National Association of Manufacturers, which last week asked Congress to let price controls die June 30. NAM charged that OPA is encouraging black markets, discouraging production, and actually contributing to inflation.

Vinson disagreed vigorously with this view, declaring, "I take issue with those who say that removal of price control will stimulate and increase production." He told the committee:

"In my judgment, there would be so much effort spent in beating the market, in buying and selling materials and inventories, in concentrating on the speculative gain, that we would find total production decreased rather than increased."

The voice of the National Association of Retail Grocers was added to those demanding that OPA be allowed to die June 30.

Tyre Taylor, association general counsel, told the Banking Committee the record shows that "OPA is in fact strangling and distorting production, depreciating quality, promoting hoarding, creating black markets, and thereby generating additional inflation and debasing the American scale of living."

Average production of crude oil and natural gasoline in the United States in 1945 was 5,000,000 barrels daily—60 percent more than in 1936 and 22 percent more than in 1941.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement some little time ago that the Ways and Means Committee of the House would conduct hearings on proposed amendments to and changes in the social security law is most important and concerns directly the domestic economic welfare of our Nation. Nearly everyone believes in some form or other of old-age pension or retirement system, but nothing particularly has been done about it except in the provisions made in the Social Security Act and provisions made in certain retirement legislation.

The Social Security Act was passed in 1935. I voted for the bill in the hopes that much good would result therefrom. However, 10 years have passed since the Social Security Act became a law, and during that time very few beneficial amendments have been made thereto. After 10 years of social security, at least one-third of all the workers in America

are without social security protection. After 10 years of social security, the average old-age assistance payment for all the 48 States is $30.46, and the average old-age insurance benefit considerably lower. There are, according to the Census Bureau, more than 10,000,000 Americans age 65 or over. After 10 years of social security, 7 out of every 10 of those people do not receive a penny either from the old-age insurance or assistance program. These facts demonstrate the necessity of increasing the benefits of old-age assistance.

During World War II, when more than 12,000,000 of our sons were drawn into service, opportunities for work were increased for our older citizens, but after the close of the war and the return of millions of these veterans, the opportunity for work of our older citizens became negligible. This will increase when two or three million more of our boys now in service return home to civilian life. Of necessity and of right, these veterans who fought so bravely during the war will be, and should be, given preferential treatment in the selection of jobs. They will constitute, with other men now employed and who have been employed in industrial work, the great body of industrial workers and will satisfy in great degree the demand for additional workers.

This leaves the problem of our older citizens a precarious one, with very little opportunity of securing a job which would pay sufficiently their increased living expenses. Therefore, the responsibility of the Congress becomes all the greater in providing means by which want and suffering may be eliminated. If at this time an old-age pension could be passed, or the provisions of the Social Security Act broadened, then the welfare of our older citizens would be better protected. I think one can safely say that the condition of our aged folks today is worse than at any time for the last 25 years. They are confronted with a 33-percent increase in living costs; opportunities for employment are greatly restricted; technical advances, inventions, and modern production methods are fast eliminating our older citizens from the field of employment.

The number included in this class—60 years of age and over—is estimated at about 10 percent of our population, or some 13,500,000. Of that number, it is estimated that at least 10,000,000 of this group are dependent in whole or in part on someone else for their maintenance. They do constitute a social and economic problem which this Congress should do something about.

It is true that to provide an adequate old-age pension would cost money, but certainly Christian principles and American justice are being violated so long as we force millions of our citizens to live in want and misery. During their younger days, they contributed to the welfare of our Nation; in their older days they should be protected if misfortune or want confront them. With all the vast appropriations which Congress has made and will make, surely some means can be adopted by which the future welfare of our citizens can be best protected.

Many of our citizens today are willing that billions of dollars should be spent in foreign countries and billions of dollars should be loaned to various European and Asiatic nations. While I am a firm believer in the fact that it is the duty and the responsibility of the American Government to prevent suffering and starvation throughout the world, insofar, as possible, yet, by the same token, we must consider the welfare of our own Nation. In order that America should continue her leadership throughout the world and take first place in the United Nations Organization, the definite fact remains that to do this we must be a solvent nation. Surely, the money reasonably necessary to be spent in increasing the benefits of old-age assistance could only react favorably on the economic welfare of our Nation.

Real justice requires that we recognize the fact that as our younger citizens secure employment, our older citizens will be deprived thereof. Should those older citizens be able to retire on a reasonable old-age pension, our younger citizens would become more assured of their jobs. The United States has always been looked upon as the pioneer of good government and worth-while home conditions. Our Nation has been built by the loyalty and the integrity and the working ability of our citizens. This must continue in order that this Nation may progress. It follows, therefore, that as men and women reach the age where jobs are no longer available to them, their future welfare must be protected insofar as possible from want and privation.

Several thousand of the fine citizens of my Sixth Congressional District of Michigan have already signed petitions requesting the Ways and Means Committee to conduct hearings for an adequate old-age pension.

I have submitted this statement to the Ways and Means Committee to be used in connection with hearings on pension legislation and I sincerely and earnestly hope that the Members of the Ways and Means Committee will consider this important matter now and report an adequate pension bill to the House for passage.

Draja Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Evening Star of March 26 by Constantine Brown on Draja Mihailovich, the Yugoslav patriot:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Draja Mihailovich, who once was described in America and Britain as the "Balkan Eagle," the "Robin Hood of Serbia" and the "White Hope" of the Allies in the Balkans, is now officially reported to be in a jail somewhere in Yugoslavia awaiting a perfunctory trial before being executed by the government of his erstwhile rival, Marshal Tito.

Those who know the people in that section of the Balkans say that the lore-loving Serbs unquestionably will make him into a legendary hero—just as the American and British governments described him before political expediency compelled them to drop him after the Teheran Conference.

Mihailovich was an obscure officer in the royal Yugoslav Army until the forces of King Peter were crushed by the Nazi's armor and air force. He was known to a few professionals as an expert in guerrilla warfare which had formed the major part of his study while on the Yugoslav general staff.

He emerged from obscurity and became an international hero after King Peter, his government, and all the rank of Yugoslavia departed for Cairo in the summer of 1941 and let him resist the Germans with a handful of poorly equipped but fanatical Chetniks.

Between the summer of 1941 and the beginning of 1944 he gained wide publicity and honors were heaped on him by his own and the Allied governments. The United States had promised his government at least one flight of bombers, if it decided to resist the Germans. The bombers were never sent to Mihailovich's hide-out for reasons which are still kept among the war's top secrets.

The British were liberal in their praise of the Yugoslav leader, but less so insofar as the sending of war materials or medical supplies were concerned. King Peter promoted him from the rank of colonel to full general and appointed Mihailovich minister of an army, navy, and air force which existed only on paper.

In the fall of 1942, General Eisenhower, then commander in chief of the Allied armies in the Mediterranean, sent the Yugoslav hero a telegram of congratulations on his valiant resistance, and a few months later General de Gaulle, the leader of the Free French, awarded the Croix de Guerre to this legendary hero who has never ceased to fight against the common enemy.

At the time Field Marshal Erwin Rommel was within 30 miles of Alexandria, Britain's General Auchinleck, Air Marshal Tedder, and Admiral Cunningham sent their warmest thanks and congratulations to Mihailovich for having slowed down the flow of Nazi supplies to North Africa with his guerrilla tactics. As an indication of deep appreciation for his activities, King George presented Mihailovich with a "purse" of $10,000 in gold.

But after the Teheran Conference of the Big Three, Mihailovich's star began to wane. Few persons knew at the time that the new map of the Balkans and eastern Europe had been blueprinted at Teheran. Greece was marked as being in the British zone of influence and so was Yugoslavia. On Premier Stalin's advice, Winston Churchill decided to change the leadership of Yugoslavia and accepted the services of the little known Partisan Commander Tito. The British Prime Minister knew Tito was a Communist, but he was not concerned over his poliitcal allegiance. He trusted his Russian colleague, who promptly undertook to order his henchman to place himself under the British wing.

From that time on, Mihailovich and his 70,000 or 80,000 Chetniks were described as collaborationists and traitors. The trickle of supplies ended. His purchase of war materials from the corrupt Italian generals was described as proof of his collaboration, although it was the British high command which provided the Chetnik leader with the necessary dollar and pound sterling currency which Mussolini's favorites demanded.

Mihailovich's refusal to undertake an offensive against the Germans when the Allied forces were still far away from Yugoslavia, Greece, and Italy was taken as a final demonstration that King Peter's commander in chief of the home forces had sold out. As a matter of fact, he informed the British that

an offensive against the Germans would be hopeless.

The man who went through the whole range of adjectives from Balkan Eagle to the Nazi collaborationist and traitor is now in the hands of his arch enemy, the new leader of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito. None of the governments which only a few years ago heaped praise and honors on him can do anything to save him. The life of a leader, even if he is known to the governments of the great powers to be an honest and upstanding man, is of little value in the face of political expediency.

The following editorial also on Draja Mihailovich appeared in the New York Times of March 27:

TRAITOR OR PATRIOT?

A loser in the Balkans, whether it be merely in a palace revolution or in a global war, can expect short shrift from the victor. Such probably will be the fate of Gen. Draja Mihailovich. Five years ago he was called a hero by most of the democratic world as he rallied a guerrilla army to fight the Germans after Belgrade had fallen. Then he became a legend. Now he is a prisoner, hunted down and captured in a cave with the 11-man remnant of what once was reported as an army of 300,000.

What is the truth about Mihailovich? In 1943 the Soviet Union accused him of being a collaborator. His own son was reported to have echoed that accusation. His place as titular leader of the guerrilla movement was taken by a then shadowy figure, Josip Broz, who called himself Tito. With Soviet backing, and later the support of others of the Allied governments, Tito organized an army that played an important part in the latter phases of the campaign against the Nazis in the Balkans. According to his supporters, Tito many times had to fight Mihailovich's men as well as the Germans. When victory came, Tito assumed control of Yugoslavia.

The Tito government apparently had tried, found guilty, and passed sentence on Mihailovich before his capture. Almost a year ago the then foreign minister of Tito's government, Ivan Subasitch, declared that, although the Chetnik leader would get a fair trial, enough evidence was at hand to convict him and that he would be shot. What this evidence is has not been made clear. Is it based on testimony of partisans only, or does it contain Nazi records as well?

Mihailovich is too important a historical figure for the world to permit his summary trial and execution. If for no other reason than his early resistance to the Germans—and there does not appear to be any ground for believing that it was not sincere and important to the Allied cause in 1941—Mihailovich deserves a fair and exhaustive trial before the world. Appeals to this end are being addressed to the UNO. Traitor or patriot? The world has a right to know beyond any shadow of a doubt. Yugoslavia would be well advised, we believe, to turn over Mihailovich and its evidence against him to an international tribunal.

St. Patrick's Day Address of Hon. Edouard Izac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech given by the Honorable EDOUARD IZAC, of California, at the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner in Youngstown, Ohio, Sunday, March 17:

My friends, I hope you will not deem it presumptuous for me to say that, loyal as you are to the memory of the great saint whom we revere tonight, you must be prepared to share with many throughout all mankind an ownership not limited to race or creed.

From the beginning of recorded history there have been great men whose service to mankind made them renowned among all peoples and objects of devotion of millions of pious souls.

St. Patrick was such a man. Claims to him and to ownership in his goodness are staked throughout the earth. Let us never foreclose from any people the benefits of the example he set.

So tonight I am glad to give you a few thoughts regarding this great man. I notice the good saint, in his later life, wrote with seeming assurance that he was born at a certain spot in Britain, the identity of which has long since been lost. Some say it was near Pembroke or perhaps in the Valley of the Severn. But I also remember, as a child at school in the little Iowa town of my birth, when a great controversy arose because so many different parts of Europe claimed to be the birthplace of the saint. My own dad, loyal to St. Patrick and loyal also to his native France, insisted that the saint was born in France and that the family shortly thereafter moved to England. It is undoubtedly true that Calpurnius, the father of Patrick, or Patricius, did bring his family from across the Channel into Britain, but there is no proof whether this occurred before or after the birth of the child. Claims also have been made for establishing other parts of Europe as his birthplace, but these claims will never be proved. Unfortunately most, if not all, authentic records were destroyed in the ninth century during the Danish invasion of Britain. However, it is true that a long and useful life covered years of study and of teaching in various parts of Europe that can now be identified as Ireland, England, France, and Italy; the three latter parts of the then-crumbling Roman Empire. And so, regardless of his place of birth, we have in Patrick the apostle of Ireland an example which fortifies our belief that true worth is not dependent on origin—nor is origin a measure of worth.

St. Patrick was probably born about the year 387 and he had his share of troubles and of pain in an unsettled and turbulent world. When only 16 years old he was carried off from his father's farm in Britain by a raiding band from across the Irish Sea. Sold into slavery, he was for 6 years a serf on the land of an Irish lord until he escaped to Gaul, as France was then called. Then emulating the heroic champions of a new faith, that still struggling Christianity, the youth studied and prepared for the work to which the Master was to call him. For many years he followed the monastic life, absorbing learning and inspiration from his saintly contemporaries. He himself later wrote "and a voice said, 'Well are you fasting. Soon now you will go to your fatherland.'" And again, "I heard the voices of those who dwelt beside the wood of Focluth which is by the western sea; and thus they cried, as if with one mouth: 'We beseech thee, holy youth, to come and walk once more amongst us.'" Thus St. Patrick became the great teacher of the Irish people; leading them from ignorance to knowledge, from slavery to freedom, and from unbelief to faith. He told them of the God of love and the Saviour who died to make men really free. Because of his power to instill confidence and trust, they listened; they learned; they embraced the new philosophy; and they remained steadfast through the centuries.

Well has one writer summed up the significance of this man's impact on the chaotic age in which he lived: "An age of magnificently great men, it was yet an age of chaotic and abysmal events such as it seemed had not been from the beginning of time. Christian civilization in Africa was wiped out by the Vandals, never to be revived again. Rome fell, and all the world cried out. Because of the withdrawal of Roman arms, Britain was laid waste by the then pagan Irish and the boy Patrick dragged off to captivity. Through him Ireland was singled out in the mercy of God to lead in the reconquest of the world for Christ. Does it not look like a divine compensation at the very moment when all seemed lost and Christianity was seemingly doomed to perish? Patrick was not merely the apostle of Ireland, he was the man of providence. Imperfect and ignorant as he accounted himself, he was thereby most fittingly made the tool of a divine design, more vast than we can trace."

It is with redoubled interest, then, that we view the half-clad slave boy, captured in the Irish raid, herding the swine of his pagan master on the hills of Slemish; that we follow his flight, led as he is by mysterious voices, and trace his travels and adventures, until, invested with the episcopal dignity, he returns as God's anointed to the shores of the Gael.

What a godsend to a tired, confused, and troubled world would be the philosophy and the teachings of good St. Patrick now. Look around the horizon today and you will agree with me the subordination of the ideals of the individual to the demands of dictatorship calls for another crusade led by another voice with the authority of almighty truth and aimed at the preservation of the dignity of the person of man and the concern for his welfare; not just for the striking of the chains of serfdom, but for the freeing of the soul that it may achieve unity with the designs of its Creator. Less than a year ago, with my colleagues of the Congress, I looked on the dead and the dying in the concentration camps of Germany where by terror and torture tyrants sought to compel renunciation of the things of the spirit by castigation of the flesh. Today right here in our own country there is ever-increasing evidence that greed and selfish disregard for the rights of the poor and the weak is the controlling influence in the conduct and the lives of many of our people.

And there are some who would even control the thoughts that run through men's minds; setting themselves up as they do as judges of what is right or wrong for people to think or believe in, what is American and what is un-American. I say to them they need not fear for the safety of the state if they will bend their energies towards making democracy work, instead of trying by coercion to make other men's minds as narrow as their own. Can anyone doubt the need for a St. Patrick among us?

As the populations of the earth increase, and as our civilization becomes more complex, so do the obligations of Government steadily mount. And I insist no government can survive that does not concern itself with the welfare of the people governed; that does not try to obtain equal justice for all.

During the war it was our objective to equalize the burdens and the sacrifices, in so far as is ever humanly possible, among all our people. On the battlefield, of course, the fatal bullet is no respecter of persons. But we tried to pass laws that would eliminate favoritism and compel the sharing on a basis of equality regardless of station in life. We were not wholly successful, but the efforts made received the approval of most people, and our country enjoyed a unity that resulted in victory over our enemies.

Today our country is entering on a period of confusion and uncertainty induced by the monumental displacements caused by a

long-fought and destructive war. None knows a panacea for all that is wrong, but most of us are trying to do something about it and you are entitled to know what it is.

With a tremendous war debt incurred at a high price level, it is apparent we can never pay it off if we permit that price level to drop too low. This is particularly true regarding wages and is one of the reasons for encouraging the payment of increases to somewhere near the previous take-home level. At the same time, we are trying to keep the cost of living from rising beyond the reach of the average family. The ideal condition would be to have the family income sufficient to support the highest American standard of living the brains and brawn of our people can provide. The experts are agreed that we will be able to carry the cost of the Government and even retire the public debt gradually if we can attain a national income of $160,000,000,000 annually.

That means practically full employment at decent wages and practically full production with fair profits. We are trying to discourage discrimination in employment and are working on plans for the aid of small business. We are giving every help to our international collaborators and to the organizations set up to erase the economic effects of war and to preserve the peace. We are striving to perform our military commitments that we hope will result in the eradication from the breasts of our former enemies of any desire to have recourse to war in the future. We are supporting every effort to give to all the peoples of the world the right to self-determination and self-rule. And to those who stood between our country and its enemies we have pledged, and we shall deliver, the care and the rehabilitation, the protection and the recompense, that are worthy of their sacrifices. Not forgetting the old, the blind, the widows with dependent children, and all those not now covered by social security laws, we propose a broadened program of assistance and protection that in the day of need there may be provided a decent minimum benefit below which none will be permitted to go. Programs for health and education and decent housing are finally being evolved which we hope will meet the requirements of our people.

I can assure you, my Ohio friends, that in the planning and the enactment of such humanitarian legislation you need have no misgivings as to where your own Congressman will stand. I have seen him in all the crucial legislative fights of the past 10 years—yes; we have fought together for every piece of legislation that had as its objective bettering the lot of the average man and woman. His is a record of which you, the people he represents, may well be proud, because I divulge no secret when I say that MIKE KIRWAN is universally loved and respected in the Halls of Congress.

And so both Mrs. Izac and I are glad to enjoy this occasion with you, the friends of our friend. And I want to conclude by telling you of the analogy I always think of whenever I see the shamrock.

St. Patrick, boldly facing the Irish king, stooped and plucked a shamrock. He then pointed to the three petals, a part of and blended into a single stem, and explained the mystery of the Trinity—one God in three divine persons, three persons in one God. Surely there is reason to believe the founding fathers of our American Nation were inspired to imitate the mystic perfection of the Holy Trinity when setting up the three coequal branches of our Government. The legislative, the executive, and the judicial departments make up one sovereignty. And the power and authority flows from the single stem represented by all the people, back to the people from whence it comes.

St. Patrick labored in God's cause in behalf of the people of all times, of all races, of all faiths. You and I cannot afford to do less.

Veterans Disgusted With Surplus Property Disposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the veterans of World War II are thoroughly disgusted with the methods being employed by the administration in disposing of war surplus property owned by the Government. A lot of lip service and promises have been made to the veterans, but they have not been able to realize much benefit from the program the administration is carrying out with reference to the disposal of Government-owned surplus property.

Complaints come in from all directions that the veterans are being discriminated against, instead of having their priorities honored and respected, as they should be. Almost innumerable protests have come to the Members of Congress from the veterans. In many instances they have given concrete instances and illustrations of what seems to be maladministration of the disposal of surplus property. At any rate, the veterans are not getting their share and they are complaining bitterly, and I think they are justified in making such complaints.

If present conditions and operations are allowed to continue, I predict that surplus-property disposal by this administration will be one of the most fertile fields of investigation by this or some future Congress. The responsibility is that of the administration and it should assume it with fairness and justice to all, especially to the ex-servicemen. Why cannot the administration require the fair and equitable distribution of Government surplus property, with adequate and just priorities in favor of the veterans? The veterans are beginning to demand their rights, and I trust they will continue to voice their sentiments and demand that the promises of priorities to them be made good, or that those violating such promised policies be exposed and appropriate punishment meted out to the culprits.

These sentiments are expressed in an open letter which I just received from John Stelle, national commander of the American Legion, which I am pleased to quote, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Legion National Headquarters is daily receiving a flood of letters from veterans citing disappointing experiences in their endeavor to obtain Government surplus property.

Many of these letters are pitiful and appalling. They reveal that the veterans are meeting insurmountable difficulties in their desperate effort to obtain surplus war goods with which to establish or reestablish themselves in a business, occupation, or profession. They cannot understand the blank wall which they come up against; neither can I.

I am certain that your congressional mail is packed with letters similar to those received by the American Legion. To put it baldly, the veteran of World War II is getting little or none of the goods being set out at surplus sales, and that which is offered him is usually shoddy and beyond use or repair while the new goods go elsewhere.

When I speak of surplus property, all types and sorts are referred to. Vehicles have drawn most conversation and in most instances they are essential to the rehabilitation of the veteran back into civilian life.

But these are not all the story. The veteran needs pots, pans, and other kitchen utensils so that he can set up his small restaurant or cafe and shorten the food lines of this Nation; he needs carpenter, plumbing, or electrical tools so that he can help in the housing problems; he needs bulldozers and scrapers so that he can terrace and save his farm from erosion; he needs materials which the Government has possessed for war purposes in a thousand instances.

But the veteran is not getting these from the Government. From the civilian sources the universal reply to him is:

"You are not an old account. We have goods only for our old customers."

It leaves the veteran empty-handed.

The Government had billions of dollars in goods of every kind for the prosecution of the war. If this property is still held by the Government some efficient method of parceling it out to veterans should be established. If this property has already been disposed of, then the American people should know who got it, and how.

The situation is such that immediate remedial steps should be taken or the veterans of this Nation are going to become dangerously discontented and they will lose confidence in promises of the Government. America cannot afford that.

We all are aware that meanwhile the surplus property is melting away through various channels. The action I suggest is for Congress by the quickest possible method, perhaps resolution, to freeze temporarily all surplus property until the situation can be surveyed. The veteran should be given improved priority. The not-for-sale signs should be torn down in the huge warehouses where thousands of articles useful to veterans are on display. Information and distribution outlets should be better organized.

The percentage of the total supply available to the veterans should be drastically increased, for his reestablishment in civil life is the pressing national problem.

Otherwise, within a few short months the veterans are going to be left empty-handed, disillusioned, and seriously disappointed—with the surplus property gone.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN STELLE,
National Commander.

Second Battle of the Bulge or Bigger Profits Versus Veterans' Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the Appendix an editorial in the Los Angeles Daily News under date of March 4, 1946.

It appears to me to present the front of the thought in this Nation which is willing and ready to see that the veterans have housing, whether a relative

few pile up and up more material profits or not.

The rule of give and take ought to apply in this housing need for veterans and their dependents. By that I mean give the veterans what they are entitled to have, to wit, decent homes at prices they can promptly afford. Take from the veterans only a moderate profit in their time of dire need. Do not subject them to the spree of inflation which will be sure to onrush if all controls are removed before we have reached a Nation-wide level of "live and let live" instead of "I'll get mine while the getting is good."

Yes; it is again the battle of "Bigger Profits Versus Veterans' Homes."

Here follows the editorial:

SECOND BATTLE OF THE BULGE

In Washington, as in Los Angeles, officialdom's efforts to answer challenges of the housing crisis, particularly for veterans, are meeting stiff opposition from self-interest groups and lobbyists.

Loud voices in the Nation's Capital the last few days have been charging the administration's low-cost housing program, together with its controls, is communistic, dictatorial, and an entering wedge for socialized housing.

Prominent among antihousing pressure groups are the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Home Builders. Long active against public housing, and against governmental planning and assistance generally, spokesmen of these organizations merely reflect the fatal short-range views many self-styled champions of private enterprise are betraying these days.

Standing in the midst of a housing disaster which thus far they, themselves, have failed either to solve or to pose a solution for, enemies of Government housing measures neither say what they mean nor mean what they say.

Take, for example, the nonsemantic verbalizing of Joseph E. Merrion, president of the National Association of Home Builders. According to Merrion, it is ridiculous to construct new housing for low-income groups.

Or ponder the arguments advanced this week by Herbert U. Nelson, vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, who urges cash grants to home-needy veterans in lieu of Government subsidies aimed at stimulating volume production of lower cost building materials.

What these men want is not a rational solution of the housing shortage—not a broadening of the scope of private housing enterprise so it may reach out and embrace the vast American consumer market.

What they really want is exactly what we have now: a shortage housing economy, with its unrivaled opportunities for skyrocketing speculative profits.

Having knocked out a proposed ceiling price control on existing homes, having successfully influenced reduction of OPA appropriations necessary to fight the black market and discourage chiselers, having slashed funds for the Wage Stabilization Board and Civilian Production Administration, antihousing lobbyists and their Republocratic friends in the House and Senate refuse to see or heed the signs of the times.

These signs say plainly that a Nation in which millions are harassed by inflation and the fear of further inflation, in which millions of returning servicemen cannot find a place to live, is a Nation teetering between two worlds.

One world is the world of an expanded, strengthened social democracy, bravely correcting any manifest evils of its economic life which prevent attainment of decent living conditions for its people.

The other world is the world Henry George so aptly described in the title of his famous book, the world of Progress and Poverty, where in the midst of potential plenty, millions are hampered and held back.

The final, convulsive months of the war in Europe produced the Battle of the Bulge—that last desperate lunge by Von Runstedt across the Belgian frontier. Outnumbered and surrounded at Bastogne by the surprise offensive, Brig. Gen. McAuliffe was called upon by the Nazis to surrender his One Hundred and First Airborne Division.

McAuliffe's reply, to Von Runstedt and to posterity, it will be remembered, was "Nuts!"

In today's second battle of the bulge—the bulge of inflation and homelessness—and against the enveloping strategy of the little enders now attacking reconversion measures—the people, the millions of veterans and their families, must stand fast and give a like answer.—R. E. G. H.

The Housing Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Portage Daily Register, Portage, Wis., on March 25, 1946:

There must be some solution for a production problem besides subsidies and restrictions, but the big minds in Washington seem to find no other way out of the difficulties which face the Nation.

These are the two methods being adopted to meet the housing crisis, but we doubt if either can, or will, prove highly effective. On the contrary, they may seriously hamper the normal recovery from war.

The new restrictions on construction which will soon be imposed will virtually stop all commercial building except that which is now beyond the blueprint stage. This will mean that there can be no new garages, no new store fronts, and few new industrial plants unless the employment situation is acute in the community.

Most of this construction calls for the use of concrete blocks, steel girders, tile, and brick. None of these materials are extensively used in home construction, especially not in the type of homes which the Nation needs most urgently right now.

Home construction is really awaiting an abundance of lumber and other such materials. Until lumber stocks are adequate there will be no extensive program of home construction for veterans. And lumber stocks will not be adequate unless price restrictions are alerted so that lumber is provided for the yards of our own country in the place of timbers now being shipped abroad.

Logging operations are being carried on extensively. Lumber mills are in operation, but there is no lumber available at retail. The Government had better look to that situation first if it really desires to provide housing for veterans.

Those of us who can look back over a period of 25 years realize that production has never been a serious long-time problem for America. Fifteen years ago we had too much of everything in America—or at least far more than the market could absorb. Today we have a much greater market, but after the production achievements of the wartime period, there should be no reason to doubt that America can do the job.

If the planners would permit certain economic forces to operate we would soon meet the Nation's most urgent needs. The Government and the muddle-headed policies being pursued account for most of our shortages and poor prospects for early improvement.

We will probably solve the problem of the housing shortage, and all other shortages, as we have in the past, but it will not be because of Government help. It will be in spite of bureaucratic muddling.

The Only Way To Solve the Housing Problem Is To Build a Lot of Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson Evening News for March 26, 1946:

THE ONLY WAY TO SOLVE THE HOUSING PROBLEM IS TO BUILD A LOT OF HOUSES

The housing situation is at one and the same time an example of what happens when price controls are not applied, and also of the need for a realistic and flexible policy in imposing or adjusting those controls.

The prices which houses—not of new construction—are bringing in the market illustrates the effect of the law of supply and demand in a time of scarcity. Homes which cost $8,000 or $9,000 to build and have been occupied anywhere from 5 to 20 years are bringing from $14,000 to $18,000, and even more. They do not even have to be advertised. Buyers apparently will take at once almost anything that has four walls and a roof, for a price which represents 40 to 60 percent more than its original cost. In some cases they do not even ask to see the interior. A statement as to the number of rooms and a blueprint or verbal description of the lay-out brings a deposit.

A vast amount of that sort of selling is going on by persons who are taking advantage of the opportunity to sell their homes at a handsome profit, or by owners of rented property, who are turning buildings into cash.

What is happening with respect to housing would happen in many other fields were not prices held down by OPA ceilings.

The obvious way to restore the balance between housing value and price is to build a lot of houses. When the supply exceeds or approximates demand, competition to sell, rather than competition to buy, will regulate price.

Houses are not being built in great number yet. The deflecting of materials to war purposes has not been overcome. In some specific lines price ceilings prevent profits, and manufacturing activity is turned into lines which yield more.

Were price ceilings on materials to be entirely removed from all building materials prices would soar immediately, as the cost of existing buildings has. They would not come down until materials were plentiful enough so that competition to sell them would force a drop.

However, some increase in ceilings, especially in some particular lines, would encourage production and increase supplies. It probably would mean construction costs lower than now prevail, despite higher ceilings. Today no builder dares to promise a house at a particular time. Assured of a steady supply of materials, he could promise

delivery. Even were prices a small percentage higher than those now established for goods which are scarcely to be had, a finished structure probably would cost less than it does today, and new houses would be built sooner.

Inflation Is World-Wide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the New York Times of March 11, 1946:

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE
INFLATION IS WORLD-WIDE
(By Henry Hazlitt)

Politically the League of Nations is no longer a going concern, but it still publishes a monthly bulletin of statistics. Owing to the present reticence of governments concerning their own economic affairs, this bulletin is not as informative as it might be. It is pointless, for example, to try to find the real values of the world's currency units by consulting the table on exchange rates. There one will find, with few exceptions, only the official rates, which are stable but meaningless. One does little better to consult the official cost-of-living indexes. These now reflect only legally recognized ceiling prices, and not what the majority of people must really pay in these countries to get goods.

The most revealing figures are those regarding notes in circulation. The real inflation in any country is measured by the increase in its money (and credit) supply. The most recent League of Nations Bulletin, in an elaborate table, publishes, first for each country the amount of money in circulation in December 1939, and then monthly figures, the majority of which are brought up to October of last year. If we take this latest figure in each case, and calculate the percentage of increase it represents over the figure for December 1939, we get the following results:

Argentina	125
Australia	232
Belgium	137
Brazil	241
Canada	307
Czechoslovakia	536
Egypt	385
Finland	327
France	249
Greece	577
Hungary	10,268
India	419
Iran	568
Iraq	659
Italy	1,066
Japan	645
Mexico	235
Netherlands	138
Portugal	209
Rumania	822
Sweden	80
Switzerland	80
Turkey	225
Union South Africa	214
United Kingdom	134
United States	268
Yugoslavia	1,797

In one or two cases it is possible that the foregoing figures exaggerate the inflation that has taken place. Thus in this country the bulk of the means of payment consists of bank deposits, which have not increased in quite the same proportion as the currency. But the table as a whole greatly understates the amount of inflation that has taken place in the world. In Rumania, for example, the latest figure available is for April 1945; moreover, it does not include 6-month Treasury bills which are legal tender; by the end of 1943 more than 30,000 million of these had been put into circulation. The figure for Greece does not remotely indicate the real extent of the inflation there. By November 1944 there were reported to be 2,500,000 million millions of drachmae in circulation; since then a new drachma, equal to 50,000 million of the old, has been substituted. No figure for China is available in the table at all, though by November 1944 wholesale prices in China had risen nearly 22,000 percent above the level of 1939. There is no figure in the table, either, for Germany, which is apparently still being flooded by occupation currency by the Russians. Other nations have similarly been flooded by occupation currency not counted in the published figures.

Here is the real problem of inflation that the whole world confronts. It has been caused mainly in each country (excluding those victimized by war occupation) by heavy government spending paid for by printing money instead of by taxation. The result has been to make money cheap, and so to force up prices of goods expressed in money. Until these policies are discontinued, the problem of inflation is insoluble. It cannot be solved by price fixing, and it cannot be solved by the proposed Bretton Woods Fund, which would try to meet the problem by forcing the world's stronger currencies to support the weaker. It can be solved only by a return to sound monetary and economic policies in each country.

Eighteenth Congressional District, California, Part of Largest Dairy County in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the article I herewith include with my brief remarks is self-speaking to those who have not heretofore realized the import of Los Angeles County with reference to the milk production of the Nation.

And, Mr. Speaker, as this splendid article, written by my friend Schwartz of the authoritative magazine, the California Dairyman is read, I again state that the dairying industry in the eastern and northern portion of the Eighteenth District, which I have the honor to represent, is one of the most prosperous and painstaking in this great dairy county. At the county and State fairs, in the milk-testing competition and in the tests wherein awards are made, the dairy herds in and about Hynes, Clearwater, Artesia, Bellflower, Downey, Norwalk are all and are always well up toward the top—if not at the top.

Recently, State-wide representatives of the dairying and feed industries of California were here at Washington. It clearly appears that population growth, shortage of feed grown this year, lack of supply from usual sources, lack of imported copra and other needs—these elements enter into the need of immediate attention to the peculiar problems of reconversion of California in this field. It appears California milk and feed producers need a fraction more than do those industries in any other State, if they are to continue on even keel sufficient to produce efficiently in this era of food shortage.

I am informed every quart of milk bottled there these last few months is at 1 cent a bottle loss.

No doubt the OPA is aware and no doubt it will conscientiously and immediately meet the issues involved.

DAIRYING IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

(By Paul L. Schwartz, Dairy Specialist and Industrial Relations, the California Dairyman, Hynes, Calif.)

Most people know that the State of Wisconsin is the largest dairy State in the country, that it has the most cows, produces the most milk, and that it is referred to as America's dairyland. But very few people are aware of the fact that Los Angeles County is the largest dairy county in the United States and that the milk producers here receive more money for their milk production, annually, than do the dairymen in any other of the some 3,076 counties of our 48 States. For the past fiscal year this amounted to $44,423,000, exceeding the combined total of all other livestock production, such as poultry and eggs, beef, pork, lamb, horses, rabbits, etc., in the county. These figures are just about doubled when a break-down of cost figures is examined, bringing the total sum of nearly $90,000,000 involved in our local milk production, viz:

Feed costs	$26,000,000
Labor costs	8,000,000
Miscellaneous costs	9,000,000
Total	43,500,000
Milk receipts	44,423,000
Total	87,923,000

Los Angeles County is the biggest money dairy county, not because it is one of the country's biggest counties in area, for, on the contrary, an exceedingly minor portion of the territory is actually utilized in dairy operations—but because of the highly professionalized, highly intensified type of progressive dairying conducted.

Unlike other dairy sections of America, Los Angeles County has a distinctive, superior, and different kind of dairy industry. Climate, economics, and a business-versus-a-mode-of-life attitude on the part of the dairymen are responsible for this peculiarly advanced state of dairy affairs. Because of climate, we cannot raise our own hay, grain, or calves * * * we must draw upon the San Joaquin Valley, Lancaster, and Imperial Valley for our alfalfa hay to the tune of more than half a million tons annually. For our concentrates, in normal times, we depend upon Hawaii, the Philippines, South America, east Africa, and other parts of the world in addition to our domestic sources—while our replacements of burnt-out cows are obtained about equally from the central and northern part of the State, and from the other 10 Western and Northwestern States. We are increasing our cow population in the county a little over 10 percent per year.

The present milking life of a cow in Los Angeles County is less than 2 years and some dairies are replacing their herds at the rate of 15 percent per month. Unless a cow can produce around 40 pounds of butterfat monthly, we cannot afford to keep that cow. That's

why we top the Nation in milk production, averaging more than 400 pounds of fat per cow per year, compared to the national average of only 180 pounds, and the State average of 269 pounds. There are around 1,000 dairy producers in the county averaging over 100 cows per herd, with a value per cow of around $200. The county cow population at present is close to 125,000.

Our milk producers devote their entire time to their dairy work, which is their sole source of revenue, compared to other sections of the country where the milk and cream check is a secondary and frequently a minor source of income. Our Los Angeles dairymen have long ago learned to appreciate the value and indispensability of high producing cattle. By increasing their butterfat yield per cow 220 percent above the national average, they have trebled their income above feed costs. There is still lots of room for improvement and bigger profits, as is manifested by the following compilation of data obtained from the dairy-herd-improvement associations, showing how sharply income over feed costs rises as the production level increases.[1]

Level of butterfat production	Value of product	Feed cost	Income over feed cost
100 pounds	$94	$83	$11
200 pounds	176	98	78
300 pounds	253	114	144
400 pounds	338	130	208
500 pounds	411	142	269
600 pounds	493	159	334

Nowhere else in the United States, if not in the world, is there such a high quality of milk produced as there is in Los Angeles County. Every dairy barn is compelled by law to have running water in it—every cow must be washed and scrubbed each time before she is milked, twice daily, and this milk is delivered twice daily to the processing plants in the cities of the county, where it is pasteurized, homogenized, bottled, and delivered to the consumer. A small percentage of raw milk is distributed, and this is on the decrease. Whereas in the big metropolitan centers of the country, such as New York City, Chicago, et al., their grade A pasteurized milk contains less than 10,000 bacteria per cubic centimeter, our pasteurized milk will persistently run around 100 per cubic centimeter; in many instances our raw milk will average less than 1,000 per cubic centimeter on a yearly average.

Our cows are out in the sunshine all year and producing an abundance of vitamin D in their milk. During normal times we supplement our alfalfa hay and concentrates with such highly vitaminized and mineralized feeds as Hawaiian pineapple, grape meal, olive meal, Kuder (orange) meal, raisins, etc. No other dairy section in the country produces such superior quality of milk.

Milk consumption is still only about half what it should be, according to our national and State dairy councils, our dieticians, medical authorities, milk and dairy products handlers. Despite VJ-day the demand still exceeds the supply of milk, with some 40,000 gallons daily going to the armed forces, an amount sufficient to take care of 112,000 families.

The Government subsidy, which expires next June, has made it possible for our milk producers to operate on a profitable basis. Most dairymen do not favor subsidies in theory and it is hoped that an early announcement will be forthcoming regarding provisions for sustained butterfat prices to the producer in lieu of subsidies.

[1] These are national figures for 1944. Los Angeles County values and feed costs are about 30 percent higher.

Free Market Versus Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Mr. Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the New York Times:

FREE MARKET VERSUS BLACK MARKET

(By Henry Hazlitt)

"It's clear to everybody," said Paul A. Porter, the new Price Administrator, one day last week, "that if price controls were removed now, the prices of most goods would rise sharply."

It is at least clear to everybody that if price controls were removed now, the legal prices of many goods would rise sharply. But it may be doubted whether actual prices would rise as much. To the extent that real price rises did occur, they would set in motion economic forces that would probably mean lower actual prices earlier than continued price control could bring them.

As one illustration we may turn to meat. Thomas E. Wilson, chairman of Wilson & Co., declares that the black market in meat, which has been flourishing ever since price control was imposed, is "worse now than it has ever been." Large packers such as Wilson must buy their livestock at ceiling, and are at a distinct disadvantage with black-market buyers, who pay overceiling prices and so get a large percentage of the available meat. A report from Chicago declared last week that the leading packers are largely "out of the market" for beef cattle. The result of this necessarily is either to intensify the meat shortage or to increase the flow through the black market. Price control, creating bad price relationships, contributes to the beef shortage in other ways. Farmers are reluctant to feed animals to a finish because outlets have been found for good corn that pay off better than feeding to livestock.

Few persons seem to recognize the major role that price-fixing and other forms of Government intervention have played in intensifying the famine abroad. A dispatch to this newspaper from Madrid reported that the food shortage in Spain, which has been acute all winter, became even more acute last week as a result of Government decrees directed against the black market. "The most immediate effect was felt among the poorer classes, who suddenly found their supply of black-market bread cut off. The little black-market bread that was available rose in price overnight from one and a half pesetas for a 150-gram loaf to two and a half pesetas, or about 25 cents. The official price is about 3 cents." On the same day a dispatch from Vienna reported that, according to a study by the Austrian official labor chamber, "the black market is playing a major role in keeping the Viennese common man fed, despite all reports that only the rich trade there." And it was found that the supplementary foodstuffs he buys on the black market above the official daily ration cost more than twice as much as the whole official ration does.

Price controllers frequently cite black-market prices as if they represented what free-market prices would be if price control ceased to exist. But there are at least three major reasons why black-market prices are invariably and sometimes incomparably higher than free-market prices would be if there were no price control:

1. Price control reduces output and creates shortages by making it impossible for many established producers to continue production. The fly-by-night black-market producers who strive to take their place never have the same capital equipment, efficiency, know-how, or honesty; they inevitably produce poorer goods at higher costs.

2. Black-market sellers always add a high premium to cover the legal risks they are taking. This premium increases—as last week's report from Spain illustrates—the more energetic and drastic the drive against the black market becomes.

3. Uncontrolled by business ethics, desire for good will, or publicity, black-market prices are always discriminatory. Different prices are asked of different buyers, depending upon their individual purchasing power or eagerness to get the goods. The markets for nylons at $20 and then at $10 a pair are skimmed off, for example, before they are offered at $6. The buyer in a black market is more easily cheated because he is more in the dark concerning what the going price actually is. For all these reasons black-market prices are never a dependable guide to what free prices would be in an uncontrolled market.

It is no doubt true that some prices would rise sharply if price controls were removed. But this very price rise, increasing profit margins, would stimulate maximum production, tending to bring the price down again as soon as the new production came on the market. Prices might, it is true, continue to rise in spite of production because of governmental policies creating a further excess of money and credit. But the cure for that could only be abandonment of such policies, not price control.

Wretched Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I introduce the following editorial from the Tulsa Daily World, Tulsa, Okla., of March 22, 1946:

WRETCHED APPOINTMENTS

Objections to the appointment of Commodore J. K. Vardaman, Jr., to the board of the Reserve bank system have reached the stage of accusation and denunciation. Allowing for politics and all that, the hearing before a banking committee of the Senate has reached a stage in which the people of the country must take pained interest. An unwilling witness has lately testified to doubtful stock deals, and bankers and financial men generally have testified the commodore is not well equipped for the duties involved. His experience it too limited, even if he were entirely in the clear in other respects.

This episode is another illustration of the talent of President Truman for objectionable appointments. He nominated Ed Pauley and Commodore Vardaman about the same time. The Pauley appointment raised a storm, and the utmost the President, the national chairman of the Democratic Party and others could do failed to land him in a high place in the Navy Department. Pauley had been mixed into too many deals, and the nomination had to be withdrawn. It is humiliating for a President to be turned down pointedly and repeatedly. The President is

allowed a great deal of latitude in appointments, but the Senate's constitutional duty is to check up on all nominees for the higher places in Government. Sometimes, of course, this senatorial prerogative is abused, but ordinarily the veto power is used with judgment and conscience. In the matter of the two appointments here alluded to it is evident the President has persisted in demands for confirmation of men who should never have been appointed.

A lasting effect of such instances as that of Pauley and Vardaman is that it clouds other appointments. These instances are likely to produce great curiosity as to other nominees. The saying is that Mr. Truman is determined to fill the high places with his pals from Missouri. Thus doubt is cast in advance upon any man from that State whom the President may prefer. That, obviously, can work rank injustice to future appointees. We are sure the President did not use his better judgment in making the two appointments in question, and he was particularly unfortunate in his stubbornness. He sticks too close to his Missouri friends without the use of due diligence in finding out if they meet national specifications.

Large Wholesale Grocery Firm Asks Continuation of Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach debate and decision upon the subject of OPA, I received a most significant telegram which I herewith incorporate in these few remarks.

The firm sending me this wire, dated March 15, 1946, is one of the oldest and largest wholesale grocery firms and distributors in the State of California:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 15, 1946.*
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As wholesale grocers we regard inflationary crisis as grave. We urge you to press for vigorous action at earliest possible moment. Renew without crippling amendments all stabilization and price-control measures. We urge you continue food-subsidy program. Our future prosperity and security demands price line be held.

HAAS BARUCH & CO.
ROBERT TRIEST,
Executive Vice President.

Jackson Day Dinner Address of Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. GOSSETT
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. President, on the night of March 23 the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] delivered a Jackson Day address in the city of Boise, Idaho. It was one of the best addresses I have ever heard. and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When we say Jackson Day our thoughts naturally turn to the past and to the forefathers of America. And when we turn our thoughts to our forefathers we naturally think of the fundamental principles for which they stood and the fundamental principles upon which they founded America, of the struggles they relentlessly endured to imbue the people with the philosophy in which they vested their full faith and best interests. This was not easy. Indeed, those men must have been inspired to have been tenacious to the end in fighting for the truths which they "held to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." And to secure these rights, "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to curselves and our posterity," they had the courage to ordain and to establish the Constitution of the United States of America. Though Jackson was not President until some 50 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence he is connected closely in our thoughts to those former events surrounding the foundation of our country because he had the same tenacity as our forefathers in fighting for the perpetuation of those fundamental truths laid down for us as a pattern to be followed through the years. His faith in those truths was such that, at the Jefferson Day dinner in the 1830's, when sectionalism ran rampant and threatened the unity and the very existence of our country, he said: "Our Federal Union—it can and must be preserved."

In thinking of these broad and expansive ideas of fundamental truths, of unalienable rights of men, of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, of Jackson as a symbol of all of these, why do we gather here tonight and partake of a repast worthy of the highest praise? You will remember from your history that when discord and disunity threatened the completion of our Constitution, Benjamin Franklin dismissed the meeting and recalled the delegates back to dinner, and after breaking bread with one another, that discord and disunity of thought dissolved and they went forward with their work. Jackson, too, knew the advantage of fellowmen breaking bread together. The idea of $100 dinners is not so far from Jackson, either; Jefferson, Jackson, and you remember the Democratic $1 dinners in Bryan's day. But the $100 dinner is properly named after Jackson—for listen to this for one of his ordinary White House affairs:

"About one-half after 6 o'clock we sat down to dinner. The table was very splendidly laid and illuminated. There was a large chandelier hanging over the middle of it with 32 candles besides those on the table, mantles and on the piers. The first course was soup in the French style; then beef bouille, next wild turkey boned and dressed with brains; after that fish, then chicken cold and dressed white, interlarded with slices of tongue and garnished with dressed salad; then canvasback ducks and celery; afterwards partridges with sweetbreads and last pheasants and old Virginia ham. The dishes were placed in succession on the table so as to give full effect to the appearance and then removed and carved on a side table by the servants. The first dessert was jelly and small tarts in the Turkish style, then blanche mode and kisses with dried fruits in them. Then preserves of various kinds, after them ice cream and lastly grapes and oranges. The wines on the table were sherry and port to drink with soups and the first course of meats. When the wild turkey and fish were served, Madeira was handed and while the wild fowl was eaten champagne was constantly poured out by the servants; after these were gone through with, claret was substituted to be taken with the dessert and old sherry was put on to drink with the fruits. As soon as all had taken what their appetites could possibly endure, we left the table and returned to the drawing room."

Jackson evidently spent a $100 per plate for his dinner. We eat all that is good for us and give the balance to Democracy's cause. Then we renew our faith in and unite again our efforts to keep perpetual those ideals and truths for which the patriots of America lived and fought, that we may better carry the torch of truth and liberty they lighted for us.

You people of Idaho are magnificiently fulfilling the responsibility which is yours because of Idaho's heritage incident to her statehood by electing to the United States Senate two Democrats who are wholeheartedly fighting for the President's program for reconversion, peace, and prosperity in America, for the perpetuation of those truths which our forefathers "held to be self-evident." You are, I am sure, fully cognizant of the need for keeping these men in the Senate. The President needs their support. America needs a Democratic Congress now to avoid the disasters we suffered following the close of World War I, and Idaho can contribute to the averting of depression and inflation and those maladies now threatening our country by returning these men to the Senate.

Your Senator TAYLOR has in the brief period of a year made a notable record in the Senate. He has spoken effectively. He has cast his vote for legislation intended to raise living standards and conditions of those who labor in the field and in the factory, and those groups which suffer discrimination. He is concerned about small business and has been an active member of the Special Committee on Small Business, in which connection he has participated in committee hearings in this part of the country. He is particularly attentive to grazing and other public-lands problems which are of great interest to our part of the country. But he is not narrow in his interests and in his vision. He sees that there is great future in the United Nations. Senator TAYLOR is able, tireless, and fearless, a representative in whom you can take pride.

You know better than I how well your former Governor and now your Senator is equipped to represent the people of Idaho. He knows your problems because they are his problems. As a former Governor, Senator GOSSETT has formed close friendships among others who served their States in like capacities. There are 28 Members of the Senate who are former State chief executives. Senator GOSSETT has prestige and effectiveness because of this experience.

Seniority in point of service in the Senate governs selection of committee chairmen. It even determines the rank of individual members on committees. It is a powerful influence. The year's service which Senator GOSSETT will have put in before the opening of the new Congress next January will give him a position ranking above all of the new men who will be elected this fall. That seniority means that he will be a much more effective force in the Senate for Idaho, for the Democratic Party, and for the Nation than would a new man in that seat.

I hope Idaho will find it fitting, when the time comes, to return these two men to the Senate to help insure the fulfillment of President Truman's program, to avert a repetition of the disasters of the years following the election of a Republican Congress in 1918, when the cost of clothing skyrocketed 200 percent, rents vaulted 54 percent, housefurnishings 179 percent, and sugar 300 percent, and about 6,000,000 workers lost their jobs

and pay rolls decreased almost 50 percent. This catastrophe was followed by the even greater Republican boom and bust cycle, culminating in the great crash of 1929. No one can forget those bitter days of America's great unemployment period.

But to avoid another repetition of a black period in our history let us be constructive and use a positive approach. Let us talk about the concept of full employment for a moment. I have lived with that idea from its beginning. It had its origin in Philadelphia with the Declaration of Philadelphia of 1944. Fifty nations from the globe, through their representatives, decided that governments' aim should be the full employment of its people. Since 1944 these same nations have worked to make that ideal part of their political systems. We have incorporated the idea into law. The concept will ever be greater than the actuality, but if there ever was a governmental practice which promoted the concept of providing for the general welfare better than the concept of full employment of the people I do not know where it could be found. That is a gift to our Nation of Democratic statesmanship. That is a gift to our people which may in time overcome the cycle of booms and depressions. Our prayer tonight is that the concept can be made an actuality. It is only from the Republican side of government that this concept has been sneered at. Cynics, ladies and gentlemen, are not statesmen. Cynics should not lead our Goverenment.

Closely connected with the full-employment issue is the need to raise substandard wages. Maintenance of purchasing power requires not only jobs, but jobs that will provide all the necessities and some of the comforts of life. Good wages are necessary not merely because industry can afford to pay them, or that they pay for themselves in increased production, but they are indispensable if our economy is to be strong, productive, and progressive. No employer of men has a right to profit because he is unwilling to pay his employees as much as his competitor. Certain industries, in equity and justice as well as in sound economics, must not be allowed to exploit their employees by paying wages substantially lower than are paid in other industries. High wages mean better markets for goods that stimulate economic activity. Economic activity means job opportunities and business opportunities, more profits, and a higher standard of living for all. An expanding market is the key to a healthy economy.

The real threat to our economy today is that ordinary workers are not able, and may not tomorrow be able, to meet the ordinary expenses with which they are confronted. Their suffering is the suffering of the Nation, for we cannot achieve full production and full employment with dragging anchors.

America can be the promised land where the well-paid worker does better work, where the man who toils, eats three square meals a day, where he is in good health because he knows that his needs can be met by his pay check, and that his family is not faced with the never-ending cycle of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The current housing shortage is an issue replete with political significance. With increasing numbers of veterans and others unable to find a place to live, a tense and potentially explosive situation has developed. There now exists an opportunity to perform a real public service that will be appreciated and lauded by millions of citizens. There is also, by the same token, a made-to-order opportunity for criticism by the opposition if effective relief is not provided. But once again we have assumed the positive approach in the program submitted by Housing Administrator Wilson Wyatt. Government-industry cooperation is the essence of this program.

All of these constructive programs initiated for the general welfare of the American people, full employment, an adequate living wage, and adequate housing facilities, need the continuance of a Democratic Congress to insure proper and complete fruition.

Because of the farsightedness of the Members of our last Congress our returning soldier boys of World War II are receiving benefits far exceeding those granted to veterans of any other conflict. Cash benefits for disability are higher than those received in any other country. Educational benefits, unemployment compensation, and special loan assistance has been made available to veterans for the first time. Free medical care for service-connected disability is available to all veterans. Care for non-service-connected disability is available to all veterans who are unable to pay for such care, provided that bed space is available in a veterans' hospital. A total of 300,000 veterans were receiving college educations at Government expense in February 1946. By September, an estimated 750,000 will be benefiting in this way. But the farsightedness of our last Congress extends beyond these personally received benefits. Through these benefits extended we have assured America of her future leadership.

Under the Democratic leadership of our late President Roosevelt a firm foundation was laid for lasting world peace. Under President Truman this policy is going forward to fruition, with full participation of the United States in the United Nations Organization. In the field of foreign relations lies America's opportunity for her greatest contribution to the world. Again we need to avert a repetition of a black spot in our history. And again we need a Democratic Congress to give the proper support needed from America to the United Nations Organization.

In 1918, just after World War I ended, the people elected a Republican Congress. The first thing the Republicans did was to scuttle the League of Nations—the instrument which then gave some promise of future peace. They scuttled it not by frontal attack, but by loading it down with reservations which made cooperation between the United States and other nations impossible.

A forewarning of what may happen if a Republican Congress is elected in 1946 was given last November when 16 Republican Senators joined Senator ROBERT A. TAFT (Republican of Ohio) in an attempt to put through amendments which would have emasculated the United Nations Organization bill to such an extent as to have made it impossible for the United States to play a really effective role in effecting and maintaining the peace. This forewarning was given in even sharper terms when Senator TAFT, his crippling amendments having gone down to defeat, could not bring himself to vote "yes" on the United Nations Organization bill itself. There were five other Republican Senators who joined Senator TAFT in voting "no."

Ladies and gentlemen, we have talked politics because this is a political rally. But after all, there is a deeper significance in all that we do and say at times like this. America slipped to her lowest moral, political, and national position in 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922. We can glibly say that that was all a result of the war. It was not entirely, of course, because men's selfishness got the better of them. It was because of ambitious persons both here and elsewhere wanted to control government not for the benefit of the people, but for their own benefit. The years 1919 to 1922 were more costly to our people than was World War I, itself. The loss of world leadership and the slipping away from idealism, the turning of our backs upon responsibility, the turning out of the light of civilization, and an invitation for the whole world to turn to sordidness, all that was the blight. In its wake, that movement toward world dictatorship, partisan killings and revolution came. Also, the mighty depression engulfed us and the whole world. Men in Idaho lost their farms because other men in Idaho lost their respect for American idealism. I could go on painting the black picture indefinitely. I do not wish to, it is too sad. Still, we have today all of the opportunity to repeat our mistakes of that time. Then too, the world over is developing selfish, ambitious trends. Who is to guide this Nation during this fateful period? Who rescued us from the depression? What leadership is responsible for our changed attitude in world relations? What leadership is responsible for our enlarged notions about money? You may answer that for yourselves. But as long as the memory of history remains, it was the Republican leadership under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover that led us down. And the people in 1932 realized that those men and their philosophy could not get us up. The American people turned to a finer leadership. They got it and not once have they been dissolutioned. Hope was restored to our land, prosperity to our people. Idealism has not been tramped in the mud, and victoriously we have won another war. That is the leadership for us. It is for us here tonight to say to ourselves and to our fellow citizens—We are not turning our backs on that leadership, we are sustaining it, and we will see the victory for democracy at home continued and the victory for democracy in the world assured.

President Gravely Mistaken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "President Gravely Mistaken," published in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., of March 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT GRAVELY MISTAKEN

President Truman is making a grave mistake. It is evident that the American people do not want the program he has urged on Congress—a program of increased Federal bureaucracy, more Federal bossing of the Nation's affairs, and continued heavy taxing to finance this socialistic course.

Many of the President's own party have revolted against his demands. His housing plan is an illustration. The House, in passing this, stripped it of a provision for huge subsidies to building-material manufacturers and other dangerous features. And about 140 Democrats either voted against these features, with Republicans who opposed them, or didn't vote at all.

Yet the President keeps insisting that Congress enact his whole bureaucratic spending program. Congress is not to listen to the voice of the people, whom it represents. It is to do as the White House says, and thereby violate the first principle of our democracy, which is that the people rule through the Congress they elect.

Again, in his Jackson Day speech, the President railed at Congress for refusing to obey him, instead of representing the people. With exceedingly bad grace, he virtually charged that the 140 Democrats who refused to accept his housing plan had been controlled by a "real estate lobby."

No doubt there is such a lobby. But since when, under the American system, has it been all wrong for a private interest to try to influence Congress, and entirely proper for any bureau to swarm down on Congress with all the persuasion and pressure-group backing it can muster?

To make a bad matter worse, Secretary of Commerce Wallace has urged that Democrats who refuse to support administration measures be purged from the party. Who is Wallace to set himself up as the party's high priest and sacred oracle? He was a rebel in the Republican Party he left to become a New Dealer. And when he urges dissenting Democrats to return to the ideals of Jefferson, he confesses an astonishing ignorance of Jefferson's political principles.

Jefferson stood iron-fronted for simplicity and economy in the Federal Government, for State rights, for freedom of thought, speech, and action; for strict adherence to the Constitution; and—of special interest in connection with the housing bill—against bounties of every kind.

It is for those very principles that the revolting Southern Democrats are contending now. Senator McCLELLAN voiced the spirit of just that type of democracy in his Jackson Day dinner speech in Little Rock. He put in vigorous words many of the things that have been in the minds of Arkansas people. And Governor Laney added emphasis to them with his own similar views.

Let's hear no more of such European dictator stuff as purging men from the party. No man can set the party's course—neither a convert to it, nor the President himself. Only the people have that right. The President should recognize that fact, should respect Congress as the voice of the people, and should accept it as such, and get in step with it. Every consideration of national and party welfare pleads with him to act with that wisdom.

Black Market in Meats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this morning Mr. R. J. Eggert, associate director, marketing department, American Meat Institute, made a statement before the House Committee on Agriculture revealing the results of a survey of retail meat sales in 11 representative cities throughout the United States. This survey presents certified factual results of their findings as to extent of actual black market in meats.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of Mr. Eggers, as follows:

Between February 26 and March 28, 1946, the Statistical Research Co., of Chicago, and C. C. Chappelle Co., Chicago, two well-known independent marketing-survey agencies, surveyed 11 cities from coast to coast for the purpose of determining the relation of actual retail selling prices on meats to OPA retail ceiling prices.

These market-survey agencies did not question meat dealers about prices. The procedure followed was that the agency used impartial housewife shoppers to actually purchase several thousands of cuts of meat from retailers in the ordinary course of business. All types of retail stores were shopped in all types of neighborhoods. In all, one or more cuts of meat were purchased by shoppers in 1,803 stores in 11 different cities.

For the purpose of determining the trend Washington, D. C., was shopped twice, the first time ending February 28 and the second time ending March 27.

Weighing of the meat was done by competent members of the staff of the research agencies. Meats were graded by qualified meat experts on leave from the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army, who were retained by research agencies.

I believe this study to be conservative for the following reasons:

1. The study was limited to retail stores since there was no practical way to shop hotels, restaurants, and night clubs.

2. All purchases were made by housewife shoppers, strangers to the meat retailer.

3. The purchases represented only the specific cuts of meat that were available to the shopper at the time. Many stores said they were out of cuts requested.

4. There were a sizable number of cuts that were prepared in such a way that it was impossible to price them under OPA regulations.

Excluding the second Washington, D. C., survey, of the 1,803 stores in the 11 cities, over-the-ceiling prices were charged in 83 percent, or in over four out of five stores.

The percentage of stores by cities charging overceiling prices were as follows: 79 percent of the stores in New York City, 85 percent of the stores in Newark, 77 percent of the stores in Providence, 81 percent of the stores in Washington, 91 percent of the stores in Chicago, 85 percent of the stores in Indianapolis, 86 percent of the stores in Milwaukee, 89 percent of the stores in Memphis, 94 percent of the stores in Houston, 84 percent of the stores in Denver, 84 percent of the stores in Los Angeles.

The average for the 11 cities showed that 83 percent of the stores were over the ceiling. In other words, housewives have less than one chance in five of buying meat in stores in these 11 cities at OPA legal prices.

Overceiling charges in the New York area which includes New York City, Providence, R. I., and Newark, N. J., with a combined population of over 8,000,000 people, classified according to the cuts by species, show as follows:

	Cuts bought over ceiling (percent)	Amount over	
		Cents	Percent
Beef	72	16	42
Veal	72	16	40
Lamb	56	8	17
Pork	65	10	28
Together	67	13	33

In the same area the average overcharges and the extreme overcharges were as follows:

	Percent over ceiling	
	All meat bought	Highest
Beef	31	197
Veal	27	262
Lamb	7	129
Pork	16	118
Together	21	262

Thus, it is seen from the above that in the New York area, when hundreds of cuts of meat purchased are all combined, that for every dollar the housewife has to spend for meat at OPA legal ceilings, she pays a 21-cent tax to the black market.

The first survey of Washington, D. C., made February 27 and 28, shows as follows:

	Cuts bought over ceiling (percent)	Amount over	
		Cents	Percent
Beef	64	7	20
Veal	76	8	21
Lamb	52	5	10
Pork	56	5	14
Together	60	6	16

The following figures show overcharges on all meats purchased and the extreme overcharges for Washington.

	Percent over ceiling	
	All meat bought	Highest
Beef	13	118
Veal	14	110
Lamb	2	60
Pork	7	100
Together	9	

The second survey of Washington, D. C., completed Wednesday, March 27, has not, as yet, been analyzed by the agency. However, the agency advises me that the second survey shows that the black market in Washington is more widespread and at a higher percent mark-up than the first one. A summary of this second survey will be filed with the committee when tabulated.

The tables attached show the result of the survey for each of the 11 cities which have a combined population of nearly 15,000,000 people. An analysis of this summary for all 11 cities attached shows the following:

	Cuts bought over ceiling (percent)	Amount over	
		Cents	Percent
Beef	74	13	35
Veal	75	13	35
Lamb	55	7	15
Pork	64	9	25
Together	68	11	29

The average and extremes in overcharges for the 11 cities combined are as follows:

	Percent over ceiling	
	All meat bought	Highest
Beef	26	197
Veal	24	262
Lamb	6	193
Pork	15	126
Together	20	262

An analysis of the surveys shows that overcharges are widespread and flagrant. Illegal mark-ups are not limited to the higher-valued cuts consumed by higher-income groups. As a matter of fact, in some areas the overcharge was higher in percentage on the lower-grade cuts ordinarily purchased by the workingman. In some of the cities the over-ceiling prices were much higher in stores located in the lower-income areas than

elsewhere. It is clear from the surveys that all segments of our people, rich and poor, are paying black-market prices.

The survey also shows that all types and sizes of stores charge over ceiling prices.

In January and February 1944 the Office of Price Administration made a study of retail meat dealer compliance with OPA regulations under supervision of Mr. Joseph A. Thornton, head of the Food Trade Relations Branch of the OPA, and surveyed 11 cities in North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, and South Dakota. This survey shows that more than 2 years ago that of the cities surveyed from 81 to 100 percent of the retail stores were violating maximum prices and that the above-ceiling prices ranged from 3 percent to 14 percent.

This survey doesn't purport to show why over-ceiling charges are made. Whether the store makes them for profit, or whether the price charged was the usual and ordinary retail mark-up from an over-ceiling wholesale price. Neither does the survey attempt to show whether the over-ceiling charges were willful and deliberate, the result of confusion, or the inability to understand the complicated retail ceilings. I am sure that retailers don't like the black market any better than the rest of us.

The study does show that from coast to coast:

1. Illegal prices on some cuts of meat are twice the ceiling and in a few instances three times the legal price.

2. Overceiling prices were charged in 83 percent of the stores.

3. Sixty-eight percent of the cuts purchased were over the ceiling by an average of 29 percent.

4. The average overcharge on all cuts purchased, including those sold below ceilings, those sold at ceilings, and those sold over ceilings, was 20 percent.

5. That the black-market inflation in meat is increasing.

In other words, the housewife has to spend $1.20 for the amount of meat that she could buy for $1 at OPA ceilings. If the amount paid for meat above the ceiling is as much over throughout the entire country as in the 11 cities surveyed, the overceiling expenses to the consumer for his meat is in excess of $1,250,000,000.

TABLE 1.—*How the black market affects consumer meat prices—Summary results of a coast-to-coast survey* [1]

	Total [2]	New York	Providence	Newark	Washington	Chicago	Indianapolis	Milwaukee	Memphis	Houston	Denver	Los Angeles
1. Number of stores visited	1,803	401	35	74	242	392	58	70	122	100	109	200
2. Number of cuts of meat purchased	3,495	739	69	136	516	724	102	145	240	192	224	408
3. Percentage of stores selling one or more cuts over ceiling	83	79	77	85	81	91	85	86	89	94	84	84
4. Percentage over ceiling on all meat bought:												
Beef	26	31	30	41	13	32	17	15	19	23	7	11
Veal	24	29	32	37	14	25	7	12	17	31	17	26
Lamb	6	8	7	5	2	6	2	(−5)	3	12	3	5
Pork	15	15	19	26	7	14	1	9	9	14	12	22
Total	20	21	21	30	9	23	10	10	14	20	9	13
5. Highest percentage overcharge:		New York area			Chicago area							
Beef	197	197			118	174			103	92	100	81
Veal	262	262			110	119			74	71	48	121
Lamb	193	129			60	193			31	116	44	73
Pork	126	118			100	94			48	106	126	108
All items	262	262			118	193			103	116	126	121

[1] Source: Shopping surveys made by independent, reliable market research agencies; Statistical Research Co., Chicago, and C. C. Chapelle Co., Chicago, February 1946.
[2] Average weighted by population.

TABLE 2.—*How the black market affects consumer meat prices—summary results of coast-to-coast survey* [1]

	Total [2]	New York	Providence	Newark	Washington	Chicago	Indianapolis	Milwaukee	Memphis	Houston	Denver	Los Angeles
1. Percentage of cuts over ceilings:												
Beef	74	69	75	84	64	88	90	76	71	86	54	67
Veal	75	68	75	90	76	92	33	67	81	100	85	72
Lamb	55	59	44	47	52	59	70	23	54	53	46	50
Pork	64	62	71	81	56	66	46	56	51	67	74	70
Total	68	65	67	79	60	77	70	63	63	79	64	67
2. Cents per pound overcharge on cuts over ceiling:												
Beef	$0.13	$0.16	$0.11	$0.17	$0.07	$0.12	$0.06	$0.07	$0.10	$0.10	$0.05	$0.07
Veal	.13	.16	.13	.16	.08	.10	.09	.09	.08	.11	.08	.12
Lamb	.07	.07	.14	.07	.05	.07	.05	.06	.05	.09	.06	.06
Pork	.09	.10	.09	.14	.05	.08	.04	.07	.07	.08	.07	.11
Total	.11	.13	.11	.15	.06	.10	.07	.06	.09	.10	.06	.09
3. Percentage overcharge on cuts over ceiling:												
Beef	35	42	32	44	20	36	20	20	29	28	14	18
Veal	35	41	34	37	21	28	32	23	26	31	22	36
Lamb	15	15	36	16	10	16	12	14	12	25	15	15
Pork	25	27	24	36	14	22	12	18	19	22	19	30
Total	29	32	31	38	16	30	17	19	25	27	16	22

[1] Source: Shopping surveys made by independent, reliable market research agencies—Statistical Research Co., Chicago, and C. C. Chapelle Co., Chicago, February 1946.
[2] Average weighted by population.

Congress Should Continue and Increase Work of Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the agricultural appropriation bill for the coming year does not provide more money and more liberal regulations for the administration of the Farm Security Administration. I think that it is a sad mistake to sidestep this organization. Their powers should be increased, their loans should be liberalized, and the limit of loans should be increased.

The Farm Security Administration has done a grand job in my district. To help the veterans its work is needed more now than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, to give an idea of how important the work of this agency is I want to include in the record what this agency has accomplished in my district. A glance at the record more than proves its worth. Why are we slighting this agency while at the same time we are squandering billions abroad?

Loans made in Tenth Congressional District, Wisconsin, by the Farm Security Administration from inception of program through Dec. 31, 1945

Counties	Total	Rehabilitation (farm plan)	Farm ownership	Emergency (feed, seed, etc.)
Burnett	799	218	26	555
Lincoln	1,179	319	47	813
Polk	1,527	500	18	1,009
Price	1,081	316	71	694
Oneida	545	145	8	392
Rusk	721	345	65	311
Sawyer	700	210	24	466
Taylor	1,397	605	139	653
Washburn	1,218	291	39	888
Vilas	165	31	2	132
Iron	278	72	1	205
Ashland	633	152	10	471
Bayfield	932	232	23	677
Douglas	899	247	23	629
Total	12,074	3,683	496	7,895

Number of active and collection only FSA families in Tenth Congressional District, Wisconsin

County	Active rehabilitation	Active farm ownership	Active emergency (feed, seed, etc.)	Collection only (rehabilitation)
Burnett	63	20	15	28
Lincoln	87	35	51	20
Polk	148	13	101	32
Price	57	57	56	8
Oneida	29	6	25	17
Rusk	87	59	22	22
Sawyer	81	20	16	14
Taylor	109	117	7	35
Washburn	70	33	7	17
Vilas	5	2	4	7
Iron	7	1	1	13
Ashland	36	6	43	25
Bayfield	41	18	36	32
Douglas	36	19	11	27
Total	856	406	395	297

Number of FSA families in Tenth Congressional District, Wisconsin, who have paid their FSA loans in full

County	Paid (rehabilitation)	Paid emergency (feed, seed, etc.)	Paid farm ownership
Burnett	118	127	6
Lincoln	187	246	12
Polk	298	221	5
Price	234	319	14
Oneida	91	150	2
Rusk	227	121	6
Sawyer	111	190	4
Taylor	422	355	22
Washburn	171	170	6
Vilas	17	55	0
Iron	48	45	0
Ashland	82	132	4
Bayfield	150	226	5
Douglas	173	244	4
Total	2,329	2,601	90

Amount of money loaned in Tenth Congressional District, Wisconsin, by the Farm Security Administration from inception of program through Dec. 31, 1945

County	Cumulative FSA advances	Cumulative principal repayments	Cumulative interest payments	Total principal and interest	Unpaid principal balance
Burnett	$364,041.97	$242,849.23	$43,877.71	$286,726.94	$121,192.74
Lincoln	506,671.08	342,982.36	50,730.59	393,712.95	163,688.72
Polk	779,960.06	544,484.73	85,510.49	629,995.22	235,475.33
Price	417,128.28	270,153.81	43,151.04	313,304.85	146,974.47
Oneida	144,581.27	110,151.02	14,265.43	124,416.45	34,430.25
Rusk	633,603.96	380,778.15	64,036.47	444,814.62	252,825.81
Sawyer	344,645.49	205,414.03	33,539.42	238,953.45	139,231.46
Taylor	985,584.30	588,062.57	108,704.60	696,767.17	397,521.73
Washburn	461,020.66	319,196.09	51,003.17	370,199.26	141,824.57
Vilas	23,559.85	15,157.83	1,955.09	17,112.92	8,402.02
Iron	58,200.47	49,765.08	7,415.20	57,180.28	8,435.39
Ashland	193,754.64	143,428.83	21,064.36	164,493.19	50,326.11
Bayfield	265,830.38	189,396.06	31,783.69	221,179.75	76,434.32
Douglas	312,664.98	247,764.48	32,982.23	280,746.71	64,900.50
Total	5,491,247.69	3,649,584.27	590,019.49	4,239,603.76	1,841,663.42

Lincoln's Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, many books have been written about Abraham Lincoln, but the subject is never exhausted. Recently Mr. Hugh D. Hart, a native and former citizen of Arkansas and at present a prominent life-insurance executive in the State of Illinois, published a book entitled "Lincoln, the Man of the Ages." The closing passage of his epic poem in prose is as follows:

When storms arise, the crisis always raises up the man.
The hurricane will ever breed the wielder of a wand
To tone the elements to sublimity and calm.
Whoever says a storm cannot subside,
Or man can never walk, as Christ, upon the waves,
Knows not those undertones of destiny
Which men like Lincoln brought beneath their sway.
All nations and all tribes of men have crises.
The disposal of themselves and of the priceless things they cherish
Are now and then put to the buffeting of unruly seas;
But as the crescendo of a crisis grows,
Like a tidal wave upon a placid ocean,
Somewhere, somehow, a sailor brings his shaken ship to port;
The tumult dies, the perilous waves go down,
Obeying a captain who calls his shipmates to the deck,
To conquer a tempest.

This beautiful tribute reflects the high conception which America has of the spiritual qualities that were inherent in the life of Abraham Lincoln. Many splendid influences contributed to this leadership and none of the many religious organizations in which he expressed an interest have an exclusive claim upon him. Lincoln's parents and also his stepmother, Sarah Bush Lincoln, were members of a Baptist congregation and Lincoln more than once paid tribute to their religious life. He attended the Episcopal Church in Springfield with his wife and in Washington often went to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church.

Recently my attention was called to an incident involving the Foundry Methodist Church in Washingon which he sometimes attended. It was then located at Fourteenth and G Streets NW. One Sunday morning after a stirring missionary sermon by Bishop Matthew Simpson, Lincoln expressed a desire to contribute to the missionary society sponsored by the church, and sent a contribution of $150 to the organization. The Foundry Church commemorates this event in a beautiful stained glass window which has a reproduction of the certificate issued to the President by the book concern in New York and which, in a gold frame, was hung in the White House until his tragic death. It reads as follows:

This certifies that His Excellency Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America, is constituted a life director of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church by the payment of one hundred and fifty dollars.

Bishops E. S. JANES, DAVID TERRY.

One of the most eloquent tributes to Abraham Lincoln's faith was that of John Hay, who served as one of the great President's private secretaries. Speaking at the one hundredth anniversary of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church on November 16, 1903, he said:

Whatever is remembered or whatever lost, we ought never to forget that Abraham Lincoln, one of the mightiest masters of statecraft that history has known, was also one of the most devoted and faithful servants of Almighty God who have ever sat in the high places of the world. From that dim and chilly dawn when, standing on a railway platform in Springfield, half veiled by falling snowflakes from the crowd of friends and neighbors who had gathered to wish him Godspeed on his momentous journey, he acknowledged his dependence on God and asked for their prayers, to that sorrowful yet triumphant hour when he went to his account, he repeated over and over in every form of speech his faith and trust in that Almighty Power who rules the fate of men and nations.

This statement reflects the deep appreciation of our people for the profound and inspiring faith of Abraham Lincoln.

One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Beginning of Struggle for Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made over Station WINX on March 23, 1946, on the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the beginning of the struggle for Greek independence.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today marks the one hundred and twenty-fifth year since the beginning of the struggle for Greek independence. One hundred and twenty-five years ago, on March 25, 1821, a small band of Greeks raised the blue and white flag of the cross. One hundred and twent-five years ago began that long and agonizing struggle for the liberation of Greece from the tyranny of the old Turkish Empire. For 7 years the soil of Greece was harrowed and reddened in the struggle for freedom, but at the end of the 7 years the courage of the people and the valiant leadership of her patriots prevailed and culminated in the establishment of independence.

Then, as now, Greece received the moral and material support of the American people. The historic fact is that the strong bonds of Greek and American friendship were forged and tempered during that struggle.

President James Monroe voiced the sentiment of the people of the United States when he declared in his message to Congress on December 3, 1822: "The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as

it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States.

"A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

Greece became the first nation in Europe, after France, to follow the leadership of the new United States of America in breaking away from the tyranny and blind reactionism of older Europe. The period following the Greek revolution marked the turning point between the old and the new forms of government on the Continent. The Greek revolution was a people's war—a war to secure a more democratic way of life for all oppressed people everywhere.

The road to freedom had been long and difficult. In all, the Greeks revolted 18 times—18 revolts occurred before 1821 and freedom was not fully won throughout the nation until 1828.

Throughout the long history of Greece in times of freedom and in times of oppression, the Greek mind has tenaciously clung to the ideal of liberty, and the Greek spirit upholds the principle that life is of small value unless freedom is secure.

In the world of today, and in the immediate past, the people of Greece have not deviated from these historic principles. The Greeks have always wanted to live in peace as have the people of the United States, and both have always fought to preserve their ancient faith when threatened.

Early in World War II—in 1940—without a declaration of war, fascist Italy treacherously attacked the Greek nation. Mussolini had long planned this well-organized drive against Greece. He chose a time when Greece was endeavoring in all good faith to maintain neutrality, and when Greece was at its lowest ebb in military preparedness.

Remaining true to its history and to the Greek spirit, the nation rose and astonished not only the would-be aggressor but the world at large in crushing the Fascist attack.

Mussolini appealed to Hitler, who began his ruthless drive on Greece at a time when throughout the area of conflict the Allies were deployed and held down on battle fronts from Egypt to Iceland. All that could be given to Greece was a token support by Great Britain and that was not enough to hold off the inevitable and bitter victory of Germany in Greece. The Greek people met the Nazi assault with courage and skill. Again and again they held back the Nazi armies where skill alone was a deciding factor. They had little equipment; they had poor communications; they had little food; they had only their indomitable purpose and love of freedom to help them in the hopeless struggle. Here, once again, the sharp hills and rugged valleys of Greece were brightened by the rekindling of the light which shines throughout the history of that nation from Thermopylae to Roupel. This one-sided conquest of Greece was so bitterly contested that the long-planned German attack on Russia was delayed for several precious weeks and gave Great Britain the time necessary to strengthen her forces throughout the Mediterranean area.

After the German conquest had been completed and that cruel and autocratic war machine had begun the spoliation of the nation the people of Greece did not stop fighting. Their nation and the people were paying a terrible price to the Nazi conquerors, but the spirit of Greece remained unconquered. The people of Greece, individually and as a nation, became a secret army behind the lines—a dangerous and silent foe within the enemy's camp.

From Great Britain, and later the United States, calls went forth over hidden radio stations, by secret message and by secret agent, to the people of Greece to continue the struggle; to sabotage the plans of the enemy by destroying the physical wealth of the nation. They were urged to demolish their own bridges, railways, public buildings, public utilities, dams and waterways, ports, and all other facilities that might aid the Nazis in the further conquest of the Mediterranean.

Despite deliberate starvation and persecution by Nazi Germany, following the occupation of Greece, the people continued their silent struggle and support of the cause of the United Nations. Innocent hostages were shot by the hundreds, entire villages were wiped out, churches and museums were systematically plundered of famous and priceless classic antiquities.

During these dark days the Red Cross and the Greek War Relief under the direction of the United States and the Canadian Governments did what they could to alleviate the horrors imposed by the conquerors of the Greek people. Since the termination of the war the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has taken over the enormous job of administering to the immediate needs of the nation. But relief, as necessary as it is, is not alone sufficient. Greece must rebuild from the ground up. Its transportation system is largely destroyed; its bridges broken; its waterways mined and blocked; its ports disorganized. Inflation has depleted and is now in the process of destroying the economic structure throughout Greece. The health of the people has been undermined.

I again repeat that Greece has paid a terrible price for its part in the war against Germany and Italy. In January of this year I visited Greece as a member of the Mead, formerly Truman, Committee investigating the disposal of surplus property abroad. I can testify to the fact that Greece has many serious economic and political problems to be solved in the years ahead. These problems can only be worked out on a satisfactory basis by hard work on the part of the people of Greece together with financial aid and a sympathetic understanding of the problems on the part of the other nations of the world.

It should be the aim of the other members of the United Nations to render assistance for the reconstruction of war-torn nations so that these countries may be able to help themselves in the vast job of reconstruction. It would not, in my opinion, be constructive to make any of these nations economic or political dependents of the great powers. However, with the energy historically inherent in the Greek people and supplied with the necessary tools with which to work, I am satisfied that they can work out their problems and once again Greece will take her rightful place among the family of nations.

The Greek Nation responded magnificently to the invasions by Italy and Germany. It responded with courage, in full knowledge of the cost to itself, to the pleas made by the Allies to destroy German plans during the occupation by Germany. Promises of future aid helped them to carry on through the trying period of the occupation in the hope that Greece would rise again. This hope, that their nation might one day rebuild, aided by those whom they supported in hours of peril, cannot be forgotten.

United States citizens of Greek extraction, from California to Maine, from Washington to Florida, have magnificently responded to the call of our country both in war and peace. You have served this Nation on the fields of battle, in its factories and fields. In your homes you have taught and lived the American faith with deepest devotion and purpose. Through the great fraternal order of American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association you have bought substantial quantities of war bonds. You comprise one of the most law-abiding elements of our population, and above all, you have contributed, in the past to the development and progress of this great country of ours.

For better or for worse the world has entered the atomic age. In the hands of man now rests at one and the same time the power of total world destruction or the opening of a new golden age.

We have a choice to make. The world will either be governed by a body of international law or by force. It is my firm belief that the average man in every country has a deep-rooted desire to see international law and order prevail but this does not mean law and order imposed upon the weak by the strong. It does not mean the subjugation and regimentation of small nations by great and powerful nations. It does not mean that any country has the right to put itself above the law.

As the American people have felt a great appreciation for the cultural and political heritages handed down by the Greek people which have had a profound bearing on developments of all nations, so the Greeks have had a great appreciation of American political institutions and the great developments that have been accomplished by free men in the new world.

We have just come through a great war to help free from a Nazi and Fascist bondage peoples who otherwise would have been enslaved, perhaps for generations yet to come. Men and women who love freedom and believe that the greatest development for humanity is possible only under such conditions are bound to be concerned at storm warnings in any part of the world which indicate that force is to supplant reason.

As a Member of the Senate of the United States I am pleased to join in these ceremonies today in paying tribute to a nation with a great history and tradition. Given peace and a chance for constructive and productive effort I am confident that Greece has much to again offer the world in the years ahead.

Housing Tussle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Housing Tussle," written by Frederick C. Othman, and published in the Washington Daily News, the issue of Wednesday, March 27, 1946. The article refers to a series of remarks made by Wilson W. Wyatt and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] on the subject of housing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING TUSSLE

(By Frederick C. Othman)

Nobody can build anything much, as you've read in the papers, unless he's a war veteran who wants to build a house.

Now we've got Wilson W. Wyatt, the Housing Expediter, before the Senate Banking Committee, seeking a new law, which would give him the power to get built before the end of next year 2,700,000 roofs over the heads of former soldiers.

Everybody agrees the idea's elegant. But everybody—and I mean that literally—has a

different idea how to do it. So let's watch the dapper Mr. Wyatt sweat out the crease in his pants, rumple his hair, and unhook his collar pin arguing with some Senators who think he's got what they call the czar complex.

Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, said the trouble with Mr. Wyatt was that he was a hard-working, conscientious man. The Senator said he had no doubt Mr. Wyatt would build 2,000,000 houses in 2 years.

"But give me the power that this bill gives you," added Senator CAPEHART, "and I could build 5,000,000 houses. Why, you can upset the entire economy of this Nation."

"Only I don't intend to," Mr. Wyatt insisted.

"And you could requisition every one of the 125,000 motortrucks that come off the assembly line each month and use them in the building industry," the Senator continued. "And——"

"Yes, but——," Mr. Wyatt tried to interrupt.

"You could take all the plywood, all the copper, all the brass, all the light bulbs, and use them in veterans' housing," Senator CAPEHART added.

"But I wouldn't do all those things," Expediter Wyatt insisted, not even noticing when his collar pin snapped open.

"Why, you could close down all the furniture factories in the United States, because they use lumber," Senator CAPEHART said.

"But then we couldn't furnish the houses," Mr. Wyatt retorted.

"Oh, yes, you could furnish the houses," Senator CAPEHART replied. "You just couldn't furnish the furniture."

"Oh," Mr. Wyatt said.

"Now you're stopping commercial building for 2 years," the Senator said. "What about the veteran who wants to build himself a place of business?"

Mr. Wyatt said that was a difficult problem. Senator CAPEHART said it was a vicious circle.

"Now one more question," the Senator said. "Would you as a Senator vote to give any one man as much power as this bill would give you?"

That stopped Mr. Wyatt. He blushed. He almost laughed. The Senator said he was serious. He said he wanted an answer. Mr. Wyatt replied that if he were a Senator, he believed he'd trust Mr. Wyatt.

This went on all day long, with other Senators arguing other points, Mr. Wyatt attempting to explain his plans by means of charts showing bricks, pipe, and lumber in full color, and the controversy getting hot over Mr. Wyatt's proposed building subsidies.

I hate even to think about 'em, they're so complicated. The general idea is to whoop up production, say, of bathtubs, by giving the manufacturers cash rewards for making more than they intended.

The House of Representatives turned down this idea. What the Senate will do is problematical. I don't envy Mr. Wyatt his job, but I must report that he strikes me as a solid citizen who'll do his dead-levelest to get those houses built. If he wangles 'em the pharaohs themselves will be piddling little builders in comparison.

Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by William F. Montavon, entitled "Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance." Mr. Montavon is director of the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the statement was made before the Committee on Ways and Means on March 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my understanding that today our discussion deals only with title II of the Social Security Act which provides Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits and with section 1426 (b) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code which exempts certain organizations from the payment of taxes imposed under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (title VIII of the Social Security Act).

The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code are the following:

"SEC. 1410. In addition to other taxes, every employer shall pay an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ."

(The rate is fixed by the statute and is intended to increase progressively until it is 3 percent of the wages paid by the employer.)

Section 1426 (a) defines wages and section 1426 (b) defines employment as follows:

"The term 'employment' means any service * * * except * * *."

(There are 10 classes of service exempt under this exception.)

Among these excepted services is:

"(8) Services performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or education purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

This exception by definition has the effect of exempting a large number of organizations and their employees from the payment of the tax under section 1410 and their employees from the payment of tax under section 1400.

This exception results further in the exclusion of the employees in these excepted employments from the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance.

A considerable number, probably a majority, of these employers do not desire to have their employees thus excluded.

These employers frequently are closely related to the church.

I cannot speak for all of these church-related organizations.

I can speak only on behalf of the thousands of voluntary organizations including hospitals and charitable and educational institutions throughout the country that are affiliated with the Catholic Church.

These Catholic organizations have not looked with favor on any provision of law which denies to their employees any benefit provided by law for employees in general.

This problem has been apparent to the National Catholic Welfare Conference from the time in 1934 when the committee on economic security was discussing social insurance in preparation for its report submitted to the President on January 15, 1935. The committee on economic security was not willing to discuss the problem of the tax-exempt organizations at that time but did recommend that in legislation to be enacted provision be made for annuity bonds for the benefit of persons excluded from old-age and survivors' insurance benefits. That recommendation was not looked upon with favor by this committee in 1935 when the report of the committee on economic security was made the basis of the Social Security Act.

I accompanied a committee representing three national hospital associations which appealed in 1935 to this committee to give consideration to the tax-exempt status of voluntary hospitals.

Appearing before this committee, the chairman of the Social Security Board, a gentleman with whom I have always had most cordial relations, recommended only 10 days ago that old-age and survivors' insurance be extended to all gainful employment including employees of nonprofit institutions.

He said at that time:

"No administrative problems are involved in covering nonprofit employees."

The exclusion of the employees of these institutions has not been based on any thought that to include them might occasion any administrative problems.

The exclusion of these employees, unfair though it is, is traceable to the failure of this committee to develop a formula under which provision would be made to extend to these employees the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance but which, in extending benefits, would give sincere and full recognition to the fact that traditionally these church-related activities have been generally exempt from taxation. Attention is called to the fact that this exaction is a tax with respect to having individuals in this employ.

This exclusion of a large number of employees and the resulting shifting by employees from covered to noncovered employment has resulted in serious administrative problems and, I might say, inequities.

The uncertain cost of social insurance, which tends to expand, as well as the fact that the traditional tax-exempt status would be jeopardized, have deterred voluntary tax-exempt organizations from demanding that their employees be not denied by law the right to share in the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance. The income of these organizations and, particularly, the church-related organizations, for whom I speak, comes in great measure from donations and from economy in administration. That income is not easily predictable. It does not justify the incurring of long-term obligations, the amount of which is not easy to calculate beforehand.

In both Houses of Congress legislative bills have been introduced which, it has been the hope of the proponents, would meet this condition.

The Federal Insurance Contributions Act of 1939 was a step in the right direction, but it was only a step. It did not extend the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance to the employees of nonprofit employers, although these employees need those benefits in as great or greater degree than do the employees of profit organizations.

There can be no doubt as to the social value of the services rendered by these church-connected nonprofit organizations through thousands of health, charitable, and educational institutions.

To levy a tax with respect to having individuals in this employ on these organizations would be a marked departure from the customary attitude toward these organizations. I believe that the difficulty thus stated is worthy of your earnest consideration.

By its nature a tax is compulsory.

It is this compulsory nature which disturbs most of these organizations.

My correspondence over the years justifies the belief that a great majority of the excluded agencies would willingly accept the present cost of social insurance to the extent of their ability to meet that cost if it were not for this compulsory nature of the contributions.

The problem here posed is not wholly unlike that which arises out of the proposal that employees of State and local governmental agencies be made eligible for old-age and survivors' insurance benefits.

Your committee has before it a bill which would extend social insurance to these gov-

ernmental agencies under a compact freely entered into and terminable on 2 years' notice.

A similar formula, it is my opinion, might be adopted to extend old-age and survivors' insurance to the individuals in the employ of the agencies now excluded from these benefits.

Speaking for the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is the voice of the Catholic bishops of the United States, I earnestly recommend to the favorable consideration of this committee at this time the following proposals that—

1. The lay employees of nonprofit agencies be fully covered by old-age and survivors' insurance under a plan which would provide optional entrance on the part of the employers;

2. That when this voluntary acceptance of coverage has been effected there shall be full contribution to the trust fund by employer and employee;

3. That the law embody a statement of policy which would adequately safeguard the customary and traditional tax-exempt status;

4. That the voluntary acceptance have reference solely to lay employees excluding the clergy and members of religious orders; and

5. That provision be made for the withdrawal, under defined conditions, by any nonprofit organization.

Taxing Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the taxing of farmer cooperatives, and published in the News, of Northfield, Minn., of February 14, 1946. The article was written by Alfred D. Stedman, who formerly was assistant editor of the United States News, and is a very deep student and authority on economic questions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO CO-OPS PAY TAXES?—HERE'S ANSWER TO QUERIES RAISED BY ADVERTISEMENT REGARDING CO-OPS

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

One little spark can cause a blast. And one little ad appearing in the State press of Minnesota has just touched off an explosion of inquiries. Here and now, those inquiries are to be answered.

The ad pictures a line of stores on a business street. All the main elements in the picture, except one, are described as being uniform. The story told is of the same town, the same general way of doing business, the same profits, but not the same taxes. All the stores on the street are labeled taxpayers, save one. The store is labeled "Co-op."

The advertisement is being paid for by the Minnesota Small Business and Employees' Committee, with headquarters at the Hotel Radisson, Minneapolis.

Tens and probably hundreds of thousands of people have seen the ad in newspapers published in every corner of this State.

Here's the first of the barrage of questions that have been aroused by that advertisement:

"Is it true that the cooperatives enjoy a blanket exemption from taxes?"

The answer to that question is "No." The co-ops are not exempt from taxes.

With a single exception, taxes generally are applied about alike as between co-ops and noncooperative kinds of business. Co-ops pay the same license fees and chain-store taxes, the same real and personal property taxes, and the same State capital stock, gross receipts, sales, and use taxes as other businesses. They pay Federal import, excise, and luxury taxes like the rest of business.

The total annual tax bill of this country's co-ops runs way up in the millions. It is only the income tax that applies differently as between some of the co-ops and noncooperative corporations. Even the advertisement admits on its face, as a close reading of its exact words will show, that it really is talking only about the income tax.

This brings up question No. 2. That question is whether the co-ops or their members have any blanket exemption from income taxes. Again the answer is "No."

Members of co-ops pay individual income taxes like all of us, and all income they receive in any form through their cooperatives is taxable.

This leads up to question No. 3. That question is whether a specific legal exemption from corporation-income taxes is available to any or all co-ops.

The answer is that such an exemption is available to some. Co-ops as such are not exempt from the corporation-income tax. Farmer-owned co-ops can apply for and receive exemption while they are in compliance with certain requirements. Of 10,000 farmer co-ops, about 5,000, or half, are receiving such exemption and are among 87,000 organizations, including mutual insurance companies, loan associations, chambers of commerce, and others which are exempt. But the exemption has very limited value to farm co-ops, which would have little taxable income even if taxed, and 5,000 of them have not applied or qualified for an exempt status. And all or most of the 20,000 consumer co-ops in the country are not exempt.

Next comes question No. 4. That question is whether small business concerns, which are not corporations but are proprietorships or partnerships pay corporation taxes. Once again, the answer is an emphatic "No."

Those small businesses, comprising the overwhelming majority of the total number, do not pay corporation taxes. They are taxed like the one-sixth of the co-ops that are exempt, paying income taxes as individuals but not as organizations. Taxing such small businesses as corporations are taxed would mean new tax burdens for little business, and a lessening of its power of competition.

Now comes question No. 5. That question is whether the cooperatives, regardless of any legal exemption, are granted a special privilege not open to other businesses by official interpretation allowing them to deduct refunds, in cash or equities, to patrons from their taxable income.

The answer still is the same "No." There's nothing to tax when there is no profit. Any business, big or small, can deduct from taxable income, or profit, any refunds made during the tax year to patrons as a portion of price.

Now, the way is cleared for No. 6, the final question. The question is whether the United States Government really is, as charged, losing huge tax revenues by not collecting corporation taxes from co-ops.

As to all other questions, the answer is "No." The conclusion of a study of the whole subject for Editorial Research Reports by Thomas K. Ford is that, at the highest rate of corporation and excess-profits taxes in 1944, the largest amount that taxation of cooperatives could conceivably have brought into the United States Treasury was $112,000,000. That would have been twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total Federal expenses. And if, as likely, such a new tax should drive the co-ops away from refunds and into price wars as a way of benefiting members, such a tax would bring new and bitter competition for other business but little revenue to the Government.

So the realities are the answer to the charges made in the advertisement, and one of those realities is that here in Minnesota, where development of the co-ops outranks that in all other States, the cooperatives are making their greatest contribution to the general prosperity. That circumstance gives the co-ops no immunity from criticism or discussion. But, at least, the cooperatives are entitled to ask critics to keep their accusations within the facts.

CO-OP LEADERS IN FOUR COUNTIES VOICE PROTEST AGAINST TAX PROPAGANDA

Nearly 100 farmers, representing more than 50 farmer cooperative associations in the four counties of Steele, Dodge, Freeborn, and Mower, met at Blooming Prairie Thursday, February 7, to voice their protest against the false and insidious propaganda on the part of the Minnesota Small Business and Employees' Committee in respect to taxes paid by cooperatives.

A resolution was adopted "deploring and protesting against this propaganda" and the meeting went on record favoring the formation of an organization composed of all farmer cooperatives in Minnesota "to voice opposition to any movement which has for its object the destruction of farmer cooperatives."

It was urged that a meeting of all farmer cooperatives in southern Minnesota be called in the near future.

The meeting was sponsored by many local farmer cooperatives through G. S. Thorson, of Blooming Prairie. Former State Senator Sam A. Rask was elected chairman. Mr. Rask is secretary-treasurer of the National Farm Loan Association at Blooming Prairie and is also a director of the Federal Land Bank and other farm credit units of the Farm Credit Administration of St. Paul. A. P. Bartsch, a farmer and president of the Central Co-operative Oil Association of Owatonna, was elected secretary.

Mr. Rask stated that "the prime purpose and objective of the Council of Farmer Cooperatives is to extend counsel, aid, and assistance to all farmer cooperatives in Minnesota in meeting postwar problems of reconversion activities and situations that may arise in the near future affecting the welfare of the farmer cooperatives."

Veterans' Emergency Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made this morning by Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. His statement was with reference to the veterans' emergency housing program.

I wish to call attention to one statement made by Mr. Ketchum in the second paragraph, where he says:

There have been inferences in some quarters that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is

indifferent to the housing needs of veterans and lukewarm in its support of a housing program. Such inferences are completely refuted by our record.

Mr. President, I know the latter statement to be absolutely correct. Both Mr. Ketchum, as the national representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars as an organization, have worked hard in behalf of housing for veterans. The Veterans of Foreign Wars were making a study of this problem long before VE-day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the privilege and opportunity of appearing before this committee as the legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization representing 1,600,000 men who have served on foreign soil or in hostile waters as members of the United States armed forces, including approximately 1,300,000 who have served during World War II, to state our position on the veterans' emergency housing program as proposed by Mr. Wilson Wyatt, National Housing Administrator, and the implementing legislation now before this committee to effectuate the program.

There have been inferences in some quarters that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is indifferent to the housing needs of veterans and lukewarm in its support of a housing program. Such inferences are completely refuted by our record. We suspect these inferences were occasioned by our refusal to make one-man snap judgment on certain political and economic differences which have developed in the housing program. The VFW is not a one-man organization. Its officers have a keen sense of responsibility to its hundreds of thousands of members, embracing varying religious, political, and economic faiths. We are not a Johnny-come-lately group that can quickly commit our large membership on highly controversial questions with the ease of an individual putting on or taking off a garment.

Recognizing the shameful lack of housing facilities for our returning veterans and the urgent need for a national emergency housing program which could only be successful through the cooperation of the agencies of government and the building industry, the national council of administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is the governing body of the organization between national conventions, met in Kansas City, Mo., on December 3, 1945, and unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"URGING PRESIDENT TO DECLARE EXISTING HOUSING SHORTAGE A NATIONAL EMERGENCY

"Whereas the shortage of housing is recognized as one of the most critical problems confronting the Nation, and

"Whereas the National Housing Administration estimates that 2,000,000 veterans are, or will become, homeless in this shortage; and

"Whereas there is indisputable evidence that many veterans are temporarily sheltered in municipal or county jails or camping in public parks; and

"Whereas less than 40 percent of the armed forces have been discharged and that continued demobilization under these conditions will further add to this shameful treatment of veterans and lead to bitter resentment and render them susceptible to Communist influences: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the national council of administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assembled in Kansas City, Mo., December 3–4, 1945, go on record requesting the President of the United States to declare the housing shortage to be a national emergency and to direct appropriate Government agencies to take the necessary steps to allocate and divert building materials and surplus housing to alleviate the housing shortage and to call on the construction industry to cooperate to the fullest extent, and that priority in rentals, construction, and sale of homes be given to veterans; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That until permanent housing can be constructed, vacant and useful structures, temporary or permanent, under the control of any governmental agency, be immediately made available for temporary housing facilities for our returning veterans and their families."

You will note in that resolution the VFW called upon the President of the United States to declare the housing shortage to be a national emergency and to direct appropriate Government agencies to allocate and divert building materials and surplus housing to alleviate the housing shortage and to call on the construction industry to cooperate to the fullest extent and that priority in rentals and sale of homes be given to veterans. This resolution was adopted by VFW leaders who came from all sections of the United States and who were thoroughly conversant with the housing shortages and needs in their respective communities. This request to the President was not an emotional flash in the pan, but rather a deliberate action based on study and observation.

The text of this resolution was immediately wired to the White House and our organization was gratified to learn a few days later the President had taken prompt action on the housing situation and announced a three-point housing program, which to a large extent met the request of our Council of Administration and amounted to what closely approximates a national emergency order. The President announced the appointment of Mr. Wilson Wyatt as Housing Expediter and Coordinator with instructions to develop a national housing program at the earliest possible moment. In addition, the President reinstated priorities and control over building material and supplies and ordered that 50 percent of such materials and supplies be allocated and diverted to the construction of new homes costing $10,000 or less and that veterans should have priority in the purchase or rental of said new homes.

On January 14–16, 1946, the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars met in Washington to consider the ramifications of the housing program announced by the President. After reviewing the program and commending the President for his prompt action on the critical housing situation, the legislative committee adopted the following resolution:

"PERMANENT HOUSING FOR VETERANS

"Whereas on December 2, 1945, the national council of administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assembled in Kansas City, Mo., publicly requested the President of the United States to declare the housing shortage to be a national emergency and take the necessary action to provide homes for veterans; and

"Whereas President Truman subsequently announced a three-point housing program in which 50 percent of all available building materials shall be diverted to the construction of new homes costing $10,000 or less to be first offered for sale or rental to veterans for a 30-day period, and designated the Federal Housing Authority to administer the plan; and

"Whereas while President Truman is to be commended for his prompt action in behalf of veterans it is believed there are some fundamental weaknesses in the program which will operate against veterans and the good intentions of the President: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assembled in formal meeting in Washington, D. C., January 14–16, 1946*, That the President and the Federal Housing Authority be urged to amend the announced veteran housing program as follows:

"1. Revise the maximum ceiling price on such homes to provide that 85 percent shall sell for $6,500 or less and the remaining 15 percent to sell for $10,000 or less. Unless this is done, the majority of the homes will be constructed at or near the $10,000 maximum and beyond the financial capacity of the average returning veteran.

"2. Establish maximum monthly rental ceilings on the 85 percent of homes in the $6,500 or less category, at $52.50.

"3. Federal Housing Authority to make certain in the agreement with builders that veterans will be adequately informed and advised during the 30-day period in which the homes shall be offered for sale or rental to veterans exclusively.

"*Be it further resolved*, That a vigorous protest be entered against further export of American lumber during the critical housing shortage."

You will note in this resolution our legislative committee was apprehensive that a top ceiling of $10,000 would be beyond the reach of the average veteran and proposed the program be revised to provide that approximately 85 percent of the homes to be built should have a top ceiling not in excess of $6,500 and a rental ceiling not in excess of $52.50 monthly.

On February 7, 1946, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, after 5 weeks of study in his capacity as Housing Expediter and Coordinator, submitted to the President a veterans' emergency housing program which called for a construction goal of 2,700,000 homes in the next 2 years. Among the many requirements in the plan developed by Mr. Wyatt was the proposal that a large proportion of these homes should come within a ceiling price of $6,000, including land, or a rental ceiling of not more than $50 per month. Thus you will note the Wyatt proposal agrees in large part with the recommendation made by the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on January 15, 1946. Among the many points in the veterans' emergency housing program as advocated by Mr. Wyatt was a request for implementing legislation by the Congress.

It has been the argument over implementing legislation which has thrown the Nation and the Congress into a sharp difference of opinion and which is delaying the launching of the actual construction program. There is no disagreement over the need for a housing program or over the need for homes for veterans. The Government, the construction industry, the producers of building material, the veterans, and the public in general are all agreed that homes are needed. It is unfortunate that a political and economic struggle has developed over how veterans' emergency housing program can best be effectuated. Mr. Wyatt and the administration are advocating and demanding the use of premium payments or subsidies, together with price ceilings on existing homes, as a necessary part of implementing legislation to adequately meet the construction goals. Elements of the construction industry, the producers of building materials, the real-estate boards and a substantial proportion of the Members of Congress apparently believe that premium payments are unwise and unsound and that the program can best be effectuated by a revision of price ceilings on building material and supplies. There is much to be said on both sides of the question but the argument is seriously delaying the launching of the actual construction program.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars do not profess to be an economic organization which attempts to determine the economic policies of any given production program in the United States. As an organization dedicated

to the protection of our Nation, the preservation of its ideals and institutions and the welfare of those who have worn the uniform and their dependents, we find ourselves, without any desire on our part, involved in a highly controversial political and economic argument over how shall we quickly obtain homes for veterans. Pressure is being exerted from both sides to persuade our organization that subsidies and price ceilings on the one hand are the proper and effective method of quickly obtaining homes for veterans, while on the other hand we are warned that subsidies and price ceilings are unnecessary, contrary to the free enterprise system, and leading our Nation along the road to socialization of American industry.

In an effort to act within the established and duly authorized procedure of our organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars national legislative committee was again called to Washington. This committee, by national convention authority, is empowered to commit the organization on problems affecting veterans which arise between conventions and on which a convention has not taken a stated position. The committee, composed of men of unquestioned integrity and ability, of differing political beliefs, serving without pay, attempt to earnestly interpret the desires of our membership, based on their long experience in veteran affairs and previous resolutions adopted by national conventions.

After 3 days of study and conference on the veterans' emergency housing program and the controversy over implementing legislation, our national legislative committee authorized and directed me as legislative spokesman to appear before appropriate committees of Congress and make the following statement with respect to the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars as interpreted by the committee:

In view of the unquestioned and urgent need for increased housing to shelter our returning veterans and their families, and the insistence of the administration spokesmen that premium payments and price ceilings on existing homes are a necessary and vital part of the veterans' emergency housing program, if it is to be successful, the Veterans of Foreign Wars therefore respectfully petitions and urges the Senate of the United States to restore the authority for premium payments and price ceilings on existing homes, which were deleted from H. R. 4761 by the House of Representatives.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars recognizes and appreciates the fact that the President of the United States acted in response to, or in line with, a request by our organization to declare the housing shortage to be a national emergency and instruct appropriate agencies of the Government to take the necessary steps to solve the problem. These steps are being taken, and even though some of them may be highly controversial, we cannot in good faith turn our backs on the action that has been taken. We recognize the necessity for priorities, control, and allocation of building material and supplies if we are to quickly build a large number of homes instead of the more-profitable projects such as office buildings, stadiums, race tracks, club houses, and road houses.

We recognize that the authority and power to establish such controls and allocations now rests with the Administration, and without its wholehearted cooperation, there is little likelihood that any substantial and successful home-building program would succeed. While we question the use of subsidies as a general principle in a competitive free-enterprise system, they have been and are being employed in other lines, and if essential to providing homes for veterans we should not hesitate to again use them.

The VFW regrets and deplores the injection of political and economic arguments into our housing shortage, which are seriously retarding construction and denying veterans the shelter which they so urgently need. We strongly suspect there is too much jockeying for political and economic advantage in this situation and the veterans are the victims. We are even wondering if it would not have been more feasible and appropriate for the President to have exercised his broad authority under the War Powers Act to accomplish this program, rather than to have tossed it into the Congress in an election year.

There is a growing suspicion among veterans that they are being used as "bait" to achieve Government spending and control objectives which are not necessarily pertinent to veteran needs and desires. Members of Congress, public officials, and veteran spokesmen are finding themselves on the spot from time to time over questionable proposals to which a veteran tag or label has been affixed. Perhaps the time has arrived when every spending and control proposal with a veteran tag attached should be carefully scrutinized and courageously denounced when found to be phony.

Let's declare a moratorium on the bickering, quarreling, and jockeying for position over housing for veterans and get on with the job. The war is not over until those who left their homes to serve our country are provided with an opportunity to house themselves and their families upon their return. We must build more homes right now, and whatever it takes to do the job—let's have it and consider it a part of the cost of war. If subsidies and price ceilings fail to do the job, the American people and the veterans in particular will hold the administration responsible.

The Proposed Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent articles from the New York Times, the first entitled "Doubt of British on United States Loan Is Hit," the second entitled "Policy of Britain on Cotton Feared." I shall not comment upon them at this time, but at the proper time I shall do so. I merely ask at this time to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBT OF BRITISH ON UNITED STATES LOAN IS HIT—FAILURE TO RECOGNIZE FAVORABLE AMERICAN POLICY CALLED FOLLY BY OXFORD ECONOMIST

LONDON, March 26.—R. F. Harrod, an Oxford economist and Government adviser, published a pamphlet today entitled "Page of British Folly," in which he attacked leaders of British opinion, and economists in particular, for their reaction to the United States loan and trade proposals.

Asserting that British leaders have failed to appreciate that the proposed loan agreement marked a major step forward in American economic policy, which, since the formulation of the lend-lease agreement, has steadily become more favorable to Britain, Mr. Harrod stated:

"Indifference and doubt of responsible British people (to this development) constitute, to my judgment, an unparalleled folly."

DEFENDS WHITE'S MONETARY PLAN

He pointed to the lend-lease agreement, Bretton Woods, and the loan proposals as major evidence of a growing United States appreciation of its responsibilities in world economic affairs, then stressed the British failure to comprehend how far these documents reflect an American advance toward the British point of view.

Recalling that the British public was led to believe that the pre-Bretton Woods monetary plan of Lord Keynes was favorable to Britain, while the plan of Harry D. White, Assistant Secretary of the American Treasury, was unfavorable, Mr. Harrod wrote that the White plan went much further than the Keynes plan in binding the United States as a great creditor country to adapt monetary and trade policies to economic realities.

"The White plan is a plan, while the Keynes plan is only part of a plan," he added.

Mr. Harrod deplored the fact that the similarity of Bretton Woods to the White plan had been presented in Britain as a defeat for British ideas.

BRITISH DRAFT EMERGENCY PLANS

London, March 26.—Plans to enable the British Government to take immediate emergency measures should Congress not approve the proposed American loan are under consideration by special Treasury committees, according to an official spokesman.

The committees have not reached the stage of making proposals to the Cabinet, he added, and their work is confidential, so that no question of influencing Congress can arise.

A serious view of Britain's outlook is still taken should she fail to get the loan, and without it, according to Treasury quarters, she would have to do without 200,000,000 sterling of imports, mostly essential goods, and about one-fifth of her total imports this year.

This view was challenged today by an economist and spokesman for the Oxford Institute of Statistics. He thought the Treasury view was far too pessimistic. Britain's trade recovery was far more swift, in his view, than the Treasury had contemplated.

At the same time British imports have been kept at almost half the level estimated by the Treasury. Instead of 150,000,000 sterling monthly the average import figure for December to February has been about 80,000,000 sterling, because of the severe cutting down of food imports into Britain.

Britain's trade balance in the last 3 months has, therefore, developed far more hopefully, the Oxford economists insist, than had been believed possible. Already Britain's trade with the sterling area was balanced, Britain's trade with Europe showed an export surplus of about 15,000,000 sterling, and only her trade with North America showed a monthly import surplus of about 30,000,000 sterling.

POLICY OF BRITAIN ON COTTON FEARED—NATIONAL CITY OFFICIAL WORRIED BY REPORTED PLAN TO ELIMINATE LIVERPOOL EXCHANGE—SEES PRIVATE TRADE PERIL—SAYS IT IS EASY STEP TO CCC SALES, CLOSING OUT WORLD'S BIGGEST COMMODITY MARKET

The reported policy of the British Government, which would continue bulk purchase of cotton requirements and eliminate the Liverpool Cotton Exchange, causes "grave misgiving" regarding the desirability of the proposed Anglo-American financial agreement, Wilbert Ward, vice president, National City Bank, and president, Bankers Association for Foreign Trade, declared yesterday.

Speaking at a luncheon sponsored by the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau, held in conjunction with the twenty-sixth annual get-together of the Export Managers Club, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, Mr Ward explained that, in general, he approved of the

proposed loan to Britain, but asserted that the cotton policy of Britain was "profoundly disturbing."

"It is an easy step from Government purchase of cotton by Great Britain to the Government sale of cotton in the United States by our Commodity Credit Corporation," Mr. Ward declared. "Net effect of this would be to close out the largest commodity market in the world in which private traders have dealt. To close out such an important part of our export market to private traders is inconsistent with the plan for an expanding world economy, for world prosperity and peace, which the Colmer committee of Congress states is the goal of our economic policy, and to which we are devoting many billions of dollars."

"It is perhaps too early to pass judgment on the situation as all we have today is the cabled statement of Sir Stafford Cripps that the Government intends to close the Liverpool Exchange and that the matter will be discussed in Parliament."

C. A. Richards, director, export division, Interchemical Corporation, who spoke with Mr. Ward during a panel discussion, in which William S. Swingle, vice president, National Foreign Trade Council, was the third participant, asserted that the Export-Import Bank had failed to make sufficiently detailed information about its operations available to foreign traders. Calling for a show of hands in support of his position, Mr. Richards won unanimous agreement from the 350 exporters present.

In October 1945, Mr. Richards declared, the bank announced that $100,000,000 had been set aside for the purchase of raw cotton, but no details were provided despite the wide interest in the announcement by exporters.

Robert J. Watt, international representative, American Federation of Labor, a speaker at the general sessions, attended by approximately 1,200 foreign traders, asserted that a strenuous campaign was now under way against American business in Latin-American countries.

Herbert R. Schell, president of Sidney Blumenthal & Co., asserted that most of our potential benefits under the reciprocal trade agreements were neutralized because of the depreciation of local currencies by many of the signatory countries. He pointed out that a simple clause might be written into the agreements to provide that, if, as, and when either party depreciated currency, the agreement would automatically terminate.

Ending Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial from the Goshen News-Democrat on the subject of the extension of OPA:

ENDING PRICE CONTROL

The question of whether price controls should be continued beyond the expiration date this summer is now before Congress, and a decision must soon be made. A comprehensive investigation by the Senate Small Business Committee found that public sentiment is sharply divided, but that virtually everyone is agreed that the real solution to our economic problem is abundant production.

The question, then, is how to encourage production. Those who oppose OPA controls say production can best be stimulated by removing controls, and there has as yet been no answer to refute this claim. The proponents of price control, largely administration figures, denounce advocates of ending price control as favoring inflation. Nothing could be further from the truth. No sane person wants inflation and no intelligent person wants to see prices go skyrocketing. But as between high prices and no production the former certainly is to be preferred.

People who sincerely believe in our traditional system of free competitive enterprise contend that removal of government restrictions will encourage production and competition will then bring prices down to a proper level. That system always has worked in this country in the past and there is no reason to believe that it won't work now. Removal of restrictions is urged not to send prices up, but to bring about abundant production and consequently lower prices.

It is pertinent to note that even OPA officials who are now so insistent on retaining control of our economy do not care to defend a system of permanent price control. They say the controls should be removed as soon as production warrants it, but in the meantime they advocate restrictions that prevent production. If it is true that Government controls as now exercised discourage production, then the time might never come when production would reach a level to warrant removal of controls. If, on the other hand, Government controls are not hampering production, why is it that so little progress has been made in the many months that have elapsed since the war has ended? Instead of improving, production of many consumer items has actually gone backward if we are to judge from the difficulty the public has in obtaining them.

The war, the forcible removal of so much of our manpower from civilian production by the draft, and all other conditions which justified to some extent at least the imposition of price control, have now passed. There is no longer one single good reason to continue Government restrictions which we were solemnly promised were to be war measures only.

Extension of Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is drawing near when Congress must decide if the Selective Training and Service Act is to be extended in some form in order to maintain our armed forces to a level necessary for the safety and security of our country during the trying months that lie ahead.

Under the leave granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter I received from General Hershey, setting forth the needs for an extension of the act, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1946.

The Honorable ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ZIMMERMAN: In response to numerous requests from Members of Congress, there is set forth herein certain information pertinent to the extension by the Congress of the Selective Training and Service Act beyond May 15, 1946.

In the President's January 21, 1946, message to the Congress, he stated that it was imperative that we relieve as fast as possible those members of the armed forces who have already done their duty but that our national security would require a substantial armed force, particularly in overseas service. He stated that the Army and the Navy were conducting recruiting campaigns but that in the event such campaigns did not produce the estimated requirements for the calendar year 1946, it would be necessary to extend the Selective Training and Service Act beyond May 15, 1946.

On February 1, 1946, there had been enlisted into the Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, 652,000 men, or approximately 1,300,000 less than the stated requirements of the services, as follows:

Service	Recommended strength, excluding officers	Enlistments, VJ-day to Feb. 1 1946
Army	1,350,000	506,000
Navy	500,000	130,000
Marine Corps	100,000	16,000
Total	1,950,000	652,000

The Navy, as of February 1, 1946, was composed of both men serving under enlistment contracts and men serving under selective-service inductions. The Navy has announced that it expects to release all selectees who wish discharge by September 1, 1946. The strength of the Regular Navy (men serving under enlistment contracts) on February 1, 1946, was 384,000. The Navy Department estimates 328,000 of that number will be under contract September 1 provided the current rate of reenlistments continues. Assuming an additional attrition of 13,000 enlisted personnel through August, the Navy Department will require 185,000 enlistments from civilian life by September 1, or 27,000 monthly, in order to reach a postwar strength of 500,000. The Navy believes that their 2- and 3-year contracts will offer sufficient inducements for voluntary enlistments and that its goal will be reached by September 1. Inasmuch as the enlistments from civilian life are almost entirely made either from persons who are liable or who are about to become liable for military service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act, I am of the opinion that termination of the act will seriously affect their recruiting program.

It is presumed that a substantially similar situation exists in the Marine Corps. However, actual statistics are not available for this branch of the service.

In the case of the Army only slightly more than one-half of the total enlistments were for 3 years, the remainder consisting mostly of 1-year enlistments with some 18-month enlistments. The majority of the 1-year and 1½-year enlistments into the Army were by men previously inducted through selective service and the remainder, about 80,000, were enlisted from civilian life just prior to being registered or inducted by selective service. It may be conservatively concluded that practically all of such men were enlisting in order to eliminate the uncertainty as to when they would be elegible for release, as men inducted under the Selective Service Act may be required to serve for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. Also, most of the 1-year and 1½-year enlistees (whose enlistments begin to terminate in the fall of this year) will not be expected to reenlist because had they been interested in a Regular Army career it may have logically been assumed that they would have volunteered for 2 or 3 years' service rather than the minimum period.

Most of the personnel of the Regular Army who were on duty prior to Pearl Harbor have already reenlisted in order to retain their

noncommissioned ratings since such reenlistments were originally required to be made before February 20, 1946.

An analysis of the strength requirements of the armed forces and recruiting therefor to February 1, 1946, leads to the conclusion that if we are to maintain our military establishment at the size announced the number of enlistments must be considerably increased or those inductees now in service retained for substantial additional duty. If the men required to meet the needs of the armed forces are to be secured through selective service it is imperative that the Selective Service Act be extended at once in order to avoid further uncertainty and disruption.

The 200,000 local board members, appeal board members, Government appeal agents, examining physicians and dentists, reemployment committeemen, and advisory groups—all uncompensated—who have so faithfully and loyally produced the largest Army and Navy in the history of the country should know whether the act will be extended in order to determine the status of the several million registrants 18 through 25 years of age and those who are becoming 18. Also, the 4,000,000 persons yet to be discharged should be given early and definite assurance that their rights of reemployment contained in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act will be preserved.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with this or other matters please do not hesitate to advise me.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Unity, Respect, Honesty in UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 26, 1946:

UNITY, RESPECT, HONESTY IN UNO

President Truman and Secretary Byrnes struck sound notes in welcoming the Security Council of the UNO to American soil.

There must be unity of purpose and the will and the strength to carry on, as the President says. There must be respect for law as that law is laid down in the United Nations Charter, says Mr. Byrnes. Nations no longer have the right to take action into their own hands.

We should like to add one further specification. There must be honesty. The UNO controversies need the injection of a bit of friendly consideration for the rights of others—a bit of faith in our fellow men, and the will to give and take until the fog lifts on the road ahead. Graphic guaranties, based on arrangements of expediency which can only by their nature be transitory, will not do the job. A spiritual determination of right and wrong leading to a moral regeneration is called for to give force and permanence to the decisions of nations. To point a finger of blame, to shout the opposition down, however righteously, is to settle nothing.

The salvation of mankind today calls for a sound plan for world reconstruction. It must be one that will set selfish interests aside to serve the well-being of all—this despite the very real difference in national interests. A realistic recognition of decent principles based on facts and a courageous effort to establish a workable code in a moral light to show the way is demanded in the name of world security.

Will this first meeting in the United States meet the test? No one knows yet. But we do know that America can, if it will, use all the strength, and will, and reasonableness, and firmness that it possesses to attain the goal. If the effort fails, we are no worse off than we would have been if we had not made it. If the effort succeeds, we have saved the world.

Railroads Now in Reorganization Have Proven Their Complete Solvency; Simple Justice Demands That They Be Returned to Their Rightful Owners—Their Present Stockholders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House have evinced keen interest in the progress of legislation designed to preserve the investments of stockholders in railroads now facing reorganization in the bankruptcy courts of our country. The fact that hundreds of thousands of these stockholders will most surely suffer a total loss of their investments unless remedial legislation is enacted makes immediate action by Congress imperative. The bulk of the stock of these railroads, particularly such systems as the New York, New Haven & Hartford; Florida East Coast; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; Denver & Rio Grande Western; Missouri Pacific; St. Louis-San Francisco; and St. Louis Southwestern, is owned by small investors and is widely distributed throughout the 48 States of the Union. Every Member of this House represents hundreds of these stockholders.

It will be encouraging to note that the House Committee on the Judiciary, after extended hearings and mature consideration by its Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization, has ordered the bill H. R. 5924 to be reported favorably to the House.

This bill, if enacted, will permit solvent railroads to be returned to their rightful owners. Then for a period of at least 18 months they will be accorded the opportunity of adjusting their differences with their creditors under the terms of the McLaughlin Act if reenacted, or any other available statute.

It is, indeed, tragic that the true intent of Congress as embodied in existing law could have been so distorted by those having the responsibility of its administration that railroads that have earned their fixed charges in full, that have made great improvements to roadbeds and equipment, that have paid colossal excess-profits taxes, that have paid State and local taxes, that have piled up hundreds of millions of surplus cash, should be denied the opportunity of proving their solvency and removing themselves from the shackles of arbitrary administrative conclusiveness.

That the courts, themselves, deplore the wholesale wiping out of stockholders' investments, and in many cases those of junior bondholders as well, is reflected in the opinions expressed by several jurists and in the remarks of others made from the bench.

In May of 1945 an opinion was handed down by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Judicial Circuit in the case of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad reorganization. Judge Orie L. Phillips, speaking for the court, said in part:

The broad language of the Supreme Court in the Western Pacific case and the Milwaukee case compels me to conclude that we cannot disturb the Commission's finding of valuation nor the finding of the Commission, confirmed by the trial court, that the equities of the unsecured creditors and the preferred and common stockholders have no value. Nevertheless, I feel impelled respectfully to suggest that the elimination of a substantial portion of the claim of the holders of the general mortgage bonds and all of the claims of stockholders and unsecured creditors, on the basis of a valuation resting wholly on an estimate of future earnings, is harsh treatment of such claims. I say this because, while according expertness to the Commission, it is my opinion that such future earnings cannot be estimated with a degree of certainty that is not likely to result in grave injustice. The injustice to junior security holders which may result from a valuation based solely on an estimate of future earnings has aroused the attention of Congress, and corrective legislation has been introduced. It is my conclusion that only through corrective legislation or a more liberal attitude on the part of the Commission can the junior security holders obtain relief.

On January 14, 1946, Judge Evan A. Evans, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, during a hearing on the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad case, said in part as follows:

I had quite a little part in the St. Paul Railroad, and it was always shocking to think that there should be such an absolute denial of any right for any stockholder, notwithstanding that money was just rolling into the St. Paul and the North Western Railroad, but notwithstanding that, it was decided, "You are out." That doesn't set very well on your conscience. If you did it wrong, it is about time you correct it. * * * I also realize that in 10 years I have never seen such a change in railroad operation and railroad revenue; I never had my confidence in my judgment of valuation so shaken as it was when the returns began to come in from railroad operation during the war period, when previously common and preferred stocks were wiped out with a sweep of the hand, and in the next year they made enough so that stock that was wiped out could have received 10 cents on the dollar and still have something left in the treasury.

When about 2 weeks ago the trustees of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. moved for a confirmation of a plan of reorganization approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission—in which plan all of the $54,500,000 par value of preferred stock, $74,000,000 of common stock, and over $30,000,000 in claims of junior bondholders were completely wiped out—United States District

Judge Michael L. Igoe, in his remarks from the bench, said, in part, as follows:

You also have the picture of a company with approximately $78,000,000 in cash or funds available to be readily converted into cash in its treasury. You have a first bond issue of approximately $60,000,000 and unpaid interest on that bond issue of twenty-one or twenty-two million dollars. * * * There is enough cash in this treasury to pay off one of these first mortgages, which totals the sum of $60,000,000 and upon which there is approximately twenty-one or twenty-two million dollars of unpaid interest. What the man on the street cannot understand is why that mortgage cannot be paid off and something left for the junior security holders and something left for the stockholders. * * * * * * From all I see of this picture, from all I hear about it and about what is said in connection with this lawsuit, I am more and more coming to a point where I think the entire matter, perhaps, should be sent back to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a reexamination of this entire situation, and in that way let everybody know exactly what is involved and how these different interests are going to be cared for, and at the same time these bondholders can have their day in court and the stockholders can have their day in court. * * * Your motion for the confirmation of this plan here today will be continued to April 25, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the climax of this battle; we are nearing the end of this 3-year fight for justice in railroad reorganizations. Perhaps in a few weeks, and surely before the summer recess, the outcome will be known. Will it be victory or defeat for the 100,000 thrifty American citizens who have invested their savings in these railroads? Will it be victory for this great multitude of little people or will it be victory for a handful of great, bond-holding corporations and Wall Street speculators?

Previously, on the floor of this Chamber, I told you about speculators' profits in the Chicago & North Western Railway reorganization—profits as high as 10,000 percent, profits made possible because the stockholders of that railroad were so unfairly deprived of their property.

Similar injustices, similar profits, similar stark tragedy will occur in these other reorganizations if present plans are permitted to become effective.

Mr. Speaker, railroads now in reorganization have proven their complete solvency. Simple justice demands that they be returned to their rightful owners—their present stockholders.

Facts About Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by unanimous consent by the House of Representatives, I include in my remarks a statement relating to an unfortunate country and people who recently have had the attention of the world focused upon them. The facts included in the statement made by Nicholas Martin, councilor at large for the Rumanian Church of America, should prove interesting and informative:

FACTS ABOUT RUMANIA

Desirous of being, within the limits of my modest means, of real service, first, to my beloved adopted country, the United States of America; second, to the cause of world peace founded upon the unmitigated principles of democracy; and, third, to the country of my descent, Rumania, in its struggle for survival against the voracity of the rapacious and power-drunk Russian colossus, I deem it vitally important in order to prevent a fatal diplomatic mistake of far-reaching consequences to call the benevolent attention of many seemingly ill-informed representatives of the United Nations to facts much too weighty in the scale of things to come to be overlooked without tardy regret.

The Rumanian people, born in the crucible of time—the offspring of the Roman conquerors and the valiant Dacians—have been the sentinel of the west, checking the subsequent invasions of the ruthless barbarians from Asia throughout many centuries, as the Roman poet, Ovidius, wrote: "Here plows the unfortunate, here he holds his weapon in his hand." Although often repressed in the relentless struggle, it had never failed to reassert itself. History proves that—for centuries, without being politically organized as a nation—not in 2,000 years has part of greater Rumania ever been successfully—that is permanently—assimilated by any other sovereignty. There have been attempts at conquest, supported by overwhelming force, material and diplomatic. But never has the subjugation lasted. No part of Rumania as it appeared on the map at the end of World War I ever ceased to be in fact, whatever its name, Rumania. The Turk overran Wallachia and Moldavia. But they continue to be the same. Russia seized Bessarabia, but Bessarabia never became a part of Russia. Austria took Bucovina, yet Bucovina was never Austrian. Hungary usurped Transylvania, but Transylvania was never Hungarian. All these suzerainties lay but on the surface of the country and their weight was heavy, but they did not penetrate the soil. There was in the people a spirit that could not be captured and tamed to the foreign yoke.

Eventually this very fact should eliminate further need of proof regarding the historical rights of a sovereign Greater Rumania. The same fact also arises from the depths of the twice-millenary past in legitimate and indignant protest against the unwooed Communist embrace of the Soviets indulging in political polygamy.

For the advancement of Europe's—even the entire civilized world's—economical as well as political rebirth in the spirit of real democracy, the power politics of Soviet Russia, therefore, must be checked at all costs, especially in the face of the despotic acts perpetrated under the pious cloak of protection against the very sovereignty of its neighboring states including Rumania, which have proven beyond doubt the boast of the late Russian general—a past governor of Bessarabia—Kutussov, that he "would leave the peasants only their eyes to weep with," to be its ruthless program in dealing with its unfortunate wards.

As a matter of fact, a free, sovereign Rumania is obviously indispensable in maintaining the political and most of all the economic balance of Europe, as well as the international trade routes on which depends in large measure the welfare of the European civilization whose strategic center is Rumania—a fact still not fully realized by the world, and neglected by short-sighted diplomats.

Notwithstanding the great amount of propaganda and the ping-pong game of bullying arguments to the contrary, in her undeveloped possibilities—by the continuous assaults of barbarians frustrated in its normal growth—Rumania, by its central geographical position, has a unique balancing role among the countries of Europe. North as well as south, west as well as east, she is surrounded by highly developed countries whose progress needs the intercommunication over her own territory.

Out of the mist of the past emerges not only the political value of the Rumanian people as an undaunted sentinel of the West, and Christianity of such excellence that Pope Sixtus IV, though a Catholic, was prompted to bestow on Stephen the Great, the Moldavian prince-warrior, the flattering title of "Athlete of Christ," but also their ceaseless struggle for national unity. This, the Wallachian prince, Michael the Brave, succeeded in achieving for a short time by the conquest of Moldavia and Transylvania, thus becoming "Prince of all the Rumanians" in the sixteenth century.

Peremptory as the historical, ethnographical, biological, political, and even strategic angles are in the postwar arrangements of boundaries and recognition of sovereignties, etc., I am convinced that there is one specific angle of the utmost importance, the economic angle, which supersedes every other reason or consideration at the Peace Conference, in the present phase of interdependent Europe, if not the whole world.

Rumania, by its central position and wealth, is strategically, as well as economically, most vitally important because, by its geographical position, it is the very heart not only of the continental but also the international commerce, since the reduction of political frontiers which previously intersected the old overland trade route (or Amber Way) connecting the Black Sea littoral with the Baltic, skirting the Carpathians.

Europe's former artificial trade routes through Trieste, Fiume, and Odessa, which existed only as a result of the predominance in continental trade of the former central states which needed exits to the Adriatic and Black Sea, were ruined by the rebirth after World War I of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Thus, the natural trade routes, and those which have arisen through the orientation of central Europe's economic interests toward the mouths of the Danube—all have to traverse Rumania. Moreover, if it is remembered that the Danube is navigable almost all the year round from the Black Sea to Galati for oceangoing vessels, and thence upward to Vienna for smaller boats, through Rumania lies the shortest and most open road to the east.

Also, the straightest road to India is, by land or air, through Rumania, which is situated midway between England and India. This fact should be given the utmost consideration, as it is vitally important as an international economic factor of first significance. Greater Rumania offers, as a petrol-producing country, also the possibility to be used internationally as a refueling station. Rumania's central position on the trade route to India presents other advantages too. All these add up to one irrefutable conclusion; greater Rumania, extended to the nation's ethnical boundaries, which include Transylvania, to the border of Poland, Bucovina, Bessarabia up to the rivers Pruth and Dniester, and the Dobrudja to the shores of the Black Sea, has to be restored as a sovereign state, entirely free from any sphere of interests, making it possible to be of unbiased service to every nation, large or small, in the pursuance of their trade and commerce.

Needless to say that without guaranteeing, if necessary by concerted action of the United Nations, the sovereignty and neutrality of greater Rumania, which by its advantages of breadth of territory, wealth of natural resources, especially the rich oil wells, and geographic position is plainly the key to the future welfare of western Europe and also England. There is no possibility of creat-

ing the conditions to the rehabilitation of the political and economic balance so important for a lasting peace and the prosperity of Europe, and the world.

Unfortunately, Soviet Russia, our mighty wartime ally, in the defiant pursuance of its imperialistic aims, disregards any reason and fact which might interfere with its power-politics designs.

Let us not forget that Rumania was forced in World War II to fight on the side of Germany by Russia in 1940, when she took Bessarabia, part of northern Bucovina, and Moldavia while she was a partner in crime with Hitler's Germany. At that time she stole from Rumania about 30,000 square miles and over 4,000,000 people, of which 70 percent are Rumanians, and the rest Ruthenians, Bulgarians, Jews, Germans, and others. Why should Russia continue the occupation of Rumania? In order that her army may continue raping 10-, 11-, and 12-year-old girls, and looting the country from one end to the other.

Out of 2,000,000 horses, she stole nearly 1,500,000. Of 8,000 trucks, she stole nearly 7,000. They took 2 out of every 3 cattle; they took the grain and shipped it to Russia, and reshipped it back to Rumania, saying "Here we are, your good friends; we will not let you starve. We shipped into your country hundreds of carloads of wheat," but what they did not tell the people was that it was the same wheat they had stolen from Rumania. They looted homes of furniture and clothing. They steal the automobiles off the streets and sell them, and if later they find the same car on another street, they steal it again and resell it.

Rumania has lived in her 2,000 years of existence under the yoke of different foreign invaders of all sorts, including barbarians, but never has she experienced more inhuman and unjust treatment, and the most immoral conduct on the part of the Russian Army, which is a disgrace not only in the civilized world, but also in a world of tribesmen. America and Great Britain have a moral obligation toward Rumania and every other country which lives under the heavy yoke of Russia, to see that she withdraws her army within her borders of 1939, and by not later than August of this year, if there is to be permanent peace in the future.

I hope that the representatives of the United Nations, led by those of the United States of America, will find the proper way to convince Russia to yield to the utter necessity of a free and neutral sovereign greater Rumania, for the survival, benefit, political tranquillity, and prosperity of the old Continent's starved and martyred population.

It is democracy versus ruthless despotism. Democracy must also win its battle for permanent world peace if it is to survive.

* * * * *

In substantiation of Rumania's irrefutable rights to the territories of Transylvania, Bucovina, Bessarabia, etc., I shall present here a few historical facts:

The territories transferred to Rumania by the peace treaties at the end of World War I united with the old kingdom by the freely expressed will of their people.

Bessarabia, which had previously proclaimed itself an independent Moldavian Republic (December 2, 1917), joined the old kingdom forever by the resolution adopted on April 9, 1918, by the national assembly (council of the country) at Chisinau in the name of "historic rights," of "national rights," and of "the power of the people to settle their own destinies." Similar resolutions were then voted by all the district assemblies of Bessarabia.

The annexation of this province to Rumania was accomplished under exceptional conditions, for Bessarabia, having first separated by its own will from the old Russian state, became an independent republic and finally decided to unite with its mother country, Rumania.

Thus, the union was not a matter of separation from, or retrocession by, Russia in the name of legitimate reintegration or of moral reparation, but a pact of union concluded between two independent Rumanian states.

Bessarabia then joined Rumania by the frequently declared will of its population, on the basis of historic rights (it had been an integral part of Moldavia until 1812), in application of the principle of nationality (the great majority of its population is Rumanian), and by virtue of the right of self-determination.

By the Treaty of Paris of October 28, 1920, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan recognized the final union of Bessarabia with Rumania.

A second province, Bucovina, annexed by Austria in 1775, was liberated in 1918. A resolution voted by the National Assembly of Cernaut on November 28, 1918, proclaimed Bucovina's perpetual and unconditional union with Rumania within its old frontiers, extending to Ceremus, Colaciu, and the Dniester. This act was based upon historic rights (since the foundation of the Rumanian lands, Bucovina had formed an integral part of Moldavia), on the right of national self-determination and on the principles of "right" and of "humanity."

The Germans of Bucovina likewise agreed to the union by a proclamation of their national council. It contains this passage:

"In view of the coming union of Transylvania and of the Banat with Rumania, and with entire confidence in the program put forward by the provisional government of the country in the session of the Rumanian National Council on November 13, 1918, and approved almost unanimously by the latter, which declares that due consideration will be given to the cultural necessities of the non-Rumanian people who live in the country, and that the principle of law and of justice will alone prevail in all circumstances, the German National Council, in the name of the Germans of Bucovina, votes for the union of Bucovina with the Kingdom of Rumania."

Transylvania, which had been forcibly annexed to Hungary in 1867 against the will of the Rumanians and of the Germans, united with Rumania by the resolution adopted on December 1, 1918, by the great Rumanian National Assembly at Alba Iulia. The resolution contains this passage:

"The National Assembly of all the Rumanians of Transylvania, of the Banat, and of the 'Hungarian Country,' meeting at Alba Iulia on December 1, 1918, decrees the union with Rumania of these Rumanians and of all the territories which they inhabit."

A delegation from this National Assembly presented the Act of Union to King Ferdinand I, and the law of December 11, 1918, announced that "the territories affected by the decision taken by the National Assembly at Alba Iulia on December 1, 1918, are, and shall always remain united with the Kingdom of Rumania."

In an assembly of their accredited representatives, held at Medias on January 8, 1919, the Germans of Transylvania declared that all the ties which bound them to the old Hungarian state were broken, and freely joined the Rumanian state, now reconstituted in its integrity. Their National Council issued the following proclamation:

"The National Assembly of the Saxons of Transylvania, meeting at Medias on January 8, 1919, has unanimously decided in favor of the union of the Saxon people with the Kingdom of Rumania. The German Saxon National Council for Transylvania has the honor to communicate to the Rumanian Central Council the text of the proclamation addressed to our people:

" 'To our people:

" 'The enlarged Saxon Central Committee, united with the German Saxon National Council for Transylvania, acting as the accredited representatives of the Saxon people of Transylvania, unanimously adopted the following resolution at Medias on January 8, 1919:

" 'World events have created a new situation for the territory in which the Saxon people of Transylvania have made their home for nearly 800 years. King Ferdinand I of Rumania, by his decree of December 27, 1918, has proclaimed and established Rumanian rule over this territory. The most numerous people of Transylvania and of the border districts of Hungary has proclaimed in the Assembly of Alba Iulia its union with Rumania. By the union with Rumania of Transylvania and of parts of Hungary inhabited by Rumanians, a common territorial unit will be created founded on a racial basis.

" 'In view of these facts, and with the conviction that this is an event of world-wide importance, the Saxon people of Transylvania, basing its action upon the right of self-determination, proclaims its union with the Kingdom of Rumania, and transmits to the Rumanian people its fraternal greeting and its cordial wishes for the realization of its national ideal.' "

In one of his works, Stefan Ludwig Roth, leader of the Saxon national movement toward the middle of the nineteenth century, recognized that the Rumanians formed the majority of the population of the Ardeal; he called their language "the secret language of the country." At the same period another Saxon scholar, Dr. Daniel Roth, declared that the future would surely bring about "the union of all the Rumanians on both sides of the Carpathians."

This is Rumania in brief.

NICHOLAS NEAMTU MARTIN,
Managing Editor,
Solia Rumania News, Detroit, Mich.
MARCH 26, 1946.

The Dairyman's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 20, 1946:

THE DAIRYMAN'S PROBLEM

Wisconsin dairymen are—and should be—concerned about the new package which has been developed to make oleomargarine more attractive and easier to color.

During the war the consumption of this substitute for the then-rationed butter rose in the State from almost nothing in 1942 to 45,000 pounds in 1943, to 975,000 pounds in 1944, and to a high of 1,609,000 pounds in 1945. A considerable additional quantity was brought into the State for or by individuals. Since the end of rationing, sales have declined materially, which indicates that most people prefer butter, if they can get it.

If dairymen are realistic, they must admit that, in the country at large, oleo has come to be a competitive item to be reckoned with. They must admit, too, that a high tax on oleo in the dairy States will not stop the competition, even in those States. The only thing that will prevent further capture

of the butter market by the substitute is a change in the butter situation itself.

The milk producer starts with one advantage and one disadvantage. Butter is a superior product, but it is more costly. At the moment, too, it is unavailable in sufficient quantity. There is now a ceiling price, kept reasonably low through a substantial subsidy. Much butterfat which used to go into creameries is being diverted, however, because the producer can make more by selling fluid cream, which is not price controlled.

In this situation many farmers are asking two things—the end of subsidies and a ceiling on butter which will cover both the subsidy and the present differential in favor of fluid cream. This, we submit, is a dangerous position for the farmer, for it would raise the retail price of butter to a point where oleo would be so cheap by comparison that its position would be greatly improved.

It is not realistic to make more butter available by raising the price to a level where fewer consumers can afford it. Butter can never be as cheap as oleo, and need not be. The differential must, however, be held within bounds.

The answer to the present problem, then, entails recognition of the fact that the price of fluid cream is now too high. Since subsidies must some day go, the time to end them is now. That will increase the retail price of butter about 12 cents a pound. If appropriate ceilings were put on fluid cream, adding another 2 cents to the price of butter should save the butter market and at the same time keep the dairyman's income at an encouragingly high level.

That is the kind of adjustment that the farmers should be for.

Resolution on Investigation of Profit Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me this morning before the Rules Committee of the House on the subject of House Resolution 481:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to ask for approval of House Resolution 481.

On January 14 I introduced this bill, calling for the resumption of the hearings held in 1939 by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance on the subject of profit-sharing plans in business and industry and the possible application of the principle of incentive taxation to encourage a Nation-wide adoption of such plans.

Since that time, this proposed measure has had the most enthusiastic reception by leaders in both labor and management, as the extraordinary volume of mail received in my office on the subject will prove.

Mr. Chairman, I have read many cogent arguments in the hundreds of letters which I have received. But I ask your indulgence to read excerpts from the argument on profit-sharing advanced by the Alliance for the Promotion of Profit Sharing. This is an organization headed by Homer Martin, formerly international president of the United Auto Workers of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. On its board is Mr. James Lincoln, of the Lincoln Electric Co., of Cleveland, which has had a profit-sharing policy in successful operation for nearly a decade. The argument sets forth very clearly the reasoning which led me to believe that the time has come for this Congress to study the whole question of profit sharing, in the hope that it is one of the dynamic democratic solutions for industrial strife we are all seeking.

"PROFIT SHARING AS AN ANSWER TO CLASS WAR

(Excerpts from the Guide Plan adopted by the Alliance for the Promotion of Profit Sharing)

"Prior to the First World War, private enterprise, although increasingly harassed by class warfare, was pushing back the borders of State autocracy everywhere. Democracy, the Siamese twin of private enterprise, was on the march of every land.

"Private enterprise was seriously affected, however, by the consequences of that war plus intensified class warfare; and from then on, the pendulum has been on the swing back to statism, with private enterprise and democracy in retreat everywhere.

"The Second World War has been far more costly than the first. We are now faced with a war debt of $300,000,000,000, plus a needy and very poor Europe and Asia.

"The destructive consequences of the Second World War to private enterprise and democracy are likely to be far worse than those of the First World War unless America succeeds in reversing the domestic trend toward statism. Our victory in this war has given us the opportunity for a final victory over totalitarian statism. However, this victory is possible only if we Americans work together as we have never done before. In order for us really to work together, the basic causes of class warfare must be eliminated by a practical plan of democratic and mutually beneficial operation of industry, by which private enterprise will become the cherished concern of employees as well as employers.

"Profit sharing is not a cure-all for social ills, but if honestly applied it offers the possibility of a radical change in the present capital-labor relationship concept and can deal a death blow to class hatred and warfare; for profit sharing quite naturally brings forth cooperation, good will, and mutual responsibility. By including labor along with investors and management among the beneficiaries of greater efficiency and more productivity, self-interest, which has been the mainspring of the private-enterprise system, will bind all together into an industrial team working toward a common goal.

"The proponents of the class struggle and statism have made tremendous progress among the laboring classes, and are obviously depending upon labor's political power to destroy private enterprise and institute a system of despotic statism. It would appear to be a practical certainty that the private-enterprise system is doomed by the sheer weight of accumulating political opposition unless it can depend upon an increasing rather than a diminishing support among the workers. * * *

"As sound as the concept of profit sharing may be from the point of view of a practical and long-range solution of the capital-labor problem, its introduction is likely to encounter objections from those not interested in the fate of our social set-up as a whole. We thus find the following attitude expressed at the 1923 Congress of the British Trade Unions:

" 'Copartnership and profit sharing must be rejected as a device to mislead the workers, prevent trade-union solidarity and the creation of a harmony that promotes aversion to strikes and minimizes the importance of leadership, and may lead to the abandonment of unions.'

"On the other hand, objection is to be expected also from narrow-minded employers who, for temporary advantage, prefer corrupt labor leaders to an honest deal with their employees, and others who, if they only could, would treat them as their peons.

"We fully expect the opposition of the elements above indicated, but we are immensely encouraged by the much better reception the idea is now given among employers, as indicated by the adoption of profit sharing by Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce for a number of years, and others. And we note also the more receptive attitude of some of the most outstanding labor union leaders. William Green, president of the A. F. of L., when questioned on this subject by a committee of the United States Senate, replied: 'Labor is not opposed to the principles involved in profit sharing.'

"John L. Lewis, as president of the CIO (1939), although not generally friendly to the idea of profit sharing, nevertheless said: 'We believe that if a concern wants to share profits with its employees, there should be no difficulty through collective bargaining, to make the necessary arrangement for it.'

"Contrary to the divided attitude of the union leaders on the question, the rank and file of labor, organized and unorganized, as indicated by sampling of opinion, is nearly unanimous in favor of profit sharing.

"Propaganda favorable to the private enterprise system may be very gratifying to employers, but is of little effect on the masses as long as they, conditioned by the past, look upon it as a hostile power to be conquered, and as long as private enterprise itself is not willing to offer an alternative solution to class warfare.

"As long as that condition exists, it is of little use to rely even on 'promises' of responsibility, for under present conditions we are all sitting on a volcano, whose manifestations can hardly be kept down by rules.

"Profit sharing offers a self-regulated, almost automatic process of solving the capital-labor problem, not dependent on promises by the simple process of more production, more profits, and hence more income for all. That is why strikes are unheard of in profit-sharing enterprises. Lest some employers, out of old habit of thought, think that they are giving things away, let them reflect on the fact that when, as now, they are forced to give an increase, the ill will created does not lead to increased production, and often leads to the contrary; nor can the increase always be unloaded on the public. Let them reflect, too, on the man-hours lost and the waste in overhead, plus taxes, created by a State built on class warfare, plus the menace involved to our social set-up as a whole, and they will conclude, as many others have done, that profit sharing is good business for all.

"Let the worker on the other hand reflect on the fact that wage increases that are unloaded on the public reach into his pocket in the form of price increases, thus taking it away in turn, in a merry-go-round of higher wages, higher prices, and making him look like the proverbial cat chasing his own tail, in a process of more dollars and less value, and he will realize that bigger and better strikes do not offer a way out. Let him ponder, too, on the saying of John L. Lewis, that it is preferable to deal with a boss (private enterprise) which, unlike the Government, is not a jail warden at the same time.

"Profit sharing, if introduced into most of the major and medium enterprises throughout the Nation, may, by better diffusion of income and the social security funds built up by the Government, cushion any eventual depression to an extent not possible in the past and thus facilitate an early recovery.

"Increased productivity, too, will tend to stabilize the dollar, preventing further inflation. The elimination of strikes and the accompanying forced price increases may also be a considerable boon to the farmers and the middle classes generally who find it difficult to unload price increases on the public. And the democratization of private en-

terprise will tend to induce greater responsibility toward the public.

"Private enterprise, feeling secure in the loyalty of their employees, may then look too with a greater objectivity upon socially beneficent measures of the Government, now suspect because of the prevailing insecurity and tension. The general feeling of good will, confidence, and security thus induced will make it possible not only to secure what is, but to expand private enterprise on a scale not possible to contemplate under present conditions.

"Profit sharing is the way to take the heat out of class warfare, easing up the tension which now is paralyzing both private enterprise and Government, making everything uncertain and suspect. It is the way to the human engineering, which young Henry Ford speaks of as the great necessity of our age. We Americans who have licked so many problems, if we will, can lick this one too, and by doing so, show a way out for the whole world."

Mr. Chairman, I also ask at this time to read a statement by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG concerning this bill. Senator VANDENBERG was a coauthor of the nonpartisan Senate resolution which inaugurated this study which my resolution seeks to resume.

The statement follows:

"MY DEAR MRS. LUCE: I know of no greater domestic public service that can be rendered America than for the House to proceed, under your House Resolution 481, to reopen and conclude an adequate study of profit-sharing as the democratic basis for adequate and equitable labor-management relationships in the United States. The capitalist system will be safest when all of our citizens are capitalists themselves—and that would be the dynamic result of the general application of profit-sharing to our industrial operations. Wherever we have had sound profit-sharing systems over the years, we have had industrial peace, economic justice, and uninterrupted production. These factors are indispensable to our prosperity and welfare. The factors are too often dangerously absent in our present national economy. To establish them we must blaze new trails. Fortunately, many American business pioneers have shown the way. In my deeply earnest opinion, the House could render no greater service to the common good than to mobilize all available information and experience upon this subject and bring them down to date.

"We started this process in the Senate in the Seventy-fifth Congress when my Senate Resolution 215 was adopted and when a subcommittee of the Finance Committee embarked upon a kindred survey. It was a nonpartisan enterprise. A year of hearings were held by the late Senator Clyde Herring, of Ohio, as chairman, and myself. Our published findings speak for themselves. They are accurately quoted in the preamble to your pending House Resolution 481. We found amazing proof that profit sharing is a significant success in many American enterprises and that it has produced veritable industrial islands of peace, equity, efficiency, and contentment. Although our voluminous report was made several years ago, it is highly significant that there is today a renewed and widespread demand for copies of the report—and to such an extent that a general reprint will be presently sought.

"But this study is not down-to-date. Much labor history—and much history of industrial strife—has been written in the turbulent interim. It is more than ever advisable that profit sharing should be re-explored in the light of current events. I am frank to say that, this time, I should like to see the task undertaken by the House. In my opinion it is bound to produce information of incalculable value—and it may well point the way to economic peace and justice.

"Senator A. H. VANDENBERG."

Mr. Chairman, certainly profit sharing should not be proposed as a substitute for high wages. It should be an addition to high wages and, if possible, regular or annual wages. It should be an extra incentive to cooperation which would ultimately pay its own way. How much has been lost in wages and profits this winter is beyond the power of anyone to compute. The General Motors strike alone is estimated to cost $1,000,000,000. Is it not practical to say that the General Motors Corp., and the General Motors employees, and the automotive industry, and the general public would all have been much better off if the employees had recognized an identity of interest with the success of the company?

Certainly profit-sharing plans should not be recommended as a means of depriving management of its right or its responsibilities to manage. Certainly it would be wrong to advocate any quick or haphazard application of the principle.

Nevertheless, the studies of the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Finance make very inspiring reading. It is reassuring to learn from these hearings that in the past the men of management in many cases showed a statesmanlike understanding of the problems of labor.

The many ways in which they have sought to bridge the gap between themselves and their employees bring to light several very practical principles.

First, it becomes plain that there is no substitute for honest and conscientious effort on the part of management to encourage and reward labor out of profits. Men who have worked such plans successfully reveal their true habits of mind and their fundamental moral soundness. Second, it is obvious that the conditions in various industries vary so greatly that it will require considerable study to arrive at any broad principle of action.

Much has intervened since the Senate committee closed its hearings because of the imminence of war. The changes and dislocations of industry in many cases have caused companies to abandon such profit-sharing plans as they may have carried on in prewar days.

I suggest now that it would be very worth while to call in the best minds of industry and labor and resume the search for some broad principle which would encourage the sharing of profits with labor. This resolution would also allow scope for a study of annual wage plans and incentive taxation plans. None of these will provide a quick panacea. Nevertheless, I feel sure that the men and women in the factories of the United States would feel greatly heartened at the news that Congress was studying these questions, and that there are among us, as among labor leaders and business leaders, many who are eager to find new ways of increasing the common man's share of American prosperity.

Speech of Hon. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, Favoring British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], delivered an address on March 29, 1946, at the town hall meeting in Winchester, Va., in which he discussed in a logical and convincing manner, the question of the proposed loan to Great Britain, and under leave granted same is submitted herewith:

When God created the birds of the air and the beasts of the field, He endowed them, for their protection, with instinct. When he created man in his own image he conferred upon him the inestimable boon of free choice based upon the power to reason. Due to that happy circumstance the proposal of our President that we negotiate a loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain, which was highly controversial when first proposed, is now generally accepted as a wise thing for us to do. Never in my recollection has a major international proposal been so widely endorsed by such divergent groups. When hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on the proposal ended, only three witnesses had appeared in opposition to the loan, two of whom based their opposition on the ground that we could not afford to borrow money to lend to Great Britain which might never be repaid, and the third, General Coxey, of Ohio, is opposed on general principles to all interest-bearing bonds, but indicated he would not object to the loan if printing-press money were used, our stamp to be on one side and that of Great Britain on the other, the money so issued to be legal tender in both countries.

National organizations which have publicly endorsed the loan, many of them testifying before the Banking and Currency Committee, are Winthrop Aldrich of the Chase National Bank on behalf of the International Chamber of Commerce; American Association for the United Nations; American Association of University Women; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Federation of Labor; Americans United for World Organization; American Veterans Committee; Committee on Education for Lasting Peace; Congregational Christian Churches; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Freedom House; General Federation of Women's Clubs; United States Associates of International Chamber of Commerce; Lace and Embroidery Association of America; Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association; National Council of American Importers; National Council of Jewish Women; National Farmers' Union; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; National Foreign Trade Council; National League of Women Voters; National Peace Conference; National Republican Club; National Women's Trade Union League; Research Committee of the Committee for Economic Development; Overseas Automotive Club; Tobacco Association of the United States; Union for Democratic Action; United States Chamber of Commerce; Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace; World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches and the Church Peace Union and Young Women's Christian Association.

If the proposed loan was nothing but a money transaction the suggestion that we cannot afford to lend so large a sum to a foreign nation might be a persuasive argument against it. But when all of the combined reasons in favor of the loan are taken into consideration such an argument loses significance.

In a full page ad in the Washington Post of Tuesday, March 26, the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., under the caption, "We can afford to make it," said, "The sum we hazard is not inconsiderable, but financial risks have meaning only when related to resources. The line of credit provided by the loan will amount, at most, to a claim on two-fifths of 1 percent of our gross output for the 5- to 6-year period over which it may be used. The interest rate charged, while moderate, is higher than our Treasury is paying upon current borrowings. The risk entailed is well within our resources as a creditor."

Let us consider the reasons influencing divergent groups. The international bankers favor this loan because it will contribute to the stabilization of international currencies, with all the currencies of the world valued with relation to our dollar. The United States Chamber of Commerce favors the loan because it realizes that during the war our industrial capacity was developed far beyond our normal peacetime needs and it favors foreign outlets for our surplus production. It also favors a continuation of foreign trade on the American basis of private enterprise, which may not be possible if Great Britain goes under or in its desperation to survive, is forced to resort to the Nazi or communistic system of state trading. The labor unions of the nation favor this loan because full production with foreign outlets above domestic consumption means full employment for them. Farm organizations favor this loan because we normally export 40 percent of our cotton; 20 percent of our wheat; 20 percent of our fresh apples and pears and dried fruits, and 10 percent or more of our lard and pork products. Like industry, our farmers learned how, during the war, to increase production and they fear the regimentation and the disastrously low prices which inevitably must result from a permanent program of production in excess of available markets. The Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, the Association of University Women, the Federation of Women's Clubs, and similar clubs favor the loan in part because they handle the family budget and realize what a stake the consumer has in the question of restrictive tariffs, quotas, and embargoes upon world trade and in part because they believe that the making of the loan will promote prosperity at home and peace abroad. The primary interests of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Freedom House, Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace, World Alliance for Friendship Through the Churches, and Young Women's Christian Association is in preventing a future war, knowing full well that trade wars usually eventuate into shooting wars.

Speaking here last February, before the annual banquet of the Rouss Fire Co., I referred to the fact that we were unhappy, and many looked toward the future with profound misgivings. There was no contentment in our hearts; our homeland was torn with industrial strife, and dark and disturbing clouds were arising on the foreign horizon. The unity of purpose and action by which we had won the greatest war in history was gone. Already some were saying again, our boys have died in vain—there will be no peace. In the meantime, however, United Nations Organization has been established; the General Assembly has met in London; the Security Council is now meeting in New York; and we, this time, are not a spectator but a major participator. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is doing its best to care for millions of needy victims, the Food and Agricultural Organization is functioning, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has been organized, and the Congress has increased the foreign lending power of the Export-Import Bank. They are all steps in our program for a lasting peace. The proposed loan to Great Britain is another step in that program.

We can drive out much discontent and lift the shadows from the road ahead if we will only realize that there is a significant difference between winning the war and winning the peace. The war is won when your opponents surrender and lay down their arms. Then those who served in that war are entitled to a discharge. King Solomon had much experience with the draft, as he drafted workers as well as soldiers. In his old age, summarizing his philosophy of life in Ecclesiastes, Solomon said, "In that war there is no discharge." Peace is not assured by signing a peace treaty or by joining an international association dedicated to the principles of peace. Peace is not a matter of days, of weeks, or of months. It must be lived, and there is no discharge. A world organization for security is important, but if it is to succeed it must rest upon continuous international cooperation in matters of peace, which is to say economic affairs.

In World War II as in World War I, Great Britain held the line for us until we were prepared. We were thrilled when, in the dark hour of England, that fearless world leader, Winston Churchill, said—"We will fight on land, on sea, and in the air until we win the victory." In making that fight the British suffered heavy losses. One home out of four in England was either completely destroyed or badly damaged. Factories were destroyed or damaged. Thousands of tons of shipping were lost. Debts to foreign nations in the sum of $14,000,000,000 were incurred. Foreign investments in excess of $4,000,000,000 were liquidated. Included in that liquidation was the American Viscose Corp. with great plants in Pennsylvania and Virginia. Over and above all this we are negotiating with a nation which speaks our language, shares our faith in democracy and from Colonial days down to World War II has always been our best customer. She desires to continue to be our best customer but cannot possibly do so without money to rehabilitate her industries at home and assist her in securing a release from the debt obligations to the sterling area abroad. In weighing the penalty for refusal to help rehabilitate Great Britain the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. advertisement previously referred to goes on to say—"The United Kingdom's orbit" (which includes the British Empire and eighteen so-called sterling-area countries) "accounts for more than half of the world's imports and exports combined. It likewise is crucial to the trade of the United States. In the years immediately preceding the war, the sterling area and payment-agreement countries provided just under one-half of both the import and export trade of this country." And then the ad lists these costs in refusing to make the loan—"We would lose through the shrinkage of our trade, through the wrench of violent readjustments in our production patterns, and eventually through the curtailment of our over-all output below what it would be under an open rather than a closed system. We would lose heavily in economic liberty under a procedure that can be followed with success only by a close regimentation of production as well as trade. Most of all, we would lose in prestige, through demonstrating that we are still unprepared to exercise a world leadership to which our giant stature as the possessor of almost half of the world's economic capacity entitles us."

Certain imperialistic reactionaries in Great Britain like certain isolationists in this country do not favor this loan because there are the conditions that we have imposed:

1. That a common code be adopted to govern the regulation of commerce by the nations of the world.

2. That tariffs be substantially reduced and that preferences be eliminated.

3. That quantitative restrictions—quotas and embargoes—be limited to a few really necessary cases and that they be administered without discrimination.

4. That subsidies, in general, should be the subject of international discussion, and that subsidies on exports should be confined to exceptional cases, under general rules.

5. That governments conducting such state enterprises should agree to give fair treatment to the commerce of all friendly states, that they should make their purchases and sales on purely economic grounds, that they should avoid using a monopoly of imports to give undue protection to their own producers, and that governments whose enterprises are completely socialized should commit themselves as to the quantities of goods which they propose to import.

6. That cartels and combines should be prevented, by international action, from restricting the commerce of the world.

7. That action with respect to the special problem of surplus commodities, in world trade, be international rather than national; that the solution of this problem be sought by measures that would remove the basic causes of the difficulty, not by measures that would perpetuate it; and that the solution be sought, in particular, by measures that would expand consumption.

8. That measures restricting exports or fixing prices, where they are necessary, be limited in duration; that they be attended, at every stage, by full publicity; and that consuming countries be given an equal voice with producing countries in their formulation and administration.

9. That an international trade organization be created, under the Economic and Social Council, as an integral part of the structure of the United Nations.

10. That each nation should agree, individually, to take action designed to provide full and regular employment; that no country should attempt to solve its domestic problems by measures that would prevent the expansion of world trade; that no country, in short, should be free to export its unemployment.

When that program for economic cooperation has been adopted by us and Great Britain, the 18 nations of the sterling area will undoubtedly participate and eventually all of the major trading nations of the world, with the possible exception of Russia, will unite in the program as they have done in the other international organizations which we have sponsored. Naturally, I hope that Russia eventually will do likewise, but in the meantime a powerful movement for a lasting peace will have been started. As Secretary Byrnes recently said: "We won the war by fighting together. We must keep the peace by working together."

No OPA for Government as Landlord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while the Government is calling attention to the shortages of food for America and the world and demanding that the farmers of this country produce food in abundance to feed our people at home and assist the starving of the world, yet our Government itself seems to be doing everything to hobble the production of food.

In the first place the President acting through Selective Service is violating the law of the land and taking from the farms those who are producing food. Only this week the Selective Service politely said, "We are paying no attention to the Tydings amendment with reference to those who are producing food."

Now the Government itself is taking an active part to discourage farmers from planting land. At Plum Brook ordnance works up in my district the

Government took thousands of acres of rich farm land from its owners. In fact thousands of acres more than the Government actually needed, so that these surplus Government lands were rented to nearby farmers for the sum of $4 per acre.

And now in the spring of 1946, when the Government demands everyone to produce more food, the very same Government is now demanding $12.50 an acre for the same land it rented for $4 an acre, being an increase of more than 300 percent in rental charge.

While the administration is talking about gouging prices and ceilings on real estate, the very same administration and Government is increasing farm rentals more than 300 percent.

Mr. Speaker, where is OPA? I demand the administration and the Government use the same yardstick of price control that it forces upon the private citizen.

Why Are Veterans Discriminated Against in the Purchase and Lease of Surplus Property?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the disposal of surplus property now under the direction of the War Assets Administration should be thoroughly investigated and revised so that veterans will be given a fair and just opportunity to purchase surplus property. Who is more entitled to a chance to get started in business?

Why should it be necessary for the American Legion to call conditions such as stated in the following letter to our attention?

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Legion national headquarters is daily receiving a flood of letters from veterans citing disappointing experiences in their endeavor to obtain Government surplus property.

Many of these letters are pitiful and appalling. They reveal that the veterans are meeting insurmountable difficulties in their desperate effort to obtain surplus war goods with which to establish or reestablish themselves in a business, occupation, or profession. They cannot understand the blank wall which they come up against. Neither can I.

I am certain that your congressional mail is packed with letters similar to those received by the American Legion. To put it baldly, the veteran of World War II is getting little or none of the goods being set out at surplus sales, and that which is offered him is usually shoddy and beyond use or repair while the new goods go elsewhere.

When I speak of surplus property, all types and sorts are referred to. Vehicles have drawn most conversation and in most instances they are essential to the rehabilitation of the veteran back into civilian life.

But these are not all the story. The veteran needs pot, pans, and other kitchen utensils so that he can set up his small restaurant or cafe and shorten the food lines of this Nation; he needs carpenter, plumbing, or electrical tools so that he can help in the housing problems; he needs bulldozers and scrapers so that he can terrace and save his farm from erosion; he needs materials which the Government has possessed for war purposes in a thousand instances.

But the veteran is not getting these from the Government. From the civilian sources the universal reply to him is:

"You are not an old account. We have goods only for our old customers."

It leaves the veteran empty-handed.

The Government had billions of dollars in goods of every kind for the prosecution of the war. If this property is still held by the Government some efficient method of parceling it out to veterans should be established. If this propeerty has already been disposed of, then the American people should know who got it and how.

The situation is such that immediate remedial steps should be taken or the veterans of this Nation are going to become dangerously discontented and they will lose confidence in promises of the Government. America cannot afford that.

We all are aware that meanwhile the surplus property is melting away through various channels. The action I suggest is for Congress by the quickest possible method, perhaps resolution, to freeze temporarily all surplus property until the situation can be surveyed. The veteran should be given improved priority. The not-for-sale signs should be torn down in the huge warehouses where thousands of articles useful to veterans are on display. Information and distribution outlets should be better organized. The percentage of the total supply available to the veterans should be drastically increased, for his reestablishment in civil life is the pressing national problem.

Otherwise, within a few short months the veterans are going to be left empty-handed, disillusioned, and seriously disappointed—with the surplus property gone.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN STELLE,
National Commander.

The Veterans' Administration should get on the job and check up with the War Assets Administration as to the reason such denial of rehabilitation should be permitted to continue.

Here is another instance of veterans getting the "go by" on the lease of surplus property when it affects medical aid and physical rehabilitation.

The following letter from the veterans' home in California indicates the need of further investigation by the Veterans' Administration:

VETERANS' HOME OF CALIFORNIA,
Napa County, Calif., March 15, 1946.

HON. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCDONOUGH: We would like to enlist your support in an effort to secure surplus Government equipment on a lease basis rather than through purchase.

Public Law No. 457 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 479, second session is known as the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and provides for the distribution of surplus Government property.

This act provides that surplus Government equipment can be transferred to Federal agencies but requires that its disposal to local governments or to nonprofit institutions must be made by sale or lease.

Section 13 of the act, in paragraphs A and B specifically reads that surplus property "may be sold or leased to the States." The lease provision of the act has apparently not been made operative and it is this part of the law governing the disposal of surplus Government property that should become effective by regulation so that veterans' facilities operated by the States could secure equipment by entering into a leasing agreement rather than by outright purchase.

The Veterans' Home of California, as does all State-operated veterans' homes, receives from the Federal Government the sum of $25 per month for each member approved by the Veterans' Administration. Our current operating per capita cost is approximately $75 per month and the Federal Government is paying only about one-third of the operating cost. The Federal Government does not participate in any expenditure for capital outlay. Our present investment in capital expenditures is $4,000,000 and the postwar building program of the home which has been approved by the State legislature and the Governor will add another $6,000,000 to our investment in capital assets.

The new buildings we are going to construct will almost double the bed capacity of the home. The Independent Order of Odd Fellows and their auxiliary the Rebekah Lodge of the State of California are raising a fund for the construction of an industrial vocational training center at the Veterans' Home of California. Training will be offered to disabled veterans of the home and we already have 75 veterans of the Second World War on our rolls.

Page 7, paragraph (c) of the Surplus Property Act states, "The Board shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use by any such State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or institution."

The States in operating veterans' homes and hospitals for the protection of its own disabled veterans are assuming a large financial responsibility, and it would seem that they should be entitled to receive surplus Government property on a long-term lease at a minimum cost.

We believe that it was the intent of the Congress in passing the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to lease to the States, and especially to those agencies of the State who are charged with the care and hospitalization of disabled veterans' surplus Government equipment.

We are sending a similar communication to each Representative and Senator from the State of California in Congress, and it would be most helpful to us if the entire California representation in Congress would help us in this matter.

Very sincerely,

NELSON M. HOLDERMAN,
Colonel-Commandant.

Russian Occupation Forces Living Off the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question is often raised, to what extent can and should the United States or UNRRA assume responsibility to feed the starving peoples of the war-torn world, particularly those areas under the domination of the Russian armed forces. Since our contribution to UNRRA represents about 75 percent of its total outlay, its activities greatly affect our economy at home.

On December 7, 1945, in a statement I made in connection with the granting of additional funds to UNRRA, I said:

Today more than 2,000,000 Russian soldiers and 1,000,000 Russian civilians are policing Poland. Russians, unlike American armed forces, do not have their needs supplied from their homeland. They live right off the people and the land they occupy. With the Polish people greatly impoverished and starved, the presence of these 3,000,000 nonproductive, parasitic foreigners is like a cancer gnawing at the vitals of the Polish Nation.

I might have stated further that if these 3,000,000 nonproductive persons were not present, Poland's hunger and suffering might be wiped out and her need for UNRRA aid materially reduced. Under the present set-up, it may be truthfully concluded that in a large measure, either directly or indirectly, UNRRA is supporting the Russian occupation forces, whereas that is the sole responsibility of the Russian Government.

But Poland is only one example of the depletion and diversion of food supplies in the Russian-occupied lands that consequently require UNRRA aid to prevent complete starvation. There are more than 6,000,000 Russian military and police personnel in foreign lands of Europe and Asia. The same conditions prevail in all Russian dominated and controlled countries in eastern and southern Europe. These came conditions prevail regardless of whether the occupied country was foe, ally, or friend in the recent conflict.

Certainly, the Russian occupation forces, wherever they are, should be supported and fed with supplies from their homeland. The countries they occupy have no surpluses and if they are denied the limited crops they can raise, they cannot rehabilitate themselves; in fact, they may perish.

C. Tyler Wood, of the State Department, brought this matter to a head at the UNRRA convention at Atlantic City in connection with the Russian forces in Austria, who have demanded acreage sufficient to feed more than 250,000 civilians through an entire year. It is high time that this practice be stopped. Our granaries, too, are nearly spent and there is no reason why we should have to deny ourselves food and injure the health of our citizenry merely to support Russian occupation forces in foreign lands. The people of these occupied lands are most anxious to be freed of occupational armies which are impeding their recovery. It is growing more apparent each day that the principal purpose of the armed Russian forces, both military and civilian, is to attempt to convert these peoples to communism, by the use of military and police persuasion. It is understandable that Russian occupation forces may be necessary in Germany and the Nazi satellite countries, but certainly there is no need for them in countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the other countries that are our allies. The UNO should give immediate study to liberating these unfortunate peoples at once. They have earned the right to freedom and the liberty of self-determination.

At this point, I wish to incorporate an editorial from the Evening Star of March 27, 1946, entitled "Living Off the Country":

LIVING OFF THE COUNTRY

The series of proposals made at the UNRRA convention at Atlantic City by C. Tyler Wood, of the State Department, brings into the open another of those issues which divide the Western Powers from the Soviet Union. Mr. Wood charges that the large Russia armies of occupation in Austria have requisitioned large areas of farm land to feed these troops at a moment when that unfortunate country is faced with mass starvation, and that such actions are contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the UNRRA agreement, to which Russia has subscribed. Mr. Wood further asserts that the local Russia military authorities had earlier agreed with those of the other Allied occupation forces that no local foodstuffs should be taken for such purposes.

The gravity of the situation was explained by Mr. Wood when he said that even one-half of the acreage requisitioned by the Russians would feed 250,000 people for a year, and he went on: "Any military attached to a government which is a member of UNRRA which diverts supplies from the use of the nation, denies the very principles to which it is obligated under UNRRA." He then urged adoption of his proposal which limited the taking of local supplies by occupying armies to fresh foods, such as fresh fruits and vegetables, of which there is a surplus, and also that local supplies of oil and gasoline found in occupation territories should be made available to UNRRA for transport and distribution of its food and other supplies.

This program has been opposed from the start by the Russian delegation, and Soviet satellite members have either kept silent or, in the case of Czechoslovakia, have frankly stated: "Under present circumstances we can't take a stand." On the other hand, the British delegation has wholeheartedly supported the American proposal, stating that its information indicated that Austria now "is more nearly threatened with extinction than any other country in Europe."

It should be understood that, while the present controversy is specifically over Austria, much the same condition prevails in other liberated countries of Europe under Russian military occupation. From the first, the Russian armies seem to have systematically lived off the country, and it appears to be a settled Russian policy to have these forces, aggregating millions, maintained by the occupied areas, regardless of its effects upon local situations. With UNRRA's overall supplies so inadequate at best, such violations of Russia's UNRRA obligations are especially intolerable.

The Constitution in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the American Legion of my State conducted an oratorical contest on the subject The Constitution in a Changing World. First, there were county contests in the various counties of my State, and then district contests in each congressional district. The contest for my district was held at Muskogee, Okla. Miss Mary Ellen Ash, of 2621 West Okmulgee, in Muskogee, a junior of Central High School of that city, won first prize, which sent her to the regional contest at Holdenville, Okla.

It is an inspiration to those interested in history and those who love our Constitution to read Miss Ash's oration. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include herein a copy of the same:

THE CONSTITUTION IN A CHANGING WORLD

In the life of every great person there is always a firm, guiding hand, so that when one falters or wanders astray it is always there to lead him back to the right path. With some, as with Washington, this guidance was achieved by prayer. He was known to kneel for hours in the snow asking for divine help before leading his men into battle. Lincoln's mother was the great influence in his early life, encouraging him when the way seemed hopeless. Beethoven, challenged and spurred on by a handicap, wrote great symphonies that will live forever. Edison, with persistent faith and determination, in spite of deafness, lighted the face of the world.

So it is with our United States. All through the years of turmoil and strife there has been one ever-shining beacon toward which our Nation has turned in times of need, the Constitution of our United States. This document was created in one crisis to tide us through that and other great crises. Through the years politicians have attempted to tear it apart, but it has stood like the Rock of Gibraltar, a solid foundation to further our American way of life.

Man's search throughout the ages has been for freedom. Governments, promising that freedom, rose, then when they failed to carry out their promise they collapsed. Egypt and Persia, Greece and Rome, Germany and Japan all failed to adjust to man's needs, and one after another they passed into history.

But can a document upon which our Government is based, written so long ago, fit a changing world, a world full of modern inventions and new methods of transportation? The answer is yes. It has been, it is, it will ever be able to meet the fluctuations of time because the 55 statesmen who formulated it were gifted with the vision and power to look into the future. They wrote it in such a manner and worded it in such language that it will fit any age.

For example, let us examine the office of President. Our President is given a great deal of authority, yet today his powers are limited just as they were in the time of Washington.

Our democratic way of life, that will exist as long as there is an America, is provided for in the Constitution, by which all men are given equal rights. This document guarantees tolerance, taking care of the ignorant that they might be given an education; taking care of the poor that they might be provided with the necessities of life; taking care of the rich that they might not oppress those less fortunate; taking care of the laboring man that he might have protection and healthy surroundings, that he might strike against his employer to gain fair wages and fair working conditions, taking care that everyone may worship God in his own manner.

Although it provides for these things it is by no means a static document, for the powers of the Constitution may be expanded to fit the American needs in several ways: First, interpretation by the Supreme Court; second, by an elastic clause for which Madison was chiefly responsible; third, by article V,

which states that Congress shall have the power to propose amendments which it deems necessary for the fulfillment of the Constitution; and fourth, by public opinion. This is perhaps the greatest factor because of its restraint and control. The people select the man they wish for President and those they wish to represent them in Congress. If these men do not carry out the desires of the public they are removed from office at the next election. In this way, as it is implied in the Constitution, the people control the Government.

We derive most of our power from the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments. These rights are ancient principles of English law which have served the cause of freedom for generations. They were not formulated in a day. The British fought for nearly 500 years to win these rights from despots and tyrants. What are these rights? They are our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom of the press, our freedom of assembly. They are the privacy and sanctity of our homes. They are our guarantee of trial by jury. These are our Bill of Rights. Now, they are over 150 years old. Will they, like the Constitution, reach their two hundredth birthday? That depends upon us, the people of this generation and of the generations of the future.

But can the Constitution and every right it contains and stands for fail? The invincible city of Rome boasted that it could not fall; yet it did. But its destruction was not caused by outside forces. The people themselves were the cause. They began to gamble and allowed their army to disintegrate. Our country might also collapse. But the fault will not rest with the Constitution but with the people themselves. Misplaced faith has ruined many nations. These nations collapsed because their supreme laws were not mobile enough and their leaders did not have the vision to keep pace with the changing world. We have no fear that our great Nation will follows the pattern of those countries because, for the first time in history, in our Constitution a government provided for its own change, without turbulence, without bloodshed, by which it could meet the demands of a changing world.

As the Bill of Rights has been set up as an example for ideal government, so our Constitution itself has exerted wide influence upon other nations, for it is a document such as this that nations of the world are seeking today to govern them as we have been governed by our Constitution. Canada, Mexico, Australia, the Union of South Africa, and many other countries have adopted constitutions patterned to a greater or less degree after our own.

These things I have previously mentioned are proof of the endurance and stability of the Constitution. Yet we have still another. For more than a century and a half of unexampled social, civil, and material advancement, the Constitution has applied itself, adapted itself, amended itself, and through stress and shock of civil war the like of which no other Constitution ever felt, it has remained firm as the basis of our Government. Because of this the American has reason to believe that his fundamental law contains what the Scriptures call "the power of endless life."

The great statesman, who penned the final draft, chose to begin the document with these words: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

That is the preamble summarizing the intention of the Constitution. It has endured 156 years, and it will continue to endure as long as the shadow of Old Glory continues to hallow and sanctify our American soil.

Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the consent of the membership, expressed but a moment ago, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most timely and a remarkably well considered feature editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of March 25, 1946. The editorial to which I have just referred is the following:

CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE

Within a few weeks, the American people will commence the eliminations preparatory to determining, in November, the identities of nearly half a thousand citizens who will comprise all of the lower House and one-third of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

The holding of congressional elections has, of course, been a biennial event for 150 years and more; they have been held in every kind of political and international weather, and are an old story.

This year is different—so much different that any American with an interest in what's going to happen to his income, his business, his Nation, his very life, in the next decade, had better start thinking about the kind of man he's going to send to the Capitol from his district.

The differences between this and an ordinary year bear enumerating. This year is different, first, because it marks the first congressional election of the post-Roosevelt era; next, because it marks the first congressional election of the postwar era; and, finally, because it marks the first congressional election of the atomic age. We may safely leave it to the sociologists to measure the impact of these historic milestones upon the future; it is enough for most of us to concern ourselves with whether that future will come to pass, and by what means.

There is no intent here, in thus dragging in the A-bomb by the heels, to suggest that each congressional aspirant be asked: "What are you going to do about that thing?" If he knew the right answer he'd be a fool to settle for a Congressman's pay. Rather, the purpose is to illustrate the people's obligation, in the gloomy light of a precarious future, to ask the candidate: "How much sense have you got?"

WHAT THE FOUNDERS INTENDED

That question, which can hardly be considered impertinent in view of whose welfare is at stake in this game, is basically one of IQ, but it does not stop there. To demonstrate his fitness to serve, a candidate should demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of the organization in which he seeks membership, of the ills which have overtaken it, and the means of correcting those ills.

He should know, primarily, what the makers of the Constitution meant when they stipulated that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." Those words, and the subsequent phraseology delineating the separate functions of the executive and the judicial branches, were not arrived at by accident. This was the first time in world history when the three principal duties of Government were so divided, and the reason they were so divided was well stated by George Washington in his farewell address:

"It is important * * * that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the power of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. * * * Let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

THREE BRANCHES NOT COEQUALS

The Constitution, then, set up Congress to make the laws, the President to execute them, and the Supreme Court to interpret them. They were not set up as co-equals. The Supreme Court, in broad terms, was the balance wheel; the President was the cutting edge; the Congress was the machinery that made the whole thing run.

Congress was thus set up as the central agency of Government, and by creating a Senate composed of two delegates from each State to serve 6-year terms, and a House whose Representatives, chosen by population unit, serve 2-year terms, the Constitution arranged a check-and-balance system within the Congress. Beyond their joint obligation to pass upon every new law of the land the two branches drew various separate duties. To the Senate went the right to inspect and approve the principal Federal officers appointed by the President, and to pass upon all treaties. And to the House went the most important single duty of all—the exclusive right to initiate financial measures. This was no accident, either—its precedent is found in the attainment of the same right by the British House of Commons a century earlier, after a long struggle to strip the King of the right to levy taxes arbitrarily. The American Colonials hadn't forgotten, either, that they launched a war on the slogan, "No taxation without representation." They weren't going to risk some future despot usurping the right for himself.

STRONGEST OF ALL AGENCIES

This grip on the Nation's purse strings, which could break the back of the Army, the Navy, or any agency answerable to the President, in itself establishes the House of Representatives as the strongest of all the Government agencies—indeed, the most powerful governmental agency in the world. And it received this power because among all the top agencies, it was closest to the people.

If all of this were not sufficient to demonstrate the dominant constitutional position of the Congress, recall one more power—the right to pass, over the President's veto, any measure deemed sufficiently in the public interest.

There is still another power which must be considered here, for it is the one which most frequently gets the legislative branch into trouble—the constitutional right to invest the President with whatever powers he needs to meet an emergency. More broadly, it is the legal right of Congress to turn itself into a rubber stamp in the hands of the President. Because emergencies demand summary action, it has happened in every major emergency in our history. Lincoln, plunged into a civil war, seized every emergency power he could lay his hands on, even suspending the right of habeas corpus; Wilson, in World War I, became, with congressional assent, the most powerful man in the world's history.

WHEN "BOONDOGGLING" WAS A BYWORD

An even more graphic example can be found in the years encompassing the three terms of Franklin D. Roosevelt. That was an era of crises, one tumbling upon another, and, indisputably, strong, swift executive action was necessary if we were to survive. But it was also an era calling for the utmost judgment and intelligence in Congress, if it was to draw the vital line between a sufficiency of Presidential power and the absolute power of

despotism. Congress just didn't have the stuff; it became, for a time, a completely supine servant of the President.

Beginning on March 9, 1933, a Congress scared witless by the specter of ruinous depression approved a mass of legislation unprecedented in history—a hundred days' stint which began with the bank-reform measures and ended with the National Industrial Recovery Act. Much of the legislation was good; much was not; but, good or bad, it was all one to Congress. The legislature completely forgot how to say no, and while it saw a lot of legitimate measures taken to speed recovery, it also gave its blind, blanket approval to the works which were presently to make shovel-leaning a national pastime, "boondoggling" a byword of millions, and Congressmen the favorite models of the comic-strip artists. Not until 1935, when the Supreme Court threw out the NRA as a gross infringement of State's rights and Justice Cardozo lashed out at Congress' habit of surrendering its rights to the President as "delegation running riot," did the legislators begin to bestir themselves. By this time the President had become so engrossed in his one-man show that the Court's action roused him to fury. He thereupon decided to whittle the Supreme Court down to size by revamping the Constitution itself and introduced legislation aimed at crowding out the old conservative Justices. Even his erstwhile rubber-stamp Congress balked at this, and the President then undertook to "purge" the truculent Democrats out of Congress.

INTELLIGENT CONGRESS IS VITAL

It is not detracting from the constructive and brilliant works of the late President to point out that he was capable of error, and that Congressmen by offering up blind acquiescence did the Nation and their own constituents a gross disservice. With such a voluble body of yes-men on every hand, it is little wonder that the President began to think he must have an uncanny gift for being right all the time. In point of fact—as the disclosure of the secret Yalta commitments to Russia has so recently and bitterly demonstrated—he could, on occasion, be very wrong indeed, and his errors could compromise the welfare of his country for many years to come.

There is no point in all this rehash of a closed era except as it concerns the present and future. The point is that neither the late President nor any President could usurp legislative powers without benefit of a considerable mass of shiftless, unintelligent, or unprincipled Congressmen.

And who sends these shiftless, unintelligent, and unprincipled Congressmen to Washington?

The truth is, the Congress will be as good as the people who elect it, for the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, is as close a facsimile as can be found anywhere of the mass will of the people. The present Congress—which incidentally has given the Nation a better deal than its recent predecessors, and shown healthy signs of shaking off the Executive grip—has been the target of frequent public gibing. This is a curious phenomenon, because the people who gibe at their Congress really gibe at themselves, and have only to indulge in a little introspection to find the root of the trouble.

THE PEOPLE'S STAKE IN CONGRESS

The present Congress is by no means perfect, but its improvement will be, as it has always been, in exact ratio to the increasing diligence of the American people. This will be as true in the coming atomic age as it has been in the past. If enough thinking people, exercise that privilege at the polls, there will be enough thinking Congressmen in Washington to give the Government the ballast, the temperance of action, the firmness of footing it needs in these dangerous years ahead. The Nation must look to its Congress for guidance, but the Congressman must also look back to his constituents frequently for the nod that tells him he's on the track. And the obligation for sound, clear thinking does not begin at the primaries, for either the candidate or the constituent. That mandate has already been served upon both, and the noise of Hiroshima and the rumblings abroad at this moment serve only to point up the finality of that mandate—to remind them that this time, they'd better be right.

The Ideal of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I take pleasure in including therein a brief essay on the subject of brotherhood. The author is a very distinguished and learned clergyman, Rev. August F. Bender, for many years the beloved pastor of the Second Reformed Church in Jersey City. He has also been for a long while Protestant chaplain of the Jersey City Police Department.

He is a sound scholar, a faithful and effective pastor, and a celebrated pulpit orator. The article published in the Jersey Observer follows:

BROTHERHOOD SUNDAY WILL BE OBSERVED IN CHURCHES TOMORROW

In the tender leading of His chosen people, God gives us a striking example of what humanity must do if we are to attain the ideal embodied in the term "brotherhood."

Out of bondage, out of the wilderness He led them into the Promised Land. But this was not accomplished without effort on their part. Many were the sorrows that came to them, many were the struggles through which they passed, many were the victories that they won before they were allowed to disperse every man to his own home to enjoy the fruits of united effort.

Viewing all these things with the vision of a prophet, the sacred writer declares of God's dealings with Israel: "As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings, so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange God with him."

In the light of revelation so wonderfully given us, we know that God cherishes all races of men as His own. There are no restrictions measured in terms of utmost borders. All frontiers are pushed back as we become citizens of the universe. Our mutual upward struggle may no longer be limited in its application to the fellowship of those who live next door to us or in the same city or State or Nation. We cannot escape a responsibility to the black man, the red man, the yellow man. "Brotherhood" is a personal thing.

We read in the Holy Scripture: "If a man says, 'I love God,' and hateth his fellow man, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he sees, how can he love God whom he cannot see?"

Prejudice, envy, selfishness, lust, greed, fear, hate—are there no stirrings among us today of the eagle's wings, beckoning us to new endeavors in the high calling of Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace and Good Will?

Did the God of Israel vacate His place of leadership when He planted His people in the hills of Judah? Glance back across the pages of history. Note the striking of the hour of destiny in the affairs of nations—Egypt, guardian of Israel's infancy; Babylon, privileged to forcibly protect the remnant in the hour of distress; Rome, whose dominion was honored by the presence of the Son of God; and—but a short while ago—Germany! All too busy with petty material affairs to build even ever so slightly the structure of brotherhood among men.

Is not this a challenge to America today? Never in all history has the door of opportunity been flung so wide as in the case of our Nation. Her prestige rises superior to that of any other land; her wealth exceeds the wildest dreams of any other generation of people; her resources, her intellect, character, true aspirations, are greater than those of any people ever known! And yet America's contribution to posterity must inevitably be measured by the extent to which she cultivates good will—the spirit of brotherhood among her own people, and through them among the sons of men everywhere, be they Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, Caucasian or Ethiopian.

America's wonderful institutions may perish, her prosperous cities become waste, and her marvelous Government be superseded by another; but the contribution she makes to man's unity of thought, to man's discovery of himself in his fellow man, will survive through the ages.

Empires rise to power; civilizations become dominant and decay and disappear, leaving behind them crumbling monuments to their glory, to gather dust with the passing of centuries; but out of their experience something lives. It is the sediment of love which the race collects and treasures and transmits in the form of eternity of good will, of brotherhood.

Out of the buried ruins of Syracuse comes the inspiriting story of Damon and Pythias. Moab today is a deserted wasteland, and her gods long since vanished from the earth, but the story of love that comes out of her borders with the figure of Ruth goes on through the years, lifting mankind toward God.

Good will then is a personal thing. It begins with the individual. We, all of us, have our responsibilities and opportunities. The contribution we make may not create even a ripple upon the great sea of human experience, but when we put out of our heart the things which stand between ourselves and our regard and love for our fellow man, our brother, we definitely step on a higher plane of life and become one with the great throng that join in the building of the imperishable structure of "peace on earth and good will among men."

"In the beauty of the lilies,
Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom,
That transfigures you and me;
As he died to make men holy—
Let us die to make men free,
While God is marching on!"

Veterans and Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a highly informative

feature-editorial from the Detroit Times of March 20, 1946, in which the provisions of the Gearhart bill, H. R. 2987, which would grant social-security credits on the assumed basis of an earned $160 per month to every honorably discharged veteran of World War II as if there had been no war and the veteran had been in covered civilian employment all of the time he was in the service of his country are endorsed most emphatically.

As the editorial explains the necessity of legislation along these lines better than I have ever seen it stated heretofore, I am sure that the membership, after reading it, will join with me in hastening the day when the provisions of my bill shall become the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Detroit Times to which I have just referred is the following:

PROTECTION RICHLY EARNED

Unthinkable as it is that Americans should be penalized for fighting for their country, the millions of men and women who served in the armed forces in World War II have been penalized in their social security benefits.

Under present provisions of the law they will receive less old-age pension when they attain the age of 65 than if they had stayed home and worked at civilian jobs covered by the social-security system.

The amount of pension to be paid depends on what proportion of his years between the ages of 21 and 65 the worker spends in covered employment. The years spent in military service must be figured into that calculation as nonwork years, and thus they reduce the pension.

Moreover, many thousands of fighting men who had established social-security protection for their wives and children before the war forfeited those benefits, wholly or partially, by serving in the armed forces.

When men to whom that had happened were killed, or died in the service, their widows and children found themselves either with greatly reduced benefits from the social-security system or with no benefits at all, depending on the length of time the husband and father had been in service before his death.

This shocking and cruel situation comes about through the legal requirement that a man must have been fully insured under the social-security system if his survivors are to receive anything.

And in order to be fully insured, the worker must have been employed at a covered job for half of his adult years since January 1, 1937, when the system went into effect, or, if he attained the age of 21 after that date, he must at least have worked half of the 3 years immediately preceding his death.

Thus the widows and children of men who served their country before their deaths for a longer period than they had worked in civilian life receive nothing for their support from the social-security system.

Survivors of those who died after serving less time than they had been on the social-security rolls receive benefits diminished by each month of the man's military service, since the benefits are calculated on the ratio between the periods spent working in a covered industry and those spent not working in such an industry.

Surviving veterans who served in the armed forces longer than they worked under social-security coverage now have no protection for their families. They must work 18 months before they begin to acquire any under the social-security regulations.

The same rule applies to those who, entering the armed forces directly from school, had never worked and, therefore, had no social-security standing. They, too, must work 18 months before they establish any protection for their families.

But others of the same approximate age group who remained at home and worked in war plants have been steadily accumulating social-security protection for their families and for their own old age.

To end this unjust and ungrateful discrimination against war veterans will require a change in the social-security law, and Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, of California, has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill designed to change it.

Representative GEARHART'S measure would provide veterans with old-age and survivor benefits based on an assumed earning of $160 per month for the term of their military service.

Congress should pass the bill without delay.

Farmers Must Get Increased Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, wherever we go or whatever we read we are told that food is the most important of all articles desperately needed. The farmers of the United States are being called upon to produce food to feed the whole world. Our farmers never shirk a responsibility. They will gladly meet this responsibility

But is there any excuse that we should deny the farmer a good price for his products? Why above all things should we hold farm prices down when everything else is going up? If labor is entitled to an 18-percent increase so is the farmer entitled to an 18-percent increase for his products. If Government employees are entitled to an 18-percent increase, so is the farmer entitled to an 18-percent increase for his products.

If the farmers of the United States are given an 18-percent increase for their products they will produce more than the food we so desperately need at this time. If the OPA would give the farmers of our country an across-the-board increase of 18 percent for all their products there would result all the food we need.

Or let us look at it another way. Suppose the OPA refuses to grant this increase—what will the result be? Any person with an ounce of reasoning knows what will happen. We have no butter today because the OPA refuses to raise the price of butter. In fact the OPA is considering reducing the price of butterfat. If this happens there will not only be a food shortage, there will be a famine. There is no reason whatever why the farmer should be the forgotten man in this mess. The future of the American farmer is the future of the world. They were the most loyal workers during the war. They will remain the most loyal workers during peace. They are entitled above anybody else to a fair break in prices.

HIGHER FARM PRICES NEEDED FOR BENEFIT OF ALL PEOPLE

The OPA should raise prices for agriculture; agriculture is the largest industry in the United States and is entitled to economic equality with other groups.

To provide higher prices for agriculture means simply to provide a 100-cent dollar and regulate the value of it at 100 for all groups.

To force the farmer to live in an economy which pays him only 80 cents on the dollar means he will sell his commodities at a bankrupt price.

We have been confronted with this farm-price problem since 1800, and there have been only two 5-year periods since that time when the farmer under normal conditions received full value for his production—1910–14 and 1925–29.

In all other periods, with the exception of war inflation, the farmer received an average of approximately 70 percent of parity price.

The farmer has had, theoretically, equality under the Constitution of the United States, but in reality he has been exploited by being forced to sell his products at public auction.

Seemingly but few of our economists and political leaders have ever recognized the importance of agriculture.

Society has always wanted cheap food. They always single out the farmer in their complaints against the high cost of living.

GOOD FARM PRICES, THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO NATIONAL INCOME

Agriculture is the governing factor in our economy—all employment and income comes from agriculture.

The prices the farmer receives for his products determine whether the Nation's income shall be high or low.

Agricultural raw materials and income determine the number of jobs and the wages which can be paid.

We have in our economy approximately 9,000,000 business units, of which 3,000,000 are nonagricultural and 6,000,000 are the individually owned and operated farms.

We have a capital economy and our farms have approximately two-thirds of the capital investment in productive enterprise.

In 1940 our farms had 10 times the capital investment of our steel and automobile industries combined and employed 10 times as much labor.

Agriculture produces 65 percent of the raw-material income of the Nation and the processing of agricultural products makes up almost two-thirds of our manufacturing industry.

The agricultural industry processing raw material through livestock has the greatest manufacturing plant in the Nation. In addition thereto, over two-thirds of all our agricultural production must be processed into other forms before it enters into our manufacturing plants.

This factor results in agricultural income being the governing factor with a normal precedence of about 6 months.

Only through production of our farms at a high price level can we maintain full employment and national solvency.

GOOD FARM PRICES, THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO EMPLOYMENT

In our economy each dollar of farm income creates $1 for payment of factory pay rolls and $7 of national income, the

1–1–7 formula. This 1–1–7 formula has never been refuted. It has held approximately constant since 1921; nor has it ever been recognized by Congress or experts in our various departments of Government. The 1–1–7 formula is probably the most important ever presented to the American people. Failure to use the formula in the period 1930–41 caused the Nation to lose $473,000,000,000 of national income.

In the postwar era failure to recognize the importance of the formula can result in a loss of $75,000,000,000 annually to the United States. Each dollar of farm income results in $7 of national income; agriculture produces 65 percent of all raw materials.

Factory pay rolls are tied to agricultural income, and as farm prices receded in the latter part of 1937 and reduced farm income approximately a billion dollars in 1938, factory pay rolls came down in ratio.

The only way that the Congress can increase factory pay rolls without incurring a huge addition to the national debt is to first increase the basic farm income. Remember, anything done that reduces the farmer's income $1, more or less, likewise affects other groups, and reduces the national income $7, more or less. That the reverse is also true, viz, anything done to increase the farmer's income $1, more or less, likewise affects other groups and increases the national income $7, more or less.

Can Congress not clearly see that the income for the farmer for his products is the foundation for full employment and national prosperity?

GOOD FARM PRICES, THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO PRODUCTION

The average value of our manufactured goods is 80 percent of the national income. Do we want the value of manufactured goods to be 80 percent of $150,000,000,000 or let the farm income go back to 1940 levels, getting 80 percent of $75,000,000,000? For each 1 percent that farm income is below parity prices, we will have a loss of 1 percent in value of manufactures and 1 percent unemployment. If we permit our farm income to drop back to 1940 levels, we will wipe out $75,000,000,000 a year of national income. Retail sales averaged approximately 60 percent of national income. Do we want 60 percent of $150,000,000,000 of national income in retail-sales volume or 60 percent of $75,000,000,000? The farm income will determine which it is to be.

Higher farm prices do not mean higher living costs. Higher farm prices do not result in higher living costs when calculated on the basis of the increased per capita income generated by higher farm income. The simple facts are that with higher farm prices we have a corresponding increase in income for all groups and the cost of living on the basis of income does not increase as farm prices increase, it remains practically constant. In 1932, with approximately 65 percent of farm parity, we had 65 percent employment. In 1940, with approximately 85 percent of farm parity, we had 85 percent of employment; the foundation for full employment is parity price for agriculture. For each 1 percent that farm prices are below parity we will lose approximately 1 percent of the physical production of our factories. Labor should support higher prices for farmers because that is the foundation for continued factory output.

INCREASE IN FARM PRICES WILL NOT LEAD TO INFLATION

The cost of raw material in determining prices is small. The resulting increase in prices to the consumer will be insignificant. What is more convincing is the fact that every dollar of increased income for the farm will bring $7 increased income throughout the Nation. With this $7 increased national income people can more than afford the small increase in price and have quite a sum left over. To say that we must keep farm prices down to stop inflation is the reasoning of a dumbbell.

HIGHER FARM PRICES, THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO TRADE AND WORLD PEACE

America now has no surpluses of agricultural products; there may be an accumulation of certain commodities that were held off the market—due to war and other conditions. Higher farm prices is the solution of our economic riddle. Had high farm prices prevailed for the period of the so-called surpluses, money for needed new industries would have been available on reasonable terms as and when it was wanted and there would have been no unemployed.

In 1930–39 we were laboring under a surplus complex and our farm production did not expand above the 1925–29 level; we had low prices which in turn gave us a low national income and underconsumption; we did not have surplus production.

RAILROAD INCOME A GOOD EXAMPLE

Gross operating revenues of our railroads followed farm income down in ratio, and they followed farm income when it rose again. In the postwar, if we permit farm income to drop back to 1940 levels, the railroads will lose $4,500,000,000 per year, with like ratio of losses to other groups. Total transportation income is approximately one-half of gross farm income.

New construction averages approximately 12 percent of the national income. Approximately 2,800,000 jobs in the construction industry are available in the reconversion period if materials are released and other controls removed. In 1920 all farm prices started downward bringing about the depression of 1921. Failure to raise farm prices in the 1930–41 period prevented our Nation from again having full employment and normal income; and, caused us to lose $473,000,000,000 of potential income in that 12-year period.

The record proves quite clearly that our first step as a Nation is to have OPA raise prices for agricultural products. By stabilizing farm prices in the United States, we automatically stabilize over 40 percent of the income of the world and, with full parity for farm products in the United States we will lay the first foundation stone in bringing about world prosperity as a foundation for permanent peace.

Our tariff should be flexible, automatically representing the difference between our parity price level and the landed cost of any imported product. With only 6 percent of the world's population we produced approximately 47 percent of the world's goods. With the natural resources to produce 98 percent of everything we need, our export trade will be trivial and insignificant. If we will maintain our present farm production and maintain our farm prices at high levels we will not have any serious unemployment or depression.

At good prices our farm production always creates the income to consume our production or in the case of any surplus, to consume the products of other nations for which we exchange our surplus. Good farm prices can end the confusion which now exists as to our future economic policies and make it possible for industry to carry on a definite program of reconversion.

THE OPA SHOULD START WITH BUTTER

A good place to start giving our farmers the fair break is with butter. People want butter. People want to pay a little more to get butter. There is no excuse whatever why the OPA should not increase the price of butter.

To sum up my whole story in a nutshell, here is how I feel about the whole matter of farm prices. It is well summed up in the following letter I have written to Mr. Paul Porter, the OPA Administrator. Here it is:

MARCH 29, 1946.

Mr. PAUL A. PORTER,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: The dairy farmers of my district, which comprises 14 counties, are very much upset over the rumor that the OPA intends to lower the price ceiling on cream to the September 1945 level rather than raise the price of butter.

I have made a complete tour of my district during the latter part of December and January of this year, and if the OPA goes through with this ruling and reduces the price ceiling on cream rather than increasing the price of butter, I know that it will deal a body blow to the dairy industry in my district. What is more, I am certain that the farmers will lose all courage to hang on and produce and they are going to quit.

At the present time the farmers are already disposing of their milk cows because of the high price of feed and farm labor. Should this ruling go through one cannot imagine how this disposing of milk cows would be increased.

This problem of price control is a very serious one with me, and I am for it. However, if it becomes a question with me as to which is more important—price control or the saving of the dairy industry in my district—I will vote against price control and save the dairy industries of my district.

I see no reason whatever why the price of butter cannot be increased to give the farmer the return he deserves on his products. Everybody is getting a raise and I see no reason why the farmers should bear the brunt of price control.

Please, Mr. Porter, accept this letter in the spirit in which it is written.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Member of Congress, Tenth District of Wisconsin.

Powers and Duties of the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River Under the Mexican Water Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Representatives SHEPPARD, Democrat, California; HINSHAW, Republican, California; PHILLIPS, Republican, California; IZAC, Democrat, California; and HOLIFIELD, Democrat, California, concerning bills introduced by them defining the powers and duties of the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River under the Mexican Water Treaty:

SUMMARY OF BILL DEFINING POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ON THE COLORADO RIVER UNDER THE MEXICAN WATER TREATY (H. R. 5944–5–6–7–8, 79TH CONG.)

This bill relates solely to the Colorado River, and has no application to the Rio Grande and Tia Juana River.

The treaty with Mexico of February 3, 1944, as ratified with reservations by the American Senate April 18, 1945, leaves many questions of domestic law and administration open, particularly with reference to the powers and duties of the Secretary of the Interior. An attempt has been made in part to define these duties by an agreement between the Department of the Interior and the Department of State, but legislation is the appropriate and permanent vehicle for such definitions.

The bill also makes clear that certain determinations with respect to the water supply of the Colorado River, which the negotiators of the treaty stated would be made by the Secretary of the Interior, shall in fact be made by that officer, who is already charged by statute with the comprehensive development of that river, and the construction of the storage dams from which the water for Mexico will necessarily come. These determinations include findings as to the existence of surplus or excess waters, which, under the treaty, entitle Mexico to receive more than the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet annually, and, conversely, the determination of extraordinary drought, which entitles the United States to curtail deliveries to Mexico.

The bill also instructs the Secretary of the Interior that, as asserted by the State Department, the United States reservoirs under his control shall not be required to release water in order to improve the quality of the water delivered to Mexico.

The bill also spells out certain matters of domestic law respecting the acquisition of property now owned by American political subdivisions, for use under the treaty. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee report on the treaty made clear that jurisdiction should be vested in the American courts to pass upon the necessity of such acquisition, the amount of compensation, etc., and such proceedings should be under the control of the Department of Justice, no jurisdiction being vested in any administrative officer to pass upon private rights of any character. The proposed bill establishes the procedure for carrying these safeguards into effect.

The treaty is wholly silent on the control of waste water turned back by Mexico into the closed Salton Sea Basin within the United States. The proposed bill sets up protective measures to prevent the inundation of American farm lands by such uncontrolled return flow. It will be recalled that the State Department asserted that some 900,000 acre-feet return flow would reach the river as the result of applying approximately 3,000,000 acre-feet of water to the lands of Arizona. If this ratio should hold with respect to the water delivered to Mexico, highly productive American farm lands in the Imperial Valley would be drowned out by the rise of the Salton Sea.

The bill extends to the Secretary of the Interior the prohibition laid by the treaty and its reservations upon the State Department, forbidding its officers to alter or control private water rights. It makes section 8 of the reclamation law, which contains somewhat similar controls over the Secretary of the Interior, applicable to the employees of the State Department.

The Davis Dam project is reauthoized, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and instructed to charge off to the treaty the investment which the treaty requires, following the precedent already established by legislation respecting the dams to be built on the Rio Grande under the same treaty. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to allocate the power equally among Arizona, California, and Nevada, and to dispose of it on the rate schedules, etc., established by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Construction by the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized for the Sentinel Dam on the Gila River, to control the floods of that stream. Floods from the Gila, not the Colorado, occasioned the disastrous break of 1905, when the whole Colorado River flowed into the Imperial Valley for 18 months, creating the Salton Sea. It is directed that this dam, and other protective works, be built simultaneously with the construction by the Mexicans of the diversion dam which the treaty authorizes them to build, in order that floods of the Gila, obstructed by this new structure, will not again break through into the Imperial Valley, or flood the Yuma Valley in Arizona.

The existing law authorizes the President to make use of the services of the States and their political subdivisions in the construction, operation and maintenance of the new works, and the bill makes this authority applicable also to the works already built but which are acquired by the United States under the treaty.

The bill authorizes appropriations for the works specifically authorized by the reservations to the treaty, including Davis Dam and protective works, and adds authorization for appropriations for Sentinel Dam. It specifically withholds authority to spend appropriated funds for projects not authorized.

The bill, in short, is an earnest effort to define and spell out the functions and powers of the Secretary of the Interior, so as to integrate his functions and duties under the treaty with those which he possesses under the Reclamation Law. It deals solely with matters which are the proper subject of domestic legislation, and the control of American statutory officers and American works, and does not necessarily concern or affect Mexico.

OPA Sugar Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, recently when an increase of 20 percent in the allotment of sugar for commercial users was granted by the OPA and a similar raise was not given to individual home consumers, I questioned the fairness of this regulation. It seemed to me that the OPA had failed to consider the proper relationship of the individual consumer to the commercial users.

Home consumers, good citizens, and patriotic as they are, made little outcry or gave little evidence of dissatisfaction when they suffered drastic cuts in the amount of sugar they were permitted to use during the war period. The half pound of sugar per week per person that has been meted out during the war was only a fraction of the usual amount of sugar consumed by our home folks. Then, you will remember that in late 1945 the home consumer was again compelled to accept a 42-percent cut in his already meager apportionment of sugar. Now our home folks are only allotted 5 pounds every 4 months. And, if the family uses coffee with sugar and expects enough for an extra cup, he will find that his sugar rationing will last little over two-thirds of this allotted time.

If a consumer used two cups of coffee per meal and one teaspoon of sugar each, at the end of a year he would find himself 7½ pounds short of enough sugar for coffee alone, to say nothing of occasional home-cooked pies, cakes, and cookies; and he would have no sugar for his breakfast cereal.

I have reliable information that we will have available for distribution in the United States during 1946 a million additional tons of sugar over and above the amount available in 1945.

I believe that the OPA should correct its maldistribution and allot sugar in such a way as to permit enough sugar for coffee and for additional home cooking uses. Certainly the entire tonnage of sugar available for 1946 should not be allotted entirely to commercial users.

We learned a cruel lesson at the end of World War I in the stock piling of sugar, and a subsequent surplus and price collapse; let us not repeat this mistake by creating a stock pile of sugar at this time.

Did America Lose the War Against Militarism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

He answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, it will be fair weather: for the sky is red * * * ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?—St. Matthew.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, did America lose the war against militarism?

Has degrading and dictatorial militarism simply been transferred from Japan and Germany to America?

Has the New Deal used its war-entrusted power to deliver the humble people of America into the shackles of an all-powerful militarism?

If that has happened, no betrayal in history will equal it. But unless the American people recover their liberty quickly, that will have happened.

How real is the threat of disaster that I am inquiring about? From widely separated but outstanding economic and spiritual authorities this week, come solemn words of warning about the danger of tyranny in America.

First. Bernard Baruch, March 25, before House Banking and Currency Committee:

If this is not done, we shall soon find ourselves in the morass of confusion that will bring us either to fascism or communism, and that Ark of the Covenant of human liberties and dignities, our form of government, will have been lost.

Second. The Christian Century, on March 27, in an editorial entitled "A Militarized America," details the march toward the Roman victory described by St. Augustine, wherein "the conquerors became ever more like the conquered." The complete editorial follows:

A MILITARIZED AMERICA

With a swiftness that most Americans do not perceive, the United States is being militarized. True, the outward forms of civilian government are intact. But more and more the military hand grips the reins of real power.

Military minds are making foreign policy by laying down the conditions under which foreign policy must function.

Military budgets are being established without effective supervision or check by any civilian authority.

Military men are being seated in key posts hitherto held by civilians.

If the present trend continues much longer, the United States will soon find itself as much under military control as was Hohenzollern Germany or prewar Japan.

At the moment, the Russian-spy scare is speeding up this process of militarization. There is no use trying to minimize the spy scare. No nation could feel comfortable in the face of such revelations as have already come from Canada, and of the fear that there are even more disturbing facts still to be disclosed. Knowledge that Russia is maintaining a vast network of spies within our borders makes us uneasy, even when we remember that it was only a few weeks since Washington was shaken by the controversy as to what agency is to run the equally vast spy system that we intend to operate from now on. (Of course, we don't call it a spy system. We call it intelligence. Ask Stalin what the difference is.)

But if the presence and danger of Russian spies is real, that does not alter the fact that the military forces in Washington have seized on the Canadian disclosures as a heaven-sent opportunity to rush their program through Congress. The hysterical manner in which these spy revelations have been played up in the press and over the air suggests that the purpose is not so much to thwart Russian snooping as to stampede the American public. Great military powers, and most lesser ones, constantly spy on one another. Their spies are constantly being discovered. Ordinarily, when they are discovered in peacetime they are expelled from the country with a minimum of publicity. Ordinarily, this equivocal business is carried on in such a way as to create the least possible disturbance in the public mind. But not this time. This time it is evidently the intention to produce the biggest possible sensation and the biggest possible scare.

Why? Probably many factors enter in, but high up on the list we would place the eagerness of the military to use this spy scare to push through Congress two pieces of legislation which, as recently as a month ago, Army and Navy men had lost hope of seeing enacted. The first of these is the bill to extend the present draft law, now set to expire on May 15. The second is the bill for permanent peacetime conscription. Had there been no Russian war scare and no Russian spy scare, conscription would almost certainly have ended 6 weeks hence and the peacetime draft proposal would have died in committee. Now the prospect is just the opposite. The military men are jubilant as they anticipate, thanks to timely help from Russia, a United States with permanent universal conscription.

Another spectacular indication of the way in which the Nation is being militarized is to be seen in the handing over of key posts in our diplomatic service to Army men. Army generals now fill the critical ambassadorships to Russia and China. A general is ambassador at Panama—an appointment whose significance needs no pointing out. An admiral has been sent to fill the vacancy in the embassy at Brussels. Washington is full of rumors that the next ambassadors to London and to Rio de Janeiro are to be military men. The President's closest personal adviser on foreign relations is an admiral. Now to cap it all, with the problem of the permanent administration of occupied Germany to be faced, and Mr. Truman's promise to put this administration under the State Department to be reckoned with, the solution reached has been to appoint a major general as an Assistant Secretary of State in charge of occupied territories. Thus the form of civil administration is to be preserved, while making sure that the actual power rests in Army hands. Moreover, there are many newspaper correspondents at the National Capital who assert that a determined campaign is well advanced to replace Secretary Byrnes with a general or admiral as head of the Department of State.

None of these developments, however, points as clearly toward the militarization of America as the recent swing toward Army control of atomic energy. Here, too, the Russian scare has played its part. When the May-Johnson bill was first formulated a cry of alarm rose from practically every college science hall and experimental laboratory in the country, for the system of control envisaged in that bill would have made a military man absolute dictator over all scientific experimentation as well as industrial development in this field. As soon as the American public began dimly to realize what was involved, public opinion began to echo the alarm of the scientists. The special McMahon committee was formed in the Senate, with the expectation that it would write a bill which would insure the freedom of civilian scientists from military control. The precise opposite has happened.

In the House the Military Affairs Committee has reported out the May-Johnson bill. If it becomes law a single administrator will hold the entire development of atomic power, destined to be the basic factor in all human life, in his hands. The only other person in the United States with anything remotely approaching the dictatorial power of this one man will be his deputy administrator. It is understood that, if this bill becomes law, the omnipotent administrator will be an Army man; the deputy administrator from the Navy. In the Senate, although as we write action has not been completed in committee, the press reports that the McMahon committee will report a bill which, as amended by Senator VANDENBERG'S motion, will place the civilian commission ostensibly in charge of atomic energy developments practically at the mercy of an advisory military group which will have the power, by resort to the President, to stall the decisions of the commission interminably. Only Senator MCMAHON is reported as standing out for genuine civilian control. The stage is set for military control of atomic development—something the armed forces want even more fervently than they want universal conscription.

The scientists, naturally, are appalled. They see their last freedom vanishing. They see their future ruled by military fiat just as were their experiments on the atomic bomb when they lived and worked under the orders of Major General Groves. They point to the ridiculous episode that occurred in Atlantic City last week when two scientists were refused permission by one Army authority to read a paper before the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology after another Army authority had authorized the printing of an abstract of the paper in the convention program. Here, they say, is an illustration of the sort of muddle-headed military tyranny that science must expect to have to submit to if Congress goes through with its apparent intention of placing all atomic developments under military control.

Nor does this tell the full story of the rise of military interests to a hitherto unknown power in American life. More than a month ago Oswald Garrison Villard in an article, Our Military Lords and Masters, in these pages, disclosed how the generals and admirals are fixing the number of our fleets, the size of our fleets, the size of our merchant marine, and the policy for expanding our overseas possessions without so much as a by-your-leave to Congress. More and more it becomes clear that one of the major influences which are working at Washington to keep a technical state of war in effect is the determination of the Army and Navy to preserve to the last possible moment the emergency powers which they possess so long as the United States remains legally at war.

While the Russian tension remains it may be a waste of time and editorial space to warn against the dangers of a militarized America. Not the least ominous fact about the world situation is the ease with which Stalin, on his part, can keep up this tension in order to induce the Russian people to put up with the continued privations his three announced additional 5-year plans will require, and the ease with which the military master minds here can keep up this tension in order to legislate their desired military transformation of the Republic. We see no advantage in dodging the facts if this tension with Russia keeps up, the military will probably succeed in imposing permanent conscription, will become the dominant factor in making and directing our foreign policy, will control our fundamental scientific and industrial activities, and will insist on the projection of American military power—of course, only as a measure of "security"—into every part of the earth.

Make no mistake about it, however. If this happens, the America of the founding fathers, the America which grew to greatness on the subordination of the military to the civil power, will have ceased to be. If it is not to happen, the American public must awaken to its peril quickly, for the legislation which would fasten military shackles on our whole civilian life is already before Congress, grinding its way toward enactment, while the policy that puts more and more military men in posts of civil power is already well on its way to becoming an established tradition. If the American people had time to read Gibbon, that would be a salutary thing. But they do not have time; if they are to save themselves from rule by the military, they must act at once.

We Had Better Take Care of Our Own People First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of H. R. 2229 and

H. R. 2230 and on behalf of many millions of people of this country—those of our senior citizens who have reached three score years, who are the only group in the United States whose income has remained the same all through the years of the depression and throughout the prosperous period of the war—who now during the present inflationary postwar period are the only group in the United States whose income has practically vanished as far as buying power is concerned.

First of all, I want to call your attention to the astonishing increase of the cost of staple foods and the necessities of life since September 1939, when the World War began in Europe. If you will go back to your own home-town newspapers and make note of the cost of these staples from the ads appearing in your home-town papers in the fall of 1939, and then compare those prices with prices of the same foods and clothing in ads in the same papers today, you will be astounded as I was when I made that comparison. The cost of living has risen, not 30 percent, not 50 percent; but to my amazement, the cost of staple foods and clothing had risen 100 percent and more. Here are some of the comparisons:

THEN

Hamburger, 14 cents per pound.
Sirloin steak, 17 cents per pound.
Chuck roast, 15 cents per pound.
Veal chops, 17 cents per pound.
Leg of lamb, 19 cents per pound.
Pork chops, 18 cents per pound.
Bologna, 14 cents per pound.
Ham, 17 cents and 19 cents per pound.
Slab bacon, 9 cents per pound.
Early Ohio potatoes, 19 cents per peck.
Flour, all standard brands, 49-pound sack, $1.49.
Peanut butter, 11 cents per pound.
Sweetpotatoes, 6 cents per pound.
Carrots, 4 cents per bunch.
Bartlett pears, $1.49 per bushel.
Prunes, 69 cents per box.
Small oranges, 15 cents per dozen.
Ladies' sport coats, $9.50 and $19.50.
Fur-trimmed coats, $16.50 and $37.50.
Snow suits, $3.95.
Men's suits, $22.50 and $27.50 with two trousers and vest—all wool suits, and no black market.

NOW

Hamburger, 25 cents per pound.
Sirloin steak, 40 cents per pound.
Chuck roast, 26 cents per pound.
Veal chops, 33 cents per pound.
Leg of lamb, 35 cents per pound.
Pork chops, 33 cents per pound.
Bologna, 27 cents per pound.
Wieners, 39 cents per pound.
Slab bacon, 39 cents per pound.
Ohio potatoes, 49 cents and 52 cents per peck.
Same standard brand flour, 49-pound sack, $2.39.
Peanut butter, 20 cents per pound.
Sweetpotatoes, 10 cents and 11 cents per pound.
Carrots, 10 cents per bunch.
Pears, $4.99 per bushel.
Prunes, $3.29 per box.
Oranges, same size, 30 cents per dozen.
Ladies' sport coats, $45 and $55.
Fur-trimmed coats, $69 and $135.
Snow suits, $14.95.

Men's suits, $45 and up, with only one pair of trousers and no vest, all wool except the stripes—and plenty of stripes.

I have read ads in newspapers advertising men's sport shirts at $6.50 and $25 each. You cannot buy a good white dress shirt now.

Members of the committee, you also know the average income of our senior citizens, who are dependent on old-age assistance, is only $30 per month throughout the United States; while some of the States are paying old-age assistance of $10 and less per month, other States average $15 and $20 per month. Think of it, $10, $15, $20, and $30 a month old-age assistance afforded to American citizens who have given the best of their lives to build up this country. That is a disgrace and a blot on the good name of the United States—the richest Nation in the world. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, How far will the average old-age assistance go toward paying the grocery bill, the meat bill, and the clothing bill of these people today?

We are so rich, we gave away billions to the other nations of the world after the First World War, eleven and one-half billions of which is still due and outstanding. Now we are contemplating giving more billions to those same nations. If we give them all they are asking, we will make gifts to these foreign nations amounting to more than ten billions more. If we can make gifts of billions and more billions to foreign nations, surely we should be able to set aside funds sufficient to cover the appropriation necessary to carry out the provisions of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230—an appropriation that is infinitesimal in comparison with the loans and the gifts we have made, and now contemplate making, to nations who do not expect ever to repay us for our munificence.

What are we doing for our own people who have reached the age of 65? Under the present system we compel them to sign a pauper's oath. If they own their own homes, we compel them to execute a deed turning over their homes to the State. We charge them interest on whatever old-age assistance they receive, whether it is $30, $20, $15, or $10 a month or less; then if they do not pay the interest and the principal of the loan—which the States and the Federal Government wrongfully call old-age assistance—their homes are sold at public auction on foreclosure. I am told that in some States even the life insurance of our senior citizens must be turned over to the State before any so-called old-age assistance is given these American citizens.

It is this unfair and ungrateful treatment of our fathers and mothers on the part of our Government, the richest in the world, that prompts me to appear here before your committee today on behalf of these good, deserving folks, whom our Government has apparently forgotten in the mad rush of turning over our money and our substance to everybody else in the whole world.

I feel that the Congress of the United States owes a moral obligation to our senior constituents to insure them a Federal annuity, insurance for all those over 60 who are disabled, so that all who come under the provisions of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230 be paid a monthly allowance that is adequate, decent, and respectable. When we have met this obligation to our American citizens, we can then consider making gifts of money to foreign nations.

Report of Joint Committee for the Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a number of editorials from various newspapers with respect to the report of the Joint Committee for the Organization of Congress:

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier of March 8, 1946]

CONGRESS LOOKS AT CONGRESS

A special joint committee of Congress has spent almost a year examining the Federal Legislature, finding what is wrong with it and evolving recommendations for improvement. It has now reported some excellent suggestions which we hope will get some legislative action.

The suggestions number 37 and cannot all be examined here. The proposal that the number of standing house committees be reduced from 48 to 18, however, is perhaps the most important. Each of these committees could keep close tab on a corresponding Government agency and department, thus giving Congress informed control over the executive branch.

Moreover, some of the nonsensical hocus-pocus of present committee activity would be eliminated. Committee chairmen would be stripped of the power to hold the bill from the floor even after it has been approved by the committee. Formal liaison with the President would be obtained through formation of new majority and minority "policy committees" with the majority "policy committees" from both Houses forming a "legislative-executive council."

Unfortunately, the examining committee bypassed as too controversial the need for eliminating seniority selection of committee chairmen. Since this system constitutes a major fault of the present set-up, the committee report breaks down on a fundamental weakness. But since Congress probably has little inclination to adopt it, a recommendation for majority vote selection of chairmen would perhaps be futile anyway.

Another series of recommendations relates to the establishment of an adequate congressional staff and research facilities. The committee proposes that each Congressman be given an administrative assistant to handle many routine matters for constituents so that the Congressman can devote more time to legislative research. The Office of Legislative Council and the Library of Congress' Legislative Reference Service would be expanded and receive larger appropriations.

On the whole, the report offers a constructive and thorough approach to the problem of making it possible for the nineteenth century Congress of today to cope with the aggressive and militant administrative agencies. If those bureaus are to be kept under the thumb of Congress, the overworked Senators and

Representatives must have available to them as much expert information as do the agencies and they must have time to assimilate that information.

There has been a great deal of talk about congressional reform in recent years, but this report gives the basis for action. Will Congress seize this opportunity to improve its operations or will it settle back into the antiquated, inefficient, and cumbersome methods which have exposed it to ridicule in the past?

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Journal of Commerce of March 12, 1946]

BRAKE ON SPENDING

A joint Senate-House committee has brought in its long-awaited plan for the reorganization of Congress. The program would overhaul the top-heavy and antiquated machinery on Capitol Hill by reducing the number of standing committees from 81 to 34, increasing salaries to $15,000 a year, providing $8,000-a-year assistants for all Members, and setting up a retirement system.

Some of these recommendations will prove extremely controversial in Congress and out. But they are not the cream of the program, advisable as some of them may be in streamlining Congress.

The high light of the report, for our money, was its proposal to increase congressional control of Government purse strings. This objective would be achieved by requiring legislative decision each session on a definite fiscal policy limiting the total amount to be appropriated in that session.

Within 60 days after the start of each session, under this plan, the appropriations and revenue committees of both Houses would submit estimates of over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for the coming fiscal year. Spending could not exceed receipts unless Congress specifically approved by record vote an increase in the Federal debt in the amount of the excess.

This requirement should prove to be a valuable brake on spending. The men and women on the Hill are less likely to swell the national debt if they have to stand up and be recorded on each annual deficit.

One of our current difficulties is that Congress raised the ceiling on Federal debt to $300,000,000,000. This step was taken in wartime, when the end of hostilities was not in sight, and the conflict's demands appeared to make that limit not unreasonable. Today, however, the debt is in the neighborhood of $280,000,000,000. As long as there is a margin there will not be much disposition on the part of the spenders to economize.

Congress as well as the office holders shares responsibility for deficit spending and no one would pretend that without pressure from the taxpayers Congress will do its utmost for economy. Nevertheless it appears to be true that we must look to its Members for whatever leadership there may be in Washington toward pruning expenditures. The knife fashioned by the joint committee could be a valuable instrument.

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune of March 6, 1946]

OBSTACLES TO REFORM

Someone has said that the sinner finds it hard to reform when the wages of sin are, not death, but power and influence. For that reason, the reforms proposed by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress will come up against an obstruction in the fact that they will have to be voted by Congress itself.

Of course, not all of the changes proposed will be unpopular on Capitol Hill. It cannot be expected that the Members of Congress will oppose an increase in pay from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, an administration executive in each Member's office at $8,000 a year, a stenographic pool to help out Members swamped with mail, or bigger and better staffs for committees.

The proposal that the number of committees be reduced from 33 to 16 in the Senate, from 48 to 18 in the House, and that an end be put to special investigating committees is a horse of another color. That would hit many Members where it hurts.

A committee chairman, for example, wields considerable influence, not only over legislation, but also in the executive branch of government. What head of an executive agency can afford to say "No" to favors asked by the chairman of a committee which will pass on legislation dear to the heart of the agency?

Also, each committee has a large clerical staff, and in the nature of things that staff performs work for the chairman outside of his committee duties. Then, too, the voters back home are impressed when the Senator or Representative holds a chairmanship. And although there are only 81 chairmen of standing committees in Congress, there are 162 other Members who see a chairmanship not far ahead of them in the future—if the gods and the voters are kind, for chairmanships go by seniority.

Naturally, those in favored positions do not want to give up what they have, and any suggestion that they do so is unlikely to be popular with them.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has done a good job. Its proposals unquestionably are based on a sincere desire to bring about reforms in our national legislative system. Congress would function more efficiently if they were adopted. Adoption would eliminate much of the overlapping of effort that now characterizes the conduct of our legislative business.

We fear, however, that this is going to prove another case of love's labor lost.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, of March 8, 1946]

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

When the proposal to raise congressional salaries first came out, it was said justly that if Congressmen were to get more pay they ought to work more efficiently. Both angles are handled in the report just made by the La Follette-Monroney committee.

This committee was set up last year to study the organization and operation of Congress and recommend changes. Its report covers a good deal of the ground, though leaving several important problems unsolved.

As to the unwieldly committee system, 16 standing committees are proposed in the Senate instead of the existing 33, and 18 in the House instead of 48. Each committee's field would be clearly stated. This would end the abuse of sending a bill to a committee which has nothing to do with the subject, merely because the right committee might not return the answer which some Congressman desires.

Each committee would have a small but qualified group of research experts. Thus, it would not have to depend solely on witnesses who have axes to grind. In this connection the general reference service would be strengthened, to give research aid to individual Congressmen.

A major congressional fault is that spending need have no relation to income. The Federal Budget thus is only a pious hope. The La Follette-Monroney report would require Congress either to keep its appropriations inside the estimated revenue, or else by record vote approve a rise in the public debt.

To get better Congressmen, and help them do a better job, the report would raise salaries from $10,000 to $15,000. This is a compromise with the $20,000 figure proposed by most students of the question, including President Truman. Each Senator and Representative would be given a well-paid assistant to do the errand-running which now takes most of a Congressman's time.

The report also would relieve Congress of much burdensome detail work. For example, it would give the District of Columbia self-rule, instead of making Congress serve as Washington's city council.

It is regrettable that the committee was unable to find any substitute for the seniority system of committee chairmanships. It also failed to deal with the Rules Committee's power to block legislation, and with filibusters in the Senate. It is to be hoped that these and other questions may yet be answered before a bill is sent to the floor.

The chief opposition will be to reform of the committee set-up. Congressmen who have gained power and prestige as chairmen or members of committees will not be eager to see them abolished. Yet a change here is an essential part of any reform bill. As the report asserts:

"No adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous work load that present-day governmental problems place upon it."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun of March 1, 1946]

WILL CONGRESS SLEEP ON SELF-REFORM?

For many years there has been a growing demand for congressional reorganization, and Congress today has before it a generally admirable plan drafted by the La Follette-Monroney committee. But in the week since its publication, few Congressmen have shown much interest. Unless the public speaks up loudly there is serious danger that the plan will drown in a sea of apathy.

Merely to list many reform recommendations is to argue for their adoption. The average legislator today spends as much as 80 percent of his time doing trivial favors for constituents. Under the La Follette-Monroney plan, each Congressman would have an administrative assistant to do these minor chores. The Legislative Reference Bureau would be greatly expanded to give Congress an adequate research staff under its own control. Members would concentrate on only one or two committees so that they could become expert in their fields. Congress would transfer personal claim bills to the courts and divest itself of the duty of governing the District of Columbia.

What are the forces working against the plan? One, as suggested above, is sheer inertia—the disinclination of Congressmen to change their ways. The other is likely to be crass selfishness—the unwillingness of 47 petty committee chairmen to accept a technical lowering in rank through the proposed reduction of House and Senate committees from a total of 81 to 34.

Yet committee reduction is one of the key points in the plan. The present committee system is a hodgepodge of overlapping and illogical jurisdictions. The proposal is for fewer committees, each related closely to a branch of the executive department, which it would keep constantly under review.

Adoption of the new committee system is all the more important because it is only one of several suggestions for improving the liaison of executive and legislative departments. The gradual crumbling of that liaison, as well as the burden of new duties, has made reorganization of Congress vital.

The reform plan is extremely temperate. It avoids such hot potatoes as the seniority system, the Senate's filibusters, and the bottleneck of the House Rules Committee. But it does suggest new institutions which might gradually reduce evils now too strongly entrenched for direct attack.

It suggests new majority- and minority-party policy committees for both House and Senate to increase party responsibility—now

largely lacking because the only real policy statement of a party is its Presidential campaign platform, which does not actually bind Congressmen. A new Executive-Legislative Council is proposed, to maintain closer relations with the President and Cabinet.

The functioning of American democracy means too much to the people and to the Congressmen themselves for them to smother the La Follette-Monroney plan. There should be discussion, debate, and a vote—and the public must serve notice that it expects such action.

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of March 7, 1946]

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

Before Congress is through dealing with the 37 recommendations for its reorganization, made after a year's study by the special joint committee of 12, headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE (Progressive, Wisconsin), there will be many reverberations in legislative halls and committee rooms. But there can be no sensible dissent from the committee's conclusions that Congress is not responsive enough to the popular will and that instead of being in close relationship with the executive branch, the reverse is increasingly and alarmingly true.

Too much of the people's business is now conducted in fashion never dreamed of by the founders of the Republic, for, as the committee says:

"Public affairs are now handled by a host of adminstrative agencies headed by nonelected officials with only casual oversight by Congress.

"The course of events has created a breach between Government and the people. Behind our inherited constitutional pattern a new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. Meanwhile government by administration is the object of group pressures which weaken its protection of the public interests."

These are pressures with which the Congress is unable to deal, if only because it is not aware of them, though it is itself subjected to many group pressures. Under such conditions there must be reorganization, the committee thinks. In it a first step has to be a tightening up of congressional functions. To this end it is suggested that the Senate's 33 standing committees be cut to 16 and the 48 of the House be reduced to 18. Party policy, the La Follette committee holds, should be enunciated by formal committees of both majority and minority.

Proposal to reduce from 81 to 34 the number of standing committees can be expected to arouse bitter opposition among those Pooh-Bahs, the committee chairmen, and by the ranking minority members, who would be chairmen in turn if the complexion of Congress changed. Party policy in the legislative branch ought not to be on the hit-or-miss basis. But those southern Democrats who rush at frequent opportunities to make common cause with the Republicans, would be put definitely out of countenance by being asked to adhere to a formal program.

In the British Parliament the Cabinet and the opposition have programs, but under our governmental form it was never intended that the Chief Executive should endeavor to direct the Congress by an incessant stream of recommendations. Lawmaking, as originally contemplated, was the business of the legislative branch, whom the President is bidden to keep aware of the state of the Union.

It is easy enough to criticize the specific recommendations and omissions by the La Follette committee. If it did not seek to abolish seniority and the powerful Rules Committees, it can be assumed that this was because there was no chance of such action being taken now. Streamlining Congress is not to be accomplished in a day or in a year.

With the proposal to staff each committee with experts in its field, there is no reason to quarrel. Giving each legislator an administrative assistant at $8,000 a year, so that he may himself be free to devote all his time to lawmaking, is at least debatable. Not honestly debatable at all is the recommendation that all lobbyists be identified and regulated. And the curbing of deficit spending and balancing of budgets, as urged, are things to be welcomed by a tax-weary people.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News of March 8, 1946]

REFORMING CONGRESS

Long-deferred and greatly needed, the reform of congressional organization and procedure has moved a step nearer realization with the report of the special House-Senate committee headed by Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin. Before Congress is put on a truly businesslike basis, however, there still are a number of hurdles to be cleared.

The proposal to put a ceiling on appropriations, in order to coordinate spending and revenue raising, for example, is excellent in theory, but it may be harder to apply in practice. Before a private citizen buys anything, he finds it prudent to consider where the money is coming from. But a politically-minded Congress, finds it much easier to vote appropriations than to authorize taxes. The Nation's fiscal situation is such, however, that Congress must, of necessity, hew to the line of economy and the committee's proposal is not only logical but imperative.

Few Congressmen will object, naturally, to the suggestions for an increase in their pay from $10,000 to $15,000, for an $8,000 administrative executive in each Member's office for a stenographer pool to help out with mail, for bigger and better staffs for committees and for retirement on the same scale as civil-service workers. These changes should increase the efficiency of individual Members and make Congress more attractive to high-grade men.

Consolidation of the Senate's 33 standing committees into 16, and the House's 48 committees into 18 may encounter hard sledding. That would hit many Members where it hurts, in their human ambition for power and importance. A committee chairmanship means much to a Congressman, both in influence with the legislative and executive branches and in prestige with the voters at home. Although there are only 81 chairmen of standing committees in the 2 Houses, there are 162 other Members, or even 243, who see the prospect of a chairmanship ahead in the immediate future, if the gods and the voters are kind. For chairmanships go by seniority. And to expect these men to forego their opportunity to get ahead in the Government is asking a great deal, for them, the price of efficiency comes high.

There can be no doubt, however, that these reforms are necessary. The present congressional organization which, like Topsy, mostly has "just growed" needs to be rationalized and streamlined. Too much is at stake to tolerate expensive anachronisms on Capitol Hill.

Congress Supports Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, for some time propaganda artists have called attention to different legislative proposals, and in almost every instance the politicians who are in control of our Government have attempted to leave the impression that they were the only friends that the veterans had in our National Government. In other words, the political pressure groups who want to elect Democrats and defeat Republicans have tried desperately to make it appear to returning veterans that the matter of loyalty to them has been based on political considerations. Such claims and such propaganda are just 100 percent untrue. Neither political party has a monopoly on patriotism or on friendship for returned veterans of World War II.

Most recent example of the gentle art of misleading propaganda has to do with the housing shortage.

CONGRESS HAS SUPPORTED HOUSING PROGRAM FOR VETERANS AND OTHERS

There can be no question about the critical shortage of houses, not only for veterans, but for other people as well. Recently Congress considered legislation intended to correct this housing shortage. Right away the attempt was made to capitalize on the situation, and the high-pressure politicians and political opportunists, who now hold public office, attempted to create the impression that all Republicans were against a housing program. Further, the propagandists tried to create the impression, especially among the veterans, that the politicians who now hold public office under the present administration were the only friends that the veterans had.

It is hoped that the veterans will not be misled by that sort of tommyrot because it insults their intelligence. Without going into the question as to why there is a housing shortage, I could boldly charge that the present administration which has been in control of our Government for 13 years is responsible for the housing shortage. It would make no difference whether or not that were true. The impression would very naturally be created, because the political party in power, which always takes credit for good things, naturally has the job of explaining away the bad things. I like, however, to be fair about the matter, and I have told a great many people that the major factor in our housing shortage was World War conditions. All building construction was stopped while the war went on, and the demand for houses continued, and this situation, together with a number of other factors, has resulted in a housing shortage. So let them be halfway honest about the matter. The facts are that the Republicans have been just as anxious to remedy the housing shortage as the Democrats. The records here show that there have been three bills considered by the House of Representatives very recently, and all of those bills dealt with the subject of housing for veterans. Republicans, including myself, as well as Democrats, supported those measures.

I, as a Member of Congress, certainly want the veterans and their families to have a chance to get a home. Now homes cost money and I want the veterans to get homes at the least possible cost to them. While the war was in progress I supported every measure that was of

benefit to the men in our armed forces, and to their dependents, and I supported every effort in which they were engaged in the winning of the war. Now that the war is over my attitude is still the same and I feel that a grateful Republic owes them the duty of help in their program of rehabilitation and readjustment.

Fair-minded people will admit that the OPA has been one great hindrance in the program of building houses. The OPA is a foolish outfit and it establishes price ceilings on building materials and supplies so that people who make these articles cannot operate at a profit. So the lumber mills shut down and the factories do not operate and we have a shortage of building materials. The policymakers of the OPA ought to know by this time that you cannot get houses just by passing a law. They tried to get meat a year or so ago by passing their laws and regulations and we just got a lot of statistical meat or perhaps horse meat. If OPA has its way and if they can keep creating a shortage of building materials we can expect some prefabricated shacks or some sort of dwellings which you might call horse-meat houses for want of a better name. The creation of another Government bureau with its red tape and foolishness is very likely to add to the housing shortage. I want to hope for the best but facts are facts and the veterans ought to understand that we are in a very grave emergency, and unless they put some practical men in charge of the housing program, there is serious danger that we will wind up with a lot of red tape houses, which is just another way of saying fiction.

I supported all three of these housing bills referred to a few moments ago, and it is my hope that the present housing program will be carried on in such a way that the building of houses is encouraged so that new buildings may be constructed and every veteran have an opportunity to either rent or purchase a dwelling. I expect to continue my efforts to remedy this housing shortage.

TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, in which enlisted men who served in World War II have a very direct interest. I refer to terminal leave. Under existing law officers leaving the service receive full pay and allowances for all accumulated leave. Under existing law the enlisted man is treated differently. It does not make any difference how long the enlisted man has served or how much leave he might have accumulated, when he is discharged from the armed forces he is taken off the pay roll and he loses this terminal-leave payment which officers who are discharged from service are entitled to receive. Some people have gone so far as to say that this rank discrimination is an insult to the men and women who served in the capacity of privates in our armed forces in the recent war. So far as I know, most Members of Congress take that same view. I know that I believe that this is an unfair discrimination against the enlisted man. Legislation is pending to correct this injustice and I am supporting that legislation and intend to vote for it and will do what I can to secure its passage.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL PROGRAM

There are other legislative proposals, Mr. Speaker, which are of interest to veterans of World War II. I expect to continue my activities in behalf of all of these matters. I supported the program for the building of new veterans' hospitals. I was active in securing necessary appropriations for the same. So were other Members of Congress. It is a matter of record that Republicans, as well as Democrats, worked together in efforts to work out a program so that veterans of World War II might receive adequate hospital and medical treatment. This was not a political proposition but regardless of party, the Members of Congress almost without exception, devoted themselves to the passage of legislation for additional veterans' hospital facilities. One of those new veterans' hospitals will be located at Duluth, Minn., and this is a part of a program being carried out by the Veterans' Administration to give the veterans of World War II the greatest amount of care, comfort, and medical treatment ever provided by any government in the world.

I have no doubt, however, Mr. Speaker, that with the political elections coming along, some of these political opportunists who want to capture the soldier and sailor vote will be arguing that medical care for the veteran is a political thing and that the men in one political party favor it while the members of another political party have opposed such a program. Men who are doing such a thing are, of course, analogous to the ghouls who, in the days gone by, robbed the graveyards to serve their own purposes. Many other matters of interest to the veterans have had the support of Members of Congress, irrespective of party lines. My record is one of which I am justly proud in this connection.

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE ARMY

I have a bill pending, Mr. Speaker, which is not exactly of direct interest to returning veterans from World War II. I refer to H. R. 5122 which provides that the Office of the Inspector General of the Army shall be placed under the control of Congress and taken away from the control of the War Department. Historically, in the early days of the Republic, Congress had control of the Office of Inspector General of the Army. I became very much interested in this proposal when one of our servicemen who visited my office occasionally during the past year or so, pointed out to me the fact that in his opinion Congress did not know what was going on in the Army. He pointed out that Congress had no way to get the facts, except as Army officials wanted Congress to get them. If there were any mistakes committed, this Army man pointed out to me that those mistakes would be covered up and it would only be by accident that Congress would learn about the same.

In view of the fact that Congress appropriates the money and is apparently the only connecting link between the War Department and the American fathers and mothers who furnish young men and young women for the armed forces, I took the position that Congress ought to have something to say. This bill, which is pending, is my answer to the difficulties and in my opinion, it ought to receive favorable action by Congress. I hope that every veteran of World War II who realizes the great advantage of this kind of legislation will give it his active support.

Let's Take Care of Our Veterans and Their Families Before We Squander More Billions Abroad

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am getting sick and tired of all this propaganda that the United States of America must give away almost $15,000,000,000 more to foreign countries. Every rule of decency and common sense proves that our Santa Claus policy brings only grief and chaos. We have given away already almost $100,000,000,000 in the last two wars, and I think it is just plain foolishness to do more than that.

Little do the people of America realize that plans are being laid to give away another $15,000,000,000. To whom? To the people of America? Not by a long shot! To those we have already given $100,000,000,000 in the last two wars.

The thing that disturbs me most is that this dishing out of more billions to foreign countries is given top priority over any spending here in our own country. Every bill to help our own people gets lost somewhere, but foreign gifts and grants are given first preference. Does this make sense?

LET'S COME DOWN TO EARTH AND DO SOMETHING FOR OUR OWN PEOPLE

It is time we got out some of those bills to help our own people. It is time we especially take care of our veterans and their dependents. We chisel pennies from them so that we can squander more billions abroad.

The mail I am getting from veterans and their dependents is pitiful. We give our disabled veterans $11.50 a month and they have a hard time getting that. Yet, there are those who think nothing of throwing away fifteen billion abroad.

What we should do is put a stop, and right now, to this Santa Claus business and take care of our own.

WHAT FIFTEEN BILLION WILL DO FOR OUR OWN VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Suppose we take the $15,000,000,000 that is planned to be given away and take care of our veterans and their dependents. We could do a lot of what needs to be done and what must be done if we want to preserve our self-respect as Members of Congress. Here are the things we should do for our veterans and their families before we even think of throwing away more billions:

First. All veterans of all wars should receive full disability compensation—100 percent—of $115 per month while

they are hospitalized for a service-connected ailment or disability.

Second. All veterans, even those discharged for essential work or at their own request should receive full mustering-out pay.

Third. All enlisted men should receive full payment for all unused furlough time up to 30 days for each year of service.

Fourth. All veterans' loans on their insurance should be reduced from 5 percent to 2 percent interest. If we can give away $100,000,000,000 to foreign countries, why milk the veterans with so high a rate of interest as 5 percent?

Fifth. We should pay now to every veteran a bonus of $1 per day for every day of home duty and $2 per day for every day of foreign—plus $250 to every veteran who has been wounded. They need this money to readjust themselves.

Sixth. We should extend the time in which a veteran can get adjusted compensation from January 1, 1940, up to January 1, 1950.

Seventh. Social-security credits should be paid by the Government for every veteran for every day of active service. Why should the veterans lose out on their social-security credits while they are fighting for their country?

Eighth. We should pay World War I veterans the same pension and under the same regulations as we now pay Spanish-American War veterans. This is long overdue.

Ninth. We should increase burial allowances for veterans from $100 to $250.

Tenth. We should give every wounded or gassed veteran of World Wars I and II a minimum of 10-percent service-connected disability.

Eleventh. We should provide funds to pay half the salaries of county service officers and their staffs.

Twelfth. We should provide space and office equipment for every county service officer.

Thirteenth. We should provide funds so that we can pay the doctor and hospital bills of all veterans and permit them to choose their own doctor and hospital through their own county service officer. Our veterans' hospitals are already overcrowded. Why should a veteran have to wait months before he can get the medical attention he needs?

Fourteenth. We should not permit any reduction in percentage of service-connected disability once it is established.

Fifteenth. We should increase all widows' pensions, children of veterans' pensions, parents of veterans' pensions, and all veterans' pensions, including disability pensions of all veterans of all wars by 20 percent to compensate them for the increased cost of living. We should do the same for all pensions based on tuberculosis.

Sixteenth. We should liberalize the GI bill of rights so that it will be possible for veterans to get loans more easily and the interest rate should be reduced to 2 percent instead of 4. It is proposed to give England $4,000,000,000 for 1½ percent for 55 years—why cannot we do better for our own veterans?

Seventeenth. We should liberalize our GI bill of rights so that veterans who cannot get jobs on account of strikes are allowed to get the unemployment compensation.

Eighteenth. We should liberalize the GI bill of rights so that it will apply to the widows and orphans of World War II veterans and allow them the same educational opportunities since their fathers and husbands have been taken from them forever.

Nineteenth. We should provide funds to take care of the hospitalization and medical care of the widows and orphans of all deceased veterans who were killed in action.

Twentieth. We should pass legislation to give an automatic 10-percent increase in service-connected-disability pensions for every 5 years of age beginning at 50 and not to exceed 100 percent.

Twenty-first. We should liberalize the insurance policies of veterans so that it will offer better protection and induce veterans to continue their insurance.

Twenty-second. We should pass legislation to pay all the benefits to widows and orphans even if death did not occur in the line of duty. Why punish widows and orphans for acts not in line of duty? If the fathers and husbands had not been taken away from them by the Government this would not have happened. They are entitled to that protection.

Twenty-third. We should pass legislation at once to restore every pension taken away by that infamous Economy Act. What is more, we should increase these pensions by 20 percent to compensate for the increased cost of living.

Twenty-fourth. We should provide funds for an Emergency Veterans' Relief Society to give assistance with loans or grants to veterans and their families in cases of emergency. Such a society should have a branch established in the office of every county service officer.

Twenty-fifth. We should provide funds for liberal loans to veterans who want to go into farming. Every veteran placed on a farm relieves the housing shortage in our cities and relieves the unemployment problem in our cities. The facilities of the Farm Security Administration should be expanded to give deserving veterans a loan up to $4,000 at 2 percent interest for 25 years. We give veterans who go to college about $4,000 each—we should do the same for those veterans who want to farm.

Twenty-sixth. We should provide funds for similar liberal loans for veterans who want to start a small business. The present system of loans through banks under the GI bill is a failure. A better, more liberal system of loans must be established.

Twenty-seventh. We should freeze all surplus property for veterans and give them first chance on all sales and at a discount of 40 percent of actual cost.

Twenty-eighth. We should provide funds to hospitalize and give medical care to all veterans—even not service-connected. The pauper's oath should be wiped out.

Twenty-ninth. We should provide funds to give a service-connected disability of 10 percent to any veteran who was hospitalized or given medical care while in service even if ailment existed prior to entering service.

Thirty. We should provide funds to give all veteran benefits to members of the United States merchant marine who were in such service from December 7, 1941, to VJ-day.

Thirty-one. We should enact legislation to give free mail service to all veterans of all wars during hospitalization.

If we have any regard for our veterans and their families we will adopt this 31-point program. We should do this at once. We should certainly do these things before we even talk of giving away more billions to foreign countries.

Where are we going to get the money for all this? I say that if we can find $15,000,000,000 more to give away abroad, we can find $15,000,000,000 to take care of our own. If we spend it here in our country it stays here. If we give it away abroad it stays there. The $15,000,000,000 which is planned to be given away to foreign countries will more than pay for this whole program.

I for one am serving notice here and now that as long as I am a Member of Congress I shall work for the enactment of all the above-mentioned benefits. What is more, I shall not vote one red penny to give away or "loan" away more billions before we take care of our own. I am dedicated to the above program for our veterans. Nothing shall change or deter me from these goals.

Just Peace for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have introduced a resolution requesting the President of the United States to use his good offices to the end that the United Nations, now assembled, invite Italy to be a signatory to the United Nations agreement of January 1942, thus recognizing Italy as a full and equal ally. The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy and recognize Italy as a full and equal ally

Whereas the present political parties reflect the will of the Italian people throughout Italy; and

Whereas the present Government of Italy, duly recognized by the United States as a fair representation of the various political parties; and

Whereas the political parties have proven to be anti-Fascist and prodemocratic; and

Whereas the will of the Italian people in both the liberated and occupied areas of Italy during the height of the battle between Allied and Nazi forces on the Italian homeland was definitely pro-ally, for throughout the battle the partisan army of Italy gave their fullest support to crushing the Axis, thus shortening the war with consequent saving of lives of thousands of gallant American soldiers: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to

direct the Secretary of State to resume friendly diplomatic relations between the United States and Italy, to extend lend-lease aid to Italy; and to use his good offices to the end that the other United Nations, now assembled, resume diplomatic relations with Italy and that the United Nations recognize Italy as a full and equal Ally.

Mr. Speaker, the war is over and it becomes our duty to win the peace, a peace that will be a permanent one. We must at all times keep in mind that a peace can only be permanent if it is based on justice and equality.

The Italian people, like all other people in war-ruined countries, have suffered a great deal. America has played an important part in the relief of suffering humanity. We are late in starting, but we have done a great job of it up to this present time. We have aided Italy particularly through UNRRA, which heretofore has been broadly restricted to child and maternal care, refugees, and public health. While at the conference of UNRRA at London last year, the conferees decided that it will become the sole channel for the funneling of nonprivate outside aid into this war-ruined country. His Holiness Pope Pius, XII, expressed his deep appreciation for this splendid help, and today the Italian program is considered to be one of the bright spots in the UNRRA world picture.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a cruel winter for the Italian people, and I pray that such a repetition shall never again occur.

The people of Italy are bewildered. They must be led. They are anxious to do all they can to remedy the situation themselves if only given a fair chance. There are two things uppermost in my mind that I believe would aid in the creation and maintain the security of a democratic Italy.

First, a definition of Italy's status visá-vis the Allies.

Second, the stabilization of domestic politics under the elections of this spring.

Mr. Speaker, today the United Nations have assembled in the great city of New York. It, therefore, is most fitting that this country of ours, through its spokesman, the Secretary of State, express to those assembled the wishes of the President of the United States for a peaceful world, one based on justice and equality. This can only be substantiated by the acceptance of this resolution by the United States of America and the insistence that it be accepted by the United Nations.

As a full and equal Ally, the Italian Government would retain its international boundaries and colonies as before the war. This indecision and desire for a break-down of the Italian holdings by outside forces has had a great demoralizing effect on the Italian people. This dull stage or era would immediately change if this resolution would be adopted. The Italian people would immediately be stimulated to activity for the restoration of their homeland. This, together with the necessary basic commodities and machinery, which are indispensable to her national recovery, would give Italy a rebirth as a democratic country.

Mr. Speaker, Italy, through her enormous sacrifices and her gallant contributions to the Allied cause, is deserving to become a member of the United Nations Organization. Now is the time for America to act. Let us not lose time. Let America reveal to the United Nations her desire for acceptance of the desires of this resolution and create for all time a peace based upon justice and equality.

The whole world looks to us for guidance and help. We hold today a unique position in the world of nations. Our American foreign policy is now intimately involved in European political problems, some of which have very recently strained the close wartime alliance of the great powers. America must stand firm.

America has rallied so many countries to the cause of Liberty and Justice. She should then be the first to restore the misled defeated countries back into the fold of liberty loving people whose great desire is to remain at peace with the world by instilling into their hearts a feeling of brotherly love and animosity towards none. The best example would be the acceptance of Italy into the family of friendly nations.

Mr. Speaker, while in Italy I had the good fortune of meeting Governor Charles Poletti, the pioneer in the restoration of Italy. He has had a very difficult assignment and has done a good job. At present he is chairman of a committee for a just peace for Italy. I am taking the liberty of incorporating in my remarks the views of this committee. I am in full accord with their public declaration and I wish to go on record for its full approval.

The declaration is as follows:

A PUBLIC DECLARATION BY THE COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE WITH ITALY

America cannot be indifferent to her responsibility of exercising international leadership in the rebuilding of a war-stricken world.

More than 6,000,000 Americans of Italian origin, whose contributions to the war effort bespeak their deep and abiding loyalty to America, are united with all other Americans in the conviction that the first concern of humanity today is a just and lasting peace.

It must be recognized that Italy has, for nearly 2 years, fought on the side of the Allies with its entire fleet and with its land and air forces. The spirit of resistance and sacrifice was exemplified by the Italian partisan who, in the words of Marshal Alexander and General Clark, constituted the most effective resistance movement in Europe.

It must be recognized also that a free democratic Italy in the heart of Europe is essential to the maintenance of the very peace of Europe.

It is in this spirit that we urge our Government to insist with all its authority and prestige that Italy be given a peace in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration and the pledges made by President Roosevelt and President Truman.

For the good name and faith of America, and in the interests of a lasting world peace, the Government of the United States should insist:

1. That the boundary between Italy and Yugoslavia be based on the Wilson line as modified by the State Department in September 1945; that Trieste remain, as it is in fact, an Italian city; and that if the port of Trieste is internationalized, it then be put under Italian administration.

2. That France and Italy find an amicable solution to their frontier problems; that because of their importance to the economic life of Italy, Tenda and Briga remain Italian.

3. That the present Austrian-Italian frontier be maintained in view of the paramount economic importance of that region to Italian national life.

4. That all colonies acquired by Italy before the Fascist assumption of power remain Italian. The proposal to transfer such colonies to the United Nations Organization does not meet with our approval unless this principle is given universal application and is not used as a pretext to give these Italian colonies to other nations.

5. That war reparations or indemnities be not exacted of Italy—this, in accordance with the declared policy of our Government.

6. That restrictions presently imposed on Italian sovereignty by the terms of the Armistice be abolished forthwith and in advance of the final peace treaty which may yet require several months before it is concluded. This would recognize Italy's rights as a cobelligerent nation.

7. That all restrictions to Italy's resumption of normal commercial and financial relations with other nations be removed forthwith to enable her to acquire basic commodities such as food stuffs and raw materials which are indispensable to her national recovery.

8. That the remaining units of Italy's merchant marine, without which she cannot survive, be restored to her.

9. That in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration, Italy be actually granted the rights of a friendly, peace-loving nation. Italy has clearly earned this distinction through her enormous sacrifices and her gallant contributions to the Allied cause.

10. That Italy be accorded membership in the United Nations Organization.

Meat Production and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George J. Buchy, vice president of Chas. G. Buchy Packing Co., Greenville, Ohio:

My name is George J. Buchy. I am the vice president of the Chas. G. Buchy Packing Co., of Greenville, Ohio, a company selling dressed beef, pork, veal, lamb, sausage, smoked meats, lard, and provisions. Our company is a small family corporation, the outgrowth of a retail and wholesale meat business started in 1901 by my father, Mr. Charles G. Buchy, the president of our company. Charles G. Buchy, the founder of our company, left a $5-a-week job in a wholesale grocery house in 1901 to begin a retail meat business. By hard work, industry, and thrift the retail business was expanded into a wholesale slaughtering and processing operation in 1911. Mr. Buchy continued the business as a sole proprietorship until February 1933, when an Ohio corporation was formed and the members of his immediate family, Mrs. Charles G. Buchy, Miss Miriam Buchy, Mr. Gerhardt Buchy, Mr. Edmund Buchy, and Mr. George J. Buchy were admitted into the business.

Our company is typical of many good old American firms and enterprises—formed of loyal American citizens who have slowly expanded their business by plowing back the small and modest profits made during these 45 years of operation. This company represents the life work of Mr. Charles G. Buchy and his immediate family. The business has always been operated on fair and honest deal-

ings with our employees, our customers, the producers who sell us livestock, and the public in general. Our business was established, grew, and thrived on competition and our position in the industry has been firmly established through efficient, profitable operation and competition. Our company expanded its business and added to the plant in every year from 1932 until 1941. There are 56 loyal American citizens employed by our company and all of us have enjoyed happy relations and hope to continue the same into the future. It always has been and will continue to be the policy of the Chas. G. Buchy Packing Co. to comply with both the letter and the spirit of the laws of our country.

We quit killing cattle for dressed beef on Friday, February 8, 1946. Since that time we have been slaughtering only such cows and bulls for use in our own sausage department as can be purchased (mostly locally) at prices in compliance with OPA regulations. This means a loss in volume of approximately 100 cattle per week. This serious decision to discontinue our cattle operation was forced on us because we cannot purchase the cattle in compliance with Regulation MPR 574 live bovine animals, and because of continued losses.

Since December 12, 1945, our company has been able to buy only one carload of bulls at St. Paul. To have paid the going price at this market would have put us out of compliance. Prior to this date we had been buying one to two carloads of bulls there nearly every week. Our order buyer in St. Paul told us as late as last Friday, March 22, 1946, that he was unable to buy any bulls without paying one to two dollars over the compliance ceiling.

Our order buyer in Algona, Iowa, has had an order for two cars of cows for over 2 weeks which he has not been able to fill. He reported last Saturday that he had accumulated one-half a car at compliance prices and asked our permission to fill in the balance with steers that would grade commercial costing $14.50 per hundredweight. These steers would have had to be purchased at $12.60 or below to be in compliance with the regulation. We were forced to cancel the order.

Monday morning of this week we had seven cattle in our yards to slaughter for our week's sausage operation. Normally our sausage department requires 18 to 25 cattle per week.

Twenty-six member firms of the Ohio Independent Meat Packers Association met in Columbus on March 13, 1946. All reported that they had reduced their cattle kill by at least 75 percent. The Scioto Provision Co. of Newark, Ohio, reported that they had stopped killing cattle on March 11, 1946. Lugbill Brothers Packing Co. at Archibald, Ohio, who also operate a community sale each Thursday at their yards, reported they were unable to purchase any cattle for their own slaughter at compliance prices.

Gentlemen, the legitimate packer in my section of the country is just unable to compete with black-market operators. Our calf slaughter the past 2 years has been less per month than we normally killed every week in the year before the war. The community sale price for all grades of calves in our locality is continually at, or near, the over-all riding ceiling price at $18.30 per hundredweight. We are compelled to confine what purchases we can make locally at our price of $15.00 per hundredweight. These purchases consistently show losses at ceiling prices for dressed veal after adding subsidy payment of $1.10 per hundredweight.

Eastern slaughterers and packers are buying up country stockyards in our territory and bidding up the price of livestock in order to assure themselves of livestock supplies. We have received reports this past week that cash is now being paid on the side in addition to ceiling prices for live hogs.

I want to read you a news article appearing in the Dayton Daily News on Friday, March 22, 1946:

"PIGS IN CLINTON COUNTY GO TO BLACK MARKET

"WILMINGTON, March 22.—Robert Yelton, price enforcement specialist of the Office of Price Administration, Cincinnati, was told yesterday that about one-half of the hogs in Clinton County are being diverted into the black market.

"Twenty members of the Clinton County Livestock League attended the meeting and said that about 100,000 hogs yearly would go into the black market at the present rate. Livestock league members said that the swine are being purchased by out-of-the-county buyers at prices higher than maximum market prices.

"Also at the meeting was A. A. Stone, associate agricultural relations officer of Washington, D. C."

The price "squeeze" that our industry has experienced and the complexity of the regulations which OPA has forced on our business have in large measure created the situation I described above.

Our plant lost money every month for the period August 1945 to February 1946 except for the month of November 1945. Improved operations in November 1945 were due to a slight break in our local hog market. We found it necessary to quit killing cattle in order to stop the dissipation of the assets of the Chas. G. Buchy Packing Co., to prevent violation of MPR 574, and loss of subsidies on calves and hogs as well as on cattle.

We asked one of our Government graders if he could grade our cattle alive and his answer was "no"—he said it was impossible to grade them alive. Yet that is what we are required to do to stay in compliance with MPR 574. After 45 years of cattle buying we find ourselves unable to purchase live cattle to conform to exact ideas of Government meat graders, some of whom have admitted to us that they have never purchased live cattle.

Three times out of the last 8 months we found ourselves out of compliance, not because we wilfully chose to be out of compliance, but because we have no effective control over our operations. We are continually at the mercy of our order buyers, the Government meat graders, and the OPA; all we do is furnish the money and sustain the losses. We have even had instances where cattle were erroneously down-graded by our Government grader and the error subsequently admitted by his supervisor. The last instance of this occurred January 21, 1946.

You know our company is not in the same position as the Federal Government for we cannot sell bonds to cover our deficits. We have every reason to believe our former customers are sorry we discontinued the beef business. We believe they are now paying 5 to 10 cents per pound over the ceiling for dressed beef in their purchases from farmers, other retailers, and straight out "black market" slaughterers. We further believe producers have been selling beef directly to consumers in our county at prices from 32 to 35 cents per pound for fore quarters and 35 to 38 cents per pound for hind quarters of beef that would grade mostly commercial and a few good grade. That, gentlemen, is 15 to 18 cents per pound over the ceiling on both fore and hind quarters of beef. Local livestock dealers that we have been buying from for years don't even bother to call us any more because they say Buchy's can't afford to pay the prevailing prices.

Price control has broken down with the legitimate packers taking the loss in money and in volume. Prices are dictated by the black market and not by the Government. The regulations have not been, are not now, and, in our opinion, cannot be enforced in the future. Conditions are rapidly growing worse than those existing in this country during prohibition.

The continuation of price control and subsidies is costing the people hundreds of millions of dollars. Additional millions are being paid by consumers in the form of black-market prices. We believe it is too late to eliminate the black market by the addition of numerous investigators or by raising ceiling prices. The continuation of OPA means to continue to subsidize an enormous and growing vicious black market. Consumers are penalized by extremely high black-market prices and by scarcity of meat in legitimate channels. We are hurt and threatened with ruin because we cannot compete with the black market in the livestock and dressed-meat markets. This cut in production of beef will only mean less hours for our workmen and fewer jobs available in our plant.

We urge the discontuance of price control and subsidies as a sure way to increase production of meats in legitimate channels and kill the black market in meats. True enough, the price of the better cuts of meat would rise temporarily on the lifting of control but it would not be long until they would seek their own level and we would again sell the cheaper cuts of meat in their normal proportion to the better cuts as we did in former days before the war. Today the demand is for the better cuts of meat because of their relatively low ceiling prices. The return of a free market will again bring supply and demand into balance in the meat business. A free market will stimulate food production in our country and will greatly help in increasing the world supply of food. This will help alleviate the world shortage we are now being told exists.

We urge the complete elimination of price control and subsidies on meat and meat animals effective immediately. The OPA regulations and the evils involved are contributing more to inflation than would the return to a free market. These evils are eating the heart out of America. We are bringing up a new generation and teaching them to lie, cheat, and steal, only we don't say so in these words—we simply use the polite word of "chiseling." We must get rid of subsidies and the subterfuge of holding down living costs. The American public should assume its own cost of living instead of depending upon the Federal Government for relief.

You Members of the Congress have the power to control inflation by adopting a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget. The continuation of these controls, the policy of cheap money, and deficit financing mean continuation of the conditions as they are today. It is up to you to decide whether we are to throw off these controls. Your decision will affect us for years to come. The Chas. G. Buchy Packing Co. hopes to resume its expansion program when we know where we are going and what we are going to do after we get there. By this we mean the throwing off of the controls that are now throttling our operations. We think it is about time that we have a chance again to run our own business.

Price Control in the Meat Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by

C. L. Farrington, of the National Livestock Exchange, before the House Agriculture Committee, Washington, D. C., March 27, 1946:

I am C. L. Farrington, of Indianapolis, Ind. I represent the National Livestock Exchange, whose members sell about 75 percent of the livestock that flows through the big terminal markets of the United States. Its members at each market are joined in a local livestock exchange to handle local problems. All of them, local as well as national, were organized, and operate, for the sole purpose of promoting and maintaining efficient and economical marketing of livestock. Their principal objective was, and is, to insure their livestock producers and feeder patrons that every animal sold for them would bring every possible dollar it was worth at a minimum of cost.

Working together in this cause these exchanges and their members developed, through a century of constructive effort, the system of terminal marketing which has for years been the envy of every country on the globe. A farmer or feeder can market a single animal, a carload, or a trainload of his livestock any day or time that he chooses to market it. We market agencies receive it, feed and water it, classify and appraise it, and sell it on an open competitive basis to packers bidding on it on a basis of its value to them, according to their own trade requirements and meat outlets. The whole transaction is in cash, too, and so established has this custom become that many people today believe it is the law that livestock for slaughter must be sold for cash. However, it is not a law—it is just an established custom that has been practiced for so long that it has really become a part of livestock marketing. Livestock exchanges take considerable pride in having established and perpetuated that custom.

In 1921 Congress, through the Packers and Stockyards Act, added their supervision to that of the exchanges, to keep the terminal markets open, competitive, free of discrimination, and to standardize fair market practices at a minimum of cost. Today the marketing cost at terminal markets is less than 1 percent of gross sales. Compare that to the marketing cost of any other commodity, either through auction or private sale.

Everything was going along smoothly until OPA came along. Then disintegration set in. Let me say here—no market man or farmer wants inflation—they never have—so when OPA stepped in the market men rallied to the cause. They offered their assistance to OPA to try to make price control as practical and workable as possible. About 130 different farm organizations along with the American Meat Institute, worked out a meat management plan with practical meat and livestock men forming a War Meat Board under Government supervision. They came to Washington and sold the idea to the OPA Administrator, to the War Food Administrator, and to the Quartermaster General of the Army; but someone else in OPA threw the whole idea out the window and set up their own plan of control which has brought all this confusion.

Last year it became evident that terminal markets could not continue to operate under conditions that had developed under OPA control, so request was made that OPA adjust ceiling differentials between terminal markets and country points sufficiently to get livestock moving in normal marketing channels again. Hearings were held, and evidence submitted which showed that livestock was bypassing terminal markets at an alarming rate—that terminal markets were about the only place where ceiling regulations were being observed, and that black-market operators could go to country points, unsupervised and unregulated, operate as they saw fit, and escape interference with their illegitimate operations. After 6 months of endeavor on our part, OPA finally conceded that inequities did exist and made an adjustment of 5 to 10 cents per hundredweight—mostly 5 cents.

Now, gentlemen, let me call your attention to that 5-cent raise: On a 200-pound hog it amounts to 10 cents per animal, and that 200-pound hog represents 6 to 9 months' work and investment on the part of the farmer. Compare that 10 cents per animal increase for the farmer to the recent wage increases per hour granted industrial workers. Is it any wonder that farmers resent such a dole? Along this line of thought, I want to submit an editorial printed in the Chicago Drovers Journal, February 8, 1946, entitled "If Labor Farmed, What Would the Hog Price Be?" I wonder myself in these times of time and one-half for overtime and double time for Sunday.

Anyhow, the nickel raise in ceiling prices was of very little benefit to terminal markets, and they continue to dwindle. The operators of other types of marketing continue to prosper. During the year 1945 receipts at public, supervised terminal markets were 43.6 percent below the average receipts of five preceding years. For the same year, 1945, only 37.3 percent of hogs slaughtered under Federal inspection were purchased through these terminal markets. I believe you realize the gravity of the situation when less than half the hogs slaughtered under Government supervision are purchased on public terminal markets, and that those markets are only able to maintain half their normal volume because of diversion into other than normal market channels.

Additional figures compiled from BAE statistics show that for the year 1945 only 48 percent of the total supply of hogs in the United States of America went to federally inspected plants, and that 52 percent disappeared through other marketing channels. Surely, the restriction written into the OPA law that price regulation must not divert business away from normal channels, has been totally disregarded in controlling livestock marketing.

Now, what is the net result of all this muddling?

Everyone loses, except the black-market operator. The farmer stands to lose his marketing system, which has served him faithfully through all the years with a cash outlet for any number of animals he chose to market. Today, his eyes are being turned away from his market because buyers are knocking on his gate, bidding him a higher price than he knows he will be allowed to receive in his terminal market. The temptation is there to take it—and many of them are taking it, with the result that his normal market is dying on the vine. Some day, however, the farmer will need it again, because when OPA goes out of the picture, black-market operators will go out just as bootleggers disappeared when prohibition gave up the ghost. The terminal market, however, will probably not be operating then, unless some remedial action is taken now. It will have passed out of the picture because it will have lost its volume, as it loses its effectiveness and efficiency. Then, how will the farmer find out what his livestock is worth? Will the back-alley trader be knocking on his door then? He will not. Frankly, I don't know where Mr. Farmer will find competitive buyers then, if there are no longer any terminal markets.

The packer will lose. Under normal marketing conditions, a packer could maintain one or two buyers on a public market, and these buyers could purchase his needed supplies at a minimum of buying expense. The other day a packer told me that his purchase of 3,800 hogs came from 29 different markets and country points and were in 54 different lots. Compare that buying expense with his normal operating expense. Instead of two buyers, he had paid—in one way or another—29 different buyers, and probably had had to make at least 29 different long-distance calls to those 29 buyers to beg for hogs. Gentlemen, someone along the line has to absorb that additional buying expense. I wonder who!

The consumer loses, too. Competition under supply-and-demand conditions through all the years has held the cost of his meat at the lowest possible level. It has forced distribution into every available outlet, so that meat was available whether Mr. Consumer lived in New York City, Chicago, or Podunk. He could buy meat when he wanted it, and any kind he wanted, in any quantity desired.

Now, gentlemen, I want to make this statement: The worst thing about this whole OPA set-up is that it is breaking down the moral fiber of so many good people. The farmer has to have an excessive amount of fortitude and patriotism to ship his livestock to market, when he can get more dollars at home. The consumer who wants meat for his family and cannot find it at his local legitimate butcher shop, is not going to let his family go hungry when he finds some meat elsewhere, even though the price may be a little higher than OPA says he dares to pay. The packer who tries to abide by all these edicts and directives finds that he is unable to operate under such restrictions, and has only to look across the street to see others going strong through disregard of these same controls. The terminal market complying with the regulations, sees more and more of its livestock by-passing the normal channels of trade, cannot help but wonder "What's the use." Should people and business be penalized for trying to live according to the law, and trying to do what is right?

One more thought in conclusion: Best compliance with OPA orders has been on terminal, Government-supervised markets. Yet every time the OPA decides to do something about enforcement, they move into these markets with a lot of publicity and fanfade. As a result, even legitimate operators get scared and move out into the unregulated channels where they will be unmolested. Too much chance of being tripped by some technicality to even run the risk. As to the market, it then loses its buying power as well as its selling supply, and eventually, will be forced to close because of lack of business. Gentlemen, at times it borders on persecution. Certainly, it is not protection. Here is a legitimate business, supervised by one branch of the United States Government (the Packers and Stockyards Act) being put out of business by another branch of the United States Government (the OPA). It does not make sense to me.

The British Loan and Silver Manipulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, some of us seem to forget what transpired after the First World War. This country enjoyed an era of prosperity for several years after that war and the financial writers contributing to our big dailies were prone to boast that the world's financial and banking control had shifted from England to America and we read of hard times over there while we were having labor shortages and enjoying prosperity over here. But after England got her

plans underway to recapture her foreign trade and international banking control our prosperity was short lived. In reviewing the financial development of that time, it seems that President Hoover and his Secretary of the Treasury Mellon, with the support of the American financiers, waged a determined fight to make the dollar better than the pound and hold the banking and financial control that had come to us as a result of the war—but it soon developed that this Republic, with its democratic way, was no match for the financial manipulation of the British Empire exercising the financial control of all its dominions and the teeming masses of India. It was the money metal, silver, that was used as a financial weapon to break down our properity.

It seems that poor old Herbert Hoover failed to see and understand what was being done to us by the British money manipulation after the First World War.

There were several contributing factors to the loss of our business prosperity when hard times overtook this country in the early thirties, but the British manipulation of silver and the loss of our oriental trade was the fulminating cap that set off the blast, an occurrence which I have recounted in some detail in a letter to my good friend a veteran mining man and experienced political leader, Irvin E. Rockwell, of Bellevue, Idaho, inserted here:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1946.

Mr. IRVIN E. ROCKWELL,
Bellevue, Idaho.

DEAR ROCK: Your letter came in with the morning mail—Rock, how do you get that way—vote for the British loan—you, a silver man, and know what they did to us and world prosperity by manipulating the price of silver? I am sure you remember what they did—first, by cashing in on the United Kingdom's subsidiary coins, which they called in and melted down and reduced the silver contents of these coins from 925 fine to 500 fine, in a plan by which they extracted 90,000,000 ounces of silver and unloaded it on the world market without breaking the price of the metal.

Not satisfied with this, they proceeded to shift their silver manipulations to India, where they put that country on a gold bullion basis in a change-over from a gold exchange basis—sounds pretty and stable, don't it? But they would only redeem paper rupees in quantities of $8,000 worth; and when the Hindu came in—if any of them ever got $8,000 worth of rupees together—they weighed him out an ingot in gold bullion—gold that he couldn't do anything with.

Well, it didn't take much time, in the ordinary banking practice, to retire the silver coinage by getting most of the circulating silver coinage in exchange for paper rupees. It worked, and they decided, so the reports tell us, to dispose of this accumulation of "useless" silver, and when the oriental, in the regular course of trade with this country, found the exchange value of his money cut in two, naturally we began to lose our oriental trade.

Maybe you were reading some of the western papers about that time and saw the press despatches about the wharves and docks of the Chinese and other oriental ports choked with flour and wheat that could not be disposed of, and then in a little while our Pacific ports were blocked in the same way, and the price of wheat began to decline in Idaho and in the rest of the United States until it fell as low as 18 cents a bushel at Grangeville, Idaho, and at other Idaho shipping points on the famous wheatlands of the Camas Prairie.

When this farm-market condition set in this country, it wasn't long until the market for farm machinery and about everything else the farmers used fell off, and when this happened, the stores and banks began to lose out and this country went into a first-class depression. And then what did we do?

Well, as credit had collapsed and money was so closely linked to credit and, more important still, integrated with credit, it developed that what little real money there was in this country couldn't be found. In this financial emergency, some bright minds told us we had to devise ways for the more economical use of gold.

As you know, the great accepted authority on metal and metal prices, the Engineering and Mining Journal, tells us that the mines of the British Empire produce 70 percent of the world's gold, and technical articles in that journal from time to time have told us of the large increase in the proven unmined gold reserves of South Africa, particularly the new discoveries made in the Whit-Water Rand by diamond-drill explorations.

Now, to provide for the more economical use of gold, we proceeded to enact a law to revalue gold from $20.67 per ounce to $35 per ounce. The Bureau of Mines tells us that the British had a reserve of 400,000,000 ounces of unmined gold in South Africa at that time. Now, you can multiply that amount of gold by $14.33, the increase this country placed on gold everywhere, and see how handsomely we did by the British by enacting this simple piece of legislation.

You are a regular reader, and it won't be necessary to make a list of what we have done to help the British in the war effort. Starting with 50 destroyer warships, the air bases we leased but didn't own, garrisoning Iceland and other places to protect British shipping, lease-lend—I am sure you know that this ran to over $29,000,000,000, besides the loan of 300,000,000 ounces of silver, which now turns out to be 328,00,000 ounces that wasn't included in the first settlement, because it was under a separate agreement which provided that this silver should be returned ounce for ounce. Practically all of this silver, by the way, has been coined and put into circulation as money at a coinage value higher than the monetary value of our silver coins.

In reading the terms of this last settlement, I don't find anything said about this silver, and now they want our taxpayers to come across with another $3,750,000,000 and you want us to make the loan, and I don't.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Wyatt's Subsidy Scheme Is Another New Deal Importation From the Bag of Totalitarian Tricks That Destroyed Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our housing problems, the claim is made that Mr. Wyatt's scheme represents a new approach to our housing needs.

What are the facts?

Let us look at the housing record in Europe. It discloses that government housing regulation, regimentation, and subsidizing are the same economic narcotics that were used in Europe after World War I.

Let me illustrate how closely this program follows the pattern of deterioration that finally ended in fascism and nazism in Europe. The following quotes are from the International Labor Office Studies and Reports, series G (Housing and Welfare) No. 1, entitled "European Housing Problems Since the War," published in 1924 at Geneva:

The chief reason why private building failed to provide an adequate number of suitable houses for the rapidly increasing population was that private capital could be invested more profitably elsewhere than in building. * * *

Another great difficulty was the rise in prices and wages, which sent up building costs to an unprecedented extent, although it was assumed that after the postwar boom they would fall again.

If building was to be resumed at all, it was clear that the public authorities must intervene, and this they did in all countries. The problems which arose and the methods adopted will be described in detail subsequently.

It is enough to say here that if the number of houses actually built is compared with the shortage of housing due to the war, the estimated requirements, and the amount of public money expended, the intervention of the public authorities does not appear to have been attended with any great success, except possibly in a few neutral countries, where it is probable that the housing shortage will soon be overcome. * * *

GERMANY

The section on tenant protection showed how low rents had been kept in comparison with the general rise in prices in Germany. This applied more particularly to old houses, but even in new houses it was impossible to charge rents corresponding to the steep rise in building costs. As in most other countries, after the war, building became an unprofitable instead of a profitable industry and no longer attracted private capital. * * *

In Germany, too, the authorities had therefore, to step into the breach, and the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities had to assume the burden of the so-called nonrecoverable building costs on behalf of the community. As elsewhere, schemes for the promotion of building centered round the municipalities, which thus obtained a far-reaching influence on the nature, management, and use of buildings, although for the actual construction they had to make use of building societies, companies, and even private building contractors. * * *

Two means of meeting nonrecoverable building costs were adopted: Subsidies and loans. * * * The part of the cost of building to be covered by the subsidies is calculated on the difference between the actual cost and either the cost of a new building of the same kind after the return of more lasting conditions, or the sum obtained by capitalizing the rent to be charged for similar buildings in the municipality concerned.

Half the subsidy is paid by the Federal Government, the other half by the Federal state and the municipality. It is granted only in respect of small and medium-sized dwellings and preference is given to large families. The subsidies are paid in cash, are free of interest, and not repayable. Speculation in the dwellings erected by means of building subsidies is prevented by the obligation to obtain the approval of the municipality when the rents and sale prices are fixed. * * *

In 1919 the total share of the Federal Government in building subsidies amounted to 650,000,000 marks. * * * By the end of 1922 the Federal Government had expended some seventeen or eighteen milliard marks on official grants toward public-utility building of small dwellings. It is estimated that as a result the number of dwellings erected during the 3 years 1919, 1920, and 1921 by cooperative societies, other public-utility societies, municipalities, and private individuals was approximately 315,000, to which a further 105,000 constructed by unaided private enterprise may be added.

Attempts to reduce the cost of building

To begin with, the most important official action in connection with housing was that taken in the direction of reducing the cost of building. * * *

A Federal housing commissioner was responsible from 1918 to 1920 for allocating war materials which could be used for building, encouraging the production of building materials, and regulating their sale. * * *

The district housing commissioners were also given wide powers to control the building materials industries and expropriate building land.

Land belonging to the Federal Government was made available with a view to facilitating the acquisition of building sites. * * *

The control of the building materials industries, which had become very strict during the war for military reasons, was maintained after the war as far as bricks, lime, and cement were concerned.

AUSTRIA

It will be seen that, although the rise in rents which took place in Austria is immensely greater than in any other country, it is negligible in comparison with the increase in other prices, which followed the collapse of the krone without legislative hindrance, and also in comparison with the rise in wages. * * *

Expenditure on rent ceased to be an important item in the worker's total budget. Before the war, this item absorbed as much as 20 percent of total wages, and represented about 63 days' earnings; in July 1923 it represented 0.87 percent, or 2½ days' earnings.

The Austrian legislation for the protection of tenants thus clearly produced the social effects which were expected of it.

From the economic point of view, however, it made the investment of capital in house property unprofitable, and thus led not only to the cessation of private building, but to the neglect of the repair and upkeep of houses by their owners.

This state of affairs necessitated the intervention of some other factor; and in Austria, as in most other countries, the state stepped into the breach. * * *

It thus happens that persons are frequently obliged to be subtenants of a house before they can become the legal tenants, and this unfortunately affords many opportunities of corruption, e. g., the so-called sale of dwellings. As it was found that in the distribution of housing accommodation, as in other forms of state control, corruption tended to become rife, the Viennese municipal authorities early in 1922 undertook a thorough reform of the system of distribution.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

As has already been seen, the Czechoslovak legislation for the protection of tenants kept rents fairly low. The result, as in all countries in which legislation of this character has been adopted was that capital no longer obtained an adequate return if invested in building and was diverted from the industry. In order to secure the erection of a sufficient number of new buildings, therefore, it was necessary to resort largely to public subsidies. * * *

The state gives both a guarantee and a subsidy—a combination of the two preceding systems. * * *

HUNGARY

Energetic steps to promote the building of small dwellings were not taken by the state until 1921. The following privileges were granted: (1) State contributions toward the cost of building; (2) facilities for obtaining loans toward building expenditure; (3) the right of expropriation; (4) the right to employ state employees; (5) special exemption from taxation (from 15 to 30 years), and, finally, (6) unlimited right of the municipality to own and dispose of the newly erected dwellings.

In commenting on rents, the International Labor Office makes this statement:

Nonrecoverable building costs in the wider sense may be said to exist when regulations for the protection of tenant prevent rents from following the general rise in prices, so that, measured in a stable standard of value, they fall below their prewar value. This occurs principally in countries with a highly inflated currency.

Here is more evidence that the actual peacetime purpose of the OPA is not to prevent inflation, but to conceal the inflation that is destroying the value of our money. Here again the political black magic of the New Deal parallels with deadly accuracy the events in Europe that brought totalitarianism, war, and misery in their wake.

USE VETERANS AS A SHIELD

Mr. Speaker, the Wyatt subsidy scheme was never considered before any committee. That $600,000,000 blank check scheme came to the House without 1 hour of study or one witness being heard on it. The basic idea of fascism is "command from above and obedience from below." On that Fascist pattern, the House was ordered to pass the Wyatt scheme, which would deliver all house-building to the bureaucrats.

Presumably the veterans of this war fought to destroy the menace of fascism. Wouldn't it then be tragic if they were used as a front to bring it about here? That very attempt has been made by the promoters of the Wyatt housing scheme.

Those who would regiment and enslave us into national socialism dare not do it openly. They would like to hide behind the veterans, using them for a shield. In truth they seem to be brutally contemptuous of the veterans. This was demonstrated in a radio sales talk, when a proponent referred to veterans needing houses as "the greatest sucker market in history."

If government would cut out its red tape and bottlenecks, American labor and industry would build the needed houses—and fast.

General Motors Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence easily ranks among the top-notch columnists. What he has to say is always worth reading, as it is informative and usually unbiased.

Last evening Mr. Lawrence had a most interesting article in the Washington Star which dealt with the recent strike at General Motors. Mr. Lawrence, in his article, brings to light facts which have long been suspected by many Members of this body. The article follows:

GM STRIKE FACTS SEEN BARED BY UNION ROW—"SHOW BOOKS" DEMAND CALLED PROPAGANDA BY THOMAS

(By David Lawrence)

It takes a row between two prominent union leaders to bring out the facts of the recent strike at General Motors, which cost the Nation many hundreds of millions of dollars and deprived 200,000 or more workers of a livelihood for nearly 4 months.

Apparently no fact-finding commission appointed by the Government dared to bring out the facts and apparently no newspaper or press association was able to verify for the American people the facts which now are openly admitted.

What are some of these facts? It is learned now, for example, that a serious political controversy involving the ambitions of two leaders led to a strategy in the strike that prolonged it unduly.

Thus, R. J. Thomas, defeated candidate for reelection as president of the United Automobile Workers' Union, CIO, told a press conference at Atlantic City, before the balloting began, that the walk-out in General Motors last autumn was badly timed by the leadership, that the strike lasted 4 weeks too long, that the price issue should never have been injected into the wage negotiations, and that "ability to pay" is not a sound argument at all.

DANGEROUS CONTENTION

Mr. Thomas contended that inability to pay would be a dangerous contention for unions to face, because it would get the unions into difficulties with competing companies not able to pay as much as the strongest companies. He added that this issue needlessly prolonged the strike, and he blamed Walter Reuther, his rival for the presidency, for these tactics.

Mr. Thomas remarked that the show-your-books demand was just propaganda. Even his opponent, Mr. Reuther, conceded that it was "just a maneuver to win public support and to get the company over a barrel," and he says Mr. Thomas knew all about this phase of the strategy.

Yet the American people were told by no less a person than the President of the United States that the demand to open the books was important and should be heeded. The incident illustrates how naive even a Chief Executive can be in the maelstrom of union politics and trick maneuvers whereby unions seek to get favorable publicity and prejudice the case against the employers.

The United Automobile Workers' Union in the CIO is one of the largest in the history of trade unionism. The fact that personal ambitions played a part in bringing on the recent strike in the auto industry has been widely suspected, but not until the convention at Atlantic City did the unvarnished truth come out.

ABUSE OF POWER SEEN

Collective bargaining as granted by the Wagner law was not intended to provide a new system of government for a special group or a new means of political exploitation of the average man. It was intended to protect the rights of workers to organize in their own interest. No provision was made in the law to prevent abuse of power or exploitation of the worker by leaders who could, if they chose, discriminate against those who

disagreed with their course. Likewise, mass picketing has been resorted to and physical violence used to prevent citizens from exercising their right to enter their own property.

Workers who want to work and may or may not be members of a union have been forcibly deprived of their civil rights.

The convention at Atlantic City of the UAW is the climax which draws public attention to the evils of "big unionism," which now parallel the evils of the big corporations that have failed to use their economic power in the public interest.

The Congress of the United States, moreover, has been browbeaten into submission by the political power of big unions which have defied governmental authority and threatened reprisals on Members of the legislative body. If trade unionism must resort to mass violence to win strikes, and if rival personalities with political ambitions can inflict hundreds of millions of dollars of damage on the country without being held to accountability for such economic crimes, it means that liberties are not being protected by so-called liberals at all and that a new set of reactionaries have arisen in America to play havoc with democratic government.

In 1948 Americans Should Place Public Principles Above Private Personalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under privilege granted me by the House, I am taking this means of calling to the attention of the Congress and the country an interesting and challenging editorial which will appear in the next issue of the Republican magazine, the national party magazine of the Republican Party and one of the most stimulating and informative monthly magazines being published in the field of political science and governmental affairs.

The attached editorial is intended primarily for Republicans and it is being inserted in the RECORD at this point because the speaker believes many Republican editors, speakers, and writers—as well as impartial columnists and commentators—may desire to discuss the challenging point of view which it elaborates. However, I believe this editorial is equally important and significant reading for Democrats.

Communists, left wingers, Fascists, and others who believe in one-man government or the complete collectivization of this country would be neither interested nor impressed by the editorial I am inserting at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the fact is demonstrable today that both of the major political parties in this country have an abundance of good, available American talent from which to select candidates for President in 1948. In my opinion, too, Americans in 1948 are going to vote for or against principles and policies and programs of government rather than for personalities or exalted individualists who envisage themselves as greater than the parties which gave them a start and as more important than the institution of Congress with which they must cooperate should they be elected to the Presidency.

In the long run the man who considers himself mightier than his party and superior to his associates goes the route of a Hitler or a Mussolini, although he may not follow it completely to such a dismal destination as that attained by the unsavory, unholy, and unhallowed dictators of Germany and Italy.

What America needs is a President who will work with Congress and not one who concentrates his efforts to working on Congress.

What America needs is a President who will administer the laws enacted by Congress rather than specializing in the futile pastime of administering rebukes to Congress.

What America needs is a President who will lead successfully the members of his own party in and out of Congress because of the logic of his program and the persuasiveness of his ideas and not by endeavoring to lash his party into meek compliance by the exercise of political patronage, platform performers, or the use of the Public Treasury.

Richard Nowinson, editor of the Republican magazine in Chicago, offers some sound advice to Republicans in the following editorial. His point of view is not copyrighted. Democrats are also encouraged to give serious thought to these expressions:

Already Republicans are looking beyond the 1946 congressional elections to the big showdown in 1948. Sixteen years is the longest period the GOP ever has been out of power. Besides the apparent ineptness of Roosevelt's successor to cope with an intractable world stimulates the eagerness to take over on the part of those of us who feel we have watched too long from the sidelines. This is natural. It is healthy.

Perhaps it is natural, too, that already we should hear it murmured: We must nominate so-and-so for President because nobody else can win. But we do not think this advance muttering shows a healthy party mentality. A caution to Republicans against this approach to 1948 would seem to be that twice before, in 1940 and again in 1944, a candidate was chosen presumably because only he could win. Neither nominee won.

But let us go to the deeper reason why this kind of thinking is unhealthy, both for the party and for the Nation. In effect, it makes an individual superior to the party; just as one-man government makes the administrator superior to a coordinated and representative government. Republicans have complained bitterly of late, and with reason, against one-man government. Let us not then fall into the error of thinking in terms of a one-man party.

The party, and we naturally think in terms of our own, the Republican, has its own program to advance. Or it ought to have. It is the responsibility of the party to have such a program, and the duty of the candidate to present the party's program. When someone, ambitious to be the nominee, assumes the privilege of presenting himself in a role superior to the party, and the only candidate who can win, and is accepted in that role, there must be something seriously wrong with the party.

To win, the party ought to depend upon the validity and vitality of its approach to the national problems and on the appeal of this approach rather than on the presumptions, however heroic, of any one person. It is true that the late President Roosevelt succeeded in commanding a singular position within his party, but we are the witnesses to the results. We should not elect to emulate our opposition party in this respect.

The Republican Party has many leaders able enough to be President.

In the United States Senate are Owen Brewster, Maine; Styles Bridges, New Hampshire; Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts; Robert Taft, Ohio; Arthur Vandenberg, Michigan; and Kenneth Wherry, Nebraska; as well as former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts.

In the United States House of Representatives are EVERETT DIRKSEN, Illinois; CHARLES HALLECK, Indiana; JOSEPH MARTIN, Jr., Massachusetts.

Among our governors are Thomas Dewey, New York; Dwight Green, Illinois; Dwight Griswold, Nebraska; Edward Martin, Pennsylvania; Earl Warren, California; as well as former Gov. John Bricker, Ohio; and Harold Stassen, Minnesota.

Business leader Eric Johnston, Washington, and Gens. Dwight Eisenhower, Kansas, and Douglas MacArthur, Wisconsin, also may be available; and on the United States Supreme Court is the distinguished Mr. Justice Harold Burton, Ohio.

So let us as practical, thinking Republicans shout down any advance claim that only this or that man can win. Instead, let us ask ourselves: Can the Republican Party win? Be sure that if the answer is "Yes," the candidate, whoever he may be, can defeat the Democrat nominee.

Spiritual Advisers at the Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was published in the Charlotte Observer of March 17, 1946:

NEED SPIRITUAL ADVISERS

To the Observer:

I note your article, The Impertinence of Religion, in your issue of this date, by Dr. William T. Ellis.

The article states "Fifty-one nations gather for a UNO assembly and, lo, Religion perches at every man's ear." Religion would do that naturally, but how did it happen that the spiritual leaders of America were actually present at the San Francisco conference when UNO was born?

The answer is that the State Department invited six religious organizations—two each from the Protestant, Jewish, and Roman Catholic faiths—to send representatives to San Francisco to act as advisers to the American delegation. The invitation was accepted and what those advisers did in the way of being a constraining and restraining influence on the delegates is now a resplendent page of history. The preamble to the UNO Charter and many specific statements therein, squaring the provisions with the Christian and Jewish conceptions of spiritual principles and moral ethics, can be credited to the presence of those religious leaders.

I submit that our Government should make similar arrangements whereby spiritual advisers will sit behind our delegates at the 21-nation peace conference presently to be held to effect peace treaties for half a dozen of the Central European nations. Insistent public demand induced the President and the State Department to include religious leaders among the list of advisers present at San Francisco. A similar demand will give these servants of the Prince of Peace an opportunity to make their all-important contribution to the peace treaties.

Will not every man and woman of good will who reads these lines write at once to President Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, your Senators and Congressmen, asking that this be done? Do your part to make this a national demand.

W. MONTGOMERY BENNETT.

BEAUFORT.

Senator McKellar, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., of March 23, written by James G. Stahlman and entitled "From the Shoulder."

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Crossville Chronicle, Crossville, Tenn., dated March 21, 1946. This is an editorial entitled "Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee."

I should like to have the article and the editorial printed one after the other in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 23, 1946]

FROM THE SHOULDER

(By James G. Stahlman)

Spring is here, and so are the politicians. They have come to talk about the campaign, at least indirectly, and to pay homage to K. D. MCKELLAR and Jim McCord at a Jackson Day banquet, as is their custom.

Before the bigwigs get down to oratory, I want to tell you what you should have known already, and that is, the Banner is going down the line, hell-bent for election of KENNETH MCKELLAR and Jim McCord.

The Banner is for MCKELLAR and McCord because they are able, honest, public servants. It believes in them because they stand for southern Democracy, the brand that has its roots in the principles of the man they will honor tonight, Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee.

The Banner believes in Jacksonian Democracy, not the type that takes its cue from commissars or Soviets. This is the Democracy that will save America, if America wants to be saved from the fifth column now bent upon sweeping away the foundations of our political, economic, social, and spiritual life.

The Banner is for MCKELLAR and McCord because it believes they represent southern Democracy and American fundamentals. It is not for them because we are against anybody else. Ours is an affirmative support out of strong conviction that MCKELLAR and McCord should be returned to their respective offices without serious opposition.

Of course, the smear brigade will have its brushes out. The customary lies will be told about "MCKELLAR, the enemy of TVA." Hogwash! And the biennial tripe about Ed Crump will be flung from Carter to Shelby, without damage to Mr. Crump or those receiving his support.

I have had to snicker every 2 years at the gyrations of candidates who would like to have Mr. Crump's support, but who denounce him, like the devil and all his works, when they fail to receive it.

There isn't a candidate who has run for major office in Tennessee within my memory who wouldn't have been tickled to death to have had the support of Crump and Shelby, if he could have had it. And all the flimflam about this great ogre doesn't frighten even little children, let alone grown men and women who can think for themselves. It may fool those who just love to be fooled, but that's all.

So watch out for the usual "baloney." It will be centered on MCKELLAR. It will come from the Farmer's Union, the Highlander group, the SCHW, the CIO pinks, and those who hate MCKELLAR because he's a real American who has dared to pit himself against men and things he considers inimical to the Nation's interests.

MCKELLAR has done more for Tennessee than any man in the history of Congress. He occupies the most powerful and influential positions in the United States Senate. His long record of service and his present high spot make it unwise to think of sending an untrained substitute in his place.

Jim McCord has done a good job. He hasn't been spectacular. That isn't his nature. But he's been honest, industrious, and assiduous in protecting Tennessee and her every interest. The State is in sound condition, financially. It is as tranquil, politically and socially, as meddlers, particularly from the outside, will allow it to remain.

Tonight's banquet will start the political artillery thundering. It will grow louder as August approaches. The heavies, lights, and mediums will rumble in every county. There are no foxholes in this campaign. So don't try to run or duck. This is your fight. Get in there and scrap for those who are scrapping to protect you and yours and yours. And when the shooting is all over, MCKELLAR and McCord will have been declared the victors. Then let us hope that Tennessee will be able to settle down to business and forget politics for another 2 years. It's MCKELLAR and McCord all the way.

[From the Crossville (Tenn.) Chronicle of March 21, 1946]

SENATOR KENNETH D. M'KELLAR, OF TENNESSEE

More than any one man, Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, has been responsible for the preservation and expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Since 1916, Senator MCKELLAR has fought consistently to develop the valley into a single unified river control for power, navigation, and flood control. While Senator MCKELLAR may have differed with some others on the ways and means of accomplishing these results, he has always stood for and fought for development of the Valley in the interest of the State of Tennessee, the South, and the Nation.

He has instigated and insisted upon the appropriation of millions of dollars for the expansion of the facilities of the Valley and has been directly responsible for the construction of the last seven dams—the Pickwick, the Guntersville, Alabama Dam, the Chickamauga, Tennessee Dam, the Hiwassee Dam, the Watts Bar Dam, the North Loudon Dam, and the Gilbertsville Dam, in Kentucky. Construction of these dams was initiated in the Senate by Senator MCKELLAR and funds for their construction were advocated and obtained by him.

Congressman B. CARROLL REECE, Republican from Tennessee, said: "The people in Tennessee were looking to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to save these projects for them when they were being agitated and he performed. Except for them, the TVA would have been in pretty bad shape.

"I have been familiar with the development of the TVA since its inception," said Congressman REECE. "I am familiar with the circumstances that resulted in its inception and I do not see how anyone who is familiar with the facts can for one moment question Senator MCKELLAR'S profound interest in the development of the Tennessee Valley area, and the TVA, and because of the eight or nine dams now that are embraced in the TVA, as I recall the facts, all except three were authorized in the Senate upon Senator MCKELLAR'S initiative, in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, and those of us in Tennessee and the South who are interested in the TVA, and its continued development, have looked upon Senator MCKELLAR as the greatest friend that the TVA has had, and now because of a difference of view on the part of Senator MCKELLAR and some particular official in the TVA, I do not see how his interest in the TVA could possibly be questioned, because he has demonstrated his interest and friendship and usefulness in the development of this great project."

In 1939, when Senator Adams, chairman of a subcommittee of a Senate Committee on Appropriations, sought to block construction of Watts Bar Dam by striking the appropriation from the bill, Senator MCKELLAR took up the cudgels for this necessary adjunct to development of the TVA and finally won by a committee vote of 13 to 11.

In arguing to have the Senate strike the appropriation, Senator Adams said on the Senate floor, "In considering the item the committee divided, 13 to 11, and then only after most persuasive and effective efforts by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who is sometimes down but never out. Twice during the committee's deliberation the Senator from Tennessee lost, but he always came back with another vote. The result was that our efforts to strike out this authorization for a new dam were defeated by a vote of 13 to 11, representing the vote of every Senator on the committee.

"The TVA already has spent over $220,000,000. The completion of the plans of the engineers of the TVA will involve the expenditure of $560,000,000, and it does seem that at least we might be a little less impatient; that we might wait a little and not crowd construction of a new dam while we have under construction four great dams involving expenditure of $200,000,000."

After lengthy debate, during which Senator MCKELLAR defended the TVA as having come through the recent investigation by a joint committee with a clean bill of health, the amendment offered by Senator Adams was rejected by the Senate and the appropriations for Watts Bar Dam were authorized and the dam was constructed.

This is a sample of how Senator MCKELLAR has fought consistently for the development of the TVA since 1916. He well deserves the title of champion of the TVA since the early days when the project was known to the public as the Muscle Shoals development. Republicans and Democrats alike in public utterances agree that the influence and perseverance of Senator MCKELLAR has been more responsible for the present development of TVA than that of any man. He kept fighting after others had quit, and the TVA stands as a monument to his statesmanship, patriotism, and loyalty to his State.

Living Costs Soar Despite OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD comparative costs of living in the Detroit, Mich., area.

A member of the Detroit public-school system, in pointing out the need for an upward revision of school teachers' salaries, has given me some very convincing evidence that the degree of increase in the cost of living is considerably greater than the OPA admits and that the OPA has failed to hold the line in food prices.

Here is the schedule of prices on regular market-basket items, compiled from the files of the Detroit News for 1940 and 1946:

Commodity	Prices		Percentage of increase
	1940	1946	
Beef:			
Sirloin	$0.21	$0.42	100
Round	.21	.42	100
Roast	.19	.39	106
Liver	.15	.35	133.34
Lamb:			
Chops	.25	.37	49
Roast	.22	.33	50
Leg of	.25	.37	49
Pork:			
Chops	.125	.36	190
Sausage	.125	.39	212
Chickens:			
Roasting	.27	.43	60
Stewing	.19	.37	94
Bologna	.11	.33	200
Bacon, slices	.125	.40	220
Ham:			
Whole	.19	.59	210
Slices	.29	.70	135
Crisco (3 pounds)	.45	.68	50
Lard (1 pound)	.06	.16	166.67
Oleo (1 pound)	.17	.27	60
Cheese, mild (1 pound)	.15	.47	213
Butter	.26	.53	103
Milk:			
Fluid (quart)	.09	.14	66.67
Evaporated, tall	.06	.09	50
Eggs (dozen)	.19	.46	142
Apples (1 pound)	.035	.15	350
United States No. 1 potatoes	.23	.57	149
Celery, Pascal	.10	.21	110
Onions, dry, yellow	.03	.09	200
Broccoli	.10	.21	110
Oysters (pint)	.29	.67	131
Whitefish	.11	.49	345
Codfish	.11	.35	218
Red salmon, tall	.20	.49	145
Pink salmon, tall	.12	.22	83.34
Grapefruit juice	.15	.29	93
Orange juice	.16	.39	143
Tomato juice	.15	.24	60
Coffee, Hill's	.25	.33	33.34
Crackers	.08	.19	137.5
Average increase			133.30

The only conclusion that can be reached from a study of these figures is that the OPA has failed to hold prices, and as a result the people are burdened with a greatly increased cost of living. This failure to hold the line has brought on strikes for higher wages, which are being followed in turn by still higher prices that nullify wage increases and leave the worker no better off than before. Obviously the salaries of school teachers, postal employees, and other workers under contract have not kept pace with the increased cost of living or with pay increases in private industries.

UNRRA

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I note by press reports that UNRRA now has a new Director General. It is about time, and I trust this outfit will now go into action. One billion eight hundred fifty million dollars was made available by Congress months ago to prevent mass starvation.

I would like someone in the Congress to tell me what UNRRA has been doing all this time to set up a program to feed the starving people of the war-torn countries of the world. Certainly the situation is desperate. We, the most favored Nation of the world, have accepted the responsibility to feed God's unfortunate famine-stricken people and why we do not get under way I cannot understand. The American people will do anything possible by way of self-denial to prevent hunger and starvation. Whoever is charged with this responsibility should tell the Nation what must be done, the foodstuffs required, when it must be delivered, give us the program, and in one gigantic intensive voluntary effort, mobilize our resources, marshal our forces, ships and manpower, chart our course, and get the food to the people who need it. This would be America in action—the America the people of the world know and respect—they are calling on us—they depend upon us—let us not fail in this mission of mercy. Let us forget for the moment our petty differences, our bickering, and get this job done.

Congress appropriated the necessary money to UNRRA to do this job, yet no one has reported, at least to my knowledge, to the Congress what has been done—what must be done—above all, on what can we do now to speed up the whole program and get action. The people of the stricken countries are crying to us to save them from starvation. Every American will gladly cooperate voluntarily. We set up UNRRA. Then call on the Department of Agriculture to set up another organization—then we set up the Emergency Food Administration—now a new Director General. I thought this program was to be carried on by UNRRA. "What is everybody's business is nobody's business," and we continue to go around in circles. People are starving to death.

In the war effort we had a job to do; we took off our coats, turned out the planes, tanks, jeeps, and guns, and foodstuffs that reinspired the world and brought victory. This is another war to prevent mass starvation. We are called upon to again take off our coats and do a job in the American way. It is time for action—starving people, famine, disease, and pestilence cannot wait or live on excuses and alibis. They want food. Let us get under way right now. This job should have been done 6 months ago.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by H. J. Heinz 2d on the subject What Must We Do to Help Feed Europe? on America's Town Meeting, March 7, 1946:

With Senator PEPPER's appeal that we must feed Europe, I agree. That it is easy, I disagree. Senator PEPPER certainly does not tell how it can be done.

But before suggesting any solutions, I wish to make my own position clear:

I speak tonight as an individual, not as a spokesman for the food industry. No one man can speak for the country's largest industry. I sincerely believe—in light of my recent trip to England, Belgium, and Holland—that the United States must act with the speed of a man coming to the aid of a drowning friend. We have just won the first battle of Europe. We are fighting the second, and the enemy is famine.

Now for my suggestions:

The President should tell what food is needed, how much and where. He should make a monthly report on progress made in meeting these requirements. Among the Government's 3,000,000 employees, somebody should have had time to get some right answers.

The President should explain the reasons why we must help feed Europe. The reasons are three:

First. The American tradition of common decency and human kindness demand that we help feed Europe. It is this tradition that has given us one of our greatest assets "a reservoir of good will throughout the world."

Second. Our future international trade demands a healthy and productive Europe which only a well-fed and energetic people can create. I thoroughly agree with Secretary Wallace's recent statement that we are part of an "indivisible world economy."

Third. The entire world's future peace and stability demand that we share our food. In the words of Lord Halifax, "hunger and discontent are a poor foundation for the peaceful and prosperous world we are trying to build." Hunger provokes despair. Despair provokes hate, especially against those who fail to live up to their promises. Hate makes war. In no better way can America's moral, spiritual, and material might be used than to restore peace of mind to a despairing world. It is time to display the strength of democracy in peace.

Explain these three reasons why we should help feed Europe and Americans will pitch in. They do not have to be led around by the nose, treated as children, or shamed into helping.

The emergency famine committee should determine and announce immediately voluntary conservation steps which the public can take—meatless days, breadless meals, fat conservation, food substitutions, etc. One thing sure, we must eliminate waste. In New York City in 1945, there was 31 percent more food thrown away as garbage than in 1931.

Then let the committee mobilize all means of influencing public opinion. The churches might institute a famine relief service. The food editors of the press did a magnificent job during the war of showing people how to save. They can and will do it again.

The Government should constantly consult with the ablest men in those divisions of the food and other industries which are directly affected by the European feeding program. These men will be able to help if their advice is heeded. Some of them have

already proposed a uniform limitation on the use of wheat for flour and cereals. Their proposal would save far more than the 25,000,000 bushels to be gained from dark bread.

A basic reason for the wheat shortage is the large amount being used for animal feed—300 to 400 percent more than prewar. Let the Government reexamine the present controlled relationship between wheat and meat prices.

It is most important that our relief program bring about the restoration of European agriculture. We should send all we can of seed, fertilizer, farm machinery, locomotives, railroad cars, and trucks. One good crop year will make Europe generally self-sufficient.

Our Government should make every effort to get other food surplus areas back into production. We are still shipping sugar to the Philippines, normally a large exporter.

Let the administration decide on an industrial policy which promotes maximum industrial production instead of strife. This will have two effects. It will help the American as well as the European farmer to get much needed agricultural equipment. It will encourage the American farmer to produce more by assuring him a steady and large domestic market.

My final suggestion concerns the children of Europe. In the name of all that this country stands for, let's provide food for those children. In some parts of Europe infant mortality is running as high as 50 percent. If necessary, give the food outright. Let's not haggle about methods when children's lives hang in the balance. For them we must ship now and save later.

Public Wants Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I desire to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the following excerpts from correspondence which I have received on the subject of labor legislation recently introduced by myself;

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS SUPPORTING THE CASE BILL

ALABAMA

Veterans' hospital, Montgomery:

"Servicemen that were over and those that didn't want your antistrike bill passed. * * * Strikes, strikes, strikes. It must be stopped or else we lose all trade with other countries."

Montgomery:

"We really need a bill such as you have for making unions responsible for their actions."

ARIZONA

McNary:

"I am firmly convinced after my 25 years of contact with labor of all kinds and classes that the laboring men themselves will be most benefited by your bill and that most of them know their leaders are as much in need of control as the old-fashioned 'public-be-damned' generation of business leaders."

CALIFORNIA

Berkeley:

"If strikes can be confined to the immediate business involved and sympathy strikes made illegal, that will go far toward stopping the tie-ups we now have."

Pasadena:

"We need a fair-labor policy based on justice for all of our people * * * and it should insure full and uninterrupted production all of the time."

Covina:

"I am sure the public commends your action * * * looking toward curbing strikes that are crippling greatly needed production."

Los Angeles:

"I wish to express my earnest approval of your bill to require fair and equal treatment for management and labor."

San Francisco:

"I do hope your bill will come to a favorable vote as conditions are very bad here on the Pacific coast; there is violence on the picket line nearly every day."

Alameda:

"We do not want our country to condone current picketing practices. * * * It is not pleasant, even after going through the war, to witness in this town, to read in the press, and to see in the news reels, the current scenes of violent picketing."

Concord:

"Let us be fair with all classes of society. The same laws and regulations should apply to labor as are now imposed upon industry."

Hollywood:

"Have been a union man for the last 20 years, and I am with you 100 percent."

COLORADO

Denver:

"I wish to record approval of the general principles of the Case bill * * * in order to balance responsibility of labor and management to the end that fullest national production may be obtained."

CONNECTICUT

Bridgeport:

"I was released from the Marine Corps after 4½ years this fall and have since been employed by General Electric Co. as an accountant. This plant is shut down by strike and, regardless of the illegality of mass picketing which prevents entry into the plant, the local union effectively kept all office personnel out of the offices. This clearly indicates the need for adding legal responsibility to the right to strike."

Lime Rock:

"Sympathetic work stoppage should be penalized."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"The members of this organization are the victims of the truck-pilot racket in New York, which the Supreme Court has said only Congress can correct; a 6-week strike which closed the wholesale produce market in Pittsburgh on the demand of union leaders that dealers sign an agreement to refuse to sell or deliver perishable merchandise to any but persons holding union cards."

FLORIDA

Orlando:

"Appoint a board of, say, five to handle all labor disputes, whose decision will be final. * * * Let the board represent the public only."

Lakeland:

"All agree that * * * unions should be responsible * * * and that violent picketing and threats of violence should be made illegal."

GEORGIA

Fort Benning:

"I could never understand why the 'peaceful picketing' authorized by the Wagner Act is allowed to mean armed guards with clubs and brickbats. I have always contended that the bulk of labor troubles would cease if unions could be held responsible in court for breach of contract, unlawful damage to property, and if picketing could be peaceful."

IDAHO

Coeur d'Alene:

"America's prosperity awaits the enactment of a law equal in its control of labor and management."

ILLINOIS

Evanston:

"It is unfortunate that newspapers have termed your bill an 'antistrike' bill. Actually, it seems to me there is nothing in it * * * which would abridge the right of labor to strike."

Chicago:

"I have long felt that if two parties contracted, both should be held equally responsible."

Chicago:

"There is no reason why labor should not be bound by the same rules as other law-abiding people. They should be obliged to live up to contracts, avoid violence, and, in general, conduct themselves as the rest of us are obliged to do."

Morton Grove:

"There are three parties to every labor dispute. All have rights to be considered: Labor, management, and the public; and adjustments must be founded on the principle that if it's right for one it must be right for all. Labor should be equally responsible with industry for any violation of contract entered into via collective bargaining."

Chicago:

"Industrial warfare * * * has now reached the point where the Government must step in, in the interest of all people, and enact such legislation as will put labor and management on an equal basis. Too little emphasis these days is being put on the rights of the public."

Malta:

"The people are feeling tired of strikes. Labor is not suffering; management is not suffering; but the American people are suffering."

Chicago:

"There can be no further argument against the fact that unions should be made responsible, just the same as management, for carrying out contracts and promises. Certainly all violence should be eliminated."

INDIANA

Terre Haute:

"The bill as you proposed is not 'too stringent.' It makes both labor and capital responsible and * * * would insure speedy action to curb and help settle industrial strife."

IOWA

Council Bluffs:

"When a minority group can grab what it wants regardless of its needs and regardless of justice to the rest of the people who really pay the bill in the long run, we have taken a long step toward dictatorship by a minority group. This must stop."

Cedar Falls:

"I think a new law should be enacted that would be fair to everybody. Letting a few radicals take the affairs in hand isn't right."

Perry:

"For 25 years I have been a member of a labor organization affiliated with the AFL, and I approve of laboring men organizing but I do believe there is a limit and that limit has been grossly exceeded."

Carroll:

"Recently I have heard a great deal of discussion in regard to your proposed legislation on strikes and I wish to advise that from reports I have heard of it, I heartily endorse and favor some legislation that would definitely fix responsibility upon irresponsible labor leaders for strikes."

Des Moines:

"So long as the leaders can assemble what amounts to an army to back them, and so

take possession of a business, nothing can be done to stop it. It is disgraceful to this Nation that such conduct is permitted."

Sioux City:

"We believe it is high time that some such bill as you propose is made a law, for we are tired of the labor troubles springing up all over. Until our Congress makes a bill with teeth in it we will see the trouble continue."

KANSAS

Salina:

"You are right 'on the beam' in your anti-strike bill—it checks with the Kansas Industrial Court Law, still on the statutes of Kansas."

Wichita:

"Urge prompt passage of Case bill or similar measure. If laws are enacted making labor unions, their officers and members, legally responsible for contract violations and outlawing violence, intimidation, and coercion in labor disputes, management and labor can and will settle own problems on basis fair to all and in the public interest without other Government controls."

Arkansas City:

"You have the only constructive anti-strike legislation offered."

KENTUCKY

Louisville:

"Please permit me to express my approval. It is imperative we enact some controlling legislation if our Nation is to be spared chaos and suffering."

Paducah:

"I want the unions to have their rights and the industry to have their rights. Equal rights for both."

Berea:

"No person is more insistent upon the protection of labor and the rights of labor than myself, but no person feels more strongly, on the other hand, that labor must accept responsibilities and impose self-restraint in return for rights. During the past months, labor has come more and more into the position of insisting on, and making the most of, its rights, while the responsibility to the American economic system has been generally overlooked or completely discarded."

LOUISIANA

New Orleans:

"Congress must see to it that all forms of interstate communication facilities are kept open as a public service."

MAINE

Bridgewater:

"You have many followers of your bill in the State of Maine."

MARYLAND

Chevy Chase:

"Labor unions should be responsible for their acts just like any other group and should not be exempted from racketeering, antitrust, income-tax, and injunction laws."

Cockeysville:

"Your bill seems to have sense and strength and I hope it passes without too many amendments to sap its strength."

Havre de Grace:

"You have the support of thousands such as I who are interested in wholesome, orderly labor relations."

MASSACHUSETTS

Cambridge:

"I am in sympathy with your bill. I believe in unions. I also believe in industry and would like to see fair play."

Wellesley:

"Favoring one party to a controversy gains nothing—we wish each side to feel it is being fairly treated, even if it does not gain everything at one blow. The public is the sufferer, and we feel each side is somewhat in error, as is human. From what I hear of your bill, I support it completely."

Milton:

"We think your bill is splendid. There is no reason why labor should not be as responsible as business."

MICHIGAN

Ann Arbor:

"I am in favor of your bill to put proper control on labor unions. Millions of persons who do not write you are in favor of balancing up the laws governing capital and labor."

Detroit:

"If your bill will make the unions responsible and law-abiding, then, I am sure, it has the support of the majority of nonunion Americans as well as a good portion of the thinking union men."

"Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, has forwarded a copy of your timely bill and it has met the wholehearted approval of my neighbors and fellow workers. * * * The bill shows a keen analysis of the faults of the situation."

Flint:

"Between November 15 and January 15, some 4,970 of this area's servicemen have been demobilized and job opportunities for these men are very limited as a result of strikes."

Grand Rapids:

"The great majority of voters in the Middle West are in favor of a bill such as the Case bill. * * * By all means make unions equally responsible with corporations * * * but go easy on the use of injunctions and compulsory arbitration."

Houghton:

"While I do not know the full content of your bill, we hope it * * * prohibits pickets from molesting workers and makes labor unions subject to the same laws as business."

Rochester:

"Accept the sincere appreciation of the great majority of the people of Michigan for your bill on labor legislation. Seventy-five percent of the union membership will welcome such legislation."

MINNESOTA

Hutchinson:

"To the best of my knowledge and belief, 95 percent of this county (McLeod) favor this bill, but would prefer a more stringent measure."

Minneapolis:

"We think what is good for management is good for labor and vice versa; but let us have something that is going to be fair and give both protection."

St. Paul:

"For too many years we have had the spectacle of irresponsible unions, bound by no law, while the employer and public are rigidly controlled. Certainly there are laws which must apply to them, but the same laws should apply to unions."

MISSISSIPPI

Aberdeen:

"We, the plain folks, approve your proposed bill to regulate labor. Some time ago in a large city during a streetcar strike, I had occasion to take a car to visit a nephew. * * * I was followed by a striker on a bicycle and he attempted to beat me up for riding a struck car. Fortunately, I had a pistol. If I hadn't, I would have been mauled by two, who ganged up on me."

Biloxi:

"I have scrutinized the provisions and policies of your bill. * * * A great many Americans, and veterans like myself, are very appreciative and thankful for your efforts in devising this bill. We hope that it will become a law without losing too much of its power."

Jackson:

"I hope your bill passes the House and finally becomes law. * * * I think unions should be required to incorporate and become responsible under law for their acts."

Jackson:

"Your single bill is the most progressive piece of legislation proposed within the last 75 to 100 years."

MISSOURI

Kansas City:

"I was * * * much elated to note that you introduced a bill to regulate the unions—to make them a party responsible to the public as much as capital and industry."

Springfield:

"Checking the sentiment of the patrons of my office, the big majority is in favor of such legislation, and I do hope that your bill has the support from our legislators that it deserves."

St. Louis:

"The bill which you now have under consideration is a sincere effort to develop a sound approach toward a solution of our labor-management difficulties."

Savannah:

"Congratulations on acceptance of your bill by the House. Could there be a popular vote, I'm confident the measure would be approved, but I am much afraid that the Senate will vote it down or so amend the bill it will be toothless."

East St. Louis:

"Your bill re labor problems is just what the country must have. However, please add a provision outlawing sympathy strikes."

St. Louis:

"Industry is not asking for favors, but it objects to having to operate under a law, whereas labor, on the other hand, operates under a different law. I sincerely hope when your bill gets before the Senate that body will have the same courage as shown by the House."

MONTANA

Miles City:

"There is some thought to the effect that union labor has Senators and Representatives of Government 'buffaloed'—scared stiff. I do not think so. Rather, I think those gentlemen * * * are motivated by their silly cupidity. Election time is the only day the subservient laborer feels that he is a free man and can cast his ballot without censorship."

NEBRASKA

Lincoln:

"The time has come, it seems to me, when labor must assume greater responsibilities to the public than they have ever conceded possible."

Clay Center:

"Labor, in seeking its rights, has reached a point where it is absorbing the rights of the public. There can be no sharing of profits without also sharing losses. What can a country do with only laborers who do not want to take responsibility?"

Omaha:

"Your bill may have a few bugs in it, but that's a step in the right direction. Labor has to be made responsible so we, the public, aren't always getting slapped from both sides."

NEW JERSEY

Roselle:

"I feel that there is a definite need to bring management and labor together on a common ground with a minimum use of the strike weapon. Whoever called this 30-day period a cooling-off period certainly chose the right word."

Seabright:

"Despite the claims of organized labor, there is nothing unfair in your bill just passed by the House. It is about time that labor unions are put on an equivalent footing with other groups of citizens in the United States."

Jersey City:

"As industry is regulated by laws, so should unions be regulated. * * * I certainly think legislative action is needed when unions stage sympathy strikes, especially now, when the manufacture of goods which are so vitally needed is being held up because of strikes."

Raritan:

"I favor your measure with its amendments. I feel it's time the Nation settle

down and get on with the serious things before it."

NEW YORK

Ithaca:

"In behalf of myself and many of the other soldiers, thank you. We've had enough of those * * * strikes when in battle and have even suffered from a lack of supplies. Now, in peace, find the strikes continuing in utter disregard of the welfare of the public. Surely a strike is not the only way to get a fair wage. You have our support on your bill."

Ithaca:

"I have just listened to a discussion of your bill between you and Mr. DE LACY. I had already read the high points of the bill * * * and I am heartily in favor of it."

Troy:

"Your strike-control bill meets the approval of myself, family, and friends. Most of my friends belong to the union."

Jamestown:

"This association of 65 members strongly urges retention of injunction and antiboycott provisions of Case bill."

Jamestown:

"We very much approve of the Case bill or any legislation which will make unions legally responsible just as management now is responsible for violation of collective-bargaining agreements."

New Rochelle:

"I am not in favor of destroying labor unions, but I am decidedly in favor of regulating them in the same manner and with the same degree of strictness and fairness that the Government uses in regulating the practice of corporations and individuals."

Syracuse:

"The general public has suffered for a long time from labor controversies and needs the protection of your bill."

White Plains:

"Congratulations on your bill to limit the violent tactics of organized labor. Labor should be responsible for the damage it causes."

New York City:

"I am neither promanagement nor antilabor, but when a man can't drive his own trucks, I don't see that there is much freedom left. I think it is time Congress did something about it."

Rochester:

"A union can break its contract and nothing can be done about it, but let a corporation break even a minor provision and what a howl and what a demand for retroactive pay, etc. A union can make any sort of statement about a corporation or its executives without any penalty whatever."

Schenectady:

"In this city there are 35,000 men out on strike, and they are stopped by about one-fifth of that number who * * * use force to prevent the remaining four-fifths from entering the plants under threat of being injured. * * * If the threat of bodily harm did not exist here the plants would be operating in no time."

Pleasantville:

"As a personnel manager, with the interests of both labor and management at heart, * * * I believe your labor bill to be the most constructive in over 5 years toward placing collective bargaining on a fair and equitable basis."

Hudson:

"I do trust that your bill will pass the House in its present consideration and thereafter pass in the Senate. * * * There is need of a thorough reconsideration of industrial legislation, especially the Wagner law and other laws setting the relative rights of one man's opportunity to work as against another man's opportunity to prevent the first man's opportunity to work. We need to consider basic principles."

Forestport:

"Years ago I was a very strong advocate of laws to control big business and fought for many years to check the 'public be damned' attitude on their part. * * * What labor wants is immunity, what I want is protection of my constitutional rights."

Forest Hills:

"Queensboro Chamber of Commerce in behalf of the great majority of small and large business of Queens wish to record with you our earnest hope for the passage of your bill in the Senate."

OKLAHOMA

Newkirk:

"I want to congratulate you for having the courage to introduce a bill which is intended to put an end to government by union labor racketeers. We hope that you will succeed in getting it enacted into law."

OREGON

Klamath Falls:

"Your labor bill has what we need to stop industrial paralysis."

Gladstone:

"In 1937–38 the AFL carpenters' union carried on a civil war against us loggers in which armed 'goons' were employed against us simply because we withdrew from them and formed our own union, when they refused to give us an independent union of our own in the AFL. * * * The unions themselves use the injunction whenever it suits their purpose. They are not out to do what is right, but to keep themselves as free from restraint as possible while regulating the employer by law, and coercing the nonunion worker, and disregarding the rights of the public."

Albany:

"Your stand on demanding equal treatment and equal contractual obligations for management and organized labor is highly commended by this chamber of commerce."

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia:

"The present chaotic conditions in industry seems to be a case of 'the public be damned' with labor being chiefly to blame and the public as usual the innocent bystander. * * * All we need is a set-up that is fair to both labor and industry so that the spirit of free enterprise * * * will again have an opportunity to rule our destinies and incidentally liquidate the perils of inflation."

Cannonsburg:

"At last we have a bill before the legislature which, if put into effect, will protect all parties, employees, employers and the public."

Elkins Park:

"Put the responsibilities of unions on a par with other corporations and individuals. Action now will prevent greater hardships later."

Philadelphia:

"In 1890 when big management stepped out of line, you in Congress righted the ship by passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Then the country returned to an era of relative peace and quiet. Today labor has temporarily stepped out of line. It is our duty to put it back in line."

Sharon:

"I am a supervisor at the transformer division of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. and have been denied entrance to the plant since the beginning of the electrical strike. I feel sure that the majority of the workers in this locality are opposed to the present strike, but because of orders from the big union bosses they walk the streets unemployed. May success crown your efforts and may the Case bill soon become law."

NORTH CAROLINA

Greensboro:

"Reading of a case where the Teamsters Union forced a small dairy out of business, demanding more than he made, and beat up an ex-lieutenant for even attempting to drive his father's truck to make a living in the country he saved, is beyond human imagination in a country supposed to be democratic."

Maiden:

"My ancestors bled and died in vain unless I can take a job and work without interference from any man or group; unless I can work without joining a union; or unless I am permitted to join a union without any prejudice to my job."

Hickory:

"I have noted with considerable approval your measure for putting a little common sense and fairness into our present labor laws. To my mind these measures are not antilabor in any sense, as I firmly believe labor as a whole will benefit if strikes are controlled to the degree aimed at."

Durham:

"I am at a loss to know wherein the brutal mistreatment by picket-line hoodlums of those who, according to their constitutional rights, try to go to their work, fits into any fair practice to any American citizen."

NORTH DAKOTA

Washburn:

"I do not believe some hard-headed union executive should have the right to hold a man off a job with threats of violence and penalties."

OHIO

Copley:

"Make unions liable for damage to health and property."

Lisbon:

"We believe that labor unions should be made responsible; that mutual observance of contracts on the part of both employer and employees should be required; that there should be no employee rights to unions of supervisory employees; and, finally, that due consideration should be given the general public—especially in disputes involving public utilities."

Bucyrus:

"Office workers and management were kept out 6 weeks by pickets who tried to choke one foreman, beat up another, and insulted girls who went in."

Cincinnati:

"The wave of strikes against the public interest is intolerable. Labor unions must assume the same responsibility under the law that has been imposed on other powerful groups."

Cincinnati:

"There is a bakery in this city known as Fischer's. It is the policy of that establishment to bake goods and distribute them from door to door through the use of conveyances owned by individuals who have their own little, privately owned bakery routes. Each of these routes is the little individual's own private business. This morning in one of our suburbs when one of these little fellows were trying to deliver his bread, he was beset by 12 men who * * * turned his little delivery truck over and committeed assault and battery upon the little businessman. How long do the people of this country have to stand for this stuff?"

New Philadelphia:

"Labor must assume its share of responsibility, and strikers who damage property are criminals, deserving punishment."

Dayton:

"We now have a situation where foremen are being organized into a union which is a part of the production workers' union. Under such circumstances, foremen simply cannot represent management in their daily contacts with the worker at the bench and on the assembly line."

RHODE ISLAND

Providence:

"I am very much pleased that you are sponsoring a bill which will put all corporations, partnerships, and associations, and labor organizations on the same basis."

SOUTH CAROLINA

Hartsville:

"Congratulations on test vote strike-control bill. Urge you make every effort to see

its early passage. It is most constructive legislation yet devised to put labor and industry on equal bargaining basis."

SOUTH DAKOTA

Sioux Falls:

"The teamsters' union has refused this company a contract because we have refused to dismiss a lawsuit that we won in the lower courts and is now before the State supreme court on an illegal strike called in 1943. Yesterday, the union employees of each and every trucking company operating out of Sioux City, Iowa, refused to accept a 10,000-pound shipment of hog serum from the Sioux Falls Serum Co. destined to points in Iowa to protect the farmers from losing their hogs because of a cholera epidemic. It is high time that the people of this country take a firm hand in handling these strikes."

Rapid City:

"It is my desire to be the first of the loyal supporters of the labor-union idea to congratulate you on the wise and timely introduction into the House of a measure designed to properly proportion authority and responsibility of both labor and industry. * * * If through your efforts balance may be restored you will deserve a vote of thanks from the thoughtful labor unionist, industry, and the general public that falls in neither classification."

Watertown:

"The Case labor bill is constructive, the large corporations and the powerful unions must be constrained by law to treat the public fairly."

Murdo:

"Our Farmers Union Local, No. 469, wishes me to commend you for sponsoring that anti-strike bill which has by now become famous. We believe the bill is not only for the best interest of our farmers but is also to the interest of the public at large and even to that of labor unions and industry—at least in the long run."

Hill City:

"There is no more reason why an organized group of labor should be immune from all legal responsibilities than there is for, say a college or a church."

TENNESSEE

Nashville:

"We commend you for your forward step toward prevention of discord and strife between employers and employees."

TEXAS

Kerrville:

"People in this section of Texas like the ideas introduced in your bill regarding labor, strikes, etc."

Dallas:

"Congratulations on the first really constructive and equitable labor legislation to be in our legislative bodies."

VIRGINIA

Richmond:

"I wish to compliment you on the splendid strike-control bill you have authored. Your proposed legislation is fair to both labor and management. After 3 years with the Army Air Forces I have recently returned to my home, and have been surprised to find that the citizens are really interested in their Government. There will be some rude political awakenings for some of our Congressmen at the next election in which servicemen and their families have an opportunity to vote for the first time in 4 years."

WASHINGTON

Bothell:

"Not long ago a local man arranged to open a tinsmithing shop, doing his own work. The union informed him that he would be permitted to lay out work but that he would have to employ a union workman to do the work itself."

Seattle:

"I happen to be a veteran of World War II—just returned—and a member of the Electrical Engineers Union of Seattle, Wash. We veterans are against organized labor's present selfish leadership. They get theirs no matter how many men are out of jobs, and they hold their jobs only by the continuity of industrial strife. * * * I'm like millions of other veterans. * * * We want labor leaders shorn of their power and industry given a chance to go ahead and produce."

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee:

"The Franklin Association of Printers of Milwaukee heartily favor legislation for compulsory arbitration and for legal responsibility of unions before the law * * * The sooner the Case bill is passed the sooner we can get back to peaceful living, for now 11,400 workers in Wisconsin alone are affected by the one steel strike and a continuation can bring nothing but chaos. You have our entire support on legislation that will bring violators of contracts to time."

Kenosha:

"Recently I returned from overseas after 22 months foreign service * * * before I was inducted I was employed at a machine shop as a turret lathe operator. I began as an apprentice at 30 cents an hour and, the day I left, two and a half years later, I was earning 72 cents per hour. * * * Such was my status as a skilled employee as of January 1942. Therefore, upon my return, you can easily imagine how surprised I was to learn that $1.25–$1.40 was the prevailing hourly rate for work requiring skills comparable to mine prior to induction * * * it is difficult for me to understand the reasons behind the current plague of strikes in this country. * * * American workers are besieging their employers for higher wages when they already draw the highest salaries in the world."

Ripon:

"The production of completed washing machines in our factory has been held up for 22 weeks as a result of a strike in the plant of the manufacturer of tubs and electric motors. In order to overcome the tub difficulty we have had to go to another manufacturer and have a complete set of very expensive dies made in order that our requirements can be obtained. The labor unions have even refused to allow us to remove our dies from the plant which is tied up with the strike and the sheriff of the county has refused to act on a replevin action because of the political complications which would result."

Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bulletin on coffee published under date of March 26 last by Nortz & Co., 82 Wall Street, New York, which gives further information on what I regard as the outrageous coffee subsidies upon which I have already twice addressed the House.

COFFEE

Emperor Francis of Austria died March 3, 1835, and the news of his demise spread fast in Vienna. A throng immediately gathered near the imperial palace, many women sobbing hysterically. A high official tried to placate them with the words "Don't cry children, everything will remain as it was," whereupon one of the mourners retorted: "That is precisely why we are crying."

The coffee trade has entertained hopes that things would change materially after March 31, 1946, when the first subsidy plan was to expire, but on March 20, 1946, Chester Bowles, Economic Stabilization Director, issued his long-awaited decision concerning the future of the coffee market. Giving credit to the cooperation of the producing countries, which made possible the success of the original subsidy program under which the great bulk of the 6,000,000 bags was purchased by February 1, and so as to permit further participation by the producing countries in the 3-cent-subsidy—while encouraging resumption of large-scale imports into this country, it was decided to continue the 3-cent-per-pound subsidy until June 30, 1946.

The new program is to cover 7,000,000 bags for a 3-month period, as compared with 6,000,000 only for the 4½-month period—November 17, 1945, to March 31, 1946. Its cost is estimated not to exceed $30,000,000 and, as heretofore, while buying price ceilings on green coffee purchased in foreign countries by American importers will be continued at 3 cents a pound above the levels set by the OPA in December 1941, no increase will take place in either the green coffee or the roasted coffee ceilings in this country.

A slightly different feature is the fact that the subsidy will be paid to importers on these additional 7,000,000 bags of coffee purchased and loaded in export carriers after November 18, 1945 and landed in the United States not later than June 30, 1946. It will be remembered that the original plan provided only that coffees, in order to be eligible to the subsidy plan, would have to be exported from producing countries prior to March 31, 1946.

The message of Mr. Bowles also stressed the hope that this measure would forestall any necessity for restricting coffee consumption in this country. Importers, as heretofore also, may participate in the program in proportion to their import allocations under War Food Order 63, which imposes limitations based upon the importers' operations during 1941.

While the trade is familiarizing itself with the new situation, one conclusion seems self-evident. Inasmuch as all coffees purchased must be imported into this country before June 30, 1946, it stands to reason that the bulk of the buying must take place very soon. In other words, we shall probably witness a mad scramble to obtain the 7,000,000 bags involved. Some of our Latin American neighbors, such as Colombia, may still have supplies available, but the Brazilian crop will only start moving in at the end of June, precisely when the extension of the subsidy plan will expire. Then, there is the question of quality—our market is well supplied with low grades and desperately in need of high grades. Producers, i. e., those who still own high grades, seem to be willing to take chance that things will improve in the second half of the year, and are most reluctant to sell them today.

There can be no doubt that the trade has a very uneasy feeling about recent developments. The question foremost in everybody's mind is, Have subsidy plans come to stay? Is there not a possibility that if this second plan fares like the first, our officials may be led to believe that the success of these measures warrants their perpetuation, and that possibly the trade could no longer do without them?

Let us remember that early last November, prior to the announcement of the first plan, a solution had been hoped for which looked like a very satisfactory one to all concerned. At that time it was said that the Administration might raise the level of the ceilings for all coffees, while simultaneously

withdrawing all its other controls from the market. Producers, on the other hand, were to obligate themselves to keep us well supplied. Instead, the trade got the first subsidy plan. The latter's success in no way has prompted the OPA to change its views about controlling the coffee market, and it has now bestowed upon us subsidy plan No. 2.

One of the irritating features which threaten to be perpetuated with the renewal of the subsidy program is, that the activities of the individual trader are strictly limited to his performance as an importer, during the year 1941. Granted that in view of the suddenness with which the trade had to adapt itself to a war economy 4½ years ago, such an arbitrary measure served its purpose and could be tolerated, as long as hostilities lasted. But now that we are reverting to a peacetime economy, there is no reason for maintaining such a biased system, which makes the lucky holder of big quotas pray for the maintenance of the status quo, while it discriminates heavily against the little fellow.

Carrying this premise ad absurdum, some traders, in decades to come, will continue to enjoy a guaranteed big share of our market just because their grandfathers happened to have been active in 1941, while the others, provided they manage to survive, will still be throttled by their ancestors' omission to avail themselves of the great boom year, to the fullest extent. The only ones we need not worry about are the descendants of coffee's forgotten men, the hapless floor brokers, because by then they presumably will all have been "liquidated" anyway.

The prevailing uneasiness can be compared to that caused by an unwelcome guest who, instead of taking his leave, is beginning to take off his shoes and make himself most comfortable. This is evidenced by the fact that the OPA has not been satisfied by issuing the new rulings, but has found it necessary to add four more provisions, the reading of which does not convey the impression that control of the coffee market is definitely on its way out. We quote:

"1. Limitations on inventories, which were provided for on November 17, 1945, but were not imposed will be carried out for the remainder of the program. 'Reasonable' inventories will be defined and announced by the Department of Agriculture. The limitation will be applied to all green coffee in the United States, and not merely to that held by participants in the subsidy program. Imposition of inventory limitations is expected to aid in distribution of coffee stocks in this country.

"2. The Department of Agriculture will also issue an order requiring equitable distribution of green coffee by importers participating in the program.

"3. To correct hardships among roasters unable to obtain an equitable share of supplies, the Department of Agriculture will be authorized to establish quotas up to 500,000 bags of coffee in addition to the 7,000,000 bags to be allocated. Hardship cases will be strictly limited to roasters who were not in business in 1941, the base period for determining quotas, or who expanded their operations after 1941 to meet military demands, or whose 1941 operations were unrepresentative because of peculiar circumstances. Operation of the subsidy program since last November has generally indicated where hardship cases lie, an OES official said.

"4. Provision is made in the OES directive to prevent possible future 'windfall' profits among importers. In the event of a price increase later, upon termination of the program, importers will be required to refund to the RFC the amount of the subsidy on coffee in stock up to the amount on which the subsidy was paid.

"Without going into further discussion on these four points, we can only express apprehension lest, as has happened so often before, this new control measure will ultimately beget further control measures. Paragraph 4, incidentally, is fully in line with the fear so in evidence in Washington, that somebody may make an extra penny in his legitimate trade.

"To revert to the Emperor of Austria, Metternich is supposed to have said that 'he administered his empire, but did not rule it.' We mention this because the coffee market today also is administered in details. A broad, over-all policy, constructive to all, still seems to be sorely needed.

* * * * *

"During the past few days our trade has been active trying to obtain fresh supplies. The response has been disappointing—either stocks of good coffees are nonexistent, or holders will only sell such coffee provided the buyer obligates himsel to purchase an equal quantity of low grades. The statistical picture, according to Mr. Chester Bowles, may look all right for the next 3 months—but we wonder what it will look like at the end of said 3 months. At best, we fear that the trade is heading for a very difficult pericd.

"Respectfully yours,

"NORTZ & CO."

Hail and Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., under date of March 31, 1946:

HAIL AND FAREWELL

After 34 years in Congress, Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, now 70 years old, delivers a stinging valedictory. He does not choose to run for reelection in September, he says, because through the years he has seen the Federal Government become "an instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption," which has made "vassals of our States and dependents of our people."

There will be many who will agree with the veteran Congressman, one of the oldest in the House in point of service and longtime chairman of the Judiciary Committee. But the student of Washington history will be inclined to place much of the blame for the centralization of power of which he complains squarely on the shoulders of Congress. To the extent that the legislative arm of Government has abdicated its functions, the administrative arm has developed power. The remedy is still in the hands of Congress. No more potent argument for the "streamlining" of Congress, as recommended recently in the report of the La Follette committee, could be found than Representative SUMNERS' swan song. The La Follette plan, among other things, would reassert congressional influence over Washington's vast network of administrative agencies. Under it the Congressman would no longer be what the venerable Texan pictures him—"virtually an errand runner with little time to study important legislation or to practice statesmanship"—for the reorganization plan would give him an administrative assistant "to run his errands" and would provide for the routing of all legislation through a few powerful standing committees, each staffed with research workers to assist the Senator or Representative in running down any information he needed for an intelligent vote.

Resolutions Adopted by National Commission on Children in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by National Commission on Children in Wartime, meeting in Washington, D. C., February 5–7, 1946:

The National Commission on Children in Wartime, impressed with the reports of the starvation and destitution from which the children of war-devastated countries are suffering, fully cognizant of the fact that immediate and effective relief is essential to the survival of civilization, and confident that the people of the United States will fully support all necessary measures to extend such relief for as long a period as they may be required resolves:

1. To extend to the President of the United States its enthusiastic commendation of his order of February 6 on the world food crisis, designed to put into effect in the shortest possible time a number of emergency measures to help meet critically urgent needs, such measures to include former enemies as well as the liberated peoples and those who have fought beside us;

2. To commend the inclusion in this program, in addition to wheat, of fats and oils, and meat, and especially to commend the inclusion of dairy products so essential to preserve child health;

3. To pledge to the President of the United States the utmost effort of the members of the commission working individually and through their respective organizations, to enlist the cooperation of every man, woman, and child in this program, as requested by the President, believing that the people would accept rationing should that be necessary to assure adequate relief abroad and equitable distribution at home;

4. To urge the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to appropriate the remaining $600,000,000 of the amounts authorized as the United States contribution to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The National Commission on Children in Wartime, impressed with the need for continuing international cooperation in measures to advance the health, education, security, and welfare of the children of the world as our best hope for a lasting peace, expresses its gratification in the progress already made in setting up the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization and certain other specialized organizations, including the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. It urges prompt action to establish international organizations dealing with health and social welfare and the formation of a standing joint committee on children and youth, composed of representatives of specialized organizations related to the Economic and Social Council, to center attention on their needs and promote efforts in their behalf.

The National Commission on Children in Wartime, recognizing the importance of full provision for the welfare of the children of the Pacific islands now under United States control, an area of the world which has suffered greatly from the devastation of war, urges prompt formulation of policies for the guidance of those responsible for the administration of these islands which will assure

the progress of the population, especially the children.

National Commission on Children in Wartime members present at meetings February 5–7, 1946, including nine representatives of absentee members:

Leonard W. Mayo, Cleveland, Ohio, chairman, Child Welfare League of America.

Edith Abbott, Chicago, Ill., Social Service Review (University of Chicago).

Leona Baumgartner, M. D., New York, N. Y., New York City Department of Health.

Livingston L. Blair, Washington, D. C., American Junior Red Cross.

Nathan E. Cohen, New York, N. Y., New York School of Social Work.

Paul B. Cornely, M. D., Washington, D. C., Howard University School of Medicine.

Mrs. LaFell Dickerson, Washington, D. C., General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Kermit Eby, Washington, D. C., Congress of Industrial Organizations.

John W. Edelman, Washington, D. C., Textile Workers Union of America.

Miriam R. Ephraim, New York, N. Y., National Jewish Welfare Board.

Mrs. Thomas G. Garrison, Denver, Colo., National Council of Catholic Women.

Franklin P. Gengenbach, M. D., Denver, Colo., American Academy of Pediatrics.

Willard E. Givens, Washington, D. C., National Education Association.

Mrs. Sidonie M. Gruenberg, New York, N. Y., Child Study Association of America.

Elsie D. Harper, New York, N. Y., national board, Young Women's Christian Associations.

Maxwell Hahn, New York, N. Y., the Field Foundation.

Henry F. Helmholz, M. D., Rochester, Minn., the Mayo Clinic.

Mrs. Kate Bullock Helms, Columbia, S. C., South Carolina Board of Public Welfare.

George Hjelte, Los Angeles, Calif., Department of Playground and Recreation of Los Angeles.

Anne Sarachon Hooley, Washington, D. C., National Catholic Community Service.

Howard W. Hopkirk, New York, N. Y., Child Welfare League of America.

Mrs. Harriet A. Houdlette, Washington, D. C., American Association of University Women.

Ruth Houlton, R. N., New York, N. Y., National Organization for Public Health Nursing.

Mrs. Robert M. Jones, Seattle, Wash., Seattle Council of Social Agencies.

Reginald T. Kennedy, New York, N. Y., Labor League for Human Rights.

Rev. C. E. Krumbholz, New York, N. Y., National Lutheran Council.

Irvin R. Kuenzli, Chicago, Ill.; American Federation of Teachers.

Mary E. Leeper, Washington, D. C., Association for Childhood Education.

Lawrence J. Linck, Chicago, Ill., National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc.

Mrs. Jack M. Little, Dallas, Tex., National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mrs. Clara Savage Littledale, New York, N. Y., Parents' Magazine.

Mrs. Vivian C. Mason, Washington, D. C., National Council of Negro Women.

Lelia Massey, Washington, D. C., American Home Economics Association.

Charlotte K. May, Washington, D. C., National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses.

Oscar L. Miller, M. D., Charlotte, N. C., North Carolina Orthopedic Hospital.

Capt. Rhode J. Milliken, Washington, D. C., Metropolitan Police Department.

Broadus Mitchell, New York, N. Y., International Ladies Garment Workers' Union.

Mrs. Rose Norwood, Boston, Mass., Boston Women's Trade Union League.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D. C., National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Rev. J. D. Pair, Washington, D. C., National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers.

J. Milton Patterson, Baltimore, Md., Maryland State Department of Public Welfare.

Emma C. Puschner, Indianapolis, Ind., the American Legion.

Grace A. Reeder, Albany, N. Y., New York State Department of Social Welfare.

Floyd W. Reeves, Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago.

Boris Shishkin, Washington, D. C., American Federation of Labor.

Mrs. Esther Ericksen Sizer, Denver, Colo., National Farmers' Union.

Mrs. Faye Stephenson, Cleveland, Ohio, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the CIO.

George S. Stevenson, M. D., New York N. Y., National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

Mrs. Mabel Garrett Wagner, Chicago, Ill., International Council of Religious Education.

Mrs. Roy C. F. Weagly, Hagerstown, Md., American Farm Bureau Federation.

Herbert D. Williams, Warwick, N. Y., New York State Training School for Boys.

Mrs. Gertrude Folks Zimand, New York, N. Y., National Child Labor Committee.

Misdirected Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial and a telegram from the labor union, I submit the following:

[From the Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald of Friday, March 29, 1946]

MISDIRECTED ENERGY

No one will have the temerity to quarrel with the avowed purpose of the so-called veterans' emergency housing program order proclaimed by the Government on Tuesday of this week, but contractors, realty men, and labor groups are wasting no time in making it clear that they see no possibility of the edict accomplishing what the administration apparently expects it to.

The protest made by Marshfield's veneer industry is but a weak whisper in the chorus of remonstrance being directed at Washington by the various groups which will be injured if the order is allowed to stand in its present form, and there is indeed much evidence that the effect of the ruling will result in a situation more troublesome than that which it was issued to correct.

On the face of it, the proposal that virtually all building be sidetracked in favor of the construction of homes for veterans is as reasonable as any proposal could be. But here is where the shoe pinches:

The order will halt work on commercial construction in which little of the type of material needed for private homes is being used. Thus many artisans in specialized branches of the building industry will be kept idle.

If it were possible for these idle men to find jobs building homes for veterans this might be regarded as a compensating factor, but builders contend that it will be at least 3 months before the building of homes for veterans will be far enough advanced to absorb much of this labor. Further, it is contended that thousands of the workers who engage in large construction projects will never be able to find jobs in the very different business of building small homes.

Consider for a moment such construction as the proposed Golden State dairy plant and the St. Joseph's Hospital addition contemplated for Marshfield during the building season now opening. Contractors for both these projects are certain that, because preliminary work on them was begun last fall, they will not fall within the scope of the Federal order. But even if they did, would it not be rather ridiculous to halt the construction of such buildings, which require little of the critical materials needed for housing? Concrete, steel, and brick will be the major items in such construction.

A tremendous responsibility will be placed upon the individuals who make up the 71 regional committees entrusted with the administration of this most difficult ruling. They will find it impossible to exercise uniform judgment over the entire country and they may find it equally difficult to obtain Federal backing for any decisions they make on grounds of common sense and knowledge of local conditions.

There is a definite belief in some quarters that the issuance of the decree is purely and simply a political maneuver conceived for the express and sole purpose of forcing the Senate into approval of the administration's housing bill and thus paving the way for resubmission of the bill to the House, which has once voted it down.

At any rate, with all due consideration for the veterans who are ostensibly its beneficiaries, it seems to us that the edict is serving merely to strew more sand in the wheels of reconversion and we cannot do otherwise than heartily endorse the view of the local building tradesman who contended that the same amount of energy devoted to stimulation of the production of building materials would have been of far greater value to the country.

MARSHFIELD, WIS., *March 29, 1946.*

Hon. REID MURRAY,

Seventh District, Washington, D. C.:

We wish to register our unqualified protest to the so-called veterans' emergency housing program order 1. We demand drastic changes. It will serve only to confound and confuse the public. It will not make one additional square foot of material available for housing. We believe in the ideal of houses for veterans, but we cannot subscribe to a program that promises to throw 75 percent of our members out of work, GI's included. We believe the construction industry can and will work out its own problems if some of the restrictions now in effect were lifted. Your efforts in pressing for immediate revocation of this order are expected.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 1733,
WILFRED GORK, *President,*
PAUL HINTZ, *Recording Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, the amendment by Hon. EMORY PRICE, of Florida, to use the proposed subsidies for houses for veterans only was defeated by administration forces when the housing bill was before the House for consideration. Cheap partisan politics have been injected into this Housing legislation. Houses could and would be constructed by the thousands if the people and the builders were given half an opportunity to build them.

Poems by Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD four poems written by Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, of the United States Army. The first of the poems is entitled "Faith"; the second is entitled "Victory Depends on Me"; the third is entitled "Victory! What Is Thy Price?"; and the fourth is entitled "The Price of Freedom." All of the poems make a moving appeal to those who are fortunate enough to read them.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH

Have you, perhaps, lost faith in God
And shun the path His Son has trod—
A path of work and sacrifice,
Without regard for self or price?

Have you, perhaps, lost faith in man
And never try the best you can
To see the good and not all bad
In man, whose world has gone so mad?

It was with faith in God and man,
That our own Nation's life began
With faith our Nation did decree
That all her people would be free.

'Twas faith that made our soldiers fight
To save the individual's right
To work, to speak, to worship too,
And his own happiness pursue.

For us to keep our precious right
To live as free men, we must fight
As long as selfishness survives
On foreign soil or in our lives.

Throughout the world, both far and near,
'Tis greed that causes war and fear.
Greed would destroy the free man's right.
'Tis greed that you and I must fight.

America should take the lead
Within our land, suppress all greed.
Our Nation can no stronger be
Than citizens like you and me.

It is with faith in God and man,
That we can win our fight and can
Preserve the rights we hold so dear,
And free the world of war and fear.

—*Walter K. Wilson,*
Major General, United States Army.

FEBRUARY 22, 1946.

VICTORY DEPENDS ON ME

I am a soldier, tried and true,
Who fights, in order to subdue
The Axis foe across the sea—
For victory depends on me.

I am a fighting sailor lad
Who sails in weather, good and bad,
To sink our foe upon the sea—
For victory depends on me.

I am a bold and brave marine
Who lands on shores I've never seen
To fight and smash the enemy—
For victory depends on me.

An aviator bold am I
Who knocks the Axis from the sky
And sinks their ships upon the sea—
For victory depends on me.

I am a steady workingman
Who works to build the best I can
The ships, the planes, the guns, you see—
For victory depends on me.

Americans, let's do our part
And work and work with all our heart;
Let each one say with certainty—
That victory depends on me.

God, our Father, to Thee we pray
To guide us on our stormy way.
Inspire, and make each one to see—
That victory depends on me.

—*Walter K. Wilson,*
Major General, United States Army.

DECEMBER 7, 1942.

VICTORY! WHAT IS THY PRICE?

O Victory, for thee we cry!
What is thy price? Is it too high
For us to pay—all we who claim
America with all its fame
For freedom? Will it ever be
That price can block our Victory?

O Victory, our soldiers die
On battlefields both far and nigh.
Our sailors and marines die too
While they their search for thee pursue.
The price seems high—must we pay more
To have thee safe upon our shore?

O Victory, we hear thee say:
"Americans must work and pray,
Forget themselves and in this fight
Give all and work with all their might.
No less will ever quite suffice
For Victory—that is the price!"

—*Walter K. Wilson,*
Major General, United States Army.

NOVEMBER 11, 1943.

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

In Normandy, my son was killed
In battle. On the ground was spilled
The blood of free men such as he
Who died to save our liberty.

Throughout the world, both far and wide,
Men, brave and strong, have fought and died.
They too loved life—not blood and gore,
But they loved freedom even more.

For us who live—our task is plain
To see their deaths were not in vain.
We must, to match their sacrifice,
Win victory at any price.

No price can be too high to pay
For freedom. So—with faith we pray.
Forgetting self, with all our might
We work, we serve, we give, we fight.

Lt. Col. John N. Wilson was killed in action July 11, 1944, while commanding a battalion of field artillery. Immediately after receipt of the official notice of his death his father, Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, United States Army, composed the above poem with the hope that it will strengthen our determination, with God's help, to win the kind of victory which will assure the future freedom of our children, our grandchildren, and of generations of Americans yet unborn.

JULY 27, 1944.

Peacetime Objectives for OPA

REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if it be the will of Congress that OPA be extended, certain simple considerations should be kept in mind when the time arrives for the submission of amendments. The activities and emphasis of OPA should be so redirected in time of peace to, first, encourage production; second, deal fairly and equitably with all groups of our citizens; third, have due regard for the rights of free citizens; fourth, bring about its liquidation on the termination date set by Congress; fifth, rapid decontrol under a clear mandate from Congress as an early incentive to the restoration of our free market; sixth, simplification of court procedure in the interest of fairness; seventh, a review of enforcement procedures.

WE ARE WRITING A LAW

Whether OPA is extended in its present form or whether it is modified, let us remember that we are projecting a law under which our people must live and do business for another definite period. What we do should be clear and unequivocal. Some years ago, Professor Redin in commenting on statutory interpretation said that a statute is essentially ambiguous and that legislative intent is a fiction. He said it was also a fiction to assume that committee reports and similar reports are constantly ratified by legislators as a body. He said further that judges should handle statutory words to suit their sense of what is desirable. On one occasion, the Supreme Court of the United States said that in examining the meanings of statutory language that it would select "the most satisfactory arrangement that the words would honestly bear in view of the actual conditions and evils toward the elimination of which the particular statute is directed." I cite this only as a reminder of how necessary it is in considering remedial amendments that, in the law itself, we say what we mean and mean what we say. "How forcible are right words," said Job. By right words we can express a clear intent of what we mean to do so that neither a court, a legal professor, or an administrator can say that our intent was a fiction.

THE PROBLEMS BEFORE US: FAIR PRICES

The major problems raised by the operation and enforcement of OPA fall into certain broad categories. Doubtless there are others but those which follow appeal to me as of primary importance. (1) There is the question of fair prices which are fair and equitable to all groups, whether it be the producer or manufacturer, the distributor, the wholesaler, the retailer, or the consumer and which cannot and will not be circumvented by some policy, pattern, or design which will throw an undue burden on any group and which will serve as an incentive to production and distribution. To that end, I submit the text of an amendment which is designed to achieve that objective:

(a) To encourage maximum production and distribution of commodities, goods, and services, the Administrator shall establish no price or price ceiling with respect to the production, processing, or distribution of any such commodities, goods, or services to which this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942 is applicable which does not reflect all current costs that may be applied to each such item or service as determined by standard commercial accounting practices, together with a margin of profit which reflects not less than the generally prevailing margin of profit for each such item during the calendar year 1939.

(b) Upon the effective date of this act, the Administrator is specifically directed to rescind forthwith all prices and price ceilings and all rules, regulations, and directives relating thereto which effectuate cost-absorption and maximum average price policies nor shall the Administrator hereafter establish or require or compel the establishment of any pattern of production and sales of any commodity or commodities by price range or price unit which is at variance with formula set forth in paragraph (a) of this section.

PROBLEM NO. 2: REASONABLE RENTS

A similar problem arises with respect to rent. If thrift and frugality—the very

virtues whereby this country was built—are to have a fair and reasonable reward, the person who has acquired property should certainly be entitled to a rental which takes into account such items as operating expenses, taxes, depreciation, and so forth, plus a fair return upon the value of the property. Would not it be an amazing law which did not permit a reasonable return on property and thereby tended to force the owner into a state of involuntary bankruptcy? To that end the following amendment is submitted:

Whenever the owner of any real property subject to the provisions of this act files a petition with the Administrator, alleging under oath that the rent ceiling as fixed by law or regulation does not produce a reasonable income upon the value of such property or the portion thereof used in the production of such income, the Administrator shall investigate the facts and shall afford the petitioner an opportunity for a hearing and for the submission of evidence. The Administrator shall prescribe a maximum rent ceiling for such housing accommodations which will reflect a gross rental which, after payment of taxes, reasonable costs of ownership, management and operation, depreciation, and allowance for vacancy, will provide a net return which is a reasonable return upon the value of such property or so much thereof as may be used in the production of such income.

PROBLEM NO. 3: DECONTROL

If, as the President of the United States, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Baruch, and many others have repeatedly stated, production is the answer to inflation, there should be a removal of price controls as an incentive to production at the earliest possible date. It has been suggested that controls be removed when demand and supply are in balance. How would you gage demand? How can it be measured? What effect would UNRRA, the British loan proposal, and other policies have on demand? Who shall make the determination? It appears to me that production in some prior year is a more reliable yardstick. In any event the basis for control should be definite and easily ascertainable. To that end I offer the following decontrol formula which I trust will stimulate discussion and search for something better if it can be found.

Whenever the production of any article or commodity either singly or in combination or any component thereof equals or exceeds by volume for any month the production of such article or commodity for the comparable month in the calendar year 1939, and such production is certified to the Administrator by the Industry Advisory Committee having jurisdiction over such article or commodity, the Administrator shall within 30 days unconditionally remove and rescind all prices, price ceiling controls, rules, regulations, and orders relating to such article or commodity.

PROBLEM NO. 4: LIQUIDATION

Over the years, I have observed that the creation of an emergency agency or an emergency function is always attended by the hope that it can be abolished and our freedom and our free market and our free enterprise restored. Too often, it is not so easy to bring that about. In 1933, Congress created the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and provided in the statute itself for its liquidation. It is now 10 years since the HOLC has made a new loan but it continues to do business and there is no definite indication when it will be liquidated. If OPA is to be liquidated at a given date, it must be a progressive undertaking with frequent reports to Congress so that when the termination date arrives we shall not be faced with a huge agency numbering thousands upon thousands of personnel who might be interested in perpetuating this function. To that end, I offer the following proposal:

It is declared to be the policy of Congress that maximum prices and price controls, together with all the duties and functions exercised by the Administrator under this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, shall terminate on the expiration of this act. It shall be the duty of the Administrator to gradually remove all maximum prices, price ceilings, and controls to which this act may be applicable and to completely liquidate the functions and duties of the Office of Price Administration not later than the expiration date as herein provided. Within 15 days after the elapse of each calendar month, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a complete and detailed report, setting forth therein the progress made under this section, the specific items on which prices, price ceilings, and controls have been removed, the rules, regulations, orders, and directives which have been rescinded, the new rules, regulations, orders, directives, or amendments which have been imposed, the reduction in personnel which has been effectuated and such other pertinent information as will set forth the progress of liquidation.

PROBLEM NO. 5: COURT REVIEW

When the Patman housing bill came before the House it contained a very simple review provision. I would suggest that the present review provision in the OPA Act with respect to court review be eliminated and that the language of the Patman bill be substituted. This would bring about the abolition of the Emergency Court of Appeals and place the administration of justice where it properly belongs, in the regular Federal courts of the country. Who can view with equanimity the observations made in the dissenting opinion of Justice Roberts in the case of Yakus versus United States which was decided on March 27, 1944. In that opinion, which involved the OPA and the Emergency Court of Appeals, he said:

When these cumulative burdens placed upon the protestant who seeks review are fairly appraised it becomes apparent that he must carry an insupportable load, and that, in truth, the court review is a solemn farce in which the Emergency Court of Appeals and this court on certiorari must go through a series of motions which look like judicial review but in fact are nothing but a catalog of reasons why, under the scheme of this act, the courts are unable to say that the Administrator has exceeded the discretion vested in him.

Justice Roberts calls it "a solemn farce." I suggest some simple, direct language in lieu of it, strike out all of section 204 and substitute the following:

SEC. 204. Any person who is aggrieved by any action taken pursuant to any regulation or order issued under the authority of this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942 may petition the district court for the district in which he resides or has his place of business for a review of such action, and such district court shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part such action or may dismiss such petition.

PROBLEM NO. 6: REVIEW OF ENFORCEMENT

Some time ago Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, stated that one of the foremost problems before the country and the Congress was to secure personnel who would carry out the intent of Congress. In other words, the enforcement of what Congress places on the statute books is a real problem. In this connection, I suggest you read the remarks made by Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, in the Senate on February 26, 1946, with reference to an OPA directive which was issued on November 26, 1945. The Senator characterized it as "one of the most remarkable and far-reaching directives that has ever been handed down by an agency of Government." It relates to enforcement. Among other things, it directs that—

Attorneys should postpone all conferences with violators until after the suit is filed. Prior notice to retailers if the filing of the suit is not necessary and is not recommended. There is no need to rush into an early adjustment of the case. No cases may be settled by office conferences. Suits must be filed in each instance. Since our drive can reach only a minute portion of retailers subject to MPR 330 and MPR 580, our prime purpose is to file a great number of lawsuits so that the attendant publicity will effectually strengthen future compliance. In view of the foregoing, we should like to see suits filed on practically every violation case.

This is but a portion of this remarkable document. But it is not the first time that a directive has been issued which is at variance with our ideas of American rights and procedures. I can see but one answer and that is to compel OPA to submit such orders to Congress for an appraisal and to suspend the operation of such orders for a 30-day period if they are violative of the intent of the lawmaking branch of this Government. If the objectionable matter is not removed, Congress can quickly exercise its powers of discipline. To that end I suggest an amendment which reposes this power of legislative review in the Banking Committee of the House and Senate:

Hereafter, every rule, regulation, order, directive, or other instrument or any amendment thereto (except those having intra-agency effect only) which is issued under the authority of this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942 shall first be submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency of Senate and House and shall not become effective until the expiration of 10 calendar days from the date of its receipt by the aforesaid committees as certified by the respective chairmen thereof or by any other person duly authorized to do so. If, within such 10-day period, either of such committees determines that such instrument is contrary to the intent of Congress in creating and delegating the function for the enforcement of which such instrument is intended, and shall so certify to the Administrator, then such instrument shall not take effect until the expiration of 40 calendar days from the date of its receipt by the committee which made such determination.

I have no doubt that many other amendments will be offered. These represent an effort to deal with the problems arising out of OPA which seem of major importance. I hope the Banking Committee will give these proposals attention. I am quite agreeable to their refinement

and modification in the hope that these objectives can be achieved. To make OPA an instrument of production, so long as it is in effect, which operates fairly and equitably is our common objective.

Strengthening Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the very able report recently issued by the La Follette-Monroney committee, I find general support in the press of the country. Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks herewith an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times analyzing the report:

STREAMLINING THE CREAKY CONGRESS

The 12-member bipartisan committee of Senators and Representatives has presented to Congress a series of proposals for reforming the procedures of that tedious legislature. The recommendations are mostly the same as those which were winnowed by a subcommittee from a heap of suggestions submitted by civic groups, Government research foundations, and colleagues of the Members.

Announcements of the committee report emphasized the recommended $5,000 increase in the congressional salary, and the emphasis is unfortunate. The salary increase can be justified. But the immediate discussion of it tends to obscure important recommendations of the committee which would increase the efficiency of Congress vastly, making it possible for the Members to act quickly, and yet with more understanding than they now can have, on the imperative problems of the postwar age. Sometimes consideration of these problems is honestly delayed in the cumbersome congressional machinery; at other times it is deliberately suppressed by manipulation of ancient rules and by the prejudices of the little oligarchs of seniority in the 81 standing committees. The special committee recommends the elimination of the causes of most of the delays.

The view is widely entertained that if the United States is going to function indefinitely as a democracy, its legislature must move with the times. One of the chief arguments of the authoritarians has been that they get things done. Fumbling parliaments often have made the rise of dictators easy by wearing out the people's patience. Our Congress plods under procedures which have not been overhauled since 1893 when the total business of the United States was not greater than that of a big modern corporation.

The multiplicity of committees is one of the hobbles on Congress. There are 33 committees of the Senate and 48 of the House. The special committee recommends 16 of the Senate and 18 of the House. Most of the objections to this reform will be found, when they are made, to be selfish. Congressmen who would be deprived of the power which goes with committee chairmanships and certain committee memberships will be opposed to change. So when objections are made, their sources should be considered.

Among committee recommendations which are not likely to be opposed through the motive of personal interest are these: a limit on sessions to provide a summer recess and a chance to hear what constituents are thinking; a schedule dividing the week between sessions and committee hearings; public hearings at least once a month by all committees considering pending bills; delegation to Federal courts of decisions on the time-consuming claims now handled by Congress.

Also important is the proposed ban on tacking unconnected bills to appropriations bills. This has been a vicious practice.

In the interest of clear-cut two-party Government which, as Herbert Hoover has pointed out, is essential to our system, the special committee proposes that Republican and Democratic policy committees be created to lay down official party policy on pending bills. Members of Congress would not have to follow the party line, of course, but such committees would tend to crystallize issues for the public.

In proposing to raise the salaries of Congressmen to $15,000 a year, the committee also recommends that each Member of Congress have an administrative assistant who would handle his employer's business with constituents and Government agencies and deal with other nonlegislative matters. According to the committee, the sum of this business now occupies 80 percent of every Member's time. The need for this remedy can hardly be debated.

Each of the committee's recommendations has sound reasons behind it. And there is the over-all reason that congressional reform is urgent.

Modernizing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the April edition of the National Grange monthly, by Fred Brenckman.

MODERNIZING CONGRESS

(By Fred Brenckman)

Many constructive suggestions for modernizing and simplifying the legislative machinery of the Federal Government are contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which came off the press early in March.

The committee, which is headed by Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, is composed of six Members of the Senate and an equal number of Members of the House.

Appointed pursuant to a concurrent House resolution, the committee was directed "to make a complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States," and to recommend improvements with a view to strengthening and simplifying its work, besides improving its relationship with other branches of the Government and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution.

As is set forth in the report, the committee was created in response to a widespread congressional and public belief that a grave constitutional crisis exists in which the fate of representative government itself is at stake. One of the opening paragraphs of the report declares:

APPOINTIVE OFFICIALS

"Public affairs are now handled by a host of administrative agencies headed by nonelected officials, with only casual oversight by Congress. The course of events has created a breach between government and the people. Behing our inherited constitutional pattern a new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. Meanwhile, government by administration is the object of group pressures which weaken its protection of the public interest. Under these conditions, it was believed that the time is ripe for Congress to reconsider its role in the American scheme of government and to modernize its organization and procedures."

The committee held 39 public hearings and a number of executive sessions between March 13 and June 29, 1945. The testimony of 102 witnesses was taken, 45 of whom were Members of Congress. The recommendations contained in the report are based largely on the suggestions brought out at these hearings.

REORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITIES

One of the first recommendations made by the committee is that there should be a reorganization of the present "obsolete and overlapping committee structure" of Congress.

"Congress," says the report, "can no longer afford the luxury and waste of manpower and time in maintaining a total of 33 standing committees in the Senate and 48 standing committees in the House."

The report therefore recommends that the number of Senate committees be reduced to 16 and those of the House to 18. It is recognized that this presents a difficult task, because the chairmen of the committees to be merged or abolished will not look with favor on the proposal.

It is likewise recommended that committee chairmen be required to report promptly all bills approved by the committee and seek a rule to bring them to the floor for consideration.

A very important suggestion of the committee is to the effect that conferees of the two Houses be limited to adjustments of actual differences in fact between the two branches of Congress, and that questions on which both Houses are in agreement be not subject to change in conference. Under present conditions, the conferees sometimes take unwarranted liberties in rewriting legislation to suit themselves. The late Senator Norris used to refer to the conference as the third House.

ADEQUATE STAFFS

One of the most important recommendations of the La Follette joint committee is as follows:

"That each reorganized legislative committee be authorized to employ four staff experts in its particular province, that employment be limited to persons qualifying under prescribed standards, that staff employees be not dismissed for political reasons, that staff employees serve on committee work only, and that all committee records and files be separately maintained by staff employees."

The lack of skilled staffs for the committee workshops of Congress, says the report, was more complained of than perhaps any other matter coming before the committee. Then follows this frank admission:

"The shocking lack of adequate congressional fact-finding services and skilled staffs sometimes reaches such ridiculous proportions as to make Congress dependent upon hand-outs from Government departments and private groups or newspaper stories for its basic fund of information on which to base legislative decisions."

Often the Members of Congress are placed at the mercy of Government bureaucrats, backed by large staffs, just because the legislators do not have time to get to the bottom of any particular question and take proper steps to safeguard the public interest.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the drafting of legislation is no longer exclusively a congressional concern. More than half of the bills dropped into the hopper, says the report, originate in the Federal depart-

ments and bureaus and are later revised in committee to accord with congressional views.

At present the bill-drafting service of Congress consists of 12 attorneys and law clerks, and the combined salaries of the staff amount to $90,000 a year. This staff contains competent men, but their number is inadequate to cope with the situation, and the committee recommends an appropriation of $150,000 for the next 2 years, with further expansion later. If Congress is to maintain its independence of the executive departments and give a good account of itself in representing the people, the recommended increase is both justified and necessary.

BETTER TEAM PLAY

In order to bring about better team play between Congress and the President, the committee recommends the creation of majority and minority policy committees, together with a joint legislative-executive council. Under the plan, the majority policy committees of Senate and House would meet regularly with the President to facilitate the formulation and carrying out of national policy, and to improve the relationships between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The majority and minority policy committees of each House would receive $30,000 per year each for the maintenance of a high-grade secretariat to assist in study, analysis, and research problems involved in policy determination. The committee report likewise recommends the enlargement of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress.

To relieve Members of Congress of the enormous nonlegislative work load which has grown up since the legislative branch of the Government became a mail-order house during the days of the depression, the committee recommends that senatorial and congressional offices be authorized to employ a high-caliber administrative assistant with an annual salary of $8,000.

The report makes detailed recommendations for strengthening the control of Congress over fiscal affairs with a view to achieving greater economy and a balanced budget.

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

To relieve Congress of the necessity of playing the part of a city council for the District of Columbia, to the exclusion of more important matters, the committee recommends self-government for the people of the District.

It is likewise recommended that Congress delegate to the Federal courts and to the Court of Claims the settlement of claims against the Federal Government.

Another recommendation is to the effect that Congress provide for a regular recess period at the close of each fiscal year (June 30) to insure the return of Members to their constituencies at definite intervals each year. The committee takes the position that the proper functioning of Congress as a representative body demands that the Members serve not as residents of Washington, but as citizens of their respective States and districts, with intimate first-hand knowledge of the problems of the places they represent. The suggestion is that Congress recess from the 1st of July to September 10 or October 1, to be called back at any time during such period in case of real need or an emergency.

HIGHER PAY FOR CONGRESS

The report recommends that beginning with the next Congress the pay of Members be increased to $15,000 a year, subject to taxation on the same basis as the income of private citizens. It is also proposed that Members of Congress be included in the Federal retirement system on a contributory basis.

Other recommendations include the registration of lobbyists and organized groups seeking to influence legislation, with the filing of sworn financial statements at regular intervals, steps to modernize the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; improvement of the acoustic properties of the Chambers of House and Senate, and similar matters.

The general feeling is that the recommendations contained in the report are sound and constructive and that most of the recommendations should be enacted into law.

The National Grange has long advocated that the committees of Congress should be properly staffed and that all necessary steps should be taken to give the Members of the legislative branch of the Government the time and facilities required to do a workmanlike job as lawmakers for the 140,000,000 people of the United States.

But with all the improvements in methods that may be made, Congress will still be overwhelmed with work so long as it attemps to legislate on matters that properly fall within the sphere of the States and their local units of government.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two letters from a friend in Puerto Rico relating certain intolerable conditions existing in that island. Due to the probability that political recrimination would be exacted against this individual, it seems advisable that his identity should be withheld. It can be assured that this individual is a person of honor and integrity whom I have known for many years.

SAN JUAN, P. R., *March 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR STERLING: It was a pleasure to hear from you and I hope when you receive this letter the world, as well as domestic affairs, will be running more smoothly. Sometimes I think we are living in a madhouse.

In regard to Puerto Rico, it will be most interesting, I believe, if the secretary of your committee will make a study of the latest laws approved by our legislature. Yesterday they approved a law reorganizing the district court of San Juan (which is equivalent to the supreme court of New York State), and after 12 midnight our Governor signed the law. It is an accepted fact by everyone that the object of this reorganization is to get out of the department of justice two of our leading, most honorable, and honest judges, for the reason that they decided two cases against the Popular Party. The names of these judges are Hon. Marcelino Romani and Hon. Ricardo La Costa, both of them very substantial and excellent citizens.

Another law which calls the attention and approved by the Governor was the following: A taxpayer brought an injunction before the district court of San Juan (Judge La Costa), raising the constitutionality of the Puerto Rico Agricultural Company (one of the new authorities), which the agricultural people of this island objected to very strongly. The court granted the preliminary injunctions and decided that business funds were being extended illegally. A few days later the legislature passed a law abolishing the rights of private citizens and taxpayers to bring injunctions before our courts against the government authorities, and in that way they killed the case.

Last week certain labor organizations went on a strike to paralyze one of our sugar mills. The company filed a suit in the district court against this labor organization for breaking the contract, which they have already signed, and embargo the funds of this labor organization. Yesterday the head of the labor organization, who is also a senator of the majority party in the insular senate, filed a bill prohibiting the embargo of funds of labor organizations. As you see, the cases pending before the courts are being won and lost by laws.

Mr. Rafael Rivera Zayas, president of the insular bar association, a member of the majority party, one of our most able, honest, and honorable citizens of this island, who sometime ago was appointed member of the insular labor relations board, his name was sent to the senate and the senate refused to confirm him and it is well known that it was because he, as a lawyer, brought a case against one of these New Deal authorities (the transportation authority).

All the newspapers of this island have written articles and editorials stating that we are under a totalitarian, Fascist, Communist government.

The latest thing they have done is that the Insular Communications Authority has filed two petitions before the Federal Communications Commission in Washington for franchise for two broadcasting stations, and the legislature have just appropriated $150,000 for such enterprise. Naturally these broadcasting stations will be used for political propaganda with the taxpayers' money.

The legislature will be closed this week and $80,000 has been appropriated for the expenses of a committee of senators and representatives to go to Washington. Besides, $200,000 were appropriated for offices in Washington for propaganda, part of which money was spent in giving a banquet to the Treasurer of Puerto Rico on his last visit to Washington and in another banquet for the vice president of our insular senate on his trip to Washington.

Never in the history of Puerto Rico so much money had been placed at the disposal of the Governor during last economic year, but it was not enough and a deficiency bill of $10,000 was approved a few days ago.

This is just an example of what is going on in this island, which executive is supposed to represent the American Government, an American ideal, and I don't want to tire you any more. My advice to you is that the next time hearings are set before the Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives that the following conscientious persons representing responsible organizations be called to justify: The president of the medical association; the president of the engineers' association; the president of the Insular Bar Association; the president of the Federal Bar Association; the president of the chamber of commerce; the president of the industrialist association; the president of the Lions Club; the president of the Rotary Club; the president of the Knights of Columbus; the president of the Masons; the president of the Elks; the president of the farmers' association; the president of the sugar producers' association; the president of the agronomers' association; the president of the bankers' association; the president of the retail dealers' association (detallistas); the president of the American Federation of Labor; the president of the CGT; etc.

Very truly yours,

SAN JUAN, P. R., *March 28, 1946.*

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR STERLING: Referring to my yesterday's letter as to the law reorganizing the District Court of San Juan, it was approved by our legislature without having public hearings. Mind you, when this is the most important court in the island, with the exception of our supreme court, which is equivalent to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York. The Governor sent immediately, after signing the bill, the names of the five judges created by the new law—the other law had only four—and the whole thing was done in such a rush that when the president and the vice president of the Insular Bar Association went to the senate to recommend that all the judges be approved, the senate already had disapproved the two judges of whom I wrote to you yesterday. In other words, the whole thing was a frame-up between the majority leaders of our legislature and the representative of the President of the United States Government in this island, Governor Tugwell.

I am enclosing with this letter the editorials of the two most important newspapers of this island, which condemn very bitterly this procedure, by which it notifies every judge of this island that if they decide a case against the government they will be thrown out of office.

In yesterday's letter there is an error: Where it reads "business money" should be "government money."

Probably you know that last year Puerto Rico had a big tobacco crop. The legislature approved certain bills by which the government could pledge a certain quantity of tobacco to get it out of the market, in order to sell it when the market justify it. This project was among others to rehabilitate the tobacco industry in Puerto Rico. The tobacco people of this island, the cooperatives and the Farmers Association, endorsed the bill, and I know that the secretary of agriculture of Puerto Rico and the head of the Tobacco Institute, a government agency, also endorsed it. The Governor was advised that if he veto the bill there would be a tobacco crisis in Puerto Rico. He vetoed all the bills and a terrible crisis came, to the extent that this year the tobacco cooperatives, on the radio and in the newspapers, are continuously advising the farmers to grow only one-third of the planting they did last year, creating an unemployment in this island.

Last year the legislature approved certain bills to rehabilitate the coffee industry. The Governor vetoed all the bills, with the exception of the one creating an organization to insure the crops. This law was not put into effect and this year certain amendments have been approved. The coffee growers, after careful study with Government officials, prepared a program for the rehabilitation of the coffee industry, which needed an assignment of $3,000,000. The legislature was ready to approve this program with only a million and a half dollars. The Governor made it known that he will not approve the bill unless they cut it down to $800,000, which sum will not be enough, and once more they tried to deceive the coffee growers of Puerto Rico. The coffee growers got together and asked that if a million and half dollars would not be approved, that they prefer that no legislation be approved, but, just the same, it was approved and the Governor signed it immediately.

At the same time millions and millions of dollars are approved for all the new agencies, including $100,000 to cover the deficit of the Insular Telegraph, which is run by the Communications Authority. More telegrams are sent free than the ones that are paid for, and this is because all the legislators have franchises to send telegrams free and they use it for every political meeting or propaganda in this island.

One legislator alone sent over $8,000 worth of telegrams free. Naturally, the conscientious people of this island feels that the protection of the American institution, American ideals, and American form of living, have been thrown in the waste basket, as it appears was thrown the report of the conditions of Puerto Rico of the Subcommittee of the Insular Affairs of the United States Congress.

I beg you to excuse me if I have extended my remarks more than I should, but really it is my reaction on account of what I learned the American way of living and government is in the same school you studied.

Very truly yours,

———.

The OPA

REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to mention these facts or call attention of the House to this report sent out by the OPA. I do not think anyone enjoys kicking anybody when they are down, and the OPA are certainly in the dog house. I hold in my hands an interesting report they are asking the farm-implement dealers throughout the State of Colorado to fill in and mail back to them. This report comes out of the OPA office. It is a financial report. I will read just a few of the items: "Total sales, less returns, allowances," and so forth. "Cost of sales, gross profit, operating expenses," and so forth.

I have a letter from one fellow who says it would put 90 percent of the implement dealers of this country out of business if they had to furnish all the extra office help required to supply this information. I can see no reason for wanting such records, and if the office force in the OPA headquarters can find nothing more important for their overstaffed swivel-chair operators to do, they might delegate them to outside activity and check on some of the black-market operations which they admit are so rampant. The report and letters follow:

SURVEY OF FARM EQUIPMENT DEALERS

To the Dealer:

The end of the war and the return of farm equipment manufacturers to their normal lines of production brings with it the opportunity for a sharp expansion in the production of farm implements. At the same time, the Office of Price Administration may be faced with the necessity of extending to manufacturers of farm equipment a general increase in maximum prices.

In all cases of general price increases at the manufacturing level, such as that now contemplated in the farm equipment industry, it is the policy of this office to require absorption, in part or in full, at the distributive levels. This policy applies in all cases, unless it can be demonstrated that requiring absorption of resellers would result in undue financial hardship.

Since detailed information concerning actual, current operations of farm equipment dealers is not available at the present time, this office cannot make an entirely accurate determination of the extent to which dealers can absorb price increases extended to the manufacturers. To be entirely fair and equitable, we feel that such a determination should be based on the current experience of dealers, as reported by the dealers themselves.

Accordingly, with the assistance and suggestions of members of your trade, we have prepared this questionnaire, which, we believe, should furnish the information we shall need to make a decision on a fair and equitable basis. The questionnaire, you will note, requests information concerning your own operations and is designed along the lines of financial reporting forms customarily used in your trade. We have tried to plan this questionnaire so as to inconvenience you as little as possible.

Since your company has been selected as a representative concern, we are requesting your cooperation in furnishing the necessary information. It is important to you and your trade, as well as to OPA, that this information be supplied as quickly and accurately as possible.

We shal ltherefore appreciate your returning the completed questionnaire on or before April 1.

NOTE.—If your farm equipment sales for the year 1941 represented less than 30 percent of your total sales volume, you need not return this questionnaire.

OPA Form 6082-2762
(3-46)

Budget Bureau No. 08-4620
Approval expires 5-31-46

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
MACHINERY BRANCH
Washington 25, D. C.

SURVEY OF FARM EQUIPMENT DEALERS

Submit the information called for in the following schedules to the Farm Equipment Section, Machinery Branch, Office of Price Administration, Washington 25, D. C. Fill in the schedules as completely as possible. *Round all figures to closest dollar.*

Name of firm

Address of firm—number and street

City, postal zone number, and State

Type of business (check)
☐ Proprietorship ☐ Corporation
☐ Partnership ☐ Cooperative

Date organized

Date

Farm equipment lines
1
2

Other lines
1
2

SCHEDULE I. OVER-ALL FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Fill in the following schedule for your entire company for as many years as possible. (If you keep separate profit and loss statements for the farm equipment part of your business, submit similar data for this division on separate sheet)

(Omit cents)

	Item	Card columns	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
11	Total sales (less returns, allowances)						
22	Cost of sales						
3	Gross profit						
4	Operating expenses [a]						
5	Net operating profit						
6	Other income and deductions [b]						
7	Net profit before income taxes						
8	Salaries of owners and officers						
9	Net worth						
10	Sales of farm equipment (%) [c]		%	%	%	%	%

[a] If your business is a proprietorship or partnership, do not include in "operating expense" any "salaries of owners and officers"; show only on Line 8. If your business is a corporation include "salaries of owners and officers" in "operating expense" and also show separately on Line 8.
[b] Include cash discounts earned, interest earned, etc.
[c] Estimate this percentage if necessary.

Do Not Write In This Space				
Dealer Code	Reg.	Type	Lines	Year

SCHEDULE II. 1941 FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR SEPARATE PRODUCTS

(Omit cents)

		Card columns	Total	New farm equipment	Used farm equipment	Repair parts	Shop labor	Other lines
1	Total sales (less return and allowances)							
2	Cost of sales							
3	Gross profit							
4	Operating expense						(a)	
5	Net operating profit							
6	Other income and deductions [b]							
7	Net profit before taxes							

[a] Include wages (shop and service) and shop supplies and equipment repairs.
[b] Include cash discounts earned, interest earned, etc.

SCHEDULE III. 1944 FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR SEPARATE PRODUCTS

(Omit cents)

		Card columns	Total	New farm equipment	Used farm equipment	Repair parts	Shop labor	Other lines
1	Total sales (less return and allowances)							
2	Cost of sales							
3	Gross profit						(a)	
4	Operating expense							
5	Net operating profit							
6	Other income and deductions [b]							
7	Net profit before taxes							

[a] Include wages (shop and service) and shop supplies and equipment repairs.
[b] Include cash discounts earned, interest earned, etc.

SCHEDULE IV. 1945 FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR SEPARATE PRODUCTS

(Omit cents)

		Card columns	Total	New farm equipment	Used farm equipment	Repair parts	Shop labor	Other lines
1	Total sales (less return and allowances)							
2	Cost of sales							
3	Gross profit						(a)	
4	Operating expense							
5	Net operating profit							
6	Other income and deductions [b]							
7	Net profit before taxes							
8	Net worth							

[a] Include wages (shop and service) and shop supplies and equipment repairs.
[b] Include cash discounts earned, interest earned, etc.

Do Not Write in This Space				
Dealer code	Reg.	Type	Lines	Year

SCHEDULE V. BREAK-DOWN OF OPERATING EXPENSE

	Item	Card columns	1941	1944	1945
1	Salaries—owners and officers				
2	Other salaries, wages and sales commissions				
3	Rent and lease expense				
4	Heat, light, power, and water				
5	Telephone and telegraph				
6	Delivery and traveling expense *				
7	Advertising				
8	Taxes (except income taxes)				
9	Insurance				
10	Depreciation				
11	Bad debts				
12	All other				
13	Total				

* Include "gas and oil," "cars and truck" expense and "traveling and sales" expense

Do Not Write in This Space				
Dealer code	Reg.	Type	Lines	Year

MARCH 27, 1946.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Survey of Farm Equipment Sales,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We are just in receipt of your financial and profit statement return for sales of farm equipment. We further notice that you are contemplating giving manufacturers a raise in price on farm equipment and repairs, which is to be absorbed by the dealers.

It is not possible for us to fill out this form accurately, since it is almost impossible for us to keep our farm implement business segregated from our other activities. To do this would entail quite an extra expense, which, together with the shortage of help, would make this next to impossible, considering the nature of our business.

Is it not an evident fact that the dealers' expenses have risen in comparison with the manufacturers' expenses? A survey of the net profits of this industry over any 10-year period would not have exceeded 2 or 3 percent. Now, with this additional expense which the dealers have, and with an extra cut in their gross profits, every dealer in the United States will either have to go out of business or do what the OPA claims is the black market. This is positive and there is no other way of figuring it out; it is the same condition that exists in the meat-packing industry, also, the lumber and building material industry.

As stated above, in the first place it is not possible for us to fill out this statement without guessing at practically everything, since these statements do not conform with any practical business. In the second place there is no use filling it out as it may never be even considered. Any organization with no more judgment than to send out such a statement would make very little use of it.

I am sending a copy of this letter to all of our Colorado Senators and Representatives in Washington with the hope that they can prevent the destruction of the farm implement and repair industry and not have it in the shape that the lumber and building industry is now in.

Very truly yours,
JETT HARDWARE & LUMBER CO.
By J. N. JETT.
SPRINGFIELD, COLO.

WRAY, COLO., *March 23, 1946.*

WILLIAM S. HILL.

DEAR SIR: This morning I received the enclosed questionnaire entitled "Survey of Farm Equipment Dealers." The small-implement dealer is kept busy lately filling out reports, answering questions, and shaking hands with OPA investigators, until we have no time to work for a living. Our bookkeeping expense alone has increased hundreds of dollars a year. We have to pay our help more money; upkeep and equipment costs more; our living expenses have almost doubled; and OPA asks the small merchant if he can absorb a price increase by taking a smaller profit.

In the days before OPA it took a smart dealer in implements to figure out a 3-percent profit for himself at the end of a year, after all operating expenses were deducted. Now we have OPA restrictions and higher operating expense, less volume, and now a lower margin of profit in the making. Personally, I am too dumb to figure it out.

I do not think it is any of OPA's business what I and my implement company's contract is. Our company has spent 50 years figuring out what a legitimate profit to the dealer should be, and it is just and fair; and if lowered, I believe it would force 90 percent of the implement dealers to quit business.

Let industry, labor, merchant, and consumer run their own business for awhile and competition will take care of price.

Some time ago I noticed an article in the newspaper stating that the war with Europe and Japan was over. It was even mentioned over the radio. Why does not someone inform our Congress about this?

Regretfully yours,
LEWIS O. WAGES.
WRAY LUMBER AND IMPLEMENT CO.,
By ROBERT L. SHUMMBUSH.
T. B. GROVER CO.,
By G. H. ISHAM.
PHIL SHEA'S,
McCormack-Deering Implement Dealer.
WRAY FARMERS' UNION OIL CO.,
By WAYNE W. OTTS, *Manager,*
Implement Department.

Keep Navy Strong—Especially Until Our Present Chaotic World Gets Stabilized

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, many times I have said on the floor of the House and at other places that we must keep our defense system strong in order to give the President and his representatives at the international conference table strength in his dealings with other nations.

The persuasion of a diplomat or our Secretary of State varies almost directly with the size and effectiveness of our armed forces. If we have a strong Navy and a strong Army, our words are heeded and respected. If we are weak and impotent, militarily, our words are not given much weight and the negotiations are more in the nature of a debate, with little, if any, action accomplished.

For this reason I think the editorial in the Times-Herald of Vallejo, Calif., for the printing of which consent has been granted me, is timely.

This editorial reads as follows:

UNITED STATES IS REPEATING THE SAME MISTAKE IN LACK OF PREPAREDNESS—COMPROMISE ON NAVY FUNDS IS PERIL TO FUTURE OF THE NATION

The same tragic pattern which characterized this Nation's preparedness plans—or lack of them, after the First World War—is being repeated again.

It is being repeated against the advice of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, who led the world's greatest Navy in the Pacific war.

Unless the people of the United States, whose sons fought in the Navy during the last war and will fight again if there is another war—unless the people act now to change this current pattern, it will be enlarged, until this Nation once again will find itself in the same ludicrous situation which we faced at the outbreak of the First World War and again when the Second World War began.

Already, we are beginning to compromise on defensive measures.

The Navy asked an appropriation totaling $6,325,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

The Budget Bureau sought to cut this figure to $3,960,000,000.

Then, after Admiral Nimitz and other Navy officials objected, the Budget Bureau offered a compromise figure, $4,225,000,000.

It was at this point that Admiral Nimitz testified before members of the House Naval Committee that the proposed cut of $2,100,000,000 would have a very serious effect on United States leadership in world affairs.

Admiral Nimitz added that if the original slash of the Budget Bureau had remained effective, it would have jeopardized not only

the Nation's world position but even defense of the country itself.

How many lessons do we have to be taught; how many American lives have to be needlessly sacrificed because of unpreparedness; how much tragedy and sorrow must come into the homes of America before the people who must fight these wars and do the dying insist that we be prepared the next time?

What kind of morons are we, anyhow, sitting back, silently, while the Budget slashers, thinking in terms of dollars and cents, propose that we make the same mistake for a third time? How long must it be before the people let the politicians in Washington know that out in the valleys of America, out in the small towns and mountain villages and the desert hamlets, out in the country crossroads and the farms, human life comes before dollars and cents?

Only a few days ago in one of these editorials, it was suggested, and it is suggested again: people in communities such as Vallejo, and other communities like it all over the United States, must learn and realize and put in action the fact that they are the ones who should and must run this country, and not a handful of men back in Washington, D. C.

"But how can it be done?" they ask. "What is the opinion of 1 person among 140,000,000 people? What can I do, as an individual?"

The answer is they can sit down and write letters to their Representatives in Congress. They can sit down and write a letter to the President. Or they can sit down and write a letter to Admiral Nimitz, and tell him in plain words: "Keep fighting for what you know is right; Admiral Nimitz, here is one American who thinks you are right."

And if Admiral Nimitz, or the President, or congressional representatives from all over America receive letters like that—simple one paragraph letters beginning: "As an American citizen, I think—"

Then we shall not have any budget slashes crippling our Navy; we shall not watch an Army that became the greatest fighting force of its kind in history be reduced again to a broomstick army; we shall not have to ask for a third time: "Why were we not prepared?"

The one question asked in Washington, more than any other question since this Nation became the United States of America, is: "What are the people thinking?"

But the people must let Washington know the answer.

The people must do the guiding.

That is how this Nation works, that is how our democracy operates, that is what makes this Nation the greatest nation on earth.

Chairman VINSON, at the conclusion of testimony by Admiral Nimitz, declared:

"You have warned Congress and warned the country that you require for proper defense and for the position the Nation holds in world affairs an appropriation of $6,000,000,000."

VINSON added that Nimitz had provided ample warning to Congress and expressed the hope that "Congress will heed the advice he has given us."

Congress should heed that advice but first of all the people should heed that advice, and by writing letters to the President, if necessary, should make certain that Washington, including the Congress, does heed that advice.

Questioning by committee members during the testimony of Admiral Nimitz brought out the fact that as a result of the currently proposed slash—a slash not proposed by Nimitz but utterly opposed by him—construction of new ships embodying the lessons of the war and latest shipbuilding developments probably would have to be halted.

As a result, Admiral Nimitz pointed out, the result would be most seriously felt in subsequent years by halting continued modernization of ships.

For America to remain silent to the warning of Admiral Nimitz would be to permit a ludicrous situation.

This was the sort of thing that happened before the First World War.

This was the same thing that happened prior to the Second World War.

All of us hope, and pray, that there will never be a third world war.

But if there is, let us, for once in the history of our Nation, be prepared for it.

And the way to prepare for it—simple as a common-sense precaution—is not to start slashing the Navy budget by $2,000,000,000.

Whether or not we are prepared depends upon the average American individual who has enough interest in his Nation's destiny—and his own well-being and the well-being of his family—to say what he thinks—and put it in writing.

Contribution of Army and Navy Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a record of the Army and Navy Chaplain Corps. The record is an impressive one, of which we may all be proud. It is a record which, in my judgment, has recommended itself in a very unusual manner because of the large number of chaplains involved, and because of the courage which they displayed in administering to the personnel of our Army and our Navy.

The total contribution of the Army and Navy Chaplain Corps to victory and to the ultimate happiness of our Nation can never be adequately measured. The impact of individual chaplains upon the lives of servicemen through counselings, services, sacraments, and through their sheer humanity, will be felt by these men for years to come. Many of these chaplains have been decorated by a grateful people, but the full story will never be told.

Foremost among the heroic deeds of the Chaplain Corps will stand the gallant sacrifice of four chaplains—a Jew, a Roman Catholic, and two Protestants—who gave their lives in the North Atlantic that their men might live. The conduct of these chaplains as their vessel, the *Dorchester*, which sank is a high light of courage. The names of Goode, Washington, Fox, and Poling now rank with the greatest heroes of American tradition. The Navy's O'Callahan and the Army's Borneman, both of whom survived the war, are among those who will live forever in the hearts of all Americans.

Although I have been advised by the Public Printer that it is estimated the manuscript submitted herewith will occupy 3 pages of the RECORD and cost $180, I, nevertheless, think that the material is of sufficient importance to be printed in the RECORD, and I make the request.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Decorations: 1,342 Army chaplains have received 1,777 decorations

(a) Distinguished Service Cross	18
(b) Distinguished Service Medal	3
(c) Legion of Merit	69
(d) Oak Leaf Cluster to Legion of Merit	1
(e) Silver Star	148
(f) One Oak Leaf Cluster to Silver Star	11
(g) Two Oak Leaf Clusters to Silver Star	1
(h) Soldier's Medal	21
(i) Bronze Star	1,022
(j) One Oak Leaf Cluster to Bronze Star	93
(k) Two Oak Leaf Clusters to Bronze Star	2
(l) Air Medal	9
(m) Purple Heart	320
(n) One Oak Leaf Cluster to Purple Heart	27
(o) Two Oak Leaf Clusters to Purple Heart	3
(p) Foreign decorations	29

This is not a complete list of decorations. Others are being added daily. The number has been appreciably increased since this January 31 tabulation.

Culled from this list of several hundred decorations are these following men whose courage has been several times recognized.

With seven decorations:

E. K. Rogers, Lutheran, UCLA, three Silver Stars, two Bronze stars, and two Purple Hearts.

J. K. Borneman,[1] Presbyterian, three Silver Stars, two Bronze Stars, and two Purple Hearts.

J. E. Duffy, Roman Catholic, Bronze Star, six Purple Hearts.

With six decorations:

M. E. Utter, northern Baptist, two Silver Stars, Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts, Croix de Guerre (France).

P. J. Ryan, Roman Catholic, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Order of the British Empire (British), Medal of War (Brazil), Order of the Crown (Italy), Bronze Medal of Valor (Italy), (Chaplain Ryan is the newly appointed Deputy Chief of Chaplains.)

With five decorations:

F. M. Arnold, Baptist, Silver Star, three Bronze Stars, Purple Heart.

L. E. Deery, Roman Catholic, two Silver Stars, Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts.

C. C. Clemens, Presbyterian, Silver Star, three Bronze Stars, Purple Heart.

Numbered among many of the recipients of honors are chaplains who come from minority racial and religious groups. We mention two Negro chaplains, I. N. Hunt, and C. S. Hunter, who received, respectively, the Legion of Merit and the Purple Heart. Two Nisei chaplains, serving in Italy, M. Yamada and H. Higuchi, received respectively the Legion of Merit and two Purple Hearts, and the Legion of Merit.

It would be an inadequate account of heroism that omitted the record of the loyal courage of Chaplain A. C. Oliver, Jr.,[1] decorated with the Bronze Star and two Purple Hearts, who bore stoically the torture of Japanese questionings. During his incarceration in Cabantuan prison camp Chaplain Oliver successfully refrained from revealing the channels through which drugs and medicine were made available to the prisoners. He undoubtedly saved many lives

[1] Chaplains Oliver and Borneman were prisoners of the Japanese for 3½ years.

and the health of others in his camp by his heroism.

As of March 20, 1946, decorations awarded to Navy chaplains were as follows:

Medal of Honor	1
Silver Stars	8
Legion of Merit	8
Navy and Marine Corps Medal	6
Bronze Stars	25
Letters of commendation (with ribbon)	20
Purple Hearts	40
Total	108

The most decorated chaplains are Capt. Francis L. Albert, United States Navy, a Baptist, and Lt. Comdr. William H. McCorkle, United States Naval Reserve, a Presbyterian, now on inactive duty. Both received the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star. Chaplain Albert received the Legion of Merit and Chaplain McCorkle the Silver Star.

In the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the Philippines, and the naval actions around Java no corps in the Navy suffered as high a percentage of casualties as the Chaplain Corps. Of the Regular Navy chaplains three were killed in action, three were prisoners (nonsurvivors), one a prisoner (survived), and one was wounded. Of the Reserve chaplains one was killed in action and one a prisoner (survived). Chaplain Drury states in his history of the Chaplain Corps, "Since there were 105 Regular Navy Chaplains on duty on December 7, 1941, this means that 7.6 percent of this number became casualties in the first months of the war. The total of Regular and Reserve chaplains on duty at the time of Pearl Harbor totaled 192, of which number 5.2 percent became casualties."

It would be difficult if not impossible to decide which of the Navy chaplains had rendered the most outstanding services in this war. From the point of self-sacrifice Chaplain George S. Rentz would perhaps be the most outstanding. After the sinking of the United States steamship *Houston* on February 28, 1942, Chaplain Rentz and several others were clinging to and resting on a drifting pontoon. Seeing that there were men without life preservers and that there was not room for all on the pontoon, he made several attempts to give up his life preserver to someone else and also his place on the raft. Finally his efforts were successful, and with the remarks that he had lived most of his life and that the others were younger with their lives and their fun still before them, he swam away from the pontoon and disappeared into the sea.

In building up the strength of the Corps to the needs of the wartime Navy and in guiding its activities Chaplain Robert D. Workman's service as Chief of Chaplains (1937–1945) was invaluable. He supervised the building of the chapels and procurement of the materials needed to bring religious comfort to the men. The following figures reveal the excellent job he did in building up the strength of the Chaplain Corps:

September 1937:	
U. S. Navy	91
U. S. Naval Reserve	63
Total	154
Aug. 15, 1945:	
U. S. Navy	187
U. S. Naval Reserve	2,624
Total	2,811

Chaplain Clinton Neyman's work as director of the Chaplains' Indoctrination School at Williamsburg, Va., was highly commendable.

In the Atlantic and Mediterranean, Chaplain Robert J. White, as fleet chaplain, supervised and coordinated the work of the chaplains making certain that the Navy forces involved in the invasions were not without the comforting presence of chaplains.

(From the Army and Navy Chaplain for July-August 1945)

COMBINED ARMY AND NAVY CHAPLAIN CASUALTIES TOTAL OVER 400

The total number of Army and Navy chaplains who have been killed or missing in action; who have died from natural causes and/or in line of duty; who are now prisoners of the Japanese; and who have been wounded is now 402. An analysis of the names gives the following table:

	Killed in action	Deaths (non-battle)	Prisoners of Japanese	Wounded	Total
Navy [1]	9	11	4	28	52
Army	68	59	19	204	350
Total	77	70	23	232	402

[1] Including 1 missing in action.

These statistics do not include the following eight chaplains who were prisoners of the Japanese but who have been released:

Navy: Earl Ray Brewster (Methodist), freed February 1945.

Army: John K. Borneman, John J. Dugan, Hugh F. Kennedy, Eugene J. O'Keefe, Alfred C. Oliver, Jr., Albert D. Talbot Perry C. Wilcox.

The statistics do not include the names of 21 Army chaplains who were captured by the Germans and subsequently freed.

The office of Chief of Chaplains of the Navy has furnished the following list of naval chaplains who have died in service or are now prisoners of the Japanese as of 1 July 1945:

Killed in action (chronologically) (Name, denomination, and date):

Thomas L. Kirkpatrick, Presbyterian, United States of America, December 7, 1941.

Aloysius Herman Schmitt, Roman Catholic, December 7, 1941.

George Snavely Rentz, Presbyterian, United States of America, March 1, 1943.

Anthony James Conway, Roman Catholic, July 23, 1944.

Eugene R. Shannon, Episcopal, March 5, 1945.

Fidelis M. Wieland, Roman Catholic, May 5, 1945.

Floyd Withrow, United Presbyterian, June 5, 1945.

Joseph J. Kobel, Roman Catholic, June 21, 1945.

Killed in operational accidents:

Karl Porter Buswell, Presbyterian, United States of America, December 24, 1943.

Killed in line of duty:

James William McFall, Presbyterian, United States of America, December 12, 1943.

Thomas E. Johnson, Methodist, August 17, 1943.

Edward J. Robbins, Methodist, July 10, 1942.

John F. Robinson, Roman Catholic, February 23, 1945.

Elwin J. Bina, Roman Catholic, March 20, 1945.

Victor W. Simons, Reformed, June 13, 1945.

Missing in action in the Asiatic theater:

John Joseph McGarrity, Roman Catholic, March 1, 1942.

Earl M. Criger, Congregational, March 18, 1942.

Deceased from natural causes:

Thomas J. Knox, Roman Catholic, March 21, 1943.

James Patrick Kerr, Roman Catholic, December 7, 1943.

Henry G. Main, Methodist, June 7, 1943.

Chaplains detained by the Japanese:

James Edward Davis, Congregational.

Francis Joseph McManus, Roman Catholic.

David L. Quinn, Episcopal.

Herbert Ray Trump, Lutheran.

The Army list, with the names in alphabetical order, is also complete up to July 1, 1945. It is as follows:

Killed in action:

Robert E. Alspaugh, January 16, 1944, Italy.

Ralph A. Antonucci, May 5, 1945, Germany.

Theodore W. Barron, November 10, 1943, southwest Pacific.

Hoke S. Bell, April 10, 1943, north Africa.

Charles S. Blakeney, September 1, 1944, France.

Peter E. Bonner, July 28, 1944, France.

Thomas T. Brady, July 22, 1943, New Georgia Island.

Edward J. Clary, July 15, 1944, France.

Aquinas T. Colgan, May 6, 1945, Mindanao.

William S. Contino, March 3, 1945, Italy.

Anthony E. Czubak, January 22, 1945, Belgium.

Morris E. Day, September 7, 1944, off Mindanao.

Arthur J. Dieffenbacher, July 5, 1944, France.

Neil J. Doyle, July 15, 1943, Guadalcanal.

Philip B. Edelen, June 10, 1944, France.

Clement M. Falter, November 8, 1942, North Africa.

Paschal D. Fowlkes, March 24, 1945, Germany.

George L. Fox, April 17, 1943, North Atlantic.

Joseph A. Gilmore, June 2, 1944, Italy.

Alexander D. Goode, April 17, 1943, North Atlantic.

Rollin Goodfellow, December 1, 1942, North American area.

Horace E. Gravely, February 7, 1943, North Atlantic.

Clarence W. Griggs, April 12, 1945, Okinawa.

Clarence J. Hagen, January 6, 1945, Italy.

Percy E. Haley, November 26, 1943, Bougie, Tunisia.

Edwin W. Hampton, December 18, 1944, Belgium.

Francis E. Hand, October 14, 1942, North American area.

Raymond J. Hansen, June 11, 1944, France.

John R. Kilbert, October 27, 1944, Germany.

Clyde E. Kimball, December 19, 1944, Belgium.

Rowland A. Koskamp, April 5, 1945, Germany, in prison camp.

Joseph V. Lafleur, September 7, 1944, off Mindanao.

Arthur C. Lenaghan, January 7, 1944, Italy.

James M. Liston, February 7, 1943, North Atlantic.

Lawrence E. Lynch, April 24, 1945, Okinawa.

Harley R. McDaniel, November 26, 1943, Italy.

Thomas E. McKnight, February 9, 1945, Luzon.

Ernest W. MacDonald, February 7, 1943, North Atlantic.

Ignatius P. Maternowski, June 8, 1944, France.

Edwin U. Monroe, January 20, 1945, France.

Owen T. Monaghan, April 7, 1945, Luzon.

Harry Montgomery, March 3, 1945, Italy.

Keith B. Munro, August 15, 1943, Southwest Pacific.

James W. O'Brien, October 24, 1944, South China Sea.

Eugene P. O'Grady, November 29, 1944, Germany.

Myles F. O'Toole, January 19, 1945, Luzon.

Clarke V. Poling, April 17, 1943, North Atlantic.

Dietrich F. Rasetzki, July 25, 1944, ETO.

Thomas H. Reagan, December 18, 1944, Germany.

Leo G. Rechsteiner, October 22, 1944, Leyte.

Valmore G. Savignac, February 7, 1943, North Atlantic.

Thomas J. Scecina, October 24, 1944, South China Sea.

John William Schwer, August 13, 1944, France.
James R. Shaw, July 30, 1944, Biak Island.
John R. Steel, June 6, 1944, France.
Clarence G. Stump, November 21, 1944, Germany.
Arvil E. Teem, February 12, 1944, Italy.
Dominic Ternan, June 19, 1944, France.
Irving Tepper, August 13, 1944, France.
Frank L. Tiffany, October 24, 1944, South China Sea.
Guy H. Turner, May 29, 1943, Aleutians.
Barrett L. Tyler, March 15, 1945, Luzon.
John J. Verret, January 8, 1945, Belgium.
Clarence A. Vincent, March 13, 1945, Germany.
Eunace A. Wallace, February 16, 1944, Italy.
John P. Washington, April 17, 1943, North Atlantic.
Quintin M. Wilder, January 15, 1945, Luzon.
David H. Youngdahl, February 7, 1943, North Atlantic.
Deaths nonbattle:
Edgar R. Attebery, May 5, 1944, Finschhafen, New Guinea.
Thomas J. Barrett, June 4, 1944, India.
Julius J. Babst, October 4, 1943, Camp Irwin, Calif.
John L. Callahan, February 18, 1944, Camp Mackall, N. C.
Burton H. Coleman, June 6, 1942, Duquoin, Ill.
Leon S. Drumheller, April 17, 1944, New York.
Walter J. Felix, August 5, 1943, Camp Miles Standish, Mass.
Patrick Flaherty, July 19, 1943, Camp Polk Hospital, La.
James P. Flynn, July 18, 1943, Wounds in Sicily-North African Area.
Dominic F. Gillespie, March 28, 1944, Nome, Alaska.
Henry Goody, October 19, 1943, Washington, D. C.
Lawrence A. Gough, September 11, 1942, Nashville, Ga.
Roy A. Griffin, December 16, 1943, Bives, N. C.
Raymond L. Hall, April 29, 1942, Albany, N. Y.
Chester P. Hanson, April 29, 1942, Atlantic Area.
Albert McCabe Hart, July 16, 1942, Southwest Pacific Theater.
Henry C. Hemmeter, December 9, 1943, Oro Bay, New Guinea.
Frederick B. Howden, July 1, 1943, in Japanese prison camp, Philippines.
John P. Hughes, November 4, 1943, Italy.
Robert H. Humphrey, May 3, 1943, Iceland.
Arlie G. Hurt, November 28, 1943, Asiatic Area.
Samuel D. Hurwitz, December 9, 1943, McCloskey General Hospital, Temple, Tex.
William A. Irwin, August 3, 1943, England.
Alfred W. Johnson, October 20, 1943, Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco, Calif.
Harry M. Kellam, June 3, 1945, Fort Meade, Md.
John W. Kilsdonk, March 5, 1945, Baxter General Hospital.
Dirk Lay, December 1, 1944, Panama.
Paul E. Loeber, June 22, 1943, Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa.
Markus E. Lohrmann, March 6, 1944, Goodenough Island.
Gustav T. Lutz, April 16, 1945, Germany.
Vaughan H. MacArthur, June 9, 1945, Czechoslovakia.
Patrick A. Maloney, August 18, 1943, Fort Custer, Mich.
Frank L. Miller, May 3, 1943, Iceland.
John F. Monahan, December 8, 1944, Washington, D. C.
Cuthbert P. Newton, October 27, 1942, Fort Dix, N. J.
Richard K. Orr, December 10, 1944, Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa.
Ernest G. Overton, November 13, 1944, England.
Raymond A. Partee, August 18, 1943, Pacific Area.
Ladislaus A. Polewski, January 29, 1945, Ledo Assam, Indian.
Eugene E. Polhemus, August 11, 1943, Leesville, La.
Floyd N. Richert, May 12, 1944, England.
William N. Roberts, September 20, 1943, Maxton Field, N. C.
Roland L. Rupp, March 17, 1944, Allentown, Pa.
Curtis J. Sharp, January 20, 1943, Camp Carson, Colo.
Paul F. Sharpe, June 7, 1945, Philippines.
George F. Slater, December 14, 1944, France.
Gilbert J. Spencer, May 6, 1945, Philippines.
Ole P. Stensland, April 9, 1945, New Guinea.
Edgar A. Swann, February 18, 1944, Camp Mackall, N. C.
Joseph D. Taylor, December 18, 1943, New Guinea.
Andrew C. Thigpen February 13, 1944, Elkins, W. Va.
Kenneth L. Thompson, March 17, 1943, Southwest Pacific area.
William H. Turner, March 11, 1944, Milne Bay, New Guinea.
Thurman Vickers, August 14, 1944, Yuma, Ariz.
Louis Werfel, December 24, 1943, north Africa.
Mel E. Wertman, February 23, 1945, Casablanca.
Earl O. Widen, June 28, 1944, Hethel, England.
Oscar A. Withee, May 31, 1945, Georgia.
Jerl D. Zimerman, May 26, 1943, Pacific area.
Detained by the Japanese:
Herman C. Baumann, Albert W. Braun, Ralph W. D. Brown, Richard Carberry, Arthur V. Cleveland, William T. Cummings, John L. Curran, William Dawson, Samuel E. Donald, John E. Duffy, Carl W. Hausmann, John J. McDonnell, Stanley J. Reilly, Henry B. Stober, Robert P. Taylor, Joseph G. Vanderheiden, John A. Wilson, Mathias E. Zerfas, Leslie F. Zimmerman.

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE CASUALTY LIST

The July-August and October-November 1945, issues of the Army and Navy Chaplain contained information about Army and Navy chaplain casualties in the recent war. Subsequent to the last issue, the following corrections and additions have been received from the offices of the Chief of Chaplains of the Army and of the Navy:

Deaths, nonbattle: Bacigalupo, Andrew, 14 August 1945, Germany. Bartley, Edward L., 26 October 1945, New Orleans, La. Clause, Albert B., 13 October 1945, Tokepa, Kans. Durham, Lucius M., 20 September 1945, Hawaii. Foley, John E., 12 October 1945, Washington, D. C.

Missing in action: Bradley, Francis E., Robinson, Eugene G.

Revised statistics of chaplain casualties

ARMY, DEC. 7, 1945

1. Casualties:	
Killed in action, including 12 lost in sinking of Japanese prison ships, and 1 killed during bombing in Germany	76
Deaths, nonbattle, including 3 died in Japanese prison camp	73
Wounded in action, including those not hospitalized	236
Missing	2
2. Returned to military control, from German prison camps and from Japanese prison camps	37

NAVY, JAN. 7, 1946

Casualties:	
Killed in action	12
Deaths, nonbattle	11
Prisoners of Japanese	5
Wounded	30
Missing in action	1

Statistics of chaplain decorations

	Army	Navy [1]
Congressional Medal of Honor		1
Distinguished Service Cross	18	
Distinguished Service Medal	3	
Legion of Merit	66	7
Oak Leaf Cluster to Legion of Merit	1	
Silver Star	141	8
Oak Leaf Cluster to Silver Star	9	
Navy and Marine Corps Medal		5
Soldier's Medal	20	
Bronze Star	165	20
I Oak Leaf Cluster to Bronze Star	87	
II Oak Leaf Cluster to Bronze Star	2	
Air Medal	7	
Purple Heart	312	41
I Oak Leaf Cluster to Purple Heart	25	
II Oak Leaf Cluster to Purple Heart	3	
Foreign decorations	26	
Individual letters of commendation (ribbon)		16

[1] Data incomplete.

ADDITIONS TO LIST OF ARMY CHAPLAINS DECORATED IN WORLD WAR II

Distinguished Service Cross

Colgan, Aquinas T., Catholic.

Distinguished Service Medal

Bennett, Ivan L., Baptist; Rixey, George F., Methodist.

Legion of Merit

Cleary, William D., Catholic; Cohee, Ora J., Disciples of Christ; Fenton, Bernard J., Catholic; Gearhard, August F., Catholic; Higuchi, Hiro, Congregational; Hunter, Wayne L., Presbyterian; Imrie, Matthew H., Episcopal; McGladrey, Marlin W., Methodist; McKnight, Alvie L., Baptist (South); O'Brien, Moran J., Catholic; Rogers, William J., Catholic; Rose, Ben L., Presbyterian; Tange, Irving N., Lutheran; Trickett, Albert S., Methodist.

Silver Star

Adams, Marvin H., Methodist; Boyle, Edward T., Catholic; Heide, Herman L., Catholic; Henderson, Benedict A., Catholic; Hochwold, Earle C., Congregational; Leith, Yoder P., Presbyterian; Miller, Raphel H., Disciples of Christ; Punda, Raymond A., Catholic.

Soldier's Medal

Johnson, Raymond A., Evangelical Missionary Covenant.

Bronze Star

Due to the fact that nearly 1,000 Bronze Stars have been awarded Army chaplains we are not publishing this list.

ADDITIONS TO LIST OF NAVY CHAPLAINS DECORATED IN WORLD WAR II

Bronze Stars

Lt. Donald W. Mayberry, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Episcopalian, for meritorious service in connection with operations against the Japanese enemy on Okinawa, during the period from April 1 to June 21, 1945.

Lt. (jg) Earl R. Brewster, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Methodist, for heroic achievement while interned at the prisoner-of-war camp, Davao Penal Colony, Philippine Islands area.

Capt. Francis Lee Albert, Chaplain's Corps, USN, Baptist (S), for meritorious service in administering to the spiritual welfare and morale of naval personnel whose duties were in connection with operations against the enemy.

Commander Samuel Beecher Bennett, Chaplain's Corps, USN, Methodist, for distinguishing himself by meritorious achievement in connection with operations against

the enemy on March 20, 1945, while serving as chaplain aboard a carrier.

Commander Alvo O. Martin, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Congregationalist, for meritorious achievement against the enemy while serving as division chaplain during the campaign for Iwo Jima from January 8 to March 16, 1945, and for the rehabilitation period from March 17 to September 3, 1945.

[From the October-November 1945 issue of the Army and Navy Chaplain]

HUNDREDS OF ARMY AND NAVY CHAPLAINS RECEIVE DECORATIONS

While statistics of decorations granted to the personnel of the other corps of the Army and Navy are not available at the time of this writing, yet the very high percentage of chaplains of both branches of the armed services who were decorated for heroism and/or for meritorious services indicates that few, if any, corps can boast of such a record.

Chaplains have gone with their men to the front and have shared all of the hazards of war on land or sea. Inspired by the high nature of their sacred calling, priests, ministers, and rabbis, have gone beyond the ordinary calls of duty to bring comfort, spiritual sustenance, and material help to the wounded and dying and to others in need. Due to the fortuitous circumstances under which the bravery of some men is seen and noted while the equal devotion of others to duty under similar dangerous conditions goes unrecorded, the list of those who have been decorated does not tell the full story.

The time has come when more publicity should be given to these chaplains who have received the various medals, letters of commendation, and other awards granted by a grateful Government in recognition of unusual services. The lists as furnished by the Chiefs of Chaplains of the Army and of the Navy follow:

LIST OF ARMY AWARDS

Distinguished Service Cross

Brown, Ralph W. D., Methodist; Curran, John L., Roman Catholic; Daniel, Eugene L., Presbyterian, United States; Doyle, Neil J., Roman Catholic; Fox, George L., Methodist (posthumous); Goode, Alexander D., Jewish (posthumous); Harrison, Edward H. Protestant Episcopal; Heindl, Elmer W., Roman Catholic; Henderson, Benedict A., Roman Catholic; Hoffman, Albert J., Roman Catholic.

Lacy, Joseph R., Roman Catholic; LaFleur, Joseph V., Roman Catholic; Maloney, John S., Roman Catholic; McGee, Tildon S., Baptist South; Poling, Clark V., Reformed Christian (posthumous); Sampson, Francis L., Roman Catholic; Washington, John P., Roman Catholic (posthumous).

Distinguished Service Medal

Arnold, William R., Roman Catholic.

Legion of Merit

Andrysick, Timothy M., Roman Catholic; Andruskevitch, C. W., Roman Catholic; Brock, Laurence M., Roman Catholic; Brown, Jorden E., Roman Catholic; Cahill, Cornelius F., Roman Catholic; Carpenter[2], Charles I., Methodist; Carroll, Emmitt T., Disciples of Christ; Chadwick, Clifford, Episcopal; Chase, Richard H., Christian Scientist; Chataignon, Marius S., Roman Catholic.

Dickinson, William H., Methodist; Diebert, Ralph C., Evangelical; Dubra, Charles H., Methodist; Dzuro, John M., Presbyterian, United States of America; Evans, Ferdinand A., Roman Catholic; Grimes, Lewis H., Methodist; Gupton, Bennett L., Baptist South; Haley, John F., Roman Catholic; Higgins, George A., Roman Catholic; Hunt, Isaiah H., African Methodist Episcopal.

Joyce, Johnie L., Methodist; Keefe, Anselm M., Roman Catholic; Kirker, Frederick, Presbyterian USA; Leel, Charles W., W. C. P. Episcopal; Lenaghan, Arthur C., Roman Catholic; Lyons, Michael J., Roman Catholic; McBride, James L., Presbyterian USA; McDaniel, Kenneth E., Protestant Episcopal; McSween, Allen C., Presbyterian USA; Mahoney, John P., Roman Catholic; Marken, DeLoss I., Disciples of Christ.

Miller, Frank L., Presbyterian USA; Miller, Luther D., Episcopal; Millican, Burr, Baptist South; Moore, Denis G., Roman Catholic; O'Neill, James H., Roman Catholic; Pinkard, Calvin M., Methodist; Patterson, James F., Lutheran; Propst, Cecil L., Lutheran American; Ryan, Patrick J. Q., Roman Catholic; Shaw, James R., Disciples of Christ; Sherwood, Gervase G., Roman Catholic.

Smith, Stanley E., Baptist North; Tiernan, L. Curtis, Roman Catholic; Uphoff, Robert A., Methodist; Wareing, Joel M., Methodist; Warmouth, Donald L., Methodist; Wood, John J., Roman Catholic; Wurm, Urban J., Roman Catholic; Yamada, Masao, Congregational; Yost, Israel A. S., Lutheran; Beebe, Milton O., Methodist; Steves, Charles B., Roman Catholic.

Silver Star

Alspaugh, Robert E., Methodist; Anderson, Isaac M., Salvation Army; Ames, Kenneth L., Baptist North; Andrews, Fred E., Disciples of Christ; Andrysick, Timothy M., Roman Catholic; Arnold, Frank M., Baptist North; Baker, Peter J., Roman Catholic; Barnhill, Frederick A., Congregational; Barry, Joseph D., Roman Catholic; Boice, William S., Disciples of Christ.

Bojcun, Arthur J., Roman Catholic; Boyle, Cosmas J., Roman Catholic; Brady, Thomas T., Roman Catholic; Buchanan, John J., Roman Catholic; Burke, Edmund F., Roman Catholic; Burkhalter, John G., Baptist South; Burr, Dudley H., Congregational; Busse, Julius S., Roman Catholic; Carberry,[3] Richard E., Roman Catholic; Cartee, Clifford C., Baptist South.

Cochran, Robert L., Salvation Army; Connelly, Edward, Roman Catholic; Connors, Edward T., Roman Catholic; Cousins, Lawrence E., Disciples of Christ; Cowherd, Charles P., Baptist South; Crane, Emmet P., Roman Catholic; Curtis, Theodore E., Jr., Latter Day Saints; Dahlen, Johan B., Lutheran, Free Church; Daniel, Eugene L., Presbyterian United States; Day, Richard W., Episcopal; Deery,[3] Lawrence E., Roman Catholic.

DeLaura, Anthony F., Roman Catholic; Desmond, Gerald D., Roman Catholic; DeWeerd, James A., Methodist; Donahue, Edward T., Baptist (North); Ellenberg, Julian S., Episcopal USA; Elmen, Paul H. Congregational; Ernest, John E., Roman Catholic; Esser, Joseph G., Roman Catholic; Farmer, George C., Disciples of Christ; Farrell, Mark A., Roman Catholic; Fenton, Bernard J., Roman Catholic.

Ferguson, Warren E., Baptist (South); Fish, James T., P. Episcopal; Flaherty, James L., Roman Catholic; Flynn, Fabian P., Roman Catholic; Francis, Charles A., Baptist (South); Frith, Clifford F., Baptist (South); Gearhard, August F., Roman Catholic; Gebauer, Paul, Baptist (South); Gorsline, Leon N., Baptist (South); Halvorsen,[3] Arlin M., Baptist (Independent); Ham, David C., Baptist (South).

Harding, Russell E., Episcopal; Healy, Jerome J., Roman Catholic; Heckmann, Carl A., Lutheran (Mo. Synod); Heindl, Elmer W., Roman Catholic; Helsel, Frank E., Lutheran (United); Henley, Odus T., Baptist (South); Hoehn, Martin C., Roman Catholic; Hoffmann, Albert J., Roman Catholic; Hogg, William K., Methodist; Jenkins, Thomas A., Presbyterian USA; Johnson, Allen L., Methodist (Colored).

Jones, James L., Methodist (Colored); Kane, Stephen W., Roman Catholic; Keating, Denis M., Roman Catholic; Kelly, John A., Roman Catholic; Kenney, James G., Roman Catholic; Kilbert, John R., Baptist (North); Kimball, Clyde E., Methodist; Kirtley, Edwin L., Disciples of Christ; Koszarek, Thaddeus J., Roman Catholic; Kozikowski, Paul H., Roman Catholic; Kusman, Stanley J., Roman Catholic.

Lang, Joseph M., Roman Catholic; Lehne, Christian A., Lutheran (American); Leuchinger, Bruno, Roman Catholic; Lorenz, Orville A., United Brethren; Lynch, Kenny E., Roman Catholic; McCleland, George D., Baptist (North); McKnight, Thomas E., Methodist; Madden, Alan P., Roman Catholic; Maness, Ralph E., Baptist (South); Martin, Kenneth C., Roman Catholic; Meany, Stephen J., Roman Catholic.

Mills, Arthur E., Advent Christian; Monaghan, Owen T., Roman Catholic; Murphy, Donald J., Roman Catholic; Naylor, Duncan N., Presbyterian US; O'Brien, William J., Roman Catholic; O'Connor, William V., Roman Catholic; O'Toole, Myles F., Roman Catholic; Paradis, Robert M., Roman Catholic; Parks, Louis B., Baptist (South); Potter, Aidan R., Roman Catholic; Probst, Reed G., Latter Day Saints.

Quinan, Augustine J., Roman Catholic; Quinn, Gerald A., Roman Catholic; Raines, Raymond L., Salvation Army; Raley, LeRoy W., Baptist South; Raley, Percy T., Baptist (South); Ray, Earl E., Baptist (North); Reed, Charles D., Methodist; Reese, Clarence H., Episcopal; Reynolds, Frank E., Evangelical and Reformed; Rogers,[3] Edward K., United Lutheran; Rogness, Burnis M., Lutheran.

Rooney,[3] John E., Roman Catholic; Scannell,[3] John W., Roman Catholic; Schilling, Charles F., Episcopal; Schweissing, Frank E. L., Baptist (North); Sharp, Joseph C., Methodist (South); Sidoti,[3] Anthony R., Roman Catholic; Steffens, Albert C. M., Roman Catholic; Steinmeier, William R., Presbyterian, United States of America; Stohler,[3] Edgar H., Salvation Army; Sweeney, James P., Roman Catholic; Taggart, Gerald W., Roman Catholic.

Taggart, William C., Baptist (South); Tange, Irving N., Lutheran (United); Teilmann, Gunnar J., Jr., Methodist; Ternan, Dominic, Roman Catholic; Tietjen, Ottomar H., Lutheran M.; Turner, Guy H., Baptist; Tye, John B., Roman Catholic; Utter, Marvin E., Baptist (North); VanDeusen, Dayton G., Lutheran; Wall, Henry, Baptist; Wick, Gideon E., Lutheran (United).

Yohe, Clair F., Methodist

Soldier's medal

Adler, Bartholomew A., Roman Catholic; Albert, John E., Roman Catholic; Barringer, John D., Lutheran, United; Bell, Hoke S., Methodist; Bennett, Horace R., Methodist; Boutwell, Alfred K., Baptist (North); Brennan, Patrick T., Catholic; Buckley, Albert J., Roman Catholic; Culpepper, Charles R., Methodist; Duggan, John P., Roman Catholic; Johnson, James W., Baptist (North); McEvoy, James E., Roman Catholic; Morford, Elbert S., Methodist; Mroczka, John A., Roman Catholic; Mullen, William P., Roman Catholic; O'Connell, Joseph P., Roman Catholic; Steffens, Albert C. M., Roman Catholic; Williams, Alfred A., Roman Catholic; Zink, William J., Roman Catholic.

NAVY CHAPLAINS DECORATED IN WORLD WAR II

Legion of merit

Lt. Fredric P. Gebring, Chaplains' Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for services with the marines at Guadalcanal from September 25, 1942.

Lt. Francis W. Kelly, Chaplains' Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for services with the marines at Tarawa, November 1943.

Lt. John V. Loughlin, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for services with Eighth Marines at Tarawa, November 1943.

Lt. Paul J. Redmond, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for services on New Georgia, July 1943.

---

[2] Oak Leaf Cluster.

[3] Oak Leaf Cluster to Silver Star.

[3] Oak Leaf Cluster to Silver Star.

Lt. W. W. Willard, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Baptist, for services with the Second Marines at Tarawa, November 1943.

Lt. William W. Lumpkin, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Episcopal, for services as division chaplain, Second Marine Division, October 3, 1942, to March 7, 1944.

Rear Adm. Robert D. Workman, Chaplain's Corps, USN. Presbyterian, United States of America, for services as Director of Chaplains' Division, Bureau of Naval Personnel, from June 1937 to July 1945.

Silver Star Medal

Lt. Robert James Cronin, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for services with Marine Raiders at Puruata Island, British Solomon Islands, November 1943.

Lt. Francis J. Keenan, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for gallantry exhibited while in the Sicilian invasion, July 1943.

Lt. George M. Kempker, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for services with marines at Bougainville, November 1943.

Lt. Francis J. McManus, Chaplain's Corps, USN, Roman Catholic, for services aboard the U. S. S. *Canopus* December 1941, Mariveles Harbor, Bataan, P. I.

Lt. Glyn Jones, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Baptist, for services with marines at Bougainville, B. S. I., November 1, 1943.

Lt. William H. McCorkle, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Presbyterian, United States, for services with marines at Bougainville, B. S. I., November 1, 1943.

Lt. Edmond C. Walsh, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for gallantry and intrepidity while serving aboard the U. S. S. *Suwanee*, while operating off the coast of Leyte Island, Philippine Islands, against nearby Japanese surface task forces on October 25 and 26, 1944.

Lt. Grimes W. Gatlin, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Methodist, for gallantry and intrepidity in action while serving aboard the U. S. S. *Franklin* on March 19, 1945.

Navy and Marine Corps Medal

Lt. (jg) Aloysius Herman Schmitt, Chaplain's Corps, USN, Roman Catholic. Posthumously awarded. Died during action at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Lt. (jg) Herbert E. Van Meter, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Congregational, for rescuing companion near mouth of a river near New River, N. C., July 20, 1943.

Lt. James Woodrow Kelly, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Baptist, for courageous service aboard a warship during explosion and fire. February 1944.

Lt. Bernard R. Boylan, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for distinguishing himself by extraordinary heroism not involving conflict with an armed enemy in removing casualties from a burning vessel in Finschhafen Harbor on August 23, 1944.

Lt. Karl E. Zetterholm, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Lutheran, for saving the life of a patient he was escorting to the naval hospital at Jacksonville, Fla. February 4, 1944.

Bronze Star Medal

Commander James F. Cunningham, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for meritorious achievement and gallantry and intrepidity in action while serving aboard a battleship in June 1944.

Lt. William H. McCorkle, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Presbyterian, United States, for heroic achievement in action against the enemy on Guam, Marianas Islands, from July 21 to August 10, 1944.

Capt. Robert J. White, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for meritorious achievement while serving as fleet chaplain of the Eighth Fleet during a period of almost continuous offensive operations against the enemy of the central Mediterranean from November 9, 1943, to December 25, 1944.

Lt. Comdr. Paul J. Redmond, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for heroic achievement in action against the enemy on Guam, Marianas Islands, from July 21 to August 10, 1944.

Lt. John H. Craven, Chaplain's Corps, USN, Southern Baptist, for heroic and meritorious achievement during the occupation of Saipan, Marianas Islands.

Lt. Emmett T. Michaels, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for heroic achievement while serving with an infantry battalion in action against the enemy on Saipan, Marianas Islands, from June 15 to July 8, 1944.

Capt. Maurice M. Witherspoon, Chaplain's Corps, USN, Presbyterian USA, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services while serving as welfare and recreation officer on the staff of commander Alaskan sector from July 1942 to August 1943.

Lt. Comdr. Merritt F. Williams, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Protestant Episcopal, for meritorious service while serving as chaplain on the U. S. S. *Wasp* during the Solomons campaign, September 15, 1942.

Lt. Charles E. Brubaker, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Presbyterian, USA, for meritorious service while serving with a Marine infantry regiment on the islands of Saipan and Tinian, Marianas Islands, from June 15 to August 3, 1944.

Comdr. Abbot Peterson, Jr., Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Unitarian, for heroic achievement in connection with operations against the enemy while serving aboard the USS *Birmingham* on October 24, 1944.

Lt. Gordon A. Michels, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for outstanding performance of duties with the Marine Corps during the battle for Saipan from June 15 to July 4, 1944.

Lt. William C. Neill, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Presbyterian, US., for heroic achievement in action against the enemy while attached to a Marine artillery regiment on June 15, 1944, on Saipan, Marianas Islands.

Lt. Roderick L. Hurley, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Roman Catholic, for heroic achievement in connection with operations against the enemy on February 19, 1945, as a chaplain attached to a Marine Combat team on Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands.

Comdr. Harry C. Wood, Chaplain's Corps, USN, Presbyterian, USA, for outstanding performance of duty during the battle for Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, from February 19 to March 16, 1945.

Lt. Morton M. Berman, Chaplain's Corps, USNR, Jewish, for meritorious achievement during the Okinawa campaign, as Assistant Division Chaplain, Sixth Marines, from April 1 to June 21, 1945.

In addition to the awards above mentioned other decorations and letters of commendation have been awarded Army and Navy chaplains. If the stories of self-sacrifice and heroism which lie back of these awards could only be written and published they would make a fascinating book. Here is a story that some day should be written.

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE CASUALTY LIST

The July-August issue, 1945, of the Army and Navy Chaplain carried a list of the Army and Navy chaplain casualties in the recent war. The lists printed were from the respective offices of Chief of Chaplains of the Army and of the Navy as of July 1, 1945. Subsequent to that date the following corrections and additions have been received from the offices of the two Chiefs of Chaplains:

Additional Navy casualties or corrections

Navy corrections:

Earl M. Criger, listed as missing in action, should be—Died while on duty, from natural causes, March 18, 1942.

James Edward Davis, listed as being detained by the Japanese, was relased from the prison camp on September 24, 1945.

Killed in action:

Francis M. McManus, Roman Catholic, January 22, 1945, Japanese prison ship.

Herbert R. Trump, Lutheran, December 15, 1944, Japanese prison ship.

David L. Quinn, Episcopalian, December 15, 1944, Japanese prison ship.

Thomas M. Conway, Roman Catholic, July 31, 1945, U. S. S. *Indianapolis*.

Additional names and corrections from Army

Killed in action:

Bacigalupo, Andrew, August 14, 1945, Germany.

Stanton, Loren L., March 26, 1945, Germany.

Deaths, nonbattle:

Reese, Clarence H., August 20, 1945, Reno, Nev.

Butterbach, Herbert F., August 16, 1945, Drew Field, Fla.

Clare, Thomas H., May 26, 1945, between China and India.

Plueger, John H., September 7, 1945, France.

Detained by the Japanese:

Baumann, Herman C.; Braun, Albert W.; Brown, Ralph W. D.; Carberry, Richard E.; Cleveland, Arthur V.; Cummings, William W.; Dawson, William; Hausmann, Carl W.; Howden, Frederick B.; McDonnell, John J.; Reilly, Stanley J.; Stober, Henry B.; Vanderheiden, Joseph G.; Wilson, John A.; Zerfas, Mathias E.; Curran, John L.; Donald, Samuel E.; Duffy, John E.; Taylor, Robert P.; Zimmerman, Leslie F.

Revised statistics of chaplain casualties, October 1, 1945

	Killed in action	Deaths (nonbattle)	Prisoners of Japanese	Wounded	Missing in action	Total
Navy	12	11	------	30	1	54
Army	81	63	5	226	2	377
Total	93	74	5	256	3	431

Denominational representation within Chaplain Corps at the time of Japan's surrender Aug. 15, 1945

Denomination	U. S. Navy	U. S. Naval Reserve	Total
Baptist, North	15	116	131
Baptist, South	15	162	177
Church of the Brethren	0	1	1
Russian Orthodox Catholic	0	1	1
Christian Reformed	0	6	6
Christian Science	0	1	1
Church of God	0	1	1
Congregational Christian	8	114	122
Disciples of Christ	4	49	53
Episcopal	15	174	189
Evangelical	1	4	5
Evangelical Mission Covenant	0	3	3
Evangelical and Reformed	1	36	37
Jewish	0	42	42
Lutheran (Missouri)	5	7	12
Lutheran	14	205	219
Methodist	36	419	455
African Methodist	0	1	1
Free Methodist	0	2	2
Primitive Methodist	0	1	1
Methodist (Wesleyan)	0	2	2
Moravian	1	0	1
Mormon	0	6	6
Nazarene	0	2	2
Orthodox Presbyterian Bible	0	15	15
Presbyterian Orthodox	1	2	3
Presbyterian, United States	4	124	128
Presbyterian, Cumberland	0	2	2
United Presbyterian	1	34	35
Presbyterian, United States of America	21	303	324
Associate Reformed Presbyterian	0	3	3
Quaker	0	1	1
Reformed Church in America	2	14	16
United Brethren	0	12	12
Unitarian	3	11	14
Universalist	0	4	4
Roman Catholic	40	744	784
Total	187	2,624	2,811

NAVY CHAPLAINS KILLED IN WORLD WAR II

Thomas L. Kirkpatrick, captain, United States Navy, Presbyterian, United States of America: Born July 5, 1887, Cozad, Nebr. Attended McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill. Ordained at Chicago Presbytery, Oak Park, Ill., February 1918. Entered naval chaplaincy in 1918. Survived by widow, Mrs. Genevieve Kirkpatrick, and a son, Thomas Ivan, born September 5, 1932. Was chaplain aboard the U. S. S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor; died during enemy action December 7, 1941.

Aloysius Herman Schmitt, lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, Roman Catholic: Born December 4, 1909, at St. Lucas, Iowa. Attended Columbia College, Dubuque, Iowa, and North American College, Rome, Italy. Ordained by Cardinal Marchetti-Salvaggianni, Rome, Italy, December 8, 1935. Affiliated with the Archdiocese of Dubuque, Iowa. Appointed Navy chaplain June 1939. Chaplain on the U. S. S. *Oklahoma;* died during enemy action December 7, 1941.

Edward J. Robbins, lieutenant commander, United States Navy, Methodist-Episcopal: Born April 14, 1896, in Illyria, Iowa. Educated at Upper Iowa University and Garrett Biblical Institute. Entered naval chaplaincy in April 1925. Survived by his widow, Doris Edna Robbins, and four children. Was serving at the naval air station, Squantum, Mass.; drowned while rowing (authorized exercise) in Dorchester Bay, July 10, 1942.

George Snavely Rentz, commander, USN, Presbyterian, USA: Born July 25, 1882, Lebannon, Pa. Attended Princeton Theological Seminary; ordained 1909 by Presbytery of Carlisle, Presbyterian Church, USA. Became Navy Chaplain in 1921. Survived by widow, Mrs. Rebekah K. Rentz, 1186 Laurel Street, Berkeley, Calif. Officially carried as missing from March 1, 1942 to December 5, 1942. The ship on which Chaplain Rentz was serving was lost in battle. Declared "dead in the Pacific theater of action" on March 1, 1943.

Thomas E. Johnson, lieutenant, USN, Methodist: Born August 17, 1908, Burkesville, Va. Attended Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va. Ordained at Lynchburg, Va., in 1934. Member of the Methodist Conference of Virginia since October 1929. Entered naval chaplaincy July 1938. Survived by his wife, Mrs. Ernestine B. Johnson, 930 Carson Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif. Announced as "missing" August 16, 1942 having been aboard a transport plane when the plane was lost between Kodiak, Alaska, and Whitehorse, Yukon. Announced "as presumed to be dead" August 17, 1943.

James William McFall, lieutenant, USNR, Presbyterian, USA: Born June 1, 1901, Anderson, S. C. Educated at Clemson College, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, and Columbia Theological Seminary. Appointed to naval chaplaincy May 1, 1942. His wife, Mrs. Gladys A. McFall lives at 511 West Main Street, Marion, Va. He was on duty with an overseas naval construction battalion at the time of his death, announced by the Navy Department as follows: "Died by drowning in line of duty," December 12, 1943.

Karl Porter Buswell, lieutenant, USNR, Presbyterian, United States of America: Born January 22, 1898, Watertown, Wis. Educated at University of Minnesota, Princeton University, San Francisco Theological Seminary, and Wheaton College. Former pastor at Beverly Hills (Calif.) Community Presbyterian Church. Entered the naval chaplaincy in March 1942. Survived by his widow, the former Ellen Marguerite Goodrich, and two children. Died as results of injuries sustained during flight operations aboard an auxiliary aircraft carrier, December 24, 1943.

Anthony James Conway, lieutenant, USNR, Roman Catholic.—Born October 22, 1910, Lost Creek, Pa. Educated at St. Charles Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa. Entered the naval chaplaincy June 26, 1942. Parents, Martin and Mary Conway, Lost Creek. Assistant pastor, St. Hugh's, Philadelphia. Died during enemy action July 23, 1944, at Guam, while serving with the Twenty-second Marines.

John Frederick Robinson, commander, USN, Roman Catholic: Born March 6, 1903, in New York, N. Y. Educated at Manhattan College and St. Joseph's Seminary. Ordained at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, June 7, 1930. Survived by parents, John Matthew Robinson and Catherine McLellan Robinson, 165 Seaman Avenue, New York, N. Y. Former assistant pastor of St. Jerome's Church, New York. Entered the naval chaplaincy in October 1936. Former assistant director of Chaplains' Division. Duty at time of death, senior chaplain, Staff of Commanding General, Aircraft, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific. Died in an American Airlines passenger plane crash near Marion, Va., February 23, 1945.

Eugene R. Shannon, lieutenant, USNR, Episcopal: Born July 13, 1906, Dresden, Ohio. Educated at Northwestern University and Seabury Western Seminary. He entered the naval chaplaincy in September 1942. Was a former rector of the Grace Episcopal Church, Freeport, Ill. He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Shannon, Freeport, Ill. He was killed when the *Bismarck Sea* was sunk near the Philippines on February 21, 1945.

Elwin James Bina, lieutenant, USNR, Roman Catholic: Born December 6, 1908, Cleveland, Ohio. Educated at St. Joseph's College and Theological Seminary, Hinsdale, Ill. Ordained in 1938 by Bishop James A. Griffin, Springfield, Ill. Assistant pastor, Our Lady of the Angels Church, Cleveland, Ohio. Entered naval chaplaincy March 24, 1943. Survived by his mother, Mrs. Bertha Bina, 13728 Thornton Avenue, Detroit, Mich. Died in a plane crash between Adak and Tanaga (Aleutians), March 20, 1945.

Fidelis M. Wieland, lieutenant, USNR, Roman Catholic: Born April 28, 1901, in San Francisco, Calif. Educated at St. Anthony's Preparatory and Major Seminaries, Santa Barbara. Ordained June 14, 1928, in the Old Mission, Santa Barbara. Former assistant pastor of St. Mary's Church and chaplain of St. Joseph's Hospital, Phoenix, Ariz. Entered the naval chaplaincy in January 1943. Survived by two sisters, Mrs. Gertrude Cronan, 135 Castro Street, San Francisco, Calif., and Mrs. H. J. Zinns, 125 Baywood Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. Died on May 5, 1945, as a result of injuries received during an attack by a Japanese suicide plane on the hospital ship U. S. S. *Comfort*.

Floyd Withrow, lieutenant, USNR, United Presbyterian: Born June 24, 1898, Greenwood, Mo. Educated at Tarkio College, Tarkio, Mo., and Xenia Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. Entered the naval chaplaincy in February 1943. Survived by his wife, Mary Scott Withrow, and two children, Paul 17 and Elizabeth 21, who live at 8137 Kingsbury Boulevard, Clayton, Mo. Chaplain Withrow died as a result of wounds received in an encounter with the enemy on June 5, 1945. He was serving aboard a battleship.

Victor W. Simons, lieutenant, USNR, Reformed Church in America: Born September 3, 1903, Newark, N. J. Educated at Rutgers University, Columbia University, New York University, and New Brunswick Theological Seminary. Entered the naval chaplaincy in December 1942. His wife and two children live at 190 Rock Road, Glen Rock, N. J. Chaplain Simons was killed instantly when he was struck by a train while crossing the railroad tracks near Glen Rock on June 13, 1945.

Joseph J. Kobel, lieutenant, USNR, Roman Catholic: Born February 2, 1903, Elmhurst, N. Y. Educated at St. Lawrence College, St. Anthony's Seminary, and Fordham University. Entered the naval chaplaincy in 1943. Member of the Capuchin Franciscan Order of Roman Catholic priests. Survived by parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kobel, 30 Osborne Place, Rockville Center, N. Y. Was killed June 21, 1945, while serving aboard his ship in an action in the Asiatic area.

Francis Joseph McManus, lieutenant, USN, Roman Catholic: Born January 18, 1905, at Cleveland, Ohio. Educated at Niagara University and the University of Innesbruck, Austria. Entered the naval chaplaincy in November 1936. Was awarded the Silver Star Medal for heroism during a bombing attack on his ship, the U. S. S. *Canopus*, December 1941. Was detained by the enemy when Bataan fell in April 1942. Former assistant pastor of St. Mary's Catholic Church, Lorain, Ohio. Was killed when the Japanese prison ship on which he was a passenger was torpedoed and sunk January 25, 1945. Survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard F. McManus, 6907 Hough Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Herbert Ray Trump, lieutenant commander, USN, Lutheran: Born December 4, 1896, Arcanum, Ohio. Ordained at Hope Lutheran Church, Dayton, Ohio, June 1922. Entered the naval chaplaincy in October 1929. Former pastor of St. John's Church at Perrysville, Pa. Educated at Capital University, Columbus, Ohio. Survived by his wife, Mrs. Stella Trump; and two children, Dorothy Mae and Phyllis Ann, who live at 1392 East Mound Street, Columbus. Was detained by the enemy while serving with the Fourth Marines at Olongapo, P. I., in 1941. He was killed when the prison ship on which he was a passenger was torpedoed and sunk in Subic Bay December 15, 1944.

David L. Quinn, lieutenant, USN, Episcopal: Born March 28, 1897, at Crisfield, Md. Ordained September 14, 1927, and entered the naval chaplaincy in March 1936. Educated at George Washington University and Episcopal Seminary. Assistant rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C. Detained by the enemy while performing his duties at the United States Navy Yard, Cavite, P. I. He was killed when the Japanese prison ship on which he was a passenger was torpedoed and sunk in Subic Bay on December 15, 1944. Survived by his wife, Mrs. Dorothy Quinn, 405 Royal Hawaiian Avenue, Territory of Hawaii. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. L. O. Quinn, live at 311 Chesapeake Avenue, Crisfield, Md.

Thomas M. Conway, lieutenant, USNR, Roman Catholic: Born April 5, 1908, Waterbury, Conn. Entered the chaplaincy in August 1942. Ordained May 25, 1934, Springfield, Mass. Assistant pastor of St. Bridget's Catholic Church, Buffalo, N. Y. Educated at Niagara University and Our Lady of Angels Seminary, Niagara Falls, N. Y. His father, Thomas F. Conway, lives at 1628 Opechee Way, Glendale, Calif. Killed when his ship, the U. S. S. *Indianapolis*, was sunk by the enemy on July 30, 1945.

John Joseph McGarrity, lieutenant USNR, Roman Catholic: Born April 28, 1905, Philadelphia, Pa. Entered Navy chaplaincy June 24, 1941. Ordained June 10, 1933, by D. Cardinal Dougherty, Philadelphia, Pa. Curate for a number of Pennsylvania churches affiliated with the archdiocese of Philadelphia. His mother, Mrs. Ellen McGarrity, lives at 1553 North Fifty-seventh Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Announced as missing in Asiatic theater May 15, 1942. Chaplain McGarrity was presumed dead as of January 18, 1946.

The Westinghouse Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following articles from the April 1, 1946, issue of PM:

WESTINGHOUSE STRATEGY: BYPASS UE, DEAL WITH LOCALS—FIRM HOPES TO BREAK STRIKE; UNION HAS CARD IT CAN PLAY

(By Eleanor Morehead)

The Nation's biggest remaining strike—75,000 workers against the powerful Westinghouse Electric Corp.—is headed for a strike-breaking union-busting show-down beginning today.

There is no question that the company deliberately has sought the show-down, selected the time for it, and skillfully maneuvered the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, into a position where it could not avoid it.

These recent developments have raised two baffling questions:

How does the company expect to win?

Why has Westinghouse single-handedly held out against its workers weeks after its two big competitors, GE and General Motors Electrical Division, settled their strikes by giving the 18½-cent hourly wage boost which UE is demanding from Westinghouse?

An impartial labor expert who knows what has been going on behind the scenes says that the answer lies in a curious UE-Westinghouse situation which the company has pounced upon as a ready-made and legal weapon.

This is it: Some of the biggest and most important locals were certified by the NLRB as the collective bargaining agents—not the international parent union. Only in relatively recent certifications which cover the less important plants is UE named, along with the locals, as bargaining agent.

This means that one minute after Sunday midnight, when the existing contract terminates, the company can approach these locals with a proposal to come to terms on a new contract individually, leaving the UE out in the cold.

Westinghouse is staking everything on this chance to deal separately with the locals, because it is convinced that many of the workers are fed up with the strike and would return to work at any wage increase the company offers. It figures there are enough of these workers who sufficiently dominate the locals to force them to bargain separately and end the strike.

If the locals took this action, it would indeed break the back of the strike which started January 15, and at the same time would strip the UE of its collective bargaining authority.

But the locals can use a simple device to stop the company in its tracks. They can agree to negotiate on a contract, and then name as their negotiators any or all of the UE officials who have been negotiating right along and who have held out for the 18½ cents.

The union says it isn't worried. It believes that the company not only will attempt this move, but also predicts, bare-knuckled, old-fashioned physical strike-breaking, including goon squads, tear gas, and guns.

Westinghouse is firmly convinced its strategy will work. Every action it has taken recently has carefully prepared the stage for it:

On March 2 the company gave the required 30 days' notice of termination of contract.

It withheld its single offer (surrounded with conditions and restrictions which also had to be accepted without further discussion) until March 19, and accompanied it with an ultimatum that it must be accepted by midnight March 31, the hour the contract terminates.

It refused the request of Federal mediators to extend the 12-day period before the contract and ultimatum expired.

It refused the union's request to withdraw notice of contract termination and to continue the old contract until a new contract agreement could be reached.

Finally, on March 22, it refused to continue to negotiate or even meet with the union and mediators unless its offer was accepted in full.

These tactics were so obviously intended to result in a stalemate to be prolonged until the contract expired at 12:01 a. m. today that the special Federal mediators, William H. Davis and Arthur S. Meyer, who were appointed on January 22, withdrew from the dispute March 22.

The company can afford to take its time to win the fight. The stakes are high: If it succeeds, its cheap labor costs will give it an important economic advantage over its competitors. In the meantime, it is secure because the demand for electrical appliances and products is so great that there is no danger that the other two competitors can corner the market.

Moreover, thanks to the carry-back provision of the excess profits tax law, if the company makes no profit this year because of the strike it will get a refund of $11,200,000; if it loses $10,000,000 its refund will be $19,750,000.

PAY SCALES AND WAGE OFFER FIGURES DON'T LIE, OR DO THEY?

Westinghouse has spent thousands of dollars on newspaper ads to tell the public that its March 19 offer was an 18½-cent hourly increase to each of its employees.

This is exactly the amount the workers are striking for. This is exactly the amount GE and GM Electrical Division granted.

Why, then, Westinghouse asks in recent ads, do the workers continue to strike?

This is why:

The offer was not 18½ cents. Even the company admitted, the day the offer was announced, that it was really only 15.1 cents. The unions say it amounts only to 9.7 cents.

The two Federal mediators put the figure somewhere between these two. They reported to the Secretary of Labor:

"The company's offer is substantially less than 15 cents an hour, though indeterminate incentive changes and other variables preclude accurate analysis."

In other words, the "18½-cent offer" was substantially reduced by the wage-cutting conditions which the company insisted must be accepted as part and parcel of the offer, without recourse to negotiation or even discussion on these conditions.

Now, what about the company's claim that it pays higher wages than its electrical competitors and therefore the workers are "being unreasonable in expecting Westinghouse to settle on the same basis" (18½ cents) "as those who have been paying lower wages?"

A report of the War Labor Board last December 29 carries a table of minimum and maximum rates paid to women employees in nine plants of GE and nine plants of Westinghouse. Westinghouse minimum rates ranged from 52½ cents to 62½ as compared with GE, which ranged from 62 to 68 cents. It's the same story on maximum: Westinghouse, 63½ to 80½; General Electric, 71 to 92 cents.

Union figures, which the company has not disputed, show that GE, before it granted the 18½-cent increase, paid maximum rates ranging from $1.30 an hour to $1.54, while Westinghouse paid rates varying from $1.15½ to $1.45½.

Westinghouse boasts of its proposal to deduct 1 cent from its 18½-cent offer to be used toward the elimination of discriminatory pay differentials for women employees. What the company actually proposed was that the workers accept this as full settlement of a WLB recommendation last December which not only called upon the company to eliminate such differentials in an amount exceeding 1 cent, but also recommended improved sick leave, vacation, and other benefits for women.

Finally, Westinghouse's offer did not cover all employees. It excluded 10,000 workers in its plant division, proposing a separate agreement for them.

This agreement was that the company would pay these workers wage rates equal to those paid by competitors in the same area.

This proposal is so indefinite, particularly in view of the fact that Westinghouse has one kind of incentive system, and GE another, and GM still another, that the mediators didn't bother to go into details in their report to the Labor Secretary, and said only:

"The company calculates that these 10 percent of its employees will receive a small wage increase, if any."

These are some of the reasons why the workers are still striking.

Unilateral Action of Britain in Setting Up Trans-Jordan as an Independent State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Trans-Jordan was always a part of the Palestine mandate. Britain derives her rights as a mandatory power from the League of Nations. She had no right, morally or legally, to set up Trans-Jordan as a separate and distinct nation. She is guilty of a unilateral infraction of the mandate.

The action was taken without consultation with the Jewish agency which was set up by the mandate as the advisory agency in Palestine.

Trans-Jordan was an integral part of that mandate. Britain has again abandoned another obligation under the mandate. Trans-Jordan comprised three-fourths of the territory of Palestine. Under article 80 of the UNO charter all existing international instruments to which UNO members are parties must remain unaltered until trusteeship arrangements are entered into.

The treaty signed by the British Foreign Office and Emir Abdullah, ruler of Trans-Jordan, is utterly worthless. It is unilateral and, therefore, unacceptable. She probably wants to present this matter to the UNO as a fait accompli.

But the world knows that the nomad Bedouins of Trans-Jordan, are not truly represented by Emir Abdullah, a mere syncophant of Great Britain, in the pay of the British Government.

Britain's new perfidy means the utter exclusion of Jews from the region known as Trans-Jordan. There is a world of difference between Trans-Jordan and Palestine. In Trans-Jordan there is uttermost poverty as contrasted with the industry and high standard of living, the fine institutions of education, the hospitals, the sanitation, and the culture of Palestine.

The Jewish people have never acquiesced to a permanent partition of their promised land. They voted against it when the proposal was first made in that other infamous white paper of 1922. They were coerced into submitting to this white paper despite the fact that the sphere of the mandate included the area both east and west of the River Jordan. But never was consent given to a permanent separation.

This final separation is not only unilateral, but is uneconomic and ungeographical. Palestine and Trans-Jordan present one economic and geographic unit as the writers of the mandate meant it to be. This unit must be kept intact if 300,000 half-starved inhabitants of Trans-Jordan are to have a happier prospect open to them. Without the benefits of Jewish settlement therein, the progress of Trans-Jordan is doomed. Britain's, not the people's, interests are served.

Under no circumstances should the United States recognize the independence of Trans-Jordan, nor should any member of the UNO and the UNO itself, by any act of recognition give sanction to the unilateral and illegal violation of a League of Nations' instrument on the part of Britain.

First Cargo of Louisiana Yams Moved by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am proud to herald an unusual event of a super fleet of Douglas C–47 planes transporting 10 tons of the famous Red Bird sweetpotatoes from Louisiana to Chicago, from my district, the sweetpotato capital of America, under the auspices of J. F. Dezauche & Son, Opelousas, La., my home town, the flagship of the fleet being piloted by J. F. Dezauche, Jr., a member of the firm. The Red Bird fleet was formally christened by pretty Mrs. Dezauche, Jr., and present for the take-off also were Mrs. Felix Dezauche, Sr., and Miss Miriam Dezauche, daughter of J. F. Dezauche, Sr., and a host of officials of the sweetpotato growers associations, chambers of commerce, civic clubs, Department of Agriculture representatives, employees of the firm, and prominent planters and leaders in the sweetpotato industry in Louisiana.

J. F. Dezauche & Son have a national reputation as being the pioneers in the development of the sweetpotato industry in Louisiana and the United States, and are recognized as the largest handlers of sweetpotatoes in the world. With elaborate ceremonies participated in by our famous governor, Jimmie Davis, at the State capital, Baton Rouge, La., and other public officials, the super air fleet landed in Chicago where they were greeted by Governor Dwight Green, of Illinois, and other officials to whom 5-pound bags of the delicious "Red Bird Yams" were presented. Full-page publicity was given the event in the leading Chicago newspapers, and the next morning J. F. Dezauche, Sr., appeared on the morning radio program of the Breakfast Club, with Don McNeil as master of ceremonies and the same night on the Olsen and Johnson stage show, both, in Chicago, where Mr. Dezauche, Sr., made a decided hit, and I am told by people who heard the broadcast here in Washington that, if the sweetpotato business should get dull Mr. Dezauche can start a radio program of his own due to his cleverness and wit exhibited on that program. J. F. Dezauche & Son in addition to being responsible for the development of the sweetpotato industry, and large handlers and shippers of Louisiana Red Bird Yams operated one of the largest sweetpotato dehydrating plants in the United States, and as a result Louisiana furnished 53 percent of all the dehydrated sweetpotatoes used by the armed forces throughout the world, and after the end of the war we were successful in furnishing 11,000,000 pounds of this delectable and nutritious food to the UNRRA to feed the starving peoples of Europe and other countries. Mr. Speaker, we now have a first-class airport under construction in Opelousas, with three 5,000-foot concrete runways, and after the same is completed I know that Dezauche & Son will inaugurate a regular cargo airplane service for the distribution of Louisiana yams to all of the markets of the world. In conclusion, I wish to say that I am proud of my friends and their accomplishments in the sweetpotato industry, and since the potatoes flown to Chicago were on the market the day after leaving Louisiana, completing the first air shipment of the product in the history of the sweetpotato industry that, the people of the country will have ample supply of yams by air wherever and whenever they want them. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks a copy of the newspaper articles of this epochal event, which is from one of the daily papers from my home town, Opelousas, La., as follows:

YAMS FLIGHT OFF TO CHICAGO MARTS

Six gaily bannered trucks, loaded with 19,500 pounds of famous St. Landry Parish Red Bird sweetpotatoes, left Opelousas early this morning for Baton Rouge, where, with appropriate and enthusiastic ceremonies, the yams were loaded aboard three huge Douglas transports and flown to the Chicago markets.

This is the first air shipment of sweetpotatoes to market, and was staged by Dezauche and Son, world's largest shippers of the delicious Louisiana product, as an advertising and publicity boost for the product.

The potatoes go on sale in Chicago and other Midwest stores, with appropriate displays; some will be awarded from the stage of the Olsen and Johnson show in Chicago—with J. Felix Dezauche, colorful head of the firm here, taking part in the show—and others will be given to the Governors of Tennessee, where the caravan refuels, and of Illinois, and to other dignitaries, with the personal greetings of Gov. Jimmie Davis.

DEZAUCHE BROADCASTS

The air flight of the yams will be featured on the Don McNeil Breakfast Club broadcast over the American Broadcasting Co. networks, Thursday from 8 to 8:40 a. m., and Mr. Dezauche will be a guest speaker on the program.

The potatoes are packed in special mesh 5-pound bags which are, in turn, packed in groups of 10 in special manila bags designed for the purpose.

The flight took off from Harding Field at noon, after a broadcast at 11:55 a. m., by Governor Davis, Mr. Dezauche, and other well-wishers.

The flight is being made in planes operated by the Zimel Air Freight lines, a St. Louis concern, with former Flying Tigers fliers as pilots. John F. Dezauche, Jr., a member of the Dezauche firm and a private flyer, will copilot one of the planes, as will John Thistlewaite, Daily World editor and a former Marine pilot. Others making the trip are James Bourdier, Opelousas newspaperman; E. A. Moise, of the Dezauche firm, and Felix Dezauche and his daughter, Miriam.

The event is being publicized by full-page advertisements in Chicago papers, in produce journals, and in Louisiana and other newspapers.

Ten 5-pound sacks of the sweetpotatoes will be given away by Olsen and Johnson nightly for five nights, and one member of the audience each evening will also be awarded a $25 savings bond by Dezauche and Son.

In addition to Governor Davis, others who took part in the send-off proceedings were Louisiana Commissioner of Agriculture Harry D. Wilson; Caye Nelson, director of marketing and industry, and Dr. Julian C. Miller, widely known LSU horticulturist and developer of sweetpotato breeds.

The planes will stop at Memphis, Tenn., for refueling, where they will be greeted by Mayor Walter Chandler and E. B. Hale, Tennessee commissioner of agriculture. The flight will remain overnight in Moline, Ill., so as to arrive on schedule at 9 a. m., Wednesday in Chicago, where Gov. Dwight Green of Illinois, and Mayor Ed Kelly will welcome the Louisianians.

Draja Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 27, 1946.*
Congressman ALBERT THOMAS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am writing this letter in connection with the recently announced arrest of Draja Mihailovich, Chetnik leader in Yugoslavia. The arrest was announced by Tito, the Earl Browder of Yugoslavia.

On July 15, 1944, I was returning to Italy from a bombing mission at the Ploesti oil fields, and was forced to parachute into the hills of Yugoslavia due to the damage our ship (B–17) had suffered from antiaircraft fire and fighter attack at the target. Eight men out of our crew of 10 were rescued from Germans by the Chetniks. For about 2 months we were concealed in small villages, fed and clothed by these people in the hills who worshiped the leadership of Draja Mihailovich. During this time we traveled to the Chetnik headquarters and had the pleasure of meeting Mihailovich. Until we were finally liberated we lived in and around the Chetnik headquarters, eating food that was very precious and scarce.

The request of these people was that we upon our return to America would champion their cause, by telling something of their resistance against the Nazis as well as the forces of communism that were seeking to dominate their country under Moscow's Tito.

It is very probable that I do not understand all of the circumstances involved, but in view of the fact that no less than 500 American airmen received similar aid from this man something should be said in his behalf.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM B. HARRELL, Jr.,
Captain, Air Corps Reserve.

The President Threatens To Veto Minimum-Wage Bill Giving Farmers Parity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are told the world is starving. It is looking to the American farmer for salvation. But, the farmer of America is confronted today with some desperate situations of his own. These are situations created by Government and in addition to the usual hardships and risks nature provides him.

The American farmer is confronted by rising costs of living and falling profits on his own products. He is confronted with a strike of 30,000 CIO farm-equipment union workers who have been idle more than 2 months now while the farmers have been begging for farm machinery. The American farmer is confronted by official plans which will not only mean a drop in prices of what he sells but will mean their drop to the world level. The farmer is confronted with orders just issued by the Federal Government which limit his use of grain to feed his stock.

In my own district many dairy farmers are quitting business because of this situation and are sending their cows to the slaughter pens. The OPA consistently refuses them any adequate relief. The Department of Agriculture has dealt Missouri dairy and poultry farmers a blow during this present feed shortage by allocating many thousands of tons of proteins, 19,394 tons, in March alone, for fertilizer for tobacco; 431,556 tons were allocated in the Nation at large for the same purpose in March. It is little wonder that there is a butter and milk products shortage. The farmer, among other things, is still harassed by lack of adequate farm labor. His sons are still being drafted in violation of the Tydings amendment which says no farmer should be inducted if he can't be replaced on the farm. The President supported that amendment when in the Senate. Now he fails to enforce it and, in fact, has vetoed a bill passed by Congress reaffirming the intent of the Tydings amendment. Yes; labor on the farm is still scarce. So scarce that 75,000 farm laborers will be recruited and brought to the United States this year from Mexico and the West Indies; 92,000 such workers came in 1945, to supplement the efforts of 122,000 prisoner-of-war farm laborers. Very few veterans are returning to the farms, the Department of Agriculture reports, because they can make more money for easier work and shorter hours in the factories. So now what happens? Now comes the pay-off.

The President has sent word to the United States Senate, through Majority Leader ALBEN W. BARKLEY, that he will veto the minimum wage increase bill if the Russell-Pace farm parity amendment is attached to it. Notwithstanding this action of the President, the Senate adopted such an amendment. I shall vote for it in the House. I shall vote to override the Presidential veto.

What is this amendment to which the President and his administration objects? It is simply an amendment which would write the cost of farm labor into the parity formula. In other words, for the first time, the farmer would be paid for his labor which goes into production of the things he sells. The minimum wage increase bill is advanced by the administration to raise the wages of industrial workers from 40 cents per hour to 65 cents now and 75 cents later. But, it leaves out the farmer. The farmer would not get anything if the President's views prevail. The farmer is being discriminated against in favor of the union workers. The farmer is being asked to pay more for the things he has to buy, and thus to pay for the increased minimum wages of industrial labor, but he is not to get a dime for his own labor. His prices are to be held down, down, down. How can he make ends meet? Oh, the Government promises it will pay him a subsidy to keep him off relief. But the farmers of this country are entitled to more than a subsistence living.

If the cost of farm labor is added to the price of farm products, would it increase the price of food in the grocery stores patronized by city consumers? The administration says yes and, assuming this to be a fact, refuses to help the farmer. What are the real facts? Fact No. 1 is that the CIO-PAC, which is making Government policy on this question, is wrong. Prices paid the farmer do not make food unduly expensive. Just compare the prices the farmer gets to the price of food in the stores. That will answer any doubting Thomases.

Fact No. 2 is that higher farm prices would benefit all people. Prices paid the farmer determine whether the Nation's income shall be high or low. Agricultural raw materials and income determine the number of jobs and wages which can be paid. We have in our economy 9,000,000 business units of which 3,000,000 are nonagricultural and 6,000,000 are the individually owned and operated farms. Our farms have about two-thirds of the capital investment in productive enterprise. When war broke out, our farms had 10 times the capital investment of our steel and automobile industries combined and employed 10 times as much labor. Agriculture produces 65 percent of the raw-material income of the Nation and the processing of agricultural products makes up almost two-thirds of our manufacturing industry.

These and other factors result in agricultural income being the main governing factor in national income. Each dollar of farm income creates $1 for payment of factory pay rolls and $7 of national income. This formula has been approximately constant since 1921. As farm prices rise or fall, national income follows close behind. If present policy is permitted to continue our national income will go down and we will have great unemployment.

The farmers are the lowest income group in the Nation. In order that they may know where to put responsibility for this situation and for the efforts to keep them on the bottom, I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1946, some excerpts from Senate debate which throw light on that question:

Senator BARKLEY. I do not rise to occupy the time of the Senate in discussing the bill or the amendment further than to advise the Senate concerning a matter which I have been requested to advise it by the President of the United States. As we all know, the President has repeatedly recommended minimum-wage legislation. He recommended the fixing of the minimum at the 65-cent figure contained in this bill. * * * But he feels that he is compelled, and he has authorized me to say to the Senate, that if the Pace amendment as carried now in the Russell proposal is adopted by the Senate and comes to him as part of the legislation which we are now considering, he will be compelled to veto the measure.

Senator RUSSELL. I am a Democrat. I belong to the party of Thomas Jefferson. I have always believed in his immortal pronouncement of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. That is the essence of democracy. We will come to a sorry pass in our Nation when the Senate cannot freely pass on the merits of legislation unless it has been approved by some great political bloc in this land and without threats as to the course of the Executive if we fail to conform to his views. * * * The Political Action Committee may take over my party but it will not take over the Senator from Georgia. My position on this legislation is absolutely unchanged as a result of this message. I shall retain my independence of thought and action. * * * The aristocrats of labor have already got theirs. An increase of 18½ cents an hour above existing wages was selected by the administration as a standard, and has been imposed in practically every large industrial organization in this land. That is not considered inflationary by those who oppose this farm amendment. It brings about an increase in the cost of steel and every article which the farmer must buy. The increase of 18½ cents per hour which went to the highly organized labor groups is not inflationary—or so we are told by Mr. Bowles and those who would slay this amendment, including even the President of the United States. I am not critical of the increases secured by organized labor groups. I am pointing out the injustice of confining increases to those who are politically powerful and am advocating a policy of equality for all the underpaid.

Mr. Speaker, I share the views expressed by the Senator from Georgia on this problem which so vitally affects the farmers of America and the millions of starving people abroad who must rely on the American farmer to overcome governmental obstacles and come to their rescue, as he has been asked to do and wants to do, with increased production.

Flood Control and Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address which I delivered at the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., Monday, March 25, 1946:

The improvement of rivers and the protection of valleys are among the most important functions of the Government of the United States.

While flood control was not declared to be a national problem until 1928, and while a national policy of flood control was not adopted until 1936, unparalleled progress has been made. Under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army improvements have been constructed along the principal rivers and in the principal valleys of the United States.

The President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, eliminated all flood control and all reclamation and all river and harbor works except to protect defense installations for the duration to win the war, and in October 1943 under War Production Board L–41 all priorities for materials for dams, flood walls, and other improvements were denied. Major floods continued. Lives were lost and property was destroyed. We sacrificed much in flood control to win the war.

Projects begun were unfinished and it was understood that work would be resumed following the cessation of hostilities.

While construction was halted, the advocates of flood control in and out of Congress were not idle. There was sound planning. The Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for construction following the war was the largest and most important authorization for flood control ever passed by Congress.

IMPORTANCE

Rivers are among the Nation's most valuable assets and are nature's contribution to the progress of people. They are the property of the people and should be improved for their benefit. Harbors must be kept open. Impediments to navigation must be removed. Bars must be eliminated. Channels must be deepened. People and property must be protected from overflows.

Rivers have shaped the course of history. They have played a major part in mythology. They figure in fables, legends, and traditions.

The Garden of Eden, according to the Bible, was located in the fertile valley between the rivers Tigris and Euphrates. The Egyptians worshipped the Nile as a goodess and without the Nile there would have been no Egyptian civilization. The Romans cast offerings into the Tiber and worshiped the river that flowed through the Eternal City. The East Indians regard the Ganges as sacred and to bathe in its waters is a part of the religious rites of the people. According to the ancients Sharon ferried the departed souls across the river Styx.

Many legends and poems have been woven around the Rhine in Europe. The Indians of North America called the Mississippi River the Father of Waters and worshiped it as such. Mark Twain would probably never have become famous nor would he have given us the delightful story of Huckleberry Finn if it had not been for his familiarity with the Mississippi River.

John Muir, as a young man, said "There is nothing more eloquent in nature than a mountain stream." Henry D. Thoreau delighted in the companionship of rivers. His stories of the Concord and the Merrimac Rivers are not only entertaining but wonderfully revealing. One of the most interesting books of Henry Van Dyke is Little Rivers. There is a charm about the brooks and streams that are "over the hills and far away."

RESUMPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS

It was appropriate, as we turned from war to peace, that flood-control improvements that had been discontinued should be resumed and that appropriations should be made for funds that had been diverted or impounded for the prosecution of the war. Following VJ-day President Harry S. Truman recommended deficiency appropriations primarily for the resumption of flood-control work on projects stopped because of the war as well as for reclamation and highway construction. The Subcommittee on War Department Civil Functions recommended substantially the amounts proposed by the Budget. The Committee on Appropriations did not include flood-control appropriations in the bill reported, but appropriations were included for Federal-aid highways and for reclamation. A spirited contest followed. The advocates of flood control were on solid ground. A famous victory was won. The appropriations were made.

It is essential for the general welfare that the normal public-work activities of the Government following war be resumed. Highways have deteriorated. Reclamation is essential for the production of food, and improvements on rivers imperative to protect lives and property.

AUTHORIZATION BILL

The problems of flood control are not static. They are continuous and progressive. Floods occur along some rivers one year and along other rivers in other years. Many surveys and studies have been made, but reports on all rivers and streams have not been submitted. Reviews in the light of recurring floods are often required. Annual authorizations certainly in normal times are in order. After a lapse of 2 years additional authorizations are now imperative. Reports have been submitted where projects should be authorized since the passage of the last flood control act.

The Committee on Flood Control has announced that hearings on an authorization bill for 1946 will begin on April 8. It is planned to report and to pass before the adjournment of Congress an adequate authorization bill.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public works are required for the normal functions of the Government. Flood control improvements are necessary in normal times. But public works should be increased when there is slack in private construction. There should be adequate plans for sound Federal, State, and local works to stimulate employment in periods of depression. In prosperous times construction accounts for some 15 per cent of the national income.

The United States is determined to profit by the depression following the First World War and by the great depression following the crash of 1929. We have in mind the mistakes to provide in time for employment. There must be no repetition of work relief. There must be no projects where the benefits do not exceed the costs. It is essential that there be an adequate shelf with adequate plans for flood control and other public works, not only for the normal functions of the Government, but for periods of crisis and of unemployment.

Economic dislocations in at least portions of the country occur annually. It is the part of statesmanship to provide in advance to prevent the distress and unemployment of depressions. Public works should be thoroughly considered. Plans should be ready. The projects should be sound. Construction should be capable of being expanded and enlarged to stimulate employment in periods of distress. Private construction must go on, but there is a proper place in our economy for public construction.

The Committee on Flood Control therefore plans to include in the flood control bill of 1946 additional authorizations in all of the principal regions of the United States, and the committee will continue the policy of approving only such additional projects as are favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers where the benefits exceed the costs.

WASTED OPPORTUNITY

Congress provided for reconversion. It was essential to turn from the destruction of war to the construction of peace. There was an unequaled and a marvelous opportunity for production following the war. Prosperity awaited management and labor. Unfortunately the plans for reconversion were thwarted. Strikes ensued. Production has been halted. Losses that cannot be replaced have occurred. The public has suffered. Discord supplanted cooperation. Strife and strikes prevented production. The American people suffered. Strikes have resulted in economic chaos.

The ball was muffed. Mistakes were made. Strike followed strike to obtain increased wages. Increased wages were encouraged but increased prices were denied. The policy was utterly unsound. Ceilings have been in effect under price administration. The American people have been assured that the prices were reasonable and that the ceilings were fair. Wage increases were not only encouraged but they were approved with the announcement that the manufacturers would absorb the increases. Prices remained. Price control obtained. Strike followed strike. Discord followed discord. Production stopped.

Economic chaos has obtained for four valuable months. The civilian population of the United States has been denied essential requirements. The farmer has been denied equipment to produce food not only for the United States but for the starving millions of other lands. He was denied equipment during the war. He recognized that war must come first. The housekeeper did without washing machines and refrigerators. Priorities for war had deprived the farm and home of essentials and of comforts. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to recoup from the billions and billions of losses resulting from the strikes of the past 4 months. We have wasted the opportunity for the greatest peacetime production ever known. A bigger piece of pie is impossible without baking a bigger pie. Increased wages must be followed by increased prices. The public must, and inevitably will, foot the bill.

STRIKES

In the nineties, and again following the twenties, the Government intervened to restrain the selfish and irresponsible exercise of vast power by management and by capital. The Utility Act and the Securities Exchange Act were passed. Capital rode to a fall. Today the exercising of unprecedented power by labor organizations threatens to destroy a helpless public. Labor is riding to a fall.

While I favor collective bargaining, the public must be protected. The effect of strikes upon the great mass of the people is paramount. The strike is a weapon, but it can be a dangerous weapon, and when dangerous its use should be restricted. Strikes have now reached the point where there is not only serious injury to the public economy but I emphasize that the public is being deprived and that the public is making sacrifices that the public ought not to be called upon to make.

It is time for action. It is time for the Congress to assume and to exercise our responsibilities as the representatives of the many rather than the spokesmen of the few. The country demands that economic chaos cease and that order and production, including the production of farm equipment, farm machinery, and household necessities, be restored.

We have had enough of public debate. We have had enough of public discussion. The Case bill was passed by the House of Representatives. Nothing better has been proposed either by management or labor. That bill is now pending in the Senate. While not a perfect remedy for indefensible strikes and strife, in the public interest the Case bill should be promptly passed by the Senate substantially as it passed the House. It will bring new hope to an ignored and neglected public.

LOSSES

Opportunities neglected seldom return. There was never such an opportunity for free enterprise to succeed and to promote the public welfare as followed VJ-day. All of the essentials for prosperity and for full employment were present. War controls were fast being eliminated. Appropriations by the Federal Treasury for construction were negligible. There were all the fundamentals of prosperity under the competitive system. Savings were the largest and the accumulation of money was the greatest in the history of the country. There was the greatest productive organization and the greatest producing capacity in this or any other country or in this or any other age. There were more trained workers than ever before. The need for civilian goods was unprecedented. The demands were most urgent.

The short-sightedness of both management and labor has set back the wheels of industrial progress and reconversion. It is not too late to go to work. It is time for cooperation. It is time for the Congress of the United States, as the representatives of the many rather than the spokesmen of the few, to see that selfishness in both management and labor ceases and that the American people receive the too-long-delayed consideration to which they are entitled.

We may not recoup the staggering losses of the short-sightedness of Government, management, and labor in the past 4 months, but we can at least undertake to correct the mistakes that all now see have prevented not only reconversion and production but have resulted in staggering losses that may precipitate sooner than expected widespread unemployment.

REGIONAL AUTHORITIES

The agitation for regional authorities was on during the consideration of, and at the time of the passage of, the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. A Missouri Valley Authority was urged. The Tennessee Valley Authority was cited in behalf of a Missouri Valley Authority. I insisted then, as I maintain now, that rivers and river valleys are different. There are no arid regions along the Tennessee River. The Tennessee Valley Authority is primarily a power project. The outstanding flood-control problem in that valley is at Chattanooga. The Tennessee Valley Authority will not provide for its solution. Congress included in the Flood Control Act of 1941 a project for the protection of the city of Chattanooga. The problem of the upper Missouri is reclamation and power. The problem of the lower Missouri is flood control and navigation. Reclamation under the Bureau of Reclamation and flood control under the Corps of Engineers are authorized along the Missouri in the Flood Control Act of 1944. It is now time for agitation and controversy to cease and for construction to begin.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The chief objection to a general adoption of regional or valley authorities has to do with the probable effect on the Corps of Engineers of the War Department and consequently on the state of national defense. Authorities plan to use their own engineers. The Corps of Engineers would thus be deprived of their traditional means of obtaining training and experience in peace for its vital tasks in war. It was no accident that in World War II many of the outstanding engineering accomplishments as well as the miracles of advance and supply of the United States Army were achieved by the Army engineers. A long list of high-water fighters won distinction in the war theaters.

The present Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, rendered conspicuous and valuable service in Iran and India. Maj. Gen. R. W. Crawford, president of the Mississippi River Commission, went to Egypt in January 1942 as commanding general, Services of Supply in the Middle East. Later he was in charge of the administration of supply and transportation under Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Maj. Gen. Thomas B. Larkin, deputy commanding general and chief of communications zone in the European theater was for many years engaged in river and harbor work. Lt. Gen. John C. H. Lee, chief of supply on the staff of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Deputy Commander in Chief was an outstanding district and division engineer for years. Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connolly built the Russian supply base in Iran. Maj. Gen. Daniel Noce trained the amphibian engineers who took part in the European and Pacific invasions. Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick built the Ledo Road. Maj. Gen. William Hoge constructed the Alaskan highway and was the first to bridge the Rhine in the European invasion. Lt. Gen. Daniel I. Sultan was the commander of the American forces in Burma.

The Corps of Engineers has a background and experience in river control and river improvement unequaled in the world. They have planned, they have built, and they have operated all of the flood-control programs for the Mississippi, the Ohio, the White, the Red, and many other rivers. When we have a Corps of Engineers of this type at our disposal it simply does not make sense not to use them.

RECLAMATION

Nor do I see why the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior should not carry on with its outstanding record of reclamation projects accomplished for the Government since 1902. It has demonstrated its worth. It should not be scrapped.

NOT USED

Neither the Corps of Engineers nor the Bureau of Reclamation have been used by the Tennessee Valley Authority. There have been duplications. The taxpayers footed the bill. I mention other duplications. The Soil Conservation and the Forest Service, of the Department of Agriculture, are doing work in other parts of the country that is being duplicated by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SOCIAL PLANNING

The authorized project for the Missouri River, however, does not include any social or cultural planning. They are not synonymous with flood control and land reclamation. There are some things a community can do for itself far better than the Government can do for it. There are some things that a community should do for itself if it is to retain its strength and its initiative. The community can do better social and cultural planning for itself than the Government can do for it.

One other reason why I oppose valley authorities is that the opportunity for using funds appropriated by Congress for social planning obtains. The language of the authorizations for valley authorities is couched in such terms that social planning is most inviting to those who would remake and reform the country. I believe in social planning, but I oppose it when it results in one pattern for all communities.

CAUTION

As I have indicated, the authorizations in the Flood Control Act of 1944 are for postwar construction. Materials are scarce, labor is scarce, but we must provide for the functioning of the agencies disrupted by war. While the needs for works are great, the taxpayers are entitled to a dollar's worth of efficient construction for every dollar expended. Labor is not only scarce, but it is high. I am not disturbed if flood-control construction does not reach its stride for the next 12 months. There is ample work for all now who desire employment. In a year or two the situation will become normal. The need for employment will be greater. The time to expand the program and the time actually to construct under appropriations made will be when there is greater need for employment than today.

PRIORITIES

Slogans sound well, but often they cannot stand critical examination. Veterans by the millions are returning to civilian life. They are not the same as when they left home. I do not condemn them for not going to work the day after they are discharged. They have been in camps. They like to be in town. There is a tendency to locate in the city.

There is a need for housing, but there has not been such a great increase in the population of the country or in the need for housing as many contend. We have provided for housing for our veterans. We have given them priorities. We are arranging for them to attend school and college. We have expanded our housing facilities. No country has ever been more generous than the United States with its veterans.

There are those who believe in state control and state regimentation. There has been a lack of production of lumber and materials. There is a scarcity of houses. It is insisted that ceilings and priorities will result in increased housing, especially for veterans. There is a place for housing. I favor adequate housing for our returning soldiers, but a soldier wants a job. Jobs mean employment. Jobs are synonymous with work. There must be furniture, stoves, and refrigerators in the house when it is built. There must be equipment on the farm.

I repeat that I am for housing, but it is my view that increased production of lumber and materials and the stopping of the export of lumber and materials will contribute a lot more to adequate housing than priorities and control of prices and ceiling prices on existing or new houses.

I utter a word of caution. It would be unwise, in my judgment, to provide that any construction and any material have a priority over the materials needed for the protection of the lives of the people of the United States. There is no occasion to subordinate the requirements for flood control to the requirements for housing or any other purpose. We must be on guard. There must be no inflation. But supply and demand still cut a figure and production is still more important than control and regimentation. The remedy is not priorities, but it is the production of more lumber and more steel rather than short-sighted policies of priorities.

It is time now to build. It is time now to produce, and we cannot build unless we do produce. Reconversion will be further delayed and rehabilitation will be hindered by the continuance of unnecessary and short-sighted controls. I am for the rehabilitation of other peoples and of other lands, but America has given more and has sacrificed more to win the war than any other nation. With me the rehabilitation of America comes first.

MAXIMUM EMPLOYMENT AND FREE ENTERPRISE

As I have said, the authorizations in the Flood Control Act of 1944 are for postwar construction. Employment is one of the most

important and at the same time one of the most difficult of public problems. There is a place for public works and there is a place for private works.

But employment is not the sole responsibility of the Government. It is not the obligation of the Government to guarantee employment. It is the responsibility to promote employment and to promote it in our free competitive enterprise system. It is most important to remove the causes of unemployment and to remove the causes of depression. I maintain that the removal of the cause is more important than appropriations for spending to relieve unemployment.

We have heard much about full employment in these postwar days. There are those who insist that it is the duty of the Government to assure every citizen a job. The vice of the program for Government full employment is that it leads to state socialism. The vice is that if the citizen is not employed in private industry, an expenditure or investment will be made by the Federal Government to provide a job.

With the scarcity of labor that now obtains and with strikes that ignore the welfare of the public, I know of nothing that would so undermine the foundations of the Republic as for Congress to pass a law that would assure every citizen, whether qualified or not, whether worthy or not, whether he is on strike or not, that the Government would provide him with employment. He would not be encouraged to retain his job. He would not be encouraged to return to his job.

I believe in sound public construction and I favor legislation to promote employment. I oppose deficit spending. I believe in a balanced public budget. I oppose state socialism. Jobs for all is a misnomer. Some workers are seasonal. Some work only a part of the year. There are always frictional workers. There are those who go from one job to another. But I favor promoting employment among all of the people in all parts of the country. Employment is important; but there is something more important even than a job. All are given an opportunity to work in Russia, but the standard of living is low. Mussolini provided for jobs for all. Hitler provided for work for all. But the Italians and the Germans had to work where they were told, when they were told, and for compensation fixed by the state.

Congress has passed legislation to cushion depressions. We have guaranteed bank deposits. We have provided for the supervision of stocks. We have passed the Securities Exchange Act and the Utilities Act. We have provided for agricultural loans. We have provided for home loans. We must provide against the day of unemployment and of depression, but the provisions must be sound. An adequate backlog of sound public works capable of expansion and ready for construction is the best insurance that I know of to prevent continued unemployment. It will be either socialism or private enterprise in the days that are ahead. We have conquered Germany and we have conquered Japan. We have destroyed the attacks upon America from the front. Is it possible now that the germs of the disease that we have overcome will destroy the American system?

We might as well be frank. The conflict is on between socialism and free enterprise. America has arrived at the fork of the road. This generation must determine the way we are to go.

Under private enterprise every citizen enjoys the privilege of shaping his own destiny. The Government promotes his right to work out his own destiny. But at the same time the Government guarantees freedom. When the Government guarantees economic security it destroys thrift, self-respect, self-denial, self-reliance. It destroys initiative. I believe that the trend toward socialism and communism in the rest of the world will be definitely checked in the United States, and I believe that our system of free enterprise will be preserved. We might as well recognize the situation. We are either for or against that system. For my part, I am ready to stand up and be counted. I am determined not to exchange the freedom transmitted to us by our forefathers for a mess of socialistic pottage.

We hear a lot about security. It is time for us to hear more about courage and about initiative. When Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death," he was thinking of something much dearer than mere security. He was thinking of something vastly more important than employment. He was thinking of freedom. He was speaking of liberty.

The Pilgrim Fathers were not seeking mere security when they landed at Plymouth Rock. They were dreaming of something more important than security. As they thought of the tyranny they had left behind in the Old World they dreamed of liberty and freedom sought by them in the New World. They sacrificed security under tyranny for liberty and freedom in America.

George Washington was president of the convention that framed the Constitution. During the deliberations there were many discussions and there was often much wrangling. Just back of the chair there was a painting of the sun as it appeared above the horizon. Differences often threatened to break up the Convention.

But when the Constitution was finally signed Benjamin Franklin, 83 years of age, who had been a great stabilizing force in the convention, arose and said: "I have looked upon that painting again and again. I have wondered whether it is a rising or a setting sun, but I now know that it is a rising sun."

For 157 years the rising sun of freedom has shone on America. It is for this generation to see that the sun has brought to America the highest standard of living and the greatest measure of freedom known in all history, and that has seen America grow from a few struggling colonies along the Atlantic seaboard to the mightiest of all nations does not set, and above all, it is for this generation to see that the light of liberty does not go out.

Just before the battle of Trenton during the Revolutionary War and just before the fateful crossing of the Delaware River at midnight when, through the tented bivouacs the rumblings of the elements could be heard with the chilling blasts, George Washington stood stalwart and stately among the clashing forces of desperation and said:

"We are on the eve of a most important battle. The destiny of the colonies depends upon its result. Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

In the contest between state socialism and free enterprise we must put none but Americans on guard.

A Tribute to Lt. Winston Gerald Emert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many brave men in America who did not go to war. They stayed home and conducted their businesses, applied their trades, followed their professions.

They also stayed at home and hoped and prayed for the safety and return of their loved ones, some of whom did not return. One of these men is an outstanding constituent of mine—Frank Emert, editor of the Omak Chronicle, in the Okanogan country in the State of Washington. His only son, Winston, was reported missing in action on a bombing raid during a critical time in the war.

I knew Winston Gerald Emert. No finer young American wore the uniform of our great Nation.

I am putting the following news article into the RECORD, for I feel that it may be of value and comfort to many other fathers who may read it and who have had a similar grief to face:

STATE PRESS CLUB HONORS OMAK MAN

Award of first prize for feature writing in the State of Washington in a weekly newspaper, during 1945, was made to Frank S. Emert at the annual awards dinner of the Washington State Press Club in Seattle, Friday evening, for a feature published in the Chronicle entitled "His Star Has Turned to Gold."

James McCain, president of the University of Montana, was guest speaker, and Werner A. Rupp, publisher of the Aberdeen World, presented the awards.

First prize in news writing was won by Dorothy Gilbert, of the Richland Villager, and first in editorial writing by M. R. Alexander, of the Winlock News.

Other winners in the weekly newspaper section were: Reporting—second, John L. Fournier, Kent News-Journal; third, Virginia Young, Chelan Valley Mirror. Editorial writing—second, Mrs. Hill Williams, Pasco Herald; third, Don T. Miller, East Wenatchee Journal. Feature writing—second, S. H. Lewis, Lynden Tribune; third, Mrs. Hill Williams, Pasco Herald.

The prize-winning article adjudged by the club as the best example of excellence in feature writing in a weekly newspaper during the year was written by Emert as he sat at his desk looking at a message just received from the Secretary of War announcing that his son, Lt. Winston G. Emert, was killed in an aerial battle over Hungary the morning of July 7, 1944.

It follows:

"HIS STAR HAS TURNED TO GOLD

"(A tribute to Lt. Winston Gerald Emert by his dad)

"Dead! Dead—they tell me. Dead—the lad whom I so proudly held in my arms only a few short years ago—who gave me my first thrill of fatherhood.

"Dead?

"It is not so! Spirits like his never die.

"I see him still as he accompanied me along the streets of Omak, as he cheerfully toiled on the Chronicle, as he represented his high school in debate, as he served as superintendent of his Sunday school.

"I hear his voice in a room at the University of Washington pleading for me to give my written consent to his voluntary enlistment to help fight the Nation's battles in the skies.

"I hear his reassuring words as he left for camp—'I'll be all right, Dad, I'll be all right.' And I think—how true, how true.

"I see him as he proudly wore his navigator's silver wings. I hear his voice as he told me about the planets, the constellations and galaxies in God's great universe. Then I think how his life shines out as bright as Sirius.

"I see him charting the course of a Liberator across the Atlantic. I see him on the morning of July 7, 1944, as he again volunteered—that time to take the place on a mission over Germany of a comrade who was ill. That was to be expected of him. Like the spirit of the great Galilean Navigator whom he followed, he was willing to bear the cross.

"No; he is not dead. He has received a finer sextant, a perfect ship, and charted his

course to a better world, where his ears perhaps are now attuned to the music of the spheres that he studied.

"And his earthly star has not fallen. It has been purified and made permanent. His star has turned to gold!"

An Answer to Walter Winchell's New Smear Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in November 435 Congressmen will be elected. Certain individuals and organizations desire to defeat many of the present Members of Congress; to elect those who, they think, will be subservient to their wishes.

Walter Winchell spearheads the present drive to undermine the confidence of the people in their chosen Representatives, to destroy the people's confidence in the Congress. One of these organizations, the press announces, has a campaign fund of some $6,000,000. The PAC and Winchell, as well as certain publications, made a similar effort to destroy the people's confidence prior to the 1942 election. They did not succeed.

After the election, Winchell asked over a Nation-wide hook-up, and I quote:

How about the voters going after those other saboteurs who landed in Congress?

Winchell knew there were no saboteurs in Congress, but deliberately sought by his question to make the people believe that in some congressional districts they had chosen as their representatives saboteurs, enemies of our country.

Winchell, who prides himself upon his so-called fearlessness, his claimed sources of secret information, his exposing of wrongdoers, was as silent as the grave concerning the activities of a secretary of his sponsor, Jergens, who aided a saboteur.

You may remember that during the war eight German saboteurs landed on the Atlantic coast from a German submarine. They were apprehended. Six of them were executed. Jergens had a private secretary who aided one of those saboteurs, an enemy of our country, in his efforts to aid the German armed forces. She was apprehended and, when confronted with the evidence, admitted her guilt, was convicted of misprision of treason, and sentenced to prison. Winchell did not publicize the facts. Had the secretary or Jergens been a Member of Congress, you would have heard much about that incident.

Over a Nation-wide hook-up on March 17, among other things Winchell said:

Veterans' organizations representatives got a verbal slap in the face from Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan.

Then Winchell charged that I said:

Veterans are the same old Americans they were before the war, selfish and greedy still as they were before the war.

And Winchell added:

Isn't it a little bit early to be slapping the faces of war veterans?

Winchell was referring to a colloquy which took place on March 12 when Mr. John C. Williamson, assistant legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appeared before a House committee considering the possibility of securing surplus housing for the use of veterans. There was no truth whatever in the statements attributed to me by Winchell, as the stenographer's official transcript will show.

As further proof of the falsity of Winchell's charge, let me quote Mr. Williamson. He wrote:

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: As Assistant National Legislative Representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars I have noted with concern the unjustified criticism directed against you as a result of certain statements made by you during my testimony before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on March 12, 1946, on amendments to the Surplus Property Act.

As are other Members of the House, I am in favor of and will vote for all worthwhile, remedial legislation the purpose of which is to assist veterans. Let me add that never at any time have I said or written anything, either as an individual or as the people's Representative, which by any distortion could be construed as reflecting upon the veterans or any organization of the veterans.

It is unfortunate and regrettable that the American Broadcasting Co. should permit Mr. Winchell to carry on a campaign of falsehood, vilification, and abuse against members of a branch of the Government. It is unfortunate that a few people without an investigation accept his statements and turn their criticism upon those vilified, rather than upon the originator and the peddler of falsehood and gossip.

Those who know Walter Winchell, who are familiar with the inaccuracy of many of his statements, with his policy of abuse, pay little attention to his utterances. Americans who believe in fair play should hesitate before accepting his statements, before repeating them, before they criticize those condemned by Winchell, who, perhaps, inspires more bitter class and racial prejudice than any other individual in America.

Last Pensioner of the War of 1812 Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 last, Mrs. Esther Ann Morgan passed away at the age of 89 in Dallas Hospital, Dallas, Oreg. Mrs. Morgan was the last surviving pensioner of the War of 1812. Her father, John Hill and 3 uncles fought with the New York Militia during the 1812 conflict. She was granted a pension by Congress in 1927. Her father was 70 years old at the time of her birth on March 9, 1857 in De Moines, County, Iowa. Mrs. Morgan attained the unique distinction of being the last surviving pensioner of the War of 1812 which ended 130 years ago. In this connection, it is interesting to note that during the year 1945, $31,000 was paid to 54 widows and 1 child of veterans of the Mexican War and there were at that time 2,673 veterans and dependents of the Indian Wars and 24,521 widows and children of Civil War veterans still on the rolls.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include a newspaper clipping with reference to Mrs. Morgan's death which appeared in the Portland Oregonian, on March 14, last. I also include a clipping from the Oregon Journal, which appeared on March 15, 1946:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of March 14, 1946]

LAST PENSIONER OF 1812 WAR DIES AT 89 IN DALLAS HOSPITAL

Mrs. Esther Ann Morgan, 89, America's last pensioner from the War of 1812, died Tuesday in a Dallas hospital. Because her father, John Hill, and three uncles fought with the New York militia during the 1812 conflict, the partially blind Independence woman received a $20 monthly pension granted by Congress in 1927.

Mrs. Morgan's father was 70 years old at the time of her birth on March 9, 1857, in Des Moines County, Iowa. She married her late husband, James Morgan, there in 1876 and came to Oregon in 1902.

NATION LEARNS STORY

She received Nation-wide publicity for her unique position as the only surviving pensioner from the war which ended 130 years ago.

Her father and his three brothers, Jedediah, Eben, and Ludlow, received no pay for their services during the war, and were required to supply their own clothing and equipment. Although he never received a pension, her father was given three land grants in Missouri for his war services.

Mrs. Morgan's grandfather, Jedediah Hill, fought in the Revolutionary War.

Surviving are a daughter and four sons: Mrs. Pearl Johnson and Verd Morgan, Independence; J. E. Morgan, Portland; John W. Morgan, Albany, and J. R. Morgan, Ashland.

Funeral services for Mrs. Morgan will be conducted at Independence at 2 p. m. Friday. A delegation of members of the Daughters of 1812 planned to go from Portland to attend.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of March 15, 1946]

MRS. MORGAN, A DAUGHTER OF 1812

One tie binding the present to the past was broken when Mrs. Esther Ann Hill Morgan, of Independence, Oreg., died Tuesday in a Dallas hospital. She was 89, the last surviving pensioner of the War of 1812, through her father's services.

As a child, she heard first-hand stories of that war in which soldiers were not paid or issued uniforms. Many of them carried their own muskets. They received no cash bonuses when the war was won.

Iowa born, she came to Oregon in 1902. She went through life with only the haziest eyesight because of mistreatment of an ailment in her childhood. Despite the affliction, she did all of her own housework, reared 10 children, plowed, dragged, and planted their farm, because her husband was in ill health.

Through her dim eyes, Mrs. Morgan saw much of life. Her favorite pastime in recent years had been giving life to the pages of history for the benefit of her grandchildren's little playmates. By her stories, they saw the

past more clearly; benefiting from her memories, they can fashion their own futures more wisely.

Cars for Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets.

WHAT IS THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION POSITION ON CARS FOR AMPUTEES

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

War amputees have petitioned Congress and the Veterans' Administration for automobiles as part of their prosthesis. They contend that only with the aid of a car can they compete with the able-bodied veterans in the postwar period. Unfortunately, their requests have fallen on deaf ears.

Even more discouraging is the fact that conflicting statements have emanated from Veterans' Administration officials as to their stand on this issue.

For instance, on March 25, the Washington Times-Herald and other newspapers directly quoted Walter M. Bura, Veterans' Administration director of prosthetic appliance services, as being definitely opposed to supplying these disabled soldiers with such additional benefits.

The next day Amvets and an amputee committee representing 350 patients at Walter Reed Army Hospital, demanded a clarification of the Veterans' Administration published statements. Whereupon, Mr. Bura hurriedly visited the Army hospital to assure all that would listen to him that he had been misquoted by the newspapers.

But during this meeting, however, every attempt to ascertain exactly how Mr. Bura felt about this proposition was met with further negative remarks.

The boys at Walter Reed feel that they are being given a grand run-around by this Administration. They are deeply resentful of the procrastinating and utterly deceitful tactics being employed by high Veterans' Administration officials to side track their car proposal. They are being referred from one committee to another.

These boys who lost part of their bodies on foreign soil fighting in defense of this Nation deserve more respectful consideration than they are now getting from the bureaucrats in Washington. The least that the Veterans' Administration can do for these heroes is to be sincere and straightforward in their dealings with them.

The following clipping relative to the Walter Reed meeting from the Service Stripe of March 30, published at Walter Reed Hospital, is self-explanatory:

"FOREST GLENNERS TRY HARD, BUT CAN'T PIN DOWN BURA

"Efforts of a determined group of patients at Forest Glen to pin down a Veterans' Administration official to a definite statement concerning cars for amputees failed this week, but a promise of a meeting with the VA's advisory committee on prosthetics was achieved.

"Nearly 400 amputees attended the stormy session which saw Walter Bura, director of the VA prosthetic appliances service, evade not too adroitly a score of questions aimed at evoking his personal opinion on the matter of Government-purchased cars.

"Bura entered the meeting a marked man as the result of statements attributed to him by Washington newspapers and to which the amputees, most of them members of the war amputees' car committee, objected. He had been quoted as saying that 'too much is involved' in issuing cars to disabled patients.

"Confronted with this statement, and others, Bura attempted to beat a hasty retreat but was trapped several times by well-aimed queries from men determined to obtain from him an affirmative answer to the question of whether he personally favored the VA giving cars to men who have lost a limb in the war. He never gave that answer directly, much to the verbal disturbance of the audience.

"The VA official, himself an AK amputee, never committed himself beyond a promise to 'be the first to buy cars for you fellows if legislation is passed authorizing me to do so.' He explained that although current regulations now empower the VA to purchase electrically operated vehicles for paraplegics, there is no provision for automobiles. He sidestepped numerous questions as to whether he thought it would be a good idea to push passage of such legislation.

"After the meeting was adjourned officially, Bura was surrounded by a large number of amputees still unsatisfied with his responses. Finally it was agreed that the men should select a committee to meet with the advisory group which Bura said he had selected and by whose decision in the matter he would abide. A meeting of the two groups will be held next month, he said.

"'Whatever the advisory committee decides will satisfy me,' he said. 'I'll go along with the committee, which I think is truly representative. That's all I can say.'"

Our Armed Forces and the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, during the current inquiry into an alleged "caste system" in our defense establishments, one point should be kept clearly in mind by legislators and the public. That point is the fact that the first purpose of the Communist program in any country is to destroy public confidence in the military leadership of the country.

We have just concluded an astoundingly successful military operation which, directed from Washington, has achieved its naval and military objectives on every sea and in every enemy territory. The strategy and tactics of this immense operation were conceived and developed by our professionally trained Regular officers, who have devoted their lives to studying the most efficient methods of securing the safety of this Nation and of all of us, the citizens of the United States.

That this could not have been achieved without an equal devotion on the part of millions of temporary officers and men goes without saying. But it is very certain that without the training given to our temporary fighters by those whose sole profession is the use of arms, we could not, in the crucial time given, have built a war machine of civilians skilled enough to gain victory. A modern war cannot be won by merely brave men who, as William Jennings Bryan boasted, would spring to arms by millions overnight.

Surely we have not so soon forgotten that the efforts of Axis agents, and from 1939 to 1941—June 22—the efforts of all Communist and Communist adherents, were centered upon denying to our Army and Navy the public funds and the public confidence needed to keep our armed forces materially equipped, adequately manned, and supported by the spiritual strength which soldiers call morale.

By all means let us examine every legitimate complaint, and hear every gripe, and use the facts to better our defense establishment. But in the process, let us keep in mind the basic fact that the first duty and the only duty of our professional soldiers and sailors is to defend the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Any charge brought against them which is not founded upon some evidence of failure to honor that duty should be examined with minutest care.

Mr. Speaker, in further support of the facts about our armed forces, I call attention to three articles by Mr. Frank Waldrop, which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 10, 1946]

SOMEBODY'S LYING

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

WEST POINT, N. Y.—There has been a lot of talk in the magazines, newspapers and by opinion-formers of many kinds lately about the "Prussian menace" of the West Point mind and its "threat to America."

So, I came up here to have a look around. And I can report promptly that somebody's lying. I can also report that you will be reading a good deal about West Point from me for awhile, so if you are not interested, now is the time to check out.

I am going to undertake not only to tell some things about what is actually going on at the United States Military Academy here at West Point, but also to throw a little light on the faces of those who are giving out with all this "Prussian menace" talk.

They couldn't have picked a better time, for their purposes, to start an assault upon this place.

As millions of war veterans come pouring home, their gripes against the army are loud and fierce. And often well-founded.

Any officer who has a grain of honesty will admit that in the little things which make army life more bearable, he does better day in and day out than his men.

His clothes have more snap and swank, his food—sometimes—is better.

His pay is higher. He has better off-duty hangouts.

And if the girls in these times don't go for a lieutenant quicker than for a private, then the female of the species has changed, indeed.

The reason the officer lives better is simple and sound.

The army is built around its professional officer corps who take up the military as a lifetime job.

The soldiers under them come and go in a steady stream as enlistments expire.

So, naturally, in order to keep officers of high caliber the civil government provides for them a better standard of living than it can hope to maintain for the changing personnel in the ranks.

That's all there is to the "officer caste" and it makes sense.

To fight and win this latest war, the Army was expanded some 8,000 percent. For every prewar Regular Army officer, about 99 new officers were drawn from civil life.

If from all these, professional and wartime alike, there had not been some officers who have abused their privileges even to the extent of infringing the rights of their men, then all of human nature would seem to have undergone an unprecedented revolution.

But if any honest officer will admit these abuses occurred, it is equally true that any GI who is honest will also have to say that it will always be so.

Reverse the field and make enlisted men of the officers and officers of the men. Would there be privilege and abuse? You know what the honest answer has to be.

No, GI gripes are natural, normal, and inevitable. And they are not the inspiration of these attacks on West Point.

The real attack is simply taking advantage of them in the hope of destroying the United States Military Academy. And why does anybody want West Point to vanish?

That is the story I propose to unfold from here on in. But first something about this place.

The great weakness of American civilization today is exactly that criticism Lord Macaulay made of our Constitution so long ago: "all sail and no anchor." We lack spiritual and abstract standards to which we will repair automatically in times of ease as well as in times of strife.

We are very able at defying authority but not so able at living without it, as indeed no people have ever been, nor will any ever be.

This is a serious as well as a real deficiency, most especially so in a country such as ours which is an unnatural and, so far, extremely lucky mingling of world racial, religious, economic, and other ideals.

Up to this point in our history we have been very successful. We have overcome foreign domination, civil war, and twice have exerted force abroad in a measure undreamed in the history of man before.

Whatever happened to compare with the furious performance of America in 1917–18? In its way it was an even greater military operation than anything we have done in this latest war, because it was started from a very much smaller base, without any logistic precedent and within a limitation of time that we still do not adequately evaluate. After all, we had some experience tables for this second operation.

But still here we are row dominant yet lacking a national spirit. Our churches indoctrinate few. Our schools do worse than nothing. They do constructive harm. They indoctrinate negatively. They teach how to negate, but they do not teach the other thing, because it is not present among their equipment in the first place. They do not teach belief in anything for the things of the spirit are missing in our educational system.

West Point is unique.

Its motto is: Duty, honor, country. And those are not idle words. The cadet is taught positively what duty is. He is taught positively what honor is. And he is taught what country means.

This teaching is not just routine. It is never finished. It is a philosophy and a force of the spirit which has been enriched by instruction, precedent, example, and accomplishment in war and in peace.

These people who talk about West Point as Prussian, and as a school for antidemocrats, speak from the depths of not just ignorance but from the depths of those deficiencies I have indicated above.

They are lacking in the things of the spirit themselves as educators. They have no philosophy which they can make alive for the students put in their charge, and therefore they do not appreciate the aims and purposes and the dedication of West Point.

I am perfectly well aware that all of this is pretty high-flown talk, but I know it to be true. I have an advantage over Dr. A. E. Morgan, whom I cite you in the February American Mercury.

I have been a cadet at West Point and he has not. I am not temperamentally adaptable to Army life but I know what it is. And I know what it takes out of a man and what it expects of him, and I respect the professional officer of the United States Army because I know these things.

I am very much disturbed because I see coming—indeed, it has already come—a revulsion in this country which is going to strike down the obvious because we are now for the moment sick and vomiting from war. Lacking that anchor and having so much sail we are going to say, "To hell with the Army." And, "Down with the brass hats and the caste system and the Prussians and the antidemocrats," and pretty soon "the G—— d—— Fascists in the Pentagon."

In this competitive world—I do not need to enlarge—the Russians have the national spirit. The British have it. The Germans had it. Who thinks we can survive without it?

West Point is a dedicated institution. Except for the most extreme and profound of the church schools, there is nothing like it left in the world today. It has a continuity of history and proud accomplishment that cannot be matched by any other military school anywhere on the face of the earth.

The aggregate of its service to our Republic is little known and certainly unappreciated, and, most important, it can be destroyed very easily, indeed. For do not forget—West Point has no private means of its own.

It is, above all, totally the creature of the public will. It is founded on and maintained by tax money and nothing more. It is a body of servants, and its services can be dispensed with in an instant.

I make here a prediction—that West Point, unless now it is understood by the American people, will be destroyed and that our Nation will be the loser.

For it does supply, in spite of all, a persistent infusion of patriotism into our national life in times when patriotism is unpopular, and that is the essence of its whole purpose.

And so, in sum: If the American civilization is to go on and become a greater civilization, it must have things of the spirit. The schools do not supply these, and for the most part neither do the churches.

But West Point teaches some abstractions as positive and elemental forces of daily conduct.

It never ceases to astonish me to discover how long those teachings live in West Point's graduates after they have left this unique old monastery and have gone out into the world.

And for that alone, if nothing else, it needs understanding.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 22, 1946]

WHO ARE THEY?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Well, now that the War Department has appointed a board of ex-officers and enlisted men to study over the behavior of our Army in the war just ended and see what needs to be done to improve the Army's democracy of spirit, the hell is going to pop.

Already, letters are coming in hot with grieviences and tales of "what they did to me."

Most wartime soldiers start their jobs not through free choice, but by selection of the draft boards. They aren't invited to like all this. They are ordered to do what they have to do because a war is declared by Congress and it is up to them to make the best of it.

Naturally, such a rough deal sits hard with most as it would with anybody. But that is no reason to lose sight of the truth and the facts of life.

And it is not a truth or a fact of life that the officers of our wartime Army were a corps of brass-bound, heel-clicking comics who claimed a natural right to all the credit while their men did the dirty work.

As a matter of fact, by far the most officers were amateurs, not even professionals. Like the men, they were on the job temporarily, and are just as glad to get out of uniform as anybody else.

From Pearl Harbor to VJ-day, the Army of the United States took in 10,400,000 military personnel—male and female.

Of these, 97,000 were officers.

The officers were made up as follows:

From the Regular Army, 18,000.

Of the 18,000 Regular Army officers, 9,000 were graduates of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.

The others had got their commissions either by rising from the ranks, by appointment from colleges with Reserve Officer Training Corps, were selected specialists, or had come into the Army during World War I with temporary commissions and had stayed on after the peace.

So of the 970,000 officers in our Army from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day, 952,000 were temporary, drawn in for the emergency, just the same as the enlisted troops.

Of the 952,000 temporary officers, 28,000 were women—Wacs, nurses, etc.

That leaves 924,000 male officers.

Of these, 72,000 were doctors, dentists, pharmacists, chaplains, and veterinarians.

That leaves 852,000.

Of these, 24,000 wer specialists—scientists, production experts (like Lieutenant General Knudsen of General Motors), lawyers, newspaper and public relations hot shots, and financial advisers.

That leaves 828,000 officers for the fighting arms and services.

Of these, 227,000 came straight in from civilian life with commissions from the National Guard or the Officers' Reserve Corps, made up of men who took military training in college, against the day they might be needed in war.

That leaves 601,000 officers, about 62 percent of all the officers in the wartime Army.

And how many of these do you think were former enlisted men?

The answer: All of them.

Yep. Of 970,000 officers in our Army between Pearl Harbor and VJ-day, 601,000 started out as enlisted soldiers and either rose up through the ranks as air cadets, as graduates of the officers' candidate schools in the Ground Forces, or were commissioned on the field of battle.

An air cadet is not an officer, and if at any point on his way toward a commission he washes out, back to the ranks he goes. Or so it was in wartime, anyhow.

How, then, can anybody make a "caste" out of any such officer corps?

The whole story is phony from front to back and won't stand up in the light of truth.

But you may say the "caste" is not among these. It is the West Pointers. Let's see if that's true. Cadets are appointed to West Point by the Members of Congress, for the most part. A few win competitive examinations from the Army and National Guard and for the Presidential and Vice Presidential appointments.

The vast majority, however, are sent by Congress from the districts and States the Members of the House and Senate represent.

Is Congress a "caste"? Is it a select body of people set apart from the main stream of American life? Take a look.

Congress includes MARCANTONIO, of New York, the nearest thing to a fellow traveler ever seen in the House of Representatives. It includes RANKIN, of Mississippi, whom MARCANTONIO opposes in just about everything, and vice versa.

It includes JAMES WADSWORTH, of New York, who comes about as close as anybody can to being what Americans mean by "a gentleman." And we won't offer a contrast to Mr. WADSWORTH as to gentlemanliness, but you can write in your own name if you like.

The point is: WADSWORTH, MARCANTONIO, RANKIN, and the guy you don't like, all send cadets from their districts to the United States Military Academy. Senators do the same for the States, at large.

Look at the cadet roster for the names of the boys they have chosen. I have in front of me an alphabetical list of all cadets who ever attended the United States Military Academy from 1800 to 1937. The first name in the book is Thomas Roswell Aaron, of Virginia, class of 1916. The last name is Ralph Wise Zwicker, of Wisconsin, class of 1923. In between is reflected by name every racial, religious, economic, and national factor that has gone into making America.

The only distinction of class common to them all is just one: American.

Of that, surely, it is not wrong to be proud.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 16, 1946]

WHAT IS AN OFFICER?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Beginning with the passage of the draft law in 1940 and up through now, about 12,000,000 American men and women have been put through the mill of military discipline. They have learned to wear uniforms, get up at an appointed time, do an appointed job, eat at an appointed hour, and rest when told.

They have had a close-up, personal look at a kind of life now popularly damned in America as regimentation, and by and large they don't like it.

Nobody can blame them much. The military profession is a very hard life at its very best, for the core and center of it is self-restraint and discipline for all, from general to private. And since 1940 the hardness has been multiplied in every conceivable way.

Not only has everything had to be done in a hurry. Not only has there been a shortage of most of the things necessary to carry out a given job. Not only has inexperience been the rule rather than the exception.

But, worst of all, the end product of the whole job has meant a good chance of getting killed. For we were at war.

And war means going out to kill people who are trying to kill you. That sort of thing can get very personal in the long run.

So, naturally it is very simple and obvious that such goings on are bound to stir the deepest resentment.

It takes quite a high order of man to organize and lead people as individualistic as the Americans into any such condition as that outlined above.

To lead them successively through major battles in every quarter of the globe is an accomplishment unparalleled in history.

No other nation has ever attempted such a thing and certainly none has ever accomplished anything even remotely like the global war just fought by the American people.

The fighting leadership of the American Nation has stemmed from two sources, the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., and the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.

The Navy hasn't had to deal with nearly so many people as the Army, and so its officers are not nearly so much under examination of the Nation as a whole.

Therefore, in these articles I have been doing on this general subject I have had little enough to say about the Naval Academy or its products.

But by and large it serves the same purpose as West Point and so when the purpose of one Academy is being explained the purpose of the other is being explained, too.

Perhaps you'd like to know a little more about how the United States finds and trains its professional career Army officers.

A little insight into the actual facts of record may help you to get a true perspective on the postwar reaction of gripes against the "brass hats."

And, more important, it may help you to see what is back of the more sinister attacks on the professional Army officers by the Communists who inflame natural prejudices into a real danger to our Nation's security.

The United States gets its Army officers year in and year out, primarily, from the United States Military Academy at West Point. As vacancies occur in the lowest rank of commissioned officers (second lieutenants) these are filled by law of Congress, first from graduating classes at West Point, then by officers who have passed examinations either from civil life, directly, or from the ranks of the Army or its Reserve officers.

Cadets are appointed to the Military Academy by the President of the United States in quotas and by areas designated by Congress. Most of them are recommended by Senators and Representatives from the 48 States. Others are nominated by Delegates in Congress from the Territories. The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners nominates the quota from the District of Columbia (at present, six). From Puerto Rico, the recommendations are made by the Resident Commissioner.

The Governor of the Panama Canal Zone nominates from among the civilians in his zone.

Heads of selected honor military schools, such as Culver, nominate their quotas and from among the Regular Army and National Guard, selections are made on the basis of competitive examination to fill the congressionally fixed quota.

Finally, the President has a quota of appointments of his own and so does the Vice President. These include a percentage who have to be sons of deceased veterans of World War I and are chosen on the basis of a competitive examination.

All in all, the cadets represent just about every section of American life.

To be acceptable, the cadet must be not less than 17 years old nor more than 21. He has to pass a severe physical examination and must have an education of high-school quality determined either by examination or approved by the academic board at West Point on the basis of the record of his school.

Once in the Academy, the cadet is held to a severe standard of physical and mental training, but above all he is tested in his development of character and ability to lead.

The Army has the view that it cannot send men out to lead other men in battle and into the presence of death unless these leaders have a high sense of responsibility.

To develop that, the cadet is taught frugality, honesty, and other habits of mind that some people now consider old-fashioned and even comical. But still these habits seem to survive generation after generation, even so, and eventually they reward whoever practices them.

And as for the enforcement of discipline, the rule at West Point is that you can lead the American soldier anywhere, but that you cannot order him anywhere.

Looking back upon the performance of the American soldier in World Wars I and II, it would seem that there is something in the system. More in detail about it from time to time.

But this much, now: It is a system that is fundamentally American, grown out of the nature of our country, and it works.

Don't let anybody kid you about that. It works.

Government Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, following is my address before the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., on the morning of Tuesday, March 26, 1946:

Gentlemen, the United States of America has come through a period of enormous Federal Government expansion. While there has been a constant expansion over the history of the country commensurate with the needs of a growing republic, the periods of abnormality are the times when we must be particularly vigilant. Wars are accountable for bureaucratic growth. There is a tendency not to dismantle wartime Government organization as much as we should in the postwar period. Today I propose to call your attention to governmental growth which cannot necessarily be charged to the exigencies of war.

The Nation has gone through 9½ years of fiscal debauchery and 3½ years of world military collision. It is certainly high time for us to carefully analyze where we have been, where we are, and where we are going.

Troubled with depression and despairing our industrial ability, in 1933 we started on a financial drunk. After each special governmental priming orgy, we attempted to sober our fantasies and insobriety by a new session of Federal spending, a new drink of deficits and waste. Then came the war and we were as a matter of self-preservation compelled to go overboard to a new depth of debt never before known by any government.

It must be said, and failure to admit is practiced dishonesty, that a true balance sheet of the Federal Government cannot possibly be produced by either the Treasury or the Budget Bureau or any other branch of the Government. We do not accurately know where we stand financially, and under our present methods of government accounting and handling of funds, we shall never know. We live by financial confusion and bureaucratic extravagance. It is an everyday course in which the right hand seldom knows what the left hand is collecting or spending. The President's budget message to the Congress this past January is a good example. This is not specific criticism of the Chief Executive, but of the system for which he now has become responsible. Bigness in government is in itself an evil.

Under the Constitution the Congress is charged with determining what the revenue shall be. Under the Constitution the Congress is charged with the responsibility and sole authority for appropriations. Beyond these designations by the Congress it is not constitutionally permissible to either raise revenue or expend money on behalf of the Federal Government. In recent years we have grown into a direct avoidance of both constitutional responsibility, so far as the Congress is concerned, and constitutional observance so far as the executive department is concerned. These are most serious indictments of practices which, if continued, spell ultimate financial disaster for the Nation.

As long as the Congress of the United States refuses to properly staff its appropriation committees and continues the present-day practice of easy deficiency appropriations, the wasteful Federal fiscal situation is unreachable. Reform and true accountability can only come through the Congress. Elimination of waste and illegal spending can, to a great degree, be accomplished by tne Executive, but under the bureaucratic monster which is the executive branch of the Government, waste is the designed practice and not the error. Citizens can hardly hope for this bureaucratic monster to bring about its own reform under any situation short of collapse and bankruptcy. The very approach of the Budget Bureau is, How much can we spend? not how little can the Government be operated for? By many in the Congress the Bureau of the Budget is considered the holy of holies.

There has been a trend in executive government to avoid the appropriating authority of the Congress by the creation of an almost endless chain of Government corporations, with authority to borrow and dissipate their own funds. These corporations have come to resemble a sort of inverted Fascist state. They are Government-owned, but privately run by a group of self-perpetuating officeholders who assume no fealty save to themselves, and need not be concerned about reporting a profitable operation to their stockholders—the people.

A great deal has been said in and out of Congress about the growing tendency to establish a government by corporations, and it has been suggested that the growing system is one of danger to our governmental structure in many ways.

The Byrd joint economy committee recently reported that we had fifty-odd Government corporations which, with the many subsidiaries operating throughout the Federal Reserve bank districts, make a total of more than 100 corporations engaged in performing functions of the Federal Government. Many such corporations have been created under the laws of the States, such as of Maryland, Delaware, New York, and perhaps other States. There have been grave questions raised as to the authority for, and validity of, the creation of State corporations to perform functions of the National Government. In one instance, when Congress directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to organize, or cause the organization of, a corporation to handle and deal in critical materials in World War II, the RFC prepared its own charters for several such corporations, and started them on their careers of handling Federal funds. I am glad to say that Congress has abolished all of those RFC wartime corporations except the one created as the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, which, after numerous and questionable Executive transfers, has turned up in the Executive Offices of the President under the name of War Assets Corporation, with the authority administratively, and executively clothed with sole power, to dispose of all domestic surplus war property of the United States. In other words, Congress, it seems, has had little to say about the career of that corporation, as it should have had.

I am convinced that Government by corporations is attended with more dangers and evils than with any amount of good that comes from their operations, for the following reasons:

The Constitution of the United States requires that all funds for defraying the legitimate expenses of the Federal Government shall be raised by uniform taxation; and that the taxes shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution provided that—

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

As shown by title 31, section 628, United States Code, we have had a law since 1809 which provides:

"Except as otherwise provided by law, sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no others."

In a great many instances, Congress has purportedly given the Government corporations power to issue their own notes, bonds, and evidences of indebtedness which are fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to principal and interest, by the United States. There are people who say that, in view of the Constitution and the system established for raising funds for operation of the Government, withdrawing them from the Treasury and the like, it was not within the power of the Congress to give authority to the corporations to pledge the credit of the United States to the payment of their obligations. That claim certainly is not without reason, since the corporate system certainly does tend to inflate the public debt—even to establish a public debt in addition to the one usually referred to. Certainly when a corporation functions on funds raised by its own action, it cannot be said to operate on funds raised by taxation and withdrawn from the Treasury pursuant to acts of Congress appropriating them.

The horde of corporations has become so great and powerful, and so little has been known of their operations and financial transactions and conditions, that Congress recently passed laws providing for the control of their operations, and for a study looking into the dissolution of some of them, or for bringing them strictly under the control of Congress. With a public debt and contingent liabilities near the end of 1945 amounting to more than $650,000,000,000, it would seem that proper and adequate control of these corporations should be speedily accomplished.

The direct public debt is estimated in the neighborhood of $265,000,000,000, but this does not include the numerous public liabilities incurred by the Federal Government. It has been estimated by authorities as competent as any that the total gross debt and contingent liabilities approximate $650,000,000,000. I personally have the opinion that substantial billions can be liquidated without the raising of revenue for the purpose. This must be done through the collection and liquidation of outstanding Government loans and through discontinuance of various lending policies which have, in fact, outgrown their emergency need or usefulness. We have recently passed what is known as the Government Corporation Control Act which tends to bring under the scrutiny of the Congress, the appropriating authority for these many Government corporations. Congress has reorganized its Appropriations Committees so that one subcommittee will review the appropriations for all Government corporations, and all Government corporations will submit their budgets through the Bureau of the Budget. This gives the first opportunity for the Congress to analyze the need of the continuance of these corporate agencies. It is too early, as a member of that new subcommittee, for me to say which of these corporations should be discontinued forthwith, or which should be maintained. A brief review indicates that most of them should be required to begin liquidating at an early date.

There is today a prohibition of the Chief Executive creating new corporations, but we have found even under that circumstance, in the case of the War Assets Corporation, circumvention of the intent of the law. Further circumvention or violation, either technically or intentionally, must be averted and the Government of the United States must be brought under careful fiscal supervision.

I am inclined to believe that the present Bureau of the Budget has outgrown its original purpose, and has been used in recent years as a vehicle with which to whitewash waste and abort congressional intention. As a part of the Executive office of the Government, it has been used as a means for the establishment of policy over and beyond fiscal requirements. It probably will be necessary to eliminate the present Budget Bureau in its entirety, set up in its place a new, revitalized Office for the Budget. One can hardly expect this to come about under present-day extravagances, but it must come if we are to have a new day in the fiscal affairs of our Federal Government and if we are to avert financial disaster.

Come Back to Oregon, Dr. Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, retires as Director of Fish and Wildlife Service effective today. I am sure that all of us who have had occasion to familiarize ourselves with the work of Dr. Gabrielson will deeply regret that he will no longer be the head of this important work. Dr. Gabrielson has had a long and successful career in the conservation of wildlife resources of the Nation and has acquitted himself with great honor and benefit to our country. He has been Director of the Service since 1940, when it was created from the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries. Prior to that time he had served as Chief of the Biological Survey, which was then under the Department of Agriculture. For some 17 years he worked out of the Portland office of the United States Biological Survey. He has been an ardent and deep student of all the problems which have to do with the preservation of our wildlife resources and is the outstanding authority in the United States on the wildlife of our Nation. He is the author of many books and scientific articles, and those of us here who have to do with the protection and conservation of our wildlife resources will greatly miss Dr. Gabrielson.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of these brief remarks an editorial appearing in the Oregon Journal on March 9 and an article in the same publication of March 7, commenting on the life and work of Dr. Gabrielson and welcoming him back to the State of Oregon:

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of March 9, 1946]

COME BACK TO OREGON, DR. GABRIELSON

Without telling why he did it and without announcing future plans, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson has withdrawn from his post as Chief of the Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior. His going out takes a great naturalist from national administration of a great resource. Since he became head of federal enterprise seeking to advance wildlife in spite of the detriments and depredations of modern life, public understanding and support have increased, and the creatures that we sometimes

describe as feathers, furs, and fins have had a better chance. In his notable book, "Wild Life Conservation," Dr. Gabrielson acknowledges there are obstacles yet to be overcome, among which lack of public understanding must still be included. The size of the task he indicates by saying "any national program for the conservation of wildlife and of other natural resources involved presents many exceedingly complex problems, the solutions of which are not now, and probably never will be, fully known."

Dr. Gabrielson, prophet of the great outdoors, will mightily please the people of Oregon if he decides to return to this State which is his home, and to its people who are his people. Oregon, richly endowed with opportunity for recreation, with wildlife naturally abundant, and with the prospects of augmented tourist travel seeking unspoiled nature, needs a man of the Gabrielson type on full-time duty.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of March 7, 1946]

GABRIELSON, WILDLIFE HEAD, TO QUIT

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Acting Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman today announced the retirement of Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, of Portland, Oreg., Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, effective April 1. Gabrielson will be succeeded by Albert M. Day, of Wyoming, now Assistant Director of the Service.

"The Government has benefited greatly by the more than 30 years' service of Dr. Gabrielson," Chapman said. "In the Fish and Wildlife Service he knit together two of the most important conservation agencies of the Government. The present satisfactory condition of the Nation's wildlife and fishery resources reflects his service."

Gabrielson has been Director of the Service since 1940, when it was created from the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries. Before that, he had served as Chief of the Biological Survey, then under the Agriculture Department, since 1935.

DIRECTOR IN PORTLAND FOR 17-YEAR TERM

For 17 years Gabrielson worked out of the Portland office of the United States Biological Survey, Department of Agriculture. He was assigned to this area in 1918 as predatory-animal and rodent-control officer in the Pacific Northwest, retaining that position until he was given increased jurisdiction and a new title in 1934, that of regional supervisor. He controlled game refuges and carried on law-enforcement control in addition to his former work.

Early in 1935 he was transferred to Washington, D. C., as Assistant Director of the Bureau of Biological Survey. While here he was known as a strong conservationist, and acquired the nickname of "Gabe" from friends also interested in wildlife.

Oldtime friends here have not heard what his future plans are but it is believed he will devote more time to writing, probably remaining in the East. He is the author of several books and numerous scientific articles.

The Court Splits a Hair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leo Wolman from the Washington Post of March 31, 1946:

BY ANY OTHER NAME, KICK-BACKS STILL REEK OF FAULTY LAWMAKING

(By Leo Wolman)

The latest of a long series of labor decisions by the Supreme Court is significant because it discloses the only means by which we can hope to achieve some genuine reforms in our basic labor law. In the case in question a majority of the Court decided that the Federal anti-kick-back law did not apply to kick-backs, or payments, extorted from employees by officers of a union and appropriated by these officers for their own use.

The arguments appealed to by the majority are familiar. The acts complained of were an incident of legitimate union activities, the enforcement of a closed-shop contract. The law is not concerned with crimes, or unlawful acts, which happen to be violations of union rules. The intent of Congress is not clear.

A LAW WITH TWO FACES

These grounds for holding unions, or their officers and members, above and beyond various laws of the land, keep coming up in case after case. Thus, racketeering, extorting moneys by threat, intimidation, and force, is a crime if committed by ordinary citizens, but is not a crime if committed by unions through their agents. Forcing employees to hand over part of their contractual wage (the kick-back) is a crime if force is applied by employers, but is not a crime if applied by unions or their officers.

In a more complex situation, it is a violation of the law for unions and employers to conspire to fix prices and bar competitive products or materials from a region or market. It is not a crime for a union to do the same thing by itself, though the economic consequences are identical in both instances. An antimonopoly or antitrust policy appears to apply in this country to some monopolists and not to others. Meanwhile, the public, because of an accident of the law, stands unprotected against the evils of monopoly.

THEY'D BENEFIT IN LONG RUN

All this confusion has arisen out of careless drafting of legislation, the anxiety of Government to safeguard every conceivable interest or right of organized labor, and unceasing opposition to any change whatsoever in existing statutes, whether by amendment or the passage of new laws. Yet, it should be clear from these examples that deficiencies in the law which permit unions to run amok ought to be remedied.

There is nothing punitive about such a legal reform. It is hard to see why unions, for self-protection, should not support legislation which is fair, relieves them from just public criticism and in the long run best serves their genuine interests.

You Are in the Army Now—Dress Rehearsal of What Labor Can Expect When We Get Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, labor everywhere in this country should take notice of what is happening in Virginia, almost in the shadow of the National Capitol, as reported on the front page of the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1946, inserted here:

POWER WORKERS DRAFT "SLAVERY," GREEN CHARGES—AFL HEAD DENOUNCES TUCK MOVE TO BLOCK STRIKE IN VIRGINIA

While AFL President William Green bitterly denounced the action as embodying the principle of involuntary servitude, Governor Tuck, of Virginia, today drafted approximately 1,500 Virginia Electric & Power Co. employees into the State's unorganized militia, subject to court martial if they refuse to report for duty with the State guard in the event of a Vepco strike.

This brings to mind the tactics used by the French Government to break a railroad strike in France before the first war.

After the strike was called to secure increased wages and better working conditions, the Government simply called the railroad men in that country, where everybody was a military reservist, to the colors and commanded them to operate the railroads under threat of court martial—a clever trick that put an end to the strike and left the railroad men right where they were, as far as wages and working conditions were concerned. Now it does not take much in the way of foresight to see what can happen here when compulsory military training has made military reservists of the manpower in this country.

In reviewing the record of what has happened to France since this labor policy was enforced and the spectacle of France today, I tremble to think of what will happen to this country if those clamoring for peacetime military conscription are successful in saddling the American people with an ancubus that seems to have been the undoing of France and Germany.

Terminal Leave for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, for many years military regulations have provided for annual leave with pay for both officers and enlisted men. However, upon leaving the service, the Army and Navy grants earned leave to officers but denies it to the enlisted men. Manifestly, this is unfair.

The veteran feels and to my notion, rightly so, that this constitutes an unwarranted discrimination against the enlisted men. Most officers and the general public agree with that position.

Discharge petition No. 23 will bring out legislation to correct this inequality. A large number of Members, including myself, have signed the petition. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars urge all members to sign this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in my remarks the position of the Amvets, an

organization of veterans of the last war, on this question:

AMVETS POSITION ON TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

It is a familiar fact that terminal leave, otherwise known as accumulated vacation pay, is given exclusively to officers of the armed forces. Enlisted men are out in the cold when it comes to receiving similar benefits.

Because of this one-sided situation 23 Members of the House and 6 Members of the Senate have introduced individual bills aimed to secure for enlisted men the right to receive pay for unused time.

In justice, as well as in good faith, Congress is morally obligated to take up for immediate consideration one of the numerous bills now pending before them. Some constructive performance on these proposals is imperative if the Congress desires to show impartiality to all men who have worn the uniform of this Republic.

In this connection Amvets' position on this issue has been stated many times. Last October Amvets respectfully urged that this unjustified discrimination against the GI's be forever corrected. Again, on November 17, Amvets dispatched a letter to Senator Thomas, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, reiterating its unqualified position in support of the men who have carried the brunt of this war. This was followed by another strongly worded statement which Representative FOGARTY inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more than a month ago. Amvets would favor deducting terminal-leave pay from benefits of any adjusted-service payments hereafter made by Congress.

Amvets believes that this repugnant special-interest doctrine is part of a caste system that is prejudicial to Army and Navy morale. Amvets is anxious to see a real citizens' Army and Navy based upon American ideals, principles, and, more than anything else, fair play for all.

At this point Amvets would like to cite the history, background, as well as the unfairness of the terminal pay as it is now constituted. Research shows that this caste-system compensation is based on a weather-beaten law that dates back to August 3, 1861 (10 U. S. Code, No. 841 Rev. Stat., sec. 1265) and reads as follows:

"Officers when absent on account of sickness or wounds, or lawfully absent from duty and waiting orders, shall receive pay; when absent with leave, for other causes, full pay during such absence not exceeding in the aggregate 30 days in 1 year, and half pay during such absence exceeding 30 days in 1 year. When absent without leave they shall forfeit all pay during such absence unless the absence is excused as unavoidable."

In addition to the foregoing there is another moth-eaten statute dated July 29, 1876 (10 U. S. Code, No. 842), which says:

"All officers on duty shall be allowed, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, 60 days' leave of absence without deduction of pay or allowances; provided, that the same be taken once in 2 years; and provided further, that leave of absence may be extended to 3 months, if taken once only in 3 years, or 4 months, if taken once only in 4 years."

Attention is directed to the fact that no mention whatsoever is made relative to enlisted men, and no amendments to these statutes have been adopted as of this date.

GI's are entitled to 30 days' furlough leave per year, but they are not permitted to accumulate this time, if it is unused. Such a privilege is given only to officers, and for that reason the following bills have been introduced in the Congress to correct the mentioned discriminatory laws that now appear on the statute books of this Nation.

Even more astonishing is the fact that the Congress enacted Public Law 226, Seventy-ninth Congress, signed by the President on November 21, 1945, to allow officers who are receiving terminal pay to secure jobs in the Government service, and thus draw an additional salary. Obviously, this was done under pressure from the brass hats in the War and Navy Departments. Yet the Congress refuses to take up for immediate action legislation to benefit the enlisted men.

The bills now pending in the Congress follow:

HOUSE

H. R. 356. Representative BECKWORTH, Texas.
H. R. 411. Representative FORAND, Rhode Island.
H. R. 1160. Representative BECKWORTH, Texas.
H. R. 2454. Representative BRYSON, South Carolina.
H. R. 2478. Representative RANDOLPH, West Virginia.
H. R. 3890. Representative FORAND, Rhode Island.
H. R. 3894. Representative HARTLEY, New Jersey.
H. R. 4051. Representative ROGERS of Florida.
H. R. 4310. Representative BENNETT of Missouri.
H. R. 4422. Representative KUNKEL, Pennsylvania.
H. R. 4511. Representative GILLIE, Indiana.
H. R. 4518. Representative BENNETT of Missouri.
H. R. 4743. Representative PACE, Georgia.
H. R. 4791. Representative EARTHMAN, Tennessee.
H. R. 4849. Representative SPRINGER, Indiana.
H. R. 4893. Representative MANSFIELD of Montana.
H. R. 4984. Representative GREEN, Pennsylvania.
H. R. 5147. Representative PRICE of Illinois.
H. R. 5505. Representative RIVERS, South Carolina.
H. R. 5543. Representative BRUMBAUGH, Pennsylvania.
H. R. 5409. Representative GRANT of Indiana.
H. R. 5642. Representative ANGELL, Oregon.
H. R. 5637. Representative HAND, New Jersey.

SENATE

S. 721. Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.
S. 827. Senator MCFARLAND, Arizona.
S. 904. Senator MCCARRAN, Nevada.
S. 1552. Senator FULBRIGHT, Arkansas.
S. 1624. Senator SHIPSTEAD, Minnesota.
S. 1693. Senator PEPPER, Florida.

Hap Arnold: Egoist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ben H. Pearse, from the Washington Post of March 31, 1946:

HAP ARNOLD: EGOIST—EVERYBODY EXCEPT THE OLD MAN OUT OF STEP, AND HE UP AND PROVED IT

(By Ben H. Pearse)

The key to the character of Gen. Henry H. Arnold is egoism—fortunately.

By this is meant not conceit, love of the spotlight, nor flair for the dramatic, but a supreme self-confidence that enabled him to overcome obstacles too great for an ordinary person.

Unlike some of the other great leaders of the late war, he never commanded as much as a single plane in actual combat. Yet he won many battles and history may record that he personally changed the course of the war.

Before his Air Force—the possessive is used advisedly—could win the victories in Europe and the Pacific, General Arnold had to win a succession of battles, all unpublicized, here at home.

At the level at which most of them were won he was only a medium-sized potato, a mere three- or four-star general and Deputy Chief of Staff. That is where his egoism comes in. No man who did not feel the pressure of destiny's hand in the small of his back could even have held his own in that company, much less have had his opinion prevail.

Air power was the decisive factor in the victory in Europe, the Strategic Bombing Survey wrote after the war. Air power, Lt. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle pointed out after VJ-day, made invasion of Japan unnecessary.

But to know years before the war that air power would do these things, to persist in his conviction after the Luftwaffe's failure to blitz England in 1940 and to refuse to change his mind when the whole strategic bombing plan was threatened with failure as late as the spring of 1944, called for a sense of infallibility none but an egoist could possess.

LITTLE DOG'S TAIL

One of the first of these secret battles occurred before the United States was at war. The question was esssentially whether we should have an air force at all, or much of one. Unbelievably, there seemed to be more points of view than one on the subject.

Some members of the Cabinet believed we should go no further than the arsenals of democracy line drawn by President Roosevelt, and should send all the planes we made to Europe, principally to the British. There was even a suggestion that if we became involved in the war we could supply replacement units for the Royal Air Force.

General Arnold argued with eloquent obstinacy that all the planes in the world would be useless without pilots and crews to man them. That meant a balanced program of planes, air crews, ground crews, bases, training, and supply lines. If we became involved in the war our Air Force would greatly exceed the RAF. Why have the tail wag the dog? He had to convince both Gen. George C. Marshall and the President before he won out.

That decision laid the groundwork for his Air Force.

Another battle, sometimes called a difference over policy, and this time with the British, threatened our whole basic strategy of daylight bombing. General Arnold was equal to that, too, but it was tougher.

FAITH VERSUS FACTS

A high-ranking RAF mission came over in 1942 for the express purpose of persuading us to shift production from day to night bombers. The RAF was sincerely convinced that daylight precision bombing was impractical and could not be sustained at the price the Nazis were exacting. To prove it, they brought with them secret tables of prohibitive losses they had inflicted on the Nazis during the 1940 "blitz" and that the Nazis had inflicted on the RAF in daylight raids since.

To oppose these facts and figures accumulated by the RAF in bitter experience, Arnold had only his adamant conviction. The "blitz" he brushed off; the Luftwaffe had never been designed for it, but nevertheless could have succeeded if it had concentrated on targets and the RAF first, instead of trying to break down British morale by bombing

cities before it had gained mastery of the air.

To the statistics on RAF daylight bombing losses, he turned a deaf ear. The Nazis had not encountered the B–17 and B–24 yet. Night bombing could terrorize, but alone could not knock out Germany's industry. That would take daylight precision bombing on a vast scale.

The consequences of a mistake in judgment would be far reaching at least, perhaps fatal. The Russians were hard pressed; the demand for a second front was growing. To mount the full-scale air offensive Arnold proposed would take a year or more of preparation. If it should fail then, production of B–17's and B–24's would have to be practically halted while they were redesigned for night bombing.

THE SCHWEINFURT DISASTER

It was just one man's opinion against time-tested experience. Yet Arnold never hesitated a moment to stake the Nation's future on his lone conviction. Moreover, he convinced General Marshall and the combined Chiefs of Staff he was right. The RAF mission went back to London shaking its collective head.

The B–17's and B–24's were successful on the first, short-range missions. As the raids lengthened, however, the Nazis developed a more effective interceptor system that took an increasing toll whenever the bombers got beyond the range of their fighter escort. Then, on one raid on the ball-bearing plants in the Schweinfurt-Regensburg area in August 1943, the Luftwaffe brought out its twin-engined, rocket-firing fighters that shot down 69 of our bombers in one day, a loss of about 25 percent.

No air force can sustain 25 percent losses very long. A few weeks later a similar raid on the same area brought a similar result. Plainly, the B–17's and B–24's would either have to have fighter escorts or resort to night bombing. Since there was no fighter with sufficient fuel capacity for the deep penetrations required by strategic bombing, the alternative seemed obvious.

It was obvious to everybody but Arnold. Daylight bombing had to continue to win the war. With the supreme faith of a small boy outlining a modest Christmas wish to Santa Claus, Arnold sat down and wrote a memorandum, somewhat as follows:

"To Office of Operations, Commitments, and Requirements, U. S. A.-A. F.:

"Within 6 months I want a fighter with sufficient range to escort bombers to Berlin and back. It can be an entirely new plane or a modification of an existing type.

"ARNOLD."

The harried staff heaved a slightly deeper sigh than usual at this latest "impossible" assignment. Everybody knew that every fighter we possessed already had all the range that could be built into it without sacrificing speed, maneuverability, or firepower. Now, without cutting down on any of these, the range had to be doubled.

FORCEFUL REBUTTAL

Not an officer on the staff dared tell the Old Man that anything he said had to be done was impossible. He would merely jump out of his chair, pound the desk, and answer, well, forcefully, "If you can't do it, I'll do it myself." And that would be the end of impossible.

The staff went over all fighters then in production, since the 6 months' limitation practically ruled out a new one. The Mustang was the most economical on gas. They called in the company engineers and went over every inch of it with a microscope.

They moved a gadget here, another there. They squeezed and fitted and figured, shook their heads and fitted again. Finally, they succeeded in creating a space behind the pilot large enough to hold an 85-gallon tank. The added weight in that particular space changed the flying characteristics considerably for the worse, but by using up that tank of gas first she would handle normally by the time combat maneuvers were called for.

To make a longer story short, Arnold got his "impossible" fighter with range enough to fly to Berlin and back, and he had it within 6 months. In a series of air battles in February 1944, the Eighth Air Force broke the back of the Luftwaffe and thereafter flew where and when it pleased.

THE ACHILLES HEEL

Arnold still had to prove that daylight bombing could provide the knock-out punch. The ball-bearing industry, a key to Nazi aircraft production, for example, was bombed out time and time again. Yet, actually, it was found later, more planes were produced in German factories in 1944 than in 1942.

The steel industry was bombed flat, too, yet managed to get along on stock piles. But there was one industry which could not stock pile because there was no place to put it—oil. Without deviating from the basic strategy, the targets were changed. The Luftwaffe's gasoline tanks soon ran dry.

Vindication of his daylight bombing strategy might have given Arnold tremendous satisfaction had he not been engaged in another unpublicized battle, this time with his own Air Forces, over a new plane which later did considerable business under the name of B–29.

Everyone agreed the B–29 was a wonderful idea, but not for this war. Aside from the bugs inevitable in any new model there were the little matters of lengthening all the runways it would use for take-off and supplying a whole tankcar of gasoline for each mission. After all that was said and done, no four motors on earth would lift it off the ground. A new one had to be built.

But for General Arnold the B–29 might never have flown and a lot of things might have happened differently. To all who threw up their hands at the latest "impossibility" he had a stock answer: The B–17 cannot cope with the distances in the Pacific; we must have the B–29. He argued, wheedled, ordered, stormed, and pounded the table until, one fine night in June 1944, a whole flight of them flew across most of China to bomb Kyushu.

HOUSE AFIRE

A few days after Pearl Harbor a colonel in charge of aircraft-warning units was called in and asked how many it would take to man stations on certain islands between Hawaii and Australia, and how long before they could sail.

After some mental calculation the colonel estimated four battalions, the first of which would be ready in about 6 months. The colonel tells the story:

"The general looked at me as though I must have misunderstood, and then said, 'You don't seem to realize, Colonel, that the house is on fire. You haven't time now to get out the mail-order catalog and order a hose.'

"Reaching for the squawk box he buzzed personnel. 'Set up space for four aircraft-warning battalions to sail from San Francisco in 30 days,' he said. 'Colonel ——— is on the way down to tell you how much he needs.'

"Still muttering to myself, I went down to personnel to try to wangle more time. The equipment was still experimental and not in production. We only had two battalions in the whole Air Force and their training was at about the same stage as that of the one on duty the morning of Pearl Harbor. Four battalions in 30 days? It couldn't be done.

"How much sympathy did I get? Why, my dog at least looks at me when I talk to him. This personnel guy, an old friend of mine, too, just said, 'The general says 30 days. Better have 'em ready.'

"Well, they were ready. That experimental equipment became permanent that same day and we had enough aboard when the ship sailed 30 days later for four battalions. They trained on the boat, each island detachment under a doctor of philosophy and radar experts we had yanked out of college and factory laboratories all over the country. They learned how to set up a warning station by setting one up, and trained on spotting planes with live, Jap Zero bait.

"And they did a bang-up job, including some fine work leading up to the Coral Sea Battle. But if it hadn't been for General Arnold they wouldn't have been there because I would have told anybody it couldn't be done—except him."

THE ARNOLD HALLMARK

It was his almost messianic faith in the potential of air power that, come presidents, prime ministers, generals, admirals, and the enemy, enabled him to overwhelm opposition. Only an egoist can successfully maintain that everybody is out of step except himself.

That is why the pronoun "his" can be applied to the Air Force. He conceived it, molded it, stamped every part of it with his imagination and indomitable will.

When he packed his trunks early this month and went back to California to sit under the live oak on his ranch at Sonoma, he carried with him a picture of a friend with, in substance, the following autograph:

"To Gen. H. H. Arnold—who made it possible to win the war."

The officer whose signature it bears was closer to him than any other during the war, knows him better, and earned his measure of recognition in his own right—Carl A. Spaatz.

Wallace, Wrong as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country have a right to expect more intelligent statements by responsible governmental officials than was given by Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to influence the General Motors strike situation and to pressure General Motors into favorable action on CIO wage demands, Wallace made a prediction which he has now repudiated. In other words, his statement can be charged to official Government propaganda. It is purely the measure of the man and Mr. Wallace should be condemned for his loose statement. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith an editorial which apeared in the Milwaukee Journal:

WALLACE'S STATISTICIANS

It is currently being charged by General Motors that statisticians of Henry Wallace's Department of Commerce connived with the CIO in getting up a prediction or projection of data, made public November 1, 1945, indicating that the automobile industry could increase wages 15 percent the first year, and another 10 percent the second, and still make good profits at the prewar prices.

The CIO went all-out on somebody's statistics when it demanded 30 percent without an increase in car prices, and then went on

its costly strike. Mr. Wallace's departmental projections were also among the documents used by President Truman's fact-finding board in arriving at its recommendation in the motor strike. Now, with the motor strike presumably settled, Mr. Wallace admits that the report of his statisticians was not factual. It is stated that he has known the report was not accurate since early in December, but kept quiet until he was forced into issuing the disavowal before somebody else did it for him.

A congressional investigation is demanded to learn whether there was conniving between the CIO and Wallace's statisticians. We doubt that an investigation would disclose any conspiracy. Men who would connive at such business are smart enough to cover their tracks, if there was conniving. What Wallace's belated disavowal does offer is further confirmation that he has no qualifications to be Secretary of Commerce.

To be sure, Wallace's appointment to that Cabinet post was not based on qualification. It was salve to ease Mr. Wallace's hurts for being denied the nomination for the Vice Presidency which Mr. Truman got.

Business has never had any confidence in Wallace. And nothing he has so far done since assuming the duties of the Department of Commerce has given industry any reason to trust his judgment.

The Great Game of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and his principal ally, Mr. Sidney Hillman, the head of the CIO Political Action Committee, have established the party line for the Democratic Party. Explicitly and clearly they have declared the Democratic Party to be the radical party of the Nation and of the States. The President has made it crystal clear that the Democratic Party, under his leadership, will continue turning to the left in the direction of state socialism, or some other "ism"; that his program shall include further centralization of Federal authority, deficit spending, radical class legislation, administration of the law to favor radical groups, curtailment of individual freedoms, progressive nullification of the rights and privileges of the 48 States, and increasing circumscription and strangling of the American system of fair and free competition in business.

As a part of my remarks I include an article written by Frank R. Kent appearing in the Washington Evening Star, Friday, March 29, entitled "The Great Game of Politics."

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—OBSERVER CLAIMS COMMUNIST IDEA IS TO CONTROL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By Frank R. Kent)

The distressing degree to which the Democratic Party management and the Democratic national administration are messed up with the Communists and the CIO (to some extent they are identical) is now so clear that hardly anybody takes the trouble to deny it.

This has been going on so long that people have become inured to it. To many it no longer seems shocking that the dominant political party should be regularly trafficking with a group whose basic purpose is the violent overthrow of the American Government. Either they just do not care or, ignoring the facts, regard the allegation as emanating from the Republicans, and, hence, not to be credited. There is also the reason that the truth is so extremely unpalatable that the average decent Democrat revolts against believing this thing about his party.

Yet there is enough evidence to substantiate the charge in any court in the country—and has been for the past 8 years. Take, for example, the facts of the existing Democratic situation in New York State, where both a Senator and a Governor are to be chosen this fall. Last week Democratic National Chairman Robert E. Hannegan made an unadvertised trip to New York and conferred with Sidney Hillman. And who is Sidney Hillman? Mr. Hillman is not only national chairman of the CIO's Political Action Committee, but he is also State chairman of the American Labor Party.

POWER ADMITTED

And what is the American Labor Party? The American Labor Party is the admittedly Communist-dominated political unit in New York City without which, according to the experienced and reliable James A. Hagerty, of the New York Times, "no Democratic nominee for Governor can be elected." Also the American Labor Party is the group from which leaders of the new Liberal Party (themselves radical enough) split 2 years ago, openly charging that the Communists had gained control and were in command. It is with the American Labor Party's State chairman and the joint ALP-CIO planning board that the national Democratic chairman is now collaborating.

And what was the national Democratic chairman told by Mr. Hillman and the ALP-CIO board? According to Mr. Hagerty, he was told that the Communist-controlled ALP will "accept" Senator JAMES M. MEAD for Governor and either Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt or ex-Gov. Herbert Lehman for Senator. In addition, the national Democratic chairman was told that the Communist ALP is strongly against Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, wants the Democrats to put up a strong ticket, but insists upon one of its State-wide candidates being a member of the ALP.

CLAIMS NOT DISPUTED

In addition, still according to Mr. Hagerty, the national Democratic chairman was informed that there are in the State 30 assembly districts, 11 State senate districts, and 9 congressional districts in which Democratic candidates have no chance of election unless endorsed by the Communist-controlled ALP.

The national Democratic chairman does not dispute these district claims. Nor does he dispute the claim that without ALP support the Democrats cannot elect their ticket. Instead, he goes to New York "to clear things with Sidney" for 1946, just as he cleared things with him at the Chicago convention in 1944. There is no way to deny these facts, mortifying as they must be to Democrats all over the country.

The Hannegan visits, his ALP conferences and their results, though supposedly secret, were known to quite a few persons and have been chronicled in the press. It isn't a pleasant spectacle to see the national Democratic chairman subordinate himself to those Communistic ALP bosses and admit by his actions that they are indispensable to Democratic success in the greatest State in the Union—which means in the Nation.

FACTS TO FACE

And it is not only in New York the Communists are boring into the Democratic Party. They are hard at work in the South as well as in the North. On March 21 the Florida Times Union of Jacksonville carried a full-page advertisement from the Jacksonville Junior Chamber of Commerce, displaying a striking facsimile of a pamphlet signed and circulated by the Communist Party of Jacksonville, openly urging Florida Negroes to register as Democrats and vote in the primaries for candidates which will support the fair employment and 65-cents-an-hour minimum wage bills, both of which are urged by the CIO, National Chairman Hannegan, and the administration.

Clearly the Communist idea is to infiltrate and control the Democratic Party as it has the CIO. And anyone who thinks they are not making progress just will not face facts.

Democrats who have a feeling for their party ought at least to know what is going on in it. They no longer should permit realities to be brushed aside by the silly retort that those who present them are seeing Reds under the bed. That is the stock answer behind which operations have been conducted for too long a time. The game still being played by deluded Democrats, willing to do anything for votes, is as unwise as it is unpatriotic.

OPA at the Cross Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith a timely editorial by the Milwaukee Journal on the subject of OPA:

OPA AT THE CROSS ROADS

OPA's price-control mechanism, conceived and built when delaying tactics were on the whole beneficial, is now proving a definite obstacle to high production in a hundred places. What we need today more than any other one thing in the production picture is an OPA itself reconverted to the requirements of an industrial speed-up period.

It would be suicidal for us to drop all controls at this time. But it will not be beneficial if we try to carry on without a major reorientation of many of our OPA policies and practices.

During the war, when both labor and materials were largely needed for military production, it made little difference if OPA price schedules held civilian production to a minimum. Then the only important thing was that the absolute essentials be produced in adequate quantities.

The situation today is different. The prime objective now is high production. Price controls must now be exercised with a double purpose—first, to encourage high output and, second, to prevent inflationary exploitation of the consumer. Since VJ-day, the OPA has too long ignored the first of these two essentials.

Policies and practices of the OPA, carried over from the war period, have penalized established businesses and eased the way of fly-by-night and shoestring entrepreneurs. These policies and practices have kept staple goods from the market by encouraging substitution of more profitable luxury lines. The slowness with which price appeals have been handled and the outworn rules by which they have been adjudicated have slowed down recovery perceptibly, by delaying full swing manufacture or by causing producers to hold back their manufactured wares for a higher market.

The recent OPA declaration on meat and the prediction of OPA Administrator Porter

that few price increases will be called for this year indicate that holding the line still overshadows encouragement of production in official minds. Unless this emphasis is speedily reversed, the country is in for an inexcusable prolongation of the present period of doubt and confusion.

There is some evidence that OPA sees the necessity for change within itself. The process certainly needs to be hastened.

United States Adopts Firm Stand for Justice Under UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of March 31, by Constantine Brown, entitled, "United States Adopts Firm Stand for Justice Under UNO":

UNITED STATES ADOPTS FIRM STAND FOR JUSTICE UNDER UNO—POLICY OF APPEASEMENT ENDS AS EVERY EFFORT POSSIBLE IS MADE TO GUARANTEE PEACE THROUGH WORLD ORGANIZATION

(By Constantine Brown)

The State Department has informed Moscow in no uncertain terms that the American people believe there is only one road to a lasting peace; the UNO, which must remain a superorganization fully empowered to dispose of all conflicts, arguments, and frictions between all nations.

Unless the Soviet leaders are so utterly misinformed about our determination to do our utmost to maintain this organization, they will realize that any bullying of the Security Council will place Moscow in an isolated position which might have unpredictable consequences for the present Russian Government.

In spite of the announcements from Moscow, up until the very day of the opening of the UNO Security Council sessions in New York last Monday no one in this country knew for certain that Russia's troops actually were withdrawing from Iran. No one knew whether a special deal had been arranged between the Iranian Premier and the Soviet representatives as a price for withdrawal. For several days the Iranian Ambassador to Washington had been unable to contact his superiors, and neither had our State Department been able to get in touch with Wallace Murray, the American Ambassador at Tehran.

SECRECY IS BANNED

Any secrecy is not conducive to good relations among the nations comprising the UNO. But the important thing, however, is the fact that the United States and Great Britain, backed by the majority of UNO's members—are determined not to permit the UNO to become a puppet in the hands of any of the Big Five.

As far as the United States is concerned, Secretary of State Byrnes made his decision after consulting President Truman, Members of the Congress, and the top-ranking advisers in the War and Navy Departments. He decided last Sunday, before he left for New York, that the Security Council could not permit the carrying out of any bilateral deals unless it was fully informed of the contents of the agreements. In other words, the stand taken by this country is that the United Nations Organization must remain, insofar as international matters are concerned, the superstate which was conceived in the San Francisco Charter.

The UNO is dear to the hearts of the vast majority of the American people.

The blood of our young men was shed and the economic and financial resources of this country were depleted for only one purpose: To obtain a reasonable guaranty for peace in our time and prevent by all means, including armed intervention, the revival of a totalitarian aggression such as we saw 7 years ago.

SLOW TO HALT APPEASEMENT

It took the American Government a long time to realize that the policy of appeasement, as had been practiced since the meeting of the Big Three at Tehran, was not likely to pay dividends.

Soon after Mr. Truman became President he attempted to adopt a policy based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter. He urged Russian Foreign Commissar Molotov to come to Washington, before he went to the San Francisco meeting, and spoke to him in stern terms. But the policy was not maintained. Some of Mr. Truman's advisers feared that a complete reversal of our previous attitude might endanger plans for the UNO.

Thus at San Francisco we reverted to appeasement again. This was fully demonstrated in the case of Poland. Some 16 members of the underground cabinet had gone to Moscow. They had been officially assured that they would not be molested, but soon after they reached the Russian capital they were thrown into jail. All efforts of the American and British Governments to obtain their release, or even to find out what had happened to them, remained fruitless.

When the question of Poland's becoming a member of the UNO was raised in San Francisco by the Russian delegation, Edward Stettinius, our then Secretary of State, backed by his British colleague, Anthony Eden, said he would not discuss the Polish matter until the 16 Poles had been released. Within 2 weeks we reversed our position and accepted Poland, with the majority of its government hand-picked by Moscow, into the family of nations. The Russian Government condescended to inflict only light penalties on the 16 men, whom the former Lublin government described as collaborationists, although they had fought the Nazis to the bitter end. And we accepted the Russian solution.

FIRM STAND DROPPED

On two other occasions we stood up against Russia's plans for encroachment at Potsdam, when Mr. Truman and Mr. Byrnes obtained the agreement of the U. S. S. R. that Japan should be directed by an American supreme commander without active interference from the other Allies; and at the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, when Mr. Byrnes refused to accept the Russian demands to set up a control commission in Tokyo and an advisory committee for the Far East with policy-framing powers. Both these "no appeasement" acts were short-lived and given up, at least in theory, at the meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Moscow last December.

Moscow's disregard of treaties concerning Iran, together with the Kremlin-inspired verbal campaign against Turkey and the "fluctuating policies" of the U. S. S. R. in Manchuria, eventually convinced our Secretary of State that he could harvest nothing but trouble from the appeasement seeds his predecessors had planted and he had begun to cultivate.

In the meantime, public opinion in the United States began to see through the game of our Russian wartime associate. With the lifting of the "hidden censorship" which dried many important news stories at the source, a number of painful incidents involving the dignity and prestige of our representatives abroad began to be revealed. Stories of our people being treated no better than suspected neutrals found their ways into the press and radio broadcasts.

All this was topped by the Canadian Government's revelation of a gigantic Russian spy ring in Canada. Moscow made things worse when, instead of keeping quiet, she sent a stiff note to the Ottawa government in connection with the case. It was not Russia's business, since the indicted men were all Canadian citizens suspected of having betrayed the secrets intrusted them by their own country to a foreign government.

In order not to aggravate matters, the American Government has said nothing about the men who have been doing the same dirty business in the United States, although it is well known that the espionage and the moral sabotage in this country is far greater than it is in Canada.

The realization that appeasement was not bringing about peace and the fact that American public opinion began to wake up convinced Secretary Byrnes that he must adopt a different attitude. And so he shifted from a policy of doing nothing which "might offend" Russia to one of demanding that each member of the UNO live up to the obligations undertaken when the San Francisco Charter was signed.

The American Government and the American people have placed all their hope for a lasting peace in the efficient functioning of the UNO. Our policy framers, and particularly the Secretary of State and some of his "less headlined" advisers, decided that unless those who wanted to flaunt the authority of the new superstate were brought to book our expenditure of blood and resources in the war would be wasted.

WOULD REQUIRE HUGE ARMY

The flaunting of the authority of the UNO means that instead of facing an era of peace during which we and the rest of the world could clean up the material and moral wreckage caused by 6 years of war and lick our own wounds, we shall be compelled to concentrate our efforts to rebuilding the greatest Army, Navy, and air force the world has ever seen. This will mean that the principal expenditures in the years to come will not be toward progress and reconstruction, but toward an increased rearmament.

The administration is aware that if it permits the UNO to go the way of the League of Nations—a mere debating society—the national defense will require at least 6,000,000 men in the air and ground forces and a Navy about as strong as we had before VJ-day. That is to say, about 8 percent of the total population of the United States will have to be under arms for an indefinite period or until a new major crisis leading to the outbreak of war. It will mean that a substantial part of our Budget will have to be spent in essential, though unproductive, activities.

These are the considerations which caused the spectacular change of policy of our Secretary of State. In a constitutional Republic such as ours, the President, his Cabinet, and Congress all are the servants of the Nation. In some cases they endeavor to "manufacture" public opinion, but when this is not successful they must follow it. The "manufacturing" of public opinion is possible only under wartime regulations when an official and unofficial censorship is clamped down on the press and radio. But when the emergency is over and free speech is fully reestablished the control of writing and speaking is no longer possible. The public is kept fully posted through the individuals whose job it is to inform the public and have many sources at their disposal.

TRY TO SELL UNO

The administration and particularly the State Department have used all the publicity means at their disposal to sell the UNO to the public. It was the only tangible thing we obtained in exchange for the 1,250,000 casualties and the $280,000,000,000 spent for the war.

A broad policy of forgetting the injustices we have been guilty of toward such countries as Poland, Yugoslavia, and other downtrodden nations has been adopted on the theory that all these matters must be overlooked in order to make the UNO live.

Thus, when Russia became defiant in regard to her solemn pledges concerning Iran, Secretary Byrnes decided to push the issue to its logical conclusion, regardless of whether Moscow liked our attitude or not. There is nothing hostile toward the great Russian empire in this new American policy. It only warns the USSR that henceforth all disputes and disagreements must be presented to the one body which is entitled to deal with them and all nations, big and small, must abide by its decisions.

WILL SALVAGE WHAT CAN BE

This policy should not surprise the Moscow leaders. They have been fully informed in the last few weeks in notes and memoranda from the State Department. The fact that the Soviet Government has never answered them is of no consequence. Their importance rests in their being presented so that Russia cannot say that she is being faced by a changed American attitude and that she had not been aware of it.

Since Pearl Harbor we have made compromises which were against the principles which caused this country to side with the enemies of the Axis. We have accepted changes in the map of Europe which also were against our principles of justice and fair play.

But now, when our objective appears to be threatened, we have arisen and are determined to salvage what we consider the only hope for peace—the UNO. And our position has been outlined to Moscow in such clear language that no one could have any doubt that this time we mean what we say.

Who's Muffing Demobilization?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, there is still too much delay in demobilization. The Navy on March 26 still had 1,603,923 officers and enlisted men, of which 185,012 were reenlistments since the surrender of Japan through March 24. If the Navy is to be reduced to 500,000, then there are 1,103,923 enlisted men and officers that ought to be discharged. Why all this delay?

Then there are still 290,805 in the Marine Corps. If the strength of the Marine Corps is to be kept at 100,000, then there are 190,805 in the Marine Corps that should be discharged. Again, why the delay?

On March 1, 1946, there were still 2,673,000 men in the Army. If the Army is to be reduced to 1,000,000, then there are still 1,673,000 men in the armed forces that should have been discharged long ago. Among these are 750,000 fathers. Of the 2,673,000 men, 617,172 have volunteered since the surrender of Germany and 548,000 have been drafted. This makes a total of 1,165,172 draftees and volunteers, or 165,172 more than the estimated necessary strength of 1,000,000.

Recently the War Department and the Chief of Staff attempted to make a trade. They suggested that they would discharge the fathers if Congress would extend the Draft Act. Let me warn these gentlemen that America does not believe in that kind of horse trading. They had better get busy and get the fathers back home to their families or they will get a taste of an indignant American people.

We are all for national defense, but the juggling with 750,000 fathers is nauseating to the American people. It will not long be condoned. These fathers were drafted for the duration and 6 months. The war has been over for more than 6 months.

The American people and the servicemen demand honesty from the War Department as well as from every other department of Government. The time has arrived for Congress to declare the war ended as of September 2, 1945. There is no longer any room for cringing. Anything that is really necessary for national defense, the President can get from Congress for the asking. But Congress will make sure that it is national defense and not just an attempt to permanently militarize our Nation.

The married men should be returned to their families and their homes. This is no trifling matter. Again, among that 1,673,000 are many young men whose fiancées have waited for them, and it is about time that these be returned. If we are not careful, we will lose part of a generation of people because of the stupidity and slowness in demobilization.

Many misleading and deceptive statements have been made to Members of Congress when they were invited to listen to the War Department and to Generals and Admirals in the Congressional Library on two or three different occasions. First, we were told that all men with the required points would be back home by April 1. Then, we were told a different story on a second occasion and now we are told that if we will trade, the married men will be back home.

I believe the time has come that Congress should demand that the promises made by General Marshall and the War Department at the first meeting be now at least carried out. This, unless we are on the verge of World War III. If we are, we have a right to know. We were told that the UNO would take care of World War III. If we are mistaken, let us have the facts—all the facts.

It is a deception and fraud to continue this war when everyone knows it has been over since September 2, 1945. All the servicemen were entitled to be discharged within six months after September 2. If we are going to have real national defense we must play the game square with the men in the service.

Here are a few excerpts of many letters from GI's that I have received. These come not only from Germany and Japan, but from every place where our armed forces are still sojourning.

ZAMA, HONSHU, JAPAN,
February 5, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to express my heartfelt thanks for your kind answers and inquiries concerning the men in the Army of Occupation. It is gratifying to know that you have at least shown your interest to date.

My reply to the question * * * Should fathers and married men be let out before points and service?

This may seem to incriminate my standing but here is my standing to date. I am married, I have 11 months' service, I have two children, I am 35 years old plus 3 months. If I were to do the discharging it would be such. Points and service equal to the number of men discharged and the same amount of men discharged with dependents. By dependents to be discharged thus classify the married men with dependents as such. Pre-Pearl Harbor fathers first. Then fathers with one dependent.

Remember this, that men being discharged now are also replacements now. They were replacements sometime ago. I think too that older men with age should be out. It is going to be damned hard for a man of my age to start life all over again if he has to go out and hunt up a job. However, my case is different. I expect to go back to my old job. I was bookkeeper and supply clerk of the State purchasing department, board of administration, State capitol.

As you are willing to listen, here is another pet bitch of the soldiers. Mail. No more need be said. Just why aren't we getting it?

Here is another. Ribbon awards. Good-conduct-ribbons award for 1 year's service in Army on recommendation of officers. Well enough, but how about the fellow who has good conduct and is discharged before 1 year's service. He just don't get it. Another, the American defense ribbon. It is issued for 1 year's service in the States. If shipped overseas before putting in a year's service and still has 1 year's service in the Army, he doesn't get it, though he is putting his time in the Army somewhere in one of the occupied countries. I get one ribbon to date. The occupational ribbon, and I am just as proud to wear it as the fellows with all ribbons and battle stars. I answered my country's call, and though I belong to the "chair-borne outfit," clerks and typists and office workers, somebody has to do this kind of work. You may already know how the Army is run with all the paper work to be done. * * *

Regards.

ZAMA, HONSHU, JAPAN, *March 18, 1946.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMEN: This, gentlemen, is my last pet peeve, my last letter to you. Again I am asking just who is running Washington still? The War Department or the people of these United States, through you, as our representatives. We have an announcement over the radio again tonight that 4 pointers and later 40 pointers are to be released shortly, but what about the old fellows—men between ages of 32, or even 30, and 37; how about the forgotten fathers? Just when in the devil do we expect to get cut? If you can't find out from the War Department on a definite policy, who the devil can? If the Navy and Marines can announce their discharges in advance, why can't the Army?

Do you know what we are doing now? Occupation? No. We are going to classes listening to lectures on how to take a bath and brush our teeth. How to salute an officer and military courtesy, parade, and reviews for the stuffed shirts and brass. Physical training exercises, not that these would hurt us, but we could do them at home.

First, the stall was boats, now the War Department is shy of men all of a sudden. Scared the draft bill will not be continued. There seems to be an overage of officers all of a sudden. If there are so many of them in the States, send them over here.

I am mailing this letter March 19; note just when you receive it. The last letter I had from my wife and family was February 5; today is March 18. Outside of a telegram I was fortunate to get through, they might be dead. This has to cease but quick. They tell us now air-mail service is being stepped up and only because the officers are bitching after the GI had done it for 6 weeks. The

stall, no ground crew. All of a sudden they transfer 24,000 men. Where did they get them all of a sudden. Where were they when the Army was sending the airmen home? Let's turn it over to a commercial line; the Army has bungled enough as it has already. * * *

I showed this letter to a buddy of mine and he said you might sue me. What for? Surely not for telling the truth.

They sent Lew Valentine, ex New York cop, to show the Japs how to take care of themselves. If so, send more and we all can go home.

With Easter coming up, I hope you men have a swell time, because we are going to do the same right here in this mud. Send your family flowers. I know my wife and family will be tickled to death to get just one little letter from me saying I have you and goodbye.

I still believe in our theme song, There Will Be Some Changes Made.

Regards.

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, *March 2, 1946.*

DEAR MR. LEMKE: MR. LEMKE, I would like to know why and when the right things are going to be done to get us boys out of the service. One day the War Department tells us one thing and the next day they will tell us something different. A few weeks ago we read that all 2-year men would be on their way home by the 20th of March and now we read that they will possibly make it by the end of June.

How about the discharging of men that is supposed to be going along so smoothly? I myself, of course, am considered more about the discharge of fathers. Here a while ago I watched boys leave this company because they had three or more children, yet some of them had been in the service less time than I or many other men. I myself have one child and as yet I haven't seen him. He is lacking about 6 days now of being a year old and it looks as though I am going to have to wait a long time yet before I can even think of seeing him. To top that off, at present I am having a little trouble with my wife and I am not so sure that I'll be very welcome to come back to see either her or the baby. When these boys that had three children left, I watched one fellow go that had just been overseas 2 months, and what I mean that was hard to take. I would like to see my baby for the first time, but no, the War Department don't take anything like that into consideration at all.

Another thing that I read a while ago was about a fellow that was sent over here as a replacement. It went something as follows: He had arrived in Frankfurt, and to his disbelief found that they did not know that they had arrived or were even expecting them. After enough inquiring about on their own initiative they finally went to work. At the time I read the article, he said that he had been in that outfit for over a month and that he hadn't done 30 hours of work since he was in it. He said that most of his time was spent sleeping, writing letters, reading, and looking for something to do. It seems that there must be quite a few of the people over here are in the same category. Why don't the War Department cut out a bunch of these unnecessary organizations and let a few more of the boys go home, where many could do a lot more for the country, as well as themselves. I myself would like to get home to my wife and baby real soon so as to know whether I am going to get things straightened out with my wife, so I'll know just what kind of future to expect.

A NORTH DAKOTA BOY IN TROUBLE.

CAMP PHILIP MORRIS,
LE HAVRE, FRANCE,
Wednesday, January 23, 1946.

Royall calls GI's unreasoning (Stars and Stripes, January 17, 1946) or "Patience is a virtue seldom seen in a man and never in a woman."

The following will disprove both of the above statements:

On December 2, 1945, 40 men in the 56–59 point bracket were transferred to the One Hundred and Seventy-eighth General Hospital to be processed for redeployment at Mourmelon, France. We had ready dates of December 10, December 18, and January 5, but all were canceled. On January 7 there were several marches by units at Camp Pittsburgh to the commanding officer at the camp headquarters. Our unit did not participate, but had a meeting that night to lay plans and select committees as spokesmen and cable publicity.

We called for a meeting before our officers at our headquarters to ascertain what they knew about our departure for home before proceeding to Camp Pittsburgh headquarters at 10 a. m. Tuesday, January 8.

Lieutenant Colonel St. Johns, our commander, appeared before us and told us that verbal orders had been received for us to leave for Camp Philip Morris on January 13, and to board ship on January 18, or shortly thereafter. Our march to Camp Pittsburgh headquarters was called off with the stipulation that all information shall be posted on the board or read to us in formation.

This was the first time he had spoken to us in the 42 days we spent in Mourmelon.

Today we were advised that, all things being equal, we should board ship on Saturday, January 26, 1946, he hoped.

Please note that from December 2, 1945, to January 26, 1946, is a total of 55 days in which we have done absolutely nothing, and that goes for all 700 men in this category IV unit.

Now comes the climax. We have from private, whose overseas pay is $60 per month, to master sergeant, whose overseas pay is $165.60 per month—a good average per man in this unit is a buck sergeant's pay of $93.60 per month times 700 equals $131,040 for 2 months plus about $2,000 for the 6 officers (2 lieutenant colonels and 4 first lieutenants), a total of $133,040—but then there is the family allowance of approximately $78 per month for, say, half of the 700 men, or 350 times $78 equals $27,300, or a grand total of about $160,340 for all of us doing nothing for 2 months. * * *

Stars and Stripes western Europe edition, Thursday, January 17, 1946:

"ROYALL CALLS GI'S UNREASONING

"PHILADELPHIA, January 16 (AP).—Under Secretary of War Kenneth Royall said today that the clamor of American soldiers wanting to return home had reached an 'unreasoning and unreasonable extent.'

"Speaking at the Maxwell Memorial Football Club dinner, Royall said it was difficult to understand 'those who urge a course that would destroy our victory in order that they may hasten young men home, many of whom have seen no danger and have suffered comparatively no real hardships.

" 'Of course, they are homesick and somewhat inconvenienced,' he continued, 'but they should be willing to perform their less arduous tasks if for no other reason than in appreciation of their predecessors, who bore the heat and burden and danger of the day.'

"Royall likewise warned against demonstrations in the presence of 'our enemies, past and prospective,' who might some day take up arms against the United States, the International News Service reported."

International News Service reported him as saying: "In Germany, Japan, and other parts of the world, millions of unrepenting and newly aggressive minded men are merely waiting for an opportunity to foment another movement for a world war."

(WRITER'S NOTE.—The above is nice going for an Under Secretary of War. What is he bucking for; Patterson's job?)

"Many of the eddying currents are whipped by unintelligent agitation against obvious military necessity by coyly playing upon emotions of lonesome wives and their sweethearts and homesick GI's," Royall asserted.

(WRITER'S NOTE.—Two months of doing nothing over here waiting to go home does not tally with that last paragraph or the second paragraph, either. What do you think about it?)

Stars and Stripes of January 24, 1946, carried the following:

"VICTORY SHIPS TO SAIL FOR UNITED STATES HALF EMPTY

"LE HAVRE, January 23.—When there are insufficient troops in staging areas to fill ships bound for the United States, Victory ships will carry as few as 600 redeployees, Sixteenth Port officials announced today. Up till now the usual load has been approximately 1,500.

"Two Victories, the *Blue Island* and *Rock Hill*, with loads of 1,210 and 1,167, respectively, sailed from Le Havre today. The *Zanesville Victory*, which returned to port more than a week ago for repairs, will reload and sail tomorrow. Due in port tomorrow are the *Montclair* and *Waycross Victories*."

(WRITER'S NOTE.—With approximately 31,000 men here now ready to go they sent two ships out with a total of 623 empty berths. Almost enough room for our unit. I don't get it, do you? That is what burns us GI's up—Army blunders.)

In view of the foregoing I and thousands of other GI's believe that the Honorable Royall and his boss, Secretary of War Patterson, don't know what time it is, or should I say "let's synchronize our calendars."

Very truly yours.

An Important Forward Step in Food Utilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to discuss the bill H. R. 5925 recently introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFFORD HOPE.

This bill is sponsored by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee and is worthy of the consideration and support of all persons who would encourage the people in their efforts to save food and to provide for better food standards.

FOOD RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The purpose of this bill is to establish—for the first time—a national policy of deliberately focusing scientific skill and research on the utilization of American food and agricultural products, and to carry that policy into practical operation by setting up within the Department of Agriculture a National Food Research Institute dedicated to that purpose.

Since 1862, when the Department of Agriculture was established, the United States has had a national policy of applying scientific research and methods to the problems of food production. At the same time we have almost completely ignored the problems of food utilization.

There is no need to detail the success with which science has been applied to the subject of food production. It is sufficient to state what is common knowledge: that through the application of

scientific research we have learned how to produce food in great abundance; this has led some people to the conclusion that we are now producing too much food and that in order to avoid surpluses and maintain farm prosperity there should be a regimented economy of scarcity with Government controls to limit the quantity of foodstuffs produced.

ECONOMY OF SCARCITY HAS FAILED

This negative and essentially defeatist philosophy was, in fact, established as the Government policy early in the 1930's, and we have been trying for 13 years to make it work.

It has failed utterly. In spite of billions of dollars poured out in subsidies and price supports, the prices farmers received for their products were lower in 1939 than they were in 1930, while many of our wartime food scarcities and difficulties stem directly from the application of this policy of an economy of scarcity during the preceding 10 years, and from misguided efforts to continue such a policy through the war period.

It was good sense to devote our scientific skill first to learning how to produce food in abundance. Having achieved some success in that field, it makes equally good sense that we should now deliberately focus scientific research and methods on the problems of using the food we know how to produce in ample quantity.

There is at present no such deliberate policy. We have spent more than $15,000,000,000 for the broad purpose of encouraging the scientific development of food production. We have spent almost nothing on the science of food utilization. We know more about the scientific feeding of beef cattle than we do about feeding human beings.

The American people do not believe there is too much food. It makes little sense to talk of food surpluses as long as there are hungry people anywhere in the world. How can there be too much food production in the United States when one-third of our own population are undernourished and as many as two-thirds suffering definite dietary deficiencies?

An economy of scarcity applied to food is inhuman and unnatural. The killing of little pigs and the plowing under of foodstuffs is shocking and revolting to the most basic human instincts.

ECONOMY OF PLENTY

This bill to establish a National Food Research Institute is an effort to express in legislative form a philosophy that is the direct opposite of that of an economy of scarcity. It offers, instead, an economy of plenty based on the theory of planned, scientific, profitable use of all the ample food production of which American farms are capable.

Careful analysis of the food requirements and desires of the American people leads inescapably to the conclusion that, in conjunction with a moderate export program, we can consume all the food that American farms will produce for years to come—if scientific skill and research are applied to the problems of food utilization as they have been in the past to the problems of food production.

The two keys to the door of complete and profitable use of abundant production are processing and distribution. Processing to give consumers the kind of food they want in the form in which they want it or can use it most conveniently and economically. Distribution scientifically geared to eliminate waste and inefficiency and give them the food they want at a price they can afford to pay.

Incidentally, processing may be the one big key to profitable export of food products. Very little food can be shipped abroad in its natural state. To be exportable at all, most of it must be processed. Profitable export trade depends very largely on discovery of processing methods which will, at the same time, return a fair profit to American farms and industry and deliver abroad a food product that people in other countries can afford to buy.

Scientific investigation of food processing was almost completely ignored by the Government prior to the war. It was carried on sporadically by a few bureaus of the Department of Agriculture as an adjunct to scientific investigation of production, and by the larger food processing companies themselves, for the purpose of improving their own products.

During the war the Government first turned its attention to this subject. Under the necessity of developing new types of food processing so that our troops abroad could be adequately fed, Government-spurred research during the war brought about greater development in 3 years than had taken place in the previous generation.

The surface has hardly been scratched, however. The ultimate possibilities of food processing are still unimagined. There is an urgent need for a national policy of carrying on this work and for the facilities and direction which will make it possible.

For example, Mr. Clarence Birdseye, pioneer and outstanding authority in the field of dehydrated food recently said:

> There is no perfect equipment for dehydrating foods, including my own. New processes and new equipment must be developed, not by me, not by any one group, but by everyone who can do that sort of work, if we are going to meet our future possibilities.

NEED CLEARLY RECOGNIZED

The need for Government leadership and responsibility in this field is universally recognized by those who are closest to the subject of food production. In fact, the present form of this new bill grew out of the recommendations of State secretaries and commissioners of agriculture in answer to a question asked them last summer by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee: "What should be the nature and extent of Government control over food production and distribution?"

A great many of them replied that Government controls should be as few as possible, but that the Government should take the lead and assume the responsibility of providing scientific research and research facilities into food processing, marketing, and distribution so that it would be possible to utilize profitably the full and unrestricted production of American farms.

In its operation, the laboratories, facilities, and services of the Institute will be available to individual members and firms of the food industry, and to recognized groups and associations, on a fee or cooperative basis in much the same manner as the Bureau of Standards is available to the construction industry. It will provide both big and little members of the industry adequate research facilities at a reasonable cost.

Enactment of this bill will not only establish the deliberate national policy of applying science to food utilization, it will give logical direction and purpose to many of the activities now being carried on within the Department of Agriculture and other Government agencies, and by concentrating and centralizing their activities, will result in greatly increased efficiency and savings in operation of those Bureaus.

Offices and activities in the Department of Agriculture which this legislation will transfer and coordinate into the National Food Research Institute, under the Secretary of Agriculture, include the following:

First. Bureau of Dairy Industry—those functions concerned with development of new products and new processes of manufacture.

Second. Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering—those functions pertaining to research in storage for grain, and other vegetables, and on temperature and humidity control in the transportation of perishable fruits and vegetables.

Third. Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry—those functions concerned with the development of new and wider industrial and food uses for agricultural products, including the facilities of the regional research laboratories.

Fourth. Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics—all functions relevant to the purposes of this act.

Fifth. Farm Credit Administration—functions of the Cooperative Research and Service Division.

Sixth. Office of Marketing Services—all functions except those concerned with promulgation of regulations and their enforcement.

Seventh. Bureau of Agricultural Economics—all functions concerned with the processing, distribution, standardization, marketing, and utilization of food products.

Eighth. Agricultural Research Administration—all those functions concerned with food utilization, as distinguished from food production.

Certain functions of the Department of Commerce would also be transferred to the Institute—particularly those in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce relating to the processing, distribution, and marketing of food.

In addition, it is believed that there are many offices and functions scattered through other Government departments and agencies which the President will find should logically be transferred to the Institute. This will both reduce the cost of their operation and render them much more effective.

By far the greatest savings, however, will result from the fact that scientific utilization of the full production of

American farms will increase the net return from agriculture, and by making it profitable, help to eliminate the need for subsidies, price supports, and other forms of Government assistance to agriculture. This will save billions of dollars a year for American taxpayers and put our whole economy on a more healthful basis.

Your committee does not maintain that the bill in its present form is perfect. It will welcome suggestions from anyone as to how it may be improved. In fact, it will soon seek such suggestions from those most familiar with every branch of the food industry and will report to you in more detail on this legislation after it has secured their advice and counsel.

The committee does believe, however, that there is here expressed a national policy that is fundamentally American in concept, sound in its basis and application, and urgently needed at the present time. It believes that this bill, particularly in conjunction with the bill soon to be introduced by Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, also a member of this committee, will result in great benefits to both producers and consumers and will aid tremendously in placing American agriculture on a prosperous, profitable, and self-respecting basis.

Something Rotten in Cairo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Independent Jewish Press Service:

SOMETHING ROTTEN IN CAIRO

Nathan Alterman, witty Hebrew poet who enjoys an excellent reputation in Palestine, describes Great Britain as a little girl lost in the jungle of the Middle East. "I am so afraid of the Arab League," says the little girl, "for haven't I told her 'frighten me'?"

One realizes this description of the relations between the British Government and the Arab League is not just a satirist's whim, when he considers the remarks of Dr. Al-Haldi, an outstanding Arab nationalist and former mayor of Jerusalem, in the Arab weekly El Vhada, issued in that city, September 29, 1945.

"It is commonly known," writes Dr. Al-Haldi, "that the organizer of the Arab Information Offices is Musa al-Alamy (a well-known Palestine Arab politician who represents Palestine in the Arab League). * * * It was Mr. Musa al-Alamy who prepared, with the help of the American and British Ambassadors in Cairo, the constitution of these Arab Information Offices. Here are some of the most pertinent paragraphs of this constitution:

"'PAR. 2A. These offices must not have any connection with anti-Semitic propaganda.

"'PAR. 2B. The Arab office in United States must not have any connection with anti-British circles.

"'PAR. 2C. The general secretary of the London office must be an Arab known for his irreproachable pro-British sympathies.

"'PAR. 3. Each one of these Arab offices should have at least one British adviser at a regular salary.'"

This trend is not entirely unknown to those who followed intelligently recent British-Arab relations. It is no secret that General Spears, witness at the London hearings of the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission, where he discoursed on the supposed kinship of Zionism and nazism, is a member of the staff of the Arab office in London. One might have thought, though, that the British general had been serving the cause of the Arab League in a purely private capacity. The paragraphs quoted from the constitution of the Arab office leave no doubt that General Spears, officer of the Arab League, is not merely a political eccentric, of which Great Britain has so many, but rather an unofficial servant of the British Government, which aims to gain the cooperation of the privileged groups in the Arab countries to foster British imperial interests. What motivates the Arabs to cooperate with Great Britain is the hope that they will be able to divert the social and national grievances of the inarticulate Arab masses against Jewish imperialism.

Only in the light of this fact is it possible to comprehend the spectacle of a former Arab Axis agent appearing before the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission as an accredited spokesman of the Palestine Arabs, Jamal Husseini, a cousin of the former Mufti, Haj Amin al-Husseini, has just returned to Palestine after 6 years in exile, a large part of which he spent in the company of his more famous relative. Jamal Husseini was the right-hand man of the ex-Mufti in all his attempts to mobilize the Arab world on the side of Nazi Germany. It was only an accident which separated the two, leading the Mufti to Berchtesgaden and his cousin to a British internment camp. This type of man has been given the opportunity to return to Palestine to assume the leadership of the Palestine Arabs, at least until his more able relative is permitted to leave his luxurious exile in Paris. In his testimony before the Commission, Mr. Husseini did not deny or apologize for his pro-Axis activities. He demanded indignantly that the ex-Mufti be permitted to return to Palestine immediately. Then to give this grotesque performance the perfect ending, Herr Husseini, taking his cue from Haj Spears, accused David ben Gurion of talking like Hitler.

Perhaps this is understandable in regard to the present British Government. Bevin is trying desperately to consolidate Britain's position in the Middle East. The spokesmen of the Labor Party seem to have reached the conclusion that in practical politics Machiavelli is a more trustworthy guide than Karl Marx. No one can be sure, that like so much real politik with which we have become so disastrously familiar since Munich, this realism, too, will not eventually prove a boomerang.

What can one say of our own Government's underwriting this British gamble in the Middle East? What American interests dictate that our Ambassador in Cairo should actively participate in helping to establish Arab, or to be more correct, Arab-British propaganda offices whose sole purpose is to bar Palestine to Jewish immigrants? We have a right to know.

Posthumous Award of Navy Cross to Ensign Thomsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that the 13th Naval District has announced the award posthumously of the Navy Cross to Ensign Robert Clarence Thomsen, of Portland, Oreg., for extraordinary heroism in action off the coast of Okinawa Jima on April 16, last, during which engagement he lost his life. I had the honor of nominating Ensign Thomsen for the Naval Academy and he graduated with the class of 1944. He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jens Thomsen, 1525 North Kilpatrick Street, Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district. Ensign Thomsen was serving as a navigator on the destroyer *Laffey* when it was attacked by a strong force of Japanese aircraft which put the radars out of action by two direct hits. Ensign Thomsen did not waiver or hesitate in his duty but proceeded aft to assist in fighting the rapidly spreading fires following the crash of two suicide planes and a bomb, as a result of which he lost his life. Secretary of the Navy Forrestal said in the citation:

Boldly defiant of the extreme danger as the attacks continued unabated, he courageously led a fire hose into a burning smoke-filled compartment to combat flames threatening the after magazine and the upper handling rooms and, while valiantly carrying out his daring efforts to control the raging inferno threatening destruction of his ship, was trapped in the burning compartment when two more suicide planes crashed the area. By his determination, personal valor, and grave concern for the safety of his ship in the face of overwhelming odds, Ensign Thomsen served as an inspiration to those who remained to carry on the fight to save the gallant *Laffey*, and self-sacrificing devotion to duty reflects the highest credit upon himself and the United States naval service. He gallantly gave his life for his country.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomsen have two other sons in the service, William J. Thomsen in the Marine Corps, and the youngest son Fred, recently enlisted in the Navy.

Fifth Annual Wheat Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I enclose a report from the Sterling Advocate, Sterling, Colo., March 26, 1946, on the result of the fifth annual contest for the best wheat grown in the United States in 1945. This honor goes to Luther F. Givens, Sterling, Colo.:

Luther F. Givens, who lives south and east of Sterling, today was declared wheat king of the United States, by judges in the Philip W. Pillsbury contest. For the third time in four successive years Logan County boasted the winner of the first award in the Nation-wide contest for the best wheat produced in America.

Other Logan County winners have included: George Hofmann, of Iliff, in 1943, and Leo Lindstrom, of Kelly, 1944. Mr. Hofmann, showing Black Hull wheat, won reserve championship in 1941, the first year of the contest, and stood first in 1943, with Reward

Spring wheat. Mr. Lindstrom showed Tenmarq winter wheat.

Mr. Givens obtained seed of the Wichita wheat from a plot at the State agricultural college, and sowed but a half acre last year. From his harvest of 1945, however, he now has 15 acres seeded. His wheat weighed 65.3 pounds per bushel.

Albert Lindstrom of the Kelly-LeRoy community also planted Wichita wheat during last year, in a small plot. On the dry-land planting the grain produced an estimated yield of 60 bushels. The season, however, was unusually moist and the grain was not of color preferred for show purposes.

Sixteen States were represented in samples judges today in the Pillsbury contest.

CHICAGO, March 26.—Colorado won first and second places today in the fifth annual Philip W. Pillsbury contest for the best wheat grown in 1945.

Luther F. Givens, Sterling, Colo., took first place with his sample of Hard Red Winter wheat. Second place went to R. E. Condon, Platteville, Colo., for his Hard Red Spring wheat.

Winning the contest this year gave Colorado its fourth victory in the five contests. It was the second time that a farmer from Sterling won.

Previous Colorado winners were George Hofmann, Iliff; Leo Lindstrom, Sterling, and Jesse Powers, Henderson. The only other State to take first place honors in previous contests was Montana in 1941.

Hickory Reservoir Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the March 24 issue of the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press entitled "Trenton Fights Hickory Reservoir Project Which Would Leave It Virtually an Island Within a Swamp." I am very much opposed to the building of these dams because the benefits claimed are not sufficient to offset the damage that will be incurred, as described in this article; nor do they justify the large expenditure of funds that will be required, especially at this time, since our Government is so badly in debt and there is such a shortage of materials and labor, so desperately needed in the veterans' housing program:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of March 24, 1946]

TRENTON FIGHTS HICKORY RESERVOIR PROJECT WHICH WOULD LEAVE IT VIRTUALLY AN ISLAND WITHIN A SWAMP—RAILROAD, HIGHWAYS, AND AIRPORT WOULD BE CUT OFF BY WATER

Trenton, the largest town in north central Missouri, has resigned itself to being a ghost city if the proposed Hickory Reservoir is built on Grand River. Water would stand over one-sixth to one-fifth of the area within the corporate limits of the city. Trenton would become a peninsula, surrounded by what the city indignantly calls swamps and stagnant water.

Objections to construction of Hickory Reservoir were presented February 19, 1946, before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at Washington. This written protest filled a 50-page book and represented 33 Grundy County organizations.

POPULATION OF 9,100

Here in brief are a few things the reservoir would do to Trenton:

Put water on three sides.

Make useless the entire sewage disposal system.

Threaten the $1,500,000 municipal light and water plant.

Inundate the city's two parks.

Force rerouting of Rock Island railroad tracks and possibly result in railroad's removal from city.

Destroy several miles of street.

Cut the population of 9,100 drastically.

Force rerouting of Highway No. 65 and possibly result in its loss.

Inundate Trenton airport.

Leave city with no room for expansion.

Destroy many miles of primary and secondary highways; also countless miles of county roads.

Reduce city's trade territory.

NO PAYMENT FOR SEWERS

Trenton was informed by Army engineers that no recompense would be made for damage to the sewer system. Burns & McDonnell Engineering Co. made a survey for the city and announced that a new system would cost $340,890. In addition there would be an annual cost of $24,930 for operation.

Many other costs and damages were not included in the Army engineers' report, the city of Trenton contends. For example, in 1941 the Central Farm Products Co. built a dairy products processing plant, and during 1945 this plant bought 20.7 percent of the milk produced in the Trenton area. The reservoir would cause an annual loss to dairy farmers, truckers, and laborers totaling $586,305, it is estimated.

Again Central Farm Products Co. put a soybean extraction plant into operation in 1945. Inundation of bottom land would make such inroads on soybean production as to cause an estimated loss of $200,000 per year.

IMPORTANT RAILROAD POINT

Some $1,500,000 loss a year would be suffered by Trenton business, the city's report states.

Trenton is especially jittery over the railroad question. For more than 75 years the Rock Island has maintained its Missouri division at Trenton. Its general offices are there, its central signal controls for an automatic signal system. It has freight houses, warehouses, shops, and a roundhouse. Fourteen passenger trains go through Trenton daily, and the railroad employs 573 Trenton citizens and taxpayers. The city fears that the railroad would abandon its entire operations there if forced to move because of a reservoir.

United States engineers propose a new route for Federal Highway No. 65, but Trenton points out that the State highway commission will be the agency making the decision and fears that the road will be taken away altogether.

The Hickory Reservoir would make useless the modern filtered swimming pool, settling basin, and filtration plant at Trenton's Mobrly Park. These facilities are valued at more than $60,000. In East Side Park, a stadium costing the city $40,000 would be rendered valueless and a $55,000 stone pavilion would be destroyed.

Trenton points out that in 1932 the Army engineers issued a report to the effect that construction of any reservoir on Grand River is unsound from an economic standpoint.

SAY SPECULATORS WOULD GAIN

Only the land speculators stand to gain by construction of the Hickory Reservoir, Trenton contends: "One man owns 10,000 acres below the Hickory Dam site. He acquired this land at an average cost of $5 per acre, or a total cost of $50,000. The Hickory Dam is constructed. His land increases in value from $5 per acre to $100 per acre, or a total value for the 10,000 acres of $1,000,000 when his original investment was only $50,000. He realizes overnight a net profit of $950,000 without any further investment, but for this speculator to realize this outrageous profit the largest city in north-central Missouri would be destroyed.

"Railroads would be relocated, highways destroyed, farmers evacuated, and cemeteries inundated. The small farmer who owns valuable land in the basin of the Hickory Reservoir would be compelled to sell land worth $125 per acre to his Government at a predetermined price of $46 an acre. Shylock, the land speculator, for a small investment of 5 percent becomes rich at the expense of an entire community. The Federal taxpayer pays the bill. This is what is known as trading a cranberry for an orange with Uncle Sam paying the bill."

Housing Program at Richmond, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many statements regarding the housing program for veterans, and I am confident the good people of Richmond, Ind., have inaugurated a plan which should meet with general public approval. The people of that fine city, which is located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, have evidenced leadership and broad vision in their plan for housing in their city and community. A very illuminating article appears in the Wall Street Journal, of New York, in which this plan is fully set forth. It is my hope that many other communities will follow the leadership of the people of Richmond, Ind., on this housing program.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this newspaper article as a part of and as an extension of my remarks on this very important subject, which is as follows:

HOUSES FOR RICHMOND—INDIANA BUSINESSMEN POOL FUNDS TO BUY LOTS, BUILD HOMES FOR VETS—FLORIST, MOVIE HOUSE, DRY CLEANER, FUNERAL DIRECTOR JOIN BIG COMPANY CHIEFS—HOPE TO FINISH 200 THIS YEAR

(By John S. Cooper)

RICHMOND, IND.—Main Street has beaten Washington to the punch in providing homes for veterans in this Indiana community.

Operating through a nonprofit corporation, Richmond Homes, Inc., local businessmen are buying lots, obtaining materials and arranging financing and construction of low-priced houses for their ex-GI employees.

The latter part of next week, former GM2c William Moore, with 28 months of active service and two battle stars, will move his wife and two young daughters into a brand-new bungalow which will cost him around $6,000, compared to a Federal Housing Administration ceiling of $7,055.

Shortly afterwards, Mr. Moore will have 5 new neighbors, also ex-servicemen, and before the year is out 200 or more veterans will be similarly accommodated through the efforts of the corporation.

RICHMOND HAD A WARTIME BOOM

During the war, Richmond, an old Quaker city founded in 1809 by North Carolinians

who came to Indiana to escape contact with slavery, grew from 35,000 to 40,000 as its eighty-odd industries took on important war jobs. As the end of the war drew near, it became apparent that the housing shortage, already critical, was destined to grow worse.

Crosley Corp. announced plans to build a new factory in the city, increasing the company's employment from a war peak of 1,250 to 3,600. Firestone Tire & Rubber bought a Defense Plant Corporation plant operated during the war by the Perfect Circle Co., and stated that they would need at least 1,000 employees. Perfect Circle, big maker of piston rings, said it planned to build a new plant of its own and eventually will approximate its wartime employment.

The city's four lawnmower manufacturers, who produce more than half the Nation's requirements, stated they would resume peacetime production as soon as pricing adjustments were granted. The Joseph H. Hill Co., largest rose grower in the world and Richmond's oldest industry, reported it would increase its 55 acres of greenhouses. Similar plans were being formulated at the local plants of Johns Manville, International Harvester and Belden Manufacturing Co.

On August 4, when these plans became apparent, H. J. "Pat" O'Brien, Indiana factory manager for Johns Manville, called on John Craig, manager of Crosley's local operation, and Will Cramer, at that time superintendent of Perfect Circle, and suggested that they go to the mayor and "put our housing cards on the table."

As Mr. O'Brien explains it, "we were all branch operations of large companies and we realized that our faces would be pretty red if later we had to go to our corporation brass hats and explain that although we had nice additions to our plants and fine new equipment there was no one to run them, because of a housing shortage."

CALLED A MASS MEETING

Acting on the three men's suggestion, Mayor John R. Britten called a mass meeting of the city's industrial people, merchants, real estate men, attorneys and civic leaders and by August 27 a plan had been completed. With a few minor changes it is the one now in effect.

Drafted by Will Reller of the local law firm of Brown, Reller & Mendenhall, the plan provided for the creation of Richmond Homes, Inc., with a capitalization of 5,000 shares of common stock at $1 a share. Each subscriber to a share of stock agreed to buy one of the company's $100 3-percent bonds, maturing December 1, 1950, but callable at any time the directors wish. Thus, when all the stock is subscribed, the corporation will have a paid-in capital of $5,000 and available bond money of $500,000. The bonds are junior to all other debts and liabilities in order that the corporation will have good credit and can borrow money from banks and loan companies.

Mr. Reller explained that it was not the intention of the corporation to invade the field of contractors, lumber companies and suppliers of housing material and equipment. Instead the organization will as far as possible cooperate with these established business firms. However, he added that if local material men can't meet the demand, "then the corporation will go out and get the job done, buying bathtubs, brick, concrete blocks and roofing materials in large quantities." At that time it was estimated there weren't enough building materials in the city to build 5 houses.

"The corporation ought to be able to effect economies in buying and construction costs, and these could be passed on to the purchaser," Mr. Reller suggested.

NEW CORPORATION FOUNDED

The plan met with enthusiasm and in the last week in September the new corporation came into existence. Largest stockholder was Crosley Corp., with 200 shares, an investment of $20,200. Other large holders were Johns Manville, Joseph H. Hill Co., International Harvester, F. & N. Lawnmower Co. and National Automatic Tool Co., each with 100 shares. Perfect Circle, Richmond Gas Corp., Richmond Water Works and the Palladium Publishing Co. followed with 50 shares.

Other stockholders included the local movie house; Sears, Roebuck; Wayne McCord, owner of the Waldorf Cafe and "several bars around town"; Charles Plauche, funeral director; the Richmond Palais-Royale, a ladies' dress shop; a foundry; Fred Lemmon, florist; Earl Gilbert, a dry cleaner; a jewelry store and several department stores; W. C. Dennis, president emeritus of Earlham College; and Mayor Britten.

Pat O'Brien was elected president of the corporation. Will Cramer is vice president, John Craig, treasurer, and Emmet Bartell, owner of the Hoosier Department Store, secretary. As these men are busy with reconversion problems of their own, it was decided to delegate much of the details to agents, who would secure land, get utilities from the city, arrange FHA loans, and priority of purchasers.

In return, the agent would receive a 5 percent sales' commission, plus having the "ground floor" on insurance and other services the home buyer might need.

POLL OF VETERANS' NEEDS

In November, ex-GI employees of all stockholders were polled on their housing preferences, size of families, price of the home needed, and what down payment they could make. They were also asked what facilities they wanted, where in town they would like to live, and the length of their service with the companies.

On the basis of this information, the corporation already has purchased 111 lots, has options to purchase others and will probably buy more when the city has its delinquent tax sale on April 1. Average size of the lots is 50 by 140 feet. Those already purchased, graded, and improved cost an average $600. Their location follows closely the answers to the survey.

For his $6,000, former Gunner's Mate Moore will get a prefabricated home with 4 rooms and a bath on the first floor and the second floor left unfinished for future needs. Each of these houses will have a full basement, automatic natural gas furnace, porch, garage, and connecting "breezeway."

Mr. Moore was able to get the first house because he had worked 8 years with the largest stockholder, Crosley Corp. The next house will go to the serviceman with the longest employment record at the second largest stockholder's plant. When stockholders have the same amount of holdings, priorities are handled in the alphabetical order of company names.

Within the stockholder plans, need is considered along with length of service in granting priorities. After stockholder veterans' needs have been taken care of, the corporation will sell homes to unaffiliated veterans, later this year. Already, requests from outsiders for the corporation's questionnaire are coming in at the rate of four a day, Mr. O'Brien reports.

As a result of its businessman's corporation, Richmond already has been able to secure an advantage over its sister Indiana and Ohio communities. Pease Woodwork Co. of Cincinnati has shipped five prefabricated homes to the corporation's agent in March, compared to an original promise of one, "because other contractors scheduled for shipments weren't ready to take delivery."

CLEARED WAY EARLY FOR BUILDING

The corporation cleared the way late last year by inviting Federal Housing Authority officials from the State office in Indianapolis to inspect sites and building plans. Officials wanted to get future insured mortgage aid on the properties with a minimum of investigation and red tape. In passing, the FHA men patted Richmond on the back, commenting that "most communities complain of a shortage but make no attempt to work out their own salvation."

The one agent now in the field, the Richmond Property Co., has contracts with the Pease Co. for at least 69 prefabricated houses for delivery this year and expects to fill this total out to 100 or more with conventional type houses.

Incidentally Richmond builders and bankers are strong on prefabricated houses. They point to several hundred Pease and Gunnison homes which were built before the war and have weathered well. But Richmond officials have drawn the line at the use of trailers and temporary facilities to meet the housing crisis. They are proud of the city's neat appearance and boast of being "the second most beautiful city in the United States." No one here seems to know what city they concede as "most beautiful."

This week the directors of the corporation expect to take another step toward increasing the city's housing supply by appointing a second agent, Keys & Pine, of Dayton, Ohio, to bring in a builder from Princeton, N. J., Lewis C. Bowers & Sons, Inc., to put up built-on-site homes. This builder plans to set up mill facilities on a large subdivision and is expected to complete 100 homes by late fall. Raymond A. Bowers has been representing the Princeton firm in Richmond.

In addition Gunnison Homes, Inc., has promised the city 25 homes in 1946; National Homes Co., of Lafayette, Ind., has scheduled delivery of 15 to 20, and the corporation is negotiating with Adirondack Homes, of New York and Richmond, Va., for 15 a week after 2 months.

FIND JOB GROWING

The officers and directors of the infant corporation, Richmond Homes, have found their job growing. They average two meetings a week, usually at night, and are also likely to go scouting on Sunday afternoons for likely bits of property or to give a once over to their fast-rising foundations.

Of some $120,000 originally at the directors' disposal (they decided not to capitalize fully until necessary) they have about $67,000 left. The corporation expects to spend about $10,000 more in the next 2 weeks, before sales of homes begin rebuilding its funds. Through FHA loans, it is estimated that the corporation's investment in each house will be repaid almost immediately.

However, for the on-site building project, larger amounts will be required while the work is in progress—for materials and such items as $4,000 for the contractor's plant, $2,000 for tools, and $4,500 for excavators and other mass building tools rented by the contractor.

For completion of 100 site-fabricated homes, approximately $300,000 will be needed for materials alone. To meet this, the directors probably will need a bank credit of about $100,000 to be called upon when needed.

This is an example of the problems confronting the directors at their meetings. Usually they invite a banker in as a sort of cautious check to civic enthusiasm.

These men know their plans aren't foolproof and admit they are feeling their way. But from President O'Brien on down, the directors are confident they are putting up, at the lowest possible price, homes good enough to attract the best possible workers to Richmond plants. Mr. O'Brien believes the program will result in at least 200 new homes in Richmond this year; the goal is 300. Before the corporation expires, it is hoped long before 1950, it plans to leave 500 homes in Richmond as a memorial to its work.

Already at least one city—Dayton, Ohio—has copied Richmond's methods and daily new inquiries are received from other cities bedeviled with the housing problem.

Department of Children's Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, among the many serious problems confronting us today, none is more vital to our future welfare as a nation than the mental, moral, and physical health of coming American generations.

The welfare of our children must, of necessity, be a matter of the gravest concern to the Nation as a whole, as well as to every family, and to local governmental units of city and State. During the war years many public services set up to aid in promoting child welfare have been seriously hampered and dislocated due to lack of personnel and funds, and, more particularly, due to lack of coordination between the various public departments, Federal, State, and municipal, concerned with services for children.

Juvenile delinquency, which is now reported to be alarmingly on the increase, is only one of the more evident results of the neglect of this necessary governmental function. Like many other manifestations this cannot be cured so easily as it can be prevented by striking at the source, which is the lack of proper facilities for children in cities and industrial communities.

Experience has shown that services for children can be best administered by local communities, provided they have the support of the Federal Government when, and as, that may be needed.

In 1944 the National Advisory Committee for Child Care recommended that—

> The present pattern of Federal assistance, direct from the Federal Government to the local community, as allowing for * * * flexibility and local initiative * * * be continued. * * * The committee recognizes that * * * this program is a new pattern in Federal assistance * * * it has given Federal assistance without Federal domination or control, at the same time allowing for full use of State resources, consultation, and advice without interference with local responsibility. The flexibility and facility with which the program has been administered has made possible provision for economically depressed areas and minority racial groups—

And the committee further recommended that—

> Provision be made for such continuity of program that local communities will not be subjected to abrupt changes nor prevented from planning their programs with reasonable certainty of continued operation through specified periods of time.

Since the problem is one which is continuous, and which will increase in complexity with the increase of population, and since it is of paramount importance to the national welfare, a continuity of program can best be assured by creating a governmental department, within the executive branch, headed by an officer of Cabinet rank.

With that purpose in mind, I have today submitted the following bill for consideration:

A bill to establish a Department of Children's Welfare

Be it enacted, etc.—

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN'S WELFARE

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established at the seat of the Government an executive department to be known as the Department of Children's Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Department) which shall be administered by a Secretary of Children's Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary).

(b) The Secretary shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and he shall receive the same compensation and his tenure of office shall be the same as other heads of executive departments.

(c) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department and provisions of title IV of the Revised Statutes as now or hereafter amended shall be applicable to the Department.

(d) The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department subject to the approval of the President and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

(e) There shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall assist the Secretary in performing such duties as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary, and he shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. There shall be in the Department such other officers and employees as shall be transferred to the Department under this act and such other officers and employees as may from time to time be provided for by Congress.

POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 2. (a) The Department shall have jurisdiction over the activities of the Government relating to the health, educational opportunity, and welfare of children in the United States.

(b) The functions, powers, and duties vested in and imposed upon the Secretary of Labor and the Chief of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor with respect to the health, educational opportunity, and welfare of children are hereby transferred to, vested in, and imposed upon, the Secretary, and any power which the Secretary of Labor or the Chief of the Children's Bureau has been authorized to exercise may be exercised by the Secretary in any case where the exercise of such power is necessary in connection with matters within the jurisdiction of the Department.

(c) In lieu of the Social Security Board, the Secretary is authorized and directed to administer those provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 42, sec. 601–606), pertaining to grants to States for aid to dependent children.

(d) In lieu of the Secretary of Labor and the Children's Bureau, the Secretary is authorized and directed to administer those provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 42, secs. 701–704, 705, 711–715, 721, and 731) pertaining to services for crippled children, child-welfare services, and maternal and child-health services, and to make such reports of such administration as may be required by such act.

(e) In lieu of the Secretary of Labor and the Children's Bureau, the Secretary is authorized and directed to administer the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., and Supp. IV, title 29, secs. 201–219, relating to child labor.

(f) In lieu of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary is authorized and directed to administer the provisions of the Walsh-Healy Act of June 30, 1936 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., and Supp IV, title 41, secs. 35–45), relating to child labor.

(g) The Secretary shall cause studies to be made of educational standards and opportunities for children in the United States, and shall make a report in January of each year to Congress with any recommendations he may have for the improvement of such educational standards and opportunities.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU ABOLISHED; PERSONNEL AND PROPERTY TRANSFERRED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN'S WELFARE

SEC. 3. (a) The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor is hereby abolished and all officers and employees of the Children's Bureau are hereby transferred to the Department without reduction in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate after the end of the fiscal year during which such transfer is made to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned.

(b) All records, files, reports, papers, and documents of any kind or character pertinent to the functioning of the Children's Bureau and all property used by the Children's Bureau or any of its personnel in official duties are transferred from the Department of Labor to the Department, except that any document required by the Department of Labor for efficient functioning may be copied by the Department of Labor prior to the transfer of such document to the Department.

TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. All unexpended appropriations in respect of any bureau, service, or function transferred to the Department shall, upon such transfer, also be transferred and become available for expenditure by the Department and be treated as if the Department had been originally named in the act making the appropriation and may be expended without regard to the requirement of apportionment under the Anti-Deficiency Act of February 27, 1906.

ORDERS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. All orders, rules, and regulations and permits or other privileges issued or granted in respect of any function transferred under this act and in effect at the time of transfer shall continue in effect to the same extent as if the transfer had not occurred until modified, superseded, or repealed.

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

Communist, Czarist Aims Declared Alike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith a timely editorial by the Washington Evening Star on the subject of communism:

COMMUNIST, CZARIST AIMS DECLARED ALIKE

(By David Lawrence)

Russian imperialism emerges as being just as bad if not worse than any other form of

imperialism. The selfish desire to grab territory and resources apparently is as much a part of communism today as it was of the czarist regime which it overthrew.

Officials here who did not like to talk publicly about such things during the war period used to say privately that all Russia's ambitions and aims, as expressed in the secret conferences we attended, were identical with those that animated Russian foreign policy under the totalitarians and despots of past history.

But the world doesn't fully realize as yet that communism and czarism are brothers under the skin. It knows only that left-wing admirers of Russia in this country have managed to paint the Russian regime in Moscow as clothed in an idealism all its own.

Back in 1939, when it suited the totalitarians in Moscow, they made an alliance with Hitler and for a time at least assured him that he could have a free hand against France and Britain. This was the signal for World War II to start. During the time of that alliance with Hitler, the Communists in this country paraded and picketed and denounced British imperialism for allegedly starting a war against Hitler. At San Francisco, 6 years later, there was more denunciation by the Russian propagandists—all aimed at British colonial policy and her attitude toward India and small nations. Just why the CIO allowed pickets to use its name in the demonstration against Winston Churchill last week as a symbol of British imperialism—and by inference defending Russia's aggression just to get some oil concessions in Iran—is difficult to explain except as a sporadic outburst not representative of the entire CIO.

MANEUVERS REVEALED

Now Soviet Russia's manuevers are revealed. She is interested in weak nations like Iran only to get what material resources she can, even if it frightens the whole world by an open violation of a treaty pledged.

Russian policy is certainly steeped in ineptitude if it assumes that these tactics will win financial and economic aid from America. If the Russians really had known how to use the powers of debate and reason as well as restraint, they could have made a good case before the bar of public opinion on the subject of security of frontiers and needed economic resources. The British Empire would have had to yield in certain important particulars in order to bring about a more equitable distribution of the economic controls that are exercised in the regions of the world populated by weaker nations.

But the Russians completely misunderstand democracy and resort instead to expletives and denunciation and to open professions of peaceful purposes while they use physical force to get their way.

Certainly the communistic influence in the United States can get little comfort now out of Russia's renewal of imperialism.

RIGHT TO CRY OUT

If any people has a right to cry out that human lives shall not be sacrificed or blood spilled over the ambitions of an imperialist nation which demands oil concessions as the price of forbearance in dominating a small country, it is the American Nation, which can now point to an oil smear in the Near East as the real origin of the recent war scare that swept this country.

If Russia is interested in economic gains, she can get them far more readily by adopting a different attitude toward world peace and toward the UNO than is indicated by her activities thus far.

For decades Americans have heard about British imperialism. This has been variously defined as exploitation of weaker peoples or protection for the British people's legitimate economic interests. But now that Russian imperialism has entered the fray with actual use of troops to terrorize a small nation with which Soviet Russia is supposed to be at peace, the debate will have to take a different turn.

If threats to use force were eliminated, Americans would want to see the world's prize areas internationalized and made accessible on equal terms to all powers. The moment Russia, however, is revealed as having looted Manchuria and to be threatening Iran, that moment of Russian communism becomes to American eyes just another materialism which bodes no good for the future of mankind.

Going Humorist McLemore One Better With a True Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many of us are amused with the piquant sallies of one of our favorite columnists, Henry McLemore, appearing in the Evening Star, particularly his account of the fondness of the average preacher for chicken, printed here:

MCLEMORE DISCUSSES PREACHERS AND CHICKEN DINNERS

I am the son of a Georgia preacher, who had a family of three boys and two girls. We had chicken every Sunday. And we had guests, usually a visiting minister or two. There are a hundred jokes about how preachers eat chicken. Actually, they aren't jokes. Preachers can eat chicken. To steal a line from Runyon, preachers can go to their right and left, like Wagner or Marion, when chicken is placed in front of them.

Preachers may be slow of hand when other viands are placed in front of them, but show them a chicken and that chicken has just about as much chance as the Stokowski's have of celebrating their golden wedding anniversary.

When we had guests some of the children had to eat at what was known as second table. The dinning-room table could handle only a certain number, so there were always two or three small McLemores waiting to eat what was left when the "first tablers" finished.

TABLE WATCH DUTIES

Those of us assigned to the second table kept a close watch on the first table. My station was just inside the door that separated the kitchen from the dining room. I spent many an hour checking on what was happening to the chicken, the dressing, the gravy, the sweetpotatoes, and the peach preserves.

The second-table watchers kept in close contact.

My sister would run to me and ask me to say a little prayer that the Reverend Jones would be nice enough to refuse a fifth piece of chicken. My brother would bring the sad tidings that Reverend Edwards' wife was working on her third helping of dressing, and that it looked like mighty lean pickings for us second tablers. I would report that Dr. Phipps—and how we hated to see him at the table—had gone through three drumsticks, two necks, all the livers, and was eyeing his second back. We particularly hated visitors who took the backs, because we knew that mother liked the back best of all, and it was all we could do to keep from bursting from our spy stations and telling visitors to leave the backs for mother.

Yes, the three-legged chicken would have been a help. After all, it is pretty tough to go through childhood without a sufficient supply of drumsticks. Some day I hope to be rich enough to fry 100 chickens, and have all the drumsticks for myself.

This brings to mind an episode that occurred during the Civil War on the occasion of a visit of the minister, a circuit rider, but unlike Mr. McLemore's account, the joke about chicken was not at the expense of the minister.

In the South, in those days, when the circuit rider came around the privilege of entertaining the minister was quite a social event. On this occasion, it was my grandmother's turn—and the house and kitchen buzzed in preparation. Unfortunately, there was an acute shortage of smoked meat. The southern custom of raising and smoking all of their own meat was a boom to the Yankee invader who promptly sent out foraging parties to raid the southern smokehouses and take all the hams and bacon in sight. What little bacon the southerners managed to hide away was precious indeed and only used on special occasions.

On the occasion of the visit of the godly man, the precious strip of bacon was brought out, noses counted and a slice for each and an extra piece for the platter was placed on the table—large platters of plentiful southern fried chicken graced the table. The minister who had arrived was entertaining the guests on the veranda among them was old man Kennedy who lived and worked in the neighborhood, and when supper was announced and all were seated, Mr. Kennedy's place was convenient to the platter of precious bacon from which he was helping himself rather liberally which was noticed by my grandmother who politely offered a helping of chicken to which the old man replied, "No, thank you, bacon is plenty good enough for me."

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just examined with great care an article by Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative for the National Grange Monthly, which was published April 1946. The title of this article is "Inflation Stalks the Nation."

Under unanimous consent, I wish to extend this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

INFLATION STALKS THE NATION—HIGHER WAGES MEAN HIGHER COSTS, AND HIGHER COSTS SPELL WORLD TRADE HANDICAP

(By Fred Brenckman)

Since nothing is to be gained by deliberately deceiving ourselves, the unwelcome truth that we are fast losing the battle against inflation may as well be admitted.

As we emerged from the war, the cost of living in the United States was approximately one-third higher than before, and the wage

increases which the administration is now virtually forcing upon certain large industries are expected to add another 10 percent to the cost of living.

In the case of the steel industry, the 18½ cents an hour increase in wages insisted upon by Mr. Truman could not be absorbed by the companies engaged in the production of steel. It was, therefore, agreed that the price of steel should be advanced $5 a ton, an amount equal to about 8 percent.

It was at first taken for granted that this increase in price would extend all along the line, but the President later declared that it applied only to the basic plants, leaving out about 700 companies engaged in the fabrication of steel, which, of course, must pay the higher price for their material and pay the same wages as the other companies, or they must suffer their plants to stand idle.

Mr. Truman admitted that the higher cost of steel would create a bulge in the line against inflation, but he insisted that the line still held.

HIGHER PRICES FOR STEEL

However, since steel enters into the manufacture of thousands of different articles and commodities, it necessarily follows that everything made of steel will have to go up in price. Farmers, in particular, will be hard hit. Plows, harrows, grain drills, tractors, mowers, binders, and all sorts of machinery and implements used on the farm will advance in price. This holds true of automobiles and trucks, which form an indispensable part of the equipment of most modern farms.

It is naturally idle to think that it would be possible to grant an increase of 18 percent in wages to the workers in the automobile and steel industries, which are dominated by unions affiliated with the CIO, without creating a demand for similar increases in other industries. The workers in the meat packing plants went on strike at the same time when the steel workers were out, and the Government took over the industry, paying the workers 16 cents an hour more than they had been receiving.

That the packers themselves would be unable to meet such a wage increase without getting higher prices is shown by the fact that they do business on a very small margin. The only way the Government can overcome this handicap is by subsidizing the meat industry to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

John Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, has served notice that his men want higher pay. If they do not get it, they will strike.

The tugboat workers in New York Harbor tied up the entire city for a time to enforce their demands for higher pay.

The employees of the General Electric Co., and those of the Westinghouse Co., went on strike, asking for $2 more per day.

And so it goes in industry after industry from State to State, in most parts of the Union.

When the employees of General Motors Corp. went on strike they demanded a 30-percent increase in wages, coupling this with a demand that there should be no increase in the price of automobiles.

In a measure these workers were encouraged in their unreasonable attitude by statements attributed to certain unnamed Government economists who asserted that the automobile manufacturers could increase wages to the extent of 24 percent and still make more profit than they did before the war.

THE PROFITS OF INDUSTRY

Usually when union leaders are asked to explain where higher wages are to come from they fall back on the well-worn assertion that they should come from the swollen profits of the employers. Sometimes these profits are quoted before taxes are deducted, which naturally makes a profound difference.

However, it is easy to verify the statement that even in the most successful business profits amount to only about 5 percent of the sum paid out in wages.

On this point Peter F. Drucker, an authoritative and impartial writer on economics, has this to say:

"If we take the income of all American business in 1944—the last year for which complete statistics are available—and take out all the money paid to people outside the business, the suppliers of raw materials and machines, the creditors, the Government in the form of taxes, we find that labor got practically all the rest.

"Out of each dollar available after obligations to outside suppliers and creditors had been paid, 92 cents went to labor in the form of wages. Even of the remaining 8 cents, a large share, actually more than half, was not profit available to the shareholders and owners, but had to be plowed back into the business for future expansion from which labor benefits as much as the shareholders. Actually only 3½ cents out of each dollar available in American business and industry last year went to the owner of the business as a profit. Even if we distributed all business profits to labor, wages would only be increased by less than 4 percent, as against the 30 percent increase demanded by the unions."

If we look into individual businesses rather than the average for the Nation as a whole, the same authority declares that we find the situation repeated.

In the United States Steel Corp., the workers received, in 1944, 93 cents of every available dollar; in Bethlehem steel, 95 cents; in General Motors, 90 cents; and at Goodyear Rubber, 91.

In the railroad industry, labor's share of the earings is even larger. In a recent year the Illinois Central Railroad spent 97½ cents of every available dollar on wages. During the period from 1936–40, both years inclusive, the percentage of dividends paid on all railroad stock outstanding was only 2.02 percent, while the railway mileage in the hands of receivers during those years was 73,963. Less than 36 percent of all railroad stock outstanding during the 4-year period from 1936 to 1940 paid any dividends at all.

But all this does not cramp the style of the railroad workers in asking for higher wages and the adoption of numerous rules that would add a tremendous sum to the Nation's transportation bill.

As this is written, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, representing a total of 290,000 workers, have called a strike, demanding wage increases averaging 25 percent, together with 45 changes in rules. The carriers' conference committee, representing the railroads, declares that the rules laid down by the railworkers would result in an addition of $785,000,000 annually in our transportation bill, exclusive of any wage increase.

Under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, the President will, no doubt, submit the case to the National Mediation Board, or to an emergency fact-finding board, and it is not considered likely that the strike will actually take place.

However, it is a foregone conclusion that a substantial part of the demands of the workers will be granted. After that happens the railroads will petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for an increase in rates to enable them to cope with the higher operating costs that will result. In the end the public will be called upon to pay the bill. This cannot continue much longer without forcing the railroads into Government ownership, a step to which the National Grange has always been strongly opposed. We had an example of what happens under Government operation of the railroads during World War I, and sensible people do not want to see it repeated or made permanent.

While every person possessed of social brains wants all workers to be well paid, there is no getting away from the fundamental proposition that higher wages must be accompanied by higher prices, unless higher wages result in increased production.

But it is all too true that in recent years labor unions have often resorted to featherbedding, slow-downs, and similar practices that have retarded production and increased costs. Numerous illustrations of these practices could be cited without doing violence to the facts involved.

UNORGANIZED GROUPS HARD HIT

Since we are all consumers, it is well to remember that higher prices will cancel higher wages, besides working many hardships on numerous groups in our national life that do not receive any increase in income, or where there may be a time lag of perhaps several years involved. These groups include the white-collar workers, those who live on annuities and pensions, together with such faithful public servants as ministers of the gospel and school teachers, besides many others with relatively fixed incomes. Those who have made provision for old age by putting their money in savings banks, or those who have tried to provide for their dependents by investing in life insurance, are also placed at a disadvantage.

Nor is this reckless and inflationary program, largely sponsored and sanctioned by the administration, fair to the holders of Government bonds. The people gladly responded to the appeal to put their money into war bonds. They were assured that this was the safest investment they could make. But if the forces of inflation that are now rampant are allowed to go unchecked, the people who put their money into Government bonds to help win the war will be paid off in dollars having much less purchasing power than the dollars they invested. Under such conditions, the Government would be guilty of a breach of faith with the people, which would be grievous, indeed.

OFF TO BAD START

When we undertook to control prices so as to prevent inflation at the beginning of the war, we made a bad start. The original legislation in this connection, which was enacted in January 1942, made provision for the control of prices, but it specifically exempted the control of wages.

The spokesmen for organized labor strongly urged that prices be kept in check. However, they declared: "Labor is not a commodity to be bought or sold. Keep your hands off labor and wages." This was a stand that could not be justified either in morals or in logic. But it prevailed.

In due time the late President Roosevelt issued an Executive order setting up the National War Labor Board. This Board was empowered to settle labor disputes and to stabilize most wages and salaries under $5,000.

As the costs of living began to climb, workers for certain steel companies made a demand for an increase in wages. The Board found that the cost of living had increased to the extent of 15 percent since 1941 and authorized a proportionate increase in pay for these workers, establishing what came to be known as the Little Steel formula, which was also made applicable to other workers. Confronted with a difficult task, this agency gave a good account of itself on the whole during the progress of the war. It was disbanded prematurely after VJ-day, when the Government relaxed its control over wages while still keeping the most stringent control over prices under the OPA. This was quickly followed by the worst epidemic of strikes in the Nation's history.

Making use of his war powers, the President recently established the Wage Stabilization Board to deal with the situation.

Great difficulty has been experienced in attempting to create a workable formula for the settlement of wage disputes, and there is such confusion that a long time will probably be required to bring something resembling order out of chaos on the industrial front.

WAGES AND HOURS ACT

Many of our present difficulties in industry are due to the fact that the Wages and Hours Act was allowed to remain operative during the war.

This act was passed in 1938, when about 10,000,000 workers were unemployed. In order to spread employment opportunities, the act established a 40-hour week for all industries engaged in interstate commerce, with time and one-half for overtime. This heavy penalty for overtime was intended to make it practically prohibitive for employers to exceed the 40-hour week.

While it was possible to make an argument in defense of this measure under the conditions that prevailed at the time of its enactment, it was clearly not suited to the changed conditions brought on by the war, when there was the most urgent demand for full production on the part of every worker.

Nevertheless, those who worked more than 40 hours per week received a premium of 50 percent for overtime, together with double time for work on Sundays. This added billions of dollars to our war costs, and it helped to set the stage for the prevailing industrial unrest.

With the termination of the war, workers demanded the same take-home pay for a 40-hour week as they had previously received for working longer hours with the 50 percent bonus attached for overtime. Strikers have boldly paraded carrying placards bearing the words: "Fifty-two hours' pay for 40 hours' work." Certainly, such a slogan would seem ridiculous if it were not such a serious matter.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM RETARDED

As an illustration of how the prevailing unrest on the industrial front is holding back reconversion, the last Congress passed the Postwar Federal Aid Highway Act, authorizing appropriations of ¢500,000,000 annually during the first 3 years after the close of the war for highway construction. Since this money is to be matched on a 50–50 basis by the States, it will be seen that all told over the 3-year period $3,000,000,000 is available for highway construction.

Congress was actuated by two purposes in passing this legislation. The first was to provide a larger mileage of modern roads to meet traffic needs. The second was to provide employment for returned veterans and for former workers in the war industries during the reconversion period.

But the execution of the plan under prevailing conditions is beset with many difficulties and uncertainties. Costs have skyrocketed to such an extent that bids for paving average about 50 percent higher than before the war. Bids for structural work, such as bridges and culverts, were about 75 percent above the prewar level, even before the recent increase of $5 per ton in steel.

It will be seen from this that if we undertake to push through our road program under existing conditions, we will get only about half the mileage that was expected when the legislation was enacted.

We have the greatest housing shortage in the history of America. Millions of homes are urgently needed to relieve the situation. But building costs have advanced by about 50 percent, and most people would consider it out of the question to build a home, even if labor and building materials were available. Many similar illustrations could be cited.

In deliberately pursuing a policy calling for higher wages and higher prices, we must not lose sight of the fact that such a program will later get us into many difficulties in our trade relations with the rest of the world.

Under the Trade Agreements Act, passed in 1934, the President was given authority to cut tariff duties to the extent of 50 percent in negotiating agreements with other nations. When this act was renewed in 1945 for another period of 3 years, the President was empowered to reduce the rates then in effect to the extent of another 50 percent.

The full exercise of this power would give us about the lowest tariff rates in our history, and under normal conditions we would be thrown into the sternest kind of competition with the rest of the world in our efforts to hold the American market, to say nothing whatever about expanding our exports.

American efficiency and mass production can work marvels, but there is a limit to all things. If we continue to push up our wages and costs, we will be compelled by force of circumstances to abandon the trade agreements program which is supposed to be one of the cornerstones in the policy structure of the administration.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

In its efforts to hide the real facts regarding the inflationary spiral in which we are caught, the administration is paying out huge sums of borrowed money in the form of food subsidies. Farmers do not want these subsidies. They prefer a compensatory price in the market place for the products they have to sell, and they have repeatedly said so with emphasis.

But the administration proposes to continue these unsound and demoralizing subsidies for another year. These subsidies, which, of course, are for the benefit of the consumer, and not for the farmer, amount to the astounding sum of $2,000,000,000 a year. At the very time when we are launching a campaign to get the people to eat less, in order that we may help to make up the deficiencies of the war-torn countries, we are subsidizing the American people so it will be easier for them to eat more.

And all this at a time when the purchasing power in the hands of the people exceeds the available supply of goods to the extent of scores of billions of dollars. Surely this all adds up to a travesty on popular government.

Battle of the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me recently:

More than 7 months have come and gone since the first atomic bomb was used on Japan. Less than a week after the second one was dropped, Japan surrendered. World War II is over, but the battle of the atom still goes on.

Unfortunately, some of the discussion that has been going on about what to do with atomic energy has added little but rancor and ill feeling. A few people—both in and out of public office—have seen fit to attribute sinister motives to those who don't agree with them. I, for one, deplore this situation, as I think every thoughtful citizen must. If there was ever a problem that calls for constructive, realistic consideration, this, surely, is one.

I

Of the several bills pending before the Congress, the McMahon bill and the May-Johnson bill have received most attention and comment. I have no desire to question the motives of those who support the McMahon bill, but I am forced to the conclusion that it is an unrealistic approach to the problem. The McMahon bill is based on the assumption that the goal for which we all strive has already been achieved. It assumes that we already have a world in which we can safely turn our backs on the military applications of atomic energy and concentrate our efforts on its peacetime uses alone. I wish this assumption were true. But it is not true. We have a long way to go before that goal is reached.

I call your attention to the nature of the action taken to date on the international aspect of this problem. Last November, the United Kingdom and Canada joined the United States in an agreed declaration which stated in part:

"We desire to emphasize that the responsibility for devising means to insure that the new discoveries shall be used for the benefit of mankind, instead of as a means of destruction, rests not on our nations alone, but upon the whole civilized world.

"We are not convinced that the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy, before it is possible to devise effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards acceptable to all nations, would contribute to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb.

"On the contrary, we think it might have the opposite effect. We are, however, prepared to share, on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy just as soon as effective enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised."

Sponsored by the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, and Canada, a resolution was adopted by the United Nations Assembly last January calling for the establishment of a commission to inquire into all phases of the problem and to make specific proposals to the Security Council:

"For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends;

"For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes;

"For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction;

"For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying States against the hazards of violations and evasions."

Secretary of State James F. Byrnes has since stated in very definite terms that the provision on safeguards in the resolution applies to all stages—including the first stage—of any plan recommended by the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

President Truman recently announced the appointment of Mr. Bernard Baruch as the United States representative on that commission. England has appointed its representative, but the other nine nations have not as yet done so.

The steps taken to date are of utmost importance, but can anyone honestly claim that we have proceeded very far? The course charted by the United Nations Atomic Energy resolution is a realistic one. It is based on the fundamental premise that a world safe from the destruction of the atomic bomb can be achieved only if all nations advance together.

From all this I can draw no other conclusion than that we must retain the atomic bomb as a vital part of our arsenal and that we must hold secure the technical secrets of atomic-bomb manufacture, until the United Nations program of enforceable, reciprocal safeguards has been put into effect. While the McMahon bill obviously looks for-

ward to the eventual goal to which the United Nations and the United States are committed, it ignores the difficult stages through which we all must go before that goal is reached. By paying scant attention to the military uses of atomic energy, by ignoring the responsibility of the armed services for the national defense, by giving inadequate attention to security considerations, the McMahon bill is inconsistent with our commitments to the United Nations program.

II

To my view the May-Johnson bills as amended and reported out by the House Military Affairs Committee last November is realistically in accord with our international policy and commitments. It is based on the realization that any system of international control of atomic energy can be achieved only by working out, step by step, an effective, enforceable system of safeguards. It bids us walk before we run.

The May-Johnson bill is not—as its critics have charged—a military control bill. It was originally drafted after months of study by an all-civilian committee appointed in May 1945 which by no stretch of the imagination could be called military-minded for the very reason that the War Department wanted to turn it over to civilian control.

In considering the bill, the House Military Affairs Committee adopted certain amendments. The principal change that was made emphasized more strongly than before the policy of noninterference with fundamental research and experimentation as carried on by scientists in this and other fields in private laboratories.

The bill as amended provides that atomic energy should be controlled for the benefit of the entire Nation by a separate civilian agency and relieves the War Department of the responsibility it had in this field during the war. It vests full powers in a Commission of nine part-time members to be appointed for staggered terms by the President with the approval of the Senate. In accordance with sound administrative practice it provides that day-to-day administration should be carried on by a full-time administrator and deputy administrator appointed by, and fully responsible to, the Commission. Nothing in the bill requires the appointment of a member of the armed forces to the Commission or as administrator or deputy administrator. The provision about which so much protest has been heard simply provides that in the event the President of the United States decides to name any military personnel to the Commission or in the event the Commission decides to name a military man to be administrator of deputy administrator, such persons can serve without losing retirement and other privileges due them as members of the armed forces. There is nothing sinister about this. There are, and there have been in the past, many instances where military personnel have been appointed to civilian posts in our Government and have, by law, been allowed to retain the privileges of their commissions. This is true today of General Omar Bradley, Veteran Administrator, and General Bedell Smith, our new Ambassador to Russia.

I am certain that no President would propose, and that no Senate would approve, any plan to appoint a majority of military personnel to membership on the Commission. In my opinion, military representation should never constitute a majority. However, I do believe that minority representation would be desirable.

In all its activities the Commission is required to give full aid and assistance to free research. It is disbarred from interfering with the conduct or the disclosing of information about private research unless the actual amounts of atomic energy released are large enough to be a national hazard or of military or industrial value.

The Commission is empowered to establish the necessary security regulations which would apply to persons connected with the work of the Commission. Persons engaged in private small-scale research and experimentation not associated with the Commission would be exempt from these regulations.

The penalty provisions of the act you have heard so much about provide high penalties only for acts amounting to treason. When treason is not involved in security violations the penalties are much lower. The provision for dismissal of persons violating security regulations applies only to employment under the control of the Commission.

III

I am sure that if those who criticized the May-Johnson bill would actually read it with care, many of them would find that it is not the monster they have been led to believe it is. It is, I submit, a bill which provides full encouragement to scientific advance in the field of atomic energy. It provides a sound domestic program. It is consistent with our international commitments.

Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the one big question my constituents are asking is, "When are we going to get more housing?" The House passed the Patman bill enlarging the power and authority of Director Wilson Wyatt, but this legislation is not yet on the statute books. People want to know just where the bottleneck is. In this connection there appears in the Jackson Citizen-Patriot a statement which emanates from local lumber and building material dealers and, pursuant to the permission granted to me by the House, I include that statement, which is as follows:

LET US FACE THE FACTS ABOUT HOME BUILDING

In the confusion created about the shortage of homes in America, one point stands out clearly:

You cannot build homes without materials!

Lumber and building material dealers and contractors obviously have a vital interest in obtaining materials for home building.

They report, nevertheless, that such materials are not flowing through the yards; that they have not been able to get them. Therefore, the Government's HH priorities offered to enable veterans and others to obtain homes, are simply home hunting licenses—for materials in quantity are not available.

As long as OPA continues its wartime control policy rather than a policy of adjustment to aid reconversion, it will neither be able to prevent an inflation nor a deflation; it will only be able to prevent reconversion by discouraging production of needed home-building items.

Here, for example, is an instance of OPA action that has resulted in increased production. After 6 months' delay, OPA granted a 4 to 10 percent price adjustment that allowed 125 of 400 closed brick and tile plants to reopen. This price adjustment allowed these plants and 400 others that had been operating to hire needed labor. As a result, in the next quarter production rose 35 percent.

But in hardwood flooring, siding, plywood, millwork, and construction lumber, OPA clings to its wartime formula. In fact, OPA follows the unrealistic policy of allowing premium prices to mills for producing lumber for such things as export to foreign countries, and for items that were needed in wartime industry.

Today's question is not essentially one of price control—if there were plenty of homes, no price controls would be necessary. The important question is one of production and manpower.

So far, OPA and Government officialdom in general have contented themselves with controls, allocations, and priority systems which at best can do nothing but juggle an insufficient supply of building materials—and at worst, delay and retard production and the employment of manpower.

Homes will not be built in the United States unless the building industry builds them. Whether they are labeled "Public housing" or "Private homes," the same materials, the same labor, the same building industry will build them.

Production can be unblocked by the removal or adjustment of OPA's wartime policies. But such a realistic approach cannot be attained as long as Government action is based on a philosophy of lack rather than a philosophy of abundant supply for peacetime prosperity.

The lumber dealers, builders, and contractors stand ready to build or rebuild America. But it is up to the people to demand that the way be cleared for the prodction of materials for homes.

Any Government program that does not first remove the obstacles blocking production of materials will simply add additional difficulties to the problem facing the building industry.

Veterans' Housing Conditions at Lima, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Eleanor Moran from the Lima (Ohio) Daily News:

TWO HUNDRED WAR VETERANS HUNTING ROOFS OF THEIR OWN HERE—INDIGNATION FLARES AS RED TAPE SNARLS HOME-BUILDING PLANS

(By Eleanor Moran)

Let President Truman and the Federal housing authorities place all the restrictions on building materials they want to—they aren't helping the 200 veterans in Lima who 4 years ago went off to war only to return and find themselves under someone else's roof.

For the critical housing shortage, spreading across the Nation like eczema, has hit Lima full in the face.

Indignation is flaring among the veterans. They're wondering what has caused such a dilemma. They're wondering why they should be crowded into two by four cubicles or be forced to seek refuge with relatives.

They're asking, "What happened to all the homes after we left here?"

And those who do obtain priorities to build houses are damning the Government red tape which officials have promised repeatedly to eliminate.

Any veteran who plans to build a new home can obtain a priority by just asking for it at the local Veterans' Administration office.

His stumbling block comes when he must hurdle the Federal Housing Administration authorities at Columbus.

And that takes from 5 days—if he's lucky—to 30 days. It depends on when the officials make up their minds.

There are two sets of priorities available to veterans who desire to build a new home or remodel old ones. Forms CPA–4386 and CPA–4386–A cover both remodeling and building.

Six copies of the priorities must be sent to Columbus for approval along with submitted plans of the type of house to be constructed—and this includes heating, basement, refrigeration, various wall structures, and the type of garage, along with the measurements of each.

According to T. F. Gallagher, Veterans' Administration officer in Lima, three-fourths of all priorities applied for in Lima are for veterans' new homes.

"They're not having trouble obtaining priorities," Gallagher said, "but they're having trouble getting them approved."

Under the GI bill of rights, any veteran may apply for a loan amounting up to $10,000, with the snap of a finger.

Upon his release from the Army the veteran is given a reservoir of credit with the Federal Government entitling him to apply for such a loan.

Next, his proposed housing and lot must be approved by locally established appraisers and when their approval is given—the veteran may go ahead with his building—if he can get building materials.

The Government guarantees one-half of all loans up to $4,000 given the veteran, who in turn is required to pay back the loan at 4 percent interest per year.

In Lima, Allen, Auglaize, and Hardin Counties, some $400,000 in loans have been given out to veterans, it is estimated by Clayton M. Paine, secretary of the Citizen's Building & Loan Co.

All is not easy-come-easy-go with most of the veterans, however, and they're living on the sailor adage, "Any old port in a storm."

Most of them have taken refuge with relatives in crowded, cramped quarters—but they're making a go of it and still hoping.

One such case is William Pursell, his wife, and 15-month-old daughter, who since his return from 43 months' Army service have made their home with Mrs. Pursell's parents.

Although mom and dad have offered the Pursells a decent place to live, they still want their own roof over their heads. The Pursells have searched in vain since last December, when Pursell received his discharge from the Army Air Corps.

Another veteran, Lowell D. Powell, who spent 4 years in the Navy and was discharged in October 1945, also had to resort to his parents' offer of a place to live at Bluffton, route 1.

Powell, a bookkeeper at the McKinley Motor Co., spent 27 months in the Pacific area aboard an aircraft carrier. He has been driving back and forth to work since last December.

Still another veteran of the Pacific war who returned to Lima after his discharge revealed he and his wife have been living with his father and mother for the last 5 months in a five-room house. Three sisters and a little brother make up the rest of the family.

"I was offered a two-room apartment, without any kind of facilities, for $18 a week about 2 months ago," he said. "I'm making money, but not that kind of money."

Maurice Core, former Air Corps sergeant, his wife, and child are another example of what a veteran is faced with in Lima.

Core and his family have been living with his mother on East Kibby Street since his discharge from the Army last October. He was a member of the Army Air Corps 5 years and after his discharge returned to his job at the Lima Locomotive Works, Inc., but efforts to find housing for his wife and child have proved futile.

He also experienced an offer from a Lima landlord for a two-room unfurnished apartment, without facilities, for $35 a month.

It was city council's hope last January to ease the housing shortage for veterans by making application to the Federal Government for 50 temporary housing units. The initial plan was submitted to council by the local chapter of Amvets.

Under the plan the houses were to be built by the Government, including the installing of sewer lines and all electrical utilities from the street to the house. Lima's share in the undertaking is to donate the proposed sites, provide technical services for certain portions of work for which the city is responsible.

All temporary housing structures, according to the plans, were to be removed from the site 2 years after the termination of the national emergency.

But evidently Lima has been given a cold shoulder by the Federal housing authorities in Cleveland. At least a dozen other surrounding cities—Findlay, Bellefontaine, Kenton, Fremont—have had their applications approved.

But Lima's plan for 50 temporary housing units apparently has been given a dash of cold water by the Federal housing authorities.

Two Vital Decisions by the Federal Trade Commission of Violations of the Robinson-Patman Act Favorable to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, two highly important decisions have recently been issued by the Federal Trade Commission through cease and desist orders for violating the Robinson-Patman Act through certain discriminatory prices which reacted to the detriment of smaller dealers. One of these orders involved the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana and the other the John B. Stetson Co., of Philadelphia, in the sale of hats.

In the first instance, the Federal Trade Commission found that the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana in Detroit favored four customers, three of them operating as wholesalers and retailers and one strictly as a retailer through its own filling stations. In each of these four instances the Standard Oil Co. sold its best-selling grade of gasoline at a price of 1½ cents per gallon lower than the price charged for the same gasoline to 358 other retail dealers in competition in the Detroit metropolitan area.

In addition, the company operating exclusively at retail was given additional half cent lower price. This company was largely responsible for price cutting, having an advantage of 2 cents a gallon over competing retail filling stations. This is in addition to the 3.3 cents a gallon margin on the posted tank-wagon price and the prevailing retail selling price of gasoline.

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

The significance of this decision in the Standard Oil case prompted the National Wholesale Hardware Association to bulletin its members in the following release pointing out that this decision, as also that of the Stetson Co., are "a very definite aid to small business":

A highly significant, and what may prove to be a far-reaching, cease and desist order under the Robinson-Patman Act has been entered against the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana by the Federal Trade Commission directing it to discontinue practices charged to be discriminatory.

Particularly important are Commission's findings that—

(a) The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana "arbitrarily" classified four "favored customers" in the Detroit area as "jobbers" and sold them at prices 1½ cents per gallon lower than it charged other retail dealers without requiring the "favored customers" to "sell only at wholesale."

(b) This gave the favored customers a substantial competitive advantage.

(c) Price cutting by one of the four has been responsible for the retail price cutting in major-brand gasoline in Detroit over a period of several years.

(d) Price differences of less than five-tenths of a cent do not lessen competition and are permissible.

A summary of the findings in the case as released by the Federal Trade Commission reads as follows:

DISCRIMINATED AGAINST SMALL DEALERS

"The price discriminations in question occurred in the Detroit metropolitan area, where Standard Oil Co. sold gasoline to four dealers at prices substantially lower than those charged approximately 358 other retailer-purchasers it regularly supplied in the same area. The four favored customers are Citrin-Kolb Oil Co., Stikeman Oil Co., Inc., Wayne Oil Co., and Ned's Auto Supply Co. Although Ned's Auto Supply Co. sold all of the gasoline it purchased from Standard Oil at retail, and the other three favored dealers sold at retail as well as at wholesale, each was arbitrarily classified by the respondent as a jobber. Standard Oil Co. sold its best-selling brand of gasoline, Red Crown, to these four dealers at its tank-car price, which was 1½ cents per gallon lower than the prices it charged for the same gasoline sold to other retail dealers in the Detroit metropolitan area. In allowing jobber classifications to the four dealers named, Standard Oil did not require that they should sell only at wholesale.

"In addition to the price discriminations granted to the four favored customers, Standard Oil for a period of time allowed Ned's Auto Supply Co. a price of 0.5 cents a gallon off the regular tank-wagon price charged to all other retail dealers.

"The retailer's margin between the respondent's posted tank-wagon price and the prevailing retail selling price on Red Crown gasoline has been only 3.3 cents a gallon in the metropolitan area of Detroit since November 1939. Consequently, any reduction allowed to a retail service-station operator below the regular tank-wagon price gives such operator a material advantage over other retail operators who pay the full tank-wagon price.

"The price discriminations granted to the four favored dealers on gasoline sold by them at retail have given them a substantial competitive advantage over other retailers of gasoline, including retailer-customers of the respondent. This competitive advantage is capable of being used, and has been used by Ned's Auto Supply Co., and to some extent by Citrin-Kolb Oil Co., to divert large amounts of business from other retailers of

gasoline, with resultant injury to them and to their ability to continue in business successfully.

TRADE COMMISSION'S FINDINGS

"The Commission finds that price cutting at Ned's Auto Supply Co. stations has been almost continuous and that this company has been responsible in starting most of the retail-price cutting in major-brand gasoline in Detroit over a period of several years.

"Under the order issued by the Commission, Standard Oil Co. is directed to cease and desist from discriminating in the price of gasoline of like grade and quality as among purchasers;

"1. By selling gasoline of like grade and quality to competing purchasers at different prices in the manner and under the circumstances found in that portion of the Commission's findings relating to the discriminatory prices granted each of the four favored dealers; or by continuing or resuming such discriminations in price;

"2. By otherwise discriminating in price between purchasers of gasoline of like grade and quality in any manner resulting in price discriminations substantially equal in amount to those granted each of the four favored dealers;

"3. By selling gasoline to some retailers at prices different from those charged other retailers who compete in the sale and distribution of such gasoline: *Provided, however,* That this shall not prevent price differences of less than 0.5 cent per gallon which do not tend to lessen, injure, or destroy competition among such retailers;

"4. By allowing to any dealer, jobber, or wholesaler who sells gasoline at retail a lower price than the price the respondent charges its retailer-customers who compete in the sale and distribution of such gasoline with such dealer, jobber, or wholesaler in their retailing activity: *Provided, however,* That this shall not prevent price differences of less than 0.5 cent a gallon which do not tend to lessen, injure, or destroy competition with such dealers, jobbers, or wholesalers in the sale of gasoline direct to the consuming public;

"5. By selling gasoline to any dealer, jobber, or wholesaler at a price lower than the price the respondent charges its retailer-customers who compete in the sale of such gasoline with retailer-customers of such dealers, jobbers, or wholesalers, where dealers, jobbers, or wholesalers resell the gasoline to any of their retailer-customers at less than the respondent's posted tank-wagon price or who grant to any such retailer-customer any discounts, rebates, allowances, or services having the net effect of a reduction in price to the retailer.

"For the purpose of comparison the term 'price' as used in the Commission's order takes into account discounts, rebates, allowances, and other terms and conditions of sale."

HOW STETSON DISCRIMINATED

In the case of the John B. Stetson Co., of Philadelphia, the Federal Trade Commission found from its investigation that it gave larger buyers not only favorable quantity discounts on hats but enabled certain customers operating branch stores where separate deliveries were made to combine their purchases and thus realize the greater discounts.

In addition, special cash payments were made to selected customers in consideration of their furnishing advertising, window displays, and other promotional services by denying the same payments or allowances on proportionally equal terms to other customers in a position to provide the same services as required by the Robinson-Patman Act.

The details of this decision as issued to the members of the National Wholesale Hardware Association are contained in the following release, which is a copy of the summary issued by the Federal Trade Commission:

THE STETSON CASE

In another case, the John B. Stetson Co., Philadelphia, has been ordered by the Federal Trade Commission to cease and desist from violation of the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act in connection with the sale of men's hats.

The Commission charges that the respondent company has discriminated in price between different purchasers and also has granted advertising and promotional allowances to some favored customers without making such allowances available to competing customers on proportionally equal terms.

The Commission's findings are in part substantially as follows:

John B. Stetson Co. has discriminated in price by the use of cumulative quantity discount schedules whereby it has sold to some customers at higher prices than it has sold men's hats of like grade and quality to other customers. The discriminatory discounts allowed under the schedules, which varied from year to year, are in addition to a regular trade discount of 2 percent allowed to all customers. The schedule in effect from November 1, 1942, to October 31, 1943, and thereafter, is as follows:

Quantity discounts

Annual shipments:	Percent
$5,000 to $7,499.99	2
$7,500 to $9,999.99	2½
$10,000 to $14,999.99	3
$15,000 to $24,999.99	3½
$25,000 to $34,999.99	4
$35,000 to $49,999.99	4½
$50,000 to $74,999.99	5
$75,000 to $99,999.99	6
$100,000 to $199,999.99	7
$200,000 and over	8

In addition to the discriminations effected by the cumulative quantity discount schedules, the respondent company also has discriminated between different purchasers by granting some customers lower prices based upon the total volume of hats sold to all of the separate branches of such customers, although separate delivery was made to these several branches, if and when this total volume amounted to certain required minima during the year, without regard to the quantity delivered to the respective branches.

The respondent also has made cash payments or allowances to selected customers in consideration of their furnishing advertising, window display, and other promotional services, without making such payments or allowances available on proportionally equal terms to other customers who are willing and able to provide the same kind of services and facilities as those furnished by the favored customers.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S ORDER

Under the Commission's order the respondent company is directed to cease and desist:

(1) From selling men's hats of like grade and quality to competing purchasers at uniform prices and thereafter granting varying discounts therefrom through the use of the cumulative quantity discounts described in the Commission's findings of fact and from resuming such discriminations in price.

(2) From otherwise discriminating in price between the purchasers of men's hats of like grade and quality in any manner resulting in price discriminations substantially equal in amount to those referred to in the Commission's findings, except as permitted by section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

(3) From paying or allowing or contracting to pay or allow anything of value to or for the benefit of some of its customers for advertising services furnished by them without making such payments or allowances available to all competing customers on proportionally equal terms.

Labor-Management Difficulties

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised at the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] making the statement on the floor of the House that the right to strike should be suspended for a year. Since when have we come to the point where we are going right into the very thing that Hitler, the Nazis, and Fascists did in Europe?

The right to strike is the only real economic weapon that the laboring man has for his protection. If the right to strike is denied the laboring people of this Nation, they are forced into involuntary servitude in violation of the principles laid down by the Constitution of the United States. I have heard the gentleman defend constitutional rights and admonish this House to abide by the provisions of the Constitution as have many other Members of this body.

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States and the principles laid down in that instrument are supposed to apply equally to all the people. However, time after time, Members of this House in their fight against those who labor for a living seem to advocate a different conception of the Constitution than when they are speaking in behalf of management. Management has its rights and its duties; labor has its rights and its duties. There is no doubt that the utopia will be when management voluntarily bargains collectively, openly, and honestly with those who labor and earn their living by the sweat of their brows. In thousands of instances, management and industry have refused to bargain collectively, in violation of the National Labor Relations Act, and in defiance of the law. When this happens, labor has no alternative other than to say to management, "We must have a living wage for ourselves and our families. We must have working conditions that are suitable to human beings and be treated as such. We will work and earn profits for your industry for a living wage and under proper working conditions but not otherwise." When laboring people assert that right which is nothing more nor less than the right to strike, I cannot understand how one who purports to profess his faith in democracy can urge and advocate that the right to strike be suspended.

In other words, it is nothing more nor less than denying to the working people of this Nation the right to raise their voices in behalf of themselves and their

families in protest to substandard wages and unbearable working conditions. When the voice of the laboring people of this Nation is stilled by edict of government, fascism will have been established supreme in this Nation, and the millions of lives and the sacrifices made by the people of this Nation in the past war will have been in vain. God forbid that fascism raise its ugly head in this Nation. I trust that no other Member of this House advocates that the right to strike be suspended for a year, or even a day.

It has become rather popular of late by certain individuals and groups of individuals to malign labor and labor unions. I do not believe that they are actually un-American in their hearts, but if this House should follow such suggestions, we would wipe out democracy from our Government and substitute it with a foreign ideology. I know that if some of these people who are driven by emotion would give serious study to the problem of labor and management, they will agree with me that voluntary arbitration—free, open, and honest collective bargaining—is the heart of democracy. It is about time that labor baiting be discontinued in this body. The backbone of America is the men and women who earn their living for themselves and their families by the sweat of their brow. Let us help them to appreciate democracy by protecting their rights rather than advocating that those rights be suspended.

Sale of Surplus Army Trucks

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House knows of the great demand that has been made by the veterans for trucks and motor vehicles. Likewise, every Member of the House knows how it was almost impossible for these men to obtain vehicles.

All of the New York newspapers on Sunday contained a quarter-page ad by Gimbel's Department Store saying that they had in their possession for sale several hundred 2½-ton new Army trucks which were available to the general public for $2,990.

I believe that the War Assets Corporation owes an obligation to this Congress and to the people of the United States to explain why these trucks were sold to a department store which could afford to spend thousands of dollars for advertising and still make a substantial profit at $2,990. Why were they not offered to the veterans at the same price at which they were sold to Gimbel's? I have no brief against the department store, for it is their duty to their stockholders to sell whatever they can sell and to make a decent profit. I do believe, and I have already recommended to the chairman of the Committee on Executive Expenditures, that the head of the War Assets Corporation should be called before that committee to give a full accounting of this deal and also to obtain guarantees from him that this procedure will not be followed in the future. Let the Chairman of the War Assets Corporation inform the committee as to the number of vehicles that he has at his disposal, and also let him state the price desired by the War Assets Corporation.

Several months ago I suggested to the then Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, Mr. W. Stuart Symington, that a branch be established in every State by his group where lists would be set forth several days before being offered to the general public of all surplus property which might be desired by veterans. On this score I received no cooperation from Mr. Symington.

The present disposal of surplus property, and of motor vehicles in particular, is a justifiably bitter question with the veterans of the country. Many veterans who have priority certificates nave been unable to obtain trucks with which they might establish themselves in business, yet a great corporation with millions of dollars of liquid cash is able to walk into the War Assets Corporation and buy these vehicles. Something smells somewhere.

The Petroleum Industry and Price Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the petroleum industry has stated its case to the Banking and Currency Committee of this House on price control. It has asked for the immediate decontrol of that industry.

As one who has been familiar for the past 3 years with every step taken by the independent producers of oil in their long fight for recognition of their position, I am in complete accord with them in the request they have made.

The supply of crude petroleum in the United States today is sufficient for all the needs. In recent months there have been shortages of particular products. The oil industry has shown that such shortages resulted from the price ceilings imposed by the OPA. Yields of products can be adjusted by refiners of crude oil. They can make more gasoline and less kerosene, for instance. That is what they did following the Japanese surrender. They could make a profit on gasoline and little or none on kerosene under the OPA ceilings. They told OPA about this long before cold weather came and before the demand for kerosene for home heating had increased. No adjustment was made until December, when the shortage was acute.

The industry itself would have made the adjustment as the need required. If it saw the necessity of stimulating production of kerosene or fuel oil, it would have adjusted its price and the increased supply would have been available when needed.

Oil producers did their best throughout the war to produce the oil their Government was demanding. They did an outstanding job in the face of great discouragement. They needed a higher price to meet their greatly increased costs. Every element of their costs went up. They were told, in effect, to "live on their fat." The OPA knew just that little about the business of drilling oil wells—and dry holes in the search for oil. On the few occasions that the OPA condescended to comment on the many recommendations of a higher price for crude oil—by committees of Congress, by the Petroleum Administration for War, by State officials and by the industry itself—it attempted to support its "hold the line" policy by pointing to the earnings of a few of the most powerful oil companies. Their profits came from the manufactured products, not from crude oil..

Price control, according to statements of the President and by Mr. Bowles and others, is to be applied to scarce commodities. Oil is not scarce. It will not be if the oil producers are allowed to have that belated recognition of their increased costs so that they can get enough money to go on exploring for new fields, developing those they find and making use of secondary recovery methods on the old fields so as to get a greater yield.

The OPA apparently has no intention of making the necessary adjustments in its price ceilings. It raised crude oil price ceiling 10 cents on April 1 in the face of the reported recommendations of a minimum raise of 35 cents.

Controls should come off now. There will be no runaway price increases to the consumer. The present ample supply of crude oil and the highly competitive nature of the industry are better guaranties than the OPA can provide.

The industry found and developed the oil fields which met the military needs under a free economy. There was no OPA to hamper the efforts of the oil producers. The future needs of the Nation can be best served by returning the industry to a free economy. That should be done at once.

Who Will Lead the GOP?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore given me by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the New Rochelle (N. Y.) Standard-Star, entitled "Who Will Lead the GOP?":

WHO WILL LEAD THE GOP?

There rises once more before the Republican National Committee the question of who will make a good national chairman. It is a big question, for the Nation faces congressional elections of serious import and 1948 lies ahead. The new chairman will be ex-

pected to elect a Republican majority in the House of Representatives, cut to the bone the Democratic majority in the Senate, and pave the way for election of the Republican Presidential candidate 2 years hence.

The GOP will need more than a mere presiding officer over the national committee. The new chairman must have other qualifications than that he has no enemies within his own party. He must be militant, courageous, foresighted, and popular. He must have the common touch.

But as leader, even with these rare qualities, he will still be helpless unless he be given proper tools for his trade. He must have able candidates, a forward-looking program, capable public-relations counsel, and full cooperation from all factions of his party. His party must give him a platform which will appeal to the intelligent American voter on both domestic and foreign affairs. He must be able to sell his party to the public against the wiles of a New Deal which has learned well that human nature is essentially selfish.

Where is this paragon of all virtues to be found?

We don't know.

H. R. 5970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Harold G. Wentworth, of 49 Wall Street, New York City, a distinguished member of the New York bar and attorney for the American Nurses' Association. This letter refers to the bill, H. R. 5970, which I introduced today. The letter is as follows:

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR GENE: As you may know, a number of national associations, such as the American Nurses' Association and the National League of Nursing Education, are organized as membership corporations under the laws of the District of Columbia. It is often difficult for members who live at a distance from the large cities, such as New York, to attend the meetings or conventions of such associations. It would, therefore, be a great convenience to such members if they were legally empowered to vote by proxy or by mail. Unincorporated associations, such as college and university alumni associations, which are not bound by the corporation laws, quite generally permit their members to vote by mail.

The statutes of a number of States now permit members of nonprofit corporations to vote by proxy or by mail, or both. For example, section 15 of the General Not-for-Profit Corporation Act of Illinois permits either type of voting, if the bylaws of the corporation so provide, and section 19 of the General Corporation Law of New York permits all corporations, whether stock corporations or membership corporations, other than religious corporations, to vote by proxy. However, while there is no direct adjudication on this point, voting by mail is probably not permitted to a District of Columbia corporation under the present law; and while an amendment to the certificate of incorporation of a District of Columbia membership corporation authorizing voting by proxy would probably be accepted for filing by the Recorder of Deeds, such corporations naturally hesitate to take action on the matter until the fundamental law on the subject is clear.

The American Nurses' Association is the national organization of graduate, registered, professional nurses, with 52 constituent State and Territorial nurses' associations and approximately 525 constituent (local) nurses' associations. The aggregate membership of the association as of December 31, 1945, was over 181,000. The attendance at its conventions is so large that such conventions must necessarily be held in the larger cities. Each time a convention is held members from other parts of the country find it difficult to send a full delegation to the convention and express a desire for some form of voting which would permit their States to avail themselves more completely of their voting rights. At present, distance, in effect, disfranchises many of the delegates from such States from voting in the election of the officers and directors of the association and restricts such voting in disproportionate measure to delegates from the States nearest to that in which the convention is being held. The situation is not cured by the fact that voting is confined to the official delegates from the State associations, inasmuch as each State is entitled, on the average, to 34 delegates, and the State associations farthest from the convention city find it much more difficult to pay the travel expenses of 34 delegates and to arrange for their absence from their ordinary occupations than the State associations which are closer to the convention city. While permitting delegates to vote by proxy would give some relief, the procedure is somewhat cumbersome, particularly in view of the fact that it is desired to maintain a secret ballot. For this reason, the association would like to offer its members the choice of voting by proxy or by mail.

I am taking the liberty of suggesting that a bill amending section 3 of chapter 6 of title 29 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia be prepared and introduced. If you are of the opinion that there is need for such a proposed amendment, I am hopeful of enlisting your active support in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD G. WENTWORTH.

Resolution of Choctaw Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings of the meeting of the Choctaw Tribe held at Hugo, Okla.:

The Choctaw Tribe met in a mass meeting at Hugo, Okla., on March 2, at 10 a. m., with the following members present:

Name	Tribe	Address	County
David Nowabbi	Choctaw	Hugo	Choctaw.
T. J. Sexton	do	Durant	Bryan.
Frank Hotema	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
N. B. McClure	do	Bennington	Bryan.
Houston Tecumseh	do	Bokoshe	Le Flore.
Mrs. Mattie Henry	do	Achillee	Bryan.
May Wilkins	do	Durant	Do.
Effie Lewis	do	Achillee	Do.
Aline Stephenson	do	Durant	Do.
Isabelle Nowabbi	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
Cornelia Pistokcha	do	do	Do.
Pearl Frazier	do	do	Do.
Julius Frazier	do	do	Do.
J. C. Collins	do	do	Do.
Perry Crowder	do	Ardmore	Carter.
Silas James	do	Talihina	Le Flore.
John B. Tillman	do	Quitman, Tex	Wood.
Viola Tillman	do	Grant	Choctaw.
Helen Willis	do	Antlers	Pushmataha.
Virginia Le Flore Marshall	do	Talihina	Le Flore.
Sissie Pitchlynn Bryan	do	do	Do.
Dick Bryan	do	do	Do.
Stella Adkins Boshears	do	Norman	McClain.
Cyrus Woods	do	Atoka	Atoka.
D. L. Auchabbi	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
J. R. Baker	do	Stillwater	Payne.
Thomas Crowder	do	Boswell	Choctaw.
M. B. Jefferson	do	Hugo	Do.
Homer Freeny	do	Caddo	Bryan.
Ray F. Henry	do	Durant	Do.
Thomas Combs	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
Nelson Morris	do	Oklahoma City	Oklahoma.
W. O. Key	do	Fort Towson	Choctaw.
Bill Stinson	do	do	Do.
A. Hotubbee	do	Wilburton	Latimer.
Harold Moore	do	do	Do.
H. L. Kaneubbe	do	McAlester	Pittsburg.
S. W. Folsom	do	Oklahoma City	Oklahoma.
P. W. Cole	do	Centrahoma	Coal.
Ben Henderson	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
Mrs. Willie Fulton	do	do	Do.
Sam Loman	do	do	Do.
Mrs. Bill Stinson	do	Fort Towson	Do.
Anderson James	do	Corinne	Do.
Elliott Willis	do	Idabel	McCurtain.
M. W. Ward	do	do	Do.
Marsilla Sampson	do	Broken Bow	Do.
A. R. Telle	do	Atoka	Atoka.
Joseph Henry	do	Achille	Bryan.
J. F. Lewis	do	do	Do.
Richard Fitzgerald	do	Goodland	Choctaw.
Grover Pierce	do	Hugo	Do.
W. F. Stephenson	do	Durant	Bryan.
Walter Veach	do	do	Do.
Joe Dukes	do	Talihina	Le Flore.
Henry Falconer	do	Spiro	Do.
Sam Downing	do	Atoka	Atoka.
Ben Daney	do	Talihina	Le Flore.
Aaron Johnico	do	do	Do.
Osborne Lawrence	do	Blue	Bryan.
Cliff Kiersey	do	Durant	Do.
John Battiest	do	Hugo	Choctaw.

Name	Tribe	Address	County
Thomas J. Pebworth	Choctaw	Coalgate	Coal.
Miss Lewie Le Flore	do	McAlester	Pittsburg.
B. J. McClure	do	do	Do.
Ben P. Choate	do	do	Do.
Ambros L. Rice	do	Purcell	McClain.
Jim A. Sumpter	do	Antlers	Pushmataha.
Mrs. J. A. Sumpter	do	Antlers	Do.
Gilbert W. Daney	do	Atoka	Atoka.
Melba James	do	Durant	Bryan.
Mrs. B. S. Cudd	do	do	Do.
Mollie Henry	do	do	Do.
Emeline Noah	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
Harriet Ventress	do	Soper	Do.
Emma Andrews	do	Hugo	Do.
B. M. McDaniel	do	Durant	Bryan.
Mrs. A. E. Archer	do	Antlers	Pushmataha.
S. G. Hogan	do	Blue	Bryan.
Sol Roberts	do	Bennington	Do.
Edmund Jackson	do	Atoka	Atoka.
Thomas K. Snead	do	Fort Towson	Choctaw.
Leo Thompson	do	Durant	Bryan.
Josephine Oliver	do	Hugo	Chocatw.
Clarence Keys	do	Fort Towson	Do.
Jim Anderson	do	Wilburton	Latimer.
Robert E. Lee	do	Idabel	McCurtain.
Kelly Spring	do	Atoka	Atoka.
Darril Johnson	do	do	Do.
Dick R. Wilson	do	Antlers	Pushmataha.
Joel S. Griggs	do	Grant	Choctaw.
Homer McPhail	do	Comanche	Stephens.
P. J. Thomas	do	Idabel	McCurtain.
Lona Phillips	do	Speer	Choctaw.
Agnes Johnson	do	do	Do.
Henry Wilkins	do	Durant	Bryan.
Arthur Fulton	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
Rufus M. Edwards	do	Broken Bow	McCurtain.
Grover Thorpe	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
Mrs. Henry Wilkins	do	Durant	Bryan.
Pete Noah	do	Hugo	Choctaw.
Julia V. Falconer, now Underwood	do	Oklahoma City	Oklahoma.
Mrs. James Dyer	do	Broken Bow	McCurtain.
Pearl Wilson	do	do	Do.
Mrs. Lillie Hotema	Chickasaw	Goodland	Choctaw.
Mrs. Susan Locke	Choctaw	Hugo	Do.
Ernestine Locke	do	do	Do.
Hilda Anderson	do	Albion	Pushmataha.
Laura Logan	do	do	Do.
Elmira Willis	do	Soper	Choctaw.
Marie Truesdale	do	do	Do.
Charley Hudson	do	Hugo	Do.
Pete Wall	do	Albion	Pushmataha.
Ephriam Billy	do	Whitesboro, Okla	Le Flore.
Jeff Hickman	do	Talihina	Do.
H. C. Dukes	do	do	Do.
Isaac D. Alberson	do	Ada	Pontotoc.
Mrs. J. A. Sumpter	do	Antlers	Pushmataha.
Mrs. Georgia Brown, nee Lovelace	do	Hartshorne	Pittsburg.
Mrs. Agnes Colbert, nee Daney	do	Atoka	Atoka.
Mrs. Hattie McKeehan	Chickasaw	do	Do.
Mrs. Myrtle Creason	Choctaw	Oklahoma City	Oklahoma.
Mrs. Mary E. Colbert	do	do	Do.
Mrs. Eleanor A. Homan	do	do	Do.

The meeting was called to order by the Reverend Nelson Morris, of Oklahoma City, Okla., and meeting opened with prayer by a visiting minister.

After the meeting was opened, Reverend Morris said it was in order to nominate a permanent chairman and secretary for this meeting.

A motion was made by Jimmie Belvin, Durant, seconded by Mr. Falconer, of Spiro, that Mr. A. R. Telle, of Atoka, be elected permanent chairman of the meeting. Motion carried and Mr. Telle is elected chairman.

Mrs. Myrtle Creason, of Oklahoma City, nominated Mrs. Emma Andrews, of Hugo, Okla., as secretary. Mr. Sam Downing, of Atoka, seconded the nomination and moved that nominations cease and Mrs. Andrews be elected by acclamation. Motion carried.

Upon motion made by Sam Downing, of Atoka, and seconded by Robert E. Lee, of Idabel, Okla., the chair was given authority to appoint a credentials committee. Motion carried and the following were appointed to said committee: Jimme Belvin, chairman; Joe Dukes and Pete Noah, members.

Upon proper motion and seconding, the following committee on resolutions was elected: Jim Anderson, Poteau, Okla., chairman; Henry Falconer, Spiro, and Nelson Morris, Oklahoma City, Okla., members.

While the above committees were out, speeches were heard from Mr. Robert E. Lee, Idabel, Okla.; Sam Downing, Atoka, Okla.; and Mr. Ben Choate, Indianola, Okla.

The credentials committee made the following report:

"All Indians of the Choctaw Tribe, whether enrolled or descendants of enrollees, were entitled to vote."

Report duly accepted and adopted by the members.

The resolutions committee announced its readiness to report and the following was read by the secretary:

"RESOLUTIONS PASSED UPON AT MASS MEETING OF CHOCTAW INDIANS, HELD AT HUGO, OKLA., MARCH 2, 1946

"We, as members of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma in mass meeting assembled in Hugo, Okla., March 2, 1946, do hereby make the following declaration with reference concerning our tribal officials and do further assert our rights and privileges, in the form of resolutions, in support of our cause and contentions, to wit:

"1. We call attention to section 29 of the Atoka Agreement, practically all of which was supplemented by the supplementary agreement approved by the United States Congress and ratified by the legal voters of the Choctaws, September 25, 1902.

"The treaty of 1902 had for its positive program and purpose the winding up of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal affairs and the dissolution of the tribal government. We find our treaties absolutely silent about the continuation of our tribal officials, but we were under the impression as provided for in our treaty, for the disposition of our property, that 4 years or less time from September 25, 1902, would be ample in which to complete the provisions of our treaty and thus terminate everything in our common affairs. Therefore, it is plain to us that the Congress of the United States assumed full authority when it gave the President of the United States the right to appoint a chief (act of April 26, 1906) which sets out in plain words just the kind of appointments the President should make but it did not say that the members of the tribe shall cease to select or designate, by convention or by vote, the man they wish to have as their principal chief.

"2. It was said in 1905 and 1906, at the time it became necessary to consider the entire abolition of the Choctaw laws, that our form of tribal government would cease but our principal chief, the tribal attorney, the coal trustee, and the school superintendent would continue under the tribal law pertaining to the office of chief and his appointees, thus carry with them the salaries provided for under the tribal law. The United States Government recognized the Choctaw laws subsequent to the act of April 26, 1906, affecting the principal chief and his appointees, by making appointments not to exceed a term of 2 years with a salary of $2,000 per annum and expenses incident to the duties of the office, and salaries with expenses for the chief's appointees were fixed in compliance with tribal customs.

"3. The duties and responsibilities of the principal chief have been decreased greatly since the allotment of lands to individuals, and the sale of all the residue land and timber of the tribes, which should have been a suggestion for the decrease in salaries, but instead the present incumbent has his salary with expenses increased, and likewise were the salaries of his appointees raised. This was done without even consulting the members of the tribe, which action was opposed by us, and today we stand protesting the excess expenditures of tribal funds and do hereby promote a program that we claim is right and meritorious.

"4. We, as a tribe, have no source of income except the small amount in royalties from our coal and asphalt, which just about pays the exorbitant salaries and expenses of the officials, for no good, except the maintenance of a tribal government. All other moneys come from the sale of our tribal properties. If these salaries were derived from taxation, we would not consider it our business, but since it is from disposition of our properties the books would show a marked decrease in property valuations of tribal holdings but a fancy increase in overhead cost. This undesirable existence of conditions should be adjusted and we, acting in good faith, believing there is yet much to be sought and acquired by us when in the name of American democracy we demand the exercise of certain privileges given to us by citizens of the United States through the virtues of which and the mere fact that we are members of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians, are entitled to a hearing so found expressed and by the following resolutions, to wit:

"That a complete and authentic record be made of this mass meeting, and its results, and that the same be forwarded to our various representatives in Congress.

"We resolve that—

"1. Aggressive action be taken toward completing coal and asphalt sales as provided by the bill passed by Congress.

"2. That the Choctaw people as a whole be immediately informed of the actual status of all matters in which they have an interest. (Information from Washington, or other sources.)

"3. That the people be informed of the number of stock, land, and other purchases made with tribal funds.

"4. We, your committee, on resolutions, hereby heartily endorse H. R. 4497, now pending in Congress.

"5. The minutes of this meeting to be published in some daily paper of note within the State of Oklahoma.

"6. Immediately upon selection of the person chosen as our next chief, his name be presented to the authorities in Washington, D. C., for confirmation and appointment, on expiration of term of present chief.

"JIM ANDERSON,
"Poteau, Okla., Chairman.
"HENRY FALCONER,
"Spiro, Okla., Member.
"NELSON MORRIS,
"Oklahoma City, Member."

Said resolutions were adopted and accepted by the members of this meeting.

It having been determined who were eligible to vote, the chairman announced it was in order for nominations for the people's choice of a chief of the Choctaw Tribe to succeed our present chief, upon expiration of his present term.

Mr. Sam Downing, of Atoka, nominated W. A. Durant. There was no second to this nomination.

Jimmie Belvin was nominated by W. Campbell, seconded by H. Wilkins.

Soloman Carnes nominated Gilbert W. Daney, of Atoka, and the nomination was seconded by Mrs. Myrtle Creason. Nominations close.

At this time some member present suggests that the persons who have been nominated as candidates for chief of the Choctaws be allowed to address the meeting; thereupon, the chairman announces it is his holding that speeches by the candidates would be out of order at this time, but that if anyone wants to put the matter to a test, upon a two-thirds vote in the affirmative of those present, the ruling will be changed and the candidates allowed to speak to the gathering.

Upon a motion, duly seconded, that the two candidates present be granted an opportunity to speak to the members present, before the voting is begun, and a vote being taken and counted, the chairman declares by a majority two-thirds vote, the members present have signified their desire to hear the condidates, and said motion carrying the provision the candidates be limited to 5 minutes each;

Thereupon, Jimmie Belvin and Gilbert W. Daney each addressed the meeting.

The chairman announces that the last one nominated shall be the first voted upon;

Whereupon, being put to a vote, Gilbert W. Daney of Atoka receives 40 votes for chief of the Choctaws; Jimmie Belvin, of Durant, receives 63 votes for chief of the Choctaws.

The chairman declares that to be a majority, and that Jimmie Belvin is nominated for appointment to the chief of the Choctaws.

It is moved by Robert E. Lee and seconded by Sam Downing that the chairman be authorized to appoint three people to assist Jimmie Belvin in presenting the affairs of the Choctaw Indians to the authorities in Washington, D. C. This motion was amended to include a committee, or at least one from each county of the Choctaw nation.

The motion and amendment being seconded, upon vote, unanimously carried.

The chairman states that he is not well enough acquainted with the members in each county to name one from each county, and, therefore, the chairman would appoint the committee of three to aid the nominated chief, Mr. Belvin, and ask that they in turn select one member from each county of the Choctaw nation to complete the committee.

Thereupon, the chairman named the following committee: Jimmie Belvin, Durant, Okla., chairman; Gilbert W. Daney, Atoka, Okla., member; Mrs. Myrtle Creason, Oklahoma City, member.

Whereupon, there being no further business to come before this meeting of Choctaws, a motion was made by Gilbert W. Daney, and seconded by Robert E. Lee that we adjourn. Meeting adjourned when said motion carried.

A. R. TELLE,
Chairman.

Attest:

EMMA ANDREWS,
Secretary.

Newspaper Terms Building Boom Wildest in United States History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly for the past several months I have called the attention of the House to the runaway inflation that is taking place in the real-estate industry. A recent report of the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics bears this out, with the figures showing that the situation is far more serious than we had anticipated.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include an extremely able analysis of that report which was recently published in the New York newspaper PM:

WASHINGTON, March 27.—The Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics has found that the current real-estate boom is the wildest in the Nation's history.

A. Ford Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, discloses the results of an exhaustive field study of changes in home ownership during the war.

The report shows this fact:

"During the war the shift of families from the position of tenants to owners has been spectacular and rapid. The proportion of dwellings occupied by their owners has increased more rapidly (15.3 percent) in this 5-year period than in the entire boom decade of the 1920's."

The result:

Almost half of all American families own their own homes.

"Whether the wartime gains in home ownership are permanent," the Bureau of Labor Statistics report warns, "or whether foreclosures will follow as happened after the twenties is yet to be seen."

The report explains what happened during the five war years to force families to buy instead of renting their homes:

"The shortages together with substantial increase in employment and income created a brisk sales market. According to many reports, banks, insurance companies, and loan agencies took advantage of this favorable market to dispose of repossessed properties acquired during the thirties.

"War workers in many areas found the only way to obtain a place to live in was to buy. As a result, tenants of long standing found themselves dispossessed because the war workers with higher earnings had bought their houses. The displaced tenants in turn often were forced to buy another house.

"Rent ceilings encouraged and stimulated the sales of rental properties. In many instances tenants bought homes at inflated prices so they would not be evicted. In spite of OPA eviction regulations, the rate of tenant evictions almost tripled between June 1943 and April 1945.

"Rapidly increasing sale prices were reported in virtually all cities in which housing surveys were made, with local estimates of the increase since prewar years ranging from 10 percent in some cities to 100 percent in others."

In some cities, the decline in the rental market was more than 50 percent. Single-family-type rental dwelling (attached as well as detached houses) disappeared quickest. For example, in New York City, while only 4 percent of all types of occupied rental dwellings became owner-occupied in the 21 months included in the survey, 22 percent of the single-family dwellings became occupied by their owners.

Are these wartime owners to lose their homes and become postwar tenants?

BLS offers these two pictures:

On the optimistic side: "In some respects the present real-estate boom is based on sounder financial practices than that of the 1920's. The faulty appraisal practices of the 1920's, the high interest rates, and the widespread use of second and third mortgages, are not now prevalent. Long-term amortized mortgages, low interest rates, and substantial down payments have characterized recent sales practices."

On the pessimistic side: "The sharp increase in sales prices together with the long-term commitments at inflated levels may prove too heavy a burden for many of the new wartime home owners, especially if there is a downward adjustment in the general price level in the postwar years. Furthermore, the forced purchase of homes by persons not yet ready financially to assume the cost of home ownership, or by persons whose residence in the community was only temporary, have created for many an unstable and insecure type of home ownership."

Price-Control Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on March 26 the House granted me permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial titled "Price-Control Extension," which appeared in the Daily News of New York City:

PRICE-CONTROL EXTENSION

Congress is considering extension of Government price control until June 30, 1947, and the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning has just concluded "reluctantly" that such extension had better be decreed.

The committee recommends also, however, that price controls be liberalized in several respects.

Its main recommendation under this head is that industry be allowed to make reasonable profits on cheap editions of essential items, such as clothing, even if the consumer has to pay slightly higher prices for these goods.

THE ZEALOUS MR. BOWLES

It seems a sound recommendation. After all, the consumer's main need in this category is to be able to buy suits, shirts, socks, overcoats, etc., somewhere.

If manufacturers can't make some profit on those items, they can't and won't go on manufacturing them. The righteous principle of price control will have been maintained in all its purity, but the poor old ultimate consumer eventually will be making do with flour sacks converted into shirts of a sort and with shoes modeled after the wooden affairs the peasants wear in Holland.

As price control has been worked up to now by Chester Bowles and his associates, there have been irritating postwar shortages in various low-priced clothing items which you would naturally expect to be in plentiful supply.

All kinds of explanations are to be heard from the price controllers, but somehow the nylon stocking lines don't get shorter and the men's shirts at reasonable prices don't grow noticeably more numerous on the haberdashery shelves.

It looks from this point of view as if much of the trouble must be charged up to Mr. Bowles. He is reported to have fallen in love with his Government job, and to be growing more zealous about it all the time. He now seems to feel that he stands at Armageddon and battles for the Lord, while everybody else conspires to wreck all price controls and spin the country into a disastrous inflation.

Zeal in a public servant is a good thing, but it can easily go too far. It looks as if Congress, while extending price control for a while longer, will best serve the interests of consumers and everyone else by putting some judicious and well-considered curbs on the zeal of Bowles & Co.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview of Lt. Col. W. S. Whitehead, GSC, Director, Property Disposal Division, Headquarters Third Service Command, Baltimore, Md., on property disposal activities of Third Service Command by Ian Ross MacFarlane, radio commentator over WWDC, Washington, D. C., and affiliated stations on January 29, 1946:

Mr. MACFARLANE. Colonel, what is the authority which permits the disposal of surplus property resulting from the war?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. The Surplus Property Act of 1944. The objectives of this law are to facilitate and to regulate the orderly disposal of surplus property. The law establishes the Office of Surplus Property Administrator whose duty it is to supervise and direct the handling and disposition of surplus property and the transfer of surplus property between Government agencies. The law also provides that disposal agencies will be designated to dispose of surplus property under the control of an owning agency.

Mr. MACFARLANE. That sounds a little complicated, Colonel. Could you give us civilians a specific example of an owning agency and a disposal agency?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Well, the War Department is a good example of an owning agency and the War Assets Corporation, which is a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has been designated as a disposal agency.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Could you be specific as to the functions of an owning agency and a disposal agency with respect to the handling of surplus property?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Well, generally speaking, Mr. MacFarlane, an owning agency, such as the War Department, does not sell surplus property. When any War Department property is determined surplus to its requirements, it is listed on a declaration, which is then forwarded to a regional office of the War Assets Corporation, whose job it is to dispose of it.

However, it should be pointed out that even though the War Department has declared to the War Assets Corporation billions of dollars of surplus supplies and equipment, the local Army installations are still charged with the responsibility of caring for and storing this property until the War Assets Corporation can dispose of it.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Well, then, I understand that the War Department does not sell automobiles, tires, and other items which are critically needed by the civilian economy?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. That is correct, Mr. MacFarlane. When the War Department determines any automobiles, tires, or other supplies and equipment surplus to its requirements, action is taken to declare this property to the War Assets Corporation within 5 days.

Mr. MACFARLANE. But I understand that the Army does sell some types of property. Could you clear up that point?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Yes. An "owning" agency such as the War Department is authorized to sell any item or group of items when the cost of such items does not exceed $300. These are known as "small lots" of surplus property.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Now, Colonel, am I correct in saying that the Third Service Command has a unique plan for selling these "small lots" of surplus property?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Yes; that is correct. In July 1944 Maj. Gen. Philip Hayes who was then the commanding general of the Third Service Command determined that it would be in the best interests of the Government to consolidate for sale these small lots of surplus property which were scattered at posts in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland.

The three principal reasons for making this determination were: First, the Government would get a better price if larger and more diversified lots were offered for sale; second, by consolidating this property in one or two central locations it would help the small buyer who otherwise would be required to incur expensive traveling; and last, critically needed items would more readily be made available to civilians.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Well after General Hayes made this determination, what developed?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. As a result the Third Service Command Property Disposal Depot was established in Philadelphia in July 1944, and the results have borne out the decision made in establishing it.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Could you give us some figures or some idea as to the volume of business you do up there, the type of property you have on hand and anything else that would be of interest?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Yes, Mr. MacFarlane; I can do that. In the 18 months since the depot has been running we have handled about $3,000,000 worth of property. We have right now over 8,000 different items on hand. We have a sale each week which is conducted on a competitive bid basis as required by the War Department. Invitations for bids are sent to prospective buyers all over the United States. We regularly receive bids from places outside the Third Service Command such as: Los Angeles, Omaha, Milwaukee, Dallas, Cleveland, New York, Boston, and Charlotte, N. C.

Mr. MACFARLANE. How can a prospective buyer get on the list to receive an invitation for bids?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Simply by writing to the commanding officer, Maj. David S. Van Vort, Third Service Command Property Disposal Depot, Wolf and Swanson Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., or to Headquarters, Third Service Command, Post Office Building, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Now, I further understand that you have inaugurated a plan of giving honorably discharged veterans an opportunity to make direct purchases at this Philadelphia depot.

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Yes, that is correct, and once again I want to say that General Hayes authorized that set-up and General Eddy, the present commanding general of the Third Service Command, has approved its continuation.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Would you explain the procedure a veteran follows in purchasing property at your depot?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Gladly, Mr. MacFarlane. A veteran contacts the veterans' unit of any office of the War Assets Corporation located in the Third Service Command and receives his certification as a qualified veteran, and lists the items he wants to purchase for his business.

The list is then sent to our Philadelphia depot and the veteran is notified by the depot whether or not the items are on hand. If the items are not in stock his list is filed for such time as they become available. If they are in stock, a definite appointment is made when he is to come to the depot to see what we have on our shelves.

He is escorted through the depot by an employee and indicates those items he is interested in. They are earmarked for him and he then submits a bid for the property, after we have informed him of the cost of each item. The papers on the transaction are sent to Headquarters, Third Service Command, for review in accordance with War Department regulations. The papers are then returned to the depot within 36 hours and the veteran has his property upon payment.

The entire transaction does not require over a 5-day period.

Mr. MACFARLANE. Could you give me some high lights or statistics on the veteran phase of your depot operation?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Certainly. During the period December 15 to the present approximately 250 veterans have inspected property at the depot. One hundred and ten have made purchases of such items as tools, radio and communications equipment, plumbing supplies, electrical equipment and hardware. Individual veteran purchases average $70. Every effort is made to take care of his requirements and if we don't have the item he desires we suggest a substitute whenever possible. Everything is done to extend the fullest cooperation and assistance to him in obtaining the items he wishes to purchase.

Mr. MCFARLANE. Well, that is a fine service you are rendering the veteran but could you tell me under what authority you have the right to make direct sales to him?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. Yes, Mr. MacFarlane. The authority comes from War Department Technical Manual 38-505, which states that such property may be sold by negotiated sales when in the best interests of the Government. Certainly it is in the best interests of the Government to afford every reasonable facility to those men and women who have so courageously served their country and their Government during the past 5 years.

Mr. MACFARLANE. There is no question about that but what I would like to know is whether other Service Commands and War Department agencies are governed by these same regulations you mentioned, which would permit them to handle small lot and veterans sales in the same manner as the Third Service Command?

Lieutenant Colonel WHITEHEAD. The answer is yes, Mr. MacFarlane.

Letter From GI in Karachi, India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter, self-explanatory, from a soldier stationed in Karachi, India:

KARACHI, INDIA, *February 25, 1946.*
HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representative,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Secretary of War Patterson's letter to you does not accu-

rately portray the situation existing in India. No plans have been made for the evacuation of American troops in case of an all-out Indian move for independence. Even a small amount of trouble causes the officers to run around like chickens with their heads cut off. The British are scared and white around the gills because they fear that the jig is about up.

The "Functions Directed by the President" amount to nothing more than loafing and boondoggling. Enlisted men have been surplus here for the last 6 months but have not been sent home. Eisenhower's order has been ignored in this theater. They do not fool us for a minute. We are here and have eyes and can see. The talk about "having a mission to perform" comes from officers who wish to remain in this country with their inflated postwar rank and authority.

American soldiers were killed and injured in Calcutta; the American flag was torn down and desecrated in Bombay; United States Army vehicles have been stoned in Karachi. Any American soldier killed or injured while being retained in India for the sole purpose or justifying retention of rank on the part of any officer, shall have been murdered at the hands of his own people.

An all-out fight by freedom-conscious Indians cannot long be postponed; both Hindu and Moslems are in a belligerent and angry frame of mind While Indian leaders have pleaded to their subordinates that Americans are not to be molested unless they are participating on the side of the British, it is impossible for an excited mob to distinguish between anything except color of the skin.

General Eisenhower has given an order, has made another promise to the Congress, the wives, parents, and sweethearts of American servicemen. The time has come, the Congress and the people deserve an accounting.

The United States of America is a place where moral obligations are paid.

Hoping to see you soon, I am,

——— ———.

Letter From Thomas Jefferson Miley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Mr. Thomas Jefferson Miley, secretary of Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

If there were anything needed to bring sharply to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate the rapidly expanding Federal bureaucracy scattered everywhere throughout this country, it is the information contained in Mr. Miley's letter. It is as follows:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1946.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Six months before Pearl Harbor, the Federal Government occupied 68,277,000 square feet of leased space throughout the country. On VJ-day, August 1945, this total had increased to 227,800,000 square feet. In the ensuing 6 months, from August 1945 to February 1946, only 4,000,000 square feet of this tremendous total of 227,800,000 square feet had been relinquished. These are figures issued by the Public Buildings Administration in Washington and reported in the New York Times of February 25, 1946.

In New York City, 36 Government agencies and bureaus occupied in excess of 6,000,000 square feet of rented space as of late February, thus accounting for close to 10 percent of the total amount of office space in the city. Since the end of the war there has been no relinquishment of space here in New York City by the Federal Government. As some agencies surrender space, they are superseded in possession by other Federal instrumentalities, thus keeping from private business users, who include a substantial number of returning veterans, the use of space sorely needed.

We sincerely trust that you will do all in your power to make available to private enterprise a substantial portion of that space which is now occupied by Government agencies.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary.

After All, Who Won?—Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast put on the air over Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WBDC, Escanaba, Mich.:

One of the bitterest strikes in the history of our country ended recently when General Motors and the UAW-CIO called a truce after 113 days, during which an estimated 200,000 employees were out of work walking the streets and many of them, at the same time, spending their well-earned wartime savings in order to live—not comfortably but to live in such a fashion to at least keep the wolf of hunger away from the door. Now, who gained anything by it? No one but possibly one blessed soul. The industry lost the production of approximately 1,125,000 cars that a hungry American public—with their pockets full of wartime savings—was ready to purchase. The strikers, themselves, lost in wages about $130,000,000. The final settlement was 18½ cents an hour increase, and according to my figures, it is going to take each and every one of those strikers about 15 months of steady employment on the job before he will begin to get back into his pocketbook one red penny that it cost him to be on strike.

General Motors lost about $600,000,000 in unfilled orders and it is going to take that corporation a long while to make it up.

The General Motors dealers organization lost about $120,000,000 worth of commissions for which they are going to have to work a long while to make up.

Just how much sense is there in a proposition such as that and what seems to be one of the basic reasons back of the entire struggle? Is it a desire on the part of the rank and file of the union employed to get more money for themselves on an hourly basis when, as I have already pointed out, they are going to have to work more than a year and a quarter before their profit-and-loss sheet is going to show a balance in their favor. And all the time, the OPA to the contrary notwithstanding, their daily cost of living is going to continue to rise because you cannot increase wages, you cannot increase cost of production unless you increase the price that they obtain for the products which they ultimately produce and, indeed, increase the cost, and therefore the price of everything they consume themselves.

Is General Motors going to gain anything from this strike? Are their stockholders standing to gain anything when, as I have pointed out, it will likewise be more than a year before the General Motors stockholders and the General Motors dealers begin to get any return on the money which they lost during the strike?

No; I believe neither General Motors as a whole, nor the unions as a whole, have any hope of, or ever had any hope of, gaining anything realistically tangible out of the strike. The General Motors officials went along drawing their salary, presumably the same as always, so aside from stock dividends they did not suffer too much personally.

Whether or not the union itself, that is the UAW-CIO treasury, profited or the organization as a whole profited is perhaps best illustrated by the figures released by its own secretary treasurer, Mr. George F. Addis, at their convention in Atlantic City early last week when as I have been informed by Washington newspapers he said their present paid-up membership was 537,000, as opposed to a membership in good standing a year ago of 1,217,000. In other words, as a result of the strike the UAW-CIO has lost 680,000 members within the past year and presumably most of them during the past 4 months that the strike was in progress and as a tangible result of which that convention found it necessary to raise the monthly dues of its remaining members 50 percent and agreed to increase its contributions to the national CIO organization 50 percent.

But the fact remains, as in the case of the GM executives, in all probability Mr. Walter Reuther and his immediate henchmen continued to draw their salaries from the union all during the strike and, therefore, were not personally inconvenienced thereby.

And so, who gained from this industrial holocaust? The answer seems to be, one single man gained. It is rather obvious and was very aptly stated by Mr. David Lawrence in an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star last Thursday night and from which I quote:

"It takes a row between two prominent union leaders to bring out the facts of the recent strike at General Motors, which cost the Nation many hundreds of millions of dollars and deprived 200,000 or more workers of a livelihood for nearly 4 months. Apparently no fact-finding commission appointed by the Government dared to bring out the facts and apparently no newspaper or press association was able to verify for the American people the facts which now are openly admitted. What are some of these facts? It is learned now, for example, that a serious political controversy involving the ambitions of two leaders led to a strategy in the strike that prolonged it unduly. Thus, R. J. Thomas, defeated candidate for reelection as president of the United Automobile Workers' Union, CIO, told a press conference at Atlantic City before the balloting began that the walk-out in General Motors last autumn was badly timed by the leadership, that the strike lasted 4 weeks too long, that the price issue should never have been injected into the wage negotiations and that "ability to pay" is not a sound argument at all.

"Mr. Thomas contended that inability to pay would be a dangerous contention for unions to face, because it would get the

unions into difficulties with competing companies not able to pay as much as the strongest companies. He added that this issue needlessly prolonged the strike, and he blamed Walter Reuther, his rival for the presidency, for these tactics. Mr. Thomas remarked that the show-your-books demand was just propaganda. Even his opponent, Mr. Reuther, conceded that it was 'just a maneuver to win public support and to get the company over a barrel,' and he says Mr. Thomas knew all about this phase of the strategy. Yet the American people were told by no less a person than the President of the United States that the demand to open the books was important and should be heeded. The incident illustrates how naive even a Chief Executive can be in the maelstrom of union politics and trick maneuvers whereby unions seek to get favorable publicity and prejudice the case against the employers. The United Automobile Workers Union in the CIO is one of the largest in the history of trade unionism. The fact that personal ambitions played a part in bringing on the recent strike in the auto industry has been widely suspected, but not until the convention at Atlantic City did the unvarnished truth come out.

"Collective bargaining as granted by the Wagner law was not intended to provide a new system of government for a special group or a new means of political exploitation of the average man. It was intended to protect the rights of workers to organize in their own interest. No provision was made in the law to prevent abuse of power or exploitation of the worker by leaders who could, if they chose, discriminate against those who disagreed with their course. Likewise, mass picketing has been resorted to and physical violence used to prevent citizens from exercising their right to enter their own property. Workers who want to work and may or may not be members of a union have been forcibly deprived of their civil rights. The convention at Atlantic City of the UAW is the climax which draws public attention to the evils of "big unionism" which now parallel the evils of the big corporations that have failed to use their economic power in the public interest. The Congress of the United States moreover, has been browbeaten into submission by the political power of big unions which have defied governmental authority and threatened reprisals on members of the legislative body. If trade unionism must resort to mass violence to win strikes, and if rival personalities with political ambitions can inflict hundreds of millions of dollars of damage on the country without being held to accountability for such economic crimes, it means that liberties are not being protected by so-called liberals at all and that a new set of reactionaries have arisen in America to play havoc with democratic government."

Walter J. Reuther, Moscow educated, alone gained—or seemingly so, at this moment—from the overly prolonged General Motors strike. His ambition obviously is to become America's czar of labor.

Well, what is the answer to a continuation of strikes and strike threats such as we have before us right today—such as the impending coal strike. I contend now as I did several weeks ago, that the answer is to get the Government out of the labor-management controversy picture just as soon as possible except insofar as it applies to strictly public utilities, in which no work stoppages should be permitted under any excuse. I believe in the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act—it is absurd and always has been—even though I confess I voted for it in the first place, believing that it offered some relief. In practice it has proven otherwise. I spoke against the Case bill, even though I was not here to vote against it. The Case bill at its best would provide merely piecemeal legislation, bringing the Government more into labor relations instead of less—and to which I am unalterably opposed. After all, we must be realistic enough to recognize that Government labor laws put into the hands of Government boards merely act on the one hand to give immunity to those unions which are Government sponsored and encouraged by this administration and, on the other hand, to punish those unions and industries which do not bow to the will of the White House. The Department of Justice is an arm of the White House and prosecutes or persecutes in accordance with the whim of the White House. We must realize that practically the entire Supreme Court was selected by Mr. Roosevelt and is sympathetic to his philosophy. The same is true of 70 percent of the lower courts of the Federal judiciary system. Industry is in abject slavery to the administration because of the administrations' control of prices through the OPA and I predict to you that the OPA will be extended although possibly in a somewhat modified form. Now, as a matter of fact, most industry has been operating in the red for the last 3 or 4 months. From the viewpoint of industry the Case bill merely seeks to achieve equality between employers and employees by enslaving more people—making them more responsible to Government edicts—and will in no way mitigate our cufrent labor strife.

The cooling-off period is a sheer absurdity, as it is merely a 30-day period when men can loaf on pay instead of on their own time. Men simply do not produce up to capacity while a strike is impending. The policing powers of the so-called Case bill merely take the responsibility for maintaining law and order from the States and municipalities, giving them an excuse to neglect their elemental responsibilities of maintaining that same law and order. That can have only one ending. It will ultimately result in bringing the United States Army into every strike and we must remember that our boys are going into the Army to be soldiers and not policemen. Therefore, it does not make sense to put the cart before the horse.

As I see it, the first thing to recognize is that labor relations are not a Federal problem; rather they are a problem of human relations inside of every shop or manufacturing establishment. After all, strikes are mostly caused because men and management are not free to negotiate under the regulations set up by this present administration and by an administration controlled Congress. Management today is regulated by price ceilings, and inflation goes on apace in spite of those price ceilings. Black markets are rampant even here in the Nation's Capital. Men are unhappy under this situation, and, therefore, they strike for more money under the mistaken idea that more money will give them more goods. You cannot have more goods as long as the OPA holds back production. The OPA is operating under the false concept that as long as an industry is making over-all profits it can thus be forced to take a loss in the production of a single item to reduce the over-all profits and yet hold the price down on the item tnat is their fair-haired boy for the moment. OPA definitely is restricting production in this country and will continue to do so. I personally never voted for it; I do not intend to vote for its continuation even though I hope that Mr. WOLCOTT's proposals may prevail in the Banking and Currency Committee, and failing there, may indeed prevail in the House itself. I shall support Mr. WOLCOTT's proposals which provide for:

1. The setting of ceilings which would bring the producer the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

2. The automatic removal of OPA controls as production achieves a certain point, say 75 percent of prewar normal.

3. The graduated removal of subsidies.

But even then I still intend to vote against a continuation of the OPA in any form whatsoever.

No UNO Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial which appeared in the March 21, 1946, edition of the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "No UNO Referendum":

NO UNO REFERENDUM

The New York State Legislature has decided by a vote which crossed party lines that it would be unwise for any Westchester town to poll its residents on whether or not location of UNO permanent headquarters in that town is desired. Westchester's board of supervisors, acting on request of up-county supervisors whose towns have been mentioned as possible UNO sites, had previously approved the measure but the State assembly said "No" rather emphatically.

This action of the assembly had not been wholly unexpected. Earlier the senate, in committee of the whole, had threatened also to extinguish the measure and only the work of Senator Williamson, of Scarsdale, had kept the bill alive in that house. In the assembly the companion bill of Assemblyman Hill, of Yorktown, was brought to a vote, but defeated by 55 to 74.

The significance of this defeat of a bill approved by Westchester's supervisors, applying only to Westchester, and sponsored by influential Westchester legislators, should not be lost. It was a blunt expression by the State legislature that harm would come to the UNO through passage of such a bill.

"It is a sniping bill," said one assemblyman, "aimed at man's supreme effort to evade self-destruction."

Another assemblyman declared: "The bill can accomplish nothing and would only give crackpots opportunity to sound off."

We are not prepared to agree with that latter sentiment. There are residents of North Castle, Lewisboro, Poundridge, Yorktown, Bedford, Somers, and other up-country towns who are honestly opposed to UNO location there, but who are not "crackpots." They just have not yet learned all the facts nor weighed carefully the alternatives.

The contrast in opinions is best expressed by the viewpoint of one opponent and one advocate of UNO in Westchester. One expressed the fear that if and when UNO failed, its headquarters would constitute a "ghost city" in the county; the other replied that when and if UNO fails there will be atomic bomb "ghost cities" all over the world. It's all in the viewpoint.

For our part, we had no particular objections to polls on UNO in Westchester, although as a rule such contests are one-sided and the outcome foreseen and therefore largely discounted. You can always get more persons who are individually affected by any proposition to come to the polls and vote negatively than you can get other persons who are affected only in a general sense to come and vote affirmatively.

What we do regret is that this incident has, we fear, given Westchester a black eye by the publicity spread throughout the Nation by the news services which carried the account of the action by the State legislature. The impression will be left in many places that Westchester is selfish, unaware of its responsibility to the cause of permanent peace, and ungracious in its attitude toward UNO. That is an extremely bad reputation to acquire in a county already known

for its great wealth and residential desirability. It makes it appear as if we place our homes upon a higher scale than international peace.

That sentiment, we are confident, does not accurately portray the real feelings of the vast majority of Westchester citizens, thoroughly patriotic, wholly aware of responsibility to the cause of peace, and sincerely anxious to cooperate in every possible way.

Some Smaller Communities of the United States Through Civil Aeronautics Board Action Are To Receive Air-Transport Service—Congress Can Assist by Passing Appropriate Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been interested in the development of air service to the smaller communities of our great country, as well as the development of long-haul and overseas routes. Recently the accent on air transportation in this country has been in connection with the international pattern.

Of equal importance, however, is the establishment of air-transportation service for the lesser municipalities, in point of population, sufficient to meet their requirements for the most modern means of transportation.

June 22, 1945, I introduced Concurrent Resolution No. 64 to the effect that, in the opinion of this Congress, air service should be established for the smaller communities of this Nation wherever and whenever it was practicable and feasible. A similar resolution by Senator MAGNUSON is pending on the calendar in the other body.

I am happy to report that the Civil Aeronautics Board on Friday last, in furtherance of the national policy to establish an adequate air transport system for this country, and in response to the public interest, and widespread demand, decided a case involving air service to smaller communities within the confines of our great Rocky Mountain States. The Civil Aeronautics Board, in that opinion, authorized a short-haul air system for 34 cities which heretofore have had no air service whatsoever. I have also been advised that today the Civil Aeronautics Board has authorized additional air service to 10 smaller communities in the State of Florida; again certificating an independent local operator to provide this service.

I call your further attention to the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board has entrusted the provision of this local air service to three new airlines which are independent and locally owned.

This is a step in the direction which the public and the Congress have been advocating for years. It is my sincere hope that these decisions, the principle of which means so very much to the development of our national aviation system, will be followed promptly by similar decisions affecting other sections of the country so that there will be provided to a majority of our citizens the benefits of direct day-by-day air service.

Resolution of Oklahoma State League of Young Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Oklahoma State League of Young Democrats in convention assembled in Oklahoma City this 22d day of February 1946 to rededicate themselves to and further the principles of democratic government do hereby adopt the following resolutions:

"Whereas the world has been covered by the plague of war; and

"Whereas in the midst of final battle we were shocked and saddened by the passing of our great Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

"Whereas his successor assumed the Presidency in the midst of trying and hectic times:

"The Oklahoma State League of Young Democrats do commend and approve the farsighted and aggressive leadership of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, and the administration for their efforts in leading this Nation to final victory over the forces of evil and for their demonstrated leadership in meeting the manifold problems of our domestic economy, international organization and the other problems that have beset us in a once more peaceful world.

"We resolve to further the aims and democratic ideals and the humanitarian efforts of our fallen leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who did so much to make democracy a living and dynamic force here and throughout the world, and to his successor who is carrying on in that same glorious tradition.

"We commend the Congress for the legislation it has enacted in behalf of the returning service men and women, providing educational benefits, hospital and medical care, unemployment compensation, readjustment allowances, surplus property priorities, and all legislative enactments to assure the maintenance of a healthy, dynamic, and prosperous nation."

"Whereas Senator ELMER THOMAS and the other Democratic Members of our State congressional delegation have fully cooperated in this fine program and other progressive and intelligent legislation which has been enacted, we commend and endorse their attitudes and efforts.

"We commend and endorse the administration of our Governor, Robert S. Kerr, for the constructive leadership he has furnished this State, for the friendship and harmony that exists between the State and Federal Governments during his administration, for his successful fight for the elimination of the differentiation of freight rates, for his part in securing of the Fort Gibson Dam project and other Federal aid for beneficial public projects and reclamation programs in Oklahoma, and for the good will and understanding he has promoted between Oklahoma and her sister States.

"We further endorse the loyal and conscientious service rendered by the faithful Democratic members of our State and local governments in the furtherance of sound, progressive, and efficient government in the city, county, and State governments.

"We further commend the State president of the League of Young Democrats and the other officers of the League of Young Democrats for their untiring efforts during the past year."

"Whereas the law provides that officers on terminal leave are paid full pay and allowances during said period; and

"Whereas enlisted men are not allowed to accumulate furlough time and receive pay and allowances for said time; and

"Whereas said inequality is deemed unjust and not in keeping with Democratic principles: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we recommend to the Oklahoma congressional delegation that the law be changed allowing enlisted men to accumulate furlough time with pay and allowances up to 120 days in the same manner as in the case of officers."

"Whereas thousands of veterans are returning home to their families and are in need of immediate housing; and

"Whereas it is deemed that the GI bill of rights is inadequate due to the fact that thousands of veterans are unable to qualify for housing under its terms; and

"Whereas it would be financial suicide for many returning veterans to buy a home due to uncertain employment conditions even though they were badly in need of houses which they can rent: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the League of Young Democrats recommends to the Oklahoma congressional delegation that legislation be passed providing for immediate construction of rental houses to be made available to returning veterans.

"That the League of Young Democrats commends civic-minded men and women and groups of citizens who are promoting housing projects and expresses the hope that other such projects may be started and fostered under the active leadership of the Governor of the State of Oklahoma, veterans' organizations, and civic-minded groups."

It is recommended that a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, the Governor of the State of Oklahoma, and each member of the State legislature.

Dated at Oklahoma City, Okla., this 22d day of February 1946.

BURL HAYS,
State President.

Attest:

RITA F. MOORE,
State Secretary.

As the Legislature Closes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted by the House, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Daily Times entitled "As the Legislature Closes":

Advices from Albany are that the New York State Legislature will close at the end

of this week, even if it be necessary to set back the clock to keep the closing technically within the week.

If this be achieved, it is timely to mention that the 1946 session appears to have done good work. Most citizens will recall the year as that in which Governor Dewey ordered and put through a 50-percent cut in State income taxes. Others will bear in mind the year as that in which the Moore committee finally devised a formula for equitable distribution of State aid to municipalities and schools, or in which the Osstertag committee reorganized the local welfare and relief systems. There has been other legislation, too, and much of it has been excellent. By the same token, not one important law of questionable merit appears to have been passed, so that credit goes to the senators and assemblymen for not only what they did but also for what they refrained from doing.

At the opening of the legislative session in January, there were predictions that, in view of next fall's gubernatorial election, the Democratic minority would tear down completely the public impression that Thomas E. Dewey had proved himself a highly competent administrator of this State. Instead, that opinion has been expanded, and impartial observers at the capitol estimate that Governor Dewey is at least 25 percent stronger in a political sense today than he was when the legislature opened.

Certainly the Governor has given another fine example of constructive leadership and never was the State in better financial condition. As a result, we feel, only the strongest Democratic candidate that can be named will have any chance to retire Mr. Dewey to private life.

Labor News and Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Victor Riesel:

LABOR NEWS AND COMMENT—LITTLE CAESAR AND JOHN L.—BOTH ON THE SPOT

(By Victor Riesel)

I have a working acquaintance with the careers of burly John L. Lewis and little Caesar Petrillo, the 5-by-5 boss of America's musicians. So I'm fascinated to see these two hardy gentlemen hit the front pages at the same time. They're both on the spot and they're learning the hard way that a public-be-damned attitude is as outmoded as an apartment-to-let sign.

The unfortunate thing about the difficulties in which these smugly belligerent men find themselves is that their followers will suffer while Lewis and Petrillo go on drawing $1,000 a week.

Why are these arrogant men on the spot? Well, Petrillo was contemptuous of the public. He waged a silly little war on amateur child musicians and drove them off the air. He had an unreasoning dictatorship over who could play what over American radio stations.

He forced the musical record people to pay his American Federation of Musicians a tax on each hot platter cut. This brings the AFM some $5,000,000 a year. Little Caesar is the sole boss of that pile of dollars.

So the other day he irritated Congress into passing a law which virtually cripples his organizing machinery and wipes out many gains won through the years.

Now where are the 148,000 musicians who permitted little Caesar to run their union out of his vest pocket?

Let's drop Petrillo for a while. The big news, of course, is John L's coal-digger strike—which to me seems abruptly called and ill-timed.

Why am I critical of Lewis' tactics? Simply because Lewis will injure the miners' cause, just as Petrillo has hurt the musicians.

Lewis has called a crippling coal strike now, not for more pay, and not for a shorter workweek—but to win the right to have his union tax every ton of soft coal mined! Three weeks ago in Washington I was told in the highest Government circles that the mine owners were willing to cut the workweek and raise wages some 18 cents an hour. This is $7.20 a week more, or $10 if overtime is included!

Despite these concessions Lewis called a coal-digger's "rest period" just when the United States Senate killed a tough labor-curbing bill because this country appeared to be back in the groove and ready to swing into production. A prolonged coal stoppage now may revive the dead bill.

All unions would fight back, of coure, and then off we would go again into a new period of industrial civil war.

This would be a stiff price to pay for Lewis' desire to tax coal tonnage to the tune of $60,000,000 a year—a fund which he will boss a la Petrillo. Lewis calls this a welfare fund for the miners. Call it what you will—this money will make him America's wealthiest and most powerful labor leader.

I'm against that. I'm for a welfare fund for the miners, the musicians, and every other workingman who faces injury and joblessness. But I'm against putting $60,000,000 in Lewis' hands every year.

By all means let's tax every chunk of coal, every jive record, if it's for the men who dig it and the men who make music. But let's take human misery out of union politics. Let's have a Government board control the money.

I'll bet $10 against a frayed pass to the old World's Fair that Lewis wouldn't strike for that.

Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a personal friend and local real-estate dealer in my district, in whose judgment, integrity, and patriotism I have great confidence. He is a genuine friend of this Nation. In his community there is a distressing shortage of available housing, not only for veterans but for everyone. I am sure my friend as well as other local interests are doing everything within their power to relieve present conditions. This man speaks from practical experience and his conclusions are worth while. I, therefore, call to the attention of the Congress, and especially the Banking and Currency Committee, his letter which reads in part, as follows:

We appreciate your stand on the recent housing bill. While we are not in the building business, yet we firmly believe that the less the bureaucrats have to do with the building of houses, the more houses there will be for veterans and everyone else, and at less cost. Also, it staggers me to think of the army of supervisors and snoopers that would be added to the OPA pay roll if the original bill became law. As to costs, we have a splendid example in the Willow Run housing project where the temporary housing units cost more per unit than like-size units of permanent housing directly across the road which was built by private local builders. In other words, Government housing costs approximately twice that built by private enterprise.

* * * * *

I wish to suggest the following for your consideration in the renewal of the Rent Control Act:

1. The law should specifically state that rents must be adjusted both up and down to comply with a fair rent.

2. Rents should be based on present day costs of food, repairs, wages, supplies, etc.

3. Local or State laws should rule as to evictions in case of nonpayment of rent, the sale of a house, etc. At the present time devious rules and regulations make it almost impossible to get possession of one's house. During the war the OPA required 3 months' notice in case of a sale; as soon as the war was over the time was increased to 6 months, and our local rent-control administrator says that is soon as the act is renewed the "boys in Washington" intend to raise the time to 9 months.

4. Local courts should have jurisdiction in all cases involving disputes between owner and the OPA. At the present time the only court that one from this section can appear in to defend himself against a ruling or order of OPA is the Federal court in Cleveland; this means the average man must submit to any decision made by the local office because he simply cannot afford to pay the costs of a case heard in Cleveland.

In making the above suggestions I do so in spite of the fact that the unfair rent control of the past 4 years has made us a lot of money. Scores of owners have listed their properties for sale with us just because of the unjust deals they have been getting from rent control. But we would much prefer to see property owners get fair treatment and keep their properties; it will certainly be better business in the long run.

Now if it is left to the OPA to change their rules, it will never be done. If any changes are secured, they will have to be written into the law by Congress itself so as to force the changes. And if you care to do so, won't you please pass the above ideas on to the Banking Committee.

To the Earthmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Solomon Simonson which appeared in the American Poetry Magazine, first issue of 1946:

TO THE EARTHMEN

(By Solomon Simonson)

The globe's no bigger than the eye of man.
A tiny pupil's all your learning, vast
Renown, you nervous trifling blowing fan,
Who tongues distinctive words, creating caste,

For you who think yourselves important, real,
Who rank phenomena high and low, compare
The seal to sea, perceiving life in seal
And death in sea; who brag that man aware
Of self is creature nobler than the beast;
Who boast that God selected man as mate
To share with Him the solar system's feast;
Who garbage atom's might and call that fate.
Your puppet eye reduces all to nought.
Remember then you'll never know God's thought.

Taking School to the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article recently appearing in the Christian Science Monitor. It is as follows:

TAKING SCHOOL TO THE VETERAN—A PLEA FOR ACTION NOW TO ASSIST MEN WHO DIDN'T ATTEND HIGH SCHOOL

(By Rachel Rowe Swiger, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture)

The GI bill provides an unprecedented equality of opportunity for returning veterans to continue their education. But of what value is equality of opportunity—funds available to all—if the educational machinery necessary to make possible the utilization of this opportunity is so designed or geared that it does not go far enough down the educational ladder to reach veterans who have less than a high-school education and therefore lack the educational qualifications to enter college?

It has been estimated that about 60 percent of our veterans will not be eligible for college work. On the assumption that 15,000,000 men had been in the armed forces by the war's end, close to 10,000,000 will lack high-school completion. Roughly, 4,500,000 will have completed no more than the eighth grade, of which 500,000 will have completed only the fourth grade or less. Whether anything is done to provide facilities suitable for meeting the needs of veterans at this educational level depends on how well their problems are understood.

How or in what way is this group at a disadvantage in trying to use the opportunity offered by the GI bill?

First, the maturity of veterans, due to both age and experience, precludes the possibility of education by traditional processes; second, the interest and rate of learning of veterans are different from those of a school child. Veterans will neither be content with nor interested in training that cannot be applied to their job of making a better living or take them from where they are toward where they want to be; third, many of the same factors—depressed economic conditions, isolation, and the like—which created economic, social, and other barriers and kept many rural veterans from having more schooling before their war experiences, are now operating to make it difficult or impossible for them to make use of the benefits that are rightly theirs under the GI bill.

The following is a brief summary of what some officials who have had most contacts with veterans returning to a predominantly agricultural county in one southeastern State had to say about the undereducated veterans' needs and wants:

County commissioner of veterans' affairs: "About 90 percent of the veterans who have returned to this county have less than a sixth-grade education. They seldom know what they are entitled to under the GI bill. The majority of them are from farms, and because they lack sufficient skills to command jobs elsewhere will return to the farm."

Manager of the United States Employment Office: "About 90 percent of those we have talked with from farms have less than a sixth-grade education. They are not interested in formal education—what they want is practical help or guidance in making a living. They are too self-conscious and don't know enough about what they need to know to seek information and help from farm agencies that farmers with more education are able to utilize."

County superintendent of education: "I feel certain few, if any, veterans with below high-school education will go back to grade school along with children."

Why will someone other than the undereducated veteran himself have to see to it that a way is provided whereby he will receive needed educational benefits under the GI bill? And what kind of program could be put into operation to give him equality of opportunity in utilizing them?

First, it seems clear that the undereducated veteran's feelings of personal inadequacy and his inability to determine what, how, and where to get the help he needs to get somewhere has already kept many from getting their rights. More and more will lose out unless someone sees to it that a program is developed that will start with a veteran as an individual rather than with a course of study. The veteran from the farm who is taking up farming as a means of making a living will be interested only in the type of education that will enable him to derive a better living from his efforts as a farmer.

Second, it seems clear that the feeling of personal inadequacy on the part of undereducated rural veterans will preclude any likelihood that many will attend school or go into a classroom to seek educational guidance. If such a veteran is to be reached, it will be on the farm where he works and where he can be taught to use whatever resources he has at hand, however meager, to the greatest advantage.

To implement a program that will fulfill the needs of rural farm veterans the following procedure is suggested:

1. Provide through some existing agricultural or educational agency an instructor who will devote full time to organizing and carrying out a flexible educational program combining individual guidance with laboratory, shop, and classroom instruction. Such a program could be put into operation by taking the following steps:

(a) Provide each veteran with a minimum number of hours of on-the-farm instruction. The frequency and amount of time devoted to such individual instruction and the range of subject matter covered should vary according to individual needs and desires. Differences in educational backgrounds, experiences, innate abilities and personalities will necessitate more individual help for some and less for others. Those who have had little or no formal schooling may want and need to devote considerable time to reading, writing, and arithmetic.

(b) Provide shop training whereby skills in repairing and constructing farm and home equipment may be developed.

(c) Provide informal classroom instruction taking cognizance of the methods successfully used by the military service, such as motion pictures and other visual aides, lectures, and group discussion to stimulate interest and facilitate progress. This phase of the educational program would provide an opportunity for veterans to learn from one another through an exchange of ideas, to work out solutions to common problems, to develop leadership, to effect social adjustments by satisfying the inherent craving of human beings to be and to belong and to create community solidarity and understanding.

(d) Restrict the number of veterans to be served by any one instructor to about 25 so that ample time can be given each veteran to assure continued progress.

2. See that all rural veterans know about this service and make it easy for them to apply for it.

3. Provide means whereby a veteran would be given reimbursement for subsistence during the instruction period—the same as if he went into a classroom.

Such a program has not only great potentialities for the happiness and contentment of those who have done much for our country, but has far-reaching implications for our democratic society as well. That such a plan is workable and will appeal to rural veterans is now being demonstrated in two or three States where programs along these lines have been inaugurated. It is urgent that programs of this type be put into effect in all States at once, before too many returning veterans unsuccessfully seek to get somewhere in life without educational guidance and help create a nucleus of aimlessness and discontent.

The challenge is clear—the funds are waiting. Can we afford to let so great an opportunity pass?

How OPA Speeds Up Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sun, published in New York City, entitled "How OPA Speeds Up Production":

HOW OPA SPEEDS UP PRODUCTION

The OPA complains that the Senate has cut appropriations badly needed by it to speed up OPA's handling of necessary price adjustments for businessmen.

A record of OPA's actions with respect to some businesses was recently compiled by Representative BUFFETT, of Nebraska. The brick industry asked for price readjustments; OPA took 6 months to do the job. The same time was required for the clay sewer-pipe industry. For enameled plumbing fixtures, 3 months; for brass plumbing fixtures, 4 months. For coal furnaces and air conditioning equipment, no action 5 months after application was made. For millwork, 18 months between application and readjustment of prices. For gypsum board, 6 months between application and the first readjustment and 9 months before a general readjustment. For window screens, a delay of 5 months.

For lumber, one of the most difficult of all building materials to get, the answer comes from Representative ELLSWORTH, of Oregon, whose district currently produces more lumber than any other in the United States. The industry advisory committee had no difficulty in reaching an agreement with the OPA price executive, an experienced and competent lumberman. But when the new prices, designed to produce the particular kinds of lumber needed after the war, went to a higher body in the OPA, endless debate ensued and 6 whole months elapsed between

application and a new price schedule. When protests mounted against OPA delay, OPA finally managed to speed up the new schedule by 6 days. Yet OPA apparently believes that the Senate is the one that is out of step.

The Shades of Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson Meet at Monticello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous censent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial, entitled "Past and Present," which appeared in the Portland Homebildor, published in Portland, Oreg., March 16, 1946:

PAST AND PRESENT

The shades of Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson meet at Monticello:

Jefferson: "Gentlemen, I read an account of your recent meeting at Mount Vernon and, like you, I am deeply concerned about the trend of Government in this Nation today. You know I helped formulate the Declaration of Independence, my sympathies have always been with those who achieve by hard work; whether in the shop, factory, or on the farm, and, having served in the Continental Congress, as Secretary of State under your able administration, General Washington, and later as President, I feel that I have a comprehensive viewpoint on national problems."

Washington: "Tom, you left America a wonderful heritage and it grieves you, I know, to see foreign ideologies, alien thought and un-American philosophies take root in so many minds today. You founded a great party and you, Abe, were the first President under the other great party. The thoughts of both of you, that the Government should rest in the people, that the Government should be by law and not by bureau or board edicts, directives and guesswork, are sound and should be pondered by everyone. Tom, you advocated decentralization of Government but today the opposite of your doctrine seems to be the trend. Your administration was characterized by a reduction of the public debt and strict adherence to the Constitution and economy in governmental operation."

Jefferson: "George, I am rather proud of that record and proud of the principles for which I stood. I want my successors to remember them, I want them to be guided by my precepts. Abe, you stood for one party and I stood for another, but the fundamental thought that actuated both of us was sound Americanism, freedom of opportunity, self-reliance and initiative. We never advocated taking from Peter to pay Paul, we never believed in wasting the substance of our people and we never subscribed to the theory that the industrious hard-working segment of our Nation should be taxed out of their earnings to provide for the improvident and indolent."

Lincoln: "You're right, Tom, I just can't understand this give-away theory that so many present-day politicians advocate. Of course, it is a bid for votes but those advocates should remember that votes bought by a mess of potage are not very stable. The potage is soon eaten up and then there is a cry for more and more. I was heartened a week ago to see, in the actions of Congress, that a number of our statesmen are arising in opposition to such give-away practices, and this isn't a one-party action but includes statesmen from both parties, in other words, Americanism is being reborn.

Jefferson: "Abe, I was delighted, like you, to see a flash of the sunlight of sanity through the clouds of deficit-spending. Maybe someone will really start an economy move, an attempt to balance the Budget and reduce the tremendous weight of needless tax burdens that now bear down on our faithful, industrious, and overly patient citizens."

Washington: "A couple of weeks ago I could only wish, I didn't dare hope for practical common sense to hi-lite our governmental operations, but Congress has given me hope when it curtailed OPA and other appropriations, when it took a stand against further subsidies, and when it refused to be stampeded into emergency legislation."

Lincoln: "Well, boys, let's keep on consulting and endeavoring to impress the people with our thoughts based upon tried, true, and proven concepts that have guided our Nation so successfully in the past."

Washington: "If we succeed, Abe, we will have what you advocated, 'A government of the people, by the people, and for the people,' not a government of bureaucrats, by the bureaucrats, and for the bureaucrats. I must go back to Mount Vernon now, but I suggest that next week we all go over and call on Andrew Jackson. I know we'll be interested in his viewpoint."—C. W. H.

Atomic Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM M. RUSSELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Abilene Reporter News, pays a tribute to Winston Churchill which I think very rightfully gives him in part the merit he deserves.

ATOMIC WORDS

Churchill, of course, is a bum, a warmonger, an imperialist, a troublemaker, a boat rocker, a schemer, and a dangerous and disreputable character. Practically everybody who could grab a microphone or commandeer a typewriter said so right after his Fulton speech. He was assailed as a troublesome old fussbudget who should be ridden out of town on a rail, slapped down, beaten up, and ostracized.

But why do you suppose Joe Stalin and his diplomatic bullyboys suddenly decided to start sweet-talking the world, after first calling Churchill every name in the catalog of choice communistic epithets? Why do you suppose Russia decided to come to an agreement with Iran and start getting her troops out of there? Why do you suppose the Russians all at once started pulling out of Manchuria?

Well, Secretary Byrnes and President Truman and Senator VANDENBERG and a few others did some straight talking, to be sure; but it was the Churchill blast at Fulton which really got under the Russkies' skin and started the ball a-rolling.

The pen is mightier than the sword. Churchill put into words the thoughts that were in everybody's minds—and his words went ringing round the world.

Churchill, the man who stood up to Hitler and Mussolini long before Munich; Churchill the man who rallied a fainting and failing world to turn back the Hun at the gate; Churchill, the man who refuses to pull punches or to crawl into the stormcellar—the one man to whom so many owe so much achieved more in a single speech than all the diplomats had been able to accomplish in 6 months.

If the world has leveled out on an even plane after teetering on the verge of a grand bust-up for weeks—and there is every indication that it has—the lion's share of the credit goes to Winston Churchill and his world-shaking speech delivered at Fulton, Mo., only 3 weeks ago.

Once more the free world is indebted to a master orator who knows how to make every word count.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ARIZONA TAX RESEARCH ASSOCIATION,
Phoenix, Ariz., March 13, 1946.

Mr. RICHARD F. HARLESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: If some Member of Congress will take time out from the petty bickering and inane arguments going back there together with committee hearings which get no place and investigate the surplus on hand from the war, the methods being used by the arbitrary two-bit bureaucrats placed in charge of the disposal, and the whole farce, and why we as public agencies, ex-servicemen, or anyone else cannot secure property except sharpshooters who are getting wealthy, they would make themselves the biggest men in the United States in the eyes of the general public.

If someone like you would introduce a bill for a little money for Congress to make this investigation, and shut out the Civil Service Budget Bureau from making the investigation, and go out and hire a few hard-headed businessmen who had to make their money the hard way, you would not only astound the whole Nation but would wake up the Congress of the United States which lately has adopted the attitude that bureaucrats can do no wrong.

There are 60,000 ex-service people in Arizona, or there will be in the very near future, who are getting tired of being given the runaround, that there is nothing available when all they have to do is peek into the warehouses and see what they are asking for stacked to the ceilings, and which suddenly appears downtown in some racketeer's place of business selling for 10 or 20 times what he paid the Government for it. One hundred thousand dollars of Federal funds spent cleaning up this thing would bring back $500,000,000 in additional material being disposed of as surplus if the racket was taken out of it.

I know where this letter is headed for before I sign it, but anyway your waste basket is big and I got it off my chest.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours truly,

S. A. SPEAR,
Managing Director.

Poles Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on February 19 of last year I introduced a measure—House Joint Resolution 110—asking that the Congress assume national responsibility for the effects of the Crimean Conference by extending to the Polish soldiers dispossessed by that agreement the right to become citizens of the United States.

The following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1946, calls attention to the fact that these brave allies of ours are in even more desperate case than they were before hostilities ceased, and that it is a problem which cannot lightly be dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, there are many Americans who feel that this problem is one which does indeed involve the national honor of the United States, and I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD the Star editorial and my reply to the editor, which appeared March 29:

POLES ABROAD

There is ample evidence that most of the 200,000 Poles who fought under Anglo-American command during the war do not want to return to Poland. The Polish Government, offering them special inducements to come back, has assured them that they will be welcome, and British Foreign Minister Bevin has just urged them to take advantage of plans for their repatriation. But still, according to some estimates, perhaps 70 percent of them have no desire to return, not a few of them because they probably hope they can settle down to a better living in other countries, and many because they have grave misgivings about the predominantly Communist character of the Warsaw regime.

This creates a peculiarly difficult problem. In Mr. Bevin's words, these men fought bravely and well in the common Allied cause, and if they do not want to be repatriated, they are entitled to sympathetic consideration. Yet, because the British cannot promise to settle them in the United Kingdom and other parts of the Commonwealth and because they cannot freely enter such countries as our own, a large number of them will face the prospect of living as exiles, without citizenship rights anywhere, unless they go back to Poland. This may seem a relatively minor matter in a period when there are so many great and perplexing issues, but it is too poignant to be dismissed lightly from the mind. Together with Britain, the United States should do all that it can in the interest of these Poles, and the Polish Government, of course, should spare no effort to demonstrate to them with specific guaranties that they can look forward to a good future in their own land.

MARCH 27, 1946.

The EDITOR,
Washington Evening Star,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of March 22, headed "Poles Abroad" is a much-needed reminder of the fact that these men, whose sacrificial courage and skill at arms saved many American lives in Italy and northern France, are today deprived of the homes and the free country for which they fought so gallantly and so long. In the rush of events many Americans may have forgotten that their present stateless situation is largely due to the agreement given by the United States and Great Britain at Yalta, by which 47 percent of Poland was annexed to the Soviet Union, and political control of the Polish state was likewise delivered to Moscow.

Just a year ago I saw the men of General Anders' Second Polish Corps on the Italian front. In spite of the destruction of their hopes for their country, they had lost neither their courage nor their faith that with perseverance they would establish the justice of the cause for which they had given six bitter years of effort.

Before I left the United States, I introduced a resolution (H. J. Res. 110) calling attention of the Congress to the great injustice done our Polish allies, and asking that the Congress assume "national responsibility for the results of the Crimean Conference as they affect members of the Polish armed forces serving today outside Poland," by "revising existing immigration quotas for Poland to admit to the United States of America, with their wives and children, all officers, enlisted men, and others who have served with the Polish armed forces in French, British, or American theaters of war."

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration, on February 19, 1945, where it has languished. Granting of the right of asylum and citizenship to these men and their families, it seems to me, is only one possible and partial solution of what your editorial rightly terms "a peculiarly difficult problem." But it is a recognition which should hardly be denied them, in view of their services in our common cause, in which they alone have been deprived of any benefit.

Sincerely,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

Inter-American Cultural Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the address delivered by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil and executive secretary of the Cuban-American Council on University Studies. The speech by Dr. Thorning, who is one of our most devoted apostles of the good neighbor policy, was given in the Ecuadorean Embassy, Washington, in response to the address of His Excellency, Ambassador Galo Plaza of the Republic of Ecuador, in the course of which the South American leader invested the Maryland educator with the insignia of the national decoration of our sister republic, known as the Order of Merit. The address by Dr. Thorning, is entitled "Inter-American Cultural Cooperation":

"Wherever ideas are free to circulate," it has been remarked by Prof. Alfred North Whitehead of Cambridge University, England, "men are free."

The ideal proposed by Dr. Whitehead is one that can inspire every intellectual interested in the promotion of inter-American friendship as part of the program for world security. The principle has a special value for and application to the university phase of any governmental cultural relations project.

During the war, young men and women were handicapped in the realization of their ambition to study in the universities and colleges of Central and South America. Eager as they were to learn Spanish, Portuguese, and French in places and under conditions where these languages constitute the vernacular, these potential envoys of the good-neighbor policy devoted their best efforts to the victory of the United Nations.

Now that totalitarian nazism and fascism have been overthrown, our American boys and girls are free to turn their attention to the splendid opportunities for research and study which are provided by institutions of learning in the other American Republics and Canada.

In Quito, the capital of the Republic of Ecuador, for example, the young people of America can examine, at first hand, the monuments of art and culture, which make of this city a veritable treasure house of beauty as well as a scenic wonder of the world. In the words of the well-known Dutch painter, Jan Schreuder, Ecuador, no less than Mexico, is "an artist's paradise."

Best of all, however, our future apostles of the good-neighbor policy can utilize in Quito the cultural facilities available in rich profusion at the Central University of the Republic. Although the catalog of this excellent university center, describing its various faculties, alone can do justice to the number, quality, and variety of the courses offered, one may mention the fame that has been gained throughout the Western Hemisphere by Dr. Antonio Quevedo, professor of international law. Dr. Quevedo's lectures on this subject, which naturally grow in value with each advance in world understanding, would be of immense importance for our young people from North America.

Something similar may be said about the courses offered in pediatrics in the medical school of the Central University by Dr. Carlos Andrade Marin. The latter, as president of the executive committee of the Centro Ecuatoriano-Norte Americano, has accorded magnificent cooperation not only in the wide field of United States-Ecuadorian friendship, but also in the more highly specialized area where inter-American studies are encouraged.

These scholars are cited, not because they in any sense exhaust the list of outstanding university professors in Quito, but simply to indicate, in brief, rapid fashion, the character of two of the faculties whose cultural wealth would be at the disposition of students or professors from North America who would have the vision and determination to matriculate in the Central University of Ecuador, or in some comparable center of university teaching in the other American Republics and Canada.

Another leader in the cultural life of America, who may be recalled by the distinguished guests this afternoon, is Dr. Nicolás Delgado, director of the National School of Fine Arts and the National Museum of Fine Arts, in Quito. As professor of painting and of the history of colonial art, Dr. Delgado may profitably be consulted in his native land, where masterpieces in oil, stone, and wood abound. Architecturally, the city of Quito itself, as well as many another cultural center in the Republic, may be the subject of serious study by young artists and scholars.

At the Instituto Pedagogico as well as in the University of Guayaquil, first-class courses in education, economic geography, and Hispanic American literature are available.

In order to open up this storehouse of knowledge and inspiration, however, it is imperative that numerous technical difficulties, which confront young people wishing to switch from continent to continent in search of learning, be ironed out by competent authorities. Indeed, no substantial progress can be registered in the university phase of

the cultural relations program of the interested governments until the fundamental problems of academic credit, coordinated courses, and some equivalence of treatment in all universities and colleges from Hudson Bay to Tierra del Fuego shall have been worked out on a broad, liberal basis. This is the hour for action.

Explicit general agreements and understandings are in order; not regimentation or even complete integration.

To be sure, the United States Office of Education, the State Department Division of Information and Culture, and a number of individual institutions in North and South America have formulated a few policies which facilitate the exchange of professors and students. All this, however, has been attempted on a relatively limited scale and with no little embarrassment and heartburning occasioned for the young men and women who undertake foreign research and study. The current crisis emphasizes the importance of a multilingual culture for the people of this hemisphere, as well as for all peoples in the world. If citizens of the American Republics and Canada can succeed in initiating a mass movement among youth eager to serve the cause of inter-American friendship, without distinction of nationality, race, or creed, they can fit their achievement into the framework of world-wide amity. In this connection, the epigram of John Henry Cardinal Newman is apposite: "10,000 difficulties do not make one doubt."

It is most fitting that ideals and principles of this character be proclaimed at ceremonies held in the Ecuadorian Embassy, under the aegis of His Excellency, Ambassador Galo Plaza, of the Republic of Ecuador. Not only have the professors and students of this Nation distinguished themselves at our North American universities and colleges, but a number of them, headed by the Ambassador himself, have returned to this country with official commissions which enable them to increase a hundredfold their influence on the solidarity of hemisphere friendship.

Galo Plaza is a living exemplar of the good-neighbor policy, of democracy in action; he is known in Washington and in other cities of this Republic as a paladin of liberty. Indeed, few South American envoys have enjoyed his popularity in all circles. In the farm lands as well as in crowded cities celebrated for political and industrial leadership, the present Ambassador of Ecuador ably represents a people and a country, to whom we owe a debt of gratitude for loyal cooperation throughout the war.

Without the naval base at Salinas and the air stations on the Galapagos Islands, which are both the national property of the Ecuadorians, the United Nations might not have been able to defend the Panama Canal. This was inter-American friendship at its best; this was devotion on the part of our good neighbors that we in North America are bound to remember with profound appreciation as long as this democracy endures. It has been said that gratitude is the mark of noble minds and noble hearts. What shall we in the United States of America say and do in order to persuade our friends in Central and South America that we are grateful?

Through the good offices of Ambassador Plaza, I wish to extend to His Excellency, Dr. José María Velaso Ibarra, President of the Republic of Ecuador, my sense of grateful appreciation for the national decoration, "Al Mérito," which he has seen fit to decree for this citizen of the Americas. In accepting the insignia of this Order of Merit, I am happy, with sincere humility, to interpret the distinction as one which is conferred upon all my fellow citizens, who in manifold ways, have contributed to the success of the Allied arms. Each official of our Government and, in particular, every member of the armed forces merits the accolade of our good neighbors. In their name and yours, I accept the decoration as a pledge of renewed fervor in a cause that cannot die.

Whatever our national differences or policies may be, we can all agree upon the motto of the democratic hosts in the golden age of Pericles:

"The secret of happiness is freedom; and the secret of freedom is courage."

OPA Policies Hamper Full Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents of the Ninth District of Minnesota who feel that present OPA price controls and policies are doing more to bring about inflation than any other factor in America today.

It is the opinion of some of those who write to me that some controls may be necessary to prevent inflation, but that generally speaking the OPA has hamstrung industry, business, and farming to such an extent that production has been curtailed or stopped entirely.

If the OPA is eliminated, there undoubtedly will be some machinery retained to control rent ceilings and also price ceilings on staple commodities that are extremely scarce, such as sugar. However, industry should be encouraged to produce at its full capacity because it is only through a program of plenty that the present inflationary trend can be halted and turned back.

Following is a typical letter received from one of my constituents relative to the part played by the OPA in one particular industry:

I hesitate to write to you because everyone writes to their Congressman about all their troubles. But Congress is the body that is going to have to remedy shameful situations that exist today.

What I have to write about is the OPA. I am not condemning their efforts or saying they are not sincere. Perhaps the job is just too big and complex for any human beings to handle. But regardless of whether their motives are good or bad, the results of their planning is leading to a terrible state of affairs.

Normally we handle between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 dozen eggs per year. The eggs are here for us to handle this year. But we can't buy egg cases to pack them in. We have enough paper cases on hand to pack about a hundred thousand dozen eggs. The first we can get delivery on more paper cases is the last of August or 1st of September, which is after the egg season is all over with. On wooden cases you just can't place order. On February 5 the OPA set prices on the wood cases and manufacturers either canceled their orders entirely or reduced them. They can get more money for their lumber in some other form and claim they couldn't come out anyway at the OPA price. A letter received from our regular supply house today says they regret the situation, but there is nothing they can do about it, and it looks like a good many eggs will just have to rot on the farms for the want of cases to put them in.

This situation is serious. I think our economic price structures are so complex that no group of men such as the OPA can regulate them without doing far more damage than they can possibly do good. Outside of rent control, I am now in favor of ending OPA completely this June, or sooner, if possible. Sure some prices would rise, but we would get production which would soon halt the rise. And eggs would not rot on the farms because we couldn't get cases to pack them in. Business would go back into legitimate channels and out of the black market. The whole situation is getting worse by the day and the quicker a stop is put to it the better off our country will be.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—America, Which Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many earnest people and many influential organizations with the best interest of our country at heart—realizing the seriousness of this situation facing our Government—want to help and advise the Congress. Those people go to considerable expense to prepare and mail communications presenting their deductions with their recommendations to the Members of Congress for their consideration.

So many of these communications are received daily with the great mass of regular mail that it is a physical impossibility to give all of these communications deserved attention. It is my purpose to present from time to time selections from the congressional mail under the caption "Pearls from the congressional mail" for the consideration of my colleagues:

EXCERPTS FROM THE BOOK
AMERICA, WHICH WAY?
(By John Howland Snow)

For the first time in the history of humanity two worlds, two systems, two irreconcilable types of state confront one another. No one but we ourselves can determine our country's course in the terrific days to come. Let us understand from the beginning that for America to make any serious contribution to world peace, Americans must begin to understand what forces threaten peace.

There was revolution in Europe in forty-eight. There was violent revolution over the land. People were rebelling against the age-old exploitation of their kind. Out of that welter of tongues was heard a voice, the voice of a man named Marx.

It was called the Communist Manifesto. Europe was answering Europe's problem—a problem ages old.

Seventy-two years before, in a little town called Philadelphia—3,000 miles away—there had been another voice, unique, from the soul of man. America had answered those ancient wrongs with the manifesto of 1776. It was our Declaration of Independence.

The voice of Marx was a Communist voice, a voice that said "Destroy."

The new-found voice of America had long since told us—build.

* * * * *

In ancient times, there were two classes of men. Those who owned and those who were owned. The latter were the slaves.

In the Middle Ages, there were two classes of men. Those who owned and those who were owned. The latter were the serfs, the villeins, the mujiks, the coolies, and the fellaheen.

In time feudal barons of the Middle Ages gave way to barons of industry. A third class slowly emerged, neither fish nor fowl. This third class Marx called the bourgeoisie. But the serfs and the coolies, the villeins and the mujiks, remained. They became poorly paid wage workers. They are the proletariat of Europe and Asia today.

Industrial capital developed, and home markets glutted. New markets had to be found. America's discovery, says Marx, "opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie," and "society as a whole is more and more splitting up in two great hostile classes directly facing each other; bourgeoisie and proletariat."

This fresh ground, these new markets, in turn were glutted. The industrial capitalist found himself facing a new class—finance capital. Gradually, finance absorbed industry. Its search for more fresh ground—more markets—brought imperialism upon the world. Imperialism brought wars. Wage workers remained starving, in glutted markets at home. The directly owned slaves of ancient days were now indirectly owned. The slaves of industry and finance, they are the proletariat of today.

The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels defines the proletariat as "the class of modern wage laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor-power in order to live."

History says: All civilization is a struggle. Marx says: All "civilization" is a struggle—of man against man. There are two "irreconcilably antagonistic classes." This struggle of the proletariat had gone on for centuries without a plan. Only human nature had led it on. A plan, therefore, should be found.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels produced the plan. It was a plan, a program, and a goal. This plan, program, and goal Marx called communism. Communism, these people say, is inevitable. Its goal is the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its call to arms was the Communist Manifesto of 1848.

So let us look at the Britain of that time. In varying degrees all of Europe was the same.

In 1844—just 100 years ago—a law was passed in England. It forbade the working of children under 11 more than 6½ hours a day. Older children had a 10-hour limit. The law was not enforced. Nearly 20 years later, in 1863, a children's employment committee reported 7-year-olds working 15 hours a day. They were paid 3 shillings 6 pence—87 cents—a week. Girls, 6 and 4 years of age, were carrying clay in the brickyards from 5 in the morning to 8 at night. In the potteries, whence the chinaware so prized of collectors, these human slaves were "stunted physically and stunted morally."

There were no less than 1,210,000 servants in the private homes of the upper classes. One million two hundred and ten thousand servants out of a population of 20,057,224 in 1861. (England and Wales.)

Machines were started up a little early, kept running a little late. Owners cut the time for meals. Adding up these minutes the House of Commons, 1859, said that "the fraudulent millowners * * * gain is * * * equal to 27 working days" a year. Think of it. Twenty-seven days deliberately stolen from those wretches every year. The law made it, moreover, a civil offense to break a contract with help, but a criminal offense for the help to break the same contract—with his employer.

Listen to this piece of impertinence, from the Master Spinners and Manufacturers Defense Fund, Manchester, 1854: "The factory operatives should keep in wholesome remembrance the fact that theirs is really a low species of skilled labor. * * * The masters' machine plays a far more important part in the business of production than the labor and the skill of the operative, which 6 months' education can teach, and a common laborer can learn." This was food for Karl Marx and his followers.

That is what made communism.

"All the wars in Europe * * * have been mock wars, groundless, wanton, and carried on on false pretenses."—Karl Marx.

Communists refer to "tens of millions killed and maimed only for the purpose of deciding whether the British or German pirates shall plunder the largest number of countries."

STALIN SEES FRUITS OF WAR

"During the first imperialist war it was intended to destroy one of the great powers, viz, Germany, and to profit at her expense. And what came of it? They did not destroy Germany, but in Germany they owed such a hatred for the victors and created such a rich soil for revanche that they have not been able to clear up the revolting mess they have made even to this day, and will not, perhaps, be able to do so for some time. But instead they got the smash-up of capitalism in Russia, the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia, and, of course, the Soviet Union. What guaranty is there that the second imperialist war will produce better results for them than the first?" Note how definitely this speaker refers to "the second imperialist war." That was said in 1934 by Mr. Josef Stalin.

While we were being readied for this "first round of imperialist wars," what had Karl Marx once said? Listen—"any war other than a world war of unheard-of cruelty and absolutely incalculable outcome had become an impossibility * * * (causing) military expenses to rise in geometric progression, and thereby force up taxes to exorbitant levels and so drive the poorer classes of people into the arms of socialism."

Years later, Stalin, clear-headed revolutionist, said, "It is not surprising that bourgeois pacifism is living its last hours." "It is not surprising that bourgeois pacifism is now dragging out a miserable existence." And, Joseph Stalin concluded, "Thus you see that things are moving toward a new imperialist war as a way out of the present situation" which "will certainly unleash revolution and put in question the very existence of capitalism in a number of countries as was the case in the course of the first imperialist war." Date, 1934.

That is how the Communists make use of death and war. It will become more clear to alert American citizens why Russia didn't ratify Dumbarton Oaks immediately; why they made such demands at San Francisco and at Bretton Woods; why they did not attend the Aviation Conference. It will become more clear—why the French collapsed so easily; why they scarcely fought at all; why "we" don't arm them at once—and get out of Europe; why Tito, Wasilewska, Kuusinen; why the slams at the Vatican, the recognition of Badoglio—and why this never-ending series of events that simply have no place in war. In war that Americans have been brought up to think should be fought hard—and won.

So imperialism and communism drain us of our men. Imperialism and communism drain us of our resources. And Communists say of 1914–18, "the United States, the great capitalist reservoir of the the world, was able to throw into Europe all its forces and save the day."

Imperialism would have us repeat that job. Bigger and better, this time, under the screen of international cooperation. But it would impoverish us. A very welcome fact to them.

Communism, in their own words, would have us lose both Europe and ourselves. A very welcome fact to them.

This is not our analysis. These are the recorded statements of the very men whose "absolute duty (it is to) systematically and unflinchingly work in that particular direction."

Such is the world-wide fight between the former dictatorship of finance, and the proposed dictatorship of the proletariat.

Only we—can save ourselves.

The Shirt Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Frederick C. Othman:

MOUNTAINS OF SHIRTS ARE FOUND IN NAVY WAREHOUSES

(By Frederick C. Othman)

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Need a few shirts? I know where you can buy 11,380,368 in two qualities and all sizes.

Your shorts are ragged? I have the address of a fellow who has 5,696,127 pairs for sale, including 2,006,029 in size 34, alone.

The Government owns this haberdashery. The Navy doesn't want it any longer, and why it isn't helping to cover the nakedness of American men is a mystery that Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, is trying to fathom. He is amazed. Me, to.

What happened was that I was deep in the bowels of the Capitol, burrowing into the files of the Senator's war investigating committe. I was jotting down notes on Army surpluses, such as 438,839 pounds of powdered soap, 11,000 one-gallon cans of castor oil, 1,527 half-gallon cans of ditto, 21,580 gravy boats, 23,281 cream pitchers, and 20,000 surgical knives in assorted sizes.

This looked like subject matter for an interesting dispatch and I was plowing happily through the surplus lists when I came upon the Navy file, turned it open and stared, bug-eyed:

Blue chambray shirts: Cost 85 cents each; 6,926,903 declared surplus; 5,560 sold to civilians; 6,921,343 still in Federal warehouses.

The Navy went on to list more surplus shirts of cotton, 4,359,025 more to be exact. It mentioned 281,000 gray cotton hats, 313,000 gray cotton pants, 116,000 cotton jumpers, 1,894,212 pairs of work gloves, 1,852,000 twill jackets, 3,280,375 twill trousers, and 167,000 pairs of cotton socks.

This was news, all right, all right. I took a sharp pencil and listed some more stuff: 218,470 rubber arctics, 352,000 black raincoats, 1,246,010 sou'westers, 2,041,615 white cotton trousers, 5,314 aviators' trousers, and other articles too numerous to mention.

Came then an item, buried among hundreds of other items, that made me gulp: Shorts, mountains of shorts, enough to provide every man in New York City, for instance, with two pairs. Good quality, too.

In the Federal storerooms, according to the Navy's count, there was one batch of 4,520,740 pairs in all sizes from 30 to 42. Another consignment of Navy shorts in sizes unspecified totaled 1,175,387 pairs.

I got in touch with Senator MEAD, who had been badgering the War Assets Corporation to sell a couple of billion dollars' worth of surplus materials to the people who need them. Senator MEAD could use a few shorts himself.

"I am amazed," he said, "to find 11,000,000 shirts and 5,500,000 pairs of shorts declared surplus by the Navy and still in Navy storage. It would seem to me that in view of the need of the men of this country that the Senate War Investigating Committee had better take steps to see that the Nation's males get these shirts, shorts, and other items of clothing still in shortage."

So much for men's haberdashery. I can report further that the Federal surplus disposers are about to get some peculiar merchandise for sale, such as five human skeletons, 130 bassinets.

A Lithuanian Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted on February 17, 1946, in St. Francis Parish Hall, Lawrence, Mass., by the Lithuanian-Americans of Lawrence:

Under the auspices of the local chapter of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Federation of America, an organization comprised of American citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, gathered on February 17, 1946, in St. Francis Parish Hall, Lawrence, Mass., for the purpose of commemorating the twenty-eighth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, unanimously voted to appeal to the President of the United States of America, to his Secretary of State, and to our honorable Senators and Representatives. It was resolved that:

Whereas Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, hereinafter referred to as the Baltic States, were recognized by the great powers on January 26, 1921, and on September 22, 1921, were admitted to full-fledged membership in the League of Nations; and

Whereas the Baltic States signed the Kellogg antiwar pact in 1929 and nonaggression treaties in 1932 with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as Soviet Russia, and that on December 1938 and on January 1939, the Baltic States promulgated neutrality laws after the Swedish pattern and also signed mutual nonaggression treaties with Germany and Soviet Russia in 1939; and

Whereas the Baltic States adhered to the Permanent Court of International Justice, and accepted the resolutions of the International Arbitration Convention, and subscribed to the Barcelona International Transit Convention, and the Paris International Air Conference; and

Whereas in June 1940, in spite of all former assurances by Soviet Russia to respect the integrity and sovereignty of the Baltic States, by unprovoked military aggression and in breach of all treaties and in violation of international law, forcibly occupied the Baltic States; and

Whereas Soviet Russian oppression became unendurable because the high standard of living of the Baltic States was inhumanly degraded, and because a foreign, rapacious, and proletarian dictatorship was foisted upon the Baltic States and also because the basic human rights to life, freedom, and right to worship according to one's own conscience were in actual practice denied that the Lithuanian people protested against those extreme injustices by seeking independence; and

Whereas by the changing fortunes of war, Nazi Germany overran the Baltic States in June 1941, in their war against Soviet Russia with whom she had been privy to inflicting unbearable injustices on the Baltic States until May 1945 when Soviet Russia with the generous assistance of the freedom-loving peoples of the Baltic States; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has still refused to grant Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia the basic "four freedoms" even though a declaration of the United Nations states: "That the declaration may be adhered to by other nations, which are or which may be rendering material assistance and contribution in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism," and regardless of the refusal by the United Nations to accept the Baltic States into the body of the United Nations, the Baltic States turned over to the Allies their entire fleets, and regardless of the indifference of the United Nations to the plight of the poor, enslaved, and helpless Baltic States and the consequent barring of any representation of the Baltic States from formal and public participation in the last International Labor Conference, the Air Conference, and from the San Francisco Conference, the free peoples of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian ancestry everywhere in the world aided cause with all their might; and

Whereas the President of the United States declared at the final plenary session of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco on June 26, 1945, that: "The charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unless we can obtain those objectives for all men and women everywhere without regard to race, language, or religion, we cannot have permanent peace and security;" and

Whereas Soviet Russia imposed an unwanted proletarian dictatorship form of government by military threats and force, disregarding the freedom and status of dignity which the Creator destined for the Baltic States; and

Whereas many hundreds of thousands of the inhabitants of the Baltic States have been forcibly abducted into Siberian prisons and labor camps throughout Soviet Russia for the sole "supposed crime" that they by God's Providence were destined to be free and sovereign peoples with the God-given right to worship according to their conscience, without any interference, whether it be political, physical, or moral, or of any other kind, against any religion whatsoever; and

Whereas we are now committed to obtain freedom for all peoples who are oppressed by tyranny and dictatorship which may again threaten our peace and security; and

Whereas Soviet Russia is now eager and determined to bring before the eyes of the world real or apparent violations of the bill of rights of other nations:

We, therefore, deem it right and proper, and we consider it our sacred duty to appeal to the highest authorities in our beloved United States of America.

We also plead for justice in behalf of the poor and enslaved Baltic States, and we ask and demand in the name of justice and humanity—

1. That the United States Government refuse to recognize the unjust annexation and forceful incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics;

2. That no action be taken by our Government that may possibly prejudice the immediate return of freedom and sovereign independence to the Baltic States;

3. That the cause of sovereign independence of the Baltic States be brought before the Security Council of the United Nations Organization so that Soviet Russia may be compelled by peaceful means to grant sovereign independence to the Baltic States;

4. That the Baltic States be allowed to elect broadly representative democratic forms of government without any political, moral, or any other kind of compulsion or interference whatsoever, under the sole jurisdiction of the United Nations Organization;

5. That all Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians abducted or deported to Soviet Russia in Europe and Asia be allowed to return to their own respective nations;

6. That the UNRRA be allowed to give aid and succor directly to the suffering peoples of the Baltic States;

7. That finally, pursuant to chapter 11, article 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, all formerly members of the League of Nations, be admitted into the United Nations Organization.

In conclusion, we humbly submit to Almighty God, and we beseech Him to bless all those who endeavor to do the works of justice.

CONSTANTINE A. VENCIUS,
President.
STELLA A. RAZNAUSKAITE,
Secretary.
LEONONA SUMCONIS,
Treasurer.

Future Milk Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hugh A. Fogarty from last Sunday's New York Times:

DAIRY FARMERS DOUBTFUL ON FUTURE MILK SUPPLIES

(By Hugh A. Fogarty)

OMAHA, March 30.—Midwest dairy farmers and processors take the dim view concerning future supplies of milk and milk products.

It isn't entirely a matter of price with them, although many are sharply critical of Government price controls and subsidy arrangements. They are, in addition, short of labor, while feed is hard to find and badly needed equipment is still lacking.

One result is that dairy herds are being liquidated in increasing numbers. Dale M. Stewart, of Madison, Nebr., brought home a prediction from a recent directors' meeting of the American Dairy Association that the country faced the most abrupt decline in dairy herd numbers that had ever been recorded. This would necessarily mean less milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream on city tables.

The situation is tied in closely with the grain shortage. Many cows and heifers which could have produced milk have been sent to slaughter for lack of feed, Mr. Stewart reports. He adds that thousands of farmers are dropping dairying for lack of feed and help.

This view was borne out in Topeka, Kans., last week when H. L. Collins, Bureau of Agricultural Economics official, expressed concern before a farm meeting over the decrease in the dairy-cattle population. He reported that both milk production and cattle population fell 9 percent in January and February, continuing a Midwest trend which got under way the middle of 1945.

Those remaining in the production end may receive an increase from an odd source this summer. Dr. Harold Gunderson, Iowa State College entomologist, has reported that spraying of milk cows with a DDT solution during fly-time would increase individual milk production 8 to 20 percent. Midwest farmers are showing an unusual interest in the plan.

Another report from the Shawano Evening Leader, Wisconsin, of March 30, shows that the Midwestern dairy farms have provided 50 percent of 26,458,000 pounds of "emergency" milk shipped to Boston during a 4-month New England milk famine ending February 27, the Federal milk market administrator said today.

Terming the November-through-February period, "the longest and most severe shortage in receipts of milk from New England farmers in the history of the Boston market," Samuel W. Tator added:

"Milk production is currently rising rapidly toward a seasonal peak that will occur early in June."

Other emergency milk receipts listed by Tator included: 10,092,000 pounds from Minnesota; and 1,169,000 from Michigan.

Resolution of Ulster County Liquor Dealers, Hotel and Restaurant Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following resolution approved and adopted by the Ulster County Liquor Dealers, Hotel and Restaurant Association:

Whereas the Ulster County Liquor Dealers, Hotel and Restaurant Association, of Kingston, N. Y., is composed of 108 members, engaged in the wholesale and retail business of selling and serving alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas said membership employ several thousand individuals who support themselves and their families by the wages received in this business; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of said association that tremendous quantities of wheat are being sent to countries and nations outside of the United States of America without restrictions of any kind being placed upon its use; and

Whereas said association recognized the need for wheat to be sent to the starving people of the world; and

Whereas this association approves of the export of wheat for such purposes, but does strenuously oppose such distribution if permitted to be diverted for the manufacture of beer or other products not necessary for sustaining the lives of such people; and

Whereas it has been reported to this association that within the past several weeks a shipload of Holland beer, containing cases stamped "Ingredients imported from USA," was brought from Holland to the city of New York for the purpose of being sold for consumption in the United States despite the fact that many places of business were forced to close because of the lack of United States made beer;

Whereas if said wheat is permitted to be sent abroad without restrictions of any kind, it will result in the lowering of the output of beer and other alcoholic beverages manufactured in this country, resulting in the necessary closing of many places where alcoholic beverages are sold, the loss of considerable investments and in many instances, the life savings of many small businessmen with resulting unemployment for thousands of people, who depend upon such employment for their livelihood; and

Whereas 17,000 employees have already lost their jobs as a result of the foregoing in the State of New York: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ulster County Liquor Dealers, Hotel and Restaurant Association, strenuously objects and opposes the distribution of wheat to other countries unless and until satisfactory restrictions are placed upon its use to the end that such wheat will be used only for the purpose of feeding the starving people of the world; and not be diverted for other purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, Hon. James M. Mead and Robert F. Wagner, United States Senators from the State of New York; Hon. J. LeFevre, Congressman of this district; and all other legislators under whose jurisdiction this matter may come, as well as other interested persons.

Unanimously passed, adopted, and approved by the Ulster County Liquor Dealers, Hotel and Restaurant Association at its meeting of March 26, 1946.

ROBERT E. TEETSEL,
President.

Termination of War Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following petition as furnished to me by Mr. Franklin J. Bowman, vice president of the Republican Club in the town of Clinton Corners, N. Y.:

CLINTON CORNERS, DUTCHESS COUNTY, N. Y.,
March 18, 1945.

Representative JAY LEFEVRE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: All over the world nations are floundering in the quicksands of socialism and communism. We ourselves have gotten off the main highway of economic freedom and constitutional government. As stockholders in the great corporation of which you are a Representative we desire to help in whatever way we can to promote the successful operation of that great enterprise known as the United States of America.

Therefore, we do urge that you represent us in presenting the following:

First. We urge that the wartime powers of the President of the United States be dissolved and the division of these powers between the President and the Congress be restored without unnecessary delay.

Second. Repeal of all Federal laws for the control of prices, production, and the allocation of materials. These controls are unnecessary and are opposed to the principles of free competitive enterprise. Price ceilings retard full production, scarce goods cause rising prices, which cause inflation through limited production and planned distribution of goods; so does allocation of materials through Federal control. These controls are opposed to the principles of a free economy and a free competitive market and hamper distribution of goods—the law of supply and demand cannot find its level through a planned price control and allocation of materials. Further it is the duty of Congress to maintain the integrity of the American dollar. To restore the value of the dollar and prevent further inflation, Congress should drastically reduce Federal spending, so that there may be no further increase in the Federal debt and to convince our people that the Congress is determined to preserve and not destroy our monetary system.

We must respect the laws and we cannot inculcate in our citizens this respect unless the law makers themselves obey the law. All laws not having unequivocal constitutional authority should be repealed, thus undoing some of the mischief that has been done in the past. For you the law is the Constitution of the United States, which you have taken oath to preserve, protect, and defend. We also took that oath; we are asking that you work to restore the United States Constitution, under which we became prosperous, great, and strong, so that our children's children may have the great privilege of living in a free America. Whatever others may do, let us preserve this Nation as an island of freedom, so that liberty may not everywhere perish from this earth.

FRANKLIN J. BOWMAN,
FLORENCE T. BOWMAN,
Voters of Town of Clinton Corners.

We, the undersigned, petition the foregoing:

Alva F. Dykeman, Wm. J. Hevenor, Eula E. Hevenor, Clinton Corners, N. Y.; Kathryn Lovelace, Stanfordville, N. Y.; Charles Olson, Oscar Olson, Grace T. Goodyear, Catherine E. Cornelius, Salt Point, N. Y.; T. W. Seger, Millbrook, N. Y.; George Dykeman, Henry H. Harper, Le Roy G. Germond, Kelsey Wirehouse, Edith A. Webster, Chauncey Webster, Dean S. Pike, Jr., James C. Allen, Anna E. Allen, Allen Webster, Minnie E. Vail, Jennie P. Wirehouse, Ira J. Wirehouse, Clinton Corners, N. Y.; Harry C. Ostrander, Jr., Salt Point, N. Y.; Gertrude B. Tousey, Clinton Corners, N. Y.; Etta H. Bedell, Geo. D. Bedell, Salt Point, N. Y.; Martha L. Burhans, Ralph L. Holt, Mary Holt, B. C. Tousey, Clinton Corners, N. Y.

Decrease of Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I enclose a letter from Jesse L. Shelton, of Rock Hall, Md., as inserted in the Kent County News. The letter follows:

URGES ACTION TO CUT LIVING COSTS

Let's be sensible. Every economic catastrophe that has occurred to America could have been avoided if we, the people, had not placed too much confidence in our leaders and had awakened in time.

The existing conditions in our country today are rapidly getting out of control and the thinking citizen is beginning to wonder if we are not headed for a revolution that will put all world wars in the shade.

Since most of us can remember there has been a constant cry of regulating wages and hours. When some of us were young men we worked for as little as a dollar a day and had as much of the material things in life as we do now for $10 a day. This proves that regulating wages is not the solution of our problems. When the organized workers get a substantial raise up go the prices, and all the thousands who are not organized and those living on a fixed income are the ones who must innocently suffer. Therefore, we Americans must realize that, in order to balance things, we must not continue to raise wages but must lower prices in order to balance our standard of living.

When a man with a wife and three children, and earning $3,600 a year, has difficulty making ends meet, although they are very good managers, live economically and have no luxuries, there is something radically wrong.

We won the war in Europe and in the Pacific, but we are not winning this war that

is on our own doorsteps. And we are not going to win it by giving a substantial raise to the favored minority because they are organized.

The solution of the strike racket is to establish a Nation-wide profit-sharing plan and make it so the employee must stay on the job in order to participate. All disagreements could be settled by a national commission while the employees continued working.

Fellow Americans, stop and think before it is too late. Don't let our country destroy itself from within.

Let all of us organize to bring the cost of living down to the level of our incomes, so we can again enjoy the freedom which was the heritage of our forefathers.

One of the hopeful Americans.

JESSE L. SHELTON.

ROCK HILL, MD.

Regulation, Control, or Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Gay R. Brown before the forum of the Investors League, Inc., at Buffalo, N. Y., February 28, 1946:

The subject assigned to me encompasses a wide range, and obviously under the time permitted, only a bird's-eye sketch is possible. My remarks will be primarily confined to the electric utilities.

I believe thoroughly in the private-enterprise system. I am absolutely opposed to Government ownership and operation of electric utilities. I favor reasonable regulation, but I am against the minute control which some administrative agencies call regulation. I agree heartily with Bernard M. Baruch, who last Sunday emphasized the point that the issue of today is—Station versus Individualism. He went on to say, "The process of individual effort which we call a capitalistic system may not be the ultimate, but it is the best thus far devised. It has proved itself so in peace and in war. I believe in trying to better that system instead of tearing it down." It is my belief that the great majority of the American citizens believe in the free-enterprise system. I am convinced that, if today a referendum were held upon the question of private versus Government ownership and operation of the electric utilities, the American people would cast a resounding vote in favor of private ownership and operation.

But, you may ask, "How about the writers and speakers who, in newspapers, magazines, and on the public platform predict that within the not-far-distant future there will be complete government ownership of the generation, transmission, and sale of electric energy?" Are these men timid; are they easily frightened; are they seeing hobgoblins under the bed? No; I believe not. They are right—yes, right—unless present tendencies are checked in the very near future. If the present program, involving the setting up of public agencies not alone for generation but for the transmission and sale of electric energy continues, then it is as certain as night follows the day that private electric utilities will be destroyed.

A man's life will be quickly extinguished if he is hung or shot. But a slow death may be brought about in many other ways. His mentality may be damaged by continuous aspersions against his reputation; his body may be impaired by lack of proper nourishment; spiritually he may be maimed and warped by denial of liberty and freedom. So, too, it is with private electric utility business. The advocates of Government ownership are keenly aware that they cannot bring about at once the complete adoption of such a program, but many of them, shrewd, farsighted, and not too finicky, appreciate that if you can besmirch and destroy the reputation of the utility executives and thus arouse suspicion and distrust; if you can at wisely selected points establish publicly owned projects generating, transmitting, and selling energy in competition with the private utilities; and if you adopt a program of regulation so wholly unreasonable and destructive that the security holders will see their investments dwindle, then eventually there will be but one result, and that is Government ownership of our utilities.

One of the strongest influences leading to Government ownership and operation of our electric utilities is the Federal Power Commission. It, of course, is not the only body or group whose influence is in this direction, but it is an ambitious Commission with tremendous power, and it hesitates not to exert its powerful support for the extension of Government ownership.

You probably have all heard of the American prisoner of war in the German camp who, after several unsuccessful attempts to escape, decided to build a mousetrap. This trap is now being shown around the country, and the remarkable thing is that after entry of the trap the mouse is given one chance to escape. But the Federal Power Commission, if they have their way, will not give the private utilities even the one chance of avoiding destruction.

In dealing with this subject let us be frank, candid, and even blunt. Let us not use weasel words. The Federal Power Commission apparently allows no opportunity to pass wherein they can arouse prejudice or suspicion against the private companies. The Commission gives no credit to the electric utilities for doing the magnificent job during the war concerning which Mr. J. A. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, said: "Power has never been too little nor too late." When the electric-utility companies had the courage to go to court to resist the encroachment of Federal jurisdiction, the Commission termed these companies "powerful and ruthless utility systems" and "recalcitrant exploiters of the public service."

Leland Olds is Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Samuel Ferguson, the courageous and scholarly president of the Hartford Electric Light Co., says that Mr. Olds "has perhaps the greatest power over anyone in the country to effect and destroy the electric and gas industries." There can be no question that Mr. Olds has adopted a determined and persistent policy to arouse an animosity among the people against private utilities. Because the utilities advertised the advantages of private ownership, he said "What have we to oppose to this malign campaign, the last stand of the devil of self-interest against the great upswing of the common interest." And Mr. Olds goes on to ridicule such advertising as an attempt to manufacture and sell national ideals to the people like chewing gum.

In his testimony given before the Boren committee of the House on January 29 last, he repeated substantially the same ideas. In his speech before the Peoples Lobby Conference at Washington on the 9th of this month, he charged the utilities of maintaining "well-financed efforts to deprive the people of the great benefits, which will flow from such a power program" (meaning similar to the TVA), and he speaks in referring to the utilities "of the centralized control of the country's economic life by an all-powerful corporate bureaucracy."

And again in this speech, he said, "The country's business is no longer seeking a just return for serving the consumer needs of the people, but is seeking maximum profits through exploitation of those needs." Many more statements of like import could be quoted. Is it any wonder, under such circumstances, that a public elected official must be a man of real courage to stand up and argue for private ownership and operation of our utilities systems and urge fair play to such business and its investors. With the charges, the insinuations and the character-destroying propaganda, it is thoroughly understandable why a man in public life hesitates to be classified as a friend of the private utilities.

We have had in the last few years a vast expansion of Government participation in the electric-utility field. We have the TVA, the Bonneville Power Administration, the REA Cooperatives, the Public Utility Districts, etc. We find these public agencies generating electric energy, building transmission lines, and engaging in direct competition with the private utilities. We find Federal projects under the law giving preferences as to service and rates to public agencies and cooperatives. We find Government projects and public agencies taking over private companies. The TVA has taken over and destroyed as tax-paying enterprises all or part of 32 private utilities. We find public-utility districts condemning private utilities and securing the funds for payment from the REA. We find a program instituted for the development of the country's water-power resources by the Government in connection with the multi-purpose river basin programs. The chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in an address at Peoples' Lobby Conference on the 9th day of this month, listed over 30 rivers of the United States that might be harnessed in this vast program.

Assuming for the sake of argument the premise that a government should be allowed to compete with its citizens, certainly no fair-minded man would ever say that such competition should not be on a fair and even basis. The privately owned electric utilities pay in taxes 24 percent of their gross operating revenues. The public-power group pay not 1 cent in Federal taxes and receive low-interest rates based upon Government credit. They issue tax-free securities in whatever amount desired while the owners of the bonds and stock of private-electric utilities according to the testimony of W. F. Sherwood, Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, given before the Boren committee on October 22, 1945, pay out 32.14 percent of said dividends and interest in income taxes. The public group receives free grants of money and are generally free from making reports and practically all regulations.

Can any fair-minded person say that this is fair competition? No; it is competition that will destroy private enterprise. I have read testimony to the effect that there is not a public agency in the country in the electric field which, if it had to pay the taxes of the private utilities, would be operating in the black. Who will assert that Government competition could stand up against privately owned utilities if the said public agencies were not subsidized Federal tax free and in receipt of so many favors and preferences.

And yet the Federal Power Commission terms the Government operation of utilities as a yardstick. A yardstick. What mockery. Give to the public agencies exemption from taxes, free their securities holders from the payment of income taxes, subsidize the agencies, give them all kinds of advantages; then such competition is called a yardstick. Mr. Olds in his speech on February 9 of this year called attention to the fact that the Federal Power Commission is providing sta-

tistics whereby people may compare the rates. He states, "These statistics enable the people in New England, for example, to compare the rates they are paying with those paid by people living in the Tennessee Valley area, or in the service area of such municipal plants as those in Seattle or Tacoma, Wash." Does he say anything about the advantages given by the Government to the public agencies? Does he advise the people that where there is Government ownership, such property is removed from the tax rolls. Does he point out that the advantages given to one locality must be paid for by the rest of the country? Does he even mention the fact that the elimination of property from the tax rolls imposes a greater burden on the remaining taxpayers of the country?

No; the Federal Power Commission is not interested in presenting the true picture. In fact, according to Mr. Elisha Freedman's article in the February 28, 1946, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, when Mr. Olds was asked why Commission report did not present the facts accurately and indicate the increase in consumers' rates due to taxation, Mr. Olds replied that the Commission did not try to explain the facts but merely recorded them. What can any fair-minded citizen think of such a procedure? Can the establishment of public agencies be called a yardstick? Would it not be more accurate to call this stick a bludgeon, to stifle and kill private enterprise? Cannot the people of this country be brought to understand the motive of Mr. Olds and his kind?

We are not left in the dark as to Mr. Old's philosophy of government. He believes in Government ownership. He says, "A real democracy must be a democracy carrying on its own business," and refers to the creation of a cooperative State as in not only the noblest but also the most adventurous of undertakings.

And this Commission which has demonstrated that it believes in Government ownership, is the body which regulates the services and rates of the private utilities under Federal jurisdiction. Is it not a fair question to ask: Can a group of men who believe in government ownership and operation of electric utilities and who believe that regulation of private utilities is a failure, be just and equitable toward those utilities under their jurisdiction? I cannot help but believe that men in an administrative agency, whose duty it is to regulate a utility should believe that regulation is the proper procedure and practice. We have the Federal Power Commission adopting an interpretation of original cost as the cost when first devoted to the public service, and then the members of that Commission gloat over their success in eliminating from the plant accounts of the utilities of this country, millions of dollars which were expended in good faith and at fair price.

"What do the investors in private utilities think when they see their investments diminish by reason and because of the strange philosophy of the Federal Power Commission? As Attorney Randall LeBoeuf has pointed out in an article in the George Washington Law Review for December, 1945, with respect to the acquisition adjustment account (where the utility must set up the difference between original cost as defined by the Commission and the price paid) "It is believed that every dollar so classified has been ordered written off and all at the expense of the investors."

Under the Public Utility Holding Act it has been and it is now necessary to dispose of many of the operating companies. If another utility buys said company at its present value then it will find that the Federal Commission will order the excess between the original cost when first devoted to the public service and the price paid, written out of the plant account. The public agencies can pay anything they desire, and they can put on and keep on their books whatever price is paid. Is it any wonder that many of these operating companies are being sold to public agencies? Could a more shrewd and cunning plan be devised to hasten the day of complete government ownership of our private utilities?

When you have a Commission and its staff believing in Government ownership, with many members thereof showing a strong prejudice against the private utilities, what can one think of the fairness of procedure which makes this body the investigator, the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury? And then we have the provision of the statute, which provides that upon an appeal, the finding of the Commission as to facts shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. And when the Commission can furnish substantial evidence by its own engineers, by its own accountants, by its own employees, one cannot view the situation with equanimity if he is a believer in the private enterprise system. This is not a system of reasonable regulation. It is a system of domination and control which will hasten the end of privately owned utilities.

Of course, the people of this country have a right to have public ownership of their utilities if they so desire. But the determination of that issue should not be foreclosed by an indirect, insidious back-door entrance. When I hear certain persons extolling private enterprise, but at the same time advertising the establishment of public agencies for generation and distribution of electric energy, I think of the Bible story of Isaac being deceived by Jacob and saying, "It is the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau." No; it was not the hand of Esau. Let us not be beguiled by the Jacobs of today masquerading as Esaus. Many countries in recent years were taken over by fifth columnists' activities. They infiltrated into various sections of the country, and when the time came, the country was without adequate defense. Let us stop this infiltration of public agencies now before it goes so far that Government ownershp is inevitable.

Cannot something be done? If I am right in my belief that a great majority of the American people really believe in private enterprise, the time for action is now. Some Federal statistics should be repealed, others greatly amended. My time does not permit a discussion of such statutes. Conscious as I am that advertisements by utilities or investors will be discounted by some people because of the charge of self interest, yet, nevertheless, the message in favor of private enterprise must be carried to the people. Does labor believe in Government ownership? Do the majority of professional men in this country believe in Government ownership? Are the great groups of farmers ready to throw away the system which has made this country strong and prosperous? Yes; I agree with Mr. Baruch. The issue of today is "Statism against individualism." Let us not capitulate. Let us not cringe or fall on our knees before this ambitious, energetic, but dangerous philosophy of the all-powerful state. Remember Abraham Lincoln was right, "You can't fool all the people all of the time." Now is the time for action. Not statism but individualism must be our watchword.

Time Is on the Side of UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Standard-Star, of New Rochelle, N. Y., recently published an editorial titled "Time Is on the Side of UNO." Permission having heretofore been given me by the House, I insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TIME IS ON THE SIDE OF UNO

As delegates of the United Nations Organization begin to gather in New York City for the second session, enforced by the official secretariat to implement arrangements for both the interim and permanent headquarters, we believe the petty objections to UNO will gradually disappear.

Time will, we are confident, wipe out the annoyances and inconveniences and misunderstandings. And a few years hence many who have worried unduly will look back and feel a bit ashamed at their raucous objections to friendly cooperation.

For our part, until a better defense against the atomic bomb is revealed, we shall continue militantly in support of UNO and its objective of permanent world peace.

The Shawano Bank Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Bankers Service Letter of February 27, 1946, from the Rowley Service Bureau of Madison, Wis.:

THE SHAWANO BANK CASE

Yesterday we read in the newspapers that the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington has denied the appeal of the Shawano National Bank in its fight against the OPA. None of the news stories that we have read give this matter the weight or importance that it deserves.

This decision affects every bank in the United States. It affects every citizen of the United States that has a bank account. Not only has the Shawano National Bank lost its case; every bank has lost the relationship of confidence and trust which has heretofore existed between banks and their depositors. No longer can a customer safely entrust his business secret to his bank. Not only can every bank be required to turn "State's evidence" against its own customers, but every banker could be required to "squeal" on his customers in advance and before they have been charged with any claim or violation of law or regulation.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States sustains the position of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Chicago, and the position of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, at Milwaukee. All hold that a bank can be required to disclose any information that it may have in regard to its customer's affairs to investigators from the OPA at any time during an investigation before any action is begun and before any charges are made against the customer.

It is easy to dismiss this decision without giving due weight to its seriousness by merely arguing that the OPA is, after all, an emergency proposition. It is easy to say that the war is over and that the OPA will soon be abolished and that in the few remaining years of the OPA the decision will not bother too many banks.

But the war has been over for 6 months and the OPA still exists. We can understand

why it must continue in existence for a considerable period. But the OPA is still continuing its dictatorial, inquistorial, and Hitler-like tactics in a manner that we cannot understand, now that the immediate pressure of the war is past.

And, even if the OPA were abolished, or if it revised its tactics, the decision is still there as a precedent for other cases, and it is a dangerous precedent. We discussed this particular case in our bulletin of November 21, 1945. In that bulletin we called attention to the fact that other offices claim similar visitorial powers. Other Federal agencies, which will not disappear after the emergency is over, claim similar rights. The Wisconsin Bureau of Taxation claims similar rights. Now that those agencies have this precedent to rely upon, no banker will ever dare to refuse to open the bank's books for the inspection of any investigator that presents the proper credentials.

We are not arguing that banks have any desire to protect tax-dodgers, black-market operators, or criminals of any kind, but certainly the door is now open for investigators to go through the records of every account in any bank at any time. The decision clearly will permit investigators to go through the records of a bank in regard to the business of any customer who is under suspicion.

Under this decision, what is there to prevent investigators from using the banks as a starting point? What is there to prevent a search of all of each bank's records to find out who runs more money through his account than would ordinarily be consistent with his business? What better place could there be to get a list of people who ought to be suspected of tax dodging? What better place could there be to find out what grocer, butcher, or baker was making too much money? It would seem that this decision has infinite possibilities for future abuses.

As we said in our previous bulletin on this case, we do not suppose that banks can be held liable for any damages which their customers may sustain by reason of information given out in situations of this kind. The fact that a test case has been run through and decided adversely to the bank involved is sufficient to protect all banks in similar situations. This is the only good thing that has resulted from this piece of litigation. Banks now know that they are compelled to give information when requested and need have no hesitation about giving information under these circumstances.

The bank's customers, it is to be supposed, will not like this decision, and what we are afraid of is that they will more likely blame the bank for disclosing their business secrets than to blame the Government which has forced the bank to comply with its request.

We are sorry that this decision had to be made. We compliment the Shawano National Bank, because they have had the nerve to fight this thing through. We are sorry that no other banks saw fit to join them and lend them their moral support in their fight.

Why Cannot Veterans Get Surplus Property?—Here Is Where Over Six Billions of Surplus Property Went

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, although servicemen are supposed to have priorities to secure civilian surplus merchandise and cars to help reestablish themselves in business, in their homes, their occupations, and professions, the letters I am getting in every mail indicate the returned veteran is not getting the surplus war goods he is entitled to, This refers to all types of surplus property. The veteran needs this surplus merchandise, but he is not getting it from his Government. The Senate War Investigating Committee has reported to Congress that over $6,000,000,000 worth of surplus property, mostly of a civilian nature, which has been lying in British ports and in British warehouses, has been sold by our Government to the British Government at 10 cents on the dollar. The State Department has agreed to sell over $6,000,000,000 worth of brand-new surplus property to Great Britain for $650,000,000. In other words, we have handed Great Britain by this one deal alone a gift of more than $5,000,000,000. That is one reason why our veterans in this country are not able to get the surplus property they need, and on which they are supposed to have priority. By this one deal alone we have given to Great Britain more than she is asking us to give her under the provisions of the so-called $4,000,000,000 loan.

Proposed Amendment to Pay Raise Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal pay-raise bill is scheduled for consideraton in the House on Wednesday. I shall expect to offer an amendment to this bill that will, in substance, substitute the 18½-percent increase "across the board" provision in the bill proposed by the committee. The amendment I shall offer provides the basic formula adopted by the Senate in Senate bill 1415, which is on a graduated scale instead of the 18.5 percent "across the board" proposal. My amendment follows Senate 1415, except that I propose an increase of 45 percent instead of 36 percent—being an increase of 9 percent—on the first $1,200 per annum basic salary or fraction thereof, prevailing in June 1945. For example, an employee now receiving an annual salary of $1,440 would, under my proposal, receive $1,740, being an increase on his present salary of 20.8 percent.

Most significantly, my proposal will result in greater increases to those employees now receiving $2,700 per year or under, than under the 18.5 percent flat increase adopted by the committee. The difference in levels is less than $100 until it reaches $3,700, and less than $200 until it reaches $4,700. My proposal is not so liberal with those who receive $5,600 or more.

I believe my proposal will result in fair treatment for those who have been hardest hit by the rise in the cost of living, and will remedy the defect of too low salaries being paid the bulk of our Federal employees who are below the $2,000 salary level. The table below indicates the rates of pay under my proposal:

Federal personnel annual pay rates

Rate prior to July 1, 1945 (1)	Current rate (Public Law 106, effective July 1, 1945) (2)	Rate under S. 1415 as passed by Senate December 1945 (3)	Rate proposed by House Civil Service Committee, 18.5 percent flat increase above current rate (4)	Rate proposed by Congressman Edward H. Rees, based on formula in S. 1415 (5)
$1,200	$1,440	$1,632.00	$1,706.40	$1,740.00
$1,440	1,704	1,915.20	2,019.24	2,023.20
$1,620	1,902	2,127.60	2,253.87	2,235.60
$1,800	2,100	2,340.00	2,488.50	2,448.00
$2,000	2,320	2,576.00	2,749.20	2,684.00
$2,300	2,650	2,930.00	3,140.25	3,038.00
$2,400	2,760	3,048.00	3,270.60	3,156.00
$2,600	2,980	3,284.00	3,531.30	3,392.00
$2,900	3,310	3,638.00	3,922.35	3,746.00
$3,200	3,640	3,992.00	4,313.40	4,100.00
$3,500	3,970	4,346.00	4,704.45	4,454.00
$3,800	4,300	4,700.00	5,095.50	4,808.00
$4,600	5,180	5,644.00	6,138.30	5,752.00
$5,200	5,810	6,298.00	6,884.85	6,406.00
$6,000	6,650	7,170.00	7,880.25	7,278.00
$7,000	7,700	8,260.00	9,124.50	8,368.00
$8,000	8,750	9,350.00	10,368.75	9,458.00
$8,500	9,275	9,895.00	10,990.87	10,000.00
$9,000	9,800	10,000.00	11,613.00	10,000.00

How Do We Get Tough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Endicott (N. Y.) Daily Bulletin:

HOW DO WE GET TOUGH?

George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania, but never a top-ranking statesman, proposed a get tough policy with Russia over the week end, a policy which is being advocated in almost all discussion groups these days.

Everybody seems to think we should get tough with Russia and none of us seem hesitant to say so. Like as not, the people who speak out this way are the same people who, a few months ago, were clamoring to "bring our boys home * * * all of 'em * * * and quick."

There's a definite connection between the two thoughts.

We have brought our boys home. Most of the high-point men with battle service have returned to civilian life. Few men with long service overseas are still abroad. The great majority of those overseas are the recruits shipped over shortly before the war ended, or since.

Furthermore, we've seen our Air Force reduced to a fraction of what it was on VE-day. A great portion of our Navy lies in American harbors, unmanned.

That is as it should be. The men who did a great job of winning the war should be released from service now that the fighting is over.

Unfortunately, all the world knows we've disbanded our armed services, that we have only a skeleton of the amazing Army and the magnificent Navy scattered over the world. That being the case, a few liberties will be

taken by nations who conceivably might be willing to grapple with us.

No one in the United States wants another war—at least no one with any honest, decent, humanitarian ideals. All of us are tired of pulling someone else's chestnuts out of the fire. Nor do we intend to fight Russia to protect British oil interests in Iran. It will take serious aggression to interest the American people in going to war again within this generation.

But we should, for the time being, keep more than a token force in certain trouble spots. We don't want to get tough, but there should be some deterrent in case a potential enemy chooses to become troublesome.

The American people do not wish to make war with Russia. We hope the Russian people feel the same way about America. In case, however, some of the Soviet statesmen or Soviet marshals become overambitious, a well-trained, well-equipped American military team will do more to prevent war than all the notes and verbal remonstrances of our well-meaning Department of State.

We can be thankful that the great discharged force, the men and women who have returned to civilian pursuits, provide a great reservoir of military might if we should be attacked and placed on pure defensive. Meanwhile, we might keep our recruits well trained and our Air Force well groomed to hold the line until such time as trained reservists could be shipped to the trouble zone.

That unhappy condition will not come to pass if all of us put our hearts and minds behind the effort for an enduring peace. That is the challenge to us. Perhaps, too, that is the best method of getting tough with Russia.

Telegram of California Processors and Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I am including herewith a wire recently received from the California Processors and Growers in California.

The failure of the interested Government agencies to effect a solution to the jurisdictional dispute which has closed most of the canneries in California has made it necessary for the California Processors and Growers to take steps to prevent the loss of California's valuable fruit and vegetable crops.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *March 30, 1946.*
Congressman JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

All canners represented by California Processors and Growers, Inc., have determined to take every step necessary to prevent the loss of California's fruit and vegetable crops. As one of those steps they will resume their regular and customary labor relations with the American Federation of Labor.

On March 1 at the behest of the National Labor Relations Board they suspended the contractual and bargaining relations with the A. F. of L. which had existed without interruption for 9 years.

This suspension has already resulted in substantial losses in the spinach crop and in the stoppage of cannery plant preparations which each year are essential for canning the oncoming asparagus and fruits, apricots, peaches, pears, and fruit-cocktail. Farmers fear to commit themselves to the planting of the great acreages of tomatoes for late summer and fall harvesting which is necessary to supply the people with this valuable food.

A condition approaching chaos involving farmers, workers and consumers in its consequences is mounting rapidly day by day. In that chaos the major fruit and vegetable crops of the State are likely to be lost.

With proper consideration for a statement from any Government board, the canners have up to now heeded the opinions regarding what they could and could not do expressed by NLRB at the time it voided the Board's October election in the canneries. This the canners did despite advice from eminent lawyers in the East, in the Middle West, and on the Pacific coast that the opinions were erroneous and that the canners had no duty to follow them.

In the 30 troubled and critical days since March 1 the issues which the NLRB created but did nothing to solve have been tossed from Government bureau to Government bureau and from one official to another, not excepting the President himself. Too hot with politics for others to handle, the issues now come back to the California canners. They accept them because no one else will act to save the 1946 crops of this State, and the crops will not wait.

The C. P. & G. canners have never had any contract with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. They are convinced that at this time the A. F. of L. is the bargaining agent for a majority of the workers now in the C. P. & G. bargaining unit.

The NLRB determined that it was in order for it to hold an election between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. in 1945, when an A. F. of L. contract was in effect It should be equally in order in the future to hold such an election while an A. F. of L. contract is in effect.

The canners' 1946 agreement with the A. F. of L. will be the same type of contract which has been in force during recent years. In case the NLRB shall hereafter certify a different bargaining agent for the cannery workers the contract will not continue beyond the date when such certification becomes final.

The canners are proceeding with a deep sense of public responsibility. Some public officials are unable, some are unwilling, all have failed to untangle the snarl which Government created. The canners to whom the farmers and the consumer public look for action have no choice but to try.

CALIFORNIA PROCESSORS
& GROWERS, INC.,
1200 Financial Center Building,
Oakland, Calif.

Production of Fire Apparatus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *March 29, 1946.*
Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
House Office Building:

We are today wiring our sales representatives to discontinue acceptance of orders for fire apparatus. Present OPA policies have left us no other alternative to protect ourselves from ruinous losses.

SEAGRAVE CORP.,
H. B. SPAIN,
President.

Apprenticeship for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an interview I made on Saturday, March 30, with Francis W. Tully, Jr., the Washington correspondent of the Yankee Network, over Station WNAC, Boston, and the Yankee Network, on the subject Apprenticeship for Veterans:

Mr. TULLY. Congressman McCORMACK, this evening we are discussing apprenticeship for the returning veteran. Do you feel that some further action should be taken toward this objective?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, Pete; I most certainly do. Every day thousands of men are returning from the armed forces to civilian life. They are eager to take up where they left off when they entered military service. Uppermost in their minds is the desire to have the opportunity to prepare for one of the professions or trades, so they may take their places in the economic life of America. It is our duty to make immediate and definite plans for the future of these returning veterans.

Some of these young men will resume their studies in institutions of higher learning to prepare themselves for the professions. A large number of them, however, plan to make one of the skilled trades their life work. It is our program for the future of this large group that I would like to discuss with you this evening.

As a doctor must complete his education in medicine and serve his internship before practicing his profession, so likewise a skilled tradesman must study the techniques of his trade and serve an apprenticeship before he can qualify as a journeyman.

Labor, management, and the public should work as a team, so that the opportunity to learn a trade can be extended to the thousands of American boys who have worked and fought so gallantly to give us victory and bring peace to a war-torn world.

Mr. TULLY. Do you think there is room for industry to absorb these men in the skilled trades?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; industry is welcoming the services of returning veterans as potential craftsmen, who may be trained through apprenticeship. Over 5,000,000 all-around skilled workers are required in American industry, and to maintain a working force that size, fully 618,000 apprentices should be employed all the time. Only a fraction of that number are so employed today.

Mr. TULLY. Can you think of any specific industries where that situation would apply?

Mr. McCORMACK. Let's look into the future and consider the construction industry as an example. The construction industry, especially needs skilled men, and apprentices. Carpenters, electricians, painters, plumbers, steamfitters, bricklayers, sheet-metal workers, glaziers, and workers in many other trades are being urgently sought today.

New homes are needed for some 5,000,000 families, including families of more than 3,000,000 newly married veterans, and about 2,000,000 families who have been living with friends and relatives because of the housing shortage. The total construction program for the Nation, including all new building projects, as well as repairs and alterations, has been estimated at $10,900,000,000 annually during the next 5 years.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this construction program will require a working force of 2,840,000 in 1946, and this number must be increased by a million additional workers before the end of 5 years. More than half of these workers must be skilled, if the President's veterans' housing program is to be fulfilled. In other words, approximately 2,000,000 craftsmen will be required to do this job.

To be assured of a force that size we should indenture at least 250,000 apprentices this year, and every year thereafter as many as 42,000 apprentices must be graduated to full-fledged craftsmanship in the building trades.

Mr. TULLY. The Government already provides some assistance to a young man seeking an apprenticeship, doesn't it?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes, Pete, we have in this country a well-organized program for promoting apprenticeship. It has been under way for several years, but it nas been seriously retarded, first by the depression and then by the war. The national movement was given its impetus by a law enacted by Congress in 1937, establishing the Apprentice Training Service in the United States Department of Labor. To advise the Apprentice Training Service there is the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship which is the national policy-making body on all major matters relating to apprenticeship.

Then, under the GI bill of rights, Congress has provided monthly subsistence allowances for the benefit of veterans who want to train for a skilled trade, but cannot afford to do so without financial aid. These Government benefits, which amount to $65 a month to a veteran without dependents, and $90 a month to a veteran with dependents, are in addition to the wages he receives from his employment while he is serving his apprenticeship. The total amount a veteran receives each month, including his apprentice wage and Government payment, however, will not at any time exceed the monthly wages paid a journeyman in the same trade.

To further the national program, management and labor are working together on joint apprenticeship committees. These committees, which are equally representative of employers and workers in plants and communities throughout the United States, are being assisted by field representatives of the Apprentice Training Service. Fortunately, more than half of our States have had the foresight to establish their own State apprenticeship agency, and these State agencies are playing an important part in promoting apprenticeship.

Mr. TULLY. What further steps do you recommend, Congressman MCCORMACK?

Mr. MCCORMACK. There are 12 fundamental points, general in scope, which I propose as the basis for every apprenticeship program.

First. Individual apprenticeship programs should be established in each trade for each locality. These programs should be formulated by representatives of management sitting in with the representatives of employees.

Second. Each program should contain a predetermined schedule of work experiences in the trade, and should state the minimum number of hours required for training in each major part.

Third. Each program should show the total number of hours necessary to qualify the veteran as a journeyman in a particular trade.

Fourth. Each program should contain a progressively increasing wage schedule for the entire apprenticeship period.

Fifth. There should be a ceiling as to the number of veterans to be indentured at any one time.

Sixth. Approximately 150 hours per year should be allowed for related classroom instruction.

Seventh. Adequate records should be kept to show the progress being made.

Eighth. There should be a supervisor of apprentices for each program.

Ninth. A written agreement should be signed by the employer and the veteran, covering the terms and conditions of the apprenticeship.

Tenth. Each program and written agreement should be recorded with the State apprenticeship agencies, or, in the absence of a State agency, with the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship.

Eleventh. A certificate should be given those who have satisfactorily completed their apprenticeship.

Twelfth. Each program should provide for the issuance of the necessary tools.

Mr. TULLY. You mentioned a need for work experience schedules, Congresman. Will you explain what that means?

Mr. MCCORMACK. In planning a program, measures must be taken to assure the veteran that he will receive the all-around skills of the trade. A job analysis of the trade in each plant or community should be made. The things a qualified journeyman must know should be listed, and the machines, tools, and equipment used, and the operations performed should be set forth. The minimum time spent in training on each operation should be stated in hours. Thus the veteran, at any time during his training, can check on the progress he is making. It is also important to fix the total time required for serving an apprenticeship. Some trades require 8,000 hours of "learning on the job." Based on an estimated 2,000 work-hours a year, that would mean an apprenticeship of 4 years. The veteran should know that.

The increasing wage scales I mentioned will keep up the apprentice's interest in his work, and maintain his morale. He starts as an unskilled worker, and his wages increase with his knowledge.

Mr. TULLY. Why should there be a ceiling on the number of apprentices in any one trade?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Everything possible should be done to guarantee the veteran an opportunity of continuous employment at fair wages in his trade. We must be careful to avoid having too many veterans learning the same job or trade at the same time. If we are foresighted now, we shall avoid one possible source of unemployment later on. Supply and demand should be studied, and the veteran advised about existing employment conditions in each trade.

Mr. TULLY. What is the employer's attitude toward bona fide apprenticeship?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Every employer welcomes the veteran into an apprenticeship training program because with a bona-fide program, the apprentice is a producer from the day he starts working. In other words, the veteran serving an apprenticeship works and learns as he earns. With proper guidance and related classroom instruction he advances rapidly in his knowledge, which readily reflects in increased production.

Mr. TULLY. This whole program you have described sounds like a very important one, Congressman MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Apprenticeship is the first line of defense and protection of this Nation. In the dark days of 1941–43 it was to the skilled worker that America turned to produce the weapons that turned the enemy back from our shores. The lessons of those days should not be forgotten; we should never again be caught with such a woeful lack of skilled artisans.

Apprenticeship is the time-tested means of replenishing America's reservoir of skilled workers. It provides the logical, sensible system for the replacement of those craftsmen who by reason of injuries, death, and old-age retirement withdraw from the labor force.

Apprenticeship will play an ever-increasing part in maintaining our industrial strength and high standards of production. Let labor, management, and Government cooperate in the continued development of a sound and everlasting program of apprenticeship for the future prosperity of the Nation and for the development of our veterans into men of responsibility and good citizenship. We must look to them to carry on the great tradition of sound leadership in American industry.

National Garden Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include addresses delivered at the National Garden Conference held March 26, 27, and 28, 1946, in Washington, D. C.

In a message read before the conference President Truman said:

To the National Garden Conference:

It is heartening to know that you are meeting today to remobilize the Nation's victory gardeners so that additional food will be produced, thereby making other foods available for hunger relief. Cooperation of Federal, State, and local groups made a winning team for home-garden production in the war years. I am gratified to see you continuing this teamwork.

During war years home gardens contributed liberally to our national food supply. They helped make it possible for us to eat better than before the war and at the same time supply the world's best-fed fighting forces and provide essential food supplies to our allies. If we had been short of food, it might have delayed the war's end.

The great conflict is over, but this is no time to let up—not while hunger stalks the world. Food is today the most sought-after commodity in the world. Literally millions of human beings in Europe and Asia are dying or are on the verge of starvation from lack of it. Hundreds of millions are suffering beyond our comprehension—suffering from hunger, from malnutrition. We who are well fed cannot conceive the extent of that suffering.

In opening the conference, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, said in part:

Everyone in this assembly knows that we are facing the most serious international food crisis of modern times. At least until the next harvest we shall be pressed to the limit of our ability to keep enough food supplies moving into stricken areas of the world to do our part in preventing widespread starvation.

At least until the next harvest, we shall need to ship every bit of food we can spare. And we can expect a continuation of the need for relief feeding in 1947. It will take another growing and harvest season to build up our own reserves again. Poor growing weather and poor crops abroad would result in continued urgent need abroad, just as bad weather here would cause food shortages in this country. We must prepare for all our needs and we must plan on producing considerable quantities above those needs, to provide a margin for safety. Those 18,500,000 gardens were one of the big reasons why we were able to eat more and eat better during the war in spite of huge shipments to our armed forces and to our allies. During the war, as much as 40 percent of our fresh veg-

etable supply came from victory gardens. That was an amazing achievement.

We are now challenged to help win this global war against hunger. Hungry people make poor disciples of democracy. Food is still one of the most vital weapons in securing a lasting and stable peace. Growing more home gardens is one way to help. Every pound of food eaten fresh from the garden, or preserved for use next winter, will release an equivalent amount of food to be shipped to the starving millions.

I hope that at this meeting you will give attention to our own future needs. As a Nation, we can still do much in improving our health by eating more of the nutritious foods from our gardens. But we can also make life so much richer for many millions of our people if we can encourage them to improve their home grounds, their parks, their cities, and the roads surrounding them.

Through your efforts we can keep organized this great army of victory gardeners who during the war learned the art of gardening.

I think the President, the famine emergency committee, and the Department of Agriculture have awakened everyone to the fact that, as far as the food situation is concerned, the pressure is not off. The pressure is greater now than ever. There are more people looking to us for food than ever before. There is more need for victory gardens in this first year of peace than there was in any year of the war. The war against famine is just reaching the stage of a decisive battle. If we lose this war we will jeopardize all that we gained on the battlefields.

There is no question that gardens tend to improve eating habits by increasing consumption of vegetables. This benefits commercial producers and canners directly—and it means a healthier, better-balanced diet for our people. I believe, for example, that the rapid rise in the popularity of tomatoes and increased consumption of commercial vegetables during recent years may be credited to a large extent to their widespread promotion through home gardening.

This conference will, I believe, assure the success of this year's victory garden campaign. I hope it will lay the foundation for a continuing garden program that will give every family in America an opportunity to enjoy a richer life through the recreation, the security, and the general community improvement that more attractive grounds and gardens provide. I hope that through your planning and the program you develop here, America will be on its way to become a Nation of gardeners—a Nation in which every plot of good ground adds something to the beauty of our surroundings and the health of our people.

In the course of the conference Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, said in part:

I hope there will always be victory gardens. The only sad thing about the end of the war was the fact that the pressure was off victory gardens. Every victory gardener felt that he was really contributing something to the good of humanity, and when the pressure was off, the urgency was off, it made me a little sad to see some of the victory gardeners were not going to put in gardens this year. But we discovered very unfortunately a few months ago that lots of things have gone wrong with the world food situation. It is amazing how many things suddenly piled on top of us. It never rains but it pours.

There has been some word passed around quietly that the situation in Europe is not as serious as we have been led to believe. When that has been put to people in UNRRA and those closer to the situation perhaps, the word comes that the tapering off of the number of calories available is now coming in a truly serious way and probably there will be more people hungry in the world during the next 3 months than there ever have been in any other 3 months of the world's history.

I think it is a marvelous thing that the victory gardeners are preparing to help. I think they have perhaps more reason to work this year than they did in any of the preceding years. If every victory gardener by his activity can release an extra thousand calories a day from his family for a 3-month period by reason of the garden, that would make a tremendous difference. It might make a difference, I would say, of more than a million lives. So I hope we will go at our work with the utmost vigor.

I don't have any message really except to urge you to do your best this year and to keep it up next year. You know we could have a really serious food situation this year if there were a drought in the Corn Belt. An awful lot depends on the weather. It could be very necessary next year to have a victory garden, but 2 or 3 years from now it won't be necessary to have a victory garden. I hope we still have them after the necessity has passed because it is good for our psychic health, even better than for our physical health.

In addressing the conference, Hon. John W. Snyder, Director, War Mobilization and Reconversion, in the course of his remarks, said:

My interest in a national gardening program at this particular time is most intensive. A successful garden program during the next year will make our job of reconversion easier and will expedite our return to full peacetime economy.

It seems to me that a national gardening program is made to order for these 3,000,000 who are now unemployed. A long-time program of home and community improvement means more jobs. The result of this type of work is a continuing increase in the attractiveness of our parks, highways, towns, cities, and farms. It is a good productive investment that will help to stabilize our real-estate values and assist in preventing blighted areas in our cities and towns.

I might point out here that gardening is practically the only way in which at least half the families in America can help produce—with the materials at hand—one of the raw materials that is most sorely needed in these critical days—food.

Finally, I should like to point out the relationship between a successful gardening program in these critical times and the war against inflation, which still goes on. The main reason for high prices may still be found in the old law of supply and demand. Nowhere does that law work with more deadly certainty than in the food market. Since food is one of the most important items in our national budget, the effect of supply and demand on the price of food is one of the major concerns of us who are trying to prevent a postwar skyrocketing of prices.

One of the easiest, quickest, and fairest ways to prevent inflation of food prices out of all reason is to supplement the civilian supply with home-grown foods—as much home-grown produce as we can raise this year.

They are all helping keep the cost of living down, not only for themselves but also for those who cannot grow their own and must depend upon commercial supplies. Anything that adds to the supply of food helps keep consumer prices down. Anything that reduces demand for food also helps keep consumer prices down. A national garden program does both. And to anyone who is worried that there may not be a demand for all that farmers will produce this year, I think we can say that it looks like the world will need every pound of food we can produce and then some.

I have not dwelled upon some of the other pressing reasons for a vigorous garden campaign because others have talked about the famine situation and the moral reasons, the military reasons, and the economic reasons why we must make every possible effort to slow down the rate of starvation in the less fortunate countries. I endorse what the President, Secretary Anderson, and the other distinguished leaders have said to you about the need for an all-out attack on this problem.

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, said:

About 5,000,000 Americans, when examined for the draft, were not able to pass the physical standards set up by the armed forces. Of the 15,000,000 who were accepted, millions had something wrong with them. For example, about 98 percent had defects in their teeth. * * * We have estimated that, while only 3 or 4 percent of the difficulties were due wholly to nutritional causes, 40 percent were caused by things that had their roots in either something the men ate or failed to eat. The fact that many of these people had enough to eat did not make them properly fed. * * * The highest rejection rate was due to mental disease. Mental disease has a connection with gardening, both through eating habits and working habits. * * * It is my firm belief that, if the hundreds, thousands, and millions of people who are psychotic, neurotic, and emotionally immature, could get back to working with the soil, they would develop stability. If they work hard physically, there will not be much trouble in getting them to eat what they ought to eat. Here is an opportunity to try to turn back the tendency of people to run away from the physical. Mental health can be combined with producing something to eat. * * * We learned from the draft that many young men do not eat enough and many do not eat the right kind of food. We also learned that many did not do the right kind of work often enough. Gardening will provide both food and the right kind of work.

Hon. Chester C. Davis, chairman of the Famine Emergency Committee, said:

The greatest concern of the Famine Emergency Committee at this time is * * * to make sure that enough food is produced and saved to meet our goals for foreign relief and to exceed them if possible.

But there will be some shortages. Besides the shortage of wheat there will be a shortage of fats and oils. * * * There may be shortages of canned foods next fall and winter. * * * And so long as consumer demand continues to take about everything the market offers, it is possible that other shortages may develop in particular localities of crops. * * *

This year we shall need millions of gardens—millions of back-yard food producers. Gardens in 1946 will help us conserve wheat by giving our families extra vegetables to make up for less bread and cereal. * * * Potatoes, for example, can substitute for bread in many ways. Gardens will provide a cushion against shortages which may develop here and there in the critical months. Gardens will enable many more people to can and preserve foods, making it possible for them to donate more to collection campaigns for foreign relief. Gardens, in short, will help us meet our goals for export and protect us against shortages at home. * * *

We are assured, by reports reaching us from all over the world, that the people of the famine-stricken areas are doing everything in their power to get back into full-scale production.

I want you to see the national garden program this year as I see it, in relation to the general campaign against famine that is being fought on many fronts. Our pressing need is to get sufficient quantities of food into the regions of the world where it is

needed to save lives—and to get it there in time.

Victory gardens will make it possible to conserve more food and to produce more food in 1946. The more gardens there are, the more food we can send abroad—the more lives we can save.

Hon. Wilson W. Wyatt, Administrator, National Housing Agency, said, in part:

You who have read the report I made to the President on the veterans' emergency housing program know that we have set as the goal we must meet the largest building program this Nation has ever known.

We all know that we must do more than just provide the veteran with a floor, four walls, and a roof. That doesn't make a home. He wants a design of house that appeals to him; he wants comfortable, attractive furnishings inside it and he wants a pleasant yard around his home.

Most every veteran will want a place where he and his wife can grow flowers and shrubs and many will want enough ground to grow vegetables as well.

You know as well as I do the importance of elbow room around a man's home, of space to relax—to build an "outdoor living room." You know as well as I do the benefits which accrue to a community from such types of housing—how the cost of crime and disease that festers in city slum jungles is cut down by sunshine and fresh air and the other things that make a better environment.

All this leads me back to what I started earlier—that the community is one of the keystones of our program. It is the community which can plan so that the veterans' homes can be built on attractive lots, so that group housing and slum-clearance housing can be set up on attractively landscaped grounds.

But I want all of you here to know that I think as you do—that four bare walls and a plot of ground are not enough. I want to set our sights high—to achieve better homes and better living for Americans than any nation has ever known before.

Dr. Frank G. Boudreau, chairman Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council, in discussing the importance of vegetables and fruits in meeting nutrition needs, said:

Food was one of the decisive factors in the First World War. It was of even greater importance in the Second World War. When food was needed during the war in greater quantities than we had ever produced before, our farmers and gardeners rose to the occasion. We produced enough food for our allies and we fed our armed forces and our people better than they had ever been fed before. Food meant victory to ourselves and our allies, and we spared no pains to produce it in abundance. Food also meant health to our people.

My task is to speak of the importance of vegetables and fruits in meeting nutrition needs. These rank high among the protective foods. Our appreciation of the nutritional value of vegetables and fruits is something relatively new.

Increased consumption of vegetables and fruits would greatly improve the American diet and it would help to overcome its most common deficiencies. Vegetables and fruits taken as a group, states Dr. Sherman, may be ranked next after grain products and milk in importance as constituents of an economical and well-balanced diet. Increasing use of vegetables and fruit seems to improve the food value of the diet at every point at which the American dietary is likely to need improvement.

The protective foods, among which vegetables and fruits are high, will do more for the women of America than all the beauty shops, and unlike the beauty shops, men and boys are also admitted to their benefits.

So, in addition to all the other advantages which home gardeners enjoy, they can have the satisfaction of knowing that they are helping to build the foundations of a more peaceful world.

This may sound like a fanciful account of the benefits of home gardens, but I can assure you that it is based on fact. Nothing was more surprising to the old student of nutrition than the discovery that vegetables and fruits have great nutritive value. This discovery has been amply confirmed in practice. Clear eyes, good complexions, sound gums, good digestion, and proper elimination are some of the rewards of the home gardener. His best reward will be the knowledge that by saving food for shipment abroad he is an active partner in man's most ambitious undertaking—building a solid foundation for world unity.

Mr. Speaker, the attention of the country has been repeatedly called to the success of home-food production carried on by the victory gardeners of the Nation. It has been estimated that nearly 50,000,000 people worked in victory gardens, producing approximately 40 percent of the fresh vegetables consumed in the United States during the war.

These millions of experienced gardeners will continue their volunteer training and will constitute a great reserve food army which can be called upon whenever critical need arises. The present world famine emergency is an example of such an emergency, and the Famine Emergency Committee is to be commended on making the victory-garden program one of the important and essential parts of the famine-relief program.

When food supplies are once more back to normal, many of these gardeners, still enjoying the benefit of healthful relaxation and exercise from working in the soil, will turn to other phases of gardening in improvement of homes and communities, and all will retain the experience gained in their volunteer training, ready to meet any food emergency which may arise.

In order to succeed, great national movements such as the victory-garden program must be fundamentally sound. They require careful planning, energetic execution, and the fullest cooperation of many public and private agencies. But there must always be leadership. There must always be men responsible for the planning and successful direction of such programs. We have here a notable instance of such leadership in Director Paul C. Stark, who presided at this conference. Mr. Stark's appointment as Director of the National Garden Program by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson was announced in February 1946 by President Truman, who took advantage of the occasion to urge an all-out effort by victory gardeners.

Mr. Stark has for many years taken a leading part in national garden and agricultural affairs. Shortly after Pearl Harbor, he helped to organize and served as president of the National Victory Garden Institute, a nonprofit service organization, which mobilized industry behind the victory-garden program, and as vice chairman of the Government's Garden Advisory Committee during the war.

The National Garden Conference called by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson was a remarkable demonstration of volunteer team work and cooperation by all phases of American life. This inspiring coordination in a mighty home food-production program by the forces of agriculture, labor, industry, youth, and women's organizations, scientific groups, Government leaders, and many others, will go far in helping to win the war against world starvation.

A National Air Policy Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, American air power was a controlling factor in the defeat of fascism. To acquire this power, tremendous technical advances were made in the aircraft industry. Many lessons were, or should be, learned from the war effort. Not least among these is the high rate of technical obsolescence and the need for continuous scientific research of the highest quality to maintain up-to-date aviation. This, in turn, requires an alert, vigorous, and flourishing aircraft industry.

It may be a surprise to some Americans to learn that the war ended without any basically new plane conceived after Pearl Harbor being used in combat. The same is generally true of many basic ideas, and already some of these later ideas are in the discard—outmoded by amazing new discoveries. Here the Germans had the edge on us. In the closing days of the war the Germans made a desperate attempt to turn the tide of defeat by employing new terrible weapons. It is now generally acknowledged that, had the Germans been granted a few months more mass-production time, the decision might have been delayed for months, if not for years.

The course of science is too swift to allow public policy to drift idly behind. Almost a year has gone by since VE-day, and we still lack a national air policy that will draw upon the lessons of war and insure uninterrupted research and development. Disposal of war-built aircraft plants is hedged around with uncertainties, indecision and delay. Plans announced by the Army Air Forces for future air power cannot be pursued in isolation. The aircraft industry must know what role it will be called upon to play in the peacetime economy.

More than a dozen individual reports and studies have been issued in the past 12 months dealing with various essential phases of our air-power problems, yet no steps have been taken to integrate these reports and documents into a single, binding policy.

The need for such a policy was particularly impressed upon me during hearings conducted by the aviation subcommittee of the Senate Committee to

Investigate the National Defense Program. Our investigations clearly revealed an absence of policy, and uncertainty as to the future of our air power.

It is because of these conditions that I have introduced a bill, S. 1639, which would create a National Air Policy Board of prominent citizens designated by the President, to sit for a stated period and chart the future course of American airpower development. This board would be obliged to report its recommendations to Congress within 3 months. I am hopeful that hearings will be held on S. 1639 early in May.

I believe the Senate would be interested in what the New York Times had to say editorially on this bill in the issue of Sunday, March 24. I ask permission to have this editorial printed in the RECORD together with a column devoted to the bill by Gill Robb Wilson, columnist for the New York Herald Tribune, the Los Angeles News, Fort Worth Star-Telegram, and other papers.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 24, 1946]

OVER-ALL AIR POLICY

At long last there now appears to be a good prospect that a National Air Policy Board may be created to perform for 1946 a function, modified to meet present conditions, like that so admirably performed by the Morrow Board in 1925. Creation of such a board has been advocated by the most responsible elements in aviation. It would be welcome, provided, of course, that its personnel is of the high caliber demanded by the industry, the armed services, and the agencies of research, both public and private. There have been in recent months some encouraging piecemeal actions with regard to the growingly important realm of the air, and some good developments, notably the courageous anticipation of expanding business, evidenced by very large commitments for new equipment by the air transport industry. We have lacked, however, any thoroughgoing investigation of the methods by which a strong aircraft industry can be kept in being, of a sensible appraisal of our needs for peacetime air forces, and of the relationships of various avenues of research toward each other and toward the over-all picture of a secure and progressive future.

It is encouraging, therefore, that Senator MITCHELL, of Washington, should have introduced and is about to press before the Committee on Interstate Commerce in the Senate a resolution to create a National Air Policy Board to study, as a minimum program, Government policies needed to stimulate a healthy rate of technical progress; coordination of military, naval, and other Government agencies concerned with aviation and transportation; the size of peacetime air forces necessary to the national defense; maintenance of balanced and expansible productive capacity in peacetime; and the extent, if any, to which wartime expansion should involve conversion of the automobile and other related industries.

The immense acceleration of technical development in the air and the certainty that our primary defense must depend upon air and cognate developments argue for the immediate creation of such a board. If its personnel comprised men of the stature of Baruch, Knudsen, Dr. Durand, Dr. Compton, for example, it could perform a service of great magnitude, not only for our fundamental security but for a true realization of the economic well-being of which rightful use of the air gives promise.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 27, 1946]

NATIONAL AIR POLICY BOARD IS FAVORED

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune."

The tide of air affairs in the United States is now at such a flood, and the instrument to harness the tide available is a Senate proposal, bill S. 1639, entitled: "A bill to amend the Transportation Act of 1940, so as to establish a National Air Policy Board, and for other purposes."

Hearings on S. 1639 are expected to begin in May, before a strong subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. Membership of the subcommittee includes Senators HUGH B. MITCHELL, Democrat, of Washington, chairman; ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Democrat, of Arizona; BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut; JAMES W. HUFFMAN, Democrat, of Ohio; CLYDE M. REED, Republican, of Kansas; ALBERT W. HAWKES, Republican, of New Jersey, and HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana.

MITCHELL BILL

S. 1639, more familiarly called the Mitchell bill, would create a National Air Policy Board of nine members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The board, required to report within 3 months, would be directed to study the following subjects:

1. Government policies to stimulate a healthy rate of technical progress in air transportation.

2. Coordination and organization of Army, Navy, and Government agencies concerned with aviation and transportation.

3. Size of peacetime Air Forces necessary to national security.

4. Maintenance of a properly balanced and expansible peacetime aviation industry.

5. The extent to which wartime expansion plans should rely on peacetime aircraft production companies, and the extent to which such expansion should depend upon conversion of automotive and other nonaviation industries.

6. The problem of converting the aircraft industry from a war to peaceful basis in such a manner that an industry adequate to meet civil and defense needs should be preserved.

7. Effective peacetime utilization of war-developed aids and modes of transportation.

8. Preservation, coordination, and strengthening of a national transportation system in all elements, whether of land, sea, or air.

SUCCESSOR TO MORROW BOARD

In effect, the suggested National Air Policy Board would amount to a resurrection of the Morrow board which, appointed by President Coolidge in September 1925, reported on November 30 of that year and by its recommendations marked a turning point in the history of American aviation. Immediately after the Morrow board report came the Air Commerce Act of June 1926; the Navy 5-year air program, also passed in June 1926, and the Army 5-year program (Air Corps Act), passed in July 1926.

Between the end of World War I and the appointment of the Morrow board in 1925 no fewer than 24 separate aviation investigations and reports had been made, but the Nation secured no action until the board took all previous investigations and projected them into an objective pattern.

A similar opportunity currently exists. Available to a presently established National Air Policy Board would be the following among many investigations and reports:

1. The Spaatz plan of airpower reorganization.

2. The final report of General Arnold.

3. The final report of Admiral King.

4. The report of the Chief of Staff to the Secretary of War.

5. The report of the Air Coordinating Committee.

6. The National Planning Association's recommendations on national aviation policy.

7. The testimony before the Mead committee.

8. The testimony before the Senate Atomic Committee.

9. The testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

10. The testimony submitted to the joint hearings on proposed national research foundation legislation.

11. Testimony before the House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy.

12. Testimony before the House Committee on Naval Affairs.

All of this material is of extreme value if now taken and used to create a national aviation policy Otherwise the tonnage of evidence on file is but an accumulation of disregarded experience. As can be realized, many agencies of Government are involved in the question of American air power, and each naturally looks at the problem from its own vantage point. The result is confusion in spite of the integrity of each agency in its particular field of interest. Another Morrow board could coordinate all angles and give the Nation surcease from this vexatious situation.

Ruins of Glue Factory Useless as Surplus Outlet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article by John L. Edwards from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

RUINS OF GLUE FACTORY USELESS AS SURPLUS OUTLET—DISTRICT STUCK BY RFC PURCHASE AS GOODS RUST OR MOLD IN ABANDONED PLANT

(By John L. Edwards)

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation apparently planned last year to give Pittsburgh a fair deal in surplus property and it bought an abandoned glue factory in Springdale for a surplus warehouse.

The price, according to county records, was $150,000 cash Federal funds.

But the only good—if you care to call it that—that ever came of the plan was the $95,000 profit George O. Ragner, a Pittsburgh contractor, made in selling the glue factory to the RFC.

Ragner, deed registrations reveal, bought the 32-acre property and its dilapidated buildings on July 14, 1943, for $55,000, and sold it to the RFC on May 14, 1945, for $150,000.

BUILDINGS IN RUINS

The property had previously changed hands for $52,500 and was originally sold by the American Glue Co. for $52,000.

When Congressman JAMES G. FULTON inspected the sprawling buildings of the factory yesterday they were literally in ruins. It was abandoned in 1932 by the glue company.

Floors are littered with tangled debris and portions of the roof that have caved in. There are gaping holes in the walls where windows and doors used to be, with sills and frames rotted and dangling.

The place is pitted with deep wells that once served as glue vats and are now full of dirty water.

The acres between the buildings and the property's 900-foot river front are being used as an ash dump by the Pennsylvania Power Co.'s new Springdale electric power station.

SURPLUS IN ASH DUMP

In the middle of the ash dump is a pile of surplus property. There are reels of steel cable, electric cable, parts for power cranes, and a steam shovel, all exposed to the weather.

A small southwest wing is the only immediately usable part of the factory. Two watchmen keep guard here over a miscellaneous stock of surplus items. They include boxes of paper drinking cups, safety helmets, crated oil stoves, welding machines, machine tools, stepladders, pipe valves, reels of electric cable, toilet bowls, and piles of crates and boxes with the contents unidentified.

Two overseas shipping crates for bulldozers stand outside the door of the wing. The bulldozers are gone now, but the watchmen said they were uncrated and left uncovered from the weather all winter.

REHABILITATION BID $263,000

The RFC reportedly had architects and contractors working all last summer on plans to renovate the buildings and paid $17,000 to have the machine shop and boiler room knocked down.

The lowest bid to turn the place into a warehouse was reported to be $263,000 by a Pittsburgh contractor.

And that's where the project stopped. The RFC tacked a few signs on the walls warning "No trespassing—$10 fine." And so the building stands.

The Pittsburgh district, meantime, is the only major city in the Nation without a Government surplus-property outlet. Disposal agencies operate elsewhere out of warehouses and Army depots with types of surplus the industrial Pittsburgh district wants and needs but has no opportunity to buy.

Mr. Fulton said he will report the RFC's $150,000 purchase in Congress today and renew demands that a surplus warehouse be established here, in something better than the abandoned glue factory, if possible.

Civil Service Commission Agrees To Study Revision of New Job Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by J. H. Leib, national legislative director of the Amvets, a letter to Commissioner Flemming and his reply:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AGREES TO STUDY REVISION OF NEW JOB APPLICATION

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, American Veterans of World War II)

Following strenuous protest by veteran groups, the Civil Service Commission announced today that it would undertake a study of the usefulness of its newly inaugurated job application known as form 57—which features a question on military rank.

Announcement of this questionnaire was immediately denounced by Amvets and other veteran organizations, as being favorable to officers but discriminatory to GI's who might seek Government employment. Charges were made that the agencies were attempting to carry the caste system over into civilian life. The civil service contention that the rank system has been helpful in passing on disability claims is difficult to understand in view of the fact that claims for such benefits are made out on separate applications.

Last Friday an Amvet representative called upon Commissioner Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission in an effort to iron out the difficulties that caused the controversy. As a result of that conference Amvets was invited to make its recommendations in writing. Here is our communication to the Civil Service Commission and their immediate reply:

COMMISSIONER,
Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER FLEMMING: With reference to meeting, March 29, 1946, our representative, Miss Dorothy Thomson, informs us you are in accord with deletion of all questions involving rank as per section 36.

Amvets, while appreciative of your accord and cooperation, believes it is irrevocably necessary for the protection of equal rights under the Civil Service Code that subsequent questionnaires specifically exclude mention of rank and ratings, by so stating.

In lieu of the use of the previous form, which we favor, we advise the deletion of rank and serial number from section 36, Form 57, and that, in addition, section 16 be revised to include a footnote directing that rank, as such, should not be indicated.

With the comprehensive realization that the Civil Service Commission intrinsically advocates democratic principles, we believe it will desire to institute, at the earliest possible date, a form in sympathy with such inherent ideals.

Very sincerely,

J. H. LEIB,
National Legislative Director, Amvets.

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1946.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
National Legislative Director,
American Veterans of World War II,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Thank you very much for your letter of March 30.

I was very happy to have the opportunity of discussing with Miss Thomson, representing your organization, the question of the information called for in our Form 57, the standard application for Federal employment.

As I pointed out in our conversation, the information called for in question 36 relative to "grade (rank) or rating at time of separation" and the "serial number" is information which the Commission has called for over a period of 27 years because it has been found to be helpful in passing on claims for disability preference.

As I stated in our conversation, however, we are going to make an immediate study to determine whether or not this information is essential for passing on claims for disability preference. This study will be completed in just as short a time as possible. If as a result of the study we conclude that the information is not essential for passing on claims for disability preference, we will revise the Form 57 so that the information will no longer be called for.

We have also noted your suggestion in your letter of March 30 that question 16 "be revised to include a footnote directing that rank as such should not be indicated." We will give this suggestion very careful consideration and will advise you as to our conclusions at a later date.

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner.

Coalition's Critics Overlook History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Coalition's Critics Overlook History," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of April 1, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALITION'S CRITICS OVERLOOK HISTORY—WRITER RECALLS PREVIOUS MOVES TO BALK AT PARTY'S POLICIES

(By David Lawrence)

Recent criticism of the coalition between southern Democrats and Republicans which has emanated, curiously enough, from the so-called "liberal" or "progressive" wing of the Democratic Party, has had little or no effect on the combination idea, and for the very good reason that it is in accord with the traditions of American politics.

The so-called liberals of today have overlooked entirely the occasions in American history when their ancestors formed a coalition of bipartisan nature. Back in 1911, the insurgent movement in the Republican Party under the leadership of Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, Republican, which arose in the Middle West, formed a temporary coalition with the Democrats to defeat the high-tariff proposals of those years. It was a coalition of insurgent Republicans which joined with the Democrats to defeat "Cannonism" and the straitjacket rules of the House of Representatives. The late George Norris, of Nebraska, then a Republican Member of the House, led the fight against his own party to modify the House rules—a reform of major importance in the history of Congress.

The same George Norris departed from the Republican fold again and again to support Democratic nominees for the Presidency but none of the present-day liberals in the Democratic Party ever rose to suggest that he be read out of the party.

INSINCERITY REVEALED

The transparent insincerity of suggestions that the southern Democrats be read out of their party now is revealed when it is recalled that the Roosevelt Democrats made it a cardinal part of their strategy to wean away Republicans. They succeeded in the 1944 Presidential campaign in persuading Senator BALL, of Minnesota, Republican, to bolt Dewey.

The argument seems to be now that it is wrong for Democratic Members of Congress to exercise their independence of judgment, but it is all right for Republicans to do so.

Another illusion which has been expressed from time to time by the so-called liberal school is that the party should be bound by caucus or conference to the administration's leadership. This concept of party discipline has long become outmoded. It is due to the fact that a President, though theoretically leader of his party, is actually today interested in his own reelection re-

gardless of what effect it has on his party following in Congress.

Rarely has an administration for nearly a quarter of a century, whether Republican or Democratic, attempted to formulate a party program with due regard to the interests of the Members of the House or the Senate. Under the New Deal, it became the custom for the executive branch with its brain trusters to write bills and bring them to Capitol Hill to be passed irrespective of the wishes of the individual Members. Again and again, the legislators were ignored or their wishes disregarded. Senator BARKLEY'S resignation as party leader of the Senate in 1944 because the late President Roosevelt vetoed a tax bill against the advice of his own leaders was followed immediately by the reelection of Mr. BARKLEY by all the Democrats in the Senate. This was a show of independence which the administration didn't like, but it was in accord with tradition

CONGRESS REMAINS FREE

For until the United States merges the executive and legislative branches of the Government, as is done under the Canadian or British Commonwealth's parliamentary system, there can be no legitimate domination by the President except through the process of public opinion. Congress remains as free to make party policy as does the Chief Executive.

The reason why the southern Democrats have combined on certain issues with the Republicans is because the Democratic Party itself is being undermined by its left wing. The anti-left-wing Democrats feel they are as much entitled to make party policy as their opponents, and there is no reason why southern or northern Democrats shouldn't make coalitions with the opposite party at will.

Strangely enough, when the anti-poll-tax controversy was up recently, the northern Democrats who came from States with large Negro constituencies, formed a coalition with the Republicans, which was beaten only by a filibuster. There is no doubt that such a coalition would have commanded a majority in the Senate if the measure had been permitted to come to a vote. So coalitions are good or bad depending on which side happens to be the beneficiary or the victim of such tactics.

Purges and reading out members from either party are not practical under our two-party system. Individuals are free to remain in or leave the party leadership in Congress as they choose, but the voters alone in particular areas can say whether they shall be punished or applauded for so doing.

Extending the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Extending the Draft," from the State, of Columbia, S. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTENDING THE DRAFT

There is considerable fight on extension of the draft and it is perfectly natural that there should be. The principal concern comes from parents of 18-year-olds, and for them we have sympathy. During the war we raised our voice more than once in behalf of these very young inductees and after the war urged that they be given consideration in discharge—that instead of reducing all the time from the top of the age bracket that attention be given to the other end. And we still think it would be well to up the minimum age. But there are two questions: (1) The age brackets of the peacetime draft and (2) whether there shall be a continuance of the draft after July 1 of this year. And it is the latter phase of selective service that we wish to deal with particularly today.

If the draft ceases July 1, then there will be replacements for the men now in service only as they come through the volunteer system. Which means that men now in service, and those youngsters who will be drafted between now and July 1, will have to stay in the service and do the job until there are sufficient volunteers to relieve them. And that could be a long time.

On the other hand, the pending draft legislation, which would extend selective service, provides that no inductee shall serve more than 18 months, creating a relief system that would give no boy or man more than a year and a half of duty unless he sought longer service, which no doubt some would.

We think some of those opposing prolongation of the draft are overlooking the fact that those already drafted are due consideration as well as those whose number has not, as yet, turned up.

The State thinks the present bill in Congress is fair to those in the services, those yet to be drawn and to our country, which, in peace, as in war, must be our first concern. If anything, our demobilization has been too rapid. The world has not yet settled to a full peacetime status and it is not fair to men to leave them in handfuls, powerless, at points that might become active.

Schedule for Citizen Participation in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD an important schedule.

This year 35 seats in the United States Senate will be filled by election. Twelve are held by Republicans. If 10 others are captured, the Republican Party will gain control of the Senate.

In the United States House of Representatives, 191 of the 435 seats are held by Republicans. The Republican Party must win 27 more seats to win a majority in the House.

Thirty-four States will elect governors. Eighteen of them are Republican, 16 are Democrat, as presently held. The Republicans will have a majority of governorships if two more can be captured.

The primaries and conventions to nominate candidates for these offices run from April into September. (Some Southern States have only the Democrat primary.)

All general elections will be held November 5, except Maine which votes September 5.

The 1946 election calendar follows:

State	Primary dates	Governors whose terms expire	Senators whose terms expire	House seats
Alabama	May 7	Chauncey Sparks (Democrat)		9 Democratic.
Arizona	July 16	Sidney P. Osborn (Democrat)	Ernest W. McFarland (Democrat)	2 Democratic.
Arkansas	do	Ben T. Laney (Democrat)		7 Democratic.
California	June 4 [1]	Earl Warren (Republican)	William F. Knowland (Republican) [2]	23 (16 Democratic, 7 Republican).
Colorado	Sept. 10	John C. Vivian (Republican)		4 Republican.
Connecticut	Convention [3]	Raymond E. Baldwin (Republican)	Thomas C. Hart (Republican) [2]	6 (4 Democratic, 2 Republican).
Delaware	do		James M. Tunnell (Democrat)	1 Democratic.
Florida	May 7		Charles O. Andrews (Democrat)	6 Democratic.
Georgia	Primary not set [3]	Ellis Arnall (Democrat)		10 Democratic.
Idaho	June 11	Arnold Williams (Democrat) [4]	Charles C. Gossett (Democrat) [2]	2 (1 Democratic, 1 Republican).
Illinois	Apr. 9			26 (11 Democratic, 15 Republican).
Indiana [5]	May 7		Raymond E. Willis (Republican)	11 (2 Democratic, 9 Republican).
Iowa	June 3	Robert D. Blue (Republican)		8 Republican.
Kansas	Aug. 6	Andrew F. Schoeppel (Republican)		6 Republican.
Kentucky	Aug. 3		William A. Stanfill (Republican) [2]	9 (8 Democratic, 1 Republican).
Louisiana	Sept. 10			8 Democratic.
Maine	June 17	Horace A. Hildreth (Republican)	Owen Brewster (Republican)	3 Republican.
Maryland	June 24	Herbert R. O'Conor (Democrat)	George L. Radcliffe (Democrat)	6 (5 Democratic, 1 Republican).
Massachusetts	June 18 [1]	Maurice J. Tobin (Democrat)	David I. Walsh (Democrat)	14 (4 Democratic, 10 Republican).
Michigan	June 18	Harry F. Kelly (Republican)	Arthur H. Vandenberg (Republican)	17 (6 Democratic, 11 Republican).
Minnesota	July 8	Edward J. Thye (Republican)	Henrik Shipstead (Republican)	9 (2 Democratic, 7 Republican).
Mississippi	July 2		Theodore G. Bilbo (Democrat)	7 Democratic.
Missouri	Aug. 6 [1]		Frank P. Briggs (Democrat) [2]	13 (7 Democratic, 6 Republican).
Montana	July 16		Burton K. Wheeler (Democrat)	2 (1 Democratic, 1 Republican).
Nebraska	June 11	Dwight Griswold (Republican)	Hugh A. Butler (Republican)	4 Republican.
Nevada	Sept. 3	Vail Pittman (Democrat) [4]	E. P. Carville (Democrat) [2]	1 Democratic.
New Hampshire	Aug. 6	Charles M. Dale (Republican)		2 Republican.
New Jersey	June 4	Walter E. Edge (Republican)	H. Alexander Smith (Republican)	14 (2 Democratic, 12 Republican).
New Mexico	do	John J. Dempsey (Democrat)	Dennis Chavez (Democrat)	2 Democratic. [6]
New York [3]	Sept. 17 [1]	Thomas E. Dewey (Republican)	James M. Mead (Democrat)	45 (22 Democratic, 22 Republican, 1 American Labor).
North Carolina	May 25			12 Democratic.

See footnotes at end of table.

State	Primary dates	Governors whose terms expire	Senators whose terms expire	House seats
North Dakota	June 25	Fred G. Aandahl (Republican)	William Langer (Republican) Milton R. Young (Republican) [2]	2 Republican.
Ohio	May 7	Frank J. Lausche (Democrat)	James W. Huffman (Democrat) [2]	23 (6 Democratic, 17 Republican).
Oklahoma	July 2	Robert S. Kerr (Democrat)		8 (6 Democratic, 2 Republican).
Oregon	May 17	Earl Snell (Republican)		4 Republican.
Pennsylvania	May 21	Edward Martin (Republican)	Joseph F. Guffey (Democrat)	33 (15 Democratic 18 Republican).
Rhode Island	Convention [3]	J. Howard McGrath (Democrat)	Peter G. Gerry (Democrat)	2 Democratic.
South Carolina	Primary not set [3]	Ransome J. Williams (Democrat) [4]		6 Democratic.
South Dakota	June 4	M. Q. Sharpe (Republican)		2 Republican.
Tennessee	Aug. 1	Jim Nance McCord (Democrat)	Kenneth McKellar (Democrat)	10 (8 Democratic, 2 Republican)
Texas	July 27	Coke R. Stevenson (Democrat)	Tom Connally (Democrat)	21 Democratic.
Utah	July 9		Abe Murdock (Democrat)	2 Democratic.
Vermont	Aug. 13	Mortimer R. Proctor (Republican)	Warren R. Austin (Republican)	1 Republican.
Virginia	Aug. 6		Harry Flood Byrd (Democrat)	9 Democratic.
Washington	July 9 [1]		Hugh B. Mitchell (Democrat) [2]	6 (4 Democratic, 2 Republican).
West Virginia	Aug. 6		Harley M. Kilgore (Democrat)	6 (5 Democratic, 1 Republican).
Wisconsin	Aug. 13	Walter S. Goodland (Republican)	Robert M. La Follette, Jr. (Progressive).	10 (2 Democratic, 7 Republican, 1 Progressive)
Wyoming	July 16	Lester C. Hunt (Democrat)	Joseph C. O'Mahoney (Democrat)	1 Republican.

[1] Primary dates that were set for "duration" or for which changes have been proposed.
[2] The 9 Senators who are serving by appointment. 6 seats will be filled for full terms in the general election. Out of order, Kentucky and Idaho elect Senators to terms expiring in 1949, and North Dakota holds a special election June 25, also primary day to fill the seat held by Senator Young for a term expiring in 1951
[3] The party committee fixes the primary or convention date.
[4] Governors now serving by succession.
[5] Governors and Senators are nominated by convention and Representatives by primary in New York and Indiana.
[6] In these delegations are 3 vacancies formerly held by Democrats. New Mexico's Representative at Large has been a continuing vacancy. Those of Pennsylvania's Twenty-third and Thirty-third Districts will be filled by special elections on primary day, May 21.

Heinkel's Statement to Governor Donnelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Missouri Farmer by F. E. Heinkel:

HEINKEL'S STATEMENT TO GOVERNOR DONNELLY

(NOTE.—You will recall that F. V. Heinkel, president of the MFA, was named a member of an official commission by Gov. Phil M. Donnelly to study the Tennessee and Missouri River Valleys and make recommendations to the governor on what should be done in the Missouri River Basin. The commission agreed unanimously on a brief report, with the understanding that each commissioner would be privileged to send the governor his own comments. Mr. Heinkel has made his report to the governor, but it is too long to print in the Missouri Farmer. It has been printed in pamphlet form and is available to any MFA member who writes us for a copy. Reproduced herewith are a few conclusions of Mr. Heinkel's that he sent to the governor.)

The Pick-Sloan Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, is a compromise plan which is to be administered in Washington by four Federal agencies. This hodge-podge plan is not only inadequate to meet the needs of the Missouri Valley but, in my estimation, it is detrimental to the best interests of the people in the State of Missouri, because:

1. The seven huge reservoirs planned for the basin in Missouri will inundate 450,500 acres of Missouri's best land. Only 388,000 acres of land will be protected, and 301,000 acres will not be protected at all. They are intended, according to a report of the Army engineers to the War Department (September 30, 1933), "for the primary purpose of alleviating flood conditions on the lower Mississippi," and any flood and electric power benefits to the Missouri River Basin will be "incidental." The Army engineers themselves who are to administer the Pick-Sloan Act in this State, admit, therefore, that the State of Missouri is to be damaged out of all proportion to any benefits derived from the compromise plan.

2. Enormous levees providing a trough for the Missouri River 3,000 feet wide from Sioux City to Kansas City, and 5,000 feet wide from Kansas City to the river's mouth, are provided for under the Pick-Sloan plan. Set back approximately one-half mile from the river's banks on either side, these big levees will ruin practically 1 acre for every acre of land they will protect. The very plans for these big levees are an admission by the Army engineers that the big reservoirs will not protect the Missouri Valley in this State from floods. They are an admission that the Army intends to deal with floods here in Missouri after the waters have swept down into the lowlands. Levees represent an age-old, fossilized thinking such as prevailed when huge levees were constructed along the Yellow River in China generations ago. Because of siltation, which the Pick-Sloan plan does not adequately deal with here, the Yellow River now flows between two walls—the bottom of the river is now higher than the land behind the levees. One does not have to be an engineer to foresee that the same conditions will one day be found in the Missouri River bottoms.

3. While there has been much ado about the generation of power at the dams scheduled for Missouri under the Pick-Sloan plan, and penstocks will reputedly be installed, the Army engineers themselves, when the seven dams in the basin in Missouri were first proposed, declared that only secondary power at widely separated intervals could be produced, and that several power sites would be ruined by the dams. Therefore, the Pick-Sloan plan, so far as the State of Missouri is concerned, offers little promise of alleviating some of the drudgery around the farmstead and in the homes, and as the sole farmer member of the commission I deplore this fact because 71.6 percent of the Missouri farms are still without this blessing which is so commonplace to city dwellers, while at the same time under the Pick-Sloan plan the power to produce it will be wasted. I submit that this is a disgrace to the State of Missouri. By the same token private industry in our State is to be denied the benefits of low-cost electric power, and thus under the Pick-Sloan plan industrial development and greater employment, which spells prosperity, not alone to city and town dwellers but to Missouri agriculture, which needs better nearby markets, will not be encouraged. This is of the utmost importance because, for example, had Missouri enjoyed the same low electric rates as are charged by TVA, Missourians would have saved $39,000,000 on their $80,000,000 electric bill last year.

4. Designed primarily for flood control on the lower Mississippi, the several reservoirs will be filled up during rainy seasons and drawn down during dry seasons, whereupon huge mud flats with an accompanying stench and mosquito habitat will be created. This will create a public nuisance and public health hazard. For an example, I refer those interested to residents of Greenville, Mo., in Wayne County, where the Wappapello Dam was built on the St. Francis River. The Pick-Sloan plan proposes to create a mess for our State, and offers to do nothing about it.

5. Lands condemned for reservoirs over the entire State of Missouri by the Pick-Sloan plan will cause serious loss in taxes to school districts and county and municipal governments in at least 17 counties. For, unlike TVA and as is proposed under the MVA plan, the Pick-Sloan plan makes no provision for in lieu of tax payments (except in cases where marginal land is rented to farmers, which will be negligible). The 17 counties that will be most affected are: Chariton, Grundy, Bates, Cooper, Daviess, Henry, Hickory, Livingston, Monroe, Macon, Pulaski, Ripley, Stone, Shannon, St. Clair, Taney, and Vernon. In addition, the counties located adjacent to the Missouri River where the big levees are to be constructed will be affected more or less. There is no way to reliably estimate the damage to our State in this respect * * * for towns will be adversely affected that are located at some distance from the mechanical structures and the inundations. Other property owners elsewhere in the State will no doubt be required to make up the difference in tax revenue.

6. Only backhanded and incidental recognition is given to soil conservation by the Pick-Sloan plan, notwithstanding soil erosion is costing the State and Nation four times more than floods over a period of years, and nothwithstanding the Army engineers themselves admit that the huge reservoirs will be silted up within 50 years time. The law says some soil conservation work shall be done by the United States Department of Agriculture, but this Department itself does not know what is to be required of it. Every person conversant with the subject knows that floods begin on the uplands where the rain falls and as a farmer I contend that the place to begin dealing with floods is on the uplands, and not after the uncontrolled waters have swept down into the lowlands.

7. The Pick-Sloan plan gives only lip service to wildlife and recreation. I maintain that wildlife and recreation in our State will be greatly damaged—the wide fluctuation in the water levels of the huge reservoirs will be detrimental to fish life, while several of Missouri's scenic streams and springs that are admired by the Nation will be ruined forever.

8. Friends of the Pick-Sloan plan and opponents of the MVA talk a lot about the interagency committee. They put it forth as a substitute for a Missouri Valley Authority. Composed of four governors in the Valley and certain Federal departments, they

urge that it be given "statutory standing" and suggest that it act as a "referee" to settle disputes under the Pick-Sloan plan. In the first place, it is an admission of the need of a Missouri Valley Authority. But in the second place it is an absurdity. For, does anyone seriously believe that the several Federal agencies, such as the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau, represented on the committee will allow themselves to be outvoted? And since when has it become wise for men to sit on their own board of directors? Governors are busy men. They would have to have substitutes of lesser ability to deal with the problems for them by proxy. Moreover, the Federal Government cannot, without changing its Constitution, permit State governors to decide policies of the Federal Government. It would be a strange thing, indeed, if a time came when four State governors could tell the Army, for example, what to do and what not to do. And how could the interagency committee act as a "referee" without any power? Webster's Dictionary defines referee as "one to whom anything is referred for decision." It would certainly be a radical departure from custom if Congress delegated powers to an agency composed of State governors and miscellaneous bureaus to decide things for the Army.

9. No recognition whatever is given by the Pick-Sloan plan, unlike that of the MVA plan, to research and experimental work necessary for the development of phosphate deposits in the Northwest where lie, undeveloped, 80 percent of the Nation's known phosphate deposits. Missouri farmers now use phosphates from Florida and Tennessee, and these deposits will be exhausted in about 30 years. Missouri farmers must have phosphate fertilizers in ever-increasing amounts if soil fertility is to be maintained and the health of our people who subsist upon Missouri's agricultural products is to be safeguarded. Every Missourian ought to investigate the experiments made at the Missouri College of Agriculture which show that runoff on a plot of sod was reduced from 60 percent to 12 percent by the mere application of fertilizer; and the experiments which show how essential this plant food is to the nutrition of the livestock of our State and hence to the people who consume the livestock.

The Army engineers have already spent $319,000,000 on the Missouri River for navigation and flood control. Neither objective has been attained, as witness the grandiose schemes to promote navigation and flood control contemplated by the Pick-Sloan plan. On the contrary, the flood situation has been aggravated. (As proof, figures recently released by the Department of Resources and Development, of the State of Missouri, based upon information obtained from the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers and the United States Geological Survey, indicate that the carrying capacity of the channel has been reduced by from 13 to 41 percent at various points from St. Joseph to Hermann.) The river has been choked off by an extensive system of dykes placed in the river, and the most that can be claimed for this enormous expenditure is that the river's banks have been stabilized, but even now the pilings are rotting off and more trouble lies ahead.

Notwithstanding this failure, however, the Army engineers, under the Pick-Sloan plan which they helped to promote, now want an additional $700,000,000 for navigation and flood control. What assurances do the people have that they will succeed in view of their past record?

As a member of the Missouri Commission, with the profound responsibility of making recommendations on which plan would best serve the Missouri River Basin and the people thereof in the development of its resources, I most earnestly call the attention of all Missourians to the fact that under the Pick-Sloan plan the State of Missouri will be greatly damaged—damaged out of all proportion to any benefits derived therefrom.

I think most of our citizens agree that the river's devastating floods must be controlled as nearly as possible, and I submit that under the tried and proven TVA plan this can be done without so much damage to our State. On the contrary, a careful study of the Tennessee River Valley makes it crystal clear to me that under an integrated, unified, balanced plan patterned after the TVA the resources of the valley can be conserved, developed and utilized, thereby stimulating the growth of private enterprise in the valley, which will spell better markets for farm products, jobs for thousands of workers, opportunities for private business, both large and small.

I most vigorously maintain that the Missouri River should be harnessed and put to work for the people under a plan similar to that of TVA, and not merely be put into a strait-jacket at the taxpayers' expense as is proposed by the Pick-Sloan plan.

Arkansans Want Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Arkansans Want Economy," written by William Johnson and published in the Arkansas Democrat of March 31, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ARKANSANS WANT ECONOMY—BALANCING OF FEDERAL BUDGET URGED BY STATE LEADERS; VITAL TO WELFARE OF ALL; NATION-WIDE DEMAND MADE

(By William Johnson)

A revolt is on in Arkansas, and the country over, against the Federal Government continuing huge expenditures, greater than the enormous total of revenues it is taken in.

The Government contemplates just that spendthrift course for 1947. Its 1947 Budget calls for expenditures of over $35,000,000,000, four times the amount for the last previous peacetime year of 1939.

That staggering outlay would exceed estimated revenues for 1947 by more than three and one-half billion dollars—and this with Federal taxes imposing a burden on our people never dreamed in the wildest visions of the prewar New Dealers.

Only the people, through Congress, can halt this perilous spree of public spending. If they don't do it, thoughtful citizens point out, they face these grim consequences:

A still bigger national debt, higher taxes, and more bossing, meddling Federal bureaucracy. This would hurt every worker, every earner, even to the smallest, who pays no direct Federal income tax.

HIGHER LIVING COSTS

For heavier taxes on industry and business must be added to the prices of goods and services. This would mark up everybody's living costs. Furthermore, severer taxing of industry and business would leave them less money to expand with, and less incentive to expand. So there would be fewer jobs. Employment would be harder to find.

And that evil effect would be increased by more Federal bureaucracy to spin its strangling red tape around private enterprise.

The people of Arkansas, and of the Nation, are aroused to those dangers. They see that Federal deficit spending is a rock on which everybody's welfare can be wrecked. So a demand for balancing the Federal Budget in 1947, at a lower level of spending, has swept over the land.

With that task done, it is emphasized, we can look forward to lower taxes, lighter living costs as industry and business expand, and a simpler government in the American tradition, not an European-type socialistic trough for swarms of needless job holders.

Spearheading this budget-balancing, economy movement is a bipartisan group of Representatives and Senators. They say that the threatened 1947 deficit of about three and one-half billions can be saved out of items totaling more than billions, which are open to challenge.

STATE DELEGATION APPROVES

The entire Arkansas delegation in Congress has swung behind this drive. And carrying it forward the country over is an organization, the Citizens National Committee, which grew out of the taxpayer associations in the various States, like our own Public Expenditure Council.

Now let's have the views of some Arkansas leaders on this budget-balancing campaign.

Praising the State's congressional delegation for its unanimous support of the movement, G. Russell Brown, president of the Arkansas Public Expenditure Council, said:

"Any sensible person who had been forced into debt by an emergency, would lose no time after the crisis in getting his expenses back within his income, and paying off his debts. A government's position is different only in that it can stave off a collapse longer. We've had deficit national budgets for 15 years, and this must be stopped now."

Another danger in continued heavy deficit spending is pointed out by R. H. Dickenhorst, Morrilton, president of the Arkansas Bankers' Association. It keeps gnawing away every kind of savings, he said.

For, he explained, this deficit spending, this pouring out of billions on billions, causes prices to rise. You can see why that is. It puts a lot more money in circulation, when there's already too much for the scant supply of goods, thus further increasing buying power and demand. So prices go up, and with every rise in prices, savings are worth that much less. For the real value of money is how much it will buy.

And it isn't only the savers who are hurt. Injured with them are all the people on pensions, and all those like teachers and city, county, and State employees, whose salaries are slow to follow a rise of living costs.

"No nation can spend more money than it collects in taxes year after year without eventually facing trouble," declared Lamar Williamson, Monticello, president of the Arkansas Bar Association. "It is, therefore, encouraging to know that a balanced budget is the objective of our two Arkansas Senators and seven Representatives. They will find unlimited support from the rank and file of taxpayers, and they may need it."

A professional man, Dr. Hoyt R. Allen, president of the Pulaski County Medical Association, speaks up for the economy drive. He doesn't think that any professional group can be expected to tell Congress how to balance the budget, but, he added: "I do regard it as proper for doctors, lawyers, merchants, and citizens generally, to let our Congressmen know that we want a balanced budget.

"Congress can find a way," he declared. "It has the facilities for getting facts to determine what needs to be spent, and what can be saved without loss in essential services to the Nation."

FARM BUREAU WANTS IT

Waldo Frasier, executive secretary of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, pointed to a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its twenty-seventh annual convention, December 1945, in regard to fiscal policies and taxation. The resolution is as follows:

"Economy in the spending of public money should be emphasized. Only so far as Government expenditures are reduced can taxes be reduced over a long period. Now is the time to discontinue unnecessary governmental agencies and release employees that were added through the necessities of war. The inescapable Federal obligations of the future as a result of the war make necessary the attainment of the greatest possible efficiency in Government."

Arkansans should think seriously about the tremendous national debt and the tax need it creates, suggested H. C. Thomas, president of the Arkansas Automobile Association. Then there are many other tax demands. The Federal taxes this year average $680 for every earner in the country, Mr. Thomas said—a sufficient warning to retrench.

Mrs. Lloyd Richards, president of the woman's chamber of commerce, believes that everyone interested in good government should encourage Congress to balance the Budget. "This can be done," she added, "by doing the same thing that every American family must do—by living within its income."

VAST DEBT INCREASE

The Federal debt is now 14 times what it was only 20 years ago, and it goes higher with every dollar of deficit spending, observed C. Hamilton Moses, president of the Arkansas Economic Council-Chamber of Commerce. This is obviously a heavy burden, and the only way it can be reduced, Mr. Moses emphasized, is for the Government to spend less than the revenues it collects.

"The most welcome news from Washington since the end of the war," is how Howard Moore, president of the Arkansas Bottlers' Association, described the announcement that a strong bipartisan group of Congressmen will work for a balanced budget.

"I am pleased," he said, "that the Arkansas delegation was the first State unit to speak up as a whole in favor of this movement. It isn't impossible to pare the total requests for $35,100,000,000 down to $31,500,000,000, which is the anticipated Government income for the next fiscal year."

Declaring that the battle cry of the Nation today is for a balanced budget, as a safeguard against inflation, John Allen, secretary of the Arkansas Bus & Truck Association, added: "Every American has a stake in this battle to limit spending to the people's ability to pay."

L. Phillips Magee, chairman of the executive committee of the Oil Dealers' Association of Arkansas, cited figures which show that the national debt has jumped from an average of $428 for each American worker in 1926, to a present high of $5,196.

"Every thinking man must realize," he said, "that continued Government spending in excess of revenues means still higher debt and taxes. We should support our Arkansas Congressmen in their stand for a balanced budget."

MUST BEGIN ECONOMY

"The Government's 16-year-old policy of spending more than it takes in must be corrected," declared William L. Humphries, secretary of the Arkansas Wholesale Grocers' Association. "We must see to it that our lawmakers practice economy, and give the taxpayers an incentive to begin lowering our mammoth $275,000,000,000 debt," he said.

An example of the zooming Federal spending was pointed out by J. N. Leeson, secretary of the Retail Grocers' Association of Arkansas. "The Government civil agencies," he said, "are asking for a billion and a half dollars, twice the seven hundred and forty-eight millions they spent in 1939. Can anyone justify this increase?" he asked.

"We need to balance the Budget, and it needs to be done now," said Charles Meyer, Jr., secretary of the Arkansas Bakers' Association. "Congress must begin to cut down the number of Federal employees, instead of putting more people on the public pay roll to work at the taxpayers' expense on projects of doubtful value."

"A balanced Budget is one of the main things in the prescription of our national ills," declared Irl Brite, secretary of the Arkansas Pharmaceutical Association. "We can," he said, "render worthy service as citizens by urging our legislators to end unnecessary spending. We may rest assured there will still be adequate funds for essential Government activities."

There's the broad picture. These Arkansans say what people are thinking all over the State and the Nation. Our people are aroused. Many doubted the wisdom of much of the New Deal spending. But that was in a time of depression. Now the country is prosperous—and has a gigantic debt. Yet the spending proposals are far greater than ever.

We must stop this flinging around of money, thoughtful people everywhere are saying. They see grief ahead if it isn't done—a stronger, happier, better country if the battle for economy is won.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, over the radio network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, Monday, April 1, 1946:

The War Department has urged that the Selective Service Act be extended for 1 year beyond the present expiration date on May 15. The reasons for this position have been explained by General Eisenhower and me in open hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Navy have also recommended extension of selective service.

The reasons why selective service should be extended are these:

Our Nation is now in a period of transition from war to peace. Active hostilities came to an end with the surrender of Germany and Japan. But we do not yet have peace. Along with our allies we are occupying those hostile countries, to disarm and demilitarize them and prevent a renewal of hostilities—in a word, to see to it that we do not have to fight the war again. We must not throw away the victory won at such heavy cost.

The Army has the task of providing the necessary forces of occupation. It has other tasks—training replacements, operating hospitals, depots and ports of embarkation, holding of key bases, caring for surplus equipment—but the prime task for the immediate future is to occupy the parts of Germany and Japan that we have agreed to occupy. We must also be prepared to furnish our share of the military forces for world peace as set by the United Nations Organization. For the time being our words are of little value in foreign relations, unless we are prepared to back them up in case of need.

How large an army does this call for? No one can say for certain, because no one can say for certain what may come up in the future. But General Eisenhower the Chief of Staff, gives it as his best estimate that these tasks can be performed by a force of 1,550,000 men as of July 1, 1946, dropping to a strength of 1,070,000 as of July 1, 1947, and January 1, 1948. Of this strength of 1,070,000, there are needed 400,000 for the Army Air Forces and 670,000 for the Army Ground and Service Forces.

The reason why this estimated reduction of nearly 500,000 in the year between July 1, 1946, and July 1, 1947 is possible is that the work of caring for surplus equipment, it is expected, will be completed, and it is also expected more stable conditions in the occupied enemy areas will allow cuts to be made in the size of the occupying forces.

I am convinced that General Eisenhower, in making this estimate of required strength, has pared the necessary force down to the absolute minimum. For example, the estimate allows a force of less than 200,000 for occupation of our part of Germany on July 1, 1947, an area containing 17,000,000 Germans. We cannot go below these requirements without endangering the future peace of our country.

The problem that faces the War Department is how to make sure that the soldiers needed to make up this force (1,550,000 on July 1 of this year, shrinking to 1,070,000 a year later) will be available.

Five hundred and fifty thousand, more or less, of the men now in the Army by induction under selective service will be available for duty after July 1. Under present commitments they will be discharged as they complete 2 years of service. It would be better if they could be discharged on completing 18 months of service after October of this year.

That leaves about 1,000,000 to be recruited or inducted. It is the policy of the War Department to recruit as many as possible from volunteers for the Regular Army. We would prefer to get the entire number from the campaign for volunteers. But there is no firm assurance that we will be able to obtain that many volunteers, unless the Selective Service Act is extended beyond May 15.

We say this because of experience, thus far in the present drive to get recruits. The drive got under way last October. In 6 months, down to the middle of March, we have secured 634,000 men. That is a favorable figure. But there are three features in the results of our recruiting campaign that should be pointed out. The first is that the rate of enlistments is falling off sharply. Last November the rate was 40,000 a week. At present the rate is 17,000 a week. The second feature is that 45 percent of the enlistments are for the short terms—18 months or 1 year. That means that a large number will be entitled to discharge beginning next October and must be replaced by new men. The third feature is that a great many of the enlistments have been brought about because of the presence of the Selective Service Act on the books. If a man feels that he will be inducted under Selective Service anyway, he is likely to enlist voluntarily. There are several advantages in voluntary enlistment. This incentive to voluntary enlistment will disappear if selective service is allowed to expire in May. It is quite certain, therefore, that without extension of selective service the number of men that can be obtained as volunteers will fall off sharply in May.

General Eisenhower and I have reviewed and checked the figures again and again. As to prospects for getting the men that will be required, I can sum it up by saying that

if selective service is allowed to expire in May it is our best judgment that the Army will not have the required strength over the period from July 1 of this year to January 1 of 1948. It is our best estimate that we will have a deficit, in the last 6 months of that period, amounting to 170,000 men, that instead of having 1,070,000 men at that time, we will have no more than 900,000. That is a risk that the United States cannot afford to take.

If selective service is extended, the Nation will have the definite assurance that the strength of the Army will be maintained at the figure estimated to be necessary. There is no other way of providing the Nation with that assurance. Extension of selective service, by making available the necessary manpower, will also enable us to shorten the service of nonvolunteers now in the Army to not more than 18 months, beginning in October. This is in line with the sound principle of spreading the burden of military service, rather than making those already inducted carry the whole load. Extension will also put it within our power to discharge all fathers, if Congress believes that social and economic considerations make this desirable.

Above all, extension of selective service will serve as notice to the entire world that the United States is determined to prevent another world conflict, that this country has no intention to scuttle and run.

I urge that the extension be for 1 year. Congress may at the same time provide that the maximum period of service for all men now serving by reason of induction under Selective Service and for all those who may be inducted in the future shall be 18 months. It may also provide that there shall be no inductions if the effect will be to raise the strength of the Army above the requirements, without further authorization by Congress. These safeguards will not prejudice the national safety in any way.

In urging extension for 1 year, I should add that the War Department is not attempting to put over compulsory military service for the indefinite future. We have no program of getting conscription as part of a long-range military policy. I am recommending extension of Selective Service for 1 year, simply and solely because I am convinced that our security as a Nation requires it in these unsettled times, in this period of transition from war to peace.

I can sum the case up in a few words. We have won the greatest war in our history. It remains to make sure that we do not throw away the victory that 10,000,000 soldiers fought for. We run the risk of throwing it away if we allow our Army to dwindle, this year or next year, below the modest figure set by the Chief of Staff as the requirement for gaining a permanent peace. The War Department will spare no effort to find volunteers, but who can say that enough volunteers will be found? We can say with confidence, however, that the extension of Selective Service for 1 year will provide the strength that the Army will require to preserve the peace.

The Resurrection of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by a charming lady from New Orleans by the name of Mary Belle Poole-Mason. The poem is entitled "The Resurrection of Hope."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESURRECTION OF HOPE

Hope lay dead, sweet, soft-eyed Hope;
And all the dream gods wrung their hands and moaned;
"Hope must not die,
Who will awaken Hope"
"Mine be the power," said Love,
With soft alluring smile,
"I've conquered all whom e'er I've met."
In vain did Love sing all her dulcet lays,
But Hope slept on and heeded not.

Then Passion scarlet roled with crimson roses clinging to her hair, said
"I will awaken Hope, one touch of my compelling breath,
And she will live again, for very love of me."
And all around grew fervid, parched and hot.
But Hope slept on; and Passion reeling back in agony of shame at her defeat
Drew close her scarlet robe and fled.

Then Hate stalked forth with scowling brows,
"I will awaken Hope, I sear and blight all that I meet."
"Hope will live, because I will it so."
But Hope slept on, and Hate with meanance in his air slunk back.

Then Kindness spoke, a timid flower that grew in wayside places and in gardens
Of good and happy homes,
"I could awaken Hope, if only I might try."
Then leaning close to Hope, she spoke of broken hearts to heal,
Of little children's need, and those so sick and weak, who needed Hope
Of old and saddened lives that Hope could bless, as Kindness spoke,
Hope with one long and quivering sigh, unclosed her lily lids,
And clasping close the hand of Kindness,
Hope arose with shining eyes to helpful life again.

—*Mary Belle Poole-Mason, New Orleans, La.*

Application of Minimum Wage Provisions to Small Town Daily and Weekly Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is absent on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Nevada, together with certain correspondence referred to therein. The statement relates to the question of applying minimum wage provisions to small town daily and weekly newspapers.

It is estimated by the Government Printing Office that this material will make 2½ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $150.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN

On March 7 I addressed identical letters to all newspaper editors in the State of Nevada, asking for expressions of opinion on the question of applying minimum-wage provisions to small-town daily and weekly newspapers, and particularly requesting comment on a letter from the chairman of the Legislative Committee of the National Editorial Association. A majority of the editors to whom I addressed my letter have replied. The replies were by no means unanimous. As a matter of fact, they showed a very interesting diversity of opinion.

I found these letters from newspaper editors in my State extremely interesting, and I believe they will be of interest to all Senators. These editors represent a cross section of the most highly informed opinion on this subject. I am extremely grateful to them for taking the time, as they did, to reply to my letters; and I hope other Senators may find these expressions of opinion as interesting and informative as they were to me.

I am therefore asking that my letter to these Nevada editors, the letter from Mr. Anderson, and the replies which I have received to my letter be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with this brief statement.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 7, 1946.

Mr. PAUL K. GARDNER,
Lovelock Review Miner,
Lovelock, Nev.

MY DEAR FRIEND GARDNER: Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I have received from Mr. Ed M. Anderson, chairman of the NEA legislative committee.

While I am impressed with Mr. Anderson's argument, I want to know what the newspapers and newspaper publishers of Nevada think about this situation.

Will you do me the favor of writing me your reaction to Mr. Anderson's letter, together with any comment you may see fit to include?

For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of the bill S. 1349 as reported to the Senate.

Thanks in advance for your help, and my kindest personal regards to you.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

THE NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
February 12, 1946.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The National Editorial Association, representing several thousand small-town daily and weekly newspapers, is gravely concerned about the implications of S. 1349, recently reported from the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Anyone acquainted with the operating problems of newspapers in the smaller communities will recognize that it is not economically feasible to pay 65 to 75 cents an hour minimum, particularly for an inexperienced worker. Considerations of practical consequence make it difficult, or impossible, for a weekly newspaper located in rural areas, for instance, to conform to present statutory requirements for apprentices and learners.

We hope you will see your way clear to support an amendment to S. 1349, which will permit the employment of apprentices and learners in small-town newspaper plants at subminimum rates. That the minimum wages are burdensome to this group of publications was acknowledged in the Wage and Hour Division's report, Economic Factors Bearing on Minimum Wages in the Printing and Publishing and Allied Graphic Arts Industry, which pointed out:

"Small establishments in the small newspaper branch would have approximately twice as many of their wage earners affected by any minimum rate as the larger establishments."

The trend of administrative interpretations and court rulings in recent months is to definitely whittle down the statutory exemptions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. New personnel needed for small-town newspapers must be drawn from the locality. The Wage and Hour Division survey disclosed:

"The rural paper customarily has more trouble in getting its labor supply. If it attempts to recruit trained people from outside the community, it has to bring them from longer distances, and is likely to have more difficulty in getting them to come for the wages offered."

Industry studies disclose that small-town newspapers are actually running a free tuition school for trainees who later migrate to metropolitan areas. Another problem is the long and involved procedure under current regulations applying to apprentices and learners. The Division admitted:

"Most of the publishers who objected to the minimum wage as an entrance rate for new workers argued that the rate was far above the minimum entrance standards for exempt work in small-town retail and service establishments. They felt that entrance rates should be set at the prevailing level for retail and service trades."

We believe that opportunities for employment can be provided in small-town newspaper plants if the regulations applying to beginners are modified and that minimum-wage rates are not applied to any persons now employed as apprentices or pursuant to any bona fide training program or to persons now exempt under administrative rulings. We hope to have your support for amendments covering this problem of the small-town press.

Cordially yours,

ED M. ANDERSON,
Chairman, NEA Legislative Committee.

THE LOVELOCK REVIEW-MINER,
Lovelock, Nev., March 11, 1946.

United States Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: Thanks for your letter of March 7 in regard to the bill S. 1349. Copy of letter sent in connection with it is returned herewith.

This is the bill that we corresponded about recently. The exemptions cover the businesses of most small towns and of small newspapers where substandard help is often employed and is unable to return a profit on the proposed minimum wages of the bill. In cases where the better help is used, it already more than earns the minimum wages proposed.

From our personal standpoint, the bill covers the boys who work for us after school, the slow, dreamy old maid who keeps our books and whose brain works very slowly, and youngsters who want to learn the business and are more bother than help.

There is a vast difference between the accomplishments of the big shops where everyone works under tension and the country shop where things move leisurely and not always on schedule. For that reason, the exemptions that appear in the bill as it now stands are only reasonable.

Yours sincerel, and with regards,

PAUL K. GARDNER, *Publisher.*

THE HUMBOLDT STAR,
Winnemucca, Nev., March 20, 1946.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: I greatly appreciate your sending me a letter from Mr. Ed. M. Anderson, chairman of the NEA legislative committee, and also a copy of bill S. 1349, as reported to the Senate.

I concur with Mr. Anderson's views of this bill and would greatly appreciate your working for and endorsing an amendment to Senate bill S. 1349, in that no minimum wage will be placed on employees in newspaper plants. It is a costly procedure to train apprentices, and as it requires a longer length of time to acquire efficiency in the printing trade than in most crafts, the cost to the industry is out of proportion with other trades. There should be no minimum on this class of worker because the length of time required to master this particular trade and become an asset to the plant instead of an expense. Wages for such employee should be governed by his ability only and the living costs in his particular locale.

As Mr. Anderson states, it is difficut to import people trained in the printing crafts and keep them any length of time, for they prefer living in metropolitan areas; therefore the small town printing plant is definitely a school for the printing crafts, and in training an employee this involves a definite expense to the employer.

Cordially,

THE HUMBOLDT STAR,
AVERY D. STITSER, *Publisher.*

THE FALLON STANDARD,
Fallon, Nev., March 18, 1946.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN.
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Even though objections against this bill have reached you from country newspapermen through the NEA legislative committee, I believe you will find that nearly all publishers are opposed to its provisions.

It is that neither the country weekly nor the large daily would oppose this minimum wage of 65 cents an 75 cent for apprentices, but because in the cities apprentices are denied this educational advantage through union limitations and in both instances it is not profitable to put apprentices to work. For several weeks in this very intricate trade apprentices cost more than their wages.

Young fellows under the GI bill of rights are trying to get into print shops now. I have had applications. The best place for them is in the country where they learn more. It is a matter of 5 years before they get a union card. Were we obliged to employ them at 65 cents and 75 cents an hour we would take our chances on securing a journeyman at prevailing rates.

In the university the young fellow pays tuition, board, and other expenses. In a print shop he has this education from the outset which upon completion of apprenticeship pays better than is to be had by college graduates generally.

I am sorry that I did not get this answer to your letter in the mail sooner but please think of this from the standpoint of the employee and not the employer. The ambitious young fellow is denied apprenticeship training under a starting wage that is too high.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE H. SMITH,
For the Fallon Standard.

MINERAL COUNTY INDEPENDENT-NEWS,
Hawthorne, Nev., March 21, 1946.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: Thank you for your courtesy in making inquiries to our attitude toward Senate bill number 1349.

To be brief and to the point, our attitude is this regarding the so-called 65-cent wage minimum:

1. We have no objection to paying the 65-cent or 75-cent minimum to a full time worker, but under existing conditions, believe that such a minimum should prevail.

2. In the matter of apprentices, however, such a policy is not financially logical. The obvious reason is this, that the apprentice must be started in the trade while he is of school age. He does not become a full time worker for a period of 2 to 3 years.

Further, there is an element of expense involved in training the youth. Frankly, we have started an apprentice boy at 50 cents per hour and will increase his pay as and when he progresses to the point when he will be worth that much to the firm.

Even at 50 cents an hour the school boy will be earning $20 a week for a 40-hour week, while he is still a beginner.

We trust that the above opinions will be of value to you. If you wish us to elaborate, we shall be happy to do so.

Thank you again for your many past favors, and kindest personal regard.

MINERAL COUNTY INDEPENDENT-NEWS,
J. R. MCCLOSKEY.

LAS VEGAS EVENING REVIEW-JOURNAL AND BOULDER CITY JOURNAL,
Las Vegas, Nev., March 18, 1946.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been giving considerable thought to your letter of March 7 concerning S. 1349. The Review-Journal has perhaps the highest wage scale in the West under existing union wage contracts, and there is nobody in the organization, composing room, editorial staff, or office force who receives less than 80 cents an hour. This applies to apprentices, mailers, etc., who are the lowest paid.

The apprentice scale which applies to beginners in other departments as well usually is between 45 to 50 percent of the regular printer's scale. This means that in many sections of the country, particularly in the agricultural areas, the beginners would receive considerably less than the 65- to 75-cent minimum. I happen to be familiar with Provo, Utah, which is in the heart of the farming district. The scale there is $1.20 and the apprentices get 48 cents an hour. However, board and room can be obtained for $30 a month as compared to $75 and $100 in Las Vegas.

Personally, I always have felt that while the theory of a minimum wage is good, in practice it fails utterly to take into consideration the difference in living costs in various sections of the country; for instance: The union printer's scale in New York City is $2 an hour, though out in the farming communities it ranges from $1 to $1.30, and yet I venture to say the man in a small Kansas shop has more left for a savings account than the higher paid individual in New York.

I would say the same thing is true of the printers in Elko or Winnemucca as compared to the printers in Las Vegas. This would apply, of course, to the beginners at low wages also. It is my feeling that if I were in the position of hundreds of publishers in the small areas and the Government established a minimum wage of 65 cents to 75 cents an hour, I would cease hiring beginners, thereby eliminating the opportunity for young people to learn the newspaper business or printing trade. Beginners require a lot of training and when the difference in wage is so small, it would be much easier and more economical to hire trained personnel.

I hope these views will be of some help to you in your deliberations on this legislation.

With best personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

A. E. CAHLAN,
Managing Editor, Las Vegas Evening Review-Journal.

TERRITORIAL ENTERPRISE,
Virginia City, Nev., March 15, 1946.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: In reference to your letter of the 7th regarding the NEA

complaint about small newspaper publishers and their difficulties under the proposed wage bill, which I believe you call S. 1349.

This doesn't apply to me exactly, because my paper is printed in a Reno shop, which carries the burden itself.

However, let me express myself, as you asked for my opinion. I see no reason why they can't pay 65 cents an hour to an apprentice. Those little devils work like hell. I wouldn't do their work for 65 cents an hour.

Here's another thing. I had occasion recently to hunt around for a job for a veteran—married—who wanted to learn the printing trade. I called everything from the State printer to the smallest print shop and was told that each of them had an apprentice and that was all he was allowed. Apparently that is some kind of a union regulation.

An apprentice starts at 65 cents and by the time he is getting 75 cents he is usually doing the work of a man who should draw $1.25 or more. Nuts, I don't see anything wrong with it.

Incidentally, the temporary address of the Enterprise is Virginia and Truckee Building, Carson City.

Sincerely,

JOCK TAYLOR, *Editor.*

ELKO INDEPENDENT,
Elko, Nev., March 16, 1946.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am afraid that I will not be able to offer you much assistance on the problem of minimum wages for the small-town newspaper insofar as that question is applied to the national picture. At least, with the confusion that now exists in all industry, it does seem difficult to make any statements that you feel you could stand behind and uphold for very long.

As far as our own little shop is concerned at the present time, application of a 75-cent minimum wage would certainly not hurt us any and it might even be beneficial although if any benefit were to obtain, the 65-cent rate would be of more assistance. Setting of a minimum rate would benefit us in that we could hold down beginners to that figure, perhaps, instead of having to pay them 85 cents per hour or more.

But, in the over-all picture, we don't often have beginners working for us so the effect of the legislation either way would not make much difference. We naturally pay our experienced help a great deal more than the proposed new minimum rate.

Of course, things are not normal. Wages and prices are straining at the bit for a runaway and what might not hurt us or be of benefit today might certainly prove very burdensome in the years immediately ahead. It does seem to me that now is a very inopportune time to enact legislation setting minimum wage schedules. Certainly with the labor market as it is and help of any kind practically dictating its own wage ticket, I can see no necessity for a law to protect workers. Help such as bindery girls and boys to do stereotyping work and cleaning up who we used to hire for 50 cents an hour (10 cents above the then established minimum wage) are now demanding and getting as high as 85 cents an hour which is not normal. When things settle down again, I imagine that this same sort of help will be available for at least 60 cents. If such is the case, the effect of a 65- or 75-cent minimum wage would be felt here.

Certainly in shops located in small towns having more employees than our shop does, and many of them do, particularly the small daily newspapers, the beginner and the beginner's wage are important considerations. The proposed minimum wage would be high for them and might serve to deprive some young men of an opportunity to start out in the printing trade because, if such wages have to be paid for beginners, I am sure that these shops would pay just a little more and put on another journeyman or at least what we call a two-thirder (one who has completed approximately two-thirds of his apprenticeship.)

I still feel (despite all I have said) that I am not competent to judge this matter from the standpoint of the industry as a whole. As I have explained, it would make very little difference now in our shop and in the years ahead it might increase our costs slightly but not enough to make any difference in the over-all picture.

Hoping that this discussion has been of some help to you, I remain

Yours very sincerely,

WARREN L. MONROE,
Publisher.

THE FALLON EAGLE,
Fallon, Nev., March 16, 1946.

Hon. PAT. MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCARRAN: Replying to your request for an opinion on bill S. 1349 will heartily endorse the argument of Mr. Ed M. Anderson, for the apprentice problem of the country weekly or daily is today greater than it has ever been.

There are few, very few, apprentices starting in the printing field who can even produce their weekly earnings less than 3 months after their start and most of them require nearly 6 months. This is due mainly to the fact that an apprentice is coming in contact with a business entirely foreign to his learnings in school, with the exception of the English language. He must use a system of measurements which is used in no other field. He must learn to read the alphabet upside down and he must learn to be exacting in his work for every spot placed on a sheet of paper must be in its proper place. Consequently, during this preliminary period his effort is mostly loss in the business. Raising of the minimum wage will only increase this loss which many small town papers cannot afford. Prior to World War II many country shops started their apprentices at around 35 cents per hour. Due to the present wage structure of the Nation and the demand for beginner-help this amount has been raised to around 50 cents per hour, which has increased the loss on beginner-help and lengthened the time before such a beginner will produce a profit.

Metropolitan papers can afford this increase mainly because they have more clean-up work, work which must be done in the natural course of business. The country weekly does not have this volume of clean-up and the beginner learns part of the trade much sooner. As Mr. Anderson states, "small town newspapers are running a free tuition school for trainees who later migrate to metropolitan areas." They do, because there is a demand for printers who are well trained in a country shop.

At present time there is in Fallon a printer who learned the trade in Oakland, Calif. He is of little use to either of the shops here, because he is trained in metropolitan methods and can do only one class of work. He is of very little help to us for we must pay him journeyman wages and he produces little more than an apprentice with 1 year's training. On the other hand an apprentice with 3 or 4 years' training can migrate to a metropolitan paper and work in any department with very little instruction. The firm employing this man profits from the training received in the small town paper.

By way of qualifying the above statements will give you a brief résumé of my experiences in the printing field. I learned the trade in a small town daily and, like others, migrated to San Francisco. Have been in the business almost 25 years, from ordinary printer to assistant superintendent of a metropolitan plant and in the editorial staff to editor. All this experience has been mainly in California. During the depression of the early thirties, I did move about in jobs and was never out of work or on relief, and that was because of the training received.

These last two paragraphs will perhaps give you a clear picture of the situation. The large metropolitan plants can afford this wage increase and absorb the loss in the volume of business they do. The small town paper cannot because our loss cannot be readily absorbed, and with very few exceptions, the men trained in metropolitan areas must go through another training period in the small town plant. The metropolitan paper profits from the training we give these apprentices.

Trusting that this opinion will aid you in determining your future action on the measure.

Yours truly,

FALLON EAGLE,
L. W. PERKINS,
Editor-Assistant Manager.

TONOPAH TIMES-BONANZA,
Tonopah, Nev., March 12, 1946.

DEAR PAT: Copy of letter mailed you by Anderson, of the National Editorial Association, protesting minimum wages of 65 to 75 cents an hour for inexperienced workers in newspaper plants, would probably voice the same complaint if put up to Nevada publishers and printing-plant owners.

Just now there is a serious shortage of newspaper workers, chiefly linotypers. It appears that where union conditions obtain in the larger shops it is very difficult for an apprentice to get practice on a linotype. This is not true in smaller shops, but few publishers, especially those listed as country publishers, could afford to pay 65 to 75 cents to a beginner or learner, as it takes a long time to learn to operate one of these machines.

The same applies to apprentices on all print-shop work. I am positive that the major number of Nevada publishers will be opposed to a minimum rate schedule embracing above figures.

At present we have a boy who comes in after school to feed press. If we had to pay him 75 cents an hour, or even 65 cents we would be compelled to let him go. As it is he makes enough to pay his way through all high-school activities and would hate like the dickens to lose his job—which he surely will if we have to jack his pay to meet the minimum requirements of S. 1349.

Sincerely yours,

R. TERRELL.

NEVADA BULLETIN,
Reno, Nev., March 16, 1946.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Received your letter of March 7, together with a copy of Mr. Ed M. Anderson's letter which pertained to the legislation of bill S. 1349.

After reading over the above bill, I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Anderson's letter. The amendments that he recommends in the bill, will definitely be fairer to the small-town paper. As it stands now the bill would put quite a strain on smaller publications.

Hoping that my opinion will help you in some way. Thanks for considering my advice, and with best of personal regards to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN GRANATA.

BOULDER CITY NEWS,
Boulder City, Nev., March 12, 1946.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I have read with interest bill S. 1349 with its minimum-wage rates set at 65, 70, and 75 cents an hour.

My first reaction is that newspapers, small or large, should not ask special consideration merely because they are newspapers. Any amendment should apply to all industry or the bill will be cut to pieces by others asking like favors.

It is true, however, that we have too few journeymen workmen in almost every trade. And setting this ceiling would not encourage hiring of apprentices. It might work to prevent a youngster or a grown man for that matter, learning a trade.

A fair guide, I believe, is our own typographical union contract. it leaves wages for the first year at the discretion of the employer. Then the next 6 months at 35 percent of journeyman's scale (about 60 cents an hour at present) thence progressively upward every 6 months. It might be noted here that even this provision has proved to be small incentive for the hiring of apprentices. The average age of printers is getting older.

For many years the larger papers have depended upon country papers for their trained-labor supply. They train few apprentices themselves.

For industry as a whole I believe an amendment granting apprenticeship for 1 year or so at the discretion of the employer, then fixing the minimum thereafter, would be fair. By that time one is either worth the minimum or should know he is a misfit. I do not believe that would be found to work a hardship on country newspapers. If they do not furnish a fair standard of living they are economically unsound anyway.

I believe the time limit would prevent "slave labor" practices.

Maybe I am wrong in trying to apply this to all industry in which periods of apprenticeship differ. But I don't believe the printing industry can be excepted without excepting others. There must be one law.

That is my opinion. I thank you for asking it.

Sincerely,

R. W. BRANN.

RENO EVENING GAZETTE,
March 13, 1946.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your letter and the invitation for comment on S. 1349 and on the letter by Mr. Anderson of the NEA legislative committee.

The interpretation of what is interstate commerce is now so broad that whatever increase is made in the Federal minimum-wage law will affect many small business firms. This is true of small newspapers, particularly dailies, and it is true in our own case for while a majority of our papers are circulated in Nevada, there is a sufficient percentage to place us in the interstate commerce class.

A change in the wage minimum will not affect the organized printing crafts or many other classifications, but the smaller papers have miscellaneous help, and it would affect this class of people and the pay rolls of these newspapers.

I recognize that some upward change in the minimum is due. But these abnormal times are not here for all time; the economic cycle will change. If too high a minimum is enacted, then when the decline comes, the pinch on small business, confronted by a loss of volume and restricted by this high minimum wage, can be completely destructive.

I believe the presentation which Mr. Anderson made to you is a reasonable and fair statement of the problem of the smaller papers and it would affect such communities as Winnemucca, Elko, Ely, and Boulder City, in the smaller daily field, and practically every weekly in the State. As you know, none of these papers have a margin that is very much above a living for their proprietors.

The State press association will meet here March 23. If there are no objections from you, I will present this communication to the resolutions and legislative committee.

With best personal good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

GRAHAM M. DEAN.

Price Control and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter from George M. Putnam, president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation, Concord, N. H., and a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation board with respect to price control and subsidies at its March 6–8 meeting:

CONCORD, N. H., *April 1, 1946.*

Hon. CHESTER MERROW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the presidents and secretaries of the State farm bureaus in the northeastern region held in New York City, on March 26, it was voted that we endorse the American Farm Bureau Federation resolution regarding OPA and that State Farm Bureau officials be instructed to so notify each of their State congressional delegations calling particular attention to the final paragraph. Copy of the resolution is attached.

We hope you can support the resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. PUTNAM,
President, New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AFBF BOARD WITH RESPECT TO PRICE CONTROL AND SUBSIDIES AT MARCH 6–8 MEETING

We reaffirm the position taken on price-and-wage control at our last annual convention. Consumer subsidies must be removed and price ceilings adjusted accordingly. The new Price Control Act must contain a definite schedule for the removal of consumer subsidies. It is utterly unjustifiable to subsidize the consumer's food bill by payments from the Treasury, which forces farmers to accept Federal payments in lieu of fair prices in the market place at a time when consumers' incomes are at record levels.

In extending the Price Control Act for 1 year, definite provisions should be made for the removal or suspension of ceilings whenever the supply and the demand for a product are in such balance as to prevent undue price increases.

Control of inflation must be made effective. The present governmental policy of encouraging and granting wage increases is incompatible with a sound price control program. One of the basic causes of inflation is the excess purchasing power in the hands of the consumer. If inflation is to be controlled, wages must also be controlled, and cannot be permitted to rise promiscuously. Steps must be taken to correct the basic causes of inflation so that we may eliminate the necessity of price control at the earliest possible date.

The officers and representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation are given the authority to oppose the extension of the Price Control Act unless provisions for consumer subsidies are removed and price ceilings adjusted accordingly. Further, we authorize the executive committee to insist that extension of the Price Control Act be limited to 1 year and that definite provisions be made for the suspension of price controls on commodities when supplies come into reasonable balance with demand.

A Better Day for American Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James Byrnes, our Secretary of State, is ushering in a better day for American diplomacy by his frank and open position in behalf of the small nations of the world at the United Nations Conference. He is not being cowed by threats and he is standing firm in behalf of the United States and our concept of world peace.

The success of the United Nations Organization will depend, in large part, on Secretary Byrnes' actions and attitudes. Together with President Truman we have a team which understands well the American mind and is wedded to American ideals. We shall have no compunction in trusting these two leaders because we know they will represent us to the best of their respective abilities and what they do will reflect credit upon us. To both the President of the United States and the Secretary of State we wish all possible success. Our hopes and prayers for a permanent world peace rest, in part, with them.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting four newspaper articles dealing with Mr. Byrnes' role in the present United Nations Conference:

[From the Washington Post of March 31, 1946]

MR. BYRNES' ROLE

The decision of the Security Council on the case of Iran conforms to the letter of the Charter of the United Nations. It provides that the two parties to the dispute shall be asked to report back within a stipulated time. Particular information is requested on the state of Russo-Iranian negotiations and of the withdrawal of Russian troops. The question is asked whether the withdrawal, if any, is unconditional or whether it has been preceded by a settlement, and what are the terms of any such settlement. No less could have been expected from a body which is charged with the sustenance of the world's security.

The Polish delegate insists that the decision conforms to the position he has taken from the very start. This is, of course, stretching a very vital point. The nub of the crisis in New York was the question whether the Iranian delegate should be heard. This is plainly provided for in the Charter, but the Russian delegate refused to be party to it, and he found a seconder in his Polish friend. Both were overruled by majority vote, and, in spite of the consequent Russian walkout, the proprieties were maintained by a hearing of the Iranian case. That case was stated with clarity and comprehensiveness. Secretary Byrnes, anxious not to add to Russian chagrin, sought to keep the Iranian delegate within the bounds of the Russian motion to postpone the hearing. But Mr.

Ala, in possession of the floor, took full advantage of the hard-won opportunity.

It would be a disservice to peace to stress the upshot of the first part of the Iran discussion as a rebuff for Russia. It is, rather, a victory for the integrity of the Charter. The Russians endeavored, not to break the United Nations, but to bend the United Nations to their will. This effort amounted to a plain repudiation of the obligation which the Soviet Union undertook at San Francisco. At San Francisco, the Russians held out for weeks for an absolute veto power for the Big Five. The impasse was broken only when Harry L. Hopkins flew to Moscow and obtained Stalin's approval for a qualified veto power. On hearing the arguments, Stalin is reported to have turned to Molotov and said, "The American position is quite right." This is the reason that the Charter contains the provision allowing for the waiving of the veto power in favor of a majority rule on a proposal to hear a disputant. In New York the Russians tried to renege on that written obligation.

To the peace system, therefore, goes the victory. But a word of praise is the due of the delegates who refused to be cowed by the Russian walk-out. The principal credit, of course, belongs to Secretary Byrnes. He has come through the test with honor to himself. Few even among his friends think of him as able to muster firmness in a difficult situation. This, however, he did in New York. His firmness was a stiffener for his customary good humor and restraint, and he combined all these qualities with such adroitness that the Russians can have no quarrel over a spilled word or a harsh gesture. This is something to record with pleasure. Mr. Byrnes was not interested in banging doors, but in maintaining the integrity of the Charter, while keeping the door open.

In this respect, he has been working with the full cooperation and support of the President. Between the two the teamwork has been perfect. This teamwork must be continued, for the crisis is not yet ended, and the days ahead are bound to be difficult. The reports persist, however, that there is disharmony between the President and his Secretary of State, that Mr. Truman plays Admiral Leahy off against Mr. Byrnes. We suggest that the President could kill these reports for all time, and further strengthen the administration of our foreign affairs, by dispensing with the services of his Chief of Staff. The war is now over and, therefore, the need for Admiral Leahy's post. The only duality that is tolerable, and then only in the present tandem, is the President and his Secretary of State.

[From the Washington Post of March 31, 1946]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE MIND OF JIMMY BYRNES

HUNTER COLLEGE, N. Y.—In the wrangling at Hunter College—which may either represent the birth pangs of a working world organization, or the death of a great world hope—at least one figure has emerged as truly important. Thus far, the Council table has been dominated by Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes.

It was in accord with Byrnes' judgment, right or wrong, that the Security Council boldly established the principle of the small nations' right to be heard, whatever great powers may threaten. It was by patience that the issue was brought to a vote with a minimum of open friction. In short, this slight, sharp-eyed sharp-nosed man with the quiet voice and the quick, nervous manner, is a major personality who deserves to be accurately assessed and clearly understood.

There are all sorts of clews by which one can try to fathom Byrnes' character and estimate his purposes. He has, for example, continued the policy initiated by E. R. Stettinius, of employing one of the national poll-taking organizations to sound public opinion on international problems. He studies the results of these confidential polls with care, from which one can conclude that he is a practical leader, who knows that any policy is worthless unless the public supports it.

Again, his training is preeminently that of a legislator—a Member of the American Congress. When he left the Senate for the Supreme Court bench, there was no doubt in anyone's mind that the Senate lost its most influential man and one of its two or three ablest men. To be a legislative leader, as Byrnes was, requires very special qualities. One may therefore emphasize that he is trained in the art of compromise; that he is a shrewd negotiator; and that in quality of mind he is the "common man of uncommon abilities," which all legislative leaders are.

Again, he is a self-made man. He was born to real poverty. He has the simple tastes of a poor man. (He once remarked that the total of his wants could be summed up in "a drink of decent bourbon once a day, and one good new suit a year.") But while his tastes are simple, one must also note that he has the drive and will to succeed of all self-made men.

It is true, of course, that Byrnes has all the qualities that have been enumerated. But they do not add up to a real solution of the problem of Byrnes' character. There are other less easily observable qualities, which are equally important. The truly determining factors in Byrnes' make-up are caution, a desire and an ability to learn, and a dogged determination to achieve essential objectives.

In his first period as Secretary of State his caution was the strongest factor of the three. He entered his job with a completely open mind about the decisive problem of relations with the Soviet Union. His two chief advisers, Dean G. Acheson and Benjamin V. Cohen, were strongly inclined toward a policy of concession to Russia, aimed to secure Soviet cooperation by calming lingering Soviet suspicions and soothing Soviet inferiority feelings.

As a trio, Byrnes, Acheson and Cohen explored this avenue together until they came to its end. Byrnes waited to be convinced that a firm policy was essential until failure to be firm would have compromised essential interests. Up to the last moment, after the London Security Council meeting, he was telling those around him that "you could not be certain" whether firmness would be required, and insisting that every other expedient must be tried first.

While he has resorted to firmness toward the Soviets, Byrnes has not lost his caution. But more important than this caution, nowadays, is his grim resolve to see the Russian problem through to a satisfactory solution. Here he is influenced by a very deep and fervent feeling.

He subscribes to the belief summed up in the phrase, "one world or none." He is convinced that the present time offers the last chance for achieving a peaceful and a stable world, and that failure in this great endeavor carries with it the sure penalty of ultimate destruction. He is constantly aware of the peculiarly vulnerable position in which failure in the great endeavor will leave the United States.

And he is a realist. He knows that power is the basic unit of politics, as the atom is the basic unit of matter. He knows that the United Nations cannot be a working world organization unless it has strength and power. He knows, finally, that present Soviet policy will not permit the creation of a United Nations with the strength and power needed for its job.

That is why he is working for a change in Soviet policy, and working by firmness since concessions have not produced the desired result. Watching the Security Council in session, one is forced to conclude that nothing will deflect him from his great objective except a failure of public support. His polls tell him the public is with him. He believes that if the facts are squarely presented to the American people, the public will stay with him. It is a healthy starting point for any Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF THE NATION—BYRNES IS ON FIRM GROUND BACKING SMALL NATIONS

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON.—What is happening to the United Nations Security Council must be considered as part of the whole complex tangle of world relationships. The United Nations meeting has provided a new framework for the quarrel between Russia, on the one hand, and Britain and the United States on the other.

It was the misfortune of the UN to inherit that quarrel at the outset. But that could hardly have been averted if the new organization was to have any reality.

The ground on which Secretary Byrnes stood was sound. If small nations cannot even present their grievances, then the UN is an empty shell.

Again, it was the misfortune of the UN that the test came over a small nation which is a backward, feudal country torn by internal dissensions. That does not, however, alter the basic principles under which the Iranian case was raised.

Recently, in another part of the world, the same kind of issue arose.

Toward the end of the conquest of Germany, Soviet forces moved onto the island of Bornholm in the Baltic. Bornholm is a Danish island commanding the approaches to both Denmark and Sweden.

How long did the Russians mean to occupy Bornholm? That was the question which caused shivers of apprehension throughout Scandinavia. If the Russians were to remain there permanently, then the Baltic would indeed be a Soviet lake and Denmark and Sweden would live constantly under the gun.

The Danish Government not long ago addressed a tactful question to Moscow. Shortly thereafter Soviet troops began to leave Bornholm. The evacuation is progressing, and Danish troops are now beginning to occupy the island.

THE SAME CAUSE?

If the issue before the Security Council had been Denmark instead of Iran, the principle would have been much clearer. Denmark is an advanced democracy. The Danish people have stood united throughout the war. But Iran or Denmark, the cause is the same. It is the right of small nations to independence and integrity.

What has characterized the UN in the months of its awkward, mewling infancy is its negativism. It has seemed to stand before the world for the sole purpose of saying "No."

You can argue, and perhaps rightly, that the Organization is too new to expect positive, constructive action from it. That answer may do for the present. It will not suffice for long.

If the UN seems to exist merely to preserve the world as it is, then inevitably it will fail. If it is no more than a policeman with a stick to keep the status quo in every corner, then it will go down.

COURAGEOUS THINKING NEEDED

What the moment desperately needs is creative, courageous thinking that goes beyond the mere do's and don't's of things as they are. That is the kind of thinking which went into the report by the State Department's committee of experts on atomic control. It is this kind of trail blazing which the UN must do if it is to grow up into a vigorous, effective organization.

The Iranian case points up that need as well as any issue could. One thing is as clear as day, and that is that Iran will not remain what it is for long.

In this connection a significant news story recently came from the United Press in London. It quoted a British Foreign Office "spokesman" as saying that Britain would like to see Iran's "unexploited oil resources" placed under international control.

This is rather vague. Would "unexploited oil resources" include the vast undeveloped reserves held by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co.? Or would they include only those reserves that have not yet been staked out by any of the great powers?

But the important fact is that the British have clearly signaled their desires. This may have been intended to put the initiative up to us. If it is to have any chance of succeeding, it must come quickly. Some such move should have been made months ago, if only as evidence of the intention of Britain and America to try to remove one of the chief sources of trouble in the Middle East.

The State Department and the British Foreign Office have drifted into the current crisis as one drifts in a becalmed sailboat. What is needed in the skipper's cabin is a good chart of action.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 1, 1946]

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

UNO HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK.—It is the consensus of the American press corps reporting the United Nations—a group not casually impressed—that Secretary of State James F. Byrnes has handled his share of the Security Council deliberations with skill and force and persuasiveness. I know that many foreign correspondents share this view.

Mr. Byrnes' leadership has been decisive and his role has been dominant. It is a role which President Truman was desirous that he should exercise, and he has performed it in a manner which has won for both himself and his Government a new respect and prestige in diplomatic quarters.

Mr. Byrnes, undoubtedly at the behest of the White House, found it desirable to come personally to Hunter College to take charge of the Iranian discussions—instead of leaving them in the hands of Edward Stettinius, chief American delegate. There is no disagreement that it was wise for him to do so.

It is evident that Mr. Byrnes' personal participation in the Security Council affairs at this critical point has accomplished three significant things.

It has demonstrated the United States Government's intention to back up the United Nations to the full and to accept prime responsibility for this policy.

It has shown, as was not manifest during the debates on the Iranian dispute in London, that American diplomacy is both qualified and prepared to mark out its own course rather than to follow the initiative of others.

It has returned to the United States the leadership of the cause of the small countries—leadership many both here and abroad had feared was slipping away through default and deficiencies.

In sum, it marks a better day for American diplomacy.

From the opening of the Security Council meeting March 25 until it adjourned March 29 for a 5-day recess it was evident that the discussions and the decisions were at every point revolving around the American Secretary of State. This time the American delegation at UNO took a clear-cut, sustained, ably argued position, and the result was that American diplomacy took on leadership among the big powers and became a source of strength to the small countries, which had begun to wonder at London whether the United States was going to content itself with having its chief delegate read a memorandum now and then and raise his hand at the proper moments.

Mr. Byrnes' personal intervention has changed all that.

Both behind the scenes and at the front of the stage, when debate was in full tide between the Russian and Polish delegates on the one side and the rest of the Security Council on the other, it was Mr. Byrnes who took the lead.

It was his strong hand which resisted the Russian strategy to delete the Iranian dispute from the Council agenda.

It was Mr. Byrnes who took the foremost part in the debate when Mr. Gromyko, after losing his plan to prevent Iran gaining a hearing, sought to delay discussion for 16 vital days.

It was Mr. Byrnes who shouldered the case for making the United Nations work now, when it is needed, not some time in the future when it might be too late; who pressed for long sessions of the Council so that filibuster tactics would have the least value; who formulated and won unanimous approval for the Council's communication to Tehran and Moscow requesting full and prompt information on exactly where the Russo-Iranian dispute stands now.

The American Secretary of State showed himself adept and alert in the rapid crossfire of significant debate and skillful at quick repartee. When Mr. Gromyko bore down heavily that there could be no dispute when Moscow had announced officially that agreement had been reached, it was Mr. Byrnes who instantly countered with incisive reply. He retorted that if the simple, unsupported declaration by a big power that it has reached an agreement is sufficient to deny a complaining nation a hearing, then under such procedure no small country could ever successfully bring a dispute before the Council; all a big power would need to do would be to cry "agreement, agreement," and the complaint would be thrown out before it was heard.

It is well that Mr. Byrnes has taken over America's seat at the Council table, but the question which has to be asked is: Can he often be spared from his post in Washington to do this and, under any circumstances, should it be necessary?

Increase in Salary for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the substantial and expressed accord which has greeted the recommendations of H. R. 5059, which would provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service, is significant. Primarily, it means that the bill demands passage—that it is imperative legislation. But the unanimity also serves notice that the recognition of the services rendered by our postal employees is tardy. Such a response must be gratifying to the postal workers who look to the passage of this bill for relief from the pressures of the rising flood of prices, but the wholehearted response cannot fail to remind them anew that the Federal Government does not respond to changing conditions with the speed of the postal service itself.

The comparison is, of course, a little farfetched, but it might profit us to make it. The contrast is strong and makes clear in black and white two facts or factors which we should not permit to slip so easily from our attention. And perhaps by throwing these two subjects of inquiry or attention under close and adjacent scrutiny they may shed some light on one another.

The Federal Government is, I believe, slow to compensate its own employees in the way of salary and wage increases to offset increased costs. Now, I do not suggest positive remissness nor deliberate stinginess on the part of Congress. On the contrary, Congress has made constant effort to remunerate Federal officers and employees adequately and to adjust salary and wage scales to changing conditions. But the time lag is inevitable. One reason for this is that recognition of increased wage demands concomitant with increased living costs has always been accorded by private industry, usually after forceful demands of the labor unions and often only after a strike. The Federal Government in late years has been constantly striving to hold a line, a succession of lines, against inflation and clearly has not been in a position to initiate proposals of wage increases, particularly to its own employees.

Again Federal employees, as I have said before, are faithful employees, and moreover are constrained from using the strike as a weapon for wage and other demands, however urgent the need is. It cannot but be recognized that this inevitably delays somewhat the granting of equitable increases. In this connection I wish to comment on the orderly, yet effective, manner with which the postal workers have brought their needs and their demands to the attention of Congress. The tardiness of the measure has not made them impatient nor has the urgency of the measure made them overbearing or discourteous. I consider that the clear documented and restrained manner with which they have brought their needs to our attention has aided their cause considerably.

It is not possible here for me to detail the reasons for the apparent, not serious, tardiness, of pay raises for Federal employees in line with dollar devaluation and pay increases in industry. The machinery is complex, the demands upon legislators tremendous, and the issues and problems of the day too numerous for all to receive immediate attention.

Now a Congressman knows about mail for he receives hundreds of pieces of mail a day. We should be well aware of the work of the postal system, we receive such evidence of it daily. There is no one in this Nation who does not know of the postal system, who does not realize, however slightly its efficiency, and who would not, if called upon, praise the work of our postmen, our postal clerks, and our postmasters. We profit by their efficiency, we depend on their speed, and we marvel at the complexity of their task. It seems incongruous that the postal employee, whom we all regard as a servant

of speed and efficiency, should suffer by the tardiness that is so often, under existing conditions, inevitable.

The comparison is extreme, and is one of effect, for their is little basic ground for comparison. But I never fail to be reminded of the readiness with which the workers have adopted themselves to changing conditions, have quickly taken advantage of technical advance and inventive genius, have met an ever-increasing burden of work with an ever-increasing efficiency.

I have not dwelt on the need of the postal workers for the $400 per annum increase which is recommended by H. R. 5059. There can be no denying that need. I am confident that it will be granted. I am glad that it will be granted. But I felt it incumbent on me, taking advantage of the opportunity, to remark again, as I have in the past, on the debt we owe to our postal employees and to remind this body again that we must be careful not to be remiss in meeting that debt.

The postal service has given the American language a fine and expressive phrase—"carrying the mail"—and the frequency of that phrase used to express doing a demanding job successfully and well is an American tribute to a deserving system.

Contribution by Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks Toward the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as a life member of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report prepared by Elks War Commission and forwarded to me by Mr. James T. Hallinan, vice chairman of the Grand Lodge of the Elks, setting forth the great contribution made by the organization toward the war effort. The Order of Elks has again demonstrated, as it did in World War I, the value of fraternal cooperation.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the smoke of battle clears away and the dust of destruction settles down upon the ruins, the pattern of the war effort becomes more clearly defined, and the factors that contributed to final victory can be better evaluated.

First of all we must pay tribute to those who held the front lines, took the worst that war could give, and the many who gave their lives to vindicate America's conception of freedom. It was these who, on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea, made the greatest sacrifices to insure victory. So long as civilization struggles to rule the world the faith and courage of those who fought will never be forgotten. The home front, too, will be remembered—those who gave their sons and daughters and kinsfolk, their labor, and their cooperation in all things that enabled the men at the front to carry on. Not the least important contributions were those made by civic and fraternal organizations, whose collective efforts did much to stimulate patriotism and sustain national morale.

One of the organizations whose contributions to the war effort are outstanding is the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. A fraternity with a membership of 800,000 American citizens (100,000 in the armed forces at the peak of the war) and since its organization in 1868 noted for its patriotism, charity, and community service.

In World War I the Elks donated several overseas hospital units, built a reconstruction hospital in Boston, rendered the financial aid which enabled the Salvation Army to carry on, established a fund for loans to returned veterans, and gave substantial financial cooperation to the vocational training program inaugurated by our Government.

When Hitler marched his legions into Poland leaders of the order foresaw that sooner or later war clouds gathering over Europe would precipitate a storm that must wrack the world. This fact was made more apparent by floods of propaganda against national preparedness, let loose by subversive influences, the danger of which was augmented by the cooperation of shortsighted isolationists, stubbornly closing their eyes to the realities of a situation each day growing more threatening to our national welfare.

To offset this tide of propaganda, swollen to dangerous proportions, by July 1940 the Elks created a National Defense and Public Relations Commission, which, after consultation with our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, a member of the order for many years, began aggressive action on many fronts to awaken America to the dangers of war and the necessity for intensive preparation for national defense.

Lodges throughout the Nation held patriotic meetings, at which full emphasis was placed upon the immediate necessity of preparations for national defense. The defense commission sponsored an essay contest in which 750,000 high-school students competed with the object of developing a spirit of national unity.

The Elks National Defense and Public Relations Commission realized that our country's youth must form the first line of defense and inaugurated a program of cooperation with the War Department to qualify young men for an aviation cadet-training course. With the slogan "Keep 'em flying," all lodges enlisted in this campaign. Rallies were conducted for the purpose of awakening the interest of young men in refresher courses, and 400 schools were established to instruct candidates in the educational requirements essential to undertake the training course.

The Adjutant General of the Army, impressed by the success of the Elks in qualifying young men for the Flying Cadet Corps, in August 1942 requested the order's assistance in enlisting 45,000 young men qualified for ground-crew work. Each lodge was asked to conduct a broad survey to find such men and endeavor to enlist them in the Army. Model programs, including local publicity, rallies, and personal contacts were carried out by subordinate lodges. In a remarkably short time the Adjutant General's office advised the defense commission that 97,000 ground-crew men had been obtained and expressed appreciation for the part played by the Elks in the recruiting campaign.

On December 7, 1941, the Japs made their treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor and on that same day the Order of Elks turned its activities from defense to offense. The national defense and public-relations commission became the Elks War Commission, and the executive head of the Order wired the President of the United States that all its resources were at the command of our country.

All of the war activities of the Order were undertaken after consultation and with the approval of whatever Government agency its proposed efforts might affect and all had one objective—to help our country win the war.

With the approval of the War Department the Elks War Commission sponsored a write-'em-a-letter campaign, designed to encourage and increase correspondence between members of the armed forces and their families and friends at home. A cartoon contest, based on the theme Write 'em a letter, was conducted in connection with this campaign and men in Army camps and naval bases were invited to compete for national, local, camp, and base prizes. Hundreds of cartoons were submitted, and the 13 considered most suitable were published in 550 daily newspapers and other periodicals. The success of this campaign proved a great stimulus to the morale of men and women overseas, and to their relatives at home.

At the joint request of the Army and Navy the Order, in April 1943, undertook the task of recruiting men for the Army Corps of Engineers and Navy Construction Batallion. The Elks War Commission enlisted the services of subordinate lodges in a Nation-wide recruiting campaign with the result that the full complement of men for both branches was obtained 3 months ahead of schedule. The success of this campaign was acknowledged under date of October 6 by the following letter from the Navy Department Bureau of Personnel:

OCTOBER 6, 1943.

MR. JAMES R. NICHOLSON,
Chairman, Elks War Commission,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. NICHOLSON: The Navy's needs for Seabees are being met far ahead of schedule, and we wish to express our thanks for the loyal and energetic cooperation of the Elks which contributed so largely to the success of the campaign.

Because of these favorable results, the recruiting program for Seabees comes to an end on October 30.

Immediately following, there will be a new program for the voluntary induction of men between the ages of 18 and 37, inclusive, to serve in the Navy's ship-repair units. These units require many of the same skills as the Seabees, and the same field or organization will work on the new job.

The need for more men to keep our ships in fighting trim is urgent, and the continuing efforts of the Elks to help the Navy fill its manpower needs will be greatly appreciated.

Further details will be given you later. In the meantime, perhaps you will want to inform your lodges of the changed program, and to convey to them the warm thanks of the Navy for the excellent work that has been done for the Seabees.

Sincerely yours,

R. K. KOCK,
Captain, United States Navy (Retired), Special Assistant to Chief of Bureau.

The War Department graciously acknowledged the services of the Elks in this recruiting campaign with the following letter:

OCTOBER 8, 1943.

MR. JAMES R. NICHOLSON,
Chairman, Elks War Commission,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. NICHOLSON: The support which the Elks lodges gave to the recruiting campaign for construction specialists for the Army engineers and Navy Seabees brought very gratifying results. The numbers needed were obtained in record time which resulted in the discontinuance of the campaign sooner than had been originally anticipated. Since the BPOE was the only civilian organization actively supporting this campaign, it is entitled to full credit for the success attained.

Assuring you again of my deep appreciation of your fine support in the past, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

At the beginning of the war the Order of Elks pledged itself to "serve those who serve," and to make good this pledge began operating fraternal centers for men and women in all branches of the armed forces whether or not they were members of the order. Immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor 15 subordinate lodges opened fraternal centers, and their number was increased until at the peak of war 122 of these, located in key cities in 34 States, and in Alaska and Puerto Rico, were in operation. Some of these centers provided sleeping quarters for servicemen. All of them offered accommodations for relaxation, stationery, and the complete facilities of the buildings in which they were located. Many were furnished with athletic equipment, shower baths, laundries, and all contained reading rooms and libraries. The fraternal centers are operated by the wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of members of the order, all volunteering their services as cooks, waitresses, and hostesses, and doing everything possible to make service men and women feel at home.

One of the busiest centers operated by the Elks is the one located in New York City's Manhattan. It occupies the entire building, once the luxurious Pyne mansion, located at Thirty-ninth Street and Madison Avenue. There every means is provided for the comfort and convenience of service men and women with sleeping accommodiations for 110 men, which are filled to capacity every night. Hostesses are on hand to entertain the boys at frequent parties staged by the lodges of New York, Brooklyn, Bronx, and Queens. This center was the scene of much gaiety during the holiday season. On each of the holidays—Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Years—more than 800 service men and women were served turkey dinners and special entertainment features were provided throughout each day. New York's fraternal center has been privileged to cater to an unusual number of service people, due to the fact that the city was one of the major points of embarkation and debarkation, but all the centers throughout the country have met their obligations in full proportionate measure. This is attested by the hundreds of thousands of appreciative letters received from those who have enjoyed the hospitalities and friendly atmosphere of the Elks fraternal centers.

Foreseeing a shortage of tobacco, the Elks War Commission, from the time our forces began moving overseas and during the entire course of the war, shipped 1,200,000 cigarettes and 144 cases of smoking tobacco each month for the comfort of our people in the service. It also promoted the custom adopted by most subordinate lodges of frequently sending "G" boxes containing gifts and tokens of remembrance to members serving in our armed forces.

The Order of Elks has not overlooked the difficulties that may arise in the readjustment of members coming out of the service and reentering civilian life. Each subordinate lodge has a rehabilitation committee charged with the duty of aiding returned servicemen solve their problems. Funds are available to these committees to furnish financial aid. The rehabilitation plans of the war commission do not contemplate encroaching upon the work of any established agency for the relief or assistance of war veterans. Its subordinate lodge committees will confine their direct efforts to the assistance of members of the order, but they are also ready to cooperate with any other agencies in any plan that may be formulated for the common good of discharged veterans.

The receding tides of war are bound to leave behind many casualties—wounded, disabled, and sick. This is the inevitable aftermath of battle and those who suffer have earned not only all the consideration a grateful Nation can bestow, but the gratitude of every citizen. Some of these casualties are destined for a long stay in our hospitals. There they will receive all that medical skill and nursing care can give, but the disabled veterans, who must spend long days and nights, in many instances far away from home, need something more than professional skill to temper their loneliness. In an attempt to bring some meed of cheer into our hospital wards the Elks war commission inaugurated a hospital program that in some States dates back to World War I. It is designed to bring entertainment into our hospitals, to supply magazines, radios, therapeutic apparatus, athletic equipment, and whatever comforts the Elks can provide to make the lot of our sick and disabled veterans easier to bear. The program for hospital entertainment is now being carried on by State Elks associations in 42 States and is expanding to meet increasing demands.

Associated with the hospital program is a campaign to produce slippers for use in Government hospitals. Many thousands of pairs have already been manufactured and distributed. Several State Elks associations are still gathering material and arranging for further distribution.

Fraternal centers are closed only where the need for them no longer exists, but wherever servicemen are arriving home and the facilities of these centers are needed, they will be maintained.

The war activities of the order are financed entirely by voluntary contributions of subordinate lodges, and members of the order. The order, noted since its inception for charitable activities and community service, never goes outside its own ranks to collect funds. The Elks' war fund, through which the war commission has carried on its activities, was contributed by subordinate lodges and members of the order.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks has demonstrated by the service rendered in many fields of war activities the value of fraternal cooperation with the mighty war effort that brought victory to Allied arms.

Presumptuous Advice to the Republican National Committee

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the press of yesterday carried the information that one WAYNE L. MORSE, a one-time member of the War Labor Board, who was a guest at the banquet sponsored by the Republican National Committee here in Washington on April 1, referring to certain addresses delivered there, made the statement that they were the "same old clichés and reactionary nostrums ad nauseaum which have produced Republican defeats since 1932."

No doubt the gentleman considers himself an authority, not only on public speaking, but on the merits of any statement of governmental principles and many other things.

A brief biographical statement, no doubt written by the gentleman himself for the Congressional Directory, reads in part as follows:

WAYNE LYMAN MORSE, Republican, of Eugene, Oreg.; lawyer and educator; was born near Madison, Wis., October 20, 1900; received h. B. degree, University of Wisconsin, 1923, M. A. degree, 1924, LL.B. degree, University of Minnesota, 1928; J. D. degree, Columbia University, 1932; completed 4-year advanced military training course, University of Wisconsin, 1919–23, and held Reserve commission as second lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army, 1923–29; taught argumentation at University of Wisconsin and University of Minnesota and was appointed assistant professor of law at University of Oregon in 1929; became associate professor in 1930, and in 1931 was made dean and professor of law, holding that position until his resignation in February 1944; served as member of Governor's Committee to Consider Judicial Reforms; administrative director, United States Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures, 1936–39; Pacific Coast arbitrator for United States Department of Labor (Maritime Industry); chairman, President's Railway Emergency Board, 1941; public member, National War Labor Board, 1942–44; married Miss Mildred Downie in 1924 and they have three daughters—Nancy Faye, Judith Mary, and Amy Ann; member of American, Federal, and Oregon Bar Associations, Rotary Club, Scottish Rite Mason, Mystic Shrine, Eagles, Moose, Pi Kappa Alpha, Delta Sigma Rho, Gamma Eta Gamma, Scabbard and Blade, Order of the Coif.

From the foregoing, it appears the gentleman has received a Ph. B, an M. A., an LL.B., and a J. D.; though I fail to find a B. S., which he so richly deserves—bachelor of science—has been an assistant professor, an associate professor and a professor.

The sketch does not show that he ever had earned or been awarded a degree of C. S.—common sense; S. J.—sound judgment; or that he had graduated from the University of Hard Knocks and Business Experience.

No one questions his learning. It has been said that a little learning is a dangerous thing. Perhaps too much learning is worse.

The gentleman bemoans the fate of the Republican Party, but from its birth down to the time when he proclaimed himself a member of it, it did very well.

Just where the gentleman received a certificate or a degree entitling him to admission to the Republican Party or to read out of it any of those who adhere to its historical principles, he has not yet disclosed.

While he was a public member of the War Labor Board, he had some decidedly screwy ideas. Permit me to cite just one example.

At a hearing of the committee charged with the investigation of executive agencies held on the 30th day of November, 1943, Mr. MORSE was asked by the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. JENNINGS]:

Mr. JENNINGS. On the other hand, suppose you impose a settlement on the employer which should result in ruinous loss and would bring about the insolvency of the concern under an order of the Board. What remedy would such employer have, if he could not go into court and undertake to assert his rights?

He replied:

Mr. MORSE. As you know, that is a very controversial point, as to what an arbitrator or board of arbitration should rule in regard to ability to pay.

I think I can say that our decisions show that ability to pay must not be considered a factor in fixing wages. I think that is pretty generally accepted by American arbitration tribunals. (Hearings, pp. 1518–1519.)

He also said—

Mr. MORSE. If we start with the major premise that the wage fixes (fixed) is the fair and equitable wage, then I say that the miners are entitled to that wage irrespective of the financial effect of the wage upon the operators. (P. 1520.)

Is there any proposition containing less of common sense and good judgment than the gentleman's theory that employers can pay increases in wages, irrespective of their financial ability?

The gentleman should forget his many degrees, his legal training; take a course in the University of Hard Knocks, in the School of Experience, and get firmly fixed in his mind the self-evident proposition that, if an employer continues to lose money, there will be no jobs furnished by him at any wages.

Then he might—I say, might—when he had thoroughly learned that fact, presume to give advice to the Republican National Committee; to offer suggestions as to the course that party should follow in its efforts to overcome the deficit spending, government by men rather than by law—policies of the New Deal which the gentleman from Oregon so eagerly, so consistently, follows.

A few callouses on his feet and hands, honestly earned; a few dollars lost practicing his own theories in connection with a business enterprise, might go far in enabling the gentleman to speak advisedly on Republican policies.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Peril to Your Welfare" from the Arkansas Democrat of March 31, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PERIL TO YOUR WELFARE

Federal spending didn't mean so much to the ordinary citizen years ago. His Federal taxes were then relatively light. But now the people of Arkansas, like those of other States, pay more taxes to the Federal Government than they pay to their State and all local governments.

This makes Federal spending a matter of urgent concern to every worker, businessman, industrialist, and farmer. It involves even more—a great deal more—than the taxes we pay to Washington. It affects our living costs, our freedom of enterprise, our opportunities to find jobs. An article in this section to today's Democrat tells you why.

The article quotes prominent Arkansans, who demand that the Federal budget be balanced. They see grave trouble ahead for all of our people if the present plans to continue deficit spending are continued. And their warnings are backed up by all human experience with government.

We have recognized the perils of deficit spending in our State and local governments. We have stopped it with constitutional provisions and legislative acts. Most States have similar safeguards.

But the Federal Government has gone its prodigal way, ignoring the dangers of constantly spending in excess of receipts, and thereby adding further to our tremendous national debt.

Congress has appropriated, not according to the revenues in sight, but in a reckless pattern set by the demands of a horde of departments and bureaus and the clamor of pressure groups. Often even these lavish appropriations were not enough for the greed of the bureaucrats, and they brought in deficiency appropriation bills, which Congress free-handedly allowed.

Our taxes shot up, and yet were not sufficient. The Government borrowed billions on billions to finance its heedless flinging-around of the Nation's earnings. We had to borrow for the war, of course. We had to borrow before the war, to relieve distress and save the Nation's financial structure.

But is this heedless, drunken-sailor policy to continue now, in a time of prosperity? It is for the people to say. The Government has served notice that its spending will go to new and far giddier peacetime heights unless the people, through their Congress, insist on a halt.

We would read the riot act to our legislature, our city councils and quorum courts, if they played as fast and loose with our State and local affairs as the Federal Government has done on a national scale. We probably would have some of our officials in jail.

The danger of such a course is just as great in Washington. It only takes longer to bring the inevitable ruin that follows deficit spending. You'd better get aroused. You'd better back up our Arkansas delegation, which has announced for a balanced budget. We urge you to read that article.

The Challenge of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge of America," delivered by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, at a dinner of the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, held at the Claypool Hotel, at Indianapolis, Ind., on Saturday evening, March 30.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Gates, Senator WILLIS, and fellow Americans, it is an honor to speak to this distinguished association, because a courageous press is necessary to our form of government.

Great editors and flaming editorials have made history and helped guide our national destiny.

In the United States the press is really free.

It keeps its freedom because its asserts itself.

As long as it does we are not forced to depend on Government-made news, despite the fact that 31,000 paid propagandists are on the Federal pay roll.

You have nearly 400 newspapers here in Indiana, and through their power and independence they help in guaranteeing this Nation a constitutional form of government.

It is, also, an honor to come to Indiana because your Governor is making a great contribution in the world-wide battle now raging to maintain the American way of life.

He brings to this fight, youth, courage, intelligence, and understanding.

His work and his worth are recognized far beyond the borders of your State.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania brings greetings to Indiana, home of President Benjamin Harrison, James Whitcomb Riley, Lew Wallace, "Kin" Hubbard, George Ade, Booth Tarkington, and a great and shining galaxy of writers, educators, preachers, statesmen, and politicians.

Your motto: "The Cross Roads of America," truly describes your great State.

English and Scotch-Irish from the South; Quakers and Germans from Pennsylvania; thrifty farmers and small traders from New England, all met here to form a remarkable people.

They were God-fearing.

They have brought their industry and thrift.

They brought their schools and churches.

They created diversified industries from your coal, oil, natural gas, and your great limestone quarries.

They developed a diversified and flexible agriculture.

Your fame, however, does not rest upon your mills, your farms, your historical backgrounds, your illustrious sons and daughters, or the haunting melody of your Banks of the Wabash. Indiana is really famous for its politics and politicians.

In the year 1817, being then a resident of Illinois and an ex-resident of Indiana, Dennis Hanks, cousin of Abraham Lincoln, said: "We lived the same as Indians, 'ceptin' we took an interest in politics and religion."

A real American always supports his church and is interested in politics—which means he takes part in government.

This is a time when every real red-blooded American should take part in politics.

This is a critical hour in American history.

Momentous decisions must be made affecting the happiness of millions at home and abroad.

They must be made with care and deliberation.

The people must have full knowledge of all the facts and conditions.

These are political decisions.

They must be discussed politically.

No party in any nation has a record comparable to the Republican Party.

It was born during a crisis.

It has always courageously met its obligations.

It keeps its promises.

A plank in a Republican platform means what it says.

Not a single plank in the New Deal platform of 1932, except the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, has ever been carried into effect.

The Republican Party was formed to save the Union.

In so doing it freed 3,000,000 slaves which made us all free, resumed specie payments establishing our credit in the world, encouraged free competitive enterprise to expand industry, build transportation systems, and develop our resources, giving work to millions.

At the close of the Spanish-American War it boldly gave us a foreign policy understood both at home and abroad.

It made us a self-respecting Nation.

As the minority party in both World War I and World War II, it showed what a great minority party should do in a national crisis.

The Mackinac Charter of 1943 was the first clear proposal for international action for world peace.

During 80 years of the great development of America the Republican Party upheld the Constitution, sustained the rights of the individual and demanded a government, not of men, but of law.

In these days of uncertainty, when the people of the world are moving in fear; when millions are hungry and cold; and while our own people are thinking too much of greed and profit, we need American leadership that will make clear our position in the world and at home.

Until that is done, how can we expect the United Nations to lay the deep foundations of world peace?

We have a right to an abiding faith in America.

The war showed that our way of life under our form of government is the best in the world.

We stopped the Axis.

We succeeded where all other forms of government failed.

Our production demonstrated that our free competitive enterprise system is the best economic plan ever devised.

The bravery, skill, and endurance of our fighting men is another unanswerable argument for our way of life.

All over the world they outmarched, outfought, outsmarted, and outmaneuvered every enemy they faced.

America has earned the right to world leadership.

We do not want domination or control, but our vast contributions to the defeat of the Axis gave weight to our wishes and our opinions.

We do ask the privilege of living as a friend among liberty-loving nations.

We do ask that every nation shall have the right to choose its own form of government, with the limitation that war-breeding forms be eliminated.

We know the godly and peace-loving nations must unite to prevent godless and selfish nations from destroying others who wish to live in peace.

World order depends upon education and religion.

Moral forces must be encouraged.

The atomic bomb may be a blessing or curse, depending upon the soul of civilization itself.

Meanwhile, there must be force enough in the world to keep the wolves of darkness checked and to insure that the spiritual and cultural powers of the world may work for human betterment.

If we are to move in the world, we must know where we are going.

Our people should know the facts about our relations with our allies; about the new boundary lines that must be drawn; about the occupation forces; the inhabitants and prisoners; the machinery and materials to be used; the kind of governments to be set up; and the commitment of troops and the command of these troops in all the conquered countries or the liberated lands.

In the matter of foreign aid we need wisdom.

Spot assistance for the cold, hungry, sick, and destitute, of course, must be given to the limit of our ability.

The end of lend-lease, however, should mark the end of blind generosity.

Enlightened self-interest demands that help should be given for such purposes as will not injure our own people or our own interests.

We, the American people, are entitled to full information about foreign loans.

It is our money.

The amount of the loan, the interest rate, the security, and the time and manner of repayment are our business.

Full knowledge of all these matters by the people of the borrowing and lending nations will prevent future misunderstanding.

Meanwhile, we had better not forget that we have a Federal debt of about $278,000,000,000, while the debts of all our allies total $210,000,000,000.

In winning the war we used up, forever, vast quantities of our resources.

Some of the friendly nations who want loans have raw materials, nickel, asbestos, tin, wool, rubber, sugar, lead, mica, tungsten, and lumber we so badly need.

We have food, fabrics, automobiles, and other goods they badly need.

Loaning and borrowing money makes bad friends.

Neighborly borrowing and exchange makes for lasting friendship.

The Republican Party believes in the widest possible world trade.

The industrial expansion of America and the growth of its world trade developed under Republican administrations.

Republicans believe all nations should have equal access to world markets.

A strong financial policy is vital here at home.

The Republican Party must demand, and keep on demanding, a balanced Budget.

There are two factors in a balanced Budget: Taxing and spending.

First. The tax levy must be high enough to meet expenditures and make a reasonable reduction in the public debt.

Second. Expenditures must be cut.

This is the more important step.

Everything that drives our spending above the tax revenues is simply a short cut to bankruptcy, depression, and that form of receivership known as communism.

Therefore, Government aid must be limited by ability to pay.

Innumerable costly projects now urged in Washington, no matter how attractive they may be, must be turned down for the simple reason that we cannot afford them without risking insolvency.

The Budget submitted by the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, is most discouraging.

It shows a deficit of four billions.

It lists projects costing more than four times those of prewar years.

It increases the cost of the President's Office, civil departments, and agencies, by more than $252,000,000.

The Federal Government should follow the example of the State governments.

In 4 years the gross debt of the 48 States has been reduced more than one-fourth.

In the same time they have laid up a net surplus of $675,000,000.

The States and local governments can help if they will stop running, tin cup in hand, asking aid from the Federal Government.

The Republican Party can help by demanding the quick demobilization of the great army of Federal job holders.

Outside the War and Navy Departments, job holders actually increased by 30,000 during the month of January.

Dismissal of 2,000,000 would save taxpayers five billions a year.

In Jefferson's time 1 out of 5,000 worked for the Government; today it is 1 out of 37.

The Republican Party should take a strong position on the problems of industry.

Labor and management are locked in battle along a wide social and economic front.

All of these disputes should be solved by arbitration.

They threaten the efficient craftsmanship and skilled management that made America great.

They menace the mass production that has given Americans more automobiles, radios, and telephones, more luxuries and comforts, than any other people in the world.

The right of labor to organize, strike, bargain, and picket, is not questioned, but to use violence and to do these things in defiance of court decrees is unlawful.

It will mean the break-down of law and order and lead finally to riot and widespread disorder.

Government must be the impartial friend of labor, agriculture, and industry. It cannot, without damaging the Nation, favor one of the three without injuring the others.

The time has come when the common man in America must do some good, old-fashioned, hard, American thinking.

Our way of living has become involved and complicated.

Few of us can live independently of others. The majority of Americans no longer live on self-sustaining family-size farms. The great majority live in densely populated areas. They depend upon others for water, light, heat, transportation, and the very food they eat. When these services cease, even for a day, health, welfare, and even life itself, are at stake.

In any strike or stoppage the welfare of the public must be paramount over the contending parties.

Since 1776 we have built up a great Nation on American principles.

This is no time to take advice from foreign, so-called idealists, on how America should be guided. They have made a wreck of their own countries, and almost destroyed civilization itself.

As a war measure we gladly suffered the restriction of personal liberty. Now the war is over. We must rapidly return to individual initiative, the rights of property and free competitive enterprise.

The Communist, the Red radical, and the extreme Leftist want controls and regimentation. They want national socialism or statism. As a party we do not want their support.

We need the practical common sense patriotism of our founding fathers.

As soldiers, statesmen and patriots, they founded a government to guarantee liberty, insure unity and serve humanity.

In the preamble to the Constitution we said, We, the people, were forming a more perfect union to insure domestic tranquillity, the general welfare and the blessings of liberty.

It was the people, not we, the bureaucrats.

Now we are being shoved around.

Arrogant labor leaders are defying the courts.

Bureaucrats are telling us what to do and 31,000 propagandists on the public pay roll are undermining America to maintain a political party in power.

State and local rights are being defied.

Communists, Socialists and others are trying to divide the Nation, set class against class, and section against section.

American families should read the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and particularly, the Bill of Rights.

All these documents are based upon the holy conviction that every human life is sacred.

They not only protect human rights, but property also, for property rights are human rights.

They are the safeguards protecting freedom of speech and religion, the safety of property and the home, the guaranty of public trial by jury and they reserve to the States and the people all other rights not specifically given to the Federal Government.

From the Constitution itself down through our laws and the interpretation thereof has run a golden thread maintaining the liberty of the individual.

This has helped men to be self-reliant and self-controlled.

The liberties under which men live are fixed for us all—from the man who works with his hands to the President in the White House—by the Constitution.

Our soldiers are swiftly returning to civilian life.

America must depend upon them.

They are the cream of the crop.

They want the opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution.

They do not want hand-outs.

The proudest achievement of the Republican Party in all the long years of its progressive history is its support of the veteran.

We must continue that support, for America must be kept American to help pay for the sacrifices made by these 12,000,000 boys and girls.

They do not want paternalism in government.

They want to work as their fathers worked.

Long ago, here in Indiana, men and women came carrying the rifle, the plow and the Bible to establish a home where men might live in tolerance, freedom and peace.

They knew and practiced thrift, hard work, decency, tolerance and the love of God.

They succeeded, and their decendants can succeed.

We want a dynamic America; but it must be a free America.

We can have it by working together, guided by divine providence, under the Constitution.

Let us glory in American achievements.

Let us keep the watch and guard against a surprise attack from within our gates.

Trends Toward Public Ownership of Electric Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, on the 12th of last December Mr. R. E. McDonnell, of Kansas City, Mo., addressed the Indiana Municipal Electric Association on the trends toward public ownership of electric utilities. This address contains so much worth-while information bearing on a subject now actively before the House that I deem it appropriate to have part of this speech bearing on national interest printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Private power interests are greatly alarmed over the rapid changing of public-utility ownership from private to municipal. This is evidenced by the fact that 174 of our largest private utility concerns have united in financing a campaign combating municipal ownership. This campaign takes the form of radio talks and center-spread ads in the leading magazines, and is reputed to be costing approximately $5,000,000 per year.

One of these display ads recently appeared in Life magazine, with a map of the United States showing the location of these 174 private companies sponsoring the publicity against public ownership.

One thing causing the private power interests to be alarmed is that England recently inaugurated proceedings taking over, by the Government, all privately owned electric, gas, transportation, and commnuication systems. France has in a similar manner started legislative proceedings to take over these private utilities. In Puerto Rico, where statehood is now being considered, municipalities have already taken over every water and lighting system of the 74 incorporated municipalities of that island.

Montreal, the largest city in Canada, with a population of about 1,000,000, now is enjoying the advantages of public ownership of the electric and gas systems. Possession by the Quebec Hydro Electric Commission is now a fact, and the price of the properties is being determined by an appraisal now under way.

The State of Washington has organized over 30 public utility districts, and the utilities are being acquired either by negotiation or condemnation in these districts, for all these communities wish to avail themselves of the cheap power developed by the federally owned hydro projects.

Missouri and Georgia have both recently voted new State constitutions by large majorities, providing revenue bond laws that will permit the issuing of revenue bonds in those States to acquire, extend, and build municipal systems. Columbus, Valdosta, and several other Georgia towns are already taking advantage of this new provision to acquire their utilities.

Nebraska, with 327 municipal plants, now claims 100 percent municipally owned electric utilities in the incorporated cities. Tennessee has the honor of being the State with the highest number of municipal electric systems—374.

The States with the least number of publicly owned systems are those wherein legislation, making it possible to acquire ownership, has been blocked by the private power interests.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, which was created following the exposure of the holding companies' activities, has been the means of checking the high-handed financial maneuvers of utilities, and has caused the breaking up of some of the larger holding concerns. Cities have taken advantage of this opportunity to acquire ownership of their utilities. The private power companies charge the Securities and Exchange Commission with dismembering the Nation's foremost utility enterprises. It is no wonder then that the private utility interests are expressing alarm over the rate at which utilities are changing from private to public ownership.

CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP

In the last year 110 cities have changed from private to municipal ownership; until now we have 3,371 incorporated cities in the United States that are served by publicly-owned electric systems. No cities are on record for the last year of going back to private ownership. Twenty-three of these 3,371 cities are of 50,000 and over population. Los Angeles, with 1,500,000 population, is the largest.

Twenty-nine cities of the 25,000 to 50,000 population group are fortunate enough to own their utilities. Fifty-three cities of the population group of 15,000 to 25,000 own their own utilities. Seventy-eight cities own their utilities in the population range of 10,000 to 15,000. Sixty-nine cities own their own municipal electric systems in the population range of 7,500 to 10,000. In the population range of 5,000 to 7,500, 183 cities own their own utilities. The largest group of all, owning electric utilities, is the smaller towns of 5,000 and less population. Three hundred and eighty-eight towns of 2,500 to 5,000 population, and 2,439 towns under 2,500 own their own utilities.

Because the smaller cities have demonstrated successfully their ability to own, operate, and manage their own electric utilities, the larger cities have become increasingly interested in ownership of their utilities. This increased interest of the larger cities is no doubt due in a large measure to the improved financial condition of the cities owning their utilities.

LOWER TAX RATES FOR CITIES UNDER MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP

Cities with a lower tax rate are invariably the cities owning their electric utilities. A comparison of city tax rates of 33 cities in Missouri was made by the Governmental Research Institute of St. Louis. This comparison shows the average tax on $100 in 11 cities owning no utility was $0.809; the average tax on $100 in 11 cities owning one utility was $0.55; the average tax on $100 in 11 cities where two utilities were municipally-owned was $0.495. This unbiased comparison was made with no other object in view than to ascertain the facts as to whether or not cities owning their utilities had a higher or lower tax rate. This conclusion is convincing, that cities without ownership of the utilities have a tax rate nearly twice as high as the cities with ownership of their utilities.

A similar comparison was made in over 100 Indiana cities with the following results:

Indiana recapitulation of tax rates per $100

Cities owning no utilities	$1.1347
Cities owning water plants only	1.0634
Cities owning light plants only	.639
Cities owning water and light plants	.5542
Cities owning water, light and heating or gas plants	.3325

This splendid work of utility investigations in Indiana was carried out under the direction of Vincent Youkey, mayor of Crown Point, Ind.

WIDER USE OF ELECTRICITY

A wider use of electricity is beneficial to the public. As the price of electricity has come down, its use has been multiplied. Formerly, electricity was primarily used in a house for lighting only, and now we have modern homes with as many as 25 to 30 electrical appliance applications, including washing, ironing, cooking, cleaning, heating, refrigeration, and air conditioning, all tending to lessen the household labors. This is made possible not only by the low price of electricity but the low price of appliances as well. The health of the family is protected by the vacuum cleaner, food refrigeration, sun, and infra-red lamps, and by providing adequate heating and proper ventilation. Education and amusement are also brought to us electrically, through the radio.

The private companies may contend that these advantages have been brought about by private utilities; however, they have been brought by a joint effort of both municipal and private utilities, but the municipal plants have been the pace setters in these lower rates that have made it possible for a wider use of electricity. In proof of this:

Tacoma, with the lowest rates of any of the larger cities, enjoys an average annual consumption per consumer, for residential use, of 3,640 kilowatt-hours; Seattle, with an average revenue per kilowatt-hour of 1.5 cents, enjoys an average annual consumption per consumer of 3,246 kilowatt-hours. The national average is 1,225 kilowatt-hours. In other words, the Tacoma consumer uses over three times as much electricity as the average city consumer. Seattle uses three times as much electricity as is consumed for residential use in New York City, Boston, or Philadelphia.

Springfield, Mo., the newest recruit to municipal ownership of cities of over 50,000, was using only 836 kilowatt-hours per consumer when the plant was taken over by the city, with an average revenue per kilowatt-hour of 3.6 cents. Thus Springfield was using less than one-fourth the electricity of Tacoma, and its rates were three times as high.

After 6 years of public ownership, Knoxville, Memphis, Nashville, and Chattanooga have just about doubled the use of electricity, brought about by a 50-percent reduction in rates.

This comparison of the larger cities under municipal ownership holds true of the smaller cities. Tupelo, Miss., the first town to avail itself of Tennessee Valley Authority power, is now using over 2,000 kilowatt-hours annually per residential consumer—nearly twice the national average. No one can deny that this has been a distinct public benefit. The municipal plants have been a real demonstration of what benefits can be derived from low-priced electricity.

The general policy of the municipal plants throughout the country is to establish rates sufficiently high to take care of the operating costs, and fixed charges, with sufficient reserve to maintain additions and extensions to the plant, keeping it modern and in condition to serve the public. Therefore, there is no incentive toward piling up a surplus. As revenues accumulate surplus, then the municipality promptly reduces its rates, and every reduction in rates produces a wider and freer use of electricity.

Of the 3,371 publicly owned systems, we find, upon investigation, that a majority of these have retired their bonded indebtedness entirely, and with the bonded indebtedness retired their fixed charges are naturally low, and they can then well afford to reduce the rates. The policy of cities has been, almost universally, to reduce the rates as the bonds have been retired.

Reductions in their own rates have been consistently resisted and contested by the privately owned companies. Many of these companies declared that a reduction in rates would be impossible and would lead them to bankruptcy. However, these same companies will often make 3, 4, and 5 reductions in rates to head off the construction or acquisition of a municipal system. Yet, after the municipal plant has become established, these same companies will then make so-called voluntary reductions and meet the rates of the municipal plant. Strange as it may seem, the companies meeting these reduced rates have in many cases enjoyed greater revenues under these reduced rates than they formerly did.

We have two splendid examples of this policy; one in the Tennessee Valley Authority, where the Georgia Power Co., in lowering its rates to meet the TVA rates, experienced the highest net income for the following year in the history of their company; another, at Cleveland, Ohio, where the Cleveland Illuminating Co., competing with the municipal plant, enjoyed a higher net revenue after reducing its rates to meet the lower rates of the municipal plant. This was a direct benefit to the thousands of users of electricity, coming solely through the establishment of competitive service.

These lower rates in municipal plants are made possible because of—

First. The lower interest rates on money borrowed by the city;

Second. No overcapitalization;

Third. No expensive holding companies;

Fourth. No exorbitant salaries to managers.

It is the policy of municipal plants to reduce rates materially as soon as the municipal plant is established, and then continue to reduce the rates as the bonds are retired and fixed charges wiped out.

MUNICIPAL RATES LOWER

An answer to the question of whether rates are lower under municipal ownership or private ownership was attempted by the Federal Power Commission. Such an analysis, made with the use of accepted formulas and interpreted by unbiased authorities, is as follows:

Arriving at the average by weighted population is fair. In other words, the correct average cannot be secured by comparing the rates of a large community with the rates of a small community. But, when compared on a basis of total population served, the average bills of private and municipal utilities in communities of all sizes of the nine geographical divisions of the United States are as set forth clearly in the tables of the Federal Power Commission, and using their own words for their analysis:

"Municipal utilities averaged lower rates for use of 25, 100, and 250 kilowatt-hours in six of the nine geographical divisions—namely, the New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, Mountain, Pacific, and East South Central areas.

"The private utilities averaged lower rates for the South Atlantic, West North Central, and West South Central areas."

Finally, the conclusion of the Federal Trade Commission was that "when averages of all nine geographical divisions are combined (still keeping the final result weighted, according to population served), for the entire United States, the private utilities charge 31 percent more for 25 kilowatt-hours, 27 percent more for 100 kilowatt-hours, and 20 percent more for 250 kilowatt-hours."

There is no desire on the part of cities to conduct their municipal affairs in anything except a legal, straightforward and correct manner, and yet the requirements of the State utility commissions treat the municipal plants as though they were profit-building concerns just like the privately owned utilities.

VICIOUS METHODS OF PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES

When it comes to the management and operation of municipal utilities I am not sufficiently enthusiastic over the success to be blinded to the defects, failures, and disappointments in municipal ownership and management. I think only by acknowledging these shortcomings are we going to be able to correct them. However, the shortcomings failures, and difficulties are minor and small compared with what goes on in the private power industry. At least, we have had no scandals like the Insull, Foshay, and Hopson scandals, and, more recently, the Union Electric exposures and the admissions of how legislators were bribed and millions of dollars were used to defeat public ownership.

Our chief difficulty comes from lack of legislation and from bad legislation which has been foisted upon us by the private power interests. It is almost impossible to see how the municipal plants function while hampered by unfavorable legislation of this kind, especially as in New York where they are prevented from making their own rules, regulations, and rates, and managing their properties, and are compelled to go to the commission for all matters of this kind.

In municipal ownership we give all the benefits to the public in the form of lower and lower rates, while the basic purpose of private ownership is profit for the stockholders and operating companies. With this idea in mind, there is absolutely no justification or reason whatever for the municipal plants to be regulated by a State commission.

Municipal plants do not object to proper auditing and keeping of accounts. Almost universally their accounts are well kept, properly audited, and meet the same requirements as the private companies meet in this respect.

It may be argued that some of the smaller plants do not have sufficient funds or help to have proper audits of their accounts, but it would be a very simple and easy matter for a group of municipalities to go together and have a competent auditing and accounting firm look after the auditing and accounting of a whole group of municipal plants.

USES OF ELECTRICITY

One interesting comparison that can always be made is the kilowatt-hours consumed. This has grown from year to year at a rapid rate. In 1915 the national average of kilowatt-hours consumed of residential electricity was 260, in 1930 it was 547, in 1935 it was 676, in 1940 it was 952, and in 1945 it was 1,225.

Keep in mind that this is the national average, and that many of the municipal plants used two and three times as much electricity as the national average. For example, Fort Wayne, with the largest municipal plant in Indiana, consumed 1,702 kilowatt hours per consumer; Knoxville, Tenn., 2,319; Chattanooga, Tenn., 2,451; Kalamazoo, Mich., 1,810; Lansing, Mich., 1,920; Nashville, Tenn., 2,432; Springfield, Ill., 2,016; Seattle, Wash., 3,246; Tacoma, Wash., 3,640.

If we compare these cities of high consumption of electricity with some of the Canadian municipalities where they have enjoyed municipal ownership for many years, we will find their consumption runs, in several cases, over 5,000 kilowatt hours of electricity per consumer. This shows conclusively that we have not half begun to use electricity in our American cities as in our neighbor Canadian towns, where the cost per kilowatt-hour is even lower.

REGULATION NOT ENOUGH

Some may hold that because we have an elaborate system of regulatory commissions—local, State, and national—that protect the public in the matter of rates and service, there is no need of public ownership. Many of our States passed what were considered ideal regulatory laws, and established high-minded, well-meaning commissions. They have been, however, almost powerless to regulate rates and operations effectively. Rates remained high. Earnings were not based on actual investments, but on inflated values. Companies were overcapitalized, and manipulations of stocks and bonds prevailed. It was soon found that many of our commissions, that were supposed to regulate rates, were being regulated themselves by the powerful holding companies. If a well-meaning commission did authorize a reduction in rates, its decision was promptly appealed and carried into the higher courts; so, in the final analysis, the courts were really the regulators of rates—not the commission.

The New York State Utility Commission had one case before it for over 20 years. It is a long drawn-out and expensive procedure for cities to attempt to secure just rates by regulation. Willis J. Spaulding, former commissioner of public property at Springfield, Ill., and for many years president of the Public Ownership League of America, says that the regulation of utilities by the commission of Illinois has become a scandalous and almost tragic failure. He further adds that the municipal plant at Springfield, Ill., has done more toward reducing and regulating rates in Illinois than all their commissions since inception.

Large contributions were made by the utility corporations to bring about the election of Frank Smith as United States Senator of Illinois. This Mr. Smith was chairman of the State utility regulating commission, and had served the utilities so faithfully that they decided to make him United States Senator. It was a common remark in Illinois that "they had the best Senator that money could buy." Fortunately, he never gained his seat after going to Washington.

In my own experience of 50 years in engineering and appearing before some 25 State utility commissions, I have reached the conclusion that taking all things into consideration, such as the expense involved and the results obtained. State regulation of electric systems has been a failure.

POWER COMPANIES FIGHT FOR "REGULATION"

Every effort to abolish the State commissions brings the utility companies to their defense. The New York Edison Co. spent over $5,000,000 in fighting one rate case; and it should be also kept in mind that this enormous expense of fighting for regulation of rates has been charged to and paid for by the electrical consumer. So in attempted rate regulation the public pays the bills of both sides in the controversy. It is this failure of regulation that has caused the public to turn toward municipal ownership.

After summing up the arguments before the Federal Trade Commission on regulation, the general conclusion is, "Think as you will, it is competition that brings the price down, and not regulation."

Further, Mr. Arkwright, president of the Georgia Power Co., pointed out that it was the United States Supreme Court that determined "the method of arriving at the value for rate-making purposes" and not the State regulatory commissions.

HOPEFUL OUTLOOK

We have in this country many splendid examples of municipal ownership and operation—plants that are operated on the basis of giving service, reducing rates from time to time as they are permitted, and maintaining the plants in an excellent, first-class condition, using the reserves for future improvement and enlarging of plants out of the revenues instead of recurring bond issues. The electric system is usually the biggest business in the community. There is a pride of ownership and in efficient operation in the cities that are fortunate enough to own their own utilities.

All in all, there is a hopeful outlook for municipal ownership and operation of the utilities. We are growing bigger and better all the time, with more efficient and better managed systems; and in conferences like these we cannot help but return with new inspiration and enthusiasm to improve and better municipal ownership and operation of our utilities.

Renegotiation Not Affected by Carry-Back Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain statements that were made during the debate on the labor bill recently approved by the House, I felt it would be valuable to get an authoritative statement on the effect, if any, of the carry-back tax law on the operation of the Renegotiation Act.

In doing so, I emphasize that I am against greed whether it be found in swollen corporation profits or in the swollen ego of reckless labor leaders. I offered the amendment to the Sixth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act of 1942 which initiated the renegotiation of excess war profits with the same basic purpose that prompted me to offer the labor disputes bill of 1946. That purpose was the protection of the general public.

In 1942, I was denounced by certain industrialists; in 1946, I have been denounced by certain labor leaders. But, just as responsible business has come to express its appreciation for the Renegotiation Act which saved industry generally from indiscriminate charges that followed World War I, so the day will come, I believe, when responsible labor leaders will express their appreciation for an improvement in our labor laws.

So, I asked for and received a statement on the effect of the tax carry-back law on the operations of the Renegotiation Act and place it in the RECORD at this time:

WAR CONTRACTS PRICE
ADJUSTMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1946.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: In your letter of February 16, 1946, you inquire whether the recovery of excessive profits under the Renegotiation Act is affected by the loss carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. Specifically, I understand your question to relate to the ability of a contractor with whom renegotiation proceedings have been completed with respect to a given fiscal year to recover any portion of excessive profits eliminated, or if such proceedings have not been completed, to obtain a cost allowance, because of losses incurred in a subsequent fiscal year by reason of work stoppages.

With the exception of subsection (a) (4) (D), directing the making of a rebate to contractors in connection with accelerated amortization with respect to emergency facilities and subsection (i) (3), relating to refunds in certain 1942 cases where profits attributable to the increment in value of an excess inventory were included in renegotiation, the Renegotiation Act makes no provision for repayment of any amount for any reason to contractors with whom agreements for the elimination of excessive profits have been made. Such agreements are final and conclusive and may not be reopened in the absence of fraud, malfeasance, or willful misrepresentation of a material fact.

Therefore, with regard to contractors with whom renegotiation proceedings for any fiscal year have been concluded by agreement, it is clear that the amount of excessive profits so determined is not affected by events of any subsequent fiscal year.

With respect to those contractors with whom renegotiation proceedings for any fiscal year have not been completed, subsection (a) (4) (C) of the Renegotiation Act contains an explicit prohibition against the allowance of any amount as an item of cost by reason of the application of a loss carry-back or carry-over.

This provision, of course, precludes the allowance as items of cost of any losses of whatever character which are incurred in years subsequent or prior to the year being reviewed in renegotiation.

Contractors who incur losses because of work stoppages are therefore not permitted to carry back such losses to an earlier year for purposes of renegotiation.

I hope that this satisfactorily answers your questions. If not, I shall be happy for you to call upon me further.

Yours sincerely,

MAURICE HIRSCH,
Colonel, General Staff Corps, Chairman.

The Politics of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a constituent recently sent me an article entitled "The Politics of OPA."

I commend it to the serious attention of the Congress:

THE POLITICS OF OPA

Was it Shakespeare who first wrote "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad"? A study of current politics and OPA confusion prompts the inquiry.

To understand OPA confusion requires a political analysis. All political straws indicate a resurgence among voters to the Republican Party. The Republicans claim it and Democratic denials are weak or nonexistent or they admit it.

OPA expires June 30 with a 4-month interval to the November election. Such an interval is short but is abundantly long enough to permit food prices to skyrocket and send all the food value voters to the ballot boxes to elect Democratic Congressmen pledged to renew OPA under Chester Bowles and start us off on an indefinite period of a national controlled economy.

The policies of OPA are driving industrialists crazy. The same policies are driving small businessmen crazy. Likewise, merchants, large and small, plus special service and personal service units, are all being driven crazy. A shining example of industrial lunacy under the needling and the bankruptcy trend of OPA policies is the NMA declaration opposing continuance of OPA under any conditions. "Whom the gods (OPA) would destroy they first make mad."

If the Republican Congressmen walk into this bear trap they should all reequip with diapers as their official uniform and especially for election emergencies. The Democratic devils who plot this bear trap for election purposes are tricky enough to set up Barney Baruch and other outstanding Democratic leaders to exhort all loyal Democrats to the defense of OPA, to retain it and continue it. Under such a smoke screen other more loyal Democrats, operating as Democratic devils and using the hypnotic word "coalition," organize with adolescent Republicans to win the November election for the Democratic Party by refusing extension of OPA June 30.

The OPA should be extended, of course, subject to restrictive amendments for the protection of industry and business. Numerous constructive amendments are suggested, but none are vitally needed if the one vital one is adopted, to wit: an amendment compelling OPA to accept without preliminary question all cost figures certified by management of individual units (not by CPA's) and subject to prosecution for perjury if afterward found willfully deceptive or wrong and, in the same paragraph, to compel OPA to grant to each unit a profit limited only by its previous records or a higher record of its industry.

If the results are industrial profits, the United States Treasury collects approximately 50 percent, and the United States Treasury can use the money.

Pay of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is called upon to consider legislation which will provide pay increases for Federal employees, and I cannot stress too strongly the need to give full and fair-minded consideration to the desperate needs of this group of workers. The most conservative figures at our disposal reveal that the cost of living has increased tremendously since the beginning of the war, and it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that these workers are given at least a fair approximation of the buying power which they possessed at that time.

Reliable estimates have shown that the cost of living has increased about 45 percent since January 1941. Even after so great an increase prices have not yet reached a peak, and it has been estimated that food prices, for instance, will go up another 10 percent this year. In addition to these costs, income taxes, particularly in the lower-income groups, have risen since 1941. Maintenance of prewar living standards is a hopeless task unless substantial increases in income are provided which will enable workers and their families to keep abreast of the high living costs.

Now let us consider the predicament of the Federal employees. The Congress did pass the Pay Act of 1945, which enabled the employees and their families to reattain, for the moment, their prewar buying power. However, within 3 months after this act became effective, the war was ended and these employees were cut down to a 40-hour week, thus losing the equivalent of 12 hours' pay per week. Thus these workers lost all the benefit and more which they had won through the 1945 adjustment of pay schedules. Their position was worse than it had ever been, and is worse, for no increase of any kind has been provided to compensate for this tremendous loss of income.

Throughout the country this year employers have found that the very least pay increase which they could give their employees was 18½ percent, and surely we can do no less for the Federal employees, who have had at least as bad a time of it as any other group. An increase of 18½ percent would not provide any too generously for the needs of our Federal employees and their families, but at least it would enable them to maintain the minimum essentials of a decent standard of living.

We have generally recognized the great importance of the next few years in our full reconversion to peacetime economic activities, and the importance of maintaining not only high employment but also high consumption in order to stimulate the recovery of production and distribution of consumer goods of all kinds. For this reason, too, we must take care to see that the substantial number of workers who are employed by the Federal Government are able to maintain their share of the high consumption necessary if we are to enjoy business prosperity and a high standard of living.

Telephones Without Telephone Wires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that the attention of the House is called to an important advance in telephone service. It has been made possible through the research collaboration of the Rural Electrification Administration and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. By means of a new instrumentality called a capacitor which has been invented or adapted to this particular purpose, telephone service may now be rendered on light and power lines. Thus telephone lines in the areas so served are eliminated.

Thought leadership in this field may be accredited to a number of electrical engineers. Two of the outstanding members of this group have written an article which is set out below. They are Mr. Lee M. Moore, of the REA, and Mr. H. R. Huntley, of the A. T. & T. Co. Mr. Moore was honored in August 1945 by his election by the board of directors of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers as a fellow of the institute; one of the youngest men ever to be so honored. He also is a member of two of the important committees of the institute: power transmission and distribution, and communications.

Mr. Huntley is the recognized authority on inductive coordination problems in the United States, having been associated in this field of highly specialized engineering for the past 25 years. He is the author of many articles on the subject. His book, treating the subject more fully, is to be published shortly.

The pictures appearing in this article cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but one of them is unique. It is of an REA truck which is at present the only service truck equipped for the purpose of serving such telephones. While it is now the only one in the world, it will be followed by others as the number of homes served by this type of telephone multiplies.

[From the Electrical World of October 13, 1945]

INDUCTIVE COORDINATION OF REA LINES AND BELL SYSTEM LINES

(Coordination engineers know from years of mutual effort how to resolve interference problems that may accompany prospective extensive rural program—Over-all system approach makes corrective measures easier—Cooperation of manufacturers of generators, transformers, and telephone apparatus facilitates program.)

(By Lee M. Moore and H. R. Huntley)

Electric power and telephone distribution systems must necessarily be close together in many cases because they serve the same people. Under these conditions, noise may be caused in the telephone circuits by induction from the power system. Unless precautions are taken, this noise may in many cases be great enough to impair telephone service; in extreme cases, it may make telephone service impossible.

PROGRAM INITIATED EARLY

Induction problems are not new; they started around 1880. In those early days little was known about the factors involved, and controversies between the electric power and telephone industries were many. Fortunately, there were far-seeing men in both industries who recognized that electric power and electric communication were both essential to the American way of life, and that, after all, induction was simply one more problem that had to be—and could be—solved by the engineers. True, the solution would require the cooperative effort of the engineers in two great industries of quite different types, but, these men reasoned, this should not be a handicap; it might even stimulate more effective work. This proved to be the case, and so successful has this cooperative endeavor been that, while the technical problems of coordinating power and telephone systems have grown in number and complexity, serious controversies over induction have almost reached the vanishing point, and the few that do arise usually do so because not all the facts are known.

This was the status of inductive coordination when the Rural Electrification Administration started its program of rural power line construction. Because of the long history of successful coordination of power and telephone systems and of the testing techniques and apparatus which had been developed, it was practicable for the REA and the Bell System to start almost immediately on a joint program of investigations.

The problem presented some interesting aspects. Several hundred small operating groups, the cooperatives, were in the process of formation. To them inductive coordination was only one of many immediate problems. The speed with which rural electric lines were being built demanded something approaching a mass-production technique for handling induction problems.

FIELD STUDIES INSTITUTED

It was decided that the best way to develop the necessary techniques was by a series of field investigations. By July 1939, REA had set up a two-man test crew equipped with a truck loaded with testing equipment and work started in earnest. The first field job involved a problem in the vicinity of Quincy, Ill., which turned out to be rather complex technically. The REA test crew, together with an engineer each from the A. T. & T. Co. and the Bell Telephone Laboratories and several people from the local power and telephone organizations, worked about a month on it.

Since the Quincy tests more than 20 other situations in a dozen States from Washington to Florida have been similarly investigated. In addition, the REA has conducted numerous cooperative investigations with other communication organizations. The 1940 REA annual report says: "REA cooperatives continue their policy of cooperating with telephone companies in planning the locations of proposed electric power lines so that exposures between power and telephone lines will be kept at a minimum. REA engineers assigned to spend full time on inductive coordination problems, as related in last year's report, continue to make tests and studies to seek the correct engineering solution to any particular induction problem."

As more experience is gained, the investigations increase in efficiency. It is now not at all uncommon to complete the field work in a problem involving several hundred miles of rural power and telephone lines, of which anywhere from 10 to 50 percent may be involved in inductive exposures in 4 or 5 days.

OVER-ALL SYSTEM APPROACH

Besides being efficient, the technique of handling problems on an over-all system influence and susceptiveness basis is proving economical. The net cost of measures to correct the influence or susceptiveness of a whole system is frequently less than that which could be involved in treating a single exposure individually by older methods.

It may be of interest to review briefly how these measures work:

On the power side, noise-frequency influence, a measure of the noise-originating ability, is a function of the audio (i. e., harmonic) frequency voltages and currents on the power line, and is controlled by controlling these audio-frequency components. While the 60-cycle currents and voltages are of interest from some standpoints—for example, induction into telegraph circuits, bell tapping on grounded ringing telephone circuits, etc.—it is the harmonics that are important from the noise standpoint. They must be considered as separate and apart from the 60-cycle components; in fact, the noise influence of a rural power circuit is

usually highest when the 60-cycle load is the lowest, and vice versa. The only reason why 60-cycle components need to be considered at all from the noise standpoint is that we have not yet learned how to design devices which will be effective at harmonic frequencies and yet have no effect at 60 cycles. However, it is usually possible to devise arrangements which do not adversely affect power operation; sometimes they actually improve it.

BALANCE FOR SUSCEPTIVENESS

On the telephone side, susceptiveness, a measure of the noise-receiving ability, is largely a matter of balancing the circuit impedances in the lines, central office equipment, and subscriber stations. On the line, this means a reasonable degree of freedom from leaks due to foliage contacts and missing or faulty insulators. Good wire joints, and relatively frequent transpositions, are required. In the central office, it means good balance of the impedances between the two wires of the circuit and ground. At the subscribers' stations, the problem usually is to limit the effect of the ringer-to-ground connections on grounded ringing lines.

It is true that, if the power system influence could be made vanishingly small, there would be very little noise on any kind of paralleling telephone circuits—even ground return; as a matter of fact, in rare cases influence can be reduced close to this point. It is also true that if the telephone susceptiveness could be made infinitesimal by perfectly balancing the telephone circuits, they would be immune to noise induction from parallel power circuits regardless of power-line influence; in rare cases, this condition can be approached. But, by and large, the best results and the lowest costs to the public are secured when both the influence of the power systems and susceptiveness of the telephone circuits are kept reasonably low; it is by this process that the long record of satisfactory solutions to noise problems has been secured.

The technical phases of this matter are described in more detail in a paper presented before the 1941 winter convention of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, by Messrs. Smith and Plucknett of the REA and Mr. Taylor of the A. T. & T. Co. and published in AIEE Transactions Supplement, volume 60, pages 586–595, June 1941.

YEAR OF JOINT EFFORT

One of the primary reasons why REA-Bell System jobs can be handled efficiently and economically is the wealth of information provided through the years of work of the joint subcommittee on development and research of the Edison Electric Institute and Bell Telephone System and the large amount of experience obtained in operating problems involving the Bell System and the private power companies.

With such a sound base to grow on, the art of inductive coordination in this field has advanced in almost direct proportion to the fourfold increase in the past decade in percentage of number of farms having electric service.

Pictures accompanying this article show some of the test equipment used in these investigations.

MANUFACTURERS ENLISTED

As a result of experience in these and other investigations, REA engineers are working closely with electrical manufacturers to secure relatively small alternators which generate voltages practically free of harmonics. Some interesting results have been secured; for example, three machines under 1,000 kilovolt-amperes each have been purchased which have an open-circuit voltage TIF (telephone influence factor) of about 2.5 and a noninductive full load TIF of very close to 1. A TIF of 1 indicates a pure wave shape with no harmonics present. Not all generators are that good, of course, but practically all of the newer ones have an open circuit TIF of less than 15 and many have an open circuit TIF of less than 10.

Another interesting line of development being followed by the REA engineers with the electrical manufacturers, is the limitation of harmonics in the magnetizing currents of distribution transformers. It is contemplated that the newer transformers will have a magnetizing I.T product (i. e., product of magnitude and TIF of magnetizing current) per kilovolt-ampere measured on the 120-volt windings of less than 15, and at the same time have low-core losses. The low I.T characteristic is important because of the large numbers of transformers on individual systems of REA borrowers, while the low core loss is required because of the relatively large ratio of connected kilovolt-ampere capacity of the distribution transformers to average load.

LOW-RESISTANCE JOINTS

A number of improvements in the over-all susceptiveness conditions on Bell System circuits have also been made in recent years. The increasing use of "rolled" or "compression" sleeves is rapidly doing away with the occasional high resistance joint that had been a major source of unbalances for many years. The newer central office equipment has much smaller unbalances than some of the earlier types. The unbalances of the newer types of party-line station sets have also been reduced. Improvements in telephone transposition systems are expected to reduce direct metallic circuit induction.

FUTURE COOPERATION

When manpower and materials again became available it is expected that many thousands of miles of rural power and telephone lines will be built and thousands of miles of exposures will be created. Obviously, if we were to attempt to care for the resulting inductive coordination problems by studying and applying measures on a specific exposure basis, the way would be hard, indeed. But with the experience we already have we are certain that if, on the power side, the harmonics are adequately controlled on an over-all system basis, and, on the telephone side, unbalances are adequately controlled on an over-all system basis, there will be very few situations where anything further needs to be done. To accomplish this it will be necessary to work closely together and to make effective use of all developments in the coordination art. However, this is a procedure which comes naturally to coordination engineers.

Currency Problems in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, the New York Herald Tribune published a news release in which it was alleged that "persistent and unconfirmed belief in American official quarters" indicated that the Soviet government has resorted to wholesale printing of occupation currency which must be redeemed when presented in the American occupation zone headquarters of the United States forces, European theater.

The article indicated that the United States Treasury will suffer tremendous loss as a result of this transaction. The information contained in the article was so astounding that I wrote a letter on March 22 to Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, asking him to advise me of the facts.

A reply was received today signed by Mr. H. D. White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. I am pleased to incorporate in these remarks the news release heretofore referred to, my letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Treasury reply:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1946]

ARMY IN GERMANY SEEKS TO CUT LOSS FROM SOVIET-PRINTED SCRIP—MAY ISSUE CURRENCY VALID ONLY FOR AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL IN UNITED STATES ZONE; UNLIMITED RUSSIAN USE OF AMERICAN-LOANED PLATES REPORTED

(By Edward Hartrich)

FRANKFURT-AM-MAIN, March 9.—Because there is a persistent but unconfirmed belief in American official quarters here that the Soviet Government has resorted to wholesale printing of occupation currency—all of which is legal tender and must be redeemed when presented in the American occupation zone—headquarters of United States Forces, European theater, is considering issuance of a new form of scrip valid only for authorized military and civilian personnel in the American zone.

Currency control books are being prepared to replace the present ones, which are inadequate to cope with ingenious financiers, and it is planned that in the near future no dollar credits will be extended to any individual beyond what he has earned from the Army or received from the United States. The new books will bear registered numbers and will be made of tamper-proof paper.

A high ranking Army official who cannot be quoted charged that the Russians were given currency plates by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., with no strings attached, while Morgenthau was Secretary of the Treasury. "We are taking a hell of a shellacking on this deal," the Army official said.

While the Army official refused to give an estimate of the amount of occupation marks printed and distributed in Germany by the Russians, he indicated plainly that it was far in excess of their needs. The Russians are working their printing presses overtime, it is believed.

"We have an idea of how much they have printed, and it has caused us all grave concern," he said, "but I can't release the figure."

Under the proposed new finance program the American Army would refuse, after a date not specified as yet, to be liable for redemption of Russian-printed occupation currency, which finds its way in unlimited amounts into the American zone or into Berlin. The Army also plans to curtail drastically activities of military and civilian personnel in the black market.

According to present plans authorized military and civilian personnel will buy coupon books in varying amounts for purchase at Army stores and post exchanges of clothes, food, drinks, tobacco, and similar items. When a coupon book is purchased its value will be deducted against the dollar credit in the control book. Thus an individual will not be able to spend his excess occupation currency in the European theater while leaving untouched the salary and savings credits entered in his control book.

If scrap is issued the Army must first call in and redeem all occupation currency now in American hands—a delicate and complicated problem, for the Army naturally wants to limit its liabilities as much as possible.

One effect of this drastic measure would be to hinder further centralization of the control and government of Germany. Allied occupation currency is now legal tender among the Allies and the German people,

although German marks are not legal tender with military authorities.

The American Army is the only army which now redeems Russian occupation currency by giving dollar credits on currency control books up to a limit specified on each book. In the British zone a soldier is allowed to draw occupation currency against his pay credits for spending, but he cannot redeem that currency for pound credits.

Because the Russians do not accept occupation currency within the Soviet Union it is spent in the occupied zone. There are no figures available on what this has cost the United States Treasury to date, but the amount must run into the millions of dollars.

MARCH 22, 1946.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VINSON: As a member of the subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with appropriations for the Treasury Department, I was extremely interested in an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 10, entitled "Army in Germany Seeks to Cut Loss From Soviet-Printed Scrip". I am enclosing this clipping for your attention. I should like to have it returned to me when it has served its purpose.

I would like to be advised of the facts in reference to this matter and whether or not there is any truth in the allegations contained therein.

Thanking you, I am

Very respectfully yours,

FRANK B. KEEFE,
Member of Congress.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 2, 1946.

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEEFE: Thank you for your letter of March 22, 1946, forwarding an article that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune and requesting to be advised of the facts pertaining to currency problems in Germany.

Constantly recurring reports, such as the one forwarded by you, have been appearing in our newspapers to the effect that Soviet occupation forces in Germany have been printing and issuing Allied military marks far in excess of their needs, thereby causing the United States unjustifiable losses from converting Russian-printed marks into dollars.

We have no information at present to indicate that the Russians are issuing disproportionately large numbers of marks or that any currency policy or action on their part has resulted in a loss to the United States Government.

Prior to the invasion of Germany, in order to attain the use of a uniform military currency, Anglo-Soviet-American agreement was obtained to use an Allied military currency, denominated in marks, which was to be printed in the United States and in the Soviet Union. Similarly in the case of Austria, the Allied military currency was printed in both the United Kingdom and the United States, with those two governments supplying all the occupying forces, including the Russians. In order to insure uniformity in Germany, the United States made available to the Soviet authorities plates duplicating those being used for printing in the United States.

There was and is no obligation on the part of any of the occupying powers to redeem Allied military mark currency. By authorization of this Government, the United States troops are allowed to convert into dollars for the limited purpose of remitting to the United States any portion of their pay which they receive in marks but which they subsequently discover is not needed for spending in Germany. This privilege applies only to currency originally paid out as pay and allowances or otherwise derived from the sale of dollars or other currency at Army finance offices. The procedure for restricting remittances to authorized amounts is constantly being reviewed with the objective of perfecting it.

When quantities of Allied military marks are made available to the United States Army in Germany, appropriated funds of the War Department are charged and the dollar equivalent of the marks is set aside in a special account of the Treasury. This account is used for conversion into dollars of Allied military marks by soldiers.

The Soviet authorities are, like other Allied Powers, paying their troops in Allied military marks. Investigations have revealed that Russian soldiers offer high prices in marks for various personal articles. Just as the French Riviera has become the popular leave center of United States soldiers, so Berlin has been used by the Russians as a leave center, resulting in large numbers of troops entering the area with accumulated pocket money.

The Allied Control Authority in Berlin, including the Russians, has agreed to interchange information quarterly on the number of Allied military marks issued. When reports are submitted under this agreement information will be available to determine more specifically the amounts of currency issued.

The clipping is returned as per your request.

Very truly yours,

H. D. WHITE,
Assistant Secretary.

Surplus Property Is a Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments again had before it the question of the disposal of surplus property and in particular the question of obtaining for veterans the priorities which the Congress has attempted to give them in their efforts to obtain items which are surplus.

So far Congress has failed to enact and the executive department has failed to administer any plan which will give real priority to the veterans.

Hundreds, yes; thousands of examples could be cited. Let me cite just one, that of a department store, Gimbel Bros., obtaining hundreds of trucks, new, unused, in excellent condition, at a price of $1,900, retailing them at $2,950—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, remarks of O'TOOLE and TABER, of New York.

A veteran of the First World War just brought in a statement outlining what he calls the American Plan for Veterans. Without expressing any opinion as to the merits of the plan, his statement is inserted herewith:

THE AMERICAN PLAN FOR VETERANS

Capt. Michael J. Brennan, of No. 1 Broadway, New York, a veteran of World War I and of 40 years avoyaging on the Seven Seas, has evolved, out of his experience and personal study of the veterans' problems, a plan that recognizes their needs and rights and shows them how to get their just dues and rewards without burdening for life either them or the rest of us with taxes either for the veterans' special needs or to provide and maintain, at our sole cost and expense, the huge and numerous bases and other military and naval establishments which we propose to provide and maintain indefinitely for the protection of everybody.

Other plans so far announced for these purposes have one feature in common. Whether they deal with bases, jobs, education, pensions, housing, hospitalization, or medical care, they all aim to extract the money from American labor by direct taxes, or by the sale of bonds which must at last be paid, principal and interest, through more taxes. The curse of such plans is that the veterans and their relatives and friends are also the "workers" of America, so that they will really, as the "workers," have to repay, by taxes, the moneys which a "grateful" Congress may "give" them as veterans.

Only Captain Brennan's plan does not have this common fault of needing huge, additional tax raids to make it work. His plan shows, in detail, ample resources available for implementing it immediately. He is about to issue it in pamphlet form to the veterans' organizations for the complete solution of their financial problems. It is called the American Plan for Veterans and has these features and merits:

Almost unaided, American forces captured from the Japanese or forced the surrender to us, not only of their homeland but of the other territories which she had captured or which had been abandoned or surrendered to her by the "Colonial Empires" which had formerly taken them by bloody force of arms from the previous overlords.

United States sovereignty having thus attached to these territories, how can that sovereignty be surrendered except by a majority of the voting population of the United States? No such vote having been cast, our United States appear to be the overlord of these territories, with the right and duty to administer them justly until the rightful owners (the natives) have qualified to take over and administer them independently.

On this basis, the American plan for veterans proposes that, by order of the President, General MacArthur immediately assume direct control of these territories, appointing an interim board of trustees to administer them pending the election of a permanent government. The interim board to be selected by General MacArthur from among the natives and the American and Allied veterans of his forces who participated in his conquest of Japan. The permanent government will also be composed of both natives and veterans, elected by them instead of being appointed by any political authority.

Captain Brennan points out that the progress of the United States has, like the path of civilization, been ever westward, and that, to meet the obligations which have been loaded on our people, we must again, and quickly, develop new sources of revenue by improving now undeveloped parts of the world—again following the sun's path in finding these. He suggests an easy and simple method of providing the huge capital needed, without burdening us with additional taxes now or postponing taxation by loading us with bonds which have to be paid in the future out of taxes. His plan has the solution for the major problems which are troubling all patriotic Americans and which must be solved now because they cannot be postponed:

1. What disposition shall we make of the Pacific territories which we captured from or which have just been surrendered to us by

Japan after they had been abandoned by their former European overlords?

2. How shall we secure ourselves against future Pacific wars?

3. How shall employment be found for the well veterans?

4. How shall we find the billions of dollars needed for pensions and for hospital care, etc., for the disabled veterans and for care of the dependents of our dead and wounded heroes?

5. How shall we find the billions needed now to establish, and the other billions needed annually hereafter to maintain the encircling chain of military bases which our military authorities insist we must have to protect us from another and worse Pearl Harbor and which, although they will also protect the rest of the world, will be our burden alone?

6. Except through piling a still greater tax load on our own people, where shall we find the additional billions for gifts (dishonestly called loans), which our allies are negotiating for under shameless "or else" threats, and where is to be found the authority for taxing our own people to make such gifts or loans to foreign governments?

7. Shall we again discard the best and largest merchant fleet on the world's oceans, as our allies are affectionately urging their Uncle Shylock to do? If not, how shall we get our fair share of the carriage of the world's seaborne commerce, or even that part which we originate, since even our veterans are being discriminated against already in favor of the subjects of the oligarchies, in some of these territories in which someone has permitted commercial representatives of the colonial empires to reenter?

As the solution of these problems, the American plan for veterans provides that, instead of handing these Pacific territories over to the colonial empires or the natives, neither of whom is able, without our great, costly, and continued help to hold them now or in the future, we make now what the United Nations Charter calls a regional arrangement that will provide:

1. For all the brave men and women, of whatever nationality, who participated with us in the conquest of Japan;

2. For the safe and permanent administration and distribution of pensions out of the surplus revenues of these territories;

3. For the training of the native populations in the ways of free people, so that they may become independent and self-governing at the earliest possible moment; and

4. For the timely transfer of the freedom and control thereof to the duly chosen representatives of the native populations.

In the operation of the plan the interests of the (1) natives, (2) veterans, (3) labor, and (4) general public will be so closely interwoven as to be almost identical and inextricable, for all will partake, in just and generous measure, of the advantages to be derived from its honest and efficient administration. Because, by providing the natives with productive employment at fair wages in the great and profitable enterprise of intelligently developing these virgin territories and incidentally guiding them, as we did the Filipinos, to a civilized standard of living aimed at their ultimate freedom and increasing their commercial intercourse with the two-thirds of the world's people on the neighboring Asiatic mainland, we will, for the veterans, create millions of new and varied supervisory jobs in both America and the Far East; make available, for salaries, pensions, and so forth, for the veterans and their dependents and for the improvement of living conditions in those territories, the profits formerly siphoned into the coffers of the exploiters of these lands and natives; produce additional income for the pension funds through the just use of native labor in supplying the enormous market which will be created by the increasing wants of these natives and other Far East peoples; for labor, the more veterans are employed in carrying out this plan the less will be the competition for jobs in the United States; the greater will be the demand for the services of labor in the usual fields of industry here; the less will be the taxes on the wages of all to provide pensions, etc., for the veterans and their dependents and for the other expenses and disbursements of our Government; the higher the wages that can be paid and the greater the portion of his wages which the worker can keep, because of the lesser taxes on both worker and employer; for the general public will benefit from, the greatly increased employment in America, this always increases the workers' funds available for still further raising the standard of living; the greatly increased income from the greatly increased, diversified, and extended foreign and domestic trade and commerce resulting from the honest and vigorous implementation of this plan and the greatly decreased taxes, because the greater part of the veterans' needs will be provided out of new income instead of out of greatly and necessarily increased taxes collected in America; and the greatly decreased cost of manning and protecting our Far East bases.

As the natives will be trained to defend their homes under our guidance, we will be relieved of the tremendous burdens of taxes and the draining away of our manpower and especially of our physically selected youth—burdens which will crush our people cruelly and inevitably if these territories be given to the oligarchies, because then we must be prepared to rescue them again and again, for, if we are so unwise as to permit the old gang again to assume control, they will be constant centers of disturbance hereafter. Voluntary enlistments in the United States will increase because of the attraction of foreign service in peacetime. Using these volunteers as instructors and native troops to a large extent as the enlisted personnel manning the bases, will make it unnecessary to draft our American boys in peacetime as is now proposed.

The general public will also benefit from the enormous savings and profits resulting from the employment of our Liberty ships in this fast-expanding Pacific trade, instead of giving them to our trade rivals or breaking them up for scrap as our former allies and present trade rivals are urging, or hiding them in obscure rivers to rust away, as after World War I.

Our entire west coast will experience a greatly stimulated development resulting from much easier access to Far East markets.

Collier's Weekly (New York) in its issue of January 5, 1946, published a message from the Pope stating that God "has placed the destinies of afflicted humanity in the hands of America." He looks to us for "a peace of resolute force to overcome or preclude those economic and social conditions which might, as they did in the past, lead to new conflicts" and he prays that "the noble flame of brotherly love be kindled in our hearts" and warns us not to let it be "quenched by an unworthy, timid caution."

Churchill's Fulton, Mo., Speech Threat to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I would like to include in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Thomas Jefferson Chapter of the American Veterans' Committee, the Bronx, New York. I wish to call to the attention of the Members this resolution because it strikes the note that all Americans are thinking about today:

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
THOMAS JEFFERSON CHAPTER,
Bronx, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

At the last regular meeting of the Thomas Jefferson Chapter, the following resolution was adopted:

"Since, we, the members of the Thomas Jefferson Chapter of the American Veterans Committee have all recently returned from a war which came as a result of the failure of the world powers to get together in common agreement, we must strongly denounce Winston Churchill's antipeace, anti-UNO, Russia-baiting speech at Fulton, Mo.

"We believe it is entirely possible for amicable settlements of world problems, without resorting to displays of force and divisionist tactics, as expressed by Mr. Churchill.

"We reaffirm our conviction that any problems that do exist and will undoubtedly arise can and must be resolved through the UNO, if peace is to be preserved.

"We cannot return to the power politics which helped precipitate World War I and II.

"Today, it can only be total peace or total disintegration. The atom bomb eliminates a middle course."

Beer Shortage in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 26, 1946.

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Relative to the beer situation in Rhode Island I wish to give you the following information:

Several retail liquor dealers have called to our attention the fact that the drastic cut in grain has created very serious conditions in the maintenance of their businesses. In fact, at this writing the condition may be termed critical, since many owners have found it necessary to lay off bartenders, waiters, and waitresses. Our salesmen actually found 8 out of 10 outlets completely out of beer yesterday morning and many of these ran off their last half barrel by Friday night.

There is no reason to believe that this condition will get any better, but with the approach of warm weather it will naturally tend to become worse.

All of these retailers have a big investment at stake. Their liquor licenses, which help towns and cities to carry their tax burdens, will be worthless without merchandise. A large majority of those affected by this ruling from Washington are the small businessmen and I know they are already making a move for help from you and our other representatives in Congress.

No doubt you are aware that the breweries have already laid off thousands of employees and just recently one large outfit (an out-of-State brewer) released 25 drivers and salesmen here in Rhode Island. This is just a

trifle to what will follow in the near future unless something is done at once.

I am enclosing a newspaper clipping substantiating my statements. In the name of those who are dependent upon this business for the support of their families throughout the State and country, and in order to safeguard their investments, I urge you as a friend and statesman to act on this matter before we have the unemployment lists in Rhode Island increased with those who during wartime accepted their call to duty. The returned veterans who are employed in this industry, as well as the people who made every necessary sacrifice during the war, will watch with eager eyes the progress you are able to achieve in their behalf.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Cordially,

McLAUGHLIN & MORAN.

Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a petition to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress from the citizens of North Andover, Mass., concerning surplus property:

To the President of the United States and to our Representatives and Senators in Congress:

We, voters, veterans of the armed forces, businessmen, farmers, professional men, salary and wage earners of the town of North Andover, Mass., petition you, the President of the United States, and our Representatives and Senators in Congress to use your abilities and your powers of office to provide for the fair distribution of Government surplus property, to the end that it may come as directly and inexpensively as possible into the hands of citizens desiring to obtain it.

It is needless here to go into the great variety and amount of this property, or to go into the manifold purposes it will serve if it is obtainable by our citizenry, our small organizations and local governments. That it is not so obtainable at present is hardly open to debate. Nor is it more open to debate that we are being kept in the dark as to what is being done with this property. All too well, however, we know that it is being purposefully withheld from us, and that large amounts of it are being wantonly destroyed. This destruction we regard as criminal.

We remark that vast amounts of material and apparatus could be produced while millions of our able-bodied men and women were not engaged in the production, but were in the armed services of our country; that it could be assembled, transported overseas even while ships for the transportation were being built, and effectively put to its intended purpose in the destruction of the personnel and the goods of the enemy. Well we know that the skillful and powerful enemy opposed all of this.

We observe that material and apparatus for our purposes as peaceful citizens is now in no such way available to us. On the contrary, it is plain that even the left-overs of conflict are being withheld from peaceful use and are being destroyed to prevent us from ever obtaining them. We are bitter and our spirit is becoming rebellious. We say to all in positions of power who are responsible for this or who sit approvingly or idly by: Learn the history of our people and of the origin of our National Government, learn it, and mark it well.

If this is our Government, it will serve our interest and our desire in this as it should in all things. It will not be led and it will not be misled by any isms. It will do what we want.

Respectfully yours,

CITIZENS OF NORTH ANDOVER, MASS.

UNO Must Face the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Evening Star. This writer points out clearly the necessity for UNO to face facts realistically and not base its actions upon pure assumptions which are contrary to facts.

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Sooner or later we shall have to force our minds away from the empty slogans that are passing for thinking.

We have based all our hopes for peace on UNO. Yet every meeting produces a fresh crisis and an insoluble dilemma. Each issue is argued pro and con in a world-wide press and radio war of nerves, but we do not face the reality, seen in advance by some sober but unlistened-to critics, that these crises are inevitable. They are in the nature of the so-called peace structure of UNO itself, which has taken on the sanctity of a fetish. If an organization is based on the sands of false assumptions, it will not work, no matter how great an Elijah chorus chants its praise, anymore than an improperly constructed engine will run by verbal exhortation.

The main assumption of the San Francisco Charter was that three great powers, one of them embodying a totally different concept of civilization from the others, can remain "united" without putting their sovereign interests in obedience to a clearly established law of nations. For this assumption there is no basis in reason or historical experience. No alliance of great powers has ever endured except as a defense against actual or potential enemies. The enemy is the only cement.

The second assumption was that these particular great powers are "peace-loving." For this there is neither historical nor relational evidence. A generation ago, imperial Russia played a major role in provoking the World War, according at least to the documents published by its revolutionary heir, the Soviet Union. The entire Communist philosophy is based on war—on the struggle for power. And no one can forsee what circumstances and movements within any country may change it, at any time, from a pacifist to a belligerent and expansionist frame of mind.

The third assumption was that all three powers were satisfied by and large with the prewar status quo and the equilibrium of power relations among themselves. That was from the beginning, a pure wish-dream with no foundation even in probability.

The destruction of the power of the mighty Axis and its satellites and the failure to reconstitute that world in a manner that would neutralize their assets, opened an epochal opportunity for adding the assets to one or the other of the Allies. When a rich man dies without a will, has there ever been "unity" among the contending heirs?

A world order capable of preserving civilization can only be created on the basis of obedience to universal law, clearly defined, to which every issue is referred, and with organs of adjudication and enforcement, not of peace, but of law. Otherwise, the most dynamic of the great powers will push for the elimination of the others to the one world of a single authority, extending itself by acquisition of the power assets of the defeated and the weak, to the point of war, or to the point where its rivals capitulate before an overwhelming consolidation of superior force.

There is no world order, because there is no law and no stakeholder, nor does UNO even create the mechanism for working in this direction. Mr. Gromyko acted before the Security Council like the representative of a "herrenvolk." He was caught in a lie, and he did not even attempt to make the concession to truth of trying to support the unveracity. He described as an existing understanding one he hopes to get if the rest of the world will grant his government time—and which it will get if the Iranian Government sees that it is only a pawn. Small countries have lost faith in the promises of western democracies. None again are going to close other exits on mere faith.

Now in the midst of such a struggle, absolutely inevitable in a totally lawless world, a report is released by the State Department to Congress urging the creation of a world-wide technological monopoly of atomic energy under this self-same, unreformed UNO. The monopoly would build nuclear fission plants around the world, to offset those in the United States of America. It would take over ownership of our atomic plants and operate them with persons who "would rise above national affinities"—like the members of the international Soviet party, perhaps.

The controllers of such a monopoly would be the dictators of the world. The struggle for power, exemplified in this session of UNO would then, of course, center in a struggle for the control of the monopoly of the instruments of life and death, for human civilizations. Every life in the world and all the freedoms of civilizations would depend on that monopoly being in the hands, not of normal human beings, but of gods.

We shall not escape reality by thus trying to turn a nightmare into an Elysian daydream. Wisdom begins with facing the facts, the first of which is that UNO is a house built on the shifting sands of impetuous, childish assumptions.

United States Policy Throws Farm Price Out of Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Dairyland News, Lake Mills, Wis.:

This country is now going through what has been called a controlled inflation. Wages first, then prices, will rise. Unquestionably the cost of farm production will increase.

The country's chief need, practically everyone is agreed, is production. If wage and price increase are necessary to induce pro-

duction, then these increases will be permitted, within the framework of a certain amount of Government control, to prevent a runaway inflation.

It is argued that the wiser course is to allow some price increases in the interests of production, rather than hold to a rigid price policy which would discourage production.

This will mean that farm returns will have to be increased along with wages and the prices of things farmers buy. As long as farm products are in strong demand, farmers are assured of good incomes, even though OPA ceilings are maintained. If farm prices are not allowed to rise, then subsidies will be increased sufficiently to induce needed production.

It is here that the inequity arises in the treatment of agriculture as compared with the rest of the economy. The present tendency is to keep farm prices at present levels while other prices are allowed a controlled rise, with farm subsidies to take care of the necessary increases in returns to agriculture.

The danger in this policy is fairly obvious. If we forget subsidies, as the consumer is apt to do, a growing unbalance between prices of farm products and other prices is apparent. The market price received by a farmer for a hundredweight of milk will buy less and less. This may not worry the farmer as long as the Government is willing to supplement his milk check enough to keep his income in balance. To the consumer, however, the false price standard becomes normal.

If and when subsidies cease to be paid this fictitious standard of food prices will have become established in the buying habits of consumers. When consumer income declines, food prices will be expected to decline correspondingly, despite the fact that they never increased commensurately with consumer incomes.

The relationship, for example, between the price a farmer receives for his hundredweight of milk and the price he pays for a pair of shoes will have been distorted. Without the subsidy, he can't buy the shoes.

The Government's present price policy cannot fail to wreck any reasonable exchange ratio between farm products and industrial products. A program of allowing industrial prices to rise while holding farm prices down will not work a hardship on farmers as long as the Government makes up their losses. But while this program is being pursued we are building up to a farm problem at least as serious as that of the early 1930's, when an unbalanced price structure nearly wrecked American agriculture.

The La Follette-Monroney Committee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, whether or not we agree with the recommendations found in the report of the Joint Special Committee to Organize the Congress, we must congratulate the members of the committee for their persistence over the long months they have held sessions, as well as on the fact that, while all those who signed the report were not in accord with each and every recommendation, they had the courage and good judgment to submit the matters to the consideration of Congress.

Senator LA FOLLETTE and his cochairman, MONRONEY, had able assistants. Every member of the committee, both by experience and training, was especially well qualified to contribute something very much worth while to the consideration given the evidence adduced at the hearings.

In this connection and in extension of my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Burlington Press, of Burlington, Vt., of date March 23, 1946, as follows:

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

Cumbersome legislative practices, a superabundance of committees and other outmoded furniture which clutters up the legislative production line in Washington, will be cleared away if the proposals of a special committee are adopted. This committee, known as the La Follette-Monroney Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and including Representatives Charles A. Plumley, of Vermont, has been working on the proposed plan for a year and is now ready to push it in both branches of Congress. The report of the committee was submitted early in March.

Congressman MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, vice chairman of the joint committee, outlined the main features of the plan before the New England Council quarterly meeting in Providence yesterday. He declared that reorganization of Congress is the most important problem facing the Government if our system of representative democracy is to be preserved.

Discussing the 37-point modernization program presented by the joint committee, MONRONEY said that the alternative to congressional reorganization is "surrender to executive government, where only one man, the President, out of 3,000,000 Federal officials and employees, is elected by the people or is responsible directly to them."

The most important recommendation, according to MONRONEY, is that to consolidate the existing 81 overlapping and duplicating committees of the House and Senate into 34 coordinated and related groups. It is recommended that the House committees be reduced from 48 to 18, and those of the Senate from 33 to 16; also that Representatives be limited to one committee assignment and Senators to two.

The improved staffing of these committees is also included in the plan, which recommends the employment of four high-level technical experts for each reorganized committee on a nonpolitical basis. It is further proposed that a well-qualified executive assistant be employed for each Member of Congress in order to relieve him of his tremendous nonlegislative burden. The report stated that a Member of Congress now spends 80 percent of his time in performing errands and chores for the people in his home district.

MONRONEY declared that one of the strongest recommendations in the report is that dealing with strengthening the fiscal control of the Government. He noted that under the present system, appropriating committees spend without any reference to our contact with the revenue raising committees. He added: "At least 50 percent of the work of Congress should be in the powers to control the fiscal affairs of the Nation."

Another important proposal of the reorganization plan would create minority and majority policy committees in both HOUSES to accept and carry out party responsibility for the enactment of legislation pledged in the party platform. The majority committees would also serve as a joint legislative-executive council to facilitate the formulation of joint national policy with the executive department.

An increase in the pay of Congressmen from $10,000 to $15,000 a year is recommended by the committee. "You'll only get what you pay for," MONRONEY declared, "and even government can't possibly expect to attract the ability needed in Congress today for less than the going rate in other lines."

Other recommendations in the committee's report include self-rule for the District of Columbia, registration by all lobbies of their total membership and expenses, the inclusion of Congress into a Federal retirement system, and physical improvements to the Capitol.

This report, which Representative PLUMLEY had a part in preparing, was approved by the Washington Post as follows: "Taken as a whole, it emanates the spirit of progressive, twentieth century democracy. It is probably the most comprehensive plan that has ever been devised to make our system of divided powers function smoothly in an era of colossal governmental responsibilities."

Let us hope the report gets speedy attention by Congress.

An Impression That Needs To Be Corrected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the March 30 issue of the Banker and Tradesman:

AN IMPRESSION THAT NEEDS TO BE CORRECTED

Articles have been appearing in some of the daily papers lately which would tend to give the headline-reading public (and a lot of people do not read much beyond the headlines) the impression that there is a sort of general conspiracy to gyp the home-hungry, home-seeking veterans by charging outrageous prices for existing homes and by manipulating appraisals so as to support these prices. Unfortunately this sort of headlining, based solely on the very rare exception and not on the very general rule, is meat and drink to the bureaucrats in Washington who are trying so hard to discredit the whole private real-estate, building, and mortgage industries, whereas it is perfectly obvious that it is the poor administration of controls which is holding in check the building boom which would solve the whole problem of present high prices if it could get under way.

The truth of the matter is—and we can speak with definite knowledge—the real estate, building, and mortgaging interests in New England are deeply concerned about the home-finding problem of the returning veteran, and are working hard, not only to protect the veteran from exploitation but also to get the authorities in Washington to quit experimenting with the situation and make it possible for private industry to build the thousands of homes these boys need, and at prices they can afford.

There may be instances where veterans have been "stuck," for no industry is wholly free from conscienceless rascals, but these instances are rare indeed, and to headline them, as has been done lately, is to give the public a wholly erroneous impression. Also there are instances—and we have heard of them—where returning veterans have insisted on paying exorbitant prices, against the advice of real-estate men and bankers, because they had the money and want that particular house and want it now.

Some of the stories printed lately predict a flood of foreclosures to follow the present

high-price buying. We do not share that fear, nor do the bankers who are making the loans. The average buyer of a home today is far more concerned with the cost per month than he is with the total cost. Many loans will run for a long term of years. Barring some national or international catastrophe, this country should enjoy several years of a high rate of employment at good wages. Also it will take several years for new building to make an appreciable dent in the demand. During those years, with steady amortization, the owners who are buying today on a reasonable cost-per-month basis will have accumulated enough of an equity in their properties to induce most of them to hang on. There should be no abnormal flood of foreclosures.

So let's gets this straight: private real estate, building, and mortgaging interests are doing their utmost, and will continue to do their utmost, on behalf of the veterans to whom we all owe so much. The battle which they are waging in Washington for the rationalization of controls, so as to promote rather than discourage new building, is being waged with full confidence that private real estate, building, and mortgaging interests can do far more for the veteran than stubborn, bureaucratic controls can.

Address of Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, leave having been granted, I offer for printing in the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, with a foreword by the distinguished attorney, George Gordon Battle, of New York. Mrs. Wiley's address was delivered before the Berks County, Pa., Federation of Women's Clubs. Mrs. Wiley is chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, and is widely known and nationally recognized as one of the leading women of the country. The subject discussed was the equal rights amendment, which has been reported favorably by both Houses and is now on their calendars.

FOREWORD TO THE SPEECH OF MRS. WILEY BY GEORGE GORDON BATTLE

Beyond any doubt, the equal-rights amendment is one of the most important matters now under consideration by the Government and the people of this country. When the right to vote was given to our women citizens by the nineteenth amendment enacted in 1920, very many of those who were interested in this cause believed that nothing further need be done. They were convinced that the power of the ballot in the hands of our American women would adequately implement their determination to secure full equality of rights. This belief, however, was shown by experience to be wholly mistaken. A number of State statutes and of State and Federal court decisions, subsequent to the nineteenth amendment, have perpetuated many and grievous discriminations which still exist. These inequalities are hostile to the whole spirit of our country and its institutions. For many years I have been deeply interested in this question. I have followed, and to some extent participated in the efforts of the National Woman's Party and the other great national organizations of women which are now supporting the amendment, and can speak, therefore, with personal knowledge when I say that, in my opinion, it is now conclusively established that complete equality of rights under the law for men and women can be secured only by an amendment to our Federal Constitution; and that the equal-rights amendment is sufficient and appropriate for that purpose.

Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of the department of legislation of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, shows clearly and unmistakably that a Federal amendment is necessary, and that the equal-rights amendment covers the ground.

As I have indicated, this is a matter of very great national importance, and her address should be brought to the attention of our Federal Legislature, and to the officials who will have to deal with the various processes leading up to the enactment of the amendment.

All those who are concerned with this matter, so vital to our liberties, will do well to study and consider the relevant facts and law as set forth by Mrs. Wiley.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs)

It is a great honor to be here today, to speak to this important group of women on the importance of the equal-rights amendment and the necessity for its adoption.

In preparing this talk I have had great assistance from Mrs. Helena Hill Weed, research chairman of the National Woman's Party, who, like myself, has been working for more than 35 years in the novement for the civil and political emancipation of women. She holds the bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees from Vassar and has done postgraduate work in law and economics in several universities in this country and abroad.

Today, November 2, we commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of that day when women cast their first vote in a Presidential election. * * * Many of us who are working for the equal-rights amendment to complete the emancipation of women went through the last 8 hectic years of the struggle for enfranchisement. Many of us, including Mrs. Weed and myself, were sent to prison at that time because we walked in front of the White House carrying banners reading:

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

And—

"How long must women wait for liberty?"

But we won our struggle, which shows that if a principle is right, if people have faith, and work hard enough, they win.

But we soon learned, from court decisions, that when women were given the right to vote they acquired no other rights under the Constitution which English women of 1789 did not have. The equal-rights amendment would have the effect of writing the phrase "including women" beside all the other guaranties of liberty in our Constitution, thus compelling the courts to apply the principle of equality to all cases involving fundamental human rights.

When the attitude of the courts toward the effect of the enfranchisement of women on other constitutional rights was learned, the National Woman's Party set out to remedy the situation. First, under the direction of Burnita Shelton Matthews, attorney, it made an exhaustive 2-year study of the legal status of women under State and Federal laws, and found more than 1,000 discriminations against women in constitutions, statutes, and court decisions. Acting on the advice of some of the best constitutional lawyers in the country, it then drafted and secured the introduction into Congress of the equal-rights amendment, to complete the work which most people supposed was accomplished by the suffrage amendment.

In 1928, the Inter-American Commission of Women, at the direction of the Fifth Pan American Conference, began a 5-year study of all the laws of the 21 American Republics affecting the civil and political liberties of women, showing which laws were equal and which were unequal. This work was directed by Doris Stevens, chairman of the Commission.

In 1936, the study of the laws of the United States section was brought up to date by Dr. Emma Wold, attorney, and was published as Senate Document No. 270. The digest published by the Commission was the first such digest ever made, and it is now a part of every important law library in the world. The revised United States section is an authoritative and monumental work on the legal status of women in the United States.

* * * * *

The injustices against women still found in the body of American law are of two kinds. One is derived from the English common law and the other is the result of the so-called protective legislation for women only, which has arisen during the last 50 years.

EXTENT OF DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST WOMEN

The common law disabilities are the older of the two and in a way have furnished the authority for the later legislation. They have perpetuated the mental and legal attitude which made the protective legislation seem natural and right to certain groups, when the occasion for it arose.

TEXT OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The text of the amendment now before Congress reads as follows:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 3 years after date of ratification."

At first the National Woman's Party stood alone in asking for this amendment, but as the years passed and women came to understand better their unequal status as citizens, one organization after another has joined in the demand, until now 30 of the most important organizations of women, representing every group of society, are marching under the equal-rights banner.

Every organized group of women, as a matter of fact, urges the necessity for equality of fundamental human rights for men and women; the only difference is the question of method. * * *

We believe that equality of rights under the law for men and women should be secured by constitutional amendment, the accepted American method of establishing fundamental principles: (1) Because the United States Constitution is the place for fundamental principles. It is where all equality is guaranteed. * * * (2) Because of permanency. There is no permanency with State laws. To establish equal rights permanently the principle must be written into the National Constitution; as what one State legislature grants, the next can take away. * * * (3) Because a constitutional amendment would prevent new discriminations against women from being made in the future, whereas a discrimination removed by State action can be reestablished by the very next State legislature.

To leave all women as they are now, outside the protection of the Federal Constitution, and to keep all women under the bondage of the common law in order to enact special legislation based on sex, leaves the State

legislatures free to enact any laws they choose on any subject with respect to all women, and leaves women with no legal right to demand the abolition of discriminations.

Supporters of the amendment also point out that without the recognition of the equality of rights of men and women citizens in the Constitution, State legislatures would be under no obligation to equalize their laws. On this point the Supreme Court has said:

"No law can be pronounced invalid for the reason simply that it violates our notions of justice, is oppressive and unfair in its operation, or because, in the opinion of some or all of the citizens of the State, it is not justified by public necessity or designed to promote the public welfare. We repeat, if it violates no constitutional provision, it is valid and must be obeyed."

And in the case of Munn versus Illinois, it is stated:

"The law itself, as a rule of conduct, may be changed at the will, or even the whim, of the legislature, unless prevented by constitutional limitations."

THE FIRST COURT DECISION DENYING EQUALITY TO WOMEN

The first test case in the Supreme Court on the right of women to the protection of the Constitution, so far as civil liberty was concerned, was the Myra Bradwell case, in 1872, when she demanded the right to practice law in the State of Illinois. She had passed the bar examinations of Illinois, but she had to obtain a formal license to practice, by application to the judges of the Supreme Court of Illinois. Mrs. Bradwell applied and was refused. She was not a "person" because she was a married woman! As a married woman, the court said, Mrs. Bradwell could not make a contract, and, "even if the legislature did not exclude women from the practice of law, it must have intended to do so, because we adopted the common law of England and for a woman to have entered the courts of Westminster Hall, as a barrister, would have created hardly less astonishment than if she should be elected to the House of Commons." God and nature were called upon to witness that "it belonged to men to make, apply, and execute the laws."

The fourteenth amendment reads:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The Illinois Supreme Court completely ignored the equality provisions of the fourteenth amendment (which some opponents of the equal rights amendment claim is sufficient to guarantee equality to women citizens) whereupon Mrs. Bradwell took her case to the United States Supreme Court. That court, however, not only upheld the Illinois decision discriminating against women, but Mr. Justice Bradley solemnly declared that "the fourteenth amendment could not be set up to protect against unequal laws which were a barrier against the right of females to pursue any lawful employment for a livelihood," a right which he, in other decisions affecting men, had declared was a fundamental right of all persons.

That was the first time that the highest court in the land declared in effect that women were not "persons" in the eyes of the law. Ever since then, one judge after another, from the lowest courts to the highest, and administrative officers throughout the land have held that unless women are specifically included in the language of general laws they do not apply to women—although when it comes to burdens and penalties women are not excluded from the operation of general laws. It is only when rights and privileges are concerned that barriers are put up.

Let me repeat what I have already stated—a principle laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States is that "the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States is necessarily influenced by the fact that its provisions are framed in the language of the English common law and are to be read in the light of its history."

Now, under the English common law, the interpretation of the word "person" is male. But it is incompatible with the principles of justice in a true democracy that the word "person" applies only to males. The dictionary does not so define the word "person." My dictionary says: "A human being, an individual, man or woman," etc.

In May 1941, Judge Eugene O'Dunne of Baltimore held that a husband's right to sue for damages for loss of wife's services in case of her injury by another was based on the old theory that she was the husband's chattel. His decision read in part:

"In spite of the nineteenth amendment and the laws enfranchising women, is the wife not still slave under this branch of the law of torts? The whole doctrine of recovery for loss of wife's services is based on the barbarous doctrine that the wife is the husband's chattel. The only difference in recovering for loss of wife's services and for damages to an automobile is that one is the husband's inanimate chattel and the other is his human chattel."

In a third recent happening in 1942, the Comptroller General ruled that the law of September 22, 1941, permitting the President to commission "qualified persons" for medical service in the United States Army during the war emergency, did not apply to women doctors. In other words, women were not legal persons. To remedy this defect a special bill had to be passed permitting the Medical Departments of the Army and Navy to include "licensed female physicians and surgeons" for the duration and 6 months thereafter.

It has thus been established, without challenge, that women are not legal "persons," "citizens," or "people," and that married women are still the animate chattels of their husbands unless special laws have been enacted to remove their common-law disabilities.

DISCRIMINATORY LAWS INJURIOUS TO WOMEN

Although labor laws have been equalized in many States, and under Federal law, special labor laws for women only are still urged by some uninformed women and by many men who are in industrial competition with women. Let us discuss some of these to show that the amendment would not interfere with legitimate protective legislation.

Married women: In Massachusetts there is a 60-year-old ban on married women teachers, based on the charge that "working wives are a menace to the public health, morals, and general welfare." In March 1944, a Boston citizens' committee for teachers' rights pleaded in vain the case of a teacher in the second grade who was automatically compelled to resign upon her marriage to a private in the Army Air Forces.

Now this could not happen in Wisconsin where an equal-rights statute was passed in 1921. There the Civil Service Commission of Milwaukee ruled that married women were not eligible to take civil-service examinations. But after vigorous protests were made, backed up by the mayor and assistant city attorney, this ruling was revoked. A second instance occurred when two policewomen were informed that married women were barred from police service. The city officials again came to the rescue and stated that the equal-rights law would not permit discrimination against married women. This is a good illustration and demonstrates the protection which would be afforded to every married woman in the country, no matter in what State, if the principle of equality of rights between men and women, were written into the Federal Constitution.

In 1936, a Teacher's Tenure Act was passed in Pennsylvania which provided, among other things, that a woman could not be dismissed because she was married. This provision has always irritated certain districts, and I have been told that at almost every legislative session since someone has tried to weaken this act, especially this provision regarding married teachers. Teachers are not safe in Pennsylvania without the equal-rights amendment, unless they are continually on the firing line resisting attack. What would we have done during the war without the married teachers?

Hours of work: Some States limit by law the hours a woman may work and in some no overtime is permitted to women, which puts them at a severe disadvantage with men, who are legally allowed to work overtime.

The National Fair Labor Standards Act, passed in 1938 and upheld by the Supreme Court in 1941, provides an 8-hour day for men and women in interstate commerce, with provision for overtime at the rate of one and one-half of the regular pay. Also the Public Contracts Act provides the same standards in intrastate commerce in contracts of over $10,000 with the Government. Twenty-one million men and women workers were covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act in August 1944. The time has now come for State wage-hour laws to cover all workers. Union-management agreements (or contracts) and collective bargaining can take care of higher standards. President Roosevelt urged such State action immediately after the Federal law was enacted.

Minimum wage laws: In Connecticut, Oklahoma, and Hawaii these laws also apply to men. New York has just passed a law that a man shall not take a lower minimum than a woman. The amendment would require equal wage laws in all States.

Federal laws also guarantee equality for men and women with respect to minimum wages. The Fair Labor Standards Act and the Public Contracts Act now provide for a 40-cents-an-hour minimum wage. If we had sex equality in State wage-hour laws, as recommended by the Division of Labor Standards of the United States Department of Labor and upheld by the Trades Unionist in its issue of July 12, 1941, it would be infinitely better than pinning minimum wages on women only and enabling men to cut under and take the women's jobs away, at the same time reducing their own wages below decent standards.

Night work:

The prohibition of night work for women is generally for employment after 10 p. m. While regulation of night work has been applied to both men and women in such places as Norway, in 17 States of the Union it applies to women only. In Connecticut this provision has worked a hardship for women entertainers, musicians, and dancers, who have lost their employment because of this 10 o'clock curfew law.

Mollie Maloney, a member of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, writes: "We are urging Congress to pass the equal rights amendment so as to save women from such indignities and injustices as the no-night-work law. Congress has been misled by a lot of uplifters who do not know the facts. We women who are barred by law from earning our living after 10 o'clock at night are just as moral and well-behaved as nurses and telephone operators, who are allowed to work all night. It is all a lot of jealousy to keep women out of well-paid night jobs."

It is the belief of those of us who favor the equal-rights amendment that industrial laws like those mentioned, when applying to women and not to men, are among the gravest discriminations against women. They close many doors of opportunity to women seeking employment, while women thrown out of work by their passage are invariably

forced into harder, more poorly paid work for which they must compete with one another.

Legislation linking women with children, instead of with adults, began years ago in the transition stage of women's invasion of industry. Today, when women are a permanently established and increasingly important part of our economic life, justice requires that legislation concerning them be on the same basis as that for their male competitors. The equal-rights amendment would require that all these industrial laws be made to apply to men and women alike. The standards adopted would be left to the States. Legislation for minors should be on a wholly different basis. They are wards of the State—adult women are not.

For a long time we were told that it was unconstitutional to legislate for the wages and hours of men. It is true that in the past the courts have held that minimum wage and minimum hour legislation could not be enacted for men because men, but not women, were protected under the "due process" clause of the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. But in the decision in the Darby Lumber case, handed down in February 1941, the Supreme Court stated that "the wage and hour provisions of the statute are not objectionable because applied alike to both men and women."

But, say some of the legally uninformed people, the equal rights amendment would automatically abolish all legislation protecting women and would prevent the enactment of such laws in the future. This is a complete misapprehension as to the effects of the amendment, as has been stated by the Judiciary Committees of both the Senate and the House.

The amendment would not become operative until 3 years after its ratification, and all laws would remain as they are during those 3 years. During this period, however, all States would have the opportunity to bring their statutes within the principles of the amendment, each according to its own ideas of its social, industrial, and economic needs. The equality guaranteed to men now has never been interpreted to mean that police regulations affecting men had to be identical in all the States, and it would be the same if women enjoyed the equal protection of the law. It would require only that the differing legislation of the several States must apply equally to men and women in each State.

The equal rights amendment would not interfere in any way with the right of the States to exercise the police power of classification to protect the health, welfare, and morals of the community, except that the arbitrary, all-inclusive basis of sex could no longer be used as a basis of classification, in singling out those to be affected by a police regulation.

There are no protective laws for industrial workers which are not equally necessary for both sexes or which cannot be enacted under the right of the States to classify in the interests of the public welfare, health, or morals, provided the classification is not based on sex. Maternity laws, for example, are based on a condition, not on sex.

Now that the change in the social and economic status of women has become a reality, a corresponding change in the constitutional law must necessarily follow.

The passage of the equal-rights amendment will not bring about the millenium, but it will give us equality under the law. All we ask is legal equality. After that is secured inequality in customs and usages will steadily become extinct.

And what more appropriate time to confer such rights than the present. The perfecting of our democracy by recognition of all citizens as equal, with discrimination against none, will serve to preserve, defend, and protect national and international democracy.

The Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "World's No. 1 Power Plant Would Be Extra Benefit in Waterway Development," from the Chicago Sun of March 26 last, and an article entitled "Army Relies on Waterway To Strengthen Defense of Nation in Wartime," from the Chicago Sun of March 28 last.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of March 26, 1946]

WORLD'S NO. 1 POWER PLANT WOULD BE EXTRA BENEFIT IN WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT

(By Eugene Rachlis)

WASHINGTON.—There are 2,350 miles of waterway between Duluth, Minn., and Belle Isle, near Newfoundland, where the Atlantic Ocean and the St. Lawrence River meet.

But few oceangoing vessels can travel between those two points. For 119 miles of this distance—about 5 percent of it—contains obstructions which keep all but shallow-draft oceangoing vessels out.

Those obstructions do not affect Duluth alone. Chicago, Detroit, and Milwaukee also are on the Great Lakes. They, too, will see few oceangoing ships being filled with Midwestern produce unless the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which has as one of its objectives the removal of the obstructions, is completed.

If Congress approves the project, the improvement of the channels would be the first order of business. Then there would be uninterrupted passage for ships from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes.

To do this, dams, locks, and canals must be constructed at the International Rapids, the Soulanges Rapids, and Lachine Rapids, all in the 119 miles between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal. The connecting canals then would be dredged.

Although on the surface this appears a difficult and arduous task, United States Army engineers have studied the problem extensively, and they say it can be done. Current estimates are that it will take from 4 to 6 years.

Included in the project is a secondary feature: the development of a hydroelectric power plant at the International Rapids section. In the building of the project it is proposed that a 92-foot drop in the water at this point be used to manufacture power.

When the power is harnessed it is estimated that some 13,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power will be generated. This would be divided equally between New York State and the Province of Ontario, providing cheap power for both.

The power project would generate more electricity per year than any other single power plant. For that reason New York State is intensely interested in the project and is pushing to get it passed by Congress.

In fact, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Republican candidate for President in 1944, has come out in favor of State development of the power project if the Federal Government doesn't approve it soon.

Proponents of the project argue that there are many corollary advantages that would be derived. First, in this transition period from war to peace, employment would be provided for many numbers of men.

Second, in the long-run economic picture, the benefits from greater shipping and cheaper power would benefit the Nation as a whole and not just the Midwest and upstate New York.

In addition, it is pointed out, one of the most expensive items on the American taxpayer's war budget could be utilized in peacetime and not be left to rot—the giant merchant fleet which carried war goods from the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf ports.

The United States Maritime Commission is on record in this respect. In its 1941 report to the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, the Commission said:

"When the present hostilities cease it will again be necessary to provide for the assimilation of an expanded merchant marine into the normal commerce of the country.

"Since the ships needed for naval and military auxiliaries in time of war or national emergency can only be maintained in normal times by absorption into the Nation's foreign and domestic commerce, it is evident that any opportunity to provide for the expansion of the use of merchant vessels in normal trades is worthy of serious consideration.

There can be little doubt but that the projected seaway would benefit ocean-going transportation in merchant vessels in both the foreign and domestic trades, since the seaway would open to such vessels thousands of miles of additional coastline and would permit them direct access to one of the most highly industrialized and agriculturally prolific regions in the United States.

The Commission recently made an analysis of the fleets of 30 of the principal countries of the world and found that there were, on September 30, 1945, some 2,354 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 5,191 within the 27-foot draft range. This would permit all those ships to pass through the proposed seaway. It is something most of they can't do now.

American ships are in a similar situation. On the same date, 763 of our vessels were within the 25-foot draft range and 1,173 were within the 27-foot range. Completion of the seaway would let these ships, flying the American flag, carry goods on waters now forbidden to most of them by nature.

With these figures among the more forceful points to be made in favor of the navigation end of the project, proponents have some equally potent arguments in favor of the power end of it.

In the area which would be served by the power plant, it is estimated that the average cost of power to farm and residential consumers would be reduced some 64 percent and the cost to commercial and industrial consumers by 25 percent. The New York State Power Authority has estimated that savings to all types of consumers would run about $25,000,000 a year.

The St. Lawrence power project frequently is compared with the Tennessee Valley Authority, which provides cheap power for the residents in the Tennessee Valley and proved so valuable a weapon during the war. The St. Lawrence, proponents say, would be TVA with added advantages.

[From the Chicago Sun of March 28, 1946]

ARMY RELIES ON WATERWAY TO STRENGTHEN DEFENSE OF NATION IN WARTIME

(By Eugene Rachlis)

WASHINGTON.—The one argument in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project that its opponents find difficult to bat down is that it would be of inestimable value to the national defense.

While this generally is considered a side advantage to the project—its main two being an open waterway from the Midwest Great Lakes ports to the sea and public power for

the Northeastern States—it is one that the Army engineers emphasize.

Both the navigation and power aspects would be of tremendous value in time of war, the engineers point out.

As for power, they suggest a look at the record the Tennessee Valley Authority made for itself before the war.

As for navigation, another outlet to the sea to supplement the tonnage carried from the eastern, western, and Gulf ports always would be welcome.

About the best argument that the opposition can give as to why the project would have no value as a defense measure is the simple fact that an atomic bomb or two could wipe it out. Since this argument holds for almost everything else, the argument is not being taken too seriously.

On all other phases of the St. Lawrence project, however, the opposition has lined up cogent arguments. Those who favor it come back with just as cogent answers. And there the matter rests until Congress, this session or next, decides to resolve it one way or the other.

For instance, opponents charge that the navigation conditions on the St. Lawrence River are so hazardous that shipowners might not risk sending their vessels on it. Proponents of the project come back with the statement that construction of the seaway would have the effect of improving the river by enlarging existing channels.

They cite a pertinent quote from a letter sent by Robert Dollar, founder of the Dollar Steamship Lines, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee some time ago. Dollar said:

"Ships will certainly go to the Lakes for cargo; in fact ships will go anywhere and everywhere to get cargoes. We have big oceangoing steamers running 1,000 miles up the Yangtze River, where the current is very swift and navigation quite difficult, far more difficult than it would be going to Lake Superior from Montreal.

"When the canal is finished, there is no more reason for doubting that ships will go from the ocean to the Great Lakes than there is that ships will go to any port on the Atlantic seaboard."

Opponents of the project cite with glee the undeniable fact that for nearly 5 months every winter the seaway would have to be closed to shipping because of ice.

Although this is admitted freely, the proponents come right back with the equally undeniable fact that the 7 months during which the seaway would be open are the most important months of the year for shipping.

During those 7 months—May to December—other transport facilities are loaded. Those are the months when farmers will be shipping their crops.

And with the seaway to help carry the load, the United States will have an integrated transportation system.

The St. Mary's Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., also is icebound during those five winter months. But it moves during the other 7 months more tonnage than the Panama and Suez Canals do during the whole year.

The coal people—both management and labor—are opposed to the project. They don't like the power plant and they don't like the seaway. The first because it would develop electric power in regions which now use coal, and second because they fear importation of coal from England would be a competitive factor in both the United States and Canada.

Again the figures refute these arguments. American coal is produced cheaper than British coal and cannot be undersold, statistics show. As for the power argument, it is one that coal producers have brought up during every fight on electric versus steam power. They did it during the TVA fight.

But this is what the figures show. From 1934 to 1940, the amount of coal used in the area served by TVA increased 250 percent. The increase in the United States as a whole was 59 percent.

There is the railroad argument. The railroad brotherhoods and railroad management contend that they would lose business to the seaway project. But this is what the seaway people say:

Cheaper water transportation would stimulate the shipment of some products, which, because of high rail rates, are not now shipped. They would represent a net increase in railroad traffic. That is what happened at the Panama Canal.

The opposition to the project which really hurts comes from cities like Boston, New York, Philadelphia, New Orleans, and Baltimore.

These cities have ports and therefore fear the competition of cities like Chicago, Detroit, and Duluth as ports. They also have large representations in the House of Representatives.

The chambers of commerce and the port authorities of those eastern cities maintain—and let their Congressmen know that they maintain—that they would lose plenty of foreign trade.

Seaway proponents see some loss of foreign trade to eastern ports, but also say that it would be more than made up by the direct all-water shipping that will come from the Midwest to the eastern ports.

These eastern cities now get their Midwest goods through rail transport. If the project is completed they will get much more goods than now—and through their port facilities. The argument has not penetrated yet, however, and many Congressmen from the big eastern cities are likely to vote against the St. Lawrence seaway.

These are the main arguments continually leveled at those who favor the project. They have been presented off and on for as long as the seaway was thought about. That, at present count, has been some 50 years.

And they will be advanced again with as much force as always as the House and Senate once again begin the seemingly eternal wrangle over United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Archaic Government" published in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., on March 16, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHAIC GOVERNMENT

We laugh at Britain's slavishness to tradition yet we attempt to operate the most complex government on earth with a mechanism that was out of date half a century ago.

But at least Congress is beginning to awaken to the fact that many changes are due, as evidenced by the following statement representing the conclusion of a joint committee of its own Members: "A new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. The time is ripe for Congress to reconsider its role in the American scheme of government and to modernize its organization and procedures."

Brave words, if only the majority of Congress can be prevailed upon to see it that way. However, after a year's study, the committee made these recommendations:

That the Senate's 33 standing committees be consolidated into 16, the House's 48 to 18, and that Congress cease creating special investigating committees.

That one suggestion alone, if adopted, could bring a tremendous change in Congress. As every constituent of every lawmaker knows, or should know, the entire time of most of the Members could be taken up in attending committee meetings and looking after the "boys up the creek."

But let's continue with the suggestions:

That the reconstituted committees be staffed with specialists and experts, and that Members' offices be provided with such assistants.

That Congress be relieved of much of the Members' work load by giving self-rule to the District of Columbia and by shifting from Congress of the Federal courts and the Court of Claims the settlement of the innumerable private claims filed against the Government every year.

Also proposed was an intricate program for the formulation of the annual budget, a big job but one that is possible.

Such needed reforms are obvious.

Division of Palestine

REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Members of this House how they would react to a suggestion that the United States be divided at the Mississippi, that separate and independent sovereignties be established east and west of it. I think there is no doubt as to what the reaction would be. The Mississippi is not a boundary, not a moat which separates and divides us; it is our main artery, through which much of the life of our great Nation flows from all its parts, east and west. The Father of Waters is, furthermore, the center of much of our great tradition, renowned and revered in our memories of the great heritage of this Nation. From Pere Marquette to Tom Sawyer, to the people who live along its banks today the Mississippi is America.

Many nations are thus intimately associated with one river, with one channel for their commerce, with one source of their inspiration. Just to mention the Thames, the Yangtze, the Volga, the Amazon is to indicate the absurdity of attempting to use those rivers as boundaries between nations, of saying to one bank that it is different from and alien to the other bank.

Yet there is one river, gentlemen, a small river, in a small country, which

flows more intimately through the history, the geography, and the traditions of its land than does any of the others I have mentioned. Indeed, it flows through the traditions of the whole of the civilized world. The river is the Jordan, and its country is Palestine. From Moses, to Jesus, to the present day, they have never been separated. Never, until just recently, have men ever entertained the slightest notion of splitting Palestine at the Jordan. Neither the east nor the west of that country could survive without it. Its traditions and its future would be profaned by such an act.

Now, Great Britain, a power thousands of miles from Palestine, holding it not as a possession, but as a sacred trust for civilization, has, for reasons of some obscure and suspect policy, dared to sunder what God has made a Holy Land. By treaty with the autocratic and feudal Emir Abdullah, she has proclaimed Trans-Jordan, that part of Palestine lying east of the Jordan River, an independent state.

Regardless of the fact that this independent state will be maintained by British troops—also by treaty; regardless of the fact that this area is the most backward of all Palestine, poverty stricken, illiterate, disease-ridden, and unable to maintain itself; regardless, for the moment, even of the traditions which bind it to the rest of the country, this spurious move comes very close to being a deliberate slap in the face of our own great Nation.

We expressed our interest in the inviolability of the Holy Land long ago, and Great Britain herself promised, in the treaty of 1924, not to change its status under the mandate without the approval of the Government of the United States. To my knowledge that approval has not been granted. I strongly urge this House to censure this unwarranted division of Palestine, and commend the American people to keen watchfulness as to the ultimate disposition of that country and the attitude taken by our State Department.

The Housing Problem

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago at the Jackson Day dinner in Washington a lady of great talent sang a very lovely sentimental song. She has, no doubt, unwittingly given to the Democratic Party a campaign song—one more expressive than that of 14 years ago. The bankground was perfect. The party leaders were adjusting their tempo and sounding their A's for the coming congressional campaign, and the lady sang "Too late to worry, too late to cry."

The President, according to the press report, turned away from his prepared text and stated:

> My friends in Congress have got to make up their minds whether they are going to fight for the veterans' rights or bow to the real-estate lobby.

The report does not state whether the song inspired the speakers or the speakers inspired the song, but in any case, we commend the lady upon her timely selection.

In the brief period I have today it is my intention to further discuss the housing problem.

While discussing why the housing shortage prevails may not serve any useful purpose in expediting construction, it becomes of great importance because the same people who are responsible for the existing chaotic condition are seeking exoneration from their guilt by covering up through new legislation. This administration is on a hot seat and they want off very, very much indeed.

It is evident that the public, especially the veteran, is becoming very much perturbed and they are beginning to ask questions and are expecting explanations which to date are not forthcoming. They know that houses are built with labor, lumber, brick, and metal, and not by any hula-hula routine on the part of Federal bureaus, and they are not going to be laughed off in this instance.

The administration has invited strikes and discord between management and labor and has sponsored scarcity of civilian merchandise. When they state that wages can go up 30 percent without increasing prices, they find themselves in this situation. If they are correct in this statement, then they are guilty of criminal negligence in permitting the condition to prevail through the period of war production. If the proposal is not economically sound, they are in turn guilty of contributing to strikes, labor-management turmoil, diminishing production, and driving scarce commodities into the black market.

To say that the real-estate lobby is influencing the acts of Congress is a pure fabrication and cannot be substantiated; and to say that those who are in opposition to the Presidential proposal do not want the veteran housed, is a low bit of demogoguery that ill becomes the leadership of any political party.

There is a general feeling that the administration is dodging the issue and is shadow-boxing to cover up past mistakes. The true picture of the housing bill has not been presented in proper fashion to the public.

The veteran is in for a verbal pounding if present activities are an indication. He has the political demagogue on the one hand bidding for votes and political support, and on the other hand he has the veteran organizations bidding for membership by trying to outdo their competitors in advocating programs which apparently have appeal for the veteran.

It has been my pleasure to know and converse with great numbers of the veterans of World War II. By and large I find them intelligent, alert, and eager to adjust themselves to the problem that confronts them. They no doubt will find the leadership they so richly deserve—a leadership that will point the way realistically and courageously to the rich rewards that this great free America holds for them. This is the type of leadership I believe they will insist upon.

It is to be hoped that men in sufficient numbers in public and private life will have the interest and courage, without selfishness or partisan bias, to counsel them frankly and honestly and help dispel the political fog that engulfs most of our problems today.

The people cannot understand why billions of feet of lumber have been exported while we are unable to buy a house pattern. Visitors from Mexico inform us that yards there are stacked sky high with American lumber. The veteran cannot understand why our Government since January 1, 1946, has shipped to France 8,111 housing units at $885 each—units that cost our Government $1,589. Why weren't these houses made available to the American veteran?

George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, a few days ago assailed President Truman and two other top administration leaders for ineptitude and bureaucratic confusion in wage control in wartime and reconversion and further he stated: "Wage regulations have been issued to a confused public at the rate of one set every 60 days and there is no sign that this flood will subside."

What has happened to the veteran upon his return home—to use a common expression—should not happen to a dog. The millions of young Americans—most of them from 18 to 21 years of age—were taken away from their schools and from work to serve in the military forces of our country. After 2, 3 and 4 years' service they returned to civilian life and found that this administration has failed in every particular to make any preparation for their return even though they were continually warned by the farmer, the builders and supply men and industry and commerce in general that Government policy as brought about by regulations through governmental bureaus, particularly the OPA, was retarding reconversion, preventing the manufacture of needed merchandise, automobiles, building materials, and so forth.

Now industrial paralysis and chaos is upon us and the administration is busying around like mad in an effort to get out from under an avalanche of public indignation. Hence, they bring forth the housing bill.

The whole price picture is out of gear. The mistakes have been tragic. Unprejudiced minds advised the President in the beginning how to prevent inflation by a real wage-price control but the President punctured his control set-up so that it became a sieve with the resultant prices of today and unending wage disputes. Sound and unbiased advice was not followed simply because the administration wanted to play political economics—wanted to get the votes of pressure groups

rather than to accomplish its announced objectives. The same philosophy, the same group of New Deal manipulators are at the helm of the housing proposal. Everyone is aware of the acute housing shortage but it cannot be remedied by the wave of a magic wand.

Considering the situation today, we have the raw materials, all the manufacturing and fabricating plants, and all the labor of the building trades, and the President, through his authority under the War Powers Act, has had the power to adjust prices, allot materials, and grant priorities. Yet, after 8 months since VJ-day, we have no construction, all because of the simple fact that our managers lack the courage to approach the problems realistically.

The Price Administrator is supposed to be an expediter. His business is to promote production, but he has operated in reverse. We have controls but no butter, no shirts or pajamas; and, likewise, we have not constructed houses. There is no assurance that another expediter, providing he has ability, would be permitted to exercise good judgment.

Anyone who has experienced for the past 4 years the necessity of going to a Government bureau for the approval of every transaction would be apprehensive about the proposed housing legislation. It is my sincere and considered opinion that the President's proposal would not build a single house. On the contrary, it would act as a deterrent to the building business because of the fact no one would have the patience or fortitude to wade through all the requirements and regulations. From the time you thought of buying a lot until the lock is on the door every act, every decision, practically every move of purchaser, builder, and seller would have to be approved by a Government agency.

Mr. Blandford, the National Housing Administrator, with a good record in Government service, was in line for the job of Housing Expediter, but it was decided that an artful political manipulator was needed, consequently they brought up the ex-mayor of Louisville, with a great record for planning and none of accomplishment—a man who had never built a house.

We should not be misguided by the publicity regarding prefabricated housing as being a new discovery. We already have prefabricating plants ready to operate but they are handicapped by the same bottlenecks—the lack of lumber and plumbing equipment.

The prefabricated housing which the Expediter seems to be impressed with and wants to provide with a guaranteed market should receive the very careful scrutiny of this Congress. If his theory prevails, hundreds of thousands of carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers, electricians, and other workmen, all of whom now earn their living building homes, would not have a job. In the meantime, thousands of other workers would have to be recruited from the already scarce ranks of labor and trained and taught new skills and new techniques to build house panels in Government factories.

It is my opinion the veteran, as well as other people, want standard construction and not glorified chicken houses. I believe the veteran would rather have a straight story than to be kidded.

Under conditions that exist today it is not possible to provide the homes we need. No amount of money appropriated by Congress can do it. Some houses will be built—not enough. The building industry is anxious to get going; an industry capable of producing a million—yes, a million and a half—homes a year. In 1925 the labor of the building trades and producers of building materials constructed the equivalent to 1,800,000 living units and if left alone they can do it again without any advice from a lawyer-politician.

Straight Down the Road to Statism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article prepared by Mr. Rogers C. Dunn of the Dunn Survey, Greenwich, Conn.:

STRAIGHT DOWN THE ROAD TO STATISM

Commencing in 1938, the reports of this survey have dealt largely with our findings that New Deal majorities in the five national elections from 1936 through 1944 came only through the use of a pay roll, or bought vote (WPA-Federal employees). And that as long as the New Deal can hold this vote, the technique for using it as a marginal vote is such as to give uncontestable control of Presidential and congressional elections. We have also emphasized that in each election the Democratic vote, excluding the pay-roll vote, was less than 40 percent of the total vote cast.

We have hammered on the relation of the pay-roll vote to elections not only because of the importance of national elections but equally because its full recognition is the necessary first step to revealing, and correcting, the far-reaching deceptions which are the foundation of New Deal power, and the cause of division and disintegration of organized opposition. In this report we touch on some of the key deceptions and results of the pay-roll vote.

FALSE MANDATES

Election majorities provided only by a pay-roll, or "bought," vote are not public endorsements of an administration's foreign, labor, farm, or any other acts and policies. This is a vital point for thought. It means that a majority of the American people have disapproved of the New Deal's program from 1936 through 1944. But leaders of the Republican Party, and others, have mistakenly accepted and promoted the idea that New Deal majorities have been public endorsements of its acts and policies.

This mistake hands the New Deal license to proceed with its program, and places democracy on a one-way street to statism.

A PHANTOM CONFLICT

Because the stewards of the Republican Party have been mistaken as to the cause of New Deal majorities, they are engaged in a conflict between those who believe the party must become "liberal" to win elections and those who believe it must stand as the conservative party. This has brought compromise, the "me, too" candidates, and left the party without character or public respect.

This is not the result of a struggle between two principles, as it may appear. It is the result of a conflict over political methods. Whether to stand and fight the New Deal, or to be expedient and coast along with the election "mandate" until the New Deal falls of its own hand.

Both liberals and conservatives appear to believe the view of the other has been tested and failed at the polls. Neither group has awakened to the fact that its view, or the view of the other, will continue to appear to be rejected at the polls, as long as a pay-roll vote provides New Deal majorities.

This is the conflict, a phantom conflict, which has reduced the Republican Party, and the two-party system of government, to little more than paper and hope.

Republican leaders have yet to face the pay-roll vote as the primary factor standing between victory or defeat at the polls. When they do, they will find that ever since 1936 a majority of the people have opposed the acts and policies of the New Deal and wishes to restore the American conception of government. They will find that they, the leaders, have unwittingly deserted their opportunity, and responsibility, to fight for the views of a majority of the American people. With this vista the Republican Party can again become a cohesive fighting organization.

PROPAGANDA

The pay-roll vote by providing a false endorsement of the acts and policies of the New Deal sets up the springboard for the New Deal propaganda machine.

Modern propaganda methods serve the purpose of controlling or distorting the appearance of public opinion on issues and topics of the day.

Renegotiation Does Not Allow Loss Carry-Back as a Cost Item

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the labor legislation recently approved by the House of Representatives, several references were made to the effect of the repeal of the excess-profits law on corporations where strikes were in progress. I have repeatedly stated that I do not believe in the financing of either side in a labor dispute by the United States Treasury and because I had just as definite a part in the institution of the Renegotiation Act as I had with the labor legislation, I asked the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board whether the Renegotiation Act, as it was interpreted, would permit a carry-back of losses incurred by reason of work stoppages. I am happy to say that I now have a letter from the Chairman of the

War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, stating that the Renegotiation Act contains a specific prohibition against the allowance of any amount as an item of cost by reason of the loss carry-back or carry-over. I shall place the letter in the RECORD, under the permission granted.

Free Prices Give a Maximum of Prosperity and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill, a Democratic Member of Congress from Indiana, 1930–38, now an author, radio speaker, and newspaper columnist, giving a common-sense analysis of the vital problem of free prices and full employment, which I believe states the case in a few words in such a way that the average citizen can understand it, as follows:

The difference between free prices and prices dictated by government is not hard to state.

Which gives a maximum of prosperity? That is the thing we are interested in.

The answer is: free prices. Why?

Here is the reason.

Producers always try to sell dear. Consumers always try to buy cheap.

This fundamental law of man's nature has not changed in thousands of years.

For example: every workingman (producer) tries to sell his labor at the highest price.

Every workingman's wife (consumer) tries to buy the products of other workingmen at the lowest price.

Do you find any fault with that statement? If not, read on.

When prices go down, that stimulates consumption, but discourages production.

When prices go up, that stimulates production, but discourages consumption.

For example: If new automobiles were priced by Government at $10 each, everyone would rush to buy, but no one would produce the automobiles for that price. But with none produced, depression follows.

If, on the other hand, new autos were priced by Government at $10,000 each, there would be a rush to produce them, but hardly anyone would buy them, and with few bought, few would be produced—also depression.

Now at what point would the most cars be both made and bought? If we find that point, we have the point of highest continuous prosperity and the most steady, well-paying jobs. The economists call this the point of equilibrium.

Buyers rush toward low prices (bargain counters); sellers rush toward high prices. In other words, as prices fall, people buy more goods, but fewer people are willing to produce. As prices rise, the people reduce their buying but production tends to increase.

For every commodity and for each day of the year, there is just one point where the production line and the consumption line freely cross each other and people freely trade, as at a public auction. Just one where goods (let us say a kitchen stove) are both made and sold at a price producer and consumer both agree on, let us say at $50 per stove. That is the point determined from day to day on a free market by the free choice and decision of thousands or millions of buyers and sellers, consumers and producers. It is at that point, and there only, that maximum production meshes in with maximum consumption—and jobs. This is economic democracy.

Whenever and wherever government, or industrial monopolies, or labor monopolies fix prices, rents, dividends, or wages, above or below that free market point, you have either a shortage of consumption or a surplus of production. You dam up the maximum flow of goods from producer to consumer, and you prevent full employment.

It must be self-evident that the millions of people themselves in a free market will judge more wisely than any Government bureaucrat what they will buy or make and how much and at what price. If this were not true, then it would follow that one man or a few men in a far-off Government office are wiser than you are as to what you will buy (or not buy) and at what price. You know what you want and can afford. No one else in the whole world knows that. Everyone else guesses.

Suppose Government put a floor under the price of a kitchen stove, say, at $75 a stove. Stove makers would (for a while) tend to make more stoves for the greater profit per stove, but people would hesitate to buy and would make the old stove "do," and soon the warehouses and stores would be full of unsold stoves, and men would be laid off at the factory.

On the other hand, suppose Government puts a ceiling price over stoves, at $25 a stove. People would rush to buy, but the stovemakers would lose money and so would soon stop making stoves. Again, men would be laid off at the factory.

Dictated prices always create either a surplus which consumers will not buy, or a shortage which producers will not supply. It is just that simple.

When Government attempts to force consumers to pay more than they freely would do, they will buy less. The consumers quit buying.

When Government attempts to force producers to sell at a lower price than they freely would do, they will produce less. The producers quit making.

The penalties for Government interference with the free market are absolutely inexorable, either in the field of economics, prosperity, and jobs, or in the field of human liberty and happiness. The only alternative is iron control over every aspect of a nation's life enforced by the gestapo and the concentration camp.

It is plain that at a free public auction, everything will be sold—no surplus.

In a free industrial market it must be plain also that someone will try to produce goods to satisfy every demand—no shortage.

If one producer charges too much and buying falls off, his competitor will charge less, or offer a better product, and take the market away from him.

A free market place is the most democratic thing free people can have. It is a continuous town meeting where every citizen votes every day with his or her dollars. His dollars are always looking for the best bargains; that is, a larger quantity or a better quality; in short, the most and best for least. This forces producers to offer the most or the best for the least, or go out of business, to their competitors who do. This results in an ever-rising scale of living.

A free market in peacetime employs the maximum number of workingmen and satisfies the maximum number of workingmen's wives, or farmers, miners, butchers, bakers, or candlestick makers.

Let us restore a free market and have a free and prosperous country.

Decoration by Ecuador of Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles published in the Washington Star and the New York Times dealing with the conferring of certain high decoration upon Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, who was honored at a ceremony in Washington several nights ago for his fine, good-neighbor liaison and cooperative work in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I wish to extend my felicitations to my friend, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, in the light of the new distinction, the national decoration of the Republic of Ecuador, which he received at the hands of His Excellency, Ambassador Galo Plaza, who is one of the most popular leaders in the capital of the United States. The people and the Government of Ecuador, whose head is President José María Velasco Ibarra, may be sure that the citizens of the United States are happy about the goodwill gesture of our sister Republic. We regard this action as another accolade for the good-neighbor policy.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 29, 1946]

ECUADOREAN EMBASSY CEREMONY HONORS TWO OUTSTANDING MEN

(By Betty Milliken)

Two people who have performed an outstanding service to modern civilization, each in his own field, yesterday received a token of appreciation from the Ecuadorean Government. For promoting cultural relations between the United States and Ecuador and for assistance to Ecuadorean students attending American colleges and universities, the Reverend Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Frederick County, Md., and special lecturer on sociology in the Catholic University of Chile, was awarded the insignia of the Order of Merit. Ambassador Galo Plaza made the presentation in a ceremony held at the Ecuadorean Embassy. Also honored on this occasion, but unable to be present because of illness, was Señor Guillermo Jones-Odriozola, leading achitect of Uruguay, who has developed an architectural plan for the future development of Quito. The idea of Señor Jones-Odriozola is to preserve the charm and beauty of the colonial city without hindering its modern development. Señora de Jones-Odriozola accepted for her husband the gift bestowed upon him by Ecuador, a leather-bound book with parchment pages, with a hand-carved reproduction of the San Francisco Church, oldest and most artistic edifice in Quito, on the front cover and a carved likeness of Señor Jones-Odriozola on the back.

Guests at the ceremony yesterday, which was followed by the serving of champagne, had the pleasure of being the first to see the newly decorated embassy, and the privilege

of viewing the collection of seventeenth and eighteenth century paintings, similar to those of the Italian painter Boticelli, which have been brought here from the National Museum of Quito.

Constructed in the modern French style, the Ecuadorean Embassy was built several years ago as a residence for Capt. and Mrs. Thomas Moran, and in 1942 was awarded a special prize by the board of trade. Last year it was purchased by the Ecuadorean Government and since then the Ambassador and Señora de Plaza have searched far and wide for suitable furnishings.

Besides the priceless oil paintings and seventeenth and eighteenth century figurines that decorate this beautiful residence, there are many modern water colors and etchings. All are the works of well known Ecuadorean artists.

As a background for this fine collection, the walls in the various rooms are painted a harmonizing shade of gray or green.

In the interesting company of guests at the ceremony yesterday were the Costa Rican Ambassador, Dr. Francisco de Paula Gutiérrez; the Chilean Ambassador, Dr. Marcial Mora Miranda; the Colombian Ambassador and Señora de Santamaría; the Cuban Ambassador and Señora de Belt; the Chargé d'Affaires of Uruguay, Dr. Cesar Montero de Bustamante; Miss Ellen Collins, Cultural Attaché of the United States Embassy in Caracas, and first woman to hold that post; Dr. William Manger, Counselor of the Pan American Union; Senator George L. Radcliffe, of Maryland; and Representative Herman P. Kopplemann, of Connecticut.

Likewise present were the Reverend Francis X. Talbot, professor of English literature at Georgetown University and former editor in chief of America; the Reverend Ferard F. Yates, professor of history at Georgetown; the Reverend Basil M. Friscon; Mrs. Amelita Diaz Sharp, of Miami and Habana; Dr. Kathryn McHale, director of the American Association of University Women; Miss Phoebe Hampton, of the faculty of Bryn Mawr College; Capt. Francis J. Braceland, head of the newly inaugurated department of psychiatry at the Mayo Clinic, and Mrs. Braceland; Commander and Mrs. Ambrose Kelly; Mr. and Mrs. George Leicester Thomas, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. Dan E. Wight, of Hopeland; Commander Russell Yates, representative of Western Hemisphere architects; Dr. Richard J. Purcell, professor of history in the Catholic University of America and a former instructor of the first of the guests of honor, and Mrs. Purcell; Miss Bertha Joseph, of the Senate; Señorita Noriega Pons; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur B. Cuddihy, of Forest Hills, Long Island; Dr. and Mrs. Charles V. Stiefel and Mr. and Mrs. William Hill Brooke, of Upper Marlboro; Mr. and Mrs. John Tyne, of Oak Park, Ill.; Capt. and Mrs. Erik von der Heide, Mrs. Amalia Riggs, Mr. and Mrs. J. Howard Morgiundo, and Miss Eugenia Beattie, of Howard Hall, Md.; Mr. and Mrs. Harold Smith, of Quito; Dr. Antonio Quevedo, former Ambassador of Ecuador at the Court of St. James, and Señora de Quevedo; Dr. Humberto Albornoz, chairman of Ecuador's delegation at the United Nations Organization; Mr. Miguel Albornoz, associate editor of El Comercio, leading newspaper of Quito; Mrs. Clotilde Smith of the Architectural Forum, La Paz, Bolivia; Mr. Henry Dearborn, of the Department of State; Mr. Joseph Flack, of the United States Department of State; Mr. Wesley J. Adams, of the State Department, and Mrs. Adams; Miss Elizabeth Clarke, of the Library of Congress; Dr. A. Curtis Wilgus, professor of history in the George Washington University; Mrs. Josephine Silva Hennings, of the State Department, and Miss Joan Hennings; Miss María Teresa Castro, daughter of Dr. Hector David Castro, Ambassador of El Salvador to the United States; Miss Brooke Stiefel, of Upper Marlboro and the Georgetown Visitation College, Washington; the Honorable Jorge Hazera, First Secretary of the Costa Rican Embassy; Mr. Jorge Fernandez, Second Secretary of the Ecuadorean Embassy, and Señora de Fernandez; Miss María Plaza and Miss Alegría Plaza, sisters of the Ecuadorean Ambassador; Miss Fabiola Quevedo, of St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md.; Mrs. Vincent Biser and the Misses Mary Catherine and Rebecca Hahn, of Urbana, Md.; the Reverend Herbert R. Jordan, of St. John's church, Frederick, Md.; the Reverend Brother Peter, former president of St. Stanislaus College, Bay St. Louis, Miss., and now principal of Catholic High, Baton Rouge, La.; the Honorable John W. McCormack, majority leader of the United States House of Representatives, and Mrs. McCormack; Judge Matthew McGuire and Mrs. McGuire; the Honorable A. Devitt Vanech, of the United States Department of Justice; Dr. William P. Schoen, Jr., of Chicago, and Mrs. Schoen; Mr. and Mrs. Clinton Pitts, of Baltimore; Mr. Tyson Lee, of Frederick; Mr. and Mrs. Gus Lee, of Washington; and Commander Charles Henry Conley, Jr., M. D.

Later in the evening, Dr. Thorning entertained at dinner at the Statler Hotel in honor of the former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ecuador, Dr. Antonio Quevedo, who will be feted at the Embassy Tuesday. Among others in this company were Ambassador Plaza; Dr. and Mrs. Harry Davies; Señor Jorge Hazera, first secretary of the Costa Rican Embassy; Señor Jorge Fernandez, second secretary and cultural attaché of the Ecuadorean Embassy; and Señorita Fabiola Quevedo, daughter of the guests of honor.

[Quotations from New York Times of February 25, 1946]

REV. DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING HONORED—INVITED AGAIN TO PRAY AT PAN AMERICAN DAY OBSERVANCE

For the second consecutive time, congressional leaders have invited the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Frederick County, Md., special lecturer on sociology, Catholic University of Chile, to deliver the invocation at the annual official celebration of Pan American Day in Washington, April 15, it was announced today.

Galo Plaza, Ambassador of Ecuador, will present the national decoration of his country, known as the Order of Merit, to Dr. Thorning on March 28, at a reception in the Ecuadorian Embassy, Washington. At that time Ambassador Plaza and Dr. Thorning will speak on the value of university education for Latin America in the universities of higher learning in Latin America.

ECUADOR HONORS DR. THORNING

WASHINGTON, March 28, 1946.—In recognition of work done in southern and Central American universities during the World War, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Frederick County, Md., special lecturer on sociology in the Catholic University of Chile, received today the national decoration of Ecuador, known as the Order of Merit. The Ecuador Ambassador Galo Plaza presented the decoration at a ceremony at the Embassy.

An UNRRA Food Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 30, 1946.

AN UNRRA FOOD POLICY

Largely because Russian troops in Austria have been living off the land to the detriment of the already short Austrian civilian diet, the UNRRA council on relief and rehabilitation has unanimously adopted a policy declaration against such practices.

Where the food supply of an occupied nation is short, says the UNRRA resolution, the consumption of locally produced foodstuffs by the occupiers should be refrained from. It further declares that the UNRRA programs for such occupied areas shall be set up on the assumption that all local supplies will be devoted to indigenous populations.

That position is, of course, sound. The Russian practice of living off the land is indefensible in the situation where other nations are being called on to supplement the diet of all overrun territories. There is no reason, for example, why the United States should send food to Austria to replace food taken from the Austrians by the Russian occupiers, especially when Russia itself has an adequate supply of foodstuffs.

This is, of course, another of those areas where Russia does not see eye to eye with the other Allies. Russia may fancy that she is here practicing retribution against occupants of a former enemy land. She is, of course, doing nothing of the sort. She is, in effect, compelling UNRRA to feed her officers and troops as well as the Austrians.

The only way out of that situation is to refuse to send to Austria more food than is needed to feed the Austrians and to make the strongest possible representations to the Russians on their duty to feed themselves.

Amvets of Tulsa Oppose Merchant Seaman's War Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following resolution adopted by a unanimous vote of the American Veterans of World War II—Amvets—of Tulsa, Okla., which they have requested me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and which I am doing in order that their views on this subject may be brought to the attention of Congress and the public.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it has been called to the attention of the American Veterans of World War II—Amvets—that there has been drafted a bill styled the Merchant Seaman's War Service Act, H. R. 2346; and

Whereas there has been drafted and presented to the Congress of the United States a bill styled the Merchant Seaman's War Service Act—H. R. 2346—which said bill proposes to give to merchant seamen and merchant marine certain benefits and rights similar in many respects to the GI bill of rights; and

Whereas it is a known fact and is the feeling of Virgil Deems Post, No. 2, of the American Veterans of World War II (Amvets) that the merchant seamen and merchant marine received ample and sufficient payment for their services in the form of salaries, bonuses, overtime payments, and retention of their civilian status for their part in World War II and that said persons should not be preferred

to other civilian personnel who performed any type of hazardous work; and

Whereas, although the merchant seamen and merchant marine received many times the pay of the soldier or sailor in the armed services, said proposed bill would give them the rights granted under the GI bill of rights and would minimize the effects of and would tend to defeat the purpose of the GI bill of rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Virgil Deems Post, No. 2, of American Veterans of World War II (Amvets), of Tulsa, Okla., That this post hereby goes on record as being opposed to the passage of the said Merchant Seaman's War Service Act (H. R. 2346) or any other bill that proposes to give the merchant seamen or merchant marine additional benefits or rights for their service during World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator from Oklahoma, a copy to the United States Representative from this district, and a copy to the daily press.

Adopted the 21st day of March 1946 by unanimous vote.

R. G. GRANGER,
Post Commander.

Attest:

R. H. SCHWARZ,
Adjutant.

Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of March 31, 1946:

MIHAILOVICH

The story of Gen. Draja Mihailovich is a striking illustration of how bitterly ironic the processes of history can be. Five years ago he was hailed throughout the Allied world as one of the great heroes of the war. Today, after having been hunted for almost 2 years, he is a prisoner of the Tito government of Yugoslavia and faces the prospect of a traitor's death in his own land.

It takes only a little jogging of the memory to recall the explosive spring of 1941 when the Yugoslavs overthrew their government for making a deal with Hitler and when General Mihailovich suddenly emerged as the leader of the forces who took to the hills and mountains to strike back at the Nazi invaders. For months thereafter this man and his Serbian followers—the Chetniks—were a legend inspiring the free world, a brave and shining example of patriotism at its best, a great, courageous legion loving liberty more than life and fighting on against tremendous odds to harry and frustrate the will of a tyrant.

But in time the legend, which certainly seemed true enough at its start, began to fade. The factions of Yugoslavia, the bitter divisions existing among the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, threw a shadow over it, and gradually from some Allied sources there came rumors and charges that Mihailovich was not quite the man he had once appeared to be. Early in 1943 the Soviet Union flatly accused him of collaborating with the Axis, and a bit later, echoing Moscow, Marshal Tito, his bitter rival and leader of the partisans, declared that he had even incited the Bulgarians to fight his countrymen. Much of this suggested a deliberate smear campaign, and it is still open to question in several respects, not least because the Chetniks were then reported to be giving battle to the Germans and Mihailovich's wife was languishing in a Nazi concentration camp.

Yet there can be little doubt that something went wrong at some point with the once-celebrated leader of the Chetniks. In any case, in May of 1944 the royal Yugoslav Government found it necessary to oust him as minister of war, and Prime Minister Churchill felt moved to tell the House of Commons that Britain had stopped sending arms to him for the simple reason that "he had not been fighting the enemy and, moreover, some of his subordinates have made accommodations with the enemy." From then on it was Marshal Tito alone who received Allied support in Yugoslavia.

Ellis E. Patterson's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, among my colleagues in the House, ELLIS E. PATTERSON ranks high in his unceasing work for peace and progress. No one has striven more valiantly for the kind of legislation that the people of his State and all of the American people want, to insure them a fruitful and peaceful life. He has fought on the floor and in committee for every measure that would meet the basic needs of the people.

He has helped get appropriations for irrigation, soil conservation, and publicly owned power in the Central Valley.

ELLIS PATTERSON is admirably fitted to serve his State and Nation. He has had long experience in public office in California—6 years as a member of the State legislature and then 4 more years as Lieutenant Governor of one of the greatest States in the Union. These years in State office have given him admirable insight into the problems facing the State and Nation and have been invaluable preparation for his work in Congress. He is recognized by his colleagues as a man of the highest ideals of public service.

Now he has been endorsed and widely acclaimed throughout his State for the office of United States Senator. His record proves beyond doubt his ability to handle that high office with the same integrity, ability, and foresight that has characterized his public life and his work in this House.

He has fought hard for every issue which is basic to the peace, prosperity, and progress of the people of this country. He has supported civilian control of atomic energy. He has introduced legislation for fair wages and prices. He has fought for emergency powers to insure housing for our returning veterans and for more democratic procedure in the Army and Navy. He has worked for the development of industry in California and the entire west coast. He has upheld the rights of the small businessmen, the small farmers, the racial and religious minorities. He has worked for the extension of social security and health measures and for child care centers and health education for our youth. He has outspokenly defended the rights of the disfranchised in this country and throughout the world. He stands for firm friendship between the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union—the solid care of a functioning UNO—the hope of the world for lasting peace.

ELLIS PATTERSON was born in California 47 years ago. He is known throughout the length and breadth of his great State. He is a member of the California bar and a veteran of World War I. He was a member of the board of regents of the University of California, district superintendent of schools, a practicing lawyer, a member of the lands commission, and the president of the senate of California. He is presently serving on the following Congressional committees; War Claims, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Labor, Presidential Elections, and Indian Affairs. He has stood unceasingly on all these committees to maintain the farsighted, progressive policies for the greatest service of the people of California and of the entire country which have made him a symbol of progressive California.

OPA Hampers Reconversion and May Halt It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving almost innumerable letters against the extension of the OPA from people in my district, individuals, business people, and those anxious to assist in reconversion and the development of our country and the production of commodities so needed by our people. With almost one voice they state that OPA has seriously hampered reconversion and that it may absolutely halt our return to a free economy. They say it has made it impossible for legitimate concerns to go ahead, and that OPA is responsible for the black marketing.

A fair example of one of such letters has just been received by me from Oklahoma City, which I take the liberty to quote:

OKLAHOMA CITY,
April 2, 1946.

HON. GEORGE SCHWABE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWABE: We would sincerely appreciate your carefully reading this letter and considering its contents very seriously.

At the present time the extension of OPA is being considered by Congress. For quite some time we were of the opinion that price control was necessary to some extent, but since VJ-day, the policies and activities of OPA have, in our opinion seriously hampered, if not in some cases halted, reconversion. It seems OPA has the attitude of regi-

menting business, controlling profits, and in no manner taking a sympathetic attitude toward the problems of operating a private business. In our own particular business there is no way in the world that a man could learn to operate our business by reading a book. In nearly every case recommendations of an industry advisory committee have been ignored by the OPA, and, in our opinion, an industry advisory committee should certainly know more about their particular business than some young students of economics, with no practical experience.

It has now reached the point where black-market operations are getting completely out of control in some lines. It is impossible for us, trying to operate a legitimate business, to get merchandise on a legitimate market. We are sure you can understand that no one can continue to operate without merchandise.

The building program is definitely slowed down and will remain in that condition, in our opinion, until we either get more adequate price relief or the OPA is junked completely. If the OPA is going to continue to operate along their present policies, it will force many businesses to close down completely. This is not an idle remark, for they have a definite policy of forcing distributors generally to absorb nearly all of any price increases they give a manufacturer.

They do this on some fancy theory that a distributor will have more volume, consequently his gross profit will be the same. Where they got this theory of economics we do not know, particularly when the Government is allowing every other item of our cost to increase. Labor has been increased very greatly, and labor is fundamentally the biggest item of cost in any item being manufactured. This increase in labor cost throughout all lines of industry is quite naturally reflected in higher costs of operation.

We cannot continue to absorb these price increases. Someone must pay for these eventually, and the ultimate consumer is the only person who can. This policy of cost absorption for distributors will cause many of them to either go out of business or discontinue handling many lines. This is particularly true of our own business, and we are seriously contemplating the discontinuance of many lines of merchandise which are urgently needed for veterans' housing.

The system of free enterprise and full production which made this country so great cannot survive if we are to continue to have a concentration of Government power, as described in the following statement of HATTON W. SUMNERS, a veteran of 34 years in Congress, who recently announced his intention of retiring. In this statement we think he summarized the conditions of governmental control at the present time, and we hope you will read this carefully, as this is a statement from a Member of your own Congress.

"I have watched what my own generation, under the administration of both parties, has been doing to the greatest system of democratic government ever evolved through the processes of the ages. By ignoring principles and the lessons of history and accepting the theories of man and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people.

"By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we now have a financially busted great piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by it nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance, and self-respect, and governmental capacity of the people, by the people, and a common danger and a common duty."

If this war was fought to preserve democracy, we think it is time we give the country back to the people who made it great and let them carry it on as they have done for many years. If we are to get any veterans' housing built, it will be absolutely necessary to eliminate the OPA from the control of building material prices or we may have a producers' and distributors' strike on our hands.

Respectfully yours,

BARNEY STEWART, Jr.,
General Manager.

Realtor Urges Rent Control Be Retained; Charges Only Chiselers and Exploiters Will Benefit From Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received further evidence today that the utterances of the Washington representatives of the National Association of Real Estate Boards do not have the support of the responsible and legitimate real-estate men over the country.

If one is to believe the lobbyists, there are no real-estate men who see the danger of inflation in skyrocketing home prices; there are no real-estate men who desire to have rent control retained during the emergency; there are none who fear a repetition of the "boom-bust" period we had following the last World War.

The untruthfulness of these statements can best be shown by evidence from the real-estate men themselves. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a letter I received today from the Midland Realty Co. of Chicago.

This letter comes from a man with 30 years in the business. He remembers the bitter collapse of the real-estate market in the last postwar period. He wants rent control continued now because, as he so rightly says, it insures the stability and soundness of the real-estate market.

I would like to suggest that the Members read what this real-estate man has to say about the lobbying activities in Washington:

MIDLAND REALTY CO.,
Chicago, March 27, 1946.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: I have been in the real-estate business for the last 30 years, so I believe I have a fair knowledge of real estate and all its branches. I am a member of the Chicago Real Estate Board and also a member of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Therefore, from the experience I gathered during these 30 years, I am convinced that never before in the history of our country has real estate been as sound, stable and profitable as it is today. Two reasons have contributed to the stability of real estate.

First, the cyclone of the depression knocked out all imaginary values from real estate. About 95 percent of all real estate that was foreclosed between 1930–40 has been sold at ridiculously low prices. Financing was made conservatively and on the actual values of the properties. Because of this, real estate became sound and stable. The real-estate mortgages today are as sound as the American dollar, and the investors received substantial returns for their investments. What other industry can equal such a record? Today the insurance companies are paying premiums to secure real-estate mortgages on apartment buildings. That in itself should convince the skeptics that the equity owners are receiving large returns from their investments.

Second, the rent control insured the stability and soundness of real estate. Today most of the real estate is owned by comparatively few. These few have been waiting for an opportunity such as has existed since the beginning of the war to boost the price of rent 50–75 percent. By so doing we would not only have had the wildest inflation in real estate, but inevitably the bubble would have burst and we would have had foreclosures by the thousands—then back again to the conditions of the early thirties. And who would have benefited by these conditions—the chislers, the exploiters, and the lazy idle parasites who are living on the wealth created by others.

Now, Mr. PATMAN, in spite of the above true facts you still have the self-appointed representatives of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Apartment Owners Association telling you to increase rents because of the great hardships suffered by property owners resulting from rent control, and as proof they are giving you examples of some of the very, very few hardship cases which they neither own nor represent.

Do you know who these self-appointed representatives are, Mr. PATMAN? They are the representatives of those who acquired very large apartment buildings between 1939–40 at very low prices, and who have been looking for an opportunity to take advantage of the circumstances and exploit the public. Every time they point out one hardship case you can be sure there are 999 profitable cases that can be pointed out.

Therefore you will render a great service to your country and yourself Mr. PATMAN if you retain the rent control as it stands today for the next 3 years because by that time I believe the acute housing shortage will have been greatly reduced.

Sincerely yours,

G. K. PAPAZOGLIDIS.

Memorial to Unknown Soldier of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a very impressive editorial appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times on Tuesday, April 2, 1946, commenting on the passage in the House of Representatives of a bill which I introduced to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheatre in Arlington National Cemetery of an unknown serviceman of World War II. Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include the editorial:

TWO TOMBS

Quietly—it called for only a single, short paragraph to be lost in the columns of the newspapers—the House of Representatives has passed a bill to provide for the burial beside the Unknown Soldier of an unknown serviceman of World War II.

Two tombs. They will stand in marble silence there on the hill in Arlington that

overlooks a Washington become world capital, the hill that broods on the sweep of monument and building, of green lawns and the gray "temporaries" that the urgency of war called up to scar the green. And before them, in constant vigil, a sentry will step off his restricted round in token that * * * in token (it comes uneasily to the memory) that a grateful Nation has not forgotten those who lie unnamed on a thousand scattered battlefields.

Two tombs. They will shelter men who died—for what? Why, to defend a home, to release the poor and the downtrodden from oppression, to bulwark the ideals and the idealism that are America's glory—to make an end to war. Or has a Nation busy with normalcy, with profits, with self-seeking and with fear already forgotten even that?

Two tombs. Two quiet, simple tombs. Mark them well: There is not room in all this land, broad and mighty though it be, for a third.

Gallup Poll Reveals 27 Percent of American People Hit by Housing Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many times in recent months the real-estate lobbyists in Washington have attempted to minimize the severity of the housing crisis. They have said the shortage of homes was being deliberately overestimated by Government bureaucrats. They have said that business-as-usual building methods would meet whatever shortage there was. Even now they are saying that no extraordinary efforts, such as premium payments, are needed to spur production of materials.

I have before me the latest Gallup poll as published in one of Washington's most responsible newspapers, the Washington Post. This poll reports that 9,000,000 American families have felt the effect of the housing shortage.

The lobbyists have termed the President's housing program as too visionary, with too high a goal. Yet that program only provides for the construction of 2,700,000 homes in the next 2 years. These 9,000,000 families have reported that, next to the high cost of living, housing was the biggest problem facing them.

They have been cramped into crowded quarters; they have been camping with in-laws or friends; they have been living in places with no adequate heat, hot water or ventilation. The results of this conservative survey should be a shocking disclosure to those who have decried America's need for homes. It should lead to some sober thinking among the leaders of Government and industry on how this problem must be met.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this news article which was published on April 3:

THE GALLUP POLL

(By George Gallup, director of American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 2.—The extent to which the housing shortage can become a factor in the fall political campaign is indicated by the number of American families affected one way or another by the shortage.

Throughout the entire Nation, an estimated 9,000,000 families have felt the effects of the shortage. An earlier survey revealed that aside from the high cost of living, housing was named most often as the big problem facing people today.

Those affected today say that they cannot find a place to live, that they are cramped into crowded quarters, that they are camping with in-laws or friends, that they are living in dwellings which they ordinarily would not live in (places with no windows, inadequate ventilation, no heat, no hot water), that they have suffered hikes in rentals or had to pay bonuses to get a place to live, or would like to build and cannot get materials, etc.

The number of families affected is an estimate based upon results from careful questioning of a representative sample of the Nation's approximately 40,000,000 families. The question:

"Are you or your immediate family now being directly affected by the housing shortage?"

The replies for the Nation:

	Percent
Yes	27
No	73

While the effects of the shortage are being felt most acutely in the great cities of the Nation, the evidence from the survey indicates that it is being felt right on down into the small towns, if to a lesser extent.

The groups found to be hit least hard in the present crisis are the older people and people living in smaller cities and rural areas. The group found to be suffering worst from the shortage is World War II veterans with families, thousands upon thousands of whom have had to double up with relatives.

A statistical picture of the effects of the housing crisis is shown in the following tables, giving the percentage of families affected by size of towns, by ages, and by income levels:

	Yes	No
By size of towns:	Pct.	Pct.
Cities and towns under 100,000 population	23	77
Cities over 100,000 population	36	64
By ages:		
Under 35 years	37	63
Over 35 years	21	79
Veterans	42	58

President Truman has so far signed two bills aimed at giving emergency housing relief to veterans. Each provides for 100,000 temporary homes. Hearings are being held before the Senate Banking Committee on the larger, Wyatt program, calling for construction of about 3,000,000 homes by the end of 1947.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Ohio State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution:

Our Forty-seventh Conference of the Daughters of the American Revolution met in Cincinnati on March 15, 1946, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

"Whereas it is all too evident from the subversive literature emanating from innumerable agencies of varied affiliations, that the Congress of the United States should continue the investigations by its Committee on Un-American Activities: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Ohio Society, Daughters of the American Revolution in annual conference assembled, urges upon the Congress the appropriation of adequate funds to make possible the continuance of effective investigations by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

Conservatism in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I request consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John Temple Graves in the Birminghom Post of April 1. Mr. Graves is one of the outstanding columnists of this country. The article is a very thoughtful one, and is founded on sound principles.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS AFTERNOON

(By John Temple Graves)

"Hymn well the great Confederate South
* * *"

Is the South conservative? William G. Carleton, professor of political science at the University of Florida, denies it with much scholarship and authority in the current Virginia Quarterly Review. He calls it a political myth. And H. Clarence Nixon, famed Vanderbilt professor and editor, told the American Political Science Association in Philadelphia the other day that the South is very much like the rest of the country in division between conservatives and progressives.

You can agree with both scholars without accepting their notion of what is the alternative to conservatism. Both seem to think the alternative is perpetual New Dealing. Dr. Nixon calls it going national and means going Washington. Dr. Carleton calls it liberalism, and means the same. But anticonservatism doesn't mean going national in the sense of subscribing to the current New Deal hangover of authoritarianism which Henry Wallace leads. In the lexicons of Dr. Nixon and Dr. Carleton there seem to be only two things. One is dark reaction, the other an eternally new dealing of Federal control. Of a third thing which is really first for Americans, including southerners, they say naught. Yet this third thing describes the basic political nature of the South.

It is a thing that comes of having always been agrarian, of being agrarian in large part still, and, as industry comes, of having some of industry's sorriest spectacles elsewhere before it for horrible example. It is this, plus a poverty among certain southern elements, that does not pinch but merely eats away. Plus a bigotry that hatefully rejects certain American lights, but blessedly rejects, too, the false lights from overseas which dazzle our perpetual New Dealers. Plus a race problem coloring the whole sky. Given these things and you have a people, some of whom will be very conservative and some of whom

very radical at times, and all of whom will be opportunistic when there is trouble, accepting one thing and another, breaking this law or making that law, in bitter need.

But by all that's out-of-doors, you have a people, too, whose hearts are for being free, for running their own affairs, and for taking chances when there is even a little hope of succeeding. You get what the true liberal is—a man open-minded enough to accept realities and great new forces, and to make concessions, but a man who goes on, nevertheless, dreaming he can be free, or regain his freedom. You get a people who might string along with Roosevelt but won't take Wallace.

The secret of the South today is its secret of long ago—agriculture. Industry is coming too late, with sins too much in sight, to change these things for us very much. Especially as both industry and agriculture are declining in the percentages of the whole population they employ, and the face of affairs is going to be made more and more by people engaged in neither. In the South they will be a people upon whom the ages have stamped agrarian loves and tastes. The secret is agriculture, in Truman's day, as it was in the day of Jefferson.

Mr. Carleton is most interesting about Jefferson. He does history a service when he points the absurdity of ultra-conservative claims to the great Virginian. But he leaves something out when he fails to point the equally poor title of the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. Jefferson was for the common man. He was for human welfare. That is why reactionaries are never entitled to him. But he was for individual liberty and against statism, and that is why socialists can't have him either. Mr. Carleton has it otherwise. He says the anti-statism of Jefferson was just a means to an end—the common man's welfare. He says in Jefferson's time the common man needed protection against great forces of privilege and special interest in the Government. Today, with government in the hands of the people, he says Jefferson would be "an advocate of more government."

That is where Mr. Carleton goes wrong, and in going points the wrong in much other going. You can't study Thomas Jefferson and the agrarian ways that made him without knowing that what he wanted for the common man was not only economic welfare but also individual liberty. Granted that in this ambition he would have been for more government in some circumstances, he would nevertheless have remained on guard against too much. It is hard to believe he would have thought more government called for in the year 1946. It is hard to believe Andrew Jackson would have, either. Certainly Woodrow Wilson would not. And even though Mr. Wallace may persuade Mr. Truman otherwise, I doubt if even a gentleman named Franklin Delano Roosevelt would be wanting more government now or associating such a thought with his liberalism. For Mr. Roosevelt, just before rejecting Mr. Wallace, the governmentalist and authoritarian, for Mr. Truman, the patriotic unphilosophic politician, said the New Deal was dealt.

Neither, it seems to me, is anticonservatism in the South to be identified with blind championing of organized labor. Much as labor deserves championing and needs organizing here, there is no liberalism in supporting it or any other powerful minority when rights of the rest of us are ignored. A true liberal is against powerful minorities whether they be business or labor. That is his only excuse for ever being for big government—protection of the common man against such aggregates of power. And the common man, in sense of the average, doesn't work in a factory. We know that in the South.

The South isn't conservative. It is just anti-Socialist. Even when it votes Socialist it is still anti at heart and eager to go back.

Wild Real-Estate Buying Spree Under Way in Washington, Survey Shows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I pleaded with the House Banking and Currency Committee during consideration of my housing bill for a provision to hold down speculation in real estate. That committee saw fit to strike the provision from the bill.

Later on I made an equally sincere plea on the floor of the House for the same proposal. I vainly pointed out that we were rushing headlong into inflation, and the House refused to heed the warning.

I have before me two news stories—one from the Washington Post of March 29, and the other from the Washington Daily News of March 29—reporting a survey of the housing situation in Washington. They show that 46 pieces of property changed hands within 90 days recently at an average increase in profit of 21 percent. One home was purchased by a speculator for $3,500 and was sold the same day for $6,500.

In my opinion, the Congress itself must bear a great portion of the blame for permitting these speculators to run wild because of its refusal to take action when it had the opportunity to hold down this speculation and protect our citizens from being gouged.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include the results of this survey:

[From the Washington Post of March 29, 1946]

An unprecedented speculative buying spree in Washington real estate, with some properties changing hands three times within a year, is in full swing, a Federal housing official said yesterday.

William H. Husband, general manager of the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp., described the rapid-fire transfer of real-estate property here as "entirely out of hand and at the expense of you and me."

OPINION BASED ON SURVEY

Husband bases his opinion on a recently completed Government-conducted spot survey of 800 local property sales during last year.

Covering the District real-estate front by areas the spot check revealed that property soared 29.4 percent in southeast Washington within a 3-month period. Real-estate prices during the same length of time rose 28.9 percent in the northeast section, and 19.3 in the northwest.

Husband explained that his research staff arbitrarily spotted 800 local real-estate sales from the legal record. They then followed those pieces of property throughout 1945. The study was completed on Monday.

REPEATED SALES SHOWN

The survey of local housing also showed:

1. Forty-six pieces of property changed hands last year inside of 90 days with an average increase of 21 percent netted in the transactions. One-third of these sales showed a price increase of more than 30 percent.

2. Twenty-nine of the forty-six private homes and commercial buildings were resold within 5 days. Twenty-one pieces of property changed owners inside of 24 hours.

3. One home was purchased by a real-estate speculator for $3,500 and was sold the same day for $6,500.

4. Seven buildings changed hands three times last year, each time "at a huge profit."

WYATT GETS FACTS

Husband explained that this first survey of Washington's wildcat real-estate market, obtained from the Legal Record, was furnished to National Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt, who is now seeking passage of the Patman bill.

"Only through passage of this bill, now before the Senate, will the homeless veteran get a break and these disgracefully high real-estate prices on existing homes be curbed," Husband said.

Meanwhile the situation on building new homes in the Washington area shows an equally inflationary aspect.

An FHA spokesman, commenting on the possibility of building 50,000 low-cost homes here, pointed out that the cost of building supplies and skilled labor in the District had increased more than 15 percent since the first of the year.

ACREAGE UP 100 PERCENT

Undeveloped acreage, he said, is 100 percent above the 1940 price level and finished, ready-to-build lots have jumped 25 percent since last September.

"I don't think the average contractor is trying to exploit the veteran. He is merely hamstrung by the high cost of labor and materials," the FHA spokesman said.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 29, 1946]

Some District of Columbia real-estate operators today had pinned on them chapter-and-verse proof of their speculative buying and selling deals that are skyrocketing Washington house prices, with speculation most frequent in under-$10,000 houses.

A spot check of houses changing hands here in 1945 made by the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp., and based on examination of actual records of transfers, shows house after house resold the same day as purchased, some with price increases as high as 100 percent. One jumped from $4,000 to $8,000 the same day; another from $3,500 to $6,500.

Forty-six of the houses changed owners within 90 days. Of the 46, 29 were sold again within 5 days, with price increases averaging 21.9 percent. Twenty-two of the twenty-nine again shifted owners on the same day. One-third of the 46 brought operators at least a 30-percent increase in 3 months. Price increases of all 46, from the first to the second sale, averaged 21.5 percent.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAD SPOT FOR IT

"Washington is one of the worst spots in the country for speculative real-estate dealing," declared John H. Fahey, Commissioner for the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, parent of FSLIC. "Houses have always sold for much more here than could be justified.

"Not only in Washington but all over the country people are being exploited right and left in the purchase of homes. Their urgent need of houses and their lack of experience in buying them means that they are paying outrageous prices out of all proportion to house values in a few years.

"All this talk about the rising spiral of house prices being a part of a natural inflationary movement is poppycock," he went on. "What we have now is a build-up in prices and lending on second and third mortgages as well as the first, with great potential harm to the country. Some people have mortgages outstanding equal to the entire cost of the house."

"VICTORY LOANS"

He said that real-estate operators are now privately referring to third trusts as "victory loans"—they put the deals over the top.

"The same sections of the country that were responsible for the financial panic of 1929 to 1930 are now showing up with the worst speculation," he added.

The survey of Washington real estate transfers, made under the supervision of Dr. William H. Husband, general manager of FSLIC, shows seven cases of houses sold three times, and one four times.

Here's the way the price increases run:

House A: Sold June 7 for $8,500; resold June 18 for $9,500; resold again the same day for $11,000.

House B: Sold in September 1944 for $7,000; resold January 31 for $9,500; resold again the same day for $9,500; resold February 9 for $10,900.

House C: Sold January 17 for $3,000; resold October 29 for $3,500; resold again the same day for $6,500.

Highest increases were in the southeast section of Washington—29.4 percent; in the northeast section, 28.9 percent; in the northwest section, 19.3 percent.

A Petition by the Executive Committee of the Rhode Island Branch of the CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 30, 1945, a petition of a group of Rhode Island businessmen and industrial leaders to the President and the Congress. It will be found in the Appendix of the RECORD volume 91, part 13, page A5069. I shall read just a sentence of it:

To our great disappointment, Mr. President, your message to Congress of September 6, 1945, advocates the adoption of measures the effect of which in our opinion would be to substitute national socialism for our American form of government and our private enterprise system.

The petition proceeds to prove that as effectively as it can.

A group of Rhode Island employees has formulated and sent me a reply to that petition, in the form of a petition to the President and the Congress, and it seems to me only fair that it should be given equal publicity. Therefore I ask that the petition in reply be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of printing the petition will be $400.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE RHODE ISLAND BRANCH OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

(In reply to a petition of a group of Rhode Island business and industrial leaders to the President and to the Congress published in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 91, part 13, page A5069.

A great commonwealth cannot be successfully governed by men with closed minds.

Mr. President, and Members of the Congress, on November 23, 1945, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a petition by a group of Rhode Island citizens. The petition was addressed to the President and to the Members of the Congress. It was signed by a number of leading Rhode Island manufacturers, by a well-known lawyer, who represents many of Rhode Island's major industries and banks, and by a former Republican Congressman.

If the document represented only the view of the Rhode Island industrial group, it could be dismissed quickly as unworthy of debate. The facts are that this petition expresses the economic and social viewpoint of a large sector of American industry, finance, and business. It is a viewpoint which has prevailed in America for some 75 years. Up to 1932, it was accepted as gospel truth by the rank and file of the American people.

Therefore it is important that this point of view should be carefully analyzed. The executive committee of the Rhode Island branch of the CIO in the following pages will undertake this task.

The task is not simple, for a full understanding of the viewpoint expressed in the petition involves much more than specific answers to such statements: (a) that the New Deal was an utter failure; (b) that a large public debt calls for curtailment of existing Government institutions; (c) that the Federal Government should not be strengthened (they really desire to weaken the central National Government); (d) that private industry should be free from any public regulation (the petitioners are not so brash as to state this directly, but do so by indirection); (e) that there should be no long-range Federal planning for: (1) full employment; (2) national security, health and public welfare; (3) greater educational opportunities; (4) unemployment insurance; (5) an extension of an institution like TVA to the Missouri River Valley and other similar regions.

The petitioners offer nothing in place of the objects of their attack, except a return "to the good old days of the past." This idea sometimes expressed as "a return to normalcy," is highly persuasive. Did not the United States of America become the greatest industrial Nation with the highest standard of living for its people when enterprise was entirely free—State governments strong—with no "planned economy by the Federal Government?" Permit us to quote from one of America's leading scientists: [1]

"Any realistic appraisal of the present situation, however, reveals that the American people are by no means adequately prepared to capitalize their extraordinary opportunity to the full. There is rather widespread approval of the general proposition that the United States should take an active part in developing some form of international collaboration after the war, but mingled with vague hopes for a better world is a strong desire to restore the social and economic relationships of prewar days. Many of us, perhaps the majority, believe we are fighting this war primarily to preserve the way of life that we have enjoyed in the past. We resist the idea that this crisis in human affairs can be met victoriously only by a basic revaluation of aims and ideals, a thorough reconstruction of social relationships, economic methods, and political techniques, at home as well as abroad."

It is essential first to take a look at the economic philosophy which was America's guiding star for the some 75 years up to the New Deal, and second, to try and understand the true character of the economic world in which we live today.

[1] Kirtley F. Mather, Enough and to Spare, p. 107.

I. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF AMERICAN BUSINESS OF THE PAST 75 YEARS

American economic and social philosophy had its roots in the theories of the "classical" economists. These economists looked upon society as a group of "independent, fully enlightened, and completely mobile individuals, each acting for himself, and possessed of equal bargaining power and equally interested in the economic systems, as producers and consumers." Within such a framework, there was envisaged complete freedom, for individual initiative and free enterprise; also, there would come about a perfect adjustment with respect to the vital factors: (1) cost of production; (2) wages; (3) prices; (4) profits.

This approach is of the utmost importance because the past 75 years have been years of rapid change. The atomic bomb is only the last and most startling of a series of rapid developments in science and technology which profoundly affected our social and economic order.

This was called laissez-faire economy. Such an economy conceived that there would be quick and frictionless adjustments between profits, wages, and prices. It followed there should be no intervention on the part of government. "The least government was the best government." Prosperity, progress, reasonable profits, good wages, low prices to the consumer, would result by the alchemy of natural economic law.

In the days of Adam Smith, which saw the birth of this theory of laissez-faire, with high emphasis upon individualism, and unrestricted economic activity, this concept of free enterprise bore some relation to the economic facts of life. The industrial system at that time was composed of small independent craftsmen, individual merchants, comparatively small manufacturing establishments. There were no large accumulation of capital in the hands of banks or industry.

The corporation, a fictitious individual, created by virtue of law, either did not exist or was just emerging. The individual entrepreneur of partnership, was the prevailing pattern. The labor force was small with a close relationship between the individual owner or owners and their workers. The worker was conceived as a free individual. Labor, as a commodity, similar to raw materials, was a later economic concept. Of course, labor has never conceived itself as "a commodity" like cotton or iron.[2]

The existing vast and powerful system of "credit" also did not exist because community wealth, upon which credit is based, was meager.

Also, of the utmost importance is the fact that at the beginning of the industrial revolution, there was an existing economy of "scarcity." Hannah More, nearly a century ago, wrote:

"Scarcity has been permitted by an all-wise providence to unite all ranks of people together, to show the poor how immediately they are dependent upon the rich."

Edward Hallett Carr, professor of international politics in the University College of

[2] Result of Monopoly:

The net result of monopoly, the net result of economic and financial control in the hands of the few, has meant ownership of labor as a commodity.

If labor is to be a commodity in the United States, in the final analysis it means we shall become a nation of boarding houses instead of a nation of homes.

If our people ever submit to that, they will have said good-bye to their historic freedom. Men do not fight for boarding houses. They will fight for their homes.

Address at Dallas, June 12, 1936. The Real F. D. R., p. 34.

Conditions of Peace, by Edward Hallett Carr, p. 72.

Wales, commenting on this social and economic philosophy of laissez-faire, states that in the early days of the industrial revolution, the smallness of industry and capital investment, made society highly mobile and adaptable. (Professor Carr points out that at no time was there a complete and absolute "free enterprise" and that in the United States the principle and operation of protective tariffs was the first great invasion of the laissez-faire economic philosophy). Therefore, in 1820 laissez-faire individualism had some justification:

"These conditions were destroyed," Professor Carr writes, "as the nineteenth century advanced, by the development of specialized mammoth industries requiring enormous capital investment and a mass army of labor, both of them incapable of rapid and frictionless transferance to meet changing demand. The unit was no longer the individual, but the joint-stock company, the trust, the banking corporation, the trade union. The hypothesis of a vast society of equal, independent, and mobile individuals was falsified to an ever-increasing extent. The individual counted less and less. The forces which dominated production and distribution and exercised a preponderant influence in the economic society were a few highly organized interest groups growing ever larger and more powerful. What is commonly referred to as individual enterprise has been destroyed, not, as its advocates sometimes pretend, by socialism or by the interference of grandmotherly governments, but by the innate trend of competitive capitalism toward monopoly." [3]

Thus we behold "the free-moving, self-adjusting, perfectively sensitive competitive capitalism" envisaged by classical economists of the nineteenth century passed out, not by the interference of government, but by the elimination, to an ever-increasing degree, of competition and free enterprise by monopoly capitalism.

II. CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT BY INDUSTRY AND FINANCE

The practical and unforeseen result of this system, as pointed out by Professor Carr, Lord Maynard Keynes, of Great Britain, and by the late President Roosevelt, was twofold—first the glorification of the producer. Henry Ford, Andrew Carnegie, J. Pierpont Morgan, and other industrial and financial wizards, so-called, for a period were looked up to as sort of modern saviors. At all times in history the people have had an inner need for heroes, giants, or kings—"the king could do no wrong."

Secondly, and as a derivative in part from big business hero worship, big business in the early twentieth century acquired almost undisputed control of the machinery of Government.

There grew up in the United States an immense invisible government. This led a preeminent conservative, the late Elihu Root, to make magisterial protest. This invisible government in the United States is well described by Harold J. Laski: [3]

"The direct corruption of legislators and judges; the purchase of influence by subscription in the local and national machines of political parties; the financing of propaganda lobbies; the control of newspaper opinion through the medium of advertisement—these were only the more obvious of the ways in which business maintained its empire without exercising a responsible share in the process of government It (the invisible government) had its presidents, senators, judges, cabinet officers; but it had them in such a way that the public did not perceive the reality of its lien. The contrast between the formal and the real government of America grew ever more stark. Popular will was never fully effective because it was always stayed before it reached the center of authority. It was bewildered by its inability to realize itself through the institutions appointed for that purpose."

Mr. Laski then goes on to discuss what should constitute a wise conservatism. Laski writes:

"A wise conservatism in politics is, as Edmund Burke said, 'an ability to improve not less than a disposition to preserve. Its essence is that prudence which knows when concessions have to be made. It is no use striking an attitude and declaring that change in itself is a violation of principle. A temper which can regard the very moderate experiments of Mr. Roosevelt as communism quite clearly invites disaster. It gives birth to a reckless hatred of necessary adaptation, which threatens the very basis of constitutional government. Conservatism in politics cannot mean a policy of no surrender; it means such a policy of compromises as will maintain the necessary unity in society upon which the process of government by consent can be founded. There has been singularly little of this conservatism in the United States since 1933. It has, rather, passed through the whole gamut of Bentham's Book of Fallacies in its endeavor to prevent the onset of change. This measure was wrong because it represented the thin end of the wedge; that must be resisted because the time was not ripe for its enactment; something else was unwise because the founding fathers could not conceive of it; or there was what Bentham called the fallacy of vague generality in which the dogma of the matchless constitution played its accustomed part. There were not the men to carry out the measures. What was proposed was good in theory but bad in practice. Or it was utopian because it failed to realize the weakness of human nature. From whatever angle the criticism proceeded, its underlying assumption was the insistence that nothing must be done to disturb the confidence of business men. It did not inquire whether they ought not to revise the limits of their timidity. It built upon the belief that despite all that had happened it was the part of political wisdom to continue to take them at their own valuation." [4]

The control of the machinery of Government by the invisible hand of economic power and a concurrent resistance to meet changing conditions, inevitably led to the deterioration of political democracy as it had functioned in the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century.

After World War I, and especially during world-wide depression in the late nineteen twenties and early thirties, political democracy was repudiated in one country after another in Europe and some form of "antarchy" took its place: Fascism in Italy—nazism in Germany, Poland, Hungary, Austria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Rumania. The stage was then set for World War II.

The most recent testimony at the Nuremberg trials shows how Hitler was financed by the Krupps, Thysens, and other owners of giant international cartels—nazism merely completed the circle giving full control to industry and finance.

In our own country, for many years prior to the great depression, political democracy was deteriorating, due to the control of the machinery of Government by the invisible hand of economic power. For many years, prior to 1933, we beheld less and less American citizens availing themselves of the right of suffrage, the very foundation of liberal democracy. In non-Presidential years, 45 percent or less of the voters went to the polls. In a Presidential year, 50 percent was a high average.

We also saw in these years prior to the world-wide depression the distinction between the two main parties largely disappearing. So it came about there was little difference in their party platforms and the 45 or 50 percent of citizens who went to the polls had a choice merely between men, not between principle. This led Nicholas Murray Butler to remark that "there are millions of Republican voters, but there is no longer any Republican Party." President Butler saw a much similar situation among the Democrats.

So we see liberal democracy repudiated abroad and slowly "rotting away," even in the United States of America. Jefferson, the great Father of Democracy, wrote in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

But liberal democracy, which had as a basic premise that business shall be free from control, failed to give the people living in the democracies equality, even equality of opportunity. It failed to give them the most important thing in liberty, viz liberty in the economic sphere. Liberal democracy, in consequence, denied the great wage-earning masses even the right to the pursuit of happiness.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "The sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon the definition of the word 'liberty.'"

A recent writer has well said: "The gravamen of the charge brought against the nineteenth century liberal democracy, both by American reformers and by European revolutionaries, was that it left the little man helpless in the stranglehold of organized economic power. * * * If democracy is to regain meaning, liberty must be redefined as something like maximum social and economic opportunity."

The revolt all over Europe against, and the repudiation of, liberal democracy, as it functioned in the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century, was due, therefore, to the fact that it created inequality, not equality. It also severely limited liberty.

Speaking on the subject that the laissez faire system of political economy had outlived its usefulness, Julian Huxley, grandson of Thomas Huxley, himself a great student of the sicence of life, put the present world situation in a nutshell. He said there are but three courses open to the nations of the world:

(1) Socialism, a system of complete government ownership and operation of the tools of production and distribution. Soviet Russia is the living example.

(2) The corporate or totalitarian state, wherein the corporate power of organized business is the ruler, through a dictator. The closest example was Nazi Germany. (Prior to 1933 the United States was rapidly becoming such a corporate state. Read Thurman Arnold, Folk Lore of Capitalism; also the sensational material in Ferdinand Lundberg's book, America's Sixty Families. To the extent any organized corporate power and finance controlled the people of Europe, read Upton Sinclair's World's End, recent Pulitzer prize winner.)

(3) The third alternative is a democratic state which exercises control over organized economic power, preserves free enterprise, to the extent enterprise is free from monopolistic control. Such a state must establish a planned economy, wherein the goal is the interest of the little man, the consumer, as distinguished from the enthronement of the producer and the financier.

Twenty years ago, Prof. R. H. Tawney (The Acquisitive Society, p. 49) noted with surprise that people "talk as though man existed for industry instead of industry existing for man."

Summary

Thus we see, in the age which saw the birth of laissez-faire economics, the industrial system was based on a society of small

[3] Essay Annual, 1938, p. 7.

[4] Essay Annual, 1938, pp. 8-9.

entrepreneurs, independent craftsmen, and individual merchants. Invested capital was comparatively small and the system was highly flexible. As the nineteenth century advanced, these conditions were destroyed. Picture for yourself the United States, or any highly industrialized country, as it exists today. We see, side by side, in the United States, several distinct systems:

(1) We still have the small manufacturer and merchant operating in a system of free and highly competitive production or distribution.

(2) We see also mammoth industries—United States Steel, General Motors, the Ford Motor Co., the General Electric Co.

(3) We see still another type of mammoth corporation, not even remotely connected with the competitive forces of free enterprise, viz, the monopoly founded on a franchise, on a basic patent or series of patents, or on a natural resource. These include the great power trusts, controlling electric power, the great oil companies—Standard Oil, the International Telephone and Telegraph Co., the Western Union.

(4) We see many of these giant mammoths combining into international cartels, dividing amongst themselves the markets of the world, fixing prices and controlling the volume of production, solely in the interest of invested capital and dividends.

(5) We see, as impartial students and fearless thinkers have observed, several consequences of this complex system:

(a) Ownership of these giant corporations and international cartels represented by pieces of paper called stocks and bonds;

(b) Management separated from ownership;

(c) Control passing from the hands of both ownership and management finally into the hands of great banking concerns like J. P. Morgan & Co.

As someone aptly said, even the old idea of "property" as conceived by the founding fathers has become a myth. "To say that some hundreds of thousands of anonymous shareholders own the great industrial corporations of Great Britain and the United States, is almost as meaningless as to call the proletariat the owner of the means of production in Soviet Russia."

Under the foregoing conditions, we see these giant corporations able to "fix prices," "determine at any time the amount of production" (they can increase it or restrict it at will, or even close it down, if it interferes with profits.)

Production not consumption becomes the chief end; proof not human welfare the controlling force.

In this historical phase, the theory of Adam Smith of a self-regulating economy is as dead as a dodo. For the classical economist held that the law of supply and demand would automatically control production, while free competition in the open market would regulate prices; in turn, the profit motive would act as a driving force to increase production or create new enterprise. Furthermore, we have seen a rigidity develop—increasingly rigid, as huge investments of capital became fixed in these mammoth corporations.

So dangerous has this rigidity of huge capital investment become, we behold these giant corporations buying up new patents and then holding new, cheaper, and more useful types of goods off the markets. We also see billions of dollars spent in advertising and high-pressure salesmanship to persuade people to buy goods which only too frequently the people do not want. Thus, obsolescence is subsidized by invested capital. All of this is directly opposite to the theory that capital, representing the savings of the people, was the driving force of progress. State socialism has been chiefly condemned because economists feared its rigidity. It now appears billions of dollars invested in a mammoth corporation is becoming equally rigid and static.

III. POSITION OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. President, and Members of Congress—

It would appear from the press, which, itself, has been one of the chief instruments in giving and perpetrating the economic control of America to industry, business, and finance, that the Congress of Industrial Organizations now seek control for organized labor.

This is not the truth. Neither capital nor labor can exercise control in a free society. Such is our firm belief.

Economic democracy

We hold, however, that political democracy is not sufficient in itself, in a highly industrialized society to expand production and as production expands, to distribute this increased wealth equitably amongst the consumers of the Nation.

To political democracy we must add economic democracy.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations subscribes wholeheartedly to the new economic bill of rights given by President Roosevelt to Congress January 11, 1944:

"We have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights," he said, "under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all, regardless of station, race or creed.

"Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large or small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

"The right to a good education."

This second bill of rights was elaborated upon in the code adopted April 1944 by the International Labor Organization. The International Labor Organization, April 1944, stated:

"Believing that experience has fully demonstrated the truth of the statement in the preamble to the constitution of the International Labor Organization that lasting peace can be established only if it is based on social justice, the conference affirms that all human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity, that the attainment of the conditions in which this shall be possible must constitute the central aim of national and international policy, and that all policies and measures, in particular those of an economic and financial character, must be judged in this light and accepted only insofar as they may be held to promote and not to hinder the achievement of this fundamental objective.

"Matters for urgent attention

"Among the matters to which urgent attention should be given by the International Labor Organization, the conference attaches special importance to the following:

"1. The maintenance of full employment and the raising of standards of living.

"2. The employment of workers in the occupations in which they can have the satisfaction of giving the fullest measure of their skill and attainments and make their greatest contribution to the common well-being and, as a means to the attainment of this end, the provision under adequate guarantees for all concerned of facilities for training and the transfer of labor, including migration for employment and settlement.

"3. The application of policies in regard to wages and earnings, hours and other conditions of work calculated to insure a just share of the fruits of progress to all, and the assurance of a minimum living wage to all in need of such protection.

"4. The effective recognition of the right of collective bargaining, the cooperation of management and labor in the continuous improvement of productive efficiency, and the collaboration of workers and employers in the initiation and application of social and economic measures.

"5. The extension to the whole population of social-security measures providing a basic income in case of inability to work or to obtain work, and providing comprehensive medical care.

"6. The provision of adequate protection for the life and health of workers in all occupations.

"7. Provisions for child welfare, and maternity protection, and the provision of adequate nutrition, housing, and facilities for recreation and culture.

"8. The assurance of equality of education and vocational opportunity" (for all boys and girls without regard to the economic status of their parents).

Thus, organized labor does not seek control. Rather, labor identifies its interests with the interests of America's 140,000,000 citizens.

Labor holds that the interests of management, of labor, and of the consumer are indivisible. Unilateral action by either management or labor is subversive to the common welfare. Therefore, labor opposes either dictatorship by capital—big business, or a dictatorship by the proletariat.

IV. SPECIFIC REPLY TO LEADING POINTS IN THE PETITION OF RHODE ISLAND INDUSTRIAL LEADERS

In the foregoing, we have sought to give a general reply to the philosophy underlying the petition of the Rhode Island industrial group. We will deal briefly with several specific measures:

(1) Full employment: S. 380—the Murray full-employment bill. Let us quote, in part, from the testimony of Philip Murray on the full-employment bill given before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Insurance: [5]

"Congress has an enormous opportunity this fall and a solemn responsibility. These months should be memorable for the progressive legislation passed. The country must be mobilized for an attack upon poverty, ignorance, and fear that compares to our war effort. No one can say such a mobilization will cost us too much; the contrary is true—it will cost us too much to fail.

"The war cost us $10,000,000 an hour: $10,000,000 a day for the transition to peace would be an insignificant sum in consideration of the treasure we shall lose and the unhappiness we shall endure if we have mass unemployment. The total dollar cost of the war will be more than four hundred billions. The sales lost through mass unemployment of Americans during the depression totaled $355,000,000,000. Even greater than wage and profit loss was the suffering of people which cannot be measured. I insist that every citizen has a right to a job at a high wage, commensurate with work performed; that it is the responsibility of the National Government to assure that right; that all the resources of the Government should be applied to make it effective.

"We must use what it takes to prevent the catastrophe of mass unemployment just as we used our resources in cooperative endeavor

[5] An Economic Bill of Rights, Philip Murray, October 1945, Survey Graphic, p. 397.

to prevent the catastrophe of fascism overwhelming the world. My idea is not merely that work shall be created through appropriation of public funds to keep people from starving on a $52-a-month WPA. We are dealing with new wealth greater than we have ever conceived, created by the application of skill, intelligence, and energy in such volume that really substantial fruits of victory will spread throughout the world.

"Some manufacturers are saying they cannot provide more jobs than existed during the war or even as many. I do not believe or admit that. We never before the war produced the quantities of food, clothing, and shelter needed to give all Americans a decent standard of living. We can expect such productive activity to provide millions of jobs.

"* * * Chapter 10 in Fred M. Vinson's July 1 report (written while he was still director of War Mobilization and Reconversion) contained this passage:

" 'The American people are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 percent better than they have ever lived before. Only the defeatist can scoff at the inescapable fact that we must build our economy on that basis.'

"But people are not going to be 50 percent better off if they no longer have jobs. People who are unemployed are 100 percent worse off. I am making no criticism of Judge Vinson; rather I praise him for the vision reflected in his statement. * * *

"The American people are asking: Why are the good things a part of war? Why can't we have them in peacetime as well? They have seen infant and child care, housing, maternity care for wives of servicemen, more ample supplies of good food, physical-fitness activities, steady jobs at better wages, more complete utilization of the labor and skill of all Americans.

"* * * The American labor movement believes in private competitive enterprise. * * *

"If private enterprise fails to give workers jobs at good wages, turning out things we all need, the people will recognize the failure of private capitalism and vigorously call for Government operation. * * * Senate bill 380 is enabling legislation, the object of which is to unite the two great oceans of production and consumption so that commerce may increase and full employment be attained. The bill designates the machinery to begin a job which cannot and must not be delayed."

The Rhode Island industrialists in their petition go all out against the full-employment bill. In one breath they say it is desirable but impracticable. Then they quote Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Boards, to the effect it leads to total regimentation and raises the Red scare of Russia. May we quote from Stuart Chase in his review of Henry Wallace's recent book, Sixty Million Jobs? [6]

"Everybody officially claims to be for full employment, but powerful minority groups are organizing to kill all specific measures leading to that end. Privately they say that it is high time to have a buyers' market in labor once more. They affirm that unemployment is the price we must pay for the blessings of our free-enterprise system. Booms and depressions, they say, are as much a part of the system as the stock exchange, and Mr. Wallace and his ilk, wittingly or unwittingly, are taking us right into the Kremlin.

"Wittingly or unwittingly, the minority groups are adopting an exceedingly dangerous strategy. It is dangerous not only for the country and for the world at large but for themselves and their properties. The formula seems to be: remove all Government controls, decimate the bureaucrats, balance the Budget, reduce corporate taxes, and let nature take its course. A better recipe for complete economic disintegration it is difficult to imagine. In a time which demands bold, aggressive action their program is completely negative. It disregards the facts of two world wars, of the super depression of the thirties, the distortions of our economy under the pressures of the last 5 years, the coming of the atomic bomb, and above all the temper of the rank and file of our people. It totally disregards the wishes of 15,000,000 servicemen, now home or coming home.

"* * * Given full employment, nearly every other economic and social problem becomes manageable. Workers are contented, and so are farmers. Negroes—the first group to be fired and the last to be hired—have a far better time of it. Crime goes down as mental and physical health goes up. Ample funds become available for education, science, research. Taxes are relatively easy to bear when the national gross income hits $200,000,000,000, and the Federal debt can be held in line. With a large volume of unemployment a debt of $300,000,000,000 will rapidly become unmanageable."

The point of view of many of our industrial leaders remind one of the fable of the man who had a goose who every day laid a golden egg. The golden eggs piled higher and higher. He was so greedy he would not even sell them and put them into circulation. Then came the day when his rapacity and greed reached such an emotional pitch he would not wait for the next day. So, he killed the goose which laid the golden eggs.

How long is the American public, how long are our Representatives in Congress going to listen to this policy of "defeatism" of big business which seems bound to kill our wonderful system of production? As Phil Murray says: "The great oceans of production and consumption must be merged into one ocean. Only so can our system of mass production survive."

(3) The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill (S. 1050).

There could be no better illustration of the intransigent and uncompromising position of conservatives in certain industrial, business and financial quarters than the Rhode Island group's opposition to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. It confirms Harold Laski's statement that conservatism in the United States since 1933, "has passed through the whole gamut of Bentham's Book of Fallacies in its endeavor to resist the onset of change."

Limits of space will not permit a detailed statement with respect to this bill. In brief, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill provides for a comprehensive social-security program; viz, preventive public health, medical care for the sick, old-age and unemployment insurance for all, care of dependent, homeless children, maternal and child care, care for all adults in need, hospitalization on a big scale.

This proposal for a comprehensive social-security system is the result of nearly 10 years of actual experience with the provisions of the original Social Security Act. It is based upon a realistic appraisal of the Beveridge report which in some 300 pages gives a critical survey of the British system as it operated over the past 25 years. It can be said that the proposed system is based upon the maturity and experience of social security as it has developed during a quarter of a century both here and abroad.

There can be little question that this program, extending as it does, social security to nearly all of our 140,000,000 citizens, has the overwhelming support of the American people. It has the approval of the whole of organized labor, comprising some 14,000,000 workers. It has been approved by national organizations of public-welfare workers, public-health associations, many church organizations of all denominations.

We point out that politically the demand for a comprehensive social-security program, supplemented by a full-employment economy, is irresistible. Both political parties have pledged themselves to it. As we know, our late President was responsible for the first comprehensive social-security system. Subsequently, on numerous occasions he advocated extension of the existing program.

In his last campaign President Roosevelt came out for full employment, demanding jobs for 60,000,000 people. He asserted this was an attainable goal in the United States.

Governor Dewey, as a candidate for President, called for a widely expanded program of social security. In his Seattle speech, September 21, 1944, the Governor advocated full employment, stating it was the business of Government to provide jobs and opportunity for all * * * if at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around.

President Truman also strongly supports S. 380—full employment, and S. 1050—social security.

V. POSITION OF CONGRESS

Why is it that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, first introduced May 24, 1943, has languished in Congress for 2½ years, with no immediate prospect of passage?

Why is it that the full-employment bill, declared by President Truman as "must legislation," has failed of passage?

We stated above that there was an invisible government in the United States of America. We pointed out big business has not only secured control of the economic destiny, but the political destiny of this Republic. As Harold Laski indicated, this control was of such a character "that the public did not perceive the reality of its (economic powers) lien.

We quote again from Laski—for here lies the very heart of America's dilemma of popular frustration in what is, without doubt, the greatest economic and social crisis in world history:

"The contrast between the formal and the real government of America grew ever more stark. Popular will was never fully effective because it was always stayed before it reached the center of authority. It (popular will) was bewildered by its inability to realize itself through the institutions appointed for that purpose."

Congressmen who read that statement, we do not doubt, will resent it.

If the majority Members of Congress are not following the line of business and industry—

(1) Why is it that the people cannot get through Congress a realistic full employment bill, together with a comprehensive social-security program?

(2) Why is it, on the other hand, Congress has handed on a golden platter to industry and big business the wealth of Croesus?

May we quote again from Philip Murray's testimony on the full-employment bill? Speaking on the topic Profit Security, as distinguished from social security, the president of the CIO said: [7]

"Those Members of Congress who are guilty of all these derelictions concerning the common people have not hesitated to add to the inflation of American corporate fortunes. Last July, a special interim tax measure was made law to hasten the return to the wealthy of some of the taxes they had been charged from their excess war profits. This action was taken at the same time President Truman's message urging unemployment compensation legislation lay untouched.

"The Revenue Act of 1942, already contained the carry-back, carry-forward provisions, as well as the provision for refunding 10 percent of corporations' excess-profit taxes which had been paid during the war. The first of these allowances made available a total of $27,000,000,000 and the second approximately $3,000,000,000. On top of all this,

[6] The Nation, September 29, 1945, p. 313.

[7] An Economic Bill of Rights, Philip Murray, October 1945, Survey Graphic, p. 399.

the working capital of American corporations listed on the national stock exchanges increased $20,000,000,000 from war profits. The July 20 report of the Securities and Exchange Commission headlines the war-profit gain in working capital of corporations at 63 percent above the 1939 level, and declares: 'The steady increase in working capital to unprecedented levels, reaching a new high estimated at $45,500,000,000 for all American corporations, is considered by the Commission to reemphasize the ability of American industry as a whole to reconvert to peacetime production and also to undertake considerable expansion without recourse to outside sources of funds.'

"Against this huge coagulation of wealth, the cost of industrial reconversion beyond that absorbed by the Government under the Contract Termination Act is only $3,000,000,000. This figure is stated in the May 10 document entitled 'The War—Phase Two' issued by Judge Vinson immediately after VE-day.

"These figures become more significant when I point out that they mean the typical American corporation is protected against reconversion loss of income to the extent of 15 years of normal net income on the base of 1936–39. If this huge sum were available to workers, it would mean that the average wage earner would now have on hand war savings in the amount of $7,200, would shortly receive a tax refund of $1,200 from the United States Treasury, and in case of reduced earnings or no earnings during the next year or two could call on the Treasury for additional payments up to $9,600. His total protection for the transition would add up to $18,000.

"Instead of such a sum, each wage earner has on the average only about $300 backlog on savings. This includes the great majority who have nothing, as well as those who are lucky enough to have saved a thousand dollars or more. Even if the full $25 a week of unemployment compensation urged by President Truman and the labor movement should be paid for the full 26-week period suggested the total amount would be only $650. This would not support a family adequately for a half year.

"I mention these matters of neglect and discrimination to show that certain people in and out of Congress are so short-sighted as to oppose purchasing power for workers. Why, I do not know, since the success of businessmen depends on their having a good market for their products."

(3) We find labor, organized and unorganized, in the past few months has sought to hold the line on wages in order that the American consumer can adequately consume the products of a mass production. We find great industrial empires, like General Motors, United States Steel, and practically all vast industrial empires, refuse to consider wages equal to the wartime take-home pay without increased prices; at the same time, industry refuses to open its books to prove adequate wages cannot be paid and still leave to these industrial empires more than adequate profits. Why is it a majority of Congress not only gives aid and comfort to these industrial empires but threatens labor with drastic legislation if it does not surrender to the economic serfdom of a feudalism more ominous to the common man than the ancient feudalisms of past history.

We find the Rhode Island group of industrialists, speaking the voice of all big industry, denouncing the efforts of Chester Bowles and the Office of Price Administration to hold down prices to prevent American consumers from being engulfed in a typhoon of inflation. Why is it the majority in Congress seem to support this inflationary program of the industrialists and other business groups?

Lest we forget:

Run-away inflation in 1922 in Germany wiped out Germany's great middle class and paved the way for Hitler, supported by German monopolists, to overthrow democratic government and establish a totalitarian corporate state.

Big corporate business in America, either with the actual support, or tacit consent of Congress, is pursuing the suicidal policies it pursued after World War I. We quote again, from Harold Laski: [8]

"In the economic realm, in a word, the necessary rule of an efficient conservatism, is to recognize that there is no such thing as unconditional power. The Romanovs of this world are followed by the Lenins as unavoidably as the Coolidges are followed by the Roosevelts. An era of temporary prosperity may, as in the twenties, obscure the size of the bills to come; it is still certain that they will be presented in the long run. And in a national economy even as contingently wealthy as that of America, the obscurity may be so misleading that to meet the bill when it does come is a shock too great for the body politic to bear. That is why the economics of businessmen in the Coolidge era were so disastrous. All its assumptions were built upon the hypothesis that business prosperity is coincident with a national prosperity. It paid no serious attention to the conditions upon which business prosperity was being achieved. When the crash came its beneficiaries wrung their hands and went in tearful hope to the White House for assistance. Why should they have been surprised when other classes in the community—the farmers, the workers—thought that they were not less entitled than business to aid from the governmental power? The inability of businessmen, once the period of recovery had begun, to learn the obvious lesson of their own ineptitude is the measure of the degree to which they had habit without philosophy. They were prepared for salvation from Washington when their own interests were in jeopardy. Once these were safe, they returned to a way of thought in which Washington and salvation were antithetic terms. When others failed to see the antithesis their alarm and indignation were unlimited. It is wonderful that in these circumstances the average man should have concluded that, whoever should control the Government of the United States, the case against its control by banker and businessman was an unanswerable one."

It was President Roosevelt who remarked:

"The rulers of the exchange of mankinds' goods have failed through their own stubbornness and incompetence, have admitted their failure, and have abdicated. * * * The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit." The President, also in 1933, expressed the belief that "we are at the threshold of a fundamental change in our economic thought * * * that in the future we are going to think less about the producer and more about the consumer."—("Looking Forward," Franklin Delano Roosevelt, p. 49).

The case against the control of the Government of the United States by the bankers and businessmen is an unanswerable one.

Why does such control continue?

It lies at the door of the Congress of the United States.

Yet, the CIO realizes that Congress is not corrupt. The CIO believes the majority Members of Congress are hard working and have the interests of the rank and file of the 140,000,000 consumers of goods and services at heart. We do not believe, and cannot believe the majority Members of Congress, would deliberately deny the people of this richest Nation on earth, social security, full employment, and a high standard of living.

We believe—we must believe, the majority Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, subscribe wholeheartedly to President Roosevelt's statement as to "The Foundations of Democracy": [9]

"There is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

"Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.

"Jobs for those who can work.

"Security for those who need it.

"The ending of special privilege for the few.

"The preservation of civil liberties for all.

"The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living."—Message to Congress, January 6, 1941.

May we respectfully submit that the trouble lies in certain beliefs—which have been common to all Americans. These beliefs—constituted the economic faith of America and have behind them the strength of a long tradition.

America has been conditioned to believe:

1. That there exists an economic system of free enterprise which has built up the greatest and richest Nation on earth.

2. America believes business prosperity is coincident with and the same thing as national prosperity.

3. America believes that her marvelous achievements are due, entirely, to the initiative, the inventiveness, and a sort of Yankee shrewdness—peculiar to ourselves. Therefore, American business has produced, alone and unaided, our wealth.

4. America believes our system of political democracy is perfect—and therefore unchangeable. America believes the secret ballot and free elections can solve every economic problem.

5. America has looked upon the man who has made the greatest success in business, industry, or finance as the great man. He is our national hero.

6. In our pursuits of material wealth, America's faith in material things has placed the producer before the consumer, wealth became an end in itself—rather than a means to human welfare.

The facts of life do not support these beliefs.

In blind faith in free enterprise, individual initiative coupled with the beliefs in a certain hero-worship of business and business leadership, our schools, our press, our motion pictures (which invariably places the rich on a pedestal) have overlooked certain facts of life, viz:

1. Natural resources:

That the continental United States possessed the greatest natural resources in forests, coal, oil, hydroelectric power, iron, copper, silver, gold, and other minerals.

Under the laissez-faire system the American people made a free gift of this vast wealth, not created by man to private individuals or private corporations. Most of the American dynasties and giant monopolies were founded on this gift of riches to the few—of what was the birthright of the many.

In many instances, if not most, America's richest natural resources were acquired by corruption of State legislatures and not, infrequently, of the courts. That is initiative but not what the classical economists meant by free enterprise.

2. Franchises: Other great dynasties of business and finance came into being by acquisition of franchises, viz, municipal electric, gas, telephone, and street railway franchises. These highly valuable natural monopolies were also too frequently acquired by corruption of municipal governments. The classical economists did not envisage such natural monopolies and certainly would have been shocked to be told the Interna-

[8] Essay Annual, 1938, p. 6.

[9] The Real F. D. R., p. 36.

tional Telephone & Telegraph Co. was free enterprise.

3. Patents:

Patents protected by government based upon fundamental scientific research, also created vast industrial dynasties including the threatening international cartels of present-day economy. The classical economists might have dubbed this as enterprise but would have been horrified to have it classified as free enterprise.

In hardly a single instance did the scientist who did the basic research and disclosed the secrets of nature which made the invention possible, receive a nickel. The scientist gave his discoveries free to all the world. In most cases, even the inventor who took advantage of the basic scientific discoveries of others, did not capitalize on his initiative and enterprise. As a rule, some great corporation or monopoly, especially in these later days, gypped the inventor out of his due reward.

4. The protective tariff: The high protective tariff system in the United States was a direct negation of the classical theory of laissez-faire and free enterprise. Many of our greatest industrial dynasties were built up under these protective walls, viz., the iron and steel industry, the electrical industry, the textile industry, and many others. We are not saying that as America emerged from an agricultural to an industrial producer, that protective tariffs were bad. We merely point out that industry did not make its achievements by individual initiative unaided by Government intervention and aid. President Roosevelt once said, "The same man who does not want to see Government interfere in business * * * is the first to go to Washington to ask the Government for a prohibitory tariff." [10]

5. America's railway empire: The facts of life show that our great railway system not only received valuable and sometimes exclusive franchises, but our transcontinental railways received as a gift from the Federal Government alternate sections of land worth billions of dollars alongside the railroad's right-of-way.

6. The automobile industry: Leaders of industry might claim that individual initiative and free enterprise were responsible for creating America's greatest of industries—the automobile industry. The valuable study, "Recent Economic Trends," issued around 1931, pointed out the automobile industry taking into consideration all its ramifications, accounted for 20 percent of employment in the United States in 1929. This included not only manufacture of automobiles, tires, parts, and acessories, but wholesale and retail establishments selling automobiles, tires, accessories, and parts; also, it included garages, gasoline stations, wayside stands, overnight cabins, etc.

Did Government play no part in this marvelous achievement of the twentieth century? Did industry and business achieve this alone?

By no means. Federal and State governments expended billions of dollars of public money to build over 300,000 miles of hard-surfaced roads and thousands of costly bridges. Without this Government aid, expanding hand in hand with the expansion of automobile manufacture, America's greatest industry with all its ramifications, would have died aborning. In fact, public capital expenditures on highways and bridges well compare with the total capital investment in our great automotive manufacturing plants.

Congress and the American people should pause, therefore, and examine the assumption of business, industry, and finance that they are primarily responsible for the growth and prosperity of America. An objective analysis shows that business and industry have received free the gifts of the richest continent on earth, viz, fabulous natural resources; exclusive franchises with respect to public services, by nature monopolistic, not subject to competition; exclusive patents based on the initiative and brains of men engaged in pure scientific research; protective tariffs, shutting off foreign competition; vast subsidies to railways, river and harbor improvements; vast improvements by public funds to enable the automobile industry to expand.

Judge Thurman Arnold, in charge of violations of the antitrust laws, learned a great deal about free enterprise (so-called). He wrote a book, entitled "The Folklore of Capitalism."

Folklore deals with the beliefs, traditions, and myths of a people. It is founded on some truth; also on wishful thinking and daydreams. Folklore is a combination of fact and myth.

There is a degree of fact with respect to the achievements of industry through individual initiative and free enterprise, with respect to highly competitive industries.

It is in the realm of myth, where business and industry have sold the American people, and through them, Congress, "a phony" bill of goods. There are two great myths of business and industry:

1. The myth that free enterprise and competitive industry are the prevailing patterns in the midhalf of the twentieth century.

The stark fact is monopoly, ever increasing, stifling individual initiative, stifling competition, and finally controlling prices, wages, volume of output, and profits.

2. The second myth is that business and industry have, unaided, created the prosperity and wealth of America.

The facts are that the gift of the vast natural resources, the gift of monopolistic franchises and patents, the aid of high protective tariffs, the expenditure of vast public funds on public works, and above all, the basic research and discoveries of pure scientists have done more to build America than all the individual initiative and enterprise of business.

Labor's contribution

One hesitates "to blow his own horn." Yet business and industry have blown their horn so long and so loud, it has become like the fatal tune of the Pied Piper who led unsuspecting children to their doom.

Labor has cut down our forests. It has sawed the trees into lumber, built our homes, our factories, our railways, our highways. Labor has delved into the bowels of the earth, mined our coal, extracted our minerals.

Labor has fabricated with its brain and hands, locomotives, cars, rails. It has made the clothes we wear. It has planted our crops and harvested them. It has processed our food.

Labor, too, has run our railways, our trucks, transporting our wealth across the continent. It has loaded our wealth onto ships and sailed the Seven Seas.

Humble—behind the counters of our stores, labor has sold us the wares of industry. Humble—in the banks, and in industry, labor has kept the books of industry meticulously—accurately.

Labor is the rank and file. Its deeds have been indeed deeds of heroism, of loyalty, of devotion to arduous and hazardous tasks—all those tasks a snobbish society calls menial.

Why? Because America held before the workers of America the great goal of equality—equality of opportunity, equality in the sharing of the wealth, which labor created in so great measure.

Yet a great economist, Lord Maynard Keynes, financial adviser to the British Government, said 20 years ago:

"The principle of accumulation based on inequality was a vital part of the prewar order of society."

Lord Keynes also said:

"The forces of the nineteenth century have run their course and are exhausted. The economic motives and ideals of that generation no longer satisfy us; we must find a new way and must suffer again the malaise, and finally the pangs, of a new industrial faith." [11]

CONCLUSION

We opened this statement with the following quotation: "A great commonwealth cannot be successfully governed by men with closed minds."

The evidence before the jury of the American people is overwhelming that large sectors of business, industry, and finance have closed their minds with respect to the nature and character of present world economy; have closed minds with respect to the catastrophe of World War I, a world-wide depression which followed that catastrophe, and the catastrophe of World War II. This sector of business, industry, and finance refuses to see the close connection between these destructive forces to civilization, and political economy and social science. Long in control of the destiny of both the national economy and the machinery of government, big business in capitalistic democracies, not only seeks to perpetuate its control but also resists any change in a world which is undergoing the most rapid changes in the history of mankind.

The question which confronts the American Congress, the elected representatives of the people, is whether Congress is to support this "blindfold" policy of business, industry, and finance, or whether Congress is going to assume leadership on behalf of the consumers of America and on behalf of human welfare.

What is needed most today is constructive imagination and bold experiments in the field of political, economic, and social affairs. Politics needs to take a leaf from the book of science. Every leading scientist in the world is calling upon the people and their representatives to realize that the discovery of the secrets of atomic energy can on one hand destroy civilization, and on the other, raise the level of human welfare to peaks undreamed of in the preatomic age. The people of the earth, however, did not need to wait for the discovery of atomic energy to recognize that the eighteenth and nineteenth century concepts and traditions were long ago shattered by one scientific discovery after another as the industrial revolution grew and expanded through unlocking by scientific research of the marvelous secrets and the hidden wealth of this planet.

ENOUGH AND TO SPARE

We have before us a little book entitled "Enough and to Spare." The author, Kirtley F. Mather, is professor of geology in Harvard University. Reviewing carefully the resources of our earth, Professor Mather states: "Mother Earth can nourish every man in freedom." There is enough and to spare for the 2,000,000,000 inhabitants of the earth. How attain it? By scientific and social planning, says Professor Mather. Let us look at society through the eyes of this eminent geologist: [12]

"All the world is in flux. Mankind is on the march. From the fiery forge and ringing anvil of history a new way of life is emerging. Change is most certainly king. But the nature of the change, the character of the new way of life, the goal toward which we march, the heaven to which the world tides flow are hidden in the mists of the uncertain future.

[10] Looking Forward, p. 25.

[11] Lord Maynard Keynes, the Economic Consequences of the Peace, pp. 19 and 238.

[12] Enough and to Spare, by Kirtley F. Mather, pp. 1, 8, 9, 10.

"In that future there is only one certainty: the nature of the new world will be determined by the ideas and ideals that govern the affairs of men. It is still true that ideas are tools and weapons, that ideals are implements and armor. Man persistently refuses to live by bread alone.

"Attention has frequently been directed by students of evolution to the fact that mutual aid and intelligent cooperation were increasingly stressed by successive members of the mammalian line leading at last to the modern human species. For millions of years our ancestors were in immediate competition for survival with saber-toothed tigers and other rapacious beasts of field, forest, and jungle. Victory was won not because of stronger muscles, sharper claws, more powerful talons, or greater bulk, but by virtue of the skillful use of sticks, stones, and fires; of clever planning for offense and defense; of superior organization of individuals into a social group; of thoroughgoing acceptance by each individual of his share of responsibility for the welfare of his fellows. The habit of cooperation, the capacity for sharing, the ability to think, and the attribute of ingenuity contributed greatly to their fitness for survival and were firmly established in the very fiber of our ancestral lineage.

"In accordance with the Darwinian principle of 'the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence' men would do well, if they wish to remain long in the land of the living, to develop to an even higher degree those characteristics and abilities that have had such great survival value for their kind in the past. The next steps in the progressive evolution of mankind will be marked by improvements in the human spirit rather than by changes in human anatomy, by increase in social consciousness of individuals rather than by greater emphasis upon personal or group selfishness, by application of intelligence to the problem of wiser utilization of the resources of the earth rather than by its application to the science of war. Only thus will the human species demonstrate its fitness to survive in the sort of world which we are discovering our world to be. As far as individual members of the human species are concerned, rapidly accumulating evidence indicates that the ability to persuade will have far greater survival value in the next few decades than the ability to coerce.

"* * * The way is now opened for more widespread abandonment of the self-centered individualism of the past and a new venture of reliance upon the social consciousness that has all too frequently lain dormant in our heritage. The summons to a life of kindly cooperation rather than of cutthroat competition comes not only as a call to greatness, a challenge to the noble elements in human nature; it is even more a demand of the intellect, a consequence of intelligence. The scientific study of man as an inhabitant of the earth makes it absolutely clear that the virtues extolled by the prophetic voices of religion are in complete harmony with the best interests of individuals and nations. Enlightened self-interest is a far cry from selfishness; when fully comprehended, it demands the entertainment of the cooperative life of universal brotherhood."

Some 125 years ago, a French philosopher wrote the following words: [13]

"Shall we attain, as some prophets, perhaps as vain as their predecessors, assure us, a social transformation more complete and more profound than our fathers foresaw and desired, or than we ourselves are able to foresee? Or are we about to enter on intermittent anarchy—that chronic and incurable malady well known to ancient peoples?"

[13] Souvenirs de Alexis de Tocqueville.

The National Grange Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the great farm organizations are very helpful to our Government and the Congress by preparing and presenting the Congress with their recommendations for a legislative program prepared as a result of their investigations and in light of actual experience gained in the Nation's greatest basic industry—agriculture. In submitting the National Grange proposed legislative program for printing in the RECORD I regret to find that the recommendation for a sound-money system and an honest dollar made in previous Grange platforms has apparently been overlooked—a plank that every Granger should support.

NATIONAL GRANGE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Agriculture demands: Sound money. Agriculture demands a monetary system providing an honest dollar, one just to debtor and creditor alike, with constant purchasing power, preventing uncontrolled inflation or the disastrous effects of deflation. (Platform, National Grange.)

GENERAL POLICY

American agriculture is entering a critical period of readjustment that goes far beyond a transition from war to peace. The changing pattern of production, distribution, and consumption makes that readjustment both necessary and difficult.

The fact that America and her allies emerged victorious over powerful enemies which had for many years been preparing for world conquest is due in no small measure to the ability of American farmers to make great readjustments speedily.

The production record of American farmers in war is a vindication of the democratic, private enterprise system which is the foundation of American agriculture. Problems of the moment must not cause us to forget that.

Peacetime readjustments present problems no less difficult than war. The fundamental principles which made America great are challenged from within by the proponents of ideologies which unsuccessfully sought to subjugate us from without.

The American farm affords the greatest single bastion from which to defend the principle that the people are the masters of their government, not the servants. A sound, self-supporting, prosperous, and unregimented agriculture is essential to the national welfare and the preservation of the American way of life.

To that proposition the National Grange dedicates its full energies and pledges unswerving loyalty. As long as American agriculture remains free this Nation never will be fettered by foreign isms. We have a duty to defend that freedom against all threats, whether from within or without our borders.

LEGISLATIVE AIMS

The legislative program of the National Grange is dedicated to the principles of justice to all and special privileges to none. Those guiding principles are succinctly expressed in the 10-point program unanimously adopted at the seventy-ninth annual session of the National Grange in Kansas City in November 1945.

The National Grange believes that a sound farm program is essential to the stability and prosperity of American agriculture and the Nation as a whole, and offers the following basic principles:

1. Conservation of our basic natural wealth of soil and timber must be promoted through sound soil building, water conservation, and fire-prevention programs.

2. Farmers' equitable share of the national income must be secured through a modernized parity and obtained through fair market prices rather than subsidies. Support prices may be justified where necessary to assure cost of production.

3. We shall continue, as in the past, to encourage both marketing and purchasing cooperative farm organizations as the first reliance for adjusting and stabilizing marketings.

4. We propose creation of a Surplus Commodity Commission by Congress to be provided with a stock of remedies for emergency actions in meeting the occasional surpluses inevitable in an economy of balanced abundance.

5. We urge extension of the Marketing Agreements Act to include producers of commodities which can use it to an advantage in assuring consumers adequate supplies at reasonable prices.

6. We favor use of marketing quotas, when approved by two-thirds of the growers voting in a referendum, for preventing surpluses from creating market gluts; supported by a two-price system domestically for diverting excessive supplies to inferior uses.

7. We also favor use of the two-price system for exports, to be accompanied by international commodity agreements assuring American farmers a fair share of world markets at stable prices.

8. We favor Federal and State guidance and assistance in the development of sound, long-range readjustment programs for problem areas.

9. We favor establishment of a Federal Office of Nutrition to cooperate with State, local, and private agencies in promoting improved diets through research and education.

10. We favor research in the sciences of production and processing; for discovery of new and expanded uses of farm products; and for improving marketing and distribution.

WORLD PEACE

The maintenance of world peace on the basis of justice and equity for all is a paramount objective. The atom bomb makes the only probably alternative the destruction of our civilization. We support the objectives of the United Nations Organization. The fraternity of nations to encourage understanding and cooperation is essential to the preservation of peace.

WORLD FARM ORGANIZATION

A free, prosperous, and self-sustaining agriculture is the foundation of national and world security. Its ability to produce and distribute its products will contribute materially to lasting peace.

The National Grange approves the formation of an international farm organization composed of representatives of general national farm organizations of the various nations of the world.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The National Grange advocates formulation of a program which would achieve a greater stability of income from farming. It believes that this cannot be achieved without a reasonable flow of goods between nations.

This can best be attained through some form of a two-price system. The Grange further believes that, in respect to major world commodities, such a two-price, or multiprice, system cannot work successfully unless a sound foundation of stability in the

world markets is achieved. We, therefore, endorse the general idea of international commodity agreements in which the United States would secure a fair share of the available international markets at internationally agreed upon stable world prices.

The Grange does not favor the dumping of surpluses on world markets in such a manner as to create chaotic price fluctuations.

PARITY FOR ALL

The Grange believes hat the material well-being of farmers and all other major groups rests solely on the relative value of goods produced and services rendered.

We believe the so-called farm problem is a result of the failure of agricultural values to remain in proper balance with the value of goods and services of other groups.

Therefore, the paramount solution of the farm problem will not be found in restricted cutput from our farms but in the establishment of a program of equitable and equalized values of goods and services produced and rendered by all groups in our national economy.

The present parity formula is inadequate and obsolete in that it does not include a most important element in farm costs—labor—and that it is not kept up to date by recognizing changes in both the diet and living demands of our population.

We reaffirm our belief that development of a sound parity principle must be brought about by a recognition of several important factors, not by great emphasis on any one. We recommend consideration of the following factors:

1. Recognition of farm-labor costs.
2. A method of keeping the formula constantly current or modern by adjusting the base-period prices to reflect the commodity relationship prevailing during the latest 5- or 10-year period.
3. The relative ability of income from both investment and labor of agriculture as compared with that from other industries and labor to purchase both the necessities and luxuries that contribute to the high standards of American living.
4. Full recognition that parity supports must not be used to sustain uneconomical and obsolete production.
5. Special emphasis upon faith in our own ability to solve the problem and a minimizing of the expectations of the Federal Government to subsidize us.

THE DANGER OF SUBSIDIES

No more real or serious threat to a free agriculture has risen in the history of our country than Federal subsidies. Un-American forces already are tightening their grip on farmers' throats through vicious subsidies.

The Grange consistently and from the very first propcsal of subsidies as a means of permitting farmers a fair market price has warned that farmers, once in the strangling embrace of subsidy forces, may never be able to extricate themselves.

Through all history, when any government undertook the task of feeding its citizens at public expense, the citizens have insisted on more subsidies, instead of fewer subsidies, as they became accustomed to the idea that it was the obligation of the government to support the individual.

A government which denies farmers a reasonable market price for the products of their land and labor in times when national income and prosperity are at record heights is open to the accusation that it seeks to exploit one segment of the population for the benefit of others.

If consumer groups are unwilling to pay their food bill when their incomes are at record heights, is there any reason to believe they will ever be willing to do so?

The Grange reaffirms and emphasizes its demand that subsidies be removed before they totally destroy the independence and self-reliance of American agriculture.

PRICE CONTROLS

The Grange has and continues to support all sound efforts to stabilize prices and prevent inflation. We believe, however, that controls which hold prices below cost of production promote black markets and create inflation.

Ample production is the best preventative of inflation. No man-made law can repeal the law of supply and demand, so long as competition is kept iree of uneconomic restraints. Price controls which prevent a free exchange of goods and services strangle production and destroy private enterprise.

FARM CREDIT

The Grange reaffirms its position in favor of a cooperative credit system based on sound business principles under the ownership and control of farmer borrowers. Federal supervision is necessary to assure that provisions of the law and the purposes of the Congress are complied with. All responsibilities for operation should be vested in the board of directors of the cooperative institutions in the field.

In the development of a sound, long-range farm-credit structure steps should be taken to establish the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency under a bipartisan board. The board should be a policy-making board only, employing administrators of the various types of credit, including long-term and short-term credit on a cooperative basis and emergency and rehabilitation credit on a direct-loan basis.

We emphasize the importance of bringing the cooperative credit agencies under a bipartisan policy-making board immediately and believe that there is definite advantage in coordinating the whole rural credit field. However, we recognize that it may be a practical approach to the problem to place the cooperative agencies under such a board as a first step, later including the direct agencies if conditions justify.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

We heartily approve of the efforts of the Government to promote improved rural electrification through the Rural Electrification Administration. As material and manpower become available, we urge that construction be made on a complete area-coverage basis.

We believe that the REA projects should be self-supporting; that rates should be established on a self-liquidating business; and that the members actively assume the responsibilities of directing the policies and the management.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

We favor the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway for power and navigation purposes as soon as labor and materials become available for this work.

SIX-DAY MARKET WEEK

Because large eastern terminal markets handling perishable foods have abandoned their long-established 6-day week and adopted a 5-day program instead, farmers have been injured through loss of produce. We believe that the practices of the labor unions and the commission-house operators in restricting marketings to a 5-day week is unfair and uneconomic.

The National Grange supports legislation which will curb activities of unions in interfering with normal and essential food-marketing services.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Our most valuable natural resource is our soil, and the wastage of our soil resources constitutes our greatest economic loss. If we are properly concerned about the welfare of generations to come, soil conservation may rightfully be termed our greatest national problem. There are three major approaches to the soil-conservation problem: (1) cultural practices, including crop rotation; (2) maintenance of mineral content; (3) protection from erosion.

STRIKES

The existing unrest on the industrial front and the growing prevalence of strikes is a matter of grave concern to every thinking American. Group selfishness and greed for power should be held in abeyance and subordinated to the general welfare. We believe that Congress, with the support of all national groups, should enact legislation which requires that both labor and management place the public welfare above the selfish demands for power and preferential treatment.

RURAL HOUSING

The Grange supports the movement for better housing conditions in rural America.

The Federal Government, through cooperation with State and local agencies, should provide technical assistance and sound credit to aid farmers in obtaining suitable housing facilities.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

We favor continued appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations to develop new crops to fill existing needs and expand uses for farm products.

The Grange believes that agricultural research offers one of the best methods of improving American standards of living through greater utilization of farm products.

TAXATION POLICIES

Taxes, spending, and debts cannot be considered separately. Our fiscal policy must be based on sound economics, because it will influence the lives of every American for many years to come. A sound fiscal policy should include:

1. Federal expenditures must be severely curtailed.
2. Federal tax income must be sufficient to meet current expenditures and steadily reduce the public debt.
3. Taxes must be more direct, in order that citizens may realize who pays for Government spending. Tax rates must leave sufficient corporate and individual income after taxes to provide an incentive to invest savings in enterprises which provide a high level of employment.
5. The taxing agencies of the various units of the Government should be consolidated as far as practicable.
6. Double taxation of the same income by any taxing unit should be eliminated.
7. Tax rates should be flexible to permit more rapid reduction of the national debt when production and employment are high.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

The dairy industry of the Nation has in recent years encountered many serious difficulties, besides being subjected to severe losses in many instances. The overwhelming majority of dairymen would prefer to receive a compensatory price for their products in the market place, rather than to have price ceilings fixed at levels below the cost of production, necessitating the payment of Government subsidies which do not benefit the producers of dairy products, but which are for the benefit of consumers.

THE COTTON INDUSTRY

In view of the important part which cotton plays in the economic structure of the Nation, the Grange recommends that:

(a) The Department of Agriculture and other Government agencies assemble at once and disseminate all the information with references to synthetic fibers competing with cotton, paying particular attention to any artificial advantages that synthetic products such as cheap wood pulp and other raw materials may now have.

(b) Proper steps should be taken to remove artificial advantages which substitutes now have in competing with cotton.

(c) A research program be launched designed to make available to farmers information on all phases of cotton production, distribution, and use.

(d) Any trade barriers that may now exist be eliminated.

(e) Consumption be expanded by making cotton in all desirable forms readily available to the public, and by reducing to a minimum the costs of production, ginning, manufacturing, marketing, and distribution.

(f) Machinery be provided to sell cotton and cotton goods in foreign markets at competitive world prices by the use of a two-price system.

(g) Adequate preparations be made for the operation of these programs by means of the necessary support of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

TRANSPORTATION

The Grange takes the position that each type of transportation should be allowed to develop and operate without any undue restrictions or handicaps imposed by the Government under the fallacious idea of equalizing competitive conditions. The carriers should not be allowed to charge higher rates than are necessary to produce compensatory returns.

We favor a continuance of the program under which our Federal-aid highway system has been developed. Undue emphasis should not be placed upon the construction of superhighways connecting the leading cities of the country until substantial progress has been made in the improvement of farm-to-market roads and rural mail roads.

Any special tax for highway improvement should be conserved for that purpose alone. No diversion of such funds should be allowed. We urge the Federal Government to withdraw completely from the field of automotive taxation, leaving the State as the sole taxing agency.

The heavy volume of wartime traffic carried on our inland waterways, relieving the congestion on the railroads, more than justifies the money expended in their development.

We recognize the vital and important role that air transportation will play in the postwar era, both in the domestic field and on an international scale. Every effort should be made to maintain our present position of leadership in this form of transportation.

FARM TENANCY

The Grange is heartily in favor of the taking of proper steps to enable farm laborers, tenants, and share-croppers to become farm owners. In dealing with this question, every effort should be made to correct conditions which in the past have resulted in reducing many thousands of former farm owners to the tenant class.

FARMS FOR VETERANS

We heartily approve of the idea that returning veterans who desire to engage in agricultural pursuits, and who appear to possess the necessary qualifications, should be assisted under proper conditions in getting established on farms.

Safeguards should be provided to protect veterans with no experience in farming from being made the victims of unwise investments.

CROP INSURANCE

Crop insurance must be considered as a necessary part of a well-rounded program to promote agricultural stabilization, and to protect farmers against the hazards of the weather and other conditions beyond their control. We, therefore, approve this type of insurance under the auspices of the Government, with such safeguards as are necessary to protect the public interest.

CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY

To insure an adequate supply of forest products, and to provide for flood control, soil conservation, and the protection of wildlife, besides improving recreational facilities, the National Grange recommends:

(a) Aid to forest land owners in such matters as protection against insect pests, fire, and diseases; technical advice in the production and marketing of forest products; suitable credit provisions; equitable taxation; research, and the completion of the forest survey of the United States at the earliest practicable date. More attention should be given to farm woodlands and other small forest holdings, which in the aggregate comprise about one-half of all our timber land, or nearly two-thirds of that which is privately owned.

(b) Speeding up acquisition and additions to the national forests of forest and submarginal land unsuited to private ownership. This should be done under conditions that will be fair to the land owners, the States, and the local governmental units.

(c) Adequate Federal reimbursements to counties in lieu of taxes during readjustment of the tax program.

(d) Continue and expand the present multiple-use program for national and other public forests, including sustained-yield management of forest, range, and wildlife resources, watershed protection, and recreational use.

(e) Extension program of tree planting and reforestation as soon as manpower is available.

(f) Retain the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture and consolidate thereunder all Federal forest activities. The administration of the Taylor Grazing Act should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

IMMIGRATION

The National Grange reaffirms its adherence to the existing immigration laws and urges their extension to include all members or former members of the Nazi, Fascist, Black Dragon Societies, or other groups or organizations whose concept of government is in conflict with our democratic form of government.

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

The National Grange urges that our full energies be devoted to the establishment of international cooperation for the preservation of peace. It opposes adoptions of compulsory military training as a national policy during peacetime and favors instead a system of federally supported programs under State and local supervision for promoting physical fitness and scientific study in schools as a means of preparing young men to fill their obligation to the Nation in peace as well as war.

The Grange believes that Congress should (1) determine the size of the military force necessary to maintain an adequate defense, with a practical means for reviewal at least biannually; (2) provide compensation and training conditions sufficient to assure adequate voluntary enlistment, and (3) reject any measure providing for peacetime conscription.

HEALTH

It is essential to the whole Nation that rural people share fully in the benefits of medical science regardless of their economic status, race, or geographical location. The National Grange recommends:

1. That because of the uneven and unpredictable cost of illness, it is of prime importance that rural people should spread the risks and share the costs of sickness by developing a comprehensive form of prepayment plans for hospital bills and health insurance.

2. That since many rural families and rural areas are too poor to support doctors and hospital services even with any form of health insurance, public or private funds be combined with insurance funds to equalize the ability of these families and these areas to secure and maintain needed health services.

3. That the people and doctors in every rural area should have access to modern diagnostic facilities and a hospital of good standing.

4. That since many rural areas cannot provide these facilities and services through their own efforts alone, State and Federal funds be made available for the construction of new hospitals and the improvement of some existing hospitals serving rural areas, but with the management of these institutions remaining in the hands of local people.

5. That public-health services with fully trained personnel be established in every rural section to improve sanitation, prevent and control disease, and promote good health. Health and welfare services for the protection of children in rural areas should be greatly expanded.

6. Rural people should organize locally to study their health needs, and to make and carry out plans with the needed expert advice from their physicians, their farm organizations, and from agencies of their State and National Governments.

EDUCATION

The National Grange has consistently opposed Federal control of education. The task of assuring equality of educational opportunity, in providing for current expenses of schools and in providing school buildings and equipment is first the responsibility of the various States.

The Grange believes those States whose financial resources are not sufficient to enable them to discharge the responsibility of providing equality of educational opportunity for all children should receive financial assistance from Federal funds on the basis of need; and that such Federal funds should be made available under a plan to be written into a Federal law, with at least a token contribution of finances by State or local units of government, so that no Federal control of education will result.

CURBING BUREAUCRACY

The phenomenal growth of our Federal bureaucracy constitutes a menace to our dual system of government and the liberties of the people. A return to our constitutional form of government is imperative if the people are to be protected in exercising the rights upon which this Republic was founded. Emergency powers delegated by Congress to the Executive should be exercised in accordance with the intent and purposes of the grant. These emergency powers should be self-terminating and should be revokable by a majority vote of Congress.

RADIO BROADCASTING

The Grange favors a fair and impartial investigation by Congress of the entire radio set-up to pave the way for any congressional action that may be necessary to prevent unwarranted restrictions of free speech, whether imposed by Federal regulations or through the conduct of publicly or privately owned radio stations. With more than 70 percent of the farm homes of the Nation dependent upon service from "clear channel" radio stations, we urge that nothing be done to curtail this service in order to grant further concessions to large cities, which are already well supplied.

Dewey Does It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, in bright and shining contrast to the confusion, vacillation, and downright contradiction in the policies and leadership of the present Democratic administration in Washington, is the splendid record of

accomplishment of the New York State Republican-controlled legislature, under the sound, courageous, and progressive leadership of Governor Dewey.

I wish to spread upon the RECORD a Republican news letter, which summarizes those accomplishments, in order that all may read, ponder, and compare:

GO FORTH AND TELL THE STORY

Republicans, you have a great story to tell. A story which you can relate to unbelievers with pride in your party. A story which needs no skill in narration. A story which tells itself. A story, the story of the one-hundred and sixty-ninth legislative session of the State of New York. And this great story is highlighted by the fact that Republican solidarity on Capitol Hill never wavered in the face of Democratic attack, subterfuge, consistent deception, and perpetual kidnapping and slaughter of the truth. Not once, mind you, in the 11 weeks of the legislative session, did the Republican majority in both houses halt for a single moment its two-fisted efforts to pass Governor Dewey's historic program, and to amplify this program by passage of varied legislation needed in the public interest. And the solidarity displayed by Republican members of senate and assembly was a tribute to the State leadership of Governor Dewey, and the skill, sincerity, and drive of Speaker Oswald D. Heck and Senator Benjamin F. Feinberg, president pro tempore of the senate.

And so it is—that having read in the press of the accomplishments of the one hundred and sixty-ninth session of the legislature—after having heard much of its achievements on the radio, and having refreshed your memory from the necessarily brief text of this news letter, go forth and tell the story, the Republican story, to all who will listen, or, if they don't want to listen, make them listen. Take off, therefore, on your mission, an effective "bombing run" of political and governmental education over enemy lines, to the end that Republican government, good government, may be continued in this State for many years to come.

LEGISLATURE ADJOURNED AT 2:30 A. M., MARCH 27

The one hundred and sixty-ninth session of the State legislature convened on January 9 last. Final adjournment came at 2:30 a. m., Wednesday, March 27, when the assembly finished its business, the senate having concluded some 90 minutes earlier. Members were tired, grey, hoarse. And adjournment in both houses came on the same sustained note of acrimonious debate initially launched by the Democrats immediately after Governor Dewey delivered his now famed message in early January. But, the perpetual crossfire tactics of the Democrats gained them nothing. They were no King Canutes. They could not tell nor force the tides of Dewey progress to recede Instead of scoring telling blows, blows hopefully sired for the fall campaign, they set a record for invective that drew editorial scoldings from the press, and derisive jeers from radio commentators. The Democrats could not, with words, blanket the deeds of the Republican-controlled legislature which enthusiastically passed 98 percent of the legislative program of Governor Dewey. And this year was the 4th year in which Governor's program has been passed virtually in its entirety. Significant achievements of this sort don't just happen, without careful planning, pioneering, forcefulness, and legislative cooperation and complete helpfulness to an unprecedented degree.

Anent the softer side of the closing of the legislature, were the heart-warming farewells taken of majority leader Irving M. Ives, who retires from the assembly after 17 years' service; presentation of testimonials to minority leader Irwin Steingut upon completion of 25 years' service, and advance congratulations to Lt. Gov. Joe R. Hanley upon his impending seventieth birthday, May 30.

SUPERLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

Highlights of the just concluded legislative session are so numerous as to make objective "firsts" difficult. However, to one writer, at least, the action of Governor Dewey and the GOP legislature in reducing taxes in the State by $122,000,000, and, at the same time, inaugurating a billion dollar postwar reconstruction program must, of necessity, rank high with administrative miracles both in this State and in the Nation. The technique, the saving and the vision, all constituted something the New Deal never learned how to do in 12 long years; it's something the Truman regime hasn't learned how to do—and never will learn. However, perhaps it is that a Presidential smile can cover a lot of administrative fumbling.

Remember, Governor Dewey slashed State income taxes 50 percent, and you'll enjoy that much needed benefit when you file your State income tax return on or before April 15 next. Similarly, business has been aided tremendously by the current reduction (another Dewey benefit) of 1½ percent in the emergency franchise tax, and by the reduction of from 4 to 3 percent in the unincorporated small business tax.

Close on the heels of the foregoing, was the vast work and fiscal genius embodied in the Moore Commission's plan extending greatly increased State aid to municipalities in the State. Evolved, among other things in this work, was the highly praised per capita formula—the formula which removes the guess work from State aid. Former Mayor F. H. LaGuardia of New York City, and the greater city's present mayor, William O'Dwyer, both praised the Moore plan at length, the latter in writing.

In any event it is restated that the Moore State-aid plan will give to the municipalities a total of $306,974,000, or 57 percent of next year's estimated State revenues, reserving only $251,601,000 for operation of State government. And of the $306,974,000 allotted in State aid, New York City will receive a guaranteed $51,825,938 on the per-capita formula. In addition, the press has estimated New York City will receive another $100,000,000 in various State aids, such as Friedsam formula, State assumption of 80 percent of the cost of relief, and the multitudinous additional bequests freely given by a Republican Governor and legislature, which caused to be passed 40 out of 45 O'Dwyer-sponsored New York City bills, tax, and otherwise. Yet Democratic legislators roared unceasingly, if ingenuously, that "New York is being shortchanged by the State. The State wears minks and sables, while we New Yorkers wear rags." It was very touching, if "corny," and untruthful.

VETERAN BENEFITS HIGH ON LIST

Virtually on an equal footing with the two great accomplishments already set down were the efforts of the Dewey administration and the Republican-controlled legislature in behalf of veterans of World War II. So excellent was the legislation enacted in behalf of veterans, and because of the Governor's insistence, the all-important subject was treated in bipartisan fashion, that Edward R. Scheiberling, until recently national commander of the American Legion, and now State legislative chairman of the Legion, said in part: "The American Legion is most gratified with the range and volume of veteran legislation passed this year. * * * The New York Legislature this year did nobly by the veterans. We are grateful."

Mr. Scheiberling had every reason for his congratulatory statement. Every consideration and attention was given the veteran by the legislature, the Governor, and by and through a bi-partisan committee on veterans' affairs, headed by Senator William F. Condon. This committee urged, and the legislature concurred, that a constitutional amendment calling for payment to veterans, or their kin, if deceased, war bonuses of $50 to $250, depending upon service. Such payment calls for disbursement of $400,000,000. The bonus will be available for payment in 1948, if passed by the legislature next year and approved by referendum of the people in the fall of 1947.

But, that wasn't all by way of recognition for the service of veterans: Governor Dewey advocated State-wide temporary housing for veterans, and put his beliefs into prompt action by directing conversion of Army and Navy barracks and cantonments throughout the State into veterans' emergency housing. Now, this housing will be had in 14 up-State communities, with more to come. And the Governor urged and the legislature passed a measure increasing the number of special veterans' scholarships with an annual value of $350, from 2,400 to 3,600. There was approved, also, a bill giving to vets who lose their jobs because of strikes, unemployment insurance rights of nonveterans, and there was passed a separate bill making the unemployment provisions retroactive to November 1, 1945. Further, emergency veterans' housing was authorized, costing $35,000,000, some of it earmarked for veteran-students at colleges and universities of the State. There was exempted from taxation, real property purchased by disabled veterans, with funds raised by popular subscription, and there was extended until July 1, 1947, the exemption of military pay from the State personal income tax. And further, in "housing" measures, preference was provided, of course, for veterans in low-rent housing projects, and Governor Dewey and the legislature directed that such housing be opened to veterans whose incomes are higher than the maximum fixed for nonveterans.

Again, a constitutional amendment was instituted to insure to servicemen and their families stationed abroad in time of peace, the right to vote in all elections. This, too, must be ratified again next year, and submitted to the people via referendum. Approved also was a Dewey-sponsored bill permitting the parole board to terminate the parole of any honorably discharged veteran who was subject to parole when inducted. Lastly, the State war ballot commission was continued for another year, and also approved was a bill clarifying the application of the veterans' civil service preference amendment to the State constitution. This procedure was adopted last year.

And, most definitely deserving a place in these lead bracketed subjects, was the action of Governor Dewey and Budget Director John Burton in inaugurating the much-simplified and precedent-shattering two-part State budget of $555,000,000; the creation of revenue stabilization fund designed to become an ever-normal granary of receipts and disbursements; the allocation of $500,000 for expanding the agricultural and training program of veterans in the six agricultural colleges in the State; restudy of the distribution of State assistance to schools, including $1,750,000 additional in State funds for central school districts, and the Governor's new and large program for public health and in the public welfare including plans to wipe out tuberculosis in our State in the next 20 years. And similarly interesting was the vision and planning which went into Governor Dewey's proposal for the $202,000,000 throughway; the late-hour passage of $10,000,000 appropriation for grade-crossing elimination.

HOUSING, AGRICULTURE, STATE EMPLOYEES, LABOR

Looking back, now, the wisdom of Governor Dewey in salting away a record-breaking State surplus, grows more startling with each passing day. And remember, it was the Democrats and the pressure groups which tried to spend this surplus as rapidly as it was accumulated. But, on with the parade

of Republican achievements on Capitol Hill since January 9 last:

Governor Dewey and the State legislature dealt speedily and efficiently with the question of vitally needed housing in the State. There was recommended and approved a referendum on question of increasing the State's subsidy to low-rent housing from $6,250,000 to $9,000,000 a year, and, in addition to appropriating $35,000,000 for emergency housing, and making available $80,000,000 for low-rent housing, the legislature relaxed restrictions of the multiple-dwelling law to stimulate conversion and rehabilitation of existing one- and two-family houses and old-law tenements.

Agriculture, constantly in the forefront of the consciousness of Governor Dewey and the Republican legislature, was given consistent attention in the lawmaking. There was renewed for another year temporary legislation permitting the employment, under certain restrictions, of minors and students in harvesting. There were special appropriations for research in plant- and animal-disease control, and there was continued for another year the commission that is investigating agriculture, with the understanding it would delve into the price spread between farm and consumer milk prices. And the State's appropriation for county and town agricultural societies was increased from $400,000 to $450,000.

The cause of State civil-service employees was again the special cause of Governor Dewey and the Republican State legislature. Accordingly a new increase of from 4 to 10 percent over the present emergency compensation was granted State employees, and it was proposed by the Governor that this increase would be incorporated next year in the permanent pay scales of these valued employees. These pay increases amounted to $20,000,000.

As to labor, labor generally, bills were approved increasing benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Law to a maximum of $28 a week, and placing on a permanent basis, prior emergency increases in weekly benefits. The new benefit is $12 a week instead of $8. Membership in the State mediation board was increased from five to seven, and temporary mediators were provided. Approved, too, was the coverage under workmen's compensation, and at the option of the employer, of domestic servants employed in cities of more than 40,000, and there were passed bills providing for the licensing of barbers, hairdressers, and cosmetologists. Enacted into law was the Ostertag bill providing for the State's integrated relief services, one of the most forward-looking advances in social welfare in 30 years.

STATE DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION LOOMS

High on the agenda of legislative effort, were measures calling for the reorganization of the health, labor, and mental hygiene departments, a continuing process, and the enactment of the Governor's expanded mental-hygiene program. The Governor's public-works program was rounded out also in budget bills passed early in the session—and, in the opinion of Capitol observers, the far-flung plans for betterment to the people of the State, and the State, demand the drafting of Governor Dewey for a second term, and his election by a sufficiently large plurality to command his continued forceful pioneering along lines which other States and the Nation have found so good that they have avidly followed the trail-blazing of New York State.

Of great interest was passage of a law creating a temporary State commission of 16 members, with an appropriation of $100,000, to study the need for a State university; the establishment of five experimental technical institutes for high-school graduates, with admission preference for veterans; the continuance for another year of the mortgage moratorium law and a provision that deficiency judgments may not be recovered in mortgage-property foreclosure actions; repeal of most of the provisions of the War Emergency Act and termination of the State War Council, but retaining military leaves of absence for public officials; a bill to make violations of Federal OPA regulations liable to State maximum fines of $25 and 5 days in jail; a bill to create a world-trade corporation to organize a commercial and industrial fair in New York State like the Leipzig fair; the increase in the value of the 3,000 regents' scholarships for $100 to $350 a year; extension of commercial, business, and store rent controls for another year, with provision for the exempting of new construction; increased pay of judges in the court of claims from $10,000 to $12,000; voted to raise the pay of the State comptroller and attorney general from $12,000 to $20,000 a year, and that of the State commissioner of education from $15,000 to $20,000 a year; instituted a constitutional amendment for removing and retiring judges of court of record, and also initiated a constitutional amendment to divorce Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties from the second judicial district, and set them up as a new tenth judicial district; approved bill permitting motor-vehicle commission to issue permanent auto license plates, renewable from year to year through insertion of removable tags, and created a 15-member commission to inquire into establishment of a permanent State fair at Syracuse.

EDUCATION AND CHILD CARE STRESSED—SAFETY PLAN

The vastly important subjects of education and child care received much consideration from Governor Dewey and the State legislature, over and above various items already mentioned herein. Bills passed provided for the establishment of State-financed technical institutions with accommodations for 4,500 full-time and 9,000 part-time students on an experimental basis in New York City, White Plains, Buffalo, Utica, and Binghamton. Capital costs are estimated at $2,250,000 and maintenance and operational outlays at $2,000,000 a year. Still another measure provided for the continued operation of child-care centers established during the war under the supervision of the State youth administration. There was fixed by legislation, also, a minimum wage of $1,650 per annum for all teachers except those serving in schools with fewer than eight teachers, and it was voted to permit New York City teachers to hold more than one job for another year.

Of great interest to car owners and users was the approval of a safety-legislation program, resulting from Governor Dewey's 2-day safety conference, including the establishment of a State division of safety, raising the highway speed limit to 50 miles an hour, and authorizing the local regulation of pedestrian traffic. Far-reaching conservation legislation was enacted also.

NEW YORK CITY TAX LEGISLATION PASSES AT LONG LAST

The closing hours of the session were marked by the passage of New York City's tax program, as promulgated by Mayor William O'Dwyer. This program, from its inception, was the cause of the bitterest and most sustained debate the legislature has seen for years. It found Democratic legislators denouncing the Democratic mayor of the city of New York for his written approval of the Moore State aid plan, and his written requests—several—for authority to impose new taxes upon the people of New York City. Persistently and consistently the Democrats in Albany tried to pin upon Republicans responsibility for the tax program of their own Democratic mayor in New York City. However, when the smoke of battle cleared early last Wednesday there had been passed, upon Mr. O'Dwyer's specific requests, bills empowering New York City to impose new local taxes estimated to raise $79,000,000, and which continued existing emergency taxing powers, both to run for a period of 3 years. New taxes the city can now levy are an additional 1 percent sales tax; a 5-percent tax on hotel-room charges to transients; a 5-percent tax on parimutuel betting at Aqueduct, Jamaica, and Belmont, with the requirement that the Belmont yield be shared with Nassau County, and a doubling of the gross business and similar imposts. Authorized the merger of separate bridge and tunnel authorities, and set up a new airport authority, which, by agreement with the board of estimate, can take over the new Idlewild Airport and LaGuardia Airport. This latter proposal was a highly controversial measure. In any event, the New York City tax program was, and probably will continue to be, something for the Democrats to storm about for weeks and months, forgetting that they themselves, and nobody else, make it possible.

Of much importance, too, was the insurance and banking legislation passed, and this included: Authorization to State regulated banks to participate in bill of rights loans to returning GI's. Authorizing State insurance department to require uniform accounting practices by insurance companies. Authorizing insurance companies to invest up to 3 percent of their reserves in office and commercial buildings to improve investments yields, and the setting up of a commission to study effect of State regulation of expiration in 1948 of Federal moratorium on the enforcement of antitrust laws against insurers.

L'ENVOI

There is much more than can be said with regard to the legislative session of 1946, much more that should be said, and much more that will be said between now and next fall. And, regret is expressed that there is not more space in News Letter to set down in greater detail all that has transpired on Capitol Hill since January 9 last. But, the foregoing should furnish to readers ample ammunition for the story you have to tell, and will tell, from here in, the great story of Republican achievement of 1946.

And news letter extends its congratulations and felicitations to Governor Dewey, his aides, to Republican legislative leaders, and to each and every Republican member of the legislature who made possible the magnificent work done on Capitol Hill these last 11 weeks.

So, good-by now, and News Letter herewith reverts to its former semimonthly publication schedule.

Urban Real-Estate Prices Skyrocket—Increase 100 Percent in Some Areas, Survey Shows

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for 6 months now the real-estate lobbyists in Washington have been poo-pooing the inflationary danger in rising home prices.

They said that a little inflation was good for the country. They said that the rise in home prices was not nearly as high as I maintained. Now, the facts are coming out, and they show a more dangerous situation than I myself had anticipated.

Belatedly now, the National Association of Real Estate Boards has issued a weak warning to its membership not to participate in quick-profit transactions; but they know and we know a weak plea for such action comes far too late to prevent thousands of our veterans from losing their savings to the speculators.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a news story which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post on March 29. This article tells the story that 14 cities have had a price increase of 50 percent since VJ-day. The land on which houses are being built is running 73 percent above 1940. Nine cities have shown price increases of 100 percent or more.

This is the reason that I urge the House to hold down speculation in real estate.

Real-estate prices in larger cities have skyrocketed anywhere from 25 to 100 percent within the last 6 years, Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt announced yesterday.

Inflation in real estate since 1940 is "far worse even than had been anticipated," according to a survey of 84 cities of 100,000 or more population and 250 smaller cities, the national housing chief declared.

EXPERTS MADE SURVEY

The survey was conducted by presidents of Federal home-loan banks, regional managers of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, insuring officers of the Federal Housing Administration, and NHA regional expediters.

Since VJ-day alone prices in the larger cities have increased from 16 to 18 percent, the report stated.

The survey showed that increases in prices of land, both raw acreage and fully prepared building lots, are even greater than those on homes.

On Capitol Hill the American Legion yesterday aired charges that real-estate operators are bent on "gouging the veteran."

Col. John Thomas Taylor, the Legion's national legislative director, asked for ceiling prices on building lots and on old as well as new homes.

Taylor told the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee considering the Administration's veterans' emergency housing program that the Legion favored the subsidy program asked by Wyatt.

While the Legion was pleading for speed on the veterans' emergency housing bill, President Truman at the White House was signing a $250,000,000 bill to provide 100,000 temporary homes for veterans.

IS SECOND PROGRAM

The measure signed by the Chief Executive is the second 100,000-unit program. It calls for the remodeling of barracks and temporary wartime housing.

The funds are designed to cover also the cost of moving temporary housing from wartime industrial centers, if no longer needed, to college towns with a housing shortage because of enrollment of veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Wyatt's survey showed startling increases in the cost of houses which sold for $6,000 or less in 1940.

Of the larger cities, 9 showed price increases of 100 percent or more; 23 showed increases from 75 to 100 percent; 34 reported price increases of 50 to 75 percent, and the remaining 18 cities registered jumps of 25 to 50 percent.

For homes which sold from $6,000 to $12,000 in 1940 the larger cities reported price rises slightly less than for the lower-priced property, although in some cases, such as New York City, the rises are greater.

The American Legion insisted that veterans must have help in getting houses at reasonable prices because their average age is only 22 or 23 and they cannot pay "fancy prices for fancy houses."

The NHA survey included 250 smaller cities. In addition studies of small communities were made on a State-wide and area-wide basis.

Price increases on homes which sold for $6,000 or less in 1940 were reported as: 47 cities, 100 percent or more; 66 cities, 75 to 100 percent; 102 cities, 50 to 75 percent; 58 cities, 25 to 50 percent, and a scattered few, less than 25-percent increases.

RATE RISE CONSISTENT

Homes in the $6,000 to $12,000 class have risen in price at about the same percentage rate.

More than half of the smaller cities report that since VJ-day prices on property have increased 10 to 25 percent, and many cities indicate increases of as much as 25 to 50 percent since September.

For raw acreage in cities of more than 100,000 population, 20 cities showed a price increase of 100 percent or more since 1940.

And in 18 cities price increases of 50 to 100 percent were reported. Since VJ-day, 14 cities have had an average price rise of 50 percent or more.

RAW LAND PRICES SOAR

Typical increases for raw land in the larger cities since 1940 is about 73 percent, and for prepared lots 67 percent. Average increases since VJ-day are about 29 and 28 percent, respectively.

The survey also covered so-called H-2 houses, built by private builders in the closing months of the war with priority assistance and under price ceilings of $8,000. More than 60 percent of the larger cities reported these have already jumped in price from 25 to 50 percent, while the average increase for all reporting cities on these houses is 32 percent.

Should England Grant Independence to the Trans-Jordan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the threat to peace currently existing in the Near East. We all know what is at the root of it—oil. And we all know the technique presently in use to secure oil—the creation of spurious sovereignties. The American position on this is clear. We recognize that oil is one of the fundamentals of modern economic life. We recognize the right of all nations to free and untrammeled access to it. But we insist that free access must be gotten legally, peacefully, and without prejudice to the rights of any nation—particularly without prejudice to the rights of the small nations which find themselves in what seems to be the unfortunate position of being involved with oil. We do not approve of illegal coercion by the larger powers. We especially do not approve of efforts by these larger powers to split the territories of small nations and set up separate sovereignties subject to their pressure.

The Security Council of the United Nations has recently been concerned with this sort of problem. It has not yet had opportunity to consider the particular situation I have in mind. I trust that it will, and soon. Discussion of the British action with respect to Transjordan is far from premature. It is, in fact, long overdue. I appreciate the position of our recent allies. I sympathize with them. But I respectfully suggest that breaking agreements, dismembering countries trustingly placed under their protection, and consorting with absolutist tyrants are not the ways to safeguard their oil lines in the Near East. They are not the ways to win the friendship and respect of peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples. They are not at all the right beginning to the reign of law and justice we are trying to establish in international relations.

I urge that our State Department consult with the British Foreign Office on this matter, that it assure the British that the heroic and creative Hebrew people, who have already worked marvels of transformation in the deserts of Palestine, can by their friendship and trust, be infinitely better guarantors of western principles of peace and freedom in the Near East than can illiterate nomadic Bedouins. I respectfully suggest that the American delegates to the United Nations be instructed to investigate this matter in the Security Council.

Another Psychological Shot for a Sick Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post appears an article entitled "United States Output Highest Ever, Truman Says." In quoting the President directly, "production of goods and services for the civilian market is higher today than ever before in the Nation's history, in war or in peace," one cannot help but wonder how Mr. Truman would analyze his statement. Is he referring to automobiles, or production of steel? These were almost nil the first quarter of this year. Is he referring to wearing apparel, such as shirts, overalls, suits, and so forth? Could he be referring to the building industry, lumber and other building materials, which we know have been almost nonexistent on the civilian market in this country? Surely he was not referring to meat. I notice in the same paper an account of the scarcity of butter, how there is 50 percent less butter being produced than in 1941. Of course, this latter was not a statement by Mr. Truman or any member of his administration.

In searching for some semblance of fact in the statement, it could be that the dollar value of all the costume jewelry for which people are being charged fabulous sums, the tremendous quantity of

high-price liquor that is being consumed, the excess in prices people are forced to put up with because of the black markets and also the terrifically high wage scales, the dollar value of goods and services today is higher than ever before. Truly there are three times as many dollars in existence as a few years back, due to our excess issuance of printing-press money, but people cannot eat dollars; they are only supposed to be tickets to the real thing—goods and services.

I am afraid Mr. Truman's statement is inclined to deceive the public by permitting the interpretation and reaction on the part of the casual reader to be that we are experiencing a full flow of quantity and volume of goods and services, whereas actually his statement simply means that the dollar price is greater than ever before. One can only speculate on the motive for Mr. Truman's statement. Could it be another psychological shot in the arm?

Mr. Bowles and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, I wish to submit an article by the Associated Press entitled "Plan for Building-Material Subsidy Hit by Lumber Dealers" which appeared in the Washington Post, of date Sunday, March 31, 1946:

PLAN FOR BUILDING-MATERIAL SUBSIDY HIT BY LUMBER DEALERS

The administration's plan for building-material subsidies was denounced before a Senate committee yesterday as a scheme to support prefabricated housing to the disadvantage of conventional builders.

The accusation came from Joseph T. King, counsel for the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, who said the plan had originated with Stabilization Director Chester Bowles, rather than Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt, its present chief advocate.

Urging the Senate Banking Committee to reject Wyatt's request for $600,000,000 for subsidies, King and building-supply men contended price adjustments would produce all the building materials needed and would result in lower-cost housing.

BOWLES IS CRITICIZED

"If Mr. Bowles had adjusted the price of lumber shortly after VJ-day instead of 'doodling' with a Government housing program," King declared, "we would be well on the way to the solution of the housing problem instead of having an emergency of Mr. Bowles' own creation."

King said that Bowles had written Wyatt on January 11 saying the Government should place "large orders" with prefabricators at prices which would "assure the producers in this field a generous profit." He quoted Bowles as saying, "we have * * * men of vision and boldness and drive, such as Henry Kaiser and many others, who have demonstrated that they can develop the methods which are required for speedy production."

"I charge," King said, "that for 8 months Mr. Bowles refused reasonable price adjustments to get construction items for conventional home builders while he 'doodled' with the plan which would put Mr. Kaiser in business at the Government's expense, with an absolute assurance that Mr. Kaiser without any risks, would receive, and I quote Mr. Bowles, 'a generous profit.' "

Wyatt has testified that he proposes to guarantee a market for prefabricated houses under certain conditions. This would mean the Government would buy them if the manufacturer could not sell them in the market.

Douglas Whitlock, representing the Producer Council, Inc., contended that actually Wyatt's program, in view of the guaranties on prefabricated housing, might run up a total cost of $1,200,000,000 or more.

James C. Downs, Chicago, representing the National Association of Real Estate Boards, argued against the administration's proposal for ceiling prices on existing houses unless Congress were willing to guarantee at the same time that the value of the dollar would not go down.

The House rejected both the subsidy and price ceiling provisions which the administration is asking the Senate to put back into emergency housing legislation. Major features of the measure as it now stands include a $1,000,000,000 increase in Government authority to insure home mortgages and price ceilings on new homes.

Control of Wages and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today designed to unify the wage and price-fixing powers of the Federal Government under the jurisdiction of a single agency to be known as the National Economic Council.

This legislation, if it becomes law, will, I am confident, supplant existing economic chaos with order and reason. Instead of shortages, it will give us production. Instead of work stoppages, we will have employment. Instead of fear and indecision, it will give us confidence and action. Instead of theory, we will have realism. Instead of creeping socialism, it will give us revitalized free enterprise. Instead of turmoil and waste, we will have internal peace and prosperity.

The necessity for new and better methods of controlling wages and prices is obvious. Some reemphasis, however, is proper. As unsatisfactory as wage and price policies were during the war, they have been many times more unsatisfactory since the shooting stopped. Let's look at the results. Reconversion as we properly expected it is still "around the corner." Work stoppages of all kinds have been the rule. Hundreds of new businesses have not been started. Thousands of old businesses have limped along or shut down. Other thousands have postponed planned expansions. Shortages have continued and the savings of too many of our people have disappeared.

It is not necessary any longer to advance specific proof. Look around you. Ask any businessman, labor leader, wholesaler, retailer, housewife, or man on the corner. They all know and all tell you that the results of our wage and price policies have been less of everything at a higher cost for everybody. The black markets flourish, unemployment increases, and the promised abundance of the postwar world has not materialized.

Fortunately it is not yet too late to do something about it. Long study of the subject has convinced me that the most essential first step is to provide for unified control of wages and prices in the hands of a single agency that can make simultaneous wage and price adjustments not only in a given industry but in all related industries. The proper control of wages and prices is the crux of the matter. How in the world can we go on granting wage increases 1 day and price adjustments 3 or 6 months later and expect business to function? And then when that situation is adjusted satisfactorily wait more months to correct the imbalances that are caused for other related businesses? And then we find after months of delay, confusion, and little production that we have to go all through the process again because the cost of living is out of proportion with "take-home pay."

The policy of "defense in depth" so consciously or unconsciously followed by the wage-and-price agencies has and is wrecking reconversion. It is driving enterprise to distraction. The bottleneck of production is the failure of the wage-and-price agencies to take simultaneous affirmative action; they have systematically tried to hold everything back and yet have not done so. They are like an individual who tries to hold a handful of sand, first by clutching it too tightly and then by holding it too loosely in the wind.

Price control and wage control are currently necessary and desirable, but a change of administration is imperative. I urge that we set up a National Economic Council composed of representatives of the public, labor, and management. Give them all the good authority that is now being misused. Keep the council as free from political control as possible. Let us begin with an immediate stabilization order. Let it then proceed without delay to start the work of making any necessary over-all or specific adjustments. Those adjustments made by individuals who know our economy from top to bottom and who would consider all factors at the same time would be far more equitable, affirmative, and realistic.

Such a body and such procedure would not only start production promptly, but it would establish confidence in the future. It is not too much to hope that soon thereafter the necessity for continued controls would be eliminated for one commodity after another.

The details regarding the proposed National Economic Council are included in the bill where I hope you will read them. And I hope as you do read them that you keep in your mind's eye the picture of the people of this country standing impatiently in lines waiting for the goods that our mines, fields, and factories can produce in abundance. While we wait, homes are not being built, steel is not being fabricated, automobiles are not running, job opportunities are not opening, tax sources are not increasing but

actually disappearing, and we eat dry toast.

How long must this go on before we shout that we have had enough of indecision, planned delay, and worse? Is not it time now that we call on the best minds from management, labor, and the body politic and tell them to do the job of getting America back to its best productive capacity? Let us put our economic affairs in the hands of our best brains and in the hands of men who want to secure full production and assure them that we will support their decisions to a successful conclusion. We have had enough of shortages, strikes, shut-downs, lock-outs, and postponed enterprise. We want production and we will get it.

When we take the power to control prices and wages out of the jurisdiction of separate agencies and combine it with a single determining body that can operate in both fields simultaneously we will be at the beginning of the end of our current economic troubles.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as most of the administration propaganda on the proposed housing bill is supplied for veteran consumption, I submit for the consideration of the membership an item from the Republican News dealing with the interesting viewpoint presented by two of our colleagues on this important subject.

The item follows:

PATMAN BILL HINDERS VETS, SCUTTLES GI BILL OF RIGHTS—CONGRESSMEN AGREE

Passage of the Patman housing bill would scuttle the veterans' loan provision of the GI bill of rights and hinder veterans from getting homes, rather than aid from it.

Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Republican, Iowa, one of over 200 World War I veterans serving in the House, last month proved this statement to the satisfaction of colleagues during the House debate on the Truman-backed measure.

After CUNNINGHAM'S second reference to the threat of the Patman bill to repeal title III of the GI bill of rights, which is the loan title CUNNINGHAM wrote in original and revised forms, Representative BARDEN (Democrat, North Carolina) agreed that the bill would scuttle veterans' loans, adding, "Who knows but that is intended?"

BARDEN further supported CUNNINGHAM'S view when he pled, "Why not meet this issue squarely and quit trying to fool our veterans by trying to make them think they are getting something good when we know that is not correct?"

PROPAGANDA MARCHES ON

Nevertheless the Truman administration persists in carrying on a propaganda campaign to fool the veterans about the Patman bill, and the President himself charged that the defeat of the measure to grant Housing Director Wyatt $600,000,000 for subsidies cut the heart out of his housing program. Wyatt has resorted to double-talk about subsidies for veterans, whereas the original Patman bill contained no subsidy provision, and the subsidy proposal inserted later was intended not for veterans but for builders and material suppliers.

CUNNINGHAM invited any member of the Democratic Party to answer three questions: (1) "With the administration having had the power all along (under the War Powers Act) to channel building materials and lumber into the building of homes for veterans, why did it permit this lumber to be used to build race tracks, saloons, gambling halls, honky tonks, and swimming pools? (2) Why did it (the administration) permit this lumber, 25 percent of the output, to be exported to foreign countries when it was so badly needed by the veteran who fought for this country? and (3) What assurance do we have if we enact this law that the situation will be any different?"

The OPA Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1946, entitled "The OPA Cancer":

THE OPA CANCER

On the Dow-Jones newsprinter Monday there appeared a Washington dispatch that the OPA plans to keep ceiling prices on cigarettes, although supplies are adequate to meet demand. The dispatch continues that "it was explained that ceilings will be suspended on a product only when the desired supply-demand balance is achieved and officials are convinced at the same time there will be no upward adjustment in prices when ceilings are abandoned."

In other words, the OPA has no intention of allowing prices to find their level in a free market. The officials of this organization speak fine words about encouraging production so that an adequate supply of goods will restrain price rises. But when goods do come into adequate supply they continue their price fixing. They do it in cigarettes, and they do it in oil.

Now, if that is their policy—and their actions indicate that it is—the story they are telling that a year's extension of price fixing will be sufficient is as false as anything ever invented by Dr. Goebbels. If OPA intends to substitute its judgment as to price for the judgment of the market place, and if prices must conform to an arbitrarily conceived pattern before controls disappear, there will be no end to this thing. The longer price distortions remain, the harder they are to get rid of. The distortions will harden into permanent deformities like a badly set bone.

Prices cannot long be held below the cost of production without bankrupting the producers. When OPA meets that situation, it suggests the subterfuge of a subsidy whereby the consumer pays in taxes the higher price without knowing it. Every industry which accepts a subsidy puts itself into the hands of a Government bureau.

Detected at its inception, a growth within the human body can be eradicated, and the patient may expect a long life. Allow the thing to remain and develop, and it destroys tissue, and spreads its poison, and condemns the victim to a lingering death. Not only is it proposed to allow this OPA cancer to remain, but also it is proposed to feed and stimulate it.

From day to day the attempt to justify these Government controls takes different forms. OPA and its kindred agencies are like a little boy of strong imagination. His crooked stick can be a gun, if he desires a gun, or if he desires a horse or a 10-ton truck, the stick can be that, too.

As this is written—the story may change before it is printed—this control system is a staff for capitalism and a bulwark against socialism.

In an address to the American Retail Federation on Monday, Chester Bowles is quoted as posing the following question:

"Can capitalism survive in a major nation in the midst of a rapidly expanding socialistic world?"

Let us consider that question and the implications that capitalism is threatened by some force from without. What are the facts? One fact is that the capitalist world is feeding the countries where socialism prevails. It will have to continue to do so for some time. If it did not the Socialist countries would be prostrate. And it is this system which is so interested in an ideology that it cannot organize to give people the necessities of life which Mr. Bowles implies is going to squeeze the capitalistic countries and force them to do something they do not want to do.

What does Mr. Bowles suppose would happen if the United States and Canada should drop immigration bars and if the inhabitants of the Socialist countries were free to come to the American Continent? He knows that in a very short time those countries would be all but depopulated. What sense does it make to go about implying that some Socialist bogey is going to creep in and possess us?

And how does Mr. Bowles propose to meet this external Socialist threat? He proposes to do it by socializing the United States. He says that is not so, but every policy he proposes, control of prices, control of wages, control of housing, is a step in that direction.

It is as though Mr. Bowles, looking upon a pet poodle which cannot even live unless its master feeds it, should shout, "Look, a raging hungry lion threatens us. To save ourselves we must jump off yon cliff."

Semantics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include as a portion of my remarks the best comment on the best speech that I have ever heard in this House for many months. My colleague from California, Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, has outlined in masterly fashion the problems of genuine democracy and I am proud to place this comment from the Washington Post of April 2 on her statement in the RECORD:

SEMANTICS

In the House, Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California, in trying to express her own political credo, has given her colleagues a workable definition of the abused and confused term "democracy." In doing so, she administered a thoroughly deserved rebuke to those who habitually apply the even more loosely construed label "communism" to every proposal designed to make democracy a healthily functioning system for the

advancement of popular purposes and the satisfaction of popular needs.

"I am jealous for democracy," said Mrs. DOUGLAS. "I do not like to see the things that democracy can accomplish credited to communism. Through the years democracy has given the people of the United States more freedom and a higher standard of living than any other system that we know—and it has done so with less inequity, less persecution, less infringement on the rights of free thinking, free speech, and free action than under any other form of government anywhere else in the world. I do not want the things that democracy has done ascribed to anything other than the democratic process."

There are some, however—and certain of the Congresswoman's colleagues are among them—who consider communistic every effort to assert even these principles. When men and women join to secure public acceptance of social or political ideas in which they happen to believe, the association is sometimes called subversive. A program for full employment or for veterans' housing or for health insurance is said by some who do not like it to have emanated from Moscow. Whatever the merits of the measures free men propose and seek to advance, the espousal of them is an essential part of the democratic process. "One of the great privileges of democracy," as MRS. DOUGLAS observed, "is the privilege to make mistakes—the privilege to say foolish things, the privilege to expound ideas with which others violenty disagree, the privilege to say them without being tracked down and labeled subversive." Indeed, these are privileges essential to our way of life.

Nothing has done so much to raise Communist prestige in this country as the habit fallen into by a few of attributing to the Communists everything that is progressive. The Communists do not deserve such kudos. Progressivism is a thoroughly American and thoroughly democratic characteristic.

Election at South Charleston, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today our newly elected chairman of the Republican National Committee received a telegram from the national committeeman from West Virginia, Mr. Walter S. Hallanan, concerning the election in the city of South Carleston, W. Va. The telegram is submitted for the edification of all good Americans who are facing this crucial year with the assurance that the New Deal is approaching the end of a misspent life.

The telegram is as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *April 3, 1946.*

Hon. B. CARROLL REECE,

Chairman, Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Your election as national chairman also brought forth the election of the mayor and entire Republican ticket in the city of South Charleston by a 500 majority. This has been a Democratic stronghold for 16 long years. I think you would like to know how West Virginia has responded.

WALTER S. HALLANAN.

United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Rear Adm. Giles G. Stedman, United States Naval Reserve, on April 1, 1946, at the change of command ceremonies at the United States Merchant Marine Academy when Commodore Richard R. McNulty assumed his duties as superintendent of the Academy:

My spirits are elevated this morning in light of the honor which has been conferred on the Cadet Corps and the Academy in the fine award of the Legion of Merit to Commodore McNulty. I am sure that all of us who are aware of his efforts in behalf of the Cadet Corps will rejoice that this recognition has come to him as he takes over the command at Kings Point, where I am sure he will achieve even greater distinction and success. We are fortunate, indeed, in his assignment as superintendent, for no person is more sincerely devoted to the Academy nor ambitious for its progress than he, and I am sure, without request on my part, that our entire personnel will give him their wholehearted support. Commodore McNulty's whole life has been devoted to American seafarers and he is eminently qualified to carry on in their behalf in the uncertain future that is immediately ahead. I welcome my distinguished friend and associate in behalf of the Academy personnel and want to assure him of my keen interest and support even though I am no longer attached to the Academy.

Once again we are favored with the presence of our first superintendent, Captain Tomb, who has never failed to be present on each memorable occasion, and I am particularly touched that he should make the effort to be with us today. I cherish the splendid personal and professional friendship that we have enjoyed for a great many years and recall with pleasure our fine teamwork in the early days of the Academy.

I desire to acknowledge publicly the splendid support afforded my administration by the officials of the War Shipping Administration and want to thank Commodore Knight for coming from Washington to be with us on this occasion. My gratitude goes forth in large measure to the Navy Department, the marine industry, and the local citizens, all of whom have assisted materially in making the Academy the fine institution that it is today.

I am sure that the officers, men and women, of Kings Point are aware of my appreciation and gratitude—certainly no commanding officer ever had a more loyal group of shipmates. They will always occupy a high place in my affections.

It would be foolish to deny to anyone present that my great joy at Kings Point has been the splendid regiment of cadet-midshipmen, not alone because it represents the best youth of our country, not alone because of my close association with it, but in it is the future greatness of the American merchant marine. I am very proud, indeed, of every graduate, and I am going to derive much comfort and happiness in the years to come by observing their accomplishments.

Now and then I linger at the memorial, and am remorseful momentarily, as I read the names of our undergraduates who were lost at sea, and wonder if, during the intense wartime course, I bore down too hard and denied them some of the pleasures that were rightfully theirs—but almost immediately comes the sober realization that if the training and routine had been less severe there might have been many more names added to the ones already there.

I wonder, too, if those cadet-midshipmen of the wartime course were ever aware of the deep affection I held for them, which was well concealed beneath a hard professional exterior. I know that hundreds of times in the future, I will think of them, hear their youthful voices calling out cadence, and the echo of their steps as they march off into the night.

It is reassuring to look back over my career and observe that all the major changes in it took place in the spring of the year, and now, as I go forth on this day, I do so with high hopes and new ambition, and the knowledge that my life has been enriched by my associations at Kings Point.

Loan to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article published by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., which appeared in the Washington Post and the New York Herald-Tribune in March 1946:

LOAN TO BRITAIN—INVESTMENT IN WORLD ECONOMIC UNITY

Congress should give swift and confident approval to the proposed loan to Great Britain.

Few other issues of foreign policy in the present troubled world lend themselves to such clear appraisal of where our national interest lies.

In simplest terms, the question is whether we should extend to Great Britain a credit of $3,750,000,000 (plus $650,000,000 in payment for lend-lease balances) in return for her promise to repay principal with interest over a 50-year period starting at the end of 1951, and her pledge to give the fullest possible support to the kind of world trading system which it is the declared policy of both the United States and the United Nations Organization to promote.

WE CAN AFFORD TO MAKE IT

The sum we hazard is not inconsiderable, but financial risks have meaning only when related to resources. The line of credit provided by the loan will amount, at most, to a claim on two-fifths of 1 percent of our gross output for the 5- to 6-year period over which it may be used. The interest rate charged, while moderate, is higher than our Treasury is paying upon current borrowings. The risk entailed is well within our resources as a creditor. In the considered judgment of the American and British technical experts who thrashed through the intricate accounting for three painful months, the amount and terms offered will suffice to allow Britain, under rigid austerity, to relax her system of foreign trade restrictions, and to expand exports sufficiently to pay her debt commitments.

Against the considered risks of extending the loan, there must be weighed the certain

costs of refusing it. Without the loan, Britain has no recourse but to maintain and extend the system of bloc trading which she adopted under stress of world depression and world war. If that is the route Britain follows, she will carry with her a large part of the sterling area countries—all British Commonwealth and Empire countries (except Newfoundland and Canada) plus Egypt, Iraq, and Iceland—and many of the nations with which the United Kingdom has payment agreements (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey).

Altogether, the United Kingdom's orbit accounts for more than half of the world's imports and exports combined. It likewise is crucial to the trade of the United States. In the years immediately preceding the war, the sterling area and payment-agreement countries provided just under one-half of both the import and export trade of this country

Russia, of course, will continue to conduct her foreign commerce exclusively upon a state-trading basis. Before the war the Soviet Union transacted only a little more than 1 percent of foreign trade business, but its future sphere of influence will be large—conceivably embracing as much as 30 percent of total international trade.

WE CANNOT AFFORD TO REFUSE IT

If the weight of British influence in foreign trade is thrown toward the Russian pattern rather than toward ours, it is apparent that bloc trading, with all of its supporting devices—bilateral deals, exchange controls, import and export quotas, subsidies, currency manipulations, and the like—will be the prevailing pattern for foreign transactions.

In self-protection, the United States would have no alternative but to conform to the dominant pattern. We should be forced to form our own bloc, and to enter into active economic warfare in bidding for trade concessions against the offers of our rivals. How well we would do this is problematical. To the game we would bring the largest economic potential in the world. But our handicaps would be equally impressive.

First, under a system in which political and economic motivations are inextricably fused, a democratic nation, and particularly one with a tradition of freedom in its domestic enterprise, would operate at a great disadvantage. We should inevitably be driven toward more and more Government control of our entire economy.

Second, with a pattern of foreign trade in which our exports habitually are greater than our imports, our bargaining position in international trade is much weaker than our over-all economic strength would suggest. Under state-controlled trading we should still find it difficult to compete successfully without resort to loans, and under these conditions our loans would be supporting a system alien to our choice and interest.

Third, under a regimented system which made economic decisions subservient to political considerations, it is virtually certain that the volume of world trade would shrink. That was the clear experience of the 1930's. Thus, the standard of living in the United States would suffer in common with all others, and we would be forced into a particularly drastic curtailment of certain war-expanded segments of our economy, at the very time when a large portion of the world is most in need of the products they can produce.

WEIGHING THE ALTERNATIVE COSTS

In the years immediately ahead it is certain that from two-thirds to three-quarters of all international trade will be transacted either in pounds or dollars. If both circuits are linked in a determined effort to restore competitive world markets, to which buyers and sellers alike have access without discrimination, that will be the dominant system of foreign trade. If the sterling group with its satellites organizes a closed grid, or exclusive effort cannot preserve the trade pattern that we believe offers most to us and to the world.

No one can accurately measure the costs to the United States of refusing the loan and accepting the consequences. But unquestionably they would dwarf to insignificance the sum risked in the proposed credit. We would lose through the shrinkage of our trade, through the wrench of violent readjustments in our production patterns, and eventually through the curtailment of our over-all output below what it would be under an open rather than a closed system. We would lose heavily in economic liberty under a procedure that can be followed with success only by a close regimentation of production as well as trade.

Most of all, we would lose in prestige, through demonstrating that we are still unprepared to exercise a world leadership to which our giant stature as the possessor of almost half of the world's economic capacity entitles us. Once again we would be exhibiting to the world political feet of clay supporting an economic frame of heroic proportions.

IT IS FAR FROM A "SOFT" BARGAIN

There has been some disposition in this country to regard the loan to Britain as a somewhat "soft" and generally unprecedented transaction that smacks of charity. This is the sheerest nonsense.

In the first place, the kind of economic system we want has never functioned and cannot operate now without a lender. For many decades prior to World War I Great Britain filled the creditor role. In 1913 her foreign investments totaled $19,000,000,000, and she not only made such transactions pay, but they proved her salvation through two grim wars. Her credits helped in the industrial development of a large segment of the world, including the United States. Of all the nations in the world, only the United States can assume now the mantle which Britain no longer can support.

In the second place, the terms of our proposed loan to the United Kingdom are far from easy. Britain put a substantially greater proportion of her relatively meager resources into the war than we did, and dissipated a large share of her foreign holdings in the process while accumulating an outside debt of crushing magnitude. On a per capita basis her internal debt is greater than ours. Many Britons feel that our proposed loan is too small, and its terms too rigorous. If the amount proves to be inadequate, we shall have to consider supplemental aid at a later date. But the majority believe that the present offer gives a fighting chance to restore the system of world trade that we and they both want, and upon which the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, and the International Trade Organization under United Nations aegis are based. It is certain that without our loan all of this will go by the board.

In the third place, our proposed loan is far from being without precedent. Canada, which is linked by far closer economic ties to us than to the Empire, already has provided for a loan to Britain of $1,200,000,000. This amounts to almost a third of what we propose to lend, although Canada's population is less than 10 percent, and her income is little more than 5 percent of ours.

SHALL THE UNITED STATES LEAD OR FOLLOW?

The way to exercise leadership is to lead. Nothing could be more futile than to go halfway toward establishing the economic order for which we stand, and then withhold the crucial measure that will make it work. Failure to approve the loan to Britain will be a clear default of leadership. Failure to approve it promptly will dissipate its effectiveness.

It has been officially stated that the British loan is a unique case that will establish no precedents for further credits to other nations. It is exceptional in its importance to our aim. But if the United States expects to make its economic program the dominant one for world trade, it must continue to exercise the creditor function without which that program cannot persist.

The most that we should ask is that future loan transactions be scrutinized as was this one to see that they offer comparable security and comparable return in support of the program for which we stand.

For the loan to Britain, it can be said that never before has one nation had an opportunity to gain so much at so little risk as has the United States in this uniquely decisive case.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 1, 1946:

WELFARE AND THE COAL STRIKE

Mining of coal has now virtually stopped in this country. It has stopped primarily because John L. Lewis insists that, before he will even discuss wages, his union must be granted the right to levy what amounts to a tax on coal for what he calls a "union health and welfare fund."

This health and welfare fund issue may or may not be sound. That can be debated. The thing which cannot be debated is the timing of the demand. For both labor and management, as well as for all the rest of us, the one really vital thing at this time is production.

It is disturbing enough to have labor striking for higher wages and management marking time for higher prices without having extraneous issues brought into the picture. At least wage and price adjustments are keyed to increasing production.

It is possible that eventually some sort of new health and welfare provision should be made for miners. It is conceivable that such a fund should be administered by the miners' union, with proper safeguards set up by law. This, however, is no time to be striking over such a thing. Today this country is facing a production crisis which, if not removed, may bring a loss of all inflation control and an inevitable repetition of the widespread unemployment of the depression period.

Does labor not realize the threat to our whole stability that these new ideas entail at this time? Settlement of the General Motors strike was delayed for months because the union insisted on threshing out the new idea of "ability to pay" as a prime factor in wage rates—"ability to pay," not of the country, or an industry, but of a single employer. Now negotiations for wage increases in the coal industry are to be held up until the mine operators agree to let the union set aside a fund for the welfare of its members, at so much a ton tax on consumers for all coal mined.

That kind of innovation is something to be discussed over a long period, and dispassionately, for it has many angles and many facets. Good faith would have to be demonstrated and proper administration assured, even after the principle had been agreed to.

For the union to bring it up at this time is bad, indeed. If we do not get to mining coal, to making steel, to building motorcars, to making all types of goods soon and at peak capacity, none of us is going to enjoy for long any degree of health or welfare.

Unions, raising extraneous issues along with demands for high wage increases, are acting just as shortsightedly as management acts when it demands an immediate and complete end to all price controls. If we are to get production really going at this time, Government will have to step down hard on the selfish in both groups.

We can and should give labor good wages. We can and must give management opportunity for reasonable profits. Promotion of high production in the present confused period demands this. We cannot, however, let either labor or management use our current confusion to gain new and perhaps questionable economic advantages—at the common expense and to the common peril.

United Nations and UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the United Nations and UNRRA, by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, March 26, 1946:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Establishment of the closest possible relations between UNRRA, which is making tremendous efforts to relieve the hungry and distressed in the war-devastated areas of Europe and the East, and the United Nations is the aim of the United Nations Committee on UNRRA, headed by Representative BLOOM, of New York, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and a delegate to the General Assembly in London last January.

Mr. BLOOM and his committee are looking forward to the time when UNRRA is to wind up its work for the suffering millions—a time when there will, in all probability, remain many who still suffer. In the opinion of Mr. BLOOM and his colleagues it will become the duty of the United Nations to interest itself in this problem and to arrange for continuing relief of some kind and through some agency. In the European area, the work of UNRRA is slated to end at the close of the present year, and in the East, a few months later.

The United Nations Committee on UNRRA, meeting recently in Atlantic City and composed of representatives of Canada, China, Dominican Republic, France, Greece, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russia, Britain, and the United States, authorized Chairman BLOOM to take four steps to facilitate his preparation of a report to the United Nations when the general Assembly meets in the United States next September.

First, to communicate with those member nations of UNRRA which have not yet made their full contribution to the relief organization; second, to approach those members of the United Nations which have not yet become members of UNRRA; third, to suggest to the UNRRA Council that its Director General be authorized to obtain information regarding the progress of those countries now receiving aid toward economic rehabilitation, so that this information may be available to the United Nations; fourth, to request the Director General of UNRRA and the Secretary General of the United Nations to consult with the committee, through its chairman, Mr. BLOOM, on the progress of the reports of UNRRA's work which are to be submitted to UNO, and on the establishment of close relations between UNRRA and UNO.

Mr. BLOOM is already at work on the task which has been assigned to him by the committee. One of his first steps was to send messages to members of the United Nations which are not also members of UNRRA, through their diplomatic representatives in this country, urging them to join up and make their contribution to the work of UNRRA, and explaining how they may be elected members of the relief organization. Messages were sent, in this vein, to Argentina, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Syria.

The story of Europe's children today is not a pretty one. It is to the relief of these children that UNRRA, however, has given particular attention—children who are to be the future men and women in many countries. Millions of gnome-like, stunted, undernourished, disease-ridden, ragged little people have been and are being aided.

Wherever UNRRA has conducted its relief and rehabilitation programs, there have been special feeding programs for children, for infants, and for nursing mothers. In Italy, for example, more than a million children are receiving extra food every day. Greece has 600,000 receiving such assistance, and it is proposed to help as many as a million and a half in that war-torn country. The children in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and in countries of the middle east, now being aided, add hundreds of thousands more to the list.

Food from those members of the United Nations whose lands have not been ravaged is the only thing that can rebuild these little people—and keep from starvation and undernourishment millions of adults as well.

In a small Yugoslav village, Flasenica, when the first load of grain was received through UNRRA, its president, commenting on what it would mean to them, said, "our children eat every other day."

These are only samples of the ills which beset the children of Europe. They give emphasis, however, to the desperate need for a continuance of the work of UNRRA, and point up President Truman's recent call on Americans to save food and eat less in order to save the lives and health of millions abroad.

Is There a Caste System in Arlington?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I place in the RECORD the following thought-provoking statement:

IS THERE A CASTE SYSTEM IN ARLINGTON?

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

Last November I attended the Armistice Day ceremony at the Arlington National Cemetery. At 11 a. m. sharp the President of the United States led the Nation in paying tribute to the memory of the Unknown Soldier of the First World War.

As this sacred rite was in progress I wondered, as no doubt millions of others have, who the Unknown Soldier could have been. Where did he come from? Who were his parents? Was he married? These were the questions that came to my mind as I heard the bugler blow taps.

And then, I began to ponder—was this honored hero a private or a general?

Historians say that he was an enlisted man, but does it really matter what rank he held when he died on Flanders Field? Of course not, yet in accordance with strange regulations piously adhered to at Arlington Cemetery, rank is a prime factor in the allocation of the graves.

Upon leaving the mammoth amphitheater after the Armistice ceremony I learned to my astonishment that former soldiers are laid to rest according to rank. It was difficult to believe that a caste system really existed in Arlington: yet here are the facts as I learned them:

Officers are borne to their graves on a caisson with all the pomp and ceremony that the Army can devise. The enlisted men receive no such treatment. Their coffins are carried to their resting place by hand without any elaborate services.

Then, there are two definite burial sections, one for officers, the other for enlisted men. To each officer is afforded a lot, the size of two graves—or a plot of ground. Enlisted men are merely allotted graves which almost touch each other. In other words, if an enlisted man and his wife are to be buried together, both caskets are placed in one grave, one atop of the other.

But for officers no such crowded condition prevails. Enlisted men are required to sign a statement that they intend to have their graves dug "twice-6-feet," also, guaranteeing that there will be no extra cost to the Government for the placing of the extra casket. Officers are under no such obligation. They get two plots automatically, without red tape or special signatures.

In regard to tombstones, the same preferential treatment is extended to the "gentlemen" of the service. Officers may have any size tombstone; but enlisted men by order of the Quartermaster General's office must be satisfied with regulation size, which is a very small headstone.

Who are the persons responsible for such a self-exalted doctrine? How is rank obtained? Why do some get it by playing petty politics or by knowing some influential friend? Others work their way up the ladder the hard way. Nevertheless, does rank make an officer any better than an enlisted man when they are laid to rest?

In veterans' hospitals there is no discrimination between patients and there should be no distinction in the graves allotted at Arlington Cemetery. This rank policy should be immediately abandoned and in its place there should be substituted a real democratic and American burial for the men who have graced the uniform of this great Republic.

If the unknown soldier was an enlisted man, and we assume that he was, then the individuals who selected him for the high honor certainly pulled a fast one on the brass hats, for he holds the most sacred spot in the whole cemetery.

In this connection I would like to give these excerpts of the report that appeared in the newspapers about the burial of General Patton:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 24, 1945]

PATTON WILL LIE BESIDE PRIVATE HE LED IN BATTLE

(By Walter Cronkite)

HAMM, LUXEMBURG, December 23.—Seventy German prisoners of war, the field gray of their wehrmacht uniforms mottled with red clay mud, dug grave No. 7,934 in the United States military cemetery here today.

* * * * *

Patton will be buried at 10 a. m. tomorrow here in the rugged Ardennes hills, which he called the worst tank country he ever saw.

* * * * *

ALL RACES AND CREEDS

They'll lay him among the Phzywarras, the Dexterns, the Williams, Moores, McFarlanes, Stamatios, Kees, Garcias, and Weisenmillers. For that is the roll call of the orderly column of graves where Patton will be buried.

Patton's place is grave 222, row 9, plot 33. In grave 221, to the right, is the body of Pvt. John Przywarra, who lived in Detroit, Mich. He died on this ground a year ago, at Ecternach in the first days of Patton's counter-offensive.

There is room for two more graves to the left of Patton's in row 9. In the same row there are two unknown soldiers. All were privates in the row with the exception of one corporal and one sergeant.

Abolish OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Tennessee Businessmen's Association on March 21, 1946. The facts as set forth in this resolution are obvious to everybody who has had any contact with the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Production Administration. This Congress should take some action at this time to abolish these agencies:

BE IT RESOLVED

Be it resolved by the board of directors of Tennessee Business Men's Association in adjourned regular session assembled at Nashville, Tenn., on Thursday, March 21, 1946, as follows:

1. That this association advocates the termination of the Office of Price Administration and the Civilian Production Administration at the end of the current fiscal year, on June 30, and that it oppose any further appropriations for a continuation of these agencies beyond that date, for the following reasons:

(1) The OPA and the CPA can be justified only as emergency wartime agencies and they are both altogether contrary to the American way of life in ordinary peacetime. Our form of Government does not countenance the regimentation and control of the business and economic life of its citizens through bureaus empowered to make their own rules and regulations, and hence a continuation of these agencies will result in an invasion of the rights and privileges of the citizens of America.

(2) The OPA and the CPA have both served their usefulness and cannot make any further worth-while contribution to our system of economy. Both have been and are now obstructing reconversion and will continue to retard the production necessary to reach the level of supply and demand. Such agencies should not be permitted to entrench themselves so deeply in the economy of a free people as to become a permanent obstruction to the normal and natural growth of free enterprise under our constitutional system.

(3) The OPA and the CPA are both more concerned with regulations which will control profits than they are with regulations which will establish legitimate, fair, and equitable ceilings. Their operations encourage some to expect, demand, and receive increased compensation for their services and materials and, at the same time, hold others to a strict observance of arbitrary ceilings fixed on the basis of past, present, and anticipated profits. These policies are directly contrary to every principle of our American system of economy and will continue to increase the present chaotic industrial situation.

(4) The OPA and the CPA are actually causing some merchandise to be sold at a price beyond that which would be obtained on an open market removed from their influence, because established ceilings are being used as floors to boost and hold up present prices above the level which would result from an application of the fundamental and basic law of supply and demand.

(5) The OPA and the CPA are both provoking the payment of increased and unreasonable prices through black-market operations, which are used to demand and receive premium prices on ordinary commodities. Competition in a free, open market is the best force to insure full value at a minimum cost, and this force cannot assert itself when it is bound and shackled by the controls of these agencies.

(6) The OPA and the CPA are not making any definite contribution to a solution of the critical housing situation and are not expediting the building program. A termination of their activities will stimulate a more orderly flow of building materials to those who are now in great need of same, and will result in a restoration to the rental market of many housing units which have been withdrawn therefrom.

(7) The OPA and the CPA both require enormous sums of money for their operations, and a continuation of these agencies will impose an unreasonable and unnecessary tax burden on the citizens without the taxpayers receiving any benefits from such expeiditures. The people are entitled to receive full value for every tax dollar spent, and to keep such agencies in operation without the public receiving any benefit from them actually amounts to waste and extravagance in its final analysis.

2. *Be it further resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to every Senator and every Member of Congress from every State in the Union, that it be printed in both the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner, the two daily newspapers published in Nashville, Tenn., and be spread on the minutes of this meeting in its entirety.

Adopted by the unanimous vote of all directors present, on this, the 21st day of March 1946.

Failure of Our Policy in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what was the basis of the foreign policy of the United States as laid down by Thomas Jefferson? Have the men in the State Department ever given the slightest heed to Jefferson's nonintervention policy when they were dealing with our South American republics? I respectfully call to the attention of the bright young meddlers and interventionists in the State Department to the words of Thomas Jefferson:

We surely cannot deny to any nation that right whereon our own Government is founded, that everyone may govern itself according to whatever forms it pleases, and change those forms at its own will; and that it may transact its business with foreign nations through whatever organ it thinks proper, whether king, convention, assembly, committee, president, or anything else it may choose. The will of the nation is the only thing essential to be regarded.

Another principle enunciated by Thomas Jefferson as the basis of a foreign policy for our Nation has been ignored by the New Deal group in the State Department. I call this principle also to the attention of the interventionists now that their meddling has greatly lowered our prestige in many of the small sovereign nations to the south of us. In Jefferson's first inaugural address delivered March 4, 1801, he let the whole world know what all nations might expect in their relations with the United States:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix an article by Sumner Welles published in the Washington Post on April 3, 1946:

ARGENTINE ELECTIONS

(By Sumner Welles)

THE FAILURE OF OUR POLICY

The Argentine election returns have not yet been officially proclaimed. Colonel Peron has, however, undoubtedly won the presidency by an overwhelming majority in the electorial college and by a substantial margin in the popular vote.

Impartial observers report that the elections were entirely fair. Argentines of all parties declare that in 40 years no elections have been freer from fraud or coercion. Even the busybodies from the United States who rushed to Buenos Aires for election day are compelled to admit the truth of these facts.

For over 2 years I have warned that the policy of the Department of State would arouse popular support for the military leaders, would weaken the liberal and democratic forces, would create antagonism toward the United States among all classes of the Argentine people, and would rapidly disrupt, because of the fears and suspicions which it would raise, the solidarity of the American republics. That is precisely what has now occurred.

The United States is tasting the bitter fruits of a policy which was held up to us shortly after its inauguration as a shining example of successful diplomacy.

The Department of State refused to recognize the great popular strength which Colonel Peron had secured because of his ability to sell himself to the masses of the people as their champion in obtaining for them social and economic reforms which were long overdue.

It ignored the self-evident truth that the publication of its blue book 2 weeks before the election would be regarded as an insult to the nation's sovereignty by every Argentinean.

Latin-American feeling is clearly expressed by Arturo Rosello in the Habana newspaper Diario de la Marina of March 10. He declares that "adult peoples" like the Argentineans "do not regard any democratic form of government as truly desirable when it is offered them as a result of foreign intervention, and the military dictatorship which could have

been dissolved as a result of the repudiation and opposition of the will of the people gained overwhelming prestige by becoming, through its victory at the polls, the symbol of national sovereignty."

As a result of United States policy, all elements in Argentina are now openly hostile to this country. Even the leaders of the democratic parties are bitterly asserting that the interference of the United States helped to bring about the triumph of Colonel Peron.

Many writers here are trying to make us believe that the damage done to the entire hemisphere is of little consequence in comparison with the fact that the Department of State has been battling for a lofty principle.

These writers would have us think that our assertion of the right to impose governments which we consider democratic upon all of the weaker peoples of the hemisphere is responsive to a lofty principle.

The United States possesses no such right. On the contrary, it has, by treaty, renounced the assertion of any such right.

Insofar as principles are involved, the policy of the State Department has deliberately violated principles to which this Government is solemnly pledged. It has violated the third article of the Atlantic Charter. It has violated the letter and the spirit of the basic inter-American agreements into which the United States has entered since 1933.

But in all of the voluminous material which has recently been written to make American public opinion believe that black is white, the first prize must be awarded to Mr. Walter Lippmann.

In an article published on March 5 Mr. Lippmann tells us that "it is altogether irrelevant" whether Colonel Peron is a dictator or a democrat, or whether he has the approval of 90 percent of the Argentine people.

Mr. Lippman alleges—what is a gross distortion of the facts—that Argentina did all that it dared do to bring about the defeat and destruction of the United States, and that this Government should declare to the Argentine people: "We shall consider liberation from your dictatorship the best form of reparation. * * * But if that is not possible, we shall have to put in our bill of damages." Mr. Lippmann makes the astounding assertion that "only by an abuse of words can this be called intervention."

An official warning by the United States Government to the Argentine people that, unless they overthrow a President whom they have just elected by a great majority in fair elections, they will be presented with a bill of damages does not, according to Mr. Lippmann, constitute intervention.

Mr. Lippmann, ignoring those inter-American agreements into which this Government has entered which provide for obligatory consultation and cooperation, urges that the United States should continue to act unilaterally on the ground that this "is the only manly and decent way for us to proceed."

The policy which Mr. Lippmann recommends is merely the age-old policy of the assertion by a powerful country of a sphere of influence throughout its neighborhood within which it proclaims its own will to be law.

What is peculiarly disquieting is the indication that the Department of State continues bullheadedly to pursue the same policies which have failed so grotesquely. It has circularized the other American Republics announcing that it will participate in no inter-American agreements in which the new Argentine Government takes part.

Unless the United States returns to the basic principles of the good-neighbor policy, no inter-American conference can now be held without risking a break-up of the inter-American system and the total destruction of pan-American solidarity.

The good-neighbor policy was founded on respect for the freedom and the sovereign rights of the peoples of the Americas; on our abstention from every form of interference in their domestic concerns; and on consultation and friendly cooperation between all of the American Republics with regard to every problem which affected the security or welfare of the hemisphere.

The good-neighbor policy and the inter-American system based upon it were altogether successful. They proved to be of incalculable benefit to the United States and to all of the other American Republics.

The policy pursued by the Department of State during the past 2 years has resulted in a series of unrelieved failures. It has done grave injury to this country's highest interest and to the welfare of the rest of the New World.

Will American public opinion permit a continuation of this disastrous policy?

Atomic Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post under date of April 3, with regard to the atomic legislation now pending.

The Post gives proper support to Senator MCMAHON in his efforts to bring forth legislation which will assure the Nation of civilian control of the development of atomic energy. I consider this issue one of the most important before the Congress today.

The editorial follows:

ATOMIC STATESMANSHIP

The McMahon bill providing for the setting up of an atomic-energy commission is now complete and will soon be sent to the Senate, where, we hope, it will receive prompt attention. Promptness is vital because the development of atomic energy is now virtually at a standstill. The scientists are leaving their work, either because of uncertainty about their status or because of unwillingness to work under military direction. The creation of the new commission as now proposed might recall them to labors which would pave the way for the new age of alchemy.

A last-minute hitch occurred when the so-called Vandenberg amendment was tacked onto the bill. The amendment, which was agreed to by 10 out of the 11 members of the McMahon committee, would have set up a military liaison board in addition to the civilian-controlled commission. Evidently the committeemen, except for Senator MCMAHON, thought the amendment was harmless enough. Senator MCMAHON took strenuous objection to it, and his lot as chairman of the committee was, in consequence, unenviable. He was attacked as a stubborn obstructionist. The fact is that he had the root of the matter in him. In our view MCMAHON is that rare bird in Washington—a man who relates current measures to our basic institutions. This was obvious when the scientists and the experts in administrative management took up his protest. The scientists pointed out that under the amendment they would be tied to military leading strings, and inveighed against it as a device which would not deliver the goods and which violated the American tradition. The administrators charged that the amendment would be unworkable. To this joint case the Post subscribed. We felt that the amendment in its original form would have been tantamount to a dual control of atomic energy, with the military element in the role of obstructionists, so that the civilian commission would have been condemned to work in a monkey house.

Either the reasoning or the protests were sufficient to persuade the committee to change the phraseology so as to take account of the objections. In the revised version of the Vandenberg amendment the military liaison board is to be appointed by the Secretaries of War and the Navy, not by the President, as originally proposed, and thus will not have a parallel status to the civilian commission. The effect of this change will be that the board will advise and not supervise the civilian commission. In virtue of its appointment, it will report back to the Secretaries of the Navy and of War, not to the President. In other emendations the liaison officers are restricted in their counsel to strictly military applications of atomic energy. All in all, the basic principle of civilian and Presidential responsibility for defense is preserved, and the country is relieved at worst of military supervision and at best of a feud-ridden administration working constantly at cross purposes.

In agreeing to this change of wording the 10 committeemen showed the statesmanship requisite to the occasion. The original resolution was the first misstep of Senator VANDENBERG in the tortured history of atomic legislation. We remember him well for his vision in proposing a joint committee of Congress for a study of atomic energy and what to do about it. His views, alas, did not prevail, with the result that two bills are now in competition. As against the McMahon bill, the House may haul out the discredited May-Johnson bill, which would put the scientists in a military strait-jacket. We hope the House will ask themselves whether they want the scientists to work or be policed. They cannot have both. Ten years of research lie ahead of the scientists in improving the manufacture of plutonium. You will no more get such an improvement out of the scientists under the May-Johnson bill than (as Senator MCMAHON once put it) you could have ordered Shakespeare by act of Parliament to write one of his sonnets.

Terminal Leave Pay, House Petition No. 23

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. Charles G. Bolte, chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, Inc., regarding H. R. 4051, and House petition No. 23, relating to terminal leave pay:

THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: The national planning committee of the American Veterans committee has gone on record favoring terminal leave pay for all enlisted personnel

who served in the armed forces. The necessity for action on this measure is urgent. If terminal-leave pay is to be granted to officers, there is every reason to grant it to enlisted personnel as well. The payment of such benefits to enlisted personnel would be of considerable help in enabling the veteran to tide over the period between his departure from the armed forces and his initial job placement.

There is at present on the Clerk's desk in the House Petition 23, which provides for floor consideration of H. R. 4051, reported on favorably by a subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee in December 1945. We call upon you to sign that petition. The petition now has 60 signatures. We would like you to add your name to make the 218 signatures necessary for floor consideration.

We are looking forward to a reply from you stating whether you will sign this petition.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES G. BOLTÉ,
Chairman.

Washington Labor Canteen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Labor Canteen operated during the war in a very interesting manner. One of its functions was to combat racial bigotry and prejudice. The officers and directors of the labor canteen have recently issued a letter containing information on the canteen's activities, which I believe to be of wide public interest. The letter is as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PUBLIC

Working for better understanding among all peoples, the Washington Labor Canteen is today an outstanding example of interracial cooperation. After toddling precariously through its earlier months, the canteen grew with amazing precocity as the idea of nonsegregation took hold. This canteen has just commemorated its second birthday. The success of the Washington Labor Canteen, the only organization of its kind operating south of the Mason and Dixon's line, has shown that racial and religious discrimination is not unalterable.

How it started: Some 2 years ago, Joe Eger, one of the GI's stationed in Washington, sensing the need for such a gathering place, convinced the Industrial Union Council of the CIO that a truly democratic social center in the Nation's Capital was necessary. From an unpretentious beginning the canteen has grown and become a symbol of true democracy.

It embodies the living spirit of thousands of young men and women and expresses their belief in equality and mutual respect. It has shown that a person of a different color is not necessarily inferior in mind, body, thought, or action. It has proved clearly that "one world" can be personified in one room and that complete understanding of others comes only through knowledge and association with them.

Come, take a walk with us through the canteen on a Sunday night. A hostess greets you at the door and gives you the program of the evening. Eight o'clock you are directed to the lounge where a current-events discussion is underway. Here service men and women, veterans and hostesses are giving their opinions on the important issues of the day. Korean boy stands up and tells what he knows of the situation in Korea. Negro boy arises and clearly brings into focus the difficulties veterans like himself have in getting worth-while jobs. The varied problems that beset the individual, and as a result the Nation, are all discussed and evaluated by the group.

Following the discussion, Pfc Johnny Hartman introduces the entertainers, both professional and nonprofessional, who give their time freely and willingly to make the evenings enjoyable. Entertainment over, the band strikes up, dancers fill the floor, the food bar becomes a place of popularity; and the game room a center for discussion, checkers, cards, and group singing. A spirit of camaraderie unburdened by prejudices, based on color or creed, pervades the halls.

The pioneering work of the canteen has been enthusiastically endorsed by many of the well-known liberals of today. Among those who have visited the canteen are Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Congressman John M. Coffee, Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, and Congressman Charles R. Savage. Many other famous people have crossed our threshold, and the unnamed who write us heartfelt letters of thanks are numbered by the score. Phrases such as "we hadn't believed it possible that a canteen of this type could exist, Washington could be a decent place after all, wonderful time, wonderful people," assure us that our project expresses an idea which not only arouses the support of those who have always shared our views, but one which has proved to many that problems of prejudice and discrimination can be solved.

Unfortunately, however, the ones who have been able to share the experience of the canteen have been, necessarily, too few. Even with the walls bulging every Sunday night, our policies and philosophies reach only a meager few. However, in spite of our limitations, the success of the canteen as a wartime service has been so great that plans are now being made to continue the organization as a peacetime social center for veterans, union members, and all those interested in fostering the growth of interracial good will. We hope that the knowledge that a truly democratic canteen and social center which has proved successful in Washington will serve to inspire and bring about the fruition of a widespread social equality.

Fraternally yours,

THE WASHINGTON LABOR CANTEEN,
Washington, D. C.

A Brilliant Latin-American Comments on Mr. Churchill's Advocacy of an Anglo-American Power Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, Señor Luis Quintanilla, Mexican Ambassador to the Pan American Union, is one of the fearless statesmen of Latin America. It was he who electrified the UNO in San Francisco late last spring with a speech discussing Franco Fascist Spain, as a result of which the delegates decided unanimously that they did not want Franco Fascist Spain as a member of the family of nations as long as that country continued to tolerate the Fascist regime then and now inflicting the Iberian Peninsula. Señor Quintanilla knows Latin-America, its regions, its thinking, its philosophy. He, like many of us, was disturbed by the proposal of the Honorable Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, for the organization of an axis composed of the United States and the British Empire on an anti-Comintern basis following the same lines and founded on the same basis as was the original anti-Comintern bloc comprised of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and Imperialist prewar Japan.

An article by Señor Quintanilla appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 17, with relation to the attitude of Latin-American democracies toward Churchill's proposals. The article is well worth studying as a reflection of the reaction of Latins to the proposal of an English-speaking union against the Soviet Union.

The article is as follows:

ANGLO-AMERICAN AXIS?

(By Luis Quintanilla)

A LATIN-AMERICAN SPEAKS

If allowed to materialize, Mr. Churchill's recent proposal for the establishment of a special relationship between the two great English-speaking nations will affect the destiny of the United States and, with it, the destinies of all the non-English-speaking Latin-American Republics, bound, as they are, to their northern neighbor by various specific pan-American commitments.

It can be said, and with good reason, that Latin America has always nurtured genuine affection for England. Comparatively few and only minor conflicts have ever arisen between us. In fact, England gave timely and valuable help to several South American Republics, during their wars of independence fought against Spain.

Also, our relations with the United States are guided by Latin-America's faith in the good neighbor policy. I firmly believe in the interdependence of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere. That is why I have dedicated many years of my life to the not always easy task of trying to remove the artificial barriers placed in the way of our mutual understanding. I like to think of the countries of America as one great family of nations, regardless of race, religion or language.

But if Pan Americanism means, among other things, that whatever affects Latin America also affects directly or indirectly the United States, then I believe it should work both ways: anything that affects the international position of the United States also affects Latin America.

On March 5, Winston Churchill came out in no uncertain terms, for an eventual merging of the political interests of the British Empire and the United States, so as to establish a mighty Anglo-America anti-Soviet coalition. Latin American democrats will firmly reject the formation of any anti-Soviet bloc of nations which, in the last analysis, would be nothing more than a ghastly resurrection of the first anti-comintern axis defeated in World War II. The step advocated by Mr. Churchill is unacceptable on moral as well as historical grounds.

Morally, because whatever our opinion may be as to the ultimate goodness of socialist or communist doctrines, no thinking man can deny that in sharp contrast to czarist conditions, the Soviet regime has succeeded in raising the standard of living of the 200,000,000 human being who comprise the population of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and that, not in spite of but because of the Soviet regime, Russia has become what it is today; one of the two great continental powers of our time.

Historically the proposal is uncalled for, because the very idea of ganging up against Russia today, when it has paid by far the greatest price for our common victory, is abhorrent to any decent American, whether English-speaking or not. It is even more so when we consider that Mr. Churchill, exhilarating in the fact that today only the United States and Great Britain share the secret of the atomic bomb, exclaimed in his Missouri appeal: "Opportunity is here now, clear and shining, for both our countries. * * * We have at least a breathing space before this peril (Russia's knowledge of the atomic bomb) has to be encountered."

What is the nature of this special relationship advocated by Mr Churchill? A mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society; similarity of weapons; the joint use of all naval and air force bases in the possession of either country all over the world—and that, of course, includes Latin America. It would greatly expand that mobility of the British Empire forces and it might well lead * * * to important financial savings. And eventually, there may come the principle of a common Anglo-American citizenship.

Then, adds Mr. Churchill to quiet down opposition: "There are already the special United States relations with Canada and between the United States and the South American Republics. We also have our 20-year treaty of collaboration and mutual assistance with Soviet Russia. But what must be clarified is that not one of these commitments is of the type now advocated by Mr. Churchill. For instance the Anglo-Soviet treaty does not call for the merging of the two peoples, nor for their joint use in peacetime of all naval and air force bases in the possession of either country all over the world; and still less for a similarity of weapons. Or isn't the atomic bomb a weapon?

Moreover, for what specific purpose is this Axis II being called into existence? Mr. Churchill produces very few concrete charges against Russia. He does mention that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia * * * lie in the Soviet sphere." But we could mention an equally impressive list of foreign cities which today "lie in the sphere" of other Allied Powers.

"Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed," says Mr. Churchill, "at the claims which are made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow government." But, again, why doesn't the former Prime Minister mention that Indonesia, Egypt, India, Syria, Lebanon, and Greece daily give bloody evidence of being at least as profoundly "alarmed and disturbed," although for quite different reasons?

The next charge deals with the situation in the Far East, and especially in Manchuria. There, Mr. Churchill must admit that "the agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favorable to Soviet Russia. But it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through the summer and autumn of 1945, and when the Japanese war was expected to last for a further 18 months from the end of the German war"; that is to say, Russian claims are in conformity with the Yalta agreement, but the promises made to Russia, at Yalta, should not be taken too literally because at the moment they were given Soviet help was badly needed.

Lastly, Mr. Churchill pulls out the usual Red-baiting argument communism. It must be eradicated. Why? Because "the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilization." Exactly the words of Francisco Franco. And, minus the word "Christian," exactly the argument brought forth by the original Axis Powers to justify the formation of Axis No. 1.

This is not surprising when we remember that after World War I Mr. Churchill used similar terms. For instance, speaking in Rome on January 20, 1927, he ardently praised Mussolini and proclaimed that, had he been an Italian he would have been "wholeheartedly" with the Fascists "from the start to the finish in your triumphant struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of Leninism." On that same occasion Mr. Churchill declared that Italian fascism had "rendered a service to the whole world" in providing "the necessary antidote to the Russian poison."

Yet the last 20 years have proved that Mr. Churchill was wrong. It is not by destroying physically the Soviet Union that we shall have eliminated the danger of communism. It is only by making all our populations—in America, Europe, Africa, or Asia—personally acquainted with the material benefits of our system, as well as spiritual, that we shall have approved the goodness of democracy.

If our hemisphere policy should ever become entangled in a diplomatic or military scheme designed to set up an English-speaking Axis against our great Soviet ally, millions of bona fide democrats throughout Latin America would be the first to denounce our pan-American ties.

Shall We Extend OPA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, within a few days the Members of the House will be called upon to make the difficult decision as to whether or not we shall extend OPA price control. The decision has been made more difficult because of bad administration of the act during the past 2 years by Mr. Bowles and his staff. The Congress has reached the point where it must write into the act in the plainest possible language certain amendments and limitations of the scope of price control and in addition write into the act, if it is extended, an amendment "providing that regulations and directives must be first submitted to the Banking and Currency Committee to determine whether the Director of Price Administration is following the law and not bypassing such legislation as may be enacted."

The time has come when the administration of price control must be realistic, honest, and fair to the farmer, the manufacturer, the wholesaler, the processor, and the retail merchant. We cannot get the volume of production and the distribution necessary to prevent inflation unless such a policy is strictly adhered to. Unless the administration will cooperate in properly amending the law and in its administration the Members of this House will be justified in refusing to extend pnice control.

The former Price Administrator, Mr. Bowles, because of his arbitrary methods and because of his unwise regulations, in many instances, has encouraged inflation by preventing the production of goods because prices were set so low that the manufacturers and processors would be compelled to do business at a loss. Added to this discouragement has been a multiplicity of rules and directives which have discouraged and confused business, holding back production. To a considerable extent the policies of OPA have prevented goods from coming onto the market, which increases the threat of inflation which is so manifest today that many Members of Congress who want to prevent inflation seriously believe that the supply of goods to prevent inflation will never be equal to the demand unless the Congress abolishes the OPA. On the other hand, I believe a majority of the Members of Congress would be willing to extend price control if the act can be amended and then honestly administered according to the law by the OPA officials.

Volumes of testimony have been given before the Banking and Currency Committee which proved without question that in a great number of instances OPA as administered in the past has prevented the production of goods.

The returning soldier is unable to buy sufficient clothing of every description. The shelves of the retail merchants, to a considerable extent, are empty throughout the Nation. The farmers and civilians generally find it equally difficult to buy ordinary necessary clothing of every description. Textile mills throughout the Nation, even though there is available to them the greatest raw stocks of wool and cotton in the history of the Nation, have not been employed to capacity, and have not been permitted, in many instances, the use of such material without being hedged in by unworkable production rules and regulations, and, in many instances, have not been allowed a sufficient margin of profit to produce the necessary clothing people desire to buy. There is an abundance of money in the country, and there could be an abundance of textile goods of every kind only for the unwise policies insisted on by Chester Bowles during the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, no group of citizens have stood more loyally behind the Government and supported it throughout the long years of the war than the retail merchants of this country.

When they did not have the merchandise to advertise they spent their money with thousands of pages of advertising in the newspapers of the Nation urging the people to buy bonds to support the war to victory. They gave their time, money and effort in every community of this Nation in the support of the war. During all this time they had been bedeviled by rules and regulations of the OPA taking hours and days of their time; they have been snooped on, abused, prosecuted, and maligned by the OPA. Notwithstanding such treatment I believe that the majority are so interested in the welfare of their country, so interested in preventing inflation for the common good that they would be willing for price control to be again extended if it could be limited in scope and if the abuses of price control could be stopped by amendments that would make the act more workable and give them a chance for the future.

We are faced today with a housing shortage for returning veterans and for the civilians. Unrefuted testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee proves without question that the unwise regulations, prices for certain materials, and prices set on certain materials have prevented full production of lumber, brick, tile, soil pipe, and various articles necessary to the construction of a home or business building. The brick manufacturers and the sawmills in thousands of cases have practically been stopped from production because of the unwise policies of the OPA. If the Price Control Act is to be extended it must be amended to correct these many gross inequities long overdue. If not so amended, it should be abolished.

Many amendments have been suggested and it is my hope that a number of amendments can be agreed upon that will bring order out of chaos which will get the country to going in full production. The bottlenecks and the log jams, wherever they occur, from the farms, mills, manufacturers, the processors, and the retailers, must be cleared so that a free flow with a fair and just profit can be had throughout the entire line. We must clear the assembly line of business from production all the way through to the consumer. OPA must be compelled to administer the act so that the green light for full production and distribution will be constantly open.

Greater production is the only way to prevent inflation. We will have the specter and fear of inflation hanging over the heads of the American people until supply equals demand and the OPA must take off controls when supply does equal demand. They have not done it in the past and the law should be plainly written compelling them to take off controls as rapidly as the supply equals the demand. Let me illustrate what I mean.

We have an overproduction of oil and refined products throughout the Nation today yet the OPA has not lifted controls.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest a few amendments which have been suggested which I believe represent a few suggestions which would be helpful to the retail merchants and to business generally, and the first amendment might be termed a policy amendment. I believe it would be well to start off with the enunciation of the following policy:

(A) That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to speed the return to a free economy under which competition will regulate prices, that the obtaining of maximum production in industry is the paramount need of the transitional period and is more important than maintaining existing price levels.

(B) That any and all controls that stand in the way of legitimate production be promptly eliminated. This includes the maximum average price program. The iniquitous policy of cost absorption forced on retailers must be stopped.

(C) That producers be granted a price sufficient to enable them to manufacture prewar quality goods at current costs with an opportunity for profit.

(D) That OPA be required to adopt realistic incentive pricing programs with liberalized cut-off points to stimulate low-priced production.

(E) That the theory, that all increases needed to produce and distribute goods at current cost can be absorbed, be discarded.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members who have given so much time and thought to the subject of price control will be able to join their efforts in support of amendments which will make the Price Control Act more workable if it is extended in the interest of the general welfare of the Nation.

I know the Members of this body in these serious times feel most deeply the serious responsibilities resting upon them. I hope, if price control is extended, that the new Administrator, Mr. Porter, will adopt an attitude of greater confidence in the good intentions of the businessmen of this country and a more friendly and cooperative attitude toward those who struggle under the burden of price controls, and particularly a more trustful and cooperative attitude toward the Members of Congress whose duty it is, under our representative form of government, to enact legislation and to protect the interests of the people we represent. The Members of Congress during the past very difficult years have been very patient with the OPA, possibly sometimes too patient. The time has come when those in charge of price control must adopt a realistic businesslike program with a willingness to cooperate with the Members of Congress in finding a solution in the correction of price-control policies so that we may have greater production, freer distribution of goods and materials in the interest of all of the people of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, unless we can amend the act sufficiently to justify the belief that it will be beneficial to the Nation in helping to prevent further inflation, the Members of this House, in my judgment, should refuse to extend it.

The Navy's Mighty Midgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Joint Board on Scientific Information Policy, on behalf of the War and Navy Departments, revealed the part played by assault rockets during the war, showing that, although neither the Army nor the Navy had a single assault rocket on December 7, 1941, by VJ-day it was one of our outstanding rockets.

My particular interest in these rockets dates back to the summer of 1944, when my secretary, Lt. J. Palmer Murphy, United States Naval Reserve, after 2 years in the Navy was named executive officer of one of the Navy's new rocket ships, the U. S. S. *LCS(L)-67*. He later commanded the U. S. S. *LCS(L)-93*, and in turn was relieved by another resident of my district, Lt. (jg) Robert H. Dyer, United States Naval Reserve, of Clifton, N. J., who had been engineering officer of the ship for over a year. Both these men were in the thick of the naval battles at Okinawa, which started just a year ago. Last January I had the opportunity to visit this area and later to see Murphy's and Dyer's rocket ships in Tokyo Bay.

Describing the use of rockets by Navy craft supporting Pacific invasions, and pointing out that the rockets, by making beaches indefensible and driving the Japanese into inland strongholds, saved thousands of American lives, the Joint Board's report adds:

In the last great amphibious operation in the Pacific, the conquest of Okinawa, rockets really came into their own. Here were combined to a degree never before realized the use of rockets on land, from the air, and from the sea.

A flotilla of 12 rocket ships went into action at Okinawa on March 26, 1945, and for the next 12 weeks poured ashore in support of land operations a total of more than 30,000 rockets.

Because of the secrecy surrounding their mission, little has been heard of the rocket ships of our Navy: the converted LCI's and LSM's, and the first ships to be designed primarily for rocket work: the LCS (L)'s, landing craft support. The following summary of their work at Okinawa is from the ship's history of the U. S. S. *LCS(L)-67*, Commanded by Lt. Comdr. J. Robert Bullock, USNR, of Montrose, Colo., who also served as a congressional secretary before entering the Navy:

These LCS's were part of that large unassorted group of miscellaneous ships that have numbers instead of names. But Vice Adm. R. K. Turner named them our mighty midgets; Fleet Admiral Nimitz called them resolute ships in praising their valor and gallantry; Admiral Raymond A. Spruance expressed his pride in the magnificent courage and effectiveness of these vessels; the late Gen. Simon Boliver Buckner praised their cheerful efficiency and heroic degree of courage; Fleet Admiral Halsey singled them out for commendation. The Japanese cursed them as miniature destroyers.

These ships, a third of the size and a sixth of the tonnage of a modern destroyer, made their debut at the Philippine invasion, fought through Iwo Jima, and made naval history at Okinawa. Although originally designed as rocket ships to provide close-in bombardment of invasion beaches in advance of the first wave of landing troops, the Navy soon found that the LCS's could be useful in other ways between invasions. They made ideal fireboats; it was found they could be used to advantage as antiaircraft ships. Their shallow draft made it possible for them to support under-water demolition teams close inshore. They were equipped to do salvage work; they had sufficient speed and fire power to be useful as escorts. Small enough to move about crowded anchorages without causing too much confusion, yet big enough for good-size loads, they could be used advantageously in intership dealings. They could lay down smoke screens. They could deliver harassing fire against enemy-held positions; do reconnaissance; investigate suspicious objects; rescue downed aviators; sink drifting mines; and patrol inshore waters.

All this they were called on to do at Okinawa, and they did it, but their chief job was out on the radar picket stations, 40 to 50 miles from the fleet and transport anchorages, outside the antisubmarine screen, where they met the Japanese Special Attack Corps, the kamikaze, and destroyed his suicide planes, boats, and swimmers. Here they, with their destroyer partners, set the amazing record total of 490 enemy planes destroyed during the 82-day campaign, but at a cost of over 1,000 casualties.

A regular radar picket team consisted of two, sometimes three, destroyers or destroyer minesweepers, and three or four LCSs, with an LSM sometimes filling in for an LCS. There were about a dozen such stations, ranging all around the island, situated so as to warn the bigger ships, engaged in landing troops or supplies or bombarding the island, of the approach of enemy aircraft. But it soon developed that the Jap pilots, sighting the small groups well out to sea, spent their forces on the pickets. With magnificent and courageous support from the marine pilots of our air combat patrol, the pickets took them on, splashed them, or drove them back.

The LCS's would spend 10 to 12 days on such patrols, plodding back and forth over a very small area, and would then return to the main fleet anchorages for 3 or 4 days to obtain provisions, fuel, water, mail, and other necessities. During these days in port the ships were called upon to perform some of their other duties: To form antiaircraft screens, make smoke, patrol against suicide boats and swimmers, bombard beaches, or perform salvage and firefighting operations either afloat or ashore.

Only 157 feet long, with a crew of 65 men and 6 officers, almost all drawn from the Reserves, these ships merited the praise given them by the highest ranking Army and Navy officials. One flotilla alone—LCS Flotilla Four—which is only this week returning from occupation duties in Tokyo Bay, rescued a total of 1,290 survivors during the Okinawa campaign, shot down 61 planes, assisted in the destruction of 34 others, destroyed 16 suicide boats, engaged in 6 landings, took part in 18 salvage operations, and captured 41 Japanese prisoners. A similar record was made by the other LCS flotilla there, LCS Flotilla 3.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. Howard Pew, president, Sun Oil Co., before the House Banking and Currency Committee:

In seeking discontinuance of price controls, the board of directors of the American Petroleum Institute believe we would not discharge our full duty if we failed to point out that such controls are seriously retarding, disrupting, and strangling all enterprise of the American people.

Jobs for petroleum workers and continued service and quality products at reasonable prices for our customers depend upon the well-being of all industries. They are our suppliers and our customers. So integrated is our American economy that what affects any one of us, affects all of us. Competitive enterprise, which has given 140,000,000 people a standard of living far above that which has ever existed elsewhere, cannot function to serve the public welfare half free and half regimented by artificially imposed price controls. Therefore I am addressing you on behalf of all business enterprise and the consuming public.

Much that I have to say will revolve around the principle that business and industry to succeed must serve the public.

This is best done through competition. To have competition we must preserve at all costs an environment in which the little man can continue to challenge the big fellow for public favor.

I learned this at my father's knee, and that faith in competitive enterprise has guided my life. Within my lifetime the company founded by my father grew from a very small enterprise to one of substantial size, although comparatively speaking, we are still one of the smaller units in the petroleum industry.

To me American enterprise is one of the miracles of modern industrial democracy in that it enfranchises everyone with a cent in his pocket and provides him with a continual polling booth whereby he can elect, or refuse to elect, the suppliers of his wants. Strangling enterprise denies every citizen of this free choice.

I shall attempt to demonstrate to your committee that:

1. America's present manufacturing capacity, unless impaired by hampering restrictions, is sufficiently large to supply the public's demand without price increases substantially above costs;

2. Price controls have retarded production, increased the deficit of needed goods and, if continued, will perpetuate scarcities and shortages, thus encouraging inflation and reducing the purchasing power of the consumer's money;

3. Price controls can never be administered with fairness and in peacetime cannot be made to work without resort to increasingly severe, additional controls, thus eventually destroying competitive enterprise and individual freedom.

First, we should clear our minds of several misconceptions which Mr Chester Bowles and his OPA propagandists have created to confuse consideration of continued price controls.

The first is the failure to distinguish the great difference between price control during war and price control in peacetime. During the war our imperative objective was to produce the requirements of our armed forces. Nothing could be permitted to interfere with that end.

Our national strategy was to make war work as attractive as possible; to make all nonessential production unattractive. Producers of war goods were given material priorities. They were given fair profit margins. Their workers received sharply increased earnings.

Conversely, producers of nonessential civilian goods were denied critical materials, forcing them in many instances either to shift to war production or shut down. They were subjected to frozen price levels, which frequently caused financial losses. The salaries and wages of their workers lagged under governmental restrictions.

All of this had the effect of more than doubling our production and shifting 60 percent of manufacturing output to war orders. This was necessary and proper; otherwise we never could have become the arsenal for democracy which won the war.

When hostilities ceased, our national requirements changed. Our postwar objective overnight became the production of consumer goods in sufficient volume to give our people those things for which they had fought the war—homes and a better standard of living for everyone. Removal of road blocks erected against civilian production became imperative. The needs of our people demanded the restoration of a freely functioning market, historically the most effective stimulant of production in peacetime.

Thus ended all justification for price control. Along with other wartime controls, it should have been thrown overboard as quickly as administratively possible. Had this been done last fall supply and demand in all industries now would be rapidly on their way to a point of balance. Instead, supply and demand have become more unbalanced and our people go without the things they want and need.

The avowed reason we have not abandoned price control is a specious argument that price increases cause inflation; that inflation helps none but hurts everyone; that OPA keeps down prices, and thus is the only barrier standing between the country and a devastating inflation.

This is double talk designed to deceive and confuse. It is putting the cart before the horse. Price increases no more cause inflation than wet streets cause rain. Wet streets are a result of rain and rising prices are one of the many disastrous results that follow in the wake of inflation.

Inflation results when there has been an expansion in purchasing power that is not matched by a comparable expansion in the production of real consumer goods and services. We have an inflationary condition today as a result of the monetizing of the Federal debt and war-accumulated shortages in certain consumer goods, aggravated by OPA controls.

The best and, I believe, the only effective ways to halt this inflationary trend are to balance the Federal Budget at the earliest possible date, and to stimulate the production of goods. This last can best be done by removing OPA controls from business.

All of this OPA talk about industry promoting scarcities is bunk. The lifeblood of industry is abundant production and nothing would suit industry better than a peacetime level of production equal to that achieved in war. There is no doubt, if the hobbles are removed, that industry can produce all the goods we need. The expansion of manufacturing production in 1940–44 is proof of that.

Taking 1939 as representing 100, the Federal Reserve Board index of manufacturing production was 231 for 1944. Factors which more than doubled the output were:

A $25,000,000,000 expansion of plant and equipment, increasing over-all capacity by 50 percent over 1939.

A 50-percent numerical increase in machine tools, with an even greater rise in their actual operating capacity.

Increased utilization of existing facilities, through second and third shifts.

A 60-percent increase in production of raw materials.

An increase in manufacturing employment from about 10,000,000 in 1939 to approximately 16,000,000 in 1944.

Of these 16,000,000 workers, 57 percent worked on orders for the armed services; 43 percent, or less than 7,000,000, produced goods for civilian use, according to the War Production Board.

This agency last year asserted: "It is especially remarkable that notwithstanding the massive shift of industrial resources to munitions production, the manufacturing industries managed to supply the civilian market throughout the war with about as much finished goods as in 1939, though somewhat less than in 1941."

Thus less than 7,000,000 workers in 1944 were able to produce about as much finished goods for consumers as were 10,000,000 workers in 1939. Of course, there were reductions in metal goods and other durable commodities, but these were offset by increased supplies of manufactured foods, textiles, furniture, and other commodities.

These facts are of the greatest significance. Not only did American manufacturing industry produce everything needed for the prosecution of the far-flung global war, but it also produced in the same period a volume of civilian consumer goods at least equal to 1939, when manufacturing production was substantially as high as at any previous time in our history. And this was achieved in a year when 11,000,000 of America's finest youth were in the armed services.

In view of these facts, why has manufacturing production fallen in February to 140

on the Federal Reserve index? Why have manufacturing plants dropped 5,000,000 workers since the peak of production? Why are the things people want so slow in coming? Why the delay in building homes? We have all the expanded plant capacity that we possessed in 1944. With few exceptions, such as shipyards, it can all be converted to the production of consumer goods. The output of these plants can be greatly increased by second and third shifts.

We continue to have adequate raw materials and, in the few cases where supplies are tight, we are able to draw on world supplies denied us during the war. Our civilian labor force is no less than it was in 1944 when 43 percent of those employed in manufacturing produced as much finished goods for civilians as in 1939. Surely this volume should be doubled when the 57 percent who were engaged on war orders are shifted to consumer products. It is simply absurd for anyone to argue that with these two groups at work there would be a scarcity of goods for any considerable length of time.

Price control and labor strikes primarily have been responsible for the failure to produce the consumer goods needed—and price control in large measure has been responsible for the strikes. Had industrial management been free to adjust prices and wages, and if the Government had not interfered, increased wage demands would have been reconciled without the lengthy strikes which have been so costly to everyone.

Even though a statistical showing of comparatively high peacetime production levels can be made, we know that we are not obtaining the goods the public wants most. Thus our production is out of balance with the desires of consumers. In a freely functioning market price changes quickly would correct such maladjustments. Price controls multiply the maladjustments until the entire production system breaks down.

At this point I desire to lay before you a very interesting report of a survey of the experiences of small manufacturers under current price controls, just completed by Opinion Reseach Corp., directed by Dr. Claude Robinson, generally recognized as preeminent in this field.

The Robinson organization made this survey as part of a program of regular polling of public opinion on subjects in which business and industry are particularly interested. My company subscribes to this service, called the Public Opinion Index for Industry. Dr. Robinson granted me permission to present copies of this report to your committee.

Time will permit only a summary of the highlights. I urge that you study this report with care, for, in my opinion, the manufacturers whose testimony is the basis of this document make the most damning factual indictment of the harm being done by OPA price control that has come from any source.

In this survey a representative cross section of small- and medium-sized manufacturers in the concentrated industrial area east of the Mississippi and north of Mason and Dixon's line were interviewed regarding the effect of OPA on their operations. The results constitute an accurate sample that can be applied to about 250,000 manufacturing enterprises in this country employing 1,000 or fewer workers.

This report shows that 70 percent of these manufacturers—roughly three out of four—say price ceilings are injuring their business; 63 percent say OPA price ceilings have been unrealistic in regard to costs; 34 percent say they have had to hold up introducing new products on the market because of price ceilings; 44 percent say they have had to stop marketing certain products because of price ceilings; 51 percent say that they have had to curtail production of certain lines because of price ceilings; 40 percent say they will be forced to curtail or eliminate products if price ceilings stay where they are; 36 percent of this last number say they would have to shut down their plants unless they get price relief.

Dr. Robinson reports that, after eliminating duplications, 67 percent of these manufacturers—roughly two-thirds—say they have already cut out or curtailed production on some items, or face that necessity in the near future. Of these 53 percent say ceilings are restricting an important part of their production line.

The next series of answers indicates why these manufacturers are stopping or curtailing production. Despite OPA ballyhoo about profits being greater than ever, only 14 percent say they are making "good profits"; 41 percent say they are making a "very small profit"; 15 percent are breaking even, and 20 percent losing money. Ten percent did not answer. Thus 40 percent of those answering are not making any profit whatever.

How long do you believe these men can stay in business under those conditions? I know several who are sticking it out only in the hope that Congress will give them relief from OPA. If you do not, many of the 40 percent reported by Dr. Robinson, reflecting some 100,000 manufacturing enterprises, will have to close their doors; 57 percent say they are losing money on some item they make; 57 percent say their recent profit trend is down; 39 percent say that if OPA were ended tomorrow their output would increase; 43 percent say in such an event they would hire more workers almost immediately.

There we have the story of what OPA is doing to production and to small-business enterprises as succinctly as it can be told. The small manufacturer is the supplier of parts and machinery to the big producers. When the little fellow cannot produce, the production line halts, and 100,000,000 consumers go without the goods they want.

Small enterprises cannot wait from 2 to 6 months for relief. When they go into the red, they must sell out to a larger unit—thus creating the monopolistic trend to which we are so opposed—or shut their doors with bankruptcy for themselves and injury to every man and woman in the country.

Patching up the present law will not correct this serious situation. Price control can never be made fair and equitable, for neither a few men nor several hundred thousand can be substituted for the day-by-day functioning of a free market reflecting the judgment and desires of the consuming public.

The weakness of any price-control scheme, no matter how competently administered, lies in the complexity of the interrelationships between prices, wages, other costs, and earnings. Arbitrarily tinkering with a price here and another there throws a myriad of other prices out of adjustment.

Aside from all other considerations, it is physically impossible for a price-control agency to work out equitable price relationships. Let me demonstrate:

We have in this country some 8,000,000 articles of trade. We have 140 metropolitan marketing areas. The number of equations necessary to establish proper price relationships in the metropolitan marketing areas would be 140 times 8,000,000 or 1,120,000,000. We have some 50,000,000 workers whose wage rates might be reduced for convenience to 1,000 classifications. To establish proper wage-price relationships the number of equations would be 1,000 times 1,120,000,000 or 1,120,000,000,000—one trillion one hundred and twenty billion equations. Computing 1 equation an hour, it would require the 50,000,000 workers in America 10 years to do the job on the basis of a 40-hour week, with only 1 week off a year for vacation.

Of course, it is fantastic. So the price fixers resort to formulas for universal application, freezing prices to some previous level. But no sooner are such formulas proclaimed than conditions change. Business conditions change constantly as people's desires and needs change—as producers increase or reduce their output in relation to those desires and needs—or as efficiency increases or costs fluctuate.

No matter how well-intentioned, the price fixers can never keep up with the changing economic picture. Necessarily large segments of industry and commerce always shall be knocking at your door for relief from the maladjustments created in their operations, and when such relief is not promptly forthcoming, production is impaired and the public suffers.

American industry and business cannot be operated by formulas. If they could, it would have been figured out years ago and all business enterprises would be successful while their managers could go on year-long vacations. Day-by-day judgments and decisions are essential to business operations. Enterprises are successful when they constantly adjust themselves to changing conditions. They retrogress when they become static.

Price changes in a free market are the regulators of American industry. They control the volume of production; they shift savings to where they are needed; they move workers into those fields of production in greatest demand; they give consumers what the, want.

In effect the free market price serves the economic system as a safety valve does a steam boiler. Under price control, however, the safety valve is tied down and, in the pending bill, it is proposed to heap on the inflation fire some $2,000,000,000 in the form of subsidies.

Such a course of action is analogous to the engineer who ties down the safety valve on his boiler while adding fuel to the roaring fire. Does anyone doubt that there will be an explosion? And the longer price control is continued, the greater that explosion will be.

During the war price control had a measure of success due to supplementary controls and because the people, out of patriotic motives, accepted it, subordinating their desires and needs to the national urgency of winning the war. With the end of the war, however, the pent up desires of 100,000,000 consumers again came into play.

Thus black markets have become rampant, breeding widespread disrespect for law. OPA officials testify to that. The situation is worse than at any time during the war, says J. M. Blackford, OPA top enforcement officer in Portland, Oreg. Leo F. Gentner, OPA regional administrator, says the same thing about the black market in New York City and makes this revelation: "Congress could give me 10,000 more investigators but I wouldn't have a chance of breaking up the black market unless the women of the city refuse to buy from such merchants."

As long as price controls continue, black markets will grow. Demoralizing though they are, they constitute a manifestation of a free people seeking to satisfy their legitimate desires when their Government has forbidden a free market. Since the days of Confucius, people have refused to accept as wrong that which in their hearts they know to be innocent, and not even a Gestapo the size of an army can prevail against them. All this has the effect of penalizing the law-abiding, whether consumer or producer, and encouraging all others. Likewise, it breaks down the legitimate sources of Government revenue.

When price control holds the price of a commodity below its free market level, two things inevitably happen—demand is encouraged and supply discouraged. Thus, the shortage of that commodity grows, rationing becomes necessary, and the consumer pays the bill. Next in order will be material priorities and all other wartime controls under which industry would be told not only at what price it can sell its goods but what type of goods it can make. What is more, consumers will be told what they can have, irrespective of what they want. A system of wage stabilization would have to be

adopted and, ultimately, workers would be told where they must work.

The result would be, as Henry Hazlitt, the brilliant New York Times writer, has so well said, "A completely petrified totalitarian economy, with every business firm and every worker at the mercy of the Government and with a final abandonment of all the traditional liberties that we have known."

If the existing OPA price-control powers are continued for another year, it will be the first and a far-reaching step toward that end. Let none be fooled. If such action is taken, the price-control administration will be back here next year pleading for extension for another year, using the same arguments they propound this year, with this one exception: Next year they will be able to plead a worse situation and a greater urgency, for continued price control meanwhile will make the problem worse, just as our situation today is more critical, in the words of Chester Bowles, than it was at the end of the war.

Termination of price controls inevitably will result in some price rises. Wage rates cannot be increased across the board 15 to 20 percent without an impact on prices.

Since, on paper at least, our prices are anchored unrealistically to the conditions of 1941–42, which long ago changed, prices generally will go through a period of readjustment. For a short period this will be a disturbing factor, but, I repeat, it is inevitable whenever price control is terminated. The sooner it is done, the less disturbing it will be.

Not all prices will rise. Some, in all probability, will go down. Certainly the public will be freed of the extortions of the black market, quality deteriorations, and the present necessity of buying high-priced goods in the absence of standard low-priced articles. Price increases will stimulate increased production which quickly will bring prices back into balance. If prices go up too fast, consumer resistance will check them.

Whatever the dangers of price-control termination—and they have been grossly exaggerated—they are infinitely less than the dangers inherent in continuing price control.

Congress will decide within the next few weeks either that America will take the road which has proven so disastrous to the rest of the world, or the road back to freedom and an ever-higher standard of living. Your decision will determine the fate of our country, not only for the next year but for many, many years to come.

Attempt To Purge Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my desire to include an article from the April 1946 Republican News.

History has proven time and time again that all governments in attempting to carry out duties beyond their capacities seek to place the blame for their own mistakes upon the opposition. We now have the chairman of the New Deal party attempting to purge Members of Congress of his own party who would not support administration bills in Congress. The present Secretary of Commerce and former Vice President, Mr. Wallace, would deny such legislators the right to run for reelection on the Democratic ticket.

The entire country will applaud men who have the courage to vote their convictions and to vote for the right when they know it to be right and to vote against the wrong when they know it to be wrong. The article follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND NINE DISSIDENT DEMOCRATS FACE PURGE

At last the Democrat administration has come out from behind its whiskers to threaten a purge of Congressmen who refuse to follow the CIO-PAC party line on major issues.

Democrat Chairman Hannegan started the purge machinery going on March 14 at a Jackson Day dinner at Wilmington, Del. Bitterly he assailed the antiradical coalition in Congress, denouncing the "dissenting Democrats" as "economic wreckers." Next, Secretary of Commerce Wallace loudly echoed Hannegan. At a luncheon meeting of the Democratic Women's Club in Washington, Wallace proposed "discipline" for Senators and Representatives who are not rubber stamps.

Enforcement of the Wallace purge plan would be left to the President, Vice President, the Speaker of the House, plus the majority and minority leaders of the two Houses, perhaps with the help of party caucuses.

TRUMAN, TOO

Pendergast-reared, President Truman tacitly supported the purge project at his news conference March 21. Laughing, he said he had not discussed the subject with Wallace, but added seriously that it is necessary to hold party membership in line if a legislative program is to be put over. Significantly, 2 days later President Truman and Secretary Wallace spoke from the same platform at Washington's Jackson Day ($100 per plate) dinner.

That Democrat leadership regards the revolt of regular Democrats as a peril to President Truman's 21-point legislative program, as well as the party's political future, is no secret.

The official publication of the Democrat National Committee takes two raps in its March issue at Democrat House Members. It acknowledges "a severe setback" to the Truman-Wyatt emergency housing program "at the hands of an almost solid Republican opposition joined by a minority of dissident Democrats."

DISSIDENT DEMOCRATS LISTED

Discussing the Case bill, the publication scoffed that "no northern Democrat voted for the measure." The list of 109 Democrats from other sections voting for the Case bill:

ABERNETHY, of Mississippi; ALLEN, of Louisiana; ALMOND, of Virginia; ANDREWS, of Alabama; BALDWIN, of Maryland; BARDEN, of North Carolina; BECKWORTH, of Texas; BLAND, of Virginia; BONNER, of North Carolina; BOREN, of Oklahoma; BOYKIN, of Alabama; BROOKS, of Louisiana; BROWN, of Georgia; BRYSON, of South Carolina; BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; BURCH, of Virginia; BURGIN, of North Carolina; CAMP, of Georgia; CHAPMAN, of Kentucky; CHELF, of Kentucky; CLARK, of North Carolina; COLMER, of Mississippi; COOLEY, of North Carolina; COOPER, of Tennessee; COURTNEY, of Tennessee; COX, of Georgia; CRAVENS, of Arkansas; DAUGHTON, of Virginia; DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana; DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; DREWRY, of Virginia; DURHAM, of North Carolina; EARTHMAN, of Tennessee; ELLIOTT, of California; ERVIN, of North Carolina; FALLON, of Maryland; FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico; FOLGER, of North Carolina; GARY, of Virginia; GATHINGS, of Arkansas; GIBSON, of Georgia; GORE, of Tennessee; GOSSETT, of Texas; GRANT, of Alabama; GREGORY, of Kentucky; HARE, of South Carolina; HAYS, of Arkansas; HÉBERT, of Louisiana; HENDRICKS, of Florida; HOBBS, of Alabama; JARMAN, of Alabama; JOHNSON, of Oklahoma; LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas; LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas; KERR, of North Carolina.

KILDAY, of Texas; LANHAM, of Texas; LEA, of California; LYLE, of Texas; MCGEHEE, of Mississippi; MCKENZIE, of Louisiana; MCMILLAN, of South Carolina; MAHON, of Texas; MALONEY, of Louisiana; MANASCO, of Alabama; MANSFIELD, of Texas; MAY, of Kentucky; MILLS, of Arkansas; MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; MURRAY, of Tennessee; NORRELL, of Arkansas; PACE, of Georgia; PATMAN, of Texas; PETERSON, of Florida; PETERSON, of Georgia; PICKETT, of Texas; POAGE, of Texas; PRICE, of Florida; PRIEST, of Tennessee; RAINS, of Alabama; RANKIN, of Mississippi; RICHARDS, of South Carolina; RILEY, of South Carolina; RIVERS, of South Carolina; ROBERTSON, of Virginia; ROE, of Maryland; ROGERS, of Florida; RUSSELL, of Texas; SASSCER, of Maryland; SIKES, of Florida; SLAUGHTER, of Missouri; SMITH, of Virginia; SPARKMAN, of Alabama; STEWART of Oklahoma; STIGLER, of Oklahoma; SUMNERS of Texas; TARVER of Georgia; THOMASON, of Texas; TRIMBLE of Arkansas; VINSON, of Georgia; WEAVER, of North Carolina; WEST, of Texas; WHITTEN, of Mississippi; WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi; WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma; WINSTEAD, of Mississippi; WOOD, of Georgia; WORLEY, of Texas; ZIMMERMAN, of Missouri.

CIO PLANS PURGE FUND

Washington wondered if Wallace and Hannegan propose to "purge" the Democrat Party of the Democrat Solid South. The CIO, apparently with administration approval, has announced plans to spend $1,000,000 organizing hitherto nonunion labor in the South in a drive to "liquidate" selected southern Members of Congress.

Editorial comment on Wallace's party line manifesto included the observation of the Washington Star that there exists "more than a little kinship between what passes for liberalism these days and undisguised totalitarianism."

The Constitution in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, as part of the extension of my remarks, I wish to include herein a copy of the oration delivered by Mr. Kenneth Smith, 408 South Main Street, Eufaula, Okla., one of my younger constituents, which he delivered at the American Legion District Oratorical Contest in Muskogee, Okla., recently.

Mr. Smith's oration won second prize, but it contains such a wonderful description of our Constitution I think it is most worthy of perpetuation.

THE CONSTITUTION IN A CHANGING WORLD

(By Kenneth Smith)

The bright sun of opportunity has risen on a new day of progress. Beneath that sun men of our time are striving to add their bit to the wisdom of 20 centuries. With their store of knowledge, our forefathers built a great nation and founded a new culture in freedom and equality.

A new star has risen in the heavens. This glittering beacon has glowed brightly in the past and will shine on as a guiding light into the uncertain future. But nations are not

made great in a year or many years, and stars do not just take their place in time's sky; they must deserve that place. How do we deserve ours? That is not too difficult a question. By fighting for what we believe in, standing on good principles, and trying to do the best thing for humanity.

In 1789 we were just another new government on the wrong side of the Atlantic. How can it be that one nation can rise so rapidly to leadership among other great powers? The answer lies in a strong foundation and courageous leaders.

The country's first statesmen who met together in 1787 to build a new kind of democracy were determined to construct such a foundation and to rear such leaders. The words they spoke there were the beginnings of a new era—their document, a pattern for the ages.

The descendants of the men have lived for 157 years by those principles. Much blood has flowed that this creed might continue. But men who die for a cause cannot be said to have really died. They live on in the ideals they believed in. The rush of the passing years only amplifies their hallowed song of liberty. Our country is the living symbol of men's ideas. Their doctrines live on in us, in this community in the American way.

The world shifts its thought and ideas as rapidly as sand in a surging tide. So it has always been and will be until the earth itself is swallowed in darkness. In all its existence, the world has had only a few model patterns to govern it. And that isn't so strange considering what an achievement it would be to set down a principle that would survive the changes even a hundred years would make in the thoughts and customs of a people. Our Constitution is such a model.

The patriots of Philadelphia were filled with the fire of newly gained freedom when they conceived their immortal system. Their aim was to build a permanent federation, but they didn't fear the changing trends that the time to come would bring. They welcomed change by making a provision for modification and addition. This flexibility has probably done more than any other thing to make the Constitution an accepted law of the States.

For 13 long years these men had struggled against tyranny in high places in the British Government. They were determined that the same condition should never prevail here. And so, no matter how great or popular a man may be, he cannot become this sole pilot of our ship of state.

There always exists a fear among small States of their larger neighbors. This fear was present in the convention at Philadelphia in 1787. The North feared the South; the planters feared the merchants, one group after the other eyed their partners with a disdainful glance. One compromise after another had to be made. The problem of representation had to be worked out: the rights of the States and the rights of the National Government: should slaves be counted as the population, also, and so on. Every new session brought forth new tests of the will and patience of the members. Democracy had already taken its place as an institution of these people, or their Constitution would never have been completed. Day after day it had worked, week after week, and finally it was done. At last the infant breathed and the stern face of fate smiled on a new Nation and a free people.

New hope welled up in the hearts of subjugated races the world over, and that spark of hope soon burst into the crackling flame of liberty, a flame that threatened to consume the corrupt bonds that held them in slavery. A tidal wave of unrest swept the areas of conquest. A new world was in the making and its model steadily made its way upward under its constitution.

It was too good to last very long, the cynics said. No system of that kind ever lasts long. But last it did. In spite of resistance, every challenge was met and overcome. There was no situation that this set of rules could not cover. A changing world does not control the efficiency of a government by its people. It changes with the years and the problems it meets.

Every period has its one great nation; this coming age promises to be ours. The rocky path of achievement gained lies behind us. Another age has passed, and we set out on our journey again. A heavy veil covers the road ahead. Strange shadows dart across the way and lie in wait for us, but beyond them a great brilliance illuminates everything. What tomorrow will bring no one can say, but the winds of learning are fast sweeping away the misty veil of ignorance which shadows the future. Whether the great light ahead is the dawning of a utopian day or the awful glow of an atomic blast, we know not. Only time can tell.

Then where does our course lie? Shall we penetrate the veil of the unknown future? That is for us to decide. That is our destiny.

Within the grasp of ours is the trust of a free world. Never before has one nation been capable of bearing such a responsibility. We can do nothing other than to carry it forward. We can do no less than to succeed.

Dispel your fears of the approaching tomorrow; nothing good comes from fear. Drive away your doubts, for in doubt lies suspicion and jealousy. We have neither cause nor use for these things. Smile into the future, and she can do nought but smile back.

We are a great nation founded on the simple rights of human freedom. What more noble code can men build upon? Change the words if you will, but the underlying principles will always remain the same. During peace and war, in times of prosperity and times of decay, as a nation we can always be secure, for all that can harm us lies within ourselves. When the people lose faith in the Nation, or the Nation in the people, our age will be ended, and our day of progress will draw to a close. Such a time must never come.

High in the heavens of time a new star has risen. It glows with the warmth of freedom and good will. It is our star gleaming up above. Who can say how long it will shine?

EUFAULA, OKLA.

William F. Shanahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very timely eulogy on the late Hon. William F. Shanahan, register of probate of Essex County, Mass., which appeared in the editorial column of the Lynn Telegram-News on April 2, 1946. For a good many years I have cherished the friendship of Billy Shanahan with whom I first became acquainted as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature. Mr. Shanahan served in the Massachusetts Senate and was appointed to fill the vacancy in the office of the register of probate by Gov. Joseph B. Ely upon the death of the register of probate, Horace Atherton. From the date of his appointment through the time of his death, our genial and wholesome friend could be found daily in his office in the courthouse in Salem giving every possible help and assistance to the members of the bar, to the court litigants, to the registry employees, and to the public at large. He was one of the few public servants with whom I am personally acquainted that was always willing to offer the services of his office to be helpful not only to the people of Essex County but to those persons who had business with the probate court. His winning way, his ever-big smile, his likable disposition, and his broad and extended knowledge of the probate court law made for him and his office thousands of friends throughout Massachusetts. At all times he was a sincere, industrious, and conscientious person, and to know him was to like him.

Essex County, the members of the bar of our State, and the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts have lost a good and faithful servant in the passing of the Honorable William F. Shanahan. I personally am desirous to extend to his wife, Ella Shanahan, and his five sisters my sincere and deepest sympathy and with the added hope that God will shower upon him every blessing.

WILLIAM F. SHANAHAN

Grief hung as a heavy cloud over this community today as word went about that death had ended the splendid career of the Honorable William F. Shanahan, of Swampscott, register of probate for Essex County, a man whose character was impeccable, whose ability was nationally recognized, and whose friends were numbered among the thousands.

The ready smile and the ready wit of lovable Billy Shanahan will be no more. His labors as the affable, helpful clerk of the Salem tribunal, which came truly to be known as the people's court under his direction, are finished. His gentlemanly manner, his thoughtfulness, his eagerness to be of assistance to men and women in every walk of life will be sadly missed.

Just as his father and grandfather were pioneers in the making of shoes decades ago, Register Shanahan was a pioneer in building success for the Democratic Party in this region. A noted orator, he possessed a winning personality which made lasting friendships. In addition, he was a vigorous and indefatigable campaigner. By dint of hard work and unexcelled initiative he won a seat in the State senate 16 years ago here to become the first Democrat in history to attain this honor.

When a vacancy arose in the register of probate post at Salem in 1933, Gov. Joseph B. Ely knew immediately whom to appoint. He named "Billy" Shanahan, the party stalwart who had proved himself a loyal campaigner and had made democracy a veritable power in this section.

It was virtually an assignment which the Governor gave the Lynn orator. Essex County was a stronghold of the Republican Party. It would devolve upon the new register of probate to retain that post for the rejuvenated Democratic Party.

"Billy" Shanahan, genial, unselfish, and eminently fair, accomplished the impossible. He won at the polls in 1934 to serve an unexpired term. In 1936 he again went forth to the political wars and emerged victorious, building votes for the Democratic Party in a day when county offices were exclusively held by men of the opposite political faith. When he ran for reelection in 1942, he received the nominations of both parties—a tribute to his ability as an administrator and as a maker of friends.

Churchmen and shop workers, statesmen and officials in hamlets, the wealthy and the impoverished—all knew "Billy" Shanahan

well, for he was a man among men, a devout crusader for righteousness, a staunch defender of the downtrodden, and a genial purveyor of good fellowship blended with good sense.

To the members of Register Shanahan's family, the Telegram-News extends its deep sympathy. His untimely passing has saddened the entire community. A beloved public servant has departed this life, but his memory will live long in the hearts of the multitude for whom he gave his every effort.

Social Security and the Responsibility of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT CANNON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Ways and Means:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN PAT CANNON OF THE FOURTH FLORIDA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 1946, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 2229 AND H. R. 2230

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman, it seems that every period presents serious problems for us to solve. The current moment has a way of making current issues appear the most important. Somehow, I have a feeling that this time, in these critical days we are now living through, we are up against the real thing. We must make some hard decisions. We cannot afford a mistake. We cannot permit ourselves to drift. We must set our course in the direction to insure our national safety.

National leadership now, very definitely, lies with Congress. We are accountable to the people we represent to lead them out of the present confusion and bewilderment to the solid ground of certainty and confidence.

This is neither the time nor place to talk about external dangers except as they bear upon the need for internal strength. The best defense against the bewildering array of international issues is to make this Nation strong and united. During the war we were just that. We know now that adjustments to peacetime activity require even greater unity and greater strength. I am not talking about military might. We can marshal that when necessary. The basic requirement for national strength is a well adjusted, productive economy in which all of the forces of free enterprise are working as a team. American mass production won the war. If we can carry our activities forward on the same scale, and sustain them at an expanding tempo, we will develop the internal strength to give us a preponderant voice in adjustments to bring world stability. We cannot permit weakness at any point in our economic structure.

For this reason I am convinced that the enactment of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230 is a No. 1 must in our domestic program. Assurance of continuing mass markets is essential to our mass output. At almost regular intervals in the past our economy has faltered under the weight of depression because large groups of consumers could not buy the products which were intended for them. Warehouses were filled, factories became idle, farmers were paid for leaving land unused—all because of a fatal defect in our economic organization. How can we ever expect our free enterprise mass economy to function with a smoothness which has now become necessary unless there is sustained mass demand for the mass production? We have struggled through previous periods when the bottom dropped out of consumer markets. I submit that we cannot afford that risk any longer.

The large group in this country who will logically become the agents to sustain consumer markets are the old folks. I am honored to propose that they shall receive retirement payments in partial recompense for 40 years of labor which have gone into the enrichment of this Nation. But, gentlemen of this committee, you see from my preceding remarks that retirement payments will serve a much larger purpose than equity for retired workers, although this result in itself is enough reason for favorable action on these bills. Above all else, the enactment of H. R. 2229–H. R. 2230 will fortify our Nation against all contingencies. We will still have plenty of problems to meet, both domestic and international, but on the solid foundation of a stable, expanding free enterprise economy we need have no fear of failure to find solutions.

The members of this Committee on Ways and Means are specialists in the field of taxation. My remarks on this phase of our subject will be limited to certain general points which I believe need emphasis. It is proposed in the bills that the revenue required for the annuities shall be derived from a gross income tax. As income is received, a small fraction—3 percent is proposed—will be diverted to the annuitants and will return immediately to merchants and producers. It wil be a part of the perpetual flow of national income, and rather than subtracting from national income and production, will increase the size of the stream.

This tax will be in the nature of a productive expense. No businessman hesitates to divert his income into uses which will increase his income. The use to which a tax is put determines its desirability. When the people can see favorable results, they do not object to a tax. The best illustration is the tax on gasoline. In my State of Florida I pay 7 cents per gallon which represents 28 percent of the receipts of the gasoline dealer. Yet I do not object. Why? Because I know that if Florida did not have the highways built by this tax money, she would not only lack the highways but also thousands of business enterprises, industries, citrus groves, and wealth of all kinds and varieties which can be traced directly to the productive use of the gasoline levy. Moreover, these highways in Florida have reduced the cost of innumerable items I buy, including the price of my automobile. What do you think automobiles would cost if their production was limited by dirt roads? The gasoline tax increases output and reduces cost on thousands of products.

The gross income levy is similar in principle. Its favorable results, in comparison with the gasoline tax, would be multiplied many times because of its wider application.

If we had started out with the gross-income tax, we could not get along without it. Now we have the barrier of novelty in thought as asserted by your committee's technical staff on social security. Surely, you gentlemen who applaud novelty, change, technological advance in business enterprise, who are grateful that we developed atomic power first, will not permit yourselves to be deterred by changes in taxation when they vitally affect the public interest.

Instead of stressing the burden of taxation, can we not put emphasis upon its beneficent results? Taxes are used to improve our agriculture, to control disease, to promote public safety, to develop better relationships between employer and employees to foster equity in business dealings, and to place education within the reach of all our citizens. Our flood-control projects, reclamation and irrigation, and the development of power resources are other illustrations of tax expenditures which have enriched our country.

Now, I am proposing the use of tax revenue to accomplish the greatest economic purpose of all—the stabilization of our free-enterprise economy, which, in my opinion, is essential to its preservation. I do not believe we can continue to survive the economic losses and social wastes of depression and unemployment.

We must not allow any other form of political and economic organization to supplant the free, private-initiative, American system.

May I leave one final thought with this committee? We are agreed, I feel sure, that over-all economic planning by Government bureaus is undesirable except during the emergencies of war. According to the philosophy of our democratic institutions, the controls imposed by government are those to keep competition free. Millions of businessmen and consumers who are free to exercise their independent judgment will keep our economy in good balance if freedom of private initiative is protected and purchasing power is maintained. The complications of price, wage, and materials control, affecting tens of thousands of industries and commodities, with all their complex relationships, are beyond the power of a government group to coordinate from the top in a free economy. Some success can be attained for a time during war, when the patriotism of the people is a significant contributing factor. During peacetime, it becomes a choice between a return to free enterprise or a trend toward totalitarianism.

When I refer to freedom of enterprise, I do not mean license of enterprise. I am thinking of freedom for all our people, not a license for a few. Moreover, when I assert that the minute administration of thousands of economic controls by Government bureaus are impossible of successful realization as a practical matter, I do not eliminate the necessity of over-all economic planning by congressional committees. The Congress is responsible for policies. Policies are set with an eye on the future. We in Congress are derelict in our duty if we fail to plan for the future in the light of current trends. We try to turn back a wrong trend; we act to produce a right trend.

I believe that the Committee on Ways and Means is considered the most powerful in Congress. Why? Because this committee initiates taxation measures. In taxation you have the power to destroy and the power to build. You can prevent things from happening that will hurt us, or even destroy us. For instance, inflation is really your responsibility. If it becomes dangerous you can impose taxes to retire the public debt. In my view, you can control inflation effectively and easily while a Government bureau, at best, can be only partially successful and may interfere seriously with production.

On the other hand you can use taxes productively to establish conditions of full production, full employment, and high national income. You need high gross national income to produce adequate revenue to meet the increased expenditures of government. Moreover, you require a form of taxation which will yield a surplus to make our huge debt manageable.

I am convinced that in the gross income levy we have a tax which will insure the great objectives, which above everything else in the world, we desire to see realized. Responsibility, opportunity, and leadership lie within this committee. National stability and safety in this critical period of world confusion and domestic doubt can be insured by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Three Important Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House within the next few days will be called upon to decide, insofar as it can, three very important questions.

CONSCRIPTION

Though the fighting has ceased, the war has not been officially ended. High-ranking Army and Navy officials are determined to continue to conscript the youth of America. To aid that drive, there has been much talk of war with Russia, though just prior to the end of the war we were told that Russia had been stripped of manpower and of munitions of war. Those who want to have us furnish conscripted men and volunteers to police Europe under the direction of the international staff of UNO, want conscription. Those who demand conscription insist that 18-year-old schoolboys be drafted.

In my judgment, we can obtain all the men needed for both home and foreign service through the volunteer system if we will pay them fair compensation, treat them properly and assure them of discharge within a reasonable time. Military training should be given in high schools, colleges, and universities. Our young men should not be forced to fight on foreign soil when we are not at war. They should not be placed under the authority of the professional military men during the years character is being formed. There has been altogether too much commercial vice winked at and condoned by commanding officers during and subsequent to the recent fighting.

The deciding factor in both World Wars has been the skill and courage of men who were not professional soldiers, as that term is used in other countries. Why change to the system of the losers?

HOMES FOR VETERANS

Everyone in Congress desires to do his utmost for veterans. Unfortunately, neither plans nor money, when materials are not available, will produce homes. Nor are prefabricated structures the answer. The veteran is entitled to something better than that. The administration is fumbling the ball and Congress has not made up its mind just what to do about it. So far, it has let OPA have its way. Price ceilings, coming on top of war's demands, have created a scarcity of building materials, home furnishings. OPA seems determined to stick to its guns in spite of the fact that the scarcity created by it tends to increase prices, not hold them down.

The so-called Wyatt housing bill is a move to pay some $600,000,000 by way of subsidies to the men, not who live in, but who build, houses for veterans. It is a scheme to have the Government buy at an excessive price at least 250,000 prefabricated homes this year, 600,000 next year, with no certainty whatever that either the veterans or anyone else will want any of them at the price offered.

If Congress would insist that OPA lift ceilings on building materials, on home furnishings, manufacturers would produce materials, and furnishings would be available, and a Government loan to a veteran would assist him, not only in getting a home but in establishing himself in business.

The remedy I suggest is that we force OPA to quit creating a scarcity by attempting to require individuals and corporations to produce and sell for less than the cost of production. It cannot be done, and the sooner that fact is recognized the quicker we will have materials for homes. Then, when necessary, aid the veterans in purchasing homes, establishing themselves in business.

MORE ABOUT PRICE FIXING

Today to my desk comes a letter which demonstrates the absurdity, the impracticability, of OPA's procedure. The company makes a heavy wool yarn used in the manufacture of high-grade socks, for which there is a demand by shop workers and lumberjacks. They were satisfied with a profit of 10 percent in 1938 and 1942. Then the plant was frozen for 3 months in 1943; 6 in 1944, and 9 months in 1945. At the end of the war they had neither stock nor merchandise on hand.

They lost approximately $30,000 in the hosiery department under OPA's rules. OPA now refuses to give them an increase in ceiling price sufficient to cover the increase in wages and the increase in the cost of material. Result, no socks.

But the competitor can sell an inferior sock for more money. Formerly this company's price was $7.50 a dozen. Their cost today is $10.25 per dozen. They offered to make socks at $10.50 per dozen, but OPA cannot see it that way. So, again, no socks.

You may not have known about socks, but you do know about shirts. The housewife knows about children's clothing. Some of us will endeavor, if OPA is continued, to force it to fix prices which will include the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. Do you think that unreasonable?

H. R. 6017

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to H. R. 6017 which I introduced today. Wyoming is one of the largest States in the Union. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it can be truthfully said that I represent but 49 percent of the area of my great State. The Federal Government claims to be the landlord of over 32,000,000 of our 62,000,000 acres. The area under the control and dominion of the United States within the confines of Wyoming is larger than the entire area of the State of New York or the State of Pennsylvania. In truth and in fact, Wyoming is in reality only a half State. The Federal Government owns over 2,000,000 acres in national parks, over 8,000,000 acres in national forests, over 14,000,000 acres in grazing districts, and over 3,000,000 acres of isolated tracts of grazing lands outside grazing districts.

Mr. Speaker, the original States retained their lands and the Federal Government has never claimed the right to any lands within their borders. No provision was made in the Articles of Confederation to hold any of these lands except and until they could be turned over to the States. The fact of the matter is that under the original concept it was never intended that the Federal Government should retain the title to public lands within the borders of the various States. The United States obtained title to the area within the public-domain States of the West through four land grants, to wit, the Northwest Territory, the Louisiana Purchase, the Mexican Treaty, and the Oregon Settlement Treaty. It was clearly stated in these treaties that the lands were to be held by the Federal Government only until such time as States could be carved out of the area granted. It was definitely stated that the States set up within that area should be admitted to the Union on a free and equal basis and enjoy the privileges of the other States.

Over 10 years ago, the right to homestead on the public lands of the West was withdrawn. Of late years, the Federal Government has been expanding its control over the area of the West in a most alarming manner. This is a dangerous threat to the economic independence of the public-land States. When the Taylor Grazing Act became law, an additional 17,000,000 acres was withdrawn from homestead entry. When that legislation was under consideration, it was agreed that it was but a temporary solution of the matter and, in fact, there was written into the bill a proviso that until final disposition the lands should be administered under the provisions agreed upon. Under section 15 of that act, there are 3,043,555 acres of isolated tracts of land scattered over the greater part of Wyoming. It is true that these tracts were unattractive for private ownership under the homestead laws. Generally speaking, they were the poorer quality lands. However, I might call attention to the fact that since 1920 there has been paid into the United States Treasury royalties on mineral leases from these and other public lands in the State of Wyoming amounting to a total of over $85,000,000. During the last two fiscal years, there has been paid in an average of over $4,000,000 a year. It is true that a proportion of these funds comes back to Wyoming, but the fact remains that in all the States except in the public-domain States, the oil royalties on production within those States accrue to the people of the States and not to the Federal Government.

These 3,000,000 acres of land, presently held under section 15 of the Taylor Act, should be placed on the tax rolls of the State of Wyoming. My bill grants these lands to the State of Wyoming for the

use and benefit of the University of Wyoming. It further provides that the present lessees of these lands shall have the right to purchase same for a period of 10 years at the appraised value but not to exceed the $1.25 per acre, which is the price the General Land Office places on the better part of these lands. Under my bill, I anticipate that within a reasonable length of time most of the 3,000,000 acres will be placed upon the tax rolls of our State. By reason of the fact that so much of the area of Wyoming has been held by the Federal Government, the people of my State have been unable to develop the University of Wyoming in a manner befitting the dignity of our State. The bill provides that all of the income from the sale of these lands shall be used for permanent construction on the campus of the university.

It is interesting to note the various grants to States, together with the acreage set over for higher education. From the following list, it will be seen that 15 States have received greater grants than Wyoming:

State	Total	Universities, agricultural colleges, and other educational
Florida	21,986,767	182,160
New Mexico	12,794,629	1,346,546
Louisiana	11,045,087	256,292
Arizona	10,543,673	849,117
Arkansas	9,373,073	196,080
California	8,807,295	196,080
Minnesota	8,374,121	212,160
Michigan	7,537,497	286,080
Utah	7,501,767	556,141
Montana	5,963,328	388,721
Missouri	5,578,974	376,080
Wisconsin	5,200,833	332,160
Mississippi	5,021,238	348,240
Oregon	4,448,957	136,165
Colorado	4,471,604	138,040
Wyoming	4,341,580	136,080

It is interesting to note also that 28 States other than the 15 mentioned above have received larger grants for their universities and colleges than the State of Wyoming, as may be seen from the following list:

State	Total	Universities, agricultural colleges, and other educational
Oklahoma	3,095,760	1,050,000
New York	990,000	990,000
Pennsylvania	780,000	780,000
Ohio	1,973,934	699,120
Illinois	3,605,993	526,080
Indiana	2,889,489	436,080
Idaho	4,275,760	386,686
Alabama	2,261,028	383,785
South Dakota	3,435,373	366,080
Massachusetts	360,000	360,000
Washington	3,044,471	336,080
North Dakota	3,163,551	336,080
Kentucky	354,606	330,000
Tennessee	300,000	300,000
Virginia	300,000	300,000
Iowa	3,032,975	286,080
Georgia	270,000	270,000
North Carolina	270,000	270,000
Maine	210,000	210,000
Maryland	210,000	210,000
New Jersey	210,000	210,000
Connecticut	180,000	180,000
South Carolina	180,000	180,000
Texas	180,000	180,000
Kansas	3,618,339	151,269
Vermont	150,000	150,000
West Virginia	150,000	150,000
New Hampshire	150,000	150,000

I do not contend, Mr. Speaker, that this is a complete settlement of the public-domain question in the West, but I do say that it is a step in the right direction. The orderly disposition of the section 15 lands under the Taylor Act can be effected in a fair and equitable manner under the provisions of my bill. It will serve two purposes: In the first place, the lands will go on the tax rolls of our State and contribute toward the support of our schools and other public institutions. In the second place, it will make possible the growth and expansion of the University of Wyoming. I trust that this bill will receive favorable consideration.

Amerada Plays Them Close to the Chest—Article From Fortune Magazine on Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of a most interesting article about Amerada Oil Co. taken from Fortune magazine.

I call attention particularly to the article's discussion of the tax situation of this company and the incredible tax advantages of the provision of continuing the 27½-percent depletion allowance even after 100 percent of all development costs have been covered and paid for by tax deductions.

Some such allowance no doubt is wise policy. But Amerada's situation points up how great the tax advantage can become.

It is informative to compare the great furore over the small tax exemption which less than half the farmer cooperatives of the county now have—no other cooperatives have any exemption at all—with the complete lack of furore over the very great tax exemption enjoyed by oil companies.

AMERADA PLAYS THEM CLOSE TO THE CHEST—BY ADOPTING A POLICY OF WARINESS THIS CRUDE-OIL PRODUCER CONSERVED A SUCCESS WON BY AUDACITY—NOW, WITH OIL BECOMING HARDER TO FIND IN THE UNITED STATES, IT MAY HAVE TO STRIKE OUT AGAIN

Amerada Petroleum Corp. is the highest-priced oil stock on the New York Stock Exchange. Its 1945 range, up to the time of writing, was $103 to $143. Brokers find the stock specially arresting for a number of reasons. Of late it has been a favorite inflation hedge, as a blue-chip stock based on a natural resource. But there is also a titillating element of mystery. The question of just how much oil is in Amerada's possession is one of the livelier topics on the exchange. Amerada, like many other companies, publishes no figures on its oil reserves, and its own private estimate is its most closely guarded secret. But one informed oilman has guessed the figure at the huge amount of 300,000,000 barrels, and a market analyst has even hinted at 550,000,000.

Amerada, in short, is a considerable stimulator of curiosity. It acquires this provocative character from its president, dour and driving A. (for Alfred) Jacobsen. Oilmen know Amerada as the company mainly responsible for developing geophysical research in the United States and as a still aggressive explorer from California to Louisiana. But A. Jacobsen's name does not appear in Who's Who; he refuses to answer questionnaires, and business manuals merely list his jobs and directorships. Even the vast files of the American Petroleum Institute contain no biographical data on Jacobsen and no picture of him. Since the war he has been publicized a little. He succeeded to the chairmanship of the National Oil Policy Committee on the death of Socony-Vacuum's John A. Brown, and last fall he went to London as a member of the committee that advised Secretary Ickes on an Anglo-American oil agreement. In committee he expresses himself well and briefly. But after the meetings, when other oilmen gather for drinks and talk, Jacobsen is absent.

SIZE ISN'T EVERYTHING

The interest aroused by Amerada is out of proportion to its size. Its 1944 gross was $26,000,000, which puts it in the class of small-to-middling corporations. By comparison with Socony-Vacuum, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Gulf, or Texas, it is minuscule. Of crude-oil producers that have no refining facilities and no pipe lines, Amerada is the biggest. But that is a small category of companies: most outfits with Amerada's production—18,000,000 barrels of oil in 1944—drift into pipe-line operations and refining. Amerada does nothing but produce and sell crude.

At Amerada's New York headquarters in the Equitable Building, Alfred Jacobsen presides over decidedly austere offices. Operating headquarters are in Tulsa, Okla., where the head man is Vice President Allmand M. Blow, and in Los Angeles, where Vice President E. H. McCollough is in charge. Amerada is licensed to operate in 20 States, holds leases in 14, and produces its oil in 8 States: nearly half of it in Texas, the rest in California, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Mississippi, Kansas, and Colorado. In addition to its oil, it has important natural-gas holdings. Its most valuable natural-gas fields are in California. Its Rio Vista field, north of San Francisco, was discovered in 1936, and in wartime was reportedly bringing in more than enough money to cover Amerada's dividends—$3 a share of late.

At first glance, Amerada appears to be a simple company. It had, of course, no wartime conversion and no end-of-war reconversion: it simply went on producing oil. It has no manufacturing problems. Its production operation, in the narrowest sense, consists merely of turning a valve to let a well flow, or throwing a switch to start a pump. Amerada has no need for any typical sales organization. Under proration, which levels out the production and price of crude oil, it operates in a strictly managed market, in which Amerada's share is virtually automatic. Amerada usually makes a nice profit and saves for a rainy day, so that when it fails to earn dividends—as in 1931–33 and in 1939—it has ample cash to fall back on. It has not failed to pay a dividend since 1922, and in 1944 boosted its rate from $2 to $3 a share. Its stockholders are naturally happy and they do not bother the management. A few months ago, when the stock was selling for around $100 a share, some of them respectfully suggested that it ought to be split. Management announced it would see if there was any advantage to the stockholders in a split, and there the matter has stood. Management, it appears, likes the look of a high-priced stock.

HAPPY TAX PROVISIONS

Amerada's tax situation is the businessman's dream. The corporation, quite literally, does not have to pay any Federal income tax if it does not want to. This is due to the highly reasonable provisions of the internal-revenue law designed for producers of crude oil. Amerada pays so little in Federal income taxes that it does not even segregate the tax item in its annual reports. In wartime, though Amerada's profits soared, it made no provision for excess-profits taxes, and from

1943 to 1944 its normal Federal income tax actually declined. In 1944, on a gross of $26,000,000, a gross profit of $17,000,000 and a net, after all charges, of $5,000,000, Amerada's allowance for its Federal income tax was only $200,000.

The tax law's solicitude for crude-oil producers begins with the fact that a company can deduct a part of the gross income of any property as a depletion allowance, free of tax. This deduction is normally fixed at 27½ percent, but because of limitations few oil companies get the full deduction on all income. If Amerada could have claimed 27½ percent on all its 1944 gross, it would have had a depletion allowance of $7,000,000. This deduction, moreover, can go on year after year. It need not stop at 100 percent; that is, when the property has paid for itself, as with depreciation allowances on machines. Second, Amerada, like other oil companies, is permitted to charge off intangible development costs (i. e., the cost of labor, fuel, and overhead in the drilling of new oil and gas wells) as operating costs, though the intangible cost of a producing well is, in an accounting sense, a capital outlay. Amerada spends, on the average, about half its gross income on development costs, on replacing and expanding its reserves of oil and gas. Development costs go up and down with income; plainly, Amerada's development cost is dictated to a considerable extent by profits that must be used up (to keep them out of the tax return) rather than by the actual amount of oil extracted. In brief, so long as Amerada has enough drilling to do, it can adjust the operations with an eye to the internal-revenue law and practically decide what tax it wants to pay, if any.

Amerada's present affluence and serenity are also due to luck—an indispensable factor in the oil business. And to the fact that it has been guided by two remarkable men—Everett Lee DeGolyer, who prefers to be known as E. DeGolyer; and the current intense leader, who prefers to be known as A. Jacobsen. Save for their common liking for economy in nomenclature, they are not very similar. But each has had his part in making Amerada what it is.

* * * * *

PRESSURES AND PROBLEMS

Amerada came to the end of the war in good underground shape and tougher than ever financially. Its gross in 1939 (a somewhat subnormal year) was $10,000,000; in 1944 it was $26,000,000. Its profits, both before and after intangible drilling costs, were about four times as high in 1944 as they were in 1939. In those 5 years the company's earned surplus shot up from $4,576,000 to $13,586,000.

Atomic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atomic Policy," from the New York Herald Tribune of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC POLICY

The Senate's confirmation of Mr. Bernard Baruch as American representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Committee; the publication of the State Department's proposals on international control, to which Mr. Baruch has now presumably acceded; the report that Senator BRIEN MCMAHON'S Special Atomic Energy Committee, having achieved agreement upon a modified form of the Vandenberg amendment, will have a domestic control bill ready by this week end; the announcement by Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves that the Manhattan district is already well on the way toward a pilot plant for the industrial use of atomic energy, are so many reassuring testimonials to the fact that this country is at last developing a rational policy toward this grim horror which we conjured up.

Most of them are also testimonials to the value of Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, as a sincere servant of his country. The House Military Affairs Committee was willing to railroad through the atomic-control measure handed down by the War Department. It was Senator MCMAHON who insisted that the subject was of too revolutionary importance for the normal congressional routines, who secured the special Senate committee and then took it—and himself—to school to the scientists and soldiers competent to provide the essential data, who exposed the whole subject to debate, to consideration, and to the processes of soberer second thought. A great many have made honorable contributions, according to their several lights, toward the evolution of a rational atomic policy. But it was very largely Senator MCMAHON'S patient, thorough sense of responsibility which created the opportunity under which they could do so.

Our atomic-energy policy still exists only in the rough. It still has to pass the barriers of congressional and public approval. But certain fundamental principles are, as of today, established. They provide for primarily civilian control of atomic-energy development in this country, with the military having a voice only in the strictly military aspects of the subject and able to appeal the civilian decisions only through their civilian secretaries; they emphasize the industrial, scientific, and medical uses of the new knowledge, subordinating military security to the maximum safe dissemination of atomic discovery; in the matter of international control they propose a voluntary surrender of our passing military advantage in return for an international control system adequate to prevent either our own or any other nation from using atomic knowledge for the destruction of civilization. These are essentially sound principles. They have been only slowly and rather painfully arrived at, with a good deal of give and take among all parties to a passionate and deeply felt argument, but they already command a very wide support and they do provide a basis on which, if they are not overthrown, we can really build for an atomic age.

Statistical Summary of Veterans' Administration Activities to March 31, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statistical report issued by the Veterans' Administration showing its activities up to March 31, 1946.

I hope all the Members will take the time to study these statistics carefully, and then he will know what a tremendous load the Veterans' Administration is now carrying.

The matter referred to follows:

Statistical summary of Veterans' Administration activities Mar. 31, 1946

Subject	March 1946 [1]	February 1946	July 1945
Veteran population:			
1. Total number of veterans, end of month	15,296,000	14,601,000	6,704,000
2. Number of World War II veterans, end of month	11,310,000	10,610,000	2,680,000
3. Number of veterans of other wars and Regular Establishment, end of month	3,986,000	3,991,000	4,024,000
Vocational rehabilitation (Public Law 16):			
4. Total number of applications received through end of month	296,779	260,438	89,961
5. Number of applications pending advisement, end of month	62,392	61,318	12,810
6. Number in training, end of month	63,823	52,397	16,003
7. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	48,187	39,251	12,705
Education and training (Public Law 346):			
8. Total number of applications received through end of month	1,691,390	1,179,905	96,828
9. Number of applications pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	116,488	137,241	7,107
10. Number in education or training status, end of month	379,788	206,137	22,349
11. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	264,766	144,075	13,281
Loans:			
12. Total number of applications received through last Saturday of month	[2] 131,955	97,728	18,835
13. Number of guaranty commitments granted through last Saturday of month	[2] 111,407	81,362	15,249
14. Number of applications pending, last Saturday of month	[2] 10,511	8,008	1,203
Readjustment allowances:			
15. Number of initial unemployment claims filed during 4 weeks ending last Saturday of month	[3] 810,347	919,356	37,622
16. Number of initial unemployment claims pending determination, end of month	(4)	134,067	3,897
17. Number of veterans paid unemployment allowances during week ending last Saturday of month	[2] 1,499,553	1,177,738	43,286
18. Number of veterans paid self-employment allowances during month	(4)	63,150	11,926
Disability pension or compensation cases, World War II (with service on or after Dec. 7, 1941):			
19. Number of new cases received during month [5]	346,236	424,928	92,790
20. Number adjudicated during month [5]	449,847	269,750	72,623
21. Number pending adjudication, end of month [5]	554,918	660,899	100,959
22. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	1,260,495	1,109,079	591,762
Disability pension or compensation cases, World War I and Regular Establishment (no service on or after Dec. 7, 1941):			
23. Number pending adjudication, end of month	8,109	7,161	6,540
24. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	458,954	460,041	460,451

Statistical summary of Veterans' Administration activities Mar. 31, 1946—Continued

Subject	March 1946 [1]	February 1946	July 1945
Death pension or compensation cases, total: [6]			
25. Number pending adjudication, end of month	34,670	37,775	52,902
26. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	379,936	374,356	289,243
National service life insurance:			
27. Number of applications pending, end of month	82,681	72,397	170,634
28. Number of insured lives on which payments of death claim awards were active, end of month	341,774	336,785	237,993
29. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) awarded during month	7,170	7,900	26,738
30. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) pending, end of month	20,798	17,877	27,901
31. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) awarded during month	20,666	25,631	31,257
32. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) pending, end of month	21,850	21,732	29,464
Requests for physical examination:			
33. Number cleared by examination during month	44,256	25,946	28,997
34. Number pending, examination not completed, end of month	188,817	188,087	137,562
Applications for hospital or domiciliary care:			
35. Number received during month	56,146	50,493	30,114
36. Number disposed of during month	54,067	47,124	29,469
37. Number pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	16,745	14,205	4,377
Veterans awaiting hospital admission:			
38. Total number, end of month	26,992	[7] 21,432	4,329
39. Number with service-connected disorders, end of month	935	[7] 812	[7] 169
40. Number with non-service-connected disorders, end of month	26,057	[7] 20,530	[7] 4,160
Beneficiaries remaining in Veterans' Administration hospitals or homes:			
41. Total number in hospitals, last Thursday in month	[8] 75,033	74,417	67,320
42. Veterans with service-connected disorders	[8] 24,553	24,301	22,700
43. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	[8] 49,779	49,470	43,907
44. Others	[8] 701	646	713
45. Total number in homes, last Thursday in month	[8] 11,682	11,834	9,086
Beneficiaries remaining in non-Veterans' Administration hospitals:			
46. Total number, last Thursday in month	[8] 9,699	8,567	4,459
47. Veterans with service-connected disorders	[8] 2,127	1,644	841
48. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	[8] 7,546	6,854	3,564
49. Other	[8] 26	69	54
Construction, new hospitals:			
50. Number authorized, funds appropriated, end of month	42	42	[9] 21
51. Number for which sites have been selected, end of month	26	25	[9] 16
52. Number for which plans and specifications have been completed, end of month	4	4	[9] 2
53. Number under construction, end of month	2	2	[9] 1
54. Number completed, end of month	0	0	[9] 0
Construction, additions to existing hospitals:			
55. Number authorized, funds appropriated, end of month	53	53	[9] 36
56. Number for which plans and specifications have been completed, end of month	29	29	[9] 30
57. Number under construction, end of month	16	21	[9] 28
58. Number completed, end of month	12	7	[9] 0

[1] Preliminary; subject to revision.
[2] Data as of Mar. 23, 1946.
[3] 4 weeks ending Mar. 23, 1946.
[4] Not available.
[5] Includes area offices.
[6] Excludes Spanish-American and prior wars.
[7] To Veterans' Administration hospitals only.
[8] Data as of Mar. 28, 1946.
[9] Data as of June 30, 1945.

British Fascism in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over Station WNYC, Friday, April 5, 1946:

I am going to ask you to depart, in fancy, from the chair in which you sit. I am going to ask you to journey overseas to war-scarred Europe, there to mingle with the exile, the displaced Jew, the homeless. You will visit the concentration camps, where he still exists on rationed food, on rationed liberty, on rationed dignity, because all doors are barred to him. You will share in the bitter memories of 6,000,000 dead, of the mother whose child was snatched from her and of the child who no longer knows his name.

You will wonder why, in a world that has poured out its wealth in destruction, that has witnessed the horrors of a global war, we can find no place for them. You will see them, as Earl Harrison, the President's special envoy sent abroad to study their plight saw them—living without hope. And then you will remember Palestine, the tiny bit of land, 10,000 square miles, no larger than the State of Vermont.

There is no other answer. Immigration laws bar their way into the democracies. Throughout the world the 12-year carefully cultivated anti-Semitism has taken a firm hold. In that regard, Hitler has been victorious. Judge Rifkind, who has just returned to the United States after a survey of the displaced-persons camps says, "The Hitlerite racial theories have become part of the European way of thinking and are integrated into the vocabulary. Jewish displaced-persons camps must be closed immediately. To throw their occupants back into the German population would be the greatest of crimes." Their only hope is Palestine. Every attempt of the repatriated Jew in France, in Poland, in Hungary to reclaim his stolen property or job has widened the area of anti-Semitism in these war-shattered economies.

I say without reservation, without modification of any kind that the full blame for the betrayal of these Jews—for it is a betrayal—rests on Great Britain. I accuse Great Britain of complicity in murder, of faithlessness and loss of honor, and of callous disregard of human values.

I do not have to recall to you how the British Government in Palestine turned away from its shores boatloads of escaping refugees during the height of Nazi terror, and of how these boats sank, carrying with them all lives aboard. I do not have to recall to you how in 1939 when Palestine was the only haven of refuge for fleeing Jews the British promulgated the MacDonald white paper which closed Palestine to Jewish immigration. Nor do I have to recall to you that Palestine had been legally and morally constituted the homeland of the Jews by the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and reaffirmed by the terms of the mandate signed by 52 nations of the world, and reaffirmed once again by the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924.

In reliance upon this mighty promise, the pioneer Jews reclaimed the land, built cities on swamps, redeemed an arid soil, brought education, culture, science, and medicine into the middle east for the benefits of all inhabitants.

Maybe Britain cannot understand colonization with plows and not with guns—the British way. Maybe Britain cannot understand colonization without exploitation, land to be lived in and tilled and husbanded for those who would live on the land, and not for the moneyed profit of absentee landlords.

When public indignation rose high after the war at the British colonial policy in Palestine, when the American Congress in 1945 passed its concurrent resolution demanding that Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, when President Truman, following the Harrison report, requested immediate entrance of 100,000 Jews into Palestine the British decided to do something to stop the growing avalanche of public protest. The British could little afford after the Indonesian killings and the riots in India further ill will of the world. So, as she always does, when faced with a dilemma, she appointed a committee which President Truman in good faith joined. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine was born amid the fears and doubts of the people whose fate was to be decided. Of course, in the meantime, the British had gained what they had sought—President Truman's humanitarian request was set aside.

Not that the question had not been studied and restudied and studied again. Both in the years following 1917 and within the present years there have been studies by the Mandates Commission by private and public agencies of all kinds. There are the Harrison report, the Eisenhower report of Walter C. Lowdermilk, the Rifkind report, and other reports too numerous to mention. Nobody expected that new facts would be brought to light. Indeed, not a single new fact has been revealed. The testimony revealed only what had already been known, both by our own policy makers and British high officialdom. What the British got was a breathing spell, a reprieve from compulsory action.

The British got a reprieve, but no such reprieve was given to displaced Jews or to the exiles from Palestine who had been deported because they had managed to get into Palestine without benefit of visa. I have just received this cable from Asmara, camp for Palestine exiled Jews in Eritrea: "On the 14th of January at 9 morning a terrible crime was committed in cold blood at the camp of exiled Jewish detainees near Asmara. Concentrated fire from machine guns and rifles was opened upon the camp by guards without any reason or provocation. Two detainees murdered, 12 wounded, several seriously. This terrible act is a direct result of our exile creating conditions which place us in a state of outlaw. All Jewish exiles detained without trial irrevocably demand immediate return to Palestine. We appeal to your conscience for active intervention for our repatriation."

While deportation and detention continue, the Anglo-American Committee, in subju-

gation to British policy, provides the smokescreen.

For instance, an interim report was to have been published recommending certain measures that would bring quicker relief to the Jews now languishing in camps. But no interim report is to be published, no interim recommendation is to be made. Mr. Bartley Crum, American member of the committee, demanded that the interim report be published and said he would resign unless such report were made. But upon intervention of our State Department, Mr. Crum, together with other American members were forced to comply with the British decision. The British decided that there is to be no interim report and the reason is readily discernible. The final report has already been written in Whitehall Street, we fear.

Suave British diplomacy will not permit the British Foreign Office to say that it is Middle East oil that is keeping the Jews out of their homeland. Suave, British diplomacy will not permit the British Foreign Office to say that their stranglehold on Palestine is one with their domination of the Mediterranean area. They will not, most certainly, call this vicious game with human pawns by the right name of "power politics." They say, instead, presently, it is the Arab question. Let us, therefore, examine the Arab question.

The most vociferous objection raised to the establishment of the Jewish homeland is made by the Arab League, a creation of the British Foreign Office which called it into being and give its policy. Now, it is a bawling baby feared by its father—so its father says.

The effendi, the pashas, and the princelings presume to be the spokesmen of the peasant Arab. Just so long as the Arab peasant is content to live in a feudal society without social and economic benefits, chained to a desert existence of privation and disease, the effendi, or Arab landowner, can wax fat and powerful. The Jewish immigration to Palestine has brought a new social consciousness to the Middle East that threatens their domination. What the Arab peasant and worker knows of modern soil cultivation, of schooling, and of medical care, he has learned from Jewish sources.

It is difficult to understand—or is it—why Britain, who has suffered so cruelly and lost so much of its strength in fighting a war against fascism, should now encourage the fascist pattern set by Arabian "economic royalists." The British are willing to overlook the Iraqui-Moslem revolt against them in 1941. They are willing to overlook the fact that the Moslem King ibn-Saud refused to advance any help whatsoever to Britain at its most critical moment with Rommel's army. They are even willing to overlook the fact that the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem conspired with Hitler to Nazify the Middle East and later went to Berlin to broadcast pro-Nazi propaganda to his Arabian fellowmen. The English carefully refrained from naming the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem a war criminal. He is now in France under what is termed residential surveillance, but is free to go and come as he pleases in the Parisian fashionable quarters and cafes, still mouthing his pro-Hitler creed.

Perhaps, permitting the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem to return to his country would have been too flagrant a move. Taking second choice, however, they permitted his cousin, Janal al Husseini to return amid great pomp and ceremony to the Middle East. Both the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and his cousin had incited the Arabs to massacre and riot in 1929 and 1936. Both had been pro-Nazi throughout the war. Yet, Janal al Husseini was permitted to return to the Middle East to continue his vicious Nazi ideology and ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem enjoys the favors of Parisian society with full British consent.

Therefore, it is not so curious to note that when Janal al Husseini and Auni Bey Abdul Hadi, testified before "this most objective" Anglo-American inquiry about the wartime association with Hitler of the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, stating that such support was given because it was thought Hitler might win, that this testimony was omitted from the official stenographic transcription of the proceedings.

The British pretend a tender solicitude for the Arabs of Palestine, but that sweet concern is not directed toward the peasant who has gained so much from Jewish settlement that he has doubled his population there in 10 years. It is rather a tender regard for the Fascist effendi who have done so much to cripple allied victory. But, of course, in all fairness to the British it must be noted that it is these Fascist effendi and princelings who control the disposition of oil deposits in the Middle East, and not the Arab peasant who lives a near slavery existence. Remember, too, the British showed no tender concern for the Moslems in Indonesia. They mowed them down by the thousands.

I think it is well to keep in mind throughout all this talk on the Palestine question that all of Arabia was freed from Turkish domination by the Allied victory in 1917 and that Arab sovereignty only followed after such victory, and that specifically and legally, by international covenant, this tiny land of Palestine was exempt for the stated purpose of establishing a Jewish national homeland therein. That specific intent was clearly enunciated and was emphasized by the Royal Peel Commission which stated categorically that the Jews were in Palestine by right and not on sufferance.

The establishment of a national Jewish home in Palestine cannot, therefore, be said to deprive the Arabs of Palestine of their sovereignty, a sovereignty which they never possessed.

Nor does the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine mean depriving the Arabs of their equal legal and social, as well as economic rights.

When Wilson, Balfour, Smuts, Wedgewood, and Clemenceau, among others, approved the aims and aspirations of the Zionists, they could not foresee the scourge that would descend upon the Jewish people with the arrival of nazism. They knew and understood, however, that no people without a land, without a home of their own, could ever live in dignity on an equal plane anywhere in the world. They knew and understood that a people without a land had no voice in international debate and settlement, nor could they hope for a status in either national or international life. They would be considered alien everywhere and the victims of political perverts. There had been no central head to speak for them either in Czarist Russia or, as later came to be, in Hitler Germany.

How much more irresistible is the case now, as the British Labor Party put it before it came into power, when 6,000,000 Jews lie dead and the remaining million and a half find themselves welcome nowhere save in Palestine?

You may accuse me of being too passionate a partisan, but keep in mind that at stake are not inanimate objects like the disposal of ships, tables, chairs, or gold, but human lives, human values, and human dignity. In the face of these, no fight can be too long; no voice too articulate. What happens in and with Palestine is a fair measure of how secure our armed victory has really been, and how sound the ideals for which so many died.

The Truth About Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Dan W. Gilbert, from the March issue of National Republic:

THE TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

[By Dr. Dan W. Gilbert]

For more than 5 years, the propagandists of planned economy have done their utmost to create in the public mind the grossest of misconceptions regarding the nature and meaning of inflation.

Every student of history, every observer of the present-day world, knows the misery which comes upon a people in the wake of inflation Every intelligent, patriotic American wishes to do what he can to help his country to escape from the encircling plague of this meance to postwar stability which already has devastated China and most of the nations of Lurope.

However, the propagandists of planned economy are deliberately exploiting the people's well-founded fear of inflation to entrench themselves in power and to advance their own revolutionary program. Whenever Congress makes a move to dismantle the bloated wartime bureaucracies, whenever Congress considers the lifting of the extraordinary wartime controls which made the planners virtual masters of the American people, the administration scaremongers raise a hue and cry over the peril of inflation.

By raising the bogey of inflation, it appears that the bureaucratic planners hope to freeze America permanently into the mold of a managed economy, under which prices, profits, wages, and every aspect of the national economy will be subjected to political regimentation. When the war came to a close, the President did relax some of the bureaucratic controls, while directing the elimination of others entirely. But only recently a number of them were put back into effect. Specifically, in the case of housing, bureaucratic control was no sooner lifted than it was clamped down again upon the whole building industry.

Now, inflation is a very simple process to understand. It has happened so often, under so many circumstances, in so many countries, that no one should be in doubt as to what produces it and how it may be prevented. Once inflation is understood, it becomes clear that, so far from operating to control or preclude inflation, the Federal bureaucracy and system of regimentation are the strongest forces operating to advance the process.

Inflation inevitably occurs when purchasing power exceeds the amount of purchasable goods in the open market. When the people have more money with which to buy things than there are things to buy, then competitive bidding occurs and prices skyrocket.

Let us take a simple example. Suppose the people have a hundred billion dollars' worth of purchasing power, but there are available only $70,000,000,000 worth of things to buy. There will not be enough goods to go around to satisfy everyone who has money to spend and the desire to spend it. The result will be competitive bidding for the available merchandise, with an inevitable elevation of prices.

An increase in the national income does not cause inflation, provided that the income is earned. No inflation will result by a doubling of the national income, a doubling of the amount of money that the people have to spend, provided that there is a doubling of the production of the things for which they may spend it. It is only when purchasing power is made artificially to outrun productive power that inflation results. It is only when unearned money is put into circulation.

Every school boy knows that the commonest cause of inflation, historically, has been the reckless issuance of printing-press money. Why does this produce inflation? Because it puts unearned money into circulation; the printing-press dollars come into competition with the dollars which were earned by producing purchasable goods. To state it another way, printing-press money increases the total purchasing power within the nation, but it does not increase the total amount of goods which the surplus dollars or new money will be seeking to buy.

Aside from creating printing-press money, the simplest way artificially to increase purchasing power is to go into debt. Every individual who ever found it necessary to secure a loan knows that this is the one legitimate way to get money to spend which one has not previously earned. The reason that inflationary pressures and movements accompany the prosecution of a supreme war effort is that the nation involved must float vast loans (or else resort to the manufacture of money). So far as the inflationary effect is concerned, it matters little whether the government prints $100 bills or $100 bonds.

Large-scale increasing of the national debt is a simple formula for setting inflationary forces in motion. When the Nation rested upon the "depression bottom of deflation" in 1933, the New Dealers deliberately employed an increased national debt as a means of increasing purchasing power and producing a rise in prices which was officially termed "controlled inflation." We shall not consider the merits of that program now. But the point is simply this: The original Roosevelt New Dealers decided prices were too low and they deliberately elevated the national debt to create a price hike.

Today, the Truman New Dealers admit that prices are threatening to go too high, but they work incessantly to create pressures to force them higher. It would be difficult to conceive of a more thoroughly inflationary measure than the President's recommendation for increasing unemployment compensation to all who prefer to loaf for 6 months rather than take the jobs which are freely and abundantly offered in the want advertisements of every newspaper which they chance to pick up.

Inflation threatens because money is plentiful but goods are scarce. Yet, to increase the compensation of those who prefer idleness and inactivity can only result in making money more plentiful, while goods remain as scarce as they are now.

The President has recommended a $5,000,000,000 loan to Britain. Obviously, Britain does not want the 5 billions in gold; she wants the money in goods. If the loan is authorized, Great Britain will be presented with $5,000,000,000 worth of purchasing power which will come into direct competition with the saved-up purchasing power of the American people. The more money the Federal Government loans, the more purchasing power will be created to compete for the limited supply of available goods.

Besides the artificial increase of purchasing power, there is another way whereby inflation is promoted. That is to decrease production. If the supply of goods in circulation is decreased, the inflationary effect is the same as though the amount of money in circulation were increased.

While spreading a vast propaganda about the maintenance of price ceilings, the OPA and other agencies of the Federal bureaucracy have in many cases so crippled and hampered production that new inflationary pressures have been created. Of course, the OPA ballyhoo about keeping the lid on prices must be realistically discounted. It means nothing for the bureaucrats to crow about keeping down the price of butter if—as occurred around Christmastime—there was none to be had in legitimate grocery stores, while patrons of the black market were paying $1 a pound and up.

All honest and patriotic citizens deplore the black market. The bureaucrats may act as though they did not know that it existed, but it is folly to talk about blocking inflation when the black market, with its outlandish prices, is booming as it undeniably is in many sections of the Nation today.

Two things happen when prices are artificially depressed below the cost of production plus a fair profit. The black market comes into existence, no matter how strongly it may be deplored. Producers are discouraged from expanding their operations. Too rigidly controlled price ceilings sometimes defeat their own purpose. It is possible that a 5-cent-per-pound increase in price to the producer would have encouraged dairymen to increase their herds (rather than killing off their less productive cows, as many have done during the reign of the OPA)—it is entirely possible that a small increase in the price of butterfat would have increased total production, so that the condition of artificial scarcity which expressed itself in the widespread $1-a-pound "black market in butter" might never have had an opportunity to develop.

No fair observer will deny that some of the controls imposed by the Washington bureaucracy during the war may have been necessary and beneficial in the long run. But, to state it mildly, the case for continuing these bureaucratic controls has not been proved. It is scarcely less than ridiculous for the bureaucrats to pose as "guardians of the Republic from the peril of inflation," when the simple facts are that the strongest pressures toward inflation derive from the policies of the present administration. The Washington bureaucracy is promoting the forces of reckless inflation from both ends: by artificially increasing purchasing power through enlarging the national debt needlessly and wantonly, and by hampering production through bureaucratic interference with free enterprise.

In addition, and finally, the bureaucrats have encouraged union leaders to reach for higher wages. Despite empty assurances to the contrary offered by the bureaucrats, the drive for higher wages will ultimately be reflected in a rise in prices proportionate to whatever increase in wages is finally achieved.

The hocus-pocus propaganda of the bureaucrats, in which they present themselves as "saviors of the Nation from inflation" which they themselves have promoted, is on a par with the activity of the mischievous boy who starts a fire and then rushes to turn in the alarm in order that he may pose as a small-town hero.

The bureaucratic propaganda endeavors to put this choice before the American people: Which will you have—inflation or permanent bureaucratic control?

The intelligent American's answer is: Neither.

Bureaucratic control is the most insidious promoter of inflation.

The only safeguard against inflation is a forthright return to free enterprise.

The sooner the American people come to realize this truth, the better off they will be, and the safer this country will be for those who wish to keep America a land of liberty.

Chester Bowles' Blind Spots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, Mr. Merryle Stanley Rukeyser has written a most interesting series of articles entitled "Chester Bowles' Blind Spots," which appeared in the Chicago Herald American. I present the first three articles and ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHESTER BOWLES' BLIND SPOTS

(At this time, when the Truman administration, with Chester Bowles as the spearhead of the agitation is asking Congress to continue for another year after June 30, the wartime regimentation of the Nation's business, Mr. Rukeyser, economic commentator for the Hearst newspapers, in this series of six articles, of which this is the first, audits the premises on which the retrogressive political program is based.—The Editor.)

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

Chester Bowles stands high in popularity polls because he seductively offers—in the spirit of blue sky—the unattainable. Without correspondingly raising the selling price, he proposes to increase the pay received by the worker from the customer for a given amount of work.

This purported miracle supposedly is to be achieved by squeezing the employer, who is only the go-between. This is to be accomplished by reducing allocations of those receipts from the customer which at present go to meet costs other than direct labor payments. These other costs include taxes, profit (which is really a payment for the use of the tools), and depreciation and obsolescence, which record the cost of the wearing out of the tools.

But Mr. Bowles' fundamental error is in failure to understand that workers, in terms of a consolidated statement of the national economy as a whole, are already receiving all the receipts, which are cleared through corporations, and other go-betweens.

Some of these receipts are directly paid out by the employer to his own workers as wages and salaries. That of course is the immediately visible labor cost, of which Mr. Bowles and pressure group agitators are fully aware.

But the fundamental oversight by the snafu school of economics, is the failure to recognize that the other elements of cost, including taxes, the cost of goods and services purchased from others, the wearing out of the tools and payment for the use of the tools are mere temporary clearing entries on the national ledger, which are in the final analysis fully expended to workers in exchange for human services.

The fact is that Government in turn uses the tax revenues to hire clerks and to buy goods. Other sums paid to suppliers for goods and services are likewise ultimately expended in labor payments.

Similarly reserves for the wearing out of tools are spent for services in replacing productive machinery. By the same token, the payments to owners are used to acquire products of which the cost is payment for the expenditure of human energy.

Therefore since workers already get 100 percent of the receipts, only confusion results from bonehead economic planning

based on the delusion that workers could get a still larger slice of the pie. If funds are arbitrarily transferred directly to workers to the neglect of other elements of costs, the result would be only to alter the channels through which payments are made to workers. Such procedure would not increase the total payments to workers.

Such shifts and diversions, however, would upset the balance between production goods (tools) and comfort goods (consumer items) and thus kill the goose which lays the golden eggs of prosperity.

CHESTER BOWLES' BLIND SPOTS

II

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

The Nation-wide industrial slow down results from bureaucratic interference with the realistic effort of business managers to bring selling prices into balance with costs.

There appears to be a strong political impulse to hide from the public view the fact that costs have risen sharply.

In the existing higher costs are the effects of a politically stimulated high-wage policy. As the number one buyer of goods during the war, the Government accumulated debt proportionate to the rise in the cost and selling prices of goods. Workers on the average received at least $1,000 more per year than in 1939, an advance of about 83 percent.

In order to finance acquisition of war goods entailing these higher costs, the Government found it necessary to pay for 75 percent of the rise in the prices of purchased supply with borrowed funds.

As a result the Federal debt rose from $34,900,000,000 in 1939 to $278,000,000,000. In order to float such an unprecedentedly large public debt, the Government had to depend heavily on the banks. When the commercial banks buy Government obligations, there is not only an expansion in the Federal debt but an equivalent rise in the total money supply, especially of bank deposit currency. On the other hand, when individual citizens or nonbanking institutions, including insurance companies and savings associations, acquire new governmental obligations, while there is an increase in the Federal debt, there is no increment in the money and credit supply.

As a result of the impact of governmental wage, fiscal and monetary policy on the national economy, there has been an increase in the money supply from $65,000,000,000 in 1939 to upwards of $175,000,000,000.

Thus it is superficial for Mr. Bowles to imply that the inflationary pressures spring spontaneously from speculative fever, on the one hand, or selfishness of businessmen, on the other. Political acts, policies and decisions have set in motion the causative factors which underlie the inflationary pressures. There appears to be political reluctance to uncover the realities and face the day of reckoning.

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

The enthusiasm at Washington for boosting money wages still further hinges on the mistaken belief money payments are identical with purchasing power.

If this illusive assumption were correct, the country with the greatest printing press capacity would have the largest buying power. Contemporary tests have again been made of this fallacious theory, and in parts of Europe money has become so depreciated that packs of cigarettes have become more acceptable than legal tender as a standard of value and a medium of exchange.

Genuine purchasing power is the exchange value of what one worker produces to trade through the businessman as go-between for the specialized production of another worker.

From this viewpoint, it becomes self evident that material well-being depends on productivity—not on seductive schemes for inflating the currency, on the one hand, or robbing Peter to pay Paul, on the other. If the money wages of all workers were lifted 100 percent overnight, the exchange ratios would be unchanged, and the chief effect on current exchanges would be arbitrarily to call one dollar's worth of goods two dollars' worth. Incidentally, such an arbitrary markup of the price of existing goods would depreciate the real value of all money savings, as evidenced by life insurance, high-grade bonds, and savings deposits.

Higher living standards result from increased output. In order to produce substantially more than in the past, the human worker requires the assistance of increased mechanical energy (horsepower) and more and better tools. These are supplied in a free competitive economic society out of the savings of thrifty persons who have sufficient self-discipline to spend each year somewhat less than they earn.

Thus, if Government interference weakens the incentives to save, it thereby thwarts the benign process which provides workers with more and better things in exchange for a week's work.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—Washing Machines for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, with all the talk about Russia and reports of Army extravagance it was disconcerting to receive a letter containing a press report of the Army liberality in supplying and transporting washing machines to Russia by air. This report was promptly taken up with the Army Air Corps and I am in receipt of a letter of explanation.

The letter and report with General Spaatz' explanation is inserted here:

WALLACE SUPPLY CO., LTD.,
Wallace, Idaho, March 23, 1946.

To the Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE,
Representative from Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I enclose herewith an exact copy of an article appearing in the March issue of the Northwest War Surplus Advisor, a Seattle, Wash., publication which we have been receiving for several months and which we regard as a reliable source of news of interest to our business.

If this article is true, it is, indeed, a sad commentary on our national administration from the standpoint of a taxpayer and small business concern. My company has received exactly three new electric washing machines in the last 5 years.

If it is not true, then it is high time such misleading items should be stopped and those responsible for them punished.

In either case the writer, along with other local merchants, feels that the matter is worthy of your investigation.

Yours very truly,

WALLACE SUPPLY CO., LTD.,
By R. T. STRACHAN.

WASHERS TO IVAN—RAZZBERRIES TO NEEDY UNITED STATES HOMES

There may be a washing-machine shortage in Seattle, but, according to Oliver M. Cass, of Fairbanks, Alaska, "the Army is seeing to it that there isn't such a shortage in Russia."

"I know it's hard to believe," said Cass, visiting Seattle, "but Army transports have been flying washing machines to Russia for 2 years. I've been trying to get one for my family ever since the war began.

"Each transport carries 20 machines, and with many planes leaving daily, Russia probably has more washing machines than the United States.

"A funny thing about washing machines in Russia is that they haven't electricity in most parts of the country to run them with."

Cass, owner of the Alaska Market Co., in Fairbanks, arrived in Seattle on a 6-week buying trip. This is his first trip "outside" in 15 months.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1946.

Mr. R. T. STRACHAN,
Wallace Supply Co., Ltd.,
Wallace, Idaho.

DEAR MR. STRACHAN: With the many irregularities being reported concerning the Army's operations in using the Army facilities to move unnecessary material into the Orient, I am glad to have the report made with your letter of March 23.

As you know statements of this kind should be verified before they are given wide publicity, and the idea comes to mind that there may be a very urgent need for washing machines for the laundering of clothing of the personnel of our armed forces in the backward and sparsely settled countries bordering on Russia.

That the Army may have an opportunity to explain the matter, I dictated the report to the secretary of General Spaatz, head of the Army Air Corps.

Unless there is a definite and satisfactory explanation I propose to air the whole thing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I feel it is high time the Army be brought to account for such abuses as reported here, and I certainly welcome any information which may be made available in an effort to correct such irregularities.

I desire to take this occasion to commend your fine patriotism in taking the action you have taken in this case.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, April 2, 1946.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I understand that you called my office by telephone late Thursday afternoon and dictated the following message to my secretary:

"There may be a washing-machine shortage in Seattle, but according to Oliver M. Cass, Fairbanks, Alaska, 'the Army is seeing to it that there is no such shortage in Russia. I know it is hard to believe,' said Cass, visiting Seattle, 'but Army transports have been flying washing machines to Russia for 2 years. I have been trying to get one for my family since the war began.'

" 'Each transport carries 20 machines, and with many planes leaving daily, Russia probably has more washing machines than the United States. A funny thing about washing machines in Russia is that they haven't electricity in most parts of the country to run them with.' "

It is my understanding also that you asked the Air Forces to comment and endeavor to explain the above. These comments follow:

The Air Forces did not purchase or transfer under terms of lend-lease or in any other manner to the U. S. S. R. any washing machines. I have been informally advised also that the above holds true insofar as Army Service Forces, the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce are concerned.

The Army Air Forces did furnish under the terms of lend-lease many aircraft, a number of which were of the cargo type. The majority of these aircraft were turned over to Russian crews at Fairbanks, Alaska. These planes were most generally loaded with miscellaneous supplies destined for Russia. The priorities under which these supplies moved were established and administered by the Russians. As you know, the Russians were in a position to purchase many items in this country direct and not through lend-lease.

As you may recall, washing machines throughout the war were in the category of scarce items but were not rationed. It is entirely possible that the Russians by their own means were able to make purchases of certain quantities.

Since there was no prohibition on the Russians themselves buying washing machines, and since the Russians established the priorities on the transportation of Russian-owned equipment and supplies destined to their country, and since the Russians ferried the airplanes out of Fairbanks with Russian crews, it is entirely possible that a certain quantity of washing machines was transported to Russia. I contend, however, that the Army Air Forces should be held blameless for any existing shortage of washing machines in Seattle, Wash.

Sincerely,

CARL SPAATZ,
General, United States Army,
Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

Contribution of Motion-Picture Industry to Charitable Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1946.

Mr. CHARLES P. SKOURAS,
American Cancer Society,
Motion Picture Division,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SKOURAS: My attention has been called to the comment in the World Telegram of April 3, in the column headed "Too much is enough," and as one who has watched and applauded the splendid contribution of the motion-picture industry toward the success of all sorts of financial campaigns during the past few years, I feel inclined to take sharp issue with the sentiments expressed therein.

Perhaps I am prejudiced by the fact that I am honorary chairman of the drive for the cancer fund in Orange County, N. Y., and by my background of interest in all sorts of efforts of this nature in my own community for the past quarter of a century but, on the other hand, I am a moviegoer myself and suspect that in the course of a year I meet more run-of-the-mill theater patrons than the average New York City newspaper columnist. Furthermore, if anyone is entitled to escape from solicitations of this nature it should be the people who have been doing the spade work in these money-raising efforts and many of whom I know very well. Yet, I have never heard a word of complaint from any of them who have been subjected to what the writer calls "genteel blackmail" right on top of a day spent exclusively in fund-raising efforts.

I am quite sure that this columnist sadly underestimates the desire of most Americans to participate in forward-looking projects of this nature. We all read the newspapers. We all know that we are enjoying a degree of prosperity unequaled anywhere else in the world. The people with whom I am in contact feel more comfortable about the pleasures which they are able to enjoy, such as movie going, when they have been able to mix in with their pleasure an occasional bit of unselfish giving toward the relief of those who are less fortunate.

I am informed that the combined efforts of the motion-picture exhibitors and of their patrons have raised in the past 4 years or so well over $46,000,000 for purely charitable projects, leaving out of consideration entirely the help given the war-bond campaigns. I have faith enough to believe that the exhibitors and those who attended their theaters are proud of this result, are anxious to maintain this splendid record, and will not be deterred by the use of adjectives such as those employed in the World Telegram story.

It will be a sad day for this country when the frame of mind demonstrated by the author of this article becomes typical of any substantial number of American citizens.

For my part, although my leisure time has been much restricted by my service in Congress, I shall make a special effort to attend some motion-picture theater during Easter week for the purpose, among other things, of playing some small part in giving the cancer fund a huge boost, which is bound to result from the cooperation of the motion-picture exhibitors and their patrons. Far from spoiling the evening for me, such an opportunity to contribute will increase my enjoyment of the entertainment which will have been prepared for me.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. BENNET.

Hospitalization for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter today from Mr. Straude E. Wiseman, president of Victors Adjustment Organization, Inc., in which reference is made to the great need for veterans' hospitals and hospital beds for our disabled veterans. This problem is an outstanding one, and since Congress has made the necessary appropriation for the construction of additional hospitals and extensions, it is highly appropriate for some question to be raised upon this very subject.

While great difficulties have been experienced in the effort to secure additional hospitals and space for our disabled veterans, some of which can be attributed, directly, to work stoppages—yet, it would appear that our people would go forward for our veterans, regardless of their own ambitions and desires—and get these hospitals and extensions completed in order that the suffering of our veterans may be given immediate attention. However, I do know that Mr. Wiseman, a veteran of World War I, is deeply interested in our veterans, and it is his desire that our disabled veterans be cared for, and in order to accomplish that purpose we need hospitals and beds, we need hospital equipment and experienced doctors, and we need nurses and experienced surgeons, and we do need men with the will and determination to go forward and make progress in this field, all to the end that the suffering and distress of the veterans may be relieved insofar as it is possible to extend relief.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans of World War II, and those veterans of World War I who need care and attention, in large numbers need hospitalization. It is the desire of all those whose sympathies go out to our veterans that they have the best of care and attention, and that they have the opportunity of hospitalization when needed. We must not turn our backs upon our veterans—they fought the good fight, and now it is our turn to fight for them.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the letter which I have just received, and to which reference is made, which is as follows:

VICTORS ADJUSTMENT ORGANIZATION, INC.,
New Albany, Ind., April 5, 1946.

Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
Member of Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPRINGER: Since so many people are suffering from a political psychosis at this time, I believe you will be interested in analyzing the following article which I am releasing today in anniversary of April 6, 1917:

YES, WE HAVE NO HOSPITALS

Someone speaking for the White House says: "The facilities for hospitalization of veterans are to be increased substantially and the Veterans' Administration plans to increase its bed capacity by 40,000 to 50,000 beds during the next 2 years."

I wish that White House could speak for itself, as there would be a different story running like this, "I'm amazed, and, oh, what defeats I needs must suffer. Think of it, with nearly 20,000,000 veterans of our wars knowing that I exist, and so many of them having seen me in all my splendor, they must be told that even these few beds are still on order. The first 418 up for contract at Providence, R. I., went on a sit-down strike. Not a single bidder; OPA did the trick. It's true, there are the Army and Navy hospitals that President Roosevelt said would be surplus that we could use, but the Army and Navy always takes the best and the others out in the sticks are too far away from the specialists, I hear. Who are these specialists; are they the same specialists that let so many of our young people die with coronary thrombosis, cancer, tuberculosis, fill the people full of sedatives, obstruct Kenny treatments and all others, unless some promoter gives them the green light? Why all this fight in the Senate about treatment for everybody, the drives: March of Dimes, cancer control, tuberculosis seals, National Health Council, physicians' committees, and all such and none of them for the prevention of health failures of our victors, the first charge of the Nation, but on the contrary, conducive to health complications? I wish we could quit using veterans as political footballs; I've always fought that. Another thing, I don't like the idea of segregating them, either, as they are planning. Those sections known as Wyatt-La for the brown eyes, Chagrin-La for the blue eyes, Chaos-La for the black eyes, Crisis-La for the colored, and Sham-greed-La for the freckled faced. If

this goes over I'm sunk in the deluge, for then the Pegler prediction will come true, 'the freckled will take over.' Victors of our wars should be free to live on Hog Island in New York or at Hogtown in Indiana in their own new house, or own remodeled old house, of their own designing. In fact, a lot of them, in the rock pens and fox holes, during the war said they would be satisfied to live in their own chicken or hog house. Maybe that's where the hospital beds are planned to be set up. They would be better than park benches when winter comes. By the way, when do we get those new post offices and rivers and harbors for the pork-barrel wealth promoters? Don't you think that I have a right to think? I think I'm tired. I want to take it easy. Where are the organized victors of this war? Who is to represent them? I suggest the Congress instead of the bureaucrats. Come up and see me some time. I am the White House."

Thank you, Judge, for telling the Congress and the world how the people in Richmond, Ind., are solving the housing problem brought on during the doling thirties to usher in the disintegrating forties.

Yours very truly,

STRAUDE E. WISEMAN,
President and National Director,
Victors Adjustment Organization, Inc.

Price Ceilings on Existing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER PATRICK
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say a few words on speculation in real estate. This bears no reflection upon the fine, ethical real-estate dealers in the United States. A desperate search is going on now all over the country by veterans who need a place for their families to live. Speculators today are gouging both buyers and sellers of houses, veterans as well as all others who merely seek to sell their houses or find homes for themselves. The people of America are looking to their Congress to protect them from the unscrupulous who make huge profits at their expense. Therefore, it is essential that we restore to the veterans' emergency housing bill which recently passed this body the provisions for price ceilings on existing homes.

In this connection, I wish to include in my remarks an article entitled "Easy Money," by Don Robinson, which appeared in the Washington News, March 29, 1946:

EASY MONEY

(By Don Robinson)

How is some real-estate speculation keeping high the cost of Washington homes today? How do speculators operate? How big are the stakes?

I wouldn't know the answers if I didn't like Chinese food. I sat down in a Chinese restaurant, and two men sat down at the next table. One was a real-estate man; the other a prospective speculator, and, apparently, an old friend who had been away and didn't know the score.

Therefore, the real-estate man explained his set-up to his friend, and, unintentionally to me.

"I've got a house that's a good thing," began the real-estate man. "I got it for $8,000 and it will bring $11,500."

Over his moo goo gai pan, the real-estate man went on to explain how this sort of deal is worked.

The agent gets a listing. Say the owner asks $8,000. The real-estate man, more familiar with the market, knows the house will bring $11,500. But he doesn't tell the householder, whom he is supposed to represent in the sale, and who is supposed to compensate him with a commission.

He calls up a speculator.

"Send me a check for $500," he says. The speculator may ask a question or two, but he sends the check. The real-estate man buys the house in the name of the speculator.

"Doesn't the speculator ever look at the house?" asked this real-estate man's friend.

"No," was the reply. "What good would it do him? The house is resold within 24 hours anyway."

So, 24 hours later, the house, bought for $8,000 is resold for $11,500. The real-estate man collects his commission on the $8,000. He also collects half the profit from the speculator. This profit can easily amount to $3,500, or which the speculator has merely provided $500 earnest money.

"We hardly ever have to settle on a house before we resell it," the real-estate man told his pal.

"And we haven't had a speculator lose a dime in 4 years."

The losers, of course, are the seller, whose agent was not acting in his interest in the sale, and the buyer, who must pay an inflated price as the result of the artificially fluid market.

Only winners in these cases are the speculators, who can easily earn $1,000 a month on a $500 stake, as this Chinese-food lover assured his friend.

"The price controls we advocate are aimed specifically at halting further inflation in real estate. We urge that the future sale price of any home be made the ceiling price on that home for the duration of the emergency. Under this plan, any home owner could sell his property in a free and open market. However, such property could not be resold by a speculator for a higher price resulting in a quick and unearned profit."—President Truman in his Jackson Day address.

The Role of the United States as a World Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include parts of the following provocative address by the Honorable Patrick J. Hurley:

The United States did not select for itself the role of the leading world power. That role has been selected for our Nation by the logic of events. Many people assume that the present position of the United States in world affairs is due to its economic strength. That is not a correct assumption. Other nations and other areas have great economic resources which are not fully developed because of oppressive governments and restrictions on enterprise. America's economic development is one of the results of the principles, the ideals, the spiritual, political, and economic liberties which the American people have developed during a period of 170 years.

We Americans know that our institutions are not perfect. We are still striving to improve them.

The rock on which America's strength is built is contained in the commitment our forefathers made in the Declaration of Independence to support governments "* * * deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *." The Constitution of the United States pledges the American people to uphold the fundamental rights of man for all of the people. Many imperial nations enjoy these rights for their people at home but they do not accord the same rights to the colonial peoples of their empires.

In two world wars we have fought for the establishment of the principles of democracy. These principles were elaborated in the Atlantic Charter to which the great powers and nearly all the nations of the world except the Axis Nations agreed. At least one of the great nations repudiated the principles of the Atlantic Charter as soon as America was definitely committed to the war. After this repudiation—and to be exact, on December 1, 1943, at the Tehran Conference—the United States obtained an agreement signed for Great Britain by Winston S. Churchill, for Russia by J. V. Stalin, and for the United States by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Iran declaration provides, in part, as follows:

"They count upon the participation of Iran, together with all other peace-loving nations, in the establishment of international peace, security, and prosperity after the war, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to which all four governments have subscribed."

The Iran Declaration removed every question that had been raised up to that time concerning the validity of the Atlantic Charter. The Iran declaration reaffirmed all the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Now let us examine the Atlantic Charter.

The Atlantic Charter pledged the nations to "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." That principle has been violated.

The Atlantic Charter pledged the nations to "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." That principle has been violated. The imperialists still control the destinies of more than a billion people—half the people of the world—without the consent of the governed. Our own lend-lease equipment is being used by the imperialists to shoot these dependent people into submission in violation of the agreement contained in the Atlantic Charter.

The Atlantic Charter guarantees the right of "all nations, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world." That commitment is being violated. It has never been put into effect. The United States contributed billions of dollars in lend-lease to Great Britain and to Russia and some to all other imperialist nations other than Axis Nations in payment for these rights and in reliance upon these commitments. The solemn commitments of the Atlantic Charter have all been violated and repudiated.

* * * * *

Our diplomats are insisting that there should be some world-wide agreement on disarmament. While they are pleading with the predatory nations to disarm, America is arming them. When the Lend-Lease Act was adopted, it was said that we were merely lending our hose to our neighbors to put out the fire. After the fire was extinguished, we had the right to have the hose returned to us. We have retained the right to repossess all lend-lease property and equipment. I read in the paper only yesterday that our State Department has agreed to

transfer all our lend-lease property and to sell all our Army equipment abroad for a token. In fact, we even lent the token that we are to receive for this equipment. It is said that this equipment is obsolete. It may be obsolete in view of atomic weapons of the future, but it is certainly the most modern military equipment in the world today. It is very effective in the hands of imperialists who are subjugating people who are not armed with any such weapons.

America should immediately repossess all American lend-lease and American-owned military equipment abroad. If we supply these weapons to anyone, we should supply them to the police force to be created by the United Nations. We should not transfer control of atomic know-how to the United Nations until the charter of that organization has been made democratic and until we are certain that the United Nations is to be the instrument of peace for the people of the world rather than an instrument of power in the hands of a few predatory nations.

Let us have a care not to return our own people to disillusionment, debts, and unemployment. America is now the most debt-ridden Nation on earth.

America should stop permitting herself to be sucked into side agreements and power blocs. America should pursue a course that will give the full support of the United States to the United Nations. The United Nations should be made strong enough to require obedience to the mandates of economic and military peace.

We should frankly admit to ourselves that the great nations, with the exception of China, have repudiated the principles and objectives for which we said we were fighting the war. In light of our experience we should frankly say to the American people that until the United Nations is strong enough to be respected, the United States must maintain a military force in being.

The American Military Establishment is floundering to the point of impotence. The popular idea seems to be to blame this situation on Congress and on the apathy of the American people. When we do this, we are deluding ourselves. The failure of the Army and Navy to agree on the form of military organization has a deadening effect on our security and weakens our role as a world power devoted to permanent peace.

We pay tribute to our professional military leaders—the products of West Point and the Naval Academy as well as the men who have come up from the ranks. These men have served our Nation brilliantly in every department during the recent conflict. In view of the great contribution our Army and Navy leaders have made to the security of this Nation, it is with deep regret that we view the present destructive controversy among them. While our military leaders are deadlocked, our future is not secure. More than 98 percent of the military forces in the war were civilians. To these ex-servicemen and women and to the public generally, it appears that the deadlock between our high military leaders is, at least to some extent, due to self-interest, prejudice, tradition, and rank rather than reason.

To perform America's immediate role as a world power and to assure a chance for the successful operation of the United Nations, our military leaders should formulate a plan for a peacetime Military Establishment with coequal status for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

If we are forced into future wars everyone who works will be fighting as well as those who operate weapons. Our military plans for the future should recognize this fact and include both men and women. In planning and in scientific warfare and leadership, women have as great capacity as men.

Our military leaders should immediately present to Congress a plan for the unification of our military forces on the basis of the recommendations made to Congress by our Commander in Chief—the President.

The renovation of military thinking is as essential to our military strength as new scientific equipment.

The various branches of the military establishment should relinquish their pride in the use of conventional and outmoded weapons.

The armed forces should be unified, reorganized, and reequipped in the light of the changed concept of national defense brought about by rocket inventions and the control of atomic energy.

The United States does not seek nor would it accept a trade monopoly or the right to rule any other nation. The United States does not seek any international privilege not enjoyed by all nations. The United States does not wish to impose its ideals, its institutions, or its objectives on any other people. The United States has no imperialistic designs. The American people expect and desire all peace-loving people of the world to contribute their share to the pattern of civilization of the future and to the organization of mankind for the establishment and maintenance of peace. The keynote of America's attitude internationally is tolerance. On the other hand, we will oppose with firmness those who attempt to lead us into alliances or power blocs outside of the United Nations. We are opposed to placing power in the hands of any coterie of men who desire to use force to compel other people to accept unwelcome ideologies. We are opposed to that kind of organized selfishness that enables vicious men to plan the murder of millions while the great majority of the people of the world are pursuing peaceful avocations. We agree that there is something rotten in a civilization that must periodically wet itself down in the blood of the best specimens of the race, but I remind my fellow citizens that it is in that kind of a civilization we live. We must change the basis of the control of power in our civilization or we must be prepared to live in the civilization as it exists. If we do neither of these, we will certainly perish. The American people are now endeavoring to change the basis of the use of force by their undivided support of the United Nations as an instrument of rational world power and world peace.

Fair Labor Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fair Labor Standards," by Rev. George G. Higgins.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YARDSTICK—CATHOLIC TESTS OF A SOCIAL ORDER

(By the Reverend George G. Higgins, assistant director, social action department, NCWC)

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

The Senate Education and Labor Committee is to be congratulated on having reported out a bill to amend and improve upon the Fair Labor Standards Act. At a time when the Congress is being widely criticized for its ineptitude—or, as some would prefer to call it, its maliciousness—in postponing urgently needed social legislation, the recent action of Senator MURRAY'S committee is encouraging.

The committee has recommended that the legal minimum wage be increased from 40 cents to 65 cents an hour (and later to 75 cents), and that the coverage of the act be extended to include a number of important industries which were originally exempted for political reasons and for political reasons only. More specifically, it has recommended that the provisions of the act be applicable not only to those industries which are in interstate commerce but likewise to those affecting commerce.

It is to be expected, of course, that this far-reaching recommendation will occasion a lot of oratory on the sanctity and sacredness of States' rights. The charge inevitably will be made that subversive elements are attempting to nullify the established traditions of American democracy, and that the Senate committee is playing fast and loose with both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, the last bulwark of our liberties. All of the arguments which were used to oppose the equally extensive coverage of the National Labor Relations Act will probably be resurrected in opposition to these proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

STATES' RIGHTS

It is suggested that students of this impending debate will find it helpful to analyze the arguments of the opposition in the light of an important book which, by an interesting coincidence, was published during the very week in which the Senate committee issued its recommendations: "The Growth of Constitutional Power in the United States," by Carl Brent Swisher.

Dr. Swisher, one of our outstanding authorities in the field of constitutional law, brings the States' rights controversy rudely down to earth by reminding us that most of the historical controversies over State versus Federal powers have been concerned not so much with locating the appropriate exercise of power, but with preventing its exercise altogether. This is the sort of hard-headed and scholarly realism which will enable us to separate fact from fiction in congressional debates over the coverage of Federal legislation in the social and economic field.

What Dr. Swisher is pointing out by implication is the neglected fact that those industries which object to being covered by the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act are actually opposed to being covered by State legislation as well. If they were not, we could reasonably expect them to be advocating, or at least to be supporting, minimum-wage legislation in the individual States. By and large, however, they haven't done anything of the kind. On the contrary, they have consistently opposed State legislation just as vigorously as they have opposed the intervention of the Federal Government.

SEEKING SHELTER IN NO-MAN'S LAND

It's for this reason, therefore, that Dr. Swisher's warning is practical and timely: "It behooves us, therefore," he says, "to take thought before drenching our handkerchiefs when the NAM and the American Bar Association bewail the prostrate position of the States before the Federal colossus. * * * Spokesmen for the enterprise seeking to avoid regulation, seek shelter from the would-be regulator by crouching within the confines of that government which at the moment is not trying to regulate at all, or by lodgement in a mythical no-man's land between the spheres of the two governments."

By way of a concluding footnote, which will probably serve only to make the picture more confusing, it can be said that it wasn't the radical or left-wing elements in Washington which pushed for extended coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Ironically

enough, on the contrary, it's alleged with considerable evidence that some of the so-called left wingers secretly maneuvered for a weakened version of the bill. A paradox, to be sure—but, then, no one is any longer surprised to find the extreme left and the extreme right unwittingly cooperating on common projects which are not in the interests of the general welfare.

CIO Political Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of April 5, 1946:

CIO-PAC RAISING HEFTY "KITTY" TO STALK UNLIKED CONGRESSMEN

(By Charles T. Lucey)

The CIO-Political Action Committee is beginning to brandish its 6,000,000-member club in the direction of the approaching congressional elections. Old-line politicians, remembering its 1944 effectiveness, show signs of alarm.

Already the political wing of the Philip Murray organization is setting out to raise a healthy campaign kitty through $1 voluntary contributions from members. It is organizing a Nation-wide drive to register voters so that labor can swing its full weight in the primaries and in November. It is putting the finger on Congressmen it wants to beat and taking up the battle for those it seeks to reelect.

James S. Kemper, retiring Republican National Committee finance chairman, has told the committee that "the CIO alone is undertaking to raise three times the amount of money we are asking for our three national committees." He warned that this is in addition to the money to be provided by the Democratic National Committee.

OTHER IDEAS, TOO

But the program of the CIO isn't limited to defeating Republicans. It is being projected now into a new organizing campaign throughout the South, and the expectation is that in some areas there will be attempts to present candidates to beat conservative Democrats who often just as strongly have opposed CIO-backed legislation as have Republicans.

CIO officials say it is erroneous to assume a $6,000,000 political war chest will be raised, as the drive is voluntary. They say it will be much less. But Sidney Hillman has written secretary-treasurers of CIO international unions urging them to "forward the money now collected and report future contributions on a week-to-week basis."

Industrial union councils have been urged "immediately to survey locals in their community and report on each situation." CIO-PAC leaders have opened the drive to get their people registered by forwarding a "sample check on political action to be used locally."

This sample check asks such questions as, Can citizens in your area register now to vote in the primaries? Do you have cards giving correct names and addresses of workers in the plants. Have these cards been broken down on a ward and precinct basis? Have they been checked with current registration lists to see who is registered?

POSTERS, BUTTONS, ETC.

That kind of detailed work is aimed at producing the same effective door-to-door campaign which helped reelect the late Franklin Roosevelt in 1944.

PAC leaders say that "large, attractive posters on registration and the dollar drive" are being produced now, and a metal lapel button for contributors is being discussed. A flood of pamphlets, leaflets, radio transcriptions, and other publicity media is planned.

The CIO, like both Democratic and Republican national organizations, is concentrating on "crucial congressional districts where the margin of victory or defeat was close in 1944. It is singling out Representatives from such districts who have been for and against CIO objectives, placing enemies on what it calls the "black side of the election ledger."

CIO Political Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN R. McGEHEE
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an article by George E. Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of April 4, 1946.

Every true member of the Democratic Party should read this article, and my advice to the Democratic Party and its leadership is to stop, look, and listen. The termites of un-Americanism are boring into the very foundation of the Democratic Party, and if we do not wake up it is only a short time until there will not be a Democratic Party.

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Sidney Hillman, CIO satrap, is raising, not by voluntary contribution, $6,000,000 to win the forthcoming congressional elections.

Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Communists, Masons, Odd Fellows Catholics, Protestants and Jews, northerners, southerners, and just plain unaffiliated Americans will be forced to contribute to Sidney Hillman's political funds, even if they hate the thing they have to support.

They used to criticize Mark Hanna for levying on businessmen, but Mark Hanna never had the gall of Sidney Hillman. An American could, in his day, exercise the freedom of refusal. There is no refusing Sidney.

His unions levy and if the American refuses to pay, he ceases to be in good standing in his union and may not, in closed shops, continue to earn a living at his trade. In those industries in which a check-off obtains, capitalistic and Republican employers must collect the levy, providing the communistically controlled CIO with the funds to destroy capitalism and to overthrow the two-party system in America.

Much of this money is to be spent in the South fomenting a racial war designed to develop such bitter hatreds in those States that the turmoil will prove beneficial to the extreme left wingers who cannot operate in any country where the people are at peace.

No one claims that the white-Negro situation anywhere in this country is sound, but no true American can accept turmoil, tumult, and stimulated hatred as a solution.

This campaign of the CIO should be watched vigilantly by Americans, for this year, for the first time, a Communist bloc actually exists and operates in the House of Representatives and certain Democrats in the Senate coalesce to do the work of the left wingers.

If Americans favor the Communist Party, they should vote for it, but it is a dirty, devious trick for Communists and their allies to invade the Republican and Democratic Parties with the object of doing their foul business for a foreign power in the disguise of Americans.

In New York State Robert Hannegan is apparently bargaining with Sidney Hillman for a continued coalition of forces. They would nominate Senator MEAD as the joint candidate of the Democrats and the left-wingers for Governor.

They want Eleanor Roosevelt nominated for the Senate, Sam Rosenman for a high judicial post, and they are to combine on Congressmen. Whoever, in New York State, accepts an American Labor Party indorsement is a Communist candidate, and decent, patriotic Americans will oppose him whoever he may be.

During the war years the Commies confused New Yorkers, who are readily fooled because they like to be, by disguising themselves as patriots. Now that the Commies are again the tools of a foreign power, no one can associate with them without risking the consequences of improper association.

If Americans will watch how the Communists operate in all countries, they will note that they always put forward non-Communists to stomp the ground for them.

If they cannot find a trick, they try to boycott the elections, as they did in Greece. When they discover that the people are on to them, they get the Russians to call off the elections, as they did in the Russian sector of Germany. In France, where some decent democratic elements joined them, they tried to steal the show. In Bulgaria, having attained power, they kicked their allies out.

The Democratic Party is doing the United States a disservice by permitting itself to be the stalking horse for the Communists through its alliance with the CIO, the PAC, and the American Labor Party.

It is also wrecking itself, for ultimately the American people will vote down the Democratic Party as a transmission belt for the Communists.

After all, Americans need not elect Stalin's henchmen to Congress. Should the American Labor Party ever achieve power on its own, it will surely rid itself of its Democratic allies. Hannegan is not to be trusted in his judgments because he is too ill-informed, too naive, and too concentrated on votes instead of his country to be sound.

The slogan ought not to be "Clear it with Sidney." It ought to be "Watch out for Sidney."

Mr. Hoover and the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Sheriff W. H. Holcombe, of Mobile, Ala., expressing concern over the rumor that the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, who has done such a wonderful job as head of the FBI, might

be replaced by a Communist; also copy of my reply:

SHERIFF'S OFFICE, MOBILE COUNTY,
Mobile, Ala., February 9, 1946.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: Received your letter of the 7th instant regarding Mr. Hoover today.

I wired you the other day because, as I stated, some of our friends here were alarmed over remarks they had heard.

Some members of the National Council of Catholic Women in Mobile, at the request of our Bishop Toolen, were calling their friends asking them to write our Congressmen and Senators urging them to stand by Mr. Hoover. It seems that the bishop heard that the Communists were after Mr. Hoover.

Naturally, we won't stand for anything like that if we can help it.

My life work, as you know, has been, and I hope will continue to be, law enforcement. This department, its officers, and your humble servant have been benefited greatly by contact and association with Mr. Hoover and his Department, and, like a vast majority of law-enforcement officers in this country, I feel that Mr. Hoover is indispensable. He has built an organization of law-enforcement officers that is a model for the world.

In later years the policy of the Director in establishing, by conferences and schools, a personal contact of his men with local law-enforcement agencies has resulted in a feeling of fellowship and has brought about the closest and finest kind of cooperation, not only between his Department and the local agencies but between the agencies themselves.

Agents of Mr. Hoover's Department have demonstrated that they are ready and willing to work with us at all times. The services and special scientific aid and cooperation rendered this and all other sheriffs and police departments throughout the country are too numerous to mention.

Suffice it to say that they are all important and make for good, efficient, up-to-date work here and everywhere else, and it was Director Hoover who adopted this system and policy of the FBI, and who has maintained it throughout the years.

If there is anything we can do to help, should it become necessary, let me know.

Sincerely,

W. H. HOLCOMBE,
Sheriff.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 1, 1946.*

HON. W. H. HOLCOMBE,
Sheriff, Mobile County, Mobile, Ala.

MY DEAR BILL: While I appreciated your strong endorsement of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I have been in Washington long enough to have a first-hand knowledge of the great job he has done. Of course, I will support him, not only by raising my voice, but by vigorously taking the offensive against those forces who are so anxious to get him out of office.

As a matter of fact, I have been expecting an attack on Hoover for some time, since he had the courage last December, and again in January, to openly attack the American Communists and all that they stand for, as well as to expose the American Youth for Democracy, which is merely a new name for the old Young Communists League. The FBI, under Hoover's leadership, has blocked the road against the advances of gangsters, racketeers, Fascists, Nazis, and Communists for many years, and it is only logical to expect that his enemies, who are the enemies of America, would level a blast at him and endeavor to get him out of office.

Strangely, their influence has manifested itself in some odd places. I know, for example, that the Budget Bureau tried to cut Hoover's appropriation, but Members of Congress saw to it that they did not cripple the FBI. It is well known in Washington that the motives of some of the people in the Budget Bureau are open to question. One of them was so brazen that he even talked of becoming Hoover's successor so much that it broke out in print, although I understand that Mr. Hoover has no intention of accepting any of the high-salaried offers which have been made to him and that Attorney General Clark hasn't any intention of permitting Hoover to leave.

I intend to see the President in the near future to take up with him the matter of throwing his full support behind the FBI and Mr. Hoover's administration of it. I am sure that he, too, will support the FBI and Mr. Hoover, for he must realize, as you have pointed out, the role that the FBI has played in advancing law enforcement and bringing security to the Nation from our domestic and foreign enemies. I agree with you that Director Hoover is indispensable.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely your friend,

FRANK W. BOYKIN.

Pope Pius' Address on the Food Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include Pope Pius' broadcast on ways to avert widespread famine. This statement, which advocates rationing, gives added weight to my resolution, House Resolution 140, which urges the return of rationing on food items in which there is a world shortage.

The address follows:

With our heart in the grip of deep anguish, we speed a cry of appeal today to the conscience of the world, to the sense of responsibility of the leaders in political and economic life, to the people's spirit of human sympathy and mutual charity: to all who have eyes to see and ears to hear, to all who are able to rise above conflicting opinions, to impose silence on the rancor begotten by the war, and have left their minds and hearts open to the holy voice of human brotherhood.

And in particular we appeal to all of those who, united with us in the Christian faiths and fed on the doctrine and the law of Christ, can see in this appeal to their brotherly spirit the touchstone of a sincere and intense love of God.

Poor humanity, just emerged from the river of blood through which it passed in the years of war, is mounting in search of peace, a path ever rougher, ever steeper, ever more beset with brambles.

At its every step arise new hindrances and obstacles, the seriousness of which very few suspected in the first flush of hard-won victory. While statesmen, in their deliberations, often beset with difficulties, are trying to lay the first foundations of political and economic reconstruction, and to remove or at least smooth out the inevitable discrepancy of opinions and interests, lo, behind them rises the threatening specter of famine; as the experts bend over their statistics and the columns of figures slowly lengthen out under their eyes, they see forced on them the insistent and bitter certainty that the sinister shadow of famine rests on at least a quarter of the entire population of the globe.

Over immense territories it threatens to reap whole multitudes unless timely remedies are brought to bear, and their number makes almost insignificant the undoubtedly impressive host of combatants and noncombatants struck down on all the fronts of the last war.

Various unforeseen and unforeseeable circumstances have aggravated the already formidable difficulties of provisioning; in eastern Europe insufficient cultivation of the soil due to the war's onrush and the subsequent forcible driving away of a great part of the local population; bad wheat harvests in southern Europe and the lands which border on it—poor harvests, especially of rice in eastern and southeastern Asia and drought in south Africa.

The consequences are becoming visibly clear. They are an increased and indispensable need of importations for Europe in these months before the coming harvest and an imperious necessity of aid for the populations of the other territories we have named which in normal times were self-sufficient.

Undoubtedly vast regions produce much more than is needed by their own populations. But not to speak of those which unhappily found themselves involved in the world conflagration and experienced war and postwar devastation, notable supplies, which had been accumulated, were withdrawn from the public market during the conflict and used as fodder for animals or subjected to chemical-industrial processes.

In any case, even with the provisions still available, to tide things over until the next harvest will not be possible without grave difficulty and unless every available means is used. And even so, at the beginning of the harvest practically nothing will remain in reserve.

The difficult food situation, in consequence, will not be definitely solved even then; it may persist, which God forbid until the following harvest.

So there will be almost 16 months, during which the daily prayer which we send up to our Father in heaven, even in times of prosperity, will have to become more earnest and more fervent: "Give us this day our daily bread."

We doubt not that the peoples who in the prosecution of their war objectives showed such a great power or organization and such an heroic spirit of sacrifice, will give proof of the same qualities now that there is need to snatch from death millions of human beings. It is a question of setting free what stocks still exist and then of building up new ones, of hindering the waste of foodstuffs or their use for any other immediate purpose than that of nourishing man, of avoiding inconsiderate or unjustifiable cessation of work, of setting apart adequate transport facilities or taking the necessary financial measures, of seeking and using every possibility of sowing.

These are matters all of which require organizational ability an dthe spirit of sacrifice. Nonetheless, if organization, however expert and strong, were to be reduced to no more than an administrative policy, if the spirit of sacrifice, urged even to heroism, were not to be fired by an ideal higher than that of mere military or national discipline, it would be little indeed.

The human race is threatened by famine. And famine of itself is the cause of incalculable unrest in the midst of which the future peace, as yet only in germ, would run the risk of being suffocated before being born. And yet how necessary is peace for every people of this earth! In the face of this com-

mon peril there is no room for thoughts of vendetta or reprisal, for lust of power or domination, nor for any desire of isolation or of a victor's privileges. That is very well understood in North America.

In this great world offensive against famine the United States has generously taken the lead. It has placed at the service of this holy cause its gigantic power of production; it has doubled efforts to increase the surplus of foodstuffs, destined for exportation. Canada, too, as we know, is taking the same way in its traditional liberality. For its part, Great Britain, with timely forethought, has convoked in its capital an international conference to discuss food problems and in the meantime has left in force wartime restrictions on the use of many eatables.

It is certain that a small, scarcely noticeable rationing in the better supplied countries would result in such saving of food as would afford other peoples, harder hit by famine, a marked relief in their more urgent needs. For that reason we look trustfully to the states of Latin America. In the past the noble hearts of their citizens, our dearest sons and daughters, have been opened wide to every appeal of charity, to all great interests of humanity.

Divine Providence has assigned them in our days a magnificent task: to be dispensers of its gifts. It is a task such as the patriarch Joseph had in the years of want when he was put in charge of the granaries of Egypt. In very truth, the granaries of the world, the Argentine and Brazil, on the eve of the calamities, saw their immense lands answer to their labor and their agricultural methods with a fertility surpassing that of prewar years.

They are, therefore, in the happy position of being able to reestablish in large measure the shaken equilibrium by lending aid to their more needy brothers. May the conviction penetrate everywhere that the present threat of famine is a common danger which should draw together all the peoples in brotherly solidarity and union such as leaves behind it all differences, all conflicts, all particular interests.

What does it matter, at this moment, to know where to lay the responsibilities or what share in them falls to each one for the wrongs and fatal negligences? What does it matter to ascertain who is more or less worthy of help?

What is really urgent now is that prompt and sufficient succor reach wherever need is making itself felt.

Today more than ever it is time to hearken to the words of the Saviour: "As long as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to Me" (Matthew 25: 40).

It is time to attend also the bitter reproach He makes to whoever for selfishness or indifference does not come to the aid of this neighbor in an obvious state of need.

In effect, these warnings show the grave responsibility before God of all those who because of their special gifts or because of their position are summoned to ward off that danger in a directive or in an executive capacity by reason of their office or by their private effort.

They show the grave responsibility before God of all who by their foresight and diligence and wise economic arrangements in the production, transport, and distribution of food have it in their power to alleviate the misfortunes of many.

And those same warnings show the yet graver responsibility before God of those whose cruel selfishness in accumulating and hiding provisions or in any other way shamefully explcit the misery of their neighbors, individuals, or peoples for their own personal profit or to enrich themselves by illicit speculation or vile forms of trade.

It would be fatal to think that the crisis can be overcome unless tranquility and public order are maintained.

It is necessary that all remain calm. History shows us only too often the disastrous results of that delusion which drives hungry mobs to revolt and pillage. That is like claiming to make the fields fruitful by sowing sparks in the desolate stretches of stubble.

Woe to those who would will to start the fire by incitements to useless disturbances. Woe to those who stir it up by the sight of their scandalous luxury and by their extravagance. Extravagance! Fathers and mothers of families: See to it that your children better appreciate the sacredness of bread and of the earth which gives it to us. Our age has forgotten it too much. From a decent simplicity of life it has slipped insensibly into seeking unhealthy pleasures and fanciful needs.

And, lo, God making scarcer his gift of bread has willed by this hard lesson to call it back to the straight path. May this lesson be taken in a docile spirit and lead to the establishment of a better economic and social order.

During the war years death passed forward and backward along the lines of battle and penetrated deeply into each land, striking down innumerable victims among the combatants and the civilian populations.

It is time that we bar its way now that we see it getting ready to spread incomparably vaster carnage than that produced by the fire of arms. We must not allow it to engrave on millions of tombs of innocent children the tragic words of accusation: "The little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them" (Lamentations 4: 4).

Hearken all of you individuals and peoples who have the means in one way or another to come to the aid of your brothers, hearken to the prophet's exhortation: "Deal thy bread to the hungry" (Isaiah 58: 7).

But fix your gaze on the grand vision: It is not only the earth's hungry who at this moment hold out to you their suppliant hands. Christ himself asks you for the bread of which his poor are in want. Every mouthful of food which you give to them is given to Him. Every mouthful which you refused them is refused to Him.

The day will come in which what many do not see even yet will be made manifest before the eyes of all, when the Supreme Judge will appear in the majesty of His justice to pronounce before all mankind His irrevocable sentence. Unhappy forever will they be on whose arms will resound the terrible condemnation: "Depart from me, you cursed * * * for I was hungry, and you gave me no meat" (Matthew 25: 41–42). But blessed forever those who will hear the divine words of infinite sweetness, "Come, ye blessed of my Father * * * for I was hungry, and you gave me to eat. * * * As you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me" (Matthew 25: 34–40).

Letter From American Veterans of World War II to Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from the American Veterans of World War II to Hon. Robert E. Hannegan.

The American Veterans of World War II requests Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan that he consider the issuing of a postage stamp commemorating the first aniversary of VE-day, May 8. They also advise him that the Amvets will sponsor from May 1 to May 8 the organization's national flower, which is a replica of the four-leaf white clover, meaning "Think of me," in honor of those who gave their lives so that this Nation might live. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, a most worthy request.

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT E. HANNEGAN,
Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HANNEGAN: I feel positive that the veterans of this war would be most appreciative if the Post Office Department would be kind enough to take under immediate advisement the possibility of issuing a postage stamp commemorating the first anniversary of VE-day, May 8.

You might be interested to know that during the week from May 1 to the 8th, Amvets throughout the United States will sponsor the organization's national flower—which is a replica of a four-leaf white clover—meaning "think of me," in honor of those who gave their lives so this Nation might live. It is a green leaved clover with a white studded center.

The flower will also bear a tag with the inscription "Amvets, American Veterans of World War II, in memory of our honored dead think of me," and in addition it will also have the Amvet seal.

These momentos will go on sale for the benefit of local Amvet posts in the development of their own programs for relief of needy veterans, patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals, rehabilitation assistance, etc.

Thank you for any consideration given to the above-mentioned proposal, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

J. H. LEIB,
National Legislative Director.

Where Lies Future Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following challenging article by Gill Robb Wilson, from Skyways magazine of March:

WHERE LIES FUTURE SECURITY

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

INHERENT ELEMENTS OF FUTURE SECURITY ARE SOUND FOREIGN POLICY, UNIVERSAL TRAINING, AND AUTONOMY OF AIR POWER

The United States was able to play a decisive part in the late war for several basic reasons. One was that good men were able to rise above a bad organizational history. Another was that our allies held the Axis in check until we could recruit and train armies, build a navy, and put an air force into the field. A third was that we had the natural resources and mechanical ingenuity to counteract employment of vast hordes of slave labor which all three Axis nations recruited to their war industries.

Our victory nonetheless was prefaced by tragic losses, and never at any time in the course of the war were we more than one jump ahead of defeat. The conflict unmercifully ravaged our natural resources, demanded utmost of both military and civilian cooperation, and upset our national economy to the point that taxes from an undeniable ceiling over the future of many generations to come. Because of haste our war effort was marked by great waste. Because of an unprepared citizenry, many of our boys were thrown into action long before they had the training which their leaders craved for them.

Truly we won the war but at what a cost in life and substance above that at which we might have won. To rectify those elements and policies which accumulated, the avoidable cost is now a sacred obligation and to let extraneous considerations stand in the way of rectification is to invite a tragic future.

Retrospect of the war reveals clearly what a few suspected, but none for certain knew—that under possible international situations, the United States in spite of her geographic position, resources, and skills, could not hope to fight the world alone or hold her homeland inviolate. In an age when scientific development is widespread, even the powerful United States must have strong ties with strong allies. A vital part of our defense policy is our foreign policy, nor can we intelligently determine what extent or balance of force is necessary until we have partners in the world and can check our contributions to mutual security with those of our partners. We might as well make up our minds that, in view of modern weapons, no nation can either afford to fight the world, or hope to maintain its security without partners. Upon a basis of partnership for security, we and our affiliates can make economies, can cover geographically the approaches of danger to either without friction, and can gear such matters as industrial mobilization and aggregate natural resources to compensate for weaknesses either partner might have.

An example of how such compensations work is found in the total power of Allied air forces. Constant pressure was exerted on the Germans because the British were able to specialize on night-bombing operations and thus develop them to a fantastic efficiency, while the United States was doing likewise with daylight operations. The British could throw their energies into short-rang jet-fighter development while we could throw ours into long-range support-fighter technique. Because the Axis was being hit so hard by Anglo-American bombers, and Nazi interceptor strength so whittled down by Anglo-American short- and long-range fighters, the Russians were able to concentrate on air-ground support for their armies. Thus from the east Russia swept into Germany without facing a full-fledged Luftwaffe, while from the west we did the same.

In times past it has been American custom to speak of a desire to have a Navy or an air force able to meet any combination of foes. This is a natural but an unrealistic ambition. Neither the United States nor any other nation can afford such a force, even if they could create it, which they cannot. The only sure answer to security lies in a defense policy geared to a foreign policy, and if this interferes with dollar diplomacy, so be it. "What shall a man give in exchange for his life?"

Next in importance to a foreign policy based on security requirements should be a policy of universal citizenship training. To many this conjures up the picture of frustrated youth walking aimlessly about with rifle on shoulder, or marching to and fro in the rudiments of the drill. To me it conjures up the picture of youth becoming at home on the sea, in the tropics, in the Arctic. It means practical training in self-reliance, in respect for law, in cooperation with others. It means a long start for the individual toward survival if trouble should ever again come to the world.

Universal training means more than masses with a smattering of casual experience. It means that during the process of training, the talents and abilities of young men may be screened, and the competent offered opportunity for specialization. It means that classification can be established long before some possible crisis makes accurate classification impossible and sends able men to minor tasks or incapable men into positions of responsibility. Too frequently a wide discrepancy between rank swiftly attained and civilian ability has been noted. Many a potential colonel wore a sergeant's chevrons throughout this war and some colonels should have been corporals.

Should war come again, our youth would be called upon to live and struggle all over the earth. Having no familiarity with strange conditions, many succumbed in the last war to tribulations which had no connection with enemy action. They had to fight the sea and the enemy at one and the same time. Universal training would have made them at home on the sea. They had to fight the jungle and the enemy contemporaneously. Previous training could have made them at home in the jungle. They had to fight the Arctic and the Japanese in the Aleutians. Citizenship training would have familiarized many with life in frigid temperatures. Much of the security of the United States will lie in the fact that her men and women are at home in their world, and I conceive universal training as a process of familiarization to that end.

Next after a foreign policy geared to security, with youthful generations screened to responsibility and at home in their world, comes the necessity for reorganization of the security establishment. The defense controversy which has developed, while a lamentable demonstration in many respects, is yet a healthy thing for the American people to witness. We now have vivid testimony to what acrimonies exist and existed before Pearl Harbor between the services. We have heard much sounding brass, if not tinkling cymbals, and the proportionate opinions expressed have almost universally hewed to the line of service affiliation rather than demonstrating dispassionate intellectual appreciation of national security as a whole. Traditions and systems have taken such a hold that they appear handicaps rather than incentives. The services have revealed their incapacity for joint recommendation of administrative reform on a basis of cooperative agreement.

Mr. Truman has had to enter the breach and has done so with a message to Congress which popularly is interpreted to lean more to Army than Navy logic, although he has safeguarded the relative autonomy of both with great care by stressing the importance of civilian control. I judge that Mr. Truman has accurately reflected informed public opinion on this entire matter, since he spoke to the point of economy. The American people have felt the cost of war in every fiber of their being. Even the hardest working, the most successful, has taken home after taxes but a meager proportion of earnings. The presence of duplication, waste, and expenditure for obsolescent equipment is familiar to all. Pearl Harbor and Bataan are indeed remembered but no more as examples of enemy treachery and cruelty than as security ineffectiveness. Chickens have come home to roost. Air power, the stone which the builders of American security neglected, has become the head of the corner. Whatever the future of security reorganization may be, it will be realistic or idealistic and archaic unless sound foreign policy, universal citizen training, and the autonomy of air power are inherent elements.

Commendation for AFL

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times when most everyone is confronted with many important problems we are inclined to overlook commendable service on the part of others who are making a worth-while contribution toward keeping our economic situation in order.

Today I want to commend the American Federation of Labor upon its conduct during the reconversion period.

It is indeed gratifying to note that this great labor organization has stayed on the job and bargained within the price ceilings while others struck and, according to Bernard Baruch, caused not a bulge but a definite and serious break in the price-inflation lines.

We also note with interest that according to John O'Donnell in the Washington Times-Herald:

All the Moscow pressure and Kremlin come-on lures won't get AFL President Bill Green into that April 12 Red mass meeting at New York's Hotel Commodore on the anniversary of the death of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Cold fact is that the AFL president has declared that he was "suckered or hoodwinked" into permitting his secretary to acknowledge the pinkish PAC invitation sent by that horny-handed son of toil, Henry D. Morgenthau, Jr., despite Henry's squeals of protest and threats of vengeance against President Truman. Green, discovering that the anti-AFL groups dominated by PAC, Sidney Hillman and other commy fellow travelers, promptly wired his Washington headquarters here that it was all a mistake, that he won't attend, that as a labor leader he is against the Red mob running the Roosevelt memorial show, and that he most certainly won't be among those present.

The following news item, quoting Mr. Meany, forcibly brings to our attention the trying situation brought about by Government regulations and lack of understanding.

The news item follows:

TRUMAN, BYRNES AND BOWLES CALLED INEPT ON PAY POLICY

George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, last night assailed President Truman and two other top Administration leaders for "ineptitude and bureaucratic confusion" in wage control during wartime and reconversion.

In an article prepared for the American Federationist, he criticized the President, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes for his handling of wartime wage problems while Director of Economic Stabilization, and incumbent OES Administrator Chester Bowles for current confusion in the wage field.

"Wage regulations have been issued to a confused public at the rate of one set every 60 days," he said. "And there is no sign that this flood will subside. From the rela-

tively simple regulations of October 2, 1942, we have steadily progressed into the labyrinths which apparently have no exit."

SAYS STANDARD DROPS

He said that wage earners have watched their standard of living drop as the number of executive orders, directives, interpretations and explanations have increased.

"The threat of inflation which deluded workers to accept wage regulation is now here," he said. "The right to bargain collectively has become a will-o-the-wisp which approaches reality under one executive order only to be drawn away by another."

Meany, who was one of the original AFL members of the War Labor Board, said that "back-door politics" resulted in a change in Government wage policy April 8, 1943, which scrapped the joint labor-management-Government agreement of December 1941, establishing the WLB.

He said that President Roosevelt made the change by Executive order "without the courtesy of letting WLB members know." He said the net result was to make Byrnes "Czar with veto power over the 12-man decisions" of the tripartite WLB.

CLAIMS RULES CHANGED

He said that WLB public members, "acting without doubt on orders from above," prevented revision of the Little Steel formula in 1944-45 "by changing rules in the middle of the game."

Meany said that President Truman's settlement of the steel strike set up a dual standard of wage regulations—one for workers who went on strike to gain their end and another for workers who stayed on the job and bargained within the price ceilings.

Meany said that Mr. Truman's February 14, 1946, Executive order on wages and supplementary regulations "sounded much like what had been said several explanations ago." He said that "the situation was still foggy" after Bowles' efforts to clear the atmosphere.

Bowles had sent out 91 questions and answers "explaining what the present policy means."

"Perhaps within a short time it may be necessary for Bowles to send out a clarifying pamphlet containing 91 times 91 questions and answers," he said.

Starvation Stalks in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 2, 1946:

STARVATION STALKS IN POLAND

Well-fed Americans ought to be thoroughly shocked by the report of Herbert Hoover on the famine conditions he found in war-torn, desolated Poland. There have been so many startling accounts of starvation in various European countries that there is danger we may become a little bit callous. There have been so many emotional appeals in behalf of certain nations, and open to suspicion that they were strongly biased by racial, religious, or political affiliations, that there is danger we may become a little dubious about the terrible facts.

But when Herbert Hoover reports that the food situation in Poland is the worst that he has seen, America must consider the awful import of those words. For Mr. Hoover is America's outstanding authority on famine and famine relief, and none can question without doubt on orders from above," presented stark realities without exaggeration or prejudice. Herbert Hoover isn't given to exaggeration.

"Over 2,600,000 children terribly subnormal from undernourishment. * * * Food situation heartbreakingly bad. * * * Infant mortality 20 percent per annum. * * * Huge increase in disease due to underfeeding. * * * More than a million orphans and half orphans." That is Poland as Mr. Hoover finds it today and the Poland that must look to the generosity of America for succor.

Nor can America forget that Poland and the Polish people were the prime victims of Nazi aggression, terrorism, and devastation, four times overrun by the armies of Russia and Germany, robbed of their pitifully small resources and supplies, murdered so that they would not have to be fed, their able-bodied men carried off to slave for the German conqueror.

Poland surely has one of the first calls, then, on the food that America can spare. Not only because the need of Poland is more desperate, but because Poland has already suffered so much more. And because of the admiration and gratitude that is her due.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Ways and Means:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, I desire to make known to you my interest in a broad expansion of the present social-security program, and to ask that you give favorable consideration to proposals to achieve such expansion.

America's reconversion to a peacetime economy is today nearing completion. Theories concerning the stabilization of that peacetime economy are advanced from all quarters. On all sides the question is asked: What will happen when the so-called backlog of buying power built up during the war is exhausted? Some people answer simply: "Depression." Nearly everyone agrees that unless buying power is sustained, it will be difficult for America to strike out toward a higher national standard of living. In other words, it appears that the future progress of our Nation may be determined to a very large extent by the amount of buying power our people will have once their savings, their war bonds, have been spent.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that social security, particularly benefits to the aged, can play an important part in sustaining that buying power. It seems to me that wholly aside from all the moral justification which most certainly exists for payment of decent benefits to senior citizens, there exists a clear-cut economic justification as well. Mr. Chairman, I believe that by recommending old-age benefits be increased to livable levels this committee can take a great step forward toward establishing economic stability in America for many years to come.

The money that is paid to the aged will never sit idly in banks or inside feather mattresses. More truly than any other, income from old-age benefits is spendable income, because very few old people have other resources and, as a result, must spend all their benefits to keep themselves alive. Higher security payments will mean more money spent on food, clothing, shelter, medical care. They will mean higher standards of living for millions of people. Through them we can discharge a fundamental responsibility to our own sense of moral right, and at the same time insure an ever-expanding market for producers of all goods.

I would like to make one more point. It is well known that during the war hundreds of thousands of old people who might have claimed social-security benefits did not, simply because they could find jobs and were needed in the war effort. Ten million young men had left the factories and farms and offices to battle the enemy; millions of old people either returned to work or kept on working after reaching retirement age, that our armies could be supplied. None of us here will question the patriotism of these old people. However, none of us should forget for one minute that they worked for another reason too—because they were tired of trying to eke out bare existences on $20 monthly pensions. And they are still tired, and they will try to stay in the labor market just as long as they possibly can, rather than go back to the drab, bitter lives they led before. And, Mr. Chairman, all of us know that every job the old people keep means one more young man, one more veteran unemployed.

If we increase old-age-pension benefits we will increase employment opportunities. That is the point I wish to lay before you gentlemen. We will increase employment opportunities in two ways. First, by creating more spendable income—the income that itself creates jobs. Second, by freeing the labor market of the old people, thus making more jobs for the young. For that reason I earnestly request this committee to authorize a broad expansion of the present social-security program.

Housing Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times:

HOUSING SUBSIDIES

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has approved the $600,000,000 subsidy requested by Housing Expediter Wyatt. The House rejected a similar recommendation. The Senate proposal differs from that passed on by the House in that it attempts to place some restrictions upon the use of these funds. Thus, the subsidies would be limited to 25 percent of the value of the units to which they are applied. However, despite these proposed safeguards, the subsidy proposal is still bad in principle and should be eliminated from the housing bill when it comes before the full Senate.

To justify these large expenditures the proposal is described as a "veterans'" housing bill. However, it is clear that many other persons in the community would also benefit from the payment of these subsidies. Many of these other persons have accumulated large wartime savings. It is difficult to understand the justification for having the general taxpayer subsidize their purchase of homes. Even for veterans this bill

is discriminatory. The veteran who can afford to buy a more expensive house, and hence who presumbaly is less in need of a subsidy, would receive a larger dollar benefit from this bill than those veterans in more moderate circumstances.

The housing situation is critical. The demand for new houses far exceeds the available or potential supply. To the extent that the cost of homes is held down by subsidy payments many persons who could defer their purchase of new homes would be in the market for them. The result would be to continue an unbalanced supply-demand situation. At the same time, it seems inevitable that the construction of some new housing will be impeded because of the uncertainties attending such a subsidy program.

It is difficult, therefore, to understand how subsidies will correct the present maladjustments. Higher prices for building materials would appear to be a more effective means of correcting the present situation by encouraging the urgently required output. At the same time, a new burden would not be added to the Federal budget and a step would be taken toward the return of a free economy.

Give Poland Back to the Polish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the Polish-American Congress, Inc., which is fighting for a fair deal for Poland, has set forth clearly its aims in a large newspaper advertisement.

Poland has been one of the great sufferers of this war. No people did more to stop the march of Hitler than the Polish people, and their demand for a square deal will find support from all fair-thinking Americans. The statement of the Polish-American Congress follows:

IN BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF POLAND!—DOES DR. LANGE'S VOTE IN THE UNO MEAN POLAND IS AGAINST IRAN'S RIGHTS AND FOR FURTHER APPEASEMENT?

WHAT DOES APPEASEMENT REALLY MEAN?

Appeasement means that you sacrifice your friends to satisfy your enemy.

Through this policy you never win the enemy; you only increase his demands. You then not only lose your friends but break their will and force them to become tools in the hands of the enemy.

Such a policy leads, therefore, to the strengthening of the enemy and to the weakening of your own position.

This is exactly what happened in Munich and afterward.

At Tehran and Yalta the mistakes of Munich were tragically repeated, only on a much larger scale.

To satisfy the demands of totalitarian Russia, the democracies abandoned Poland, their most faithful ally in the war. Indeed, this tragic compromise did not end Russia's demands. On the contrary, it increased her aspirations.

Today, a year after Poland was sacrificed at Yalta and as a consequence Europe partitioned, the democracies are already forced to defend Iran.

The results of our policy of appeasement are clear today. With the expansion of totalitarianism, the area of freedom has shrunk.

We not only lost our numerous friends but, against their will, they were merged with the totalitarian camp opposed to us.

Their resources were pooled together with those of Soviet Russia.

Governments imposed on them by force are combating now our concept of freedom and their foreign policy has been turned against us.

Dr. Oscar Lange, the delegate of the satellite Warsaw Government to the United Nations Security Council meeting, exemplifies this state of affairs. He does not speak for the Polish people. His position on the question of Iran, a small but sovereign nation, is not Polish, it is Soviet dominated.

For 3 years we warned against the tragic results of appeasement. We repeatedly stressed that once a precedent of legalized violence in Poland was established, aggression would become an accepted method in international relations.

Therefore today, we warn again, that unless the foreign policy of the United States of American returns to the fundamental principles of independence, freedom and respect for law, and demands their application everywhere, totalitarian aggression may some day reach our own soil.

For our own sake, let us end aggression where it first began—in Poland!

Restore Poland's independence!

Remove Soviet troops, the N. K. V. D., the secret police, and the Communist puppet regime from Poland!

Give Poland back to the Polish people!

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
DOWNSTATE NEW YORK DIVISION,
FRANCIS J. WAZETER, *President*,
Rev. MIECZYSLAW MROZINSKI, *Vice President*,
MRS. J. SRUTKOWSKA, *Vice President*,
MAXIM BOBINSKI, *Vice President*,
LEON TOMASZEWSKI, *Secretary*,
J. GLOWACKI, *Financial Secretary*,
KAROL ZIELINSKI, *Treasurer*.

Hook and Dillon Get the Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Harry Hook and Edward Dillon, former business agents for Lodge No. 68 of the International Association of Machinists, have finally reached the end of their rope. Suspended and fined by the executive council of the IAM; they are now left to shift for themselves.

During the war these two so-called labor leaders formed an unholy alliance with local 1304, the CIO machinists' union, across the bay from San Francisco, and proceeded to run things to suit themselves in defiance of Federal laws and regulations and against the wishes of the grand lodge of the IAM.

They even defied the President of the United States at times and they called strikes and work stoppages continually on naval and maritime ships that were vitally needed for the war effort. Now their sins have caught up with them, their jurisdiction is terminated, and I predict far more peaceful labor relations in the San Francisco Bay area as a result.

Harvey Brown, international president of the IAM, and his executive council are to be commended and congratulated for their successful efforts to solve one of the most serious labor-management problems in the country. For the information of my colleagues, I include herewith a communication from Harvey Brown and a self-explanatory article from the San Francisco Examiner:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1946.

The Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: This will acknowledge your communication of March 28.

Enclosed is a clipping of the March 16 issue of the San Francisco Examiner. The information therein will give you a fairly good idea of our work in San Francisco.

For your further information, we extended the territorial jurisdiction of our San Jose organization to include Sunnyvale. We then negotiated an agreement between the Hendy Iron Works and our San Jose organization.

Our executive council and the writer were in San Francisco exactly 5 weeks. Our stay was longer than anticipated. We believe we have made a contribution in the field of public relations and I feel certain that the employers in San Francisco and adjacent communities will agree that we have contributed greatly to bring about improved employer-union cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. BROWN,
International President.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF SAN FRANCISCO LODGE NO. 68 INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

To All Members of San Francisco Lodge, No. 68, International Association of Machinists, and Other Interested Persons:

San Francisco Lodge, No. 68, I. A. of M., as is well known to all, called a strike on October 29, 1945, in all shops in and around San Francisco, known generally as marine shops, uptown shops, and fringe shops.

This strike was illegal in that it was not sanctioned by the international president or the executive council of the I. A. of M. in accordance with the laws of the I. A. of M. The lodge was advised that strike sanction would not be granted unless the laws were complied with, and further that the lodge must cease cooperating with East Bay Machinists Local 1304, CIO. The lodge did call the strike contrary to the laws and in defiance of the order of the constitutional authority.

Chaos resulted, millions of dollars in lost wages was being suffered by not only members of the I. A. of M., but by thousands of other workers. The economy of the entire community was affected, resulting in the grand lodge being urged and implored by members of organized labor and the public to take action to bring about an adjustment of this chaotic situation.

The executive council decided to and did convene in San Francisco on February 16, 1946, for the purpose of making a personal investigation and getting first-hand information. The result was that charges were preferred against Lodge No. 68; a hearing was held before a trial committee; the lodge was found guilty of the charges; a decision rendered to temporarily suspend the lodge; and the grand lodge ordered to take over the functions of the local lodge and administer its affairs until the suspension is lifted. The suspension became effective at 12:30 p. m. March 11, 1946.

The executive council negotiated an agreement for and in behalf of the membership of San Francisco Lodge, No. 68, I. A. of M.,

covering the so-called uptown shops and an agreement covering the so-called fringe shops. These agreements became effective on March 11, 1946. The executive council then ordered termination of the strike in these shops.

The following new hourly rates now prevail:

	Minimum rate per hour
No. 1. Machinists, erection, dismantling, and maintenance of machinery or mechanical equipment in publishing houses, printing-press establishments, and breweries, or new construction work of like nature in industrial plants, etc., performed by and through contractors	$1.81
Helpers, this classification	1.31
No. 2. Die and toolmakers, experimental, model and instrument work	1.81
No. 3. Maintenance machinists: Machinists on erection, dismantling, repairing, and maintenance of machinery and mechanical equipment used in the operation of the employer's plant or business	1.64
Helpers, this classification	1.24
No. 4. Journeymen machinists: General jobbing, manufacturing, and repair shops	1.51
Helpers, this classification	1.14

(NOTE.—When employees of No. 4 classification are sent on outside work, their rate shall be $1.64 minimum per hour for machinists and $1.24 minimum per hour for helpers, excepting when the work is performed in such institutions, or under conditions set forth in No. 1 classification. In such case the minimum rate shall be $1.81 and $1.31 per hour for machinists and helpers.)

	Minimum rate per hour
No. 5. Specialists	$1.31
No. 6. Apprentice rates: Computed on percentage basis of journeyman machinist's rate as follows:	
First 928 hours, 52 percent	78
Second 928 hours, 56.5 percent	85
Third 928 hours, 60 percent	90
Fourth 928 hours, 65 percent	98
Fifth 928 hours, 69.5 percent	1.05
Sixth 928 hours, 74 percent	1.12
Seventh 928 hours, 74 percent	1.25
Eighth 928 hours, 91 percent	1.37

Since the council's arrival in San Francisco, the I. A. of M. and other parties to the Pacific coast master and ship repair agreements accepted the 18 cents per hour increase approved by the National Shipbuilding Conference in Washington, D. C., which bound the membership of lodge No. 68. The executive council then ordered termination of the strike in the marine shops.

The following new hourly rates now prevail:

Machinist, new construction work	$1.38
Machinist, ship-repair work	1.54

All shops, marine, uptown, and fringe will resume operations on Monday, March 18, 1946. Members formerly employed in shipyards and ship-repair shops will be notified individually by the grand lodge when to report for work. Members formerly employed in the uptown and fringe shops will report for work on Monday, March 18. All members, after returning to work, will be checked and must qualify for a work clearance.

On March 10, 1946, a meeting of San Francisco Lodge No. 68 was held in the civic auditorium. At this meeting a motion was adopted to secede from the I. A. of M. and form Machinists Union No. 68.

All members of the I. A. of M. are advised that this secession action is illegal. No group of seceding members can, under any circumstances, by any action, cancel or take away any individual's membersship in the I. A. of M. or jeopardize his rights therein.

It is reported that this secession movement was sponsored and advocated by the former leadership of lodge 68, I. A. of M., and that they are now heading "Machinists Union No. 68."

Any member of the I. A. of M. attending a meeting of this dual group, or who participates in any of their activities, will jeopardize his good standing in the International Association of Machinists.

The former leadership of San Francisco Lodge, No. 68, I. A. of M., have been misleading the members, they have defied our laws; they have been guilty of many illegal acts. They will also attempt, by their statements and promises, to persuade many to follow them in their new venture. We must warn and advise those who desire to maintain their good standing membership in the I. A. of M. not to fall for such statements and promises. Instead they should visit the headquarters at 108 Valencia Street, San Francisco, Calif., bring their due book with them, and arrange to be kept in good standing. Failure to have paid the illegal strike assessment will not be a bar to being kept in good standing.

San Francisco Lodge, No. 68, I. A. of M., has been in existence for 56 years and is an old and cherished lodge in our association. It is a beacon beckoning the younger generation to become affiliated with our association. The grand lodge is determined to maintain this grand old lodge, and is equally determined not to let a few misguided individuals destroy the work and efforts of so many of our staunch and loyal members.

While the executive council has temporarily suspended the lodge, we did so for the purpose of preserving the lodge. We will administer the affairs of the lodge until we have weeded out those who are not loyal to our association, and until a new leadership is developed who, when selected by the membership, can be depended upon to guide the lodge and administer its affairs in a lawful manner in accordance with the laws of our association. When this is accomplished the suspension will be lifted and thereafter the lodge will function as a local lodge of the I. A. of M.

In the meantime, preserve all of your rights and benefits in the association by keeping yourself in good standing. To accomplish this, pay your dues at our office, 108 Valencia Street, San Francisco, Calif. If, for any reason, you are in bad standing, consult the grand lodge representative at the above office.

Fraternally yours,

By order of the executive council, I. A. of M.

ERIC PETERSON,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *March 14, 1946.*

A Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish under an extension of remarks to insert in the RECORD a communication which appeared in a Pennsylvania newspaper:

A COMMUNICATION

The Army says I can't wear my uniform after I arrive home because I'll be impersonating a soldier.

The stores say I can't buy a suit of clothes because they haven't my size.

The police say I can't go on the streets naked, because it is against the law.

I would gladly stay off the streets, but I can't find a house to live in and with the shortage of lumber I can't buy a barrel.

Having been wounded, the Army won't take me back because I'm not physically fit.

I shall be 21 in 1948. Can you tell me who will be running on the Republican ticket for President?

This Bill Provides $400 Increase Per Annum Across the Board for Federal Officers and Workers With Salaries Less Than $10,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, after 2 or 3 days of debate and consideration, the House, by a vote of 337 to 27, passed H. R. 5939, providing additional compensation for approximately 1,000,000 officers and employees of the Federal Government, effective July 1, 1946.

I was present and was one of the 337 who voted for the bill.

There were three proposals before the House for consideration:

First. H. R. 5939, as reported by the Civil Service Committee of the House to the House, provided for a straight increase across the board of 18½ percent for all Federal officers and employees that now approximates 1,300,000 persons, but they will be reduced to 987,000 by July 1, 1946, and whose present basic salaries range from $1,320 to $10,000. If H. R. 5939 had been approved by the House then the salaries would have ranged from $1,564.20 to $14,142.97, except this bill would include the salaries of members of the Cabinet and would increase their salaries from $15,000 to almost $20,000 a year. Serious objections were offered to the original H. R. 5939 because of the small increase it would give to the lower paid Federal employees. Some of them would receive an increase of only $244.20 over and above the salary they are now receiving, while those now receiving $10,000 would receive an increase of $4,142.97, and those receiving a salary of $5,000 would receive an increase of $1,500 over their present salary. About 60 percent of these increases would go to the employees receiving substantially small salaries, and 40 percent to those already receiving substantially large salaries. The total cost of this increase under H. R. 5939 would have been approximately $400,000,000 annually.

I might say that these increases do not apply to the salaries of the President, Vice President, to the judges of the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, or to Members of the House and Senate. Neither does this increase apply to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or to many of the civil employees of those departments of the Government.

Second. Mr. REES, of Kansas, the ranking minority member of the Civil Service Committee, offered an amendment. His amendment cut out any increase for officers and employees whose salaries now are or are in excess of $10,000 a year, and he provided a graduated increase based on the salaries these officers and employees are now receiving. Those in the lower brackets would receive a much larger increase in proportion to those in the higher brackets. Sixty-one or more percent of those whose salaries are in the low- or moderate-income brackets would have benefited much more under the Rees amendment than they would have under the original bill, H. R. 5939, and no one could receive an increase in salary whose salary now is in excess of $10,000.

The Rees amendment appealed to those who desired to give the greatest consideration to the Federal employees whose salaries were in the lower and moderate brackets.

Third. Mr. LYLE, of Texas, offered a substitute to the Rees amendment. His substitute provided for a straight increase across the board of $400 per year to all persons included in this act. The persons with small salaries would receive increases of $400 and those whose salaries are $10,000 would receive a like sum. An amendment was offered to the Lyle amendment denying this increase of $400 per year to those whose present salaries are $10,000 a year or more and that amendment was accepted and the Lyle amendment, as amended, was adopted in lieu of the Rees amendment and in lieu of the original bill by a very substantial majority in the House, and the bill as finally amended was approved by a record vote of the House of 337 to 27. The amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas would have cost less than $400,000,000. The Lyle amendment, as adopted, would have cost annually approximately $400,000,000. There was very little difference in the cost to the Government between the Lyle amendment and the original H. R. 5939. The Lyle amendment would bring more benefits to the officers and employees with small or moderate incomes than they would have received under the original H. R. 5939, and, of course, those with incomes above moderate and high will receive less increase than they would have received under H. R. 5939, and the Lyle amendment also eliminates these increases to those whose present salaries are $10,000 and above. In other words about 61 percent would be more benefited by the Lyle amendment than they would have been under the original bill, H. R. 5939, and those with incomes in the higher brackets representing about 40 percent of the persons benefited under this legislation will receive less increase under the Lyle amendment than they would have received under the original bill. In fact, under the original bill, H. R. 5939, many employees of the Government would have received a little over $200 increase while members of the Cabinet would have received approximately $4,000 increase.

The main purpose of this bill was to provide additional compensation on account of the increased cost of living, and an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House felt there should not exist this great difference in fixing the increases. Members of the House and Senate receive a salary of $10,000 each per year. They must go through campaigns, and there are many other demands made on them that are not made on the appointive officers of the Government. This bill does not include any elected officers or employees in the Government, and if Members of the House and Senate can get along on $10,000 a year salary, other officers of the executive branch of the Government should be able to do likewise. Members of the Cabinet already receive $15,000 a year in salary. Of course, if we had plenty of money in the Treasury and our country was not facing a national debt approaching $300,000,000,000 and other contingent liabilities running into the billions we could be much more liberal with the executive officers of the Federal Government receiving more than $10,000 a year.

This was a very difficult bill, but I feel that the Congress worked out and adopted the very best bill that could be put through at this time. This is a very substantial increase over the bill recently passed by the Senate. While the bill was not entirely satisfactory to me, I was very glad to have an opportunity to give this bill my support and bring this substantial relief to hundreds of thousands of our Federal workers who find it difficult to meet the high cost of living in providing for themselves and their families. We passed a bill for postal workers April 2, giving postmasters, officers, and other employees in the postal service, an increase of $400 annually across the board.

Increased Cost of Living Justifies Increase of Pay to Postmasters, Officers, and Other Employees of the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House, by unanimous vote, favorably reported to the House H. R. 5059, which provides for an increase of pay to postmasters, officers, and other employees of the postal service.

After full debate and consideration, the House, by a record vote, approved this bill by a vote of 368 to 1. I was very glad indeed to be present and to urge the adoption of this bill and was one of the 368 who voted for it.

This bill granted an increase of $400 annually for each of all the postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service whose rates of compensation are prescribed by the act entitled, "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service," approved July 6, 1945, except fourth-class postmasters and those postal employees that are paid on an hourly or part-time basis. This bill grants part-time employees compensation at the rate of 20 cents an hour, and it is further provided that postmaster of the fourth class receive an additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 20 percent of their annual basic compensation. In other words, the postal employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis and fourth-class postmasters do not receive the additional $400 per annum but the 20 cents an hour to part-time postal employees is an increase comparable to the yearly increase received by the postmasters, officers, and other postal employees of the postal service, and likewise, the 20-percent increase in the basic pay of fourth-class postmasters is an increase comparable to the increase of other postmasters, officers, and postal employees.

This increase is made necessary because of the increased cost of living. It becomes effective as of January 1, 1946.

It is hoped that the Senate will act promptly and favorably, and that the bill will be approved by the President.

Let Us Not Send American Grain Abroad To Keep European Breweries and Distilleries in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HADWEN C. FULLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of evidence that neither the American people nor the starving peoples of Europe are getting a square deal from our exportation of American grain abroad.

For that reason I have introduced H. R. 5893, a bill to prohibit the exportation of American grain to nations which are manufacturing alcoholic beverages from agricultural products while their people are starving.

Through this legislation I hope to bring about an investigation by the Congress and the Federal Government which will determine the extent to which the alcoholic-beverage industry abroad is using agricultural products which should be used for food for starving peoples.

Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of the Congress more interested than I in seeing that the people of Europe are kept from starving, but it is not fair to them, nor to the American people, who are going without, that the alcoholic-beverage industry in those nations should continue to use grain during this crucial time.

Even if only European grain were being used to make beer and other alcoholic beverages, this would not be right, but American grain sent abroad to relieve hunger is also being used for that purpose while Americans at home take up another notch in their belts.

I call the attention of the House to reputable press reports that we have

shipped 8,000,000 pounds of malt to Holland and Holland has resumed shipment of Heinekens beer to the United States.

As a sidelight on this situation, I know the farmers of America will be interested to know that in Europe a short time ago Denmark gave France 20,000 tons of American wheat in exchange for 20,000 tons of American corn and 430,000 American dollars. While our farmers are told to cut down the feeding of their hogs so the grain may be given to starving Europe, Denmark got our corn from France in order to feed her pigs.

In my district and throughout the Nation thousands of persons in the brewing industry, many of them veterans, have been thrown out of their jobs with the sharp reduction of our grain to breweries. Yet I am told that abroad curtailment of grain to European breweries has been no greater than that to our own breweries.

I submit to the House that if a thorough investigation establishes that millions of bushels of American grain, and grain raised in starving countries, are going into beer and alcoholic beverages abroad then it is not right that we should continue to supply Europe with American grain at the expense of public health and employment. And I believe that if such an investigation is made, the results will startle the Nation.

May I repeat that I will support every worthwhile program to feed the starving peoples of the world as vigorously as possible, but I also intend to do everything I can to see that America does not suffer in health and employment so that the alcoholic beverage industry abroad can flourish.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of our big problems today is to seek a correction of the sale and disposition of the surplus property so our veterans, and our people, generally, may have some reasonable opportunity to obtain a portion of it. At the moment it appears that there are some very inequitable and unfair policies adopted respecting the disposition of this surplus property. Our veterans, our farmers, our small businessmen, and our people throughout the length and breadth of our Nation want to secure some articles, or articles of this surplus property, but it is a sad commentary to note that they are usually prevented from obtaining that which they desire when they attend these sales. There is too much red tape involved in these sales of surplus property. Many instances have been reported of the sales being made in large lots, and to authorized dealers, and this procedure has been a barrier against the rank and file of our people, and our veterans, obtaining any part or portion of this huge stock pile of surplus property. Many people want to buy some part of this property, but they are prevented from making the purchase they desire by the multitude of rules respecting the same, and by the plans adopted and carried out at such sales. This policy is exactly opposite to the intent of Congress, as it was the clear intention of that legislative body that the sale and disposition of our surplus war property should be made so that the people of every community, including our veterans of this war, should have the fair and reasonable opportunity to purchase any part or parcel thereof they might desire.

Mr. Speaker, a very illuminating article appeared in the Washington Post, of date April 3, 1946, reflecting some of the ills pertaining to the disposition of this property, which article I herewith extend into the RECORD as a part of my own remarks, and which article I hope all may read. This article is as follows:

SIX HUNDRED VETERANS EAGER TO BUY FIND LITTLE AT SURPLUS SALE

(By Sam Stavisky)

BALTIMORE, April 2.—Six hundred veterans converged here today eager to participate in the widely-publicized sale of $1,500,000 worth of surplus photographic equipment.

But when they got here they found the cupboard virtually bare. The surplus stock pile had been stripped of all choice equipment, particularly cameras, by a long list of buyers with higher priorities.

The top preference group included four Army and Navy canteens, which are permitted to sell the surplus equipment to servicemen for personal use, although veterans are restricted by law to purchases for operating a business only.

Among the canteens making purchases were the Army post exchange at Bolling Field, $1,066; Navy ship's store at West Potomac Park, $300; and ship's service at Indian Head, Md., $668.

At the opening of the sales "for veterans only" today, the high priority holders already had bought over $800,000 worth of equipment, according to Paul S. Greer, sales officer of the War Assets Administration, which is disposing of the surplus.

Only around $50,000 to $75,000 worth of what is left over is of any value to the veterans, he said. Greer described the sales, so far as veterans are concerned, a fizzle.

This surplus sale is the first held for photographic equipment, which rates second only to motor vehicles in popularity with the veterans, according to the thousands of applications filed with War Assets. In Washington alone 600 veterans obtained certificates of eligibility to participate in this sale, and many of them were among the disappointed group of would-be purchasers here today.

The sale was advertised over the eight WAA regions east of the Mississippi, but so great was the demand that veterans showed from all over, including one who flew in from Los Angeles. The west coast veteran, Samuel A. Levine, hoped to buy enough equipment to open a camera shop in Los Angeles, but all he was permitted to buy of the limited stock was $250 worth. His plane fare was $128.

Dismayed by the unexpected heavy demands of high-priority holders, WAA made an attempt to warn veterans that there'd be little left for them, but with little success. Veterans poured into Baltimore yesterday and today, and more are expected tomorrow. The sale to veterans continues through Thursday. The sale itself has been well-handled and orderly.

Heaviest buyer was Veterans' Administration, which announced the $100,000 worth of equipment will be used in its shop-retraining program for veterans' hospital patients. The second highest purchase of $35,660 was made by the Virginia State Board of Education. High priorities were also held by the YMCA, Boy Scouts of America, Maine Seacoast Missionary Society, Science Service, 1719 N Street NW., and National Geographic.

Indignant veterans asserted that the skimming off of the best items was further proof that the veterans' preference given to them under the Surplus Property Act needed to be given a priority next only to the Federal Government. It has been estimated by surplus-property officials that the top priority holders—Government agencies, State and municipal governments, and tax-supported institutions—number 350,000.

In Washington the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments announced several days ago it will recommend Congress give veterans the No. 2 purchasing priority. All major veterans' organizations have requested the action.

Mr. Speaker, at the sale referred to in the newspaper article above, the photographic equipment was offered for sale, and the time and place of the sale was indicated, but when the veterans arrived, in compliance with the notice of sale, they found that others had preceded them and practically all of the desirable property had already been sold and taken away, leaving only the crumbs for the veterans to purchase if they desired that kind, type, and character of property. It has become a national topic of conversation, and almost a national scandal, respecting the manner and method of handling this surplus property. Many instances have been reported of the deliberate destruction of this property by Army officers, in an effort to dispose of it in order that they would not have the responsibility of caring for it. That character of waste and destruction of this surplus war property is entirely contemptible and unthinkable. Those Army officers who participated in, or sanctioned, this utter destruction of this property should be forced to respond either in replacing this property, or in paying for the same, or in losing their commissions. That policy is unthinkable on the part of any officer in the United States Army, and such an act would condemn any officer as being entirely incapable of serving in that capacity.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that some special effort may be made to rectify the ills that now exist in the disposition of surplus property. A much higher priority should be extended to our veterans, so they will be able to secure some of this property which they need and which they desire. And, these sales should not be so conducted as to eliminate any purchaser—the property should be sold, in the regular way, at the advertised time and place—and no one should be permitted to select the desirable property from the lot, and purchase it, leaving the undesirable property for others. These sales must be fair and equitable, and every American citizen should have a fair chance to buy that which he or she desires in the competition of the sale, without partiality being shown to the prospective bidders. It is my considered judgment that if the present policy is pursued, in the manner indicated in the newspaper article made a part hereof,

the sale of surplus property will become a mockery and a shame in our Nation. The Administrator must adopt a policy of fairness in all of these activities, and that policy must remain inviolate.

Principles of Sound Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Leslie C. Stratton, national director of public relations for the Boy Scouts of America, delivered an excellent address at the annual meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars held at Kansas City, Mo., on December 6, 1945. I heartily approve of the sentiments expressed by Mr. Stratton, and ask that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO APPLY THE PRINCIPLES OF SOUND PUBLIC RELATIONS

I appreciate the honor you have conferred on the Boy Scouts of America in inviting its director of public relations to come here today and talk over with you the important topic of public relations. I am happy, indeed, to share with you what we have learned through the years in building up and maintaining an understanding attitude toward Scouting. The same fundamentals of public relations apply to the Veterans of Foreign Wars; indeed, to any organization, industry, or group that comes under public purview.

Let me congratulate the Veterans of Foreign Wars on its awareness of the dominant role of sound public relations in carrying out aims and objectives. It denotes progressiveness.

In discussing ways and means of applying the principles of good public relations, I think we should have clearly in our minds just what we mean by public relations. Some think that the name itself is all embracing; that it defines an organization, an industry or a person's relations with the public. Others define public relations as the art of interpreting an organization and its policies to the public. Both definitions are good. There are, of course, many others.

To my way of thinking, there are seven important aspects of public relations which give substance to what we are trying to accomplish. Perhaps I shouldn't say aspects, although I believe they are. They might be regarded as seven correlated definitions. Here they are: Public relations basically is the art of informing people by telling them the truth. Public relations is the art of living together. Public relations is the art of working together. Public relations is the art of evaluating and applying research to common objectives. Public relations is the art of mobilizing experienced personnel, professional, and volunteer, for broad worthy social purposes. Public relations is the art of being creative, and, finally, public relations is the art of being resourceful. There you have them as I envison public relations.

And keep in mind that we are considering public relations rather than publicity. They are related, of course, but there is a difference of which most of you are aware. Publicity takes care of the present; it projects the day-by-day activities of an organization. Publicity is the up-to-the-minute reporting of facts and events in an organization which are interesting. Public relations, on the other hand, contemplates long-range planning. It interprets and puts into practice basic policies that have been established by the organization, utilizing the various channels of dissemination.

What are these channels by which our thoughts and our policies are brought to the attention of the public? Let me give them to you in the order that man himself developed them. They are: word of mouth; the written word, which includes letters, books, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, exhibits, and billboards; music, the theater, the movies, and newsreels, the radio, and now television. All are important; not one may be neglected in a rounded program. We should use these media nationally, regionally, and locally. And let us not forget, the closer you get to your neighbor the more effectively you interpret your organization and its policies. I have only to illustrate that a fire in your own community is more real than one you have heard about a thousand miles away.

I have enumerated the channels by which the public-relations program is interpreted and I have given you my own definitions of the term. What, you may ask, determines the success of a sound public-relations program and how does one apply the principles in his own organization?

Let me say that success depends on everyone doing a good job. We feel that if the Boy Scout himself and his troop are doing a good job—if our local councils and local public-relations committees are doing a good job, and if we at national headquarters are doing a good job—then success at the bar of public opinion is assured. We feel that one of the finest public-relations tools the Boy Scouts of America has is the Boy Scout himself with his character-building assets of good conduct, consideration for others, his willingness to serve, and his devotion to God and country. He is our example at national headquarters and in the community. He is the one who inspires the rest of us to do a good public-relations job.

The success of a public-relations program depends, too, on the kind of leadership it has nationally and locally. The guiding spirit, the public-relations director, must have the moral and spiritual conviction and the zeal and fortitude of a Saint Paul. He must believe wholeheartedly in his organization and its objectives; he must have the confidence and support of his leadership. His public-relations committee, whether at national headquarters or its counterparts locally, must include men who are respected both personaliy and professionally, whose advice will strengthen the program. In our Boy Scouts public relations committee, for example, are many former scouts who have achieved leadership in public life, industry, the arts, professions, and sciences. Their interest in serving is real and their earlier experiences in scouting, which have been assets in later life, are helpful in charting our public-relations course.

A public-relations program must have objectives. Since it is on the community level that you are especially interested, let me trace for you our Boy Scout program. Stated in a broad way, the objectives of the public-relations program of the Boy Scouts of America are two—namely: (a) To maintain attitudes or public opinion so that boys desire to be scouts; and (b) to maintain conditions so that men are willing to give service to scouts and support the movement for others.

To further these objectives, the national public-relations committee of the scouts has set up more than 300 local public-relations committees patterned after the national committee and taking leadership from it. Our national public-relations service furnishes these local committees with appropriate material adaptable to the various channels of dissemination to help them carry out basic objecives.

Let us together briefly examine the Boy Scouts of America's public-relations tenets. They are:

PUBLIC RELATIONS IS BASICALLY THE ART OF INFORMING THE PEOPLE BY TELLING THEM THE TRUTH

No public-relations program, however, well conceived and adroitly promoted, can succeed unless it is founded on truth. You simply cannot fool all of the people all of the time. Today as never before in the history of the world, there is a need for "a deep and abiding reverence for truth." Truth ultimately destroys evil.

In the early days of scouting in America men of strong minds, stout hearts, and capable hands gave the movement its start. They believed in it, and believing in it, they felt that it was their God-given duty to protect scouting from evil in any form. If they were to capture the imaginations of boys through the vehicle of the movement, they held that it had to be kept so clean that it would never let them down. For nearly 36 years now but few boys who have ever worn the uniform of the Boy Scouts of America have been disillusioned by deceit, evasion, or untruth. Scouting is forthright. It is attractive to boys and is kept so by its idealism, traditions, and great purpose. Public relations is charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that "the truth is well told." And the art of telling the truth isn't difficult. The first thing, of course, is to be sure of your facts. When they have been checked and double checked the story, tersely written, should be released through every possible channel of communication. I believe I can say that news releases issued by the Boy Scouts of America receive prompt attention in all newspaper offices and they are never queried. They are taken at face value because of the confidence we have engendered by our regard for truth.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IS THE ART OF LIVING TOGETHER

Whether we like it or not we have to live together in the world. And as it is a world of men, it is, therefore, an imperfect world. But with all the deviltry that is loose, it is a rather fine world after all. Public-relations activities that are based on truth, that repeat and repeat those truths, are making a contribution to a better world for our sons and their sons. In scouting we believe that we have a virile movement, one that is so designed that it is attractive to all boys wherever they are in the world. Were you at my desk and had the opportunity, as I have, to read of the accomplishments of these boys—Boy Scouts—you would have a succession of thrills. Boy Scouts truly played an heroic part in the winning of the war. It is my belief that scouting is the most democratic movement at work in the world today. It brings boys of all races, all creeds, and all colors together on common ground.

Boy Scouts can, given time, remake this world. They can wipe out hate and prejudice and cupidity. When the Boy Scout, no matter from which nation he may have sprung, repeats the Scout oath and law, he means it. Indeed, he lives it. As a matter of fact, he rarely, if ever, forgets it during all the years of his life. Scouting plants deep in the heart of a boy a concern for others. Continue to plant these seeds throughout the continents, and in a generation or two we'll have a world in which men will be living together in peace, respecting each other as we would have it under the "four freedoms." Here, then, is a challenge to public-relations groups in Scouting—to see that the people, all the people, wherever they are, understand the true purposes of the movement.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IS THE ART OF WORKING TOGETHER

In a membership of nearly 2,000,000 boys and men you must have a satisfactory program—one that is well coordinated and directed—if you are to hold the enthusiasm of your membership. Here, again, is evidence of the genius of the Boy Scout movement. It gives men of character an opportunity to do something for boys, and boys to do something for themselves. Scouting never approaches its problems on a dollars-and-cents basis. Its first concern is to discover the needs of boys in a given community and then determine to meet the situation as it exists. After that, men who have a concern for boys are invited to come together—to work together—and evolve a plan that will give strength to the local council in order that it may bring Scouting to more boys. Frankly, my friends, the 425,000 volunteers in the Boy Scout movement, broken down into their individual units, constitute one of the greatest forces for good this country possesses. They work individually and collectively for an ideal—a better boyhood, a better manhood. And year in and year out their numbers grow. Actually, the Boy Scouts of America helps keep men young, because it keeps men close to boys. You grow old in a poker game, gentlemen, but you don't grow old as fast in a Boy Scout camp. One of our public-relations jobs is to see to it that an ever-increasing number of desirable men have an opportunity to pool their talents by working together for boys through Scouting.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IS THE ART OF EVALUATING AND APPLYING RESEARCH TO COMMON OBJECTIVES

Any sound public-relations program must be based on facts. And the way to get the facts is through research. Today's great organizations have proved beyond doubt that there is no such thing as venture when they have first sought the facts, evaluated and applied them to a given project. The movement which I represent must be sure it is right before it makes decisions because those actions have a bearing on the lives of generations of boys who will one day have in their hands the destiny of this country. The Boy Scouts of America does its best to know what is right, not who is right. It accomplishes its purpose by the work of its own research division, local studies, "customer" and other surveys. Sound executive administrative activity such as this affects every member of the organization. It seeps down to the smallest local council; indeed, to the troop itself eventually. So, actually, you are building confidence in the program and the leadership of the organization, and when you have achieved that on the part of 425,000 volunteers and 1,500,000 boys, and 1,800 professional executives, you are well on your way to attaining, broadly, the goal of public relations; public acceptance. You are constantly adding to the value of the most precious thing you possess—your reputation.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IS THE ART OF MOBILIZING EXPERIENCED PERSONNEL, PROFESSIONAL AND VOLUNTEERS, FOR BROAD, WORTHY SOCIAL PURPOSES

In our respective organizations there are many gifted men, experienced in the various fields of public relations, who would gladly assume positions of leadership locally to carry out our program of public education. It isn't difficult gradually to discover these men if you have a plan and are patient. The Boy Scouts of America have in 10 years discovered enough experienced men locally to organize 300 successfully functioning local public-relations committee. They serve as volunteers. They do a fine job. They grow as their interest in promoting the Boy Scout program grows. I need not tell you that these committees are a great strength to their local councils. But, gentlemen, it took planning and patience to mobilize them.

Of course, there is still much work here for the Boy Scouts of America to do.

As we have 540 local councils, we have yet to organize 240 public-relations committees in as many councils. But we are on our way; we have found our way; the pioneering job is done. Perhaps in the next 5 years every local council of the Boy Scouts of America will have its own public-relations committee. Committee personnel is made up of men who represent the public educational outlets in a given community—newspaper editors, radio executives, advertising men, public speakers, magazine writers, motion-picture theater managers, music composers, outdoorsmen, and so on. In every case we do our best to attract former Scouts to accept committee posts. Obviously, we only seek those who qualify.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IS THE ART OF BEING CREATIVE

Nothing happens by itself, either on a national or community level, and as this discussion is based on community enterprise let us for the moment explore a public-relations opportunity for an organization such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Every community in America has felt the tragic consequences of the war just concluded. All over the land there are homes that will be forever empty because loved ones of those homes—heroes in the eyes of the Nation—sleep forever in battlefields that actually ring the world. We hear of community groups setting up memorial committees to honor these dead in many ways—by naming streets in their memory, by erecting stone shafts to commemorate their deeds, and laying out parks to perpetuate their idealism. Why not living memorials to these brave dead? I have in mind the organization of Boy Scout troops, sponsored by organizations such as yours and given leadership by the best men among you. If such a step were taken throughout America now, you would accomplish four things—all vitally important: (1) Honor our heroic dead fittingly by living memorials—Boy Scout troops—which would perpetuate the best traditions of the United States; (2) help to wipe out juvenile delinquency in all strata of society, and thereby save the taxpayers millions of dollars annually; (3) build up a citizenship that would accept as its responsibility the duty to uphold the democracy and the principles of the great Republic we so devotedly cherish; and (4) prove by deeds your concern for the country you yourselves so valiantly defended in an hour of trial. Here is an opportunity at the community level which needs earnest consideration.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IS THE ART OF BEING RESOURCEFUL

As you see, public relations is many-sided: It is basically the art of informing the people by telling them the truth, the art of living together, the art of working together, the art of evaluating and applying research to common objectives, the art of being resourceful, the art of mobilizing experienced personnel, professional and volunteers, for broad worthy social purposes and it is the art of being creative. If you desire favorable public reaction to your works, you must be resourceful in telling your story. Here is where your local public-relations committees play their part. They mobilize local outlets to assist in what is, no more no less, a public education program. Resourcefulness is important here because your program must be repeatedly told and retold truthfully, if you desire public acceptance and appreciation. And the seasoning, of course, is the intelligent use of imagination as it is needed.

Let us examine one of the many Boy Scout war-service projects and trade its course from national headquarters to the local Boy Scout and the community itself. Parenthetically, we take a pardonable pride in the war record of our Boy Scouts, just as we do of the constructive things they are doing in these days of peace. Boy Scouts have participated in 70 war-related projects. Typical was the Boy Scouts-General Eisenhower campaign for waste paper. They collected in this campaign to alleviate the critical shortages in excess of 318,000 tons.

At national headquarters we devised incentive awards to be bestowed on Scout troops and the individual Scouts. For example, we had special General Eisenhower medals designed and cast. These medals were awarded at the community level to Scouts who had collected a thousand or more pounds of waste paper during the campaign. One side of the medal bore a likeness of General Eisenhower, the reverse side featured an engraved citation extolling the achievement of the Scouts.

As a unit incentive, we announced that a World War II real shell container, with a scroll bearing a special citation from General Eisenhower, would be presented to each Scout unit which collected an amount of waste paper equivalent to 1,000 pounds for each Scout in the unit.

These were some of the useful tools that our movement supplied to local Scout groups for local use. They were supplemented by appropriate factual material, for local adaptation as the case may be, by public-relations committees in newspapers and publications and on the radio.

As you see, local Boy Scout public-relations committees play an important role in these Scout activities. They work with the national committee, but they are in the driver's seat locally. They look to national headquarters for help in basic policies and for such assists in the way of material as I have indicated in the case of the wastepaper campaign.

Another community function that was carried out in the wastepaper campaign was the setting up of courts of honor and other special ceremonies at which the awards were presented to the Scouts "who had performed over and above the call of duty."

Local committees stimulate press coverage. They develop ways of presenting Scouts over the radio. They enlist the support and endorsement of civic, religious, business, and professional groups. They tie in Scouting with the community events and celebrations, such as the Fourth of July and Christmas. They play up camping—the out-of-doors. But they never lose sight that everything is built around the Scout, and the patriotic and character-building programs that are represented in the aims and aspirations of the Boy Scouts of America. Ever alert to making Scouting available to more boys, they make sure that the parents of prospective candidates are kept abreast of current activities of Scout troops, for Scouting, like any other organization that is worth its salt, should never long remain static. New challenges have to be met; new problems await solution. There are always interesting facts to be presented—human-interest stories and experiences of youth that are worth telling.

Now, as to the application of the community level to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is my conviction that in carrying out any public-relations job there are no substitutes, either at the national or the local levels, for truth, research, training, imagination, realism, initiative, resourcefulness, acquaintanceship, coordination, cooperation, simplicity, and just plain work. And I hope that you noticed I put the word "truth" first.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars start out with a public relations plus in my opinion, as it is composed of men who have served their country and served it well on foreign soil. The Veterans of Foreign Wars represent men of courage who have banded together in worthy common purpose. So, as I said, I think you have a public relations plus in winning acceptance and approval of your

organization and the things for which it stands. Your problem is analogous to that of other organizations which embark on programs which must be interpreted to the public, along with the aims of the organization itself.

Your national organization is active, your local posts are doing things. No matter how virile a post, no matter how sound and constructive its basic policies set up at your national conventions, its light will never shine before men unless you tell your story. Just as we interpret Scouting prominently, locally, so may you do the same by integrating the activities of your posts into the community pattern. Don't stand aloof; isolation today is a thing of the past.

It is in your power to build up a great reservoir of friendship for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, community by community. All of the public-relations procedures that we in Scouting follow, as I have outlined, are equally applicable to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Peace has brought us all new responsibilities. I know that the Veterans of Foreign Wars will strive to be in the vanguard in doing its share in helping solve some of the problems which face our country, just as the Boy Scouts of America seek to be abreast of the requirements of youth in this shifting world which we bequeath to youth.

Great opportunities for living are offered to all of us. Alfred Tennyson expressed this prophetically in Ulysses 103 years ago when he wrote, and I quote, "Come, my friends, 'tis not too late to seek a newer world."

Congress and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress and Price Control," published in today's New York Times. I think the editorial is worthy of the attention of all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROL

Congress is now confronted with the question whether it should extend price control beyond the present termination date of June 30 of this year, and if so, how it should amend the powers granted to the Office of Price Administration. We are unlikely to deal with this problem intelligently unless we understand the basic economic principles and facts involved.

There has been an unfortunate assumption in Washington that price control is or ought to be the major means of combating inflation. Yet price control deals only with the symptoms and consequences of inflation; it does not deal at all with its two basic causes. The first of these, and the most important, is the increase in the quantity of money and bank credit in the country. The amount of this has more than tripled since the outbreak of the war in Europe. We cannot have such an increase in the monetary purchasing power in circulation without its forcing up the level of prices. The second basic cause is a shortage of goods.

Price control does nothing to remove either of these basic causes. It has at best only a secondary and transitional role to play in combating inflation. Its chief function from now on is to prevent needless price rises in those cases in which a shortage cannot be made up for a long time, and in which a price increase could do little to speed the process. The outstanding example of this is rents on existing housing.

With this background it is clear that the time has come for Congress to make sure that price control is liberalized in some directions, tapered off in others, and in some cases terminated altogether. These general requirements indicate the nature of some of the amendments that are now necessary:

1. Rationing powers should be continued for all goods that are in short supply. Fortunately, Congress has already provided for this. It was a basic mistake for OPA to abolish rationing while continuing price control. This has helped to aggravate the world food crisis. Price ceilings in themselves encourage consumption; as long as they are retained, rationing is required to offset this effect.

2. It is a mistake of the first order to put ceilings on new houses or on rents for new apartments. The effect of this can only be to discourage, reduce, or prevent the construction of buildings now so desperately needed. Rent ceilings should, of course, be retained on existing houses and apartments. Congress would do well, however, to put the States and localities on notice that Federal rent control will definitely terminate on June 30, 1947. In this way the question of rent control could be taken out as soon as practicable from the Federal domain and placed in that of the States and localities, where it properly belongs.

3. Congress should provide that as soon as possible after June 30 price fixing will no longer apply to any commodity that does not enter into the Government's cost-of-living index or is not a recognized substitute for such a commodity. One way in which Congress might deal with this problem would be to instruct OPA to compile and publish a list of such articles subject to price control and to regulate no others later than, say, October 1.

4. To aid the process of decontrol, Congress might provide also that when any product in competitive production once goes below the ceiling price and stays there for, say, 30 days, the price ceiling should be permanently removed. Such a provision would not, of course, prevent a later price rise of that commodity, but it would be a method of checking out commodities, one by one, wherever a sudden price rise was unlikely.

5. Some method must be found for removing articles from price control when they have ceased to be in short supply. The provision that they shall be removed when supply comes into balance with demand is too vague to be of much value. One possible formula, as an illustration, is that OPA should be instructed to remove price controls from any article when the supply or production rate of that article is equal to the average of that in the immediate prewar period and when unfilled orders for it do not exceed the equivalent of a month or two's production.

6. Some liberalization should be made in the pricing standards for goods that remain under control. The profit standard of the period 1936-39, when unemployment averaged more than 8,000,000, is not adequate for full employment conditions. OPA should not be permitted to force any existing firm to sell goods below its actual out-of-pocket costs of production. It should not be permitted to continue cost-absorption policies, or to force manufacturers, wholesalers, or retailers to sell goods at a lower dollar-and-cents margin of profit per unit than the prewar or the existing level.

7. Subsidies should not be increased, but should, on the other hand, be tapered off as rapidly as possible.

8. Congress might well consider setting up a Board of Price Appeals, the members of which would be independent of OPA administrators and appointed directly by Congress itself. Such a board would have purely advisory powers. Its chief function would be to clarify the public mind regarding the factual merits of price disputes.

There is wide possible latitude in amendments to the Price Control Act, but their basic purpose is clear. They should try to provide for a tapering off of price controls as promptly and as smoothly as conditions make possible.

Chester Bowles' Blind Spots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, Merryle Stanley Rukeyser has written a most interesting series of editorials entitled "Chester Bowles' Blind Spots," which were published in the Chicago Herald-American. I presented the first three articles yesterday, and now present the last three articles, and ask unanimous consent to have them published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHESTER BOWLES' BLIND SPOTS
(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)
IV

Chester Bowles, Director of Economic Stabilization, and his fellow economic planners at Washington appear to overlook the simple fact that business enterprisers do not wish to commit economic suicide.

The first rule of business is that survival depends on pleasing customers sufficiently to recoup all costs, including the cost of the tools (capital).

In order to remain in business in a competitive economic society, the business manager, who brings the worker, the materials, and the tools into contact with the customer, who is another worker, must undertake to achieve a selling price which will meet all elements of cost. Not every businessman succeeds. There is many a slip. The records of business mortalities are replete with instances where managers misjudged the ability and the willingness of customers to buy.

Business ventures are nevertheless willing to assume the risk of anticipating customer behavior. They are animated by the hope of success in a free market.

However, if in the face of rising costs Federal administrators arbitrarily hold down selling prices and thus destroy the incentive of being rewarded, business initiative is stilled.

Bureaucrats can arbitrarily fix selling prices, but they cannot assure a high volume of production under price ceilings which businessmen regard as inadequate. For businessmen will not knowingly produce goods at a loss for long periods. If any were foolish enough to undertake to do so, they would be estopped as soon as their capital was exhausted.

For an economic franchise to stay in business is contingent on recouping all costs from the customer.

In the confusion resulting since VJ-day from an unrealistic Federal price policy, business, seeking to survive, has cut down on

unprofitable items and has sought to shift into those which held out the promise of a profit.

According to a brochure prepared by the National Retail Dry Goods Association, kitchen curtain makers, not being able to produce at historic prices in face of the interim rise in costs, shifted to making infant dresses, and for a similar reason makers of baby dresses shifted to the production of kitchen curtains on which they had no prewar price record. Such shifts were designed to take advantage of the OPA policy of allowing higher price ceilings to newcomers. Thus bonehead economic planning interferes with the normal tendency in a competitive economic society of each firm to make those specialties for which it is best fitted.

Likewise, the freezing of the price differential between butter and higher-priced dairy products has led to a shortage of butter. Under present price ceilings it has been deemed more advantageous to shift milk into ice cream, cheese, and fluid-milk channels.

Such adjustments by businessmen do not constitute a sit-down strike, as has been charged, but represent an attempt to survive despite the man-made obstacles created by politicians who fail to understand the philosophy of the cost sheet, which determines success or failure in the business world.

CHESTER BOWLES' BLIND SPOTS

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

V

Restrictive policies growing out of the mutual interaction of politicians and pressure groups upon one another tend to retard the wholly beneficial transition from a war economy to a peace economy.

The cessation of the shooting phase of the war offers the promise of ending the wartime economic detour. It gives an opportunity for once more releasing the productive energies of the people for purposes related to lifting the material well-being of 35,000,000 American families.

On the other hand, during total warfare, Government at times seized up to 60 percent of the output of workers for purposes related to killing and maiming the enemy.

With such need for producing lethal weapons on a mammoth scale behind us, men can once more enjoy all the fruits of their production. In the circumstances, it is puerile to talk in terms of freezing the maladjustments and disparities of the wartime economy.

The premise underlying the demand for freezing wartime take-home pay is fallacious. The assumption that overtime would be eliminated and that industry would drop back from a 45-hour or longer week to a 40-hour week has been disputed.

Besides, the reduction in the 1946 rate of Federal income tax automatically raises take-home pay if other factors remain equal. Similarly, the pressure of wartime to divert 10 percent of wages to war bonds has been relaxed.

But the most significant factor is that the abnormally heavy diversion of goods and services from workers, farmers, and others through the channels of Government can be substantially curtailed in time of peace.

The promise of peace does not lie in further manipulation of the money count, but in the opportunity to reward workers with more and better civilian goods in exchange for a week's work.

Peace also gives an opportunity to release from the working forces some 7,000,000 emergency war workers, including children who should be in schools, old folks beyond the retirement age, and homemakers who for the duration forsook the kitchen for the assembly line.

In addition, regular workers added to the hours available for production by increasing the average length of the workweek. The abnormal increment in the working force, in relation to the total population, was necessitated by the fact that, while Government in the prewar year, 1939, directly employed around 8 percent of the working force, it used upward of 31 percent of the total during war years.

But the total increase was insufficient to offset the growing requirements of government, and output for civilians had to be reduced by Government orders.

Demobilization makes it feasible to release those who temporarily came into the working force as transients animated for the most part by patriotic motives.

The coming of peace necessitates widespread reallocation of personnel, and rigidities imposed by the dogmas of politicians and pressure groups only serve to delay and complicate the benign and desirable process of reconversion. Reconversion means a return to the normal set-up in which production is used primarily to lift the material well-being of civilians.

CHESTER BOWLES' BLIND SPOTS

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

VI

Whereas the businessman knows that his success or failure hinges on the realities as disclosed by simple arithmetic in double-entry form—bookkeeping, Chester Bowles, Director of Economic Stabilization, dwells in the esoteric economic stratosphere of statistical averages.

As businessmen yell when squeezed between frozen selling prices and rising costs, Mr. Bowles throws statistical charts into their faces.

Statistical averages represent unreality, for flesh and blood men and their enterprises constitute deviations from the mean or the average. If one man is 5 feet tall and another is 6 feet, the shorter man's reach is not helped by the fact the average height of the two is 5½ feet.

Businessmen have costs to meet—taxes, payments for goods and services purchased from others, depreciation, wages and salaries, and payments to owners for the use of the tools. They can remain solvent and outside the clutches of the sheriff only if their expenditures stay within their receipts. Each businessman must meet his obligations promptly on the due date with dollars and cents. He cannot satisfy his creditors by dispensing the statistical averages about which Mr. Bowles and his colleagues talk so glibly.

The same bureaucratic confusion runs through the new price-wage policy—recently announced in connection with the settlement of the steel strike.

The Administration revealed that it will grant price increases only in hardship cases where earnings on net worth on an industry-wide basis fall below the 1936–39 level of profits before taxes. If the profit position of an industry as a whole is the criterion, it might well be equaling the 1936–39 level on the average, while the bottom third of the least efficient producers may, nevertheless, be seriously in the red.

Furthermore, the concept of net income before taxes is itself an unreality. Corporate income taxes in 1946 will be at the rate of 38 percent, compared with an average of 17 percent in the 1936–39 base period. Thus, if net income before taxes is equal to the 1936–39 level, then net income after taxes, which is available as a payment for the use of the tools and for the future growth of the business, will of necessity be very much smaller.

Likewise confusion is further confounded by OPA tendencies at times to look at only part of the cost sheet in computing profits. It has spoken poetically of out-of-pocket costs, from which overhead, depreciation, and administrative costs have been laughed out of existence.

The argument of the bureaucrats is that overhead and depreciation and similar costs are fixed and inevitable, and that, in deciding whether or not to produce goods at a fixed price, the businessman should consider only the fluctuating costs, such as wages, which can be avoided by idleness.

The distinction between total actual costs and so-called out-of-pocket costs is clever dialectics. However, the practical business operator, in planning his own operations, knows it would be fatal to his own success and survival to wink at any authentic elements of cost.

Let's Do Away With the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article by the Honorable Thurman Sensing, director of research of the Southern States Industrial Council, at Nashville, Tenn. The title of the article is "Let's Do Away With the OPA."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN SOUTH

(By Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.)

LET'S DO AWAY WITH THE OPA

The Office of Price Administration, backed by the full force of the administrative branch of the Government, is attempting to make opposition to continuance of its price-control policy unpopular by making vociferous claims that it is acting in behalf of the masses of the people, that it is preventing a run-away increase in the cost of living.

However, when we look under the surface of such claims we find that they are untenable; we find that the OPA is stifling production, we find that it is regulating the price of goods which do not exist and which never will exist so long as the OPA continues its dictatorial and contradictory regulations—we find that the OPA is nothing more than a relic of that bureaucracy made necessary by war emergency which should forthwith be abolished for the good of the Nation.

The OPA, typical of all bureaucracy, is antagonistic to the profit system which has made the United States the world's most productive and powerful Nation and which has brought its people the highest standard of living the world has ever known. The OPA is not working in behalf of the masses of the people of this country when it kills that incentive through which alone can be created jobs which the people can fill and produce goods which they can use. Turn in any direction you wish and you find that goods are not being produced because restrictions set up by the OPA make it unprofitable to produce them.

Only two items, both basic necessities, might be made exceptions to the relinquishment of price control—and that only because they cannot be put into immediate production. One is sugar, which must of

necessity await another crop, and the other is rents, because housing also requires a reasonable time to provide.

The removal of price control would, of course, bring a shock to the economic body of America—but it would bring back full production, without which our economic recovery from the effects of the war is impossible, and which the continuation of OPA control will interminably delay. Moreover, it would bring an end to the black market—that inevitable consequence of unwise legislation which causes evasion of the law and favors the few over the many.

However desirable it might be, we need not think we can escape the consequences of war. Even though we won the war, we lost our wealth in winning it, and we must get hard at work to regain this wealth with the least possible delay. How much better to undergo a severe shock by releasing price control immediately and bringing about reconversion quickly than by releasing these controls gradually and having reconversion delayed or made forever impossible. In other words, is it not better to cut off the dog's tail with one swift stroke rather than just a little bit at a time so it won't hurt him so much?

The American economic system has been built upon allowing full incentive to the American people to work and produce, with each individual having the full knowledge and assurance that he will profit in accordance with his own individual efforts and his own individual production. Kill that incentive, as the OPA is doing, and reconversion of the American economy from the effects of the war is impossible.

The trouble with all of us is that we have had our goods rationed and our prices regulated and our lives ordered for us so long by the bureaucratic system set up during the war that we are afraid to strike out again for ourselves. It is only natural that this should be true of the public at large, for it is human nature at work—such a system destroys self-confidence—but the strong hold it has upon us is emphasized by the fact that we find the same apprehension among many businessmen who actually know better, and we find the same fear among our legislators, many of whom honestly feel we should get from under this regimentation but are afraid of the consequences. The OPA, of course, is playing upon these fears to the fullest in order to maintain its hold upon the economy of the people.

Then, too, there are certain powerful forces within this Nation that would like for it to be impossible for America to reconvert through its traditional system of individual freedom and private enterprise. They want the traditional American way of doing things to fail so that the only recourse will be for the Government to take over. Whether that government is communism, or socialism, or fascism, perhaps these forces do not particularly care. They just do not believe in American constitutional democracy.

Such forces are not working in the interest of the masses of the people, and it is not to be believed that any large part of the American people agree with them. Once the people are aware of the dangers which encroach upon them, it is to be believed they will rise in united action and righteous strength as they have done throughout the history of this country and demand those things of their Government which will preserve for them the rights upon which this Nation has grown and prospered.

There is more to the agitation for the continuation of OPA price control than meets the eye. It is time the people of this country give serious thought to this matter and then, having done so, let their position be known in no uncertain terms.

Newspaper Urges Swift Passage of Housing Legislation—Says Housing Regulations May Create Hardship Without Bill To Spur Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement of the Civilian Production Administration order virtually halting nonessential building, many responsible leaders over the country are expressing the fear that this order may create unnecessary hardship unless the legislation needed to spur production is promptly passed by the Congress. The New York Herald Tribune, one of the leading newspapers on the east coast, recently published an editorial pointing out that the public is behind the President's program for housing, and urging the Congress to make all haste in enacting the legislative half of the complete plan to bring housing to our veterans.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include that editorial:

HURDLES FOR THE HOUSING PROGRAM

A Senate Banking subcommittee has restored to the veterans' emergency housing bill the subsidies and the price ceilings on existing homes rejected by the House—provisions which Wilson W. Wyatt, Housing Expediter, says are the heart of the program to build 2,700,000 dwelling units by the end of 1947. There are still many hurdles to be taken before that program can go full speed ahead: approval of this bill by the full committee, passage by the Senate, and, finally, as Senator BARKLEY remarked, "selling" the restored provisions to the House.

In the meantime the Civilian Production Administration, answering fears and queries about the effect of order No. 1 on nonessential construction, issued an interpretation of its strictures. The CPA release explains how citizens' district construction committees will advise on what building is essential or nondeferrable. These committees will represent local government and business, builders and suppliers, the press, etc. They it is who "will screen each project in the light of the peculiarities of the local situation," as Civilian Production Administrator John D. Small has pointed out. In regard to buildings necessary for community life—the badly needed hospital or other public institution—the CPA explanation says that the district committee "can be expected to act in accordance with that need." It also says that the committees "may be expected to take a sympathetic attitude" toward work using materials not critically short for housing. Steel comes to mind. Since not much steel will be required for any but large urban housing developments, presumably we may expect sympathetic consideration for steel construction in areas where it would have no adverse effect upon building or labor supplies for housing. Consideration will be given, the CPA says, to new community needs and to individual hardship cases.

But though local citizens' committees may give to order No. 1 a flexibility too often absent from bureaucratic decisions, not even its sponsors deny that it will cause hardship. And though they deprecate fears that it may have a serious adverse effect on the general economy, nevertheless the public is required to defer already long-deferred building plans. In view of the far-reaching strictures order No. 1 invokes, Congress must, it seems to us, make all haste in enacting the full program to speed production of housing materials and insure decent and modest-priced homes for veterans. We believe that the public is behind that program, and the greater the speed of production, the sooner restrictions on other construction can be lifted.

A Banker's Warning—Pearls From the Congressional Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to the congressional desk an analysis of present-day financial trends by Vice President Riddle, of the Bankers Trust Co., made available through the courtesy of the Economist National Committee for Monetary Policy—an analysis that I have taken the liberty of rearranging and condensing in the interest of brevity and clarity.

Continuously declining interest rates and rising bond prices cannot be ignored by the monetary authorities or by the banking community. The possible long-run consequences on our financial structure and on the general economy should be weighed with great care. It has never been possible to inflate commodity prices, stock prices, or real-estate prices indefinitely, because sooner or later economic forces have called a turn. How far can we inflate bond prices without having these economic forces call the turn? Holding down debt costs is a commendable objective, but when excessive zeal in this direction causes further needless expansion of bank credit and accelerates existing inflationary influences, it is false economy and will ultimately defeat its own ends.

While no comprehensive statement of debt management policy has been announced by the Treasury, it has become more and more apparent that the dominant objective is to keep interest costs at a minimum. In fact, that one objective seems to overshadow completely all other considerations, even the desirability of checking a further rise in our money supply. The Treasury continues to issue large amounts of short-term securities and, with the apparently reluctant acquiescence of the Federal Reserve System, to hold down short-term interest rates. It is generally rumored that the current policy of converting all maturing obligations into seven-eighths percent certificates of indebtedness will be followed for the next several years. Instead of refunding the short debt into longer maturities, according to traditional concepts of sound debt manage-

ment, the present policy is headed in opposite direction, that is, toward the gradual conversion of the debt into short maturities.

Bill rates continue to be pegged by the Federal Reserve at three-eighths percent and certificates rates are held down by the Federal, partly by the preferential discount rate of one-half percent and partly through open-market operations. The Federal Reserve banks, in accordance with Treasury wishes, stand ready to support the market by taking from member banks any amount of short-term issues, thereby supplying the necessary Federal Reserve credit to support debt operations. This, in effect, guarantees a market for short-term securities regardless of the amount issued, and the Treasury depends less and less upon the investing public to absorb the Government debt.

If the Treasury's present policies remain unchanged there is little doubt that the downward trend in interest rates will continue. The mechanism for creating credit and driving up bond prices works almost automatically. The downward influence on rates first affected the intermediate maturities, but gradually spread into the longer maturities eligible for commercial bank ownership. The yield on the longest 2-percent taxable bond outstanding, for example, has declined to 1.26 percent, and on the bank eligible 2½'s of 67–72 to 1.99 percent.

Apparently the Treasury contemplates the continued domination of monetary policies for purely fiscal purposes. So long as this situation prevails, the Federal Reserve System is not free to direct monetary policies toward the traditional objectives of trying to prevent inflation and unsound credit developments. A continuation of present policies will lead to increasing reliance on the banking system to support the debt structure. Instead of encouraging the distribution to the public of the excessive amount of debt held by banks, such policies may cause a growing proportion of the debt to be concentrated in the commercial banks, thereby further increasing the country's already inflated money supply. This additional Federal Reserve credit spreads out over the system as member bank reserves and provides for multiple expansion of member bank credit.

Furthermore, when the banking system supplies the Treasury with unlimited funds at excessively low rates, the Government is relieved from all normal restrains on spending, and its resistance to pressure groups is weakened. With none of the usual tests of the market applied to its financing, the Government finds it hard to resist the easy course of borrowing and spending. Pleas for balancing the Budget and following a sound fiscal course are easily brushed aside.

The easy money advocates give no recognition to the importance of the saver and investor, nor any consideration to the possible long-run consequences of penalizing the thrifty at a time when we are faced with a demand for goods unrivaled in our history and when liquid assets are more than sufficient to support this demand.

It is somewhat disquieting to find the Government so economical and even niggardly in paying interest to those who have saved and furnished the funds for financing the war, and at the same time so generous in its other expenditures.

While there is general recognition of certain benefits from low interest rates, there is a growing conviction among objective students of monetary matters that the doctrine of easy money is being overstressed and its benefits greatly exaggerated. Treasury officials whose policies continue to drive interest rates lower and lower reiterate the benefits of low interest rates but appear to give no consideration to the adverse side of the question. It does not take a prophet to foresee what will happen to them in the next financial crisis or business depression, or what the effects on the banking system will be. Furthermore, any debt management policy based upon the assumption that we will never again go through a financial crisis or depression is short-sighted indeed.

History of the Air-Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion in magazines and newspapers as well as in the Senate about the history of air-mail service. Inasmuch as I had something to do with air-mail service in its early beginnings and with its development to its present state, I asked one of the experts on investigation in the employ of the Senate, Mr. E. W. Cooper, to investigate its history and make a report.

Mr. President, I find that beginning about 1910, the late esteemed and highly respected Senator Morris Sheppard, who was then, I believe a Member of the House, made a number of attempts to have investigations made as to the feasibility of the use of airplane for carrying the mail. He introduced the bill authorizing postage rates for air mail and got a number of small appropriations and his work was splendid and continued up until about the year 1917. He is entitled, therefore, to the greatest credit for having exercised much vision in even dreaming that airplanes could be made useful for air-mail service.

When he became a Member of the Senate, he went into other fields—as I remember, principally agriculture and commerce and later on military affairs—and did not actively pursue the air-mail proposal after he reached the Senate.

Mr. Cooper has shown fully the facts and I think that they ought to be given to the Senate as stated in the first part of his report.

MY PART IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR-MAIL SERVICE

I came to the Senate on March 4, 1917, and was put on the Post Office Committee and immediately took up the fight that seemed to have been lost, and as the following record will show, I defeated the King amendment striking out $100,000 from the postal bill for the purpose of establishing an experimental air-mail line between Washington and New York. The next year we had a similar fight for another $100,000 to continue that experiment. The third year I got through a provision for $450,000 to extend the line from New York to Cleveland and Chicago. The fourth year I had the appropriation increased and got an extension from Chicago to Omaha and then on to San Francisco.

These records as presented by Mr. Cooper show all the details of these various steps. Since that time, as I predicted in 1917, we have not only used air-mail lines running to every State in the Union but to practically every country in the world, and what a successful business it has been and what a profitable business it has been for our Government.

I take great pride in the part that I played in the development of air-mail service, and I ask unanimous consent to publish as a part of my remarks the report that Mr. Cooper has prepared.

I desire also to publish as a part of my remarks a speech of Postmaster General Walker delivered in San Francisco on September 8, 1944, commemorating the twenty-fourth anniversary of the entrance of air-mail service into San Francisco.

It is now proposed, notwithstanding the objections of Senators Gallinger and King and others who were opposed to the project, that all first-class mail be carried by airplanes.

I ask that the matters I have referred to may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have received from the Public Printer an estimate which indicates that the cost of printing in the RECORD will be $300.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF THE AIR-MAIL SERVICE

THE EARLY EFFORTS OF MORRIS SHEPPARD

June 14, 1910, Congressman Morris Sheppard, of Texas, introduced H. R. 2683, for an investigation to determine the practicability and cost of an airplane or airship mail route, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads and died there. (This was 7 years after Orville Wright had made the first airplane flight in 1903.)

May 6, 1918, Mr. Sheppard, in calling up S. 4208, authorizing postage rates on airplane mail, for final passage, stated as follows:

"Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, on May 15 aerial-mail service will be inaugurated between New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. No authority has been given to the Postmaster General to fix the rate for this service. It is necessary to the proper inauguration of the service that the rate be fixed and the object of the bill is to clothe the Postmaster General with the requisite authority. I ask that the bill be read. It is short.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

"The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may require the payment of postage on mail carried by airplane at not exceeding 24 cents per ounce or fraction thereof.'

"The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

"Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Texas if it is practically understood that the rate of postage will be 24 cents.

"Mr. SHEPPARD. That is to be the maximum rate, Mr. President, although I am not advised as to what is the exact intention of the Postmaster General.

"Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if we are to establish a postal route on which it will cost 24 cents an ounce to transmit a letter, I think we might as well abandon the scheme at one time as another. It may amuse somebody for 2 or 3 days, but my impression is that it never will become a reality. However, perhaps it is well enough to try the experiment. It will be about a 2-day wonder, not a 7-day wonder; there is no question about that.

"Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, while I was a Member of the House of Representatives, on June 14, 1910, I introduced in the House a bill to investigate the advisability of establishing an aerial-mail route, which I think was the first bill ever introduced in Congress on the subject. I desire to have that bill incorporated in the RECORD in this connection, as well as the humorous and somewhat skeptical comments of the New York Telegraph on the bill at that time.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objections? The Chair hears none.

"The matter referred to is as follows:

"'[H. R. 2683, 61st Cong., 2d sess.; in the House of Representatives, June 14, 1910; Mr. Sheppard introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed]

"'A bill for an investigation to determine the practicability and cost of an airplane or airship mail route

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the practicality and cost of an airplane or airship mail route between the city of Washington and some other suitable point or points for the experiment and report the results of said investigation to Congress at the opening of the short session in December next, in order that it may be definitely determined whether aerial navigation may be utilized for the safe and more rapid transmission of the mails.'

"'[From the New York Telegraph, June 19, 1910]

"'AIRPLANE MAIL, COLLECTORS, AND CHUTES TO SHOOT UPWARD—REPRESENTATIVE SHEPPARD URGED POSTMASTER GENERAL TO INVESTIGATE FEASIBILITY OF SCHEME TO QUICKEN LOCAL TRANSPORTATION OF LETTERS

"'And when the mail chutes go up and not down, where will we go to post our letters? Will we take elevators or tip the janitors to carry them to the slot?

"'In these times it is well to give the subject a little forethought. Forethought is the only word than can be correctly used in facing airplane possibilities. If there is to be an airplane mail service, as the Texas Representative thinks, now is the time to prepare for it.

"'A modern apartment will be thus equipped with its aerial mail box, and the postman will flit in the air once every hour.

"'Representative Sheppard's resolution authorizes and directs the Postmaster General to investigate the practicability and cost of an airplane or airship mail route between the city of Washington and some other point or points suitable for experiment. "The aim is to find out if aerial navigation may be utilized for safe and more rapid transmission of mails."

"'But it is doubtful if aerial legislation will be reached at this session in Washington. By this is meant that we are given time to prepare.

"'If a propeller breaks in a Jersey swamp or a rudder gets anchored in a Rocky Mountain peak, don't fuss because your mail is delayed. Hasn't a blizzard or a wash-out held letters up before?

"'By a series of signals you may let the postman navigator know the sort of letters you are expecting. This will aid him in his work and assist in accurate delivery.

"'Love letters will be carried in a rose-pink airplane, steered by Cupid's wings and operated by perfumed gasoline. If you are awaiting a love letter, stand with one foot on the edge of your roof and place the right hand over your heart. This ship's name is "Dearie."

"'If you owe money, lock yourself in your flat and refuse to believe in signs. Bills and missives from collecting agencies will be a special cargo of a dull-gray ship charged to carry 13,000,000 pounds of first-class dunning matter.

"'This airplane will descend with a roar and will emit fumes of gasoline at the chute. When it soars away it will send an echo that can be heard for 33 miles. Name this ship "What's the Use."

"'Letters from mine promoters and from the "optimist society" will carry a brass band in the bow, will be painted yellow, and will be named "Cheer Up."

"'Postmen' will wear wired coattails and on their feet will be wings.

"'A postman's feet will hereafter be a study for ornamentation. Decorative designs will be used in profusion, as, naturally, feet will be quite unnecessary things in postal delivery.

"'This is the day for one-legged and no-legged men. Civil-service examinations will consist of questions hitherto unknown. "What is your reach?" will be the question by which the examining board will test a man's endurance.

"'There will be another ship which must be reckoned with—conveying letters from reformers, those who are mad for social uplift. It will be called hot air, and will be operated by many of our best-known and most highly respected muckrakers.

"'No man can apply for a job on this unless he has eaten a bad piece of meat, choked on diluted milk, or intimately knows of white slavery.

"'The Government will have no jurisdiction over the management of this ship, but will be held responsible for any jolts received and given, for any accidents due to bad judgment or caused by a hasty preparation for the flight. The ship will be bright red, and the engine will run to the strain of Marseillaise. It will be called Liberty. Julius Hopp is writing a poem for its dedication.

"'That's about all for the present.'

"Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if it is in contemplation for the Government to go into the business of manufacturing or purchasing airplanes to carry out this enterprise?

"Mr. SHEPPARD. My understanding is that the Post Office Department will use such planes as the War Department may let them have.

"Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, to my mind it is about as absurd an enterprise as ever was thought of without more complete investigation and the development of more accurate facts, but, as I said a moment ago, it may serve to amuse somebody. It will be about a 2 days' wonder, and in my judgment that will be the end of it."

The bill providing for the 24-cent postage for air mail was thereupon passed.

The above quotations serve to reflect the popular sentiment of that day as to the feasibility of air-mail service, and demonstrate the handicaps that had to be overcome in order to eventually establish the air-mail service.

Beginning in 1914, the Post Office Department in submitting their estimates of appropriations requested $50,000 "for experimental aerial mail service by airplane or other devices," but year after year the request was refused by the Congress. Meantime, the Department progressed as far as they could in such experiments under their general appropriation "For inland transportation by steamboat or other powerboat routes."

In the Post Office Appropriation Act approved July 28, 1916, the words "or airplanes" were added to the wording of the general appropriation so that it then read: "For inland transportation by steamboat or other powerboat routes or by airplanes." This amendment was put on in the Senate and was agreed to in conference by the House. Thereby, in the fiscal year 1917 the Department was authorized to proceed with what arrangements they could make for airplanes. The total amount provided for this general item of appropriation was $1,060,000. The previous year's appropriation was $1,049,400.

For the fiscal year 1918, the Post Office Department requested in their estimates the addition of the following proviso: "*Provided*, That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding $100,000 for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of airplanes for an experimental airplane mail service between such points as he may determine."

On January 13, 1917, when the proviso was being considered on the floor of the House, a point of order was made against it as follows:

"Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

"Mr. TILSON. I desire to offer an amendment.

"The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order, and the gentleman from Connecticut desires to offer an amendment.

"Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the purpose of this appropriation of $100,000 carried in this proviso, it is to enable the Postmaster General to carry on experiments, to purchase a Zeppelin to carry the mail in competition with the railroads of this country.

"Mr. MOON. I do not know that it is a competition with anything; it is an experiment.

"Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order so far as the words 'or by airplane,' in line 10, and also against the proviso in the paragraph.

"The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard on the point of order?

"Mr. MOON. No; Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order made on the words 'or by airplane' is correctly made. If the gentleman does not want the experiment, all right.

"The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

"Mr. MOON. Right there, Mr. Chairman, the increase in this appropriation on account of these words that were stricken out was $100,000, and if they go out the amount ought to be reduced. I offer the following amendment.

"The Clerk read as follows:

"Page 16, line 10, strike out the sum '$1,224,000' and insert '$1,124,000.'

"Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, just what part went out on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin?

"Mr. MOON. The words "or by airplane' and the proviso.

"The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee reducing the amount by $100,000.

"The amendment was agreed to."

Later on the floor of the House, the point of order was explained as follows; following a further reference to the provision by Mr. TILSON:

"Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, it was most unfortunate that the point of order was made against that part of the bill which provided for the experimental use of airplanes for the mail service. I have great faith in the future of aerial navigation. I believe that it is the duty, and at this time it would seem to be the opportunity, of the United States to take the lead in the development of aeronautics for peaceful purposes. I had prepared an amendment increasing the amount in the bill from $100,000 to $200,000.

"In Europe, as we know, the development of the use of aircraft has been abnormal, not to say uncanny, but almost exclusively for war purposes. It is already the principal factor in directing the army in action and performs a most important function in the navy. It is the natural enemy of the submarine and possibly the best agent with which to fight this dangerous seacraft. All of Europe, however, has done nothing, comparatively, toward its use for peaceful purposes. Here we have the great opportunity of developing this new means of transportation for use in peaceful pursuits, and we should not neglect it. After the present war is over and naval armament may decrease, large armies are sure to dwindle, but I for one believe that the air service has come to stay, and that it will grow in importance in peace as well as in war. If we should ever be so unfortunate as to become involved in war, every expert who is able to drive an air machine will be worth his weight in gold.

"Considerable sums have been appropriated for use by the Army and Navy and are being expended just now in attempting to establish and build up in this country an adequate aviation service as a part of our national defense. Here is an opportunity to utilize by cooperation some of this money for peaceful purposes, because the Army and the Navy have expressed themselves as ready to cooperate with the Post Office Department in providing for the delivery of mail by airplane. I believe that there should be an appropriation made, and I hope that the other end of the Capitol will add such an appropriation to this bill in order that we may begin the use of airplane service in the carrying of the mails. I should like to see an airplane route from every large city to every other. I should like to see before the end of the fiscal year for which we are now appropriating an airplane mail route from my home city of New Haven to the city of New York, and one from New York to Philadelphia or Washington. There is much important mail that might well be carried in this way. It would thus serve a positively useful purpose in our business life, besides the training that it will give the aviators and the development in aircraft that will surely result from it.

"We have already appointed a national advisory board to handle the subject. That body has appointed a subcommittee composed of Lieutenant Colonel Squier, now in charge of the aviation section of the Signal Corps of the Army; Dr. Stratton, Director of the Bureau of Standards; and Dr. Marvin, Director of the Weather Bureau, who have offered to the Post Office Department their fullest cooperation.

"We are at this time carrying the mail by aeroplane from the Mexican border to General Pershing at Colonia Dublan, a distance of 110 miles. It takes a passenger automobile 8 hours to make that trip. It takes an autotruck train more than a day, and yet the aeroplanes we now have in the service carry the mail and make the trip in 66 minutes. General Scriven, now the head of the Signal Corps, a short time ago made the trip as a passenger by aeroplane from Columbus, N. Mex., to Colonia Dublan. General Pershing could come to the border for a conference in 66 minutes and nobody know anything about it. We should not neglect the opportunity we have of developing and using this great service.

"Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. TILSON. Yes.

"Mr. FESS. In carrying the mail down on the border, have there been any interruptions in the service?

"Mr. TILSON. The horsepower of the engines in the first aeroplanes that we used down there was not powerful enough, and they did not succeed well in the higher altitude. The horsepower of the engines, however, has been increased up to 160, and any we now have of this type make the regular trip without any difficulty. As I have said, regular service is now maintained between Columbus and Colinia Dublan.

"Mr. FESS. We could have reliance upon mail delivery in that way in the future?

"Mr. TILSON. Undoubtedly. Perhaps the weather conditions might interfere to some extent, but that is one reason why we ought to adopt the service, so that we may develop a service which will be of great value in time of peace and of absolute necessity in time of war.

"Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee the weight of mail being carried in these aeroplanes?

"Mr. TILSON. Well, there are all kinds of aeroplanes capable of carrying different weights. It depends upon what you build your aircraft for, as I said before.

"Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has stated a concrete instance of mail being transported from the border down to the camp where General Pershing's troops are encamped. Can the gentleman give the amount of mail one of these aeroplanes has carried and of these airplanes?

"Mr. TILSON. I do not know just the amount in pounds and ounces, but I know that General Scriven, a man probably twice the size of the gentleman, was carried as a passenger, and his weight alone would make a considerable package of mail.

"Mr. STAFFORD. That is not any great feat. We all know that airplanes have reached that development where they will carry an extra passenger besides the navigator. The gentleman has made some investigation and says this service is practicable, and I wish to inquire how much weight is being carried, and the gentleman does not seem to have that information.

"Mr. TILSON. I do not know exactly how much could be carried by one of our present machines. Probably four or five hundred pounds. In Europe the very large airplanes seem to carry indefinite weight in the shape of bombs, machine guns, wireless apparatus, and such appliances, and it seems to be capable of indefinite expansion.

* * * * *

"Mr. CANNON. The gentleman speaks of the use of airplanes in Mexico. Can they fly high enough to be immune from attacks of the enemy on terra firma?

"Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes. So far as Mexico is concerned, there are no airplanes to be used against us there and no antiaircraft guns, but in the European war it is necessary for them to fly very high. The highest battle I think I have heard of was fought at an altitude of over 19,000 feet, which is nearly 4 miles high—certainly too high for any antiaircraft gun yet produced.

* * * * *

"Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Could an airplane carry in the atmosphere of Alaska?

"Mr. TILSON. I do not think there will be any difficulty at all to get sufficient horsepower to carry in all sorts of altitudes and latitudes. When you reach 19,000 feet, that is a considerable altitude.

"I think we ought not to lose the opportunity of developing this service. As I said in another connection, after this war is over the armament of navies may decline; the armies of Europe will certainly dwindle, but the air service will remain as the greatest development of this awful war. Why should not we, the greatest of nations, now at peace, point the way in the use of this wonderful agency for purposes of peace? Let us use it in peacetime for economic purposes as well as for the training of men for service in time of war. It will be of incalculable advantage to us if we can develop a number of men who are experts in the navigation of the air. They will be literally worth their weight in gold in case of war. For that reason, it seems to me, instead of simply training men to fly in time of war for purposes of destruction, necessary as this may be, we should also use the same agency for the purposes of peace. I shall be very sorry not to see an experimental appropriation in this bill to begin the good work, but I hope the omission will be supplied in another body before the bill comes out of conference.

* * * * *

"Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman acquainted with the purpose of the Postmaster General in asking for this appropriation, that it is to experiment with Zeppelins?

"Mr. TILSON. I do not understand it to be so.

"Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had read the Postmaster General's report he would not have any mistaken idea about that.

"Mr. TILSON. I do not believe that to be the present attitude of the Post Office Department. I talked with Mr. Praeger, the Second Assistant Postmaster General, and I feel sure he has no such idea whatsover in reference to the use of the Zeppelin. His idea is, if I understand his position right, that this appropriation is to be used for airplanes as stated in the part of the bill stricken out on the point of order of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

"Mr. CANNON. Would an amendment using the word 'airplane' exclude the use of a Zeppelin?

"Mr. TILSON. I am not sure, but think that would exclude a Zeppelin.

"Mr. CANNON. It seems that the objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin is that a Zeppelin might be used. Now I am inclined to believe that an appropriation ought to be made for one or both, and if there is any doubt about the use of a Zeppelin cannot the gentleman devise an amendment which would apply to an airplane and exclude a Zeppelin?

"Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that the word "airplane' means a machine heavier than air and that always has been its well-defined meaning and that would exclude a Zeppelin. Furthermore, you could not undertake to build a Zeppelin with $100,000.

* * * * *

"Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, confirming the position I took in making the point of order concerning a provision that has just been referred to by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. WILSON], I wish to call the attention of the committee to the report of the Postmaster General upon which I base my objection. It is found on page 46 of the report, and is as follows:

" 'From published reports of aerial operations abroad it would appear that the dirigible-balloon type of airship had been so perfected that it would convey great weight. In fact, the last statements that appear in connection with the subject assert that 300 passengers may be carried in an airship. This would approximate 15 tons net weight. The department is interested in determining the practicability of this method of transportation with a view to its utilization. It is suggested that authorization be given for experiments to be made with this

type of conveyor. For aerial experimentations an appropriation of $100,000 is recommended.'

"With the extravagant use of public money by the Signal Corps services in the appropriation carried in last year's military appropriation bill of $13,000,000, under which they are authorizing experiments in every machine shop in this country that will manufacture or attempt to manufacture some motor that may be of use in aerial navigation, I think we have gone plenty far enough with that extravagant policy without delegating a similar line of experiment to another branch of the service. Let the naval and the military arms of the Government develop these matters, and when developed, for which the Government is paying heavily, then it will be time to utilize that service in connection with the Postal Service."

SENATOR M'KELLAR'S PART IN ESTABLISHING AIR-MAIL SERVICE

February 10, 1917, when the proviso reached the floor of the Senate, the amendment of the committee was agreed to, with the following comment:

"Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge whether there have been any experiments made with the aeroplane in mail service in the United States?

"Mr. HARDWICK. There have been some expriments made; exactly where, I cannot inform the Senator; but the Post Office Department informed us that there have been some experiments of this kind made, and that they were satisfied that in certain parts of the United States that are very difficult to get at by the ordinary methods of communication some service of this sort could be very reasonably employed. We first appropriated $50,000.

"Mr. SMOOT. They think the conditions are such in some parts of the United States that this service would be justified?

"Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; that this service would be justified; and, really, they say it is the most economical service that we could maintain in some parts of the country. They are experimenting with it, of course. A year ago we appropriated $50,000 for experimental purposes along this line, to be expended in the discretion of the Postmaster General. The cost of airplanes have increased so that they were not inclined to extend the experiments.

"Mr. SMOOT. What I wanted to know was whether there had been any report made to the committee, or to Congress, showing the result of any experiments of that kind?

"Mr. HARDWICK. No; except in a very general way. The Postmaster General claims that this method of carrying the mails is still in the experimental stage, and he never has asked the committee for any considerable sum. You will notice that he only wants an increase now of $100,000, to be expended in his discretion.

"Mr. SMOOT. Did they spend the $50,000 last year?

Mr. HARDWICK. They never made any report."

* * * * *

(Discussion was continued on use of airplanes in Alaska and on the experiments being conducted by the Department itself, instead of by contract.)

* * * * *

"Mr. JONES. You might be able to get this done more cheaply by persons who are already prepared to do it than if the Government had to keep it up itself. That just occurred to me.

"Mr. HARDWICK. I know. We have simply adopted the language suggested by the Post Office Department in this matter, for this reason: This service was experimental and we wanted the Department to get the experience with it itself, so that if there is to be any considerable extension of it in the future, or any considerable expenditure upon it in the future, the Department will have some practical knowledge of it. The change in language was made at the suggestion of the Post Office Department, I suppose, because they wanted to experiment with it in this way. The amount asked was very small.

"Mr. JONES. They will come in and ask for $500,000 next year.

"Mr. HARDWICK. Then we will give the matter a little more careful consideration.

"Mr. JONES. Then they will come in and ask for $1,000,000 the next year.

"Mr. HARDWICK. When the matter passes beyond the experimental stage we will apply a different rule to the consideration of their requests.

* * * * *

"Mr. TOWNSEND. He is a rash man indeed who will suggest that the aeroplane service is not going to be of real, practical use to the department in carrying the mails.

"Mr. HARDWICK. We think so.

"Mr. TOWNSEND. And it seemed to me, as it did to the other members of the committee, that we could well afford to make this experiment.

"Mr. HARDWICK. That is right."

March 1, 1917, the conference report shows the agreement of the House on the proviso.

(During this same time Senator MCKELLAR had been vigorously supporting the enlargement and proper equipment with aeroplanes of the Aviation Corps. He took his seat in the Senate on March 5, 1917.)

May 8, 1918, during the consideration of the post office appropriation bill, there was again a motion to strike out the language on aeroplanes; this time in the Senate, as follows:

"Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to make one other inquiry of the Senator. I notice that the appropriation referred to in the section just read provides for the carrying of mail by airplanes.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

"Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator whether or not the investigations of the committee justify the embarkation by the Government now upon a scheme to employ airplanes in carrying the mails? It seems to me that at this time, and in view of the unstable condition of aeronautics, it is a visionary, utopian, and absurd plan to utilize aircraft for use in transmitting mail matter. We are in war and we have been unable, notwithstanding the tremendous amount expended, to provide sufficient airplanes for the training of our soldiers and for doing our full duty upon the battlefields of France. To dissipate any of our energies now in the construction of airplanes for the purpose of carrying mail would be, in my opinion, not only imprudent, but it would be carrying absurdity to the most absurd limits.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, of course the committee were compelled to take the opinion of the officials of the Post Office Department on this question, they having made a thorough examination, as they state; but the fact remains that we have been appropriating for this purpose in the last two appropriation bills, and this provision also provides that these planes shall be secured from the Government, those that have heretofore been used by the Army and have been discarded and are not now used for military purposes. I do not think the provision contemplates the building or buying of new airplanes. It is true that this is something of an experiment.

* * * * *

"Mr. WADSWORTH. I think if the Department has given such information to the committee it must be through an error, because I myself have seen, at the Curtiss plant at Buffalo, new planes being made for the Post Office Department.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. I think they intend to use them between here and New York. That is to be paid for out of the limited appropriation they have for that purpose.

* * * * *

"Mr. KING. If there were any way by which the amount of the appropriation which is to be devoted to airplane service could be segregated from the residue of the amount, I should move to strike out from the appropriation bill the former sum.

"Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, cannot the Senator do that—I hope he will—by moving to strike out the language on page 17, beginning at line 7 and running down to line 15?

* * * * *

"Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama what portion of this $1,185,000 is to be devoted to this ill-advised scheme of utilizing aircraft for carrying mail?

"Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think if the Senator will read the provision he will find that the expenditure for this purpose is limited to $100,000.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 will show it."

* * * * *

THE PROVISO FOR $100,000 TO START THE AIR-MAIL SERVICE

Senator KING thereupon moved to strike the proviso, and the debate over the vital importance of the provision continued, as follows:

"Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, as I stated awhile ago, for 2 or 3 years we have been appropriating $100,000 for this experimental service. The principal purpose of this is to experiment in Alaska and to use airplanes in Alaska if they find they are practicable, where the cost of carrying the mails by boat or by overland transportation is simply out of the question. You have got to substitute something for it, or you cannot afford to pay the cost of carrying the mails.

"It seems to me, Mr. President, that this small sum of $100,000 should be appropriated, the purpose being to experiment, if further experimentation is necessary, and determine whether or not the mails, in certain sections and over certain routes where it is impracticable, where the cost is outrageous, to transport them by the usual methods, cannot be carried by airplane at a much less cost. That is the sole purpose of the provision. I do not think it ought to be stricken out.

* * * * *

"Mr. KING. I understood the Senator to state a few moments ago, and before the suggestion was made by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that some appropriation had been made for airplane mail service between here and New York City. I want to ask the Senator whether any part of the appropriation carried in this bill is for that service?

"Mr. BANKHEAD. No. The only thing in this bill which pertains to airplane service between here and New York is the provision that the Postmaster General may charge 24 cents a letter. That is all that relates to the airplane service between here and New York. They are getting ready now to proceed with that service. I do not know where they have gotten their airplanes, or anything about it, but they seem to have gotten them.

"Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator where the Post Office Department has obtained the money with which to construct airplanes to operate between here and New York City?

* * * * *

"Mr. HARDWICK. We passed legislation authorizing them to get condemned airplanes from the War and Navy Departments, where they were no longer used for military purposes, and could be furnished by those departments to the Post Office Department. They were not practicable for the uses of the other departments. I think that is what they are operating with now.

"Mr. KING. Then, if the statement of the Senator from New York is accurate—and I have no doubt but what it is—that the Curtiss factory is now making new machines for the carrying of mails, as I understood him, between here and New York, the Department is exceeding its authority.

"Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think that is the fact. Is the Senator certain of that?

"Mr. WADSWORTH. I have seen the planes in the course of manufacture myself.

"Mr. HARDWICK. For the Post Office Department?

"Mr. WADSWORTH. For the Post Office Department.

"Mr. HARDWICK. Then it must be intended that they are to be paid for out of this $100,000 appropriation.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. If that is the case, under what authority did the Postmaster General let the contract?

"Mr. HARDWICK. I could not tell the Senator about that. I do not know.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. I will say to the Senator that, as I understand, there was a like provision in the bill of last year.

"Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator pleases, the same provision has been carried in the bill for 2 or 3 years, and there has been a current annual appropriation of $100,000 for experimental purposes.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. When the Senator used the expression 'this appropriation,' I thought he meant the one made in this bill.

"Mr. HARDWICK. No; I mean this same $100,000 appropriation which was in last year's bill. I can refer the Senator to the bill of last year in exactly the same language, and exactly the same amount was carried. So that if the Postmaster General has obtained airplanes from the Curtiss Co. he has done it out of a similar appropriation for last year, as he might do, of course, to the extent of $100,000 out of the appropriation carried by this bill, if this bill should pass.

"I do not want to keep the floor very long, because it looks to me like this is a meritorious proposition. The progress of science is so great in some of these fields that the post-office officials feel that they ought to adapt themselves to its progress. There are portions of Alaska, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, where they carry mail by sledge or by dogs at very great expense and by boats at very great expense. We adopted an amendment here just now that was necessitated largely by the situation in Alaska, where there is practically no competition among some of these boats that go away up in the recesses of the country, and where they are charging eight and nine times as much as they charge for the highest-class express, because there is no competition, and they can force the Government to pay what they charge. We are trying to remedy that; but it does seem to me that in this enlightened age, when certainly under some circumstances airplanes can be used to carry mail or anything else to a certain amount of weight, it is wise to let the Postmaster General continue these experiments and use, in a small way, money for this purpose.

* * * * *

"Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that this appropriation has been carried in the bill for 2 or 3 years?

"Mr. HARDWICK. Two or three years; yes.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. What has been done in the way of experiment? How many machines has the Post Office Department?

"Mr. HARDWICK. I am informed that the fact is that only recently has the Post Office Department undertaken to have airplanes constructed under this appropriation; and possibly the Senator from New York refers to the first instance, as far as I know.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Have they used any discarded machines anywhere?

"Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, yes.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Where?

"Mr. HARDWICK. I am sure they have used them in Alaska.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to know where in Alaska. I should like to know what the route is up there and what sort of landing places they have, and what they do when they land out in the forest somewhere.

"Mr. HARDWICK. I imagine that an airplane could land in Alaska about as well as it could in Washington.

"Mr. JONES, of Washington. There are some landing places arranged for around here.

"Mr. HARDWICK. They do not have to have artificial landing places for all of these airplanes.

"Mr. JONES, of Washington. They cannot land very safely anywhere; and, furthermore, they could not land around here anywhere without being pretty close to transportation facilities, while in Alaska they might land a long way from gasoline tanks or means of getting out, and the poor fellow who was operating the airplane might starve to death.

"Mr. HARDWICK. I will say to the Senator very frankly that I do not know and cannot give him the information about exactly where they have conducted these experiments. I know that the Post Office Department thinks that Alaska is probably the most useful field for experimentation of this sort.

"Mr. JONES, of Washington. They may be right in that, but it is the last place that I would pick out to experiment with airplanes.

"Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator may differ with the Department about that; but as far as I am concerned I can see no doubt about the advisability of letting the Department use a very small part of the postal funds for purposes of experimentation of this kind.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know that I am questioning that, but I do think that the experiment ought to be carried on in a little bit safer field than they would have to operate in up in Alaska. Finding that this appropriation has been carried in the bill for 2 or 3 years, I was interested in knowing what they have actually done, because I have heard nothing about their having airplanes or using them anywhere.

"Mr. HARDWICK. I think the truth is that they have done very little in this country. They have done some experimenting; but, as I understand, up to date it has been largely with the machines that were left to them by other departments, the War and Navy Departments, that were not serviceable or useful to those departments—not fighting machines, not adapted for fighting. There is quite a difference between a fighting machine and a commercial machine, as we have found out lately.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I have understood so; but it does seem to me that if they have had this money for 2 or 3 years we ought to know something about the kind of experiments they have carried on, and where they have carried them on, and what has become of the money that we have appropriated—what use has been made of it. I can see great possibilities in this service.

"Mr. HARDWICK. I think the Senator is right. As a matter of fact, while the appropriation has been carried several years just in this amount, of course it came out of the postal funds, and the Postmaster General has used very little of it. He has made some few experiments.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. It did strike me very forcibly when the suggestion was made that we were using these airplanes up in Alaska. I know that the transportation facilities there are very inadequate and I know they are very expensive, but it is pretty hard for me to conceive of having airplanes take the place of boats and other facilities up in that country.

"Mr. HARDWICK. I must confess that I do not know about that. I do not know much about this airplane business except what I read in the newspapers, but the department thinks there is some future for it.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. I also question the advisability of the Post Office Department experimenting with discarded machines. It seems to me they ought to have just about as good and safe machines as possible, and that is especially true if they are going sailing over the mountains and forest and waters of Alaska.

"Mr. HARDWICK. They are perfectly safe, but for one or another technical reason, which I cannot undertake to give to the Senator, they are not considered adapted for fighting purposes.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that a schedule of airplane mail service has been arranged between Washington and New York, and it is to begin on the 15th of this month. They are to make stops at Baltimore and Philadelphia, and I believe only at those places, between here and New York. The amount of this appropriation that the Senator speaks of that has been expended I should say has gone into that arrangement or to prepare for this service; and in this bill we have authorized them to charge 24 cents a letter between here and New York. Of course, a man can take his choice. He can send his mail either by airplane or in the regular way.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to say to the Senator that I can very easily see how a route of this kind could be established between here and the city of New York and be a very safe one, too. I should like to go on it myself with a good man.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. We will arrange for the Senator to make the trip.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. I should enjoy it very much; but a route between here and New York is quite different from a route between some points in Alaska.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

"I just want to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah, Mr. King, who is the author of the amendment to strike out the airplane provision, to the fact that objections of this kind have uniformly been made, and frequently by our ablest and most distinguished men, to new discoveries and inventions of this kind and to progressive measures generally. I think it was no less a person than Mr. Webster, who, on the floor of this Senate, about 1830, said that he would vote against any appropriation to be used for any purpose for the improvement of anything beyond the Mississippi River on the ground that the great West was a desert waste and never could be used by this country. Now, we read the statements of the men who opposed those things in those days and we wonder how it was that with their great reputations they were men who did not have more perspective or insight into the future, to say the least; and in the years to come I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from Utah will be referred to by others, just as I am referring to Mr. Webster now, in the very same way. I can say to the Senator that I believe that he is just standing across the path of progress.

"Why, as young a man as I am, I remember distinctly when it was considered that the telephone was a toy and that it had no real use or advantage, and later on the automobile was considered a toy that would never be of any practical benefit, and yet the world could hardly get along today without telephones and automobiles. The telegraph, the ocean cable, the electric light, the electric motor, the moving picture, and numberless other improvements had the same history, and so it is with airships. I have no doubt that the time will come when we will use them for a hundred different purposes and that the world will feel that it could hardly get along without them.

"I hope the Senator will not interpose an objection to this very worthy measure, as it seems to me. It may be that the money may not bring full results the first year or the second year or even the third year, but the time will come when results will be shown by reason of these experiments. Why, the time will come when we will use airplanes just as frequently as we now use automobiles, in my judgment, and there may be inventions in the future that will far surpass them. We cannot afford to take chances on it if we want to help develop things of this kind and make them the best for our country; and I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment.

"Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is assuming the role of a prophet today. It was stated by the great prophet of old, that 'without vision the people perish.' Prophesy did not cease when Malachi, the last of the prophets of the Old Testament, gave his words to an unwilling world.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator does not refer to me as a contemporary of the prophet Malachi. [Laughter.]

"Mr. KING. No, Mr. President; the amiable and able Senator has the flower of youth upon his brow; I was assigning to him a distinguished position in associating his name with the prophets of old. We all know the great service rendered by those who have spoken with the voice of prophetic inspiration. Prophets have been those who saw into the future, pointed the path of duty, and indicated impending dangers. All great leaders have been prophets. Humanity has advanced in proportion to the broad vision and prophetic power of men upon whom the mantle of Providence rested. Great political leaders have looked with prophetic vision into the future, and the great statesman is the one who glimpses the mighty events which the future holds within her grasp. Poets, too, have been prophets, and they, like Tennyson—

" 'Dipped into the future far as human eye could see,
Saw the visions of the world and all the wonders that would be,
Saw the heavens filled with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight dropping down their golden bales.'

"So the great poet of England, more than half a century ago, foretold that above the clouds the commerce of the world, in part, would be carried upon ships not baptized in oceans deep.

"I am glad to know that my distinguished friend looks beyond the present hour and seeks to read the future and to meet its mighty problems. There is need of prophets and of vision here in this Chamber, in the activities of the Government. We need prophets here to challenge attention to the staggering expenditures which are being made and to the inevitable consequences that will flow therefrom. We need voices to cry out gainst improvident expenditures, against unwarranted appropriations that are often made. The task of the economist in legislative bodies is always a difficult and an undesirable one. It is so easy to pass laws appropriating money; there are always a multitude of people willing to receive in every quarter gifts and bounties and gratuities and appropriations. Even in times of peace the man who seeks to protect the public treasury becomes unpopular, and in times of war, where public attention is riveted upon great struggles upon land and sea, and all eyes are looking to great issues which perhaps involve the life of nations, and the cause of civilization itself, any plea for economy and providence in expenditures falls upon deaf ears.

"In this world war figures have become meaningless. We cease to speak of thousands, or hundreds of thousands, even. The man upon the street as well as the one in public service speaks of hundreds of millions and billions. So a hundred thousand dollars for an experiment for some fad or some utopian plan causes no comment; indeed, attracts no attention. And if objection is interposed to an appropriation for one hundred thousand dollars or a million dollars or a hundred million dollars it excites derision, and the objector is denominated a 'mossback.'

"However, the criticism of my distinguished friend loses something of its sting because he tempers it with the asseveration that I remind him of Daniel Webster. So in the years that are to come it is possible I may live in history, because in this august body my name has been coupled with the great and immortal statesman, Daniel Webster, and that standing with Webster I opposed things essential to progress and conducive to the cause of civilization.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

"Mr. KING. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. There are many points of similarity between the distinguished Senator from Utah and Daniel Webster; but I really think that on the occasion referred to, when he voted against the appropriation for Government improvements beyond the Mississippi River, that was one of Mr. Webster's signal failures to diagnose the future.

"But that was not what I rose to say to the Senator. He speaks of this airplane mail service as being a fad. I happened to be acquainted with a lawsuit some time ago in my home town of Memphis, Tenn., involving a question with a telephone company, and that company dated back for its charter to a resolution on the minutes of the council meeting which referred to the telephone as 'Carnes' toy.' A far-visioned and progressive man by the name of Carnes had adopted this toy—this fad, if the Senator pleases to call it that—and received a contract from the city to operate it, and even the city fathers laughed at his fad; but Mr. Carnes was right, and the Senator sees and the whole world sees what we have in the telephone; and I say to the Senator that it does not take a prophet to see that something of real worth and of real merit is coming from airplane service in the future, just as it has already come from the telephone service."

Senator King continued on at length in the same vein, and explained the statement of Daniel Webster about the West, and concluded with the following:

"Now it is proposed, when we cannot build planes enough for military purposes and when their use is so essential to our country's safety, to engage in the foolish experiment of carrying mails from Washington to New York City with airplanes and to go into the frozen fields of Alaska and fly from icebergs to ice peaks. Mr. President, we have one of the best transportation systems in the world. We can carry mail from here to New York in 4 to 6 hours. What is the necessity for this scheme? Who is demanding it? Why dissipate our energies, squander our money in this experiment at this time, when all our resources ought to be devoted to the prosecution of the war?

"I have no doubt that in years to come, and perhaps in the near future, we will be using airships for many purposes, perhaps carrying the mails; but certainly no reason appears now to justify the expenditure of one dollar for the purposes suggested by the gentlemen who are sponsors for this proposition.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think that this provision is not designed to be used by the Post Office Department in trying to develop airplanes.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, all I know about the provision is what the Postmaster General said. This appropriation, as I said before, has been carried for 3 years. It is a House provision. It was not put in by the Senate committee; it came from the House It reads—

" 'That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding $100,000 for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of airplanes for an experimental airplane mail service between such points as he may determine.'

* * * * *

"Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, in other words, to see how the airplane can be adapted to the mail service. Let me say, while I am on my feet, that section 8 of the bill, on page 30, shows exactly what the object is. It provides—

" 'That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver and turn over to the Postmaster General from time to time, and without charge therefor, for use in the postal service, such airplanes and automobiles or parts thereof as may prove to be, or as shall become, unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department.'

"Then the section goes on to provide that the expenses shall be paid out of the very appropriation we have now under discussion."

Senator Jones and Senator Hardwick thereupon discussed the development of airplanes, and Senator Jones concluded as follows:

"The Senator will find that there will be difficulty in going over Alaska in airplanes. The situation now presented to us is get quick communication with the city of New York. You can send there by telegraph a letter that will carry 50 words for 40 or 50 cents, or you can talk over the telephone for about the same price. So I cannot see how it would be used very much. I do not see any special benefit to come from it.

"As the Senator from Utah said, if we reject it it will be a saving of that much money, and every little we can save now may mean quite a great deal. When the war is over, with a surplus of airplane ability not only in the men to handle them but in the machines themselves, some service of this kind might be developed, but I doubt the wisdom of it at the present time. I can see what can be done by it, and if we are going to take the position that this is the time to try it, that this is the time to determine whether it is feasible and practicable and economical or not, all right; but I doubt the wisdom of such a course.

"Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a few days ago I took occasion to somewhat criticize the proposition. I am not a reactionary so far as the work of the Government is concerned; I want to see it go on in the most efficient manner possible; but I do not feel today, as I suggested I did not feel 2 or 3 days ago, that we are going to establish very much of a mail route between here and New York and charge 24 cents postage on every letter that goes. I said then it might be a 2-days' wonder and would attract some attention, but that as a matter of practical utility it would inevitably fail. I hold to that view now, and I hope the appropriation will not be made.

"The Senator from Washington called attention to the fighting airplane, the Italian airplane, that we have all seen in the air and its great strength and said that they have planes of greater horsepower. That is true, but they are a very expensive machine, and so far as carrying mail is concerned it would cost a great deal of money. It costs a good deal to keep them in operation. For the life of me I am unable to see why at this time, when we ought to be conserving our finances as well as our other activities, we should go into this experiment and spend any money upon it.

"The time may come, as the Senator suggests, after the war is over, when we have our young men trained for aerial service, when we will have more junk than we will know what to do with, both in airplanes and in ships and everything else, when we might take some of those service planes and

convert them into a postal route, perhaps at a longer distance than from here to New York, possibly going to Boston, and they might be of more or less service in the West; but why do we want to make any appropriation now for a matter of this kind? I know we are voting money by the billions, and nobody seems to think much about it. It startles me, because I can see there is going to be a day of reckoning; there is going to be a day of liquidation, as far as our finances are concerned. The taxpayers have got to meet these obligations sooner or later, and I think we can get along without this appropriation. I think it is a purely chimerical matter.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me?

"Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator is aware of the fact that this appropriation began 2 or 3 years ago, and it is just a continuation of the policy that was begun before the war. The question here is, now that we have begun it and it has been of service, would it not be very much more hurtful and very much more costly if we discontinued it during the war?

"Mr. GALLINGER. Since it has been tried for 2 or 3 years, I ask the Senator what the result has been.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. They are still experimenting with it, as provided in this bill."

Further similar statements were made by Senators Gallinger, Smoot, Weeks, and Vardaman—the latter two requesting more information on what had been done with the previous appropriation, although generally favoring the experimentation—and then it was announced:

"Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, the Post Office Department will send us at once a detailed statement of exactly what has been done and what is contemplated under this appropriation, which will be presented to the Senate before a vote is taken."

Accordingly, the item was passed over until May 13, 1918, when the following letter from the Postmaster General was read on the floor of the Senate:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1918.

Hon. JOHN BANKHEAD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: The item in the post office appropriation bill authorizing the expenditure out of the appropriation for "inland transportation by steamboats or other power boats or by airplanes" of the sum of $100,000 for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of airplanes for an experimental airplane mail service seeks to repeat the authorization carried in the appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918. Practically all of this appropriation has been expended, a part in the purchase of airplanes, spare parts, and hangars, and putting in condition landing fields for the aerial mail service.

In 1916 the Post Office Department was informed that an airplane passenger and express service would be established in Alaska, and inquiry was made whether arrangements could be perfected for carrying the mail by airplane in that territory. Accordingly, bids were invited for aerial mail transportation in Alaska, but no results were obtained. The parties who had expected to introduce this service in Alaska assigned for the reason that the airplanes at that time were not sufficiently high powered, nor reliable enough to cope with the weather conditions in that Territory.

The appropriation of $100,000 available during the current fiscal year enabled the Post Office Department to enter upon the work of inaugurating its present aerial mail program. This is the first money expended by the Post Office Department for airplane service, it being the first appropriated by Congress. Heretofore Congress had not appropriated money, but had permitted airplane service by contract under the appropriation for inland transportation by steamboats or other power boats or airplanes. The experiments in carrying mail by airplane in the past have been purely voluntary by fliers and have not cost the Government any money. The results, however, are not satisfactory, as they give no indication of the ability to maintain a daily service.

Construction of airplanes, and especially of airplane motors, has reached such development as to make it reasonably certain that a daily dependable aerial mail service can be maintained. The Department is advised that Italy has already established such a service, which is so successful that it is being rapidly extended in that country. In developing its aerial mail program, the Post Office Department conferred with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, with the Aircraft Board, and with the War Department. All of these Government agencies approved the proposal of the Post Office Department to enter upon the operation of its aerial mail service at this time, and the release to manufacturers of the necessary equipment for the service was given, as the problems which the operation of a daily aerial mail service will help to solve, and the cross-country training it will give to aviators is regarded as being distinctly helpful to the Government air-service program.

On March 21, 1918, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics addressed the following letter to the Secretary of War on the subject of the aerial mail service:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,
"Washington, D. C., March 21, 1918.

"The Honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics on March 15, 1918, recommending cooperation between the Aviation Service of the Signal Corps and the Post Office Department in the experimental development of an aerial mail service between Washington, Philadelphia, and New York. Congress authorized and made an appropriation of $100,000 for the purpose.

"Under existing conditions practically all aircraft-manufacturing facilities are being utilized by the War and Navy Departments, and all capable aviators are in the service of these Departments. In view of the further fact that it is exceedingly desirable that Army aviators be regularly and systematically trained in long-distance flying, it would appear to be to the advantage of the Government and of the War Department that military airplanes and aviators be used to render practical and effective service to the Nation in the manner proposed. It was with this in view, and after careful consideration, that the committee passed the following resolution:

"'*Resolved*, That the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics recommends to the Secretary of War that, if practicable, active cooperation be established between the Aviation Service of the Signal Corps and the Post Office Department in connection with the proposed experimental aerial mail service between Washington, Philadelphia, and New York.'

"Respectfully,

"CHARLES D. WALCOTT,
"Chairman, Executive Committee."

So well did the post-office project appear to lend itself to war-training plans that the Signal Corps offered to weave the Aerial Postal Service into its training work and furnish the planes, mechanics, and flyers for the route between Washington and New York. In a memorandum dated March 1, from the Chief Signal Officer to all divisions of the Signal Corps, it is announced: "The Signal Corps is interested in this project (operating aerial mail service), because of the experience it will give pilots in cross-country flying and will give an opportunity to make endurance tests in actual service."

The service between New York and Boston will be operated with airplanes purchased and maintained by the Post Office Department for that purpose out of the appropriation for the current fiscal year. Six machines and duplicate parts were purchased as the result of advertisements inviting competitive bids. Those purchases, together with the acquirement of hangars and the preparation of landing fields, and other equipment in connection with the aerial mail service and its operation until June 30, 1918, will consume approximately the entire appropriation

A great advancement in the mails will result from the route between New York and Washington. Besides accomplishing the delivery of letters on every carrier delivery in New York City and by immediate delivery service in Washington on the same afternoon that the letter is mailed from either terminus or from Philadelphia, connections are made at New York for the larger cities in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey; at Washington for Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and intermediate points; and Charlotte, N. C., Atlanta, and Birmingham, and intermediate points. Important connections are also made at Philadelphia. In order to have made these connections by railroad it would have been necessary to have had a letter in the post office in time to leave on the 8 o'clock morning trains.

The airplanes to operate the Washington, Philadelphia, and New York route, I am advised, have been set up by the Signal Corps at Mineola, N. Y., and that branch of the War Department will be ready to operate this route on May 15.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

A telegram was also read from the Aero Club of America requesting an increase of the appropriation to $500,000, and the item was discussed further by Senators Smoot, Gallinger, Thomas, King, and Hardwick, after which the item went over till the next day for final vote.

May 14, 1918, on the motion to strike out the provision President pro tempore Saulsbury first ruled the motion to strike out lost by a division of 12 ayes and 13 noes. Senator Gallinger took an appeal from the ruling based on a calling of the yeas and nays, and the decision of the Chair was overruled by 25 yeas and 29 nays. Thereafter on a roll-call vote, the amendment of Senator King to strike the provision was rejected by 24 yeas and 32 nays. (May 15, 1918, the first daily mail service by airplane was inaugurated between New York and Washington.)

The Post Office appropriation bill approved February 28, 1919, incorporated the airplane mail service in a different item—

"For inland transportation by railroad routes and airplanes," with the following proviso:

"That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding $850,500 for the purchase of airplanes and the operation and maintenance of airplane mail service between such points, including service to and between points in Alaska, as he may determine."

Extensive provision was also made for the purchase of equipment and supplies for the service from the War and Navy Departments; and also that separate accounts be kept of the amount expended for airplane mail service.

January 31, 1919, and February 1, 1919, during the debate in the Senate on an amendment by Senator New to reduce the amount to $300,000, which was defeated on a division, many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD were filled and a detailed memorandum was read on the service from Otto Praeger, Second Assistant Postmaster General. During this debate Senator MCKELLAR participated as follows:

"Mr. KING. Were we not assured * * * by someone who assumed to speak for the Post Office Department, that there would be a revenue in the airplane mail service? As I recall the debate when the last appropriation bill was before the Senate, some statement was made which indicated that it would be profitable, that the people would avail themselves to a very large extent of the airplane service in the transmission of mail.

* * * * * *

"Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to direct the attention of the Senator from Utah to the testimony of Mr. Praeger, who has this matter in charge. It is found on page 88 of the Senate committee hearings:

" 'Senator HARDWICK. As I understand it, we only have one route actually established and in operation, and that is between Washington and New York.

" 'Mr. PRAEGER. Yes, sir; only one route, and it carried seven thousand four hundred and odd pounds of airplane mail at the airplane rate of postage; and the receipts from that were $60,053.28.

" 'Senator HARDWICK. You get that much in actual money from the mail you carried?

" 'Mr. PRAEGER. Yes, sir.

" 'Senator HARDWICK. And how much did it cost you to carry it?

" 'Mr. PRAEGER. The cost of operation was $75,165.94, which includes a bookkeeping charge of 6 percent interest on the investment, and 33⅓-percent depreciation.'

"I call the Senate's attention to the fact that this route, which is confessedly an inadequate route insofar as the cost and the efficiency of it are concerned, lacked less than $15,000 of paying for itself last year. I think under the circumstances it is a splendid showing.

"The Second Assistant Postmaster General goes on further to say in his examination that if he were permitted to extend the route from Boston to New York and to Washington and Norfolk, he believes that it could be made fully self-sustaining another year.

"It seems to me, in the light of those figures, we should give him this extra amount for the purpose of extending the route. It appears to me that it is a splendid showing. No one expected it to pay, and the fact that there was a loss of less than $15,000 in 1 year shows the wisdom of Congress in undertaking it. The time will come when probably most of our mail will be carried by airplanes. I hope to see the day when we shall have airplane service all over this continent.

"I hope the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be voted down. It ought to be voted down. It is an amendment against progress. We discussed this question here a year ago. It was discussed fully by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. King] and others who were not in favor of the appropriation at that time. The wisdom of Congress in making the appropriation has, in my judgment, been fully established by the experiments that we have already made and the very small loss involved. We should always go forward in this work and not backward.

"I trust the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will not be agreed to."

Other questions were answered by Senator MCKELLAR as to the purchasing of airplanes and the extension of the routes proposed. It developed during the debate that the Department had requested appropriation to extend on two routes; one from New York to Omaha, 1,225 miles, and the other from Boston to Atlanta, 1,100 miles; and the Department did not recommend an ocean-to-ocean service at this time. Then, just before the vote by which the amendment lost on a division, Senator MCKELLAR stated, as follows:

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to indorse all that the junior Senator from Michigan (Mr. Townsend) has so well said. It is a plain common-sense proposition. Last year when this item of appropriation was under consideration it will be recalled that the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. King) took then the same position about the appropriation that he takes now. Since that time, it seems to me, the experiment we have already had is sufficient to show the error of the position of the Senator from Utah. It is no longer an experimentation. A line then was established from Washington to New York, not so much because the business between Washington and New York was great enough to make it a paying proposition—that could not have been, because Washington is not a commercial city—but the idea was to give greater publicity to it, so that legislators could see what was being done with it.

"The Post Office Department took that appropriation. I think the service has only been in operation about 6 months; and they come back with figures showing that in that time the expenses of the plan or operating arrangements of the line have been $75,000 and that the receipts from stamps on the mail carried amount to $60,000. So that there has been an actual loss of about $15,000. I say that means not an experiment; or if an experiment, a successful experiment; and that there is no longer any doubt but that rapid airplane service will be the thing of the future. It will in a measure take the place of the telegraph and telephone doing the same thing. I believe if a line was established between New York and Chicago it would pay and pay well. When a line is extended to Boston, or a great commercial city of that kind, it is going to pay, and I make the prediction right now that in 1 year when we discuss this again and when my good friend from Utah makes a speech against it again he will find that it had been a good business proposition.

"Who in this country wants to stop the use of airplanes in mail service? Is there a Senator here who will want to stop it? Practically no one in this country would want to stop it. It is a progressive thing; we know it is coming in the future; we know it is going to be utilized more and more all the time. We are proud of the line that goes from here to New York. We are proud of its success. It has done splendidly. It shows that it is no longer an experiment, and we ought not to stop it, but we ought to increase it sufficiently to make it pay. It is purely a business proposition. All we have to do is to add to the line other commercial cities, and the result will be that it will be a paying proposition and bring the Government in just as much as the Government has to pay out.

"There is another thing connected with this matter. The Government has a large number of airplanes on hand. If they are not used for some purpose they will decay and be lost entirely. They are already built. They can not all be used in the Navy or in the Army. What are you going to do with them? Are you just going to let them lie up and decay without doing any good to anyone?

"The amendment provides that the appropriation here shall be used in buying those machines and using them on these mail routes. Is not that the sensible thing to do? Is it not the business thing to do? Why should there be a doubt in the mind of anyone about it? The money will be turned over to the Department that now owns them. In other words, the Government will be dealing with itself in buying these planes.

"Another statement is made to the effect that we have invested a good deal of money in these machines already. So we have; and I was delighted to see the report of Mr. Praeger, which I read a few moments ago, in which he says that practically all the machines that we started out with are still on hand and that only one of them will have to be renovated. I think it is just about to be renovated now.

"I say the Post Office Department has made a splendid showing, and we ought to increase this service and defeat the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, which would curtail it."

The post office appropriation bill for 1921, as approved April 24, 1920, contained the following provisions for the airplane mail service: *"Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may contract with any individual, firm, or corporation for an airplane mail service between such points as he may deem advisable and designate, in case such service is furnished at a cost not greater than the cost of the same service by rail, and shall pay therefor out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

"For the purchase of such airplanes as may be necessary to establish, operate, and maintain an airplane mail service between New York, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., via Chicago, Ill., and Omaha, Nebr.; for the operation and maintenance of such airplanes, including stations, equipment, tools and machinery, and other necessary incidental expenses; and for such personnel as may be necessary therefor, $1,250,000."

January 6, 1920, Senator MCKELLAR placed in the RECORD in the Senate a lengthy letter from Postmaster General A. S. Burleson addressed to him, contained in five printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (pp. 1084–1089, vol. 59, pt. 2), giving detailed comparisons between airplane mail service and train mail service, which had then been in continuous operation since May 15, 1918, and had covered 473,210 miles with a performance of 91.49 percent. He refers to the difficulties of legislation for the service, as follows:

"The development and extension of the air mail has been seriously hampered through failure of Congress to make substantial appropriations. This failure did not result from antagonism to an air-mail service, but was the result of a campaign conducted to force legislation for the creation of a department of air."

He also lists dozens of communities who have made application to be included in the airplane mail routes. At that time the service was operating out of its own landing fields adjoining Washington, Philadelphia, Newark, N. J., Bellefonte, Pa., Cleveland, Ohio, and Chicago.

Under "History of the Air Mail" Postmaster General Burleson at that time stated:

"The air-mail service was initiated by the Postmaster General, who directed the Second Assistant Postmaster General in 1917 to make a study of this subject with a view to establishing such a service, provided assurance could be given that the service would be practical, continuous, and efficient. As early as 1913 the Postmaster General recommended that Congress make an appropriation for an air-mail service. The recommendation was frequently repeated, and in 1916 the Congress appropriated $100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918. In the meantime a careful survey of the subject was made not only by the postal authorities but, at their request, by practical businessmen identified with the development of aviation, and particularly by the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, who detailed specialists on this investigation. Assurance being given the Postmaster General that such a service could be permanently maintained with efficiency, he directed the establishment of the first regular air-mail route between New York and Washington, effective May 15, 1918."

He also refers to the antagonistic sentiment prevailing among Army men, even to trying to call off the inauguration on the ground the service could not be run in bad weather, and states:

"The Army operated the air mail from May 15 to August 10, a period of 2 months and 25 days."

This letter was referred to by Senator McKELLAR in order to answer questions during the debate on the floor of the Senate in March 1920 on the Post Office appropriation bill for fiscal year 1921.

Senator Dial, of South Carolina, tried to amend the bill to provide for the airplane mail service between Boston and Atlanta, first asking for $800,000 and later reducing it to $625,000, which was one of the alternative routes proposed by the Department; and there were many other attempts to amend the bill to provide for service to other points. The purpose of the committee, however, was to then extend the service to San Francisco.

There was extensive debate on the floor of the Senate, among which is Senator McKELLAR's statement on March 29, 1920 (p. 4958):

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina because I am so heartily in favor of the air-mail service that I am willing to extend it; but I hope nothing that will be said here today will in anywise jeopardize the amendment which has been offered by the committee."

Senator McKELLAR thereupon quoted the committee amendment in full.

"I take a great deal of pride in that amendment. Three years ago, in 1917, I fought here to obtain an appropriation of $100,000 to establish an experimental route between Washington and New York. After a very vigorous fight that appropriation was made and the experiment undertaken, with the most splendid results. The next year a like sum was appropriated to continue that route, and last year that sum was increased to $850,000—an enormous increase—for the purpose of establishing a line between New York, Cleveland, Ohio, and Chicago. In every stage of its development the service has been a most marked success. At first a great deal more postage was charged for letters carried by airplane than for letters sent in the ordinary way, but since that time they have made such a success of this service that the postage has been reduced to the ordinary 2-cent letter rate, and, despite that reduction of postage, the service is paying for itself every day.

* * * * *

"Mr. NORRIS. That is a most remarkable statement. Why would it not follow that we ought to cut out of this bill the entire appropriation for the railway mail service, carry all the mail by airplane, and have all the mail between distant points transported in 1 day without any additional cost?

"Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will think about that for just a few moments, he will find that that would be wholly impractical at this time. This service has got to grow just like any other service. We had to establish railroads before we established the railroad mail.

"Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but we have got through with the railroads now. We have already demonstrated, judging from what the Senator says, that we can carry the mail by airplane and make money out of it. Now, we can not do that on the railroads. There is always a deficit, and it seems to me that is a solution of this proposition—just to have them carry it all by airplane.

"Mr. McKELLAR. We hope that wherever first-class mail has to be transported for long distances that it can be done at a very early time. The growth of the airplane-mail system has been something remarkable. This bill, as it is reported, increases the appropriation to $1,415,000, and the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, if adopted, would mean a further increase.

"I am for this system of mail transportation. I have long believed in it. I believe it is practicable. I do not think it is in the experimental stage any longer. What can be done has been already demonstrated, and I want to read very briefly from this report as to what has been done. It is a startling proposition as to what has been accomplished by the airplane service. I quote from a recent report of the Postmaster General:

"In the first place * * * The air mail service of the United States is the only practical commercial airplane service in the world. No service in foreign countries compares with it in magnitude, in continuous dependability, and in benefits to commerce.

"Now listen to this:

" 'Its record of performance during the fiscal year of 1919 was 96.54 percent, and this record was obtained with more than 30 percent of the trips made in rain, fog, mists, or other conditions of poor visibility. The operation of the service by months for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, is given in the accompanying table.'

"When it was first started it was not believed that it could be made continuous; some days the fliers did not want to fly, but the Post Office Department has managed that so that the fliers now fly every day. The airplane carries the mail nearly as regularly as a train, practically, and there has been but one fatality during the last year, something very unusual and very remarkable.

"Now, I want to call attention to another matter. I want to show what will be the advantage of continuing this route to California. Of course, it ought to be continued to California. This is not a sectional question. It is just a question of which route you are going to take first. I imagine that the next route will be either the one along the Atlantic seaboard or down the Mississippi Valley. It must be extended. I very much desire a route down the Missisippi Valley, from Chicago, by way of Memphis, to New Orleans. The necessities of commerce and the desirability of having quick mail service are going to force an extension of this air-mail service. It is going to force it on the part of Congress whether we are in favor of it or not. It is going through. This is one of the things that have been demonstrated by the experience of the Post Office Department."

Senator McKELLAR then described the New York-Cleveland route, which picked up 5,000,000 letters a year from New York for delivery in Chicago, and thereby saved the space on railroads for carrying that mail. And in reply to a question by Senator Kirby as to why the rate was reduced to 2 cents Senator McKELLAR stated:

"They did not want to make money out of it. It is not the purpose to make money out of any branch of the postal service. The object is to give the service and not to make money out of it; and the rate was reduced for that purpose, and for the further reason of experimentation, and because the airplanes did not get a sufficient load at the higher rate. When the lower rate was established so much mail was then carried by airplane that the Department was enabled to reduce the space and pay of the railroads carrying mail. It was to ascertain what could be accomplished.

* * * * *

"I will not read further from this report, but I merely desire to say that I am very anxious to have an airplane route established down the Mississippi Valley. I should like it, above all things. Memphis, my home, would be on such a route. I know that it is just a question of time when it will be established. I have not the slightest doubt of it. I should like to have it established this year, but I do not believe that we can do it all at once, and I am not going to offer an amendment for it at this time. I should like to do so. I am gratified that the committee, or a majority of the committee, have done as much as they have at this time for airplane service. They have increased the appropriation from $850,000 to $1,415,000, a very gratifying increase. It will be a valuable thing for the people of this country. It will be a great thing for the people of the Pacific coast; and the only experiment about extending the line to the Pacific coast is the ability of these planes to cross the mountains—certain mountains in Nevada and other far Western States. Now, I have no doubt about their having no difficulty about this. It was supposed that we could not run these planes regularly to New York when they were first started. Why, they run daily without trouble and without difficulty, so that it is no longer an experiment. When we establish this route it is perfectly obvious that with this large saving in time, with this perfection, almost, in the regularity of the delivery of mail, the service must be extended to our whole country.

"I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, because I have not any doubt about the desirability of the extension of this service.

"Other members of the committee seem to have doubts about it. I have never had any doubt but that airplanes could be used for the purpose of expediting our mail system. It has been a great success. It is a great honor and a great credit to the inventive genius of our own country. It is a great credit to the Post Office Department. We ought to build it up; we ought to add to it; we ought to make it more effective, in my judgment. I am just as strong for it as I was 3 years ago, when some Senators on this floor tried so hard to defeat the first appropriation for the service.

"I feel that it is for the best interests of our country, and I hope the committee amendment will be agreed to. I hope the amendment of my good friend on the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Dial], will be agreed to also. But I hope that no man who believes in the extension of this service, whether in one part of the country or another, will fail to vote for the amendment as it is, because if we cannot get what we want, let us get the best we can, and in that way build up our common country."

September 8, 1920, the first airplane mail service was established on a regularly scheduled basis from New York to San Francisco; being an extension of the previously scheduled service as far west as Omaha out of Chicago.

Many interesting details of the inauguration of the service to San Francisco are contained in a speech delivered by Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, before the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce on September 8, 1944—the 24th anniversary of the service.

The Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1922, approved March 1, 1921, contained the same provision as the previous year on contracting for transportation of mail by airplane, and the operation and maintenance section was changed as follows:

"For the operation and maintenance of the airplane mail service between New York N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., via Chicago, Ill., and Omaha, Nebr., including necessary incidental expenses and employment of necessary personnel, $1,250,000."

Points of order were made in the House against the provisions for the airplane mail service, but the items were restored by the Senate Committee, with no debate on the floor, and were agreed to in conference.

COMPARATIVE FIGURES

As of December 1, 1945, there were 72 domestic air-mail routes.

In 9 years of Government operation (1918–26) the cost of air mail was $17,411,534.

In 1944, according to the cost ascertainment report (which takes into account all direct

and apportioned expenditures), the profit on domestic air mail was $29,530,917, and on foreign air mail was $20,876,093.

Preliminary figures for 1945 show revenues on domestic air mail of $80,692,000 as against expenditures of $50,000,000, or a profit of $30,692,000; and on foreign air mail, revenues of $109,924,000 as against expenditures of $39,000,000, or a profit of $70,924,000.

In 1918 9 tons of mail were carried between New York and Washington. In fiscal year 1945 the total domestic air mail carried was 61,698,222 ton-miles.

E. W. COOPER.

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK C. WALKER, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1944

It has been said that the true history of America is the history of transportation—that the names of leaders of transport are as significant as those of Presidents of the United States.

If that be true, this magical city, which symbolizes romance even to those Americans whose eyes have never looked upon it, has witnessed a great share of American history. It remembers that the conquistadores made their phenomenal progress, not because the men whom they fought were less brave, but because the Spaniard rode and fought upon a horse. His adversary—looking with awe upon beasts of burden for the first time—thought that in the armored warrior mounted on his armored horse he confronted a single, terrible animal. San Francisco remembers the days of ox carts and covered wagons, and how your city at the Golden Gate experienced its rapid development because men willingly faced the discomfort and the tedium of the passage around Cape Horn rather than undergo the hardships and the terrors of the journey across the continent. Your fathers and grandfathers saw the coming of the transcontinental railroads. You yourselves have witnessed the beginning and swift development of our great airway system.

The past and the future are in our minds today as we commemorate the twenty-fourth anniversary of the completion of the transcontinental air mail route and the beginning of the twenty-fifth year of successful operation.

Air mail has an unusual importance to San Francisco. Your unique geographical location, with your far-distant Pacific coast cities tied to you by natural trade affinities—your status as the western terminus of the transcontinental route and the eastern terminus of the trans-Pacific route—all these combine to make air mail and San Francisco natural and intimate commercial allies.

In the development that seems destined to come about in our own time in Asia—with the vast possibilities of an awakening China—who will place a limit upon the growth of commerce which San Francisco will know? And thus it is appropriate that San Franciscans—old enough to be concerned for the future and young enough to be the leading participants in the future—should have inspired this fine gathering.

In 1910—7 years after Orville Wright made the first airplane flight in 1903—Representative Sheppard, of Texas, sought consideration for a bill "for an investigation to determine the practicability and cost of an airplane or airship mail route."

How often must Morris Sheppard have thought of that legislation in the closing years of his life, when as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee it became his duty to sponor measures authorizing the use of airplanes by the Army in numbers undreamed of in 1910—or 1920—or even in 1939.

Early in 1912, as a result of successful experiments sponsored by the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General recommended that $50,000 be appropriated to start an experimental route. From year to year the Department requested appropriations, and in 1916 funds for airplane service were made available from the appropriation for "steamboat or other power boat service." In that war year, as in this war year, there was difficulty in procuring planes. The Department advertised for an air mail route in Massachusetts and for several in Alaska, but no bids were received. Nevertheless, the Department continued negotiations with airplane manufacturers, as the World War spurred interest in aviation.

Finally, in 1917, by way of an amendment to a House Appropriations bill by the farsighted Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, who was then a member and who is now chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, Congress appropriated $100,000 for the establishment of the first experimental air mail route. The line was put in service on May 15, 1918, between New York and Washington, a distance of 218 miles. There was one round trip daily except Sunday. The War Department conducted the flying and maintenance operations. The Post Office Department handled the mails. The cooperation of the War Department was continued until August 12, 1918, when the Post Office Department took over the entire operation of the route, furnishing its own equipment and personnel.

Consider the situation which prevailed in those days. Here was an infant industry to which potential capital feared to entrust itself as did potential passengers. The Post Office Department, however, was an agency owned by all the people of America—the most widespread and all-pervasive agency in the land—an agency seeking the speediest form of transportation, and, fortunately, one which was ready, willing, and able to try the new device to see whether it could fulfill the promise of conquering time and distance. I think that what our fellow Americans accomplished in those early years deserves our gratitude. These men were pioneers who wrote a chapter in our history and in the history of human progress which commands our admiration.

With the success of that first route connecting the Nation's Capital with its largest city, they dared to dream of an air line flung to the West—west to Cleveland—west to Chicago—and some day, they hoped even as far west as San Francisco. They dreamed of a new mode of transportation for an enterprise of infinitely great importance to the American people—the carriage of the mails.

Again and again Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR was a champion of the air mail service. He fought for the appropriation to continue the first experimental route—he fought for the extension of air mail to Cleveland and Chicago—and finally, over bitter opposition, it was this confident air mail enthusiast who introduced the amendment which provided funds "for the purchase of such airplanes as may be necessary to establish, operate and maintain airplane mail service between New York and San Francisco."

Despite obstacles, the work went rapidly forward—so rapidly, in fact, that in less than 28 months after that first experimental air mail route was inaugurated the epochal westbound trip which we commemorate today, the last section of the transcontinental route, from Omaha to San Francisco, was accomplished. The post office historian noted with pride that this trip was flown at the rate of 80 miles an hour, without a forced landing for either weather or mechanical trouble, and that the plane carried 16,000 letters which arrived in San Francisco 22 hours ahead of the best possible time by train.

The United States Army now has 75,000 airplanes, of which 34,000 are combat planes, flying day and night. Let us picture, if we can, from the vantage point of 1944, a year in which the marvels of radio communication are regarded as commonplace, the daring that lay behind the decision to institute night flying. The Post Office Department recognized that if the transcontinental line could be operated on a through schedule with planes flying both night and day, a wonderful advance would be made. Plans were carefully made which envisioned a flight by night between Cheyenne and Chicago.

A plane left San Francisco at 4:30 in the morning of Washington's birthday in 1921. Just before 8 o'clock that night Pilot Frank Yager completed his section of the flight at the North Platte, Nebr., airport. There Jack Knight awaited him to relay the mail through to Omaha, where the world's first night air mail flight was to begin. Without radio or modern navigation instruments of any kind, Knight took off at 11 o'clock, pointing his plane toward Omaha. Another relay pilot and plane were to have taken over at Omaha but because of reports of adverse weather, the carefully prepared plans had been disrupted. No relief pilot was present to carry on.

Knight was unfamiliar with the route between Omaha and Chicago. He studied the map and flew east from Omaha at 2 o'clock in the morning. A driving snowstorm prevented his landing at Des Moines. Over Iowa City, with a supply of gasoline for only 10 minutes more in the air, Knight could not locate the airport. The ground crew, certain that bad weather had halted the flight, had gone home.

The watchman, hearing a plane overhead, lighted a red flare in the center of the field. Knight saw the flare through the snow and made his landing. He refueled, with the aid of the watchman, and continued the daring flight on through a dense Missouri Valley fog until he landed at Chicago at 8:40 o'clock in the morning. There the mail was taken on east and the flight was completed to New York. The total elapsed time for the trip, including all stops, was 33 hours and 20 minutes. The actual flying time was 25 hours and 16 minutes, with an average speed of 104 miles an hour over the entire distance of 2,629 miles.

The triumph of the flight in the face of such difficulties was persuasive evidence that the Post Office Department's air-mail service, with night flying as an essential part, had come to stay.

Rapidly, radio stations were established at fields and weather information was made available, and a system of beacon lights soon was put into operation. But all of the mechanical progress may be summarized in the apt statement which has been made that aviation radio, modern meteorology, and the finest operating techniques all sprang from the original determination that the mail must go through.

Neither the Congress nor the Post Office Department has ever intended that the Department would operate the air-mail service longer than was necessary to demonstrate its practicability. Several contract air-line routes were put in operation in 1926 and by August 31, 1927, the entire air-mail service was turned over to contractors and the Department was able to withdraw completely from the field.

A survey of the progress that has been made challenges the imagination. In 1918, over the 218-mile New York-Washington route, 16,009 airplane miles were flown and approximately 9 tons of mail were carried. In 1926, the last full year of post office operation, 2,256,137 miles were flown over routes that had expanded to 3,597 miles. By fiscal year 1944 there were just under 50,000 miles of routes over which almost 107,000,000 scheduled miles of mail service were flown, carrying 31,000 tons of mail. On the first transcontinental flight there were 16,000 letters carried to San Francisco. On this twenty-fourth anniversary we are delivering

more than 2,000,000 letters a day to the Pacific coast by air mail.

In terms of dollars and cents, the figures are just as remarkable. In the 9 years of Government operation, the cost of air mail was $17,411,534. Since 1926, $270,923,221 were paid to private carriers of domestic air mail and $122,402,162 to carriers of foreign air mail. Thus air mail has meant an expenditure of $410,736,917. In the last fiscal year more than a billion and a half pieces of air mail were carried, from which the revenue was an estimated $103,000,000. In the face of these figures, the Postmaster General's request for $50,000 for an experimental service appears indeed to have been a modest one across the vista of 32 years.

The growth of foreign air mail has been no less amazing than the domestic service. Beginning with the route established between Key West and Habana in 1927, and going on through 1935 when service was inaugurated from San Francisco across the Pacific by way of Hawaii, Midway, Wake, and Guam to Manila, foreign air mail has gone on to an extraordinary development. The war tended to accelerate that development and on the day before the Japanese bombs fell on Pearl Harbor service was inaugurated from Miami to Leopoldville in the Belgian Congo. Thus, since 1928, when 99,530 miles were flown, the foreign air-mail service has expanded to 19,500,000 miles flown in the fiscal year which ended last June 30—slightly more than 53,000 miles per day, and more miles in 2 days than were flown in the entire fiscal year 1928.

Due to the war, the schedules of foreign air-mail routes are not published but it may be stated that the frequency of service to most destinations is better than at any time in the history of the foreign air-mail service. This applies particularly to service to countries in Central and South America and the West Indies, which now operates with a much greater frequency than was the case at the beginning of the war.

On my last postal-inspection trip to the Pacific Coast States in March, delays were occurring in the transportation of the air mail. Because of the tremendous increase in the volume of air mail, the situation was extremely difficult for those of us concerned with maintaining an expeditious postal service. Our fleet of 324 mail-carrying planes had been reduced to 165 on June 1, 1942, to provide urgently needed transport aircraft for military use. By March of this year, the War Department had returned 26 of the 159 planes requisitioned, bringing the total fleet available for the domestic service up to 191 planes. But the volume of air mail had increased at an unprecedented rate and there were times when it could not be completely accommodated along with heavy war-connected priority traffic. With only half the number of planes formerly available, the air lines were called upon to carry a volume of air mail which had swollen by 150 percent.

Happily, that situation has now largely been corrected. In response to our urgent appeals, the War Department has found it possible to assist us with the return of additional planes and we now have a total of 257 in the service with a total of 300 expected by the close of the year. High utilization developed by the air carriers has almost doubled the daily mileage per plane and a greater number of schedules are being operated on the trunk lines than ever before. Thus, while occasional delays are inevitable under present conditions, the inherent advantages of air mail are again being demonstrated and emphasized.

What has been accomplished since last March may be understood by reference to the number of daily schedules from the Pacific coast to the East. At San Francisco, these have been increased from 9 to 13, and for the entire west coast from 33 to 47—increases in daily trips of more than 44 percent and 42 percent, respectively. Five of these 47 trips are exclusive cargo ships and sometimes the mail load runs higher than 3 tons on a single plane. The total volume of air mail being carried daily to the East from your west coast is more than 24 tons—not including north-south mail.

The present monthly volume of air mail being dispatched to planes, according to our trend-analysis figures, is upward of 4,500 tons, at a little more than 300 points—for a current increase of approximately 30 percent over the same month a year ago. You will be particularly interested to know that San Francisco's current increase of 135 percent leads the entire country. The monthly total air mail dispatched to inland routes from San Francisco at present is about 375 tons, or 12½ tons daily. This is being slightly exceeded only by Chicago, New York City, and Los Angeles, in the order named.

Today, September 8, 1944, 24 years after adventurous men pioneered the first transcontinental air-mail flight, air mail is on a self-sustaining basis. What can we expect to see in the future?

All of us have heard predictions as to the role of the airplane in the years to come. We know that great aircraft have been constructed in a quantity undreamed of even 5 years ago, and we know that the end of the war will probably find many thousands of planes available. We are told that within a decade after the end of the war the United States may well have 500,000 military, commercial, and private planes in active use.

I think we might well pause here and recall what was our experience in the past. In 1930 the air lines had 479 planes and flew almost 15,000,000 revenue miles. By 1937, when the number of revenue miles had soared to almost 40,000,000 the number of planes had fallen in those 7 years from 479 to 257 because of the larger size and better utilization of new types. The highest number of planes in use since 1937 was 364. The swollen volume of passengers and mail transport of wartime America in September 1944 is being cared for by 257 planes.

We can now reasonably believe that at least the European war is approaching its conclusion. For many months the Post Office Department has been laying its plans and the Department is prepared and ready to meet changing conditions and needs. To us, nothing is more important than swift, safe, and sure transportation. There now exist—and development goes on apace—methods of transportation by air, rail, motor vehicle, and water craft not envisioned even a few years ago. Each one of these systems is important. All of them must be coordinated so that each will complement the other—with the sole end of achieving speed of communication.

Many months ago I wrote to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board concerning the future expansion of domestic air-mail service, at a time when much was being said concerning feeder routes to connect with our great air trunk lines which cross and recross the continent. I called attention to the fact that there was not an immediate prospect of using aircraft in sections where the passenger and express traffic, combined with mail, would be so small as to make impracticable the establishment of such routes.

I stated that:

"In contemplating the matter of feeder routes, it should be borne in mind that motor transportation will be resumed after the war with increased emphasis. This medium is well adapted for short-haul traffic and high in popular favor. Supersedure by aircraft is not in immediate prospect. There will be few of the many proposals for local and feeder air service that will meet the searching tests of practicability and economy in competition with surface transportation having inherent advantages.

"The Post Office Department will continue to give all proper encouragement and wise assistance to aviation development. At the same time it will be mindful of a like obligation to other forms of transportation also vital to the safety and well-being of the Nation. By utilizing the peculiar advantages of each impartially, a completely effective and reliable postal service will be maintained, and a material contribution made to the stability of the entire transportation system."

This we do know, that the domestic air-mail service is on a fully self-sustaining basis. Revenues have exceeded payments to carriers and all other expenses for the past two fiscal years. It has undoubtedly been chosen by the public generally as the communication instrumentality of the postal service best suited to long-distance mail transport in the stress and tempo of our day. Continued popularity and increasing volume seem assured for the future.

Air mail has become an accepted feature of American life. Its growth is assured. It reflects the spirit of our age and in a peculiar way the spirit of America. It is tied to the growth of our commerce and to the binding together of the many parts of our country. It is something of which all of us may be proud. It is something in which all of us and especially you in San Francisco have a substantial interest. Because it is so important, because it is a part of the muscle and sinews of our country, I urge all of you, as men and women interested in your country's welfare, to lend your thoughts and your best efforts to help the air-mail system of the United States develop in the fashion that will be best for air mail and best for America.

Foreign Policy of United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States speaking in Chicago last Saturday said:

In the pursuit of peace, there is no single path. We must have a policy to guide our relations with every country in every part of the world.

With this statement I am in complete accord.

I believe that this House, composed of the representatives of the people, should take active leadership in developing a policy to guide our relations with every country and with every section of the world, such as the Balkans, the Middle East, and so forth.

For this and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Resolution 433 on November 29, 1945. In view of what the President said in Chicago I hope that the administration and the leadership of this House will support my resolution and that we will soon have a select committee to study foreign policy.

The resolution I introduced is as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) a comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world—such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan States, the Middle East, Central and South America, and so forth; and

(2) an investigation of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States;

(3) methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) the communication of such information to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days—the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1947.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Address Before Ninth Virginia District Democratic Convention—Bristol, Va., March 16, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech I delivered before the Ninth Virginia District Democratic Convention, held in Bristol, Va., on March 16, 1946:

Let me begin, as my heart prompts me to begin, by thanking you from a grateful heart for the nomination, which, of course, I accept, and expressing to you my appreciation for your action here today and on many former occasions.

The people of this district have been good to me far above my deserts, and my one hope, my one aim, in life, is to be able to repay them in some small measure for their many kindnesses.

I love the people of the mountains, and I call upon those who are present here today to witness my vow, whether in or out of Congress, I shall fight their battles as long as I live.

I now repeat what I have so often said: I had rather represent the mountain men and women of the Ninth District of Virginia in the Congress of the United States than to hold any other office within the gift of the people.

And, also, before I begin my address this afternoon, let me pay tribute, though feeble it may be, to the great leader of the Democratic Party that has passed on since we last met.

Yes, he was the great leader of our party, but he was more, he was the great leader of democracy, not only here in America, but everywhere throughout the world. His vision was not dimmed by territorial limits, his goodness of heart knew no bounds, he belonged to the world and the world recognized its own.

The yellow man of China, the black man of Africa, the brown man of Asia and the islands of the sea, the white man of the countries of Europe, all trusted him, and looked to him for leadership and guidance, and for deliverance from the accumulated tyrannies and oppressions of the ages.

He preached the gospel of freedom, of liberty, of equality, of my brother's keeper, of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, of good will, of peace on earth, that was so closely akin to the teachings of the Lowly Nazarene, that his voice commanded a world audience and his pronouncements a respect never before accorded to man.

He had his faults, he was human—the most human man I ever knew—and because he was so intensely human, because his humanity had been tempered by affliction, he understood and appreciated the great human problems that have harassed and baffled man over the years, and was able to bring about the solution of many of them. Had he lived—I hesitate to prophesy.

And so, when his noble, courageous spirit passed on, a pall fell over America, and men and women mourned as if the family circle had been broken by the passing of one of their loved ones.

Yea, more; a pall fell over all Christendom, and men and women of every land, of every color, of every tongue, of every creed, bowed their heads in grief and wept as little children, because they, too, knew that humanity had lost its greatest champion and friend.

My friends, in honor of the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, may we not pause for just a moment and bow our heads in silent prayer.

We now have a new party leader, a new American leader, who is confronted by problems—domestic and world—as complex, as vexatious, as any leader of men during the history of the world ever faced. He is honest, he is courageous, and endowed by nature in a high degree with common sense. Thrust into the midst of so many confounding problems it is but natural that he has, and will, make mistakes. He is, however, a great man, and I am persuaded will make a great President. My friends, I ask for him your patience, your tolerance, your prayers, because I know that Harry Truman will never let the American people down.

We meet today under conditions far different from those existing when we assembled 2 years ago. Then we were in the midst of the most devastating war ever waged by man. Now peace, blessed peace, again reigns, and we confidently hope, and fervently pray, that her reign may continue on down through the ages to the end of time.

Then we had our problems, great, fearful, direful, fateful problems, the problems incident to the preservation of our liberties. But we were militant, united, fighting together, sacrificing together, in a common effort to retain our freedom, and because we were filled with the spirit of unity, of sacrifice, we successfully worked out all the problems that stood between us and freedom's victory. Now that peace has been restored we still have our problems, different problems, it is true, but no less great than those of the war years, but we do have the spirit of unity, of sacrifice, of purpose, to win the problems of peace.

The problems of today, lasting peace and the reconversion from war to peacetime economy, have been, and are now, giving all thoughtful people real concern. It is of these problems that I would speak to you this afternoon.

Ours is the task of solving these problems in such a way that their solution will be permanent. Why? Because this is probably our last chance to reconvert from war to peace. Another war! I shudder when I think of the consequences. Its history would probably be the closing chapter, not only of American, but of world, civilization. At best, the problem following another world conflagration would not be the problem of reconversion. Rather it would be the old, old problem of evolution, of man working his way back through the centuries to his present estate of civilization.

WORLD PEACE

First, let me discuss with you for a few minutes our problems as they relate to world peace.

While engaged in war the allied democratic nations were together in purpose. That purpose, the noblest that ever filled the souls of nations, was to abolish war, free the body of man from the shackles of slavery, and the mind and soul of man from every form of restraint except the God-imposed restraint of conscience. At least, so they proclaimed in all their joint and separate pronouncements, and, in spite of the cynics, I believe they were sincere in their expressions of purpose.

In support of the belief that the Allied Nations were sincere, I cite to you the occupation by the Allied Nations of Germany and Japan, where the ruthless machinery set up by the dictators to control and regulate the body, mind and soul of man, is being destroyed, and democratic processes are being set up and employed to regulate society.

In further support of the belief that the Allied Nations were sincere, I remind you of the great progress that has already been made in the direction of world peace. During the recent past our accomplishments have exceeded the fondest dreams of the most sanguine. First, the San Francisco Charter, organizing a world corporation to be known as the United Nations, in which corporation all the democratic nations became stockholders. Then the London meeting of the stockholders, at which meeting officers and directors were elected, bylaws adopted, and the machinery blue-printed in the Charter set up and put in motion. All of these things, my friends, have happened in less than 1 year. It is hard for the mind to grasp the significance of such accomplishments.

Now, when doubts and fears begin to beset you, when disquieting rumors and counter-rumors begin to spread, when happenings take place that cause you to question the sincerity of some of the member nations, quietly sit down and contemplate this thought: We have accomplished more toward world peace in less than 1 year than was accomplished during all the centuries that are behind us.

The accomplishment of the declared purposes of the Allied Nations is no easy task. A lot of problems have accumulated in this old world during the centuries past, and it is too much to expect that they are going to be worked out and solved overnight. It is going to take time to remove the political, religious, and economic causes that create dictators and breed wars. And while these causes are being worked out, while practicing patience, forbearance, and a cooperative will to be of service in their solution, we have got to keep

in position, if necessary by force of arms, to immediately suppress any power that attempts to bring about a breach of the peace. War, like fire, spreads, and the United Nations, until the causes for war are removed, will have to be ready to be on hand with an extinguisher to put out every blaze that flares up.

Last fall it was my high privilege to act as one of the four congressional advisers to the United States delegates to the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations held at Quebec. In the beautiful Chateau Frontenac in that historic city gathered the representatives of 42 nations of the earth earnestly seeking to work out the food problems of the world. And may I digress to state that if the world food problem is solved, one of the greatest causes for war will be eliminated. Among the delegates were the outstanding men of the assembled nations in agriculture, in food, in nutrition, in marketing, in soil chemistry, in forestry, in fisheries. I never came in contact with a more earnest, a more sincere, a more intelligent body of men. While our aim was a common one, our viewpoints developed differences and disagreements that presented real problems. I found, however, the delegates to be big men, men of vision, common-sense men, eager to find solutions, usually ready to compose differences, and after 2 weeks of full and free discussions, of conferences around the council table, we reached agreements that were approved by all the participating nations. My friends, I left that conference fully convinced that no problem is so big, so explosive, that it cannot be solved around the council table, provided, of course, an honest, sincere effort is made by men who have the purpose of will to bring about its solution.

The United Nations Organization can work out the world problems that it was set up to solve. There is no question in my mind about that. The question is, will it work out the problems? There is but one way by which they can be worked out, and that way is by having the purpose of will to work them out. The will is a mighty force. Its strength has never yet been measured. If geared to action, it is strong enough, it is mighty enough, to bring lasting freedom and peace to the peoples of the earth. The work ahead of the people of this Nation and the peoples of the other nations that belong to the United Nations Organization is to create the national purpose of will to make the organization function. Let's do our part by creating the national purpose of will here in America.

The proper national purpose of will, I am constrained to believe, will create the proper peace complex among our people in that it will eliminate prejudice, create a desire to ascertain the facts before forming opinions, and will place the emphasis on the council table rather than the field of battle as the proper place to settle differences.

Down through the centuries man has been dreaming of the parliament of man, the federation of the world, and God in His own time, in His own way, has placed the responsibility upon this generation to make that dream come true.

My friends, the dreaming period in man's history is at an end. We have at last arrived at the stern, momentous day of decision.

Shall we continue to have a future with all the golden opportunities that are wrapped up in the tomorrows of that future, or—I shudder when I contemplate the thought—chaos?

We cannot, we dare not, fail the task a merciful, all-wise providence has placed upon us.

RECONVERSION

Having considered our problems of peace let me now discuss with you our problems as they relate to reconversion.

In order to understand this problem it is necessary for us to look into its background, because, I am persuaded, this problem is the legitimate offspring of the happenings of our yesterdays.

While the background logically falls into three parts, each differing from the other, all parts are akin in that they brought about unreal conditions and when added together explain our present unhappy estate.

Concretely stated our present unhappy estate has been largely brought about by the American people dwelling in an unreal world for the past two decades.

Let me briefly sketch these three periods:

In the unreal, fanciful boom years of the twenties we were simply living in a fool's paradise. Those of us who were not millionaires were putting our hard-earned savings into speculative stocks and questionable investments at highly inflated values, confidently expecting that the impossible would happen and, overnight as it were, we would be in the moneyed class. Any old stock, any old investment, regardless of its intrinsic value, that held out the faintest hope of fantastic returns was what we were looking for. This optimistic psychosis naturally brought on inflation and kept us floating around in the clouds until our inflationary balloon sprung a leak that sent us tumbling back to Mother Earth with such velocity that the shock when we finally contacted terra firma was so great that we were frightened out of our wits.

Then, before recovering from the shock, followed the unreal, whimsical years of the depression. In the beginning we sat on the curb in the middle of the block stunned, first looking up then down the street, confidently expecting prosperity to come agalloping around one or the other corners any minute. But prosperity did not come agalloping, or did it come a-limping around either corner, and our fears increased until we all became panicky. Then we resorted to this sedative and the other sedative, this stimulant and the other stimulant, this control and the other control, in our effort to bring relief, calm the fears of our people, and put back into them a little confidence and fight. While these sedatives and stimulants, these controls and restraints, were necessary at the time to sustain and revive a stricken and frightened people, in the long run they only added to our confusion and augmented the unreal conditions under which we labored.

Then, when we were about to sober up from the sedatives, free ourselves from the controls, recover from the jitters, and get our feet back on the ground, came the unreal, hectic, heart-breaking, soul-testing years of the war. But be it said to our credit the war, over night, united our people and planted in our hearts the fighting, sacrificial spirit that is the normal condition of the true American. We forgot our fears, our grievances, our differences, freely accepted all necessary controls and restraints, and in true American fashion girded our loins for the conflict. Production became the shibboleth of the farmer, the industrialist, the laborer, and this production team, working in a common effort, produced food and fiber and munitions of war in such unprecedented quantities that fear was thrown into the hearts of our enemies and hope and confidence engendered in the hearts of our allies. And our boys, sustained by the efforts of our great production team and the prayers of our people, though they faced the greatest war machine ever marshaled on the field of battle, acquitted themselves in such a manner that through their efforts and sacrifices victory, complete victory, became our portion. With victory, however, came the inevitable let-down from which, of course, we are still suffering.

Having lived in such an unrealistic world for so long, there is little wonder that we now find ourselves in the cold, gray dawn of the morning after, perplexed, bewildered, and floundering around in search of solutions for our peacetime problems. While we all agree that speedy reconversion from a war to a peacetime economy is imperative, offtimes we seem to work at cross purposes in bringing it about. Is this because we do not know how to reconvert? Is it because we do not know the kind of peacetime economy we want to revert to? Or is it because we have not as yet fully recovered our true perspective? I am confident it is the latter.

Now, as to the way to reconvert:

Grover Cleveland once said, "The way to retrench is to retrench" and, my friends, the way to reconvert is to reconvert. Now, the physical reconversion of our plants and machinery from war to peacetime production is no riddle, it is a simple problem in mathematics, of figuring out the number of men and working days necessary to make the change. No, the physical aspect of the problem is simple. It is the psychological aspect of the problem that seems to have us stumped. And this psychosis seems to affect industry and labor, the public in general, alike. We seem to still be nervous, jittery, and on edge. Unity of purpose seems to be lacking. The spirit of sacrifice, of give and take, of cooperation, of hard work, characteristically American, seems to be dead. And, too, many on both sides of the reconversion problem seem to be doing a lot of false thinking. All of this added up spells out the fact that we have not, as yet, recovered our true perspective.

The only way we are going to straighten the psychological aspect of the problem out is by thinking straight, talking less, and working more. We have talked about the production miracle of the war until some actually think it was a miracle and assume that all we have to do is just drift along and we will have a peacetime production miracle. Now you know and I know that this war production miracle is a figment of the mind brought about by false thinking. It was cooperation and hard work on the part of management and labor, and unremitting toil on the part of the farmers, that sent our war production to unprecedented heights. And, if we bring about the right kind of reconversion, the kind that will bring about the full production and full employment we had during the war, it is going to take straight thinking, cooperation, and hard work on the part of both management and labor. There is no other way.

As to the peacetime economy we want to revert to:

We are going to reconvert back to the good old traditional American economy of free competitive enterprise, and if there be those who do not like such an economy, let them buy a one-way ticket to the land of their choice and America will be the better off by their departure. Our system of free competitive enterprise, in that it has permitted a greater amount of freedom and produced a higher standard of living, is the greatest system of government ever devised, and the American people have no idea of swapping it off for some ideological system that sounds good on paper but that is so impractical and visionary that it would not work if we were right in the middle of the promised days of the millenium.

To the relatively few that would like to go back to the rugged individualism period of our system of free enterprise, a period that did more to discredit the system than all the crackpots, radicals, and Reds we have been afflicted with, let me counsel you that the American people have no idea of giving up the protective social and economic gains that have been woven into our system over the years, especially during the momentous years when we went forward under the guidance and leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, such as unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, collective bargaining, wage-and-hour laws, Federal deposit insurance, the Securities Exchange Act, and so forth. These

gains in no wise weakened the basic concept of our system. Rather they strengthened the system by humanizing it in such a way as to bring its benefits to a greater number, thus assuring its perpetuity. And as our civilization progresses still further social and economic benefits will be woven into the system in the further interest of the masses.

While the American people are determined to hold on to these social and economic gains, they are equally determined to rid the system of all stimulants and sedatives, regulations, and controls at the earliest possible moment. At least two of these wartime restrictions, price fixing and subsidies, which, of course, have no place in a free economy, will have to be removed before our free-enterprise system can function in the normal American way.

Price fixing will, in order to keep down inflation, to some extent, have to be retained until we get back to full production. When, however, the supply level of any given commodity reaches the demand level, price ceilings should be immediately removed. There can be no question about full production being the answer to price regulations. However, in seeking to bring about full-time production we have got to take a more realistic view of the profit motive that speeds up production. We need not think that we can speed up production as long as certain items, if produced, will have to be produced at a loss.

As to subsidies: I have always questioned the wisdom of a subsidy policy. Such a policy is one of the most dangerous things a free people ever embraced, has ruined every government that ever projected with it, and if not entirely gotten rid of will, sooner or later, not only destroy our system of free enterprise, create among our people a paternalistic complex that will continually send them running to Washington and crying for relief, but will eventually undermine and destroy our democratic government. The subsidy program, so far, has been largely a food-subsidy program, though there are those who would like to see it extended to other fields, and I confess that there is as much sense in subsidizing a man's housing bill, or rent bill, or his fuel bill, or his clothing bill, as there is in subsidizing his food bill.

The answer of the industrialist to subsidies is this: Give us a free competitive market which, alone, will bring about full production and employment, and we will produce abundantly and cheaply all the goods, wares, and merchandise the consumers need.

The answer of the farmers to subsidies is this: Give us a fair price in the market place and we will produce abundantly and cheaply all the food and fiber the consumers need.

The answer of labor to subsidies is this: Give us full employment at a fair wage and we will be able to go into the market place and purchase abundantly and cheaply the things the farmers and industrialists produce and in such quantities as to maintain our high American standard of living.

And the answer of the consumers to subsidies is this: Give us a free market where supply and demand plus competition regulate prices, and we will be able to buy better and cheaper food, and better and cheaper goods, wares, and merchandise.

Yes, my friends; the answer to subsidies is full employment, full production, a fair price, and a fair wage.

Now we need not think that reconversion can be made a painless operation. Straightening out the kinks in our economy that have crept in during the unreal conditions of the past two decades is no painless operation. At best it is going to bring on many hardship cases, a few headaches, a few cases of nerves, and a few cases of the jitters.

There are two other problems that figure prominently in our reconversion picture, namely, industrial-labor relations and the rehabilitation of our soldier boys.

As to our industrial-labor relations: Some seem to think you can regulate all the relationships between industry and labor by statute. It can't be done. Passing, in the heat of passion, your Smith-Connally Acts and your Case bills, which are condemned alike by the sensible industrial and labor leaders, who have given thought to the question, only aggravates the situation. Why even the most ardent advocates of the Smith-Connally Act now realize that it did more harm than good and are demanding its repeal. The Case bill, passed by the House in the heat of passion, upon which no hearings were held, is equally as vicious, and I do not know of a single outstanding industrialist that has given thought to the provisions of the bill that would endorse it. Collective bargaining, where men representing industry and labor sit around the council table and arrive at an agreement is the only democratic way. Of course, you need certain rules of the game to see that the contract openly and freely agreed upon is fairly and honestly carried out by both sides. And these rules of the game should recognize that the public has a vital interest not only in the terms but in the observance of industrial-labor contracts. Industry and labor, if possible, should agree upon these rules of the game and submit them to the Congress for consideration, and the Congress, after open hearings, free and full discussions, in order to determine if the rights of all parties—labor, industry, and the public—are protected, if it determines that the rights of all the parties are protected, should write them into law; or, in the event it determines changes are necessary in order to protect the rights of all parties, should make the necessary changes and proceed to write the proper law. If such an agreement is impossible, then after full hearings before a joint committee of the Senate and House, held at a time when industrial-labor relations are peaceful so that passion and ill will play no part, fair and just rules should be worked out and written into law.

Figuring prominently in our reconversion problems are the defenders of our country. The status of many of them was adversely affected by the war, and one of our most pressing reconversion problems is to rehabilitate them in such a way that they will be able to find their rightful place in society. The promises we have made our veterans should be redeemed now, and not like they were after World War I by IOU's due one-fourth of a century after hostilities.

We have, with remarkable speed, passed legislation aimed at the rehabilitation of the veterans. Much of this legislation was hastily drawn, and, if not revised, will do the veterans very little, if any, good. This legislation should be carefully reviewed at once and the necessary corrections made in order to work out a constructive veteran's program that will, with the red tape eliminated, actually function in the interest of the veterans.

My friends, I know that our reconversion problems are great, and I would not, in any way, discount them. We are still harassed by strikes, by bottlenecks, by price ceilings, by subsidies, by restrictions. The situation at times looks gloomy, and while now and then I become vexed, sometimes disgusted, I do not become discouraged. I still have faith in the American people, and that faith tells me that they still have the courage, the stamina, the ability, to work our problems out, and work them out in the American way.

Oh, I know we have had some pretty tough traveling during the past two decades. At times the road has been pretty rough and the going has been pretty hard. When I sit down, however, and think, and recall the period of inflation, the period of the depression, the period of the war, compare our condition with conditions prevailing in other lands, and begin counting our blessings one by one, before I get through counting I invariably wind up by thanking the one in whom we trust for His loving kindness and for successfully piloting us all along the way. I am no defeatist. My faith is still strong. I still have my face toward the future, and still believe that America's greatness lies not in the past but out yonder in the future that, under God's guidance, is beckoning us on to higher heights.

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George R. LeSauvage, president of the National Restaurant Association, on the Extension of the Emergency Price Control Act, H. R. 5270, March 26, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, my name is George R. LeSauvage. I am president of the National Restaurant Association and also represent the 80 State and local associations affiliated with the National Restaurant Assocation. The National and those affiliated associations represent all restaurant trade associations in the United States except one or two very small ones. These associations represent the majority of the restaurant operators in the country, which restaurants are 90 percent independently owned and mostly small business—situated in the cities, towns, villages, and crossroads of the country. Since the existence of the Emergency Price Control Act, the restaurant industry has fully cooperated with the OPA so that we, as an industry would fulfill our social obligation to the welfare of the country. Representing these operators, I have come to Washington 102 times. Our relationship with the OPA, in the main, has been very satisfactory even though at times honest differences of opinion did exist.

The general purpose of the Emergency Price Control Act was to stabilize prices—in short, to prevent inflation. With the main purpose of the act we have no objection, nor do we wish to ask price control for everyone else and have an exception made for our particular industry. We do, however, seriously object to the administration of the act and many harsh rules and regulations purported to be issued under the authority of the act.

Since retailing is the immediate channel of distribution with which the consumer deals, for obvious reasons, the burdens of price control have fallen most heavily upon retailers. In general, the Office of Price Administration has ignored the position of retailers—whether or not price adjustments at this level are warranted. The number and complexity of regulations, orders, and amendments issued by the Office of Price Administration have already been pointed out to you.

The Emergency Price Control Act was admittedly not a perfect legislative enactment. Yet despite its weaknesses, it has been reenacted in substantially its original form since 1942—perpetuating both the weaknesses of the law and the causes of its inequitable application. Unless Congress acts, these inequities will be continued or the Office of Price Administration will take the reenactment of the Emergency Price Control Act in its present form as a mandate from Congress to continue and to extend the present

inequitable and undemocratic administration of the act.

The restaurant industry, embracing the small and large public feeding establishments in the United States, has three comprehensive and deep-seated criticisms of the Office of Price Administration.

(1) The method of application and enforcement of regulations and orders issued by the Office of Price Administration in the field offices of this agency;

(2) Absorption by the public eating establishments of price increases granted to producers and distributors because of certain increased costs—even though the same justification for price adjustments exists at the retail level;

(3) Failure to provide adequate relief for those restaurant operators whose expenses are rapidly forcing them into financial hardship.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT

With respect to the field administration and enforcement of the Office of Price Administration, the emphasis which this agency has placed upon the detection of petty violations—in many cases inadvertent clerical errors resulting in single overcharges of 5 cents and in some cases as little as a single penny—is rapidly breaking down the faith these American merchants have in their Government.

The arbitrary and capricious methods used by many of the local price-control boards in compelling the small restaurateurs to consent to $25 and $50 administrative settlements resemble gestapo technique.

In their zeal to detect accidental overcharges, the enforcement branches have neglected the greater problem of the black markets where the real inflation is taking place.

It is currently being reported in the newspapers that dealings in the black market are on the increase. We believe that the enforcement division of the OPA should be concerned with the stopping of these practices and less concerned about using their inspectors to detect petty violations, most of which are inadvertent and through mistake or misunderstanding. Price control controls only the legitimate operators and not those dealing in the black market. Consequently, we believe that unless the black-market operations are stopped, a continuation of the Price Control Act is useless.

We do not wish to minimize the splendid work done by the members of the price panels, but in our discussions with members of these panels, we are referred to the operating instructions issued by the Washington office of their agency. We earnestly request that this committee on the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act examine the following booklets issued to the price-control boards:

1. Operating Hand Book for Members of Price Control Panels.

2. How Price Control Works.

Even though the penalties of the Emergency Price Control Act are quasi penal in n ture, there is no consideration given in OPA enforcement to inevitable and accidental errors resulting in overcharges. It is doubtful if Congress in its most recent extension of the Emergency Price Control Act was thoroughly familiar with the extensive authority which it was delegating to this Agency. We trust that Congress did not intend the extension and use of the power assumed by the Office of Price Administration as presently exercised.

The National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee has repeatedly requested that the instructions given to price-control boards be made available so that the members of the industry will know the procedural policies of the Agency. The Office of Price Administration has refused to make these instructions available, giving as their reasons that such instructions are confidential. This is a dangerous and undemocratic attitude. Administrative regulations and instructions should be public information.

Even with these secret instructions, there is a definite lack of uniformity in the interpretations given by price-control boards and in the activities of individual price-control panels. The same set of facts may provide relief in one case and deny relief in another, depending upon the attitude of the price-control boards.

The antagonism against the Office of Price Administration for the use of such tactics is best illustrated by an item appearing in a Chicago newspaper on March 11, 1946. This newspaper item describes how OPA agents are to be proceeded against in Lewistown, Ill., on a charge of operating a confidence game. Pertinent quotations from this newspaper article follow:

"Scheduled for hearing here at 10 a. m. before Justice of the Peace Opie Lambert on confidence-game charges are Edward Fox, of Pekin, Ill., OPA district enforcement officer with headquarters in Canton, Ill., and Miss Rosalie Baldwin, of Canton, one of his price investigators.

"Lachen Crissey, State's attorney of Fulton County, who authorized the warrants yesterday, said today he did so in order to bring into the open for a legal test the OPA practice of assessing fines against accused violators of OPA price ceilings under threat of injunction proceedings.

" 'We are not charging that Fox kept any of the money for himself,' Crissey explained. 'We do charge that Miss Baldwin reported violations of price ceilings, which in fact had not taken place, and that Fox wrongfully exacted money in the name of the United States by threatening Ludlum and others with litigation to put them out of business.'

"Crissey said that under Illinois law the essence of the offense of operating a confidence game is the wrongful obtaining of money, and that it is immaterial that the person wrongfully obtaining same was acting under the color of Federal authority and giving the money to the Treasury.

" 'Ludlum is only one of five grocers in Canton who have closed up or sold their businesses within the last 6 weeks,' Crissey said. 'These men had all been in business for long periods of time, some for over 20 years. All were accused of violating price ceilings and hailed into Fox's office where, without any formal hearing, they were coerced into signing confessions of violations and paying settlements.'

" 'Apparently the OPA had some sort of drive on to find out how many violations it could uncover and how much it would collect in fines,' the State's attorney commented. 'These five men have been driven out of business and now they have nothing to lose from coming forward and telling the truth.' "

COST ABSORPTION

The policy of cost absorption has descended with particular viciousness upon the restaurant and public feeding industry. The operators comprising these groups are frozen at prices charged during the week of April 4 to 10, 1943. Since that date, the number of price increases permitted producers and distributors of food commodities have been numerous. Commercial rents and wages have increased and, in general, the expense rates in this industry have been increasing steadily. In some cases rents have increased two and threefold. Unless recognition of these factors is given and relief granted, the public feeding industry will face ruin. This danger is not in the distant future, but is a present reality. Because of the present world food crisis, increased production of raw food commodities will not solve the problems of the restaurant industry.

ABSENCE OF ADEQUATE RELIEF IN HARDSHIP CASES FOR RESTAURANTS AND PUBLIC FEEDING ESTABLISHMENTS

Restaurant prices are governed by Restaurant MPR 2, section 17, of this regulation entitled, "Adjustments," provides that ceiling prices for any eating or drinking establishment may be increased under certain circumstances, briefly, that they are (1) operating under such financial hardship as to threaten the discontinuance of operations; (2) such discontinuance would result in inconvenience to customers, and (3) that, if restaurants were discontinued, customers would be forced to pay as much or more than proposed adjusted prices elsewhere.

This hardship clause has caused considerable misunderstanding and dissatisfaction with the Emergency Price Control Act in that very few applications have been acted upon favorably and the showing to be entitled to price relief is too cumbersome.

We are quoting from a letter received from one of the district offices of the Office of Price Administration denying relief under section 17 on restaurant MPR 2:

"In conjunction with processing your application, an audit was made of your establishment's operations during the base period year of 1942, and during 1944 and during the first 3 months of 1945. A comparison of your establishment's profit and loss after deduction of a $2,500-per-year proprietor's salary shows that in 1942 the establishment earned $1,822.87 (6.83 percent of sales) while in 1944 it earned $1,964.30 (3.91 percent of sales). Its earnings during the first 3 months of 1945 was $42.62 (0.37 percent of sales), annd while not considered as a conclusive indication of its profits position for the year 1945, do show that the establishment continues to operate profitably."

The National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee to OPA has continuously attempted to get a revision of this hardship clause. This matter came to a head in October 1945 at which time the committee met with the Restaurant Branch of the OPA in Washington on October 31. The advisory committee was advised that an amendment had been signed and would soon become effective. This proposed amendment would revise the hardship clause and eliminate the objectionable section. This action was never taken.

For the benefit of the committee, we quote section 17 of MPR 2:

"SEC. 17. Adjustments: (a) OPA may adjust the ceiling prices for any eating or drinking establishment under the following circumstances:

"(1) The establishment is operating under such financial hardship as to cause a substantial threat to the continuance of its operations; and

"(2) Such discontinuance will result in serious inconvenience to consumers in that they will either be deprived of all eating or drinking services or will have to turn to other establishments that present substantial difficulties as to distance, hours of service, selection of meals, food items or beverages offered, capacity, or transportation; and

"(3) By reason of such discontinuance, the same meals, food items, or beverages will cost the customers of the eating or drinking establishment as much or more than the proposed adjusted prices.

"(b) If you are the proprietor of an eating or drinking establishment which satisfies the above requirements, you may apply for an adjustment of your maximum prices by submitting in duplicate to your OPA District Office a statement setting forth:

"(1) Your name and address and the name and address of your establishment.

"(2) A description of your eating establishment including: type of service rendered (such as cafeteria, table service, etc.), classes of meals offered (such as breakfast, lunch,

and dinner), number of persons served per day during the most recent 30-day period, and any other information which is necessary to describe your establishment and the nature and extent of your operation.

"(3) The reasons why your customers will be seriously inconvenienced if you discontinue operations.

"(4) The names and addresses of the three nearest eating places of the same type as yours.

"(5) A list showing your present maximum prices and your requested, adjusted prices.

"(6) Detailed profit and loss statements for the establishment for (I) a 3-month period which ended not earlier than 90 days prior to the date of your application, (II) a 12-month period which ended not earlier than 90 days prior to the date of your application and (III) the calendar or fiscal year approximating the year 1942.

A study of that section will convince any fair-minded person that although the restaurant might be in financial difficulty due to the increased cost of doing business, it might still be refused relief under this section.

To make a showing that a restaurant was essential a restaurant operator might have to go to the extremes of securing signed statements from all of his customers to the effect that they would be unable to obtain food if his restaurant was closed. Ridiculous as this may seem, many restaurants throughout the country have been denied price relief, even after they show financial difficulties, for the reason that they are not essential.

We believe that the so-called essentiality clauses should be entirely eliminated for the reason that we do not believe any official or employee of the OPA should have such wide discretionary powers over any operation, which power is being constantly exercised.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Subsection (e) of section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, should be modified in the following respects:

(a) Persons who violate a regulation, price schedule, or order should be liable for only the amount of overcharges, except in cases where violations are willful or the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of violations. In cases of willful violations or where the violator has failed to take proper precautions the penalty should be discretionary with the court.

(b) The authority of the price-control boards derived from this section 205 should be limited to fact finding. The present system of administrative settlements should be abolished and penalties assessed under the Emergency Price Control Act should only be made after formal action, using regularly constituted courts of the United States, upon proof of willfulness or the failure to take proper precautions against occurrence of violations.

2. The undemocratic policy of cost absorption and indirect profit control should be eliminated from the administrative programs of the Office of Price Administration by adequate declaration of congressional intent in the Emergency Price Control Act. Cost absorption is the most harmful brain child of the Office of Price Administration. Legal basis for the application of this principle has been in the nature of a rationalization by its proponents in the Office of Price Administration. It certainly is not contemplated by the Emergency Price Control Act and should not be a policy of government. Cost absorption is discriminatory in its essence and subsidizes certain groups in our national economy at the expense of retailers.

3. The hardship clause of section 17 of Restaurant MPR 2 should be rewritten in accordance with the suggestions of the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee of the Office of Price Administration.

4. The justification for the continuance of price control is rapidly being overshadowed by the evils of present administrative policies of the Office of Price Administration. Unless Congress recognizes these dangerous trends and takes steps to correct them in connection with the extension of the price control act, it might be better to abolish such controls, rather than permit these controls to break down the American system of free enterprise and individual opportunity.

We recommend the formulation of pricing programs which will take into consideration the realities of the increased cost of doing business by the restaurant industry. Such programs should recognize the changing conditions of the reconversion period and should be directed at the ultimate elimination of controls in the restaurant industry, as well as in other industries, and over particular items as soon as decontrols are warranted.

Public Service of Senator Mitchell, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, since the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] has served as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, I am pleased to see that magazines, newspapers, and columnists recognize the diligent and capable service he is performing.

It was no more than correct, but pleasing to me, nevertheless, to read in Drew Pearson's Washington Merry-Go-Round column in the Washington Post yesterday that columnist's estimate of HUGH MITCHELL as capable and hard working. The writer apparently agreed with Life magazine, which praised the Senator's capacity for work.

Even more pleasing to me as one who knows the importance of hard-working Senators to the Nation are the comments of newspaper writers in the home State of the Senator from Washington. It was good to read Karl Stoffel's estimate in the Wenatchee World that "the Republican who goes gunning for him this year had better be oiling up his shootin' irons early."

And Ross Cunningham, in the Seattle Times, outlines a problem for both the Senator from Washington and his constituents in these busy days of continuous congressional sessions. I ask unanimous consent that the brief article written by Mr. Cunningham be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEAKING OF THE NEWS—DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS LINE UP CANDIDATES FOR COMING ELECTION RACE

(By Ross Cunningham)

The business of fitting the square-plug candidates into the round-hole offices for next year's general elections is well into the state of "who's going to run for what?"

While the primary elections are 6 months away, political plans are laid well in advance and certain patterns are beginning to be apparent. The prospective candidates are not committing themselves, but their various advocates make known the pattern.

The most coveted office is the one held by United States Senator, HUGH B. MITCHELL, Gov. Mon C. Wallgren's former senatorial secretary, appointed by Wallgren to fill his unexpired term in the Senate.

Among some Democrats there is a serious doubt as to Mitchell's ability to be elected. Few question Mitchell's ability as a Senator; he's a hard worker, knows his way around the capital from his long experience with Wallgren, and has demonstrated an ability to get things done.

But his willingness to work at the job of Senator may be his undoing. Mitchell is so busy that he neglects his political work, lacks voter appeal. He's an unorthodox Senator—since many others do their political work first, and then do their governmental work if they have time.

Unfortunately, the voters don't always understand those things and often cast their ballots for the public official more often heard and seen.

Some of the Things the English Say About the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress approves proposed British loan we should carefully consider this country's financial condition and the expressed attitude of many of the leaders of England concerning the loan and plans for repayment.

STATEMENT OF JOHN B. TREVOR, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN COALITION, TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY OF THE SENATE ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 138, MARCH 20, 1946

OUR LIABILITIES AND ASSETS

Mr. Chairman, the National Industrial Conference Board, which was organized and is maintained for the sole purpose of carrying on purely objective research into economic problems, estimated that the total national wealth of the United States in 1938 was $309,400,000,000 (Economic Almanac, 1945–46, conference board). I take this figure to be as nearly authoritative as it is possible to obtain.

Against this estimate of our national wealth, permit me, Mr. Chairman, to point out to the committee that according to the daily statement of the Treasury (February 1, 1946), the gross public debt and guaranteed obligations of the United States is put at $279,379,000,000. To this figure must be added the gross State, municipal, and private debt consisting of farm and other mortgages and short-term obligations of varied character. The most up-to-date figure which we have been able to obtain from official sources for these items is $176,400,000,000 (U. S. Debt Pattern in War and Peace, by Alvin Slater, reprint from Survey of Current Business, Department of Commerce). This figure added to our total national obligations gives a grand total of $455,779,000,000. I suggest to the committee that this total of $455,779,000,000 is probably a minimum figure of the total debt now saddled on the backs of the American people, which must be met some

day unless we abandon the principle that honesty is the best policy.

Mr. Chairman, if the committee will compare this debt of the American people with the estimate which I have already given of our national wealth, it will be observed that the debt exceeds our national wealth, as estimated by the National Industrial Conference Board, by approximately $146,000,000,000. It is, of course, true that the estimate of our national wealth made by the conference board was computed for the year 1938, but I suggest to the committee that the estimate may now be excessive by reason of the fact that the wastage of war has depleted all our national resources to an extent which it is difficult to compute in terms of dollars and cents.

In the light of these facts, which, in our opinion, are indisputable, it seems to us that the Congress has no right to give $3,750,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to any foreign nation, no matter what its necessities may be. As a matter of fact, Mr. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, told the press, in substance, on December 6, 1945 (New York Herald Tribune, December 7, 1945), that if the only purpose of the loan was to enable Britain to meet the annual deficit in her trade balances for the next few years or to provide a stimulus for purchases by Britain in the American market, there would not be sufficient consideration for the United States in the deal to justify the credit. Mr Clayton bases his argument for the loan, however, on the theory that it will enable Britain to join in full partnership with us in bringing about a multilateral nondiscriminatory trading system throughout the world.

MULTILATERAL TRADE

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to us that if the promotion of multilateral trade is the sole justification for the loan, it is proper for us to thoroughly analyze this question of multilateral trade. An examination of data compiled by one of our great financial institutions (Bulletin, National City Bank, December 1944) discloses that between 1922 and 1939 the American people spent outside of the United States $1,200,000 more for goods and services than they received. Perhaps even more significant than that fact is the circumstance that during this period from 1922 to 1939 it is demonstrable that foreigners conducted what may be classified as stock-market or banking operations in the United States to an amount well over $7,000,000,000. They did not use this sum of over $7,000,000,000 to buy American goods. What they actually did was to repatriate foreign securities to an amount, in round figures, of $1,100,000,000. Furthermore, they spent about $3,400,000,000 in the purchase of American securities. Finally, the account shows an inflow of short-term capital to the amount of $2,600,000,000; that is to say, a grand total of $7,100,000,000 for all these operations.

Mr Chairman, the committee is, of course, aware that during this period foreign nations owed the United States at least $14,000,000,000, but no effort was made by these foreign nations owing this sum, with the exception of Finland, to utilize any of the credits which they had accumulated, as set forth above, to reduce their national obligations to the American people.

Let me add, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in the loan agreement which prevents the use of funds obtained by means of the loan from being used in stock market operations after the money has been spent by Britain. Let me illustrate this fact: Suppose Great Britain buys Argentine meat up to any amount with the proceeds of this loan. According to the multilatera' trade theory, these dollars spent in Argentina would be utilized to purchase goods in the United States, but that is a pure assumption. It is our contention that this money could be spent solely in the American stock market for the repatriation of Argentine bonds, or for speculation in American securities. In other words, once the American people part with this money to Great Britain, there is not the slightest assurance that it will perform the purpose which Mr. Clayton says is the real justification for the loan.

Since Mr. Clayton has made a fetish of multilateral trade, permit me, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee to an interesting statement printed in Foreign Commerce Weekly, of January 19, 1946, which, as the committee knows, is published by the Department of Commerce. This statement appears under the subtitle of "Gold and short-term capital," and the article reads:

"Shortages of many civilian commodities and lack of shipping space made it impossible for some foreign countries to use all the dollars they received during the past year to purchase merchandise in this country. Altogether they received an estimated $1,991,000,000 more than they used (see introductory summary), although this tentative figure may be either raised or lowered as more complete data for the year become available."

Further on in the article, it states:

"With the increase in 1945, foreign balances in this country reached about $6,400,000,000, while United States balances abroad were about $290,000,000 at the end of the year."

Now, here is a very important statement:

"Foreign gold reserves at the end of 1945, including both stocks held abroad and amounts held under earmark in the United States for foreign account, may be estimated at roughly $16,000,000,000."

There would appear, therefore, to be a total of gold and dollar balances available for multilateral trade among the foreign nations amounting to $22,400,000,000, and I understand that, in addition to this figure, there is somewhere around half a billion dollars to a billion dollars in currency floating around in these foreign countries or in foreign accounts. These figures, Mr. Chairman, certainly do not justify the Congress saddling an additional debt of $3,750,000,000 on the American people.

REPAYMENT OF PRINCIPAL

Mr. Chairman, we further object to this loan because we see no reasonable ground for the belief that the principal will ever be repaid. It seems to us that the committee should not lose sight of the fact that when Lord Keynes first came to the United States he did not come to negotiate for a loan, he came to negotiate for a gift. On September 13, 1945, the New York Times, under the title "Keynes' Statement of British Position," printed the following:

"No doubt an easy course, Lord Keynes said, would be for you to offer, and for us to put our name to, a substantial loan on more or less commercial terms, without either party to the transaction troubling to pay too much attention to the question of the likelihood of our being able to fulfill the obligations which we were undertaking.

"But not only did he fear that the deception would probably have a very short life but it would be extremely short-sighted if the absence of friction and bad feeling between the two countries is one of the principal aims."

In spite of that statement, Mr. Chairman, the loan agreement, as the committee is well aware, took on the form of a more or less commercial character. It embodied, moreover, the very deceptions which Lord Keynes stated it was the purpose of the British negotiators to avoid.

A careful examination of the parliamentary debates on the loan agreement offers abundant grounds for the belief that there was almost a consensus of opinion on both sides of the House of Commons and on both sides of the House of Lords, that the British Government would not be able to meet the terms of the agreement which it had signed. Consider this quote, if you please, from the remarks of Mr. Bevin, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, which must be taken as authoritative:

"It has been said that, inevitably, this will lead to another repudiation. That is in the hands of the United States, and nobody else. The United States say that they want freer trade, but freer trade does not only mean the lowering of a tariff barrier, it depends on the actual fact as to whether they buy goods. The trouble of the Baldwin settlement, as it is called, and the trouble that would arise under this settlement, will arise if we are not allowed to work off our debts." (Parliamentary Debates, December 13, 1945, p. 734.)

The committee is, of course, familiar with the fact that Great Britain defaulted on the First World War loan, which, with interest, now reaches a total of approximately $6,500,000,000. In connection with this default, you will observe that Mr. Bevin fixes the responsibility upon the United States and proposes to fix the responsibility upon the United States for the possible future default on this loan on the same basis. In other words, if the committee is prepared to recommend to Congress the passage of the resolution now before it, it must be prepared to recommend a clean sweep of all tariff barriers together with the adoption of a policy of promoting the purchase of British goods in contradistinction with the purchases of competitive American goods in the American market. If the committee is not prepared to go that far, then Mr. Bevin can say, "Well, I warned you we could not pay if you did not take all the goods we had to offer."

One of the outstanding spokesmen for the opposition in the House of Commons, Mr. Boothby, goes even further than Mr. Bevin. He said: "I conscientiously believe that this country is not, and will not be, in a position to discharge the obligation she is being invited to undertake by the Government." (Parliamentary Debate, December 12, 1945, p. 456.)

In the House of Lords, Lord Woolton said:

"My Lords, I am fearful of accepting this bond, and I am fearful of it because I admit that I am a financial puritan. I was brought up in the school which regarded financial probity as a matter of the greatest importance. For generations it has been one of the characteristics and the glories of the city of London. I am very fearful of the name of my country being placed on a bond which we may not be able to honor. I am more fearful of that than I am of the consequences of refusing to sign such a document. I could not sign a bond unless I knew that I could redeem the pledge. The Government will have signed this bond without knowledge that they will be able to redeem it. The very conditions involved in the transactions deny such knowledge to them. They rely upon some nebulous scarce-currency clause in article 12." (Parliamentary Debate, December 17, 1945, pp. 711-712.)

Mr. Chairman, allow me to submit to the committee this additional quotation from the debate in the House of Lords:

Lord Altrincham speaking:

"I fear, therefore, that these obligations may be the cause of grave misunderstanding in the future, and that the people of the United States should understand this, which is absolutely fundamental to these agreements. They do not understand that the conditions attaching to our acceptance of this line of credit—the only conditions on which we can pay for this credit if we take it up—involves a complete transformation, and, indeed, a transfiguration of the American economic system, if they are not to compel default." (December 17, 1945, p. 735.)

In the face of these excerpts from debates in the British Parliament, it seems to us unthinkable that the Congress of the United States should approve this agreement. It

seems to us that it is conclusively demonstrated that any blame for the default by the British on this loan is going to be placed on the Congress of the United States, should it determine to offer any protection whatever to the American standard of living as we understand that term.

An examination of editorial comment in the British press discloses the same point of view. The present loan agreement has indeed been compared with the Dawes plan and the Young plan, with the conclusion that, as in the case of those plans, there must inevitably result a revision of the terms of the agreement which you are now asked to approve in the resolution before the committee.

Allow me to repeat, Mr. Chairman, it seems to us that there is no justification for the Congress to approve a loan of $4,400,000,000 to England in the face of the British attitude toward this project.

INTEREST

Mr. Chairman, permit me now to take up the question of the right of Great Britain to waive interest upon the loan. In this connection permit me to read to the committee the following statement made by Lord Keynes in the House of Lords:

"We pay no interest for 6 years. After that we pay no interest in any year in which our exports have not been restored to a level which may be estimated at about 60 percent in excess of prewar. I repeat that. We pay no interest in any year in which our exports have not been restored to a level which may be estimated at about 60 percent in excess of what they were prewar.

"Lord BARNBY. In volume or value?

"Lord KEYNES. Volume. That is very important. I should have said so. The maximum payment in any year is £35,000,000, and that does not become payable until our external income, in terms of present prices, is fifty times that amount." (Parliamentary Debate, December 18, 1945, pp. 785–786.)

Now, let me suggest to the committee that there is nothing in the recent prewar history of British foreign trade which offers any substantial basis for the belief that the British can, or will, increase their exports by 60 percent over the prewar volume. This arrangement offers a terrific temptation to any government, whether it be Socialist or non-Socialist, to adjust the economic policy of Great Britain so that interest on the debt will never have to be paid. Indeed, in the light of the restrictions which have been imposed by British labor unions on the productivity of labor, we think it is as fair an assumption that British trade may well fall below its prewar averages, as there is ground for the belief that it may exceed prewar averages. Let me illustrate this point. After a goal of 200 to 300 bricks a day had been set for bricklayers in rebuilding bombed London, Sir Harry Selley, a man 73 years of age, bet George Hicks, Parliamentary Undersecretary of Works, that he could lay 200 bricks in less than 2 hours, it being his contention that the number of bricks a man ought to be able to lay in a day was 800. Sir Harry proved his point by laying 200 bricks in 58 minutes. (New York World-Telegram, May 18, 1945.)

If the quota of 200 to 300 bricks a day can be taken as evidence of the present standard of production by British labor, no American can reasonably assume that British exports will exceed prewar levels. However this may be, Mr. Chairman, we regard the waiver of interest clause as one of the outstanding deceptions in the loan agreement. That is to say, one of those deceptions which will prove as Lord Keynes feared provocative of misunderstanding between this country and Great Britain.

Permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that we regard this waiver of interest clause as peculiarly indefensible because it would be perfectly possible for the British to allocate raw materials at a predetermined price in substitution for dollars in payment of interest. The government now in power in Great Britain is converting the nation, over which it rules, into a socialistic commonwealth, and it has taken over properties of all kinds to be managed by the state. Under these circumstances, there is no good reason whatsoever why the British could not have offered the products of their mines of scarce metals in substitution for dollars in the event of a scarcity of dollars. Indeed, it may be seriously contended, in our opinion, that mines and other Government monopolies could have been offered, or asked for, as collateral for the advance of funds contemplated in the agreement now under consideration by the committee.

In this connection, permit me to call the attention of the committee to the fact that Lord Keynes, in a paper read to the Economic Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in August 1938, in speaking of loans secured by raw materials, stated:

"But, on the other hand, here is an opportunity for a substantial volume of foreign investment, where the capital involved is absolutely safe. And in these days that is a primary consideration. We should be enabled by this technique to make loans where for other reasons we might desire to make them—in southeastern Europe, for example—on the absolute security of commodities physically situated within this country."

We think, Mr. Chairman, that Lord Keynes on this occasion, was on sound ground when he was advising his fellow countrymen as to a policy which should be pursued in supplying funds to bankrupt nations.

FINANCING BRITISH SOCIALISM

Mr. Chairman, we object to the proposed loan to Great Britain for still another reason. We regard it as a subsidy to enable the Socialist regime now in control in Great Britain to remain in power until, in accordance with the British Constitution, it is necessary to call a new general election. The loan agreement provides, as Lord Keynes pointed out to the House of Lords, that the British will pay no interest upon the loan for a period of 6 years; that is to say, interest will not begin to run on the loan until after the next general election in England. If this loan should be granted, the Government of the United States would, in effect, be supporting a Socialist economy of a Marxian character in its competition with our system of free enterprise. We hold this to be true because the loan agreement would exempt the present Labor government in England from any obligations to pay interest on the loan during its present term in office. Such a policy, Mr. Chairman, we regard as utterly indefensible.

BRETTON WOODS

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me turn to another phase of this question. The preamble of the resolution, and, indeed, the resolution itself show that the sponsors of it realize that this loan is tied to the Bretton Woods agreements. Furthermore, it is tied to the Bretton Woods agreements because the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in presenting the case for this loan to Parliament made it perfectly clear that Britain's acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreements was dependent upon our putting up the money to cover her commitments to those agreements. In order that there may be no controversy as to the fact, I will read, with the permission of the Chair, what the Chancellor of the Exchequer said:

Mr. Dalton speaking:

"I will turn now to the Bretton Woods agreements, our acceptance of which is a condition of the loan agreement. And I submit to the House that the acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreements, subject to one proviso which I will make in a moment, is definitely to the advantage of this country."

Mr. Chairman, I will skip briefly and go to this point of Mr. Dalton's remarks:

"But the proviso is that we have the financial strength to undertake the obligations of the Bretton Woods agreements and thus to acquire the benefits which Bretton Woods offers. In this sense, the loan agreement is, for us, a condition of Bretton Woods." (Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, December 12, 1945, pp. 430–431.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of this committee to fully appreciate all the implications of that statement. If we make it possible for the British to meet their commitments to Bretton Woods, how can we refuse to do likewise for every other nation of the world which is hovering on the brink of bankruptcy, and is one of the signatories of the agreement? To refuse these other nations equality of treatment would be to make a mockery of our profession of fair dealing and brotherly love for all nations without distinction or discrimination.

Income-Tax Insomnia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a pamphlet written by Almo Beals Simmons, who is one of my hometown boys who has won national recognition through his work in trying to simplify our present tax forms. It is my understanding that through his efforts the State of Utah has revised its income-tax blanks, and other States are promising to do the same. I think his suggestions should be given very careful consideration by our tax experts here, and I hope Members of Congress, and especially those who have to do with our taxing problems, will find time to make a study of his suggestions which have been given wide publicity:

INCOME-TAX INSOMNIA—A HUMOROUS SATIRE ON OUR PRESENT-DAY INCOME TAXES

(By Almo Beals Simmons, B. S.)

This pamphlet has been written in the hope that our Government will equalize and simplify our present tax system; for if anything under heaven should now be easy to do, it should be the filling out of a tax report.

I have tried to put a smile in this dry tax subject, but the answers to the questions asked—are informative, and they are all applicable to income received in the year 1945—plus the changes made by Congress (November 1945) for your income-tax returns for 1946 (due March 15, 1947).

Question. What is this that I may deduct for "bad debts" on my income-tax report? Hell! I owe everybody. May I deduct for these debts?

Answer. You have this deduction up side down and backward. The ones who may deduct for bad debts—under certain conditions—are the ones to whom you owe money. Send for our free song, Owe No One a Dime, and You Will Sleep Peacefully All the Time.

Question. I was married twice in the past year. May I deduct the two surtaxes?

Answer. No. The tax courts have ruled that one may only deduct for one spouse during the taxable year. Send for our new song, My Father Does Not Drive a Tank—He Is One.

Question. While I was under the influence of liquor, I wrecked my beautiful car. May I deduct for this damage?

Answer. No; wrecks caused by one's own negligence are not deductible. Send for our free surprise package—and believe me you will certainly be surprised. Note: We have just a few of these explosive packages left. Wire for yours today. Remember they are mailed only to drunken auto drivers.

Question. I have five children, and my husband is in the Army. I go out to work 6 days a week, therefore, I must hire a woman to care for my children. May I deduct for her wages on my tax return?

Answer. No; wages paid to personal servants are not allowed. We have just mailed you our new song, Oh, How Happy I Will Be When My Pistol Packin' Papa Comes Back Home to Me.

Question. I am a farmer. This year I bought a beautiful heifer for $140. Three months later she died. May I show this loss on my tax return?

Answer. Yes; if a farmer buys cattle (or work animals) and they died, he may deduct. However, animals that you raised on your farm, you cannot deduct value when they die. Note: A tax consultant asked a farmer, "Do you own any stock in a holding company"? The farmer answered, "Well I own some cows, if that's what you mean."

Question. I was really in the dough this past year, and I bought my old lady a fur coat. The luxury tax alone was 80 bucks. May I deduct this tax?

Answer. No; luxury, stamp, excise, nor amusement taxes are now not deductible on the Federal tax report. But why buy fur coats? Remember a bill in a bond is worth more than a bill in a billfold.

Question. During the past year I have worked for the different companies at Kalamazoo, Kankakee, Walla Walla, Coulee, Pasco, Dallas, Las Vegas, and Provo, Utah. May I deduct for traveling expenses?

Answer. (A loud) no; the tax laws are very specific, regarding the above. Going to and from work, or looking for work expenses are not allowed; but what in the world is the matter with you? Were one of your ancestors a kangaroo? Send for our new song, Why, Oh Why, Do You Continue To Roam, When You Could Make Beautiful Provo Your Permanent Home.

Question. I was robbed of $180.60 last July 4 in Las Vegas, Nev. May I deduct for this?

Answer. Yes. Losses by theft are deductible. (What puzzles me is how anyone could in that "livetown" of Las Vegas know to a penny just how much money he had, and especially on the Fourth of July.) Sh-h, I was in Las Vegas on July 4, but please don't ask me questions about anything except taxes.

Question. A group of we high-school girls were just a wondering, do "those women" need to show their "wages"?

(Signed) A GROUP OF GIGGLING GIRLS.

Answer. Yes. The tax law states: "Gross income includes gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal services, also from rent, interest, dividends, securities, business, or gains or profits derived from any source whatever. (But send for our book, Promiscuity. Guaranteed to knock the giggles out of anyone.) After reading this you will not even smile about such things ever again. Send proof that you are 16 years of age—no; on second thought, just prove that you are in junior high school, and the above book will be mailed, postage paid, and sent in a plain wrapper when we have them available.

Question. I receive rents from a house. Should I sell this property, must I charge off for depreciation allowable when in prior years I did not receive any tax benefits for allowable depreciation?

Answer. Yes. Under our present tax laws, one must deduct for allowable depreciation. (To me this law seems most unjust.) Send for our thesis, 101 Things That Are at Present Unjust With Our Tax Laws.

Question. The widow Prudence Prissilla Peterson fell and broke her leg. I gave her $15. May I deduct this as a donation?

Answer. No. Donations cannot be deducted when given to specific individuals. They must be given to organizations, charitable, religious, or educational. Note: When listing your donations on your tax return be sure and list just the amounts you actually gave, not what your heart says you should have given.

Question. I have lived in my present home for over 15 years. I paid $4,000 for same, and I just sold it for $6,000. Do I need show the above profit on my tax return?

Answer. Yes—50 percent long-time capital gain. However, had you sold your home for a loss under our present tax laws, you could not deduct for same. Wire for this one: 102 Things That Are Unjust in Our Present Tax Laws.

Question. I inherited a house. Must I show this on my tax report?

Answer. No. You must, however, show the income derived after you inherited the property. Send for song: To Rent Just One Room in Your Home. Makes it Become a House.

Question. What is your opinion of income taxes for Government revenue?

Answer. In my humble opinion, there is no tax that is more just than an income tax, providing it is administered absolutely fair and equal to all citizens.

Question. A group of we school teachers, clerks, and office workers were discussing our present tax laws. As you know, all wage earners of the above class must dress well in meeting the public. Yet, we are not allowed anything for expenses in earning our income, but all other workers are allowed deductions for tools, uniforms, and special work clothes. We all come to the conclusion that this is unfair. What do you believe?

Answer. I believe that all wage earners should be treated exactly the same. Under the present laws, one mechanic may deduct, say, $120 for tools, another will only deduct $10; and yet the latter may earn twice as much as the former. But this, above all else: The amount allowed as a tax deduction should be the same rate for all wage earners. (As a suggestion, 5 percent of gross wages. See the simplified tax form at the end of this "stuff".)

Question. I was reading last night a story about France, in the days of that gay old bird, Louis XIV. And, by the way, Louie had a tax collector that was a whiz (he pulled Louie out of the "red".) His name was Jean Baptiste Colbert. Back in the seventeenth century, Colbert said: "The art of taxation consists in so plucking the goose as to obtain the largest amount of feathers with the least amount of hissing." I believe our present taxmakers are using Colbert's formula. What do you think?

Answer. Anyone in the United States today that listens may easily hear the above-mentioned hissing. In fact, I feel as though this hissing might turn in a honk, unless something is immediately done to equalize and simplify our present tax forms, rates, and deductions. Note: Income taxpayers could be counted in the thousands prior to 1940. In 1940 they amounted to 4,000,000, but in 1944 the income taxpayers amounted to approximately 50,000,000. (Collectively, they could honk.)

Question. I lost $400 in a poker game. Is this loss deductible?

Answer. No. The tax code states that gambling losses are offset by winnings. The latest song hit goes: A Gambler's Wife Gambled by Marriage and Lost.

Question. I pay my 16-year-old son $10 per month to help me with my work. May I deduct his wages?

Answer. No. One cannot deduct wages paid to a dependent. Please write and notify me what kind of business you have, that you can get a 16-year-old boy nowadays to work for $10 a month. It must be very pleasant work, or you certainly have a dutiful son.

Question. I am what is known as the cream of society. Naturally I must have my maid, housekeeper, and butler. Are their wages deductible?

Answer. No. We have just mailed you our new song: People Who Believe They Are the Cream of Society Are Truthfully Nothing More Than Sour Buttermilk.

Question. Could it possibly be true that there are some States in America that pay a less tax rate to our Federal Government than the citizens living in other States of our Union?

Answer. Yes. There are nine States that have community-property laws. In these States the husband may enter one-half of his wages and income on his tax return, and his wife shows the other half. This does, and can, greatly reduce their surtaxes. (Wire for this one: 103 Things That Are Wrong, Unjust, and Unfair With Our Present Tax Laws.) If you have high blood pressure, do not wire, for the facts in this book will make your blood boil.

Question. I am a banker, and we made a loan to a poor, sick widow. The fact that she was poor, we charged off the note. May this be deducted?

Answer. Yes. But when you collect it later—and you will—you must show the amount collected as income. Your statement, the fact that she was poor we charged off the note, makes me smile. I know, and you also know, that a banker does not charge off notes, as a rule, because one is a sick widow. Why did you not say: "The fact that we could not, under any circumstances, collect the note, we charged it off." Should a banker ever read this and smile; well, bless your heart, the cap does not fit. But should a banker read this and scoul and frown, well, send for our old joke book: If the cap fits, wear it! (and listen—shh it's free).

Question. I am only 17 years old, but, gosh, I made over $600 digging "spuds" in Idaho in 1945. The man told me that when I made that much I have to pay income taxes. Is that true? And if so, to whom do I pay, the postmaster, the mayor, or the President of the United States?

Answer. Yes. You not only must file a tax report, but you also must pay a tax. You pay those taxes to the collector of internal revenue in the State in which you live. We have just mailed to you our pamphlet: "Taxes should be so simple to compute, that a young Idaho potato digger could fill out the tax forms. For, remember, he must now, 1945, pay a tax."

Question. I am a father of two children by former marriage. The court ruled that I was to pay for their support. I consulted a lawyer to find out if I could deduct these payments from my taxes. The lawyer read and reread a long, legal, academic, ambiguous, ingenuous bunch of words that went something like this: "Whereas (see par. 9 revised 1944) courts have rules (see Smith *v.* Jones) (sec. B. 152) has decreed by court order (see Dingledine *v.* Zperzteh, sec. 1928 Revised) that when the father pays for the chief support of the above issue, or offspring; the fore said spouse may claim under certain conditions. (See Offenheimmer *v.* Pazinsky) as a deduction, the dependency, of issue by former marriage, Rev. 10–66 and 84) etc." Now after we plowed through that hazy maze of words, the lawyer said: "Yes, one may claim children as dependents when the courts ruled that the father furnished their chief support. (The wife need not show amounts received for child's support on her tax report, nor may she claim them as dependents; however, she must show any alimony received.) But what I want to know

is: Why in h—— does not the Government write a simple statement regarding tax laws?

Answer. Since that obstrosity form of 1943 was printed, I have given your above statement much thought. And the only reason I can think of is that lawyers, not accountants, write our tax forms. And these lawyers seem to be purposely wording the law in order to have tax litigation rather than tax administration.

Question. How would a lawyer that writes our tax laws express this simple sentence? Speak plainly, say what you mean, mean what you say, and do not use big words.

Answer. (As remembered from a university class many years ago, this is the way they would write the above sentence:) "In promulgating your sentimental sentimentalities, beware of ponderous ponderosity, bombastic and pompous prolixity; and sedulously avoid all polysyllable profundity." (Note: There are thousands of lawyers in America today that now refuse to calculate and fill out income-tax reports. They will freely admit they do not have time to keep up with the ever-changing forms, rates, and regulations.)

Question. I see that the Members of Congress are going to vote a $2,500-per-year salary increase to themselves. I firmly believe they should be granted this increase. What do you think?

Answer. I agree with you. With living conditions as they are today, Congressmen do need and deserve this increase. (But who doesn't?) However, when the Members of Congress state, "This increase need not be shown on an income tax—just as an expense account," well, then I say, this is most unfair, unjust, unequitable, unbelievable, and unbearable. We have just prepared a very special, scholarly, academic, stiff-collar, and long-haired thesis, for Congressmen only, titled, "There Is Absolutely No Question About Members of Congress Needing an Increase in Salary." Explain in detail why this increase is deserving, but, moreover, it also tells why Congressmen should also place the total of all wages received on their tax reports, the same as all other wage earners in America. This thesis is not "milk for babies," and it ends with these nonliterary words: "This law stinks." (Note: The fact we have given you all the "high points" there will now be no need for you Congressmen bothering us by sending for a copy.) Since this was written Congress tried to vote themselves $10,000-per-year increase in salary. No comments, please. (These are the times that tax men's hearts, souls, minds, and pocketbooks.)

Question. I am a skilled bachelor mechanic. And, gee! I was earning a pile of "jack" or at least I thought I was. But that was before the end of the year rolled around, and I paid my income taxes. Then I felt like crying like a baby due to the fact I had not saved any more money than I did back in Wichita in 1939 Although my wages have doubled, well, so has everything else. The Government certainly does lay it on we bachelors. Therefore, I am going to high tail it back to Wichita, what do you think?

Answer. We have just mailed you a very sad, pitiful, and pathetic tale titled: "The Widow Jennie Josephine Jones." This tells of her struggles to raise six children on the exemptions allowed today for tax purposes. Mr. Wichita Mechanic: Do you know that a person living in the United States today, 1945, that earns a net wage of only $600 and has 6, yes 100 dependents, must not only file a tax return, but addition will owe a tax. (We have mailed you our song: "If One is to Live without Want or Fear, You Cannot Start Taxes at $500 per Year?")

(For 1946, one may deduct $500 for each dependent on this surtax and normal tax.)

NOTE.—For income tax reports for the year 1946, Congress has (November 1945) changed the dependency law to allow $500 for each dependent on the normal tax. (This does not apply for 1945 reports.)

Question. Just between a taxpayer and a tax consultant, what do these letters stand for "PPBWHDKUWTLCNADEOWD"?

Answer. Previously poor bookkeepers who have diligently kept up with tax laws can now afford dessert even on week days.

Question. Why does the State of Utah need all the taxes that have ever been conceived in the brain of man?

Why does not the State of Utah allow deductions for sick benefits? Gasoline taxes? Alimony? Expenses for entertainment of employees? A carry-over for business losses?

Why does the State of Utah only allow $300 for a dependent?

Why don't the Governors of States that have both income, and sales taxes wire—or write—the Governors that have neither, and ask them how they operate? (Their replies would give them all the answers.)

Why don't all States that have income-tax laws get out of this field now our Federal Government is so far in the red? (And in return the States could ask the Government to get out of the gasoline tax, gift, and inheritance field.) This would greatly eliminate the duplication and pyramiding of taxes.

Why does not our Federal Government allow deductions for excise taxes for the year 1945?

Why does not our Federal Government specify just what taxes are deductable on Form 1040? (Rather than leave all the tax lines blank?)

Why does not our Federal Government give in dollars the amount deductable for depreciation on a farmer's fruit trees?

Why does not our Federal Government allow deductions for damages done to a home by termites?

Why do they print income-tax forms upside down and backward?

Answer. Damfino.

Question. I have just read that the United States taxpayers are now in the red $300,000,000,000. Truthfully, if silver dollars were laid flat (one upon another) how far would this tremendous stack of silver dollars reach?

Answer. If silver dollars could be placed flat, one upon another, in order to pay the principal alone on this debt, they would extend from the earth to the moon (approximately 240,000 miles), then twice around the moon (14,000 miles), then back again to the earth, and then circle this world, at the Equator, four times. Oh, you Congressmen of the Ways and Means Committee plus all our tax officials, can't you plainly see that if we are to repay this herculean indebtedness, you simply must lay this now heavy tax collection equally, fairly, and justly upon all the shoulders of our present 50,000,000 taxpayers? (Note: It takes 13 dollars laid flat to equal 1 dollar stood on edge. Therefore, if you desire to get a mental picture of the above path of silver dollars laid flat, times the above pile of silver by 13. To anyone that reads this, close your eyes and visualize a path of United States silver dollars that would extend to the moon 26 times, then circle the moon 26 times, and there would be yet enough dollars to circle our dear earth 16 times—that is what 300,000,000,000 silver dollars would do, if they were laid edgewise.

Are you dizzy? So am I. Do you desire to get more light-headed? Let's. Note: The interest per year on the above indebtedness is $6,000,000,000. A silver dollar is 1½ inches wide. Therefore, 6,000,000,000 times 1½ inches equals 9,000,000,000 inches, and 9,000,000,000 inches equals 142,234 miles. Therefore, the yearly interest on $300,000,000,000 would lay a silver path around the world 5½ times. Let's hurriedly get back to some "chicken feed." Note: Just a few years back President McKinley shocked America by asking the Morgans for a $20,000,000 loan to finance the Spanish-American War. The Morgans said, "No, we will not loan you that much in one loan—but we will loan the Government $10,000,000 at two different times. But $300,000,000,000 is 15,000 times the abovementioned $20,000,000.

Let's get back to earth. Note: One may buy a $25 Victory bond for $18.75.

Note 2: Our Federal Government collected $45,000,000,000 in taxes during the fiscal year 1944. Therefore, the above indebtedness can be and will be paid.

Question. You mentioned that the answers given in this tax insomnia all apply to income received in 1945. What changes did Congress make (November 1945) for the year 1946?

Answer. For the year 1946 the taxpayer is allowed $500 deduction against the normal tax for each dependent. (Remember, this does not apply for 1945.) Another change Congress made for 1946 was the reduction of 3 percent on each surtax bracket, and after computing the total tax obligation, the taxpayer is allowed to knock off 5 percent. Enlisted men will be forgiven Federal income taxes on their service pay, and officers will be given an additional 3 years to pay their back taxes. Yes, for the first time in many years Federal taxes have been reduced, rather than greatly increased. (This is for 1946 and not 1945.)

Question. What does fiduciary mean?

Answer. That is income received from an estate or trust. Just remember this ditty: "Oh, how happy is my Aunt Mary. She receives income from a fi-du-ciary!"

"Question. What is the definition of the word "tax"?

Answer. Tax is from the Latin "taxare"—means "to touch sharply." A United States definition for 1945—should be added these additional words—"To touch sharply, deeply, heavily, and often." Note: The New Testament linked tax collectors with sinners. Approximately 2,000 years later—in the United States—it is not the collector that should be linked with sinners—shh. The revenue department collected over a billion from taxpayers (1945). Yes, this was just for "tax evasion." (From the Chinese: "It is better to light one small candle than to curse the darkness.")

Question. Our tax courts are crowded today with litigation regarding the forming of partnerships between husband and wife. And no judge has as yet (November 1945) been able to clarify or give any predictable decision regarding the above. How could these courts be cleared, and at the same time allow taxpayers in noncommunity property States to pay exactly the same rate of surtax as those in community-property States?

Answer. Behind the success of every man can be found some woman who has contributed to the making of all income. Therefore, our tax courts could be cleared—and the same rate of taxes would be paid by all taxpayers—if Congress would add this one sentence to our present tax laws: "For income-tax purposes a husband may report one-half of income and the wife may report the other half." (We certainly needed a smile after that one.) Have you heard of the man who laughed and cried at the same time? Our song goes like this: "He laughed when he learned how much he was going to earn per day. Then cried when he noticed how small was his take-home pay."

Question. Who do you accountants consider the greatest mathematician in the world today?

Answer. The man (or men) that calculated the interest tables on war and victory bonds. For note how small the interest the first 4 years, then note how this interest accelerates the next 3, and the last 3 years is where one is given the extra dollar for every three. Yes, all accountants throughout America doff their hats and salute the one who with an interest table can truthfully make a fool out of anyone that cashes in a bond without first missing at least three meals in a row. Our latest song goes: "Oh! I'm a wild, wise Ute from Utah! And I live

in Old Kanosh, and I'll not sell my bonds till I start to starve, b'gosh."

But why go on with any more of this "stuff"? In conclusion let me say the answers in this "insomnia tax story" only apply to Federal tax regulations, not to States. For example: The State of Utah does not allow deduction for sick benefits, alimony, entertainment of employees, and so forth. Federal does. Utah does allow for social security, auto stamp and amusement taxes, and so forth; Federal does not. Utah only allows $300.00 per year for dependents, Federal allows $500.00 on the surtax. Utah does not allow for gasoline taxes, other States permit this. Why Utah does not is a mystery to many taxpayers. But again why go on, for when one gets to State tax regulations, they find the same unjust and unpredictable regulations, as those now found in our Federal taxes.

Also, before ending this, I would like to say: Historians will certainly place the name, Henry G. Morgenthau on the credit side of the world's ledger, for the records will prove he collected the finances to enable us to fight—and win—a global war! In fact, he collected more money than all the previous secretaries of recorded history. Therefore, as Walter Winchell would say: "Orchids to 'Hank' Morgenthau." (But I say a "Bronx cheer" to his lawyer, that worded the tax regulations and forms to purposely confuse the taxpayers!)

Question. Seriously, what changes do you believe should be made in our present tax laws? (Not listed in the order of importance.)

Answer. First: All of the citizens of the United States of America should be entitled to have plenty to eat, warm clothes, a decent place in which to live without fear of want. And also, they should be allowed to save 10 percent of their income, no matter how much, nor how little. Everyone, naturally, should be treated absolutely equitable! Therefore, immediately grant to the citizens of all States of the Union, the same tax rates as those now allowed in community property States.

Second. Let all wage earners deduct the same rate for wear and tear on all tools, clothes and uniforms. For example 5 percent of their gross wages. (Up to $5,000.00 a year salary.)

Third. If one is to live without fear or want let the taxpayer deduct for all sickness, hospitals, doctors, and medicines, plus funeral expenses for any member of their family when there is no insurance received.

Fourth. You know, yes, everyone knows, that one cannot live without fear, on $500 per year. Therefore, the tax laws should be, yes, must be changed, allowing a single person at least $1,000 before taxes start. Married couples, $1,500 and at least $500 for each dependent. (Abolish the present 3 percent normal tax, or allow $500 for dependents as a deduction for the normal tax as well as the surtax.)

(NOTE.—Congress changed this for 1946. Allowing $500 for dependents for normal tax. Does not apply for 1945.)

Fifth. Allow a widow (or widower extra consideration if they maintain a home for their children, and grandchildren who come for a visit.) (As a suggestion—$200 a year.) Based upon the previous head-of-family law.

Sixth. Allow citizens credit on taxes for purchase of Victory bonds. Say 10 percent of net income as a savings account for the uncertain future. A special Liberty bond could be issued, not negotiable for 5 years.

Seventh. The normal tax. Plus the surtax rates should be—and could be in one tax table. (And why not now call it a liberty tax?)

Eighth. If anything in America today, should be made easy to do it must be the calculating of income taxes. Therefore, simplify the income-tax forms.

Ninth. Change tax law to read: "Depreciation allowed" and omit the unjust words "Depreciation allowable."

Tenth. Change the present tax law to read: "Anyone who does not rent more than two rooms in his own home need not compute the small net profit if any." The same change should be made for those who do not board more than four in their own home—or at least simplify the present complicated cost-accounting form.

Eleventh. Change the law to read: "It is not necessary to show the capital gain on the sale of one's home. (When it has been occupied by the taxpayer for 5 or more years.)"

Twelfth. When writing to a taxpayer for the future payment on his estimated tax, omit the words: "We demand payment."

Thirteenth. All Government officials should memorize thorough this old but very true saying: "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Fourteenth. Have a standard rate of depreciation on the farmer's fruit trees, farm equipment, and farm buildings, autos, and trucks.

Fifteenth. Clarify our tax code regarding: Partnerships between husband and wife. (In fact, clarify all tax regulations.)

Sixteenth. Have a standard rate of depreciation for all rented property—lumber, brick, or stucco.

Seventeenth. Reduce the high tax rate on capital gains. (As a suggestion: Short-time gains to 75 percent. Long-time gains to 33⅓ percent. The present high rates are preventing the normal sales of property. Also, there would be more taxes collected, and far less tax evasion if this were done.)

Eighteenth. Extend the time limit to those who must pay estimated taxes for the fourth payment, from January 15 to February 15.

Nineteenth. Reduce in number our present Federal hidden taxes. (All States should do the same.)

Twentieth. Leave a space on Form 1040 for credit on taxes. (Carried forward from the previous year.)

Twenty-first. As a special deduction to our present law for the blind, $500. For the loss of a limb, $400 a year.

Twenty-second. Exempt from income taxes—amounts received as interest on series E war bonds.

Twenty-third. Print tax forms on one sheet. A suggested form can be found at the conclusion of this "tax insomnia." Everyone knows the calculating of income taxes is nothing more or less than adding and subtracting. I sincerely hope our Government and States will at least use this simple tax form as a guide. Truthfully and sincerely, behind this simple tax form has gone years of thought and study.

Twenty-fourth. (The last, yet the one change that should certainly be the first.) Those tax consultants, who have calculated income taxes for the past 5 years have noticed this: Oh, how free, liberal, and lavish have been all the taxpayers of the United States in donating to all worth-while organizations—Red Cross, polio, churches, Salvation Army, war funds, Boys' Town, hospitals for crippled children, etc. This was all prior to the end of 1944, and over 9 months of 1945. And then, millions upon millions of wage earners—plus the millions who used the Standard deduction table—discovered there is no line for donations to charity; neither upon a wage-slip return nor upon Form 1040 using a standard table of deduction. The above now also know that the one who donates $400 pays the same tax as the one who donates 40 cents. Believe me, this is sincerely and truthfully jeopardizing everything in life worth while. Therefore, let me most reverently, humbly—yes, prayerfully—write this concluding sentence: "Dear Congressmen: If you are going to make just one change on our present tax let that one change be this—

Add a line on a "Wage slip tax return" for charity; yes—add this one line—for God's sake.

A SUGGESTED SIMPLIFIED FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURN

Our Government, or any State of our Union is hereby freely granted the use of this form—either as a guide or in its entirety.

INCOME

1. Put on this line the total of all wages received ..... $____
2. Add interest and dividends received ..... ____
3. Total gross income for taxable year ..... ____

DEDUCTIONS

(Omit lines that do not apply to your income)

4. All wage earners put on this line 5 percent of line 1 (for wear and tear on tools, uniforms, or clothes) not to exceed $250 ..... $____
5. Add amounts paid for union dues and fees ..... ____
6. Add all hospital, medicine, and doctor accounts paid ..... ____
7. Add all interest paid ..... ____
8. Add all donations (charitable, educational, religious) ..... ____
9. Add all real estate taxes paid ..... ____
10. Add for all personal property taxes (include automobile) ..... ____
11. Add for State income taxes paid during the year ..... ____
12. Add for loss by wreck, fire, flood, theft, blizzard ..... ____
13. Add funeral expenses (not to exceed $500 if no insurance) ..... ____
14. Add 10 percent line 1 for Victory bonds. List serial numbers (savings) ..... ____
15. Add $1,500 if married ($1,000 if single) ..... ____
16. Add $500 each dependent ..... ____
17. Add $200 if widow or widower and maintain a home ..... ____
18. Add $1,000 if one is totally blind ..... ____
19. Add $500 for loss of limb ..... ____
20. Add lines 4 to 19. These are your total deductions ..... ____
21. Now subtract line 20 from line 3 as follows:
22. Line 3 equals ..... ____
23. Line 20 equals (subtract) ..... ____
24. This is your taxable income ..... ____

Tax from table (see table below) ..... ____

Subtract amounts withheld from wages ..... ____

Balance ..... ____

Subtract amounts paid on estimated tax ..... ____

This is the amount of your tax due Mar. 15 ..... ____

SUGGESTED TAX TABLE

(Combines the present normal tax with present surtax. Why not now call it a liberty tax?)

20 percent up to and including the first $1,000.

22 percent up to and including $2,000.

24 percent up to and including $3,000.

(Then go up on tax rate 2 percent for each $1,000, up to and including $25,000.)

All income $25,000 to $100,000, rate to be 80 percent.

All income above $100,000, rate to be 90 percent.

NOTE.—If you are a farmer, professional, or businessman, put on line 1 your profit (or loss) from farm, rents, capital gains, or business (and enclose profit-and-loss statements).

Let Russia Now Withdraw Her Agents From the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, now that Russia has agreed to withdraw her forces from Iran, we should demand that she withdraw them from the United States.

Every Communist in America is an agent of the Russian Government and is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

We should demand that she withdraw these spies and fifth columnists from the United States and from Canada.

We should demand that she withdraw her agents from this country and take their loathesome hands off the American press, take their offensive voices off the American radio, and take their baneful influences off the moving-picture shows, and eliminate her agents from our educational institutions.

It is time for America to demand that her rights be respected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Our Debt to Mr. Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

OUR DEBT TO MR. CHURCHILL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Among all the comments, praise, and criticisms which have been directed toward Mr. Churchill's recent addresses, there is one reaction that has not occurred, or, at least, has not been publicly stated.

There are two outstanding factors concerning the great state documents (in form of speeches), coming from the pen and courageous brain of Mr. Churchill that should make every American who is proud of his country's history and fighting record for nearly 200 years, feel a deep sense of humiliation and resentment: First, that the honor and duty of speaking firmly and bravely to Russia from the soil of the United States should have been allowed, by our default, to become the privilege of a visiting Englishman; second, that our right and duty to speak out should have been boldly grasped by him upon our doorstep, while a weak and fumbling administration stood aside, holding open the door of our rightful opportunity, and meekly murmured: "After you, Mr. Churchill!"

And this was dared by him notwithstanding the terrible losses in blood and treasure by Great Britain, during a war for which she was as thoroughly unprepared as was the United States; a war in which she, at one time, stood alone against a host of enemies demanding her life's blood and the break-up of an empire which was much safer and better for the world, both spiritually and materially, than had its dismembered parts been divided among Germany, Russia, and Japan, as they inevitably would have been had Britain gone down. Today Britain faces a future full of peril, a domestic table not replete with rich foods and luxuries, such as we possess. She bears the great burden of a Navy and an Army which she dares not demobilize, notwithstanding her exhausted finances; she sees discontent, fomented largely by her foes and stupidly encouraged by some of her ignorant friends, rife in countries truly dependent for their safety upon her Commonwealth of Nations. But, with all her great burdens, she carries her head high and in the moment of her greatest danger, she faces her enemies with her courage heightened by the clarion call of the greatest statesman of the age.

It is neither sufficiently understood nor appreciated, in the United States, why we need the commercial, international and military cooperation of Great Britain as much as she needs us; why, today, our international safety is inseparably linked to hers, as it has been for over 140 years. The world-wide military strategy of the English-speaking nations is the same.

This is because Britain guards outposts and trade routes of democratic civilization in a disturbed and disobedient world; these are hardly less vital to the United States and other trading nations than to herself. The Mediterranean and the Suez Canal are the long jugular vein of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Nothing is more democratic than a free world commerce; the peaceful commerce of the world must move freely through the great canals, straits, and waterways of the world. Unthreatened access to our oil concessions in the Near East and in Saudi Arabia is as essential to the United States as continued ability to reach her oil fields, in Iran, is to England. The available oil supply of Russia now exceeds that of the United States.

Russia has been offered free passage of the Dardanelles, both to her merchantmen and to her warships—in other words, equal rights of passage. She demands, in addition, the right to erect a great fortress to dominate the Bosporus and the Turkish capital of Istanbul (Constantinople). There is a grim humor in the fact that a few years after the First World War, following the Russian revolution, and when she was militarily weak, Russia herself objected to a proposal favored by Britain and France to open the Dardanelles and the Black Sea to the free commerce of all nations.

No formal or military alliance is necessary between Britain and the United States, nor has Mr. Churchill proposed one. There is as much misunderstanding upon that question as upon the misnamed "loan" to Britain, which is not a loan but the granting of a commercial letter of credit to Britain, under which she may purchase goods in the United States, but under which she may not draw money to lend to others.

Mr. Churchill, if I mistake not, intended to point out and emphasize the inevitability of, and consequent need for, a fraternal association between the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations, which has existed in the past, has been enormously strengthened by two world wars, and which, of necessity, must continue for the common safety and commercial benefit of the English-speaking nations of the world.

As there are tides in the affairs of men, so has there always been, and inevitably will be, a tide in Anglo-American relations that makes the military safety of one necessary to the security of the other, the economic prosperity of one essential to the commercial well-being of the other. We are today faced by a state of things which by the laws of nature brings on its necessary effect.

Not only has England always been our best customer, but we have, in the past, depended upon and been more often inconspicuously protected by her military and naval power than most Americans know. We are much too inclined to believe that in World Wars I and II "we saved the British Empire." Only a few are aware that world peace was, for many years, an Anglo-American peace, particularly in the Atlantic, and that not until England and the United States, after the First World War, allowed their armaments to disintegrate, did we and they suffer the punishment we deserved from Hitler and Japan.

Britain and the United States are in vital military and economic need of each other now, as they have been in the past. If the British Empire is broken by assaults or encroachments of the Slavic powers, the United States will stand alone; the colonial empire of Britain will be taken over by a power that will rule these poor countries with a rod of iron, as Japan would have ruled and exploited India, had we lost in the Pacific, as, at one time, we nearly did.

A single historical reference will give us ample food for thought and for sharp correction of some bady mistaken views.

Thomas Jefferson, the first great Democrat, thoroughly appreciated the inescapable relation between policy and power. Early in 1802, when he was President, the threatened cession of Louisiana, especially the mouth of the Mississippi at New Orleans, by Spain to France, arose as a serious threat to the safety of the young Republic of the United States. Spain was a decadent power; France, under Napoleon, was the first military nation of the day.

In a letter to our Minister at Paris, Robert R. Livingston, dated April 18, 1802, Jefferson wrote "this private one to impress you with the importance we affix to this transaction," stating that the cession of Louisiana "works most sorely on the United States."

After referring to France as the natural friend of the United States, the President, nevertheless, penned the following carefully calculated words:

"There is on the globe one single spot the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans, through which the produce of three-eighths of our territory must pass to market. * * * France, placing herself in that door, assumes to us the attitude of defiance."

Jefferson then added the words which have for all time marked out the accepted, but not formally agreed, relation between the United States and Great Britain:

"The day France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence which is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of two nations, who, in conjunction, can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation."

Jefferson recognized that "the change of friends, which will be rendered necessary if France changes that position, embarks us necessarily as a belligerent power in the first war of Europe," adding that such "consequences (are) not controllable by us, but (are) inevitable from the course of things."

The problems of Iran, the Persian Gulf, Suez, and the Dardanelles; Russia's ambitions toward Salonika, the great Greek port on the Aegean, and the pressure by Russia's Yugoslav ally, Marshal Tito, for the port of Trieste, at the head of the Adriatic, should not be regarded as isolated or individual questions any more than Manchuria, Port Arthur, and Dairen are disconnected issues. Rather must they be recognized as parts of a panorama of world ambition, gradually but surely unfolding before our anxious eyes. What are we, the United States, going to do about it?

First, we must promptly restore our temporarily lost negotiatory position toward Russia by continuing the Selective Service Act for one full year from May 15 next, with

the expressed intention of enacting a universal military training statute upon the expiration of the service act. Such training act must require all young men to take such training for 52 consecutive weeks under the auspices of the Army and Navy. This is not conscription for service but "training only." Next, the House Committee on Military Affairs should not report out the resolution of Representative MARTIN, of Massachusetts, for further international disarmament, when we have no stake to place upon the gaming table of world affairs. We are now without bargaining power.

As to our relations with the other English-speaking nations of the world, they require no formal agreement. In the words of Jefferson, they may safely be left as a cause compelled "by the laws of nature" and as their "necessary effect."

Respectfully,

ARCHIBALD G. THACHER.

NEW YORK, *March 20, 1946.*

Dissemination of Information About the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on October last the Foreign Affairs Committee held hearings on a State Department bill designed to set up machinery which would make possible effective dissemination of information about the United States, its policies, its people and the promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries. Interchanges of persons have been in force between us and some of the Latin-American Republics and have proven of great value to mutual understanding. Among other things these exchanges would be extended throughout a fast-shrinking world.

H. R. 4982 extends this and other such efforts to the other countries of the world. Certain that one of the surest ways to secure world peace is to find ways for interchange of information, I have been deeply interested in the legislation.

A great deal of time and study by members of the committee in close association with State Department staff and legislative drafting office have gone into the changes made in the original bill, all incorporated in H. R. 4982.

Just before the House recessed in December my distinguished colleagues the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and I appeared before the Rules Committee testifying in favor of the granting of a rule. The Committee on Rules at once aware of the far-reaching significance of the legislation wisely postponed action until there should be opportunity to make a proper examination of the bill.

During the interval criticism by the AP and UP of the legislation on a propaganda basis was spread across the country. It seemed to a number of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee it would be the better part of wisdom to make opportunity to sit down with these press organizations and other interested persons to discuss and clarify the points at issue. Therefore, when the Rules Committee reopened hearings we appeared asking the committee to withhold the rule until such time as the Foreign Affairs Committee should reopen the hearings. I am particularly happy that action was taken on last Friday, April 5, to hold further hearings on H. R. 4982.

I have always been an ardent believer in the exchange of personnel and knowledge at all levels. I have done many things as an individual in years past to bring this about. During the trip I made as a member of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the fall of 1945, my beliefs were strengthened. In addition I became convinced that whatever framework we do set up to give other countries a picture of ourselves, exchange ideas, and understandings, as well as personnel, must rest upon a secure foundation. We must be certain that everything done through this medium vividly, deeply, and honestly reflects American methods, hopes, and dreams.

The shifting top personnel in the State Department is particularly regrettable in its effect upon both old and new departmental machinery. This fact, however, makes it more than ever necessary that the Foreign Affairs Committee should be completely informed of the plans of the Department in its many fields, that it should know beyond any shadow of doubt the basis upon which personnel is chosen, who is responsible and what checks are kept upon the work done. Never was the position of the House Foreign Affairs Committee so strategic or so important.

That there may be no misunderstanding as to my position relative to H. R. 4982, let me repeat: I believe it is necessary and important that the United States have an adequate and thoroughly protected program of exchanges of knowledge and personnel with the other countries of the world. I have supported H. R. 4982 both in the Foreign Affairs Committee and before the Committee on Rules. My recent appearance before that committee urging a delay until clarification of certain points be arrived at in further hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee should not be interpreted as a change in my position. It is my opinion that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that Congress will be called upon to consider this year and that we must be certain that the honesty of its purpose cannot be questioned.

The Farmer and Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Farmer and the Sit-Down Strike," from the Progressive Farmer, of Raleigh, N. C., one of the leading farm papers of the United States.

This editorial refers to a very splendid article by H. E. Robbins, who is an intelligent labor man and has belonged to the union for many years. He writes a most sensible article, and I ask that it be published along with the editorial.

I am also sending forward an article entitled "Outlaw Strikes," written by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers Journal, the official organ of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America. I should like to have this editorial to follow the other articles.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive Farmer, Raleigh, N. C.]

THE FARMER AND THE SIT-DOWN STRIKE

One of the most remarkable articles we have published this year is that by Mr. Robbins on page 9, voicing a farmer's protest against sit-down strikes. The Progressive Farmer believes in unions and collective bargaining. It is principally through the power of union organization that laboring people have been able to deal effectively with employers. But unions as well as corporations have their obligations to society. So long as we live under a capitalistic form of government which gives a man a title to property, no group has either a legal or moral right to seize that property by sitting down in it and refusing to work or to allow others to work.

It is true that certain property owners have acted as though a title to property gave them the right to disregard the welfare of the workers who helped to give their property its value. Employers who by injunction or other legal but unfair means have sought to evade their obligations to workers are partly responsible for the present situation. But even that does not justify unlawful seizure of property. Such actions retard rather than hasten the betterment of labor conditions.

Socially irresponsible organized labor is fast acquiring the ill repute that has become attached to the soulless corporation. The Nation as a whole will be forced to protect itself not only from the ruthless corporation but the lawless labor union as well. A continuation of sit-down strikes is pretty certain to lead to governmental regulation of labor unions and compulsory arbitration of labor disputes.

LET LABOR RESPECT THE FARMER'S RIGHTS—MORE CONSIDERATION NEEDED BY STRIKE LEADERS AND OTHERS

(By H. E. Robbins)

("I would not for a moment have you believe that I am opposed to union labor organizations. I am heartily in favor of them. They have been the means, and practically the only means, for the advancement of the laboring class of the world to its present position. I myself have been a member of a labor organization more than 40 years." So writes H. E. Robbins in sending us the following notable article. But Mr. Robbins also farms on the side and warns labor leaders against the dangers of rubbing all farmers the wrong way.)

With all the turmoil and dissension in the labor world at the present time and with the national administration doing so much to help and encourage organized labor, the time is ripe not only to give labor a living wage and an American standard of living but also to pass laws to compel organized labor to realize that other people also have the right to a living wage and an American standard of living.

Farmers as a rule do not have weekly pay days as labor unionists do. In many instances a farmer and his family labor an entire year and have only one harvest. Hence it is not only unfair and un-American but it is outrageous and a national disgrace when labor organizations destroy without recompense or punishment another worker's labor of an entire year.

I have stood on the sidewalks in the market districts of large cities and seen perishable farm products rot in the hot sun and the juice run into the gutters because of a strike of some labor organization.

Recently there was a strike at the plant of a large candy company in Pennsylvania. Farmers with contracts to supply milk to the chocolate factory were forbidden to deliver it because some arrogant labor leaders thought they were going to obtain their idea of an American standard of living by compelling the farmers to throw away their means of living for a week or a month until the company acceded to the demands of its employees.

More recently some eastern Carolina farmers shipped truck to Philadelphia (in this case beans) only to have it rot on the sidewalks and depot platforms because a Philadelphia striking labor union refused to move it or allow it to be moved.

Still more recently a strike took place at the plant of a packing company in Maryland. Farmers in the vicinity had thousands of acres of vegetables growing under contract for the cannery. The snapbeans, for one crop, were ready to be delivered and canned. Yet when the farmers appealed to the labor leaders to delay their strike and not ruin them (the farmers) they were told, "When we get ours you'll get yours!" The labor leaders did not have brains enough to know that when "they got theirs"—in a week or a month—the farmers' crop would be ruined, many a farmer would lose his farm because he was depending on his bean money to pay the mortgage, many a farm family would go shabby another year, and many a farm boy and girl would be denied the year in college they had worked for so hard.

As this is written Buffalo, N. Y., a city of more than 500,000 population, is in the throes of a labor struggle, and citizens with no interest in the controversy are without food, babies are without milk, and invalids cannot get their accustomed and necessary diet.

It has been demonstrated that labor disputes can be adjusted by arbitration. The National Labor Relations Board is working along this line. It is true that in many instances the work of even this National Board is hindered by the arrogance of one side or the other.

In the case of perishable farm products at least, labor unions should be held responsible for any loss or destruction they may cause. Such a law must be passed by Congress, as the trade in most perishable commodities is a matter of interstate commerce.

I believe in labor's organizing to get its just rights and in having its just rights protected. But farmers also have their rights and should both vote and organize to defend those rights against all comers.

[From the Railroad Workers Journal]

OUTLAW STRIKES

Public opinion is rapidly forming to the point of demanding legislation to outlaw all labor strikes. An aroused citizenry is being promoted to demand the surrender of labor's prerogative, and only effective weapon. No doubt, many promoters of this legislation are under the impression that a law outlawing strikes would be a forward step toward industrial harmony.

If strikes were always unwarranted, a law of prohibition would be beneficial to industry as a whole. But this is not a fact. Our industrial disharmony is not always promoted by the workers or the unions. We have captains of industry who refuse to better the condition of their workers unless forced to accede by means of a strike.

Records definitely prove that most benefits for the workers have been derived through striking or threatening to strike. If all employers were blessed with a humanitarian instinct it is safe to say strikes would be a rarity.

Admitting the strike to be labor's weapon, it should be remembered that a strike, like all weapons, is something to be carefully guarded and never allowed to get into incapable hands. No sane person would allow a child to play with a machine gun, nor would he hand a razor to a maniac. Whether labor realizes it or not, this is precisely what has been done with their weapon.

Today, strikes are being handled by labor leaders who, in many cases, have about as much mentality as a child behind a machine gun. They are playing with this weapon for their own amusement and to hell with the outcome.

The use of a strike has never been intended as the first means of attack. And it cannot be legitimately utilized until all measures of reasoning have been exhausted.

Legitimate labor disputes are generally nothing more than differences of opinion between the employer and employees. These differences can usually be settled with mutual satisfaction by the employer and the representatives of the employees around a table without resorting to a strike.

No intelligent labor leader should make demands impossible to meet. And, by this same token, no employer should refuse to give his employees everything they are entitled to, consistent to good business acumen.

Labor leaders who use labor's weapon without full justification are nothing less than bullies and nothing more than legalized stick-up men. If our legislators wish to do something beneficial to industry they will pass a law prohibiting strikes and lock-outs until after every fair measure of arbitration has been used.

Unscrupulous individuals are generally practitioners of psychology to its fullest extent. They believe in the psychology of striking while the iron is hot, and believe me the iron has never been hotter than at this very moment. They are forging their weapon in the form of legislation which will outlaw strikes. Their propaganda for getting this legislation passed is that it will promote and protect our national defense program. In reality their main purpose is to kill the labor movement. These students of psychology are boundless in stirring up patriotic mob psychology in order to "railroad" through a law that, in the main, is to serve their own selfish objectives.

Our national defense program is entitled to the fullest cooperation, with a sacrifice on labor's part if necessary. This means there should be no stoppage of production through a strike when there is a chance to arbitrate.

When labor permits racketeer and incapable leaders to cause unnecessary strikes, whether they realize it or not, they are playing into the hands of mob psychology, and this mob will demand laws to not only eliminate the racketeers but the racketeered as well.

If a law is to be passed, beneficial to industry as a whole, it must be a law with "teeth" that will eliminate the outlaw labor leaders and the racketeer industrialists who are the real ones responsible for the promotion of outlaw strikes.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

Proposed Congressional Investigation of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. P. CARVILLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I have been requested to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Amvets Ask for Congressional Investigation of Surplus Property." I present the statement and ask that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMVETS ASK FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

(By Joseph Leib, national legislative director)

Amvets is contemplating a Nation-wide search in the hope of finding a veteran who has been successful in buying Government surplus property. When we find this veteran—if we ever do—we plan to ask Mr. Ripley to run his picture in a Believe It or Not cartoon.

Seriously, there has been a great deal of noise about the preference rights given to veterans in acquiring surplus property. It is obvious that veterans have not been fully told that they come first—after many others, namely, the Federal Government, the various subdivisions of the Government, i. e., the State and local agencies and certain nonprofit organizations.

At this point, I would like to insert a brief letter from a veteran, addressed to a Member of Congress. Here it is:

"I am an ex-serviceman with 45 months of service, 3 years of which was overseas.

"I had 2 months of combat service, being wounded and sent to a hospital for many months.

"Now, upon returning to civilian life, I am expecting to apply for a truck through the War Assets Corporation.

"A friend of mine, also a veteran, recently put in an application for a truck. He asked me to make a trip to the disposing agency to look over these trucks.

"Here is what happened:

"1. My friend had no choice on what truck he wanted.

"2. The War Assets Corporation had the truck picked out for him.

"3. He could not even start it, or even move it, until it was paid for.

"In short, the War Assets Corporation wanted my friend to buy a 'cat in the sock.'

"I would like to know if some of these flaws could be eliminated.

"We would like to know why we haven't the same rights that dealers have. We would like to inspect the articles before purchasing them.

"We are investing our hard-earned money on unseen articles, and you know this is unfair."

Can this be called a priority? This veteran might as well stay at home and wait if he must waste all of his time and energy in breaking through red tape, and then, in the end, be unable to satisfy his wants developed through years of sacrifice. In some cases it would have been much better for the veteran to have remained in the service and returned to civilian life after reconversion becomes an accomplished fact, for the chances of

getting into a business now are practically impossible.

The priorities system, as set up by the Surplus Property Act, gives the Government and its agencies, State and local subdivisions and nonprofit institutions first preference in purchasing surplus commodities before they are made available to the public and veterans. It is obvious that the first-choicers take whatever they want first and the balance is released for public sale, which is where the veterans come in. In many cases these commodities are in very poor condition, and some are unfit for use without first undergoing major and expensive repairs.

Frankly, some changes must come about or the patience of veterans will be strained to the breaking point. The veteran, whether as an individual or a group, if he is going to maintain his so-called preference rating should enjoy it without equivocation.

I have briefly portrayed the "run-around" a veteran gets when he goes out to purchase surplus property. This is not entirely the case with all commodities, provided they are available for public sale. Nevertheless, this bottleneck must be broken to give a veteran a true priority right, and expedite the flow of godds of all sorts into productive and useful channels. Whether a veteran is an individual or a group, these priority rights should be operated with every courtesy and dispatch.

Recently the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, studying this matter, stated that the following commodities have been declared surplus: 15,000 passenger cars, 110,000 trucks $77,000,000 worth of communication equipment and electronic devices, $8,100,000 of photographic equipment, $9,000,000 worth of clothing, $7,000,000 of textile or other wearing apparel, $2,500,000 worth of footwear, $4,400,000 worth of contruction materials.

I believe that all veterans' organization would like to have a break-down as to where and to whom these items were sold, and whether or not any veterans benefited by these transactions.

From the record it appears that in all of these declarations the veteran was not considered as an acceptable purchaser thereof. If veterans are to enjoy a priority in obtaining surplus property, then we feel that capital goods should be included with consumers goods.

After all, that adjustment should include the opportunity to establish a business. A veteran's right to purchase capital goods might bring forth a new Henry Ford, a Thomas Edison, or a Henry Kaiser, who knows.

We feel that veterans should not be barred from using their initiative or be penalized because they are veterans.

May we give, at this time, a brief outline of the history in disposing of surplus property. First, it was designated to the Treasury Department then to the Department of Commerce, and from there it was passed on to the RFC, then the Smaller War Plants Corporation began buying in an attempt to aid the veterans in securing surplus property. Now it is the War Assets Corporation. This hot potato is being tossed around from one Government bureau to another.

Now, here are our recommendations:

1. Freeze all surplus property until an adequate system of disposal in behalf of the veteran is established.

2. Amvets would like to see a clear-cut definition of the phrase "top priority."

We believe that "top priority" should be defined as either above, or on the same level with the Federal Government, giving authority for the veteran to buy capital goods as well as consumers goods and to be used basically to either establish or maintain an existing small business or a profession.

3. Why couldn't a plan be devised, as we suggested in the press some months ago, to place a rubber stamp on the back of a veteran's discharge, to include the type of purchase and the price paid for the commodity? Why couldn't a veteran's discharge together with his social security card or birth certificate, dog tags, draft cards, and other supporting papers be sufficient to establish preference to purchase. In addition, a definite curb should be placed on speculation by purchasers of surplus property. This would prevent one person from buying up large lots of surplus property, and by so doing, preventing others from gaining advantage from surplus property sales. Purchases should be on the basis of first come, first served—with full publicity being given to all sales.

4. By the nature of its authority, the RFC has become a trustee for Government-owned war installations and manufacturing plants no longer in operation. These abandoned plants and installations are well disbursed throughout the country. Why cant' these same properties be used for the disposal of surplus goods to the veterans.

5. The cost of transporting goods will be cut materially, because of the various and well-located collection stations and supply depots, namely, the existing quartermaster depots of the Army and Marine Corps, plus the supply units of the Navy. A great percentage of all property, whether declared surplus or not, are located at these points at the present time, which should facilitate in redisbursing them to smaller subdistribution points. In this manner, the veteran would have the opportunity of inspecting before purchase. and a great deal of the red tape that now exists would be eliminated.

6. As to the execution of a plan to dispose of surplus property, I should like to emphasize that at the present time there are more than 1,000,000 veterans unemployed who are drawing unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week. By simple multiplying of 1,000,000 by $20, there is a cash outlay of $20,000,000 each week.

This substantial unemployment pay is not benefitting the veteran in his readjustment and the tremendous cost to the Government is obvious. This $20,000,000 could go a long way in putting veterans to work in some worthwhile capacity, possibly in the disposal of surplus goods. Certainly, from his great unemployment pool, workers could be gathered to efficiently carry out the surplus-property-disposal program.

7. Furthermore, it seems to us that we are shooting in the dark on surplus disposal, because it has not been determined how large or what type of an armed force will be needed in the postwar period. Consequently, the armed forces cannot fully announce with any degree of accuracy what its surplus will be. This question must be answered by Congress and the White House to release the obvious bottleneck that now exists.

8. More adequate publicity concerning disposal points and the procedures for certification and sale should be furnished veterans. At least a 15-day advance notice of the stock on hand and the price, the location, and so forth, should be given to the press and posted in each post office in that locality.

These disposal plants should be set up in departments with proper personnel to give adequate service to the veterans.

May I state here and now that it is about as difficult to secure copies of regulations and information from the surplus people as it is to obtain surplus goods. I can cite many instances where officials working in these agencies have never heard of some of the new regulations.

Therefore, we implore the Congress to immediately take the proper steps to cut the existing red tape that engulfs veterans when they attempt to buy surplus property. An investigation is in order.

Surplus Property: Hope Versus Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 26, 1945, I introduced in the Congress a bill which I hoped would clarify and improve the priority of veterans in the purchase of surplus property. Five months have gone by; the bad situation which in November was as plain as the nose on your face has steadily grown worse. Today everybody talks about surplus property. I think we ought to do something about it.

Recently in the capital of Texas a surplus property sale was held at Camp Mabry. One of Texas' cleverest writer, Weldon Hart, of the Austin American Statesman, attended that sale. He wrote two articles which did more than detail the bare facts. He caught the spirit.

On the first day, it was a gala spirit. Veterans had been told this sale was particularly for them. As Mr. Hart's article reflects, they were in a jubilant and picnicking mood.

On the second day, they came up against the cold hard fact that priority is meaningless insofar as it applies to the veteran. And Mr. Hart caught that spirit, too. In the incident of the soldier who could not run quite as fast to the purchase window to beat the dealers there, because he still walked on a cane.

I hope the Members of Congress will read these two articles. The clever writing will amuse you. The cold facts will chill you. And they will offer one more argument for the urgency of action by this Congress.

STAMPEDE ON MABRY LIKE FRONTIER RACE
(By Weldon Hart)

Bearded Sooners whipping their horses across the Cherokee Strip would have paused in amazement Monday and lifted dusty Stetson to their modern counterparts at Camp Mabry.

Occasion was the opening of the $3,000,000 war surplus property sale at the ordnance shop. All night automobiles were lining up outside the Camp Mabry front gate. By 8:30 a. m. the cavalcade stretched for blocks in both directions. A hundred or more persons had forsaken mechanical transportation and were ready to make the three-quarter-mile dash to the ordnance shop gate on foot.

At 8:30 sharp the front bars went down and they were off. The footmen started fast. As soon as they cleared the entrance the automobiles started in. At the front of the administration building the runners swung left and the drivers swung right. There was earlier talk some easterners had hired track men to represent them in the dash for the shop gate, but by and large the field looked decidedly amateurish. Most of the runners soon slowed to a jog-trot and then to a walk. The hardier ones thundered up to the gate panting and one had to lie down and be ministered unto with cold water.

Meanwhile a sight to chill the blood of Lucky Teeter was transpiring across the parade ground. The arsenal cut-off at Camp Mabry curves through giant oak trees, then

breaks into a straightaway that turns into a 90° corner this side of the ordnance shop. Bumper to tail light, scores of vehicles roared around the course. Some of the automobiles, driven by optimists, pulled trailers to carry home the loot. One daredevil in a high-powered car with trailer broke out of ranks and whipped against another car, ripping its fender. State police didn't spot the offender before he lost himself in the crowd, but they were prepared to greet him when he returned to his automobile.

THIRTEEN DAYS TO SELL

By 8:45 some 300 people were lined up in front of the ordnance-shop gate, second objective of operation bargain hunter. Among them was an Air Corps captain, still in uniform; a boy with steel hooks for a left hand; many men with discharge buttons in their lapels; several women; a young couple with a baby girl, just walking, on a leash; a number of older men, not World War II veterans, obviously dealers in various stages of postwar prosperity.

The sale manager, a crisp elderly gentleman with an authoritative voice, explained the sales procedure and barked: "It's a $3,000,000 sale—we've got 13 days to sell this stuff—don't rush, don't crowd—take it easy."

The only confusion was around the head of the line, where three elements instead of the prescribed one jockeyed for position. There was some grumbling about "the six guys who were standing here when we got here," and some particularly pointed remarks tossed at a little fellow with an Eastern brogue who came up late but was one of the first dozen or so through the barrier when it opened at 9 a. m.

A big Texan in officer's pinks told pals: "Wait'll we get through the gate—I'm going to trip him up if I get a chance." He had his chance but passed it up in favor of sprinting past the little guy and beating him to the purchasing office. This was a 200-yard dash from the shop gate.

POW'S HELP OUT

German POW's squatted in the shade of the stacks of boxed engines, ready with hammers and pinch bars to help prospectors get a better peek at their "pig in a poke." All this equipment had been paid for by Americans to help lick them and their kind, and now they were helping the Americans sell it back on one another.

Warned to inspect the engines, axle assemblies, transmission assemblies, or what not before they bought, anxious seekers found that while they were inpecting, others were buying. At 9:30 only three men had bought—but it took an announcer nearly 15 minutes to call out the numbers of the lots that had been purchased. As the voice droned on, one veteran folded his catalog and started walking away. "I've heard enough," he announced. It was first come, first served, and the first man up could have bought the works if he'd had the money and the inclination.

As a matter of fact, the No. 1 man made one of the day's smallest purchases—one jeep engine. He was a hefty, broad-beamed ex-GI, sweating and grinning over his successful mission.

His pleasure might have been tempered if he had heard the remarks of a man a little farther down the line.

"If I'd known that was all he wanted to buy," this dealer gritted, "I would have given him $5,000 for that place."

SURPLUS GOING FAST AT MABRY SALE

(By Weldon Hart)

It probably will be no news to the Government that some people didn't like the way the Camp Mabry Ordnance Shop surplus property sale was conducted. According to the accounts and comments we have seen concerning other sales, few people ever are pleased. Perhaps that's inevitable; it would be unfair to minimize the tremendous chore involved in disposing of war-surplus property equitably and economically.

At the same time, we saw enough of the Camp Mabry deal in half an hour to be convinced that the so-called open sale isn't the answer.

This was a first come, first served sale. Eligible to buy were: (1) Representatives of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; (2) war veterans who had secured certificates authorizing them to make purchases; (3) authorized dealers.

The only priority recognized was swiftness of foot. (That and, in some noticeable cases, the brass to shove in ahead of other people.)

The average American is inclined to consider the "first come, first served" principle fair enough. But let's consider a few facts. First, there was no ceiling on purchases. That means the first man up to the purchasing window could have bought the whole shebang if he had the money and wanted it.

THIS RACE IS TO THE SWIFT

It follows that the men at the head of the line could skim off the cream, leaving latercomers to paw over the less desirable lots. Again the average citizen might say: "Fair enough. They should have been there earlier." But it certainly put a tremendous premium on the more or less haphazard business of "gettin' thar fustest."

Let's consider another angle: the veteran's.

Theoretically the "open sale" was a break for the veteran; it meant he had an opportunity to get ahead of the Government buyers who at most other sales have had first priority. At the same time, dealers had the same opportunity. And when representatives of big dealers got up to the window, it was Katy bar the door. From a publicity story released by the War Assets Administration, consider this statement: "Sales officials indicated that probably the heaviest purchaser the opening day of the sale * * * was the Lone Eagle Auto Salvage Co., of Kansas City, Mo. The representative of this firm was ninth in line and purchased page after page from the catalog and the exact total of the purchases will not be known until the paper work on the huge purchase order has been completed."

We talked with a veteran who was behind this purchaser and several other heavy-buying dealers. The reason he was behind was that he couldn't run as fast as some of the other buyers, and the reason he couldn't run fast was that during the recent unpleasantries overseas he happened to get shot in the foot and has to walk, not run, with a cane. By the time he got up to the window, all the property in which he was interested had been sold.

WAS IT IDLE TALK?

This young man had read, no doubt, that veterans were supposed to get certain advantages in the disposal of war surplus materials. He came away wondering if that was right. It appeared to him—and it appears to this observer—that the wound he received in his country's service was a distinct handicap, rather than an asset, in the Camp Mabry sale.

This veteran wonders, if the Government actually is concerned with giving the veteran a break, why a properly limited presale couldn't be conducted for veterans alone. Even if they were restricted to the purchase of a single lot, most of the vets would come away with something they wanted and needed. Few of them have the financial resources to buy "page after page" of catalogued property. Most of them wanted only a few hundred dollars' worth In fact, the first man in line Monday, a young veteran, bought only one motor, for $36.

Another suggestion came from a local man; a single-purchase ceiling. He suggested a 10-lot restriction. Then, after everyone had a crack at some of the better property offered, the big-lot buyers could come through again and again until they had all they wanted.

More able minds than ours have studied the war surplus disposal problem, and far be it from us to say they're all wrong. It does seem, however, that there should be evolved a more satisfactory priority system than a foot race.

Terminal Leave for GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to petition No. 23, a discharge petition to bring to the floor H. R. 4051 introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], a bill to grant enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave.

This bill was introduced early last fall, and it is now time for action to decide either to pass the bill or defeat it.

For my part I have signed the petition for the bill's discharge and intend to vote for it on the floor. The bill, as you will recall, provides for a means of equalizing the accumulated leave of a GI with that of a commissioned officer. Under current practices, a commissioned officer who has not taken his annual leave as it occurs can receive terminal leave in cash benefits of continuing salary for a period equal to the amount of leave he has coming. A GI who has not taken his annual leave but who, through lack of desire or opportunity, has allowed the leave to accumulate receives at discharge no benefit at all. He has simply lost that many days of leave. H. R. 4051 would rectify this injustice by paying the GI for the days of leave he did not take in the same manner as the commissioned officer is now paid. In other words, the GI would get paid for annual leave he did not take at the rate of 2½ days per month for war service. If he served 1 year without taking any annual leave and then were discharged, under the provisions of this bill he would be entitled to 1 month's pay. If he served 2 years without taking any annual leave he would be entitled to 2 months' pay, and so on. If he took any leave, that amount of leave would be subtracted from the amount he accumulated. If he took all of his annual leave, he would be entitled to nothing upon discharge.

The bill provides that the money shall be paid in a lump sum and only if the GI makes application for this leave within 90 days after the enactment of the act. It is a plain, easily understood bill, obviously correcting an injustice, and I believe that Congress should call the bill from the committee and pass it at the earliest possible date.

Future of Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I had remarks in the RECORD pertaining to the future of the farmers of America with particular attention to the dairy farmers.

To further impress upon the Congress of what the farmers are thinking, I wish to insert a timely article by a citizen of my district. It is worthy of reading by every Member of Congress.

DAIRYMEN LOOK AHEAD

(By Conrad O. Peterson)

During the depression years, we dairy farmers were sunk in gloom. Our milk, hauled to the cheese factory, brought us about 2 cents per quart.

Today, our milk brings us about 7 cents per quart in winter, and about 6 cents during the summer months. That price includes the subsidy. We can do very well at this price. But what lies ahead?

About 6 months ago I thought that the future prospect of the dairy farmer was dismal. I then happened on a newspaper item that gave hope.

This item was an amazing revelation concerning the astounding increase in our population. We are having a boom in births. Where in 1940 our population was about 132,000,000, it is now estimated that we had at the end of 1945, about 140,000,000. This is an increase of nearly 8,000,000 people in 5 years. It is further estimated that we will have a population gain of about 13,000,000, between the years 1940 to 1950.

Added emphasis can be made by the fact that by 1950 we will have over 5,000,000 more children under 10 years of age, than in 1940. And that is not all. Looking further ahead, it is possible that our Nation will have a population of at least 190,000,000 by the year 2000. The 13,000,000 increase during the 10-year period between 1940 and 1950 is more than equal to the entire population of Canada.

What does this mean to the dairy farmer? It means a demand for milk, and more milk. For dairy products of all kinds. As time goes on, the demand will continue to increase. It will give comfort to the dairy farmer to know that a return to the ruinous prices of depression years is very unlikely. The dairy farmer finds, as the years pass by, that the costs of operating his farm are increasing yearly. Good clean milk from a disease-free herd cannot be produced profitably at the prewar market prices.

WHAT OTHERS THINK

The dairy future looks bright, but time often upsets predictions. To find what other dairy farmers thought of the future I decided to get the opinion of other farmers.

I found Lester Rowe busy with his fine herd of Holsteins, a high-producing herd. Lester was noncommittal as to the long distance future of dairying, but commented on the present.

"I don't know about these strikes. Maybe they have a good reason to strike," said Lester. "But what about the price of steel, and how are we going to purchase farm machinery if prices go too high? It isn't only too high in price at present, but we cannot get the machinery we need."

Joseph Innes commented on the past, present, and future of dairying.

"The farmers have been held down during the war years. We were paid a subsidy so that farm market prices held steady. This kept the cost of living on an even keel. But now that the war is over, we hear that the subsidy comes off. This will come at a time when a surplus of farm products will mount, thereby lowering prices of farm products. We get kicked both ways. The prices couldn't mount during the war, but they can come down now. The city laborer received a raise and short hours. We still have our long hours, including Sunday work, and are apt to get a large drop in income when things go back to what they call 'normal.' On top of that we will have to pay a much higher price when buying farm machinery."

Howard Hardie, another dairy farmer, has an interesting view of the future as it pertains to the dairymen.

"I believe that the market price for milk will hold steady for another 2 years. But what will happen then? Milk prices in the future will be greatly influenced by how much milk will be used in plastics and other products.

"Then, too, as things come back to normal, a greater emphasis will be placed on the phosphorous content of milk. We have to put superphosphate fertilizer on our soil to replace that lost through years of cropping. Many of our soils are so depleted of phosphorus, that hay, grains, and other feed carry this lack right through the cow to the milk products. I believe that the time will come when prices of milk will be influenced by the phosphorus content in addition to the butterfat test."

A farm that started with a section of cutover land, without a clearing of any kind, has now become a large and progressive dairy farm.

Harry Barr, with wife and two daughters, worked long and hard to get their acres into production. Adequate farm buildings took much in energy and cash to produce. Farm machinery was costly. Later, a son-in-law, Wayne Hoffren, joined in partnership and now the firm of Barr & Hoffren look to a better future.

WORLD TRADE IMPORTANT

Mr. Barr takes a world-wide viewpoint on future opportunities in Wisconsin dairy farming.

"We must equalize labor's wages and farm prices to a lower level so as to enable us to have free trade with all the world. We cannot have a world trade creating a big demand for dairy products, unless our products of both factory and dairy are produced at a cost low enough to enable countries of the world to buy from us. We are the 'haves' today; the other nations the 'have-nots.' Restriction in world trade can only lead to another war."

Alvin Gullickson, my next-door neighbor, was busy feeding his cows when I interviewed him. He commented about the future dairy feed situation.

"Our dairy feed costs are too high. We must produce more home-grown feeds by raising more corn, oats, and other grains. We can have these ground and mixed with high-protein feeds and reduce costs greatly. I understand that there are some earlier varieties of corn being developed, which by maturing earlier can help feed production."

CREDITS OPA

J. H. Van Ouwerkerk has had many years of experience in Wisconsin dairy farming. His farm is well equipped for the dairying. He gives us another slant on the many complex and difficult aspects of milk production.

"Many people resent the OPA, but I believe that OPA and the subsidy payments kept things going by not allowing prices on many things to go sky high. We could have received much higher prices for farm products without the OPA, but it would only have made the prices rise on a lot of things we farmers have to buy. I believe that if the OPA is discontinued, prices will go out of kilter. We had a ceiling on prices during the war. It would be fair to have a base on prices during peacetime, this base price to be based on an average cost of production."

A few years ago Willard Van Ouwerkerk bought a tract of cutover land. He worked energetically clearing land, building a house and farm buildings. He now has the start of a fine dairy farm. Willard is also dubious about the future, especially dairy prices, but stated that there is a pressing improvement needed for his farm.

"What I need now is electricity. That would give me lights for house, barn, and other buildings."

The problems and views as stated by these dairy farmers are representative of all Wisconsin dairymen. Their futures are linked with future dairy prices. The amount of cash received by the dairy farmer determines his present and future status. His farm can only be operated successfully if his income equals or exceeds his operating costs. When buying, he must pay prices based on cost of production. When selling, he must take what he can get. His products are not sold at prices based on production costs.

The dairy farmer's future can only be made secure by placing the farming business on the same cost-of-production footing as all other business.

Hawaii the Forty-ninth State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD to include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii:

THE FORTY-NINTH STATE

Hawaii has asked, through an overwhelming vote of its house and senate, that the United States take immediate action toward admitting the Territory to statehood. Hawaii has a population of 500,000, more than any State except Oklahoma had at the time of admission to the Union.

The House investigating committee, which finished its work in January, was concerned with the mixed racial composition of the islands. Would it, committee members asked, prove a military hazard in time of war and a political hazard in time of peace? Robert L. Shivers, Federal Bureau of Investigation agent in charge of Hawaii, said that there was not a single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Thirty-three thousand citizens of Hawaii served in the Army, Navy, and Marines during the war. Hawaiians of Japanese ancestry made up most of the One Hundredth Infantry and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team serving in Europe. These units accumulated five Presidential citations, 65 Distinguished Service Crosses, 290 Silver Stars, 782 Bronze Stars, 50 Army commendations, and 82 division commendations. They were known for their fighting ability and morale.

A political survey convinced the investigating committee that bloc voting on the basis of national origins does not exist to a dangerous extent. The percentage of Hawaiians

of Japanese ancestry has declined since 1940. The Hawaiians live together harmoniously, the committee found, and their primary interest is in the United States.

The investigating committee also was concerned with the activities of the 5 companies that control 96 percent of sugar production in Hawaii. Critics charged that these companies constituted an oligarchy that would stand in the way of satisfactory state government. Investigation refuted these charges, the committee said, and pointed to prospering small business, active labor unions, and social legislation in the islands.

The committee report goes far toward resolving any remaining questions as to Hawaii's claim to statehood. It gave Hawaii an honorable war record, responsible government, good schools, an adequate health department. The gross assessed value of real property in Hawaii is more than $500,000,000. In 1945 it paid $42,000,000 in taxes. It has met the requirements for statehood and voted its desire to join the Union. Immediate action would lend sincerity to the talk of freedom for all.

Pittenger's Washington Comment—Springtime in Washington

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I issue reports to my constituents and I submit herewith my comment dealing with the subject of springtime, and other matters.

JACKSON DAY DINNERS

In a practical way, the Jackson Day dinner recently held on March 23 is rated the outstanding high light of activities in the Nation's Capital since the first of the year. It was reported that the attendance at the Washington, D. C., banquet was up to the standard with 2,000 banqueteers paying $100 a plate for the occasion. This made it a $200,000 banquet. Of course, throughout the country similar banquets were held. The purpose was to replenish the war chest of the followers of Andrew Jackson. I do not think Ed Pauley, oil man, was there. Harold Ickes, former Secretary of Interior, was notable by his absence.

The Honorable Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, was apparently the substitute and called loudly for all independent Republicans, all independent Progressives everywhere, to enter the door of opportunity, labeled "The Democratic Party."

The importance of the Congressional elections this fall was stressed and evidently Andrew Jackson's spirit, or those who use his cloak, had that in mind in the war chest activities at $100 a plate. Some time ago it was stated that one of our pressure groups in Minnesota had raised and would spend a jackpot of something like $70,000 for the purpose of electing Congressmen in Minnesota who were to the liking of this pressure group. So, the contest is shaping itself early. As in other political contests, Mr. Average American Citizen will go to the ballot box and be the final person to decide which political party wins. He will hear much about issues. This is America. As long as the freedom of the ballot box is preserved here, the people will get the kind of government they want.

THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS

For a few brief moments I reviewed some of the facts connected with the life of that illustrious man, Andrew Jackson, just the other day. He ranks with other great and patriotic Americans. He was a rugged individualist, hated by his enemies and loved by his friends, but above all he was a great American. Volumes have been written about his character, his leadership and his achievements. Just to give you a glimpse of this soldier—statesman—and President of the United States, I quote from volume 1 by A. S. Colyar, of Nashville, Tenn. The title of this book is the Life and Times of Andrew Jackson. In commenting on General Jackson's victory at New Orleans, 1814–15, this author says:

> If this country has onerated any man with greater responsibilities than were put on General Jackson in defending New Orleans against the British Army, the evidence has not been given to the public; and if any public man, in civil or military life, has discharged a great public duty with more intelligent fidelity and courage than he did, history does not proclaim it. His beloved country had been at war for 2 years with the most warlike nation in the world. The enemy had attacked and literally overcome, beaten on every field where the issue had been joined, the American troops, and this in the most populous parts of the United States, and where the Government had put forward all its strength to oppose the invaders. Such had been the victories of the trained armies of England over our raw militia in the North, that we were fast losing the reputation, as a people of martial spirit, which we had when the Revolution closed; and the English press, from the London Times down to the doggerel makeshifts, was berating us as a nation of cowards—ready to get up a war, but too cowardly to fight.

As I continued my review of the life of this great man, I encountered the following eulogy by Alexander Walker whose book Jackson and New Orleans is found in the Congressional Library. Mr. Walker says:

> There is no campaign in modern military history, which, for its extent, was more complete in all its parts, and more brilliant in its results, than that conducted by Andrew Jackson in 1814–15, in the defense of New Orleans. In the brief period of 26 days, a town of less than 18,000 inhabitants, including all sexes and ages, without forts—natural or artificial defenses—exposed to approach and attack on all sides, by land and water—with an army of less than 5,000 militia, hastily raised en masse, and illy armed and accoutered—was not only successfully defended against a veteran army of 10,000 of the best soldiers in the world, but was made forever glorious by the most brilliant victory, which has been achieved since the invention of gunpowder.

Mr. Speaker, in these days when straight thinking is needed, it is well that we pause to pay homage, not only to Andrew Jackson, but to other great patriots whose achievements constitute the cornerstone of the Republic of the United States.

SENATOR ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE

A development which attracted very little attention, except from Henry Wallace, was the meeting recently held in the State of Wisconsin by the Progressive Party. This party, by an overwhelming vote of those in attendance, voted to disband and to join the ranks of the Republican Party, because it offered the best opportunity for people of progressive tendencies to accomplish the most for America. In a speech in the House of Representatives, Congressman KARL MUNDT welcomed Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE and his associates into the ranks of the Republican Party.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The speaker at the Jackson Day banquet here covered a lot of territory. He must have had a grand ghost writer whose imagination far exceeded any semblance of truth. No doubt the speech will be widely circulated. Read it. You will note that the Republican Party was charged with responsibility for World War II; that it was indicated that the Republican Party opposed every step made to prepare for winning the war; that the Republican Party has been guilty of committing all of the errors and mistakes made during the past 13 years; that the Republican Party is now following its old prewar isolation tendencies and is just as dangerous as ever. The ghost writer left the impression that everything good has come from the leadership in the Democratic Party and that nothing but good has come or will come from any other leadership. To say the least—was this a very nonpartisan viewpoint as to what happened before and during World War II and thoroughly nonpartisan as to what has happened since World War II and what will happen in the future? Of course, you will have to spell the word "nonpartisan" by using the letters "political."

Some time ago I pointed out the fact that we have had no foreign policy and that if there is such a policy, nobody knows anything about it. I also pointed out that Russia had a very definite policy and not only took what she wanted but was on the high road to success in her plans to conquer the world. If we are going to talk politics, then what party has controlled for 13 years the destiny of this country, and while Russia has robbed mankind of its birthright?

In this connection the speaker at the Jackson Day banquet talked about isolation as though that were a terrible thing and the property of the Republican Party. He did not define isolation. I would like to do so, but I have other things to discuss and I prefer to say that, as I see it, this word "isolation" stands out in bold relief when you think of Russia and Joe Stalin. Russia believes in "isolation." Russia looks after Russia. They even go so far as to prohibit American newspapermen or anybody else from entering their country and from finding out what they are doing, what form of government they really live under, and so forth. Our party leaders in America apparently condone the Russian policy. Some say that if we were half as anxious

to look after America as we have been and apparently are now anxious to let Russia look after Russia, we would be better off.

Anyhow, I paid my respects to Russia and to Joe Stalin in my remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 21, 1946. I hope you read them. I will be accused of partisanship, but I find that I was too modest. Former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, who, by the way, is a Democrat, landed at Boston, Mass., on Saturday, March 23, and proceeded to give the American people some good advice. Said former Governor Earle, among many other observations that he had to make:

> We must issue an ultimatum to the Soviet Government to get back to her own country or use the atomic bomb on her while we have it and before she gets it.

The Governor further said that Russia is a far greater menace than Hitler and that Stalin's word is useless because the present Russian Government is still following the teachings of Lenin that any lie, theft, or trickery is moral and ethical if it will help their cause. While we are developing coming political issues, it might be well to find out if the United States has a foreign policy, what it is, and why the administration has permitted Russia to move forward in its plans to dominate the world.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

The Jackson Day banquet speaker did not mention OPA by name but did everything else. He talked about inflation and the possibilities of a depression in this country. He then favored the audience with the promise of the OPA that we would have to keep prices and rents under control and check inflation and get production going full blast. Probably these remarks were inspired by the political battle now going on—and it is not limited to party lines—to perpetuate the Office of Price Administration, because that agency expires on June 30—not very far away.

FOOD SHORTAGES AND STARVING EUROPE

In connection with the Jackson Day dinner, they served a meal of 700 calories. That was absolutely proper. But the contrast to the speaker's remarks about the good job that the administration had done must have stood out in rather bold relief. We have had OPA for a long time. We have had it so long that many people think you have to keep OPA if you are going to have price and rent controls. Of course, that is not true. But the propaganda which Government agencies are putting out is intended to make people believe that we have to put up with the bungling methods and mistakes of OPA. This agency started out with the Henry Wallace idea of burning up the pigs and plowing up the corn, the doctrine of scarcity. They did a real job in making that doctrine work. They discouraged production on the farm. They have done everything they could to kill off the small businessman and the small manufacturers by refusing to let them make a profit.

Now, in the year 1946 this country is called on to renew an agency which offers no hope except shortage of food at home and starvation to the people of Europe. Wrong methods, followed by Government agencies, namely, OPA, can be charged with this food shortage which now exists in the land of plenty. Our relief program to help the starving people of Europe has gotton so bad that Herbert Hoover, who made a success of relief matters after World War I in helping feed the unfortunate people of Europe, was called on to take over relief matters, so poorly handled by UNRRA, which evidently did not know what this problem was all about. May we suggest that this glorious failure of OPA and of UNRRA was overlooked at the Jackson Day banquet. Nor was Hoover's name mentioned.

HOUSING SHORTAGE

It was evident that the speech we heard over the radio at the Jackson Day banquet on March 23 was intended to be a political primer for the campaign to elect administration Congressmen this fall. The ghost writer, according to the text of the speech, cleverly fanned the fires of class hatred by painting a picture of 2,700,000 homes to be built in 1 year and 8 months. It was said that legislation for this proposal was before Congress and that those who voted against this legislation would be responsible for the housing shortage. Reference was made to the real estate lobby. The veterans were mentioned and the impression left with the radio audience was that unless you supported the administration legislation you were an enemy of people who wanted homes, and particularly that you were an enemy of the veterans. I wonder if any veterans are going to be misled by that sort of sophistry and that sort of distortion of facts. We all recognize that there is a housing shortage. Honest people will differ on the best methods to get those homes. Many people who have studied this problem carefully take issue with the administration legislation. They say that this legislation favors the manufacturers of prefabricated houses. They say that subsidies will not solve the problem. The politicians blame all who disagree with them as obstacles in the way of building houses. Therefore the veterans are asked to believe everybody is their enemy who does not follow this program of having the Government, in effect, go into the business of building homes.

I had a circular the other day which said that veterans wanted an opportunity to own homes but they did not want shacks. Homes are not built overnight and the matter of policy in taking care of the housing shortage must recognize this fact. All of us are in favor of erecting temporary dwellings and all of us are in favor of a building program not only for permanent dwellings, but for other permanent buildings needed in our industrial and commercial life. It is just political bunk to say that a man who disagrees with the planned economy and planned regimentation of the New Deal is opposed to home building. Many point out that we will have to get rid of OPA with its ceiling prices which prevent production of materials, before anything can be done. This talk about a real-estate lobby is only intended to muddle up the issues in the proposed program. It is an appeal to class hatred. The bricklayer and the carpenter and people who produce building materials, as well as those who furnish the labor to produce homes are all interested in getting the productive processes going. If the Government will permit them, American labor and American contractors will build dwellings. Long before the war people who could not afford to own a home were able to rent, and then in due time they became home owners and all of that was done under our system of free enterprise.

However, one of the coming campaign issues will undoubtedly hinge on the housing shortage. If we disregard facts, and follow the unfair tactics of the politicians who now want to rush through a law, we may get legislation which is not in the interest of the veterans or anybody else. Of course, this legislation will help the job holders who want to build up more jobs by having the Government go into the housing business. If we talk the language of these political opportunists, we could properly charge the present administration with the failure to have homes and with the housing shortage. They have been in control in this country over 13 years. That line of talk would be just as honest as the tactics of administration spokesmen when they condemn everybody who does not believe in their regimentation program and leave the impression that everybody except themselves are opposed to the veterans. I do not believe the veterans will be misled by this sort of nonsense. There is a housing shortage and to a large extent I think it is due to the fact that all building operations ceased while World War II was going on. It is too bad that political parties have to resort to some of their tactics in order to carry out their efforts to capture the soldiers' votes. That is just what the politicians are doing now in connection with this proposed housing measure.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Those who honored the memory of Jackson assured us radio listeners that there was not any question about a balanced budget and lower taxes. No wistful child looking for Santa Claus could display more optimism. If history repeats itself it will be because of the enormous expenditures of our Government with no revenue to meet its obligations. I commend to everybody the article by John T. Flynn in the Reader's Digest for January 1946. It is inserted by Congressman WHITE of Idaho, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1568 under the heading "The worst enemy you have."

As Mr. Flynn points out, our Government owes over $260,000,000,000. He predicts the interest obligations on the debt at $6,000,000,000 a year. He points out that that is more money than the Government spent in any peace year prior to 1934. He points out that the money to pay this interest on Government bonds and other obligations will have to come from taxes.

It will indeed be a sad day when this country has to default on its obligations. We hope that day will not come because it will mean a ruined currency and

worthless stocks and bonds and the savings of millions of people wiped out. It is time that we held more meetings like the Jackson Day dinner, and talk about problems such as the balanced budget.

LOAN TO BRITAIN

While the ringing of the dinner bell was going on at the Jackson Day banquet, they forgot to mention the proposed loan to Great Britain of about $4,000,000,000. I will bet if Andrew Jackson had been able to come back for a visit from that bourne from which no traveler returns that he would have counseled the boys not to waste the funds and resources of the United States in that way. He would have pointed to the aged people in this country who are asking an adequate old-age pension, and he would have told the boys to spend some of the British loan for pension purposes, or on our veterans. He even would have told them to get busy on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which development will contribute to the wealth of America and the welfare of its own people. As I figured out sometime ago, the amount of money we are going to hand out to Great Britain would build our share of 14 St. Lawrence projects and there would still be a little change left over.

Address of A. L. M. Wiggins, Former President of American Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a speech delivered before the South Carolina Legislature by Mr. A. L. M. Wiggins, former president of the American Bankers Association, Hartsville, S. C.

I am certain that every Member of the House would enjoy reading Mr. Wiggins' speech, as it contains more logic and common sense than any speech that I have read on this subject during the past few months.

Mr. Wiggins is one of the leading bankers and businessmen of this country, and has been called to Washington on numerous occasions to appear before standing congressional committees as a consultant in framing some of our most important legislation.

Mr. President and members of the general assembly, I appreciate the honor and privilege of addressing the General Assembly of South Carolina.

My only claim to your time is to lay before you some of the facts and problems of South Carolina, as well as some of the hopes and prayers of the private citizens of the State, of whom I am one. We share with you a love for this State and a common destiny in its future.

I am proud to be a citizen of South Carolina. Having traveled throughout the Nation, observing life in our great cities, in the industrial areas, on the western plains, in the vigorous Northwest and on the thrilling west coast, I have always returned to South Carolina with a feeling of thanksgiving and of satisfaction that here, at home, in our own State, are found the most abundant opportunities for achieving a fruitful and satisfying life for all of the people to be found anywhere.

Too often are people enchanted by distant scenes, of greener pastures far away and too seldom do we appreciate the blessings and opportunities that lie at our feet.

This does not mean that we should close our eyes to failures or to the facts of our economic life. It does mean that we should be realists, that we should properly evaluate our assets and our liabilities and that wherever we find obstacles to the well-being and progress of the people of South Carolina, we should in the common interest, seek to remove them.

A GOOD STATE

I need not say to you that South Carolina is a good State in which to live, to work, and to invest capital. The rest of the country is just now beginning to discover our attractions and increasing numbers of fine citizens from other sections are coming into South Carolina to live and to work and to invest their capital. We welcome them.

It has been unfortunate that through the years we have paid a high price for a great deal of unfavorable publicity for our State. As an illustration, our tax laws were for a long time severely criticized, on the platform and through the press, and this criticism often chilled the investment of capital in the State. No tax structure anywhere is perfect and there are always inequities of one kind or another, and we have had some in this State; but I would like to bear testimony to you and to investors everywhere that except for property taxes, which are largely local matters, the State-tax structure of South Carolina today is as fair, as wholesome, as reasonable, and as sound as will be found in any State in the Union.

The charge has been made through the years that the attitude of State government and, in particular, the legislature has been unfriendly to capital. There were times when such was the case, but the record of this legislature and of State government in recent years gives convincing proof that business and industry need have no fear of being penalized by new legislation that is unfair or punitive, but on the other hand, will have a wholesome and healthy legislative environment in which to operate. It is too important to the future of this State for it to be otherwise. Any measures or policies that have crept into government that are unfair to wholesome business life should be rooted out as promptly as possible. Confidentially, the people look to State government to see that such is done.

If we examine the economy of this State, three important facts stand out.

BALANCE OF TRADE

The first is that under normal conditions the balance of trade with the rest of the country is against South Carolina. This means that in normal years we send out of the State more of our money, our bank deposits, and our liquid wealth than we receive in return. The cause of this unbalance of trade is that we are largely producers and sellers of raw goods or of goods after the first stage of manufacture. Our imports are largely of consumer goods or durable goods that represent highly skilled production. For most of our workers in agriculture and in industry it requires the product of 2 to 3 hours of their labor on the things they produce to purchase the product of 1 hour of labor of the workers beyond the State for most of the things we consume. So long as we do much trading of 2 hours of our production for 1 hour of consumption of items made out of the State, just so long will the balance of trade be against us, so long will our liquid wealth tend to flow out of the State, and so long will our standards of living, compared to the rest of the Nation, remain relatively low.

In spite of our wartime prosperity, the facts are that the average per capital income in South Carolina remains about 50 percent of the per capita national income.

To some people these facts of adverse balance of trade and low per capita income are matters of apologetic admission, but I regard them as facts which spell unlimited opportunity in South Carolina. They show that we have a vast market at home for goods requiring a high degree of skill in production and invite us to produce them ourselves. Why should we buy goods from distant points on a labor exchange basis of giving two for one when we can produce those goods in South Carolina and give our own people more profitable employment and keep all of the money at home? Of course, there are many articles that we cannot produce, and I am not for building a wall around South Carolina. We must trade with the rest of the Nation and with the world. Our task is to develop types of production requiring greater skills that will exchange in the free markets of the Nation on a basis of parity income per hour of our production with the income of the worker who produces the goods that we must import.

UNBALANCE IN AGRICULTURE

The second basic fact in our economy is the unbalance of the state in agriculture. We are inclined to overlook this problem at present because during the war years agriculture has received an artificial stimulus under the policies of the Federal Government and for the past few years has been in a favorable trading position. Agriculture now faces a postwar readjustment in which its relative favorable trading position may disappear. This is particularly true with cotton. We have seen our cotton acreage cut in half within recent years and have overcome that in part by improved production per acre. Now we are confronted with increasing competition of foreign cotton production, with the development of cheaper synthetics at home, and with the increasing mechanization of cotton production. The problems of cotton are the most difficult that lie ahead, not only from a national standpoint, but particularly as affecting South Carolina.

Fortunately, in this State we have an agricultural leadership that has long recognized these problems and has made substantial progress in meeting them. It will require a sympathetic understanding of the problems of the farmer on the part of Government, State and National, and of businessmen and of people generally and their full cooperation to work out a satisfactory solution of the inevitable readjustments in agriculture.

A GOOD WAY OF LIFE

Out of these difficulties arises another opportunity in South Carolina. The white rural nonfarm population in the State has been steadily rising. This means that more of our people are living in the country but are working in the business and industry of our towns. This means that many people are discovering a way of life in South Carolina that is both profitable and satisfying. What finer life could man find than to live on a few acres of land near a paved highway a few miles out of town, enjoying running water, electric lights, a refrigerator, and all of the conveniences of a city, with his chickens and eggs and hogs and cows, a vegetable garden, and an acre or two in cash crops, with a job in the town at which he works 40 hours a week and from which he secures the cash money to buy the comforts and conveniences that he wants. Good roads and rural elec-

trification have made this possible. In my opinion, this is the most satisfying, the most stable, and the most secure way of living for a large number of people that can be found anywhere. It is a way of life for which South Carolina is particularly well suited.

This requires, however, that new opportunities for employment in industry and business in our towns must be made available. It means many small new industries throughout the State. It means pioneering in new products and investing our money on our faith in the industrial future of this State.

OUR OWN CAPITAL

Fact number three is a new and unusual one. For the first time in the history of South Carolina the people of this State have accumulated in liquid resources, cash on hand and in banks, War bonds and other savings, an estimated $1,000,000,000.

This is more than $20,000,000 per county. What a vast potential of financial power with which to start the wheels of new industries, with which to expand and multiply the productive economy of this State.

In all previous periods of our history the one serious deterrent to our progress has been the lack of money to finance a fundamental change in our economy. We now have that essential resource. We shall continue to welcome foreign capital but we are no longer dependent upon it. We have our own capital.

NEWLY EQUIPPED MANPOWER

We have another important new resource. Many of our boys are returning from military service where they have developed new and important skills. They have a new vision and a new ambition and want to invest their energies and hopes and their lives in South Carolina. They offer to us, they offer to the State the manpower and the know-how for a broad program of industrial development. Surely with our abundant present capital and with the intelligent and largely trained young manpower at hand, the day of going forward in South Carolina is here. All we require is the courage, the vision and a solidarity of purpose in order to reconstruct the economy of this State on a basis that will yield a more satisfying life to more of our people, that will yield abundant opportunities to our young men and women for successful achievement and that will keep at home and in the State much of the flower of our youth that through the years have sought their fortunes elsewhere.

Time is of the essence for effective action. Within a year the flow of our present liquid wealth will begin to move out of the State and with increasing volume. The task is to capture this wealth and convert it into productive enterprise in South Carolina before it is gone. The need is to provide more attractive opportunities for our returning men and women in South Carolina before they seek such opportunities elsewhere.

OUR TEMPORARY PROSPERITY

Let us not be deluded by a temporary prosperity nor assume that the flush period of the present will long continue and that no action need be taken. Are our memories so short that we have forgotten the mistakes of 1919 and 1920 and the years that followed when we dissipated our cash resources, mortgaged our future, and spent long, dreary years struggling to overcome the disaster that followed? Our future is already mortgaged by the Federal Government with a debt of $10,000 for every family of 5, and the full faith and credit of the United States demands that this debt, with interest, be paid in full.

Nor should we overlook the fact that in the highly prosperous year of 1944 more than one-fourth of the income received in South Carolina came directly out of the Federal Treasury.

PROGRESS IN ACTION

I congratulate the General Assembly of South Carolina for its foresight and vision in passing the Research, Planning, and Development Act of 1945. Under vigorous and intelligent leadership, the board set up under this act is providing the spearhead of constructive action for an improved economy in this State and should have full cooperation and support of chambers of commerce, bankers, and businessmen throughout the State.

If I understand the thinking of the people of South Carolina today, they are yearning for vigorous, progressive, and immediate action. They want the leaders in business, industry, and banking to take steps now to multiply business and industrial employment opportunities. They want an improved and enlarged economic environment in which they can reap substantial rewards for worthwhile accomplishments.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

I would not be faithful to the responsibilities of this occasion without saying to you that in my opinion the people of South Carolina have come to the conclusion that a constructive and progressive program for reorganizing and modernizing the machinery of government in South Carolina is overdue. For a score of years or more the conclusion of every committee, every commission, and every group that has studied our governmental machinery has been that the public interest will be served better, increased efficiency can be had and some economies effected by a complete reorganization of State government. The machinery has been patched up so long and so often that it cannot operate with the highest degree of service in the public interest. This also means a wholesome and thorough revision of the State constitution.

I think it also means that the State should adopt a clear and undertandable unified budget which will reveal the income of the State from all sources and the expenditures for all purposes.

The people of South Carolina are demanding an enlargement and improvement of health programs that will make available adequate hospital and medical facilities to every citizen and, in particular, to people of small means and at costs they can afford.

A NEW EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

More than ever before, the people of South Carolina are becoming fully aroused over the needs for improving our educational system, its administrative machinery, its programs and objectives. There is a wide-spread feeling that our public school system needs considerable revamping in order to help fit our boys and girls to achieve a satisfying life in the world as it is today and will be tomorrow. We cannot deny that something needs to be done with an educational system and program in which less than one in four of the boys and girls who enter the first grade receive a high school diploma.

South Carolina has taken many progressive and notable steps in the development of its educational system. The general assembly has always been responsive to the needs of the people for a progressive development of our public school system. South Carolina today devotes a larger proportion of its income and of the wealth of its people for public education than any State in the Union, but our difficulties are greater because South Carolina has a larger proportion of children of school age to total population than any other State. It is always necessary, therefore, to find a balance between the things we want to do for education and our ability to pay for them. Nor have we any money to waste, we must be careful to get full value for every dollar spent. But the time has now come when the pressing needs of a postwar world for better equipping the boys and girls of South Carolina are demanding a broad advance on the educational front.

Much of our progress in education has been the result of a missionary zeal on the part of our public school teachers and officers who have labored with the machinery at their disposal with a self-sacrificing devotion. Their present need is a backing of State government an of local governments as well, in a comprehensive program of reorganization of our school system, its methods and objectives, plus a reawakening of the people of the State to the necessity of improving the educational level of our people and of the need for increased financial support for our schools. Simple justice and fairness to the teachers demand an immediate increase in salary schedule to meet rising costs of living.

ALL OF THE PEOPLE

Would that every man and woman in the State, particularly those in positions of leadership in Government, in business, in agriculture, in labor, in education, and in the professions, think in terms of all of the people of South Carolina. For too long have the people of this State had too little wealth, too little economic well-being comparable to most of the other States. We now have an opportunity unsurpassed in the history of this State to go forward. We must not allow progress in South Carolina to be retarded by any whose personal or selfish interest is in preserving the status quo.

South Carolina will never become the prosperous State that she has the right to be and that her resources provide the opportunity to be until more of the people at the bottom of the economic scale are better educated and achieve a substantially higher income. Prosperity and well-being of a people do not filter down from the top—they arise from a good life for the people at the bottom.

We must fertilize the life of the State at its roots.

The people of South Carolina, the workers in agriculture and in industry, in the stores and in the shops, and in particular, the boys and girls, the young men and women, citizens all, bring you their hopes and prayers for the vision, the courage, and the will to help them realize a reasonable ambition and help make their dreams of a fully satisfying and prosperous life in South Carolina come true.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, adopt the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill and you have not only socialized but political medicine. Your family doctor will be a memory of the past.

Yes, if this proposed legislation is passed, there will be a new character on the national scene—Uncle Sam, M. D. Doctors will be forced to sign on the dotted line if they desire to practice medicine under his rules and regulations. All fees will be determined by Uncle Sam. The doctor will be told what patients he may see and the patients will be told what doctors they may have. The life of every citizen would be in the hands of a medical czar, not run by doctors,

but by politicians, who hang around the courthouses.

Free medicine, unshackled, and with little government interference, is the envy of the world. In 40 years it has reduced the death rate by 60 percent in the United States. American medicine is unequaled in any part of the world. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill would revolutionize our medical institutions and adopt methods controlled by salaried political bureaucrats.

The Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill of 1945 is designed to centralize all social welfare and public health activities, in the hands of a few persons. It has not a stepchild's chance of being passed. The present Congress has no stomach for such stuff and the gentlemen sponsoring this bill know it.

The important question is: "Shall medicine be continued to be practiced by men and women who are scientifically trained and who are devoted to the relief of suffering humanity, or shall the practice of medicine be made over by a group of medically untrained bureaucrats, who will use the medical profession as a tool, and the sick as their clay in molding a huge political machine?"

Mr. Speaker, the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill proposes a complete revolution of medical practice in the United States. All institutions concerned in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease would have to modify their method of rendering service under this bill. The type of medical education and research and the administration of hospitals would be grossly altered. The immediate results of such a revolution would certainly be destructive.

The arguments for socialized medicine are often tied up with the number of men who were rejected by the Army. There were a great many men rejected because they were physically unfit. But the Army had very high standards of physical requirements. The standard was higher than in any other country. The proponents of socialized medicine never point out that many of those rejected were rejected because of illiteracy, and this country has had compulsory education for many years. Many were rejected because of mental illnesses and the care of the mentally ill has been under the direction of the Government for many years. The results are not very satisfactory. A large portion of the rejectees had physical defects and deformities which could not have been prevented or cured.

The practice of medicine, under free institutions, in this country has advanced the healing art until it is the envy of the whole world. New methods of treating diseases and many new drugs have been discovered. Freemen with great minds have made progress. There has been a ceaseless probing and searching of the unknown for the purpose of curing disease. All of this advancement has been made under a free, untrampled medical practice.

Germany, after 54 years' sickness insurance, was a happy hunting ground for quacks. It gave a full inducement to all forms of quackery. Preventive medicine in the United States is the envy of the medical profession all over the world. The hospitals in this country have the finest equipment. In Germany, and European countries, which lead in socialized medicine, the doctors failed to take postgraduate courses. The American physician takes more postgraduate courses than any other physician in the world.

I am certain that under the socialized medicine bill, there might be more people under the care of the physician, but less under the stethoscope. Yes; the doctor's time would be taken up in filling out endless forms, with ink on his fingers instead of iodine.

To finance such a huge health program would cost between ten and twelve billion dollars a year. This would be a direct tax upon the employer and the employee. The care the patient would get would be indifferent.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of viewing, on three different occasions, socialized medicine as it operates in Europe. The patient gets very indifferent care. He is merely a number and a cog in the machine. No one gives him that personal contact and touch which is so desirable when one is ill. The practice of medicine does involve a personal contact between physician and patient. There comes a time in the life of all of us when cold facts of science do not prevail. The people want personal service with sympathy, particularly cheerfulness and confidence in the doctor. No amount of scientific service can take its place in the dark hours of sorrow and trouble so common in the experience of all of us. These are intangible things, and I have found, as a physician, that through the troubles and situations of life, fame often dies, honor may perish, but loving kindness is immortal.

Mr. Speaker, this socialized health bill assails the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as promised the people of this Nation by our Constitution. This bill does not spring from our traditions nor from the public spirit. It is an offspring of foreign ideology, first brought to perfection by that German statesman, Bismarck. In every country where fascism, nazism, and socialism prevail, there is socialized medicine. The government makes the people smoke an economic pipe dream and they think they are getting something for nothing.

The United States gained its leadership in medical education and care by methods that have been tested in the crucibles of time and economic hardship. But now it is proposed to abolish these institutions and methods and to substitute others whose trial in many countries has failed to produce health conditions equal to those existing here. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill would abolish the voluntary control and inspiration that have brought medical education, hospital management, drug purity research, and medical service to their present high level. As a substitute, the people are offered a system controlled by salaried political bureaucrats.

Biography of Hon. B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, Chairman of the Republican National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is great interest in the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, and I am pleased to print under my remarks a biographical sketch of Mr. REECE:

A doughboy hero of the Rainbow and Yankee Divisions in World War I, and a consistent winner in congressional campaigns in his native Tennessee for 25 years since hanging up his uniform, BRAZILLA CARROLL REECE fills the bill as a fighting chairman of the Republican National Committee who does not know the meaning of defeat.

As the 56-year-old veteran of distinguished service in the Halls of Congress and on the battlefields of France assumes his new duties as successor to Herbert Brownell, the Republican Party rallies after four set-backs in Presidential campaigns in an effort to capture the control of Congress in the 1946 elections as a prelude to success in the contest for the White House in 1948.

As a soldier, B. CARROLL REECE never flinched, as his many decorations, including the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Purple Heart, Croix de Guerre with palm and citations for bravery by Marshal Petain, Generals Pershing, Edwards, Hale, and Colonel Lewis so eloquently attest.

The kind of man the Republicans have chosen to lead them in the forthcoming congressional campaign is indicated by a citation awarded him as a first lieutenant, One Hundred and Second Infantry, of the Twenty-sixth Division, the YD, of the American Expeditionary Force in 1918.

"For extraordinary heroism in action in the Bois d'Ormont, France, 23-28 October '18," Maj. Gen. Harry C. Hale, division commander, cited the young Tennessean, a school teacher before the war, as follows:

"In leading his company through four successful actions, Lieutenant REECE was twice thrown violently to the ground and rendered unconscious by bursting shells, but upon recovering consciousness he immediately reorganized his scattered command and consolidated his position. On several occasions, under heavy enemy machine-gun fire, he crawled far in advance of his front line and rescued wounded men who had taken refuge in shell holes."

His various other citations were for bravery of a high order. By command of General Pershing, Lieutenant REECE received the Distinguished Service Medal for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service. The citation read, in part: "He showed energy, initiative, and military ability of a high order, while serving as second lieutenant in the One Hundred and Second Infantry, in command of a company and later a battalion. He led his company brilliantly in the attack upon the St. Mihiel salient and during the operations of the Twenty-sixth Division north of Verdun. Confronted later by a task of great difficulty when placed in command of a battalion, which suffered heavy casualties and became badly disorganized, he displayed marked ability and determination in reorganizing his command,

and molding it into a good fighting unit, able under his leadership to achieve valuable results."

Marshal Petain, Commander in Chief of the Armies of the East, cited Lieutenant REECE as an "officer of great bravery," who "from 23d of October to 28th, 1918, in the Bois d'Ormont north of Verdun led his company four times in the attack, reorganizing after each attack his scattered unit and repulsing the enemy counterattacks. Has given proof of the greatest devotion in going to search for the wounded of his company lying between the lines."

Lieutenant REECE's regiment was in action from October 10 until November 11, 1918. The history of the One Hundred and Second Infantry states, "Casualties for this period were extremely heavy, the regiment being wickedly shelled by terrific machine-gun fire and gas on all areas in zone of operations. The Third Battalion, which REECE commanded, occupied Cote 360, but was literally blown off it back to the original line. During 2 hours, 10,000 shells fell in the One Hundred and Second Infantry sector alone, most of them on Cote 360, where Companies L and M were located. The fighting strength of Third Battalion on October 30 was only 145 men. Even these were all affected from gas, laryngitis, and bronchitis, all nervous and worn from lack of sleep and the intense strain of being constantly shelled and machine-gunned. The men lived in the German dugouts and concrete shelters or pill boxes. Ground was one mass of shell holes partly filled with water. Casualties were many."

Although identified mainly with New England's famed Yankee Division, the Republican National Committee's new chairman was originally a member of the Fourth Ohio Infantry, and went overseas with the also renowned Rainbow Division, the Forty-second. His unit was Company A, One Hundred and Sixty-sixth Infantry, Eighty-third Brigade, which was commanded by Col. Benson W. Hough, later United States judge in Ohio. REECE enlisted in May 1917.

A brother, Lemiel, also served in World War I, while two brothers, Wilson and John, fought in the Spanish-American War, and still another, Raleigh, was engaged in the recent World War.

There hangs in Mr. REECE's congressional office a commission bearing the signature of Gov. Alfred E. Smith, of New York, and signifying his appointment on March 11, 1920, as first lieutenant, infantry, in the New York Guard, and aide de camp to Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan. At that time he had returned from overseas, taken up his duties at New York University as director of the school of business administration, 1919–20, prior to entering politics.

HIS EARLY LIFE

Republican National Chairman REECE was born and reared on a farm in the Great Smoky Mountain region of east Tennessee—the northeastern corner that is practically in Virginia. He was born at Butler, Tenn., on December 22, 1880, and was one of 13 children. His present home address is Johnson City, largest town in his district, population 30,000.

One of his ancestors, his great, great, great grandfather, Capt. Jacob Brown, founded Nolachuckey Settlement, the first settlement in that section of the Great Smoky Mountains. Captain Brown fought in the Battle of King's Mountain, with John Sevier, the first Governor of Tennessee. Afterwards Captain Brown was slain by the Indians. Just outside Johnson City is Sycamore Shoals, the rallying point of the mountaineer soldiers for the King's Mountain battle.

The farm boy was educated at Watauga Academy and Carson and Newman College in his native State, later attending New York University for graduate work in economics and finance, and the University of London in the winter of 1918–19 following the armistice.

While attending Carson and Newman College, Mr. REECE served as president of the debating society, and he recalls a debate with Maryville College in which the opposing side was represented by a young man now sitting on the United States Supreme Court, Justice Rutledge.

At Carson and Newman, the young debater also served as president of the student body, which supervised the student government; as class president, and president of the YMCA. He was valedictorian of his class both in college and high school. He excelled in two sports in college, football and basketball.

Upon graduation from Carson and Newman in 1914, Mr. REECE became principal of a high school for 1 year, and then went to New York University for his graduate work, later being retained as an instructor, until answering his country's call to military service as a private.

ENTERS POLITICS

Mr. REECE obtained a leave of absence from his position as director of the School of Business Administration in New York University in order to make his first political race for Congress from the traditionally Republican First District of Tennessee.

His opponent was a veteran Congressman, Hon. Sam R. Sells. It was a hard-fought race, but Mr. REECE won by a substantial margin, without benefit of the women's vote, which was to come in Tennessee later, largely due to his efforts.

His district is traditionally overwhelmingly Republican, having been strongly pro-Union during the War Between the States. It is probably one of the most typically traditional American areas in the country—the same area that produced Abraham Lincoln and from which Lincoln drew the inspiration that directed his course in public life.

Smoky Mountain Park is in Congressman REECE's district. Main crops in this mountain country are tobacco, small grains, and livestock. The district has been dry for many years.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Elected to Congress in 1920 at the age of 30, Mr. REECE was the "baby" of the Congress. At a Washington party he met Miss Louise Despard Goff. Both had attended the party reluctantly. About a year and a half later they were married in 1923. They have a daughter, Louise Despard Goff Reece, now 17 years old and a junior at Stephens College, at Columbia, Mo.

Miss Reece is concentrating in home economics and is interested in aviation. Now taking the preflight course, she wants to become a pilot. Mr. and Mrs. REECE plan to visit their daughter late in May.

Mrs. Reece comes from a politically prominent West Virginia family, and she herself likes politics. She always campaigns with her husband, attending functions of all kinds, and, if she has to do it, can make a good political speech in her husband's behalf. In fact, she is indispensable in a campaign because she drives the automobile, while the Congressman is left free to think out his strategy and talks. Today he never does the driving of the family car.

Mrs. Reece's father was Guy Despard Goff and her grandfather was Nathan Goff. Guy Goff was United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin (Mrs. Reece was born in Milwaukee); colonel in the Department of the Judge Advocate General in World War I; served on General Pershing's staff at Chaumont; Assistant to United States Attorney General Daugherty in the Harding administration; and United States Senator from West Virginia for one term. Nathan Goff, youngest brigadier general on the Union side in the War Between the States, was a Member of Congress in the early eighties, Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Hayes, United States Senator from West Virginia for a term, and presiding judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Richmond, Va.

It was from an illustrious ancestor, Maj. Gen. Brazilla Carroll McBride, who fought in the War of 1812, that BRAZILLA CARROLL REECE received his Christian name. "Brazilla" was no doubt derived from the Old Testament name "Barzella," meaning "man of iron"—a heritage which should prove an asset in the arduous tasks confronting the national chairman of the GOP.

A sister of General McBride, by the way, married Gen. Nathaniel Greene, of Revolutionary War fame.

LEGISLATIVE CAREER

Not until after his marriage did Congressman REECE become a lawyer and banker. He had studied law at New York University but did not take the Tennessee bar examination until after his election. He is today a member of the American, Tennessee, and Federal Bar Associations. In banking circles he is president of the Carter County Bank, First National Bank of Jonesboro, and the Sullivan County Bank, as well as board member of the Farmers Bank at Blountville.

In his 25 years in the Congress, from which he has announced his intention to resign to devote his full time to the work of the Republican National Committee chairmanship, Mr. REECE served 10 years on the Military Affairs Committee and 14 years on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. He is a member of the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning.

With Representative CHAPMAN, of Kentucky, he developed and sponsored the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, legislation which has proved to be extremely satisfactory.

Representative REECE initiated the resolution adopted creating the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee of the House.

He is the author of a resolution adopted by the Republican caucus in 1925, resulting in the adjusted compensation bill for World War veterans.

As ranking member of the Military Affairs Committee during the twenties, he took an active part in the establishment and development of the Army Air Force, which proved its great worth in the war recently concluded.

He was among those instrumental in drawing up many amendments in connection with the enactment of the Stock Exchange, Securities, and Utilities Acts.

He was ranking member of the subcommittee which drafted the Railroad Retirement Act and got it through the House.

He also was a member of the subcommittee that drafted the Federal Communications Commission Act.

He had an important part in the enactment of the Motor Transportation Act, as well as much other transportation legislation.

A Republican by conviction, Mr. REECE might be termed politically a middle-of-the-roader from the middle of the Nation.

When he was appointed to the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1938, Fortune Magazine said of him: "REECE comes from a northeastern corner of Tennessee. He is young, prosperous, and well connected, loaded with World War medals, and has several years of university teaching behind him. Impossible to tag either as liberal or conservative, he has a competent, freewheeling mind."

Recently the Parkersburg News referred to him as a clear thinker and a man of sound and penetrating judgment. He has what we call in West Virginia mountain sense.

His aptitude to get along with people and inspire their confidence in him through personal relationships is proven by the fact that he has had no opposition for Congress from either party in the past 14 years. This trait, as well as his organizational ability, counted heavily in his appeal to Republicans for their national chairman in the vital campaign ahead.

It may be said of Representative REECE that he has nearly always been endorsed in his Congressional races by the American Federation of Labor and railroad brotherhoods, while the Negroes have consistently supported him and looked upon him as a friend.

His voting record has been in line with the position of the party, and since he comes from a border State, it might well be pointed out that he has voted for the repeal of the poll-tax requirement for voting and for Federal anti-lynching legislation.

As a national committeeman for Tennessee, a post to which he was elected in 1939 succeeding the then Congressman J. Will Taylor, Mr. REECE has been long generally regarded as the head of his party in his State.

Very quiet, patient, and even-tempered in disposition, Chairman REECE seldom gets ruffled, and is rarely stirred to anger. He takes problems in stride, is diplomatic and has an engaging personality. He has steel gray hair and gray eyes. His height is 5 feet 9 inches; his weight 155 pounds.

He is a forceful speaker, and has a fund of stories expressing the philosophy of the mountaineers back home.

Chairman REECE is so wrapped up in his political life that he seldom has time for hobbies. He would like to have time for farming, or at least gardening. He plays some golf during the pleasant weather with a friendly foursome either at the Johnson City Country Club back home or at the Chevy Chase links here. He likes bridge, and also good books. He does not smoke, and is not inclined to take a drink. He and Mrs. Reece are dog lovers.

He is a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, American Economic Association, American Statistical Association, American Academy of Political Science, Delta Sigma Pi, Newcomen Society, and the following clubs—Chevy Chase, Metropolitan (New York and District of Columbia), Lotos (New York), and Johnson City Country.

(See following appendixes:)

HEADQUARTERS,
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE,
France, February 28, 1919.

General Order No. 17.

V. The division commander takes pleasure in announcing the award of the Distinguished Service Cross by the Commander in Chief to the following-named officer of this division, who has distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism in military operations against the enemy:

First Lt. B. CARROLL REECE, One Hundred and Second Infantry.

For extraordinary heroism in action in the Bois d' Ormont, France, October 23–28, 1918.

In leading his company through four successful actions Lieutenant REECE was twice thrown violently to the ground and rendered unconscious by bursting shells, but upon recovering consciousness he immediately reorganized his scattered command and consolidated his position. On several occasions under heavy enemy machine-gun fire he crawled far in advance of his front line and rescued wounded men, who had taken refuge in shell holes.

HARRY C. HALE,
Major General, Commanding.

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
DECORATIONS SECTION,
PERSONNEL DIVISION,
France, March 28, 1919.

From: The Adjutant General, AEF.
To: First Lt. B. CARROLL REECE, United States Army, One Hundred and Second Infantry (through the Adjutant General of the Army).
Subject: Distinguished Service Medal.

1. Under the provisions of cablegram No. 2830, received from the War Department, March 1, 1919, the Commander in Chief, in the name of the President, has awarded the Distinguished Service Medal to you for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as set forth below:

First Lt. B. CARROLL REECE, United States Army.

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services.

He showed energy, initiative, and military ability of a high order while serving as second lieutenant in the One Hundred and Second Infantry, in command of a company and later a battalion. He led his company brilliantly in the attack upon the St. Mihiel salient and during the operations of the Twenty-sixth Division north of Verdun. Confronted later by a task of great difficulty when placed in command of a battalion, which suffered heavy casualties and became badly disorganized, he displayed marked ability and determination in reorganizing his command and molding it into a good fighting unit, able under his leadership to achieve valuable results.

2. A suitable officer will be designated to make presentation to you, the date and place of which you will be advised at a later date.

By command of General Pershing:

F. L. WHITLEY,
Adjutant General.

[Extracts from the History of the One Hundred and Second Infantry, furnished by the Adjutant General's Office]

The regiment rested in quarters October 10–14, 1918, and was again ordered to the front in the Verdun sector, and was in action until November 11, 1918. Casualties for this period were extremely heavy, the regiment being wickedly shelled by terrific machine-gun fire and gas, on all areas in zone of operations. The Third Battalion occupied Cote 360 but was literally blown off it back to the original line. During 2 hours 10,000 shells fell in the One Hundred and Second Infantry sector alone, most of them on Cote 360, where Companies L and M were located. The fighting strength of the Third Battalion on October 30 was only 145 men. Even these were all affected from gas, laryngitis, and bronchitis, all nervous and worn from lack of sleep and the intense strain of being constantly shelled and machine-gunned. The men lived in the German dugouts, and concrete shelters or pill boxes. Ground was one mass of shell holes partly filled with water. Casualties were many.

Extension of Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include as part of these remarks an editorial from a recent issue of the Traer Star-Clipper:

BEFORE EXTENDING THE DRAFT, PEACETIME ARMY ABUSES NEED TO BE RECTIFIED

Tremendous pressure is being put upon Congress to extend the Selective Service Act beyond May 15. The Army high command is applying most of the heat, and has the support of President Truman, and high-ranking officers of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and possibly other servicemen's organizations.

This editor is a charter member of the Traer post of the American Legion. I have served in several offices of the post, and my record of attendance at meetings over 26 years far exceeds the number I have missed. I have found much more in the Legion to praise than to criticize. But one thing I have never liked in the Legion is the habit of top-flight officers to decide most of the matters of policy of the organization without so much as consulting the membership. These self-appointed policymakers for years have been telling Congress and the Nation that the Legion favors compulsory military training. As far as I know, the membership has never been polled on this issue. Certainly this writer was never asked by any Legion official how he thinks. I know many Legionnaires who are against this proposition. But the Legion is on record in Washington and before the public as a near-solid front in favor.

One of the best speeches I have ever heard in opposition to compulsory military training was a radio address a few months ago by a Waterloo Legionnaire who holds no office in the Legion, but who served in both World Wars and whose son was killed in action in the late war.

Now the Nation is being told that the Legion favors extension of the draft law beyond May 15. Perhaps the majority of the members do; I doubt if anyone really knows. Our leaders have always taken far too much for granted, and in my opinion have often exceeded their authority. This is a fault of many other pressure groups.

I think the majority of World War I veterans have always favored reasonable military and naval preparedness. This is a subject often discussed in local post meetings throughout the country. Not many of us disagree with the President or the Army high command about maintaining military strength at a time when another war is being forecast from 3 to 20 years hence. We do not argue that power for our protection and to enforce peace is unimportant. But peacetime draft for military service is another matter. It is one of the repulsive things our people hoped could be kept out of America. Servicemen of two World Wars have been told they were fighting to eliminate such devices of dictators and aggressors as compulsory military service. They were told by their sacrifices America would be saved from militarism.

The present pressure by leaders of the American Legion and other servicemen's organizations for extension of peacetime draft hardly makes sense when you consider the terrific barrage of criticism by GI's which has been going on for months in protest against the military system under which they so recently fought. Hundreds of thousands of men who served in the late war are boiling mad over the unfairness and favoritism of the military caste system.

The idea of a peacetime conscripted Army of 4,000,000 men for America after finishing a war which was to have brought peace to the world is a great shock to many people. The prospect is more odious because the Army is obviously ill-fitted for the responsibility. A lot of things need to be changed before we start a hurried rebuilding of a large, new, peacetime Army. An Army of 4,000,000, made

up of volunteers or draftees or both, will certainly not operate efficiently unless built on a solid foundation.

The widespread criticism by the GI's of the Army caste system has caused Secretary Patterson, of the War Department, to set up a committee with the avowed object of bringing about some reforms. We have seen no mention of any GI's or civilians on the committee. Will the generals and admirals find all the flaws in the system which they have long been responsible for?

Another change highly essential before the Draft Act is extended is a clean-up of immoral conditions in the armed services. Youths of 18 hustled into the service before or soon after they graduated from high school need moral controls which cannot be furnished by the armed services nearly as well as by the home and by the churches, schools, and other constructive forces in their home communities. The least that parents of youth should expect on the part of the Army and Navy is that something be done to rectify the moral laxity which is being widely criticized by their chaplains and others who are in a position to know what they are talking about.

In peacetime our Army and Navy have always been noted more for inefficiency than anything else. They are filled with "deadwood"; everyone knows it. The example to youth is often not good. There is an old saying: "There are two ways to do anything. One is the right way; the other is the way the Army does it." If boys of 18 are to have their higher education interrupted by 18 months of "higher education" in the armed services, let the standards of the Army and Navy be first raised substantially.

If I were a Member of Congress and had to decide whether peacetime draft shall be extended beyond May 15, 1946, I would insist that the armed services first recognize their responsibility for the moral and intellectual as well as military training of our youth. Until they are better prepared to carry out that great responsibility, I would oppose peacetime conscription.

There is a serious doubt by many informed people whether we really need peacetime conscription. The number of volunteer enlistments in the Army since the surrender of Japan has exceeded expectations. The Army and Navy ought to be made so attractive and worth while that they can stand on their own merits and attract a sufficient number of young men who want to make a career in armed service, thus rendering conscription in peacetime wholly unnecessary. The fact that no other country in the world today—with the possible exception of Russia—has peacetime draft makes us wonder how badly we need it in this country. Unless the situation is more serious than we think it is, the draft should end on May 15.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a dear friend of mine, an overseas soldier, which is rather thought provoking and indicates that the people back home are thinking things through:

MARCH 26, 1946.

Hon. J. W. TRIMBLE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: Thank you for your letter of March 11, 1946, and the Congressional Directory which came along in a later mail. You were speaking for both of us when you wrote, "Boy, I'm homesick."

There are two things I have sought never to do: write to a newspaper or attempt to influence legislation. I can say the same when I finish writing this, because I write to you in the spirit of sharing my inmost thoughts and not with any purpose of influencing your vote. I have refrained from that because I realize how impossible it is in Congress, amid all the competing and conflicting interests, to do always that which ought to be done. Instead, most of the time you have to be satisfied with what can be done.

You are a mature man of independent thought and sound judgment. I am sure you are capable of reaching great heights in serving our people. I feel that with you in Congress our interests are in safe hands. Yet I should be doing you a disservice if I failed to point out anything that I may have observed that would give you a more broad basis of information when you reach a decision upon the issues that are sure to come.

One of the most alarming things that has occurred to me in adult life was all the talk I heard when I returned from Europe about our going to war with Russia. I was not so much afraid of our really going to war, because anyone with enough sense to know a chicken hawk from a hand saw knows that there is no present-day issue worth going to war about. But I am afraid of the insidious propaganda floating over the country against Russia. One hears the same thing here that is heard all over Europe, especially in Germany, except what emphasis it gains or loses in translation. It is definitely the skeleton of the Nazi eagle with the flesh and feathers added by our America First boys. I am surprised that our national intelligence has not been sufficient yet to see the source of this evil and stop it. The danger is that Russia, a young and struggling nation with a brilliant war record behind her, is self-conscious like a growing and awkward boy. The Russians are a realistic people, feeling the surge of power, and like all parvenu, are touchy about what people say about them. We will succeed, if we keep on at the present rate, finally in convincing them that we do not intend to carry on with them on any basis than one of force. We are not in a position, whether we like it or not, to start dealing in international affairs on a basis of force.

I hold no brief for the Russian political or social philosophy. I think any American who advocates forsaking our system for theirs has the intellectual level of a moron. I am equally sure that the average Russian has no desire to imitate us. The theories of Russian socialism and German fascism are as divergent as the poles. Somewhere between cowardice and rashness lies the golden mean in human conduct. Somewhere between the extremes of anarchy which extols individual freedom and abhors order, and fascism which abhors the individual and extols order, is found the political and economic aim of every community in the world. We hear Stalin and Hitler compared, and those with a prejudice or an ax to grind say there is no choice between the two. We hear Russian socialism and German fascism compared, and the unwise say there is nothing to choose between. These people either know nothing of the personal philosophy of Stalin or Hitler or the theory of the two systems of government, or they dislike the American way.

The Russian Government is based on revolutionary socialism. Every democracy of the world has something of the same ideals. The difference is in the method of attaining the ideal professed by all—the betterment of mankind. In Russia, as it is often found in America and England, the practices are not sanctioned by the ideals. In Germany the practices and ideals were one, nothing but order with the hopeless sinking of all human rights. Under fascism all authority flows from above, and all obedience arises from below. There is no human hope under such a system. In Russia, as in America and England, the theory, if not always the practice, is for the betterment of all. There we have the principle always well above the practice. We can never reach a settlement in human, religious, or governmental affairs so long as we compare our own ideals with the practices of the other.

I thought it was a bad speech that Mr. Churchill made at Fulton. America is bound to Britain by common ties of blood and custom that are far stronger than any formal treaty. We have always taken our place by her side in conflict because she was always right. We became her ally in war because her interests were our interests. We could never afford the luxury of joint citizenship any more than we could tolerate common enterprise. We have too many competing and ofttimes conflicting commercial interests to risk authorizing them to bind us in dealing with other nations.

I listened with a great deal of interest to his second speech. I think there was a time when he was without peer as a statesman. His last speech sounded good, but upon careful analysis it was nothing but a list of platitudes. Mr. Churchill is great only when he is in a world waging war. We are not in that kind of world now. We are in a world seeking peace. I thought perhaps as he said that there was little that could be called democratic in an election where only members of one party are on the ticket. After a while it occurred to me that under that system the people always get that feeling of exaltation as one has when his candidate wins, and never have that awful fear that the world is going to hell that we have when our candidate loses. So maybe after all the Russian voter too has his compensations. I feel sure that both his speeches did nothing toward settling world affairs. On the contrary, they probably did a great deal to engender in the hearts of Russian leaders a lasting distrust of America and Britain.

I have always been for the British. It is from them that we learned many of the arts of government. They probably shed more of their own blood than any other race in human history to make government the servant and not the master of man. We took from them our fundamental principles of justice and the reign of law. Ancient theories of government developed there have a sacredness and authority to liberty-loving men all over the world. We are in their debt for these things and more. Our blood, our religion, and our ideals are as one. Most Americans feel a pride in the traditional friendship and understanding that exists between us. Let us never forget that there is a great difference in being allies in war and in being a member of an international cartel in peace. In effect that is about all both speeches proposed.

Even though we have taken our place beside Britain in war when our common needs were as one, if the time comes when they should choose a path of conduct inimical to ours, you would see America remain at peace. The old story about pulling Britain's chestnuts out of the fire has grown tiresome.

There never has been any basis of truth behind it. We fought beside them for a common need. Let any man attempt to lead us into an alliance with her where the aims are not parallel to ours, and we should be on the alert.

It is time that we forget our selfish interest as nations long enough to unite in such way that we can progress in a peaceful world. Let us not forget that the three great powers went forward in mutual confidence as one to win the war against evil. We should now strive with that same degree of confidence we enjoyed in the war to win the peace. There exists the shadow of a plan to accomplish that. The form has been dimly sketched in the UNO. It remains for America, England, and Russia to supply the flesh and features, the life blood and strength necessary to give anything but rhetoric to the program.

The great majority of Americans are inarticulate on this. These people that constitute the bone and sinew of our country are saying nothing. They believe there is no cause for war, and that in spite of all the talk and propaganda, there will be no war. We remember that these same people were silent before Pearl Harbor; but everyone believed that there was just cause for war. Every thinking adult knows that there can be no war unless there exists a will for war. Social movements start from some unknown source and war is the result. Historians have never been able to say with any degree of accuracy what causes war. It seems to be a series of little unimportant things that in themselves give spirit to the mass movements of mankind that lead to war. We prefer to think that this statesman kept us out of war, or that that general won great battles. Those ideas are only a sop to our vanity. The feelings in the hearts of a people decide whether there will be a war, never the leaders. The numbers, morale, and equipment decide battles, never the generals. The statesmen or generals follow and attempt to give direction to social movements and battles. It is a great statesman or general indeed that can give more than the slightest direction to these movements or to soldiers in battle. America is tired of war now—dog tired. The whole world is tired, and all movement is away from war. I think it is time for the world leaders to declare a moratorium on war talk. What we need is time to think. Time settles most of our differences anyway, and there is nothing on earth but that which will give America and the world the rest they need to digest the victory, consolidate the advantages, or equitably distribute the responsibilities that have come to us as a result of war.

Let those who are crying for war with Russia go to Germany. They call America the greatest military power on earth. That is a truth only when America has cause for war. We have no cause for war, and it is a sophism when used to make other nations hate or fear us. Let anyone dare lead us into a war without cause and the roads to Washington will be clogged with patriots to shed his traitorous blood. Those who want a war with Russia are men who didn't see enough of this last one. They are men who are letting their prejudice guide them. America didn't win this war. England didn't win this war. Russia didn't win this war. We all won it working together. One of the priorities on Hitler's program was to divide and conquer. It seems to me that Hitler can't be here, so some of our America First boys have taken up the hue and cry against Russia in his stead. If they will but go to Germany, they will find the people who think the way they do, but that is not the American way.

The League of Nations, one of the greatest propositions for justice among nations ever conceived by the mind of man, failed because our Nation would not heed the voice of Woodrow Wilson, who pleaded in vain that the world might take steps fairly designed to promote peace instead of war. We shall do the same thing again if we continue treating Russia the way we are presently. I fail to see how we can reasonably expect her to become an integral part of the UNO so long as we are threatening her with the use of force. If she fails to take part in the UNO we have lost the peace that day, and, from then forward, the powers will begin to seek sides again to prepare for another war.

We have won a great war by fighting side by side. Let us stay together in peace and move forward under one God and in confidence engage in making a better world. We condemn the Russian leaders and their philosophy of government without knowing any more about it than Louis XVI knew about the real causes behind the French Revolution. People like you and me, who descended from forebears who made America, ought to make their voices heard against this flood of vicious propaganda designed but for one thing, to cause us to go to war with Russia. Someone should speak out for the Anglo-Saxon majority in America which has always been silent. No one ever heard of a lobby in Congress for the majority. It looks like with all these pressure groups seeking selfish interests that we may have to set up a lobby for the majority if representative government is to survive. Some of us may have to take up the cause of America; the cause of every man, woman, child, and dog, and not the cause of any particular group or set of groups. I know of no man better fitted by birth or training to help do that than you.

I shall be happy if this provides you with an idea or even a single sentence that may be useful. In any event it will not be written in vain, since this has been pent up in my heart for a long time. I wanted to write somebody about it, and you are among the few who will understand what I am trying to say. It has this to commend it; that what I have said represents the things I honestly feel. I am sure if our Representatives in Congress knew always what the people felt, that they would have less difficulty in determining what should be done.

Your friend.

Immediate Statehood for Hawaii Wins Support of Republican National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include the text of a resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the Republican National Committee at its meeting at the Statler Hotel, in Washington, on April 1.

The resolution, supporting immediate statehood for Hawaii, is as follows:

Whereas the Republican Party in its national platform has supported policies looking toward ultimate statehood for Hawaii;

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty, patriotism, and, by an overwhelming vote, their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood;

Whereas the capacity of the people of this Territory to assume the responsibilities of State government has been fully demonstrated; and

Whereas the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State would be in fulfillment of a promise long made, is in keeping with a policy of self-determination and would strengthen the position of this country in the Pacific: Be it

Resolved, That the Republican National Committee endorse the effort of the people of Hawaii to obtain immediate statehood.

Extending the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, the question of extending the selective service law will soon be before us. I believe the approach made by the writer of the editorial taken from the April 6 issue of the New York Herald Tribune should be considered. The draft law can be continued. Should the volunteer enlistments be adequate, then there would be no need for draft calls. Eligible men would be registered. Should the military authorities later find the voluntary recruitment to be inadequate, the list of available men is ready. The editorial follows:

EXTEND THE DRAFT

As Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal emphasized Wednesday in the Senate draft extension hearing, the world has not yet completed the transition from war to peace. Maintenance of adequate military force is essential to meet American responsibilities during the tension of this transition period. In the view of the Secretaries of the Army and Navy, who ought to know, volunteer enlistments will not be enough to meet the need. The decision should be clear. Congress cannot work both sides of the street. It must either continue the draft or weaken occupation forces with serious effect on our foreign policy. The armed forces cannot meet demands to bring men with long service home and at the same time meet minimum occupation requirements without being assured of an additional supply of manpower. The only solution, if the United States is to fulfill its commitments and keep its necessary strength, is to prolong the Selective Service Act for a year beyond its expiration date of May 15.

In continuing the draft, Congress need not disregard the vigorous efforts now being made to obtain volunteers. If, as Senator Thomas seems to feel likely, the volunteer rate turns out to be adequate, well and good. In that case draft calls can always be lowered or eliminated in keeping with the immediate situation. But it would be foolhardy to rely wholly on the prospects of a recruiting campaign which has not filled the bill so far. The Army and Navy must deal with realities. They must know in advance what they can count on. They must have an uninterrupted flow of trained replacements for the men they want to send home.

In his testimony of January 15, General Eisenhower reminded Congress that it is the policy maker. It has assigned the Army the job of governing and policing occupied terri-

tories, principally Germany and Japan, and of disposing of surplus property abroad. The size of the Army required for this job has no connection with the size of the postwar Military Establishment to be determined by Congress. The absolute minimum set for carrying out the necessary immediate task is 1,550,000 men on July 1 of this year and 1,070,000 in July 1947. A liberal discharge policy already has pared Army strength in some areas to the point of reducing efficiency. Prompt action is imperative.

From no responsible source have seen it advocated that our occupation commitments be reduced, though the manner of the occupation, as we have said before, was based on a wrong military concept. But the commitment is there. And, if it had to be withdrawn, there would be an immediate drop in American prestige which would be extremely dangerous and would imperil the victory. It would in effect serve notice on the Germans and Japanese that we were going to repeat our actions after the last war, and that we didn't care what happened. The only alternative to this is to accept the facts. Our entire national policy is at stake. The draft extension should be passed without further delay.

Armed Industrial Guards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a companion bill to S. 1803, which was introduced in the upper House on February 5 of this year by Senators LA FOLLETTE and THOMAS. It makes the use of labor spies, strikebreakers, oppressive armed guards, and industrial munitions illegal in industries engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce. The need for such a measure was demonstrated by the very exhaustive hearings held over a period of some years by the La Follette Committee on Civil Liberties. This need has furthermore been emphasized by the recent killings in Illinois of two union pickets by armed guards in the employ of the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad. I want to call the attention of the House to this regrettable case, since it indicates the need for effective action.

On February 6 of this year, two union pickets, namely Irwin K. Paschon of Peoria, Ill., and Arthur W. Browne, of Spring Bay, were killed and three other union men were wounded at Gridley, Ill., by shots fired by armed guards in the employ of the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad.

The Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad which is under the absolute control of its president, George P. McNear, Jr., has a long and flagrant record of violating the rights of the public. For a long period of time it was a nonunion road but then two of the railway brotherhoods won elections under the Railway Labor Act and sought to bargain collectively with Mr. McNear. He refused to put into effect the standard working conditions which existed on virtually every railroad in the country. Both lockouts and strikes occurred and then, although we were at war, Mr. McNear refused to have the points at issue submitted to arbitration. The President, in order to ensure service, was therefore compelled to take over the property in March of 1942. The road was operated efficiently, agreements were made with the unions on wages and working conditions, and big profits were made by it during the war. It was again turned back to Mr. McNear last fall but unfortunately no terms were worked out prior to this return which were to govern working conditions and provide uninterrupted service. Mr. McNear would not reach an agreement with the unions and a strike followed on October 1, 1945. There has been no service on the railroad since that time.

Beginning in January of this year there were clear indications that Mr. McNear was preparing to break the strike by force. Thus on January 29, 1946, a company guard by the name of R. E. Payne shot a picket at East Peoria and at the time apparently carried in his automobile several shotguns. See Peoria Journal-Transcript for March 19, 1946, page 19. Shortly after this the Illinois State police intercepted an automobile full of weapons destined for the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad. Upon orders which apparently came from some source in the State government at Springfield, these weapons were, however, turned over to the railroad. Then, on February 6, the first train on the railroad since the preceding October pulled out of the East Peoria yards and started eastward. In addition to the engine it had two steel cabooses, one car of coal, and two empty steel gondolas. One of the gondolas was pushed ahead of the locomotive. This car was still further reinforced with armor and had four portholes for firing cut through its sides. At Eureka, which is about 20 miles east of Peoria, the guards in the train shot at the picket shanty beside the road and also into the home of Thomas Tracy, the chairman of the maintenance-of-way workers. Then the armored train went on to Gridley, which is 20 miles farther east. Here an effort was made to hitch on a car of grain, but the elevator owner refused to allow it to be moved. A group of pickets had assembled at a grade crossing and, as four of the guards got out of the train, armed with rifles and shotguns, the pickets jeered at the guards and called them names. A neutral witness at the coroner's inquest stated that the guards then opened fire without being fired upon—Peoria Journal-Transcript, March 9, 1946, page 3.

Five men were hit by these shots and two of them were killed. The pathologist who performed autopsies on the bodies of Irwin Paschon and Arthur Browne testified that they had been shot through the back—ibid., page 1. Coroner McClellan stated that the State police had seized eight shotguns, two rifles, and four revolvers from the train—Peoria Journal Transcript, February 7, 1946, page 1. No weapons were found on or near the pickets.

The four guards were arrested and have been indicted by the McLean County grand jury and will be tried later this month. It is hoped that full justice will be done. There should be no whitewashing of the higher-ups. On the contrary, there should be a full probing of the circumstances under which the guards were hired, the instructions given them, and where and how the weapons were obtained. Those who put the weapons into the hands of the guards certainly bear as heavy a responsibility for what happened as the men who fired the shots. These men in the background should not be whitewashed. Certainly Mr. McNear has shown no contrition for the deaths of these innocent men but has persisted in his arrogant attitude of claiming that not the murderers but the murdered were guilty. He should be summoned as a witness and given a searching examination.

Legal points are being raised that the Federal Government cannot act in this matter because the armored train itself moved wholly within the State of Illinois. I believe that there is ground for Federal action however on two counts:

First. A group of shippers are already bringing suit in Federal courts to have the courts place a receiver in charge of the road instead of Mr. McNear so that service may be resumed. The Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Defense Transportation should join this suit as friends of the court and seek the appointment of such a receiver. There are good grounds for such action since, while the Toledo, Peoria & Western is a small road, it does carry a large amount of interstate freight from Ohio and Indiana to Peoria, much of which is shipped to points west of the Mississippi.

As long as Mr. McNear continues in his present attitude, there is no hope that service can be resumed and the situation has become progressively embittered because of the killings. The appointment of a receiver seems to be the only effective way of starting traffic again. I strongly urge that the Interstate Commerce Commission act at once in this matter.

Second. These tragic killings have shown anew the need for a law such as that which Senators LA FOLLETTE and THOMAS have proposed and which I am now introducing. The whole country was shocked some years ago by the disclosures of how many employers were hiring industrial spies, professional strikebreakers, and were laying in supplies of munitions. But Senator LA FOLLETTE's bill to remedy these practices was never passed by Congress, and, under the pressure of war, interest in it lagged. We see now that had it been on the books we might have been able, in the Toledo, Peoria & Western case, to fasten responsibility where it belonged, for shipment of rifles, shotguns, and revolvers across State lines would then have been punishable as an unfair practice. All patriotic Americans had hoped that industry had

given up the practices which many had formerly used. Some had concluded that in view of this hoped-for change of heart no new legislation was necessary. I, too, believe that industry as a whole has improved, but is it not now clear that we still need legislation to restrain the more brutal and irresponsible elements? I hope that these tragic deaths may lead us to take such action as is proposed by this bill in order to prevent such killings from ever happening again.

Nothing we can do can bring those who are dead back to their families. But it is our duty to see that the guilty are brought to account so that no one else may be tempted into such action in the future. We should also see to it that a sounder system of industrial relations is brought into being on the Toledo, Peoria & Western so that those men may not wholly have died in vain. Finally, we need legislative action to prevent even worse disorders in the future. I ask, therefore, a serious and speedy consideration of this bill.

Socialist England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial by Frank C. Waldrop which appeared in the Times-Herald on April 7, 1946. The editorial is entitled "Socialist England." The article is comprehensive, and I wish that every citizen of this Nation could read this excellent, thought-provoking editorial which throws light on how the proposed $4,400,000,000 British loan by this Nation will aid in destroying free enterprise.

SOCIALIST ENGLAND

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Keep your eye on the news from England for the next few days. The extreme radicals of the Labor (Socialist) Party have started a revolt against Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin's policies which have trampled J. Stalin's toes. Bevin is being accused, in effect, of being an Englishman instead of a Red.

The upheaval is also directed against domestic policies. The rank and file of the Socialists think the party leaders are going too slow at taking property away from the English people and giving it to the English Government.

The party leadership, therefore, is out to appease the membership. Emanuel Shinwell, Minister for Fuel and Power, told a regional party meeting yesterday that the government will have completed taking over the British coal-mining industry by July. And he added:

"There is much more to come. And by the end of the present parliament we will have completed a bloodless revolution in our national affairs."

It is about time that we face the facts over here concerning what is going on over there.

It is a national vice of Americans to be sentimental about England, and for very powerful emotional causes; so many American ancestors came from the British Isles. Our language began from there. Our literature likewise.

We like the happy picture of England as a land of beautiful countryside, quaint villages and shops, of steady, sturdy people.

The only trouble with that happy picture is that it is a phony. Our ancestors came to America not because they loved England so. They came to get away from it.

Our language began from England, but it has gone a long way past it. And our literature—well, that's a story in itself. But we'll just say at the moment that most Americans never read American literature at all. They read the works of lick-spittle apes who want to be mistaken for Englishmen.

The England we dream about is dead. The England that is today has no old squire stalking around the village as you see him in the movies.

You may not realize it yet, but Churchill is not the prime minister of England. Clement Attlee is.

Churchill is the greatest living press agent for an England that is gone.

Attlee is the front man for something that means to do death to all that Churchill stands for—and is doing it.

The Socialists in power have started to take property away from Englishmen. First it was the Bank of England. Next the coal mines. Next the railroads. They have given notice of further details:

All forms of transport, truck lines, bus lines, trolley lines. The steel industry.

Coming up:

The textile industry, the automobile industry. And after that the little projects of light industry.

Inside of 10 years, the Socialists will begin to take over titles to land, so the English farmer will be collectivized. Watch and see.

England is very nearly a ruined country and the Socialists are hastening the end.

Here is the sort of thing that is going on:

While in England last December this writer talked with Sir Miles Thomas, managing director of England's biggest automobile company.

Thomas was a licked man. He had just been in a meeting with Sir Stafford Cripps, the Henry Wallace of England.

Thomas wanted the Government's O. K. to make automobiles for the English people, the little, low-power tin Lizzies that come within English road and pocketbook range.

No, sir. He got orders from Cripps to make big, heavyweight American type cars to sell outside England.

For England, the Socialists have a plan based on austerity, meaning poverty, so they can dump quality goods on the export market in heavy competition with the United States of America.

Why? So their Government will become economically powerful in the world at the expense of the English home-living standard.

And we are asked to aid in this with a direct cash loan, amounting to $4,400,000,000. If we do it, we're nuts and not even good friends of the English people.

OPA Blamed for Bad Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, I wish to submit an article from a Louisiana paper under date of April 2, 1946, entitled "Dairyman Blames OPA for Output of 'Filthy Milk'," by Mr. Henry T. Owen, Louisiana dairyman, who recently appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives. The article is as follows:

DAIRYMAN BLAMES OPA FOR OUTPUT OF "FILTHY MILK"—PRICE POLICIES DO NOT PROVIDE FOR PRODUCER, SAYS OWEN

Henry T. Owen, Alexandria dairyman who entered the national limelight with his fight against the OPA, today blamed OPA price policies for the production of literally filthy milk in Louisiana.

Commenting on surveys which resulted in the removal of grade labels effective Monday, Owen declared: "OPA officials in Washington admitted to me that their method of calculating production costs does not provide for any return for the labor of the owner of the dairy or his family. Other factors which are not included are the value of home-raised feed, depreciation, and return on investment. Under this method of determining prices, there is no incentive to produce clean milk."

"Furthermore, the OPA insists on one price ceiling on all milk regardless of quality," Owen said, "with the result that many milk producers have eliminated practically all efforts to maintain sanitary conditions in their dairies. OPA is definitely responsible for this."

Owen declared that failure of the OPA to provide an incentive for the production of clean, safe milk presents a major obstacle to the commendable efforts of the State health department to raise quality standards of milk in Louisiana.

He predicted that "an adequate supply of safe milk will not be produced until the OPA permits an adequate differential on quality milk as compared with inferior grades."

Grade labels disappeared Monday from all milk sold in Louisiana. The labels will be restored after a 60-day period during which board of health officials will make a comprehensive survey of all milk producing and distributing plants in the State.

No More Loans to Defaulting Debtors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles F. Potter, of Pasadena, Calif.:

NO MORE MONEY SHOULD BE LOANED OR GIVEN TO OUR DEFAULTING DEBTORS

(By Charles F. Potter)

President Truman has asked Congress for prompt aproval of a proposed loan to Great Britain of $3,750,000,000 and an additional credit in the matter of settlement of lend-lease aid to the United Kingdom amounting to a lump sum of $650,000,000 more.

It is axiomatic in trade to say that a defaulting debtor loses his credit and it is well fol the American people to consider carefully the question of loaning or giving any more money to the British Commonwealth, and to see that Congress does not approve the loan now suggested by the President.

During the administrations of President Coolidge and President Hoover huge loans

were made to England and other European countries primarily for the purpose, as stated, "to stimulate the purchase of United States products." When Franklin Roosevelt became a candidate for the Presidency in 1932, he severely condemned the loans made to European countries during the administrations of Hoover and Coolidge. He stated in one of his campaign speeches:

"This is a disastrous policy pursued by the administration in Washington, none other, if you please, than the policy of lending to backward and crippled nations. My job will be to prevent the hard-earned dollars of American investors from being frittered away in foreign fields, with the encouragement of the Federal Government of the United States, and with profit only for certain international financiers whose greed exceeds their patriotism."

In 1934 Great Britain listed its debt to the United States as "Government Loan $4,368,000,000." This enormous sum Great Britain promised to pay in definite yearly installments, but in December 1935, the British Government formally notified Secretary Hull, that Great Britain refused to pay the December 15th installment, then due on its war debt to the United States amounting to $582,803,306. More than 10 years have passed since the repudiation by Great Britain of its debt to the United States and during that time no effort has been made to pay any of this indebtedness; not even interest. Certainly a defaulting debtor, who not only defaults in its payments, but actually repudiates the debt, is not entitled to further credit.

The huge loans made to Great Britain and other European countries during the Coolidge and Hoover administrations were said to have been made "to stimulate the purchase of United States products after World War I." Now President Truman tells us that the purported further loan of over $4,000,000,000 at this time "will set the course of American and British economic relations for many years to come; in so doing it will have a decisive influence on the international trade of the whole world."

Will it? From past experiences, and in the judgment of many good financiers and men familiar with foreign trade, this view of the President is a fallacy. For years in competition, the United States has successfully battled with Great Britain for commercial supremacy or equality in trade, and much wealth and progress have been built up from the results of this contest. We have nothing, in fact, to ask from Great Britain except that she pay her present debt before she tries to borrow more money. This is nothing but good business.

The United States now has a debt of its own so great that the mere mention of it causes the anxious American taxpayers to wonder when and how it is ever to be paid; a debt exceeding $270,000,000,000; more money than is owed by all the States, plus that which is owed by all the corporations and associations in business in the United States. The taxpayers have bravely and successfully met all of the demands of the administration which controls our Government, by paying enormous taxes during the period of the war, and now the American taxpayer wants to know when this excessive demand will cease. In a recent message to Congress, President Truman said that the indebtedness of our country would be substantially reduced during the present fiscal year, but a careful analysis of his figures and statements leads to the conclusion that if it appears that the debt will be less at the end of the year, it will be caused by taking the money out of one pocket of the Government and putting it into another.

The pressure upon Congress to approve the proposed new loan to Great Britain is very strong and backed by all of the power of a spendthrift administration which does not appear to know the value of $4,000,000,000, or what it means to the taxpayers, or to the prosperity of our country.

We have many demands upon our resources for the rehabilitation of our country and to bring it back to normalcy; but the administration seems utterly indifferent to, or grossly careless about, the possibility that the resources of our country, largely coming out of the pockets of the American taxpayers, will be insufficient to meet our urgent and compelling needs in the course of our reconversion to the happy days of normal and satisfactory business. Commander William M. Floyd, of the Veterans' Association, sums up one feature of the case very clearly when he says:

"Congress should not only carefully scrutinize all proposed loans and gifts to foreign Governments but should weigh them against present and future needs of our own fighting men;" and he might well have added "and the future needs, good will, and prosperity of American business and the American taxpayers."

The enormous expenditures which are now being made to maintain the administration's agencies in Washington and elsewhere are excessive and exorbitant and undoubtedly unnecessary. Instead of thinking about loaning billions of dollars to some European government, it seems wiser and better to adopt a policy of retrenchment and reform. The war is over; we should no longer extravagantly use our income to maintain political privileges or to pay political debts. We do not need over 3,000,000 men and women to take care of our business.

In justice to the people they represent and serve, the Congress of the United States should not approve a further loan or gift to Great Britain or to any other foreign government. We have many able men in Congress, men who are striving at all times to represent their constituents in a fair and just manner and who are not willing to follow the requests or demands of an administration, when such demand is not for the best interests of our Government and its people. The people of the United States must let our Congress and the President know that if a further loan is made to Great Britain at this time, while that country is a defaulting debtor and a debtor which has repudiated its debt also, such a course will be against the best interests of our country and our citizens.

Great Britain has great influence with many other European nations, and when that country repudiated its debt and refused to pay what it owed to the United States 10 years ago, France, Italy, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, and Poland, each quickly followed the lead of Great Britain and repudiated its debt. Finland was and is the only foreign debtor of this country that has consistently met its installments of interest and principal. All honor to Finland for its honesty and integrity.

And what about that enormous debt we owe as a Nation? Nearly $50,000,000,000 of "E" type Savings bonds were sold to thousands of our citizens who have used their hard-earned savings to help the administration in its time of need in carrying on the war. These bonds are payable practically on demand and each month will see many of them surrendered for redemption. Another $50,000,000,000 or more of outstanding obligations represented by bonds and notes will soon have to be paid, and from month to month and year on year following, bond holders and note holders will demand payment of outstanding obligations of the Government, the proceeds to be used by larger and small business enterprises in our land to establish trade and produce revenue, out of which must be paid heavy Federal taxes for years to come in order to liquidate our national debt. The men and women who labor, the men and women who provide the capital to employ labor and who themselves labor to earn the capital, and all who depend upon the increments of capital and labor for their living, must view with alarm, any proposed loan or gift by our Government to defaulting debtors who have repudiated their debts. "They call us Santa Claus when we give, they call us Shylock when we refuse."

We are now recovering from the effects of a disastrous war which has taken the lives of many of our loved ones and made cripples and wrecks of many more, and has created for us a debt such as no country has ever known before; we have used a large part of $40,000,000,000, coming from the hard earnings of the American people (as President Roosevelt put it) to aid, assist, and free many of our defaulting debtors from their enemies. This generous contribution is enough, and no part of it will ever be paid back to us. We have nobly done more than our duty as a Nation; we have borne a large part of the burdens of the world, and until our country has put its own house in order and has provided for its war veterans and their families, to whom we owe a debt which can never be fully paid; and until we can substantially reduce the yearly tax burdens upon our citizens, small and large alike, and until our business life as a Nation has returned to the normal life of the freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution, our Congress should answer all requests of these defaulting countries for money with an emphatic "No."

We Will Process the Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling the attention of my colleagues to the following statement recently issued by the California Processors & Growers, Inc. Because of the continued failure of the interested Government agencies to bring about a solution to the jurisdictional cannery workers dispute in California, I believe that the California processors and growers are to be congratulated for the courageous stand they have taken.

To the growers, the public, and the cannery workers:

WE WILL PROCESS THE CROPS

All canners represented by California Processors and Growers, Inc., have determined to take every step necessary to prevent the loss of California's fruit and vegetable crops. As one of those steps, they will resume their regular and customary labor relations with the American Federation of Labor.

On March 1, at the behest of the National Labor Relations Board, they suspended the contractual and bargaining relations with the A. F. of L. which had existed without interruption for 9 years.

This suspension has already resulted in substantial losses in the spinach crop and in the stoppage of cannery plant preparations, which each year are essential for canning the oncoming asparagus and fruits—apricots, peaches, pears, and fruit cocktail. Farmers fear to commit themselves to the planting of the great acreages of tomatoes for late summer and fall harvesting, which is necessary to supply the people with this valuable food.

A condition approaching chaos, involving farmers, workers, and consumers in its consequences, is mounting rapidly, day by day.

In that chaos the major fruit and vegetable crops of the State are likely to be lost. California cans one-third of the total canned fruits and vegetables of the Nation.

With proper consideration for a statement from any Government board, the canners have, up to now, heeded the opinions regarding what they could and could not do, expressed by NLRB at the time it voided the Board's October election in the canneries. This the canners did, despite advice from eminent lawyers in the East, in the Middle West, and on the Pacific coast that the opinions were erroneous and that the canners had no duty to follow them.

In the 30 troubled and critical days since March 1, the issues which the NLRB created, but did nothing to solve, have been tossed from Government bureau to Government bureau, and from one official to another, not excepting the President himself. Too hot with politics for others to handle, the issues now come back to the California canners. They accept them, because no one else will act to save the 1946 crops of this State, and the crops will not wait.

The C. P. & G. canners have never had any contract with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. They are convinced that at this time the A. F. of L. is the bargaining agent for a majority of the workers now in the C. P. & G. bargaining unit.

The NLRB determined that it was in order for it to hold an election between the A. F. of L. and the CIO in 1945 when an A. F. of L. contract was in effect. It should be equally in order in the future to hold such an election while an A. F. of L. contract is in effect.

The canners' 1946 agreement with the A. F. of L. will be the same type of contract which has been in force during recent years. In case the NLRB shall hereafter certify a different bargaining agent for the cannery workers, the contract will not continue beyond the date when such certification becomes final.

The canners are proceeding with a deep sense of public responsibility. Some public officials are unable, some are unwilling, all have failed, to untangle the snarl which Government created. The canners, to whom the farmers and the consumer public look for action, have no choice but to try.

CALIFORNIA PROCESSORS & GROWERS, INC.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a crisis is developing in the meat industry. The legitimate packers of meat are unable to get sufficient fat cattle to slaughter. The 7 leading livestock markets on Monday, April 1, had 47,000 cattle and calves and 43,800 hogs. The large packing companies bought a little more than 11,000 of the cattle and calves and 5,200 of the hogs. It is estimated that many of the fat cattle now are purchased by other than licensed legitimate packing houses who must operate under Government regulations if they are to receive the subsidy offered by the Government.

In Chicago some 20,000 CIO packing workers have been laid off. These men are all threatening to strike because the packing houses have laid a few of the men off because there is not sufficient meat available through the legitimate channels to keep the packing houses working but a small percentage of the time. The fact that this meat goes through the black market is rapidly ruining the business of legitimate meat-packing companies and robbing the public of millions of dollars daily. This is a serious situation and shows how the OPA and other Government agencies have bungled and confused the meat industry. Certainly, if OPA is to continue, there must be some regulations adjusted which will permit this meat to flow into legitimate channels in order to avoid the black-market routing. Statement follows:

OPA

Dr. Stokes, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about continued price control with you and Congressman LE LACY. It is my firm opinion that, since the war is over, we should stop all price control on everything except the very essential items of living.

The OPA, from their own testimony, attempts to control prices on more than 8,000,000 separate items. This involves billions of transactions every day. Just what connection teething rings, bird cages, artificial snow, manhole covers, and pictures have with the cost of living is indeed difficult to understand.

The OPA by its regulations has driven off the markets much of the standard merchandise which the public was accustomed to have before the war. Their regulations have permitted a cheap, inferior goods to appear at a bloated price.

Whenever an article becomes scarce, under price control, it seeks the black market. The OPA has had its best success in controlling prices on articles that are plentiful. Witness now what price control is doing to corn, wheat, meat, and butter. At least 80 percent of the corn and wheat being trucked to market today goes through the black market. Butter is about nonexistent except at black-market prices.

The workingman and those with a limited income are forced to pay a higher price for meat, if indeed it is available at all. A careful analysis has shown that four out of five meat markets in Washington and other cities are selling meat over the ceiling price. The black market is rapidly ruining the business of the large meat-packing companies and rob the public of millions of dollars daily. The OPA fathers this black market, which gets wilder every day.

The workingman is unable to buy good quality overalls, gloves, or white shirts. The housewife is unable to buy diapers and other essential items for the house.

Competition is still the best method of assuring the public of fair prices. No manufacturer can overcharge on an item in a free and open market. Not if he expects to continue in business.

Rigid price controls hobble and restrict business. They are a stumbling block to reconversion. It is impossible for our Government to guide the entire economy of the Nation without subjecting the citizens to a host of Government regulations. Our boys did not go through all the horrors of war and become wounded physically and mentally to make a regimented government secure in America. Rigid price controls foul the spark plugs of reconversion. The controls they are now fostering upon the American people tamper with profits, the very mainspring of our economy.

True, free competition is the hallmark of the free enterprise system and this cannot be attained under Government regulations which eliminate competition. Price controls have placed a harness of tyranny upon industry and is causing economic stagnation and atrophy of business.

Business has been forced to come to Washington and stand, hat in hand, before some bureaucrat begging for a price which will permit him to supply a hungry public with desired products. Many operators have closed their shops and gone fishing.

I question seriously if it is possible for any businessman to legitimately stay in business and observe faithfully all regulations issued by the OPA. There are just too many illegal, absurd, useless, and conflicting regulations which create great confusion to the extent that the average citizen does not know how to comply with the law. The OPA, with its red tape and regimentation, gets tangled up in its own feet. If OPA continues, uncontrolled, democracy will slip overboard on the icy decks of price freezing and work freezing. Regulations which permit no play at the joints are, in the end, unworkable.

Regardless of OPA, prices will go up. The OPA is not holding down prices. They have granted many increases. It is impossible to grant wage increases and not have them reflected in the price of the finished article.

There are bureaucrats, in Washington, who are under the delusion that the businessmen of this country are no longer capable or competent to run their own business. They feel they must chart their production, their buying, and their selling.

OPA controls, which may have been necessary in wartime, become shackles when their removal is neglected and delayed in peacetime. The OPA is like an anesthetic during an operation. It relieves the pain of inflation, but permanent price control, like the anesthetic, is dangerous.

It is interesting to note that every radical organization in the country, and this includes the Communist front organization now holding meetings at the Commerce Building wants price control continued because it means regimentation and state socialism.

Lou Maxim, one-time chief enforcement officer of the OPA, when he resigned from that agency said, "Our young lawyers have OPA so bound up in legalistic red tape that Houdini, himself, could not untangle it."

Government never tries to put itself out of business. It becomes more and more entrenched. The bureaucracy grows and feeds upon bureaucracy. It gives the bureaucrats an opportunity to blueprint and regiment everything. Regulations and controls put business and the citizen in a strait-jacket making him do a mental, physical, and ritualistic goose step with the tune being played in Washington.

The Twenty-Third Annual Vermont State Sunday at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the twenty-third annual Vermont State Sunday at Valley Forge. I have asked leave granted to extend my remarks to insert the address which, at the request of Gov. Mortimer R. Proctor, I delivered at Valley Forge:

Vermont Day, this Sunday, is a day for meditation and contemplation. It is a day on which to think about what independence means, what it costs to be free, to realize that

isolation never spells independence, and that license is not liberty. This is the day to remember that the integrity of constitutional government never meant so much to all of us—and that means you—as it does this minute. Vermonters know. Do not forget that nowhere today is there any real freedom save u..der a form of constitutional democracy. Vermont was an independent republic. This is the day to think on these things. Lest we forget!

It is not for merely doctrinal reasons or for the satisfaction found in successfully defending a position that we as Vermonters are concerned for the spread of democracy—not merely because democracy is the only scheme of organization yet wrought out that keeps the door of opportunity open and invites all men to their fullest development. We Vermonters are interested, because, disguise it as we may, and postpone the acknowledgment of the fact as long as we will, the human family will eventually have to admit that under no other system can the world be made an even reasonably safe place in which to live. We shed blood because we believed it to be true.

Vermont and Vermonters have always guarded jealously the right of independence of action in word and deed. Vermont was for 14 years an independent republic with its own government, prior to its admission to the Union in 1791. Incidentally, Vermont was willing to continue its existence independently of the Crown and the Congress. That may be thought about. Its people still are traditionally strong for independence; self-reliant and competent; possessing initiative, courage, endurance, and reliability, and believes in free enterprise.

With privileges go responsibilities and responsibilities are privileges. It is a tremendous responsibility that rests on the shoulders of the American people, and their representatives—this job of making the world safe for democracy. The fundamental dogma, if you like, is the unchanging and unchangeable resolve that every human being, every individual shall have his opportunity for his utmost development—his chance to become and to do the best he can. Democracy is not only a system of government it is a scheme of society.

Upon those of us who comprehend just the beginnings of all that democracy stands for and may mean rests the responsibility of bringing our neighbors to a realizing sense of the blessings that are theirs and an appreciation of the fact that there are commensurate responsibilities for each one to assume.

"Liberty," said President McKinley, "is responsibility, and responsibility is duty; and that duty is to preserve the exceptional liberty we enjoy within the law and for the law and by the law. God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

In such a government as ours, are to be found a free press, free speech, personal liberty, and all the priceless privileges we enjoy as distinguished from our brother and sisters, the hunted, helpless, and subjugated peoples who make up the cogs in the soulless machines of the Hitlerized states.

Those founding fathers of our Vermonters and others, undertook to establish a government in which the will of the people should be supreme. Every end they sought to attain or had in mind was motivated by a desire to found a democracy, free on the one hand, from the perils of autocracy and dictatorship, with which they were altogether too familiar; and on the other, protect themselves against anarchy and a disorderly government, thus to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity.

The story that the ages tell is that "No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from local self-government. So often tried it has as often and always failed. Probably Vermont with its local town meetings has as nearly a true democracy as exists anywhere today. No plan of centralization has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction, and decline.

If history teaches anything, or we may learn from lessons experience speaks, we must know and realize that of those who have overturned the liberties of republics the greatest number have began their career by paying an obsequious court to the people.

The danger is that millions of Americans do not realize the gravity of the situation in which democracy finds itself today. It is not vested with any inevitable immortality. It has died before in history. No price is too great to prevent its death in the United States.

Against all attempts to crucify it, Vermonters stand, as must others, an insurmountable barrier beyond which they shall not pass.

So we must today take stock of our freedoms enjoyed, preserve them now, and determine what kind of world we will live in hereafter. This is going to be a different world. We are henceforward a world power with all the responsibility that entails, which is tremendous.

Even our thinking in our own selfish interest henceforward must and will be internationalistic instead of nationalistic. We are entering into a new world order. No man can see the end from the beginning. It is one world, or none.

It is true, however, as is generally felt by those who think things through, that unless there is a changed state of mind there can be no more real basis for hope for success for a new world order than there was in fact for the Geneva effort to prevent war. We must be realistic. We should not fool ourselves. We Americans are still, and naturally so, an extremely nationalistic people.

A durable peace can only be created by internationally minded peoples. You and I must forbear our nationalism and be internationalists henceforward. You may shy at that word, with an involuntary sense of its being something evil, but that is only an example of how nationalistic-minded you are. It is not that in the new state of mind which we must all acquire we should love and serve our country less. The contrary is true. We must recognize the fact that the United States will have to be basically comparable with the position of an individual State in the United States.

Yesterday was Army Day, and President Truman made a speech at Chicago which should arouse the interest of every American who loves his country. We do not have to agree with all his pronouncements. Clear-thinking, real Americans can take little exception to his statement:

"The past is history. It is the future to which we must turn our thoughts and energies now. What of the world on the Army Days to come? What of the future of mankind in the atomic age which is upon us?

"Let us look clearly at today and tomorrow. The facts are plain, and I think our course is also plain.

"The United States today is a strong Nation; there is none stronger. This is not a boast. It is a fact which calls for solemn thought and due humility. It means that with such strength we have to assume leadership and accept responsibility. It would be a tragic breach of national duty and international faith if, consciously or carelessly, we permitted ourselves ever to be unprepared to fulfill that responsibility.

"We still have much to do. We are determined to remain strong.

"We still have all the duties of the Armies of Occupation. We still have to do our share in supervising former enemy governments, enforcing the peace terms, disarming and repatriating enemy troops, taking care of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons. We still have to service and supply all our troops overseas. We still have to protect and preserve American property all over the world. We still have to destroy the war material and the war-making industries of our enemies.

"But far and above all those things, we must remain strong because only so long as we remain strong can we insure the peace of the world. Peace has to be built on power for good. Justice and good will and good deeds are not enough. We cannot on one day proclaim our intention to prevent unjust aggression and oppression in the world, and on the next day call for immediate scrapping of our military might.

"We must remain strong, not because we plan or want to impose our views upon the world by force, or do battle with any nation. We must remain strong in order to retain our leadership, and with all our resources, exercise that leadership on behalf of a world of peace and harmony among all nations and all peoples. That is not only our moral duty; it is a firm obligation which we have undertaken as a member of the United Nations."

Sitting here as we do today at Valley Forge, full of historic reminders of what it costs to be free, we must rededicate ourselves to the cause for which those who fought and died here gave their all in order that we might have liberty and enjoy our freedom.

In a world of scorched earth of famished people, of starving countrysides, and hungry children, of cities reduced to rubble by air bombardment; of ravished cathedrals, museums of art destroyed, a world shattered and impoverished; the problems of postwar reconstruction are staggering, stupefying, and are thought compelling. It is for us and principally for those who follow us to undertake to formulate some workable plan for and to find a satisfactory solution of the problem that will provide, as William H. Chamberlain has well said: "The reconciliation of the right of man, in the mass, to security, with the right of man, the individual, to liberty." That is the burden of responsibility which rests on us. That is a problem to the solution of which will be required the dedication of the best brains of this country without respect to partisan politics or personal ambition.

So, and so only, shall we emancipate ourselves, measure up to our destiny; preserve our independence; save civilization.

"The high crusade whereon we have embarked calls forth the free
In Hosts, with spears and flaunting flags arrayed;
Not for one dragon's end, one victory,
One last great war, but to unending war
Without, within, 'till God's white torch supreme
Melts the last chain; and the last dungeon door
Swings slowly wide to the triumphant dream."

Work of Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MERCHANTS SUPPLY CO.,
Dubuque, Iowa, April 2, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Members of United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have on hand a mimeographed report from you and notice at the

bottom of this sheet a paragraph headed as follows: "Millions of shirts and shorts, trousers, and jackets available soon."

Being in the wholesale business and serving about 2,000 smaller retail dealers in this area, believe we may speak for them, and for ourselves, in stating that we sincerely appreciate the work of the Small Business Committee in trying to pry loose from Navy and Army storage much needed merchandise today.

As a perfect example of the continued delays that are being experienced, we might give you this specific experience of our own in the purchase of Navy short boots and five-buckle arctics:

On November 28 we sent an order for $11,000 worth of boots and arctics to the Chicago office of the War Surplus Corporation.

On December 11 they wrote to us for payment by certified check and we sent them the same day $11,000 to meet this obligation.

Upon checking with our bank we find that on December 22 the Treasurer of the United States presented our checks for payment and they were paid. Thirty days later we inquired of the Chicago office as to why we had not received the merchandise and they stated, "Your order is in process."

Two weeks ago we inquired of the Brooklyn Navy Depot, to whom we learned our order had been sent, and they advised us "That our order was in process."

We fully realize that certain precautions must be taken in handling orders but we cannot understand why Army and Navy goods declared surplus months ago must continue to lie in storage when wholesalers, retailers, and the public need these goods so badly.

Again we state that we sincerely appreciate the work of the Small Business Committee in attempting to correct this situation and if there is anything you can do for us we will certainly appreciate it and so will the hundreds of retail dealers that have bought these rubber boots and five-buckle arctics from us and we are awaiting delivery.

Yours very truly,

MERCHANTS SUPPLY CO.,
W. T. LANDSCHULZ,
Treasurer.

Shortage Amid Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial that is taken from the Washington Post of which Mr. Eugene Meyer, nationally known Republican, is publisher, for April 6, 1946. This editorial very graphically illustrates the pressing need for "holding the line" in our reconversion economy.

SHORTAGE AMIDST PLENTY

Shirtless men and stockingless women along with a multitude of other frustrated shoppers will be disposed to jeer at the production estimates contained in the Snyder report. In the midst of so many shortages, they simply refuse to believe that civilian production is at peak point. Yet Mr. Snyder's estimates are supported by the Federal Reserve Board's industrial production index and a lot of other confirmatory evidence. While the FRB index dropped 6 points in February, owing chiefly to the steel strike, it was nevertheless still 54 percent above the 1935–39 base level. Of course, there has been a sharp drop in total physical output since February 1945, when the index stood at 236, but that is explained by the drop in munitions output. Our present concern is with production for peacetime needs, and, unless figures lie, the record is impressive.

The explanation of the anomalous situation is not far to seek. In the first place, the productive output of the Nation consists of a vast quantity of goods, such as basic materials, machinery, etc., that have to be provided before consumer goods can be placed on the market. A high degree of activity in basic industries is, therefore, quite compatible with contemporary shortages of many sorts of needed consumer goods, especially during a transition period such as we are now undergoing. The situation is accordingly extremely spotty. We are short on such durable goods as radios, refrigerators, electric irons, and automobiles. But—believe it or not—woolen and rayon fabrics are being produced currently in greater quantities than ever before, and the production of cotton febrics is currently above 1939 levels.

That brings us to a second cause of specific shortages: the diversion of materials from production of certain types of goods greatly needed to other types of goods which manufacturers may find it more profitable to produce. For example, the extreme shortages of low-priced cotton work clothing and men's shirts have been aggravated by shifts to less essential production.

A third cause of shortages, seeming rather than real, results from the low state of retail inventories. As soon as goods come in they are grabbed by shoppers on the prowl, many of whom have become confirmed hoarders. Consequently, it is extremely difficult to reestablish a smooth flow of goods by building up stocks on hand so that customers will be persuaded to postpone buying, as they would in normal times, until in actual need of goods.

The fourth and probably the most important cause of shortages stems from public possession of huge amounts of cash. When the once ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed acquire money they become claimants for more food, more clothing, and better housing. The result is the creation of market shortages even when supplies of goods are abundant, judged by former standards of adequacy.

No matter how much we produce, the conviction that we are short on supplies of many kinds of goods is bound to persist so long as buying power remains excessive in relation to the volume of output. The immediate removal of all price controls would, of course, soon exhaust reserves of consumer buying power and put a curb on buying, but that could be brought about only by bidding up prices to dizzy heights. It would not lead to the production of more goods to satisfy buyer's demands. On the contrary, it would upset cost calculations and halt productive expansion.

American Watch Industry Has Been Traded Out of Existence by the Action of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to the President of the United States from the Republican Members of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress. This letter protests against the action of officials of the Department of State in condoning and approving the continued unlimited importation of Swiss watches and Swiss movements to an extent which precludes any real opportunity of continued employment for 8,000 American watch workers and the operation of the few remaining American watch companies.

The letter to the President follows:

APRIL 6, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Republican Members of Congress, representing the people of Massachusetts, we hereby respectfully protest the action of those officials of the Department of State who have deliberately broken the pledge you solemnly made to the Congress of the United States.

You stated, in a letter dramatically presented to the House of Representatives, on June 15, 1945, by Speaker RAYBURN:

"I have had drawn to my attention statements to the effect that this increased authority might be used in such a way as to endanger or trade out segments of American industry, American agriculture, or American labor. No such action was taken under President Roosevelt or Cordell Hull, and no such action will take place under my Presidency."

The American watch industry, recommended by the Ways and Means Committee and supported by vote of the Congress as one essential to our national defense, has been traded out of existence by the action of your Department of State officials. These officials have condoned and approved the continued unlimited importation of Swiss watches and watch movements to an extent which precludes any real opportunity of continued employment for 8,000 American watch workers, and the continued operation of the few remaining American watch companies. Bear in mind that it was this industry, and their patriotic watch and precision instrument-making workers who made it possible for America during the war to supply all of our allied forces with the timing instruments so essential to our success.

The products of the Swiss-American watch cartel have been and are flooding American retail outlets with watches and watch movements to a point where there is no opportunity for competition in the United States on the part of the products of our skilled American watch workers. We believe for our national defense it is unwise to destroy this industry.

During the war, while Switzerland was surrounded by the Nazis and the Fascist armies, the American importing associates of those who were authorized to pass these watches and watch movements through the Nazi and Fascist lines were able to, and did, import into the United States some 20,000,000 watches and watch movements. This, at a time when it was common knowledge that the same Swiss-German watch cartel was furnishing the Nazis with the timing instruments which were used to kill or maim more than a million American boys serving in our armed forces.

These imports represented more than 7 years full production of our American watch factories.

Last December Dean Acheson, as Acting Secretary of State, stated to the president of the American Watch Workers Union, that the Government recognized the need of imposing a limitation on the imports of Swiss watches and watch movements. Dean Acheson stated that the State Department had notified the Swiss Government that not more than 3,000,000 watches and watch movements would be permitted entry into the United

States for the 13-month period ending December 31, 1946.

What has happened since the Department of State notified the Swiss Government of the necessity for the limitation of imports of watches and watch movements?

Today, we understand that the Swiss Government has succeeded in getting the State Department to abandon altogether the American watch industry. We ask, why?

The New York Times reported yesterday that the State Department agreed that there was to be no limitation on the number of watches and watch movements to be imported into the United States from Switzerland.

Mr. President, we cannot believe you are aware of the seriousness of the threatened destruction of a great American industry by some influential members of your administration. We ask you to review the case in the light of your promise and help save the jobs of thousands of patriotic American workers.

Sincerely,

PEHR G. HOLMES, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, CHARLES L. GIFFORD, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, GEORGE J. BATES, CHARLES R. CLASON, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, JOHN W. HESELTON, ANGIER L. GOODWIN.

Rural Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by our colleague from Tennessee, Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, before the National Rural Health Conference in Chicago on March 30, 1946:

I am very happy to have the privilege of meeting with a group such as this, to whom the general problems of rural health are a first concern. My own interest in the health of our rural population has grown out of my personal observations over the years, and has been stimulated by my recent associations with these problems in the Congress.

More important, in my judgment, however, is the fact that rural health is one fundamental facet of the broader problem of rural life which I consider a very basic issue to the future of this Nation.

Despite all the breath-taking discoveries of science and the remarkable technological advances that characterize the present age, civilization today is no less dependent for its very existence upon the fruits of agriculture than it was one, two, or five generations ago.

It is no mere economic theory, but an obvious, established fact, that the fundamental strength and stability of a country is primarily a function of balance between its agricultural achievements, on one hand, and its industrial developments on the other.

While this principle, in itself, has long been universally accepted, the ways and means, methods, and political instruments through which such balance can be maintained are matters which have exercised the imagination and taxed the ingenuity of statesmen throughout the world for many years. In my view, they constitute one of the major challenges at this time to the leadership of our country.

How to make rural life in the United States sufficiently attractive and sufficiently stable to permit the production and utilization of essential farm and related products within a pattern of intelligent conservation of rural resources—both human and natural—is not merely a question for emotional appeal to the humanitarian. It is one of cold, calculating, hard-headed economic significance—yes, even political significance.

Since I have been in Congress, I have had the honor to serve as a member of the Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce of the House of Representatives, and for the past 2 years have been chairman of its Health Subcommittee, under whose jurisdiction falls a very substantial portion of all health legislation that comes before the Congress.

During this time my committee has had under consideration the widest variety of legislative proposals dealing with health, and we have heard testimony from an equally wide variety of distinguished witnesses, both officials of Government and private citizens. While, as is only natural, divergent views have been expressed on many details, such as ways and means of accomplishing desired ends, I have been impressed with the wide area in the health field on which there seems to me to be almost universal agreement.

For example, everyone is agreed that the health record of the United States is, on the whole and relatively speaking, good. There is agreement, also, however, that it is not as good as it should be, not as good as it is possible for it to be. Indeed, for certain areas in the country and for certain groups of our people, it is agreed that the record itself is definitely not good.

Everyone concurs, so far as I can tell, that within the past 25 or 30 years, there has been an almost complete reversal in the position of rural and urban areas in what one might call salubrity. Whereas a quarter of a century ago, the open country was considered the healthiest place to live, today one's chances for health, so far as one can define that term, seem to be much greater in the larger and more populous areas. The reason advanced for this reversal, though to some extent technical, are not altogether beyond the comprehension of a layman.

They seem to me to all come under the general category of organization. Organized efforts not only for the prevention of disease through such mass procedures as education, sanitation, water purification, and protection of milk and food, but also for the care of people who are ill have advanced much further in our more populous urban areas.

They also have concentrated within the same areas such a large proportion of the Nation's highest technical and professional skills that these disparities in health opportunity are not only understandable, but, under existing conditions, inevitable.

There seems to be general agreement—certainly I am impressed with the evidence—on the interrelationship between disease and poverty. And while there is agreement in the abstract as to the interdependence, there is wide disagreement on details as to how each can be successfully overcome.

There are those, for example, who believe that if we could overcome poverty, health for our people would automatically follow; there are others who believe that if we could attain health for all our people, poverty would automatically disappear.

Adherents to the first school of thought—particularly the extremists—take the position then that our whole approach to improving health must be economic; that all our efforts should be concentrated on measures directed specifically to such economic factors as housing, wages, taxes, trade, and commerce. Adherents to the other school see health promotion exclusively in terms of specific health, medical, and sanitary measures, leaving the economic factors to take care of themselves.

My own personal conviction is that both points of view are, within limits, essentially correct. But as a practical matter, I am convinced that neither health as such can be attained nor poverty abolished solely through one for another separate approach. And, to be realistic, we must move in both directions simultaneously, extending health services wherever possible, on the one hand, and improving social and economic conditions to the extent practicable on the other.

Ideally, of course, one would wish progress in all directions to be made evenly and orderly. Such an ideal, however, could be attained on a national scale only under the most exceptional circumstances of homogeneous population and national equality of economic opportunity.

It is the very opposite of these conditions, so characteristic of the United States, that greatly complicates the problems of the Congress in its attempt to prescribe the limits of our national-health policy.

One of the issues that is repeatedly before the Congress is whether the benefits of proposed health legislation, whatever it may be, will eventually be realized by the people who need them most. It is impossible to conceive of health legislation that would apply with equal benefit to all parts of the country. As a result we are faced with the question as to whether we should legislate down to the least advanced areas, or up to the most advanced.

It is my opinion that the only way to progress is through the latter approach. It is only in this way that government can meet its responsibility of assuring the whole population, as far as possible, the full benefits of good health care.

Every one of us here today recognizes the great progress which has resulted from organized public-health programs. Experts and laymen alike are aware that diseases amenable to community-wide controls cause only a small fraction of today's ill health. We know, too, that any real progress in the future must depend upon control of such diseases as heart disease, cancer, mental disease, dental disease.

And until medical research is able to tell us how to control these threats to life and health, we must place our reliance in early diagnosis and early treatment in personal services to the individual.

Even though science has yet to give us the cure for many maladies, the full application of what is known would do much to prevent or minimize the effects of illness. The real problem, then, is to devise the instruments of organization through which all the benefits of present medical knowledge can be applied to the needs of all the people.

President Truman recognized this fact in his health message to Congress last November when he proposed that the total resources of the Nation be utilized to equalize the opportunities of its citizens to obain needed health services.

I believe the President's message expresss a national health policy that is highly desirable—a policy which, when realized will go far toward improving the national health.

I realize that the program which he recommends must be implemented by a considerable amount of legislation, and I am proud to be sponsor of two bills which I consider essential to the development of a national health program. These bills are H. R. 5628, to provide for the construction of hospital facilities where they are needed, and H. R. 4512, known as the National Mental Health bill. This bill has passed in the House. Both have had the support of our medical and health authorities, and I trust, will be approved by the Congress in the near future. The hospital bill, in general, is the same as the Hill-Burton bill already passed in the Senate.

While these legislative proposals of mine are directed toward meeting basic health needs—needs which are particularly acute in rural areas—they are by no means the entire answer to the whole health program.

Before we can even begin a full attack on that problem, we must determine how we can best provide for all of the people anything approaching adequate medical care. One vital question must be resolved—this is, how can we pay for adequate medical care for the whole population?

The President has suggested that we accomplish this by spreading the cost over the entire Nation through expansion of our existing social-insurance system. It is my belief that only through application of the insurance principle to the risks of illness can we make possible equal opportunities for health in every part of the country.

Students of medical care seem to be in accord in the opinion that prepayment by groups for medical service is more efficient and, hence, more satisfactory, than post payment by individuals.

Here, again, there appears to be no area of serious disagreement. One finds controversy only on details of how the insurance principle can best be applied. One of the major issues today is whether group prepayment should be on a basis of local control and voluntary participation, or on a basis of national control with universal participation.

I do not propose to attempt to settle this broad question here today, nor do I believe that I, alone, or any other single individual can come forth with the answer immediately. My own mind is open on this subject. I am willing to study closely every particle of evidence.

I do believe that in such groups as this, where we have the privilege of sharing views and opinions of members of the medical profession and others who are vitally interested, there can emerge a meeting of minds, and the controversy that centers on details rather than on broad principles can be successfully and satisfactorily resolved.

Health services to a large portion of our rural population are alarmingly deficient. There are far too few physicians and other health personnel; far too few hospitals, public health services, and sanitation facilities in rural communities to serve the 57,000,000 people who live in these areas. Since I have proposed remedies to the problems of hospital and mental care, let me take these two fields of need as examples of inequities that exist among rural and urban areas.

Adequate numbers of psychiatric personnel and clinical services are exceedingly limited throughout the country. They are nonexistent in rural communities. While the hospital facilities problem is not as acute, the disparity between urban and rural areas in the hospital field is almost as great.

Rural areas have about half as many hospital beds as do the metropolitan centers; less than half the number they need to serve their people adequately.

It is generally conceded that where one finds hospitals, one also finds doctors and other health personnel. Certainly this is true for rural America. The ratio of doctors to population in the metropolitan centers before the war was 1 to about 650; in the 1,000 most-rural counties, it was 1 to 1,700.

The war accentuated this maldistribution since rural doctors almost everywhere exceeded their quotas for the armed forces. Even though demobilization is not yet complete, there already is marked evidence that a sizable number of doctors who left rural communities for the Army and the Navy are turning toward the urban centers to resume civilian practice.

In the field of preventive services, these disparities continue. Despite the progress that has been made under the impetus of the Social Security Act, there are still about 1,400 counties lacking full-time health departments. Practically all of them are rural counties. There are gross deficiencies, too, in sanitation facilities.

The reason is simple. People in rural communities and rural States do not have the purchasing power with which to avail themselves of the facilities and services that are essential to good health care.

The year 1943 was unprecedented as a year of farm prosperity, yet the income from farming amounted to only 9 percent of the national income, while farm people made up about 21 percent of the population. According to the last census of agriculture (1940) about two-thirds of all farm families had gross incomes of under $1,000, with one-third under $400. States predominantly urban (70 percent) had an average per capita income of $800; States predominantly rural (70 percent) of about $300.

It is basic to our economy that some solution be found to this grave imbalance, and I applaud the Farm Bureau Federation for its efforts to obtain greater equalization of rural and urban incomes. Until that time has arrived, justice demands that the urban States, which are, in a sense, draining off the wealth of their rural neighbors, help to extend into our rural communities those facilities and services which are necessary to good health care.

For the Nation to meet its obligations in a field as broad, as complicated, and as fundamental as health, it is of the greatest importance that the public agencies administering the program be maintained at the highest possible degree of competence.

The nature of the task calls for the closest copartnership at all levels of government. At the Federal level, I am confident that we have in the Public Health Service a national health organization that is unique—unique in its record of accomplishment, in the quality of its personnel, and in its leadership.

As we expand our activities in the national health field, it is becoming increasingly important that the official bodies charged with responsibility for these programs be maintained on a high plane of performance and that they receive from the people sympathetic support and assistance in their undertakings.

There is no question that the development of a program designed to obtain adequate health care for the population will be fraught with many difficulties.

There is no question also, that the solutions can be found in the united effort of all sectors of our national life. If we but understand our national health needs and strive sincerely to meet those needs we shall develop the proper methods, and we shall attain for every American the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

Lest Ye Forget: Wisconsin Hears From Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BROWNSTOWN, IND., *March 30, 1946.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: No one can appreciate more profoundly than myself your article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1611, entitled "Lest Ye Forget."

Little did you guess half the wisdom you expressed, hence this epistle. For 87 years I have watched the fateful pendulum of time swing to and fro, from utter joy to bitter pain and woe. The most bitter was my dealings with old-age assitsance. My good wife had a little home left to her by her parents. I got $15 per month, old-age assistance. Three years later my wife died. With doctor, nurse, and funeral expense, I was forced to mortgage the home and had to increase the loan and pay back all the assistance I had got, at a time when it was bitter pain. The terms unfair, ungrateful (used in your speech) pale into insignificance.

Now I am alone. Not a blood kin in 3,000 miles, and the poor house looks like a good bet. Our temple of justice consisting of three rooms are taken by assistance. Don't you think a three-ball sign at the front entrance would be fit?

Some of this bunch-bureaucracy-loaned billions on the cuff long before Pearl Harbor, to say nothing of the millions spent killing pigs, paying farmers not to sow wheat, and I might add, raking leaves.

I am glad to know one man (Representative STEVENSON) who has got the guts to tell it to the people of our great Nation, the United States of America.

With best wishes,

I beg to remain,

J. D. B.

P. S.—You have my consent to use this letter any way you see proper.

Blue Book Blunder Blamed on Leftists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star:

BLUE BOOK BLUNDER BLAMED ON "LEFTISTS"—ADMINISTRATION ERROR REALIZED BY LATIN AMERICA, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

More than meets the eye is contained in the statement of Francisco Castillo Najera, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, that the United States has not proved its case in the so-called Blue Book condemning the Peron regime in Argentina.

Senor Najera used to be Mexican Ambassador to the United States and is at present representing his country on the UNO Security Council. He was present at the San Francisco Conference last year when the Latin-American nations won their fight to have Argentina admitted to UNO. He knows the background of United States policy. He openly takes the position that the Washington administration made a mistake and he reveals that the other governments did not see fit to approve the Blue Book.

This is a startling revelation of the disagreement that has prevailed among pan-American nations concerning recent trends in the Byrnes-Braden policies toward Argentina.

ERROR IN JUDGMENT

When Mr. Braden began his public speeches in Buenos Aires and when Secretary Byrnes listened to the emotional arguments of left-wingers and in effect repudiated the policy of the late President Roosevelt toward the Argentine problem, a serious error in judgment was made.

There is no doubt that the Peron regime had Axis backing and no doubt either that it has proceeded along fascistic and totalitarian lines. The recent election was easy to win because the stage was prepared by nearly 2 years of strong-arm tactics inside Argentina. But the Washington government stuck its neck out. It insisted on playing a lone game instead of acting only in unison with other pan-American countries.

Most of the errors can be attributed to the misrepresentation by the left-wing press in this country of what actually happened at San Francisco. The plan of the late President Roosevelt to recognize the Farrell regime and to admit it to the family of pan-American nations once more was put in writing and was initialed by F. D. R. Nevertheless when the San Francisco Conference came, the charge was made by the left wing that so-called appeasers in the State Department made the policy in opposition to the wishes of Mr. Roosevelt.

Nothing could have been further from the truth. The United States delegation was unanimous in getting behind the proposal to admit Argentina. What wasn't generally realized was that the Latin nations pressed for that very action and wanted Argentina to be made a member of the San Francisco Conference. The left wingers have never accepted that explanation. It is to be hoped they will read between the lines of the Najera statement now and see how far they have wrongly influenced the Truman-Byrnes administration.

FULL EFFECT OF BLUNDER

No good was served by needling the State Department and forcing it out on a limb. Only the amateurs who know nothing of the history and background of Latin-American affairs could have suggested such a course. Sumner Welles, from the very beginning, has been eternally right in opposition to any unilateral policy with respect to Argentina.

Now the full effect of the blunder is coming to the surface. The prestige of the United States in Latin America has been damaged. Great Britain has declined to go along with our policy and has made friends with the Peron regime and will shortly recognize it. The British commercial interests in Argentina will capitalize on the mistake made by Washington.

Word comes that Russia may send a trade mission to Buenos Aires. The Peron group wants to make a deal with Russia. Yet the Soviets fought at San Francisco against admitting Argentina and called it a Fascist state.

The whole episode suggests that President Truman and Mr. Byrnes listened to left-wing clamor instead of calmly examining the facts, and turned out of the State Department last year the very men who were really striving to get rid of fascism in Argentina in the only effective way it could be done—by collective action and collective pressure by all the pan-American states.

Distressed Families of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of J. H. Leib, national legislative director, American Veterans of World War II:

LET US ASSIST SURVIVORS OF THOSE WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THIS WAR

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

Now that the war is over this Nation ought to give equitable consideration to those families whose loved ones will never return again.

Those who have survived this world conflagration now have a number of champions to fight for their rights and deserved benefits. But, on the other hand, little thought has been given to the many distressed families who have no organized voice to turn to in the hope of protecting their interest.

It is a well-known fact that corporations and powerful individuals were given substantial tax relief in the last revenue act, but widows of many men who lost their lives in the service of their country are now asked to sacrifice further, through the present estate taxes, the money that they have on hand for their maintenance and for the support and education of their children.

In this connection I would like to quote a letter touching on this matter. It is from a father who lost his son fighting to help defeat the Japs. The letter, in part, follows and is self-explanatory.

"In the case of my son, a submarine officer, lost with his ship in combat in the Pacific, he left a wife and two young children.

"The proceeds of all of his life insurance, etc., will be required to pay his estate taxes within 1 year. It is questionable whether his remaining assets will provide sufficient income to maintain a home and educate his children.

"It seems that with all that the Nation is deservedly providing for the welfare of surviving veterans, that some help through a change in the estate taxes, should be enacted into law for the benefit of dependents of those who did not survive.

"I hope very much that your interest and that of your patriotic organization in the welfare of dependents of deceased servicemen may warrant your support and influence toward favorable consideration in behalf of those who gave so much to their country."

Such families deserve every consideration, and it is hoped that Congress will give them every assistance that they possibly can.

It's Your Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON for the news service, Labor Press Associates, and appearing this week in more than 75 labor papers, both A. F. of L. and CIO, throughout the country:

IT'S YOUR ATOMIC ENERGY

(By Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, chairman, Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy)

The basic issue in the current atomic energy debate in Congress is whether we are to abandon our historic principle of government administered for the people by civilians representing the people.

Certain of my colleagues feel that the control of atomic energy constitutes a problem essentially different from any previously encountered in the history of the Republic. It is suggested that today's problem bears no relation to our previous successful experience in developing military projects and operations under the control of a civilian Congress, a civilian President, and civilian Secretaries of War and Navy. Some good Americans, both within Congress and outside, have expressed fears that opponents of military control of atomic energy may not have a proper appreciation of national security.

Union men, who rallied several million strong to defend the "four freedoms," will want to know the answer. So will the millions of home-front fighters who made the United States of America democracy's arsenal.

My answer is, no plan of atomic energy control which fails to provide for proper development of military research, no plan which neglects the needs of national defense, has a right to public support. Everyone agrees the military should have a voice in all security matters. What we have to decide is whether they are to take over the crucial administrative powers completely.

Giving the military top hand in this matter would tend to lessen and not to enhance our national security.

Generals are experts in the employment of weapons. But development of new weapons has been almost entirely the work of civilians. Simon Lake, civilian, invented the submarine. The Wright brothers, civilians, developed the airplane. The pioneer work that culminated in the atomic bomb was done by civilian scientists. Science, they insist, cannot progress under military control.

The American people invested more than $2,000,000,000 in the research and industrial development that culminated in the atomic bomb. The Government—you and your neighbors—under Franklin D. Roosevelt's far-sighted leadership took a necessary financial risk. That investment of ours made good; it can pay off now, and more importantly, in the future, in a fashion we can only dream of today.

If atomic energy is really put into harness in America's productive economy, the result may well be a substantial boost to everybody's standard of living. People will be able to have more of the good things of life, and a shorter workweek will be feasible.

The best-informed observers are agreed that atomic industry should create jobs for many more workers than it may displace.

The people as a whole will also benefit greatly from the medical application of atomic energy to such problems as the treatment of cancer and leukemia; problems which the scientists tell us are now coming nearer to solution.

Yet unless the people speak out loud and clear, civilian application of atomic energy may be unnecessarily delayed. The American people, given the facts, have the vision to see ahead to the political, social, and economic implications of atomic energy. They will demand civilian control of this basic power just as they have always insisted on civilian authority in the administration of justice and the shaping of the Nation's foreign policy.

I am convinced the people of this country will not approve any legislation exalting the military to a position of authority in our national affairs which is unprecedented in our history, repugnant to our traditions, and destructive to our principles.

OPA Destroying the Butter-Making Industry in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, attention of the House of Representatives many times has been directed to the disastrous results of OPA's unrealistic orders. As is shown by the letter below, its bungling has nearly destroyed the butter-making industry in Iowa. Gov. Robert D. Blue and Iowa Secretary of Agriculture Harry D. Linn emphatically point

out what is happening in Iowa to the dairy business.

STATE OF IOWA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Des Moines, April 6, 1946.

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: Inequalities in prices paid to farmers for butterfat are creating havoc in the dairy business in Iowa.

Last October OPA price restrictions were lifted on sweet cream, with butter being left under unreasonable price ceilings. This condition created a prohibitive price barrier for the manufacturer of butter.

Since the action of the OPA, butter manufacture in the United States has been on a steady decline, with Iowa no exception to the trend in this industry. OPA must be forced at once to right this situation of price inequalities in the dairy business or Iowa creameries will cease to manufacture butter and many farmers will be forced out of the dairy business.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT D. BLUE,
Governor of Iowa.
HARRY D. LINN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Louis M. Daniel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times, with chaos all over the world, it is refreshing to learn how the youth of America are interesting themselves in world affairs. I have had considerable correspondence with the high school and college students throughout my district and I am amazed at their grasp of world problems.

Mr. Speaker, a young lad in my district by the name of Louis M. Daniel, son of Mr. and Mrs. G. C. Daniel, of Grantsburg, Wis., received first place in an oratorical contest at Moorehead, Minn. The subject of his speech was right in tune with the chief problem confronting the world and his statements are worthy of note.

Under unanimous consent, I include his speech as an extension of my remarks:

WORLD MUST UNITE FOR FREEDOM OR SUFFER AS SLAVES UNDER CONQUEROR

First place was awarded Louis M. Daniel, son of Mr. and Mrs. G. C. Daniel, of Grantsburg, on an oration written and delivered by him at contests at Moorehead, Minn., February 8 and 9, and Eau Claire on February 22 and 23.

Louis was also a member of the first debate team of River Falls State Teachers College, which won at both meets, and was a high individual scorer.

The oration on which he won first place is as follows:

"COOPERATION OR CONQUEST

"Have you stopped to realize that if Germany had developed the atomic bomb before the United States, we would today be subject of a world dictatorship imposed by conquest? We cannot afford to overlook the implications of the new atomic age which is dawning. For the first time in the history of man it is inconceivably within the power of a single nation to rule the world. The atomic bomb has made political and economical nationalism meaningless, and the people of the world must choose between world government or world destruction. It is time for America to wake up and to realize that unless we take the lead in establishing world government, based on law and order through cooperation, we will be forced into political slavery by a world government imposed through conquest.

"There are at work in the world today two powerful forces which are in constant conflict: industrialism and nationalism. Industrialism is an economic and social force which tends toward progress. The forces of industrial progress reach out, demanding broader markets and freer trade, thereby moving to embrace the whole globe in their sphere of activity. Nationalism on the other hand, is a political force which retards expansion and progress simply because it tends to limit the productive capacity of every nation to the narrow political confines of the nationalistic state. Such policies manifest themselves in government control of industry, of labor, and finally complete government control of all human activity. These practices reached their climax in prewar Germany, Italy, and Japan. The result is obvious.

"We are now living in a world where the political structure of the nation-state has been rendered obsolete by the inevitable evolution of mankind and the irresistible forces of progress. Therefore, nationalism, with its outmoded political framework of 80 sovereign states, must logically give way to a political organization which is comparable in development to the tremendous strides of industrial progress in the last century.

"This progressive adaptation of political structures to meet the increased responsibility brought by social and industrial development has been going on for over 5,000 years. The sad part of it is this: The change in political structure has always lagged far behind the more dynamic evolution of society. Therefore, the inability of the progressively outmoded political structure to provide security, under the changed conditions brought about by industrialism, has always resulted in wars and bloodshed until the political structure has again been able to provide security under the new conditions.

"The attainment of peace lies in the ability of the highest unit of government to provide security for its citizens. We will never have peace until we create a unit of government above and beyond the nation-state to enforce law and order in the field of international relations, which has never been regulated by justice before.

"In speaking of peace, sovereignty is a key word. To define sovereignty as it is actually used it must be said that it is the absolute power of the highest unit of government to fulfill its primary function: which is to provide security and protection for its people, such a political structure has become obsolete. Pearl Harbor and the bombing of England leave no doubt as to the obsolete nature of our present political structure, the nation-state.

"The political progression of 5,000 years are conclusive proof of these undeniable facts. The family was the first sovereign unit. When the families were no longer able to protect themselves as a single unit, they banded together and finally, a little over 150 years ago the next change was begun, and today the world is composed of eighty-odd supposedly sovereign states. Each nation firmly believes that it has the right to do whatever it pleases or deems necessary to the perpetuation of its own nationalistic state, regardless of the rights of others. As long as these self-righteous political units remained more or less isolated from each other their aims did not conflict to a very great degree. But, since the turn of the century the nations have been moving closer and closer together until finally the two opposing forces of industrialism and nationalism clashed with titanic violence, culmination in World Wars I and II.

"The problem of the world today is to find some means of regulating the relations of men who belong to different national states.

"This present crisis is not a new one, and its solution is the same as has been applied many times before in political progression, namely; the integration of the warring units into a higher legal order. The problem of establishing law and order which is peace, and of meeting the demand of industrial progress for a broader sovereign base, can be solved by the institution of democratically controlled legislative, executive, and judicial bodies to regulate international relations under a common sovereign law. By so doing we can make world peace just as natural and practical as United States' peace.

"Two or three years ago the average American thought that the attainment of a world government to maintain peace was merely an idealistic dream. But in today's context of radar-controlled rocket ships and atomic energy, I believe that a world government is inevitable. It is the next logical, practical, and necessary step in the political progression of history.

"We must either resolve to establish a democratic world government through cooperation, or face political slavery and extinction at the hands of a superstate imposed by conquest.

"If the United States will take the lead in establishing a world government, based on justice and human equality before the law, then we will be fulfilling our calling as a Christian Nation. A world government founded on cooperation will be the decisive step toward the brotherhood of man and a lasting peace on earth."

Old-Age Pension Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy when the Ways and Means Committee decided to hold hearings on proposed amendments to the social security law and the several pending bills to provide benefits for our elder citizens.

Practically everyone is in favor of some kind of national old-age pension legislation or a retirement system that will provide adequately for those of advanced years. There is a greater need for this legislation than ever before.

The old folks have contributed much to the welfare of our Nation, and they need help now. They can be given a liberal pension at little additional cost to the Government. When an adequate old-age-pension law gets into operation it will be a great benefit to all our people and very stimulating to our national economy.

It has been repeatedly charged that about half the money available for old-age assistance is spent for administration. While I do not have definite information on this, it is safe to say that a very large percentage is spent solely for administration.

Many of our old people have undergone hardships and suffering because they did not have money with which to buy food, clothing, and medicine and to provide proper shelter.

Many complaints have been made of favoritism to some and prejudice toward others as the result of the misadministration of the law by local welfare boards and their army of supervisors and investigators. A national old-age pension law would do away with the numerous local welfare boards and the large number of supervisors and investigators who are administering the present old-age assistance laws. This would save a huge sum of money which could be applied to the payment of old-age pensions.

Under the present social-security law about one-third of the workers are not furnished any social-security protection, and millions of our elder citizens are not provided for. The Census Bureau figures show over 10,000,000 of our citizens are 65 years of age or over, and only 3 out of every 10 of these receive any benefit under the present law.

It is very difficult for people 60 years of age or older to secure employment. During the war, when so many young men were called into the service and we had great demands for war production, it was possible for many of these older people to get work; but now that the war is over, those in the service are returning to civilian life and the demand for war production lessened, the opportunity for work for these older people has practically ceased.

Added to the difficulty of getting work is the increased cost of living. This makes it all the more imperative that Congress provide legislation which will eliminate want and suffering. At the earliest possible moment Congress should pas sa national old-age pension law so that all the old people could be properly provided for. These old people are worse off today than they ever were before. They need help, and they need that help now. Just think of what they face: an increase of over 33 percent in the cost of living and the opportunity of securing work greatly restricted.

Statistics indicate that about 10,000,000 people over 60 years of age are dependent in whole or in part on someone for their food, clothing, and shelter. This presents a most serious problem and one that Congress should solve now.

It is true that an adequate old-age pension would cost money, but surely American justice and Christian principles are being violated as long as we cause millions to live in misery and want. Our Nation has spent and given away billions of dollars to assist the people of practically every country in the whole world. Surely we can afford to spend some money to help those of our own people who cannot help themselves. During their younger days these old people contributed much tc the welfare of our Nation; in their older days they should be provided for if misfortune or want should confront them.

Our country has an abundance of raw materials and natural resources. It has the mines, the mills and the factories, and the manpower necessary to produce enough to provide plenty for every American family. It has sufficient agricultural production to provide an abundance of food for all. Our Government for years has been spending huge sums to conserve many of our natural resources, to protect wild game, to protect and improve many animals, and I think it is high time that some attention be given to conserving human beings and to making life comfortable for our old folks.

It has been our purpose and our privilege to have a standard of living higher than that of the people of any other country, and at times we are wont to boast of this fact. No doubt this is true generally, but it becomes a fallacy when applied to many of our older citizens who, through no fault of their own, are unfortunate in not having adequate incomes sufficient to supply their needs.

A natural mother will look after her own first. It is a blot upon the national reputation of America that she has not heretofore had the foresight to provide for the unfortunate and the aged of her people.

In recent years our Government has taken more interest in and spent more money for the welfare of people of other nations than it has for the people of the United States; it has seemed more interested in providing luxuries for other people than in providing necessities for our needy people.

A proper old-age-pension law would react favorably upon our national economy. If these older citizens could retire on a reasonable old-age pension, the younger people would be more secure in their jobs, and the added purchasing power of the older people would provide a market for the things produced by the younger people. Thus everyone would be benefited, and we could have prosperity once again.

If our Nation is to continue as the pioneer of good government and high living standards, then Congress must act without delay.

During the past 12 years we have seen the New Deal lend and give billions to foreign nations, none of which will ever be repaid. It is now proposing to lend additional billions to foreign nations and is using the argument that the loans should be made because they would create larger markets for our production. If some of the money proposed to be lent to foreign countries were used for old-age pensions, our old people would have money to spend which would create larger markets for our production right here at home. While we want to help others who are in need, we should help our own people first.

Almost everyone agrees that we must have a large buying power if we are to progress. There must be a market for our products if employment is to be sustained. Therefore it seems plain that there is economic as well as moral justification for liberalizing social security and for granting an old-age pension to our old folks which will permit them to live according to the American standard of living. This action would go a long way toward establishing economic stability.

We must realize that the money paid to our people for old-age pensions will not be idle money, but will be immediately spent and therefore will be kept in circulation. Increased old-age benefits mean increased employment for the young and increased markets for our production.

For many years I have been intensely interested in getting national old-age pension legislation. I have signed several petitions to discharge committees and bring old-age-pension bills before Congress for consideration. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will hold full and complete hearings on all old-age-pension bills and that the committee will favorably report some bill and give the Members of Congress an opportunity to pass an old-age-pension law.

I have submitted this statement to the Ways and Means Committee to be used in connection with hearings on pension legislation, and I sincerely and earnestly hope that the members of the Ways and Means Committee will consider this most important matter now and report an adequate old-age-pension bill to the House floor for immediate vote and passage.

New Deal's Game of Give-Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of April 2, 1946:

THE NEW DEAL'S GAME OF GIVE AWAY

(By Samuel Crowther)

On March 18, at Wilmington Island off Savannah, Ga., closed episode No. 3 in an administration scheme which began in sham and pretense, has lived in sham and pretense and is now close to the borderline of an actual fraud upon the people.

The record should give pause to every American who believes in government by the people for the people. For this is a case of government by government pressure for its own ends.

The public is not even complimented by being damned.

The technique is becoming standard.

It was used to put over the reciprocal trade agreements and the United Nations Organization Charter.

It is now being used to put over the British loan and the OPA.

It is founded on the flagrant misuse of public money and influence, on smear and on the perversion of the truth by Government officers who are sworn to tell the truth.

The Wilmington Island meeting was an innocuous gathering for the organization of the $8,000,000,000 International Monetary Fund and the $8,000,000,000 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

These are the organizations which grew out of the meeting of supposed experts of 44 nations at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July 1944.

That meeting was held before the end of the war was in sight, so that the world after peace would not have to wait for financing as it did in the bad old reactionary days following World War I.

President Truman sent a message mostly quoting President Franklin Roosevelt.

Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, in a fervid speech of welcome, said:

"Ours is a race of time against sanity * * * we must get on with our peace-building work."

The two institutions duly elected officers, fixed on Washington as headquarters, and adjourned. Everyone acted as though something had been accomplished and slung the same old phrases about peace through stable currencies, foreign trade, and rehabilitation.

It was noted with regret that Russia had not joined and neither had 10 others who were at Bretton Woods—Australia, Denmark, Haiti, El Salvador, Liberia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Venezuela, and Cuba.

The way was left open for these nations to join up in 6 months.

The British made it clear that they could not put up any money unless we granted them a loan. They would join with our money.

It was darkly hinted that although the two shows might get on without Russia it would be impossible to get on without the United Kingdom. That made the British loan an imperative.

But no one officially saw fit to note that China, France, and practically all the other European countries would not be able to join unless we lent them money to pay their dues.

Under the original fund plan as presented to Congress, the United States would have put up about two-thirds of all the assets of known value and would have had 28 percent of the vote.

Under the new plan the United States will put up all or nearly all the assets of value and still have only 28 percent of the vote.

The fund and the bank are washouts. That everyone knows and admits except the bureaucrats of our State and Treasury Departments.

Those are episodes Nos. 1 and 2.

Take episode No. 1. No agreements were drafted by 44 nations at Bretton Woods.

The projects for the fund and the bank were worked out by Lord Keynes and Harry D. White at Atlantic City long in advance of the Bretton Woods meeting.

Lord Keynes had principally in mind a method by which Britain could get rid of its debt to other parts of the Empire and Commonwealth—known as blocked sterling.

If his plans had carried, probably there would not now be the demand for the British loan.

But they did not carry, for White was principally interested in a scheme by which the New Deal could continue deficit finance without a money collapse.

The eventual plan was a compromise. That was presented to the delegates as something to be signed on the dotted line. Of these delegates, only the American and the British wanted to be there. The others were afraid to stay away.

After some delay, mostly caused by the Russians making unexpected demands, the delegates agreed to take the documents home to their governments. This was the only agreement.

Then began episode No. 2, which had to do with getting through the Congress what the administration officers unblushingly called agreements.

The State and Treasury Departments papered the country with pamphlets, the Political Action Committee did likewise, and so did various other organizations which were lugged into the picture.

The Treasury held meetings for correspondents, clergymen, school teachers, and other groups of citizens, and even school children were indoctrinated.

Anyone who opposed the fund and the bank was not only an enemy of peace but also a confederate of greedy bankers.

One Senator went about the country bellowing that $6,000,000,000 was little enough to pay for peace.

Here is what Henry Morgenthau, then Secretary of the Treasury, told a committee of the House:

"Legislation to carry out the Bretton Woods program is the first practical test of our willingness to cooperate in the work of world reconstruction and stabilization. It is also one very important step toward orderly, expanding foreign trade upon which the future prosperity of our agriculture and our industry depends. * * * We are seeking a solution to one of the world's knottiest problems. Only the good will, good sense, and sincerity of all the 44 nations could have found it, and I am confident we did find it."

The Congress did not stand up under the pressure. It overwhelmingly passed the enabling legislation.

Those were the good old days when nothing was too good for Russia.

Russia, by putting up $900,000,000 in worthless paper rubles in the fund, could take out 900,000,000 in United States dollars. She also expected to borrow heavily from the Bank. If she collaborated with the United Kingdom she would whipsaw the United States. It seemed to her like a good buy.

That is why the PAC and all the fellow travelers went out for Bretton Woods.

The United Kingdom, standing between Russia and the United States, saw a trading position.

Then things began to happen.

The British ardor for Russia cooled and Russia saw the possible chance of not getting everything she asked for.

A number of the small nations, after San Francisco, saw that they were to get only what stuck to the rungs of the ladder. The British no longer felt like taking a chance. They wanted a gift-loan. So do the others.

And so the world is saying to Washington: "We will play one world if you insist. But we will play for only one way—heads we win, tails you lose."

Episode No. 4 could be tying up the Fund and the Bank into neat packages—and dropping them into the ash can.

Teen-Age Voters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del.:

TEEN-AGE VOTERS?

A new drive to lower the voting age to 18 seems sure to be set off by President Truman's statement at Chicago that he didn't see why any intelligent boy or girl of 18 should not have the right to vote. But it seems doubtful whether a proposal which made very little progress during the war will get any more substantial support today.

The strongest argument in favor of the suggestion is that a country which asks its boys to fight at 18 cannot fairly refuse them the right to vote at the same age. Fighting in defense of one's country is a citizen's highest duty. If they are old enough to perform this duty, the argument runs, they are also old enough to enjoy the citizen's privilege of selecting their country's leaders and having a voice in its policies.

There is also little doubt that a great many boys and girls of 18 are informed at least as well as a great many of their elders on national and international affairs. Some of them would probably cast a more intelligent ballot.

But the issue is less likely to be determined by these arguments or by the intellectual capacity of youngsters of 18 than by political considerations. Lowering the voting age by 3 years would add a whole new army of voters to the electorate. It is possible that, as in the case of women's suffrage, this would not have much effect on the relative strength of the two major parties. But the uncertainty is great enough to make most politicians shy of taking the gamble. However, if the drive is extended and universal service adopted, the campaign to extend the vote to 18-year-olds may very well, and with good reason, gather strength.

Veterans' Pensions Should Not Be Withheld While Receiving Hospital or Domiciliary Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, since I have introduced H. R. 5549, which would, if passed, abolish the practice of withholding veterans' pensions when they are in Veterans' Administration hospitals or receiving domiciliary care, my mail has been heavy from all points of the Nation urging its passage. Herewith follows one of those letters which I think expresses the views of most veterans who favor H. R. 5549:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOME,
Biloxi, Miss., March 26, 1946.

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let me, with hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans, thank you for your efforts in our behalf, and for your H. R. 5549, to void the law withholding veterans' pensions while receiving Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary care.

Please let me give you a picture of true and actual facts, resulting from the practice of withholding the veterans' pensions. Then if you and every reasonable man do not concede that it imposes a shameful, if not pitiful, condition, then I admit to a wrong conception of human justice.

I am writing of the sick or disabled veteran who has no other resource than his pension, receiving either hospital or domiciliary care in one of the Veterans' Administration so-called homes.

The unjust and shameful conditions imposed are:

1. With all but a very small fraction of his pension withheld, the veteran finds himself marooned in a Veterans' Administration facility without financial means to travel or subsist, until his resumed pension (check) reaches him (in from 30 to perhaps 90 days). So he has his choice of remaining as a direct result of this practice the remainder of his days, a prisoner of this circumstance, deprived of his civil rights and inherent human right to live as he wishes; or

2. He may leave the Veterans' Administration facility a penniless beggar, an object of charity, a degraded pauper, and a shamefaced outcast who must beg the "bitter bread of charity" in order to live.

In either case, due to the act of withholding his pension, he is deprived of all human dignity, his self-respect, and the respect of his fellowman.

To bring such a state of affairs about, to impose such conditions on mankind, let alone upon disabled veterans who have served their country in time of war, is not only shameful and inhuman, it is a stigma on this land of freedom, and anathema to the victims of this malignant practice, who due to it are "necessitous men," our own "displaced people."

While at the same time, ironically, our Government is spending millions of dollars to free and feed aliens all over the world, as well as admitting thousands of refugees into this country to compete with our discharged, returning veterans for jobs and a living.

In closing, I believe that all reasonable men will agree that the practice of withholding veterans' pensions is against public policy, and is opposed to human welfare; that it imposes a social and economic evil not only on the veteran, but the community at large. If continued, it will adversely affect hundreds of thousands of veterans.

Pensions should, without undue delay, be restored to disabled and sick veterans in Veterans' Administration facilities, and a bill should be introduced and passed by Congress to return to the veterans the pension money which has been so unjustly withheld, so that those veterans who, against their wishes, have been too long, due to the circumstances of having been deprived of their only financial means, prisoners to all interests and purposes in Veterans' Administration facilities, may be free to leave.

Sincerely,

W. T. SKEGGS.

P. S.—The unwary disabled veteran who enters a Veterans' Administration facility finds that he has walked into nothing short of a trap, his pension is taken from him, the trap closes, he becomes a hopeless man.

H. R. 5549

A bill to provide that a veteran's compensation, pension, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide certain benefits for World War veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes," approved July 19, 1939, is amended by striking out the following: "and subject to those provisions of paragraph VI (A) of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (c) which provide for reduction of monetary benefits to veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care," so that such section shall read:

"SEC. 4. In the administration of laws pertaining to veterans, retired officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, who served honorably during a war period as recognized by the Veterans' Administration, shall be, and are, entitled to hospitalization and domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities on parity with other war veterans."

A Proper Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I desire to place in the RECORD the following letter from the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, answering questions I had asked him on the relative program of construction before the war and what is in sight at this time:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, April 5, 1946.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: I am pleased to comment on the questions which you have heard raised as to whether or not the Bureau of Reclamation is getting funds that will permit it to keep up the rate of progress that was made before the war.

In 1940 the estimated cost of work remaining to be completed was about $850,000,000. About $91,000,000 was expended during fiscal year 1940. At that rate the work would be completed in about 9 years as an average.

In 1945 the estimated cost of work remaining to be completed (including work authorized since 1940) was about $1,750,000,000. Considering the amount of work remaining to be done, an annual rate of expenditure comparable to the 1940 rate would be about $195,000,000 in order to complete the authorized work in 9 years as an average. If we were to achieve the desirable end of constructing projects in 6 years as an average, the annual rate of expenditure should be slightly in excess of $290,000,000.

It is my firm belief that the normal program of the Bureau now should be conducted at an annual rate of not less than $300,000,000. The resumption of work on many projects deferred because of the war and the start of work on units which have been authorized since 1940 should be undertaken at about that rate if the separate projects are to be completed in an orderly and economic way.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner.

Liquor Follies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, because of an accumulation of old and obsolete liquor laws and regulations, the liquor administrators of the various States have made some rather disturbing and confusing rulings. In the State of New York, the evidence appears to indicate that the members of the ABC Board cannot distinguish between a street and avenue and get all fouled up granting licenses on the wrong thoroughfares. These same liquor maestros almost created a panic among the delegates to the UNO. There was to be an oasis and no bar at Hunter College, the present meeting place of the UNO officials. Imagine Gromyko without his vodka, Byrnes without his bourbon, and Cadogan without his Scotch. It would be like Sally Rand without her bubbles.

In California highballs cannot be served while flying high above the State. California liquor administrators direct that liquor on the ground is O. K., but liquor in the sky is No-K. To my mind, that is the high proof of schizophrenia. In the Nation's Capital, no one can stand at a bar and bend an elbow. All alcoholic beverages must be consumed while sitting down. That may be a protection, in a certain sense, as it makes falling flat on one's face a little less hazardous. In other States, the reverse is true. The elbow bending must be accomplished in a vertical position or it is no go. I advise the liquor administrators that most people can drink just as well sitting down as they can standing up. But few people can stand up as well after they have been drinking sitting down, as they can sit after drinking standing up.

And, in Washington, D. C., you can advertise the prices of your liquid grains in a newspaper but you would be closed up if you put the price on a bottle in your window.

In the States of Texas, Iowa, and Washington, you cannot buy a single drink—you have to buy a bottle for table use while in a public place. Every drink is a "lost week-end."

These liquor laws are supposedly designed to foster temperance but such various and nonsensical provisions will positively make topers out of the citizenry who may be partial to alcoholic beverages.

In New York there are no bars, as such—they are euphemistically referred to as restaurants, taverns, or grills. The underlying purpose is to encourage revenue from food rather than liquor. I think it is a reasonable statement that many of these bars and grills do not feature food as a specialty of the house. Frankly, some of these grills are as bare of food as Mother Hubbard's cupboard.

The New York State regulations provide that there must be an unobstructed view from the outside into any restaurant or grill. This harks back to the days of prohibition when we had to make it easy for the prohibition agents to peek and snoop through the windows and keyholes. In New York State swinging doors are tabu in liquor premises, eliminating forever the old picture of the small child peeking under them with the plaintive query, "Is my father in there?" If a youngster were on a parental search these days, he has a pretty good chance of being knocked down in a revolving door.

Ten States allow gift of liquor to wholesalers but not to retailers. Apparently these States feel that retailers are not impervious to baksheesh. But wholesalers are angelic.

Minnesota prohibits liquor sales to Indians and prostitutes. Forever Amber would find it tough going out there. How does the barkeep recognize an Indian? Must he wear feathers? That State permits streetcar conductors to arrest summarily without warrant any intoxicated passenger.

In Des Moines, Iowa, a woman is suing a hotel company for $80,000, charging that the hotel made liquor available to her husband and thus was responsible for breaking up her home. The action is brought under an Iowa statute which provides "every wife * * * who shall be injured in person, property, or means of support by any intoxicated person shall have a right of action against any person who shall, by selling or giving to another any intoxicating liquors, cause the intoxication of such persons." In this particular instance the only alleged wrongdoing by the hotel was in giving to

the husband the job of bartender. Will wonders never cease? Here the liquor establishment is charged with alienation of marital affections.

In South Carolina, you cannot use Santa Claus as a theme for a liquor ad. Perhaps South Carolina solons think Santa Claus could not get down the chimney if he imbibes some of the South Carolina "corn." Would they object to an ad depicting Dasher, Dancer, Prancer, and their reindeer coworkers gratefully disposing of a dry martini after a hard night over the roof tops of the world?

In many areas made dry by local option or by State prohibition, if liquor is seized by Federal agents, such refreshments may only be turned over to Government hospitals and institutions, but if the liquor is seized by city or county officials, it must be sent down the drain—maybe.

A rather anomalous situation arises in Mississippi. Mississippi is dry, although there are quite a number of thousands who have taken out Federal licenses to sell liquor, wines, and beer to the dry public. These licensees have been doing a thriving business, and have sold above the ceiling prices. They maintain that the Federal Government cannot interfere with liquor selling in a dry State. The liquor dealers in Louisiana started to send their goods over the line to get higher prices. Then, Mississippi, in order to get her share of the gravy, put a 10 percent black-market tax on liquor sales. Remember, Mississippi is a dry State, but it does not hesitate to try and make its prohibition pay. Apparently payment of the taxes makes the violation holy and cleanses the violator. It reminds us of Gilbert and Sullivan's Mikado in which Pooh-Bah loudly proclaims his virtues and then slyly accepts a gratuity—an insult to his honorable ancestors, of course.

Apparently, there are 48 ways to buy, sell, and drink liquor under the crazy quilt of laws, obtaining in the States. Superimposed upon these laws is the double talk and the weasel words of the liquor regulations. It is confusion worse confounded. Some administrators—State and Federal—are affected by the "sahib" complex and misuse their authority, but most of them want to do a good job, but they inherit the silly laws that tie their hands.

A few of them are carry-overs from the days of the prohibition error. They still have the crusading spirit of the ignoble experiment. They are as different from the old prohibition directors as is tweedledum and tweedledee—and are about as intelligent.

But all of the liquor administration are overcome by the welter of traditional ritual and repressive measures governing the art of imbibing. Hence some of the ludicrous decisions daily promulgated.

Then, too, the liquor administrators' interpretation of fact and law must always be accepted as correct. Their word is law. So says the State statute. It recalls to mind an incident in Alice in Wonderland. "When I use a word," said Humpty Dumpty, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "Whether you can make words mean so many different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "Which is to be master—that's all."

The attempts of some State administrators to prevent tie-in sales is sheer asininity. Tie-in sales are as old as the hills. It is human nature to expect a customer to buy slow-moving goods to get the more popular items. Tie-in sales are as natural as sweat in summer time. But these liquor administrators would change human nature. Some appear to be endowed with the best minds of the eighteenth century. A recent decision of the United States Supreme Court has knocked into a cocked hat the campaign against tie-in sales.

Meanwhile, what is the liquor industry doing about this mish-mosh? Apparently very little. It takes it all lying down. I remember the story of the little titmouse who happened upon a little pool of whiskey. He sipped and beamed and sipped some more. Raising his little head with dignity and bolstered by the spirits of the occasion, he piped, "Where is that cat that was chasing me yesterday?"

I believe the liquor industry needs to imbibe some of its own beverage to acquire the courage to fight some of these silly laws and regulations. Heretofore, there has been apathy and even an unwillingness to protect their basic rights. The industry seems satisfied with the Peter's Pence it receives from the authorities. The industry has been suffering from a beggar's inferiority complex. It must not feel that it has two strikes against it before going to bat. I believe the industry should not succumb to this mood of futility. The liquor industry did a magnificent job in the munitions field and in the manufacture of penicillin during the recent war, and in peacetime it has a lawful and important place in the national economy.

The industry pays yearly in direct Federal, State, and local taxes, over $2,700,000,000. A tidy sum. It betokens the industry's importance in the national scene. Nonetheless, the industry is timid and scared.

Because of its wartime achievement and its peacetime status, it should insist upon dignified recognition and treatment of its inherent problems. Otherwise, it will always be treated as a stepchild and subjected to the circumlocutions and abracadabra of an endless stream of liquor regulations.

If horses knew their own strength, no one would dare ride them. The liquor men are like horses. They do not realize their own strength.

Poll-Tax Repeal Up to States—Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a recent Associated Press report from Chicago credits President Truman with having avowed that repeal of the poll tax is a matter to be worked out by the poll-tax States. The statement was welcomed by those of us who have persistently and undoubtedly correctly contended that this was a State and not a Federal issue.

Doubtless it was most unwelcomed by certain organized groups and "do-gooders" who annually force the issue before the Congress.

The President is to be congratulated for his forthrightness and courage. May others follow him and thus bring to an end, for all time to come, a repetition of the shameful scenes which year in and year out are made in the Halls of Congress over an issue which bears no resemblance to a Federal question.

The press report is as follows:

POLL TAX REPEAL UP TO STATES, TRUMAN TELLS CHICAGO YOUTHS

CHICAGO, April 6.—President Truman today disclosed the view that repeal of the poll tax must be left up to the States.

His pronouncement concerning one of the most controversial issues ever tackled by Congress came unexpectedly at a news conference he held for Chicago high-school journalists.

The question was raised by a nervous, shy little girl, whose query escaped most of the reporters regularly assigned to cover the President.

While in the Senate Mr. Truman was a proponent of Federal repeal of the tax levied in a number of Southern States as a prerequisite for voting. On several occasions, when asked about his attitude, he has pointed to his Senate record.

"Do you see any immediate solution of the poll tax in the South?" came the question at today's conference.

No; he did not, the President replied. That is a matter they will have to work out for themselves.

There are a number of Southern States, the President went on, that have repealed the poll tax.

He expressed hope they all will eventually. But that is a matter for them to work out for themselves, Mr. Truman continued.

He added that it also was a matter for education.

Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, are we approaching a crucial point after 13 years of inflationary spending by the New Deal radicals?

Will that situation give the radicals who have cunningly debased our currency a long-sought chance to shift the blame for the inflation they have caused?

Why are all left-wing and communistic groups in America supporting fanatically the continuance of OPA without change?

Can America be herded into totalitarianism by selling the people the false notion that price controls can erase the effects of existing inflation?

Can every method of handling OPA lead the Republican minority and conservative Democrats into a trap, where they may be politically destroyed?

Before answering these questions, consider the difficult task before Congress. It must terminate OPA, an economic narcotic, with the minimum possible amount of economic and social disturbance. Yet here are the alternatives facing Congress, stripped of details:

First. It can vote to end the OPA on June 30.

Second. It can consent to OPA renewal without genuine amendment. This procedure, spiced with scattered opposition, could be given the appearance of constructive action by the adoption of inocuous amendments.

Third. It can pass amendments that would direct OPA to stop hamstringing production and to work effectively toward termination. In this effort the Republican minority could combine with a sufficient number of conservative Democrats to secure such constructive amendments.

As the Administration high-pressure drive to extend OPA this week goes into high gear, let us survey the outlook.

INFLATION JITTERS RESULT FROM PROPAGANDA

Alternative No. 1, a vote to end the OPA on June 30, seems to be made to order for the radicals. Yet OPA could have been ended this June but for two administration moves. First, President Truman, taking Secretary Wallace's fictitious statistics that wages could go up and prices go down, decisively broke the line on steel wages. Too late he found out that steel prices must also go up.

This Truman-engineered breakthrough brought about a general scramble for wage and price increases that all but paralyzed reconversion for months.

Secondly, the OPA, in an effective propaganda campaign to retain its war powers, has drenched the country with inflation scares. Economic jitters and hysteria have been created. Consequently, ending OPA on June 30 would probably be followed by serious economic disturbances.

With overwhelming dominance of the four radio networks, plus other propaganda machinery, the radical crowd could cunningly exploit the self-created confusion to discredit the conservative majority. Then they would have their long-sought chance to overturn the American way of life.

This alternative, ending the OPA on June 30, now seems only remotely possible. But the methods Bowles and company have used to prevent this termination can quickly be repeated and expanded to panic proportions. That dangerous possibility, as a later termination date approaches, should be fully understood now.

OPA EXTENSION WITH FEEBLE AMENDMENTS WOULD ONLY HOODWINK THE PEOPLE

Alternative No. 2 is to extend OPA in its present form. Suppose Congress follows this course? Then the radicals strangling American business through OPA will have another full year to complete their plans to put over economic fascism in America.

How far have these plans already progressed? The progress of this fascism can perhaps best be understood from the report, How Nazi Germany Has Controlled Business, issued by the Brookings Institution in 1943. Almost down to detail, OPA is using the Fascist methods that destroyed free enterprise in Germany. Here you may ask, "Then why are Communist elements so vociferously for OPA?" Because totalitarianism is their goal, and they will use any methods to get there.

The OPA road to fascism has already been used in the building industry. There OPA strangled production and created a chaotic situation. Rigid regimentation has followed, with the veterans being used as a shield for the planners.

How OPA is discouraging business was brought out by Ralph Flanders of CED, who testified:

I do not think that business can live with price control in its present form for another year.

Accordingly, suppose conservatives participate in the extension of OPA, as is, for another year? It would seem then that the radicals have been given the necessary time to replace American free enterprise with economic fascism, prelude to all-out totalitarianism.

In following alternative No. 2, the conservatives could wind up as passive participants in a scheme where free enterprise was condemned without a trial.

EFFECTIVE AMENDMENTS CREATE HAZARDS

Alternative No. 3 of the conservative majority is to get amendments to OPA that would direct this agency to abandon the myriad of regulations, restrictions, and profit squeezes that block full production.

On the surface this procedure looks very attractive, both for the Republican Party and for the Nation. Obviously full production is what the country desperately needs, and is vital to reconversion. An amendment to make the OPA workable, yet giving the agency time to taper off its activities, seems the sound and sensible way to end this economic narcotic.

This course also presents dangers. Any effective move to secure full production involves some price increases, especially now that the price line has been broken by the President. These will come at a time when many people already are battered from the steadily increasing cost of living despite OPA attempts at concealment. What could be sweeter for the radicals than to have these higher prices coincide with substantial changes in the OPA?

Quickly the radio waves would be deluged with their cunning ballyhoo to this effect: "We were holding prices down, but Congress—particularly the Republican minority—passed crippling amendments, and now, like we told you, prices are higher." This inflammatory propaganda, to a people already badly hurt by rising prices, would constitute a seductive appeal.

So necessary changes in OPA, simultaneous with advances in legal prices, could give Bowles and the OPA radicals behind the scenes both the alibi and the scapegoat they have long been seeking.

Furthermore, regardless of amendment, the OPA chiefs can thwart the will of Congress in their day-to-day administration of the act. No matter how well we spell out amendments, they can twist them to their own purpose. Such flouting of congressional intent is not a new trick. It could be cleverly fitted in with other tactics.

That sums up alternative No. 3.

THIS DILEMMA LONG IN THE MAKING

Sensing the day when the New Dealers would find their chance to transfer the blame for their wild inflationary spending, I made a suggestion in the RECORD on May 2, 1945:

The responsibility for this strain and peril to the public credit rests on the New Deal administration. However, as these difficulties eventually become critical, it is probable that clever efforts will be made to shift responsibility for this financial Frankenstein away from the New Deal that nursed it to its present terrifying proportions.

With the propaganda machinery already in the hands of the Government, plus the dominated radio and movie, it is possible such an attempt to evade and shift responsibility could be effectively made. It behooves all lovers of liberty to be watching for its appearance.

The administration borrowed and spent the money. Those acts created the existing concealed inflation, and in the final outcome the administration must be held accountable by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, just as the New Deal copied its price-control and food-subsidy scheme from the Roman Empire, so may another Roman scheme be used. In the historical novel, Quo Vadis, it tells how Rome was burned at the command of Nero. After the fire Nero attempted to shift the blame.

He was looking for a victim who might really satisfy the people's anger, and he found him.

"Tigellinus," said he after a while, "it was thou who didst burn Rome." * * * The face of Tigellinus was wrinkled, like the lips of a dog about to bite.

"I burnt Rome at thy command," said he.

But after some discussion, Tigellinus hit upon a scheme and presented it to Nero.

"Listen, O Caesar, for I can say: 'I have found.' The people want vengeance; they want not one victim, but hundreds, thousands. Hast heard, lord, who Christos was, He who was crucified by Pontius Pilate? And knowest thou who the Christians are? Have I not told thee of their crimes and foul ceremonies, of their predictions that fire would cause the end of the world? People hate and suspect them. * * * The people suspect thee; let their suspicion turn in another direction."

Can the radicals, by modern propaganda, similarly transfer the blame for inflation?

The possibility seems remote, but perhaps not to anyone who has studied the fearful consequences of long-continued deficit spending in other lands. When the humble people learn what inflationary spending has done to their savings, their indignation may hardly know any bounds.

PROPAGANDA EXPERTS IN KEY POSITIONS

Is it just an accident that at this moment Chester Bowles, recognized as a master propagandist, and Paul Porter, likewise a propaganda wizard, hold the key positions, where they can command the most effective avenues of communication to the people? Neither of these men

are economists or have production experience for the jobs they hold. But they are wizards at fooling the people and mass deception.

It would seem that Republicans and conservative Democrats are now or later "between the devil and the deep blue sea" on OPA.

Likewise, sober analysis of this problem discloses the fearful responsibility resting on the Members of this Congress. No matter which alternative is chosen, we face trying times. The already-created inflation by wasteful spending means that either higher prices and/or ruthless regimentation are ahead.

The gravity of this situation can be appreciated only when one comprehends the economic illiteracy prevailing on the cause and cure for inflation.

The economic confusion of many sincere and well-intentioned people in and out of Government seems pathetic. Keenly aware of the disastrous effects of inflation, they fail utterly to grasp its causes. So they continue indifferent to deficit spending because of the false notion that price control can stop inflation. According to Rauschnigg, in the Voice of Destruction, Hitler suffered from the same delusion.

Nevertheless, they are in seemingly august company. Apparently the President does not realize that the basic cause of inflation is the past and prospective increase in the country's money supply. Nor do his actions indicate that he understands that the problem of inflation cannot be solved until there is a return to balanced budgets and an end to the creation of more inflationary money.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that this blunt analysis overstates the dangers. In any event, getting all aspects of this problem out in the open may be helpful and salutary.

I have tried to summarize the problem. In this crisis, no genuine patriot is interested in casting a political vote. Which alternative is the right way to preserve righteousness, justice, opportunity, and free enterprise in America?

Address by Senator Mead on Grover Cleveland Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at a Grover Cleveland Day dinner at Buffalo, N. Y., on Saturday, April 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

It is a source of genuine satisfaction to me to participate in this program with our distinguished and beloved citizen, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. In her own right and by virtue of her own character and her high public service, she has won the respect and the gratitude of the American people. The former First Lady of our land has in fact become the First Lady of all lands.

GROVER CLEVELAND

It is fitting and it is wise that we Americans, regardless of party affiliation, pause to pay tribute to an outstanding statesman and to a great President, whose memory we honor today—Grover Cleveland. From his deep devotion to public service we can all draw inspiration. He set for himself, as he set for future Presidents, a lofty standard to which he adhered with fidelity and courage. When he declared that public office was a public trust, he meant it and exemplified it in all of his official actions as mayor of this city, as Governor of this State, and later as President of the United States. His stature has grown with the passing of years.

THE REPUBLICANS BROUGHT THE NATION TO THE BRINK OF DISASTER

Thanks to the sound and constructive work of the Democratic administration during the last 13 years, our country is headed for one of the greatest periods of prosperity in its history. In spite of the difficulties occasioned by reconversion from total war to peace, there is no unemployment, the national income is high, the Nation's production is large, and the stage is all set for a long period of prosperity and progress, for higher standards for our people.

To fully appreciate what all this means we must look backward to 1932. The country then was on the verge of bankruptcy; when President Roosevelt was inaugurated in 1933, there were 15,000,000 unemployed; thousands of banks failed; agriculture was in the depths of depression; foreign trade had shrunk to a vanishing point. Fear, born of three long years of terrible depression, paralyzed the Nation's will to action. This was the state of the Union which followed 12 years of Republican misrule, displaying lack of leadership, lack of vision, and lack of courage.

THE NEW DEAL

The Democratic Party was not content merely to restore business and trade to normal levels. Under the inspired leadership of a great humanitarian, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic administration strove to bring to American life a full measure of equity to all classes including the forgotten man.

As another great leader, Gov. Al Smith, used to say: "Let's look at the record." And that we can do with pride born of party accomplishments.

1. Agriculture was given a new lease on life. Legislation was enacted which guaranteed the farmer a fair price on farm products.

2. The workers of the Nation were guaranteed by law the right of collective bargaining. This magna carta for labor contributed substantially in raising the standard of living of our organized workers.

3. For the less fortunate; for those unable to use the weapon of collective bargaining, the Democratic Party enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act which guaranteed a minimum wage through the land.

4. By the enactment of a Nation-wide system of unemployment insurance 30,000,000 workers are now protected against the loss of earning power due to unemployment.

5. By the enactment of the Social Security Act some 40,000,000 are now given a measure of security in old age.

6. The first steps have been taken to improve the health of the Nation.

This partial and brief recital of the humanitarian accomplishments of the New Deal is sufficient to indicate that our party was concerned not alone with property rights but with human rights and with the dignity of the individual regardless of race, of creed, or color. This is in keeping with the long-time tradition of our party from Jackson through Cleveland, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt down to our present Chief Executive, President Harry Truman.

INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AND PEACE

The Democratic Party's march of progress was not confined by our own national boundaries.

1. International trade agreements, engineered by an able Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, leveled many of the trade barriers which had been erected by the Republican administration through abnormally high tariff walls.

2. The good-neighbor policy adopted toward the Central and South American countries has produced an unexcelled spirit of unity in the Western Hemisphere.

3. Anticipating the disastrous effects of the war our Nation, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, was primarily responsible for the creation of an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank. These two institutions now approved by the majority of the nations of the world will go far to facilitate, to encourage, and to promote the expansion of trade and commerce throughout the world.

4. Peace: For centuries mankind has dreamed of a world at peace. Woodrow Wilson tried with all his might to create an international machinery to make this dream a reality. The failure of the League of Nations was due in no small measure to the isolationist opposition within the Republican Party which prevented us from joining the League.

Once again a Democratic President, Franklin Roosevelt, became the architect of an inspiring structure, the United Nations Organization, by which the nations of the world might live in peace. President Truman has expressed not only his great faith in the United Nations Organization, but his determination to have it succeed insofar as our cooperation can make it work successfully.

WE HAVE PRESERVED THE AMERICAN PATTERN

In many foreign countries drastic changes in government have come about in the last two decades through violent revolutions. In the depth of the depression during the Hoover administration, there were those who predicted that revolutionary upheavals would occur here.

It is a significant fact—never to be forgotten—that the American pattern of economic and political life has remained intact; that these social and economic reforms were accomplished in an orderly way, during the last 13 years. We conducted one of the greatest wars in history without in the least disturbing the basic fabric of our political life. We are reconverting to peacetime prosperity in the same orderly, democratic fashion.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY HAS A FORWARD-LOOKING PROGRAM

Our party takes justifiable pride in its brilliant record of achievements in the domestic and in the international fields, but it is not content to rest on its laurels. We know there is much more work to be done; we know there is room for further improvement.

Our present standard bearer, President Truman, has pledged himself to preserve the reforms instituted by the Roosevelt administration; more than that he has given the country a comprehensive program on which the Nation can and should go forward. In his message to Congress last January, our Chief Executive outlined in great detail a complete program—a platform of specific reforms that need to be achieved. He has served notice that he will battle vigorously for his program for the general welfare of our country.

He will put into effect the principles embodied in the Full Employment Act which he

signed in February. Under this law he will exercise the powers and the resources of the Government to stimulate business activity to the end that there will be a minimum of unemployment.

He will continue to urge the enactment of a more liberalized unemployment insurance law by which larger weekly benefits will be paid for a longer period.

He insists that the benefits of unemployment insurance be extended to those groups in society that are not now covered under existing law.

He is still battling for the enactment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Act to protect all Americans against discrimination in earning their livelihood.

He insists on raising minimum wages to a higher level as a means of raising the standard of living of the lowest paid workers.

The President's program includes a comprehensive bill which provides for adequate health and medical care to every member of our society. He insists that our Social Security Act should be extended to cover 20,000,000 people not now covered and to liberalize the benefits paid under the Security Act.

His program aims to protect the Nation against inflation. He favors the extension of our Price Control Act to protect the purchasing power of the workers and the savings of the American people.

His program includes legislation for a national housing program to provide adequate shelter for all of our citizens.

His program calls for the enactment of emergency legislation designed to provide housing for veterans.

This is but a partial list of the measures advocated by President Truman and which form a basis for the Democratic platform for future action. These are not glittering generalities; these are concrete, specific proposals, each designed to strengthen the economic and the social structure of our American life.

WHAT DO THE REPUBLICANS OFFER THE AMERICAN VOTERS?

During the last 13 years the Republican record has been one of obstruction and isolationism. On the domestic front the Republican Party vainly attempted to thwart the enactment of the New Deal program. In the international field they have consistently adhered to the policy of isolationism of two decades ago. Their past record has been one of negation and futile obstruction.

And what does the Republican Party offer the voter of the future? It has no positive program except a reversion to old-fashioned reaction. The Republican Party is still looking to the past in contrast to the forward look of our party. You don't have to take my word for it. Listen to what a liberal-minded Republican Senator from the State of Oregon has said: "Senator TAFT, in his radio tirade against bipartisan sponsored progressive legislation demonstrated in a frightening manner why the common men and women of America cannot look to the reactionary Republicans who are seeking to control the Republican Party, to protect and improve their standard of living." Those strong and truthful words came not from a Democrat but a Republican United States Senator.

Make no mistake about it: the Republican Party is still in the grip of the Old Guard. The elected Representatives in Congress of this Old Guard have offered nothing constructive since they were driven from power in 1932. They offer the American people only opposition and obstruction. In lieu of a constructive program they offer only platitudes. The proof of their bankruptcy is found in the joint party statement released by the Republican group in Chicago recently. They have no concrete, no practical, no workable program. Faced by the most tremendous problems in our history, a Republican leader recently declared that what this country needs is merely "Old-fashioned conservatism."

A few days ago the Republican Party elected a new leader of the National Republican Committee, Congressman REECE of Tennessee. His voting record in Congress is a gage of what you may expect of the Republican Party.

He voted against revision of the Neutrality Act (1939), conscription (1940), lend-lease (1941), the Price Control Act (1942), extension of price control (1944).

He voted for the arms embargo (1939), drastic antiunion legislation (1941), return of employment service to the States (1946), overriding of the antisubsidy veto (1944).

Surely here is a record of obstruction and isolationism, and is a true measure of what the voters may expect from the Republican Party. Is it any wonder that the progressive thinkers in the Republican ranks like Governor Stassen and Senator MORSE, of Oregon, are far from enthusiastic over the election of their new chairman?

1946: HOUR OF DECISION

This is indeed a year of decision, as President Truman has warned us. Momentous events are in the making. We are at the crossroads. The decisions we make this year will determine not only the future destiny of our own Nation, but of civilization itself.

We have it in our hands to go forward as the most powerful and progressive nation in the world; or to go backward as we unfortunately did under the Republican administrations following the last war. The Republican slogan today is "Back to old-fashioned conservatism." This is but another name for reaction and retrogression. This is but another name for "back to normalcy."

No, my friends, we cannot turn backward. We must march forward on the highroad of progress to higher living standards with the Democratic Party.

I am confident the voters this fall will give President Truman a Democratic Congress to carry out the New Deal program in behalf of the common people. This will be done in the true tradition of our former leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Termites in the Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Termites in the Housing Program," published in Business Week for March 30, 1946. It seems to me that this article reveals some of the things which prevent us from getting the housing which we claim we want to give to the veterans. After all is said and done, the important thing is to get the houses for the veterans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERMITES IN THE HOUSING PROGRAM

By adopting what has become a standard Washington propaganda technique and labeling his national housing program The veterans' emergency housing program, Wilson W. Wyatt has placed those who criticize it in the uncomfortable position of being misunderstood as in favor of having our war heroes and their families sleep in the park. However, along with substantial virtues, the Wyatt program has so many and such dangerous weaknesses, perhaps particularly from the veterans' point of view, that it seems worth while to run any risk of misunderstanding involved in pointing them out and urging most careful consideration of them.

Among the biggest but by no means the only bugs in the Wyatt program we would list the following:

1. So far as it is directed to the housing needs of veterans (that is only a part of the program), it is designed primarily to sell them a high-cost house, thus saddling them with a financial burden, instead of providing them with good housing and leaving them relatively footloose financially while they are making their postwar adjustments.

2. When coupled with the top priority given to it, the high and indeed impossible goals set for new housing give every promise of blocking industrial production which will be needed to keep the economy going full steam ahead.

3. The program unnecessarily adds a lot of fuel to the inflationary fires now menacing the Nation.

The biggest single part of the Wyatt program is designed to build and sell new houses of a conventional type at about $6,000 each, largely to veterans. The $6,000 price is set primarily on the ground that veterans usually cannot afford more. The fact is, however, that many of them and perhaps most of them should not be buying a house at all at this juncture, but renting a place until they get satisfactorily settled in their postwar careers. This seems particularly true since, although they are designed to cost only $6,000, the houses will be built on a high-cost basis which will make them a dubious investment and one which, once veterans in the mass are encouraged to make it, may well keep the Federal Government in the business of bolstering up veterans' real-estate prices indefinitely.

But is there any alternative? Certainly there is. Major emphasis could be placed upon more effective use of existing housing, both by conversions which would make it possible to accommodate more families comfortably, and by more effective use of existing vacancies. There are over 2,000,000 vacant dwellings in the United States at the moment, many of which could be utilized to relieve the housing shortage if a major drive were made to do so. Many other dwellings could be rather easily remodeled to provide relatively satisfactory emergency quarters for more families, and with far less use of critical materials per family accommodated than the Wyatt program contemplates. Here is how a program emphasizing emergency housing, as opposed to the high-cost permanent housing stressed by the Wyatt program, would look:

	Feasible emergency program	Wyatt program for 1946
Conventional homes	450,000	650,000
Prefabs	150,000	250,000
Temporary reuse war housing	200,000	200,000
Trailers	50,000	50,000
Conversions	200,000	50,000
Use of existing vacancies	600,000	300,000
Total	1,650,000	1,500,000

By concentrating on conversions and use of existing vacancies, the probability that the Wyatt program will cripple crucially important industrial construction could be largely eliminated. As matters stand the goals set for new housing are so high that, given the overriding priority sought for construction of dwellings, they promise to force a cut from a half to two-thirds in industrial

construction in the second half of 1946. There is no reason to believe that industrial construction can stand any such cut without greatly increasing what is already an alarming crop of industrial bottlenecks.

Because they make it possible to buy something and postpone paying for most of it, the 90-percent-mortgage loans which the Wyatt program contemplates would add greatly to present inflationary pressure. Except for the fact that too many new houses are planned, however, that is more or less inevitable. But it is not inevitable that we build up inflationary pressure by subsidizing the production of building materials as Wyatt wants to do, thus adding to the already excessive volume of purchasing power available. The only thing the subsidy would surely accomplish is to aggravate the already great danger of a runaway inflation.

The Wyatt program has good points, many of them. It is aggressive. It gives a needed, if excessing, right-of-way for housing. It places a wholesome if too optimistic emphasis on prefabrication. Its provision for local committees to expedite housing and particularly to try to eliminate archaic and costly building restrictions is all to the good. These and many other aspects of the program will be illuminated by a special Housing Outlook in the next (April 6) issue of Business Week. But it can be made a vastly better program than it now is. We have hit only a few of the high places in showing how.

Poland and the Mythical Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the signers of the mythical Atlantic Charter proclaimed to the world that they "respected the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

All the members of the United Nations later dedicated themselves to the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter. That included Poland and Russia, Great Britain and ourselves and all the rest.

What has been done to apply these principles to the fate of Poland? Absolutely nothing.

Instead the so-called Big Three meeting in secret at Yalta, brushed these resolutions aside and proceeded to again partition unhappy Poland.

A year later the people of this country and of the world were permitted to know some of the secret deals that were made at Yalta. It is rumored that still others are yet to be released.

It has been said that an iron curtain has descended across the continent of Europe, blotting out any news of unhappy Poland and other peoples in the Soviet sphere of influence and control.

Kingsbury Smith, European general manager of International News Service, recently made a visit behind that iron curtain. He accompanied former President Herbert Hoover on his mission to bring bread to the starving millions.

Mr. Smith has written his eyewitness account of the terrible conditions he found in Poland. This story gives a graphic picture of the extent to which the New Deal administration here in Washington has sold out the people of Poland in the secret deals of Yalta and Potsdam.

Mr. Smith's story appeared in the April 6, 1946, issue of the South Bend Tribune. It follows:

LONDON, April 6.—Poland appears today to be an armed camp with Soviet forces maintaining a virtual military protectorate over the country. This is the outstanding impression gained in a flying trip behind the iron curtain into one of the most tragic countries in Europe.

Battered and beaten during the war with its historic capital still in ruins and 5,000,000 of its people killed, the one shining light in this land of distress is the flame of national pride which burns more fiercely than ever in the hearts of its destitute people. This will to love national pride, perhaps not wisely but too well, makes people cling to the heap of rubble that is Warsaw instead of building a new capital elsewhere. It is also one of the factors considered responsible for Russia's action in maintaining strong armed forces in the country.

UNDERGROUND STRONG

The political underground, estimated by authoritative foreign observers at 40,000 strong, is composed mainly of Polish nationalists who resent having their country hitched to the red star and bitterly oppose Soviet annexation of Poland's prewar eastern territories.

This underground, which President Boleslaw Bierut charged at a news conference of foreign correspondents recently is financed and directed by General Anders' army in Italy, is so active that foreign observers believe it would precipitate a revolution were it not for the presence of Soviet forces in Poland.

Despite the strong military control maintained over the country, foreign observers claim there have been 2,000 political murders in Poland during the last 6 months. Official government figures give Polish security force losses during that period at 1,410 killed, 1,400 wounded, and 989 captured.

FIND FOREIGN CURRENCY

"The terrorism is directed by the underground," President Beirut told correspondents. "Without considerable help from abroad this underground would be unable to function. We have found considerable sums of foreign currency among underground members and there is definite evidence of a link between them and Anders' army."

This is the situation which gives Poland the appearance of an armed camp. Regular army soldiers with tommyguns resting on their chests stand ready for instant action and patrol the main thoroughfares of Warsaw day and night. All traffic is directed by men and women soldiers with rifles slung over their shoulders. The palaces of the President and Prime Minister resemble military field headquarters in wartime. Red army troops, some carrying tommyguns, also can be seen daily in the main streets of Warsaw.

FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND SOVIET FORCES

Foreign observers conservatively estimate Soviet forces in Poland at 400,000. Although President Beirut has described as lies foreign reports that Poland is not independent but is under Russian rule, he confessed he does not know the number of Soviet troops in Poland.

"There are certainly fewer Russian troops in Poland than there are American and British troops in France and Belgium," he declared. Asked how many Anglo-American troops he thought were still in France and Belgium, he replied, "My statement was based on what travelers have told me. I do not know how many Soviet troops there are in Poland, or how many Americans and British there are in France and Belgium."

The Government admits the Soviets occupy 300,000 acres of land in new Poland to sustain occupation troops. President Beirut said the Russians are in Poland to guard Russian communications westward, but foreign observers in Warsaw said Soviet garrisons exist in almost every provincial town, even those far off from the lines of communications and many soldiers in Polish uniforms do not speak Polish, but Russian.

The explanation of the situation, in the opinion of foreign diplomatic sources in Warsaw is that Poland, as a gateway to the invasion of Russia from the west, constitutes the key pawn in the Soviet system of borderline security and Miscow is determined that it shall remain a friendly neighbor.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on the subject of veterans' affairs, at Walter Reed Hospital on March 21, 1946:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish first to express my sincere appreciation for your courtesy in permitting me to come out here this afternoon and discuss briefly the subject of veterans' affairs.

Frankly, I came well fortified because I anticipated that you fellows may ask me some questions which I would not be able to answer, so I brought along three of your comrades—Millard Rice, national service director of the DAV, who is the dean of veterans organization representatives here in Washington; Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative director of the VFW; and Guy H. Birdsall, Assistant Administrator in Charge of Legislation for the Veterans' Administration. I am quite sure that in the field of veterans' affairs, you won't be able to ask any questions this afternoon that these three fellows won't be able to answer.

I was in Detroit when your invitation was extended, but was informed that I was to discuss veterans' affairs. I am of the opinion that the subject can best be presented by giving a little historical background as to veterans' benefits in this country. You see, I am a builder by profession and I believe in starting with the foundation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Besides the ordinary pay, clothing, and rations provided as a compensation for military and naval service, on the principle of wages or monthly stipend, the gratitude of nations for the sacrifices of their armed defenders has found expression through the provision of other remunerations for the casualties of wounds and disabilities, for the care of widows and orphans, and as an encouragement for extra protection, which provisions have come to be known as pensions. Sometimes the threatened peace of people has prompted legislative enactment of pensions made by promissory resolves, in anticipation of contingencies on which based, by way of encouraging the enterprise of enlistments, continued service, and personal daring.

In the pre-Revolutionary War period the peace of the Colonies was frequently disturbed by Indian uprisings and intercolonial

wars, and colonial legislation affords many instances of relief of wounded and maimed soldiers. Probably the first pension law passed in America was in 1636, when the Pilgrims at Plymouth enacted in their courts that any man who should be sent forth as a soldier and returned maimed, should be maintained competently by the Colony during his life.

In 1676, regular meetings in "Boston toune house" were held by a standing committee of the General Court of Massachusetts Bay Colony to hear applications of wounded soldiers for relief. After the union of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay Colonies under the charter of 1691, the Province continued to make provision for the relief of disabled soldiers out of the public treasury.

A disability pension law was passed by the Virginia Assembly in 1644, and later this Colony made provision for the relief of the indigent families of soldiers who should be slain. In the colonial statutes of Maryland and New York similar acts are found. Rhode Island in 1718 enacted a pension law providing an annual pension for disabled soldiers, and for the wife, children, parents, or other relatives of one slain in the Colony's military service, so long as these relatives were unable to provide for themselves. Other instances of colonial pension legislation might be cited but the above shows that the practice of pensioning soldiers prevailed in the Colonies for over a century before the Revolutionary War.

EARLY PENSION LEGISLATION

Within a few weeks after the signing of the Declaration of Independence the Continental Congress passed resolutions promising pensions to soldiers and seamen who might be disabled in the Revolutionary War. These resolutions were shortly followed by others containing further promises of pay and gratuities inaugurating, at least by anticipation, a system of pensions and veterans' relief which has been fostered and expanded from year to year by the National Congress.

The earliest pension acts of 1789 and 1790 did not specify any procedure for the administration of the pension system, other than to provide that the pensions granted should be continued under such regulations as the President might direct. Accordingly, the President issued instructions placing the administration of these laws under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War, although Congress still retained control of the actual allowance of claims.

Under the general pension law of 1792 the duty of examining and allowing pension claims was imposed upon the United States circuit courts, with the requirement that they should report their actions to the Secretary of War. The judges unanimously denied the power of Congress to impose such duties upon the judiciary, and the Congress finally yielded by enacting the law of February 8, 1793, providing new regulations as to procedure. Under these new regulations the judges of the United States district courts, or commissioners appointed by them, received the evidence in the claims and submitted it to the Secretary of War, who then placed the individual claims before Congress for action, the latter having reserved the power of final action in the allowance of claims.

ADMINISTRATION OF PENSION LAWS

In 1803, however, a new pension law was enacted which endowed the Secretary of War with the power of final decision in the allowance of claims. In 1828 the administration of the law granting pensions to Revolutionary War survivors was placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, but it was, in 1835, transferred to the Secretary of War. It appears that from about 1799 to 1832 pensions were also paid from the Navy pension fund, which was administered by a commission composed of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War; but, in 1832, the management of this fund passed into the hands of the Secretary of the Navy.

On March 2, 1833, a law was enacted providing for the appointment until the expiration of the next Congress of a Commissioner of Pensions, "to execute, under the direction of the Secretary of War, such duties in relation to the various pension laws, as may be prescribed by the President of the United States." Subsequent legislation continued the office from time to time until, under the act of January 19, 1849, the office was given a permanent status. In the meantime that part of the pension business which had been transacted in the Navy Department was transferred to the office of the Commissioner of Pensions, and the commissioner was directed to "execute, under the direction of the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, such duties in relation to the various pension laws as may be prescribed by the President."

With the establishment of the Interior Department in 1849, the Bureau of Pensions became a part of that Department, and the Secretary of the Interior was given supervisory and appellate power over the acts of the Commissioner of Pensions. The Bureau remained in this same legal status until, by Executive order of the President of July 21, 1930, in conformity with the act of July 3, 1930, it was transferred to and made a part of the newly created independent organization known as the Veterans' Administration under the control of an Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The invalid pension system thus adopted by the earlier acts and later known as disability pension has been subject to various changes in the rates payable. Pension was first awarded for certain disabilities and in the amount adequate for support not to exceed one-half pay. The act of June 5, 1785, provided for the rate to increase with the degree of disability, as low as $1.66⅔ per month and not to exceed one-half pay in the case of officers and not to exceed $5 for privates. The acts of January 11, 1812, and August 2, 1813, provided for rates as low as $20 per annum determined by nature and degree of disability from pensioned cause and considering rank of soldier; officers' rate not to exceed one-half pay of lieutenant colonel; privates not to exceed $5 per month. Subsequently the act of July 14, 1862, fixed the rate for total disability ranging from $8 for enlisted men to $30 for lieutenant colonel and higher ranks. Later amendments established certain specific rates for certain grades of disabilities, the maximum rate being $125 per month.

The rates originally allowed for service-connected disability by the several acts have been markedly increased by subsequent legislation and the element of rank as a factor in pension legislation was removed. Now a war veteran may receive rates ranging from $11.50 to $115 per month depending upon the degree of disability, with specific rates for the more severe disabling conditions ranging as high as $300 a month. Peacetime rates are approximately 75 percent of the wartime rates.

Widows and children of veterans of various wars likewise have been granted pensions. The first national pension law for the benefit of widows and orphans was the resolution of August 24, 1780, but limited to widows of officers. The rate now provided for a widow where the veteran's death was service connected is $50 a month with additional amounts for a child or children ($38 peacetime service). Dependent parents are included in the pension legislation subject to certain conditions.

Pensions for a disability not connected with service were first provided by the act of March 18, 1818, for Revolutionary War service; $20 a month during life for commissioned officers, and $8 a month for others during life. The rates were changed by the act of June 7, 1832, ranging from $20 to $600 a year and were not increased by subsequent legislation for Revolutionary War service.

Service-pension laws have been passed for service in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, Indian Wars, and the Civil War. The act of June 5, 1920, was the first service pension law for veterans based upon service in the War with Spain, Philippine Insurrection, or China Relief Expedition.

The pertinent historical background to legislation providing monetary benefits for veterans of the World War suffering with non-service-connected disabilities is as follows: Under the amendment of July 3, 1930, to the World War Veterans' Act of June 7, 1924, disability allowance was provided for veterans of the First World War suffering from 25 percent or more permanent disability not acquired in service during that war, the monthly rates being $12, $18, $24, and $40 for permanent disability 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent, and total in degree, respectively. This law was repealed by Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933. Veterans Regulation No. 1, promulgated under that act, authorized payment of pension for total permanent non-service-connected disability for veterans of World War I and the Spanish American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion, but made no provision for permanent non-service-connected disability less than total in degree. The pension was originally in the amount of $20 per month under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1, dated March 31, 1933, but was increased to $30 per month by Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), dated June 6, 1933, and continued at that rate until June 10, 1942, when under Public Law 601, Seventy-seventh Congress, the rate was increased to $40 per month. Under Public Law 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, amending paragraph I (f), part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, the $40 rate was increased to $50, except that where the eligible veteran shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled, pension is payable at the rate of $60 per month Veterans of World War II receive the same rates.

Widows and children of veterans whose death was not due to a service-connected disability may be paid pension. The amounts for widows is based upon age for the earlier wars. For World War I and World War II service the amount for widows is $35 a month with additional allowance for a child or children. This pension is subject to the income limitations.

No provisions are made for dependent parents for non-service-connected death.

BOUNTY LANDS

Another form of relief or reward for service with the armed forces of the United States was the issuing of warrants for land, known as bounty-land warrants. The earliest grants of this kind were for services in the Revolutionary War. The Continental Congress by its act of August 14, 1776, held out the reward of land bounties to the foreigners and dissatisfied in the ranks of the enemy in our Revolutionary struggle to make joint cause with us. By such legislation varying quantities of land were granted to those entitled.

It is interesting to note that the first bounty-land law—that of August 14, 1776—was passed as an inducement to Hessians and other foreigners to desert the British Army and become citizens of one of the States.

Later laws—those of April 23, 1783, and April 7, 1798—contemplated the granting of land rights to refugees from Canada and Nova Scotia.

Between September 16, 1776, and March 3, 1855, a number of bounty-land acts were passed, providing gifts of land to men (or their legal heirs) who had rendered service

in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, and the Mexican War, and Indian Wars.

Bounty-land warrants aggregating 160 acres have been issued to the following prominent men: Abraham Lincoln, service in Black Hawk Indian War in 1832; Jefferson Davis, service in Mexican War; U. S. Grant, service in Mexican War; Robert E. Lee, service in Mexican War; William T. Sherman, service in Seminole Indian and Mexican wars; David G. Farragut, service in War of 1812 and Mexican War; Winfield Scott, service in Mexican War; Philip H. Sheridan, service in Indian War in 1853.

LONGEVITY OF PENSIONERS

Inasmuch as I have given you some of the historical background of our early pension system, I think this little bit of information will be of interest to you, also. It has often been stated by those engaged in the selling of life insurance that persons with established incomes generally live longer than others. This fact is borne out by the pension rolls.

The Revolutionary War lasted from April 19, 1775, to April 11, 1783. The last Revolutionary War veteran to receive a pension was Daniel Frederick Bakeman, who died April 5, 1869, at Fredonia, N. Y., aged 109 years 6 months and 8 days. At the time of his death, he was receiving pension at the rate of $500 per annum under provisions of a special act of Congress approved February 22, 1867. The last widow of a Revolutionary War soldier to receive a pension was Mrs. Esther S. Damon, of Plymouth Union, Vt., who died November 11, 1906, aged 92 years. The last daughter of a Revolutionary War soldier to receive a pension died April 25, 1911. I have heard reports that there are real daughters of Revolutionary War soldiers still living. In fact, it was only last year that I held hearings on a bill that had for its purpose the pensioning of a son of a Revolutionary War soldier, who lived down in South Carolina.

The War of 1812 covered the period from June 18, 1812, to February 17, 1815. The last survivor of that war to receive a pension was Hiram Cronk, of Ava, N. Y., who died May 13, 1905, aged 105 years and 16 days. He was in receipt of pension at the rate of $25 per month at the time of his death under the provisions of a special act of Congress approved March 11, 1902.

We paid a pension for service rendered during the War of 1812, until a few days ago, although it ended more than 131 years ago. Esther Ann Hill Morgan, of Independence, Oreg., received a pension based upon service rendered by her father under the provisions of a special act of Congress approved February 17, 1927, until her death March 12, 1946, when she was approximately 90 years of age.

The Mexican War covered a period from April 24, 1846, to May 30, 1848, and the last veteran of that war to receive a pension was Owen Thomas Edgar, who died here in Washington at the John Dickson Home on September 3, 1929. He was born on June 17, 1831, and his service during the Mexican War was in the United States Navy. We still are paying pensions to widows whose husbands served during the period of the Mexican War.

It goes without saying, that we still have on the pension rolls, veterans of the Civil War, Indian war, Spanish war, and campaigns and expeditions of other wars since that time, as well as dependents of those who rendered such service.

BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, EX-SERVICEMEN, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

I have for many years been intensely interested in legislation that would be beneficial to the members of our armed forces, our veterans, and their dependents. For more than 10 years I served as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives. This committee has broad legislative jurisdiction—in fact, the broadest of any pension committee in either the House or Senate. It has exclusive jurisdiction, under the rules of the House of Representatives, over both private and public bills predicated upon service rendered in our armed forces for all of the wars of the United States and peacetime service, other than the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and World War. It is also 1 of the 11 committees of the House that has the right under the rules to report on general legislation under its jurisdiction, and this right carries with it the privilege of immediate consideration by the House.

It was obvious to me for many months prior to World War II that the conflict was inevitable. In fact, shortly after the *Panay* incident in the Chinese-Japanese war, the Committee on Invalid Pensions began a study relative to payment of pensions to those who were disabled during active service in our armed forces under conditions simulating war. As this study progressed, the *Reuben James* and the *Greer* were destroyed by the so-called shooting war on the Atlantic prior to our entry into World War II. The committee studies covered a period of more than 1 year and, as a result thereof, the committee sponsored, and I introduced, and the House passed, the following day after our Government declared war on the Axis, a pension bill, now known as Public Law 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, which was approved by the President on December 19, 1941. This was the first pension law for our veterans of World War II and their dependents.

It has several times pointedly come to my attention that benefits intended by Congress for servicemen, ex-servicemen, and their dependents are frequently not received by them—generally, I believe, because of the failure of potential beneficiaries to know what they are entitled to, and under what circumstances.

The technical language as to the many laws pertaining to those serving actively in our Nation's armed forces, or to those who have so served, and to their dependents, is very confusing.

It is very difficult for one to keep in his mind all of the legislation that would be beneficial to him. In fact, not all of the laws are applicable to all of the veterans, in fact, most of them are applicable to only certain groups and under certain conditions.

You fellows are mostly interested in laws predicated upon service rendered in World War II. In order to benefit under some law predicated upon service in this War, a veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war. For others the official beginning date of the war is applied that is December 7, 1941. You must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable. A veteran having a 10 percent or more disability resulting from disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by war service, will if his application is approved, receive monetary benefits from $11.50 to $115 per month for total disability. The law also provides additional monetary benefits for specific disabilities.

Eligibility for pensions for nonservice-connected disabilities requires discharge under conditions other than dishonorable and 90 days wartime service—or if period of service was less than 90 days, have been discharged for disability incurred in service in the line of duty. The disability must be permanently and totally disabling and not due to the veterans' own willful misconduct.

Any single veteran with an annual income of over $1,000, or any married veteran—or with dependent minor children—with an annual income over $2,500, is ineligible for nonservice-connected disability pensions. This pension is $50 per month and is increased to $60 upon 10 years of continuous, permanent total disability or upon reaching the age of 65.

INSURANCE

Service personnel are eligible for the cheapest and best life insurance attainable—the national service life insurance. This is term insurance for 8 years, convertible into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policies.

Insurance that has lapsed may be reinstated by the veteran, either within 6 months after date of separation from active service, or within 3 months after date of lapse, whichever is later, by payment of only 2 monthly premiums without interest.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

LOANS

Veterans have up to 10 years after official end of the war in which to make application for guaranty or insurance of a loan at no more than 4 percent interest. These loans are automatically guaranteed if made in accordance with the provisions of the act and if the amount does not exceed the appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, with the Government guaranteeing 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business-loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent. Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm-realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction. Loans may be made for all ordinary farming purchases, and any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Special provisions have been enacted by Congress for the tax benefit of veterans. These benefits include (a) $1,500 of active-service pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year 1943 and until the termination of the present war is proclaimed; (b) mustering-out pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year of 1944 and later years.

JOBS

1. Employment placement and assistance: The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment. This assistance includes employment counseling.

2. Employment preference: Preference in job referrals through the United States Employment Service is available to veterans under regulations adopted by the Veterans' Placement Service Board, carrying out the direction of the GI bill of rights that the veteran receive "the maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment."

3. Civil-service preference: Veterans with service-connected disabilities or in receipt of pensions, disability-retirement benefits, or compensation from the Federal Government, receive an additional 10 points on their civil-service examination ratings.

A five-point preference is allowed to war veterans not disabled.

These preferences will place veterans' names above all other names on the civil-service list except for professional or scientific positions paying over $3,000 a year.

4. Restoration to former Federal job: A veteran who held a permanent, probational, or probational-indefinite civil-service job when called to active service with the armed forces is entitled to mandatory reemployment in his former position, or one of like seniority, status, and pay, provided he has satisfactorily completed his period of service, is still qualified to perform the duties of his position, and applies for restoration within 90 days after separation from active service or discharge from the hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year.

5. Other civil-service benefits: The civil-service rule that not more than two members of a family, living in the same house, may hold a Federal civil-service position does not apply in case of a person entitled to veteran preference.

BUSINESS AND HOME AIDS

1. Small-business aids: Assistance is provided to veterans in establishing small businesses through (a) loans not connected with the GI bill of rights for worthwhile manufacturing projects; (b) assistance in obtaining surplus war materials that will be helpful to the planned business venture; and (c) supplying of technical assistance.

2. Material priorities: Priorities for materials are granted by the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration to veterans.

3. Purchase of surplus property: Veterans can purchase surplus property to set themselves up and help to maintain themselves in business without buying through regular dealer channels or paying a profit to anyone.

4. Housing priorities: Priorities for the construction or purchase of new houses have been established for veterans in obtaining homes under $10,000.

5. Legal assistance: The American Bar Association has adopted a program of legal assistance to veterans and members of their families.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. Education: Any eligible veteran may receive 1 year of education or of training plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service on or after September 16, 1940. There is no age limit nor is there any need to show that a veteran's education was interrupted by war service.

The time during which a course may be initiated is within 4 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completion of the course is 9 years after the end of the war.

Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500. Veterans may apply to take a correspondence course but they are entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Monthly subsistence allowance, while in school or training, is $65 for veterans without dependents and $90 for veterans with dependents.

2. Vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans: The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to restore the employability which has been lost by virtue of a handicap due to a disability incurred in or aggravated by service, on or after September 16, 1940.

Vocational training involving more than 4 years of training may be begun by disabled veterans, subject to approval of the Veterans' Administration. The time for completing such training is 9 years after the end of the war.

Disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation training are entitled to receive monthly subsistence allowance of $65 (without dependents) or $90 (with dependents) plus whatever pension they are entitled to by law. The minimum total amount such veteran may receive is set at $105 per month (without dependents) and $115 (with a dependent), plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for any dependent parent. If the veteran would otherwise receive less than these minimum amounts, his allowance is raised to equal the minimum during the period of training and for 2 months thereafter.

HOSPITALIZATION AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospitalization: The Veterans' Administration provides hospitalization for any veteran of any war who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Veterans with service-connected disabilities are given preference. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible if a hospital bed is available and the veteran makes a sworn statement that he is unable to defray expenses of treatment.

The Veterans' Administration has been authorized and directed to expedite additional hospital construction and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

2. Artificial limbs and prosthetic appliances: Provision has been made to insure ample funds for the Veterans' Administration to purchase prosthetic appliances for service-connected veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

3. Guide or seeing-eye dogs: Guide or seeing-eye dogs may be provided for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation or pensions for a service-connected disability under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center to become adjusted to the dogs.

Blind veterans are also entitled to mechanical or electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

4. Domiciliary care: A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may be admitted for home care to a facility of Veterans' Administration providing such accommodations.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Service personnel up through the rank of captain in the Army and Marine Corps and senior lieutenants in the Navy and Coast Guard are entitled to: (a) $300 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days outside the United States; (b) or $200 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days, no part of which was served outside of the United States; or (c) $100 for any active service less than 60 days.

RETIREMENT PAY

Service personnel on active duty for more than 30 days and disabled from disease or injury received in the line of duty are entitled to receive the same retirement pay as now provided for regular personnel of the service.

SERVICE OFFICERS

Discharged veterans and their dependents have the privilege of requesting needed advice and assistance from experts in the field of veterans' affairs provided by the Veterans' Administration as well as the service officers of the several recognized veterans' organizations. I recommend that veterans and their dependents make use of this service.

There are many pamphlets giving a thumbnail digest of veterans' benefits. During the Seventy-eighth Congress, my good friend Millard Rice, national service director of the DAV, compiled a résumé of benefits for servicemen, ex-servicemen and their dependents. At his request, I inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and on May 15, 1945, I inserted again at his request a revised edition of this digest. It contains much helpful information and I suggest that you contact the DAV and secure a copy of the digest. They should have copies available, because I had printed for them at their expense at the Government Printing Office approximately a quarter million copies of the digest.

STATE VETERANS' LAWS

There are many State laws granting benefits and privileges to veterans, their dependents, as well as veterans' organizations. The Committee on Pensions of the House of Representatives have a very useful compilation on this subject. I have been informed that several Congresses ago Millard Rice, of the DAV, was largely responsible for its initial compilation. I recommend that you get in touch with Mr. Rice or the House Pension Committee and secure a copy of this very valuable document.

VETERANS' ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY BILL—FOR SERVICES RENDERED

During the Seventy-eighth Congress, at the request of Omar B. Ketchum, of the VFW; Millard Rice, of the DAV; and William Floyd, national commander of the RVA, I introduced what is commonly referred to as the Veterans' Adjusted Service Pay Act. This bill was also introduced by seven or eight of my colleagues in the House as well as one or two Members of the Senate. We made an effort to get hearings on the bill during the Seventy-eighth Congress, but were unsuccessful. I reintroduced the bill on the opening day of this Congress as did my colleague, Mr. IZAC, of California. I have received thousands of letters and inquiries about this bill from veterans and their dependents. I frankly do not favor the title that some of the newspapers throughout the country have given the bill. They refer to it as a bonus bill. It is just what the short title of the bill implies—it is a veterans' adjusted service pay act, and in my opinion will eliminate some of the inequalities to which the members of our armed forces and our veterans have been subjected. It is my privilege to represent in the Congress of the United States the largest industrial district of the world—it is the very heart of what was referred to during wartime as the arsenal of democracy—I know full well the high wages that were paid in those war plants as well as in the shipyards. Don't misunderstand me—I am a firm believer in high wages and have supported since my election to Congress all legislation that has been beneficial to our laboring men and women. The way I look at this picture—while many men were making only at the beginning $30 per month and later $50 per month in the armed services—men and women in civilian capacity in the war plants and shipyards were drawing down that much sometimes for working week ends. Frankly, I consider the provisions of the bill inadequate—yet it will, in a small measure, recognize the difference between the pay received in the armed forces and that received during the war by those employed in war plants and shipyards as well as in other civilian capacities.

The bill of the present Congress is numbered H. R. 127 and was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives—which committee has jurisdiction over legislative proposals of this character.

It provides an earned credit of $3 a day for home service and $4 a day for foreign service with an extra credit of $500 when wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of the enemy. These benefits would be applicable to all who served honorably during the war. The minimum earned credit would be $100 for home service and $500 for foreign service, with a maximum credit of $3,500 for home service only, and $4,500 where foreign service was had, with an extra credit of $500 when wounded—making $5,000 the maximum amount allowable. The bill provides that the payments are to be made in bonds, with coupons, issued by the Treasury Department upon certification from the War and Navy Departments.

The bonds will bear simple interest at 3 percent for the first 5 years and compound interest at 3 percent for the second 5 years, after which interest will cease. The bondholder would have the option to withdraw one-fifth of the face value of the bond each year during the first 5-year period by cashing the attached coupons or the veteran could retain all or part of such coupons to draw the prescribed interest up to the full 10-year period.

The bonds would be nonnegotiable, tax free, and not subject to liens, reverting to the veteran's next of kin or estate in case of death. Where the veteran's death occurs prior to application, the application may be made by his next of kin or his estate.

This bill in its present form would provide a tangible earned reward for all who served honorably in the armed forces—from buck private or apprentice seaman to five-star general or admiral included. The reward is measured according to the length and place of service proportionate to the service rendered and the sacrifice made.

I figure the men and women who served during the war have earned this recognition. I have heard it mentioned here and there, and for that matter advocated by persons in high offices, that a bonus should be given to everyone who served in the armed forces in the amount of $1,000 or more. That I do not consider a fair proposal. The bill, H. R. 127, recognizes both the length and place of service. The bonus paid for service during the last war was predicated on a stipulated amount for domestic service and an increased amount for foreign service.

I have been asked as to the cost of the bill. Well, the actuaries of the several veterans' associations who drafted and sponsored the bill have been unable to definitely estimate its cost. I am quite sure, however, that the entire cost would not equal what was paid to some of our large plants to make instruments of war. For that matter, the newspapers as well as the debates of Congress have been dealing at length with loans to foreign governments running into billions of dollars. I say before we make any loans to any foreign country let us adjust the difference in a small measure between what we paid the members of our armed forces and what we paid our civilian employees in our war plants and shipyards during the war.

I need not tell you fellows how hard it is to get a loan. You just can't walk into a financial institution and sign your name on the dotted line and come out with a loan. In fact, many veterans are unable to establish credit to secure the kind of a loan they desire because they entered the military service when yet young and have no established credit in their communities. I say enact this adjusted service pay act now and veterans won't need loans. It will also be good for the economic stabilization of the country. This bill should be enacted into law now because a proposal similar to this will be some day and now is the time because now is when the veteran needs the cash most. I have said on many occasions—in fact, just recently in speeches in my congressional district—that there must be less lip service to veterans and that the American people must put their shoulder to the wheel and do the things that will mean most for the future happiness and physical well-being of our fighting men and women. The enactment of H. R. 127 will, in my opinion, be the American way of showing our appreciation for the services rendered by our veterans during the war. I understand that at the conclusion of my remarks there is to be a question-and-answer session and I shall be very glad to answer any questions in regard to this or any other part of my remarks in detail at that time.

CONCLUSION

Now I have really taken more time than I planned. You have been a most patient and attentive audience. I want you to know that so long as I am a Member of Congress, I will always support legislation that, in my opinion, will be beneficial to you. I started out that way. I voted for the bonus bill when it did not have administration support. I care little whether legislation has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the administration so long as it is for the betterment of the many. I know full well that the members of our armed forces, and our veterans have a rightful squawk as to conditions in many instances. I trust in time these conditions will be remedied. I watch the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD rather closely and was pleased to see that a group of veterans here at Walter Reed recently sent a petition to Congress advocating that an automobile in certain instances be given to each with certain suitable appliances. I assure you that if legislation proposing that is brought before the House, it will have my wholehearted support. I likewise admit that there is much discrimination in the disposal of surplus property as well as preference in securing homes. I trust in due time this and other matters that affect the well-being of the members of our armed forces and our veterans will be remedied. It is my honest opinion that the Congress as a whole wants to do the right thing not only by the members of our armed forces, but by our veterans. You fellows must make your wants known. This, in my opinion, can be best done through established and recognized veterans' organizations—they are experienced in presenting the problems of the veterans to the several committees of the House and Senate. They also have expert advisers who are qualified to give not only the veteran but his dependents advice as to his rights and privileges. The Veterans' Administration, under the able leadership of General Bradley, has also expanded their offices so that a veteran and his dependents can receive the very best advice as to benefits to which they are entitled. Regional offices have been established in every part of our country and, in addition thereto, expert advisers of the Veterans' Administration have been placed in our hospitals and at our army camps. You would do well to avail yourself of these opportunities.

You have here on the platform this afternoon representatives of two great veterans' organizations—Omar Ketchum, of the VFW, and Millard Rice, of the DAV. Both of these gentlemen are exceptionally well qualified and are thoroughly familiar with all phases of veterans' affairs. It has been my privilege to know them for many years and I frequently have relied upon them for advice and assistance. They have always given freely of their time and counsel and my confidence in them has never been misplaced.

I wish for you fellows here a complete and speedy recovery and I sincerely trust that, in the not too distant future, each of you will be home with your loved ones—the Government owes each of you an obligation which it can never repay.

I thank you.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolution memorializing Congress to adopt an adequate anti-poll-tax bill

Whereas there exists in a number of the States of this Nation a policy of requiring payment of cumulative poll taxes as a condition to the right of citizens to vote; and

Whereas the vast proportion of the citizens, many millions in number, both white and colored, are prevented from exercising their right of franchise because of poverty; and

Whereas the governments of these several States have done nothing to alleviate this undemocratic situation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to adopt an adequate anti-poll-tax law which would remove forever the vicious poll-tax system which has now and for many years deprived millions of our citizens of their constitutional right to vote; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives adopted, March 28, 1946.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 3, 1946.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The Bakers and Millers Are Right in Their Complaint Against Reduction of Wheat Flour

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to again say the substance of what I said on the floor of the House earlier today.

No doubt a large majority of the Members of this House have received urgent telegrams from bakers and millers in their districts complaining against an order which the Department of Agriculture is about to make with reference to reduction of wheat flour. This order, if it is made, will call for a 25-percent reduction in wheat flour.

The suddenness with which this order is about to be made will completely dis-

organize the bakers and millers and the amount of the reduction will disorganize the distribution of flour.

I have received many telegrams about this order and I know that many other Congressmen have received similar telegrams. One Congressman tells me that he has received more than 50 telegrams of complaints.

The various Members call me, I think, because of the fact that I am chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee which has been giving a great deal of consideration to food matters during the last 2 or 3 years.

So that I may impress upon the Members of the House the importance of this matter, I am going to quote from two or three of these telegrams. I am not giving the names of the senders of the telegrams for their own protection. One telegram reads in part:

As for myself I would be forced to make drastic changes which would not only affect my personnel but would be my first step toward bankruptcy. May I urge you as my close friend and Congressman to consider this strongly before such a disaster can strike me and your many other friends.

Another telegram reads:

This is equivalent to rationing and will lead to black-market operation and bread lines and would make a decided hardship on us.

Another telegram reads:

Twenty-five percent will positively lead to black-market operation and higher cost for salesmen. Snap judgment may lead to crisis in this instance.

No doubt the reason for this proposed order that the Department of Agriculture is about to make is that apparently they feel that they could save wheat and flour so that the same might be sent to Europe. This is a laudable purpose, but the Department of Agriculture should know that the flour business and the bakery business are far flung in their activities. Their business is carried on according to a system and in compliance with regular contracts and any order that would reduce 25 percent of their production with only 2 or 3 days' notice to them is bound to bring disastrous consequences.

In an effort to stay the issuance of this order, I have written a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture which reads as follows:

APRIL 9, 1946.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that the Department of Agriculture is considering issuance of an order which will restrict wheat millers to 75 percent of their production of flour in 1945.

I believe I understand the reasoning behind this proposed order, and I am fully sympathetic with the objective of obtaining as much wheat as possible during the next 3 months to meet our relief commitments abroad.

I think that the difficulty lies not so much in the quantity we are using for flour domestically as in the fact that grain is not moving from the farms rapidly enough.

In any order tending to further interfere with our already seriously disrupted channels of food distribution, the anticipated gain should be carefully weighed against the certain damage that will result from any further dislocation of food distribution.

In view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture initiated only last Tuesday, April 2, 1946, a plan calculated to speed up delivery of wheat from farms by giving farmers a warehouse receipt cashable at current market prices any time up to March 31, 1947, it seems to me that this plan should be given an opportunity to produce results before any further restrictive measures are imposed.

I hope, therefore, that you will hold up issuance of the proposed quota on flour millers and bakers until the Department is able to determine and report on the results of the marketing plan announced last week.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

I hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will reconsider this matter or at least hold it in abeyance for a few days until the millers and bakers can adjust their business better to meet the shock.

In my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, I call attention to a program which he announced a few days ago and which I think is a very sensible program and which I hope will result favorably. I have in mind the plan to encourage the farmers to dispose of their wheat by giving them warehouse receipts which will guarantee that they will get the market price for their wheat at any time from now until the 31st of March 1947.

This program was suggested by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Chester Davis when they were called in for consultation by President Truman. Everyone who has given consideration to this program recognizes that it is fair. It may result in the release of considerable quantities of wheat and if this is true, it will go a long way toward helping solve the European food situation. I think the Secretary of Agriculture could well afford to wait a few days before issuing his flour order until he can ascertain whether the farmers will accept his bid with reference to releasing their wheat.

This is a serious situation. The bakers have on several occasions in the last 2 or 3 years been given some severe jolts. I refer particularly to the sugar orders which worked greatly to their disadvantage.

Maintenance of Camp Edwards for Hospitalization of War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolution memorializing Congress relative to providing for the maintenance by the Federal Government of Camp Edwards in this Commonwealth for the hospitalization of war veterans and as a place for their convalescence and recreation

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress to take immediately such action as may be necessary to provide for the continued use of Camp Edwards in this Commonwealth by the Federal Government by maintaining the facilities at said camp for the hospitalization of war veterans and as a place for their convalescence and recreation: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In the house of representatives, adopted, April 1, 1946.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 4, 1946.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—The Basic Industries Must Have an OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, if we are to avoid the business difficulties that overtook this country during and after the First World War, the people of this country must do some clear thinking and support the administration's plan for price control during the reconversion period. For the information and consideration of my colleagues I insert a letter recounting my personal experience and giving my views on the subject:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1946.

Mr. J. H. EBY,
Spokane, Wash.

DEAR FRIEND EBY: Glad to have your letter about OPA. In thinking back to the changes that came to business when the first war started and the ultimate result—depression—I am wondering if we hadn't better have an OPA.

When the first war started, I had quit my good-paying railroad job and tackled a stump ranch that I had visions of building up into an estate, and had made a good start—had procured a good farm and land-clearing outfit, heavy draft horses, good wagons and sleighs, harnesses, logging and land-clearing equipment, some milk cows and dry stock, chickens and pigs enough to raise our winter meat, a good garden with potato and grain fields to raise the things to fill the cellar with good things to eat for the family and hired help, and with meadows that produced hay and grain for the horses and cattle.

At this time, everybody was satisfied, and the work was going fine. The cooks and hired men were glad to work for fair wages with good board and accommodations, and I had learned how to use dynamite and take advantage of the work of taking out the stumps and turning brushy cut-over land into pretty meadows and cultivated fields.

And then the war came, just when I had obtained one of the first Federal land-bank loans, and the purchasing power of the money I had borrowed to clear the fields and build fences and buy farm machinery shriveled up in my hands. I had always wanted an

Oliver grain drill, that cost $60, but before that time we could never spare the money, and I wanted a McCormick binder, that out there before the war cost $175, and a cream separator was a thing we needed, and lots of barbed wire for fencing, and in those days an 80-rod spool of heavy hog wire at a local store cost $1.40 a roll. I had planned to get all of these things when I got my loan, but the first war changed all that.

Things went sky-high and nobody wanted to work at clearing land any more and get their clothes and skin all black, nor drag chains and cables around with a stump puller, nor cut brush in the hot sun. The prices of everything went out of sight. Barbed wire jumped from $1.40 a roll to $6.50, and the McCormick binder I had always wanted went up from $175 to $350 and stayed there. After all these years, I finally got my grain drill. I was lucky I got the Superior I wanted, but I had to pay $240 for a new one, and I've got the cream separator, too, only there is no one around now, for any kind of wages, who wants to work on a farm and milk a few cows, and the brush has grown back on the land I had cleared and was using for pasture while I've been waiting to hire some help to take out the stumps. The WPA spoiled that. Now, you've got to farm in a big way, with machinery the hired men can ride, if you can get anybody to work on a farm at all, and you can't get started that way on a stump farm.

Besides, the Forest Service, no matter how well watered and fertile the land, rates stump land as marginal, and has ruled that we should wait until it grows back into timber. Land clearing interferes with the forest management, because the smoke from the clearing fires obstructs the view of the lookout on the top of the mountain. You can't do much clearing in the rain or while the ground is frozen and covered with snow. In the depression years, the timber men who made up our board of county commissioners seemed to think the same way about the stump land, because they deeded to the Forest Service over 34,000 acres of good cutover land in my home county of Bonner, alone. A lot of this land was farm places, with houses and small clearings. The people had moved away in the depression, when farm stuff was so cheap. Now, farming conditions have changed, and many of these places could be made, with a little work, into good homes for returning veterans, but the college ideas of the Forest Service people never change. They want to keep this land in their control, a rendezvous for ground squirrels and coyotes, while we wait another 100 years for reforestation.

The land is there, fertile, with water and wood, maybe too much wood, much of it the kind of land the pioneers cleared with an ax and grubbing hoe in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. In Pennsylvania they reclaimed stony ground and left miles of stone fences, as can be seen around the Gettysburg Battlefield. The cut-over land of the West is as good as the industrious people cleared up to make farm homes of in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

But the depression, gas engines, and college training, with plenty of Forest Service propaganda, seem to have changed the viewpoint of the average American. Now Government appropriations are the thing. It seems that large Forest Service installations, with numerous and highly paid personnel, is the most important thing in the minds of our civic leaders and local chamber of commerce members.

Well, we have got all of these boys coming back from the war, to house and feed. Maybe our mechanized farms will do the job. Gas has sure made it a lot easier than it was when I was dragging log chains around and digging out roots to clear the land that makes me a good living now, in a valley where there are plenty more places just as good, but we have the Forest Service and a lot of fool notions about conservation and now everyone has so much money they have lost the old urge to get "well fixed" with a farm and independence.

It seems to me this is only a stage in the transition. Money is the finest thing in the world when you can buy things with it, but after the last war when the Russian printing press went into high and everybody left the farm to go to town for big money and good times, the poor Russians found out too late that food was more important in their daily lives than a great abundance of paper money, and the Russians starved to death with market baskets full of money.

Maybe, with all of this complaining, they will take off the OPA and let prices soar. Only, I don't want to be around when things like railroad freight rates and passenger rates, coal prices, and gasoline and light bills and telephone bills, and all of the big utility companies start doubling up in prices. When that gets going right, a man on a farm with a good team of horses, some cows, chickens, and pigs, a man who isn't too high-toned to plant and reap, and maybe milk a few cows, will be a gentleman.

Maybe we better keep the OPA until this money business finally settles down.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Health in Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health in Virginia," from the Washington Post of April 9, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH IN VIRGINIA

Several months ago, in making a comprehensive report to the Governor advocating immediate expansion of rural medical facilities, the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council pointed out some rather disturbing facts about health conditions in that State. Citing an earlier congressional report, the committee emphasized that in 1944 one-third of the counties in Virginia had a ratio of more than 3,000 people to each active physician, and 2 counties had more than 20,000 to each doctor. Forty-two States made better showings than Virginia on selective service rejections for health reasons, and the rate of rural rejections was higher than in cities. The recommended ratio of hospital beds to each 1,000 of population is 4.5. Virginia ranked thirty-third in the country, with an average of 3.1, and 63 of its counties had a ratio of only 1.1 hospital beds per 1,000 people. Rural families were especially lacking in provision for adequate medical facilities they could afford to patronize.

It is encouraging that the Virginia Assembly, before it adjourned, enacted many of the committee's more important recommendations into legislative action. Recognizing that a mere increase in rural physicians is not enough without a parallel increase in hospital facilities, it made available a revolving fund from which areas may borrow up to 45 percent of the cost of constructing regional hospitals. The legislature provided 20 medical scholarships at State medical schools, with the requirement that the recipient agree to serve 1 year in a rural area for each year he benefits from such assistance. A health service encompassing the entire State, instead of only 49 counties, was made possible by a $1,000,000 grant. This will allow, among other things, preschool examinations for children. In addition, the assembly established a cancer unit to conduct an educational campaign, and provided for a master planning survey by the State public health department. The only major area in which the advisory committee's recommendations were ignored was in licensing and inspection of hospitals, a matter which, although it received some opposition from interested groups, ought to be included in the next legislative agenda.

By and large the Virginia Assembly's action is a good start toward improving conditions that are far from bright. Money intelligently spent on making more adequate medical facilities available to people who need them will pay strong dividends in a healthier citizenry in the future.

Why the May-Gurney Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following is a very forceful article on compulsory peacetime military training, written by the Reverend J. Hugh O'Donnell, CSC, president of the University of Notre Dame. It was first printed in the current issue of the Ave Maria, published at Notre Dame.

WHY THE MAY-GURNEY BILL?

(By J. Hugh O'Donnell, CSC)

The clamor for compulsory peacetime military training began during the war. The movement received much of its impetus from a wartime psychology which, although well calculated to aid in solving the problems that faced the United States up to the late summer of 1945, is not a sound basis for considering a course of action that proposes such a violent departure from American democratic principle. Realizing the national state of mind, and feeling that it is sometimes well to make haste slowly, many observers, the writer among them, urged a cooling-off period before seriously considering legislation that is a permanent peacetime, and not a temporary wartime, measure.

The May-Gurney bill was introduced in Congress during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and a select committee on postwar military policy held hearings beginning last June. In substance, the bill provides that all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 21 residing in the United States be conscripted for a full year of military training, that following the training they shall be enrolled as reservists in the Army or Navy for a period of years, and that they shall take such refresher courses as from time to time may be prescribed by law.

To its advocates, compulsory peacetime military training is the most direct and satisfactory means of insuring adequate national defense. To its opponents, it is a booby trap, a long step in the direction of the totalitarian regimentation that in World War II we fought and, as we hope, defeated in all quarters of the globe. As an expedient, compulsory military training has always been of questionable value; as a principle, it is morally indefensible, except as a last re-

sort, despite the attempts to rationalize it as democratic.

"Could it be possible," a Notre Dame alumnus who has been in the service wrote to me, "that militarism leads to the degeneration of a nation? Paradoxically, the decades of militarism in Germany and Japan have ended only in disaster for them. * * * Could it possibly be that the accurate conception of right and wrong and the freedoms upon which this Nation was founded (including freedom from compulsory military training) have anything to do with this country's great strength? * * * I will always be willing to fight for what is right and the aforementioned freedoms, but this includes freedom from compulsory military training in peacetime."

I quote this young man's letter because it is typical of many I have received from a cross section of the 9,500 Notre Dame men in the armed forces, young men whose love of country stems from their love of God who created them and gave them inalienable rights. They have fought, and many of them have died, for their country. Men like these rebel against regimentation. And if compulsory peacetime military training does not mean regimentation of our young manhood, if it does not involve a treatment of the citizen as a mere creature of the state, then I have been mistaken in my definition of regimentation. If the May-Gurney bill is enacted into law, we may, in the words of Lincoln, say good-by to "the last best hope of earth."

Of the arguments advanced in favor of the measure, some are illogical, the result of wishful thinking; and others so specious as to be frivolous. But one argument seems to be missing altogether. Nothing is said of the fact that compulsory military training has already had a laboratory test in the United States. Insofar as I know, however, advocates of conscription do not point with pride to the effectiveness of the training program under selective service in the months between September, 1940, when the act was passed, and December, 1941. If that period proved anything, it proved that a solid year of training is not needed to turn out a proficient fighting man. At any rate, during the war itself, a 13-week period was considered long enough, and civilian soldiers went into combat after that time.

The backers of compulsory military training also display an inexplicable and almost coy reluctance to consider other methods of raising a military force strong enough to guarantee national security. To be sure, we may become involved in another war; there is already an uneasy feeling that World War III may be in the making. Should it become a reality, we must be prepared. But it does not follow that a military nation must be a militaristic nation. It does not follow that compulsory military training is the best way—or the only way—to raise an armed force that will command the respect of other nations. Before we espouse the way of dictators, at least two alternatives deserve serious consideration.

I may be pardoned if I repeat the substance of a paragraph of an earlier article in the Ave Maria—February 10, 1945. First, it has yet to be proved that an adequate standing army, even as large an army as we may need in case we are attacked, cannot be raised on a voluntary basis. In the past, volunteers have been turned away at recruiting stations because the enlisted personnel had reached the maximum fixed by law. Today, the number of men who are reenlisting is exceeding all expectations. In the future, it is reasonable to suppose that a large number of young men will enlist if they are given the proper incentive. If the armed forces offer a pay scale comparable to that in other occupations, if they teach technical skills that will be useful in civil life, volunteers will take advantage of the opportunities. The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps must provide an outlet for "mind power" as well as "boot power" if intelligent young men are to look to these branches for a career. Those who advocate compulsory military training seem to have relegated these considerations to the limbo of the impossible. At least they should be explored.

A year ago, when the demand for universal conscription first began to be strenuous, I suggested, as an alternative, a more intensive use of the facilities of colleges and universities as a training ground for the Army and Navy. Developments meanwhile have strengthened my belief that such a course is not only feasible but wise. I also suggested a revival of the national guard.

A program for a reserve officers' corps could be integrated into the curricula of high schools, colleges, and universities to the advantage of officer candidates, and without impairing the academic standards of the schools. As a matter of fact, such a program was so integrated, both in World War I and World War II, when the Army and Navy turned to the colleges and universities as the institutions whose physical facilities were best suited to the training of officer personnel. In the last war the Navy's V-12 program was proof of the Navy's realization that higher education should be part of officer training. It seems reasonable to suppose that the programs that were well administered in time of war could be adapted to times of peace.

The National Guard should play an integral part in any plan for defense. This historic branch of the service, which, unfortunately, was permitted to lose something of its identity after World War I, can provide basic training equal to that given in wartime. What is of particular importance is that the training may be had in the guardsman's home town while he follows his ordinary occupation as a civilian. Thought should be given to encouraging enlistments, especially of boys who do not intend to go to college.

Lest there be an accusation of class distinction in establishing officers' training programs in the colleges and universities, and leaving the National Guard to enlisted men, let me say that I imply no such division. I only recognize a condition that exists. The records for the past 30 years show that only 25 percent of high-school students continue their education on a higher level. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of the remaining 75 percent go into trades, since ours is predominantly an industrial Nation. For many boys, therefore, the National Guard would solve the problem of mastering a trade and serving one's country at the same time.

How would this dual purpose be effected? Let us assume that John Jones has finished high school. He has a knack with tools, and wants to be a machinist. He apprentices himself to his trade. About the same time he joins the National Guard and devotes two or three evenings a week to drill and classroom work in a carefully determined program. In the summer, for a month at least, he goes on maneuvers that are not just a lark—on time arranged for with his employer. If he proves worthy of a commission he receives one.

The proposals that I have made are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they are complementary—voluntary enlistments, use of colleges and universities, and a strong National Guard restored to its proper place. In my opinion, they would be much less expensive to the taxpayer, and at least as effective as compulsory military training. And what is perhaps most important, they would not imply, as conscription does, that man is the servant of the state before he is a citizen.

Up to the present, the most vocal advocates of compulsory military training have been the Army high command. It might be said, with some truth, that because of their profession they should know what they are talking about. Perhaps. But it might also be said, with equal justice, that because of their profession they are necessarily deaf to any proposal but their own; and their present proposal may well lead to a militaristic regime that would be alien—and perhaps fatal—to the American tradition.

I recommend that Congress establish a commission to study this very serious problem. Its personnel, in my opinion, should comprise representatives of the armed forces, education, business, and labor, as well as representatives of the veterans of World War I and World War II. The United States should not be steam-rollered into accepting a plan so completely at odds with the American way of doing things just because the leaders of the armed forces in time of peace say, "This is what we must have."

What we dare not have—what we dare not risk—is the regimentation of American manhood into a strong militaristic system no different from that of the Prussia of Bismarck, the Soviet Russia of Stalin, or the Third Reich of Hitler. I, for one, still believe that America is the last best hope of earth and that it can be defended in the true American way.

Freedom for Radio Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Broadcasting, of April 8, a national magazine devoted to the radio industry, which I believe will be of interest to Congress and the country:

REPUBLICAN CHIEF URGES FREE RADIO—FCC INTERFERENCE IS HIT BY REECE IN STRONG STATEMENT

The newly elected chairman of the Republican National Committee, in his first public statement after taking office last Monday, came out flatly for freedom of radio from Government interference.

Representative B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, veteran Member of the House, served notice that freedom from program control by the FCC will be a major issue in the forthcoming November campaign. The Republican Party last week elected two strong proponents of free radio and bittter critics of the FCC's program policy to key posts on its national committee. Mr. REECE succeeded Herbert Brownell, Jr., as chairman. Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN (Republican, Onio) was elected chairman of the executive committee on recommendation of Representative REECE.

Both men are Members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in which radio legislation originates; both are on the committee's subcommittee on communications; they served together as House conferees on the Lea-Vandenberg bill (S. 63) and fought hard for passage. Representative BROWN carried the burden of floor debate in favor of the measure to curb James Caesar Petrillo and his American Federation of Musicians.

REECE WILL RESIGN

At a news conference following his election, Representative REECE said he would resign from the House within a "reasonable" time, but first wanted to "clear up some

pending matters," among them his bill to amend the Federal Trade Act. Since Congress plans to adjourn sine die in July, it was reported in some quarters that Mr. REECE might complete his term.

Chairman REECE, in his exclusive statement to Broadcasting, lashed out at the FCC's report on Public Service Responsibility of Broadcast Licenses (Broadcasting, March 11). He declared the Commission "must have tossed" the Communications Act "in the FCC's incinerator." He charged the Commissioners "wrote their own law as to radio programing."

"Radio today is half slave, half free. It cannot thus survive in a democracy," he declared. The Republican Party "insists that the people themselves determine to what programs they want to listen, not a body of seven men sitting in Washington," he said. Following is complete text of Chairman REECE's statement:

"The Republican Party is pledged to the maintenance of the freedoms—freedom of expression, of religion, of the press, and of radio. That means freedom from the restraints of government, however imposed. In times of peace there is no place for censorship in our way of life.

"Radio, newest of the media for expression, is entitled to the same guaranty of freedom accorded those other media by our founding fathers. That means freedom to engage in radio as a free enterprise, on a par with the press. Radio today is half slave, half free. It cannot thus survive in a democracy. Any infringement upon the freedom of radio inevitably will be reflected in regulatory excesses against the press, the motion pictures, and other media of expression.

"When Congress enacted the Radio Act of 1927, during the Coolidge administration, it wisely decreed there should be no censorship of radio. Provision was made for the regulatory authority, then the Federal Radio Commission, to control the allocations of facilities to various types of services and to set up technical safeguards against interference. Has the licensing authority, now stacked with New Deal appointees, followed the mandate of Congress?

FCC'S OWN LAW

"One has but to peruse the report of the Federal Communications Commission issued last March 7, titled: 'Public Service Responsibility of Broadcast Licensees.' It was written by several willful men who had substituted their concept of what radio should be for that of the great American public. They must have tossed the Communications Act of 1934, which embodies in toto the provisions of the Radio Act of 1927, in the FCC's incinerator. They wrote their own law as to radio programming and set up their own standards of program performance. Is this an American agency or the counterpart of the late Herr Goebbels' Rundfunk-Gesellschaft?

"Radio today is the most powerful medium of mass communication the world has ever known. Certainly it has been and can be a potent weapon in the hands of any administration in power. That was demonstrated in Germany, in Japan, in Italy, where the people heard only what the dictators wanted them to hear, and it is still being demonstrated in Russia.

"Indeed, it might be said that radio has helped to perpetuate the present administration in power. When there were definite policies to put over, the various Government agencies turned to radio.

PEOPLE MUST DECIDE

"The Republican Party insists that the people themselves determine to what programs they want to listen, not a body of seven men sitting in Washington. We are fighting for the protection of the American way of life and that means the American system of broadcasting—free from government interference.

"In the 1944 national campaign the Republican Party adopted in its platform a plank calling for a free radio and a free press and demanding that full and complete information be available to Americans through the radio and the press. We said then and we repeat it now: 'There must be no censorship.'

"The issue upon which we will elect a Republican Congress next November was laid down at Gettysburg by Abraham Lincoln who said, 'that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.'"

Used Car Dealers Say OPA Controls Inflate Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the further OPA extends and continues its operation, apparently the more difficulties it encounters. This, itself, indicates that its usefulness has ceased—if, indeed, it ever existed.

In nearly every line of endeavor, we find those engaged therein complaining bitterly that OPA and its activities have had exactly the opposite effect from that which it was intended they should have. Instead of encouraging production, apparently OPA has limited and decreased, and, in some instances, stifled and almost stopped production. It certainly has hampered reconversion.

Used-car dealers say that OPA controls inflate prices. Instead of holding prices down, the activities of OPA have inflated the prices of used cars, and the results have been discriminations against both the used-car dealers and the buying public, according to the analysis of the Used Car Dealers' Association, of Tulsa, Okla. It is charged that OPA officials have bungled the situation by not using as a basis of their operations and controls fair, statistical, or experienced backgrounds, and that those in charge do not have a practical and working knowledge of the used-car business. This situation is well developed in a letter which I have just received from the Tulsa Used Car Dealers' Association, of Tulsa, Okla., which is as follows:

TULSA USED CAR DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
Tulsa, Okla., March 29, 1946.

Representative GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Tulsa, Okla.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: The Tulsa Used Car Dealers' Association for Tulsa, Okla., have faithfully complied with the regulation MPR 540 of the Office of Price Administration, and if an extension is not granted on or before June 30, 1946, the powers of the Office of Price Administration will cease to exist; and since the war has long since terminated and trade is now returning to normal channels, it is the firm conviction and belief of the Tulsa Used Car Dealers' Association of Tulsa that complete control of our business should be returned to us.

It has been resolved by the Tulsa Used Car Dealers' Association that the renewal of the powers of the Office of Price Administration in regard to prices of used cars be not continued in effect after June 30, 1946, for the following reasons:

I

That the regulation of the OPA with reference to ceiling prices on used cars defeats the very purpose for which it was created because it discriminates against both the used-car dealers and the buying public. It is now axiomatic that the regulation does not control the prices on used cars but definitely inflates them. This is particularly true as of this date because the larger number of used cars now on the market fall in the category of "rough" merchandise. The ceiling price, therefore, becomes the minimum sales price of this inferior chattel. On the other hand, the better of the used cars have as their maximum sales price the same price which is received for the "rough" chattel.

II

It is the opinion of this association that the OPA officials have not handled the regulations with reference to used cars based upon a fair statistical or experienced background; that the officials do not have a practical and working knowledge of the used-car business and have failed to apply the regulations fairly and equitably in the operation of the used-car business.

III

New cars are now in production. A steady stream of new cars are being distributed to all of the States. This situation completely justifies the elimination of the Office of Price Administration with reference to used cars. Business is resuming its normal channels and should not be curtailed by arbitrary and capricious regulations.

IV

The revocation of price curtailment with reference to used cars will eliminate the vast black market situation which now exists in this country with reference to the better of the used cars. This situation is deplorable and the so-called ceiling prices on used cars is primarily responsible for it.

V

The registrations records of Tulsa County, Okla., show that the majority of transfers of used cars are between individuals where no dealer is involved.

A spot check revealed as follows:

On March 11, 1946:	
Transfers show	112
Between individuals	74
When dealers involved	38
On March 13, 1946:	
Transfers show	64
Between individuals	43
When dealers involved	21

We therefore respectfully request the elimination of the OPA regulations to the used car business and sincerely believe that the removal of such regulations will cause used cars to be bought and sold at a price which is commensurate with their reasonable market value under existing circumstances.

TULSA USED CAR DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
By JOHN FELTS, *President.*

Veterans' Benefits for Members of the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolution memorializing Congress in favor of extending the benefits of the GI bill of rights, so-called, to persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States during World War II

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to extend the benefits provided by the Federal law known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and also called the GI bill of rights, to persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States during World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 28, 1946.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 3, 1946.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The "Win the Peace" Outfit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal of April 5, 1946, entitled "The 'Win the Peace' Outfit."

In view of the recent meeting here in Washington by this organization the editorial makes interesting reading indeed.

THE "WIN THE PEACE" OUTFIT

On the very day Russia informed the United Nations that her troops were leaving Iran and that she would negotiate her difficulties with that country and not settle them by threats or force, a strange document appeared in the advertising columns of this newspaper.

This advertisement was sponsored by an organization calling itself the Milwaukee Win the Peace Committee.

The advertisement followed the Communist Party line, not only in regard to the Iranian situation but on most of today's international problems.

It was in reality an attack on American foreign policy. In effect, it accused our Government of plotting with Great Britain to turn international opinion against the Soviets. It sharply criticized British policy. But nowhere, not in a single line, did it contain one word against the Russians. Its theme throughout seemed to be that Russia could do no wrong.

The advertisement was full of misstatements and spurious arguments. There is not space to cite them all. We do, however, want to nail the carefully planted suggestion that the whole Iranian crisis was brought about because the United States and Great Britain want to keep Russia from Iranian oil. Both of these Nations have consistently recognized Russia's right to some of this oil. They insisted only that Russia negotiate with Iran without the pressure of force or the threat of force. When Russia quit doing this, there was no longer an issue.

We have no thought that all those who joined as sponsors of this advertisement are Communists. Many are loyal Americans, conscientiously concerned about world peace. They may be uninformed, or possibly just misguided.

These Milwaukeeans should seriously recall the days before the last war, when organizations like this Win the Peace Committee sprang out of fertile Communist minds like weeds out of the ground. Such organizations were in reality false-front outfits, doing the work of Russia. They foolishly opposed our Government's preparations for defense until Russia was attacked by Hitler.

Some Americans have a queer delusion about Russia. Giving her credit for all she has accomplished since the revolution deposing the czars, Russia is still not a democracy. Her people do not know the meaning of the word as we understand it.

Her people know of the outside world only what the little group in her Government offices tells them. Those who vote can vote only for a hand-picked ticket. There is but one political party—the Communists—with 5,700,000 members in a population estimated at 192.000,000.

There are no automobile, no steel, no coal strikes in Russia. No labor leader would even attempt to call a strike in Russia against his employer—the Communist government. The people are regimented in their work, their play, in their thinking. No group of citizens could put into a Russian newspaper an advertisement rebuking their own Government as this Milwaukee group is privileged to do.

The world's chance for lasting peace lies in the hope that Russia will develop her manufacturing and industrial capacity to the point where all her people may have what Americans consider the absolute necessities. And that as she does so develop in supplying material needs, her people will also be given educational opportunity to learn what democracy is. She will not reach that desirable maturity, however, if she is treated like a spoiled child who must have its way all the time or it won't play.

We expect American Communists to follow the party line; that is what they were organized for. But it is strange company for any honest-minded liberal.

Our Foreign Policy May Wreck Our Exporting Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following letter from one of the leading manufacturers of the Southwest engaged in the manufacture of oil well pumping supplies and other oil-field equipment. During the hostilities this concern was one of the leading manufacturers in our part of the country of war supplies and materials. It made a very enviable record in efficiency. After the cessation of hostilities naturally this industry attempted to reconvert to production of peacetime items. But now it finds that the policy of our Government, or of this administration, is impeding its progress. Apparently the national administration is thinking more of the welfare of England and its commercial rehabilitation than it is of the rehabilitation of our own industries and the successful conduct and prosperity of American concerns and American citizens.

It is high time that the Members of this Congress and the people of the country at large are apprised of the devastating policies that are being pursued by those in charge of our national administration. If the present plans and system are not checked our foreign policy may wreck our exporting industries. This is vividly brought out in the following letter which I just received from W. C. Norris, Manufacturer, Inc., of Tulsa, Okla., and a copy of letter addressed to it by Armco Argentina S. A., Industrial Y Commercial Corrientes 330, Buenos Aires, which I am pleased to quote:

W. C. NORRIS, MANUFACTURER, INC.,
Tulsa, Okla., April 4, 1946.

The Honorable GEORGE SCHWABE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For several years Armco Argentina S. A., Buenos Aires, Argentina, who are a subsidiary of the American Rolling Mills Co., of Middletown, Ohio, have been exclusive distributors of our manufactured line of oil well pumping and production supplies. Armco Argentina, in the past, have been very successful in selling large quantities of our manufactured materials to the Argentina Government. However, as you perhaps know, the United States manufacturers have not been permitted to participate in the requirements of the Argentina Government oil wells for the past 2 or 3 years.

We have had several carloads of material on order for them through Armo Argentina, which were eventually canceled because export license covering the shipment was not forthcoming.

Within the past 6 months negotiations have been under way to reopen the matter in regard to reinstating some of the materials canceled, and we have quoted on additional requirements as well.

I am attaching hereto a copy of letter just received which is self-explanatory and which, to say the least, is very discouraging to us and perhaps most all other United States oil country goods manufacturers, because it has been desirable business to us in the past from a production standpoint, especially due to the fact that they, like other foreign governments, buy large quantities of supplies at one time for their anticipated several months' requirements instead of pursuing the policy of buying monthly or semimonthly which is the practice of the United States oil companies.

Due to the large quantities of materials involved it is further desirable, particularly at this time when plants such as ours have open capacity for additional production which could be utilized and employ a large number of returning veterans and as well keep our present production forces in employment.

You will note from the copy of letter attached that apparently the Argentina Government are having no trouble whatsoever in buying from British manufacturers, and at much higher prices, the same materials which we manufacture. We realize that it has been in the past our Government's policy to help dear old England cut our throats and pay dearly for the privilege and apparently the same situation still persists.

We, as well as other United States heavily taxed industries, are now being severely penalized by the fact that our United States

steel mills are being required to ship and perhaps eventually give to England large tonnages of steel products which in many instances is putting a hardship on us because there is not enough production in the steel industry at the present time, and from what we understand will not be for perhaps another year to 18 months, to satisfy the tonnage demands of our own industries.

From this letter you can readily see the position in which our industries are being placed. We sell, give, or loan England the materials we are very litterly in need of and they in turn take the same materials to build up foreign trade for themselves at our expense; whether it be Argentina with our strained relations with that country or any other country.

If the materials we give them were used to rehabilitate England I do not believe there would be any criticism but when such materials as are sent to them are used by them or any other nation to eventually destroy our own United States markets, I believe that our Congress should do something about the matter and we earnestly solicit your support by bringing this matter to the attention of the proper legislative bodies.

Yours very truly,
W. C. NORRIS, MANUFACTURER, INC.
J. H. EUSTICE, *President*.

ARMCO ARGENTINA S. A.,
Buenos Aires, March 28, 1946.

Re our inquiry 1353.
W. C. NORRIS, MANUFACTURER, INC.,
Tulsa, Okla., U. S. A.

GENTLEMEN: We are very sorry indeed to advise you that notwithstanding high prices and long delivery the YPF have decided to place their order for the material covered in the above inquiry with British manufacturers.

As you already know, some time ago YPF sent a purchasing delegation to the United States, headed by Mr. Catinari, for the purpose of reviewing the possibilities of purchasing material in the United States. The report sent in by Mr. Catinari was pessimistic as to YPF having any chances of getting material for the time being.

As this delegation is now in England and they have obtained assurances from the British Government that there will not be any restrictions on the export of material, YPF have placed their order for these rods in England.

This is not the only piece of business we are going to lose if the United States insists on the present policy of restricting the export of materials to Argentine Government departments, while England and some European countries deliver everything they want.

For your information we might say that YPF has already placed orders in England and Europe to the value of $1,200,000, and this is only the beginning. Some of the orders placed cover the following material:

One thousand tons of casing and 450 tons of sucker rods to England and 3,000 tons of casing and 500 tons of tubing to Belgium.

We would very much like to receive your comments on the above.

Very truly yours,
ARMCO ARGENTINA S. A.
M. C. EVANGELISTA.

Congress and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Monday, April 8, 1946:

CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROL

Congress is now confronted with the question whether it should extend price control beyond the present termination date of June 30 of this year, and if so, how it should amend the powers granted to the Office of Price Administration. We are unlikely to deal with this problem intelligently unless we understand the basic economic principles and facts involved.

There has been an unfortunate assumption in Washington that price control is or ought to be the major means of combating inflation. Yet price control deals only with the symptoms and consequences of inflation; it does not deal at all with its two basic causes. The first of these, and the most important, is the increase in the quantity of money and bank credit in the country. The amount of this has more than tripled since the outbreak of the war in Europe. We cannot have such an increase in the monetary purchasing power in circulation without its forcing up the level of prices. The second basic cause is a shortage of goods.

Price control does nothing to remove either of these basic causes. It has at best only a secondary and transitional role to play in combating inflation. Its chief function from now on is to prevent needless price rises in those cases in which a shortage cannot be made up for a long time, and in which a price increase could do little to speed the process. The outstanding example of this is rents on existing housing.

With this background it is clear that the time has come for Congress to make sure that price control is liberalized in some directions, tapered off in others, and in some cases terminated altogether. These general requirements indicate the nature of some of the amendments that are now necessary:

1. Rationing powers should be continued for all goods that are in short supply. Fortunately, Congress has already provided for this. It was a basic mistake for OPA to abolish rationing while continuing price control. This has helped to aggravate the world food crisis. Price ceilings in themselves encourage consumption; as long as they are retained, rationing is required to offset this effect.

2. It is a mistake of the first order to put ceilings on new houses or on rents for new apartments. The effect of this can only be to discourage, reduce, or prevent the construction of buildings now so desperately needed. Rent ceilings should, of course, be retained on existing houses and apartments. Congress would do well, however, to put the States and localities on notice that Federal rent control will definitely terminate on June 30, 1947. In this way the question of rent control could be taken out as soon as practicable from the Federal domain and placed in that of the States and localities, where it properly belongs.

3. Congress should provide that as soon as possible after June 30 price fixing will no longer apply to to any commodity that does not enter into the Government's cost-of-living index or is not a recognized substitute for such a commodity. One way in which Congress might deal with this problem would be to instruct OPA to compile and publish a list of such articles subject to price control and to regulate no others later than, say, October 1.

4. To aid the process of decontrol, Congress might provide also that when any product in competitive production once goes below the ceiling price and stays there for, say, 30 days, the price ceiling should be permanently removed. Such a provision would not, of course, prevent a later price rise of that commodity, but it would be a method of "checking out" commodities, one by one, wherever a sudden price rise was unlikely.

5. Some method must be found for removing articles from price control when they have ceased to be in short supply. The provision that they shall be removed "when supply comes into balance with demand" is too vague to be of much value. One possible formula, as an illustration, is that OPA should be instructed to remove price controls from any article when the supply or production rate of that article is equal to the average of that in the immediate prewar period and when unfilled orders for it do not exceed the equivalent of a month or two's production.

6. Some liberalization should be made in the pricing standards for goods that remain under control. The profit standard of the period 1936–39, when unemployment averaged more than 8,000,000 is not adequate for full-employment conditions. OPA should not be permitted to force any existing firm to sell goods below its actual out-of-pocket costs of production. It should not be permitted to continue cost-absorption policies, or to force manufacturers, wholesalers or retailers to sell goods at a lower dollar-and-cents margin of profit per unit than the prewar or the existing level.

7. Subsidies should not be increased, but should, on the other hand, be tapered off as rapidly as possible.

8. Congress might well consider setting up a board of price appeals, the members of which would be independent of OPA administrators and appointed directly by Congress itself. Such a board would have purely advisory powers. Its chief function would be to clarify the public mind regarding the factual merits of price disputes.

There is wide possible latitude in amendments to the Price Control Act, but their basic purpose is clear. They should try to provide for a tapering off of price controls as promptly and as smoothly as conditions make possible.

The Indian in the Postwar Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from a booklet entitled "The American Indian" published by the American Association on Indian Affairs, Inc., volume III, No. 1. The article is entitled "The Indian in the Postwar Period" by Willard W. Beatty. As a member of the Indian Affairs Committee in the House, I believe some consideration should be given toward giving the American Indian his freedom and rights as an American citizen, just as Lincoln freed the slaves.

THE INDIAN IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD
(By Willard W. Beatty)

Four years of war have brought about tremendous and unexpected changes in the lives of thousands of our American Indians. More than 24,000 men and women of Indian blood have served with the armed forces, and the records indicate a higher percentage of volunteers than in any other racial group in the United States. Other data indicate that approximately 40,000 adult Indians left the reservations to participate in war industry.

The value of vocational training offered by our Federal Indian schools and of the

on-the-job training in Indian CCC camps is evidenced by the surprisingly large proportion of Indians who have achieved promotion into technical positions in the armed forces. The same training experiences have stood Indian war workers in excellent stead and in many types of industry where high degrees of manual dexterity are at a premium, the Indian has been a preferred workman.

The question naturally arises, now that the war is over, What are these Indians going to do? Will veterans and industrial workers both return to their reservation homes and resume the kind of life in which they were engaged at the outbreak of war?

It must be remembered that the natural resources on many reservations have been inadequate to support the entire population. On other reservations, much Indian land has been leased to whites.

Will Indians return to their reservations and begin to operate them themselves? Will Indians, who have grown accustomed to living and fighting side by side with their white brothers, prefer to return to more isolated areas where they will be living primarily among other Indians, or will the returned veteran wish to locate in a city or industrialized area and work for wages side by side with whites? The same questions may be asked with regard to Indian industrial workers.

By the thousands, these men and women have gone into crowded urban areas to work at shipbuilding, aircraft production, and factory work of all kinds. They have been subject to the same overcrowding of residential facilities that has confronted everyone else and they have also found it difficult to obtain adequate schooling for their children.

Will they have become sufficiently adjusted to this kind of living and this kind of work so that in the future they will choose to remain away from the reservation?

Of course, no one has all the answers. Here and there, very positive statements have been made by veterans or by industrial workers prompted by the pleasant and unpleasant experiences through which each individual has passed. Out of the comments made directly to Indian service employees and out of correspondence which has come to our attention, certain trends of feeling appear to be definitely set.

Indians from Arizona and New Mexico, who for years have been deprived of the right to vote and who have suffered other economic discrimination because they are reservation Indians, have become very conscious of their rights as citizens and resentful of the discrimination which has deprived them of some of these privileges. Many an Indian boy reports that, sharing a fox hole on Guadalcanal or Bougainville with a white buddy, he has been asked searching questions as to the handicaps and advantages of being an Indian. The southwestern boy has been unable to explain why he is denied the right to vote and his white companions have been unable to understand how this privilege could be withheld from any citizen who has been asked to fight for his country. When the boys come home, many of them are going to put that question right up to the citizens of their home States.

Resentment against the present law prohibiting sale of liquor to any Indian anywhere, which has been seething underneath the surface on many reservations, has become greater. Wearing the uniform of the United States, Indian boys in all parts of the world have had as free access to liquor as their companions in arms and they have probably used and abused it with equal enthusiasm.

By and large the Indian soldier, sailor, or marine finds it difficult to understand why he should encounter discrimination in the matter of buying liquor after he returns to civilian life when he has, insofar as he can see, acquitted himself equally with whites in the use of liquor while in uniform.

During this same period, while the boy in uniform has been obtaining liquor freely and wondering why discrimination should have existed in the past, there are numerous older Indians who have developed a growing conviction that the ban against liquor should be continued on the reservations. Most of them are willing to grant that when an Indian leaves his reservation he should have the same freedom in the matter of liquor as any other American with whom he associates, but they believe that Indians in Indian country will probably be better off if liquor is kept away.

Indians in uniform and out who have fought for their country, worked for their country, bought war bonds, and supported the Red Cross find it a little difficult to accept the racial discriminations they encounter in many restaurants, hotels, and stores which display signs reading, "Indian trade not solicited," "Indians keep out."

Other Indians have been unhappy to find that in many of the cities to which they have gone to work in war factories, they have been refused the privilege of living in districts where homes are good and sanitary facilities adequate, and have been condemned to live in less desirable areas. They have found that not only are they not wanted as residents in select neighborhoods or better apartment houses, but that their children are not wanted in public schools. Sometimes the rejection is not an out-and-out refusal to enroll the child, but a disinclination to do anything to encourage regularity of attendance.

Where such conditions have existed, the Indians have not been happy and it is doubtful whether they will continue in such an environment after the patriotic need is over.

Whatever happens, there is bound to be a temporary return to the reservation now that war jobs are terminating and men are being mustered out. What will happen thereafter probably will be determined by the general adjustment in economic life which occurs throughout industry. If reconversion takes place smoothly and peacetime jobs take the place of the wartime jobs which are ending, many Indians will leave the reservation and return to these work opportunities. If, on the other hand, we fail to realize the 60,000,000 jobs which have been discussed during the last year, Indians face the likelihood of the same kind of discrimination which drove them back to the reservation in the early twenties. Then, when jobs became scarce, Indians found themselves among the first to be laid off. Since then, however, many employers have learned that Indians are superior workmen.

The postwar trend of Indian employment, therefore, is largely beyond the control of the Indian service and will not be influenced greatly by what the Service believes to be desirable or undesirable. It will depend in a large part upon the attitude of the other American citizens toward the Indians whom they meet. If it is friendly and equalitarian, many Indians will decide to move to cities. If it is discriminatory and prejudiced, many Indians will decide that they are better off on their home reservation and return or remain there.

How will all of this affect the Indian Service? If Indians find a welcome reception away from the reservation areas, it will greatly simplify the problems of the Service. If 22,000 of the 55,000 Navaho Indians found successful employment on farms, in mines, on the railroad, and in factories, life would be much simpler for those who remained on the reservation. The local resources could be more easily stretched to provide for the remainder of the kind of living that would raise their economic status, improve their health, and enable them to contribute more effectively to American life.

In lesser degree, on other reservations, the problem of economic rehabilitation demands that varying proportions of the total Indian population find employment away from the reservation. In some areas the slow return of Indian lands to Indian operation as Indians acquire skills and a desire to farm or to raise livestock, is not keeping pace with the increase in Indian population.

It is not reasonable to argue that Indians who can make and who are making a living in the livestock industry at Pine Ridge, Tongue River, or Uintah, should abandon their activities and enter the cities to become wage earners in factories, condemned to live in slums. On the other hand, it is clear that economic rehabilitation for all Indian families now living on many Indian reservations is not possible unless more land is acquired for them. It would be an alternate solution if many sought wage work elsewhere.

For a number of years, the program of Indian education has been a dual one: (1) training Indian youth to make the maximum use of Indian resources; and (2) training Indians who can be interested in activities away from Indian country to succeed in such activities. It seems inevitable that this dual program will continue. It would not be sensible for a tribe like the Rosebud Sioux, who own nearly 2,000,000 acres of excellent grazing land, to abandon this to whites and try to readjust themselves to an industrial economy somewhere else. On the other hand, the economic and effective operation of these grazing lands will depend upon the education of young men and old men in more effective use of these resources.

There is no point to suggesting that all the Navaho, who are now eking out an existence on the semidesert lands of the reservation in Arizona and New Mexico, give up their homes and way of living. However, if that way of living is to become more profitable and healthful, the land must be used more conservatively. There must be a careful upbreeding of sheep to produce bigger and better specimens with heavier fleece to replace the present inferior stock.

If the tribal skills in weaving and silversmithing are to contribute in increasing measure to the support of the Navahos, greater skill will have to be taught and greater efficiency practiced. Much of this training will have to come through the schools of the Indian service. On the other hand for many of the Indian children who wish to find their way into industry away from the reservation, the schools of the Indian Service must offer a foundation for successful mastery of industrial skills.

The service, however, is not equipped to make its best contribution to Navaho training, because school facilities now exist for less than 6,000 of the 20,000 to 22,000 Navajo children of school age. Immediate steps should be taken by Congress to remove this discrepancy.

It is not probable that any larger proportion of Indian youth will seek a higher education than is true with regard to white youth; but where the aptitude and the desire exist, the schools of the Indian service must prepare Indian youth for admission to colleges and universities.

The Indian service has no intention of monopolizing the education of Indians. More than half the Indian children of school age today are enrolled in public schools and the number increases yearly. The remainder, who attend Federal schools, live in areas of compact Indian-owned land where there is no property tax base for the support of local public schools. In most of these areas, the educational problem is one which demands specialized attention.

The Indians of the United States, more than any other linguistic group, have retained the use of their native languages. There is hardly an area in the Indian service where all children have learned to speak the English language before entering first grade. Teachers of Indians are, therefore, confronted with the necessity of breaking through language

barriers and instilling fluent use of the English language on the part of pupils to whom it is foreign and who come from homes where it is not in use. The average non-English speaking Indian child will continue to make more rapid educational progress in the schools of the Indian service than in public schools not equipped to deal with the language problem.

The public school has made its greatest contribution in the education of Indians in areas where whites and Indians have been able to go to school together. On the reservations where most Federal schools are today operated, there are no whites who can go to school with Indians. Therefore, the advantage of biracial education does not and cannot exist.

In the period immediately ahead, many Indians are going to need and seek retraining to equip them for new skills and new jobs. It is still too early to predict how active a part the Indian service will play in this program of reeducation. Nine high schools in the Indian service are approved institutions for veterans' training and a few of the boys and girls who are returning to civilian life have already elected to attend these schools to obtain the retraining which they need. The schools are planning programs of retraining to fit the needs as they arise. The next year should determine how large a part these schools will play in such reeducation.

Surplus Property Moscow Bound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we have had many complaints recently from veterans to the effect that they are unable to acquire surplus property which they need on their farms and in their small business establishments which they are trying to set up as a means of making a livelihood for themselves and their families.

I have heretofore predicted that it is probable that the manner in which the surplus property is being disposed of may become scandal No. 1 of the postwar period. All sorts of practices of favoritism and discrimination against the veterans have been observed. Many veterans have written me letters stating that large concerns and foreign purchasers have been preferred to the veterans, and that veterans have been deprived of obtaining surplus materials which they so much want and need. Congress has favored the sale of this surplus property to the veterans, but the veterans complain that those in charge of the disposal of surplus property do not give the veterans a chance to buy it.

Now comes a letter from an Oklahoma businessman who has recently been attempting to buy some of this surplus property. But he says that surplus property is Moscow bound. His letter gives a better explanation of what he has found in Oklahoma during the past few weeks than I could give, and I quote from his letter of April 3, 1946, as follows:

For the past 5 or 6 weeks we have been inspecting machinery and equipment to be sold by the Government at the various plants in the Southwest. It seems unreasonable to find so much machinery, equipment, and other merchandise tagged "Moscow."

This past week we found in Tulsa several carloads of manila and sisal rope, both scarce items in this country, all tagged "Moscow." Is this what the Communists are stocking up so they can hang the gullible Americans a little later on?

I wonder if the people generally favor this method of disposal of our surplus property? I wonder still more how the veterans will feel when they find out what this businessman has ascertained with reference to the disposal of the Government's surplus property?

Mr. Speaker, this certainly is enough to infuriate all of us, and Congress should investigate immediately what is taking place and put a stop to preferences for Moscow. It is bad enough to let the foreigners have all or a great portion of the surplus property which we left overseas, but it is eminently worse to deprive our own citizens, especially the veterans, to whom we have made such noble promises, of this surplus property and then ship it to Moscow. It is time to call a halt.

Statement of Lt. Gen. Raymond Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include statement by Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors today:

Mr. Chairman—

1. Since passage of the last River and Harbor Act a number of authorized project reports have been reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and out of that number, approximately 50 have been favorably recommended by the Board and approved by the Chief of Engineers. The proposed improvements range in size and importance from small-boat harbors of refuge to deep-draft ship channels and major extensions of the inland and intracoastal waterway systems. Each recommended project has been examined and weighed for justification in the public interest and found individually worthy of improvement. Each, however, will derive its maximum usefulness as an integral part of the improved national river and harbor system. The progressive addition of each new link in the chain of coastal ports and in the interconnected waterway systems extends the routes, expands the volume of traffic, places new sources of materials and new markets within economic reach of each other and thus benefits both the newly opened areas and the regions already served by existing facilities.

2. These proposed improvements have been favorably reported only after their economic worth has been established under the revealing light of critical analysis. All of these projects are responsive to the needs of local interests as freely voiced in public hearings. Expressions of opinion and supporting facts have been diligently sought from all interests concerned and have been given careful consideration by the reporting officers and the Board in arriving at their final conclusions. Influences tending to accelerate or retard the growth of water-borne traffic on completed projects have been studied for their probable effect on proposed river and harbor developments. Statistical records of going waterways under the varying and abnormal business conditions obtaining during the past two decades have been compiled and analyzed for guidance in estimating the future role of river and harbor improvements in the general transportation pattern of the Nation.

3. The significant fact brought out by these records is that, not only during the war period, but in general throughout the preceding decade of unprecedented business depression, the inland and intracoastal waterways have continued, in ever-increasing quantity, to attract and build up a growing volume of barge-borne freight tonnage. The reason for this growth is that, when reduced to the common denominator of cost, water transportation emerges as the best adapted and most economical agency among the several means of transport, for the movement of our essential basic commodities. In the long run the waterways are sought by that class of traffic. This fact is shown clearly by the large-scale ton-mileage chart of the inland and intracoastal waterway systems placed on the board at my left. It shows that inland water-borne commerce increased from a low of 7,826,000,000 ton-miles in 1931 to more than 31,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1944. This and the other small-scale charts which have been made available, were constructed from the only complete and reliable reports available covering all the freight movements on all the waterways—those compiled by the Statistical Division of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. Fortunately, congressional foresight has required the Engineer Department to maintain those complete records of freight movement on the waterways making up the inland system in all the various stages of maturity of traffic to serve as guides for the future.

4. As shown by the charts, the existing partially completed systems of river and harbor improvements, to which these proposed additions, extensions, and connections would be added, have proven their indispensability during the critical war period. If the accomplishments of the ports of embarkation and dispatch of vital war material could be publicly stated in figures, it would constitute a most remarkable record of achievement. It has not yet been practicable to compile complete statistics on transportation of munitions and other strategic materials from production points deep in the interior to ocean ports for transshipment to the various theaters of hostilities. They constituted a large item of barge-borne tonnage that likewise had to be excluded from published statistics during the war for reasons of security. However, it can now be disclosed that no less than 3,943 seagoing military and naval craft plus 146 drydocks were constructed at widely scattered shipyards on the Lakes and inland waterways during the critical months and propelled or towed down the rivers to deep water to play their indispensable part in the major invasions of enemy-held territory. If some of the projects now recommended could have been available to navigation 5 years ago, I am convinced that their contributions to the prosecution of the war would have added substantially to this highly creditable story.

5. Like housing, manufacturing, and other normal peacetime activities, however, additions to waterway facilities and floating equipment were drastically curtailed by war priorities. Early in the war period, the demand for towboats and special-service barges for use on the most strategically located waterways swept the lesser channels clear of barges, and efforts of ODT to obtain a more liberal allocation of critical materials for water transport were necessarily unproductive for more than a year. The effect of hav-

ing reached the limit of available barge equipment in the meantime is clearly apparent on the chart. Many of us are convinced that, in view of the almost unlimited capacity of standard waterways to absorb traffic, a liberal allocation of materials to barge transportation would have resulted in a speedy and elastic type of transportation that would also have had great postwar usefulness and salvage value. It is significant that no waterway is idle now. The curtailment of waterway expansion during the war was not, however, altogether a misfortune, because it logically now places a large-scale river and harbor improvement program among the foremost undertakings needed for national postwar development. Such a program can now be prosecuted in an orderly manner with appropriate materials and designed to take advantage of all the technological advances of the war period.

6. The pattern of future wars, if wars must come, is uncertain, but foremost among the lessons impressed upon us by the sum of our experiences from Pearl Harbor to Hiroshima is that our war-waging potential cannot safely be concentrated in one place or even in a few places. The judicious distribution of our production centers and the maintenance of alternate transportation routes will obviously be more essential to security than ever in the so-called atomic era. A successful outcome of military operations is clearly becoming less and less a matter of individual heroism and tactical skill and more and more a grim problem in logistics, geared to our foresight and ability to produce the necessary materials and place them at critical points at the proper times. A fundamental principle of strategy that does not change with the art of either waging or averting war is that preparations have to be made largely during the intervals of peace. We should prepare for the probable trend of the postwar era to decentralize major national activities, by making available innumerable sites for the dispersal of industrial expansion along the banks of our improved waterways and ship channels, and by providing extensions of these facilities through desirable land-locked areas for maximum accessibility. Authorization of the projects here recommended will permit continuing and intelligent long-range planning in recognition of this trend with a view to insuring the maximum net public benefit attainable. It is the sort of planning that, in my opinion, has been properly delegated to the Corps of Engineers as the one agency most conversant with the problems of maintaining the security as well as the orderly economic development of the Nation as a whole.

7. Clearly the energies of the country must be expended wisely in the period we are about to enter, if we are soon to regain our normal national equilibrium. As more abundant man-hours of labor become available in the peacetime years they must be used to conserve and build up our natural resources and reserves of essential commodities. Wisely, Congress has provided that projects must be authorized prior to being available for appropriation. The most advantageous choice of projects for appropriation in the amount measured by Congress can best be made if many economically sound projects are available for selection. In these times of changing conditions, it is to my mind urgent that desirable projects should be authorized by Congress as soon as possible after their consideration by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and myself. The river and harbor bill enacted in the spring of 1945 was considered by your committee in the fall of 1943 and the spring of 1944. Hence, a period of 2 years or more has now elapsed. It seems to me a healthy condition for new projects to receive the careful scrutiny of your committee and to be authorized while the engineering, the cost, and the benefit data are fresh and truly responsive to general conditions obtaining at the time.

8. Mr. Chairman, as you may recall, I had the pleasure of appearing before your committee as resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors back in 1936 and the years immediately ensuing and I am pleased again to be available whenever your committee desires me. I was informed yesterday to appear throughout the flood-control hearings, but I am sure that arrangements can be made to comply with any schedule you may wish. With your approval, Mr. Chairman, I have asked Colonel Feringa, the now resident member of the Board, to serve your committee in its detailed consideration of each report. Colonel Feringa returned from overseas late last year and immediately resumed his former position as resident member of the Board, in which capacity he is well known to many of the members of your committee and is thoroughly familiar with the individual projects to be submitted. In turning the duty of their detailed presentation over to Colonel Feringa, I want to repeat my serious conviction that the authorization of additional river and harbor projects at this time is prescient wisdom.

Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations Idea Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at Geneva, Switzerland, was ended the League of Nations, but its work will be carried on by the United Nations Organization.

Those of us who followed the leadership of Woodrow Wilson in creating the League of Nations, and who still believe that his prophetic words should have been heeded by the adherence of the United States, find comfort and consolation in the splendid article written by Anne O'Hare McCormick in the New York Times of April 8, which, under leave granted, is submitted herewith:

ABROAD—HAIL AND FAREWELL TO THE SOCIETY OF NATIONS

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Long thoughts of a world that is gone, sad thoughts of a first great chance that was missed, will haunt the minds of the delegates of forty-odd nations gathering in Geneva today for the last session of the League of Nations. But they will not be funereal thoughts, as they might have been if the wind-up had occurred a year ago. Like the budding trees along the banks of the foaming Rhone and the fingers of green that stretch up toward the snowy crown of Mont Blanc, the feel of spring is in the air of Geneva and in today's rites in the palace by the lake that has been shuttered up, a satire done in marble, for nearly 7 years. For at last the time has come when they can be celebrated, not as a burial service but as a feast of resurrection.

The end of the League is not the end of the dream which it embodied. It is not an end at all, indeed, but a new beginning. Today it meets to transfer its physical assets, its records and its functions to the United Nations. It meets to hand over its unfinished business to its successor. If it had no successor the League might be pronounced a failure. But it is forever vindicated by the fact that before the close of the war it could not prevent, before the first attempt to make peace, the first thought of the nations that belonged to it had—more significant—of the nations that had never joined was to organize another league.

HISTORIC JUSTIFICATION

This is the historic justification of the Geneva experiment. It is the best proof that the world has reached a point in time when organization for peace is inescapable.

Many ghosts hover today around the table where the delegates assemble to resume the twentieth session, adjourned in 1939 when the shadows of the approaching war engulfed the newly built palace and the final deliberations of the Assembly took on the air of tragic farce. That was the day when the League seemed to be dying. The flags of all the nations flew above the hotels along the river, as they do today, but in the eyes of those who watched they were already at half-staff, furling banners of the forlornest of all hopes. Now they float again, in farewell to the League, but also in salute to the transplanted banners—the same flags and more flags—that are unfurling on the other side of a lake called an ocean, but hardly wider than Leman used to be.

If the shade of Woodrow Wilson is among the ghosts of Geneva, hovering perhaps beside the tablet which hails him as Founder of the League his country abandoned, he must derive more than a melancholy satisfaction from this transplanting. It took a second war to drive home the lesson he saw so clearly in the first, but it has been learned so thoroughly that the United States was this time the first to sponsor and the strongest in support of the United Nations. That the stone that was rejected in 1920 has become the very cornerstone of American policy in 1946 was the keynote in President Truman's Chicago speech. "The immediate goal of our foreign policy is to support the United Nations to the utmost," he declared. "To be strong," he said, is "a firm obligation we have undertaken as a member of the United Nations." And again: "I have confidence that there is no international problem which cannot be solved, if there is the will and strength to solve it, through the United Nations which we have created."

A PROPHET HONORED AT LAST

Woodrow Wilson will be remembered in the valedictory of the League, not as the leader of a lost cause but as a prophet who was honored at last in his own country. The cause he fought for was never abandoned by millions of his countrymen. When it was taken up again by Franklin Roosevelt, in the blinding light of events that showed how right Wilson was, the ground was already prepared for a popular support as nearly unanimous as has ever been given to a national policy. It is hardly overstatement to say that the United Nations is the League of Nations, larger, stronger, perhaps more difficult to manage, come home to its birthplace to make a fresh start.

Among the ghosts are living men who saw the old League rise and fall. Lord Robert Cecil, of Britain, and Joseph Paul-Boncour, of France, are among those at the last session who were also present at the first. The President of this adjourned session is Dr. Carl Hambro, of Norway, one of the most familiar figures of the old days. Dr. Adrianus Pelt, of Holland, former head of the Information Section of the League, is still there, though he is now one of the Assistant Secretaries General of the UN. Many League officials are occupying or are slated for similar posts in the successor organization.

Actually, the League is only merging into something else. What is closing in Europe will be known as the Geneva chapter. It is not even certain that the work is ending there, for as soon as the decision to move

the headquarters was made, the Russians dropped their campaign against Switzerland and are now reported to be considering it as a headquarters for trade between the Soviet zone and western Europe. The unused palace in Geneva may yet become the center of the European activities of UN.

Anyway, the American chapter has begun. The United Nations is established here because everybody in the dissolving Assembly in the old capital, everybody in the world, is convinced that its future lies in the hands of the United States. If the age-old dream of universal law and order is to be fulfilled, it is the New World that must find the way.

Medal of Merit for Hon. Karl Stefan, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD today the statements and speeches made March 9, 1946, when Congressman KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, was awarded by President Sergio Osmeña of the Philippines the Philippine Medal of Military Merit for recognition of his work before and during the war.

Congressman STEFAN has proved himself to be a true friend of the Filipino people and this award is an indication of our esteem and regard for him.

CONGRESSMAN KARL STEFAN DECORATED

In an impressive ceremony at the Philippine Commonwealth Building in Washington on the afternoon of March 9, 1946, Representative KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, was given the distinction of being the first Member of Congress to receive the Philippine Medal of Military Merit from President Sergio Osmeña as conferred by Gen. CARLO ROMULO, Resident Commissioner from the Philippines to the United States. General ROMULO was in charge of the dignified program accompanying the giving of this award which was attended by a distinguished group of Senators and Representatives as well as officials of the State Department, Army and Navy officers, and the Veterans' Administration.

General ROMULO said in opening the ceremony, "Congressman STEFAN is being honored today for his meritorious services to the Philippine Commonwealth before and during the Japanese occupation.

"For many years we have known Congressman STEFAN as a true friend. His interest in the Philippines goes back to the year 1904 when he served in the Philippine Constabulary. His work took him all over the Philippines and he became one of the earliest advocates of Philippine independence. More recently his services in psychological warfare through his broadcasts to the Philippines throughout the war are well known to the loyal Filipinos who risked their lives to hear him. So it is a happy occasion for me today to present to Congressman STEFAN, on behalf of President Sergio Osmeña, the award of the Military Merit Medal, with the following citation:

CITATION

"Hon. KARL STEFAN, Congressman from Nebraska: For meritorious services rendered to the Commonwealth of the Philippines during the period from January 1942 to October 1945. During the period of Japanese occupation, Congressman STEFAN's friendship for the Filipino people moved him to an ever-increasing activity which was of great assistance to the Nation's morale. Long before the liberation campaign was launched, he issued statements which did much to encourage the Filipino resistance movement. These statements were followed by important radio commentaries, broadcast via short wave at weekly intervals throughout the entire campaign to liberate the Philippines, under the auspices of the United States Office of War Information. The cumulative effect of his statements and commentaries was to counteract enemy propaganda and to heighten the popular confidence in ultimate liberation and victory. The value of his fighting messages was frequently mentioned in the intelligence reports furnished to General MacArthur before the landings in October 1944.

" 'His broadcasts served the military purpose of reminding the Filipino people that the American people knew of their travail and were determined to pour their blood and their treasure into the struggle for their freedom. His broadcasts strengthened further the loyalty of the Filipino people to the people of the United States and encouraged them to further successful operations against the enemy. Because of his devotion to the cause of the independence of the provinces, Mr. STEFAN's efforts beyond the line of duty during the campaign for the liberation of the Philippines were to a considerable degree responsible for the speedier achievement of military victory and thereby for the saving of innumerable American and Filipino lives.' "

General ROMULO recognized the widespread interest throughout numerous Government departments in the honor being conferred upon Mr. STEFAN by saying, "Now, before we hear from Congressman STEFAN, permit me to introduce Mr. William Stone, Director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, who is representing Mr. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Stone will read tributes paid to Mr. STEFAN by President Truman and Secretary of State, Mr. James Byrnes."

Mr. Stone:

From President Truman:

"Hearty congratulations on the award by the Philippine Commonwealth of the Military Medal of Merit in recognition of your services to that hard-pressed nation.

"Happily, when you were serving in the Philippine Constabulary so long ago you formed a desire to see your friends, the Filipino people, attain nationhood and independence. Fortunately, it has been your satisfaction in these later years to make a substantial contribution to the cause of nationhood through your faithful and conscientious service on the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. I think it is especially fitting that the Philippine Commonwealth has decided to confer so signal an honor upon you."

From Secretary of State, Mr. James Byrnes:

"It is with real pleasure that I have learned that the Philippine Commonwealth is awarding you the Medal of Military Merit. The citation, I understand, states that your messages to the Filipino guerrillas during the war were 'to a considerable degree responsible for the speedier achievement of military victory and thereby for the saving of innumerable American and Filipino lives.' I well remember our trip together to the Philippines in 1935 and your deep concern for the aspirations of the Filipino people, gained from your previous residence in the islands. The American people have reason to be proud of your long service to the Philippines."

General Romulo presented Mr. Earle Chesney, former Commander Chesney, who represented Gen. Omar N. Bradley, of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chesney:

From Veterans' Administrator, Gen. Omar N. Bradley:

"Please accept my congratulations upon your award of the Military Merit Medal from the Commonwealth of the Philippines in recognition of your outstanding service to that country. I should like to take this opportunity also to thank you on behalf of the many American veterans whom you have helped by your magnificent cooperation in veterans' affairs of this country."

In introducing Congressman STEFAN, General Romulo pointed out that the dean of the Nebraska delegation in Congress was elected in 1934 and saw service on the Insular Affairs Committee. Mr. STEFAN, General Romula said, is at present a member of the Appropriations Committee and ranking minority member on the subcommittees for the Departments of State and Justice, Federal Judiciary, Department of Commerce, and the District of Columbia. The Resident Commissioner for the Philippines alluded to the recent conferring of the degree of doctor of laws by the National University of Washington for work on good government, and to the Nebraska Representative's outstanding achievements in farm legislation. In conclusion, General ROMULO stated that not only was Mr. STEFAN vitally interested in farm legislation and domestic progress, but that he had been an official advisor to the American delegation to the United Nations Organization meeting at San Francisco.

Mr. STEFAN, replying to General ROMULO—acting for President Osmeña—in receiving the Philippine Medal of Military Merit, said:

"In receiving this unforgettable evidence of the appreciation of the Filipinos for what I have done for our common cause in our time of common suffering, I am deeply cognizant of the signal honor which has been conferred upon me. I accept this great gift in the spirit of humility.

"For over twoscore years my career has been closely connected with the Filipino people. As a member of the Telegraph Division of the Philippine Constabulary—during which time I had the opportunity of meeting and knowing Filipinos from Luzon to Mindanao—I gained first-hand knowledge of the universal determination of my Filipino friends to retain their personal and collective freedom and the right to govern themselves. These ties grew with the years, nor did distance make them less strong. It was my privilege to be a member of the inauguration of the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth in 1935. I told the story of the courageous Filipino people in newspapers, in magazines, over the radio, and on the floor of the House of Representatives. When the Japanese aggressor struck at the Philippines, it was my fervent desire to do all within my power to aid in driving the hated enemy from Philippine soil and in restoring orderly processes of constitutional government.

"I count it the outstanding opportunity of my lifetime that my time, my effort and my words were, in their modest way, responsible for saving the lives of Filipinos and Americans so that the youth of both our peoples could devote themselves to the rebuilding of a war-torn world.

"It is a challenge to us whom war has spared to give all we can, whenever we can, to keep faith with our youth who died that we might be free. We have learned what blood brotherhood means in the roar of battle. We must continue that blood brotherhood in a world at peace if civilization itself would survive."

PRAISE IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

On behalf of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN KERR, of North Carolina, had this to say in the House Chamber:

"I noticed in yesterday's Washington Post that a very outstanding honor has been accorded our beloved and able colleague, Hon. KARL STEFAN. He has been awarded the Philippine Military Merit Medal from the Commissioner of the Commonwealth Government representing President Sergio Osmeña.

"Of course, I am not familiar with the services our distinguished colleague did in respect to his contact with the Philippine Constabulary when he resided in those islands, but I assert unhesitatingly that what he did then and thereafter during the recent war was a great service to these islands and to the United States, and was occasioned by a heart attuned to the heartbeats of humanity and his love for his followman.

"KARL STEFAN never did a bad job and never will. He has become one of the outstanding men of this House because of his accurate knowledge of the problems of the Nation, his wisdom, and his personality. This House is proud of his achievement and extends to him its warmest congratulations."

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a brief analysis of approximately 12,000 letters dealing with the extension of price control and written to the House Banking and Currency Committee. Of the letters from business concerns one-third were in favor of continuing OPA, two-thirds were against extension or were for extension with definite limitations. However, it is interesting to note that the letters in favor of OPA were mostly from small business; the letters against OPA were largely from trade associations, or from lumber people, real-estate firms, and textile manufacturers.

The letters from individuals ran 9 to 1 in favor of the extension of price control. Individuals opposing it were mostly owners of rented property who felt they should get higher rents.

These findings coincide with the Gallup poll and also with the ballot mailed to the 50,000 readers of Modern Industry magazine. Their readers are management men in more than 31,500 plants reported to be responsible for roughly 89 percent of all American manufacturing production. Of those who responded 53.8 percent voted for the continuation of price controls and 46.2 percent voted that price controls should be discontinued after June 30, 1946.

The letters from individuals tell their own story. They express the confidence which the plain people have in the job which OPA has done in keeping down run-away prices and their realization of the need for the gradual tapering off of price control during the period when production of consumer goods is catching up with industrial production which is now some 60 percent above the average for 1935–39. This greatly increased production is proof that price control has not hampered production.

Following are quotations from typical letters written by individuals in support of OPA:

As an ex-GI who came back and had to pay a fee to secure an apartment for his wife and child, and was fortunate at that, let me add my plea to millions of others who wish to see the extension of OPA. The falseness of the arguments of various pressure groups to kill the OPA and controls can be seen in one instance. What has happened to rentals in industrial buildings? Have they been kept at reasonable levels? Judge for yourself. (Chicago, Ill.)

It seems to me as a housewife, mother, and lastly, a consumer that my dollar buys less and less every day. I look back to the days when full price control helped us to resist inflation and wonder where the Congressmen are that understood our problem. (Columbus, Ohio.)

I am not only a consumer, but a businessman and a property owner (own several properties). Yet I want you to do everything in your power to enforce and continue OPA. (Hardware and House Furnishings. New York City.)

Remember, the people are not stupid or blind and you can be sure we all watch performances in Washington where it concerns the welfare of the people and our wonderful country. (New York City.)

Belonging as I do to the group on small pensions and fixed incomes, I seem to see the whole economic schedule threatening to lift beyond our reach for no one's real advantage. * * * Why not keep it down where we of the lower stratum can participate? (California.)

As a mother of eight children, my mother, my husband, and myself to feed and clothe, I very strongly desire the continuing of OPA. I know if it hadn't been for OPA during the war, my family would have been hungry during this period. (Massachusetts.)

The OPA has protected my young daughter and myself from a midwinter eviction and increases in rent. (Massachusetts.)

I note by the newspapers that every business organization in the country that can possibly do so is lobbying against OPA. * * * Yes; remove all controls and throw us to the wolves. It is a well-known fact that in the event of wild inflation, we, the little people, will see our puny little savings disappear so fast that we really won't know what hit us. (Indiana.)

I certainly shudder at the prospect of no OPA to control prices. Veterans would be one group that would take a terrific beating if the OPA were abolished. Most veterans are taking it as it is trying to find homes, decent jobs, and education without depriving them of the limited protection of our present OPA. (New York.)

The problem millions of my buddies have to support their families on $80 or $100 a month. Paying $50 a month rental doesn't leave very much for food, clothing, etc. I'd hate to think of what might happen if OPA were to be taken out of existence at this time. (New Jersey.)

I am a returned veteran of the European theater living on the $20 temporary weekly allowance from the rehabilitation insurance, unable to find work, married, and desperately need the OPA. Please in all fairness to all Americans see that price control is not only continued but strengthened. (New York.)

I watch with wonder and astonishment the attempts by such people as the National Association of Manufacturers who are doing everything within their power to destroy price and rent ceilings. * * * I am a veteran, earning a small wage. * * * The majority of American people are not large wage earners. We cannot afford to give up even a few pennies to make rich people richer. * * * When it is safe to remove ceilings—O. K. But until then, please get in and pitch for us—we consumers depend upon you to carry our best interest into the Halls of Congress and fight for us. (New York.)

I am a returned serviceman with two brothers killed in action on foreign soil. One of the few real and live ideals for which they, and I, and millions of others fought was for a fair and decent living. By abolishing the OPA, you are destroying one of these fundamental structures, and making way for a dangerous inflationary period. Combat veterans like myself are banking on you to save price control. Salaries overseas were low so we cannot afford inflation like the lobbyists who remained at home. (California.)

I'm a veteran. After 3 years overseas, I return to find every greedy clique, led by the NAM, clamoring for removal of price controls. Fortunes will be reaped by the few, while the country is propelled into chaotic disaster. (Pennsylvania.)

As a serviceman soon to be retired on a disability pension, it will be impossible to maintain my home and family without rigid controls on rent, food, and clothing. (New York.)

I am a returned veteran. My salary now is hardly enough to keep me in good clothes and furnish the necessities of life. Movies are 60 cents compared to 35 cents several years ago. * * * Did we come back to inflated living and no reasonable upgrade in salaries? Did we return to scarcity after abundance of everything we needed for the war effort? Why can't industry produce under regulated prices as well as they did during the recent war? Why do they want to milk us of our meager savings from the Army and of the civilians' savings, too? (New York.)

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that, by using the strictest economy, a family of three can now just break even on an income of $40 a week. My husband and I, both World War II veterans, and our week-old baby expect to have an income of $90 a month for the next 12 months. * * * We are terrified at the thought of increasing cost-of-living in the future. (Virginia.)

This is the first letter I have ever written to protect my rights as a citizen. I find myself stung to action by the flagrant work of selfish lobbies—men who seem to have forgotten war so soon, and the millions of us average citizens who won it—and who deserve something better than inflation. * * * We ask—no, demand, that you, our representatives in Government, prove our trust in you to have only the best interests of all its citizens in mind. (New Jersey.)

As I only make $26.30 net a week, you, too, must see what I am up against today. Oh dear sir, what about tomorrow. Please for Christ's sake, don't let us little folks down. We, too, are American. (New York.)

As a veteran who is attending school under the GI bill of rights, I must appeal to you to see to it that price control under OPA is continued. I have a wife and baby and it will take every cent of the $90 a month plus our meager savings to get me through school. (New York.)

When I get out of school I want to be able to step into a future which is bright and clear and not a mess my generation has to try to straighten out. * * * Keep up the good work on your fight to have the Price Control Act renewed, for you are not alone. (Illinois.)

We are in the wake of a terrible conflict and if OPA control should be suddenly abolished * * * conditions could become so chaotic that the consumer might very easily become the consumed, as by the sudden opening of flood gates. (California.)

What I've always been wondering about is why a congressional committee just never calls upon the plain, ordinary, common guy or gal in the street. * * * Perhaps you ought to suggest to the rest of the committee members that they ask their wives about prices and the cost of living. I, as a veteran, feel very embittered at the state of affairs here at home in the United States. (New York.)

If the line is not held the 36 bonds I bought while in the Army will not be worth the price I gave for them. (New York.)

When I see how the profiteers and big lobbies are still trying to take everything

from us, I see red. In the war we killed for freedom, so they could live; now they wish to kill us slowly, through starvation and privation, to line their pockets. (Flight officer.)

Four years ago when I entered the service my savings would have been sufficient to see me through 4 years of school. Today, even with the aid of the GI bill, they are not quite enough for 2 years. If a strong OPA is not confirmed they may not be enough for 6 months of schooling. (New York.)

I wish to raise a question ignored by the NAM and various chambers of commerce, even though such groups have actually thrown the question into bold relief: It is the question whether human selfishness is a safe basis for a responsible economy. (Massachusetts.)

I am a home economist who worked directly with families during the last depression, and I know the misery and agony that follows inflation. Inflation and deflation have followed every war in the history of our Nation, and there is no reason to believe that it will not happen again if we do not try to prevent it. (Ohio.)

I am a recently discharged veteran, disabled through combat with the Twenty-sixth Division. * * * While in Europe, I saw what harm and misery inflation caused, and I definitely do not want that to happen here. The United States is too great a country, with abundant resources, to ever let inflation get the best of us. It happened before, but it had better not happen again. Support OPA ceilings and powers, and we will support you. Safeguard our future as well as your own. (New York.)

Farmers' Home Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years the Farm Security Administration has been operating under Executive order and without the benefit of basic law passed by this Congress. Even with bad administration a part of this time it has proven itself worthy when applied to the small and poorer farmers of the Nation.

Through the aid extended by the Government, through FSA, many industrious tenant farmers have embraced the opportunity of becoming farm owners. Though a great amount of money has been loaned to help such farmers the losses have been very small.

The Cooley committee which has brought in this bill has spent the better part of 2 years making a searching investigation of the entire FSA set-up and the provisions of this bill are written so that the errors of past administration will be obviated in the future. This bill should, and I am sure will, be passed by this House by a substantial majority. This is the first application of reconversion which has been applied to the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to extend the helping hand of the Government to the tenant farmer and the man of small means who desires to become a farm owner. It is important when one takes into consideration the trend of those leaving the farms because of higher wages in industry, that this effort as well as other efforts must be made in order to make it more desirable for men to remain on and till the soil.

The passage of this bill writes permanent legislation for the Farm Security Administration and in my judgment, is one of the best pieces of farm legislation that has come before this House.

I find myself in full accord with the objectives it seeks, and am glad to register my vigorous support and approval of this legislation.

Bargains for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me by unanimous consent I wish to include an article by Al. Williams, entitled "Bargains for Britain," which appeared in the Washington Daily News, of date April 6, 1946, as follows:

BARGAINS FOR BRITAIN

(By Al. Williams)

Let's talk again about the so-called trades made by the British with our State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board in the matter of air trade routes.

In addition to the trans-Atlantic route connecting the United Kingdom with seven coterminals in the East and Middle West, along with reciprocal routes from Bermuda and Nassau, Great Britain obtained the rights to four great trade routes to and through the United States.

One is the extension of the trans-Atlantic route from England to New York and then directly across the United States to San Francisco, to Honolulu, Manila, and the Orient. That's really nice for the British. It's the long way from London to the British interests in the Far East. The short way is from London through Canada, but if the British adopted a trans-Canada route they would be competing with the Canadian trans-Canada air lines.

They won't have that.

They traded with us for the right to fly passengers to New York from London, discharge them there, pick up new passengers at New York and drop them at San Francisco, or carry them right on to Honolulu and eastward. Or, they could drop the entire planeload of American passengers they picked up in New York at San Francisco and pick up another planeload (all American passengers), and continue on to Honolulu and the Orient.

That's just plain ducky for them, but it's not so hot for TWA, United Air Lines or American Airlines, who have pioneered the route from New York to the west coast; and it's not so good for Pan-American, which has done all the pioneering work from San Francisco to Honolulu, Manila, and the Orient.

The British will fly American transports, purchased from American manufacturers at the same price that the same types of ships are sold to our American airlines. The British will pay their pilots anywhere from one-third to one-half what our domestic airlines pay their pilots. The British thus will be permitted to compete with American domestic air lines, tapping a market which provides about 80 percent of all the originating air traffic of the world. The United States gets in return the right to carry traffic to and from certain British colonies, such as Hong Kong and Singapore, none of which originate much air traffic.

Swapping the right for the British to tap our home air traffic market for the spotty traffic between the British colonies and the Far East doesn't make sense for American interests. The British air lines are to be allowed to share with our pioneering American air lines the trade between the United States and the Orient. Practically none of the traffic that the British will carry from New York and San Francisco to the Orient will be of British origin because British air travel to the Orient undoubtedly will move from England via the Middle East. By such a trade of air routes the British are to be permitted to jump right smack into the cash registers of our American air transportation interests and eventually into the pockets of our air line pilots, our stewardesses and our aircraft mechanics.

A Plea For Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem on statehood for Hawaii by a former Member of the House of Representatives published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

A PLEA FOR STATEHOOD

(As may be made by Hawaiians to the mainlanders)

(By M. H. Thatcher)

(Mr. Thatcher, a former Member of the House from Kentucky, now an attorney of Washington, D. C. With Mrs. Thatcher he visited Hawaii in 1925 as a member of a congressional party.)

The promise, long since spoken,
Is ripe upon the tree;
And by each test or token,
It now should, garnered, be.
If it be doomed to perish,
The world will wonder why;
And all the faith we cherish,
May wither soon, and die.

You tax and double tax us,
(And we without a voice.)
And if your method racks us,
(Who minds our will or choice?)
The democratic process,
That made you strong and great—
O keep it free from blindness,
Its strength inviolate.

Of Federal exaction,
In tithe and revenue,
We pay a worthy fraction—
We share our wealths with you.
The record, please compare it—
Observe how we excel;
The load, we bravely bear it—
Ours be the truth to tell.

The ox ye shall not muzzle,
That treadeth out the corn.
Ours is no racial puzzle,
However we are born.
Though dark, or white, or yellow—
Regardless of our hue—
For fellow, each for fellow,
We're much the same as you.

In all this Orient West,
From Miaway to Kalae;
Throughout these ranging isles o' rest,
That bloom upon the sea—
No doubtful counsels darken—
We claim a single land;
Unto one call we hearken,
We heed but one command.

If war should bring commotion,
And guns again should roar;
If on the Mother Ocean,
The tides of death should pour—
We'll fight in spirit loyal,
(Whate'er the hostile pow'rs.)
Beneath a banner royal—
That which is yours—and ours.

We know you as our brothers,
We love you as our own;
Of ties, there are no others—
We're bound to you, alone.
One future, great, invites us;
Together we must fare;
One destiny unites us—
We ask for freedom's share.

By all that's just and holy,
By all that's wise and true—
We ask for Statehood solely
Because it is our due.
Our civic day should brighten,
Kamehameha calls:
Be swift to note and lighten
The shadow, ere it falls.

Our bastions are the western bar
To alien arms or fleet;
Within your blue you need our star
To make the flag complete.
Hawaii has the right to be
A free and equal State;
O write aloha so that she
May join the Forty-eight.

Claghorn, the Dixie Foghorn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, entitled "Claghorn, the Dixie Foghorn" which I think most appropriate. The editorial follows:

CLAGHORN, THE DIXIE FOGHORN

For years, yes, decades, we've been battling to bring some measure of rationality into the fried-chicken-watermelon-mammy-magnolia-moonlight-mocking bird-moon-June croon school of thinking on southern problems, and now we've run up against the toughest proposition yet. We refer, of course, to that bombastic bumbling, brou-ha-ha of the air waves, Senator Beauregard Claghorn, "from the deep South, that is," whom a writer in Life has just referred to as "the most-quoted man in the Nation."

This amazing character on the Sunday evening Fred Allen program must have given millions in the North and West the notion that southern Senators spend their time in making frightful puns, and bellowing "That's a joke, son!" and in such professionally southern deliverances as: "When in New York ah only dance at the Cotton Club. The only dance ah do is the Virginia reel. The only train ah ride is the Chattanooga Choo-Choo. When ah pass Grant's tomb ah shut both eyes. Ah never go to the Yankee Stadium! Ah won't even go to the Polo Grounds unless a southpaw's pitchin'."

We "southrons" have been kept sufficiently busy asserting to our northern friends that we aren't all morons and degenerates a la Tobacco Road, or banjo-picking mammy-singers, a la Al Jolson, but now we have to go around protesting that we aren't all raucous nitwits and foghorns like Senator Claghorn, "from the South, that is." Gad!—Condensed from Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch.

Fight for the Spirit of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Akron, Ohio, April 4, 1946, before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations:

Fellow members of the Republican Party, we Republicans this year face a new and crucial responsibility which the broad sweep of events has placed upon us. The responsibility falls equally upon Republican men and women. It can only be discharged if we muster all our strength. We face powerful enemies. They are the enemies of free representative government and the issue is free, representative government itself.

We who have for so many years fought side by side to preserve traditional American freedom now see with new clarity and sharper vision the clear-cut issue of the present day. We are able to see the issue because we understand and respect the fundamental processes of the form of government guaranteed us under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Our respect and devotion to these principles of free government has been heightened, strengthened, and made more keen not only by our own unflagging fight to preserve them, but also by the sight in recent years of the rise of new forms of tyranny which have crushed the peoples of the world and ground them down in the miseries of fear, hunger, and physical cruelty.

Thinking Americans have relearned the true meaning of freedom in the example of those who have lost it. We have relearned the meaning of freedom by losing some portion of it ourselves. You and I—despite our stubborn and unrelenting opposition for these many years—have seen a measurable part of American freedom taken away. All of us in wartime voluntarily submitted to governmental controls and the broad, blundering supervision of our personal lives. Yet the necessities of war served only to accentuate a trend which had already existed in this New Deal administration before the war. That record being carried forward today promises only continued assaults on American freedom, if the New Deal continues in power.

Our responsibility as Republicans in this time is twofold. We must take vigorous measures to perpetuate the knowledge of liberty in coming generations and we must take immediate action to turn back the enemies of freedom now.

The success of the American form of free, representative government depends upon the ability of each rising generation to understand it. Herein Republican women have a long-range responsibility—a vitally important responsibility—separate and distinct from ordinary organizational activity in political campaigns. The American woman of this generation must not only engage in the tactics and strategy of campaigning in which she has proven herself to have such great talent and initiative, she must likewise, as the mainspring of the home and family life, inculcate in the next generation the philosophy upon which our free representative government is based.

We must remember and never forget that freedom begins in the American home. A people who would enjoy liberty must have knowledge of it and love for it. Freedom is based upon character and character depends upon training. The destiny of future generations of Americans therefore places a charge upon the women of America not only to rise to the challenge of these uncertain times and turn back the enemies of freedom, but to instill in the youth of America that love of independence, that innate self-reliance, that integrity of purpose which are the marks of a free people and which provide the foundation of free, representative government.

But all Republicans—men and women alike—have a critical and immediate mission which must be performed today and will not wait for the faith or the energy of some new generation to undertake it. We must not bequeath to American youth the choice between the bitter cup of tyranny and a bloody struggle for liberty. We must provide the rallying point and the instrument for the fight to maintain American freedom against the destructive radicals of this present time.

It has become increasingly evident that the Democratic Party is held captive in the tight grip of the radical and fellow traveler. It has become increasingly evident and is even now openly declared that the power and influence of the present administration is to be employed to advance the influence of leftist, New Deal elements, and to destroy or drive from the Democratic Party all those who do not blindly subscribe to the Communist-inspired radical line. President Truman has substantially endorsed the statement of Secretary Wallace that those who do not conform to this line should be purged from the Democratic Party.

You may wonder why it is that after remarking upon the responsibilities of the Republican Party, I suddenly turn to consideration of the divisions and dissensions within the Democratic Party. I do so because the most significant political fact of our generation is this: That the exponents of the master state, the radicals who call themselves New Dealers, the fellow travelers, and the Communists have now disclosed their intention to bid openly for power. The Truman administration seeks their support. With cynical disregard for the very traditions which have given them their opportunities as men, administration leaders now betray the spirit of America for the sake of a bloc of votes. For the support of a minority, for a few million votes at the polls, administration leaders now foreswear the ideals of the vast majority of Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike. They seek first to drive from the Democratic Party and then from the entire American scene all men and women who oppose their radical schemes wishing to conserve the philosophy and the practice of free representative government.

This issue transcends ordinary party considerations. It is no longer just a contest between Republicans and Democrats. It is a contest—and a bitter, vital contest—between fundamental philosophies of government and of life.

The gauntlet is down. Henry Wallace and President Truman, the two main leaders of the Democratic Party, have openly proclaimed their intention to recognize only the left wing of the Democratic Party and to purge the rest. They have thus brought home to all thoughtful Americans the realization that this year the clear-cut choice before the American voter is the choice between mass organization, mass regimentation, mass psychology, mass government as against our belief in the traditional American system in

which the individual liberties of each individual American are preserved inviolate. The choice is between the combination of misguided radicals of the New Deal who would first destroy the bulwarks of freedom and then exploit the change for their own personal and sordid advantage—the choice is between that kind of radicalism and forward-looking Americanism which holds that the problems of our society, all its defects and inequities, can be corrected under the orderly processes of law without sacrificing in any measure the true and traditional liberties of each individual American citizen. The New Dealers extend to us a master state—a state in whose name the rights and liberties of any citizen may be trampled and crushed. They mouth great humanitarian ideals and then seek to smother or impair the most humanitarian concept of all time—which is traditional American freedom. They speak largely of the public interest and then maneuver secretly for private gain; they pretend to serve the people and behind that pretext serve only themselves.

We hold that this Government is the servant of its people. We hold that the governing of this society must be under a rule of law laid down by the people themselves, instead of a rule of personal whim. We oppose irresponsible persons who use the authority and power of government to inflict their personal ideas and ambitions or their private greed upon the American citizens.

These are the views, these are the beliefs for which the Republican Party has fought with unceasing devotion for these many years.

These views and these beliefs are shared by all true Democrats, for these are the views and beliefs of the founders of this Nation. They are the principles upon which the great advancements of America were based. They were never questioned before by any major party. The issues between the Democratic and Republican Parties were the issues of policy or detail, but they were never issues involving the very form of government and the most sacred concepts of human freedom which are now raised by the professional radicals of the New Deal who have captured the machinery of the Democratic Party.

Democrats—true Democrats—have now lost their traditional political home. Henry Wallace may talk of party responsibility, but the men and women of the Democratic Party who truly believe in the traditions of the Democratic Party and who truly believe in the American system of free, representative government cannot now bridge the gap between their scruples and the radicalism of the New Deal.

This is the doom of the Democratic Party. It is the final rift which has ruptured all possible cooperation between the left and right wings of that party. It is the final foreclosure of any hope that good government can emerge from a party whose own best statesmen repudiate the philosophy and the practices of its radical leaders.

It is now the responsibility of the Republican Party to provide that constructive, forward-looking leadership which can emerge only from a party whose members all agree on its fundamental tenets of faith. It is no longer a question of political labels, of those overworked and empty words "liberal" or "conservative." It is no longer a conflict between sections—of East or West, North or South. It is a crucial and dynamic issue involving the fundamental approach to government itself.

All men differ. Republicans differ. On occasion, and in regard to specific issues there are a variety of opinions within Republican ranks. It must always be so in any great organization. Some men and women will devote themselves to those phases of our society which demand change and improvement; others will devote their energies and attention to administrating and operating those mechanisms of our society which they believe have achieved satisfactory progress. Some will see great challenges; others will wish to conserve and improve without drastic change. Nevertheless, on principle, on philosophy, on the approach to the daily conduct of Government, Republicans are in unison and have fought together these many long years to advance those common beliefs. Our philosophy is such that there is room for many shades of opinion within our broad area of agreement. "In my Father's house are many mansions." Within the Republican Party are the spires of great hopes and new ambitions for the future and new concepts of the public welfare and new plans for a better life and new resolve to serve the whole people. In the Republican Party are the great edifices of experience, of wisdom, and of judgment. In it, too, rise the structures of new invention, new ideas, and new imaginative understanding. Only in our desire and our intention to preserve the American way of life and the American form of government are we rigid and unyielding. We welcome to our ranks all those who would now fight to preserve that way of life and that form of government against the sinister and powerful influences which willfully and sometimes traitorously assail it from every side.

There are now two main parties in the United States. The Republican Party and the New Deal Democratic Party.

The differences in principles and intentions between the two parties are wide and distinct. They must be made clear to the voters of America in order that they may be able to make an intelligent choice between the plans and beliefs of the New Deal Democratic Party and the plans and beliefs of the Republican Party. They must be made clear in order that the voters may choose at election time, in order that they may decide upon stated and adequate grounds to which party they wish to entrust the administration of the affairs of this Nation which we revere.

The first great difference between the parties is this—and it is a difference so wide, so deep, so simple, so important that it dwarfs almost into insignificance all other debatable points. It is a difference that cannot be adjusted; that must not be compromised. It is the difference between black and white, the difference between day and night, the difference between safety and danger. It is so basic and so elementary that upon its decision rests every important and minor particular of the kind of life we will lead in the years that stretch before us. Upon it depends the way we will live, the hopes we will hold, the way we will plan for our families and our business and our ambitions for a happy, a serene, a secure life for ourselves and for our children.

This difference between the New Deal position and the Republican position is this—and it may be stated in few words and simple phrase:

The New Deal Party is without faith or confidence in the future of the United States; the Republican Party has a sure and courageous faith in the future of the United States.

The New Deal fears that we are sick with an incurable disease and thinks we may look forward only to the life of an invalid, kept unhappily alive by artificial respiration, with no hope of cure, with no hope of being restored to vigor and health. The Republican Party knows that our country suffers only from a temporary illness, that its Constitution is sound and its vital organs unimpaired. The Republican Party knows that our country can be restored to health and sanity so that it will continue to live and to prosper for generations to come. The Republican Party knows that our Nation is young with tremendous natural strength and energy, and that a future of splendid usefulness and prosperity and glory stretches before it—a future so sure, so solid that not even our miraculous past will compare with it.

We are not at the end of our national life—we are only at the beginning of it. We are not finishing, we are only beginning. We are not hopeless and helpless. We are not a crumbling ruin descending into dust and rubble. We are a young, unfinished edifice, erected upon a solid foundation, skillfully planned by great architects, and carried forward by master builders, growing every day in strength and beauty and usefulness, until it shall become the wonder of the world. It is an edifice that never will grow old because it never will be finished. It is a building to which each succeeding generation shall add its part as new requirements shall arise. It is an edifice that never can grow old because it never shall be completed; but will constantly be improved and enlarged and beautified until the end of time.

There, my fellow Americans, is the elementary difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. One crawls forward, limping, groaning without faith, the other marches proudly, with head up and banners waving, with high hope and sure confidence in its ability to endure and to live and to accomplish.

It is true we are ill, but it is not with an incurable illness. It is an illness caused by neglect and ignorance and blundering. It is a surface illness that can be cured, and cured speedily by operation.

The date of that operation is set. It is on election day of next November. The hospital is the election booth. The operating knife the people's vote. The electorate is the surgeon. Upon it depends the success of the operation and the restoration of the patient to health. It is for the people to cut out the malignant growth of doubt and fear so that the clean, healthy tissues of our national body may grow again.

If our people want a nation restored to health and vigor and confidence in its long life and prosperity, let their vote be for candidates of the party of hope and vigor. If they want our country to drag out a life as a hopeless invalid, made unaware of its pain by drugs and sleeping potions, then let their choice be for candidates of the party that holds that belief, the New Deal party.

They tell us that our economy is a finished economy. They tell us that because we have stretched from ocean to ocean that we have no more frontiers to bring us prosperity. They tell us that we have grown to manhood, lived through our prime, and have reached senility. They tell us that we have accomplished all there is to accomplish, and that from this day henceforward there is nothing for us but to live on our fat until it is exhausted.

We say that this is nonsense. We say that it is worse than nonsense, it is stupidity. We say that we have not even seen a vision of the frontiers that lie before us, or of the glories of the lands that stretch beyond those frontiers. We say that our glories of the past will seem drab and pale as we march forward into the glories of our future.

We say that America is on the march. It is going forward to conquer. It cannot be stayed nor halted in its progress. Our future can be circumscribed and limited only by our will to go forward. And we say that that will, indomitable, efficient, eternal, lives in the hearts of this great people, and that nothing—nothing—can halt our victorious march.

We have faith in the United States. Our party—the Republican Party—has faith in the United States. We call upon all citizens to join our army, to take up their weapons, and set out upon our campaign with us. It is a campaign against doubt and fear, and we will not lay down our arms nor cease from the battle until our enemies shall have been vanquished, destroyed, abolished, and eradicated. Fear is the enemy. We can and will destroy it.

What are these new frontiers beyond which lie prosperity? They are not frontiers of

land or of water, although there are millions of acres of our soil not yet brought into human use. They are the frontiers, widened every day by science and invention and the discovery of new methods of doing. Just as vast industries have appeared over our horizon in the past, employing millions of our citizens, pouring wealth into the lap of the Nation—so will new industries be born in our future, bringing with them opportunity and new wealth and new employment. Just as the automobile, the airplane, the radio appeared to revolutionize our lives and to bring us the blessings of prosperity, so in the years ahead will come other and now undreamed of contrivances that we will want to buy and to use—which will employ their millions. We are at the dawn of the atomic age. Who can say what wonders, beneficial to all mankind, may not be waiting behind the curtain of tomorrow?

Not only will there be splendid inventions; there will be new ways of doing, new ways of manufacturing, new ways of farming, new ways of mining, and of utilizing our natural resources. We will discover that our farmers can grow more to the acre, that our manufacturers can produce more at lower cost in cash and in toil. We will see the workday shortened and hours of leisure be given to lives that have known little leisure. We will see lives more comfortable, richer in those things that make life rich. We will see no millenium, but a country in which every man, by diligence and skill and intelligence, will be given the opportunity to grasp happiness and self-won security for himself and his family. We will talk no longer of cramping frontiers but only of a limitless future unhampered, uncramped, wearing no handcuffs or shackles—a future which holds out promise to be shared by all who have the will to share it.

It will not be a future of uncertain security given to us for a few precarious days by a Government that cannot find its way, but a future earned and made secure by the efforts of individual men, free to choose their way of life, their own occupations, their own careers unimpeded and uncircumscribed by un-American regimentation imposed by the hands of a short-sighted and selfish bureaucracy.

How can we possess for ourselves so desirable a future?

We can possess it by setting America free. All American history has been a history of fighting for freedom. It is a never-ending battle. We must continue it today. Not to free ourselves from a foreign master; not to free ourselves from overlords or the tyranny of archaic laws; but to free ourselves from the deadening grip of those men who have seized our land and are strangling it; who are choking its spirit and its genius, and who are smothering its initiative. We must free it from a system which is undermining our integrity, denying us the inalienable right to compete with one another fairly, forbidding us the God-given privilege of independence of individual action and enterprise.

We must fight for freedom again. The army in revolt against this new, destructive tyranny is the Republican Party, and the Republican Party says to you, "My fellow American, America once more shall be free!"

The Republican Party is awake. There shall be no compromise or appeasement or imitation. We know what we are for and what we are against. We know what is right and what is wrong. We have defined the causes of battle and we have drawn rigidly the battle line. We will fight it out on this line if it takes a generation. We say, "America once more shall be free."

The Republican Party is the party of forward-looking wisdom opposed to the party of reckless experiment.

The Republican Party is the party of Americanism opposed to a party riddled and inoculated with foreign, left-wing, un-Americanism.

The Republican is the antiradical party, opposed to the radical party.

The Republican Party is the antiregimentation party opposed to the party that would put a nation in a tyrannical production line or under the thumbs of political top sergeants.

The Republican Party is the antibureaucratic party opposed to the party that would fasten the dry rot of a vested bureaucracy upon every phase of American life.

The Republican Party is not a party of the past but a party of the future. It is opposed to a party bound by rules of its own making, imprisoned in a cell of its own building. It is opposed to a party that can only stand still but never move forward as new events demand a forward progress.

The Republican Party is the party that believes in paying a debt rather than increasing a debt. It is a party that believes we should pay our way, day by day with our earnings; not that we should pay our way for a year or two by borrowing ourselves into bankruptcy. It is a party that looks at our staggering debt as a thing that must be faced and paid as opposed to a party that believes it should be dodged and increased.

The Republican Party is the party of governmental economy, opposed to the party of governmental waste and prodigality.

The Republican Party is the party which believes that civil governmental employees should be drastically decreased instead of recklessly increased until our salary list alone becomes an insupportable burden.

The Republican Party is the party that believes in treating every man as an individual citizen opposed to the party that believes every man must belong to some class or group. It is a party opposed to the stirring up of class or racial strifes in opposition to the party that fattens on class prejudice and racial warfare.

The Republican Party is the party that knows the vexing question of labor-management relations must be settled fairly and squarely so that industrial peace shall come to the Nation. It is opposed to the party which believes that this question should not be settled but should be fomented and inflamed, because that party fattens on quarrels and strife and unrest.

The Republican Party is the party that believes that capital and industry and labor should be regulated in their conduct by fair and just laws, honestly administered. It believes that the security of the public is the paramount consideration, and that both capital and labor must recognize the public interest.

We believe that the men and women of labor have the right to unite for their own protection and advancement and to bargain collectively, if they choose to do so. We believe that the end product of such bargaining, however, is an agreement or a contract and the parties thereto are mutually responsible. We believe that the true and legitimate aim of both organizing and collective bargaining is to improve the condition and the returns of labor. We do not believe that those purposes should be distorted into efforts to destroy our free society or to destroy the very jobs which provide the worker with his wage. We see a public interest in the settlement of labor-management disputes which by disrupting the broad functions and services of our society damage us all alike—labor, management, farmer, and white-collar worker. We see in the use of violence by either side in labor disputes a threat to the individual liberties of American citizens.

The emphasis upon labor-management relations must be upon ultimate agreement and cooperation on a satisfactory basis to both—not upon governmental domination, not upon intimidation, not upon dictatorial methods, not upon artificial issues, not upon destruction rather than progress. We seek to construct a cooperative society in which the mutual interests of each of its elements will be recognized; in which labor may find ever-increasing opportunities for advancement, ever-increasing real wages both in terms of take-home pay and in purchasing power; in which the weak will be protected from the strong; in which the interests of labor, of management, of white-collar worker, and of farmer may be universally advanced under a rule of equal justice for all.

The Republican Party is the anti-Communist, and anti-left-wing party, in opposition to the party that conciliates and fraternizes with Communists and revolutionists. The Republican Party is affirmatively the party of competition and the right of the individual to carry on his business subject to fair regulation but without improper governmental meddling. The Republican Party believes that the law of supply and demand can never be repealed and that no spurious enactment can permanently become a substitute for the law of supply and demand.

The Republican Party is the party that believes in firm, honest, unselfish, open dealing in international affairs in opposition to the party that places its faith in secret agreements secretly arrived at. It is the party that believes in telling the facts to the public in opposition to the party that works in secrecy and fails to tell the public to what conduct it has been committed against its will and without its consent.

The Republican Party is the party that supports our Constitution as the framework of just government in this land. It is the party that believes that changes in the Constitution should be made, when necessary, by amendment openly advocated, rather than by devious, conspiratorial, revolutionary technique.

The Republican Party believes that no department or bureau should be supreme, and that any decision by any appointed, not elected, bureau should be subject to review by the properly constituted courts of the land. The Republican Party believes and will fight to conserve the resources and the Government of this Nation in opposition to the party that wishes to undermine and waste and destroy our way of life.

These matters that I have here described are the purposes and principles of the Republican Party. They are stated to you tonight as the opposite of the purposes and principles of the New Deal Democratic Party. The line of demarcation is plain. It is upon this line that we shall fight. We must now point out to others the clear difference between the Democratic and the Pepublican Parties. It is the citizens' right to decide which they prefer to entrust with the responsibility of governing them in the years to come. The choice is clear. The chasm that stretches between the parties is wide and cannot be bridged. We must have the one thing or the other. The decision rests with Americans. The day of decision comes on election day. In this land the majority rules. Let the majority speak. If they believe that the Republican Party, fighting for the principles I have here stated, is the party they wish to trust, then let them cast their votes for Republicans. If they desire to preserve this Nation as it is constituted with liberty and freedom for all, they will vote the Republican ticket. If they want to continue the America of our forefathers, and an America in which our sons will enjoy equality and individual freedom and the right to achieve by their own talents and industry, then the vote will be for our side. If they wish a changed, uncertain, regimented, communized America under bureaucratic tyranny, without pride in its past or hope for its future, then they will cast their vote for the New Deal Democratic Party.

As you go forth to carry this issue and to delineate this choice to the American people, it is well to bear in mind what results Americans may expect from the system advocated by the New Deal as opposed to the free system to which we devote all our energies and devotion.

The end product of the New Deal can only be the worst combination of governmental corruption and tyranny in history. Too many times over the past years have we seen the pattern of New Deal operation repeat itself. They move from crisis to new powers in the name of humanitarian ideals. Those new powers they then use to grasp for greater powers. The starry-eyed radical announces great flaming challenges to the humanitarian instinct of all men; the crooked radical moves in to exploit for his own advantage.

Let the New Deal continue and the success or failure of an American businessman will finally depend upon which inside track he can develop to governmental favor. The job of the workman may depend upon how well his union delivers a vote for the administration. The housewife may set her table well or poorly because her husband is in or out of favor with the party in power. The farmer may obtain a high or a low price for his product depending upon the arbitrary whim of this or that bureaucrat. The white-collar worker may be granted a raise or refused one, may pay high prices for cheaper merchandise because some New Deal henchman has decreed it so.

We are opposed to such practices. We will fight tooth and nail to restore to American citizens the rule of law which will provide equal justice to all, regardless of political faith or contacts, which will protect the weak against the strong, which will guarantee the rights of the individual against the political favorite, which will stop the spending of enormous amounts of the people's money for the sake of the privileged few, and which will remove from the backs of our people the deadening and discouraging burden of this administration whose only political hope and whose greatest vested interest lies in ever-increasing debt, ever-increasing control, ever-larger Government pay rolls, and ever-present strife.

We hold out on the other hand the promise of an America released from the dead hand of bureaucracy, restored to the sound principles of management and finance which spell economy and sanity in Government and more money in the pockets of the citizen. We repudiate the system of political caste and privilege which has been foisted upon the American people by the New Deal. We repudiate the princes of New Deal privilege who use the great humanitarian ideals of American citizens as a screen behind which to hide the most sordid efforts to feather their nests. We will restore to America a state of affairs wherein any American may stand before his Government and demand fair play, regardless of his race, color, creed, or political beliefs. We will repress this sprawling Government until it once again becomes the servant and not the master of the people. We will restore a rule of law under which no man, be he Republican or New Dealer, can willfully violate the rights of others and draw unto himself instruments of power improper for any American to hold.

Finally, we will so release the energies of the American people that the creative spirit of this Nation may contrive new approaches and open new avenues to a broad and magnanimous future. In the poorer third of the American people is a great challenge to industry and to agriculture and to labor to utilize the genius of America to produce new and better products, greater and more satisfying services at such lower cost as to bring this poorer third of our Nation within the compass of luxury. We will so foster and so encourage the enterprising spirit of American youth that the war veteran and the young men and women of this time may look forward with true enthusiasm to new goals of achievement and new marks in the forward progress of civilization.

From the great struggle through which we have just passed have emerged the devices and invention of a new and wonderful age—an age in which the sciences of electronics of nuclear physics, of chemistry, biochemistry, and mechanical engineering hold out to Americans of this generation and the next an advancement in the standards of our homes far beyond the fondest imaginations of our fathers. Release the energies of the American people and we can bring not only to America itself but to the broadest spread of humanity all over the world a new hope in the dynamic possibilities of independence and a concrete example of the physical rewards which are the finite product of personal freedom.

Yet there is some other increment, some other and almost indefinable thing which makes freedom worth fighting for itself. It is not the automobiles and the bath tubs of America which make this a great Nation. It is not the gadgets or the insurance policies alone which make this the happiest people on the face of the earth. Men may live as prisoners in palaces amid the utmost extravagant luxury, yet find no satisfaction for themselves. There is a measure of satisfaction in freedom which can be taken only from within and which cannot be marked out on the dimensions of a golden bath tub. Freedom's greatest satisfaction and reward lies in the knowledge of it. It reposes in the mind, and shows itself in a man's carriage and his character, and bespeaks itself in his eye.

Here is the spirit of enterprise. Here is the spirit of moral courage. Here is the spirit of advancement. Here is the spirit of America. Here is the hope of the world. We must fight to keep that spirit alive.

Dewey Out of Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 28 issue of the Albany Knickerbocker News:

DEWEY OUT OF STEP

On the very day the subcommittee of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted 3 to 1 in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway scheme, the Governor expressed himself in its favor, but the State assembly voted 109 to 21 to ask Congress to reject the proposal.

The three events present a contradiction in the representative system. Take the subcommittee first. It has just completed its hearings, which could not be considered complete because they did not include this proof the people of New York State are against the plan. The approval is an anomaly; the subcommittee was part of the Foreign Relations Committee and our Constitution says our dealings with foreign nations must be approved by two-thirds vote of the Senate, yet the proposal the subcommittee voted to approve calls for only majority vote of both Houses. If this were not a foreign relation, what was it doing in this committee?

The assembly has served our people well in adopting the resolution. For years an attempt had been made, with the urging of your newspaper, to get such a resolution passed. Now it has been done and the State is on record that its people are against the scheme. It is not realistic or fair to say the resolution was not complete because the Senate had adjourned and could not vote on it. The number of people for each assemblyman (the quota system) is so much smaller than for Senators that the assemblymen are much closer, much more representative of the people than the Senators. It is quite plain, undeniably so, that the vote proves our people oppose the seaway.

It is also equally plain that the people do not support Governor Dewey in his support of the seaway. The Governor says that will make no difference; he feels the resolution doesn't bind him because it was not complete and was not directed at him, but the first duty of the Governor is to represent the people, and when he does not follow a plain expression of their will he fails to do so. Mr. Dewey may be sincere in believing the whole people of our country favor the seaway (the proof is all the other way) but his first duty as Governor is to the people of his State, not the national population.

Mr. Dewey is out of step.

British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution in opposition to the proposed loan to Great Britain, which was adopted unanimously by the Allen County Republican Club, Fort Wayne, Ind., on April 3, 1946:

Whereas the Congress of the United States is contemplating approval of a gift to the British Empire, misnamed a loan, since the British themselves say they can never repay it; and

Whereas this gift in the net sum of $3,750,000,000, if made, will add to a heavy burden of national debt under which the American people now struggle * * * the war debt of the United States is four times as great as the combined war debt of the rest of the world; and

Whereas, if such a gift is made to Britain, similar gifts must be made to many other nations, unless we are to unfairly discriminate against nations; and

Whereas Bretton Woods was created for the purpose of giving financial aid to foreign countries, and the United States was the heaviest contributor to the Bretton Woods Bank; and

Whereas the making of this gift would cancel all of England's lease-lend account amounting to $27,000,000,000 worth of goods, and her unpaid balance of her World War debt; and

Whereas this gift need not be made to obtain the advantages which the British Empire seeks since she has raw materials and possessions which we need and she is in a position to sell; and

Whereas there is a threat that unless we make the gift, Britain will institute trade boycotts against us; and

Whereas there is such a limited supply of goods in the United States at present that purchases by England, instead of being desirable, would be undesirable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Allen County Republican Club, bespeaking what is believed to be the sentiment of rank-and-

file Americans everywhere, urge Senators CAPEHART and WILLIS and our Congressman GEORGE GILLIE to vote against approving the proposed gift to Britain.

Discrimination in Taxation of Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ralph L. Van Name, secretary, New York City Employees' Retirement System, to the American Society of Chartered Life Underwriters, New York chapter, at the Hotel Martinique, New York City, Tuesday, March 19, 1946:

The sale of annuities by individuals to individuals has many competitors and enemies. That it survives must be under the evolutionary concept of "survival of the fittest."

Government retirement plans such as I represent, with part, often the greater part, of the cost provided by the employer, eliminates from your market most Government employees; group retirement and annuity plans for most large employers and many who are smaller, however profitable to the negotiators of the group sale, erased further huge chunks of the former market for individual annuity sales; social security, offering untaxed annuities up to $1,020 to the bulk of the country's population, that is, to as many of social security's 60,000,000 and more participants as may remain in the fund to retire in old age, not only sharply restricts your remaining primary market but by totally exempting from income tax a product which you must sell subject to a full income tax and, as I expect to show, subject to an unfair tax—all these obstacles would discourage any but determined insurance salesmen.

Who, then, remain as individual annuity prospects? Small employers, their employees, the self-employed, persons of means, a minority who practice uncommon thrift, and persons who are determined, cost what it may, to make the security provision and distribution for beloved dependents which untaxed annuities would give to a degree hardly equaled by any investment available to the average person—all in all, a select group but not a numerous one. Even the cost of the sale of a commercial annuity (which is your living) must be in the mind of many a potential purchaser because the expense of administering the employer annuity plan in which he participates is not included in the purchase price which he must pay.

I list these weighty obstacles without attempt to make the list complete and cumulative. For my purpose, today, is not defeatist; it is rather to bring to your attention a particular obstacle common to your annuity business and mine which can and should and must be leveled if your business is to continue to survive. That obstacle is unjust, discriminatory Federal income taxation of annuities commercially purchased and of annuities of local government employees.

From what source are annuity payments derived? On one point, you and I and the Federal Treasury will agree—this, that while an annuitant's purchase money is being repaid to him, the annuitant is in receipt of capital previously income-taxed; he should not be taxed again. On the other hand, (subject to certain qualifications which will be discussed later) we might admit as taxable the amount of the employer's purchase money as it reaches the annuitant whether regarded as deferred compensation or as an outright gift.

There are other sources of annuity payments. Contributions by individuals and employers (and the interest on their contributions) usually turn out to be too much or too little. The annuitant who lives precisely as long as an annuitant should live is practically unknown.

A vast amount and number of annuity payments are made after the end of assumed expectancy of life. Of these, the Federal Government continues to collect an income tax at an annual rate of 19 percent or more.

From whence are those later payments derived? Not from the recipient's purchase money, for after expectancy has been lived, the annuitant's purchase money has been consumed, not from interest on the purchase money for that, too, is about exhausted. From where, then? The further payments—a substantial part of the annuity payment total for all (not to say for each) are derived from the forfeitures to the fund by the short-lived. At the outset, the short-lived and long-lived entered into an agreement that those who die soon should bequeath their unused residue and that those who live long should inherit that residue. That is the essence of an annuity contract. One does not put his money into an annuity contract to distribute out his capital within the period of expectancy. The individual could do that without recourse to a fund. They enter an annuity agreement in order to trade their possible short-lived forfeitures against the possible short-lived forfeitures of another to their possibly required long-lived income. I repeat: "They entered into an agreement that those who die soon should bequeath their unused residue and that those who live long should inherit that residue." This is so fundamental that I must apologize for stating and restating it before such a company as this, but I do so because of its vitally important bearing on correct taxation of annuities and because the principle continues to be ignored, notwithstanding its prime importance, by taxing authorities and even by those who suffer from its neglect.

Thrifty aged folk are willing to bequeath their life savings in case of premature death in order to have the assurance of bequest from others should they live and the others die.

The Government ruins this time-honored balance of bequest against inheritance which is present in an annuity contract by ignoring the disposition of the short-lived man's capital loss and taxing at 19 percent up annually as income the annual distribution of that capital to the surviving annuitant.

In years of full employment, this tax prospect compels aged workers otherwise ready to retire to continue beyond their best productive years and defers many an opportunity for the younger man ready to step in. In lean years, the aged thrifty are forced out of employment on incomes which are then taxed below a decent subsistence point to give them a lean and miserable old age. As you know, a woman purchasing an annuity at the age of 60 may not hope to receive back her own purchase money over and above tax if she dies before 100 years of age. If you are able to sell annuity in the face of such government seizure of annuity purchase money, it must be because your prospect does not realize the tax trimming she is in for.

Are you indifferent to present annuity taxation when it so vitally restricts your socially desirable and personally profitable volume of annuity business? Have you taken it for granted that, however, offensive, the taxation is necessary and just? It is not at all just.

If Doe and Roe each with less than $60,000 agree individually with each other to draw down their savings throughout their lifetime and agree further that if the first dying leaves a residue, that residue shall go to the other; one would not be taxed by the Federal Government for making the bequest nor the other for receiving it since the passing of an estate up to $60,000 is not taxable under the Federal law. Even as they rise above $60,000 estates are taxed at a slowly accelerating once-for-all rate which, unless the estate is huge is less than the 19 percent income tax minimum annually levied against small annuities.

Is it not plain that if estates under $60,000 are not nationally taxed at all, then from the time an annuitant has outlived his expectancy or received back all his purchase money and the interest earnings thereon, his annuity, except as it has a remaining value exceeding $60,000, should not be taxed at all? And, few indeed, are the annuities that have a remaining value of $60,000 when expectancy has been outlived. And, if an annuity, after expectancy has been reached, must be taxed in respect to its value in excess of $60,000 then if the Government will treat aged annuitants not better than but as well as younger folk in receipt of a lump-sum inheritance, it will tax aged annuitants on their installment inheritance at low, once-for-all inheritance tax rates but not on high every-year income-tax rates.

Why tax the individual whose medium for receipt of an estate up to $60,000 is an insurance company or annuity system when, directly from the estate, up to $60,000 would be free of tax? Is our Government so anti-social? Must insurance companies and their contracts be a Government medium for ruining thrifty little investors who prefer to or must do their collective financing their own way?

Even Internal Revenue with its harsh constructions would have held the remainder of a short-lived annuitant's purchase money free of income tax had he lived and not died. Had he left a lump sum of $25,000 or of $50,000, that would have escaped tax as income and as inheritance—as inheritance because it was less than the established tax-free maximum. But when the purchase money remaining at death is payble in annual installments for annuity, Internal Revenue taxes it and taxes it not less as inheritance but more as income.

Before we suggest a formula for uniform and equitable taxation of annuities, we pause to inquire not only how the Government taxes other estates but how it taxes other annuities. We discover that not only veterans' salaries but their pensions are exempt from taxation up to $1,500 (there are over 12,000,000 living veterans). We find that the House has passed and the Senate is considering a bill which will exempt up to $1,440 a year the annuities of as many of the Federal Government civil employees (of whom there are or were recently 3,000,000) as remain to retire on annuity from its service; that 700,000 railroad workers on private railroads as they come up for life annuities will be exempted by national law from annuity income taxation up to $1,440 a year; that 60,000,000 and more social-security workers so far as they reach old-age retirement will have income-tax exemption up to $1,020 a year. Sixty million and 12,000,000 and 3,000,000 and 700,000.

Assume that, after overlapping has been canceled out, there are left only a few more than 60,000,000 workers who may look forward to income-tax exemptions in old age. Sixty million workers entitled to look forward to income-tax annuity exemption, most of them for most of $1,500 a year while annuities purchased in regular trade channels by individuals are fully income taxed. Gentlemen, that is not government encouragement of thrift; that is unfair competition,

continuous discrimination, year after year, against personal thrift, unless that thrift is federally sponsored and supervised. One must be a soldier; one must, if he survives, be a veteran; one must belong to social security unless he falls into a group hard to define or difficult to administer; a railroad worker must belong to the railroad retirement fund. Acquiesce in the Federal "must" and you may have annuity-tax exemption. Organize personally your own annuity thrift outside paternal Government supervision and even though your plan has the seal and approval of generations of experience, you pay a full 19 percent or more annual income tax on your thrift.

How we prate abroad of equal economic opportunity here and how we deny equal economic opportunity.

Not that there should be condemnation of tax exemption, if equally available to all of annuities up to $1,500 a year.

Every citizen, however young, if he lives will certainly be old. If he lives to be very old, the chances are 100 to 1 that he will have to live them on much less income than he has known. If the productive millions of this country decide to lessen income tax on their reduced, unproductive old-age income as they have for the majority, and if they apply the plan equally and justly to all whose income are so reduced, as they have not, that, it is thought, will be sound economics and sound taxation—taxing the productive years and fairly alleviating the tax on the less or totally unproductive aged.

What is objected to is discrimination in tax treatment of the aged.

For just taxation, annuity payments break naturally into two periods (1) the period of refund; (2) the period of inheritance.

PERIOD OF REFUND

1. Divide the purchase price paid by the annuitant by the number of years of his assumed life expectancy as an annuitant. Exempt annually—

(a) The indicated appropriate pro rata part of the purchase price.

(b) The additional amount by which $1,440 (as now allowed other annuitants) is greater than the part of $1,440 annually purchased by their contributions under a similar computation; or

(c) In addition to (a) and alternative to (b) (if Congress prefers) exempt any lesser annual amount by which the current taxable income is less than the maximum income tax in a preannuity year (the Government has the record). This would be on the assumption that moral right to additional exemption is limited to the amount of reduction in the former standard of living.

(d) Income tax the remainder.

For this period, this method gets away from the computation either at the governmentally assumed rate of 3 percent or the actual rate. If less than the appropriate part of the purchase price is received back annually, the annuitant receives no interest and pays no interest tax; if more, the rule taxes the excess on the basis of fact, not theory.

PERIOD OF INHERITANCE

2. Because of paragraph 3, following, the individual annuitant, during this period, should be taxed only on the assumed interest on his diminishing inheritance. Income tax on 3 percent of the slowly diminishing reserve for his attained age would give internal revenue more than a just-tax basis as, no matter how long he lives and no matter how much he receives, there will always be an income left to tax from the remainder of the original principal which was inheritance taxed.

3. So far no Government "cut" has been provided from the estate of the short-lived annuitant. As we have demonstrated, this should be an estate or inheritance tax, not an annual income tax. While inherited annuity is payable after assumed expectancy, after annuity income tax ends or should end, the funds to supply the inherited annuity will mostly be available years earlier as deaths of short-lived annuitants occur. It would be better for the Federal tax collector, for the insurance company or retirement system and for the annuitants themselves if the companies and systems were to make an annual tax report of the deaths during the year of all annuitants who receive during life less total annuity than the purchase price plus assumed interest.

Deduct the total annuity payments received by the short-lived annuitant from the sum of the purchase price paid by him and assumed interest thereon. The resulting net excess of consideration over payment, in the fund, to the extent that it is part of a total estate exceeding the $60,000 estate exemption should be taxed once for all at current appropriate Federal estate- or inheritance-tax rate. In consideration of the payment of this tax, companies and systems doing so may be authorized by law to make the slight appropriate adjustment of annuity payments to those who, by survivorship, have become beneficiaries of income tax-free annuity. Almost uniformly, the result would be a slight reduced gross annuity for the remainder of life but a largely increased net annuity due to freedom from further annuity income tax.

Such a procedure would recognize that not only does the survivor of a joint and survivorship annuity contract inherit his equity; that survivorship equity, even in a single-life annuity, is no less inheritance because it is received impersonally through the fund from an unknown short-lived benefactor.

The Federal Government must grant uniform annuity taxation and exemption to all aged.

The Federal Government must stop taxing inheritance annuities as income annuities.

The Federal Government will do neither unless you understand and make Congress understand that their present discrimination against provision for old-age annuity is eating into the capital of thousands of thrifty little investors who would be subsidized instead of taxed had they used Government-sponsored assistance.

A lot of work has been done among local public employees during the past 2 years; many of our Representatives in Congress have been made conscious of this injustice and we should obtain legislation this year which will afford local public employees annuity income-tax relief. Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has promised hearings. Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, is reported as saying that when the next tax bill is written equal annuity taxation of all will be written into the bill. As a beginning, a rider might be added to any one of a variety of bills to provide, in substance, that "notwithstanding any provision or construction of this act or of internal-revenue or income-tax law, the net pension or annuity income up to $1,440 in any year of every person who has attained the age of 65 years shall have exemption from income tax not less than any annuity or pension exemption granted by law for any reason whatever."

The amended tax law, in my opinion, will be an incomplete job if commercial annuities are not given relief. Your clients and prospects are entitled to the same tax reduction in old age as retired railroad workers and social-security beneficiaries. Old age, wherever it is found, should be respected and assisted, not penalized.

Gentlemen, if, out of enlightened self-interest or in a spirit of decent respect for the aged and infirm, or both, you desire to enlist in the closing half of this battle which, I like to think, is not a gimme campaign but a crusade for justice to the aged, I promise you the same kind of cooperation which I know you are able to extend.

Publisher Resigns From Draft Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the April 3 issue of the Mishawaka (Ind.) Enterprise. The letter was written by Mr. John J. Rhodes, editor and publisher of that newspaper. Mr. Rhodes had served for 4 years and 9 months as a member of the draft board. He recites herein, in an able manner, the reasons that prompted him to tender his resignation from said board.

Among other things he states as his conviction that the war should have been officially terminated at the end of 1945, and we still would have had six additional months to make whatever military arrangements needed to be made.

In this connection I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 98 on last October 24, which would proclaim the termination of hostilities and of the national emergencies which are still in effect. However, we are still denied an opportunity to consider this or similar legislation on the floor of the House.

The article follows:

PUBLISHER RESIGNS FROM DRAFT BOARD—DISMAYED AT PROBLEMS CONFRONTING RETURNED SOLDIERS—CONSIDERS IT UN-AMERICAN TO LEGISLATE ONE GROUP SUBSERVIENT TO ANOTHER GROUP. THINKS END OF WORLD WAR II SHOULD HAVE LONG SINCE BEEN PROCLAIMED

After serving 4 years and 9 months as a member of Selective Service St. Joseph County Board No. 1 (the Mishawaka board), John J. Rhodes, editor and publisher of the Mishawaka Enterprise, the latter part of March tendered his resignation in a letter forwarded to Selective Service National Headquarters at Washington with a copy of the letter going to State headquarters at Indianapolis. The full text of his letter follows:

The President of the United States,
National Director of Selective Service,
The Governor of Indiana,
Indiana State Director of Selective Service,
Subject: Resignation.

Honorable Sirs: During recent days, as though by "well-layed plans of mice and men," the Nation has been subjected to the rantings of many radio commentators attempting to "soften up" the people to a continuance of the draft system by scares of another World War.

Somebody should tell them to shut up, get themselves a victory garden and get back to earth.

In Washington the heads of the armed forces that most strongly are urging continuance of the draft on the grounds that we need a large army for defense are the ones permitting destruction and abandonment throughout the world the best equipment ever built by man—United States Army and Navy equipment.

The appeal and action do not compare.

It is my conviction that an end to World War II should have been proclaimed at the end of 1945. This still would have allowed 6 months for whatever necessary military arrangements needed to be made.

I do not favor continuance of the draft. I am firmly of the opinion that it is un-Ameri-

can to legislate one group of citizens subservient to another group. However, I do favor, if a larger Army is necessary, substantially increasing soldier remuneration, a program of educational training continuing along with military service. In other words a professional army as we have professional policemen, firemen, and G-men. If the inducement or the need exists Americans will respond.

While World War II still continued our servicemen were regarded as our heroes. Nothing was too good for them. They were well clothed and fattened. The war was won for us. Now our men are returning. But not to conditions they dreamed of when they were facing enemy fire. Instead they find themselves confronted with a dire housing shortage, meat shortage, butter shortage, clothing shortage, a 50- to 60-cent dollar and many times discriminated against and snubbed.

I have served as a member of Selective Service System, St. Joseph County Local Board No. 1, since July 1, 1941. Over 150,000 copies of my paper I caused to be sent to local men and women in service during the past 5 years at no cost to them. And, too, I saw to it that the paper contained nothing that would promote worry about the home town to those far away from home. Besides this I donated hundreds of dollars' worth of space for war-bond advertising and other wartime campaigns.

Now I find myself as much dismayed and disappointed with attitudes and conditions as any returning GI. No longer do I feel that I am rendering my country a patriotic service by continuing as a member of the Selective Service System. And so, I hereby tender my resignation, effective as of March 30, 1946.

The time that I would spend on the board were I to continue to serve I will spend on my newspaper attempting to make better the lot of our returning soldiers.

Very cordially yours,

JOHN J. RHODES,
Member, St. Joseph County Board 1, Indiana.

P. S.—Whatever is stated above casts no reflection on my fellow board members, our office personnel, State and national headquarters of Selective Service, of whom I hold the highest regard.

J. J. R.

Disgraceful Gestapo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. J. H. Van Winkle in the Oregon City (Oreg.) Banner-Courier of April 2, 1946:

DISGRACEFUL GESTAPO

Not satisfied with bringing doubtful suits against alleged price ceiling rule violators, the OPA now adopts a policy of not waiting until the infraction is committed, but charges its victims before the rule-breaking act occurs!

Compared to ordinary criminal procedure law officers could arrest a person for burglary because he is carrying a wrecking bar down the street.

The case in point is that which the OPA has filed against the Clackamas Lumber Co., Oregon City, for treble damages amounting to $944.16. The OPA claims that the company would have sold lumber at over-ceiling prices if the OPA hadn't snooped around the lumber in transit.

These poorly drawn and unnecessarily instituted OPA suits are bad enough when they are brought after an alleged infraction, but they are disgraceful in a free country when the Gestapo starts yanking persons into court on suspicion.

Statehood for Hawaii Wins Support of Newspapers in Many States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD so as to include excerpts from editorial comment by newspapers in 19 States favoring statehood for Hawaii:

CALIFORNIA

Oakland Post Enquirer: "Favorable action urged on Hawaii's statehood appeal." After citing the House Territories Subcommittee's favorable report, the editorial quotes Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of California, as declaring: "I favor statehood for Hawaii and I will support it. The whole territorial picture, from the standpoint of economy, production, and strategical location, make it very necessary that Hawaii be welded into the Union."

Reviewing the Islands' history the editorial concludes:

"It was not unexpected, therefore, that the congressional committee brought back a favorable report. They found that 'the people have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibility of statehood.'

"Hawaii has come of age."

Sacramento Union: "Territory statehood. Hawaiians and Alaskans hold American citizenship. It is time they were given the full value of that citizenship by being granted statehood."

Hollywood Citizen-News: "Hawaii Is worthy of statehood. The record of the people of Hawaii during the war clearly indicates that further postponement of statehood will be unnecessary."

Bakersfield Californian: "Hawaiian Statehood. Certainly that area is entitled to statehood and indeed the issue should have had the attention of this Government in the long ago."

Burlingame Advance and Redwood City Tribune: "Statehood for Hawaii. We heartily second the motion made by Secretary Ickes for the admission of Hawaii 'in the immediate future' as the forty-ninth State in the Union. Admission of Hawaii to the list of full-fledged States would be the fulfillment of a century-long dream of the islanders. * * *

"The full case in favor of statehood for Hawaii cannot rest, however, upon the mere wish of the islanders. The stronger case is provided by the record of national loyalty established by them, and our obligations to them. * * *

"The islanders in 1940 voted 2 to 1 in favor of statehood. Congress without further delay should complete the admission proceedings."

Redwood City Tribune: This paper published the same editorial which appeared in the Burlingame Advance.

FLORIDA

Jacksonville Journal: "Clean bill for Hawaii. The citizens of Hawaii have labored hard over many years to fit their Territory for the assumption of statehood. The quality of their work was put to the test during the Pacific war, when their islands formed one of the critical bases of our strategy. There should be no further delay in extending to Hawaii full recognition as a State."

Jacksonville Times-Union: "Hawaii has contributed to the Union she joins. The war, because of Pearl Harbor, has brought Hawaii closer to the hearts of American people. This is the propitious moment for entry of the Territory to the Union, for it has shared intimately in an American crisis. The measure in which possessions contribute to the history of their mother country affords one accurate way of determining their right to statehood."

Orlando Reporter-Star: "Make them a part of the homeland. The Hawaiian Islands desire to become the forty-ninth State of the United States of America. Statehood should be granted its people."

GEORGIA

Augusta Chronicle: "Statehood for Hawaii. Under our American Federal system, we cannot regard a Territory as having a permanently fair and just status and must consider it as being in a transitional state toward statehood. For the United States has no policy acceptable to the American people of 'owning colonies.'"

ILLINOIS

Chicago Tribune—Noting President Truman's recommendation for immediate Hawaiian statehood in his State of the Union message to Congress the Tribune says:

"We are glad to see that he is recommending steps toward the liberation of Puerto Rico and that he is thinking of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska."

Jacksonville Courier: "Statehood for Hawaii. We are in a poor position to lecture the British and Dutch about their treatment of submerged people so long as we go on ruling the Hawaiians as we see fit."

IOWA

Des Moines Tribune: "Hawaiian statehood. The war demonstrated as nothing else could the fundamental loyalty of the largest racial minority in the islands—the Japanese-Americans, who make up a full third of the population. * * *

"With that, most of the excuses for not granting statehood disappeared."

Sioux City Tribune: "Hawaii as a State. Hawaii is, of course, one of the most important areas of all United States territory. Its strategic value to us is invaluable. * * *

"Not only is Hawaii strategically important to the United States, but it is of great economic value to us. The area and its people would seem to merit representation as the forty-ninth star in the flag. Statehood for Hawaii sooner or later is inevitable. Why not now?"

KANSAS

Salina Sun: "Statehood for our territories. Secretary Harold L. Ickes of the Interior Department has suggested that Hawaii should be admitted to the Union as the forty-ninth State in the near future. His suggestion should be acted on favorably by Congress. * * *

"The people of Hawaii themselves want statehood. * * *

"What more grounds does Congress need for admitting the Territory to the Union? After all, this is a 'government by consent of the governed'."

Topeka State Journal: "Our nationality is mankind. There is growing support in Congress for the proposal to bring the Territory

of Hawaii into the Federal Union as the forty-ninth State. Most of the pressure upon Congress to initiate this step comes from the people of Hawaii, which is as it should be.

"If Hawaii is brought in, look for a similarly reasoned movement to make Alaska the fiftieth star in the flag of the United States.

"Nothing could better illustrate than these two possibilities the fact that the principle of Federal Union is not a static principle. In Union there is both strength and an impetus toward the amalgamation of seemingly diverse peoples into a common, frictionless pattern of living, economically and politically."

LOUISIANA

Shreveport Journal: "Hawaii Forty-ninth State? The claims of Hawaii to statehood are bolstered by some interesting facts, one being that its population of 500,000 is greater than that of several States already within the Union. It pays Federal taxes—more than these same thinly populated Commonwealths. Either Hawaii must be admitted to full statehood or required to be content with its present Territorial status. The Hawaiians are American citizens, entitled to every consideration granted those of continental United States. We do not see how their demands for statehood can be justly refused."

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston Herald: "Forty-ninth State. Before the war the American people might have frowned upon a suggestion to admit the crossroads of the Pacific to the Federal Union. But the last few years have accustomed us to global thinking besides emphasizing our responsibilities in this part of the world. Residents of Hawaii already have had their baptism of fire as an American outpost and have made a war record which Secretary Ickes cites as supporting their claims to statehood.

"Naturally statehood would please most residents of the present Territory although politically they already enjoy most of the privileges of citizens of States. Abroad such a step should be helpful to America in efforts to improve the lot of the world's unhappy colonials. Once the United States has granted independence to the Philippines—as we are scheduled to do next year—and statehood to Hawaii the doctrine of self-determination of peoples cannot longer be dismissed as empty rhetoric."

Boston Globe: "Hawaii, Forty-ninth State? The deep attachment of these people to American ideas and ideals was symbolized by location there of our Pearl Harbor base—of imperishable memory in our national saga because of our triumph after the infamous Jap sneak punch there. How soon after Hawaii shall our more familiar neighbor—Alaska—be admitted as the fiftieth State of the Union, so compelling new editions of the national flag?"

MICHIGAN

Grand Rapids Herald: "Statehood for Hawaii." After referring to the ballotless status of the District of Columbia, this editorial continues:

"These people have been disfranchised throughout the country's history. They—Washington, D. C.—are clamoring for the ballot. Most certainly they are entitled to it fully as much as are the people of Hawaii, and few will deny the Hawaiians that right.

"Moreover, if Hawaii is granted statehood, we shall have a similar application from Alaska, Puerto Rico, and perhaps even the Canal Zone. Once these things get started, there is no stopping them.

"But Hawaii is entitled to the status of a State."

Monroe News: "Fifty States? In area, population, and productivity, certainly these two Territories—Alaska and Hawaii—match or excel many of the States, and in importance as Pacific outposts they are not exceeded by any member of the Union. If the Territorial inhabitants express themselves strongly in favor of statehood, the people in the States are quite likely to approve of this desire."

MONTANA

Butte Post: "Hawaii's statehood claims seem well grounded. It is true that Hawaii's war record was excellent. The stories of sabotage and fifth-column activities that were heard early in the war later were completely refuted. The Territory's performance in a difficult and dangerous situation puts its claims for statehood before Congress in a favorable light. It helps to abate misgivings engendered by the Territory's polyglot population and racial background."

NEBRASKA

Omaha World-Herald: "Praise for Hawaii. The report of the House subcommittee investigating Hawaii's qualifications for statehood deserves more recognition than it has received. For, in addition to recommending that Hawaii be admitted as the forty-ninth State, the six Congressmen gave their reasons.

"They reveal that our most mature Territory has fulfilled every historic qualification for statehood—sufficient population, a law-abiding, stable citizenry, high standards of education and health, a prosperity based on a profitable agricultural economy, and growing industry.

"The best of all is Hawaii's war record. Though a third of Hawaii's population is of Japanese descent, its half million people sent 33,000 men to the armed forces—more than half of them Japanese-Americans.

"But what went on at home? Let the FBI take up the story, as quoted by the Congressmen: 'There was not one single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity committed in Hawaii before, during, or after Pearl Harbor.'

"Racial groups in Hawaii do not vote as blocs. The racial strains are so intermingled that 85 percent of the people are of two or more blood strains. Moreover, the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii existed when we annexed the Territory. It was not then regarded as an obstacle to annexation, and, say the Congressmen, should not be so regarded now.

" 'Hawaii's people of various racial ancestries can and do work together,' says the subcommittee. 'Hawaii is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action.'

"Hitler's race theories would need little more than the history of Hawaii to discredit them, if an outraged world had not already done so."

NEW YORK

Troy Record: "Another State? The situation is vastly different from the situation of a decade or two ago and the petition of the islanders ought to be studied with the greatest of care. For on the surface their plea seems very nearly unanswerable."

Little Falls Times: "Forty-ninth State. Hawaii is ready to become the forty-ninth State."

Rome Sentinel: "Hawaii should have statehood. Secretary of the Interior Ickes has come out strongly in favor of granting statehood to the present Territory of Hawaii. The Sentinel for years has urged it as a right for both Puerto Rico and Hawaii. * * *

"We have no logical or ethical business to go around telling other governments that they should give home rule to their colonies, dominions, or other possessions the while we deny either statehood or independence to Puerto Rico and Hawaii."

Schenectady Gazette: "Hawaii, forty-ninth State. The request by the people of Hawaii for admission is not the result of snap judgment, but is made after four decades of experience under Uncle Sam's direction. It is fitting that Congress consider the proposal now."

NORTH CAROLINA

Raleigh News and Observer: "Fifty States in sight. In the air world of today Alaska and Hawaii have become of the highest importance and they ought to be incorporated as States without delay."

OHIO

Cincinnati Enquirer: "Statehood for Hawaii. In the absence of any really cogent reason for denying it, statehood should be granted to the people of the Hawaiian Islands on their petition. Statehood may not be as advantageous as the islanders imagine it to be. But if they want it, there is no good reason for the Congress to withhold it."

OREGON

Sunday Oregonian: "The forty-ninth State. Congress should hesitate no longer in making the Territory of Hawaii the forty-ninth State of the Union * * *.

"The truth is that the people of the islands have learned the lessons of democracy better than many on the mainland. The varied races live and work together harmoniously. Racial intolerance and bigotry are almost nonexistent. Intermarriages have increased. Economic standards are high. Education is far advanced. Legislative movements have been initiated to limit the financial, industrial, and agricultural dominance of the Big Five families and small business ventures have multiplied * * *.

"Hawaiians of all ancestries have adequately demonstrated their patriotism and loyalty and their qualifications for equality of status in the United States of America."

Oregon Daily Journal: "State of Hawaii. There has been a community of interest and of trade between Hawaii and this area from the beginning of the exploration and settlement of the Oregon country. * * *

"Now of prime significance are the potentialities of future expansion of that commerce—particularly should the Territory be raised to the stature of sovereign statehood.

"Aloha to Hawaii and its aspiration for statehood."

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma City Times: "Should Hawaii have statehood? The events of the past 5 years have thrown a powerful and searching light on this proposition. The position of the United States with relation to the entire Pacific area has been revolutionized. Whether we would have deliberately chosen it or not, we are now deeply involved in the affairs of the Pacific Ocean, one symptom being that we are now actually governing Japan—a contingency that would have seemed fantastic 5 years ago.

"Under this enormously changed situation, the relation of Hawaii to the United States has been correspondingly made a matter of prime importance to the whole Nation. * * *

"The admission of Hawaii as a State would have a powerful psychological effect, not only upon the peoples of the Pacific area, but of the people of the United States as a whole, for it would signify a permanent and substantial sphere of influence extending thousands of miles west of the mainland. It would go far toward averting a future Pearl Harbor calamity. Regardless of the technicalities, it would give new and significant meaning to the Monroe Doctrine."

PENNSYLVANIA

The Evening Bulletin: "The forty-ninth State. Hawaii, with a population of more than half a million, now has more inhabitants than any State had at the time of its admission except Oklahoma. Five present States have fewer residents. The polyglot population has at times been cited as a barrier to statehood, but performance during the war left little doubt of the patriotism of the great majority of Hawaii's citizens. Since the annexation the percentage of Caucasians has steadily increased.

"It may seem odd to have a State more than 2,000 miles away from the continent, but no more so than it must have seemed

when distant California was admitted in 1850. The flag is ready for another star."

TEXAS

Tyler Telegraph: "Hawaii is no step-child. The Territory of Hawaii wants to become a State.

"And why not?

"Let's quit treating the even-tempered, luxurious island Territory like a step-child and admit her to full sisterhood in our Union of States."

Dallas News: "The case of Hawaii. Hawaii probably would have been admitted as a State before this except for the opposition of Army and Navy officers, who think they can operate there more advantageously under territorial government. But territorial status did not keep the Japs from destroying our fleet and our air force there on December 7, 1941. The Army-Navy argument seems based less on real defense factors than on a wish for domination of civilian life in the islands.

"The Hawaiians want statehood. * * * Hawaii's admission would strengthen the pleas of Puerto Rico and Alaska for statehood, but each of these could be considered on its own merits. Hawaii should not be forced to remain outside until the others are ready."

Greenville Banner: "Statehood for Hawaii. The recommendation by Secretary of the Interior Ickes that Hawaii be admitted to statehood is one that naturally was received jubilantly by the citizens of the islands which have been termed 'the paradise of the Pacific,' and no doubt will meet with the general approval of the people of the United States. There is much to justify Mr. Ickes in making such a recommendation."

VIRGINIA

Newport News Times-Herald: "A forty-ninth State? In size, population, and contribution to the Federal Treasury, Hawaii is entirely suitable for statehood. Its citizens have proved in the main most loyal to the United States, conspicuously so in the case of the Nisei soldiers who fought valiantly under the United States flag."

Portsmouth Star: "Insular statehood for Hawaiian Islands. After reviewing the history of the islands and the bonds of friendship between Hawaii and the rest of the United States, this editorial states:

"'Why not welcome this Pacific Territory, so vital to our defense, as the forty-ninth member of our great American federation? Then the American Union would, for the first time, reach beyond its ocean boundaries, indeed half way into the Pacific, to grant statehood, thus surpassing even the dreams of the most ardent former proponents of "manifest destiny."'"

Charlottesville Progress: "Hawaiian statehood. In population and in economic development the Territory of Hawaii outranks quite a number of the present 48 American States. And despite the diversity of its population in racial background, the war record of its people has shown them to be as good Americans as any * * *.

"Hawaii, by all the standards hitherto applied, is now ready for admission."

Investigation of United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein House Resolution 433, which I introduced on November 29, 1945, to provide for a study and investigation of all phases of the foreign policy of the United States:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) a comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world, such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan States, the Middle East, Central and South America, and so forth; and

(2) an investigation of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States;

(3) methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) the communication of such information to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days, the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1947.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Food Violation Is Charged to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the present food situation, I want to include a news item from the Toledo Blade covering my remarks:

FOOD VIOLATION IS CHARGED TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, April 2.—Representative ALVIN WEICHEL, Republican, Ohio, told the House the Government is violating its own food and price policies and "hobbling food production" by drafting farm workers and increasing rentals on federally owned farm lands.

He asserted the Government is discouraging farmers from planting while calling "attention to the shortages of food for America and the world and demanding that the farmers of this country produce food in abundance."

The Ohioan cited a situation at the Plum Brook Ordnance Works near Sandusky, Ohio.

"There," he said, "the Government took thousands of acres of rich farming land from its owners; in fact, thousands of acres more than the Government needed, so that these surplus Government lands were rented farmers for $4 an acre.

"Now, when the Government demands production of more food, it is demanding $12.50 an acre for the same lands rented for $4."

Mr. WEICHEL said President Truman, acting through selective service, is violating the law of the land and taking from the farms those who are producing food. Selective service is paying no attention, he asserted, to a law exempting certain farm workers from military service.

The Cost of Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Birmingham News dated March 29, 1946:

THE COST OF HOMES

Heavy emphasis has been placed on the necessity of producing homes for veterans. It is of great importance to consider immediately how many veterans will be able to afford homes at present price levels.

It is our understanding that the cost of a two-bedroom frame house is in the neighborhood of $8,000—perhaps a little less or a little more, depending on the quality and number of features to be included in the home. A good lot on which to build that home costs, say, between $1,000 and $2,000. This means house and lot now are near the $10,000 limit which has been set for homes to be built for veterans. Earlier there was talk of $6,000 homes. Where is there to be found a new, small house and lot for $6,000 today? It should be evident that even if materials and labor are provided—with or without subsidies—lower-cost home-building is going to be mainly in the $7,000 to $10,000 bracket.

Can a demand be found—a sound demand, backed up by financial ability to handle a debt of this size—for 2,700,000 homes which cost that much? If not, what effective demand is there for those homes? What is the earning capacity of the bulk of persons who now are in need of homes? It is estimated that the home builder should figure some 30 percent of his income for his payments on a home. Can the bulk of would-be buyers pay for a $7,000 to $10,000 home with only 30 percent of their incomes?

Consider beyond this the fact that since most of the present demand for homes comes from veterans newly back in civilian life, many of them will have other expenses in setting up their households. Is it likely that

many veterans have sufficient money saved to buy the things that go into a house? And most veterans will want automobiles within the next 2 or 3 years. How heavy is the financial load going to be on the average veteran who buys a home, buys all the items that go into a home, buys a car, and feeds and clothes his family at a cost level which, despite price controls, has soared?

There is little talk of renting homes today. Most of it is on buying. Many real-estate developers are building homes for veterans—small homes, but homes which cost close to $10,000. Veterans are not given the opportunity of renting many of these. The demand is so great as yet that all homes can be sold. But many veterans who leap to buy homes will take on heavy burdens. How long will it take to build up a group, a large group, of people who are over their heads in financial waters? What will be the effect on our total economy? What will be the effect on our future, on the stability of our community, and our national existence?

Guaranty Against War—A Peacetime Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Guaranty Against War—A Peacetime Army" prepared by me and published in the Army Day Review on April 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARANTY AGAINST WAR—A PEACETIME ARMY

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee)

The greatest problem connected with a peacetime Army is how to get one and how to keep one. Peacetime soldiering has not been lucrative or widely popular. In the absence of bursting shell few persons ever have imagination sufficient to conceive of the notion that they have a duty to perform. It is traditionally justifiable in this country to escape any military responsibilities whatsoever during peacetimes, to think nothing of the omission, and to derive no ill will from one's neighbors and associates by reason of such escape. It seldom occurs to anyone to volunteer except for benefits. Even the Government sins to the extent of stressing the benefits to the soldier instead of invoking the sacrifice which a young citizen should and no doubt would, under more fetching direction, make for his love of country.

Under present conditions the little brother does not realize this, that he is unwilling to do safely what the big brother was glad to do over a longer period of time and under a greater stress. He may be said to be reluctant to ride forth on a mission of peace and achieve the education of travel, though his older brother was happy to die on a sortie in a lost grave in the salt waters of foreign seas, More, he is unwilling to replace his older brother, to spell him, to take up his work where his battle-weary brother left off. Right here it would be easy for me to be misunderstood. The attitude as described, unfortunate though it may be, definitely is not a reflection on anyone. We simply have returned to traditional peacetime United States. It is a normal (for this country) situation. By force of habit we may think, loosely enough, of the 1946 Army as comprising those who for reasons best known to themselves find profit in enlisting, the fellow who likes to drill for a monetary reward on Monday nights, wherefore he joins the National Guard; and the young man who, wanting to be certain that if he is called out he will be an officer, takes reserve training.

To butter this heterogeneous group up a series of "benefits" are devised, and the whole pattern glamorized by a program of description which is supposed to be educational material.

We pick up a few more than a half million volunteers, volunteers for miscellaneous reasons, and feel successful. Still, all this, without a note of patriotism, without a touch of glory that one's dress is the uniform of the United States armed services, and with the notion, as one rather futile song suggests, that the boys were really fighting for a blue serge suit. That one, I believe, actually became a song hit. If we are to approach the consideration of universal military training or its equivalent, we owe it to ourselves to have a proper formula, a studied plan, a meaningful program, and something more individual than lock-step application. First, for today we had best pause and see what is the matter with our system. What has happened to this Nation which perhaps more than all others cohered to itself and adhered to its allies through one of the sharpest crises in human history? One may not excuse an attitude with the explanation that he is only pushing the Army or the Navy in the face. There is no indicated violent protest, as some would suggest with rather bad logic, against officers, for the officers have gladly crowded the separation centers themselves and in most cases have been spoken of by the enlisted men as being, like themselves, pretty good fellows, which indeed they are. The fault is not, in fact, traceable to anything experienced in or developed by war service. It simply is the traditional notion that if there is no fighting there is no service, and let him go hang who would try to catch the individual or his son for military service now.

It is, moreover, practically impossible to educate the American young man concerning our national responsibilities, and as a former educator I confess I would have difficulty in knowing where to begin or what to teach simply because there is no very clear conception, at least no comprehensive understanding, of what our responsibilities are. We had a war, which for a better name, was somctimes known as the war of survival, so perhaps in that term may be found a cue to our responsibility, namely that we should so live among nations as to be sure to survive, through a mixed formula of trading and keeping secrets, partly joining one another and partly not, partly mobilizing and partly demobilizing until we are universally confused, the teacher and his pupil.

Out of all this we can readily have order. Things are not, at least, potentially black. International relations are building upon at least solid fragments. We understand, too, that the departments concerned with national security soon will make known their ideas of Army and Navy permanent strength. If this information is ready, Congress certainly will be glad to have it. Even these impending recommendations speculatively may be tempered with provisions, such as the prior determination of what the Government's policies and commitments are in foreign lands. For example, it is understood to be planned to get out of India, but relatively few persons have digested the available information on this subject, or will pay any attention to the matter until an overseas cousin writes in from the comparative discomfort of his mosquito bar and asks, usually in heaven's name, whether he has been forgotten and why should he still be in India.

Some of these political questions the peacetime GI ought to know. If prospects for the peacetime armed forces did have this knowledge, there would be more live candidates for the task before us. It is one thing to offer a GI bill of rights, lifetime hospitalization, mustering-out pay, $50 a month, clothing and allotments, and so forth, so that the soldier can measure these benefits against his job, and quite another to make our true situation so obvious that one would no more think of shirking his plain duty than he would think of failing to come forward with Boston or San Francisco afire from enemy bombs.

Our experiences have shown that even our military leaders lack imagination on the subject of what an enemy may do to us. If it is true that Congress has not always given the Army and Navy whatever they have asked, it is equally true that we never have been asked for our real needs either. We, including the responsible military authorities, are ultraconservative by nature when it comes to any military considerations unless we are actually engaged in the sole and active business of war. Even yet we think with too much military respect for our distances and our oceans. Whether we will yet pay dearly for our passivity remains to be seen. We do know very well that the type of surprise that attended Pearl Harbor can be repeated, perhaps aggravated, and that nothing can prevent the recurrence.

Our first duty in order of logical events is, of course, political. It is our evident duty to keep wars from our lands through friendships and associations. The world's successes in this direction are at least embryonic. We have as good association as we deserve, but, unfortunately, for the efforts exerted in hundreds of years, we do not deserve very much. Until we can qualify as an organized society we must have our own singular protection for our own especial public, and so must the other nations.

That is not where occupational service comes in. Occupational service is pure policing, nothing else. In a way it is a pity that a single Regular Army volunteer is called upon for replacement of occupational troops, for occupational troops are not getting training, and we are only fooling ourselves when we believe they are. Training, at least intensive training, means one school after another, one lesson after another, inurement to military life, its disciplines, its hardships, even its dangers. Ten years of keeping a Paris or a Berlin orderly would not necessarily qualify a soldier to stand up under the simplest attack from bayonets and hand grenades in actual combat. Sudden use of these men would find them with their basic training, which has been reduced, and little else. Such troops might accidentally be weather-conditioned but more likely would be soft with routine work. There would be no practical way to make scientific warriors of them or to expect an efficient return on their enlistment if they suddenly were to be needed. Yet they are our Regular, our standing Army. I say, in a way, none of these men should be sent overseas, yet practically they must be, for there is great pressure not to draft more men, to release all fathers, to return men after 2 years' service, or after so many points, and both Houses of Congress for the moment have given outright discouragement to any notion of what has been termed universal military training. Therefore, as usual, we are scraping the bottom, and diverting our forces as an expedient rather than with sound practice.

Our problem is to come out of our present conflict of demobilization from war with mobilization for a postwar Army, with occupational forces sufficient in number to meet the demands of General MacArthur and General McNarney, with the kind of streamlined,

trained, and mobile standing Army that General Marshall so ably recommended, with an energetic Organized Reserve so well developed as to keep abreast of what all Army men come to call the "newest stuff," and so well culled that it can demand and obtain guaranties that it will not have future complaints about discrimination or nonuse; an adequate National Guard for its limited purposes; and, if a sensible program is presented, widespread intensive instruction to large numbers of young men in the arts of war, taking care to utilize their civilian employments, arts, and studies to the limit. It is my understanding that the experts will present to us their ideas of strength figures at an early date. This will tend to eliminate much of the present confusion. This will help us and help the departments to attain their objectives, with perhaps some corrective amendments.

I would not cut Army or Navy pay. I would raise it if this will help. I believe that those who now volunteer for service will find benefits that are everlasting, and I would add to these if necessary or desirable. In fact, pay raise bills are before us now. I would not retrench, or renege on any promise, but would increase and fortify our early promises as we might, trying to pay a man honestly for what his services are actually worth. Yes, I would do everything humanly possible to substitute attraction for compulsion, and will count it a failure if we cannot eliminate compulsory service or training altogether.

But over and beyond the material gains are the opportunities to find the young citizen's ear and eye and beset him with, "How much do you love your country?" His conscience will not let him sleep. He will not let someone else, especially his brother, who has been in combat, do his job for him. He will don the uniform proudly and demand the respect, yes the admiration, which it should compel. I do not need to tell any educator, even any propagandist, how this is to be done. A word to the wise is sufficient.

Veterans' Problems

REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago it was my pleasure to talk briefly to a gathering of ex-servicemen in my congressional district composed of veterans of both wars. One of the new members made inquiry as to the potency of the Legion's representation in Washington. I assured him that the representation was of the highest type and adequate in strength and ability, and further I told him that the veteran has a representation within the membership of Congress far greater than that of all other group interests inasmuch as most of the Members are veterans of one or both of the World Wars and a great number have sons and daughters in World War II—many having paid the supreme sacrifice. It would follow that the veteran's interest would receive proper attention in all instances.

Today I submit for your consideration an article by General Bradley in This Week magazine which, in my opinion, is timely and reminds us of a duty to the veteran, aside from legislative obligations, which we and the public are inclined to overlook.

As the time for further consideration of the housing bill approaches, I remind my colleagues that it is our duty to protect the veteran's interest and not have him shoved around and kidded by some high-sounding slogans and become the victim of propaganda that is intended to protect the hides of bureaucrats who have miserably failed in making preparation for his return to civilian life.

The article follows:

FORECAST FOR AMERICA—WHAT HAPPENS TO OUR VETERANS CONCERNS EVERYONE IN AMERICA—HERE IS A LOOK AHEAD BY THE MAN WHO IS CLOSEST TO THEM

(By Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs)

Back-yard troubles quickly become national problems when you multiply them by the needs of 15,000,000 veterans.

With that many men coming home to a Nation busy in the tasks of reconversion, we must alert ourselves to their needs and help to meet them. If we neglect their wants, we shall have to take the consequences.

When I say "we" I don't mean only the Veterans' Administration and the agencies in Washington. I'm speaking first of the partnership of the Government and the people of these United States.

This job of human reconversion during a period of demobilization isn't one we can fold into an envelope with our income-tax returns and conveniently hope to forget. It's far too big for the Government to do alone, and much too close to home. Big because it directly affects a tenth of our population and the national future of our lifetime. Close to home because the problems of veterans wait on the Main Streets where they live.

Because there are so many of them, I'm afraid that we sometimes fool ourselves with figures in talking about these veterans. It's easy to look over the head of the fellow next door with the button in his lapel and talk instead in cosmic terms of his 15,000,000 buddies. Fifteen million men make it a national problem. And national problems, we're inclined to believe, are Washington's worries.

Where, then, do you come in, if you run a drug store in Iowa?

Perhaps all of us might try a little division in the place of multiplication by 15,000,000. Take the total of all our veterans' problems and divide them by the communities in which these veterans live.

Some can be solved by the Veterans' Administration—as far as we go under the law—or by other Federal, State, and local agencies with pay rolls equipped to do the job. But many are beyond the governmental reach—their solutions cannot be legislated for you.

These are problems that exist among veterans you know well, often within a stone's throw of your own back yard.

YOU CAN HELP VETERANS

Within the Veterans' Administration we will continue to build hospitals, provide doctors, pay pensions, handle veterans' insurance, help them through college, certify them for loans, and steer them through training. But all that is only part of the job.

The rest of it belongs to you. Little can be done even by law about the plight of the homeless and jobless veteran unless you are willing to do it. Unless the veteran can turn to his friends and neighbors for the advice and material assistance he needs on an accumulation of personal problems, he will stumble about making mistakes and growing angry. Some communities have anticipated this by calling on local resources to give the veteran a lift. Others have hidden their heads in the sand, risking the veteran's boot.

These men are caught in a trying moment of history and in a trying time of their lives. They're not asking for anything more than the chance to pick up their civilian careers again. They don't want hand-outs and bread lines. They want to join you in building this postwar world they fought so hard to save.

READJUST CIVILIANS AND COMMUNITY

Because I'm Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, there are some who think I should talk more often to veterans and perhaps less to these people they left behind. But the biggest trouble with this business of readjusting the veteran is that the civilian and the community often need readjustment more than the men who are returning. These men learned the value of peacetime opportunity—many of them by shivering through the winter in a frozen fox hole. They are not likely to squander it. They want to make good.

But we must stop thinking of them as statistics. They're men—individuals, each with hopes and ambitions as well as their personal troubles. For all of us there are no patient solutions, no easy ways out. Unless we can tear the statistics aside and look at these men as the alert, vibrant, and ambitious humans that they are, we shall lose ourselves in depressive figures and forget that human reconversion is a lot more touchy—and important—than even the replacement of machines on production lines.

These are the men that risked the most to win the war. They are too deserving, too promising, and certainly too numerous to be overlooked now.

American Legion Demands Houses for Veterans To Sell at Less Than $6,000—Newspaper Points Out United States People Overwhelmingly Want Positive Government Action on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, no clearer evidence is needed that the people of the United States are strikingly in favor of positive Government action to end the housing shortage than the facts related in an editorial published recently in the Nashville Tennesseean. In that city the American Legion post went on record with a plea for veterans' houses to cost $6,000 or less.

The editorial also gave the facts on the recent survey of public opinion by Fortune magazine, one of the most reliable and accurate reporting services in the country. That survey reported that 81 percent of the people favored continuation of rent control, 61 percent of the people want ceiling prices on building materials, and 75 percent demanded that the Government channel scarce building materials into the low-cost housing field.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include that editorial:

WHERE THE ROOF PINCHES

Nashville American Legion Post 5 has addressed to the President and to the State's

Representatives in Congress a plea for the construction of veterans' housing to cost less than $3,000 per unit. The Legionnaires' message is pithy:

"The majority of veterans cannot afford $6,000, or more homes as now provided for the housing program. The veterans' ability to pay seems to have been overlooked."

It is an observation that must have occurred to many. Certainly it had occurred to the President and to officials of the National Housing Administration who asked authority to grant subsidies to spur the flow of building materials and to hold down the cost of new housing.

In refusing this request, and in striking from the housing bill the provision for price ceilings on used homes after a first sale following a date to be fixed, the Nation's lawmakers have indeed either overlooked or purposely ignored the fact that most veterans could not afford, even if they could borrow the purchase money, homes much above the $3,000 price level.

It is amazing that the lawmakers do not seem to be aware of the situation perceived so clearly by Nashville Post 5—and, it would appear, the public generally. The Fortune Survey of Opinion just released finds the United States people strikingly in favor of positive Government action to end the severe housing shortage and keenly alive to the necessity of holding housing within reach of families of modest income.

The survey reports 81 percent of the people for the continuation of rent ceilings, 63 percent for keeping ceiling prices on building materials, 75 percent for channeling these materials into the low-cost resident field by Government action.

"All these measures happen to be fairly close to recommendations announced by Housing Expediter Wilson W. Wyatt after his survey was finished," Fortune points out, speculating that "The people seem to be in a mood to put overwhelming political pressure behind legislation that would implement Mr. Wyatt's program."

This well may be. Undoubtedly Post 5's plea is not arriving in Washington alone. As yet, however, there has been little indication in congressional treatment of the administration's housing program that either the expressed popular will or perception of the popular need has overwhelmed the lawmakers. The breaks still are going to the lobbyists of the building industry who prefer the Government to keep its hands strictly out of housing—and the housing, such as is available, still is going to those who can afford to deal for materials in the black market or to buy existing houses for whatever may be asked.

The majority of the veterans will have to look alive if for an indefinite period their lot is to be any better than a recondition section in the barracks they had so fervently hoped to have left behind them.

Heading for Hell No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if I said what a great and respected newspaper never known for its undue friendliness to Russia says editorially, I should be criticized; but I am not saying it. I am, however, under permission previously granted me, inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of April 10 warning us that the peoples of all the world want peace, but that is not the direction in which we are going. It follows:

HEADING FOR HELL NO. 3

The Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is maintaining an army estimated at from 11,000,000 to 15,000,000 men. The U. S. S. R. has announced a 5-year industrial plan, with emphasis upon armaments.

Great Britain is maintaining the largest peacetime army in her history. She is building up her navy to a strength far greater than in prewar days.

The United States is spending $1,000,000 a day on atomic bombs and in atomic energy experiments. The United States is also engaging in roof-of-the-world Arctic expeditions, via Canada, the shortest distance between the United States and the U. S. S. R.

Added up, this means the three most powerful nations in the world are in what is called an armaments race.

All this is happening 8 months after the most destructive war of all time. Simultaneously, there are grave disputes around the conference table among the three powers which are in the race.

It is probably tactless to say it, but—

The fact is that the nations of the world in 1938 had only a few more disagreements and not nearly as many engines of destruction as they have today.

The peoples of the world passionately want peace. But that is not the direction in which they are going.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the more people hear and learn about the so-called Wyatt veterans' housing scheme, the surer they are that about all that program will build is a greater bureaucracy, with more Government control, to stifle production of homes for veterans.

Yesterday the Senate restored to the bill the $600,000,000 subsidy which Wyatt, the big czar over all American production, contends he must have to encourage industry to produce. That contention has been blown sky high by facts and figures furnished by thousands upon thousands of our American businessmen in every phase of the building industry. They say, "No; we do not want subsidies out of our bankrupt United States Treasury. All we ask is a fair and just price so we can pay a just wage, and so forth, and get our plant going." Wyatt, who knows nothing about the building business, says, "You will do it my way or else."

Mr. Speaker, you are well aware, as are all my colleagues in this House, that I have on several occasions from the floor of this House voiced my concern about the high cost of houses as proposed by Wyatt and others. On February 13 I had plenty to say. Here is a letter from a businessman who bears out my contention by facts and figures from the home front:

GRISWOLD, IOWA, *April 8, 1946.*

Hon. BEN JENSEN,

Representative, Seventh District, Iowa, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As promised, I shall try to outline my thoughts on a national housing program, which would seem to stand a chance of breaking things loose.

Such a program should be physically possible, as to material and labor yet this year.

It would need complete popular support both by those families who would directly benefit, by those who would supply the material and labor and by all other groups that will be concerned, that is, the whole country.

A program limited to small homes preferably four walls and a roof, say 16 by 24, but with plumbing including hot water, would be physically possible. Every industry affected should be able to easily support their part of a million-unit program for the year.

As to its support:

Unless the veterans and others to whom I have talked locally and anyone else I could get a hold of in the past week who need or may need living quarters or those who would consider selling their present home, at present prices, to those who have the money, if they could have such a small home to live in for several years until a new one could be had under more settled conditions, are normal American people, the majority are thinking in terms of such a house. Particularly the veteran, it is all he wants. Something not over $2,500 and better yet $2,000, that he can see a chance of paying for and do a little living besides. They are scared of a $6,500 home and will not take it unless they are forced to by a lack of no other housing. They want their own home and do not want to live with someone else. But how can they make payments on a $6,500 home, finance their other household goods and have anything left to do a bit of living? The veteran put up with living quarters during the war that convinced him he doesn't need a mansion now, but he doesn't want to choose between a financial load and housing that is a hand-me-down from somebody else. He wants his own, but at a price he believes he can afford now and in the future. And he is not going out of the house market forever—just until he can see his way clear for something better.

As to those supplying the material, is there not a good chance that given a fair price (one that would leave a profit) that they would be glad to produce in order to take from OPA their big excuse for their ceiling prices—"with the pressure off, and supply and demand starting to work there would be no excuse for ceiling prices on their products." The lumbermen in particular do not like the prospects of more regulations—especially when there is no material to regulate. The mason, carpenter and plumber should be glad to at least see the prospect of getting merchandise unhampered by price and material controls. They are sort of calloused to disobeying price and material regulations in order to keep things going, but they would feel better not doing it.

As to the support of the rest of the country, let us confine the possibilities to two groups of manufacturers—appliance and cars. Would not their sales possibilities in the future be better to families with their financial affairs in hand? That is, unless they are more interested in financing sales than selling merchandise that will give their customers a better living.

It would seem the first problem is to find out how many families would want this type of housing. (The material required for each house could be just as well combined and used in duplexes, small apartments, and barrack-style construction.) It would be best if the newspapers could handle this job

so that the response would, as near as possible, be voluntary—so that there would be as few squawks as possible that it was a promoted deal by the big boys.

Guessing from what contact I have had with the situation, about 10 families per 1,000 population will express a desire for such a home. Further, it would seem sufficient additional housing to break the present jam. And if price restrictions could be removed or eased, additional housing would be built plenty fast by those people with the money.

Ted Simpson, of the Atlantic News Telegraph, has promised an editorial with his views of the possibilities and will ask for those interested to turn their names in to the local veterans' housing committee. He said he had no idea how much response his small paper would get, but I replied, "If the idea is good, it will catch on fast; and if not, it had just as well die quick."

Then, if those 1,000,000 American families expresss themselves as being interested, we will also learn just about what they want in their four walls and their willingness to pay more than present ceiling prices, if necessary, so that the material supplier can produce—as long as total dollar increase on his house would not be large (15 percent of $1,200, the material is $180). This would let CPA contact the necessary industries as to how soon they could produce and if not why, and OPA to ask (not tell) the suppliers what price would be necessary to move the material.

Then if everybody seemed willing, priority coupon books with OPA prices thereon could be issued to those in on the program. Their priority would be top—there would be no other. Book should show that they are financed and have a lot. They would make their purchases from their regular dealer and give up a coupon. Coupon would travel with order back to supplier to manufacturer. Manufacturer would order necessary parts and raw materials and take a duplicate copy of his orders and send with priority coupons to CPA where the two could be compared for reasonableness. A time limit on coupon's use of say, 30 days, should put coupons in manufacturers hands without delay. No one making the material should be required to proceed without all of necessary raw materials available, but should report immediately if not being made available to him.

Very truly yours,

LACO OIL BURNER CO.,
H. R. COCKLIN,
Manager.

Material for 16 x 24 home with flat roof. Prices local ceilings or otherwise explained. Not an accurate bill of material, but prices and quantities kept on high side:

LUMBER

Frame, 2 x 4's, 423 board feet	$39.43
Roof, 2 x 8's, 534 board feet	40.05
Floor, 2 x 6's, 400 board feet	29.78
Sheeting, 1 x 6's, 720 board feet	55.08
Flooring, 1 x 4's, 284 board feet	33.65
Cupboards, shelves, etc., 1 x 4's to 1 x 12's, 1,000 board feet (estimated)	101.25
Finish lumber, 1 x 6 and 1 x 8, 200 board feet (estimated)	25.00
Total	324.24

WALLBOARD

Inside walls, 640 square feet; ceiling, 384 square feet; total 1,024 square feet at 6 cents	61.44
Insulation board for roof sheeting, 400 square feet	30.16
Built-up roof, paper, $14.50; tar (estimated), $20	126.10
"Brick" composition paper for siding, 800 square feet	49.00
Insulation (estimated)	100.00
Foundation cement blocks, 60 at 22 cents	13.20
Sidewalk, 300 square feet, 4" thick	$36.00
Chimney, transite, 12 feet	7.20
Total	331.50

MILLWORK

6 24 x 28 windows (window, frame, trim, storm sash, screen), $18.46	110.28
2 doors complete	39.84
Finish lumber, 200 board feet	25.00
Total	175.12

PLUMBING

Sink and faucet	26.00
Toilet	30.00
Shower cabinet	60.00
Hot-water heater	65.00
	181.00
Labor, sewer pipe, 8 pipe fittings	170.00
Digging sewer ditch (estimated)	20.00
Total	371.00
Heating stove and 110-gallon oil tank	75.00
Wiring (estimated)	75.00
Paint	10.00
Water to lot line	30.00
Sewer to lot line	65.00
Lot	300.00

LABOR

House, 2 men, 2 weeks	300.00
Roof, 2 men, 1 day	16.00
Foundation, 2 men, 1 day	16.00
Sidewalk, 2 men, 1 day	16.00
Lumber	324.24
Wallboard, etc	331.50
Millwork	175.12
Total	2,104.86
Material involved approximately $1,400; estimated price inrease to move material, 15 percent; ceiling price increase	210.00
Total cost of house and lot	2,314.86

Of course there are small items omitted, but the average fellow could cut some of these costs to take care of them.

Peter's Pan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the Peter's Pan column of the Weyauwega (Wis.) Chronicle. With all the newspaper articles and all the radio comment there is about the food needed domestically and abroad, I am sure that everyone should be appraised of the situation:

PETER'S PAN

The Wisconsin farmer who plans to work 12 to 16 hours a day this summer at a minimum hourly wage, as he has always done—and he's beginning to believe that he's about the only person left in the United States who plans on working—wouldn't feel so badly about the whole thing if the rest of the country wasn't trying to hinder him all it could by refusing to manufacture farm machinery and transportation equipment, by making it so difficult for him to secure help because of wage differentials and long hours and in aggravating him by publicizing the requirements of farm production this season when nobody else seems to be required to produce anything.

In other words, if the Wisconsin farmer and his counterpart in other Midwestern States have to feed the world, he would appreciate, at least, a little moral assistance.

Peter's Pan is edited by Mr. Peter Walch, my former secretary, who is now owner and editor of this splendid weekly newspaper. He has grown up in close contact with farmers and by his many years in newspaper work he has long been cognizant of the fact that the farmer's problem is a community problem. Peter has appropriately "panned" some of the dreamers and schemers here in Washington who are constantly issuing false propaganda and issuing false tables and charts in their frenzied efforts to show how much they are needed on the public pay roll.

Soil Conservation in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Soil Conservation in Connecticut," which I broadcasted over a Statewide radio hook-up on April 9.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Americans have always taken for granted the earth in which our food is grown. Those of us who live in the cities refer to it as the good earth. Many of our farmers use this earth as pay dirt which would always be there.

Many persons do not know that America is losing its topsoil at an alarming rate. America was well on its way to becoming a desert area because our topsoil was being washed out to sea or whipped into the air in great dust storms.

For many years wise farmers and many students knew that we must adopt a sound system of land-use management if we were to retain our fertile acres at top production. Some people knew this—but little, if anything, was done about it.

The turn came in 1933 when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President. The owner of a farm himself, President Roosevelt knew the driving necessity for halting soil erosion. He took immediate steps to bring about a sound program of land use.

The most dramatic action, perhaps, was the Tennessee Valley Authority. Here was an entire river valley in which the farmers were impoverished, unable to earn a decent living because the soil—the source of their wealth—was being washed to sea.

A system of soil conservation and improvement was instituted in the Tennessee Valley. A series of dams was built to halt disastrous floods. Other steps were undertaken—with the result that the Tennessee Valley today is a region of prosperous farms. The goodness has been restored to the earth.

Then President Roosevelt created the Soil Conservation Service to help the farmers of this Nation fight soil erosion on their own lands. The work of this agency has never

been fully understood and appreciated by the people of this country. More than any one group of men—the experts of the Soil Conservation Service have saved America from becoming an area of blight and disaster. They have helped thousands of farmers all over the country to restore their land to its old-time fertility and productiveness.

The Soil Conservation Service estimates that more than 90 percent of the agricultural land of the United States needs soil-conservation treatment to protect it from soil erosion, maintain fertility, and put it to its most efficient use.

It is true that soil erosion in Connecticut is not as serious as in some other States. Nevertheless, it is still serious enough to cause alarm. A survey, made by the Soil Conservation Service in 1934, showed that more than 185,000 acres in Connecticut have moderate to severe sheet or gully erosion. This represents 6 percent of the total land area of the State. Nearly nine-tenths of the cropland of the State is suffering from slight to moderate erosion.

A survey made in 1936 showed that erosion is most severe on the valley lands where potatoes and tobacco are grown, particularly on the Enfield, Manchester, Cheshire, and Wethersfield soils. Attention to erosion control should be given wherever sloping land is cultivated. Erosion-control practices that should be used wherever crops are grown in this area include rotation of crops wherever feasible (already a general practice except with specialized crops such as tobacco, potatoes, or truck), good soil-management practices, use of cover crops, contour tillage, and strip cropping, and the occasional use of buffer strips. Terraces to control run-off may be desirable in a few locations. Woodlands and pastures should be managed to encourage rapid growth and development of satisfactory cover.

For each individual farm the suitable practices should be selected after detailed study of the present land use, type and degree of erosion, slopes, and soil types that are recorded on the conservation survey map. These practices must then be developed into a suitable cropping plan.

Although erosion is not generally serious, sufficient damage has occurred to indicate the need for corrective measures, particularly on land where tobacco and potatoes are grown.

This survey of Connecticut was made in 1936. In spite of the obvious need for action to help the farmers, nothing was done. Last year Connecticut was the only State in the Union which had not adopted a soil-conservation plan. Recognizing the great need for positive action, I personally intervened the last night of the 1945 session of the legislature and saw to it that a bill setting up a soil-conservation district was adopted. To my way of thinking it was my duty to see to it that one of the great social policies of President Roosevelt was carried out in my own State.

At the present time the farmers of Connecticut are holding meetings, throughout the State regarding the creation of soil-conservation districts. Already the farmers of Tolland County have voted to set up such a district. My good friend, N. Paul Tedrow, soil conservationist for the State, representing the Soil Conservation Service, is helping to bring the message of the need for soil-conservation practices to the Connecticut farmers.

Connecticut needs the advice of good conservationists like Tedrow and others from the Soil Conservation Service. It needs the help of good soil-conservation engineers.

A study of the Nation's soil potentialities reveals that Connecticut's needs for agricultural land include the following practices: On cultivated cropland—contour planting on 236,000 acres; cover crops on 185,000 acres; crop residue management on 254,000 acres; crop rotations on 352,000 acres; green manure crops on 251,000 acres; perennial hay crops on 43,000 acres; rotation hay or pasture on 199,000 acres; and strip cropping on 218,000 acres; on grazing land—contour furrowing on 24,000 acres; deferred grazing on 398,000 acres; fertilizing established grazing land on 472,000 acres; liming established pastures on 439,000 acres; mowing of grazing land, 260,000 acres; rotation grazing on 391,000 acres; on farm woodlands—field and gully planting on 69,000 acres; harvest cutting on 232,000 acres; improvement cuttings on 462,000 acres; pruning on 72,000 acres; and prevention of grazing damage on 211,000 acres. This list does not cover all the practices needed. For example, 20,000 acres of wet land in Connecticut would be benefited by drainage.

Let me explain what creation of soil-conservation districts means.

In soil-conservation districts, farmers work cooperatively to protect their lands. The work of each farmer on his own farm fits into the district-wide plan. Farmers often work in groups, helping each other to apply good land use and conservation methods to their farms. This teamwork is necessary in many cases, because water does not stop flowing and the wind does not stop blowing at farm boundaries.

In order that its assistance may be fully effective, the Service assembles and makes available the physical facts about the location, quality, extent, and conservation needs of the agricultural and range lands in conservation districts, watersheds, and other areas of the United States. This includes woodland and pasture areas in farms. Such data are used in classifying land and recommending land and water uses and conservation practices that will fit each type of land.

This definite knowledge of land conditions, with the planned land and water treatment, makes for higher yields per acre, saves labor, machinery, and seed, lowers the cost of operations and maintenance and reduces the effects of drought. Through careful planning, an effort is made to use each acre of land and each acre-foot of water so it will contribute most to the farm economy.

Connecticut farmers are finding that it pays to put soil-conservation practices on their land. For example, Ned Wheeler of New Haven was able to increase the number of his milk cows from 30 to 65 by fertilizing and properly managing his permanent pasture and by utilizing 20 acres of cropland as a hay-pasture combination. Eli and Joseph Paquette of Bethel produced 100 pounds more milk a day in 1944 than in 1943 by growing more and better roughage on their farm. They accomplished this by proper fertilization and management of their hay and pasture land.

Harmful soil and water losses appear after soils have been subjected to the cultivation of clean-tilled crops. Different crops vary widely in their influence upon erosion losses. Intertilled crops, such as potatoes, corn, and tobacco, may be classed as erosion inducing. Sod crops, as well as most legumes, may be classed as erosion resisting.

Last year Connecticut produced 3,344,000 bushels of potatoes on 20,900 acres, which was slightly less than the 1944 figures but considerably more than the 2,805,000 bushels averaged annually during 1934–43 on 16,800 acres. Last year's corn crop in Connecticut was 2,150,000 bushels. Tobacco is another leading crop in the State. Potatoes, corn, and tobacco all call for the application of soil-conservation practices to maintain productive soil. Conservation is a continual must as far as these crops are concerned in order to safeguard soil.

Last year, also, Connecticut farmers harvested 400 tons of grapes, 37,000 bushels of pears, 99,000 bushels of peaches and 511,000 bushels of apples.

Erosion of farm land is often found at its worst in improperly managed orchards and vineyards. This is explained chiefly by the fact that few cultivated crops other than fruits and nuts are grown continuously on the same land for so many years.

Another reason for the severity of soil erosion on orchard and vinyard sites is the almost universal choice of sloping land for such sites. Fruit plantings are made on sloping sites because the trees need good water drainage and good air drainage. Too, fruit trees and grapevines can be grown successfully on slopes too steep to be used satisfactorily for growing cultivated row crops and grains. In some parts of the country orchards are commonly established on valley slopes and river bluffs, sites that are often subject to severe erosion.

A conservation program of orchard soil management is designed to bring about absorption by the soil of the greatest possible quantity of rainfall, prevent abnormal run-off, and hold soil losses to minimum, and at the same time provide the cultural conditions most favorable to growth and fruiting of the trees—for example, conditions preventing undue wetness of orchard soil at any season.

On the other side of the ledger, Connecticut's hay, alfalfa, oats, clover, and timothy crops tend to build up soil instead of lowering its productivity.

Conservation farming should center around the farm plan. The tendency today is to utilize each acre on the farm to the best advantage. By planning ahead, Connecticut farmers can diversify their crops more widely, increase yields and, at the same time, keep the soil productive. After all, poor soils make poor people. Conversely, good soils make a prosperous State and Nation.

We know exactly how many acres of Connecticut's agricultural land need the various soil-saving practices contributing toward a permanent agriculture. These practices apply not only to cultivated cropland, but also to grazing land and farm woodlands. The next step is to apply the practices where they are needed.

Inflation is a word on everyone's lips. Remember, farm woodlands and forest products are an excellent "inflation hedge" that increase in value with the years.

Businessmen—particularly bankers—are endorsing conservation farming as a sound venture. In Missouri, a "bunch of hard-headed bankers have discovered that soil conservation is such good business that they can lend money on it and get paid back in 9 years out of increased farm income." That is the story in the current issue of one of the farm magazines.

Countless instances could be cited of the worth of "common sense" farming. The phenomenal growth of districts in the past 9 years speaks for itself. Farmers organize districts because they are convinced that soil conservation pays.

Real Labor Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Real Labor Statesmanship," published in Collier's magazine of April 13, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL LABOR STATESMANSHIP

Labor must never forget that it is part of the general public, and that when the public suffers, labor suffers.

We borrow the above statement from a remarkable article printed in the March issue of the Postal Record, American Federation of Labor publication devoted to the interests of the Post Office Department employees. The author is W. C. Doherty, A. F. of L. vice president, and the article is about as enlightened a discussion of labor statesmanship as we've seen.

Particularly astute, we think, is Mr. Doherty's (and other A. F. of L. leaders') view of pay increases in a time when, as now, a bad inflation is threatened. As Doherty sees it, no pay increase which will crack a price ceiling in an inflationary period should be even requested. The reason is clear. It is simply that if prices are forced up every time pay goes up, the pay increases will mean nothing to the workers receiving them. If the process goes on long enough, unbridled inflation will have been let loose.

The Doherty article contains, too, some cogent comments going to demonstrate that the strike weapon should be kept as a weapon of last resort, and should never be used on impulse, or out of ill temper, or because some labor leader wants to make some publicity for himself.

Some strikes are unquestionably justified; and labor should by all means retain the right to strike. But Doherty urges, and we think with great wisdom, that the workers in all cases go into strikes only with their eyes open and after they have reckoned up all possible costs to themselves.

This article seems to us to be a real contribution to management-labor thinking in this country. Our feeling is that the A. F. of L. could do a lot worse than to have several thousand copies of the piece printed in pamphlet form and mailed around to industrial and labor leaders, the press, the colleges' economics departments, and so on. It ought to do a great deal of good.

Sitting Ducks in Our Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me entitled "Sitting Ducks in Our Air Forces," and appearing in the April issue of the American Magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SITTING DUCKS IN OUR AIR FORCES

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah, chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee)

(This article wil come as a shocking surprise to those who believe that America is first in the air. Senator THOMAS tells how VE-day found us woefully behind the Germans in the development of fighter planes, bombers, and rocket projectiles; we beat them only by the weight of superior numbers. If we are to avert a future disaster far worse than Pearl Harbor, he says, civilians instead of brass hats must control our air defense.)

We won the air war against the Germans with muscle, not mind. We smothered them with the sheer weight of our planes. Their air weapons were ahead of ours at the start of the war, and far ahead at its end. Had our invasion of Europe been delayed 6 months, we might have lost the war, due to our inferiority in the air.

For years our Air Forces have given the American public a false sense of security by untruthful boasting. Before the war, we were told that American air power was best. It wasn't. . . . During the war, we were told that it was both best and biggest. It wasn't best; it was just biggest; it was muscle, not mind. . . . We'd better learn the truth. For in the next war—God forbid—boasting won't count, and there will be no time to build mere muscle into victory, as we did this time. Mind, not muscle, will win, and in days or hours instead of years.

Our combat airmen, the fighter pilots and bomber crews, fought magnificently with the weapons given them. But they weren't the best weapons, as they should have been. Our Air Forces high command clung stupidly and stubbornly to the ideas and weapons of yesterday, while the Germans developed and put into combat those of today and tomorrow.

After VE-day, Allied civilian scientists and engineers visited Germany and inspected the laboratories, experimental stations, and factories which served the Luftwaffe. Their findings show not only the superiority of new German weapons but the details of Germany's long-range research and development, a program marked by vision and eagerness to try new ideas. By contrast the findings reveal our Air Forces' appalling lack of vision and stubborn allergy to new ideas, which were concealed from the American public.

Under wartime pressure we overtook the Germans in some conventional developments and passed them in others. But even in these things the Germans often showed advanced thought. They were first in combat with pressurized cabins, essential to high-altitude flight; with pilot-ejection, a mechanical bail-out vital to high speeds and altitudes, with special high-altitude parachutes; with unified engine-control, needed by fighter pilots; with plane-to-plane rockets; with a true aircraft gun, a cannon 10 times as destructive as our comparable cannon. We produced just one important "first" in conventional developments—the G-suit, which prevents pilots from blacking out in dives and other maneuvers of high-speed combat.

The real shock comes when we view the Germans' unconventional developments, their really new ideas and weapons. They had most of them in combat. We had a few in partial development, none in combat. While we were being told what our new weapons were going to do, the new German weapons were doing it.

"Possession of the fastest aircraft in existence," said Gen. Henry H. Arnold in a recent magazine article, "has always been an ardently sought objective of every major air power." But our Air Forces' search was far from ardent. In fact, even before the war they rejected the very idea which gave the Germans, instead of us, the fastest aircraft.

This was the Messerschmitt-262 jet-propelled fighter, which first appeared in combat in the summer of 1944. Making 525 miles per hour, it was much faster than our Mustangs, Thunderbolts, and Lightnings. At sea level it was more than 150 miles per hour faster. Except at very high altitudes, it slashed through our bomber formations at speeds 50 to 100 miles per hour faster than our defending fighters. They couldn't catch it or escape it in straightaway flight at any altitude.

Another German jet plane, the Heinkel-162 Volksjaeger—people's fighter—had about the same performance. Still another, in development, was the Triebflugel Flugzeug—power-wing aircraft—which had three wings radiating from the fuselage, like the fins on a bomb. Each wing tip carried a jet engine. Launched vertically and shot to high altitude by rockets, its three jets would make it extremely fast in combat.

The Germans had jet bombers, too. The Arado-234 was made in 2 models, with speeds of 470 and 546 miles per hour. The Junkers-287, in fight test when the war ended, had more than twice the power of our B-29 Superfortress, could carry as many bombs to London as a B-17 could carry to Berlin, and made 537 miles per hour. There was to be a Junkers flying wing, with 4 jet engines and a speed of 620 miles per hour.

Even their jet bombers were faster than our fighters, making interception difficult and pursuit impossible. Our tactical commanders never understood why German jets, fighters, and bombers didn't raid southern England. They had the range and would have found hundreds of airfields crammed with our planes. With their great speed, they would have suffered little from antiaircraft fire. Our fighters couldn't have coped with them. Such raids would have been utterly devastating.

German rocket fighters, in combat during the last 6 months of the war, were even faster than the jets. One model of the Messerschmitt-163 made 550, another 590, miles per hour.

The Bachem Natter—Viper—in development, was launched vertically to get upstairs fast and attack bombers with rockets, and by ramming after its pilot was ejected. Thought test flown, its maximum speed was still estimated, but at more than 600 miles per hour.

Rate of climb, important in intercepting enemy bombers, is the rocket plane's forte. The ME-163 reached 30,000 feet in about 2½ minutes. Another rocket fighter, the Junkers-263, reached 49,000 feet in 3 minutes. It took longer for our best fighters to reach 1,000 feet. The Natter's advantage might have proved still greater; its initial rate of climb was estimated at 37,000 feet per minute.

Some of these facts about German jet and rocket planes were known during the war. Virtually none of them appeared in Air Forces combat communiques or "publicity releases," which continued to glorify our propeller-driven planes.

The V-1, or "buzz bomb," was really a pilotless jet plane carrying a ton of high explosive in its nose. It had a very simple jet engine. Everyone but the Germans knew that a jet engine wouldn't work on a plane, and could have told them why. But they put one on a bomber and boosted its speed from 250 to 420 miles per hour. None of our wartime bombers even approached the latter speed.

The V-1 made 360 miles per hour at 3,000 feet altitude or less. Our fighters had to dive from higher altitude to catch it. Of 8,070 V-1's launched from the continental coast during 80 days in the summer of 1944, a total of 5,394 reached England. They killed 5,964 persons, injured 40,371, destroyed 24,491 houses, and damaged 1,002,688. In terms of time and bomb-tonnage, the V-1's were much more destructive than Allied bomber raids on Germany. And much cheaper. The Germans lost a few thousand inexpensive V-1's and the lives of no German airmen. Allied raids on Germany cost 40,000 planes, each far more expensive than a V-1, and the lives of 158,546 British and American airmen.

The V-2 was still more spectacular—a rocket 45 feet long, 5 feet in diameter, weighing 12 tons, and carrying a ton of high explosive. Its maximum altitude was about 70 miles and its range 250. It was launched at first from fixed ramps, which were discovered and bombed, but later from easily hidden mobile bases. It was guided by radio signals which were very difficult to jam, and was to have internal controls which couldn't be jammed at all. It was 6 times as fast as the German jet and rocket planes, traveling about

3,600 miles per hour. Far from catching it, our fighter pilots couldn't even see it. No one ever saw a V–2 in full flight; it was invisible. There was literally no defense against it.

About a dozen new V–weapons were on drawing boards, in laboratories, and nearing production. One would carry troops in a pressurized cabin. Another would be launched from a submarine 300 feet below the surface. A third would cross the Atlantic in 14 minutes, arching to 500 miles' altitude and flying at 16,000 miles per hour. It was intended for morale-shattering mass raids on New York. It wasn't impractical. The Germans' prediction that they would do it in a year or so was no idle boast.

Had our invasion been delayed 6 months, the Germans could have regained air superiority, not only in Europe, but over the Channel and southern England. We could have continued night raids, but our daylight raids would have been suicidal. They could have raided England both night and day. Our planes couldn't have stopped them. Striking at airfields, troop-concentration areas, ports, and shipping—decimating our armies and destroying their equipment—they could have made an invasion of Europe almost impossible. Their better planes could have destroyed ours on the ground, as ours did theirs' when muscle outweighed mind.

Between raids by their planes there would have been thunderous barrages of V-weapons. They planned to launch 1,000 V–1's a day. Rockets more deadly than the V–2 would have reached north to all important cities in England. We couldn't have prevented it.

England would have been pounded to rubble. Even if the Germans didn't invade, and they might have, a stalemate and negotiated peace would have been our best prospect, and total defeat not at all unlikely. We had a narrow escape as it was. After our Ground Forces conquered the continental coast just before VE-day I visited a V-weapon factory. I could not help but utter to myself, and I've repeated it often, "We are just in time." That was no flight of poetic oratory; it was the stark and awful truth. And the threatened defeat which it so clearly implied would have been due directly to our backwardness in the science of aviation.

With more appetite for publicity than respect for truth, our Air Forces brought us to World War II, believing that we were the world's leading military air power. Press-agent activities produced such magazine articles as Our Own War Birds Are Best, in 1939. They weren't; they were inferior in speed, altitude, fire power, armor, and other respects. Commenting on this in 1942, a congressional report said, "All this, despite the fact that congressional committees were frequently told our war planes of that period (1939) were better than those of other nations."

There was no secrecy about the Germans' superiority. They described and illustrated their planes in books and magazines, discussed them on the air and invited foreign pilots, including ours, to inspect and fly them.

Yet during the war hundreds of press agents, advertising men, and others more or less skilled at deceiving the public were hastily commissioned as Air Forces public-relations officers. Combat results, especially in bombing operations, were grossly exaggerated. Scores of enemy strong points were wiped out on Monday and obliterated on Tuesday, only to offer the bloodiest resistance to our Ground Forces on Wednesday.

On the home front, newspapers were deluged with misleading hand-outs. Magazine writers were given similarly misleading information about planes and equipment. Thousands of radio programs went on the air from hundreds of stations, with similar disdain for the truth. Our air weapons were described as first, best, biggest, fastest, highest, farthest, hardest-hitting, etc., though German superiority, in at least half such cases, was definitely known at the time. That was war and was deemed necessary. The people's morale had to be nursed.

One of the outstanding hoaxes of military history was the myth of precision bombing. There was no such thing. Bombing was less accurate than naval gunfire, artillery, machine guns, mortars, rockets, rifles, pistols, or even hand grenades. Direct hits were so rare as to make news, even in Air Forces communiqués. Nor was our bombing precise, as compared with the Germans. They had a bombsight so much better than ours that it made their ordinary bombardiers as good as our experts.

Our bombing altitudes decreased during the war, not because of clouds over the target, as alleged, but because only from lower altitudes was bombing even fairly accurate. We largely abandoned bombing by single planes in favor of formation bombing—dropping all bombs at a signal from the leading plane's bombardier—taking many misses to get a few hits. This retreat from the concept of precision bombing was explained in a truly astounding manner: "Bombing gained in precision until a single expert bombardier could aim the bombs for an entire formation of aircraft."

During and immediately after the war the new German weapons—jet and rocket planes, V–1's and V–2's—were ignored or belittled as "weapons of desperation," "fantastic," or "on the lunatic fringe," though anyone who thought so was clearly on the lunatic fringe, himself. Once the weapons were in our hands, the fashion changed. Recent articles discussed them seriously as weapons in our own air arsenal, but their German origin has never been denied.

What new weapons did our Air Forces produce? They produced the Roc, a radio-controlled 1,000-pound bomb in television communication with its "mother" plane. The plane's bombardier releases the Roc within sight of the target, and guides its descent. It can hit a 100-foot circle from 15,000 feet altitude. It was in development, but not in combat, during the war. The GB–4 is a radio-controlled, 2,000-pound glide bomb which can be released from a plane as far as 20 miles from the target. It was used a few times experimentally in Germany in 1944. The Azon is a radio-controlled fin which can be fitted to standard bombs, permitting some guidance in descent. It had limited experimental use in Italy and Burma. The Razon is a similar device with more elaborate control. It is accurate to within 20 feet from 15,000 feet altitude. This accuracy, like the Roc's, improves on ordinary bombing, but is still below the standards for all other forms of firepower.

To put it bluntly, these new weapons are as far behind the German V–1's and V–2's as our propeller-driven planes were behind the German jet and rocket planes. They would be comic if they weren't so tragic in their revelation of our professional military's lack of vision and consequent laggard development. The Germans thought of guided missiles in terms of self-propulsion, long range, terrific speeds, attacks against which there would be little or no defense. Our Air Forces thought of guided missiles in terms of bombs released by planes over or near the target, attacks against which there was adequate defense. The Germans produced the weapons of today and tomorrow, while we improved those of World War I.

The defense usually offered by the Air Forces when charged with lack of progress is that they weren't given enough money. That is largely nonsense. It costs little more to build first-rate planes than second-rate. And they had enough money to build the right kind of planes. Of 40 fighter planes authorized, between the P–40 and P–80 (the jet plane which recently set a transcontinental record with an average of 586 miles per hour) most were just a little better than immediately preceding models, and some were not so good. The millions spent on most of these minor improvements, or failures, with propeller-driven planes would have produced jet planes. It was vision, not money, that was lacking.

"In the past," said General Arnold in his third annual report, "the United States has shown a dangerous willingness to be caught in the position of having to start a war with equipment and doctrines used at the end of a preceding war." True, we were thus caught as to air weapons and doctrines at the start of the last war, but not, as General Arnold says, willingly. We thought that we had the best weapons and doctrines in the world, and largely because of misleading assurances given us by military professionals.

The general also errs if by willingness he means that the United States, the American public, you and I, are responsible for these inexcusable deficiencies. Responsibility for clinging to obsolete weapons and doctrines rests with the Air Forces, as with any military service, and presumably final responsibility rests with their chief. The general goes on to say, "We have paid heavily for this error. A repetition of this error in the future could mean annihilation." And there he speaks truly.

A change in leadership is not the solution of the problem. The truth is that our Air Forces suffer the ailments common to all military self-perpetuating organizations—ruling cliques, caste, politics, petty bureaucracy, fixed regulations, the purely arbitrary authority of rank and seniority, promotion for these reasons more often than for genuine ability. All these factors encourage acceptance of the past and discourage vision for the future. They produce "bomber generals" just as surely as "battleship admirals."

All competent authorities agree that the next war, if any, will probably start in, and be won from, the air. All planes may well be obsolete, made so by the speed and destructiveness of rockets and other weapons beyond present imagination. Atomic explosives, and perhaps atomic power, will play roles as yet undreamed of unless international controls effectively ban them. It will be a war of mind rather than muscle. It will be won, perhaps overnight, by those with vision—a quality clearly lacking in our Air Forces in the past, and rare in military minds at any time.

For all these reasons, our future air defense should be in civilian hands—in some organization such as the National Defense Research Council, composed of the best scientific minds in America. Such a group should be guided by world developments, the prospective rise of aggressor nations, and other factors affecting defensive and offensive strategy and tactics; and in such matters it should be able to draw on Air Forces' experience in the past.

With these things in mind, the civilian group should originate, direct, and control research, experiment, and development of new planes and other weapons—in all laboratories, factories, and testing stations, including the Air Forces' Wright Field. It should have full and final authority to accept or reject new ideas, to declare old weapons obsolete, and to substitute new ones. This group should deal directly with the scientists and engineers in American industry and research establishments whose talents, rather than those in the Air Forces, are principally responsible for the production of our air weapons.

Contrary to Air Forces publicity, Wright Field carries on relatively little research, experiment, design, and development. When a new plane, engine, piece of equipment, or the like is wanted, the Air Forces tell industry what the engineering problem is. How to solve the problem, a horse of an entirely

different color, is industry's job. Only after the problem is solved, perhaps with interim suggestions from Air Forces engineers, is the plane, or whatever, brought to Wright Field for test, which is the field's main function. Many ideas for new planes or the like originate in industry. Some, alas, like jet propulsion, are rejected by the Air Forces for reasons as obscure as they are unsound.

It is unlikely that the Air Forces would welcome such a change. But they should. Such control, by producing better planes, would have averted near-disaster in the air during the last war. It would give them better weapons for the next war, if there is one. It would protect them from a future air-power Pearl Harbor which would surpass all former cataclysms.

An American characteristic is secret departmental thinking and action. Thus, the best which our country has to offer is not available because of compartment development. Civilian control will break down professional smugness and narrow satisfactions. It will promote a broader source of scientific knowledge.

In any case, such civilian control of our air power is imperative. Other nations have full information about the new German ideas and weapons, and will employ their best scientists, without military interference, to forge such weapons into their future air powers. We dare not face the future with air power limited by military minds. Only the massed strength of American scientific knowledge and vision can protect us.

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, many views have been expressed on the extension of price control, with the belief that there should be discussion of some of the issues before the bill reaches the floor of the House, I agree, and would like to start by a brief examination of a few proposed amendments to the Price Control Act.

In the first place, nothing really new has been suggested. Most of the proposed changes have been before this Congress several times and have been emphatically rejected. They represent and always have represented the approach to price control which Mr. Roosevelt used to call the "yes—but" technique. They say "We're for it" in a loud voice to satisfy the overwhelming demand of this Nation for the continuation of strong price control, at the same time proving they really do not mean what they say by introducing amendments which will make effective price control impossible.

Let there be no mistake about where the American people stand on this issue. Of the huge volume of mail received by the House Banking and Currency Committee, I understand that about 95 percent of it urges effective price control for another year, and to those of you who might say that such mail was artificially inspired let me tell you of the recent Gallup poll, which shows that 73 percent of the public are in favor of the continuation of the present price- and rent-control program. This same poll shows that businessmen favored continuation 3 to 1. A survey by the National Opinion Research Center in January indicated that 83 percent were in favor. The recent Des Moines Register poll of opinion in Iowa turns up 81 percent in favor, and a poll taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], in his district—a representative district—shows that 83 percent of his constituents favor the continuation of price control for another year. I think every Congressman should read the thoughtful remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] regarding his poll and how it opened his eyes to what opinion really was in his district. His remarks were printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A1399.

Many of the "amenders" have argued for "fair prices," proposing a cost-plus system of pricing. Fair to whom? Certainly not to consumers, or the national welfare, or, indeed, even to business, for all of us would go down in the bust that would follow the inflation encouraged by a national policy of cost-plus pricing. The Colmer Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning recently reported to this House and emphatically rejected the cost-plus principle, stating:

> It is simply not compatible with acknowledgment that great pressures are still present. To use it would be to abandon the principle of cost absorption, thereby virtually eliminating resistance to cost pressures on most products and setting the upward spiral in motion. It would change the law from a barrier to an invitation.

Gentlemen, our own committee tells us that this proposal is not merely sham price control. It is worse than that. It is encouragement—an invitation to inflation.

A change in the court review procedure on the Price Control Act has been suggested—another old provision which Congress has before rejected. It is proposed that the special emergency court of appeals be supplanted by district courts throughout the country for review of price-control regulations. And on what basis is this suggestion made? Quotations have been cited from a minority opinion in the United States Supreme Court in the case of Yakus against United States. The court decided in this case, however, that the procedure which has been in effect for 4 years is reasonable and legal. In the majority opinion, Chief Justice Stone pointed out the advantages of having a single, expert court to decide price cases, and stated:

> Inflation is accelerated and its consequences aggravated by price disparities not based on geographic or other relevant differentials. The harm resulting from delayed or unequal price control is beyond repair. And one of the problems involved in the prevention of inflation by establishment of a Nation-wide system of price control is the disorganization which would result if enforcement of price orders were delayed or sporadic or were unequal or conflicting in different parts of the country. These evils might well arise if regulations with respect to which there was full opportunity for administrative revision were to be made ineffective by injunction or stay of their enforcement in advance of such revision or of final determination of their validity.

One more point regarding the emergency court of appeals: It is not necessary to come to Washington in order to obtain a hearing. As Chief Judge Maris has testified before the Banking and Currency Committee, the court has held hearings throughout the country and has never refused a request for a hearing outside Washington. It has, in effect, provided more inexpensive and expeditious judicial review than could be expected in the district courts.

OPA enforcement policies have come in for their share of discussion. I certainly agree that there have been cases in which OPA enforcement was carried on in an overzealous fashion to say the least. I have read Mr. Porter's letter outlining his beliefs in regard to enforcement practice. I am satisfied with it and am confident that any deviation from this policy will be dealt with promptly. I do not understand, however, the relation between any OPA enforcement abuse and the proposed amendment requiring prior submission of all OPA regulations to the Banking and Currency Committee before they become effective. Such a requirement certainly has little, if anything, to do with the correction of overreaching enforcement activities. Apart from that it is unthinkable that the Banking and Currency Committee should even attempt to review the 5,000 official documents that OPA issues each month. To interpose such a procedural step is to advance the cause of undermining price control by creating so many obstacles and hurdles that OPA cannot possibly do the job.

I have had my share of irks and angers at the OPA, but I certainly do not want to let them blind me to the terrific inflationary dangers now existing. I do not want to be party to any weakening of OPA and permitting inflation to engulf the Nation. Indeed our efforts should be in the opposite direction in strengthening OPA and in fostering it in the fight against inflation.

How Good Are the Schools in Your State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. John W. Studebaker, entitled "How Good Are the Schools in Your State?" and appearing in the April issue of the American magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW GOOD ARE THE SCHOOLS IN YOUR STATE?

(By John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education)

Why it is, people ask me, that America's schools are in such bad shape today? I do

not concede that all, or even most of them are bad. It depends on what schools you are talking about.

There are some schools that are an educator's dream, in spite of the difficulties of wartime. They have excellent facilities and splendid teachers—teachers, a few of them, who are paid as much as $3,500 a year. This may seem like a small amount to some industrial workers, but it looks fabulous to most teachers. There are other schools in certain areas, I acknowledge, where it may possibly be warranted to charge—as two investigators of an educational organization did recently—that "students are housed in hovels and taught by nearly illiterate teachers."

The explanation for such variations in our schools lies largely in the financial support, or lack of it, given the schools by the various communities and States. What can we expect from teachers who must subsist on starvation incomes?

Right now our schools are still staggering from their wartime setbacks. While school salaries have risen 15 percent since 1939, industrial salaries have gone up approximately 85 percent. During the war more than 200,000 teachers left their positions; many entered the armed forces, but more went to higher-paying war jobs. In one year the schools had to fill 80,000 positions with teachers holding only emergency certificates. Georgia recently had about 3,000 emergency teachers on its rolls. Arkansas reports it is suffering from an exceedingly serious teacher shortage.

Meanwhile, school building programs have stagnated during the war, with the result that more and more of our youngsters have been placed in schools that are not only understaffed, but also overcrowded.

With the war's end the crisis is heightened. The high wartime birth rate is swelling our kindergartens. Thousands of pupils who left high school for war jobs are returning. Thousands of serious-minded veterans are applying at our colleges. Many are bringing wives. Already veterans are being turned away from some institutions for lack of housing and teaching staffs.

Under the GI bill of rights veterans have an opportunity to continue their education. These millions of men and women were given equal opportunity to prepare for war service. But now some States will offer their veterans much better educational programs and facilities than other States are able to furnish. Why should the opportunities to prepare for peacetime living be so unequal?

The fact is that extreme differences do exist in the schooling our various States provide. This is shown in such facts as these:

One study made of draft registrations shows that while only 1 boy in 1,000 in New York State signed his name with a mark, 1 boy in 8 used a mark in 2 Southern States.

Whereas 90 percent of Nebraska's youths between 5 and 17 are enrolled in schools, only 75 percent of Arkansas's youth are enrolled.

On an average, a 20-year-old person in Utah has 5 more years of schooling behind him than a 20-year-old in one of the Southern States.

Michigan pupils receive, on an average, 2 more months of schooling each year than Mississippi pupils.

New York spends about $185 on each elementary and secondary school pupil's education during a year, whereas Mississippi spends about $41 per pupil.

But do not jump hastily to the conclusion that the Southern States mentioned and others are more indifferent to schooling than the States with greater resources. Actually, the South as a whole makes a greater effort than any other region to educate its children and youth. The South doesn't have the wealth; 14 Southern States receive 21 percent of the Nation's income and have 35 percent of the Nation's youngsters to educate. In Mississippi, for example, the average annual income per capita is about $528, whereas in New York State it is $1,519. Is it any wonder Mississippians spend much less per pupil than New York?

Actually, Mississippi, together with other Southern States, spends a greater percentage of its total resources on education than New York. If Mississippi were to bring its schools up to the national level of expenditure per pupil, it would have to devote almost 9 percent of its total income to education, while the Nation as a whole is spending less than 3 percent.

Thus you can see that profound economic differences stand in the way of plans to put all our schools on a par. What can be done? More money, of course, is not the only answer. Some localities with determination and public spirit have better schools than their more wealthy neighbors. But basically the over-all solution must be economic. The ideal would be to bring all sections of our country up to high standards of prosperity. Then excellent schools would be assured.

In the meantime, one suggestion frequently made nowadays is that the Federal Government should take action to equalize the schooling in the various States, so that every youngster could have a good education.

Here, however, we come up against the fear that Federal aid would bring Federal control of our schools. I have always been consistently opposed to centralizing in Washington the authority to control our schools. As I see it, Federal control of the administration of education in the States would be very unfortunate, for 5 reasons:

1. An educational system controlled by a central ministry would tend to be inflexible.
2. There would be a tendency to inhibit progress born of experimentation.
3. Centralized control would lead to a dead uniformity in our educational program.
4. It would remove education from the immediate concern of our citizens.
5. There would always be the danger that an unscrupulous administration might prostitute our schools to propaganda purposes.

In recent decades the Federal Government has increasingly enacted legislation to aid the States and has frequently subsidized particular phases of education, such as agriculture and home economics.

During the past war many millions of Federal dollars were poured into the technical education of war workers.

At present, there are many bills before Congress providing Federal support—in one form or another—for our schools. My own feeling is that a Federal plan designed to provide greater equality of educational opportunity among the States would be of enormous benefit and could furnish Federal aid without Federal control of the administration of education in the States. I believe very firmly that control and administration of our public schools should remain where it is—in our various States and localities.

Whatever official action is taken, I believe the communities themselves, within the limits of their resources, should take swift action to repair the ravages to their schools caused by wartime conditions, before their children suffer further. The communities should do this if only for a practical reason. Their own future prosperity depends on it. As Thomas C. Boushall, chairman of the Committee on Education of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has said: "Education is the rock-bottom foundation of the whole connective tissue of our economy. Business is dependent for its very lifeblood upon men and women willing and able and anxious to work competitively, efficiently, and steadily."

It has been established that high standards of education engender high standards of civilized living and high standards of government and health.

If America is to stand high in all these respects, it must remember that educationally, at least, our Nation cannot be much stronger than its weakest State.

Extension of Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, at this time the two Houses of Congress are seriously considering the extension of selective service. I had the privilege last night to discuss the question over the Mutual network. I stressed the importance of the decision that must be made, and pointed out that Congress must assume the entire responsibility for it. I earnestly hope that all the Members of Congress may consider the points which I have raised.

With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on April 9, 1946, together with an editorial from the Washington Post of April 2, 1946, and an article by Thomas L. Stokes, published in the Washington Daily News of April 8, 1946, on the subject of extension of selective service.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States has emerged from the most devastating holocaust in all history as the strongest nation in the world, politically, economically, and militarily. This undisputed fact imposes upon our Nation and all its citizens the gravest of responsibilities. We shall stand condemned by all future generations if we fail, either by reason of our lack of political wisdom or because of our moral indifference, to use our great resources and our powerful position to achieve a peace of justice and international stability for the whole world.

Among other things, we must have an army sufficiently strong to measure up to these tremendous obligations. Accordingly, the War Department, after consultation with the State Department, decided that it must have an army of 1,550,000 men on July 1, 1946, and 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947. I want it understood that I accept the War Department's own estimates of its present and future needs. I differ with the Secretary of War only in the proper method of acquiring replacements for the Army. I favor getting replacements under the volunteer system and he favors continuing the Selective Service System.

It should be remembered that at the present time practically the only persons being drafted are teen-age youngsters. So, if selective service be extended another year, only beardless youths will be conscripted. Therefore, when Secretary Patterson demands that selective service be extended 1 year, he would place the heavy hand of the law on each boy in America the moment he reaches his eighteenth birthday. He does not stop with a request for manpower. He demands boypower, and he insists that this boypower be mobilized by conscription.

Secretary of War Patterson contends in the name of the security of this Nation and to win the peace that he must have these beard-

less boys to send to Germany, Japan, and everywhere. He would dispatch these tender youths to the most morally corrupt places on this earth, and to its foulest human cesspools. He knows as certain as the rising of the sun in the east on the morrow that these youngsters, torn from their home environments, will be exposed under the most unfavorable circumstances to the most sordid and seamy side of life. He knows they will be officered by men who are reportedly attended in their private quarters by the girls of our captive countries. Recently a general in Japan ordered that lovemaking in public must cease. Secretary Patterson knows that from the day these immature lads—these teen-age boys—put on the uniform they will be thrown in the paths of diseased prostitutes and lewd women of this and every other country on earth. Congress must refuse to authorize this proposed crime against society.

Secretary Patterson knows that his physicians will be equipped and alerted to give the young boys first aid for the unmentionable diseases of sin and debauchery. And he knows they will require such treatment in abundance. With all of this knowledge, and apparently with a calloused and closed mind, he insists the school children of this fair land be rounded up like cattle and herded straight into the paths of sin and debauchery. Even if Secretary Patterson is blind to these conditions, Congress must adhere to a nobler course.

Every American citizen, including the high command in the War Department, prefers a volunteer to an impressed Army. The reasons are particularly persuasive at the present time, when the principal duties are to police subdued former enemy nations. General Eisenhower readily admits that teen-age conscripts are not as suitable for such tasks as older men. Even the Army assures us it wants to get away from conscription as quickly as possible and get back to a volunteer force. But they do not agree that the way to return to that system which has been traditional in America for 150 years is to adopt it now.

New York City requires many policemen, as does Washington and all the other cities of America, but none of them will consider using a teen-age boy for police work; no sheriff in any county in America deputizes boys; and yet this greatest of all nations, with all of its wealth, unlimited resources and high ideals of juvenile protection, through a law to be enacted by Congress, would snatch children out of their protected homes and away from their school books to serve as international policemen in the world's most lawless districts. A Nation of 140,000,000 people, in order to provide an army of a mere million and a half policemen, must rob the American homes of their young sons. I cannot believe that Congress is stupid enough to make such a wicked mistake.

I must add one more blow to the fathers and mothers of America, whose hearts are already filled with misgivings and heartaches. I feel compelled to tell them that this sacrifice is not necessary at all. Your young men are not needed in the service of your country. I have had full access to the facts. I have listened hours without end to Secretary Patterson's mathematical jugglers and statisticians. Their figures and their testimony is my proof. They have not been able to establish a deficit of men for the Army. General Textor, who was assigned by Secretary Patterson to review the whole problem, reported to Congress that if the draft were not to be extended there would be no deficit of men on July 1, 1946, and only a possible projected deficit in the Army of 51,000 men on July 1, 1947. Think of it. Because a possible shortage of 51,000 men may develop on July 1, 1947, a date 15 months in the future, we are asked now to extend the draft for 1 year and grab every boy qualified for service the day he reaches the age of 18 years. I have too much faith in the judgment of Congress to believe it will commit such a crime against the American people.

During the fighting war the impetuous 18-year-olds brought new glory to the Stars and Stripes. Quick as cats and unafraid they struck down the invincible battle scarred veterans of Germany and Japan. They were the pride and delight of their commanding officers. But now the task is different. Here broad worldly experience and mature judgment are required. These young boys belong in the classroom and not in a military garrison.

On March 1 of this year the War Department raised the standard of recruits 11 points because they were receiving too many volunteers. On March 1 of this year the standards which were good enough all during the war were raised by 11 points for volunteers, but strangely enough—not for conscripts.

On my oath and responsibility as a Senator, I say to the mothers and fathers of America that the draft beyond July 1, 1946 is wholly unnecessary. Even the War Department, as I have said, has agreed that no deficit will occur until July 1, 1947, a date nearly 15 months away. How can anyone predict anything 15 months away? Such a flimsy prediction is certainly no basis for extending the draft 1 year.

They say they will require 900,000 enlisted men on that date and they do not believe they can get that many volunteers. Last October the War Department contended that only 300,000 volunteers could be recruited by July 1, and now they admit with red faces that the number is 800,000, most of whom enlisted for 3 years. They were off half a million in their estimates of volunteers for July 1, 1946. Is it not probable they are off far more than 51,000 volunteers in their estimates for July 1, 1947? That very bad guess is no basis for extending the draft another year and yet that is the only argument they have.

The War Department in this asinine assumption is displaying small faith in America. My own prediction is that they will have two volunteers on July 1, 1947, for every man they can use. I am basing my estimate on our 6 months' experience with the volunteer method. They are basing their low estimates on their passion to conscript 18-year-olds.

Conscripting 18-year-old boys is a harsh and brutal thing but in time of grave peril such steps must be taken. When it was necessary to have 12,000,000 fighting men to overpower 3 of the most desperate and ruthless enemies civilized man has ever faced, Congress deemed it necessary, but now when these foes are prostrate and the requirement has dropped to a total of 2,000,000 men for all the branches of the military service, the need for 18-year-olds cannot be established, and it has not been established.

There are, however, dark hints that a new war may be brewing in the Middle and Near East. Such talk strikes me as most unfortunate at this time. I should like to say to you that if there is any reason for fearing the imminence of armed conflict, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has not been taken into confidence in the matter.

There is nothing known to me to justify fear of a conflict. On the other hand, everything I know discounts it. The War Department, of its own volition, will reduce the Army by a million men between now and July 1, and in the following year they propose to reduce it another half million. The President has recommended the appropriation of the Navy be cut $2,000,000,000 under the Navy's estimates. Does that look like war is just around the corner?

The world is ready for American leadership, but America has one fatal weakness. We are too jittery. Every time there is a little dispute in the Council of UNO we begin to worry about going to war. The UNO was created to settle disputes. If there were no disputes there would be no UNO. We must develop more national poise and quit fingering the trigger of war over every unfortunate outcry. I am positive that while Harry Truman is President and James Byrnes Secretary of State, the United States is not going to war over some ill-advised speech or some unhappy incident. These statesmen want peace, and when statesmen have a passion for peace ugly things will be worked out.

In the two World Wars, propaganda and a war of nerves were developed to a fantastic degree. A stop must be put to it. Now the factories of propaganda are bellowing for a year's extension of the draft. The United States cannot afford to become a Government inspired by clever and vociferous propaganda. American newspapers and radio commentators are largely responsible, but they could not succeed so well if the people would study facts more and listen to the cry of "wolf" less. They do not give the people the facts and so the people are confused. We are too gullible. Congress has a great opportunity to serve in establishing the facts in this crisis. Will Congress measure up to its possibilities, or will it also swallow the propaganda, line, hook, sinker, and all? I believe that common sense will prevail and that Congress will do the right thing. My faith in Congress is not limited.

[From the Washington Post of April 2, 1946]

KILGORE COMMITTEE

It is difficult to understand the reasoning which prompted the Senate Committee on Audits and Accounts to recommend a drastic cut in funds for the important investigatory work of the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee. This group, established in 1942, under the chairmanship of Senator KILGORE, has proved itself one of the most effective congressional goads to Executive action, and it has made available to Congress and the public a wealth of illuminating material on the technological aspects of war mobilization. It has much significant work still to do. The Military Affairs Committee requested for it an appropriation of $57,000, but this request, as it goes to the floor today, has been cut, inexplicably, to a mere $18,000.

Out of the subcommittee's studies on the technological resources of the United States there has emerged, in accordance with a request from the President, a bill for the creation of a national science foundation. Embodying the best features of conflicting proposals after long and careful hearings, the bill is a thoroughly sound and considered piece of legislation; the subcommittee which developed it should stay on the job to see it through to enactment. Even more vital, perhaps, are the studies of the subcommittee in connection with German cartels and hidden resources for waging war. Captured German documents dealing with Nazi infiltration into foreign countries and economic reserves have been analyzed by the Kilgore group; the findings thus far disclosed make completion of the job seem imperative. The Senate would be very imprudent, indeed, we think, to frustrate at this juncture, one of the most useful of its own instruments for dealing with postwar problems.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 8, 1946]

FINISH THE JOB

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

One of the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress

that has won general support urges additional expert staff help for congressional committees.

Even before the joint committee, headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE (Republican, Wisconsin) and Representative MONRONEY (Democrat, Oklahoma) began its investigation a year ago bills were introduced for this purpose. This denotes recognition of the need for more information, both for individual Members and for committees, so they can perform intelligently their legislative functions in the face of the growing complexity of Government and the expansion of its activties.

Few major committees have anything like adequate staffing to cope with the problems that confront them constantly. Some committees set up, from time to time, special subcommittees to dig up information.

One such subcommittee was created in October 1942, by the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Known as the Subcommittee on War Mobilization, it proved a most helpful adjunct to the Military Committee and the Senate.

During the war its investigations resulted in improvements in over-all coordination of the war program and in mobilizing scientific research for war. During the war and since, through an exhaustive investigation of the German cartel system, it has thrown light on the effects of that system on our own war preparations through economic penetration and espionage here and in South America.

Incidentally, its inquiry into war production and manpower bottlenecks brought recommendations that influenced creation of the Office of War Mobilization, the high civilian command in the last 2 years of the war. Its study of scientific research resulted in the bill for a National Science Foundation, both for military and peacetime advancement of science, which has been reported favorably to the Senate.

Now the subcommittee is in the midst of a most important job which is analysis of secret documents captured in Germany relating to cartels.

This important task now suddenly is threatened by the action of the Senate Audit and Control Committee in slashing the requested $57,000 appropriation for the next fiscal year to $18,000. The Senate has not yet passed on the committee's recommendation.

There are interests in this country which would be very happy to see this investigation restricted or stopped, big economic and financial interests that had tie-ins with German cartels before the war. They should not be permitted to prevent revelation of the complete story.

Efforts to hamstring congressional investigations that affect powerful interests are not new or strange to anyone who has covered them through the years. Attempts were made to shut off the famous Senate Banking Committee investigation into stock market and banking abuses, conducted by Ferdinand Pecora—also, among others, the Interstate Commerce Committee's investigation into railroad receiverships in which President Truman, while Senator, took such an important part as chairman of an investigating subcommittee.

The power of investigation is one of the most cherished and most effective powers of Congress. Through congressional investigations have come corrections of many evils in our economic and social system.

The War Mobilization subcommittee should have the means to complete its important job.

Better Utilization of the Mississippi River by Development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, without attempting to be critical, I want to correct the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET], as to the discovery of the Mississippi River. It was not discovered by Marquette in 1673, it was discovered by Hernando de Soto in 1541. De Soto has been described as the most intrepid knight, the most daring adventurer, and the greatest soldier that Spain ever sent to the New World. His name will be forever linked with the "Monarch Stream" which he discovered and beneath whose turbid waters his remains still rest.

I agree with what the gentleman from New York said about the Father of Waters being such a wonderful asset to the American people; but unfortunately they are denied its use to a large extent today because of the fact that the swift current on that mighty river prevents the shipment of materials upstream at anything like reasonable costs.

The Board of Army Engineers has recently made a full report on the short inland waterway connecting the Tennessee with Mobile Bay down the Tombigbee that would correct that situation.

It will be a great blessing to the people of every State in what we call the Mississippi Valley, that is every State between the Alleghenies and the Rocky Mountains, as well as a benefit to the Nation as a whole.

I want to explain in as few words as possible what this great project will mean to the people you represent.

When this Tennessee Tombigbee project came before the last Congress, you will remember it was rejected on the ground the report recommending it had not been signed by the Chief of Army Engineers. Members of both the House and Senate requested a new report.

With the aid of my friend, Representative FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama, who serves on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors with me, and other members of the committee, we secured the passage of a resolution providing for an additional report. That new report has now come in. In it this great project is not only recommended by the Board of Army Engineers that made the investigation, but the report is also signed by the Chief of Army Engineers. It is one of the finest reports of its kind I have ever read, and I hope we can get this project through at this session of Congress. If we do it will be the greatest development of its kind in America.

This project would give us a slack water route connecting the Tennessee River with Mobile Bay down the Tombigbee, and complete one of the finest inland waterway systems in the world. It would take about 5 years to construct it, and would employ something like five or six thousand men during that period. When finished it would really enable us to navigate the Mississippi, as well as all the other streams composing the Mississippi River system.

This new report increases the size of the locks to 110 feet by 600 feet, making them the same size as the standard locks on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Illinois Rivers, so that all the barges that travel on any streams in the United States may pass up and down the Tombigbee.

The Tennessee River is on a plateau about 100 feet higher than the Tombigbee where it is formed by the confluence of Brown and Mackey Creeks about 25 miles from the Tennessee.

This connection between the Tennessee and the Tombigbee was virtually out of question until the Pickwick Dam was built on the Tennessee River, raising the water level at the mouth of Yellow Creek on the Tennessee by about 55 feet, and making it possible to cut through the sand ridge that separates the two water sheds and leave the summit of the project in the Tennessee River where the water supply is unlimited. If the Pickwick Dam had not been built, it would have been necessary to have locks to raise the traffic from the Tennessee River up to the crest, as well as locks to raise it up from the Tombigbee, which would have been virtually impossible, since there would have been no water supply at the summit. But, as I said, the summit will now be in the Tennessee River, and the water supply will be unlimited.

It will not turn any floodwater from the Tennessee into the Tombigbee, as some people seem to fear. Only enough water will be taken out of the Tennessee to operate the first set of locks. It is the only place in America where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, with so little expense, and with such tremendous saving in transportation costs and distances. It will cut the water distance from New Orleans to the Tennessee River from 1,121 miles to 637 miles, and will cut the water distance from Mobile, Ala., to the Tennessee River from 1,277 miles to 481 miles.

Now let us see about the savings in transportation costs. The average barge load consists of a tow and 8 barges carrying a load of 3,500 tons. All traffic going upstream now has to fight the swift current on the Mississippi River at a terrific expense. When this Tombigbee inland waterway is developed, the traffic will move counterclockwise. These barges, carrying through traffic will go up through the slack water route provided by the locks and dams on the Tombigbee, and return down the Misssissippi, in order to take advantage of the swift current. Of course, the ones coming from the upper Tennessee will probably use this short route going and coming.

The following table will show the savings which this new route would provide:

Possible average savings in line-haul costs for through traffic via proposed Tombigbee-Tennessee waterway as an alternate route for upstream movement of existing traffic on the lower Mississippi River based on an average tow composed of 8 barges (mixed sizes) carrying 3,500 tons of freight

From	To	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow
Houston, Tex	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890
	T-T Junction	2.74	9,590	1.60	5,600	1.14	3,990
New Orleans, La	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940
	T-T Junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005
Mobile, Ala	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530
	T-T Junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595
Port Birmingham, Ala	Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035
	Paducah	3.04	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525
	T-T Junction	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590
Demopolis, Ala	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525
	T-T Junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590
Columbus, Miss	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610
	T-T Junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710
Aberdeen, Miss	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470
	Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960
	T-T Junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025
Fulton, Miss	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310
	T-T Junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375

You will note that if one of these through barge loads of one tow and eight barges, carrying the average load of 3,500 tons of freight, should go from New Orleans, La., to Cairo, Ill., or to any point above Cairo, up the Mississippi River, the Missouri River, or the Illinois River, fighting the swift current of that stream, the cost to Cairo would be $7,070. If it went across to Mobile, Ala., along the intercoastal waterway, up the Tombigbee and down the Tennessee and the Ohio to Cairo, the cost would be $4,620, or a saving of $2,450. In other words, every barge load of 3,500 tons going from New Orleans, La., to Cairo, Ill., or to any point above Cairo on the Mississippi or the Missouri or into the Great Lakes, by way of the Illinois River, would save on every single trip the sum of $2,450, which is more than the present profits on such a load.

If it went up the Mississippi and the Ohio to Paducah the cost to that point would be $7,350, whereas, if it went across through the intercoastal waterway to Mobile then up through the slack waterway on the Tombigbee to the Tennessee, and then down the Tennessee to Paducah, the cost would be $4,410, or a net saving of $2,940. In other words, every average load of 3,500 tons going from New Orleans to Paducah, or to Louisville, Ky., Cincinnati, Ohio, Wheeling, W. Va., Pittsburgh, Pa., or any other point on the Ohio above Paducah, or to Nashville on the Cumberland, would save $2,940 on every trip.

If it were going into the Tennessee River, the cost from New Orleans to Pickwick Lake, up the Mississippi, the Ohio and Tennessee Rivers, would be $8,470. Whereas, the cost from New Orleans by way of Mobile and the Tombigbee, would be $3,465, or a net saving of $4,005 on every load going from New Orleans to Sheffield, Florence, Decatur, Huntsville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, or any other point on the upper Tennessee.

But suppose this traffic were going from Mobile to Cairo; if it went around by New Orleans and up the Mississippi River the cost would be $8,365 for each load of 3,500 tons. Whereas, the cost up the Tombigbee and down the Tennessee and the Ohio to Cairo would be $3,325, or a saving of $5,040 on every load going from Mobile to Cairo or to any other point on the upper Mississippi from Cairo to Minneapolis, or on the Missouri to Kansas City, Omaha, or Sioux City, or on the Illinois up to Chicago.

If it were going into the Ohio River, the cost from Mobile to Paducah by way of the Mississippi River and the Ohio, would be $8,645. Whereas, by way of the Tombigbee inland waterway for the same load the cost would be $2,170, or a saving of $7,595 on every load of 3,500 tons going from Mobile to Paducah, Louisville, Cincinnati, Wheeling, Pittsburgh, or to any other point on the upper Ohio, or to Nashville on the Cumberland.

If this traffic were going from Mobile into the Tennessee River, by way of the Mississippi, the Ohio and the Tennessee, the cost on every barge load of 3,500 tons, from Mobile to the junction of the Tombigbee route with the Tennessee, would be $9,765; whereas, if it went by the Tombigbee, the cost would be $2,170, or a saving of $7,595 on every load.

That means that on every barge load of 3,500 tons, going from Mobile to any point on the Tennessee River, from Pickwick Dam to Knoxville, the saving would be $7,595.

Every barge load going from Birmingham, Ala., would have to pass down the Warrior River and into the Tombigbee at Demopolis. If it went from Demopolis around by New Orleans and up the swift Mississippi to Cairo, the cost would be $9,380. Whereas, by the Tombigbee route the cost would be $2,345, or a saving of $7,035 on every 3,500-ton load going from Birmingham or Demopolis to Cairo or to any point on upper Mississippi, the Missouri, or the Illinois into Chicago.

If this traffic went from Demopolis to Paducah on the Ohio River by way of the Mississippi, the cost would be $9,660 on each 3,500-ton load. Whereas, via the Tombigbee route the cost would be $2,135, or a saving of $7,525 an each such load going to any point on the Ohio between Paducah, Ky., and Pittsburgh, Pa., or to Nashville on the Cumberland.

If this traffic went from Demopolis into the Tennessee River at Pickwick Lake, the cost for such a load by way of the Mississippi River upstream to Cairo, then up the Ohio to Paducah and up the Tennessee River to Pickwick Lake, would be $10,780. Whereas, the cost via the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway would be $1,190, or a saving of $9,590 on every such load.

Remember that this would mean the saving of $9,590 on every barge load of 3,500 tons going from Birmingham or Demopolis to any point on the upper Tennessee from Sheffield to Knoxville.

Remember that at one time steamboat traffic on the Tombigbee extended up to Columbus, Aberdeen, Cotton Gin—or Amory—and Fulton, and even on up to Walker's Bridge, which is near the confluence of Brown and Mackey's Creeks.

If this project were completed now, a barge load consisting of a tow and eight barges, carrying a load of 3,500 tons, going from Columbus, Miss., to Cairo, Ill., by way of the Mississippi River would cost $9,905; whereas, by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee route it would cost $1,785—or a saving of $8,120 on every barge load going from Columbus to Cairo or to any point above Cairo on the Mississippi, the Missouri, or the Illinois Rivers into the Great Lakes.

If it were going from Columbus to Paducah on the Ohio, the cost by way of the Mississippi River would be $10,185; whereas, by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee route the cost would be $1,575, or a saving of $8,610 on every bargeload to Paducah, Ky.; Nashville, Tenn.; or to Louisville, Ky.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Wheeling, W. Va., or Pittsburgh, Pa.; or any other point on the upper Ohio.

If this traffic were going from Columbus, Miss., into the Tennessee River, by way of the present route up the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Tennessee Rivers, the cost to the junction of this Tombigbee Canal with the Tennessee River, in Pickwick Lake, or at the mouth of Yellow Creek, would be $11,305; whereas by way of the Tombigbee inland waterway the cost would be $595, or a saving of $10,710, on every barge load going from Columbus to any point on the Tennessee River from Pickwick Lake to Knoxville.

Going from Aberdeen, Miss., to Cairo, Ill., by way of the Mississippi River, the cost would be $10,080; whereas by the Tennessee-Tombigbee route the cost would be $1,610, or a saving of $8,470, on every barge load going to Cairo or to any point above Cairo on the Mississippi, the Missouri, or the Illinois Rivers into the Great Lakes.

If it were going from Aberdeen, Miss., to Paducah, Ky., by way of the Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers, the cost would be $10,360; whereas, by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee route, the cost would be $1,400, or a saving of $8,960.

If this traffic were going into the Tennessee River, the cost on every 3,500-ton load from Aberdeen to the junction of the Tombigbee route with the Tennessee River, going by way of the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Tennessee, the cost would amount to $11,480; whereas, by

way of the Tombigbee inland waterway, the cost would be $455, or a saving of $11,025 on every load going to Cairo or to points beyond Cairo, on the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, or the Illinois River, into the Great Lakes.

If this traffic were going from Amory, Miss., or Cotton Gin Port, the savings would be still greater; and if it were going from Fulton, Miss., the cost on every barge load from Fulton to Cairo would be cut from $10,255 to $1,435—a saving of $8,820. From Fulton to Paducah the cost would be cut from $10,535 to $1,225, or a saving of $9,310, on every load going to Paducah or to any point on the Ohio from Paducah, all the way up to Pittsburgh, Pa.

If this traffic were going into the Tennessee River, the cost on a barge load of 3,500 tons from Fulton to the junction of the Tombigbee inland waterway with the Tennessee River would amount to $11,655; whereas, by way of the Tombigbee inland waterway from Fulton to the junction of the Tennessee River, the cost would be $280, which would mean a saving of $11,375 on every barge load going from Fulton to any point on the Tennessee River from Pickwick Lake to Knoxville.

This would give us cheap water transportation not only into the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi River Basins but even into the Great Lakes by way of the Illinois River. It would benefit every human being living between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains. It would stimulate agricultural, commercial, and industrial development in our section as nothing else has ever done. It would literally lay our products at the market door.

It is opposed by certain through railroads, and they are trying to mislead the railroad employees to believe that it would injure them. The truth is that it would not only give us cheap water transportation, but it would enable the railroads to bring their rates down to meet the water rates, get rid of the present discriminatory charges, and stimulate railroad traffic in that area as nothing else has ever done.

That is what happened when the barge line was constructed to Birmingham, Ala., on the Warrior, and that has been the result wherever water transportation has been provided to any city or any section in the United States.

I have gone somewhat into detail on this proposition because I regard it as one of the most important developments now confronting the people I have the honor to represent.

No project that has ever been surveyed and reported on favorably twice by the Army engineers, as this one has been, has ever finally failed of consummation, and I predict that this project will go through, and that the people of the Tombigbee Valley, the Tennessee Valley, the Ohio Valley, the Missouri Valley, and, in fact, that entire great network of inland waterways will benefit as they have never benefited from any other such development.

We start hearings on this measure right away, and, as I said, we hope to get the measure passed at this session of Congress.

It is the greatest undeveloped project of its kind in America, and would be of untold benefit to the people of the entire Nation.

Food for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Gordon Roth, director of public relations, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, on the food for freedom program, March 31, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening from GTA: The world needs wheat. That still is a great crying need from millions of people. Much of that burden of feeding the world right now falls on two nations—the United States and Canada. There is a special reason for this. Nearly all of the other great food producing regions, outside of the war zones, have been stricken by drought. Many of you may not realize this. These have been years of abundance in the Northern Hemisphere, but the whole Southern Hemisphere has been swept by a great drought. This drought has parched the fields of Asia, north and south Africa, of Australia, and Argentina. The critical period for the world will be between now and next July. The next 3 months will tell the story. By then, the Northern Hemisphere will be producing food in abundance again. These new crops will help ease the critical food shortages that now exist in almost every country but the United States and Canada. We said before, the most important food of all is wheat.

The plan is to export a total of 225,000,000 bushels of wheat from the United States in the first 6 months of this year. We are falling behind on our promises, but that much wheat must reach the stomachs of as many people as there are in this country, almost 140,000,000. It will save millions and millions of lives. It may do even more.

President Truman emphasized this in a recent talk. He said that "if any nation would keep security for itself, it must be ready and willing to share security with all. That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace." Right now the price of security must be measured in wheat. Wheat spells victory.

No one disagrees with what has been said so far. It is when we get into the mechanics of how to do the job that the arguments start. They may be economic or social or political differences. Right now the world's food needs continue to be dominated by the news that comes out of Washington, by such things as the Feed Grain Order WFO No. 145, by the passage of the Pace bill rider, and by the drive to adopt the Thatcher plan to get the wheat moving off the farms and into market.

The feed grain order was issued last Friday. It limits inventories of feed grains to 45 days in most cases and cuts feeding from 15 to 20 percent under 1945.

The Pace bill rider would include farm labor in deciding farm parity prices. It is believed that the bill would increase parity prices on farm products by 30 percent. It has been passed by both the House and Senate. President Truman says he will veto the bill.

The Thatcher plan was first proposed early in February by General Manager M. W. Thatcher of GTA. The proposal was endorsed by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and other farm organizations. The original proposal was to have the Government borrow the grain it needed for relief export directly from the farmers, but instead of paying cash for the grain, the Government would issue I O U certificates to the farmers. These certificates would be worth the face value of the grain at the time they were cashed in by the farmers. The reason back of this GTA plan is simple. There are millions of bushels of wheat alone on the farms. The total amount runs close to 200,000,000 bushels. The farmers have every reason to believe that prices will go higher. They read how the National Association of Manufacturers want the OPA wiped out. They see bulges all along the way on price controls. They see bakers making smaller loaves and selling them at the same price as before. Why sell your grain in exchange for rubber dollars? That is the question they ask. Until the Government decides what it is going to do about prices, the farmers figure wheat in the bin is a lot better than money in the bank.

At first, Washington laughed at the Thatcher plan. Washington said the whole problem was boxcars. Your GTA agreed. Without cars, you cannot move grain. It had been trying to get the cars out into the country for over 2 years, not just a few cars but all the cars that are needed. In March they started moving and millions of bushels of wheat came to market, but this was grain that had been piled up in the country elevators, and just as GTA had pointed out, when the elevators were emptied, the grain stopped moving. Millions of bushels still are on the farms.

Then up in Canada last week, the Canadian Government adopted its version of the Thatcher wheat plan. Starting on April 1, it will issue certificates to Canadian farmers. It will borrow the wheat from Canadian farmers who do not want to sell their grain right away. These certificates can be cashed in any time in 1946 or 1947 or 1948. The Canadian Government, in announcing the I O U program for wheat, said that the Canadian farmers were holding a lot of the wheat on their farms because they did not want to pay a double income tax on that share of the wheat they would normally not market until next year.

Under the Thatcher plan, however, the income can be applied to their tax declarations this year, or next year, or in 1948, whichever they choose. Now, the United States Government is working on the plan. The first draft of the order includes only wheat. It guarantees the farmers, who market their wheat right away, full market prices up to March 31, 1947. It means that the farmers will be protected against being short-changed on their prices for a whole year. It means that the wheat that is so badly needed, needed to keep millions of people from starving, will start moving to market. It will also help to build up a supply for the flour mills and processors here at home.

Now, these three bills to all practical purposes are very minor bills. Most people probably never even noticed them. They were lost in all the black headlines about the United Nations Organization and the atomic bomb scare, but that is the way we do things in this country. As T. R. B. points out in the New Republic for April 1, 1946: "We have two political parties in this country. One does not know where it is going, while the other seems bent on committing suicide. The Republican Party is not isolationist but isolationists vote Republican. The Democratic Party has a mutinous legislative crew

who seem bent on wrecking the ship. Now, Chairman Hannegan, Henry Wallace, and most recently President Truman in his Jackson Day dinner speech, have called on the poll-tax conservative Democratic wing to get into line with White House policies, but lacking the power of the parliamentary system to dissolve a balky and stubborn legislature, the President must see his program blocked and frustrated. After patronage is exhausted, there is little he can do. Mr. Truman lacks the inspired gift of Roosevelt to rouse the public and dramatize the issue. Yet, it is clear that the Democrats will destroy themselves if the present legislative disorganization continues. The Republicans may well capture the House this fall and such a victory almost inevitably forecasts a Republican victory in 1948, but the Republicans are split too. Their skeleton is a foreign policy." But the moral should be clear to every listener. Until we can devise a system of discipline, the over-all prospect of party responsibility in Washington is not bright.

It is not that our democratic processes are obsolete, or antiquated, and ready for the ash can—far from that. The best system in the world will not operate efficiently unless you fix responsibility, fix responsibility and have discipline and order. If you have these things, then you have efficiency.

Take the problem of getting wheat, enough to feed millions of people abroad. That means 225,000,000 bushels of wheat, but before you can ship it abroad, you have to collect it. Think of the work that takes, and the cooperation. That wheat is scattered over thousands and thousands of farms—500 bushels on this farm, a thousand or two on this one, and maybe ten or fifteen thousand bushels on some of the big farms. The farmers must be induced to sell. There must be cars to move it, ships to haul it over the oceans. Some of it must be stored. Money has to be appropriated to pay for it. Those are just a few of the problems, but when you fall down on any one of them, you have another bottleneck.

It is not that Government regulation is bad. It is a matter of bad Government regulation which causes all the troubles. Your Farmers Union GTA does not believe in going back to the wild, free days of unbridled speculation and gambling; neither do the farmers. The farmers, who own GTA, have expressed themselves on this, time and again. As a business institution, cooperatively owned by thousands of farmers, GTA believes that we must, as a Nation, assume the collective responsibilities that come with maturity in meeting the world food problem. The farmers cannot do it alone; neither can business. But with the aid of a Government, in which the people can measure the performance of individual members as well as the parties they represent, the job can be done. A world food plan is practical; it not only will open up new markets for both farm and industrial products, but, at the same time, it will banish hunger and malnutrition and the fears that go with these diseases of mind and body. Wheat and food offers one plan—to get the nations to cooperate with each other instead of fighting with each other.

For those who call this starry-eyed idealism, we want to tell you what General Eisenhower, a practical fighting man, said: "Until the peoples of the world understand and respect the interests of their neighbors, the victory will elude us. Until the peoples of the world embrace the democratic belief that the dignity of the individual is the basis of the success of nations, the world will not find an enduring peace."

What stands in the way? Hunger and fear. Food can banish them both. That is what wheat can do.

So we want to end with this bit of advice made by T. R. B. in the New Republic: "Once there were two city-states, Athens and Sparta. They had every reason to cooperate. They had the world to live in. Their wisest leaders pointed out the necessity for peace, but they fought. Why? Because they were afraid of each other, and they were both destroyed." There is much for us to ponder in that tragic chapter from history.

So, good evening, and in behalf of the thousands of cooperative farmers who make these broadcasts possible, remember that—

GTA is the co-op way.

A Raw Deal for Our Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Army regulation 605–115, governing leaves of absence of commissioned personnel states in substance: "A leave credit of 1 month per year with full pay and allowances will accrue to each officer in the Army of the United States on active duty for each year of service up to a maximum of 120 days."

Army regulation 615–275 governing authorized absence—furlough—of enlisted personnel, states in substance: "Authorized absence is a privilege granted to enlisted men under certain conditions. This privilege may be denied for disciplinary reasons or for the good of the service. No right will accrue to any enlisted man as a result of authorized absence not availed of or denied."

Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, I am glad that our commissioned officers are getting this break. Many of the officers have not had a chance for any furlough. They are entitled to every cent of that money and more. There is no danger of our country doing too much for its servicemen—officers or enlisted men. Our commissioned officers deserve this money and more besides. They have done their part, too.

Many of our officers will get as high as $1,600 upon discharge. This will help them make the transition back to civilian life. This is as it should be. I am glad for the officers that they are getting this break.

But Mr. Speaker: Again the privates, private first class, corporals, sergeants and so forth get a dirty deal. To give commissioned officers a 120-day leave with pay and deny same to the enlisted men is one of the most disgraceful and dishonorable acts perpetrated on all mankind.

Even the hundreds and thousands of officers here in Washington who never saw combat are given 120 days accrued leave and pay. I am glad they are getting it. They should get it. But the privates and other enlisted men who starved, who contracted diseases, who fought the war and did the dirty work and paid the heaviest price are denied that privilege. This is grossly unjust.

Is it coming to pass that we are going to favor officers over the enlisted personnel? There is no excuse whatever for this. If we allow this raw deal to continue we don't deserve the respect of the people we represent. Let's act now. In all fairness let's act now!

Mr. Speaker, the morale of our enlisted men is breaking. It is a wonder it has kept up as long as it has. Are our enlisted men to suffer and endure and be denied accrued leave pay?

Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to insert an article from a service paper published in the Pacific—it gives an idea of how our enlisted men feel about it.

Our enlisted men who have spent 3 and 4 years in combat never had a chance for a furlough. Why should they be denied this accrued leave pay?

ACCRUED LEAVE—A CRUDE LAW

Why is it possible for an enlisted man to serve in the same theater of operations with an officer for a period of 3 to 4 years where conditions have not allowed receiving the benefits of accrued furlough time or a terminal leave based upon 30 days per year for total service? At the separation center the enlisted man receives his discharge button denoting an honorable discharge, travel pay from the center to his home at the rate of 5 cents per mile, and the first of three $100 payments commonly referred to as mustering-out pay.

The officer who has been in the same theater and subject to the same conditions, climate, diseases, hardships, and various other hazards will receive accrued leave of 30 days per year, with full pay and allowances up to the maximum of 120 days. In addition, the officer receives the discharge button denoting honorable service, railroad fare, and, if he is of company grade—lieutenants and captains—will receive the first of three $100 payments of his mustering-out pay. All of which will total in the case of the average officer who has 120 days of accrued leave approximately $1,000 to $1,600, depending upon whether the officer is single or married. Which when contrasted to the $300 mustering-out pay that the enlisted man receives, plus mileage at the rate of 5 cents per mile to his home, is a glaring inequality which the citizens of the United States are no doubt unaware of, in my estimation.

It is the opinion of all personnel with whom I have discussed this matter, both commissioned and enlisted, that the variance between these two regulations is an oversight on the part of the War Department. It is inconceivable that any branch of the American armed forces would willingly and intentionally keep a regulation in effect which unjustly discriminates against any group simply because they are enlisted men. But it appears to every enlisted man that AR 615–275 in its present form is completely out of harmony with the best customs and traditions of the service and unfair to the men who have been selected for the service but who, due to the exigencies of the war, have spent the majority of their Army career in the forgotten, little-known, and bypassed corners of the globe, where furloughs and rest camps were virtually unheard of, but hardships, loneliness, disease, dehydrated food, constant danger, and even death were SOP.

Under present regulations inequality exists. The choice should not be difficult. What are the enlisted men in the theater doing to bring this injustice to the attention of the War Department and Congress? (Reprinted from a letter by Master Sgt. John A. Johnson to the Daily Pacifican.)

It is the enlisted men who have borne the brunt of this war. It is the enlisted men who endured more and suffered more. It is the enlisted men who paid the heaviest price. Why in heaven's name deny them the privilege of 120 accrued days leave with pay we give our officers?

A. F. of L. Labor Statesmanship Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A. F. of L. Labor Statesmanship Pays Off," delivered by Mr. W. C. Doherty, vice president of the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR STATESMANSHIP PAYS OFF—EXPERIENCE, UNDERSTANDING, PRICELESS ASSETS—ALL PARTIES GAIN BY PROVED POLICY OF FEDERATION'S LEADERSHIP

(By W. C. Doherty, vice president, American Federation of Labor)

Labor statesmanship as practiced by the experienced negotiators of the American Federation of Labor is paying off in terms of higher net wages to workers, an increased flow of goods to the public, and greater long-term gains to management.

The record speaks for itself. But behind this impressive record of low work stoppage lies a sound philosophy of business understanding resulting from years of negotiation and healthy relationship with management.

Admittedly, the critical postwar days have brought an increased responsibility upon labor. This responsibility means more than ever before we must consider all parties affected by any demand for increases or concessions of any sort. The basic premise followed by the A. F. of L. rests upon the sound national need of maintenance of price ceilings. The A. F. of L. has taken the position that if the price ceilings are cracked and prices are generally forced upward with the general public paying more for its goods and services, labor does not make substantial net gains. Labor must never forget that it is part of the general public and that when the public suffers, labor suffers.

When the cost of living is forced out of control by unwise compulsion, the tide of inflation is let loose and everyone suffers. Wage gains simply do not pay off, if the increases have to be paid out of a higher cost of living.

AFL RECOGNIZES RESPONSIBILITY

Leadership of the A. F. of L. recognizes its responsibility to the membership and dependents. With more than 7,000,000 members with an average of four persons per family, our leaders are responsible directly for some 28,000,000 persons. This very considerable portion of our population represents both an important and a powerful segment of the Nation's economic life.

The right to strike is a powerful and an important economic weapon which must not be abridged by unwise legislation such as the Case amendment or other of the anti-strike bills now pending in Congress.

Incidentally, it might be well for some of the antilabor Congressmen if they are really sincere in protecting the public interest to take a little time out and counsel with experienced leaders of both labor and management. These Congressmen could then develop a real understanding of the very complex relationships between present-day business and labor.

Labor, however, must discharge its responsibility to the public in not using the strike weapon until other remedies have been exhausted. Constant statements by both management and labor to the daily press too often foment discontent on both sides as well as by the public. The strike or the lock-out as a weapon and public opinion as a factor in labor disputes should not be used for personal gain and personal publicity. This applies to both management and labor.

The sound long-term labor policy demands that labor and management be absolutely convinced that diligent and genuine efforts at collective bargaining, conciliation, and arbitration have failed before either the strike or lock-out as a weapon is invoked.

LABOR MUST CONSIDER COST

When labor does consider the use of the strike, the cost should be counted, the cost to labor and the public as well as the long-haul costs to management. For example, let's imagine a case in which a union is being paid $1 per hour and the members feel they should have an increase, say to $1.18. The company offers 12 cents and the negotiations are stalled at that point. The union strikes and is out for 8 weeks thereby causing each worker to lose $358 (pay for 8 weeks of 40 hours at $1.12 per hour).

An arbitration board has investigated, and awards the requested 18 cents per hour, 6 cents more than the company originally offered. The company accepts the board's findings and recommendations and the wage rate is set at $1.18. It will take nearly 3 years' work before the strikers would have made up that out-of-work costs. Should the board recommend 15 cents or if the company agrees to 15 cents, the workers will have to work nearly 6 years to make up the loss caused by the strike.

We must not, however, forget certain long-term benefits in strikes. There are times when labor is justified in striking even though it mean an immediate and short-term out-of-pocket loss if the strike results in long-term gains for labor over the years and even generations.

Collective bargaining is the keystone of labor progress, and the A. F. of L. leadership is proving that this approach in labor disputes is paying off handsomely to all parties. There has been developed what might be called a four-point plan, or, if you please, four commandments of progressive bargaining:

1. Good faith and fair dealing on both sides of the conference table.

There is a mutual interest involved in labor disputes, and this mutual interest which means the protection of the rights of all, is safeguarded only if each party trusts the other. Labor should always show that it seeks only a fair and just settlement through orderly processes. Broken contracts may mean temporary gains, but they mean long-term losses and broken faith with both the public and management losing confidence.

The understanding which the A. F. of L. has shown over the years has built up a mutual respect which pays off in labor disputes when the chips are down.

2. Know your industry and your company.

In the usual processes of negotiation and collective bargaining labor should have certain basic facts at hand. Costs of operation, outlook for continued strong markets, special production and sales problems affecting wage levels, etc., must be borne in mind. When these facts are known labor must consider and compare results of anticipated wage increases.

These facts are basic in collective bargaining and for the most part they can never be obtained from government. Many A. F. of L. unions through their responsible leadership have proved their good faith and have merited the confidence of management to the extent that this confidential data has been forthcoming. Labor knows that if it injures the company's business through unwise and thoughtless disclosures of confidential trade data, it injures itself.

3. Three groups—workers, management and consumers—share the wealth created by American industry.

The American worker's living standards have been raised over the years through wage increases, price reductions and rewards to management as incentive for the improvement of production.

We must always remember that management has its problems. Reserves must be laid aside to buy new machinery which will further increase productivity and thereby make further wage gains possible. Investors must have continued confidence in the business so that supporting and new capital must be available. Labor knows that all profit cannot go into wage increases.

4. Work to improve production per man-hour.

Labor has found that through a mutual understanding between it and industry they can produce more and thereby will have more income from which the workers can expect higher wages. Labor has found that the partnership philosophy works better than the intimidation strategy. A true partner must work with management and consequently has the right to share in increased productivity.

It should be pointed out that daily gains are being made by the A. F. of L. policy for its members through the simple medium of developing a sound understanding by business management in the leadership of labor. This confidence is no casual incident; it is the result of a long period of working together and a building of mutual confidence and trust. Strikes, on the other hand, are most extreme remedies and many of the current ones are the result of inexperienced labor and business leadership.

These commandments are not accidents. They were developed through a businesslike understanding of what it means to work as part of the labor-management team in good times and in bad. A. F. of L. leadership operating with the sure and steady hand of experience is making continued gains for its membership which is paying off in this critical postwar period.

One word about contracts: Contracts are the instruments of sacred trust between employer and employee. Both must honor these contracts. If either breaks them, the mutual trust is destroyed and the path to industrial harmony is made rocky and dangerous. The A. F. of L. takes a strong position among its people that contracts must not be trifled with—they must be kept.

There is no substitute for experience.

There is no substitute for reliable leadership.

Army's Needs Are Modestly Estimated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Army's Needs Are Modestly Estimated," by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—ARMY'S NEEDS ARE MODESTLY ESTIMATED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 8.—Very little is being heard on Capitol Hill, during consideration of bills to extend selective service, to the effect that the Army's manpower budget for the next fiscal year is too high. This is in sharp contrast to what happened in 1943 when many congressional and other admirers of the War Department high command felt and said that its projected total for that calendar year was excessive and too far ahead of any possible production of essential supply. The reason for the change is that the Army's manpower requirements for the period ending July 1, 1947, have been most conservatively estimated.

For the end of this fiscal year, July 1, the ground and air forces requirement has been set at 1,550,000, to be reduced to 1,070,000 on the succeeding July 1. The subtraction proposed is in the ground and service troops, the plan being to maintain the air forces at a minimum of 400,000 men in 70 air groups. If the Selective Service Act is extended, preferably for a year and without crippling restrictions as to age limits, and so forth, it is estimated that both year-end figures can be met. But as numerous expert witnesses have patiently explained to Congress—the latest being General Eisenhower today—the best judgment is that neither can be met by sole reliance on the volunteer system of recruiting.

There are several reasons for this judgment. Among them are (1) the natural reaction from military service of a peace-minded people, and (2) the shorter term of service which a citizen can sign up for if he volunteers instead of waiting to be drafted. If the draft act is maintained, the authorities have concluded from experience, volunteering will be brisk enough to fulfill the budget in combination with those men provided by selective service. But if the act is abandoned or crowded with hampering amendments, volunteering will not provide the requirements, even if soldiers' pay is increased. The official Army estimate of the deficit in these circumstances on July 1, 1947, is 165,000, and that again is conservative.

ONE-WAY PRESSURE ON CONGRESS

The War Department's presentation of the whole issue has been so moderate and factual that the resistance to its manpower plans in Congress would be surprising if the immediate explanation were not plain. This is to be found in the pressure on Members of the House and Senate in election year from families which believe they have made all the military contribution that can fairly be expected from them. How wide is the base from which this pressure is being exerted is a matter of guesswork. But the Members of Congress are made to feel that the foundation is broad and deep.

The Army cannot very easily reach those families which are making Congress hesitate to extend the draft as it is for a year. That must be left to the impact of the serious international news in the daily press, to public consciousness of the obligations in peace this Nation assumed in war and victory, and to the effect of demands of members of these families still in service (especially in occupation forces) that they be replaced. But the Army can get its case before Congress, and it has done so with candor and conservatism. That, however, is not the same as winning the case.

In this presentation the Army has listed the functions which the rest of the Government expects it to discharge in the period between the end of what General Eisenhower calls "the shooting war" and real peace. These include normal protection of the United States and its possessions, and of the bases which are and will be maintained; foreign occupation duty; a quota for the United Nations' guardians of world order, and the supply of service units for all men engaged in the foregoing. In estimating its requirements to perform these functions, the Army, after counsel with the State Department, has relied on a number of assumptions, the optimistic nature of which explains the conservatism of the estimates.

YARDSTICK OF OPTIMISM

Among these assumptions are that the shooting war is over for a period of years at least and that the United Nations will succeed in its objectives. But still required is a military force, exclusive of the Navy, sufficient to fulfill the Army's expected functions in such a world on July 1, 1947, and also able to deal with minor emergencies that may appear within the framework of the larger assumptions. That force—dropping from 1,550,000 next July 1 to 1,070,000 a year later—is one which the War Department does not feel can be assured by volunteering, but only through the extension of the draft.

Even with this extension it has been thought necessary to lower the standards of admission to what the authorities consider the lowest point consistent with safety and effectiveness. By that move it has become possible to make use of 4-F's of fine capacity exclusive of the physical whose services were denied to the Nation in wartime.

The impression left with this correspondent, after hearing the Army's case in detail, is that its estimates as well as the bases on which these rest are intelligent, prudent, and sound. And certainly they are moderate. It has only been a few months since more than 8,000,000 men were in combat service under the War Department. The shooting war, as General Eisenhower says, is over. But the shrinkage to 1,070,000 in July, 1947, is a far more rapid rate of descent toward normal than the reduction in war-making potentials among the nations in the same period.

Is Voluntary Rationing Adequate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the results of the recent Gallup poll on the degree to which American families are saving food under the present voluntary plan, and which appeared in the Washington Post for April 10. While it is gratifying that 56 percent of the people are cutting down on their consumption of food in order to feed the starving peoples of Europe and Asia, I should like to call attention to the fact that at least 40 percent are not doing so. I believe this corroborates the need for a program of food rationing such as that which I proposed on April 1 in House Concurrent Resolution 140:

PRINCETON, N. J., April 9.—As the work of the Famine Emergency Committee goes forward, virtually 9 out of every 10 voters say they have heard or read about the plan to send food to other nations during the weeks ahead.

There is also indication, however, that American families could participate more fully in conserving foods, as requested by the committee.

At the present time more than half of the families included in the interviewing say they are doing something about saving food.

That a great many people can support the program without harm to themselves is evidenced by the fact that nearly half among those interviewed by the institute field reporters said they thought their health would be better if they ate less.

The questioning of field reporters for the institute included the following:

Have you heard or read about the plan to send food to other nations during the next 4 months?

The replies:

	Percent
Yes	92
No	8

Is your family doing anything now to save on food:

	Percent
Yes	56
No	40
Don't know	4

Those who said their families are participating in the food-saving program were asked to tell in what way. Here are the replies in the order of the frequency with which they were mentioned:

1. Cutting down on food; eating less; doing without things.
2. Making it a point to use leftovers at the next (or another) meal.
3. Saving fats and drippings.
4. Eating more of foods not especially needed.
5. Growing own vegetables.
6. Eating rye and/or whole wheat bread instead of white.

An interesting sidelight in the present study is found in replies to the question:

"Do you think your health would be better or worse if you ate less?"

In few nations of the world today could you find nearly half of those questioned saying they think their health would be better if they ate less. Yet that is what replies to the question show:

	Percent
Better	44
Worse	27
Same	25
Undecided	4

Professional and business people are particularly prone to consider themselves overeaters. More than half of them think they should do less eating. More women than men think they should eat less. This is particularly true of women over 30 years of age. The same trend of thinking is found among the men. Those over 30 are more inclined to think they eat too much than those between 21 to 29 years of age.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J., for April 3, 1946:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY INSANITY

Whatever may be said in favor of the St. Lawrence River and its potential huge sources of electric power for the 18,000,000 citizens of New York and New Jersey, little if anything can be said in favor of its related St. Lawrence seaway project, which proposes to create a deep-water channel for ocean-going vessels from the Great Lakes to the sea.

Briefly, the seaway project would cost not less than $500,000,000, of which $350,000,000 would be provided by Uncle Sap and $150,000,000 by Canada. United States taxpayers would have to foot an annual bill of twenty-millions for operating, maintaining, and amortizing their portion of the seaway, about 25 percent of which would each year come out of the pockets of the citizens of New Jersey and New York.

Naturally, they ought to know what they will get in return. Well, one of the things they'll get is the loss of 3,000,000 tons of commerce from the port of New York each year. That's about one-sixth of the port's annual commerce. There are approximately 200,000 people employed in New York's port activities, many of whom live in northern New Jersey. With 17 percent of the traffic from which they support themselves and their families diverted through the St. Lawrence, 34,000 people and probably 100,000 of their dependents would be directly affected, while indirectly many others would be adversely affected by the loss of the earnings and the sequential spending power of those displaced people.

Certainly the people of the eastern seaboard States could do nothing but lose by the seaway proposal; so let's see how the manufacturers and shippers of our industrial and agricultural Midwest would fare. Using Detroit as an example, the distance via the Great Lakes and the costly New York State Barge Canal is 750 miles, while the distance via Great Lakes, St. Lawrence seaway, Atlantic Ocean to New York is 2,300 miles. It seems obvious that neither time nor shipping costs could therefore be saved for the Midwest by a costly annual-deficit-producing fantasy that would benefit the United States little if at all but would benefit Canada much.

Of course, if the Congress believes it has a mandate to develop Montreal as a great port at the expense of New York and other Atlantic seaboard ports there may be some merit to the proposed seaway between us and our neighbors on the north. Circumstances in the Second World War impelled our people to give away their proverbial shirts to their allies; they're now giving away their figurative pants to European and Asiatic friends and foes alike among postwar semi-nourished peoples abroad; but it might be quite timely to hint gently that if they now also hand over their underwear to their likable and friendly northern neighbor, which emerged from the recent human holocaust proportionately more affluent than overgenerous Uncle Sap, they'll be stripped bare.

Then, very much unlike the tale of Lady Godiva, the rest of the world will look not away from but at a spectacle of naked national damfoolishness without parallel in history but not infrequently found among inmates of our public mental institutions.

JOHN BORG, *Publisher.*

Veterans March on New York Realty Board—Demand Housing—Denounce Real-Estate Lobbies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over our country's shortage of homes is steadily becoming more heated in the conflict between the speculative lobbies, seeking selfish profits, and the need of the American people for shelter. Thousands of returning servicemen, unable to find the homes they have looked forward to so long, are becoming more and more restive and indignant.

In this explosive situation there have come increasing suggestions from the ranks of the veterans for a general march on Washington. I have repeatedly deplored such action, and have counseled patience to those who are becoming more and more insistent on taking such a rash step to bring home to Congress the tragic plight of the homeless veteran.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I would deplore such action, but I want to sincerely warn the Members of the House that America's veterans will march on Washington, in my opinion, unless swift and adequate legislation is passed to meet the housing crisis.

In several sections of the country veterans already are holding mass meetings. I have before me an article from the New York World-Telegram of March 23 relating the story of how New York veterans marched on the offices of the real estate board in New York. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this story:

Two hundred veterans of the recent World War, carrying placards denouncing real estate lobbies opposing the Patman housing bill, marched on the offices of the Real Estate Board of New York at 12 East Forty-second Street yesterday with a request for permission to bed down in the spacious offices for the night.

The board officials talked the veterans out of that idea but were drawn into a heated discussion of the Patman measure and housing in general.

BETTER HOUSING NEEDED

The veterans, members of the American Veterans Committee, told the real estate men that 4,000 of their 6,000 members needed better housing accommodations. The march, which began on the steps of the New York Public Library, was led by Lawrence R. Knobel, a former captain of the Fourth Infantry Division.

Ten policemen stood by while part of the group picketed the real estate board offices. One sign read: "We're tired of brave words and idle deeds."

Mr. Knobel, in a discussion with Carlisle Davidson, public relations counsel for the board, accused the organization of lobbying in Washington against price controls in the Patman bill. Subsidy provisions in the measure were eliminated by the House.

VETS RESTLESS

Mr. Knobel told Mr. Davidson the veterans were restless and had urged a march on Washington and seizure of homes on Fifth Avenue. He added:

"There'll be more than a march on Washington."

Arrangements were made for a meeting to be scheduled Monday at which each group will appoint a 10-man committee to debate the housing worries of veterans.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—Foreword From a Book on the United States Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the mail has just brought a new book entitled, We the People, by Nathan Boone Williams, each of its seven chapters dedicated to one of the seven objectives of the United States Constitution.

This historical analysis of our Constitution is timely and I present the foreword taken from the book for the consideration of my colleagues:

FOREWORD

In the full course of human history, in all the record of the race, it is doubtful if there was ever assembled in one objective political declaration a more pungently powerful group of words than those found in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, whereby to state the aims of a free and determined people. Thousands of school children daily commit to memory this preamble. Only rarely do mature men and women take thought of its meaning, or of what is of more immediate concern the distance yet to be traversed before these aims may be approximately realized.

Here we have the expressed determination to "form," "establish," "insure," "provide," "promote," and "secure" a plan of government, whereby each of these special objectives is directed to the supreme aim to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These six major goals set forth the purpose of a free people in a new land. They were to be reached in the fullness of time by a virile population, under a then new and unique plan of society created by the voluntary act of a vigorous citizenry, who are themselves the ultimate source of all political power."

Words, phrases, sentences are but the coin of thought; coin which like the gold used as money by the ancients is not infre-

quently debased, and which, like other coin, is often devoted to evil uses. In the words of the preamble to the Constitution, "the power of a free people finds noble expression."

The declarations, wrought and turned out in times of stress and at critical junctures in world history, are the simple facts which make the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States so worth careful study, and particularly so in these grave days of American political history. It is in times of difficulty men realize that personal ambition and lust for power must be laid aside and forgotten; that "We must all hang together, else we will hang separately."

Benjamin Franklin, who gave this wise warning to the members of the Continental Congress in 1776, described the new government set up in 1787–89, as "A republic, if you can keep it." Technically, a republic it is, though popularly and often thoughtlessly our constitutional form of government is most frequently referred to as a "democracy." Our form of government provides a proper and widespread diffusion of individual rights, rewards, opportunities, and responsibilities. The word "democracy" does not accurately describe the system of government set up by the act of a devoted band of determined patriots and which are approved and ratified by the will of a free people. Democratic institutions are produced by the application of reasoned intelligence to political problems. Mei-Ling Chang wrote: "We live in the present, we dream of the future, but we learn eternal truths from the past." It was President Jackson, who said: "Providence has chosen you as the guardians of freedom to preserve it for the benefit of the human race." We are inheritors of the past; trustees of the future.

Under the American form of government, "democracy" is rule by law; law applicable to all alike, and enacted by elected representatives with these representatives subject to the "supreme law of the land"—the Constitution of the United States—a Constitution which protects the equal political rights, not only of the individual, but of all minorities, to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In a world gone berserk, a world which in the eyes of many seems bent on total destruction of all the moral and political accomplishments that civilized men hold dear, faith in the future is dimmed. With governments toppling hourly in the throes of a world revolution; with ourselves at war throughout the world, a war which renews the hostilities of 1914–18 under dreams of totalitarian conquest; with our economic and political security under constant sabotage and attack, it seems timely to examine the roots of our system. We would discover how firmly these roots are embedded in the evolutionary history of our people; how the tree of government has slowly grown from the rich soil of tested experience to develop in the fullness of time into the Constitution of the United States in 1787. Under the impact of the objectives stated in the Preamble of that matchless document, our people have become a bulwark of strength and of hope of free men everywhere. In the words of Abraham Lincoln: "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

Our country is yet in the vigor of youth.

Our people are now, as at other times in our brief history, at a directional crossroads in government and social policy. Our course, our compass boxing, and the manner in which we meet and discharge our own responsibilities as a free people; in other words, our efforts to realize and carry forward the objectives of the preamble to the Constitution, are now of renewed consequence and vital moment to every citizen.

NATHAN BOONE WILLIAMS.

WASHINGTON, *March 1944.*

Truman's First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of April 8, 1946:

TRUMAN'S FIRST YEAR

This week Harry S. Truman, thirty-second President of the United States, can look back upon a year in office, and the Nation can weigh in the scales of public opinion his worth and his place in the history of the first and greatest modern democracy.

An analysis of the comment on President Truman is revealing. The average person loves American democracy chiefly because it affords an opportunity to an average person for advancement socially, intellectually, and financially. Our main objective is normalcy. In these most perilous times for our way of life President Truman has talked like a normal, average man—not like a great statesman, not like a pundit, not like a messiah.

Without disparagement the average person says that the President was just an unsuccessful haberdasher. Looking beneath the cruel candor of that judgment, however, it will be found that the motives and thought-processes of President Truman are better understood than the most high-minded and statesmanlike thoughts of the man he succeeded. There is less of the perfect knight without fault about President Truman than there was about President Roosevelt.

The late President had faults which were made to appear to be virtues. President Truman's faults are open, unabashed, and utterly average.

No one will quarrel with President Truman's Army Day speech and his warning that the differences between Britain and the Soviet Union in the Near and Middle East may erupt into conflict. It is precisely what every average American has been thinking for many weeks, now stated and made a part of the national policy.

It is fair to say that the President's voice lacks the beguiling quality of Roosevelt's, but, in cold type, matched speech for speech, the public utterances of both Presidents do not suffer by comparison.

Some people profess to find a menace in the failure of his old colleagues in the Senate to follow his lead and declare that the Senate is more concerned with showing him who is boss. It is fair to ask this wing of public opinion when any Congress, even those under Roosevelt, went along in docile compliance with all the wishes of the executive branch.

Too many self-constituted apologists, too many self-seeking sycophants have had their little day during the past year while President Truman groped for the kind of proficiency he needed to cope with the most powerful office in the world. Much has been made of his plaintive appeal for "everyone's help." It was denounced as a weakness. What is democracy, however, but a cooperative society?

Men whose records as administrators and big businessmen are unchallenged in private life have failed miserably as public officials. It was manifestly unfair to expect that President Truman would grasp the reins of government in an hour, a day, or a month.

The enormous pressure of events has borne down upon him. He was President during the most dynamic and shaking 100 days in all our history. No myths have gathered around his name. He has remained an average American.

If You Need Help, Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the business of the United States of America Federal Government today is the biggest business in the world. Just as it is big so it is complicated. "Red tape" is a term that has become known to every citizen of our country as a result of their experiences with the Federal Government in the past 12 years.

In this era of red tape the people of our country have only one source of help. This source of help is the Congressman.

A Congressman is the only agent the people of a district have in Washington. As their agent—a conscientious Congressman should work for his citizens whenever called upon. Of all my acts as a Congressman the thing I am most proud of is the fact that every request for help by a citizen of my district was acted upon by my office. Even a few words on a simple post card from a citizen of my district is all that is needed to get my wholehearted attention. Where else could the people of our country go to for help to unfurl the red tape which is so prevalent in Washington today?

In the little more than 3 years I have been a Member of Congress I am proud of the fact that the people of my district had such faith and confidence in me. In the little more than 3 years I have been in Congress more than 36,000 people of my district have written me for help. I tried with all the power at my command to get that help for them. The happy feature of this is that out of the more than 36,000 who wrote me more than 30,000 got what they wanted.

I employ in my office five full-time secretaries. In addition to that, many times I call on my personal employees to give a hand. So important do I feel that a Congressman's duty is to help the people who sent him here that I will hire more people if and when that is needed. If the Government does not allow me sufficient funds, then I will dig into my own pocket for those funds. The people of my district are not going to be neglected or shunned regardless of the cost.

I invite the people of my district to write me any time they have a problem which pertains to the Federal Government.

Veterans especially should feel free to write me because all veterans' matters are given top priority in my office and are taken care of first.

Should you need help, simply write Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

OPA and Furs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that my district is one of the largest fur-producing districts in the United States, and that we have been in continual controversy with the Office of Price Administration in regard to their administration of this program, and our people now feel that it is not necessary to further continue the application of price regulations in this industry. Mr. Speaker, I have called to the attention of the Office of Price Administration the dealings in the black market in this industry, but, so far as I am aware, nothing was done about the matter.

Mr. Speaker, as an evidence of the present situation in my district and State I wish to submit a letter on the subject dated March 30, 1946, addressed to the Office of Price Administration, by Emanuel Steinberg, one of the largest handlers of muskrat pelts and furs in the State of Louisiana, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1946.

Mr. GILBERT S. JACOBS,
Head, Fur Section, Leather, Furs, and Fiber Branch, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of a letter from Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER with which was enclosed copy of letter which you wrote him under date of March 19, 1946, pertaining to various kinds of raw fur skins, more especially to muskrat and mouton lamb.

Your statement with reference to muskrat demand and supply is so glaringly incorrect that I am compelled to write you relative thereto.

It is evident that you are still obtaining information from sources that are either ignorant of conditions or purposely furnishing you with false information and it strikes me as well as all others associated and interested in the raw fur industry that from past experience you would be disposed now to obtain information from reliable sources that are in possession of facts and data and do not have to guess or estimate and from which information you would be able to regulate your actions pertaining to that particular item.

I recall very distinctly that the course which you pursued some 2 or 3 years ago in the handling of price control regulations governing southern furs was somewhat similar to that now being pursued by you if all of your information is as reliable as that outlined in your letter to Senator ELLENDER.

For your information the present supply of southern muskrats in the hands of dealers is from approximately 30 percent to 40 percent greater than stocks held by dealers at this time during the past several years.

You will recall some 2 years ago the raw fur dealers outlined to your Department scale and range of prices which were deemed by you fair and equitable and which you had decided to incorporate in your regulations but through the influence from some source you changed your attitude and decided to adopt ceiling prices now existing which are anything but fair and equitable and workable and have actually had no bearing on the retail price to the consumer of fur garments, the only result being increased profits to the retail dealer. The ceiling prices which you had adopted and then changed on muskrats were about on a level with what were paid during the present season 1945–46.

In conclusion I wish to state that it is the belief of myself and others associated in the raw fur industry that if price control should be abandoned at this time the law of supply and demand would establish prices which would enable the manufacturer to turn out fur garments at prices commensurate with prices of other wearing apparel and the consumer would be benefited by being able to go into the open market and purchase such garments from legitimate retailers without having to resort to the purchase of garments that are made of inferior skins and which prices are influenced by the black market.

Aside from the fact that the law of supply and demand would protect the consumer in view of the ample supply of raw furs in storage, fur garments are a luxury and not a necessity and there should be no price control on either the finished garments or the pelts that go to make up such garments.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL STEINBERG.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include statements in favor of the extension of the Price Control Act without crippling amendments submitted March 27 by various organizations to the informal Committee for the Protection of the Consumer, AIME FORAND, chairman; JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, co-chairman; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, secretary. This meeting was attended by 63 Members of the House of Representatives and by representatives of the following organizations: American Association of University Women, American Association of University Professors, American Federation of Labor, American Home Economics Association, American Labor Party Consumers Councils, American Veterans' Committee, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries, Consumers Union of the United States, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, League of Women Shoppers, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Council of Catholic Women (observer), National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Negro Women, National Emergency Committee for Price Control, National Negro Congress, National Women's Trade Union League, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Washington Urban League.

The statements for these organizations are as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, GENERAL SECRETARY

On February 10, 1946, the secretariat of the American Association of University Professors joined with the representatives of 29 other national organizations—educational, religious, civic, labor, consumer, and professional—in a call to their members and to all other citizens to communicate with their representatives in the Congress urging support of price and rent control for at least another year, the immediate extension and the strengthening of the Price Control Act, and appropriations adequate for the effective enforcement of these measures. The membership of these 30 national organizations represents a large segment of our population. The members of many of these organizations depend for their livelihood on fixed incomes—wages and salaries. Because of that fact, they are aware of the adverse effects of inflation upon their economic status, of the imminence of the danger of disastrous inflation, and of the crucial test we face to prevent it. It is their hope that the Congress will continue and will strengthen the measures necessary to insure protection against further inflation in the interest of the general welfare.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, CAROLINE WARE

The American Association of University Women, an organization of 80,000 members in branches in more than 900 communities, has supported price control since long before Pearl Harbor.

We all know that the ultimate answer to inflation is production. But we know, equally, that supply cannot catch up with demand for a long time to come. Food shortage and famine conditions will be with us at least until the 1947 crops. The pent-up demand for refrigerators, autos, and other durable goods cannot be fully satisfied during the coming year. The critical housing shortage will continue to get worse unless 50 percent more houses are built in the next 2 years than at the highest period of building in the past.

In the face of these shortages we must have continued price control to escape economic disaster.

Firm price control, moreover, is in itself a stimulus to production for it removes the uncertainty which may make business hold back, and it assures relatively stable costs.

We, therefore, urge that Congress act immediately to extend price control for a full year, and without weakening amendments. Specifically we urge that no amendment restrict the OPA's right to require cost absorption and that no specific requirement be included relating to the removal of items from price control. We urge, furthermore, that adequate subsidies be provided to make it possible to hold prices of food and of building materials. We urge adequate appropriations to enable OPA to do its job.

THE AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION, MRS. MARGARET D. THOMPSON, EDITOR OF CONSUMER EDUCATION SERVICE

The American Home Economics Association has members in every State, in every college home-economics department, and in many business concerns. Its members are home-economics teachers in colleges and secondary schools, homemakers, home economists in food administration, home-demon-

stration workers in extension service, social-welfare workers, public-health workers, writers of women's pages in the Nation's magazines and newspapers, and other leaders in consumer education.

Our association's action program includes:

The support of legislation to prevent increases in the cost of living and insure fair distribution of scarce commodities.

The support of legislation to reduce the cost of housing to put decent sanitary homes within the reach of low-income groups.

The living standards of American families have been the interest of this association during its 38 years of work. At present these living standards are closely bound up with the question of emergency price control.

Because its purpose is to further the best interests of the home and family, the association favors stability of living costs, so that families can plan their expenditures ahead, and it would seek to prevent excessive consumer cost of housing, house furnishings, and equipment because this makes it more difficult for homes to be established or maintained.

The American Home Economics Association favors price control for as long as the threat of inflation continues, and at least until June 30, 1947. Extension should not be for less than a year because the near end of price control tends to encourage withholding by producers and dealers and overbuying by consumers. We hope that price control over new housing and over building materials will be provided at least until December 1947, and, if necessary, to June 30, 1948, and that existing houses and building lots will be brought under emergency price control. This will supplement rent control, which we recommend extending to June 30, 1948.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, CHAT PATERSON, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE

The American Veterans Committee (AVC) has consistently supported OPA as the veteran's best weapon against inflation. The veterans admire the type of fight which Messrs. Bowles and Porter are putting up for a strong price-control program. There are four simple reasons why the veterans need price control if they are to be given an even break in getting back to civilian life.

1. The majority of veterans just do not have much money now and will not have much money for a long while. Any increase in prices would mean poorer food and clothing and cheaper living quarters for veterans. Even with present inflationary prices they are having a hard enough time making ends meet.

2. Veterans want steady jobs. A runaway inflation, such as followed the last war would create job insecurity and bring on unemployment. A buyer's strike would again throw millions out of work.

3. A lot of veterans want to go in business for themselves. Their GI loans and small investments would be worthless in an inflationary market.

4. They want families and homes the same as any normal American. But what are their chances if prices go up and put expenses beyond their reach?

The veteran has not been able during the years of war to organize and operate lobbies to protect his interests. He elected Congressmen for this purpose. It is now up to these Congressmen to provide for insurance against the disasters of inflation with the same courage that the veteran protected the American people from the disasters of war.

We emphasize the importance of maintaining stable economic conditions so that family security will not be jeopardized by inflation, especially of the prices of food, clothing, and rent. We therefore support legislation to extend a strong price control act during the reconstruction period ahead.

CONSUMERS UNION OF UNITED STATES, ELIZABETH ROHR, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE

Consumers Union of United States, an organization with more than 100,000 members, favors the enactment of H. R. 5270 without amendments. Inflationary pressures on prices and rents have reached the explosion point. We are specifically opposed to the following:

1. Forbidding OPA to require cost absorption: Opponents of OPA are pressing for "cost plus" formulas which would bring price increases in food, clothing, reconversion goods, and many other cost-of-living items. The abolition of cost absorption would pyramid price increases throughout the economy and set an inflationary spiral in motion.

2. Discontinuing the maximum average price regulation for clothing: OPA uses this regulation to secure production of low- and medium-priced clothing and to prevent manufacturers from shifting all their production into high-priced lines.

3. Ending the food-subsidy program.

4. Permitting manufacturers to set their own price ceilings.

5. Abolishing price controls on all items except so-called cost of living essentials: It would be impossible to define what is essential and what is nonessential, and the result would be the speedy death of price control.

6. Setting arbitrary standards for removing controls from goods and commodities.

7. Extending the renewal of price control for less than a year.

8. Compelling OPA to remove price control when the Department of Agriculture or the Civilian Production Administration certifies that acute shortages in production are relieved: This proposal would strip OPA of flexibility of action and would, in effect, give the Department of Agriculture and the Civilian Production Administration a veto power over OPA's operations.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Whereas in no war in the history of the United States has the general public been protected so successfully from runaway prices and general and serious inflation as has been the case during the war just ended; and

Whereas the United States now faces graver dangers of uncontrolled inflation than during the war or at any time in its history: Therefore

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs supports continued Federal legislation for equitable wage ceilings and price control on basic commodities such as food, shelter, and clothing as being essential to the common good and to sustained prosperity during the period of readjustment.

INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' COMMITTEE OF THE ARTS, SCIENCES, AND PROFESSIONS, INC., HAROLD G. TIPTON, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

The Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions considers that holding the price line is of fundamental importance during the difficult year ahead of us. Price and rent control are essential to enable veterans who have fought in this war to take up a normal life and reasonable standard of living. They are necessary to protect the buying power and living standards of professional and white-collar groups. Above all, price control is necessary to maintain the steady purchasing power of the whole Nation as a foundation for full production, full employment, and the economic stability which is a necessary part of our contribution to a peaceful world.

Therefore, we call upon Congress to extend the OPA's authority to control prices for at least 1 year without further restricting OPA's powers.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS, KATHLEEN R. CLIFT FOR KATHERINE ARMATAGE, CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The League of Women Shoppers strongly advocates the following legislation:

1. Renewal of the Price Control Act for at least one more year without crippling amendments and with an adequate appropriation to carry on the tremendous task involved in fighting inflation.

2. Renewal of the Second War Powers Act.

3. Extension of rent control to June 30, 1948.

4. Continuance of food subsidies for another year.

5. Restoration of premium payments on building materials to the Patman housing bill.

6. Placing of price ceilings on old and new homes.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, MRS. C. D. LOWE

Throughout the war years the National Congress of Parents and Teachers gave consistent support to price control but now we are asking our members to be even more zealous in their efforts to keep down inflation. We urge:

1. Price and rent control for another year.

2. Immediate extension of the Price Control Act.

3. No weakening amendments to the act.

4. Adequate appropriations for the big job of holding the line against inflation.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, INC., MRS. JOSEPH M. WELT, PRESIDENT

The 65,000 members of the National Council of Jewish Women in 300 senior and junior sections throughout the country have been deeply concerned with the pressures being exerted upon the administration and Congress to relax or entirely repeal the Price Control Act.

As early as 1940, delegates to our triennial convention passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the protection of the consumer is a vital aspect of our social and economic life: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the National Council of Jewish Women endorses measures which will assure the consumer an equitable distribution of essential goods by rationing and price control for the period of the war and as long as it is necessary in the postwar world for rehabilitation."

Our members speak for no special interest groups. They represent the wives of small and large businessmen, professionals, and workingmen; they live in large and small communities North, East, West, and South, but they are all united on the necessity of the continuation of price control, and are determined to prevent a run-away inflation, which they feel will wreck our economic life.

Therefore, we urge Congress to recognize its responsibility to the people of the United States by immediately extending the Price Control Act without any crippling amendments so as to protect the welfare of the majority as against the interests of the few.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN, MARY M'LEOD BETHUNE

The National Council of Negro Women has supported and advocates the continuance of the Price Control Act beyond June 1946

without amendments which would negate the force and effectiveness of the measure.

For great numbers of wage earners the cost of living has become an extremely difficult process of balancing a budget that is unequally weighted. This has reduced many to going without necessities and for others to dip into hard-earned savings, their only resource against "a rainy day."

The National Council of Negro Women respectfully urges with the full knowledge of conditions among thousands of Negro and other families that price control be maintained, that adequate staff be provided for proper administration of the act, and that such controls exist until there is no longer a need for them.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, J. L. M'CASKILL, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE-FEDERAL RELATIONS DIVISION

The National Education Association includes in its membership approximately 330,000 teachers. Through its affiliated State education associations, the National Education Association speaks for approximately 730,000 members of the teaching profession.

The National Education Association supports extension of price controls.

The gap between income and cost of living has steadily widened to the point where today the teachers of our children as a group are perhaps the most underpaid of all American citizens. Any further increase in cost of living without compensatory income will force additional thousands of teachers to abdicate unwillingly a profession, essential to the general welfare, to which they earlier dedicated their services and their lives.

For Government to do anything which leads to further cost-of-living increase, without at the same time providing commensurate increase in teacher income, is one way to lead the schools of the Nation to an inevitable disaster.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, ANNA LORD STRAUSS, PRESIDENT

The National League of Women Voters believes that it is essential to renew the Price Control Act another year. The danger of inflation is greater at this time than it has been throughout the war and price control forms a bulwark for stabilization. We urge Congress to take a strong stand at this time, and to renew the Price Control Act without crippling amendments.

NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS, DOROTHY K. FUNN, LEGISLATIVE SECRETARY

Because Negro workers would be most affected by inflation and because Negro consumers would be hardest hit by increases in prices, our organizations have constantly urged our members to keep up the fight in their local communities against discontinuance of OPA for the present time.

The National Negro Congress, representing as it does the working population of the Negro minority, adds its voice of protest to a removal of the price ceiling and urges extension of OPA.

"American industry," says Mr. Bowles, "is on the whole extremely profitable. The food industry, textile, clothing, and service trades have kept on producing after the end of the war. They were profitable during the war and will continue to be so in peacetime." This means that they will not suffer for profits because of OPA extension. He further states, "In September of 1945, the average hourly earnings of all workers in plants were 65 percent higher than the average level of 1938–39. But industrial prices rose only 23 percent during that same period. Were profits reduced by the fact that wages increased nearly three times as much as prices? On the contrary, corporation profits in the same period increased by 400 percent." Big business has not lost.

We of the National Negro Congress are convinced that the Congress of the United States must give serious consideration to the plight of the working group, particularly the Negro group, in its deliberations on extension of OPA. The economic security of this all-inclusive minority of which the Negro is a part is basic for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" guaranteed him by our Constitution.

OPA should be extended for another year. No crippling amendments should be attached to the legislation. Special, serious consideration must be given to maintenance of ceilings on basic commodities.

NATIONAL NONPARTISAN COUNCIL ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY, MRS. THOMASINA W. JOHNSON, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE

The Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, the oldest Negro college women's organization in America, is composed of 165 chapters in 46 States. Its members, comprising some 6,000 college and university women, are community leaders throughout the country—teachers, social workers, lawyers, physicians, dentists—professional women of all types, hence consumers and housewives as well

As buyers and users of consumer goods, we have a very real and personal interest in holding the line on prices and rent. As Negro women, we have a particular interest in rent control. Living in areas where rents have been excessive and where for the most part accommodations and services given are not comparable to those furnished white tenants for the same financial expenditure, we have been and are especially in need of protection through rent control. We know that the provisions for the regulation of rent as provided in the act cannot correct the original abuse, but it can prevent an extension of this abuse. It is in prevention of this extension of this abuse that we now urge the continuance of rent control along with price control. Because we believe that housing is our most critical shortage and that the present crisis will not be overcome for a couple of years we urge that rent-control provisions should be renewed until June 30, 1948.

We believe that controls for the purpose of stabilizing our economy are fundamentally and essentially democratic. The purpose of controls specifically being that of warding off inflation takes into consideration the economic welfare of the people, hence the economic welfare of the Nation.

We wish to support the move to extend price control to June 30, 1947, the renewal of the Second War Powers Act until June 30, 1947; to prevent hoarding of scarce materials that would result in blocking the channels of distribution; to renew the rent-control provisions until June 30, 1948; the enactment of legislation for imposing ceilings on the prices of new and old housing; and the move to extend the consumer-food-subsidy program until June 30, 1947.

On behalf of the National Non-Partisan Council on Public Affairs of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Pennsylvania and District of Columbia units of the National Organization of the Gay Northeasterners, the International Ladies' Auxiliary to the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., may we supplement our support favoring the extension of price control with a plea for immediate extension of our Price Control Act without crippling and emasculating amendments.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE OF AMERICA, MARGARET F. STONE, CHAIRMAN, LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

The National Women's Trade Union League feels that the extension of price control is basic to the economic welfare of workers and their families—especially women workers, many of whom still have to fight a double standard of wages.

Our local leagues have been very much concerned about the rising cost of living in the face of job uncertainties, and they believe that extension of the Stabilization Act for another year is the first essential in holding the price line. Our Chicago League has gotten up a petition to Congressmen to this effect and there are already 1,000 names on the petition with more coming in every day.

THE SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE, DR. CLARK FORMAN, PRESIDENT

It is because we are organized to promote human welfare that we earnestly urge that the dangers of postwar inflation which would affect the lives of every person in this country be held in check by the extension of the Price Control Act.

This organization is made up of people from every one of the 13 Southern States, and represents men and women from the farms, the church, the professions, from business, and from labor. They know that prices on all these essentials of living must be controlled until there is food enough for all our own people, and to provide our share for the starving nations abroad; until enough clothes are produced to supply the immediate needs; enough houses are built to take care of the thousands without homes; and production catches up with demand for the varied commodities of their daily living. If there is no price control, there will be an avalanche of loose money descending upon a market short of goods and extinguishing the scanty supplies. There will be a temporary inflation boom; then in all probability a depression more disastrous than this country has ever known.

We are organized to promote human welfare, and we believe that for a well-faring people, each individual person must know security for the present and for the future. It is not possible for only a part of the people to prosper. In the South there is an exceptionally low per capita income. We know that if the farmers in the South have no price control on the fruits and vegetables and grain that they raise, these foods will be diverted for the time being to markets where there is plenty of ready cash, and the men and women of the South who work in the factories, and the southern men released from the services, and their families, will not be able to afford the increased prices for these foods. We know that if the lumber cut in the southern woods is uncontrolled, a few people may profit temporarily, but the serviceman returning to his family in the South will not be able to buy that home he dreamed of.

If prices on southern lamb and beef are uncontrolled, teachers, and civil-service workers, and other people with fixed incomes—who also live in the South—will be unable to buy their due share. If the cotton crop is sold in a market ready at the moment to pay any price, it will not be long before overalls and children's dresses, and women's blouses, and men's shirts will be beyond the purchasing power of the southern workers whose budget cannot stand the stretching of inflation pricing. And if for a short time there is a veneer of prosperity over a small area, we of the South, because we have not the backlog of great industries to depend on, will suffer perhaps even more

than the rest of the country from the depression that will inevitably follow this inflation.

We therefore urge that the Price Control Act be extended, and that action be taken promptly. We urge that the act be extended without crippling amendments. The Price Control Administration must also be given sufficient funds to operate effectively.

UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, JOHN F. P. TUCKER, ASSISTANT NATIONAL DIRECTOR

The Union for Democratic Action, a political and educational organization founded for and devoted to the promotion of democracy at home and abroad, urges upon the Congress of the United States the extension—with maximum expedition—of price-control authority for at least another year.

The vital need for maintenance of ceilings on prices in order to control inflation is capable of lengthy demonstration. May we simply suggest the following overriding considerations:

1. Unless price control authority is extended, reconversion to peacetime production and needs will be disastrously retarded; even now speculators are holding back in the hope of sky-rocketing prices with the defeat of OPA.

2. The needs of the American people, hungry for goods after wartime restrictions, should be placed above those of a small group of special interests and profiteers. Among those American people neediest for civilian-goods production are our veterans in need of homes, clothes, and the necessities of life at cost within their income. The present backlog of savings measured against the trickle of consumer goods production, which must prevail for many months to come, cannot fail to bring a wild inflation with tragic impact upon our wage-earning people. Only by a retention of ceilings until production again strikes a proper relationship to consumer demand can such inflation be avoided.

3. The present world-wide tragedy of vast populations starving while America eats beyond its needs adds to the necessity for price ceilings on food. As the situation now stands, food producers are encouraged to hold back in the hope of rising prices, thus jeopardizing not only the American housewife's income, but also our commitments to the war-devastated populations of the world.

For these three, among many reasons, we believe the Congress of the United States, if genuinely responsive to the real needs of the American people, will authorize continuation of the OPA and do so without delay.

THE WASHINGTON URBAN LEAGUE, LIVINGSTON E. BEANE, INDUSTRIAL SECRETARY

The Washington Urban League is a social service organization interested in bettering living and working conditions among Negroes in the District of Columbia. The league was founded in 1937 and is an affiliate of the National Urban League, which has 52 affiliates throughout the country with a combined budget of $600,000.

The National and Washington Urban League urge the continuation of price control legislation until the supply of commodities catches up with the demand. It feels that in the inflationary spiral that would ensue by failure to continue OPA legislation, the real purchasing power of Negro workers would be even more seriously affected than other groups, because Negro workers are at the bottom rung of the economic ladder. They not only get less money wages, but have to spend a larger proportion of it for the basic necessities. The withdrawal of price control legislation would increase the real cost of living to them.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four editorials, all dealing with the proposed reorganization of Congress. The editorials are, respectively, from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 6, 1946, entitled "For a Modernized Congress"; from the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of March 6, 1946, entitled "Right Direction"; from the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of March 11, 1946, entitled "Reorganizing Congress"; and from the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 10, 1946, entitled "Antiquated Legislative Machinery May Finally Be Modernized."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of March 6, 1946]

FOR A MODERNIZED CONGRESS

The La Follette-Monroney joint committee, appointed in 1944 to study the streamlining of Congress, has now submitted a report recommending that the national lawmaking machinery be subjected to a complete overhaul. Chief item on the 36-point reform program is the elimination of the present "obsolete and overlapping" committee structure. The report proposes to reduce the number of standing committees in both Houses from 81 to 34, and to abandon the practice of creating special investigating committees.

Another proposal is a 50-percent increase in congressional salaries. This has been a live topic for years. It received a rude check right after Pearl Harbor, when passage of the Mead-Ramspeck pension bill precipitated a deluge of "bundles for Congress." The measure was hastily repealed.

The public, however, is better informed now. The American Political Science Association and the National Planning Association have recommended salary increases of 50 to 150 percent, seconded by such individuals as James F. Byrnes, Bernard Baruch, and Maury Maverick. It is realized that legislative problems are infinitely more complex now than when the present salary was fixed in 1925, that volume of mail has doubled, and that sessions then lasted an average of under 200 days, against the present 354, which virtually eliminates the chance to earn a supplementary income.

The committee recommends a direct salary increase of 50 percent, plus the hiring of "assistant Congressmen" to take petty political details off the lawmakers' shoulders. It is not probable that either proposal would arouse any great popular opposition today.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of March 6, 1946]

RIGHT DIRECTION

Undoubtedly some of the recommendations made by the Joint House-Senate Committee on Organization of Congress are in for rough sledding, but that should not alter the fact that the group performed its assigned task in a workmanlike manner that is not overly common in Congress these days.

The committee's proposed program is on the ambitious side, but a thoughtful study of each recommendation will show it to be the result of some careful thinking.

It has been evident for years that the efficiency of Congress has been lessened gradually because the legislative branch has become increasingly bogged down in its own antiquated machinery.

As the first step to modernize Congress the committee recommended reducing the number of committees from 81 to 34, allowing a Senator to serve on no more than two—some now serve on 10—and a Representative on no more than one—some now serve on six.

That is one of the 36 recommendations that is in for a hard struggle, because zealous chairmen will fight against elimination of their committees, which they would construe as the loss of personal influence and power.

Each of the remaining recommendations has sound reasoning behind it, including those to raise salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year—long overdue—and to increase the size of a Congressman's staff so he can handle the thousand and one duties that his constituents foist on him and still give his attention to his fundamental job of lawmaking.

We would add one additional recommendation to the list—that Congressmen would have to stand up and be counted on all matters of vital importance. The people at home have a right to know where their Congressman stands on every issue and this business of hiding behind a voice or teller vote should be stopped.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of March 11, 1946]

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress made its report Monday. Its proposal will have to be adopted by Congress itself. We find a marked division of opinion already in the Members of Congress in their reaction to the terms of the suggested changes.

Senators and Representatives, of course, are united on the virtue of some of the proposals—increase in pay from $10,000 to $15,000; an administrative executive in each Member's office at $8,000 a year; a stenographic pool to help out Members swamped with mail; bigger and better staffs for committees.

On the other hand, most Members will be opposed to other changes, such as reducing the number of committees from 33 to 16 in the Senate, from 48 to 18 in the House, with no more special investigating committees. Why? Because a committee chairman has considerable influence not only over legislation but also in the executive branch; because each committee has a large clerical staff and that staff performs work for the chairman outside of his committee duties; and because voters back home are impressed when their Senator or Representative holds a chairmanship. Although there are only 81 chairmen of standing committees in Congress, there are 162 other Members, or even 243, who see a chairmanship ahead of them—if the gods and the voters are kind—and chairmanships go by seniority.

So, the Members of Congress undoubtedly will favor a part of the committee's recommendations and oppose another part. However, Members will feel some trepidation about adopting an increase in their own salaries and perquisites, while defeating less expense and political opportunity.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune of March 10, 1946]

ANTIQUATED LEGISLATIVE MACHINERY MAY FINALLY BE MODERNIZED

One of the most hopeful and healthful signs appearing on the Washington horizon is the self-searching mood apparent in Congress with the report of a joint committee on needed reforms in that august body. Antiquated and top-heavy machinery which has been the stumbling block of efficient legislation should be modernized along with other reconversion plans, the committee declares, and in this the majority of the American people will concur.

Chief among the proposals made by the group, which is headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE and Representative MONRONEY, is the abolishment of a number of interlocking committees in both Houses. A reduction in the Senate from 33 to 16 of the standing committees and in the House from 48 to 18. This reform in the congressional committee system is of prime importance both to the legislative bodies and to the people of the United States.

Too many important measures have been held up by arbitrary committee majorities who represent but a small proportion of the Congress and the voters of the Republic. Too many pieces of necessary legislation have been permitted to expire under the watchful eyes of opponents in some committee. Limitation of membership in these groups, as urged by the committee, also would provide a needed check on abuses and mark a step toward a more democratic government.

In addition to removing interlocking membership in the committees, the reform plan would ban interlocking jurisdictions and clearly define the duties and powers of each group. Creation of special investigating committees also would be curtailed and machinery would be provided to follow up and check on legislation after it leaves a committee.

Substantial increases in salaries for national lawmakers, a retirement program, and the provision for each Member to employ an executive assistant to take care of many details now perforce handled by the Congressmen and Senators themselves are other recommendations.

Other details of the congressional reform program are:

1. Official majority and minority policy committees in each House to meet regularly with the President.
2. Provide for a regular summer recess, except in emergency, from June 30 to October 1.
3. Experiment with three full days of sessions and three full days of committee hearings each week and also with night sessions.
4. Relieve Congress of governing the District of Columbia.
5. Raise salaries of Senate and House employees 50 percent and set standards for employment.
6. Require committee chairmen to report promptly all bills approved by the committee.
7. Have each committee set aside days to let Members who have introduced bills speak on them.
8. That a complete and understandable digest of each bill accompany every committee report.
9. Expansion of the Legislative Reference Service and the Office of the Legislative Counsel.
10. Strengthen fiscal control through better coordination of revenue raising and appropriations committees.

Doubtless there will be opposition to the proposal both in and out of Congress. Standpatters and status quo Members of the two Houses will send up loud cries against any change, as they habitually do. Special interests and pressure groups will object to any modification which might imperil their present modes of influencing legislation. Bureaucrats who have found the present system of committee rule advantageous will deny the need for any reforms. Already a southern Senator has declared the slashing of committees as dangerous.

But the people of the United States who are interested in the perpetuation and growth of democratic ideals and who have chafed under congressional bumbling and fumbling will approve. How loudly their applause will be heard and how much attention Congress will pay them may be, of course, another matter.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Seattle Times.

This is a very timely editorial and certainly one that should help this House when it grapples with the matter of extending, abolishing, or amending the Price Control Act of 1942.

Certainly the solution of this Nation's economic problem is full production, and anything that interferes with the needed program of full production should be seriously considered and heeded by the House.

ECONOMIC EXPERT SEES NO GOOD IN THE OPA

Laymen disposed to look to trustworthy and reliable experts for guidance on complex economic problems of the day will be interested in the views of a distinguished member of the University of Washington faculty on the subject of price controls, inflation, and the OPA.

Dr. Henry A. Burd, professor of marketing in the university's college of business administration, declares that after watching developments of the past 6 months he has definitely come to the conclusion that "our present system of price control does not control prices nor does it prevent inflation.

"Since it fails to accomplish the only purposes for which it allegedly exists," Dr. Burd remarks, "I believe it should be promptly discontinued."

Dr. Burd reviews the arguments for perpetuation of OPA price controls as follows: Prices will rise if and when controls are removed; therefore they can be kept down only if control is continued. Increased production, when it catches up with demand, will automatically control prices; therefore artificial controls must be kept until automatic controls become operative. Extreme inflation would be ruinous; price controls prevent inflation; therefore they should be continued another year.

Dr. Burd says he agrees with each of these premises, but disagrees with every conclusion. Price controls as presently administered, he points out, are neither preventing gradual inflation nor increasing production. Though American industry now has the highest productive capacity in history, "nothing moves, we only mark time." Next, price controls encourage black markets—another case where "prohibition does not prohibit."

Among other things, the university economist objects to the useless and wasteful burden imposed on business by the infinitude of OPA regulations, schedules, and paper work; to the punitive attitude of the OPA toward business, and the assumption that "all businessmen are crooks"; and to the fact that, under the OPA, "profit regulation is openly espoused."

"OPA," he concludes, "is a costly, complex Government bureau, overstaffed with young, inexperienced, theoretically trained individuals. Its abolition would be a move in the direction of economy and simplification."

Dr. Burd's views were set forth in a talk before a recent gathering of lumbermen, entitled "Take Off Your Rose-Colored Glasses." Those who are inherently suspicious of "brain trusters" are the more inclined to value the opinions of an economist of sound background and known qualifications. Dr. Burd has given us a point of departure for some sane and informed reasoning on our own part.

Patents Make Jobs and Increase Purchasing Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made by Mr. Conder C. Henry, Assistant Commissioner of Patents, before the Chicago Patent Law Association on January 10, 1946:

PATENTS MAKE JOBS

Mr. Chairman, members of the Chicago Patent Law Association, and guests:

It is both a pleasure and a privilege for me to meet with you to consider some of our patent problems. Because so many of you have been dealing with patented inventions longer than I have and those of you who have not are men of such outstanding accomplishments in the field of patent law and have participated in the establishment of so many new enterprises in Illinois and elsewhere, particularly in and around Chicago, based on patents, it was with considerable reluctance that I accepted your very kind invitation to meet with you this evening for the purpose of discussing with you the relation of patents to jobs.

The air is full of proposals regarding our patent laws and patents. Every wind that blows through press, air and Congress, carries ever-changing patterns for new restrictions and new interpretations of such laws and new proposals regarding granted patents and for regimenting research. Each of them is spread out on the bargain counter of the country and offered at a price so cheap as to require no more than a little manipulation of economics and of the Constitution; but never an explanation of what our patent laws are for, or how they have raised the standard of living, by providing new products and better products at lower prices, for all of our people. It seems to me, consequently, that now is an opportune time for us to reexamine the questions whether patents in fact make jobs and whether there are any serious impediments to the full functioning of our patent system and, if any exist, whether they can be removed or ameliorated.

Obviously, it will be impossible in the brief time at our disposal for us to discuss the various ramifications of this problem or any considerable number of the factors in-

volved; but there is one aspect of it which is frequently overlooked, and which we may well consider with interest and profit, namely, the relation of patents to jobs. By creating jobs I do not mean providing unnecessary work, or sharing jobs by dividing the work one man can do between two men, but creating new work year after year under patents hereafter granted and which will continuously require new skills and furnish additional employments.

How do patents create jobs? They create jobs because they are the incentives for the production of new machines and new products, and just how new machines and new products create jobs was very dramatically explained by Mr. Cameron of the Ford Motor Co. in an address over the Ford Evening Hour some years ago. As I recall, he pointed out that the inner sheli of the hub cap of the Ford car sold for 12 cents. To produce it by hand he said would cost $2.50 and at that rate the cost of the Ford car would be $17,850. Few people could buy cars if they cost that much. Consequently, with all hand work there would not be an automobile industry, and no employment created by anything connected with automobiles for the millions of people who are now employed in that industry.

The truth of these statements that patents make jobs are discernible all about us. Consider, if you please, the number of jobs created by the patents granted since World War I. The list runs into the hundreds of thousands, but I will mention only a few: The autogyro, nitrocellulose lacquers, ethyl lead gasoline, push-button elevators, bromine from sea water, vitamin D by irradiation, color photography, radio beacon, nylon, refrigerants (low-boiling fluorine compounds), synthetic rubber, a. c. receiving tubes, and television. Furthermore, the wages paid in these industries are the highest paid in the world. Indeed, the entire radio and electric refrigerator industries were developed since the last war.

These new inventions, which supplied employment to so many of cur people, were patented, and the majority of such patents were granted to individuals and to small companies. In his testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee, former Commissioner of Patents Coe pointed out that from 1921 to 1938, inclusive, 82.8 percent of the patents granted were to individuals and small corporations, and in 1930 three patents were granted to every 100 industrial workers. It was to these workers, who had trained themselves to invent for peace, that the call was literally made by the Chief Executive in the latter part of 1940 to invent for war. It is not necessary to point to their success, for it is now manifest that they evolved tools and weapons of war superior in most categories to anything our enemies were able to produce, although they had a 20-year headstart. These tools and weapons of war were represented by over 10,000 secrecy orders which were issued in applications for patents under congressional authority, representing inventions many of which were only recently used on the battle fronts of the world.

The ability and capacities of our workers to meet the call of the Chief Executive to invent for war evidence a secondary advantage of our patent system which is not generally appreciated, that is, the benefit of having a citizenry capable of making new discoveries. Our workers, under the stimulus provided by our patent laws, have received the highest form of education, the ability to make practical application of theoretical knowledge and to discover new and better ways of making and doing things, and the worth to the country of this major national asset is beyond estimate.

Many of the war inventions will find their way into the channels of commerce during the period of peace. Just as nylon freed us from the dominance of the Japanese silk industry, I believe that our synthetic-rubber inventions can free us from the dominance of the foreign-controlled natural-rubber industry. Then, too, amazing strides are being made in the chemical, electrical, and agricultural fields. The electron microscope, for example, has opened up an entirely new field for medicine, and all signs point to new industries based on television and plastics. Moreover, it involves no flight of the imagination to predict the utilization of atomic energy for purposes of peace. Truly, the progress which can be envisioned in the field of inventions and the new jobs which can be created by them should be a source of gratification and consolation to all of us.

Inventions now made and awaiting commercial exploitation will, in my judgment, carry the Nation on to greater achievements in the years to come; but it should be remarked that continued advances in the future will not rest on inventions already made. We must give more and more incentives to inventors and more and continuous encouragement to the investment of speculative capital needed to develop inventions into marketable products as time rolls on. This can be done only by enabling our scientific and other inventors freely to inquire and search for the unknown and without any form of regimentation or control, and by continuing to hold out the hope of reward to them assured by our patent laws and by removing the "booby traps" and stumbling blocks in their way—what is most important—to extend to them intelligent and sympathetic understanding of their problems and claims at every point of their contact with Government. To do more is desirable; to do less may prove disastrous.

Several trends today militate against the making of future inventions. Fortunately, however, such trends are insignificant compared to the forces which not only made this country industrially great and equipped us for the successful waging of total mechanized war, but also enabled us to provide a greater number and more kinds of jobs, on a progressively increasing scale and at higher wages, for more men and women than any other nation on earth. But these adverse, reactionary trends, whether ignorantly or deliberately initiated, should not be ignored or lightly dismissed. They should be met boldly and challengingly by those who believe in America's past and entertain hope for its future.

Perhaps the most ominous tendencies that today discourage the making of patentable discoveries are the persistent attempts not only to place inventors—these public benefactors—as a class in an odious category but also to disparage their accomplishments and to make their ownership and use of patents a liability instead of an asset, as well as the efforts to establish the unsound principle that patentable inventions can be made only in rare instances and in exceptional circumstances.

It has been asserted by persons who should have known better, that patents as such have been abused in that their owners have deprived the Government of new articles, processes, and materials needed for the war effort; that the patent laws are in conflict with the antitrust laws; that the grant of patents is unnecessary because if one man did not make a new discovery another man would at a later date; and that step-by-step research cannot result in anything patentable. The panacea advocated for curing most of these supposed evils is some form of compulsory licensing system, which is sometimes disguised.

The allegation that patent owners have deprived the Government of its anticipated needs for war inventions is an indictment of the sacrifices and the patriotism of the 10,000 inventors mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, and whose war inventions disclosed in their pending applications were placed under secrecy orders and made available to the Government, as well as over 200,000 of our fellow citizens who made inventive suggestions during the last 4 years directly to the Government through the National Inventors Council. These inventions and inventive suggestions, together with the more than 2,392,300 patents which have been granted since the beginning of our patent system, offered a myriad of inventions from which the Government might and did pick and choose for war purposes. Moreover, the statement is completely refuted by the fact that there is nothing in law which could have prevented the Government from supplying its anticipated needs at any time either before or during the war irrespective of any patent situation which may have existed. The Government has and had the power and the right to cause at any time the manufacture and use of anything it needs or needed for governmental purpose, and no patent owner can or could have prevented it.

As to the antitrust laws, there is no conflict between such laws and the patent laws. The antitrust laws begin where the patent laws end. We have on the one hand the right of the patentee to exclude others for a limited time from making, using, and selling his patented invention. This is a monopoly on something the public did not have or know about until the inventor disclosed his invention through his patent. On the other hand, the public has the right to a free market, but not the right to make free use of the inventor's patent property, or his copyright, or his automobile, or his house, or anything else belonging to him. A free market does not mean free license to expropriate the property of others, yet many so-called reforms of the patent laws made in recent years, including the compulsory licensing proposals, would do just that.

For my part, I have never known, heard, or read of any abuse of a patent right; that is, of any abuse which is attributable to the exercise of any privilege inherent in the patent grant itself. No evil or abuse of such rights has yet been brought to light and, moreover, no abuse of patents has been brought to light which is incapable of solution under existing laws.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not unmindful of the fact that patent owners have entered into contracts about patents in which, under color of the patent laws, they related their property to the property of others, either to use such properties for unlawful purposes, or unreasonably to restrain trade, or in the attempt to create some other monopoly forbidden by law. Activities of this kind are not peculiar to patents. There have been far more abuses of law itself and of contracts concerning tangible merchandise such as beef, tobacco, sugar, oil, coal, and wheat sold by the trusts in interstate commerce than about patents. The abuses concerning patents were no more inherent in the patents than the abuses concerning beef were inherent in the beef. In every such case, they were abuses of the law of contracts.

Many examples could be given of how unlawful contracts have been entered into about patents. Unless we have reached the millenium, I have no doubt that in the future other ways will be sought to enlarge by contract the right patent owners have under their patents, which is merely the exclusive right, granted to them to make, use, and vend the patented invention within and throughout the United States and its Territories, and that such attempts will be restricted only by the limits of the mental capacities and desires of cunning and unscrupulous men. Such antisocial contracts, whether about patents or anything else, are indefensible, and I do not defend them. I desire to make the point, however, that no

changes in the patent laws are necessary in order to prevent abuses of the law of contracts concerning patents, since it has been repeatedly demonstrated that the antitrust laws are adequate to take care of any such situations that may arise.

This brings us to the assertions which we have frequently heard in recent years, and to which I have previously referred, that if one man did not discover something, another would, or, as the matter is sometimes stated, somebody would find the needle in the haystack, and that step-by-step research is not invention. Confront these dogmatic and speculative statements with history and with the facts discernible all about us, and they will fall of their own weight. The facts I have in mind are: First, the mere existence of the 2,044 industrial research laboratories listed by the National Research Council in 1940, which were largely brought into being by our patent system; and, second, the progress in this country under our patent system, compared with the progress in foreign countries which do not have, or only recently have enacted, patent laws. While no scientific study has ever been made of the influence which patent protection has had in stimulating inventive effort, our present industrial era began about the time such protection was first effectively accorded, that is to say, about 150 years ago. Within that period much greater progress has been made in industrial activity than during the entire preceding period of human history.

Our patent laws were designed to encourage and to make it worth while for our citizens to seek or to discover the needle, whether in the garage, attic, or in the laboratory, to the end that all of the people would be benefited, and to hold out the hope of reward to them while they, in many instances, laboriously and sometimes at great expense and personal risks proceeded step by step to discover the unknown. An instance is the 606 trials made before the drug Salvarsan was discovered, which is commonly known as 606. Another instance is the innumerable attempts and the $2,000,000,000 expended in the production of the atomic bomb. Ofttimes we are prone to forget that the Constitution provides for securing to inventors for only a short period the exclusive right to their discoveries—not inventions. What is a discovery?

Robinson says a discovery may be the result of accident, or of experiment based on reasoning or conjecture, or of study and research. But however made, a patentable invention may result when it takes the form of one of the classes of things enumerated in the patent statutes. The trend of inventions today, however, is from the accidental to the surer methods of attacking specific problems adopted by workers engaged in cooperative research in well-equipped laboratories. This trend seems inevitable because as the sum total of human knowledge becomes greater, the knowledge of the individual becomes proportionately less. Consequently, the chances of making a new discovery are greater if a problem is attacked by group workers. These group workers usually attack a main problem by first endeavoring to discover its details and their functions and effects. The discovery of the details themselves may involve major inventions. A consequence of this trend is an increase in the rate and efficiency of inventions and the enlargement of the fields in which inventions are made.

It is a grave mistake to penalize these highly trained and skilled workers by pronouncing that their achievements in making new discoveries cannot amount to inventions. The services of scientific inventors grow more and more important in every phase of life, and the security and progress of society makes it essential that their interest in making new discoveries shall continue to be stimulated by the grant of patents, that their work shall remain untrammeled, and that their accomplishments shall be fully recognized and rewarded.

Attempts were made in the past to distinguish between inventions and discoveries, but the distinction has now practically disappeared. For example, a chemist searching for a new product or an effective catalyst makes an invention as soon as he makes the sought-for discovery.

An instance of a discovery is Goodyear's invention. He discovered that by mixing crude rubber with sulfur and subjecting it to a high degree of heat, vulcanized rubber results. That discovery made high speed automotive transportation possible. Long before the present war, the Germans invented a synthetic rubber of the type adopted by our Government for the manufacture of tires and were induced to disclose it to us through patents Nos. 1,938,730 and 1,938,731, both issued in 1933, and others subsequently granted to them, because of the reward offered by our patent system. These disclosures proved to be windfall for us.

When the Japanese captured the chief source of supply of natural rubber, independent inventors and research laboratories of the country immediately undertook, by improving the German inventions, to manufacture adequate quantities of satisfactory synthetic tires which would not disintegrate or be materially affected by heat generated by friction due to high speeds. They were successful. That was a war problem of the first magnitude.

I have seen lists of other similar problems which would like to have handed to each of the critics and disparagers of our patent system and asked them if they could have solved them. So far, many of them have not been solved, although it appears that some of such problems would involve no more inventive ingenuity than was exercised by the person who first conceived the idea and perceived the desirability of folding a dagger blade down into its handle to make a pocketknife.

If the needles represented by these problems are discovered, whether by persons working at home or in research laboratories, it will be because of the patriotism of our inventors and their confidence that our courts will protect them in their discoveries under our patent laws which stimulated their individual and group efforts by the fairness of opportunity and sureness of the reward provided by them. It would be regrettable and discouraging if, after they shall have achieved success, our penetrating hindsight misleads us into charging them with having discovered nothing more than the obvious, or to deprecate their efforts by proclaiming that they are entitled to no recognition because someone else would have made the discoveries if they had not done so, as has been so often done in the past.

Truly, our patent laws blazed a broad path for human advance which was paced by American inventors for the guidance of the 2,038,000,000 other human beings in the world, who have learned of, and aspire to possess the same living standards and high wages as our own. By adopting similar laws, they are following the example America has established, and the path of progress America has recorded. The accomplishments of American inventors are the real services to the world of American patent philosophy and practices which translate themselves into the security of individual homes and the possession of individual content and happiness. So splendid a record of achievements which have firmly established our industrial world leadership must not be sacrificed to any untried legal, economic, social, or political theory that strikes at its very roots.

I thank you.

"Land of the Free"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gazette and Bulletin, Williamsport, Pa., for April 9, 1946:

"LAND OF THE FREE"

We are proud of our Nation and quick to proclaim it the land of the free because our Constitution says it should be that way. We like to think of our individual liberty as prescribed in the Constitution and to consider our government as representative and servants of the people.

Looking back at the thoughts of founding fathers and the program they set up to make this Nation the great country it is today, we should consider if we actually are now following that program. Do we have the individual liberty today that brought success to this Union of States? Are we today actually a land of the free?

In considering answers to these problems we should remember our government was established to provide and maintain freedom, protect individual liberty and insure equal freedom. We have been told oftentimes that government's function is to protect against foreign invasion, domestic insurrection, illegal monopolies, swindling, overreaching, violence and other conditions menacing individual liberty.

We as a Nation seem to have broadened our viewpoint of the functions of government and in doing so to have surrendered much of our individual liberty. We are tending toward sharing the wealth, socialism, and other forms of government where the individual becomes a part of the mass to such an extent that the individual has lost what might be described as personal rights.

We have become members of unions and various other groups and made ourselves subject to mass thinking rather than maintaining our individual thinking. We have been exposed and cajoled to the thought of giving up our personal rights for so long we have ignored the thoughts and warnings expressed in our Constitution that it is only upon serious thinking we realize how much we have lost.

While there has been a speed-up of this trend in recent years, the condition is not new as evidenced from some remarks made by Abraham Lincoln. He said:

"Labor was prior to capital, but property is the fruit of labor. Property is desirable and is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently, and build one for himself, thus by example insuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

We have surrendered so many rights and come to lean so heavy upon Federal Government that Government has taken over for us many of the functions we should be doing as individuals. We are willing to ignore our own history and shun or seriously control individualism, because too many of us see only the glitter of socialized and centralized government without realizing what it will do to our Nation. Look at Henry Ford, Thomas Edison, and some of the other great

individualists. Would we today be the greatest industrial Nation of the world if men such as they had surrendered their individual rights and liberty as we have done in the past few years? Individualism and free enterprise have been responsible for placing this country at the top in a short period of 150 years.

Europe and the Orient in which individualism has been unknown for centuries have gone down while we went up, and yet we now are willing to follow their pattern of making the individual secondary to government.

A Georgian, Henry W. Grady, writing about the Constitution said:

"Exalt the citizen. As the State is the unit of government, he is the unit of the State. Make him self-respecting, self-reliant and responsible. Let him lean on the State for nothing that his own right arm can do, and on the Government for nothing his State can do. Let him cultivate independence to the point of welfare sacrifice and learn that humble things with unbartered liberty are better than splendors bought with its price. Let him neither surrender his individuality to the Government, nor merge it with the Government, nor merge it with the mob.

Are we selling our individual liberty today for splendor we will regret later? Have we made our Government our master instead of our servant? Is our Government listening to the majority, or are we seeing several minorities rule our daily life and economy? Are we as individuals coerced into following Government programs we in general may not want? Are we a self-government Nation or have we permitted Federal agencies, and bureaus, not chosen by the people, to regulate our lives, our business, our economy?

Let's look again at the principles of our Constitution and then, as individuals, do our utmost to reestablish them in our national thinking and way of life.

Destiny of Hawaii Envisioned by Daniel Webster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harry W. Frantz, United Press correspondent:

DANIEL WEBSTER WAS EARLY CHAMPION OF HAWAII

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON, March.—Daniel Webster, thought by many historians the ablest Secretary of State in American history, initiated the United States policy that has since controlled the political evolution of the Hawaiian Islands.

More than a century ago, the Massachusetts giant fixed the principle that the mid-Pacific archipelago was out of bounds for European countries seeking territory and political power in the Pacific, and he powerfully supported the right of the Hawaiian people to determine their own political future.

His political thought was strangely prophetic of the tremendous national interest in Hawaii to be revealed at the hour of Pearl Harbor attack 129 years later.

The inside story of Daniel Webster's formulation of basic policy toward the Hawaiian (then called Sandwich) Islands, has come to light in a recent book entitled "American Expansion in Hawaii 1842-98", written by Sylvester K. Stevens, former professor of history at Pennsylvania State College.

The book carries Hawaiian relations with mainland United States only through the annexation period, and does not discuss the pending appeal of the Territory of Hawaii for statehood. Nevertheless, it reveals the continuous trend of Hawaiian interest and sentiment toward the Union and by implication seems to strengthen the statehood case since it relates Hawaiian history to that of other American territories.

"For almost all of the period since 1842 there has been a steady strengthening of the influences which impelled the growth of a concept that Hawaii, of all areas in the Pacific, was within the fold of a continuous and binding sphere of special American influence," Dr. Stevens concluded.

"The story of Hawaii is a chapter, the last chapter, in the history of the spirit of manifest destiny and agrarian expansion which gave the United States Louisiana, the Floridas, Texas, California, and Oregon."

Daniel Webster became the arbiter of Hawaiian destiny in 1842, the same year in which he negotiated the Webster-Ashburton Treaty on the Canadian boundary, a masterpiece of diplomacy. In the same period he was studying diplomatic relations with China, which led to the negotiation of Caleb Cushing's treaty with that country in 1844.

On December 15, 1842, Timoteo Haalilio and William Richards, emissaries of King Kamehameha III, delivered to Webster for President John Tyler a request for formal recognition of the independence of the island kingdom and the full sovereignty of the King. A similar plea was to be made to France, Great Britain, and other powers which then looked acquisitively toward Pacific islands.

The King's agents reported the revolutionary changes taking place in the internal political and social structure of the island, marking the emergency of a civilization state, legitimately entitled to recognition.

Adroitly, Stevens recounts, they invited special attention of the United States to the commercial importance of the islands, the important whale fisheries, and the investment of from five to seven millions of American capital in the annual business of the islands.

Whig diplomatic policy in that period frowned upon active commitments in foreign fields, and Webster responded cautiously, at first, merely promising that existing agreements and agencies would be used to maintain close contacts with the kingdom, and that a consul or agent from Washington would continue to reside in the islands.

But Webster's broad vision encompassed the immediate problem by formulating broader principles of United States foreign policy that would be applied. He was author of the so-called Tyler Doctrine, which, in practical effect, extended the principles of the Monroe Doctrine to the Hawaiian Islands.

"The United States are more interested in the fate of the islands and of their government than any other nation can be; and this consideration induces the President (Tyler) to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest, or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek any undue control over the existing government, or any exclusive privileges or preferences in matters of commerce."

President Tyler messaged Congress in this sense a few days after a dramatic meeting in which Richards and Haalilio were introduced to the President and his Cabinet. Richards there hinted the possibility of a British protectorate in the case of the failure of the United States to recognize the islands.

This produced the desired effect and on December 20 Webster replied formally. The first diplomatic agent, George Brown, was appointed Commissioner to Hawaii in March 1843.

Webster resigned on May 8, 1843, but became Secretary of State again in Millard Fillmore's cabinet, on July 22, 1850. At that time, French political pressure on the Hawaiian Islands was great, nd Webster stiffened the Hawaiian position by new instructions to the American Commissioner.

Reasserting the desire of the United States for the independence and prosperity of Hawaii, Webster wrote: "But while thus indisposed to exercise any sinister influence itself over the counsels of Hawaii, or to overawe the proceedings of its government by the menace of the actual application of superior military force, it expects to see other powerful nations act in the same spirit."

Webster took note that five-sixths of the commerce of the islands was with the United States and that they are "ten times" nearer to the United States than to any of the powers of Europe.

"These considerations, together with others of a more general character, have fixed the course which the Government of the United States will pursue in regard to them."

Webster, although opposing immediate annexation, thus established the protected position of Hawaii which enable its political inclination to the American flag. Hawaii now hopes to be the forty-ninth star.

The Home Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit to my colleagues an editorial by Mr. Sattis Simmons, editor of the Jackson Herald, published in Ripley, W. Va.

Here is a message from the grass roots regarding Federal regulations, and I am pleased to call it to your attention, as we soon again will consider the administration's housing proposal.

The editorial follows:

THE HOME QUESTION

Building supply dealers over the country are being warned this week that new OPA housing regulations are being formulated which will further complicate the building situation, and might conceivably result in a complete bottleneck which would all but stop building of homes until it could be remedied.

According to reports the new housing authority which the Federal Government has established to manage the housing problem in the country is making ready to issue an order that everybody who saws a board, or any other kind of lumber must sell it to a wholesale dealer, and that no citizen would be able to cut and retail any kind of lumber products.

These complicating regulations are today doing more to slow down a much needed

building program than anything which is being done, and with such a new order it would just about finish off what has already developed into a terrible mess as a result of the meddling of men who know nothing about the business which they are supposed to tell others how to handle.

If the Federal Government would get completely out of the picture, give people who want to build a free hand with no restrictions to negotiate, buy the materials they need, and contract to build, or build themselves, there would soon be a better program under way than we have now, or have any prospect of having with present regulations and restrictions in force. If they would do this, many a man would be able to be living in his own home by next winter—a place which would be a home to him and his family and friends.

People want homes. They are afraid of inflation and want to get their money invested in homes and real estate, and would do it if given the opportunity.

Americans are by nature a home-loving people. It is a wonderful feeling to have your own home. People know that and that is why they are anxious that they be given an ambition to realize that dream. What they build may be to the Government a residence, or to the neighbors a shack—but to them it will be a home—home, sweet home.

We must never let this country drift to the place where you will find it necessary to get a permit from Washington before you can build, or approval of his ideas before he can build, because when that would happen a man's home would not in reality be his castle.

America's Stake in the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the statement by the National Planning Association, entitled "America's Stake in the British Loan."

This matter will be coming before the Congress soon, after we return from the Easter recess, and it is encouraging to see an organization of this nature taking such a broad and enlightened stand on a matter of such vital importance.

AMERICA'S STAKE IN THE BRITISH LOAN—AN NPA INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Today the best interests of the United States require the restoration and expansion of world trade. Only through our leadership can a market place be reestablished where national economic systems can meet without conflict and contribute to each other's prosperity and welfare. The British loan is one of the necessary steps which America must take to revive an expanding world trade on a free enterprise basis. In itself the loan does not assure success; without it, failure seems certain.

Other necessary steps essential to the realization of nondiscriminatory multilateral world trade—the Trade Agreements Act, expansion of the Export-Import Bank, ratification of Bretton Woods and the United Nations Organization, and the proposed International Conference on Trade and Employment—have already been taken or recommended by the United States.

It is unfortunate that our foreign economic policy has had to be established in piecemeal form. The measures above, along with the British loan, are related steps of one policy. The NPA committee on international policy in its earlier reports has recommended this integrated policy and has supported each of the steps our Government has taken to achieve it. In the committee's report of November 1944, America's New Opportunities in World Trade, we pointed out that "at the end of the war the United States will be the world's single great creditor Nation * * * the only potential large-scale exporter of capital." We stated further that "the key to a properly functioning foreign trade program is the provision of adequate dollar exchange."

With the committee's previous studies [1] as a background, we have examined the provisions of the Anglo-American financial agreement, and the arguments which have been made both here and in Britain for and against it. Our conclusion is that the British loan is vital to the national interest of the United States.

We believe that failure to approve the agreement will be a step backward that may well be irretrievable. Its rejection will, in our opinion, lead to a condition of economic warfare that will undermine the United Nations Organization and make impossible the effective operation of the world fund and bank, as well as the proposed International Trade Organization.[2]

The United States and Great Britain are the world's two most important trading nations. Before the war half the world's commerce was conducted in either the dollar or the pound sterling. So great is the relative weight of these two countries, and so far-reaching the effect of their policies on the world economy, that a stable and growing world trade cannot be realized unless their aims and policies are harmonized.

The Anglo-American financial agreement cannot be regarded as a simple monetary transaction between two countries. Nor does it fall in the same category as loans to other Allied countries now under discussion. Rather, the credit to Britain must be evaluated in its wider economic and political context. It is not an end in itself—either for Britain or the United States—but a means to an end. For with the termination of lend-lease a dollar loan is the only means whereby Britain can join the United States in freeing world trade from the shackles which the war has forged around it.

The demands of war made it necessary for Britain in particular to intensify and develop further the program of trade restriction and protection it first embarked upon in the thirties as a counter to the restrictive measures taken by other countries. This program sought to minimize exchange difficulties by making of the Empire and certain other countries a more closely knit unit (the sterling area) whose economic relations with other nations were subject to restriction and control. Thus, a free-exchange market does not exist today within the so-called sterling area, and the conversion of sterling exchange into dollars is a matter of strict governmental rationing.

The war has so altered Britain's exchange position that without United States assistance these stringent exchange and trade controls cannot be relaxed. Imports are essential to the physical and material well-being of the United Kingdom. Under normal circumstances Britain would pay for such imports through income received in payment for exports, shipping, and other services, and interest on investments it holds abroad.

Conversion to war output drastically cut Britain's ability to export, and war damage has reduced her relative position in the shipping field. During the war Britain sold many foreign investments in order to pay for war supplies, thus reducing her income from this source.

The net result is that imports essential to British reconversion and public health for the time being cannot be financed in a normal manner. Two alternatives are open to the British:

1. They may obtain a loan from the United States to tide them over until exports can be expanded, or

2. They may arrange to draw more heavily upon the sterling area, with a promise to pay with tomorrow's exports for those goods which the sterling area agreed to sell today.[3]

The latter course inevitably must increase Britain's debt to the sterling area, a debt which, as a result of wartime necessity, already has grown to the staggering total of $14,000,000,000. Any further increase would have to be held to a bare minimum. To achieve this, as well as to arrange repayment of the whole over a longer period, Britain would be forced to continue stringent exchange and trade controls. Of necessity, Britain would attempt to build and maintain artificial trade channels from which the United States would be excluded.

Even today, many Britons from all political groups argue that their country's best interest is served by the latter course. They fear United States instability, with memories of the thirties. These Britons would promote sterling area self-sufficiency, their country the favored purveyor of industrial goods to the members of the area in exchange for foodstuffs and raw materials.

Such a program does not appeal to that majority in Britain who actively seek a loan from the United States. Enlightened United States policy should support the loan, since the development of a separate economic bloc by Britain can only lead to a similar and retaliatory effort on the part of the United States.

Irrespective of its serious political consequences, this is not good business for the United States. We have very little to offer in the way of a firm commitment to import from a world divided into economic blocs. Nor are we apt to prove willing and efficient organizers of the necessary system of centralized government trade control so alien to our traditions.

Enlightened opinion, both here and in Britain, seeks to liberate trade in order that it may develop on that broad and generalized basis which permits to all countries a free access to markets and materials. It is to this end that Britain has agreed to take a

---

[1] See: America's New Opportunities in World Trade, Planning Pamphlets Nos. 37, 38, November 1944, 50 cents. The Stakes of Bretton Woods, Special Report, April 1945, 25 cents; International Economic Collaboration, Planning Pamphlet No. 50, February 1946, 25 cents.

[2] I do not dissent from this report, although I believe the argument is unnecessarily limited. For example, the wide disparity in living standards between the United States and other countries, even such advanced nations as Britain, makes it imperative for us to help them hasten their reconstruction and the elevation of their standards to minimize the friction and suspicion engendered by these differences. World peace depends upon our helping to expedite the improvement in living conditions so that the peoples of all countries will gain renewed faith in the progressive advance of their economy. The rulers of nations which do not possess this confidence tend to compensate by aggressive international policies.—Solomon Barkin.

[3] The sterling area is in too great need of aid to be a fruitful source of adequate funds. (Solomon Barkin.)

number of important and positive steps in liquidating its structure of trade and exchange controls, provided we make such action possible by the grant of a loan.

1. Immediately on the effective date of the loan all restrictions on sterling exchange arising from transactions with Great Britain on current account will be removed for products of the United States or for transactions of its residents. Every day of delay in the granting of the British loan further imbeds in postwar trade the wartime pattern of restrictions and thereby increases the difficulties in removing them.

2. Within 1 year after the effective date of the loan, all sterling received by traders of any country in payment for current transactions will be freely convertible into dollars or any other currency. The effect of this will be to eliminate those British exchange restrictions which have directed trade into artificial channels.

3. Britain will attempt to reduce and fund her debt to other sterling area countries, repaying in pounds convertible into other currencies. As a result, the large British indebtedness no longer will provide a guaranteed market for British traders at the expense of American exporters.

4. Britain will cooperate wholeheartedly as a member of the world bank and fund. The speedy solution of Britain's financial problem will enable the world bank and fund to establish a stable international exchange and credit structure at a much earlier date than otherwise would be feasible. Indeed, without the loan it is not unlikely that Britain and many other sterling area countries would be forced to withdraw from the world bank and fund.

5. Britain will join the United States in a program to reduce or eliminate tariff preferences, discriminatory import quotas and other barriers to trade. As a part of this program, Britain will assist the United States in establishing an international trade organization to supplement the World Bank and Fund. Again, without the loan, it would be impossible for Britain to promote this liberal international economic program, let alone join the International Trade Organization. The British thus agree to undertake a number of positive commitments which are in the interest of the United States in exchange for a $3,750,000,000 line of credit, to be amortized over 50 years at a 2 percent rate of interest on the obligation outstanding in any year.

There are those in the United States who would grant the British the loan but scale it down and seek further political and material concessions in exchange. It is our opinion that any substantial alterations of this character most likely will render the loan unacceptable to the United Kingdom. A sum less than that upon which the negotiators have agreed clearly will not bridge Britain's exchange gap over the next few years and thus permit her to carry out the above commitments. Any smaller sum will require Britain to continue exchange and trade restrictions. In such an event the agreement as it stands must collapse.

Events of the past few years have thrust upon the United States a responsibility which it must not evade without a full understanding of the consequences. A free and multilateral trade cannot exist without some nation assuming the role of creditor—a role that by the very nature of things is synonymous with leadership. For many decades Great Britain played this part in world economic affairs. Today only the United States is capable of carrying on the task.

The United States has much to gain by a revival of multilateral trade, and, by enlisting the support of Britain, the prospects of such a revival are good. But it has even more to lose in failure. For the alternative is a further division of the world into competing and rival economic blocs, with the employment of political means to realize economic ends.

This is our choice. In our considered judgment the circumstances more than warrant the United States risking such a considerable sum as $3,750,000,000, which is well within our means, in order to realize the type of economic world it requires for peace and prosperity.

THE NPA COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Stacy May, chairman, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.
Frank Altschul, vice chairman, General American Investors Co.
Solomon Barkin, Textile Workers of America.
Edward J. Brown, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
Wallace Clark, Wallace Clark & Co.
Charles Colby, University of Chicago.
J. B. Condliffe, University of California.
Milton Eisenhower, Kansas State College of Agriculture.
E. W. Gaumnitz, National Cheese Institute.
Carter Goodrich, Columbia University.
Allan B. Kline, American Farm Bureau Federation.
Joseph D. McGoldrick, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Charlton Ogburn, counselor at law.
Robert H. Patchin, W. R. Grace & Co.
Clarence E. Pickett, American Friends Service Committee.
Clarence Poe, Progressive Farmer.
Victor Reuther, United Automobile Workers.
Morris Rosenthal, Stein-Hall & Co.
Theodore W. Schultz, University of Chicago.
Edgar W. Smith, New York City.
Robert J. Watt, American Federation of Labor.
Robert West, Esmond Mills.

Reception to Albert Chambon, French Consul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein my remarks in extending the congratulations of my congressional district to Hon. Albert Chambon, French consul, at a reception tendered to him by members of the Holy Name Society and their friends and families held in the Assumption Hall in Chelsea, Mass., on Sunday evening, April 7, 1946:

The most devastating war in history is over. The nations of the world are sitting down to the great, stern task of reconstruction, the job of building a new pattern for human society. As all the battle cries fade away, we are faced with the fact that this has been a world revolution, in which we have come to realize the need and value of human brotherhood.

Two thousand years ago Christ the Saviour brought this faith to a pagan and unbelieving world. It was not until the eighteenth century that a revolution in America and a revolution in France translated this faith into political action. The French helped us to win our independence and we have helped them to win their liberation from a savage aggressor. Small wonder that there is a mutual friendship and understanding between our peoples, united by our common faith in the dignity of human personality.

To make a peace that will work, balancing security with freedom and providing justice for all, the nations will need the inspiration of Christian faith, and they will need the civilizing leadership of France and the United States. Our two nations stand together in this as a guaranty that the peoples of the earth will not find themselves in the grip of a new tyranny which has simply replaced the old. We believe that the things of this world must be made to serve man and not enslave him. We believe, in turn, that man shall only serve God, the ultimate image of his own mental and spiritual perfectibility.

Tonight, in democratic fellowship, we welcome the presence of the Honorable Mr. Chambon, consul of France, who is to be our principal speaker. It is my privilege to extend to him the greetings of this, the Seventh Congressional District of Massachusetts.

There are many thousand Americans of French ancestry in this district, working in the textile appliance plants. They are in the electrical appliance plants. They are in the professions and in our public life. They have been conspicuous in our armed forces and they have given generously of their sons and daughters to the holy service of God. Mr. Chambon will be proud to know that so much of his Gallic blood flows in the veins of our American democracy.

His distinguished countryman, the Marquis de Lafayette, traveled this section and knew it well. In our tradition, we fondly recall the help which Lafayette gave to our forefathers when they were struggling to win their freedom against overwhelming odds. And because of that tradition, there was destined to grow up in this county of Essex, a man who would return to France to repay our debt. It was he who led our armored columns across France, routing the Nazi invaders and breaking their power for evil before they could escape across the Rhine. Mr. Chambon, we welcome you to the neighborhood which developed, for France and the world * * * Gen. George Patton.

In this spirit of cooperation, which has served both of our democratic countries so well, in time of need * * * we shall go on to win an enduring peace, where all men of good will may prosper and be happy. In that work of building a new social order, the civilizing genius of France will work side by side with the youthful energy and vision of America.

From this neighborhood, in 1919, went Colonel House, as principal adviser to President Wilson in that noble effort to create a community of nations that would outlaw war and encourage mankind in the arts of peace. Our people have never lost sight of this objective, which we consider to be the historical mission of these United States. Today, most of the peoples of the world are allied with us in this great purpose.

France knows, from tragic experience, the desperate need for security. Twice, in our time, she has been ravaged and bled by the greedy assaults of ruthless ambition. What she has lost, the world has lost.

There are hopeful signs that the people of the world, frightened by the destructive possibilities of future wars, are demanding international cooperation to outlaw force as an instrument of national policy.

Therein lies security for France, ourselves, and the world.

I bring to the Honorable Mr. Chambon, Consul of France, the greetings of my constituents. As their Representative in the Congress I can assure you, Mr. Chambon, of

their heartfelt confidence in the recovery of your country. Already we see her speaking up with her clear and respected intelligence in the councils of the family of nations.

Tonight we are proud to welcome you, as her representative, bringing a message from friends to friends.

Foreign Legions for the U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of freedom-loving people throughout the world without a country and without a home. By the hundreds they are committing suicide rather than go back to where they came from. Millions know that to go back to Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Austria, or Hungary means death or slavery.

It is against every segment of decency to force these millions to go back against their will. They, more than anyone else in the world, know what fate awaits them should they return. These millions were among the most loyal and faithful allies during the entire war. These are the type of soldiers who captured Monte Cassino Hill and Tobruk. Today they are men and women without a country.

Since our Nation had a part in shaping up their destiny it is our responsibility to care for them. They are reliable and dependable people who have always been willing to do more than their part. They have suffered perhaps more than any people in this war. They have been victims of concentration camps and slave labor. What are we going to do with these people? That is the burning question of our time.

At the same time our own boys in the service who have made victory possible are tired and weary. They want to come home. Not a day passes where a Congressman does not get mail from our boys pleading that they be brought home. They are weary and tired. The war is over and we cannot blame them for feeling as they do. They should be brought home. The men who are married and have families want especially to come home and soon. They should be joined with their families for the good of our country.

There is no reason why our country cannot enlist help from among these millions who have no country. They would be more than willing to enlist in the armed forces of the United States of America and take over the duty of occupation. I have received letters from hundreds of Poles, Finns, Serbs, Hungarians, Slovaks in Europe begging me to help them get into our Army. Their letters are sad and they even offer to serve for life and gratis. Our own boys could easily be replaced with these unfortunate victims of appeasement.

I have introduced a resolution giving authority to the Military Affairs Committee to make a study to determine the advisability of providing for the establishment of an American foreign legion by accepting enlistments from among the citizens of foreign countries for military service in the armed forces of the United States.

While this would be a new departure, in a military sense, for our country, it is certainly in line with the Nation's new departure into world-wide internationalism. It seeks to help to implement, by military force, our international commitments made up to date and which will be made in the future.

There are 300,000 well-trained Polish soldiers who are still under arms, some of them being used in the Army of Occupation in Italy and other countries and many of them in England and other countries who dare not return to Poland. There are hundreds of thousands of trained Finns, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Serbs, and Slovaks in the same category. These soldiers rendered exceptional and heroic services in the defeat of the Axis Powers and doubtless great numbers of them would regard it as a godsend to be able to join an American foreign legion where, as professional soldiers, they could be used in the Army of Occupation or wherever the military leaders of our Government deemed necessary.

It is quite possible that with the proper standard of pay and benefits which could be worked out, that a force of 500,000 men could be enlisted within the next few months in an American foreign legion and probably within less time after the plan had been worked out. This force could completely take over our army of occupation serving under regular United States of America Army officers. We could at once eliminate the draft law as a source of replacements for occupational duty.

The proposed foreign legion could have its own uniform and could be housed, clothed, fed, and paid in accordance with American Army standards and should be officered, above a certain rank, by our own United States of America Regular Army officers.

We know now, that the American soldier, his friends, and relatives do not want him retained for months and years overseas after victory is won and hostilities have ceased. If we insist on keeping the homesick soldiers overseas after they have won the victory for us, it lowers their morale and, to a certain extent, destroys the confidence of the people in maintaining a strong military force in peacetime. To that extent, we are playing into the hands of certain powers, and we are weakening our efforts for peace throughout the world. We are encouraging, by the weakening of our military position, other nations to reach out for territorial and military power and are, in fact, sowing the seeds of World War III.

It is my belief that the thought contained in this plan is worthy of the serious and early consideration of the people of America and Congress. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will approve the resolution and that the proper committee will contact the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, the Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower, and other military leaders in an effort to get their thought and advice on this most important subject. General Alexander in Italy has used Polish troops for occupation of Italy. His advice and recommendation should especially be sought by this committee.

I believe that the announcement of the formation of an American foreign legion would be a proper and great step for this Nation to take at the present time. It would hold out a new hope for hundreds of thousands of men who have fought in various military organizations for the freedom they hoped would come after victory. It might well make up the major military force which we will be called upon to supply under the United Nations Organization; and certainly one could easily visualize that it might succeed to the extent that it could furnish practically all of the troops necessary for our armies of occupation in Europe and in Japan.

Such a move, I believe, would be welcomed by the American people. It would provide seasoned and trained men for the armies of occupation rather than the continuous drafting of our teen-age boys, disturbing their opportunities for an education by sending them to Germany and Japan to do police work in the army of occupation. To send 18- and 19-year old boys little trained to occupy a foreign country is not good for their morale and future welfare. Seasoned and trained troops would be a better way out.

I believe the plan is worthy of most serious consideration by our military leaders and by the Members of this Congress and by the American people. If these unfortunate refugees go back to their countries they will either be killed or imprisoned or put in slave camps. We certainly do not want to force that on them. Take care of these people we must because our Nation had a hand in shaping their future. Hence, why not put them to good use? We need them. A foreign legion is the answer. We have them on our hands. To refuse to put them into worth-while tasks would be stupid to say the least.

Army Day Address by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the President in Chicago on Army Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this Army Day in America, freedom-loving men all over the world rise with us to salute our fighting men of the Army.

Our American soldier is respected everywhere for his courage, admired for his fighting skill, and loved for his charm and simplicity. Like his gallant brother in arms in the United States Navy, he is the symbol of our traditions and our hopes.

Our Army has written many glorious chapters in our Nation's history, but none so brilliant as the last. Its story in this war has been written in every corner of the globe—on the continent of Europe, in the wastes of the Arctic, over the vast expanse of the Pacific: in jungle, and desert, and mountain, and over the beaches. It is a glorious history of men against the forces of nature as well as against the forces of evil.

Ours was a civilian army, not a professional one, either in leadership or manpower. Of the 850,000 officers who led it only 16,000 were professional soldiers. Of the 10,000,000 men and women who at some time served it, only 300,000 were Regulars.

This Army Day is a fitting day for us to look thankfully at the past and hopefully to the future.

As for the past, the pages of history will pay the only lasting tribute to those millions of citizens who were the Army of our Nation. No eulogy, no epitaph, no monument is enough to express this Nation's debt and sorrow for those who gave their lives or limbs or health in the cause of human decency. Nor can it adequately tell of our joy and our gratitude to those whose lives were spared in battle, and who have returned to us to take their place as citizens again.

The greatest tribute to the men of our Army is the very fact that the enemy has surrendered and that we are once again turning our thoughts and hopes to peace. This Army of democracy, of every walk of life, of every faith, of every national descent, was victorious over the professional armies of the dictators who had scorned us as too soft, and cowardly to fight. The survival of a free civilization is the reward for the struggles and battles of the men of our fighting forces, on land and sea and air.

The roll call of the battles of our American soldiers show how world-wide was the conflict: The Philippines, India-Burma, the East Indies, the Aleutians, China, Pacific Islands stretching across the vast ocean, north and south; Africa, Sicily, Italy, Normandy, France, Luxemburg and Germany.

No one can think of the great American Army without those leaders of victory who now take their place in history with the immortals of the past: General Marshall, General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, General Arnold, and all the others who served in their commands. And the Army itself as well as the American people will always remember the inspiration, leadership, courage and determination which came from that gallant warrior in the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The past is history. It is the future to which we must turn our thoughts and energies now. What of the world on the Army Days to come? What of the future of mankind in the atomic age which is upon us?

Let us look clearly at today and tomorrow. The facts are plain, and I think our course is also plain.

The United States today is a strong Nation; there is none stronger. This is not merely a proud boast. Rather it is a fact which calls for solemn thought and due humility. It means that with such strength, we have to assume leadership and accept responsibility. It would be a tragic breach of national duty and international faith if, consciously or carelessly, we permitted ourselves ever to be unprepared to fulfill those responsibilities and obligations for which the world looks to us.

We cannot, and we are determined that we will not, disintegrate into weakness. For we still have much to do with our strength.

We still have all the duties of armies of occupation. We still have to do our share in supervising former enemy governments, enforcing the peace terms, disarming and repatriating enemy troops, taking care of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons. We still have to service and supply all our troops overseas in war-torn areas all over the world where essential supplies are very scarce. We still have to protect and preserve the many billions of dollars worth of American property scattered all over the world. We still have to roll up our own bases which we no longer need, and destroy the war material and war-making industries of our enemies.

But far and above all those things, we must remain strong because only so long as we remain strong can we ensure the peace of the world. Peace has to be built on power for good as well as on justice and good will and good deeds. We cannot on one day proclaim our intention to prevent unjust aggression and oppression in the world, and on the next day call for immediate scrapping of our military machines.

We must remain strong, not because we plan or want to impose our views upon the world by force, or do battle with any nation. We must remain strong for just the contrary reason. We must remain strong in order that we may retain our leadership and exercise that leadership with all our resources on behalf of a world of peace and harmony among all nations and peoples. That is not only our moral duty; it is a firm obligation which we have undertaken as a member of the United Nations Organization.

From the military point of view, how can we best maintain this strength and leadership? I have, during the past year, given what I consider appropriate answers to the Congress and to the Nation. Because the time in history grows short, and because delay is itself a process of deterioration, I emphasize those answers again today—the day on which we do honor to our Army.

There are three keystones to the arch of our strength. One is a unification of the War and Navy Departments. The second is extension of the Selective Service Act. The third is universal training.

I recognize that there are difficulties of detail in a unification of the armed forces. But the objective must be realized.

Unification does not mean subordination of any branch of the service. It does not mean a loss of identity. But it does mean just what the word says—"unification." It means a concentration and cohesion of our best military thought and our best military resources, geared to maximum efficiency. It means using our experience in World War II for the peace of the world.

I am hopeful that the second objective will very soon be achieved in the Congress—the extension of the Selective Service Act. We have won the war, and we must now make certain that the victory is secured. It is perfectly clear that victorious nations cannot, on the unconditional surrender of a vicious and dangerous enemy, turn their backs and go home. Wars are different from baseball games where, at the end of the game, the record is made and the teams get dressed and leave the park. For in wars, the victors should make sure that there will not be a recurrence of enemy tyranny. That tyranny must be rooted out from the very soul of the enemy nation before we can say that the war is really won.

I think that the American people recognize that fact. But the process is a long, tedious and exacting one. It requires an army of many men. And that army of many men can be continuously and adequately supplied for another year only by the Selective Service Act. If the act is not extended beyond the next month, when it would otherwise expire, we face these alternatives: Either we shall have to keep men indefinitely in foreign lands who are justly entitled to come home to their own country and their own families; or we shall turn our backs upon the enemy before the victory is finally assured.

Justice to the men still in the armed forces, to all our people, and to civilization itself forbids the choice of either of these alternatives. And the Congress, I am sure, will not choose either.

The third essential of a strong America is a program of universal training. Let us understand this clearly. Universal training is not conscription. It does not mean that our young men would have to serve in the Army or Navy for any period during peacetime. They remain citizens and civilians.

What is proposed is that each individual train for a period during which he can be fitted by his Nation to take his place if war unhappily should ever come again.

It is no answer to say that we do not need a large Army in the atomic age. No one knows yet precisely what we do need—in terms of infantry, pilots, paratroopers, ships, radar, planes, rockets, or bombs.

We do know, however, that modern war calls for the total mobilization of all men and all energies. We know, too, that we are not likely again to be given 2 years or more by heroic allies to get set and ready. Next time, if there is a next time, we are likely to be the first target.

And so at short notice, each man must be ready to take his place and go forward—not at the end of a few months, or a few years, but immediately. Otherwise it will be too late.

There is only one way that each man will be ready in that sense. That way is by his having been trained ahead of time. He will not be trained to do things which are obsolete. He will be trained to do only whatever is required in modern warfare. A nation whose people want it to be a leader, to be a bulwark against tyranny and oppression, surely cannot expect less of its people than that they be made ready to fight or to work to preserve the Nation.

Unification of the armed forces, extension of the Selective Service Act, and a universal training program—those are the keystones which hold the promise of a strong nation. Each is by itself of great importance. In combination, they are essential for us to maintain our leadership and to permit us to fulfill our destiny of leading the way to peace and freedom.

For the desire for peace and freedom is the very root of our foreign policy.

I have stated my understanding of the fundamental foreign policy of the United States in New York City on Navy Day last, and in my message to the Congress delivered January 21, 1946. That policy remains the same today. It is based squarely upon righteousness as we see it, and it definitely rejects any prospective advantage to ourselves.

The immediate objective of the foreign policy of the United States now is to support the United Nations Organization to the utmost.

It is my conviction that the Security Council of the United Nations Organization now meeting in New York City, is fully capable of reaching agreements between the peoples of the world—however different their traditions and philosophies, and however divergent their interests may be. The essential requirements to that end are that its member nations follow the dictates of justice, that they consider and respect the legitimate aspirations and needs of their fellow members, and that they avoid that selfish desire for individual advantage that is stimulated by opportunity and by military superiority over other nations.

All citizens of the United States, worthy of the honor of that citizenship, are determined to preserve our present form of government. They will not interfere in any way with the governments of other peace-loving people.

The people and the Government of the United States desire peace based on enlightened justice. Our peaceful aspirations are embodied in our outlook, our philosophy, our very way of life.

But peace is not a reward granted to those who cherish it; it must be pursued, unceasingly and unwaveringly, by every means at our command, with imagination, ingenuity, and insight. Peace is decidedly not the preservation of the status quo; it is not merely the absence of war; it is the presence, rather, of order with justice.

In the pursuit of peace there is no single path.

We must have a policy to guide our relations with every country in every part of the world. No country is so remote from us that it may not some day be involved in a matter which threatens the peace. It is well to remember that the First World War began in Serbia; that the peace of Versailles was first broken in Manchuria; and that the Second World War began in Poland. Our foreign policy must be universal.

In the Far East our program for peace is designed to combat and remedy the conditions that made it possible for Japan to turn upon her neighbors. We have demilitarized Japan and are promoting reforms which we hope will bring into being a democratic and peaceful nation. But the control and reform of Japan is only a beginning. We must take other and more positive steps to create conditions of peace in the Far East.

Our foreign policy rests on the conviction that the cause of peace is served by the spread of democratic government and the institutions of human freedom. Where the people are sovereign, there we shall find loyal allies in defense of the peace. We believe that self-government is good insurance against war. We believe that peoples who govern their own affairs by democratic methods will prefer peaceful settlement of differences with their neighbors by the democratic machinery of the United Nations.

In the Far East, as elsewhere, pursuant to this policy, we shall encourage the growth and spread of democracy and civil liberties.

In Korea, we are even now working with our Soviet allies and with Korean leaders to bring into being a provisional democratic government, and to speed the day when Korea will again take her place as an independent and democratic nation.

In China we are supporting a free and democratic government. Through the wise counsel of General Marshall the Chinese leaders are on the road to achieve political unity by peaceful democratic processes.

The Philippine Commonwealth will, on July 4 next, become a fully sovereign and independent nation.

In southeast Asia, we encourage the peaceful settlement of the differences that have arisen between the peoples of that area and the colonial sovereigns. We view with hope, not fear, the growth of the democratic spirit among these people, as among all peoples.

The young roots of democracy, however, will not draw much nourishment from a soil of poverty and economic distress. It is a part of our strategy of peace, therefore, to assist in the rehabilitation and development of the far eastern countries. We seek to encourage a quick revival of economic activity and international trade in the Far East. To do that we stand ready to extend credits and technical assistance to keep building peace.

We recognize that the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth, and other nations have important interests in the Far East. We expect recognition by them that we also have important interests in that area. We expect understanding on their part that our objectives are dedicated to the pursuit of peace.

The Near East and Middle East comprise an area which presents grave problems. This area contains vast natural resources of enormous value. It lies across the most convenient routes of land, air, and water communications between the west and the east. It is consequently an area of great strategic importance. In this area there are a number of friendly sovereign states, members of the United Nations. They are not strong enough individually or collectively to withstand armed aggression on the part of any great power.

It is easy to see, therefore, how the Near and Middle East might become an arena of intense rivalry between outside powers, and how such rivalry might suddenly erupt in armed conflict. No country, great or small, however, has reasonable and bona fide interests in the Near and Middle East which cannot be reconciled with the interests of other nations through the use of the machinery of the United Nations. The United Nations have a right to insist that the sovereignty and integrity of the countries of the Near and Middle East must not be threatened by coercion or penetration.

If peace is to be preserved and strengthened in this important section of the world, however, we cannot be content merely to assure self-government and independence. The people of the Near and Middle East are beginning to realize that if they are to occupy a place in world affairs they will have to develop their resources, widen their educational opportunities, and raise their standards of living.

The United States will contribute its share in helping the economic and cultural development of the Near and Middle East.

The face of Europe today is twisted in the pain of hunger and privation.

The economic reconstruction of Europe is first of all a task for the people and governments of Europe.

Help from outside, however, will both quicken the pace of reconstruction and reduce the cost in human misery. The United States is in a position to help; we are helping now; and we shall continue to help. We shall help because we know that we ourselves cannot enjoy prosperity in a world of economic stagnation; we shall help because economic distress, anywhere in the world, is a fertile breeding ground for violent political upheaval; but we shall help, most of all, because we feel it the duty of simple humanitarianism to lend a hand to our friends and allies who are convalescing from wounds inflicted by the common enemy.

Food is Europe's most critical need. It is not enough to share our surpluses, for to share surpluses is not really to share at all. No worthy American will hesitate to reduce his own consumption of food, when the food so released will avert starvation abroad.

Next to food, Europe's greatest need is for machinery and raw materials to rehabilitate her transportation systems, her mines, and her factories. We have been supplying these products to Europe on long-term credit, and we shall continue to do so.

I hope we shall soon be able by liberal loans to speed recovery in Europe and bring about an ever-expanding trade.

We seek to lay the groundwork of a world trading system which will strengthen and safeguard the peace. We want no return to narrow economic nationalism which poisoned international relations and undermined living standards between the two wars.

In settling our lend-lease accounts, we have resolved that allied war debts shall not be permitted this time to clog the the channels of trade for years to come. We shall work unceasingly in behalf of the principles of equal opportunity in world trade, because closed economic blocs, in Europe or anywhere in the world, can only lead to the impoverishment and isolation of the people who inhabit it.

We shall press for the elimination of artificial barriers to international navigation, in order that no nation, by accident of geographic location, shall be denied unrestricted access to sea ports and international waterways.

We shall measure the success of our foreign policy by its effectiveness in safeguarding the peace. We have no interest in face-saving or verbal victories. Where we are shown to be wrong, we shall yield. Where reasonable adjustment will serve the lasting interests of peace, no nation will find us stubborn. Where yielding or compromise will imperil the peace, we shall be unyielding—even obstinate. This Nation will never trifle with the peace. We shall pursue it with every bit of wisdom, earnestness, and doggedness that we possess.

We shall do our share to make impossible a revival of the barbarian philosophy of the Nazi and Fascist aggressors. We believe that the people of Germany, Japan, and their satellites, by their freely expressed choice, when they are finally purged of their false leaders and false philosophies, will form peaceful governments that can be fully accepted into the family of civilized nations. We shall give them every encouragement and every practical assistance in choosing and setting up such governments, and in preparation for acceptance into the family of friendly nations.

The cause of international peace will be advanced if all states in good standing in the society of peaceful nations have access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world. This is especially true of petroleum products which in this mechanized age are necessary to the life of industrial states. For too often in th past, the matter of oil has disturbed and threatened the peace of the world, chiefly because of monopoly control imposed by certain states on areas beyond their own borders. Agreements should be made by the nations concerned to make such petroleum resources as are available for export accessible on equal terms to all users. There is no reason why the question of oil cannot be disposed of equitably by calm and peaceful discussion.

In the interest of improved general European living conditions and in the interest of the preservation of peace, these agreements on commerce and transportation and raw materials should be reached without delay—not by force or show of arms—but by getting around a conference table. I am sure these agreements can be made.

The United States intends to prevent war coming to the Western Hemisphere from abroad by joining with the other sovereign republics of America in a regional pact to provide a common defense against attack. The American Republics propose to settle differences between the nations of the Western Hemisphere as good neighbors by consultation in the common cause of peace and national well being—consultation in which all of them will have equal representation.

In many quarters it is thought that the existence of the atomic bomb is a constant threat to the peace of the world. It need not be. The atomic bomb should no longer be used for destruction. It should be our objective to develop and employ atomic energy for peaceful purposes in industry by all the peaceful peoples of the world. I feel confident that the United Nations Organization will succeed in obtaining an agreement by its member nations to prohibit and outlaw the use of atomic bombs.

I do not want to appear overoptimistic about the future of the world in the face of the grave problems which lie ahead. But I certainly am not pessimistic about the future. In fact I have great confidence that there is no international problem which cannot be solved if there is the will to solve it, the willingness to understand the other fellows' point of view, and the desire to sit down and confer and negotiate. The danger comes when negotiation gives way to force and unilateral action.

We attained overwhelming victory in close union with the freedom-loving and peace-loving nations of the world. In the same kind of union with them, and with the help of the same heroic men and women who won the war and whom we honor today we can attain a lasting peace.

Win the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Dowagiac Daily News of April 6, 1946, published at Dowagiac, Mich., comes an editorial which concisely and clearly expresses much better than I have been able to some of the things I have been saying, expresses some of the thoughts I have been trying to express during the past 5 years. It is worth your attention—read it:

To us no greater sabotage of the ideals of the United States could be exemplified than in the program of the so-called win-the-peace conference. They recommend that we take the initiative in friendly negotiations with Russia instead of creating situations which appear to be aimed at embarrassment of the Soviet Union. They want the loan to Russia, the sharing of the atomic bomb. They ask repudiation of the Churchill idea of an Anglo-American alliance. They want us to halt the manufacture of atom bombs, and hand over its information to the UN and place atomic energy development under civilian control. They want draft extension and compulsory military training defeated. They want MacArthur "one-man rule" of Japan ended and the emperor tried as a war criminal. They want all problems submitted to the UN and that we quit "unilateral action." That we strive for complete independence of India and withdraw our troops thence. That our delegation on the Security Council "demand the removal of all interventionary forces in Indonesia." They want to get rid of Hoover as head of the famine committee and want us to take action against Franco. Nice program, indeed, we take responsibility for all the world. The loudest Russophile seemed to be Senator PEPPER. It takes all kinds to make up a world, but there ought to be a limit on the exploitation of human credulity. The most damaging element in this country today is the group following the communistic line, which is trying to create dissension, to discredit American policies and activities, trying to take us for a ride and sell us down the river for a bunch of saps. This outfit is well entrenched all through existing governmental agencies, in the unions, and in politics. It is a fellow traveler crew of supposedly high intelligence which would deliver us body and soul to the ideologies of international thinking without a single protective device to save us when idealism cracks up. Heaven help us. And they profess to be Americans.

Having read and digested the foregoing, do you not agree with me that our first duty is to our own people, to the preservation of our own form of government, toward strengthening our own national defense, so that no nation, no group of nations, will venture to attack us?

Concurrent Resolution Demanding Non-recognition of the Independence of Trans-Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the treaty between Great Britain and Emir Abdullah purporting to recognize Trans-Jordan as a sovereign and independent state serves nobody's interests except Britain's. It makes of Trans-Jordan not an independent state but a vassal state. England is using Trans-Jordan as a facade for her Empire demands in the Levant. She reads the handwriting on the wall. Except for a handful of men to guard the canal, she will have to withdraw from Egypt.

Never in history has a treaty between two countries been so quickly consummated. Under the terms of the treaty Trans-Jordan is to provide facilities for the training and movement of British troops and her communications are to be developed with British money and with British technicians. Trans-Jordan's Arab League will be trained and commanded by Britain's Arabophile John Baggot Glubb.

What manner of independence is this? The desert Bedouin Arabs of Trans-Jordan will continue in their starved feudal existence while Abdullah wallows in luxury.

In defiance of the League of Nations instrument creating the mandate over Palestine which includes Trans-Jordan in further defiance of the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, and in violation of article 80 of the United Nations Charter, Britain took it upon herself to confer unilaterally independence upon Trans-Jordan which is inextricably a part of the whole Palestine mandate. While the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine is now deliberating upon its findings made in course of its investigations, Britain sabotages that inquiry by presenting it with the independence of Trans-Jordan as a fait accompli.

Ironically taxes collected by Britain from Palestinians will be used to support British military might in Trans-Jordan.

The United States and the members of the United Nations should certainly not clothe with legality by any act of recognition the illegal establishment by Great Britain of the independence of Trans-Jordan.

A copy of the resolution follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States Government withhold recognition of Trans-Jordan as an independent state, and that it condemn such action of the Government of Great Britain for its violation of the solemn terms of the mandate over Palestine which includes Trans-Jordan, its violation of the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, which protects the rights of American citizens in all of Palestine, including Trans-Jordan, and which precludes unilateral infractions of its terms by the parties signatory, and for its violation of the United Nations Charter.

That the attempted bestowal of independence upon Trans-Jordan is contrary to the purpose of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

That the United States Government request all members of the United Nations to refuse recognition of the independence of Trans-Jordan.

United Nations League of Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "The Alternative," delivered at the initial conference of the United Nations League of Lawyers, in Washington, D. C., on March 30, 1946, by Associate Justice Wiley Rutledge of the United States Supreme Court, who was introduced by Col. Heber H. Rice, secretary-general of the league, 5 Taylor Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

It is for me a high privilege to have a small part in launching the United Nations League of Lawyers. If the moment is not altogether propitious, that only furnishes more compelling reason for the effort.

The world is just emerging from its most violent and destructive conflict. No man or nation has come out unscathed. Six years of mass destruction, of men and of the resources by which they live, have destroyed populations and laid waste vast regions. Hunger and disease stalk in the wake of war. At best we can ward off only a portion of their toll. Sheer physical existence presents problems of a scale and difficulty more gigantic perhaps than at any past period.

The toll of destruction is not only in lives and fortunes—national and individual. It is not merely in pain and suffering. It has come, too, in the impairment of our old securities and of the institutions by which they were maintained. War cannot be democratic. It cannot regard the individual human being, his dignity and worth, and their preservation, as the end of the state's existence. It may be, and at times must be, fought to preserve the chance for those ideals to return to primacy. It cannot be fought in a manner which makes the fighting itself effective otherwise than in great measure to impair them.

All of this might have been avoided. There was a time, after the last world conflict, when the world might have been brought into a structure of law. That opportunity slipped away. Men and nations were blind to the necessity, but not without warning. They refused to see that the choice was between the rule of law and the rule of force. They believed in the illusion of old securities. They thought men could be free, though nations were unrestrained by any law save the will of their own leaders. They had no vision and the people perished. They perish today.

Much has been said of why the last World War was fought. This, in my judgment, was the essential reason: Neither men nor nations would face squarely the fact that our world, as it was then, is now, and ever shall be, had but one alternative—to establish the rule of justice through law universally, for all nations and all men, or to succumb to the rule of sheer force, universally, for all nations and all men.

That alternative remains. There is no escape. Time again becomes the essence of decision. Events will not wait. Now as before the work of justice, of law and of peace must be done. It must be done before the moment of opportunity slips away. It must be done while moods and memories are fresh with the suffering which brings the determination not for revenge, but for justice and with this the will to establish it.

This is preeminently work for the lawyer. His are the ways of adjustment and adjudication. His methods mobilize force behind the right, not to overthrow it. His ideal is to decide by reason, not by physical power. At least once the lawyers of the world let pass, in timidity and division, the chance to establish justice, to form a more perfect and embracing union, to insure both domestic and international tranquillity, to provide for the common defense of mankind, and to secure the blessings of liberty not only to ourselves and our posterity but to all the generations of the earth.

We have that chance once again. If it be missed, there can be no more than a breathing spell until other and greater horrors break upon the world unawares. Your effort is token that lawyers now purpose that this shall not happen.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on April 4 there was submitted to me by a commentator, a series of questions to be answered over the radio through Station WTAG at Worcester, Mass. These questions related to various phases of the atomic bomb problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have the questions and answers printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I mention the date because more and more information on this subject is developing daily, and some of the replies might be modified or changed since the date named.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Is there any special interest in the atomic bomb among the Members of the Congress?

Answer. There is exceedingly great interest, especially in regard to the problems of secrecy, national defense, and international control. The first impression, and it is a lasting impression, of those who have studied these problems in connection with the atomic bomb, is one of fear. All students of atomic energy are shocked and horrified at the tremendous destructive character of atomic energy.

Question. What is the objection to a policy of secrecy and suppression concerning the atomic bomb?

Answer. Such a policy would probably result in other governments putting pressure upon their scientists to develop atomic energy for destructive purposes only. Such a policy would so restrict scientists, not only in this country, but also in other countries, that the practical applications of atomic energy to peacetime uses would be delayed immeasurably. Scientific knowledge concerning atomic energy in general would be retarded.

Question. Is there any likelihood of adequate defense against the atomic bomb?

Answer. No. Even if we expected attack and if all the defenses were alerted, some atomic bombs would be detonated on or over our cities. The bombs can be carried by plane or rocket. We might be forced to defend ourselves against thousands of the bombs in the air at the same time. Antiaircraft defense cannot be 100-percent effective. Yet death and destruction for an entire city can come from a single plane. This single plane armed with one atomic bomb can cause the defenses of an area to be overwhelmed.

Defense against a surprise attack would be extremely costly and not completely effective. In the case of a sudden attack, it might be difficult even to know from what country the bombs were launched.

There is no scientific reason why atomic bombs cannot be shipped in trunks or boxes in peacetime to key industrial and population centers and detonated at the moment desired by remote control wireless or other means. Atomic bombs last for a long time after they are made and can be stored or hidden with slight possibility of detection.

Scientists do not foresee any defense against atomic warfare.

Question. In the event of an atomic war, what measures must be taken in order to survive?

Answer. In order to survive atomic war, we must resort to three different types of activities. These are: (1) measures for active defense; (2) measures for passive defense; (3) measures for an offensive.

To defend ourselves actively, we must provide for antiaircraft defense to the best of our ability, even though we know there is no entirely adequate defense. Thus we must do our best to detect the approach of enemy planes or missiles to our shores. Upon detecting such an approach we must do what we can to intercept and destroy these planes or missiles.

We must also resort to such passive defense measures as going underground and dispersing our industries as well as our population. In a mass atom bomb attack both measures must be taken. Vital defense industry plants and bomb making plants must be underground.

We must also launch an offensive atom bomb attack against the enemy.

The best defensive, however, is to build a world without war.

Question. What the possible economic or peaceful uses of atomic energy?

Answer. The development of atomic energy as a new source of industrial power has been much discussed. However, there are many problems to be solved before we can make practical use of atomic power. Coal and petroleum are, at present, our chief fuels. Water power has been so harnessed that we can provide electricity in large amounts for industrial, commercial, and domestic use. Atomic fuel or power must compete economically with the existent fuels and sources of power. The various fuel and plant costs must be considered. The problem of putting atomic energy to practical use is difficult and complex. The day of atomic power stations or atomic heating plants is not yet here nor will it come suddenly. However, it is along these lines that scientists are seeking to put atomic energy to practical use.

Question. What about the bill pending before the Congress permitting a large number of naval ships of various types and character to be used in atomic bomb tests in the Pacific Ocean?

Answer. There is a bill of this kind pending, and it has already passed the House. The purpose of the experiment is to test the effect of the atomic bomb against naval vessels in order to get information that will possibly require changes in: (1) ship design; (2) tactical formations at sea and anchoring distances in port; (3) number and location of operating bases and stations; (4) strategic disposition of ships. Incidentally, the tests are designed: to give information on the effect of the atomic bomb against aircraft, both airborne and grounded, and upon a wide variety of military ground weapons and equipment; to learn more of the varied effects of the atomic bomb against living beings, in order to provide much needed information upon protection, early diagnosis, and treatment of personnel who may hereafter be exposed to atomic explosions in war or peace; to get further information of general scientific value and phenomena accompanying atomic explosions.

Question. What suggestions have been made as to what the United States should do about control of the atomic bomb?

Answer. One suggestion has been made that, since possession of the atomic bomb makes the United States stronger than any other nation, we should not inform other countries as to how atomic bombs can be made. However, such a policy would lead to an atomic armament race.

Another suggestion is that the nations of the world should outlaw the use of atomic bombs. The outlawing of weapons has never been effective. Nations which agree not to use atomic bombs must also agree not to make them.

Another suggestion is that an international group, such as the United Nations, have control of all atomic-bomb developments. International control will, of course, require an efficient inspection system.

The best way I know to deal with the atomic-bomb problem is to banish war.

Question. How much would the proposed test of the atomic bomb at sea with naval vessels cost?

Answer. Exaggerated statements have been made as to the cost of the proposed test. The actual elements of cost are: (1) the pay and food, for about 6 months, of the crews of the target ships and a few operating ships previously scheduled for the inactive fleet; (2) the maintenance of these ships for the same period; (3) the scrap value of these obsolete or otherwise surplus ships actually destroyed in the tests, plus the value, as fighting ships, of the few modern vessels sunk, if any; (4) the cost of repairs to a few modern ships damaged; (5) the ammunition and fuel destroyed by fire or explosion; (6) the fuel and transportation costs of the operation.

The obsolete or surplus ships to be used in the tests originally cost approximately $425,000,000. Of course, their value at the present is very much below this.

The Navy Department claims that the total cost of the tests will only be a few percent of the annual naval appropriations, and will probably not exceed the cost of one large new ship. That would be approximately $100,000,000—a large amount of this would be expended anyway in the operation of the ships on a peacetime basis.

The lessons learned may save many ships and many lives.

Question. What effect is the discovery and the use of the atomic bomb going to have upon the Army and Navy of the future?

Answer. The Army will still need its existent arms and services. The Air Force and Ground Force must be equipped with the latest and best weapons of all types, including atomic weapons. Our Air and Ground Forces must be mobile. They must be able to go into action immediately from a peacetime basis. Of course, they must rely upon being dispersed and upon being underground for defense against atom bomb attack.

Those nations that have navies will still need them for protection of commerce at sea, for protection of distant bases and outposts, for prevention of piracy, and for protection against enemy naval vessels. It might be necessary to alter the types of naval vessels in use. It might even be necessary to travel underseas only.

The determine the answers to such questions preparations are being made by the Army and Navy for the atom bomb tests in the Pacific.

The atomic explosion experiences at Nagasaki and Hiroshima, as well as on the desert of New Mexico, demonstrated somewhat the destructive effects of an atomic bomb being detonated on or over land. We do not know what effects the explosion of atom bombs will have upon vessels, naval or commercial.

If tests are conducted, we would be less uncertain about the plans for protection.

Question. Can the atomic bomb be kept a secret?

Answer. The fundamental principles of the atomic bomb were known to all scientists by 1939. The United States has two categories of secrecy concerning the bomb: (1) Technical tricks of manufacture and final assembly of the bomb itself; (2) a mass of information, acquired in the last 5 years, about artificial radio activity, the biological effects of radiation, and other scientific topics bearing only indirectly on the production of atomic bombs.

The first category, namely, technical tricks of manufacture and the final assembly of the bomb itself, should not be released to individual nations, because instructing a particular nation how to make atomic bombs will not further world peace. However, it is agreed that any industrial nation can learn these technical tricks in a few years. Any information that should be divulged in regard to the atomic bomb should go only to international agencies capable of controlling atomic bombs. Certain other information about the atomic bomb should be released because it would benefit medicine, biology, engineering, and industry. It is essential to progress in physics and chemistry.

Question. Has a committee of the Congress been appointed to study the question of atomic energy? What is the present status of any proposed legislation?

Answer. Yes. A special committee of Senators have been studying this question, and they are about to make a report to the Senate. The proposal is that a control commission composed of civilians be appointed to make decisions concerning the use and control of atomic energy within the United States. The bill also provides for a military liaison committee appointed by and subject to the Secretaries of War and Navy. If the members of the military liaison committee think that any decisions of the civilian control commission jeopardize national defense, the military liaison committee may appeal to the Secretaries of War or Navy, who in turn may appeal to the President. It is felt that this bill, as it now stands, assures civilian control of the development and use of atomic energy while providing for the proper relation of the military to the atomic problem.

The Senate committee is also working on a plan for international atom control. The committee has begun hearings on the State Department plan for international atom control by the United Nations.

The State Department plan is intended to be the basis for any international proposals made by the United States representative to the United Nations Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy.

The plan assumes that no nation can have a permanent monopoly on atomic weapons. Therefore, it is proposed to provide for United Nations control of the mining of uranium and thorium wherever these substances may be found. So far as is known, control of uranium and thorium is tantamount to control of atomic weapons production.

The international plan is not intended to restrict the research and production efforts of individual nations with respect to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The Theater Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. S. H. Fabian, president of the American Theaters Association, at the convention of the association in St. Louis, Mo., on April 1, and preceding it a brief statement with reference to the occasion when the address was delivered.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is not generally realized that there are 16,500 motion-picture houses in the United States. This group comprises one of the largest and most important elements in American small business.

In order to be of service to their country during the war, these theater owners organized for the first time—Nation-wide—into a wing of the war-activities committee of the motion-picture industry.

With the single exception of banks, they sold more Government bonds than any other group. During the war they collected more than $36,000,000 for relief and charitable endeavors. They collected blood plasma, scrap metals, and paper.

Recognizing these and other contributions, President Truman indicated to War Mobilization and Reconversion Director Snyder his interest in eliciting the continuing cooperation of the theaters during the reconversion period.

And the theaters have responded. They have just organized the American Theaters Association at a meeting at St. Louis, attended by some 200 representatives from every State in the Union.

Mr. S. H. Fabian, chairman of the theater division of the War Activities Committee throughout the war, heads the new association. Mr. T. R. Gamble, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and National Director of the War Finance Division during the war, has agreed to serve as the association's board chairman.

Because Mr. Fabian's address at St. Louis states so clearly the tremendous value of this new organization, its social and educational potentialities, I have asked that it be printed in the RECORD.

ADDRESS OF S. H. FABIAN, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN THEATERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, fellow exhibitors, it has become my lot to present to you a statement of the aims, purposes, and hopes that underlie this meeting. This is a responsibility that I would gladly cede to more skillful hands, for my feelings concerning the importance of the issues that have brought us together are too sharp and deep to enable me to treat them with the detached objectivity that I would like to achieve. Four years as chairman of the War Activities Committee, working in intimate association with men in this room—watching them put into our Nation's war effort the power of their united zeal—has left me humble and in awe of the strength of exhibitors joined together for public good. It has made me fanatic in my hope that this power and understanding born of union may be preserved. If, however, the depth of my feelings disqualifies me, I know it does us all, for as I have gone among you, I find that you echo my ambitions, hopes, and dreams concerning the future of our industry. I hope you will listen to me, therefore, as one who is endeavoring to put into words the thoughts imparted to me by you, and by others of our colleagues who are not with us today.

The record of our industry during the war is history. Our files are crammed with documentation of this accomplishment. It requires no further delineation by me. The voices that have been raised in praise and gratitude from the ranks of government and the ranks of our citizenry carry such authority as to make redundant any review or repetition at this date. From the past let us merely take guidance; to the future let us direct our thoughts and strength.

We look back briefly for guidance and we see several fundamental and impressive points of experience:

(a) We see exhibitors united for the first time in the annals of our industry.

(b) We see an organization that served as a bulwark against outside pressures and as a conduit through which our war work moved in an orderly and systematic manner.

(c) We see a new esprit de corps created among theater men—a new pride in their efforts in the national interest.

(d) We see theater men emerging with a new dignity and standing in their communities. The war is now over. Our industry is presented with alternatives.

1. Shall we go our separate ways in disunity and confusion? or

2. Shall we contrive a method whereby the unity of the war years and its products may be salvaged for our future well-being?

Theater men everywhere have been spontaneous in their urging that the War Activities Committee should graduate to a new organization in which every exhibitor, regardless of size, affiliation, or association ties would be welcome and in which the best interests of every exhibitor would be served.

The creation of this organization is the important business before us today. Every exhibitor in the country by specific or published invitation has been encouraged to be here to assist us in our deliberations.

I feel at this point I should voice a number of assurances for the record. There is no intention or desire to deprive individual exhibitors of their independent right to operate their businesses in their own best interests without interference or coercion.

There is no intention to dominate intra-industry matters, clearance, distributor-exhibitor relations or other internal trade practices.

There is no intention to give away our screens; there is every intention of protecting our screens against selfish, subversive, or other harmful use.

There is no intention of permitting producer affiliated theaters to dominate or dictate policy or action; there is every intention to insure a truly representative character for the group which alone can promise success for our undertaking.

There is no intention that this proposed organization should be in disparagement of or in conflict with efficient national, State,

and city exhibitor organizations now functioning.

So much for our negative objectives. The sense of this body will probably add to those I have mentioned.

Our positive objective in general will be to constitute the theaters of this country as a national institution of dignity, of influence and of responsibility.

The specific objectives within this framework can be gathered, I think, into two categories:

A. Public relations.

B. Industry welfare.

A. PUBLIC RELATIONS

The theater is a firmly rooted institution. It has been so for decades. It still suffers, however, from the inheritance of the day of strolling players, carnivals, circuses, turkey troupes; and the irresponsibilities of the racket-minded drawn to our business not through devotion to it, but for quick gain. The public-relations problem remains a challenging one. How to bring the theater to its proper estate: to bring recognition to the greatest medium for the visual exposition of events, internally toward and by members of the industry and toward the public. These divisions of necessity overlap, but for purposes of discussion can be separated.

1. Internal: The internal operation is fundamental. The industry cannot adequately present the true values of the theater as a public institution to the country in general unless the mass of its members are made sharply conscious of the instrumentality for public good they hold in their hands and are militantly proud of their association with it and humbly aware of their great responsibility. This phase of our program would have many facets.

(a) Self-examination leading to appraisal of strong points and weaknesses, the good and the real or potential evils, inherent to the theaters and its operation. For example, how few theater operators know how high in the esteem of credit men are theater loans and the extremely low default rate? How many theater operators remember the importance of their charity work in the impressive proportions it has assumed during the past few years? How many theater operators realize that their institution in most communities exceeds any other business enterprise, by most standards in tangible, provable public influence for good? They should be made aggressively aware and proud of this standing.

(b) Parcel of this internal program might be consideration of a self-imposed code of ethics for theaters in their relations with the public, standards of safety, of sanitation, of comfort for the public.

(c) The internal program might encompass awards to industry members for outstanding achievement within the industry.

(d) It might include plaques of recognition for and compliance with the standards decided upon.

(e) It might include an educational program to improve the knowledge of new members (and old) concerning good business methods, pitfalls, good and dangerous practices—in a broader sense engender within the industry keener appreciation of the theater, its product, its traditions, and the great force it must be in the world community of the future. By this educational program could emerge an improved awareness that the theaters' welfare is synchronized with the communities' welfare: and the recognition that public issues, however broad, include a responsibility by the theater owner to be informed and to be prepared to take a position concerning them.

(f) A social program to develop among the industry a sense of oneness, sympathy, and fraternity.

(g) A program for passing on the appropriateness and wisdom of public interest screen subjects.

2. External. The public relations involved in contacts and relationship with the nontheater world flow naturally from those relationships and standards sought within the industry. They would run the gamut from personal activity of industry members to identify themselves as persons with social and civic life, to the broad group moves involving the mobilization of industry strength in support of worthy public projects or in defeat of projects inimical to public interest. The establishment of improved personal relationships and responsibilities to the community can be expected as a normal premium to the unity which we hope will develop from the union of industry members and as their pride in their association and objectives grow.

The broad group moves would include a portfolio of activities and interests limited only by the discretion of the association (conference, congress); among others it could include such items as:

(A) Participation in public charity projects—this would include determination of industry leadership, methods, goals, motivation, publicity, and general control.

(B) Government cooperation—use of screens for Government subjects.

(C) Use of theaters and facilities for public cooperation unclassified.

(D) Public endorsement or opposition of the industry to public matters not selfishly related to the industry but of such character as to recommend the industry's interest and strength, in their determination, viz, full employment, public health, housing, and other public matters in which leaders of other industries have been heard but concerning which our industry has been silent.

(E) Donations to charity by the industry.

(F) Establishment of scholarships by our industry.

(G) Awards to citizens for outstanding contributions to peace, science, and the arts.

(H) Institutional advertising.

(I) Institutional radio programs.

(J) Awards to writers for outstanding stories.

(K) Awards to motion-picture producers for outstanding production.

This category would be limited only by the imagination and judgment of the membership of the organization. It would be so conceived as to identify the theaters as being in the business of community and national building, and not as an institution to become vocal only when its interests or those of its members are in issue.

In charity drives, fund raising, and other public projects, it should emerge as a planning agency and not merely a group of convenient collection plates for others to use. In representation on matters of general public welfare, its presentation and advocates should set a standard as the best. Particularly effective can the industry be in convincing the world that even when there is no ax to grind, in the lobbying sense, industry opinion is sound and a force to be taken into account in the settlement of matters joint to us all. If the industry takes a sound, logical, statesmanlike position on matters not in its immediate interest, its voice carries added conviction. When industry welfare becomes endangered, its advocates will gain credence by the sound background for temperance and reasoning it will have established.

The second great category I have mentioned affects—

B. INDUSTRY WELFARE

1. The theater, by its contact with the millions of people, offers a convenient and relatively hidden conduit for politicians to tap the pocketbooks of the people. The normal resistances to taxation are not asserted in the case of admission taxes. Such taxes receive little public attention until they are in effect. The theater owner and operator must assume the duty of protecting his business and his customers by watching the trends toward extortionate taxes and combating them as far as possible. The theater owner as such has neutralized himself as a politician insofar as the use of his theater is involved. The screens of the country must so remain. It remains then for the owners themselves to be vigilant and to prepare systematically and efficiently and in unity for the protection of the industry and the public in matters of industry welfare and public welfare.

2. It would be within the province of the organization to study and assert distinguished advocacy in legislative, governmental, and other matters affecting the industry and its operation. These matters would include (among other things): Taxes, building codes, licensing, censorship, interstate commerce, public health, discriminatory legislation.

The study of developing problems would be done for the entire country. Representation would be made before appropriate bodies on the national level and on the State and local level when the State and localities involved indicate the desirability of such intervention. Thus no conflict would be set up between the national functions and those State and regional organizations which are qualified and willing to bear the responsibility of State and local legislative and other representation and counsel in industry problems that may arise.

CONCLUSION

I have tried to indicate to you collectively the idea of our industry united that I have gleaned from you individually. The points and suggestions I have touched upon are by way of description and not limitation. We see this organization as creating a new force in our national life. Let us not constrict our thinking by precedent. Let us make the precedent here in St. Louis; let us lay the groundwork for our industry to move into a new estate; we are independent thinkers. The independent thinking of our individual members can be blended into unit thinking and action of potency that defies the imagination if we have the courage and resolution to do it.

The work of theater owners and operators is arduous and they meet problems of such variety and intensity as to make the industry truly unique. The theater demands much of those who run it. Theater men, however, accept gladly the responsibilities and vicissitudes inherent in their business. Our devotion to our business, our belief in its unused potential, our hopes for the industry's future, our ambition to blaze new trails lie at the root of our resolve to face the future together, joined in a lasting union of strength and good will. Thank you. [Applause.]

Only True Test of "Due Allowance for Differences in Cost of Delivery" Under Robinson-Patman Act Is Where Seller Nets the Same Prices F. O. B. His Place of Shipment—Should Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, attention is directed to the most important speech delivered by Mr. Walter B. Wooden, assistant general counsel of the

Federal Trade Commission, before the "Robinson-Patman symposium" in New York City to some 259 attorneys of leading corporations on the validity of a delivered price under section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In his address Mr. Wooden clarifies some of the points involved in the Corn Products Refining Co. and Staley Manufacturing Co. cases which ruled that they had violated the Robinson-Patman Act with respect to delivered prices and phantom freight absorption. This was a far-reaching decision. More important than this, however, is his clarification of the meaning under this law of "due allowance for differences in cost of delivery."

Many manufacturers in different industries selling on a delivered price basis will be affected by this interpretation of the act. Under the circumstances this should mean a revamping of sales policies generally, which should prove beneficial to local enterprises and tend to promote a greater diversity of production in more sections of the country in order to provide due allowance.

DUE ALLOWANCE TEST

The Supreme Court, according to the Assistant Chief Counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, recognized that in a system of delivered prices the only measure of the amount of the discrimination and the only test of its existence is to be found in the failure to make due allowance for differences on the cost of delivery.

There can be no discrimination when due allowance is made—

Said Mr. Wooden.

There is always discrimination when due allowance is not made. When due allowance is made the seller nets the same price f. o. b. his place of shipment. When due allowance is not made it reflects itself in varying prices f. o. b. the seller's place of shipment, varying among his respective customers by the exact extent of his failure to make such allowance.

Mr. Wooden also directs attention to the point that "due allowance for differences in cost of delivery" is not present if the delivered price is based on rail freight rates and delivery is made by truck or water. In addition, he discusses the zone rates in an effort to provide such due allowance.

Because of the extreme importance of this issue which is of uppermost importance to small business, I am reproducing herewith Mr. Wooden's speech in full as follows:

It should be understood that the opinions expressed in this paper are only those of the speaker and are not necessarily those of the Federal Trade Commission.

The decisions of the Supreme Court upholding the Federal Trade Commission in the Corn Products and Staley cases have far-reaching import to American industry. They are of particular importance to numerous heavy goods industries which deal in purportedly standardized products quoted at standardized delivered prices. The decisions involve the validity of the delivered prices determined under such systems from the standpoint of price discrimination unlawful under section 2 (a) and independently of the question whether they may also involve systems of collusive price fixing, a thing which has been long known to be unlawful under other statutes. To the extent that such discriminations by individual sellers have substantial, reasonable probability of injuring or preventing competition either among the sellers or among the buyers of the commodity so sold, they may now be challenged and enjoined as unlawful. To what extent such a probability can be demonstrated in the case of particular sellers and particular commodities quoted or sold at delivered prices depends, of course, on the facts of each case and is outside the province of this paper.

One might philosophize at great length upon the social and economic questions that underlie section 2 (a) but it is futile to discuss them here. They were all exhaustively debated in connection with the passage of the original act of 1914 and the amended act of 1936. While section 2 (a) is one of the antitrust laws it was specifically designed to outlaw utilization of one of the traditional tools of monopoly. In so doing it does not prohibit any and all discriminations in price or make such discriminations unlawful per se. Only if and when the effect may be to injure or prevent competition does the prohibition apply. The Federal Trade Commission has always construed this requirement as a necessary part of a prima facie case and as such a burden to be assumed and discharged by the Commission. In that respect the Commission has been more conservative than the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which construed it in the Moss case by way of dictum as the burden of respondent. Such a construction would constitute a very substantial and radical limitation on the right of sellers to make different prices to their different customers. Indeed, except for the element of competition between their customers and the right of refusal to sell, the effect of it would be to give industry in general the status of a public utility required to serve all comers alike.

Few defenders of the competitive system would care to take issue with the philosophy that underlies section 2 (a). Still fewer would care openly to contend that there is anything sacrosanct about delivered prices that would justify their exemption from the general prohibition against price discrimination. At any rate the Supreme Court in the Corn Products and Staley cases held that discrimination in delivered prices was not exempt from the reach of the section. But complete exemption of such discrimination apparently would have resulted had the Court accepted the view urged upon it that basing point systems of delivered prices were exempt. For to the statutory exemption of differences in delivered prices which make only due allowance for differences in cost of delivery there would have been added judicial exemption of differences that do not make such allowance, and what would then be left of delivered price discrimination under the statute thus construed.

The Court, however, recognized that in a system of delivered prices the only measure of the amount of discrimination and the only test of its existence is to be found in the failure to make due allowance for differences in cost of delivery. There can be no discrimination when due allowance is made. There is always discrimination when due allowance is not made. When due allowance is made the seller nets the same price f. o. b. his place of shipment. When due allowance is not made it reflects itself in varying net prices f. o. b. the seller's place of shipment, varying among his respective customers by the exact extent of his failure to make such allowance. In the Corn Products and Staley cases the Court recognized that this failure and the resulting variations in mill net prices included two types of discrimination, one consisting of so-called phantom freight and the other of so-called freight absorption. One reaction among lawyers and industrialists appears to be that probably the phantom-freight type of discrimination can no longer be defended under these decisions, but that the freight-absorption type can perhaps be reconciled with them. Whether that can be done will depend on the factual showing in a given case, but it is difficult to see any basis for the contention that so-called freight absorptions are not the equivalent of price differentials among the seller's customers. Under the Corn Products and Staley cases the range of the discrimination lay between the highest price, which included the largest amount of phantom freight, and the lowest price, which included the largest amount of freight absorption. In the Staley case the largest amount of discrimination shown was 36 cents per hundredweight, of which one-half was freight absorption. So far as effect on competition was concerned it was impossible to show any difference in nature or degree resulting from that one-half as distinguished from the other. And who can quarrel with the thesis that if the 18-cent discrimination represented by freight absorption had the prohibited effect on competition it should be subject to the same condemnation as the 18 cents represented by phantom freight.

In the Staley opinion the Court said that where the price-basing point is distant from the point of production "price discriminations are necessarily involved." It then stated that this is "because * * * the delivered prices * * * usually include an item of unearned or phantom freight or require the absorption of freight with the consequent variations in the seller's net factory prices." The Court then said, "Since such freight differentials bear no relation to the actual cost of delivery, they are systematic discriminations prohibited by section 2 (a), whenever they have the defined effect upon competition" (pp. 750, 751).

There is still another language in the Staley opinion that would be difficult to reconcile with systematic freight absorption.

The Court said that good faith could not be attributed to a seller who "has never attempted to set up a nondiscriminatory system, giving to purchasers, who have the natural advantage of proximity to its plant, the price advantages which they are entitled to expect over purchasers at a distance." (Ibid. p. 757.) The ordinary meaning of those words is that it is a discriminatory system which does not give nearby purchasers "the price advantage which they are entitled to expect over purchasers at a distance." Such words would apply to systematic freight absorption because purchasers with "the natural advantage of proximity" to the plant do pay higher prices than those at a distance and are thus denied what the Court said "they are entitled to expect." In the very next sentence of the Staley opinion the Court stated that "for like reasons" it rejected the argument that the Commission's order could be rendered nugatory by "establishing such a high factory price as always to admit of reductions in order to meet the prices of competitors who are using a Chicago basing point system." (Ibid. p. 757.) Such a hypothetical substitute was characterized as a "practical continuation" of the condemned system and as not being in good faith. Systematic freight absorption necessarily contemplates and requires the establishment of "such a high factory price as always to admit of reductions in order to meet the prices of competitors" who are using a similar system. The defenders of freight absorption frequently rely on the sentence in the opinion beginning "but it does not follow that respondents may never absorb freight when their factory price plus actual freight is higher than their competitor's price," etc. But that sentence is part of the same paragraph from which I have been quoting. Accordingly it can hardly be treated as though it read "it follows that respondents may always absorb freight," etc. For that is exactly what the preceding context shows

the Court thought was not permissible. Even the sentence in question closes with the statement that "there is no discrimination in price" where sellers maintain "a uniform delivered price at all points of delivery." And yet the Court held Staley's prices discriminatory despite the fact that his pricing system was one which "if followed, would produce exact identity in prices of glucose of the several producers when sold in any city of the United States." (*F. T. C.* v. *Staley*, 324 U. S. 751.) By the sentence in question the Court may have been referring to a system of zone delivered prices and if so it was indulging in a bit of dictum.

It is sometimes suggested that the proviso regarding due allowance for differences in cost of delivery does not compel the seller to give the buyer the full benefit of such allowance but permits the seller, in his discretion, to withhold some part of it. Another way of stating it is that it fixes the maximum allowance beyond which the seller may not go.

Let us subject the proposition to critical analysis. In the first place, it is futile to consider the meaning and application of the proviso apart from the substantive provisions of the section. Whatever plausibility the proposition has may be the result of an attempt to analyze the proviso by itself. Of course, it may be readily conceded that discriminations which do not have the adverse effects on competition prescribed by section 2 (a) are not unlawful, and that this is so no matter what form the discriminations may take. This may be conceded whether or not such discriminations reflect a failure to make due allowance for differences in cost of delivery and also without regard to whether they involve the withholding of all or merely a part of such allowance. But wherever the prescribed adverse effects on competition exist and the discriminations are themselves the alter ego of the failure to make due allowance, that failure is the very thing that is illegal. To argue that such failure is any less illegal because it makes less than full allowance for differences in delivery cost is to argue that an illegal result accomplished by illegal means can be defended simply because other means might be still more illegal.

What is "due allowance" for differences in cost of delivery within the meaning of the statute unless it be an allowance that is proportioned mathematically to the difference in delivery costs? Unless the standard of proportion between the difference in price and delivery cost be followed consistently, the effect would be to substitute a maximum standard which is quite another concept than that embodied in the word "due." If one were to put such other concept into words, it would emphasize how different the two concepts are. It would take language something like this: "Nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials in price that do not exceed the differences in cost of delivery," etc. And what is the significance of the word "only," preceding the words "due allowance," unless it be to emphasize that nothing but a proportionate allowance is permissible. The statutory relationship between different prices and different costs is blurred, narrowed, and deprived of its full natural effect when not applied until the allowance exceeds the difference in cost.

The proposition under discussion also seems inconsistent with the practice of so-called freight absorption. By hypothesis the proposition conceded that the proviso does not permit a seller to make more than due allowance for differences in the seller's cost of delivery. If that be true, it would condemn freight absorption, for that is just what freight absorption does. It operates to include in the seller's delivered price a freight factor that is less than the amount of the seller's actual cost of delivery. It thereby makes more than due allowance for that cost and therefore exceeds what the proposition concedes is the maximum allowance.

Moreover, if the proposition were sound, it would provide a plausible defense of the practice of phantom freight. For as among the cities on which phantom freight is imposed, the amounts charged as phantom freight do not exceed the differences in the seller's actual cost of delivery but represent the exact amounts of such difference. The fact is that this is not due allowance to the purchasers at all, but is simply a method by which the seller systematically proportions his discriminations among those from whom phantom freight is collected and which deprives such buyers of any allowance due them under the statute. No acceptance of the proposition under discussion would involve acceptance of what is usually regarded as the most indefensible feature of the basing-point system.

Another point to be considered in connection with the principle of due allowance for differences in cost of delivery is whether it applies to differences in delivery cost arising from different modes of transportation as distinguished from geographical differences resulting from transportation by the same mode. If, for example, delivered prices are figured in terms of rail freight while delivery is actually made by truck or water at a lower delivery cost, how nearly does that failure conform to the standard of due allowance? The only answer that can safely be made is the general one that if such failure has the adverse effects on competition specified in the statute, there seems to be no reason why it should not be treated as unlawful price discrimination under the principles of the Staley and Corn Products cases.

A question frequently asked is what is the status under the Corn Products and Staley cases of zone delivered prices on a specialty product such as a prepared cereal or a toothpaster. So far as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned it is not interested in challenging such prices on the academic ground that they necessarily deprive buyers of the precise amounts of due allowance for differences in cost of delivery which they may be entitled to expect. In the first place it does not appear that such prices could have any adverse effect on competition with other producers of similar products. That would differentiate them materially from delivered prices on a standardized heavy product where the effect is to create identity of such prices among competitors. Specialty goods are usually light in weight, freight costs are relatively low and may even be negligible on a given unit of the product. So any effect on competition even among purchasers of the failure to make due allowance is correspondingly reduced and it may be reduced to what is no more than a theoretical possibility, falling far short of the substantial probability required under the statute. If, however, in a given case, competition among the customers is prevented or injured or there is a substantial and reasonable probability of such result, such price differentials would seem to come within the reason and therefore within the reach and the rule of section 2 (a).

The status under section 2 (a) of zone delivered prices which include an averaged freight factor calculated not only from a place other than place of actual shipment but which is averaged to all destinations within the zone, has not been passed upon by the courts. They have been condemned by the courts in Commission proceedings where they were found to be parts of an unlawful, collusive price-fixing combination, but that is familiar legal doctrine. However, in a proceeding against the lead producers now pending before the Commission the issue is raised whether the use of zone delivered prices involves price discrimination under section 2 (a) by the respective members of that industry, without regard to the existence of collusion among them. This zone case may be considered the counterpart of the Corn Products and Staley cases on basing point discriminations. Like the glucose basing point cases, however, it will turn upon the discriminatory status of systematically varying factory net prices and their effect on price competition among the sellers or among their customers in that particular industry. Measured solely by the standard of due allowance for differences in cost of delivery, however, it would seem that a system of zone delivered prices is even less conformable to that standard than a basing point system. For the basing point system does at least purport to make due allowance for differences in cost of delivery from the basing point. By contrast a zone delivered price, while necessarily calculated from some point taken as a base, although it may or may not be the actual shipping point, ignores completely the differences in cost of delivery from that base to different destinations within the zone.

As a final observation there is one question which cuts to the heart of all delivered price systems that operate to preclude the making of due allowance for differences in cost of delivery. Why are the respective sellers desirous of withholding such allowances from their respective customers? If the real reason, as distinguished from the "good" reasons frequently assigned, is demonstrated to be its effect on preventing or injuring competition either among competitors of the original seller or among his customers, then the legal status of such failure to make due allowance should not be very obscure. The problem becomes obscure only as it becomes difficult to sift out the "good" reasons from what may be the real ones.

Veterans and Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1946, I issued a statement that we were facing a scandal in connection with the disposal of surplus Government property to war veterans. That possible scandal is no longer something which can be ignored. In the past 2 weeks a large New York department store has advertised the sale of new Army trucks and the sale of used Army trucks at prices which are within the established ceiling ranges, but which are far in excess of the cost to them.

Cleveland veterans have informed me that they have been sent to Point Pleasant, W. Va.; Camp Atterbury, Ind.; Sandusky, Ohio; New Castle, Ind.; Dayton, Ohio; Warren, Ohio, and Ravenna, Ohio, seeking trucks in the possession of the WAA. One of these veterans purchased a truck in January and went out to the Plum Brook Ordnance Plant at Sandusky, Ohio. The truck had already been sold to another veteran and was not even available. In order to cover up this inefficiency, the officer authorizing the refund of his money noted that the truck was refused because it was in very poor mechanical condition. This veteran waited 2½ months before receiving the refund of his money. The same man then purchased a second truck which was to be picked up at New Castle, Ind. It was estimated that repairs on this truck would amount to approxi-

mately $150. He did not expect a new truck, but when he saw the truck he found that its front end had been smashed; it had no hood, no grill, no bumpers, no lower control arm support, no ignition, no battery, and the front fenders had been smashed beyond repair. He refused this truck and is now waiting for the $330 which he paid for it. This past week this same veteran went into the WAA office in Cleveland and purchased another truck for $215. This one was supposed to be located at Warren, Ohio. Two days after he purchased it, a local WAA officer informed him that the truck had been sold meanwhile to someone else and was no longer available.

I am informed that, while veterans cannot obtain these trucks, used-car lots in the city have Army trucks available or sale at prices far in excess of what they were supposed to have been sold to veterans. I demand that all sales of the War Assets Administration be certified by responsible officials. There is no reason whatever why Gimbels in New York should be able to obtain 600 new trucks from the War Assets Administration and sell them at $2,900 when veterans for whose benefits many of the regulations of the War Assets Administration were designed cannot have an opportunity to purchase them directly from our Government.

It is no less appalling that used trucks which are unobtainable by most veterans are being offered in the same way. Something is certainly very peculiar, to put it mildly, in this whole mess, and it must be stopped at once. There is no justification whatever for sending veterans hundreds of miles to look at piles of junk after somebody on the inside has had first crack at all the good equipment available.

I propose the following specific steps in order to correct this situation:

First. A complete inventory of all available surplus property should be established at once. If every Government agency which has surplus property for sale were compelled to list all of it within 10 days' time, that inventory would be ready for inspection and use.

Second. An immediate allocation of the available merchandise with a fair division of the best merchandise available, to each State based upon the number of veterans who served in the armed forces from that State, should be established.

Third. Officials of the War Assets Administration in every community should be supplied with a complete day by day inventory of merchandise available for their State and no sale should be made in one community without being cleared through a central office to be sure that one sale only for a particular article would be made.

Fourth. Detailed description of the merchandise should be furnished to each office of the War Assets Administration so that those purchasing the property would have an accurate description of its condition and quality.

Fifth. The system by which veterans are permitted to purchase property after Federal, State, and local agencies and publicly supported institutions should be modified to give them an absolute priority. With public funds available for expenditure by the Federal Government and the State and local governments far more plentiful than the funds available for veterans our servicemen should have the first opportunity to purchase property.

What I am advocating is nothing but honest decency in our treatment of servicemen and intelligent business management in the handling of surplus property. What we have now is neither.

An Honest Columnist Says President Truman Has Succeeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, many an observer of the American scene has remarked on a tendency of the American people to build up a public figure and then tear him down. Only 6 months ago President Harry S. Truman was at the very zenith of public popularity. Then that popularity began to decline, as reflected in opinion polls and in general comment.

Yet President Truman had not changed.

The only thing that had changed was the attitude of certain groups with special interests to protect or promote. The hammer-and-tongs boys had gone after him. No matter what he did, he was attacked and criticized. Yet Harry Truman has gone right ahead with supreme honesty and courage on the course he chose—a course of able and honest administration in a period fraught with vast responsibilities for the future of the world.

President Truman not only has not changed in his efforts to obtain needed legislation in the interest of the country; I am convinced the country has not changed in its faith in him to carry out the policies of the late President Roosevelt. Though Congress has unfortunately failed to pass the bills that President Truman has asked us for, and has urged and advocated, because of Republican opposition aided by a few gentlemen from the Southern States, nevertheless I am hopeful that the people will continue to demand that his legislative program will receive favorable consideration from Congress.

It is, therefore, refreshing to find in one newspaper column an honest and objective estimate of President Truman's administration, published on the eve of the first anniversary of his career in the White House.

Under permission previously granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the column by Tom Stokes, an honest reporter for the United Features Syndicate, printed in Scripps-Howard and many other newspapers on April 10:

This is "be unkind to Truman" week.

The occasion is his first anniversary in the White House, which comes Friday. Consequently, most of those here who make a living by writing for the papers have oiled their typewriters, settled back majestically in their best analyst pose, and let go at the President.

This is a democracy, isn't it?

Some with a flair for economics have drafted pieces about his wage-price policy and labor policies and their inadequacies. Experts on political matters have treated of the widening split in his party, the moral being drawn according to which side of the split you sympathize with. Some have dealt with Truman the man.

It's the fashion—so here goes another.

Nobody has been really mean or unkind to the President because it's practically impossible to be. That tells something about the man, and about his failures in his first year, and his successes; nor can he be unkind to anybody. He's not built that way—which tells something more about him.

It's been a long year because of all that has happened. To Harry Truman it probably seemed like the longest in his life.

It has been a long time since that day when President Roosevelt died at Warm Springs and Mr. Truman came down from the Senate to take the oath. He stepped, first and foremost, into the management of a war which then appeared likely to last much longer in the Pacific than it did.

It seems years since that day 5 months later when the President walked out on the White House lawn with Mrs. Truman to announce the end of the war with Japan.

Yet the distance from that day to this seems even longer when it is measured by the distance from the joyful concord at the dawn of peace among the three allies and their people—this country, Britain and Russia—and the warning issued by the President last week-end to our two chief allies against playing old-fashioned power politics in the Middle East.

It is measured, too, by the happy concord at the end of a terrible war and the discord created by Russia in the United Nations meeting in New York.

Yet, within the year, and this is not to be forgotten, the United Nations was created, ratified by our Senate with only two dissenting voices, and now is a functioning organization, whatever troubles beset it. And so, too, were created the International Bank and International Monetary Fund, now functioning, and so, also, various other agencies for keeping the peace through promoting international stability and welfare.

The distance between that day, when Harry Truman became President, and now, is measured also by the distance between those days when Congress wished him so well and now, when it is fighting him on so many fronts.

We are in an era of great change.

Franklin D. Roosevelt started it in our own domestic economy, not only because he was so intentioned, but because he had to. He rode the storm.

Harry Truman is the victim of the transition, for it is still going on. He inherited it. Never was the clash so sharp between what, politically, is called the right and the left. Extremists are making the big noises.

On the right are those who would take us back to that age for which Vincent Youmans created his most enticing songs, the hilarious twenties. Youmans died the other day, but that age had passed long ago. On the left are those who would hurry us forward, dizzily, to a bright new age, and Americans don't like to be hurried.

Harry Truman is the middleman in all this, caught between the conflicting forces. So, in truth, would be any other man who succeeded to the Presidency in these times. Someone might have done better. Someone might have done much worse.

Perhaps it's a good occasion, as citizens, to wish him luck for the next year in the toughest job in the world.

American Liberalism: A Faith To Fight For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been 16 years since the American people, defrauded by the gross and opportunistic materialism of three selfish and incompetent Republican administrations, turned again to the party of the people, the party of idealism, and swept a Democratic Congress into office; and it is 14 years since the clean winds of that liberal storm blew out the stale tiredness of Hooverism to bring in the fresh vigor and liberal genius of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Now that great leader is dead; his works will live forever, and his words of flame and hope and promise for a people's world. The spirit of the American people is, perhaps, a little tired from 6 years' of total war against reaction. There is some slight danger they may relax their vigilance and allow the cynicism of reaction and special privilege again to rule in this Hall of the will of the masses.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave, I insert in the RECORD a clarion call to liberals, slightly shortened to conserve space, contained in an editorial in the Philadelphia Record of Sunday, March 24, 1946:

AMERICAN LIBERALISM: A FAITH TO FIGHT FOR!

Let America's liberals take stock.

This sick world is looking for leadership. Liberalism should be offering it. It is not.

Liberalism is no feeble philosophy of compromise between Marxism and conservatism, as the Fascists told us yesteryear and as the Communists tell us now.

Liberalism is a positive, dynamic force. It is the faith of freemen. It is a faith we must fight for at home, a faith to carry to oppressed peoples abroad.

Alas, many of the men who should be fighting for liberalism are now apologizing for it. Some even seem to have fallen for that false and mischievous notion that liberalism is just a stage along the road to inevitable Marxism.

It is time to scotch that lie.

Fascism was not yesterday's wave of the future. Communism is not tomorrow's.

Some American liberals are so indifferent, they are letting hitchhikers take over the car—permitting Communists, who came along for the ride, to climb into the driver's seat.

If liberalism has faltered since its prewar peak of the New Deal—

It is because too many liberals have lost sight of their goals and forgotten their primer of principles.

Check over some of those principles:

1. Freedom of man, of the individual. A slave with a full belly is still a slave.

2. Freedom of speech, of press, of worship. (We even hear some liberals suggest that they be modified.)

3. Economic democracy, freedom of workers to organize, to strike, not to abolish capitalism but to make it work better.

4. Spreading the American standard of living among all Americans, not tearing down that standard, highest in the world and one which any worker anywhere else would trade for his own lot any time he could.

5. Economic security, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, health insurance, good medical care for all.

6. Development of national resources, such as an MVA following the TVA.

7. Reliance on collective security, through the UNO, to keep peace and build an order in which every land will enjoy real social, economic and political freedom.

8. Racial and religious tolerance.

It is America's hour and liberalism's challenge.

It is conceivable that our children may end up as slaves of a state if we dissipate the faith of our fathers.

World leadership is thrust upon us. We have a faith to proclaim, a job to do.

We can escape that responsibility. We cannot escape the consequences.

Support the La Follette-Monroney Committee Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to enclose two recent editorials which point out forcibly the reasons for supporting the recommendations of the La Follette-Monroney committee as a whole. The editorials are from the Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, Va., of March 11, 1946, and the Nashville Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn., of March 17, 1946:

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of March 11, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The La Follette-Monroney committee on reorganization of Congress has released its report, and a right ringing document it is.

This is not just another outline of reshuffled offices and expense accounts boosts offered as a prescription for increased congressional efficiency. The committee has called upon Congress both to "modernize its organization and procedures" and to "reconsider its role in the American scheme of government" and has provided a comprehensive series of specific proposals to meet both purposes.

The report urges reduction of the jumble of 33 regular Senate committees to 16, the tangle or 48 House committees to 18, with the functions and field of each clearly defined. Overlapping jurisdiction would be ended, the committee assignment load of individual members eased, expert assistance provided in the form of specialist staffs. Regular meeting days would be set and the committees would be required to take definite action within a specified time on bills referred to them. Congressional salaries would be raised to $15,000 and each member given an $8,000 assistant to handle nonlegislative duties.

These and such other proposals as registration of lobbyists and self-government for the District of Columbia to relieve Congress of the obligation to act as a city council have been discussed before in interim statements. The present report covers much more ground, citing detailed proposals for at least three major reforms in the procedure of Congress as the policy-making branch of the Government.

The first has to do with the gulf between Congress and the executive departments. Public affairs are now handled by a host of administrative agencies headed by nonelected officials with only casual oversight by Congress. As the elective arm of government, responsible to the people, Congress needs to improve its lines of communication, its relationships, its understanding of the departments. The report suggests that the streamlined committees undertake a continuous review of the agencies administering laws originally reported by them and that Congress obtain annual service audits for all executive agencies.

The second new reform is aimed at the lack of policy coordination for the majority and minority parties in Congress. At present they depend upon so-called steering committees which "seldom meet and never steer." These should be replaced, the report urges, by majority and minority policy committees elected at the start of each new Congress. The Senate and House majority committees would constitute a council to meet regularly with the President and formulate a legislative program for each session.

The third reform contemplates a frontal attack on the problem of continued deficit spending and firn fiscal controls. The plan advanced would require the Revenue and Appropriations Committees of both Houses to prepare by April 5 of each calendar year a concurrent resolution setting estimated overall receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year beginning July 1. If this "budget" were unbalanced, Congress would have to authorize by roll-call vote the addition to the national debt needed to offset the deficit. If the total of actual appropriaions made should exceed the resolution total, all operating expenditures would be cut back by a uniform percentage until they once again were within the authorized over-all figure.

The report as a whole, whatever the verdict on individual items, is a rousing call to Congress to discipline itself to meet the responsibilities of effective representative government in an increasingly complex and difficult modern world.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of March 17, 1946]

NOT A PIECEMEAL JOB

The program for reforming Congress which was recommended by the joint committee headed by Senator BOB LA FOLLETTE and Representative MIKE MONRONEY has been referred to the Senate Rules Committee. What the Rules Committee does about getting the program into a legislative draft will be more than a hint of the willingness or unwillingness of Congress to put its own house in order.

The procedure which logically suggests itself is that the men who drafted the recommendations should be assigned the responsibility to put them into a bill. Furthermore, both Houses should have the opportunity to vote on the program as a whole rather than on piecemeal reforms. If handled in popgun bills, the most significant parts of the reorganization proposal, such as the reduction in the number of committees, will be doomed to defeat. If presented as a program to be rejected or approved in toto, the Members who don't like this or that provision will find it harder to muster the temerity to register a negative vote.

The Conservative South—A Political Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding men in this country in the field of political science is Dr. William G. Carleton, professor of political science at the University of Florida. Dr. Carleton has written for the spring issue of the Virginia Quarterly Review a most illuminating and significant article entitled "The Conservative South—A Political Myth." I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Carleton be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

An estimate from the Public Printer indicates that the article will require one-third of a page more of the RECORD than the two pages allowed under the rule and that the cost of printing will be $140.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSERVATIVE SOUTH—A POLITICAL MYTH

(By William G. Carleton)

During the Presidential election of 1944 there was more than the usual amount of speculation about a conservative revolt in the South. This speculation concerned itself with several possibilities: a revolt within the Democratic Party, a southern third party, secession by conservatives to the ranks of the Republican Party.

Similar rumors and predictions crop up every 4 years. Repeated miscarriages seem to have no effect in stopping them. No doubt another plethora of like prognostications will appear in 1948 and again in 1952.

Back in 1908 Archie Butt saw the South in open revolt against Bryan and that form of socialism he has lassoed and dragged into the Democratic Party. About the same time William Howard Taft predicted that within "15, 20, possibly 50 years" the South would save the Nation from radicalism, and preserve Anglo-Saxon law as we have it in this country. A little later President Taft concluded that the South could be depended upon to hold the country from absolute socialism.

Many kindred predictions might well be quoted. There is, of course, a good bit of wishful thinking in this business, but only a widespread misconception of the fundamentals of southern politics can explain the extensive popular belief in these recurring prophecies.

II

It must never be forgotten that the South fought longest against the triumph of commercial and industrial capitalism. It is, therefore, rather to be expected that the South should be most sensitive to the evils of industrial capitalism today.

To begin with, American liberalism was essentially agrarian, and it had its origin in the South. Thomas Jefferson was America's first great liberal. It is mortifying to have to state so obvious a truth, but with modern conservatism attempting to appropriate Jefferson as its patron saint, it is necessary to affirm and reaffirm Jefferson's liberalism. Jefferson hated kings, feudal left-overs, hereditary aristocrats, priests, guilds, business monopolies, and privilege in all forms and guises. He had a profound suspicion of commercial and industrial capitalism. He had faith in common men in an age when such faith was rank heresy.

Jefferson built a political philosophy—a philosophy of individualism, laissez-faire, and States' rights—designed to help the mass of men under the conditions prevailing at the end of the eighteenth century. The task of the eighteenth century in Europe was to free governments from the control of kings, nobles, guilds, monopolies, and established churches. The task in America was to prevent a strong government which might come into alliance with powerful groups and give special privileges in the form of tariffs, transportation subsides, banking concessions—privileges which ordinary men felt to be burdens borne by the many for the enrichment of the few. If Jefferson were here today, his fine Italian mind would discern that the progress of the industrial and business revolutions of the past century had made necessary a change of means to attain that never-changing end—the advancement of the common man. He would be among the first to recognize the need to bring the vast financial and industrial combinations of today under political control. Jefferson would fit his rationale to his fundamental purposes, and today he would be an advocate of more government, not less.

Jefferson, I think, would be amused were he to come back and witness conservative industrialists drinking toasts in his name. Jefferson, the friend of the French Revolution and of Tom Paine and of the oppressed and exploited and bamboozled. Jefferson, the enemy of the pseudo-pious, the pseudo-conventional, and the pseudo-respectable. These modern conservatives drink a toast to Jefferson because today they like the Jeffersonian means, the Jeffersonian forms, the Jeffersonian rationalization. They ignore, because they do not like, the Jeffersonian substance, the Jeffersonian essence, the Jeffersonian ends. In the name of Jefferson they would destroy the spirit of Jefferson.

Modern southerners are amused to see Liberty Leaguers appropriate the name of Thomas Jefferson, and they are not deceived.

The great majority of voting southerners cast their ballots for Thomas Jefferson in 1796. They cast their ballots for him again in 1800, and they were largely responsible for his election to the Presidency. In fact, the vast majority of southerners were Jeffersonians. To be sure, there was a Federalist Party in the South in the early days of the Republic, but the Federalists were usually in the minority and the Jeffersonians constituted the majority party.

Again, in the Jacksonian revolution of 1828, it was the South which took the lead. The hillbillies, the poor whites, the piney-wood folk, the red necks, the crackers, and the mudsills adored Andrew Jackson. They did much to put the "Old Hero" in the White House, and they sustained him during his two terms as President. True, the big planters, bankers, land speculators, transportation and internal improvement interests, and broadcloth element generally went into the Whig opposition—the "lords of the lash" joined hands with the "lords of the loom"—but in the South they were usually no match for the small farmers. The South, in the Jacksonian period and in succeeding decades, was a two-party section, but the Whigs were in a minority in most of the States of the South, and the Democrats were normally the majority party and generally carried most of the South in State and national elections.

The 15 years following reconstruction were a time of conservative politics. This is the period of the Bourbon South. But what section of the Nation was not Bourbon in this period? During this era the resources and the politics of the Nation were surrendered to the businessman. This was the gilded age. This was the period when the difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties was the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee, when the economic views of a Tilden or a Cleveland differed little from those of a Garfield, a Blaine, or a Harrison.

Additional factors contributed to conservatism in the South. Fear of the Negro and a return to carpetbag rule cowed the poor whites. Conservative white leaders warned the Southern masses that they were henceforth to behave themselves and follow "safe" leaders lest they split the whites and restore Negro rule. Gone were the pre-Civil War days when the hillbillies and crackers contested with the broadcloth elements. The southern masses were tied to the chariot wheels of the big planter, the commissary owner, the banker, the manufacturer, the railroad magnate. Henry Grady and his disciples were busy selling the South the industrial and financial creed of Wall, Chestnut, and State Streets. For the most part, the southern "Redeemers"—the Joe Browns, the Gordons, the Colquitts, the Hamptons, the Georges, the Lamars, the Bloxhams—stood with the Republicans on monetary, banking, and railroad questions. The old Whig alliance of the propertied and broadcloth elements of North and South was revived as a bipartisan alliance, but this time these elements controlled both sections of the country and in the North held sway over the dominant Republican Party and in the South over the dominant Democratic Party. The scarecrow labeled "Negro rule" was the bogey set up to frighten all Southern independents and liberals and to reduce them to docility.

But the tradition of agrarian liberalism was too strong to be stilled. The southern masses had fought against the triumph of industrial capitalism. After its triumph they were more sensitive to its shortcomings and evils than any other section of the country. Having failed to prevent its triumph, they could at least attempt to control it and to check its evils. The burdens of a developing monopoly capitalism were felt not only by small farmers, tenants, sharecroppers, and wage earners, but also by big planters and small businessmen. Moreover, it must always be remembered that in the South opposition to big business has not only a class appeal but also a sectional appeal. Big business appears foreign, it is northern and eastern. To many southerners the South is a "colony" of New York in much the same sense that Cuba is such a colony.

By the middle 1890's the acquiescence of the white southern masses was at an end. The hard times, the deflation policies of the Federal Government and the circulative effects of a too-rapid industrialization of the country goaded them into passionate rebellion. They could no longer be silenced by the old conservative cry of "Nigger." In some areas of the South, Populism spread like a prairie fire. In others, the small farmers and poor whites bored within the Democratic Party and gained control of the party organization. This was notably true in South Carolina under the leadership of Ben Tillman. With the decline of the Populist movement, a majority of the former Populists went into the liberal wing of the Democratic Party.

Since the middle nineties the Democratic Party in the Southern States has in general been divided into two wings: a conservative wing and a liberal wing. And the liberal wing has most frequently been in the ascendant, certainly with respect to national politics. The Bourbons have been reduced to leading a faction only, and in Presidential politics this has usually been a minority faction.

For the past 50 years the political leaders who have most frequently been victorious, who have most often stirred southern hearts, and who most fondly linger in popular memory have been the leaders of the liberal wing. These liberal leaders have been of two types. One is the stormy petrel, as represented by men like Ben Tillman, Tom Watson, James K. Vardaman, and Jeff Davis of Arkansas. Huey Long may in some respects be considered a representative of this type. Such leaders often arouse social prejudices and passions and play the demagogue. The other type is more conventional-mannered and manages to attain leadership without spectacular and crass appeals to prejudice, although it is not, of course, without color and picturesqueness. This type is represented by men like Charles B. Aycock, Hoke Smith, Napoleon B. Broward, James S. Hogg, and Josephus Daniels. No matter how much these liberal leaders may differ in their manner of appeal, they are alike in fundamentals: both types are critics of monopoly capitalism, and they seek to check its evils and to bring it under government and social control.

Even our conservatives within the Democratic party of the South often get a start in politics by taking the liberal side. CARTER GLASS and KENNETH MCKELLAR are cases in point. Moreover, the exigencies of party politics have usually forced them to support a liberal Democratic administration nationally, if not consistently, at least more often than they personally would wish. And when these conservatives come up for reelection, liberals in the South are frequently treated to a delectable little comedy denied northern liberals. Southern liberals put these conservatives through their paces, "bring them to their milk," and force them to give lip service to liberal principles. This is something that northern liberals have never been able to do to their own Hannas and Quays, Penroses and Lodges, Mellons and Hoovers.

Leftists must admit, I think, that since the midnineties the South has usually been a part of the national Popular Front which is slowly bringing social democracy to the United States. In the United States the social democratic movement in national politics may appropriately be dated from the midnineties with the Populist crusade and Bryan's first nomination for the Presidency. It is very significant that Bryan's first nomination was made possible by southern support. In 1896 the South was aflame with Bryanism. Daniel of Virginia, Jarvis of North Carolina, Tillman of South Carolina, Crisp of Georgia, Call of Florida, Pugh of Alabama, Harris of Tennessee, Jones of Arkansas, and Blackburn of Kentucky were among those who led the battle which resulted in Bryan's nomination. And Bryan never lost his hold on the South. The South rallied to him in 1900 and again in 1908. Bryan's ascendancy within the Democratic Party would have been impossible without southern support. Moreover, it is well to remember that the impact of Bryanism upon Theodore Roosevelt's new nationalism is unquestionable.

Again, the progressivism inside the Democratic Party crystallized by Bryan made possible the nomination of Woodrow Wilson, and it also made possible the new freedom which characterized Wilson's first administration. More specifically, Woodrow Wilson could not have been nominated in 1912 without Bryan's personal aid and without the kind of consistent support he received at the Baltimore convention from North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas.

In the reactionary days of the 1920's the Wilson-Bryan progressivism was kept alive by men like Josephus Daniels and William G. McAdoo. It was this progressive wing of the party which made possible the first, the decisive, nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt at Chicago in 1932. In general, southern leaders and the southern masses were strong for Roosevelt's nomination, and without that support his nomination would have been impossible. At the same time Roosevelt received little initial support at Chicago from the eastern delegations. It would be well for Harlem and Manhattan Center and Union Square to remember these southern contributions to the popular front. The southern bloc should not be made the perpetual whipping boy of the front's proletarian bloc. And it would not be if the Browders, the Marcantonios, the Hillmans, the Countses, the Dubinskys, and the La Guardias better recognized these southern contributions to the leftist cause.

III

Within the Democratic Party of the South there have always been dissident elements. In every generation conservatives have arisen within the party to challenge the prevailing liberalism. In Jefferson's time John Randolph and the Quids, representing aristocratic agrarianism, broke with the majority, but they were never able to carry with them more than a fraction of the southern people.

In Jackson's time many conservative southerners broke with the Democrats and went into the Whig Party, but that party, as we have seen, succeeded in becoming the majority party in several Southern States only. After a few years, many of the seceders reconsidered and returned to the Democratc Party. Among these was John C. Calhoun. He and his followers returned, moreover, not when the Democratic Party was getting more conservative but when under Van Buren it was fighting the banks of the country and getting more radical. Those who still think of Calhoun as an arch-conservative should read the great Carolinian's speech of September 19, 1837, in the United States Senate on the Independent Treasury bill, the speech which rationalized his return to the Democratic Party and which advocated that Government credit and Government money be substituted for private bank credit and bank notes. Furthermore, these doubters should read the famous speech of Calhoun's able lieutenant, Representative Francis W. Pickens, of South Carolina, delivered in the national House of Representatives on October 10, 1837. That speech of Pickens boldly proclaimed that southern farmers and eastern proletarians were natural political allies against bankers and industrialists, and it remains to this day one of the most realistic speeches ever delivered in Congress. Years later, in 1868, one of the southern leaders who remained in the Whig party, Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, admitted that the Calhoun group was right in returning to the Democratic Party and that those southerners who went into the Whig party and stayed there committed a serious political blunder.

Since the middle 1890's there have been several conservative political revolts within the Democratic Party. With one exception, these have never been as widespread or as significant as anticipated. There were the Gold Democrats in 1896. There was the Landon movement in 1936, the Willkie movement in 1940, the Dewey movement in 1944. Each of these resulted in fiasco. Only the Hoover movement of 1928 bore fruit, and the subsequent devastating elimination of the practical politicians, big and little, who took part in this movement has terrified and deterred the politicians who have since contemplated rebellion.

Many conservative Democratic leaders will say frankly that they would have been Federalists in the 1790's and Whigs in the 1840's, and that today if they lived north of the Mason and Dixon's line they would be Republicans. Then why do these men remain in the Democratic Party? They remain because they know that the moment they seceded they would diminish their political influence. They cannot carry a sizable following with them. The white masses in the South are still Democrats because they are poor and believe the Democratic Party to be the poor white man's party. And significantly, the fact that the Negro is now for the most part in the Democratic Party has not altered this fundamental faith.

Many liberal Democrats in the South would actually like to see these conservatives go over to the Republican Party. This would sharpen the issues. This would decrease conservative influence and make it easier for real Democrats to win in the primaries. And liberals feel that in the ensuing two-party campaign the Democrats would win, if not all the time, as now, at the very least even more often than in the days of Federalist and Whig opposition. They have no doubt that the Democratic Party would remain the majority party in the South.

IV

The South's record of political liberalism is all the more remarkable because it has been made without benefit of that great mass of potential liberals—the Negro people. In the South the fifteenth amendment has been circumvented and the Negro largely disfranchised.

In the 1890's the Populists sought to follow a Marxian pattern and unite poor whites and poor blacks in a common protest against economic exploitation. Reversing the southern tradition, the Populists sought political equality for the Negro. Said Tom Watson, fiery Georgia Populist, "The accident of color can make no difference in the interests of farmers, croppers, and laborers." "You are kept apart," he told the two races, "that you may be separately fleeced of your earnings."

But the Populist experience had a sobering effect upon liberal leaders in the South. During the Populist campaigns they saw the Negro voter purchased with Bourbon gold; they saw many poor whites withhold support to the liberal cause when that cause linked Negro equality to a program of economic reform. They recalled how in pre-Civil War days, when slavery safely eliminated the Negro from politics, the hillbillies and piney-wood whites fought planters and bankers with lusty abandon. Therefore, they reasoned, the Negro must again be eliminated from politics if the poor whites were to be successfully consolidated in the fight against economic exploitation. Thus we arrive at a tragic paradox: It was the poor white folks in the South who disfranchised the poor black folks. About the turn of the century the leaders of the poor white man's faction in southern politics—the Tillmans, the Watsons, the Vardamans—devised grandfather clauses, literacy tests, and white primaries to deprive the Negro of democratic participation in politics.

But today fear of the Negro in politics is diminishing in the South. The relative decline of the Negro population, the spread of the racial views of the New Deal, in spite of protestations to the contrary, and educational advances are softening the old prejudices. The cry of "Nigger," employed to divide the liberal forces, is losing its old magic. That cry was raised against Senator CLAUDE PEPPER in the 1944 Florida primary, but it was raised in vain. It was raised against Senator LISTER HILL in the 1944 Alabama primary, but to no avail. Even in South Carolina the old Red Shirt slogans could not save "Cotton Ed" Smith from defeat.

There is a strong movement among southern whites to repeal the State poll taxes. At a meeting in Atlanta in the winter of 1945 Mark Etheridge and other prominent southerners came out in favor of repeal. Several years ago Florida by voluntary State action repealed its poll tax and the State of Georgia followed suit when its 1945 legislature, under the leadership of youthful and liberal Gov. Ellis Arnall, repealed a poll-tax law of long standing. The liberal writ-

ings of Virginius Dabney on the racial question are having a profound influence on the professional people of the South, causing many of them to take stock of their inherited conceptions and to recast their political thinking in wider molds. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare and the Southern Regional Council are steadily growing in strength and effectiveness. They are helping the share cropper and the wage-earner; they are doing much to soften racial prejudices and antagonisms.

More and more Negroes are voting in southern elections. In many Florida municipalities it is not uncommon for a large portion of the Negro voters to cast their ballots in the municipal elections. This is the entering wedge. As this tendency gains headway we may expect to see the Democratic majorities in the Southern States increased, because today the mass of men and women of both races are in the Democratic Party. The increasing Negro vote, moreover, should be a boon to liberals in their fight within the party to gain and keep party control.

V

The picture of the political South I have delineated is not meant to be roseate. There is no intent to deny that the South has its Joads, its Jeeter Lesters, yes; even its Simon Legrees. The woes of the South have been recounted over and again: its grinding poverty, its share-cropper problems, its wages and income differentials, its crippled schools, its meager endowments for colleges and universities.

It is precisely because of such conditions that the masses of the South are critical of our industrial system and liberal in politics. To be sure, there is a terrifying amount of inertia in the South. Where is there not? But when the fundamental issues are raised in an able and an attractive way and the mass of people have a chance to express themselves, southerners usually vote liberal. The southern masses belong to the popular front because it is to their economic interest to do so.

There is no denying the strength of southern conservatives. When native southerners manage to rise above the poverty common to the southern masses, when they climb into the business and professional classes, when they become managers and purveyors for the northern capital which owns the factories and mills of the South, they all too often become conservative defenders of the status quo and apologists for existing inequalities. Indeed, the true carpetbaggers of today are the southern-born white-collar employees of northern-owned industry who parrot the conservative clichés used by northern industrialists to defend laissez-faire capitalism. (These bought-and-paid-for southerners have the effrontery to call the New Deal a Yankee importation.) And these conservatives have no mean weapons at their disposal. Among these are the power of money in a region where money is scarce, the shrewd use of the genteel tradition based on the ante-bellum mythology, religious conservatism, the prevailing lack of educational opportunities, the racial bogey, and the agrarian suspicion of labor unions and metropolitan ways. Their representatives in politics are clever enough to give lip service to Democratic principles, but when they go to Congress they not infrequently manage to sabotage the specific measures of a Wilson or a Roosevelt. And when they go as delegates to a Democratic National Convention, they often misrepresent their constituents, as when numbers of them voted against Henry A. Wallace in the Chicago convention of 1944, although Wallace was leading in all the southern polls of popular sentiment, and had he run in southern primaries probably would have been as popular as McAdoo in 1924 and Roosevelt in 1932.

But with all their weapons, the southern conservatives have not been able to wean the South from the popular front, and the chances are that in the future they will not. Why is this? First, the Democratic Party probably will continue to be the party approximating social democracy in the United States, and the South is wedded to the Democratic Party tradition. Second, southerners are poor folks and have enough sense to vote for the party which does the most for poor folks. Third, the forces which will make the South even more liberal in its voting are gathering strength every day. What are these? The weakening of the poll taxes. The increasing tendency of Negroes to vote. The movement to enfranchise youth, which has already borne fruit in Georgia where the 18-year-olds now vote. The steady growth of labor unions and their increasing influence in both economic and political affairs. The recent aggressive attacks in the South on labor unions are an indication that southern conservatives are aroused over the growing power of southern labor unions.

VI

The South has not failed liberalism. Where in the whole region west of the Mississippi River is there a college president as consistently liberal as Frank P. Graham? Where in that region is there a judge as consistently liberal as Hugo L. Black? And now that George W. Norris is no more, where in that region is there a statesman as consistently liberal as CLAUDE PEPPER? If liberalism has failed anywhere in the United States, it has failed in the old progressive Northwest where it has been compromised by a too frequent alliance with Republicanism and bogged down by isolationism.

Several months ago a shrewd editor of a Florida country weekly newspaper observed that should national conditions require the Democratic Party to move even farther to the left than it has under the New Deal, the southern masses would endorse such a move and would continue to vote the Democratic ticket. In making such an observation, that country editor showed more insight into southern politics than those high-powered publishers, publicists, columnists, commentators, dopesters, and wiseacres who, ignorant of southern political history, dispensed during the campaign of 1944 the usual quadrennial rodomontade about the revolt of the "conservative" South.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Lives On in the Hearts of Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the memory of a great leader. His greatness will grow with the passing of the years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article, entitled "Franklin D. Roosevelt Lives On in the Hearts of Men and Women," written by Aubrey Williams, which appeared in the Southern Farmer of April:

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIVES ON IN THE HEARTS OF MEN AND WOMEN

(By Aubrey Williams)

Franklin D. Roosevelt died a year ago come April 12.

Men and women all over the world have missed him in the months that have passed. Even those who did not agree with him during his life, now praise his courage and strength.

To those who knew him it never seemed that his stout heart could be stilled, or his steady hand relaxed. He had a warm and kindly spirit for all his strength. It drew many to his side to share the battles he was fighting. Thousands who never saw him counted him a friend.

The newspapermen around Washington like to tell the story of a visit he had from two men who owned big newspapers. They came to the White House to give the President a piece of their minds. Once inside the room they forgot what they had come for. Instead they were soon listening to him.

They left in a friendly mood, and had walked a few blocks when one turned to the other suddenly and said, "We've been stabbed."

One of Franklin D. Roosevelt's great strengths was that he loved people. He liked to listen when visitors had something to say.

Once five young people came to see him. The secretary had told them they could have 5 minutes. They entered the Lincoln Room on the second floor of the White House, and stood up since all chairs had been taken from the room. This was a way the secretaries had of keeping people from staying too long.

The President greeted the young people. Then he began by saying he had heard that one of them had been arrested for picketing the White House. "Don't let that worry you," he said. "I knew a fellow once who got put in jail five times."

He began to tell them the story about the five arrests. As soon as he finished the story of the first time, one of the young men raised his hand and said, "Mr. President."

The President stopped and said, "Yes, my boy."

"I don't want to be impolite, but, sir, if you tell us all five of those stories, our 5 minutes will be up."

The President threw back his head and roared out a big laugh. Then he rang his bell and had a secretary come in. "Mac, have chairs brought in for these boys. They will be with us for lunch."

It was 3 hours before the young men left. In the meantime the President had heard what they had come to say.

The part that government should have in the struggle of men to have a free and better life was Roosevelt's great interest. He believed that government should be the servant of the people in their fight for the good life. Government should not be the tool of a few or to be used for the benefit of a few.

He saw to it that farmers for the first time had a chance to begin to get a fair price for what they raised. He made it possible to set up "co-ops" to help farmers get credit, cheap electricity, and a market. He saw to it that workers began to get the right of collective bargaining in fact and not just in theory. He led in putting a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours.

He led this Nation into an all-out effort to finish a war quickly and thus save the lives of men throughout the world.

In all of this, as in everything he put his hand to, his weight added strength to every cause he aided. There is not a man or woman in America who cannot turn at any hour and see some good cause to which he added his strength.

All over America men and women will think of him this month. They will think back and with clear memories recall what his leadership meant. The carping and nagging of his critics and detractors will echo only faintly.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—Steel Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the novel idea of using steel for money is presented in a booklet received from Mr. F. F. Frazee. The author evidently misses the point when the interest yield and financial control objective of those in charge of nations' money machinery is taken into account. An outline of the plan for using steel for money taken from Frazee's booklet is inserted here:

When everything else is plentiful as, barring war, it practically always is, and sound dollars are also plentiful, exchanges proceed rapidly and prosperity abounds.

This is axiomatic and directly related to competitive dollar production.

I had lived a long life before I saw this simple fact. In 1896 I was sold on free silver by Bryan, and in 1933 on gold devaluation by Roosevelt and his advisers. However, both these theories are now clearly seen as only shots in the arm for temporary relief—in no way a permanent solution of our money problems.

Therefore, in 1934, after our fiasco gold devaluation, this simple question was pondered: In our competitive system how could and should we produce sound, basic dollars?

SOON THIS ANSWER CAME

Why, competitively, under the same principle and methods that produce everything with which dollars exchange. When this answer came, I quickly saw that here is the flaw in our competitive system which leads to our repeating ruins. With everything else splendidly plentiful, because competitively produced, we are dependent upon a limited, naturally monopolized gold dollar to finance and buy all this splendid production.

That favoritism to dollars is an unfairness which repeatedly brings ruinously low prices. Of course, hysterical war prices cannot be considered in considering dollars and their effect upon prices. During a total war we are thinking mostly of victory—not about dollars or prices. But, war won, we shortly revert to the old problem of what is a fair dollar? Certainly, a believer in the fairness of competition cannot consistently argue for a monopolized dollar.

Therefore, in a competitive system the only fair dollar is one competitively produced. But when we turn to dollars—the one vital factor all must get to pay debts, taxes, and live—they have never yet been competitively produced. Certainly man cannot make gold, while its natural scarcity prevents workers from largely shifting to its production when jobless. Therefore, as gold is not and cannot be competitively produced, the question came: What other metal or material would make a sound, valuable dollar, and also fill every need for a competitively produced dollar? Brief thought showed that steel fills every requirement. Of the basic material—iron ore—we have proven ore supplies for centuries—probably forever. Steel is valuable for a thousand uses, and therefore would make a sound, valuable dollar, provided only that we use enough steel to make the dollar worth 100 cents—when adopted.

Necessarily, Congress would decide that, being dependent upon the commercial price of steel ingots when adopted. Then, once fixed on a medium, fair price basis, no change would ever be needed. Quite possibly, around 40 pounds might be found a fair weight for this steel ingot dollar. But the dollar's weight is entirely immaterial. However, the transition of thought from a gold dollar weighing only 13⅝ grains of pure gold to a 40-pound steel dollar is quite surprising. In fact, we are inclined to think it absurd or impossible. But the actual weight of a basic dollar means absolutely nothing. For everyday use we prefer the legal tender, paper dollar receipts or certificates, whether for gold or steel.

And while we could not carry many steel ingot dollars in one pocket, yet all would be free to redeem as many steel ingot dollars as they needed.

That is, any mill manufacturer or person would be free to secure steel ingot dollars by redeeming them with free steel-dollar certificates. Contrast this with present-day gold-dollar facts. We now supposedly have free gold, but not practically. True, Government freely accepts and hands back legal tender paper certificates for all gold offered. But these are not now, as formerly, gold certificates, but only Federal Reserve notes. Also, this gold is mostly buried in Kentucky, while no person can have a single gold dollar for internal money use. In other words, gold is not allowed to circulate, knowing it would be hoarded during breaks, when dollars are most needed. This one fact should convince real thinkers that gold is not fit for a single gold standard.

A money so scarce and considered so valuable that we must adopt unheard-of expedients to keep us from hoarding so much that the whole financial system would be disrupted is certainly not the money to bring this Nation prosperity. Plainly, a monopolized dollar, never competitively produced, which cannot furnish free employment and cannot be allowed to circulate, cannot bring any nation prosperity. Indisputably only labor in its various forms, brings this Nation prosperity—not money of itself. But when the production of sound, free-steel dollars can be so easily and wisely correlated with the supply of labor that jobs are practically always available, then money itself is the vital agent of prosperity.

In other words, that dollar would bring and keep prosperity because furnishing the new jobs needed to keep labor prosperously employed. With this much stated about free steel, we have not fairly started on its full biography. There are so many angles related to the money problem that a great book could not treat them all fully. One angle is—

While we have truly said much against gold, we still should not discard gold. Gold mining now employs around 20,000 workers, and while that is not even 5 percent of the jobs free steel could and would furnish, still it's a drop in the bucket and desirable to keep. Besides, gold is still useful for settling international balances. Further, the sentimental thought that we still had gold would mean much to some persons.

For these reasons we should still keep gold as a minor or subsidiary part of our money system. But, once adopted, free steel would be the permanent, job-furnishing and prosperity-bringing dollar. And permanent because when perfection is reached that point cannot be passed. And perfection would be reached when dollars, and everything else, are competitively produced. That is the sum and substance of this whole booklet—competition—competition everywhere—no monopoly anywhere. Surely, real thought can see that with full and fair competition everything produced will always exchange on a fair basis. Indisputably, when we open our eyes to truth, that fact applies to money as fully as to all other production. That is, with dollars competitively produced they would at all times, barring war prices, exchange fairly with all other competitive production, all facts considered.

Of course, with wheat a famine crop, its price would be high; with a double crop, low. With gold and steel bimetallism established, such facts would develop exactly as now. But many other facts would be vastly different. Instead of unduly high followed by ruinously low prices there would be a fairer average price level than ever before known. Not a dead level of prices. We don't want stagnation. Neither do we want the booms and breaks.

Eagles Fly To Aid of Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 29, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it will no doubt be significant to those who hear and listen and read to know the contents of the following resolution from the Fraternal Order of Eagles, South Gate, Calif., Aerie No. 2080. This busy and able group of citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional District is continually on its toes doing constructive, sensible things for the protection and progress of the children of the community.

While it is a known fact that I have actively supported the school-lunch program, it is refreshing to receive this voluntary resolution, unsolicited by or for me.

I commend reading it to all.

Whereas there is now pending in Congress legislation which would provide annual Federal appropriations to the States for school lunches, and which would place Federal school-lunch aid on a permanent basis, and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles has sought to improve child health, and has advocated as a major part of a child health program, school lunches for every community, and

Whereas there are many States and communities which are unwilling or unable to provide school lunches, with the result that children, through no fault of their own, are denied adequate nourishment; and

Whereas in many communities mothers are not fully informed on the preparation of wholesome meals, or are too busy to prepare sustaining school lunches; and

Whereas surveys have disclosed that a major cause of juvenile delinquency is malnutrition and ill health of children, and the Fraternal Order of Eagles has waged long and unceasing warfare on juvenile delinquency, regarding measures to improve the general health of children a potent weapon in this battle; and

Whereas properly prepared and nutritious food for school children is essential to health, happiness, and good grades, and contributes to the well-being of America's future citizens and the general welfare of the Nation itself: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That South Gate Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, herewith endorses the principle of pending school-lunch-appropriations legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Harry S. Truman, the United States Senators from California, and Congressman CLYDE DOYLE of this district.

Preamble to United Nations Charter Timely To Read Again Now—The Hope of This Present-Day World for Enduring Peace To Evolve From—Wars Must Cease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, would you and I do as well in their places of tragic responsibility? Would you and I be willing to say we would do differently than they have done on many things?

I refer to the American representatives on the UNO. Yes; I refer to the rank and file of the representatives of all the member nations.

Why should we expect the UNO to do the impossible and do it all at once? Is it not comprised of "just folks"?

What is there about the situation that justifies us in criticizing or condemning the progress made—or not yet made?

Who am I to know better than those there who hear so much more of facts and evidence?

Is it not a situation comparable to that wherein we, as Members of Congress, know full well we have much more information than does the constituent back home who condemns our vote or our opinion?

To me the situation is full of positive cheer and hope. Never before in history have so many nations met so long for so definite an objective World peace! Never before has the atomic-energy discovery compelled men to reason together or be blown apart.

I am giving every member of the Security Council and every nation represented the same benefit of belief in good faith and sincerity which I expect them to give my own beloved Nation.

So I thought it timely to again set forth these statements of the preamble to the UNO Charter

These are the guiding principles governing the attitude and conduct of the UNO. Yes; they are mere words of man. But given the breadth and spirit of mankind these words become life and hope and faith and world neighborliness. Put our faith and hopes and works into these preamble words and there results freedom from world war. Wars must cease! Wars must cease! But we must labor for peace as we labored for victory for peace.

As we would have others do unto us, unless we have proved ourselves unworthy of the confidence of mankind, so we must do unto others in common bonds of this preamble declaration.

Read it again and again. Let us here again highly resolve that we of America will do our solemn duty for a peaceful world. In this responsibility each citizen has an important plan of daily attitude and action.

Here it is:

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined—

"To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedoms;

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security; and

"To insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

"To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples;

"Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

In chapter 9, section A, of the accepted Charter, it is provided:

"1. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the Organization shall promote:

"(a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.

"(b) Solutions of international economic, social health, and other related problems; international cultural and educational cooperation.

"(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex.

"2. All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of these purposes."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 11, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a splendid address, Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Project Be Developed? given by Harry Brockel, municipal port director of Milwaukee, over radio station WTMJ:

For three decades, America's most distinguished statesmen, engineers, and business leaders have emphatically answered yes to the question: Should the St. Lawrence seaway be completed? Legislation to complete the project is now before Congress. President Truman, following in the tradition of every President since Taft, has recommended it for immediate action. Ten distinguished Senators, of three political parties, have introduced legislation to carry out our agreement with Canada for its development.

The State Department has given the seaway first place in its international program to demonstrate to the world that nations living side by side can peacefully develop projects whose benefits transcend international boundary lines, and to prove that America is sincerely determined to strengthen international relationships and achieve permanent peace, by peaceful commerce between nations.

The seaway has two great economic justifications—low-cost water transportation and low-cost hydroelectric power. The St. Lawrence is the greatest undeveloped source of hydroelectric power in North America. Two million two hundred thousand horsepower of electrical energy are running unused into the Atlantic because of our failure to harness this tremendous resource. President Truman has emphasized that our whole economic and military future requires further development of our power resources including the vast potential energy of the St. Lawrence.

Wisconsin wants the seaway as a transportation resource. By extending ocean shipping to Wisconsin, our farms and industries can take advantage of cheap water transportation, on a scale hitherto impossible. Our industries could import raw materials in large quantities, at minimum cost, by substituting a water haul for costly rail transportation. Wisconsin agriculture and industry will be able to tap new markets abroad.

There is nothing new or experimental in the seaway project. For more than a century Wisconsin has shipped to European ports through the St. Lawrence. Between 1920 and 1940 a substantial trade developed between lake ports and northern Europe, in spite of the handicap of the present 14-foot canals in the St. Lawrence River. These operations prove beyond doubt the large freight savings by use of direct vessels, eliminating transshipment charges at seaboard ports and a costly rail haul to the interior. A 27-foot seaway would accommodate the majority of the world's cargo ships.

The St. Lawrence is not an inland waterway nor an artificial waterway—it is a natural highway into the heart of the continent. It is basic in water transportation that ships will penetrate inland as far as possible before discharging cargo, proven by the inland location of many great seaports, and by ocean shipping operations a thousand or more miles inland on rivers such as the Yangtse and the Amazon. A single factor—the rapids in the St. Lawrence between Ogdensburg and Montreal—has obstructed this principle of water transportation on the St. Lawrence. These rapids are now passable by locks only 14 feet deep and 260 feet long, which limit the size of ships using the route to those dimensions. The project thus contemplates nothing but a modernization of an existing transportation route. Ninety-five percent of the 2,400-mile sailing distance between Milwaukee and the Atlantic is now fully navigable for deep-draft shipping.

The engineering works in the St. Lawrence River will cost the United States about $312,000,000. New York State will pay ninety-five million for the power rights on the American side of the river. The net cost of the project would be about $220,000,000, or less than 1 day's war expenditure. This nominal expenditure is economically justified by tremendous potential savings in freight charges and power rates.

Aside from the seaway's economic value, another consideration of infinitely greater importance is the future security of the United States and Canada. Before World War II, our military leaders urged the completion of the project for the national defense. A month ago, the joint Chiefs of Staff advised a Senate committee that from our experience in World War II, the project is absolutely essential to the national security, as a shipbuilding resource, as an added transportation facility, and as a new source of power.

It is a national misfortune that the seaway was not developed before World War II. With it, Midwest industry and agriculture could have made a more effective contribution to the war effort, and much money and perhaps many lives could have been saved.

Our wartime shipbuilding production approached 70,000,000 tons. Sixty-five percent of the steel, machinery, and other component parts of these ships originated in the Great Lakes area. However, only about 2 percent of the completed ships were constructed on the Lakes, although we have sheltered harbors, skilled workmen, vast industries, and great steel production. Small ships were constructed in Lake ports and sent to sea through the Mississippi River at great expense. The shipbuilding potentialities of the Great Lakes have hardly been scratched. The bottleneck has been the difficulty of getting the ships to salt water.

Had the seaway been developed, we could have constructed in Lake harbors, escort carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and merchant ships. These ships could have been loaded in Lake ports with foodstuffs, munitions and matériel of war—and if this seems like mere speculation, remember that Detroit was ranked as America's No. 1 arsenal, and was closely followed in war production by Great Lakes industrial centers such as Cleveland, Chicago, and Milwaukee.

Convoys could have been assembled in Lake ports and sent to Europe with an ocean crossing 1,000 miles shorter via the St. Lawrence than from Atlantic ports. The submarine hazard would have been reduced by one-third, in terms of distance; and shipping losses could have been reduced in proportion to the saving in ocean mileage by use of the St. Lawrence.

The war has depleted our natural resources. We have used lavishly our forests and our minerals. We find ourselves with rapidly dwindling supplies of iron ore, petroleum, managanese, copper, lead, and other strategic materials necessary in war and peace. A strategic stock-piling program is now planned, based upon industrial requirements and the national defense. These critical materials should be transported and stored as effectively as possible, in sheltered interior locations, where they will be used in volume, which means the industrial area surrounding the Great Lakes.

Considering the exposure of our coasts to naval and air attack, it is sound national policy to locate strategic industry in the interior and at the same time, provide it with the advantages of ocean transportation by extending deep-draft shipping into the Lakes.

The seaway will check the drift of population from the Midwest to the seaboard. In recent years, there has been a mushroom growth of new industry along the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Coast. The employment offered by these new industries has encouraged many people to migrate from the Middlewest to the seaboard, resulting in a rapid growth of population around the seacoasts and a gradual decline of population in the interior. Between 1930 and 1940, many midwestern States actually lost population. This trend was accelerated during the war.

States tributary to the Great Lakes normally account for 35 percent of our national exports. Wisconsin has a great stake in foreign trade and our products move into world markets in large volume. In normal times, Milwaukee alone shipped export goods to the value of $50,000,000 a year. A large part of this business is competitive and must seek the most economical transportation route.

Merely to look at the map of North America proves the logic of the seaway. Seven Presidents, our greatest engineers, and many top-flight business and labor leaders support it. In spite of its distinguished support, it has strong opposition.

The principal objectors are seacoast ports, which fear the loss of transfer business between ship and rail; the eastern trunk line railroads, which are hostile to Great Lakes water transportation; utility interests, who object not to the St. Lawrence power development, but to the fact that it will be publicly rather than privately controlled; and finally, the coal industry, which opposes hydroelectric developments as a threat to coal markets.

The early canal builders opposed the development of the railroads; when Edison invented the incandescent bulb, the gas industry declaimed the impossibility of electric lighting; the railroads opposed the Panama Canal bitterly, as impracticable, just as they today oppose the seaway. Nevertheless, the railroads were built, the automobile succeeded the buggy, electric lights have become commonplace, and the Panama Canal has joined the Atlantic and the Pacific. In each case benefits have exceeded expectations, and predicted disasters have not materialized.

History will prove the justification for the St. Lawrence and its accomplishment is merely a matter of time. The case for the seaway has been proved and reproved so often that its merit is axiomatic. It is not the St. Lawrence Waterway which is on trial in Washington. The issue before Congress is whether the national interest will prevail or whether the self-interest of certain powerful and articulate groups will determine national policy. The seaway is inevitable. The only question is—how long can delaying tactics obstruct it?

American postwar planning is geared to a philosophy of expansion—greater production, full employment, expanded foreign trade, an enlarged merchant marine. The St. Lawrence seaway will help us to obtain every one of these objectives. An expanded foreign trade will cement friendly foreign relations. We need new trade routes and new traffic to support our merchant marine, the largest in the world. Full employment and full production must be geared to a greater volume of commerce and transportation. No project before the American people today will do more to accomplish these objectives than the seaway.

Wisconsin's inland communities, like our port cities, will share in the benefits of improved and cheaper transportation through the seaway. Lake ports will enjoy new shipping and commerce, with increased employment and revenue. It is estimated that the seaway will create in Wisconsin alone from 15,000 to 25,000 new jobs.

A score of Midwestern States, with 40,000,000 people, will share the benefits of the seaway, and Wisconsin will be foremost among them. Its opening will begin a new era for the Great Lakes region and for Wisconsin.

To summarize—the St. Lawrence seaway will open the Great Lakes and its vast industrial and agricultural resources to ocean shipping; it will give power-deficient areas a new, low-cost source of electrical energy; it will add immeasurably to national wealth and national security.

Friends of Democracy Congressional Bulletin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the Friends of Democracy Congressional Bulletin dated February 11, 1946:

FRIENDS OF DEMOCRACY CONGRESSIONAL BULLETIN

A REPORT ON GERMAN SYMPATHIZERS

The Germanophiles have a new line. While Hitler's armies were overrunning Europe they shouted that the war was none of our business; they were unmoved by tales of Hitler's starving, persecuted, enslaved victims. But now that Germany is a conquered nation, the Germanophiles have turned humanitarian. Their hearts are wrung by stories of European starvation and slavery. Their voices clamor their protest against planned famine in Germany, against Gestapo methods used by the Allies against the German people, against the killing of those poor Germans for defending their country.

Ironically enough, even this new humanitarianism is extended only to the Germans; it does not include the non-Germans; victims of nazism. The Hitler apologists still do not have hearts that bleed for all mankind—their hearts bleed for Germans exclusively.

In the vanguard of this "humanitarian" movement is the Steuben Society, a "respectable" group which was formed shortly after the last war to build sympathy for the defeated Germany. George Sylvester Viereck, a German agent operating in this country during both wars, was instrumental in founding the organization and formulating its policies.

In the 1930's the Steuben Society openly admired Hitler and exchanged official visits with the Nazi Party. During our pre-Pearl Harbor days they fought to keep our country isolationist. During the war they criticized the administration and our war efforts. Nowhere in the pages of the Steuben News did one find expressions of shock or pity for wrecked Warsaw, homeless Poles, starving Greeks, enslaved Europeans, or blitzed England.

Currently, however, the Steuben News is fighting our "harsh treatment" of the Germans. "If these are to be days of Carthaginian peace, why cloak our intentions in the guise of pious prattle?" the paper wants to know. "We cannot expect to win people over to our way of life unless we show them our way is less cruel."

Meanwhile, the New York Staatszeitung, which, like the Steuben Society, has a long record of pro-German activity, is enlisting sympathy for the poor, pitiful, persecuted Germans. Dr. Paul Schwartz, writing for that paper, depicts the present misery of the German people and stresses the plight of the children. If it is the American intention to annihilate millions of Germans, he says, it would be better to allow them to die quickly rather than starve them to death.

Other German-language papers echo the Staatszeitung. The California Staatszeitung, the Chicago and Milwaukee Abenposts call the 1,550 calories a day allotted by our Government to each German civilian "planned famine." Reports by the United States Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations are ignored—for these reports show that even now the Germans are better housed and fed than the bulk of European nationals.

The anti-Semitic section of America's pro-Fascist press has also taken up the cudgels for the poor, persecuted Germans. X-ray wants to know: "Why don't the 8,000,000 of German-Americans protest against the savage treatment of their people?" Richard Koch, one of the founders of the Nazi-financed American Fellowship Forum, is back on the scene with a tabloid-sized sheet which calls the Allied occupation of Germany the biggest atrocity story of history. The Broom complains that Americans enslave and starve the entire German nation. One of the so-called mothers writes: "Isn't it just too dreadful—the killing of those poor Germans for defending their country? All they wanted was to be left alone to live in peace after Hitler had built their country up so fine."

German relief groups springing up all over the country act as propaganda organizations soliciting sympathy for the Germans. Some twenty or so of these groups have been organized within the last few months; 17 of

them have been gathered into a federation called American Relief for Germany, Inc. These groups are pressing for: (1) resumption of communications between America and Germany, (2) official endorsement of their efforts to send relief to Germany, and (3) permission to set up headquarters in Germany from which the relief can be administered.

Many officers and "front men" for these groups no doubt are sincere humanitarians. But the bulk of their support and propaganda comes from the old German-American Bund element which is not overlooking any opportunity to work in the open again. Frank Werk, who is active in the relief groups, was once a member of the German-American National Alliance, a brother organization to the bund. Leonard Enders, another relief advocate, belonged to the German-American National Alliance, the Einheitsfront, and once taught German classes for the Friends of the New Germany. At a recent meeting of the American Relief for Germany, Maj. A. Siebel, former president of the Germania Club, told an excited audience that Germany had made America what it is, and that now Eisenhower was throwing good Germans out of their homes to make way for minorities. The crowd booed Eisenhower and shouted: "The Jews! The Jews!"

In Cleveland, Ohio, Otto Fricke was responsible for the organization of a German relief committee. Fricke used to be attorney for the German consulate in Cleveland and he was once associated with the Nazi-financed American Fellowship Forum. Fricke's assistants include five pro-Nazis whose activities range from supporting the phoney "mothers" groups to strutting about in Nazilike uniforms.

In New York City, Kurt Mertig, until his arrest last October, fought the deportation of bund members and issued appeals in behalf of German sufferers. Even if Mertig should go to jail his efforts would be continued by henchmen.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, commanding officer of the American zone has denied categorically that there is any sign of mass starvation in Germany. His statement has been confirmed by newspaper correspondents. As victors we have our responsibilities which we are meeting. A recent study has just been made of the French, British, and American zones of occupation by an American Council of Voluntary Agencies under orders from the President's War Relief Control Board and the War and State Departments. As a result, certain items such as medical supplies, soaps, food, powdered milk, clothing, etc., are to be allowed for infants, the aged, the sick, and pregnant women. All humanitarians would feed the hungry and clothe and house the cold. But Americans must remember that even now the Germans on the whole are better off than their victims. We should be wary of pleas for the "poor suffering Germans" lest beneath the humanitarian garb we find the old Nazi propaganda.

The New Drug, Rutin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, a few short years ago the Senate unanimously passed a bill authorizing the establishment of four chemurgic laboratories, one in each of the great agricultural sections of the country. Now, since the war is over and an army of a thousand or more scientists and chemists is becoming active in an effort to solve the problem for which these laboratories were intended, I am glad to report that the laboratory at Philadelphia has just made a very wonderful discovery which means much not only to all the American people but especially to the farmers of a great many counties in the State of Pennsylvania.

A new drug source has been discovered in the buckwheat which is grown in a great many counties in the State of Pennsylvania. It is claimed that there will be sufficient buckwheat grown in Pennsylvania to supply a new drug known as rutin, which has been found by the medical profession to be the best known remedy for the treatment of high blood pressure. I feel that my colleagues will rejoice in this wonderful discovery by the laboratory, which they all took a part in establishing a few years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Philadelphia Inquirer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE-SAVING CROP—NEW DRUG SOURCE FOUND IN PENNSYLVANIA BUCKWHEAT

(By Gerson H. Lush)

HARRISBURG, April 6.—Pennsylvania may soon become the principal source of rutin, a new drug that has been found to combat high blood pressure, the Nation's No. 1 killer. After carrying on a 2-year search for rutin-yielding plants, the eastern regional research laboratory of the United States Department of Agriculture at Wyndmoor, discovered recently that green buckwheat plants contained 4 percent of the drug, a glucoside.

Pennsylvania produces more buckwheat than any other State, according to Miles Horst, State secretary of agriculture, and the discovery may lead to the development of a new industry in the commonwealth's buckwheat-growing areas.

Mr. Horst said he had been advised by Dr. J. F. Couch, of the Wyndmoor Laboratory, that two or more pharmaceutical plants in Philadelphia may start commercial production of rutin this summer.

Flue-cured tobacco was the previous best source of the drug, but the higher yield and lower cost of buckwheat is such that "$10 worth of buckwheat will produce as much rutin as $1,000 worth of tobacco," it was said.

Two crops of buckwheat a year are possible, Mr. Horst pointed out, since rutin content is highest in plants 5 weeks after sprouts appear. The substance is found mainly in the leaves and blossoms.

"Scientists find rutin content begins to diminish within 3 to 4 hours after immature plants are harvested," Mr. Horst said, "and rutin must be extracted immediately or the plants flash-dried into meal without delay for later extraction.

"Buckwheat plant meal may be sold, on a rutin-content basis when dried. Some existing alfalfa driers might be adapted and the drying plants may bring new revenue to farmers."

Rutin is a bright yellow nontoxic powder extracted from the buckwheat plant with alcohol. According to information here, scientists at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School have found it effective in the treatment of conditions arising from high blood pressure associated with increased capillary fragility.

It has been deduced that bursting of weakened blood vessels causes small hemorrhages which may result, when the rupture occurs in the eye or brain, in blindness or apoplexy. The research also has disclosed that rutin can serve the circulatory system in a manner resembling the action of vitamin C in the growth and hardness of teeth and bones.

Dr. Percy A. Wells, director of the Wyndmoor laboratory, has forecast that 1,300,000 pounds of rutin will be needed annually "to meet both the medicinal and nutritional requirements of this country," and has estimated the 1946 medicinal needs at 10,000 pounds. Dr. Wells also believes that 50,000 acres of buckwheat plantings will be required each year to supply the national demand for the drug.

Pennsylvania averaged 126,000 acres of buckwheat each year in the period from 1934 to 1943, but last year grew only 109,000 acres, which produced 2,016,000 bushels of grain, valued at $2,278,000.

Buckwheat as a grain crop, Secretary Horst added, thrives best in the higher altitudes of the State.

The largest acreages in Pennsylvania are found in the northern tier, central and western counties of Tioga, Crawford, Bradford, Erie, Somerset, Indiana, Jefferson, Venango, Warren, Mercer, Lycoming, Potter, Susquehanna, Cambria, Clearfield, Bedford, Sullivan, Armstrong, Butler, Clarion, and Columbia.

Demand for Hired Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Demand for Hired Farm Labor Continues as Major Problem," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of April 9, 1946.

This article is a very good summary of the labor shortage in our area, which I believe is prevalent over much of the Middle West. The article states that there is a shortage of many thousand farm hands in North Dakota. It comes at a time when we have not sufficient help for spring-planting operations, much less hauling to market the millions of bushels of grain which are now needed to feed the starving people of this world. In my opinion, we cannot get grain from the farmers unless we give the farmers sufficient help to put in their crops and haul the grain from the farms. This cannot be accomplished unless induction of great numbers of farm boys under selective service is stopped at once.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMAND FOR HIRED FARM LABOR CONTINUES AS MAJOR PROBLEM

Demand for seasonal hired labor continues to be North Dakota's major farm-labor problem, H. W. Herbison, NDAC farm-labor supervisor, told a district county agents' conference here Tuesday.

Herbison said 20,000 man-days work in late April and early May in cutting seed potatoes in the main potato area will require services of approximately 2,000 workers for a 10-day to 2-week period. The demand for men by the day or month for spring planting operations now is running far ahead of supply

of workers willing to accept farm work, he continued.

Spring sugar-beet blocking operations will require approximately 1,800 special workers. Seed-corn detasseling will require approximately 2,000 workers, beginning about July 15, Herbison declared.

Herbison estimated that the main harvest season will require approximately 40,000 workers.

For the small grain harvest, Herbison said, negotiations with Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Kansas is expected to produce a "sizable supply of harvest hands with good farm backgrounds."

Approximately 2,050 Spanish, American, and Mexican nationals are expected to arrive in the State the latter part of May for sugar-beet work.

Citing the fact that in 1945, only 75 percent of the grain harvest labor demand was supplied and pointing out that this year's total acreage has increased, Herbison said all available local labor will have to be mobilized.

Foreign labor for the grain harvest is not likely to be available in large numbers, he said. Holdover of Mexican nationals allotted the State for sugar beets will depend largely on interim employment opportunity in the State from July 15 to August 15.

For the potato harvest, Herbison said, it is expected Canadian and Jamaican workers will be among those employed.

Herbison advised county agents to meet with their county farm labor advisory committees in laying plans for the coming year.

Harry Graves, NDAC extension service horticulturist, discussed the victory garden situation.

Graves, who recently returned from a national victory garden conference in Washington, D. C., told the county agents that "few people who have gardened in the past can afford not to have a garden this year."

Ninety percent of city homes and 98 percent of the farm homes had gardens last year, Graves said. There can be no let down in view of the critical food situation he added.

Attending the meeting, one of several being held throughout the State were county agents from McLean, Sheridan, Burleigh, Kidder, Logan, Emmons, Grant, Morton, and Oliver counties.

H. J. Brush, Dickinson, district extension supervisor, was in charge of the meeting. Oscar J. Nessett, assistant State farm labor supervisor, also attended.

Old-Age Security a Matter of Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on the matter of old-age security I want to include the statement that I made before the House Committee on Ways and Means:

OLD-AGE SECURITY A MATTER OF RIGHT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the present social-security program means little for millions of Americans, and I believe it should be greatly improved.

The most important change to make it real, in my opinion, is to pay benefits as a matter of right to every aged citizen.

To more than 2,000,000 aged American citizens the only income is old-age assistance payments, and these are made only on the basis of need. None of these toil-worn 2,000,000 aged people are permitted to feel that this meager amount is a matter of right.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that this is not a mere question of words. The cold fact that aid to the aged is not given as a matter of right, takes the heart out of every aged person. It means that rigid limitations are placed on the aged person's little income, if he is to be granted old-age assistance.

Personally, I have known an aged woman who was obliged to spend the few hundred dollars she had saved for her funeral, before she could have the so-called aid for the aged.

The relief agencies can and do pry into the little private affairs of our old people, some States requiring our worthy aged to turn over their meager savings, even a little home, household goods, and personal property, before aid is given to the aged. The field investigators snoop in the homes of these aged people to make sure the budget is as low as possible. In many States every effort is made to keep from paying the maximum to the aged, even with the Federal Government paying one-half of the amount. Such indignities brought about by the so-called means test, have no place in our American way of life.

Mr. Chairman, there are more humane ways and I believe the best way is to provide old-age security insurance as a matter of right without red tape and the indignities of the present system. The existing old-age and security-insurance program does not cover all our people who reach old age.

Therefore, I believe the present program should be changed to one of security for the aged as a matter of right.

America as a World Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. DOUGLASS BUCK
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a profound and thought-provoking article the author of which is Mr. Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, Inc. The article is entitled "America Has Abandoned Her Role."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA HAS ABANDONED HER ROLE

In 12 years the United States of America has abandoned her role of world example.

Not to discern this is merely to think wishfully, impractically. Other nations with other economies have come to calculate and depend upon it. If many of us fail to note it, we are indeed far gone.

Winston Churchill recently said we are the greatest Nation since the fall of the Roman Empire. Churchill was wooing a loan from us. Potentially we are still great. But our actual greatness is already impaired. What is left is ebbing away.

Our abandonment of world exampleship has been moral, political, and social. It has been going on while the American people were being exhorted as never before to assume world leadership. While the phrase-makers were erecting an appearance of world leadership, they and their friends, behind the scene, were actually undermining the qualities and values which really made America great.

The present impotence of the United States, less than a year after the end of World War II, is no accident. It lies not alone in the rapid demobilization of our Armies and Navies. It can be said of America's foreign policy, as was once remarked of the Democratic Party before F. D. R., that it has the uncanny ability to snatch defeat out of the jaws of victory.

For while we won nearly all the battles of World War II, yet we lost the war. For we have abandoned nearly every principle we said we fought for. Our diplomatic moves have been almost an unbroken series of defeats. The causes relate, not to others, but to ourselves. And the chief of these is that the United States has abandoned the role of world example.

Prior to 1933 in most fields, the United States led the world. Not only in the minds of her own citizens but of freemen everywhere whose faces were turned to the future, she was the last, best hope of mankind. Today, in a world largely wrecked and desolate, she is so regarded no longer. The nations today want but one thing from her; money, to be wrung for them from American taxpayers. That is all. They do not want her advice. They no longer imitate her. They no longer respect her. They view her with contempt, suspicion, or downright hatred.

In the minds of men throughout the world and among their governments, the word of the United States could once be trusted. Her promises to others were depended upon—they were fulfilled. In this, our Government merely reflected the prevailing moral standards of American life.

But today the word of the United States of America is not held in the old regard. Before and during the recent war, our Government was lavish in promises to conquered peoples. The burden of these promises was that they would be free. Most of these promises have not been fulfilled. Millions of persons feel we have betrayed them. Through us they have simply exchanged temporary bondage for permanent bondage. We have joined in making settlements in Europe, the Middle East, and in east Asia that are morally and politically monstrous. When taxed with the truth our leaders have two months; to the uninformed they deny the tragic nature of the settlements. To those who cannot be deceived, they confess they "had to do it to get along with Russia." To the latter also, they murmur words about political realities, which is probably as close as they have ever come to them. Either answer highlights the moral palsy of recent American policy.

This did not happen all at once. Just as America's integrity abroad was once the reflection of her integrity at home, so the habits of our representatives in promising everything abroad and then breaking their word, merely reflect the dealing of our own Government with our own people ever since 1933. Demagoguery nationally has spawned internationally exactly what it could be expected to spawn. The New Deal was a marriage in which glittering promises were united with cynical contempt for their keeping. In leading us to a spurious "world leadership," they have abandoned the priceless moral leadership we once gave the world by simply being true to our word and to our great past.

The political system of the United States was for a century and more imitated throughout the world. But today what nations go through even the forms of such imitation? The Soviet Union is copied, usually through force and compulsion. It seems well accepted throughout Europe today that some sort of totalist state is the pattern of the future, as if mankind were in for a long winter against which only a slave-pen could provide shelter.

Again, if we will look candidly at the facts we will see at least one major reason for all this. Both the spirit and the letter of our political system have, in the last dozen years, been betrayed by those sworn to maintain

them. The world, looking at the New Deal in its various facets and implications, has said, "Thus America is going." And, with an insight into what was really happening, that escaped most Americans, they observed that the measures most characteristic of the New Deal were reactionary rather than new—Marxist rather than American.

Can we be surprised, then, that when the United States began to abandon its own political system, other nations should conclude that it had failed? The irony of this abandonment is not rendered less grim by the fact that the "new order" is being sold to the American people as "more democracy," and is being paid for by our taxpayers. And much of the high-power propaganda by which America is being seduced from American principles is conducted in our midst by agents of foreign governments who have drawn billions of lend-lease from us, and now have their hands out for more.

If one lofty conception more than any other made the United States a beacon light in a dark world for 150 years, it was that of the freedom of the individual. That freedom was the hope of millions of the earth's oppressed. It was religious, political, economic. The free man, as the founders of our Republic dreamed him, is the man who is free in all the relations of living. It cannot be a compartmented freedom. A man cannot be free in any sphere unless he is free in all. That freedom is a natural right. It was conferred upon man, not by any act of government, even the Constitution. It belongs to him, is inalienable. The whole genius of our American institutions flows from it. And any government that seeks to take it away is tyranny. Government exists to preserve and foster these rights. When it infringes upon them it violates the purpose of its creation.

In its place—sugar coated to be sure—we are told there is an entity called "the masses," who collectively have rights that override those of the individual man. Henry Wallace speaks of "the common man." The uninitiated do not understand that we are witnessing one phase of the age-long conflict between those who want the state to act for the individual and those who want the individual to be free. We thought the question was settled in the American Revolution. But it has now been revived. And if we do not move quickly—we red-blooded Americans—that eighteenth century decision will soon be irrevocably reversed.

America has for a century and a half stood for freedom. The Nazis, Fascists, and Communists subject the individual to the State. Today, we Americans are turning to statism—are changing from freedom to slavery. Is it any wonder that in other countries respect for the individual falls to a new low when the United States, history's greatest example of the kind of life that can be established and maintained by free men, is abandoning it?

Persons act always in accordance with their natures. A slave who is content to be a slave will act like one. A free man will naturally create institutions congenial to himself which offer opportunities for progress. Our Constitution, with its careful separation of governmental powers into legislative, judicial and executive, and with its protection of minorities, has fostered the greatest growth in the ambition, the spirit and the imagination of a people that has ever been seen at any time.

All this we are abandoning. Instead, we are being taught that government for the good of all should more and more, day by day, regulate and supervise the life of the individual. We are being inched into totalism. Already the change in the climate of living is observable. Productive capacity per man (independent of machines) has in a few years actually declined. Man seek, less today than formerly, to rely upon their own foresight or prudence. They look to the Government just as reservation Indians looked to the Great White Father to supply their needs. If our ancestors had cherished no loftier principles, where or what would this country be now?

Our people are being taught that freedom is divisible. It is not taught them in those very words. They are told, rather, that it is necessary to have both political liberty and economic security. By the latter is meant, of course, state control over the processes of economic life, which are supposed to guarantee the security.

This is a deception, for in it men barter their economic liberty for a mess of pottage which, ultimately the state cannot deliver without exacting the further price of political freedom. The British laborites are being widely publicized today as firm believers in individual freedom within the Socialist framework. Perhaps they are. But sincerity is no substitute for clarity. Freedom within the framework of a Socialist state would be the freedom of a jail.

Freedom is not divisible. The right of a man to work where he will, for whom he will, is as essential to his political freedom as his political freedom is necessary to his economic freedom. The techniques of tyranny never call for the complete surrender of freedom at the beginning. It is done step by step. Each initial surrender of one portion of the indivisible thing called liberty makes more likely the ultimate surrender of the whole.

Small wonder, then, that the British, the French, the Belgians, the Dutch, the Czechs, and others look with a jaundiced eye upon any thought of adopting the kind of liberty under law that made our Republic great. If we don't want it, why should they? Why should they not yield to the blandishments and pressures of communism?

America is in the process of abandoning Christianity. While Christianity fights for its survival against Marxism, we are ceasing to be the great exemplar of Christianity among the nations. It was because the United States held to Christian principles, even amid the diversity of her many churches, that the national character was fixed. This is recognized even by those who make no formal religious profession. The consequence of that Christian character flowed into every sphere of life. Internationally it gained for America a unique moral preeminence.

There is no better gage of the wane of Christianity in America than the fact the San Francisco Conference last spring was opened without prayer. Timid, appeasing America feared to offend Soviet Russia by appearing to believe in God.

The shield of Harvard College consisted of the Latin word "veritas"—truth; and above, the words "Christo et Ecclesiae"—for Christ and the church. This shield thus appears, for instance, on the walls of the Harvard Club of New York. It always appeared that way. But of late years, probably under the influence of the Frankfurters and other New Dealers, "for Christ and the church" have been omitted. Perhaps they don't go with the intellectual mind. But the incident testifies to the casting loose of America from an ancient and vital mooring.

Protestant churches in particular have suffered inroads from those who, with conspicuous success, have substituted a form of Marxism for historic Christian faith and principles. This Marxism is carefully dressed in Christian terminology. But it is Marxism, all the same. Its technique is simple: it equates the profit motive with selfishness. Since it is a sin to be selfish, men and women, boys and girls are urged to seek a Christian social order in which the motive of profit-making (private, free enterprise) is replaced by the motive of cooperation—Marxism). Even a superficial study of the facts will show the close similarity of these proposals with the fundamentals of communism itself. But relatively few persons take time to make this study.

A great share of responsibility for this plausible subversion of Christianity lies at the door of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Because it operates behind a screen of apparently high religious principle, the uninformed are loath to suspect it and the informed are reluctant to expose it. Such exposures are invariably met by the charge that those who make them are attacking the churches. Because of this strategic immunity, the Federal Council is probably the most useful ally of communism and collectivism within our borders. Where paid agents of the Soviet reach their thousands, such religious teaching is given weekly to millions, and is represented to be, not some foreign ideology, but Christianity itself.

Former American philanthropy, born of an abundance of good will unequaled in any other land, was active the world over. Hospitals, orphanages, institutions of learning, missions, were widely given, staffed, and supported by Americans. The pockets of our people have always opened for sudden disasters requiring help in far-away countries. The resulting good will was a priceless asset.

Today the springs of such philanthropy are dried up. In its place huge sums of money are voted by Congress under communistic pressure tactics. These moneys, given to governments, largely share the fate of any sums given into unscrupulous hands. In some countries, for example, our moneys are going to the bolstering up of pro-Soviet regimes based on force and opposed by a majority of the people. They are used as political instruments for rewarding the submissive and, by their withholding, for starving men who want to be free as we are free. Thus we Americans are robbed of our savings, the credit for "generosity" goes to politicians, and our own money is used to enslave our kind of people. This is another tragic abandonment of which we are already reaping the consequences.

In no way has American genius better shown itself than in invention and scientific discovery. It was our free life that caused the flowering of this age of enriching technical progress. In no country on earth have the private laboratories of business corporations, spurred on by competition, been of greater service to the whole world. But the New Deal would have us abandon all that, even after having won history's greatest war. It now seeks, through Federal subsidy, to take control of these activities, to reduce them to the dictation of slow-moving, arbitrary bureaucrats, many of them almost certain to be under the influence of alien ideologies and of the governments they represent.

How have these things come about? Have Americans suddenly become atheists? Have they discovered overnight that individual liberty is a danger, not a benefit? Have they been convinced that our free economy has been wrongly conceived? Not at all.

They have been deceived. They have been told they are extending and improving the American way, not abandoning it. They have been filched of liberty in the name of more democracy. The thing has been done piecemeal. They are told they are going in one direction, but are led in another.

No Caesar ever bluntly informs the people: "I shall take away your liberties." Instead, he stands in the market place and cries, "On with me to abundance!" Then he leads them to the slave pens.

How can this process be arrested and our government restored? That is too large a subject for this letter. But here is at least one clue: America is in the hands of those who control the votes of 3,200,000 Federal officeholders. To get our liberties back, at least 1,000,000 must be pared from this swollen figure. It is equally important to prevent the setting up of new bureaus.

There is reason to believe that the presence of these 3,200,000 officeholders practically guarantees the continuance in power of whatever party is in control. For if each office holder could influence but two votes in addition to his own, they could well nigh swing any election. Indeed the Dunn Survey has long asserted that office holders control on the average four votes each. By dropping at least a million of these employees, we would break a political machine that is fast carrying us toward serfdom; we would greatly cut the national budget; we would free private enterprise, and we would open the way for America to return to her position of honorable example.

When, in July, 1837, Ralph Waldo Emerson read his Concord hymn at the dedication of the battle monument in the little village of Concord, Mass., his closing words were:

"Spirit that made those heroes dare
To die and leave their children free,
Bid time and nature gently spare
The shaft we raise to them and thee."

More than a quarter of a million American heroes died in the war which the present administration says is not yet over. But in dying, they did not leave their children free. For the country has fallen into the clutches of an alien-minded group, who, in their zest for power, have destroyed America as an example to the world. Our people are no longer free. And such freedom as they have is being undermined every day.

This is the great tragedy of today.

Yet it is not too late for Americans to rise up and turn the whole tide back. America can be free again. She can return to her role of example.

MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc.

National Service Life Insurance Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement written by Mr. J. H. Leib, national legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II, I wish to say that this article was handed to me last Monday with the request that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This organization of American Veterans of World War II is entitled to this courtesy, and I take pleasure in inserting this statement in the RECORD for the attention of the appropriate committee and the Members of Congress:

AMVETS ASK FOR CLARIFICATION OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

On April 7, 1946, General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, announced that veterans who allowed their service insurance to lapse because of nonpayment of premiums would be permitted to reinstate their policies without submitting to physical examination, provided:

(1) That they furnish an affidavit certifying that they are in as good health as they were when the insurance was dropped.

(2) That applications be accompanied by premium payments for 2 months if policy was not converted—or in case of conversion to old line insurance that repayment include interest on all premiums missed.

This is indeed a splendid gesture on the part of the Veterans' Administrator—but what are the facts and circumstances that brought this most unusual action about? Why haven't all of the facts regarding this matter been published?

Early in February 1945 this writer propounded a number of questions to General Hines, formerly Veterans' Administrator, in an effort to find a suitable solution to this most unfortunate predicament. General Hines obviously found the questionnaire somewhat embarrassing and therefore refused to give a detailed explanation as to the basic differences between war risk insurance of the last war and national service life insurance of the recent conflict. A direct reply to other pertinent questions was also evaded. Further inquiry likewise brought no satisfactory information.

On November 20, 1945, there was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by this writer entitled "Veterans of World War II Given Raw Deal on GI Insurance." The conditions that prompted my criticism of the national service life insurance and the reasons why General Bradley has seen fit to give GI's additional time are identically the same for nothing has been done to correct the underlying factors that are causing veterans to drop their insurance. Sooner or later the Congress will be obligated to study this situation and before doing so it should demand from the Veterans' Administrator the answers to the following questions—as of this date:

(1) Number of insurance policies issued under national service life insurance?
(2) How many are paying premiums?
(3) Total amount of premiums paid?
(4) Number of lapsed policies?
(5) Total amount of benefits paid out?
(a) To how many persons?
(6) Number of paid-up policies due to total disability?
(7) Number of policies converted to permanent insurance?
(8) Total balance and assets in treasury of National Service Life Insurance?
(9) Full explanation of basic differences between war risk and national service life insurance?
(a) Regard to premiums?
(b) Regard to benefits?
(c) Comparison in rates and benefits to old-line insurance.
(d) Give specific mortality figures (during both wars) upon which premium rates are based.

If and when these facts are obtained then the Congress will know what is wrong with the national service life insurance, and why so many GI's are no longer holding on to their policies.

More Mail by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Times, issue of Tuesday, April 9, 1946, entitled More Mail by Air":

MORE MAIL BY AIR

Recommendations in a recent report by Assistant Postmaster General Sullivan emphasize the fact that we are rapidly approaching the air-mail age. The speed and convenience of air mail, which was demonstrated so convincingly during the war, must lead inevitably, and before long, to the carriage of all first-class mail by air. Mr. Sullivan's report brings forward convincing arguments to show that the time is not quite ripe for this step as yet, principally because the air lines do not have facilities and are not yet fully able to warrant performance of schedule so as to justify a complete conversion. He does strongly advocate, however, a 5-cent rate for air mail and the establishment of an air parcel-post system. He points out, moreover, that all long-haul first-class mail could now be carried by wings and show a profit if the air lines or the Post Office were prepared to handle it. That this is the goal of both the Post Office and the carriers there can be no doubt.

A significant straw which shows which way the wind is blowing was the recent demonstration before Post Office and Air Transport officials of a Fairchild C-82 Packet, so arranged internally as to be a flying mail car. A complete sorting section, including sorting table, letter rack, and chutes, converts the Army's flying boxcar into a sky post office. Able to handle loads up to 6 tons on a 500-mile flight, and more than 4 tons on a 1,200-mile flight, the plane has about 93 percent of the cubic capacity of a railroad boxcar.

It is evident that both the Post Office and the aviation industry are ready to contribute the factor of swift mail service in ever-growing volume to a peacetime economy of full production and employment.

Government Questionnaires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I requested the Director of the Budget to give me certain information with reference to the number of questionnaires presented by the various executive agencies, independent establishments, and emergency agencies of the Government and approved by the Budget. The Director soon complied and the information is so interesting and illuminating that I think it ought to be made available to the entire Congress. The table which I received discloses that in 1944 the total number of questionnaires sent out by all of the above departments and agencies was 6,144. The total for the year 1945 was 5,039. In the year 1945 the Department of Agriculture topped the list with 857 questionnaires and the Office of Price Administration came next with 825.

Now, it should be borne in mind that the figures presented herewith represent the number of single questionnaires which were approved and sent out, but that many of these questionnaires might have been sent out several different times. Perhaps many of these questionnaires were sent out again and again, monthly or otherwise. Therefore, the number of times the people were presented with questionnaires perhaps exceeded these figures greatly. The infor-

mation which was given me by the Director of the Budget follows:

Reporting requirements and repetitive forms in use by agency Dec. 31, 1945

Executive departments:	
State Department	35
Treasury Department	36
War Department	92
Department of Justice	206
Navy Department	40
Department of the Interior [1]	490
Department of Agriculture	857
Department of Commerce [2]	412
Department of Labor	326
Total	2,494
Independent establishments:	
Federal Security Agency	357
Federal Works Agency (Public Roads Administration)	27
Federal Communications Commission	69
Federal Power Commission	27
Federal Reserve System	143
Interstate Commerce Commission	216
Railroad Retirement Board	97
Securities and Exchange Commission	145
U. S. Civil Service Commission	30
Veterans' Administration	22
Other	74
Total	1,207
Emergency agencies:	
Foreign Economic Administration	35
National Housing Agency	138
Office of Alien Property Custodian	31
Office of Defense Transportation	3
Office of Price Administration	825
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion [3]	71
Selective Service System	39
War Manpower Commission	32
Civilian Production Administration [4]	135
Other	29
Total	1,338
Grand total	5,039

[1] Includes Solid Fuels Administration for War.

[2] Includes Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

[3] Includes Office of Contract Settlement and Surplus Property Administration.

[4] Includes Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Grand total in use December 31, 1944: 6,144.

Minority Report on Price Control Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the official print of the minority report on the proposed price control extension bill, a very confusing error occurred in the Government Printing Office. In the third paragraph, the last sentence reads:

Both this delusion and price control itself are operating to prevent normal economic healing processes from functioning to save America from mere inflation.

This sentence should read:

Both this delusion and price control itself are operating to prevent normal economic healing processes from functioning to save America from more inflation.

MINORITY VIEWS

The minority believes that emergency price control bill, H. R. 6042, contributes to an ominous delusion, existing in this administration, that we can escape a catastrophic inflation without terminating reckless spending and balancing the Budget.

Every ruinous inflation in history has had the same primary cause, a sudden and enormous increase of money or currency among a people without a corresponding increase of things to buy.

This bill deals with the effects of inflation and does not even remotely concern itself with the cause. Yet it is represented to the Nation as a preventive of inflation. Both this delusion and price control itself are operating to prevent normal economic healing processes from functioning to save America from more inflation.

To genuinely cope with inflation, Congress must both stop the outpouring of public funds and simultaneously encourage the output of goods. The effect of OPA to date has been just the reverse—actual encouragement of congressional and public complacency about the outpouring of money and bonds and persistent discouragement of the production of goods.

For 5 weeks the committee received evidence from producers and enterprisers who, perhaps with only a single exception, testified that OPA was crippling and restricting production. Despite our war-expanded production facilities, the OPA policy of "too little too late" has been lowering the American standard of living by creating widespread shortages.

Nowhere are the deadly effects of OPA more clearly apparent than in the home-building industry. There OPA bottlenecks and delays have brought about a reduced production of building materials that has already prevented thousands of veterans from having finished homes.

Besides creating artificial shortages, OPA pricing policies have resulted in black marketing and bootlegging on a scale that threatens the moral foundations of the Nation. For example, competent witnesses, plus careful surveys, indicate that upward of 80 percent of the trade in fresh meat is black market by OPA definition.

The subsidies provided in the bill are highly inflationary, and continue the attempt to conceal from the American housewife the rising prices resulting from inflationary spending. How the Administration can ask the American people to cut down their food consumption, yet continue to sell them food at less than cost, is impossible to understand.

This bill multiplies another evil automatic in governmental price control—the favoritism of one group over another. Equal justice under law is a basic truth on which our Government was founded; yet not only in the law, but also in the daily activities of OPA, this fundamental precept is flagrantly violated again and again.

Under price control, wage control, materials allocation, and profit control, the American system of free enterprise is not operating. That system saved America in time of war; it should be given a genuine opportunity to save us in time of peace. Unless that opportunity is restored to it, the American standard of living, and our western civilization as well, are direly threatened.

Despite the propaganda pressures inspired by OPA officials, the House should deal with this economic narcotic on the basis of the economic facts involved. Regardless of what the House does, the natural economic laws of the universe will continue to function, unchanged by legislative fiat or Executive order.

Finally, the minority urges the House to consider this: That in every ruinous inflation the crushing weight of the loss always falls on the working classes and the poor. While OPA has been posing as a peacetime guardian of the people's savings, actually it has been prolonging and accelerating the ravages of inflationary spending. By concealing inflation and acting as an economic narcotic it has become most dangerous to the future happiness and welfare of the people. This fact is attested to by the record of every price-control scheme in the history books.

FREDERICK C. SMITH.
HOWARD H. BUFFETT.

Don't Fence New England Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Boston Herald of April 11, entitled "Golden Egg Hens." This editorial sets forth the fact that for a number of years in New England poultry breeders have been steadily working toward the production of better strains for utility purposes. The editorial calls attention to a clear case of discrimination. It is possible that the situation is only another piece of evidence to show that OPA has undertaken a task too big for any human agency to administer fairly and equitably. At any rate, it is an evidence that the discrimination exists. The Members of Congress, while representing individual constituencies, are still desirous that there shall be no sectionalism where the general welfare is concerned. Do not fence New England out. The editorial follows:

GOLDEN EGG HENS

It is the custom in Washington to include New England out in the matter of poultry. The early OPA pricing, for instance, set a ceiling for 26-ounce (to the dozen) eggs, but none for the 30-ounce variety, which is our specialty here, with the result that the extra large eggs had to sell for the price of the merely large ones. Now the Department of Agriculture in its grain conservation order has laid down the law that poultry growers must cut their flocks to 80 percent of last year, regardless of their quality and importance.

The blunder in this is the failure to take into account the special status of New England in this industry. Through years of careful and costly breeding work, certain growers in this section have produced disease-free strains of high-producing birds unequaled anywhere else in the world. Hatching eggs and chicks from these flocks are shipped all over the Nation and abroad, often by air, to become the layers and broilers for far-flung eggs and chicken markets. We are in a sense producing capital goods, or, should we say, golden eggs.

The new order cracks down on these breeders with the same severity as on the producers in the Del-Mar-Va area, who are merely growers. One well-known Wrentham breeder, who now has 38,000 birds of an especially fine strain, must slaughter 17,000 this month if this feed-limitation order stands.

This problem will be brought to the attention of Secretary Anderson when he travels to Boston today. One of the leaders in the industry, Leavitt C. Parsons, will propose that the order be amended to ease the cut on those breeders who have established improved flocks under the Agriculture Department's own program. It is to be hoped that Mr. Anderson sees the light.

One Year With Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the first year of President Truman's administration. I have recently read two articles which I consider good. One is an editorial from the Washington Daily News entitled "Give Truman a Break." The other is an article by Tom Stokes in the Washington Daily News entitled "Good Luck to H. S. T." They follow:

GIVE TRUMAN A BREAK

Harry Truman has made some mistakes since he entered the White House. Who else wouldn't?

None of Mr. Truman's mistakes has been fatal. They have been small and human errors, reflecting the trustful qualities of the man who is loyal to his friends and has faith in the good intent of others.

Anyone of any fairness, or sportmanship, or understanding of the great political and economic forces that sweep our Nation and the world today, must admit that even had Mr. Truman possessed superhuman judgment and clarity of vision, even had he done everything exactly right—still, his administration would be in trouble. The difficulties and confusions that beset his administration are largely the legacy of global war, suddenly ended. They are the deluge, coming after another administration which had not prepared for peace. Mr. Truman's mistakes have added, comparatively, only a little to his woes.

Four years of war, destroying most everything produced, and 12,000,000 men to be demobilized from the far corners of the earth. Four years of curtailed or halted production of the things civilians depend upon, while what they had was wearing out. There was bound to be hell to pay. Meanwhile the development through political pressures of a wage and price structure that didn't add up to getting more production of those things so urgently needed. And into this mess steps Mr. Truman, with malice toward none, seeking the cooperation of groups and factions which had been led for years to live by class conflicts and strife. And he had to start off with Cabinet officers and administrators who felt they owed no allegiance to him.

He has tried to build a new administration, loyal to him and with no axes of self-aggrandizement to grind. Some of his choices of men have been unfortunate. Therein lies most of whatever part of Mr. Truman's troubles have been of his own making.

We think, and hope, and trust, that Mr. Truman will learn by his mistakes—that in time he will gather about him men who have know-how as well as loyalty.

The great rank and file of Americans believe Mr. Truman to be of their own kind. They look to him hopefully for leadership. And they are a little fed up on all the shrill caterwauling and brickbat hurling now being directed at him.

GOOD LUCK H. S. T.

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

This is Be Unkind to Truman Week.

The occasion is his first anniversary in the White House, which comes Friday. Consequently, most of those here who make a living by writing for the papers have oiled their typewriters, settled back majestically in their best analyst pose, and let go at the President.

This is a democracy, isn't it?

Some with a flair for economics have drafted pieces about his wage-price policy and labor policies, and their inadequacies. Experts on political matters have treated of the widening split in his party, the moral being drawn according to which side of the split you sympathize with. Some have dealt with Truman the man.

It's the fashion—so here goes another.

Nobody has been really mean or unkind to the President, because it's practically impossible to be. That tells something about the man, and about his failures in his first year, and his successes. Nor can he be unkind to anybody. He's not built that way. Which tells something more about him.

It's been a long year because of all that has happened. To Harry Truman it probably seemed like the longest in his life.

It has been a long time since that day when President Roosevelt died at Warm Springs and Mr. Truman came down from the Senate to take the oath. He stepped, first and foremost, into the management of a war which then appeared likely to last much longer in the Pacific than it did.

It seems years since that day 5 months later when the President walked out on the White House lawn with Mrs. Truman to announce the end of the war with Japan.

Yet the distance from that day to this seems even longer when it is measured by the distance from the joyful concord at the dawn of peace among the three Allies and their people—this country, Britain, and Russia—and the warning issued by the President last week end to our two chief allies against playing old-fashioned power politics in the Middle East.

It is measured, too, by the happy concord at the end of a terrible war and the discord created by Russia in the United Nations meeting in New York.

Yet, within the year, and this is not to be forgotten, the United Nations was created, ratified by our Senate with only two dissenting voices, and now is a functioning organization, whatever troubles beset it. And so, too, were created the International Bank and International Monetary Fund, now functioning, and so also various other agencies for keeping the peace through promoting international stability and welfare.

The distance between that day when Harry Truman became President and now is measured also by the distance between those days when Congress wished him so well and now, when it is fighting him on so many fronts.

We are in an era of great change.

Franklin D. Roosevelt started it in our own domestic economy, not only because he was so intentioned, but because he had to. He rode the storm.

Harry Truman is the victim of the transition, for it is still going on. He inherited it. Never was the clash so sharp between what, politically, is called the right and the left. Extremists are making the big noises.

On the right are those who would take us back to that age for which Vincent Youmans created his most enticing songs, the hilarious twenties. Youmans died the other day, but that age had passed long ago. On the left are those who would hurry us forward, dizzily, to a bright new age, and Americans don't like to be hurried.

Harry Truman is the middle man in all this, caught between the conflicting forces. So, in truth, would be any other man who succeeded to the Presidency in these times. Someone might have done better. Someone might have done much worse.

Perhaps it's a good occasion, as citizens, to wish him luck for the next year in the toughest job in the world.

Wheat and Beer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a sensible, plausible, factual, and timely editorial from the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat.

Every American will sacrifice to the utmost to help the starving millions of the war-torn areas of the world. But in our zeal to lend a helping hand let us hope that we will not needlessly take a single step that will bring us back to the crime waves, lawlessness, and gangsterism that we knew in the days of the so-called noble experiment, prohibition.

The editorial follows:

WHEAT AND BEER

We have yet to hear of any convincing reason advanced why the breweries of America should cut production 30 percent.

President Truman, in his directive to the brewers, stated it was for the purpose of conserving grain, and the grain thus saved was to be sent abroad to feed the starving millions in the war-ravaged areas.

Nobody in this country kicked about that.

We can grasp the idea that distilleries use vast amounts of corn, wheat, and rye and that a 30-percent cut in these grains taken from the manufacture of liquor and converted into food would go far in alleviating the suffering of starving people in foreign lands.

But the authorities are not talking about conserving corn and rye, or even rice, which is the principal grain used in the brewing of beer.

They stress the saving of wheat.

And no less an authority than the president of the United States Brewers Foundation claims that less than .0008 of 1 percent wheat is used in making beer.

Only last night we were informed by a long-time brewmaster of Belleville and St. Louis that no wheat at all was used in the making of beer in this area.

Now for a few facts about wheat gleaned from Government records.

The wheat conservation order came soon after the close of the Nation's biggest wheat year.

The 1945 crop of 1,123,000,000 bushels surpassed by 50,000,000 bushels that of 1944 which was the first billion-bushel year in history.

The war years, 1942–45, averaged a billion bushels—an impressive increase over the 740,000,000-bushel average of the 10 preceding years.

Offsetting the record production is record disappearance—the flow of harvests into channels of export and home consumption.

The wheat stock pile tapered down from 1,373,000,000 bushels late in 1942, when farmers had to store wheat under any available cover to 835,000,000 bushels at the close of

1944 and to 689,000,000 bushels at the end of 1945.

In the last 6 months of 1945 the "disappearance" of 715,000,000 bushels was more than the full-year crops of the middle 1930's.

This dwindling of the surplus supply is understandable in that millions of bushels of wheat went into the manufacturing of alcohol for explosives during the war years.

But it remains unexplained why the breweries, which used, if any, an infinitesimal amount of wheat, should be penalized.

Furthermore, there is not the remotest possibility that the supply of wheat will reach anywhere near the vanishing point.

Wheat is grown so extensively in temperate regions that every month is a harvest month somewhere.

Normally the United States crop is about one-seventh of the world's production.

Only Russia grows more.

India and China, traditional rice countries, grow and consume large wheat crops in their northern reaches.

Canada, Argentina, and Australia, with vast wheatlands and sparse populations, rank as the world's big wheat exporters.

It has not been reported that any of these three countries have ordered the brewing of beer cut 30 percent or any other percent.

Wheat is grown in all 48 States.

In historic 1776, Vermont was the American breadbasket.

Now the honor goes to Kansas, the Nation's top producer.

Out of Virginia in 1851 came the mechanical reaper that made a square mile as easy to harvest as an acre had been, and the winning of the Midwest by wheat was ready to start.

Yesterday a news report was received from France stating that an American ship had arrived at Marseilles with a cargo of 8,000 tons of wheat.

That probably represents all the wheat American breweries would use in an entire year.

So the breweries already have done their part toward conservation, yet are still held to the 30 percent production cut in output.

Why?

Washington Daily News Calls Collier's Magazine Awards to Senator Vandenberg and Representative Monroney "Well Deserved"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News in praise of our colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who has been signally honored by Collier's magazine:

To Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG of Michigan and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma have gone the first annual Collier's awards for distinguished congressional service.

In presenting them, President Truman said that Colliers' magazine has done a fine thing by thus recognizing and encouraging good work in the National Legislature. We agree. And, while many Members of the Senate and House served the Republic's interests well in 1945, we admire the discernment of the jury of distinguished citizens, headed by Owen D. Young, which chose the two men to be honored for serving best.

Senator VANDENBERG, a Republican statesman, was selected "for his ability to rise above partisan politics in welding together the Senate in support of American participation in world affairs." He richly deserves the praise given his skill in statecraft, his awareness of America's responsibilities and opportunities, and his moral courage.

Of Representative MONRONEY we cannot write without a little special pride. We knew this young Democrat as a reporter—and a great one—long before he dreamed of becoming a Congressman. We never have known, in newspaper work or politics, any man less interested in what seems expedient or more interested in what is right. Measured by years, his career in the House has not been long. But concerning him it was said that, "without the aid of seniority," he has worked with conspicuous usefulness to improve the organization and procedures of Congress, to support price controls, to curb inflation, showing "a profound understanding of the duties and functions of a representative of the people."

That pleases us greatly, and surprises us not at all. Usefulness and understanding are what we have always expected from MIKE MONRONEY, and always found him supplying.

We Must Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because, great as we are, there is nevertheless a limit to our manpower and resources, we should no longer drift along the course of least resistance without counting the cost, visualizing the situation in which we will ultimately find ourselves.

It is true that, at the end of the war, we were, from a military and economic standpoint, the most powerful nation in all the world. Some people jumped to the conclusion that we could continue indefinitely to aid the rest of the world by furnishing food, clothing, and shelter to those made destitute by the war.

Other countries have as great or greater natural resources than have we. We are rich and powerful because our efficiency is greater than that of other nations. But there is a limit to our ability to aid others. We can, by being overgenerous, impair that ability. If we eat or give away our seed-corn, we cannot grow a crop next year.

We are told we must use less flour, consume less grain, do without this, that, and the other, so that it may be shipped abroad. Each day letters come to me from housewives, stressing their inability to buy clothing, household necessities. Yesterday, a manufacturer of shovels—a useful if not an artistic implement—gave facts showing that, under OPA's regulations, he would lose money on every shovel turned out. No shovels made by him. And so it is, a scarcity of almost everything needed by the housewife, by the farmer, by the businessman. The administration plans it that way.

You can buy all the ice cream you want, but you can't get butter because OPA plans it that way. The packers are running short of cattle. The black market operators are getting them. Many of the better cuts go abroad. The wealthy buy most of what is left. You and I get hamburger and spareribs—that is, occasionally—because OPA plans it that way.

We are told we must continue to draft schoolboys—they are needed to police the world, settle the quarrels of other nations—yes, perhaps to fight another war with Russia—and that before the veterans of the last war have received adequate care and assistance. Why fight Russia? What for?

We are told we must continue the draft to meet our "foreign commitments." What are they? No answer. Why? Military secret.

The internationalists have their plans, which disregard the fact that we are almost $300,000,000,000 in the red, but call for billions of dollars as gifts—not loans—to Britain and to Russia.

To me, the plans do not make sense. In my judgment, we can do with less planning, with more of the methods and principles which for more than 150 years worked so well, made us so powerful, brought us so much prosperity.

The issue seems rather simple. Do the American people want more of planning, of being told by Washington what they should eat, wear, and in what kind of homes they should live; what they should make and sell; how they should conduct their business; that it is their duty to furnish the cannon fodder needed to settle the quarrels of Europe? Or shall we break the hold of the planners and, protecting the weak from the strong, go back to the old way which we have tried and found efficient—the way where every man had an opportunity to travel just as far as his ability, his thrift, and his willingness to apply himself would take him?

The American people should decide upon the course they intend to follow, select next November the representatives who will carry out their wishes. Let us make up our minds which way we are going—right or left.

Draft Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial by Mr. Angelo Scott in the Iola (Kans.) Register of April 3, 1946. He presents with forceful logic a convincing reason for continuing selective service that our forces may be maintained at the strength necessary to complete the job of winning the war and the peace to follow without imposing upon the men

who have already contributed long and hazardous service.

NO OTHER CHOICE

It is hard to see how Congress can refuse to extend the draft for another year.

It is an unpleasant duty. We all would like to see it stopped, goodness knows. We all agree that it is tough to take our young men out of school or away from productive jobs for "wasted" time in the Army.

But which is tougher? To put new young men in the Army for 18 months, or keep old ones in who have already been there 2 or 3 years?

That is precisely the choice we have. You can't liquidate a world war in 6 months. You can't spend 4 years whipping great nations like Germany and Japan to their knees, then just walk off and leave them.

We simply must maintain a large enough Army this next year or two to finish the job we have started. And the only way we can do it is by keeping men in who have already done more than their share or by supplanting them with new ones.

It is not too much to ask a few hundred thousand youths to serve their country now as 12,000,000 have done before them these past 4 years. At least they won't be shot at. And they will only have to serve a year and a half.

It is just one more necessary job that has to be done.

Negotiation of Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition prepared by Mr. Francis A. Adams, of New York City:

To the United States Congress, Through Direct Appeal to the House of Representatives:

This petition is respectfully presented to the United States Congress in conformity with the constitutional privilege assured a citizen of this country of his right to present his personal views, and to seek such protection as is guaranteed under our laws, in a matter in which he has direct and weighty concern.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which was extended in 1945 for a period of 3 years, provision was made for the continued negotiation of trade agreements through the offices of the State Department. The act of 1945, with amendments, was a perpetuation of the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act passed in 1934, which provided that, in all instances where the Government of the United States of America undertook trade agreements with any foreign country, our citizens would be afforded an opportunity to learn what commodities were under consideration for rate changes, and to be permitted to present facts as to how such changes would affect the individual and his business interests.

As publisher and principal owner of Rayon Textile Monthly, a trade publication interested in the chemical industry, the chemical yarn industry, and textiles, your petitioner desires to present for the consideration of the Congress, the following facts.

Since 1922, the tariff law of this country has extended protection to the producers of synthetic organic chemicals, under a provision of all tariff acts from September 1922 to date, on the basis of having imports of synthetic organic chemicals appraised upon the American valuation of the same or similar products. This has been a safeguard to the industry and has permitted it healthy and continuous growth.

All other dutiable commodities entering this country, with the exception of those which have been specifically shifted by Executive order, under the flexible provisions of our tariff, enter on a foreign valuation basis.

With the chaotic conditions throughout the world, both in industry and as to the monetary conditions prevailing in different foreign countries, your petitioner seeks that such action be taken by the Congress as will extend to all dutiable commodities entering this country, the necessary safeguard of being appraised upon the basis of American valuation. This does not impose an embargo on the importation of goods; nor does it destroy either the spirit or purpose of any existing laws. It does furnish the necessary measure of protection to American wage earners, American industry, and, as a consequence, to the American consuming public, against unfair competition. The chemical industry, the rayon industry, and the textile industry are interrelated, so that they move forward and prosper together, or, they are blighted by the same circumstances in periods of business upheaval.

Your petitioner specifically requests that the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, calling for individual hearings on pending trade agreements by the United States of America and any other country, be held in Washington; and that due time be given to labor representatives and representatives of the industries affected to appear and present facts relating to their commodities and the working conditions in their industry.

Your petitioner respectfully urges that the attempt to have a simultaneous hearing by the State Department on trade agreements with a multiplicity of countries, 14 being specifically enumerated, be ruled out as a mode of procedure.

The building of every industry in this country has been one of slow and tortuous effort, calling for the investment of private capital, long years of development by trial and error, and the ultimate establishment of industries that pay the highest prevailing wages in the world under the best working conditions, and which are of great value to the country in the matter of national defense.

All these benefits to American labor, to American industry, and to the people, as a whole, may be jeopardized by hasty mass consideration of trade agreements, held ostensibly under the Trade Agreements Act, by waiving one of its most essential provisions, that of bilateral, and not multilateral, negotiations.

FRANCIS A. ADAMS.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 10, 1946.*

Recent Events in Washington High Light the Challenge of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, herewith, a copy of a magazine article which I wrote for the March issue of the Republican, under the title of "This Month in Washington."

Primarily, I desire to call attention to the gratifying firming up of recent American foreign policy and the significant—perhaps the determining—part which Senator VANDENBERG played in the transition of our foreign policy from one of abject appeasement to one approaching realism in our contacts with the U. S. S. R.

Incidentally, the following article calls attention in passing to the Presidential qualifications of Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and of Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois. Any discussion of the field of 1948 candidates for the Republican nomination for President must give careful consideration and thoughtful evaluation to the experience and ability of these two prominent legislators as a survey is attempted to determine the qualifications, attributes, backgrounds of experience, and capacities for leadership which should be found in the Republican candidate for President in the crucial election of 1948. The vote-getting ability of both of these men is also an established and demonstrable fact.

In this speaker's opinion, the Republican Party could gamble more greatly and do much worse than by deciding that its outstanding legislative talent should be harnessed as a team to spearhead the 1948 drive back to Constitutional Americanism by presenting the American public a ticket comprised of VANDENBERG for President and DIRKSEN for Vice President. Their victory in the election of 1948 would assure the country of experienced leadership drawn from both the Senate and the House and it would assure all lovers of freedom that America would have an administration in which the Executive and the Houses of Congress would work together in harmonious and effective action.

These men could lead an action program to put the United States back on the road of prosperity, high production, fair profits, steady and substantial wages, in a world free from the threat and scourge of war.

The article follows:

THIS MONTH IN WASHINGTON

(By KARL E. MUNDT, Member of Congress, South Dakota)

Like a great boat battling its way through alien, uncharted seas, our American ship of state has been floundering along since war's end in its foreign policies, without compass, without a directed course, and without the guiding hand of an experienced and proficient pilot. It was left to a Republican last month to take the first big, important step in getting the American ship of state headed in an understandable direction once again!

If Congress awarded a medal for the speech of the month, in February the honor would have gone, unanimously, to Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, Michigan, for his courageous, candid, and convincing speech delivered on the Senate floor, upon his return from the United Nations Organization meeting in London. Senator VANDENBERG spoke out eloquently on points upon which President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes had not dared even to whisper faintly.

On February 27, the Michigan senior Senator summarized for the Senate and the country his reactions and observations during the 37 days the UNO conference had held sessions in London. He spoke in high terms of

the accomplishments and activities of both the General Assembly and the Security Council. He reviewed with refreshing candor both the credits and the failures of that historic meeting. His descriptions of the General Assembly as "the town meeting of the world" and "the vocal conscience of the earth" were on a level with Winston Churchill's great use of the English language. Those word pictures are destined to stand in the world's memory as optimum goals toward which the UNO must steadily aspire.

In these days of reckless and prodigal spending by our own New Deal Administration, with its disdain for the importance of economy or budget-balancing, it was inspiring to learn that the United Nations Organization is to be financed from a so-called working capital fund of $25,000,000 and that its provisional budget for 1946—including the Court at The Hague—is $21,500,000, of which the United States' share is only 25 percent. As Senator VANDENBERG pointed out, on this basis the United States will spend for peace in this connection far less per year than it spent per hour for war.

VANDENBERG CASTIGATES APPEASEMENT POLICY

However, it was in his discussion of Russian-American relations that Senator VANDENBERG rendered his greatest constructive service by calling upon the administration to abandon its appeasement policies of Russia. Adding his great influence to the speeches and reports of others in Congress who have recently visited Russia or had opportunity to study her techniques in her section of the world, the eloquent Michigan Senator asked the question, "What is Russia up to now?" He suggested the outlines of an American foreign policy based on realities and firmness which would—before it is too late—find the answers to that all-important question.

Here is how he put it: "What is Russia up to now? It is, of course, the supreme conundrum of our time. We ask it in Manchuria. We ask it in eastern Europe and the Dardanelles. We ask it in Italy where Russia, speaking for Yugoslavia, has already initiated attention to the policy legions. We ask it in Iran. We ask it in Tripolitania. We ask it in the Baltic and the Balkans. We ask it in Poland. We ask it in the capital of Canada. We ask it in Japan. We ask it, sometimes, even in connection with events in our own United States. * * * It is a question which must be met and answered before it is too late.

"I assert my own belief that we, Russia and the United States, can live together in reasonable harmony if the United States speaks as plainly upon all occasions as Russia does; if the United States just as vigorously sustains its own purposes and its ideals upon all occasions as Russia does; if we abandon the miserable fiction, often encouraged by our own fellow travelers, that we somehow jeopardize the peace if our candor is as firm as Russia's always is; and if we assume a moral leadership which we have too frequently allowed to lapse. The situation calls for patience and good will; it does not call for vacillation."

The two-time Michigan candidate for the GOP Presidential nomination (perhaps again?) summarized his position forcefully, "There is a line beyond which compromise cannot go; even if we have previously crossed that line under the pressures of the exigencies of war, we cannot cross it again. But how can we expect our alien friends to know where that line is unless we reestablish the habit of saying only what we mean and meaning every word of what we say? I have the deep conviction that this way is the dependable way to permanent peace and concord between us, with its inevitable effect upon the United Nations. Indeed, I have the feeling it is the only way. I have the feeling it is the best way to win Soviet respect and Soviet trust. Respect must precede trust; and both are indispensable to peace."

VANDENBERG DEMANDS WE ADOPT CANDID POLICY

Senator VANDENBERG was not the first or only Member of Congress to speak up for the adoption and implementation of a consistent and candid policy toward Russia; but as a member of the American delegation to UNO, his voice is the most authoritative. This writer, who spent a month in Russia and its area of domination last fall, agrees with every word and emphasis of the VANDENBERG report.

During the past 3 months, I have carried the burden of the same theme to Chicago, Philadelphia, Des Moines, Canton, Massillon, New York City, South Dakota, the White House, and Congress. Everywhere, I have found Americans supporting the gist of this message which expands upon the simple statement, "The path to permanent peace with Russia is a six-lane highway: Be firm, be fair, be friendly, be definite, be realistic, and be American." Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio has been making similar recommendations since our visit to Russia last fall.

This writer also believes that, until now, the Truman-Byrnes operators, in the field of foreign policy, have failed completely to be consistent in the use of any of these straight lanes marking the highway to peace and to mutual understanding with Russia. It is hoped that the great voice of Senator VANDENBERG will help produce some order out of the confusion of our foreign policies.

Indicative of the fact that the straight talk of the Michigan Senator and others is having its effect, is the fact that just after his report to the Senate, Jimmy Byrnes made a public address which was the most commendable and American statement he has made as Secretary of State. His address indicated a shift toward the right. Displaying a certain amount of mental heel-dragging and reluctancy, he spoke up for the first time in conformity with the recommendations of those insisting that continued appeasement of Russia on all points can have only calamitous results. Still later, Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, moved timidly in the same direction.

If this administration, at long last, will turn a deaf ear to the American Labor Party of New York, the left-wing crusaders of the CIO, and its Political Action Committee, and to its counselors from among the Communists and their fellow travelers (note the neat manner in which Senator VANDENBERG brought in that point during his address) who have, collectively and individually, been demanding continued appeasement of all Russian demands as the price for their continuing support of New Deal congressional and Presidential candidates, it can greatly serve America and the world by reenforcing peace through the development of Russo-American relations which will preserve the self-respect of both countries and require abject surrender of the principles of neither.

THE AMERICAN SCENE

During the past month, followers of public affairs have found much to stimulate both contemplation and conversation on the American scene as well as in the field of foreign affairs.

The exciting and prophetic exit of Harold Ickes from the President's Cabinet is a case in point. Not for a great many years, if ever, has a Cabinet member accompanied his resignation with more pungent accusations than those used by the self-styled "old curmudgeon." His stirring and startling statement, "I could not retain my self-respect and stay in the Cabinet of President Truman," could scarcely be classed as Republican propaganda about the ineffective and devious devices of the present administration, but it was stronger by far than any accusations made by responsible Republican leaders regardless of the evidence and provocation which might call for their use.

The strange and stubborn insistence of President Truman that his hand-picked choice (Ed Pauley, former national treasurer and campaign-fund collector for the Democratic Party) should be appointed as Under Secretary of the Navy, with the way cleared for him soon to become Secretary of the Navy, still has that appointment tied up in committee as this is written. Whether the millionaire California oilman will withdraw his name as a candidate or whether he will be ratified or rejected by the Senate is not yet clear. Clear for all to see, however, is the fact that the President's penchant for "government by cronies" is fast losing him friends and supporters. Even numerous Democratic newspaper editors and commentators have openly criticized the President for such appointments as Pauley's and for having installed in Washington so many old cronies and former associates of the Pendergast machine that this growing contingent is now known as the Missouri Mob.

On the American scene, too, there has been much more the past month to interest and alarm the student of contemporary public affairs. The inept fumbling of the administration's price policy people has continued to encourage strikes, slow down production, prolong shortages, and expand unemployment. By their stubborn failure to readjust price schedules so that production at a profit can be resumed on many products and by its dangerous advocacy of higher wages to be squeezed out of prevailing price ceilings, these policy makers of White House appointment have developed the closest thing to a nationwide man-made general strike and shutdown—resulting directly from programs and positions fashioned in Washington—that the United States has endured.

Not all the fault in this connection stems from unreasonable labor leaders. Much of it flows from official agitators such as Secretary of Commerce Wallace, Chester Bowles, and other White House associates. Some of it comes from unyielding industrialists, some from the inevitable disruptions of war, some from communistic agitators in the labor movement, and some from other contributing causes; but the solution is in the hands of the administration if it would choose to act courageously to correct the legitimate abuses and then provide price adjustments and wage and profit possibilities which would be fair to all concerned.

SPRAY FROM THE POTOMAC

To Senator CHARLES TOBEY, New Hampshire, hard-working and crusading Republican liberal of the authentic vintage that realizes that the most liberal government is that which governs least, goes this month's award for the senator who has done most to help rid government of corruption and complicity. Senator TOBEY has spearheaded the fight against the appointment of Ed Pauley. It was his energy and zeal that produced the witnesses who revealed Pauley's "oil for contributions" activities in the testimony of Secretary Ickes and others. It was his determined desire to bring all the facts to light which prevented a Democratic whitewash of the whole affair and which finally developed a deflection among Democratic senators which—regardless of the final results—will be slow to eliminate.

Talk in the House is heard again that Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, may be among those given serious consideration for the Republican Presidential nomination for the 1948 election. DIRKSEN was a preconvention contender before the last convention and won himself many friends by his penetrating attacks upon the New Deal, made in speeches in the numerous States he visited during his campaign. He is a veteran of World War II, and his long experience in Congress provides him with one of the important criteria by which Republicans are likely to examine potential candidates for 1948: How much experience have they had

in national affairs which would enable them to make the necessary corrections in government which are so badly needed in Washington now?

"Elections are won in the precincts." With this phrase, a great former South Dakota State Republican chairman, J. D. Coon, Sioux Falls, used to conclude every Republican workers' meeting. Coon's curtain line is good doctrine for all of us these days. This is "precinct organizing time" in many States. It is time to call together Republican workers to start the work of bringing in new Republican registration cards, to fill up vacancies in the ranks of the workers, to weed out the deadwood, to select effective candidates for every office, including all of the county or city positions. Into this precinct teamwork this year, it is especially important to bring the veterans of World War II who are of voting age.

"Elections are won in the precincts." We have the most important elections in American history to win in 1946 and 1948—now is the time to put power into the precincts!

Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, from the Washington Evening Star:

OUR ARMED FORCES—I

(By George Fielding Eliot)

The present period of transition from victorious war to established peace is one of special trial and difficulty for the armed forces of the United States.

They are beset on every hand by elements of novelty and of uncertainty.

They face tasks which are altogether new. Never before has the United States been compelled to assume the tremendous responsibilities of world leadership, of being at one and the same time the most powerful military nation in the world and the principal pillar of a world-wide organization for the maintenance of world peace and security.

Yet at the very moment that these responsibilities must be shouldered, the armed forces must also face the task of recasting their whole organization, their plans, and their thinking, to meet the exigencies imposed upon them by the new weapons which the war has brought into existence, weapons which drastically affect the making of war in the future and the maintenance of security against war.

These responsibilities are heavy. They cannot be borne by the armed forces alone. They must be shared by all of us. There are certain fundamental principles which every citizen should understand if we are ever to have the secure, peaceful world for which we fought this war and made so many sacrifices.

First, we should forget the word "defense." There is no longer any such thing as national defense. The only defense, as General Marshall has said, is in the power of attack. For the present, at least, the basic contribution which military power can make to our security and to the security of the world is offensive power so great that no one will dare to challenge it.

Second, the primary element in that offensive power must be air power. It can hit first, it can reach farther and it can strike heavier blows than any other form of power. Time, reach, and destructive potential are of vital importance—not only in the winning of a future war which we hope will never be fought, but in the consideration of others who may at some future time weigh the chances of peace or war.

Third, for the present the maintenance of an unchallengeable air power requires (1) the command of the sea, in order to have access to outlying bases and strategic mobility to move our air power wherever we may need to send it; (2) sufficient ground forces to protect the bases and communications of our air power from any form of land attack.

These principles are generally accepted. There are differences of view as to the strength, type, and equipment of the forces necessary to implement them, but these differences really lie within comparatively narrow areas, and relate to immediate needs rather than to future objectives.

Many of these differences arise from the extremely difficult conditions of the postwar period, in which the armed forces are carrying out a tremendous demobilization program, including not only the return of millions of young Americans to their homes, but the disposal of billions of dollars worth of surplus property, at the same time that they are trying to establish the firm foundations of the permanent military establishments of the future.

It should be clear that they must for the present be allowed a considerable degree of latitude in this respect. In the fighting of a war the objective is clear. You know what you are trying to do. You can form a reasonable estimate of what you need to accomplish your objective. But in facing the problems of maintaining peace in a chaotic, uncertain world, with new weapons and new political conditions, there can be far less certainty.

But put it this way: If we now spend more on our armed forces than future events prove that we need have spent, we shall have wasted money. But if we do not spend enough, we may bring about the collapse of the world's hopes for peace by not being strong enough to support those hopes, and we may in the end bring about the destruction or enslavement of this Nation.

Our armed forces must continue to be the servants of our people. No man in high place within them has any other desire. But military advice and military considerations must be given a far more prominent and assured place in the formulation of national policies than ever before.

The penalty for failure or carelessness in this respect has heretofore been heavy, but we have been able to pay because we have always had time to rectify our errors. This will never be the case again. Our next mistake in this field may well be our last.

During this period of political, military, and scientific uncertainty our first military consideration must be to have enough power. Later on, as the outlines of the future become more sharply defined, and as the confusions of the postwar period subside, we can make suitable reductions and rearrangements. But unless we are to throw away this victory as we threw away the last one, we dare not mortgage the future now, either in the name of a false economy or a bad guess.

OUR ARMED FORCES—II

(By George Fielding Eliot)

The basis of military strength is trained and available manpower.

It is fair to say that no immediate danger threatens the United States as we pass through what General Eisenhower called this period "of world readjustment and reconversion." No nation is ready for war or desires war—today. Congressmen tend to calculate in terms of next November. They say to themselves: Nothing very serious can happen before election day. Meanwhile the extension of the draft and universal training are unpopular. Or, anyway, they're unpopular with some people, they can lose us votes, but we can't lose any votes by letting them slide because nothing's going to happen between now and November that we will need an army for.

Which is an excellent example of the ultimate responsibility of the citizen for the security of his country. As long as Congressmen are not called to account for this short-term political juggling, just so long they will keep it up; the only remedy is for the people to start thinking of the long-term needs and policies of the country. When they do, automatically the public servants will be compelled to do likewise.

Vast numbers of men who were inducted for the period of the war are passing back to civilian life. This process will be completed by the middle of this year. Meanwhile, the new Regular forces are taking shape. They are composed partly of volunteers, and partly of men called up under selective service since the end of the war, who are serving (under present arrangements) for a period of 2 years. The Navy and the Marine Corps are receiving very few recruits from selective service. Their personnel officers are convinced that they can obtain their full requirements through volunteering, at least for the present; but these officers add that they do not know whether this would continue to be the case if the incentive to voluntary enlistment provided by the continued existence of the draft law were to be removed.

The immediate manpower problem to be dealt with is that of the Army (including, of course, the Army Air Force). There are at present about 650,000 volunteers in the Army. The bulk of these (about 55 percent) are serving 3-year enlistments. The others are serving 1-year or 1½-year enlistments. The target strength for the end of the fiscal year 1947 (that is, for June 30, 1947) is 1,070,000 officers and men. Can the Army attain that strength by that time through voluntary enlistments alone?

Nobody knows. It is a matter of making the best guess possible, with very little to go upon. If the draft law is repealed, or rendered inoperative as of May 15 (its present date of expiration), what effect will this have on voluntary enlistments? It's certain that a good many of the short-term volunteers have enlisted to avoid being drafted for 2 years. As to the 3-year enlistments, it's also certain that a great many of these are high-grade noncommissioned officers or former Regular Army men who enlisted to protect their ratings or their seniority. Has the cream of this source of manpower been skimmed off already?

But why must we do these things now, when no immediate danger threatens? Because it is now that we should begin laying the foundations for the future. Because others are watching us—those who may wish to know whether they can depend on our strength in the world of tomorrow, those who may wish to calculate whether they can challenge it. No one can say what the state of the world will be on June 30, 1947. The proposed "target" strength for the Army on that date is the minimum which will enable the Army to discharge its obligations in the matter of armies of occupation, forces earmarked for UN use, and training, and still have a small reserve in hand with which to meet emergencies.

We dare not reduce the Army to a lower point than this until we have had a chance to see how our hopes work out. There is grave doubt that the number of men required can be obtained by voluntary enlistment if the draft law is permitted to expire, or is rendered inoperative by any legislative de-

vice, on May 15 next. The Army asks only that it be extended for 9 months—which will carry its operation past the period when the next Congress will convene, with a fresh mandate from the voters and with an opportunity to reexamine the situation as of that time, both in terms of the operation of the voluntary system in the meanwhile and in terms of world conditions. The duty of the present Congress is clear—to take no risks that can so easily be avoided. Congressmen who fail in that duty have little claim to the further confidence of their constituents.

United Nations Headquarters and Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter received by me from one of my constituents, Col. Truman Smith, of Fairfield, Conn. Colonel Smith has just retired from active service after a very distinguished Army career which included 10 years of observation as assistant military attaché and military attaché to our embassy in Berlin before the Second World War, and also 6 years in the Military Intelligence Division of our General Staff following 1939.

This experience certainly qualifies Colonel Smith to speak with authority on the subject of securing our strategic areas against espionage and enemy action so far as that is possible. It likewise entitles his opinion on the subject to serious consideration. In view of these facts, it seems to me that his statement as to the location of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations is of tremendous importance to every American who is interested or concerned in the security of the United States.

I feel very strongly that the questions raised by Colonel Smith as to the dangers of locating the UN headquarters in the vital New York-New England triangle should be exhaustively examined by the security officers of the State, War, Navy, and Justice Departments of our Government, and that comprehensive reports should be made by each of these agencies to the respective committees of the Congress responsible for the departments.

It is my considered view that our national security requires that no permanent action be taken toward establishing a permanent enclave for the United Nations until such reports have been presented and considered, and recommendations thereon been made by the committees to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend these remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Colonel Smith's letter, and an editorial on the same topic from the April 7 issue of the Bridgeport Post:

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *March 13, 1946.*

DEAR MRS. LUCE: I should like to bring to your attention an aspect of the UNO-site controversy which while having been largely overlooked, so far seems to me of the utmost national concern—I mean its aspect of national defense. The point is, that except for a location close to Washington or Oak Ridge I can't think of any location less favorable to us from a defense point of view and more advantageous to an enemy espionage network than the Fairfield-Westchester site. Welcome as one may the UNO in our country, it just isn't in our interest to make it into a spies' paradise. And yet the proposed 42-square-mile international enclave is just that. Thirty miles away from our largest navy yard—Brooklyn—and our greatest overseas harbor—the port of New York—and an equal distance from our machine-tool metropolis—Bridgeport—which our ordnance department has always considered one of the six most important cities of America with regard to national defense, it is, indeed, the answer to every intelligence agent's prayer.

Having worked for 12 full years in our military intelligence service I know what I am talking about. I know from experience how difficult it is to operate espionage from the limited confines of an extraterritorial embassy premise, where every visitor to one's office is scrutinized or trailed. One could rarely stir abroad oneself from this tiny bit of American soil without being followed at a discreet distance by a casual appearing stranger whose unostentatious clothes and square-cut shoes betrayed a plain-clothes policeman.

What would I not have given as an American military attaché in Berlin from 1935 to 1939 for the existence in the Berlin environs of a 42-square-mile international enclave, located, let us say, at Zossen or Doeberitz. In such an enclave I could have located a suboffice of the military attaché. Then not even the all-powerful Gestapo could have prevented my agents from sneaking in and out of the enclave to report or to receive orders from this suboffice. With such a base of operations, I could have disregarded the efforts of Heinrich Himmler. And how nice it would have been for me to have close at hand international airfields and radio stations from which to communicate with Washington at will and where to have my office safes and codes adequately guarded by a squad of husky American soldiers.

Now there is not the slightest reason to assume that foreign intelligence agents would be less smart in using the Fairfield enclave than I would have been with regard to an enclave near Berlin. Any foreign military attaché worth his keep must necessarily be starry-eyed at the chance to use the proposed UNO enclave in the United States of America for the intelligence purposes of his country. For aside from the location near our greatest port, navy yard, and machine-tool center, the Fairfield site has another advantage: The countryside in both Westchester and Fairfield is so wooded and rugged that unauthorized ingress or egress could only be regulated by many thousands of tons of barbed wire and as many hundreds of police and plain-clothes men. Worse luck; any capable foreign intelligence service could operate a fairly efficient espionage network from headquarters in the Fairfield enclave, despite all efforts to prevent same by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's highly proficient force of FBI operatives.

In other words, the counter-intelligence disadvantages of the proposed UNO site are such that they should at least be weighed by our leaders if not aired in public. There might come a time when the American people will blame those who should have known better for creating a uniquely ideal basis for foreign espionage from an ill-advised faith in the honorable intentions of ten thousand-odd UNO employees. Nor has the argument that foreign espionage would have been conducted successively anyway—UNO enclave or no UNO enclave—much validity. While it is difficult to checkmate the operations of foreign intelligence agents altogether, there is no good reason to play Santa Claus to them by giving them an enclave withdrawn, as proposed, from supervision of our FBI, State police, and Army and Navy intelligence agencies, and close to our most important defense installations.

It is, in my opinion, essential that our policymakers, particularly those having responsibilities for national defense, like Admirals Leahy and Nimitz, General Eisenhower, and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, should be consulted—and their opinions heeded—before America damages irrevocably its security by ceding to UNO an area peculiarly dangerous from the standpoint of national defense. There are sites aplenty in America which could be offered UNO with less danger to our own security; for instance; Mount Desert Island off Maine; the Prescott region of Arizona; Mackinaw Island in the straits between Lake Michigan and Lake Huron; or one of the beautiful Sea Islands of Georgia's Atlantic coastal archipelago. They are favorable sites, both climatically and scenically, even though a trifle far from the flesh pots of Broadway.

But, no matter where the UNO enclave will be located, our Government should announce here and now that its borders be sealed hermetically from the rest of the country and that unrestricted travel to and fro across its borders will be limited solely to heads of foreign missions. Other UNO employees and American citizens coming from outside must, in the interest of national security, not be allowed to cross the border of the enclave except with a special individual FBI permit.

It is the least, so it seems to me, that we can do to safeguard our national security.

Sincerely,

TRUMAN SMITH,
Colonel, General Staff (Retired),
United States Army.

From 1920–24 assistant military observer and attaché, United States Mission and Embassy, Berlin, Germany.

From 1935–39 military attaché, United States Embassy, Berlin, Germany.

From 1939 to date Military Intelligence Division, General Staff, War Department, Washington, D. C.

[From the Bridgeport Post]

OUR NATIONAL SAFETY

Newspaper correspondents have been hinting lately that Russia, which was one of the nations initially favoring a permanent UNO site in the United States of America, is experiencing a change of mind and beginning to look toward Geneva.

That's the kind of news we should classify as "important if true." And we hope it is true.

For there is one aspect of the proposed Westchester-Greenwich-Stamford site which has received very little discussion. Perhaps it isn't polite even to discuss it, but there are times when our national safety ought to depend upon something more substantial than politeness. That is the question of foreign espionage.

Russia, for instance, is shown to be a very badly behaved ally in this respect. Russian espionage in Canada is an admitted fact. Furthermore, despite the abject apologists in this country who will say anything they can conjure up in favor of Russia (or against their own country) Russia was not forced into espionage by fear of the atomic bomb but actually began her systematic corruption of Canadian officials long before the atomic bomb was in the works. It's just an old Russian custom, it seems.

Now the location of UNO permanent headquarters in Fairfield County would furnish a perfect nest for such espionage. Of all possible locations, it is one of the most dangerous from the viewpoint of our national safety. It is just 30 miles away from our largest navy yard in Brooklyn and our greatest port, New York. It is about an equal distance from Bridgeport, which is regarded by the ordnance department as one of the six most important

cities in the United States for defense purposes.

Apropos of this, it may be told now that when there was fear of German bombers breaking through our defenses and getting to this country, Bridgeport was No. 2 on the list of American cities rated by the War Department as most likely to be attacked.

The operation of a spy ring or, in more polite language, a military intelligence service from the central UNO site in Fairfield County would offer almost ideal conditions for the violation of our hospitality and the betrayal of our military secrets.

Meantime, we still have that abandoned peace palace at Geneva. Why not use it as a temporary headquarters? Representative CLARE LUCE made this suggestion some weeks ago, and the more it is considered the more sensible it appears.

Then, if the Russians really have changed their minds (which we don't believe), make it the permanent headquarters. Or if they haven't changed their minds, let's change ours. Why build a new palace for UNO when the old one will serve?

Nobody will be ferreting out American military secrets in Geneva.

Draft Extension and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, this House was troubled today as it discussed the draft extension measure before it. Personally I feel that we somehow are missing a central hub to which the relationship of this measure could be attached and thereby be proven true or false in its relationships to other factors which should be considered with it.

This Nation of ours is not militaristic. We are not martial in our attitude. We crave a method for peaceful arbitration of world problems.

We should be about it. As the article by Dorothy Thompson—which I have permission to include with these remarks—says, "We should make a radical move for the abolition of war":

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

General Eisenhower, in his Army Day speech, reiterated the theme of General MacArthur: "The goal is the universal renunciation of war * * * with certainty."

That is possible presuming that the UN governments mean business—to make the Kellogg-Briand Pact a reality, and abolish every possibility of force as an instrument of national policy.

But the United States cannot disarm on that assumption. The Soviet Union—a dictatorship ruled by a party of world-embracing ambitions, and a philosophy which affirms violent struggle as the only road to progress—is rebuilding an army of 15,000,000 men, adding new armed forces from neighboring states and proselyting people from all nations into its international party and instrument.

Our Government, it seems to me, has failed to initiate a radical move to abolish war while permitting our military defenses to decay and our internal affairs to drift, at the same time collaborating in political decisions which create easy opportunities for a powerful aggressor and the likelihood of another war—after we have put ourselves in the best position to lose it.

We are thus both entering an armament race, and tying our own feet.

As long as war is a possibility, it should be an axiom of American foreign policy never to permit a situation to form under which any power could attack and defeat us, while we could not defeat it. As long as war is a possibility, we should take a leaf from the book of the Soviet Union and regard as possible aggressors against us all countries powerful enough to risk such a venture.

The Soviet Union would be in a position to do so if it controls Europe. It can control Europe if it controls Germany. Our political policies are leading inexorably in that direction. The Potsdam agreement was, for the United States and Britain, the most disastrous political action of this war. Through it we are creating all but the certainty that Germany will produce, not another Hitler but another Tito to add German labor, science, ingenuity, and military aptitude to what is already the most powerful military state on earth. That will be the German "revenge politics" of the future. If we go on as we are.

Just as Hitler during the Russo-German Pact moved or developed industry eastward to protect production from British bombings and western invasion, so we are now helping move all German heavy industries into the Soviet military complex or destroying them. The Silesian, Czech and Austrian heavy industries of incomparable use to Hitler, the Yugoslav copper mines, and all the oil of Europe, Polish, Rumanian, and Austrian, are at the disposal of the Soviets. The Polish oil fields were taken by the Soviet Union from an ally; Austrian oil, first discovered and developed by American initiative, is wholly in Soviet hands; Rumanian oil belonging to American, British, and Dutch firms has been taken by the Soviets without compensation.

The Soviets themselves assert that their oil reserves are above American oil reserves without the oil of Europe. Now, in all probability, the Soviets will add that of northern Iran. All of this is at Soviet disposal within a contiguous land complex.

The only great heavy industry left in Europe is that of the Ruhr-Saar. That we are engaged in dismantling. The Soviets do not want the Ruhr to go to France. Any proposal to Europeanize it meets demand for Soviet participation, though there is no western participation in eastern German heavy industry.

The latest decrees for Germany ban 14 additional industries, including synthetic gasoline, oil, and rubber, and seek to establish for 70,000,000 people the living standard of 1932—the year of highest unemployment and unrest that brought Hitler.

Germany may have light industries, but these need tools, oil, rubber, machinery, metals. Germany can pay for them only by exporting consumer goods. But to whom? Certainly not the United States. Germany can find a reciprocal market and source of supply only in the Soviet Union. Her only hope to keep her workers employed under present arrangements is to tie her economy with the Soviets, exactly as the light industries of Hitler's Europe had to work with and for German owners of heavy industry, a plan which when practiced by Germans was correctly called "Raubwirtschaft."

Politics follows economic necessity. The necessity we are creating for Germany is to join the Soviet economy or perish.

The negative American policy plus starvation will inevitably produce a German Tito to combine a purge of anti-Communist elements (called Nazi collaborators) with patriotism and revenge directed against the west.

Yet Potsdam was not an American policy. We were committed to its insanities without foresight, discussion, or approval of Congress.

This writer wants to be on the record before the American people against the almost certain results of this policy for our freedom and security and to urge that we make a radical move for the abolition of war. If that fails, we shall know where we stand.

When the Martin resolution was before the Military Affairs Committee I presented a statement outlining my own opinion regarding a real program looking toward the possibility of abolishing war. I offer it here for your consideration:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Martin resolution involves our foreign policy in the broadest possible degree. To work, it would have to be prefaced by a well thought out policy designed to promote and maintain confidence between nations who were entirely unarmed. Merely to outlaw compulsory training will not alone achieve this. Nations, in their distrust, could fall back on professional armies of any size.

I am interested in world peace. I feel that every proposal should be considered, every possibility explored. I believe I know, from first hand observation and experience, some of the problems. I believe that the success of the peace we all hope for is inextricably tied up with the success of our wise use of force as we now go about the work of restoring law and order and a civic consciousness among the peoples of conquered, liberated, and war-devastated countries.

I would like to suggest:

1. That we take immediate steps to correct our army of occupation policies.

This should never be done with combat troops. It should be done, in my opinion, with volunteers, especially trained, distinctly uniformed and equipped, and especially indoctrinated. The nature of occupational work is entirely different from that of combat.

We are trying to rebuild and rehabilitate—more, we are trying to revive a spiritual quality. It is indeed a peculiar type of missionary service. Service in this work should appeal even to those who object to service under our flag because of the violence of war. These should be doing this work rather than those who were trained and skilled for combat. It is small wonder that the latter feel that their time is being wasted and that many are disgruntled. Our combat troops should have been returned at the earliest possible date.

We should have learned some real lessons from the mistakes of our own attempt to rebuild the South after the War Between the States. We could make good use of some of the lessons learned thereby in the occupational task abroad. We should be building confidence among and between the nations.

2. That we push the Martin resolution.

There is a powerful sentiment in this country for such a move. We should lead in presenting this challenge to the nations of the world.

3. That we should also propose the alternative of total and complete world disarmament.

This possibility should be explored before we can intelligently make alternate determinations.

4. That we hold in abeyance our own military training program for a year until we determine the reaction of the world to the above three suggestions.

Certainly we should profit by the effort. We would, at least, have a better concept of the nature and location of our menaces.

5. That we attempt to develop out of the experience of especially trained occupational troops some idea of the nature, purpose, and size of a world police force called for in the United Nations plans.

Certainly, if the peace of the world does depend upon the wise use of force by UNO, we should begin as soon as possible to find out when and how to develop such a force and the mechanics for using it.

Certainly, there are values in such a suggestion and if we are sincere about our desires for world peace, it is my opinion that we should try them.

Ships Galore—But Who Gets Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled, "Ships Galore—But Who Gets Them?" which appears in the April issue of the Washington News-Digest.

The Washington News-Digest, as most of us know, is edited by our distinguished former colleague from New York, John J. O'Connor, who for many years was chairman of the House Rules Committee. The article follows:

SHIPS GALORE—BUT WHO GETS THEM?

(By Fred M. Plumb)

So, you want to go into the ocean shipping business. Well, you could not have picked a better time except that your own Government, in cahoots with the big-shot ship operators, may have the cards stacked against you.

Most Americans, when they think of the steamship business, have in mind only line sailings, on regular schedules. To go into such a business requires an awful lot of money, but what is not generally known is, that in even normal times, 30 percent to 35 percent of our huge foreign traffic is carried in so-called tramp vessels—that is, independent ships operated as the business shows up, and without any fixed schedule as to sailing dates or as to any particular ports at which they will stop.

In this typically American free lance type of business, a man might start without too much difficulty and without enormous capital, by buying or chartering just one vessel. It would seem, with a good part of the world to be fed and rehabilitated with foods and materials, which must come from other countries, principally ours, that there ought to be plenty of shipping business in the coming years, to provide real opportunities for Americans who wish to enter this important industry.

Naturally those thousands of merchant marine men we have trained on our ships during World War II, and at our academies, would seem to be likely newcomers in this business. But read on, brother, and you'll see they haven't the chance of the proverbial snowball.

You must have read that your Government owns about 6,000 surplus vessels of various kinds, the greatest fleet in all the world, about 75 percent of all ships afloat. You have probably also read something about it being the policy of the Government to encourage American citizens to enlarge our Amercican merchant marine. Let's see now, whether this is on the level.

Suppose we consider the conditions which will affect your chances of actually operating an American ship on the high seas. Hold your horses.

THE SHIP-SALES BILL

Congress has just passed, and President Truman has signed, the ship-sales bill, which sets forth the terms on which surplus ships can be sold or chartered. The low-down is, that the Commission, and the big ship lines, hope and pray that nary a ship will be sold, or even chartered, especially to an outsider, the so-called independent. They have cooked up a smear on this typical American venturer, that he is engaged in cutthroat competition. The truth is they would love to cut his throat for having the audacity to compete with them. Remember when competition was the keystone of free America? New days, these.

And speaking of the independent ship operator, the big fellows in the monopoly, American and foreign, have done such a good job on him—with the aid of the official Government agency, the Maritime Commission—that the species "independent" has become almost extinct.

All the boys, permitted to swim in the big pool, would prefer that all these surplus ships be moved in the Hudson, the James River, or at Mobile, and in California waters, and let the barnacles do their damnedest.

Most of our surplus ships are Liberty ships, which have a capacity of some 10,000-odd tons—that's a big ship, son—which means that for tramp or unscheduled sailings, these vessels would be useful only for such period of time as large lots of cargo would be available for shipment. It looks, however, as if there may be considerable cargo, moving in bulk—a whole shipload—for the next 2 to 4 years, especially as to UNRRA and other relief and rehabilitation supplies.

TRY TO CHARTER SHIP

You might have the happy thought, that if you did not wish, or could not afford, to buy a vessel, you might want to charter one. If such is the case, you had better bear in mind that this ship sales bill gives to the United States Maritime Commission discretion in chartering the surplus Government-owned vessels.

If you've been around, you'll know that any discretion Congress foolishly grants to any administrative agency, is the old "Mother Hubbard which conceals the works." And when the bureaucrats get through giving the works to the outsider, either applying to buy, or even charter, one of these ships, well, let's quote the type of eugenic examination that is in store for the bemedalled veterans, for instance.

Read what one of the best informed Washington newspaper correspondents reports, in the New York Journal of Commerce, the outstanding newspaper carrying shipping news:

"The Commission is also going to want to know a good deal about the buyers of its ships. It is going to ask questions about his associates in business and about what he intends to do with his ships. There are no restrictions on use of vessels specifically placed in the act, but there are enough warnings that the commission's transactions must be in harmony with this and that section of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and the 1916 Shipping Act, to warrant a careful screening of each purchase. At best, ship dispcsal is going to be a complicated business."

There's a rude awakening waiting for the hero of the Bulge who thinks his discharge emblem will get him at least to first base.

To better understand the possibility of expanding our American merchant marine, more than temporary attention should be called to the past policies of the United States Maritime Commission. First of all, that body considers that, ordinarily, it is necessary to provide subsidies to equalize the cost of building and operating American vessels because of the lower costs of building and operating them in other countries. The Commission's policy has been to extend such subsidies generally to only one American operator in a particular trade or route.

There are about 300 steamship lines operating in and out of the United States in the foreign trade, but under the restrictive policy noted above, there are only some thirty-odd American lines engaged in servicing foreign shipments.

THE CARTELS

Furthermore, in each trade or route there exists what is called a steamship conference, a polite name for an international shipping cartel. "Cartel" is a nasty word. It signifies a combination or monopoly by a few big shots to control a certain trade or product and crush, or keep out, the little fellows. These monsters of business are well known throughout the world, but have never been given carte blanche in our Land of the Free, except in this one instance—mark you well—in connection with foreign shipping.

The Department of Justice, through its Antitrust Division, has done a consistent and glorious job, since the days of President Teddy Roosevelt, in trust busting. Steel, oil, aluminum, movies, the Associated Press, insurance, gunpowder, meat, and other combines or cartels have been yanked into court to make them toe the mark, in the American way—not a la London or Amsterdam.

About the only outstanding cartel left for the trust busters to bust up is the conference system of the foreign steamship lines, in which our American operators are in a very small minority. The cream of the combine goes to the foreigners. You might even ask why America continues to suffer from this inferiority complex toward things foreign.

Despite the fact that the foreign lines dominate such cartel groups, the United States Maritime Commission has, more or less, insisted that all subsidized American lines must become members of these shipping cartels.

So, make up your mind, ambitious American youth, first of all, that your chances of securing a competitive subsidy are mighty small. Next, should you be permitted to buy or charter one of these surplus American vessels, built with the taxpayers' money, partly yours, you might or might not be able to become a member of any one of these shipping cartels, because understandably, they are not anxious to see new competition on their trade routes. And on that exclusiveness, again, they have the blessing of the Commission.

Incidentally, you might not be able to raise the membership dues, recently boosted by some cartels from $250 to $5,000, or perhaps you would have trouble digging up the $25,000 deposit you must make, to guarantee you will stay in line and not be caught having a highball with any cut-throat independent.

You may say, "All right, I will operate outside of the conference." Just try it, brother! If that is your thought, then you had better stop, look, and listen! Inadvisedly, the 1916 Shipping Act did not prohibit these monopolistic shipping cartels from being formed, but did provide for a watchful regulation by the United States Shipping Board and its successor, the United States Maritime Commission. Sure Congress never intended that these shipping cartels should be permitted to become monopolistic. The 1916 law forbade the principal and most effective weapon theretofore used by them to that end, namely, the "deferred rebate" system. That connivance was simply a scheme whereby the shippers were forced to sign contracts to ship exclusively with the cartel lines, otherwise they could not secure the regular and usual and fair going rates.

Since that scheme was outlawed by the 1916 Shipping Act, these shipping "conferences" (strangely enough, with the blessing

and official approval and support of the United States Shipping Board and its successor, the present Maritime Commission) dropped the deferred rebate system for a new racket—known as the conference contract system. This is the same old horse, the different color being that if the harried shipper signs a contract to ship exclusively with vessels of the conference lines, he secures the regular going rate, without, as under the old trick, of having to pay a higher rate and wait for a rebate of the difference. If he does not sign up—well, read on.

SHIPPERS ARE AT THE MERCY OF THE COMBINES

Take Ford Henry, auto truck maker of Pontiac, Mich. He has a new truck he wants to ship to London, on one of the lines which are in the group of 12 steamship lines (3 American) in the trade between New York and Shangri-la. They are members of the "Liv-New" (our concoction) Conference. Mr. Henry is told that if he wants the regular rate of $20 a ton on his trucks, he must sign a contract to ship all his trucks for 1 year on ships which belong solely to the Liv-New Conference Group.

If he balks at signing that contract for a year, he is compelled to pay $30 a ton. That 50-percent penalty puts him at a competitive disadvantage with the truck makers in Europe.

Multiply Ford Henry by thousands and thousands of shippers in the United States and you will get a picture of this colossal, legalized hold-up.

Oh, yes; an attempt was made in Congress to remedy this scandal. Just this year, during the time the ship sales bill was being considered in Congress, amendments to the bill were passed by the Senate of the United States, providing, in effect, that in carrying out the measures of the ship sales bill nothing should be done to hinder or restrict lawful steamship operation, and also providing that—

"No application by an American citizen for the charter of war-built vessels, under the jurisdiction of the United States Maritime Commission shall be rejected for the purpose of (a) denying lawful operation of any kind or (b) restricting or eliminating competition in ocean shipping in the foreign trade of the United States."

But—"but," that is, when the House and Senate bills were sent to conference—the legislative one, we mean—the lobbies around the conference committee room were so alive with representatives of the big shipping interests—foreign as well as American—that the committee was compelled to sneak off and hold secret sessions. Of course, the representatives of the Maritime Commission were inside the locked room—whether properly or not—"advising" with the conferees.

Result! Of course you guessed it! Out the window went said amendments, providing for free American independent operation of our American-built, owned, and tax-paid-for ships.

There is right now a bill in Congress to give veterans priority on the sale of these surplus ships, but you can lay 10 to 1, it will continue to languish in that cute little pigeonhole—unless some real friend of the veterans comes to life.

So Mr. American citizen, and you young graduate of the Merchant Marine Academy, and you honored sir with the Purple Heart—won at Okinawa—you who want to go down to the sea in ships—just keep a cool head and don't kid yourself that, pronto, you'll be in the foreign shipping business. You sure won't, unless Congress wakes up.

Nor can you count on the situation being much different because the United Maritime Association (UMA) of the allied nations wound up its business and dropped its controls of international shipping on March 2 last. That drug, power, is never relinquished willingly. (Like UNO, its illegitimate cousin, UMA was the offspring of the world government striped panters.)

If you're still thinking of going into the foreign shipping business just keep in mind what our Federal court said in an analogous law suit, *U. S.* v. *National Lead Co.* (66 U. S. P. Q. 141,149)—

"It is more difficult for the independent outsider to enter this business than for the camel to make its proverbial passage through the eye of a needle."

Where Is the Butter?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more evident every day that the foolish and unnecessary rulings of the OPA are causing butter to disappear from the tables of many American families. The OPA has adopted a short-sighted policy, have been stubborn, and refuse to take the advice of the advisory council in regard to the production of butter.

I received a letter from Mr. Leonard Hurtz, president of the Fairmont Creamery Co., and he tells me, in substance, that hundreds of creameries are closing and black markets are flourishing in butter. The situation is extremely dangerous, and the people are greatly annoyed by the actions of the OPA, with their regulations, which have caused many small creameries and farmers to quit producing butter. I understand that the production of creamery butter in 1946 will be the lowest in 25 years and that there will be the greatest shortage of butter this fall that we have ever experienced in this Nation unless something is done to improve butter production by some of the means suggested by the Pace committee in the House.

The record shows that the production of creamery butter in 1920 was 863,000,000 pounds. In 1921 it was 1,054,000,000 pounds. In 1921 the population of this country was about 105,000,000 people, which means that the production of creamery butter was about 10 pounds per capita.

From the present records and the projected present trends, the production for 1946 will be less than 900,000,000 pounds, which is less than 6½ pounds per capita. The population of the United States is now nearing 140,000,000 people. The dairy industry has repeatedly pointed out that the OPA is directly responsible for the present shortage of butter, because they have failed to follow the experience and the advice of the dairy industry.

The only way to beat the black market is to have full production, and there can be no full production unless there is a price for the product which reflects a profit. There must be an increase in the price of butter, or there will be no production. The Members of this Congress will be facing an election this fall. It may be a little hard for you New Dealers in Congress, and those who avidly support the OPA, to explain to your constituents just why there is no butter. Believe me you will be on a hot seat, because the housewives of this country will not be fooled. They will know that the principal cause of the great butter shortage is incompetence of Government and the ineffectiveness and failure of Congress to write regulations in the OPA Act, which will help to increase the supply of butter.

Mr. Hurtz predicts that when the elections come this fall, that both the good, hard-working, and the poor, lazy Congressmen will find it extremely difficult to explain to the voter why hundreds of the creameries have closed on account of the present butter situation. They will find it difficult to explain why they let the OPA continue to fiddle while the dairy industry is being wrecked.

This fall will be 1 year after the war was over, and yet the butter shortage will be the worst in our history. Amendments to the OPA Act are in order.

Necessary Amendment to Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Robert B. Irwin, executive director of the American Foundation for the Blind, recently discussed what he terms a necessary amendment to the Social Security Act—to provide insurance against blindness. I believe Mr. Irwin's statement should interest every Member of Congress, and I ask permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statement follows:

AN INSURANCE AGAINST BLINDNESS
(By Robert B. Irwin, executive director, American Foundation for the Blind)

The Social Security Act includes a plan for extending relief to needy aged people with investigations to determine need in each case. In order to relieve the aged from the humiliation and surveillance associated with a relief administration, an insurance plan is included in the law which those who become aged in the future will receive from the Government an annuity as a matter of right. The act also includes a relief plan for the needy blind, but it is not accompanied by a corresponding plan for insuring wage earners losing their sight in the future against the consequent dependency.

The law should be amended to set up an insurance against blindness. It should not be exactly like the old-age insurance because the situation of the blind is different. Blindness may come at any age. It not only reduces earning power but increases the cost of living because of the special expenses resulting from the lack of sight. Unlike the aged, however, the blind have a possibility of partial rehabilitation, and the annuity should operate in such a way as to stimulate such rehabilitation. To accomplish this, the insurance payments to the blind should be in two parts:

1. An annuity, such as the person would have received had he reached age 65 instead

of becoming blind, based on such equity as he as a pay-roll taxpayer may have built up in the Insurance Trust Fund; and

2. An allowance of say $40 a month to meet the increased cost of living imposed by blindness.

While the $40 a month should never be disturbed, the annuity factor might be reduced as earning power is recovered. The reduction, however, should be made in a way not to interfere with the processes of slow and tedious rehabilitation. The blind annuitant should be permitted to acquire a demonstrated earning power up to say $60 a month before there is any reduction in his annuity payments. These payments should then be reduced in such a way as to leave an incentive to acquire a greater earning power. These should neither be reduced suddenly, as in the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance plan, nor by one dollar for each dollar earned, but by 50 cents for each dollar earned. Thus there would be a monetary reward for further effort. The increased cost of living still continues and therefore the $40 a month should not be withheld.

True, the gradual reduction of the annuity will require some slight additional administrative expense. However, the number of blinded wage earners of working age will be only a few thousand. The human rehabilitative value of the gradual reduction is well worth the extra cost.

Three-fourths of blindness is preventable. The incidence of blindness in the wage-earning years is declining and will eventually tend to disappear from the population. The $40-a-month permanent allowance to industrial workers who are blind is not excessive. It is only one-fifth of that of the permanent pension allowed the military blinded.

SPECIAL EXPENSES OF THE BLIND

Blind people have certain expenses which seeing people do not have to incur:

Traffic conditions of the present time make it difficult for blind people to get about without a guide. This naturally entails expenses which seeing people do not need to meet. Blind people who do travel alone often find themselves in a situation where they must have special help. This very frequently involves the giving of gratuities which a seeing person in similar circumstances would be spared. A blind man must of necessity frequently use a taxi which a seeing person with a modest income would regard as a luxury.

Clerical service must be employed, at least part time, by my blind people, even though they are not in business, so that they may do the reading and writing which seeing persons in similar situations would do for themselves.

Minor repairs to the house owned by a blind person usually must be done by hired help, while the seeing house owner would take care of these himself. If the blind person has a lawn to mow he must pay for having this done. In most instances his living quarters must be operated with automatic heat which usually costs more than a hand-tended furnace or stove.

The place of residence of a blind person must be one from which he can travel to his work without incurring too much danger. This means he must have a good sidewalk or well beaten path to follow and this often involves the payment of higher rent than a seeing man working on the same job would have to pay.

Groceries and some other commodities must be ordered over the telephone by the blind housekeeper as she cannot get out to do much shopping. This presupposes the cost of a telephone which a seeing family might forego, and also usually results in paying higher prices for commodities because they must be purchased from the more expensive stores which will deliver, instead of at the public market or cash-and-carry stores.

Furthermore, a blind housekeeper frequently misses money-saving sales as she cannot read the advertisements.

Clothes belonging to a blind person who wishes to appear neat must be sent out for cleaning or repairs, whereas the seeing person may often do this work for himself.

House cleaning is done without hired help by most people in limited circumstances, but the blind woman finds its necessary to hire a certain amount of house cleaning done in order to keep her home looking presentable.

Communists Sponsor American Youth for Democracy Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, unsuspecting people are now positively on notice that the noisy American Youth for Democracy group is a front for communism. The university and college people of this country should now govern themselves accordingly. This organization is out to take over this Government, if it can.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a news item from the Washington Post, which relates to this subject:

COMMIES PUT O. K. ON AYD, STUDENT GROUP

(By Frederick Woltman)

NEW YORK, April 9.—The Communist Party finally admits its paternity of American Youth for Democracy, student storm center on university campuses.

The party's national board ordered Communist State headquarters throughout the Nation to regard AYD as the official successor to the now defunct Young Communist League and to use it as an innocent-sounding front for recruiting young Communists.

All talk of reviving the YCL was forbidden as "diverting the party from its real tasks and responsibilities to the AYD."

By denying any Communist tie-in and claiming to be a broad, student organization of no political leaning, the AYD has won official campus recognition in 63 universities, according to its own figures.

Last month 15 delegates appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee to oppose military training as an "imperialistic" device.

The AYD has also lined up many prominent backers, including Edward G. Robinson; Col. Evans Carlson, of Carlson's Raiders; Barney Ross, ex-boxer; Frederic March, Norman Corwin, Danny Kaye, Gene Kelly, and Attorney General Robert W. Kenny, of California; also Jane Froman and Garson Kanin, the movie director.

The Communist Party itself let the cat out of the bag. Its directive was based on a report to its secret National Committee Plenum last February by Max Weiss, national executive secretary of the YCL when the latter was dissolved in October 1943.

"Today," the Communist State branches were notified, "the most important and effective channels for organizing and promoting effective action of the advanced anti-Fascist youth is the American Youth for Democracy. It would be the crassest mistake to minimize the importance of this organization."

Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from James D. Graham, president of the Montana State Federation of Labor, dealing with peacetime military training and conscription.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Helena, Mont., April 6, 1946.

Senator B. K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: The Montana State Federation of Labor at different conventions during the past 30 years or more, has gone on record against peacetime military training and conscription as not the best thing for an enduring peace between nations and contrary to our democratic way of life.

The Selective Service Act was intended, as its name indicates, to defer those whose services were of more value to the war effort on the home front than in the armed forces, to provide the munitions of war, food, and maintaining morale and civilian activities. In the administration of the act, this was lost sight of in many places. We have now reached a stage when the home front must be considered. Our food production is breaking down as well as the production of clothing.

The production of wool in this country has dropped during the war, or from July 1940 to July 1945, from 450,000,000 pounds to 300,000,000 pounds per year, or one-third of our annual clip.

This is caused by the shortage of manpower, or the Selective Service Act drafting men engaged in animal husbandry.

The sheepmen have not been breeding the ewes for a number of years on account of being unable to secure efficient help during the lambing season. This in turn has caused a great decrease in the number of sheep in this country. Judging by the drop in wool production we can safely estimate that the number of sheep in this country has fallen off one-third during the war.

At the office of the tax commission or board of equalization at the State capitol building, the following figures were secured—therefore must be considered authentic:

Number of sheep in Montana and assessed value for taxable purposes

Month	Year	Number of sheep	Assessed value
July	1942	3,169,557	$17,782,389
Do	1943	3,021,001	17,635,006
Do	1944	2,711,939	16,147,312
Do	1945	2,248,082	13,111,742

The foregoing figures show a decrease in the number of sheep of a fraction less than one-third in 3 years' time.

There is a greater number of old ewes at present than in normal times. The old ones are a poor asset on account of the high death rate caused by old age.

It is safe to assume that the drop in the number of sheep in the other wool-producing States will be about the same as in Montana. The decrease in the annual wool clip in the country will warrant this assumption.

Owing to the shortage of manpower, $5 per day with room and board had to be paid for help at lambing time. It is said that some sheep men paid as high as $10 per day for lambers, but the writer has not been able to get confirmation of this. However, the production or breeding of sheep at present does not pay, it is not good business. The writer is not sentimental about this as the iron law of wages applies to wool production and animal husbandary, the same as it does to any other industry.

Unless we give some consideration to the sheep industry, the time is not far off when only the very rich will be the ones in this country who will be able to eat lamb chops.

At present, the sheep industry of this country is being liquidated and the Selective Service Act is a great factor in the liquidation. The lamb crop and the wool clip will both be low this year.

Considering dairying in Montana, we find that dairy cows dropped from 170,000 in 1943 to 135,155, which is almost 20 percent reduction.

In January of this year the production of butter in Montana was 14½ percent below the butter production in January 1945. The production of butter in Montana for a 5-year average ending 1945 has decreased 43 percent. Montana exported butter to the Pacific coast States, including California, and now not enough butter is being produced to supply the demand of the people of Montana.

The production of cheese in Montana during January 1946 was 41 percent below that of January 1945.

Montana has very few large dairy herds. The greater supply of milk and cream came from the farms that had from 5 to 30 milking cows. Few farmers milking less than 10 cows have milking machines.

When the Draft Act went into effect and the farm boys were inducted few were deferred, although deferments were asked.

During the first 3 years of the Selective Service Act auction sales of dairy herds took place all over Montana. The reason for this was the shortage of manpower on the farms, as more farm boys were inducted, the greater number of dairy stock was sold. Many of these dairy cows reached the butcher's block, heifer calves were vealed, and the dairy herds were depleted. The farmers, after selling their dairy cattle, purchased beef cattle. This in turn sent the price of young beef cattle skyward.

Through the war years the farmer could not get all the farm machinery he desired. He also had a time getting parts to make repairs to his machinery or to get mechanics to do the repairing, as the Draft Act took the mechanics from the garages. All the boys that were drafted from the farms and are now demobilized are not going back to the farms. To what have they got to go back? There are no cows to milk, as the dairy herds are badly depleted and the weekly check that the farmers received from the creamery for milk and cream was a stabilizer for those who were establishing themselves on a farm.

The sheep raising is unprofitable at present, and farmers cannot get farm machinery with which to commence farming.

Starvation faces the people of the world and will for a few years to come. It is time to get back to production.

Our armed forces, with the cooperation of the workers in the war industries, won the war and in doing so accomplished a gigantic task.

It is the work of the Department of State to secure the peace. If there is a failure, then we will have to do the fighting over again and finish up with world starvation.

Russia is the only nation that there is danger of getting into war with.

Is Russia so strong and so well prepared for war with us that war is imminent? No.

We have enough military trained men in this country in reserve to equal any trained body of men that Russia can put in the field. However, we are not in shape to fight another war until we build up our food production and civilian goods including clothing.

For over a century and a half, Russia has been planning and dreaming of territorial gains. The threatened attack by Russia on Turkey is nothing new, as Russia has fought two wars during the past century to get Turkey and the straits.

Ninety years ago, the Crimean war was fought over territory and the straits. Russia against Britain, France, and Turkey. Again in 1879 Russia attacked Turkey. In this war Britain supported Turkey. At this time Turkey is in better shape than Russia is for war.

Let the Selective Service Act end. If war becomes imminent, then a new law can be enacted. We are in a better shape than Russia is now. However, we need time to recuperate.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES D. GRAHAM.

Liberals Duped Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, those "liberal leaders" (?) who participated in the Win the Peace conference held in this city last Sunday must have red faces today. The Communist line was so marked that it should be a cause of real chagrin to any loyal American.

The Milwaukee Journal editorial is to the point. Under unanimous consent, I incorporate it as part of my remarks:

THE LIBERALS DUPED AGAIN

The Win the Peace conference in Washington is a clear indication that many of the liberals of this country—and we are speaking here of honest liberals—are being taken for another ride. We are back to the days of the false front organizations which flourished before America entered the war—organizations that had no other purpose than to do the work of Russia.

What other purpose has this "Win the Peace" movement which has been drummed up over the country? It ladles out the same line of argument as the Daily Worker in New York. Russia is always right—she can do no wrong. The Win the Peace delegates at Washington are willing to hiss Herbert Hoover's name, while they pat Stalin on the back for putting the screws on Iran. Strange, isn't it? They are ready to adopt the Communist "line" for Japan, going against MacArthur, who is on the job and knows the situation.

The liberals, including congressmen, who have joined up with the Communists, are doing more than just letting themselves be duped. They are setting the stage for reaction in this country. Liberalism gets a black eye every time numbers of its adherents swallow the Communist line, which is not liberalism at all. The Communists are laughing but these dupes will not be when they get toryism fastened on them.

Terminal Leave for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor at this time to urge the House to give immediate consideration to the terminal leave bill for enlisted men. I introduced a bill over 6 months ago to rectify the inequality between officers and enlisted men in this respect. There is a discharge petition now on the Speakers' desk which has been signed by myself and 162 other Members of this House. The required number of signatures to bring this terminal leave bill to the floor of the House of Representatives is 218. I should like to urge every Member who has not done so to sign this discharge petition so that this terminal leave bill can be discussed and passed. It is only simple justice that this adjudication be brought about and this wrong corrected—not next week, or next month but now.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a letter sent to all Members of the House of Representatives by Omar Ketchum, legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and with which I agree wholeheartedly:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1946.

To all Members of the House of Representatives:

The Veterans of Foreign Wars at its national encampment in October 1945 unanimously adopted a resolution providing for terminal-leave pay for enlisted men. Our organization, representing approximately 2,000,000 members, 90 percent of whom are veterans of World War II, is of the opinion that discrimination against enlisted men on this question represents a great injustice and, consequently, has been urging for many months past that Congress pass legislation in rectification of this injustice.

The present system of awarding terminal-leave pay to only officers represents a serious indictment of the Nation's archaic reluctance to care for the enlisted men to the degree with which it has attended the wishes of the officers.

Throughout the war the average officer had a considerably higher income than the enlisted men. Upon discharge the officer, in addition to having earned more, is eased through his period of readjustment by continuing to draw pay and allowances for a period equal to his accumulated leave. Then, too, the number of officers who were promoted immediately prior to terminal leave are legion. By what stretch of the imagination can one conceive of a system that would be more generous to an already fortunate few and so ungenerous to so many.

The Congress of the United States has been asked to remedy this unfortunate situation. Twenty-seven members of the House of Representatives have introduced legislation granting terminal-leave credit to enlisted men. Over 150 Members, obviously in favor of such legislation, have signed a petition to discharge the House Military Affairs Committee from further consideration of H. R. 4051. There then appears to be a great sentiment among Members of the Congress to

rectify this great injustice. The question then resolves itself into this alternative: Is the officer to continue to draw terminal-leave pay and the enlisted men only the sentiments of the Congress?

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, representing 2,000,000 veterans and speaking in the interest of 13,000,000, urges you to sign Petition No. 23, to discharge the House Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of H. R. 4051.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the OPA extension, written by the Honorable Charles A. Sprague, former Governor of Oregon. This editorial was published in the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg., recently and I suggest that membership of the House avail themselves of the opportunity of reading it:

OPA EXTENSION

The most important issue before Congress at this time is the question of the extension of OPA. The House Banking Committee voted Friday to prolong its life by 1 year, but made revisions in the present act under which OPA operates. For example, price controls are required to be relinquished when supply in various lines of production comes into balance with demand, the maximum average price policy (MAP of the clothiers) is banned and historic margins of retailers are protected by law. The second change strikes at the OPA directive designed to increase output of low-cost clothing and the second to protect automobile, radio, and other dealers from being forced to absorb certain authorized increases in manufacturers' prices.

Left to the people as a whole the OPA would probably be continued by a substantial majority. Left to the business and farming community it would be abolished. The consumer group feels the pinch of price increases but feels some restraining hand must still be used to prevent further price inflation. The business community, fed up on OPA regulations, and in many cases eager for breaking OPA's price dike, would either throw price control out the window or force changes in its administration. The upshot will be that the life of OPA will be prolonged, Congress being unwilling to take responsibility for killing it off.

The statesman favors extension of OPA, though it lacks confidence in its ability to do the job well, and is fearful of price revolt in the nature of added black market operations or of production slow-downs because of the imbalance of OPA pricing policies. We are not all impressed with OPA's praise of itself as it looks at itself in the mirror. Granting the deficiencies of OPA, it remains true that removal of all controls now would be a grave risk to the economy, from exorbitant price increases. The skyrocketing of real estate prices is an index of what might occur without control.

Nor is this paper impressed with the attempts of Congress to alter OPA's policies. If OPA is too stiff-necked, Congress is too pliant to pressures. The reasoning back of OPA's narrowing the margin on retailers of cars and appliances was sound, namely, that volume would make narrower margins possible without sacrifice of fair earnings.

We shall be heartily glad when price controls are thrown off. They will become increasingly irritating as the time from the fighting lengthens. One year is surely the maximum for extending OPA's life; in fact 6 months might see enough of a change to warrant its demise. Maybe if we draw on reserves of patience we can survive OPA's control for one more year. That surely is the maximum to be endured.

Penny Pinches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress will soon be called upon to vote on whether the life of OPA shall be extended for an additional year. I do not believe there is a single person in this room who questions the commendable theory of price control to counteract inflationary trends. However, the conduct of that agency in meeting pricing problems is throttling industrial activity and retarding our reconversion progress. The shortages caused by the war was being transformed into artificial scarcity, and the American people can no longer tolerate the cheapening of products to maintain an imaginary price line. Instead of an honest effort to hold a price line, we have an organization which apparently spends full time making a political showing by imposing heavy penalties upon citizens because of trivial errors.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following editorial which appeared on April 4, 1946, in the Daily Jefferson County Union, Fort Atkinson, Wis.:

Nothing that has happened in the last few weeks has convinced us that we are wrong in our assumption that the OPA should have been discontinued, with the possible exception of rent controls in critical areas, the moment the war ended.

OPA is now engaged in a series of futile and harrassing activities which have no beneficial effect other than to hamper reconversion and to perpetuate the OPA in office. This policy of petty meddling and futile fumbling led to the wholesale resignation of the Jefferson county price panel and a lot of other local price panels in the State. Most of the members of these price panels still believe in price controls, but they cannot stomach an arrogant organization whose obvious purpose is to make a showing for political purposes, rather than an honest and intelligent effort to hold the price line.

The OPA condemns itself as a petty, hair-splitting, power-drunk organization of hopeless bureaucrats by its own utterances. Here are typical settlements reported in the current OPA bulletin, scheduled for release April 1:

"Kahn's Clothing Store, Milwaukee, overcharge of 5 cents on one man's grey stripe wool suit. Refund to customer, 5 cents; payment to United States Treasury, $24.95."

"C. W. Anderes Co., Madison, overceiling on not more than 12 sales of bath towels at an overcharge of 3 cents per towel, $25; Rothblatt Grocery, overcharge of 21 cents on one can cranberry sauce, $37.50."

"City Market, Mauston, sale of 2 bars of soap for 15 cents, making overcharge of $0.015 each bar (288 sold), $25."

"Krok's Tavern, Kenosha, overcharges of 3 cents on 2,853 drinks whisky, $128.52."

Milwaukee—"Eddie Kafura's Tavern, 3 cents overcharge on 1,947 drinks, $74.15; Alexander's Restaurant, 5 cents overcharge on 168 T-bones; Boston Store, sale of three pairs ladies' snuggies at overcharge of 15 cents each, refund to customer 45 cents, payment to United States Treasury, $24.55."

George F. Kempen, Hartland, overceiling sales of 480 bags of 5 pounds granulated sugar at overcharge of 1 cent, $25; Wallich's Store, Pewaukee, over ceiling 2 cents each on 12 5-pound bags granulated sugar, $25; Mrs. Baltazer Schuler, Mukonago, over ceiling 2 cents a pound on 25 pounds processed cheese, $25; Charles H. Vroman, Oconomowoc, over ceiling of 1 cent per bag on 1,200 5-pound bags granulated sugar, $25."

Here is the proud record of the Nation's most powerful economic agency in all history—an agency so powerful that by the stroke of a pen it may destroy a whole industry, make thousands jobless, and bankrupt every retailer in the Nation.

No one denies that the OPA has temporarily held down a few prices of scarce merchandise, but at what cost?

OPA has precipitated an automobile strike that threw 175,000 men out of work for long months—and when the price issue is finally and permanently settled we will be paying the same price for cars as the manufacturers would have been willing to offer them before the strike began.

OPA has delayed the building of homes many months after the end of the war, principally by its ridiculous assertion that finished lumber can be produced at the same cost as rough lumber.

OPA has made a violator out of every honest retailer. Even OPA investigators frankly admit that no retailer can hope to know the complexities of OPA's rambling regulations.

OPA has hilariously engaged in penny pinches while the Nation writhes in the agonies of unemployment and underproduction and a stalemated reconversion economy.

But the saddest and most costly lesson of OPA is this: We cannot give away part of our economic liberties without forfeiting all our economic liberties. If we are to guarantee security to the consumer successfully, we must also guarantee security to the producer, the retailer, and the worker. We cannot sensibly or reasonably control prices without controlling wages and profits. And if we do all these things we are doing precisely what Hitler and Mussolini and Joe Stalin began preaching two decades ago. We cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We cannot have regulation against the other fellow, without regulation against ourselves. And if we go all the way in that kind of an economic philosophy, we are preaching dictatorship, not democracy.

Wholesale Meat Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent out by a meat packing company in my district:

APRIL 6, 1946.

To Our Customers:

Legal wholesale meat operations for some time past have been unbearable—unbearable from the standpoint that at the end of every week we don't have as much money to operate with as we had at the beginning of the week. The combined cost of our product greatly exceeds the money we can obtain for it. Under these circumstances one thing is inevitable—we'll go broke.

There seems to be one solution and that is to charge black-market prices. That we will not do—we have tried all during the war to give our customers as much meat as possible at legal ceiling prices, even though at times it put us deeply in the red. We are proud of our record of never having been cited by the Office of Price Administration for even minor infractions.

We have done our part in holding prices down and giving to you, our customers, a margin of profit, but now we must cut down and wait until conditions change. You may rest assured that when we can again sell meat at legal prices, our salesman will be at your door.

Yours very truly.

Wage Increases in Sugar-Refining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 days have gone by since the serious danger became known of an impending strike which would cut off more than two-thirds of the cane sugar refining production of this country. I have a special interest in this problem because several of these refineries are located in my own city of Philadelphia. But the importance of the situation is Nation-wide in view of the present critical situation in sugar production.

The local unions in my own city are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. In other ports on the Atlantic coast the unions involved are members of the CIO. In this situation, however, all of these unions, CIO and A. F. of L., have functioned cooperatively and, I must say, on the basis of the record have functioned in a manner far more reasonable and with far more regard for the public interest than is evidenced by the refining companies.

The wage requests of these unions have been extremely moderate. From all reports they have sought increases which fall below patterns established in most other industries. They have not even been obdurate in their insistence on these demands. They have offered, because of the critical nature of the industry, to arbitrate the issue or to agree in advance to accept the findings of a fact-finding panel.

The companies have refused to arbitrate. The companies have refused to agree to accept the conclusions of any fact-finding panel.

We in Congress have for years made sugar refining a favored industry. We have limited the importation of refined sugar. We have done this not by tariffs but by direct quotas and prohibitions.

These sugar refiners have come to us in the past asking these special protections because these protections supposedly meant good jobs for American workers.

In the current situation we are forced to ask ourselves whether that protection will really mean good jobs. Is an industry, which receives those special favors, free to accept those favors with one hand and with the other turn down its workers' requests for wage levels in accordance with current American standards?

These are serious questions which may be asked in December of this year when the Sugar Act comes up for renewal. I sincerely hope that these questions will not have to be asked and that these companies will yield to the national interest by granting to their employees the moderate increases which have been requested, or by agreeing to permit the peaceful processes of arbitration or fact finding to resolve the issue.

Food for Starving People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people are most anxious to make every possible contribution toward feeding hungry people wherever they may be throughout the world. In spite of what has been done, however, it appears that our efforts are not coming up to the requirements. I believe that we must do more than we have done and that the Department of Agriculture and other agencies of the Government should explore every possibility of saving and shipping food to the famine stricken countries. In this connection, I desire to call attention to what I believe are some excellent suggestions made by Dr. H. C. M. Case, head of the department of agricultural economics of the college of agriculture, University of Illinois. Dr. Case's suggestions are as follows—it will be noted that suggestion No. 3 has already been put into effect. Possibly some of the other suggestions made by Dr. Case are receiving consideration. All of them seem to me to be sound and practical:

First. Inventory military food supplies in scarcity areas and release such quantities which are not needed immediately and which can be replaced in ample time.

Second. Set aside or purchase definite amounts of grain as received at terminal markets for foreign shipment, even though it does reduce markedly the supply on our own market and forces us to make more use of the large potato crop.

Third. Farmers still holding wheat should be induced to release it through getting them to loan it to the Government or in effect giving them a warehouse receipt for wheat if they are unwilling to accept the current market price for it. Such an arrangement might well extend for a period of 1 year.

Fourth. Immediately increase the price of lightweight hogs and give the farmer sufficient time to sell his heavy animals before reducing the price on heavyweight animals if the later proposal is included in a program. The premium on lightweight hogs should be put on the market at 220 pounds to bring about a marked saving on corn. The weight of 220 pounds was considered the optimum profit weight by many of the best Corn Belt producers before the war.

Fifth. Advance the price of fattening steers or pay a premium for beef steers sold under 1,000 pounds weight if marketed prior to June 1. The objective of this suggestion is to enable those feeders who bought high-grade calves for the purpose of a long feed to liquidate them without too much sacrifice and with less finish. Selling hogs and fattening cattle at lighter weights afford the best opportunity to save feed immediately.

Sixth. Farmers should be told, as many in the Corn Belt already realize, that the poor quality of corn and shortage of protein supplements do not justify the price now being paid for feed corn even at market prices, let alone the black-market price, which many are paying in order to continue their feeding operations. Selling both feed and underfinished livestock would be more profitable for the majority of farmers.

I would like to add to what Dr. Case has said, the suggestion that no grain be used for the manufacture of alcoholic beverages until the present crisis is over. The best figures which I have been able to obtain through the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress are that in January 1946, 14,567,000 bushels of grain were used for the making of alcoholic beverages. For the 6 months ending December 31, 1945, 79,350,000 bushels of grain were used. Undoubtedly the restrictions which had been placed upon the use of grain for this purpose have resulted in a present rate of consumption below the figures just quoted. However, when millions are starving, I do not see how we can justify the use of any grain for making alcoholic beverages.

Who Should Control the Atom Bomb?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion over the radio and in the press of the country relative to atomic energy and civilian versus military control thereof. One of the principal newspapers of my own city of Tacoma, Wash., recently published an editorial which summarizes this situation aptly. There is grave danger of misuse for military ends of this great power inherent in atomic energy. The editorial writer points out that civilian control of atomic energy should be rigidly maintained. The editorial from the Tacoma

News-Tribune of March 19, 1946, is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL DUTY

Two bills on atomic energy control, long buried in committee and now up for congressional consideration, deserve the deep attention of the American voter. One, the May-Johnson bill, was drafted by the War Department and would place control in a part-time commission dominated by the military. The other measure, introduced by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, would place control in a civil agency. The latter bill, amended to include security features and representation of the military, comes before the House under Alabama's Representative SPARKMAN.

The fact that the McMahon law is endorsed by the 1,500 scientists known as the Association of Atomic Scientists, and that the May-Johnson bill is considered by them a prelude to another war, should influence Congress to pass the McMahon measure. These scientists believe the McMahon measure assures both the safety of the United States through its international control features, and the peaceful development of atomic energy, two provisions emphasized by these men as essential.

With revelations of the Canadian bomb spies and Churchill's warnings of Soviet expansion, the American people are going to insist that their Congressmen pass legislation promptly, advertising to the world this country's determined, peaceful intent regarding atomic energy.

One thing sometimes forgotten is that the Constitution requires civilian control of military affairs. The Commander in Chief is the President, who is a civilian. Congress holds the "powers of purse and sword," without which war cannot be declared or waged. Consultation with military leaders is right; control by the military arm is in opposition to the principles on which the Nation lives.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, little thought is being given now to the advantages taken of this country by the British in the conduct of business and money manipulation in the past—but the people of this country will rue the day that their leaders were importuned into making the British loan.

The letter inserted here expresses my views concerning the proposed loan:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1946.

JENNIE FARQUHAR,
Orofino, Idaho.

DEAR MRS. FARQUHAR: I am glad to have your letter of April 1 and to know that you approve the publication of your poetical tribute to Idaho in the Columbia Valley Authority.

As you mention the creation of a world republic, I am enclosing a copy of a charter which I have prepared as a basis for an organization to prevent war and insure the maintenance of permanent peace. I do not feel that all the sacrifices we have made to save England and preserve the British Empire that the taxpayers of this country should add to their tax burdens by financing Great Britain now that the war has been won. This opinion is influenced in a large measure by the records of the conduct of the Government of Great Britain and its financiers in dealing with the people of this country over a long period of time.

My father was a great admirer of the British and of their laws and their diplomacy, and so am I, but I would rather have them as a neighbor than as a dependent.

Thank you for your nice letter and good advice.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Crisfield Times, one of the outstanding papers of the Eastern Shore in reference to OPA ceilings.

The editorial follows:

SOME CEILINGS NEED TO BE LIFTED

About the worst indictment that can be brought against the OPA is the method it uses to try to control prices.

For some unknown reason, when OPA sets up a price ceiling once, it seems to feel the matter is settled forever, no matter what changes take place in the general economic situation that have a bearing on that particular ceiling.

There is general agreement that production, and more production, will in the shortest time restore goods to store shelves, fill the wants and needs of buyers. That in turn will mean lower prices. As long as scarcity exists, prices must be high.

To get production started, especially after recent raising of wages in so many industries, ceilings must be lifted on many products. To prove the point, ceilings have been lifted already in a number of instances, but for many articles people need, old price ceilings are holding down production and will continue to hold down production until ceilings are lifted.

Too often, shoddy goods are put on the market at high prices, with OPA blessing, because they differ in some minor detail of material or workmanship from good goods, on which the old price ceiling has been clamped down and fastened.

In other words, OPA methods encourage manufacturers to find substitutes of cheaper materials for good materials, for which the makers can get higher prices because those cheaper material products were not marketed before, and in setting price ceilings over them, allowance is made for increased manufacturing costs. The result? Manufacturers turn out goods of which they are ashamed, because they must make a profit or go out of business, and the fine articles of the past, which the people want now, won't be made because they would have to be made at a loss, whereas a raise in the price ceiling on them would permit their manufacture and sale at cheaper prices than shoddy materials now cost.

The idea to do away with price control entirely is unsound. There is need for price control for a time yet. But there is also immediate need for changes in ceilings over many items upward. For a time such items would cost considerably more than their old-time price, but once their production began to approach the demand for them, prices would seek a lower level.

Raises in ceiling prices to prime the pump of production will do more to level off inflation and get the Nation back into sound shape than anything else the Government could do at this time.

The Fight Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of permission duly granted, I extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting a letter from Mr. Julius Perlmutter concerning cancer, which appeared in the New York Times on the 24th of March, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

When the war burst upon us in 1941, the shock of its onslaught welded this Nation into a magnificent unit. Political differences were forgotten, personal considerations cast into the limbo. Our country was imperiled; that was all we knew and all we needed to know. We forged the mightiest war machine the world had ever seen, and we crushed the enemy.

Today we—and by "we" I mean not only the United States but every nation in the world—are faced with another scourge whose annual death toll in this country alone was 501,019 persons during the yast 3 years. (American deaths due to enemy action during World War II totaled 273,000.)

Yes; cancer killed nearly twice as many Americans as were killed by Nazis and Japs. Today, throughout the world, every time the clock clicks off 3½ minutes, one person dies of this dread disease. According to Dr. Frank Adair, president of the American Cancer Society, 17,000,000 Americans now living will die of cancer—unless a cure is found.

What is even more terrifying is the knowledge that the percentage of deaths from cancer is constantly on the increase. If this rising spiral is to continue—and science cannot now assure us that it will not—the future total of deaths from cancer staggers the imagination.

The purpose of this letter, then, is to call to your attention Senate bill 1875 and House of Representatives bill 4502, popularly known as the Pepper-Neely bills. This proposed legislation calls for the expenditure of $100,000,000 for an all-out attack against cancer. It would summon the world's outstanding physicians and scientists in the first gigantic effort—similar to the effort that produced the atom bomb—to find a cure for this horrible affliction.

The bills call for utilization of present plans available, of all knowledge available, of all present existing organizations, institutions, and societies, together with their facilities and know-how to the end that no stone may be left unturned to eradicate, through Government action, the terror of cancer.

Does $100,000,000 sound like a big expenditure? Well, we spent $2,000,000,000 to devise the atom bomb. We spent $221,043,000 every 24 hours to pursue World War II to a triumphant close. The cost of the proposed cancer program is less than was spent

in one-half day of warfare. The Pepper-Neely bills propose to preserve life, not destroy it.

Is the idea Quixotic? Is fighting cancer like fighting windmills, or butting against a stone wall? Here's what Col. Stafford Warren, of the atomic research project, and assistant to Major General Groves, said in a recent speech: "This cancer problem is no more impossible than the atomic bomb. In fact, I would have bet 5 years ago that we would have found a cure for cancer before we would have been able to produce an atomic bomb."

In the beginning of this letter I spoke of the wonderful unity that followed Pearl Harbor and brought us ultimate victory. Can we not again band together as a fighting, organized Nation to face an enemy even more cruel, destructive, and undiscriminating than the foe we met on the battlefield?

If a disaster such as flood, earthquake, or tidal wave should strike an American community, you and I know that every American would rush to do all in his power to alleviate the sufferings of those affected. Yet in cancer we find an enemy that threatens to kill 17,000,000 of our people. Can we face it with equanimity? Can we afford the luxury of a penny-wise, pound-foolish negligence?

I appeal to your interest in your Nation's welfare, to your understanding of the importance of our country's supplying the means to carry on this vital work. I ask that you sincerely study the Pepper-Neely bills. Having studied them, you will, I am confident, give them your conscientious support.

JULIUS JAY PERLMUTTER,
Chairman, Sponsors of Government Action Against Cancer.

Disposal of Surplus Government Photographic Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold Putnam from the Boston Globe:

VETERANS' FORUM

(By Harold Putnam)

OUT OF LUCK ON PHOTOGRAPHIC SURPLUS

A sale of photographic equipment now going on in Baltimore, Md., represents another shut-out for veterans seeking to set themselves up in business with the help of some of the Government's surplus property.

In the 2½ years th Government has been disposing of surplus property, not a single piece of photographic equipment has ever been sold in New England.

This made the Baltimore chance attractive to the hundreds of New England veterans who needed cameras, projectors, enlargers and other equipment to set up their postwar businesses. Most of this equipment is still hard to get in retail stores, and prices are still high.

Veterans who have seen the enormous amount of good photographic equipment used by the armed forces had good reason to count on the Baltimore sale.

They figured that a round-trip ticket to the Baltimore sale would cost them $22.74. Add a $6 hotel room to that, if they could get it, and figure in a loss of a day at work, and they puzzled hard over whether or not the trip would be worth it.

The Consumer Goods Division was unable to tell them exactly what items would be available, or exactly what prices would be charged. Most veterans had their hearts set on specific items, which they would have been glad to order by mail. Were those items in the sale? Would they be priced cheap enough to make the trip worth while.

Well, Congress, the Administration, and the War Assets Corporation have saved the veterans a lot of trouble. The following groups had first presale crack at the equipment last week: Federal agencies, States, counties, and cities; tax-supported institutions, nonprofit charitable institutions.

And now 75 percent of the goods have been sold.

The Boston war assets office sent out "an important message" to certified veterans last week end, explaining that first and second priority claimants had taken 75 percent of the major items, and that "the stock of Speed-Graphic or smaller cameras, motion-picture projectors, small enlargers, print washers and dryers is completely exhausted. * * * The bulk of remaining items are accessories."

The Alaska International Highway Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 2871, a bill to create an Alaskan International Highway Commission. This bill has passed the House Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously and is now before the Rules Committee for its consideration. I have appeared before this committee on four occasions in behalf of this bill and I hope the Rules Committee will see fit to give it its approval.

My interest in this bill lies in the fact that I consider our national future, both economically and strategically, lies to the north over the polar ice cap and the Territory of Alaska. Billy Mitchell was right when he declared that Alaska was the most important area in the world, and time and war has vindicated his judgment. The recent flight of a group of B–29's from the Alaskan Air Command into the polar region, the Operation Musk Ox now being carried on jointly by the United States and Canada, and the recently completed Operation Frostbite all indicate the importance of the northern areas of this continent.

It is necessary that an international commission be created to investigate the building of the necessary roads to connect this country with Alaska. It is, in my opinion, the most important question facing the welfare and security of this country today. There is a distinct connection between my proposal and the present-day operations now being carried on in the subpolar and polar regions of this continent. I am certain that the Canadian Government will be tremendously interested in this matter and would be more than happy to cooperate with us.

It is no mere coincidence that our Army garrisons in Alaska are not being reduced in numbers. It is no coincidence that various operations are now being carried on in the subpolar and polar areas. No, Mr. Speaker, all these movements only indicate the inexorable march of events in this day and age and bring home to us quite clearly the importance—from all points of view—of Alaska and the Arctic areas. My bill, H. R. 2871, is only the proposed foundation of the building that must and will take place, both on the ground and in the air in the future. Our destiny lies in that direction and we would do well to remember it always.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in my remarks two newsworthy articles from the Great Falls Tribune and the Christian Science Monitor, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune]

UNITED STATES ENVOY, VIEWING FUTURE OF ALASKAN HIGHWAY, SAYS NORTH AMERICA IS INDIVISIBLE IN MATTERS OF DEFENSE

(By W. P. (Luke) Wright)

WHITE HORSE, YUKON TERRITORY, April 7.—What is the future of the Alaskan highway now that the United States has relinquished control?

1. It may be said safely that the route will not be abandoned.

2. The hope that eventually it will be brought under the jurisdiction of an international commission actually has been increased.

At the formal ceremony here in which the 1,200 miles of the road in British Columbia and the Yukon were turned over to Canada, Ray Atherton, American Ambassador to Ottawa, said significantly:

"In matters of defense, North America is indivisible."

Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, former Canadian minister of defense and chairman of the dominion section of the permanent joint board on defense, made it plain that Canada was calling on its army to operate the route as an interim measure.

AIRFIELDS DICTATED ROAD LOCATION

General McNaughton asserted that the sites of the airfields, started by Canada, enlarged by the United States and later purchased by the Dominion, dictated the location of the highway. And so long as aviation, military or civilian, in any considerable volume, operates, there still will be need for a service road.

Why were the airfields located where they are?

It no longer is a secret that the route east of the mountains was chosen for one reason—it was the first location found, in search of considerable magnitude, where there was sufficient contact flying weather to insure the delivery of planes to Russia in the volume agreed upon.

Army Air Forces officers here said the search started on the west coast. The next suggested base for the southern terminus of the air supply line to Siberia was Ephrata, Wash. That was abandoned, as was Spokane. Only by getting on the prairie side of the Continental Divide were the aerial pathfinders of 1942 able to promise to deliver the goods.

The promise was fulfilled. The airfields are being used today for both commercial and military planes. Aviation gasoline is being trucked over the Alaska highway to service these planes. It may be years before commercial traffic is sufficient to equal that of the war years but civilian flying is increasing rather than decreasing.

Since the airfields along the highway are being used by companies incorporated in the United States and Alaska, as well as in Can-

ada, the idea of some sort of joint supervision over them is logical.

Since the true value of the Alaska highway never can be realized until there are additional access roads, and since Canada is short of such funds for expansion, an international commission meets with favor of the man in the street in this section of Canada.

NOT A HIGHWAY YET

Farther south there is strong demand for a better outlet from the Peace River block centering around Fort St. John. British Columbia is endeavoring to meet this demand by building a new route over Pine pass which will connect Fort St. John with Prince George. But even when this is done there would have to be material improvement on the route from Prince George to Vancouver before it could be called a highway.

On the other hand, the outlet from the Peace River farming center to Edmonton now is little more than a trail. A huge expenditure would be needed to provide an all-year road over the present route. Engineers say that if international or even Dominion funds are to be spent the logical thing would be to construct the Whitecourt Valley-View cut-off, which would mean 150 miles of new road through virgin territory but would cut approximately 100 miles off the distance between Dawson Creek and Edmonton.

If this road were built a traveler could go from the Peace River block to the capital of Alberta and return and put only 50 miles more on his speedometer than the one-way trip from Fort St. John to Vancouver, the principal metropolis of British Columbia.

Alaska highway boosters are none too hopeful of getting their cut-off unless there is an international commission. Under present circumstances it would have to be built with Alberta provincial funds, and Alberta is having enough trouble building roads between its more populous centers without taking on the added task of running a new route through an area in which there are few voters.

So those who insist that the present highway really be put to work are convinced that their best bet is to appeal to the Dominion Government in Ottawa. But, they admit, the lack of interest in the Alaska highway in the eastern provinces is immense. They believe, then, that the Dominion could get the votes in Parliament for an appropriation only if the road were to be a joint United States-Canadian project on which the defense angle could be interjected so as to permit American participation in the financing.

COST WILL BE LESS NOW

An additional 150 miles of new construction could be provided at far less than an average 150 miles along the highway. In the first place, it would be south of the present route, where the construction season is longer, and the cost of labor should be less than in war days, when it was necessary to pay men for 90 hours, although they worked only 70, to attract them to the north country.

If both the Whitecourt cut-off and the new route from the Peace River country to Vancouver were completed, it would provide a new circle tour for American motorists through a land noted for scenery, hunting, and fishing, as well as agriculture.

It also would provide a start on a new route paralleling the present highway to help satisfy the ardent west coast boosters who are convinced that the Alaska road today is valueless.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

UNITED STATES FROSTBITE OPERATION AIMED AT AIR COMMAND OF POLAR AREAS

(By Capt. Frederick L. Oliver, U. S. Navy, retired)

"Operation Frostbite," recently concluded, was the seagoing counterpart of the land-based "Operation Muskox," currently under way in northern Canada. Together these operations have the mission of determining what methods must be perfected to permit efficient use of the air power in the frigid reaches within the Arctic Circle.

For many years the Russians have been intensely interested in the Arctic region, particularly in finding an ice-free route from Russian ports to the Bering Strait.

The year-round ice packs in Vilkitsky Strait, south of the Severnay Zemlya Archipelago, have always been a hindrance to using the northern sea route between Europe and Asia, but rumors have persisted that a comparatively ice-free route exists in the vicinity of latitude 82°.

If there is such a northern passage, the Russians have kept the information to themselves, together with their vast accumulation of detailed data covering Arctic conditions of tide, ice movements, and weather.

SOVIET GETS INFORMATION

More recently, the Russians acquired additional information while flying planes out of Archangel, Murmansk, and other Barrent Sea bases, as did the Germans in their air raids on Arctic convoys destined for northern Russian ports. Doubtless the United States has obtained the German data, but probably has secured little information from Russia.

It is known that in the summer of 1932 a Soviet ice breaker made the passage from Archangel to Bering Sea in 6 weeks, but the route followed was not disclosed.

The long-sought northwest passage across the top of North America was definitely determined to be clogged with ice when Amundsen drifted through on an ice pack from 1903 to 1906.

In 1937, a Russian expedition landed within a few miles of the North Pole, where it established a camp on an ice field. Supplied by airplane, it was taken off by ice breakers 9 months later, after having drifted some 1,300 miles to a point east of Greenland.

In the same year, a Soviet plane flew over the top of the globe from Moscow to Vancouver, Wash., in an attempt to reach San Francisco.

MANY DIFFICULTIES

Many difficulties incident to operating airplanes in polar temperatures were solved long since in a nonmilitary way. The several Antarctic expeditions made successful use of airplanes, and civilian aviators in Alaska have evolved a very satisfactory cold-weather airplane technique.

However, the planes used were not military types, and the time element, so vital in military operations ashore and afloat with airplanes, was of little moment. In most cases, if a plane balked in starting, tomorrow was another day as yet untouched.

Some military information was obtained in cold-weather tests conducted 8 years ago by the aircraft carrier *Ranger* off the Aleutians. However, there has been a radical change in carriers, planes, and methods of operating since 1938.

"Frostbite" was more of a test of personnel and their gear, than it was of the planes themselves. Practically any modern airplane in a matter of minutes can attain altitudes where temperatures vie with anything the Arctic produces, and a plane which can cruise under such conditions has nothing to fear from Arctic cold.

HAD TO DRAIN OIL

Formerly, when a plane landed in severely cold weather, the oil had to be drained lest its solidification make it impossible to crank the engine. When readying such a plane for flight, preheated oil and a blowtorch on the gasoline heater were requisites.

Oil which remains fluid at low temperatures and easily vaporized gasolines have been perfected, making modern airplane engines flexible in cold weather, leaving the matter of take-offs and landings the only issue as far as aviation material and handling of planes on carriers is concerned.

The carrier *Midway* was provided with small snow plows to push accumulations of snow overboard, and with mechanically operated sweepers to brush the remaining snow and ice away. Very probably high-pressure steam hoses and various chemicals were also used to keep the immense flight deck of the ship available for handling planes.

Apparently, the precautions taken were adequate as the *Midway* reports that on only two days was it impossible to fly planes, and intimates that high winds rather than deck conditions were responsible for the hiatus.

EFFICIENCY VITAL

It is axiomatic on board ship that efficiency goes hand-in-hand with the morale of the crew, and that the morale drops off quickly if the men are not properly cared for. Consequently, it was of moment to determine what effect Arctic weather had on the health and comfort of the crew.

In cold weather, the average man-of-war can be an exceedingly uncomfortable abode for its crew. Men-of-war differ from merchantmen in the matter of access provided for going to and from various parts of the ship. A man-of-war has numerous doors and hatches so its crew can man the battle stations quickly, whereas the merchantman has no more openings than are absolutely necessary, and usually no hatches in the passenger spaces.

Hatches, which are horizontal openings in decks, are proverbially difficult to seal against wintry blasts of air which can make living quarters on board ship almost unlivable with icy drafts.

SEEKS REMEDIES

It of course did not require an Arctic cruise to bring this matter to the front, but it did afford a test of whatever remedial action had been taken.

In balmy weather, where most of our carrier operations have been conducted, the matter of clothing other than for the aviators, has presented no problem. "Frostbite," however, developed the need for a radical improvement in the present types of cold-weather clothing, which are reported to have slowed down operations as much as 30 percent due to the delay in donning and using the bulky garments.

Other matters investigated undoubtedly included searching out weaknesses in the design of the ship, developing methods of securing planes to an icy, wind-swept flight deck, determining the effect of cold on antiaircraft guns and equipment, learning how long the watch on deck can withstand cold driven on the wings of a gale, ascertaining how the homing devices installed in planes function in cold weather, how the landing beams perform, what weather and Loran stations are needed, and finally whether or not the carrier deck provides better facilities for airplane operations in the Arctic than does a base on the shore.

OPERATIONS INFORMATION

The cruise also provided information concerning the possibilities of carrier operation where no shore bases could be established in a cold, desolate area.

As planes become more reliable and longer ranged, the routes over the top of the world through Arctic snow, ice, cold, and fog will become more and more frequented. For instance, it is 7,700 miles from New York to Chungking, China, via the Arctic, and 11,700 miles via San Francisco and Hawaii.

In view of this trend of events the United States feels new interest in air operations in the Polar spaces.

The United States Marine Corps Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1946

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by Maj. Gen. A. H. Turnage, United States Marine Corps. The substance of his remarks exemplify the fundamental reasons why the United States Marine Corps is the greatest military organization in the world. His address follows:

I have been honored by a request from the Commandant of the Marine Corps Schools to tell you, the graduates of the first postwar basic school class, what your seniors and your subordinates—the men—will expect of you when you leave here and go out into active service. What I have to tell you won't take very long, even though it covers my observations in peace and war over a period of almost 33 years' service in the Marine Corps.

Within a few weeks each of you will assume control of the lives of a number of men—this is a most important responsibility.

When you join your organizations you will find there a willing body of men who ask of you only those qualities that will command their respect, their loyalty, and their obedience. To be a success in the service you must possess leadership—military leadership in the most exalted sense.

The commissions you receive do not make you leaders—they merely make you officers. They have placed you in a position where you can become leaders if you possess the proper attributes, namely, self-confidence, moral ascendancy, self-sacrifice, paternalism and fairness, initiative and decision, dignity, courage, and loyalty.

Self-confidence results from a thorough knowledge of your profession and your ability to impart that knowledge to others.

Men will not have confidence in an officer unless he knows his business, and he must know it from the ground up. You must be so well informed that the men will hunt you up to ask questions, and your brother officers will say to one another, "Ask Smith, he knows."

Moral ascendancy over your men is your firm conviction that you are the better man. To gain and maintain this ascendancy you must have self-control, physical vitality and endurance, and moral force. To exert moral force you must live clean, you must have sufficient brain power to see the right, and the will to do right. A loud-mouthed, profane captain who is careless of his personal appearance will have a loud-mouthed, profane, dirty company. If you have a poor platoon it will be because you are a poor platoon commander. In or out of combat the best platoon has the best platoon commander.

Self-sacrifice is essential to leadership. Give yourself mentally and physically in the accomplishment of all of your responsibilities.

By paternalism is meant the watchful care for the comfort and welfare of those in your charge. Look out for them in every possible way. In doing this you create a soul in your platoon that will make them respond to you as though they were one man; then you have esprit. Be just and fair at all times. In awarding punishment remember that you cannot treat all men alike. A punishment that would be dismissed by one man with a shrug of the shoulder is mental anguish for another. Be sure that you know your men. Be fair in giving credit. When one of your men has accomplished an especially creditable piece of work, in or out of combat, see that he gets the proper reward, and turn heaven and earth upside down to see that he gets it. Train and lead your men in such a way that when your name is mentioned, your men will say: "There is a leader. We would follow him to the end of the earth." No greater compliment could be paid to any officer of any rank.

Without initiative and decision no man can expect to lead. Any reasonable order in an emergency is better than no order. The situation is there. Meet it. It is better to do something and do the wrong thing than to hesitate, hunt around for the right thing to do, and wind up by doing nothing at all. Having decided on a line of action, stick to it. Don't vacillate. Men have no confidence in an officer who doesn't know his own mind.

When I arrived in the Pacific theater in 1943 I asked the distinguished D-3, First Marine Division, Colonel Twining, now executive of the Marine Corps schools, what shortcoming on the part of junior officers in the Guadalcanal campaign made the greatest impression on him. Without hesitation he replied, "Lethargy, or lack of action—a sort of mental paralysis—the willingness to let matters run their course once the platoon or company was committed to action." In other words, lack of initiative and leadership. It goes without saying that such weaklings were eliminated, sent home where they were relegated to some unimportant assignment, or sent back to their home communities as civilians where they became subject to the draft.

The element of personal dignity is important in military leadership. Be the friend of your men, but do not become their intimate. Your men should stand in awe of you, not fear. If your men presume to become familiar it is your fault, not theirs; your actions have encouraged them to do so. And, above all things, don't cheapen yourself by courting their friendship or currying their favor. They will despise you for it. If you are worthy of their loyalty, respect, and devotion they will give all these most willingly. If you are not worthy, nothing that you can do will win them.

Keep clearly in mind your personal integrity and the duty you owe your country. Do not let yourself be deflected from a strict sense of justice by feelings of personal friendship. If your own brother is an NCO or a second lieutenant and you find him unfit to hold his rank, report him. Be honest with yourself, your corps, and your country.

With reference to courage—it is taken for granted that you have physical courage. We need not tell you how necessary that is. Courage is more than bravery. Bravery is fearlessness—the absence of fear. The merest dolt may be brave because he lacks the mentality to appreciate his danger; he doesn't know enough to be afraid. Courage, however, is that firmness of spirit, that moral backbone which while fully appreciating the danger involved nevertheless goes on with the undertaking. Bravery is physical; courage is mental and moral. You may be cold all over; your hands may tremble; your legs may quake; your knees ready to give way—that is fear. If, nevertheless, you go forward, in spite of this physical defect you continue to lead your men against the enemy, you have courage. Don't ask a man to go where you would not go yourself. Always remember that his life is as valuable to him as yours is to you. Occasionally, some of your men must be exposed to danger which you cannot share. You call for volunteers. If your men know you and know you are "right," you will never lack volunteers, for they will know your heart is in your work, that you are giving your country the best you have, that you would willingly perform the task yourself if permitted to do so. Your example and your enthusiasm will have inspired them to the highest degree.

The most essential attribute of an officer is loyalty—loyalty up and loyalty down. That is, be loyal to your subordinates as well as your superiors. Be loyal to your country, the naval service of which you are a member, and the Marine Corps in which you are honored to hold a commission. Loyalty to our corps begins with loyalty to our chief—the Commandant of the Marine Corps. His loyalty and high sense of duty are reflected by his untiring efforts to improve the efficiency of our corps. Therefore, throughout your career, regardless of how the laws, regulations, and orders emanating from his office may affect you personally, bear in mind that they are intended for the good of our corps—be loyal up and loyal down.

Gentlemen, I congratulate you on the successful completion of the long and difficult courses designed to prepare you for active service. Henceforth, grave responsibilities will rest upon your shoulders. Your captain and your men will depend on you. Wherever you may be—on land, at sea, or in the air—be a leader, and above all, a gentleman leader.

Know yourself.
Know your men.
Know your job.

Be loyal—and never forget the famous motto of our corps, "Semper Fidelis."

Good luck, and God bless you one and all.

Streamlining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress submitted a report. Editorials commenting on this report appeared in the Concord Monitor and in the Manchester Union, two of the leading newspapers published in New Hampshire. Since these comments are both timely and noteworthy I include them herewith:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of March 7, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

The joint Senate-House committee appointed to study methods of reorganizing Congress to enable it to cope with its job has presented its report. This is one of the most clearly stated and capable documents that has been presented by any committee in Congress for a long time.

Among the many valuable suggestions which it contains is the proposal to limit the amount that may be appropriated by any Congress at the beginning of each session. This provision would require that within 60 days after the start of each session, the Revenue and Appropriations Committees of both Houses submit estimates of over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for the coming fiscal year. Spending could not exceed receipts unless Congress specifically approved by record vote an increase in the national debt in the amount of the excess. All appropriations except those of a permanent nature would be reduced by a uniform percentage in case total appropriations exceeded the amount of the approved Budget figure.

In other words, Congress would be required to cut its suit to its cloth, financially speaking. This is a matter to which Congress has given little regard in the past, and which should be the basis of any sound fiscal program. No individual and no business could hope to thrive unless they made their avail-

able money a guide to their expenditures. There is no sound reason why Congress should not follow a similar course. Such a plan interferes with no prerogatives of committees or Members, but simply demands that Government finances shall be run on a business basis.

A second valuable suggestion is the consolidation of committees to lessen their number and strengthen their efficiency. Under this plan the present 33 standing committees in the Senate would be cut to 16, and the 48 standing committees in the House to 18. Senators and Representatives would also be restricted in the number of committees on which they can serve. This change strikes at the cherished right of seniority by cutting down standing committee chairmanships and will therefore be likely to be opposed. But the proposal is good. At present Senators serve on as many as 10 special and standing committees, and House Members on as many as 6 or more. It is impossible that these Members should do their best work with so great a demand on their time. Under the plan special committees would be outlawed.

Among other valuable suggestions are provisions for both committees and Members to have more trained assistants; registration of lobbies and pressure groups, with statements of expenditures to influence legislation quarterly; the requirement that bills reported by committees be accompanied by digests in nontechnical language to make them plain; elimination of time-consuming congressional activities not directly connected with running the National Government; and procedural provisions to enable Members to initiate more legislation.

All these changes are well calculated to increase congressional efficiency, and to make the mechanics of that body equal to the problems of present-day legislation. They merit careful consideration.

[From the Concord (N. H.) Monitor of March 11, 1946]

SUPPORT THIS REPORT

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has finally made its report. It is one of the most important documents to reach the Congress in many a day, though its consideration will probably be long drawn out and subject to repeated delays For Congress must reform its own ways, and that is as hard a task as for the average individual. Yet the need for reform is startlingly evident, and without it the handling of the Nation's affairs probably will simply go from bad to worse.

One aspect of the joint committee report are five recommendations which directly affect the handling of Congress' responsibility for Federal fiscal matters. Control of the purse is one of the principal functions of Congress. Yet today appropriation and revenue committees sit separately and make their recommendations to Congress without regard for or consideration of the relationship between income and expenditures Appropriations are made whether the treasury is bare or not, and revenue measures are drawn without knowledge as to how much income is needed.

So the joint committee has recommended: "That by joint action the revenue and appropriations committees of both Houses submit to Congress within 60 days after each session opens a concurrent resolution setting over-all Federal receipts and expenditures (estimates) for the coming fiscal year. If total expenditures recommended exceed estimated income Congress should be required by record vote to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess. All appropriations, excepting those of a permanent nature, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions and benefits, trust expenditures, and public debt retirement, would be reduced by a uniform percentage in case total appropriations exceeded the amount of the approved budget figure."

The mechanics involved may be subject to discussion but the basic approach contained in this recommendation should be supported by every American in the interests of a sound and solvent Federal Government. The recommendation is supported by four others, affecting organization and staffing of the committees, service audits by the Comptroller General, discontinuance of indefinite appropriations, and the methods of legislating on appropriation bills, all designed to improve the business of handling the world's greatest business. Together the recommendations make an honest attempt at introducing reason into Federal fiscal affairs.

The need for taking action according to the general theme of the joint committee's report is urgent. The war is over. The Federal debt is nearing $300,000,000,000. The 1947 fiscal year budget submitted by the President does not eliminate continued deficit spending, which has been going on for 16 years without interruption. Debt service of the Federal debt alone has climbed to $5,000,000,000 a year. To keep it at this figure interest rates throughout the Nation have been depressed, currency increased, and credit expanded until Federal fiscal policy is a principal cause of strong inflationary pressures which threaten to destroy all savings. Inflation has proceeded to the point where price levels in this country are unreasonably high and far above similar levels in other nations, which operates against free world trade. International trade barriers in turn are a principal irritant which will help to produce another war.

The cycle of causes and effects thus delineated can only be stopped in their beginning at the point at which the joint committee recommendations would be applied if adopted, i. e., in Congress itself. For Congress does set the Federal policies. It does the appropriating. It determines the revenue laws. But it has not handled either well, and the country is suffering and the world is affected.

Congress must understand that the people of the Nation want the proposed reforms in its methods of operation and in its performance, because Congress by itself will be loath to change its ways. It won't want to hold joint committee meetings. It won't want to hold all budget hearings open to the public—they are now secret. It won't want to reduce the number of its committees and by that device the prerogatives, political in nature, of its members. It won't want to do other than it has done for so long, appropriate without regard for anything except to give somebody what somebody wants, no matter what the end results.

The ways of Congress are obsolete. Many of them are simply bad habits acquired with the age of that branch of Government. Habits are not easily broken, and that is why the people themselves must provide the demand for reform in congressional methods of operation which will bring them more nearly in keeping with the tremendous responsibilities of Congress in modern society. With the joint committee report now before Members of the Congress and available for study by all citizens it is time to let Congress know how the American people feel in the matter.

Increasing Service Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to excerpts from the statement of John Slinkman, representing Army Times, before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs on H. R. 5625, a bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended. In that statement Mr. Slinkman said:

The pay proposal we are about to make is original only in its application to the armed forces. The House of Representatives last week approved by overwhelming votes legislation to give over half a million postal employees and a million other civilian employees of the Federal Government a flat $400-a-year increase in pay. Army Times urges this committee to apply that same formula to the armed forces—$400 a year per man, extending to all enlisted personnel. We suggest this as a minimum, blanket increase, but we do not ask this figure as a maximum for all officers. That is a matter which, we are sure, can be left to the discretion of this committee.

In the event final action by the two branches of Congress changes this $400 formula to a graduated percentage scale of increases for civilian employees, Army Times urges that the minimum increases granted Government workers be extended to the services' enlisted personnel. It would seem that such action should follow as a matter of course.

Army Times opposes the flat 20 percent increase proposed by the Army and Navy interdepartmental board and endorsed by Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal, because it gives the least to those who have the least and gives the most to those who have the most. We do not oppose it because it gives too much to the officers but because it gives too little to the enlisted personnel.

It is our position that any flat increase embracing all grades and ranks is inequitable, wasteful, and wholly out of keeping with current concepts of justice and equity. Any satisfactory increase must stand the test of its effect in spending power, that is to say, in dollars, even if a percentage formula is used.

Our reasons for supporting a flat $400-a-man increase are the same as those advanced to your committee by the representatives of the Army and Navy in support of the flat 20 percent increase. But our proposal would achieve the two objectives sought of the services while their own would not. In other words, we support a pay increase because it is absolutely necessary to meet the increased cost of living and because of the necessity for the armed forces to compete with civilian pay scales if they are to attract the type of personnel needed in today's complicated, highly mechanized, aerial, and scientific military machines.

Our Government, including the Congress, already has adopted or indicated its general approval of formulas for pay increases in Government and industry that are based on cost-of-living expenses. It seems strangely incongruous to overlook now the enlisted personnel of the armed forces.

It is also a queer commentary on our sense of values when the armed services formally cite the increased cost of living as justification for their recommendation for a 20-percent increase in all grades and ranks, knowing full well that while such a formula gives a major general $1,990 a year, it gives a private only $120, or a very meager 33 cents a day. That, of course, figures out to a mere 4 cents an hour for an 8-hour day.

You can readily understand the hullabaloo that would be raised if civilian employees of the Government were limited by this Congress to a 4-cents-an-hour pay increase. How, then, can we reconcile placing such a limitation upon the great majority of the members of the armed forces?

The real viciousness of the flat percentage formula becomes more apparent when it is understood that its adoption would increase the present pay of a combat infantryman from $60 to $70 a month only until such time as the war has been officially terminated when combat infantrymen automatically will lose their extra $10 a month. Thus, adoption by Congress of the 20-percent increase formula actually would result in no permanent increase for combat infantrymen who remain in service after the official ending of the war.

That is hardly the way to build the best type of democratic citizens' army which is being called for today. Neither does it seem to be a good formula to follow if there is any real intention of curbing the type of caste thinking which has aroused so much resentment among enlisted personnel.

It would seem unjust and extremely unwise at this time to give further substantiation to the suspicion that in times of peace, those whom we hail as our favorite sons in time of war, become mere stepchildren of an otherwise bountiful Government.

To increase the pay of a private in the Army from $50 to $60 a month is not going to get us many of the additional recruits we need. It seems entirely reasonable to predict that nearly every private or potential private will feel justly aggrieved over any act of Congress which gives him a mere $120 more a year with which to support his family while, at the same time, it gives a major general an increase of $1,990 to meet substantially the same increase in the cost of living.

It is not the intention of Army Times to oppose any equitable extension of the $400 minimum figure to officers, nor to oppose substitution of a graduated scale of increases which recognize merit, ability, and responsibility, but we cannot stress too emphatically that it is of great importance that this committee give the same consideration to enlisted personnel of the armed forces as has been given to the lower bracket civilian employees of the Government.

The cost of substituting such an equitable plan for the flat 20 percent plan of the services would be small compared to the benefits derived. The estimated cost of the 20 percent increase, with no material benefits going to enlisted personnel, is approximately $600,000,000. The estimated cost of the $400 flat increase for an Army and Navy of 2,000,000 would approximate $800,000,000, but the benefits would be material and the enlisted personnel would be treated justly.

The cost of failure to consider enlisted personnel of the armed services as employees of the Government equal in merit and pay to the run-of-the-mill civilian employee will be reflected adversely in the size, character, and quality of our peacetime Army.

With the welfare of our country and our armed forces paramount in mind, Army Times urges this committee to give greater consideration to the men of the armed forces upon whom we depend for so much.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a veteran of World War I, Mr. Charles L. DeReu, of Marshall, Minn., brings out very vividly in his letter to me relative to the British loan, the fallacy of granting that loan.

Is not the security and collateral which can be put up by our own veterans as good, if not better, than that of the British Nation? That is the question which Mr. DeReu asks in the following letter.

APRIL 1, 1946.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am a disabled veteran of World War I. I am in debt. The depression left me heavily in debt. No one would loan me money to pay that debt. I mortgaged my property. I pay 5 percent interest. I must pay that promptly when due or they foreclose. I would like to pay this indebtedness, reduce the interest rate to 2 percent, have 50 years to pay the principal in and have 5 years before beginning to pay. I need this delay in payment and the reduction in interest to rehabilitate myself. I assure you I am as hard up and as deserving as the British are. Can't you get the United States Government to make me a loan at 2 percent interest payable back in 50 years without any payment of interest and principal in the first 5 years? I need this loan badly. I, too, will spend this money in the United States.

Am I not as good and worthy as the English whom you propose to loan our money to on these terms? I assure you my security and collateral is as good, if not better, than that of the Englishmen. I, at least, will repay the loan. I pledge you it will not be used to speculate with, make more money for big capital and business, for the greedy. It will not hurt the common man of England and the United States as the loan to England will do. It will not be used to make more war, to finance another Hitler into power.

Can you help me? Get me a nice and easy loan. Ask Congress for a loan to me. Stop helping big business. Help us, the plain ordinary people of all countries. A loan to England does not help the common man of England. Why not help me? Give me a like loan. Introduce a bill to help me. Please do. Can I get my loan?

Thanking you, I remain,
Yours very truly,

CHARLES L. DEREU.

Why Not Borrow Grains From Breweries and Distilleries?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last night I wrote the following letter to the President of the United States:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The suggestion of Great Britain that the United States join her in rationing bread gives a startling emphasis to the world food situation.

If things are as bad as that, why not halt all use of grains in breweries and distilleries immediately and borrow their grain stocks for immediate shipment abroad? Surely if the power to ration exists under the War Powers Acts, this authority also exists. Appropriate steps could be taken to compensate the owners of the grains or to replace them later.

Such a step would get results and would certainly not be attended by all the difficulties that rationing of bread and flour would entail.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress, Second South Dakota District.

This morning I notice by the papers that the President said yesterday that the next 90 days would be the most critical in the world food situation. In view of his own estimate of the urgency of the situation, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the President will act promptly to borrow the present stocks of grain in the hands of the brewers and distillers and stop all deliveries to them until the crisis has passed.

Are We Losing or Gaining Public Respect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an address by Frank R. Schwengel, president, Distilled Spirits Institute, before the National Association of Beverage Control Administrators on April 2, 1946:

Are we gaining or losing public respect? It is my purpose to provoke a realistic appraisal of the standing of our industry with the public. In making such an appraisal it is essential to include an estimate of liquor control, for control in the public mind is irrevocably associated with the industry. So, for the purpose of this discussion we are in many respects on a parallel footing.

Representing the thinking of a member of the industry, my remarks naturally reflect partiality with the cause of legally controlled liquor under our present system. But perforce, I must also confess certain undeniable shortcomings. If dry proponents take comfort from such a confession, I say to them that we are realistic in our appraisal of the industry, and it is only reasonable to request that they in turn recognize the overwhelming benefits accruing from legal control.

What I wish to emphasize is the awareness of the industry of its social as well as economic obligations—and, in that awareness, what it has done about them and what it further intends to do about them. There is no general attitude among men of the industry to dodge their responsibility. Quite the contrary is true and it is upon that premise that the industry fundamentally lays claim to deservedness of public confidence and cooperation.

The record of progress of the past 12 years by the industry furnishes evidence of the acute realization by them that good conduct is good business.

Fully recognizing the serious problems we have encountered during the war period and still face today, and which have disturbed the public attitude, my answer to the question—"Are we gaining or losing public respect?"—is still in the affirmative. Upon what, then, do I base this conclusion at such a critical moment?

First, the most recent Gallup poll on public sentiment toward continuation of the

legal sale of alcoholic beverages showed in December 1945 that 63.4 percent of all who were questioned indicated that they would vote favorably if the question of national prohibition was to come up again. Of the balance 31.6 percent indicated a negative vote; while no opinion was registered by 5 percent of those polled. In other words, of those with definite opinion, 67 percent indicated a favorable vote while 33 percent were negative. This is a gain of 4 percent in affirmative sentiment over 1944, when the same question resulted in a 63 percent affirmative vote and 37 percent negative.

Second, the public recognizes to an extent at least, the importance of the industry as a factor in the war effort which was cited as "an unparalleled example of the conversion of an industry from peace to war." Its contributions related not only to the production of alcohol, but to byproduct feeds which aided the Nation materially in its food program during the war period when it was the breadbasket of the world.

Third, while the irritations to which the public is subjected due to rationing even now, 6 months after the war, militate against us, the industry itself likewise is an unwilling victim of it. Time has already justified the efforts of the industry in the light of its inventory position.

Fourth, the public has experienced a period of de facto prohibition and its attendant abuses and wants none of it.

Fifth, the huge and more or less painless revenue produced for Government and State at a time when most needed.

Sixth, during World War I prohibition was forced upon us at a time when millions of men were in the armed forces and deprived of the right to express their opinion.

During World War II, similar pressure was exerted to bring about the same result, but because of our improved relations with the public and the appreciation of Government officials of the evils that prohibition might again bring about, coupled with protests from the men in the service, the attempt was unsuccessful.

If we had not gained in public respect since repeal, the conclusion is inevitable that the experience of World War I would have been repeated.

Therefore, for these reasons and others during these trying days, it is felt that in the aggregate the industry has kept faith with the public. This justifies the belief that it has also gained in respect, though in a latent or concealed sort of way.

In taking stock, I must resort to contrasts as between what the public had before repeal and what it has today.

Seeking relief from what it believed to be an intolerable situation due largely to the flamboyance of the era, lack of commensurate laws and enforcement and a producing industry largely unidentified to the public because it mainly sold its commodity in bulk, the public hysterically brought on that painful, violent, and farcical experiment—15-year prohibition.

History records, and you who survived it know, that the prohibition era was the greatest period of national immorality and corruption the country had known up to that time, or has known since. Demoralizing effects of the experiment touched every strata and phase of life. It brought on a flood of poisonous alcoholic concoctions. It created an economic plutocracy of thugs and gunmen. It inspired a Nation-wide contempt for law. Its blighting influence rested heavily upon politics. Wholesale bribery and thievery in its innumerable forms, hypocrisy in social and civil life, corruption of youth, highjacking, racketeering, and murder, all had their origin in this tragic effort to alter by statute human customs not in themselves immoral or objectionable.

That is how completely the public, which has been promised the millennium, was misled. That is how completely it had muffed the ball in its prohibition thinking. Maybe it was worth while as an object lesson, but at what a price.

Call it revolution, or evolution—the public finally called a halt, repealed prohibition and in came legal control.

Today there are comprehensive laws and regulations and an industry responsive to them. Today there are able, experienced, and conscientious Federal Government and State officials to enforce them.

There has been created a multibillion dollar producing industry the equal in plant equipment and modern, scientific facilities unexcelled by the country's finest food plants. Many thousands of the public are shareholders.

Unlike preprohibition days and still more unlike the dry era the packaged products of the industry are today directly identifiable with the producer.

There have been developed highly organized distribution systems responsible to the law. In your 17 States you are responsible for both distribution and control, and a high level of public service is being rendered. In the remaining or "free enterprise" States, time and evolution also has brought the wholesale distributing industry to a comparatively high level of business conduct and public consciousness, but there is still work to be done.

Those at the distilling and wholesaling level are only indirectly in touch with the public. The first point of direct contact with the public is through the package store and the tavern, so let us look into these.

The exclusive package store as an outlet does not present, in its social implications, so much of a problem. As a point of public contact, especially to the home buyer, it does represent an opportunity to the credit or discredit of the whole depending upon the integrity of the owner.

The most extensive point of contact with the public is naturally the tavern. That is why it is of such great importance that conditions here be proper, for upon the status of the tavern with the drinking and nondrinking people of the community greatly depends the status of the industry.

The laws of a number of your States do not provide for taverns nor for on-premise consumption of spirituous liquors. The question here arises, to what extent is consumption thereby driven into clandestine spots? You are in best position to know. The laws of most other States provide for the tavern of which greater number are clean, scrupulously managed and law-abiding; operated by self-respecting businessmen, both good neighbors and good citizens. Such taverns are a credit to the social life of the community.

As the other extreme, the tavern, as other segments of the industry, has attracted some very bad people, that 5-percent fringe which is conducive of no good, in whatever business it might be. This regrettable minority deplores and repudiates. The license they hold, to them, is not a privilege of responsible management but merely a convenience or cloak to their abuses. Management makes a tavern, the lack of management makes it an old-time saloon.

A spokesman for a dry organization has stated that 90 percent of the local option elections are due to local nuisances where enforcement has broken down. There is also much evidence that men and women otherwise liberally disposed to alcoholic beverages have worked and voted against its sale as a protest against conditions locally surrounding it. Therefore results in local option elections are not always a fair index of wet against dry sentiment, but too often one of expediency in ridding the community of possibly a single hot spot, which license revocation might have been otherwise corrected.

In the catalog of age-old abuses with which the industry is charged, we find juvenile drinking, drunken driving, alcoholism, and other social evils. As moral problems these are deplored by wets and drys alike. There is no difference of opinion between us on that score. The question here is to what extent are licensed outlets and local enforcement agencies contributing factors through negligence? To what extent is it a question of human weaknesses, the prevention of which society has not yet devised? To what extent does it involve the basic question—legal liquor against bootleg liquor? Despite all this, it is undeniable that social and moral conditions throughout the country are healthier today than they were during prohibition.

Public opinion is the greatest force in the world today. It is the intangible and tremendously powerful factor which influences the thinking and actions of nations, industries, and men. Public opinion can make or break an industry, a product, or an individual.

Our industry at best is a creature of public sentiment. We cannot, hence, afford the luxury of ignoring public opinion. It is incumbent upon us that every step we take, either collectively on behalf of the industry, or individually for our own immediate self-interest, receives proper analysis as to the public reaction it is likely to engender.

Good public relations for the liquor industry means proper industry conduct through self-control coupled with vigorous, alert enforcement by State and local officials charged with the responsibility. Superficial bids for public favor have no place in such a program. There must be consistent and progressive application on the part of the entire industry and every segment of the industry must contribute its share to bring about the desired results.

It is also necessary to apprise the public of what the industry is trying to do. The more the public is kept informed, the more likely it will lend approbation and approval to the efforts of its control authorities and to support those authorities.

The drys see a great opportunity to bring back prohibition under the present threat of world famine. An organized cry has been set up against the use of grain for beverage purposes while starving Europe pleads for bread. Washington is being deluged with letters, telegrams, and pressure groups to stop all production of alcoholic beverages. That is a problem of the moment.

Though the distilling industry, under its present grain allowance uses only a negligible amount of grain suitable for bread, it does not lessen the vituperous onslaught of the prohibitionists and even some well-meaning people who do not understand the situation. Here are the facts:

Beverage distillers have been authorized to use only No. 3, 4, or sample grades of corn up to 5 days' operation per month to June 30, 1946; of which 6 percent may be rye. No wheat, which is the basic ingredient for bread, is being used. It is expressly stipulated that 15 pounds per bushel grain used must be recovered by distillers for cattle feed. Thus, over one-third in weight having a higher feed value than the total original grain when used as a supplement, is returned in the nature of highly nutritious feed, much needed by cattle, hog, and poultry raisers and milk producers.

Thus, the distilling industry, in effect, merely processes the grain. It extracts only the starch content and what is lost in bulk is more than made up in supplement-feed values.

The present attack upon the industry is, therefore, as unfair as the perennial charge that it is responsible for the sugar shortage.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to renew acquaintance with so many of you whom I have known ever since we both became interested in the highly complex but interesting problems of a legal but vulnerable product.

Our industry has made great progress in furthering its relations with the public. No longer are we regarded as outside the social pale as we were before prohibition. Today we are accepted as respectable members of the business, fraternal, religious, and civic community. Governmental agencies seek our advice and counsel on problems of mutual interest. And the fact that members of our industry have been given high posts in civilian advisory capacities, governmental commissions and committees, attests to our progress.

There can be no question but that we stand much further along in the public's esteem than ever before. This is not to say that we have made the most of all our opportunities. But there can be little doubt that when a balance is struck it will be apparent that our industry has made tremendous strides forward. I trust that when we next meet that we can honestly say that our rate of progress has been further accelerated.

So in answer to the question, "Are we gaining or losing public respect?" my answer is definitely that since repeal our relations with the public have improved and that with the years we have gained added good will.

A Year Later: Roosevelt Grave To Be Honored; Home a Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, as Representative for the Thirtieth Congressional District of the State of New York, which includes Dutchess County, it is my pleasure and honor to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning with reference to the dedicatory ceremonies that will take place at Hyde Park this afternoon at the time the Roosevelt home will be entrusted to the care of the National Park Service as a national historic site:

A year later: Roosevelt grave to be honored, home a shrine.

Truman to place Nation's wreath in rose garden today, with observances throughout world; city dips flags, silence asked at 4:35 p. m.

President Truman will place a wreath today on the grave of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, preceding the ceremony at 2:30 p. m. in which the late President's birthplace and home at Hyde Park, N. Y., will become a national historic site under the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

Members of the United Nations Security Council, and Trygve Lie, Secretary General, representing the world organization for peace, which President Roosevelt was instrumental in establishing, will be among the 700 official guests at the ceremony on the veranda of the cream stucco and granite house, shaded by spruce trees, which was the spot Mr. Roosevelt loved best on earth. Members of President Truman's Cabinet, and those who served in Cabinet posts under President Roosevelt will be present, with chiefs of other Government departments and the heads of diplomatic missions of many countries.

Meantime, throughout the world people will observe the anniversary of Mr. Roosevelt's death, for translation of the addresses at Hyde Park will be rebroadcast in 23 languages, and in many places special observances will be held.

Mayor William O'Dwyer last night ordered the flags on all New York City public buildings to be lowered to half-staff, and asked all citizens to observe a minute of silence at 4:35 p. m., the hour of Mr. Roosevelt's death at Warm Springs, Ga.

The half-hour public ceremony at Hyde Park will follow a quiet hour, in which President Truman, accompanied by Mrs. Roosevelt, will honor the memory of his predecessor. Arriving at 1:30 p. m., at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library, located on the Roosevelt estate, the President will be welcomed by Mrs. Roosevelt and escorted a few steps down a lane and through an opening in the 15-foot hemlock hedge which surrounds the garden where Mr. Roosevelt was buried 3 days after his death. Already in place at the head of the grave will be roses grown in the old-fashioned greenhouse adjoining the garden, but these will be the only floral emblems in sight. Visitors have been requested not to bring flowers, and if brought, the flowers cannot be placed beside the grave today, the National Park Service ruled last night.

The general public will be free to attend the ceremony, which will take place on the veranda, where President Roosevelt greeted his Hyde Park and Poughkeepsie neighbors on three victorious election days in 1936, 1940, and 1944. There will be seats on the graveled roadway for 700 Government officials and personal friends of President and Mrs. Roosevelt to whom cards have been sent by J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior. No ticket or invitation will be necessary for as many others as wish to take their chances of standing on the lawn.

In the half-hour ceremony Mrs. Roosevelt will formally present to Mr. Krug the deeds of the property which actually came under Government ownership last October, when Mrs. Roosevelt and her family renounced all rights to residence in the home. Mr. Krug will speak briefly in acceptance, and President Truman will deliver an address lasting from 5 to 7 minutes. Miss Marian Anderson will sing The Star-Spangled Banner. The invocation will be by the Rev. Dr. George W. Anthony, rector of St. James Protestant Episcopal Church, Hyde Park, and the benediction by Rabbi Jerome Unger, of Vassar Temple, Poughkeepsie.

WILL FLY FROM WASHINGTON

President Truman, who will fly from Washington for the ceremony in his special plane, is scheduled to arrive at the estate at 1:30 p m., after motoring from Stewart Field, part of the United States Military Reservation at West Point. Mrs. Roosevelt will meet him in her husband's study in the library building and accompany him to the rose garden. Jonquils and a few early tulips will brighten the spot, but not the premature springtime loveliness which surrounded it a year ago.

After the wreath has been placed on the flat white stone President Truman will continue on foot another few yards to the house, where Mrs. Roosevelt will guide him privately through the rooms most closely associated with the late President's career and which he has never inspected in detail.

The 700 other official guests will be invited into the house after the ceremony, but the general public will not be admitted today. From 10 a. m. to 5 p. m. tomorrow and thereafter every day except Mondays the house will be open to the public for an admission fee of 50 cents, which includes also admission to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library.

Sunday has been designated as Dutchess County Day, with a special welcome for Mr. Roosevelt's neighbors and friends.

TEN ROOMS TO BE SHOWN

Ten rooms will be shown in the Big House, as it was known in distinction from the Val-Kill cottage where Mrs. Roosevelt had her week-end retreat and where she now has her permanent home. The 10 rooms are the hall, dining room, drawing room, snuggery, and living room downstairs and upstairs, the President's own room—the room in which he was born—and three guest rooms, including those occupied by King George and Queen Elizabeth, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Madam Chiang Kai-shek All furniture in these rooms is as it was in 1940, when photographs were taken under Mr Roosevelt's personal supervision, for this purpose. He had already offered the house and 33 acres of surrounding land to the Government for a national site. Mrs. Roosevelt and the children have reserved each a few cherished small mementos, but in general the appearance of the home is as it was when Mr. Roosevelt lived there.

Radio coverage for the event will be the most elaborate since VJ-day. The addresses from 2:30 to 3 p. m. will be broadcast by the National, Columbia, and American Broadcasting Systems and Station WQXR. The British Broadcasting Co. will carry the program to England and Europe. The State Department will broadcast it to Latin America, and later will rebroadcast it in 23 foreign languages throughout the world. Other special features will be heard on short-wave broadcasts to other countries.

The anniversary of President Roosevelt's death will be marked by other special services or memorials elsewhere than at Hyde Park.

WILL BUILD A HOSPITAL

The American Committee for Yugoslav Relief announced that the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Hospital would be built by the Yugoslav Government and equipped by the committee.

The National Citizens Action Committee will hold a dinner at the Hotel Commodore this evening, attended by Mrs. Roosevelt and former political comrades of Mr. Roosevelt.

The President of the Provisional French Republic, Felix Gouin, will make a special broadcast in honor of the anniversary, according to an announcement by the Paris radio yesterday. The French Foreign Minister, Georges Bidault, will speak also.

The State Department will broadcast to overseas audiences today a tribute to President Roosevelt from Trygve Lie, Secretary General of United Nations, in which he called President Roosevelt "one of the foremost of those who gave life and being to the concept of the United Nations."

In Lima, Peru, there will be a memorial meeting under the auspices of the International Association of the Press, at which the American Ambassador, William D. Pawley, and Peruvian Government officials will speak.

OBSERVANCE AT WARM SPRINGS

At Warm Springs, Ga., where President Roosevelt died in the "little White House" on April 12 last, the patients will observe the anniversary with exercises in the foundation chapel. Gov. Ellis Arnall has proclaimed the day a public holiday, and the State capitol and all State offices will be closed.

At Hunter College, Park Avenue and Sixty-eighth Street, Justice Frank Murphy, of the United States Supreme Court, will be the chief speaker at a memorial meeting at noon.

The seven organizations which occupy the Wendell L. Willkie Memorial Building at 20 West Fortieth Street will hold a special assembly at 2:15 p. m. today, after which they will listen to the Hyde Park broadcast.

The Midwood High School at Bedford Avenue and Glenwood Road, Brooklyn, will present the Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial award to Frank Sinatra for furthering interracial understanding.

The Common Council for American Unity announced that Mrs. Roosevelt would accept at 11:30 a. m. today a collection of foreign-language newspapers for display in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library at Hyde Park. The papers include accounts of President Roosevelt's death, in 36 languages.

For Distinguished Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, our illustrious colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. MIKE MONRONEY, along with Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, has been accorded a signal honor. They were selected to receive the Collier's award for distinguished congressional service.

A brilliant scholar, sincere patriot and indefatigable worker, the gentleman from Oklahoma, MIKE MONRONEY'S contributions to the Congress have indeed been remarkable. This award is well deserved. His contributions toward resolving his country's problems are only surpassed by his devotion to duty and his perfect integrity. I applaud the award.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from Colliers magazine:

FOR DISTINGUISHED CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

(By Frank Gervasi)

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, a Republican from Michigan and a Democrat from Oklahoma, have been selected by a committee of eminent Americans to receive the Collier's awards for distinguished congressional service in 1945.

The awards, unique in concept and scope, were made for the first time. They will be bestowed annually on one Member of each House of Congress who, in the opinion of a national jury, has best served the Republic's interests in the calendar year. Their purpose is to stimulate the people's concern with the quality and effectiveness of their representatives in Washington and to inspire the legislators themselves to higher levels of statesmanship and service.

Of the 96 Members of the Senate and the 435 Members of the House, VANDENBERG and MONRONEY, in the committee's opinion, were the most useful citizens in Congress in the year which saw the victorious end of our greatest war, but which also brought upon the Nation new and heavy responsibilities to a world society, revealed organizational weaknesses in our legislative structure, and created unprecedented strains on our political and economic system.

At stake in 1945 were the permanency of a peace won at a cost of $400,000,000,000 and over 300,000 dead and 650,000 wounded, and the survival of the American way of life in a changing, revolutionary world. VANDENBERG and MONRONEY worked courageously, intelligently, and skillfully to achieve the first and insure the second.

VANDENBERG was chosen for his ability to rise above partisan politics in welding together the Senate in support of a policy of American participation in world affairs. In so doing he demonstrated consummate skill in statecraft and an awareness both of the country's responsibilities to a world society and of its opportunities for democratic leadership. He had the moral courage to abandon his former isolationism in favor of active and constructive internationalism. He is 62 years old, married, has three children, was an editor and published from 1906 to 1928 and has been in the Senate since.

MONRONEY was selected for fostering legislation intended to reform the organization and procedures of Congress. Although his efforts had not yet resulted in new laws by the time the award was made, they have commanded the respect and admiration of his colleagues, many astute newspapermen, and the committee itself. Moreover, MONRONEY labored for American participation in the Bretton Woods plan for world economic rehabilitation and in the United Nations Organization. He supported price controls and all measures designed to curb inflation. He is 44, married, has one son, was a reporter and political writer, later a businessman, and was elected in 1939.

Appropriately, in a brief and simple ceremony in the White House, President Harry Truman—himself until only recently a legislator and profoundly concerned with the fate of the world and of the Nation—presented to VANDENBERG and MONRONEY the silver plaques symbolizing their distinction. With the awards went individual prizes of $10,000 each, but the money, according to the committee's rule, is to be turned over to any worthy public purpose designated by the winners.

Plans had been made for an elaborate banquet to celebrate the occasion. The menus were printed and ready to be mailed. The Presidential and Congressional ballrooms of the Statler Hotel had been engaged. Suddenly, however, the President called the Nation's attention to the food famine in Europe. Collier's and the awards committee decided it would not be proper to hold a banquet to commemorate the event, however, important, while fellow humans starved abroad.

Accordingly, the awards committee chairman, Mr. Owen D. Young, notified the President that the sum of $5,000 which would have been spent on the banquet would be turned over to him for the relief of hungry people. The President gladly agreed and consented also to present the awards to VANDENBERG and MONRONEY at the White House instead of at the dinner as originally planned.

The ceremony in the White House itself more particularly calls attention to the role of Congress in our democratic lives. In recent years the responsibility, and with it some of the power for the conduct of the Nation's affairs, has shifted increasingly from the legislative to the executive branch of our Government.

The legislative department is the only one which, most broadly and directly, is the people's personal instrument of Government. In the executive department, only the President and the Vice President are elected by the people. None is elected in the Federal judiciary. Yet on these three pillars, legislative, executive and judiciary, the house of our Republic stands. A weakness in any pillar is dangerous. Clearly, however, the disintegration of the legislative pillar would mean disaster.

According to Macaulay, "Democracy is all sail and no rudder." We have disproved that.

History, ancient and modern, warns of the dangers to popular government of allowing legislatures to fall into disrepute and disuse. Eventually they die. Lord Bryce said, "Democracy is founded on the rule of the majority." The majority, however, sometimes can be wrong. The story of the rise of police states in Europe has been that of the progressive paralysis and atrophy of parliaments. They are as essential to democratic vitality as freedom of thought and speech.

Wars are particularly critical periods in the lives of parliaments. These are deliberative bodies and they must ponder and argue. They are consequently slow to decide. But the endless emergencies of battle demand quick decisions. And even in the best democracies, such as ours, the tendency in wartime is to yield the deliberative functions of the Congress to the executive arm of government out of the sheer necessity of getting things done.

Strong Presidents, too, exert a repressive influence on the legislative side of government even in peacetime. They are often impatient with the delays occasioned by the legislators' compulsion to debate the Chief Executive's views on any matter, whether an appropriation for the construction of a Federal power project, or a loan to a foreign power is involved. And because a strong President is usually also a popular one, the mood is to side with the Chief Executive and against "the obstructionists" in Congress.

For 14 years the Nation has moved from one domestic crisis into another and finally into the greatest crisis of all—war. It had a strong and popular President. All of the forces which tend to restrict the functions and lower the prestige of Congress operated, therefore, at a maximum pressure.

When those forces were mitigated with the untimely death of the dominating personality in the White House and the premature arrival of peace, the Government was plunged into internal and international political and economic crises no less urgent than those of war. Again the White House and its occupant, the executive rather than the legislative department of government, held the eyes of the voters.

"What will the President do now?" people asked, and not, "How will Congress solve this problem?"

It was to attempt to correct this imbalance that Collier's last year asked a group of distinguished Americans to select the Senator and the Representative who had done most to restore the prestige and functions of Congress.

The committee had the unstinted cooperation of authoritative Washington newspapermen, leading editors throughout the country, and of professors, educators, and others intimately concerned with the state of the Union and the world. For many months Mr. Young and his associates examined, weighed, and sifted the public statements, legislative acts, and the achievements and failures of the Members of both Houses of Congress. Polls were taken privately among trained Washington correspondents who daily report the activities of the Senate and the House.

THE CRITERIA OF APPRAISAL

The candidates' devotion to national interests as opposed to personal ambitions, their intellectual capacities and integrity, political courage, understanding of issues, effectiveness as legislators, diligence, actual achievements, and public influence were assiduously scrutinized.

The gages and standards employed by the 14 members of the awards committee in measuring the candidates' stature were exacting. They looked for those specific qualities, tangible capacities, and broad attitudes which lift men from the level of politician to that of statesman.

Voting records, for instance, were carefully assessed. Due allowance was made for those political exigencies which sometimes impel a Congressman to vote "yea" on a bill which he has been quietly working to disembowel, or to vote "nay" in order to have a bill recommitted for improvement and passage. Those Senators and Representatives who, neither in the eyes of their colleagues nor the judgment of the jury, had national stature were quickly eliminated.

To merit consideration, the candidate for an award had to know what was going on in his country and abroad, to comprehend the evolutionary and revolutionary political and economic forces at work and to show definite signs of wanting to function as a delegate of the American people rather than as a political hack. The men ultimately chosen had in the opinion of the committee the brains and imagination to look forward instead of backward, to analyze the specific problems of the moment, and to be able to synthesize their findings into a sensible democratic pattern. The awards committee looked for Alexander Hamiltons and Tom Jeffersons.

"To the people [of Hamilton's and Jefferson's era]," said the late President Roosevelt at a Jackson Day dinner in 1940, "it mattered on the whole very little what party

label American statesmen bore or what mistakes they made in the smaller things so long as they did the big job that their times demanded."

The candidates for the Collier's awards were so measured. In the Senate, in the fateful year of 1945, the big job was undoubtedly in the field of foreign relations. Here the Senate constitutionally shares with the President and his Secretary of State the responsibility for peaceful and profitable political and commercial relations with other countries. In the conduct of foreign affairs, perhaps more than in any other area, the Senate had yielded most ground to the executive department, and its advice and consent, especially in wartime, had been sought increasingly less.

Here, then, was a twofold task: to prevent, as happened in 1918, America's withdrawal from the world community and to restore to the Upper House its constitutional prerogatives in actual practice. As peace approached and with it an end to those patriotic compulsions to conformism which during the war had provided bipartisan support to the policies of the executive branch, the possibility arose of a repetition of 1918. VANDENBERG saw the dangers as he saw, also, the necessity for the Senate's reassertion of its powers.

It was largely due to his influence, exerted both as a member of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations and in his speeches, that a purely partisan approach to foreign affairs was avoided. A split on party lines in the Senate would have meant a blow to the administration's internationalist program. Republicans, anxious to discredit the administration and so take a step toward power themselves, might easily have been tempted into withdrawing support from Roosevelt's and subsequently President Truman's program for American participation in a United Nations Organization for the maintenance of world peace.

But in the decisive amount, in those preatomic days when the desirability of world unity was even less clear than now, VANDENBERG rose at the San Francisco Conference to say: "In my opinion our intelligent American self-interest indispensably requires our loyal cooperation in the great adventure to stop World War III before it starts."

And in the Senate, after the Conference, he said: "America has everything to gain and nothing to lose by giving it (the Charter of the United Nations) support; it has everything to lose and nothing to gain by declining."

He pleaded with Republicans and Democrats to come out of the "valley of the shadow of two wars" and to support the ratification of the United Nations Charter as an alternative to "physical and moral chaos in many weary place of the earth." Republican colleagues, some of whom had been seemingly unregenerate isolationists, rallied to him wrung his hand and voted his way. America joined the United Nations Organization.

With equal sincerity he fought for lend-lease, for the continuance of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and for other means to insure a democratic victory and peace. Later he was foremost among those to deplore the scuttling of many of the idealistic objectives of the Atlantic Charter and in reminding Russia that there can be "no dark corners in an atomic age—suppression of news inevitably invites the suspicion that behind the iron curtain of secrecy there is suppression of human rights."

WARTIME PROBLEMS OF THE HOUSE

The big job in the House was, unquestionably, to prevent that body from becoming the mere rubber stamp of the executive branch, to maintain its functions as the principal guardian of public funds, and to legislate judiciously on innumerable issues affecting the general welfare. Here, more noticeably than in the Senate, there was need to raise the standards of American statesmanship. At the same time the difficulties militating against its efficient operation as a legislative body, apparent for years before the war, had grown enormously.

The Members of the House had to cope with tax bills, innumerable wartime emergency appropriations, the financing of government grown to gargantuan dimensions in the war years and the economic terrors inherent in the shift from wartime to peacetime production. Inflation hovered over the land like an evil genie, and while the Senate shared the responsibility for preventing the wrecking of our national economy, the House shouldered the greater burden, for it, in the last analysis, held the purse strings. Whatever measures required the heavy expenditure of taxpayers' money to achieve economic stability through subsidies, Federal support of housing, public works, or for relief to jobless and homeless returning veterans were its particular although not exclusive province.

Even when he was a freshman Member of the House, MONRONEY showed a profound understanding of the duties and functions of a representative of the people. His horizons lay beyond the dimensions of the House itself. It was not enough, he saw, to be a good Congressman in the old political sense of the term, which meant merely to obtain the requisite number of Federal appointments for his constituents, and the culverts and bridges they desired for their communities.

In 1939 he saw the inevitability of America's entry into the war. He defied a then popular trend and voted for the fortification of Guam. He spent the summer of 1943 barnstorming on behalf of a House resolution in the interest of the erection of permanent peace machinery. It was obvious from the start that MONRONEY was something new in Representatives.

FAVORED THE BARUCH PLAN

In 1941 he disclosed his interest in and understanding of domestic economic affairs. With Representative ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, he tried to enact Bernard M. Baruch's price-control plan which would have put a ceiling over all prices and wages. Inflation was a toddler in diapers then but already MONRONEY saw what it might become. He has since played a strong hand in fashioning ways and means of preventing inflation from wrecking our economic system.

MONRONEY fostered legislation designed to prevent abuses in restraint of trade by trade unions and was the author of the anti-racketeering bill to bring the activities of delinquent unions under the jurisdiction of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

But it was in recognition of the organizational and operational deficiencies of Congress that MONRONEY really distinguished himself. He not only saw what was wrong, but was instrumental in devising correctives which are being studied by the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.

MONRONEY had not been long in Congress when he became aware of the low state of the lower House. While the Constitution divided the legislative and executive branches of government, it had not intended these to go their separate ways and often in opposite directions. The executive branch had thickened with 3,000,000 employees and the political power they represented. Yet, only two of them, the President and the Vice-President, were elected representatives of the people. By contrast, the Congress had withered.

Moreover, MONRONEY discovered that a gulf deeper than party prejudices or partisan ambitions separated the executive from the legislative branch. The executive side had grown, bureau on bureau and department on department, administered the laws of Congress but acted independently of Congress. They disbursed funds without congressional supervision. Obviously, said MONRONEY, these should be made accountable to the General Accounting Office.

MONRONEY found a "shocking lack" of adequate congressional fact-finding services. He saw Congressmen working without skilled help and dependent on the mimeographed hand-outs from Government bureaus, the newspapers and, worse still, the mimeographed hand-outs of professional lobbyists for the basic information upon which to make legislative decisions.

It is MONRONEY's hope that he and his colleagues in both Houses will eventually obtain legislation which will provide Senators and Representatives with well-paid administrative assistants who can assume the nonlegislative duties now cluttering legislators' desks. He hopes, too, that the salaries of the Members of Congress will be raised to a level which will attract intelligent, ambitious young men who ordinarily shun government for business and the professions. He hopes, in short, to make of government an honorable career for honorable men.

A THOUGHT FROM EDMUND BURKE

MONRONEY hopes to raise the sights of lawgivers to his standards eloquently described by Edmund Burke in his reflections on the nature of statesmanship:

"The true lawgiver ought to have a heart full of sensibility. He ought to love and respect his kind, and to fear himself. It may be allowed to his temperament to catch his ultimate object with an intuitive glance; but his movements toward it ought to be deliberate. Political arrangement, as it is a work for social ends, is to be only wrought by social means. There, mind must conspire with mind * * * (to the end that) * * * we compensate, we deconcile, we balance."

In the achievement of a Congress streamlined to meet the exigencies of our new and complex society such as MONRONEY suggests lies America's hope for a new era in government. It was in recognition of the magnitude of MONRONEY's dream that he was given one of the Collier's awards.

There are other men, many others, in both the Senate and the House who have worked and will continue to work for good government, by which is meant a government more clearly responsive to the general and specific will of the people. The choice of the winners this year is, of course, no belittlement of those who have not been chosen.

Year after year will bring new problems and with them new men and new leaders of men. Members of the Congress who were relatively obscure in 1945 may be the men of the front pages—and of the Collier's awards—this year, or the next.

Address of Hon. Paul V. McNutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, over Station WBAL, Baltimore, Md., on March 31, 1946:

It is a source of great satisfaction to me this afternoon to speak as the guest of the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Maryland, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS. Senator TYDINGS is not only one of the distinguished statesmen of the United States Senate, he

is also one of the historic figures of the Philippine Islands. He is the author and father of the Philippine charter of political liberty, the Philippine independence law, legally known as the Tydings-McDuffie Act. This great law created the position I now hold as United States High Commissioner to the Philippines. Senator TYDINGS' name is a household word in the distant islands. His name will forever be associated in the Orient with one of the most important actions the United States has ever taken in that part of the world, the grant of political freedom to 18,000,000 Filipinos.

It was in 1933 that Senator TYDINGS lent his name to the piece of legislation which proposed to make the Philippines independent. In little more than 3 months from today, the American flag will be hauled down in the Philippines under the terms of that Independence Act, and the Philippines will be a free, a sovereign nation, under its own power, the equal of all the other nations, great and small, of the earth. It will be a new member of the great family of nations. It never existed as a nation before. We will have made it a nation. Under our 48-year tutelage, a sprawling archipelago of 13,000,000 people, who spoke 83 different dialects, who included two great and different religious sects, the Mohammedan and the Catholic, were unified and fused into single nationhood. That union was fired in the crucible of the recent war. Today I no longer doubt—although I had strong doubts 8 years ago—that this great people, given an opportunity for economic survival, will grow and prosper as a nation. Despite all the grave and tragic difficulties brought to the Philippines by war, I am satisfied that the Phillippine people have the will to exist as a nation, and have the resolution and courage to solve the tremendous problems which face them—problems which have crushed many less courageous people along the byroads of history.

The Philippines are starting off with all the odds against them. They are hideously wounded by war. Their cities and farms are scarred by violence to an indescribable degree. Eighty percent of Manila, the metropolis of the Philippines, formerly the Pearl of the Orient, is gutted beyond repair. The second largest city, Cebu, is 95 percent destroyed. All the other major cities present the same heartbreaking picture. The roads are ruined. The ships which once bound these 7,100 islands together, are gone and must be replaced. The farms are fallow and uncultivated. Homes are burnt to the ground. The beasts of burden are gone from the rice paddies and cornfields, stolen by the Japanese or eaten. Where once the Philippines shipped to the United States $160,000,000 worth of goods yearly, their shipments now are only a trickle. Production is at a standstill. There are many business transactions, but they are all of the type called in the Philippines buy and sell. Goods for consumption are at a premium. There is still available the money emptied out of the pockets of the 2,000,000 GI's once stationed in the islands, but of whom are left now only a relative handful. Imported goods from the United States stream in. They are sold to a wholesaler, sold again to a subwholesaler, sold again to a distributor, sold again to a subdistributor. Sometime down the line they get to the retail outlets. People buy. But no one is producing, no one is building, no one is making. It is a consumptive economy, feeding on its own substance. Unemployment has assumed major proportions. Hunger stalks many parts of the land. Disease and epidemic threaten to break out at any moment.

Those are not the only problems these people have to wrestle with. Some of their number collaborated wholeheartedly with the Japanese. These are now being tried in the people's courts. The men on trial were once the top leaders of the Philippines. Now they are on trial for their lives. The issue of collaborationism is a bitterly divisive one.

There are still areas in the Philippines where armed bands of violent men rule in the place of law. Some of these armed bands were given guns and munitions by us to help fight the Japanese. Many of them did fight the Japanese and heroically. Some of them come from areas which for long centuries have been woefully underprivileged, where absentee landlordism and sharp money-lending practices have kept hundreds of people in virtual bondage for all of their lives. Now they are armed. They would redress their wrong with force. They defy law and order. They do not trust the promises of their national political leaders. There are among these armed groups unprincipled leaders who prey upon the anguish and distress of their followers.

A great and deep ferment is upon the land. And yet in 3 months these people will get their independence. They will be swept out into the chaotic and bitterly contesting world to fend, politically, for themselves. Yet I believe that the future of the Philippines can be a happy and a prosperous one, a democratic one. It can be, if we, the United States, observe our obligations to these Islands and their people.

We have many obligations to the Philippines, some written, some unwritten. Our primary obligation to them stems from the fact that the Philippines have been part of the United States, a possession of the United States, for 48 years. Filipinos have been American nationals for that long, ever since we acquired these islands from Spain, half by conquest and half by purchase in 1898, and set about preparing the people for their eventual freedom. We have spent 47 years in that process. We have the obligation to see that all the efforts that have been made by this Nation, and by its colonial pioneers shall not have been in vain. We have the obligation of seeing to it that a nation, constructed in the democratic image of the United States—in its institutions, its political traditions, its laws, and its language—is preserved in our image and is able to maintain its independence and its democracy, both against external aggression and against internal economic collapse.

The United States moulded the economy of the Philippines according to a pattern which suited our economic interests. We encouraged the production of things we needed—sugar, coconuts, tobacco, and hemp. These products constituted 70 percent of the value of total Philippine exports to the United States. And more than 80 percent of all Philippine exports were shipped into the American market. That trade, which is the heart and the substance of the entire Philippine economy, depended almost entirely on the existence of a duty-free market in this country. Under the terms of a law passed by Congress in 1909, Philippine products were not required to pay tariffs. Filipino leaders, at that time, were opposed to that law. They knew it would bind their economy irretrievably to that of the United States. But we passed the law anyway. It resulted in prosperity for the Philippines. It brought great benefits to American businessmen, and to American business. As Philippine exports to the United States increased, so did American exports to the Philippines. In recent years, the Philippines have been the sixth most important buyer in the world of American cotton goods. The Philippines have been an important market for our canned foods, for machinery, for construction material and equipment, for all sorts of commodities made and manufactured here. Those exports to the Philippines were valued at $105,000,000 in 1940. Trade with the Philippines was far from a one-way street.

Today, as independence approaches, and with the Philippine productive economy in ruins, we are faced by the obligation to help restore that economy and to give back to the Filipinos the market they lost while their land was occupied and ravaged by the Japanese.

Our obligation to the Philippines, based on Philippine participation in the war, is immeasurable. Their valiant fighting men formed the major part of General MacArthur's heroic army which wrote immortal history on Bataan and Corregidor. The plain folks of the Philippines who formed the famous guerrilla armies of resistance during the Japanese occupation did as much for victory in the Pacific as any single force we had. They saved us many months of fighting, they saved us billions of dollars, they saved us thousands of American lives.

The Filipinos—the only colonial people in the world to fight for their sovereign—were with us through those long dark years because they believed in America, in democracy, and in our way of life. Now we have the obligation of justifying that belief and that faith.

But it isn't only gratitude which should impel us to help the Philippines to the full extent of our capacity. It is or should be something more than that. We stand today on the threshold of a new epoch in history. In the Philippines there is about to take place an event which signifies the swell of a new tide in world affairs * * * the tide that recognizes the humanity of man, the dignity of individuals, the right of every people, regardless of color or nationality, to be free, independent, and to be treated as equals whether they be small, powerless people or great, wealthy, and mighty people. That tide is sweeping over the entire Orient, over the entire world. We have not tried to breast that tide or oppose it, but to lead it, to flow with it.

We, the mightiest Nation in the world, are setting a small people free. But in so doing we are entering upon a new kind of relationship with the people whom we have raised to nationhood status. The Philippines cease to be a political dependency or possession, but they become a partner in world affairs in the sense that they are dedicated to the same ends, aiming for the same goals, and using the heritage, the methods, and the institutions which we bequeathed to them. We are setting up in the Philippines, so to speak, a branch bank of democracy, an outpost of western idealism. The only profit, the only income we should and will seek from this installation is a furthering of our mutual national purpose, the freedom and dignity of man, the preservation of peace in the world.

This idealistic goal cannot be achieved if the Philippines are left to founder on the rocks of economic chaos. We are, in major part, responsible for their economic chaos. We must help them unselfishly to solve their economic problems at whatever cost. It is as much to our interest to help solve the economic problems of the Philippines as it is to solve the economic problems of our own depressed areas in the United States. And the obligation to do so is far deeper and far more dramatic.

Last Friday the House of Representatives passed the Philippine trade rehabilitation bill, an action which was long, long overdue. That bill, which provides 8 years of free trade and 20 years of preferential tariffs, now goes to the Senate for action and approval. Next week the House will be asked to act on the Tydings war-damage bill, which authorizes an appropriation of $400,000,000 for the payment of individual damages suffered as a result of war and a payment of $120,000,000 to the commonwealth government for the rebuilding of public roads and structures damaged by war. Senator TYDINGS is the author of this latter measure, which will pay for about one-half of the damages suffered by these islands from the devastation of battle. The Senate has already passed this bill.

These two measures are the economic cornerstones of Philippine recovery and rehabilitation. There are other measures

which must be considered. There are other steps which the United States must take soon, and in the future, to finish the job it is obligated to do.

I hope the day will come when every American will be able to look with a thrill of pride across the Pacific to the Philippines, where we will see the prosperous cities, industries, and people of a great and free democracy, an offshoot of the might and generosity of the United States. On July 4, when our flag comes down in the Philippines, it will fly actually higher in the hearts and minds of the people of the Philippines and of the entire Far East than ever before in history. We are embarking on a new kind of relationship, a new kind of obligation which will set a new pattern of thinking and, I hope, of acting throughout the world.

Tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on this, the anniversary of the death of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and place in the RECORD a tribute to President Roosevelt, delivered by Miss Lois Kilpatrick, of Ayden, N. C., at the Jackson Day dinner held in Raleigh, N. C., on the evening of March 30.

Miss Kilpatrick formerly delivered this address and won highest honor at an oratorical contest in eastern North Carolina. I am proud that a citizen of the district I have the honor to represent has paid such a fitting tribute to one of the greatest Presidents, and certainly the most beloved, that our country ever had.

TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Never in the history of the world has there been as many tributes paid to the memory of a man as that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Never in the history of the world has there been a man as worthy of those tributes as Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We should be thankful to God that He raised a man capable to help us in our great crisis. The crisis of the early church was met by Paul. The crisis of the Middle Ages was met by Martin Luther; the crisis in western civilization was met by our President Woodrow Wilson; the world crisis of 1933 to 1945 was met by Franklin Roosevelt. He was and always will be one of history's greatest figures. None can take his place. He was, perhaps, the greatest of all great leaders. He was a champion of freedom who raised the United States to heights never attained by any nation.

Roosevelt was a man of great faith, faith in God, faith in people, and faith in himself. Out of his faith came courage, courage which inspired the world. His high courage was tested in the fierce fires of great crisis; personal, national, and international.

Early in 1921 in the prime of youth, Roosevelt was stricken with infantile paralysis. Other men would have given up, but not this man of faith and courage. No word of complaint against his misfortune was overheard to pass his lips. His handicap, instead of being a liability, became an asset. Out of his misfortune he developed a tough body, a radiant personality, and a robust mind.

In the great crisis of 1933 when a great fear seized the people, Roosevelt smiled and said, "The only thing we need to fear is fear itself." He spoke words of courage and hope. He acted promptly and boldly with a faith which revived the people. His great faith, courage, and strategy was displayed in 1941, when the great crisis of Pearl Harbor came.

We saw Roosevelt's cooperative strategy for peace in the early recognition of Russia in the war; the good neighbor policy; in the Atlantic Charter; "the four freedoms," Bretton Woods; Yalta; and the Dumbarton Oaks. We know this Nation and all nations lost a great leader when Roosevelt passed away on April 12, 1945. Men of all races, creeds, and colors were bound together in mutual sorrow when his death became known to the world. Even prisoners bowed their heads and paid tribute to this great leader.

Roosevelt was one of the few men in all history who lifted the humble people of a Nation up and out of themselves into a great unity, a unity in which they learned the glory of fellowship in a noble cause. He embodied the very spirit of our time and carried within his great heart the hopes and dreams and aspirations of millions of little people. His passing away took away something very precious from each one of us. For most of us his death was a personal loss. It was an immeasurable loss to our country and to all mankind.

Franklin Roosevelt not only dreamed big things but he dared to face the fiercest of enemies and he did not fail to win. Although his body is here no more, his spirit will be with the people as long as the world stands. He did not die at Iwo Jima, Corregidor, or some other battlefield but he is yet a casualty of war. "He was the greatest symbol of freedom and the greatest humanitarian of all times." Of the many tributes to this great humanitarian and statesman, one though seems to be supreme, the thought that no greater tribute can be given to Franklin Roosevelt than to resolve to practice what we believe to be his ideals. Is not this the greatest tribute ever to be paid to the memory of any man?

Many a doughboy on land and sea,
With half his life not spent,
Would have more than willingly
Died in the place of our President.

Now I know and understand,
Some men are born to lead,
But few in this vast land
Are as great in thought and deed
As was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Old-Age Pension

REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the American Government has wisely recognized the justice and importance of a pension for the aged, but we need to correct the faults and injustices in the old-age-pension system. There are thousands of people in the United States today who have with their own hands produced enough to feed and clothe their families for a thousand years, but, because of economic accident or economic change beyond their control, are left today without means of support in the days of their old age. As for me, I would as soon see the Nation impoverished as to see its most deserving and faithful builders impoverished, cast off, and neglected.

Paupery and penury are not proper payments for a lifetime of faithful service and citizenship. We have a just and fair obligation to see to it that those who have put in a lifetime of work building this great Nation shall not in their last years face only a future of want and dependence. These aged citizens by and large merit the recognition that was accorded the faithful servant to whom it was said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Our Government has recognized the fundamental justice of an old-age-pension program, but it is evident to all of us that the present program is unsatisfactory and needs amendment. It must be improved and changed to correct the injustices and errors to the point of having a sound and fair and just program.

There have been many bills introduce dto provide a worthy old-age-pension system. I myself have introduced a bill, back in 1937, to provide for a pension system with the pension (1) paid direct by the Federal Government; (2) an equal amount for all citizens of 60 years of age; and (3) requiring only proof of age and citizenship for eligibility. That bill expressed my views then and now, but it is unimportant whose bill is passed, except that it is important that at least one of these sound bills be passed now to improve the old-age-pension system.

Now is the time for all of us to unite and put through legislation that will equalize old-age assistance and will remove the unfair conditions to drawing a pension and the inequitable and arbitrary determination of pension amounts.

The entire Oklahoma delegation in the House of Representatives has met and agreed on a program to improve the old-age-pension system. The program that we have agreed on has the support of the old people in our State. Mr. O. J. Fox and others, representing organizations of those who are working in an effort to make the pension program fair and workable, have considered the provisions of this program and have approved it. I am referring to H. R. 1831, introduced by Congressman PAUL STEWART, of Oklahoma. The Oklahoma delegation of the House is solidly behind this bill. We urge that each State delegation meet as a delegation and consider the problem, and we are confident that if you will take such action, your decision will be to join us in putting over this program.

The Stewart bill is offered as an amendment to the Social Security Act. In the first place, it equalizes old-age assistance in each of our States. In the second place, it makes age and citizenship the only basis for eligibility, except it provides a limitation on the annual income or total capital of the applicant. Personally, I do not believe that that limitation is necessary, but it is reasonable. But above all, this bill creates an equal system. It removes the arbitrary decision of the case worker who under the present system determines the amount of the individual pension.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this bill would not result in any considerable

added cost. The savings that would be affected in the administration of the program would equal the added cost of the increased and equal benefits the bill would provide. It is a simple program and one that ought to be adopted now. I can today think of many men and women by name that I know personally who need and deserve this pension. It is not right that the hand of want should be forever extended in a nation of plenty by the creators of that plenty. It is my conviction that one tear of hunger or grief outweighs a nation's gold.

There are many thousands who deserve the consideration at the hands of our Government that will guarantee an equal pension to all in an adequate amount on fair terms and conditions. I urge each and every Congressman to sign discharge petition No. 21. Let us get action.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the presidents and secretaries of the State Farm Bureau in the northeast region recently adopted a resolution with reference to the extension of OPA proposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation. The Farm Bureau Federation has emphatically reaffirmed its position in advocating the removal of consumer subsidies. The declaration of the farm bureau that there is no reason or justice in subsidizing the food bill of this country by payments from the Federal Treasury indicates clearly that farmers generally believe that prices of farm commodities should seek their own level in a free market.

However, Mr. Speaker, the immediate removal of subsidies will require such substantial adjustments in consumer prices that the effect must in some way be cushioned. The report of the Pace subcommittee of March 9 offers suggestions which are worthy of most careful consideration. The recommendation of the committee with respect to the gradual removal of dairy-production payments, for instance, offers a means for the elimination of this particular subsidy although the method suggested could also be used in the elimination of other subsidy payments. The position taken by the Farm Bureau is fundamentally sound although the manner of putting it into effect should follow the pattern suggested by the Pace committee.

The resolution further provides that any extension in the Price Control Act should provide for the removal of controls over any commodity the supply and demand of which are in reasonable balance. Maintaining of control over a commodity until the supply is sufficient to meet the demand merely prolongs not only the control but also the scarcity. Controls should be lifted whenever the supply, even though insufficient to meet total demand, will shortly be sufficient, considering the available production facilities and the incentive to produce which will result from the cancellation of controls. That unsatisfactory supply of many commodities is a result of unreasonable controls is a demonstrable fact.

Killing Our Flocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Manchester Union of April 11, 1946:

KILLING OUR FLOCKS

People of New Hampshire feel deep concern over the recent Government instruction that farmers must reduce their flocks and herds to the visible feed supplies available through regular channels. Much of our difficulty in the past in handling the food situation in this country has come from the inability of Government policy makers to see beyond the end of their own noses. Policies have been drafted to meet present emergencies without the exercise of foresight to discover what the longer-range effect of these policies will be. As a result, in meeting one emergency, a new one often has been created before the full effect of the measures taken has been felt.

People at present facing a meat shortage in the markets of cities like Manchester are compelled to fall back on chickens to meet the demand for meat of some kind. Now we are told that farmers in New Hampshire must kill off a part of their flocks, as well as their herds, because of their inability to get feed. These farmers are told that they must be "realistic," and adjust their flocks and herds to the visible feed attainable.

Thus our basic resources in the meat field are to be depleted, removing the only backlog on which the housewife can rely at present, as well as threatening a definite lack of fowl and cattle products for the future.

This program is plainly unsound and dangerous. America's ability to feed herself, and to be useful in helping to feed hungry peoples elsewhere in the world, rest on the maintenance of her basic food resources. The haphazard method of handling the food situation is becoming steadily more intolerable and threatening. Farmers in New Hampshire are told that they must liquidate their flocks and herds because grain producers in the West refuse to release grain for feed as a result of Government indecision, or because they are selling it into the black market.

Something is seriously wrong when a nation that produced enough to supply the world in the greatest war against aggression than mankind has ever fought, now is unable to supply its own needs. The streets are blocked with butter lines, and people generally are clamoring for the bare essentials of living. The American people are justly getting impatient over this situation. The existing conditions have now gone on long enough to show some prospect of improvement, yet instead, they become steadily worse.

It is no excuse to say that the American people must be willing to sacrifice to help starving peoples elsewhere. The American people always have been ready to sacrifice to save suffering elsewhere. The plain fact is that the feed necessary to support our flocks and herds is not going to other peoples. It is held up by farmers in the West due to the failure of Congress to settle definitely the question of future prices, or it is being fed into the black market to be used for other purposes than feed.

To meet this situation by calling for a depletion of our existing food resources through a decimation of our flocks and herds points only in the direction of further impoverishment. We now have a shortage of butter. The next thing will be a shortage of eggs, of chickens to eat, and of milk and other dairy products. The time has come to call a halt in this crazy program that is leading further and further toward disaster. The American people should demand that the Government bring order out of the present chaos or stand accountable for its gross failure.

Why Not Retain the Men in the Service Who Want To Remain There?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much of late to the effect that it would be necessary to continue the draft in order to keep our numbers in the service up to the requirements of the heads of our military organizations. I am just in receipt of a letter which seems to require an explanation. A young man in the service, a commissioned officer, now situated in the Philippine Islands, states that he wishes to remain in the Regular Army and has recently gone to the Regular Army reviewing board in Manila and has taken the required examinations, and his application has been forwarded to Washington, D. C.

This serviceman further states that out of 110,000 applications, 10,000 will be selected. He has asked that everything possible be done to allow him to remain in the service. This young man is above the average in intelligence and attended college before he entered the service.

Why is it that only 10,000 out of the 110,000 applications should be chosen to remain in the service? Perhaps if all of those who wanted to remain in the service were permitted to do so, we would not need an extension of the Selective Service Act. Why should the Army be so particular in their selection of men who are already tried and true soldiers and want to draft others? Why should they draft new material and reject material already available and wanting to serve? It does not seem to make good sense. Perhaps it may suggest that the military officials want the draft extended, regardless of whether or not the required number can be obtained by a mere retention of those who have already been approved for service and are now in the service. This should be investigated by the proper authorities and should be taken into consideration by Congress before passing an extension of the Selective Service Act beyond May 15, 1946.

More Comments on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of permission duly granted, I extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting an important article entitled "More Comments on Inflation," which appeared on April 9 in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, as follows:

MORE COMMENTS ON INFLATION

The city of Washington is overrun these days with lobbyists seeking to defeat or emasculate the price-control law which will expire June 30 unless it is extended by an act of Congress. A great deal of dust is being stirred up for the purpose of concealing the real objectives of this drive. The real intention is the lifting of Government regulation of prices and the distribution of manufacturing supplies. There is a loud outcry about Government interfering with production and the free flow of goods.

Manufacturing and business interests do not spend large sums for lobbying and advertising for philanthropic purposes. When they do that you may be sure they are reaching out to grab something. Our reconversion problems would be much easier of solution if it were not for the fellows in the old grabbing game.

The big industries were assured large rebates by the Government to tide them over the hump of reconversion. This was done with the thought that business and industry would cooperate with the Government in keeping our economy on an even keel. They are grabbing the rebates with one hand and squeezing the consuming masses with the other. Such is human greed.

Let us examine this weeping and wailing about Government regulation. Just what are the functions and duties of government? The answer is to protect the weak against the exploitation of the strong and to establish justice among men. To do this we restrain and, if necessary arrest and imprison bandits, robbers, and cheaters. In principle we see no difference between certain kinds of profiteering and highway robbery.

Business is thought to have developed some ethical principles in recent times, but, when we observe the mad struggle for advantage and exploitation, we wonder.

As society becomes more complex, Government regulation is a necessity. Our citizens accept such regulations for the peace and order of the community. We have building and traffic regulations in our cities and the State, on the demand of its citizens, passes laws for the control of many activities. Modern developments have demanded Federal laws for the regulation of interstate commerce in all of its phases. We are now talking about international or world control of atomic energy.

In view of these things, why should there be such lamentation about Government control of some phases of business. The exploiters admit that such controls were necessary during the war, but claim the need is now past. The public-opinion polls and all tests of public sentiment show that a large majority of our people want price control continued.

The consuming public knows that the cost of living has increased but consumers are dead certain that prices would soar higher if all controls were released. We are not impressed with the argument that with full production prices would drop. Through monopoly and trade associations, a tremendous effort would be made to maintain prices at the higher level.

With modern inventions and machinery the labor cost in production is not increasing. We need only go to the mines to find that with machinery more coal is being mined with fewer men. We are told that the farms in the Middle West by the aid of modern machinery are raising more grain with fewer farm hands. This development can be observed in every form of human labor.

With proper cooperation between industry and Government we can get back to a normal basis without an orgy of high prices and the inevitable boom and bust. If human greed and exploitation dominate the situation, we will be headed for serious disturbances and upheavals.

The Administration under the leadership of Chester Bowles is standing firmly against the forces of inflation. The final responsibility will rest squarely on the Members of Congress. The great majority of consumers back home do not have noisy lobbies in Washington but they will have their eyes on the voting in Congress when the measure to extend price control is passed upon. If effective price control is not continued and prices of food and common necessities shoot up. the wrath of the people will descend on the heads of those responsible.

Reconversion is proceeding in an orderly way under Government supervision and it should be completed in another year. If Congress yields to the clamor of special interests, it will be courting disaster.

Send Surplus Category V Air Corps Officers Home From Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following letter from one of the servicemen, insisting that he knows personally that in his bombardment group over 100 Air Force officers that have signed category V statements, with 36 to 41 months' active service, are still not allowed to return to the United States. What is the explanation?

I quote from the letter which I have received from this serviceman, dated March 24, 1946, in which he explains the situation somewhat in detail:

Headquarters of the occupation forces in Japan has just announced that officers in category V with 42 months' active service as of June 30, 1946, will be sent home possibly by late May.

I know personally in this bombardment group over 100 Air Force officers that have signed category V statements, have between 36 and 41 months' active service, and still will not be allowed to return to the United States until late summer at the best. These officers have been overseas between 9 and 15 months. The last 2 months they have been here in Japan doing nothing. There are no duties for them to perform, so they will be here at Government expense and idle for an additional 4 to 6 months. These officers have been declared officially surplus by their organization. This situation exists in many organizations throughout the occupational Air Force.

What we want is more shipping space made available immediately to get these unnecessary, surplus, category V Air Corps officers out of Japan.

We would all appreciate your cooperation and immediate attention on this matter.

War Food Order No. 144 a Total Flop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a large milling concern in Oklahoma which expresses the sentiments of those in a position to know how futile and how ridiculous some of our modern Executive orders appear when put into practice. I quote:

APRIL 2, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Some time ago we wrote all members of the Oklahoma delegation asking that every effort be exerted to prevent enactment of that part of the War Food Order No. 144 which compelled mills to lengthen their extraction to 80 percent.

We received replies varying from 100 percent endorsement of our stand to statements that our protests were being presented to the proper persons. No one stated that they were opposed to our request.

Today two important items come to my attention and I certainly feel they should be brought to yours. First, is an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune entitled, "Administration's Wheat Relief Plan Is a Failure." I do not have copies but should you care to see this, feel sure the Washington office of Millers' National Federation would be glad to supply you with one. At any rate the basis of the editorial is the fact that WFO 144 is a total "flop." This was exactly what leaders in the industry expected and fought futilely to prevent—and was the purpose of my former letter to you.

Secondly, we are informed that, as of 12:01 a. m. this morning, another amendment to WFO 144 has been issued—this permits mills to produce 72-percent flour for shipment between the Tropic of Cancer and the Tropic of Capricorn.

If, as contended by the experts, grinding 80 percent extraction flour was the only way to save wheat, for export to those starving in other parts of the world, why now are we going to forget about saving wheat and ship shorter extraction flour for export to Cuba, part of Mexico, and part of South America, while we force citizens of the United States to eat the inferior quality of 80-percent extraction? We feel that we are entitled to an answer to this question which will hold more water than either of the two excuses given—the first of which is that 80-percent flour will spoil quickly in the Torrid Zone, and the second that Canada refused to lengthen extraction and our mills can't compete with their flour in this area. The first excuse seems silly to a mill doing business in Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and the other hot Southern States that we serve. We know it will spoil—right where we're being forced to ship it; not just in Cuba or South America. The second excuse should not affect our high motives—

after all, if saving wheat was necessary and long extraction the only way to save then Canada should be permitted to sell all she wants in the Torrid Zone and the wheat we save made available in flour to starving areas.

The truth is, of course, that Canada refused to be led into a theoretical plan against the advice of practical millers. They were smart and we were dumb.

It appears to me that Congress should make itself felt in this matter. The time has come to do more than write a letter asking for an explanation, the only effect of which is to get a reply from some underling in the Department of Agriculture quoting propaganda that probably he doesn't even understand.

We believe that we, and the people of the United States, are entitled to flour just as good as milled for the Tropics. We ask that you insist upon ending of the 80-percent extraction rate at the end of this crop year; that you insist on mills being permitted to resume milling of normal extraction of 1946 wheat which will soon begin to move to harvest.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I enclose two letters from very prominent Eastern Shore business people in reference to the OPA and its pain to our business people.

The first letter follows, and I quote:

We have just received information through the Corn Canners' Service Bureau, Chicago, and the Tri-State Packers' Association, Easton, that after publicly announcing that wage increases up to 65 cents would be reflected in our ceiling price for the coming season, they have now come out and said that this is not their policy.

We have already planted about $10,000 worth of pea seed in the ground, have raised our wages as they had suggested doing and agreed to reflect in the ceiling prices, have same $4,000 worth of corn seed, which is about ready to be planted, and so it continues throughout the season, with the prospect of no ceiling prices or not knowing again this year what we are doing, no doubt until after we have spent all the money we have and have borrowed all we can to finance our business until some late date when OPA decides they can tell us what we can sell it for.

I have refrained all during the war from expressing my opinion of this OPA organization due to the fact that I felt that we were under extreme pressure, all of us, and no doubt this was the best that could be done; however, after having lived under the OPA and its regulations for these many years, they are still as inefficient, incompetent, and inconsiderate as they were the first day they were organized. I am asking your efforts to help relieve this situation promptly and make it possible for us to do business.

I might state that last year we were practically promised a ceiling raise on asparagus, which we did not get and on which pack I lost over $8,000. We are, of course, not packing this item this year as other costs besides labor such as raw stock, cans, and cases, supplies and in some instances freight have all directly or indirectly advanced in price.

If you feel that we are justified in claiming a hardship in this situation, we would greatly appreciate your cooperation.

The second letter follows, and I quote:

I speak to you now in the name of small rural storekeepers in my community, and in their name I implore you to use your influence with Mr. Porter to remove the scourge of pretty provincial espionage, misleadingly called investigators.

This vicious and needless rural espionage system more than any other OPA frill discourages legitimate business and in exasperation drives it out of existence.

The housewife is now competent to protect her interest or should be instructed to do so. The "snooper" must be eliminated, and no OPA investigator allowed to trespass business premises, except on complaint from a housewife.

As our representative in the Congress, you are our only hope and shield against administrative abuse, and we implore you, for God's sake, to try and do something to help remove this needless scourge.

Federal Income Tax Relief for Pensioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution urging Federal income tax relief for pensioners, which was introduced in the New York State Legislature, 1946, by Senator Seymour Halpern, fourth senatorial district:

RESOLUTION URGING FEDERAL INCOME TAX RELIEF FOR PENSIONERS

Whereas the rapid increase in the cost of the necessities of life has seriously threatened the physical well-being of thousands of citizens who subsist upon fixed pensions paid to them by various public retirement systems; and

Whereas such retired employees, by reason of their advanced age and long periods of service are particularly subject to illness and frequently require medical or surgical treatment in addition to their necessary living expenses; and

Whereas workers throughout industry have received increases in income to offset the increased cost of living, while retired public employees on pension have had and will receive no income adjustment of any kind to assist them to meet the ever-increasing rise in the cost of living; and

Whereas the Congress has heretofore exempted from income taxation, pensions received under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act; and

Whereas exemption from income taxation is the only form of relief that can be given to retired public employees to help them to maintain the purchasing power of the pension they earned by long years in the public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully requested to enact appropriate legislation to exempt from Federal income taxation all income up to two thousand ($2,000) per annum, received by any retired employee from any public retirement system; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee of this House has made an approach in H. R. 6042 to giving effect to the repeated declarations of administration policy makers that price controls are to be applied to scarce commodities and facilities. We shall soon discuss at considerable length the merits of the bill.

I want to call attention once more to the petroleum industry which plainly, by all the standards mentioned by administration leaders, should be released from price control at once. By "released" I do not mean that such controls should be suspended. They should be ended and the OPA should at once cease to have any basis for interfering with the operations of this industry. The supply is fully equal to the demand and will continue to be so for as long as the future existence of the OPA is contemplated in the bill. In that time, however, it can increase the damage which it has done to the independent branch of the industry.

If we Members of this House, who have been professing faith in free enterprise, want to make our words effective we will act to take Government interference out of petroleum industry and all other industries so situated with respect to supply.

The OPA concedes that the supply of crude oil is adequate. It falls back upon a pinch now being felt in the supply of fuel oil as the pretext for maintaining controls on the entire industry. The greater part of the responsibility for the deficiency in fuel-oil supply comes back to the OPA's price policy. It is in position now to create a shortage of any product and thus supply a pretext for continuing controls world without end.

The American petroleum industry began, as most of the historians reckon events, with the drilling of the Drake well near Titusville, Pa. There was no OPA to outfit Colonel Drake with a price ceiling on his oil in case he found some, nor to haggle with him over accounting methods. The industry, therefore, progressed and it marched on for about 82 years before Government took hold of every phase of its activities. Its record is one of plentiful supply for all purposes, except for curtailment of civilian use during the war, and improving quality and diversity of products at decreasing prices.

The OPA is no help to the petroleum industry in its efforts to discover and develop the oil for the future needs. It is a hindrance. It is a burden the industry should not have to carry further. Its

excuse for regulating oil industry prices vanished last August when the end of the war came and rationing of petroleum products was stopped. Price control should have gone off with rationing.

It certainly should not be continued longer.

Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1945, during the debate on S. 380, known as the full employment bill, I made the following statement on the floor of the House of Representatives—found on page 11969, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1945:

Mr. Speaker, we are today considering S. 380, the so-called full employment bill. I am frankly disappointed this bill does not give specific recommendations that will truly endeavor to solve the unemployment problem. In my opinion, this bill is a conglomeration of words—or merely reading material—which will not give employment. I was hoping among other things the bill would give full recognition to the sad plight of the aged people, who are seemingly the "forgotten group" of our Nation.

Recently we passed legislation that granted a gift of over a billion dollars to citizens of foreign nations. Is it not time we considered the American people? We talk about giving our returning soldiers jobs. Where are these jobs going to be found if we continue to force our aged people to work in order that they may have the bare necessities of life? The younger group must have jobs in order to again be established in civilian life. Is it not a better plan to permit our older people to retire in order to give their places to the younger class? Thousands upon thousands of our aged people are innocent victims of circumstances. Their savings are gone, due to conditions which were beyond their control.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that we immediately take definite action to give recognition and assistance to our aged people and in this way give to our returning veterans the jobs to which they are justly entitled.

I am indeed happy, Mr. Speaker, that the Ways and Means Committee is now conducting hearings on the proposed amendments to the social-security law, and several pending bills, to provide benefits to our elder citizens.

These old folks have contributed much to the welfare of our Nation—they have sacrificed that you and I might have the privileges we now enjoy—they helped us when we needed help—they need help now.

Census Bureau figures show over 10,000,000 of our citizens are 65 years of age or over, and only 3 out of every 10 receive benefit under the present law. Congress should immediately pass old-age-pension legislation in order that aged people will be cared for properly.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we are more justified in giving adequate aid and assistance to our own people than we are in giving to the people of other nations.

Increased old-age benefits mean fuller employment for the young, increased markets for your production, and will certify to our aged people that we, as a great Nation, recognize our obligations and will bring some semblance of happiness and peace to our citizens in their declining years.

I have submitted this statement, Mr. Speaker, to the Ways and Means Committee, to be used in connection with hearings on Social Security legislation that is now before them for consideration, and it is my sincere and earnest hope that this great committee will favorably report an adequate old-age pension bill to this House for immediate vote and passage.

Shades of Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Jackson Gathered in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Past and Present," which appeared recently in the Portland Homebuilder, published in Portland, Oreg.:

PAST AND PRESENT

Shades of Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Jackson gathered in Tennessee.

WASHINGTON. Andy, this is the third meeting that we have had and we felt that your counsel and advice, especially since you recently have been honored throughout the Nation by Jackson Day dinners, will be most opportune and helpful. You had a great record. You were indirectly responsible for the sale of Florida to the United States and served as its first governor. We more closely associate you with this great State of Tennessee because you served as governor, also you represented Tennessee in the House of Representatives and the Senate and so distinguished yourself that the people overwhelmingly voted for you for the office of President.

JEFFERSON. Yes, Andy, all four of us have served as President of these United States and I feel as though we have something to offer to the present-day officials and citizens at large. You and I have been closely identified with the Democratic Party and Abe is regarded as an outstanding Republican but, regardless of party lines and issues, we were first and foremost devoted to our beloved country. In other words, the welfare of the Nation was paramount to political expediency. I wish we could make everyone adopt that viewpoint today.

LINCOLN. Tom, you are sure right, and, Andy, I know those are your sentiments. They couldn't be otherwise with your splendid services and the great imprint you left on our country's history. They used to call you Old Hickory. I take that to mean that you were tough and sound all the way through.

JACKSON. Waal, boys, you-all are kind in your remarks. Yes; I was regarded as rather a tough old rooster, but doggone, if I felt that I was right on an issue I would fight for that conviction with all my might.

JEFFERSON. Andy, I want to break in on you for a moment; you have a deep interest in Florida. What did you think of a suggestion that we give all our wartime secrets to Russia, destroy all our atom bombs and virtually lay our lives and destiny in the hands of the Communists?

JACKSON. Tom, words fail me, I just cannot conceive of a man claiming to be a good American and a good Democrat uttering such foolishness. I am plumb disgusted with him. He doesn't voice the sound doctrines that you and I taught our people."

To resume, I have always been against monopoly of power, whether by business, labor, or Government. I fought, as a boy of 12, in the War of Independence against greed, tyranny, and oppression. In spirit I am continuing that fight. I never, for a moment, countenanced the centralization of power. I was a firm believer in the fact that Government belongs to the people, not people to the Government. I believed in the rights of the States to handle their own problems. I never felt that superwisdom was lodged in Washington, D. C., and today I view with alarm the great horde of bureaus and their millions of satellites that attempt to regulate every phase of the everyday life of our citizens.

WASHINGTON. Tom, Abe, and I have discussed this before, Andy, and I think we all would appreciate your summation of the subject as you see it, and your advice.

JACKSON. George, you asked for it and here it is straight as a hickory sapling: I think our Government has piled department upon department, bureau upon bureau, agency upon agency until it is top-heavy. It is wasting money by the billions and getting little in return. Unless the boys in command get rid of the alphabets the Government will be, in fact it now is, in the alphabet soup. We have too many people who advocate totalitarian doctrines, too many whose loyalties are across the seas, not here on our own soil, and they have infiltrated into Government jobs as well as into many organizations all over the country. We should make as the test of jobs, association and preferment, a true unswerving, unadulterated Americanism, a devotion to American ideals, concepts and practices. We should do just as you did with your orchards, George, prune away the parasites, dead wood and suckers, the underbrush of waste and confusion and emerge with a sound growth and views unobstructed by weeds and foul tangles. We should live within our income, eliminate the drones that fatten on our earnings, demand work and efficiency instead of laziness and stupidity, cease trying to set up little czars, big czars, or any czars, take the handcuffs off of business and, by freedom of opportunity, provide an incentive for our people to go forward on the road to full production and prosperity.

LINCOLN. Well spoken, Andy. There is just one thought that I wish to add. When we were in Congress, gentlemen, we always wanted to know what the folks at home thought because, after all, they pay the bills. I think people today should keep in close touch with their Senators and Congressmen and let them know what they think about conditions, trends and actions.

JEFFERSON. By all means that should be done. In our day it cost 25 cents or more to send a letter to Congress. Today it costs only 3 cents, a pretty small amount, to contribute to the cause of good government. Yes, the people should write.

WASHINGTON. I hope the people will do as you suggest, it is effective and powerful. Gentlemen, I think we are getting somewhere. We must meet every week or so. Let's step out on the lawn and watch the moon rise over the Tennessee River.

Statements of Surgeon General Kirk, Gen. Omar S. Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, Concerning Harmon Hospital, Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have written to Mr. T. W. Dunbar, Longview, Tex.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1946.
Mr. T. W. DUNBAR
Household Supply Co.,
Longview, Tex.

DEAR MR. DUNBAR: I recall your letter of March 9 with reference to hospitalization for veterans.

Many members of the American Legion in Longview in the early summer of 1945 began to make efforts to interest the Army in retaining in Longview, Harmon General Hospital. I worked with these Legion members and citizens of Longview from the first to accomplish this. I discussed the matter personally with General Kirk, the Surgeon General. Too, several similar requests I made to him in writing to which I received answers in writing; however, we did not wait for the Army to decline to retain the hospital before we contacted the authorities of the Veterans' Administration to urge them, in the event the Army did not retain Harmon Hospital, to take it over. I personally discussed the matter with both General Hines and General Bradley while each was the head of the Veterans' Administration; too, in writing several similar requests were made and in writing several answers were received.

As this point I wish to quote the pertinent part of a letter I received from Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, War Department, Washington, D. C. The letter was written by General Kirk February 8, 1946:

"As I told you in my office last fall when you were kind enough to come to see me bringing with you some interested persons from Longview, Tex., it would soon be necessary for the Army to close Harmon General Hospital. This occurred in December. At the time Harmon was closed the Army had no further use for it. This hospital was built for the war emergency. Our patient load had decreased and we could not, therefore, operate this hospital nor could we hold personnel in the service who were not busily engaged in giving treatment to the sick.

"I am most appreciative of the support that your constituents gave the commanding general of Harmon General Hospital, and of the many grand things they did for the patients hospitalized there.

"As you probably know, at the peak the Army operated 65 general hospitals. In December some 23 hospitals were closed, including Harmon. It is planned to close 17 more hospitals by the end of March—a total of 40—and by June, after the other hospitals are closed which were built or the properties leased to meet our patient load, only 10 general hospitals will remain in operation. These hospitals to remain are not of temporary construction, as was Harmon. The hospitals we had in operation before the war were naturally selected to be used for the peacetime Army. There will be no hospitals operated after June of the type construction at Longview."

I quote General Kirk again: "These hospitals to remain are not of temporary construction as was Harmon.

"Again I want to thank you and your constituents for all that you did to assist the Medical Department of the Army to give care at Longview to the men who fought our war."

At this point I quote the pertinent part of a letter written to me January 2, 1946, by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D. C.:

"I was glad to have another chance to talk to you about the question of Harmon General Hospital. I remember your recent visit to my office with a group of friends from Longview and appreciate your interest in the matter. I can also understand your efforts to have us take over this hospital.

"So far we have been offered 69 Army and Air hospitals which are being declared surplus. Of these, 28 are of temporary construction, like the one at Longview; 2 are of permanent fireproof construction; and the remainder are of semipermanent construction—that is, brick or tile—39 is the remainder.

"We have taken over no hospitals of temporary construction like the one at Longview."

Note, I quote General Bradley again, "We have taken over no hospitals of temporary construction like the one at Longview."

Too, I quote a paragraph from a letter written to me by Gen. Omar Bradley, December 29, 1945:

"I thought you might also be interested in the plans for the installation to be constructed at Bonham, Tex. This is to be a domiciliary home for women veterans. The decision to place it there was made prior to my assuming my present duties, though the announcement was made only recently."

Always I'm glad to hear from you. I assure you of my desire to cooperate fully with you fine citizens of Longview, Gregg County, and east Texas.

Your friend,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress.

Increase Dependent-Children Aid to States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the astonishing number of young men who were rejected for physical defects by the armed forces, the steady increase in the cost of living, and the growth of juvenile delinquency, combine to ask us: "Are we falling down on the job of helping the dependent children of our Nation?"

While our attention is presently focused on such issues as providing food for the people of war-torn lands, or giving a loan to Britain, we must not forget that our first responsibility is to promote the common welfare here at home.

The plain fact of the matter is that under the assistance program the minimum requirements are not being met.

Under the present law, the Federal Government contributes one-half of $18 each month for the first dependent child and one-half of $12 for each additional child. These sums are totally inadequate. Furthermore, under this rigid formula, whereby Federal aid stops at the $18 and $12 levels, many States are discouraged from increasing these amounts because they would have to shoulder the burden alone. To correct this unfortunate situation, I am introducing a bill, which will provide that:

Section 403 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, United States Code, 1940 edition, title 42, section 603 (a), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1935, an amount, which shall be used exclusively for carrying out the State plan, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter under such a plan."

This will permit payments to the States equal to one-half of the amount expended by the States for aid to dependent children without regard to the amount expended with respect to any dependent child for any month.

Social workers in the field, who are in daily contact with welfare problems, are best qualified to speak on this matter. With support approaching unanimity, they favor the recommendation incorporated in this bill. They believe, as I do, that no maximum limitation on Federal participation in payments be fixed by the Federal Government, determination of appropriate standards of assistance being left to the States. The proposal to eliminate ceilings in the Federal share in payments is consistent with the fundamental principle in the administration of assistance that the primary responsibility rests with the States.

It is not fair to make the States responsible for determining the levels of assistance and then to hold the Federal share to an arbitrary maximum. This cripples the functioning of any welfare program. It is like one member of a partnership telling the other to go ahead.

We must tackle this problem on a national basis so that there will be no inequality of assistance given to a dependent child in one State, as against the assistance given to a child in another State.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill recognizes this need. It contains a flexible formula whereby the Federal Government contributes 50 percent to those States whose per capita income is greater than or equal to that of the continental United States as a whole. The Federal share in those States whose per capita income is less than one-half of the percent by which the State per capita income is below the national average, with a maximum Federal contribution of 75 percent.

This variable Federal grant is based on a recognition of the fact that the well-being of the country as a whole can only be achieved if the Federal Government uses its broad legislative and taxing powers to equalize geographic economic inequalities. This is very important in view of the highly mobile character of our population—as contrasted with the parochial nature of the welfare problem of another day. The poorest States have the highest birth rate and bear a disproportionate share of the cost of rearing

tomorrow's citizens. This variable grant principle recognizes that an even matching formula places the least Federal money in the States where the need is greatest, a condition which would be aggravated by a lifting of the ceilings alone. However, the variable grant formula precludes any extension of inequality. Tied in with the elimination of residence requirements, it makes for an equalization of assistance standards throughout the country. It is to the national as well as local interest that inequalities in the level of public aid should never be permitted to become a factor in influencing migration.

We have found that, in some States, due to varying economic and climatic conditions, the unit minimum cost for assistance runs much higher than in others. In these cases, the abolition of ceilings which presently limit the Federal Government's contribution, is imperative. Therefore, in a practical sense, the lifting of ceiling is to the higher-income States what variable grants are to the lower-income States, a means of providing a measure of Federal financial participation commensurate with their needs and their effort to meet these needs.

Nonresidents currently suffer from the residence requirements which determine eligibility. Under the changes as recommended, these hardships would be removed. In addition, such legislation would be in line with the high degree of mobility in our national population. The mother or other responsible relative would not be bogged down by the red tape of State or local welfare machinery.

In most of the 28 States that require localities to share in financing public assistance, the amount a locality puts up for matching determines how much it gets in State and Federal funds. Under these provisions, States with small economic resources, and poor localities within richer States, lack the funds to finance decent standards of assistance. Too often, the amount of a payment to a child depends on where he happens to live, not on what he actually needs. Need is usually more prevalent in the poorer communities, and even a highly inadequate assistance program may represent a greater fiscal burden for a poor community than a fairly adequate program represents in more prosperous places.

In the light of program deficiencies revealed by experience, the Social Security Board of the Federal Government, recommends that special Federal aid be granted to low-income States. High-income States, perhaps defined as States with per capita income above the national average, would continue to receive dollar for dollar, as under the present provisions of the Social Security Act amended so as to remove the present ceiling on Federal contributions. Under a grant-in-aid formula, patterned after the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, States with low economic ability would receive more than a dollar in Federal funds for each dollar which they themselves provide. The addition would be relatively greatest for the State whose economic ability is relatively least, with appropriate graduations for others. The removal of ceilings plus grant-in-aid to the poorer States, plus the elimination of residence requirements that set off State from State, plus requirements for the States to distribute Federal and State funds to localities in relation to their needs and, where the localities participate in financing also in relation to their fiscal ability, these together, will remove present inequities. This is no special pleading. I believe, with the Social Security Board, that these overall adjustments will improve the assistance program in all States, consistent with their good faith, their economic position, and the real needs of recipients.

The Board believes that maximum limits on Federal matching should be eliminated for dependent children so that the Federal Government will pay its full share of whatever amount the State agency finds necessary to meet its responsibilities.

Of the 640,000 children receiving aid to dependent children at the beginning of 1945, probably more than three-fifths were in need because of the death or disability of one or both parents. The Social Security Act specifies only the maximum residence period that may be required by a State that receives Federal funds for aid to dependent children, a year's residence preceding application on behalf of the child, or birth in the State within the year preceding the application if the mother resided in the State for a year preceding the birth. Under the approved plans as of July 1, 1945, 45 States still retained substantially these maximum requirements for aid to dependent children; 3 States had eliminated it. It has been feared that an influx of applicants would result if residence requirements were lowered or removed in States with relatively high standards of assistance. There is no evidence to support this. In fact, the effect of additional Federal aid to low-income States would be to reduce the present large variations in standards of assistance.

The maximum limits for Federal participation are particularly serious in aid to dependent children, since the amounts are lower and no allowance is made specifically for the mother or other relative who cares for the child. While the payments to an aged couple, both of whom are eligible for assistance, may include as much as $40 a month in Federal funds, that to a mother with one child may not include more than $9 a month in Federal funds. As a consequence, the Federal Government pays only about one-third the total cost of aid to dependent children, as compared with about half the cost of old-age assistance and aid to the blind, because States must add unmatched funds to give these families even the bare essentials.

The Federal act authorizes use of Federal funds for children who lack support or care because of the death, absence, or incapacity of a parent, and are living with certain specified relatives. Federal funds, however, may not be used for children who may be in equally serious need because of the parent's unemployment or under employment or for children who are living with a cousin or a legal guardian or in a foster home. I believe that aid should be available to a child who is in need for any reason and is living with a natural or adoptive parent, legal guardian, or relative. Appropriate provision must be made under the Social Security Act for the care of a child who is in need of foster-home care.

The war has made us humbly aware that our Nation's greatest asset is the vigor and quality of our people. Yet in the development of provisions for social-security children, who cannot plead their own cause, have fared less well than certain other groups. The time has come for us to make up for our neglect of them, lest we have beggars on horseback as our leaders of tomorrow. Poverty breeds ignorance, disease, and crime. It stirs up antisocial forces which could threaten our whole society.

Knowing this, let us correct it. I call for the elimination of ceilings on Federal aid to dependent children so that all of them, in every State, may have a fair chance to grow up into healthy, happy, and dependable Americans.

Housing Program a Strait-jacket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the most essential factor to building a home is to have the materials and equipment with which to build. We are not living in Cinderella land, where all that is necessary is a magic wand or a fairy godmother. It takes lumber, brick, tile, glass, plaster, hardware, and so forth. Legislation does not take the place of the magic wand. You cannot legislate these materials and equipment or houses themselves into existence.

The following advertisement, recently appearing in the Green Bay Press-Gazette, tells a good part of the story:

LET'S FACE THE FACTS ABOUT HOME BUILDING

In the confusion created about the shortage of homes in America, one point stands out clearly: You can't build homes without materials.

Lumber and building-materials dealers and contractors obviously have a vital interest in obtaining materials for home building.

They report, nevertheless, that such materials are not flowing through the yards; that they have not been able to get them. Therefore the Government's HH priorities offered to enable veterans and others to obtain homes are simply home-hunting licenses, for materials in quantity are not available.

As long as OPA continues its wartime control policy rather than a policy of adjustment to aid reconversion, it will neither be able to prevent an inflation or a deflation. It will only be able to prevent reconversion by discouraging production of needed home-building items.

Here, for example, is an instance of OPA action that has resulted in increased production. After 6 months' delay OPA granted a 4- to 10-percent price adjustment that allowed 125 of 400 closed brick and tile plants to reopen. This price adjustment allowed these plants and 400 others that had been operating to hire needed labor. As a result,

in the next quarter production rose 25 percent.

But in hardwood flooring, siding, plywood, millwork, and construction lumber, OPA clings to its wartime formulas. Instead, OPA follows the unrealistic policy of allowing premium prices to mills for producing lumber for such things as export to foreign countries, and for items that were needed in wartime industry.

Today's question is not essentially one of price control—if there were plenty of homes, no price controls would be necessary. The important question is one of production and manpower.

So far, OPA and Government officialdom in general have contented themselves with controls, allocations and priority systems which at best can do nothing but juggle an insufficient supply of building materials—and at worst, delay and retard production and the employment of manpower.

Homes will not be built in the United States unless the building industry builds them. Whether they are labeled "public housing" or "private homes," the same materials, the same labor, the same building industry will build them.

Production can be unblocked by the removal or adjustment of OPA's wartime policies. But such a realistic approach cannot be attained as long as Government action is based on a philosophy of lack rather than a philosophy of abundant supply for peacetime prosperity.

The lumber dealers, builders and contractors stand ready to build or rebuild America. But it is up to the people to demand that the way be cleared for the production of materials for homes.

How right that ad is can be seen by comparing the monthly production figures for January 1946 with the average monthly production in 1941. In making this comparison, we find, bath tubs, 36 percent less; brick, 35 percent less; clay tile, 27 percent less; gypsum board and lath, 7 percent less; lumber, millwork, and flooring, 38 percent less; plywood, 29 percent less; cast-iron sewer pipe, 42 percent less; clay sewer pipe, 26 percent less; cast-iron radiation, 73 percent less.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the 24 Members of this House that voted against the so-called Patman housing bill when it passed this House on March 7. At that time I said that the bill was fundamentally dishonest because it tries to make the people think that Congress is doing something to relieve the housing shortage while all that it does is add another czar to our Government structure and impose more rules, orders, regulations, and regimentation upon the people of this country. I said that the way to solve the housing shortage is to get rid of, or at least relax, existing restrictions which are stifling the production of building materials.

The Civilian Production Administration has launched a so-called veterans' housing program. We have a housing czar. Daily we are getting more rules, regulations, and orders. And daily the Government is adding confusion upon confusion to the housing picture. I continue in my belief, Mr. Speaker, that all these slide-rule operations and regulations will not relieve the housing shortage but will delay and hinder the solution of this problem and add new problems.

May I call your attention to an editorial appearing in the April 6 issue of the Marinette Eagle Star. I believe this sums up extremely well just what we are getting into:

Commenting on the so-called veterans' emergency housing program order proclaimed by the Government about 10 days ago, the Marshfield News-Herald had this to say:

"On the face of it, the proposal that virtually all building be sidetracked in favor of the construction of homes for veterans is as reasonable as any proposal could be. But here is where the shoe pinches:

"The order will halt work on commercial construction in which little of the type of material needed for private homes is being used. Thus many artisans in specialized branches of the building industry will be kept idle. If it were possible for these idle men to find jobs building homes for veterans this might be regarded as a compensating factor, but builders contend that it will be at least 3 months before the building of homes for veterans will be far enough advanced to absorb much of this labor."

The Marshfield paper concludes that the edict serves merely to strew more sand in the wheels of reconversion and heartily endorses the view of a building tradesman who contended that the same amount of energy devoted to stimulation of the production of building materials would have been of far greater value to the country.

The News-Herald is but mildly critical, as developments here already indicate. An officious Federal pay-roller already has visited Marinette and ordered all building activities on two local projects halted at once, stressing that failure to do so would subject the owners of the property to severe penalties in Federal court. Concrete, steel, and brick will be the major items in the construction of the two buildings, none of them critical materials needed for housing. But that doesn't make any difference with a bureaucrat. His job is to further tangle the confused economy of the country.

Nor does it make any difference with the bureaucrat that hardships are involved in ordering that construction on the two projects in question be halted. The fact that in one instance, the owner has been compelled to start construction of a building to house his business after being forced to vacate the quarters he occupied doesn't enter into the picture so far as the Government is concerned. Neither is the Government concerned with the fact that in the other instance, the building of materials sorely needed for new homes will be hampered by the no-building edict.

It's a screwy mess and it is going to become screwier unless Congress intervenes in a hurry and straightens it out. Instead of a housing program for veterans, we are going to have a strait-jacket on production. Millions of artisans are going to be made idle and its effect will be so far-reaching that we dread the thought of it.

When are they going to wake up in Washington?

Care of Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, heretofore several Members of the House have made remarks regarding the illegal trafficking in Government property both during the late war and during the postwar period, and I wish to amplify that matter and to impress upon the Members of the House, the country, and those in control of such property, the need for closer scrutiny of the vast amount of property now possessed by our Government. We have received authentic reports of the destruction of Government property, much of it being war property, by those of both the military and the Navy personnel. Doubtless some of this property was destroyed by those in charge of it rather than to have the duty and responsibility of caring for it. No one can estimate the value of the property so destroyed, but when there is a reckless abandon and constant effort to destroy tanks, jeeps, tractors, trucks, and other essential equipment by those in charge of it in foreign countries, a vast amount in value can be destroyed in a short space of time. Many reports have been received from many sources upon this very subject. Some of the participants were of both the enlisted and commissioned personnel of both the Army and the Navy. This character of utter waste is both unthinkable and indefensible. This character of surplus war property would serve our people well in this postwar period and the destruction of this property prevents all opportunity on the part of the Government to recoup anything therefrom. Those officers and enlisted men who participated in this terrible waste and destruction of property should be called upon to account for their unlawful and cowardly acts. They were imposing an additional obligation upon all of the people, including themselves, throughout the years to come, because the destruction of property prevents our Government from realizing any payment for it, and therefore the national debt cannot be reduced to the extent of the value of the property destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to expand my comments upon the care of Government property, and to some of the acts committed with respect thereto. I have just read, with great interest, an article appearing in the Washington Post of date April 10, 1946, to which reference is made of Twelve Indicted in Hawaii in Plot to Defraud United States in Navy Stores. It appears from the article, to which reference is made, that many irregular business transactions were made, and that by these illegal manipulations the Government was defrauded out of huge sums of money. It is a very sad commentary for us to know, and for the people to know, that our Army or naval officers would participate in a venture of this character, but such appears to be the case. The articles appended hereto, which relates the story as told in the newspaper, gives the names of 12 people, 2 of whom are members of the commissioned personnel of our fighting forces, who, with several civilians, have conspired to defraud our Government, and by their unlawful manipulations they have defrauded our Government out of tens of thousands of dollars—which has already been ascertained—and no one can now tell how much money was thus obtained by this group which has not yet been ascertained. An act of this character causes every Army and naval officer in the service to depreciate materially in the eyes of the people. That

character of conduct brands all those who participated in it as wholly unfit to serve in any position of responsibility either in the Army or Navy, or in civilian life. That is an outrage upon the people of this Nation, and it is a direct offense against our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith extend as a part of my remarks, with the unanimous consent of the House, the newspaper article which relates to this outrageous conduct, which is as follows:

12 INDICTED IN HAWAII IN PLOT TO DEFRAUD UNITED STATES IN NAVY STORES

HONOLULU, April 10.—Two naval officers and 10 civilians were under Federal grand jury indictment today on charges of conspiracy to defraud the Government of tens of thousands of dollars during the war through irregular business transactions.

The indictments charged the defendants siphoned heavy profits from naval cantonment area 3 and the submarine base ship's service store at Pearl Harbor.

Those named in five indictments were Capt. John Henry Kangeter, of Charleston, S. C., officer in charge of the cantonment; Lt. John Edgar Carter, assistant to Kangeter; Aubra Laura Kilgo, civilian manager of the area in charge of food and retail sales; William Sherred Mitchell, civilian activity manager of the area; August Albert Sack, Edgar Barraclough, William Frederick Bradley; Philip L. Kellerman, sr.; Philip L. Kellerman, jr.; Raymond Y. C. Gee; Claud Columbus Fitts; and Francis Ah Chew Siu; all of Honolulu.

Judge Delbert E. Metzger set bonds at $2,500 each and scheduled arraignment for tomorrow morning.

In the principal case, the indictment alleged that Kangeter, Carter Kilgo, and Mitchell formed an Oklahoma corporation known as the American-Pacific Trading Co., and used naval funds as well as their Navy connections to buy merchandise on the mainland for shipment to Hawaii, where it was sold to the Navy or civilian merchants.

The American-Pacific Trading Co., from August 8, 1944, to about February 28, 1945, purchased merchandise and personal property for $253,539 which was advanced to Mitchell, on the mainland, by the Navy's Cantonment Area Three, headed by Kangeter, the indictment alleged. This merchandise and property, the Government said, was "sold, resold, and invoiced" to the cantonment area for $301,708, to the profit of the American-Pacific Trading Co.

The charges carry a maximum penalty in case of convictions of 2 years' imprisonment and $10,000 fine.

Mr. Speaker, may I make this further statement, that the people of this Nation have suffered greatly during the recent war. They have financed the war, and they have yielded so many things—they have contributed their all, and they have toiled day and night for victory; they have given their boys, and they have hoped and prayed for victory in the war. Now, at this postwar period, for them to realize that there are Army or Navy officers, and civilians, who would practice frauds and deception upon their Government, and who would plan to secure the hard-earned tax money the people have paid for the prosecution of war, that is about the last straw. All those who participated in this ugly, illegal, and miserable affair should be forced to "walk the gang-plank" and should pay the price for such unholy conduct.

Address of Hon. Dewey Short, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to present to the membership the address of welcome by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, on the occasion of the General Bradley convocation, Drury College, Springfield, Mo., on Monday, March 18, 1946, and to also insert the responding address by General Bradley. The House is well acquainted with the eloquence of Mr. SHORT, but on no occasion has he been more inspiring than in his tribute to General Bradley. The encomium of one of America's most brilliant statesmen to one of our bravest generals will live long in the memories of all who were privileged to hear it:

ADDRESS OF HON. DEWEY SHORT

President Findlay, members of the faculty and the board of trustees, students, and friends of Drury College, always it is good for any Missourian to come home, but in these trying and troublesome days we are doubly happy to return from the madhouse in Washington, which many people say is the only insane asylum on earth run by its own inmates, and come back to the heart of America where love of God, home, and country is uppermost in peoples' minds.

All of us love Missouri. We love her hills and plains, her rushing rivers and fertile valleys, her mines and forests, farms and factories—from the smallest peaceful hamlet to the great metropolis—throbbing and pulsating with human life and commerce.

But more than her rocks and rills, her dogwood and redbud, we love her people. Missouri, mother of the West, is rich in many things—not only in her physical resources but most of all in her men and women.

In the field of literature we are not ashamed—Sara Teasdale, Fannie Hurst, Mary McBride, Eugene Field, Rupert Hughes, Dale Carnegie, Harold Bell Wright, Rose O'Neill, Rose Wilder Lane, and above all the incomparable Mark Twain. I might also add that Edgar Lee Masters, Carl Sandburg, John C. Neihardt, Vance Randolph, and others have come to the Ozarks to drink at the inexhaustible fountain of inspiration which has fired their imagination to do their best works. We have our own Mother Mahnkay and May Kennedy McCord.

In the field of statescraft we have produced Benton, Vest, Cockrell, Reed, Stone, Clark, Blair, Bland, Francis, Hadley, Hyde, and Spencer, whose names will not be soon forgotten.

President Findlay, Missouri is an empire around which you could build a wall and we could live comfortably unto ourselves. This is not Pauline boasting; it is justifiable pride, and whether in peace or war we have never been found wanting.

In the First World War we furnished Admiral Koontz, General Fries, General Crowder, and above them all our great and admired friend, Black Jack Pershing.

In the war just ended we have furnished other distinguished commanders, both on land and sea and in the air. Time does not permit me to enumerate them all, but I shall say that in all our wars we have never had a greater commander than the one to whom we do homage today.

As 1 of the 12 Members of Congress who visited the atrocity camps in Germany 2 weeks before VE-day, it was my privilege to spend a day with General Eisenhower at Rheims, a night with General Devers at Heidelberg, and for 160 miles with Senator Saltonstall, I rode with the late and lamented Gen. Alexander Patch all the way from his headquarters to Munich.

In the meantime our party spent two nights with our honored guest at his headquarters in Wiesbaden, and I talked not only to officers but also to privates in the different armies we visited.

All to whom I talked, both officer and enlisted personnel, were of one opinion. Universally they agreed that there was no man in our American Army who had better judgment, more unquestioned integrity, or unexcelled courage than the man from Missouri whom we are honoring today.

He, with others, has won this war, and it is now up to us to win the peace. I only wish that the American people can have some of his deep understanding, his human sympathy, his unwavering loyalty, his indomitable will, his pleasing patience, his unsullied soul, his unspotted idealism, his unconquerable spirit to bring into this world a just and lasting peace.

Great soldier that he is—and remember, he had under his command the Twelfth Army Group, General Simpson, of the Ninth Army, General Hodges, of the First Army, and the great Patton, of the Third Army—he does not like to kill. With the sweetness and tenderness that Drury College stands for, he will do everything in his might to avert such another catastrophe.

Some people have objected to certain appointments which our own President from this great State has made, but no one in or out of Congress who understands the task which has been assigned our great leader has ever uttered one word of protest. His nomination met with universal approval and he has received the plaudits of a grateful people.

Next to the President of the United States, our distinguished guest today, who receives a merited honor from a worthy institution which contributes much to the intellectual, physical, moral, and religious development of this vast region, has the most important and responsible job in our Government. He will discharge its duties faithfully and well. For many years to come the welfare of millions of men, women, and children will be in his hands. Always he will be sympathetic, but naturally he must abide by the law. Congress enacts the laws.

President Findlay, I would be less than human if I did not express to you, the members of your faculty, and the members of your board of trustees, that I have cherished the high honor which you conferred upon me several years ago, and now I am more than happy that Drury College is conferring the honorary doctor of laws degree upon a great soldier, a good man, and an outstanding American—Omar Nelson Bradley.

ADDRESS BY GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY

President Findlay, students of Drury College, ladies and gentlemen, in the Army we have a term I'm sure veterans here will recognize. In fact, many of you may have heard it before.

It's called the big picture—a term describing the situation as it appears to top-level command. More often than not, it's also used to characterize that thinking.

Where big-picture thinking is applied in war, it results in large-scale tactics and world-wide strategy. Both are essential to the winning of battles. But big-picture

thinking also has a blind-spot. Invariably, it tends to obscure the soldier.

Unless a top-level commander keeps in touch with his troops, he may lose himself in the give-and-take of maneuver or in the mathematics of supply. And unless he is close enough to his men to know something of their weariness and their fear, such a commander—or anyone else for that matter—can forget that wars are won by battles—that those battles are won by men.

In much the same manner, big-picture thinking conceals a similar danger in Washington—in the Veterans' Administration as in any other Federal agency.

Schedules of statistics on Nation-wide operations may eventually mean little unless we can think of the men they represent.

Veterans' problems tend to become unreal phrases until we follow them down into the private lives of veterans. And until we can feel the terrible impact of those personal problems on the lives of our young men, we shall have missed much of the human meaning of the job we are trying to do.

For that reason, I welcome the occasional chance to climb over my desk and step out into the country among the veterans themselves. There is no need to tell you how glad I am that this visit has brought me to Springfield—a Missouri town much like the one in which I was born.

In thinking President Findlay and the board of trustees for the degree you conferred this afternoon, I want to tell you first how happy it has made me. It helps to recall the comradeship of our troops overseas.

We must remember a commander is known not so much for his own achievements as he is for the accomplishments of his troops. I would like to believe that you chose me today primarily as a symbol of these men. In honoring me, you are in a wider sense honoring all veterans who should be sharing this distinction.

When you look at me, I would prefer that you think of them. And when you welcome me, I would prefer that you remember them.

Seven months ago, on my arrival in Washington, I was told that the Veterans' Administration was the world's largest business. Since then it has skyrocketed even higher.

With annual expenditures headed sharply toward the $5,000,000,000 mark, its hospital and medical system is the largest in the world's peacetime history. No other agency in the history of government has ever had a more comprehensive responsibility directly influencing the lives of so many people.

I tell you this not to impress you with the vastness of our operations. But I tell you this only to remind you again of their widespread significance and of their importance to the development of our country.

Administratively, our problems are being solved. With well-ordered supervision, trained personnel, sufficient space, and up-to-date procedures, we can bite heavily into the great work load and pare it down to size. This is being done as promptly and effectively as the mountainous size of the job permits.

For example, strides have been made to insure the prompt payment of subsistence. Employees of the Veterans' Administration have been ordered to make periodic checks at each college and university to determine where delays in payment have continued. If any of you veteran students are not being paid, tell this to your Representative when he calls on the college.

However, you must remember this: Administrative changes alone within the Veterans' Administration will not insure the successful operation of our GI legislation.

A far greater responsibility for making it work falls upon the business, the laboring, and the educational elements of our communities. Or, if you wish, on the citizens themselves.

Basically, the GI bill is a bridge, constructed to carry veterans from the Army and the Navy into civilian life. No matter how sturdy a bridge we build, it means nothing unless we also open up avenues on the farther end of the bridge along which veterans can make their way.

Of what value is it to pay subsistence promptly unless schools expand to make room for the waiting veteran student?

How worth while is it to provide for the guaranteeing of loans unless the banks make loans? And what good is a loan to buy a home unless homes are built?

What sense is there to our rehabilitating wounded veterans to make them employable unless employers are ready to give them jobs?

And what is the meaning of readjustment allowances if there is no job to put an end to the need for readjustment when the allowances have run out?

These questions cannot be answered in the Veterans' Administration—no; nor in any agency of Government. We shall find the answers only if we will widen our view to grasp the full intent of our GI legislation.

More than anything else, the veteran today desires opportunity. Veterans' benefits have been established to help veterans find that opportunity, to ease their reabsorption into our economic and social life, and to help the individual by broadening his chances in the world.

Nowhere is that more evident than in the generous educational provisions of our Nation's Readjustment Act.

Seventy years ago the founders of Drury College voiced their faith that "the end and aim of education is the development of character." Young men with character in search of development are heading like a mighty army toward the gateways of every school and college in the country.

In the free and democratic development of individuals who comprise this mighty army there rests our country's greatest hope for the future.

Our pyramiding figures tell this story clearly. In July 1945, 1 month before the ending of the war, there were nearly two and three-quarter million veterans of World War II. Seven months later, in February 1946, we counted more than ten and three-quarter millions—or four times the number discharged last July.

How do they feel about education and training? Well, back in July 1945 the total number of applications filed for education and training was 186,000. By February 1946 applications had snowballed to a total of 1,450,000—almost eight times the number of only 7 months ago.

The number of veterans actually in training or education by last July was 38,000. Seven months later the number actually in classrooms had climbed to 257,000. That's an increase of almost seven times.

Already it has been estimated by authorities in Washington that more than 750,000 veterans will look for enrollment in our colleges next fall.

When you recollect that our full peacetime capacity for college and university instruction in 1940 was slightly more than 1,300,000 students, you will begin to understand the situation our institutions will face.

The Nation-wide university plant that was operating at only about 75 percent capacity in November of 1945 will by next fall find itself choked in record-breaking enrollments.

In addition to the anticipated 750,000 veterans of World War II, favorable economic conditions may be expected to swell regular applications for enrollment from men and women completing secondary schools this June.

Add to that the deferred educational needs of other men and women—aside from those in the service—and you begin to grasp the extent of these problems.

Here at Drury you are not unaware of the tremendous implications these factors bring with them. In 1940, I am told, your faculty hoped for a student enrollment of 500 by 1950. With 142 veterans already enrolled for this school term, you have passed that mark 4 years sooner.

These enlarged enrollments everywhere are challenging the organizational ability and ingenuity of educators to accommodate their students. Important as was the function of educators during the war in specialized speed-up training, that role is a lesser one than the one they face now.

The perplexing problems faced by colleges have become more apparent as enrollments continue to mount. Briefly, the Nation's educational systems were not in a position to accommodate the overwhelming influx of education-seeking veterans. Shortages are found in all phases of the system—shortages in plant and in laboratory facilities—shortages in housing, shortages in trained personnel, shortages in textbooks, and, in fewer instances, shortages in planning.

When Congress wrote the educational provisions of the GI bill, it wisely determined that there should be no invasion of educational prerogatives by any Federal agency. The precaution was well taken. We have always safeguarded the freedom of higher education from governmental controls and restrictions that might deliberately or unwittingly challenge its integrity.

Under the provisions of the law, therefore, the Veterans' Administration's function in education is justifiably limited to counseling and to the payment of tuition, fees, and subsistence.

The burden of whatever action is to be taken by colleges and universities in meeting their veteran student loads must necessarily be first taken by the institutions themselves.

Several times it has been suggested that the Veterans' Administration help out in the crowded-college problem by establishing veterans' universities of its own in abandoned camps. The suggestion is an impossible one, ignoring as it does not only the dangers that would exist in so unsound a development but also flaunting the needs and desires of veterans themselves.

Veteran students prefer their schooling within the existing framework of our educational system—even though that system may considerably reshuffle its pattern to accept enlarged enrollment. Only in this way can we maintain in our centers of learning the free traditions that have come down to us from the very infancy of our Republic.

Faced with critical shortages during next September registrations, most colleges and universities can choose one of two courses.

Either they will enlarge their plants with temporary housing, schedule round-the-clock classes, provide accelerated programs and build enlarged emergency staffs. Or they will become increasing selective and turn away a greater number of applicants.

Some educators contend that GI educational advantages will result in a dangerous lowering of academic standards, eventually tending to undermine the significance of college education.

Preliminary experience indicates that this is not so.

Everywhere universities are reporting that veteran students not only equal, but in most instances surpass the scholastic level of other students. These men are for the most part serious-intentioned students, acutely conscious that time is running by. Many of them have months and years of war experience behind them. Even more important, they have acquired a mature and meaningful attitude toward life.

The danger that unqualified students will use the Readjustment Act as an educational dole can, of course, be reduced by intelligent counseling and advice. This is also true where students select courses for which they have no aptitude and for which they lack ability. Although the Veterans' Administration is equipped to give this service to all disabled veterans in our 207 guidance and advisement centers, we cannot provide as thorough a service for others. Soon we shall have 300 such centers but even they will be inadequate.

The best insurance a college or university can take to avoid misplaced or misdirected students is to provide intelligent and scientific guidance service prior to admission.

Standards, however, should not be used as a smoke screen for turning away veterans where enrollment is restricted by other limitations.

Student housing continues to be a ceiling factor on campuses throughout the country. Shortages in critical building materials needed in residential housing, scarcities of funds in private institutions operating on reduced enrollments during the war, and the relatively short-term requirements for large-scale needs have all conspired to prevent dormitory building programs. Married veterans, moreover, pose a new and unique college housing problem.

In some places, universities have obtained trailers and demountable housing for erection on the campus of the institution. In other States, nearby Army and Navy cantonments are being used for residence, with regular bus service provided by the college or university. Other institutions have taken a page from their wartime training programs and have converted existing structures into barracks-style dormitories. And in still other communities universities have appealed to home owners to share their space with students.

In one measure or another, each of these devices has brought relief. True, these facilities have not always been desirable. But they do afford an emergency solution to an emergency situation. And even a partial answer here is better than none at all.

Then there is the matter of adapting current academic procedures to fit more easily into the current shape of educational pressures.

I am thinking now of one eastern university, to use a pertinent example. What they are doing is not unique nor confined to that institution. I mention it only because it's one with which I am familiar.

In normal times, this university ran two schools in a normal day. It is now preparing to operate three schools during a 24-hour round-the-clock period. Officials there say they would stretch the three schools to four if the problems in their scheme could be satisfactorily worked out.

Prewar procedures called for lectures in the morning, laboratory work in the afternoon. Thus laboratories were idle in the mornings while students crowded the lecture halls. By running another school in reverse with laboratory work in the mornings and lecture courses in the afternoons—both facilities get full-time use. With the same equipment, the same space—schooling capacity is doubled. Flying squadrons clean up between classes. Unthinkable, perhaps, in 1936, but both thinkable and workable in 1946.

Other universities have planned the creation of extension units. This program does not envision the establishment of separate universities but simply calls for the extension of teaching to reconverted war plants and camps, sharing the faculty, name, and facilities of the parent school.

Educators have also variously proposed the enlargement of our junior college system or the establishment of community colleges—college freshmen courses conducted on a cooperative basis by colleges in existing secondary school facilities. Presumably this would ease the first year load on our universities until plants can be expanded.

Each of these plans calls for sizable increases in college and university faculties.

Here and there colleges and universities have found their own solutions. Instructors when asked to carry heavier teaching loads on a year-round schedule, have replied generously. Graduate students have been drafted into teaching basic courses for which they are qualified. And colleges have gone to successful and qualified professional people in the community to teach on a part-time basis.

When faced by a similar situation in the Veterans' Administration resulting from a shortage of competent doctors with which to staff our hospitals, we appealed to the medical community to help us on a part-time or consultant basis. Instead of lowering medical standards, this device has raised them.

In many instances, some of these shortages—particularly in housing and in space—can be more readily solved in smaller colleges than in the larger universities.

A survey made by our people shortly before Christmas showed that 43 percent of the school-going veterans were concentrated in 42 schools out of the total of approximately 1,300 in the Nation. And yet these 42 schools had only 25 percent of the total student capacity.

Believing that some more profitable regrouping of veteran students might result if they were apprised of opportunities available, we are conducting a survey to determine where such openings might exist.

This survey will permit us to report on enrollment and capacities in the Nation's colleges. It may ease an educational bottleneck which has turned thousands away in some schools while others operate below capacity.

It isn't pleasant—and certainly it is far from convenient—for veterans to brave the shortages and discomforts that going to college in 1946 entails. But they are not going in the dear-old-college-days tradition. The very extent of their enrollment applications is the surest index to their determination to equip themselves to make the best possible contribution to the growth and progress of America.

This is a tremendous challenge, not only to our colleges but to the whole Nation. We cannot afford to let our qualified veterans knock at a bolted door.

I am sure the knock will be answered and welcome made secure.

I believe this because I know that the habit of America is the habit of victory.

Have Living Costs Gone Up or Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the OPA says food costs have increased very little. What is your opinion and experience, Mrs. Housewife? The following table is from the Washington Star of April 8:

LIVING COSTS COMPARED—TABLE SHOWS PERCENTAGE INCREASES IN CONSUMER PRICES DURING WARS

Here is a table showing the percentage increases in consumer goods during World War I compared with those during the war just past to the present time, as well as wage earnings:

Percent of average family expenditures	Item	World War I, percent change from 1914 to peak of inflation	World War II, percent change from August 1939 to February 1946	Since the hold-the-line order, percent change from May 1943 to February 1946
100	All consumer prices	108	31	3.4
40	Food	126	49	−2.4
	Round steak	85	18	−11.1
	Pork chops	125	24	−10.7
	Eggs	208	59	1.4
	Bread	92	12	.1
	Milk	94	31	−.4
	Cereals	139	18	2.0
	Canned goods	(1)	43	−.2
	Fresh fruit and vegetables	(1)	108	−6.2
	Potatoes	291	119	−23.0
16	Rent	54	4	.3
13	Clothing	200	50	17.2
	Men's suits	(1)	42	6.5
	Men's shoes	(1)	37	4.7
	House dresses	(1)	148	54.0
	Cotton work shirts	(1)	80	15.9
6	Electricity, fuel, ice	91	14	3.2
3	House furnishings	179	48	18.6
21	Miscellaneous	101	25	8.5
	All wholesale prices	148	44	3.5
	Industrial prices	165	27	4.8
	Building materials	218	25	2.4
	Plate glass	271	0	0
	Steel plates	232	13	13.1
	Copper	65	15	0
	Anthracite coal	82	44	15.9
	Bituminous coal	675	30	7.8
	Textile products	252	51	4.9
	Blue denim	266	104	16.4
	Men's cotton hose	277	77	3.2
	Average weekly earnings of factory workers	140	74	−4.2
	Average hourly earnings of factory workers	150	61	5.4

[1] No data available.

The source of the above table is the OPA. The table accompanied an article extolling the wonders and achievements of the OPA. Let us analyze this table. Are these New Deal schemers deceiving themselves or are they trying to deceive the housewives of the Nation?

Column two of this table shows the percentage increase in prices from August 1939 to February 1, 1946. This column, however, does not show that in August 1939 we had 8-cent cotton, 5-cent hogs, $1.10-per-hundred-pounds milk, 30-cents-per-bushel rye, and 54-cents-per-bushel wheat. Most farm products were from 40 to 50 percent of parity in 1939, so what of it if these prices would advance to a point where they would bring somewhere near the cost of production? Farm labor alone has increased in the United States from $35 per month in 1939 to $88 per month in 1945.

Column three may tell many stories. One could be obtained by asking any housewife if she is buying meats and other foods for less than she purchased them in 1943. Two, column three may show the listed price, but the housewife might not be buying the steak for 11 percent less, pork chops for 10 percent less, potatoes for 23 percent less. Three, if this chart is right and gives the true picture, it is more evident than ever that the farmer is the only one whose prices are being held down. His prices are not only frozen at zero in 1943, but he is being pushed down below zero, if this chart is to be depended upon.

Potatoes no doubt are lower, and the main reason is because the legal support price on potatoes has not been maintained in accordance with the Steagall amendment.

Treasury Deprived of $50,000,000 or More in Taxes Due From Shipping Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite the attention of the Members of the House to what I consider to be the greatest injustice to the American taxpayer which has ever come to my attention. It involves action by a Government agency which has so far deprived the Treasury of a sum which I dare say may amount to $50,000,000 or more. The fact that this evasion has taken place at a time when we are sorely in need of Government funds, and that the moneys exempted from taxation are war profits, makes this situation doubly damning.

A provision of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 specifies that ship lines receiving a subsidy shall be permitted by the Maritime Commission to deposit earnings in tax-exempt reserve funds. During the early days of the war, we of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had before us a bill which, among other things, dealt with certain tax exemption provisions of the 1936 act. In the course of those hearings, representatives of the Maritime Commission informed the committee that no tax exemptions would be permitted these ship lines on earnings unless a subsidy was actually being received and that, as subsidies were not being paid during wartime, legislation rescinding these tax exemptions would not be required. Relying on these statements, our committee took no further action on this bill.

In the course of our hearings on the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1945, the committee received information that the subsidized lines had amounts estimated to be up to $200,000,000 available in reserve funds for the purchase of ships. On further examination, I have found that these sums, which have been completely tax exempt, are almost all profits which have been deposited during the war years from wartime profits. Since that disclosure, Judge Bland and I have been attempting, without success, to require that the Maritime Commission take action which will subject these funds to their proper tax burden. Last week, in the course of a committee hearing, I questioned Mr. Wade Skinner, the general counsel for the Maritime Commission, about the action of the Maritime Commission in permitting these tax-exempt deposits. He informed the committee that, in his opinion, such exemptions were completely illegal and that on at least half a dozen occasions he had orally advised the former chairman of the Maritime Commission and Mr. R. E. Anderson, its former Director of Finance, that such tax exemptions were contrary to law. It interested me further to hear a statement by Mr. Skinner that no written opinion to this effect had been prepared because he believed they had not wanted a statement of this kind in the files in view of the Commission's action.

As you will see from the correspondence which I should like placed in the RECORD at this time, I have communicated both with the Treasury Department and with the Maritime Commission regarding these exemptions. I have been informed by the Treasury that action is now being taken to recover the taxes due and Mr. Skinner testified that, at long last, his recommendations are being put in writing and that action will be taken to insure that taxes are properly imposed on these war profits. My greatest interest is to insure that the taxes, which I understand can be conservatively estimated as up to $50,000,000 or more, be recovered for the Federal Treasury. However, I do feel that the Maritime Commission is to be condemned for permitting an evasion of taxes contrary to the advice of their own legal division.

The correspondence follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1946.

Capt. EDWARD MACAULEY,
Acting Chairman,
United States Maritime Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CAPTAIN MACAULEY: In the course of the hearings on the Merchant Ship Sales bill, testimony was given that subsidized operators had huge sums of money deposited in tax-exempt reserve funds which are available for purchases of ships. I have recently looked into this matter of tax-exempt funds and have found what seems to me to be a situation in which the Maritime Commission has protected vast profits of subsidized operators from Federal taxation despite express legal limitation on its power to do so. As a result, not only have subsidized operators made tremendous profits during the war but, unlike any other business, these profits have not been subject to taxes.

This tax exemption has been granted under the provisions of 607 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which provides tax exemption for moneys deposited by subsidized operators in reserve funds. That section specifies that "the earnings of any contractor receiving an operational differential subsidy under authority of this act, which are deposited in the contractor's reserve funds as provided in this section * * * shall be exempt from all Federal taxes."

No operating subsidies have been paid during the war period, and hence no operators have been receiving operating differential subsidies under authority of the 1936 act. Although this wording of the law is clear, the Commission has nevertheless permitted these tax-exempt deposits. Such action unauthorized by existing law has deprived the Treasury of huge sums and has given subsidized operators great financial advantages not intended by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

In 1942 the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held hearings on a bill which would have, among other things, suspended the tax-exemption provisions of section 607 (h). At the hearings on the bill the Maritime Commission's representative, Mr. Goertner, testified that these tax exemptions were dependent upon the existence of a subsidy contract and the receipt of subsidy payments thereunder. Because of this testimony and informal representations which were made to the chairman of our committee by other of the Maritime Commission's representatives, no further action was taken regarding this bill. I believe that no member of the committee knew, until the ship-sales bill was before us, that the Maritime Commission had continued to permit tax exemptions on moneys deposited in the reserve funds, although no subsidies were actually being paid or received.

At the time of the ship-sales bill hearings we also learned that for the years 1941, 1942, and 1943 approximately $151,000,000 in profits were deposited in these funds with but a small fraction of this amount paid as taxes, plus $43,000,000 of capital-gains profits made during 1941 to 1944 upon which not a penny of taxes were paid. It is probable that profits for the last 2 years, for which we were not furnished figures, exceeded these amounts; and I understand that these profits were similarly protected from taxes.

I have examined the committee's file on this matter and have found that in August of last year, as soon as this matter was brought to the attention of the committee during the ship sales bill hearings, our chairman, Judge Bland, wrote to you demanding an explanation. No reply to his request was forthcoming until March 13, 1946, when in response to a follow-up letter from Judge Bland, you stated that the matter was being considered but that progress had been rather slow due to the occupation of your staff "with so many urgent questions." In my opinion, the well over $100,000,000 in taxes which I believe the Treasury should recover is an urgent question. Accordingly, I must lend my support to the chairman's request for an explanation of this problem and for appropriate action. I feel that this matter should be dealt with immediately and I should like to be informed as to what action will be taken to recover these funds. In my opinion, the Commission's action has given an unfair and uniawful advantage to subsidized operators. But, even more important, it has deprived the Treasury of what probably amounts to well over a hundred million dollars of tax revenues.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to the Secretary of the Treasury with a request that he take whatever action he may deem to be appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, April 4, 1946.

The Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: In reply to your communication of March 20, 1946, you are advised that as a result of work which has been done at the direction of the Commission, it is planned that a discussion of the principles involved and a program of action to be taken (which program will include consultations with the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Internal Revenue) is being placed on the Commission's docket for consideration at its meeting on Friday, April 5, 1946. The result of the Commission's deliberations will take the form of a further and definitive reply to Judge Bland's inquiry, and I will see to it that you are furnished with a copy thereof.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD MACAULEY,
Acting Chairman.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 29, 1946.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: The Secretary has asked me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 20, 1946, enclosing a copy of

your letter to the Acting Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

This matter will be given consideration and a further reply will be sent to you as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, Jr.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1946.

Capt. EDWARD MACAULEY,
Acting Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CAPTAIN MACAULEY: Reference is made to my letter of March 20 concerning tax exemptions allowed subsidized lines during wartime. While Mr. Skinner's testimony before our committee last Friday was most informative, I have had no reply to my letter other than an acknowledgment. Because of the large amount of money involved and the importance to the taxpayers that immediate steps be taken for its recovery, I shall appreciate hearing from you promptly as to what action is being taken.

During last Friday's hearings before the subcommittee I requested that all correspondence between the Commission, the Treasury Department, and the subsidized operators regarding this matter be forwarded to the committee. Would you also please see that this is done in the next few days?

One thing that disturbs me a great deal is that these operators may have already used some of these tax-exempted reserve funds for the purpose of purchasing ships so that difficulties might be experienced by the Government in recovering the taxes due. Even more important, however, is my fear that sums now in the reserve fund will be used for the purchase of ships under the merchant Ship Sales Act before the tax assessments are made. It seems to me that it is the duty of the Maritime Commission to insure that no further withdrawals are made from these funds by the subsidized operators unless the tax amounts due to the Government be adequately protected. If any other action is taken, I feel that Congress can have no choice but to institute a full-scale investigation of what would be a compounding of this unfortunate situation.

In order that I may have a more complete picture of the existing situation, would you please also forward to me the following information:

1. The names of all lines having contracts for subsidies.

2. The dates on which these lines last received subsidy payments.

3. The total amounts of deposits which these lines have in their reserve funds, with a break-down separately, to show amounts in the construction reserve, capital reserve, and special reserve funds.

4. The total of any withdrawals made by each line from these funds since subsidy payments ceased and the purposes for which withdrawn.

5. The total earnings of these lines, including capital gains as a separate item, during each of the past 5 years.

6. Any estimates which the Commission may have concerning the percentage of these earnings which would have been paid under the ordinary corporate taxes and the excess-profits taxes if tax exemptions had not been permitted, and the dollar amounts now subject to taxation.

7. The total amount of taxes which have been paid by each of these lines during each of the past 5 years.

It is my understanding that this information is readily available in the Commission's file and I should therefore appreciate your reply to these queries within the next few days. If any individual item or items are not immediately available, will you please furnish the others within that period.

This matter is one which has been disturbing me a great deal as I feel it to be the most regrettable and unauthorized action by any Government agency that I have ever encountered. In the next few days I plan to inform the Congress of the facts in this situation and the efforts which we of the Merchant Marine Committee are making to insure their correction.

Yours very truly,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Member of Congress.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., under date of April 3, 1946:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY INSANITY

Whatever may be said in favor of the St. Lawrence River and its potential huge sources of electric power for the 18,000,000 citizens of New York and New Jersey, little if anything can be said in favor of its related St. Lawrence seaway project, which proposes to create a deep-water channel for ocean-going vessels from the Great Lakes to the sea.

Briefly, the seaway project would cost not less than $500,000,000, of which three hundred and fifty millions would be provided by Uncle Sap and one hundred and fifty millions by Canada. United States taxpayers would have to foot an annual bill of twenty millions for operating, maintaining, and amortizing their portion of the seaway, about 25 percent of which would each year come out of the pockets of the citizens of New Jersey and New York.

Naturally, they ought to know what they will get in return. Well, one of the things they'll get is the loss of 3,000,000 tons of commerce from the port of New York each year. That's about one-sixth of the port's annual commerce. There are approximately 200,000 people employed in New York's port activities, many of whom live in northern New Jersey. With 17 percent of the traffic from which they support themselves and their families diverted through the St. Lawrence, 34,000 people and probably 100,000 of their dependents would be directly affected, while indirectly as many others would be adversely affected by the loss of the earnings and the sequential spending power of those displaced people.

Certainly the people of the eastern seaboard States could do nothing but lose by the seaway proposal; so let's see how the manufacturers and shippers of our industrial and agricultural Midwest would fare. Using Detroit as an example, the distance via the Great Lakes and the costly New York State Barge Canal is 750 miles, while the distance via Great Lakes, St. Lawrence seaway, Atlantic Ocean to New York is 2,300 miles. It seems obvious that neither time nor shipping costs could therefore be saved for the Midwest by a costly annual-deficit-producing fantasy that would benefit the United States little if at all but would benefit Canada much.

Of course, if the Congress believes it has a mandate to develop Montreal as a great port at the expense of New York and other Atlantic seaboard ports there may be some merit to the proposed seaway between us and and our neighbors on the north. Circumstances in the Second World War impelled our people to give away their proverbial shirts to their allies; they're now giving away their figurative pants to European and Asiatic friends and foes alike among postwar seminourished peoples abroad; but it might be quite timely to hint gently that if they now also hand over their underwear to their likable and friendly northern neighbor, which emerged from the recent human holocaust proportionately more affluent than overgenerous Uncle Sap, they'll be stripped bare.

Then, very much unlike the tale of Lady Godiva, the rest of the world will look not away from but at a spectacle of naked national damfoolishness without parallel in history but not infrequently found among inmates of our public mental institutions.

JOHN BORG, *Publisher.*

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the veterans' emergency housing program have attempted to discredit the plan by making statements which contain only half-truths. In considering a measure of such grave importance to our veterans we must have all the facts. A recent example is to be found in charges which have been made about the export of lumber.

The lumber which we are exporting, Mr. Speaker, is entirely heavy timber, not suitable for construction purposes. The critics fail to point out the fact that lumber imports into this country are three times as great as lumber exports, and that all the lumber imported is in construction dimensions. It has been stated on the floor that visitors in Mexico report yards stacked high with American lumber. This is true, Mr. Speaker, but such statements do not tell us all the facts. In 1945 we did export to Mexico about 15,000,000 board feet of hard woods and millwork lumber, which that country does not produce at all. But we imported from Mexico more than 50,000,000 board feet, all in construction-type lumber. If we had not exported to Mexico the heavy lumber which we cannot use in building houses anyway, we would have jeopardized our chances of importing over three times as much construction lumber.

Criticism has also been leveled at the export of housing units to France. Here, again, the critics did not tell the whole story. Under lend-lease, the United States had contracted with the British Government to send to England 30,000 houses for workers in British munition plants. By VJ-day only 8,000 of these had been shipped, and 7,000 more were near completion in this country. With the cancellation of lend-lease on VJ-day, this contract was terminated. Since the war-housing program terminated the same day, the United States Government had no legal authority to make use of the 7,000 nearly completed housing units in this country until Con-

gress passed legislation enabling it to do so. Furthermore, the units were not up to American standards and were temporary in nature. For these reasons, the United States Government entered into a contract with the French Government for these 7,000 units, to be installed for dock workers in bombed-out port areas in France. This was not unselfish on our part, for these dock workers were necessary to service ships which were to bring American soldiers home from Europe. Without the dock workers whose homes had been entirely destroyed by bombing, there might have been months' longer delay in getting our combat veterans home again. This contract was closed October 16, 1945, and ownership was transferred to the French Government at that time. Meanwhile, it was not until December 31, 1945, that legislation was enacted under the Mead-Lanham resolution authorizing the Government to take even the first mild steps toward building houses for veterans.

The entire program to accomplish this end has now been formulated and much debated. Its essential features—premium payments, price ceilings on existing homes, and prefabricated houses—have been attacked by the opposition. But let us not be led astray by false charges and half truths. Let us face our responsibility and enact the veterans' emergency housing program in its entirety.

Extension of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include in my extension of remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a letter from the Tulane Lumber Co., Inc., of New Orleans, La., to which is attached a copy of a letter to that firm from the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., of Randolph, Wis. Mr. Speaker, I wish that the letter and the copy attached thereto be published, as follows:

TULANE HARDWOOD LUMBER CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La., April 10, 1946.
The Honorable HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing copy of a letter received from one of our sources of supply at Randolph, Wis., which is self-explanatory.

So desperate have the manufacturers of millwork and other building materials become at the OPA prices and policies that they are resorting to the barter system as indicated in this letter. This system obviously effects serious changes in distribution policies and unless something is done about it thousands of small businessmen all over the country will be forced to close up.

We who are in the business of dealing in building materials know that the shortage of these materials is considerably more acute today than it was at the end of the war and we know what we are talking about when we tell you that the principal cause for these shortages is the OPA and its stupid blundering policies.

How long they will be permitted to hoodwink the public by clever publicity and news stories is a matter for you to decide.

In the name of common sense, I ask your vote against the extension of the OPA.

Yours very truly,
LOUIS G. RIECKE,
Vice President.

THE ROCKWELL MANUFACTURING CO.,
Randolph, Wis., February 22, 1946.
Mr. LOUIS G. RIECKE,
Tulane Hardwood Lumber Co., Inc.,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR LOUIS: Just returned home from the coast and find your letter of February 8. Since being out there and seeing all the fancy deals and special tie-ups on shop lumber, I just can't tell you when we can get out your order No. 1091. It seems that the only people who can get millwork are those who have strings on shop lumber and they trade shop lumber for millwork. If you have any strings of this kind and can furnish us shop lumber, we will arrange to get you some shipments quick. Have you anything along this line? If you haven't, then we will have to wait until sunnier days and when that will be is still a mystery. It all depends what the politicians in Washington do to approach the situation realistically instead of the wild idealistic attitude of the present building czars.

We hate to write you so pessimistically, but perhaps you can give us the answer to the problem? Best regards.

Sincerely yours,
FRED A. HOERNER,
Vice President.

Pay Increases for Men in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the pay of enlisted men in the armed forces. My bill provides for increases all the way along the line. I have increased the seventh grade, being the lowest pay of an enlisted man, from $50 to $75. Under my bill, the other grades are as follows: Sixth grade, $54 to $85; fifth grade, $66 to $95; fourth grade, $78 to $105; third grade, $96 to $115; second grade, $114 to $125; and first grade, $138 to $150; and chief petty officers from $126 to $140.

It is my considered judgment that if we materially increase the pay of enlisted men, and make provision for an enlistment of a minimum of 18 months, we will have no difficulty in getting enough men to take care of our occupational forces.

Under this proposal, most of the men will come from reenlistments. By following this procedure, the Army will immediately have a big percentage of trained and matured men. They will be much more capable and qualified for performing police duty than an 18-year-old youngster, who is unmatured and has no training at all.

Under a volunteer program, more consideration should be given to trimming down our caste system so that enlistees will at least have just as comfortable accommodations and as good quality food as is accorded commissioned officers.

Fewer men will be required by following this system, than by using untrained youngsters as a police force in foreign countries.

Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Herald-News, Passaic, N. J., under date of April 2, 1946:

Who's the veteran going to blame for this housing shortage which made it impossible for him to rent rooms for his wife and child? He came home to find himself one of eight persons in a dwelling intended for five, in which there is little privacy and where tempers rise easily. The house built for $5,500 before he went away sells now for $9,200 or more. The contractor who used to put up $6,000 houses can't afford to erect such a dwelling for less than $10,200 now—and he can't buy materials. "What's a priority? Only a hunting license," says the builder, who can't make a living marking time.

If the veteran listens to a left wing commentator, who habitually smears Congressmen, and who seems to think there is a brighter, fairer land whose capital is Moscow, he's likely to believe that the Republicans on Capitol Hill are so intent upon embarrassing the Truman administration that they are preventing the erection of homes for veterans; this despite the fact that Democrats control Congress.

If the veteran wants to know why he cannot buy a white shirt, he ought to get a copy of the current Saturday Evening Post and read Lew Hahn's enlightening explanation. Shirts or houses—it is the same story—bureaucratic bungling.

The housing shortage has been growing since 1938 because people were marrying faster than houses were being built. During the war nobody could build without a permit; the Government did most of the building in war-plant areas. Still the supply was a million homes less than the demand.

War controls ended on October 1, 1945. Within 60 days the construction industry started the erection of 125,000 homes. By late December OPA had tightened its controls in such fashion that builders could not get materials. You cannot build homes without bathtubs and radiators and the manufacturers who were making them, paying higher labor costs, were held down to prewar prices which made profitable operations impossible. So no radiators or bathtubs were produced. Builders could not get nails, lumber, other materials. It is still that way.

Joseph T. King, counsel for the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, told a Senate committee Friday that "if Chester Bowles had adjusted the price of lumber shortly after VJ-day instead of doodling with a Government housing program, we would be well on the way to the solution of the housing program, instead of having an emergency of Mr. Bowles' own creation."

There is the answer to the problem and there is the villain of the piece. The same

Mr. Bowles, said the lumbermen's counsel, wrote Wilson Wyatt on January 11 that the Government should place "large orders" with prefabricators at prices which would "assure the producers in this field of a generous profit," and he mentioned "men of vision and boldness and drive, such as Henry Kaiser," as the type who could do the job. This is the first time Chester Bowles has ever suggested anybody make a profit; and who is the bright-haired boy for the job? The same Mr. Kaiser who has been doing so handsomely for himself, set up in business with Government money; one of that small favored group of insiders that does such a big job for the administration in campaign years. Said Mr. King to the Senators:

"I charge that for 8 months Mr. Bowles refused reasonable price readjustments to get construction items for conventional home builders while he diddled with the plan which would put Mr. Kaiser in business at the Government's expense, with an absolute assurance that Mr. Kaiser, without any risks, would receive 'a generous profit.'"

That's how bureaucracy works. That's why the suspicion will not down that inept bureaucrats, deadly afraid that the American system of getting things done would rob them of power, have created this crisis so that they can go to Congress and say the only way to get homes for veterans is to put the Government into business.

Moreover, that's why the hope of meeting the demand for proper housing for veterans and their families this year is fast growing dim.

Industry Is Having a Hard Time Under Government Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the record of earnings and profits during the war has now been completed with the publication and compilation of the reports on 1945 corporation earnings. The National City Bank of New York has been compiling and publishing such reports for many years now and its compilation which has just become available in its April Monthly Letter contains some interesting and important facts about profits during the war.

I am interested, for example, by the low margin of profit on sales earned by the leading war industries, and especially by the aircraft-manufacturing industry. This industry, credited in large part with developing equipment which won the war and upon which rests the responsibility for keeping the United States foremost in the air in peace, during 1944–45 stood at the bottom of a list of 30 industrial groups. Its net income after taxes during the last 2 years of the war was just 1.2 percent of its sales. Only the meat-packing industry, with a percentage return of 0.9, ranked below aircraft manufacturing.

It is also noteworthy that the National City Bank's reports for preceding years show a steadily declining profit rate for aircraft and parts manufacturing. In the period 1938–40 the industry had a profit margin of 10.9 percent.

The following tables show the 7-year drop to the 1.2 percent 1945 position and the relationship of aircraft industry profits to other war industries and to industry in general during 1944–45:

Aircraft and parts manufacturing war profits, 1938–45

Period:	Percentage of profit to sales
Average 1938–40	10.9
1941	7.4
1942	3.2
1943	1.8
1944	1.2
1945	1.2

Source: National City Bank.

War industries profits

Industry	Percent net income to sales	
	1945	1944
Iron and steel	3.0	2.6
Electrical equipment	2.9	2.9
Machinery	3.6	3.2
Nonferrous metals	6.4	8.6
Other metal products	3.6	3.8
Autos and trucks	4.5	3.1
Auto equipment	2.8	2.8
Railway equipment	3.9	3.1
Aircraft and parts	1.2	1.2

Source: National City Bank.

Net 1944–45 income by manufacturing groups

Manufacturing	Number of companies	Sales, 1945	Net income, 1945 [1]	Percent net income to sales	
				1945	1944
		Thous. of dol.	*Thous. of dol.*		
Baking	19	$812,425	$26,715	3.3	3.1
Dairy products	12	1,691,079	36,179	2.1	2.1
Meat packing	18	4,108,790	35,011	.9	.9
Sugar	22	544,399	25,638	4.7	6.1
Other food products	32	1,627,518	52,655	3.2	4.3
Beverages	45	2,220,644	79,450	3.6	4.1
Tobacco products	12	1,636,181	66,341	4.1	4.2
Cotton goods	39	678,794	22,715	3.3	3.1
Other textile products	44	1,300,961	58,657	4.5	2.8
Leather and shoes	27	676,119	20,267	3.0	3.1
Rubber products	22	2,561,788	64,388	2.5	2.7
Wood products	18	312,107	12,201	3.9	3.7
Pulp, paper products	54	1,170,410	50,778	4.3	4.5
Chemical products	43	2,155,384	159,348	7.4	5.4
Drugs, soap, etc	20	1,073,564	68,639	6.4	6.5
Paint and varnish	12	428,762	13,552	3.2	3.4
Petroleum products	30	4,962,272	346,311	7.0	7.0
Cement, glass, and stone	41	859,148	38,366	4.5	4.9
Iron and steel	43	5,661,093	169,501	3.0	2.6
Agricultural implements	10	1,409,586	51,250	3.6	3.7
Building, heating, and plumbing equipment	37	871,779	31,414	3.6	4.0
Electrical equipment	37	2,528,410	7,963	2.9	2.9
Machinery	93	1,789,291	63,698	3.6	3.2
Nonferrous metals	16	779,224	49,813	6.4	8.6
Other metal products	107	2,589,775	93,649	3.6	3.8
Automobiles and trucks	21	5,479,753	246,935	4.5	3.1
Automobile equipment	43	1,419,916	39,302	2.8	2.8
Railway equipment	16	748,563	29,552	3.9	3.1
Aircraft and parts	19	1,255,842	15,668	1.2	1.2
Other manufacturing	65	1,396,945	82,369	5.9	4.7
Total manufacturing	1,017	54,750,532	2,123,655	3.9	3.3

[1] Net income after taxes, includes income from investments and other sources as well as from sales.

Source: National City Bank.

With the Government taxes, the Government regulations, Government red tape, none of the industries are making profits that will spur private industry on to the heights that America will benefit most.

National Pension System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to adopt a complete system of national pensions covering all adult citizens of the United States.

It is interesting to note that in the past 10 years great strides have been made throughout our Nation in favor of affording a greater measure of security to all American citizens. This particular act on the part of the Legislature of Massachusetts will indicate to the Members of Congress the views of their constituents at home, for this memorial was adopted after full debate in the legislature.

I am pleased to set it forth in full for your consideration:

Resolution memorializing Congress for the adoption of a complete system of national pensions covering all adult citizens of the United States

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact into law the substance of a bill entitled "A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys"; being H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, modesty is becoming virtue, all too rare. There is news value, therefore, when such an able, hard-working, self-effacing Member of Congress as WILLIS ROBERTSON gains unsought and deserved national recognition.

On March 18, 1946, the Washington Evening Star presented an editorial, Merited Award, noting the presentation of the annual award of Field and Stream for outstanding conservation accomplishment in 1945 to our friend and colleague from Virginia.

In its issue of April 10, 1946, Pathfinder joins the complimentary chorus which has been swelling over the Nation in the following article:

FAUNA'S FRIEND

The Nation's wildlife is on the come-back trail, thanks in large part to the efforts of a tall, iron-gray-haired, studious Virginia Congressman who has made conservation a keystone of his 30 years' service in public office.

Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, whose home is in historic Lexington, Va., in the rich Shenandoah Valley, and who has preached and practiced conservation since he entered the State senate in 1916, sums up his philosophy:

"I have regarded wildlife as a great national asset and one that belongs primarily to our farmers."

He has been named to receive the annual Field and Stream award for outstanding conservation accomplishment in 1945.

When ROBERTSON—himself an ardent hunter and fisherman—entered the Virginia Senate, the State had no game department and no conservation fund. He sponsored legislation which set up a department providing conservation funds through a tax on hunters and setting up the State warden force. In 1926 he was named to head the agency, and for 6 years devoted himself to developing the commission into one of the most progressive of its kind in the country.

CARRIES ON

Soon after he came to Congress in 1933, he sponsored a resolution under which was created a special House committee on conservation, which has had a tremendous influence in shaping and guiding Federal policy in the field.

He joined in sponsoring the Robertson-Pittman act providing Federal grants to match State funds for conservation work. Federal funds are provided through an excise tax on sporting arms, ammunition and equipment. Practically all States are participating in the program.

Through his committee he also induced the Civilian Conservation Corps to make wildlife conservation an important part of its program; encouraged the soil-conservation service to include in its program construction of farm fish ponds and similar projects; and advocated pollution control measures as a safeguard to the Nation's fish resources.

"Working on the farm is hard and the financial returns are relatively low," he says, "but it is an independent type of life and one which can be made attractive to boys reared in rural communities if we can provide for them suitable opportunities for recreation.

"When the farms of America are served by improved roads and schools as good as city schools; when drudgery of farm and household work is lightened by widespread use of electric energy; when forest fires are prevented and fertile topsoil no longer washes away; when our streams are filled with fish and our fields with game birds and animals, the trend of the past 50 years away from farms to the industrial life of cities will end. That is a program for which all should work, and wildlife conservation is a part of it."

Mr. Speaker, whether it be his personal service to constituents, his work which won the Field and Stream award, or his service as a member of the great House Committee on Ways and Means, the high character, outstanding ability, and devotion to duty which WILLIS ROBERTSON is constantly manifesting have earned him a high place in the esteem of his colleagues in Congress. But it is his qualities of mind and heart which have earned the lasting friendship of those who have been privileged to know him.

Settlement of Lend-Lease Claims and Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are at this moment witnessing the processing of the most amazing agreement ever entered into between any nations as far as history records.

Like all fantastic enterprises into which we have been drawn, before and since the war, this is being sold to the American people with the same pretensions of altruistic concern for the world, mixed with supposed benefits which will never materialize. In effect, we are making two separate agreements. One of them is for a settlement of our lend-lease claims against England and the other is an agreement with England in which we undertake to make the British loan.

The first agreement provides that England, in full liquidation of all her loans of arms and supplies, as well as cash, under the general terms of lend-lease is to pay us $650,000,000. It is to be remembered that our lend-lease account with England was approximately $29,000,000,000; the $650,000,000 will also pay us for the surplus property still remaining in the United Kingdom. However, we are not going to receive the $650,000,000. It is to be settled in the future as stipulated in the loan agreement.

The second agreement provides for a loan of $3,750,000,000 to the Government of Great Britain. This loan is to be repaid to us in 50 annual installments, beginning in 1951, at an interest rate of 1.62 percent. On its face, the loan is at 2 percent, but since no interest is to be paid for the first 5 years, the net interest will be 1.62 percent.

We must keep in mind that this loan, or gift, will not be money but merchandise. England will use the dollar credit to purchase consumer and durable goods on the American market in competition with the American buyer. The result of this action is easy to contemplate when we consider that we are now short of merchandise and will be for 4 or 5 years without foreign demands. This action will be definitely inflationary as it will increase the buying pressure for all scarce merchandise and materials.

I submit today an editorial from the Clarksburg Telegram, published in Clarksburg, W. Va. You will find it a timely statement and sensible proposal.

The editorial follows:

TAXPAYER BECOMES FORGOTTEN MAN

United States Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, comes the second nearest to really representing the sentiments of the American citizens in the British loan controversy. We say second nearest as we believe the views expressed by the Clarksburg Telegram are the nearest.

Senator TAFT, one of the hardest-working and best-informed men in Washington, probably knows more about what is going on than any other man there. He is not afraid to express his views regardless of politics.

The Clarksburg Telegram proposed that Congress and Senate permit the British Government to borrow the $3,750,000,000 from persons who wish to subscribe through bonds. This will give those who have been pushing this loan for personal and political reasons—many of whom would directly benefit through their corporations—an opportunity to display their feeling and broad-mindedness toward the British Government.

Some are perfectly willing to invest the money of the United States, with bonds to be guaranteed by our Government, but how many would be willing to invest their own money and take the chances they are asking our Government to take?

If the bonds were forfeited or the interest unpaid, the investors in the bonds would lose. That would not affect the people so much. However, if our Government makes the loan, the money is taken from every taxpayer. The interest would have to be guaranteed and paid each year for 5 years without receiving a dime in return. From then on it would be a question of whether the British Government would ever pay a dime.

The bonds, as reported, would run for 50 years. This would result in a purely political issue every 2 years—shall we collect or forgive the loan? A very small minority could win and defeat collection of even a dime.

Senator TAFT proposed to help the British by giving them an outright gift of $1,250,000,000 instead of a loan of $3,750,000,000. We would save two-thirds in that way. It has been shown that all foreign countries always do not pay their financial obligations. In this way the matter would be settled immediately without lingering financial difficulties and political wrangling for years to come.

If those determined, and possibly promised, to make the loan to the British Government would use common business sense, they would insist on securities for a loan and the rate of interest being paid to the bond holders. This would help the British Government if it is impossible for it to borrow the money in its own country. In this way, payment would be assured to us.

Britain has some of the richest men in the world and possibly her assets, directly and indirectly, exceed ours at the present time. The British, however, make more noise and

there are many in this country who join them.

It is indeed strange that a number of Representatives and Senators will advocate loaning the British Government millions and at the same time vote against any assistance to their own people. No country in the world has gone as far and received less in material benefit than the United States.

Seemingly all our efforts are not appreciated. All nations apparently are trying to milk us of every dollar possible. At the same time, we have thousands unemployed, thousands with no homes or storerooms or office space. Our veterans evidently have been put on the dole and forgotten. No real effort has been made to assist them in what they really want—a job and a home.

The people who make up the Government, vote the Representatives and Senators into office, and pay the taxes somehow are forgotten in the maze of politics and internationalism. How to hang on for 2, 4, or 6 years longer, how to keep the officeholders in, how to continue the dole (for dole means votes) are so often the main objectives of politicians.

An economic shock in this country is not far away. Many foreign countries are struggling to get on their feet and are using war prisoners at starvation rations and wages in their efforts. It is against our concepts to practice this. Even in most penitentiaries the convicts are well fed, housed, and clothed. Despite our moral outlook on the situation, we will soon be affected by it. Foreign products will soon be on the market. The American shopper is anxious to receive the most for his money, and seldom cares where the product is made. After a war is ended, it makes no difference.

Two-fifths of our country's main arteries of steel, iron, and coal are paralyzed by strikes. With all our internal problems, surely some time should be devoted to them by our Congressmen and Senators.

Being a humanitarian with other people's money may get a man in headlines, but what we really need are representatives whose main interests and efforts lie in the United States and the forgotten man—the taxpayer.

A Unique Radio Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues an interesting and unique education program called Halls of Congress.

This radio program, originating with radio station WMCA, in New York, reenacts congressional debate from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an alternative to a direct pick-up.

High lights of the week's discussions in the House of Representatives and the Senate are brought to radio listeners throughout the country. The main issues before the legislature are dramatized for the American people.

Just last month the program was cited by the Writers War Board. The commendation reads: "Interesting lesson in the practical workings of government."

This program demonstrates the use of radio in promoting greater understanding of the democratic processes in action.

Self-Help for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edna Lonegan from the Commonweal of January 4, 1946:

SELF-HELP FOR PUERTO RICO

Our greatest gift to Puerto Rico has been in medicine. In the American Army forces that landed on the island in 1898 was a young Army doctor, Bailey Kelly Ashford, who stands for the best of the American spirit. On his first march northward, Dr. Ashford had noted the "pale men of the mountains." When the short war was over, he asked permission to study them. He quickly learned that their languor was due to anemia, caused by the absorption of their blood by an intestinal worm, the hookworm, and that their plight was curable.

With the simplest facilities, Dr. Ashford and his Puerto Rican colleagues, under Dr. Juan Guiteras, started clinics up in the hills, which treated 400,000 people with "incurable anemia, and cured most of them. The disease, when not fatal, had reduced the efficiency of the Puerto Rican jibaro by about 50 percent. This brilliant demonstration of idealism and practical sense led directly to the founding of the School of Tropical Medicine in Puerto Rico, which has made contributions of great value to the world. What irony that the starving Puerto Rican jibaro should have helped cure people all over the world of diseases due to diet deficiencies!

IMPROVED SANITATION AIDED POPULATION RISE

The improved sanitary conditions that followed the American occupation led to a quick rise in the population, as the fearful mortality rates went down. The difficulty underlying all the problems of Puerto Rico is the fact that the islanders never developed the ability to raise the productivity in farming and trade as fast as their population increased.

The development of employment within nations follows a clear-cut pattern. Men begin with subsistence farming because they must. As roads improve, they begin exchanging local products with those who have different goods, and so get more for their labor than they can get by more intensive labor on the land. After long experience in exchange, progressive nations begin to stimulate a larger supply of goods for exchange, by steps that we now call manufacturing. Finally as manufacturing increases, surpluses keep growing, and the nations can invest money in services that are impossible luxuries for poorer peoples.

Education, medicine, hygiene, and dentistry are not necessities. They are surpluses, that can be paid for only by people who are engaged in highly productive work. The services can be widespread only after a nation has mastered farming, trade, and industry. The Americans made the mistake of giving to the Puerto Ricans a share in our services, without at the same time giving them a share in the economic arts that had enabled us to support those services.

The best example is in education. We gave the bright young Puerto Ricans a great many chances to become doctors and lawyers. But that was not giving them American opportunities. For every American who had been educated at Harvard or Princeton, from the time those colleges were founded, hundreds of young Americans had been educated on the farms and in the workshops of America, to raise good crops, to know how to market them, to use and tinker with tools and machinery, to change from farming to industrial work and back again, with no lost motion.

Puerto Rican farmers kept on struggling to raise crops with poor seed, to raise an expensive grade of coffee with no marketing program. Electric wires in the streets hung in sinuous curves, while electric poles pointed in almost all directions. Almost no one knew how to run a little shop. There was no merchandising system for efficient collection of the products of the farms, packing them, and moving them swiftly to market.

We gave the young Puerto Ricans a share of our luxurious twentieth century education, without giving them a share in our three centuries of self-help. The Puerto Ricans had been living in a world of subsistence agriculture. Suddenly, with the American occupation, they were called on to bridge the gap of centuries. We invited them to enjoy the airy towers of success but put no foundation under them.

The American sugar companies brought in American engineering. They bought Puerto Rican lands and made them pay handsomely. To the Puerto Ricans this looks like something stolen from them. Actually the companies bought poor-quality land, they paid good American dollers for it, thus giving the islanders more liquid capital than they had ever had before. They brought heavy expenditures for engineering installations, to irrigate their sandy lands, and large current pay rolls. Most of all, they brought the only means by which Puerto Ricans could learn that from which Americans had slowly built their wealth. They were learning to become skilled workers, machinists, foremen, and superintendents. Men whose fathers had been barefoot laborers coming down from the hills for spasmodic work in the cane fields were sent to technical schools and mastered the most complex industrial arts.

No one would assert that the sugar companies were engaged in philanthropy in Puerto Rico. They were engaged in hard-headed business. The important question is: which is better for Puerto Ricans, philanthropy which teaches them to wait for gifts, or hard-headed business which teaches them to leap the industrial gap of centuries?

LAND SHORTAGE IS NOT THE TROUBLE

Land shortage is not the trouble in Puerto Rico, Dr. Julius B. Matz, a member of the technical committee which was sent to the Island in 1934 by four Federal departments to study the Tugwell-Chardon plan, said that there were still thousands of acres that might be used for farming. Even without this evidence, the simplest observation shows that the islanders are not making the fullest use of their present land. The desperate shortage on the island is not a shortage of land or capital, but a shortage of the simple productive arts that the English learned in seatrade and the Americans in the wilderness. Today, as in 1900, the Puerto Ricans must learn to produce more, to move it quickly to market, to exchange it for what they need, and to use the surplus to start small workshops to make more of their own consumption goods. The only barrier is mental. We have not taught them our own admiration for the dull arts of production.

The arrival of American sugar companies made one change in the economy of the island. Workers who formerly had had their own garden plots, or a share in the produce of the plantations, were now getting cash wages and buying food. But they began to eat food the cost of which was unbearably high. The staple diet of the poorest Puerto Ricans is codfish brought from Labrador and beans brought from Mexico by way of New York. While Americans are importing Puerto Rican grapefruit and bananas and alligator pears, because of their high vitamin content

and rich oils, the poorest islanders are paying labor and capital charges to bring food over a long ocean voyage, with costly transshipments in the harbor of New York.

What is the cause of such a fantastic waste of the small income of the worker? The cause is again that the Puerto Ricans did not see how to move in and take advantage of the increased capital circulating in the island because of American business. The men who had sold their lands to the sugar companies had capital enough to have moved in and started the little businesses of Puerto Rico, as they were started in New England. Instead they built splendid new houses, or took their daughters to Paris for their debuts.

The rise in cash wages from sugar-company operations would have been followed in a British or American community by a rapid movement of local people into the business of collecting local foodstuffs and creating market channels by which they could flow toward the workers. They would have made profits to be sure, but what is the advantage of having the profits made by the shipping companies in New York?

There is no implication here that our continental ways are "right" and island ways are "wrong." It is not so simple as that. A visitor from the continent went into a hairdressing shop in San Juan to have her hair washed. After much soaping, the attendant tried to rinse it with a teacup of hot water. A hard struggle brought forth four or five cupfuls but the visitor had the sense of having used a whole afternoon's supply. As she was leaving the hairdresser charmingly expressed the hope of seeing her again, and said, "May I present you with a copy of my book of poems?"

PEOPLE MUST KNOW HOW TO WORK

What is said here is one part of the problem of values. If the Puerto Rican birth rate continues to rise, or the infant death rate to fall, the growing population cannot be supported by an economy of doctors, lawyers, politicians, and writers. The bulk of the people must be, as in England and the United States, people who know how to farm, to trade, to do mechanical work.

An unstable economy reeled under four successive blows: the world-wide collapse of sugar after the fall in war prices, two destructive hurricanes, and the great depression. For all of them the remedy of the American Government was relief—money instead of diagnosis. In every instance it made the difficulty worse.

The coffee growers whose mountain groves had suffered most from the hurricanes used the relief money to cultivate carefully the strips near the roads, where the Government inspector could see them, and spent the rest on new houses or new furniture. This was not simple dishonesty. It was much more serious. It was an inability to see that more production in farming would follow more work, and that the use of capital was a way to get still more return from one's work. They did not know "enterprise."

By 1933 thousands of workers who had been needed in the coffee hills had migrated to San Juan, where food was expensive, the housing shortage acute, and there was no hope of their getting jobs. The coffee hills were still barren, and as the trees which supported the coffee vines were left to die there was nothing to hold the soil in place. A great brown current could be seen far out in the blue ocean, where the rivers were carrying the island's topsoil out to sea. Everything indicated an end to the policy of relief and a shift to production and training in the productive arts.

When Governor Tugwell, then Under Secretary of Agriculture, came down in 1934 he saw the crowding, he saw the sugar companies making money, and he did not see the intricate lines of connection that must be followed for sound diagnosis. He "knew" that sugar company earnings must have been taken from the poor inhabitants.

Muñoz Marín, son of one of the island's great patriots, was building a new political party. He and Mr. Tugwell worked out the Chardon plan, which provided that the Federal Government was to give the Puerto Rican Government the funds to buy the sugar lands, which were then to be turned over to cooperatives of farmers, who were to divide the former sugar company profits.

Nothing was said in the first Chardon plan about who was to divide the losses. The authors apparently believed that profits followed automatically from the possession of land. Nothing was said about who was to direct the difficult engineering techniques of large-scale sugar production. Nothing was said about the coffee hills.

It would be unjust to assume that the only interest of the authors of the Chardon plan was political. They probably believed that the Robin Hood method was the only way to help the poor. But they also knew its political potency. When one of the members of the technical committee asked the Chardon group why they wanted Federal money, one of them said in a moment of laxity, "How do you think we are going to get into power if we do not get this money?"

The technical committee report severely criticized the omission of a plan for coffee and soil conservation in the Chardon plan. So a new plan was drafted with a new section, describing the technical committee's coffee program. They also adopted another recommendation of the technical committee, the proposal that the Federal Government form a kind of CCC for the young men of the island, to teach them skilled farming, simple mechanics, and cooperative marketing.

The United States has poured millions into the Chardon plan. It has bought millions of dollars' worth of sugar lands, and turned them over to politically organized "cooperatives." It has spent millions in wages for military installations. It has put many young Puerto Ricans into the Army, and they are now entitled to dismissal allowances which are large capital sums on the island. It has always given money, never skills.

YOUNGER MEN ARE PRIMARY PROBLEM

High sugar prices and military expenditures will support this artificial structure for a few years. The new sugar cooperatives are dependent on Federal subsidy in good years. They obviously will not weather bad ones. The economy of the island is no whit better than it was in 1932. In one sense it is worse. Politically the young men are learning how wicked the United States is, how little it gives compared with all its riches, and how foolish are the men who grub for a living. In this rich field the organizers of totalitarian movements are cultivating every spot. Anti-American feeling was never so high. The primary problem on the island is the young men. They now lack the old work habits of their grandfathers and the new ones of the continent.

They are the source of the population crisis, because there is a widespread belief that men are not obligated to stay with their wives. Many of the young men have one family, desert their wives for a younger woman and start another, even a third, family. Where a man who supported his family would have 5 children, they have 15. Where a man and his wife would work together to give each generation a better chance than the one before, the women work alone, and with all their desperate efforts achieve at best mere survival for their children. When the economic storms rise, they cannot even do that. In the end they sit down on the stones of the plaza, draw their babies about them, and wait for death from hunger.

Everything the young men of the island have learned since 1929 has weakened their ability to produce and their willingness to work for slow productive gains. That is the place to begin. It means a new kind of education, something that goes on all the time, draws in adults as well as children, and is closely tied to work. It is something like what Booker T. Washington did for his people, something like the original proposal of the technical committee for a CCC to teach farming and mechanics.

What is needed first is a complete shift from political to economic direction. Congress should declare that, after a very short and fixed period, not a dollar of money from the continent should be spent to maintain governmental income for projects that cannot sustain themselves. This change is essential to shift the balance of power on the island from those who are organizing political war to those who know how to organize production for peace.

NEED AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL TRAINING

Any Federal money that is spent on the island should be spent for agricultural and industrial training in actual work—not for the leaders but for the rank and file of workers. No program of relief or artificial employment has ever helped the islanders, and withdrawal of such aids, though harsh, will be healing, like resetting a badly set arm. But government cannot make the real contribution. What the Puerto Ricans need is a few economic Dr. Ashfords, men who will go to the island and live there, love the people for their lovable qualities and teach them what we learned from the frontier. The Puerto Ricans are able, devoted, and passionately eager. They will do everything they can. So far we have shown them only the wrong road.

Other models of what could be done are the self-help communities for miners started by Monsignor Ligutti in Iowa and the magnificent self-education of a people led by Father Tompkins and Father Coady in Antigonish. The new projects must be local and personal. They should have no overhead and no planners. They should plant seeds and let others reap.

Dr. Ashford tells in his autobiography of the only skirmish fought by his regiment with the retreating Spaniards. The peasants unperturbed worked on in the fields. One man, a Negro, was wounded. Carried to the Army medical station, his last words were: "I never thought to have had the honor of dying under the American flag."

It is still possible to redeem that hope. The Puerto Ricans wanted to be loyal to us. It is necessary only to give them of our best, not our money but our hard-won productive arts. It is not quite too late. And all Latin America, all Russian-organized Europe, and all Asia, are watching.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a letter from one of my constituents in my district in regard to OPA. The letter follows:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *April 9, 1946.*

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE:

Just a word of gripe I have to say. I am a man of 36 years of age, married, have a wife and 7-year son. Just got back from

serving 2 years in the United States Army, with 17 months of it in Europe, and now back in the grocery business, but don't think I can hold up much longer on the account of the OPA on your neck every day telling you how to run your own business. As a war vet, like all the other war vets, where is the free country that we just fought for? We all wonder. All of my buddies, like myself, stood from fox hole to another fighting to keep our freedom. We fought because we didn't want to have a dictator. We won this war, and now we feel that we don't need the OPA to dictate to us or try to show us how to run our own business.

It's not a small businessman in this country that can tell me he understands all about the OPA laws because it takes a damn good lawyer to understand it all.

Again, I will say, Where is our free country?

Sincerely,

HARRIS THIBODEAUX.

The Editor of the New Orleans States and the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me on April 12, 1946:

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask your indulgence tonight in a matter which I consider of the utmost importance because it establishes emphatically and beyond any doubt the extent to which individuals who at the moment happen to be in possession of editorial pages will go in a studied campaign of persecution against those who disagree with them politically.

I strongly agree with Thomas Jefferson in that if I had to choose between a government without newspapers or newspapers without government I would unhesitatingly choose the latter. I believe not only in the freedom of the press but of the freedom of the air. Freedom of the press is a freedom to tell the truth. It is also the freedom not to tell the truth. The selection of one course or the other lies in the conscience and intellectual honesty of the individual editor. I am proud of my 23 years' experience as a newspaperman. During those 23 years I disagreed on many occasions politically with many people. Tonight it is a source of satisfaction that I can look back over those years of service with the full knowledge that at no time did I take unfair advantage of those with whom I disagreed.

During recent weeks, the New Orleans States has seen fit to deliberately lie and misrepresent, as well as distort, my public record. I use the word "deliberately" advisedly because after the true facts were made known to them and they cringed under the lash of truth, this Ananias not only repeated his venal lie, but brought to the witness stand through trickery practiced on six of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, in a vain effort to persuade unsuspecting readers that the lie fell to me instead of to the editor of the New Orleans States.

Tonight I ask, Who lied?

And I shall unravel as the minutes pass, irrefutable documentary evidence of the malpractice of the editor of the New Orleans States insofar as I am concerned, because I refused to take political dictation from this newspaper. I shall attempt to present the case impassionately, without histrionics or oratory. The facts which I am about to present speak more eloquently than any phrases I could possibly put together.

Tonight I shall take this editor apart, bit by bit, and then let you who are good enough to listen to me present my case, decide who lied.

The New Orleans States on Wednesday, March 21, published an editorial under the heading "FELIX HÉBERT and the Pension," which was based on a definite statement, and I quote:

"We see by the Associated Press where FELIX EDWARD HÉBERT, Representative from the First Congressional District, has voted to provide a pension for himself."

There were no if's, and's, and but's about that statement. It was a definite statement that the Associated Press had said that I had voted myself a pension.

I have asked the Associated Press whether this is a true statement or not and the Associated Press has denied that it ever made such a statement. The Associated Press has sent me a copy of the dispatch which it sent out and in no part of that dispatch is there a mention of my voting myself a pension or any indication that I had voted myself a pension.

I, naturally, challenged the editor of the New Orleans States on this point, and on Wednesday, March 27, he buried my letter (which was to be expected) in the column Views of States Readers, and then devoted several times more space to another editorial pleading guilty of misrepresentation with an explanation and then trying to justify his guilt by using some remarks attributed to two Members of Congress from Louisiana, and four Members of Congress from the State of Mississippi.

It is noteworthy that this editor deliberately set about to distort the truth when he used only that part of the statements from my colleagues which suited his purpose, and deleted that part which exposed him.

This editorial was read to me on the long-distance telephone in Washington and I immediately sent the following wire to the editor of the New Orleans States. I quote:

"Text of your latest truth-twisting editorial just read to me on the telephone. Your editorial and cartoon was based on the lie that I voted myself a pension. All your half truths placed in the mouths of Members of Congress cannot rub out that lie. Why didn't you print entire statement of the Congressmen you quoted. I challenge you to explain why you used only that part of their statements to suit your purpose in an effort to cover up your unvarnished lie.

"I call upon you to prove and substantiate the unqualified statement that I voted myself a pension or stand publicly indicted for what I have exposed you to be. Here's your chance to prove which of us is telling the truth. I ask in the name of common decency and as a semblance of fair play that this telegram be published Thursday, March 28, the day after your latest untruthful editorial appeared and not wait until next week in a play for time to squirm out of the mess you have gotten into through distortion and misrepresentation."

What was his reply to that request?

Silence.

Complete silence.

The same silence which he has maintained in two other statements which I have sent him emphasizing the charge I have already made that the policy of the editor of the States is unlimited space for misrepresentation and one paragraph (sometimes) for the truth.

Instead of printing the wire, the editor the next day sunk to the lowest level of journalistic chicanery when he again engaged in characteristic prostitution of his news columns by including editorial matter in what was purported to be a news article on my weekly radio report from Washington. Following up the short résumé of my radio speech he requoted Representatives BROOKS, DOMENGEAUX, WHITTEN, WINSTEAD, WHITTINGTON, and MCGEHEE, but lo and behold, the quotes on the second day were different from the quotes he used in the editorial. Obviously, these gentlemen could not have said one thing one day and something else the next day. Since that time, everyone of these Members of Congress has directed a letter to the editor of the New Orleans States denouncing him for having twisted their words to suit his purpose. Everyone of these Members of Congress, for the sake of fairness, has asked that his letter be published in the New Orleans States.

And what did the editor do when these gentlemen requested him to publish their letters?

He attempted to avoid publishing them.

Although in one instance, that of Congressman DOMENGEAUX, the letter was written on March 29, it was not until Tuesday, April 9, that the letter of Congressman DOMENGEAUX was published by the New Orleans States. It was published with the letters of Congressmen WINSTEAD, WHITTEN, and WHITTINGTON.

What became of the letters from Congressman BROOKS and Congressman MCGEHEE on Tuesday? Why weren't they published with the others?

Lack of space?

The editor consumed enough space in a repetition of his half-truths involving all these men. He not only consumed the space but he trapped himself when in the comment he admitted that he had not published Congressman DOMENGEAUX's entire statement in his editorial.

Why didn't he publish the entire statement?

Obviously he was only using that part which suited his purpose and deleting that part which supported my position that he had deliberately misrepresented my vote and position.

Can the honesty and sincerity of such an individual be trusted?

He again treaded on the truth when he said, "Some of these Congressmen in letters to this newspaper have since expressed a desire to explain their original statement."

The fact is that not some, but every one of those Congressmen immediately wrote to the editor, not to explain their original statement but to call his hand for the manner in which they had been misled and the wrong interpretation placed on their statements. As Congressman BROOKS, of Louisiana, so aptly said: "They have used innocent words for an evil purpose."

Again he treats the truth lightly when he says each Congressman was asked, "Did you consider you were voting against the pension when you voted against the resolution to bring before the House the pension bill?"

Now it was easy or as casual as that.

This simple question was not asked and a simple statement given.

There was plenty conversation between the States' representative in Washington and the editor of the States himself with Members who were not in Washington at the time.

Because these men were quoted in part, and because they resented being used as tools of this editor, is the reason why every one of them have protested, only four of which were published Tuesday.

And why were they published 2 weeks after the editorial appeared and not when they were received?

That's an easy question to answer.

The editor of the New Orleans States never had any intention to publish any of the letters—he never had any intention until he learned that I was going to make this radio broadcast tonight.

He did not have any intention until he was informed of the title of the ad which has since appeared in the newspapers but which has been in their possession for several days before publication.

Chills went up and down his spine when he learned the question I was going to ask tonight.

"Who lied?"

He knew who lied and he immediately decided it was time to again try and explain away the truth and take a long shot at preventing my broadcast tonight.

He has accomplished neither objective but, in the delayed publication of some of the letters and his admission that in at least one instance he did not publish a complete statement until the next day, has focused the spotlight upon his perfidy more than ever.

I have before me copies of each letter written by each one of these gentlemen to the editor of the New Orleans States. I shall read each one of these six letters to you and again ask you, Who lied?

The first letter which I shall read was directed to the editor on March 29, and was sent him by Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX. Here is Mr. DOMENGEAUX'S own words in repudiation of the truth-straying editor:

"DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: I have just read your editorial appearing in the New Orleans States on Wednesday, March 27, 1946, entitled 'FELIX HÉBERT and the Pension.' It is not my desire to inject myself into this controversy that you are having with Representative HÉBERT, but since a portion of my statement given to your Washington correspondent was used as an argument to brand the statement of Representative HÉBERT as a lie, I feel that in fairness to all concerned it is incumbent upon me to express that if my entire statement had been used, such an interpretation would not have resulted.

"In this editorial you quoted Representative HÉBERT as follows: 'Let me state here and now that I did not, nor did any other Member of Congress, vote for or against any pension. * * *' I challenge you to show me where and when and by what vote H. R. 4199 [Editor's note: The pension bill] was acted upon by the Congress.

"This statement made by Representative HÉBERT is correct.

"In referring to my vote on this rule you commented in your editorial as follows: 'Representative DOMENGEAUX answered: "I did consider that I was voting against a pension for Congressmen."' This is also correct, but is only part of the statement which I gave. What I told your Washington correspondent was: 'I did consider that I was voting against the pension for Congressmen, but a vote for the rule would not necessarily mean a vote for the pension.'

"The fact that a Member of Congress votes for a rule, which was the vote in this instance, is not an indication of how he would vote if and when the legislation being considered is submitted to a final vote. I have on many occasions since being in Congress voted in favor of a rule and upon final passage voted against the legislation. I know many Members of Congress who follow the practice of always voting for a rule because in doing so they consider that legislation should always be given the opportunity of being argued and discussed by the House as a whole.

"Obviously, neither Mr. HÉBERT nor any Member who voted for the rule in this instance can be said to have voted himself a pension.

"You are at liberty to publish this letter.

"With every good wish, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES DOMENGEAUX."

Now comes the letter from Congressman OVERTON BROOKS which was not published on Tuesday with the letters from Congressmen DOMENGEAUX, WHITTEN, WINSTEAD, and WHITTINGTON. Congressman BROOKS said:

"DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: In a recent issue of the New Orleans States, in an editorial entitled 'FELIX HÉBERT and the Pensions,' I am quoted as having stated in reference to my vote at the time the rule to consider the so-called pension bill came to the House of Representatives that 'I consider that I was voting against that type of pension at that particular time.' The quotation is correct.

"It was my intention to vote against and to kill the pension bill. At the same time I am sure you recognize the fact that the vote was on the rule which would decide whether or not the pension bill itself was to be considered and debated by the House of Representatives.

"Since the House killed the rule, the bill has never been presented for consideration. I am sure you realize that an affirmative vote for the rule did not bind a Member to support the bill itself.

"I trust this clears up the parliamentary situation, and I will appreciate your giving this letter appropriate publicity.

"Yours truly,

"OVERTON BROOKS,
"Member of Congress."

And now comes the letter to the editor of the New Orleans States from Congressman JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, who, too, asked that his letter be published, and who resented the unfair implication in the editorial, and I read you Congressman WHITTEN'S letter:

"GENTLEMEN: I have had shown to me a copy of an editorial in a recent edition of your paper quoting my statement with regard to the vote on the rule to bring up the congressional pension bill. This statement was given without any desire or intent to be involved in political matters. Personally I was opposed to the congressional pension and knowing that a vote for the rule sometimes might be misconstrued as a vote for the bill I voted against the rule.

"Ordinarily many Members of the Congress follow a practice of voting for all rules in order to consider bills, regardless of whether or not they are in favor of the bill to be considered. I believe if you will make a check you will find this to be true. I think I am safe in saying that while I voted against the rule because I was opposed to the bill, others who were just as much opposed to the bill believing that the House should be permitted to consider any measure voted for the rule.

"I write you this because I believe it is unfair to use my statement as against the great number who supported the rule but were opposed to the bill.

"Thanking you to correct the impression left by quoting my statement, I am,

"Yours very truly,

"JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
"Member of Congress."

Now comes Congressman ARTHUR WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, whose name was also used in the editorial and who was also a victim of the liberties taken by the editor of the New Orleans States with his words. He calls the hand of the States editor when he wrote him on March 29 as follows:

"GENTLEMEN: I have seen an editorial which appeared recently in your paper with reference to the vote on the rule to bring up the congressional retirement bill.

"I do not follow the practice, but many Members of Congress support the rule to permit the consideration of legislation even though they are opposed to the legislation itself. I was opposed to the congressional retirement bill, and if the rule had passed I expected to vote against it. However, I do not feel that my statement with reference to this matter should have been used as evidence to show that anyone who voted for the rule was in favor of the legislation. I certainly did not intend for my statement to imply such, nor do I feel that it should be used against any Member who voted for the rule, for the reason that there are many Members who no doubt opposed the bill but did vote for the rule.

"I shall appreciate it very much if you will correct the impression left by quoting my statement.

"Sincerely yours,

"ARTHUR WINSTEAD."

The next is a letter from Congressman WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, whom the editor of the New Orleans States sought out at his home in Greenwood, Miss., on the long-distance telephone, and who specifically asked the editor of the New Orleans States that his entire language be quoted if anything was quoted at all, and whose request for publication of the truth has been ignored by the editor of the New Orleans States. Mr. WHITTINGTON wrote as follows:

"EDITOR, NEW ORLEANS STATES:

"My attention has been called to an editorial from the States of March 27, 1946, entitled 'FELIX HÉBERT and the Pension,' and to that part of the editorial in which I am quoted as having said, 'I considered that I was voting against the pension bill. I oppose pensions for elected officials. I voted against the rule and I would have voted against the pension bill if the rule had carried.'

"In addition to the language of mine quoted, I also stated and asked that the following be included with the language quoted: 'It is not unusual for Members to vote for a rule and then vote against a bill on final passage.'

"I will appreciate the publication of this letter so that the statement in full may appear substantially as I made it.

"Respectfully,

"WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
"Member of Congress."

But now comes the most damning testimony of all. It comes from Congressman DAN R. MCGEHEE, of Mississippi, who not only was misquoted but argued with the editor of the New Orleans States about the propriety of insinuating that a vote for a rule was a vote for or against a bill. On April 6, after his return to Washington, Congressman MCGEHEE sent the following letter to the editor of the New Orleans States and he doesn't pull any punches in what he has to say.

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: On my return to Washington, I was shown a copy of an editorial in your paper on Wednesday, March 27, the day after I talked with you over the telephone in New Orleans, which editorial had reference to the vote of your Congressman, Mr. FELIX HÉBERT, on the pension bill. I note you have quoted several of the Congressmen from Louisiana and Mississippi as to their intention in voting against the rule which provided for the consideration of a new bill.

"Fitzpatrick, you did not quote me as I intended, and the reason for the misquotation, I am sure, is because you misunderstood my intentions in our conversation. You quotation says, 'I voted to kill the rule because I knew that would kill the bill. When you get a fork on the snake's neck, you step on it.'

"As I stated to you over the phone, a vote for a rule certainly does not indicate that you are for the bill for I have uniformly voted for rules on many bills which I was opposed to and voted against the bills when they came up for consideration. I voted against this rule because I did not like this

pension bill. It was one time during my service that I voted against the rule so as to try to make short order of further consideration of the bill.

"You are certainly unfair to Congressman HÉBERT to accuse him of voting for a pension because he voted for the rule. In fact, it would be unfair to any Congressman for any person to accuse him likewise. A strict interpretation of the vote on the two, that is a rule and a bill, is certainly two separate and distinct propositions, but uniformly our newspapermen and the public judge the intentions of the membership of Congress by their vote on a rule when the membership does not consider a vote on a rule as any intention whatever of voting on the legislation the rule controls.

"Fitzpatrick, I have read HÉBERT's letter to you which you quoted along with the editorial, and he is absolutely correct in his statement, and I am sure that every Member of Congress will bear me out in the interpretation that he gave you, and that which I tried to convey to you over the phone.

"I am writing this letter to you in fairness to Congressman HÉBERT. He is looked upon by the membership of the House of Representatives as one of its most outstanding Members. Not only for his exceptional ability, but straightforwardness and a square shooter, and without any reservations in letting you know where he stands at all times, which characteristics any constituency should be proud their Representative possesses.

"Sincerely yours,

"DAN R. MCGEHEE."

In my letter to the editor you know that I made the statement that no Member of Congress had actually voted for or against a pension.

I repeat that again and again and offer these documentary statements by the very witnesses the States used in its distortion of the truth and attempted to pass the lie to me after they had been caught in a lie.

Yes, Mr. Editor, to use your own words, this mass of evidence gives the lie to the statements and half truths contained in your editorial. These six Congressmen are the Congressmen that you quoted only in part. These six Congressmen told you the truth, but you failed to repeat what they said, and when they made a request for you to tell the whole truth you ignored that request until you got smoked out.

And now to clinch the case against you, you make the statement, "These six Congressmen were opposed to the bill and they voted then and there to kill it."

I read you the letter which I have from Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian, House of Representatives, and the highest authority on parliamentary procedure. His letter to me speaks for itself and I read it:

"DEAR MR. HÉBERT: I have before me your letter dated March 26, 1946, and note your question as to the present status of H. R. 4199, a bill introduced by Mr. CARL VINSON, of Georgia, known as the congressional retirement bill.

"You also ask, 'Has this bill ever been voted on by the House of Representatives?'

"The bill, H. R. 4199, was reported from the Committee on Civil Service December 7, 1945, was referred to the Union Calendar of the House, and is still on that calendar. On December 7, 1945, the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives reported a resolution (H. Res. 452) making H. R. 4199 a special order of business. This resolution was called up in the House on March 12, 1946, and after debate the resolution was rejected on a roll-call vote, yeas 116, nays 217, answering 'present' 2, not voting 96. The bill, of course, did not come before the House and still retains its place on the Union Calendar.

"LEWIS DESCHLER,
"Parliamentarian,
House of Representatives."

I repeat for the sake of emphasis Mr. Deschler's last sentence, "The bill, of course, did not come before the House and still retains its place on the Union Calendar."

The bill is certainly not dead and is just as alive as it ever was and can be brought to a vote in the House at any time a rule is adopted, or by unanimous consent.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have heard the evidence. You have been good to listen to me, and having listened and having heard the evidence, I ask you, who lied?

And as I leave you this evening I leave you a vivid picture in your mind, I leave you the picture of a journalistic Rasputin seeking to cover a black heart with the armor of a Galahad. I leave you a picture of a knave posing as a knight, hanged by a rope of truth and dangling on a gallows of public scorn and contempt, and I caption that picture in the lines of Tennyson—

"Ay, knave, because thou strikest as a knight,
Being but a knave, I hate thee all the more."

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, who lied?

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Left Our Democracy Stronger Than He Found It

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, of all the words which we Americans poured forth on the first sad anniversary of the death of our fallen leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, I feel that one of the most intelligent and objective estimates of our late President's role in world and American history was made by Raymond Swing, the widely known commentator of the American Broadcasting Co., in his radiocast of Thursday, April 11. I am, therefore, under permission previously granted, inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Mr. Swing's script for that broadcast:

As we reach the end of the first year since the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the thoughts which come most easily to those who love and honor him express a sense of loss from his death rather than an assurance of gain from his life. It is natural to miss his experienced hand in national and international affairs. It is a temptation to make comparisons, and to estimate how much different the state of the world would be had he lived. But such thinking not only is idle, it misses the mark altogether. A great man is not known by what he might have accomplished. Keats and Schubert died young and some lament them for the works they were prevented from writing, whereas the works they poured out in their short years are what make them renowned.

Franklin Roosevelt did not need to stretch out his hand to an unlived future for his laurels. Nor does one have to measure him alongside lesser men to see that he was great. The acclaim of history and the love borne a leader by his generation are neither of them relative. One does not count Jefferson to be great because some of his colleagues were less great, or esteem Lincoln for the reason that he presents a contrast with his predecessors or successors. If one thinks in these days only of the loss suffered by the country and the world through Roosevelt's death it would be a dismal mistake to take note of the anniversary of tomorrow. On the contrary, to think of it should bring a renewal of faith and courage.

BRINGING PERIODS TO A CLOSE

At the time of his death a signal characteristic of President Roosevelt's career seemed to be that it was given to him to bring important periods to a close. Thus he led the Nation almost within sight of the end of the war. Previously he had led it out of the depression. He put an end to the studied indifference on the part of Government to the cycles of business. He closed off finally and permanently all social disregard for the security of the aged and the unemployed. His leadership in foreign affairs ended the epoch of isolation.

And it seemed, when he died, that this emphasis on his having brought things to an end somehow meant that we lacked the leadership to grapple with the almost insoluble problems of the future. Since he had not lived quite long enough to witness the culmination of the victory he helped to forge, he would not be there to manipulate and mold the peace. He would not pilot the newly launched organization of the United Nations. He would not be present with his priceless ability to command the respect of the leaders of other systems and cultures, like Russia and China, and so be available to make the inventive adjustment and modifications which cooperation with others always calls for.

It seemed that Franklin Roosevelt either ended things or was destined to be the man of transition. He took his generation out of something familiar and led it to the threshold of something unfamiliar. And, as a man of transition, he appeared to be bringing things to a close rather than to be beginning something new. That was the way the emphasis has fallen naturally during a part of this past year. For we as a nation have been feeling our way in untried paths, not sure of our power, our wisdom, our safety, and we ourselves have been obsessed with bringing to a close the entire episode of the war, and all that went with it in the way of restraints and regulation.

THE DOORS HE OPENED

But anyone who stops to analyze the career of President Roosevelt is likely to see that while he did end things, he was more notable for beginning them. And his truer significance is not in the doors he closed but the doors he opened. At the time of his death that was not so apparent as it is today. One of President Roosevelt's most important decisions was not known then. That was his sponsorship of the physicists in their work to release atomic energy. I say that was one of his most important decisions. More likely it is the most important single decision made in our times in the effect it will have on the human race. The door which President Roosevelt opened with his decision has not closed out the industrial concepts of the past, but it has given the world the promise of untold blessings from an inexhaustible supply of atomic energy. It also has raised the greatest peril the human race has ever faced. The blessings of atomic energy cannot be enjoyed until the peril has been mastered. And this now becomes the chief concern of mankind for the years ahead. Surely this is an era which Franklin Roosevelt opened rather than his having simply closed the preatomic era.

One also can be sure he would not have surrendered to the concept of an inevitable atomic war. That was not his cast of mind. He did fight a world war, he could fight. He was not afraid. But he fought against tyranny, not to enter into an age tyrannized by the terror of annihilation. He fought for the freedoms, to enlarge the liberties of men, to advance the status of common people. What he valued in power was the use that could be made of it to liberate. He did not so conduct the war as to make the United

States strong for the sake of strength, but strong for the sake of the moral responsibilities of which we then could acquit ourselves.

I should like to suggest that it may be a mistake to stress the factor of transition in President Roosevelt's leadership. That is, the change which we call transition may not be quickly over. It may be a semipermanent condition. President Roosevelt, in pulling the country out of the depression, rescued the system of private enterprise and lived to see it expand to surpass any anticipations of abundance ever previously held. It was not unregulated private enterprise. It had to give full economic power to workers. It had to function in a society which paid enough taxes to bring a new minimum standard of social security. This society produced wealth unequally but it redistributed it. The Nation as a whole assumed the responsibility to provide for the individual who, in the complexity of modern industrialism, was unable to survive by individualism alone.

FREEDOM AND ABUNDANCE

Two words are the heart of the Roosevelt philosophy—"freedom" and "abundance." They are not words of transition. They are not words of the past. For ancient, medieval, and modern man has never enjoyed abundance in the measure which he is capable of producing. And two of the "four freedoms," the freedom from want and the freedom from fear, have yet to be achieved, not only in the world at large but in this country as well. Both perhaps are within sight. We are moving toward the reign of law in international affairs, which will be the end of anarchy and war. Indeed the discovery of atomic power makes the acceptance of law among nations essential to survival. And we now know that since we can produce bountifully for war we can produce in like measure for peace. There is no more virtue in scarcity than in illness or malnutrition. The first economic virtue is to produce and to be able to consume what is produced.

Writing in the current Saturday Review of Literature, Norman Cousins observes the anniversary of the death of Pericles, who also led his people into war, who taught them the virtues of freedom, and died before the war ended. It is an arresting parallel and a brilliant contemporary commentary. It points out that Pericles alone could not achieve what he envisioned. That was for the Athenians to do. They had to live according to the truths he showed them. And so today the leadership of Roosevelt will have come to an end only if the infusion of his generation with his light has been stopped, and we fail to apply the truths we expounded. These are the truths of freedom, not only the freedom of worship and of expression which are well established here, but the freedom from fear and want which are by no means established.

Is it not a fair assumption that President Roosevelt, one of whose courageous acts in the foreign field was to recognize the then ostracized Soviet Union, would not point the way today to a revival of that ostracism? Can one not be sure that he would want to find ways to get along with foreign countries, and would make any personal effort, and devote himself to the most careful study and most patient exploration to bring about better cooperation? Would he not keep the emphasis on the imperative necessity of living free of fear, not only our living that way, but other nations living that way, if all of us are to enjoy the blessings of the abundance which we are capable of producing? I am not suggesting that he would have surrendered moral principle for the sake of pacific relations with anybody. But the emphasis would have been marked on trying to find a way to get along, and on trying to understand.

AMERICAN PEOPLE HIS PARTNERS

I would not agree that we are the Athenians of modern times. For I would not agree that the American people have abandoned the truths upheld by Franklin Roosevelt. The American people joined in the comprehension of those truths. They always were partners of Mr. Roosevelt, rather than mere followers. They had a creative hand in his creations. He guided them and they guided him. That this can be is the secret of the vitality of democracy. And Mr. Roosevelt left our democracy stronger than he found it, much stronger, and more capable of survival. And that is to say that the American people are more aware of being democratic, know better their own power and their principles than they did.

Nor is the fidelity of the American people to Roosevelt truths partisan in its nature. For some it still may count as partisan to praise Franklin Roosevelt within a year of his death, and a narrow Republican in a campaign year might be chary about doing it. But the doctrine of freedom and faith in abundance are not truths earmarked by any party. There are as many Democrats as Republicans who hold to the principles of Lincoln. Just so, it is good Republicanism today to aspire to a world of good neighborliness, to social security, and to full employment in a world of freely moving trade. Nor is the application of these principles something in transition. In the future there may be more or less Government regulation of economic life. But thanks to Mr. Roosevelt, there long will be private business in America and there long will be personal freedom. And if we heed Mr. Roosevelt truly enough we can be entering an era of abundance which will lift the level of this Nation to unprecedented heights, and in so doing raise the level of living everywhere.

Franklin Roosevelt's death deprived us of his immediate guidance. That is indeed a loss. But his life was a gift which does not diminish unless, like the Athenians, we do forget.

Congress and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted Friday, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial, which appeared in the April 6, 1946, issue of the New York Times entitled "Congress and Price Control":

CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROL

Congress is now confronted with the question whether it should extend price control beyond the present termination date of June 30 of this year, and if so, how it should amend the powers granted to the Office of Price Administration. We are unlikely to deal with this problem intelligently unless we understand the basic economic principles and facts involved.

There has been an unfortunate assumption in Washington that price control is or ought to be the major means of combating inflation, yet price control deals only with the symptoms and consequences of inflation; it does not deal at all with its two basic causes. The first of these, and the most important, is the increase in the quantity of money and bank credit in the country. The amount of this has more than tripled since the outbreak of the war in Europe. We cannot have such an increase in the monetary purchasing power in circulation without its forcing up the level of prices. The second basic cause is a shortage of goods.

Price control does nothing to remove either of these basic causes. It has at best only a secondary and transitional role to play in combating inflation. Its chief function from now on is to prevent needless price rises in those cases in which a shortage cannot be made up for a long time, and in which a price increase could do little to speed the process. The outstanding example of this is rents on existing housing.

With this background it is clear that the time has come for Congress to make sure that price control is liberalized in some directions, tapered off in others, and in some cases terminated altogether. These general requirements indicate the nature of some of the amendments that are now necessary:

1. Rationing powers should be continued for all goods that are in short supply. Fortunately, Congress has already provided for this. It was a basic mistake for OPA to abolish rationing while continuing price control. This has helped to aggravate the world food crisis. Price ceilings in themselves encourage consumption; as long as they are retained, rationing is required to offset this effect.

2. It is a mistake of the first order to put ceilings on new houses or on rents for new apartments. The effect of this can only be to discourage, reduce, or prevent the construction of buildings now so desperately needed. Rent ceilings should, of course, be retained on existing houses and apartments. Congress would do well, however, to put the States and localities on notice that Federal rent control will definitely terminate on June 30, 1947. In this way the question of rent control could be taken out as soon as practicable from the Federal domain and placed in that of the States and localities, where it properly belongs.

3. Congress should provide that as soon as possible after June 30 price-fixing will no longer apply to any commodity that does not enter into the Government's cost-of-living index or is not a recognized substitute for such a commodity. One way in which Congress might deal with this problem would be to instruct OPA to compile and publish a list of such articles subject to price control and to regulate no others later than, say, October 1.

4. To aid the process of decontrol, Congress might provide also that when any product in competitive production once goes below the ceiling price and stays there for, say 30 days, the price ceiling should be permanently removed. Such a provision would not, of course, prevent a later price rise of that commodity; but it would be a method of checking out commodities, one by one, wherever a sudden price rise was unlikely.

5. Some method must be found for removing articles from price control when they have ceased to be in short supply. The provision that they shall be removed "when supply comes into balance with demand" is too vague to be of much value. One possible formula, as an illustration, is that OPA should be instructed to remove price controls from any article when the supply or production rate of that article is equal to the average of that in the immediate prewar period and when unfilled orders for it do not exceed the equivalent of a month or two's production.

6. Some liberalization should be made in the pricing standards for goods that remain under control. The profit standard of the period 1936 to 1939, when unemployment averaged more than 8,000,000, is not adequate for full employment conditions. OPA should not be permitted to force any existing

firm to sell goods below its actual out-of-pocket costs of production. It should not be permitted to continue cost-absorption policies, or to force manufacturers, wholesalers, or retailers to sell goods at a lower dollar-and-cents margin or profit per unit than the prewar or the existing level.

7. Subsidies should not be increased, but should, on the other hand, be tapered off as rapidly as possible.

8. Congress might well consider setting up a board of price appeals, the members of which would be independent of OPA administrators and appointed directly by Congress itself. Such a board would have purely advisory powers. Its chief function would be to clarify the public mind regarding the factual merits of price disputes.

There is wide possible latitude in amendments to the Price Control Act, but their basic purpose is clear. They should try to provide for a tapering off of price controls as promptly and as smoothly as conditions make possible.

Thomas Jefferson, Author of American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ever since I was 18 years old I have endeavored to familiarize myself with the history of our great country, and when I read several volumes and essays on the life and works of Thomas Jefferson, author of the immortal Declaration of American Independence and enunciator of more great and broad principles of democratic government than any other man in history, my imagination and my loyalty were seized. Ever since that time I have been a true and loyal devotee of Thomas Jefferson and of the lofty principles of popular and responsible government which he urged and advocated.

The tireless and versatile energy of Thomas Jefferson impels my admiration as much as his unswerving devotion to the principles of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. He was a patron of the arts, an architect, an agriculturist; his vast and prized library was purchased by the Congress as the foundation of the present Library of Congress. He was an athlete of note, and socially popular. He was a scientific observer and writer of distinction.

JEFFERSON YEARS AHEAD OF HIS TIME

Notwithstanding the fullness of his private life, with its amazing sweep of interest and accomplishment, it was Jefferson's tremendous impact on modern government which has made him one of the heroes of the onward march of democratic government.

He was years ahead of his time.

It is, in fact, only now, under the impetus of another Jefferson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that we in America have begun to reach fully the sovereignty of the people envisaged by Thomas Jefferson; and how much better off we would be, Mr. Speaker, if even now we devoted ourselves fully to the magnificent concepts of human freedom established by this genius of the American continent.

Jefferson's interests in popular government were as wide as his private interests in the arts and sciences.

On his tombstone, at his request, are no fulsome eulogies of his life; but simply engraved are the words he asked for: "Author of the Declaration of Independence; of the Statute for Religious Liberty in Virginia; and founder of the University of Virginia."

HE BELIEVED IN ENLIGHTENMENT

Thomas Jefferson believed, as others have before and since, that the people, given light, will find their own way. His great contribution was in making enlightenment possible; in the instrumentation and application of principles on which modern popular governments of republican form are firmly founded. He was the author of scores of major state papers during his public life. His devotion to a free, independent, tax-supported educational system in Virginia, which was to be the source of inspiration for free public schools of the United States elsewhere, occupied many years of his life. Similarly, his struggle against ecclesiastical restrictions on the freedom of the human mind, resulting in the Religious Liberty Act, laid down the pattern of separation of church and State and of freedom of religious conscience which was embodied in the United States Constitution and has insured to all Americans the right to worship God in their own way and without any legal restriction.

There are, unfortunately, many who claim to be Jeffersonian Democrats who yet do not follow his admonitions and his precepts, and who choose from his vast writings only a few points which are, frankly, inconsistent with Jefferson's greatest and broadest principles. My fervent hope is that, as a result of the large attendance in the House today, as we observe the two hundred and third anniversary of his birth, there will be impressed upon the minds and hearts of all present a renewed understanding of the cardinal points of Jefferson's teaching.

FOUNDATION OF ALL DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENTS

First and foremost I would stress his advocacy of a republican form of government and of the sovereignty of the people, and his opposition to privileged orders of nobility and the entail system which this naturally implied.

Then I would stress Jefferson's belief in universal education, free circulating libraries, separation of church and State, freedom of thought and speech, peace, political equality, universal suffrage; opposition to monopolies, slavery, and nepotism.

These are the foundations of the American form and practice of government. They are the foundation of the Democratic Party. They are the foundations of every democratic government in the world today, and it is my fervent hope that all governments which are not modeled on the principles of government pronounced by Jefferson and instilled into our own democratic processes will be so modeled shortly, for I firmly believe that our form of government, molded by him, is the most advantageous to any and all people.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—When Congress Had Power and Exercised It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, an interesting account of the proceedings of Congress during the period when it exercised control of the executive departments of Government recently came to the congressional desk in the regular mail. The record is presented in a book entitled "The President, the Supreme Court, and Seven Senators." Congress still retains all the power conferred upon it by the Constitution—exercised in these days by the direction of those in control of the executive departments.

Witness legislation that created the existing national debt and the sacrifice the homes of this country have been forced to make to wage a global war and now the plan to use taxpayers' money to finance peacetime commerce of favored European nations. In considering present day conditions it is reassuring to know that Congress still has the power to formulate and control governmental policies. If the membership was properly organized and knew how to use this power. For the information and consideration of the Members there is presented here five chapters taken from the book, The President, the Supreme Court, and Seven Senators, by "Alfalfa" Bill Murray and Anson B. Campbell:

CHAPTER V

STEVENS BUILDS A DIRECTORY

Jackson had his Kitchen Cabinet, but it was more of a sales staff than an advisory board. Roosevelt has his "brain trust"—a kind of combination sales staff, lobby, and school of ghost writers. And Thaddeus Stevens had his directory.

It was a joint committee of 15 Congressmen and Senators, vested with absolute power in all matters related to the South, with one exception, and that blithely ignored by the Pennsylvania boss. The directory owned Congress, and Stevens owned the directory.

As a slight concession to the finer sensibilities of his coconspirators, he called it the Committee of Public Safety. It came out of a secret caucus the night before the regular Republican caucus, and was swallowed in toto by the party caucus and both Houses of the Thirty-ninth Congress—and that despite a possible majority in both Houses favorable to the Lincoln-Johnson reconstruction plan, had there been aggressive leadership.

But revolutions are not born in a day. While the decisive battle of the postwar revolution was fought in 1868, it was Booth's bullet, on the night of April 14, 1865, that marked the zero hour, and all the forces of dark and dangerous dogma went into action.

In record time the Congress jammed through an intricate network of reconstruc-

tion legislation including the Tenure-of-Office Act—a law to prevent the President from removing any administrative official, including members of his own Cabinet, without the advice and consent of the Senate. That law, unchallenged, would have destroyed the Executive, and reduced the three equal and coordinate branches of Government to a monstrous fiction.

Ironically enough, it was Edward M. Stanton, Johnson's Secretary of War, who wrote the Johnson veto message on the Tenure-of-Office Act; and it was for the removal of Secretary Stanton that Johnson was impeached, under the act passed over his veto.

With the groundwork of impeachment well laid in legislation, the Directory turned its attention to propaganda, to the distribution of incendiary material and the building of a machine to bury Congress with petitions should occasion require. They did their work well, and the hecklers along the Presidential tour proved, if mobs ever prove anything, that the country was prepared for anything the Directory wished to do to the Presidency, the American system, the Constitution, the South, or anything else.

The press and pulpit echoed Yates' "The President must be taken out of the way." Great church leaders prayed for God to "save our Senators from error," not defining themselves very clearly but figuring God would catch on; and a Negro bishop called mightily on "de Lawd" to save us from "dat demented Moses of Tennessee." They were under the impression that President Johnson and certain "wavering" Senators were standing between them and something. They were, but it wasn't what they thought.

Stevens' espionage system was the equal of anything ever seen in Washington. Spies literally camped on the doorsteps of timid solons, rubbed shoulders with them in restaurants and gaming places, and kept some of them scared half to death with salacious inferences. Not that they were necessarily immoral—they were probably about an average—but frighten a timid man with a woman story he is afraid to publicize by denying, and he can be blackmailed into almost anything.

Then, of course, there was the feminine lobby. During the World War it was called the sex squad. A woman with a sylphlike form and lazy, languorous smile makes a splendid lobbyist, and Thaddeus Stevens wasn't overlooking anything. A great many good people who think they know their Government would be surprised to know how a great many laws are passed, and some of them good laws.

You've heard of little Vinnie Ream? She has relatives in Oklahoma. Vinnie was a sculptress with a studio in the Capitol basement, and her father owned the boarding house where Senator Edmund G. Ross, of Kansas, lived.

Certainly that didn't prove anything, nor was it an occasion for accusation, but spies dogged her steps day and night, and big, heavy-jowled solons browbeat and threatened her until she was on the verge of hysterics. Vinnie wasn't a member of the sex squad; they were only trying to draft her. Later they put her out of the basement, and it was Stevens, the most unconscionable of them all, who made them put her back.

Stevens was conscious of his power. With the Directory taking orders verbatim, with Congress cowed and whipped into line, with the press and pulpit voicing hates born of war, and with the Supreme Court intimidated, his objectives seemed assured.

CHAPTER VI

THE DIRECTORY STRIKES

When the Fortieth Congress met, Stevens deemed it time to strike—to strike at the mudsill of the Republic, the principle of separate powers. He had the votes; he had the press and pulpit; he had the occasion—Johnson's removal of Stanton; and he had the law—the Tenure of Office Act.

The set-up was so complete, so airtight, so foolproof that no member of the President's Cabinet doubted that he would be convicted. The House had voted 11 impeachment articles, and the Senate was more than 3-to-1 Republican. Apparently there was little chance to fail.

Some of the President's friends were counseling conciliation in a vain hope of recruiting doubtful or wavering Senators, but that hope was dashed 2 days after the trial began, when the President lashed Congress with a sizzling veto of a bill to reduce the powers of the Supreme Court. It was the sort of strategy that would have been expected of a "Hickory" Jackson or a Grover Cleveland.

The Johnson veto message was a bold stroke, but the Directory had an answer. Both Houses promptly passed the bill over his veto, with only nine Senate Democrats voting to sustain him.

The veto message was worthy of the best in American tradition, but it only furnished a vehicle for the calumnies of his foes. The previous Congress had damned his first message with faint praise, commended his disposition to cooperate with Congress, and facetiously indulged the hope that he would continue to cooperate; and some of the President's more timid friends were expecting something from the "cooperate" argument until Johnson knocked it into a cocked hat. Years later the President of the United States was to bitterly complain that the Supreme Court lacked a disposition to cooperate.

The Congressional Globe of 1868, particularly the debate on the Supreme Court bill veto, reads very much like portions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1937.

Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana, Democratic leader and later Vice President under Cleveland, led the fight to sustain the veto; and William M. Stewart, of Nevada, Republican and member of the Committee on Judiciary, led the fight to override the veto.

Hendricks contended that the Constitution contemplated that all legislation should be subject to court test, that the Supreme Court is the final arbiter on all questions of Constitution. "Marshall thought so; Taney thought so; and I cite the lights of the law," he argued. Johnson had taken the same ground in his veto. "Thus far," he said, "during the existence of the Government the Supreme Court of the United States has been viewed by the people as the true expounder of the Constitution."

Stewart's answer has a familiar ring. "The Supreme Court must receive the law from the lawmaking power," he said. The President of the United States was insisting on the same principle in 1936 when he told Congress: "The Congress has the right and can find the means to protect its own prerogatives."

Now, get this straight. Hendricks was a Democrat, and he was voicing what has always been and still is the Democratic position. Stewart was a radical Republican, and was voicing the radical, or what Theodore Roosevelt later termed the "lunatic fringe," philosophy.

The Stewart answer was in harmony with the anti-Court agitation that had raged since the decision in the Milligan case about 2 years before. And that takes us back to the closing years of the war.

Lamdin Milligan, of Indiana, was an alleged member of the Knights of the Golden Circle, a secret order that had sprung up in the Northwest during the Civil War as a counter movement to the Union Leagues the Republicans had organized. They had about 175,000 members in Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois; and were in rather bad repute in the North by reason of their password—"Nu-oh-lac," the name of the great Carolinian, Calhoun, spelled backward.

In the fall of 1864 Milligan was arrested, tried before a military tribunal, and sentenced to be hanged. Nine days before his date with the hangman the United States Circuit Court of Indiana granted him a writ of habeas corpus. He appealed to the Supreme Court on the ground that he was entitled to trial by a jury of his peers; that he had not been in the military service; that the authority of the General Government had been unopposed in Indiana; that the courts were open and their processes unobstructed; and that the military tribunal had no jurisdiction over him.

Early in April 1866 the Supreme Court, by unanimous decision, held in favor of Milligan; and the revolutionists struck at the Court with a vindictiveness unprecedented and little expected. The radical press waved its bloody shirt. Let the courts beware.

The Cleveland Herald believed: "A future Congress will reorganize the Court." Harper's Weekly suggested that "The Supreme Court be swamped by a thorough reorganization and an increased number of judges." A Washington correspondent for another paper wrote: "Mr. Stevens is preparing some stringent measures to protect the country from the evil tendencies of the Supreme Court." John Jay expressed apprehension about the attitude of the Court on "the great questions that will come before them in reference to reconstruction."

Then came the McCardle case—and after 2 years of fire in one of the greatest crises of the century * * *.

Colonel McCardle was an editor down in the fourth district, what had been Mississippi—they weren't using names then, you know. He had written something about General Orb, the fourth district commandant, that the general didn't like.

Orb had him arrested, tried before a drumhead court martial, and sentenced to be shot. A drumhead is a summary trial during military operations, and certainly not the right procedure, but the general wanted the editor killed and the courts were too uncertain. McCardle had been denied a writ of habeas corpus, and it looked bad for the southern editor until his lawyer remembered a provision in one of the reconstruction laws providing for a direct appeal to the Supreme Court. It was a provision jammed through the previous Congress to protect carpetbaggers unfortunate enough to fall into the hands of local courts.

McCardle filed his appeal, and the case was argued shortly before the Johnson impeachment trial began. But pending a decision the Congress jammed through another bill, over the President's veto, depriving the Court of jurisdiction, and the intimidated Court was glad enough to find a way out.

That was the Supreme Court bill President Johnson vetoed the second day of this trial, knowing the Congress would pass it over his veto, but hoping the Court would act within the 10 days that had to elapse before the bill became law. The Court didn't act, and Justice Grier, who had been appointed to the Court by Polk, filed an opinion disclaiming responsibility for the deliberate "evasion of the performance of a duty imposed on us by the Constitution."

The directory had struck; Johnson had struck back; the Supreme Court had been clubbed out of the way; and the trial swung into high.

CHAPTER VII

TRYING THE CONSTITUTION

Technically, the United States Senate was trying one Andrew Johnson for the violation of a Federal law, but actually it was trying the President of the United States for being President, trying the Constitution for making him President, and trying the doctrine responsible for the Constitution—the doctrine of separate powers.

The trial was an interesting vindication of the philosophy that right makes might, that

"one with God is a majority." I want no more conclusive proof of God than the story of the Republic. Three times the Republic's basic theory has been seriously challenged, and its organic law tested in an unfriendly court.

One test was in 1837, with all the banks and 75 percent of the businesses closed; with revenue stopped and no way to pay laborers, soldiers, and sailors; and little between the Government and complete collapse but a few men in Congress like Benton of Missouri, Calhoun of South Carolina, Allen of Ohio, and Wright of New York, clinging tenaciously to "first principles."

It was tested again in 1868 with only a dozen known friends in a court admittedly dominated by its accuser. And it was to be tried again in 1937 by an overwhelming one-party Congress and Executive with the unlimited credit of the United States at their command.

It is always the same story—right makes might. Skeptics do not believe it; politicians do not even suspicion it; and despots unqualifiedly deny it; but it is true. It was the philosophy of Elijah on Mount Carmel, of Leonidas at Thermopylae, of Lincoln in the day of the Nation's travail, and of the poet Faber who sang: "For right is right, since God is God, and right the day must win."

The Johnson impeachment trial lasted nearly 3 months, counting recesses—3 months of evidence, argument, and oratory; 3 months of polemics, passion, and perjury—and the gallery gods looking down on a steaming putrid cauldron of hatreds spawned by war thought they were watching the trial. Strictly speaking what they saw was the show, but I have an idea it was a show worth seeing.

Bingham, of the House managers, was a great trial lawyer, but the irrepressible Ben Butler, slated for Secretary of State under Ben Wade in the event of conviction, elbowed him out of the leadership and nearly out of the picture until the last day when Bingham loosed a pandemonium with his closing argument.

Boutwell, another House manager, was known as a word wizard, but Evarts of the defense turned his "hole in the sky" speech against him so cleverly that even the conspirators had to laugh.

Stevens was looking straight into the jaws of death, carried in and out of the sessions by two giant Negroes, but his iron will dominated the prosecution, and when the time came for argument he planted his clubfoot in the aisle and consigned "wavering" Senators to "everlasting obloquy."

At the other table sat Benjamin R. Curtis, former Supreme Court Justice, and in the fullness of his powers; Henry Stanbery, former Attorney General, 65, and as commanding a presence as "ever graced a court or adorned a rostrum"; William Maxwell Evarts, whose 4-day philippic made the venerable historian Bancroft nod; the able and fluent William S. Groesbeck; and Thomas Nelson, Johnson's Tennessee neighbor, who nearly got thrown out of the trial when he proved Ben Butler was a liar.

But the real trial—the trial that determined the fate of the Presidency, the Constitution, and the American theory—was staged in the souls of seven Republican Senators. The seven had been credited to the prosecution by all recognized political rules—party affiliation, political background, recorded votes, and what weighs very heavily with politicians, their own political fortunes. Through 3 months of wrangles and recesses they sat quietly in the Chamber, weighing the evidence, hearing the argument, resisting pressure, defying the smear hounds, and keeping faith with themselves.

It must not be supposed, however, that they were the only incorruptible members of the Fortieth Senate. Certainly they were not, but of the 54, representing 27 States, they were the only ones who had anything to lose by their votes. The 12 Democrats had nothing to lose by voting for acquittal, and the 35 Republicans who voted for conviction could hardly lose by staying regular.

Nor is it contended that the 35 were corrupt. Doubtlessly some of them were, but some only lacked courage. One of the hardest things for people to realize is that Washington is a mecca for mental menials and moral cowards. Frequently a Senator or Congressman is not in position to vote his convictions, and the Directory with its spies and feminine lobbyists had taken particular pains to make that the case.

Witness what happened to a Senator from this State not many months ago. On the eve of the vote on the President's reorganization bill he sent a very strong telegram to a State paper, stating unequivocally that he would not vote for the bill without certain amendments. But 24 hours later, and before the ink was hardly dry on his published telegram, he voted for the bill without the amendments, and explained at length that it would have carried anyway. The obvious conclusion is that somebody had given him the works.

Nor was the Stevens directory indulging in empty threats. They made their threats good; and what happend to the 7 Republicans who bolted his leadership is the darkest stain on the party of Lincoln and Trumbull, so dark in fact it is seldom told; but it attests the power of a political machine, corrupt in operation and intolerant of opposition.

Out of the stillness of forgotten conflicts and the limbo of forgetfulness to which they were consigned, their voices come but once, some round and resonant, some low and faltering, but distinctly heard above the roar of mob-baiting cant. "Not guilty." Certainly they made other speeches, many speeches, great speeches; but once their feeble voices leaped the barriers of time and distance, changed the cannel of history, saved the American experiment; and once they made all men their debtors. Who were they?

CHAPTER VIII

THE TEST BEGINS

William P. Fessenden

The first to deliberately sacrifice himself for a fundamental was William P. Fessenden, of Maine. For weeks they watched him from the whispering galleries—a man of slight figure, academic face, thin gray hair, and a veritable dynamo of intellect.

He had been numbered with the radicals. No one had ever charged him with sympathy for the Southern cause. He had vigorously supported Lincoln's war policy when the border State Congressmen were urging compromise and peaceful secession.

After the first Battle of Bull Run the demand for compromise nearly swept the North from its moorings. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, in a fiery speech denounced Lincoln's war policy as unconstitutional, and branded the North as the aggressor. Baker, of Oregon, interrupted him to ask: "Suppose a Roman senator, wearing the Roman purple, had denounced Rome as the aggressor when Hannibal was thundering at the gate?" It was the quiet, scholarly Fessenden who answered, "He would have been hurled from the Tarpeian Rock."

Fessenden never roared, never stormed, never shouted, was not given to rhetorical flights, but his colleagues had a profound respect for his ability. He could captivate without eloquence, by his power of reason and logic, and Hendricks once pronounced him the greatest debater in the Senate.

He was a member of the directory. He had voted for the resolution creating it, and until then had never given the radicals any occasion for alarm. He had helped unseat Senator Stockton, a Democrat of New Jersey, to provide a two-thirds majority for Presidential vetoes. He had favored provisional government for the stricken States, had offered no serious objection to the conquered province theory, and was as loyal as either Butler or Sumner or Wade, but with a dignity and refinement those Senators lacked.

As the trial progressed Washington literally boiled over with bloody-shirt politicians, thirsting for somebody's gore. To reason with them was as futile as to reason with a case of mental buckaguers. Fessenden knew he had come to his political Gethsemane, en route to his political Golgotha. His colleagues ganged him in the cloak rooms; lobbyists boldly approached him on the floor, buttonholed him in public places, waylaid him at his lodging; and misguided philanthropists hounded him day and night.

They courted him, patronized him, flattered him, and deliberately insulted him. Fessenden never flinched. Theodore Tilton, a legislative expert from New York, something on the order of the "bright young men" now operating out of the departments, was on the floor continuously. He hurried about from Senator to Senator, reckless of appearances, but when he reached Fessenden's desk he was quietly snubbed. The judge on his bench—and every Senator was a judge under oath—was supposed to be inviolate.

Fessenden's mail abounded with insulting letters, demanding his "price." But when General Dow, of Maine, wrote him to vote to hang Johnson "like a dead cow in a corn field" he answered, "I wish you and all my friends to know I have sworn to do impartial justice."

He did just that, and was retired at the next election. Early in Grant's administration we find him in his home in Maine reading a letter from Grimes: "Thank God my political career ended with the beginning of the corrupt political era." Soon after that he died.

Joseph S. Fowler

The second cell in political death row was taken by Joseph S. Fowler, of Tennessee. Fowler had left Tennessee under President Jefferson Davis' 40-day proclamation, but had returned to help organize the "Loyalist" government, and in 1865 the Loyalist legislature had elected him United States Senator.

Now note, the President of the United States was from Tennessee, but the first postwar Congress denied her Senators and Representatives admission on the theory that Tennessee was not a member of the Union. Later it developed that one Tennessee Senator, Joseph Smyth Fowler, was a radical; that he sympathized with the Stevens-Sumner idea of Africanizing 11 helpless States and crushing the servilocracy, and he was promptly seated. The other Senator, David T. Patterson, however, was the President's son-in-law, and the directory kept him waiting until the last day of the session.

No one knew better than Fowler that the loyalist government in Tennessee would go along with the directory. Loyal then, like liberal now, was made to signify strange things. He had served as comptroller general in Tennessee under Johnson, but if he expected to stay in the Senate he would have to look to Johnson's foes instead of Johnson's friends.

Fifteen votes had been cast, nine for conviction and six for acquittal, when the clerk called Fowler's name, and the Chief Justice droned his monotonous, "Mr. Senator Fowler, how say you? Is the respondent Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, guilty or not guilty of high misdemeanors as charged in this article?"

The Tennessee Senator had been subjected to the cruel program of pressure meted out to the others, and probably due to emotional strain his answer was indistinct. Only the last word, "guilty," was heard. The clerk hesitated and the Chief Justice asked him the second time, "How say you?"

"Not guilty," was his bell-like answer—and his political doom was sealed. It was his last term.

James W. Grimes

When the Clerk reached the "G's" another name was added to the political death list. James W. Grimes, of Iowa, another member of the directory, and a man of meticulous habits and standards, had been subjected to a particularly vicious attack. "Tell the damn scoundrel if it's money he wants there is a bushel of it," Butler had shouted, and the badgered Grimes had found it difficult to enter the Chamber without subjecting himself to insult.

Grimes had had his baptism of fire in the previous session when he had fought to death a vicious tariff, and Greeley had charged him with corruption, blanketing Iowa with his Tribune.

He was desperately ill on the day of voting and had to be carried into the Chamber. As he reached his desk, his face pale and twisted with pain, Fessenden sprang forward to grasp his hand. He had been carried to his own political execution, and at his own command. There were moral giants in Washington in those days. Ben Butler's hypothetical "bushel of money" had gone begging.

John B. Henderson

The directory had discovered, probably through Grant, that John B. Henderson, of Missouri, was "doubtful." Henderson had dined with Grant one evening and learned that Wade had already picked his Cabinet, and that Grant had been offered the Republican nomination provided he would accept Wade's Cabinet. Grant, however, had not given the required promise, but Henderson, refusing to commit himself on the Johnson impeachment, made it very clear that he did not approve of Grant's active interest in impeachment.

The Missouri Senator had been in the Senate since the expulsion of Polk in 1862, and his loyalty had never been questioned. When it was discovered he was "doubtful," he was deluged with insulating telegrams, and the Missouri delegation attempted to "instruct" him. "As I am an honest man I shall obey my conscience and not your will," he told a St. Louis committee, and the Revolutionists set him down as No. 4 on their proscribed list.

He never came back. But for two brief intervals, his latter years are wrapped in obscurity. In 1874, under appointment from Washington, he prosecuted the notorious St. Louis whisky ring, but was relieved in the middle of the trial for hanging an indictment on the President's private secretary. Ten years later he presided over the convention that nominated Blaine.

CHAPTER IX

"NOT GUILTY"

Edmund G. Ross

"I felt that I was looking into my open grave," is the way Edmund G. Ross, of Kansas, explained it years later.

Ross was a newspaperman and a radical Republican, but newspapermen have a little different way of looking at things. They hear both sides, write both sides, and in time develop an ability to see both sides.

Lawyers and ministers have no such training. Lawyers study the other side for flaws, and the minister is a herald rather than an advocate. But as I have said in my speeches, I'm not an authority on how to get to heaven, and I prefer not to define the holy calling.

Ross had come to the Senate in 1868 by appointment, later ratified by the Legislature, to fill an unexpired term. He had helped write the Kansas Constitution; he had served in the Legislature through the "bleeding Kansas" era; he had enlisted as a private in a Kansas regiment and served through the war; he had been trained in the hard school of intolerance and bloodshed—and he had few illusions as to who would do the "bleeding" in Kansas if the President should be acquitted by his vote.

He knew he would be hounded to his political death, probably mobbed, his name blackened, his friends punished, his career ended; and he had good reason to believe the issues involved were a matter of a single vote. Senator Pomeroy, later dubbed "Subsidy Pom" by reason of his relations with Credit Mobilier, had told him as much a few days before the day of verdict. Pomeroy had also told him they were dependin' on him.

And a lot of people were telling Edmund Ross a lot of things in the closing days of the trial. Excited partisans jammed his room demanding his vote for impeachment. Resolutions from home denounced him as a skunk and a traitor. Shameless jury fixers probed every domestic, business, and political affiliation of his whole life. What wonder that the ominous silence in the Chamber filled him with dread as the Chief Justice droned: "What say you, Mr. Senator Ross?" And Ross' "Not guilty" was his own political epitaph.

Years later, the Kansas Democrats gave him a gubernatorial nomination, but he was defeated. Grover Cleveland, mindful of democracy's debt to the aged Senator Ross, made him Governor of New Mexico Territory, where he died.

Lyman Trumbull

Only two cells were vacant in death row, and only three votes were needed for acquittal, when they came to Lyman Trumbull, of Illinois.

Trumbull had helped organize the Republican Party. He had served in the House as one of the first members of the new party, and he had defeated Lincoln for the Senate in 1859. He was just beginning his third term when Thaddeus Stevens pocketed Congress, and he knew what it was about. His constituents in Illinois wired him to either vote for impeachment or expect to be hanged from a lamp post the first time he appeared in Chicago.

The day the trial began Julian saw Trumbull in earnest conversation with Fessenden, standing by Fessenden's desk. Trumbull's manner was serious, cold, and unsympathetic, but his face reflected intellect and high-mindedness.

Senator Trumbull was a member of the Directory. He was a pronounced Loyalist, and all his political interests were on the side of impeachment. He had represented the Government in the McCardle case when the Attorney General, believing McCardle right, refused to appear.

He had the cold precision and ethics of his profession. He could hang or shoot a man on a technicality, but he couldn't violate an oath of office nor stultify his legal conscience with a political decision. It just wasn't done in those days by men like Lyman Trumbull.

He was a great partisan, a great politician, but a greater constitutional lawyer; and he had sworn to do impartial justice under the organic law. As a Senator, he might have voted differently, but he was not sitting as a Senator. He was sitting as a judge under oath, and with Lyman Trumbull in the ermine of the jurist there could be but one answer—"not guilty."

He had pronounced sentence of political death upon himself. He was indeed the just judge.

Peter G. Van Winkle

The prosecution lacked but six votes and the defense but two when they came to the V's. Actually, only one vote was needed by either side, for only one was doubtful—Senator Peter G. Van Winkle, of West Virginia.

The West Virginia Senator was serving his first and only term. He had helped organize the new State of West Virginia during the war. He was a Loyalist, and had been considered safe until someone noticed him talking to Senator Trumbull. There was a tradition that conscientious men couldn't afford to talk to Trumbull unless they were prepared to agree. Trumbull could sell a political gallows gibbet, or grave, and make it look attractive where an oath of office or point of Constitution was involved.

A breathless silence gripped the Senate, the galleries, and even the crowd on the outside. One more word and the Constitution, the American theory, and the Presidency, would be exonerated or condemned. One more word, and the Republic would survive on the original pattern or succumb to the corrupt schemes of the Stevens centralizationists; and that word was in the mouth of a radical Republican.

"How say you?" inquired the Chief Justice.

"Not guilty," said Van Winkle—and Colonel Crook, the President's bodyguard, came down the Capitol steps several at a time and ran the entire length of Pennsylvania Avenue to announce the result at the White House.

Addresses at the Roosevelt Shrine Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses made yesterday at the dedication of the shrine of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt by President Truman, Mrs. Roosevelt, and Secretary of the Interior Krug:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

We stand in reverence at this hallowed spot consecrated to the memory of a great American who has become a great citizen of the world. We stand here in solemn tribute. All over the globe, plain people join with leaders and statesmen in recognition that it was largely because of him that civilization has survived. Only history can do him full justice.

The loss which America suffered through the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt cannot be softened by the spoken word. Tributes can only emphasize the loss. But those of us who have survived him in the seat of government can pay homage to his memory by our deeds.

The progressive and humane principles of the New Deal embodied the great hope which in an hour of extreme crisis President Roosevelt gave to the American people. As carried out in practice, the New Deal became the realization of that hope. It was a recognition of the basic truth that this Government exists not for the benefit of a privileged few but for the welfare of all the people.

RECALLS PROGRESSIVE MEASURES

Those principles and their execution in practice have today become an accepted part of our way of life. When an employee joins a union, when an investor buys a share of stock, when a man buys a house or a farm on credit, when he puts money in the bank, or grows and sells his crops, or gets cheap electricity, when he lays aside part of his income for unemployment or old-age insurance, those principles are right there by him—and on his side.

These same principles apply to legislation assuring full production and full employment, legislation for a health program, a

social-security program, an educational program, a program to provide emergency housing for veterans and to solve the long-range problem of decent homes for all Americans. These and other progressive measures stem from the principles for which President Roosevelt fought, and for which we, who are carrying on after him, now fight, and for which we shall continue to fight.

In the foreign field, President Roosevelt's guiding thought was that this Nation as a good neighbor must play an active, intelligent and constructive part in world affairs. He saw clearly that we cannot continue to live isolated from other nations. He knew that what happens on other continents must affect the welfare of our country.

He recognized, above all, that our hope for the future of civilization, for the future of life itself, lay in the success of the United Nations. He not only recognized these truths. He determined to do something about them. And he did.

SAYS OBLIGATIONS WERE REALIZED

His foreign policy called for fair, sympathetic and firm dealing with the other members of the family of nations. At the same time, it recognized our obligation to the starving and homeless of other lands. It recognized the solemn duty of this country toward nations which have been weakened in the death struggle against tyranny.

For these principles of international cooperation we are determined to fight with all our strength. We are determined to do all within our power to make the United Nations a strong, living organization; to find effective means of alleviating suffering and distress; to deal fairly with all nations. These principles were the basis of the foreign policy under Franklin D. Roosevelt. They are still the basis of our foreign policy.

In the aftermath of a global war the overall task is difficult. But it can be simply stated: It is to carry forward the underlying principles and policies, foreign and domestic, of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Changes may be required here and there to meet changing conditions. Fundamentally the objectives are the same.

We are here not only to do honor to the immortal spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt. We are here to gain strength for what is ahead—to gain it from the inspiration of his deeds, from inspiration of the humane principles which brought them to pass.

Here, where he was born, in the spot which he loved the best in all the world, he is now at rest. We shall not soon see his like again.

May Almighty God, who has watched over the Republic as it grew from weakness to strength, give us the wisdom to carry on in the way of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

ADDRESS BY MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. President, Secretary Krug, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen:

This is the house in which my husband was born and brought up. It has undergone some changes since the days when he first saw the light of day, but they were changes made to meet the needs of the growing family and his own tastes. He always felt that this was his home, and he loved the house and the view, the woods, special trees, the particular spots where he played as a child; or where he had ridden his horse as a boy and a man, or where he later drove his car when he was no longer able to ride.

Life here had always a healing quality for him. Here he spent the summer 9 months after he had infantile paralysis, and laboriously worked to regain some measure of strength which would enable him to get about. As he gained physically, the healing of the spirit went forward at the same time.

All but the last 4 years of his life this was his mother's home, but he came here with the sense of complete ownership and partnership with her, since his father died when he was still in college. In spite of his father's age and delicate health during the last few years of his life, he gave to my husband a great enjoyment in country life and a great understanding of what was owed to the land.

I have often thought it must have been a great regret that he had only the time to direct the forestry work on the place and was obliged, after his mother died, because of the pressure of work in Washington during the war, to let the farm run down, for he had always wanted to see it run on a business-like basis and become an asset to the community.

HOME SITES THAT BECOME SHRINES

His years in the White House taught him that the homes of Presidents, particularly their birthplaces, usually become of such great public interest that the families find them hard to live in. During my husband's term of office he was asked to take over various birthplaces of former Presidents.

Loving history as he did, I think my husband always rather enjoyed to project what the future might bring, and so he could see his own home as one day being owned by the people of the United States and being one of the points where they would come to increase their understanding of history through a greater knowledge of the men who had made it.

Our children became equally familiar with their father's trend of thought, and so it surprised none of us to find the memorandum, after my husband's death, telling us that while under his will we had a right to live here if we wished during our lives, he thought we would be happier if we did not try to live in this house. He knew the times were changing and that it would be difficult to run a big establishment, and that my tastes were not for the type of formal living that such a big house would entail.

He warned us that the people might want to come here often, and that we would not feel justified in keeping them out. So he pictured us as looking for privacy in the attic, or in the woods.

WAS MARRIED IN THE HOUSE

I have many associations with this house, both as it was when I was married, and as it is today. But it is with no regret that I turn it over to the Government of the United States. It will be well cared for and preserved, and our children and grandchildren will have the privilege of learning about my husband and his mother in a way which perhaps would not be possible if any of us had gone on living in this house and left the stamp of our own personality by creating associations and a different atmosphere.

I am glad that I shall live nearby, and I hope that some of our children and grandchildren will continue to live in this vicinity for many years to come. It is the place where we have roots, and I am a great believer in putting roots down deep and preserving family tradition, even if we change the homes in which we live.

My husband has built one cottage upon the top of a hill on some land which he had bought himself, and I am particularly happy to have it occupied now by my son Elliott, since that was a place where my husband was particularly happy; this house of his own creation. He liked to think that some day it would be occupied by one of his children.

Since this is the first anniversary of my husband's death, I am happy to have it connected with something which will always be as alive as the dedication of this house to the people of the United States. My husband's spirit will live in this house, in the library and in the quiet garden inside the hedge where he wished his body to lie. It is his life and his character and his personality which will live with us and which will endure and be imparted to those who come to see the surroundings in which he grew to maturity.

PLACE FORMALLY TURNED OVER

It is with pleasure that our children and I see this house dedicated to the people and opened to them. It was the people, all of the people of this country and of the world, whom my husband loved and kept constantly in his mind and heart. He would want them to enjoy themselves in these surroundings, and to draw from them rest and peace and strength, as he did all the days of his life.

Mr. President, I am happy that you could be with us on this occasion; and to you, Mr. Secretary, I now turn over the full possession of the land, the house with its contents, and the other things which my husband willed to the people of the United States.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY KRUG

On behalf of the Government of the United States, it is my privilege to accept the guardianship of this beautiful place, the home of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, his generous gift to the people of the Nation.

This is Hyde Park. Here President Roosevelt was born, here he lived, and here is his grave. This tranquil Hudson River landscape, the broad river, these majestic trees and rolling acres nourished his love of nature. The books and papers collected here informed his quick intelligence. This lovely river valley, rich in the traditions of America, deepened his sense of history and sharpened his vision of his country's future. From these vistas of serenity and peace he renewed the courage and refreshed the strength that led his country through its darkest years.

By his life he made the name of Hyde Park a symbol to the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

It is good for men to have such shrines as this—places where they pause to honor and to remember. It is good for us who are gathered here to remember this man. He brought hope to those without hope because all he had here, all he learned here, he shared with other men. He was passionate in his dedication to the cause of all the people.

HIS LOVE OF NATURE EVIDENT

His love of nature did not stop with his delighted contemplation of this scene. It grew until it encompassed all our natural resources, and it expressed itself in his determination that the waters, the land, the forests, and the minerals of this Nation should be developed for the benefit of all the people, not ravished for the profit nor held for the pleasure of a few.

Because he loved these trees, forests are growing today from hundreds of millions of seedlings planted by the peacetime army of boys his leadership recruited for a gigantic program of restoration. Because he cherished these acres, millions of acres he never saw are fertile again, green and productive where once they were brown and eroded. Because he loved this home, the homes of other men were saved for their continued ownership in cities and towns and on farms all over this country. Because he loved these books and respected scholarship, hundreds of thousands of this Nation's youth continued their learning in the dark days of the depression.

He had security here. So he wanted security for others. And he fought for freedom from want, a decent home for every family, an education for every child, a good job for every man and woman.

Because he knew freedom he gave his life that men might be liberated everywhere.

ALWAYS EXPANDING VISTAS

He never stopped growing and he never stopped sharing. With all his fellow citizens he shared his expanding knowledge of world affairs. From him millions of Americans learned what he knew so well: that they could not be free while other men were slaves, that their homes were not inviolate when millions were dispossessed. The boundaries of his vision and his faith never

contracted. When he died he was in the midst of plans for a world where all men would be free.

He knew, as no other man, how hard the road ahead would be, how many prejudices must be foresworn, how much in sacrifice was still to be required, how steadfast America would have to be, how brave.

This is his home. The people he loved will come here; young people, poor people, aliens, and neighbors, men who are freer men because he lived. Statesmen from many lands will come; sometimes weary and disheartened from their struggle with the problems of the day.

May his memory deliver all of them from selfishness and from greed. May he forever share with all who come something of his timeless qualities—his contagious vitality, his gallant courage, and his infinite compassion.

Lumber Snafu—An Analysis of the Lumber Production and Forest Conservation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Ellery Foster, research director, International Woodworkers of America, CIO:

Housing is going to be held back for a long time by lumber shortages, unless the Nation wakes up to the facts about our lumber industry and our dwindling forests. Here's the story:

Even for the person who can afford present inflated prices, lumber is hard to get. And what you get is usually green, truck-dried stuff that shrinks and warps after the house is built. Then doors and windows stick and plaster cracks. Also, there is much more danger of decay than in seasoned lumber.

Yielding to heavy pressures the OPA is permitting the prices to be pushed even higher. Yet, despite the high prices, lumber wages over the Nation as a whole are near the bottom of the ladder, as compared with other industries.

Lumber, of course, means trees. Sawtimber trees are getting scarcer and scarcer. Current lumber production needs to be geared in with long-time forest conservation, if our forests are to last. But there is no indication that the Government is thinking in such terms. Let's look at the facts.

In lumber's best years of the twenties—1923 and 1925—only time when we built almost as many houses as Housing Expediter Wyatt has charted for 1946, production was 41,000,000,000 board feet. We haven't even come close to those peaks since then, either in houses or lumber.

Lumber production in 1945 is officially estimated at about 27,500,000,000 feet. So far 1946 is falling way short of the 1945 production rate. For the first 9 weeks production in the southern pine region was only 84 percent of the corresponding period in 1945, southern hardwoods 76 percent, west coast 74 percent, western pine 63 percent. (National Lumber Manufacturers Association figures for identical units reporting in the major producing regions.)

Lumber has been scarce ever since early 1942. Production has gone down year by year from 1941's 37,800,000,000 board feet (best year since the twenties). So, in reporting lumber snafu (situation normal—all fouled up) we're referring to what's been normal ever since 1942 when lumber first went on WPB's critical list, where it has stayed ever since, despite many widely publicized production drives.

CHANGING NATURE OF LUMBER INDUSTRY

The essential fact that has to be reckoned with in solving the problem is that the industry has changed radically in the last quarter century. That change calls for a new approach to the lumber problem.

Today, the bulk of the log and lumber production comes from small producers—many of them small-like farmers. Let the industry's own figures tell the story. In a brief submitted to the Senate education and labor committee, November 16, 1945, official southern-pine spokesman stated:

Twenty-five years ago the mills were counted by the hundreds. They were large operations. Today they number between 12,000 and 17,000. Now they are small units. Less than 500 of the total number have an annual production of 5,000,000 board feet. The remainder, 97.4 percent by number, manufacture 67.5 percent of the total production."

That is the story on sawmills in the huge southern pine region. The number of individual operators in logging is even greater.

True, lumber has what appear to be industrial giants—big outfits, well financed and well staffed with engineers, sales experts, foresters, costs analysts, and all the other hierarchy of experts which help to make modern business efficient. But those giants are only a tiny fraction of the total operators. The bulk of the lumber industry, like farming, is very small business. It is this fact which the Government apparently has not recognized sufficiently and which the lobbyists, who represent the big operators, apparently will only recognize when they want to argue against progressive labor legislation (the above quotation is from a brief opposing the 65-cent minimum wage bill).

The Government, however, knows at least part of the reason for the lumber bottleneck. Here is what Stabilization Administrator John C. Collet said in an official release of January 30, 1946: "Factors which have retarded production (of southern pine) include labor shortages, especially in logging operations, inadequacy and poor condition of equipment, and high stumpage costs. One of the most important is the scarcity of labor, attributable to the low wages paid in the industry, loss of men to the armed forces, and higher paying industries, the difficult work, unsatisfactory living conditions, and unsteady employment because of bad weather and mechanical break-downs.

"The industry itself has stated that in many individual instances production can be expanded only by raising wages as a means of attracting additional workers.

"To an unusual degree in the southern pine industry, uniformity in wages, working conditions, costs, plant structure, stumpage basis, equipment, and many other factors, is lacking."

The change to small operations has also taken place in the Northeast, the Appalachians, and the Lake States. It has begun even in the far West.

The fact is the industry is made up of a few efficient operations and thousands of "by guess and by God" outfits whose operators try to be a jack of all trades in buying, labor relations, forestry, logging, and sawmill engineering, cost-keeping and marketing. The inefficiency of these small producers—and they are not to blame for it—accounts for the paradox of high lumber prices and low wages for lumber workers.

SHOCKING DISPARITY BETWEEN PRICES AND WAGES

In fact, the minority of well set up, efficient lumber outfits is on a gravy train of high prices and low wages that have been adjusted so as to keep the thousands of inefficient producers in business. In high excess-profits brackets during the war, the efficient outfits are now tempted to save their trees for the future, live off the carry-back-carry-forward provisions of the tax law and let the public wait for its lumber.

The story of shocking disparity between lumber prices and wages is told by official Government figures. Lumber prices have been out of line with the average for all commodities ever since World War I. That is when the trend to second-growth trees and to small operations became significant.

In 1920 (peak year of inflation) lumber prices were more than 230 percent higher than in 1914, while the all-commodities average was only 126 percent higher than in 1914. At the bottom year of the depression (1932) lumber prices were still 17 percent above the 1914 average, while the all-commodities average was 5 percent less than in 1914. In 1939 lumber was 87 percent higher than in 1914, while all-commodities averaged only 13 percent higher. In 1945 lumber was 211 percent above 1914, all commodities only 55 percent (from BLS figures).

On wages, in official testimony at Senate committee hearings on the 65-cent minimum wage bill, Chester Bowles, of OPA, listed 17 principal manufacturing industries, showing the proportion of workers receiving less than 65 cents.

Of 443,000 workers in lumber and timber, 54 percent were receiving less than 65 cents an hour. This compares with only 19.5 percent for the 17 industries as a group. Lumber was second only to tobacco in employees under 65 cents.

Here, then, is an industry crucially important in housing, grossly overcharging its customers and underpaying its workers. Only through increased efficiency can this situation be remedied.

GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED

Most of what the Government now does about lumber production, however, is to issue various regulations and news releases. Contrast this with the farm program. The Government has a genuine program to provide the farmer with technical assistance and financial aid, as well. Government farm experts get right out on the land and help the farmer make his production plans. Maybe the food program is not all it should be, but in contrast with the lumber program, it is a B–29 compared to an oxcart. The record speaks for itself. During the war, American farm production smashed all previous records. Lumber production didn't even come close to its best previous record. Any number of Government reports reveal these facts.

With two industries so similar, why has the Government developed this split personality in dealing with farmers and lumbermen, a helpful Dr. Fixit on food, an ineffectual tinkerer on wood? Maybe we should leave it to the Government to answer, but its record for answering the lumber problem is so poor, we offer our explanation. We think it's simple.

On the one hand, farmers for generations have come to the Government asking for technical and economic assistance to improve their production methods and solve their marketing and credit problems. The rank and file of farmers long ago learned to organize themselves to make their wants known.

It is only in the last quarter century or so, however, that the lumber industry has changed from a set-up of fairly good-sized outfits into one of predominantly small business. Many of the small logging and lumber operations are run by relative newcomers to the game. These newcomers—these small fry—are not influential in the lumber associations. Most of them don't even belong. Needing the same kind of assistance which

the Government gives to the farmer, they are not organized to ask for it.

Another fact doubtless has a bearing. Except in wartime, the Government has taken little interest in current lumber production. But Government officials for over half a century have been talking, writing, and working on the problem of lumber for the more distant future. These are the forest conservationists, most of them employed in the USDA's Forest Service. For decades they have been in a pitched battle with the lumber lobbyists. Thus, the Agricultural Department, which has cordial relations with most farmers and farm groups, has strained relations with the organized sector of the lumber industry.

This antagonism is due partly to the fact that the Government foresters' chief interest has been in managing and extending the Government-owned forests. In contrast the Government farm program is designed to strengthen the system of private farm ownership. The lobbyists of the lumber industry, of course, are champions of private ownership.

PUBLIC FORESTS ONLY SMALL PART OF THE ANSWER

The public forests account for only a minor fraction of the total lumber production. To solve the lumber problem through public ownership is a vain hope in the present political climate of America. There is a place for public-forest ownership. But for quick results—and for long-time results consistent with American ideals of free enterprise—both lumber production and forest conservation must be tackled where the bulk of the problem exists, namely, on private timberlands and in private logging and sawmill operations.

Logical agency to do this is the Department of Agriculture, whose vast field organization could work with lumber producers as they now do with producers of food. Instead of such an arrangement, the responsibility for lumber production throughout the war was in the WPB.

It still remains in the reconverted WPB, now called the CPA. That agency never has had more than a tiny lumber staff, far too small to provide the service needed by the far-flung, highly decentralized lumber industry.

During the war, WPB provided some advisory service through the Forest Service. Known as TPWP (for timber production war project), it barely scratched the surface, reaching only a small portion of all producers. With the war's end, even that merger program was discontinued.

So, here we are. The Government has two programs, one a so-called lumber-production program in the CPA (with no field staff), the other a forest-conservation program (mostly in the Agriculture Department). Neither program is even beginning to catch up with its problem.

And the forest-conservation problem is important, too, as we shall see. But, so far, the Government has indicated no intention of changing its ways. Nor is the lumber lobby proposing any basic change, except to lift price ceilings.

PRICE INCREASES NOT THE ANSWER

In fact, lumber lobbyists and the lumber-trade press are screaming, "Lift, or, better still, take off, price ceilings and we'll produce lumber."

Fortunately, the Government is not convinced that higher prices are the answer. In his release of January 30, then Stabilization Administrator Collet pointed out that in "lumber manufacture in general, and southern pine lumber manufacture in particular, * * * there is no consistent relationship between increases in production and increases in prices."

"Following World War I," he said, "lumber prices increased 138 percent from November 1918 to March 1920, while lumber production increased only 9 percent through 1919 and hardly at all in 1920.

"Since October 1941, mill prices for southern pine have increased 27.8 percent. Production of southern pine has declined 34.4 percent from 1941 to 1945."

No; price increases are not the answer. Nor is any high-pressure production drive which fails to pay attention to the problems of inefficiency, of wood waste, and the longer-range problem of forest conservation.

FOREST CONSERVATION MUST BE CONSIDERED, TOO

The lumber industry is running short of good quality trees. High stumpage costs, referred to by Stabilizer Collet, are merely an indication of the fact that trees are getting scarce.

The available trees, moreover, get smaller and scrubbier, as the forests are combed over again and again for sawlogs, pulpwood, mine timbers, railway ties, chemical wood, specialty bolts and what not.

As good timber grows scarcer and scarcer, the industry lowers its standards. It takes smaller and scrubbier logs. This means higher costs for a poorer product.

The only solution to that problem is fuller wood utilization and scientific forestry. It calls for use of the police power as well as the assistance powers of Government, because the temptation will always exist for the individual to cut every tree that he can sell. Yet the essence of scientific forestry is wise selection of which trees to cut and which to leave for future growth with an eye to the future as well as the present. No nation has ever stopped forest destruction without using its police powers to require that kind of tree selection by private logging operators. The United States has yet to take that step.

PRIVATELY SPONSORED TREE FARMS ONLY A SMALL PART OF THE ANSWER

The lumber lobby, however—representing the larger outfits—is trying hard to convince the public and the Congress that private industry can solve the problem of destructive logging, through its program of privately sponsored tree farms. Pointing with pride to several million acres of forest already organized as tree farms by various forest owners, the propaganda (published chiefly by AFPI—American Forest Products Industries—a joint promotion agency of lumber, pulp, and allied wood industries) is pouring into schools, press, over the air waves, and displayed in lumber retail stores.

The tree-farm program, however, overlooks the fact that most privately owned forests are small tracts whose owners cannot be expected to take the initiative in scientific forestry plans for their acres.

The realist is bound to suspect that certain knowing ones are not eager for an abundant supply of reasonably priced timber. Such a realist is Roy A. H. Thompson, long-time financer of lumber operations whose What's Happening to the Timber appeared in Harper's Magazine of August 1945. In the New York Times of January 24, 1946 he wrote:

"The following quotation from a prominent official of the National Lumbermen's Association, spoken in recorded proceedings not long ago, may be pertinent:

" 'The day of cheap timber is passing, and will soon be gone. But those who will make money are men who can hold it until the supply in other parts of the county is gone. Then they can ask, and get, their own prices.' "

Indeed the day of cheap timber is already gone. Generations of misuse and waste of forest resources are finally catching up with us. Many existing sawmills will run out of trees in the next 2 to 9 years, and that's Government Forest Service information, too.

A UNIFIED PRODUCTION-CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Only by recognizing that the problems of wood for today's needs and forest conservation for the long pull are Siamese twins can we develop a realistic and practical solution to both problems.

The solution consists of three major steps:

One is a program of Government assistance similar to the national farm program. That program assists the farmer to produce efficiently for this year, and at the same time conserve and build up his soil for the future.

Current lumber production must be geared in with long-time forest conservation in the same way, through a comprehensive program of technical and economic assistance to the many thousands of individual logging operators, sawmill operators, and forest landowners.

Assistance should include silviculture, logging, sawmilling, marketing, credit, improving the forest fire-protection system, building a permanent system of logging roads (needed for sustained-yield selective logging), and in restoring good, productive forests on cut-over lands. It will cost money, but the investment will add to our national wealth, just as the national farm program does.

Two, the police power must be exercised in order to conserve the forests by preventing destructive logging. It must be Federal regulation, because the problem cuts across State lines too much to be left for separate action by the 48 States. Regulation needs to be accompanied by Government assistance, but there must be regulation.

3. Government must act to stimulate the development of plants which can utilize waste wood to make substitutes for ordinary lumber. The technical processes are available to make fiber board, fabricated lumber—built up from small pieces by mass-production methods—and wood plastics from the mountains of wood that are now wasted, as a byproduct of lumber production. Much-needed building materials could be made in this way and at the same time help to conserve our forests.

Because most of the larger fry of the lumber industry apparently are too content to make money in the wasteful ways that grandpappy did, and the small fry lack the finances to go into these ventures, the Government should subsidize or directly finance new wood-utilization plants.

With such a program current production can be stimulated and made more efficient. Wood waste can be reduced and scientific cutting of trees under the principle of selective logging will speed the growth of our forests for the future. We will be building up our timber reserves instead of further depleting them.

We are looking for the Government's answer to this analysis and the proposed action. We think the answer and a program should be forthcoming quickly because the present "snafu" of lumber will plague us with even worse shortages in the future, excessive lumber prices, continued low wages for lumber workers and wrecked forests unless constructive far-reaching action is started at once.

Feed Shortage in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 12, 1946.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Special commission created by Massachusetts Legislature to study feed shortage in

this area has made preliminary survey which discloses that dairy and poultry industries face extreme difficulties obtaining grain and grain products for feed. Drastic drop in production threatens unless a continuing and adequate supply of feed for our livestock and flocks is assured. Repetition of milk and egg shortages of 1945 in prospect for this year unless action taken immediately. Urgently request that you take necessary steps toward securing feed supply for this area to produce essential foods.

Representative CHARLES E. SHEPARD,
Chairman, Special Commission
Studying Feed Shortages.

Sixty-five-Cent Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the newspaper Labor, publication of 15 standard railroad labor organizations.

We all remember how after the last war, I mean World War I, the veterans became the forgotten men, how many of them had to take to peddling shoestrings from door to door or selling apples on the street. All of us make pious statements and promises that this will never happen again. Well, we have not yet gotten to shoestrings or apples, but many veterans, just the ordinary GI who came home from the war to get a job and support his family, is pretty nearly that bad off.

A lot of people who talk against increasing minimum wages in this country in one breath, and in the next talk about how we must take care of the veteran, do not realize that the veteran group will be among the largest to benefit from an increase in the minimum wage. As illustrative of this point, I would like to put in the RECORD an editorial about one veteran and his struggle to take care of his family:

WHY WE NEED AT LEAST A 65-CENT MINIMUM—CASE OF A DENVER VETERAN CONFIRMS THE PLEA MADE BY ORGANIZED LABOR FOR LIBERALIZED WAGE STANDARDS

You undoubtedly read the story from Denver—it appeared with pictures in practically every daily newspaper in the land—about the returned veteran and his wife, who have four tiny girls, including triplets, and who discovered they couldn't keep the home fires burning on $30 a week. Therefore, they proposed to offer two of the little ones for adoption. Immediately the big-hearted Coloradans went to the rescue and arranged matters so the family may remain intact and in comparative comfort.

Unfortunately, all American youngsters, who are endeavoring to rear families on $30 a week, are not so fortunate. Their privations are not publicized. They live in hovels; they and their children are undernourished and they are constantly on the edge of financial disaster.

Fifty years ago when Denver was still on the frontier, a young man could maintain his family on $30 a week and even arrange to buy a home, but not any more. Today $30 a week for the head of the family is "a mere subsistence wage" and scarcely that.

Nevertheless, we find Members of Congress and leaders of great industries, which have piled up fabulous reserves, protesting against a 65-cent-an-hour minimum with all the vigor they might be expected to display if they were opposing some evil thing which threatened the safety of the Republic.

Just take your pencil and a piece of paper and figure it out. If a man works 40 hours a week at 65 cents an hour, he will collect $26 on Saturday night, and some of that will go for taxes. If he works 48 hours a week, he will do a little better. His total will be $31.40, but he will still be on the mere subsistence level.

Should he get sick or be deprived of employment for even a week, he and the members of his family will face catastrophe, unless some friend or relative comes to their rescue.

These are cold, hard facts. They can't be challenged. They can't be escaped. It is shocking to know that millions of our fellow Americans are denied even this minimum. Congress should make the passage of an adequate minimum wage law, without crippling amendments, a legislative must.

Extension of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper article:

WESTON, MASS., *April 1, 1946.*
Hon. PEHR G. HOLMES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wrote to you once recently about the strike situation and received a very nice and prompt reply which showed that you were very interested in helping toward getting production under way as soon as possible.

I want to write now about the extension of the OPA. I strongly hope that the least amount of power possible will be provided in the extended life of that governmental administrative body. Just as a small exhibit, I am enclosing a statement about butter, and a cartoon that tells quite a story. I consider conditions like this to be almost 100 percent of the fault of the OPA. There are many other things that could be written, but the enclosed will suffice as a sample of conditions, now that the war has been over for more than one-half year.

Yours very sincerely,
GEORGE W. BROTHERS.

STORES CAN'T AFFORD TO SELL BUTTER

(By Fred Rae)

Your storekeeper cannot afford to sell you butter.

That surprising statement is the literal answer to the question asked by a butter-hungry public: "Why can't I buy butter?"

Your storekeeper is telling the truth. He could supply you with more butter if he wanted to resell it at a loss of 50 cents or more a pound. But he is not in business to lose money.

If your storekeeper wants to buy butter from a distributor he must also tie in the sale with some other commodity for which there is no demand on the part of the public. But those latter goods will rot before he can sell them.

Many storekeepers have been victims of this tie-in sales racket and have taken a terrific loss in order to secure a few pounds of butter for regular customers. But the cost has been too great. They cannot afford to continue to buy butter under such an arrangement.

Who is to blame for such a vicious, stupid situation? The Office of Price Administration has to shoulder much of the blame for it in its price ceilings. The greed of manufacturers and primary distributors can also be blamed.

But to get the story straight it would be best to start with some simple mathematics. Butter production is now 50 percent below normal prewar years.

This production centers in Wisconsin and Minnesota where most of the sweet cream originates. The creameries there sell most of their output to nearby buyers because of better price and easier shipping conditions.

This leaves a very small surplus for the rest of the country. The black market takes a good portion of that surplus, and New England on the end of the line as far as shipping and prices conditions go gets a mere dribble of butter.

SOME PLAY FAIR

The butter trade estimates that this area gets less than 10 percent of its normal peacetime amount. Some of that 10 percent goes through distributors who are playing the game fairly. They distribute it without any ties in an effort to hold the good will of their customers for future business. That is why dribbles of butter sometimes appear on storekeepers' shelves.

At the present time there is a great supply of 30-pound turkeys with no demand. They are too big for the average family. They should be selling at prices substantially below ceiling.

Some butter manufacturers and primary distributors see a chance to make money by tying in turkeys with butter. Their margin on butter is very low and they hope to make a good profit on the turkey. They force the turkeys at ceiling prices on secondary distributors and storekeepers who want butter.

Most restaurants now serve butter. But take a look at the menus and you see how they have been able to secure the butter. Those menus feature turkey soup, turkey hash, turkey croquettes, and turkey dinners.

This tie-in sales racket is perfectly legal. The OPA has failed in an attempt to get a conviction in court.

Your next question might be: "Why is butter production so low?" The answer is simple: There is a ceiling price on butter, but none on the butterfat in sweet cream.

COMPETITION STRONG

Butter is made from sweet cream. Lack of a ceiling price on the wholesale cream has forced the price up and competition for it has become very strong. The butter manufacturer with his ceiling cannot compete with ice-cream makers and others.

There has also been a heavy demand for fluid cream. Farmers and even creameries find it more profitable to sell to ice-cream makers or on the fluid-cream market.

Thus the butter maker has to be satisfied with what cream he can get at a low price. He cannot buy more because of the competition. If he bought in competition with others he would have to get 80 cents a pound for his butter which has a ceiling of less than 50 cents.

Some creameries have stopped churning butter and are selling on the fluid-cream market. Others tie in with unwanted goods to make up the difference and some sell on the black market.

As a result of this price tangle, you cannot buy butter, but you can buy all the ice cream

you want. Retail sales of sweet cream show that many housewives are churning it into butter. It is costing them almost a dollar a pound for their butter by this method.

Price Controls and Whom To Follow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., April 10, 1946:

PRICE CONTROLS AND WHOM TO FOLLOW
(By John W. Owens)

If you decided to throw a bridge across a stream and were unable to determine exactly the length necessary to make the bridge safe, you would rather take a chance on having it 50 feet too long than 50 feet too short. Fifty feet too long might cause some bother and expense that hindsight would show to have been unnecessary. Fifty feet too short might cause the bridge to crumple and collapse and make all your bother and expense fruitless. Every engineer worth his salt allows in every undertaking a margin for safety.

Apparently, the country is determined to extend price controls for a period. Usually, we picture price controls as a dam against an inflationary flood. Change the figure and think of price controls as a bridge across a raging flood of inflationary pressures. If, in this postwar period, we are again to throw a bridge across the dangerous stream, what is the use of trifling about the character of the bridge? It ought to be long enough to be firmly planted on each side of the stream. And, of course, it also ought to be constructed soundly in the middle and in every other section. If, in the period of 1 year from June 1946 to June 1947 this country is to rely for safety upon a bridge of price controls, why not resolve all doubts in favor of building a bridge sound enough to serve the purpose that we intend it to serve?

Now, of course, somebody will say that this is beyond argument and that the discussion turns primarily on differences of opinion as to the necessary margins of safety. But is this the fact? Much of the current argument about the dimensions and the quality of the bridge to be again thrown across the inflationary stream comes from people who wish no bridge at all. If they cannot do away with the bridge in its entirety, they wish to limit the bridge in dimensions and in quality. They prefer a small bridge, a feeble bridge.

The question that the public must soberly consider, then, is whether it wishes a sound bridge. Once that question is decided, the balance is fairly simple. One resolves doubts in favor of the men who say, "Make it 50 feet too long, rather than risk making it 50 feet too short" and against the men who say, "Oh, you do not need so much bridge." The general public has no way of examining and judging all technical data that will be presented by the engineers. It can no more judge all technical data of a bridge across the inflationary stream than it could judge all technical data of a bridge across the Patapsco River. If the public desires a bridge across the inflationary stream and if it decides that no bridge is worth building unless it is built soundly, the public must base its course on men. It must turn to such men as Mr. Chester Bowles and his associates, who believe the bridge necessary and wish to build it soundly, rather than to such men as the leaders of the National Association of Manufacturers, who do not wish the bridge to be built again this year and have, at best, only a laggard interest in it.

To say that mistakes will be made in construction of the bridge by those who wish it built soundly is to prattle of the obvious. To say that mistakes will be made in the movement of traffic over the bridge is to prattle. For that matter, to say that mistakes were made in the construction of the old bridge and in the movement of traffic over it is to prattle. Whoever supposed that a bridge of price controls could be built over the inflationary flood, in the past or in the future, without mistakes in construction or in management after construction? Whoever supposed that any man or any group of men in Washington could manage the prices of this continental Nation without mistakes?

But merely to talk about mistakes, merely to prove mistakes, settles nothing. We must go on to compare the mistakes under price controls with mistakes made in the absence of price controls. Will anybody argue that the disappearance of limited price controls after the first war did not bring in its train evils as serious as any that have followed the enforcement of price controls after the second war? Will anybody argue that evils more serious did not appear? If we look in the other direction will anybody argue that the price controls of the past few war years have not thus far prevented the inflationary floods overwhelming us? And will anybody argue that, since the close of hostilities, they have universally prevented increase in production? Will anybody argue that some failures in production, since the close of hostilities, have been due solely to errors in price controls and not at all to greed which counted on a rise in prices and waited?

And, if we are to roam around in search of mistakes, are we able to say that the free-enterprise system, which most of us desire fully to restore as soon as restoration will be safe, is without errors? What of the depressions of the past? What of the collapses? What of the recurrent maladjustments between supply and demand which led to endless debate as to whether we suffered from overproduction or underconsumption?

In the midst of all the clamor the public will serve itself by keeping its head. It will remember that few people in this country desire price controls because they are good in themselves. The apparent majority of people, as of authorities, desires price controls because experience has pointed to controls as the means of safety against grievous evils during reconstruction. And if now we are to build again this bridge over the inflationary flood, surely we ought to rely for soundness in the dimensions and the quality of the bridge upon men who are convinced of the need for it—not upon men who hate it.

Tribute to the Public Service of Hon. Robert Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Republican Club of Massachusetts, paying tribute to the illustrious public service of our late colleague, Hon. Robert Luce, of Waltham, Mass.:

The executive committee of the Republican Club of Massachusetts, meeting on April 9, 1946, pauses to pay tribute to the illustrious public service of the Honorable Robert Luce, of Waltham, a former president of this club.

His life ended on April 7 at the ripe age of 83. Graduating from Harvard College in 1882, where as an undergraduate he had worked as a newspaper correspondent, he entered journalism as a profession, pioneered in the establishment of a press-clipping bureau, studied law but did not engage in its practice; he entered the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1899, serving until 1908. He was the author of the Luce Law for primary elections and direct nominations. He was Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts in 1912 and performed a highly useful service as chairman of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living in 1910, 1916, and 1917; he was a member of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, 1917–19; president of the Republican Club of Massachusets in 1918, and Representative in Congress from 1919 to 1935 and from 1937 to 1941.

The author of standard works on legislative procedure, he brought to his task in the National House a scholarship that commanded attention and oratorical gifts that were in the best tradition of the flowering of New England.

Tenacious of his convictions, he exemplified Edmund Burke's definition of the constitutional position of a parliamentary representative, "who owes you," said Burke, "not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

OPA and Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

OPA AND BLACK MARKET

The meat packers who testified this week before the Senate Agriculture Committee against the OPA paint a black picture of the black market, but two phases of their testimony argue against them.

In the first place, after telling the admittedly unfortunate effects of black-market operations on the public and on legitimate meat operators, they urge, not action to stop the black market, but abolition of meat ceilings, giving the impression that they are gunning for the OPA rather than for the black market.

In the second place, they urge an end of price ceilings for their industry. If that were feasible, it might get a sympathetic consideration. Meat, while a desirable part of the diet, is not indispensable. Perhaps some households would do without it rather than pay exhorbitant prices.

But, money being what it is today, plenty of people would pay high prices, tending to force meat prices out of the reach of low-income families, and, more important, spurring the demand to end all ceilings.

Probably Chester Bowles himself would admit that the price-production situation is pretty badly fouled up. It may be that production will not come at least without

modification of ceilings. But price control, like the horns of a bull, is something we shall have to let go of carefully, and before we do that we should hear more testimony than that from men who talk in one direction while looking in another.

While we are waiting, the OPA might well see what it can do about constructive price control, to maneuver prices in the interests of the elimination of shortages. Up to now it has seemed to think all it can do is raise ceilings in cases of distress. It is time for it to realize that ceilings can also go down. Lowering the prices of other milk products might eliminate the butter shortage.

Oil and Government Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was my pleasure to hear an address by J. Howard Pew, president of the Sun Oil Co., in which he discussed the effect of Government control on the oil industry.

In my judgment, no man can speak with more authority on the oil industry than Mr. Pew, who is a recognized figure in this field.

It goes without saying that the oil industry is a vital factor in the national economy and in national defense. Its future is a matter of concern to every American.

For these reasons I call the attention of the Congress and of the country to Mr. Pew's timely and significant remarks, which were made at a meeting of the Empire State Petroleum Association, an organization of New York State independent oilmen, in Elmira, N. Y., on April 11, 1946:

TOMORROW'S OIL

For several reasons, I find it a great pleasure to be here tonight. First, I long have admired the aggressive, intelligently alert spirit of your organization. From what I know of your activities you refuse to accept as truth the many sophistries which are publicly discussed so much these days. With inquiring minds, you have dug deeply for facts and upon these findings you have based your thinking. Thereby you have served our industry well and have made a great contribution to a sound public understanding of our problems.

Without criticism of anyone, I wish we had in each of the 48 States, organizations of oil men with the enthusiasm and zeal for straight thinking and sound business practices displayed by your group. Such a "grass roots" coordination of mind and action at the local and State levels would be an invincible force in behalf of our American way of life.

Secondly, I am pleased to be here because I always feel at home in a gathering such as this. You are small businessmen and therefore you are the hope of the future of America. I have always rated myself as a small businessman and I know, from experience, the difficulties and problems of the small fellow. But I also know the advantages and opportunities which small businessmen have under the American competitive enterprise system.

And the third reason I eagerly accepted your hospitality was that it gives me an opportunity to discuss with you several current trends vitally affecting the future of our industry and particularly undermining the opportunities for small business in this country.

When your secretary, Harry Hilts, invited me to address you on the subject, Tomorrow's Oil, I assumed he wanted me to do more than knock down the old canard that "we are running out of crude oil." We need have no worry on that score, for, as you know, our proved reserves are at an all-time high, despite the heavy war demand—and our oil resources are sufficient for many generations provided only we have the proper incentive to develop them. If that were our only concern, we could be happy, indeed.

Never has the petroleum industry internally been in better shape to meet the requirements of the future than it is today. We emerged from the war with increased public acceptance; with our crude oil resources unimpaired; with the largest plant and equipment in our history; with technological developments unimagined a decade ago; with manpower both highly skilled and happy in its management-labor relations, and with an increasingly efficient distribution system.

Nor shall we lack a demand for our output in this increasingly mechanized world as long as we continue to give the consumers better and better goods at prices they are both willing and able to pay. As far as the industry itself is concerned, there is no reason that it should not continue to prosper, grow, and expand just as it has during the last 50 years.

But our future is threatened by a menace which has its source outside of the industry. This menace is the trend toward so-called planned management of our economy, which, in truth, is national socialism under which men's activities are directed and controlled by an all-powerful government. The development of this collectivist system threatens to destroy all industry and our American way of life as well, for if it becomes intrenched the result will be economic stagnation and the loss of all human freedom. We are closer to that result than many of us realize.

A powerful editorial in the Wall Street Journal recently stated: "No people ever entered the compulsory state through a door on which the price of admission was plainly posted." The people of America have now arrived at the door leading to such a compulsory state. But it is so posted with hieroglyphics that they are confused. We know the meaning of this posting. It now becomes our duty to impart this information to the American people. Once they grasp the facts they will find their own way to overcome this danger.

Unfortunately a great part of our people—including many in business—remain indifferent or oblivious to what is going on. Their passion for individual liberty has been numbed by the soothing but deadly sirup of years of governmental paternalism. They become exorcised only when these threats to our way of life pinch their individual pocketbooks. Meanwhile, bit by bit, the foundations of our American system of competitive enterprise have eroded away until the welfare of us all is in peril.

Tonight we can rejoice that the men of oil have never surrendered, nor even remained silent, in this battle to preserve unfettered our competitive-enterprise way of life. Ours is a highly individualistic industry in which the talent and competence of men count most heavily. None has ever assumed a divine right to a place and a share in the industry. Our attitude has been that if somebody else could serve the public better in quality or price, he was entitled to the business.

Everybody has recognized that his right to continue in business depends on his ability to give the public what it wants at prices it is both willing and able to pay. To live up to that principle has kept all of us scratching. It has been a case of root, hog, or die, and my farmer friends tell me the most vigorous rooter is usually the healthiest hog.

Thus the whole history of the petroleum industry has been marked by unstinted competition—the kind of competition that always looks for better methods, improved processes, invention, discovery—the kind of competition that seizes upon every new idea looking to lower costs, better products, wider markets—the kind of competition that has demanded millions of dollars every year for scientific research and study and experimental plants—the kind of competition that provides the consumer with constantly improved products at lower costs.

Such competition has been responsible for the amazing progress of our industry. It has been this kind of competition that has kept each of us alert and assured that, as we advanced our own interests, we also rendered the greatest service to the public. It is this kind of competition that has kept open the door of opportunity for the small fellows of today to become the big units of tomorrow. This is the kind of competition that has provided for our industry a constant infusion of new blood, new talent, new energy, and an ever-widening outlook.

Government-managed economy—collectivism—national socialism—call it what you will—is the deadly enemy of this kind of competition, and it is the deadly enemy of small business. Indeed it has as a primary purpose the stifling of small business, for once the Government takes over it would prefer to deal with a few big units than with many thousands of small independent enterprises. It has been upon this theory, for instance, that European socialists long have favored industrial cartels.

Thus when the advocates of managed economy succeed in advancing their program, the petroleum industry is one of the first to be hit, not only because of our highly developed individualism and the widespread diffusion of our business among tens of thousands of small units, but also because what affects any part of the American economy affects the petroleum industry. So it was with the now discredited Blue Eagle of NRA, which had as a later-day counterpart the superstate cartel system embodied in the originally proposed Anglo-American oil agreement. So it has been with the devaluation of the dollar, deficit financing, and all the other schemes hatched by the economic planners which have been will-o'-the-wisps, luring us to national socialism.

And so it is today with price control and the accompanying regimentation that has and will be invoked in vain efforts to make it work. Since price control in peacetime is the latest and, in many respects, the most vicious of the many attacks made in recent years against competitive enterprise, I would like to develop in some detail its implications.

To get a clear understanding of the evil nature of price control, let's fix in our minds several fundamental principles. The first is that the very essence of our American competitive system is prices free from all controls, except those imposed by a free market.

If you do not have such free prices, you cannot have the kind of competition we have been talking about. You cannot have opportunity for individuals to go into business, to work where they wish, to move ahead by doing a better job than the other fellow; nor can there be opportunity for small business to grow and expand. Consumers cannot have freedom of choice. They do not have it today.

Now why is that so? Because free prices are the regulators of American industry. They control the volume of production; they shift savings to where they are needed; they

move workers into fields of production in greatest demand. They give consumers what they want.

There is no substitute for free prices. Government directives cannot do the job in peacetime for the simple reason that neither a few men, nor even several hundred thousand, can take the place of the day-by-day functioning of a free market, reflecting the judgment and desires of 100,000,000 consumers.

That is the answer to those who say price control is all right if OPA administered the law fairly. Price control cannot be made fair because it is physically impossible for OPA to work out equitable price relationships. Let me demonstrate:

We have in this country some 8,000,000 articles of trade. We have 140 metropolitan marketing areas. The number of equations necessary to establish proper price relationships in the metropolitan marketing areas would be 140 times 8,000,000 or 1,120,000,000. We have some 50,000,000 workers whose wage rates might be reduced for convenience to 1,000 classifications. To establish proper wage-price relationships the number of equations would be 1,000 times 1,120,000,000 or 1,120,000,000,000—one trillion one hundred and twenty billion equations. Computing one equation an hour, it would require the 50,000,000 workers in America 10 years to do the job, working 40 hours a week, with only 1 week off a year, for vacation.

Of course, it is fantastic. So the price fixers resort to formulas for universal application, freezing prices to some previous level. But no sooner are such formulas proclaimed than conditions change. American business cannot be operated by formulas. If it could, it would have been figured out years ago and all business enterprises would be successful while their managers could go on year-long vacations.

Under these principles price control clearly is wrong. But, say the OPA propagandists: "We did a great job during the war; therefore, we should continue now."

This failure to distinguish the great difference between price control during war and price control in peacetime goes to the heart of the controversy. During the war nothing could be permitted to interfere with production for our armed forces.

Our national strategy was to make war work attractive and to make nonessential production unattractive. Conversely, producers of nonessential civilian goods were denied critical materials; they were subjected to frozen price levels, and the wages of their workers lagged under governmental restrictions.

This was necessary and proper—otherwise we never could have become the arsenal for democracy which won the war.

But when hostilities ceased, our objective overnight became the production of consumer goods in sufficient volume to give our people the things they needed. This required the restoration of a freely functioning market, historically the most effective stimulant of production in peacetime.

Thus ended all justification for price control. Along with other wartime controls, it should have been thrown overboard at once. Had this been done, supply and demand in all industries now would be rapidly on their way to a point of balance. Instead, supply and demand have become more unbalanced and our people go without the things they want and need.

But, say the OPA propagandists in another specious argument: "Price increases cause inflation; inflation helps none but hurts everyone; OPA keeps down prices, and thus is the only barrier standing between the country and a devastating inflation."

This is double talk designed to deceive and confuse. It is putting the cart before the horse. Price increases no more cause inflation than wet streets cause rain. Wet streets are a result of rain, and rising prices are one of the many disastrous results that follow in the wake of inflation.

Inflation results from an expansion in purchasing power that is not matched by a comparable expansion in the production of real consumer goods and services. We have an inflationary condition today as a result of the monetizing of the Federal debt, and war accumulated shortages in certain consumer goods, aggravated by OPA controls.

The only effective ways to halt this inflationary trend are to balance the Federal Budget this year and to stimulate the production of goods that people want by taking the OPA off the backs of business and industry.

If the hobbles are removed, industry can produce all the goods the public needs. The doubling of manufacturing production in 1940–44 is proof of that. Not only did American manufacturing industry produce everything needed for the prosecution of the global war but it also produced in the same period a volume of civilian consumer goods equal to 1939, when manufacturing production was substantially as high as at any previous time in our history.

In view of these facts, why has manufacturing production fallen so sharply since last summer? Why have manufacturing plants been compelled to drop 5,000,000 workers since the peak of production? Why are the things people want so slow in coming? Why the delay in building homes?

We have all the expanded plant capacity that we possessed in 1944. We have adequate raw materials. Our civilian labor force is no less than in 1944, when 43 percent of manufacturing workers produced as much goods for civilians as in 1939. Surely this volume should be doubled when the 57 percent engaged on war orders are shifted to consumer products. It is simply absurd to say that with these two groups at work there would be a scarcity of goods for any considerable time.

Price control and labor strikes have been responsible for the failure to produce the consumer goods needed—and price control has been responsible for the strikes. Had industrial management been free to adjust prices and wages, without Government interference, increased wage demands would have been reconciled without the lengthy strikes which have been so costly to everyone.

A recent survey of the experiences of small manufacturers under current price controls, by Dr. Claude Robinson's Opinion Research Corp., succinctly tells the story of what OPA is doing to production and small business.

Of the manufacturers interviewed, 70 percent—roughly three out of four—say price ceilings are injuring their business; 67 percent, or two-thirds, say that because of price ceilings they have already cut out or curtailed production on some items, or face that necessity in the near future. More than half of these say price ceilings are restricting an important part of their production.

Despite OPA ballyhoo about profits being greater than ever, only 14 percent of the manufacturers interviewed say they are making good profits; 41 percent say they are making a very small profit; 15 percent are breaking even, and 20 percent are losing money. Ten percent did not answer.

Thus 40 percent of those answering are not making any profit. How long do you believe these men can stay in business under these conditions? I know several who are sticking it out only in the hope that Congress will give them relief from OPA. If Congress does not, many of the 40 percent reported by Dr. Robinson, reflecting some 100,000 manufacturing enterprises, will have to close their doors.

The small manufacturer is the supplier of parts and machinery to the big producers. When the little fellow cannot produce, the production line halts and 100,000,000 consumers go without the goods they want.

Small enterprises cannot long wait for relief. When they go into the red, they must sell out to a larger unit—thus creating the monopolistic trend to which we are so opposed—or shut their doors with bankruptcy for themselves and injury to every man and woman in the country.

Another result of OPA are the black markets which have become rampant, breeding widespread disrespect for law. OPA officials admit the situation is growing worse and confess their inability to do anything about it.

Only the other day, the American Meat Institute revealed a survey that indicated 83 percent of meat sales exceeded ceiling prices. Persons in a position to know estimate that one-third to 40 percent of all current transactions in consumers goods are in violation of one or another of the OPA regulations. These with interpretations, amendments, revisions, and whatnot, cover some 21,000 closely printed pages in the Federal Register. How can a small businessman, without an army of lawyers, economists, and accountants avoid violating some of the whims and foibles of this amazing organization?

The real tip-off regarding OPA intentions to keep a stranglehold on the Nation's basic industries is found in its handling of the oil industry. OPA has constantly promised freedom from price control for any commodity as soon as supply balanced demand. Oil supplies have been in excess of demand since the war ended. But OPA refuses to decontrol our industry. The result has been a dislocation of kerosene and fuel-oil supplies to such an extent that an acute shortage of these products threatened the country last winter. A further result was a weakening of gasoline prices.

That is not all that is happening to the petroleum industry. In a desperate effort to cover up the shortcomings of price control a ban has been placed on construction of refining and distribution facilities, under which the Government planners now say who has the right to expand—who may build a service station and where. Using as a pretext an unjustifiable shortage of tetraethyl lead, the Government is limiting both the quality and the quantity of gasoline the industry can make, thus penalizing millions of motorists.

But that, believe me, is only the beginning of what must be done to make price control work. Many more controls will have to be invoked—rationing, material priorities, and other restrictions far more severe than those in force during the war. Industry will be told what type of goods it can make and where it can sell them. Consumers will be told what they must take, irrespective of what they want. A system of wage stabilization will have to be adopted, and ultimately workers will be told how, when, and where they must work.

The final result, under continued price control will be, as Henry Hazlitt, of the New York Times, has said: "A completely petrified totalitarian economy, with every business firm and every worker at the mercy of the Government and with a final abandonment of all the traditional liberties that we have known."

In conclusion, I appeal to you and all the men of this great industry to stand firm and fight staunchly in defense of American competitive enterprise. For the truth is that no economic planning authority could ever have foreseen, planned, and organized such an amazing spectacle of human progress as the world has witnessed during the last century. No trust or combination, private or governmental, could have accomplished it. It could have been achieved only under conditions of wide open invitation to all the genius, inventive ability, organizing capacity, and managerial skill of a great people.

Nobody must be barred, no invention rejected, no idea untried. Everyone must have his chance—and under our American system of free enterprise and equal opportunity everyone gets just that chance. It is our freedom that has brought us to this high estate—intellectual freedom, religious freedom, political freedom, industrial freedom; freedom to dream, to think, to experiment, to invent, to match wits in friendly competition; freedom to be an individual.

That is our great American heritage. With so many witch doctors abroad in the land, teaching communism, fascism, planned and dictated economies, governmental paternalism, and all the other isms—I urge you to guard well that heritage and to turn a deaf ear to all their sophistry.

When a people come to look upon their government as the source of all their rights, there will surely come a time when they will look upon that same government as the source of all their wrongs. That is the history of all planned, dictated economies. That is the history of tyranny. To each of us is assigned a part to play in the great drama of life. We can only play our parts with the greatest measure of perfection as free, unhampered individuals.

Freedom is indivisible. When a part is taken away, that which remains is no longer freedom. Once industrial freedom is lost, political freedom, religious freedom, freedom of the press and of speech, will all fall. Surely it is unthinkable that, in the light which shows through this twentieth century, a great progressive people will be beguiled into turning back to the ways of controlled economies and dictated social programs.

Give the Veterans' Administration a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a statement by Mr. J. H. Lieb, national legislative director, American Veterans of World War II:

Complaints are pouring into veterans' organizations and congressional offices regarding red tape in the vocational rehabilitation and educational program sponsored by the Veterans' Administration.

It is significant to call attention to the fact that more than 2,000,000 applications for free tuition, subsistence-supplemented education, and on-the-job training have been received by General Bradley to date.

Amvets is anxious to see that all applications are handled expeditiously. We have taken this matter up with the Veterans' Administration, and we present herewith their reply. In view of the fact that the VA is attempting to rectify the bottlenecks that are delaying the program, we believe that they should be given a reasonable opportunity to carry out their functions. The communication from H. V. Stirling, Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, follows:

"I feel sure you will appreciate the difficulties that have been present during the past several months which have been in a measure dependent upon the tremendous increase in the number of veterans who have applied for or who are now pursuing courses of education or training. Administrative steps have been taken to reduce the time required for action on these cases to the end that veterans may promptly receive the benefits for which they apply. It is believed these plans will be productive of the intended results, but there are areas in which they have not as yet been fully effective.

"In connection with the Veterans' Administration Form 1950, it will be observed that under question No. 9, space is provided for a veteran to be based upon his statement as to whether or not he has a wife, a child or children, or dependent parents. Procedures now make provision for the payment to a veteran to be based upon his statement as to whether or not there is a dependent, allowing him a period of 60 days to submit proof of dependency, for example a copy of the record of his recorded marriage. Since experience shows that a great many veterans who make application for the benefits do not enter upon their courses immediately, it is believed more satisfactory to allow the submission of evidence of dependency to await the actual entrance of the veteran into education or training, particularly in view of the action on the part of the Veterans' Administration in making payment to him on the basis of the statement made on his application."

Know Your Public Health Nurse Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no group of women has done more consecrated self-effacing work through the war years than the public-health nurses of this country. With a tradition of selfless service in the tragic slums of our cities, in the little towns and less populous counties and on the wide prairies, these women held the fort in these same areas while their sisters joined the armed forces and went across the seven seas. Oh, yes; many of them joined up, too, but part of total war is the need to protect the civilian population from illness, to insure the health of those on the production lines and in the homes, and the nurses trained and experienced in public-health work gave themselves to war service as truly, though not as dramatically as those who wear the service stripes. Fewer doctors everywhere with heavier patient loads in hospitals put upon hospital nurses also a burden beyond any layman's imagining. Thanks and appreciation should be meted out to them in full measure, too.

But this particular week has been set aside as Know Your Public Health Nurse Week and today I want to pay special tribute to this faithful army of highly trained, widely experienced women who, year in, year out, in storm and sunshine, regardless of summer heat and winter cold, go to the homes of America caring for the sick, teaching health methods, checking epidemics and the spread of every sort of disease.

In the first days of their service their bags often weighed 40 or 50 pounds, for they took with them clean sheets and towels and other such supplies. Now the bag of the visiting or district nurse, the public-health nurse, is less cumbersome. How do they get about? On their two feet, in streetcars, in little Ford cars, in Chevrolets, even in jeeps—and in the mountains of Kentucky where the Frontier Nursing Service has pioneered in trained-nurse midwife service they are nurses on horseback, in breeches and high serviceable boots, their equipment rolled behind their saddles. In years back when I was closely associated with public-health nurses all over this country I often talked with nurses in from the far reaches of our prairies and deserts where their transportation was a well-worn Ford, their close companion an Army pistol lest the hungry wolves might prove a real danger.

So today I want to salute these women of the field public health wherever they may be serving—in the hideous congestion of our crowded cities, in the bayous and the swamps of the deep South, on the prairies, and in the mountain areas. There is no measure great enough with which to calculate the daily contribution they make to the physical, mental, and moral strength of our Nation.

Franklin Roosevelt Has Great Place in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago yesterday Franklin D. Roosevelt died at his Georgia home. Sitting calmly for a portrait, the President said he had a fierce headache and within a few minutes he had passed to his reward. The news stunned Washington and rocked every world capital. Later came the dull, deep awareness of what it meant. Some may say that it is still too early to size up the place Franklin Roosevelt earned for himself in history, but I think now, a year afterward, we have a pretty good idea of just what his stature is going to be in the history of tomorrow.

His achievements from the time he became President and world leader in 1933 already stand out predominantly in history. He came to the Presidency at a time when the economy of this Nation had reached its lowest ebb. He assumed office when a world revolution was taking place. He guided this Nation through a most turbulent period. He was faced with one emergency after another. Throughout it all Franklin Roosevelt kept faith in the democratic system. He kept faith in the ability of the United States as a nation. He believed in our future as a leader among the nations of the world. He felt we had to take our place at the front working, leading, and showing the way to justice and right among the peoples of the earth. Franklin Roosevelt felt that the domestic strength of this country lay with the middle class of people. It was they who received his first consideration. He worked incessantly toward building up the wages, improving

the living conditions, and giving opportunities to the common man, the worker, the farmer, the small businessman. He felt that as long as we could maintain a strong middle class in America there was no danger of this country adopting any of the isms which were embracing other parts of the globe. Then Franklin Roosevelt was a great war leader. He took every possible step to prepare the Nation for the inevitable conflict which was to come and his ability as a Commander in Chief has been attested to by military men in every nation associated with us in the great conflict. The spirit of Roosevelt will live on during the ages.

Equalization of Price of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress of the United States is called upon to deal with great economic questions and the relationships between the various groups who make up the population of the Nation, we must think carefully of the welfare of all. Perhaps for political reasons, great effort is being put forth in the interest of workers. I have every reason to support legislation in the interest of all.

If there rests within the Congress authority to place a floor under wages, there also rests the same authority to place a maximum on wages. Surely it is the duty of the Congress to express itself in legislation in the interest of all classes of people of the United States. Therefore, the Pace amendment must become a part of the minimum wage bill to equalize the price of the farmers' products and give them a return that is in line with the prices they have to pay for what they need in the way of help and equipment.

Under unanimous consent, I include herein an editorial from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., entitled "What Would Happen if Farmers Struck?":

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF FARMERS STRUCK?

Farmers of North Dakota and other Northwest States are shouldering heavy responsibilities this year under severe handicaps.

With a world food shortage of extreme gravity, with every indication that our reserves of wheat and other grains will be close to the vanishing point as we go into a new crop year, there probably would be a lot of hungry folks in the United States next year if the farms of this spring-wheat area, for any reason, should fail to produce in close to record quantities.

Not only does the Nation look to North Dakota and Minnesota, Montana, and South Dakota for immense quantities of basic foods; this region also supplies the United States with the bulk of its flaxseed.

And the linseed oil from flax is among the supplies which are needed for construction, for linseed is the chief ingredient of paints and of many varnishes and other preservatives.

The Nation would not be able to get far in providing suitable homes and in the construction of other buildings without the paints that are essential in preserving them and in the interior-finishing processes.

The Flax Institute of the United States has prepared some information as to the importance and value of this crop to North Dakota farmers and to North Dakota's economy, as a further inducement to farmers of this State to consider flaxseed as they map the season's seeding programs.

Last year, the institute comments, North Dakota led the Nation in the production of flax, grossing a total of $45,584,000 from the sale of flaxseed, flax straw, and acreage payments. The figures are based on compilations by Ben Kienholz, former United States statistician for North Dakota, located at Fargo.

In gross cash returns flax was second only to wheat.

With an aggregate total of 1,500,000 acres of flax in the State, the gross return was $30 an acre.

Yes; the farmers probably will be well compensated for the flax they produce, provided some disease or insect plague or other vagary of nature does not get it away from them, but we wonder, as they face these heavy responsibilities, if there are not enough rather bitter reflections running through their minds.

Once more they are being asked to take on the burden of providing the Nation with these all essential products, with farm equipment, a lot of which is more appropriate for a junk heap, than as a link in the food production line.

They cannot get new equipment, and in many instances they are finding it extremely difficult to get the essential parts and repairs to keep the worn-out, junky stuff in any kind of usable condition.

That is in large part because strikes have tied up some of the great implement factories. Regardless of who is right or wrong in these labor disputes, it does seem that another tragic blunder has been committed in permitting such a situation to continue, as it has for months.

Little wonder that there is a growing volume of protest from the agricultural producers who are beginning to ask:

"What would happen if we struck?"

They will not strike. They will carry on under all the handicaps. But that question and all the implications bound up in it ought to ring through the Nation until it reaches those "highest levels" in Washington which have the power to take over struck plants and keep them operating, when their continued operation means so much to the economy of the Nation and the world.

Veterans' Appeal Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am urging the Veterans' Administration to expedite plans for the decentralization of appeal boards to the various branch offices throughout the country, so that a "personal appearance" before rating boards in the higher levels can be assured the veterans of World War II as was for many years the case for World War I veterans.

The decentralization of procedure to the 13 branch offices throughout the country provides an ideal set-up for such appeal boards I believe, and I urge that steps be taken to prepare for rehearings on many hundreds of claims.

The problem is not acute at the present time, but now is the time to prepare for orderly and expedited attention to appeals at a point close to the veteran's domicile and not later when the claims have mounted to unmanagable numbers.

With a home station at the branch offices, such appeal boards could travel to the various regional offices in their territory and give as many days as are needed to appeals in that area. The final action, in the hands of the Administrator, would remain in Washington as before.

From long experience in veterans' work, I feel I can speak with authority on the needs and desires of veterans in proper adjudication of their claims. The personal appearance before an outside board oftentimes provides the opportunity to present a veteran's claim successfully and at least to secure for the claim more detailed study than under regional procedure alone.

Roosevelt in the Perspective of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under the permission for each Member to extend his remarks on the life and character of President Roosevelt, I shall insert as my remarks the following from the New York Times, written by Anne O'Hare McCormick:

ROOSEVELT IN THE PERSFECTIVE OF HISTORY

A year ago is not long enough for historic perspective, even a year that has witnessed the end of two wars and the beginning of movements that crowd upon one another like billows in a stormy sea, taking no count of time. It is hard to believe it is only a year since Roosevelt died. It is harder to recapture the feel and mood of that day last April when the news of his sudden passing shocked the world. Great armies were in action in Germany and the Pacific. Men and armor were all streaming outward instead of inward and backward. The United Nations was not organized. The problems overwhelming the governments today—reconversion, demobilization, occupation, deadlocks in peacemaking, inter-Allied contentions, the political effects of atomic fission—were still in the cubbyholes.

It is idle to guess how the dead President would have met the issues of this year. He is a figure of history, and while his stature in world history will certainly depend on the success of the international policies he initiated, he is already set high in the record by the events in which he moved and by the impression he gave that he mastered these events—was the pilot and not a mere passenger on the ship of destiny.

That he was four times elected President will set him apart in the annals of the United States. The remarkable thing about this break with tradition is that it did not seem so unusual while he lived as it does now. This alone "places" him; it means that we are back on the political plateau where the

rules count. It means that Roosevelt was the exception, a man caught up and swept beyond precedents by the drama of his times.

He thought in terms of drama and of history. The care he took to preserve personal documents and the records of his administration and the provision he made to leave the library he built for this purpose and his home in Hyde Park as a memorial to the Nation demonstrate that he was as sure of his niche in history as he was of his role in the war and peace. For all his apparent impulsiveness, his flair for improvisation, Roosevelt was a careful, far-seeing man. He was good at accounts, patient and resourceful in pursuing his purposes. He took bold risks in politics and in war, but not without calculation. He trusted his instincts where the people were concerned—"I know how the people feel," was one of his frequent phrases—but this trust was not blind. He did not agonize over decisions, but as far as he could he studied the possible consequences of his acts.

Yesterday's memorial services took the form of a dedication, not only of a national shrine but to the aims and ideas that Roosevelt represented. This was the gist of the humble and moving address of President Truman. It was the motif running through all the tributes. A year after his death Roosevelt has become a symbol, the kind of symbol he perhaps desired and expected to be. The tone of the round-the-world homage shows that abroad he personified not only the American spirit but the kind of peace other nations hoped for.

The implication in some foreign comments is that the peace policy of the late President is not being carried out. There is little basis for this judgment. On the contrary, there is plenty of evidence that Mr. Truman and Mr. Byrnes, allowing for the evolution of events, are following as closely as possible the "Roosevelt line." Mr. Truman has the disadvantage of inheriting a set of agreements, concessions and general understandings, sometimes oral, which are more difficult for him to alter than they would be for his predecessor. Roosevelt himself heartily disliked some of the compromises he felt obliged to make while the war was on. He accepted with strong reservations certain settlements in eastern Europe. Undoubtedly he would have attempted to modify them in the next phase of Big Power relationships. It is obvious that he could correct mistakes of judgment more easily and certainly more adroitly than the heirs of his decisions.

In regard to Russia, his approach might have been different, but he was convinced before he died that a firmer though no less friendly line was indicated in our relations with the Soviet Government. Those who talked to him after Yalta believe that Roosevelt's death delayed rather than hastened the toughening of the American attitude, since if his own feeling had been expressed immediately it would have suggested that his successor was deviating from his policy. The truth is that Roosevelt never deviated from the conviction that good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are the imperative and attainable condition of peace. This was the cornerstone of his policy and he would have pursued it stubbornly and flexibly as he worked for his political objectives at home. But he was a devotee of the trial-and-error technique, and having tried one tack with doubtful results he was beginning to change the method when he was stricken.

The world misses Roosevelt because of his buoyancy, his assurance, and the confidence he inspired. "He was a man, almost the only man of our time," said a Belgian last year, "who thought in terms of men." But none knew better that he was powerful and persuasive because he spoke for America. None was more convinced at the end that Big Three's and personal leadership had to give way to the collective strength and will of many nations if peace and order are to be restored on earth. He is succeeded, as he might have said with a touch of humorous vanity, by the United Nations.

Liquor Industry Blackened With False Label—Grain It Uses Does Not Cheat Starving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which Americans are reimposing upon themselves voluntarily restrictions which existed in wartime in order that foods may be sent to succor the hungry throughout the world is proof of the feeling of brotherhood which permeates our people.

Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of the aid which our people demand shall be sent to all those who are in need. The need exists in many countries and is self-evident. The will to meet the need exists certainly in our own country and is likewise self-evident.

There is, however, a considerable misunderstanding of the situation which prevails in the beverage-distilling business in its relation to our problem of food conservation.

An organized effort, aided unwittingly by those who do not know the facts, is being made to discredit the beverage-distilling industry, by imputing to it noncooperation with the food-conservation program. The drys and prohibitionists have seized an opportunity presented by the wide news coverage of the food program to open a wedge whereby they can impose the dread days of the prohibition era upon the people. Only the dissemination of the actual facts can counteract their wild, unfounded, and malignant slander.

Those who are sincerely interested in providing the maximum amount of food for those who need it should be careful not to lend themselves to this prejudice. They should exercise care that the distilling industry which established such an outstanding record during the war by their invaluable aid in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, in the making of smokeless powder and the like, is given the justice which the facts of its present operation warrant.

The fact is that the beverage distillers are now permitted to operate their distilleries on the basis of 5 days of mash operation per month, if they can get the raw materials which are essential to their operation. And the further fact is that they cannot, nor do they wish to, use materials even in those 5 days which are fit for human consumption.

Use of wheat by the distilleries is expressly forbidden by Presidential order, and wheat is the No. 1 grain which we need for the hungry. Under existing orders the distilleries are permitted, if obtainable, to use numbers 4 and 5 or sample grades of corn, plus an infinitesimal amount of rye. The corn thus permitted for distilling purposes is unfit for human consumption. It could not be used for food here, nor for food abroad. In addition, it should be made clear that while the distilleries are permitted to use this corn which is unfit for human consumption, they do not consume it. Actually, in the distilling process they merely extract from it the starch. All the other elements of the grain are restored, and the grain becomes a valuable protein feed for cattle, of high vitamin content.

No governmental authority has been flouted by the industry; it is acting in cooperation with the effort to conserve food. Such talk of discontinuing the industry because of baseless accusations is highly dangerous. In these days of black markets, inflationary trends, heightened juvenile delinquency, no more tragic upheaval in our internal structure can take place than the reimposition of prohibition.

It is interesting to note that there has been returned to the feed dealers by the distilling industry all of the protein content of grain recovered from the distilling process. In 1941, there was recovered 191,000 tons of such dried grain. That has now been increased for the year ending June 30 last to 608,600 tons. This was sufficient to fatten 1,600,000 steers for the food supply. This is enough beef to furnish every person in the United States 3 days' meat supply for 1 year.

It is well to keep in mind, therefore, that in order to save food there is absolutely no necessity to close down the industry, an industry which has already been drastically restricted and which now operates at 20 percent capacity. This curtailment was voluntary and the distilling industry did not wait until the Government forced them to take this action.

Significantly, all through the war Canada operated its whisky industry at 100-percent capacity, and only 2 weeks ago, as a result of public pressure, changed to 50-percent capacity.

Over and beyond that, a number of countries, notably the Netherlands, receiving relief shipments of grain, are exporting beer to this country. We were startled about a fortnight ago by reports that a Dutch brewing company was about to send to this country some 240,000 cases of Dutch beer—this at a time when in order to provide grain for starving Europe, beer production in the United States was cut 30 percent. Holland imports 50 percent of her grain. It would take 300 tons of barley for beer that will be sold to the United States. Holland will receive from this country during the present quarter 45,000 tons of wheat. As a result of mounting protest, the aforesaid Dutch shipment of beer has been canceled, but we have not been informed that Dutch beer is not being sent to other countries. Mexico has unlimited alcohol production, importing large quantities of our grain for that purpose.

Actually, no sugar is used in making whisky. Whisky is made of grain and yeast. The only people who use sugar to make whisky are moonshiners.

Contemplate for a moment the consequence of making the country dry by indirection. No law would possibly be accepted by Congress that would allow prohibition to descend upon the Nation. The evils of the ignoble experiment are not easily forgotten. We recall the hip-pocket flask, the bath-tub gin, the hooch, with their consequent defiance of the law. The shutting down of the distilleries would not mean the evaporation of the desire for whisky. That desire will be satisfied, come hell or high water. The absolute curtailment of spirits manufacture with its consequent evils would be like the "fool that returneth to his folly."

Reorganization of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to support the bill now before us, H. R. 6064, in its present form. I may be able to support it if it is amended to exempt persons under 21 years of age from the draft and reduce the time limit of its operation in order that the Military Affairs Committee may submit a bill for a reorganization of the Army providing for a volunteer system with increased pay for enlisted men and including a fair and just retirement policy. I shall address myself to such a program.

The matter of organizing or reorganizing our military forces so as to provide and maintain an army of sufficient strength to meet any emergency at any time is not a new proposal. It is a suggestion that has impressed itself upon a number of us for several years, and I think I can express my attitude by repeating part of a speech I made on this subject on August 12, 1941, nearly 4 months before Pearl Harbor, where I emphasized the necessity of increasing the rate of pay of both volunteers and men enlisted under the Selective Service Act of 1940, providing further for a graduated scale of pay according to length of service with the right of retirement after 15 or 20 years of active service with an annuity sufficiently attractive to insure a volunteer army of sincere, capable, loyal, and patriotic citizens, and before proceeding further I want to quote the following from the speech to which I have referred:

> Mr. Chairman, this will be the first step toward reorganization of our Army on a basis that will afford a career for men following this emergency or possibly before it is over.
>
> To me this is a highly important matter, and I shall, therefore, discuss it at greater length. The passage of this bill will not solve our military problem from the standpoint of an Army, and now is the time to study and prepare legislation that will provide an Army of sufficient strength and efficiency to meet any future emergency.
>
> Regardless of the outcome of the present world conflict, I am convinced this country will not follow a disarmament policy for the next 25 or possibly 50 years. On the contrary, we are going to maintain a much larger Navy and standing Army than at any time in our history and the question now confronting us is how we can best achieve these objectives. We have already made provision for a two-ocean navy, and it is high time we begin considering a program for strengthening the Army. I have an open mind as to the program to be adopted, but my feeling is we should not delay in submitting plans for study and consideration. There is wisdom in a multitude of counsel and it may be a good idea if we begin now to make suggestions with the hope that the best policy may be evolved. I am not enthusiastic over the idea that we should wait and let one or two men work out a plan without suggestions from anyone, and then expect everybody to say by their actions that the best possible conclusion was reached. This is really one of our troubles today. Instead of trying to plan a long-time policy for our land forces when the existing emergency arose, we proceeded with a temporary expedient. Possibly this was the best that could be devised within a short time. The prevailing thought a year ago was that we should proceed to provide for a very large Army, and we were told the best way to do it was to train some for 12 months and place them in reserve and then train others. However, we are now told that it may not be necessary to train an enormous number of men but it will be best to train them longer and make them more efficient. If we were certain they were to be needed in war, we are inclined to subscribe to the latter theory, but we acted upon a different theory last year, and I assume it was done for the reason we did not have more time to deliberate. It will be very embarrassing for some of us to admit that we were wrong or made a mistake last year when we passed the Selective Service Act limiting the time of training to 12 months and now say that the training should be for a longer period. It is also going to be disappointing to many young men who patriotically made their plans and volunteered to take a year's training in order that they might be fitted for military service, if needed. However, if we made a mistake, then we might just as well admit it now and correct it instead of repeating it because two mistakes do not make a right.
>
> For the past 25 years, particularly the last decade, Congress has been very considerate of those selected to serve the Government in a civil capacity; that is, those employed in the discharge of the functions of government from an administrative standpoint are now able to make such work a life career. I feel that our Army should be reorganized in such a way that it will offer a career and make it sufficiently attractive for men to make it their life work. Such a policy has in a way been adopted for the Navy, and, if adopted for the Army, I think we could reasonably expect to keep trained men—men who would be real experts in military life. The reorganization should provide for a graduated scale of pay according to length of service, with the right to retire after 15, 20, or 25 years with a fair and reasonable annuity of compensation. Such a program would not only be a good guaranty against war but should be sufficiently attractive to insure a volunteer army made up of sincere, capable, loyal, and patriotic citizens. My further thought is that such a program will not only strengthen and develop the spirit of loyalty and patriotism of coming generations but will in a measure take the place of what has heretofore been a relief program. In other words, instead of encouraging the youth to look to our Government for aid and support with the least possible amount of service in return, the suggested policy will afford an opportunity to develop a different spirit, a different type of devotion, a different type of loyalty, a different type of citizenship on the part of many who are to direct, protect, defend, and perpetuate our system of government. Our Military Affairs Committee should begin now to study and provide for an army commensurate with our needs and in keeping with our military agencies, such as the Navy and Air Corps.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

The President was right when he said a few days ago that the problem of providing a system of training men for military service in this country is the responsibility of the Congress. It was not absolutely necessary to say it, but he is correct and instead of trying to dodge the question or shift the responsibility we should face it courageously. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides: "Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy."

In construing this provision of the Constitution our Supreme Court has held that the power to raise armies carries with it the exclusive power to say who shall serve in them and in what way. Some have said that the President wants this or he wants that, but I want to say that his responsibility is not involved here today. The Constitution makes him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. His responsibility begins when an army has been raised and navy provided for, but not before. Undoubtedly he has the right to make suggestions by reason of his position as Commander in Chief of the armed forces and they should be given due consideration, but we cannot shift our responsibility to him. We are representatives of the people and our responsibility is to them. In the last analysis the people will determine the nature and extent of our defense program. They will get a defense program sufficient to defend their rights and interests if they want it. If this Congress does not provide for it they will get a new Congress.

A further interpretation of this provision in the Constitution by the Court holds that the power of Congress to raise and support armies carries with it the power of determining how they shall be raised, whether by voluntary enlistment or by the selective draft policy under which we are now proceeding. The Congress is also charged with the responsibility of determining the age at which a soldier shall be received, the period for which he shall be taken, the compensation he shall be allowed, and the service to which he may be assigned. This is an extraordinary power lodged in the Congress, but it was placed there by the framers of the Constitution and ratified by the people. Time and again it has been held that Congress may confer upon minors the privilege of serving in land or naval forces, authorize them to enlist, or draft them upon such terms as it may deem expedient or just. As a matter of fact, the exclusive power given to Congress to raise and support armies carries with it a responsibility equal to or greater than the responsibility placed upon any other branch of our Government. It should, therefore, be exercised with great deliberation and patriotic courage. It is a power not to be treated lightly and in the exercise of which the individual Member cannot consult his personal feelings. He must be guided by a patriotic sense of duty and demonstrate the courage of a conscientious conviction.

In the exercise of this power and in the discharge of this obligation he should have in mind the protection and maintenance of the rights and liberties of the people. It is not an easy matter for Members of Congress to know at all times the proper and best way to proceed in protecting the rights of our Nation, but if we could see the agencies of force now operating in Europe placed upon a screen as a moving picture and observe their actions for the past 2 years and properly analyze each step taken, we could not escape the conclusion that our national safety is seriously threatened and, therefore, it becomes necessary for Congress in the discharge of its responsibility to devise the

best ways and means for raising an army that may successfully meet the enemy forces as they draw nearer and more pronounced in their designs day by day.

I am not alarmed over the probability of immediate invasion of our landed territory, where an army will be needed in case of invasion, but I am greatly concerned about raising an army and being ready if there should be an attempted invasion. We connot wait until an invasion actually begins and then try and get ready for it.

I cannot understand how a person can say he is in favor of full and complete defense and at the same time be unwilling to provide for an adequate army. They are saying, "Hitler will never come here." He may not. I hope he will not, but I would like to know where he is going, because there is no evidence he is planning to stop any time soon. Within less than 3 years he has overrun a dozen separate countries and virtually placed in bondage over 150,000,000 people. How did he do it? Every high-school boy in this country will tell you his success is due primarily to his large and well-trained army. Most of the people balking at building up an army put their objections on the ground that they do not want our boys to go to Europe. Certainly, we do not want them to go to Europe and I would be one of the last Members of Congress to send them there or to any other foreign country but, as I have said, I am interested in making necessary preparations to defend this country against invasion and we cannot wait until invasion begins to make preparation. I think a strong and permanent army is going to be essential in any defense program and I have taken this time to suggest to the Committee my thought and ideas as to how such an army can be provided.

As stated at the outset, I am not wedded to any particular program or policy. I may be wrong in the program suggested, but I am submitting it for whatever it may be worth. If there are other plans and better plans they should be submitted for the purpose of discussion and consideration. I repeat, it is the duty of the Congress, the representatives of the people, to provide appropriate and adequate defense for this country and we cannot afford to neglect our duty and shift our responsibility to our successors and hope for perpetual security, because they may be as weak and indifferent as we are should we neglect or fail in the discharge of our responsibility at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that nearly 5 years ago I felt it was not too soon for the membership of this body to submit their ideas or plans by which our Army and military forces might be definitely and efficiently provided for, and I still feel that if the suggestions made at that time were incorporated into a policy or program we would have an army—a contented and satisfied army—an army we would well be proud of and one that would command the respect and fear of every other nation or any combination of nations throughout the world. The suggestion that action should now be postponed until after the election is absurd. The responsibility is as great today as it will be then, and I hope we have as much ability and courage now to face this responsibility as we will have 6 months from now. Immediate action would furnish to the young men of the country a definite policy, a policy that would enable them to have definite assurance of the opportunities in the military service and what they could reasonably expect in the way of economic security should they decide to make this service a career, which should be just as attractive and possibly more inspiring than jobs or positions in the Civil Service of their Government.

We have waged a great war since the above remarks were made and we have learned a great deal in the meantime. My suggestions now would be to fix the minimum pay of an enlisted man at $65 or $70 per month and increase this amount to the extent of $10 every 5 years so that if he served for more than 15 years his salary would be $95 or $100 per month, when he could then retire at two-thirds or three-fourths of his salary. I am convinced that under such a policy the Secretary of War would have a waiting list of volunteers and we could have one of the most efficient military forces of any time in our history and such an army can be maintained at less or, at least no greater, cost than any other program suggested.

When it comes to cost we should remember that we are living under a cooperative system of government. It is a government of the people. They not only have the right to provide and direct our policies of government, but are charged with the responsibility. In the discharge of this responsibility there are both individual and collective responsibilities and my theory is we should collectively provide facilities for our national defense and in providing for this defense we should not require persons acting in their individual capacity to make an individual sacrifice out of proportion to our collective sacrifice. We should not expect individuals to offer their personal services in the way of defense and thereby make sacrifices out of proportion to our collective sacrifices in discharging our collective responsibilities. That is, we should not expect individuals to volunteer their services in our defense unless we are collectively willing to make the sufficient sacrifice to reasonably compensate them for their services. In other words, we should not be willing to have them sacrifice their time, their talents, and possibly their lives for our protection unless we are willing to make corresponding sacrifices and reasonably compensate them for their services. My position in the matter is not new. It is not the product of war. It is a conviction of long standing, one openly expressed nearly 6 years ago. It is in keeping with the ideals of the founders of our Republic. So far it has proven to be a successful policy and I am of the conviction that the American conception of the military responsibility of the individual is still sufficiently strong to defend this Nation and will continue sufficiently strong to protect it against all enemies so long as the collective gratitude of the people is sufficient to merit or command such services.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1944 the Congress passed the Surplus Property Act. Disposal of surplus goods to veterans and other priority claimants is a basic philosophy of the law as enacted by the Congress. We find, however, from the hundreds of letters we are receiving and the telephone calls and wires coming in, that the veterans as well as others having a priority status are experiencing so much difficulty, and finding the administration of the program so enmeshed in red tape, that they have about given up as hopeless and have about written off any prospect of getting any of the property that has been declared surplus.

Favoritism in the handling and disposition of surplus property and the methods employed in the handling of many of the sales are so utterly ridiculous and so steeped in partiality, that the only conclusion anyone can reach is that a gigantic conspiracy and racket is going on between officials connected with the administration of the sale of the property and favored purchasers, the net result being that a few highly favored dealers are in many cases getting all the property offered and at a very small percentage of the actual value of the property. Indicative of the ridiculous manner in which some of these sales are being conducted, I include as a part of my remarks two letters which I received recently from two potential purchasers in my own congressional district, which is attached to the Fort Worth, Tex., region, which letters refer to a sale of automotive parts at Mabry ordnance shop at Austin, Tex., on April 1, 1946.

G. O. WILLIAMS AUTO CO.,
Sharon, Okla., April 6, 1946.

MANAGER, WAR ASSETS CORPORATION,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR SIR: We are not pleased with the methods of the sale of automotive parts at Mabry Ordnance Shops at Austin, Tex., on April 1 for the reasons indicated below.

1. It is incomprehensible to us that automotive parts be sold so cheaply, when your office has orders from us and other dealers for the identical parts at much higher prices. To illustrate: Page 93 of the catalogue listed "Lot No. 1646 606636 cylinder block, chev W/pistons, pins, and rings new 11 each, lot price $206.25." This figures $18.75 each. Your office has had our order since September 24, 1945, for four of these assemblies at $143 list or net of $64.35. On page 66 lots 973 and 974 are 21 more of this same item shown "reconditioned Std. Bore" at $12.50 ea. Under the terms of our order you would have been privileged to have shipped these to us and other dealers at the $64.35. There are few Chevrolet dealers in the United States who would not have given their Chevrolet cost of $85.80 each for these, and due to the present parts shortage, we would have given $110 each for delivery within 7 days.

2. The sale was well advertised and the attractive prices brought about 3,000 would-be buyers. Their preference order was determined by a sporting classic, a race on foot between two gates about a mile apart. The winner, a soldier, chose only a $64 motor for his jeep. No. 2's sponsors bought about $150,000 and No. 3's sponsors about $125,000 leaving only about $20,000 of fairly undesired items. But some 2,991 buyers, including our representative, probably spent more travel expense than the sale grossed, and got exactly nothing. However, our representative estimated the material which sold for about $25,000 would have brought over $1,000,000 on competitive bid basis. And there was a very definite belief among the unsuccessful buyers that the sale was "rigged" in this manner,

to allow certain fortunate gentlemen to profit by more than $500,000.

In our opinion your method of selling on mail orders is the most satisfactory, if, you would fill our orders with the material you have. At least it doesn't involve expense if we get nothing.

Yours very truly,

G. O. WILLIAMS.

WESTERN CHEVROLET CO.,
Guymon, Okla., April 5, 1946.

Mr. ROSS RIZLEY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROSS: I am sure that you will be happy when and if the time ever comes when a letter from your district contains other than an airing of grievances. Be that as it may, I have just returned from a sale of surplus automotive parts held at the Mabry Ordnance Shops, Austin, Tex., and feel it my duty to give you an account of the handling of the sale.

The sale started April 1 at 9 a. m. and was scheduled to last through April 13. However the instructions in the sale notice urged the prospective purchasers to come to the grounds on the preceding Friday or Saturday and register in order to gain immediate admission to the grounds when the gates opened at 9 a. m.

Following these instructions I left Guymon on Thursday, March 28, arrived at Austin on Friday evening, and registered at the place of sale on Saturday, March 30. The officer in charge could not or would not give me any information as to how the sale would be handled. He did state however that he was sure that priority to purchase would not be determined by a foot race and that every prospective purchaser would be given an equal opportunity to purchase from the approximately $4,000,000 worth of parts.

I arrived at the grounds of the ordnance shops about 7:30, Monday, April 1, and found a line of cars reaching from the gate about ½ mile down the highway, with a large group on foot around the gate. Numerous questions were asked the officers at the gate as to how the sale would be handled but none seemed to know, as they advised they were not the group who would handle the sale. However they did state that any car attempting to pass another car en route to the immediate sales grounds would be disqualified, for as the officer said, "This is not going to be a foot race or car race either."

The outside gate to the ground opened about, 8:15 and the cars started on one road and the men on foot by another route. The cars arrived first and those especially who were in the first cars jumped from their seats and raced madly for the gate in order to be first in the line. This applies especially to the first 8 or 10 automobiles. For the greater part the crowd walked down to the line in a very gentlemanly manner.

The gate to the sale barn opened at about 9 a. m., one purchaser being admitted at a time, with positively no attention being given to whether or not a prospective purchaser had previously registered. The instruction to register Friday or Saturday was a farce causing many dealers to waste time that was precious to them. In order to have kept their word the men in charge of the sale should have had anyone not registered to step out of line until those previously registered had been admitted. On being admitted, especially the first 8 or 10, raced one another to the sale barn, which would remind a farm boy of a bunch of shoats racing for a choice bucket of swill.

The story is this, Ross, that when 9 purchasers had finished buying, every desirable item had been sold, and the 500 silly fools like myself who had imagined they could buy a few parts so badly needed, after 4 months of strike-bound parts plants, were ready to come home with their hands in their pockets just like they went. One man purchased the 156 new motors advertised. Another the approximately 1,000 used Chevrolet motors; another every new part for Chevrolet cars and trucks listed in the book. Mr. Warshawsky, of Chicago, got practically every transmission, front-end assembly, and rear-end assembly listed for the entire sale. In other words when these big shots had finished their buying nothing was left but undesirable merchandise which should have been sold for junk.

I do not object so greatly to letting the big boys have all the merchandise, that all the taxpayers have purchased, at a fraction of what it is worth, if the damned liars will quit advising us that we have a chance to buy the parts we need from the War Assets Corporation. Their men were given positive information as to how to handle the deal to get the job done. Otherwise, how could it happen that out of the first nine, eight were big buyers?

I do not suppose that I shall attempt to attend another sale, but if it is possible to stop the War Assets Corporation from selling out to only a few rich men who will concentrate their purchases in a few places, in preference to an honest distribution over the country, it should be done. It would have been a very simple matter to rotate the purchasing privilege at this sale so every eligible buyer present could have bought a satisfactory bill of goods, with which he could have been able to serve a large number of customers in his community.

I lost a week's time and spent $150 in trying to purchase parts sorely needed, without getting 1 penny's worth purchased, while the old boy who got the 1,000 Chevrolet motor assemblies could have sold out immediately for a profit of $20,000. Well, Ross, I guess that about demonstrates my speed.

You can readily see, Ross, that I have written this myself. Hope you can make out what I am trying to say. There is probably nothing that can be done, but at least I have had my turn at belly-aching.

Why not come home and we will go fishing and I will finish the story. With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours.

Government Housing Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the observations of Edward Hoffrek, a building contractor with 25 years' experience in home construction:

Perhaps a builder's viewpoint on OPA and housing would be of interest. None seems to find expression in all the propaganda on the subject. As one who has built several hundred small homes in suburbs of New York, I believe that scarcities in privately built small housing will continue and increase regardless of any increases in material prices.

I say this because I am convinced there will be no market for such materials on any worth-while basis so long as there is any chance that ceiling prices will be placed on new homes.

The uncertainty that accompanies the variety of materials and labor, as to cost to the builder, is so great because of the personal element into the matter of subcontractors' estimates, that no builder would expose himself to a ceiling price, or contract price, for the sale of his product unless he was of a reckless gambling disposition.

I have found no prospective owner willing to enter into a cost-plus agreement so far for a small home, though several have asked me for estimates.

Out of all the propaganda I have observed, none seems to me to deal practically with the matter of getting small homes built or apartments made available for low rental tenancy. OPA controls are frustrating both of these results, in the opinion of this builder.

In all my 25 years of experience, I have found only 2 percent of home-building owners to be young people, such as the present-day veteran They are nearly all middle-aged and a few elderly people who have the means and inclination to have new homes built.

These people for a number of years have been comfortably situated under abnormally low depression-year rentals and are disinclined to spend their money because of habit formed in these years, when all realty investment was so bad, and supplies were unobtainable during the war.

If these rental controls were removed, thousands of such people would step out under the lash of increased rents and have homes built as always happened in the past. This, of course, provided the danger of ceilings on new homes was past and the thousands of small builders reentered the field competitively, in the confidence that materials would again flow freely.

It would not be long before the rentals of these vacancies came tumbling down as the high rentals would find them standing unoccupied.

This would be the working out of natural law which will ultimately have to prevail in any commercial field. It is very unfortunate that so many novices and politicians and professional people are holding back this adjustment just because they must be educated in natural business law at such frightful expense to businessmen and consumers throughout the country.

There is also the terrible moral degeneration caused by the imposition of impossible controls because of violations by opportunists, who are being multiplied by hundreds of thousands, while prices rise due to black markets. Impossible prohibitions are much more quickly violated in necessities than it was in liquor

It should be obvious to the public that when the attempt failed so badly to set floors under prices by the NRA and its General Johnson, that the law of competition cannot be ignored by bureaucratic government. Chiselers were everywhere cutting prices when it would have appeared to their interest to keep them up; how then can ceilings be maintained when it is not to the interest of business to produce at a loss?

Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that I am not satisfied with the fact that the United States is taking practically the entire crop of rice of the United States for allocation to the Combined Food Board. My district and State is the largest rice-producing section of the United States, and, especially in Louisiana, rice is one of the basic foods for our people; and, notwithstanding that we have made representations that our citizens, inmates of hospitals, schools, penal, and other in-

stitutions were unable to obtain rice, which replaces bread, we find that most of our rice is going to the Combined Food Board, and we are being deprived of a reasonable amount for our domestic use. Of course, the fact is overlooked that those who are interested in the development of the rice industry have spent millions of dollars advertising the use of rice, and now that it is being generally used in breakfast foods and otherwise, if our domestic market is destroyed, it will take years to reestablish this market to replace the substitutes which will be used.

Mr. Speaker, the British Government, as usual, is looking after the needs of the Empire, and in an article entitled "A Statement About the United States Rice Industry" inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date February 28, 1946, I included an article substantiating my previous statements in this regard.

In other words, the British have grabbed 33,600,000 pockets from Siam, 3,300,000 pockets from Egypt, the surplus from Brazil, and still our Government finds it necessary to take most of our pitifully small supply and place it in the combined food board. The amount the British have secured from Siam alone—33,600,000 pockets—is more than twice the amount of the entire production of the United States.

Yet, our country is trying to supply the world with rice when this country only produces approximately 1 percent of the world supply.

Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like those in authority should realize that notwithstanding the fact that our country's resources are great that we cannot feed the balance of the world, and that they should have some consideration for our own people.

Of course, we are all willing to share all of the food that we can spare to relieve the hungry and starving peoples of other countries, but it looks to me like our officials are trying to assume a burden which is beyond our resources, and at the expense and deprivation of our own country.

It was a great surprise for our Government officials to learn that Russia and Argentina and other countries had great surpluses of food and were sending food to other countries. We were sending food to Russia, and all of a sudden we learned that Russia was sending 600,000 tons of food to France. Of course, we rushed to furnish the ships to Russia to move this food to France, but Russia said no. We want credit for furnishing this food to France; we will use our own ships; we do not need your ships.

Now, I was in France shortly after the liberation, and I saw the most bountiful crops and finest herds of cattle that I have ever seen, and the problem which I observed was a matter of transportation there, and I think many of the other countries in Europe are in the same position.

Unless we are going to establish a world-wide WPA, it looks to me like it is time for someone to go to work.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that we did not feed the world before the last war, and, in justice to ourselves, we cannot do it now.

Hon. William Randolph Hearst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Enquirer of January 21, 1946 entitled "A Merited Tribute to Mr. Hearst":

A MERITED TRIBUTE TO MR. HEARST

It was indeed fitting that the American Legion honored Mr. William Randolph Hearst with its highest award—its Distinguished Service Medal—for certainly this organization of patriotic Americans knows, as do we all, that Mr. Hearst has been outstanding in Americanism and in the advocacy of those policies which are best for our country.

National Commander John H. Stelle, in pinning the medal on Mr. Hearst, called attention to the fact that Mr. Hearst has stood solidly with the Legion on national defense, rehabilitation, and other major programs.

Of course, Mr. Hearst supported the Legion program. As a matter of fact long before the Legion was born he led the way in every project that had for its purpose the strengthening of our country's defenses, the promotion of true patriotism and the improvement of the welfare of all Americans. At times his was the only voice raised in behalf of true American interests. At times his only reward was a smear campaign originating with those who hate America and who hold America's interests as secondary to those of some other country.

But these attacks did not stop Mr. Hearst. They did not cause him to vary one iota from his course. Regardless of the pressure, the slanders, and the calumnies, he fought, and still fights for the good cause. His inspired patriotism is armor that can withstand a thousand blows, regardless of their origin or their viciousness.

The people of America, particularly those who have risked their lives in the armed forces, value Mr. Hearst's services. In this connection it will be recalled that when Mr. Hearst, through his newspapers in 1931 exposed a secret Anglo-French commercial treaty that would have proven detrimental to American commercial interests, the French retaliated by expelling Mr. Hearst from their country.

However, what Mr. Hearst suffered at the hands of the French was more than made up for by the reception he received when he returned to America. A tremendous throng awaited him here in New York, and chief among his welcomers were thousands of sightless and limbless veterans of the First World War who left their hospital beds to go down the bay in the steamship *Hook Mountain* to show Mr. Hearst that they—men who had shed their blood for America—believed in him and supported him in his stand.

Further, the reception in New York was duplicated in every city where Mr. Hearst stopped on his way to California. Boston, Chicago, Omaha, and other cities turned out en masse and accorded Mr. Hearst one of the greatest series of ovations ever accorded any American.

History records Washington as the greatest American of the eighteenth century; in the nineteenth this honor is undoubtedly Lincoln's. And when the full record of the twentieth century is written, certainly the name of William Randolph Hearst will lead the list.

America owes a great debt to Mr. Hearst. It is encouraging to find the American Legion paying public tribute to him, for with their example before them, other organizations of patriotic men and women should also arrange to bestow on Mr. Hearst some of the honors a grateful America owes him.

Ceiling Price Should Be Removed on Rough Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include letters, I beg to submit a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Hon. Paul Porter, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1946.

HON. PAUL PORTER,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to respectfully urge upon behalf of the rice producers of my district and the State of Louisiana that ceilings on rough rice be eliminated for 1946, if the Price Control Act is extended without my proposed amendment to exempting rough rice from the provisions of the Price Control Act.

My district is one of the largest rice-producing districts in the United States, and my constituents, and myself as their Representative in the Congress have consistently opposed the placing of ceiling prices on rough rice from the inception of the price-control program.

Rough-rice growers have consistently argued that no ceiling price was necessary in view of the fact that there is a ceiling price on the finished product.

Rice is one of the few crops which go through a processing operation for which price ceilings at the grower level are now in effect.

While I am sympathetic to the millers as they are a necessary adjunct to the industry, and I have always contended that they, like all other businesses, are entitled to a fair and reasonable profit on their operations, the sole effect of price ceilings on rough rice has been to guarantee a profit to the miller.

For full information in regard to the position of the rice industry in regard to ceiling prices on rough rice, I would respectfully refer you to your files where you will find that on behalf of my constituents, for the past 3 years I have fought the administration of this program by your administration—day in and day out—over that entire period, resulting happily for us in a concession by the increase of the ceiling price after we furnished uncontrovertible facts and figures that the ceiling price as established by the Office of Price Administration was below the cost of production. The OPA had none. The ceiling price established was arbitrary.

If your Agency is continued, the leaders of the administration have announced on numerous occasions the policy that present orders, regulations, and controls will be relaxed as promptly as possible without endangering the cost of living or contributing to inflation. Maximum Price Regulation 518 is one order which can be readily dispensed with in line with this policy.

Very respectfully yours,

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Seventh District, Louisiana.

A Tribute to the Memory of Hon. William Olin Burgin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I pay a tribute to the memory of a departed friend, the late Congressman WILLIAM OLIN BURGIN, of North Carolina, who served as a Member of the House of Representatives until he was recently stricken and taken from our midst. The tribute is in the form of a beautiful and appropriate poem, composed by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, a loyal employee of the Federal Government, who is now attached to the office of the Architect of the Capitol:

The Congressman BURGIN of North Carolina
Has bravely responded to Death's silent call,
To enter that life, fraught with pleasures diviner
And far more abundant and sweeter than all
The joys with which men are endowed while they're living
In this changing world, with its smiles and its tears—
Less int'rested seemed he in getting than giving
To others all thru life's laborious years.
He knelt at the shrine of the Goddess of Duty,
And tried to meet justly her every demand—
True worshipper was he of natural beauty,
With which God abundantly has blessed our Land.
Above all the virtues he placed sacred honor,
Protector of all of the virtues that are—
Old Glory he loved, and he showered upon her
His praises in times both of peace and of war.
His voice has been silenced among us forever—
We'll never more feel the warm clasp of his hand—
That welcoming smile on his face we will never
Again see until in the Beautiful Land
We meet, where there'll be no more sad separations
Nor sorrows, nor tears, and no more last goodbyes,
No more disappointments and painful vexations,
Up yonder in Glory, where life never dies.

With becoming dignity, courtliness of manner, with great impartiality and with courage that never failed, our departed friend discharged honorably and well the duties of every trust reposed in him by the people he was chosen to represent. He had a wide circle of friends, and all who knew him loved him. It was my privilege to be his friend, and his friendship will always be one of the cherished memories of my life. We shall miss him. We may, however, find some consolation in the words of the poet who wrote:

They say that life is a highway,
The milestones are its years,
But here and there is a toll gate
Where we pay our way with tears.
It's a high road and a rough road,
And it leads near and far,
But it leads at last to the Golden Town
Where the golden houses are.

Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., March 18, 1946:

Confusion and let-down are salient characteristics of the period through which we are now passing. These characteristics are nowhere more evident than in the matter of our policy toward Germany.

How did our policy evolve, what is it, and how is it being applied? So many conflicting answers are being given to each of these questions—so many allegations and counter-allegations are being made—that people are becoming bewildered and tired of the whole problem. This state of mind can have dangerous consequences.

From the summer of 1944, when the question of policy toward defeated Germany first began to be discussed at the Cabinet level, until my resignation from the Cabinet about a year later, I was intimately in touch with the development of that policy. I want to try this evening, on the basis of my knowledge of events, to clarify the record on a number of matters which have been in dispute. This may help to reduce present confusion, some of which, I regret to say, has been deliberately created.

In the first place, how did our policy toward Germany evolve? It was a matter which President Roosevelt considered of crucial importance and about which he held strong convictions. The keystone of the President's wartime policy was the development and maintenance of solidarity among the Allies both to accomplish the complete defeat of our enemies and for the subsequent winning of the peace. Less than 1 month after we entered the war, the United Nations was founded. The joint declaration by the United Nations, issued at Washington on January 1, 1942, stressed the essentiality of the full use of resources to achieve complete victory, and the signatory governments also pledged themselves to refrain from making any separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

As a further step in strengthening United Nations solidarity and assuring the complete defeat of our enemies, President Roosevelt devised the now famous formula of unconditional surrender. He secured the British Prime Minister's acceptance of this formula at the Casablanca meeting in January 1943, and the principle was subsequently submitted to and accepted by Marshal Stalin.

At the Tehran Conference in November 1943, President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill reached an understanding for the military occupation of Germany after unconditional surrender had been achieved. Occupation by the forces of the three powers was to be on a zonal basis, with a consultative and coordinating body at the top. There was also some preliminary discussion of policy toward defeated Germany. The Tehran plan for three-power occupation of Germany was revised at Yalta to include France as an occupying power.

This, then, was the general background—unconditional surrender to be followed by military occupation of Germany along zonal lines. This was the framework into which our plans had to be fitted. The policy issues involved first began to be considered and discussed at the Cabinet level in the summer of 1944. During a visit to the European theater at that time, I had an opportunity to look into the plans for occupation of Germany which were then being prepared at SHAEF. This planning work was being carried on by British and American officers in the staff division concerned with military government. It seemed to me that these military plans placed too great a share of the responsibility for rehabilitating Germany on the occupying forces rather than on the German people themselves, and that not enough emphasis was being placed on the task of destroying Nazi influence and eliminating Germany's industrial potential for war. In any event, it was clear that these were important issues of national policy which ought not to be decided at a technical military level.

On returning to Washington I reported these impresisons and views to President Roosevelt. I found that he, himself had already given a great deal of thought to these issues and that his own convictions and views were in close accord with the opinions which I had expressed. Following my report to him, the President directed that the question of policy toward defeated Germany be considered by Mr. Hull, Mr. Stimson, and myself. In the ensuing months, the three of us explored and discussed this problem at considerable length. Failing to reach full agreement, each one submitted his own views to the President, who made the final decision. That decision was essentially in accord with the President's earlier conclusions and it did not differ significantly from my own views on the subject.

At the Quebec conference in September 1944, the President raised with Mr. Churchill this question of treatment of Germany. He invited me to Quebec to join in these conversations. At the conclusion of the discussions on this topic, a memorandum of agreement was dictated by Prime Minister Churchill to his secretary and was then read and initialed by him and by President Roosevelt. Because I feel that it may be helpful for the record, I am going to read this memorandum:

"At a conference between the President and the Prime Minister upon the best measures to prevent renewed rearmament by Germany, it was felt that an essential feature was the future disposition of the Ruhr and the Saar.

"The ease with which the metallurgical, chemical, and electric industries in Germany can be converted from peace to war has already been impressed upon us by bitter experience. It must also be remembered that the Germans have devastated a large portion of the industries of Russia and of other neighboring allies, and it is only in accordance with justice that these injured countries should be entitled to remove the machinery they require in order to repair the losses they have suffered. The industries referred to in the Ruhr and in the Saar would therefore be necessarily put out of action and closed down. It was felt that the two districts should be put under somebody under the world organization which would supervise the dismantling of these industries and make sure that they were not started up again by some subterfuge.

"This program for eliminating the war-making industries in the Ruhr and in the Saar is looking forward to converting Germany into a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in its character.

"The Prime Minister and the President were in agreement upon this program.

"O. K.

"F. D. R.
"W. S. C.

"SEPTEMBER 15, 1944."

After this agreement was reached, the question whether northwestern Germany, including the Ruhr, should be occupied by American or by British forces was quickly settled in Britain's favor. This question had

previously been the subject of much debate over a number of months.

Before going ahead to describe the subsequent stages in the development of Allied policy toward Germany, I should like to digress briefly in order to comment on two features of this Quebec memorandum. The first feature is that this laid special emphasis on the disposition of the Ruhr and the Saar. The Saar will, I presume, be formally transferred in due course to France, but the question of the disposition of the Ruhr is still unsettled. The French proposal for internationalization of this critically important industrial area has not been given a thorough hearing. Instead, the proposal has been treated evasively. The issue has been dodged.

Second, the Quebec memorandum sets forth the objective of converting Germany into a primarily agricultural country, through the elimination of war-making industries. I believe in this policy. I wish also to emphasize, however, that the policy is an official policy of governments, not—as is so often alleged—a personal scheme or plot of mine.

What this policy means has also been the subject of much misrepresentation, sometimes deliberately hostile. The policy means a reorientation of German economic life away from heavy industries which cater to the war machine, toward agriculture and other activities directly related to the satisfaction of civilian wants.

In my book, Germany Is Our Problem, I have put forward a detailed blueprint for effecting this reorientation. Despite her intense concentration on heavy industry and armament, Germany before the war employed more workers in agriculture than did the United States, out of a smaller working population than ours. During the war Germany was nearly self-sufficient in foodstuffs. If Germany's industrial war potential is to be eliminated, a substantial proportion of the workers released must be absorbed in agriculture unless they are to remain unemployed in cities. Agricultural activities must become the largest single field of employment for the German population. Far from being an inhuman program, this is the only humane way of effecting the necessary industrial disarmament of Germany. It is probable that the transfer to Poland of a substantial part of eastern Germany will prevent Germany from reaching full self-sufficiency in food, even with increased productive effort, but this need not interfere with maximum concentration of effort in agriculture.

So far as I am aware, no one has proposed the elimination of all German industry. Certainly I have not, although if I did not know better, listening to my critics would long ago have convinced me that I had. As is clearly set forth on pages 70 and 71 of my book for anyone who wishes to find out, my proposed blueprint, based on Germany's 1937 frontiers, calls for the retention of 6,600,000 workers in industry and an additional 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 in transportation, utilities and trade. Because of the loss of Eastern territory to Poland, a somewhat larger proportion of German workers will have to be employed in light manufacturing to provide the exports to pay for needed food imports. This necessitates some modifications in the detailed blueprint, but does not call for any alteration in the essential substance of the policy. So much for that.

After Quebec, the next forward step in Allied planning for Germany was taken at Yalta in February 1945. The communiqué issued at the end of this Big Three Conference contained a comprehensive, general agreement on policy toward Germany. Here are the key sentences.

"It is our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and nazism and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world. We are determined to disarm and disband all German armed forces; break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production; bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans; wipe out the Nazi Party, Nazi laws, organizations, and institutions; remove all Nazi and militarist influences from public office and from the cultural and economic life of the German people; and take in harmony such other measures in Germany as may be necessary to the future peace and safety of the world. It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when nazism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans and a place for them in the comity of nations."

The final step in the process of reaching Allied agreement on Germany was taken at Potsdam. The accomplishment at Potsdam was to translate into more specific terms the general principles agreed upon at Yalta.

The Potsdam communiqué contains specific agreements on "the political and economic principles to govern the treatment of Germany in the initial control period" and on German reparations. I shall quote only a few significant sentences from the Potsdam agreement:

"In order to eliminate Germany's war potential, the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as well as all types of aircraft and seagoing ships shall be prohibited and prevented. Production of metals, chemicals, machinery, and other items that are directly necessary to a war economy shall be rigidly controlled and restricted to Germany's approved postwar peacetime needs. * * * Productive capacity not needed for permitted production shall be removed in accordance with the reparations plan recommended by the Allied Commission on Reparations and approved by the governments concerned, or if not removed shall be destroyed. In organizing the German economy, primary emphasis shall be given to the development of agriculture and peaceful domestic industries. The amount of equipment to be removed from the western zones on account of reparations must be determined within 6 months from now at the latest. Removals of industrial capital equipment shall begin as soon as possible and shall be completed within 2 years from the determination specified (in the preceding paragraphs)."

This completes the story—so far as my knowledge goes—of the main steps in the formulation of Allied policy toward Germany. The process of evolving this policy extended over a period of 2½ years—Casablanca, Tehran, Quebec, Yalta, and finally Potsdam. President Roosevelt's masterful and wise influence is evident throughout, even at Potsdam when he was no longer alive. I shall always be proud of the part which the President gave me the opportunity to play in assisting in the formulation of a plan for Germany which would contribute toward world peace.

So much for the evolution of policy. What is our policy toward Germany today? Officially it presumably still remains the policy contained in the Potsdam protocol and in our published general directive, to the commander of the United States occupying forces, on the military government of Germany, known as JCS 1067. In any event no statement has been made to indicate that these documents do not stand as our policy today.

How is the policy being applied? The consensus of almost all observers is that the whole program to make Germany incapable of future aggression is being applied hesitantly and half-heartedly. This is true with respect to denazification, removal of industrial plants, seizure of German external assets, and decartelization.

Why has the program not been vigorously carried out? It would be easy to blame the men on the spot—to say that the contractor hasn't followed the architect's blueprint. I don't believe that this is the whole story. I think that the men on the spot haven't received from London, Moscow, Paris, and Washington the continuing guidance, clarification, and support which they need to do the job, and I'm afraid that occasionally the men on the spot may have received the impression that their governments don't want the blueprints to be followed very closely, anyway.

Why have Britain and the United States been so reluctant to carry out in Germany the broad policies on which they have professed agreement with each other and with the Soviet Union? The usual excuse is that humanitarian considerations have made it necessary to concentrate on rehabilitation—that destruction of Germany's war potential can come later. But this excuse is specious. As I have already indicated, the removal of Germany's war potential goes hand in hand with the reorientation of economic life toward agriculture and light manufacturing to meet consumer needs.

I cannot escape the feeling that the main reason for reluctance to carry out the program is of a quite different sort. It is that some of the people concerned really don't want a weak Germany. Despite the experience of two world wars, they still prefer a strong Germany. This seems to me one of the underlying sources of present United Nations difficulties.

Basic conflicts and disagreements among Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States made possible the comeback of German militarism after the defeat of 1918 and led inexorably to World War II. Will disputes among the victors lead them again into competition for the allegiance of a resurgent Germany, and from these into World War III? No one can yet know the answer, but the danger of the kind of split which would give Germany another chance has already become serious. Many Germans, even today, are hoping and working for precisely this objective, and the deterioration in relations among the victorious powers has provided them with rich opportunities to apply divisive tactics.

In my judgment, the failure of the occupying powers to carry out a clear-cut, cohesive policy to remove the threat of future German aggression lies at the heart of present United Nations' difficulties. If we can reach real agreement on the treatment of Germany, even at this late date, the other elements in the European settlement will fall into place. If we fail in Germany, the effort to agree on such matters as peace terms for Italy, Rumania, and the rest will be abortive, and the old pattern of European power politics will become solidly entrenched. The foundation for renewed German aggression and future war will have been laid.

I call on the signatories of the Potsdam agreement—the United States, British, and Soviet Governments—to carry out in Germany the spirit and letter of this agreement. Many valuable months have been lost. Even so, it may not be too late if the signatories of the Potsdam agreement begin now to confirm by action their faith in this agreement and their confidence in each other, so that we may look forward to peace in Europe.

Statement by Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, to the United Jewish Welfare Fund, Toronto, Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the United Jewish Welfare Fund, of Toronto, Canada, Friday, April 12, 1946:

It is pleasant to dwell briefly among you and to bring to Canada's Jews a word of cheer and encouragement from Americans of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

I'd like to say that while all about us the air is thick with words like cooperation, pacts and agreements of unity and accord, all with the high glee of "something new has been added" to the dream of world harmony, those of us aware of the history of North America know it is not something new, something untried. Here in the United States and Canada is the vital, living proof that two independent countries could, and did, live side by side, respecting each other's integrity and conscious identity, without glaring military eye, without a network of intrigue and intelligence, nor with the sword ready to leap from its scabbard. We point with justifiable pride to our unfortified frontier.

To say that the magnificence of our achievement in amity was due to lack of causes for friction is to minimize that achievement. Friction there was, but also self-restraint and temperance. Disputes there were, but also just compromise. There were controversies over timber rights and boundaries, the 54–40 or fight, tariffs and fisheries.

That is all in the past now. I merely recall them to emphasize how again and again continuous consultation, the sense of fair play, the binding of passions, the realization of the honor of the given word had made an enduring peace, daily strengthened in the recognition of a common heritage and a firm belief in the future of democracy.

In the war years Canada has grown to a new political and psychological maturity, leaving aside the obvious connection with the atom bomb secrets, we realize that Canada occupies an enviable and unique position on the international scene. Her integrity as an independent unit is inviolate, yet her place within the orbit of the British Commonwealth and her eventual membership in the Pan American Union, make her today a very international-minded country. Canada during these years has seen profound changes. From a debtor nation, she became a creditor nation. From an agricultural country, she has developed a tremendous industrial potential.

Canada now has the plants, the materials and skills to supply the stricken world with the food, goods and machinery it needs so desperately.

This is April 12, a day of meaning for all men of good will. On that day, a year ago, a world wept. Franklin Delano Roosevelt had passed away. The grief is still fresh. Yet, to live in the hearts of those you leave behind is not to die. He walks among us today in challenge and in hope.

We pause to contemplate the many conflicts that distressed and disturbed him. Then we realize how effectively he applied his personality, his indomitable spirit, his visionary statesmanship to the resolution of these conflicts. It is then, and then only, that we achieve a full and lasting appreciation of this truly great man.

God gave him as servant the understanding heart for which Solomon prayed to judge his people and enable him to discern between good and evil, between right and wrong. If ever there was a man who, in the words of the prophet Micah, "did justice, loved mercy, and walked humbly," it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He ever listened to the still, sad music of humanity. His heart was ever attuned to the needs of the common man. He struggled with might and main to find the true answer to those needs. It is said that heaven gives its favorites early death. Roosevelt died with much of his work unfinished but he had laid the foundations and he had charted the blueprints for a better world. These will be his testament—a legacy to the peoples of the world. It is for us, the living, to carry on the building and completion of the peace and the establishment of a lasting world security for which he so arduously labored.

Never in recorded history have we had a man, stricken down in the prime of life as he was, who exemplified such fortitude in overcoming the handicaps of paralysis and thereby inspiring thousands of others so afflicted to make a similar effort toward the establishment of useful and satisfactory lives. As Emerson truly said, "For everything you have missed, you have gained something also." Fate dealt Roosevelt a cruel blow but the law of compensation that is invariably operative increased Roosevelt's mental and spiritual life a thousandfold as his physical capacities were weakened. His determination to conquer the ravages of the disease with which he was afflicted will ever linger in our hearts. As you well know, he was stricken at his summer home at Campobello. He was carried to the steamer on a stretcher. Years later he returned as President, cruising on the *Amberjack* as its skipper. He spent several days there and planned to return to Washington on a large destroyer. As he reached the gangplank of the ship, escorted by admiring residents, he thrust aside the willing assistants and slowly, yet firmly, walked up the gangplank grasping a rail and using his cane for support. He had licked that problem as he was to lick so many others.

Not one in a million would have attempted, as he did, to plunge into the political maelstrom, ignoring his affliction. He succeeded where many less stout-hearted would have failed. It was my proud distinction to know him intimately well. I frequently visited with him at the White House and elsewhere. He rarely appeared depressed. On the contrary, he always seem to be buoyant, sparkling with infectious humor, loving to trade quips and puns, indulging in that pastime as frequently as he would flick the ashes from the cigarette in the perennial long holder.

The dramatic scene of his last inauguration will be, for me, unforgettable. He was wheeled out on the south portico of the White House and lifted to the lectern by his son, James, and a secret-service man. It was a cold day with a drab, dreary sky, yet at that very moment the sun came from behind the clouds and shone upon him as though divine providence had sought him out to give him guidance. There this man stood, crippled in body yet firm and vigorous of mind, mastering the destiny of his own country, with the hopeful believing eyes of the whole world turning toward him. Tears welled into the eyes of many present. The Marine Band played "Hail to the Chief" and the "Star Spangled Banner," and then the President repeated the oath of office from memory, administered by Chief Justice Stone, with his hand resting on the family Bible. He spoke briefly, yet fervently, and promised he would carry on. At that time, the flame of democracy seemed to burn more brightly as his words echoed to the far corners of the earth over the air waves. Tumultuous applause greeted the end of his address and as he turned to retire to the White House he waved a hand in jaunty greeting to the crowd and gave us a broad and comforting smile.

It is easy to be brave from a safe distance. Roosevelt was brave at any distance. He never shunned the fray. He may have taken comfort in the thought that to be great is to be misunderstood. He set the course for the ship of state and held the wheel firmly. He steered our vessel past the shoals of intolerance and the reefs of swollen privilege. He knew there would be vilifiers and detractors and isolationists and American firsters and other rabble rousers, but all they won was his contempt. We could love him for the enemies he made.

Roosevelt always respected the integrity and greatness of Canada and her people. You will remember the speech he made at Queen's University a short time before the war, when he said that the United States would never stand idly by should Canada ever be threatened.

Forever remembered will be his first inaugural address: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror, which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

With the passing of Roosevelt, the Jewish people have lost a loyal friend, a true believer in the dignity of man, be he jew or gentile, black or white. He knew well the words of Tom Paine, whose pen proved mightier than any sword during the American Revolution. Paine wrote at that time, "Prejudice, like a spider, makes everywhere its home and lives where there seems nothing to live on." Roosevelt never hesitated to strike, and strike hard, at these spiders weaving their webs of prejudice and intolerance for the unwary and the ignorant.

I believe that if we were to add a total in summing up his achievements, we would find that he thought of peoples as human beings, not as collectively this religion or that color, but as individuals, entitled to live securely and in dignity.

As I said before, he dwells among us. For you who are here this afternoon, he has a very special meaning indeed. The grace of the world is upon those who do not turn their back to suffering, and not upon those who, because they know no need, do not know the needs of others. For years now, the reports of the murder and the terror suffered by the Jews of Festung Europa filled us with a helpless rage. We considered how, but by sheer accident of birthplace, we might have been at Coventry when the blitz was at its worst. We might have been martyred at Lidice or suffocated in the lime-lined cattle cars of the Nazi fiends, or cremated in Bergen Belsen ovens. Now, for most part the guns are silent, silent enough so that we can hear in our most conscious depths the voices of the remnants of European Jewry. In a world that has been asked to give its blood to leave behind loved ones, to tear up roots, we are going to be asked to do the simplest, easiest thing of all, to give money—not our lives, not our children, not homes—only money. Money to fill out the skeletons overseas, to replace the rags with clothing, to give them hope again. Money this time, not for destruction, but for re-creation. As campaign workers for the united Jewish welfare fund of Toronto, you have reason to be proud, proud in the knowledge that the job you are doing needs doing.

I remember this story: There was once a Zadig who said to his disciple, "Look out the window. What do you see?" The disciple said, "I see the grazing cattle in the pastures, the green of the grass and the glories of nature." Whereupon the Zadig said, "I place before you this mirror. Now, what do you see?" "I see only myself," the disciple replied. "See," said the Zadig, "what a difference a little silver makes."

Yes, silver and gold makes us too often see only ourselves and blots out from view the sight of those who suffer.

You banner your campaign, Give and They Live. It's not just a euphemism. Listen, in Rumania one-half of the Jews have to depend on charity. In Hungary only 11 percent are able to earn their living. In Vienna, where 180,000 Jews had lived before the war, only 500 now have regular jobs. In Paris, landlord associations have been formed to fight Jews who want their old apartments back. A pogrom atmosphere hangs over all of Poland. Anti-Semitism has become deeply rooted in Europe. In this Hitler has won a decisive victory.

Of course, we are all united in the hope that we will some day solve the problem of Jewish homelessness. I am one of those who say that Palestine is the only solution, but I am not here this afternoon to stress that point. The problem of homelessness has become the concern of national governments everywhere. In Canada, I am happy to learn a special cabinet committee is studying the question of admitting European refugees to Canada. Prime Minister Mackenzie King described the matter as "about the most difficult problem with which any administration is faced at the present time. Up to now the Dominion has not been able to admit any large number but as the situation in the world changes we hope to take a more liberal attitude than it has been possible to take in the past." I hope he will keep that liberal attitude as the sticking point and implement good intentions with action.

That is the long range point of view. We're faced now with the immediate present. It is now a question of the saving of human lives. Look upon it that way. We are not asking subscription to an abstract concept. It is not an act of condescension, nor an act of patronage. If a homeles waif, emaciated and frightened, knocked at your door and asked for a piece of bread you would not turn him away. Well, he is knocking at your door, and hundreds of thousands like him. Because that waif is multiplied into a million and a half, we, somehow, begin to look upon it impersonally; we lose the heartthrob in the compressed mass. But think of each one as a unit, with blood, muscle, and sinew, with heart, and lungs, with dreams and despairs, even as you and I. It no longer is impersonal then; it no longer becomes a matter labeled "Problem" with a capital P, for only men with big brains and lots of government and corporate funds to tackle. You become aware that you, one entity in the teeming millions of humanity can share in reconstructing another entity who might otherwise be lost and unseen.

You have heard these horror stories of mass starvation so many times that they have almost lost their impact. You've been tempted to cry so often, "enough, enough. I know all about it." But do we? Have we heard it often enough? Can we be shocked into action? Do we really care? Ask that of those whom you will ask to contribute. Do you care enough?

I know that those who will contribute will do so willingly.

But, perhaps, unfortunately, most of us wait to be asked. Even the selling of war bonds had to be accompanied by rallies, what we call "pep" talks, auctions, prizes, slogans, radio programs, posters. We were made bond-conscious by a steady stream of catch phrases and banners. Such is our lethargy. Everybody knew the war had to be financed, but the story had to be told over and over again to induce purchases of bonds. Everybody knows of the plight of the Jews, but the story has to be told over and over again. That is why the campaign workers of the United Jewish Welfare Fund of Toronto have to tell that story again and yet again and even once more.

It will be work, but it will be rewarding work.

I have stressed the overseas aspect of the relief work, but we cannot afford to overlook the nature of the work to be done here. We must constantly keep in mind that the center of Jewish learning and culture, as well as the demographic change, has shifted from Europe to the New World. The synagogues are devastated, the Yeshivas and institutions of higher Jewish learning are gone. The famous rabbinical seminaries in Central Europe have been wiped out. You must, therefore, know that we in the New World are faced with a great and grave responsibility, the responsibility of preserving the cohesion of our people. We must, henceforth, know that ours is the task to provide the climate for the preservation of Jewish culture and tradition. Far beyond that, if the Jews of this continent do not accept this challenge, the religion will diminish in meaning and the light of Judaism will grow dim.

This is not idle talk. It is a warning as well as a challenge. Consider it well when you go out seeking contributions to the welfare fund. Only with the encouragement and the nourishment that is given by our people here to the Jewish institutions can you halt the forces of disintegration. Throughout history, the Jewish people have watched civilizations die and other civilizations replace them. The Jews have always stood at the graves of their tormentors. They have seen dynasties grow fat with power and then sink in decay. Throughout the tides of time, the Jews held firmly to their faith and their culture that no Pharoh could destroy. Now for the first time in history, destiny has charged the Jews of this continent with the burden and the joy of upholding the people. How terrible, yet how wonderful is that charge. As I glance through the names of the beneficiaries of this fund, I could not help but feel that as a people, as a culture, as a faith, the world can ill afford to lose the Jews. The Talmud Torahs, the Jewish public library, the Hebrew free schools, the Workmen's Circle schools, and abroad, the J. D. C., the Histadruth Ivrith, the Council of Palestine Institutions, the Hebrew university, all these will take nourishment from the work you will do.

We cannot shirk off that responsibility; nor can we ask the pitiable remnant of European Jewry to carry on for us our work here. We owe that to our fathers, ourselves, and our children's children.

I recall another story which I believe to be quite in point. A very wise and learned Jew had been promised by the richest man in town a very substantial contribution to be used in building a new synagogue. Time and time again the wise man asked for the promised sum, but each time was turned away with more commitments but no fulfillment. One day the rich man, losing patience at the persistence of the pious Jew, slapped his face. The wise man looked squarely at him and said, "That was for me. Now, what do you give for the schule?" Yours is a work of self-sacrifice. Despite the slap of frustration and disappointment, carry on.

It seems to me that I have taken a global tour, from the amity of our two countries, to the meaning of Franklin Roosevelt, to the devastation of Jewry abroad, to Jewish culture and learning. That's a lot of territory to cover in one address. But I think you can tie them all up together and find that the central core of what I was trying (and, I hope, succeeding) to say is that of all the precious gifts with which this world of ours is covered, the most precious of all is people, the human soul and spirit, the human mind and body. Any human suffering, human privation, human degradation is a violation, a spoliation of the real meaning of life. Every contribution you make or induce others to make helps to reduce and assuage that suffering, that travail, and thus helps to reestablish the real meaning of living.

Not That Men Shall Die, But That Men May Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we have lately won a war to guarantee the freedom of man from oppressions. It was a bloody business. But even from the harsh, cruel, and blind demands of war, man can learn.

War demands courage: a spirit and a will to win. It demands intelligence. And it demands a physical hardihood, a capacity of man's body to measure up to his spirit and his intellect.

In the will to win and the intelligence to win, and the hardihood to win, the peoples of the United States equaled and surpassed the most exacting standards.

But the shameful fact is that to find the manpower for that job we had to comb through our male population, rejecting for physical and mental defects almost as many as were found good enough for the job. That shameful story is told in the records of Selective Service.

In common with most other men, I try to reject unpleasant things. Unconsciously I try to put them from my mind. Perhaps you have forgotten the story of selective service. Let me remind you of it.

ONE MAN OUT OF THREE REJECTED

Through August 21, 1945, selective service rejected 4,828,000 men before our 15,000,000-man Army was secured. That was a ratio of nearly 1 to 3. But that does not paint the facts sufficiently black.

Selective service was instituted prior to the actual outbreak of hostilities; and for those few months before Pearl Harbor, the inductees were more carefully screened than was true at a later period in the war when we were scraping the bottom of our manpower barrel. And in those early days, 52 men out of every 100 examined were rejected. More than half of the male citizens in what should have been the best years of their lives were not physically or mentally fit for Army service.

Subsequently standards for admission were drastically lowered. Here are percentage figures from Selective Service during the period from July 1942 through December 1943. Various factors influenced the rejection rate; nevertheless, it did not ever drop below 33 percent. One man out of every three was unfit. Even that low figure of 33 percent was reached only when we first started taking the 18- and 19-year-olds and the first wave of these youngsters materially lowered the percentage of rejections. During this period, the monthly rate of unfit ranged from 33 to 46 percent.

PERCENT UP WITH AGE

The percentage of unfit mounted with the age of the man. In the 18 to 22 age group, approximately a fourth of those examined were unfit. When a man reached 34, the chances were 50–50 that

he would be rejected. At 43, the draft rejected 61 men out of each 100.

Well, figures are dull listening, I know. And there are not many more. I will try to make them as graphic as possible. Remember that these figures are telling the story of your country.

Like every Congressman, when I find statistics worked out for the Nation, I like to see how they apply to my State. So I turned through Mr. Hershey's book to Texas—Texas, the home of the rangers, one of the last frontiers, where men are men. Texas, as usual, was a leader, but I was not particularly proud of our leadership, when I read this sentence:

> In the South, the rejection rates were above the national average, for educational deficiency and syphilis.

I brooded over these Texas figures—and remember, your State's is not much different. I brooded over them and decided they should be presented in this fashion.

ONE HUNDRED TEXANS REJECTED—FOR WHAT REASON?

Here are 100 Texans who were unfit to serve their country. For what reasons were they rejected?

Seventeen of them were suffering from syphilis.

Fourteen were not sufficiently literate to pass Army tests, and this was after Army educational standards had been lowered.

Nine had various types of heart ailments.

Nine were crippled with various types of muscular and skeletal defects.

Eight had bad eyes.

Seven were suffering from mental disease. Incidentally, these figures were set up separately for our white and Negro inductees; and the record showed the mental disease was more common among the whites; syphilis more common among the Negroes.

Six of these one hundred men had hernia.

Nearly five—to be exact, 4.5—suffered from nervous diseases.

Three had tuberculosis, and 2.5 others had some other form of lung ailments.

Three had various degrees of deafness.

THE WHOLE MAN MUST BE CONSIDERED

I will spare you any more of the catalog. I think the point has been sufficiently made, that we were taught a great lesson by the war.

The war taught us that the proud race of Americans is far from perfect. But Americans are famous for one thing. When a wrong is pointed out to them, they will do their best to right it.

Government is a tool fashioned when the people join together to win an objective for the greatest good of the greatest number, and which they could not achieve except through united action. You could multiply the examples of this function of self-help. Our victory over fascism and nazism on foreign shores is a brilliant instance.

Very early in our history the people of the United States joined together to lift the level of the Nation's intelligence. Back in my State, one of our founding fathers once said, "a cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy." Education of all the people has been a goal of the people united in their Government and working through their Government.

Now we are coming to realize that man is not divisible. We are beginning to understand that the whole man must be considered. That a healthy mind, a healthy body, and a healthy soul are component parts of the whole man; and that what happens to the body will be reflected in the mind and the soul.

NOT ONE SINGLE CHILD PERFECT PHYSICALLY

I go back to my own State again to illustrate my meaning—not with generalities but with cold, indisputable facts. Our scientists went into our classrooms—classrooms housing all races of students and all economic strata. They examined those children impersonally. Their eyes, their teeth, their throats, their postures, their bodies, their health records. And they found an appalling fact. On the basis of this scientific sampling, they found not one single child who was perfect physically. Each child has some bodily defect.

I hasten to add that those who made the tests tell me this condition is not peculiar to Texas. It just happens that in Texas was conceived the idea of making such a survey.

MIND REFLECTS PAIN

Those same scientists set about to take remedial measures. You may find the details in the records of our State health department or the files of the United States Public Health Service. Suffice to prove my point here is this—to me—startling phenomenon. When those physical defects, or their causes, were remedied, the whole child started to grow. In direct ratio to the improvement in his physical well-being, that child's school grades improved. His mind had reflected the aches and pains of his body. Man has not found any scales with which to weigh the human soul; but I have no doubt that as the body and the mind grow and develop, all the foundations are laid for a happier, a more useful individual—one of the units in a society which is as indivisible as the individual himself.

I am concerned about the whole man. I am concerned about what the people, using their Government as an instrument and a tool, can do toward building the whole man, which will mean a better society and a better world.

HOPE CONGRESS WILL PASS S. 191

Mr. Speaker, I have not taken the time of this House for a lecture on public health, education, or morals. My purpose has been to lay a proper predicate for a bill which I hope this Congress will favor.

That bill is S. 191. It is a bill through which the people working with the device of government would take one crawling step toward bettering the condition of Americans by expanding their hospital facilities.

SEVENTY-FIVE MILLION A YEAR FOR 5 YEARS—A CRAWLING STEP

I urge this bill without pride of authorship. I wrote a somewhat similar bill for the House, but this one will be first to reach us for action. It is, as I said, a first crawling step toward the objective of helping raise the level of man's physical well-being. It proposes to use the power of the Government and the funds of the people to make available to the people some of the facilities they need.

S. 191 proposes to appropriate seventy-five millions a year for 5 years for the purpose of assisting the States to build proper hospital facilities. When you divide seventy-five millions among 48 States, and several Territories, the amount for each State is small indeed. As I said, it is a crawling step. But at least it is a step.

I shall not go into the intricacies of the matching plan at this time. I would call your attention to this fact. This is no attempt to federalize the Nation's hospitals. Once a hospital has been constructed with the aid set up in this bill, no Federal employee has the right to exercise supervision or control over its operations.

TEXAS SHORT 1,400 DOCTORS

Right here I should like to interject this thought. Before the Congress starts talking about socialized medicine, we ought to get enough doctors to take care of our people. It wouldn't do much good to have a card entitling you to medical service if there is no doctor to furnish that service.

The fact is that we have right now an acute shortage not only of hospital facilities but of doctors and nurses. In Texas, as an example because I know about Texas, we need 7,000 doctors for our population; we have fifty-six hundred. We are short fourteen hundred. The same picture prevails as to nurses. I think all of the talk about socializing medicine is nonsense and should be laid on the table until we train enough doctors and enough nurses and build enough hospitals. Unhappily, those are things you do not do overnight.

DESERTING RURAL PRACTICE

The hospital or public health center will make the smaller community more attractive to physicians who, more and more, are deserting rural practice for the cities, where they can find all the aids of science at hand for treatment. You cannot criticize the doctor for leaving the community where he does not have the facilities to practice what he has been taught by science. Nor can you expect the doctor to keep abreast of changing methods when the community offers him no facility for using those methods. Recently I heard a speaker say that with the progress medical science has made in recent months, in a brief time all germ diseases will be conquered. That may or may not be so, but we do know that to save lives, the doctor must have a place where he can take the emergency patient; where blood for transfusions is available; where aseptic conditions prevail to minimize the danger of infections; where nurses will watch the patient—and where nurses may be trained to meet the great need in this profession.

There is but one other provision of the bill, to which I would particularly direct your attention.

You will find in several places language substantially providing that serv-

ices must be provided without charge when the patient is not able to pay.

MASTER ADMONISHED US TO HEAL THE SICK

This is no bold concept; it is established practice in the medical profession. Certainly a hospital is not strictly a charitable institution; you and I who are able to pay should and do pay. We accept it. We make provision for it when we budget our incomes. On the other hand, our Master admonished us to heal the sick. It is our ethical obligation to hospitalize those who need it, and many communities already accept that obligation willingly. Certainly the medical practitioner does not inquire into the ability to pay of the man brought to a hospital by ambulance, suffering from traffic injuries. The doctor's first function is to heal. The money he is paid becomes incidental. His skill, under his oath, is as willingly given free as for the highest fee.

The community responsibility is as great as that of the individual practitioner. In fact, it may well be that the doctors are shouldering today much of the burden which the entire community should bear.

If you prefer to pitch this bill on a cold-blooded business basis, entirely apart from moral and ethical considerations, I believe it good business to keep up the health level of the community.

FLY DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE

A friend once remarked to me the fly which eats at the open privy of a slum area has no scruples about carrying polio to the child in the silk-stocking area. Today my blood chills when I see flies in my home where my baby is playing. The health of a community can be no better than the health of those least able to afford medical and hospital care.

The community is the sum of its individuals, the State the sum of its communities, and the Nation the sum of its States. The whole man is not divisible; nor the community; nor the State; nor the Nation.

THAT MEN SHALL LIVE

That, then, is the bill. It proposes to spend in 1 year much less than the cost of 1 day of war. It proposes to make these expenditures, not that men shall die but that men may live. It is rooted in the sound American doctrine of local government.

Let us have the courage to spend but a small fraction of war's cost in order that men may live a fuller, more complete life.

Legal Aspects of Contempt Charges by Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the existence of the Committee on Un-American Activities is a threat to our democracy and our constitutional liberties. This Congress should abolish it.

The House of Representatives has by no means delegated its full power to conduct investigation to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In fact, the resolution which created the committee limited the committee to the investigation of certain propaganda activities.

This propaganda is described as: "Un-American propaganda activities within the United States," and "subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin, and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution." The committee is given power to investigate other questions "in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

Propaganda which is American, that is propaganda which is permitted by the constitutional guarantees of freedom, speech and press, is not within the scope of the committee's inquiry. Even propaganda which is alleged to be subversive is not within the committee's power of inquiry unless it attacks the principle of our form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

From this grant of power it is clear that the House committee exceeds its authority when it investigates organizations distributing relief abroad—as the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee; when it inquires into matters of tax exemption—as in the case of the Council for American-Soviet Friendship; when it attacks organizations defending the Bill of Rights and advocating legislation—as the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; when it attacks the Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism for circulating a petition in support of a congressional resolution; when it attacks an advertising agency for placing an advertisement asking for the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee itself; when it seeks to examine the books and records and contributors' lists of various organizations without regard to their aims and purposes and without regard to the nature of their activities, propaganda or otherwise.

The internal affairs of these or other organizations, their records and membership lists and financial contributors, are not the concern of the Committee on Un-American Activities under the mandate of Congress unless these organizations are engaged in propaganda as defined in the above resolution. If they do not engage in such activities, the committee clearly exceeds its powers in investigating them.

It is settled law that when a congressional committee or any other body to which Congress has delegated power exceeds that power, resistance to this abuse of power is justified and lawful.

The following quotations from the United States Supreme Court decisions make this clear:

> And it is a necessary deduction from the decisions in *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* and *In re Chapman* that a witness rightfully may refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded, or the questions are not pertinent, to the matter under inquiry. (*McGrain* v. *Doughterty* (273 U. S., 135, 176) (1926).)
>
> An investigation not based upon specified grounds is quite as objectionable as a search warrant not based upon specific statements of facts. Such an investigation, or such a search, is unlawful in its inception and cannot be made lawful by what it may bring, or by what it actually succeeds in bringing, to light. (*G. C. Byars* v. *U. S.* (273 U. S. 28, 29) and cases cited.)
>
> No one can read these two great opinions without perceiving how closely allied in principle are the three protective rights of the individual—that against compulsory self-accusation, that against unlawful searches and seizures, and that against unlawful inquisitorial investigations. They were among those intolerable abuses of the star chamber, which brought that institution to an end at the hand of the Long Parliament in 1640. Even the shortest step in the direction of curtailing one of these rights must be halted in limine lest it serve as a precedent for further advances in the same direction, or for wrongful invasions of the others. (*Jones* v. *Securities and Exchange Commission* (298 U. S. 1).)

The Committee on Un-American Activities is limited not only by the terms of congressional resolution, but also by the constitutional guarantees of speech and press. The committee's realm of inquiry is limited to the field of propaganda. Propaganda in its broadest connotations includes the entire realm of expressed opinions and beliefs, of educational matters disseminated to call attention to evils, the methods of their elimination, and of legislative and political activities. These "propaganda activities" are all embraced in the concept of press and speech guaranteed by the first amendment to the United States Constitution. Certainly the House of Representatives did not intend to give this committee the right to investigate matters of opinion, education, and legislation upon which Congress itself cannot constitutionally legislate.

The first amendment to the Constitution is express on the limitation of congressional power:

> Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people lawfully to assembly and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The Supreme Court has oft repeated the principle that legislation which interferes with the right of speech and press is unconstitutional unless limited to those expressions which are rendered "in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent."

> And very recently we have also suggested that "clear and present danger" is an appropriate guide in determining the constitutionality of restrictions upon expression where the substantive evil sought to be prevented by the restriction is "destruction of life or property, or invasion of right of privacy." (*Thornhill* v. *Alabama* (310 U. S. 88, 105, 60 S. Ct. 736, 745, 84 L. Ed. 1093).)
>
> What finally emerges from the "clear and present danger" cases is a working principle that the substantive evil must be extremely serious and the degree of imminence extremely high before utterances can be punished. (*Bridges* v. *State of California* (62 S. Ct. 190, 193, 194, 314 U. S. 252, 86 L. Ed. 192, 1941).)

Early this year the Supreme Court recognized that—

> The preservation of a free society is dependent upon the right of each individual citizen to receive such literature as he himself might desire.

And that—

> The right to exercise the liberties safeguarded by the first amendment "lies in the foundation of free government by free men." (*Marsh* v. *State of Alabama* (Jan. 7, 1946) 14 L. W. 1083.)

The Court has emphasized the wide latitude which must be given to propaganda:

> Freedom of discussion, if it would fulfill its historic function in this Nation, must embrace all issues about which information is needed or appropriate to enable the members of society to cope with the exigencies of their period. (*Thornhill* v. *Alabama* (310 U. S. 88, 102).)

No Member of Congress mindful of the constitutional guaranties can support the committee's investigation.

Both the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties submitted to the Un-American Activities Committee copies of their published material including books, pamphlets, speeches, summaries of meetings, bulletins of information, and other material urging support for the general aims of these organizations or for specific issues. But the committee was not interested in this material.

The activities of the Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which takes no stand on domestic issues, in disseminating information about the Soviet Union, in holding tremendous public demonstrations of American-Soviet friendship participated in and approved of by the highest Government officials, at all times clearly acted in a field in which prohibitive or restrictive legislation cannot be constitutionally imposed—a field in which no "remedial" legislation is necessary or is legally permitted.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in defending the Bill of Rights, in seeking FEPC legislation, the repeal of the poll tax, the defeat of anti-labor legislation, and the elimination of discrimination was similarly engaged in "propaganda activities" not subject to congressional limitation.

The Moss-Arnold Advertising Agency, acting on behalf of a client—the Citizens United to Abolish the Wood-Rankin Committee—in placing an advertisement opposing the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and seeking its abolition, certainly did not engage in un-American or subversive activities. The advertisement itself was clearly an expression of opinion on which Congress could not—and would not—legislate.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, dedicated to giving relief to the victims of fascism and raising funds solely for that purpose, is not engaged in any propaganda activities whatsoever, subversive or otherwise.

But the Committee on Un-American Activities ignored the evidence—either of the lack of propaganda activities or of their nature. The committee refused to consider the clear proof submitted that the organizations under its attack did not come within the scope of its power. Instead the committee pressed its unwarranted demands for books, records, correspondence, contributors' lists, and so forth.

These demands cannot possibly be motivated by any valid legislative purpose. They are motivated solely by the political opposition of the members of the committee to the aims and objectives of the organizations under investigation.

The ambiguous language of the House resolution creating the committee does not contain adequate criteria setting forth the limits of the power granted to the committee. Taking advantage of this ambiguity, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has attempted to exercise a power greater than the power of Congress itself in its sweeping attacks upon organizations dealing with matters of opinion, education, legislation, and political activity. The power taken by the Committee on Un-American Activities to itself is so subversive of the constitutional guarantees that it must be deemed to be void. The House of Representatives could not have intended that this committee should have the untrammeled power to interfere with the activities which are the very foundations of democratic government.

The organizations and individuals who have been charged with contempt by the Un-American Activities Committee have actually committed no contempt of Congress. They have, in each case, respected the subpena power of Congress and have appeared before the committee. They have, in each case, submitted freely, though hampered by the committee itself, the factual information and material prepared and distributed by them which might conceivably be classed as propaganda. They were prepared and willing to be examined on this material and to establish affirmatively that they engaged in no propaganda which could possibly be declared un-American or subversive.

Resistance to the committee's demands developed only when the committee exceeded its powers, violating the constitutional rights of the organizations and individuals involved by asking questions and demanding records not pertinent to any matter within the scope of the committee's power and by a misuse of the subpena power.

The very statute under which this proceeding is brought requires only that a witness answer pertinent questions and furnish pertinent letters or documents. The books and records of organizations not engaged in un-American or subversive activities are not pertinent to the matters which have been committed to the Un-American Activities Committee for investigation. Under those circumstances, as the organizations themselves have pointed out, it is their right and in fact their duty to resist the unwarranted demands of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Justification for their position is in the following language of Justice Brandeis:

> The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive right and the right most valued by civilized man. To protect that right, every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the fourth amendment. (*Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438, 478-479).)

This observation is particularly true, as we have indicated, when there is an invasion of the freedom of the press, speech, and opinion which is involved in the case of every organization and individual under attack by the committee.

It is emphasized by the sweeping demands in the subpenas issued by the committee which in themselves constitute a violation of the fourth amendment of the United States Constitution. That amendment provides:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.

As the United States Supreme Court held in a very recent case—*Oklahoma Publishing Co.* v. *Walling; News Printing Co., Inc.*, v. *Same*, Nos. 61 and 63, October term, 1945; decided February 11, 1946, 14 L. W. 4161—the use of the subpena power is a constructive search and may only be exercised when the investigation is authorized by Congress, is for a purpose Congress can order, and the documents sought are relevant to the inquiry. The use of the subpena power beyond these limitations is an invasion of the guarantees of the fourth amendment.

In the pending contempt case the subpena power has been used by the Committee on Un-American Activities to justify or to implement fishing expeditions into the internal affairs of these organizations, under the ostensible purpose of determining whether or not these organizations are engaged in un-American or subversive activities. Because the propaganda activities of these organizations are neither un-American nor subversive no information elicited on members, the correspondence, contributors' lists, or other internal matters could possibly change the character of the propaganda activities so as to make the organization a proper subject of the committee's inquiry.

The resistance of the individuals is therefore based not on a contempt of Congress nor on any defiance of any legitimate or proper activity of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The resistance is soundly based on constitutional principles and on a reasonable interpretation of the vague power given to the Committee on Un-American Ac-

tivities. It is based also upon the inescapable conclusion that the committee is not conducting these investigations for any legislative purpose. Since the inception of the committee and its predecessor, no remedial legislation has been offered to Congress by this committee. The reason is not far to seek. Legislation on the matters of opinion, on the educational and political activities which the committee seeks to interfere with by its investigations, is palpably unconstitutional. That is why no legislation is offered. If it were, Congress would reject it in deference to the constitutional principles which it would necessarily violate.

Editor and Publisher, in its current issue—April 13—charges that the investigation by the committee of "opinion expressed in paid advertising copy amounts to intimidation" and is "an attempt to control thought." It comments further:

> If, through such methods, a branch of Congress can label such opinion good or bad, right or wrong, it need not go much further to do the same with the now free editorial expressions in our newspapers.

The persons charged with contempt before the House are persons who did nothing more than to disseminate information and engage in expressions of opinion on matters of the day. These, in the judgment of members of the committee, were bad or wrong. Their refusal to accept this judgment is their only crime. The House would render the greatest service to its own dignity and prerogatives by ruling that congressional power shall not be used to further persecute these Americans for their opinions and beliefs.

Let us keep faith with the American people by voting this unconstitutional committee out. Let us rededicate ourselves to freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, and the right of one to petition his government.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN DOUGLAS MANKIN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mrs. MANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

LET DOWN BY THE HOUSE

We share with Members of the House reluctance to see compulsory military service continued even a day longer than is necessary. Yet we think that, in voting to suspend selective-service inductions for 5 months and to exempt youths of 18 and 19 years from the draft, the House has let the Nation down in a thoughtless and irresponsible way. Someone aptly remarked that these amendments have not killed the bill but merely buried it alive.

Specific arguments for both the major changes written into the bill on Saturday carry a good deal of weight. Even General Eisenhower said the other day that he would prefer to have men beyond their teens for occupation duty. Unseasoned youths of 18 and 19 often lack the discretion and moral stamina that troops occupying a foreign land should have. Why, then, should this group continue to be drafted? One simple answer is that not all troops are assigned to occupation duty. Many are needed in this country to service the troops abroad. More important is the fact that to eliminate youths under 20 would be virtually to cut off the flow of selective-service recruits into the Army, for the older men capable of bearing arms have already been drafted.

Plausible arguments were also made for the amendment suspending all inductions for 5 months. This delay, it is said, will tend to throw full emphasis upon voluntary enlistments. Then, if the voluntary system fails to bring in enough men, the President can order a resumption of selective-service inductions. But this is to treat the whole business of maintaining our position in the postwar world as if it were a matter of signing up enough men to lay a sewer or put in a sidewalk. It will carry the impression all over the world that the United States is once more preparing to abandon its world responsibilities at the earliest possible moment.

What we obviously need is a policy of maintaining our reduced military strength on a systematic and routine basis. The Post sincerely hopes that enough volunteers will be found to fill up the occupation forces in both Germany and Japan. Meanwhile, however, the armed forces should not be left to operate on a shoestring. We can exert a strong influence for peace and order in the world only if we carry through without quibbling or hesitation the obligations we have assumed. To withdraw into our shell in the present unsettled state of international affairs would be to leave the world to chaos after a great expenditure of life and irreplaceable resources in the pursuit of liberty, order, and peace. From this broader point of view there can be no question that the House has gambled with the security which has so recently been purchased at so high a price.

In other words, the House indulged in a shortsighted throwback to localism and domestic politics in dealing with an issue that demands a United Nations viewpoint. It cut a sizable piece of ground from beneath Secretary Byrnes in his struggle to establish an orderly peace system. This tragic aspect of Saturday's performance cannot be reasoned away by petty arguments based upon personal convenience or the preference of Americans for civilian jobs. Nor can the damage that has been done be set right by anything less than a final vote in both Houses for uninterrupted continuation of selective service during the next year.

Reinstitution of Rationing

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been sent to me, perhaps because I am an alumnus of the institution, a petition from Yale University containing the names of 1,476 students who, by petition, urge the Congress to take all possible action and the Nation to take all possible action even including, if necessary, the reinstitution of rationing to meet the relief needs of a hungry world. I merely want to point out in this connection that in filing these petitions which I shall do in the proper way, there is one mistake of fact in the petition, because the students have assumed that Congress has not made all the appropriations which we have pledged ourselves to make for the purpose of supporting the work of UNRRA. We have made those contributions, and I think that should be made clear. Other than that I want to most sincerely commend these students for the humanitarian action they have taken.

Address of Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at Roosevelt Memorial Dinner, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the dinner given by the National Citizens Political Action Committee in honor of the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on April 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, in the 12 months that have rolled by since the loss of our great leader, there is one thought which has been given expression more frequently than any other.

The thought has been this: that in both domestic and international affairs, America should carry forward faithfully the programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And yet, we must be careful, in the application of this thought. Otherwise, in our concentration upon being faithful to the specific programs which Roosevelt initiated, we may reach a result directly opposite to what he would have wished.

For to follow any program of the past, however good it was in its day, is a very different thing from following the spirit of liberalism and progress, which constantly formulates new programs to meet new needs.

It is not the specific programs of Roosevelt that have eternal validity. The eternal verities lie in the spirit with which Roosevelt approached problems—his courage, his determination, his faith in the people, his subordination of every other consideration to the welfare of humanity.

When Roosevelt became President in 1933, he carried forward in the spirit of Andrew Jackson. But he did not use the programs of Andrew Jackson. They would have been entirely unsuited to the nineteen-thirties. Roosevelt formulated new programs that were suited to his times.

And now, in 1946, I believe that the world is changing more rapidly than ever before.

Ten or twenty years from now our world may be more different from 1933, the beginning of the age of Roosevelt, than 1933 was different from 1833 the age of Jackson.

That is why Roosevelt's last message to the American people ended with the words: "We must move forward with firm and active faith."

In domestic matters, the social security and housing and full-employment measures, which Roosevelt advocated in the middle thirties, are already inadequate for the tasks of today and tomorrow. But the ideas and ideals, with which Roosevelt infused the minds and hearts of the American people, are splendidly adequate for today and tomorrow. They will be a beacon light for the next century.

For underneath the details of Roosevelt's domestic programs for the middle thirties, there was his faith and confidence that all the people can and must be protected from the hazards of unemployment and old age and ill health. There was his faith and confidence that all the people should have decent homes. There was his faith and confidence that all the people should have the chance to work, and that unemployment in a man-made society is no more inevitable than scarlet fever. There was his faith and confidence that democracy, better than any other system, can achieve these goals of human dignity and human freedom.

Today, our task is not merely to look at what Roosevelt proposed, and then to seek to get it adopted by the Congress and approved by the people. Any person or group of persons who seek to walk in Roosevelt's footsteps, in this narrow sense, will be walking backward rather than forward. They would be adopting what Roosevelt did in form, but rejecting it in substance.

We need bigger social-security programs, bigger housing programs, and more comprehensive full-employment programs, than any we dreamed of 10 years ago. Our war production achievements make it clear that only these bigger programs will measure up to what we can easily do. Therefore, only these bigger programs will measure up to what we must determine to do.

In our relations with the rest of the world, it seems to me that this same proposition is equally valid. We cannot maintain peace with the world, simply by research into what Roosevelt did or intended to do, beginning with the Atlantic Charter and ending with Yalta. But we can realize a formula for permanent peace, if we continue to manifest the spirit and outlook that Roosevelt displayed.

This spirit and outlook, as I see it, may be easily summarized. Roosevelt was fully aware that America had become the mightiest Nation on earth. But he felt that those who were strong can best afford to be generous. He felt that only by an unqualified expression of American generosity could the nations which suffered so much more than us during the war retain a feeling of good will toward America.

Roosevelt knew that the miserable and demoralized and exhausted peoples of Europe and Asia will not remain that way forever. Through one means or another, with their resources and their talents, they will become strong. Roosevelt therefore sensed that American welfare could not rest upon shaking the big stick. American welfare can rest only upon appreciating the problems of other nations, and helping them to surmount their immediate difficulties. Morality in international affairs should never be confused with self-righteousness. Trying to convince any other great nation that it is wrong is a hazardous and unprofitable task. It is much more profitable to seek to convince other great nations that America is their friend.

The scientists are wrong when they say there is no defense against the atomic bomb. There is one defense, and only one, against the atomic bomb—a contented world. America has the responsibility to lead in achieving that contentment. I believe that Roosevelt was supremely aware of this. I believe that we should proceed in the spirit in which he acted.

Foreign policy, in most cases, is a byproduct of the domestic economy. I agree with Sir William Beveridge that full employment in America is the most important single requirement for permanent world peace. It follows that a domestic program for America, in the spirit of Roosevelt, is the best foundation upon which to build a foreign policy in the spirit of Roosevelt.

Unfortunately, there are some people in public life who have gained a reputation for being liberal in foreign affairs, while they remain reactionaries at home. The American people are not yet fully awakened to the bearing which our own domestic affairs will have upon the future of the world. That awakening must be made complete—and quickly.

We must carry forward, between 1946 and 1950, a domestic program which is as bold and advanced, for these times, as Roosevelt's domestic program between 1933 and 1937 was for his time. We must carry forward, between 1946 and 1950, a foreign policy which is as far-sighted, for these times, as the foreign policy which Roosevelt developed between 1937 and 1941 was for his time. We must fight the war against social injustice and against want in a land of plenty, as unrelentlessly as Roosevelt led in the war against fascism between 1941 and 1945.

Anything less than this will be unfair to the American people and to the world. Anything less than this will fail to capitalize the heritage which Franklin Roosevelt left us. We must live with that heritage and multiply its fruits.

Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur Laud the Merchant Marine's Contribution to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the debate last Saturday I asked the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], if he had read the tributes paid the men of the United States merchant marine during the war by General Eisenhower and General MacArthur.

During the summer of 1944, shortly after the Normandy beachhead was established and I had worked my way to England on a tanker carrying high octane in convoy, I learned at SHEAF that General Eisenhower had issued the following statement:

When final victory is ours, there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the merchant marine.

On April 1, 1945, General MacArthur, lauding the merchant seamen for their aid in the liberation of the Philippines, said:

With us, they shared the heaviest enemy fire. On these islands I have ordered them off their ships and into fox holes when their ships became untenable targets of attack. At our side they have suffered in bloodshed and death.

The high caliber of efficiency and courage they displayed in their part of the invasion of the Philippines marked their conduct throughout the entire campaign in the Southwest Pacific. They have contributed tremendously to our success. I hold no branch in higher esteem than the merchant marine service.

The Worst Is Yet To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, this week, will be considering an extension of the OPA. Is there any Member of this House who will defend the action of the OPA, as it relates to meat, butter, and other foods? The OPA has some 32,000 political Pharisees, who have been trying to control every section of the economy of this country. They would regulate everything from your shoestrings to your hair tonic. They try to control the prices on more than 8,000,000 separate items, involving billions of transactions every day.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to this humble Congressman that the OPA has outlived its usefulness, but not its appropriations. Their appropriations should be cut off and they should be permitted to die on the vine. Their Enforcement Division leaves a stench in the nostrils of the honest businessman. It stinks with corruption and crime.

The OPA fathers the black market. Legitimate packers can no longer buy enough cattle for slaughter. The worst meat shortage of all times now faces the country, because the honest packer is purchasing about 15 percent of the meat. The Department of Agriculture will inform you that uninspected black-market meat has tripled in the last few months. The packing houses are laying off employees. The black-market cattle rustlers are in the saddle. They leave a trail of slime and corruption which would make the bootleggers in prohibition days blush with shame.

What will Congress do about attempting to get more meat, butter, and food to the tables of hungry Americans? The OPA, with its colossal egotism, is a political fraud. It ought to be drastically amended or eliminated.

The following editorial from a leading stock journal, in the bread basket of America, reflects accurately the condition which now exists:

THE WORST IS YET TO COME

Conditions in the livestock and meat industry are deplorable. Even tragic. Legitimate operators are being forced to be crooked or quit. The slaughter business is being scattered to the four winds, with the concerns exposed to public scrutiny and official inspection hopelessly handicapped. They stand helplessly by, while their established trade drifts away from them. All sorts of dodges are worked by mushroom outfits that

have no expectation or desire to remain in the business permanently, so long as they can cash in now. The retailer's conscience is atrophied. The consumers are being bilked of hundreds of millions of dollars. Pay to the producer is inadequate. He has no chance to share in the big money. His operations are discouraged, and so long as production continues to lag, which it will until the producer is better paid, all the current evils will persist, and probably multiply. There is no hope, until and unless OPA is legally interred, so far as the livestock and meat business is concerned.

The war is over. We were promised, and had reason to expect, that once the war was over Government controls would make their exit. But the pay rollers did a grand job of scaring the country, to keep their jobs good. At first they would have to be kept just a while longer, till things got in a little better shape. But things didn't get in better shape. They got worse, and with every turn for the worse, claims for continued control were set up and cemented in the public mind. On and on. This was bad, that was bad. And with every new bad, a new order, farther reaching, more complex, more confusing, precipitating new emergencies, requiring new regulations. Never kill an old one. No, sir. Never less regulation; always more. Till we are where we are, in the livestock and meat business, and that is a mess, such as never before did America witness.

It is bad enough that the country doesn't have the meat it should have, and could have were producers given fair treatment; it is bad enough that the entire livestock and meat industry is suffering dislocations from which it will take years to recover; but it is a downright crime, an offense to common decency, that, in a wholesale manner, self-preservation, in a business sense, has been forced to rest on a foundation of cheating. That, OPA has done to the livestock and meat industry; that, throughout the history of this country, has rated at the top, in its standards of business ethics. It takes the very heart out of a business in which men of character have always taken pride.

OPA has done this thing to us, in the livestock and meat industry. That will never be forgotten, nor forgiven. If the end is not in sight, the worst has not yet been seen. Is there no hope?

Westinghouse Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Westinghouse strike still continues. It is now in its fourteenth week. The Westinghouse employees' proposal to the company was no more than was asked for, and readily granted, by the Westinghouse competing companies.

The employees at Westinghouse are entitled to ask the company for a decent living wage consistent with the advance in the cost of living. The negotiations were followed by an ultimatum by the company to its employees. The attitude of the company since March 19 smacks of the feudal days of the open shop. The company rendered its proposal to the employees, gave them an ultimatum, and sought the use of the State police, which are still on the job patrolling the town of East Pittsburgh. Whether it was the intention of the company or not, it bears all the earmarks of an effort to destroy the union and bring about the open shop. These are the same methods used in the old days of hammer and tongs.

It is to be regretted that this has happened, especially in western Pennsylvania, the greatest industrial center of the United States—or of the world perhaps—where amicable relations seem to exist in all the industries in the area. This strike is the only remaining strike of importance in that territory, and at this time negotiations are in abeyance. I say abeyance, because the company is mistaken in thinking it can issue an ultimatum to the employees in this day and age.

I may be just a voice crying in the wind, but my recommendation to the management of the Westinghouse Co. would be to resume negotiations with the employees and do it on a straight across the board basis, and not to follow the conduct outlined by the mediators of the Department of Labor, who were compelled to withdraw from the mediation because the company issued the ultimatum to be effective March 31. In the mediators' report it is stated:

> Though the company's proposal of March 19 takes the form of an 18½-cent offer, it is, in substance, neither an across-the-board offer nor an offer of 18½ cents or 17½ cents an hour in any of the classifications to which it applies.

Further, the report clearly shows that the lamp department was excluded from an increase:

> The lamp department, containing approximately 10 percent of all employees, is excluded from the general offer. Under its special lamp-department offer the company calculates that these 10 percent of its employees will receive a small wage increase, if any.

Other matters in dispute, according to the report of the mediators, were not squarely met by the company, and in the final conclusion of the mediators' report it is stated:

> When, on March 19, the 25-page proposal was finally submitted to the union by the company with an accompanying letter saying that "this proposal expires at midnight March 31, 1946," it seemed clear to the mediators that unless the company's proposal were to be considered as an ultimatum, the remaining 12 days of the month would not be sufficient for a reasonable negotiation or mediation of the many provisions of the company's proposal. The mediators, therefor, formally requested the company to agree to an extension of time. This request the company formally refused.
>
> The refusal of the company on March 22 to continue negotiations or meet with the union unless its wage offer was accepted in full, together with its refusal to extend the contract for a reasonable period, created conditions that made mediation impossible. Accordingly, the mediators withdrew in the afternoon of March 22 and now render this report to you.

It is hoped for the best interests of the Nation, the State, and the community that these matters will be settled by proper negotiations immediately. These people have families to feed and clothe and to house, and they are asking only what is just. If the company could not afford to pay this the matter would not be of such outstanding importance, but the earnings of the company show that it can afford the increase. Let the community settle down once more to peaceful pursuits and the entire population of the area will be happy.

Address of Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, at Roosevelt Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Roosevelt Memorial dinner, Hotel Commodore, New York City, on April 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For Franklin D. Roosevelt democracy did not stop at the water's edge. He applied to foreign affairs the essential, dynamic spirit of democracy which moved him in domestic affairs. Though at home it was called the New Deal and in foreign affairs the good-neighbor policy, it was all from the same great heart and head. It was obvious that the man who taught his fellow men at home to respect the dignity and the welfare of little people all over America would in foreign affairs respect the dignity and welfare of little nations in all parts of the world. And it was equally natural that one who was the implacable foe of monopoly in the United States should remain the uncompromising fore, formally requested the company to agree deur, often called imperialism.

And, when Franklin D. Roosevelt talked about freedom of religion, freedom of speech and expression, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, he was talking about the aspirations of people everywhere in the world. That is why people everywhere in the world trusted Franklin D. Roosevelt and his administration. That's why Franklin D. Roosevelt in a free election would have gotten more votes in most nations of the world than would the heads of the governments in those nations. That's why, to the peoples and the nations of the world, the policies of the United States were the living principles of Franklin D. Roosevelt and not that cold abstract concept, the Government of the United States.

The people of the world trusted Franklin D. Roosevelt because they knew he was too much of a Democrat to give his support to undemocratic principles anywhere, and too wise to be made the unsuspecting instrument of antisocial people or forces in any part of the world.

The people of the world knew that it was not Franklin D. Roosevelt who limited the Atlantic Charter to only favored parts of the earth. And the people of the world knew, as the minorities in the United States knew so well, that when Roosevelt spoke of the dignity of men, he meant it without regard to race, creed, or color, national origin, or the fortune of birth anywhere in the world.

When President Roosevelt recognized the Soviet Union in 1933, he laid the foundation of the unity of the Big Three upon which was built victory in the war, and the foundation of a permanent peace and prosperity everywhere in the world. And the Russians trusted Roosevelt because they knew he was not a Soviet baiter and he would not countenance Soviet baiters.

And having confidence in President Roosevelt, confidence that he would not wage war upon them or join a secret cabal to destroy them, confidence that he would not throw them to the wolves of fascism because they were Communists in their own country, the Russians worked and fought with President Roosevelt and with our great common ally, Britain, in the most effective and the most powerful military alliance ever seen upon the face of the earth. President Roosevelt knew the Russian faults and shortcomings, but he also knew the long, dark, and rugged road over which the Russians had come. He knew their struggles and their obstacles and he knew that they were essentially like all other human beings groping for the light of freedom and security. He believed that given understanding, encouragement, and fair cooperation the Soviet Union would find its place in the family of democratic nations and peoples.

In the good will of the wartime alliance the Soviet Union disbanded the Comintern. We extended Russia lend-lease, and we stopped war upon communism in Russia. And all of us concentrated upon the common enemy, Hitler, and then Japan. In this mutual confidence we won the victory and built the possibilities of a permanent peace. That's why the masses of Moscow surged with tear-filled eyes and husky throats into the square in front of the American Embassy in Moscow when Roosevelt died just 1 year ago today. That's why Stalin tearfully told the American Ambassador of his sorrow when Roosevelt passed.

Yet it would seem to Franklin D. Roosevelt a strange lack of reciprocity if, after the dissolution of the Comintern, we should, wittingly or unwittingly, become a party to another anti-Comintern pact.

Would we have today the crisis of confidence which has thrown the world into a fearful atomic armament race if we could instill again in the nations of the world the confidence in American foreign policy which Roosevelt inspired? Would we have the talk and the threat of war in the world today if somehow the unity of the Big Three had not slipped away? Have we, without being aware of it, become the guarantor of the status quo and unintentionally become a party to a strategy that seeks to contain Russia within the boundaries set by western imperialism? Do we really realize that you cannot have the new order in the earth and preserve all the old empires? Are we truly in the spirit of Roosevelt standing before the world today as the spokesman of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Covenant, and the "four freedoms"? These questions we must in all candor ask ourselves as we search our national soul on this anniversary of the absence of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I recall what an old professor in college used to tell my class, that we must learn to draw our strength from the invisible as well as the visible forces of the world. In this unsettled present, as we hurtle into the uncharted future, we shall need, as we strive for peace, to draw upon all the spiritual sources of strength we can summon. There will be many—the Christian spirit, the principles of human brotherhood under one God, the memory of great fellowships and friendships.

But we who loved him can find nowhere greater strength and courage than when we turn to that ever-living leader, both invisible and visible—invisible to our eyes but forever visible and vivid in our memories—that other great prince of peace, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Radio Address of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, to Anti-Inflation Rally, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to an anti-inflation rally held at the Astor Hotel, New York City, on Friday, March 22, 1946. The address was broadcast over a national radio network, and I feel that it deserves the attention and study of every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If we lose the fight to extend price control without crippling amendments, 140,000,000 people are going to get hurt. Most people would get hurt right away. Food prices would go up, clothing prices would go up, rents would go up. The only things that would go down would be your hopes and your pocketbooks. A few people might not get hurt until later. These would be the people in a position to get a temporary profit out of high prices. But when the deflation came—and if we get an inflation, you can be sure we'll get a deflation later—these people would get hurt too.

But I want to talk about the people who would get hurt right away if prices start shooting for the sky. How would you like to go to the store and find that sugar had gone up from 7 cents a pound to 26 cents? Or that eggs had gone up from 50 cents a dozen to 92 cents a dozen?

How would you like to drive into your filling station and find that gasoline had gone up from 20 cents a gallon to 34 cents? How would you like to get a notice from your landlord that your rent now would be $60 a month instead of $40 a month?

Do the prices I am quoting sound fantastic? Do you think sugar and eggs and gasoline and rent wouldn't go up that much if we abolished price control?

Well, the prices I'm quoting are the prices we all had to pay for these things during the inflation that occurred after the last war.

We didn't have many price controls during the last war and the few that we did have were wiped out at the Armistice. What was the result?

In less than 2 years after the end of the war in 1918, food went up 32 percent, clothing went up 42 percent, and rents went up 54 percent. Now that's the sort of thing a few powerful pressure groups would like to see us try again. Some weeks ago the National Association of Manufacturers asked for the abolition of all price control by February 15. If price controls had been abolished on February 15 last, I wonder how many of you would already have heard from your landlords. I wonder how much more money you would have to set aside each week for groceries. Do you think nylons would still be selling for $1.40 and less?

Today, the Federal Reserve Board estimates that inflationary pressures are 8 to 10 times as strong as they were after World War I. Our accumulated savings in bank accounts and war bonds amount to nearly $150,000,000,000—six times as much as at the end of the First World War. There is over five times as much currency in circulation today as there was at the end of World War I. And when you consider our vast pent-up demand for goods that were off the market during the war—for automobiles, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, electric irons, toasters, and all other things we couldn't get—it should be obvious to anyone that if we took the lid off prices now, we'd get an explosion that would blow the poison gas of inflation into every household in the land.

And, after the explosion, what then? After prices got so high that people couldn't pay them and had to stop buying, what would happen to production and employment?

I don't have to draw on my imagination to answer that question. Many of us can remember what happened after the last war when we didn't have price control and when we did have inflation—and after inflation—depression. The depression of 1920–21 threw 5,000,000 people out of work. Thousands of business establishments closed their doors. Corporation profits—$6,500,000,000 in 1919—turned to losses of $55,000,000 in 1921. Total inventory losses amount to $16,000,000,000. Nearly half a million farms were foreclosed.

On Monday of this week, the president of the National Association of Manufacturers told the House Banking and Currency Committee that we ought to abolish price control by the Government. "Instead," he said, "we want price control by the American housewives."

I'd like to ask the American housewives who are listening in this afternoon, just what they think of that proposal. I think I know what their answer would be. In a Gallup poll of March 3, 79 percent of the women interviewed were in favor of continuing the present price-control law. The question asked in the poll was this: "The present price-ceiling law ends in June. Do you think the price-control law should be continued or should it end in June?"

Eight women out of 10 said it should be continued.

It seems to me that's the answer to the suggestion that the Government should get out of price control so that it could be left to the individual housewife. American housewives have strongly supported the Government's price-control program ever since it was enacted. More than 30 national women's organizations are on record as favoring the continuance of the price-control law. The list includes such well-known organizations as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, the Young Women's Christian Association, the National League of Women Shoppers, the National Urban League, and numerous others.

No one has ever claimed that the OPA is perfect. It would be a miracle if it were. Setting prices on more than 8,000,000 goods and services that are manufactured and distributed and sold in more than 3,000,000 business establishments, is a tremendous assignment. Mistakes were inevitable but OPA has always tried to correct its mistakes when brought to its attention with the least possible delay.

On the whole, price controls have been more than fair to business. Under price control, corporation profits, after taxes, have reached the highest levels in history. Industrial production, under price control, has

increased 116 percent as compared with only a 25-percent increase in World War I. Profits of retail stores, before taxes, have increased as much as 1200 percent, and business failures in 1945 slumped to only 810 as compared to 14,000 business failures in 1939.

If we are to maintain effective price control we need the effective participation of the American people. We need their help in enforcement. We need their suggestions for improvement. Such participation and support, however, are a far cry from the feverish activity of selfish pressure groups who are scurrying around Washington trying to amend the OPA, not to make it better but to destroy it. These groups are not really distressed by what they call the inadequacies or the inefficiencies of the OPA. On the contrary, it is the very activeness of OPA which has aroused heir opposition. For the OPA stands in the way of their raising prices and making huge profits by squeezing the American people dry. Let these Washington lobbyists go home! No one wants price control to continue a minute longer than necessary. But I believe, and a vast majority of the American people have always believed, that price control was necessary during the war and that it will continue to be necessary as long as inflation threatens our economic security.

The Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, the draft law expires automatically May 15. The bill, H. R. 6064, to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 will make the extension for a period of 9 months if it should become a law. One amendment, if it remains in the bill, will suspend inductions for 5 months or until October 15, 1946, to give volunteer enlistments a chance to fill requirements. Since present debate seems pretty well to agree that over 75,000 a month since last October have volunteered to join the armed forces, it would seem that there is no real need of an extension of the draft.

DISCHARGES NOT AFFECTED

It has also been shown in the debate to my satisfaction at least, that men will volunteer fast enough to replace all who will be discharged on eligibility. Substantial arguments have already been made to prove that the discharge of men now in service need not be delayed if the draft is not extended.

All of us are in favor of carefully guarding national security. The extension of the draft is not necessary for that purpose.

The war is really over and everyone knows that. Surrender papers have been signed by enemy nations and their military forces disbanded.

Russia does not want war and neither does the United States. Then why have compulsory military conscription in time of peace, for we do have peace now?

Freedom is never lost all at once. It is lost only little by little. We gave up some of our freedom willingly to win the war and would do so again under the same conditions. But why permit that freedom to continue to be lost in time of peace?

Compulsory peacetime military service is contrary to all ideals and fundamental principles of our great American Republic. It goes far to destroy American freedom. In my opinion and in the opinion of a large majority of the American people, I think the unnecessary continuation of the draft is very much along that same line.

Volunteer enlistments will do the job. With the atomic bomb in our sole possession, so far as we know, what good will military forces be in the future is a question anyone might well ask. At least it should be a good enough reason not to extend the draft and not to have compulsory peacetime military conscription.

Let us preserve our freedom.

Old Age and Survivors Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include my statement on old age and survivors insurance before the House Ways and Means Committee.

No domestic issue is of greater importance to the American people today than the social-security program which underpins our system of productive enterprise in assuring them a decent livelihood. The Ways and Means Committee is to be congratulated on opening up this whole question not only through its own excellent staff study but also through public hearings, at which all points of view can be expressed.

I wish at this time to register my wholehearted support for an extension and liberalization of the old age and survivors insurance program so that all working people will be adequately protected against loss of earning power due to old age or disability and their surviving dependents protected in case of their premature death.

The insurance program, providing protection for workers by means of contributions made from their own earnings and in their behalf by their employers through the course of their working life, is the very heart of the social-security system. It carries forward the American tradition of self-reliance but translates it into the terms of a modern industrial economy. People who receive payments under the insurance program are entitled to them as a matter of right and equity because of the contributions they have made. This is surely the best possible way to provide for the predictable hazards of old age, disability, and premature death.

This system, however, cannot fulfill its role in our total economy unless it does these following things:

First. It must apply to everyone who suffers from the hazards it covers and whose coverage is administratively feasible.

Second. It must be realistically geared to actual hazards.

Third. It must provide an adequate level of benefits to assure real security in the average situation.

Fourth. It must be equitable to all sections of our population including, of course, our veterans.

In order to achieve these objectives, I favor amendments to title II of the Social Security Act to provide the following:

First. Extension of coverage to the self-employed—including farmers—farm workers, domestic workers, workers in nonprofit organizations, and public employees. I understand the Social Security Board has worked out feasible methods of administration for all of these.

Second. Addition of benefits for extended disability or illness and reduction of the retirement age to 60 for women. In terms of the actual situation no worker can protect himself against a protracted loss of earning power from illness or disability and relatively few women work after 60.

Third. A liberalization of benefit payments and a raising of minimum benefits so that people can reasonably be expected to maintain themselves on their insurance payments without having to apply for assistance except in the most unusual cases. If, in the long run, this requires a Government contribution, as is done in other countries, I would support such contribution from general tax revenues but solely as a supplement to the contributory fund.

Fourth. Credit for military service should be provided under the OASI system as a matter of simple justice to the millions who lost benefit privileges through their service during the war and as a matter of continuing policy to achieve universal coverage.

There is one additional plea I would like to make to this committee and the Social Security Board. This concerns those elder citizens who have already retired from the labor market, having made the contribution of their productive years to the Nation's well-being but without having had a chance to acquire coverage under the OASI program. I fully sympathize with the desire of some of these people and their organizations for a straight pension payment made from Federal funds without regard to need, but I cannot give it support because I feel that to do so would endanger the long-time interests of the total population as represented in the old age and survivors insurance program with its payments based on an equity interest in a contributory fund. The millions who have already in good faith made contributions to that fund deserve protection of the insurance program as well as the many millions more who will benefit from this system in the future.

On the other hand, I wish to urge upon this committee and the Social Security Board a thorough study of the possibilities of covering under the insurance program people who are now past the retirement age but who would have been

covered were it not for the accident of time. I am no technician in these matters, but I feel there must be some practical way to give these people the same protection which we seek to provide for those who come after them.

Atomic Energy and Human Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address on atomic energy and human welfare delivered at a meeting sponsored by the American Veterans' Committee in Colorado, by Dr. Joyce C. Stearns, formerly director of the metallurgical laboratory, Manhattan project.

Dr. Stearns, now dean of faculties, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., a few years ago served with great credit on the faculty of Denver University.

His warning in this address that atomic bombs will be used if there is another world war, is worth its weight in gold. He puts it in these words:

There is only one way to prevent the use of the atomic bomb, and that is to prevent war.

This address is recommended to anyone courageous enough to face facts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been said that the atomic bomb made citizens out of scientists. This statement, I think, is incorrect. Scientists have always been citizens. The atomic bomb has given them the opportunity and the prestige which is required to make them articulate, effective citizens. Scientists have always taken an interest in affairs of their government, their community, and the welfare of their people. Until now they have never been heard. It took the terrific "bang" of the atomic bomb to release these scientists from the ivory towers to which they had been erroneously assigned by their fellow citizens. As a citizen who has some scientific information on the development of atomic energy, I deem it a rare privilege to talk to a group of people who have made so large an investment in the future of this world. In talking with you, my purpose will be to give you information which will enable you to act more intelligently as citizens who have saved this world from destruction and must determine its future. Specifically, I shall attempt to bring you information concerning nuclear energy and its application, in the fields of both destructive and constructive utilization. The subject matter will be divided as follows: (1) What is nuclear energy? (2) What are the destructive uses of nuclear energy? (3) What are the constructive uses of nuclear energy? (4) What are the inevitables we must face? (5) A proposal which, I believe, if followed, would lead to the utilization of such energy for peaceful purposes, and the prevention of future wars.

Let us consider the first question. What is nuclear energy? It is not my intention to go into technical details concerning this energy, but rather to give you the salient facts which must be yours in considering any future plan. When coal is burned, heat is evolved, elements combine, and ashes and gases are formed. New molecules are made; no atoms are made or destroyed; no mass is destroyed. The oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and other atoms may change places but they remain oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon atoms. Chemical energy is transformed into heat energy; only the position or condition of some particles of mass has been changed. For the combustion or burning of coal to be continuous, or chain reacting, each lump of coal must be within a certain minimum distance from the next lump. In summary, combustion is a chain reaction which releases heat by transforming rather than creating energy.

When uranium metal is placed in a machine which supplies energy, each piece of uranium must be a certain distance from the next one. A reaction takes place, in which one type of uranium atom is converted into a plutonium atom and another type of uranium atom is split into two parts, and these two parts become two new atoms, such as barium and lanthanum. In both cases atoms are changed into other atoms. These two new atoms formed by splitting (fission) fly apart with a high velocity and heat is evolved. In this instance mass is destroyed. The uranium atom destroyed weighed more than the two barium and lanthanum atoms thus formed. This destruction of mass is the principal source of energy. To summarize, the elements are changed. One type of uranium is changed to an atom of much greater value. The other uranium atom is split into two atoms of lesser value, but still of great value in the fields of medicine and science. Energy is released which is 5,000,000 times as great as that released by a TNT molecule during an explosion. New atoms are formed, mass is destroyed, and energy is created. The energy manifests itself as heat, and thus it differs in degree but not in type.

A large scale analogy is provided by our solar system which has a nucleus, the sun, around which planets and the earth, Mars, Jupiter, and so forth, revolve in their own orbits. If the earth were to fall nearer the sun and then travel in an orbit which is nearer the sun, and the energy thus lost by the earth, radiated in the form of heat, X-rays, or light, you would have a process similar to that which happens in the atom when energy in the form of X-rays or light is emitted by atoms. In the case of the atom there is a heavy central sphere called the nucleus. Electrons which are little electrical spheres travel in orbits around this nucleus. When one of these falls from one orbit to another, light or X-rays are evolved. Energy up to the present time has to do with the disturbance of the particles in their orbit, all to do with the combining of one atom which another atom to form a molecule. The energy with which we have usually been concerned comes from the disturbance of the planets, called electrons, of the atom. These are outside the nucleus and the energy is called extra-nuclear energy. If the sun were to be bombarded by some comet and split into two parts as a result of such a collision, one part retaining some planets and going off at a great speed to some place to form a new solar system and the other part doing likewise, this process would be called a fission. Now if by some process the two new parts of the sun did not weight as much as the whole did, great energy would be released. This is what happens in the case of the fission of an atom. In the splitting of the uranium atom, the two newly formed atoms usually have the properties of radium. Fissions can be produced in radium, thorium, uranium, and plutonium, the man-made element. The energy released is the greatest in the cases of uranium and plutonium.

Uranium provides via the fission process several million times as much energy pound for pound, as does a TNT molecule during an explosion. A single bomber could carry enough plutonium to equal in explosive power the total amount of TNT dropped by the Fifth and Eighth Air Forces during the entire war. The temperature of the exploding mass is millions of degrees Fahrenheit and it gives off radioactive rays which are extremely lethal. The atom bomb is in reality a three in one bomb: A demolition bomb, an incendiary bomb, and a gaseous bomb.

It is important that we get some concept of this instrument of destruction which is real. Therefore, let us consider some of the effects of the trial explosion in New Mexico. A small bomb containing about 5 pounds of material was supported on steel girders and exploded in a barren region. The explosion lasted for the order of a millionth of a second. In that time the steel girders were completely evaporated and the sand below it was melted to a depth of about three-eighths of an inch and converted into glass. At a distance of 20 miles from the explosion the intensity of light exceeded that which we receive from the sun. This means that within a mile of one of the bombs dropped over Japan the light intensity was of the order of 2,000 times as great as that we receive from the sun on our brightest day. Look directly into the sun some day and try to imagine the effect you would get if the intensity were multiplied by 2,000.

Philip Morrison, a physicist who worked at the laboratories at Chicago and Los Alamos, headed a group of scientists who investigated the effects produced by the bomb at Nagasaki. He is one of our most competent young scientists. Let him talk to you as he did to the Senators during the Senate hearings on atomic energy. He said, "The atomic bomb is a weapon of saturation. It destroys so quickly and so completely such a large area that defense is hopeless. Leadership and organization are gone. Key personnel are killed. With the fire stations wrecked and firemen burned, how control a thousand fires? With the doctors dead and the hospitals smashed, how treat a quarter million injured?

"When the bomb is detonated in the middle of a city, it is as though a small piece of the sun has been instantly created. There is formed what we have called the ball of fire, which is a hot, glowing mass something about one-third of a mile across, with a temperature of about 4,000,000 degrees Fahrenheit in the center. There is a sudden expansion which pushes away with terrible violence, the air that once occupied this region. Behind the wave of pressure, which travels rapidly through the air, there come great winds, 500 to 1,000 miles per hour, winds which damage and destroy all structures.

"Houses and buildings for a mile in all directions are totally destroyed. A good deal of comment has been attracted by the ferro-concrete structures whose walls still stand. These are very strong buildings. But they too are useless. I have been in these buildings. Their interior walls are down, the roofs are collapsed, the furniture battered, overturned. Brick buildings, and even steel-frame buildings with brick walls, are extremely vulnerable.

"Of these people within a thousand yards of the blast, about one in every house or two escaped death from blast or from burn. But they died anyway from the effects of rays emitted at the instant of the explosion. This radiation affects the blood-forming tissues in the bone marrow. The blood does not coagulate but oozes in many spots through the unbroken skin, and internally seeps into the cavities of the body. The white corpuscles which fight infection disappear. Infection prospers and the patient dies, usually 2 or 3 weeks after the exposure. Like all nuclear

physicists, I have studied this disease a little. It is a hazard of our profession. With the atomic bomb, it became epidemic.

"It is probable that an atomic-bombed American city would be as badly damaged as a Japanese city, though it would look less wrecked from the air.

"In Japan the wreckage burned clean; in a western city, the rubble would stand in piles in the streets, but the city would be just as ruined and the people of the city as dead."

Remember, these Japanese cities had received no previous bombing, hence the story told is that due to one atomic bomb alone.

The effect of the bombs can be most tersely summarized by stating what we all know; two atomic bombs, both of which almost surely contained no more than 50 pounds of active material, killed more than half as many people as all the American soldiers killed in the whole war.

Now let's turn to the constructive side. At the present time many gallons of water are pumped through the plutonium-producing piles at the Hanford Engineering Works near Pasco, Wash. This water is warmed, kept in a reservoir for a while, and allowed to flow back into the Columbia River. The temperature of the cooling water is not raised enough to be used for power but this is by design. There seems to be every assurance that a pile can be operated at high temperature. One such unit is now in the process of construction.

In the case of plutonium man is making synthetic fuel. It is estimated that within 10 years we could produce 20 tons of plutonium, which would produce as much power per year as we used a year before the war. The amount of plutonium produced goes up as a geometric ratio. If we can produce 3 tons in 3 years, then the the end of 6, 9, 12, and 15, we would have produced 6, 12, 24, 48 tons, respectively. Hence plutonium may not be an important source of power or economic factor for 10 years, and then become very significant. This nuclear power, which within 15 years could be equal in amount to all other power combined, is unique in that:

1. The pile which produces nuclear power is a source of radiation. The smallest shield which would be required to protect the operating personnel would weigh 50 tons. Hence, such power units will not be used for present-day automobiles or airplanes or as heating units for homes but for large control heating or power units.

Since the unit is such a prolific source of such varied radiation, it may be used for large-scale radiation therapy. Many types of rays are available and many patients could be treated at the same time.

Also this radiation can be used for many important scientific experiments in the fields of biology, chemistry, metallurgy, and physics.

2. The release of nuclear power is accompanied by the formation of radioactive chemicals which are in great demand for medical, scientific, and industrial use. Enough of this material has already been produced at Hanford to supersede all the radium in the world. Let us consider the use of certain of these materials. Carbon (14) is an excellent sample. This carbon isotope behaves chemically just as the ordinary carbon (12); in chemical reactions it takes the same route. However, an atom of carbon (14) is radioactive; it acts as a small broadcasting station or machine gun in that it sends out waves and ejects electrical particles all the time, thus constantly telegraphing its position. It is the bell sheep which portrays the location of the entire flock (12) of carbon atoms. Thus by mixing a little carbon (14) with ordinary carbon and using sensitive detecting devices it is possible to follow the course of a carbon atom during a chemical reaction. This is a method which will greatly accelerate the study of the chemistry of hydrocarbons, one of the most important group of chemical compounds we have.

Such materials promise to be of use in studying and treating many diseases.

They will play a large role in metallurgy, in biology, medicine, in chemistry. Before fissions only speci l radioactive isotopes could be made in limited quantities at an enormous cost by means of a cyclotron. The price and amount restricted their use to a few men but even then great scientific progress was made. Now enough will soon be available to meet the needs of all reliable scientific workers.

3. The release of nuclear energy requires no oxygen so it would be possible to drive a submarine under water by means of a steam turbine. Such a ship could travel under water at higher speed and for longer distances with none of the hazards connected with storage batteries.

4. Finally the release of atomic power may be accompanied by the production of more fissionable material. Thus a nuclear power plant produces power, radioactive elements, and more fissionable material. Imagine a furnace which burns coal to produce heat, forms ashes of great medical and scientific value, and at the same time converts some very inferior fuel which is more plentiful than coal into a high-grade coal. A plant may be built to produce plutonium and the power used as a byproduct, or the plant may be designed to produce power and plutonium and radioactive isotopes be considered by-products.

5. Finally, because the fuel is so concentrated, such a source of power is particularly useful for the following purposes:

(a) Long trips by large ships where refueling is difficult.

(b) Power for heat and light for those regions of the earth which do not have good transportation facilities. The polar regions are good examples. Fuel in the form of plutonium can be delivered by plane. The Government could furnish uranium for such a power plant.

In considering this problem we must face the following inevitables:

1. Scientific progress will continue. It cannot be stopped by legislation, national or international. We must be prepared to live in a world in which ever-greater power will be available to man.

2. Other nations can be building bombs in 2 to 5 years.

3. Such bombs will be used if another war begins.

There seems to be a dangerous philosophy abroad that if we control the bomb another war wouldn't really be so bad. This philosophy is false because the bomb doesn't make a war more horrible. A visitation comes from the sky, a combination tornado, Bessemer furnace, and a battery of X-ray machines are turned on you. For most people the job is completed before they can have any sensation. The job is complete and thorough, dust truly returns to dust, there are no remains, it's a quick, clean, sanitary job. Not so, of course, with those who suffer only from exposure to radiation. It's true that probably all cities could be destroyed and 25 percent of our population killed in a very short while, but that is probably the cost either the victor or loser must eventually pay should another war be permitted to occur. Further, any control of the atomic bomb would last only so long as we are at peace. As soon as any war started the nation which was able to make bombs would use them. After all, that's what we did in this war, a war which we could have won without using them. Make no mistake about it, any nation will follow our example. There is only one way to prevent the use of the atomic bomb and that is to prevent war.

That can be done if we want to do it as badly as we wanted to make the bomb. We need n w to chart a sensible course and to follow it with courage and undying determination. In my opinion, which happens to coincide with the opinion of many others who have given thought to this matter, three separate programs need to be started at once.

The first program should be effective during the period required for another nation to start manufacturing bombs. During this period we should do everything we can to merit and gain the confidence of other nations with whom we must live or die. We should conduct our affairs so as to decrease international tensions, and to allay fear and distrust of other nations.

The program should be so directed as to prevent our making obvious and unnecessary national blunders. Some examples of blunders to date are given in order to illustrate what is meant.

Our destruction of the Japanese cyclotrons will be considered by other nations for what it was, a wanton act of vandalism. These cyclotrons are not instruments of war and cannot possibly be used to make any military material. They are scientific instruments, as are the microscope and the X-ray. They are to the doctor, the chemist, and the physicist what books are to the historian. Other nations cannot help viewing this as we did the burning of books by the Nazis.

Another incident shows how it is possible to create something out of nothing. Kapitza, an outstanding physicist in Russia, went to the mountains to study cosmic rays. He is reported to have found a negative proton—a particle that scientists everywhere have been looking for. It's of great scientific interest but has no bearing on the production of power. In normal times an account of such a discovery would have never gotten in the press, but now it was played up as something which might lead to bigger and better bombs and did create some misunderstanding and fear on the part of our people. Whether such a statement was perpetrated through ignorance or with malicious intelligence, it was inexcusable.

Near the front page a large item appears which says Russia is mining uranium in Czechoslovakia. This is denied 2 days later by a small item on the want-ad page. On February 1 the newspapers reported the richest uranium deposits are found in Sydney, Australia. On February 2 a well-hidden article says there are no traces of uranium in the area mentioned.

The May-Johnson bill, which would have created an atomic power commission with powers of a dictator in the field of atomic energy in excess of anything heretofore imagined, was presented to Congress in such a way that the scientists of this country believed it was intended to railroad it through with little or no hearing. The quick, courageous, decisive action by the young scientists prevented this. This bill would have said to the world the atomic armament race is on. Yet the framers said, "It had not international implications, let's look after our national needs first and the other later." They must have known the two needs are inseparable.

We do need to know other nations. How little we know about most nations; how much we fear those we know least; how much we trust those we know best. We need to start now on a definite policy of becoming acquainted with Spain, Argentina, Russia, so we may know them as we do Canada, England, Mexico.

Language difficulties are great hurdles. It is as important to teach these languages now in the interest of future peace and understanding as it was necessary to teach Japanese and German to help us win the war.

We sent millions of boys and girls and men and women to foreign countries to win a war. We should now send thousands to foreign countries to get to know the people with whom they must live. The cultural program with South America, although inadequate in all respects, has borne valuable fruit. We have a better knowledge of them

and understanding with them. Let us take steps to know our neighbors, all of them now within gunshot of us, and to consider their problems sympathetically.

Finally, let's insist on a peace which leaves no nation any possible means of making instruments of war but every opportunity to produce food, clothing, shelter, and to develop true culture.

Read public statements with a critical attitude; make and try to encourage others to make only statements based on the best facts available. Extend this influence to your Congressmen and Senators if possible.

Instead of a chip on our shoulder, fear in our heart, and suspicion in our mind, we must extend the warm hand and heart and keep an open, understanding mind.

The second program we must start is that of making the UNO work until it grows into or is superseded by an international government which has the power to preserve the peace of the world.

Many of us wanted a stronger organization than the UNO. However, for the first time in the history of the world all nations of strength have agreed to try an international organization. It is an excellent pilot plant which can be remodeled as needs arise and agreement permits. Surely there can be no more unreasonable points of view presented than are presented in our Senate by well-known Senators, no technique which is more archaic than the filibuster can be employed.

We must consider the action and early attempts of the UNO with the same charity we view the action of our own legislators. Fortunately, the UNO has to come to grips with a problem which is truly international in scope—that of controlling the atomic bomb. We are now learning to think in terms of world symbolism and to plan and practice international procedures. If the UNO has our full support it will become the open door to the strong, durable world government we must have if the world is to survive.

Also, immediately we must start planning for a strong world government which has the sovereign right and the necessary police force to prevent any nation or combination of nations from making war on another. In the final stage the relation of the police force of this government to the military strength of any nation should be that which exists between a good city police force and an individual citizen, not that which existed between the Chicago police force and the North Side gangsters a few years ago. This result should be achieved primarily by reducing the national armaments. We shouldn't fool ourselves—an ineffective international police force would be of no value. One of real strength is needed. This international government needs sovereignty in only those activities necessary to prevent war. It should guarantee to all nations those sovereign rights which are national in nature and especially the right to religious freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of press, and freedom of the type of national government.

Such a government will fail unless we have citizens who intelligently support such a government. Certainly we are not ready for such a government. To try world government now would be to commit international suicide. We don't get along together; as Beardsley Ruml says, "Too many whites hate blacks, too many Christians hate Jews, too many men hate women." Capital and labor are surely not seeing eye to eye these days.

But if we really care to save the world, a generation can be created in 25 years which will be worthy of the benefits of the world state. To do this it will be necessary for us to tell each other the facts, to teach the students of our schools the real impacts of this new discovery on our future lives, success is possible. It means a long, continuous, intelligent, courageous fight. New text books must be written; we must educate ourselves; we must plan our course in the future rather than be blown by the winds of chance into the whirlpools and rapids.

Nor does this new generation have to be perfect as many contend. Our own Government survives, so does BILBO. Marriage can be consummated or terminated under far different conditions in different States. Laws regarding appetites, the rights of citizens to vote, vary greatly from one State to another, but no State has a right or the power to make war on another.

Hitler appealed to a baser motive and developed a generation which nearly conquered the world. This was done in 25 years. Between the First and Second World Wars, Russia changed from an ineffective nation to one which lost 25,000,000 people in this war and still fought back to win.

Surely we can do no less and the strength of the United States is such that courageous leadership on her part will be a great incentive for other nations to "go thou and do likewise."

For the last 3½ years I worked on the atomic-bomb project. Here men and women of many different colors, religions, professions, philosophies worked side by side, with more cooperation and understanding than I have ever seen in a completely homogeneous group. They wanted to save lives, to win a war, to stop an aggressor. It was this all-impelling motive which made them forget personal differences.

There is such an all-impelling motive for all nations who have eyes to see, ears to hear, and minds to understand the future. One-world nation is inevitable. It may come via another war, at a cost to both victor and vanquished far greater than Germany paid in this war. The winner will be the ruler of a devastated world in which hate, fear, and tyranny will prevail.

A one-world nation can also come about by wise, careful, and intelligent planning. In that case we will lose the sovereign right to make war but gain a healthy world nation of freemen. The all-impelling motive is just as real to do our job now as it was during the war. We should be able to see and feel the need for prompt action. The chances of success are just as good as we make them. As President Hutchins of the University of Chicago says, "We must either succeed or die."

German Resistance to Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 I inserted in the Appendix a remarkable report of the German underground and its efforts to destroy Hitler. Now under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a companion story reprinted from the same source, the weekly news analysis, Human Events, edited by Felix Morley. This article reports the courageous efforts of certain members of the German Foreign Office and diplomatic service to combat Hitlerism and to retain or develop democracy in Germany. It was written by E. A. Bayne, who was an intelligence officer of the Enemy Branch, Foreign Economic Administration, during the war, serving in Africa, Europe, and China.

When we consider how loyal the devotees of certain ideologies are to their friends and supporters who carry out dangerous secret activities against their enemies—among whom usually they include our own country—it is all the more incredible that we Americans have been so tardy in not giving full recognition and support to those Germans who were on the same side as we were with respect to Hitler. The problem of Germany can never really be solved except by such men who are themselves Germans. Why do we fail to see that our hope is in such men, not in the ill-conceived plan adopted at Potsdam under which the situation daily deteriorates before our eyes?

It appears we have only about three choices. First, we can starve some twenty to thirty million Germans. Second, we can try to feed them ourselves. Or, third, we can try to change promptly the Potsdam plan so Germany can become substantially self-feeding and self-supporting under such Germans as described below, a few of whom are still alive after purges by Hitler and neglect by us and our allies:

RESISTANCE IN THE GERMAN FOREIGN OFFICE
(By E. A. Bayne)

In the stone vastness of the Nuremberg Courthouse, there are perhaps a dozen former members of the German Foreign Office who have been assisting the prosecution staffs of the International Military Tribunal. There is a certain poetic justice in the fact that these officials are thus grimly ending more than 10 years of secret war against Hitler's foreign policy.

There were not very many German foreign-service officers who joined this fight, and of those who did, only a few are left to tell the tale of bitter frustration that dogged their efforts. These anti-Nazi career diplomats represent a triumph of loyalty to a democratic Germany. A handful of them survived the Gestapo terror that purged all walks of German life after the abortive putsch in July 1944. Those who remain are not to be regarded as German traitors turned state's evidence, but as consistently patriotic Democrats whose moral victory provides some comfort amid the ruin of a great nation.

These diplomats had seen the threatened evil of Hitler in the twenties, had warily watched the reactionary Von Papen government, hoped vainly for protection from political disaster in the second election of Hindenburg. Foreign Office leaders, like Baron Ernst von Weizsäcker, Ulrich von Hassel, A. Twardowski, Theodor Kordt, Otto Kiep (former consul general in New York), Hasso von Etzdorf, Paul Schmidt, and others were recognized at the League of Nations and in many important capitals as men of integrity and courage. Most of these men were liberal in outlook and political affiliation and despite Nazi domination they zealously strove to uphold the reputation of Germany in the family of nations.

The rise of nazism put the members of the German diplomatic service in a quandary. Some of them became active party members. A few resigned or left the country. Quite a number, perhaps a hundred of the career service, elected to remain as a moderating influence and later, when the true stamp of Hitler became apparent, worked secretly as key men for the sabotage or overthrow of nazism. Under the extraordinary circumstances the latter choice was honorable. The loyalty of a civil servant is to the nation, not to a specific administration. To many German diplomats Hitler simply did not, and could not, speak for Germany.

But as Hitler's control consolidated, as Hindenburg died, as the Army swore fealty to Hitler and the Gestapo established its ruthless rule, it became apparent that only

an international crisis could defeat the Führer. Liberal Germans were faced with tragic alternatives: wait for a military defeat that would remove Hitler but ruin their country; or fashion a revolt dependent upon a diplomatic defeat of such magnitude that the people could not fail to see its significance. These Foreign Office liberals knew that a popular revolt was impossible in a totalitarian country and that a coup d'état depended upon a few top-drawer leaders. With a successful putsch, it was reasoned, the truth of Nazi corruption, inefficiency and evil leadership would be obvious, and the German people would unite to confirm a return to democratic government.

There were scores of resistance groups in Germany, some of which started before the war, whereas others grew up after the Wehrmacht had begun to suffer serious defeats on the eastern front. Most of these were regional, for the Gestapo made consolidation of these groups difficult, if not impossible. Karl Gördeler as related in the recent human events analysis on "The Epic of the German Underground," was one of the few resistance leaders who managed to reach other groups and develop a nationwide program for expulsion of the Nazi administration. In this work he relied heavily on the band of sympathetic diplomatic officers and the military group with which they eventually joined. The part of these German diplomats in the epic should also be made available to Americans.

II

Early in the Nazi régime, when Hitler appointed Von Ribbentrop Commissioner for Disarmament Questions, he requested Secretary of State Bernhard W. von Bülow to provide assistance to the new Commissioner. Von Bülow named Erich Kordt, former secretary of the German delegation to the League of Nations, to be Ribbentrop's aide, and instructed him: "At no time conceal or correct the incompetence and errors of the new special commissioner. Then he will have enough rope to hang himself."

But Ribbentrop unfortunately did not hang himself. And Hitler's estimate of the champagne salesman increased despite the latter's exhibition of extreme bad taste as Ambassador to Britain, his jealous fear of encroachments in the foreign field by Goebbels and Hess and his generally bad judgment.

During the spring of 1934, a clash between the Reichswehr and the Nazi private armies seemed unavoidable. At this time the anti-Nazi conspiracy began to take shape, its objectives clearly seen, its trusted members known only to a few. The first necessity was constant intelligence on official developments But the destruction of Hitler emerged sharply as the vital target.

The Foreign Office was being pushed aside by the Nazis. Ribbentrop created a personal bureau with a staff of more than 300. Fortunately for the conspirators, he retained Erich Kordt as his deputy, providing the opposition with a vital link to Hitler's inner circle. For example, Hitler's decisions to reestablish compulsory military service and to reoccupy the Rhineland were relayed to the Foreign Office first by Kordt. Even von Neurath, who was then Foreign Minister, had to learn of these decisions without participating in them.

Secretary of State von Bülow was a close friend of Gen. Ludwig Beck, then Chief of the German General Staff. They shared the same anti-Hitler convictions. In 1936, Erich Kordt divined from a short dinner conversation with Admiral Canaris, Chief of Intelligence at the War Ministry, that he, too, was working against Hitler. Other Foreign Office members made contact with anti-Nazi political leaders. The night that former Chancellor Heinrich Brüning secretly left Germany, he met with Theodor Kordt and they agreed that Brüning's former secretary, Dr. Günther Bergemann, would provide liaison.

Dr. Paul Schmidt, official German interpreter at the League of Nations with ministerial rank, had been assigned to the German disarmament mission as interpreter for Ribbentrop. Hitler had previously used him to interpret during the Berlin visit of Anthony Eden and Sir John Simon. Schmidt was destined to become a confidant of Hitler, who was boyishly impressed with the former's learning and experience on the European diplomatic stage. Kordt and Schmidt agreed to share all intelligence available to them about the policies of nazism; and while Schmidt was dubious about the success of the conspiracy, he never hesitated to give full reports on Hitler's conferences and secret schemes.

III

The chief function of the Foreign Office conspirators was to provide inside information for the resistance leaders. When the network was established it reached from Hitler's deskside to the Foreign Office, to the Army High Command and intelligence organization, and to the : any leading citizens (as noted in Human Events of February 27) whose responsibility it was to develop the coup d'état.

All communication was by word of mouth only and, especially over the telephone, in coded conversation. Tension was constant, for Himmler and Ribbentrop were both extremely suspicious, and frequently appointed secret operatives as assistants to suspected members of the Foreign Office. One of these agents, Reinhold Spitzy, ultimately admitted his Gestapo mission and asked if he could help the conspiracy, although he had no more than his suspicions to prove there was one. After a time he was admitted and gave valuable service in acting as a courier between London and Berlin, memorizing whole reports. Erich Kordt's desk in "Bureau Ribbentrop" became the transmission point.

Since Ribbentrop was inexperienced and ignorant, the opposition group in his office was able to influence some of his appointments, thus placing their friends in strategic positions. In this manner Baron von Weizsäcker was made secretary of state after Von Bülow; Theodor Kordt, Erich's brother, was sent to London as Chargé d'Affaires; Albert von Kessel and Von der Heyden-Rynsch, working under the supervision of Kiep, were made liaison men with the war ministry. One member of the group, Bruecklmeier, was arrested by the Gestapo and subjected to torture, but he divulged nothing.

Up to 1938 members of the conspiracy had managed to keep out of the Nazi Party, but then an edict by Hess made it imperative that they join or face expulsion from government service. The secretary of state, however, arranged that while the names would be added to the party roll with the usual equivalent SS ranks no member would be required to sign the party oath.

IV

In May 1938 Hitler held a secret conference and drew up his annexation plan for all Czechoslovakia, simultaneously ordering the construction of the west wall. This seemed to provide the overt act of aggression which the underground neeeded to move against the Führer. After conferences with Von Weiszäcker and Beck it was decided to inform the British Government of Hitler's secret plan. Beck believed that a firm declaration by Britain would place him in a position where he could incite the Army to revolt.

During July, the conspirators made contact with Philip Conwell-Evans, an Englishman in close touch with Downing Street, and requested him to transmit Hitler's plans to Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain. In addition, Theodor Kordt, then at the London Embassy, visited Sir Horace Wilson, one of Chamberlain's advisers, and told him of Hitler's plans. Late at night Wilson took Kordt through the rear entrance of No. 10 Downing Street and had him repeat the information to Lord Halifax. The resistance leaders had thus advised the British of Hitler's intentions, so far as known, and of their own preparation for a putsch, but no stand was indicated by the British Government.

Beck had reason to believe that Hitler would order a general mobilization on September 16, and openly stated that, as Chief of the German General Staff, he was unprepared to accept the responsibility for a war with the Western Powers. Tactically, this was a mistake, for Beck was promptly removed, with considerable loss of face, and was replaced by General Halder. The Nazis did not realize that the latter shared Beck's convictions and had agreed to particiate in the planned revolt.

The role of Admiral Canaris had been to work out the detailed plans; the timing to depend upon the moment Hitler ordered a general mobilization. Colonel Oster, Canaris' deputy, reported that the Army's commander in chief, General von Brauchitsch, was finally ready to participate, and troop units were designated for a putsch. General von Witzleben, garrison commander of Berlin, was to place the city under martial law, take over public services, SS headquarters, and communications. General von Brockdorf, commanding a Panzer division at Potsdam, was to rush these troops to the Reich Chancelry and occupy it; Hitler, himself, who was planning to make the announcement of a general mobilization in the Sports Palast, would there be taken into custody by the Berlin police under Count von der Schulenburg.

Then, tragically, came the hasty Godesberg conference and its aftermath at Munich. Hitler no longer needed to order mobilization. When Chamberlain left for England after the first conference, Hitler watched the car roll away, turned to Paul Schmidt and said, "I fooled the old b——!"

V

The meaning of appeasement for the future of Europe was all too painfully evident to the conspirators. The group held together but, their plans gone awry, their faith in the Western Powers shaken, it was difficult to plan for another coup.

In the spring of 1939 Erich Kordt went to London and had various talks with Foreign Office officials. Kordt then also worked out arrangements for the entry into Britain of some Jewish leaders connected with the underground. In April, the British Foreign Office was informed by Kordt of the impending alliance between Italy and Germany, and further that a change in Hitler's heretofore hostile attitude toward Russia was possible. In June, London was advised that secret negotiations were already in progress between Russia and Germany, and that an agreement dividing eastern Europe into spheres of influence was being considered by Ribbentrop, as told by the latter in his testimony at the Nuremberg trial last week. The impression conveyed to Kordt was that Britain expected to come to an agreement with Russia long before Hitler's hopes could be realized.

In Germany, with the success of his bloodless conquests, Hitler's position grew stronger. Meanwhile, the leadership of the earlier frustrated conspiracy had been in part dispersed. Witzleben was sent to Frankfurt; General Brockdorf to North Germany; Halder, now that the die was cast for an adventure in Poland, was too closely associated with Hitler to be able to act. Another opportunity for a putsch might have been developed during Hitler's indecision before his final order for the advance into Poland, but time was too short.

Encouraged by his easy success in the Polish campaign, Hitler decided to launch a blitzkrieg against France on November 14,

1939. Learning this, the conspirators agreed that this development would facilitate another attempt to organize a putsch.

Ribbentrop left for field headquarters with Hitler, and the Foreign Office group seized the opportunity to place reliable officers in strategic posts with the army, such as Count York von Wartenburg at the headquarters of General von Witzleben. Canaris developed the military aspects of the plan. Two divisions of the army group under General Hoepfner were left in Berlin to surround the Chancellory and important Nazi centers. The draft of a general proclamation was prepared charging the Hitler regime with the murder of General von Fritsch and other crimes. This plan provided that Beck should take over the government and offer an immediate armistice to the Western Powers. But an Air Force intelligence officer reported rumors of the putsch to Goering. General von Brauchitsch had also told Hitler that the army was not ready to attack. Hitler stormed at him but nevertheless postponed his plan for a western offensive; declared that drastic action was needed in clearing the "decadent spirit" out of the high command.

VI

When the attack came in the west, in May of 1940, the Nazi successes further enhanced the Fuehrer's prestige and the army leaders declared that they doubted any possibility of successful revolt until Hitler suffered a major military defeat. In April 1942, with the Axis everywhere triumphant, General Beck told a group of his fellow-conspirators that to kill Hitler in the hour of his greatest success would only "further his evil influence on humanity" by creating a new stab-in-the-back legend.

Another opportunity was not to come until the early summer of 1944, when German reverses in Russia were so great that not even the gestapo could prevent the news of the disaster from spreading among the war-weary and bomb-shattered populace. Admiral Canaris and the foreign office group then risked everything in the attempted coup d'état already described by Human Events. Among the thousands of revengeful executions Canaris met one of the most hideous. A steel band was placed about his neck and he was hung until nearly dead. Then he was resuscitated and the process repeated. The sixth strangulation proved fatal.

Even though the conspirators failed to oust the Nazis, they consistently help where they could. In May 1940 a member of the resistance group, von Nostriz, received notice from the Swiss Government that Brussels had been declared an open city. He conveyed the message to General Halder, without Ribbentrop's approval, and Brussels was thus saved the fate of Rotterdam. A German diplomatic representative in Copenhagen transmitted cables to Danish consulates that were in reality instructions from the British Ministry of Economic Warfare. In 1942 the resistance group, through Gördeler, warned the Swedish Government that Hitler was considering invasion of that country. The Swedes immediately mobilized and thus avoided catastrophe. General Ott, German Ambassador to Tokyo, successfully pigeonholed a proposal made jointly by Oshima, the Japanese Ambassador to Germany, and Ribbentrop, that Allied PW's be shackled hand and foot.

The story of the foreign office conspiracy is no whitewash of an agency that was in many respects a very effective arm of Nazi aggression and power politics. The German diplomatic service during the Nazi regime was shot through with Nazis and Nazi fellow-travellers, many of whom played diabolical and disgraceful roles. That is the more reason for giving due credit to those courageous career men who stood firm for their convictions and principles.

Space does not permit the full revelation of their heroic endeavor, heretofore so strangely concealed from American readers. Here it is enough to indicate the bitter story of frustration. These German career diplomats knew the amorality of nazism, and the disaster that nazism threatened for Germany and the world. They did what they could. When they failed, there was nothing left but to endure pulverization by the Allied bombers, and to hope that there would be enough of Germany left eventually to reassume its rightful place in a democratic world.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous complaints from my district that the OPA has stepped up their gestapo methods and are cracking down on small stores, and assessing heavy penalties. Several of the small-business places in Nebraska knew nothing about the proposed suits being brought by the OPA, until they read it in the newspaper. They have no way to defend themselves. The OPA has adopted the old French European system, that you are guilty until you prove you are not guilty. Our American system is one in which an individual is considered innocent until he is proved guilty by proper court procedure. The individual accused by OPA and haled before their kangaroo courts, have no recourse. The merchants realize that if they fight this monstrosity that they will be subject to more expense and bigger fine. The OPA seem to dote upon their ability to pounce down upon the small unsuspecting merchant, who unwittingly may be charging a few cents more for a box of Post Toasties or violates some of the imposing regulations of the OPA. Their regulations are numerous, conflicting, and overlapping. No business can operate legitimately and be always in compliance. It is impossible. This agency closes its eyes to the big black marketeer, the operations of which would make the bootlegger of prohibition days blush in shame. The cost to the American people is far more than in prohibition, because the OPA is now trying to control some 8,000,000 separate items. It makes a citizen, who unknowingly violates the OPA regulations, a criminal. The citizen has no opportunity to defend himself in his own courthouse. There is a stench and a stink coming from this enforcement agency, that ought to turn the head of the most avid supporter of OPA. If this Congress does not correct the evils as they now exist, there will be further spreading of black markets, and an absolute disregard of all of its rules and regulations by the citizens of this country. It is time to take action.

The letter, which I now introduce, indicates what is happening in many communities all over the United States:

APRIL 10, 1946.

A. L. MILLER,
Congressman From the Fourth District of Nebraska, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have no objection to extension of the Price Control Act if something can be done about the gestapo methods of enforcement of the OPA.

I'm a small businessman, a humble grocer, mortgaged to the gills, but a good citizen trying to establish a business on the basis of honest and square dealings. Any of my fellow townsmen or my minister will vouch for me. However, in eyes of the OPA I'm a black-marketeer, a criminal, an arch enemy of the United States, and why? March 28 they filed suit against me for $5,300. The charges? I followed what certain OPA investigators "thought" was the interpretation of certain regulations. They were wrong, but I'm the one who pays.

What recourse do I have? I don't know what I'm going to do, but if I do what all other businessmen have done, and what they advise me to do, I'll not go to court; it will cost me less to say I'm guilty and make settlement out of court than to go through one of their kangaroo-court procedures and even try to prove that I'm not guilty. And thus my case will become one more success for the OPA.

In the words of the United States marshal who served the summons: "I hate to do this. I served 52 last month, and it's the biggest farce I've ever seen. I'd lay $100 on the table for anyone who could show me that one of these summons I've served has uncovered a black-marketeer. They have all been small, legitimate firms like yourself who have unintentionally made an error in their records, who have misinterpreted one of their thousands of regulations."

Our brothers and sons didn't fight and die for an America like this. If the Price Control Act must be extended, for God's sake do all you can to have it amended to curb action like the above. We want the American way of life back again.

A SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF NEBRASKA.

Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am for the provision which will provide for the retention of essential farm boys on the farm. I voted for the amendment to exempt boys under 20 from the draft. I think they are too young.

In view of enlistments greatly exceeding estimates, I voted for the amendment to suspend the draft for 5 months to determine if the increased voluntary enlistments will meet the needs. Personally, I have urged and shall continue to urge that the necessary training of boys be given in the high schools and colleges close to the homes of the young men because of the higher morals existing in the home communities.

SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS HAVE RECOMMENDED THE EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT

Then I voted for the draft of those above 20 in order to secure sufficient replacements to take the places of thou-

sands of those who have families and to insure the return of servicemen who have served 18 months. I personally dislike to vote for continuation of the draft, but, in view of the heavy responsibility of maintaining peace, it is necessary to have an occupation army in some of the countries for some time in order that we may avoid future wars. Furthermore, there are international problems which are very grave at this time and unless we use every precaution and adopt a definite foreign policy and be very firm in our dealings with certain countries we might become involved in another war and be without sufficient defense.

Promise Versus Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY. O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of April 12, 1946:

PROMISE VERSUS PERFORMANCE

While official propagandists over here talk seductively of the proposed British loan as a step toward restoring competitive and unrestricted international trade, Great Britain appears to be moving in the opposite direction.

Certainly the political victory of the British Labor Party, with its plan for socialization of coal, banking, and other basic activities, runs counter to the pious utterances in the loan agreement about restoring freedom and the abrogation of governmental interference with the flow of trade.

In specific cases, Britain is in fact fastening still further on its economic set-up the spirit of regimentation and of state domination.

In the international field, with which the loan agreement is primarily concerned, a dramatic move against free action by individual citizens has been taken in the announcement by Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the board of trade, to the effect that the British Government intended to perpetuate the wartime policy of bulk purchase of Britain's cotton requirements, thus eliminating the private cotton trader and the necessity for the continuance of the world-famed Liverpool Cotton Exchange.

The House of Commons sustained this revolutionary position by a vote of 337 to 186.

The action constituted just one more stone in the larger mosaic of substituting dictation by government for the free action of individual citizens.

With diplomatic understatement, the monthly letter of the National City Bank of New York stigmatizes the British decision, saying:

"While the action is not specifically contrary to the trade proposals, it is regarded here as not in harmony with the principles of freer international trading which this country is sponsoring, and which, we are told, is a primary objective of the British loan agreement."

In spite of noble talk about a brave new world, there are signs that freer trade is to be a one-way street in which Americans will let down their tariffs without corresponding concessions by other nations.

It was made clear as early as the Bretton Woods Conference in July 1944 that, while other nations applauded United States theorizing about free trade, India, Egypt, Latin America, and other parts of the world clearly expressed their own intention to employ tariffs as a means of industrializing their own home economies.

The Hearst newspapers have already shown from the record that propaganda about Britain's trade concessions as a consideration for the loan add nothing to the more rigid commitments along this line previously made by the United Kingdom in connection with the master lend-lease agreement.

The cotton episode, in which totalitarian dictation is to be substituted in one commodity for a free market, raises serious doubts as to the enthusiasm with which the British Government regards proposals for freeing international trade from the shackles of government interference.

British Loan—It Won't Help Trade if It's Not Repaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY. O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leslie Gould from the New York Journal-American of April 12, 1946:

BRITISH LOAN—IT WON'T HELP TRADE IF IT'S NOT REPAID

(By Leslie Gould)

An argument being made for the British loan—three and three-quarters billion dollars—and that much again to other countries, including Russia, France, and China, is that the United States must export or go into an economic tailspin. That foreign trade is the difference between prosperity and depression.

There is no question that export trade is important for this country's economic well-being.

That is real foreign trade—an exchange of goods and services between this country and other lands.

But is this what the international do-gooders and lovers of everything foreign mean when they talk about foreign trade and the current line-up for loans out of the American Treasury?

They are arguing that this country must lend England three and three-fourths billion dollars, on top of writing off thirty billions of lend-lease and the twenty-billion debt hanging over from World War I and the years immediately following. A large chunk of the last is owed by Britain.

And that additional billions must be lent to Russia, China, France, Holland, and so on around the world.

They argue that unless the United States makes these loans, these nations cannot buy here. That they will have to pull in their belts and trade within limited tariff restricted areas.

So what they are proposing is for this country to lend these other nations the money to buy goods here. Then American factories will keep busy and American workers will have more employment, as long as the American money holds out.

But if these foreign borrowers can't repay these loans, what then? They will have the American goods, but the American taxpayers will be out the billions so lent.

That, in our book, is not foreign trade. The only exchange is borrowed American dollars for American goods. It is good business for the British, the Russians, the Chinese, and Dutch. But where do the American taxpayers who have to foot the bill come off?

As far as these poor benighted and forgotten citizens—the taxpayers—are concerned, they would have been better off to have spent the money on a binge. They'll have the hang-over, anyway, but have missed the fun of the night before.

If these are loans, then they should be made on a business basis and made on ability to pay. If they are gifts, then they should be made on a charitable basis and in keeping with what the American taxpayers can afford to contribute.

As a matter of fact, this country does not know what it can afford to contribute to raise the living standard of the rest of the world. It is time America took an inventory of its resources. In these last 5 years it has dug deeply into that barrel.

Some will say this is being nationalistic. We think its being realistic. And it is time this country's citizens and its leaders became realistic and faced the fact that there is a bottom to the barrel. We can't go on forever underwriting the rest of the world.

Newspaper Praises Energy of Housing Expediter Wyatt—Urges That Veterans' Need Be Kept in Mind in Housing Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, although he has held office for only 4 months, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the Housing Expediter, is rapidly gaining a reputation for direct, energetic action and able administration that is almost unparalleled in Government in recent years.

There can be little question that President Truman made an exceedingly wise choice in appointing Mr. Wyatt to one of the most difficult administrative posts that exists in Washington.

However, Mr. Wyatt faces a long, hard, up-hill struggle in attempting to meet a problem that has defied adequate solution for a decade. He will need the help and understanding not only of the American people, but of the leaders in business and in Congress if he is to succeed.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include an article by Merlo Pusey, one of the ablest commentators on the American scene, which appeared in the Washington Post on April 2. The column very accurately sums up the over-all task facing Mr. Wyatt, and his ability to meet it:

HOUSING MOVEMENT

(By Merlo Pusey)

MR. WYATT PUTS STEAM BEHIND IT

Amid the confusion and disillusionment of the postwar period, the steam which Wilson Wyatt is putting behind the housing program is a refreshing sign. His assault on the housing problem has assumed the characteristics of a David and Goliath affair. And while the David in this story is a long

way from triumphant victory over the giant, his courage and activity have brought new hope to a great number of wretchedly housed Americans.

Mr. Wyatt's immediate objective is to provide new housing for veterans at prices or rentals they can afford to pay. The task of producing 2,700,000 new dwelling units in the next 2 years is critically urgent because of the acute shortage of housing resulting from the war. But this is only the spearhead of the housing movement. Behind it is the larger task of building 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 dwelling units in the next decade for families who have never had a decent place to live.

Possibly the most significant factor in the present outlook is that energy, initiative, and imagination have been brought to bear upon the whole housing problem. Mr. Wyatt is more than a sound thinker about housing; he is also a driving force toward action. If he succeeds in intermeshing all of the complex factors that are essential to the creation of a stable mass-production housing industry, it will be one of the great accomplishments of our time.

The unpalatable fact is that a vast number of people in our cities have always been shamefully housed. Living quarters have been produced, with precious little comprehensive planning and largely for families in the upper income brackets. As they have become old and obsolete, they have been passed down to families farther down the economic scale. Only in recent years has there been any concerted effort to build new and appropriate housing for families in the middle and lower income brackets. And this has been provided in relatively small quantities.

We had a building boom in the 1920's. But it was followed by a bust because so little effort was made to provide modern housing for the groups who needed it most. In the 1930's the revival was so halting that we fell critically short of providing enough housing to supply the new families added to our population.

At present, therefore, the United States presents the spectacle of the most wealthy nation in the world steadily slipping backward in this vital matter of housing. Our great motor industry has put the Nation on wheels, and other industries have filled our homes and offices with gadgets. But the business of providing comfortable, healthful, and attractive living quarters in a pleasant environment is still in the horse-and-buggy stage.

Considerable progress has been made in providing public housing for those whose incomes give them no chance of obtaining a decent home through private enterprise. Much less has been done to date to improve the quality and increase the quantity of housing available to families in the middle-income brackets. The time seems to be ripe for concentration of our best city planning, engineering, and financing genius on the rescue of both these categories of city dwellers from the depressing drabness or downright squalor of their home environment.

The fact that this task involves a very large measure of rebuilding for most of our cities should only quicken the general eagerness for undertaking it. Most of our cities are afflicted with the ugliness, the blight, and incongruity that result from poor planning. Today they are frantically pushing into new suburban areas to get away from the decay attacking them at or near the core. But that trend leaves enormous pockets of rotten housing, crime, delinquency, and disease to spread their demoralizing influence through the entire community.

What are obviously needed are major operations to eliminate living conditions that bring out the worst characteristics of human kind. These will require new vision in our legislative halls as well as in administrative agencies, and among the peoples themselves. it is a matter of good fortune that such vision has already been manifested in the drafting of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and in the shaping of Mr. Wyatt's program as Housing Expediter.

This great objective should not be lost while every effort is being turned to the creation of housing for veterans. The great hope that Mr. Wyatt and the sponsors of housing legislation in Congress have aroused is that the momentum we must achieve in meeting the present emergency can be projected into the rebuilding of our cities during the next several decades.

Democratic Party Should Purge PAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, how long shall the Democratic Party covet the support of the CIO–PAC who, upon reliable information appearing in this morning's Post, will meet here in Washington tomorrow and Wednesday to discuss the congressional campaigns in various districts?

The story goes that the PAC will decide to throw its support to several Republican candidates as well as Democrats. Then just why shouldn't they be brought to task for political irregularity just like they attack and try to purge good Democratic Congressmen for carrying out the will of their constituents? There is no sound answer. We should wash our hands of any organization that tries to steal our party label and take us to an accounting for supporting or not supporting certain bills here in Congress.

As we view it the people are responding to the Members of Congress who are voting to remove the yoke from their necks, and will not be influenced by the arbitrary big money garnered, against the will of most of them, from the lay workers in this organization.

The item I am referring to appeared in Leonard Lyons column, Gossip from Gotham, in this morning's Washington Post, and is as follows:

The Political Action Committee will meet in Washington on Tuesday and Wednesday to discuss the Congressional campaigns in various districts. The PAC will decide to throw its support to several Republican congressional candidates, as well as Democrats. The committee then will announce its opposition to the formation of any third party.

Industrial Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH PETERSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by Dr. Blake R. Van Leer, president of Georgia School of Technology, at the thirty-fourth annual banquet of Hibernian Society, Savannah, Ga., on March 16, 1946:

The Georgia which we toast tonight is industrial Georgia—a new Georgia built upon and growing from the old. Each generation endeavors to pass on to their children a heritage of better living, so tonight as we look to the future we also pay a respectful and reverent tribute to those of the past who have brought us to where we are today. We do not worship our ancestors but we honor their memories.

An industrial revolution is taking place today in the great State of Georgia, similar to that which occurred in Great Britain a century ago and in New England about the time of the American Civil War. Georgia, the largest State east of the Mississippi River, is changing from an agricultural to an industrial economy.

This change started just 25 years ago and was brought about by various things. From 1870, following the Civil War, up to 1920, there was a steady increase in the State's largest single source of cash farm income, namely, cotton, upon which Georgia's economy was chiefly predicated. Production of cotton reached its peak in Georgia in 1911 when 2,769,000 bales were produced on about 5,000,000 acres. But in recent years, production of this item has decreased until today it averages about 1,000,000 bales per year. This decrease was brought about by erosion, impoverishment of the land, a drastic decline in cotton prices following World War I, and the invasion of the State by the boll weevil.

However, the loss in cotton has been replaced to a large extent by new and expanding industries and by other crops such as peanuts, tobacco, and vegetables. Believe it or not, up to recent times, the largest item of expenditures by Georgia farm families was for food, most of it imported from other States.

It was about this time that groups of Georgia leaders began to see in the cotton-textile industry the possible medium for commercial prominence and the reconstruction of Georgia's industries. Georgia had an almost unlimited supply of raw cotton and a vast amount of labor which could be drawn from the farms and villages and put to work in the cotton mills. Since working in a cotton mill requires relatively little skill or training, these farmers and farmers' children could be easily and quickly trained for cotton-mill work.

These groups of leaders, not having the funds themselves, secured financing credits from cotton-goods merchants and textile-machinery companies. For the most part, however, our early cotton mills were built by cotton-mill manufacturers from New England who expanded their plants by establishing branches in Georgia.

From these early beginnings the textile manufacturing industry has grown until today it is composed of more than 200 plants located in 59 counties. These mills are engaged in the production of a wide variety of cotton yarn, fabrics, knit goods, finished materials, and many other types of products. Georgia ranks third among the States in its textile productive capacity with over 3,000,000 spindles.

In a normal year these mills consume more than a million bales of cotton. During World War II mill consumption has exceeded 2,000,000 bales per year. This quantity is more than twice the amount of cotton grown in Georgia. This means that more than 1,000,000 bales of cotton had to be imported from other States.

At present there are more than 100,000 people employed in cotton textile plants of

Georgia. It is estimated that one-sixth of the State's white population is directly supported by the textile industry. The present textile pay roll of Georgia amounts to about $125,000,000 a year. These pay rolls from the textile mills, no doubt, have played a major role in placing Georgia once more upon that sound economic basis which the State is now enjoying.

These details with reference to the textile mills have been given mainly to illustrate the fact that the cotton textile industry has not only grown to be a great industry in Georgia, but has served as a springboard from which many of the other industries have come into existence.

We hear frequently the expression, "Georgia should be industrialized." The fact is the industrialization of the State is already under way and has made much headway, as the following facts show.

The estimated invested capital in Georgia industries in 1945 was over $900,000,000. This contrasts with $448,000,000 in 1919 and $202,000,000 in 1909, an increase of over 100 percent now as compared with the years immediately following World War I. The estimated number of wage earners in 1945 working in Georgia industries was 318,000, as compared with 123,000 in 1919—an increase of 150 percent. The estimated wages paid workers in 1945 in Georgia were $390,000,000, as compared with $101,000,000 in 1919, an increase of more than 280 percent. The number and variety of types of industries in Georgia have increased until at the present time there are catalogued 3,625 industries of all types. These industries cover in the main the following: Apparel, chemicals, furniture, metal working, naval stores; stone, clay, and glass; textiles, wood products, and many others. From September 1944 to September 1945, there were more than 300 new industries started in Georgia. Hundreds of firms manufacturing a variety of products are seeking locations in Georgia.

You might be interested in some comparisons between the importance of agriculture and industry in Georgia as an income-producing medium. Previous to the year 1916, gross farm income in Georgia exceeded gross income in industry. Following 1916 the income from industry increased very rapidly. By 1929 the income from industry in Georgia was more than twice that from agriculture. From estimates recently released, it appears that the total agricultural income for Georgia for 1945, including basic crops, fruits, and vegetables, was a little more than $387,000,000, while that estimated from industry exceeds a billion dollars. There is no doubt that we do possess sufficient industry, both in volume and variety, to serve as the base for greater and greater expansion. According to some estimates, we can easily double our present industrial output without importing labor, capital, or raw materials to any large extent. This expansion will in time come of its own momentum, but it would be much better if this expansion were planned.

We at the Georgia School of Technology, realizing the need for scientific planning, have for the past several years been engaged in industrial research and survey projects with the aim to determine what our resources are, how abundant they are, and what can be made from them. The main idea in these studies has been to catalog the material and human resources with the idea of determining what would be the best course to pursue in utilizing both to bring about a higher standard of living. Certain facts stand out prominently. Among these are: first, the utter destruction, waste, and neglect of our material resources; and second, a wasteful and uneconomical use made of our human resources. Both of these undesirable things may be avoided by the use of planning and sense. Too many of our native raw materials are still being shipped out of the State as such. I am reasonably sure that we could double our industrial employment rolls and add $1,000,000,000 to Georgia's annual income by processing our own raw materials in our own plants.

In planning this industrial expansion of the future we might well ask what have we to work with. We have almost unlimited resources of certain types and a vast quantity of others.

1. First is our climate, which is probably our most basic and important resource. In industry and in agriculture this is worth money, in lower production costs and cheaper living costs, such as clothing, food, and housing, and in long growing seasons.

2. Our forest area. Fifty-six percent of Georgia's land is covered by commercial forests which contain almost every variety of both hard and soft wood in abundance. The pine tree is rapidly becoming our most useful product.

The State produces 65–70 percent of the Nation's naval stores and 50 percent of the world's production. But the most significant growth of any industry in Georgia is that of the pulpwood industry. The following figures include wood shipped to pulp mills in Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, but exclude wood imported from other States by Georgia pulp mills:

	Standard cords
1935	47,000
1936	77,000
1937	212,700
1938	432,000
1939	542,700
1940	700,800
1941	769,900
1942	945,000

3. Our population. It is safe to say that in an industrial Georgia the colored population will prove to be a greater asset than it has been in an agricultural Georgia. The experience of persons who trained people for industrial jobs during the war was that both white and colored labor were easily and quickly trained for the higher skills. Skilled and semiskilled labor is more abundant in Georgia now than it has ever been. According to the records there were 96,581 persons trained for war jobs in Georgia by June 1945. This is almost as many persons as there were employed in industry previous to the war. This figure does not take into consideration the 40,000 or more who were trained in the ship yards. In addition to this, Georgia had more than 300,000 young men in the armed forces. Many thousands of these received, as a part of their training for war, specialized training which can be well utilized in an industrial Georgia. Taking all these groups into consideration it would be conservative to estimate that the number of skilled and semiskilled workers in Georgia is now three times what it was prior to the war.

4. We already have many well-established industries. Our industries are literally going concerns. They are expanding. Our home people have become industrially minded. A large number of people from other sections of the country already have their attention fixed on Georgia. There will be a large migration of industry in this State.

5. Our farm land. Its potential in the production of basic farm crops, vegetables and fruits and livestock is unrealized. We probably need to make some changes in our agricultural aims and methods. Further mechanization, production of higher quality products, and the use of supplementary irrigation and drainage should be encouraged. More attention will be given in the future to production of those crops of higher quality which can be processed in canning, freezing, and preserving plants. Any advancement along these lines is bound to bring about higher productivity of labor and the consequent rise in the standard of living.

6. Finance: For the first time since the War Between the States, Georgia finds itself with an adequate supply of its own financing to meet its every practical need. Just to give you some idea of the change that has taken place in our basic financial ability: in 1914 the total deposits of our banks were about $131,000,000; in 1919 the deposits had grown to $311,000,000; by 1924 to $317,000,000; by 1929 to $341,000,000; by 1934 deposits dropped back to $298,000,000; by 1939 they went to $451,000,000; by 1944 to $1,315,000,000; and by the end of 1945 to more than $1,500,000,000. The increase of present deposits over those of 1919 is 366 percent. In addition to these figures we have as a backlog vast amounts of savings in the form of Government bonds. As an additional potential, we have the borrowing capacity of over 300,000 veterans under the GI bill of rights. These vast credit resources just mentioned do not take into account all the other many means by which credit can be secured, both from private sources such as mortgage and insurance companies, and from the Federal Government through such agencies as the Commodity Credit Corporation.

A little while ago I made reference to the fact that industrial research projects have been under way at Georgia Tech for several years, and that one of the main objectives in making these studies was to ascertain, if possible, just what types of industries should be promoted in Georgia. In times past the record shows that Georgia industries in the main have been those employing largely unskilled labor and those in which, of course, earnings for workers were low. They have been industries in which wages were low everywhere, not just in Georgia alone, and where the value added by manufacture was also low. The industries for Georgia for the future should be planned with the idea of establishing those industries in which wages are high, and in which value added is high. It is only in this way that adequate purchasing power may be provided to buy our manufactured products and to furnish taxes with which to build up our communities and improve our schools and hospitals.

Among the industries to be encouraged are the following: All kinds of apparel, including boots and shoes; food processing; electrical machinery and foundry products; household furnishings; pulp, paper, and paper products; textile machinery; vegetable oil refining; ceramic products; paints; hundreds of different kinds of wood products; many and varied types of products made from steel, aluminum, and plastics; and all types of products used in the building trades. This is not the complete list, by any means, but it contains those offering the most probable immediate gains.

One of the first questions the potential manufacturer asks is: "Where will I sell my product?" This question is entirely appropriate in connection with the subject of this talk. If we expand our output as contemplated, where shall we sell the product? With the contemplated increase in average wages and number of workers the local market will be tremendously increased. As output is increased we shall reap the benefits of lower unit cost, resulting from mass production, and will thus be able to compete in the outlying markets. With the opening of our ports foreign markets with Central and South America and coastwise markets will be available with cheaper transportation. Transportation facilities have played, and will continue to play, a tremendous part in the industrial growth and expansion of Georgia. Georgia has 6,200 miles of railway mileage, which is much greater than any other Southern State east of the Mississippi.

For this same southern area Georgia ranks first also in the total number of motortruck and bus registrations. Georgia has taken to the air, and all of Georgia's largest cities are served by an excellent network of air lines with connections to every part of the air world.

Already our present consumption of power is great. The retail sales in Georgia amount

to more than $2,500,000,000 per year. With the increased wages during the war, our people have been able to buy things which have never before been within their reach. In the future they will want not only these luxuries but others, and will strive to increase their earning power in order to obtain them. Insofar as the immediate outlook is concerned, there should be no worry about being able to sell what is produced within the next few years if only good sense will be used in our manufacturing plans. For example, there are still 318,177 rural farm and nonfarm dwelling units in Georgia without electric service. What a potential market for electrical equipment and units manufactured in the State of Georgia.

I have pictured for you a future life for the average Georgian vastly different from the one he has lived in the past. I should like for you to think of this life to be lived in Georgia as a busy life, intelligently directed, sustained by enthusiasm, training, and knowledge. Such a life will call for basic training in fundamentals, not only of living, but of planning for a life and industrial activity along scientific lines. Very largely as I see it, this expanded industrial activity, if successful, will have to rely upon scientific management of industry and business, and improved engineering technique. According to a study made by Dun and Bradstreet, 85 percent of the failures in business and industry are directly traceable to poor management. There are some phases of management which can be learned only from experience. There are some phases of management which can be learned in our colleges. There may be certain phases of management which can be successfully performed only by supermen—by those who are endowed with unusual and rare qualities.

In Georgia we are well-provided with courses of study in our colleges. In the engineering and industrial management courses at Georgia Tech, all phases of engineering are thoroughly taught. A recent survey of 13,537 alumni of Georgia Tech discloses that more than half of our graduates in engineering remain in or come back to Georgia to help build the State's industrial future. In addition, almost 80 percent are making their contribution to the industrial economy of the Southeast. (See table II).

In management itself, we have at Georgia Tech the department of industrial engineering and industrial management, each with a 4-year course leading to a degree. We have fine schools of commerce at the University of Georgia in Athens and at Emory University in Atlanta, and there are other schools in the State which give courses in the field of business administration. Within the course of time, more and more of the graduates of our engineering, management, and business administration schools will find their places in Georgia industries, and will devote their time and lend their talents to the upbuilding of this State.

The industrial future of Georgia is bright; it is hopeful. That it will grow and develop is assured. Whether it will be great, glorious, and magnificent rests with the people of Georgia. We can make it so if we will all come to a realization that a high living standard and a great industrial development are dependent upon our ability to produce more goods and services for less money than anyone else, and that we must all educate ourselves, train ourselves so that we can each produce in his or her chosen field the maximum of goods and services of which each is capable. The solution to achieving a magnificent industrial development in Georgia is production. We must produce the maximum of goods and services for the least expenditure of time, money, and materials. There is no other way.

The industrial revolution in Georgia is well under way, making possible a higher living standard for its people, increased industrial development of its many natural resources, and a better education for all. Machines in agriculture, in industry, and in the homes of Georgia are aiding the people to enjoy life with more time to think, live, and grow. No wonder that Louis Bromfield, world-famous author, on a recent visit to Georgia said, "I saw the resurrection of life and a new world in the making. And the people are doing it themselves."

TABLE I.—*Data concerning industrial Georgia*

[Total area: 58,876 square miles. Land, 58,518 square miles; water, 358 square miles]

	1900	1910	1930	1944
Population	2,216,000	2,609,000	2,908,000	[1] 3,223,727
Property, assessed value	$433,324,000	$765,966,000	$1,303,406,000	$1,109,814,488
Property, estimated value	$936,000,000	$1,924,415,000	$2,606,920,000	$2,885,516,669
Manufactures: Products, value	$94,532,000	$202,863,000	[2] $718,603,000	[3] $677,402,657
Installed horsepower	136,000	298,000	[2] 643,000	[3] 800,870
Electric output, kilowatt-hours	[4]	142,082,000	937,229,000	3,169,866,000
Cotton manufacturing:				
Products, value	$18,458,000	$48,037,000	[2] $212,852,000	[3] $218,573,104
Spindles, active	816,000	1,871,000	3,152,000	3,097,384
Looms, active	19,398	39,000	60,000	55,730
Cotton consumed, bales	304,000	530,000	1,107,000	2,010,908
Cottonseed products, value	$8,064,000	$23,641,000	$20,830,000	$24,968,000
Coke made, tons	74,000	44,000	[5]	[4]
Furniture made, value	$1,273,000	$2,060,000	[3] $7,611,000	[3] $21,919,989
Lumber cut, board feet	1,308,610,000	1,041,617,000	[3] 1,386,250,000	1,564,650,000
Minerals, value	[4]	$6,048,000	[3] $15,294,000	$18,663,000
Bauxite, tons			[4]	[4]
Cement distributed, barrels	[4]		1,561,000	1,245,546
Coal mined, tons (bituminous)	315,000	177,000		21,000
Iron ore, tons	336,000	314,000	53,000	[6] 1,414,990
Lime, tons			11,000	6,079
Sand and gravel, tons			604,000	569,908
Stone, tons			2,447,000	1,773,150
Farm land, acres	26,392,000	26,953,000	[7] 21,945,000	[3] 23,683,631
Available cropland, acres	10,616,000	12,298,000	[7] 11,507,000	[8] 11,690,225
Number of farms	225,000	291,000	256,000	[8] 216,033
Farm crops, acres	8,267,000	9,661,000	10,622,000	7,718,000
Farm lands and buildings, value	$228,375,000	$580,546,000	$638,673,000	[3] $480,344,531
Farm products, cash income from	$104,304,000	$257,351,000	$265,000,000	[9] $377,459,000
Farm crops cash income from [10]	$86,345,000	$216,972,000	$200,721,000	[9] $273,447,000
Cotton:				
Acres	3,514,000	4,873,000	3,903,000	1,360,000
Bales	1,233,000	1,767,000	1,625,000	810,000
Lint, cash income from [10]	$42,534,000	$123,700,000	$75,562,000	$90,630,000
Cottonseed:				
Tons	615,000	795,000	721,000	320,000
Cash income from [10]	$6,447,000	$22,626,000	$15,141,000	$12,324,000
Corn:				
Acres	3,412,000	3,585,000	3,729,000	3,548,000
Bushels	34,119,000	51,982,000	45,494,000	40,802,000
Cash income from [10]	$19,448,000	$40,546,000	$39,125,000	$8,163,000
Oats:				
Acres	467,000	404,000	360,000	545,000
Bushels	7,010,000	7,353,000	8,280,000	13,080,000
Cash from [10]	$3,435,000	$4,706,000	$6,127,000	$3,520,000
Wheat:				
Acres	551,000	141,000	49,000	228,000
Bushels	5,011,000	1,480,000	588,000	2,964,000
Cash income from [1]	$4,760,000	$1,924,000	$794,000	$2,006,000
Tobacco:				
Acres	2,000	2,000	127,000	93,700
Pounds	1,106,000	1,488,000	104,994,000	93,780,000
Cash income from [1]	$160,000	$297,000	$10,814,000	$39,656,000
Cattle, number	899,000	1,080,000	863,000	1,126,000
Swine, number	1,424,000	1,784,000	1,154,000	1,575,000
Horses, number	127,000	120,000	33,000	38,000
Mules, number	207,000	295,000	337,000	298,000
Sheep, number	336,000	188,000	51,000	16,000
Banking resources	[4]	$165,141,000	$435,631,000	$1,538,388,000
Capital stock	[4]	$27,161,000	$39,395,000	$33,286,000
Deposits	$33,125,000	$82,457,000	$294,727,000	$1,406,659,000
Life insurance:				
Written	$27,771,000	$67,969,000	$385,655,000	$435,978,000
Total in force	$106,327,000	$306,725,000	$1,325,262,000	$2,139,057,000
Exports, value	$45,626,000	$78,021,000	$45,563,000	[11] $367,000,000
Imports, value	$448,000	$3,928,000	$14,525,000	[11] $36,000,000
Railroad mileage	5,652	7,056	6,716	6,196
Highway expenditures	$895,000	$3,688,000	$27,000,000	$11,359,000
Motor vehicles, number		19,000	342,000	532,431
Public school expenditures	$1,980,000	$4,419,000	$17,741,000	$30,874,623
School enrollment	483,000	556,000	705,000	728,457

[1] Census Bureau estimate, 1944.
[2] 1929.
[3] 1939.
[4] Not available.
[5] Included in Virginia.
[6] Include North Carolina.
[7] 1925.
[8] 1940.
[9] Does not include Government subsidy payments.
[10] 1900, 1910, and 1930 are gross values, not income.
[11] Preliminary; subject to revision.

TABLE II.—*Geographical distribution of Georgia Tech alumni*

Alabama	516
Arizona	3
Arkansas	125
California	131
Colorado	20
Connecticut	102
Delaware	20
Florida	856
Georgia	7,065
Idaho	8
Illinois	123
Indiana	27
Iowa	12
Kansas	18
Kentucky	64
Louisiana	186
Maine	8
Maryland	133
Massachusetts	120
Michigan	67
Minnesota	6
Mississippi	169

Missouri	132
Montana	20
Nebraska	10
Nevada	5
New Hampshire	2
New Jersey	281
New Mexico	5
New York	581
North Carolina	379
North Dakota	3
Ohio	203
Oklahoma	46
Oregon	5
Pennsylvania	248
Rhode Island	10
South Carolina	320
South Dakota	2
Tennessee	564
Texas	254
Utah	4
Virginia	266
Vermont	5
Washington	12
West Virginia	50
Wisconsin	35
Wyoming	3
District of Columbia	91
Foreign	225
Total	13,537

Benefits for Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, a bill to provide benefits for merchant seamen. Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, is the chairman of the subcommittee and the subcommittee will probably report to the full committee shortly after the Easter recess. The bill will be followed up diligently, and it is hoped that favorable action may be taken thereon. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include as a part of my remarks a column printed in My Day of April 12, 1946, written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt entitled "Merchant Marine Veterans Entitled to Benefits, Too":

MY DAY—MERCHANT MARINE VETERANS ENTITLED TO BENEFITS, TOO

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HARTFORD, CONN., Thursday.—There is one thing I have been meaning to write about for a good many days. It is the bill of rights before Congress to extend to the men of the merchant marine certain rights that now belong exclusively to the men in the naval service.

It seems unfair that these merchant seamen, who were all volunteers and who, in proportion to their numbers, lost more men in the war than any other branch of our fighting services, should not have the same benefits that sailors in the Regular Navy enjoy. Over 1,500 merchant ships were lost and over 6,000 merchant seamen were lost or taken prisoner during the war.

According to a poll taken by Dr. George Gallup, I understand that, on the whole, the voters are in favor of doing more for the merchant marine men. One of the reasons they gave was: "The merchant-marine boys are not going to have any easier time than the rest in finding jobs after the war." And again: "They risked their lives for their country, and they are volunteers, too."

Many a man who could not get into any of the other services finally got into the merchant marine. Many men who sailed in the merchant marine were old sea dogs, far over draft age. I think, as do the 60 percent of the citizens who voted "Yes" in Dr. Gallup's poll, that they are entitled to the benefits under this bill. Their needs, as well as the needs of the men in the naval service, should have full consideration and protection through our Government.

It is something of a jump from the men of the merchant marine to the production of a play. The connection is hardly obvious, and yet, if you read or see On Whitman Avenue you will see it is in the case of the mechant seamen. It took Canada Lee and Mark Marvin a long time to raise the money to produce that play, and I hope very much that, after it has played Buffalo and Detroit, it will come to New York and have a long enough run to repay those who had faith enough to produce it.

It deals with a question which is very vital to us at the present time, since the eyes of the world are on us just now. Our fight for democracy and justice, when all the various elements that make up our citizenship are concerned, is an essential fight to give that sense of strength and confidence in democracy which has to permeate the world. This play, through its portrayal of day-by-day incidents in an average community, makes one alert to the dangers that may defeat democracy and justice if we are not on our guard.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Acheson report on international control of atomic energy has been presented as a starting point for public discussion. It is not the finished American program. The State Department hopes that the American people will discuss it fully and intelligently to give our American representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission a clear idea of what they want our national policy to be. I urge fullest possible public discussion at once. This problem is conceded to be the most difficult we have ever confronted. Only the widest possible discussion will evolve a policy which will be rational and workable.

I note that any program of international control will test the sincerity of the nations in their claims that they want peace. No nation can be conceded the veto power which the big five now enjoy in the United Nations Organization—Security Council.

Furthermore, any workable system will demand that Russia lift the iron curtain which at the present, conceals her activities not only in the Soviet Union, but in all of eastern Europe as well.

It is generally conceded that the problem of how to control atomic energy is the most crucial problem confronting the world today. In publishing the Acheson report on the International Control of Atomic Energy, the State Department has made an excellent first step, but, as the writers of the report declare, it is only a first step. In his foreword to the report of Secretary of State Byrnes declared that the document should be considered as a "starting point for the informed public discussion which is one of the essential factors in developing sound policy."

We shall not arrive at a sound national policy without Nation-wide knowledge of the facts and debate over their implications. This means that the Acheson report should be widely circulated throughout the country. I call attention to the fact that this report is priced so prohibitively that such circulation is almost impossible. The Government Printing Office has produced an elaborate pamphlet which costs 20 cents. There is a crying need for a cheap edition of this study so that mass distribution can be made. I am informed that the State Department sees no need for such a step. It is my suggestion that a much cheaper edition be published as soon as possible, so that the widest possible study of this epochal document may be encouraged.

Extension of Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in my support of the Vinson amendment, I wish to state that I firmly believe that this proposal is sound and the American way of approaching this vital question before us today.

If a state of emergency still exists, I think it is the duty of the President to let that be known.

However, the armed forces are in a state of demobilization, not only in manpower, but also in disposing of war implements, under the Surplus Property Administration.

There is not a Member of this House who would recommend an 18-year-old boy to serve as a police officer in any community. Then why should we take these boys out of school to make international police officers out of them?

Suspending the draft from May the 15th to October the 15th would certainly give the Army and Navy ample time to find out just how many men would actually volunteer for service, knowing what they were volunteering for.

We all remember, in the early part of last year, when the armed forces tried to prevail upon us to draft every person in America, either for military duty or to engage in some kind of war work; at a time, mind you, when the Army itself was cutting back in renewing war contracts, and a vast number of war workers were then out of employment.

They set up the scare then that it was essential that all persons between the ages of 18 and 65 be placed under military control.

I was one who voted against that proposal and, somehow or other, that proposal disappeared into thin air.

Another reason why I am supporting this amendment is because the court martial procedure of the military is too drastic.

Boys who are still babes who, never having had their fling in life and are normal and natural individuals, will, in their mischievous ways, become involved in minor trouble, but under military authority they will be tried like hardened criminals and, if the future is like the past, they will be given jail sentences that will ruin their entire lives for the future.

I have seen that occur.

I had the pleasure of reading a book a short while back entitled "The Wilson Era," by Josephus Daniels, who was Secretary of the Navy under President Wilson, which clearly shows what would happen every time a little flare-up in world affairs would occur if the military had control of government, and I quote, as follows:

> The passage in the early part of 1913 by the California Legislature, of a law forbidding the Japanese to own or lease land in that State, created such strained relations between Japan and the United States that many feared the long-predicted war between the two countries would ensue.

And if it were not for the level-headedness of Daniels and Wilson, the Navy of the United States might have gotten us into war in 1913, with Japan.

They issued statements to the press, in that year, contrary to the administration's wishes.

It got so bad that finally Secretary of State Bryan became so indignant at the action of the joint board and its publications that he declared that military officers were the last men to determine the policies of government and said, and I quote:

> While we were discussing how to prevent a threatened war, these men were busying themselves with plans of how to get us in. It is time enough for the Army and Navy to make plans when the Commander in Chief calls upon them to do so.

I cite this as an illustration of what could happen under military might.

I have supported all measure in the past for preservation of peace and, when it became unavoidable, preparations for war, and would gladly do so today if an emergency exists.

But I do not want to take boys out of school who are specializing in highly technical courses, for they will be among the most valuable citizens of tomorrow.

Many boys right now in camps in America complain about the idle time they have, day in and day out, which leads to a life of laziness and breaks down their morale.

I have, myself, witnessed young boys of school age intoxicated in public places and on the streets—boys who would not allow themselves to fall into this environment if they were back in school, but which seems to be a part of Army life.

Under the volunteer system the armed forces will get more than their share of boys who wish to adapt themselves to military life.

This seems a fair amendment in the interest of all concerned.

Aluminum Specialty Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

MANITOWOC, WIS.

ATTENTION SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES ABOUT TO VOTE ON THE BRITISH LOAN

Are American farmers and workers in a position to stand the terrific tax burden that the loan to Britain will incur?

Will increased taxation on every home, on every day's work create a better condition throughout our Nation?

Will the loaning of this great sum in any way prove constructive in settling our other highly critical domestic and foreign problems—or will it further tangle them?

Are the American people going to awaken later on to find that their other good allies must, in fairness, have equal assistance?

Is repayment of the loan any more likely than repayment of World War I indebtedness?

Is repayment, if it is ever to be made, to be in dollars on the basis of gold dollar values?

Or is the debt to be paid off in foreign merchandise which would cause unemployment by flooding our markets with cheap labor produced goods?

Should this loan to Great Britain be made when our veterans are homeless?

Before approving this loan, think of our own Nation—let the best interests of America and Americans be your guide.

If this loan is passed, our children will curse the sale of their freedom.

You will be answering these questions to the American public this coming election and those to follow.

Respectfully,

ALUMINUM SPECIALTY CO.,
W. E. SPINDLER, *President.*

The Legion Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today 19 Ohio Congressman of both parties were hosts at a luncheon in the Speakers' dining room in honor of the winners of the American Legion essay contest in Ohio. This contest, which has been carried on for a number of years by the Legion, is a most interesting and significant contribution to sound Americanism. The title this year was "Can World Peace Be Secured Through the Allied Nations?" The contest is open to any high-school pupil in Ohio. The subject and terms of the contest are furnished to each high school in Ohio through the local legion posts. Upward of 100,000 essays were submitted this year. The principal and teachers of each high school submit to their county committee the winning essay from each school. The county committee then submit the winning essays to the district committee. The winners from the district are submitted to a board including two justices of the Ohio Supreme Court, a representative of the State department of education, the State welfare division, a past department commander of the Legion, and two past department presidents of the Auxiliary. The winners receive a 10-day trip which takes them to Gettysburg, Washington, where they spend 4 days, to Yorktown, Williamsburg, Charlottesville, and Monticello. This trip is skillfully planned to cover about as much of the history of our country, past and present, as can be included in 10 days. While in Washington these young people meet their representatives in Congress and the Senate, see the Government in action and visit the historic shrines around Washington.

This contest is a great influence in building up an intelligent patriotism among our young people and throughout our State. The discussions in the homes, and individual research that go into these essays all over the State make the contest worth while for those who do not win and for the communities in which they live. The publication of the winning essays continues this educational process and gives us oldsters a chance to learn from the youngsters. The trip for the winners brings back to Ohio each year a group of chosen young people, who are informed and inspired by their experience, in the fundamentals of American history and government.

The winners this year who were our guests are as follows:

Ninth grade: Robert Hill, Bellaire; Charles I. Presar, Wapakoneta; Dolores Valmassoi, Cincinnati.

Tenth grade: Melvin Rose, Lancaster; Martha Buckles, Willoughby; Marion Kern, Cincinnati.

Eleventh grade: Jack L. Fryman, Oxford; Patriciai Findlay, Toledo; Louine Hamilton, Cadiz.

Twelfth grade: Milton L. Farber, Jr., Columbus; Zane Duncan, Nankin; Eva Faklis, Campbell.

Accompanying them on their trip here are Department Commander Harry A. Eaton and his wife; Mrs. Loucks Brown, department president, and Miss Anita Brown; Mr. M. M. Carothers, editor, Ohio Legion News, and his wife; Mr. W. L. Deweese, director, junior activities for the Ohio department.

We Ohio Congressmen are proud of these Legion winners. Their visit is one of the high spots of the congressional year. We wish them a safe and pleasant journey and we know that the values of their trip will reach back through Ohio.

Hatton Sumners Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I had been a Member of the House of Representatives only a short time before I learned that there were a few Members of the House for whom a special respect existed. When they took the floor, word would trickle around, so-and-so is speaking, and Members would put aside what they were doing and would come in from the cloakrooms and the Speaker's lobby to hear them. One of the Members whose name carried that magic was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

I came here in January 1937 for the first time. That was the Seventy-fifth Congress. Shortly afterward, the late President Roosevelt sent up his message asking for a radical change in the composition of the Supreme Court, and the bill that was introduced to carry it out became known as the Court-packing bill. Most Members said something about it. I recall speaking my piece on that subject shortly after the message appeared.

The speech which really sent the legislation reeling with a blow from which it never recovered was delivered by the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, who has recently announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection. He is about to do some more speaking. An interesting story has been written about the gentleman and his plans, and under permission heretofore granted, I place it in the RECORD at this time. The story is by Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent for the National Grange Monthly, and appears in the current number of that publication, as follows:

CONCENTRATION OF POWER—IS OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TOO GREEDY?

(By Fred Brenckman)

There is deep significance in the recent announcement of Congressman HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, veteran chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, that he will retire at the expiration of his present term.

For years Mr. SUMNERS has protested against the constantly growing usurpations of power on the part of the Federal Government and the corresponding decline in the power and prestige of the States. He is convinced that this process is destroying the dual system of government established under the Constitution and robbing the people of their liberties. It is his purpose after returning to private life to devote his time and energy to correcting these unhealthy tendencies, which have long been manifest to every thinking American. Mr. SUMNERS' statement was, in part, as follows:

REDUCED TO VASSALAGE

"I have watched what my own generation, under administration of both parties, has been doing to the greatest system of democratic government ever evolved through the process of the ages. By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people.

"By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially "busted," great, piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption; the destroyer of self-reliance, self-respect, and the governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free.

"The people are coming to realize what has happened—Republicans and Democrats—people of all stations and political faiths. But they are yet too much depending upon the Congress."

PLIGHT OF CONGRESS

"The powers of the Congress are not what they used to be. Largely because of this concentration, even the policy-fixing and legislative power, the most basic of the essential powers of Congress, have largely been shifted to the executive agencies and organized minorities. The time of the Congressman is now taken up largely as go-between for his constituents and these agencies, writing innumerable letters about their matters, with little time left for attending to even the most important legislative matters, and almost no time for the duties of statesmanship at a time when our circumstances require of us the highest type of statesmanship ever required, perhaps, of any people.

"Effective at the expiration of the present Congress, I tender my services to the States for whatever they may be worth, should they be willing to make an effort to regain their sovereignty and reestablish their power, strip the Federal Government down to Federal business, so that it must be operated under laws enacted by the Congress instead of largely by directives emanating from an appointed, unsupervised personnel, and the unnecessary expense of the Federal and State Governments working at the same job be eliminated."

A COMMON RESPONSIBILITY

"I also tender my services to organizations and groups of private citizens who are willing to lay aside class consciousness, and instead of pointing the finger of accusation at each other, admit each to the other a common responsibility for our condition, recognizing a common danger and a common duty to bring to bear our united strength in a determined effort to save our democracy from destruction by ourselves."

Mr. SUMNERS, who has served as a Member of the House for 33 years, and who has the respect and affection of all who know him, is well aware that he has cut out a gigantic task for himself. But the battle he proposes to wage is one that must be fought if our republican form of government is to be saved and the liberties of the people made secure.

Dorothy Thompson Discourses on Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted I place in the RECORD an interesting discourse on democracy which will bear reading by Americans, young and old. It appeared in the Washington Star of April 12, 1946, under the name of Dorothy Thompson, but she confesses to a bit of interesting plagiarism. The article follows:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

This is the evolution of many self-governing societies:

The masses—those who work with their hands—often have little to live on. They, when assembled, are the most powerful class in a democracy. But they are seldom willing to take political action, except for money. So their leaders promise to deprive the rich of their estates and distribute them to the masses.

Then the persons whose property is threatened feel compelled to defend themselves, though they have no desire to overthrow the existing system, when they are charged with plotting against the people, and see the masses, through ignorance and deception, seeking to do them wrong, they become revolutionary, and then come impeachments, judgments, and trials of one another.

The masses always have a champion whom they nurse into greatness. This, and no other, is the root from which a tyrant springs. He first appears as the people's protector, and, having a mob at his disposal, is not restrained from shedding the blood of citizens. By the favorite method of false accusations he brings them into court; some he kills, and others he banishes, at the same time hinting of abolition of debts and partition of land. After this he must either perish at the hands of his enemies or become a wolf—that is, a tyrant.

If his opponents are not able to oust him, they conspire to assassinate him.

Then comes the famous request for a bodyguard, which is the device of all who have got thus far in their tyrannical career. "Let not the people's friend," they say, "be lost to them." The masses assent, fearing for him, not themselves. And when an opponent sees this he flees from the country and is not ashamed to be a coward.

And he, the protector, standing up with the reins of state in his hand, is no longer protector, but tyrant absolute.

At first he is full of smiles—he, to be called a tyrant, liberating debtors, distributing land and wanting to be so good and kind to everyone. But even when he has disposed of foreign enemies by conquest or treaty and there is nothing more to be feared from them, he is always stirring up war so that the people may require a leader. Furthermore, he impoverishes them by taxes, and compels them to devote themselves to their daily wants, so they are less likely to conspire against him. And if he suspects any one of them of having notions of freedom, and of resistance, he will find a pretext to destroy them by putting them at the mercy of the enemy, and for all these reasons he must always be getting up a war.

But now he begins to grow unpopular. Then some of those who set him up speak their minds, and the more courageous of them cast in his teeth what is being done. The tryant, if he means to rule, must get rid of these. He, therefore, looks about him to see who is valiant, wise, or successful. He is the enemy of them all and seeks occasion to purge the state—not the sort of purge which physicians make, for they eliminate the worst to save the better part of the body. He does the reverse.

The more detestable his actions are to the citizens, the more satellites he will require. He will find new devoted bands—and from every land—to flock to him, if he but pays them. Even poets will eulogize the tyrant, and go to other cities and attract mobs and draw them over to tyranny and democracy.

They are paid for this and receive honor—from tyrants and masses.

You may ask how the tyrant maintains that fair, numerous, and ever-changing army of his.

Well, if there are treasures in the state he will confiscate and spend them. As long as the confiscated fortunes of opponents suffice, he will diminish the taxes on the masses. But when these fail he and his retinue will maintain themselves from the masses.

If then they fly into a passion and remonstrate, they will discover what a monster they have been fostering, but they will find that he has grown strong, while they have become weak.

It may be protested that no tyrant will use violence against the masses who gave him his power, but he will. And at that point he becomes the real and complete tyrant, about which no one can make a mistake. The people who sought escape from the smoke which is the slavery of freemen will have fallen into the fire, which is the tyranny of slaves. Thus liberty, when it passes out of order and reason evolves into the harshest and bitterest form of slavery.

Every word in this column is a free translation of a conversation between Socrates and Adeimantus as recorded in Plato's The Republic. The passage is recapitulated as an answer to those who believe classical studies should be eliminated from our high schools and universities as useless to education for our times. And they are further addressed to the American Youth for Democracy, who are being encouraged to lead this land along the course of development here sketched cut 25 centuries ago.

Veterans in Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some informative correspondence on the way in which veterans are being taken back into the civil service:

APRIL 5, 1946.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I quote for your consideration and comment excerpts from a letter received at my office today from one of my constituents, a veteran of World War II:

"Knowing the perils of the employment situation with the veteran and what he is up against, I would like to know what consideration is being given to the veteran with Government employment.

"I realize Civil Service is doing all it can to place veterans but I'm sure they are not going far enough. Why the following:

"1. Civil Service has a group that is recognized as the old timers with the various agencies—which is recognized and accepted.

"2. Civil Service has employees that are of civilian status that were employed on a wartime appointment and given draft deferments who at the present time are still holding their jobs.

"3. There are married women whose husbands are employed, the two working in private industry or in a Government agency.

"4. I believe the civil-service policy should be revamped so that the veteran can be absorbed as much as possible by the agencies as they are the problem of today."

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER H. JUDD.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
April 11, 1946.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JUDD: The Commission is glad to have the opportunity to furnish you and your constituent information under the four items appearing in your letter of the 5th.

On the general statement preceding the four items the Commission wishes to point out that during the calendar year 1943, 136,665 veterans were placed in the Federal civil service; during the calendar year 1944, the number was 142,438; and for the calendar year 1945, the number was 285,123. This makes a grand total of 564,226 veteran placements for the 3 calendar years.

For January 1946, more than 44,800 veterans were placed in the Federal civil service, and in February the total was 45,063. These placements are wholly oustide the number of veterans who have been reemployed by the Federal Government upon their return from military service.

Under Item 1, it is pointed out that because of the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, a considerable number of the "old timers" in the Government service are being dropped during reductions of force and employees of much less service who are entitled to veterans' preference are being retained. The law requires that a person entitled to military preference whose efficiency rating is "good" or better is to be retained in Federal employment over any non-veteran employees regardless of their efficiency rating.

Item 2 may be considered under two heads. In the matter of draft deferments it may be stated that the record of the Federal Government is much better than that of comparable private interests. At the peak there were approximately 3,000,000 civilian employees with the Federal Government, 2,000,000 being men and 1,000,000 women. Approximately 650,000 Federal employees entered the armed forces—a very high percentage. Deferments from military service had to be cleared through a special committee appointed under an order of the President, and this committee had a very high standard. Only persons holding civilian positions that were essential to the war program were granted deferments.

The second head under item 2 may be regarded as relating to persons appointed for not to exceed the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. This includes both men and women. The President early in February 1946 issued an Executive order under which the Commission is directed to hold examinations as rapidly as its funds and organization will permit to secure employees on a permanent basis for the Federal Government. The first of these examinations has been announced, namely, for stenographer and typist positions, and more than 264,000 applications have been received. This one examination indicates the heavy work load that the Commission will be obliged to carry in connection with each examination that is held to secure eligibles to displace war-service appointees.

As to item 3: At the beginning of the economy program in 1932 Congress passed a law adopting the policy that only the husband or wife should be employed at the same time in the Federal Government. This statute aroused so much opposition throughout the country that it was repealed. One charge against it was that it discriminated against the employment of women since in most instances it forced the wife out of employment.

Under item 4 it is stated that an ever-increasing proportion of persons entitled to veteran preference is being employed by the Federal Government. Recently spot checks have shown percentages as high as 30 of the total number of employees in numerous Federal offices.

By direction of the Commission:

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

A. L. M. Wiggins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a statement by a former president of the American Banking Association, Mr. A. L. M. Wiggins, which appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail on April 5. Mr. Wiggins, whom the paper describes as a level-headed and successful South Carolina businessman and no New Dealer, said:

It has taken 25 years for the people of South Carolina to recover from the disaster that followed the inflation of 1918–20. * * * I think that price control has been a godsend to the common people of America and to our national economy. On the whole, its administration has been effective. * * * We must not let present irritations divert us from the goal of full production and a reasonable price level that is now almost in sight. The line has been held too well to abandon it just before the pressure is released.

More Pay for More Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thought-provoking discussion of fundamental factors in our economic situation, written by Mr. Chester D. Tripp, author of Economic Trend Line Studies:

INDUSTRIAL AND MARKET COMMENTS—FUNDAMENTALS DO EXIST

Beyond the realm of controversy, certain simple fundamentals of life are pretty universally accepted, as for instance, that two and two really do make four, that the laws of gravity pull weight toward the earth, and that rolling stones gather no moss. These observations, and many, many others, enter into every activity of man or beast and they are recognized as noncontroversial. In the realm of the social sciences and in the equally important realm of economics, there are also some fundamental rules that go beyond controversy. To illustrate: you cannot consume

more than you produce, and you cannot subdivide a whole into parts that add in total to more than 100 percent. Any society that disagrees with these platitudes is due to fall. Many have disagreed and these have fallen. Any individual or group of people who base their theory of life on contrary assumptions will, given time, either reverse their views or become extinct. Any political party by any name in any part of the world that sponsors an economic theory of life that assumes even indirectly that as a whole we can have more than we produce, or that we can increase the standard of living by producing less, eventually faces political eclipse. Real statesmanship would not assume such a position.

Politics, however, seems to seek strange bedfellows. History is full of examples where it seemed the political expediency of the moment to take a position which could be devastating in the longer view of things. However, I am convinced that the rule still stands: If we pattern our lives on the theory that two and two do not make four, or if we allow our form of government to drift into the acceptance of such a theory, it follows that the Government and its sponsors are headed for oblivion and that the fallacy of their thinking will go into the historical record as just another human blunder.

At the present time the world, particularly the economic world, is in a state of flux. Humanity, as a famous English economist once said, is on the march. We are trying to cure our troubles and we are seeking a better way of life. It is human nature to make mistakes, but it behooves all of us to try to keep the fundamental atmosphere clear for ourselves and for our contemporaries.

At the present time the economic world is divided into three great groups with about the same objectives: A greater abundance and a greater satisfaction in living.

We in America tend toward the individualist, incentive economic scheme of things. There is much wrong with it. It has produced much hardship. But, in an overall way, it has accomplished wonders. If our society puts creature comfort high on the list of social objectives, the free-enterprise system has fully justified itself. I sometimes wonder whether creature comforts are not higher on the list than their importance deserves. The fact nevertheless remains that if they are what we want, we have attained a goodly number of them and have at hand the means to get the greatest possible number.

The next group in size and importance in the world are the collectivists. In theory, at least, they magnify the evils of individualism. In their early days, individualism was extinguished entirely. There are strong indications, however, that over the years there has been more and more weight placed on the importance of individual productiveness. Of late they seem to be continually dilating on the economic importance of individual contribution. Few of us realize how greatly they have changed in such matters in the last 20 years. They have all but deified the Stakhanovist theory of production. They sound from the housetops the merits of anyone who can make two blades grow where one grew before and they lay a heavy hand on any trend that may result in but one blade where two might grow. Even with all this, their efficiency is still very low. They need more tools, more know-how, more ideas, but the trend of their thinking is toward greater productivity and the social consciousness, at least of the political leaders, is unswerving in that direction.

In between the technique of these two groups, we have the nineteenth century socialism of western Europe. For 75 years this group has been trying to garner the advantages of individual efforts but doing so under conditions that have a deadening influence on such effort. To make a long story short, the pure theory of socialism tends to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I am of the opinion that, in the next generation or two, the socialism of western Europe will be a poor third to what might be accomplished if we in our group stick to our knitting and what the Russian ideology is endeavoring to accomplish by its incentive technique.

It seems to me that these three economic approaches toward satisfying social requirements could be described in a few words. Economic socialism, wherever it exists in the world, appears to be based on the theory of more pay for less work. This concept was deep in the political thinking of France before the war and in the early days of the Russian revolution. The record shows that it did not work in France and that it had nearly ruined Russia before its errors became apparent and a violent shift to a new concept was made. That new concept can be described as more work for less pay. I do not believe that a Russian Communist would quite be willing to express the matter in these words without some qualification but he has gone to great extremes in telling the world that the laggard is a nonproducer and not worthy of his hire. He might justify the low pay as a temporary necessity on the grounds that national efficiency has not yet had a chance to build up to adequate levels. But, even with these qualifications, the Russian economy is today dedicated to more work for everybody and less pay to anybody who cannot pull his full weight. In a very practical way, the talent of the unproductive servant is taken from him and is given as further incentive to the servant of the state who has shown by deeds that he has performed his tasks well.

One has to grant that the Socialist technique of more pay for less work is a worm that is boring deeply in the United States today. I do not believe the average workman likes the idea, but, to a surprising degree, the heads of American unions are committed to the policy. It is hard to understand this because many of these union heads profess great sympathy with the Russian or Communist approach to life and believe it should be introduced in this country, and yet their demands for shorter hours and feather-bed rules and cut-backs are as different from the current technique in Russia as day is from night. They think and talk communism and yet they urge and abet practices that would not be tolerated for a minute in the Russian economy.

These union leaders have acquired great power and they have acquired it far less from the support of their members than they have by their ability to enlist the support of substantial political machinery. Whether they even believe in the less-work theory that they preach is an uncertainty. They may feel that it is warranted as a talking point and that they can change the technique in the hour of need as the Russians themselves did.

I believe the words describing the relationship between work and pay can be worked out into an American slogan, or, more correctly, a slogan for an incentive and free economy wherever it exists. I would like to suggest the wording—more pay for more work—as describing what is necessary for the general well-being of our population under a free-enterprise system. If we go back for a moment to my opening paragraph and agree with the platitude that you cannot divide that which is not produced or cannot increase well-being without increasing productivity, the phrase begins to take on real meaning, one I believe to be necessary if our manner of life is to succeed.

More work and less pay has its bad sides. Nobody could really favor it. Everybody dreams of better things in the future, and more work and less pay implies hardship, the reward of which may be gathered by some future generation. More pay and less work clearly has a momentary appeal. It is intriguing from a political point of view but certainly it is not sound. In the longer run, it is bound to break down and everybody will find himself worse off than he was before. On the other hand, however, what can be wrong with the concept of more pay for more work. To be sure, it implies a greater effort but the willingness to make effort is the very essence of human progress.

Would it be difficult to make this concept a popular thing politically and gain for its support the best elements in the community no matter what their activities? I think not. Most everybody in reality believes in more pay and greater production. We have seen its good effects. I strongly urge that politicians, businessmen, and workers reface their whole problem and discard as rapidly as possible the concept of more work for less pay or more pay for less work as being socially repugnant and direct their thinking to the idea of more work for more pay. Any course to the contrary runs against the best interests of America.

ECONOMIC TREND LINE STUDIES,
CHESTER D. TRIPP.

Attitude on Minimum Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1946, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], styling himself chairman of a committee of cosponsors of the minimum wage bill, H. R. 3914, distributed a list of members of that committee upon which my name appears. Such inclusion of my name was an error on Mr. OUTLAND'S part because I never agreed to act as a cosponsor and because I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

Future of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared under date of April 5, 1946, in the Shipbuilder, Newport News, Va.

The Shipbuilder is published weekly by and in the interest of the Peninsula Shipbuilders Association, of Newport News, Va., that being the bargaining agency for the employees of the Newport News Shipyard.

The future of the United States Navy is a matter of vital concern and the editorial referred to is very timely and contains much food for thought.

The editorial follows:

OUR NAVY

After the Japs had crushed our fleet at Pearl Harbor, taken all of our Pacific possessions and were threatening our home

shores, Admiral Nimitz was placed in charge of what was left of the Pacific Fleet. We relied implicitly on his judgment and gave him everything he asked for. And he did the greatest job in the world's naval history, bringing the Japanese Empire to its knees by sinking and ruining its fleet and cutting all its communication lines. For this unparalleled work Nimitz and his men won the highest possible praise from Congress and from the American people.

But now the judgment, even the veracity, of Nimitz is being questioned. And the President of the United States is among those who are casting aspersions on it.

President Truman and the Budget Committee say that the United States does not need the fleet which Nimitz says it needs to protect its interests and to maintain peace. And $2,000,000,000 have been lopped off the naval appropriation.

The curtailment of the fund for the Navy will mean fewer active ships, fewer bases, less research, and the cessation of work on all naval craft which are less than half completed. Nimitz says that this would be dangerous in the extreme. But as already stated, his word is being questioned.

It is this kind of thing which disgusts loyal Americans with politicians and with our political system. The United States must have a fleet second to none—a fleet large enough, powerful enough, and modern enough to protect our interests throughout the world and to discourage aggression from any quarter. Anything short of such a fleet is an invitation to another war and to national suicide, as was demonstrated after World War I and at the outset of the last war.

Now, as in the past, fools are talking about relying upon Britain's Fleet. But where was Britain's Fleet in the last war? What good was it to us at Pearl Harbor and in those dark days which followed? What good would it be to us again in a similar emergency.

We must build and maintain a fleet of our own, regardless of cost. The two billions which the peanut fleet men hope to save now may cost us hundreds of billions of dollars and millions of lives at some future date.

Are we never going to learn anything from the grim lessons of war? Are we never going to trust men whose whole life has been spent in studying specific problems? Are we never going to place Americanism above all other isms?

We played the fool after the last war and invited another conflict which almost cost us our existence, to say nothing of billions in money and millions of dead and maimed men who had every right to expect normal and happy lives.

When anyone attempts to tell you we can get along without a Navy, tell him he is a fool and a liar. We can no more exist without a Navy than we can without the air which we breathe.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives:

For years now, we have been uneasily aware of the Nation's responsibility to provide reasonable security and comfort for our worthy aged citizens. During that period we have tinkered and patched together a Social Security System which hardly deserves the name it carries. In fact, its architects themselves would hardly deny that the system provides very spotty and inadequate protection, and that it rests on the most doubtful financial foundation.

Although the system is known to have glaring basic shortcomings, Congress and this administration have gone along from year to year merely adding a patch here and a patch there to a faulty structure, never really facing up to the necessity of making the sweeping changes which would provide minimum protections for all our deserving citizens in their declining years.

As a result, there are today hundreds of thousands of worthy people in need who receive no recognition or reward from the Nation they helped to grow and prosper. There are as many more who receive pittances which are actually not sufficient to provide minimum subsistence. It is well known to each member of this committee that the first to feel the pinch of inflation, such as we are now suffering, are those groups who must depend upon limited fixed incomes. It takes no imagination to know what is happening to the recipients of old-age assistance in these days. The little handful of change they receive each month would not insure reasonable comfort even in normal times. Now their pittance will go no more than two-thirds or one-half as far toward providing the barest existence. And the end to the sharply rising price trend is nowhere in sight.

It seems to me, therefore, that now, more than ever before, it is the inescapable duty of this committee and this Congress to undertake an entirely new approach to this problem. There are several thousand people within my district who are looking to us to find a real and lasting remedy, just as there are thousands within your constituencies. I know of no single group of citizens more worthy of our respectful attention. These are the loyal, thrifty, industrious people who in their more vigorous years contributed in full measure to the growth and development of our great Nation. Theirs is not a selfish interest, for you and I know them to be sincere, patriotic Americans who are asking nothing which they believe is not in the best interest of the entire country.

I hope, therefore, that this committee will act immediately to bring this question before the House.

Extension of Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. STARKEY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a peaceful world and make future wars unnecessary or impossible, we must still ask those who have not as yet made sacrifices for their country to do so. We all have obligations to our country. Many of our citizens have fulfilled that obligation for a longer period of time and under conditions more dangerous and gruesome than will be required in the future. We have tasks and obligations to perform, occupied territory to be garrisoned, enemy territory to be controlled and the only way we can fulfill our obligations, make good on our commitments, is through men.

We have other obligations here at home—or rather to our folks at home—and these obligations require as speedy a demobilization of the armed forces as possible in order that men may be restored to families, long-absent sons to parents, and boys returned to aid on the farm. At the same time the older drafted men must not be allowed to remain in the Army through force until all jobs and opportunities are gone. And to fulfill these obligations we need to release men from the Army now.

But where are the replacements to come from if on the one hand we release all those elegible for release and on the other we attempt to fulfill our commitments in world affairs? Some will volunteer, many already have but not perhaps in sufficient numbers. The others must be drafted. The present bill for the extension of the draft for 9 months provides a maximum army. If volunteers equal that army, nobody will be drafted. If volunteers equal half that army, half the army will be drafted. It is anticipated that nobody will be drafted until October 15 and that the Army will put on an intensified recruiting campaign in that time. If there appear to be enough volunteers, the draft will not go into effect. If the drive falls short the draft will begin October 15. But the draft will be considerably modified. It will take in persons only between 20 and 30; no father will be drafted; no agricultural worker will be called unless his local board certifies that his work is not regular agricultural work; the period of service will be limited to 18 months.

I am for this bill, because it permits us an opportunity to learn whether or not we can get along with a volunteer army. It also provides for the release of all those now in the service after 18 months' service or if they fulfill certain other minimum requirements of the new draft law. I believe that if it is at all possible only volunteers should be used in our occupying army.

In a sense, the men of our occupying army are our ambassadors abroad. What they do in the foreign country, what they say and think of their own country, their Army, their officers, will have more influence on public opinion in those countries than all the radio talks and newspapers we publish to propagandize the occupied countries for democracy.

While I would like to see world affairs in such a condition as would make an extension of the draft unnecessary, it seems to me that that time is not now. We have our obligations to perform abroad; we have our obligations to perform to the men already in the service. If we do not have a large enough force, we will be working an injustice on the men now in the Army eligible for release who must stay in longer and to their comrades who have been discharged. Certainly, we did not fight this terrible war merely to wash our hands of world affairs. If we mean to do everything in our power to establish peace on a permanent basis, we must continue our tasks until we have completed them. We cannot just pull out now and say forget it. We have a duty to the dead and to the living who fought this last war. And

that duty declares no shirking, no backing up, now. We started the job, and we must complete it. I would like to see the military authorities use some judgment and some discretion in their handling of the new draftees. The war is now over. Training need not be so rigorous or so dangerous. Educational advantages in the service might be developed more and certain tours of duty arranged to broaden and enlighten our youth so that when they return home they will have a knowledge of other peoples and an appreciation of the great world. But I believe we must have this present draft—not to make war but to see that wars are no longer made.

Future of the Pennsylvania Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 11, 1946:

FUTURE OF THE PRR

The Pennsylvania Railroad held its ninety-ninth stockholders' meeting in Philadelphia Tuesday. This, the greatest single transportation system in the world, is now celebrating its one hundredth anniversary.

Although the politicians in Washington are hailing this an era of unprecedented prosperity, President Clement was forced to tell the stockholders that the great Pennsylvania did business at an estimated loss of $5,000,000 during the first quarter of this year.

Small wonder it was that one of the stockholders urged his fellow shareholders to delegate five of their number to devise a social security plan to provide for stockholders after their sixty-fifth birthday.

When the Pennsylvania Railroad loses money in times like these it is a portent of disaster. This will force the abandonment of improvements and extensions which would provide more jobs. It will mean the curtailment of expenses wherever possible. Whenever capital is driven to the wall look out for a crash.

Comptroller Hart of the company has made a forecast that 1946 will be a year of generally increased cost of operation and maintenance with a decreasing business. He considers increased freight rates to meet these increasing costs imperative. President Clement says that a 25- to 30-percent freight rate increase is less than the increase allowed other industries. Certainly such an increase is justified if the company is to survive.

But suppose this increase is granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, what will happen? Cost will go up on every commodity handled by the railroads. If the present coal strike adds 50 cents a ton to the price of coal up will go the cost of fuel and everything into which this fuel enters. Increases in the price of steel as a result of the recent strike will up the price of everything into which steel enters. As soon as the makers of automobiles and trucks find that they cannot pay present wages and sell their cars at OPA figures, prices will have to go up or the companies will go out of business.

Suppose all these increases in rates and prices are granted, what will happen then? Up will go the cost of living, to be immediately followed by demands for increased wages. The inflation spiral or the vicious circle will be working. Inflation is already on its way.

America should be proud of the Pennsylvania Railroad. It is an outstanding example of what American transportation brains coupled with good management can do. Chartered in 1846 to build a railroad 249 miles from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh, it is now a system 26,000 miles long. In 1857 it purchased the line to Philadelphia. In 1849 the first section, 61 miles, was opened between Harrisburg and Lewistown, with one passenger train daily and freight trains twice a week.

In 1852 President John Edgar Thomson considered it important to invest judiciously in roads being built in Ohio and Indiana and thus create feeders. This made possible extension of service from Pittsburgh to Crestline and then to Fort Wayne. Fifteen years after the company was chartered it was running trains from the Atlantic seaboard to Chicago and lines were under way to St. Louis and other midwestern cities.

It took vision to drive two tunnels under the Hudson and four under the East River to reach the vast passenger station in the heart of New York City. This covers 28 acres, through the gates of which 2,000,000,000 passengers have passed. It took vision to electrify the 194 miles from New York to Harrisburg and the 226 miles from New York to Washington, with a total of 2,667 miles of track.

The history of the Pennsy reads like a romance. It has served the country through five wars. In the last war 54,712 officers and employees entered the armed forces and 1,045 gave their lives to the cause. War bond subscriptions by officers and employees reached more than $72,000,000, and the system itself purchased $259,000,000 in addition.

The company has paid dividends every year since 1847 amounting to $1,297,893,025, and it has paid in wages over $10,000,000,000. Through cycles of prosperity, depressions, and wars it has never failed to meet a financial obligation when due.

From January 1, 1941, until December 1, 1945, 17,507,647 men and women of the armed services were moved over the system, requiring 29,670 extra trains and 400,000 cars. During the same period it hauled 1,400,000,000 tons of freight.

This is a record of achievement that has had no parellel in the world. Will the spirit that made possible this achievement be crucified by a ruthless combination of self-seeking politicians and communistic crackpots?

Extension of Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I have followed the debate on this legislation during the past 2 days with the keenest interest, and have been deeply impressed with the honesty, sincerity, and earnestness which has been displayed by all members who have participated in the discussion of this vital question. The pros and cons of the bill have been ably argued by members of the Military Affairs Committee, and there is very little that I can add to what already has been said.

I would, however, like to express my firm agreement with the argument which has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and others that we should give the voluntary system a chance to prove itself before we break with tradition and, for the first time in America's history, vote to send conscripts overseas in time of peace.

I am sorry that we are not voting today on the pay increase bill for members of the armed forces. This body already has voted $400 pay increases for postal workers and civilian employees of the Government, and I believe we should extend these increases to members of the military without delay. I further believe that if we do this, extension of the draft will become wholly unnecessary.

The War Department has testified that if we increase the pay of privates by only $10 a month, voluntary enlistments can be expected to increase by 30 percent. If this is true, and it is a logical assumption, a $400 annual increase should more than provide the incentive necessary to fill all personnel requirements of the armed forces.

All of us here today want America to remain strong in this postwar period and able to defend herself. The only thing we differ on, and it is an honest difference, is the method whereby we can achieve this common objective.

I have always believed that the volunteer army is the best army in the world. I have always believed that free men could outwork, outproduce, and outfight slaves.

In times of war a nation has the right to compel its able-bodied men to serve in the armed forces, because a nation is entitled to take whatever means are necessary to save its own life. But the rights which a nation has when its existence is obviously threatened do not obtain when the nation is at peace and the danger to its future existence is remote.

There is no justification for taking our 18- and 19-year-olds away from their schools and their careers and drafting them into a peacetime army. We have no right to gamble with the lives and future destinies of these young men. I think we made a mistake by drafting them even in wartime. I certainly am opposed to drafting them for occupation duties for which they are totally unfit. We need older men, with mature judgment, for our occupation forces—not teen-age kids who are in no way qualified for such responsibilities.

I have found no support for this proposal among the people of my district. On the contrary, I have found bitter opposition among my churches, my labor unions, and my sober-minded citizens. They say—and I agree with them—that we should not saddle upon our people a peacetime draft, an Old World system which is totally foreign to the traditions of a free people.

Let the draft law expire on May 15 as we intended it to. Encourage enlistments by voting substantial pay increases and offering other inducements to career-minded young men. Do this and I predict that we will obtain all the volunteers we need to keep our armed forces fully manned and prepared for any eventuality.

Give the Vets a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Beckley (W. Va.) Post-Herald of Wednesday, April 10, 1946:

GIVE THE VETS A BREAK

Many of the rosy promises made to the returning veterans by Congress have turned out to be just promises—as was to be expected—but the one that has disappointed the returning veterans more than anything else—except housing—is the promise that they would be given a high priority on purchase of surplus Army and Navy materials.

According to the promises, translated into legislation, veterans would be allowed to buy any surplus equipment needed for business or profession. Under terms of that act, veterans have sought trucks, bulldozers, cameras, jeeps, automobiles, dental and medical equipment, printing equipment and a host of other items duly certified by the War Assets Administration as being surplus.

Much of the disgust of the veterans, they have found that their "priority" is fourth or fifth in line, with the Federal Government, the State government, the county government and the municipal government ahead of them, and, many times, dealers in second-land equipment, though they were not given any priority by law.

The result has been that thousands of veterans have traveled long distances to such sales, only to find that everything movable has already been sold, and, in a few cases, a small amount of junk remains.

Individual victims of this vicious practice have been aroused for several months, and now their indignation is spreading to organized groups, where some action may be expected.

This week Raleigh County Post, No. 32, American Legion, passed a strong resolution against the run-around being given its members, and a committee was appointed with power to take whatever action it deems necessary to bring some relief.

Beckley has started the ball rolling, and the Legion deserves the support of all citizens, and of all other Legion posts, to stop this disgraceful practice. It can be stopped in an instant by Congress by a simple resolution to freeze all surplus property until veterans have been allowed to purchase what they need for legitimate business.

It is not likely that the Government can dispose of a large percentage of its huge surplus by this method, and it is very likely that such sales will be less profitable than selling large quantities to second-hand dealers, but it would give the veteran the preference he was promised—and which he deserves.

National Farm Loan Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the national farm loan associations are a part of the Federal land-bank system and are wholly and entirely subject to the supervisory authority of the Farm Credit Administration.

It is the general belief of most of the directors and officials that the employees of these institutions should be included under the same provisions for civil-service retirement benefits as are now accorded the Federal land banks.

I include here a resolution adopted and signed by the directors of the Cavalier County National Farm Loan Association, Langdon, N. Dak.:

Whereas national farm loan associations are an integral part of the Federal land-bank system, and are wholly and entirely subject to the supervisory authority of the Farm Credit Administration; and

Whereas by an act of Congress, passed January 24, 1942, the employees of the Federal land banks were covered under the Civil Service Retirement Act, section 3 (a); and

Whereas employees of national farm loan associations, most of whom have been in the employ of these associations for more than 12 years, are not covered by any system of retirement benefits: Therefore be it

Resolved by all secretary-treasurers of the Seventh Farm Credit District in a conference assembled at St. Paul, Minn., on the 20th day of March 1946, That we urge the speedy enactment by the Congress of legislation which shall provide for the inclusion of all the employees of national farm loan associations under the same provisions for civil-service-retirement benefits as are now accorded to the employees of the Federal land banks; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all United States Senators and Members of Congress from the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

MARCH 20, 1946.

We, the directors of the Cavalier County National Farm Loan Association, are wholly in accord with the contents of the above resolution and do recommend and urge our members in Congress to support such legislation as referred to in said resolution.

The secretary-treasurer of this board is instructed to forward a copy of this to the North Dakota Senators and Members of the United States Congress.

JOS. T. WILD,
Osnabrock, N. Dak.
PETER MCKECHNEY,
Calvin, N. Dak.
PETER JIMINY,
Munich, N. Dak.
OTTO DETTLER,
Langdon, N. Dak.
ED. A. HILL,
Wales, N. Dak.

We Must Give Our Aged Citizens the Consideration They Deserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has delayed too long in the consideration of legislation which would grant some measure of security for senior citizens of the United States. I believe it is the duty of the Members of Congress to recognize the needs of these men and women who have contributed years of valuable service to the communities in which they live and to the Nation, and who have now reached an age where they can no longer find employment and are unable to earn the money necessary to supply food, shelter, and clothing. I believe it is the duty of the Congress to do something about it now.

Senior citizens who were not covered by the benefits of the Social Security Act during their productive years, and who were unable to lay aside a sufficient sum to care for themselves in their declining years are faced with the choice of begging for help from relatives who may be unable to bear the additional burden, or of humiliating themselves in a search for charity.

Some States have provided old-age benefits, but these are, for the most part, wholly inadequate in the face of a steadily rising cost of living and a continued scarcity in many low-priced materials.

Certainly it is the first duty of the Government to alleviate the suffering of its citizens. The United States has not hesitated to answer the appeals for food and clothing, and for funds to supply these to the needy of war-torn Europe and Asia. Certainly the representatives of the people should not now turn a deaf ear to the need of Americans here at home whose situation will soon become desperate if some action is not taken.

I believe our senior citizens have earned the right to retire from their labors, releasing positions to younger men and women with family responsibilities, and to be assured of an income adequate to supply their needs. I do not feel this would be granting a charity, but rather a retirement pay to which these men and women are entitled as citizens who have produced for the Nation, and who have contributed taxes for the maintenance of the Government over a long period of years.

I therefore urge that this Congress consider legislation now to grant adequate retirement benefits to our senior citizens.

The OPA and the Building Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BURLINGTON, N. C., *March 27, 1946.*
Hon. CARL DURHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DURHAM: Two days ago the CPA issued an order which means the virtual cessation of commercial building until a large number of GI housing units have been completed. Someone in the Administration has pulled a boner which will have serious repercussions unless the matter is rectified immediately. I should like to discuss several phases in the following paragraphs to elucidate this statement.

The real reason for the shortage of building materials lies with the maladjustment of OPA Administration. Having recently done some building I know the true facts about the matter. Suppliers cannot sell their products for enough to pay costs of production because the Government is forcing wages up and OPA is holding prices down. The saw mill cannot sell rough lumber at OPA prices and receive enough remuneration to pay wages. Every stick of lumber available is obtainable only at black-market prices. You either pay and keep your mouth shut or you don't build. I don't blame the miller; he can't operate at a loss. Most of them simply don't cut any timber. The same situation exists with other building materials.

The majority of GI's do not want to build homes at this time. Any house built at present must necessarily be a makeshift affair and the greater number of us had rather wait until we can build decent homes. There will be a great waste if this thing is forced now.

A great wrong will be visited upon those businessmen whose plans for expansion include new building. To halt business expansion now will only lead to curtailment of production and reconversion. It will create an artificial scarcity of consumer goods and serve to increase the inflationary process.

It has to cause the preservation of the large reserves of money now extant and inflation is the only end to such a process. In this community alone there are a number of businessmen who will be ruined if their present plans are to be halted by CPA's scheme. I happen to be included in that number.

Enclosed is a clipping from today's News and Observer. It states that a large number of returning veterans are now unemployed and that the number is increasing every day. It states further that the potential labor force in this State is 250,000 greater than at any time in our history. Industry must be allowed to expand in order to absorb this labor. How are veterans to pay for these homes which the Government so magnanimously donates unless they are provided with jobs which are not available at present? How are we who plan to go into business to survive when the administration comes forth with a new regulation every few days which changes the entire economic system? Veterans need employment before they need homes and only expansion of industry can support them.

The present plans of the administration seemed to be aimed at one thing: Complete control and domination of industry by the Government. Not a veteran in this country fired a shot in order to promote such a scheme; on the contrary, the reverse is true. You simply cannot have a capitalistic economy with the present controls imposed upon industry. This thing must be brought to a screaming halt and the time is now!

In the past I have always tried to support the administration in its efforts. I have even expressed my feelings to you in this regard, but things have now passed the realm of reason. I know that my arguments are based upon sound economic reasoning, or, if not, my years at Chapel Hill were wasted and the school of economics there is a dismal failure.

The OPA has served its purpose and should be dispensed with. Government should step out of business before the entire economic system is thrown into a state of chaos, for the controls are only serving to make the unscrupulous wealthy and the poor, the honest, and the small businessman more destitute. We will all be driven to the black market unless someone begins to use some common sense in Washington. I hope you are willing and able to do your part to put these things right.

At present I have all the savings I accumulated during 4 years of service at sea in a concrete business, plus all I have been able to borrow, and face utter ruin if nothing is done to stop this foolishness. The restoration of competition and the profit incentive will do far more than all the Government restrictions that all the brains in Washington are able to devise to speed reconversion and normal business. To give veterans' priorities on materials will be admirable, but to restrict industrial expansion can but lead to disaster.

In conclusion I state that I hope you will investigate this matter and do all in your power to assure the proper measures for the benefit of all concerned.

Yours truly,

W. R. TEAGUE.

Democratic Party in Wisconsin Hits New Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting letter has come to my attention and it reaches me through a junior civil-service employee in the city of Washington. This is a circular letter and apparently has been sent to all former Wisconsin residents who are now employed by the Government in civil-service positions or otherwise. This person who gave me the information is a young lady who has no connection with the Democratic Party in Wisconsin and no doubt, her name has been secured from the civil-service register. If this is so, Mr. Speaker, it is a contemptible practice on the part of someone close to the administration. In no other way would it have been possible for the Democratic Party of Wisconsin to have secured her name. Indeed, the Democrats in Wisconsin have reached a new low when they find it necessary to solicit young girls away from home, working for a very meager salary. This practice should be condemned and those responsible for giving out this information should be discharged from the public pay rolls.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith, the entire letter which is over the signature of Charles P. Greene as general chairman of the Jackson Day campaign committee. It would seem that the Democrats expect Government employees to keep them in office and they do not care where the money comes from:

JACKSON DAY CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR FELLOW DEMOCRAT: We are now entering one of the most decisive campaigns in the political history of Wisconsin. As members of the oldest political party in the world, the Democratic Party, we must concentrate our efforts to meet the challenge of the times.

On the national scene, a loss of only 9 seats in the United States Senate and a loss of only 27 seats in the House of Representatives would mean loss of Democratic control in both Houses. The results for our own Nation and for the world would be disastrous.

Here in Wisconsin we will elect 1 Senator and 10 Congressmen on the basis of issues clearly defined as liberalism versus a combination of reaction and political expediency.

If Wisconsin voters understand these issues, the Democratic Party will capture the majority of the State's delegation to Congress. This is an unparalleled opportunity, and we must make every vote and every dollar count.

To get our message to the people of the State will require money. This is a direct appeal to you to dig down into your pocket and give what you can to the 1946 Democratic battle fund.

You are acquainted, of course, with the custom of holding an annual Democratic fund-raising drive. I have again been appointed chairman and general treasurer of that drive by National Committeeman Robert E. Tehan. The campaign will be conducted by the Jackson Day Dinner Committee of 1946.

We are honored this year by having as guest speaker at the Jackson Day dinner the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives. You well know his long record as a real, fighting Democrat.

The dinner will be held Saturday, June 15, at the Pfister Hotel in Milwaukee. As is the custom, a complimentary ticket will be given to each person who contributes more than $25.

Please give us your assistance in this critical period by sending in your contribution immediately.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. GREENE,
Chairman.

The American Legion Appoints Committee To Consider Farm-Credit Needs of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial from the Arkansas Legionnaire, of April 11, 1946, with reference to farm-credit needs of veterans:

THE LEGION AND THE FARM BOY

When the new national agriculture committee of the American Legion meets in Washington, April 16 and 17 to study the agricultural credit needs of the farm-boy veteran, a long-needed step will have been taken to advance and safeguard the interests of veterans who follow, or would choose, agriculture as a way of life—and not merely to eke out a living, or to exploit the land through commercial or nonresident farming.

The Legion has a vital stake in agriculture because more than 2,000,000 left the farm or agricultural pursuits to take their place in the military or naval forces of the country. Recent surveys show that a very large percentage of these boys are not returning to the farm.

Many factors enter into this, but in our opinion the main one is the lack of satisfactory and sufficient credit to meet the requirements of establishing a farm home

under conditions that would make such life attractive, or even bearable.

Commander Stelle has chosen men well qualified by experience and training to serve on this committee. These men will prepare for the Legion an agricultural program which, after due consideration, will become the Legion policy of the country.

The committee members are: Charles F. "Farmer" Brown, Springfield, Mo.; R. W. Hudgens, Greenville, S. C.; Dr. Harry Parker, Warrensburg, Mo.; Robert D. Morrow, Jackson, Miss.; Ralph W. Mitchell, Marysville, Calif.; A. A. Yardley, Dublin, Tex.; William W. Tanner, Union City, Tenn.

Arkansas was one of the first departments to advocate a national veterans' program in agriculture, but it is hoped that all Legion departments will lend their efforts to the new committee in accomplishing its purposes.

To the committee we would say that the Legion-sponsored veterans' agriculture program will not be worth a tinker's dam unless it is so sound and solid that the rights of veterans in agriculture will be safeguarded and placed beyond the whims of politicians, or the partisan fights of agricultural pressure groups.

We do not believe the veterans' agricultural program should be fixed or influenced by market speculators, or processor groups, or by alleged experts in so-called bureaucratic offices in Washington. We think whoever has a controlling voice in agriculture for veterans (or for anybody else) ought to know something about dirt farming, such as when he plowed all day with blisters on his heels or elsewhere on his anatomy.

In the first place, the Legion believes veterans have as much right to agricultural credit at low interest rates and liberal repayment terms, with any needed supervision and guidance to enable them to make a living, pay out their property, and become independent citizens, as banks, railroads, industry, industrial farm operators, and others who now are eligible to borrow from the RFC, the Federal Reserve banks, and other Federal or federally supervised lending agencies.

In other words, we believe the Government must provide means and methods of rehabilitating our farm veterans as "moral risks," rather than using the cold measuring stick of "bankable risk."

It must be understood by all that there is necessity for these two forms of risks. Those who have some assets can meet the requirements of State and national banks, the Federal land bank, Federal Housing Administration, and other lending agencies, which usually call for a certain percentage to be advanced.

Most veterans had little opportunity to save money while in service and few will have any money for a down payment on a farm, livestock, machinery, furniture, and other necessary outlays incident to establishing a farm home.

This takes them definitely out of the usual credit, or bankable-risk class. The only way veterans will return to the farm or establish themselves on farms is for the Government to provide a lending plan on a moral credit basis, through an agency or agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

In advocating such a plan, the Legion is not asking for charity when it asks the Government to provide suitable credit for worthy war veterans who, in fact, are displaced persons and many of whom never will be able to find their way back into the community life and self-supporting, self-respecting citizenship of our country, if left to fend for themselves in the highly competitive bankable-risk-farming industry.

The Legion recognizes and commends farm organizations, such as the Grange, Farm Bureau Federation, Farmers Union, and others, for what they have done and are doing for agriculture. Many of our members are members of those organizations. We hope the individuals and the organizations will join in this effort to see that the American farm boys who left the farm to defend this country, get their chance to return to their place among the solid citizens of a great country.

Peacetime Conscription Abhorrent to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental question involved in the consideration of the legislation now before us—the bill to extend selective service—is whether the United States of America should, for the first time in its history, adopt the policy of military conscription in peacetime.

Of course, I realize that the military philosophers will immediately respond that peace has not yet been achieved, that there will be no peace until our commitments to our allies have been fulfilled in every part of the world, and that the only way these commitments can be fulfilled is by conscription of American manpower.

Mr. Speaker, if these contentions are true, we must look forward to repeated extensions of the draft in the future, to innumerable reiterations of the argument that the world is not at peace, to indefinite postponement of the day when the hateful institution of peacetime conscription can be abolished.

Mr. Speaker, in 1940 I voted for the Selective Service Act as a measure for the national defense. I did so because I was profoundly convinced that this country was in imminent danger of attack by the Axis dictators. The tragic events of the following year proved that this apprehension was well founded.

In explanation of my vote at that time I said: "Throughout my thinking life I have feared and distrusted the intrusion of military instruction into the fabric of democratic society, because it has seemed to me that the two things were fundamentally incompatible and that if they were forced to endure side by side the military influence might destroy the processes of democracy. I do not intend now to abandon the idealism of my earlier life save only that part which stark realism in this bloodshot world has convinced me is temporarily untenable. It is precisely because I hold the freedom of the American way of life so dear that I am now persuaded to relinquish for awhile my objections to compulsory military service in America."

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the time has arrived when the American Nation is no longer in danger of attack by any foreign power. I believe, therefore, that this is the appropriate time to return to our traditional American policy of opposition to peacetime conscription.

This world has entered upon a new and awe-inspiring era of scientific progress. Certainly the invention of the atomic bomb will transform the future technique of warfare, if wars should occur in the future. The old military concepts of vast aggregations of manpower designed to overcome a foe by the sheer power of overwhelming numerical superiority, are no longer important. Future wars, if wars there must be, which God forbid, will be decided by the use of scientific weapons whose destructive power would be so terrible that I entertain the hope that no civilized nation will ever attempt to employ them. Even in the frightful war which has just been victoriously concluded, the result was not due to the numerical superiority of our armed forces. It was due, in large part, to the fact that American civilization was able to produce the implements and munitions of modern warfare in far greater volume than all of the rest of the nations of the world combined could do. So there is no longer any necessity to maintain huge establishments of men trained in methods of making war which are already obsolete.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the fundamental issue now before us is whether we shall now adopt the policy of peacetime conscription, or whether we shall return to the traditional American policy which holds that the institution of conscription is abhorrent to the American way of life.

The military philosophy will always contend that we should have conscription of manpower, whether war is threatened or not. Only a little more than a year ago, while the war was still in progress, our military advisers insisted that conscription of American labor was necessary for the success of our armed forces. The other body of Congress did not yield to the insistent arguments by military leaders that such a policy was essential. Subsequent events have proved the wisdom of that decision.

Now the argument is that general conscription of American manpower is needed in order to guard against the possibility of future wars. Such an argument would be applicable at any time in our national existence. It is the same argument which has kept other nations armed to the teeth in the past and which has led to all the wars in history. Military philosophy has no regard for the traditional ideals of the American way of life. Indeed it would destroy the basis which has made America what it is, and would establish here a military system similar to those systems which have always existed in other parts of the world, and which have made peace an impossibility in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, by adoption of various amendments, has already made this bill incapable of accomplishing the results which our military leaders have been demanding. For a time the bill would produce no manpower at all and, in its present form, if enforced in the future, would not yield the numbers of men which our military leaders have asked. However, even in its present emasculated condition, it would establish the principle of peacetime conscription in America and would serve as a basis for future amendments designed to conscript a greater number

of youth of America for enforced military service.

I am as anxious as any other American to win an enduring and just world-wide peace. It is my intention to support the bill now awaiting consideration by Congress which would raise the pay of our soldiers sufficiently to enable them to support themselves and their families in accordance with the American standard of living. I am confident that enactment of this law will make it certain that the Army can procure all the men needed by voluntary enlistments.

For the reasons which I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this bill.

Letter to Congressman From Pastor on Four Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter which I deem most constructive and clear. With permission of this able leader in the religious world in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, I include it for the reading of my colleagues in Congress and any others:

COMMUNITY METHODIST CHURCH,
Lakewood City, Calif., March 22, 1946.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Drastic steps must be taken to strengthen the United Nations Organization and remove the threat of atomic bombs. The initiative rests with our Nation.

Specifically, I feel sure the following should be vigorously undertaken immediately:

1. United States Government use its influence to end the veto in UNO Security Council. This means renouncing its use and calling others to do so.

2. United States agree to compulsory arbitration of disputes through UNO channels. This means no secret deals, no unilateral decisions, no Big Three domination.

3. Place atomic power under civilian control in the United States and renounce use of atomic bombs. This means stop making bombs.

4. Free exchange of scientific information on atomic power.

Then the really important step might be near—constitutional world government. Is anything less going to be enough?

Sincerely,

JOHN ATWOOD.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the House paid tribute to our great leader, the late President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. On that occasion I did not participate in the program; however, I do feel that the editorial written by the Honorable Charles E. Broughton, which appeared in the Sheboygan Press on April 12, 1946, well expressed the thoughts that passed through our minds on that day, and expresses them better than I might have been able to. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial from the Sheboygan Press of April 12, 1946, entitled "He Died for Humanity," as part of my remarks:

HE DIED FOR HUMANITY

One year ago today in midst of a world-wide war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt passed to his reward at the little White House in Warm Springs, Ga.

It was tragic news because it came like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky. It was hard to credit the flash that came over the air followed by a similar story on teletypes in newsrooms. Telephone communications were disrupted by calls to verify the flash. Then it dawned upon the United States of America, and later the world, that the great champion of freedom, our "four freedoms," had died while making preparations to attend the Conference in San Francisco.

Perhaps it would be well to recount the first message that was sent over CBS with John Daly interrupting a serial drama, Wilderness Road, to announce the sudden death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In a short space of time the Associated Press and the United Press confirmed the flash and from that time all through the night radio commentators gave additional news. Newspapers, including the Sheboygan Press, had extras on the street as early as 9 p. m. with the complete life story of President Roosevelt.

A year has passed and the things that Roosevelt hoped for are being slowly realized. Perhaps if he were alive his insistent voice in behalf of downtrodden people everywhere would have hastened a better understanding and an earlier realization of what our "four freedoms" mean when put into action.

On the anniversary of his death, great throngs will visit the Roosevelt home in Hyde Park which is a national memorial. The home is preserved in its natural state and looking from the window one can see the grave—the last resting place of F. D. R. as he was familiarly called. The Roosevelt mansion at Hyde Park, N. Y., which had been the home of generations of the Roosevelt family, has been made a national memorial to the late President. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and her children waived the rights of the family and donated the house to the United States. The Department of the Interior is the custodian with the National Park Service directly administering the place as a national historic site and monument. It comprises nearly 34 acres of land, several outbuildings, auxiliary houses, gardens and a greenhouse in addition to the home.

Years before Mr. Roosevelt thought of being President it was the pleasure of the writer and A. Matt Werner to visit Governor Roosevelt at Albany and later on several occasions at Hyde Park. At that time Mrs. Roosevelt, his mother, was alive, and we shall never forget the courtesies extended or the pride that she took in pointing to the cherished keepsakes of her family. Though well along in years, it was easy for her to get around, and she delighted in pointing to this or that memento of some great occasion. Hyde Park is a place of scenic beauty and now it is to be even more attractive.

A year has gone by and we have seen two victories achieved—one in Europe and the other in Japan. Victories for American and Allied arms. Roosevelt to a large extent was the guiding genius in the war and it is unfortunate that he could not have lived a few months longer to see the fruits of his labor realized. He was an inspiration to the fighting forces all over the world because he was viewed in the light of a saint among the common people.

Throughout the evening hours from every nook and corner of the world came messages of condolence, intermingled with soft music heard over the radio, and finally at 9:30 that evening a year ago Raymond Massey, interpreter of Abraham Lincoln's great work, recited this prayer that he had written:

"God of the free, we pledge our hearts and lives today to the cause of all free mankind. Grant us victory over the tyrants who would enslave all freemen of nations. Grant us faith and understanding to cherish all those who fight for freedom as if they were our brothers. Grant us brotherhood in hope and union, not only for the space of this bitter war but for the days to come which shall and must unite all the children of earth. Our earth is but a small star in the great universe—yet of it we can make—if we choose, a planet unvexed by war, untroubled by hunger or fear, undivided by senseless distinctions of race, color, or theory. Grant us that courage and foreseeing to begin this task today, that our children and our children's children may be proud of the name of Man. The spirit of man has awakened and the soul of man has come forth. Grant us the wisdom and the vision to comprehend the greatness of man's spirit that suffers and endures so hugely for a goal beyond his own brief span. Grant us honor for our dead who died in the faith, honor for our living who work and strive for the faith, redemption, and security for all captive lands and peoples. Grant us patience with the deluded and pity for the betrayed, and grant us the skill and valor that so cleansed the world of oppression and the old base doctrine that the strong must eat the weak because they are strong. Yet most of all, grant us brotherhood, not only for this day but for all years, a brotherhood not of words, but of acts and deeds. We are all of us children of earth—grant us that simple knowledge. If their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure. Grant us a common faith that man shall know bread and peace, that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom, and security, an equal opportunity and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our lands but throughout the world, and in that faith let us march toward the clean world our hands can make. Amen."

Sound Wisdom in Indianapolis Star Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, today the House is voting on extension of the draft. I cannot see any justification for peacetime conscription of a large army, for two reasons.

First. The evidence brought out in the debate on this bill proves indubitably that more than enough volunteers can be obtained to meet all of the requirements of the armies of occupation.

Second. The creation of a large army is perfectly useless in view of the revolutionary change in the character of warfare that has been brought about by the discovery of the atomic bomb.

In this connection I would like to say that the most sensible editorial I have

read in many a day appeared in yesterday's issue of the Indianapolis Star. It points out very clearly and conclusively how the atomic bomb has negatived the necessity for a big Army and Navy and compulsory military training. I think everybody in the country should read that editorial, and that the militarists would do well to revise their thinking to conform to its sound wisdom.

The editorial is as follows:

PEACE OR ATOMIC CHAOS

Men of vision have always been rare in the military forces of any country. Even the Germans, who built an entirely new military machine from scratch, merely made new use of old weapons when they rolled into Poland and France.

Today our military men are confronted with a revolutionary problem in warfare, and they are facing it by turning their backs on it. With proof of the obsolescence of nearly all modes of conventional warfare exploding in their faces, proof which they themselves demonstrated by dropping the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, they are still planning a huge Navy, including battleships, cruisers and aircraft carriers. They still think in terms of tanks, artillery, and masses of infantry. They still act like the court-martial board which sacrificed Billy Mitchell on the altar of spit-and-polish and the tradition of the old schcol tie.

The atomic bomb is a revolution in itself, a revolution already accomplished. No matter how many statistics our military leaders may present to prove the success of their weapons and tactics during World War II, they can't blink the fact that World War II is already old stuff. It became past history the day Hiroshima turned to dust and rubble.

How long will a 100-mile armada of warships last if attacked by five atomic bombs? How long will our arsenals turning out howitzer shells last if attacked with 10 atomic bombs? How long will we have any airfields if they undergo a sudden rocket attack from 5,000 miles away with 1,000 atom bomb charges?

Our Army and Navy brass hats had better think up the answers to these questions instead of coming to Congress with plans for a 1,000,000-man Army, and a big Navy, and compulsory military training. It would be a worth-while experiment to drop an atomic bomb on or near our new 45,000-ton aircraft carrier *President Roosevelt* and six of our latest type battleships. If these ships withstand the attack perhaps we should build some more of them. If they, too, disintegrate under atomic power, we might as well rid ourselves of our entire naval force in the same way and get busy implementing the United Nations Organization to prevent any possible outbreak of hostilities anywhere.

There is some logic in keeping large military forces for garrison duty in the countries of our defeated enemies. But is there any logic in training these soldiers for a future war in modes of warfare as out of date as the bow and arrow?

The scientists have taken war out of the hands of the generals and admirals. The scientists have forced the issue of world peace upon our statesmen. They cannot stay on the fence now. There is no fence. The atom bomb will either unite the world or blow it apart. It's here. We can't wish it away or minimize its power without being blind to our peril. Militarily, it's one world now, like it or not.

If our military men are too blind, and our statesmen too timid to see this, we, the people, must take the lead in saving ourselves from their stupidity. What are we going to do about it? It's getting late.

The Right To Pass Freely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the chief sources of the unity and strength of the United States is the unhampered right of every citizen and visitor freely to circulate. More than any other one factor, perhaps, this freedom to adventure has given us the incentive to develop our systems of transportation, our production of vehicles, and our facilities for communication which, in size alone, surpass those of all the rest of the world put together.

This right is very ancient in our civilization. It derives, legally, from the time of the Roman Republic when keeping open the highways for peaceable travel was a principal duty of the Roman Government. Both common and statutory British law dealt harshly with anyone who interfered with the safe journeyings of Britons on the King's highways. Ownership of any plot of land includes the right, guaranteed by the government, to "ingress, egress, and regress," without which possession of the land would be meaningless, or a self-imposed imprisonment; either being unable to enter, or unable to leave with certainty of return.

In this new era, when the world must find unity and mutual understanding, or will assuredly fall into a chaos leading to destruction, common sense would seem to indicate the necessity for removing every possible barrier to friendly international contact and acquaintance between individuals resident in the various States of the United Nations.

Having in mind our own history, and the success we have achieved in promoting neighborly sentiments among the citizens of our own several States by the freedom of travel we have enjoyed, I propose the following resolution be adopted in order that an opportunity be given to effect on a world scale the same freedom for fellowship as exists in the Americas:

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations, as ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 28, 1945, is drafted in the name of "We the peoples" of these United Nations; and

Whereas the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States is, under article 1, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, particularly representative of the people of the several States, who are now also people of the United Nations; and

Whereas the people of the United States, and of other member nations of the United Nations, are at present debarred by various governmental restrictions from travel and temporary sojourn in countries now indissolubly linked in the fellowship of this international organization; and

Whereas the people of the United States have long realized that freedom of movement within nominally united areas is essential to the formation of the spirit of unity; and

Whereas the decision to locate the permanent headquarters of the United Nations within the territorial confines of the United States places special responsibility for the development of this spirit of unity within the United Nations on the people of the United States, and more especially on this, their House of Representatives in Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Department of State be, and is hereby, requested, through the representation of the United States in the next General Assembly of the United Nations, to urge, and to report back to the Congress upon, the immediate establishment of United Nations passports, valid for educational, cultural, and other reasonable travel, as distinct from permanent settlement, in all States, Members of the United Nations, to be granted gratis to any of the people of the United Nations, on the discretion of the appropriate diplomatic officer of the applicant's government, and then to be honored by the governments of all States, Members of the United Nations.

Extension of the Draft Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, recently General Hershey addressed the Associated Industries of Missouri on the subject of the extension of the draft law.

One of our outstanding businessmen, who holds the position as chairman of the executive committee of the Associated Industries of Missouri, wrote me on the subject of General Hershey's address as follows:

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF MISSOURI,
St. Louis, Mo., March 16, 1946.

Hon. WALTER PLOESER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: This week, I had the pleasure of sitting at the head table at a meeting at the Statler Hotel in St. Louis where General Hershey was the principal speaker on the subject of why the draft law should be continued. The meeting was called jointly by the Associated Industries of Missouri and the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce for the purpose of expressing their appreciation of the excellent work done by the draft boards of Greater St. Louis. Everyone is genuinely grateful to the members of these draft boards who served so well without compensation and, in a large degree, without any real recognition of the work they did during the entire war period and are still doing.

My purpose in writing to you is to discuss the question of whether or not the draft law should be extended from the viewpoint of the manufacturer. I am forced to say that General Hershey did not advance a single argument that was convincing to those Members whom I have been able to contact since this meeting last Tuesday. It was also remarked that the Navy was not represented at the meeting and that the entire argument advanced was for the purpose of showing the necessity of having the draft law extended in order to get men into the Army.

Briefly, the important points that General Hershey made were that the draft law should be extended (1) in order to win the peace; (2) no major war was ever fought by the

United States or any other country without conscription; (3) because the Army cannot raise the number of men required at the present time unless we have the compulsion of the draft law. The attitude expressed by General Hershey on this point is that the generals state they need the men, and therefore, since they need the men, Congress must pass a law that will provide the men; (4) the enlistments that seem to be so numerous at the present time are only due, according to General Hershey, to the desire on the part of the individuals enlisting to escape being drafted. As far as I am concerned, I certainly came away from the meeting with the impression that the entire point of the general's discussion was that the Army needs the men, and they are not going to try to get them in any way excepting by means of a law which will force the men into the Army.

Needless to say, it was clearly evident on the faces of the audience, whom I carefully observed from the speaker's table, that this was an astounding attitude as far as they were concerned. For my part, there are certainly some pertinent questions that I would like to have the general answer. First of all: Why are we talking about having a draft law when it is agreed that the shooting war is at an end? His major point, that no major war was ever fought without conscription, certainly must be discarded unless Congress is willing to admit that we are about to fight another major war. The argument that we need men to win the peace cannot be denied, but it is agreed by everyone that the peacetime work of our armed men, or perhaps the better way to state it, of the men we now have in the Army and Navy, is entirely different for the most part, particularly those members of the armed forces in foreign countries, than the occupation they were engaged in during the shooting period. Is it not almost mandatory that the men who are sent abroad at this time to do this work for us should go voluntarily in order to be certain that we do have the very best esprit de corps under such conditions? We constantly hear that the behavior of our men in service is sometimes discreditable to the home folks. Under the compulsory plan, this is not at all surprising because when a man is placed where he has not elected to go, he certainly has every reason in the world to blame the other fellow and become somewhat disgruntled.

Those of us who employ labor cannot understand the viewpoint that Congress shall compel the citizens of the United States to serve just because the officers of the Army have thus far been unable, or have had no desire, to set up a program which will attract the number of men they require. All I need ask is, what would happen to industry if we were to say to Congress, "We need 40,000,000 men to do the work our customers want done; you pass a law forcing the men into our plants so that the work will be done." Naturally, this is exactly the thing that I understand this war was fought to prevent. If that is true, why should the Army advocate that it be continued during the peace years?

Perhaps the most alarming statement General Hershey made, as far as I am concerned, is the statement that we must get the men we need from the 18-year-old class because that is where we find them. I ask you, where is industry going to get the technical personnel in the form of engineers, scientists, researchers, medical men, school teachers, and so on, if the Congress continues the draft law requiring 18-year-olds to serve in the Army before they have an opportunity to enter college and get a technical education? At every hand, we are told that the Army and Navy need technical men, and they certainly robbed industry to the very danger point during this war. It will be 3 years more before we get full production of technical personnel in these United States, and then we will get it only if the draft law is discontinued at least with respect to those boys who desire to enter college. General Hershey carefully avoided pointing out that in Russia, for example, the young technicians were continued in school. It is my understanding that provision for their continuation in school was made in England. It was not permitted in the United States. So we have, as our greatest shortage, a shortage of trained technicians to carry on the work of all civilian activities.

Surely, the most devastating and destructive feature of a draft law in peacetime is the actuality that it would compel our 18-, 19-, 20-, and 21-year-olds, who should be in college, to police Germany and Japan; what for, for the purpose of seeing that the youth of our former enemies goes to school while they are being policed by our youth who are not permitted to go to school.

I am firmly convinced that the armed services can get all of the men they need for peacetime purposes if they are told the draft law will not be extended and that it will be necessary for them to make their service attractive to the men they need. The Navy has demonstrated that they are doing it. Just one more point, and then I am closing this letter. If it is training that the Army wishes to give the young American, they can accomplish this by providing it during the college years, or during the vacation periods of the college years. Both of my sons have had five summers of military training at the Culver Military Academy. This supplemented their winter schooling.

I hope this letter has not been too long, and I hope that you will see to it that the draft law is discontinued.

Yours very truly,

WALTER SIEGERIST,
Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the lenten season is one for self-examination and candid recognition of our errors of omission and commission during the past year. In view of this, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD two editorials appearing today, one in the New York Times, the other in the Washington Post, both of which charge a serious error of omission committed by the Members of this House last Saturday in a matter gravely affecting the security of our Nation and the maintenance of peace among all nations.

The accusation is not lightly made. It should command serious consideration from us all as we shall have to answer to our own consciences for the safety of the people of this Nation, and for the judgment of history.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times]

GAMBLING WITH DESTINY

The House of Representatives is reported ready to pass today an emasculated Selective Service Act that belies its name. It carries so many exemptions that it is difficult to know who would be eligible for induction under its provisions. The majority apparently are more willing to gamble with the country's destiny and commitments than with the fall elections. It could very well be that they are as wrong on the elections as in their judgment on the country's future.

The 6-hour exhibition indulged in by the Representatives was an illustration of how not to legislate. The alliance that put over the crippling amendments to the administration-approved bill was as odd a melange of so-called Democratic leaders and rank-and-file Republicans as the lower House ever has seen. The end result is an insult to the intelligence of the voters and a reflection on the statesmanship of over half of the House. It is a reflection on their courage too, as they declined to permit a roll-call vote that would have put them on record before the voters back home.

The bill that is scheduled for passage extends the Selective Service Act for 9 months from May 15. But it raises the age limit to 20 years from 18, exempts fathers and other categories, sets a limit of 18 months on service and suspends all inductions under the act for 6 months. Inductions could be started then only if the President should find that voluntary enlistments were not meeting the quotas to give us an armed force of 1,736,000 men by July 1, 1947. The responsibility for ordering inductions would thus be shifted to the President just before the elections.

In the face of the warning of General Eisenhower and practically every other qualified person who has studied the problem, that selective service must be continued if we are to have the men needed to continue occupation and provide us with a minimum force for our national security, a majority of the House say it isn't necessary. They have taken the minimum requirements put forward by the services and reduced them to a practical zero. With our responsibilities abroad growing instead of decreasing, the House majority would remove our one best hope of maintaining an adequate Army and Navy. With selective service the only fair method of assigning civic responsibility, they would resort to the basically unfair practice of depending on volunteers because they think the other way is politically inexpedient.

The Senate has before it a bill for a year's continuation of selective service without the holiday provision or the 20-year restriction. Less sensitive to political considerations at this time than is the House, the Senate is expected to pass the measure substantially as it has been drawn. A compromise would then have to be worked out in committee, however, and there would be a strong possibility that some of the more crippling House amendments would stay in a compromise measure.

The House bill is a senseless, weasel-worded measure that would make desperate the present Army manpower crisis. It is to be hoped that the Senate will pass its bill substantially as written and that the House—its Members having "made a record" for the voters—then will bow to the Senate and accept a workable act. That wouldn't be statesmanship. But if it provided the men needed it would be better than a compromise or the present House bill.

[From the Washington Post]

LET DOWN BY THE HOUSE

We share with Members of the House reluctance to see compulsory military service continued even a day longer than is necessary. Yet we think that, in voting to suspend selective-service inductions for 5 months and to exempt youths of 18 and 19 years from the draft, the House has let the Nation down in a thoughtless and irresponsible way. Someone aptly remarked that

these amendments have not killed the bill but merely buried it alive.

Specific arguments for both the major changes written into the bill on Saturday carry a good deal of weight. Even General Eisenhower said the other day that he would prefer to have men beyond their teens for occupation duty. Unseasoned youths of 18 and 19 often lack the discretion and moral stamina that troops occupying a foreign land should have. Why, then, should this group continue to be drafted? One simple answer is that not all troops are assigned to occupation duty. Many are needed in this country to service the troops abroad. More important is the fact that to eliminate youths under 20 would be virtually to cut off the flow of selective-service recruits into the Army, for the older men capable of bearing arms have already been drafted.

Plausible arguments were also made for the amendment suspending all inductions for 5 months. This delay, it is said, will tend to throw full emphasis upon voluntary enlistments. Then, if the voluntary system fails to bring in enough men, the President can order a resumption of selective-service inductions. But this is to treat the whole business of maintaining our position in the postwar world as if it were a matter of signing up enough men to lay a sewer or put in a sidewalk. It will carry the impression all over the world that the United States is once more preparing to abandon its world responsibilities at the earliest possible moment.

What we obviously need is a policy of maintaining our reduced military strength on a systematic and routine basis. The Post sincerely hopes that enough volunteers will be found to fill up the occupation forces in both Germany and Japan. Meanwhile, however, the armed forces should not be left to operate on a shoestring. We can exert a strong influence for peace and order in the world only if we carry through without quibbling or hesitation the obligations we have assumed. To withdraw into our shell in the present unsettled state of international affairs would be to leave the world to chaos after a great expenditure of life and irreplaceable resources in the pursuit of liberty, order, and peace. From this broader point of view there can be no question that the House has gambled with the security which has so recently been purchased at so high a price.

In other words, the House indulged in a shortsighted throwback to localism and domestic politics in dealing with an issue that demands a United Nations viewpoint. It cut a sizable piece of ground from beneath Secretary Byrnes in his struggle to establish an orderly peace system. This tragic aspect of Saturday's performance cannot be reasoned away by petty arguments based upon personal convenience or the preference of Americans for civilian jobs. Nor can the damage that has been done be set right by anything less than a final vote in both Houses for uninterrupted continuation of selective service during the next year.

In the Spirit of F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial by A. B. Whitlock, editor of the Gary American, Gary, Ind., in commemoration of our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Whitlock has been a loyal and constant supporter of our departed President and his policies since 1930.

The editorial follows:

IN THE SPIRIT OF F. D. R.

At a fateful hour on that dark April 12 of 1 year ago, the great and gallant heart of Franklin Delano Roosevelt stopped beating. And for a stricken while, it seemed to a majority of the peoples of the earth as though the world had stopped with him. For he had come to symbolize hope, courage, tolerance, good neighborliness, freedom from oppression and want, and the world will to permanent peace through peaceful cooperation and united effort, to all the people of the earth.

He was their friend: they knew and loved him. He had become the world leader; as such, they respected, believed in, and leaned on him. For America he had penned the incomparable second bill of rights; for the world, he had put this same new covenant for the common man into world form in the words of the Atlantic Charter.

In these immortal documents, and in the immortal and ever-inspiring spirit of the man, which lives on in his words and in his amazing record of deeds accomplished, Franklin Roosevelt lives on. He will never die.

Nor will he ever be forgotten. History will accord him, we have no doubt, an even greater acknowledgment than we tender him today. But even more is he assured a permanent place in the hearts of all humanity.

So, on this day, when we pause to pay him tribute, let us not only stand with heads bowed and hearts full, but let us, as we remember, rededicate ourselves to go on, on the forward path he blazed—to fight on, for those things for which he fought, and for which he gave his life—literally pouring out his life's blood, giving every last ounce of energy, till he had no more to give—and giving all willingly, cheerfully, hopefully, with a courage in which there never was room for any doubt.

He fell as a soldier—our great Commander in Chief; victory in sight. But he fell no less as a soldier for peace, for it was largely for permanent world peace, and the United Nations, that he campaigned in 1944; educating the people, giving them of his belief and his hope.

It is well that we remember now, that there was in his courageous makeup no room for doubt, no room for fear.

As we rededicate ourselves, let us do it in his spirit, recalling that when he took office in 1933, our whole land was stricken low, and millions had only doubt and fear, and want. His matchless voice sounded a clarion call to hope, to renewed faith, as he declared: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

It is significant, too, that from out of the tomb, as it were, those same words came, when the champion lay still in death. For the last words of his last speech, the speech he was to have given the world on Jefferson Day, and which was given the press from the funeral train at Atlanta on the night he was to have spoken it, breathe that same challenge: "The only limitation to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong, active faith."

Yes; let us continue to move forward.

Let us go forward with strong and active faith.

Let us not forget that the only thing we need to fear still is fear itself.

The Lord saw fit to take our Moses on the very threshold of the promised land, after he had led us through the dead sea of the depression and the wilderness of war.

It is for us to go on and build the world of peace and of plenty for everyone, of which he dreamed. The world he envisioned from the mountain top. The promised land to whose very threshold he led us.

Leadership Means Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star, Washington, N. J., under date of April 11, 1946:

LEADERSHIP MEANS RESPONSIBILITIES

Fate has catapulted our country into a position of world leadership. We cannot discharge the responsibilities which that leadership imposes by forgetting the great part the American farmer must take.

The course of world history during the next century will depend largely on what we are doing in this country. If anyone believes that the farmers of America favor a policy of living to ourselves alone, such a person is tragically mistaken.

We devote a little of this column to discuss with our readers the importance of the American farmer in the world.

In another 2 months the world will have a better idea whether it will have very little bread or nearly enough. By that time fairly accurate estimates could be available on wheat production. Wheat is harvested throughout most of the year in some sections of the world, but July and August are the critical harvesting months when the fate of about 75 percent of the world's production is determined. Southern Hemisphere crops were harvested in December and heavy producing Argentina reports only about 25,000,000 bushels for export to Europe against a normal 200,000,000 to 250,000,000 bushels.

North Africa will begin harvesting wheat in about 2 weeks and Spain will also harvest in May. Crop reports from that section are better. Southern and central Europe will harvest early in June. Texas wheat begins to come in in June and reapers gradually work their way north, reaching Canada in August. While the acreage here in the East is comparatively small, wheat harvest begins about July 1, but June should give a fairly accurate idea of how the world's bread basket will look next winter.

Warren County and in fact the northern tier of counties are included in the rural sections of New Jersey with valuable dairy-farming interests. Any study of the food situation in relation to the problem of adequate safeguarding dietary requirements of Americans and at the same time provide relief for millions of Europeans facing starvation, milk may be even more important than bread.

A. F. Foran, director of milk control in New Jersey, points to danger in a recent survey showing that herds in New Jersey since 1939 have been reduced by 1,100 and that today we have 2,000 less milk-producing animals than 2 years ago, and that consumption is higher than dairies can supply. The dairy farmer is crying for a long-range program from Washington. If that is the only solution, let's have it.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—Silver and the Green Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the outrageous method of propaganda by the silver jewelry manufacturers and fabricators to influence legislation by the Congress. I have before me a quarter page paid advertisement being inserted in newspapers of many States urging the readers to write or wire their Senators and Congressmen, and giving the Member's name and address. Some of these letters have been referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, of which I am chairman, and these letters, together with a reply by John McBride, clerk of the committee, are inserted below:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. HELEN DOUGLAS MANKIN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. MANKIN: I have been directed by Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE, chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, to write you regarding letters referred to this committee for explanation by your secretary, Mr. Moore, in which some of your constituents denounce the activities of "a small selfish group known as the silver bloc at the expense of the great bulk of American citizens."

OUTRAGEOUS PROPAGANDA

The sincerity of your constituents is fully appreciated, but I am sure that you and they will readily agree that their letters were the result of large and expensive advertisements carried in Georgia papers by the silver jewelers and fabricators who are moving heaven and earth to drain the United States Treasury of millions of dollars—not merely at the expense of the silver producers, but at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation, including the taxpayers of the great State of Georgia—and right at a time when the Treasury is urging our people to buy more Government bonds.

I have before me a quarter page ad from the Atlanta Constitution of April 5, 1946, which is so worded as to be a grim reminder of Voltaire's observation that, "When engaged in performing a discreditable action there is nothing so advantageous as to utter loudly virtuous sentiments." But I am very sure when the full facts are known the patriotic citizens of Georgia in common with all patriotic people elsewhere will resent and repudiate their efforts.

GOLD AND SILVER MONEY

As you are aware, the United States has two monetized metals, gold at $35 per ounce and silver at $1.29 per ounce, both of which are recognized and accepted in all parts of the world at their monetized value. Now if the gold jewelry manufacturers should attempt to purchase millions of ounces of United States Treasury gold at a discount of 45 percent—that is at $19.25 per ounce—the desk of every Member of Congress would be piled with protests, and yet that is just exactly what the silver jewelry manufacturers and fabricators are trying to do with silver in the United States Treasury—to buy it for a 45 percent discount, which in reality means a subsidy of that amount to the silver fabricators at the expense of the American taxpayers.

SILVER PURCHASE ACT

Under the Silver Purchase Acts of 1934 and 1939, silver was monetized at $1.29 per ounce, and the Treasury was instructed by the Congress under these acts, to purchase domestic silver from the producers at that price, charging them 45-percent seigniorage for minting and handling charges, and deliver the remaining 55 percent in silver-minted dollars or the equivalent to the producers, thus netting the producers 71.11 cents per ounce for their silver. This wise legislation has made a profit of many millions of dollars for the American taxpayers, and also supplied them with the only United States money in circulation on which the taxpayers are not required to pay interest charges of many millions of dollars annually. The argument of the silver fabricators is that since the cost to the Treasury was 71.11 cents per ounce, we should sell it to them at this price. The bulk of the gold now held in the Treasury was acquired at $20.67 per ounce and it would be just as logical to sell our gold at $20.67 as to sell our silver at 71.11 cents.

EFFECT OF SILVER PRICE ON JEWELRY

The price of silver bears no more relation to the price of fabricated silver jewelry than the price of raw cotton does to the cotton dress your constituent is trying to buy, nor the price of wheat does to the price of a loaf of bread. In fact, the disparity is even greater in the case of silver, and if your constituents will place on the scales any piece of silver they contemplate buying, they will quickly ascertain that the retail price asked is from 5 to 15 times the value of the silver in the article.

PLAYING FOR BIG STAKES

There is nothing to keep the silver fabricators from buying silver on the world market, but the world market on silver is more than $1 per ounce, and they are trying by every device of propaganda and lobbying to buy the peoples' silver at from 30 cents to 58 cents below its actual value. They can afford to carry large, expensive ads, for they are playing for big stakes. If, as a result of those ads they can start a deluge of letters to Washington to stampede the Congress into allowing them to purchase even 200,000,000 ounces of silver at only 30 cents below the world market price, they will have made themselves the neat sum of $60,000,000 at the expense of the American taxpayers.

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES INVOLVED

The above facts explain the present controversy, but the principle involved is fundamental. Silver is not an issue. A sound world economy is, and every effort to destroy silver as a monetary metal helps to perpetuate the unsound monetary system, thereby delaying peace and recovery and again leading into chaos and war.

For three-quarters of a century—and as a direct result of the crime of 1873—the United States and much of the world has been afflicted with panics and depressions of ever-increasing intensity—in 1873, 1893, 1929—all finally culminating in World War II, which came close to destroying civilization.

THE HIGHWAY TO WAR

Every war since the wars of the Crusades has been, in essence, an economic war. If we would end depressions and their natural aftermath of war, we must first ascertain and then eliminate the causes of depressions and wars. The inevitable result of the monetary policy pursued by this country and the world since 1873 is more depressions and more wars. It is the present "funny money" policy that brought Hitler to power, that enabled a bankrupt Germany to rearm, that caused France to disintegrate, that allowed Japan to first industrialize and then militarize Manchuria, and then took your son and mine to fight and rot and die on battlefields all over the world and placed on the shoulders of our people and generations yet unborn the staggering tax burden of $300,000,000,000.

A MANAGED ECONOMY MEANS REGIMENTATION

The only alternative offered by our pseudo economists is a managed economy and a managed currency, which means regimentation and the retention of the most vicious part of the present system—a vehicle on which the internationalists hope to rise to power and replace our system of government with a financial superstate and world dictatorship.

THE PATHWAY TO PEACE

There can be no permanent peace and recovery without a sound world economy, and a sound world economy must be founded on a stable, dependable dollar, or other monetary unit, of a universally recognized value. Money must have a recognized value of its own entirely unaffected by the credit of any nation in which it circulates, and the only way such a dollar is possible is to have it backed by adequate reserves of redeemable gold and silver at a proper and fixed ratio, which, of course, means a return to bimetallism.

Every facility is at hand to put such a plan into effect, and unless we speedily adopt such a plan we are headed for a short, mad inflationary boom followed by a depression from which we may not emerge.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MCBRIDE.

DECATUR, GA., *April 8, 1946.*
Representative HELEN DOUGLAS MANKIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. MANKIN: We are definitely opposed to the pending silver legislation attempting to raise the price of silver from its already artificially high price, which is for the benefit of a relatively small selfish group known as the silver bloc at the expense of the great bulk of citizens.

We also feel that restrictions on all the Government's huge surplus stocks of silver for use in coinage only should be changed to let these silver stocks be released for industrial use.

Therefore, as our Representative in the House of Representatives, we want you to exert all your efforts against this and similar legislation.

Very truly yours,

H. D. WILSDON.
MRS. WINNIE S. WILSDON.

ALTO, GA., *April 5, 1946.*
Mrs. HELEN DOUGLAS MANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. MANKIN: You can show your interest in the people of Georgia by helping to put the silver stock into circulation.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY THORNTON.

HOPEVILLE, GA.

MY DEAR MRS. MANKIN: Since silver is not a luxury metal and some of our everyday needs are made from it. I am hoping you will do what you can to keep the western silver bloc lobbies from raising the price so that it will be beyond the price the means of even the middle class.

Many young matrons, like myself, have started our sets of silver which we hope to complete. But if the proposed price raise of $1.25 per ounce should pass with the already inflationary price on other necessities,

we would never be able to afford, even piecemeal, the price asked for flatware. In the Nation where more people have more and better things for a happier life let's keep it that way.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. E. F. LIVSEY.

Complaints of Detroit Property Owners Against OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement made on behalf of the Detroit and Michigan Property Owners, Inc., and also the resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Detroit regarding the administration of rent control under the OPA. These complaints are not new. They have existed since rent control went into effect and the administration of this agency has been one of inequity and injustice to the thrifty and frugal common people and small property owners in the Detroit area.

DETROIT AND MICHIGAN
PROPERTY OWNERS, INC.,
Detroit, Mich., April 12, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: We urge abandonment of the OPA, but if extended as proposed in H. R. 6042, we recommend extension of the subsidy program to 6 months and price control not to exceed 12 months with due regard for the following relief and limitation as being necessary and proper.

1. Stop OPA from issuing any directive or regulation that exceeds the law and authority of the court.

2. Stop the OPA directive on eviction and allow landlord the right to recover possession of his property by due process of law.

3. Stop the OPA from giving legal advice, coaching, or giving instruction to tenants or witnesses and making recommendation to the court.

4. Stop the OPA from "squander bugging" the taxpayers' hard-earned money by propagandizing the people.

5. Stop the OPA from refusing to act upon appeals in hardship rental cases.

6. That rents be increased 10 to 15 percent over the base rent.

7. That a tenant or buyer be required to file an action within 90 days from date of violation or thereafter be barred from further action or damages.

8. That any person seeking treble damages be required to retain an attorney.

9. That OPA get verification from a tenant that his rent is paid to date before they can entertain any complaint whatsoever.

10. Reduce the OPA program to cover food, shelter, and clothing and thus reduce the budget.

A copy of a resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Detroit is attached in support of our appeal for proper relief.

We appreciate your fine efforts in support of American ideals.

Very truly yours,

JOHN DALZELL,
Secretary.

CITY OF DETROIT,
Office of the City Clerk.

Resolution by Councilman Edwards:

Whereas the problems and complaints of property owners and landlords relating to rent control have been brought to the attention of the Common Council of the City of Detroit; and

Whereas this council is aware of the excessive demand for housing in this city which necessitates the maintenance of rent control; and

Whereas a plea for this council to express its opinion to the Office of Price Administration on this subject has been presented: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council requests the Office of Price Administration to make a careful survey of the complaints cited above in the light of present circumstances, and to make a fair and equitable decision on the merits of the cases presented; and be it further

Resolved, That this council requests the Office of Price Administration to study alleged inequities resulting from rent freezing and work out machinery for adjustment where injustice is proved; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Lawrence Ferrell, director of OPA for the Detroit area, and Mr. Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator.

Adopted as follows:

Yeas: Councilmen Castator, Comstock, Dorais, Lodge, Oakman, Rogell, Van Antwerp, and the president, 8.

Nays: None.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
City of Detroit, ss:

I, Thomas D. Leadbetter, city clerk of the city of Detroit, in said State, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the common council at a session held on the 12th day of March 1946 and approved by the mayor on the 19th day of March 1946 as appears from the journal of said common council remaining in the office of the city clerk of Detroit, aforesaid; that I have compared the same with the original, and the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of said original.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of said city, at Detroit, this 27th day of March A. D. 1946.

[SEAL] THOMAS D. LEADBETTER,
City Clerk.

Against Peacetime Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a list of organizations favoring, and also those opposing, compulsory military training and the peacetime draft.

This list, I hope, will be carefully perused by every Member because it indicates the overwheming character of the opposition to compulsion in raising and maintaining our armed forces.

ORGANIZATIONS IN FAVOR OF COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING AND THE PEACETIME DRAFT

Government organizations: United States Army, United States Navy.

Military organizations: American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary, Citizens' Military Training Camps Association, Disabled American Veterans, National Guard Association, Reserve Officers Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Church: American Council of Christian Churches.

Other organizations: American Defense Society, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Citizens' Committee for Military Training, Inc.

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING AND PEACETIME DRAFT

The following organizations have taken action within the last 2 years in opposition to compulsory military training in peacetime; or in three or four cases in opopsition to action by Congress pending further study of over-all defense needs:

Educational groups: American Association of Junior Colleges; American Association of School Administrators; American Association of University Professors; American Association of University Women; American Council on Education; American Education Fellowship; American Federation of Teachers; Association of American Colleges; Association of Baptist Educational Institutions; Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions; Association of Land Grant Colleges (for delay until expiration of Selective Service Act); Associations of Schools and Colleges of Methodist Church; Council of Church Boards of Education, National Committee on University Work; National Catholic Education Association; National Commission on Christian Higher Education; National Congress of Parents and Teachers; National Council of Chief State School Officers; National Education Association: Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA; Department of Higher Education, NEA; Commission for Defense of Democracy Through Education, NEA; Council for Social Studies, NEA; National Association of Secondary School Principals, NEA.

Religious groups: American Friends Service Committee, American Unitarian Association, Catholic Central Verein of America, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Church of the Brethren, Church of God Ministers Convention, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormon), Congregational-Christian Church Council for Social Action, Council of Catholic Bishops, Council of Methodist Bishops, Disciples of Christ, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Fellowship of Southern Churchmen, Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America, General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, General Conference of the Methodist Church, Jewish Peace Fellowship, Methodist Federation for Social Service, National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Conference of Methodist Youth Fellowship, National Council of Catholic Women, National Intercollegiate Christian Council, Northern Baptist Convention, Rabbinical Assembly of America, Society of Friends, Southern Baptist Convention Commission on World Peace, United Christian Youth Movement, United Council of Church Women, United Lutheran Church in America, World Peace Commission of Methodist Church, Women's Society for Christian Service (Methodist).

Farm groups: American Farm Bureau Federation, Associated Women of American Farm Bureau, National Farmers Union, National Grange.

Labor groups: American Federation of Labor, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Congress of Industrial Organizations, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, International Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, National Federation of Telephone Workers, Railway Executives Association, United Automobile Workers, United Mine Workers, United Transport Service Employees, Workers Defense League.

Military organizations (veterans, etc.): Catholic War Veterans' Association; Military Order of the Liberty Bell; Veterans' League of America; Willard Straight Post of American Legion, New York City.

Other organizations: American Civil Liberties Union; International Order of Good Templars; International Reform Federation; Liberal Party of New York State; Michigan Commonwealth Federation; Minnesota Division, Younger Republican Clubs; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Council Against Peacetime Conscription; National Federation of Settlements; People's Lobby; Postwar World Council; Prohibition Party of America; Socialist Party; Socialist Labor Party; Union for Democratic Action; War Resisters' League; We the People, Sovereign; Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The St. Lawrence Seaway & Power Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement from New England-St. Lawrence Project Conference representing the New England sentiment at a meeting in the Imperial Ballroom, Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., April 1, 1946, which was attended by 400 representatives of business, industrial, maritime, port, shipping, financial, and labor organizations from each New England State, that New England does not want the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

TEN REASONS WHY NEW ENGLAND IS OPPOSED

First. The project would add to the tax burden.

Second. New England's railroads, already struggling against serious hardships, are in no position to withstand any further loss of traffic.

Third. The power needs of New England industries can be more economically supplied by steam-generating plants.

Fourth. Public interest would be better served by utilizing available manpower, materials, and Federal funds to complete meritorious domestic projects.

Fifth. Boston and other New England ports would suffer because low-operating cost foreign-flag vessels would by-pass New England ports and practically control transportation of materials through the St. Lawrence to Great Lakes ports.

Sixth. Hydroelectric power developed in the International Rapids plant would be controlled by New York.

Seventh. It would seriously affect coastal shipbuilding plants—an important New England industry and big factor in unemployment relief.

Eighth. Opposition to the St. Lawrence project is Nation-wide, principal support being limited to the area tributary to the Great Lakes.

Ninth. Proponents have indicated that efforts to obtain authorization of the so-called Champlain-Hudson Cut-Off—a seaway channel from Montreal to New York—would be renewed, and pressed if and when the St. Lawrence project is authorized—this would virtually make an island of New England.

Tenth. The project should be handled as a treaty and not as an agreement.

Compton, Calif., School Plan Copied as Model re Use of Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the Eighteenth District of California is the prosperous city of Compton. Overburdened by heavy population increases as a result of the war and post-war problems, the school program of this country has been designated by the Bureau of Community Facilities, Federal Works Agency, as an example to all other similar counties.

Therefore, I asked permission of the able superintendent of schools of Compton, Ardella B. Tibby, to set forth the Compton statement for the benefit of Nation-wide information and guidance.

Also it will clearly show the businesslike manner in which public schools can be and are administered under most stressing and difficult conditions:

PROBLEMS OF FINANCE IN RELATION TO GOVERNMENT AID FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

The problems of financing school facilities and of providing sufficient school housing in the Compton City elementary school district is acute. During the past 3 years the district has been unable to finance its operations from its regular sources of revenue, nor will it be able to do so in successive years. Only by supplementing these regular sources from grants under the Lanham Act has the district been privileged to meet the minimum standards of education. The discontinuance of such grants will result in a serious crisis.

The elements contributing to Compton's problems are peculiar to the particular area and present in similar degree in no other.

Compton has no industrial development, no large homes and no highly developed business center. There are only few two-story residences in the district, and no more than one or two business houses exceeding two stories in height.

Compton is a war-impacted community adjacent to such highly developed centers as Los Angeles, Long Beach, and the harbor district. Practically all business and all industrial developments are outside its taxable limits. Essentially devoted to small farming in the beginning, the district has been engulfed by a rapid overflow of low-cost housing and the increase in assessable wealth has not kept pace with the growth of pupil population. This is indicated by the following figures of total assessable wealth and the wealth per pupil.

	Assessed valuation	Wealth per pupil
1939–40	$13,636,995	$4,147
1944–45	19,639,850	3,825

The assessable wealth per pupil should be further considered in the light of the increased cost of operating the schools in 1944–45 as against 1939–40. Because of this increased cost of operation the spread between the pupil wealth in the 2 years noted is much greater than reflected in the figures set forth.

It might be thought that, with the end of the war and the closing of defense plants, there would be a decrease in population in Compton. This, however, is not the case nor is there any sound prospect it will be so in the future. Strategically located as a community of small homes, Compton is growing and will continue to do so. Peacetime industry in surrounding areas is increasing and will continue to employ more workers than during the war:

	Population	Average daily attendance, grades kindergarten to 8	Enrollment (yearly peak)
1939–40	32,880	3,579	3,063
1944–45	50,890	5,675	5,108
1945–46	53,930	6,059	5,236

There is serious overcrowding in school housing. At the present time the several school plants of the Compton elementary school district have two classrooms set up in each auditorium, residence dwellings are being used for school buildings, classes are held in cafeterias and the plants have been enlarged by the use of bungalows and shacks. Some of these temporary classrooms, particularly those in dwellings, accommodate too small a number of pupils, thereby placing a heavy burden of pupils in the larger rooms. The pupil per teacher ratio is too high and completely out of balance. All first grades are now on double sessions, and before next year one-half of all classrooms will be used for double-session instruction.

	Number of classrooms	Number of teachers
1939–40	87	87
1944–45	136	140

Our educational cost per pupil is at a minimum. In the past 12 years we have been no higher than fifth lowest in a total of 115 school districts in Los Angeles County. Salaries have, necessarily, been low and the schools have suffered as a result:

	Cost per pupil
1939–40	$80.60
1944–45	98.50

A financial burden, peculiar to the Compton district, was imposed by the earthquake of 1933. To rebuild the school plants destroyed at that time funds for reconstruction were obtained from the Federal Government by means of the socalled Greene bill. These funds were a loan and not a gift. Income from local taxes is reduced by the necessity of yearly payments of interest and principal on this account. The amortization of this loan requires about 12 cents of the 90 cents per $100 of assessed valuation available by local taxation. It has been as high as 17 cents. The 90 cents total tax rate is the maximum permitted by law and is the rate now assessed.

	Total tax rate, including bonds	Greene bill tax rate
1939–40	1.2759	0.16
1940–41	1.1912	.16
1941–42	1.1970	.14
1942–43	1.0948	.13
1943–44	1.1207	.13
1944–45	1.0853	.12

The taxpayers of Compton are already overburdened. The total tax rate for all purposes is, with one exception, higher than any other city in Los Angeles County. High school district bonds, now before the citizens for approval, will further increase the tax rate by 15 cents.

Because of the increased population in Compton the kindergarten classes have grown apace. It should be noted that the expense for this service is borne entirely by district taxation, no State aid being given. Birth rate statistics indicate this growth in kindergarten load will continue disproportionately for several years.

An analysis of funds received on a per-pupil basis is as follows:

	Local taxes	County aid	State aid	In lieu of taxes	Miscellaneous
1939–40	$36.17	$0.19	$54.82	--------	$0.26
1940–41	32.14	.11	53.60	--------	.21
1941–42	37.34	.18	52.24	--------	.10
1942–43	36.17	.12	54.42	--------	.28
1943–44	33.98	.18	55.21	$0.90	.08
1944–45	32.13	.16	60.01	.85	.59

During the depression years the bonded debt of the District, because of the marked decrease in assessed valuation, actually exceeded the legal limit. In recent years this condition has corrected itself but the present bonding capacity is sufficient to provide much less than the sum needed to meet the growing demands for the school. The amounts of housing contributions granted the District by the Federal Government for various years is as follows:

1941–42, 13-classroom addition, project 4–133	$88,900.00
1942–43, Victory Park School, project 4–478	32,890.51
1943–44, 4 nursery schools, project 4–571–F	62,500.00
Total	184,290.51

A recent survey by the State department of schoolhouse planning estimates $1,500,000 as cost for fulfilling present housing needs for current enrollment. An actual count of dwelling units shows 3,347 increase from 1941 to 1946. Within the last 6 weeks we have received notice of the purchase of six large tracts which are to be subdivided for small homes. A list of these tracts follows:

1. McAllister estate, 65 acres, west of Roosevelt Junior High and Olive.
2. Johnson tract, 80 acres, Wilmington and Olive, approximately 400 homes.
3. Howard Day, 26 acres, southwest corner of Greenleaf Drive and Long Beach Boulevard.
4. Howard Day, 7 acres, border north side of George Washington School, 42 houses.
5. West Coast Bond & Mortgage Co., 130 acres, 600 homes, Bullis Road, frontage on Rosecrans Avenue to Carlin Street.
6. Five acres east of Roosevelt sold for subdivision.

This projected building boom does not take into consideration normal continuing construction throughout the district. Since the schools are already overcrowded the prospect is little less than appalling.

Lanham Act contributions for the last 4 years for maintenance and operation are:

1942–43	$37,244.09
1943–44	51,451.59
1944–45	106,122.24
1945–46	127,121.00

An estimate for 1946–47, based on a projection of average daily attendance and increased costs, is $145,000.

There is no desire on the part of the Compton elementary school district to increase the pupil cost if added Government aid is extended.

The present situation is abnormal in cause and the community is not responsible for the unexpected burden placed upon it.

We feel the Government will, in view of the circumstances, help to bear the expense of the educational system in Compton by continuing aid.

The Proposed Office of Peace Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the bitter experiences that the world was forced to endure in World War II were largely the result of Hitler's propaganda machine of yesterday; and the embarrassing and uncomfortable situation that now confronts the United Nations Organization is largely due to the Stalin propaganda machine of today. In the first case the German people were indoctrinated with the Hitler philosophy of world conquest, which conditioned and prepared them for the part Hitler expected them to play in the war. In the second case the Russian people have been convinced or sold through Stalin's propaganda machine on the justice and righteousness of Stalin's program of empire expansion and the need for sovietizing most of the nations of Europe. I say, if these examples of the dangerous potentialities of government-subsidized propaganda machines are not enough to make Americans stop, look, and listen before we decide to ape Hitler and Stalin by setting up our own government-subsidized propaganda machine, then we ought to have our heads examined.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the purpose of this proposed Office of Peace Information—which is to replace the Office of War Information—is to tell the story of America, our American way of life, our American conception of democratic freedom to the world in the fullest and most unbiased manner. I ask: How can the voice of America best be heard without compromising the integrity of the news, the objectivity of the news, which the voice of America is pledged to protect? I claim the State Department cannot afford to speak the truth after participating in world crimes as it has. It is difficult for me to see how the State Department, for instance, would dare tell all the truth in short-wave broadcasts to Poland explaining its partition which the State Department agreed to; or to Yugoslavia explaining its reign of terror; or to the Baltic states explaining the exiling and interning of large segments of their populations. The task, if it is to be done at all—truthfully and impartially—must be left to the American press. It alone has merited the respect of the American public and it alone should carry on the untrammeled exchange of unbiased news among nations.

Mr. Speaker, there is an Ethiopian hidden in the State Department's proposal that I am anxious to expose. It is in connection with Order No. 24, issued by the Board of War Communications on November 4, 1942. That order provided for the seizure of the international radio broadcasting stations WRUL, WRUS, WRUX, and the use of those short wave world stations for Government propaganda purposes. That order was issued under the authority of Executive Order No. 8964.

These stations are the only privately owned international broadcasting facilities in the United States today that are subject to this seizure order and are now under Government control. The World Wide Broadcasting Foundation has petitioned the State Department for the return of these stations to continue their educational broadcasts. The Foundation contends that since the war is over the purpose for which the Government seized these stations no longer exists. Assistant Secretary of State William B. Benton has taken this petition under advisement, hopefully awaiting favorable congressional action on the Bloom bill which would authorize the State Department to enter the broadcasting field, the newspaper field, and the movie field.

The Boston Herald, Wednesday, December 26, 1945, in commenting on this matter said:

When America entered the war, it appeared necessary in Washington to take over WRUL, along with the commercial short wave radio stations, to insure that the voice of America would speak the authentic words of the Office of War Information. The wisdom of that action is debatable; there was no such governmental "enlistment" of the American press. But that issue is now moot. What should concern us is whether WRUL should continue to speak the official American line. * * * WRUL, or Radio Boston, as it is called, can serve America best in the American way * * *. If the United States is to have a voice of democracy, it ought to be a democratic voice, and not one which echoes primarily what the Government says. WRUL should be returned to the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation without delay.

I echo the sentiments of the Boston Herald, and, therefore, I shall oppose the establishment of this OPI in the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I include in my remarks an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, April 12, 1946:

BOSTON, *Friday, April 12, 1946.*

WRUL'S FREE VOICE

It was in 1942 that the United States War Communications Board preempted the vocal chords of the "last free world voice"—Station WRUL—known the world over as "Radio Boston." The reason given was because of the need of having all short-wave facilities available to the Government before offensive action by American troops began in the European theater. And the station which had done so much, through news broadcasts and inspirational messages, to prepare peoples in the occupied countries to cooperate in that offensive bowed to the seemingly inevitable.

Whatever justification there may have been for such action, there would seem to be none for keeping control of the facilities with VE-day almost a year passed. The main offensive to be waged now is by the forces of enlightenment and education, and WRUL, because of its background, experience, and international status, is ideally equipped to help win this postwar battle in a truly dem-

ocratic way. Its former programs, broadcast in a score of languages, and its nonprofit short-wave world university of the air spanned the globe.

With the coming of war, it spoke hope and encouragement to overrun but "unconquered" peoples throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa. In Norway, the Netherlands, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Madagascar, China, the Philippines, people risked their lives again and again to listen to the newscasts and the Comfort, Bridge of Friendship, and Comradeship in Arms programs. Their governments-in-exile spoke through its transmitters. It, in effect, became their station.

Thus WRUL fought a valiant battle for freedom. It deserves to have its own freedom restored, so that it may once more become a free United Nations voice—not a one-nation outlet subject to propaganda charges.

Gambling With the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of this day contains an editorial which states my position in respect to the so-called draft holiday. Pursuant to the permission given me by the House, I hereby insert this editorial in the RECORD:

LET DOWN BY THE HOUSE

We share with Members of the House reluctance to see compulsory military service continued even a day longer than is necessary. Yet we think that, in voting to suspend selective service inductions for 5 months and to exempt youths of 18 and 19 years from the draft, the House has let the Nation down in a thoughtless and irresponsible way. Someone aptly remarked that these amendments have not killed the bill but merely buried it alive.

Specific arguments for both the major changes written into the bill on Saturday carry a good deal of weight. Even General Eisenhower said the other day that he would prefer to have men beyond their teens for occupation duty. Unseasoned youths of 18 and 19 often lack the discretion and moral stamina that troops occupying a foreign land should have. Why, then, should this group continue to be drafted? One simple answer is that not all troops are assigned to occupation duty. Many are needed in this country to service the troops abroad. More important is the fact that to eliminate youths under 20 would be virtually to cut off the flow of selective-service recruits into the Army, for the older men capable of bearing arms have already been drafted.

Plausible arguments were also made for the amendment suspending all inductions for 5 months. This delay, it is said, will tend to throw full emphasis upon voluntary enlistments. Then if the voluntary system fails to bring in enough men, the President can order a resumption of selective-service inductions. But this is to treat the whole business of maintaining our position in the postwar world as if it were a matter of signing up enough men to lay a sewer or put in a sidewalk. It will carry the impression all over the world that the United States is once more preparing to abandon its world responsibilities at the earliest possible moment.

What we obviously need is a policy of maintaining our reduced military strength on a systematic and routine basis. The Post sincerely hopes that enough volunteers will be found to fill up the occupation forces in both Germany and Japan. Meanwhile, however, the armed forces should not be left to operate on a shoestring. We can exert a strong influence for peace and order in the world only if we carry through without quibbling or hesitation the obligations we have assumed. To withdraw into our shell in the present unsettled state of international affairs would be to leave the world to chaos after a great expenditure of life and irreplaceable resources in the pursuit of liberty, order, and peace. From this broader point of view there can be no question that the House has gambled with the security which has so recently been purchased at so high a price.

In other words, the House indulged in a short-sighted throw-back to localism and domestic politics in dealing with an issue that demands a United Nations viewpoint. It cut a sizable piece of ground from beneath Secretary Byrnes in his struggle to establish an orderly peace system. This tragic aspect of Saturday's performance cannot be reasoned away by petty arguments based upon personal convenience or the preference of Americans for civilian jobs. Nor can the damage that has been done be set right by anything less than a final vote in both Houses for uninterrupted continuation of selective service during the year.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Pan-American Day it is appropriate to look back at our record with our sister countries to the south and to indicate the broad outlines of our policy. On the whole, we have far more to be proud of than ashamed.

In the first place, we should never forget that it was the Monroe Doctrine which prevented the South and Central American states from being conquered by the European nations and reduced to the role of dependent vassals. For this was just what the holy alliance of Russia, Austria, Spain, and France wanted to do. It was because of the Monroe Doctrine, backed up by our potential strength and the friendly help of Great Britain, that the Americas in the nineteenth century did not go the way of Africa and Asia and were not partitioned among the big imperialistic powers. We gave them the protection which allowed them to continue free. After the Civil War we helped to get France to withdraw its support from its puppet, Maximilian, whom it had placed on the throne of Mexico while our energies were absorbed in the conflict of 1861–65. In this way we restored Mexico to its own rule. At the turn of the century, we kept Germany off from Venezuela. By these and other acts, we restrained Europe from taking the aggressive against the weaker republics to our south.

By the Spanish-American War, we gave freedom to Cuba as well as to the Philippines. The diplomats and the press of Europe were cynical about our motives in this war and said that once having entered these countries, we would never leave. It was charged that we ousted the Spaniards not to give freedom to the native peoples but to enthrone ourselves as their rulers. There were indeed some in this country who were tempted to act in this fashion but they were fortunately in the minority. We freed the Cubans as we are now giving independence to the Philippines. This furnished a unique and happy example in the dealings of great countries with smaller nations.

During the troubled years from 1912-30, we resisted temptation and provocation to deal harshly with Mexico and instead allowed the Mexican people to work out their own salvation.

We cannot pretend, however, that our record is perfect. The more one goes into the circumstances under which we took the Panama Canal, the more it looks as though we were collusive partners in the rebellion of 1903. This wrong we later recognized when we paid Colombia the full price for the Canal, to which we had formerly objected. I believe also that the dollar diplomacy which embroiled us in armed interventions in Haiti, San Domingo, and Nicaragua was unfortunate and unjust. It offended peoples not only of these countries but of all Latin America as well, and created distrust and ill will. But happily, the conscience and good sense of the American people rejected these one-sided acts. The theory that the Monroe Doctrine allowed us to do whatever we wished was repudiated. In its place came the principle that it should be a mutual relationship in which all the American countries agreed to protect each other against aggression. In our own dealings with Latin America, the good-neighbor policy replaced the selfish doctrine of dollar diplomacy. We chose to build on good will rather than on force and it is in this spirit that we are acting today.

Not only is our conscience easier because of this better policy but we are reaping some of the fruits of right conduct. In this last war, all of the Latin-American countries save one were emphatically on our side. They have learned not to fear us and realize that we were their protectors against Germany as over a century ago we had protected them from Spain. In all of the countries without exception the great masses of the people are now far more friendly toward us than they were 15 years ago.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks, I include therein a radio interview made by Richard Eaton, noted news analyst and commentator on world affairs, and myself, on Thursday evening, April 11, 1946, over Station WOL, in Washington, D. C.:

Mr. EATON. I understand, Mr. McCORMACK, that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was very fond of you and that you were one of his close personal friends and admirers.

What, in your opinion, were the attributes of character which most strongly attracted you to President Roosevelt?

Mr. McCORMACK. He was a gallant leader. His intellectual strength, constructive imagination, moral courage, and deep religious conviction marked him as the greatest of our war Presidents. He assumed office as Chief Executive of our Nation at a time when despair gripped the hearts of our citizens. The crash of the house of cards built upon the quicksand of over-speculation, the monotonously regular closing of the doors of our banking institutions with resultant loss of the life savings of countless depositors, the bread lines, soup kitchens and apple sellers—all these had cowered and frightened the American citizenry. America needed more than ever in history a leader. Franklin D. Roosevelt, born of high estate but with a warm heart, generous nature, and admirable temperament, was the man of the hour. From the day he donned the mantle of Chief Executive he was the fearless leader of the destiny of America.

Mr. EATON. President Roosevelt won the trust of the American people to an extent never previously granted any man. I speak of his election to the office of Chief Executive for four consecutive terms. To what do you attribute this unprecedented expression of public confidence?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to preface my answer to that question with the observation that Washington and Jefferson never dogmatically opposed a third term for the office of President in the event of national crisis. Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected for a third and a fourth term at a time when America and the world were at the cross roads. The dark clouds of war growing heavier and more ominous aroused the people of this Nation to a realization that President Roosevelt must be retained as our Chief Executive and Commander in Chief. The election of President Roosevelt was an American must.

Answer your question, just as President Roosevelt had termed Al Smith of honored memory "The Happy Warrior," Franklin Roosevelt was the people's warrior. Never since the days of Andrew Jackson has any man championed the cause of the common man with more vigor and devotion. He was a man of dynamic action in the cause of strong social order. He never ceased fighting for the forgotten man.

Mr. EATON. Do you care to comment on his fireside chats?

Mr. McCORMACK. The fireside chats of President Roosevelt endeared him to the Nation. The sense of the unusual in this approach to the most exalted and the humblest made Franklin D. Roosevelt an imagined guest in every home in this country. The simplicity of his diction, the charm of his voice, the sincerity of his hopes, and the beauty of his vision brought him into a closeness with Americans which inspired hope and faith in the hearts of all our citizens.

Mr. EATON. What do you believe were the domestic objectives of President Roosevelt?

Mr. McCORMACK. He answered that question to a visiting Canadian editor at a press conference in 1935. He desired to do what any honest government would do: To try to increase the security and happiness of a larger number of people in all occupations of life and in all parts of the country; to give them more of the good things of life; to give them a greater distribution not only of wealth in the narrow terms but of wealth in the wider terms; to give them places to go in the summertime—recreation; to give them assurance against starvation in old age; to give honest business a chance to go ahead and make a reasonable profit; and to give everyone a chance to earn a decent living.

Mr. EATON. Can you epitomize the earlier days of the administration of President Roosevelt?

Mr. McCORMACK. One might say that after our recovery from the depression in the early thirties, President Roosevelt was famous for his relief program and his reforms. I believe that recovery, relief, and reform were called the three R's of the Roosevelt administration. That would make four R's: recovery, relief, reform, Roosevelt—and the greatest of these was Roosevelt.

Mr. EATON. What do you consider his most famous saying?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that question because so many of his sayings are now historically famous. I would like to point to the statement contained in his first inaugural address, March 4, 1933, as the one which I believe revivified America:

"This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. * * * This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive, and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

That was President Roosevelt's clarion call to America. Americans rallied to his New Deal for the forgotten man. His faith in America and Americans and the faith of America and Americans in President Roosevelt have made us the greatest national power for good in the world of today and tomorrow.

Mr. EATON. What in your opinion, Congressman McCORMACK, was President Roosevelt's attitude toward war?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot overemphasize my answer.

President Roosevelt hated war. In August of 1936 at Chautauqua, N. Y., he stated:

"I have seen war. * * * I have seen blood running from the wounded. * * * I have seen dead in the mud. * * * I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war."

Need any more be said.

Mr. EATON. Was President Roosevelt alert to world events and what did he personally do to keep America out of war?

Mr. McCORMACK. No President was more keenly alert to world developments than was President Roosevelt. When the clouds of war rolled over Europe and Asia in 1937, 1938, and 1939, President Roosevelt never hesitated to throw the full prestige of the United States in the hope of peace. When Japan closed the "open door" in China, and Europe went to war in 1939, he gave all his intellectual power to keep America out of wars and wars away from America. He used every diplomatic means at his command to ward off the cataclysm of World War II. He appealed personally to Hitler and Mussolini to guarantee the peace of Europe for 10 years or a quarter of a century. In return he offered the promised efforts of this Nation in economic conversations to achieve world peace. After recalling our Ambassador to Berlin to express the displeasure of this country at pogroms against the Jews and the use of force as a national policy President Roosevelt appealed repeatedly to the rulers of Europe. He addressed a personal appeal to ask Soviet Russia to modify its demands against Finland. He marshaled the 21 American Republics in the cause of peace.

Mr. EATON. What measures did President Roosevelt take to protect the United States should war be declared?

Mr. McCORMACK. In April 1939 he startled America when leaving for Warm Springs with the remark, "I'll be back in the fall if we don't have war." When Congress met, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull proposed revision of the neutrality laws to eliminate the embargo barring shipment of arms to belligerents. This proposal was pigeonholed, and President Roosevelt complained that his opponents were gambling with the fate of America and humanity. After the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourned the President, cruising off Halifax, learned of the nonaggression pact between Russia and Germany. He rushed back to Washington, was in command of national policies when Germany marched into Poland and Britain declared war on Germany. He reconvened Congress on September 21, 1939, and had approved by Congress, and this in 1939, the lifting of the arms embargo, described proscribed combat areas for American shipping, proclaimed a limited state of national emergency, instituted a Navy Coast Guard, neutrality patrol of coastal waters, lend-lease legislation, increased the size of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, recommissioned World War I destroyers, added personnel to the FBI for counterespionage and antisabotage. He gave Britain overage destroyers, arranged for American military bases in the Bahamas, Bermuda, and other strategic positions, demanded speed, and more speed, in production, requested and obtained the first peacetime military draft.

Tireless, fearless, imaginative, with his only thought the security of America and the safety of Americans, against spirited opposition he carried the burden of the defense of this Nation to successful conclusion.

Mr. EATON. Did President Roosevelt allow war to strike with our defenses inadequate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Emphatically no. We all remember the partisan isolationists and their efforts to thwart preparedness. President Roosevelt proposed lend-lease which organized industry to war-production levels and helped hold the Axis while we prepared. He proposed—and his idea was called fantastic—the 50,000-airplane program which was the basis of the air power which destroyed Germany. He had proposed but was defeated by a small group of reactionaries the fortification of Guam. Whenever anyone says "Remember Pearl Harbor," I could also say "Remember Guam."

Mr. EATON. What about the Jap attack at Pearl Harbor?

Mr. McCORMACK. No American could have prevented the Japanese war. It came because Japan wanted war—not because of anything America did or failed to do. It came while we were in diplomatic conversation with Japan endeavoring to avoid war—and simply because Japan willed war. Any intimation that President Roosevelt allowed war with Japan is neither a casual lie nor careless distortion of the facts. It is a deliberate fabrication to deceive the American public for ulterior purposes.

Mr. EATON. What did President Roosevelt envision for America?

Mr. McCORMACK. President Roosevelt visioned an America where factory workers are not discarded when they reach their prime, where there is no endless chain of poverty from generation to generation, where impoverished farmers do not become homeless wanderers, where monopoly does not make youth a beggar for his job. He foresaw an America whose rivers and valleys and natural resources are protected as the heritage

of the American people. He was ever working for the ideal that small business would have the right to grow and prosper. He saw the great cultural and educational opportunities of this Nation. He saw in the America of tomorrow the wheels of trade and industry continuing to turn without stifling by the cruel hand of monopoly, with legitimate profits the fair reward of legitimate business. He saw peace in the ranks of labor—freedom from servitude through unions undominated by outside force or inside dictator. He visioned management-labor reconciliation through which the dignity and security of the humblest citizen would be achieved. He saw an America devoted to peace, unified by tolerance and religious faith, confident of her strength because her citizens were strong in body and mind and heart, secure and unafraid.

That was the America for which President Roosevelt fought. That America was the country he loved so well and for which he died.

Mr. EATON. Would you care to prophesy the place President Roosevelt will occupy in history?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Franklin Delano Roosevelt belongs to the ages. He established for America a sound social order adequate for our economic greatness. Under his leadership America grew in strength. His life illumined the way. He takes his place with Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Wilson. The America of today follows in his footsteps, confident of every tomorrow.

Use of Committee Subpena as Punitive Measure Is Abuse of Delegated Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago I voted, with misgivings, to support the recommendation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that the chairman of the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee be cited for contempt as a result of his refusal to obey a subpena issued by the House committee directing him to produce the books and records of his organization.

I did so because I felt that the subpena power of Congress, when legally exercised, should be obeyed, and that no person has a right to defy the orderly processes of our Government. I did so, despite the fact that I had voted against the creation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and that I entertained grave doubt whether a majority of the members of that committee always exercised the powers delegated to them by Congress in a fair and unprejudiced manner. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I voted, together with an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House, to quash citations for contempt which the Committee on Un-American Activities had recommended to be issued against all of the members of the board of directors of the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

The citation for contempt voted by the House of Representatives against the chairman of the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was a sufficient action, Mr. Speaker, to enable the courts to determine whether the authority of Congress had been illegally defied.

But today, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities, by divided vote, again recommended that citations for contempt be issued against the 17 members of the board of directors of the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee whom the House of Representatives had previously refused to cite. A distinguished member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, took the floor and stated that he was opposed to the committee's recommendation and that in his opinion the members of the board of directors of the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee were innocent of the charge of contempt.

Mr. Speaker, I think these facts clearly indicate that the committee, by divided vote, is attempting to use the subpena power delegated to it by the House of Representatives for punitive purposes. In my opinion the House never intended that its subpena power should be used in such a manner. The committee was created for the purpose of investigating un-American and subversive activities in this country and of recommending legislation which would prevent the existence of any such activities. No convincing evidence that the individuals named in these contempt proceedings are guilty of such activities has been presented to the House. Indeed, members of the committee have today stated that much of the testimony concerning these individuals was of such a secret nature that it could not be disclosed even to the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is no law of the suspect in America. No evidence has been presented to the House to prove that these 17 individuals can reasonably be presumed to be guilty of subversive conduct. Therefore, I have cast my vote against this resolution.

Bidding for Star Mail Routes Is Antiquated System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in my district we have a great many star mail routes because of the fact that there are areas that are sparsely populated. I have personally talked to several of the men who hold star-route contracts under our present old-fashioned star-route bidding system. I find that they have had to compete against competition to such an extent that in many cases they are actually operating their route at a loss.

In one instance, the holder of a star-route contract has had to deliver mail by water, by airplane, by skis, and by walking on snowshoes over high snow drifts. He has been compelled to hire an assistant and pay for his wage out of his own salary. To my knowledge, this is the only branch of our Government that expects its employees to work for little or nothing and often at a financial loss.

I feel very strongly that H. R. 2000 and S. 635 should be made into law at the earliest possible date. This opinion is shared by many.

Following is a letter addressed to the Journal-Gazette, of Fort Wayne, Ind., signed by Mr. Melvin R. Schwartz, vice president of the Indiana Star Route Organization, which sets forth many of the arguments against the present antiquated system of star-route mail operation:

FACTS CONCERNING STAR-ROUTE SERVICE

EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL-GAZETTE:

The star-route service was installed in 1845 for a specific purpose and conditions of that time—transportation of mail in locked pouches between post offices—primarily and largely by stage coach which was then the principal means of transportation.

The star-route service is still one of the most important units of the postal service.

Needless to say it is a long way from the conditions of 1845 to the transportation conditions of 1945. However, that law has never been changed except for a couple of minor amendments in 1940 which did not alter the principle or make any change in the policy or system in use for the last 100 years. One of these changes was the 90-day clause which gave the contractor 90 days in which to give up his route or rebid it in case the pay was inadequate. Now the Department controller comes along and says if there isn't a competent new contractor that the old contractor is responsible until the new contractor is awarded the contract. Since when can a department official go over Congress and Senate and make his own laws? This has happened right here in Indiana where the old contractor was held responsible and pay deducted from his pay to give to the new contractor after the 90-day period.

In the 100 years since 1845 the entire postal service has changed. Most of today's postal service has been created since that time and none of it on 1845 principle. Successive changes have been made in modernizing the various branches and units in keeping them up with changing times and conditions. The single exception has been the failure of inclusion of the star-route service.

There has been worked out a principle and policy of permanency and security of employment with fair pay for postal work which for many years Department officials have set up as an absolute necessity, essential in postal work, which they assign postal efficiency and all other postal units and have been kept abreast of the times and changed conditions by revision changes and amendments to existing laws governing them.

The result of maintaining the star-route unit under an obsolete and outmoded system is thousands of bankrupt carriers, thousands of failures of contractors and mail service, inefficiency, chaos beyond belief, excessive administrative costs, surplus officials, racketeering, sale of postal routes, in short a bewildering maze of conditions, that are nothing short of a national disgrace.

For the last 10 years officials have gone to extreme ends to defend and perpetuate this system. The record will support this statement.

Instead of any changes in the laws as for other units, Department officials have put into effect their own regulations.

After 50 years the stagecoach had disappeared and the railroad era had taken its place. Then rural delivery was established. At that time (in 1901) the Department announced a "new regulation" requiring star routes to perform partial delivery service and followed that in 1918 with what the Department termed "a new feature" which was added full rural delivery service to any star

route which the Department wanted to so designate. Thus was born the operation of star routes as rural service under the stagecoach law.

There is no law for that procedure. There is no law for two kinds of contracts under star-route service, but hundreds of such contracts are made annually. Department records show 67½ percent of total star routes now perform full or partial rural service.

Without question, it was never the intent of Congress that the law enacted for the stagecoach era of 100 years ago should have been carried into today's modern postal service under conditions which have brought bankruptcy and ruin to thousands of contractors, resulted in excessive administrative costs and losses, and loaded an important unit of the postal service with chaos and confusion and failures of mail service, all by a system of exploitation which has been built up through the years because the system has made it possible by predicating the operation upon a bond under which bids are more important than service. If Congress and Senate would pass the bills H. R. 2000 and S. 636 which are up before them now it would eliminate all this deplorable situation. These bills put the star-route carriers on an equal basis with the rural carriers, which is necessary to make the star-route service a successful unit in the postal service. The star-route carriers are supposed to get their orders from the Second Assistant Postmaster General, but every postmaster down the line gives orders and expects them to be carried out, and if the star-route carriers don't carry them out they are reported to the Department. Now, if they want these carriers to take these orders why don't they make them an employee of the Postal Department instead of a contractor?

Just what is behind the reason officials have sought to continue this system and conditions?

MELVIN R. SCHWARTZ,
Vice President of the Indiana Star Route Organization.

Mr. Schwartz' article in the Public Letters Column evidently inspired the editor of the Journal-Gazette of Fort Wayne, Ind., to write the following editorial in support of Mr. Schwartz' views:

STAR-ROUTE CARRIERS DESERVE A BREAK

Last Sunday the Journal-Gazette published a letter by Melvin R. Schwartz, vice president of the Indiana Star Route Organization, calling attention to the obsolete and outmoded system under which the star-route mail service is operated.

The service was installed in 1845 for the specific purpose of the transportation of mail in locked pouches between post offices. The stage coach was then the principal means of transportation. The law which was passed 100 years ago has never been changed except for two minor amendments in 1940, neither of which, Mr. Schwartz contends, altered the principle or policy in use for a century.

The Post Office Department, however, in 1901 announced a new regulation requiring star routes to perform partial rural delivery service. In 1918 the Department added full rural delivery service to any star route which it wished to perform that service, so that now 67½ percent of the star routes perform full or partial rural delivery service.

The star routes are let by contracts based on bids received, and those who are familiar with the system claim that the conditions under which it is operated have brought bankruptcy and ruin to thousands of contractors, resulted in excessive administrative costs, and caused much confusion in the mail service.

Two bills, designated as H. R. 2000 and S. 635, are now pending before Congress which, if passed, would clear up the difficulties and bring the star-route service up to date. Since the star-route contractors have been the forgotten men for so long, it is doubtful whether the bills will pass.

Congress should get busy and push these bills to passage into law and correct a condition which is 100 years old. The star-route carriers would then be on the same basis as regular rural carriers.

Dairy Price Controls and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent three counties in New York State, in each of which counties is a highly developed dairy industry. The three counties which comprise my district are Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegany. The fine dairy herds in these counties have made a great contribution to the welfare and prosperity of the communities of western New York. What I may say with reference to the dairy industry in the district which I represent will hold true so far as other dairy sections of the country are involved, in the distress caused by the political system of subsidies, and by OPA regulations. What the dairymen want, and what all liberty-loving Americans should have, is a free market. A free market is one of the freedoms that should be a part of any honest reconversion program.

Without a free market there will be no relief from the present program of ruin which is day by day destroying one of the basic farm industries of the United States. To restrict production is to feed the fire of inflation and starve the consumers. Under the present totalitarian political program of restricting production, tested herds of dairy cattle have already suffered perilous depletion as a result of OPA's feed program and price regulations. If OPA is continued, it will mean the destruction of milk-producing cattle for beef if feed enough can be obtained to fatten them. Such a course of procedure will be a direct blow at the economy of the country as a whole; moreover, it is an inhuman program that, if continued, will affect disastrously hundreds of thousands of babies dependent upon milk for nourishment, health, and life. There will be no escape from the inflation of milk prices until a free market is established by the removal of subsidies and OPA control. I am opposed to H. R. 6042.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a letter which expresses the needs of 1,500,000 persons—all members of farm families:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1946.

To All Members of the House of Representatives:

Re H. R. 6042, extension of price controls and subsidies.

I am writing you in behalf of the more than 1,500,000 persons, all members of the farm families comprising our federated organizations. Their income in greater part depends upon the success or failure of our day-to-day activities in their behalf. In addition to these, there are thousands of hired farm workers and salaried workers who are employed by our member organizations in the field and in plants, whose income can only be paid by the returns on dairy products handled by us.

We object to the passage by the House of H. R. 6042, a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts of 1942, in the form reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

We object to the continuation of the combined price-control and subsidy system envisaged by the reported bill. We fear that its enactment will fasten upon dairy farmers for many years to come both controlled price ceilings and subsidies, in lieu of fair prices. Certainly the Brown formula embodied in the committee bill gives us no relief nor hope of relief. Also the directive, known as the Monroney amendment to the committee bill—which reduces authorized subsidies by one-fourth but provides for no raises in price ceilings except at the whim of some government officials—is a cruel and callous answer to dairy farmers' cry for relief and freedom.

Our people seek termination of dairy price controls, subsidies, and the regulations flowing out of this system not later than June 30 of this year. They have seen the hand of incompetence in official position snarl the price structure of milk and its products. Today the people of this Nation are experiencing the greatest shortage of butter in our history. Price relationships of dairy products in the various regions and among the various products are so unbalanced that no official order or series of orders issued from Washington can relieve the situation. Nothing can now allay the steady trend toward lessened production of milk and cream on the farms except an order to abandon control. Only the abolition of the twin evils of control and subsidies can bring a return to normality.

Our people are desperately worried over the effect upon them of Mr. Bowles' bulge-the-line policy. Wage renegotiations on some dairy farms for hired labor subsequent to this announced policy already have increased costs alarmingly. Dairy herds continue to disappear and thousands of dairy farmers today are planning to continue their active production of milk only through the present flush season and then beef their cows in late summer for such prices as the butcher will give.

If the House in its judgment cannot give us the relief we beg by June 30, the next best congressional action would be adoption of an amendment which was offered in committee by Mr. JESSE WOLCOTT of Michigan. This amendment would require a removal of not less than one-fourth of existing subsidies within every 45-day period until subsidies have disappeared. It would also provide for compensatory increases of price ceilings in lieu of removed subsidies and for increases in cost of production since January 1, 1941. In the case of milk and its products it would provide that these increased costs shall be calculated by regions and areas. The Wolcott amendment applies to all agricultural commodities and products manufactured from them.

At this time I am calling your attention to the fact that the longer the subsidy price-control system continues the harder it will be to get rid of it. Also in a day of uncertainty those who receives subsidies, while hating them, will become increasingly fearful of the results following their removal. Thus this vicious policy each year will have a greater chance to become incorporated into our economic structure, with accompanying increases of the public debt and the hazards of Government financing.

Finally, the bill is unrealistic in that it seeks to continue the pretense of price control when everybody knows that its administration has deteriorated and is rapidly breaking down.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary.

Jeopardizing the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, the short time assigned to debate upon the bill to increase the pay of men in the armed forces deprived many of us of the opportunity of expressing our position in respect to this measure upon the floor of the House. I hereby exercise the privilege granted Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD, in relation to this proposal for the purpose of stating that I deemed this bill unwise and voted against the same for the following reasons: First, the bill increases the annual burden imposed upon the true forgotten man, the American taxpayer, by many hundreds of millions of dollars; second, the bill works extreme injustice to those who bore the hazards of battle while the "shooting war" was on by paying substantially larger sums for peacetime service than were paid for wartime service; and third, the bill will eventually work toward the destruction of the strength of the armed forces of the Nation.

This last observation is true because someday we shall have a Congress which does not believe that all national problems must be solved by extracting moneys from the Federal Treasury. When this comes to pass, Congress will practice economy by reducing the personnel and equipment of the armed forces, not by decreasing the pay of men in the armed forces. History shows that salaries and wages established by Congress are never reduced. It, therefore, follows that if this bill becomes law, its ultimate effect will be the reverse of that promised by its sponsors. It will insure that our armed forces will be small and inadequate.

The passage of this bill by the House is an inevitable consequence of the error made by a majority of the House in emasculating the measure to extend the Selective Service Act.

It is difficult to assign a psychological explanation for the strange tendency of the American people to forsake their reasons and to follow their emotions when questions involving the providing of manpower for the Army and Navy arise. One of the beloved teachers at the University of North Carolina, Collier Cobb, professor of geology, was wont to remark that wise men learned by the experience of others, that fools learned by their own experience and that the majority of us learned by neither the experience of others nor by our own experience. Evidently, three wars in less than 50 years have been insufficient to give us the wisdom possessed even by fools. We still pay no heed to Oliver Cromwell's injunction "to trust in the Lord and keep your powder dry."

It is passing strange how Americans ignore the truth of history that mankind spends a large part of his treasure and blood and time in the waging of war. It is also passing strange how easily we delude ourselves into believing that we are to be blessed beyond all past generations and are to enjoy forever the blessings of peace. We have established the United Nations for the purpose of preserving peace for the world. I believe in doing everything to uphold the hands of the United Nations Organization. I hope with all of my heart that the United Nations Organization will be able to preserve the peace of the world, but I frankly admit that my faith that it will be able to do so is exceedingly weak. Evil has not yet forsaken the hearts of men. We are repeating today the folly which we pursued after the First World War when we sank a fine Navy with our fountain pens and permitted our Army and Navy to become too weak to protect us against foreign aggression.

The privileges of citizenship carry with them corresponding duties. Among these duties are those of paying taxes and of serving in the armed forces in times of national emergency. To my mind, it would be just as logical to depend solely upon the contributions of voluntary taxpayers for the support of the Government as it is to depend solely upon the service of volunteers for our national defense in times of national emergency.

The Military Affairs Committee of the House presented to the House a forthright bill extending the Selective Service Act until February 15, 1947. A majority of the House wrote into this bill amendments which absolutely destroyed the value of the bill. The majority of the House did this in the belief that sufficient volunteers would be forthcoming. I think that the majority of the House acted unwisely because their object would have been reached under the original bill without jeopardizing the national defense and without indicating to the world a tendency to refuse the responsibility now resting upon us as the greatest nation on earth. This is true because the original bill provided in substance that no person should be drafted during any month when sufficient volunteers were obtained to fill such month's quota.

I opposed and voted against the Vinson amendment suspending the operation of the Selective Service Act from May 15, 1946, until October 15, 1946, and transferring from Congress to the President the responsibility of deciding whether inductions under the act should be resumed after October 15, 1946, because I considered that such amendment constituted an abdication of congressional functions and because I believed that such amendment jeopardized the national security in one of the most crucial periods of our national history.

I also opposed and voted against the May amendment increasing the age limits of those subjects to the Selective Service Act from 18 to 20 years because I realized that this amendment reduced to a mere handful the groups to whom the act would apply. This is so because practically all physically and mentally competent boys, who have heretofore become 18 years of age, have already entered the armed forces. There will be few men of the age of 20 years in the United States available for induction into the armed forces between October 15, 1946, and February 15, 1947, when the extension of the act expires, who are not now in the armed forces or who have not heretofore been discharged therefrom after arduous service therein. It follows that one is not far from the truth in asserting that, as a practical matter, a majority of the House has approved a draft law under which nobody can be drafted.

It is bad enough to exempt from liability to military and naval service all of those able-bodied boys in civil life under 20 years of age on February 15, 1947, and to retain in the Army and Navy the hundreds of thousands of those reaching 18 years of age before May 15, 1946. It is far worse to jeopardize the national security under the circumstances now confronting us.

After my votes against the Vinson and May amendments proved ineffectual, I voted to recommit the emasculated Selective Service Act to the House Military Affairs Committee in the hope that the committee might bring forth a new bill. This vote was also ineffectual. I then voted to send the emasculated bill to the Senate in the hope that such body would amend the measure by restoring the provisions removed therefrom by the House amendments.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the Crawford amendment to H. R. 6042, but I want it distinctly understood that I am opposed to H. R. 6042 known as the OPA extension bill. It is a vicious piece of legislation and in operation and administration it has followed gestapo methods inimical to the welfare and security of our citizens. It has been one of several New Deal instrumentalities for tyrannizing our free people, preventing reconversion, increasing inflation, and fostering black markets.

Under leave to extend and with permission granted to include telegrams, I here insert them:

WELLSVILLE, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL REED,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

As president of Allegany County Auto Dealers Association, representing 29 dealers, we wish to go on record and solicit your support for Crawford amendment adopted by House Banking and Currency Committee which

prohibits OPA from changing dealer trade discounts long established over many years. This amendment will mean great help for old and new dealers to create more jobs and give better service to the motor public.

GLEN L. SMITH,
President, Allegany County Auto Dealers Association.

FRANKLINVILLE, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please vote for Crawford amendment; maintaining traditional discount will help starved dealers remain in business, encourage replacement dealers get started, create employment, maintain higher standards of service to motoring public.

WATKINS & SONS.

DUNKIRK, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your approval Crawford amendment; will enable us to keep going, give employment to more men, and better service to public.

DAMON DUDLEY MOTORS, INC.

OLEAN, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL REED,
Congressional Office,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your best endeavors to pass the Crawford amendment to OPA extension bill H. R. 6042. This amendment will help dealers to recover from the past years of no business; will permit expansion with increased employment.

MAZZA MOTORS.

GOWANDA, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Congressman DANIEL REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand OPA extension bill, H. R. 6042, comes up for action today. It should be killed in full; if not that, at least very much limited in scope and paragraph q, section 2, Crawford amendment should be kept in new bill at all costs. Please do your part.

FOX MOTOR SALES AND SERVICE.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Passage of bill H. R. 6042 most essential to allow dealers to recuperate from lack of new cars for the past 4½ years and to give them enough profit to get started and create more jobs for veterans.

TELSHOW SCHULTZ PONTIAC CO., INC.

WESTFIELD, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. Representative DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

OPA extension bill H. R. 6042 will be on House floor, Monday, April 15. Request you attend and give careful attention. This bill will give new and old dealers a fresh start, create more jobs, and give better service to the Nation.

PORTAGE GARAGE.
JOSEPH LACHIUSA.

OLEAN, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Considering security of motor dealers business and his employees, I urge you to support the Crawford amendment. Living costs of workers who sell and service motortrucks deserve just as much consideration as is shown the workers who build them.

FREEMAN EQUIPMENT CO., INC.,
VICTOR D. FREEBORN,
President.

WESTFIELD, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Do all possible to support Crawford amendment and let the auto dealers have a chance.

MEADS FARM STORE.

SHERMAN, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate support of Crawford amendment. Having had no new cars for 4 years, we feel that a cut in discount with low rate of deliveries is grossly unfair.

W. L. NUTTALL & SONS,
Ford Dealers.
GLENN NEWHOUSE,
Chrysler-Plymouth Dealer.

DUNKIRK, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Congressman DAN REED,
Member of House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

It is vital to automobile dealers that the Crawford amendment be passed. In all sense of justice we are hoping sincerely for your vote in this matter.

With kindest thanks.

BEATTY SELLERS NASH DEALERS.

DUNKIRK, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Congressman DAN REED,
Member of House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

It is vital to automobile dealers that the Crawford amendment be passed. In all sense of justice we are hoping sincerely for your vote in this matter.

With kindest thanks.

WILLIS CAR SALES.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We request that you support the amendment to bill No. 6042 which prohibits OPA from changing established trade discounts.

HOLMLUND NELSON MOTORS,
CARL O. NELSON, *Manager.*

WESTFIELD, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to do everything possible to support the Crawford amendment. Should dealers' discount get further cut every legitimate dealer will be forced to sell through black market in order to make any profit. This one-man government must be stopped.

F. B. JONES CHEVROLET.

SILVERCREEK, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
DAN REED,
Congressman:

For more jobs and better service to public back the Crawford amendment.

LEWORTHY MOTOR CO.,
N. L. HOFFOWER.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,

If we can't get rid of OPA your support in voting for the Crawford amendment would be appreciated.

PARKER MOTOR SALES INC.,
L. L. PUTNEY, *President.*

FREDONIA, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your approval of the Crawford amendment as it would help to keep our head above water and allows us to expand and offer more employment.

DUDLEY MOTORS.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly request that you support the Crawford amendment to OPA extension bill H. R. 6042 which prohibits OPA from changing established trade discount or handling charges.

NEW EAGLE MOTORS INC.

OLEAN, N. Y., *April 14, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please support the Crawford amendment to OPA extension bill H. R. 6042. This is urgently needed by automobile dealers to enable them to get started in business again.

HASELOFF MOTORS.

PORTVILLE, N. Y., *April 13, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Request you be present on vote on H. R. 6042, section 2, paragraph (q) on Crawford amendment to hold the line. Kindly advise, collect, as to results.

Yours truly,

KAYES MOTOR SALES,
LEO J. KAYES.

GOWANDA, N. Y., *April 14, 1946.*
DANIEL A. REED,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

The OPA extension bill No. H. R. 6042 coming up for action Monday. Please try to understand that our income as auto dealers stopped December 1941. With your help to eliminate H. R. 6042 relating to this injustice H. R. 6042 and your cooperation continue paragraph Q, section 2, known as Crawford amendment would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MAIN STREET SERVICE STATION,
W. F. LEY.

GOWANDA, N. Y., *April 13, 1946.*
Congressman DANIEL A. REED,
The Capitol:

Understand OPA extension bill, H. R. 6042, comes up for action Monday. Important that bill is killed. If not, that it be limited to paragraph Q, section 2, known as Crawford amendment, should be kept in new bill at all costs. It will give us back our margin so that we can again operate as we did before to the interest of our community and the public. Also hire more veterans to do the service job necessary and pay our present employees in proportion to the times.

WITT-ANDERSON MOTOR CO.
CARL P. WITT.
WALTER C. WITT.
DANIEL B. ANDERSON.
M. L. STROUSE.

OLEAN, N. Y., *April 13, 1946.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives:

Hope you will vote for Crawford amendment, thus helping reestablish old and new dealers, create new jobs, and assist during a period of shortage new cars.

VINCENT WILDAY, INC.

FREDONIA, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*
DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building:

Please support amendment to preserve old discounts for auto dealers. Why should we take a cut in order to give auto workers a raise? We employ labor, but will not employ as much if our income is reduced.

ROBERT B. CARR.

GOWANDA, N. Y., *April 13, 1946.*
Congressman DANIEL A. REED,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Understand OPA extension bill, H. R. 6042, comes up for action Monday. Feel that it should be killed in full. If not that at least very much limited in scope. Paragraph Q, section 2, known as corporate abendment should be kept in new bill at all costs. It will permit us to regain our margin so that we can again properly function as we should to the best interests of our community and the public. Hire more veterans to adequately do the service job necessary and pay our present personnel in proportion to the times.

Superior Motors, Inc., J. S. Woodward, E. W. Holland, G. L. Dawley, E. J. Leiker, George Schutz, Gordon Barthel, Helen Szymanski, Merl Esterly, Howard Simmons, Raymond Bradford, Kenneth Edwards, Herbert Glair.

GOWANDA, N. Y., *April 13, 1946.*
Congressman DANIEL A. REED,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Understand OPA extension bill, H. R. 6042, comes up for action Monday. Feel that it should be killed in full. If not that at least very much limited in scope and paragraph Q, section 2, known as Crawford amendment, should be kept in new bill at all costs. It will permit us to regain our margin so that we can again properly function as we should to the best interests of our community and the public. Also hire more veterans to adequately do the service job necesary and pay our present personnel in proportion to the times.

Gowanda Motors Co., Daniel Draudt, Stuart Spittler, Raymond Saunders, Howard Strohauer, Maxson Gibbs, George Huber, Peter Rosen, Marjorie Saunders.

American Legion Commander Reverses Stand on Wyatt Housing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, the Washington Post carried an article entitled, "Stelle Puts Legion's Weight Behind Wyatt Housing Plan." The article went on to state:

Not only did Commander Stelle come out with a declaration that the Legion would fight alongside Wyatt against what the President termed the "real estate lobby," but he also announced that he would stump 20 New England and Southern States on behalf of the housing crusade.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been members of the American Legion for many years and who are acquainted with the machinery and policies of that great organization were somewhat surprised by this alleged statement on the part of Commander Stelle.

At no time, so far as we could learn, had the Legion executive committee or the Legion in convention assembled ever endorsed the Wyatt housing program.

On March 27, 1946, I addressed the following telegram to the national commander at Indianapolis:

Washington papers yesterday stated: "Commander John Stelle and the national legislative committee came out unqualifiedly in support of the full Patman housing bill, including ceiling provisions." By what authority are you acting in this matter?

On the same day I addressed one to Mr. William Doyle, national legislative chairman, which is as follows:

Press release yesterday states: "Commander John Stelle and the national legislative committee came out unqualifiedly in support of the full Patman housing bill, including ceiling provisions." Please verify if your committee has taken such action and, if so, by what authority.

I have had no response from Commander Stelle or Mr. Doyle.

A few days ago, however, my attention was called to the following release by the national public relations division of the American Legion at Indianapolis, Ind. This release was forwarded to all State publicity men, and I herewith quote said release:

[From national public relations division, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind.]

CORRECTION

EDITORS: On page 2 of this week's Legion News in a Nutshell, mailed to you from Indianapolis, March 28, 1946, there appeared the following two-line item:

"National Commander Stelle has launched a 20-State speaking campaign in a fight to restore premium-payment and price-ceiling provisions to the Patman housing bill."

Please kill this item.

It was sent out through an oversight after the original story in which the digest item was based had been found incorrect.

NATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS DIVISION,
THE AMERICAN LEGION.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Congress who has served his country in time of war wants adequate housing for those men who have served in World War II. It is my personal opinion, however, that the Wyatt program will not provide this housing. The private building industry in this country is qualified and competent to build homes for these men if government will give it an opportunity to move forward. Restrictive governmental action and governmental subsidies are no solution for this problem.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, and I call to the attention of the Members of this House a statement appearing in the Washington News in an article by Jim Lucas on the authority of the national commander of the American Legion to endorse the Wyatt housing bill. In a telephone conversation with Commander John Stelle on yesterday, Mr. Lucas quotes Commander Stelle as saying:

I am, however, without authority to endorse a subsidy for housing. Neither the American Legion convention nor the executive committee has given me authority to endorse a housing subsidy. I will present the entire question to the executive committee which meets in Indianapolis the first week in June. I want authority to do so before going on record.

Mr. Stelle also explained that his alleged tour of New England and Southern States to whip up sentiment for the Wyatt housing plan was in error. His regular itinerary would take him through New England and the Southern States and there is no relationship between that and the housing plan, according to Mr. Lucas.

Apparently the publicity division of the American Legion fumbled this matter very badly, all of which has been a reflection upon the national commander. This is not a healthy situation from the standpoint of the average American Legionnaire.

Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230 are companion bills introduced in the House on February 16, 1945, and, as stated in the title, seek to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at the age of 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. It is the purpose of this legislation to substitute the relief provided in it for that now provided by the Social Security Act. It is the purpose of the legislation not only to provide retirement benefits to citizens of the United States 60 years of age and over, on a Nation-wide program, but also to provide consumer power to a class of our citizens heretofore neglected, which will equalize consumption and production in the United States.

This legislation differs from the program now being carried out by the Social Security Board in that the coverage is extended to include all citizens coming within the age group who seek to avail themselves of its provisions and who are not engaged in any occupation for profit. It differs also from the social-security program in that it is on a pay-as-you-go basis. The tax levied is expended each month less administrative expenses, pro rata among all annuitants under it. Unlike the social-security law, it does not pile up a huge reserve fund to care for future maturing obligations.

In section 201 of the bill it is provided as follows: "In addition to all other excises, duties, or taxes there shall be levied, collected, and paid a tax of 3 percent of the gross income of all persons or companies derived from any and all sources, except in personal incomes there shall be an exemption up to $100 per month."

The supporters of this legislation feel that it is sound to levy an adequate tax to take care of the payments which will be made. We realize that it is difficult to determine in advance the amount of funds which will be required, and while we are not wedded to the

tax formula in the bill we do feel that a definite levy should be provided, of sufficient size to provide an adequate monthly annuity for the elderly citizens who will qualify, to maintain them in decency and health in their declining years. In drafting the legislation we have endeavored to eliminate, as far as possible, restrictions which would complicate its enforcement and administration, and to that end we have provided that all persons coming within the qualifications set forth in the bills are eligible to receive the annuity provided and without a means test.

The bills provide that the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and titles I and II of the Social Security Act, and all other acts or parts of acts in conflict with this legislation be repealed.

It is common knowledge that this group of our citizens, namely, the old people 60 years of age and over, is as a group not adequately provided for in accordance with the standards of living in the United States. Many of them have been without the necessities of life even in our periods of great prosperity. The various types of assistance rendered by the Federal Government and the several States, by way of pensions, annuities, care in old people's homes, and other forms of relief are woefully inadequate. President Truman issued a statement on the tenth anniversary of the Social Security Act, and, among other things, said, "We still have a long way to go before we can truthfully say that our social-security system furnishes the people of this country adequate protection. Therefore, we should lose no time in making our Social Security Act a more perfect instrument for the maintenance of economic security throughout this country. * * * Social security worthy of the name is not a dole or a device for giving everybody something for nothing. True social security must consist of rights which are earned rights—guaranteed by the law of the land. Only that kind of social security is worthy of the men and women who have fought * * * to preserve the heritage and the future of America."

The Social Security Board, in its annual report for 1945, recommends that the coverage of old age and survivors insurance be extended to include all gainful workers, including agricultural and domestic employees, public employees, and employees of nonprofit organizations, and self-employed persons, including farmers; that credit to servicemen for their period of service in the armed forces be recognized; that the reduction of the qualifying age for all women beneficiaries be reduced to 60 years; that the benefits, particularly for low-paid workers, be increased; and that benefits during periods of extended or permanent disability be provided similar to benefits for old-age retirement. This is a recognition by the Social Security Board that the present law is inadequate; that its coverage is too restricted; and that the coverage should be extended, either now or eventually, to cover all groups. Dr. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, testified before this committee in November 1944 that there were 39,900,000 of our citizens under full coverage of the Social Security Act and 69,900,000 who had partial or full coverage. If the act is extended to include the additional groups now recommended by the Social Security Board, it is obvious that the major portion of those employed in the United States will come under its provisions. It is logical, therefore, that the act should be extended as provided in H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, to cover all citizens within the age group for old-age annuities who are unemployed and who comply with the provisions of these bills. The funds raised for meeting the commitments under the Social Security Act are provided by the Federal Government through direct taxation and by the employers and employees who come within its provisions. The funds raised in this manner are a direct charge upon industry and production, and therefore must be reflected in the cost of the products produced. These products are purchased by the American people, and therefore, in the end, the American public pays for the benefits thus bestowed on special groups of our citizens. The groups now excluded, therefore, are required to contribute but do not participate in the fund raised. It is intended by the legislation we are proposing to obviate this injustice and to provide a system where all citizens will contribute in accordance with their income and all will be eligible to participate in the benefits upon reaching the age of 60 years. Under the provisions of these bills the funds raised would be paid out monthly to the annuitants and there would be no large fund taken from the channels of trade and frozen into a reserve fund to be drawn upon 50 or 75 years from now, as provided under the present Social Security Act.

Some $6,679,000,000 have been accumulated under the Social Security Act by reason of the collection of funds in excess of the amount needed for current obligations. As a matter of fact, these funds have all been expended by the Federal Government to carry on its governmental activities, and when the funds are needed to meet commitments under the act, 50 years from now, it will be necessary for the Federal Government to again levy taxes against our citizens or sell bonds in order to meet these obligations. Such a procedure is an inducement to deficit spending and is a practice that should be frowned upon. If the time comes when the Federal debt is retired, we would not be able to maintain such a reserve fund without going into the open market and buying the securities of private enterprise, which would, in effect, put the Federal Government into private business, and which procedure is foreign to our American system of free enterprise.

At the hearings before this committee in 1944, to which I have referred, Mr. Altmeyer stated that under this insurance system of the Social Security Act, we had taken in to that date about $5,750,000,000; that it would be about six billion on January 1, 1945; and that we will pay out at the rate of a little better than two hundred million a year, which was about one-fifth of the income. In other words, $4 of every $5 collected was put into the so-called reserve fund, which, in reality, was spent by the Federal Government not for the purposes for which it was intended but for general obligations of the Government. This whole procedure, which is unsound, would be obviated by the enactment of the bills under consideration, which would raise the funds needed to finance the social-security program for old-age annuities and which sum would be expended monthly as raised, thereby feeding back into the channels of trade the taxes raised instead of attempting to pile them up in a huge reserve fund to be available 50 or 75 years hence.

The 1945 report of the Social Security Board, in discussing a comprehensive program of public assistance for citizens irrespective of the reason for need or place of residence, said such a program should be designed "to remove the great disparities which now exist in the treatment of various classes of needy persons and in the treatment of persons who are in like circumstances but live in different parts of the country. It would also be designed to remove serious present inequities in the relative burdens borne by States and localities in financing public assistance" (p. 6).

This statement of the Board recognizes the principle for which we are contending in this legislation. namely, that old age annuities is a Federal problem which spreads over State boundaries and should be set up on a Nation-wide plan and should ambrace all citizens coming within the age limit and entitled to annuities. It is further stated in this report, on pages 1 and 2, "A program of social security can, however, aid to an appreciable extent in attaining this broader objective, provided its scope and coverage are broad and its benefit provisions are reasonably adequate. Benefit and assistance payments, taken by themselves, increase the purchasing power of beneficiaries. They contribute thus, to a minimum level of demand for the output of farms, factories, and mines. These payments, moreover, have an economic effect on consumer demand disproportionate to their size. They are made largely to individuals and families whose earnings have been curtailed or stopped. They provide these recipients with the means to buy food, clothing and other goods and services they otherwise might not obtain. Thus they are soon reflected in the markets and the income stream of the Nation."

Under the provisions of these proposed bills all of our people would contribute in proportion to their income in providing the funds to meet these monthly payments, and every citizen, on attaining the age of 60 years and not gainfully employed, would be entitled to share on equality with every other citizen in like circumstances in the fund. Furthermore, it would replace many elderly citizens with younger men in the industrial and commercial work of our country and thereby give additional jobs to those on the unemployed rolls.

Before our entry into the war, it was estimated that of the persons 60 years of age and over in the United States, 54.9 percent were supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies or were dependent upon their children, relatives, or friends, for their subsistence and care. A considerable proportion of the remainder received part or all of their support from various pension systems—Federal, State, municipal, industrial, or private.

It is interesting to note that the Gallup Poll on old-age pensions, taken before our entry into the war, showed that the American public in response to the question, "What do you think is the smallest income per month that a couple over 60 years of age needs for a decent living in your community?" answered $73. This is arrived at by averaging the answers throughout the United States. The South obviously was considerably lower, namely, $59. The West Central States gave a similar sum as the South. The West and the New England and East Central States gave the higher sums of $74 and $78.

This poll shows that 91 percent favor Government old-age pensions and the majority approved lowering the age to qualify to 60 years. We should pass legislation for the security of these old people and for adequate wage scales for low-paid Federal employees before we consider the proposals for increasing our own salaries or providing for ourselves retirement allowance. The old folks should come first.

It is interesting to note that the United States census for 1890 shows at that time 75 percent of all our people over 65 years of age were gainfully employed. At the present time, 80 percent of our citizens 60 years of age or over are unable to obtain the minimum for decency and health.

The Social Security Board reports that for August 1945 the average monthly allowance for aid to the aged in all States of the Union was $29.97. It ranged from the high of $49.25 to the low of $12.79.

In discussing the meager benefits now received by our elderly citizens, the Social Security Board in its 1945 report, on page 35, said:

"At the end of 1944, family benefits in force under the old-age and survivors insurance system averaged $37.60 a month for an aged couple—a retired worker whose wife also had reached age 65 and was receiving a supplementary benefit; $47.50 for a widow and two children, and $50.40 for a widow and three or more children. For an aged widow, the average was $20.20 and for a child alone, $12.40. Actual amounts received by an individual or family vary within the limits set by the benefit formula, according to the wage record of the insured worker. The minimum benefit is

$10 a month for a retired wage earner or for a single survivor benefit based on his wage record, and $15 for an aged couple. The total amount of all benefits payable to a family with respect to a particular wage record cannot exceed $85 a month, or 80 percent of the wage earner's average monthly wage, or twice the insured worker's primary benefit amount, whichever is least."

On page 37 of the report, the Board states, "It is to be expected and desired that beneficiaries of a social-insurance system will accumulate resources of their own; the Board believes that social insurance encourages thrift and independence because the small basic amount of the insurance benefit itself gives hope and incentive and makes greater individual effort worth while. * * * The Board does not believe that the benefit provisions of the old-age and survivors insurance system conform with such a gage of adequacy. Field studies and other evidence indicate that most beneficiaries have been pinched by the rising cost of living. Many eligible persons have failed to take the benefits due them when they could get work because they did not think it possible to get along on the benefit amount; of the workers now receiving retirement benefits, the great majority have been forced to give up their jobs because of failing health. With the end of the war, old people, women, and children have, at least temporarily, fewer chances to earn. It is desirable socially, as well as from the standpoint of the individual, that benefits be sufficient to enable many marginal insured workers to leave the labor force—among them, aged workers in failing health, widows who are needed at home and would like to devote themselves to their children, and children who should get more schooling.

"The Board recommends liberalization of benefit amounts, particularly for low-paid workers, and certain changes in benefit conditions."

Under the Social Security Act, to qualify for old-age annuities, one must be 65 years of age or over. The Social Security Board recommends, in its 1945 report, that the qualifying age for women beneficiaries should be lowered to 60. This is in keeping with the provisions of our proposal in H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, that age for both men and women should be lowered to 60 years. We believe that the argument advanced by the Board for lowering the age for women applies equally to men. The Board stated, on page 40 of the report, "The qualifying age for women beneficiaries should be lowered. Women have greater difficulty than men in keeping jobs after age 60. Since wives are commonly several years younger than their husbands, many aged couples suffer hardships when the man is forced to retire at 65 and the supplementary benefit for his wife is not payable until several years later.

"Women in their sixties who are widowed or cease to receive a widow's current benefit because they no longer have a minor child of the deceased worker in their care, ordinarily find it difficult to support themselves until they reach 65. It is therefore recommended that the qualifying age for women be reduced from the present 65 years to age 60 with respect to primary benefits, wife's and widow's benefits and—for similar reasons—also for parent's benefits."

Under our bills, provision is made for covering cases where total disability exists. The Social Security Board recognizes the soundness of such a program in its report when it says, "Public assistance in 1944–45—the special types of assistance and general assistance—went almost entirely to people who were unable or little able to work, the aged, blind, and families in which the normal breadwinner was dead, absent, or incapacitated.

"A Nation-wide basis has been laid for defenses against most of the major causes of individual insecurity. New governmental techniques and resources have been effectively developed through the collaboration of the Federal Government and the States. The widespread public acceptance and support of the program give evidence of the extent to which it represents and is meeting generally recognized social and individual needs. The achievement by the end of the first decade gives reasonable ground for hope that progress in the second may be even greater.

"Just as the life of a man or of a family is a whole, though particular needs and circumstances may change, so an adequate program of social security must have the unity, flexibility, and equity that will enable it to defend all families against any common social risk that threatens their independence and well-being.

"In so doing, social security does not weaken individual incentive and responsibility. Hope, not fear, drives men to greater endeavor. No country looks to sick or ill-fed people for its leaders or workers or customers. Adequate social defenses against risks that individuals cannot meet singly are essential to maintain the individual initiative and enterprise on which our past was founded and to which we look for future progress. They are an essential part of both the heritage and the future of democracy."

On pages 94 and 95 the report states: "The 2,000,000 recipients of old-age assistance in June 1945 represented about 1 in 5 of the total population aged 65 and over, but among the 27 States with a higher ratio, Oklahoma and Texas aided nearly half their aged populations. Among the 22 States below the national ratio, the number of recipients represented only 1 aged person in 20 in Delaware and the District of Columbia and less than 1 in 10 in Connecticut, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Virginia.

"As in earlier years, most of the recipients of old-age assistance were 70 years of age or older; the average age was about 75 years. Many were bedridden. Almost three-fourths lived with relatives or other persons, many of whom contributed something to the recipient's care or support—shelter and perhaps a part of other living expenses. The average monthly payment of $29.46 for old-age assistance in the United States in June 1945 represents a composite of averages ranging from less than $12 in Georgia and Kentucky to more than $48 in the State of Washington. Within a State, levels of payments differ among counties and cities, and in any place actual payments to individuals differ widely according to the recipient's resources. In individual instances, when a recipient has no other resources and has exceptional needs, such as for special or extensive medical care, States may have to claim the maximum amount allowable from Federal funds ($20 a month) and add three or four times as much from State or State and local funds to meet his expenses. In November 1944, for example, more than one-tenth of the old-age assistance payments in the United States exceeded the $40 a month which the Federal Government will share equally; 33 States, however, made no payments above $40. Some States supplement low payments to the aged by medical services. Cash payments from general-assistance funds or such aid in kind as grocery orders or coal are sometimes received by other members of the families of recipients. Whatever the arrangements in these States, the fact remains that Federal funds for old-age assistance were distributed without full recognition of the needs of individuals or the financial resources of the States in which they live."

On page 97 of the report, the Board states that "Many needy persons receive no part of Federal funds for public assistance because the State in which they live imposes eligibility conditions more restrictive than Federal requirements for matching grants under the Social Security Act. As of July 1, 1945, for example, citizenship requirements or their equivalent were imposed by 26 States for old-age assistance and by 7 for aid to the blind. In old-age assistance, 37 States had residence requirements substantially the same as the maximum permitted under the Social Security Act for receipt of Federal funds. With a few modifications or alternatives, the maximum permitted for aid to dependent children under that act was imposed by all but 3 States; and for persons who had lost their sight before they became residents, in 19 approved State programs for aid to the blind. Twenty-two States denied aid to the blind if the applicant had not reached age 16, 18, or 21, and eight States with approved plans for aid to dependent children failed to grant that form of assistance to school children who had reached age 16. Moreover, not all States with approved plans for aid to dependent children had as broad definitions and interpretations of eligibility as are permitted for Federal matching under the Social Security Act.

"In determining eligibility for each type of public assistance many States also deny aid to applicants with relatives who might contribute to their support, even though such support is not forthcoming or might be provided only after humiliating recourse to legal compulsion. States differ widely, too, in imposing fixed limits to the amount of real or personal property an applicant may have if aid is to be granted. Requirements such as these have no analogue in the requirements for Federal matching. The Social Security Act requires that the recipient who can share in the Federal funds granted to the State must be 'needy' and that, in determining need, States must take into account any other income or resources of the recipient."

One of the main purposes of this legislation we are proposing is to obviate the difficulties enumerated by the Social Security Board in the above quotations from its 1945 report. The enactment of this legislation would provide a uniform system available to all qualified annuitants without hindering State restrictions, and affording equality and uniformity to all regardless of State lines. By requiring contributions from all citizens in accordance with their income, the right of all to participate is justified.

As stated at the outset, the sponsors of this program appreciate that the tax formula will have to be carefully considered by the Congress while the bill is under discussion in committee and on the floor. The amount of revenue to be raised in the first instance will depend upon the percentage of the tax to be levied. We have suggested 3 percent of gross income, with a $100 monthly personal income exemption. It will further depend, in each year's levy, on the national gross income subject to the tax. It is impossible to estimate with accuracy at this time what a 3-percent levy would raise, but experts and tax accountants have estimated that, based on current national income, it would provide a fund sufficient to pay at least $60 a month to each annuitant, which should be the minimum to provide the necessities of life for these elderly persons. It should be noted that this method of providing revenue to meet annuities for elderly citizens is elastic and will rise or fall with the national income. When the national income is low and we are in a deflationary period, with consequent reduced living costs, the revenue made available from the tax will be correspondingly decreased. The opposite condition will obtain when prices are high and we are on a rising market with an expanding income and relatively higher costs. A larger fund will be made available for distribution by the tax. The war has demonstrated the ability of Americans, through private enterprise and the profit system, to produce the goods and services, not only to meet our own requirements but to supply others as well.

The science of production has submerged the science of distribution. The very achievement of our goal—maximum production with minimum employment—has undermined our

economy by reason of our failure to provide that distribution shall keep pace with production.

If we are to preserve the American way of life and protect our own democracy from disintegration and collapse, we must find a solution for our unemployment problems as well as providing a decent living for those of our citizens who, under our economy, are unable to be provided with remunerative employment. The severest indictment that has been lodged against us is that while we are the richest and most-favored Nation on earth, and while we have developed the greatest and most effective productive enterprise the world has ever known for providing the necessities of life—more than sufficient for all—we have failed miserably to provide a method by which the fruits of our industry may be shared equitably by all groups of our people.

National recovery without inflation in the United States is entirely dependent upon full production and an adequate and sustained purchasing power by the American people. If business and industry are to be assured of the opportunity for the steady production of goods with reasonable profits, and if labor is to be assured stable and sufficient employment, with fair wages, purchasing power must keep pace with production. Economic stability depends today almost entirely upon the expansion of demand balanced with full production. With adequate purchasing power available, demand for commodities and services will come naturally, and this demand will force increased production and in turn stabilize employment and make more work available.

The aged, through no fault of their own, cannot take part in this production. In this machine age of mass production, it is almost impossible for a person to get a job after he reaches the age of 60. This group over 60 years of age, who have toiled the longest, should not be deprived of taking part in the consumption of goods. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. We owe a duty to these old folks, and we can perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system on a pay-as-you-go basis.

These bills embrace the principles of taxation and utilization of the revenue so raised, to permit the private enterprise system to function on a plan of stabilized activity. The current expenditure of moneys raised under these bills will flow into the channels of trade so that the products of the farms and factories will be absorbed by consumer demand, helping to prevent unhealthy overproduction or under consumption and ruinous depressions such as that which we faced in the thirties. Our own domestic market is the best market in the world; our productive enterprise can and will produce the goods needed to supply all of our people. It is only necessary that our citizens be afforded the opportunity to secure the purchasing power with which to buy the output from our farms and factories.

We can now afford to retire our older citizens from economic activity. In this machine age with mass production, it has become increasingly difficult to keep all, and especially the older workers, employed. The older workers are the unwanted men in industry. In any period of declining employment, they are the first to be discharged and the last to be hired. This provides clear evidence that younger men render a larger economic contribution. A sound program will permit the older workers to retire and clear the path for all younger men and women to be fully employed. Otherwise, in any period of declining business activity, younger men, as well as older ones, will be unemployed. In addition to this economic waste, the social hazards of unemployed youth are beyond calculation.

If and when the older group is needed in the active labor force, they are always ready and eager to take their places at the plow and lathe. The war is witness. With 12,000,000 young men in the armed forces, the older men, along with others, performed miracles of production. With the war over and the young men wanting jobs, it is an opportune time to retire the elderly citizens.

With an accelerating advance in technology in the postwar era and with the discovery of atomic energy presaging more rapid transitions in productive enterprise, the social risks of unemployment are increased. Rather than see workers pushed from the active labor force, hit or miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. The older group has earned retirement. Many of them are now covered by the Social Security Act. By covering the entire group the whole process of business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will exert continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand and will help to provide mass consumption without which our mass-production economy cannot function successfully.

Mr. Chairman, as sponsors of this legislation, we feel that it will not only provide retirement payments to the elderly citizens of our country, now the forgotten people, but it will also help to lift the Nation's peacetime production to full capacity and help to solve the unemployment problem by affording retirement for our elderly citizens, and will be a stabilizing influence in balancing consumption against production. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in our Nation. The aged, through no fault of their own, cannot take part in production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in the consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. We owe a duty to these old folks, and we can perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. Chairman, the witnesses who will follow me will give testimony on various phases of the legislative program embodied in H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, each presenting a special phase of the subject.

AFL Calls for Strict Limitation of OPA Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be of interest to the Members of the House that the American Federation of Labor's Monthly Survey, which came across our desks this morning, calls for a strict limitation of OPA and other bureaucratic controls.

The AFL stand on this question is an open challenge to every Member of Congress to stand up and be counted—in the eyes of labor—on the side of the AFL or on the side of the CIO and its Political Action Committee dominated by Sidney Hillman.

The Monthly Survey charged that OPA orders, paralleling the upward trend of administration wage-control policies, is the beginning of an inflationary spiral bound to injure all wage earners. Further, it flatly charged that the labor policies of the administration play directly into the hands of the Communist fifth column now working in the United States. I ask permission to quote:

By the Executive orders of February 14 and 21—

The Labor Survey declares—

dictatorial power over American economic life has been placed in the hands of persons subject to political controls and pressure. Free collective bargaining has been shelved. Every price adjustment and every wage adjustment affecting prices comes under the scrutiny of a few immensely powerful Government officials. Their decisions affect 54,000,000 American workers, employers, and farmers. The result is confusion and new loss of freedom. If the Communist fifth column in the United States of America were devising ways of undermining democratic institutions, it could not have invented more useful strategy.

The February 21 order decreed 18½-cent wage increase for 700,000 striking steel workers, after their employers had advance promise of a $5 per ton price raise. It increased pay for 2 percent of all workers; but the resulting price break in price ceilings will raise everyone's living cost 10 cents on the dollar by the year end.

So the Government, in effect, gave every worker a 10-percent wage cut to benefit a small minority who used their right to strike as a political weapon.

All workers must get comparable wage increases in order not to suffer a decline in their standards of living. Employers and families, too, must pay higher prices for their tools and materials. The aftermath of this political maneuver is already upon us. Because 39,000,000 other workers and 10,000,000 other employers and farmers have a right to expect treatment equal to that of the steel workers and steel employers, claims are pressing upon the Government from all sides. A helter-skelter of wage and price adjustments is under way, holding back reconversion with widespread delays and confusions and working injustice on millions. When political considerations replace collective bargaining the result is chaos.

Already OPA has issued 76 price increase orders raising prices on more than a thousand items. Its order effective April 1 permits retailers to pass on to consumers the manufacturers' price increases resulting from the new policy which, of course, was unavoidable. Price increases are thus already provided on all meats, canned goods, bread, clothing, shoes, leather goods, consumers' metal products, and many other things. Living costs may rise more than 10 percent as the new policy unfolds.

Wartime experience shows what happens in a race between wages and prices. From January 1941 to October 1945, Labor Department figures show that straight-time wage rates in cities rose 34 percent, but the cost of living rose 33 percent. Where is there any gain to workers in this? This happened under Government wage and price controls, while the prewar period workers made steady progress under free collective bargaining. * * *

We all know that real gains in living standards can come only by increasing production per man-hour and turning out more food, clothes, housing, autos, and other products for everyone. This requires joint effort of workers and employers. The new policy, however, deceives some workers by making them think they can advance by Government hand-outs.

Point to a solution the survey says:

Government controls must end as rapidly as possible if American workers are to keep their freedom.

Although OPA will be necessary for awhile longer, definite limits should be placed on this and other controls. We give this warning:

The vast majority of workers, employers, and farmers did not want the present wage-price-profit policy because they believe that extension of Government controls hampers production and that increased production is the only way to raise living standards and avoid inflation. We solemnly warn every worker, employer, and farmer to be on guard against Communist "fifth-column" strategy both in domestic and international issues and against further efforts to extend Government regimentation.

The vast majority of American workers want to be represented by a labor movement free from Communist influence. The federation has consistently kept Communists out of policy-making positions. We call upon all workers to join with us, particularly the low-paid workers. We are fighting for all free workers of America, to raise everyone's living standards through free enterprise, free unions, and free collective bargaining.

Wartime Conrtibutions of Members of Congress to Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, during the course of the debate on the State, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill, I stated that 111 Members of Congress had told the truth as they saw it by participating in the psychological warfare program of the Office of War Information.

The reaction to this statement was that many Members phoned me—and still other Members called in person—to inquire if their names had been included on such a list. The demand was so widespread, the interest was so great, that I wrote Assistant Secretary of State William Benton asking for this information.

I wanted to know—as I am certain you want to know—what had been done, and who among my colleagues had done it, to share in psychological warfare activities: Those activities which Director of Science Service Watson Davis on December 4, 1945, selected to be 1 of the 10 most important scientific developments of 1945, ranking along with the atom bomb and the proximity fuze.

Assistant Secretary Benton answered my letter immediately, including a list of more than 25 percent of both Houses who had taken part in psychological warfare.

At this time, I pay just and deserved tribute to my fellow Congressmen whose duties have been great, but whose hearts have been greater than their duties. Let it be your eternal reward that your patriotism has paid off. Because of what you have done the war has ended sooner than it would have done otherwise, without your cooperation. American boys are alive today who would not be alive had you kept silent. Gentlemen, your compensation for your service in psychological warfare is that your words have been a shield and a buckler to American youth.

Mr. Speaker, in sincere humility for my own small part in this gigantic task, but in honest pride in the united accomplishment of my fellow Members of Congress, I extend my remarks to include this list of Members of Congress who have participated in international radio broadcasting for the United States:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO CONTRIBUTED TO INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTS DURING THE WAR

A total of 111 Members of Congress—60 Democrats and 51 Republicans—representing 44 States contributed to the successful operation of American psychological warfare by short-wave radio during the shooting war. Forty-nine of these congressional contributors were Senators; 62 were Members of the House of Representatives.

Four of the one hundred and eleven were called upon almost daily for statements or commentaries during times of greatest stress. These four were:

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah: He spoke on American policies pertaining to education, labor, relations with South Africa, and American military operations. In addition, from the very outset of the war, he made monthly recordings in the Japanese language for broadcast to Japan.

Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa: He provided statements and commentaries designed to break down the morale of the German military. His work was reported to be especially effective in impressing the enemy with the magnitude of American ground operations.

Representative BERNARD W. KEARNEY, of New York: He prepared statements on important movements in the European theater of operations and daily commentaries on American action on Saipan, the Philippines, and Okinawa, which were especially important on Near East broadcasts.

Representative KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska: He contributed statements encouraging Czechoslovak resistance, and commentaries designed to make Filipino guerrilla warfare more effective. The Philippine Government considered his work extremely useful.

The following Members of Congress contributed statements and commentaries to American psychological warfare whenever requested in the face of other heavy demands on their time:

SENATORS

Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont: His statements on American foreign policy were often used to Balkan and Near East Regions.

Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota: Statements on American foreign policy beamed to Scandinavian countries, pointing up the freedom of the American press.

Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL, of Delaware: Statements which helped to improve American-Swedish relations and others which helped American-Italian relations after the Allied landings.

Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, of Alabama: Statements on the inevitability of Allied victory, with emphasis on the power of American ordnance.

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky: He contributed statements clarifying important phases of American foreign policy. His statements on the war guilt of the Nazis were featured on European broadcasts.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine: Statements to further understanding between the United States and our allies, based on his tour of world battle fronts.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire: Statements beamed to Italy, France, and Greece explaining military developments.

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia: Statements on the United States Constitution, on anniversaries of Washington and Jefferson, and on the origins of local free government in America.

Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois: His statements on American military and naval striking power emphasized the role of the United States Marine Corps.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas: Statements pointing up the freedom of the American press. His statements on the food situation were also widely used.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico: Statements of the value to American culture of the words and deeds of Americans of Spanish and Portuguese ancestry.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas: Statements on important phases of American foreign policy, much in demand for broadcast to Europe from ABSIE (American Broadcasting Station in England).

Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of California: Statements emphasizing the impact of American air power.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana: Statements encouraging the French underground. His explanation of the American agricultural picture was also of great value.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan: Statements on American sympathy with the resistance movements in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Greece, and the Netherlands.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas: Statements designed to strengthen inter-Allied unity.

Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, of Rhode Island: Statements broadcast to Greece, Poland, and Germany on the inevitability of Allied victory and the restoration of liberty to conquered areas.

Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania: His statements were directed toward Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Italy to point up American war aims and to show the power of American war production.

Senator CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota: Statements on the progress of American infantry and ordnance in the Italian and French campaigns.

Senator THOMAS C. HART, of Connecticut: Statements to the Near East on the effect of American naval victories in the Central and Southwest Pacific.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona: Statements on American appreciation of Filipino resistance, encouraging Filipino guerrilla warfare.

Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama: Statements tying in American foreign policy and military progress. Helpful in encouraging Greek resistance.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado: Statements encouraging Norwegian and Danish resistance, as well as helping to strengthen American-Swedish cooperation.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia.: Statements on American industrial and military mobilization.

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin: Statements explaining the role of American industry in the war effort.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota: Statements expressing American understanding of conditions prevailing in Iceland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden.

Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois: Statements broadcast to Poland, Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia in which he emphasized American and Allied food conditions.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada: Statements on Nazi war guilt and the prosecution of war crimes.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee: Statements to emphasize to the German people the futility of resistance to Allied arms.

Senator JAMES H. MEAD, of New York: Statements to create a better understanding between the United States and our allies, based on his tour of the world battle fronts.

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington: Statements encouraging Scandinavian-American friendship.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana: His statements concerned both Allied military progress and American foreign relations, with particular attention to American-Soviet friendship.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania: Statements widely used in the Near East and Balkans on the liberation of Albania and of Greece.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming: Statements beamed to Germany telling of the part played by American food and mineral resources in advancing the day of Allied victory.

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana: Statements expressing widespread American sympathy with the activities of the French underground.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida: Statements on American foreign policy which were directed chiefly toward the Near East and the Soviet Union.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia: Statements cementing American-Allied friendships, based upon his visits to world battle fronts.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio: Statements encouraging the liberation of the Philippines, directed to the resistance groups.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire: Statements on how the United States Navy helped to get men and supplies to the European theater of operations.

Former Senator Harry S. Truman, of Missouri: Statements showing the relationship of American war production to the Allied military effort.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland: Statements encouraging Filipino resistance, emphasizing American liberation aims.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan: Statements on the war unity of the United Nations, as well as special recordings beamed to The Netherlands.

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York: Statements directed at Germany, designed to impress the German civilians with the futility of resistance.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts: Statements on major American naval actions from Midway to the Battle for Leyte Gulf.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska: Statements bringing out the effectiveness of American naval-air action, emphasizing such action in the war against Japan.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin: Statements, both in Norwegian and English, to bolster Norwegian and Danish resistance. He also spoke on American appreciation of Polish culture.

Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS, of Indiana: Statements on American naval warfare, with special emphasis on naval-air operations.

REPRESENTATIVES

Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota: Statements stimulating resistance activities in Norway and Denmark.

Representative JOSEPH C. BALDWIN of New York: Statement on French patriot resistance, beamed to France, Switzerland, Italy, and North Africa.

Representative C. JASPER BELL, of Missouri: Statements which were effective in stiffening the determination of Filipino patriots to resist the Japanese.

Representative SCHUYLER O. BLAND, of Virginia: Statements beamed to our Allies and to Germany on the value of the Merchant Marine to the war effort.

Representative SOL BLOOM, of New York: Statements on American foreign policy which were in demand from India to Iceland, but which were most frequently used over ABSIE in broadcasts to the European continent.

Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio: Statements to the Balkans and Near East with especial emphasis on the appreciation of the role of small nations in the war.

Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana: Statements showing the relationship of ground and air forces in the West-of-the-Rhine campaign.

Representative FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas. Statements influencing Swedish-American cooperation.

Representative CHARLES R. CLASON, of Massachusetts. Statements on American air power, clarifying the part played by land-based air in the reduction of German industry.

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina. Statements on naval-air developments useful in Australia, India and the Near East.

Representative WIRT COURTNEY, of Tennessee. Statements on the attitude of the United States toward small nations, emphasizing American determination to deliver them from Nazi domination.

Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, of Maryland. Statements useful in encouraging the resistance of Italian patriot groups.

Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois. Statements on American social and economic progress, used in North Africa and the Near East.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan. Statements showing the role American education played in developing self-reliant citizens to maintain our industrial structure at home and to better serve in our armed forces.

Representative EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Statements on the role of American women in the war effort.

Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California. Statements on the support given by American war production to the Allied war effort.

Representative CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey: Statements supporting the American stand on freedom of religion throughout the world.

Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania: Statements on American military strength, beamed to Germany.

Representative CHARLES H. ELSTON, of Ohio: Statements on American military air power, establishing the connection between American air strength and Allied air success against both Germany and Japan.

Representative JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, of Virginia: Statements on the ability of the American farmer to produce for war, beamed to Germany and our European allies.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania: Statements on the American position on food, sent to Central European and Balkan countries.

Representative CHARLES L. GERLACH, of Pennsylvania: Statements beamed to Germany on American war production.

Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, of Minnesota: Statements stimulating patriot resistance movements in Norway and Denmark.

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana: Statements to strengthen ties between France and the United States, pointing up influence of French culture in this country.

Representative E. H. HEDRICK, of West Virginia: Statements on health conditions within Germany, beamed at German civilian workers.

Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa: Statements and Dutch-language recordings designed to encourage resistance groups in The Netherlands.

Representative PEHR G. HOLMES, of Massachusetts. Statements to maintain the good relations between the United States and Sweden.

Representative ED. V. IZAC, of California: Statements emphasizing French-American military cooperation.

Representative PETE JARMAN, of Alabama: Statements on American ground operations especially useful to Greece and the Near East.

Representative BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa: Statements and recordings in Danish to help encourage Danish patriot resistance.

Representative J. LEROY JOHNSON, of California: Statements on American air power valuable in explaining the place of our air power in the Allied war effort to resistance groups in the Scandinavian countries.

Representative BARTEL J. JONKMAN, of Michigan: Statements encouraging the resistance of Dutch patriot groups.

Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota: Statements widely used in the Far East, pointing out the necessity for continuing good relations between the United States and China.

Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee: Statements on the increasing interest of Americans in world affairs.

Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota: Statements of encouragement to resistance groups in Denmark and Norway.

Representative HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., of Louisiana: Statements bringing out the popular support in this country of resistance groups in enemy-occupied France.

Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota: Statements on the value of Scandinavian culture to the United States, especially well received in Iceland.

Representative JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan: Statements emphasizing the link between the United States and small nations.

Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut: Statements in French, Italian, Spanish, and German languages. She emphasized Italian-American relations.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts: Statements on important phases of American foreign policy, especially helpful in maintaining inter-Allied cooperation.

Representative DAN R. MCGEHEE, of Mississippi: Statements on the value of the Filipino resistance movement, beamed at Far Eastern areas.

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana: Statements on Allied military progress in the Far East, with emphasis on Chinese-American relations.

Representative ANDREW J. MAY, of Kentucky: Statements on the role played by the American military as part of the Allied war machine. He explained American strategy in all theaters.

Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota: Statements on American leadership in world affairs, beamed at German and other central European areas.

Representative MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey: Statements on what the American woman did to help the war effort and on American labor policies.

Representative LOUIS RABAUT, of Michigan: Statements designed to encourage resistance activities in France and Belgium.

Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia: Statements beamed at the Far East, telling of the importance of cooperation of land-based and carrier-based aircraft.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas: Statements on outstanding American constitutional and historical anniversaries, explaining our American system of government.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts: Statements on the importance of the work of American women to the war effort.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois: Statements showing the value of Czechoslovak-American friendship.

Representative GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, of Michigan: Statements on American appreciation of what Poland had done—in the air and on the land and sea—toward the Allied victory.

Representative MARGARET C. SMITH of Maine: Statements on the significance of the International Labor Organization to world understanding which had wide circulation in Allied countries.

Representative JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama: Statements on American military progress, emphasizing the superiority of our infantry and ordnance.

Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS of Texas: Statements beamed to Allied countries explaining the American judicial system.

Representative R. EWING THOMASON, of Texas. Statements establishing the relationship between aircraft production in this country and our military and naval aerial successes.

Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia: Statements on every outstanding American naval accomplishment, beamed especially to enemy areas.

Representative THAD F. WASIELEWSKI, of Wisconsin: Statements on the occasion of important Polish anniversaries.

Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts: Statements on the American realization of the determined resistance of the Filipinos.

A Radio University Changed the Tide of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting story picturing the part WRUL Radio Boston, played in World War II, before the Government seized the station for propaganda purposes, provides a clear-cut definite example to show why we need not nor should not set up in the State Department an Office of Peace Information to take the place of the abolished Office of War Information:

A RADIO UNIVERSITY CHANGED THE TIDE OF WAR

If the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of England's oldest school, a sizable share of credit for helping win World War II must go to America's newest university.

It is a seat of learning without campus or classrooms, and its students—numbered in the tens of thousands—are scattered throughout the globe. Its name is the World Radio University. And this is how it came to play a leading role in two major turning points of the war:

Station WRUL, in Boston, seat of the world university, is devoted exclusively to educational programs and to creating understanding between nations. It was just getting into its stride when war broke out in 1939. The imaginative and philanthropic directorate of the radio college, long before America was actually a participant in the war, placed its organization at the service of liberty.

Thus, the trans-Atlantic air waves were turned into a potent weapon of morale. As the little countries went under one by one, the university devoted itself to broadcasting messages of hope and encouragement. Harvard University assigned practically its entire staff of modern-language professors to WRUL to increase the scope of these messages. Broadcasts in no fewer than 24 languages have kept alive the spark of resistance in overrun countries. Highest tribute of all was the denunciation of Goebbels, who named WRUL "this American meddler in the Fuehrer's new order."

Then suddenly an opportunity came to strike a specific and stunning blow at the Nazis' war plans. When Hitler invaded Norway, his greatest loot was to have been the Norwegian merchant fleet—fourth largest in the world—of nearly 1,000 ships. The Germans remembered how Britain was all but defeated in 1917 by the shortage of shipping caused by the U-boat campaign.

They calculated that in the second world war, with its much greater dependence on gasoline and oil, Britain would have a hard time finding sufficient vessels to handle her necessary fuel, munitions, and food imports. So the invading Nazis forced Norwegian shipowners to make recordings in their own voices ordering the masters of their ships, scattered throughout the world, to return to Norway.

These recordings were broadcast from the powerful German short-wave station outside Berlin, and were beginning to take effect. But Walter S. Lemmon, founder of the World Radio University, hurriedly conferred with the Norwegian Ambassador in Washington. They decided to try to counteract the Nazi orders.

Before the war, WRUL had broadcast Norwegian programs to which the crews of these ships had been accustomed to listen. So, starting immediately—and continuing for hours without pause—the station filled the ether with messages directed at the Norwegian ships. WRUL told them the truth about what was happening to their homeland and urged them in the name of the free Norwegian Government to make for the nearest Allied port. Every single vessel of the huge Norwegian Fleet—which carried more than half the gasoline shipped to England during the Battle of Britain—was turned over to the Allies.

The second turning-point stroke by the World University of the Air came when the Germans were sweeping over the Balkans to secure their flank for the big push into Russia. Yugoslavia was about to fall to the Germans without a struggle; Hitler had all but completed a deal with the weak Prince Regent Paul. But when negotiations were reaching a climax, WRUL beamed a series of broadcasts, several times a day, at Yugoslavia, urging the people to resist betrayal.

In that country, crowds gathered around street loud-speakers, and it is on record in the State Department that the broadcasts so aroused the patriotic fervor of the people that they overthrew their Government and took up arms against the Nazi invaders.

Ultimately Yugoslavia was overrun, but the heroic resistance proved to have thrown Hitler's program fatally out of gear. His attack on Russia was delayed by 6 weeks, at a time when every moment counted. Later, when the German armies almost reached Moscow and stood before the gates of Leningrad, they were too late. Bad weather halted active operations, and by the following spring Russia was able to reinforce her manpower and supplies on a sufficient scale to meet the attack.

All through its service as a "freedom station," bringing reassurance from America to darkened Europe, the university reserved a small portion of its time to continue its work of universal education. And it has made plans to resume its broadcast courses, interrupted by the war, on an even larger scale.

WRUL's objectives, as set forth in its charter, are "to foster, cultivate, and encourage the spirit of international understanding and to promote the enlightenment of individuals throughout the world." Realization of these aims would bring full, if belated, vindication to a man who tried so hard more than 25 years ago to achieve world unanimity in outlawing war—Woodrow Wilson.

For WRUL was born at the ill-fated Paris Peace Conference, and nurtured by President Wilson. Walter Lemmon, then a young radio inventor, was acting as scientific-aide to the President. At the conference he saw that the delegates stood on no real common ground, and had no real basis for understanding. Even the mechanics of deliberation, the tedious conversations with their interminable repetitions in translation, brought it home to him that the means of communication were utterly inadequate. He realized that something revolutionary would have to be done if people of different outlooks, cultures, and customs were ever to be brought together in mutual understanding.

On the return journey Mr. Lemmon spoke to President Wilson about the coming wonders of radio, and propounded the idea of an international university of the air as a means of bringing nations together in common understanding and friendship. Such a university, too, would serve at home to bring higher education to adults who had never had the opportunity to go far in school. These would include youths unable to attend college, and the vast number of people who live in remote places—on isolated farms and ranches, in mining camps, and on islands.

President Wilson was instantly interested. As a former university president, he realized the vast potentialities of the idea. As the head of a country, bringing home a new idea in international relations, he realized the possibilities of radio in informing the scattered population of the merits of the League of Nations. He promised to work with Lemmon in establishing the world university.

But before plans could be started Wilson was defeated. It was years before Lemmon could find the financial support and scholastic collaboration necessary to found the newest university in America.

But when the university was finally launched, just 10 years ago, it was an instant success. Public-spirited men and women gave their time and experience to the administrative work; professors contributed lectures and advice without fee. Soon courses were going out, day and evening, to students throughout the United States and in 30 foreign countries. Subjects of instruction included law, history, literature, languages, music, arts, and sciences. Languages included French, Spanish, and Portuguese, and special attention was given to basic English, which had a very large following in Latin America.

An imposing roster of prominent men appeared on special good-will programs designed to bring the people of different countries closer together. Many regular colleges assisted; Harvard, for example, prepared a special course in international law. The World Radio University was able to reciprocate at Harvard's tercentenary celebrations by devoting no fewer than 45 hours of broadcasting time to the lectures delivered on the occasion by such famous scholars as Sir Arthur Eddington and Dr. Jung.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology contributed a special course in physics, Tufts in philology, and Boston University in humane letters.

The World Radio University's system is similar to that of a standard college. Questions in a lecture room, for instance, are usually permitted only at the close of the lecture, and the same procedure is followed by listener-students. They send their questions by mail, and receive answers the same way. General-interest questions are dealt with comprehensively in subsequent broadcasts. Examination papers are submitted by mail, corrected, and returned. Supplementary study courses, with recommended books, are mailed to the student before the courses begin on the air.

The university is financed in much the same was as are regular colleges—by fees and endowments. The World Radio University has as yet no established endowment, but it has received a number of grants from foundations and philanthropists, and many small supporters contribute annual sums as low as $2. Students' fees are optional.

The work ahead of the World Radio University will require all the resources it can muster. A whole generation of young men

and women of university age has been absorbed by the war, and will be too old on demobilization to return to full-time education. Abroad, the Nazis have torn down educational institutions throughout Europe, including those in their own country. And the many false lessons they taught will have to be unlearned.

The services of the World Radio University will be in greater demand than ever. Men and women who have passed through the unspeakable horrors of war, deprived for years of the consolation of culture, will turn to it as a faithful mentor for counsel and help. From it, they will expect inspiration, knowledge, and the answers to the all but insoluble problems they will have to face.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Chester Bowles who has propagandized the Office of Price Administration far more effectively than he has controlled prices, and the recent heir to OPA enforcement, Paul Porter, are finding it difficult now to convince the American people and the Congress that OPA should be continued. The Congress has understood the false premises upon which Mr. Bowles has predicated his enforcement, however, until recently, by false claims and the deception of the people generally, and through shouting the fear of inflation over the air weekly, he has been able to mislead many of them and cover up the real truth from the people. Now they are fast catching up with OPA and its policies.

The Congress has provided Mr. Bowles, during the past years, with everything he could wish for with which to hold the price line and prevent inflation. He has failed to hold the price line but has continued to keep his name in the headlines of the newspapers and his propaganda of fear dinning into the people's ears.

Mr. Bowles has been using a propaganda machine of 487 employees in his information bureau, plus an administration group of junior executives of 2,900, plus 650 top flight executives, more propagandists writing script and bellowing from a thousand platforms, over the air and through the press than there are Members of Congress at a cost annually of over $13,000,000 of the people's money.

To show their disregard for the truth and an effort to grip the people with fear, I wish to insert one of their superlative statements by quoting a paragraph from a speech delivered in my State at Peoria, Ill., made last February before the 43rd annual convention of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Illinois at the Pere Marquette Hotel, made by Garritt Roelofs, regional agricultural adviser of the Office of Price Administration. The speech was delivered and I call your attention to the one paragraph which I regard as rather outstanding:

As the year 1865 opened, the price (of wheat) had jumped to $80 a bushel. By February of that year wheat was selling at the farm for $110 a bushel. From a top price of $110 a bushel, it fell to a low of $2.25. It was boom and bust again.

Of course, there is no truth in this statement. It is a sample of the fear they try to instill into the minds of the people, often without any regard to the truth.

Mr. C. C. Tisler, editor of the Daily Republican-Times, Ottawa, Ill., after confirming the statement, made as above related, made a thorough investigation to determine if there was a possibility of truth in it. He went back into the records around the year 1865 calling for such information as could be given by the Chicago Board of Trade which was operating at that time, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, at Washington, and the department of agricultural economics at the University of Illinois. None of them indicated that wheat ever sold for as much as $110 a bushel in the United States.

The highest price the editor was able to learn as to the sale of wheat during the year 1865, was quoted from market reports taken from the Tri-Weekly Mercury printed in Charleston, S. C., on the 31st day of January, when wheat was quoted at $8 a bushel. This was due to the scarcity at the close of the war in the deep South.

The editor wrote C. C. Stine, head of the Division of Statistical and Historical Research of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. Mr. Stine replied, and I quote:

In reply to your letter of March 2, the highest monthly average cash price per bushel of wheat at Chicago during the Civil War was $2.04 in July of 1864. Prices declined steadily until by June 1865 the monthly average price was 99.4 cents per bushel.

Mr. Stine also enclosed to the editor averages of wheat prices for a long period of years from 1860 to 1867 during the Civil War, which are as follows: 1859–60, 89.2 cents a bushel; 1860–61, 80.1 cents; 1861–62, 68.8 cents; 1862–63, 92.4 cents; 1863–64, $1.10; 1864–65, $1.45; 1865–66, $1.05; 1866–67, $1.88.

I wanted to call the attention of the Members of the House to this wide and wild range of thinking and propaganda which has been turned loose upon the Nation and to show to what length the OPA propagandists have finally gone in deceiving the American people. Let us hope if the act is amended, approved, and is made more workable, that Mr. Porter will concentrate his efforts to keep down prices rather than further extend his efforts on useless and false propaganda.

Milk Strike in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years the milk producers of New Jersey have been trying to get a square deal from the New Deal. Time after time, delegations of milk producers have met with Government officials but always to no avail. Many dairymen from my district have come to Washington but likewise in vain. The situation of the New Jersey milk producers has become so critical that their patience has been exhausted to the point of a threatened milk strike. This we must prevent if possible, but it has now reached such a point that only the administration in Washington can stop it. I can best describe this deplorable state of affairs by inserting in the RECORD the correspondence which I have received in the last few days from Thomas L. Lawrence, general manager, United Milk Producers of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., and Walter W. DeWolfe, manager, Ideal Farms, Washington, N. J. In line with this correspondence, I have communicated the sentiments of the New Jersey milk producers to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable Paul A. Porter, Administrator, Office of Price Administration. The matter is now before these Federal Government officials, who, if a milk strike is called in New Jersey, will be held responsible by all the people in New Jersey. The correspondence follows:

UNITED MILK PRODUCERS
OF NEW JERSEY,
Trenton, N. J., April 2, 1946.

Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMAS: On March 28 over 600 New Jersey milk producers gathered in Trenton, N. J., to protest the announced reduction in dairy-production payments to become effective May 1, 1946. A copy of a letter sent today to the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture is enclosed herewith, as well as a copy of the resolutions unanimously adopted at the meeting.

I cannot impress upon you too strongly the temper of these farmers who attended the meeting, and also that they came from all areas of the State, and included a large number of our very finest dairymen who are traditionally conservative, and the last to resort to drastic action in any matter. That these men attended and took part in the discussions and concurred in the action taken is evidence of the seriousness of the situation.

It was not without considerable tactful handling of the meeting that our president, Clarence J. Little, of Sussex, with the able assistance of Milk Director Foran, was able to stave off a demand for a milk holiday on May 1. The resolutions adopted were the result of a premeeting conference of our board of trustees with the producer representatives from out of State. It was fully realized that Congress has not as yet acted on extending OPA beyond July 1, 1946, or on the continuation of the payment of subsidies on milk after that date, and that any action to be taken should await that decision. The resolutions speak for themselves or this score.

May I urge that you give this matter your immediate and earnest consideration, and that I be advised as quickly as possible of any action which may be taken or contemplated.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS L. LAWRENCE,
General Manager.

IDEAL FARMS DAIRY PRODUCTS, INC.,
Washington, N. J,. April 12, 1946.
Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter requesting information relative to the consensus of opinion of producer farmers in the northern New Jersey area on the subject of the threatened milk strike, may I state from contacts which we have with over 250 producers in Sussex, Hunterdon, and Warren Counties there is, without question, the most grave situation that I have ever encountered in the dairy industry. Producers are extremely critical of the fumbling and ineffectual handling of farm problems by the administration.

There is an extreme shortage of farm labor; the high cost of feed, machinery parts, and various materials, when available, has risen far beyond a reasonable cost. As far as the strike is concerned, there is a question in my mind that there will be any necessity of it because at the rate the farmers are selling out their herds and farmers within the next 90-day period there will be a critical shortage of milk, and this will govern the price on the competitive basis.

Unless the OPA grants some price relief in the dairy industry, the entire milk industry will be in chaos. Costs right from the farm to the consumer have risen out of all proportion, and from my personal knowledge there are many plants who are on the verge of closing their doors. It is hardly reasonable to expect an industry to absorb an increase in costs of approximately 200 percent to survive without some price relief at the consumer end.

I would suggest that for your information you subscribe to some of the rural newspapers and check the number of farm sales that are listed every week. In this area there are so many sales listed that it is necessary for the farmers to take their turns with the auctioneers so that there are not too many sales on the same day.

Hoping that any information I have given you may be of some assistance to you, I am,

Yours very truly,

WALTER W. DEWOLFE,
Manager.

Peacetime Conscription Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 6064 extending the Selective Service Act because I am convinced after an analysis of the testimony submitted in favor of the bill by military authorities that it is unnecessary and does not justify continued peacetime conscription, which is unprecedented in the history of our country.

Throughout our entire history we have followed the principle of voluntary enlistment in peacetime, both through the regular military and naval forces and the National Guard. That it was a wise policy is fully justified by history. The practice of voluntary enlistment has not been given a fair chance of trial since the end of the recent conflict.

In the limited chance which voluntary enlistments have been given, enlistments have far exceeded the requirements set forth by military authorities for our armies of occupation. This proposed legislation is predicated on a failure to secure those voluntary enlistments for our continuing needs. Until such time as that failure is demonstrated in experience there is no need for this law.

We should continue to encourage voluntary enlistment by using every proper course at our command. H. R. 6084, to increase the pay for personnel of our military and naval forces, should be speedily enacted into law and the House will pass that bill today. I freely predict that with proper effort and with the increase in pay provided for in this bill there will be a further increase in the number of enlistments. In the three Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington, there are almost three-quarters of a million men unemployed, many of whom will be glad to enter our military and naval forces if they are assured of the increased pay provided for in H. R. 6084.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly adhere to the principle that until every possible means has been exhausted to secure voluntary enlistments and they fail, we should not resort to the unprecedented policy of peacetime conscription as this bill provides.

OPA Needs Some Dachaus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the ugly methods that the Nazis used in Germany to prevent rising prices are continuing to develop in America. In the offing now is a campaign of ruthless regimentation. Watch for OPA to announce it in their fantastic attempts to stop black blackets resulting from OPA definance of God's law of supply and demand.

It was a wise philosopher who said, "People will continue to commit atrocities as long as they believe absurdities." As the OPA continues to slyly edge us toward totalitarianism, the editorial printed below seems to be an accurate forecast of what is ahead. Of course, if the OPA gets into ruthless regimentation, they would never use the term "concentration camps." Instead they would have "enforced periods of education" for citizens who, to make a living, must ignore OPA regulations.

OPA NEEDS SOME DACHAUS

If Congress votes to extend price control, it ought to make provision for strict and literal enforcement of OPA rules and regulations. Most people think the war is over (even though its end has not been officially recognized) and this surely means that patriotic spirit is not enough. The OPA must have teeth.

Best available indications are that a great many smaller businessmen are pretty casual in their observance of OPA edicts, largely because they are convinced that the choice before them is to overlook certain restrictions or go out of business. This carelessness must be extirpated. The choice placed before these individuals should be to keep the law as OPA makes it or go to jail.

It might well require an enforcement staff of around half a million agents to tighten up on this thing. Nearly every store, plant, and office would need at least one plain-clothes man. For each hundred agents there ought to be at least one supersleuth to check up on the regular enforcement agency. This would mean 50,000 more OPA men. And to check on the supersleuths there would have to be something of a gestapo arrangement—very select and very secret, of course. Altogether, the matter of strict enforcement would take quite a crew.

These people might be unpopular, but a good-sized educational effort would back them up. School children, for instance, could be taught to do a little spying—particularly on their parents and relatives. Rewards could be offered for tips on OPA violators. This idea was more or less brought up some time ago by an OPA enthusiast in New Jersey and it has a lot to recommend it. Somebody could be sent to rummage around in the records of Germany to get details on the technique.

Of course, there wouldn't be enough courts to handle the cases if violators now getting away with it were hauled in—and it should be done swiftly. But special courts could be created. It's been done elsewhere when assembly-line judicial methods were deemed necessary.

If everybody now violating OPA regulations could be brought to book along the lines we have suggested, of course the jails would be too small. But happily there are Army camps available in most sections of the country—and barbed wire is in production. A few dozen strands around each camp, plus a few thousand armed guards and most of the price-control criminals could be detained as long as necessary. A few would be shot while trying to escape, but this would only serve to put the rest in a proper frame of mind. The sentences ought to be stiff. After all, if these men and women think the alternative to violating OPA rules is merely going out of business, something really unpleasant should lie in store for them.

When all this has been done and done right, we predict the OPA will be abolished.

Let's Understand Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Surplus Property Act of 1944 was enacted there has been a great deal of criticism concerning the disposal of the vast quantities of goods which this Nation produced to win the war and which proved excess to the needs of the armed forces before and after the abrupt cessation of hostilities.

This criticism has been directed in turn, and with mounting intensity, against all the different Government agencies which have been connected with the disposal of surplus property.

The War Assets Administration, which has been in existence only since the 25th

of March—less than 3 weeks—and which is now responsible for approximately 90 percent of all domestic surplus-property disposals, is currently bearing the brunt of that criticism.

It is easy and natural to criticize, but it would be far more constructive first to consider well whether criticism is justified. From all the evidence available, it can be shown beyond doubt that the War Assets Administration has often been criticized unjustly.

After weighing the evidence, it is my firm conviction that the War Assets Administration, under the direction of Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, is striving to do everything possible to expedite the disposal of surplus property in accordance with the provisions and the objectives of Surplus Property Act, and that it is succeeding in spite of the obstacles it faces.

Much of the criticism in connection with the disposal of surplus property has concerned the inability of veterans to buy the goods they want. But the Surplus Property Act, rather than the disposal agency, is to blame for that. The act provides that Federal agencies and State and local governments shall have a prior claim, giving them the right to acquire surplus property before it can be offered to veterans or other prospective purchasers. Sometimes the Government agencies absorb the entire available supply.

The War Assets Administration is attempting to satisfy the demands of veterans insofar as is possible under the act. Nevertheless, the War Assets Administration was criticized extensively recently in connection with a sale of motortrucks in which veterans were given ample opportunity to participate.

This was the sale of 600 surplus Army trucks which were advertised by Gimbel Bros. department store in New York City, and which it was charged veterans and regular dealers had no chance to buy. Actually, these trucks had been offered for sale to veterans for almost a month.

Originally there were 728 trucks declared surplus at the Terre Haute Ordnance Depot, Terre Haute, Ind. They were packed for overseas shipment, two to a crate, disassembled.

On December 8, 1945, catalogs advertising these 728 trucks were mailed to all priority claimants in the region in which the sale was conducted, including the States of West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky. All State highway departments in the United States were also notified.

On the same day catalogs advertising the sale were mailed to all veterans in the region who had expressed a desire to buy surplus trucks and who had been properly certified to purchase them under veterans' preference regulations.

At the same time all truck dealers in the region who had asked to be notified of truck sales were sent catalogs, and all other WAA regional offices were also informed of the sale. There were 4,900 catalogs issued, most of which were circulated to veterans.

These trucks were offered at a fixed price of $1,950 each to veterans and dealers alike.

On January 21, almost 7 weeks after the catalogs advertising the sale had been sent to prospective purchasers, the trucks were placed on sale to Federal agencies. On January 22 and 23 they were offered for sale to State and local governments. Beginning January 24 and continuing through February 1, the trucks were offered to veterans exclusively.

From February 4 to February 20, inclusive, the trucks were on sale to dealers. Although the veterans' preference period expired on February 1, veterans could still purchase the trucks on the same basis as dealers. Thus it was possible for veterans to buy the trucks at any time between January 24 and February 20.

Reports of the sale from January 21 through February 20 show that only 128 trucks were sold. Federal agencies bought none, the State of Minnesota bought 2, veterans bought 40, dealers bought 86. Six hundred remained unsold. These were available to any qualified purchaser.

On February 20, 8 Cleveland, Ohio, automotive dealers bought the remaining 600 trucks in lots of 74 and 76 each. The Cleveland dealers resold the 600 trucks to Arthur Price Associates, of New York City, and they were subsequently placed on sale to the public at Gimbel's.

The facts of this sale clearly show that the criticism of the War Assets Administration in this case was unwarranted. In the disposal of these trucks, the War Assets Corporation, which was the disposal agency at that time and the predecessor of the War Assets Administration, carried out to their fullest extent the provisions of the Surplus Property Act and the applicable regulations thereunder.

This case provides a typical illustration of the unjust criticism that has been heaped upon the War Assets Administration in many instances because of a lack of knowledge or a misunderstanding of the facts pertaining to the disposal of surplus property.

The fair course to follow is to give General Gregory and those associated with him and employed under him, a reasonable opportunity to function to see what the results are under his leadership.

OPA Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the OPA, the officeholders of which now seek to fasten their hold upon their jobs, have launched a program of propaganda at the taxpayers' expense to extend the life of OPA. The technique and psychological approach to the control of the mass mind by the OPA officials is patterned after the methods used by Hitler. It will be recalled that with the usual contempt for the intelligence of the masses which those clothed with totalitarian powers invariably display, Hitler proclaimed in his book, Mein Kampf, that "By clever and sustained propaganda an entire people can be made to believe that heaven is hell and the most miserable existence a paradise." Under this philosophy he was able to obtain 1,000,000 dues-paying members and a half million storm troopers.

The number of persons who have been deceived by the OPA's propaganda is impossible of accurate determination, but that it has had its effect on the public mind is certain. There are 45,000 paid publicity persons on the Federal pay roll, at an annual cost to the taxpayers in excess of $74,000,000. I hope the time will come when the American public will cease to be moved to such a high state of emotionalism by OPA propaganda and other New Deal publicity that they can no longer be made to believe that heaven is hell and the most miserable existence a paradise.

A continuation of the OPA is one of the contributions to inflation, black markets, and crime. Its program leads to the punishment of the innocent and the enrichment of those who can and do evade the OPA edicts. Some honest industries are rapidly going out of production while the black markets thrive and increase.

I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, the testimony of Mrs. James A. Reed before the House Banking and Currency Committee, relating to the extension of OPA:

For the record, I am Mrs. James A. Reed, president of the Donnelly Garment Co., of Kansas City, Mo., manufacturer of "Nelly Don" dresses. I manufacture good quality, low-priced dresses which are sold directly to approximately 2,000 accounts throughout the United States, and retailing from $2.95 to $14.95 each. I have about 1,500 employees in two factories in Kansas City, Mo., and St. Joseph, Mo.

I am not coming here to urge higher prices, or to ask for any increase in prices. If this Congress is to continue price control then I respectfully submit that the extension carry with it specific limitations of power and directives of policy which will eliminate the evils of the present price control system. In this connection, Mr. Ralph E. Flanders has already testified before this committee as follows:

"Price control at present is unworkable and unfair. We must look for legislative standards and administrative procedures which will operate quickly without impeding production or creating major inequities."

Again he stated:

"I do not think business can live with price control in its present form for another year. We must modify it so that it can live and be lived with. It should be liberalized and streamlined to reduce delays, inequities, and obstacles to production."

Price control as it exists today is one of the biggest obstacles to production. In my industry one of the chief obstacles is the maximum average price regulation of OPA. This regulation was put into effect on June 1, 1945, over an industry-wide protest. At that time many industry advisory committee meetings were held and the maximum average price regulation was arbitrarily forced upon my industry, over its earnest plea that the regulation was not practicable and that it would greatly hamper the production of good-quality low-priced dresses. On several occasions, and specifically at the industry

advisory committee meeting held in May 1945, the head of the Apparel Division of OPA admitted that the maximum average price regulation could not be complied with. At the same time, he announced that it would not be revoked even though it would not work because word had come down from above that it would not be withdrawn.

This regulation has been in effect for 10 months. It is supposed to increase the supply of low-priced dresses; actually it decreases the supply of low-priced dresses in favor of those selling at higher prices. It penalizes old-established firms with several price lines.

Under the maximum average price regulation I am not permitted to sell as many $6.95 to $14.95 dresses as I could produce because I cannot obtain sufficient material for $2.95 to $4.95 dresses to average out against the $6.95 to $14.95 dresses. This regulation then curtails my production of $6.95 to $14.95 dresses, even though its supposed purpose was to increase their supply. The same type and quality of material that I cannot manufacture into the dresses of this price range is sold in $19.95 and $29.95 dresses, and even in those selling as high as $49.95, with the OPA's blessing. Some manufacturers are free to produce these higher priced dresses because they had ceased to manufacture the lower price groups by 1943, or manufactured only one price line instead of several in 1943, or they come under contractor's regulations, or they are new in the business, or they escape the maximum average price regulations for other reasons.

When Mr. Bowles announced his low-priced textile program 14 months ago he promised to increase the supply of good quality low-priced clothing, and to roll back the cost thereof. I quote from the press release of January 23, 1945:

For consumer it would mean:

1. A greater proportion of the supply of apparel will be in the low and medium price essential garments, beginning to appear in the stores by last spring.

2. Reduction of currently inflated clothing prices by 6 or 7 percent.

3. Every effort will be made to improve quality of clothing for the price.

Mr. Bowles' program has been in effect for 10 months and his forecast has not materialized.

I have been in the dress business for 30 years, which would take me back to the beginning of the First World War, and even during that period I have never seen in the stores as poor quality, badly made dresses at as high prices as there are today.

At a recent meeting in New York a Government representative announced that the reason priorities for dress goods had to be reduced to approximately 70 percent was that there were 2,000 new businesses that had to share in the materials. Two thousand new manufacturers are a lot of manufacturers. I have an account in every city and town of any size, including some very small towns, in the United States and I have only 2,000 accounts. I am told there were about 8,000 manufacturers who came under the original OPA order for women's and children's outerwear garments. This shows what is happening to the garment business and, to my mind, accounts for the large quantity of badly made, high-priced, junky merchandise fostered by the maximum average-price regulation.

Mr. Bowles has not come before you and acknowledged the failure of the maximum average price program in the garment industry. In fact, he has not even shown you any charts of what has happened to the price of clothing during the last 10 months under maximum average-price regulation. In place of acknowledging the failure of maximum average price and doing away with this regulation in accordance with industry's plea he, having gained control of CPA, has now issued a new order by that agency compelling the mills to go back to the war goods they were producing in 1942 to 1944. Production at that time was geared to provide materials for wartime needs. Do we want to freeze our cotton mills in the production of the qualities of 1943, or any of the 10 years previous to 1943? In 1943 we were in a terrible war and even my plant was running up to 75 percent of its production on war orders; our first energy and effort was on war production. The preceding 10 years were depression years. In America must our cotton mills turn out practically nothing but vast quantities of low-end and staple merchandise? Must we import our fine cottons if we are to have them at all? Cotton is too important in America to tie it down to false economic ideas. American mills can make beautiful fine cottons, as fine as any other country, and I think we are doing the cotton-producing States, as well as all America, a great disservice by trying to regiment our mills to low-quality and war-needs cotton materials.

The English cotton mills are already soliciting business in America on fine cottons. As a result of OPA control policies my company has been forced into a position of going to the British to buy fine cottons. I have placed an order for 100,000 yards of 2-ply/120 voiles and am promised the first 100,000 yards that come off their looms. I placed this order for English goods because our mills are so tied up with regulations that I saw no possible chance of obtaining that material in America.

The experience of the past 10 months has demonstrated the impossibility of meeting a shortage of good quality low-priced merchandise with detailed regulations. We need less regulation, not more regulation. If Congress feels it is best under all the circumstances to continue OPA I sincerely hope they will write into the act such limitations of power and directives of policy as will streamline the operation of this agency.

In a previous extension of price control Congress wrote into the act a provision that no pricing department of OPA could be headed by anyone who did not have at least 5 years' business experience. It was an attempt to eliminate impractical and unworkable regulations. Today those of us who have dealings and conferences with OPA often find the decisions of any practical minded department head in OPA completely overriden by the decisions of a corps of career economists and legal advisers who work in first one department of the Government and then another, whose impractical theories have never been tested in business life and whose philosophy of life and economy is tainted with principles on which business and industry in America could never have developed. They are the real heads of OPA—they dictate its policies and write its orders. If this Congress in extending the Price Control Act will take cognizance of by-passing activity on its previous legislation and write into the act a death sentence for the stifling activity of these career economists it will do more than anything else to disentangle the strangle hold on production and industry.

Specifically, I recommend that any extension of OPA be for 6 months only in the textile and clothing industry. The maximum average price regulation and all other regulations that interfere with production should be removed at once. The industry should be advised that other price controls will be gradually relaxed so that by December 31, 1946, all controls will be off. We have the raw material, we have the mills, and we have the clothing plants to more than take care of all of the textile and clothing needs of this country.

In summary, may I again urge that if Congress is to continue price control it should at the same time define its duties and powers to reshape it for transition needs. In that reshaping such regulations as the maximum average price regulation and all other regulations that interfere with production should be prohibited. Failing to do this we should be prepared for greater scarcities, higher prices, and a public that will hold Congress responsible for the entire situation.

May I show you a few dresses that will demonstrate how the maximum average price regulation is creating higher rather than lower priced merchandise?

Housing Executive Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, April 13, 1946, as follows:

AIDE CALLS WYATT'S 1946 AIM IMPOSSIBLE

Don Campbell, lumber consultant to Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt, called Wyatt's 1,200,000-homes goal for 1946 impossible and said last night "someone is making political capital of this emergency."

He asserted the Office of Price Administration "refuses to be realistic" and declared "just a little break, a little give in the line, is all we need to produce.

"If private industry fails to meet that (1,200,000 homes) goal this year," Campbell told the Louisville Building Congress, "the Government can go in and say 'private industry has failed and we'll build the rest with the taxpayers' money.'"

RECALLED BY WYATT

Campbell served in Washington 3 years during the war, administering lumber distribution for war needs. On his return to his home at Lebanon, Ky., he was elected mayor of the town before being requested by Wyatt to return to Washington as lumber adviser to the housing agency.

He said he knows "of no man more sincere than Wilson Wyatt," but declared he disagreed sharply with the National Housing Agency's current building-restriction orders. "Instead," Campbell said, "he advocated a nonpriorities go-ahead order for all private homes costing up to $8,000."

He asserted that "Since VJ-day there has been no policy set on reconversion."

IS CRITICAL OF OPA

"The Office of Price Administration," he continued, "refuses to see that it's production and production alone that's holding up reconversion."

"Certainly there is a shortage—caused by the greatest war we've ever been through," Campbell said, "and we're in the midst of a housing hysteria. * * * We're getting headlines and ballyhoo, but I'll tell you frankly we are not getting houses."

He listed some of his objections to the Housing Agency's program:

1. It's unrealistic—I don't think 1,200,000 homes will be built this year.

2. The $6,000 limit on cost of veterans' homes: Sure, we want cheap homes for veterans but we can't build them for $6,000 in metropolitan areas.

SKEPTICAL OF PRIORITY SYSTEM

3. The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill in general: Why bring another buyer into the

market when there is a shortage of materials already?

4. Veterans' priorities: I'm skeptical of the way priorities are going.

He quoted OPA Administrator Chester Bowles as having said the Goverment should subsidize manufacturers of new and untried building materials because we know the public won't buy them.

"I have nothing but praise for legitimate prefabrication," Campbell continued, "but there's nothing I can say before ladies about all these crackpot prefabricated crackerboxes of which I'm afraid we're going to see too many—bought by veterans—within the next few years."

SAYS HE'S IN DARK

He then listed three things "that don't make much sense to me":

1. Subsidies in the building-materials field.
2. Radical prefabrication.
3. Untried materials "which the Government will have to buy if the public won't."

He said lumber is going into "black-market channels," and insisted "The OPA must be made to see the light" and increase lumber prices "to get lumber back into normal channels."

He said, however, that OPA has been "seeing the light" for the last several weeks, and has raised ceilings on plywood, fir doors, western pine, hardwood flooring, red cypress and Lake States hemlock, with the result these materials are being shipped. Douglas fir, redwood, and southern pine are slated for price increases, he said.

HOPES FOR SUCCESS

Despite his expressed disagreement with the restrictive orders, the price controls, and the 1,200,000-homes building goal, he said he hopes the housing program succeeds.

"What I have said has no political tinge," he concluded. "I'm talking as one American to another. * * * If you don't see that you are losing the American way of life and losing it pretty fast, then I don't think you'd recognize the Goddess of Liberty if you passed her on the street."

In a forum period, following his talk, Campbell was asked:

"What are we going to do about it?"

"I don't know," he replied.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from a very able and highly respected furniture manufacturer in my district a letter which ought to be read by every person who is interested in demolishing the OPA and all of its works. It is about time that some heed be given by this administration to the views of businessmen with reference to the deplorable situation created by the OPA. It is obvious that millions of people are being made to suffer because this political group seeks through its propaganda to remain in office.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this letter, without disclosing the name of the firm or the author of the letter, because to do so would only bring down the Gestapo of the OPA and other totalitarian agencies of the Government on the neck of an outstanding citizen of my district:

I have just returned from a 2 weeks' trip (5,000 miles) visiting the southern lumber mills and thought that you might be interested in the conditions which prevail as I observed them.

Frankly, they are just terrible. Without any doubt 75 percent of the lumber moving is in the black market and this includes both pine and hardwoods and no attempt is being made to "cover up." New small mills are springing up everywhere but the good, old substantial mills, those who operate on existing ceilings are closing down. Without any doubt there is one thing that this black market has created, namely, more production.

I will not burden you with the details of what I saw and found but of one thing I am sure, that we will never get the production which we must have in this country while the OPA exists. If it is thrown out, as I am sure it should be, the "balloon will surely go up" but it will be back down and level off in 6 or 8 months and 12 months from today we will be far better off than we will be under any form of the OPA. We will have chaos for a time but over the long pull conditions will gradually right themselves for we cannot continue under present conditions and they will surely get worse rather than better. If you wish more details then I will gladly give them.

The thought of any housing subsidy under present conditions is just pure folly and just another way of wasting the taxpayers' money.

RFC Doing Good Job in Small Business Loan Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have here an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal which I am certain will be of interest to many Members. It is entitled "RFC Plan Backing Bank Help To Small Business Shows Rapid Expansion," and gives a very good picture of the possibilities of financial aid to small business utilization of RFC's blanket-participation agreement with banks.

I believe that this plan offers a realistic approach on the part of the Federal Government in rendering financial aid to small business. It offers a medium whereby the small businessman's problems may be discussed on the spot with a banker who should have a direct interest in the success of that small businessman's operation—his local banker.

I have had called to my attention a policy letter sent by Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the heads of all of its loan agency offices and note the following:

If the applicant has not contacted his bank, or a bank, the agency examiner agrees with the applicant on a selected bank. The agency then arranges an appointment for the applicant with the bank and, if possible, an examiner accompanies the applicant to the bank to assist the applicant in properly presenting the facts of his case to the bank.

The bank, of course, can either make the loan itself, or if it has an agreement under the B. P. A. plan (blanket-participation agreement), it may desire to place in under such plan. In any event, the agency does what it can to assist the applicant in having his credit needs met.

Operating under the terms of the blanket-participation agreements, the local banker, if he heads a small bank, will not be faced with either of the two most serious problems which confront the average small bank: First, the necessity of accepting the full responsibility of a loan which may be on the border line of the amount it can safely handle. Second, being faced with a loan application which may be completely acceptable from the banker's viewpoint, because of the bank's full knowledge of the circumstances, but which may be slightly larger than the maximum limit of its credit to any one borrower.

Under the blanket-participation agreement, a bank is enabled to process a loan four times the size which it normally would be able to handle. This might mean the difference between success and failure of the applicant firm, because all too often the true merits of its application can only be known by the local banker, and not by a banker who does not know the principals of the firm, the circumstances surrounding the need for financial aid, or specific local conditions surrounding the operation of the applicant firm.

Under the blanket-participation agreement, the small bank is not called upon to assume the full responsibility for the loan. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation guarantees up to 75 percent of the loan. The RFC's experience on loans is such that we can be assured the taxpayers will not have to foot any deficit on the over-all program.

This blanket-participation agreement should prove a healthful stimulus to the loan functions of small banks with respect to small business.

The article to which I refer follows:

RFC PLAN BACKING BANK HELP TO SMALL BUSINESS SHOWS RAPID EXPANSION—MAXIMUM BORROWING $350,000, AVERAGE $47,500; A CHICKEN FATTENER GOT $240—400 NEW BPA LOANS MONTHLY

(By Henry Gemmill)

WASHINGTON.—One of RFC's fanciest lending programs, a year old this month, has loosed more than $100,000,000 in credit without use of Federal funds.

It's the B. P. A. plan, now expanding at a good clip. The initials stand for "blanket participation agreement." Any bank which has such an agreement with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can freely make a wide variety of business loans with an automatic guarantee that if they go sour RFC will take as much as 75 percent of the loss.

So far, this scheme is peanuts to RFC which in its time has lent more than $40,000,000,000 and a lot of that to very big businesses. But directors of the agency like to talk about it, because it satisfies their hankering to help small banks and little business borrowers. And the project is growing fast.

NEARLY 2,800 BANKS JOIN

By the middle of this month about 18 percent of the Nation's banks had joined up—nearly 2,800 of them. They authorized almost 2,300 B. P. A. loans for $106,000,000, about double the number and amount which were out 3 months ago. New B. P. A. loans are now running about 400 a month; by the end of the year officials expect they'll hit 1,000 monthly.

A Mississippi chicken-fattener got the smallest of these loans—$240. They range up to a legal top of $350,000. The average loan for a while was running at $56,000, but now that figure has been whittled to $47,500.

Conceived in wartime, the B. P. A. lending program is only now being pushed by the Government's loan offices scattered throughout the country. The 31 RFC field agencies are circularizing banks and addressing banker's conventions. Their men intend to start making door-to-door bank calls to explain the set-up. But officials insist there'll be no pressure on any bank that wants to stay out.

A good many BPA loans have been made with maturities as short as 6 months. But the emphasis is on longer term credit. The RFC believes it's valuable to help small banks get into this more profitable business while maintaining their liquidity with guaranties of Federal backing in a pinch. Officials say many a small institution which could otherwise lend no more than $10,000 to any one borrower under State banking regulations can now extend $40,000 credits because of RFC participation agreements.

More than half (50.6 percent) of this new sort of credit is being extended in towns of less than 10,000 souls. RFC officials say they've heard but can't track down rumors of big-bank opposition to the plan, springing partly from suspicions of Federal competition with their own correspondent dealings with little banks.

The RFC spokesmen contend that Government competition with the banks is the last thing in their minds; they are happy that 98 banks with over $100,000,000 of deposits have joined this small bank program. These participants aren't the giants of the banking world, but include such large institutions as New York's Corn Exchange Bank and Trust Co. and Brooklyn Trust Co., Chicago's City National Bank & Trust Co., the Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit, the First National Bank in St. Louis, and the American Exchange National Bank of the same city.

HOW THE PROJECT WORKS

Here is how BPA works in high light form:

The American National Bank of Kalamazoo, or any similar institution, decides it would like this kind of backing, and applies at its regional RFC office for a blanket participation agreement. The document goes to Washington for scrutiny by directors of the agency. Theoretically, they could turn down an application, but almost any bank of deposit supervised by Federal or State officials is okayed.

When the bank is blessed, it has blanket permission to advance any amount of business credit, with automatic RFC guaranties up to 75 percent of each loan. The Federal officials explain that this freedom was granted after a decade of experience. "We felt we could close our eyes," says one expert.

As a matter of fact, the RFC's eyes are not quite shut—just squinting. The agency puts a $350,000 ceiling on lending to any one borrower; it sets a 10-year maximum maturity on BPA loans and specifies that not less than 10 percent of the principal be repaid annually. It gets monthly reports on bank disbursements and the repayments they receive. And, under the law, regional officials must be informed of the salaries and other compensation of top employees, officers, and directors of borrowing firms—and certify they are reasonable. In practice, Washington officials say they don't know of any which have yet been deemed unreasonable.

On the portion of a loan backed by RFC the top interest rate which a bank may charge is 4 percent; it can ask 6 percent on the balance. On many loans the banks ask for no more than 50 percent RFC backing. On protection up to this amount they pay the RFC only one-half percent, but if they seek more the charge is three-fourths percent. On each $100,000,000 of loans the RFC thus takes in between $500,000 and $750,000 annually. That's enough to cover administrator costs and any losses officials believe.

DOESN'T USUALLY ADVANCE COST

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is not generally expected to advance cash to a bank unless a loan looks shaky. Then the agency is to buy participation of its agreed percentage from the bank. So far, this has happened only once, in the case of a $16,000 loan to a company erecting steam boilers in a northwestern city. The RFC expects no ultimate loss in this instance. Whenever losses are incurred—and the experts are sure they will be—the agency will share them in the same proportion as its participation.

This money is going into new enterprises and expansion of old ones; it could even be used in part for payment of old indebtedness to put a firm more squarely on its feet. A wide variety of businesses have taken advantage of the scheme. Last month the Federal loan officials enlarged the plan specifically to include contractors building homes.

Rifling through papers on a recent batch of loans, an official pulled out these typical cases:

A pecan cracker and packer in Missouri gets $9,500, while an Indiana bank lends $50,000 to a wholesale grocer.

A New York rubber-stamp manufacturer takes $100,000, while an Arizona water company is receiving $10,000.

In Seattle an electrical-supplies company borrows $2,800, and in the same area a manufacturer of truck bodies is granted $12,000.

A small Illinois town is going to be improved by a bowling alley and soda fountain, to the tune of $30,000, while a Louisiana boat-and-barge project gets $100,000.

A fruit- and vegetable-freezing enterprise in Maryland is awarded $140,000, and a $12,000 theater is being erected in Oklahoma.

In Newark, N. J., a producer of molded-rubber items is handed $10,000, while an Iowa jeweler gets $5,500, and a Michigan wholesaler of auto parts takes $6,000.

How much of all this lending is going to really small businesses? RFC's statistics don't show for sure, but they give indications. By the end of last month 28.6 percent of the B. P. A. loans were for $10,000 or less. At the same date 75.4 percent were for $50,000 or less, and 88.2 percent for $100,000 or less.

That's a numerical accounting of the loans, of course, and since a few big credits can outweigh many small ones, the figures on distribution of funds give a somewhat different picture. For instance, just 29.8 percent of all money advanced under B. P. A. went out in loans of less than $50,000.

This new style of lending is underway throughout the United States, but in a very spotty fashion. The western end of the country, for instance, including California, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Montana, and most of Arizona, had at the end of last month benefited by just 225 B. P. A. loans. That's less than the Chicago area alone.

And all New England had just 20 loans. The New York area was second to Chicago, but much of the East apparently has not yet become interested. The most activity so far has been in the Midwest, parts of the old South, and Texas.

Let's Eliminate the Bloated Bureaus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Byrd committee has just made another report on civilian employment of the executive branch of the Government. Those figures show a steady expansion of the nonmilitary departments of the Government since the end of the war.

Just a few days ago the House adopted an amendment to the pay-raise bill for Federal employees that was intended to start a reduction of the Federal civilian pay roll. It is perfectly obvious that definite and drastic action will have to be taken by the Congress before this trend toward ever-expanding Federal pay rolls can be halted and then reversed.

There must be a prompt weeding out of all of these wartime emergency agencies which have completed their essential wartime work.

It is almost a year since the war ended in Europe and 8 months since VJ-day, yet the current report of the Civil Service Commission shows that our Federal bureaucracy still employs 2,921,673 civilian pay-rollers. No emergency powers have been relinquished. Renewal of expiring war power is being pressed by the administration.

In the nonmilitary departments there was an increase of 29,149 civilian employees in the month of February this year, as compared with January. This continued expansion of the wartime agencies in peacetime suggests that President Truman contemplates a permanent bureaucracy of regimentation, priorities, allocations, and Executive order controls over the American people. If that be the administration's program, the people should know the facts.

The Department of Agriculture added 473 names to its pay roll during February, bringing the present total to 87,323.

In the same month the Department of Commerce increased its rolls by 1,494 civilian employees, to make a total of 33,868 pay-rollers.

The Post Office added 9,885 names during the month, for a new total of 463,628.

During the month of February 1946, 31 different agencies of the Federal Government expanded their civilian pay rolls.

Even the President's Executive Office rolls took on 5 additional workers, in the Budget Bureau, for a new high of 757 in that division. The Treasury Department added 2,426 pay-rollers. The State Department 1,408, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation 3,680—all during 1 month.

This expansion in the civilian agencies must be curbed if Federal spending ever is to be brought under control. What has happened in Washington that the bloated wartime bureaus still find it necessary to increase their rolls in peacetime, rather than reduce them to the scope of normal operations?

An examination of the official figures from the Civil Service Commission suggests either that bureaucracy is out of hand—bigger than the men who are supposed to be managing it—or that the Truman administration now has embraced the doctrines of European collectivism as the permanent peacetime pattern of American Government.

When the New Deal came into power in 1933, the total civilian pay roll of the Federal Government was but 575,000, including the postal service. At the wartime peak, when Government arsenals and shipyards were in maximum production the total civilian pay rolls reached a high of 3,600,000. Since the end of the war the military rolls have declined sharply, with the closing of Government arsenals, powder plants, and shipyards. But the Washington bureaus still are growing at the old wartime rate.

If we do not check this rampant and noxious growth in the Federal establishment, bureaucracy ultimately will devour us with pay rolls and busybody spending of the taxpayers' substance.

Extension of the Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill to extend the Selective Service Act for the following reasons:

First, this bill should not have been brought before the House at this time, and since it will not become operative until October 15 it would have given us an excellent opportunity to try out some other method of maintaining a necessary armed force.

For instance, there is now pending a bill which would increase the pay of the armed forces personnel. This bill is scheduled to follow. This is placing the cart before the horse. Had the increased pay bill been brought in here and passed, it would not, in my opinion, be necessary to extend the Selective Service Act now or on October 15, because the pay bill would be the incentive the country needs to get volunteers for our armed forces. At any rate, this would be the ordinary procedure and I believe sufficient incentive to maintain our forces.

I know this would be quite costly, but no doubt the pay bill will pass anyway. And since we are loaning vast sums of money to foreign governments without interest, while we are charging our GI's 4 percent for money with which to buy homes, farms, or a business, I believe we should charge interest on foreign loans. We should charge at least as much interest as our Government has to pay to borrow the money to make the loans to foreign governments. Even if it were only 2 percent on these billions it would go a long way toward paying the increase which would be necessary to maintain our armed forces under a volunteer system.

I am also opposed to this bill because I believe all fathers now in service should be released. I know fathers who have not seen their children for as long as 3 years. I find no provision or assurance in this bill that they will be returned by the enactment of this law. Under this bill as now proposed fathers will no longer be drafted. This penalizes the fathers already in the services.

Mr. Speaker, the period of emergency is over. The war should be declared at an end, and the Selective Service Act should be allowed to terminate on May 15, and the emergency agencies set up under the War Powers Act should speedily fold up and the country get back to normalcy, which is impossible so long as these emergency agencies are operating.

New Bank Procedure for GI Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an article which appeared in the April 1946 issue of Banking entitled "GI Loans Speeded by Amendments." It is as follows:

GI LOANS SPEEDED BY AMENDMENTS

The average veteran who seeks a loan from his home-town bank under guaranty provisions of the amended Servicemen's Readjustment Act will probably have the loan money available for use in less time than would a regular bank customer, according to William Powers, deputy manager of the American Bankers Association, who is also secretary of its committee on service for war veterans.

The amendments to the GI Act, which are covered by regulations of the Veterans' Administration, cut the time for making a bank loan from as much as 4 weeks to only a few days. The automatic guaranty of a portion of the loan by the Veterans' Administration provides the bank-loan officer with what is in effect collateral of a definite value, and this permits the bank to go ahead with the loan procedure with a minimum of delay.

For instance, here is a schedule of how the average veteran can make a loan under the new amendments, compared with procedure under the original act:

NEW PROCEDURE UNDER AMENDMENTS

Veteran discusses loan with bank officer.

Bank may accept veteran's honorable discharge certificate as certificate of eligibility for loan.

Bank proceeds with credit operation. Selects appraiser from Veterans' Administration list of approved appraisers. After receiving appraiser's report may complete loan and pay out funds to the veteran. The veteran has the money he needs in a matter of hours or at the most in a few days.

After making the loan to the veteran, the bank sends to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration: (1) the veteran's honorable discharge certificate; (2) the note or evidence of debt signed by the veteran; (3) the appraiser's report, and (4) loan closing statement of the bank.

The Veterans' Administration endorses the discharge certificate with the amount of the loan made and the portion of the guaranty right used and remaining for the veteran. The Veterans' Administration endorses the note, indicating the guaranty reserve covering the loan. The Veterans' Administration returns to the bank the discharge certificate and note and keeps the appraiser's report and closing statement. The discharge certificate is given back to the veteran.

OLD PROCEDURE UNDER ORIGINAL GI ACT

Veteran discusses loan with bank loan officer.

The veteran and bank fill out form for application for certificate of eligibility for the veteran. This application is sent to regional office of the Veterans' Administration.

The certificate of eligibility is returned to the bank and enclosed with it is the name of a qualified appraiser who is to appraise the real property involved.

The bank obtains a credit rating report on the veteran from an approved credit rating agency.

The bank completes arrangements to make the loan and applies to the Veterans' Administration for a certificate of guaranty.

The Veterans' Administration sends the guaranty certificate to the bank.

The funds may then be paid out to the veteran.

Under this new automatic procedure, the bank in the majority of cases does not need to make any contact with the Veterans' Administration until after the loan is completed. The bank is required to fill out only one form, and that is the loan closing statement. In most cases there is no need for a credit rating report. All form filling out and processing time has been eliminated under the revised method, except for unusual cases.

Under the old procedure, the bank and the veteran and the appraiser filled out a minimum of six forms which on the average required a total of 7 hours to complete. As long as 4 weeks were needed to process these forms, and during the time which elapsed, many veterans lost an opportunity to buy a home or business.

OPA Alone Cannot Prevent Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include one of the most comprehensive and concise statements I have seen on the real factors that are causing inflation in this country and to which little or no attention has been given by most citizens in their naive belief that to keep OPA will automatically mean inflation is controlled. At best OPA treats symptoms. It is an opiate to make the patient feel better during a crisis. If properly understood and handled, it is, I think, a proper and necessary opiate. But this country is in for a most tragic awakening if those in control do not promptly take vigorous steps to correct the genuinely causative factor, chiefly too much easy and cheap money in circulation and too little production.

OPA ALONE CANNOT PREVENT INFLATION

(By Milton Friedman, associate professor of economics and statistics, School of Business, University of Minnesota)

The American people resemble the 70-year-old man who suddenly discovered he had been speaking prose all his life. Most of us are worried by the threat of inflation, but seem not to realize that we have already had a substantial inflation and that inflation is continuing.

Government figures show a rise of some 35 percent in the cost of living during the war. And these figures seriously understate the price rise. A major effect of OPA price control has been to disguise rather than prevent increases in price. Rough allowance for these disguised price increases suggests that the cost of living has risen about as much during this war as during the First World War, when it rose nearly 70 percent.

This inflation has not yet reached its peak. The accumulated demands of consumers and business for a wide variety of goods are backed by an unprecedented volume of cash and liquid assets.

OPA price controls alone cannot restrain inflation and might best be eliminated. In many fields legal or illegal evasion will make them entirely ineffective. In others, they can be effective, but only at the expense of doing more harm than good by disorganizing markets and restricting production.

We can and must take measures now to control the basic causes of inflation by limiting the supply of cash and bank deposits. This will require that Government collect as much and spend as little as possible; that we put the Federal Reserve System once again in control of the volume of cash and deposits by drastically raising reserve requirements; and that we pin down the liquid assets in the hands of the public by a realistic Federal debt policy, even if that means higher interest rates on the Federal debt.

The chief danger is that continuance of OPA price controls will be regarded as a substitute for measures that strike effectively at the basic causes of inflation.

Britain Orders Deep Cut in Taxes in Expectation of Loan From United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I hereby offer for the RECORD a recent dispatch from London, which appeared in the New York Journal and American. I am wondering if the same is not offered as just another piece of propaganda on behalf of the proposed British loan:

BRITAIN ORDERS DEEP CUT IN TAXES IN EXPECTATION OF LOAN FROM UNITED STATES

LONDON, April 9.—Hugh Dalton Chancelor of the Exchequer, announced today that Britain's 60-percent excess-profits tax has been repealed, as of December 31, 1946.

He said this and other reductions were based on the anticipation of approval of the American loan and that "if it fails we shall at once have to take restrictive measures to reduce imports, especially those affecting American dollars."

He cut purchase taxes on a long list of items, reducing the levy from 100 percent to 33⅓ percent on phonographs and phonograph equipment and lowered the sports-entertainment tax except for horse, motor, and dog races.

He announced that workers' contributions under the National Insurance Act would be exempt from income tax, relieving an estimated 156,000 persons of income tax.

He also made two small changes in low-level income taxes, increasing the basic exemption of working women by $120 to $440. The earned-income allowance was boosted from one-tenth to one-eighth.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—Sound Money and a Fair Interest Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to the interest question. Shakespeare in his Merchant of Venice portrayed the cruel side. Until recently the rate of interest exacted by money lenders laid a heavy burden on the farmers of this country and small borrowers. Now, with the money volume swollen all out of proportions to the currency needs and credit requirement of the normal business of the country, as a result current interest rates fail to make a fair return on the invested savings of those who have obtained a competency by their thrift and savings on which they must depend for support in their declining years, a subject discussed in the correspondence inserted here:

ANDES, MONT., *April 8, 1946.*

Hon. COMPTON L. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In your article, found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1956, you express the idea that low interest rates is a menace.

I have lived on a homestead in Richland County, Mont., for 32 years. I've paid interest rates as high as 12 and never lower than 6 percent. At times when prices were at the lowest point, say in 1931 and 1932, I've stood the banker off with a Winchester.

In going over those 32 years I had no trouble to pay after the depression came on. In 1937 there was a recession that took the prices out of cattle. A neighbor sold his cattle for 7½ cents in early August. I sold mine October 22 for 4 to 5 cents. I suffered a loss. At 7 cents I always had a profit on grass-fed stuff.

I say this interest rate should be reduced to 3 percent and held there by a rigid law.

The bankers in eastern Montana ruined Richland County after 1920. Think of it—1,100 mortgage foreclosures in this county from 1921 to 1925, both inclusive.

Money supply. Hold it at the present level until every dollar of debt is paid.

I am, very respectfully,

WM. A. ALEXANDER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1946.

Mr. WILLIAM A. ALEXANDER,
Andes, Mont.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: It was both interesting and a pleasure to receive your letter with reference to the interest rates charged for the use of money.

It appears that your experience in borrowing money in operating a farm is right in line with my own and thousands of others in this country. Back in the days when we needed so many things to reclaim and equip a farm in Idaho we had to borrow money at 12 percent and the loan companies made it a special favor to lend money to a farmer on a first mortgage at 8 percent and forced an applicant to pay their agent an advanced commission of $100 before they would even consider the loan.

Much of my earnings went to pay the quarterly installments of 8 percent interest on the farm loan. It was after this that the farm-land bank came along. We refinanced the farm loan at 6 percent, 5 percent of this was interest and the other 1 percent was applied on the amortization. This loan has been paid off, thank goodness, and now we are trying to keep out of debt.

I think interest rates, like rent of a house, or the lease on a farm, should bring fair returns for the use of the money. If you devote your time and efforts to building a home and someone comes along and wants to occupy your house, you are entitled to a fair rental. Then if circumstances make it necessary to sell your house and someone comes along and wants to borrow the money you received as the proceeds of the sale, you are just as much entitled to a fair return for the use of your money as you were for the use of your house or your farm, or any other form of property that you may have, or may convert into money.

You and I are discussing a problem as old as the ages—interest and usury. The rates of interest, like the price of many other things, is subject to the law of supply and demand. The rate of interest is controlled by certain legal restrictions devised to prevent the collection of usury. I am inclined to believe that 5 percent would be a fair ceiling on interest to be fixed by law, although the Congress has established a higher figure in fixing the rate of returns on capital invested in railroads and public utilities, which is placed at 6 percent for rate-making purposes, and the thing that our law should prevent is the creation of artificial money and credit and thereby eliminate schemes by which bank manipulators amass vast accumulations of synthetic money and capital—purchasing power, capital on which the Government, business, and those engaged in industry must pay interest, under the prevailing conditions, naturally money is cheap and interest is low.

The article you refer to in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was not my statement, but the condensation and publication of the plea of a banker for better interest returns on invested capital. The thing my efforts are being directed to is the preservation of a sound national economy with staple prices for the products of the farm and manufactured products of this country.

This can best be accomplished by giving this country a sound, adequate, and workable money system—a plan that will safeguard and protect the integrity of financial commitments as a means of putting business on a safe and secure foundation while eliminating booms and depressions.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Relief for Surviving Hebrews of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter sent to Mr. T. F. Tsiang, chairman of the recent session of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which was held in Atlantic City last month and which was addressed by Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation. I am sure that my colleagues will find this letter of great interest since it deals

with the specific problem of relief by UNRRA to the surviving Hebrews of Europe whose place of residence today is in former Axis countries. I also insert excerpts from the official journal of UNRRA's fourth session, in which this proposal of the Hebrew committee is discussed and a special and worthy plea is made by the then Director General, Mr. Herbert H. Lehman, for immediate implementation of this recommendation.

The letter and excerpts follow:

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1946.

T. F. TSIANG,
Chairman, the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Hotel Traymore, Atlantic City, N. J.

DEAR SIR: We beg to call the attention of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to a problem which has been under advisement since the Council's meeting in Montreal in September 1944 and yet remains as far from a solution as it was 18 months ago.

We again respectfully direct the Council's attention to the fact that the Hebrew people are one of the chief victims of the war, having suffered in proportion to its total population more casualties than any other nation involved in the war, and that the unique situation in which the uprooted and pauperized Hebrew people find themselves creates peculiar problems in bringing relief and rehabilitation to Hebrew nationals in the devastated countries of the Old World—problems to which the proposals advanced by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation bring the only practical solution thus far conceived.

The difficulties caused by the unique situation of the Hebrew people were not overlooked by the Montreal Conference. But instead of accepting our proposals at that time, the Conference attempted to circumvent the difficulties by passing resolutions 57 and 60. Bitter and costly experience has proved, however, that these complicated problems have not been solved by these resolutions. It remains a lamentable fact that the million Hebrews in the Balkans, who fall under the provisions of these resolutions, have failed to receive any assistance from the UNRRA.

The present session is to deal with and decide the fate of the so-called nonrepatriable displaced persons. We beg to submit that unless the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration will regard and treat the Hebrews as members of a distinct nationality additional suffering and privation will be inflicted on these sorely tried people for refusal to recognize their true status, which is that of Hebrew nationals, renders their problem insoluble.

So obvious is this fact that in Germany, despite the lack of formal resolutions and even against the opposition of the Director General, special camps for Hebrew (Jewish) displaced persons have been set up by UNRRA. It is to be regretted that, while the local staffs of this great organization realize the fact that the Hebrews in Europe have to be regarded and treated as a distinct national entity, the Council has not heretofore thought fit officially to recognize the real status of the Hebrew people.

There is a basic difference between nonrepatriable Yugoslavs, Poles, Czechs, etc., who are individual nationals of a free nation, who for personal or political reasons refuse to return to their countries, though these are willing to receive them. In the case of the Hebrews it is the reverse which is true. The Hebrews are all anxious to return to their country, which is Palestine; the British administration of Palestine, however, refuses to admit them. The UNRRA for the time being is the greatest and most successful instrument of United Nations cooperation progress. It must be dedicated to its humane task and steer away to the maximum degree from political involvements and considerations. It would be a gross injustice or an absurdity to insist upon and force German or Rumanian nationality upon the Hebrews who survived the massacres in Germany or Rumania merely because they were born in and live in these countries. They are not, and are determined not to be regarded as, Axis nationals, but as Hebrew nationals, and they believe they deserve the same treatment as the citizens of any other of the United Nations.

We do not refer, when we speak of Hebrews, to those persons, even though they are of the Jewish faith, who are bona fide citizens of free countries and wish to remain citizens of such countries. Such persons are in every respect nationals of the countries of their citizenship. Hebrews are those persons of Hebrew ancestry (though they may or need not now be adherents of the Jewish religion) who regard themselves as Hebrew nationals and are willing to renounce all political allegiance with any other nation. American and British Jews, therefore, are not Hebrews, but Americans and Britons. The Jews of the former Axis lands, however, have expressed their wish to be dissociated from those countries, and, in view of the gruesome fate they suffered at the hands of the Axis, it would be, as we have said, cruelly unjust to insist that they are Axis citizens and to treat them as such. In any event, such an attitude perpetuates the troublesome problem and inflicts useless untold suffering which it is the very task of UNRRA to alleviate and prevent.

We propose, therefore, that the UNRRA Council pass the following resolution:

"Whereas the situation of surviving Hebrews in Europe has not been improved to any considerable extent since the liberation of Europe from Nazi oppression; and

"Whereas the specific needs for relief and rehabilitation of these survivors have been brought into focus even more sharply by recent events indicating the utter impossibility of returning the Hebrew survivors to the countries of their former residence; and

"Whereas the lack of a specific program and of a definition of the status of these people, and of a special apparatus adequately to deal with the problems of Hebrew survivors in the field of relief and rehabilitation is causing undue hardship to those victims of persecution; and

"Whereas the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is duty bound on the basis of its charter to extend to Hebrews the fullest measure of help compatible with the means at its disposal, considering that Hebrews in Europe have fought at the cost of high sacrifice for the cause of the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That all displaced and uprooted Hebrews, regardless of their present whereabouts or countries of origin, be made subject to UNRRA assistance and given treatment on a par with all other destitute people of the United Nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a special mission of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration be constituted and put in charge of all matters pertaining to relief for Hebrew people."

Faithfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—ELEVENTH PLENARY SESSION

The eleventh meeting of the fourth session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was called to order at 3:45 p. m., Saturday, March 23, 1946, at the Traymore Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., by the chairman, Dr. Tingfu F. Tsiang.

REPORT BY THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

The Chair called upon the secretary of the general committee to read its fourth report, which read as follows:

The general committee met today and submits the following report:

* * * * *

"5. Proposal by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation: The committee determined that two items proposed by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation were not appropriate items for the council agenda. The first item, an application for membership in the Administration, was not considered appropriate since the application was not made on behalf of a recognized government or authority within the meaning of article II of the agreement. The second item proposed by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, relating to assistance to certain displaced persons in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, was not considered an appropriate item since there is adequate authority under the existing resolutions and since the Director General has taken all steps possible to comply with the Council resolutions on this subject."

* * * * *

Turning to item 5, the Chair called on the Director General for a statement.

"Mr. LEHMAN. I will just make a very brief statement with regard to the second item on this proposal relating to assistance to certain displaced persons in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. As you know, under our agreement and resolutions, UNRRA is not permitted to give assistance to the civilian populations of enemy or ex-enemy countries save on specific authority of the Council or the central committee. It was, however, at the meeting in London last August given authority to give assistance to certain classes of displaced persons in enemy or exenemy countries, notably those who were displaced by reason of race, religion, or assistance to United Nations during this war. That resolution, of course, authorized UNRRA to commence operations confined exclusively, of course, to displaced persons in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary.

"Immediately after the conclusion of the session in London, the Administration asked for authority from the Allied Council, consisting of representatives of the occupying forces in those three countries to be permitted to send missions to survey and study the situation with regard to displaced persons in those countries, and to take such other steps as might have been deemed desirable or necessary. That request was repeated on a number of occasions, both through direct contact inspired by UNRRA with the Allied Council and through the governments of the countries whose representatives composed the Allied Control Council. UNRRA is anxious to send missions in and to undertake this work which is necessary.

"In no case was that authority given by the Allied Control Council with respect to these countries. A month or two ago authority was given to carry on an emergency program in Hungary among the general population, and, of course, among the displaced persons, and a mission of UNRRA is either in Hungary or on its way there. No authority has, however, been given to UNRRA by the Allied Control Council to send in missions to Rumania and Bulgaria. I want to make one correction. I said that resolution 57 was adopted in London last summer. As a matter of fact, it was not adopted in London but in Montreal in September a year ago, and steps were taken by the Administration immediately thereafter and continued from that time on.

"Now, while I understand that the general committee has not proposed a resolution by this body, inserting the matter of the Administration gaining the authority and permission to send missions to Rumania and Bulgaria in order to undertake the work which the Council itself had authorized, may I say personally that since the work is necessary it should be undertaken at the earliest possible moment. I believe it would be extremely helpful if those governments who

are represented on the Allied Council would take whatever steps may appear to be practicable to gain favorable action by the Allied Council of those two countries and thus permit UNRRA to undertake the work which, as I have already pointed out, has been authorized by previous resolutions by this Council.

"The chairman called for action on item 5, which was adopted. He announced that, although it had been intended to hear a report from the committee on procedure relating to the application of the Government of Albania for membership in UNRRA, consideration of this item would be postponed, since some members of the council found it inconvenient to take it up at this time.

"Mr. NOEL-BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I think I am a little out of order, but you went a little too fast for me. I hope that I am not at all imposing on your indulgence. I do not wish to oppose the recommendation of the general committee under No. 5, namely, that no item should be added to the agenda. I would like to ask you, sir, if, at a later stage, I thought it desirable, I should be free to make a comment on what the Director General has just said. The statement which he has made is a new fact since the general committee adopted its resolution."

* * * * *

These conditions were found by missions of Polish officers to exist last September, and were still largely prevailing. Unfortunately these officers from his government had not been given the name or authority of liaison officers. Elements hostile to Poland had been assigned the work of maintaining security and order in the camps, while the Polish Government's officers' duties had been confined to technical matters connected with transporting the repatriates. This state of affairs constituted a severe obstacle to Poland, which would like to gather all its citizens to rebuild the devastated countries, and a burden for UNRRA, since it prolonged artificially the duration of the repatriation program.

Problem of national liaison officers

His government, said Mr. Stanczyk, was in accord with the grave concern over activities of national liaison officers expressed by the special subcommittee concerned with Resolution 71.

Mr Stanczyk stated he held in his hand a document containing a factual description of the antirepatriation activities of some liaison officers. He added the sincere hope that the liquidation of military missions and liaison officers appointed by unauthorized Polish emigration circles, which had taken place in the French zone, would also take place in the rest of Germany and Austria, thus placing Poland on an equal footing with other United Nations.

Problem of internal camp authorities

As pointed out in the subcommittee's report, UNRRA was responsible for the internal administration of the assembly centers, housing United Nations displaced persons, and coordination and supervision of voluntary agencies working in displaced persons assembly centers. UNRRA was thus responsible for the supervision of camp committees and similar organizations in the camps. These "self-government" bodies, elected by no one, had distributed food, clothing, reading matter, and Red Cross and other packages, had had charge of recreation, and had maintained liaison with so-called camp militia and security forces. The composition of these camp authorities must be reviewed, and management must not be placed in the hands of elements utilizing their position to impede UNRRA's repatriation program.

Propaganda in the camps

Until the first of this year not one Polish publication had been permitted to enter the camps in the British zone of Germany, and since that date only one Polish paper and one periodical had been admitted to the camps. Because of camp management by hostile elements, the Polish Government had no assurance that any printed word from Poland had in fact reached the displaced persons. One could find at the same time in the recreation halls of every camp publications from London, Rome, Germany, propagandizing against repatriation, and libeling the Polish Government.

Problems of Collaborators

Among the numerous categories of collaborators who had received UNRRA aid were many who, by ingratiating themselves with the camp authorities, had been appointed to important posts. As an example, Mr. Stanczyk mentioned the command of the so-called Swietokrzyska Brygada which had collaborated with the Germans in 1944 and 1945 in the war against Poland. The leaders of this brigade, now still active and publishing its own newspaper, had helped Hitler carry out his policy of exterminating Jews. This brigade had reconstituted itself as the command of the so-called First Group of Security Companies, and was now recruiting displaced persons to carry on armed manuevers, convening with the assistance and approval of military authorities in the field, and of UNRRA. The Polish Government hoped this review of the situation would lead to the liquidation of these armed bands and the collaborators leading them.

Return of Poles

A great majority of displaced persons had already returned to Poland and most of those remaining would return in the next few months. Two thousand Polish teachers managing some five hundred displaced-persons camp schools had accepted the Polish Government authority, and a delegation of church institutions in displaced-persons camps in Germany had also assured the Polish Government of its complete loyalty. The Polish delegation, therefore, believed that only those few would remain outside of Poland who preferred to enter the employ of foreign countries.

Revision of Resolution No. 71

The subcommittee's report had revealed that UNRRA's role had been far less significant than expected, and had been largely limited to such matters as internal camps administration, coordination and supervision of voluntary agencies, operation of tracing bureaus, and assisting military authorities in repatriation programs. The life of these camps was definitely limited, and the United States Government had proposed closing most of the camps in its German and Austrian zones by August and September of 1946. The development of this situation confirmed the position taken by the Polish delegation at the third session of the Council:

1. That repatriation constituted the main objective and should be carried out as speedily as possible;

2. That UNRRA should take care of all displaced persons during the period of repatriation, and until the program was concluded no one should be assumed to be unwilling to return.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the splendid statement given by Mrs. Caroline E. Ware on behalf of the leading women's organizations of the country. These consumer groups have a total membership in excess of ten million, and, although they testified before the Banking and Currency Committee, the hour was very late when they were called and, as a result, I feel Congress is entitled to the advantage of their statement to be printed in the RECORD. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CAROLINE F. WARE ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION, COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL ACTION OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, CONSUMERS UNION OF THE UNITED STATES, INC., DEPARTMENT OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS OF WOMEN'S DIVISION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS, INC., NATIONAL BOARD OF YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF COLORED PARENTS AND TEACHERS, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN, NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SETTLEMENTS, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE, NONPARTISAN COUNCIL ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF ALPHA KAPPA SORORITY, NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, AND NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

Mrs. WARE. The organizations which join in this statement urging the immediate extension of the Price Control Act represent the great mass of the American people—millions of parents and teachers, urban families from settlement house neighborhoods, farm-home economic leaders, housewives, and working women from all economic levels, from every type of community, and from every racial and religious group, veterans' wives, community leaders organized for social action in the interest of all the people.

The decision to allow the price line to be broken by the increase in the price of steel and the accompanying new wage-price policy have turned the vague fear of inflation into the very positive recognition that substantial increases in living costs are inevitable and that unless efforts to hold prices in check are redoubled, these current increases will set off the fatal spiral of costs and prices, and bring on the even more fatal collapse. These decisions have made it imperative that Congress act promptly and decisively to demonstrate its determination to protect the people from economic disaster and to set in motion forces which will prevent this decision from turning into the beginning of the end of economic stability.

There is every indication that the need for price control will be greater for the next year than it has been at any time in the past. The pressure of accumulated savings and money to spend continues to mount, while shortages in virtually all lines remain acute.

We all know that the ultimate answer to inflation is enough supply to meet demand. But supply must meet both the demand that comes from day to day and that which has accumulated over the past years and will hang over the market as an inflationary force until the bulk of these pent-up wants have been satisfied. And we know that supplies will not catch up with this accumulated demand anywhere in the immediate future. For many months more we consumers will have to take a chance on finding a quarter pound of butter, and join the scramble for a pair of nylons. For the next year and a half or 2 years we cannot expect to walk into a store and find a refrigerator, a sewing machine, a vacuum cleaner, or an auto.

There is no need to remind this committee of the inflationary experience after World War I. That was child's play compared with the prospects of galloping inflation today. We have only to look at what is happening around us now—at the jump in living costs in the recent months when they were expected to decline, at the booming stock market, at soaring real-estate values, at such simple items as clothes pins taken out from under price control after VJ-day and now selling at over twice their prewar level. The situation is clearly ominous.

But what leads us to urge Congress to act immediately is the danger that this bad situation will be made worse. If manufacturers, distributors, and landlords can look forward to price freedom after June 30, or if they can even take a good gamble that price control will not be extended, they will be under a very strong temptation to hold back production, fill up warehouses, and sit out the next few months waiting for a chance to make a killing when the lid comes off and prices jump. Delay in making clear that price control will go on will also invite a black-market boom based on the likelihood that enforcement will not catch up until it is too late.

While we do not mean to suggest a general sellers' strike, for many producers are wise enough to try to get into the market as soon as possible, we know that withholding goods from the market is no idle threat. We have seen this happen in the period before the excess-profits tax went off. While we have been able to secure no estimates of just how much withholding took place in the months prior to January 1, there appears to be no doubt that in clothing especially it was very considerable.

We therefore urge that you regard the extension of price control as emergency legislation which cannot safely be further delayed. We urge that you report the measure promptly; and vote extension immediately. Only thus can you check the inflationary spiral which the steel price break-through has started, and prevent the inflationary gamble of a sellers' strike.

It is essential that price control be extended for at least a full year. I am sure we all hope that, except for rent, housing and building materials, a year more will be all that is necessary. But anything less than a full year will be too short to allow for the inevitable tapering off of price control during the last months. Extension for a year means extension of effective control for only about 9 months. Whatever the date at which price control ends, the last 2 or 3 months are bound to be a period during which fewer and fewer items will be controlled and enforcement will become more and more difficult as the end draws near.

It would be tragic to repeat the mistake of recent months by again lifting controls too soon In the 7 months since VJ-day, expected declines in prices did not materialize, rapid reconversion and mounting production left supplies still far behind demand, and it has been necessary to retrace our steps and tighten our policies all along the line. The policy to drop food subsidies has had to be reversed; controls over building materials, discarded in October, have been restored and strengthened; the program for channeling materials into essential clothing (whose continuance for even the first quarter of this year was in doubt last fall) has had to be not only continued but strengthened for the second quarter of this year. The past 7 months should warn us of the danger in relaxing controls too soon. It would be better to err by retaining price control for 6 months too long than to open the door to inflation by stopping it 6 months too soon.

We cannot predict exactly when supplies will have caught up with demand sufficiently to bring a reasonable balance in the market, for many factors enter in. But under the most favorable conditions this will not happen soon.

Even if we meet our expanded food-production goals, and European harvests are good, the world food crisis will continue to be acute. According to Theodore Schultz, foremost agriculture economist, there is no prospect that famine and food-shortage conditions will come to an end in less than 18 months. Clothing supplies, especially shirts, shorts, and other cotton clothing, as well as household textiles will continue seriously below demand for the coming year. Cotton-textile production has been below the 1939 level.

We cannot expect the pent-up demand for durable goods to be met in a year even if production reaches unprecedented heights. When it comes to housing, the prodigious program called for by Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt, exceeding by 50 percent the peak production of the biggest housing boom in the past would still only prevent the situation from being worse than in October 1945 without making a dent on the acute shortage at that time. Delays in launching this program and failure to provide the Housing Expediter with necessary authority to carry it through means that the housing shortage will continue to increase.

In the face of the most optimistic possible estimates as to when supply may begin to balance demand, it is abundantly clear that the dangerous pressures on prices will not be relieved by production before June 1947. It is equally clear that rent control and the control over building materials will have to be retained for a minimum of 2 years, either by extension for 2 years at this time or by reenactment of rent control again next year.

We therefore urge that price control be extended to June 30, 1947, and rent control be extended to June 30, 1948. We hope that price control over new housing and over building materials will be provided at least for the period requesed by Wilson Wyatt, to December 30, 1947, preferably to June 30, 1948, and that existing houses and building lots will be brought under price control.

Furthermore it is essential that the act be extended without any weakening amendments. Violent attacks are being directed at the principle of cost absorption which has been the heart of the Office of Price Administration's pricing policy from the start. If Congress should modify the act so as to limit the authority to apply this principle equitably throughout the economy, the result would be price control in name only. Without cost absorption every increase would be pyramided and cause additional increases before it reached the consumer. To legislate a cost-plus formula as a substitute for cost absorption would simply be to legislate inflation instead of price control. The steel price increase and the wage-price policy make it doubly important that the principle of cost absorption be retained and firmly applied. Unless the resulting increases are absorbed up to the limit, they will wreck the price structure and set off wild and uncontrolled inflation.

We believe that no important commodity can be exempted from price control if it threatens to set in motion an inflationary rise. The announcement by the Office of Price Administration that it would have to impose ceilings on cotton if the price continued to rise above parity was met with protests and threats. Yet, quite apart from the obvious inequity of applying one set of principles to one main crop and a different set to other crops, a further cotton price increase would shove even higher clothing prices that are already the part of the cost of living which has risen most in recent months.

We believe, too, that no attempt should be made to define legislatively the circumstances in which the Office of Price Administration must remove items from price control. Needless to say, we are eager for the day when price control will no longer be necessary. But we believe that the determination of whether to take any commodity out from under price control must be made administratively in the light of the total price situation. Since before VJ-day, the Office of Price Administration has been operating according to a decontrol formula which permits suspension or exemption of an item from price control when supply and demand are in balance or the item is insignificant in the cost of living. We have examined the application of this policy for the past 7 months and find evidence that a number of items have been removed too soon. Release of too many minor items, each of which is unimportant in itself, can combine to make a real dent in the cost of living. In addition, items decontrolled because supply and demand appeared to be approaching balance have shot up in price, presumably because the pressure of general demand was so great that it distorted the normal supply and demand relationship for the particular article. Citrus fruit was, as you know, the most notorious instance.

An interesting example came to my attention this morning. In a little town out in North Dakota, the town of New Rockford, where the First Lutheran Church ordered a Hammond organ on January 26. The control over musical instruments was taken off on March 6. In January in response to its order in January 1946, the organization quoted the organ at $1,719.23. On March 28, 2 days after the announcement that musical instruments were out from under price control, the church received a letter saying that the price of the organ was now $2,235.34, an increase of $516.11 or 30 percent. That is just a sample of the kind of thing that we are afraid of in decontrol.

We, therefore, urge that no amendments be made in the Price Control Act which would limit the authority of the Office of Price Administration to require cost absorption, to apply controls, equitable wherever needed, to use administrative discretion in releasing items from control, or otherwise to hamper the administration of price control in this difficult period.

The present act contains provisions which several of our organizations have strongly opposed in previous years, most especially, we have pointed out that the limitations which Congress has placed on the use of quality standards in price regulations have undermined price control. This weakness in the act has been vividly brought to the attention of Congress in the exhibits presented by the National Retail Dry Goods Association, showing price inequities resulting from the failure to tie prices closely to quality. Although these exhibits were presented as an attack on the Office of Price Administration, they actually revealed the error of Congress, which not only failed to require that prices be defined in terms of quality, but actually forbade such definition. We need to know that goods are worth the ceiling prices marked on them and are not low-grade substitutes. Under the present law, the Office of Price Administration cannot require that we be given this assurance.

In the difficult year which lies ahead, the whole burden of stabilization cannot be placed on the price-control mechanism alone. Congress must supply also the other two supports for stabilization, subsidies and allocations. The need to continue present food subsidies was recognized in January when the plan to drop present food subsidies this spring was abandoned and the President called for continuance of subsidies for another year. When the steel-price increase and wage-price formula have been reflected in higher levels for parity and consequently higher price ceilings on agricultural products, larger subsidies than at present would be required to hold meat, dairy products, and bread prices at

present levels. In addition, the use of subsidies to break bottlenecks and get production of needed building materials, without thereby pushing up housing prices beyond the reach of veterans and other lower-income families is an essential part of the Housing Expediter's emergency program.

Money spent for subsidies which make it possible to hold prices in line is an investment which yields high returns in saving the public the terrible cost of inflation.

We urge that Congress provide the authority and funds for the payment of such subsidies as are necessary to prevent increases in price for the foods now subsidized, and to hold down the prices of needed building materials. We hope that premium payments on building materials may be restored to the Patman housing bill by the Senate and accepted when the bill comes for final approval to the House.

Since authority to allocate scarce materials and to use priorities is an essential supplement to price control, we are very glad that the Second War Powers Act has been extended and that allocation authority over building materials is being provided through housing legislation. We believe, however, that the terminal dates of March 1947 and June 1947 for the Second War Powers Act and the housing bill respectively, are too early in view of the almost certain need of such authority to allocate food supplies for relief abroad and to allocate building materials beyond those dates, with the possibility that production control may still be needed for some textiles. Although we know that this is not the committee responsible for recommending extension of the Second War Powers Act allocation authority is so integral a part of the stabilization machinery that it cannot be ignored in discussion of extension of price control.

We cannot close this statement without pointing to the need for adequate appropriations if price control is to be a reality in the coming year. Although this is not the committee which determines appropriations, it is in a position to influence the decision by indicating in your report on this bill your recognition of the need for sufficient funds. At no time has the task of administering and enforcing price control been more difficult and demanding than it is now and will be in the months ahead. For this task the Office of Price Administration will need to be kept at its present strength, especially since the field organization of the War Production Board, which formerly enforced the regulations on civilian production, has been disbanded, leaving the Office of Price Administration to carry the whole load alone.

Furthermore, the Office of Price Administration staff should not be required, by a policy of retrenchment, to spend time in administrative reorganization which absorbs energies and undermines morale. There should be no repetition of the months after VJ-day when, because of consolidation of local boards and districts offices, much of the energies of the Office of Price Administration staff went into disposing of desks, dismissing or reassigning personnel, and arranging records rather than into administration of price control.

We urge that your report on this bill make clear the need for sufficient appropriations to maintain a price control administration which can carry out and finish the difficult task assigned to it.

In conclusion, may we again remind this committee that the many millions of plain citizens who make up the organizations presenting this statement look to the Congress to pass legislation which will meet the needs and reflect the desires of themselves, their families, and their neighbors. They desperately need price control for another year. They desire it earnestly. On their behalf, we urge that you act now.

Domestic Issues in a One-World Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made by me at Town Hall, New York City, on January 23, 1946, as follows:

Some Americans get pleasure from denying obvious facts, but whether we like it or not we are living in a one-world economy. Realism—and American pride themselves on their realism—demands that we recognize this fact. And once we have recognized it, we have no alternative but to gear our domestic economy into this one-world economy.

Throughout what I shall say will run two themes. First, we have an obligation, a moral commitment to adopt those policies which will make us a part of this one world and not apart from it. We have just fought and won a war against anarchy, against exaggerated nationalism, against economic nationalism. We must construct a peace in which economic internationalism is the order or we shall be unfaithful to our own deepest motives in fighting to maintain a free world.

My second recurring theme is that any failure on our part to adjust our economy to a one-world economy is just bad business—to fail in this adjustment would be in our own economic disinterest.

Let me tell you a true story. A friend of mine was sitting as the American member of an international committee in Paris. They met all day on VE-day. All of the European United Nations were represented. Informally, my friend asked the group what they believed America's greatest contribution to the peace could be. They all thought it out and came to a unanimous agreement. Their answer to this question was given in two words, "Be prosperous."

Think of it. Other people ask us to be rich, to have plenty, to have two chickens in every pot, to be comfortable and successful. These men did not mean that they wanted us to have two chickens so we could give them one. That was not their point. Their fear was and is that if the United States goes into another depression, again has an acute unemployment problem, we shall by our own failure to maintain and increase our own living standards at home, by our failure to use our manpower and our productive capacity, put the brakes on world-wide economic recovery.

This point is sound. It needs to be spelled out in order to be made clear. What must we do in order to be rich so that we can, just by being prosperous, just by raising our own standards of life here at home, help this one-world economy to run more smoothly and productively?

First, and at all costs, and I mean at every cost, we cannot afford unemployment. It is paradoxical but true that we are so rich we cannot afford the luxury of unemployment. We have more highly skilled men and women in our labor force than ever before. The rate of increase of our productive capacity for peacetime uses was accelerated as a result of our war production. When we have reconverted we shall be able to produce more goods more efficiently in this country than we could have done if there had been no war.

During the first 6 months of 1945 our gross national product was reaching an annual rate of nearly $206,000,000,000. We have demonstrated that we can produce. By the summer of this year the manufacturers of refrigerators, radios, and electric supplies plan to be producing at three or four times their 1939 volume, and the manufacturers of household laundry equipment and sewing machines at double their 1939 volume. At first glance this may only mean to you, "I'll be able to buy a new refrigerator." It does mean that. But it means much more. It means we have to be able to continue to buy the products of our great industrial machine, and the purchasing power for those products comes from working people. Since our productive capacity has risen, our purchasing power must not only be maintained in future years but increased.

We must have a full-employment policy, not just a policy of hope and pious wishes, but a full-employment act that means what it says—that has a specific, practical plan worked out immediately so that we shall never again have to rake leaves while we wait for industry to get going again. We are too rich to let that happen again. We are so rich that if we let ourselves get into another depression it will be relatively, that is relatively to our capacities, worse than the last one.

The one world economy cannot stand that. The American public will not tolerate it, and the time to head this off is right now.

Historically the history of the American economy has been one of ever greater productivity, greater efficiency, lower costs to the consumer and a rise in real wages. This rise in real wages must continue. The working men and women must be able to buy not only what they produce but more and more of what can be produced.

Prices must be held in line and the workers must receive adequate wages. The workers know that, they understand that, and there, in a nutshell, you have the explanation of the current wave of strikes.

The OPA cannot be liquidated yet. The campaign to get rid of it is vigorous, loud, and well financed.

I read of the possibility of an 18-cent-a-pound increase in the price of butter. Inflation, yes; but it's also cruelty and downright economic suicide.

There is a powerful group trying to get rent restrictions removed at an early date. We cannot allow ourselves to be thrown to the tender mercies of the organized landlords of the country. Until the bottlenecks in housing construction are removed and some millions of housing units are built, we must continue to have legal protection from profiteers and gougers.

All the benefits of increased production cannot go to the profit makers. They must go to the people. I don't mean some of the people. I mean all of the people. That is why we are morally bound, and, again, bound in our own economic interests to have a permanent FEPC.

We cannot continue to discriminate in our employment practices and force large minorities to continue to be underconsumers. Our greatest potential internal market is our minority groups. These groups cannot have the purchasing power so essential to a healthy and prosperous national economy so long as so many fields of endeavor are closed to them. Filibusters are not economic remedies, they are a denial of the very process of democratic government and an effort to continue a real danger within our economic structure.

The greatest economic danger we face is underconsumption, low wages, the threat of the competition of a pool of cheap labor in our midst. If we are going to continue to have a free and competitive economy, the rules of competition must be the same for all.

And if we are ever to speak of social security, we cannot continue to hope for health in our economy, and continue to deny the

benefits of the Social Security Act to farm workers, to household employees, and to merchant seamen, to mention important groups now excluded. We cannot afford this type of occupational discrimination any more than we can afford occupational discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed.

What does this insistence of mine, that we be prosperous, have to do with a one-world economy? It has a great deal to do with it. The United States does not live in an economic vacuum. Prior to the war we exported about 10 percent of our national production and that exportation was essential to our economy. As soon as possible we are going to have to import again, too. It is not enough to send food and clothing to our allies. We are morally bound, and bound in our own self-interest, to aid them in every possible way to rebuild their economic life.

I don't mean that we should rebuild their economic life for them. I mean that our policies and actions must be such that they can rebuild their own economic lives. We must move toward a larger and freer flow of goods in international trade than ever before existed. The period between World War I and World War II was one of tariffs, restrictions, import and export licenses, bounties, and regulations until international trade virtually disappeared.

We were, in part, responsible for this absurd condition. At a moment when we should have done everything possible to encourage international trade we put up the greatest barrier to it, the Smoot-Hawley tariff, the highest in our history. Did it pay? It certainly did not. Cordell Hull saw that it did not pay, and his reciprocal trade treaties were his answer. They were based upon sound principles. They did help, but great damage had been done.

You may wonder why I bring up what may sound to you like ancient history. You may say we have learned the error of our old ways. Maybe you have but many have not.

It is naive, and dangerously so, to believe that isolationism died at Pearl Harbor. Only one kind of isolationism died, or, better, went underground. I warn you to be on the watch for isolationism in its contemporary form. Isolationists, pretty much the same old crowd and with the same press, take every opportunity today to tell the American people to again play ostrich. They deny the existence of a one-world economy.

They snipe at the United Nations Organization.

They hope that the Bretton Woods agreement does not work.

They alternately stimulate unnecessary fears of the British and the Russians, fears which breed fears in our allies.

They are really economic isolationists today.

Their voices are loud in condemnation of our loan to the British. They state, in effect that we can have a safe and sound economy no matter how poor and weak the economies of other countries are. This is not true; it is a fundamental economic error.

Again, it is our obligation and in our own interest to see that the economies of other nations are rehabilitated. A war-bankrupted England, a devastated France are just not good for us. They can be good customers, but they must have dollars with which to buy our goods.

Then, and here is the real danger in the future from our economic isolationists, we must buy their goods in order that the flow of dollars will continue. If the flow of dollars does not continue, the flow of goods will stop.

We are going to have to import more than we export. We will make loans and foreign investments and the returns on these will, finally, be only in the form of goods and services. There is no other possible form.

We certainly don't want their gold. We must travel and spend our money abroad and accept foreign goods. This is not a menace to our economy. It will be a boon. It will actually raise our standard of living as well as assist our customers, and it will lead to a healthier world economy because it is based upon the recognition of fact, the awareness of the interdependence of national economies in this one world.

Britain agreed to liquidate the sterling bloc. This was an important condition of the loan. It is an important step in the direction of freer world trade, toward multilateral, not merely bilateral world trade.

I warn you again to expect an outcry against imports just as soon as the war torn countries have anything they can send us. I warn you that all the threadbare arguments about cheap foreign competition will be dusted off and presented to you as economic gospel and there will be a drive for protectionism again.

But remember that these same protectionists will be eager to export our agricultural and industrial surpluses. They really are funny people. They are so amazingly inconsistent.

They are alarmed when Russia insists upon security. They call for the instant dissolution of the British Empire with no conception of what that process might involve. Yet they are the very people who want us to hang on to far-flung bases over the face of the globe.

They are such ardent imperialists themselves that they are afraid, even, of trusteeship for Pacific Islands under the UNO. They trust no one but themselves.

They will not trust anyone else, are suspicious to the point of paranoia of other nations, and then cannot understand that their very attitudes and pronouncements create suspicion of us. For in the final analysis it is they who make the foreign offices abroad doubt that they can rely upon the commitments of American delegates and upon the continuance of any long-term consistent American policies. We must remember that the rest of the world cannot easily forget what happened to President Wilson's hopes and promises; we Americans let the rest of the world down hard and, therefore, today, discordant voices in America are heard throughout the world with deep concern.

The rest of the world cannot forget the economic stupidity of the Amercan public in its total lack of understanding of the problems of intergovernmental debts after the last war.

The very Americans who damn our Government for not having a consistent foreign policy are, in general, the people who preclude the possibility of our having one and, when one does get announced, preclude other nations from believing that we shall be able to follow it through.

Except for some of our veterans who have been on the spot, it is practically impossible for us stay-at-homes to appreciate the condition of the economy of Europe and Asia. Remember how depressed we were when we read of what the Germans did to Rotterdam and Coventry. Remember how we praised the courage of the Russians and Chinese for their policy of scorching their own earth as they retreated.

Remember how proud we were of our Air Force as it blew up bridge after bridge and canals and railways, throughout western Europe, behind the lines of the retreating Germans, as our land forces slugged and slugged and then made their brilliant dashes.

But those bridges are still down, and they are down as part of the price not only of China's, Belgium's, and Greece's victory but as the price of our own victory and security.

We were happy to send the planes and the bombs. But is that the end of the matter? Our moral responsibility is great. Our own economic insecurity—so long as the destruction and dislocations remain—is real and must be recognized. And our political insecurity is increased just as long as we are surrounded by a more than half devasted world.

The years of occupation, plus the horror of Nazis and allied destruction, plus the cold and hunger of this winter are bound to produce political movements, strong political movements of which we disapprove and which we fear.

We should expect the wrangling and the tumult that goes on and will go on. It is a necessary product of our war.

But we cannot run away from it and ignore all this. We here in America can ignore this no more than New Yorkers could ignore a great Mississippi flood or the great drought in the West in the thirties.

As this is one country, one complicated interrelated country, so this is one complicated, interrelated world.

We have made our second contribution to UNRRA. In terms of the needs, it is totally inadequate. We have abandoned rationing when England has cut her dully, poor, wartime diet in order that others may have more to purchase in world markets. We are averaging twice the food consumption here of the best fed country in Europe, and the best fed are far better fed than the worst in Europe.

The situation in Asia is far worse than in Europe. We must give food to Asia, to southern and eastern Europe. Northern and western Europe are buying their own food.

Britain, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France are not receiving free food. But the world-wide shortages of fats and oils and of wheat and rice are serious. They are in very short supply for everyone.

There has been a drought in Australia and a drought in southeastern Europe. UNRRA and the northern and western European nations are having a very hard time buying the food commodities they must have. They aren't on the market in sufficient quantities.

And when I say they must have them, I really mean must. It is a matter of life and death. It is not a matter of comfort or plenty. It is literally a matter of survival.

This problem cannot be solved merely by giving our old clothes or by dropping a can of tomato juice into the barrel at the church door every Sunday. This may make us feel better, and it does help, but it is not the answer.

I am certain that if the whole matter were made clear to the American public, they would eagerly go along with a program which would promise a real solution.

We are eating about 14 percent more than our prewar consumption. In Europe, in some countries, they hope to have one-half their prewar consumption this year. We could do with less. We would happily do with less.

It is probably politically impossible to reinstitute rationing but we should demand a vigorous and coordinated Government policy and action which will see to it that at least the minimum food needed is delivered.

Those people over there need our low-priced calories, not our few high-priced surpluses. They are in a tough spot, and they need our help in making suitable purchases in the country.

I know that you will agree with me that we could each forego a few slices of bread each day plus some of the mayonnaise we spread around if we know the wheat and oil would be bought to the feed the hungry.

But the food problem is a rather short range, though acute, one. Agricultural and industrial rehabilitation are the real answer. I have been informed that even before the steel strike it was planned to export only 3 percent of our 1946 steel production. Again, I believe we would gladly do without or delay buying new steel products if we were given the facts.

I could drive my old car a little longer if I knew that a tractor could go to Greece

or Poland. They need tractors and plows so that they can feed themselves next winter.

But the purchasing countries and UNRRA are having extreme difficulty in buying these here. Our farmers could drive their tractors another year.

We simply must cooperate to make those people able to take care of themselves and to become functioning members of the one-world economy.

The Poles and the Greeks do not want charity. They want to produce. The Danes want fertilizer and fish nets so that they can take care of themselves.

America is unquestionably the richest and most powerful nation in the whole of history. We glow with pride at our achievements. But greatness carries responsibilities with it. Our duties are commensurate with our dominant position.

We cannot avoid these duties. We cannot deny their existence. They may stagger us, but since when are Americans frightened by the size of a problem?

We put our all into a magnificent effort to win the war, and now the real, the long, the tough problem of reconstruction faces us. It faces us just as much as if we had been bombed and ruined before liberation. Fortunately, we do not have to reconstruct our country. All we have to do is reconvert. But we do have to put our heads and our shoulders to work to construct a world that will permit decency and that will allow us the security many stupidly believed we had. No; we are not the greatest nation in the world until we have properly discharged the responsibilities of greatness.

The test of our greatness was not at Anzio, at Tarawa, or on the beaches of Normandy. You do not believe our greatness was demonstrated beyond moral doubt at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We have yet to demonstrate that we deserve the position we hold in the world, and our testing is just beginning and we shall be sorely tested soon.

We don't have another long period again in which to make mistakes. We can't look the other way for another generation and hope there will be no more Hitlers and Tojos. The next Hitler will be the end of us—the end of civilization. And I mean the end.

As we listened to Lister and Pasteur and Marconi and Burbank before, we must now listen to the men who put their brains to work at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos.

When I tell you we must listen to the atomic scientists, I mean we must listen with both ears or we won't have any ears to listen with. We will hear just one last big noise; maybe not; destruction today comes faster than the speed of sound. The alternative today is not one thing or another. It is one thing or nothing, and that one thing means cooperation.

How able are we to cooperate? What does it require of us?

I've said we must be prosperous. We must be wisely generous in helping the rest of the world to get on its own feet. We must be tolerant of other peoples and of their shell-shocked reactions to the war, to occupation, to the disillusionment of liberation.

We must be patient about the United Nations Organization and not expect miracles; we must not expect to have our own way every time. We are apt to forget that maybe we are not as easy to get on with as we believe others should be. We must get over our youthful inferiority feelings which make us believe we're dupes and the others are sharper and shrewder.

We have just as sharp and shrewd representation as the other people. Our weakness has come from not backing up our representatives—from not carrying through.

UNO, Bretton Woods, the food conference, all of these are nothing but machinery, and new and untried machinery at that. This machinery grew out of our own decisions, out of our own sacred promises to others and to ourselves. It's good machinery, created out of high resolve. Now we must put our living faith and devotion behind that machinery.

Think for a moment of what the hopes of the smaller nations are. For the first time there is reason to believe that the great United States might really come along and take responsibility and give the world its last chance.

Will we get impatient and insular again? Will we, like kids, pick up our marbles and go home?

We can't. Not this time nor ever again. There's nowhere to go.

It's not going to be easy. There will, as always, be plenty of occasion for suspicion and cynicism. But let us remember that we are committed as never before. Let us remember our goal, the big, broad goal, and not lose ourselves in irrelevancies and pettishness.

We shall be disappointed and piqued but we must rise above that and keep the real goal in mind.

If we can't be mature in our attitudes, we shall be remembered, if there's anyone alive to remember us, as the people who had the know how to make atom bombs, but not the "know how" to behave like grown-up people, like adults in the family of nations.

There is a lot to be done. I know that there are powerful and well-organized and well-financed groups who believe that what I have said here today is wishful thinking, sentimentality, love and light and dangerous nonsense.

I know what sections of the press are still isolationist or nationalist—the newer name they like. It's the same old crowd that wanted to do business with Hitler.

They were wrong then and they are still wrong. I know and you know the Senators and Representatives who regularly block measures, who won't let measures come on the floor and if they do get to the floor consistently vote against world friendship, against own future.

But these newspapers and individuals are only problems we face—problems to be overcome.

I have faith in the common man. I have an abiding faith in people—in the American public—to solve its problems, to shoulder responsibility and to come out with the right answer when faced with the facts.

But in an atomic age we need to listen and read and learn—to think.

We have to find out what UNO is, what our delegates are doing and why?

We have to watch what our delegates are doing and why.

We have to watch Congress.

I want the people from my district to keep very close tab on me. And I hope that a close tab will be kept on some other districts I can think of.

This country needs an alert, informed electorate as never before, and the need is not only for today but for tomorrow as well. That's part of the job of insuring our future.

That is why I urge Federal financial assistance in the field of education. So long as the variation in standards of schooling remain what they are, we are not safe in our democratic society. Many States have shocking low educational standards. The draft brought that home to us. But in terms of their resources, those States' expenditures for education are high. They must be aided so that we can have the knowing electorate we need.

Universal suffrage will come when we get rid of the poll tax. Universal suffrage without really good Nation-wide education will not solve our problems because both today and tomorrow we are, and will be, called upon to solve problems which will require trained and informed minds.

Finally, the fact that UNO will have its headquarters in this country presents us with a challenge and an opportunity. At close hand we shall be able to watch the development of the new forms of international cooperation. The staff and delegates will be closer to us and will understand us better.

It is a challenge! And an opportunity for the American public to follow the new issues.

Every library, every church, every school, every women's club must be hard at work. It is an opportunity for some real adult education, for a new and vital program of reading and discussion in every community in this country.

One world—the building of a new life and new relations. We cannot fail if we remember that man is the object of our concern—the well-being of human beings the world over—the end of all our labors.

Passport for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made at Chicago, Ill., on February 24, and at Portland, Maine, on March 22, 1946, entitled "Passport for Tomorrow":

Do we who are gathered here tonight—do the peoples of the world—really want to go on living?

If we do, there is only one way. We must take for our platform—for the platform of the peoples of the world—the one short, simple word: peace.

We must fight for it, make sacrifices for it, believe in it—mean it—with all our minds and hearts and souls. It is our only salvation.

It is utter nonsense to talk about insuring ourselves against the destructive use of atomic energy so long as there is any possibility of another war—anywhere in the world.

It is sheer idiocy to talk about outlawing atomic weapons of war unless we outlaw war itself. Another war and you can be sure atomic weapons will be used—and that will be the last war.

A curious phenomenon has taken place in American political life.

Traveling in and out of Washington at the present time is a group of serious, thoughtful men. They are not subsidized by any political or economic group. And, strangely enough, they are not seeking anything individually for themselves.

Who are these people? The foremost scientists of the day.

What are they trying to do? Trying to save us from ourselves.

Why are they trying to do it? Because they feel responsible. They uncovered the secret of the universe, tore away the veil between man and the gods and thereby they placed in our hands the power to destroy ourselves utterly. They cannot sleep—they can find no rest until they know we are safe.

How are they trying to do it? By repeating the facts over and over and over again—by bringing us the facts, hoping that the facts will so clearly mark our way that we will not stray off on to the wrong road—the road that leads to destruction.

What are the facts?

1. Other nations will be able to produce atomic bombs.

2. No effective defense is possible in atomic warfare.

3. Safety cannot be obtained by superiority in atomic armament.

Henceforth, war will mean the destruction of a large part of civilization.

International cooperation of an unprecedented kind is now necessary for our survival.

Are we going to listen to the only men who have the facts? Or are we going to lull ourselves into eternal sleep with soothing sirup passed out by local, national, or international medicine men?

Professor Einstein has said:

"We helped in creating this new weapon in order to prevent the enemies of mankind from achieving it ahead of us, which, given the mentality of the Nazis, would have meant inconceivable destruction and the enslavement of the rest of the world. We delivered this weapon into the hands of the American and British people as trustees for the whole of mankind, as the fighters for peace and liberty."

How do we fight for peace and liberty? You certainly don't do it by trying to lock up science and scientists under military surveillance, as was attempted in the May-Johnson bill. That only succeeds in doing two things: (1) rousing distrust in other nations and thereby prompting an atomic armaments race, and (2) drying up the source of our own genius—our own development.

As one of our leading educators has put it: "We did not achieve our present leadership by policing laboratories or by Government control. Our science had its doors and windows open to the entire world. Contributions from scholars everywhere, including refugees from our enemies in this war, played right into the open and free intercourse and reciprocal enrichment of free science."

No; we cannot lock up anything. The only way that we can in truth be trustees of this cosmic weapon is to mobilize the peoples of the world behind a real peace program.

How do we mobilize people for peace? How do we make them want to live? That is the issue.

There is only one way: by the promise of greater freedom, political and economic, for all the peoples of the earth. That is the only way that peace can become precious to the peoples of the earth. For unless peace becomes precious to all the peoples of the world, there will be no peace for anyone.

Peace is indivisible. Liberty is indivisible. Security is indivisible. The future itself is indivisible.

We mobilized our own people and the peoples of the world to resist the forces of evil because of the promise of greater freedom. It was this promise that cut the bonds of apathy, that released the strength that finally destroyed the most powerful war machine the world had ever known.

Franklin Roosevelt understood this when he enunciated the "four freedoms," just a little more than 5 years ago. Remember his words:

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded on four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God and in his own way—everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose.

"To that high concept there can be no end save victory."

This is the root of the matter. The danger that confronts us today does not rest in the atomic bomb, but in the hearts and the minds of the people, the world over. Do we or do we not want to live? Then living must be made what it can be—a free and joyous thing for black, white, and yellow men, wherever they are on this globe. Only so can we tear out the seeds of our own destruction that we carry within ourselves.

I repeat again—it is sheer idiocy to say that you can control atomic weapons if there is to be another war. If there is another war, atomic weapons will most certainly be used—and it's anybody's guess how many people will be left, or how much of our planet—if any.

Here is what atomic energy could do if and when it is ever made fully available to work for man.

Smashing the atoms in one pound of water would create enough energy to heat 100,000,000 tons of water from freezing to boiling temperature.

A breath of air would operate a powerful airplane for a year continuously.

A handful of snow would heat a large apartment house for a year.

The pasteboard in a small railroad ticket would run a heavy passenger train several times around the globe.

A teacup of water would supply the power of a great generating station of 100,000 kilowatts capacity for a year.

If the atomic energy in matter is made fully available for mechanical use, all other forms of energy would be antiquated, such as fuels and explosives. Dams and electrical transmission lines would be as outmoded as stagecoaches.

These estimates were made before the war (1934) when physicists were just beginning to visualize the tremendous potentialities of atomic research. They were published in the Advance of Science, edited by Watson Davis and published by Doubleday, Doran & Co.

One of our scientists has said that we are in fact the last earthbound generation—if we survive.

Our children, he says, will have the two things man has always sought. On the one hand, endless material—make anything. On the other hand, the power of the gods—to make it. If we survive.

Enough atomic energy in a breath of air to operate an airplane continuously for a year—enough in a handful of snow to heat a large apartment house for a year—enough in a small pasteboard railroad ticket to run a heavy passenger train several times around the globe—enough in a teacup of water to supply the power for a great generating station of 100,000 kilowatts capacity for a year. All these things may be ours some day, we are told—if we survive.

The possibilities in atomic energy in the control and cure of disease go far beyond anything medical science has yet achieved. Arthritis, nephritis, diseases of the brain, all the germ diseases—even the common cold—these may be unknown to future generations—if we survive.

But if we are to survive, the welfare of man must be the end of all our endeavors, the well being of human beings the end of all our labors.

It's people who are important. It's people we must put first, from here out. Not machines, not wealth. Neither the United Nations nor a world government will work unless people are the object of our concern. The UNO—any government, international, national, or local—can only be the instrument, the machinery through which we work for an enlargement of freedom. For what? Not a machine, not profits, but a human soul.

Do you remember the words of William Jennings Bryan, spoken here in Chicago, nearly half a century ago?

"Shall we crucify mankind upon a cross of gold?"

Never forget, in the last miserable child in the world rests the future of man.

How do we secure this future? How do we work toward the fulfillment of the four freedoms and the larger liberty men dream of?

We, the people of the United States, have a representative government. The power is ours. The power rests on the Main Streets, the Primrose Lanes, quiet suburban byways, crowded city streets all across and up and down this broad land of ours.

We speak through the men and women we select and elect to represent us—from the alderman to the President.

What yardstick shall we use in this uncertain hour? Do we put them up against a screen and X-ray them to see what their reaction is to atomic energy? Will this determine whether they are worthy of our trust?

No. We must measure them now—as they should have always been measured in the past. Have they, or have they not, respect for the dignity and worth of every human being?

There is no magic formula we can invent to measure this quality. We have before us now in Congress bills which will tell us very quickly where our representatives stand on the one issue that will be our passport to the future.

The FEPC bill, which lays down the principle that no American can be denied a job because of race, color, or religion.

The bill for repeal of the poll tax, which would remove an economic barrier which now prevents many thousands of American citizens from exercising that basic right on which we founded our Republic—the right to vote.

How will your representatives stand on Wilson Wyatt's projected housing program, which seeks to cope with the housing problem realistically, by setting up a quota that is cognizant of the need, and by asking for subsidies which will insure homes within the price range for veterans and the average American citizen?

Where does your representative stand on inflation—the present OPA bill that extends price control until such time as the supply will meet the demand?

Where does he stand on the minimum wage? Does he believe in a subsistence wage, or does he believe that only his children are entitled to orange juice, milk, and codliver oil?

How will he stand on the child and maternal welfare act, designed to provide help for 200,000 American mothers who have babies each year without any care during pregnacy or at time of delivery—a bill that might have saved the lives of most of the 430,000 American babies who died before they were a year old, between Pearl Harbor and VJ-day—430,000 helpless, defenseless Americans, almost twice the number of all Americans killed in the war?

There are other bills—but you get the idea.

How will your representative stand on the loan to Britain? Will he pull out the old Santa Claus gag, or does he realize that we must set world trade moving again—and that we are the only ones who can do it?

How did he stand on UNRRA, UNO, Bretton Woods, full employment?

Congress voted a hundred billion dollars a year for war. That's what it cost us.

Have you found out how much your representative thinks life is worth?

Do you know whether your representative is a world citizen or an atomic-age isolationist?

Find out how your representative feels on domestic control of atomic energy—that will tell you.

Senator McMAHON's bill in the Senate—which I introduced in the House—is one con-

crete way to find out. This bill recognizes the fact that every technological advance made in the world has directly affected the way men live—that the release of atomic energy will be more revolutionary upon our political, economic, and social life than was the discovery of fire. It places the control in civilian not military hands—and it places final application of atomic energy where it rightfully belongs, with the President and Congress—the elected representatives of the people. The bill recognizes squarely that any program we work out for atomic energy in this country must be harmonious with our international policy and must be operated in such a way as to inspire trust and not to arouse distrust. This bill recognizes the oneness of a one-world.

These are some of the measures your representatives will be asked to pass upon.

But the power to make the decisions is derived not from within the Congressmen themselves but from the people.

That power is yours. It rests in the vote of every man and every woman in every house on every street, lane, and byway in America.

The power is there. But do you turn it on? Do you use it?

Never forget that it is this power—the power of the vote—the power of the secret ballot—toward which men yearn, toward which men are moving, the world over.

You have that power—now, here, tonight—within yourselves, in your hands. What are you doing with it—this power that will determine whether mankind survives or becomes but a mere momentary incident in the ageless history of the universe?

Wake up. Wake up before it is too late.

Don't tell me you have no time. Take time. Take time now—so that you may share a part of time in the future.

Here in this land of the free we speak through the men and women whom we select and elect to represent us. Do you do any selecting? Do you do any electing? Or are you one of those millions of Americans who didn't even bother to vote in the last congressional election?

How many streets have you walked up and down, ringing doorbells, to get out the vote?

You take out insurance policies—but this insurance policy, without which all other insurance policies are mere scraps of paper, what are you going to do about it? Do you care enough for your children to give them the only protection that is any real protection?

Do you use your power at all? Or have you turned it off, merely letting off steam in endless, futile vapors of complaint, frustration, and forebodings of doom?

Only the "four freedoms" can save us—the "four freedoms" for everyone everywhere in the world. Only the people can make the "four freedoms" live—for everyone everywhere in the world.

Not all of the peoples of the world can speak in this hour. But we have a people's government—a government we built upon our belief in the worth and dignity of man.

The question is:

Will we betray ourselves—will we fail ourselves? Will we fail our great promise? Not if we understand. Of that I'm convinced.

Go out and carry the word.

And remember—in that last miserable child, wherever it may be, rests our future.

People must be the object of our concern.

Walt Whitman said it—this way:

"The wonder everyone sees in everyone else
he sees, and the wonders that fill each
minute of time forever,
What have you reckon'd them for, camerado?
Have you reckon'd them for your trade or
farm work? or for the profits of your
store?
Or to achieve yourself a position? or to fill
a gentleman's leisure, or a lady's
leisure?
Have you reckon'd that the landscape took
substance and form that it might be
painted in a picture?
Or men and women that they might be
written of, and songs sung?
Or the attraction of gravity, and the great
laws and harmonious combinations
and the fluids of the air, as subjects
for the savants?
Or the brown land, the blue sea, for maps
and charts?
Or the stars to be put in constellations and
named fancy names?
Or that the growth of seeds is for agricultural tables, or agriculture itself?
Old institutions, these arts, libraries, legends, collections, and the practice
handed along in manufactures, will we
rate them so high?
Will we rate our cash and business high?
I have no objection.
I rate them as high as the highest—then a
child born of a woman and man I rate
beyond all rate.
We thought our Union grand, and our
Constitution grand,
I do not say they are not grand and good,
for they are,
I am this day just as much in love with
them as you,
Then I am in love with You, and with all
my fellows upon the earth.
We consider bibles and religions divine—I
do not say they are not divine,
I say they have all grown out of you, and
may grow out of you still,
It is not they who give the life, it is you
who give the life,
Leaves are not more shed from the trees,
or trees from the earth, than they are
shed out of you.
The sum of all known reverence I add up
in you whoever you are,
The President is there in the White House
for you, it is not you who are here for
him,
The Secretaries act in their bureaus for you,
not you here for them,
The Congress convenes every twelfth-month
for you,
Laws, courts, the forming of States, the
charters of cities, the going and coming of commerce and mails are all for
you.
List close my scholars dear,
Doctrines, politics and civilization exurge
from you."

New Factor in Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me last week, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in The Sun, published in New York City, entitled "New Factor in Unification":

NEW FACTOR IN UNIFICATION

President Truman ushered in the last 24 hours of the first year of his administration with a note that was decidedly sharp, not to say sour. In his remarks at his press conference yesterday afternoon he voiced severe displeasure with opposition by naval personnel to the proposed Army-Navy merger. He sought to draw a distinction between opposition of naval officers as individuals and opposition voiced by them as members of the service. This distinction is not so clear to most persons as is the President's determination to have his way in the fight over unification. The current plan, unveiled by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs the other day, is not like the original Army plan; it adopts some features of the substitute proposed by the Navy Department. Indeed, it is presented, though not very convincingly, as combining unity with autonomy.

If, as predicted in Washington, Secretary Forrestal, of the Navy Department, and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations, resign as a result of the President's remarks, it will be emphatic notice of the interpretation which the high command of the Navy has put on his words. That is to say, the Navy will construe them as meaning that opposition to the merger will be permitted only by naval officers whose opinions do not count. But the salient feature of the debate which the President is seeking to limit is, that neither the case for unification nor the case against unification is particularly strong. The best evidence of that is the last-minute overhauling of the well-considered Army plan so that it might be studded with features calculated to appeal to the Navy. The resulting hodgepodge may or may not combine unity with autonomy; it does combine almost every administrative suggestion made since the fighting stopped.

Though it may not be quite polite to do so, in view of the President's invocation of his rights as Commander in Chief, naval officers who consider themselves hushed may dwell on the fact that in the past year there has been a considerable gap between what the President announced himself firmly for and what he got from Congress.

The Disgrace of the Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY. O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, on a brisk March day two Senators called at the White House to talk business with the President, business which directly involves every American's pocketbook. That business was the scandal reported from time to time in the disposal of American surplus property abroad. It was significant that one of these two senatorial callers was the chairman of the Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, Senator MEAD, of New York—the same committee which once had for its chairman Senator Harry S. Truman.

The Mead report, which was subsequently issued, only confirmed and collaborated the stories of monumental waste which has been seeping into the handling of surplus materials abroad since even before VE-day. These stories told of fully equipped trucks being driven into the sea; of precious foodstuffs and other stores callously dumped overboard. The incredible viciousness of the situations stunned Americans. It meant that for every dollar wasted or every dollar's worth given away or traded for profit to alien recipients a dollar had to be added to the burden of the American taxpayer, civilian and veteran alike. It was as though more than a dozen battleships the size of the enormous U. S. S. *Missouri* had been sunk at sea without a trace. It

was "no salvage" for the American taxpayer.

How much do our surpluses overseas amount to? The United States News for April 5 estimates that—

> Surplus property abroad will represent $12,831,000,000 to taxpayers when the services finish declaring all their surpluses.
>
> Sales to date involve surplus property that cost $592,716,000, or not quite 10 percent of the entire eventual surplus. If the buyers ever pay for them only about $335,974,000 will come from these sales.

In the examination of this inexcusable peacetime extravagance, let us first look into the disposal of combat equipment. What is being done with our fighting equipment overseas? Some of it is being destroyed. That is obvious, especially in areas where it would be more expensive to maintain it than it would be to dispense with it. That, however, is not the chief problem when it comes to getting rid of our still-militarized armaments. For the most part, our transactions in this department of our surpluses have been in connection with foreign governments for either cash or credit. There has been little cash. In other words, we are selling our guns for scrap. Have we forgotten what happened to our scrap metal before World War II? It will be impossible to estimate accurately how much of that scrap went into the bodies of American boys as shells and bullets. Nor can we fail to remember the effective application of still-militarized equipment that was considered obsolete after the First World War. The French 75's of 1917–18 took a deadly toll of Hitler's Nazis in 1940. We have no power of prophecy to predict who may be an ally in 1960 and who may be an enemy. It is a matter of history that Japan was a member of the combination of nations against the Kaiser when General Pershing's forces smashed the Hindenburg Line.

The selling or giving away of American military equipment abroad must be closely scrutinized for still another reason. As these transactions are being conducted today, they are one-man jobs. Congress has had little or nothing to do about it. With our Constitution and our system of representative government facing peril from so many directions, it is imperative that we become increasingly alert and watchful when the rights and duties of Congress are both threatened and ignored.

There are many ramifications of this problem of the disposal of surpluses distinct from the disposal of military equipment. What about using our surpluses—our nonmilitary surpluses abroad—as a trading lever to pry open the barred door of foreign trade, and to bring into the United States some of the scarce materials so badly needed today and which we do not and cannot produce. On the surface, there is logic in this approach. Yet, even this trading of material for material must be carefully studied so action will not be too hasty. If we do trade, what surpluses will we offer for trade? We have a vast amount of mechanized equipment overseas. We need rubber, tin, and many other things. But, would it be the wise move to trade our mechanized equipment, our trucks and our bulldozers, for the things we need? Would this work a hardship on our automotive and heavy machinery industry, depriving them of potential market abroad? Even if they would not be hurt by such a procedure, it is their right in our Republic to be heard. And the only place where they could get a fair hearing would be before congressional committees and before Congress as a whole. Furthermore, these matters should have been placed before Congress in September of 1945 and not a half a year later when every second of delay is costing each American citizen extra dollars in taxes, as well as extra inconvenience in the difficult tasks of reconversion.

The administrative selling-agents taking part in the disposal of our surpluses abroad—without the advice and consent of Congress—are gaining a deserved reputation as the world's worst traders. When the opportunity does present itself to sell at a profit to our Government, these self-styled "experts" turn their backs on advantages at hand and sell at much lower prices, at a tremendous loss, in order to grasp the "will-o'-the-wisp" of "international friendship." It is difficult to follow such reasoning since in numerous instances the alien purchaser is well known to be a century-old respecter of those who practice close dealing.

Moreover, the American sellers allow themselves to be the victims of all forms of international horse trading. They dispose of the property of all Americans for a mess of pottage because they have been promised foreign support for the United States at some hypothetical trade conference to be held at some unstated time in the unspecified future. They take for their pattern of payments for goods sold the pattern of loans not yet approved by Congress, blissfully coupling money loans and equipment sales. They, themselves, would not deign to ride in a 10-year-old automobile. Yet they sell surplus American trucks to be paid for in 50 annual installments at less than 2 percent interest. How many trucks made in this country in 1946 will be still on the roads in 1966? How many foreign governments are going to keep on paying for this equipment after the equipment has become junk? You—and your Congress—know the answer to these questions.

It is no wonder the United States News of April 5 bitterly complains that—

> Four hundred and ninety-eight million dollars' worth of Army and Navy equipment was declared surplus in the United Kingdom.
>
> All this was sold for (an amount) to be paid in 50 annual installments at less than 2 percent interest. The terms are the same as those for the proposed loan to Britain. This represents only 10.7 percent of the total cost of the inventory involved. After the last war, the United States got a 50-percent return, in credits and forgiven claims, on surplus goods sold in France.

The Soviet Union and the Soviet-front countries of Europe got an equally advantageous deal in American overseas surpluses. In their case, we gave those countries hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of our surplus goods and agreed to take their I O U's in exchange. Many of the Soviet-bloc countries are even now clamoring at our doors for a more satisfactory arrangement; that we should loan them the money to pay the interest on the debt they owe us on paper for taking over our surpluses. They ask this in the face of history. Where are the promises of Casablanca? Where are the promises of Teheran? Where are the promises of Yalta? Where are the snows of yesteryear?

There certainly is no assurance that these nations will not keep the goods and the money, and use the money to foment strife within these United States.

Up to this point, I have spoken chiefly of the condition of overseas surplus disposal today and—to a lesser degree—of those who are doing the disposing. Just who are these so-called administrators who have been trampling on the authority of Congress? They are the American diplomatic representatives who, in their zeal to gain alien good will, have consciously sold at a loss and neglected their own country's financial interests abroad. They are the disposal agents of our armed forces who, in general, have no concept of what to retain and what to sell. They are the men who did not get the materials back to the United States in time or quantity for the tremendous tasks of the change-over from war to peace. They are the Office of Surplus Property representatives who could make policy but who could not carry it out. Yes. These are the culprits. These are the men who sold American taxpayers down the international river. And the stain of guilt reaches on up to high places where the responsibility lies to tie in each arm of every organization detailed to sell our surpluses overseas. The guilt is still here. So is the problem.

What are we going to do about it? What can we do about it?

The answer is for Congress to see to it that these people go about the business of selling our surpluses abroad in a businesslike manner. Our Government has a charter, a Constitution. Our Constitution provides that our Congress shall be the true bulwark of the American taxpayer, and it is Congress who must rightfully and ultimately decide on the procedure to follow in the disposal of surpluses overseas. Above all, such sales must be made by a policy-making agency which has its authorization directly from Congress; not by a non-policy-making agency, with only tentative authority—and that from the Executive, unchecked by Congress. Business practices, proved business practices, must be followed. We cannot gain respect for our Nation by selling at a give-away price so the nation or individual buying can resell our products on the local black market. We cannot gain respect for our Nation by destroying our surpluses when the people in the very locality in which they are destroyed are desperately in need of what we destroy. We do not stand to gain anything, anywhere, by selling America short or in selling American goods short.

It is time for Americans to rise up and condemn the wasting of their money and their property. It is time for Americans to think in terms of their future and their children's future. It is time to do away with the black disgrace of the disposal of our surpluses abroad.

Development of the Mississippi River and Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Mississippi Valley Association on March 25 last in St. Louis, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, members of the Mississippi Valley Association, ladies and gentlemen, it is with a feeling of humility and at the same time of gratitude that I acknowledge the complimentary phrases with which our distinguished toastmaster has presented me to this magnificent audience. I am very happy about his reference to what I have undertaken in my feeble way to do for flood control and river and harbor improvement throughout the United States.

I am very happy to be the honored guest of the Mississippi Valley Association. The contributions that I and Congressman WHITTINGTON and Judge MANSFIELD have made to flood protection and to the improvement of our rivers and harbors are due very largely to the inspiration and the cooperation that we have received from the Corps of Army Engineers of the United States, from the Mississippi Valley Association, from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, from the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, and similar organizations.

There is one member of your association to whom I think special credit is due. I never hold a hearing on any river-and-harbor bill, or flood-control bill, or authority bill, that he is not the first one to appear and the last one to leave. I reserve him usually as a last witness because, like a bulldozer, he tears down all the hills and obstacles of the opposition, fills the gaps that our own witnesses have left untouched, smooths the whole field, and presents such an attractive picture of the entire proposal that it carries with it conviction and favorable action by the committee. I refer, of course, to your very able, distinguished, and patriotic president, Mr. Lachlan Macleay. [Applause.]

I think it would have been more interesting to you if the toastmaster had mentioned some of my many faults and foibles. I'll present you with one. I suffer under the dreadful embarrassment of being unable to remember names and faces. This is an awful confession for a supposed politician to make. I wouldn't make it on Louisiana soil. [Laughter.] I get by in Louisiana as I go through its cities and towns and along its highways and byways by speaking to everyone and calling them by the first sobriquet that pops into my mind, such as "old scout," "young squirrel turner," etc. [Laughter.]

In my last campaign for reelection I was going along the main street of one of our Louisiana towns, shaking hands and backslapping right and left, getting along famously, as I thought, until I spied a man approaching me a few feet away. I thought that I recognized him as being an old friend of mine, a farmer down on Red River and a politician of some local influence. So I grabbed his hand warmly and said, "Old duffer, old friend, how are you, and how is farming on Red River?" He said, "I dunno." I said, "What! You haven't given up farming on Red River, have you?" He replied, "I never farmed on Red River. Who are you?" [Laughter.] I said, "Why I am JOHNNY OVERTON." That didn't seem to register, so I drew myself up in all of the senatorial dignity that I could command and exclaimed, "I am United States Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, senior Senator from the State of Louisiana." He said, "Stranger, I never heard of you befo'." [Laughter.] And he added, "I'm from North Caroliny and am passing through this burg on my way to Arizony." [Laughter.] Whenever I encounter anyone of you and do not call your name, just give me a swift—tap on the shoulder [laughter] and tell me who you are.

I am also happy to find myself in the city of St. Louis, beloved daughter of Old Man River, one of the great principal cities on the Mississippi River, a wonderful port and manufacturing center. St. Louis was predestined to succeed because it was founded in the old colonial days by three enterprising citizens from the city of New Orleans. [Laughter.]

I love to think of these fine daughters of the great Father of Waters—glamorous New Orleans, eldest born; industrial Baton Rouge, over which the flags of five nationalities have floated; romantic Natchez, which perhaps more than any other city has kept up southern traditions and ante bellum aristocracy; historic Vicksburg, that gave you damyankees so much trouble in the War Between the States [laughter]; Cairo, nestling between the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, which periodically gives us the jitters in flood stages; especially when the Tennessee Valley Authority lets out of its dams millions of cubic feet of water to heighten the flood stages of the Ohio in the most critical hour. [Laughter and applause.] I never think of dear old St. Louis but what I recall Mark Twain's statement that the first time he saw St. Louis he could have bought it for $6,000,000 and it was, he added, the mistake of his life that he did not do it. [Laughter.] And from St. Louis on up the Mississippi River to the twin cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis.

They are all wonderful cities. I told you what makes them great cities. With all due respect to my great friend Colonel Johnson, who has just addressed you, I venture the assertion that they are great cities because they sprang from the loins of Old Man River. These daughters of Old Man River came into being and grew and prospered because they are the product of the mighty Mississippi. Here civilization found a natural and God-given asset for travel and transportation and traffic.

In the pioneer days they used the great stream and tributaries through flatboats and rafts and skiffs and sailboats. Then came the invention of Robert Fulton and the glorious days of steamboating. I remember the steamboats well in their latter days, and I am still quite a young man. I was born and reared right by the Red River of the South, a great tributary of the mighty stream. We shipped our crops on the steamboats down to New Orleans, and the steamboats brought back our supplies.

I remember Bill Jenkins. You know, every man in Louisiana is expected to make at least one trip during his lifetime to the Crescent City. Bill Jenkins, a young and prosperous farmer, had made a fine cotton crop and sold it for a good price. He got himself a store-bought suit of clothes, a 10-gallon hat, and a red bandana, and boarded the *Jesse K. Belle* for the metropolis of the South. As he was marching up the gangplank a friend spotted him and hollered to him, "Hey, Bill, where are you going?" Bill waved his hand majestically and shouted, "I'm on my way to New Orleans, by heck!" Ten days passed away. The roulette games and night life were too much for Bill. He started home broke and disgusted. He came back in the little old *Ke-O-Kuk*. As he was slowly walking down the gangplank, looking the picture of despair, with 3 days' growth of beard on his face and his clothes all disheveled, another friend saw him and yelled out, "Hello, Bill, where have you been?" Bill looked neither up nor down, to the right nor to the left, but muttered, "Been down to O-r-l-e-a-n-s, damn it!" [Laughter.]

Now the great Mississippi Valley has come into its own. Its water-borne tonnage today is infinitely greater than in the days of the steamboat or at any other time.

I want to read you some statistics on water-borne tonnage on inland waterways of the United States given in ton-miles. I got them from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and they are official and authentic:

"The total ton-miles on the Mississippi River from Minneapolis to the Head of the Passes or the Gulf of Mexico, excluding oceangoing traffic, was, in 1937, 3,500,000,000 ton-miles. By the end of 1944 this tonnage had increased 8,700,000,000 ton-miles."

There may be some of you who do not exactly know what a ton-mile is. I was somewhat confused as to its meaning, so I looked it up in Webster's unabridged dictionary, and I am going to read you the definition:

"A ton-mile is a unit of measurement of the freight transportation performed by a carrier during a given and selected period, usually a year, the total of which freight transportation by such carrier for such period consists of the sum of the products obtained by multiplying the aggregate weight of each shipment in tons during the given period by the number of miles for which it is carried."

Now there is no excuse for any of you leaving here without knowing exactly what a ton-mile is. [Laughter.]

I might put it to you in another way. During 1944 the total tonnage of water-borne commerce on the Mississippi River from Minneapolis to the Gulf was 44,671,316 tons. On the Ohio the water-borne commerce in 1937 was 2,700,000,000 ton-miles; and in 1944 it was 7,000,000,000 ton-miles. On the Illinois waterway, the water-borne traffic in 1937 was 326,000,000 ton-miles, and in 1944 it was 1,227,000,000 ton-miles. On the Gulf intracoastal waterway the traffic in 1937 was 581,000,000 ton-miles, and in 1944 it had increased to the astronomic figures of 5,919,000,000 ton-miles.

Combining the inland traffic on the Mississippi River system, which includes all tributaries of the Mississippi River, but excludes the intracoastal waterway, the water-borne commerce in 1937 was 8,100,000,000 ton-miles and in 1944 was 19,000,000,000 ton-miles—representing an increase on the Mississippi River system in 7 years of almost 250 percent.

It cannot be stated that this rapid increase in water-borne traffic was due entirely to increased carrier transportation during the war years because on the Mississippi River system the traffic in 1932 was 5,100,000,000 ton-miles, in 1934 was 5,900,000,000 ton-miles, in 1937 was 8,100,000,000 ton-miles, and in 1940 was 11,600,000,000 ton-miles, showing a fairly rapid increase in navigation of our inland waterways in the prewar period.

Now these great city ports that I have mentioned are the ones through which this vast water-borne tonnage moves. They stand today as the evidences and eloquent illustrations of the necessity of keeping up, strengthening, and improving our inland waterway system; and all the competitive and extraneous influences that may be exerted will not, I am sure, ever cause Congress to change its present policy on waterway improvement and development. [Applause.]

Of course, we like the railroads and, in the past, we have done a great deal for the railroads. We are continuing to help them. Not long ago Congress enacted a bill relieving them of their obligation to transport material for the United States Government at

one-half the regular rates. This was an obligation that they incurred in consideration of their obtaining grants of vast acreage of public lands from the Federal Government.

We take our stand with Colonel Johnson in the encouragement of railway and motor-truck transportation. I submit, however, that we ought to do all that we can for inland waterway navigation. We ought to improve it at Government expense, and let the people pay for it, and then let them use it, and let them use it free, just as our Federal Government aids our highways and air transportation. They are used without the payment of any tolls to the Federal Government. We want to enlarge our present inland waterway system. We want to make better channels of transportation out of them.

The Congress has authorized the deepening and widening of the channel from Baton Rouge to Cairo from a 9- to a 12-foot channel with a width of 300 feet. Our Army engineers are investigating the feasibility and practicability of deepening the channel, from Cairo on past St. Louis to St. Paul, to a depth of 12 feet and providing a similar depth for the Illinois waterway and the Ohio River.

There is another form of project in which I am very much interested, and that is to provide what I call inland harbors for inland waterways. Down in New Orleans we constructed what is called the inner harbor, connected by a lock with the Mississippi River—now part of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal—a harbor in which vessels and barges and boats may be moored and loaded and unloaded with facility and unmolested by the eddying currents of the Mississippi River.

I inserted a provision in the last River and Harbor Act for an engineering investigation of a barge channel just above Baton Rouge, La., approximately 5 miles in length, 300 feet wide, and 12 feet in depth, where barges can load and unload under modern terminal facilities, from barge to railway car, from railway car to barge, from barge to industry, from industry to barge, all at greatly reduced expense as compared with unloading at wharves on the main river.

I am also backing a proposal coming out of Memphis to build an inner harbor for that splendid city, and it is now receiving engineering investigation. I feel somewhat attached to Memphis. It was founded by a great-granduncle of mine, whose descendants have made fortunes and rolled in wealth in the improvement and sale of Memphis real estate, while my branch of the family has struggled along in poverty for generations down in old Louisiana. [Laughter.]

Now, the same thing could be done here in the city of St. Louis, either on this side of the river or in East St. Louis. Probably East St. Louis offers better terrain and opportunity for the channeling of a canal in which barges could be moored and could be readily loaded and unloaded.

Do you know that it sometimes costs no more to transport a barge from New Orleans to St. Louis than it does to unload that same barge here in the city of St. Louis?

We ought to improve all of our inland waterway terminal facilities wherever economically justified in order that our great river cities may continue to grow and develop and prosper.

Colonel Johnson stated in his splendid address that the railroads built up such cities as St. Louis. What made the railroads come to St. Louis? It was because St. Louis was first founded here as a river city, because it had grown strong as a river city, because it had taken advantage of river transportation. The railroads came here to St. Louis, and they went to Memphis, and they went to Baton Rouge, and they went to New Orleans, because they were inland waterway cities, built up as such, and because the railroads found in them a direct contact with inland waterway transportation.

We help the railroads, we help every line of transportation, when we develop the navigability of our inland waterways. The reason why St. Louis today has railways, highways, interstate and transcontinental highways, radiating in and out to all points of the compass, is that it sprang from the loins of Old Man River, was cultured by Old Man River, and as such grew in strength and vigor until it occupied a commanding position in these continental United States.

I think this association might very well adopt as a slogan "Inland harbors for inland waterways" and urge their construction wherever they are justified from the standpoint of economy and savings.

There is another reason why I am glad to be here, because I am at the southeastern extremity of the Missouri River Valley. I feel at home here. For the last several years I have, in repeated hearings on different bills connected with the Missouri Valley, traveled all over it again and again and yet again until I feel that I know every cowpath and pig trail in the whole basin. [Laughter.] When I think of this mighty valley, I don't think of it altogether from the standpoint of irrigation, reclamation, navigation, flood control, generation of hydroelectric power, but I look upon it as a great segment of our common country, 560,000 square miles in area, constituting over 17 percent of the domain of the United States, dotted with homes wherein live and struggle and prosper honest, patriotic Americans, serving their country in peace and in war, and representing the very best type of American manhood and womanhood; and so I have tried to do all that I can to aid in a sound and practical way the development of this great basin. [Applause.]

My first serious study of the Missouri Valley came up on the consideration of the Pick plan. As the subcommittee proceeded with the hearings there were those who kept on saying that there was an intense rivalry between the engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, one favoring the Pick plan and the other the Sloan plan. I had the headmen and representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation appear before the committee and had both sides explain their plan, to see what the differences were. We found that the differences were very small; in fact, I may say, rather insignificant. We suggested, and the engineers and Bureau of Reclamation were perfectly willing to see if they could do so, that they get together and reconcile what differences there were and present a joint plan. The result was the coordinated, comprehensive Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri Basin, as splendid and as sound a plan as could, in my judgment, be presently conceived by the brain and purpose of man. This plan was set down for hearing, and not a single witness raised any objection to any project, part, or parcel of the coordinated plan. It was unanimously recommended by the Commerce Committee, unanimously passed by the United States Senate, and unanimously passed by the House. The Senators and Representatives from the Missouri Basin, as well as Senators and Representatives from the rest of the United States, voted to authorize the coordinated plan.

It was suggested to me when the invitation was presented to me to speak to you that I talk to you about the Missouri Valley Authority. I am not going to do it. De mortuis nihil nisi bonum, and I can't say anything good about the Missouri Valley Authority. [Laughter.] The Missouri Valley Authority is as dead as a doornail. [Applause and laughter.] And I have no desire on so festive an occasion as this to hold any autopsy or post mortem.

When we considered the Missouri Valley Authority in the Committee on Commerce we issued a very mild and temperate report. We put all the main pros and the main cons in the report and said, and very truthfully, that the cons far outweighed the pros. This report was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Commerce.

Then the proponents of the bill wanted the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to consider S. 555. Again we had before us self-selected representatives of the proponents and of the opponents and conducted full hearings. This time, however, I determined that I ought to handle the Missouri Valley Authority as it should be handled and that without gloves. I got the best talent that I could get in Washington and from the Missouri Basin, and together we prepared a report; and this report did not have in it any pros at all—it was all cons. We emasculated the bill, as it should be emasculated. [Applause.] The Commerce Committee had given the old codger a decent burial. The trouble was we buried MVA face up, and it managed to scratch out of the grave and bob up in the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. This time we buried it face down, and the more it scratches the deeper it digs its own grave and the nearer it gets to the place where all bad things ought to go. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, there is a certain newspaper published in the Missouri Basin. It is still being published, as I understand, not very far from where I stand. [Laughter.] I had been selected to conduct the hearings and handle the Missouri Valley Authority bill in the Committee on Commerce. When it reached the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, without, of course, any request from me or suggestion on my part, I was selected to conduct the hearings on behalf of that committee. Then this newspaper came out with a leading editorial entitled "Too Much OVERTON." [Laughter.] Well I guess it was too much OVERTON for that publication when it came to its pet plan of an MVA, but I am sure it was not too much OVERTON when I fought tooth and toenail to authorize the deepening of the navigation channel from Sioux City on down to the mouth of the Missouri River from 6 feet to 9 feet and to make it an all-year-round navigation channel. And it was not too much OVERTON when I fought like a demon to have authorized the great dams and reservoirs, beginning with the Garrison Dam in North Dakota and coming on down to near Sioux City, and to construct levees and protection works in the southern reaches of the river to prevent the periodical inundation of this great valley resulting on an average of twice a year in the destruction of hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of property and the loss of human life. [Applause.]

But it is too much OVERTON when I take a firm stand against turning over the destiny of this vast domain to a bunch of neophytes and amateurs under a proposed law that would clothe such an authority with powers more vast than the framers of our Constitution bestowed upon the Congress of the United States, vested with the power to exercise practically unrestrained authority over the regulation and control of the waters of this great basin, over the generation and distribution of electric power, over flood control and navigation, over irrigation and reclamation, over its mines and mining, over vested water rights, over State regulations, over its mighty herds of cattle and its vast fields of grain, over its entire economic growth, and, in the language of the bill, over the education and cultural development of the Missouri River Basin and territories adjacent thereto. No, my friends, I am not going to submit to an authority of this kind over the Missouri Basin or any other basin or valley or river in these United States. I prefer to take my stand with the Bureau of Reclamation and its experts, seasoned to their appointed tasks, who for over 40 years have busied themselves so successfully about the reclamation of this great basin and other areas. I prefer to take my stand with the engineers of the United States

Army whose personnel is selected from the upper 10 percent strata of the graduating classes of the West Point Military Academy, who for over 120 years have been vested by Congress with the power to make recommendations for the improvement of our rivers and our harbors, who have suffered no blot upon their escutcheon, who in times of peace display in their work a thoroughness, and conservatism, and sound judgment that commend them to our respect and confidence, and who in times of great conflict as in World War II proceed with brilliant and dazzling dispatch quickly to devise and execute plans for the landing of our troops and their transportation to enemy territory in the theaters of war, building roads and bridging streams for the movement of our troops, and keeping up the roads and bridges for the transportation of supplies, the Engineers of the United States Army, the greatest body of engineers of any nation anywhere on the face of the globe and in all the history and the mighty tide of time. [Prolonged applause.]

Housing the Student Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered on the subject Housing the Student Veteran, before the faculty and students of Syracuse University, at Syracuse, N. Y., on March 18, 1946, together with an exchange of correspondence between Hon. Philip M. Klutznick, Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority, and myself.

There being no objection, the address and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am extremely glad of this opportunity to visit with you here on the campus of Syracuse University for many reasons.

Not least among these is the opportunity to see at first hand some of the concrete results of steps which the Federal Government has taken to aid forward-looking educational institutions in enabling our returning veterans to avail themselves of the benefits of the G. I. bill of rights.

It must be abundantly clear to even the most casual observer of the current scene that this country is in the grip of the worst housing shortage in its long history, the brunt of which is falling on those who least deserve it—our veterans.

Colleges and universities all over the country are feeling the increasing impact of the housing shortage as demobilization goes on at an unprecedented rate. Thousands upon thousands of ex-servicemen, many of them now married, are resuming their interrupted educations or entering college for the first time.

EMERGENCY ACTION DEMANDED

But without a place for them to live, the GI bill becomes an empty promise—an unfulfilled pledge to the men and women we sent off to war with such fervent patriotism a few short years ago.

Obviously, this is an emergency, calling for emergency action.

First I would like to discuss with you what the Federal Government is doing to move up on the acute problem of providing living accommodations for student veterans—both single and married. Then I would like to call attention to other steps which are being taken to make certain types of surplus or obsolete Government property available to schools for the benefit of veterans.

Under legislation sponsored by me and approved by the President on December 31, 1945, the Federal Government appropriated $191,000,000 to enable the National Housing Agency, through the Federal Public Housing Authority, to make available 100,000 temporary war housing units, surplus on their present sites, to colleges, universities, communities, and States for the use of veterans and their families.

The Government stands the cost of removing these temporary structures—mostly built for war workers—transporting them to new sites and reerecting them. Also included in the program is the removal and reconversion into living quarters of surplus Army and Navy barracks and other surplus Federal facilities which readily lend themselves to conversion into living quarters.

UNITS ASSIGNED BY FIELD STAFF

The municipalities and universities are only required, as their share in the program, to furnish a suitable site and the necessary outside utilities, such as water, gas, electric service.

Applications for this temporary housing are received by the regional directors of the Federal Public Housing Authority and assignments and arrangements are made by these field representatives.

Through this decentralized operation the program has moved rapidily. As of March 1, a total of 89,609 units had been allocated to some 549 educational institutions and 462 municipalities while as of the same date the FPHA regional offices reported applications had been received for a total of 365,388 units.

In New York State as of March 1, more than 9,000 units had been allocated, over 2,000 of them to colleges and universities.

Measured against the country's total need, no one in the Federal Government believes for a moment that this emergency program is more than an expedient or that through it we could do more than knock the edge off the most acute need.

It does, however, have certain advantages—the housing could be provided quickly and without drawing to any appreciable extent on the scarce supplies of building materials so badly needed for construction of permanent homes and apartments.

PROGRAM MUST BE EXPANDED

But with the avalanche of applications, it quickly become apparent that it would be necessary to expand the program which has now been incorporated in the bold and challenging proposals put forward by National Housing Expediter Wilson W. Wyatt for 2,700,000 moderately priced homes and apartments for veterans by the end of 1947. Mr. Wyatt's program has the unqualified approval and support of the President, and, I am convinced, of the Nation as a whole.

To implement one phase of this program, I introduced new legislation to authorize an additional $250,000,000 to provide another 100,000 temporary units. I am hopeful the measure will receive final congressional approval and the funds be made available this week.

Without in any sense minimizing the seriousness of the situation, I am nevertheless optimistic that we can lick this housing shortage if the proposals—both emergency and long-range—which are pending in Congress, are adopted promptly and if we attack the problem with the same nonpartisan vigor and determination on the part of industry, labor, and Government—local, State, and Federal—which made possible our miracles of war production.

For instance, Mr. John A. Kervick, the regional director of the Federal Public Housing Authority for New York State, reported to me early last week that if the additional $250,000,000 appropriation is secured that the FPHA expects to be able to meet the original requests of colleges and universities of New York State for needed emergency housing facilities for student veterans and their families.

Prior to the introduction of pending legislation authorizing $250,000,000 for 100,000 additional units, I had introduced S. 1770 to authorize the National Housing Administrator to provide housing for colleges and universities to accommodate student veterans and their families. No action has been taken on this measure in view of the subsequent legislation for the additional 100,000 units under S. 1821. However, since S. 1770 was introduced, I have received letters from the presidents of colleges and universities throughout the country heartily endorsing this measure. In view of the fact that the later legislation might provide sufficient temporary units to fill the needs of the colleges and universities, I have not pressed for action on S. 1770. If the pending legislation does not fill the needs of the colleges and universities, then I shall press for hearings on S. 1770.

Because of the foresight and initiative of Chancelor Tolley and Vice Chancelor Crawford, Syracuse University long ago laid plans to meet this present emergency. It is well that they did. I am told that where you had a prewar enrollment of 6,500 students that by the time the September semester rolls around you will have 10,000 students.

Under the leadership of Chancelor Tolley, Ernest Reid was placed in charge here of the veterans' educational program, and Professor Rotunno and Mr. Jackman were assigned to handle veterans' housing and surplus property problems of the university. These men have been very active, and I might add highly successful in obtaining needed housing and Federal surplus property for the university. Your veterans' housing project at Syracuse is one of the finest in the country. We hope, of course, that the time is not far distant when we can move our veterans out of trailers and temporary housing when normal building gets back into production, but to the credit of Syracuse University it has made the best of the critical situation.

I might observe that this clearly indicates that it is thoroughly worth while for other colleges and universities to designate representatives to supervise veterans' problems and to act as liaison with the Federal Public Housing Authority, the War Assets Corporation, and the Federal Security Agency.

HOUSING PROVIDED SYRACUSE

How has Syracuse fared? It has received, with the assistance of the FPHA, 50 demountable two-family units from Massena, N. Y., which I am told are now almost entirely occupied by married veteran students with children; 175 trailers, mostly occupied by single veterans, except the expansible type, which are used for families; and 214 family dwelling units. In addition, currently en route here from Lathrop, Calif., are 200 dwelling units, of metal construction, which were made available through the FPHA from the Army. These, I understand, will be used for dormitories for single veterans.

It has been estimated that Syracuse University will need an additional 2,000 of these temporary units, and I am assured by the Federal Public Housing Authority that they will be provided if the additional 100,000 units are made available by Congress. Where allocations of units to colleges and universities in the State of New York have been less than the requests, Mr. Kervick reported, it is planned to meet the original number requested as soon as additional

funds, proposed in the pending legislation, are made available.

Syracuse is by no means the only institution in the State of New York which has been assisted in providing housing for student veterans.

Cornell University received 50 two-family demountable dwelling units for married veterans with children at the opening of the spring semester. In addition, the university is also getting 300 family units and 500 dormitory units. The majority of the student veterans are undergraduates and the FPHA is providing them also with furniture which has been declared surplus.

I am glad to report that President Edward E. Day has expressed his appreciation of the work done by the FPHA in extending aid to Cornell.

OTHER COLLEGES GIVEN AID

I might mention in passing some of the other schools which have received help. They include Columbia University, which was assigned 800 temporary family units or 1,600 dormitory units; St. Lawrence University, 35 temporary family units; Fordham University, 100 dormitory units; the University of Rochester, 40 temporary family units and 80 dormitory units; Colgate University, 50 temporary family units; Ithaca College, 60 dormitory units, and Rensselaer Polytechnic, 150 temporary family units, and a number of others.

SURPLUS PROPERTY AVAILABLE TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Under the legislation which made this temporary housing available, Federal surplus property including building materials and furnishings such as beds, mattresses, linens, and blankets are being provided for the housing free of charge. Complete information as to the manner in which this property may be received from the Federal Government is available at the regional offices of the Federal Public Housing Authority throughout the country.

Under statutes enacted prior to the surplus property law of 1944, both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to donate to educational institutions certain types of obsolete or excess property, including machinery, mechanical equipment, and tools. It has been determined that these old statutes under which such donations were authorized have not been superseded or repealed by the surplus property law of 1944.

PROCEDURES TO BE SIMPLIFIED

Recently I inquired into the procedures being followed by both departments in complying with the authority delegated under the statutes and conferred with both War and Navy Department officials on the matter. As an outgrowth of these conferences, the War Department and the Federal Security Agency agreed to simplify the procedure under which obsolete or excess property of the War Department might be donated, and amended regulations will shortly be issued.

Under the proposed regulations, the Federal Security Agency will assign representatives at the headquarters at each Service Command of the War Department for the purpose of certifying to the War Department that the applicant educational institution requesting available excess or obsolete property of the kind described is entitled to such property under the law, whereupon the War Department will donate the property. Although the Navy Department has recently issued a regulation which contemplated the same result, I have found upon investigation that very little, if any, excess or obsolete property is being donated under the new regulation of the Navy Department.

I am inquiring further into this matter, and I am hopeful that an agreement will be reached between the Navy Department and the Federal Security Agency under which the same benefits will be available to educational institutions through donations by the Secretary of the Navy as will be possible under the new agreement reached with the War Department.

In addition to the donation of excess or obsolete property by the War and Navy Departments, the War Assets Corporation makes available to educational institutions aircraft parts, instruments, or engines which are obsolete or impaired, at a nominal charge.

It is important that colleges and universities, with their expanding programs to meet the needs of the returning veterans receive the full benefits contemplated by Congress under these statutes which permit the donation of excess or obsolete property.

It is also important that we start as soon as possible on a long-range program to get our veterans out of temporary accommodations, relieve the terrific pressure of overcrowding—families living doubled up one with another—clear our slums and blighted areas in the urban centers and replace our rural shacks with decent homes for our farmers.

That is why I am heartily in accord with the Wyatt emergency program. It is designed to gear up the private enterprise home building industry to produce at a rate never achieved in this or any other country in the past. Then under the stimulus of the provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, we can go forward with a sustained annual rate of production of 1,000,000 homes a year until every American family has a decent place in which to live at a price which it can afford.

MARCH 28, 1946.

Hon. PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK,
Commissioner, Federal Public Housing Authority, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: With the approval today by the President of S. 1821, sponsored by me for the purpose of authorizing the expenditure of an additional $253,700,000 to provide 100,000 additional temporary units, the program designed to provide 200,000 temporary housing units for servicemen and their families seems assured. I am confident that within the next few days the Congress will appropriate the necessary additional funds

At the outset of the second phase of the temporary housing program, I wish to call certain matters to your attention. As you know, the first phase of the program was undertaken upon the approval by the President on December 31, 1945, of the original emergency legislation. Under this emergency housing program, principal beneficiaries are the municipalities and educational institutions which have applied for allocations of units, and the Federal Public Housing Authority has made allocations based upon need and the proportionate number of units which are available, as determined by the formula which you adopted in view of the fact that demands exceeded the available supply of units.

During the ensuing months I have received communications from mayors of cities, local housing authorities, and from representatives of colleges and universities, pointing out some of the difficulties encountered in the program. While many problems have arisen, I believe that there are two principal difficulties being encountered by the cities and the educational institutions.

First among the problems is the lack of sufficient funds available to the municipalities and the educational institutions to underwrite their responsibilities, namely, the acquisition of sites and the furnishing of utilities which, under the law, are the responsibility of the applicant, with the Federal Government bearing the expense of all other phases of the operation, namely, the furnishing of the buildings, dismantling them, transporting them, and reerecting them. In addition, where surplus materials, such as buildings and surplus furnishings, including beds, mattresses, linens, and similar items are available, they are furnished free under the Mead resolution, through your agency.

The other serious difficulty, according to the telegrams and letters which I have received, springs from the fact that in some cases the municipalities do not have legal authority to undertake their share of the program, namely, the acquisition of sites and the installation of utilities. In this latter connection, I have in mind a particular instance where a municipality advises it is without authority to perform this function, has appealed to the governor of the State to call a special session of the legislature to secure enabling legislation.

The Federal Public Housing Authority is peculiarly fitted, by reason of its long experience in this defense and war housing, to continue to perform its share of the program. Furthermore, the legislative history of these two measures indicates clearly that it is the intention of Congress that there be a dual responsibility and sharing of expense. As a matter of fact, at the outset there were some in the Congress who felt that the entire problem was one for solution by the State and local governments, but in view of the national emergency and the inherent difficulties in securing immediate action throughout the country by State and local governments, and the pressing needs of the returning serviceman, the Congress saw fit to authorize nearly $450,000,000 in the program.

It is imperative that this vast sum which is being expended by the Federal Government be utilized to the fullest extent. It occurs to me that this will only be possible if the State, local governments and educational institutions furnish full cooperation in the matter of procuring sites and in the installation of main utilities. In some States, action has already been taken making available State financial assistance to communities and educational institutions to cover their share of the participation in this program. These examples will probably be followed by other States. This should tend to accelerate the program.

I might state in this connection, also, that under title V of the Lanham Act, rentals to be fixed for housing provided to servicemen and their families thereunder are to be within the means of the veteran. In some cases which have come to my attention, where the educational institution has incurred large expense in the acquisition of sites and the furnishing of utilities, rentals which appear to be beyond the means of the veteran were fixed, as a result of the necessity for the educational institution to recoup the expense which it has borne in providing the housing.

Although I have not attempted to outline all of the problems inherent in this program, I believe that the above resume presents a highlight of the picture. I will appreciate your comments in this matter and any suggestions which you may care to offer.

Sincerely yours,

JAS. M. MEAD.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Washington, March 30, 1946.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MEAD: I am in receipt of your letter of March 28. It sets forth in most admirable fashion the principal problem with which we have beer confronted in the execution of the Federal responsibility in the temporary housing program for veterans. I am personally grateful to you for your comprehensive understanding of the problem.

I know that you will be pleased to learn that many communities and educational institutions are solving their phase of the situation splendidly. In those cases where the contrary is true we have noticed an increas-

ing awareness on the part of the State and local officials which should enable the localities and the educational institutions to surmount their difficulties. It is unfortunate, but it is nevertheless true, that the existence of such difficulties tend to delay the completion of our Federal responsibility. Our several field offices, as well as our Washington office, have a sympathetic understanding of these problems. Within the spirit of the congressional intent we are doing everything we can to help the States and local governments and educational institutions reach a satisfactory solution.

In the execution of the emergency temporary housing program the maximum amount of shelter will be secured for our veterans by a proper harmonization of the activities of the Federal, State, and local governments. You have aptly indicated that the State and local governments and educational institutions can make a maximum contribution by dovetailing their site-acquisition activities with those which are within our purview. To the extent that State and local governments and educational institutions provide the sites and principal utilities we are able to increase the number of veterans who will receive temporary housing relief out of the Federal funds that have been appropriated. Throughout the hearings and discussions of this program in the Congress it was expressly understood that this sharing of responsibility would be basic in the execution of the title V program.

You have directed our attention to the matter of rent scales. As you state, title V of the Lanham Act requires that rents be fixed that are within the means of the veterans. In the early stages of the reuse program and before Federal funds were made available some rents were established that were out of line. We are engaged in reviewing these rents. It is our interpretation that as the Federal agency charged with administering this phase of the law we must make certain that all such housing is made available at rents within the reach of veterans. I assure you that in this connection, as well as in regard to the other matters you have raised, we will continue to discharge our responsibilities to the fullest extent of our ability

We are aware of the extreme urgency of this program and of the spirit which motivated you in its sponsorship. We would be untrue to that spirit if we did not do everything possible to bring housing to the veterans as quickly as possible and within their financial reach. We are grateful for your sympathetic understanding and shall continue to count on you for such information as may come to your attention and advice in the successful execution of the Federal responsibility in this emergency activity.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK,
Commissioner.

What America Can Give Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What America Can Give Away," written by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] and published in the March issue of the Republican Magazine.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AMERICA CAN GIVE AWAY
(By Senator RAYMOND WILLIS)

Every once in a while, when I register my opposition to giving away more of America's money and materials in vain attempts to increase the real wealth of other nations, someone rejoins by asking: "Well, what would you do for those people?" That is supposed to be the $64 question. It is designed to floor me. But I am not floored. After doing our humanitarian duty toward our friends and former foes by helping them to have enough to eat and wear to stay alive, there is only one thing more we can afford to give to the peoples of the world—friend or foe alike.

I suggest that we make available to every library and every school in the world a copy of the Federalist, which, in spite of the passage of 16 decades, still remains America's most important contribution to the literature of political science.

With a copy of the American Constitution and ready access to a volume of the Federalist, the people of any nation have the directions for a most interesting, and, I believe, materially constructive adventure. If they choose to act upon the wisdom contained in this volume, to heed its warnings against pitfalls in government, and to go forward as freemen, they will not have to ask us for material help. They will prosper as our Nation has prospered.

It is surprising to me how quickly Americans—particularly those high in Government—overlook the Federalist as a guide to good government today. It must be admitted that millions of our citizens are unfamiliar with the greatest single series of political pronouncements yet penned on American soil. It would not be amiss for the Government to sponsor an advertising campaign to familiarize our own people once more with the incomparable logic of Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, as contained in the Federalist. Certainly such a campaign would obviate the necessity of having one distinguished United States Senator stand on the Senate floor and explain to one of his colleagues the difference between a representative government and pure democracy, as happened just recently.

The Federalist clearly defines the difference between a republic (which the United States is) and a democracy (as to which our country is so erroneously referred). "In a democracy the people meet and exercise the government in person; in a republic they assemble and administer it by their representatives and agents. A democracy, consequently, will be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region."

If there are those who would mark my idea down as the plea of an old fashioned fuddy-duddy, I must reply that a citizen has but to read the Federalist carefully to realize the gold mine of eternal truths which came from the pen of America's early great political and practical philosophers.

"The natural cure for an ill administration, in a popular or representative constitution, is a change of men."

That sentence could easily have been uttered last week. it is so timely.

We of this era like to think that the problems we face, the conditions that prevail, the activities of modern men, represent wholly new phenomena under the sun. Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth. Few of the situations facing us as a people—in government or in our personal lives—differ greatly in principle from those faced by our forefathers in the 1780's as they pondered what type of government they would set up to give them a maximum of freedom and safety with a minimum of governmental interference.

The fact that a certain type of government was chosen, the men of that day knew, was no guarantee that the same type of government would remain in existence. They recognized then—as we know now—that every generation decides what kind of government it really has, regardless of written constitutions and words imbedded in stone. So, since the very beginning of our Government—as even in its formative days—there has been a continual struggle between men who believe in representive government by free citizens and other men who believe in totalitarianism in one of its various forms—monarchy, bossism, fascism, or communism.

Astonishing Increase of Juvenile Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, recently an old and esteemed friend, Mr. F. A. Miller, publisher of the South Bend Tribune, requested me to write something bearing upon the subject of juvenile welfare, giving my thought about the problems that affect the children of our country and how to solve those problems. It is a most intriguing and soul-searching subject, for whatever affects our children appeals straight to the heart.

I was trying to marshal my thinking on the subject when my eye accidently contacted a copy of the hearings of the Department of Justice on its appropriation bill for 1947 before the subcommittee of which the able gentleman from Michigan, LOUIS C. RABAUT, is chairman. I noted there a most interesting line of testimony by J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, relating to juvenile delinquency, and I decided to let Mr. Hoover write my article for me. I know of no more important or challenging contribution to the sum total of knowledge on this subject than that made by Mr. Hoover, which is printed on page 155 of the committee hearings, just released for publication. Appearing before the subcommittee on January 17 last, Mr. Hoover gave this astonishing word picture of juvenile crime:

We have talked about the danger of a post-war crime wave. That danger is with us now; we are in the midst of it. For instance, as of November 1945 serious crime increased over November 1944 by 13 percent; there were 29 percent more murders, 27 percent more automobile thefts, 37 percent more robberies, 6 percent more larcenies, and 19 percent more burglaries.

YOUTH IN CRIME

The matter of youth in crime is one of our great problems today. We in law enforcement—local, State, and Federal—view this increase in crime with great concern. I have always said that much of this type of crime is due to parental laxity. You cannot have teen-age hoodlumism unless there is parental laxity—and it is always present—in the home from which the hoodlum comes. The outdoor haunts, the dives, the street corner that he hangs out on, and the crowd he goes with—all point to the lack of parental discipline.

This is the problem which I think the adults of this country must recognize and take steps to cope with it.

For instance, 21 percent of the arrests today involve youngsters under 21 years of age. There are more arrests at the age of 17 than at any other age, and thereafter there is a decrease in the arrests under 21.

I have here a chart I want to show to the committee which shows the arrests from the ages of 16 to 24. You will note that 17 is high and from that time it goes on down. The arrests under 21 for the first 9 months of this year showed that 15 percent of all murders in this country are committed by persons under 21 years, 36 percent of all robberies are committed by persons under 21, 51 percent of all burglaries are committed by persons under 21, 34 percent of all thefts are committed by persons under 21, 26 percent of all crimes of arson are committed by persons under 21, 30 percent of all rapes are committed by persons under 21, and 62 percent of all car thefts are committed by persons under 21. These are the figures that come in from all parts of the country.

In my estimation, it portrays the picture of what we are faced with today on the home front in regard to the crime situation.

When we read in Mr. Hoover's testimony of the high percentages of various crimes that are committed by boys under 21 the idea bears down upon us with crushing force that there is something radically wrong with our social system. This idea penetrates more deeply when we read from Mr. Hoover's further testimony that the arrest of girls under 18, the mothers of our next generation, has increased 198 percent since 1939 and the arrest of boys under 18 since that time has increased as follows: 48 percent for homicides, 70 percent for rape, 39 percent for robbery, 72 percent for assault, 55 percent for thefts, and 101 percent for drunkenness.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation made a check of 409,922 arrest records for the first 9 months of 1945 and found that 87,028, or 21 percent, of the arrests represented boys and girls under 21.

There were 96,270 persons, out of 409,922, arrested for robbery, burglary, rape, auto theft, embezzlement, forgery, and arson and, of that number, 37,990 were under 21 years of age, or practically one-third.

What are the main causes of this great increase of juvenile crime and what can we do to save our children? It is a vital question and no more absorbing theme can, or should, engage our attention until some tangible solutions are reached. The war caused a moral let-down and Mr. Hoover testified that all over the country crimes are being committed with firearms brought home by returning soldiers which have fallen into the hands of the underworld.

In many of the schools the discipline is far below what it should be.

He continued:

Many of the children of today lack discipline. First of all, the problem must be approached in the home; then in the school and in the church.

There are two things that can be done. Social agencies can help, but it is in the school that the youth spends the most of his time. If steps are taken to correct it there, you have taken a great step forward in combating the continued rise of the juvenile criminal. The churches can also play a great part in this program.

But after all else is said, Mr. Hoover places the major blame on parental laxity and there, perhaps, is where it will have to rest. Parents are often more thoughtless than culpable. Many times, in the heavy stress of earning a living, they cannot give the attention which their children need. But I think the principal lesson to be derived from Mr. Hoover's testimony is that parents everywhere should be more mindful of their children, not to threaten them but to guide them lovingly into ways of right living. I think that if parents would give their children more of their time and lead them into the church and the wholesome environment of our fine religious institutions they would go a long way toward solving the problem. Every child is worth all we can do to save him, and a million times more, and the child who has love and respect for his father and mother, and love and respect for his God, will walk erect.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been fighting the OPA from its very inception and I am gratified to know, as indicated by the reams of telegrams which I have received from my district, only a few of which I can insert in the RECORD, that I have represented the intelligent opinion of the district. The bill itself is unsound and the administration of it has been vicious and unjust to honest citizens, and has accentuated inflation. The time has come when the profit motive must not be destroyed if we are to have reconversion. I have heard from many of my small businessmen and automobile dealers all of whom have stressed the importance of enacting the Crawford amendment. Its adoption today by an overwhelming vote of the House should be most gratifying to those who believe in the survival of free enterprise in a free country. I am in hopes that not only the automobile dealers but the lumber dealers and others whose very existence is threatened by the OPA, will be protected by amendments when the bill is finally enacted by the House. I have already inserted some letters and telegrams relating to the effect of the OPA on the dairy business and under unanimous consent, I am inserting telegrams relating to automobile dealers, the lumber industry, and the dairy industry, and a letter in each of which the views of prominent dairymen with reference to their situation is well expressed:

CRAWFORD AMENDMENT

SILVER CREEK, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Congressman DANIEL REED:

Would appreciate your special effort in passing Crawford amendment.

SCHRADER CHEVROLET,
R. J. SCHRADER.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,

Care House Office Building.

We urgently request your support of the Crawford amendment to House bill 6042 as a matter of justice and common sense.

JAMESTOWN MOTOR SALES,
JOHN A. ERICKSON, *President.*

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,

Member of House, Washington, D. C.:

I am a returned veteran of both wars, I am a Ford dealer employing 24 people; 9 of them are also veterans. The Crawford amendment is absolutely necessary to the new and old automobile dealer and will help create more jobs and give us an opportunity to give better service to the public, I want you to support it vigorously. Several hundred persons in Jamestown will be benefited thereby if amendment is passed.

CHADAKOIN MOTORS, INC.,
CARL V. E. GUSTAFSON.

WELLSVILLE, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL REED,

House of Representatives:

We respectfully urge you to support Crawford amendment. It offers hope to used auto dealers to survive in business.

LESTER CHEVROLET CO., INC.,
P. S. LESTER, *President.*

FREDONIA, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,

House of Representatives:

I wish to go on record in support of Crawford amendment H. R. 6042 which will be on floor for passage week of April 15. In my opinion this bill is fair and will help dealers get back on their feet today. There are not any trade-ins and with a discount slash after 4 years of struggle to remain in business with nothing to sell seems grossly unfair.

GERALD N. DINGLER SERVICE
CHEVROLET SALES CO.

OLEAN, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Congressman DANIEL A. REED,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Vote "yes" on the Crawford amendment. Get the small businessmen going again. Don't forget our cost of operation has also risen in staggering proportions. We are a new car automobile company. Our building rental is exactly double the 1940 rent. Our mechanics' and helpers' wages have risen 40 to 50 percent over 1939 to 1941 wage levels. To pay a living wage we must be assured of a reasonable profit and return on our investment. Quantity new car production must be attained before cost can be reduced. Therefore don't burden an already war starved unhealthy automobile organization until volume can uphold this present vampire action. Again we earnestly solicit your support to vote "yes" on OPA extension bill, H. R. 6042.

Thank you.

H. M. STEWART,
STEWART MOTORS.

DUNKIRK, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,

Washington, D. C.:

I am wiring you once more soliciting your valuable help to aid we small dealers and small businessmen to ride out the storm that has taken such a toll of dealers in the past 4 years. OPA price extension bill, H. R. No. 6042 will be on the floor for passage the week of April 15. All dealers want all paragraphs as written in the bill with the possible exception of minor clarifying amendments which will be offered from this amendment. It is designed to give dealers a chance to get back on their feet before permitting OPA to tamper with their traditional discount until we can rebuild our floor, renew our leaky

roofs, and renew and replace our worn equipment which we were compelled to forego during these past 5 lean years.

GEORGE E. QUAY.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

The Honorable DANIEL REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe Crawford amendment to OPA extension bill fair to public and equitable to retailers, therefore, urge you to support this amendment.

BUSKIST NASH SALES,
ALBERT H. BUSKIST.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wiill greatly appreciate your support of the Crawford amendment in OPA extension bill, H. R. 6042, in order to operate business and to help keep new cars out of black market. We dealers need to obtain full discount and feel a further cut would be unfair. This will also give the dealers a better start to operate after no cars have been sold for the past 4 years.

LEONARD N. RHODES.

LUMBER PROJECTS

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 12, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a matter vital to the lumber and building industry we urge that you support amendment No. 1 to stimulate production of lumber and No. 2 to do away with the Absorption Act.

UNITED LUMBER & SUPPLY CORP.,
B. C. LINDBECK.

WELLSVILLE, N. Y., *April 12, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently support amendment No. 1 to stimulate production of lumber and oppose amendment 2 to do away with absorption.

L. E. HOPKINS LUMBER CO.

DAIRY AND FARM PRODUCTS

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 4, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Discontinuance of price control over farm supplies and farm products necessary to adequate production. Draft deferment of regular farm workers more important than during the war. Supplies and labor remedy factors in farm production.

EMERY R. GROUT.

CATTARAUGUS, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Think of all the butter we would eat if we could get it here in western New York. Therefore, Leon Cooperative Milk Producers, with its 250 members are opposed to the continued price control on milk and dairy products; also subsidies. With 15,000 less cows in New York State now and auctions every week, please tell me what will happen next fall if nothing is done so farmer will know what he can expect of a price program.

J. L. SAMUELSON,
Director.

CATTARAUGUS, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please do everything to oppose any legislation for continuance of price controls and dairy-subsidy payments, the most damaging evidence against administration policy of price control. And subsidies is the cause of the present lack of butter, of heavy cream, of thousands of dairymen going out of business, of shortage of fall and winter milk, of increasing black markets, and of threatened milk strikes.

WILLIAM E. MAIER.

EAST OTTO, N. Y.

FREWSBURG, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DAN REED,
House Office Building:

Frewsburg Grange desires to help alleviate world famine, but protest the handicap of OPA control of farm supplies and products and demand the removal of this shackle on production.

SIDNEY GROUT,
Secretary.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 16, 1946.*

Hon. DANIEL REED,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D. C.:

Stabilization Director Chester Bowles has announced that the sale of heavy cream will be prohibited and that limitations on the use of butterfat in the manufacture of ice cream similar to those which were in effect during the war will be restored. Farmers are selling cows and disposing of complete herds because of dissatisfaction with prices. Milk production is constantly going down in relation to last year, and demand is going up. All of this is the result of the unrealistic price policy of OPA holding prices on dairy products at artificially low levels, while at the same time our Government supports large increases in industrial wages. Because of decreased milk production we face shortages of dairy products this fall and winter much worse than we have seen before. Ice cream uses only 6 to 7 percent of total milk production. Ice cream uses such a small part of the total milk production of the country that a limitation order would be no answer to the butter problem. A limitation order would not be enforced but would put the ice-cream industry in the hands of bootleggers, just about ruining the legitimate manufacturers. Limitations orders would simply start another black market. The answer lies only in higher prices to stimulate greater production of milk and discourage abnormal consumption. The proposed increases in subsidies are not sufficient to accomplish anything. Prices must be increased. In view of the unrealistic attitude of Director Bowles toward the dairy industry, we hope you will demand the removal of price control on all dairy products effective June 1 this year and oppose all limitation orders.

GENERAL ICE CREAM CORP.,
CARL W. LARSON, *Manager.*

RIPLEY, N. Y., *April 15, 1946.*

DAN REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Our cooperative is opposed to continuance of price control on milk and dairy products. Also to continuance of subsidies.

CHAUT MAID COOPERATIVE,
A. J. COCHRANE,
Vice President.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Whitesville, N. Y., April 15, 1946.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am taking this opportunity to register my protest against the continuance of OPA as it now operates. I thoroughly believe that its continuance operates against the thing that the country needs most, namely, increased production.

As a combined banker and dairy farmer I have another pet peeve which is the milk subsidy. I can see no justification for the subsidy on milk for I am convinced that the price of milk should be sufficient to enable a farmer to produce it without help from the governmental taxpayers, or perhaps I should say from the buyers of Government bonds. With wages as they are, and the likelihood that they will be higher, certainly the consumers can afford to pay a few cents a day more and not have to be the recipient of a form of relief.

With the high price of feed, and its low milk producing qualities, as well as poor hay due to the wet summer last year, I also know that winter milk this year has not been produced at a profit with the subsidy, and in many cases has caused an actual loss, even though the farmers' time is figured at nothing, except his groceries. Milk should sell higher if there is to be any milk, for farmers cannot pay the price for labor (which is practically impossible to secure on a farm in competition with industry) and the prices prevailing for commercial feeds now, and have anything left to keep their farms up and enable their families to live in a proper manner. In connection with this, I might mention the number of farm auctions where the farmers are selling their cows and going out of business. We have had a wave of them in this section, and there are going to be more. As a banker in a rural community, this concerns me deeply, as I am beginning to wonder just what is going to happen to our rural communities, which to me are the backbone of America.

To my mind these things are serious if one has the good of the country at heart. Certainly we have to protect our rural life if our country is to thrive, for we cannot all belong to the CIO and live in the industrial centers. Too, when sufficient farmers sell their herds and abandon their farms, some one is going to be hungry.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. BLOSS,
Cashier.

St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Assembly of the New York State Legislature in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway:

Whereas there is widespread dissatisfaction on the part of the people of the State with the proposed plan, providing for the deepening of the St. Lawrence River by constructing a seaway or canal and thereby permitting ocean-going vessels to enter the Great Lakes and have access to all its ports; and

Whereas such a canal would be inimical to the best interests of the people of the State and would seriously impair the commercial usefulness and potentialities of the New York State barge canal system; and

Whereas the ports and cities of the State of New York will of necessity be adversely affected if the St. Lawrence is canalized; and

Whereas the construction of such a seaway would materially disrupt shipping, commerce, railroads, industry, and labor within the State; and

Whereas there now exists, adjacent to the Great Lakes region, numerous railroads, highways, and inland canals, including the New York State barge canal; and

Whereas such facilities have fully and adequately served, in the unprecedented emergency just passed, the transportation requirements of this region and area proposed to be served by the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas these existing transportation facilities have been constructed at a great cost to this State and Nation; and

Whereas the railroads operating in this region represent a tremendous investment, and have been constructed and maintained without expense to the taxpayers of this State and are in fact paying huge taxes to the State annually; and

Whereas diversion of traffic from Buffalo alone would affect adversely employment of approximately 15,000 workers in the milling and marine industries; and

Whereas at the present time, and within the predictable future, there is no transportation need that justifies this undertaking; and

Whereas it would be a grave injustice to add to the taxpayers' already heavy burden the cost of this exceedingly doubtful St. Lawrence project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to provide for development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River with adequate provisions to safeguard the rights and interests of the people of the State of New York in these resources, and to prevent the canalization of the St. Lawrence River as a deep waterway; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York, by order of the assembly.

Hon. William O. Burgin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a memorial address of Rev. W. L. Hutchins delivered at the funeral of our deceased colleague, Hon. William O. Burgin:

My brief estimate of the life and achievements of Hon. W. O. Burgin will be from the standpoint of a minister and friend, and not that of a political statesman. He was my friend and in that friendship I found unfeigned delight. Twenty-six years ago I became his pastor. He needed me then, and with equal truthfulness it can be said that I needed him. His poise made stable my passion; his sense gave direction to my sympathy. We teamed well together. Though separated by many miles and with different approaches to the problems of life, we knew that each was carrying the responsibilities of the other. And in this knowledge we pulled together. Now that my friend has become unhitched by death, I feel more keenly the heaviness of the burdens of life. I begin to feel already that I must now slip out of the harness a bit earlier because he no longer pulls with me. But, after all, is it really true that death dissevers us from the tasks of life? Do we lay our burdens down in order that our empty hands may grasp a harp? I am inclined to deny such belief.

"Ever near us, though unseen,
Their dear immortal spirits tread;
For all the boundless universe
Is life. There are no dead."

Various types of human brotherhood have been perpetuated from remote times. Kindred spirits are linked together through all centuries. The poet of the twentieth century holds kinship with the poet of the first century. That kind of brotherhood that has meant most for the race has been the brotherhood of the prophetic mind. It began with the prophets of Israel in the long ago. Their outcry for justice and righteousness so nearly expressed the divine mind that their writings have been thought of as God's word. Mr. W. O. Burgin, though not a minister, belonged to this class. He hated injustice, he despised oppression. Wherever human rights were disregarded his soul went unbidden in sympathetic helpfulness. He longed for that far-off day when "man to man shall brothers be for a' that and a' that," and found great joy in helping to usher in such a day.

In questioning for a word that might serve as an index to his life I soon found the word "loyalty." It is no mean word; it has a depth of meaning. Any life is poor that has no strong attachment to high and worthy aims. His loyalties began back in the hill section of McDowell County when a widowed mother needed the strong arm of a son. Both arms were given in filial love. In that period of his life he was faithful in the small things, and as life unfolded toward larger responsibilities he was still faithful. He was a man who had ideals. He saw life as it should be lived by all on the uplands where shines the righteousness of God, where there is peace and plenty for all. He spoke but few times on the floor of the House but when he did speak it was for souls in pain throughout the world. His comrades here today will recall his speech favoring a large appropriation for the starving people of earth. Perhaps his last official effort was a request made to the President that we discontinue the manufacture of the atomic bomb. It may be that the Prince of Peace had whispered to him: They that use the bomb shall perish by the bomb. He believed that peace through fear had never come and never would. His remarks extended in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD always carried the same plea for good will, mutual trust and for high endeavor. His voting record as carried by a nationally known progressive magazine illustrated his desire to help the common man. He was a progressive by principle but never made himself odious to those who saw through the eyes of the conservative. He was a world citizen and therefore fitted well on the Committee on Foreign Relations. His abiding sense of duty kept him in constant touch with the proceedings of the legislative body of which he was a Member. A member of the North Carolina delegation remarked to me that Bill Burgin rarely ever missed a roll call.

It was my privilege to be his pastor following those tragic years after World War I. He was deeply interested in Mr. Wilson's League of Nations. He believed that its success meant peace; that its failure might be tragic. To what extent World War II has been occasioned by the failure of that League some future historian will tell us. Here again it might be said that it was the ideal of peace rather than a political document that elicited from his heart such devotion.

His loyalty to his late chief will shine in the political heavens like a star of the first magnitude. He did not follow blindly nor did he listen to the dictates of party politics. Rather did he believe that Mr. Roosevelt was a God-sent man destined to protect our common humanity when an effete economic order could no longer function for the good of all. Mr. Burgin's historian will make this statement concerning him as a Member of Congress in a tragic period: He was loyal to his leader.

Now his work is done. He comes back to us for his final rest. Knowing him as I do I feel safe in saying that he comes back with clean hands and a pure heart. Not for one moment could anyone entertain a notion that he would accept a bribe, nor can we feel that in his manly breast there was any other purpose than to serve his Nation worthily, and the whole world, of which his Nation was a part.

Measured by any standard you please you will find that Mr. Burgin was a good and useful man. In Marion, Thomasville, Lexington, and Washington he lived an honorable life. He readily espoused every good cause that came his way. He hated sham and loved reality; he saw the good, the beautiful, and the true and sometimes was impatient with society because it moved so slowly toward those qualities. He was well married to a good woman who rendered her full share to the usefulness of his life. They were devoted to each other with that kind of devotion that death cannot touch. That devotion is the divine life within us and is as eternal as the hills that guarded his infancy. To his good wife, his colleagues in Congress his many friends here assembled, let me plead that we live a life worthy of the hope that some day we shall meet again in our Father's eternal home.

"Hasten, O thou bright tomorrow!
Hearts grow weary of delay,
Give them courage, strength for sorrow
Till tomorrow bring today.

After all these nights of longing,
After all the wild unrest
We shall find them somewhere waiting
Ending there life's burning quest."

Unification of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I received an anonymous communication, the contents of which the Members of this House might desire to study. The author of the note suggests that if unification of the armed forces is desired it can best be accomplished by transferring the personnel, equipment, and command of the Army to the United States Marine Corps.

At first glance this statement appears humorous, but it might be well to bear in mind that the Marine Corps has in its service at the present time far more men than are normally in the Army in times of peace. It has been accustomed for over one hundred years to act under a unified command with the Navy. During peace and war it is accustomed to full coordination with that branch of the service and would require no new training, paper work, or period of adjustment.

The Marine Corps has all of the component trained parts that exist in the Army: artillery, quartermaster corps, signal corps, infantry, aviation and all other arms which constitute a modern army. Its men, noncommissioned officers, and officers have ever met the test of battle and emergency and have at all times in our history captured the imagination of the American people.

All that would be required to accomplish this unification would be an act of Congress authorizing an increase in the personnel of the United States Marine Corps up to a point that our defense experts maintain is necesary for the National Defense. The Marine Corps could then take over the functions of the Army for which they are extremely well-trained.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

JONES SAYS BRITISH LOAN MAY "LEAD TO DISASTER"

Former Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones believes approval of the proposed $3,750,000,000 British loan would start the United States down a financial road that is likely to lead to disaster.

In an editorial published yesterday in his Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Jones opposed the loan on the grounds that it would:

1. Be most unbusinesslike. If Great Britain wants American money she should put up proper security for it.

2. Tend to debase the United States dollar. This country should stop issuing Government bonds and pay every dollar we can spare on our debt.

3. Impress countries denied loans on similar terms as an alliance with Great Britain and make them feel that we are less friendly to them than to Britain.

4 Give Britain money which she would spend in competition with us in world markets.

LISTS BRITISH ASSETS

Jones declared that the British are by no means strapped. Asserting that they could put up security for their borrowing, he listed British assets as follows:

In the United States: $3,000,000,000 plus, including $587,000,000 in United States Government securities, more than $40,000,000 in corporate bonds, and 623 controlled branches of corporations having a value of $611,000,000.

In other countries: some $8,000,000,000 in various assets, $15,000,000,000 in unmined gold reserves, $8,000,000,000 in diamond reserves, and several billions in cash.

Jones proposed that loans to Great Britain be made on a basis similar to that of a $425,000,000 loan authorized by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in July 1941. That loan was fully secured and was made payable over 15 years at 3 percent interest.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to be helpful to the British and still protect our own Federal Treasury, Jones recommended that:

1. The RFC increase its loan to Britain by an additional $1,000,000,000 on security already pledged and repayable in about 40 years at 2 percent. This would not require congressional approval.

2. Further RFC loans on the same terms be made on British investments and operations in this country, up to the earning value of the security.

3. This country make an advance payment of around $500,000,000 to Great Britain for critical materials for the stock pile which President Truman has recommended to Congress that the United States build up.

4. Congress consider authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation or some other agency to sell cotton, tobacco, fruits and other farm products, durable goods, and manufactured articles to the United Kingdom for the next few years on credit in amounts about equal to her normal imports of such items from this country.

Tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt by Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article paying tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, written by Walter Winchell, and published in the New York Daily Mirror of April 12.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL, IN NEW YORK

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

He had a great dream in his heart. He could visualize nations where people hugged the world and lived in dignity. He knew that the rightful heritage of mankind was peace and security and liberty. The privileges of the few were not as important to him as the welfare of all. He believed in the essential interdependence of humanity. And his name swept the globe like a message of hope to the poor and the oppressed. Wherever there was misery and fear, Roosevelt was the password to decency.

But F. D. R. was not a dreamer who gazed at the stars and waited for angels to present miracles. He was a realist and a fighter. Every evil was a challenge to his courage and wisdom. He declared war against the forces of darkness long before any shots were fired. When our economy was shattered or tyrants left civilization in tatters—he fought a grim and relentless battle with astounding patience. He was aware that progress is not a gift—it is a victory. Decency does not advance in a parade; it struggles through a jungle of greed, ignorance, and muddy battlefields. He knew that many fine things have crude origins. Ragged Minute Men gave birth to a great Nation. The raw material of humanity is dust.

He blazed a trail through the wilderness of poverty with all the fortitude of the frontiersman. Remember the bread lines extending around America's throat like a noose? Apple hawkers on street corners were the tombstones of a dying economy. Brother, can you spare a dime? Yankee Doodle waiting for a handout. Aged men who could no longer provide for themselves treated like beggars, while youths were beggars for jobs. But F. D. R. pointed out that famine-haunted men could not be free. Starvation is the trigger of chaos. Freedom of speech was not given to us so that a child could plead for a bowl of soup. Man cannot live by bread alone, but without bread everything else perishes. The only thing we have to fear is fear itself, he said. The people listened and believed and trusted him. And it marked the rebirth of a Nation.

He put wings on our democracy and sent it zooming toward the heavens. But he never neglected to fight the devils of bigotry who swarmed around every free nation. Roosevelt continually reminded Americans that our greatest strength was the single unity among many religions, nationalities, and races. America was the glorious offspring of that unity. He knew that whoever seeks to set one race against another seeks to enslave all races. Whoever seeks to set one religion against another seeks to destroy all religion. Freedom of worship is of no use to men who have lost their God. His faith in religion was as deep as his respect for tolerance. He believed that the people of a free land must not have any master but God.

F. D. R. only wanted other countries to look us in the eye, take our hand and live as a family of nations. The good-neighbor policy lived up to its name under his leadership. But when the Axis foe cast menacing shadows across the planet—Roosevelt was the first to lift his eloquent voice against the approaching storm. He warned of blood and thunder when stupid ostriches painted pretty pictures. No man can live alone, and no nation is an island. The world is a body made of the bones of nations and the flesh and blood of its people. Events in a city can affect a continent. F. D. R. realized this was one world long before the phrase was coined.

He didn't want to see history written in blood and punctuated with death. But the man who loathed war was forced to lead his Nation into battle—because the alternative was unspeakable slavery. The Axis saber rattlers who believed Roosevelt's innate kindness was a weakness and democracy's decency an easy target—laughed and sneered—and sneered and laughed. They vowed to leave America in ashes and the scare word was blitz. But the American people and their Commander in Chief didn't scare easily. The result now raises the loudest whimpers in hell. Yet long before the final bullet whizzed through the air F. D. R. admonished America that military victory was not enough. If we fail to preserve the peace—then the monument to the Unknown Soldier will be a part of the rubble of a devastated and desolate planet.

The greatest love in F. D. R.'s life was his devotion to America. He told the world that we are free to love and live and laugh. He knew America as one knows an intimate friend. America was his life and he gave his life so that it could live.

And on a crisp day in April there was a whispered roll of muffled drums at Hyde Park, a squad of soldiers slanted their rifles toward the sky, and the sharp cracks of gunfire startled the stillness as their Commander in Chief was laid to rest.

But the bitter foes in his own country who had shortened his life were already jigging on his grave. The vultures were stabbing his memory just as they had stabbed his back. The orgy of ghouls is still in full swing—vilifying the man who saved their liberty, their lives, their homes, their jobs and their right to disagree with him. They hate him because they know that they will be defeated by the living memory just as they were whipped by the living man.

Those of us who still fight under the Roosevelt banner, know that F. D. R. can no longer lead us. We are guided by his words and deeds. If men follow his ideals, civilization can never lose its way.

Roosevelt was as aristocratic as Robert E. Lee or George Washington. Yet he was as humble as Abraham Lincoln. He was as courageous and daring in attack as Stonewall Jackson, but he could be as stubborn as U. S. Grant when he believed he was right. The American Navy has had no greater admiral since John Paul Jones, and American democracy has had no warmer advocate since Thomas Jefferson. American institutions have had no greater defender since Alexander Hamilton, and the common people have had no more rugged a champion for their rights since Andrew Jackson.

As Daniel Boone staked out the wilderness trails for the American people, Franklin D. Roosevelt staked out the broad highway to world peace. He was the voice of freedom, the friend of humanity, and the conscience of America. You will find his spirit wherever there are decent people, amity among nations, justice for individuals, and deep faith among God-fearing people.

And wherever a child sleeps in peace—F. D. R. lives.

Mr. Truman and the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Truman and the Poll Tax," by Ernest Lindley, from the Washington Post of Monday, April 15, last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATIONAL ISSUE

(By Ernest Lindley)

MR. TRUMAN AND THE POLL TAX

In his formal statement last week explaining his position on the poll-tax issue, President Truman said, "While the Federal anti-poll-tax legislation has been pending in Congress, several States have abandoned the poll tax. This is a great step forward and I hope more States will see fit to change their poll-tax laws."

Active proponents of the Federal anti-poll-tax bill point out that the President's statement was somewhat rosier than the facts justify. The attempt to get Federal legislation to knock out State poll taxes as prerequisites to voting began in 1939. Before that, Florida and Louisiana had abolished the poll tax by State action. But since that only one State has done so. That is Georgia under the leadership of the liberal Governor Arnall. Even Arnall might not have succeeded, however, but for a peculiar provision in the Georgia constitution permitting the Governor to suspend any tax for 1 year. He held the threat to suspend the poll tax over the heads of the legislature. The results of one election held without a poll tax might not have been pleasing to some of the members if they had voted against repeal of the tax.

In Tennessee the legislature voted to abolish the poll tax but the State supreme court invalidated the action on the ground that it conflicted with the State constitution. So Tennessee still has the poll tax, as do six other States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia.

In all seven of these States the poll tax is imbedded in State constitutions. Proponents of Federal action insist, therefore, that as a practical matter there is not much hope of getting rid of the tax in most of those States in the near future by State action. They hold that only Congress can provide a reasonably prompt and effective remedy.

The House has passed anti-poll-tax legislation three times. The Senate has filibustered it twice, and the southern opponents of Federal action undoubtedly will continue to resort to filibustering whenever the bill comes up, unless they are stopped by cloture.

Some of the supporters of Federal legislation may doubt that it is wise or constitutional. Many of them, like President Truman, who as a Senator not only favored Federal action but voted for cloture, would feel relieved if the seven remaining poll-tax States would go ahead and abolish the tax under their own steam. But for the reasons just indicated, the prospects are not favorable for this more comfortable solution.

There are, however, other ways to work toward the objective sought by the opponents of the poll tax: the broadening of the electorate. One is to increase the number of people who pay the poll tax, which requires not only money but, in some States, quite a bit of red tape. The impending CIO organization drive in the South should, if successful, increase the number of voters who see that their tax is paid and that they are otherwise properly qualified. Supreme Court decisions in recent years have also tended to broaden the electorate, by lifting some of the restrictions on Negro voting.

Federal anti-poll-tax legislation, however, has become a national issue. It is one on which many voters in the 41 States which do not have a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting may turn. For urgent political reasons, therefore, it is becoming increasingly impractical for Democrats in Congress from outside the poll-tax States to wait for the solution of this problem by State action.

Veterans' Housing at Huntington, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 19 I brought to the attention of the membership a plan for the housing of veterans which was in operation in my home city, Huntington, W. Va. At that time I stated I thought it a worth-while project and suggested that my colleagues bring it to the attention of their respective communities.

Today I learn from the press that the housing committee has placed 350 veterans in rooms and apartments. The committee receptionist reports that not one landlord has complained about the tenants, and on many occasions when one of the veterans vacated, the landlord called the committee to send them another tenant. The results of a month's campaign is indeed commendable when we consider that the housing situation in Huntington is comparable to any other metropolitan area.

Patterson for Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the National Pension Advocate of April 1946, in which recognition is given my colleague the gentleman from California, ELLIS E. PATTERSON, for his outstanding efforts in behalf of the people of California and the Nation:

PATTERSON FOR SENATE

When an organization that stands for a worthy cause finds out, after long experience, that a man in public life valiantly stood by that cause, in all his public commitments, it is the duty and even the pleasure of the members of that organization to help such a man in his endeavors to be of further service to the public. In Congressman ELLIS E. PATTERSON, of California, we have the type of candidate that is an inspiration to all of us. Without any hesitation, we support his candidacy for United States Senator in Congress in the coming primary and on election day. We mention election day because we feel absolutely sure that he will be nominated in the Democratic primary. Yes; he may even carry both primaries.

We have to be practical in politics. Congressman PATTERSON is a Democrat and a good one. If he were a Republican, he would be a good Republican. Above any party consideration, he is a solid citizen and a good man to have in office. His long experience in public office in California, for several years a member of the State legislature and as a Lieutenant Governor for 4 years fitted him for his seat in the present Congress. He has served his district and the Nation faithfully and with distinction. He is recognized by his colleagues as a man of the highest ideals of public service. You can help in his campaign in two ways. Regardless of your party affiliations, you can vote for Congressman PATTERSON in the Democratic primary or the Republican primary. His name will be on both party ballots. After his nomination, in one or the other primary, you can then vote for him on election day and send him back to Washington to serve in the upper branch of the Congress.

We need PATTERSON in the Senate. And the way to have him in that body is to vote for him. To recount all of his activities in our behalf would take the entire issue of the Advocate. Just one little incident will show his longe-range view of things to come. You may recall the time when we were shipping millions of tons of scrap iron to Japan, that most of us knew was to be converted into naval vessels of all sorts. PATTERSON, at that time in the high office of Lieutenant Governor, not only spoke against these shipments but at great personal risk to himself and his career, picketed the docks where the vessels were being loaded. He knew that this vast loading of iron for Japan meant that in the immediate future some of our young boys would meet this same iron in combat in the Pacific. And they did. Had the vision of Congressman PATTERSON been heeded, the shipments would not have been made and Japan would have been more easily put out of the war. Let PATTERSON for the Senate be in your mind from now to election day.

Muzzling the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial, Muzzling the Navy, which I include herewith as part of my remarks, is taken from the Manchester (N. H.) Union of Saturday, April 13. It deals with a subject of the greatest importance to the security of our country. To those who will say that the point of view reflects that of its late owner and great Navy champion, Frank Knox, let it still be said that the comment merits the consideration of all Americans who would bring out of any changes in the Military and Naval Establishments the strongest and most effective organization of which we are capable.

MUZZLING THE NAVY

It is tragic, for the country and for President Truman personally, that he should start his second year in the White House with a muzzling order to the Navy which is shocking in its implications.

He says the Navy has been "lobbying" against his proposed unification of the armed services. He says the Navy must stop talking against unification, or else. He says that when he establishes the policy of unification, it is the duty of the Army and Navy to support his policy, regardless, because he is commander in chief.

In all conscience and common sense, why?

According to the record of the President's own words in the past, matters of national policy should be and would be left for decision to the Congress, where they properly belong. If he was right then—and of course he was—his present complete reversal of position now must be wrong.

For if the problem of military and naval unification is not a matter of national policy, there never was one. Furthermore, it is a highly controversial problem, of vital importance to future national defense, not yet clarified by any means, and with all the evidence as yet far from in. All of the evidence never will be put in, either, if the President's muzzle order on the Navy stands unchallenged.

Who wants unification? The Army. The Air Corps wants independence and equal status as a separate command. It will be content, with or without unification, so long as it attains its goal; a goal, incidentally which events have proved justified. But it is obvious that the Army would care a lot less about unification if it were not confident that under unification it would come out top dog.

The President is not satisfied, as an old Army man with Army sympathies, merely to agree with the Army point of view. He sets himself up, against the judgment of others who have given their lives to the service of their country, as the sole arbiter of the wisdom of unification. Having made up his mind, he forbids anybody—civilian or naval authority—in the opposite service even from questioning that decision.

He should have foreseen the consequences. Mr. Forrestal might understandably have resigned at once. Men of the top naval command like Admiral Nimitz, who fought this war in every ocean, talk of retiring. A hard blow, and a low one, has been dealt the Navy; and to no purpose except to damage Navy efficiency, do an injustice to men who deserve better of their country, and lessen the executive stature of the President himself.

The decision on unification rests with Congress. The decision will be made by Congress. It will not be made, and should not be made, until every controversial phase of the problem has been thoroughly studied and debated by Congress. The President's interpolation of personal authority has done nothing to hasten or clarify that decision.

Government Administrative Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 6159, to provide for independent examinations and investigations of Government administrative efficiency and for other purposes. In case this legislation is acted upon favorably, it would be known and cited as the Administrative Efficiency Act of 1946.

I have sought to create by this legislation an agency of the Congress defined as an Office of Administrative Efficiency, which shall be independent of the executive branch of the Government and under the control and direction of a director. The Director and the Assistant Director are to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and are to receive salaries of $10,000 and $7,500 a year, respectively. Each of them are to hold office for 15 years and the Director shall not be eligible for reappointment.

This provision and the general provisions of the act are designed to parallel the legislation setting up the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General as agencies of the Congress. What I am trying to reach is a practical solution to inefficient administrative practices so that they may be nipped in the bud and not simply brought out by sporadic congressional investigation. The need for this legislation has presented itself to me during my observation of the attempt which the Civil Service Committee made to investigate employment practices in the Federal Government insofar as they related to civil-service matters. However, the Civil Service Commission, in all fairness to it, can only certify people for employment and set up standards and norms. The efficient employment of these people rests with the administrative agencies to whom they are assigned. Experience has further shown that the General Accounting Office has turned up many expenditures evidencing very bad and inefficient administrative practices which, at the same time, were not illegal and therefore payment of moneys could not be denied nor improperly paid moneys could not be recovered.

The legislation which I have introduced is designed to give the Congress a completely independent agency, properly equipped to check the administrative branch of the Government as to its efficiency of operation, but the legislation is surrounded with safeguards so that I do not think that there is any violation of the separation of powers inherent in the Constitution. I do not proclaim that this legislation, as introduced, is necessarily the most perfect legislation which can be drafted on the subject. I am convinced, however, that I am on the right track and that some such agency as I have attempted to create, responsible to the Congress only, can result in the saving of millions of dollars without, at the same time, interfering with the expansion of the activities of the Federal Government into those fields which are national in character.

Basically, I think I have drawn initial blueprints of the best tool which can be designed to promote administrative efficiency and to avoid the necessity of attacking appropriations with a broadax and, at the same time, give to the Congress an intelligent set of agency standards by which to judge the operation of executive and administrative bodies and a continuing check on the efficiency of those bodies so that the efficient department or bureau may be treated fairly in its appropriations, thereby rewarded, and the inefficient one not only penalized, but furnished a set of guideposts by which it may increase its efficiency of operation and thereby warrant fair treatment by the Congress when its efficiency standards have become such as to lead the Congress to believe that the moneys appropriated to it are being intelligently used for the purposes intended and without waste and extravagance.

I earnestly commend the consideration of this legislation to my colleagues on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, all Members of the Congress, and to all people who are concerned with government and with the problems which a necessarily expanding Federal activity is constantly bringing to our citizens.

Russian Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Manchester Union of April 16, 1946:

RUSSIAN EXPANSION

Reports that Secretary Byrnes has decided to stand firm, even at the cost of unity, against Russian maneuvers for position in the Mediterranean and the extension of Russian influence in western Europe will be welcomed by most Americans. Whatever may be Russia's motive, the attitude of Moscow in trying to gain control of key positions in the Mediterranean and to push the sphere

of its domination farther toward the west, cannot fail to arouse deep concern among the western nations.

Already Russia has pushed too far west on the continent of Europe, by taking advantage of the exigencies of the war. She demanded that she should be given the right to capture Berlin alone and to establish her line of advance westward on the Oder. The Allies acceded to this demand and withdrew their troops behind the Oder. This tremendous sweep westward, that brought all of central Europe, with almost half of Germany under Russian control, in a real sense made Russia a western power. Certainly the time has come to call a halt in this westward advance of Russia in the name of the security of the western powers.

Just why should Russia wish to push into western Europe and to obtain strategic positions in the Mediterranean? This surely is not necessary to Russia security. The logical answer to the question is that the present Russian Government desires to spread communism over western Europe, or that Government has vast dreams of Russian expansion that look westward as well as toward the east.

If either of these conjectures is correct—and so far no others have been suggested—the western powers are fully justified in taking a firm stand against Russia's westward aims. To do less would be to permit a steady Russian encroachment at the cost of the strength and security of the western powers, that eventually must make Russia a greater menace than she is today. There can be no unity with Russia at the cost of the rights of Britain and the United States.

Why does Russia demand a trusteeship over Tripolitania and Eritrea; and why does she object to the return of the Dodecanese to Greece? These are all key positions in the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, and the national that controls them can be a menace to all other powers with rights in these areas. This is not a question on which there can be compromise. If Tripolitania is not returned to Italy either outright or as a trusteeship, it should be placed under international direction. If there must be a show-down on these questions, the time to have it is now, before the wedge of Russian influence in the west expands too far.

The Menace of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

COMMUNIST WINDOW DRESSING

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of Communist infiltration into the United States the Communists used effective strategy to inoculate innocent, unsuspecting Americans with their Communist doctrine. They formed organizations with high-sounding names, such as the League Against War and Facism and its successor, the League for Peace and Democracy. All decent Christian people are against war and facism and for peace and democracy, so literally millions of good Americans joined these organizations, and other organizations like them, because they believed in the objectives suggested by the names of these Communist-front organizations. Many prominent, well-intentioned Americans, taken in by this device, became dupes or tools for the Communists, and helped to spread Communist doctrine in America by lending their names and influence to build up these Communist-front organizations. The so-called Dies committee did an excellent piece of work in exposing these Communist-front organizations and their founders who carried on their nefarious activities behind the window dressing set up as a screen for their real objectives. Most of these organizations went underground during the war.

Today we see the same Communist strategy cropping up again in the Win the Peace Conference that met recently in Washington. This Win the Peace Conference was sponsored by Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, 20 Members of Congress, and leading Communists of America representing some 90 organizations that have been investigated and branded by the FBI as Communist-front organizations. The object of the Win the Peace Conference was to further appease Russia. We also see the same Communist influence in our State Department's attitude toward the present Government of Spain. Can it be that good old Uncle Sam is now to become Communist window dressing behind which Stalin will work his will or have his way in Spain?

A TRAVESTY ON POLAND

Mr. Speaker proof that Poland is now a puppet of Russia is found in the action of the Polish representative to the UNO meeting in New York when he presented to the Council Stalin's trumped-up charges that the present Spanish Government is a menace to world peace. When a representative of Poland, "the most Christian nation of Europe," acts as a Charlie McCarthy for Stalin, it is a travesty upon Poland, and upon Christian people everywhere.

Our own State Department now says that Franco of Spain and Peron of Argentina are dictators and therefore we should get tough with those two nations. If we are so strongly opposed to dictators, why not devote a little of our attention to the greatest and bloodiest dictator of them all—Stalin? Why not get tough with Russia as well as Spain and Argentina? The writer maintains that it is none of our business what sort of government the people of Spain, of Argentina, or of Russia desire, any more than it is their business what form of government we elect to live under. We should attend to our own knitting. Uncle Sam has enough to do to keep his own nose clean.

OCTOPUS OR BEAR, WHICH?

Mr. Speaker, the Encyclopedia Britannica says:

The octopus or devil-fish confuses its enemies and protects itself by squirting out a quantity of inky fluid when under attack, darkening the surrounding water so that the octopus can either hide or escape.

Soviet diplomacy these days has adopted the tactics of the octopus. Whenever Stalin is annoyed or called to account by foreign diplomats concerning his expansionist policies, he proceeds to raise a countercharge to obscure or becloud the real issue, and he is not particular about the validity of his countercharge. This octopus diplomacy has been resorted to time and again. When England protested against Russia's attitude in Iran, Russia brought countercharges concerning Britain's conduct in Greece and in Indonesia. When the United States sent a note to Bulgaria urging her to include in her Communist regime two representatives of the opposition parties, Stalin immediately charged the United States with taking "unilateral action." Has the Russian bear, under the influence of communism, changed into an octopus or devil-fish? What is Stalin up to?

Mr. Speaker, the following two articles are taken verbatim from Communist propaganda booklets now being circulated throughout Europe. They form a blueprint showing both the aims and the strategy of Communists. What should real Americans do about it?

CREED OF COMMUNISM

1. All Communists know that to bolshevize means to liberate humanity from the slavery created by centuries of Christian barbarities; to free humanity from the concept of religion; to free humanity from the concept of national authority; and to free humanity from the concept of private property.

2. All Communists must remember that our purpose is to bolshevize the world, no matter how much the cost or in what way.

3. The task of each individual Communist is to bolshevize your own surrounding group.

4. Each such individual knows that his or her task necessarily has to be limited for the moment.

5. It is the duty of each Communist to give the working man and woman the illusion that only Communists are free and that only Communist membership and action can free him and her.

COMMANDMENTS OF COMMUNISM

1. Do not manifest the purpose of communism to immature companions.

2. Struggle against those—especially the hypocritical priests, ministers, and rabbis—who say what is more or less true about communism, by denying emphatically that we are opposed to religion, family, and private property.

3. Show with jokes, sarcasm, cynicism, and with a more pleased and happier show of conduct how you are freer without the impediments of religion * * * making it understood that we who live without religion live better and do more freely what we wish to do.

4. Destroy morals, teaching the inexperienced; create a milieu (environment) satiated with that which the clergy of all sects call immorality.

5. Always remove your companions further from their religion by any and all means, but especially by putting priests, ministers, and rabbis in as bad a light as possible.

6. Destroy the family—especially the Christian family—by planting ideas about freedom in marriage, showing divorce as a more human way of life, and encouraging your people to love, love freely, free love.

7. Educate workers, especially the young ones, to be intolerant of any and all authority, especially police authority.

8. Encourage workers to participate in disorders, to use brute force, to revenge, and not to have a fear of bloodshed.

9. Be at the forefront in rendering small services to workers; speak loudly and make

yourself heard in their behalf; impose yourself into their midst; hide the good which others do for them and make it appear as if you did it; and, to enlist such workers in your cause; be in the forefront of all labor movements and organized opposition to parliamentary proceedings.

10. Struggle constantly against all priests, ministers, and rabbis, against their religions, the morals of all religions, and against their religious organizations and institutions.

Venezuela in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Venezuela in Transition," from the quarterly magazine World Affairs, for March 1946. This study was prepared by my friend the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, special lecturer on Latin America in the extension division of the University of Maryland.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VENEZUELA IN TRANSITION

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil)

One of the most hopeful signs for true democracy in the other American Republics is that, in all likelihood, a world-famous novelist, Rómulo Gallegos as a result of free elections, will be chosen the next President of Venezuela.

At first blush, this may appear to be a paradox. Why should the selection of an eminent man of letters be interpreted as a victory for humanity, freedom, and good government on the southern fringe of the Caribbean? What significance, if any, does successful literary creation possess for the orderly, peaceful development of the richest (and most expensive) country which, like an arc of "black gold," flanks the American Mediterranean? Is there a key to the paradox?

The answer, like the solution to numerous problems, is discoverable in Venezuelan history. In the central plaza of Caracas, capital of Venezuela, rises, proud in grandeur, the monument to Gen. Simón Bolívar, the Liberator. The figure of this paladin of independence continues to radiate glory as well as inspiration to all quarters of the Republic. Bolívar's passion for democratic liberties vivifies the soul of each Venezuelan patriot, just as the Liberator's ideal of inter-American friendship quickens the pulse of every worker for the good-neighbor policy.

At the same time, one must remember that the tradition of military leadership, exemplified by Simón Bolívar in Greater Colombia (Venezuela, Colombia, and Ecuador) did not die with the disease-ridden body of the relatively youthful South American genius on December 7, 1830. Exiled though he was at the moment of his departure from this world, the Great Captain, 47 years of age, bequeathed to his countrymen as well as to the world a rich legacy.

No better description of the Bolivarian treasure-chest has been written than that available in Venezuela by Erna Fergusson. In the climatic chapter of her study of Venezuela and the Venezuelans, this lady records her dominant impression in these words:

"Venezuelans have kept for a century the Liberator's belief in intrinsic human worth and the possibility of human betterment. Old men may falter, but five generations of youth trained to idolize Simón Bolívar have kept alive a faith which may be suppressed for a time, but never conquered. The miracle for which all Venezuelans hope actually exists in her young men and women. Alert and intelligent, fully aware of the backwardness which hampers their every step, they are bound this time to free their country and make possible her development. They are fortified to wait and to achieve a democracy by constitutional means, if possible, but grim in their readiness to use other means if they must."

These intimations of the future were typed out in 1939. Each word of the prediction, tenative as it was, would seem to have been fulfilled in October (not Red) in 1945. After 26 years of the brutal dictatorship of Juan Vincente Gomez (1909–1935) and the moderate, fairly constructive reforms of two succeeding Andean generals (Eleazar López Contreras and Isaias Medina Angarita), a group of civilians, supported by almost all the younger army officers, produced a week-end revolution, with a handful of lend-lease planes (without power-driven bomb-racks) and toy-like, baby tanks. Although desultory rifle fire continued for a week or 10 days in Caracas and a few other populous centers, it hardly created a ripple beneath the surface of Venezuela's political and industrial life. While the venerable military chieftains, mostly Andinos, scattered to the four winds, largely in the direction of the palatial Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, the young men, led by 37-year-old Provisional President Rómulo Betancourt, moved into the positions of responsibility and power in their national capital.

At this point, it should be noted that the revolutionary junta is, avowedly and sincerely, a "caretaker government." Rómulo Betancourt and his new cabinet look upon themselves, not as another clique that has, for its own selfish interests and those of its class, seized the machinery of administration, but simply as a transitional committee of trustees, whose stewardship will cease once the people, next April (1946) shall have been given an opportunity of registering their will. The author of this article, by suggesting that Rómulo Gallegos, Venezuela's dean of letters, will be the popular choice is simply anticipating the verdict of history. The attempted prophecy has a double interest, because in the last federal elections (1941), General Medina, the recently ousted dictator or president, received a total of 120 electoral votes to the 13 cast in favor of President-to-be Rómulo Gallegos. By one of those sudden turns in the wheel of fortune, the vanquished seems destined to emerge the victor.

In the meantime, Sr. Betancourt has surrounded himself with young, liberal ministers. The handsome, alert secretary of agriculture, Juan Mendoza, in a continent, where land is the core of most problems, is just 26, while four of his colleagues are in their thirties. Only two top the age of 50. Viewing the cabinet composition from Washington, D. C., one cannot overlook the fact that 7 of the 11 in the ruling group received their education in the United States. Can it be that youth and inter-Americanism go hand in hand? Is it an historical accident or just one of those picturesque anomalies that sometimes crop up in the unfolding of the human drama that the new minister of the interior (not war) is Sr. Luis Valmores Rodriguez, whose career includes a tour of duty as a United States Army sergeant? To be sure, peace breaks out from time to time in Latin America, and it is the impossible that happens, unexpectedly.

What are the policies, domestic and foreign, of the new administration? Replies to this interrogation are important, because what happens on the shores of the American Mediterranean has an impact not only on North America, but also throughout the West Indies, in Central America, and in the vast continent that stretches from the Republic of Panama to the Antarctic tips of Chile and the Argentine. Perhaps Venezuela will prove to be either a vital catalytic agent in the violent chemico-political reactions that are beginning to flare up in the other Americas or else, perform the function of a cork or stopper brusquely removed from the neck of a bottle filled with precious liquids. The mixtures—racial, social, and economic—are already in the alembic.

On the home front, oil-wealthy Venezuela has been startled to hear that 168 members of the richest families will be required to give an account of their land stewardship before a seven-man tribunal, whose members include a Catholic priest, a Communist official, and representatives of both Army and Navy. Although no far-reaching distribution of the vast estates has as yet been ordered, it is taken for granted that the huge properties, mobile and immobile, that were accumulated in the hands of favorites under the Gomez regime, will be transformed into model dairy and cattle farms of reasonable size. Definitely, the millionaire ranch owner, with his holiday merrymaking in Paris and Monte Carlo, is on the way to oblivion. The people, on the other hand, now half-starved and riddled with tuberculosis and malaria, have been promised something more sustaining and appetizing than black beans and rice.

This land revolution, which, it is hoped, will prove fair and evolutionary, cannot succeed without a wealth of high-minded morals, intelligence, and technical skill. The dashing, gallant Minister of Agriculture, J. Mendoza, has invited a corps of foreign experts to formulate plans for the future. The program of Secretary Mendoza, who gained his own considerable specialized knowledge of farming in Argentina, now depends upon the integrity and ingenuity of a freshly organized staff headed by 24-year-old Mauricio Baez, a trained agronomist, and Claudio Muskus, who learned his lessons in livestock production at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. Acting on the advice of these two experts, both his own countrymen, Secretary Mendoza is also deriving valuable help from all parts of the Western Hemisphere, starting with the United States Embassy in Caracas.

The reallocation and more efficient exploitation of farm land, if it develops according to plan, will represent another triumph of inter-American cooperation. In that case, too, it can easily set the pattern for similar reforms or redistributions that are long overdue and sadly needed from Hudson Bay to Tierra del Fuego. What a miracle of initiative, technical skill, honesty, and spiritual friendship would it be, if the inter-American century and its inter-American generation could adopt as a watchword: "As goes Venezuela, so marches the New World."

This is the hope; this is the challenge. In the heart of America, a new ferment is at work. Neither extreme right, nor extreme left, the Republic of Venezuela, groping its hazardous way from the old to the new, is engaged upon a magnificent adventure.

Rómulo Betancourt, a one-time Marxist and a full-fledged member of the Communist

Party in his salad days, is now a champion of democratic unity among left-wing groups and left-wing governments. As odious to the Moscow-dominated Third International as he would be to any recrudescence of the pulverized Axis, he and his associates, standing just left of center, are preparing the ground for a gifted, literary, chief magistrate.

What is the best evidence of reconstruction? The fact, emphasized by the minister of education early in 1946, that, for the first time in history, the budget for popular instruction overshadows the sums alloted for the ministry of war and marine. With some land and more education, the masses of South America can forge forward into the light. Peace can enjoy her victories, much "more renowned than war."

What the Miners Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the American Federationist entitled "What the Miners Want" and certain excerpts taken from a statement by Mr. John L. Lewis to the National Bituminous Coal Conference.

What the miners want will find a sympathetic ear from many people, and even among a few coal operators. Most everyone familiar with the extreme hazards and working conditions of the industry will agree that the miners should be well paid and the working conditions improved.

The terrific toll which day after day occurs in the industry should be ameliorated as far as humanly possible. Miners and miners' families have suffered intolerably through the years. The record of dead and maimed is the highest of any industry. A few conscientious operators have tried to correct this high loss. The largest captive coal producers, the H. C. Frick Coke Co., years ago inaugurated strenuous efforts in this direction and spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to accomplish a reduction of mine accidents. Some few operators followed suit. But this is something a few companies cannot do. The entire industry must be geared to do it. The request of the miners for improvement in this matter is on solid ground.

Many of the other evils must be uprooted. These evils are well set forth in the article entitled "What the Miners Want." It is a shame these conditions are permitted to exist in this country.

Mr. John L. Lewis is bitter in his denunciation of the operators, and I assume he speaks for all of the miners when he says:

When we sought surcease from blood-letting, you professed indifference, when we cried aloud for the safety of our numbers you answered "Be content, 'twas always thus." When we emphasized the importance of life you pleaded the priority of profits; when we spoke of little children in unkempt surroundings you said, "Look to the State." You scorn the toils, the abstinence, and the perils of the miner * * * we denounce the senseless cupidity that withholds from the miner the rewards of honorable and perilous exertion.

These are strong words but when he says them, I can hear almost every miner, his wife, and children, whom I have known, say them.

The subcommittee of the House Labor Committee, which has been studying aid to the physically handicapped, and of which I have the honor to be chairman, was astonished to learn of the terrible toll of deaths and injuries which this industry exacted, of the manner in which many of these injured are treated, and of the helplessness of the families of the victims. The records of this committee sternly point to the necessity for correction in the coal industry, and all industries, of conditions that lead to loss of life and crippling of workers; and for improvement in living standards to assure strong bodies and good health of the workers' families.

The article follows:

WHAT THE MINERS WANT

(By K. C. Adams, editor, United Mine Workers' Journal)

The joint wage conference in Washington last month between the United Mine Workers of America and the bituminous coal operators—the second to be held on a basis of national representation—embraced more than the customary wage meetings such as have been held during the past 48 years.

Equally important, if not more so, with a wage increase, shortened day and work-week (bituminous miners have been working 9 hours a day, 6 days a week—54 hours a week where the operators choose to operate the mines), the UMWA called for the establishment of a health and welfare fund such as has prevailed in the British mines for the past 25 years, to be raised by a tax on each ton of coal produced.

COMPANY ABUSES INVESTIGATED

During the past year the UMWA has employed coal miners who have previously served their union in varying official capacities and who know the coal camp conditions and way of life, to investigate the abuses by coal companies of group insurance, the employment and inadequate service of company doctors, and illegitimate practices to circumvent and cheat on State compensation laws. The revelations coming to light from a compilation of the reports made by these investigators tell an inhuman story of profiteering in life insurance, compensation, burial of the dead, and even childbirth by many companies located in the States of Alabama, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, and spotted in other fields, as well as reaching into western coal-producing areas, that makes one's blood run cold.

Of course, the worst conditions prevail in the States named for the reason that they were the last to be completely unionized by the UMWA.

How antiquated and un-American the company doctor system and hospitalization are can be best illustrated by the fact that in certain sections of West Virginia the old Chinese custom of discrimination as between the sexes in childbirth prevails. A charge of $25 is made for the delivery of a girl, while $20 is charged for the delivery of a boy. The boy can, of course, as per the old Chinese custom, grow into mine manpower, while the girl in the isolated mining town becomes a financial liability which, in considering the family budget, might necessitate wage increases for the breadwinner and larger housing accommodations for the family.

Throughout the years since coal mining began in the United States a huge toll of life has been snuffed out annually as a result of inadequate safety provisions, lack of thorough mine inspection and proper ventilating facilities. The number killed in American coal mines from all causes annually from 1906 to 1945 averaged 1,981. This figure does not include the men who died from 2 days to a year after sustaining their injuries and who are listed by the State mining departments in the accident or partially disabled columns.

The average injured annually from 1930 to 1944 totaled 66,968.

The number of permanently totally disabled, permanently partially disabled and temporary disabilities for the period 1930 to 1944 totaled 1,004,524.

That the known hazards of the coal industry prevent coal operators from securing employees at will is best attested by the operators' own statement, in which they reveal that a survey of 171,984 employees showed that 129,904—or 75.54 percent—have been employed in the coal mines less than 3 years.

The killed and injured in coal mining take such a large human toll necessitating such great replacements of manpower, that only 25 percent of the men survive for a reasonable tenure of service.

Willful negligence in the enforcement even of inadequate safety laws has repeatedly resulted in major disasters. Despite all efforts to achieve compensation legislation commensurate with the injuries and permanent disabilities as well as outright death, today's payments are totally inadequate. Not a single coal mining State provides adequate compensation to maintain a widowed family or fairly compensate the injured.

Ineffective compensation laws have aided in the perpetuation of the so-called company doctor system. The scourge of the master and servant days that was foisted upon the American coal miners by nonunion operators at the beginning has continued on down to the present time, embracing approximately half of the total annual coal production.

The medical service under this system is mediocre and inadequate. A company doctor does much more than treat the sick and injured. He acts as a company representative in compensation cases. He is the company agent in insurance claims. He determines the physical fitness of job applicants.

The company selects a doctor of its own choosing. Although his salary is paid out of deductions from the miners' wages, the doctor works for the company, not for the employees. A doctor thus selected testifies against workers in compensation cases where the company disputes the extent of an employee's injuries. He does the company's bidding in passing upon the physical fitness of job applicants.

SWEET SET-UP FOR OWNERS

In many cases doctors are hired with the distinct understanding that they will treat compensation cases free of charge. This set-up pays double dividends to the company:

1. It transfers to the miners, who pay the doctor's salary, the duty imposed upon the company by the workmen's compensation law of paying for medical treatment of injured workers.

2. It enables the company to show low-cost medical maintenance, thereby entitling it to a cut in its compensation rate.

In most instances where group insurance prevails, which is protection bought out of the miner's pocketbook, the insurance contract is made with the coal company; the company has the supreme word through the com-

pany doctor system in determining the claimant's eligibility. The rates charged coal miners are exorbitant. Insurance companies admittedly "increase their base rates for coal miners due to the nature and hazards of the industry." For nonoccupational health and accident insurance they add an average flat 40 percent of the base rates.

Under what is known as an experience rating system of adjusting cost of insurance premiums, earned rebates are paid to the coal company contracting for the insurance. But, although insurance companies maintain that as a general rule covered miners are given their share of the rebate, insurance companies have no jurisdiction to enforce division of the rebated funds among covered miners and they receive no report on the disposition of such rebates.

The Mine Workers' investigation disclosed further that in most districts miners participate in group hospitalization plans, but the hospitals entering into these agreements are, for the most part, virtually inaccessible owing to their distance from the mine, ranging up to 160 miles; they are understaffed and lacking in modern equipment and ambulance service. For the poor service provided them and their dependents under hospitalization insurance, the miners are currently paying an average of $1.95 monthly.

In addition to what he pays into the burial fund and for hospitalization, the miner pays an average of $1.94 a month for medical service and $2.56 for accident insurance. None of these fees, however, entitles him to dental care. In most instances, he also must pay an additional fee for certain vaccines, special medicines and treatments, such as X-ray and radium, and for house calls beyond prescribed limits. Delivery of his child costs him from $10 to $50, ambulance service from $10 to $30.

Base expenses for medical treatment, etc., average $7.74 per month. The "extras" bring the total average check-off per month up to an estimated $10.68 to $12.68.

The basic reason why the mine workers have been unable to correct the inhuman relations by forcing the operators to give greater consideration to human problems during the past 50 years lies in the fact that it was not until 1941 that the miners succeeded in forcing the captive mines of the country, as well as mines in all other nonunion areas, to accept the union shop and sign a written agreement with the United Mine workers of America.

Since that date the war has been on, Government "burrocrats" have been in the saddle, and it has been impossible to induce any Government agency, official or otherwise, to give serious consideration to the slaughter in American coal mines.

Prior to the convening of the wage conference the operators began an attack upon the proposed health and welfare fund for the rehabilitation of the injured and care of widows and orphans, the establishment of which they felt certain the UMWA would propose. Castigating the operators for jumping the gun, President Lewis charged that the operators "must think that the public is interested in continuing killings in the mining industry," and then he asked the operators if they "would agree with the UMWA to ask Dr. Gallup to take a poll of the country" on the question of whether or not the operators should accept a clause in the contract which would provide as follows:

"The contracting parties recognize that the loss of life in coal mines and the ratio of injuries is too great to be condoned in any civilized country, and the operators signatory to this contract agree that henceforth they will meticulously carry out and put into effect every safety recommendation made by the inspectors of the United States in the employ of the Bureau of Mines."

While having the right of inspection of coal mines in any State, Federal mine inspectors can only recommend improvements and safeguards and the adoption of new mining methods. They have no power to enforce such recommendations.

"Such a provision in the next contract," declared Lewis, "will reduce the killings in West Virginia and in every other State, and under the moral law of Christendom the saving of life to a fellow human being is a meritorious act." Then he queried: "Will you do it?"

There was no answer.

Without Food There Will Be No Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a radio broadcast made on April 16, 1946, over the American Broadcasting Co. network. It expresses the thought that we should return to rationing at once. We cannot build foundations of peace in a hungry world where 500,000,000 people face starvation.

The radio broadcast follows:

ANNOUNCER. Tonight Headline Edition features the question of food for Europe. Our guest is California's Congresswoman from the Fourteenth District, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, who will speak from Washington. Mrs. DOUGLAS speaks tonight for the Union for Democratic Action, a national nonpartisan citizen's organization.

Mr. LEACH. Mrs. DOUGLAS, what is the truth about the food situation abroad?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Food—or rather the lack of it—headlines every edition of all European papers. Hunger is more than a word in Italy, China, Holland, Yugoslavia, Greece. In Europe and Asia hunger means infants whose skin hangs in folds, infants who don't learn to walk or talk. It means rachitic children, tubercular children. It means death. Hundreds of men and women are dying daily on the streets of Bombay and Calcutta. The death rate is rising throughout Europe. Today, famine, literally threatens one-fourth of the earth's population—500,000,000 people.

Mr. LEACH. What does that mean, Mrs. DOUGLAS, in terms of daily diet?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. According to the food pamphlet published by the Union for Democratic Action which every Americaan ought to read it means that Vienna's population of more than a million live on a diet of bread and peas. It means that fresh meat and potatoes are nonexistent in Holland. It means that the people of Hungary must live mainly on bread. And even bread is rationed in Italy, Holland, France, Russia, and Sweden. Translated into calories, the picture is even more desperate. The experts tell us that people must have a minimum of 2,650 calories. We here in America average about 3,300 calories a day. But the people of Austria, Finland, Hungary, Germany, Spain, Holland, France, Greece, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Yugoslavia are getting considerably less than 2,500 calories daily.

Mr. LEACH. Why in your opinion should America be responsible for feeding Europe and Asia, Mrs. DOUGLAS?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The problem of feeding Europe is more than a humane or ethical question. General Eisenhower said that "without food there will be no peace." He's right. Hungry people are desperate people. If they must go to war to get food, they'll go to war. And, if they must make a choice between food without freedom and freedom without food—they'll take food. America wants peace. America wants a democratic world. She must do her share, shoulder her responsibility, if she is to have either of them. Our farms and factories remain intact. We must feed our allies and those we liberated until they can replenish their own supplies.

Mr. LEACH. What can the average radio listener do about it?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. A great deal, Mr. Leach, a great deal. American food production is up 33 percent. We can ship millions of tons of food to Europe. And we will do it if Americans insist that we return to rationing and make the excess available to a starving world. If other Americans write to their Representatives and their Senators, Congress will support the program for food relief and price protection. The continuance of OPA, incidentally, is an integral part of the food picture. I say tonight that an increase in food prices here will increase deaths all over the world. That's obvious. If prices rise, hungry countries and UNRRA will be forced to buy less with the money they have to spend to buy food. That's up to the American people too. They must fight for the continuance of OPA.

Americans, Mr. Leach, might take a lesson from the English. England is eating even less than it ate during the war. A magazine editor just returned from England, tells me that everyone in Britain goes to bed hungry every night of the week. Despite this, however, England has volunteered to tighten its belt even further and share what little food it has with Europe. And Mr. Leach, Americans who want to enlist their support in the fight for food for Europe ought to start now, tonight, for the next 90 days are crucial if we are to keep Europe alive until the harvest is gathered.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. J. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the President's request for a national health program is not only political but socialized medicine. Just why this radical left-wing group of this administration should be urging a change in the present high-standard medical care now being given by our physicians to the public is, indeed, difficult to understand. A regimented medical profession means regimentation of the American people. It would mean a poor quality of care, and one which would not be pleasing to the individual who becomes ill.

The following letter points out very clearly some of the facts which would develop should the President's national health program be adopted:

HEALTH INSURANCE

Newspapers are running articles about the Federal health insurance recently proposed by President Truman. They all seem to be

written by persons who are not doctors. Most of them are written by individuals who favor State control because they are already slaves to a Government pay check. Those who favor the Truman Federal health plan cannot be opposed to regimentation or be against socialized medicine, for the plan is aimed at taking away the freedom of the patient, and that of the doctors who attempt to serve him. It is not for the common good. It is as un-American as communism, national socialism, or fascism.

No Government insurance plan is free from regimentation, and no plan yet proposed has any advantage over our present undictated, typically American method of medical practice. It stands to reason that our present method of medical attention cannot be put under Federal control unless people like Federal controls more than they do today. The regimentation of so personal a matter as medical attention cannot be successfully foisted upon freedom-loving Americans.

Under our time-tried American way of medical practice, American patients and physicians have enjoyed unrestricted freedom and independence. Under it, American medical men have led all other countries the world over in giving consistently high quality medical service to all the people without fear or favor, and to the indigent without price. It does not make the poor pay for the rich as the Federal health scheme and insurance medicine would do.

Last, but not least, the American doctor keeps inviolate the confidences with which the patient trusts him. He does not divulge it to the Government, any insurance company, or any third party. Under the present doctor-patient relationship, nobody can get at his records, for the doctor caters only to the patient who employs him, and nobody else helds any financial, political, or recriminatory club over his head. This unregulated doctor-patient relationship is simple, direct, uncomplicated, cheaper, and fairer than any other method yet proposed or in operation in any other country.

ADRIAN H. SCOLTEN, M. D.

PORTLAND, MAINE.

Linz Award to Dr. E. H. Cary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record some newspaper clippings respecting Dr. E. H. Cary, of Dallas, Tex., a very famous and outstanding physician and surgeon of my State.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Dallas (Tex.) Daily Times Herald of February 21, 1946]

DR. E. H. CARY ACCORDED 1945 LINZ AWARD HONOR—PHYSICIAN CHOSEN FOR LEADERSHIP IN MEDIC CENTER

Dr. Edward Henry Cary, outstanding Dallas eye surgeon and medical educator for nearly half a century, was acclaimed Thursday as the outstanding citizen of Dallas during 1945 for his work as founder and guiding genius of the great medical center of the Southwestern Medical Foundation.

At a luncheon at noon Thursday at the Baker Hotel Texas Room, Dr. Cary was presented wtih the annual Linz Award, a plaque presented by Linz Bros. The award was presented by Frank McNeny, chairman of the committee which selected Dr. Cary over a field of nominees that included outstanding leaders in many fields of endeavor.

Mr. McNeny extended his appreciation to Linz Bros., donors of the award, and the Times Herald, sponsors, declaring the two were "dominant factors in the development of Dallas to its high state of civic consciousness."

In accepting the award, Dr. Cary expressed thanks to Linz Bros., and "the community of Dallas."

"So many magnificent men have done their duty in Dallas that to be selected as one of those honored is very gratifying," he said. "But I could have accomplished nothing without the support of the newspapers, the Foundation trustees, and the citizenship of Dallas."

The award was a silver shield on a mahogany base. On the shield were inscribed the words: "For the high ideals and noble aims, from which your splendid work has resulted in greatest benefit to the community of Dallas, this presentation is made by Linz Bros."

Albert Linz, president of Linz Bros., opened the meeting.

ONE HUNDRED NINETY-FIVE NOMINATIONS

The committee had a difficult task in reaching the final decision, Mr. McNeny said, reporting that more than 50 persons were presented in some 195 nominations.

"It is a moving thing to read as in a great volume a record of the good deeds of one's fellowmen," Mr. McNeny said of the nominations.

Among the nominations, those that impressed the committee most were for servicemen, Mr. McNeny said. "Their gallantry is not to be compared with mere civic duty." But, he pointed out, the rules of the award as set down over many years require that the service be rendered directly to the community.

However, he said, when all nominations were in, one name led all the rest. In presenting the award, Mr. McNeny said to Dr. Cary:

DR. CARY'S WORK CITED

"The highest achievement of any calling is the character and devotion of the men who give it leadership. It is given to few men to excel in their chosen profession and at the same time to retain the good will and friendship of apparently all of those engaged in the profession.

"And it is given to fewer still to rise to the highest national office within the gift of the members of the profession, and to few indeed is given the capacity to combine these accomplishments with that of outstanding civic achievement.

"Dallas is deeply conscious of and deeply appreciative also of the great humanitarian institution which is emerging under your fine leadership. If we have properly appraised the sentiments of the community, Dallas expects you to heal its hurts.

"On behalf of Linz Bros., the Times-Herald and the Linz award committee and, too, I presume to speak for the entire community, I esteem it the highest privilege to present to you the Linz award for crowning civic achievement. And by the authority vested in me by these groups, I designate you Dallas' Citizen No. 1 for 1946."

AIDS MEDICAL CENTER

As president of the board of trustees of Southwestern Medical Foundation, Dr. Cary saw the dream on which he worked for many years expand into a full-fledged reality during the year just past. Opening in 1943, a war year, the medical school operated by the foundation immediately gained favor of the medical profession.

During that same year the citizens of Dallas made known their whole-hearted support by contributing $1,500,000, of which $1,000,000 was set aside as a building fund. During 1945 the school prospered, gained in student body and faculty and established a strong position in the community. Under Dr. Cary's leadership, the institution's future was insured when Dallas again came across with the cash, $1,315,000 for a 5-year operating fund.

Throughout the yet short service of the foundation, its driving force has been the Dallas physician, who will be 74 years old next Thursday. Despite his advanced years, a busy medical practice, far-reaching civic leadership and business affairs far beyond the realm of the average medical man, Dr. Cary gave heavily of his time and money to insure the future of Dallas as the medical center of the Southwest.

COLLEGE GROWS RAPIDLY

Under Dr. Cary's leadership the foundation and its college have made rapid strides since opening 32 months ago. The Dallas Venereal Clinic has won national recognition for its work on syphilis. The clinic was selected as one of the five in the Nation to receive grants from the National Research Council. The Buchanan Blood and Plasma Center at Baylor Hospital continued on its program of research and humanitarian work. There are many other outstanding achievements.

The college already has been ranked class A by the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association. During the early months of 1945 plans were begun for the medical school buildings.

Edward Henry Cary was born February 28, 1872, in Union Springs, Ala., the son of James Milton Cary and Lucy Powell Cary, solid Southerners of English descent. He grew up in Union Springs, attending preparatory school at Union Springs Academy. In 1898 Dr. Cary received his medical degree from Bellevue Hospital Medical College, New York University, and interned at Bellevue and at the New York Eye and Ear Infirmary.

ACTIVE CIVIC LEADER

Dr. Cary came to Dallas on completion of his internship and immediately went into medical practice and teaching. From 1902 until 1943, when it moved to Houston, he was professor of opthalmology and otolaryngology and head of that department at Baylor, Dean of Baylor Medical School from 1902 to 1922, he has been dean emeritus since 1929. Other positions at Baylor include chairman of the department of surgery from 1921 to 1929; chairman of the faculty from 1909 to 1929; chairman of the staff of Baylor Hospital during the same period; and chairman of the advisory board of the school and hospital.

In business affairs, Dr. Cary is president of the Cary-Schneider Investment Co., president of the Medical Arts Hospital, and a director of Republic National Bank. He heads the Cary clinic.

Other positions include president and chairman of the board of the National Physicians Committee, president of the old Kessler Plan Association, chairman of the district medical examiners board in World War I and member of the Selective Service Appeals Board in World War II, organizer of the Baylor Hospital unit which served in France during World War I, past president of the Texas Philosophical Society, fellow of the American College of Surgeons, member and past trustee of the American Medical Association, and president of a number of medical groups, including the American Medical Association.

Club and lodge affiliations include Critics Club, Dallas Athletic Club, Dallas Country Club, Brookhollow Country Club, thirty-second degree Mason and a Shriner, and member of the Order of the First Families of Virginia.

The Linz award is presented annually to the Dallasite who is selected by a committee of judges as having rendered the greatest service to the community during the past year. The award is sponsored by the Times Herald, which received nominations for a period of several weeks during January and February.

[From The Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of February 23, 1946]

AWARD TO DR. CARY

The designation of Dr. Edward H. Cary as the recipient of the Linz award was peculiarly appropriate as viewed against several different backgrounds of civic affairs and development. He clearly deserved the award on the basis of the merit for which it is specifically given: "High ideals and noble aims * * * resulting in greatest benefit to the community of Dallas" during the last year. But in winning the award on this basis, Dr. Cary exemplified also the especial and increasing need of, and opportunity for, broad service to humanity in a day of specialization. He is a specialist in his own profession, but it was not as a professional that he won the award, even though it was through his profession that he entered the field of civic service in which the choice is made.

There are men who devote themselves exclusively to their specialized fields and, by doing so, greatly benefit humanity. This has been peculiarly true of the field of medicine. But there must always be the Dr. Carys to take the general as well as the specialized view. Otherwise, our social development would fall apart for lack of something to knit it together.

In passing it should be noted that, while Dr. Cary wins the award for 1945, the achievement of the year is really the accumulation of a quarter of century of untiring effort toward an end. For many years, he has dreamed of a great medical center here, not merely because he aspired to build such a center for his home city, but because he saw the logical need of one for the service of city, of the surrounding region, and—through medical research—service to humanity throughout the world.

The Linz award is fittingly given. The people of the community should follow through with the kind of recognition and support that will fully materialize Dr. Cary's quarter-century vision.

Foreign Policy and the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my speech on foreign policy and the British loan, which was made in New York City on January 31; Louisville, Ky., on February 24; St. Louis, Mo., on March 11; Boston, Mass., on March 24, 1946:

Foreign policy. What is foreign policy?

Policy means "a settled course." Foreign, "something not native or domestic."

Why don't we drop the word "foreign"? It would help us to settle our course.

In a universe where an association of planets is dreamed of, when we can send radar massages to the moon and get back an answer in 2½ seconds, to think and talk of our policy in relation to the English, the French, the Russians, the Chinese, the Mexicans, the Canadians, or any other peoples as foreign is outworn, outlived, antiquated, obsolete.

The whole world has become the corner drugstore.

Is not every place on the earth our locality? Find me today the spot foreign on our globe.

All affairs have become domestic. Their effect upon us intimate—immediate.

"We the people of the United Nations * * *" We modeled those words in our living. Faith in men was our standard.

No longer are men foreign to men.

The "four freedoms" are not foreign to the desires of any man—white, black or yellow.

There are different words to express freedom. But it doesn't matter how you express it. It matters only that you have it.

And our policy in relation to the peoples of the world can never again be foreign if that policy is based upon the principle we believe in—the principle to which we profess loyalty—the principle to which we are committed before the peoples of the world—in the jungles, the mountains, the deserts, in the villages, the farms, and in the cities—the principle of the dignity and worth of the human person—the principle of the equality of man.

For the recognition of man's equalness, out of which our oneness alone can grow, is the cornerstone of our existence tomorrow.

We shall determine in the immediate future whether or not we are to have that existence.

There is no security against the atomic bomb—against world chaos—except through international cooperation.

International cooperation has meaning only if the welfare of men is the end of all our endeavors—the well-being of human beings the end of all our labors.

We have agreed to that.

Under our people's charter, we have declared war against intolerance, poverty, disease, illiteracy, against the economic irregularties that breed wars.

We have written the creed. We have declared the policy. Together we will secure the future common to all of us—foreign to none—or there will be no future.

Our share in welding the human family into a harmonious oneness is privileged—is great. We have much to give. Much will be asked of us. We are young—healthy—strong—rich in material goods and power.

But the greatest power we can wield is the power of morality.

Today when the extension of freedom in the world is the common goal, we must lead the way. Out of the freedom we have won and enjoyed, we should find our greatest strength.

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose.

"To that high concept there can be no end save victory."

These words were forged, to freemen, to release their strength. People were the concern when these words were written.

A sleeping paralysis gripped man's heart and mind in that hour.

Hope for the extension of liberty—greater liberty—mobilized the strength that was needed to repel the forces of evil that threatened man. People had to be mobilized.

Will we forget that it is people now we must mobilize to win the peace?

Man's hopes are to be found in the "four freedoms." He told us, that good and gentle man who understood, that if there was to be peace, it must be a people's peace. Prophetic words.

The danger—the immediate danger—is passed. But unless the "four freedoms" are living words, emblazoned in our hearts and minds, and unless hourly, in our everyday workaday lives we measure our acts by the yardstick of the "four freedoms," there is no future.

We who have enjoyed freedom, we the people of the United States, in all our power, must use that power for others. Morality is demanded of us as our passport for tomorrow.

There is but a short time left to put our house—the world house—in order.

We must grow up—mature. Develop our understanding.

We are so quick and easy in our fear and suspicion of others. We forget that the greatest single cause of fear and suspicion in international affairs today is doubt as to our long-range commitments—the commitments of the American people.

The fear of our isolation again, the fear of our indecision, of our withdrawal from the challenge of our responsibility is the greatest single cause of mistrust among all nations today.

So long as the possibility of our withdrawal exists, whether physical, economic, or moral, no other nation will be able to completely abandon its own selfishness in building up its own security by the old, costly, dangerous methods—methods which are temporary shots in the arm—methods which only achieve temporary balance, the sort of balance which crumbles.

The next time that sort of balance crumbles, there may be no one left to pick up the pieces.

Our strength isn't questioned. Our ability isn't questioned. But the strength of our morality is to be proven.

Today if the peoples of the world really believed that the first concern of this people's government is its own people they would know that the peoples of the earth are safe.

That's why they loved and believed in Franklin Roosevelt—because he believed in the American people, and therefore in all people.

It may sound paradoxical, but it is nonetheless true, that our own prosperity is asked first of us.

Are we to be prosperous or not? This is asked not because we cannot afford another depression, but because the world cannot afford our having another depression.

You see, full employment wasn't just Franklin Roosevelt's promise—Henry Wallace's dream.

The answers to the questions we are asked in our own backyard are awaited anxiously in the corner drug store.

Are we going to maintain our domestic productivity by the maintenance of the purchasing power of our industrial and agricultural workers and farmers?

Or are we going to allow concentrated wealth to go on a sit-down strike again and let the very blood of our economy stop in our economic veins?

Will we fully use our trained labor force that is better trained and larger than ever before, or will we let part of it rot and with that rotting destroy the purchasing power that assures properity and freedom from want and fear in the world?

Our factories, our railroads were not bombed in the war. Will we bomb them now, in peace, with "closed" signs? This is the answer which is being awaited, for we cannot quarantine unemployment. We will export it to the world.

If we cannot operate at close to maximum capacity we shall pull the rest of the world down into a depression from which we and they may not recover.

International policy and domestic policy are not two separate policies. They are one. They must be consistent.

Can we refuse to pass the FEPC bill and expect the world to listen to our protests about the subjugation of peoples—the subjugation of nonwhite peoples? Where is the morality of this?

Can we expect the nonwhite peoples—and they constitute the majority of the human race—to take us at our word?

Can we complain about the absence of free elections elsewhere when we continue to charge poll taxes? Or can we fully champion free elections when millions of us do not use our free election to vote?

Our good name depends in part upon our own actions here at home. We cannot expect the world to believe that we are motivated by the spirit of the four freedoms when we do not live up to them ourselves.

What about prosperity abroad? Are we going to pull the old Santa Claus story out of the closet or will we remember that we have the money, that our farms and homes and factories are intact, that our merchant marine floats?

What will our long-range economic policy be for others now that we really get down to cases? Will we make the same stupid mistakes we made after the last war or will we remember that, if all the chips are on one side of the table, the game stops?

The first big test will come when the House debates the British loan. Will ancient history, all the petty hates, be revived? Will our neighbors at the corner drug store, living on wartime rations, which have been further cut since the end of the war, have to listen to a flood of abuse?

The fact remains that as long as Britain has no foreign exchange, as long as Britain's factories are in ruins or worn out through war production, as long as Britain cannot buy raw materials, world recovery is impossible. Peace is a mirage.

Britain spent her working capital before lend-lease was operative. She mobilized her foreign investments and sold them when she was fighting our common war and fighting it alone. Britain derived no financial advantage from lend-lease. The peoples of the world derived the real advantage by her stand—day after day, night after night. Will we forget?

We cannot go into economic isolation again. Yet there is a danger. We do not realize yet, all of us, that there is no prosperity, no hope, no security that way. In the world community we are going to have to export as others will have to export. As others will have to import, we will have to import, too.

Between the world's two wars we missed the great opportunity. We passed the highest tariff on record, thinking we were protecting ourselves.

We allowed—yes; the responsibility was in part ours—we allowed international economic relations to break down. Instead of economic cooperation, we let the world resort to economic warfare. Instead of economic statesmanship, on the part of our leaders, we let ourselves get into a depression, and we stood by and saw the world resort to exchange depreciation and clearing arrangements and a host of similar restrictive measures.

International trade dried up. People's hopes dried up with it.

What we do and are about to do will shape the postwar economic world.

Because our economic power is so overwhelming, the decision sets squarely with us as to whether there shall be economic order or economic warfare with poverty for all of us.

If we are shortsighted, mistrustful, and ungenerous there will be little trade—little prosperity—no security. If we take the long-range view there will be a tremendous increase in the flow of goods for ourselves and for all the peoples of the earth.

We have only a few years. The pattern is being determined now. Our errors will not be mere mistakes this time.

Pray God we don't hang man, and we are a part of man, in the closet with that old Santa Claus line.

The loan isn't even an immediate one-way proposition. The British give up the silver bloc and sacrifice short-term, sure economic advantages which mean much to an exhausted, devastated people. But as a result certain restrictions on trade are released to the long-range advantage of all.

We are not only building trade but building unity. Our strength is our unity.

I can see the sneers—hear the all-wise and jeering laughs. Unity? Sure—why not? Uncle Sam foots the bills.

I can hear the questions, And will there then be a Russian loan, a French loan, and so on?

Yes, there may be—in all probability—yes.

One hundred billion dollars a year to finance the war. That's what it cost. It won't even be recorded what the next war will cost. There will be no one to keep the records.

What can we afford for living—for men? I don't know. Life may be worth another hundred billion dollars. I don't know.

Unity—to be unity—must have the partners standing on their own feet as quickly as possible. You begin with the Big Three, for it is the condition of any other unity.

If Britain and Russia and America cannot thrash out a concerted economic policy, it's dog eat dog for all nations, large and small. If the Big Three can agree then there is a high probability that the problems of the smaller nations can be solved and solved with justice.

What interests me is the fact, and it is a fact, that there are no disagreements between the Big Three which cannot be settled by conference.

There are no differences of international interest which cannot be worked out by our mutual agreement if we remember that boundaries and security lines are not our ultimate goal, but the welfare of people whose future is indivisible.

Arrangements will not be perfect, and we will not always have our way. But we must remember the times when the other fellow gave a bit and didn't have it all his way either. It may be hard to realize, to recognize that fact—but we are not mature until we do.

There will be difficulties in achieving and maintaining unity. These should not only be expected but they should be anticipated. But let us at each turn ask ourselves two questions.

First, what have we contributed to unity?

Second, what groups are opposed to unity and why?

I am certain that we shall discover that those who are opposed will, in general, be found to base their opposition upon ignorance or fear, or because of their own selfish interests.

Then let us ask, what alternative do they offer? Basically they offer none.

It is agreed—unity or chaos.

If the United Nations Organization cannot become a truly deliberative, powerful organization, there is no hope. The world today faces exactly what we faced when we gave up the Articles of Confederation and adopted the Constitution.

The Constitution was certainly not welcome in many quarters. All States were somewhat jealous, each with its own fears and suspicions. But its adoption and the long process of learning to live together under it saved us.

This country was in danger of being Balkanized. It required statesmanship and give-and-take to avoid that.

Today the alternative to understanding and cooperation is the Balkanization of the world with the subsequent tragedy of man.

Remember when Franklin Roosevelt spoke and said we should quarantine the aggressor? He was accused then of being an anglophile, a jingo, a warmonger, an interferer, or worse. But he was right, as his opponents found out. But those same opponents learned nothing. Today they still resist international action to avoid aggression, not after it needs quarantining but before it breaks out into an epidemic.

In this postwar world, in this atomic age, we must remember that we are not dealing with dynasties and powers, first, second, and third rate, not merely with governments. We are dealing with and determining the future of people, of human beings like ourselves.

If we can just remember that it is people who are concerned, our charity and sentimentality will become distilled into mental generosity and wisdom.

No; it is not the Franco Government we continue to recognize. It is the oppressor of the Spanish people whom we continue to recognize.

Put in those terms, we feel ashamed. We should feel ashamed. Again, we were not really shocked about anti-Semitism abroad until we saw the pictures of Buchenwald. Then we saw that it was people who suffered. That hits us. It hits us where it hurts—in our conscience.

No; it is not Britain and Poland and Russia. It is people who were bombed—people who had V-bombs fall on them by the thousand, bombs that traveled faster than the speed of sound.

It is Russian—yes; Russian people—who dynamited their dams and burned their homes as they were pushed back.

It is Poles—yes; Polish people—who lived under the Nazis, who died as scum or starved as drudges.

It is Chinese—yes; Chinese people—who resisted Japan those many years, and it is Chinese people who will build the new China.

It is Belgians and Frenchmen—yes; Belgian and French people—who courageously formed their liberation armies behind the lines. Those people have been through hell and some survived. Their behavior may not presently be to our liking, but who are we to judge them?

We must try to understand them. Our judgment should be cooler than theirs, calmer, more tolerant. The obligation rests upon us. Much will be asked of us. Blessed and fortunate, we have much to give.

But we cannot have, as one soldier wrote me, "Peace on earth at 2 percent."

The war against Fascist tendencies at home and abroad is still on. Yes; we have beaten the Axis. But will we continue the fight against narrow nationalism, isolationism, and against the Fascist philosophy which denies the principle of the equality of men, wherever it is found?

How do we do these things? How do we continue the fight? By picking up the weapons of political battle—by concerted

unified political action—by the use of the privilege and power that is ours as members of a free society—by the expression of our will at the ballot box.

Are we securing the peace as we sit gathered here tonight?

I quote again from my soldier overseas:

"Mrs. DOUGLAS, what is happening at home? Do people know what is going on? Do they realize we are going straight down the road to another war? Is there any dissent, any protest? Where are the liberals who should be raising their voices? Where are the writers and journalists who should be awakening the public to a sense of the peril? Where are the statesmen who should be steering the course of events instead of allowing them to drift? Where are the people with the common sense to know that peace cannot be built on foundations of reaction and starvation? What is happening in the Halls of Congress? Have we forgotten the tragic cost of the war, that we now so easily fritter away the victory?"

Well, have we? President Truman hasn't forgotten. Have others?

There is only one way to answer in a representative government.

The responsibility rests with the people. They will have what they want most—nothing more, nothing less.

This Year—Vote Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial in the Cleveland News, of Cleveland, Ohio, under date of April 11, 1946:

THIS YEAR—VOTE REPUBLICAN

America has come to the crossroads where a choice will carry long into the future.

The congressional elections of 1946 and the Presidential election of 1948 will determine American destiny very definitely.

America will stick to the ideals which have made it great or it will adventure with something new and foreign.

America will stand by age-tested certainties or take up with experiments which will be half the product of chance and half of design.

Our conviction that this is so will be developed herein. Upon it is based our belief that the welfare of the Republic demands Republican victory this fall.

In the News, the slogan for this campaign will be: This Year—Vote Republican!

For the first time in 14 years American voters have the opportunity to make a clear choice of the national future.

The occasion for that decision has not been present before, even though for years the country has been New-Dealing by fits and starts.

In the past there were other considerations affecting elections. There was notably the war, and there was the dominating personality of Franklin Roosevelt.

The plea not to change horses in the middle of the stream was a determining factor in countless votes. Mr. Roosevelt's personal persuasiveness caused many Americans to go against their grave doubts on some of his policies.

Now that situation is gone. There isn't any Roosevelt. There isn't any war—at least, we hope there isn't.

This year's political campaign can be, and ought to be, conducted on basic issues of government, social philosophy, and economics.

This year it can be, and ought to be, a return to a contest between the considered program of the Democratic Party versus the considered program of the Republican Party—a return to determination of national policy within the tested two-party system of checks and balances.

This year, things can be seen as they really are. The Democratic and Republican Parties can be tagged and assigned to their respective places.

The Democratic Party, as it has existed precariously and by expedience for the last 14 years, is shot full of holes. Its tatters and patches and fringes are now revealed for all to see.

What the Democratic Party has to offer today, as a party policy, we do not know.

What its program is, we do not know.

Does it offer a foreign policy? Senator PEPPER assails the performance of the State Department.

Does it offer an FEPC? Its own southerners killed that legislation.

Does it offer a housing program, a labor relations policy, a military-service program, a wage-price policy, a food-production program? From its own side of the aisle in Congress come the votes to sabotage virtually every recommendation of the administration.

There is no Democratic policy. There is no coherent administration policy.

There is nothing on which the party has taken a united stand, to which it is committed on principle, and for which its representatives will vote together.

Even in the executive family there is no teamwork.

Chester Bowles pulls to the left and John W. Snyder to the right.

Henry Wallace bides his time in the background. Harold Ickes refuses to be muzzled and walks out. Bob Hannegan plays with the liberals one day, the standpatters the next.

In the White House a wavering, ineffectual President utters hopeless platitudes and is despondently resentful of a heedless Congress.

There is that on the Democratic side. For that a citizen who votes the Democratic ballot will be casting his choice.

Under cover and anticipating opportunities to cash in on the confusion are the zealot radicals who muscled into the party in the days of Roosevelt.

That is the element to which a citizen voting Democratic will be giving aid and comfort.

Because the Republican Party has been the party of the minority in Congress, it has been forced to operate in the traditional role of opposition.

It has been forced on the negative simply because positive action rarely was possible.

However, it has stood consistently for some fundamental Republican principles. It can offer those as a campaign platform.

It has stood for, and it stands today for, freedom and liberty of the individual American; for the limitation of Government authority, for decentralization of administration; for a curb on wasteful Federal spending; for an end of appeasement in foreign policy; for abandonment of the theory America can tax itself into prosperity; for a free economy as opposed to a managed economy.

In short, the Republican Party stands for the basic practices under which America grew mighty.

What a Republican administration will do in power in Washington is predictable with substantial sureness.

It will move aggressively against the socialization tendencies of the current wobbling administrators. It will bring into executive office men free of the prejudices and predisposition now influencing Government bureaus.

In the labor field, for example, the Republican Party certainly will seek some sensible, workable adjustment of the one-sided Wagner Act. But more importantly it will install a decent, fair administration to make the law work. It will lift politics out of Government labor policy.

The Republican Party will eliminate as speedily as is wise the Federal controls which wartime saddled on the American people—and which the leftists are striving desperately to fasten on for good. In the meantime, it will attempt sensible administration of the necessary controls, for a change.

The Republican Party will end the attempts to create a utopia by law. It will try, instead, to establish the favorable economic conditions under which peace and plenty would flourish by their own strength.

On foreign policy, the Republican Party can point to the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG as an expression of conviction that there is a sensible and courageous course for America to follow in our international associations.

In domestic affairs, the Republican Party will, above all, stress the return of responsibility to States and local communities.

It will restore democratic government.

With this program, a Republican victory will insure stability and guarantee preservation of the honorable American traditions.

It will be a smashing repudiation of latter-day theorists, crackpots, dilettantes, and radicals who have hitched themselves to the Democratic Party and weaseled their way into power.

It will reassert the freedom of the individual American citizen to live his own life, go his own way, and make his own success according to his own efforts.

The choice is there to be made.

Either the American people will elect to be managed into an eventual state socialism—with the citizen subordinated to a central government. Or they will elect to put their faith in the country as a historic citadel of liberty.

As surely as anything ever was, the Democrats are headed one way and the Republicans the other.

To preserve the America that became the greatest nation in the world by the sweat and toil and initiative of free men.

This year—vote Republican!

Starvation and Communism in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a United Press story from Berlin, under date of April 13, disclosing the tragic situation that exists there. It will be noted that former President Herbert Hoover, who is President Truman's personal emissary to Europe, as well as Gen. Lucius D. Clay—General McNarney's deputy—point out that many Germans are starving to death.

The second article under the same date line shows that a group of prominent editors emphasize starvation and point to the danger of driving the Germans into communism. The articles follow:

FOOD STOCKS GONE, MCNARNEY REPORTS—TELLS HOOVER SUPPLY WILL NOT SUSTAIN LIFE—EDITORS CALL FOR ASSISTANCE FROM UNITED STATES

BERLIN, April 13.—Former President Herbert Hoover was told by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, commander of the United States forces in the European theater, today that there was not enough food within the borders of the United States area to sustain life even at starvation levels.

Mr. Hoover, chairman of President Truman's Emergency Famine Committee, heard United States officials say that the German food inventory was exhausted, that essential commodities of life no longer were available, that economic recovery was at a standstill, and that the picture could not improve without more food.

A statement issued by Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, General McNarney's deputy for the United States commander, said supplies on hand plus imports on the way would support a daily calorie ration of only 915 for each German until the next harvest.

POINTS TO DANGER OF UNREST

The statement said that long continuation of the meager food rations together with the present economic doldrums "might lead to unrest which will necessitate a larger army of occupation than is now contemplated and for a longer period of time."

General Clay's statement emphasized the direct relationship of food to production, and asserted that the Ruhr coal output had "decreased substantially" since the latest reduction in rations and said "production cannot be increased until there is a requisite supporting economy."

Earlier Mr. Hoover concluded a series of conferences with American food, political, and economic experts and went into the bleak, rubble-strewn streets of Berlin to get a first-hand view of conditions in the wrecked capital.

He received a detailed report on health conditions within the United States zone from Maj. Gen. Morrison C. Stayer. Afterward he conferred with aides of Robert D. Murphy, chief United States civilian authority in Germany.

Mr. Hoover was scheduled to arrive in Vienna just before noon tomorrow. After lunch with Gen. Mark W. Clark, commander of United States forces in Austria, he will begin immediately a series of conferences with food experts, similar to the ones he has held here since his arrival Thursday.

EDITORS URGE UNITED STATES AID—SEE DANGER OF COMMUNIST RISE UNLESS GERMANS GET FOOD

BERLIN, April 13.—A group of American editors and publishers touring Germany under Army auspices warned the American people today that they must assume the responsibility of feeding the Germans if democracy is to compete with communism in Germany.

One said the American people must feed the Germans in their occupation zone or abandon the occupation.

After the editors and publishers had heard from Herbert Hoover, Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay, United States deputy military governor of Germany, and other food experts, they were asked: "What do you think should be America's responsibility for feeding postwar Germany?"

Their answers:

Julius Ochs Adler, vice president and general manager of the New York Times: "The Germans must be fed for humanitarian reasons, if for no other reason. But food for Germany should be held to a minimum because of serious shortages in other countries that were American allies.

"The American people need to be aroused over this great problem."

Editor Edward T. Leech, of the Pittsburgh Press: "We had better either give the Germans enough food or get out. We cannot democratize the Germans on 1,200 calories a day when communism is being taught on 1,600 calories in the Russian zone. The situation has reached the point where eating is the biggest thing in life."

Associate Editor Robert Reed, of the Kansas City Star: "The American people do not want to see anyone starve, whether enemies or friends. Now that the war is over we must convince the American farmer that he must get his food out, the same as during the war."

President Frank Gannett, of the Gannett newspapers: "If we do not provide adequate food for the people of Europe, anything may happen over here. In the United States zone in Germany people are getting a diet that amounts to 1,270 calories a day. In the Russian zone people are getting 1,600 calories a day. Democracy cannot successfully compete with communism when such a situation prevails. The American people must be made to realize our great responsibility in this disturbing situation."

Editor Paul Bellamy, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer: "We have to feed the Germans or throw Central Europe into the hands of Communists."

Asked whether he foresaw such a danger, Mr. Bellamy replied, "Yes; I certainly do. We must feed the Germans if only from the viewpoint of our own selfish interest."

Managing Editor Robert Fuoss, of the Saturday Evening Post: "We must make up our minds to feed them adequately or starve them to death. I personally think the Germans should be fed adequately. We must feed them if we are to compete with the Russians."

Publisher Gardner Cowles, Jr., of the Des Moines Register-Tribune: "I am very convinced about the whole food situation. If we do not feed the Germans adequately, it is inevitable that a great deal of chaos will result and there will be a tendency to swing Germany toward the Soviets, which I consider unfortunate. I think it would be much cheaper to feed the Germans adequately now than to face the consequences of an inadequate diet in the future."

And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote below from the eighth report made by the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and which was made to the President, the Congress, and the country last fall on our return from an economic mission to several European countries, including Germany. The pertinent part of that report follows:

On all the evidence that the committee could assemble, it seemed clear that the food conditions, as well as those of shelter and fuel, would be more serious in Germany than anywhere else in Europe this winter. While it is true that in the country districts—in spite of poor harvests in the British and, to some extent, in the French zones and a continued stripping of the Russian zone—the population will probably have barely adequate supplies, the picture of the cities is truly desperate, the official ration of 1,550 calories per person, which as far as could be learned it was not proposed to increase, actually runs in some cities as low as 800 to 1,300 calories per person, with small chance of any supplement even by black-market operations. * * * Already many deaths from starvation are occurring in cities like Berlin. The people in the cities in any case have no adequate means of earning a living and are reduced to selling off their remaining possessions.

The committee, therefore, feels that to strip transportation equipment and the machinery of factories capable of manufacturing it, as well as to strip other basic German industries beyond the point recommended by General Clay's advisory committee of experts, can mean only one of two things: (a) That a considerable part of the German population must be liquidated through disease, malnutrition, and slow starvation for a period of years to come, with resultant dangers to the rest of Europe from pestilence and the spread of plagues that know no boundaries, or (b) the continuation both of large occupying forces to hold down "unrest," and the affording of relief mainly drawn from the United States to prevent actual starvation.

If a hard peace requires the elimination of eight to ten millions of Germans, it would be much more humane to eliminate them at once. The committee feels that the American antipathy to theories of racism includes an antipathy to the theory of racial guilt. Those Germans who will suffer will in the main be the very old who generally opposed Hitler and the very young who were hardly responsible for him. It would not be feasible to attempt to make Germany pay for the war without reconstituting its industries beyond the point needed for the support of the population at a minimum level. It warns that for the prevention of a catastrophe in middle Europe will impose a further heavy burden on the taxpayers of the United States and upon our occupying armies, if the present contradictory directives stress reparations and the elimination of all industry that can even indirectly support a war as against the necessity for a minimum standard of living for the German people.

The committee cannot refrain from asking the simple question: "What incentive under this plan exists for Germany to turn to democratic ways?" The committee would like to recall the origins of the Nazi movement in the disintegration of Germany during the period of inflation after the last war. The plight of German cities will certainly be worse this winter unless fuel and food are provided on a scale beyond that presently planned.

OPA Maximum Average Price Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have here 2,000 advertisements from newspapers in 200 cities in 45 States and District of Columbia. They cover, with few exceptions only, 3 days of advertising of low-priced clothing from between March 28 and April 4.

These ads clearly show that low-priced men's, women's, and children's clothing is back in the stores, thanks to OPA's maximum average price program. Stores do not advertise goods unless they have a substantial supply of merchandise in their stores to make the advertising a paying proposition.

Much of this merchandise will again disappear from the market if the maximum average price program is abolished, as it will be under the bill now under consideration.

All of the ads show clothing advertised for sale at or below these prices which I ask consent to include in the RECORD at this point:

Garment	Cotton	Rayon
Dresses:	*Each*	*Each*
Children's and toddlers'	$2.50	$6.50
Girls'	2.50	7.00
Teen-age girls'	3.00	10.00
Women's, misses', and juniors'	4.00	10.50
Maternity dresses		
Blouses:		
Girls'	2.00	3.00
Teen-age girls'		3.00
Women's, misses', and juniors'		3.50
Slips:		
Girls'	1.50	2.00
Women's	1.25	2.50
Panties: Girls'	.75	
Nightgowns:		
Infants'	.75	
Toddlers'	.75	
Children's	1.25	
Girls'	1.75	
Women's	3.00	
Gertrudes and kimonos: Infants'	.55	
Shirts:		
Boys'	1.50	
Men's	3.00	
Undershorts:		
Boys'	.55	
Men's	.75	
Pants: Boys'	1.70	
Wash suits: Boys'	2.50	
Coats:		
Infants'	7.40	
Toddlers'	9.00	
Children's	10.60	
Girls'	13.60	
Teen-age girls'	16.80	
Women's, misses', and juniors'	26.00	
Pajamas:		
Toddlers'	2.00	
Children's	2.00	
Girls' and boys'	2.50	
Suits:		
Girls'	13.60	
Teen-age girls'	16.80	
Women's, misses', and junicrs'	26.00	

Garment	Wool	Rayon
Skirts:	*Each*	
Children's	$2.10	
Girls'	3.90	
Teen-age girls'	4.70	
Women's, misses', and juniors'	5.50	
Suits (masculine):		
Juniors'	11.80	
Cadets'	18.40	
Students'	24.50	
Men's (other than tropical weight)	33.00	
Men's (tropical weight)	26.50	
Separate trousers:		
Juniors'	3.90	
Cadets'	5.10	
Students'	6.60	
Men's	8.60	

The maximum average price program, known better as MAP, is the OPA clothing and textile regulation which was devised with the production of low-priced clothing in mind. It is achieving its objective. The consuming public will pay the price if we abolish it today when the low cost clothing program is just showing real results.

The garment MAP requires each manufacturer to deliver garments at no higher average prices for each category he produces than his average in a 1943 base period. There are also MAP regulations for rayon piece goods and woolen fabrics. Cotton goods have never been under MAP.

MAP was developed because between May 1943 and June 1945 clothing prices went up 15 percent, while other cost of living items remained stable. This increase in clothing prices came about largely because manufacturers shifted production from lower to higher priced lines. The highest price line limitation put a lid on prices but could not prevent a manufacturer from dropping his lower price lines and concentrating his production on his highest-priced lines.

MAP has had results. In the last 3 months of 1945 the increase in the clothing index was less than 1 percent, the smallest increase since 1942, and this was at a time when the piece-goods shortage was at its worst. And clothing prices have continued stable.

MAP has not held down clothing production. The output of the two fabrics subject to MAP—wool and rayon—is above peacetime levels. Cotton textiles, not subject to MAP due to manpower shortages, lag behind.

Without MAP fewer low-priced and more higher-priced garments would be produced. If MAP were abandoned now, the clothing bill of the American consumer would go up $1,000,000,000 during the coming year. The garment manufacturers would also suffer, for if more and more of the garments turned out were in the higher-priced lines, fewer people could buy and volume would decline with resulting loss of profit.

Since the beginning of the war average clothing prices have increased 50 percent. Most of this rise in clothing prices has not been due to higher prices on the same items. Because styles are not standardized it has been possible to make slight changes in the trim of low-priced garments and then place them in a higher-priced line. About nine-tenths of the increase in average clothing prices came from the disappearance of low-priced lines and concentration of production in higher-priced lines. Most of this shift took place before MAP was put into effect a year ago. Since then the shift has been nearly stopped and more low-priced clothing has become available.

The overwhelming majority of firms have operated profitably under MAP, in spite of some claims to the contrary. During the third quarter of 1945 only 1 out of every 10 manufacturers had average prices above those permitted by MAP. Even in such cases the surcharges were less than one-half of 1 percent of the total business transacted. Between 50 and 60 percent of all manufacturers actually produced at prices below the average required by MAP.

The record of garment manufacturers' profits also shows that MAP has not caused the garment industry any hardship.

The 1944 earnings of the garment industry were about 10 times as large as during the last peacetime year. Since MAP went into effect OPA has made many price adjustments to compensate for cost increases. While actual figures for current earnings are not available, reliable estimates indicate that they are well above prewar levels.

Since MAP applies to manufacturers only it has no effect on the profit margin of retailers. As a matter of fact, MAP helps retailers by bringing back the low-priced goods their consumers are looking for. Retailers sell the garments produced under MAP at the same average profit margins they have always used.

If MAP goes there will be an increase of 10 percent in annual clothing bill. In other words a vote for abolishing MAP is a vote to give $1,200,000,000 to the garment industry—a curious gift to come through the action of the very people who are so disturbed at subsidies hampering free enterprise.

Gimbel Bros. Sale of Trucks—Veterans Deserve Better Break in Disposal of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, most Members of Congress have received telegrams from veterans' organizations and veterans relative to the recent sale by Gimbel Bros. of a number of trucks, whereas the veterans have been unable to secure the desired number of trucks from the War Assets Administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a number of documents relating to the transaction. Typical of the telegrams received by Members of Congress is the following telegram to me:

Investigation requested regarding 600 new Studebaker 2½-ton trucks advertised for sale by Gimbel's department store on page 48 of March 31, New York Times, which advertisement states were bought from War Assets Corporation and stored at Terre Haute, Ind. Many veterans in Chattanooga area are without jobs for lack of this type equipment. Why wasn't this new equipment sold direct to veterans who can't even buy worn-out equipment in this area?

Lookout Post 1289, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Sumners-Whitehead Post 14, American Legion; Veterans Advisory Center of Chattanooga.

I took the matter up with the War Assets Administration and I include letter dated April 5 from the liaison office of War Assets Administration, which is as follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1946.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: In accordance with your telephonic request of today in which you ask to be advised of the circumstances in the recent advertisement by Gimbel Bros.' department store, New York City, of 600 surplus Army trucks, the following information is submitted:

There were originally 728 trucks declared surplus at the Terre Haute Ordnance Depot, Terre Haute, Ind. The trucks were packed for overseas shipment, two to a crate, disassembled.

Under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Federal agencies and State and local governments have a prior claim on surplus property, giving them the right to purchase before it is offered to any other type of purchaser.

On December 8, 1945, catalogs advertising these 728 trucks were mailed to all priority claimants in the sales region in which the sale was held. In this region are the States of West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky. In addition, all State highway departments in the United States were notified.

On the same day catalogs were mailed to all veterans in the States within the sales region who had expressed interest in trucks and who had been properly certified to purchase them under veterans' preference regulations.

On the same day all truck dealers in the region who had asked to be notified of truck sales were sent catalogs. All our regional offices were also notified of the sale. In all,

4,900 catalogs were sent out, the majority of which went to veterans.

This was a fixed-price sale, and the dealers who ultimately bought the trucks paid the same price at which the trucks previously had been offered to veterans.

On January 21, nearly 7 weeks after catalogs advertising the sale had been sent to prospective purchasers, the trucks were placed on sale to Federal agencies.

On January 22 and 23 the trucks were offered for sale to State and local governments.

Beginning January 24 and continuing through February 1, the trucks were offered to veterans exclusively.

Beginning February 4 and continuing through February 20, the trucks were on sale to dealers. Although the veterans' preference period expired on February 1, veterans could still purchase these trucks on the same basis as dealers. Thus, it was possible for veterans to buy the trucks at any time between January 24 and February 20.

Reports on sales from January 21 through February 20 show that only 128 trucks were sold during this period. Federal agencies bought none. The State of Minnesota bought 2. Veterans bought 40. Dealers bought 86. Six hundred remained unsold. These were available to any qualified purchaser.

On February 20, eight Cleveland, Ohio, automotive dealers, none of whom had made prior purchases as dealers, bought the remaining trucks in the following quantities:

Carnegie Body Co., Cleveland	76
Nottingham Auto Sales, Cleveland	76
United States Truck Sales Co., Cleveland	76
Larick Motor Sales, Willoughby, Ohio	76
Hirsch Motor Sales Co., Cleveland	74
United States Truck Equipment Co., Cleveland	74
Bedford Auto Sales, Bedford, Ohio	74
Brownless Chevrolet, Inc., Cleveland	74

These are the trucks that were offered for sale in Gimbel Bros.' department store in New York City.

The purchasers had the trucks uncrated and assembled at the Army ordnance depot at Terre Haute. The trucks were then driven to New York.

Since Monday, April 1, the United States Truck Sales Co., one of the purchasers, has stated that the trucks purchased by that company were resold to a Mr. Mayorga, of New York City, acting as an agent for Arthur Price Associates, Empire State Building, New York City. A representative of Gimbel Bros. has further stated that Gimbel's does not own the trucks, but are offering them for sale for the account of Arthur Price Associates.

No complaints concerning the Terre Haute sale have been received from veterans or dealers in that region.

It is our experience in previous sales of automotive equipment that there is a relatively small demand for these 2½-ton, six-wheel-drive trucks. Also, these trucks, crated for overseas shipment, are without bodies, which is perhaps another factor contributing to the lack of interest in this sale.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

E. M. SCOTT,
Assistant Liaison Officer.

I asked the staff of the Small Business Committee of the House to make an investigation of the transaction. The report of the investigation by J. G. Crost, of the Small Business Committee, which I am privileged to use, is as follows:

SUBJECT: GIMBEL BROS. SALE OF 600 STUDEBAKER 6 X 6 TRUCKS

I am attaching a copy of a report dated April 4 which the Consumer Goods Division gave to General Gregory on the subject. The facts seem to be in line with the report given Congressman KEFAUVER by Mr. Scott April 5. My comments are as follows:

1. As far as giving sufficient time to Federal, State, and local agencies and veterans is concerned, the War Assets Administration's action seems to be entirely proper. A No. 1 priority to veterans would do absolutely no good in cases such as this, since veterans had the preferences and would not buy the supply.

2. I am informed that a six wheel, two-and-one-half-ton truck with four-wheel drive is an expensive truck to maintain. The price is $1,954 each and not many veterans are considered to be interested in this type of vehicle.

3. The only respect in which the sale may be criticized from the veterans' standpoint is that newspaper advertising was not used and other regions did not undertake to notify interested parties in their regions through the use of newspaper advertising.

The statement was made, however, under point 6 of the report to General Gregory, that "copies of the catalog were mailed to each regional office." In my opinion, when one regional office of War Assets Administration has substantial quantities of a greatly desired item, like new trucks, which are unsold to priority claimants and veterans in the region, other nearby regions should be notified by teletype so that they can take newspaper space to inform veterans in the nearby regions of the opportunity.

The statement was made to me by Mr. Worth, of the War Assets Administration Truck Section, that veterans were loath to travel great distances to purchase trucks. Inasmuch as these were new trucks already crated, which could reasonably be purchased on specification and by mail, I don't think that argument is too sound.

I discussed the case with Mr. N. H. Bell, who is an assistant to General Gregory (working with Colonel Kenderdine). Mr. Bell advises me that under their new policy the Cincinnati regional office would have been required to contact other regions advising them that there remained unsold substantial quantities of new trucks for veterans in other regions to purchase. Furthermore, Mr. Bell informs me that newspaper advertising is to be used in such cases.

I call your attention to the recommendation of the staff of the Small Business Committee that items like trucks, which are unsold to priority claimants in one region, should be so advertised as to inform veterans in nearby regions of the opportunity of securing them. In the case under consideration, if this procedure had been followed, veterans undoubtedly would have secured the trucks involved.

The foregoing material is included in the RECORD in the hope that it may clarify the facts of the controversy.

California's Grange Health Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the usual run-of-the-mill problems of operating a farm in these days of uncertainty, the farmers of California have had to concern themselves with the possibility of increased taxation, added confusion, and more and more bookkeeping because of the introduction of compulsory health-insurance measures both in this Congress and in the California State Legislature.

California farmers, I imagine, are no different than those who till the soil in other States. They are, for the most part, a very self-reliant class of individualists. They have to be to take the risk they are forced to face each year as they gamble with the soil and with the elements to produce a living for themselves and their families.

When it comes to a matter of medical care they demonstrate their self-sufficiency. Many of them live miles from the nearest doctor and even greater distances from a hospital.

Because of this they have learned to take care of many of their own ills, the troubles of their families and their employees' minor ailments without the assistance of a doctor.

Because many farmers live and work in isolated areas of my State and because of their natural trait of self-reliance, these men and women do not run to the doctor for every little ailment, as do many of their city cousins who have medical and hospital services more readily available.

However, when it comes to a matter of having to pay for compulsory health insurance through another tax levy on his total pay roll, the farmer knows he will be discriminated against. He will have to pay his share on the same basis as the city employer who has easy access to medical services. The unfairness of this situation is most obvious.

Because of the inequities, which are so evident in all broad programs of compulsion, the farmers of California rose in almost unanimous opposition to the proposed compulsory health insurance program when it was before the 1945 session of the California Legislature. And, let it be underscored, it was their opposition which had much to do with the defeat of the proposal.

Without going into a lengthy discussion on the merits or demerits of this compulsory plan, this program which has proven and is proving such a failure in every foreign country where it is in operation, let me tell you how some of California's farmers are meeting the problem head on—with customary direct and positive action.

Early last fall members of the California Grange began investigating available health- and accident-insurance programs which would adequately care for the farmers' needs.

They wanted first, reasonable, but limited service. They wanted a plan which would take care of them in case of illnesses requiring hospitalization and they wanted a way to provide for the payment of the bills in case of accidents of such seriousness as to require hospitalization.

In other words, they wanted streamlined protection.

They knew their needs would not be as demanding upon the medical profession and the hospitals as would a like number of city dwellers.

Knowing this, they wanted to purchase a service that was without frills. And, likewise, they wanted to pay a price that was equally "unfancy."

Out of their study was generated a contract between the California Physicians' Service and the Grange which is,

in my opinion, an outstanding example of how the physicians of my State are cooperating with the farmers.

In so doing they are continuing to merit the praise which has been given them by others of my California colleagues here on this floor.

It is at this point, I believe, that I should point out that the California Physicians' Service only last month again received a signal honor when the organization was selected by the officials of the Veterans' Administration to provide out-patient care for all veterans living in California.

According to the latest estimates, there are now between 1,200,000 and 1,600,000 veterans—natives and newcomers—living in the State. The Veterans' Administration-California Physicians' Service contract takes care of them all—including veterans of World War I and the veterans of the Spanish-American War. Think what this means in terms of taking such a load from the overcrowded veterans' hospitals.

It is little wonder then that these farsighted professional men of my State have been so roundly congratulated.

Col. T. J. Cross, Veterans' Administration chief for California, Arizona, Nevada, and Hawaii, termed the agreement one of the "biggest steps in speeding up medical treatment for veterans with service-connected disabilities."

It means that the California physicians, the family doctors, the general practitioners, and the specialists—the 6,200 members of the California physicians' service—have been entrusted with a sacred honor and duty—the nurturing back to health the thousands of men who have made such great and gallant sacrifices for us all.

That they will take care of the veterans I have no fears because, according to the program, the veteran may make his own choice of physician. His own family doctor will be available to him.

In countless instances the very same family physician, who brought the young man into the world, cared for him during his baby days, watched over him as he grew from adolescence, and saw him march off to war, will again take over the responsibility of his care and welfare.

These, then, are the same professional men of my State who have cooperated with the members of the Grange. Though the field is a new one, they have entered it daringly. The physicians have taken the greater part of the risk because the costs, which I shall mention a moment later, are of small consequence in comparison with the services offered.

The physicians and the farmers have hit upon what they believe to be the practical solution to the farmers' health problem. It is the California Grange Health Cooperative.

The program is being thrown open to all Grange members, their families, and their employees and employees' families.

No medical examinations are necessary, there is no age limit, and there are no confusing forms to be filled out. The red tape, so much a part of governmental operations, is a minus quantity in the application form and in the broad protection. This is because all existing conditions are covered once a farmer becomes enrolled.

Here are a few of the hospital benefits offered:

When a member or a member of his family is ill and requires hospitalization or needs an operation, or must have immediate emergency care because of an accident, his CPS membership card is his passport to a "paid in full" receipted bill.

Hospitalization is provided for 21 days for each separate accident or ailment. Should hospitalization be longer, the California Physicians' Service pays one-half of the hospital bill for the next 345 days immediately following the original 21 days. The patient is covered for an entire year and a day.

In addition he has the free use of the operating room, dietitian-planned meals, general nursing care, surgical supplies, use of the cystoscopic room, supplies, dressings, splints, casts—all these services are free to the Grange member once he is enrolled in the health cooperative.

But the CPS plan goes even further. It also includes certain assistance to ease the load of added expenses when there is a new arrival in the family. After 10 months' membership, a $50 allowance is given for maternity care at childbirth.

The health cooperative also provides for the finest available surgical care in time of illness or serious accident.

Major or minor operations will be made in the office of the member's doctor or at the hospital. If hospitalization is needed, by the way, the member has his choice of hospital as he has his choice of physician.

This surgical care further includes treatment for all fractures and dislocations, X-rays, if necessary, ectopic pregnancies, and caesarean operations.

X-ray and routine laboratory tests are available to the CPS-Grange member and his family when hospitalized. When the regular surgeon requires the services of an assistant, an assistant surgeon is brought in at no added cost. Likewise, should the family physician find he needs the services of a specialist—the specialist is brought in and again there is no added cost.

You—my colleagues here on the floor of the House who know the expenses that always accompany long periods of illness and how unpredictable are accidents—you who know the care and the time involved in treating these cases will, I'm certain, be most interested in the fees charged in this new health cooperative.

The few Members of Congress who are also honored members of the medical profession, I am certain, will be impressed when I tell you that all these services, which I have described, are now available to male members of the Grange for only $5.15 per quarter or $18.60 per year.

Families of three or more—and there is no limitation on the number of persons in the family—may enjoy all this protection for the nominal charge of $16.70 every 3 months or but $64.80 per year.

From my farming experience and knowing of the tragedies I have seen ride in upon families when illness or accident stops earnings, evaporates savings, and leaves the farmer with a mountainous bill for extended medical and hospital services, I, for one, would not be without the protection at any cost.

This service, let me repeat, is available not only to the 30,000 Grange members and their families, but the employees of the Grange and the employees' families.

But the contract does not stop there. It further provides that after 1 year's time when 50 percent of the Grange members shall have become a part of the program, the contract will be opened up for a thorough inspection and review.

The California Physicians' Service will open its records and show all details, the number of members enrolled, the number of operations and the total time spent in hospitals by members. In short, the CPS officials and Grange leaders will, at the end of the year's operation, have all the facts for their appraisal.

Then, it has been agreed, if necessary, a downward price revision will be made. Likewise, if it is found that the physicians' costs have been too great—that is, if the low fees are endangering the continuation of the service—an upward revision will be made.

This, I know all will agree, is the American way.

It is open and aboveboard. The basis for the contract is honesty and mutual respect marked with a decided spirit on the part of the physicians to assist the rancher in solving his health problem.

Also, it is the voluntary way. It is the way of freedom—not compulsion.

No army of bureaucrats will be required to operate the plan. No second army of bureaucrats will be required to see that the first set did its work properly, that the voluminous forms were made out in triplicate and quadruplicate—that they were filed in a dozen offices throughout the land—with copies for all the curious to see. None of these things will interfere with the successful operation of this voluntary health insurance plan.

As such, I am certain, it is the American way—on its way to success!

Changes Needed in the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, while the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act is under consideration I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following timely correspondence from the National Small Business Men's Association:

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 15, 1946.

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: We believe the attached recap of our questionnaire will be of value to you in connection with your consideration of the extension of OPA.

This recap is a compilation of 4,454 questionnaires which were filled in and returned

by members of our association. The members who returned questionnaires are scattered over the 48 States and represent more than 100 different categories of business which can be broadly classified under 4 main heads—manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing and service.

To my mind, the most interesting and most important point in the whole recap is that 96 percent are not satisfied with OPA as it is now constituted. This unquestionably means that if Congress extends OPA without drastic revision, there will almost automatically be a vast increase in black-market operations.

The American people, particularly those in business, will give wholehearted support to any national policy which adds up and makes sense. But they definitely will not support a policy which they consider to be unnecessary or unreasonable. We should have learned this lesson from the futile attempt to enforce the eighteenth amendment.

Another very interesting thing about the recap is that 92.5 percent would like to have Congress investigate a healthy cross-section of the personnel of OPA. Probably one reason for this is that while the OPA personnel at the top level may be trying to do an honest job in a helpful manner, such an attitude does not go very far below the top level. There isn't even one ounce of friendly helpfulness in a whole carload of OPA field personnel. Another reason may be because someone or some group in OPA is responsible for fixing different prices on the same product put out by different manufacturers. I could give you many examples of this, but the one which follows will serve to make the point:

On December 7, 1945, the Clay Equipment Corp., of Cedar Falls, Iowa, applied to OPA for an increase in price on their 14-foot steel farm gate. They wanted to increase the price from $9.42 to $10.92 or $1.50 per gate. This increase in price was denied although it was fully warranted on the basis of their increased cost of production. Later, on February 18, 1946, OPA authorized Clay to increase the price on this gate one-half of 1 percent or approximately 5 cents per gate.

In the meantime, another company, the Bellmer Manufacturing Co., of Fort Dodge, Iowa, applied to OPA for a price on a 14-foot steel farm gate. This company had not previously made such a gate. OPA fixed a price of $14.50 on the Bellmer 14-foot steel farm gate, which, I am told by competent authority, is no better, if as good, quality as the Clay gate.

This sort of thing is happening all the time in all lines of business and must be partly responsible for the widespread suspicion of the motives of OPA personnel. Also, it is a good example of why businessmen do not feel that OPA adds up and makes sense. Still further, this is promoting inflation as farmers are forced to pay $3.50 more per gate than they would have had to pay had Clay been granted the requested increase in price. Also, it cuts down the supply of gates, as Clay cannot turn out very many gates on the basis of the larger his volume the more he loses.

The recap also brings out that if businessmen are granted permission to fix their own prices within certain prescribed limits, employment will increase 34.5 percent and sales volume will increase 55.9 percent.

In the final analysis, if disastrous runaway inflation is to be prevented, two basic things must be done: (1) Deficit financing must be eliminated in order to reduce the oversupply of money; (2) trade channels must be filled with an ever-increasing supply of goods, which means that all possible emphasis must be placed on production and distribution.

Our association is not advocating that OPA be discontinued on June 30, 1946, but rather that OPA be extended in modified form for 1 year.

We suggest that the modification be along the lines of drastically narrowing the area of the Administrator's discretion and that the Administrator be required to prescribe a formula under which each manufacturer, wholesaler, retailer, dealer, and service organization can fix his own prices within certain limits.

We suggest further that the formula for manufacturers fixing their selling prices might very well be cost as of October 1942, plus provable increases in cost since that date with a maximum increase of 15 percent above October 1942. All price increases to be filed with OPA on simplified forms which would clearly show which costs had increased and how much. Hardship cases—that is, those cases where an increase of 15 percent is not enough—to be handled by special application to OPA.

Wholesalers, retailers, and dealers, under this formula, would apply their October 1942 mark-up to their new cost price in order to determine their current selling price.

The application of this or a similar formula would almost immediately move a much larger volume of goods to market and thus overcome one of the basic causes of inflation, which is an oversupply of money and an undersupply of goods.

It would be necessary to put teeth in the formula in order to take care of the chiselers. This could be done by setting up a schedule of heavy fines to be assessed for violations in the application of the formula.

It has been suggested that the application of this formula would put OPA up against a very difficult policing job. This may be true, but difficult as that job might be, it would not be nearly as difficult as is the impossible pricing job OPA is now up against and under the formula an infinitely greater volume of goods would move to market.

It is the considered judgment of our association that the suggested formula is by far the lesser of two evils and will, in a much shorter time, again permit the establishment of our traditionally free market under which the ebb and flow of supply and demand plus free competition regulates prices more effectively and more equitably than they have ever been regulated by any other method in the entire history of the world.

Sincerely,

DEWITT EMERY,
President.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION—CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE ON OPA

Please answer the questions which pertain to your business.

	Check with an X	
	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Are you satisfied with OPA substantially as is?	-------	96.0
2. Do you have difficulty figuring out what you are supposed to do under OPA regulations?	88.5	-------
3. Do you consider that OPA requires excess paper work?	87.5	-------
4. Do you think OPA regulations could be greatly modified without danger of serious inflation?	94.6	-------
5. Have you found OPA too inconsiderate and unyielding in the handling of appeals?	88.8	-------
6. Are you reluctant to approach OPA because:		
(a) Of the excessive cost of getting any changes made?	83.7	-------
(b) They demand too much information of a private nature?	86.2	-------
(c) You fear they will use retaliatory tactics on anyone who questions their regulations?	77.8	-------
(d) You do not think there is any chance of getting reasonable consideration?	64.2	-------
7. Do you feel that Government agency practices limit your freedom of speech?	75.8	-------
8. Are your prices figured on a base period that is unjustly low?	83.8	-------
9. Are your margins being badly squeezed because of OPA increases being allowed to producers in the primary markets without compensating increases being allowed to you?	88.5	-------
10. Have OPA regulations forced you to reduce your quality of merchandise or service?	60.0	-------
11. Do you expect to experience genuine hardships before June 30, 1946, unless:		
(a) OPA is thoroughly overhauled?	85.8	-------
(b) Methods of temporary relief are rushed through?	86.0	-------
12. Are you keeping some of your former products out of production because making them would be unprofitable under your established ceilings?	63.9	-------
13. Are some of your needed materials or merchandise unavailable because:		
(a) OPA ceiling prices on them are too low?	91.5	-------
(b) Of OPA delay in pricing them?	83.5	-------
14. Would prompt approval of temporary prices requested by your sources of supply be of considerable help?	64.5	-------
15. If OPA issued a regulation permitting you to fix your own prices, the top limit being an increase of not more than 15 (15–36.5 percent) or 18 (18–10.1 percent) or 20 (20–28.4 percent) or 25 percent (25–25.0 percent) above October, 1941, would you (check increase you need):		
(a) Be able to operate at a satisfactory profit?	99.3	-------
(b) Increase employment?	91.4	-------
(c) Expand your sales force?	79.0	-------
(d) Increase your advertising and sales promotion?	88.6	-------
(e) Bring out new products or increase your stock of merchandise?	92.4	-------
16. If some such regulation, as above, is not issued within 60 days, what will be the effect on your business? (Use separate sheet for reply if necessary)		
17. Would you like to have Congress investigate the background of a healthy cross section of the personnel of the OPA?	92.5	-------
18. Do you think that some sort of price control will be necessary until:		
(a) June 30, 1946	46.2	-------
(b) Dec. 31, 1946	46.2	-------
(c) Until approximately (date) (1947–48)	7.6	-------
19. What is your line of business		
20. Approximate number of employees February 1946: 288,142—average per company, 65.		
21. How many would you employ if permitted to go ahead on your own as outlined in question 15? 387,668—an increase of 34.5 percent.		
22. Estimate of volume for 1946 under existing conditions: $3,239,701,000, if permitted to increase prices as checked in question 15: $5,051,815,000 an increase of 55.9 percent.		

Name of company-----
Signed by----- Title-----
Address-----

We'll be glad to have you sign this questionnaire, although that is not essential. All questionnaires will be held in our office and individual answers or figures will not be divulged to anyone. A recap will be made of all questionnaires returned and this recap will be presented to Members of Congress, to President Truman, and to administrative officials; also, released to the press.

This recap was compiled by Dr. John Mertzke, business analyst, Chicago.

A Labor Law That Has Worked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is so much discussion with so little conclusion regarding the advisability or inadvisability of legislation to deal with labor disputes, it is gratifying to be able to point to the success of the labor relations law passed by the Minnesota legislature in 1939 under the leadership of Harold E. Stassen. The law was assailed on all sides at that time but it has given us an unsurpassed labor relations record during the war and I commend to my colleagues a review of the law appearing in the Chicago Sun. The first two sections follow:

[From the Chicago Sun of April 15, 1946]

PATTERN FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE—10-DAY COOLING-OFF PERIOD AND STATE CONCILIATION FIXED IN MINNESOTA LAW

(By Milburn P. Akers)

ST. PAUL.—Minnesota, after nearly a decade of strife, adopted a labor-relations act in 1939 which, its advocates maintain, provides a present-day pattern for maintaining industrial peace throughout the Nation.

Many times, during the recent wave of strikes, the Minnesota law has been cited with the contention that its principles, enacted into Federal statute, would result in a fair deal for labor, management, and the public, without resort except in rare instances, to work stoppages.

What are those principles? How does the Minnesota law work? What has been its effect upon labor, management, and the public? And how did Minnesota chance to pioneer in this particular field?

The State had extensive unemployment during the thirties, as did other States; it had considerable labor unrest, as did other States. But it also had, incident to that unemployment and unrest, more than its share of conflict; conflict which, in a number of instances, led to rioting and bloodshed.

It was the day of the Dunn brothers whose dominance of the turbulent teamsters' union in the Twin Cities was exercised with iron fist. In other unions, labor racketeers and extremists cowed honest labor leaders who sought only to protect the rights of their members.

Minnesota also had, in the thirties, a State administration controlled by the Farmer-Labor Party. The late Floyd Olson was its first governor. He was succeeded, during the same regime, by Elmer Benson.

Friends of the two men contend that some elements in labor took advantage of the friendliness toward labor of these men. Opponents still maintain that the governors, first the one and then the other, encouraged, directly or indirectly, some of the excesses committed by the hoodlum elements.

The merits of that dispute are not germane to this series. Whatever the cause, the rioting, the bloodshed, and the turbulence incident to strikes became a political issue in the State.

In 1938 candidates sought election to the legislature on platforms pledging labor straitjackets. Others ran on pledges to do away with what few restraints the State had. Of those elected, there were few who did not take an extreme position, one way or the other, on the issue.

At the outset of the 1939 legislative session, bills representing the conflicting viewpoints were introduced. Some had the sanction of the Minnesota Federation of Labor. Others had been drawn by the bar association, industrialists and the farm element. Each faction was determined to ram the bill containing its own pet theories down the throat of the other.

Minnesota, if it got any labor legislation at that session, appeared destined to get an extreme bill—one way or the other. Into that breach stepped the state's newly elected governor, Harold E. Stassen, then 31 years old. He had been elected on a platform pledging a genuine effort at industrial peace.

So he sought to reconcile the conflicting interests. He held many conferences with the contending forces. Out of them emerged a measure, enacted into law at that session, which became known as the Minnesota Labor Relations Act, one which now has had a 7-year test.

It has become known as the "count 10" law, as its essence is, after a strike notice has been served, a cool-off period of 10 days during which a State conciliator attempts to bring the contending parties together.

Here, in brief, is the Minnesota procedure:

An impasse is reached in negotiations between union and management. The union decides that its only recourse is to strike. Or management determines on a lock-out.

Neither can take such action lawfully without filing notice of intention with the State labor conciliator and then waiting 10 days.

During the 10-day interval, the State conciliator attempts a settlement.

If he is unable to do so and if he has determined that the dispute involves the public interest, he certifies it to the governor. The law states that the public interest is involved in any dispute in which a temporary suspension of operations "would endanger the life, safety, health, or well-being of a substantial number of people of any community."

A dispute having been certified to the governor, both sides are enjoined from making "any change in the situation affecting the dispute, and no strike or lockout shall be instituted until 30 days shall have elapsed after the notification to the governor."

The governor may seek to reconcile the conflict himself. Or he is empowered to appoint a commission of three—one representing labor, one management, and the third the public.

That commission, in essence, is a fact-finding body. It has power to administer oaths, subpena records or data pertinent to its inquiry, and require the presence of witnesses. The commission seeks a formula on which agreement between the disputants can be reached.

The acceptance of that formula by either party is optional. If one or the other rejects it and no agreement is reached for either further negotiations or arbitration, the strike or lockout legally can ensue.

[From the Chicago Sun of April 16, 1946]

PATTERN FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE—MINNESOTA LAW DEFINES CURBS ON MANAGEMENT AS WELL AS ON LABOR

(By Milburn P. Akers)

ST. PAUL.—Minnesota's "count 10" labor law is not limited to procedures for the settlement of industrial disputes. It contains, in addition, specific outlines of the rights of labor and of the rights of management, as they have been resolved in Minnesota.

Whether those rights, as expressed in the Minnesota Labor Relations Act, are sufficiently inclusive may be disputed, and have been, by both labor and management. The fact remains, however, that, as sanctioned in Minnesota, they have been clearly set forth. Either party, labor or management, is free, at succeeding sessions of the State's legislature, to attempt enlargement, abridgment, or clarification—and both have.

The statute penalizes either party guilty of breaking a collective-bargaining agreement. Labor is prohibited from instituting a strike "if such strike is in violation of any valid collective-bargaining agreement" with which, at the time, the employer is complying in good faith. Similarly, the employer is prohibited from engaging in a lock-out of employees with whom he has a valid collective-bargaining agreement if, at the time, they are complying with its terms.

In the enumeration of unfair labor practices—both for the unions and the managements—the act cites a greater number which preclude labor from taking certain definite actions. Some labor leaders use that fact in seeking to substantiate the contention that the measure is partial to employers.

Advocates of the act contend, however, that the mere number of cited offenses is not the test. They argue that the scope of the limitations must be considered. And they maintain that the workings of the law—its final effect upon either labor or management—is the only test of its efficacy and fairness.

That dispute cannot be settled here. Each may judge for himself as he considers the unfair practices prohibited labor and management.

Consider first those listed as unfair practices by labor.

"Any employee or labor organization" is prohibited from instituting "a strike if such strike is in violation of any valid collective agreement between any employer and his employees or labor organization and the employer, is at the time, in good faith complying with the provisions of the agreement."

The technique of the "sit-down" strike also is outlawed. It is also unlawful "for any person to picket, or cause to be picketed, a place of employment of which the persons is not an employee" unless a majority of the persons engaged in picketing that place are employees of the concern.

The statute makes it illegal for more than one person to picket or cause to be picketed a single entrance to any place of employment where no strike is in progress at the time.

And it is likewise illegal for any person to interfere in any manner with the operation of a vehicle or the operator thereof when neither the owner nor the operator of the vehicle is at the time a party to a strike."

It is declared illegal for any employees, labor organization, or officer, agent, or members thereof to compel any person to join or to refrain from joining any labor organization or any strike against his will by any threatened or actual unlawful interference with his person, immediate family, or physical property, or to assault or threaten any such person while in pursuit of lawful employment."

Strikes must be approved by a majority of the members of a collective bargaining unit. "For any person or labor organization to cooperate in engaging in, promoting or inducing a strike that has not been so approved is illegal."

The farm element in Minnesota's legislature wrote a strong provision into the law in an effort to prevent interference, during a strike not directed against them as employees, with their delivery of produce or other farm products.

It is held illegal for any person or labor organization to hinder or prevent by intimidation, force, coercion, or sabotage, or by threats thereof, the production, transportation, processing, or marketing * * * of agricultural products, or to combine or conspire to cause or threaten to cause injury * * * whether by withholding labor or other beneficial intercourse, refusing to handle, use, or work on particular agricultural products * * * in order to bring about such processors or marketing organization against his or its will into a concerted plan to coerce or inflict damage upon any producer.

Such are the main limitations that have been placed upon labor.

What are those that have been established as unfair practices by management?

Employers are prohibited from instituting "any lock-out of his employees in violation of any valid collective bargaining agreement * * * if the employees are at the time in good faith complying with the provision of the agreement."

Employers are also prohibited from seeking "to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any terms or conditions of employment."

They also are prohibited from "discharging" or otherwise discriminating against "an employee because he has signed or filed any affidavit, petition, or complaint or given any information or testimony" in a labor dispute.

Labor spying is also declared illegal and so is blacklisting.

These, in brief, are the rights of labor and of management as set forth in Minnesota's Labor Relations Act. They, together with the procedures outlined in a previous article for the attempted settlement of disputes without resort to strikes, constitute the State's widely advertised law.

Its effect on labor organizations, together with illustrations of its operations, will be detailed in a third and concluding article.

Butter Prices Below Production Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, OPA ceiling prices on butter may benefit the cost-of-living index, but Americans cannot spread their bread with butter when it is not available on the market. Idaho and Utah dairymen have been harassed by the regulations of OPA and other Federal agencies, although these farmers have sought to maintain a high production of dairy commodities.

The Deseret News recently published an editorial, showing why milk has been diverted into products other than butter. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following editorial from that newspaper:

IT WASN'T CAUSED BY LACK OF MILK

Those who have complained over the lack of butter on their tables cannot rightfully blame the milk producers for that condition, according to information released by the National Dairy Council. For those figures disclose that in 1945 milk production in the United States reached the highest total in history—122,219,000,000 pounds, or 56,846,000,000 quarts. Those statistics disclose also that there were 25,519,000 cows on the Nation's farms last year, slightly fewer than in 1944, but they produced an average of almost 4,800 pounds, or 2,227 quarts, of milk each. This was 410 pounds or 191 quarts per cow more milk than was produced in the prewar years.

It is shown further by those figures that the per capita consumption of milk and cream jumped to 442 pounds in 1945, the highest total ever reached, and 102 pounds more than the per capita consumption for the 5-year period from 1935 to 1939, inclusive. This means that an average of about 206 quarts of milk was consumed for each man, woman, and child in the Nation, in the form of milk and cream. In the 1935–39 period the average consumption was one-fourth less.

That is one of the reasons that more butter was not available for the tables of the Nation—more milk was consumed as such instead of in the form of butter. Other organizations of dairymen call attention to the fact that the low price permitted for butter made it unprofitable for the dairymen to produce butter when more profit could be realized from the sale of milk and cream and ice cream. They are the ones who contend that less butter will be made and that many dairy herds will be sold if the ceiling price on butter is not raised to make its production more attractive.

In the meantime prices are not permitted to reach their normal level through the natural channels of supply and demand, and millions of persons are deprived of the little luxuries and delicacies to which they always were accustomed until the wizards of Washington, through their system of controls, made it necessary for practically all to do without.

The British Loan—We Do Not Have the Money To Lend—We Owe Approximately $300,000,000,000 and Deficit of $22,000,000,000 This Year—The Loan Will Not Be Repaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Speaker and the House of Representatives for granting unanimous consent to permit me to extend in the RECORD the speech which I made on Tuesday, April 16, 1946, over Station WWDC, Washington, D. C., on the British-American financial agreement—the British loan.

The British-American financial agreement is one of the most important questions now before the Congress and the American people. Representatives of the Truman administration met with representatives of the British Government and entered into an agreement. This agreement cannot become binding until it is approved by the Senate and House of Representatives. I dare say it involves more money and the fundamental rights of the American people than any other proposal that has ever been submitted between this country and any other country. These representatives of the British and American Governments propose:

First. That we make a cash loan to Great Britain of $3,750,000,000.

Second. Turn over $6,021,000,000 of valuable equipment, materials, and supplies to Britain at 10 cents on the dollar.

Third. That we turn over free to Britain our Army, Navy, and air bases, with installations, equipment, and improvements now in Britain.

Fourth. That we cancel the $25,000,000,000 lend-lease debt balance, after giving Britain credit for $5,000,000,000 for reverse lend-lease.

Fifth. That we agree to take Britain's note without security for the cash and supplies amounting to $4,400,000,000 and give her 55 years to make the payment, with no payment of principal or interest until December 31, 1951, and interest to be waived for any year or period for which the foreign trade of Britain does not exceed in volume approximately 60 percent of what it was before World War II.

The British representative, Lord Keynes, stated—

Has any country ever treated another country like this in time of peace for the purpose of rebuilding the other's strength and restoring its competitive position?

No agreement has ever been proposed for this country that was more unfair, more inequitable, or more unjust to the American people. The American people are against this proposal, and I cannot believe that the American Congress will ratify it.

In this radio address we undertake to set forth in detail, with supporting facts, disclosing how unfair it is to our country:

I wish to thank Station WWDC for their gracious invitation to speak to my fellow countrymen on the British-American financial agreement—the British loan.

In this financial arrangement our country agrees:

1. To make a cash loan to Great Britain of $3,750,000,000, and turn over to the British $6,021,000,000 of other supplies, consisting of all types of motor vehicles, great quantities of cotton, wool, clothing, men's garments, shoes, sugar, meats, canned and preserved vegetables, fruits, and great quantities of practically every other type of materials and goods for $650,000,000—a little over 10 cents on the dollar.

2. Cancel $25,000,000,000 lend-lease debt balance, after giving Britain credit for $5,000,000,000 for reverse lend-lease.

3. We agree to make a present to Britain of the Army, Navy, and air bases, with all the installations, equipment, and improvements thereon. These cost us an enormous sum of money.

4. We agree to aid Britain in removing all trade barriers, eliminating tariffs and bringing about free trade throughout the world. Britain has striven for years to have us adopt such a policy.

5. The items for the cash loan and the lend-lease supplies amount to $4,400,000,000. We agree that Britain make no payments on this huge loan and pay no interest until December 31, 1951, and that she have 50 years thereafter, or until 2001 to pay off this loan, with interest at 2 percent, and this interest under certain conditions to be waived.

These are the five fundamental issues presented in this most amazing and inequitable British-American financial arrangement.

I AM OPPOSED

I do not approve, and careful polls indicate that an overwhelming majority of the American people, Republicans and Democrats, are likewise opposed to it.

I trust that my hearers will not jump to the conclusion that I am unfriendly to Britain. My ancestors and 98 percent of the people I have the honor to represent are of English descent. If we are partial to any country, it is Britain. I admire British statesmen and people for their loyalty to their own country. They place the welfare of Britain ahead of any other nation, and that is exactly what I am doing in opposing this agreement.

My objections are these:

(a) We do not have the money to lend. We have a national debt of approximately $300,000,000,000. We must meet tens of bil-

lions of contingent liabilities, largely growing out of the war. We have been going in the red for the last 15 years. President Truman announced April 12 that we shall have a deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, of nearly $22,000,000,000. Great Britain has a national debt of approximately $90,000,000,000, if she does not count the $6,000,000,000 she owes us from World War I but which we knew she will never repay.

(b) Neither will she pay this proposed loan or interest.

(c) If we make this loan to Britain, we shall have insistent demands for loans from a score of other nations, aggregating from fifteen to twenty-five billion dollars. We shall incur their resentment and everlasting ill will if we refuse.

(d) Under the Constitution, Congress has the power to levy and collect duties, imposts, and taxes. It certainly is unwise for Congress to surrender this power under this proposed agreement for 55 years. When normal economic, industrial, and trade conditions come with the increased knowledge, experience, and modern equipment for mass production in industry and agriculture in the hands of our competitive nations with their low standards of living and wages, I want the Congress to be free to take such steps as may be necessary to protect American industry, agriculture, and labor against the dumping of low-cost products and materials into our country. We must preserve our own home markets.

(e) This proposal is inequitable, unjust, and unfair to the American people.

NO STRINGS TIED TO THIS LOAN

The American people have been told that the proceeds of this loan are to be spent in the United States and will thereby promote industry, agriculture, and provide jobs for American workers. This is a gross misrepresentation. Lord Keynes, who conducted these negotiations for Britain, makes this point crystal clear in his speech explaining this proposal to the House of Lords on December 17–18, 1945. In referring to tied loans made by us to other nations, he said:

"All the other loans which are being made are tied loans and limited to payment for specific purchases from the United States. Our loan on the other hand is a loan of money without strings, free to be expended in any part of the world. That is an arrangement, I may add, which is entirely consistent with the desires of the United States."

It will be observed that Lord Keynes is very definite that this agreement does not require Britain to spend the money with us and it was not our desire that she do so.

If she is not bound, will she spend this money for goods produced under our high wages and short hours, or for goods in countries with low wages and low cost of production. Won't Britain buy where she can get the best bargains?

WILL BRITAIN USE IT TO BALANCE BUDGET?

We quote from an Associated Press dispatch, dated London, April 6, 1946:

"'Britain's next budget has been written on the assumption that she will get the $3,750,000,000 loan from the United States' a government source said today.

"'If it does not go through we will have to make a new budget,' he said.

"Hugh Dalton, Chancelor of the Exchequer, will present the budget (for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1947) to the House of Commons Tuesday. Under it Britain is expected to balance her overseas accounts by the middle of 1947, due to the unusual success of the drive to increase exports. If the United States Congress does not ratify the loan, Britain will face the necessity of reducing imports or borrowing sterling from her banks.

"The spokesman said the loan would cover the £750,000,000 ($3,000,000,000) deficit this year with not a great deal to spare."

This is a most interesting statement from the Chancelor of the Exchequer (comparable to our Secretary of the Treasury). Britain is doing very well in her export trade. Chancelor Dalton says that Britain is expected to balance her overseas accounts by the middle of 1947, due to the unusual success in the drive to increase exports. She will balance her budget—ours will not be.

In this proposal we agree to turn over to them our rich American home markets, and furnish them $4,400,000,000 of cash, goods, and supplies. With these advantages from their chief competitor Britain should achieve even greater successes in the future.

Lord Keynes certainly was right when he told their lordships in his speech:

Has any country ever treated another country like this in time of peace for the purpose of rebuilding the other's strength and restoring its competitive position.

With these disclosures, how can American farmers, businessmen, and workers, who must make good in the end the default of Britain on her other loans and on this, hope to profit by this improvident deal? Certainly no other country was ever so generous to its competitor as we are to Britain. We furnish the money to balance her budget when our own budget is out of balance nearly $22,000,000,000 for this fiscal year, and has been out of balance for 15 years, and our debt is three times as much as Britain.

If she is going to use $3,000,000,000 of this loan to balance her budget she will not have much left to buy our products.

BRITAIN AGREED TO PAY

Britain and 16 other countries owe us $14,000,000,000 on money advanced to them in and following World War I. Not one of them for years has made any offer to pay any part of those honest debts, except little Finland. Britain owes $6,000,000,000 of that sum. Now she insists that we cancel $25,000,000,000 of balance of lend-lease of World War II. She did agree to pay. President Roosevelt in one of his messages to the Congress on lend-lease used this language:

"For what we send abroad we shall be repaid within a reasonable time following the close of hostilities in similar materials or at our option in other goods of many kinds which they can produce and which we need."

But instead of offering to pay they insist that we cancel this $25,000,000,000 balance. We might just as well agree to cancel it because she will not pay it and we have no peaceful way to force collection.

I do object, however, to turning over the $6,021,000,000 of supplies that Britain got before and after the war closed for $650,000,000, a little over 10 cents on the dollar. We could have sold it for more but Britain refused to permit any of her subjects to buy any part of it from us. She was the only bidder and insisted on her pound of flesh.

We have been passing laws giving our veterans, States, counties, and cities the right to buy if they were willing to pay good prices, but we see more than $6,000,000,000 of it in this proposal turned over to Britain. She will make much of this immense stock of supplies. The veterans will continue to wear out their shoes and patience in trying to get part of these surplus war supplies.

BRITAIN WILL NOT PAY PRINCIPAL OR INTEREST

The London Economist, one of England's leading financial newspapers, recently had this to say:

"The odds are billions to one that this new credit will not be paid—it is willing to bet all Lombard Street to a China orange that it will not be paid."

The London News Weekly stated:

"The chances are that long before America can collect, a new international conflict will throw the loan and kindred superstitions into hog wash."

These and other British publications are realistic. They know that neither the principal nor the interest on these obligations will ever be paid.

The unpaid and uncollectible $6,000,000,000 of World War I, the $25,000,000,000 of World War II, the $6,621,000,000 came out of the pockets of the American people. If we add $3,750,000,000 to that it makes approximately $37,000,000,000. This will all be borrowed money. At 2 percent interest it will amount to $740,000,000 annually. The American people must carry this interest load for many years and finally pay off the principal sum of $37,000,000,000. We can do very little about the $6,000,000,000 and $25,000,000,000. We could disapprove this loan and the sale of the $6,021,000,000 of supplies at 10 cents on the dollar, and I have been and shall continue to vigorously oppose this alleged loan.

PROVIDE CAPITAL—NO INTEREST AND AMERICAN MARKETS

Lord Keynes, in his speech to his lordships waxed eloquent in pointing out the generosity of our Nation in these words:

"We pay no interest for 6 years. After that we pay no interest in any year in which our exports have not been restored to a level in volume which may be estimated at about 60 percent in excess of prewar. I repeat that we pay no interest in any year in which our exports have not been restored to a level which may be estimated to about 60 percent in excess of what they were in prewar."

He continues:

"If the Americans have tried to meet criticism at home by making the terms look a little less liberal than they really are so as to preserve the principle of interest, is it necessary for us to be mistaken? The balm and sweet simplicity of no percent is not admitted but we are not asked to pay interest except in conditions where we can reasonably well afford to do so."

Britain bucked against agreeing to pay any interest. You observe Lord Keynes points out that in order to satisfy the American people it was agreed to put in the 2-percent rate, but with the condition it should not apply for any year or any time unless the foreign trade was 60 percent more in volume than it was at prewar level. Of course, Lord Keynes knew that it would not be 60 percent more, and therefore, we might just as well have omitted the matter of interest. Therefore, we will receive no interest, but they wanted to deceive the Congress and the American people. This is another reason why he emphasized to the House of Lords that this is the greatest act of generosity ever known of one nation to another in helping to build up the power and strength of its competitor, and with this statement of Lord Keynes I heartily agree.

HELP OUR VETERANS, THE NEEDY, AND BUSINESS

Lord Keynes is one of the chief figures in the Socialist Government of Britain. He and the leaders of many of the countries of Europe are doing what they can to discredit and break down private enterprise and our capitalistic system of Government. They freely predict the end of private enterprise in our country and other countries. They believe in government ownership and control and the socialization not only of industry, but agriculture as well. The chief exponents of these policies are the present Governments of Britain, Russia, and France. They have been the generous recipients of the bounties and benefits of our private enterprise and capitalistic system. They denounce our system but are constantly seeking our bounty and favors. They insist that our Nation borrow the money from the American people and lend it to them when we know that it

will never be repaid. They will use our money and our credit to compete with and help destroy private enterprise in this country. I am quite willing for the Socialists of Britain and France and the Communists of Russia to have the kind of government that their respective peoples desire and are willing to pay for, and will not threaten the security of our country and the peace of the world, and to socialize their industry and agriculture if that is the wish of their people, but the American people should not be called upon to finance them. It is difficult to understand why our American representatives will agree to this one-sided proposal. Why does not Britain borrow this money from her own banks and her own people or from the international bank? They would have to give security and pay interest; and repay the debt, but in securing this money and credits from us Britain puts up no security and in the end will pay no interest and will not pay the debt.

We require our veterans to give security for the money that our Government advances to them, pay 4 percent interest and liquidate their loans in 10 years. When our Government makes loans to our farmers, we require them to give security, pay 3½ to 4 percent interest, and this is also true when we lend money to those engaged in industry.

If we wish to distribute three or four billions in cash and six billions in war supplies, let us use these to rehabilitate disabled veterans and hundreds of thousands of private business enterprises that are war casualties, and increase the pension benefits to our disabled veterans and their dependents, and to our needy aged, needy blind, needy disabled and needy orphans

We have been very generous in World War I and World War II with Great Britain, France, and Russia. They and other nations in Europe seem to think there is no limit to the resources of the United States.

We must preserve the financial integrity and the economic stability of our Nation. We cannot balance the budget of Britain when our own budget will be out of balance nearly 22 billions at the end of the present fiscal year. This proposed financial arrangement with Britain is a real threat to the security of our own country and this Congress surely will not approve this proposal and place additional burdens on the shoulders of the American people and unborn generations.

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, 500,000 women from the great State of Illinois cannot be wrong and those who voted for crippling amendments and against H. R. 6042, the bill to extend price control, will be apprised of that fact between now and the November election. While I did not count them I saw a roll of signatures of Illinois housewives approximately half a mile long delivered in Washington on Monday, April 15. The signatories all pleaded with the Representatives from the third largest State in the Union to support the price-control bill. It is perhaps one of the largest petitions ever brought to Washington and represents women in every section of the State, mostly mothers and housewives who are fearful of run-away inflation which they insist will ensue if the price-control bill is emasculated.

Mrs. Frances Adams, custodian of the enormous petition which was afterward broken up and distributed to the 26 Representatives from Illinois in the Congress of the United States, said that this document was buttressed with thousands of letters from Illinois women appealing to the Members to give consideration to the plight of the housewife in the event of inflation.

Supplementing the plea of the women came thousands of requests from men in the lower income brackets who view the future with great trepidation in the event price controls are removed. Not only organized labor, but laborers who are not organized, white-collar workers, tenants and people receiving pensions and annuities, all joined in this colossal petition to the Representatives from Illinois to keep down the cost of living by the passage of H. R. 6042. All aver they will be heard from again, and again, and again.

Grange Is Opposed to Subsidies

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now debating whether to continue payment of subsidies on agricultural products in order to maintain low price ceilings under the OPA program. Although it is contended these subsidies benefit the producers, it is apparent that consumers are the direct beneficiaries, because they are enabled to have a part of their grocery bills paid out of the Federal Treasury. It is interesting to note the viewpoint of Idaho farmers, as reflected in a recent editorial appearing in the Idaho Granger. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following editorial:

HAND-OUTS TO CONTINUE

The President insists that subsidies on agricultural products be continued.

Secretary Anderson stood out for the elimination of subsidies on June 30, but reports indicate that he has reversed his position and that he will back the subsidy program of the President.

And who is to get the subsidy?

It is true that the argument is made that the farmer gets the subsidy, but the facts remain clear and distinct that labor and the general consumer will buy his groceries for less than the cost of production and that the Federal Treasury will be called upon to make up the difference.

Labor is striking and winning wage increases of 17½ percent in many cases, and various other settlements, all of which assure labor of a take-home pay larger than was the case of wartime income.

Labor and the consumer are in a better position to pay their own grocery bills than ever before, but a subsidy bill will be incurred to pay the farmer, and the farmer will be taxed to help pay himself for the goods he sells.

Deficit spending is to continue.

Hand-outs are to continue.

Inflation is turned loose.

The answer to such a program is "chaos."

The stream of time is littered with the wrecks of governments that undertook to subsidize their citizenship out of the national purse.

The demand by the President and those in authority, that in order to placate labor that the National Treasury will be called upon to pay for groceries, is placing the farmer in the position where he must sell his products below the cost of production and beg Congress for a hand-out to help him survive.

The hand that gives is the hand that takes away, and the farmer is finding himself placed in the position of becoming a professional and permanent mendicant.

Permanent hand-outs, permanent subsidies, permanent deficits only spell one word: "inflation."

Who won the war?

OPA and High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the economic faking of the Office of Price Administration has been exposed in many ways, but its most fraudulent claim of stopping high prices is best refuted by an editorial of the Bellevue Gazette, of Bellevue, Ohio, which I include, as follows:

HOW HIGH IS UP?

Some notion of the ambiguous query "How far is up?" came with a comparison of present day prices with those contained in a J. C. Penney advertisement which ran in the June 24, 1932, issue of the Bellevue Gazette.

Prices listed in the 14-year-old advertisement were so astoundingly low that we were prompted to check them against the prevailing market for like items in today's situation in which producers have "the price bit in their teeth while OPA jostles uncertainly in the saddle."

Many of the items advertised are not procurable even at today's inflated level, but prices are quoted as if they were for the sake of comparison.

Glance, if you will, at this summary showing 1932 prices against those of today for the following items:

	1932	1946
Boys' all-wool suits	$2.98	$12.75
Men's union suits	.25	.85
Men's denim overalls	.49	1.85
Men's chambray shirts	.25	.95
Men's work socks	.05	.19
Men's broadcloth shorts	.19	.49
Men's pull-over sweaters	.98	3.98
Men's ties	.25	.98
Men's handkerchiefs	.03	.10
Boys' denim overalls	.39	1.32
Boys' shirts, blouses	.34	.98
Boys' wash suits	.39	.98
Boys' canvas shoes	.49	1.69
Standard muslin	.05	.23
Sheets, 80 by 90	.43	1.39
Pillowcases, 42 by 36	.10	.37
Gladio percale	.07½	.33
Women's slips	.25	.90
Women's rayon mesh hose	.25	.80
Women's rayon panties	.25	.49
Women's silk hose	.49	1.35

These are enough to show that prices in the depths of the depression were sometimes only a fourth, often only a third of today's

prices, and still there is a resounding grumbling to release controls and let them go still higher.

Our reputation as an economic theorist does not permit us to say whether this upswing is right or wrong, but we do know that to be able to afford them, one's income must go up in proportion and even if it does, what has it gained one?

The sufferers in this situation are those in the "lag" group whose wages do not immediately follow increased prices and those whose incomes are derived from investments.

It's like airplane travel—it looks safe, sounds safe, but there are always a few getting hurt. This makes a lot of people prefer to travel on a lower level.

Continued Price Control Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio interview granted by me to Francis (Pete) Tully over the Yankee Network on Saturday, April 13, 1946:

Mr. TULLY. Congressman FORAND, as you are chairman of the Congressional Committee for the Protection of the Consumers, would you explain for the benefit of our audience just how that committee came into existence and what its purposes are?

Mr. FORAND. I shall be glad to do that, Mr. Tully. The Congressional Committee for the Protection of the Consumers was organized during the war by a group of us Members of Congress who realized that the low-salaried and fixed-income groups—the pensioners, the old people, the veterans, the retired persons, and others—were having a difficult time meeting the mounting cost of living. The purpose of the committee is to do all in its power to protect the consumers against the enactment of legislation that would make it more difficult for them to meet their needs on the small incomes they received.

Mr. TULLY. Could you be a little more specific, Congressman?

Mr. FORAND. Yes. For example: During the war, when goods of all types were even more scarce than they are now, our committee interested itself in the enactment and enforcement of the rationing and price-control laws, to the end that the poor as well as the rich would be able to secure his share of the commodities that were available. Now that rationing is practically nonexistent, and that legislation to extend the life of the Price Control Act is under consideration, our committee has been reactivated and intends to do all it can to secure extension of the act for 1 year beyond June 30, oppose amendments that would sabotage the act, and seek adequate appropriations for its proper enforcement.

Mr. TULLY. What, in your opinion, will happen, Congressman, if the Price Control Act is not extended for another 12 months?

Mr. FORAND. I don't want to be a pessimist, Mr. Tully, but frankly I fear that if price control is lifted now this country may be swept by a wave of inflation that might well ruin our economy for many years to come. The 1929 collapse that wiped away the life savings of many of our people, pauperized many of America's wealthy, and brought on the worst depression in our history, would seem insignificant in comparison.

Mr. TULLY. Is it true, as is being alleged, that inflation already is here, that more of it is inevitable, and that we may as well let it have its way?

Mr. FORAND. My answer to that question is in three parts:

1. It is true that inflationary pressures are at a very high level.

2. In uncontrolled areas of our economy, like the stock market, residential real estate and farm lands, dangerously inflationary conditions now exist.

3. Control of commodity prices has been quite successful.

We must keep in mind these facts which are a threat of inflation: Public spendable income in the last 6 months of 1945 was at the rate of $131,800,000,000 a year. This is only $8,100,000,000 below the wartime peak of $139,900,000,000 which was reached in the first 6 months of 1945. This is 47.5 percent above spendable income in 1941, and 95 percent above 1939, our last peacetime year.

The Nation's money supply is greatly expanded. Currency in circulation at the beginning of the war was $7,200,000,000 and by November 1945 it had increased to $28,200,000,000.

The stock market in the 5 months following VJ-day rose 22 percent. Not even the requirement of 100 percent cash payments for stocks could check that speculative rise.

In real estate, a survey shows that of 63,347 single-family homes sold recently the sales prices were 149 times monthly rental values as compared with a normal rate of 100 times monthly rental. Farm prices have increased by 58 percent.

Only commodity prices, where controls are had, have remained stable, and even these are beginning to mount under pressure. We are sitting on a powder keg, Mr. Tully.

Mr. TULLY. When do you think supply and demand will come into balance, Mr. FORAND? Do you see any indication that this will be soon?

Mr. FORAND. I don't believe anyone can answer that question with any degree of certainty, but experts tell us it will be several months before we can go into a store or other business house and select just the article we want, as and when we want it.

There is encouragement, however, in the recent report of Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, John W. Snyder. On April 1, Mr. Snyder informed the President that the physical change-over of plants to peacetime use has been virtually completed, and that the bringing of men, materials, and components into harmonious balance for full production is already showing results.

Despite the stoppages of production by labor-management disputes, total civilian production during the first 3 months of 1946 was at an annual rate of $150,000,000, the highest level ever reached by our Nation—in war or in peace. If we keep up at this rate it should not be too long before supply catches up with demand.

Mr. TULLY. Returning servicemen report that they are having difficulty in getting civilian clothes, despite your statement that production has increased. How can you explain that, Congressman?

Mr. FORAND. Price control and hoarding are closely related, Mr. Tully. No doubt you have heard, as I have, that not only are civilians buying more than they actually need in many instances but also that some manufacturers and many dealers are holding back their stocks in the hope that the price-control law will not be extended. They see an opportunity to make an extra profit on their hoarded stock if price control is not extended because they know prices will skyrocket. Farmers are refusing to market their grain for the same reason.

Mr. TULLY. What is your remedy for this situation, Mr. FORAND?

Mr. FORAND. The best remedy that I can suggest is that Congress act promptly to either extend the price-control law or declare that it is not going to do so. We should let the manufacturers, dealers, and farmers know just what to expect. If the law is to be extended, as I am very confident it will be, then these hoarded stocks of merchandise will be released.

Mr. TULLY. Congressman, you say that the stocks will be released—do you mean through the regular channels of trade?

Mr. FORAND. I should hope that it would be through the regular channels of trade, but I am not so naive as to believe that all of this merchandise will come through legitimate markets. I expect some of it will be channeled through the black market. That is the reason why we of the Committee to Protect the Consumer are asking that adequate appropriations be made for the proper enforcement of the law. We want to eliminate the black market. OPA is being blamed for not cleaning up these rackets and black markets, but in fairness I must say that Congress has been most reluctant to vote sufficient funds to provide a large enough staff of investigators to bring these law violators to justice. It is most distressing to note that while the general public applaud our returning servicemen for the grand job they did on the battlefields, they, at the same time, encourage the black market and thus prevent the veterans from securing, through legitimate channels, and at reasonable prices, those things that they need to rehabilitate themselves. Unless funds are made available for proper enforcement the extension of the price-control law would be a mere gesture.

Mr. TULLY. When you speak of rehabilitation of the veteran you do not mean only clothing, I assume?

Mr. FORAND. No, Mr. Tully. When I speak of rehabilitation, I include clothing, food, shelter, and a decent job at good wages. Right now I think that housing is perhaps the most distressing item to the average serviceman upon his return home. That is why I heartily favor the so-called Patman bill which embodies the suggestions made by President Truman and House Expediter Wilson Wyatt.

Mr. TULLY. Congressman, is it your opinion that OPA should stick to any fixed policy or should there be some flexibility?

Mr. FORAND. My opinion is that while there should be a general program, there must be a certain amount of flexibility to fit the particular circumstance. By that I mean that an over-all plan cannot apply with justice to all cases. That fact is recognized by OPA, as can readily be seen by the fact that since VJ-day 12 important changes have been made in the OPA policy to fit postwar needs. Among these are the program for pricing goods that have been out of production during the war, the program of speeding up pricing of new products, steps taken to break bottlenecks in production, fixing the dollar-and-cent prices on building materials, steps to relieve hardships and keep many producers in production where there was a wide extension of individual adjustment provisions, the issuance of general rescue orders, orders making special increases to stimulate production of low-price goods, a program for decontrol developed and put into effect, with the result that since VJ-day controls have been removed from products with an annual sales value of about $5,500,000,000. Controls will be removed from other items as fast as it is safe to do so. In fact, hundreds of items were freed of controls this very week.

Mr. TULLY. Congressman, what has happened to the many applications for price increases that have been filed with OPA?

Mr. FORAND. Since VJ-day there were 6,809 individual applications for price increases. Of that number, 3,567 were granted in full, 1,290 granted in part, 1,221 were denied, 435 were dismissed, and 296 were withdrawn. Further—and this should be of interest to landlords—in 1945, out of a total of 278,828 petitions for rental increases fixed in 1945, 192,673 were granted. This proves that there

is flexibility within the framework of OPA and that it is being used to afford relief where proof of hardship is given.

Mr. TULLY. It has been said during the hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee that OPA pricing policies have driven low-end goods off the market, thus forcing the public to buy higher priced goods and defeating the purpose of price control. Do you care to comment on that, Congressman?

Mr. FORAND. We must realize, Mr. Tully, that manufacturers are human beings just like the rest of us and that they are in business to make the biggest profit they can. High-price goods always yield bigger profits than low-price goods and very often yield higher margins of profit. That is the reason why no manufacturer cares to make low-price goods if he can avoid it, and very often makes low-price goods only because materials for high-price goods are not available. Then he makes low-priced goods in order to get volume. During the war buying power of the public was greatly increased and more people bought more merchandise and thus created shortages. It is but natural for persons who have money to buy the better grade of merchandise, but we must bear in mind that always there is a certain number in our population who have not the means to buy high-price merchandise. They, too, must be provided for. It is, therefore, necessary that in the price-control program steps be taken to compel the manufacturer of some low-price goods. I believe that not OPA but the profit incentive is responsible for today's shortages of low-price merchandise.

Mr. TULLY. I imagine, Congressman, that you have heard the statement that production, which is considered the principal cure for inflation, is being curtailed by price control and that instead of preventing inflation price control will perpetuate it.

Mr FORAND Yes, Mr. Tully; I have heard that statement. But anyone who cares to study the fact will admit, I am quite sure, that these claims are based upon misinformation. The fact is that during the month of November 1945, 4 months after VJ-day, production in this country reached a level above that of any year when the Nation was not actively at war. On that date production was 51 percent above production in 1939, our last real peacetime year. Another indication that price control is not hampering production is the fact that in December 1945, there were employed in this country 51,400,000 persons. This is 2,000,000 more than held jobs in 1941, and more than were employed in 1939. Pretty full employment of the labor force and substantial increase in total output are not indications that the price control law is interfering with production.

Mr. TULLY. Does your mail show much opposition to price control, Congressman?

Mr. FORAND. No, Mr. Tully; it does not. Of course, I get some complaints, but these are on specific cases and not against the law itself. You know no one likes Government controls as such. We all want them removed at the earliest date possible—that is, when supply and demand are in balance. To remove controls too soon would be to invite inflation, which might well result in wiping out the savings of the people, destroy the value of their insurance policies, cause foreclosures on their homes and their farms, and disrupt our national economy.

A check made of the mail received recently by the Banking and Currency Committee indicates that the majority of the people realize this danger and want price control continued.

The tally of 12,000 letters from individuals showed 95 percent favored extension of the price-control law. Business firms and trade organizations divided one-third for and two-thirds against. The small firms favor the extension and the large firms oppose it.

"Four Freedoms" or None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, from the Pilgrims to the GIs, we have fought for the famous "four freedoms"—freedom of speech, of religion; freedom from fear and from want. If the word "American" can be defined, the "four freedoms" are the very heart of the definition. How is it possible, therefore, that a group can consciously or unconsciously violate three of these four freedoms and still continue to operate as the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee repeatedly has been guilty of endangering the very roots of Americanism which it was set up to protect. Over 50 Members of Congress have already indicated their desire to see it abolished. Two members of the committee itself have already spoken out against its most recent actions. Churches, schools, and civic organizations all over the country have protested its procedure and questioned its motives. Why?

VIOLATION OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Last November nine radio commentators had their scripts requested. The only aim of this was to make the most liberal and democratic of our commentators seem mysteriously dangerous, to make employers of these men think twice before hiring them.

VIOLATION OF FREEDOM OF RELIGION

An investigator for the committee, in the presence of its chief counsel, made a violently anti-Semitic statement to a professor of education at Columbia University. The statement was never repudiated by the committee, and because of this statement the Greater New York Federation of Churches asked for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

VIOLATION OF FREEDOM OF PRESS

The New York Times recently ran a paid advertisement calling for the abolition of the committee. The responsible advertiser was subpenaed by the committee and asked for the names of his clients. Editor and Publisher, the most respected trade journal in the newspaper field, says:

Investigation by this committee of opinion expressed in paid advertising copy, particularly the subpena of the agency and newspaper, amounts to intimidation.

VIOLATION OF FREEDOM FROM FEAR

Several organizations have recently been subpenaed by the committee and their officers cited for contempt of Congress. One of these is a relief group which, along with the Quakers, has performed a great humanitarian service in collecting funds for the victims of fascism in Spain. The committee has smeared this group and attempted to end its worthy efforts. Another organization, working for a better understanding between us and our former allies, the Soviet Union, finds itself attacked by the committee. Yet only a short time ago, General Eisenhower wrote to this organization:

As an American soldier and lover of peace, I wish your council the utmost success in the worthy work it has undertaken.

REPUDIATION OF THE WORD "DEMOCRACY"

Mr. Adamson, the counsel of the Committee on Un-American Activities, in a letter to a group of veterans—most of whom are wearers of the Purple Heart, protested their frequent use of the word "democracy" in their literature. He said:

I wonder if you are sufficiently familiar with the history of the United States to be aware that this country was not organized as a democracy, and that section 4 of article IV of the Constitution reads in part as follows: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." Is it your purpose to ask for an amendment of the Constitution or do you propose to conduct a propaganda campaign against the administration of the provisions of the Constitution?

This statement, denying that America is a democracy, has never been repudiated by the committee. This statement and a dozen more violations of American ideals are the reason why the Committee on Un-American Activities must be abolished.

Congress Today—A Radio News Program Which Focuses Attention on Our National Legislative Body

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, Ray Henle began a news broadcast, Congress Today, through the facilities of WOL and given direct from the radio correspondents' gallery of the House.

I consider Mr. Henle one of our top-notch radio newsmen. He is honest and presents the picture as he sees it and not from any biased viewpoint.

In opening these broadcasts I believe the explanatory statement he made is interesting and timely. I include a part of that comment, as follows:

Mr. HENLE. By way of explanation, in starting this new broadcast, you'll be interested in a word or two as to why we are undertaking it, and what it will deal with.

Well, the answer is that here at radio station WOL, we think we see a general, widespread revival of interest in what's happening on Capitol Hill—the like of which we haven't noticed for a good many years. You, the public, are beginning to make it clear that you are swinging back the pendulum of your interest to the institution of Government which actually is closest to you, and which is most responsive to your will and wishes.

Of course, it's nothing new to say it, everyone pretty generally knows that Congress is closest to the people, and was intended by the founders to be so, but the fact is, that in

recent years, the Congress of the United States has been something of a news "stepchild." And, at a time when the boards and bureaus of the executive branch of the Government have practically wallowed in a sea of publicity.

Of course, that's perfectly understandable. High powered and highly paid publicity agents in the boards and bureaus of the executive branch become almost a branch of government in themselves. No agency seemingly can function without them. And those publicity agents plied their trade with such aggressiveness and zeal, that for a while all of the important headlines featured their activities, at the expense of news developing in Congress.

Then, of course, war came along, and public interest gravitated to the tremendous undertakings of the Army and Navy and also to a number of the new civilian agencies which were created as a necessary appendage to handle special problems raised by the war.

Now it appears to us, here at radio station WOL, that the time has arrived when you, the public, once more are discovering that the United States Congress still is a primary source of public interest, and that consequently, the people not only here in Washington but all over the country, want to know, with renewed interest, and in greater detail, precisely what their Congress is doing.

So this is the radio program to which we hope you'll turn every evening for a report which deals exclusively with what the Senators and Representatives on Capitol Hill are doing, the nature of the questions they are wrestling with and perhaps some of the meaning behind those problems.

I hope to be telling you also, something about the men behind the legislation, something of the personality and background of the Congressmen who figure in the news. Needless to say, over this microphone, you'll get both sides of any issue, and when a controversy is partisan, as it usually is in Congress, you'll get the Democratic view and the Republican view, as the party spokesmen state their views for us.

Monopoly Versus the People of California—The Central Valley's Program Is Being Endangered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the huge power monopolies and great landholders of California have always opposed the full development of the Central Valley program. They are still doing their utmost to undermine it and defeat its purpose. They have been successful in having an appropriation slipped into H. R. 5400 which will give to the Army engineers the task of constructing two dams in California, the Isabella Dam on the Kern River, and the Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River.

I want to see these dams built. I want to see construction on them get under way as quickly as possible. But I want to see them built as multiple-purpose dams under the Bureau of Reclamation, so that they may provide low-cost water for irrigation and low-cost power for pumping, as well as fulfilling their flood-control purpose. Only in this way and as part of the Central Valley program will these dams fully serve the farmers and consumers of California.

For this reason, they must be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, whose program of Central Valley development has already proven itself beyond a doubt. Under the Army engineers, these dams may be alienated and managed in a manner which may easily defeat the entire Central Valley project. Under the Army engineers, what will happen to the 160-acre limitation law? I have asked this question myself and been asked it many times by constituents. This law must be upheld, if the small farmer is to be protected. It must be upheld if we wish to make farms available to as many veterans of World War II as can qualify. It has been pointed out that under the Army engineers' construction of these two dams, the worthy principle of acreage limitation may be completely set aside.

I would like to explain the danger to the Central Valley program, to multiple-purpose dams, to the 160-acre limitation law, if we permit the Kings and Kern River Dams to be constructed by a department which, consciously or unconsciously, plays into the hands of the big power interests in opposition to the Bureau of Reclamation program.

As long ago as May 5, 1941, the late President Roosevelt wrote the Secretary of War reaffirming an earlier decision that the Kings River project should be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Then, as late as April 2, 1945, Mr. Roosevelt when he signed the War Department's civil functions appropriation bill for 1946, declared he had been reluctant to do so, because the bill contained appropriations to enable the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans for these projects in the Kings and Kern rivers. He added that in the near future he intended to submit to Congress recommendations for legislation transferring jurisdiction over all of the Central Valley projects to the Bureau of Reclamation—but meanwhile he died, and such recommendations were never submitted.

Picking up the threads of this situation, President Truman on June 2, 1945, requested both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers to make comprehensive reports of their plans. Now the plans have been developed and the only thing delaying their submission to the President—and a fair comparison of them—is the fact that the Governor of California is holding them for further consideration.

The Director of Public Works of California has asked that the Army engineers be granted funds for construction work on the Kings and Kern Rivers Dams. This request, plus Governor Warren's delaying tactics, has prevented a comparison of the two plans. I have had an opportunity to examine these plans and think there is no doubt that the Army engineers' plan is undesirable and should not be railroaded through the Congress before the reports which the President asked for have been received.

A comparison of the two plans makes it amply clear that the Army engineers have no comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of the Central Valley. The Corps of Engineers does have a physical plan for flood control which comprises but a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's comprehensive plan. It is not the physical plan of the Army engineers that causes me deep concern, however; it is the policies under which they propose to develop their plan.

These policies are clearly those that will promote land monopoly, bring about confusion in Federal administration until it became a joke, lead to unwarranted subsidies for a comparatively few landholders, promote ruinous land speculation, waste the resources of California, and weaken the democratic process in California.

The Corps of Engineers has intentionally confused the processes of democratic government. While pretending to observe the wishes of Congress, it has taken action which has had the direct effect of encouraging great land-owning interests of California to oppose the reclamation laws laid down by Congress years ago and reaffirmed many times after searching debate upon the floors of the House and Senate. What is more, its action has encouraged the monopolistic interests of California to thwart the will of the great masses of farmers and working men of my State. This has been made clear to me in no uncertain terms by my constituents. I am firmly convinced that a majority of the people of California can no longer be hoodwinked by these interests.

Surplus Property Disposal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a very appropriate and penetrating article which recently appeared in the Worcester Telegram.

This supplements previous insertions I have made illustrating the confusion existing in our surplus property disposal program and the difficulties and barriers which prevent our veterans from securing the consideration which the Congress intended to provide for them when it passed this law.

While I appreciate that this is a vast program, it seems to me that the administrators have had enough time to place it upon an efficient basis. In the light of current inadequacies, however, I again urge that the War Assets Administration intensify its efforts to channel this property into the hands of our veterans, our small businessmen, and farmers by the immediate elimination, insofar as it is practicable, of administrative delay and bureaucratic red tape.

The Worcester Telegram is performing a distinct public service in bringing these matters to the attention of Congress and our people:

VETS ARE POOR THIRDS AT SURPLUS GOODS SALE

(By Marvin Richmond)

Early in my childhood I was told the story of old Mother Hubbard, who went to the cupboard and found it bare, but it was only the other day that I made the acquaintance of the cupboard.

The beginning was a War Assets Administration advertisement, printed all over the country, of a colossal sale of photographic equipment in Baltimore, Md., March 25 to April 12.

I am still looking for the sale. There was no Army red tape. There was—literally—no merchandise.

After being discharged from the Army I went, like thousands of other ex-GI's looking for materials they needed, to the War Assets Administration, which handles the disposal of goods no longer of any use to the War Department.

WAITED FOR THE SALE

At the Bureau's Worcester office I received the fullest cooperation and a certificate which, on the face of it, entitled me to buy $2,500 worth of photographic equipment which had been declared surplus. Then I waited for the sale.

In due course I received a circular which described this colossal event in these glowing terms:

"You will find in this sale photographic equipment which you can sell, which you need, which you've been looking for. You do not have to think, just say, 'I will be there in Baltimore.'"

I said I would be there in Baltimore.

I went. I am still looking for the photo equipment. I still need it. But I am apparently never getting any.

HAD HIGH HOPES

On D-day-minus-one I drove a weary 12 hours and finally reached Baltimore, tired, dirty, and with no place to sleep, but with high hopes of getting somewhere on the next day, on which—they said—veterans could inspect the equipment they proposed to buy.

Next morning I found, in front of the Paca-Pratt Building, where the "colossal sale" was to take place, about 200 ex-soldiers, sailors, and marines, many still in uniform. Mumbling and grumbling, they waited for the doors to open.

The doors were supposed to have opened 15 minutes before, but it seemed some clerk had not yet arrived with the keys to certain files. I joined the waiters.

JUST LIKE THE ARMY

We waited. It seemed like old times. This is the Army, Mr. Jones.

The place finally opened up. We entered a room about 160 by 105 feet, where samples of equipment to be sold were supposed to be on display.

As set forth in an 84-page, check-sheet pamphlet — complete with illustrations — there was supposed to be available photo equipment worth $1,500,000 or more.

"SOLD OUT" EXCEPT JUNK

All we saw on counter after counter were signs—"Sold out."

Gone were the cameras, the enlargers, projectors. Gone were all the choice scarce items which we, all ex-service photographers, had been persuaded were there for the purchase. Nothing was left except ordinary junk.

This cupboard was bare.

Sure, there was some stuff left. Look, here's the locknut off a Mitchell movie camera. The eyepiece from a Speed Graphic. There's a movie camera—a Moviola about 10 years old and minus the lens.

WHO GOT THE STUFF?

Who got the good stuff?

I met men who on the strength of the powerful and convincing advertising traveled to Baltimore from Louisville, Ky., 500 miles; Cornersville, Ind., and even Los Angeles, Cal., to name a few.

They could not even buy a flash bulb.

But the customers who beat us to the jackpot of precious merchandise were not veterans smarter or earlier birds than ourselves.

They were priority holders given special preference under the Surplus Property Act, which states that Federal agencies can buy first; counties, cities, and tax-supported institutions, second.

And veterans third.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PAYS NOTHING

The Veterans' Administration took $99,000 worth of the best in this "colossal sale." And under the law the Veterans' Administration pays nothing for surplus property used in its facilities.

The Virginia Board of Education got $35,660 worth. Also ahead of the veterans were the Smithsonian Institution, National Geographic Society and Carnegie Institute. And the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Churches. And the Y. M. C. A. And so on down the line to substantial sales made to Army post exchanges and Navy ships stores, which will place the goods on sale to men still in the service at posts and bases.

Congress is now in the process of correcting the priority regulations. But until they get around to it veterans will be greeting each other at these "sales" with the now practically universal,

"Hello, sucker! How far did you come?"

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has at last made a start in the direction of remedying the situation of the Nation's postal employees, but it is only a start. These workers have been notoriously underpaid for a long time, and the Congress has finally passed legislation to provide them with a small increase in income. This increase is not really enough to provide these workers and their families with a decent standard of living under the present high-living costs, but it is a start. I sincerely hope that in the near future the Congress will consider this problem again and will pass legislation which will bring the compensation of the postal employees very much closer to that decent standard which should be the right of all of the American people.

There is, however, another matter in which the postal employees have been unjustly discriminated against, and this is something to which we should turn our immediate attention. I refer to the matter of annual vacations and sick leave. Other Federal employees are now enjoying the benefit of 26 days of annual vacation and sick leave, but the postal employees are not covered by this just and necessary provision. In spite of the fact that they work long hours the year round, and in spite of the fact that many of these hours are spent outdoors in all kinds of weather, absolutely no provision has been made for vacations and for sick leave for these workers.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4630, which, if enacted, would give the postal employees the same rights and privileges which are now enjoyed by the other Federal employees, and I cannot urge too strongly the importance of passing this bill. It is the responsibility of the Congress to provide working conditions for Government employees which are at least comparable to those enjoyed by the great majority of the workers throughout the country, and certainly an annual vacation and some provision for sick leave are among the minimum essentials. This fact has long been recognized by other employers, and it is high time that it be recognized by the Federal Government. The Congress must pass H. R. 4630 and provide the postal employees with the annual vacations and sick leave which they so clearly need.

New Nylon Developed by Du Pont Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item:

ELASTIC NYLON IS DEVELOPED BY DU PONT CO.—STRETCHABLE AS RUBBER; NONE OF MATERIAL AVAILABLE FOR COMMERCIAL USE

A new elastic nylon which would make women's stockings as stretchable as rubber was disclosed today by du Pont Co. chemists—with a great big "if" warning that women should not get too optimistic.

Research development on an experimental scale of a new nylon capable of rubberlike properties was announced by the du Pont Co. in a paper read to members of the American Chemical Society in convention at Atlantic City, N. J.

The "if" attached, which should keep the hopes of nylon-hungry American women from soaring beyond the clouds, lay in the statement that none of the material is available for commercial use, and won't be for a long time, if it ever is.

Experiments with textile fibers made from these new nylons "have elastic properties approaching those of rubber," said Dr. Emerson L. Wittbecker, of the du Pont rayon department.

Nylon yarn of the type now used in hosiery "with the highest combination of strength and elasticity of any fiber now in commercial use," has an elongation of only 15 to 25 percent, Dr. Wittbecker pointed out.

The new nylon, he said, has an elasticity of 95 to 99 percent in comparison with 100 percent for rubber.

Dr. Wittbecker emphasized that the new nylon family addition is only a laboratory development.

"Nothing in our paper should be construed as evidence of even possible commercial application," Dr. Wittbecker warned in presenting his report. "None of the materials described is now commercially available, or will be for some time to come, if at all."

A new industrial plastic capable of withstanding acids which dissolve gold and platinum and temperatures of 572 degrees was also announced at the convention today by the company, with this product already in use.

It is already contributing importantly to modern engineering developments such as the jet engine, in which it is the only plastic that will stand up under the high temperatures to which it is subjected. Radar and television are among other fields in which it is solving serious problems.

"No substance has been found which will dissolve or even swell the polymer," said Dr. Malcolm M. Renfrew, who presented the development to the society in a paper which he prepared with Dr. Ernest E. Lewis, also of the du Pont Co.

The plastic material, tetrafluoroethylene resin—to be known by the trade-mark "Teflon"—was developed in du Pont research laboratories. It was manufactured for special military uses during the war in a pilot plant at the Arlington, N. J., plant of the company's plastics department.

Limited amounts in the forms of sheets, rods, tubes, coated wire, tape, and fabricated sections are now available for experimental purposes. Difficulty in fabrication and high cost of manufacture are conditioning factors in the plastic's present stage of development.

Dr. Renfrew predicted that the new plastic will find use by industry where unusual resistance to solvents and corrosive agents is demanded, where heat endurance is of paramount importance, and where insulation against high electrical frequencies is needed in combination with one or both of these properties.

Race Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress and the Department of Labor the fact that the United States Employment Office at 1100 South Flower Street recently had a sign posted in one of its information windows reading, "For white applicants only."

We do not like that sort of thing in California any more than any decent American should tolerate it in any part of the United States. I think it is necessary that the matter be investigated by the Labor Department, and that the persons responsible for this flagrant violation of United States Government policy, and our Constitution, be properly dealt with.

It is disgrace enough in the eyes of the watching world, that the United States needs a fair employment practices commission after having fought a war against racial and religious discrimination. That one is necessary, is more than obvious when an office of the United States Government fosters the very subversive, undermining, divide-and-conquer tactics of our recent enemies.

The question of America growing up and living in accordance with the precepts of our Constitution becomes more pressing every day. We now are hearing from discharged servicemen the stories of vicious discrimination in the armed forces.

The War Department's further promotion of Jim Crow during the war has accentuated tensions which have no right to occur in twentieth-century society, and which could have been eliminated if a decent and proper program had been worked out by those planning an effective American military force.

Now, as a veteran, the Negro soldier is returning to a world even more difficult for him than before.

The GI bill of rights, which we have enacted, is inadequate enough; but, in the educational provisions of this bill, we did not provide that discrimination and quotas by the schools and universities should be laid aside.

In housing, to get a GI loan on a house, it must be within a certain price range, and under 12 years old. We did not provide that restrictive covenants—by which the majority of such residences are covered—must be set aside for any veteran who needs housing.

The most important phase of the GI bill provides readmission to jobs and reasonable preference to veterans on new ones. We overlooked the fact that discrimination, for one or another vicious reason, is a part of our employment system, and did not include provisions in the bill to prevent discrimination because of race, religion, color, creed, or national origin.

It is understood that there should be no race discrimination in the carrying out of any of our laws. We must not sit idly by. Action must be taken in the immediate future to prove to ourselves and our world neighbors that we practice as well as preach democracy.

Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial appearing under date of April 13, 1946, in the Texarkana Gazette with respect to the proposed loan to Britain:

THE PROPOSED LOAN TO BRITAIN

One of the very important matters now before Congress is the proposed loan to Great Britain—not the British Empire. We have watched these negotiations with considerable care over a period of several months and have studied the statements of those favoring the loan and those opposed.

We have come to the conclusion that it is proper and in the public interest that the United States should make this loan, but there is one important item in the proposal which we think should be changed, and that is the one providing that the interest may be waived in years when it is thought impossible for Britain to make this payment. This leaves entirely too large a loophole, which easily may be taken advantage of by the British Government under political pressure, as we saw demonstrated after the last war. If in any year England is unable to pay the interest in addition to the principal payment due the provision should be that this interest payment might be deferred and should become interest bearing, but it certainly should not be wiped out entirely. Britain should understand that when she borrows this money she owes it and the United States will insist that it be paid in full with interest, as agreed.

The United States will have to borrow this money from its citizens and the Government will have to pay interest on it. Therefore the loan should not be made in any such way that the taxpayers of the United States will have to pay any part of it for which they will not be reimbursed by the British.

Memories of the aftermath of World War I are still fresh in the minds of a substantial portion of the American people, and they have no desire to ever again be called Uncle Shylock by their friends across the sea.

Men's Clothing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of men's clothing continues. There are many factors which cause this shortage. It is admitted that an unusually great demand requires more production than ever before.

The OPA and CPA have attempted to bring low-cost clothing to the market in abundance. Their attempts to achieve this result has not been successful due to the fact that many of their regulations were impractical and unworkable.

The greatest mistake they have made, has been the so-called MAP program. Under unanimous consent, I include the following newspaper article from the California Apparel News, in the Appendix of the RECORD. This article is the second of a series of three articles on this subject.

MEMO TO CONGRESS: THE CLOTHING FIASCO
(By William J. Bowen)
MEMO NO. 2. PRICING INEQUITIES

Short-sighted indeed is he who would abandon price controls while supply still falls far short of demand. The disaster that would result is elementary economics to a nation well schooled in the pitfalls of unbridled inflation. A Gallup poll discloses that 70 percent of the people favor retaining ceiling prices until supply can satisfy demand. It is safe to say that among apparel manufacturers (the very people suspected of trying to break the line) a rousing 90 percent, or better, are solidly behind price controls.

Nevertheless, the structure and administration of these controls within the apparel field leaves much to be desired. Admittedly an extremely complex sphere in which to impose ceilings, a better, more equitable job should and can be done. Some of these shortcomings have direct adverse effects upon the consumer, for whose protection they were established. Others have indirect effects. No less a force than the powerful United States Congress can hope to cut through the tape, put an end to the hemmming and hawing, and prod the reluctant OPA to set about correcting these evils.

Especially offensive and unjust to the consumer are present OPA regulations which grant ceilings to new manufacturers (who have no comparative base periods) which are sometimes as much as twice as high, on identical items, as those allowed older, established houses. Patently unjust to competitive manufacturers, it results in nothing short of fraudulent misrepresentation to the

unsuspecting consumer. A large portion of the population has always had to rely upon price as an idex to quality in the clothing it buys. Under the supposed protection of ceiling prices, the purchaser has an increased sense of security in this reliance. Little does he know that the dollar pair of shorts he spurned is identical to the $2 pair he bought, except that perhaps the cheaper one was better sewn.

Under the system of free, competitive enterprise, the housewife is on guard and protects herself as best she may against a business world that she suspects of contriving to do her out of her last dollar. This she does by employing her own limited, often misguided measures of value and quality; by relying upon the reputation of the merchant; but most of all, by helplessly using price as the yardstick of quality. No longer suspicious, she now feels free to place all her trust in that little statement on the tag, "OPA ceiling price, $8.95." Why, that's her Government saying so, and saying it to protect her against the merciless merchant. Little does she know that often she is being hornswoggled by a well-meaning but bumbling OPA. And nobody tells her, so her faith persists, and when the manufacturer who knows asks to have it all straightened out he is glared at as a selfish hanger-on to the lost ideals of foul capitalism, a meddler whose whole intent is to sabotage all bureaucracy.

What end is served in fixing nice, low, little 1943 ceiling prices and then driving all the good, old, reliable, standard brands off the market because those confiscatory prices thwart the incentive to produce? What is gained in having these prices on the books unless the merchandise is on the shelves? And how awkward when, in their place, new and ersatz goods mushroom up and are rewarded with generous prices, all because they have never been heard of or made before. In this manner OPA has actually fostered a camouflaged inflation while professing to be fighting it.

Realistic pricing, equitable to all and conducive to production, is sorely needed. This not only can be done within the framework of noninflationary price fixing, but, by encouraging production, and hence creating competitive selling, can help to remove the very threat of inflation.

But before realistic pricing can be assured, a realistic evaluation of costs must be established. The apparel industry cannot absorb a 30-percent increase in labor charges and hope to sell profitably at antiquated base-period price levels. Perhaps some industries can do it, particularly those with automatic production methods. You can toss another batch of toothpaste into the hopper or another load of ingots into the furnace and increase unit production with little added labor. But you can't throw a bolt of fabric at a sewing machine and catch a stack of skirts coming out the other end. Even if it were so, the principle of labor absorption is predicated upon increased productivity and abnormal volume. In many a garment factory it is subnormal. In the making of apparel, the relation between the units of labor and the units of production is very nearly constant regardless of volume. Only the less significant factor of overhead has any place within this type of reasoning as applied to this industry.

The list of grievances occasioned by a complex maze of inflexible and unrelenting regulations is legion. Typical is the lot of a manufacturer whose foresightedness caused him to convert to cheap utility wear early in the war and prior to the point of which base periods were subsequently fixed. If he happened to have been a manufacturer of higher-styled apparel before the war he is now unable to return to his normal business since he was caught at the base period unhappily producing clothing for a nation of riveters and welders. Now the welder is a lady again and the manufacturer has lost her as a customer to his traditional competitor who was slower than he to pitch into war production work. But even if he had the customer he couldn't get the goods and under normal conditions he is not equipped to compete with the old-time mass producers of this type of clothing.

Relief from hardship was originally granted under OPA only on an industry-wide basis. Individual cases of hardship were specifically forbidden a hearing. The howl that went up as a plant here closed its doors, and another there went into the red while the Nation enjoyed unprecedented prosperity, made a quite considerable noise. It was even heard inside the OPA offices. So OPA recently did something about it by way of an amendment. Soberly and profoundly it has now agreed to listen to all hardship cases from those who suffered from floods or fires in 1943! This, however, appears to be somewhat less than a full solution to the problem. The oppressed have nowhere to turn, and are even barred from the courts.

No wonder that black markets are big business and that the loophole artist lives on top of the hill. The scoundrel prospers; the estwhile good citizen reluctantly engages in white lies and common garden varieties of shady practices that sting his conscience; and the rare individual whose zeal for law-abiding honesty has doggedly persisted, is paying for it in red ink. California's CHET HOLIFIELD was not far from wrong when he recently addressed his fellow Congressmen and said that OPA had forced every garment maker in the United States to become a violator of the law.

Perhaps there is no faint praise which is so damning as to say, "The poor soul, he has so many worries and he means so well." But damning or no, the OPA should try it on for size, and Congress must judge the fit. In the beginning, much could be forgiven—the hurry, the war, the complexity and all that. And after forgiving there was much room for admiration. But now all that is well behind us and we should join with the walrus in saying the time is come to talk of many things—but let it be more of shoes than of cabbages. Congressmen, it is high time that OPA was forced to take a second look at the tangled web it has woven. We need OPA. Give us price controls; but fair, equitable, and realistic price control. The harried but still unhurried OPA has much work to do.

Shortage of Men's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of men's clothing continues. There are many factors which cause this shortage. It is admitted that an unusually great demand requires more production than ever before.

The OPA and CPA have attempted to bring low-cost clothing to the market in abundance. Their attempts to achieve this result has not been successful due to the fact that many of their regulations were impractical and unworkable.

The greatest mistake they have made, has been the so-called map program.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article from the California Apparel News on this subject. This article is the third of a series of three which I am putting in today's RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

MEMO TO CONGRESS: THE CLOTHING FIASCO

(By William J. Bowen)

MEMO NO. 3. MAP'S FAILURE

Nothing but building can get a house built. And nothing but production can produce a supply. If increased supply is to be desired, and if the ultimate demise of OPA is our goal and that goal contingent upon a balance between supply and demand, then it should appear elementary that it is OPA's responsibility to encourage production and thereby enrich the supply. Otherwise OPA tends to perpetuate itself. Instead of serving as a stopgap in an unbalanced economy, an OPA which imposes restrictive controls upon production not only fails to encourage recovery of balance, but actively engages in barring the natural forces of supply and demand in their search for equilibrium.

Nothing but building can get a house built, but OPA, which has mastered the most fantastic algebraics, has thus far flunked on this two-plus-two problem. If OPA forces the materials off the market, how can the house get built that it is desperately encouraging to be built? Yet, that is the case. Most particularly that is the case against MAP (the maximum average price regulation).

MAP is a production control, not a price control regulation. It has nothing to do with fixing prices. It merely dictates how many units of apparel at a given price level may be produced. This it attempts to do by saying go ahead and make whatever you want to (at your ceiling prices), so long as your total production averages the same price as it did in your base period. This was intended to accomplish the high purpose of forcing cheap merchandise back onto the market. (As discussed in previous memoranda, the very fundamental is unrealistic as the public no longer wants cheap clothing.) To this extent OPA laudably sought to encourage production. But, by failing to provide for a flow of low-cost fabrics with which to make low-cost clothing it has actually stymied production instead of promoting it. By failing to get production of cheap apparel it has also forced off the market clothing in the medium and higher priced ranges because a manufacturer can produce these only to the extent that he can offset them (and thereby maintain his average price) with such cheaper stuff as he can get. That, incidentally, and contrary to the outcries in the press, is the reason for the stock pile of shirts and other items which were withheld in warehouses from the public. The manufacturer stands subject to treble damages if he releases these to a hungry public before he can find some cheap fabric to pacify the surcharges he is accumulating. MAP has sought to recreate the price and quality allocations of 1943 without the ability to restore the conditions then existent. While making this fumble it has hog-tied production.

MAP was issued on April 19, 1945. The war was almost over. At that late date, production controls had just begun. Despite war's end the clothing situation has steadily worsened until today store inventories are at an all-time low. In a false attitude of self-sufficiency, OPA imposed MAP upon the Nation without seeking the council of industry advisory committees until after it had become law. It is now reaping the whirlwind. In the end it is the consumer with the frayed shirt collar who is penalized.

Inflation is threatened less by prices today than by short supply. But MAP has little to do with inflation anyhow. It has nothing to do with the value received for the dollar spent. It is only a mollycoddling attempt to force cheap goods out of the merchant and down the throats of an unwilling public.

The OPA has studiously avoided bringing any enforcement cases to court where the constitutionality of MAP might be put to the test. There are extremely grave doubts that the courts would uphold OPA's right to impose a system of maximum average prices. OPA derives its authority from Congress. Congress has empowered it to fix prices to prevent inflation. Nothing more. It has no constituted authority to engage in production controls which have no bearing upon price regulation or inflation. Congress, if not the courts, should see that the responsibilities delegated by it are not exceeded.

The powerful mills have been bypassed by MAP. OPA says to the manufacturer, "You shall use cheap fabrics." But, does it say to the weaver, "You shall use cheap fabrics"? No. Nor have the mills seen fit to do so voluntarily. Thus OPA has left the cutter in a vicious squeeze play. His production falls off; his product goes into a warehouse instead of onto a store shelf; and his surcharges mount. Only low-cost textiles can produce low-cost clothing. Only lumber can get a wooden house built.

The repercussions of a faulty MAP have been felt in more than one way: Legal and unimpeachable subterfuges within the law have worked against its very purpose. For one thing, a fictitious disintegration of a unit of apparel can be employed to provide the low-end merchandise necessary to maintain the proper average. For instance, all that a manufacturer of play suits need do is take a $10 shorts-and-brassiere set and sell them as two separate items of apparel: Shorts for $7, say, and brassiere for $3. His average unit price has dropped nicely, allowing him to go to work and cut up that high-priced fabric he has got back there in the storeroom. But where did the consumer get her cheap clothes out of this deal? She has got to have both the shorts and brassiere whether sold separately or together. All she has gained is the opportunity to come back tomorrow and buy that nice, expensive pair of slacks she would rather have anyhow, and let a shocked OPA stand in the corner and say tsk, tsk, for all she cares.

For another thing, MAP has driven the medium-priced items off the market. Even if they have to produce their low-end goods at a loss, as they often do, manufacturers prefer to play the keyboard at both ends. They produce the cheapest possible items so that they may then turn to the luxury class of clothing. Thus, a sweater manufacturer who formerly made sweaters priced at $2, $4, $6, $8, and $10 now only makes the $2, $8, and $10 lines. His average is maintained but the stable, bread-and-butter items are gone. The cheapest, largely unwanted, items are produced in order to balance a weighted average. If it weren't for MAP he would unquestionably continue his $6 line and probably the $4 one, but would discontinue the unwanted and unprofitable $2 line. Whole lines which MAP and price controls have made unprofitable to produce have been abandoned and the manufacturer turns to something else. That is the story of the vanishing white shirt. It's the OPA that has jokeyed the reluctant manufacturer into this position, and only the consumer is hurt by it.

What low-priced merchandise MAP has forced onto the market has not been channeled into the hands of the low-income groups. There is nothing that prevents the bank president from finding that scarce pair of 85-cent shorts at his store, while the cotton picker digs deep to pay $2 for his.

This, then, is the story of MAP: Designed to encourage production, it has throttled production; intended to produce cheap clothing, everybody wants good clothing; ordering that cheap apparel be made, it fails to provide cheap fabrics from which to make it; intended to hasten the end of controls, it perpetuates them by sustaining the shortage; constituted within the framework of price controls, it has nothing to do with prices or inflation. Congressmen, let's scuttle MAP and get back to producing clothing for the people of America. Nothing but building can get a house built.

War Surplus in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I read on the floor of the House a report of wanton handling of war surpluses in the Pacific, and stated that I was bringing the matter to the attention of the Secretary of the War Department. Subsequently I received a reply, which I offer for the RECORD at this time. The letter follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 27, 1946.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in reply to your letter of March 11, 1946, in which you inclosed a clipping from the Washington Daily News of March 6, 1946, and a copy of your remarks in the House concerning the disposal of supplies in the Pacific.

It is the policy of the War Department to abandon only such supplies that have no value on the civilian market or that require destruction for reasons of health, safety or security, such as contaminated food or deteriorated ammunition. Under the procedures that have been established, serviceable surplus property in overseas theaters is reported to the field representative of the Foreign Liquidation Commission of the State Department who is responsible for the disposal of Government surplus supplies outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions. In some instances such supplies may be returned directly to the United States for disposal by the War Assets Administration where it is believed that such supplies are urgently needed to relieve critical civilian shortages in this country.

In the event the Foreign Liquidation Commission is unable to sell surplus supplies, including scrap, provisions are maintained whereby property may be donated. Only as a last resort are surplus supplies and scrap abandoned and only after it is determined by the Foreign Liquidation Commission that the cost of care and handling would exceed the proceeds of sale and that it is, therefore, uneconomical to expend further funds to maintain the supplies or to attempt to develop a market for them.

The only property which will be dumped at sea are those items for which the Army is responsible for its demilitarization. The item is first stripped of any component of value and it is ascertained in coordination with the Foreign Liquidation Commission that the residue has no value even as scrap.

Under Secretary Royall has completed the first part of a trip around the world and I was interested in noting a report that he issued in Manila. He stated that dumping at sea was the cheapest and safest way of demilitarization of some types of military equipment. Theater commanders are exercising this authority cauticusly and are trying to protect United States property and troops. He further stated that the many rumors of wanton destruction of Government property had proved to be without foundation and on the contrary all possible steps are being taken to conserve and protect Government property.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that the War Department only abandons such property which has been determined to be dangerous to health, safety or security or where the cost of handling such property and preparing it for sale would exceed the proceeds. You may be assured that the Foreign Liquidation Commission is exploring the Chinese market to the fullest extent and that no property will be abandoned which can profitably be used by the Chinese.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

In comment, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I believe the people of the country generally will applaud the steps the War Department is taking to curb waste in the handling and disposition of surplus stocks and wants constant vigilance to be the order of the day.

The Coming Show-down at Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Barnet Nover from the Washington Post of April 16, 1946:

THE COMING SHOW-DOWN AT PARIS
(By Barnet Nover)

In the opinion of high officials here, the coming Paris Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France will be the most important, and also the most critical, since the end of the war.

The outlook for that Conference is, as I have previously pointed out, anything but bright. Yet the issues which the Foreign Ministers must deal with at Paris cannot be postponed any longer.

The continuation of the present armistice arrangements with Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland, as well as the conflicting occupation policies pursued by the big four in Germany and Austria, only tend to perpetuate that state of uncertainty and confusion that has seriously retarded the reconstruction of Europe.

Almost a year after the fighting ended Europe continues to be divided into hermetically sealed zones, each separated by an iron curtain from the rest of the Continent. That state of affairs has been as important a factor as last year's drought in producing Europe's desperate food plight.

At last summer's Potsdam Conference it was agreed that a peace settlement with Italy would be first on the order of business for the peacemakers.

Since Potsdam, however, no progress has been made in drawing up the terms of that settlement. Every attempt to do so has gone aground on the rock of Soviet opposition to any arrangement that failed to satisfy Russian claims on Italy.

These claims are four in number:

1. A unilateral Russian trusteeship over Tripolitania and, possibly, Italian Eritrea as well. This the British have opposed on the ground that it would mean, in Ernest Bevin's words, drawing "a knife across the throat of the British Empire." This Russian demand has been opposed by the United States as

well. The American Government has favored a multiple trusteeship over Italy's former colonies, with representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and Italy taking part and no one power dominant in the arrangement.

2. A grant of naval bases to Russia in the Dodecanese, the Greek-populated islands, which Italy has held since 1912 and which, on the grounds of self-determination, the United States and Great Britain want Greece to own.

3. The payment by Italy of an indemnity of $300,000,000 to Russia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Albania, with the lion's share going to Russia. Since Italy is not in a position to pay for even indispensable food imports, now being provided by UNRRA, Italy is in no position to finance such an indemnity as Russia demands unless she receives financial assistance from the United States. In that case we would be the ones paying the indemnity.

4. The transfer of Trieste and the whole of Venezia Guilia to Yugoslavia. Since Trieste is Italian in population, the United States and Great Britain have opposed any such cession. Instead, it has been proposed that Trieste remain under Italian rule but with its port facilities internationalized and its hinterland divided along ethnographic lines.

Behind these Russian claims and Anglo-American opposition to them, far more is involved than the future of Italy. What is involved is whether Russia, already in unchallenged control of all of eastern Europe and a large part of the Balkans, is also to secure a powerful foothold on the Mediterranean, thus further weakening Great Britain.

There is also involved the central question whether it is possible for any other great power to do business with Russia except on a basis of forever capitulating to Russian demands.

In the 2½ years that have elapsed since the first Anglo-Russian-American Conference, the one held at Moscow in the autumn of 1943, the area of maneuver and accommodation between Russia and the western democracies has steadily narrowed down to the point where, today, it has practically disappeared.

It is this circumstance which goes a long way to explain so much that has been happening in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Russian activities have tended to throw grave doubt on the wartime belief that it would be possible for Russia, Great Britain, and the United States to continue in peace the cooperation that obtained between them in war. The result has been that both the United States and Great Britain have looked more and more to the United Nations as the agency through which to establish and maintain a decent world order.

It is now up to Russia to decide whether rivalry or cooperation is to be the order of the day in Anglo-Russian-American relations. What happens in Paris beginning on April 23 will be the acid test. If peace cannot be organized by the Big Three operating as a unit it will have to be established in some other way. So far as Italy is concerned, this may mean that in lieu of a general settlement a separate peace with that country may be made by the United States, Great Britain, and possibly France.

This would, no doubt, provoke Russia into making separate settlements with Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland.

Separate settlements would no doubt also intensify the rivalries among the great powers. It would give tremendous impetus to the creation of a western bloc and to that fraternal association of the English-speaking countries which Churchill advocated and which the Russians have denounced so bitterly.

The choice is up to Russia. Both the Washington and London governments are desperately anxious to have that country join in a program of cooperation with the other powers in organizing the peace of Europe on a decent and reasonable basis. But if Russia refuses they will have no alternative but to act on their own. The sands have begun to run out.

Indonesian Struggle for Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a flagrant violation of people's rights has been taking place in Indonesia for many months now. It is time that we in America, whose tradition is to support a people struggling for their independence, take note of this little-known part of the world. The Indonesians, ever since VJ-day, have been struggling not just against the Dutch, but against the British. In these islands of the Netherlands East Indies lies a serious trouble spot, which could infect the world because of the usual imperialistic striving for trade advantages which is at the root of Dutch and British resistance to self-determination of these subject peoples.

This is certainly a problem for the United Nations Security Council to investigate. I am introducing a resolution which will express the wish of the House that such an investigation by the United Nations may be made. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the petition that is being prepared for submission to the American delegation at the United Nations Security Council. We ought all to pray that serious consideration may be given the letter which follows, since neglect of such a problem is so dangerous to the peace of our world:

PETITION TO THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

Hon. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS,
Chairman, American Delegation,
United Nations Security Council.

SIR: May we call your attention to the crisis which now exists in Indonesia and presents, in our opinion, a threat to world peace and security.

As Members of Congress, we believe our duty toward establishing world peace is not accomplished until Japanese militarism is eliminated, root and branch. For this reason we are concerned over the presence of Japanese troops in Indonesia 8 months after Japan's unconditional surrender.

Japanese troops in Indonesia today are under arms. They are under orders of British commanders on the scene to preserve law and order in Indonesia. This is in itself an impossible situation. The perpetrators of the Bataan death march and similar atrocities against our soldiers and those of our allies could, under no conditions, warrant such confidence. The reason for their present use is equally abhorrent. The Japanese troops are cooperating with British and Netherlands forces to suppress the Indonesian Republic.

The Atlantic Charter pledged to all nations the right to self-determination. Indonesia is the first prewar colony which has translated this principle into reality. The republic has maintained the confidence of 70,000,000 Indonesians over the last 8 months. It has secured the confidence of British commanders to the extent of having been assigned the removal of Japanese forces from the interior of Java while on the coast the British persist in using the Japanese against the populace.

The Netherlands Government, at the London meeting of the Security Council, was instrumental in preventing that body from investigating these conditions by pledging that the Netherlands and Indonesia were to negotiate their differences. We support peaceful negotiations; such, however, is not the case in the present Dutch-Indonesian discussions. There are at present three interventionary armies in Indonesia: Japanese, Dutch, and British. The British forces at present are being withdrawn as Netherlands reinforcements arrive to relieve them. The United Press reported from Batavia April 13, 1946, that the Indonesian Governor of Celebes and six other Republican leaders had been arrested by the Dutch. This transpired in the midst of the negotiations.

It, therefore, behooves the undersigned to urge the American delegates to the Security Council to consider the fact that the present negotiations between the Netherlands and Indonesian leaders is to the decided disadvantage of Indonesia because of the presence of three interventionary armies; and that the continued use and presence of armed Japanese forces violates the unconditional surrender terms placed upon the Empire of Japan. We believe our duty and yours to the honored war dead of the United States and its allies compels reopening the Indonesian question in the United Nations in order to establish a precedent for the realization of the independence of colonial countries in the atmosphere of freedom and security that the United Nations alone can provide.

In the light of the foregoing, may we recommend that the American delegates request that the question of Indonesia be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council for immediate consideration.

ELLIS E. PATTERSON.

Indian Veterans' Chance for School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Indian Veterans" printed in the Pierre Capital Journal of Pierre, S. Dak., with which I am heartily in agreement.

The article follows:

THE INDIAN VETERANS

We don't know anything about the Hopi or Navaho Indians of the Southwest, but we have been observing the affairs of the Indians living in the Great Plains States for a long time. We have long since reached the conclusion that attempts to impose a tribal culture on those Indians are a mistake and an injustice to the Indians as individuals.

There are a large number of young Indians who during the past 5 years have had the first opportunity of their lives to enter a society in which they worked and competed with their white associates on an equal basis. Some of them flunked the test, but the great majority of the Indian boys who served in the armed forces and of the Indian girls who served with the Red Cross and as nurses came through with flying colors. Those boys

and girls are never going to accept a tribal existence willingly in the future.

The alternative to a tribal existence is individual effort. We believe that the time has come when thousands of individual young Indian men and women can hope to succeed in making a satisfactory living for themselves by their own efforts in normal competition with the white people among whom they live. Their race today is no bar to their securing jobs in a great many fields of commerce and industry; neither is it any bar to succeed in a great many professions. The greatest help they could possibly have toward achieving such success would be a higher education, and this is open to a lot of them who can take advantage of the GI bill of rights.

Any Indian boy or girl who can do so ought to get a high-school education if he hasn't completed high school, and if he has, he should go on to college. The alternative should be a trade school if there is any trade to which the individual is attracted and which he feels might afford him a living.

Control of Barbiturates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following explanation of a bill introduced by me today:

SECTION 1

Section 3228 of the Internal Revenue Code contains definitions of terms as used in certain sections of the Internal Revenue Code pertaining to narcotics and coca leaves. Section 1 of this bill would add to that section a new subsection (g), defining the word "barbiturate" as used in the sections of the Internal Revenue Code proposed to be amended.

SECTION 2

Section 2550 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for a tax of 1 cent per ounce on opium, coca leaves, isonipecaine, opiate, any compound, salt, derivative, or preparation thereof, produced in or imported into the United States, and sold or removed for consumption or sale. This tax is represented by narcotic commodity tax stamps, which are to be affixed to the bottle or other container. Section 2 of the bill would make barbiturates, and any compound, salt, derivative, or preparation thereof, subject to this tax and the control incident thereto.

SECTION 3

Paragraphs 5 and 6 of section 2557 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, derived from sections 1 and 2 of the act of August 12, 1937 (50 Stat. 627), and sections 1 and 2 of that act also codified in the United States Code, title 21, sections 200 and 200a, provide additional punishment for second, third, and subsequent offenses for selling, importing, or exporting, or conspiring to sell, import, or export, opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine, opiate, or any salt, derivative, or preparation thereof, in violation of the laws of the United States. Sections 3 and 8 of the bill would add barbiturates to the drugs enumerated above.

SECTION 4

Section 2558 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the confiscation and disposal of opium, coca leaves, isonipecaine, opiate, and all salts, derivatives and preparations of opium, coca leaves, isonipecaine, and opiate, seized by the Government from a person charged with any violation of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics and of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, secs. 171–185). Section 4 of the bill would merely enlarge the scope of this section by adding barbiturates.

SECTION 5

Section 5 of the bill, which would amend section 2565 of the Internal Revenue Code, would add a necessary reference to section 3228.

SECTION 6

Sections 3220 and 3221 of the Internal Revenue Code require every person who imports, manufactures, produce, compounds, sells, deals in, dispenses, or gives away opium, coca leaves, isonipecaine, or opiate, or any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation thereof, to register with the Collector of Internal Revenue and to pay an occupational tax. Section 6 of the bill would require every person who engages in such activities with barbiturates to comply with these requirements.

SECTION 7

Section 1 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 171), defines various terms as used in that act. The term "narcotic drug" is defined to mean opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine, opite, or any salt, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine, or opite. Section 7 of the bill would add "barbiturate" to the term "narcotic drug" and the necessary reference for the definition of the term "barbiturate" as used therein.

SECTION 8

See reference under section 3.

SECTION 9

Section 9 of the bill would amend the second paragraph of section 584 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1584), by enlarging the scope of the penalty imposed by that section against vessels carrying unmanifested heroin, morphine, cocaine, isonipecaine, or opiate, so as to include "barbiturates."

SECTION 10

This section would authorize the necessary appropriation for administering the act.

WRUL's Free Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

WRUL'S FREE VOICE

It was in 1942 that the United States War Communications Board preempted the vocal chords of the last free world voice—Station WRUL—known the world over as Radio Boston. The reason given was because of the need of having all short-wave facilities available to the Government before offensive action by American troops began in the European theater. And the station which had done so much, through news broadcasts and inspirational messages, to prepare peoples in the occupied countries to cooperate in that offensive bowed to the seeming inevitable.

Whatever justification there may have been for such action there would seem to be none for keeping control of the facilities with VE-day almost a year passed. The main offensive to be waged now is by the forces of enlightenment and education, and WRUL, because of its background, experience, and international status, is ideally equipped to help win this postwar battle in a truly democratic way. Its former programs, broadcast in a score of languages, and its nonprofit short-wave world university of the air spanned the globe.

With the coming of war it spoke hope and encouragement to overrun but unconquered peoples throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa. In Norway, the Netherlands, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Madagascar, China, the Philippines, people risked their lives again and again to listen to the newscasts and the Comfort, Bridge of Friendship, and Comradeship in Arms programs. Their governments-in-exile spoke through its transmitters. It, in effect, became their station.

Thus WRUL fought a valiant battle for freedom. It deserves to have its own freedom restored, so that it may once more become a free United Nations' voice, not a one-nation outlet subject to propaganda charges.

Surplus Property Is Being Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, surplus-property disposal is a target for all kinds of criticism. This is natural. Billions of dollars are involved. It would be strange indeed if the American people were not vitally interested in how the enormous mass of surplus war property, representing their contribution as taxpayers, was being disposed of.

It is undoubtedly true that not every surplus sale has been handled as expeditiously as you would expect your purchase order to be handled by a large-scale mail-order house. I have no doubt at all that there have been veterans who have been disappointed in not finding or getting the goods they wanted to buy from surplus. But what of the thousands who have bought and used surplus to the advantage of themselves and their country?

It is essential that the country understand what is right and wrong about surplus disposal. This understanding will not come about through indiscriminate, careless criticism. Surplus disposal is a national problem. How all this surplus accumulation of goods, machinery, equipment, materials, plants, land, buildings, and so on is sold will have tremendous effect for good or ill on the American economy. Successful handling of surplus is one of the "musts" of today—it is an emergency problem.

So far there has been acquired as surplus under the Surplus Property Act a total of $11,000,000,000 of property—excluding nonsalable aircraft—measured in original cost. This cost is a book value. It is what the property cost the Government at war-high prices. It is

by no means an accurate measure of what the property is worth today. Most of surplus is, of course, second-hand property. Great quantities of it are simply unmarketable—the shining example is surplus tactical aircraft, few of which have any peacetime use.

Out of the $11,000,000,000 total of property declared surplus to date there have been disposed of $2,200,000,000. Disposals of surplus have been rising at an accelerated rate. Since November disposals have been going ahead; in March more property was sold than in the three last months of the war. Surplus property is being sold.

Sales of surplus so far have netted a dollar return of $1,000,000,000. Figured against the book value of the property sold, that is a return of 50 percent.

There is now in the Government's surplus-property inventory a grand total of $8,800,000,000 of property. But let us analyze this inventory. More than 33 percent of it is accounted for by those same nonsalable surplus aircraft. Surplus consumer goods—the type of goods you and I buy retail everyday, and that naturally form one of the most highly desired classes of surplus—surplus consumer goods account for only 13 percent of current inventory. Plant equipment and materials account for another 25 percent.

Obviously, surplus property is something you cannot generalize about. There are all kinds of property in surplus. They are in all kinds of condition; they are located in scattered places, often at a distance from available markets; and they each demand a different kind of merchandising. Used trucks cannot be sold the same way as used plants, for example.

The War Assets Administration is the agency responsible under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 for the policies that guide surplus disposal in the United States, the Territories, and the possessions. The War Assets Administration also disposes of about 90 percent of all surplus; it is the major disposal agency.

The War Assets Administration must dispose of property within the prescriptions of the law. The act sets forth 20 different objectives to guide the disposal of surplus. It would be foolish to attempt to interpret these objectives literally because one would contradict another. Congress never intended that. Instead Lt. Gen. E. B. Gregory, the War Assets Administrator, is wisely following the general objective, derived from the act, of disposing of surplus property in the national interest rather than in the interest of special groups or individuals. That is a practical guide to have in the thousands of difficult sales situations that confront the War Assets Administration every week.

The act also sets forth priorities and preferences. The Federal Government is given first priority and State and local governments are given second priority. Preferences of different scope and specification are set forth for nonprofit educational, health, and other institutions; veterans; farmers and farmer cooperatives; and small business.

The War Assets Administration and the other surplus disposal agencies are faced with the job of distributing billions of dollars of goods, involving hundreds of thousands of items, through a series of preferential groups of buyers, including thousands of eligible institutions and millions of eligible veterans.

This is not a normal merchandising operation. No normal business would attempt such a job without radical changes in procedure and organization. Let us make another comparison. The War Assets Administration has on hand now nearly $9,000,000,000 of salable surplus goods. Its total personnel—not its selling force but its entire staff of all grades—includes 25,000 persons and 33 sales offices. On a comparable scale, the two largest American mail-order houses would require nearly 234,000 persons and more than 2,000 sales offices throughout the United States.

When General Gregory became Chairman of the Board of the War Assets Administration last December and assumed charge of most domestic disposals of surplus goods, he instituted with the cooperation of the Surplus Property Administration, a prompt investigation of surplus sales problems and procedures. This is what he found:

He found that from the day of the surrender of Japan, Government-owned property had come into surplus in such tremendous amounts that War Assets had more property to dispose of during the last 4 months of 1945 than there was total surplus after World War I.

He found that the surplus disposal problem had overnight made imperative a reorganization of the disposal organization so as to eliminate bottlenecks to sales.

He found that only the most stringent streamlining of sales procedures could channel surplus out of the Government's hands fast enough to keep surplus property from being a millstone around the neck of the American economy for years to come.

And this is what was done:

The War Assets Administration was organized to combine in one shop surplus sales policy and the greater part of surplus sales operations.

Duplicating sales organizations were abolished in Washington and the field. Policy was brought into direct contact with sales operations.

Sales procedures were simplified so as to make clear where the final responsibility for sales rested. Thousands of referrals to Washington were eliminated.

Regional sales directors were given broad authority to sell, thereby eliminating one of the chief bottlenecks to faster sales. For example, regional sales directors have authority to sell, with simplified clearance with Washington property valued at up to $1,000,000. They have greater freedom within the law, in choosing methods of sale, in giving public information on sales, and in making terms.

The policy of selling surplus, apart from the preferences, through customary trade channels and by customary methods was strengthened by selling all possible items at fixed prices.

Here are some highly interesting facts about surplus property disposal that were developed by General Gregory's investigation:

We are now passing through the peak in surplus high mark of property becoming surplus. In other words, surplus disposal is just beginning.

About as much again of surplus will be available for disposal during the rest of this year as there was on February 28.

It requires about a hundred days to get a surplus consumer goods item ready for disposal. This includes inspection, advertising, sales programing, and sale.

Before disposal, a surplus item must be inspected to provide an accurate trade description; its sale must often be programed; advertising or announcements must be prepared and issued; and the sale consummated.

To speed up disposals, the War Assets Administration "peels" off items of most importance and concentrates on getting those items sold first. This peeling process has been found to reduce paper work from 40 to 4 days.

There are now being carried on at locations of large quantities of surplus property—usually Army and Navy depots or war production sites—what are called "site sales." At these sales, the property is sold direct without the extra cost and delay of transport, storage, and so forth. So far, there have been 532 sites scheduled for these sales, each involving from $34,000 to $94,000,000 of property. These sales are being constantly improved in method.

These are merely examples of what is being done to put surplus property into civilian hands. The problems are immense. And one of the chief problems of the War Assets Administration is to give the American people an understanding of what surplus property really is, what they can rightly expect from it, and how sales procedures are being modified daily to make it easier to buy surplus.

It is not as easy to buy surplus as it is to buy from your local department store. It cannot be. That is the nature of surplus and the way it must be disposed of under the law. But the War Assets Administration, having unified and simplified its sales procedures, is attempting to smooth the way for the surplus buyer.

Surplus disposal has distinct accomplishments to its credit. In February, for example, sales to veterans accounted for one-fourth of total consumer-goods sales. Surplus beds and similar equipment were sent to a State university where they were badly needed for housing GI students. Surplus equipment was rushed to Buffalo to help it dig out of last winter's blizzard, and to the Mississippi Valley during a recent flood. Hundreds of once Government-owned machine tools are now at work for private owners. Seventeen carloads of steel landing mats have been sold to the State of Wyoming to be used for fencing game preserves.

At this time the disposal of war surplus is one of the critical problems facing the Nation. Above everything else, that disposal must be in the national interest. It is essential that as much as possible of surplus be disposed of as soon as possible. That is the responsibility

of the War Assets Administration. But it is a responsibility that requires, and deserves, the understanding cooperation of all.

United States Sea-Air Service to South America To Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appears in the April issue of Marine News, written by Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, editor:

UNITED STATES SEA-AIR SERVICE TO SOUTH AMERICA TO BOOM

Shipping lines operating out of New York to Caribbean and South American ports, paced by high-flying Pan American Airways, plan to provide several times prewar accommodations by 1950.

Next to the North Atlantic the heaviest unfilled demand for travel is the Caribbean, Central and South America. The Grace Line reports a backlog of 2,000 each way with a minimum 6-week wait for passage on any of its freighters now offering only temporary accommodations to ports in the Caribbean and the west coast of South America.

Active in projecting "sea-air" service contemplating integrated round trips by ships and airplanes operated by shipping lines is the Waterman Steamship Corp., of Mobile, Ala. In addition to several ocean routes, this company operates the Waterman Air Lines, an air-freight service within the limits of the State. Waterman also has developed a long-range cargo plane designed for Caribbean flight to supplement its present freight steamer service to Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES SURRENDERING ITS FREEDOM OF SEAS AND AIR

In our "big-hearted Herbert" sap-like attitude as a Nation in the most realistic period in world history our Government, ignoring a century of experience in travel and trade abroad gained by our own shipping lines, brushing aside a world-wide organization which for decades has spearheaded American participation in foreign travel and export, and discounting altogether that know-how developed by accumulated trade connections, banking facilities, familarity with travel habits and preferences, is shooting down American transoceanic airplanes and sinking American ships through absurd rulings of the Civil Aeronautics Board, one of the many devastating Federal Government bureaus having autocratic bureaucratic powers. Orders issued by the CAB granting too little and too late or altogether denying certificates for foreign air service, when approved by the President become final and are not subject to judicial review. Was ever a more hideous dictatorship within what we all along keep telling the world is a democracy? Possessing sole discretionary power, subject only to Presidential approval under the spell of wartime emergency powers of virtual dictatorship, CAB allocates overseas air routes in such a way as to delimit United States air competition in world-trade areas, forbidding any new American flag companies to enter the international aviation field.

Nine major United States transoceanic ship lines have applied to this Board over the past few years for permission to use airplane and flying-boat service in connection with their existing overseas ship service, over their regular routes, serving their regular customers. None has been permitted this service. These companies are the Atlantic, Gulf and West Indies Lines, serving the Atlantic Coast, the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean; the Grace Lines, Inc., serving the west and north coasts of South America; the Oceanic Steamship Co., serving the Hawaiian Islands; the Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., serving the east coast of South America, Scandinavia and the Baltic; the Seas Shipping Co., Inc., and the American-South African Line, Inc., serving South Africa; the United Fruit Co., serving Central and South America and the West Indies; and the Waterman Steamship Co., serving Puerto Rico, the United Kingdom, continental Europe and the Far East.

The CAB's negative position is based upon a tortured interpretation of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Briefly, the CAB contends that section 408 (b) of the act prevents steamship lines from operating planes while continuing to operate ships. Actually, there is nothing in the act which bars steamship companies from participation in air service. On the contrary, sponsors of the measure have given assurance in committee hearings that ship companies would have this right.

It is high time that Congress act and instruct and confine the CAB to the intent of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The position taken by CAB seems to be based upon the false assumption that it was the intent of Congress to prohibit one type of carrier from making use of another in its operations. The steamship lines rightly emphasize that they have both a legal and an equitable right to supplement surface operations with airborne transport upon a proper showing before the CAB of their ability to serve the public interest and convenience.

The further contention of the American ship lines that the national interest of the United States is not being served by precluding the use of their experience, facilities, assets, and "know how" in overseas transportation and travel fields at a time when aviation is changing the world map as radically as did Columbus' discovery of America, and when foreign competition offers the stiffest test ever confronted by American carriers, is unanswerable. The economic facts speak for themselves. National prestige and markets are being lost by the CAB's failure to use the American ship lines' resources and knowledge. Marine News lends its wholehearted and undivided support to the splendid campaign being initiated by the recently former sea-air committee of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., in going on record that "if the CAB persist in not permitting America to use the knowledge and experience of our ship operators, it becomes the responsibility of Congress to correct this situation in some appropriate manner."

Indeed, our Congress should go further and abolish ninefold or more Federal Government bureaus actually preventing American industry to function for the great good benefit of the American people—who, after all, pay for the luxury of these bureaus.

Congress should do something about this matter and restore free enterprise in the United States, that which made our Nation the greatest on earth. Would our Yankee forefathers have wrested the control of the seas from Britannia with their "freedom of the seas" sailing of the great clipper ships, had they been obligated to get clearance papers from some Washington bureau? Think it over.

CONGRESS TAKES A STEP AHEAD—A TRANSPORTATION INVESTIGATION

Modest as appropriations go—penurious, to say the least, or most—the House of Representatives has just approved an expenditure not to exceed $35,000 for a much-needed transportation investigation. This pin-money sum for so important an undertaking that cannot get the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce very far, is supposed to provide "an investigation into all phases of transportation, looking toward a coordination of various transportation modes."

Perhaps, however, the committee will recommend, and then Congress make into law the absorption of CAB by the United States Maritime Commission as its Sea-Air Department; and, also, divest the Interstate Commerce Commission of all powers having to do with the inter- and intra-coastal operations of American shipping as well as America's inland waterways, placing these, too, under the Maritime Commission—and then strengthen the United States Maritime Commission by making it a Government department with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet? Indeed, the world-wide importance of American private shipping and the vital part it plays in time of war raises its Federal governmental control to the same status as the Army and Navy. In view of the lessons we should have learned from our all-out participation in two World Wars within a quarter of a century, the American people, the taxpayers and buyers of war bonds, would like to see a separate Department of Merchant Marine and Aviation and a Secretary of the same in the President's Cabinet.

Central Valley Project, California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the courageous candidate for Governor of California, the Honorable Robert W. Kenny, present attorney general of the State of California, has taken a forthright stand on the development of the Central Valley's project in California.

"Bob" Kenny is conscious of the economic value of this project and that an over-all plan for the development of the Central Valley is essential if maximum benefits are to accrue to all of the people in the northern California economic area.

I am in receipt of a telegram from Mr. Kenny, dated April 14, 1946, originating in Berkeley, Calif., in which he frankly defines his position on this important issue. His telegram reads as follows:

For your information in connection with the conference report on the appropriation to the Army engineers which will come up in the Congress this week. I understand that the Kings River Dam in the California Central Valley project may be initiated and the money will be made available without full application of the reclamation law regarding land speculation and traditional limitation on acreage. This is to notify you that the Democratic Party in California, all endorsed candidates on the State ticket, including both candidates for United States Senator, the candidate for lieutenant governor, for attorney general, as well as my campaign as candidate for governor will make the restrictions of the reclamation law a major issue.

The so-called Pine Flat Dam will benefit a monopoly of six landholders owning 44 percent of all irrigable land under this one dam. California may have 1,000,000 unemployed before the end of this year. We oppose this abandonment of the Reclamation Act. Restrictions which will make war veterans and war workers be victims of unjustified land inflation when they seek settlement on land, brought under water, provided by the taxpayers of this Nation. The Democratic Party in California is 100 percent behind the President in the position he took in his letter dated March 13. We are going to put this issue squarely before the people of California in this campaign. Please continue to fight with your great heart to see that the small farmer can get some land in California at reasonable value, because he will be buying a foreclosure if he tries to buck further land inflation.

Social Security for California and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in response to many requests from citizens in every section of California I am offering a brief statement of my ideas on social security and old-age assistance. It seems only reasonable that a candidate for the high office of United States Senator should be definite and clear on all questions and especially on the broad question of social security. The fact that I have fought for broader and better social laws ever since I first entered public life is pleasant in retrospect, but the public sometimes forgets. It is not what I believed as a State legislator or as Lieutenant Governor of California that is so important today as what I believe, now that I have been in the Congress and studied national legislation at first hand. So I will try to bring it right up to date.

I am in favor of the changes recommended by the Federal Administrator, Dr. Altmeyer. He recently appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and gave an extensive review of the whole set-up of the Social Security Act. But, as a Californian, I am proud to note that we have already taken steps that put us in advance of the Federal laws. We feel that the only way in which the deserving citizens of California can be given more liberal treatment is by urging the Congress to make improvements. I favor the immediate reduction of the age for old-age assistance to 60 years. I favor the national abolition of the obnoxious law that compels responsible relatives to contribute to the support of those seeking old-age assistance. I favor lifting the restrictions on earnings of those who are recipients of assistance. I am for liberalizing all features of the present laws that in any way restrict the freedom of the old folks in the proper enjoyment of the assistance now accorded them or that will be given them in the future.

I feel that there should be no difference in the rules of administration in the different counties of the State. I am in favor of a national welfare law that will take care of citizens moving from one State to another. By such a law, the citizens would not be a burden on the State to which they have just moved, but while they were getting their citizenship in the new State adjusted they would be provided for. As to the amount now being granted to elderly citizens, it is inadequate and should be increased substantially in order to meet the advancing costs of living. I favor Federal participation, of course.

There is one group that has been woefully neglected through the years. I refer to the blind. Thanks to the Federal Government there is a new machinery set-up that can function in every State of the Union. Thousands of blind persons in California are not yet being given the advantages that this new law offers. As Congressman I have done my best to broaden the coverage and as Senator I will continue my efforts. I favor all of the present rehabilitation programs that are already in effect and that are now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee. Summed up, I am in favor of social security and social progress, not merely as high-sounding theories of government, but as practical and humane efforts to get to the largest possible number of our citizens the happiness that our forefathers said is the just due of every citizen who conforms to the law and tries to be a good member of society.

UNRRA Relief Should Help All People in Europe and Occupied Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following statement made by Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, on March 26, 1946, while attending the fourth session of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Council meeting in Atlantic City. This thorough and concise presentation of the Hebrew relief problem in Europe today is worthy of study by the Members of this body. For, while these people have no recognized representatives of their own to speak for them, they do have a few men like Peter Bergson who are fighting for their recognition and they do have thousands of American friends and supporters who back up their right for help from all the United Nations agencies. I am proud to count myself as one of those Americans who under the leadership of Senator Guy M. Gillette are working in the American League for a Free Palestine to see that these people receive the justice they deserve.

Permit me, in introduction, first to say a few words as to the structure and purposes of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation. The Hebrew Committee is a temporary authority of the Hebrew Nation. It seeks to represent their interests on a governmental level in a manner similar to the efforts of the French, Greek, Polish, and Yugoslav Committees of Liberation that existed during the war.

The long and unique history of the Hebrews has created a great deal of confusion as to our position in the world. Actually, it can be normalized. We are a nation seeking a free and sovereign life in Palestine which has been our country from time immemorial. Our total national population today is probably around two and one-half to three million people who are scattered in Europe, Palestine, and the Middle East; all of whom would have been in Palestine today if external forces had not prevented them from doing so. If you realize, therefore, that there are people of Hebrew ancestry and of the Jewish faith all over the world who belong to other nations then it can clearly be seen that they are not part of the Hebrew nation, since one cannot, and does not, simultaneously belong to two nations.

Here in America, for example, there are more than 5,000,000 Americans of Hebrew descent, and our position thus becomes very similar to the Irish, whose total national population in Ireland is 3,000,000, and the number of Americans of Irish descent are estimated at at least 16,000,000. There is, thus, a popular distinction between the term "Jew" and the term "Hebrew." A Jew can be an American, Englishman, Brazilian, etc., while a Hebrew is a member of the Hebrew nation and is synonymous to Palestinian. Hebrews today are the people often referred to as "stateless Jews," "refugees," "persecuted people," etc.

It is unfortunate and unfair to persist in ignoring the specific identity and status of the Hebrew people. Millions of us have died, not because we were Germans or Rumanians or Hungarians—even Poles or Czechoslovaks—but because we were Hebrews. The Hebrew nationality in Europe has been recognized under the Versailles Treaty, it has been recognized in the granting of minority status by all the central and eastern European countries after the last war. It exists de facto today in each of these European countries. It exists in the Allied zones of occupation where specific camps for Hebrew people had to be set up. This reality, these facts, must be recognized by the UNRRA Council as they will have to be recognized by the UNO if a positive solution to the Hebrew problem in Europe is to be achieved.

The Hebrews are a nationality just as the Poles, the Yugoslavs, or the Ukrainians are. Their national territory is, and has been from time immemorial, Palestine. There are Hebrew displaced persons in Europe just as there are Polish, Yugoslavs, and Ukrainian displaced persons. There is indeed a difference between Hebrew displaced persons and other displaced persons and this is that whereas large numbers of the Poles and Yugoslavs, et cetera, refuse to return to their homelands, the Hebrew displaced persons are eager and determined to a man to return to their country—Palestine. They are, in effect, Palestinian displaced persons. For months now the UNRRA has kept close to 100,000 of them in camps. The millions of dollars spent on the upkeep of these camps could have been saved if Britain had not blocked the entry of these people into Palestine months ago. Such as the compliance with President Truman's similar request eight months ago.

For the past 10 days a delegation of the Hebrew Committee has been attending the present session of the UNRRA and has endeavored to secure the extension of adequate UNRRA relief to the uprooted Hebrews of Europe and the admittance of the Hebrew nation to membership on the UNRRA. The delegation conferred with the delegates of many participating nations and with the help of some of them its proposals were brought

up for discussion in the council committees and at the plenary session.

At its eleventh plenary session on March 23 the UNRRA Council adopted a report of the General Committee which rejected the application by the Hebrew Committee for a seat at the UNRRA Council to represent the interests of the Hebrew nation. It also rejected the request of the Hebrew Committee to pass a resolution which would make all uprooted Hebrews eligible to UNRRA relief and which would set up a specific UNRRA mission with an adequate budget to carry out such relief operations.

The General Committee report denied the membership request because it maintained that the Hebrew Committee was not a recognized government or authority within the meaning of article 2 of the agreement. As to the second proposal, the report stated that resolutions previously passed by the Council had authorized the Administration to carry out such relief operations. This was supplemented by a statement made on this point by Director General Lehman in which he reiterated the responsibility of the UNRRA to extend relief to the Hebrew people in Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria and stated that the reason this was not done until now was due to the refusal of the Allied Control Council to permit UNRRA operations in these countries. Mr. Lehman made a strong public appeal to the governments represented on the Allied Control Council to remedy this situation.

The Hebrew Committee wishes to express its gratification upon Mr. Lehman's frank statement. That statement, while it shifted the responsibility from UNRRA, in effect confirmed the assertions of the Hebrew Committee that no relief whatsoever has been given to close to 1,000,000 of the surviving Hebrews of Europe, though they have been entitled to receive it under UNRRA resolutions.

While pleased with the progress made by having secured the reaffirmation of UNRRA's responsibilities toward the Hebrew people, the Hebrew Committee wishes to express its disappointment on the decision of the general committee to deny membership on the UNRRA to the Hebrew nation and its failure to have recommended the setting up of a special mission to deal with the problems of relief for the Hebrew people.

As long as no specific machinery is established within the UNRRA to carry out relief operations amongst the Hebrews of Europe, these long-suffering people—their nation having been denied membership in the UNRRA—will continue to be ignored and forgotten, continue to die of starvation and disease, as hundreds of them are now dying daily.

In order to help overcome the difficulties with the Allied Control Council, of which the Hebrew Committee was previously informed, it had cabled on March 8, 1946, Generals Susaikov and Birousov, the Russian chairmen of the Allied Control Council in Bucharest, in Sofia.

Following the public appeal made by Director General Lehman at the Plenary Session to the American, Russian, and British Governments, who comprise the Control Council, the Hebrew Committee immediately addressed communications to the representatives of those three countries attending the UNRRA Council meeting, Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton, Mr. N. I. Feonov, and British Secretary of State Noel-Baker, requesting that they "announce to the Council session that your government favors the extension of UNRRA relief to the Hebrew people in Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria and that your representatives on the Control Council will be instructed to secure a speedy agreement between the Control Council and the UNRRA for the carrying out of these operations." The communication to the Soviet representatives stressed the specific responsibility of the Soviet Union in this matter, its representative being the chairman and the dominant member of the Allied Control Council.

Not having been admitted to UNRRA membership, the Hebrew Committee wishes to make public its views concerning the problem of displaced persons. On the general problem the Hebrew Committee is in complete accord with the outline contained in the proposed resolution which was offered this morning by the representatives of the United States. It contains an effective solution to a complex problem.

It particularly welcomed the assertion of the United States representative, Col. C. Tyler Wood, that UNRRA funds or other international funds will have to be secured to finance the cost of the repatriation of displaced persons which we feel confident will not exclude the repatriation of the Hebrews to Palestine.

Food Rationing for Relief of Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recent developments have greatly strengthened the case which I made when I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 140 for our rationing those food commodities of which there is a world-wide shortage in order to reduce the famine abroad. First, it is becoming apparent that the famine will not be over in 90 days but will instead, as virtually all authorities agree, continue on into next year. Secondly, the great mass of the American people are now aware of the fact that tens of millions are actually facing death and are willing to make the necessary slight sacrifices in order to help. This is shown by the Gallup poll, by the resolutions in favor of resuming rationing which were passed yesterday by the Federal Council of Churches and the PAC, and by the votes of many meetings and organizations throughout the country. In my judgment, we should act before it is too late, for every day of delay means the loss of human lives.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—The Case for Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a communiqué from the Government of Argentina has recently reached the desk of the Members of Congress which I have taken the liberty to condense and present herewith:

BUENOS AIRES, *March 29, 1946.*

SIR: I have the honor to address Your Excellency expressing to your Government the point of view of the Argentine Government with regard to the declarations contained in the document known as the Blue Book, published by the Department of State of Washington on February 12 last.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Blue Book has come as a disagreeable surprise for the people and Government of Argentina. The document accused the present Government of the Republic of being inspired by totalitarian ideologies and guided by a spirit of military aggressiveness dangerous to the peoples of the Continent and, most especially, to the neighboring countries.

The publication of the Blue Book constitutes a unique case in the diplomatic annals of the Continent, it offends the best practices of international law. This document appeared at the time of convocation to elections, in which the people voted on February 24 with liberty and under conditions publicly recognized as being completely clean by all the political parties participating.

The publication of the Blue Book, by reason of the time of its appearance and of the political attack it contains, as cruel as it is unjustified, is a lamentable interference in the internal political affairs of Argentina.

The Argentine Nation has always adopted its decisions with absolute sovereignty. Foreign pressure has never influenced our policy; and even those who disagreed with and vigorously opposed the policy of neutrality which they believed to be mistaken, both during the previous war and during the present one, never have had cause to doubt the patriotism of the members of the Government who believed that neutrality was the best policy for the interests and the political welfare of the Nation.

In the last 25 years the world has witnessed the clash of ideological conceptions. The forces which upheld these ideologies looked for their universal expansion. These doctrines touched and affected even the most long-standing democracies. Our country, by reason of its spiritual and material contact with the nations of Europe, could not remain impervious to events.

Totalitarian theories have not been able to serve as inspiration for a people like our own, which was born to independence with sentiments of equality, liberty, and fraternity and with an intuitive democratic vocation.

It would also be ridiculous to deny the existence of Nazi espionage, which has existed in Argentina just as it has existed in all the countries of America and the world.

It is really amazing that the Blue Book should reproach Argentina because this kind of activity took place in her territory during the war period, as if it were an exclusively Argentine case and had not unfortunately occurred all over the world.

Argentina does not desire any hegemony in America, nor does she wish to form any regional bloc of nations, or any other kind of bloc, to oppose any country of the continent. The mere enunciation of this purpose is an affront to the sister republics, with which we only aspire to strengthen the spiritual and material bonds uniting us to them.

We are, from one extreme of the hemisphere to the other, a community of free nations, but united by common purposes, and we represent in the present times the hope of the rest of humanity. No other continent has afforded mankind a freer, more peaceful, or comfortable standard of living.

To emphasize the importance of the unexpected discovery of Columbus, it was said that Europe stumbled upon America and that the impact contributed to destroy the bulwarks of the feudal system, bringing about the triumph of those noble and just political, moral, juridical, and economic principles which are the salient features of western civilization. It is by reason of this common origin that the heritage and the destiny of America are indivisible. The New World has contributed to the enlightenment of Europe and of its fundamental culture, for it has

been in the great extensions of America that the principles of philosophers and prophets have been experimented and materialized.

The great northern republic has rapidly moved through stages of evolution which in Hispanic-America have yet to be traversed in accordance with our respective racial, spiritual, social and political modalities.

The Argentine Constitution was inspired in its greater part by the American Constitution; but our forefathers of 1853, prudent and wise, took care to adapt our charter to the social medium for which it was intended. For this reason its preamble is an enunciation of purposes.

It is the duty of the strong to be tolerant with the weak. The United States cannot disregard this precept; and the Argentine Government firmly believes that once the causes of a controversy which it is absurd to prolong are eliminated, the continent will once more live in that spirit of harmony and progress which is the result of good neighborhood.

These are, sir, the statements that I make on behalf of the Argentine Government, in face of the publication of the Blue Book, at the same time repeating its firm purpose to maintain its traditionally pacifist ideals and its unequivocal democratic faith.

I avail myself of this opportunity to greet Your Excellency with my most distinguished consideration.

Black-Out of News in Eastern Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in last Sunday's New York Times magazine section, written by Mr. Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, entitled "The Black-Out of News in Eastern Europe."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLACK-OUT OF NEWS IN EASTERN EUROPE

(By Mark Ethridge, publisher, the Louisville Courier-Journal)

One of the great tragic feats in this deeply troubled world is the inability of peoples, as distinguished from governments, to communicate directly with each other. There are, indeed, the common languages of the arts and sciences. Peoples do speak to each other through music, the theater, and certain forms of literature but, between the United States and eastern Europe, which so desperately ought to know and understand each other, the communication ends exactly at the point where it is most needed at the moment: on the political level.

The easiest means of communication between peoples is, of course, the press of their countries. Unfortunately, in the present world tension the press is unable to perform the vital function which might greatly help the cause of peace. Worse, the use to which the press is being put, particularly in eastern Europe, tends to increase rather than to diminish the tensions and to distort the American position and the feeling of the American people. The brief short-wave broadcasts which we beam to that part of the world and the mimeographed bulletins in the reading rooms of American chancelleries may give some few people an idea of what we have really said and what we really mean, but they do not in any respect serve the purpose which could be served by a full and free interchange of news between press associations and newspapers of the two hemispheres.

As Edwin L. James, managing editor of the New York Times, pointed out in a recent article, the primary difficulty is the difference in approach, in the United States and in Russia, to what the function of the press should be. Since the Russian pattern, with variations, obtains in almost all eastern European countries, with the exception of Greece, it is that pattern with which we must compare ours to understand the difficulties.

No matter how much newspapermen in America may argue among themselves over the meaning of freedom of the press as guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, there are fundamental concepts upon which they agree. Certainly there is overwhelming agreement upon the idea that freedom of the press is not a right of publishers but of the people; an essential right asserted over the objection of Alexander Hamilton and others because the people considered it necessary to the preservation of the kind of government they wanted. It is significant at the moment that one of Hamilton's arguments was that the people's political representatives at Washington could keep them well informed about what was going on. It was the very mistrust of having the politicians tell them what they should know that stimulated inclusion of the press guaranty.

American papers have been shaped, on the whole, to that idea. The American press is not the creature or the organ of government, and it is so sensitive to Government restrictions of any kind that it waged war on NRA proposals touching newspapers and even during the period of World War II operated under a code of censorship that was voluntary.

Nor are American newspapers the organs of parties. Some of them have been, and some of them have had long and continuing allegiance to organized political parties, but no major American newspaper that I know of is now financed by a party or a politician. They are on the whole the organs and voices of individuals, who exercise not only the guaranty of a free press but frequently strain the laws of libel in dealing with public officials. Nobody gets shot or hauled up before a Government tribunal for saying a Cabinet officer is a crook or the President is a liar. That fierce individualism which makes the businessman repeat over and over clichés about free enterprise has its reflection in the American press.

The Russian press as it now exists grew out of and operates under totally different concept, a concept as different as our ideologies, if that is possible. As Mr. James pointed out in his piece, the press in Russia is an instrument of government, making no pretense to the printing of news as such. Its function, as the Russian Kuzmichev, said, is "in educating the great mass of workers, in organizing them under the exclusive direction of the party for clearly defined tasks." "Information," he said, "is the means of class struggle, not a mirror to reflect events objectively." The news services are state owned and heavily censored, so that what the reader gets about what his own government is doing has been strained through a fine netting of ideology.

There are, of course, no opposition papers in Russia, but in those parts of eastern Europe where they do exist, or where there are papers that call themselves neutral, the rigid control of news sources is implemented by indirect methods of restriction on newsprint, which is generally a government monopoly, refusal of trade-union workers to publish or distribute opposition papers, suspension of newspapers by government decree, and arrest of editors and their assistants on harrying charges or without charges.

Beyond any direct or indirect methods, however, there is a restraint on the press which is generally quite as effective as censorship or decrees. That is the fear of editors that they will overstep restrictions imposed upon their discussion—a fear which causes most of the newspapers inclined to print news or criticism unfavorable to one of the Big Three to kill the news or the editorial. The hope that liberal editors of eastern Europe nurtured through the war—that they might again, after more than a decade of dictatorships and Nazi censors, say what they thought—has turned to ashes. They have found that liberation has brought tyrannies no less effective than those they knew under the Nazis.

Nowhere in eastern Europe are there newspapers in the sense in which the American reader understands them. Almost all of them are party organs and most of them are merely propaganda sheets, carrying very little domestic news and less foreign news—with that generally slanted. In Bulgaria, for instance (and it is true in other countries) an individual cannot establish a newspaper; nor can a political party be recognized as a juridical personality unless it has a party organ. The two go hand in hand; consequently the reader, in an effort to get at the truth, must pay his money for a great many newspapers and make up his mind about what is the truth.

Between the censorship of incoming material and the requirement that a newspaper must be the organ of a party, there is little chance for the reader to get objective news of any sort. On the contrary, what he has been getting in eastern Europe recently has been heavily slanted against the Western powers.

Censorship restrictions on our correspondents in occupied countries have been lifted somewhat in recent months. But our primary concern in trying to arrive at an understanding with the Russians, the Rumanians, the Bulgarians, and the Yugoslavs is not what we get out of those countries, which is, of course, important, and generally well done by American correspondents, but what is not allowed to go in. The people of eastern Europe get an entirely distorted picture of America and American foreign policy because their newspapers cannot give them any other kind.

Since the Churchill incident is freshest in our minds, it may be used to illustrate the point.

Almost all American newspapers printed Pravda's and Stalin's blast at Churchill. Some of them even printed Stalin's speech in full. But what the Russians know about Churchill's speech is by reflection; they have not been able to read it. It is not necessary to defend Churchill's Fulton (Mo.) speech to say that it has been given to the Russians through their own propaganda agency rather than from his pen.

The Rumanian people have no more idea of what he said than the Russians have. A Reuter dispatch from Bucharest said that Rumanian censors (who operate under the Allied Control Commission, which is actually Russian control in that country) prohibited publication of reports of Churchill's speech except for a four-line reference to his support of an extension to 50 years of the British-Soviet alliance.

Brooks Atkinson reported from Moscow, during the London meeting of the UN, that every newspaper in Moscow handled the story of the Vishinsky-Bevin debate in exactly the same way—four columns for Vishinsky, one-third of a column for Bevin. We in America know what Churchill said, what Stalin said, what Vishinsky said and Bevin said, but the 250,000,000 and more peoples in eastern Europe have a completely one-sided picture of the argument between Britain and Russia.

Nor has America come out any better in the deal. When we recognized the Tito government, the document of recognition contained in addition some unkind words about Tito's methods. That was eliminated from all Yugoslav papers. Only by radio, or by a mimeographed reproduction of the American note that was put on the bulletin board at the American Embassy and distributed to 3,500 Serbs and Croats who asked for it, was American policy toward that country made clear at all. An employee of the American Ministry, of Yugoslav descent, was hauled up before the police in connection with the distribution. The people of Yugoslavia generally still do not know, and will never find out from their controlled press, that we are not too fond of Tito's methods of repression.

The same thing happened in Rumania. When we wrote a note to Rumania setting out our willingness to receive a political representative, the recognition was coupled with a statement of the conditions under which we did so. The stipulations were connected with freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, free elections, and other matters which honored our Yalta pledge. Yet, unless the Rumanian people have found it out by short-wave radio or by some other means, all they know is that, regardless and heedless of our Yalta pledge, we have recognized a government that has been oppressive and repressive of all their civil rights. The black-out could certainly give rise to the feeling in Rumania that America has reneged upon all her promises, particularly upon the Atlantic Charter.

In Yugoslavia the Russian press pattern has reached its full flowering. Article I of the Yugoslav press law has a grandiloquent preamble which says, "No one can be prevented from freely expressing his views through the press," but on the tail end of the sentence there is this phrase, "except in cases foreseen by this law." The Yugoslav press dictator had a long foresight; 27 subsequent articles outline the restrictions under which any newspaper could be seized and the editor tried for treason.

The editor of Demokratija, an opposition paper, apparently took the first article of the press law seriously. His edition of November 7, 1945, on the eve of the election, was confiscated "for spreading false and alarming news that threatened the Government and the national interest." He protested by open letter. The courts upheld the Government. On November 14 the printers' union refused to print the paper any more because of "its calumnies * * * and for insolently attacking our United Syndicates." (Printers' strikes in the Balkans to prevent publication of criticism of Communist-dominated governments are not a rarity; I witnessed one in Bulgaria and knew of others.)

That part of the Yugoslav press which is free to operate concentrates upon attacking the American press, playing up American labor troubles without any explanation of what they are about, and printing stories and articles critical of American foreign policy. Freedom of the press in this country is brushed off in Borba, for instance, in this way: "Only the wealthy own newspapers in America and only capitalists enjoy freedom of the press."

American correspondents intent upon doing a conscientious job of reporting Yugoslavia to us hardly enjoy their freedom to move around and read the distorted news about and attacks upon their own country.

Communist Yugoslavia in eastern Europe, Fascist Spain, and dictator-ridden Portugal in western Europe are not far apart in their control of fractious editors, in their distortion of news, or in their attempts to discredit democracy. (Portugal's press was recently forbidden by censors to carry Stalin's conciliatory statement.)

The situation is somewhat better in Rumania, although 2 or 3 months after the Groza government came in all independent and so-called Historic Party press had been suppressed, including a 105-year-old Transylvania newspaper that had survived the tyranny of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Nazis, and the Rumanian dictators. Under the Moscow agreement, the Rumanian Government was to allow freedom of the press, as well as freedom of political assembly. I understand there has been some improvement, but newsprint is still a Government monopoly dependent upon Russia's supply. When I was in Bucharest newspapermen told me that the Communist organ had received a supply beyond what it could use and financed itself by selling to other newspapers on the black market. Editors were being arrested when I was in Bucharest.

Rumania's neighbor, Bulgaria, benefited from a protest made by the American Government. We protested elections called for August of last year on the ground that there was no freedom from fear and that the opposition had no press and no sanction for political activity. The Government allowed three opposition papers to come into being. Two of them are quite vigorous. One of them, the organ of Nicola Petkov, leader of the Agrarian Party, was vicious and slashing in its opposition. When Lulchev, leader of the Socialists, undertook to be equally vigorous recently, his paper was suspended for 10 days and he was put in jail. The organ of the Democrats was struck by the printers while I was in Sofia because of an editorial it proposed to carry. The Bulgarians have a strong sense of individualism and appreciate the fact that they can, at least, read opposition editorials even if they do not get too much news.

The Hungarian, Czech, and Austrian papers may be classed as a good deal freer than but quite as nervous as papers in their neighboring countries. In fact, President Karl Renner only recently urged the Austrian papers to speak out, with this reassurance, "I assume that the occupying powers will not make difficulties for our press when things are discussed openly on which it is now silent."

An illustration of the nervousness of the Hungarian press, where suspensions occurred in two cases recently and others threatened, may be found in what happened to a sentence in President Truman's report on Potsdam in August of last year. At one place he said, "It was reaffirmed in the Berlin declarations on Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary that these nations are not to be spheres of influence of any one power."

Nothing could have been more interesting or important to Hungarians. Some of them heard it on the radio from London, but the news agency which monitored the complete speech was ordered to suppress that paragraph and include it only in a confidential bulletin. After the entire speech had been released through official channels, a number of Hungarian papers picked it up and published the speech without deletion. There was no idea that the prohibition was sponsored by outside political forces; it arose out of the Hungarian Government's nervousness over offending Russia as the occupying country.

In Czechoslovakia, where the papers are party or state-wide organization organs, they can and do attack local situations and conditions, but they are expected to stay within decent limits and not abuse their freedom, conditions to which they subscribe to the point of innocuity. There may be noted, however, a cautious spreading of the wings.

Greece enjoys the freest press in southeastern Europe, according to all reports. The Government has consistently permitted the Communists to publish their papers, although immediately after the civil war there was a certain amount of smashing of presses and other trouble. The editor of the leading Communist paper was one of the accredited Greek correspondents at San Francisco and the Greek Government facilitated his trip. His viewpoint was freely presented. Official news organs, as well as the radio, as is common in all Balkan countries, present only the Government point of view.

Not even in Greece, however, is there any free press in the sense that we know it. Whether there is any "iron curtain" in that part of the world or not, there is certainly a black-out of honest news from America that should be a matter of serious concern to us. Peoples that we so recently helped to liberate get a caricature of us, not a picture. It is generally the caricature of a rich, fat cat fighting the battle of the capitalist, imperialistic world.

Naturally, the question arises: What to do about the situation? There are several things that suggest themselves.

Under the Yalta Declaration, the United States Government can continue to insist, as it has insisted in Bulgaria and Rumania, that a condition precedent to recognition of the Government of a conquered or satellite country is that no election even relatively free can be held unless freedom is granted the opposition to have a press. It will be most difficult for the Bulgarian Government, for instance, to revoke the measure of freedom which it has given the opposition without endangering the Government itself or admitting its completely totalitarian character. The occupied countries want peace treaties and they want occupation troops removed. If we insist that the Governments of those countries shall also give the opposition freedom in their press, we can greatly help, as we have already helped in small measure.

It is utopian to hope that the United Nations will be able to adopt at any time in the near future an international code setting up standards for the press similar to those outlined, for instance, under the International Labor Organization, but the difficulty of achieving that goal should not make us despair of doing something about the world-wide exchange of information. Mr. Stettinius has demonstrated an interest in proposals looking toward that freer exchange.

The State Department can, it seems to me, become more exercised about the situation than it is. It has a good many diplomatic weapons to achieve a quid pro quo basis for the freedom of movement of correspondents, for the exchange of news, particularly official texts, and so forth, magazines, books, and movies. It is not a question of propaganda; it is a question of recognizing that the peoples of the world can never achieve a lasting peace upon the basis of suppression of facts, distortion, and plain lying by their Governments.

The recent report by Lewellyn White and Robert D. Lee, of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, points the way to practical measures which can be taken by the State Department through diplomatic channels. In the meantime, radio is perhaps the most effective outlet America has. To my mind, the Associated Press directors have made a most serious and shortsighted mistake in denying AP news to the Government for short-wave broadcasting. The policy is actually harmful to American interests. It is certainly a fact to which I can testify that the peoples of Rumania and Bulgaria with whom I talked trust American news above all other news because they feel that we have less selfish interest territorially and politically than any other power. They do not regard our news broadcasts as propaganda; most of them believe them more than they do the distorted, slanted news of their own Governments.

The publishers of the United States who control the Associated Press actually have in their hands a vital instrument in making not only our foreign policy but our domestic policies understood. They do great damage as long as they refuse to allow the State Department to broadcast AP news; as long as they refuse even to consider an arrangement that would meet their objections. The directors

of the Associated Press are shortsighted beyond words if they think that without the help of the American Government they can get their news behind the curtain; if they think that without stimulating the desire for American news through the medium of radio they can persuade the governments that control their press to print more—and truer—American news.

Potash and Other Fertilizers in Food Production In Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Emil Truog, chairman of the Department of Soils, University of Wisconsin, enclosing a statement prepared by Mr. Truog entitled "Fertilizers, Particularly Potash, in Relation to Food Production in Wisconsin." I ask unanimous consent that the letter and statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, April 11, 1946.

To Wisconsin Members of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: With each passing day the food situation "worsens." Fertilizers are raw materials out of which foods are manufactured by our crop plants. That is why any program for increased food production should start with a program of fertilizer allocation or use which is geared to maximum food production. That is what they did during the war in the British Isles where they doubled food production. In this country, fertilizer was allocated on an historical basis during the war, and reports being received are to the effect that an effort is being made by some to continue this policy. Such a policy, particularly as regards potash fertilizer, is not at all fair to Wisconsin farmers and is not in the interest of maximum production of basic foods. A rather detailed statement of the matter in relation to food production and agriculture in Wisconsin is inclosed. I thought you might like to have this information.

Respectfully submitted,

E. TRUOG, *Chairman.*

FERTILIZERS, PARTICULARLY POTASH, IN RELATION TO FOOD PRODUCTION IN WISCONSIN

(Statement by Emil Truog, chairman, department of soils, University of Wisconsin, April 11, 1946)

Although the supply of each of the three main fertilizer elements—nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium—has been short at times during war years, the shortage of potassium commonly referred to as potash, has been the most serious in recent years. During the war, fertilizers were allocated on an historical basis, rather than on a basis which would assure maximum food production. As a result, a very large share of the fertilizer stocks were used for the fertilization of cotton which had already been overproduced so that enormous surpluses were on hand, while food production in the Middle West, where a vast bulk of the Nation's basic food is produced, was seriously curtailed by the lack of fertilizer. In the British Isles, fertilizer was not allocated on an historical basis but rather on the basis of maximum food production as determined by soil tests and the best factual evidence available as regards soil conditions and crop needs. That is one reason why Britain's food production was doubled during the war.

Now we are faced with a serious food shortage, partly because of a shortsighted fertilizer-allocation policy during the war. As if that were not enough, it is now reported that it is proposed to continue this same fertilizer-allocation policy. Continuance of such a policy will greatly hinder maximum food production in Wisconsin, and also other States of the Middle West, which are often rightly referred to as the "bread basket" of the country. A few data to illustrate Wisconsin's position and importance in the food picture follow:

Wisconsin's production of the Nation's total of a number of critical or so-called health-protective foods

[Data furnished by Walter H. Ebling, agricultural statistician for Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and U. S. Department of Agriculture]

	Year	Percent of United States total
Dairy products:		
Cheese	1941	50
Evaporated milk products—condensed, powdered, etc.	1941	28
Butter	1941	9
Dried casein	1941	25
Milk, total before processing	1941	12
Weighted average of all processed or manufactured milk products	1941	18
Canning and truck crops:		
Canning peas	1942	32
Canning corn	1942	11
Canning beets	1942	31
Cabbage	1942	8
Snap beans for canning	1942	10

In addition to the above, Wisconsin, of course, produces notable amounts of other food crops and food products.

It will be noted that Wisconsin produces a strikingly high portion of the Nation's total of some of the most critical foods. Wisconsin leads all States in the production of dairy products and canning vegetables. It will be noted that the data given are for 1941 and 1942; data for more recent years are still in line with these, and if at variance, are probably in the direction of further emphasizing Wisconsin's important position as a food producer. Information regarding the relation of potash fertilizer to the production of these foods follows.

DAIRY AND TRUCK FARMING EXHAUST POTASH SUPPLIES RAPIDLY

Contrary to general belief, dairy farming may exhaust the potash supplies of soils more rapidly than grain farming. In the case of corn and the small grains, about three-fourths of the potash is in the stalks and straw, respectively. Consequently in grain farming as now practiced, about three-fourths of the potash taken up by the crops is automatically left on or returned to the soil.

In dairy farming much of the corn (both stalks and ears) goes into the silo. On being fed to cows, about two-thirds of the potash is excreted in the urine and is easily lost. Even the potash in the solid excrement is water soluble and is easily lost. As a result, usually less than one-half of the potash removed by silage corn is returned to the soil in the form of manure. In Wisconsin about 50 percent of the corn goes into the silo. The State makes about 25 percent of the Nation's corn silage.

Also, in dairy farming, large acreages of hay, particularly legumes are grown for feed. (Wisconsin leads the Nation in tonnage of hay produced.) Legumes are potash loving, that is, they use exceptionally large amounts of potash; thus, it takes about 75 pounds of muriate of potash to supply what there is in 1 ton of alfalfa hay. Here, as in the case of silage corn, usually, not more than one-half of the potash in the hay is returned to the soil in the form of manure.

Then, the truck crops, such as canning peas, cabbage, and canning beets, of whose production Wisconsin leads the Nation, all remove unusually large amounts of potash from the soil.

Thus, it is seen that because of the type of agriculture practiced in Wisconsin, the annual drain or loss of potash per acre of cropped land in this State is very heavy.

LARGE AREAS OF LAND IN WISCONSIN WERE NATURALLY LOW IN AVAILABLE POTASH

It is sometimes assumed that much of the farm land in Wisconsin is comparatively new, and hence, should still contain a good natural supply of available potash. Unfortunately, this is not true. In fact, it is in the extensive new dairy sections of north central and western Wisconsin that the supplies of available soil potash are the lowest. This was discovered to our surprise when the State-wide soil-testing program got in full swing several years ago. It is now known that even in the virgin condition, the supplies of available potash in the soils of these sections were extremely low. Thus, just when many of the older soils of the State began to show a serious lack of potash, the newer ones did so also. The results of tests of over 300,000 soil samples collected in all parts of the State during the past few years show that 54 percent of the cropland in Wisconsin is definitely in need of potash fertilizer.

WHY RATIONING OF POTASH FERTILIZER ON A HISTORICAL BASIS IS UNFAIR TO WISCONSIN

Unfortunately for Wisconsin, the rationing of fertilizers in recent years on an historical basis caught her just at the stage when her fertilizer consumption was going up phenomenally, and she was in a period of establishing what might be considered a normal base or level of usage commensurate with her needs. Beginning about in 1940 the great need of fertilizers in the State was made known generally to farmers and others by means of thousands of soil tests and fertilizer demonstrations which represented all sections of the State. Some 300,000 soil tests have since been made, and these show that of the cropland in Wisconsin, 54 percent needs potash fertilizer; 76 percent, phosphate fertilizer; and 65 percent, lime. Rationing on an historical basis catches Wisconsin at a time when she is suffering from a large accumulated deficit of fertilizer, and is just in the state of establishing a base which might be considered normal or high enough to take care of the situation in a reasonable manner. It is apparent that Wisconsin's position in relation to rationing is different from States in the South and Southeast where a much more normal base as regards needs had been established prior to the war.

HOW MUCH POTASH FERTILIZER DOES WISCONSIN NEED?

In round numbers Wisconsin has 10,000,000 acres of crop or land under plow; since at least 50 percent is in need of potash fertilizer, there are 5,000,000 acres of such land that need this fertilizer. The great bulk of the potash fertilizer used in Wisconsin should be applied when the land (about 30 percent of the cropland annually) goes into small grain and is seeded down to alfalfa, clover, and grass. Thus, 30 percent of 5,000,000 acres or 1,500,000 acres of this land should receive enough potash fertilizer annually to meet the needs of one grain crop and two hay crops

that follow. On the basis of average yields, the one grain crop and two hay crops will remove 160 pounds of potash (K_2O) per acre in the 3 years, and estimating that one-half of this removal will be returned in the form of manure, it leaves a balance of 80 pounds of potash per acre that needs to be supplied as fertilizer. Accordingly, 1,500,000 acres of small grain annually should receive 60,000 tons of potash.

It is also estimated, conservatively, that for the fertilization of 2,000,000 acres of corn and considerable acreages of potatoes, peas, and other truck crops, 20,000 tons of potash are needed annually.

Then, of the 3,000,000 acres of permanent pasture, about one-half plowable, possibly 200,000 acres annually should receive potash fertilizer at a rate of 100 pounds of potash per acre. To do this would require 20,000 tons annually.

Thus, the annual potash requirement of Wisconsin, to balance the soil fertility budget, reaches the grand total of 100,000 tons of potash (K_2O) (60,000+20,000+20,000).

Of course, an annual usage of 100,000 tons of K_2O cannot be hoped for, for some time, because the supplies will not permit it. However, it is reasonable to expect that if the material were available and could be delivered, the farmers would use to good advantage nearly one-half this amount, namely, about 40,000 tons.

PRESENT ALLOCATION OF POTASH TO WISCONSIN IN RELATION TO NATIONAL SUPPLY

At present Wisconsin is getting only a little over 2 percent of the national potash supply. Some States in the South and Southeast are getting 7 to 10 percent of the national supply. If Wisconsin were allocated 40,000 tons of potash, it would represent about 5 percent of the national production. On the basis of much larger allocations in the past to less-important food producing areas, and in view of the present critical food shortage and prospects for its continuance for several years, it would seem to be in the interests of maximum production of basic foods that adjustments be made so that Wisconsin farmers can get much more potash than at present or may be possible under proposed or contemplated allocations.

Right now Wisconsin farmers are clamoring for more potash, while mixers in some areas in the Southeast have such a large supply that was shipped to them from the mines in New Mexico that they are reshipping it in the form of their potash-containing mixture or product through the back door into Wisconsin. This not only shows that present allocations are inequitable, but also that the present policy causes unnecessary transportation, is unfair to the manufacturers in the Wisconsin area, and in addition does not tend to give the Wisconsin farmers the grades or mixtures of fertilizer which they need and will be most effective in food production.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article from the North Platte (Nebr.) Telegraph of the issue of February 28, 1946, which has to do with the British loan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The address by Alfred Edwards, British labor leader and member of Parliament on the Rotary Institute here was not extremely popular with his audience. His appearance in the afternoon at the high-school assembly proved a definite mistake—if he was trying to cultivate a more friendly feeling between Great Britain and the United States. The young people at the high school asked some very intelligent questions—some of the answers they received were not so intelligent. Perhaps, as Mr. Edwards says, Great Britain has never defaulted on a loan to this country; perhaps she has never asked for the $4,000,000,000 appropriation of American money, although she seems to be striving to get it; perhaps our record as a nation is not lily white in some of our dealings with less fortunate races; perhaps the American press, which was scored soundly for misinterpreting facts relative to the British loan, which according to Mr. Edwards is not a loan, does make mistakes; perhaps our Senators and Representatives in Congress don't know what they are talking about when they come out against the proposed loan, which is still not a loan according to Mr. Edwards; perhaps Great Britain can get along without the United States but the United States can never get along without Great Britain, as suggested by Mr. Edwards; perhaps all these things are true, but it is rather bad taste to be told so by a British Parliament member and such expressions certainly do nothing to cement better feeling between Great Britain and the United States, something that is seriously needed today. The entire address reminds us very much of a short story with Mr. Edwards playing the part of son Alfred. The parents were witnessing their son in a military review for the first time and as the company he was in passed the stand, the fond mother turned to dad and exclaimed—"Look, John; everybody is out of step but our son Alfred."

Poland, the Victim of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Poland, the Victim of Appeasement," recently delivered by Attorney Charles Rozmarek, the president of the Polish American Congress, and also the president of the Polish National Alliance, over Station WSPR in Springfield, Mass., and Station WORC in Worcester, Mass.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, we Americans of Polish descent have established our love for America by everything we have done and in particular by our unblemished record of patriotism on both the battle and home fronts. We are not anti-Russian. But we are anti-Nazi, anti-Fascist, and anti-Communist. In plain language—we are pro-American. Unlike Communists who take their orders from a foreign power, we Americans of Polish extraction owe our allegiance only to one country and that country is America.

The forces of evil are on the march. Let us make no mistake about that. The war which was fought to put an end to all aggression and slavery, has merely destroyed nazism. That is all. Freedom is in its death throes not only in Poland but in all countries of Europe and Asia occupied by Russian troops.

If Germany and Russia had been democracies instead of dictatorships this last war would never have taken place. The year 1939 marked not the first but the fourth time in history that these two aggressor nations had partitioned Poland and annexed other countries. History teaches us that for centuries Germany and Russia have been the traditional troublemakers of Europe.

When England and France, to honor their pledge to defend Poland's territorial integrity declared war on Germany, it was Molotov who said: "There is no justification for a war of this kind. It is not only senseless but criminal to wage a war for the destruction of Hitlerism camouflaged as a fight for democracy." Those were Molotov's own words.

During the Hitler-Stalin alliance, when German airplanes, supplied with Russian oil, dropped devastating bombs over Allied countries and Russia seized Eastern Poland, digested the Baltic republics and invaded Finland, all our domestic Communists were pro-Nazi. And they would have continued to be pro-Nazi if Hitler had not decided to grab not only Russia's spoils of war, but Russia herself.

Thus, when Russia, not by deliberate choice, but by accident became a member of the United Nations, what course did the Poles adopt? Not only did they reject all the flattering overtures of Hitler, but they were the first to offer to Russia the hand of friendship. Christianlike, they forgave her for all the trespasses committed against the Polish Nation in the past. But unfortunately historical crimes have a very bad habit of repeating themselves. It wasn't long before the Poles suffered disillusionment, betrayal, and tragedy at the hands of an "ally."

The cruelest of all blows was delivered to Poland at Yalta when she was stripped by the Big Three of one-half of her pre-war territory and a Russian-dominated communist government was imposed on the remaining half. No greater tragedy could befall any nation than the loss of its freedom.

The fate of Poland is without parallel. The country has been supposedly liberated, yet it lacks freedom. The cause for which it was the first to fight has been victorious, yet it has been penalized more than the enemy in defeat. It is supposed to be the shining example of the good faith of the United Nations and yet it has been ignominiously abandoned to a ruthless despoiler in the guise of a savior.

Will Poland, the cradle of European liberty, be the graveyard of world democracy?

This is the big question today, for our fate on this side of the Atlantic is intimately wrapped up with the outcome of the uneven struggle now in progress.

Taking a page from Hitler's book, Stalin has been exploiting through illegal seizures and servile puppet governments, the advantages of his new power to the fullest.

The world has watched with unbelieving eyes the events that have been transpiring at a breath-taking pace. Emboldened by the weak appeasement policy of the United States, Soviet Russia is reaching out for bases in the Mediterranean and in the Pacific; it is angling for a toehold in Persia, Korea, China, Japan, and Africa; it is riding roughshod in the exploitation of overrun countries without even a pretense at consultation with the United States or Great Britain. It is leaving no room for doubt

what its intentions are with respect to its place in the sun.

Thus unwittingly, we have substituted one form of totalitarianism for another and we are in the process of foisting it on an unwilling world. And to rub salt into the wounds, we have been financing the Communist revolution in Europe and in Asia with America's vast resources and with American lend-lease armaments. The poverty of our statesmanship was never more strikingly demonstrated than it has been by developments since 1939.

Our foreign policy was guided exclusively by the principles of shameful submission to Soviet aggression. The surrender to evil was incompatible with Christian behavior and contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

Now the time has come when in sorrow and dismay our statesmen are beginning to realize to what appalling conditions the countries in Russian zones of influence in both Europe and Asia have been reduced, as a direct result of the evil commitments made at Moscow, Tehran, and Yalta.

It is our duty to help our Government to regain what was lost on the diplomatic battlefields under the pressure of wartime expediencies.

The United States must behave like a world power. It is in a position to make demands. It can support these demands by its powerful economic strength, even by the use of economic sanctions if need be. Above all it must remain strong.

We don't want to see the war which started as a crusade for freedom end in slavery.

The United States should demand in no uncertain terms that Russia, in the interests of world peace, abandon its policy of aggression and interference. The immediate evacuation of all Russian troops and the withdrawal of puppet governments from Poland and other friendly countries should be Russia's first contribution to the good-neighbor policy.

To prevent the possibility of another war, it is our sacred obligation to steer our Nation from the wrong to the right path. We want peace not only for our generation but for our children's children. And we know that appeasement of aggression is detrimental to peace.

We must not assist in the strangulation of democracies. Ours is the flag of freedom. Let us always keep it that way.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The British Loan," published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH LOAN

The Senate has begun debate on the most important question in the field of foreign policy which has come before it since the United Nations participation bill. This question is the British loan, on which extensive hearings have been held by a committee, following a careful and prolonged examination of the merits of the whole proposal by administrative officials of the Government. Fortunately there now appears to be in sight votes enough to approve the loan. The chief question is by how large a margin. We hope, for reasons which we shall state, that it will be a smashing margin, sufficient to carry proof in all parts of the world of the continuing close friendship and collaboration between the English-speaking peoples—between a strong United States and a strengthened Britain.

We do not argue for approval of the loan on the familiar ground (of which much will probably be heard during the Senate debate) that by advancing credit to Britain we can develop a profitable export market for American goods. This argument seems to us to be of doubtful value in the light of experience between the two World Wars, when a vast extension of American credit to foreign borrowers was accompanied by a failure on our part to make repayment possible through a lowering of our own tariffs on foreign goods, by which means alone repayment could be made. But there remain two solid arguments for the proposal now before the Senate, either of which would in itself justify its approval.

The first of these is the desirability of speeding the transition from a regime of wartime controls in international trade to more normal conditions under which free enterprise can prosper. A loan to Britain in dollars will greatly facilitate this process. For it is dollars that Britain critically needs. Alone among all nations of the world, Britain fought against Germany and Japan from the day the great war started to the day the last shot was fired. In that long-sustained and exhausting effort the British people sacrificed most of their export trade and the great bulk of their foreign assets—such as British holdings of American securities—under the immense pressure of obtaining funds with which to purchase the weapons of self-defense until lend-lease came to their assistance. The result is that Britain finds herself today severely and even dangerously handicapped by a shortage of foreign currencies (principally dollars) which are needed not for the purpose of carrying on social experiments and labor reforms at home—for that purpose the British Government can use British pounds—but for the purpose of enabling the United Kingdom to carry on the overseas transactions which are of such vital importance both to the British people and to world trade in general. A dollar loan to Britain will greatly help the British Government in carrying out the pledges it has given, in connection with the loan, to remove as rapidly as possible the existing emergency controls over foreign exchange, to abolish the so-called sterling area dollar pool, to abandon discriminatory import restrictions and to reestablish over a large part of the earth's surface conditions under which free enterprise can function. It is manifestly to the interest of the American people, as believers in free enterprise, to achieve these conditions.

The second major argument in favor of the loan rests on political and social, rather than on economic, grounds. It is no secret to the world that we have entered an era of peaceful but none the less genuine and decisive competition between two great rival systems, the one democratic, the other totalitarian. It is no secret that millions of people in many nations are watching the outcome of this competition, in order to determine for themselves under which system there is the greatest yield in terms of human happiness and an advancing standard of living. The British people stand stanchly at our side in championship of every long-established principle of democratic government. It is logical and proper and essential that out of our abundance we should help them face the future with assurance and new strength. An overwhelming vote in Congress in favor of the British loan will be regarded in all parts of the world as a vote of confidence in the future of the democratic system.

Appeal to the Peoples of the World by the Rollins College Conference on World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the statement of the Rollins College conference on world government, together with the names of the signers thereof. In my opinion, this is one of the truly important documents of our time. I only hope its appeal will be heeded.

The statement follows:

ROLLINS COLLEGE CONFERENCE ON WORLD GOVERNMENT, MARCH 11–16, 1946, WINTER PARK, FLA.—AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

THE AIMS OF THE CONFERENCE

(By Carl Van Doren, chairman, drafting committee)

The Rollins College conference on world government, in which the members represented the widest variety of professions and interest, fully and harmoniously agreed on the statement which follows.

It is called an appeal to the peoples of the world, because the conference believed that this should be, not a manifesto, but an appeal; and that it should be addressed, not to officials charged with the execution of tasks already assigned to them, but to the peoples everywhere who desire to move forward out of the present condition of world anarchy into a condition of world law and order.

The appeal first outlines the fundamental agreements on which the conference proceeded in its deliberations. These include the certainty that the atomic bomb has enormously increased the destructiveness of war; the conviction that nations cannot be trusted with the sovereign right to make war on their own terms; and the conclusion that nothing short of world government—constitutional federal government—can preserve the peoples and their liberties.

These ends, the appeal goes on to say, cannot be achieved by the United Nations in its present form, because it is a league of sovereign states bound together by treaty, not by world law. But since the Charter of the United Nations provides for amendments as the need may arise, and since atomic war has made that need immediate, the constructive measures now demanded should, without delay, be undertaken through the necessary amendments to the Charter.

The Rollins College conference therefore proposes what it believes to be the chief and essential objectives of such amendments, leaving to the persons chosen to frame them the right to carry these objectives out through such detailed methods as they shall think most likely to succeed. The minimum requirements, the conference believes, include the transformation of the General Assembly of the United Nations into the legislative branch of a world government responsive to the will of the peoples; the transformation of the Security Council into an executive branch charged with administering and enforcing the laws enacted by the General Assembly; and the creation of independent courts with jurisdiction, and with the support of sufficient police forces, to prohibit or otherwise control the weapons of mass destruction. The powers not dele-

gated to the General Assembly would, of course, be reserved to the member states.

Finally, the Rollins College conference points out that a lasting and responsible world government must be based on a world-wide program of education among the peoples.

AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The atomic bomb and other applications of science and technology to modern warfare have made it so destructive that the outbreak of another major war must be prevented.

Atomic secrets cannot be kept for more than a few years by any nation or small group of nations; nor can there be any adequate military defense against a surprise attack capable of paralyzing the country and peoples attacked.

There can be no absolute guaranty that peace will be maintained as long as any nation has the sovereign right to decide questions of war and peace for itself.

If nations live under the permanent threat of war each sovereign state will inevitably become more and more totalitarian; thus depriving its citizens of more and more personal liberty.

No nation-state can today hope to be strong enough, sovereign enough, to protect its citizens from war. Twice in one generation the United States has been forced to enter a war which the people wished to avoid.

Peace is not merely the absence of war but the presence of justice, of law, of order—in short, of government.

World peace can be created and maintained only under world law universal and strong enough to establish justice and prevent armed conflict between nations.

The only way by which a people can assure its survival and preserve its liberties is to create with the other people a world government—a constitutional federal government—to which shall be delegated the powers necessary to maintain the general peace of the world based on law and justice.

THE ARGUMENT

The United Nations as now constituted is a league of sovereign states. As such, it is not a world government, and therefore cannot by law prevent armed conflict between nations and establish justice and security. Nevertheless, it is the greatest step yet taken by mankind toward world peace. Since the Charter provides for amendments, every effort should be made to transform the United Nations in a world government.

Such objectives cannot, we know, be reached overnight. The difficulty of building support within each nation for a world government is multiplied by the diversity of cultures, governments, and institutions among the nations.

But a start must be made. It must be made now. It must be made with the tools at hand. It must be directed, in the first instance, at the removal of the haunting fear and suspicion with which atomic weapons and weapons of similar destructiveness afflict mankind. The United States has the opportunity and duty to take the lead in proposing such constructive measures as are necessary to that end. It is with these considerations in mind that we make the proposals which follow.

THE OBJECTIVES

We propose that a general conference of the United Nations be called as provided in article 109 of the Charter to draft amendments accomplishing the following objectives:

1. That the United Nations be transformed from a league of sovereign states into a government deriving its specific powers from the peoples of the world.

2. That the general assembly be reconstituted as the legislative branch of the world government, in which the citizens of the member states are represented on an equitable basis.

3. That the general assembly, in addition to its present functions, shall have power:

(a) To make laws prohibiting or otherwise controlling weapons of mass destruction and, so far as necessary for that purpose, regulating the uses of atomic energy.

(b) To make laws providing for such inspection as is necessary or appropriate to the execution of the foregoing powers.

(c) To provide for appropriate civil and criminal sanctions for the laws enacted pursuant to the foregoing powers.

(d) To provide and maintain such police forces as are necessary for law enforcement.

4. That independent judicial tribunals be created with jurisdiction over cases and controversies arising under laws enacted by the General Assembly or involving questions concerning the interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations.

5. That a bill of rights be designed for the protection of persons affected by laws enacted by the General Assembly.

6. That the Security Council be reconstituted as the executive branch of the world government with the power (a) to administer and insure the enforcement of the laws, and (b), under the direction of the General Assembly, to perform its present functions as defined in the Charter.

7. That the powers not delegated to the General Assembly be reserved to the member states.

THE CONCLUSIONS

We believe these to be the minimum requirements necessary for the creation of a world government capable of averting the catastrophe of another war in the atomic era. The present United Nations Charter does not meet these minimum requirements.

The establishment of a world government representative of the peoples of the world must be accompanied by a broad program of mass education and the free exchange of knowledge among them.

Only world government, even in the limited terms here advocated, can bring the peace in which the people can mature to the full responsibility by which they can realize their destiny as freemen.

SIGNERS OF THE APPEAL

S. K. Allison, chairman, Institute of Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago.

Ray Stannard Baker, official biographer of Woodrow Wilson.

JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota.

Charles G. Bolte, chairman, the American Veterans Committee, Inc.

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO.

William O Douglas, associte justice, Supreme Court of the United States.

Albert Einstein, theoretical physicist, Princeton, N. J.

Brooks Emeny, president, Council on World Affairs, Cleveland.

Robert M. Gaylord, chairman of the executive committee, National Association of Manufacturers.

CARL A. HATCH, United States Senator from New Mexico.

W. T. Holliday, president, Standard Oil Co. of Ohio.

George C. Holt, director, Rollins College Conference on World Government.

Hamilton Holt, president, Rollins College.

Frank A. Juhan, chancellor, University of the South, bishop of Florida.

CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Member of Congress from Indiana.

Louis L. Mann, rabbi, Sinai Congregation, Chicago.

Alexander Meiklejohn, former president of Amherst College; United States delegate to UNESCO.

Cord Meyer, Jr., Boston, Mass.

John R. Mott, president, World Alliance of YMCA's.

CLAUDE PEPPER, United States Senator from Florida.

I. I. Rabi, Nobel Prize winner, nuclear physicist, Columbia University.

Emery Reves, author, the Anatomy of Peace.

Preston Slosson, historian, University of Michigan; secretary, Rollins College Conference on World Government.

Henry DeWolf Smyth, atomic physicist, Princeton University.

Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Christ Church, New York; chairman, World Peace Commission of the Methodist Church.

Raymond Swing, radio commentator; chairman of the board of directors, Americans United for World Government.

CHARLES W. TOBEY, United States Senator from New Hampshire.

Harold C. Urey, discoverer of heavy hydrogen; Nobel Prize winner.

Carl Van Doren, author, historian.

H. JERRY VOORHIS, Member of Congress from California.

Owen D. Young, former chairman of the board of directors, General Electric Co.

Jackson Day Address by Oscar R. Ewing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. The address was delivered at a Jackson Day dinner at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on March 23 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight, from ocean to ocean, Democrats are holding these Jackson Day dinners. These dinners afford us an opportunity of renewing the inspiration that comes from spiritual contact with one of the founders of our party—Andrew Jackson.

In Jackson's day the political battle was primarily a battle between the manufacturing and commercial interests of the East on the one hand, and the farmers of the West and laborers on the other hand. The eastern manufacturers and financiers were fighting to make themselves richer at the expense of agriculture and labor. It was Jackson who led a triumphant Democratic Party to victory as the protector of farmers and laborers.

But the fight of the manufacturing and commercial interests against farmers and laborers did not end with Jackson's victory. Down through all the years to this very day the manufacturing and commercial interests have always sought to make themselves richer at the expense of other groups. And always the Republican Party has championed the cause of the manufacturers and financiers.

The fundamental philosophy of the Republican Party is very simple. They believe that the best way to have good times is to insure prosperity for the manufacturers and other commercial interests. The Republicans argue that if our factories are busy then this provides employment for labor and with labor employed, there is a market for the products of the farm. In other words, the Republican idea is to make the manufacturer richer and then his prosperity will seep

down and make the laborer and the farmer prosperous.

This Republican philosophy reminds one of the biblical story of Lazarus and Dives. You will recall that Dives was the rich man and Lazarus was the poor beggar who crawled in and ate the crumbs that fell from Dives' table. Now the Republican way of helping Lazarus is to pile more food on Dives' table so that more crumbs will fall to the floor for Lazarus to pick up. On the other hand, the way the Democratic Party would help Lazarus is to get him a job, restore his self-respect and his health so that he would no longer be dependent upon the crumbs from any rich man's table.

Speaking here in a State which is predominantly agricultural, I want to address myself for a moment to your farmers. I want to show the farmers of South Dakota how much better they have fared under Democratic administrations than under the Republican administrations.

In 1920, the last year of Woodrow Wilson's administration, the index number for the price received by farmers for food grains was 249. The Republicans took over in the following year, 1921, and by 1932, the last year of Hoover, this index number of 249 had shrunk to 45—practically to one-sixth. Then came 12 years of Democratic rule and the number approximately quadrupled back to 165. The index number of the price farmers received for meat animals tells the same story. In 1920 it was 173. By 1932 it had fallen to 86. Then with 12 years of Democratic administration, the price climbed to 200.

These figures tell a very plain story. Farmers get lower and lower prices under Republican administrations and continually improving prices under Democratic administrations.

To prove this latter statement, let me give you a few more figures. As of January 15, 1933, some 2 months before the end of the Hoover administration, the average price received by farmers for beef cattle was $3.42 per hundredweight, while on January 15, 1945, at the end of Roosevelt's third term, the average price was $11.70 per hundredweight. Lambs on January 15, 1933, averaged $4.30 per hundredweight, while on the same day in 1945 they averaged $13 per hundredweight. Wheat averaged 32.9 cents a bushel on January 15, 1933, and $1.46 per bushel on January 15, 1945. Corn averaged 19.1 cents per bushel on January 15, 1933, and $1.07 per bushel on the same day in 1945.

Another measure of farm prosperity under the Democrats is the reduction of farm indebtedness between 1930 and 1945. In 1930 the farm debt of this country was $9,630,768,000. By 1945 this farm debt had been practically cut in half, having been reduced to $5,270,675,000.

In the face of these figures it is difficult to imagine a South Dakota farmer voting the Republican ticket. But I understand some of them do. I have been trying to figure out why this should be true.

For one thing, practically every piece of farm literature that goes into a farmer's home is anti-administration. The Republicans have almost complete control of the farm press. For example, the Farm Journal, one of the largest of the farm papers, is owned by the Pew family of Philadelphia. The Pews are among the largest contributors to the Republican Party. The Pew fortune was made in oil. Their simulated interest in farmers is really not in farmers, but in farm votes. They want to get farm votes for the Republicans, knowing full well that Republican politicians are very sympathetic with large oil companies and other big business.

The Pew-owned Farm Journal and other Republican-controlled farm papers subject our farmers to a continuous barrage of propaganda. For the past few years this Republican propaganda has taken a very subtle form. It does not oppose the Democratic farm program. Oh, no. In fact, it praises it. But the Republican propagandists are grieved beyond belief at how badly the farm program is administered. If only the Republicans were running the Government no farmer would ever have to make a report.

If a farmer is required to cut down his acreage under the farm program, the Republican farm papers put all the blame on some Washington bureaucrat. There would be nothing like that under a Republican administration. If a farmer's subsidy check is late, the Republican writers would have the farmer believe that the "damn Democrats" deliberately delayed it. These Republican writers, of course, utterly ignore the fact that there would have been no check to be late if it had not been for the Democrats.

In 1944 the United States Government paid South Dakota farmers almost $14,000,000 to equalize their situation in our complicated economy. Republican administrations never paid South Dakota farmers a cent.

When Hoover left office early in 1933, after 12 years of Republican rule, the outlook for South Dakota farmers was almost hopeless. Most of them were faced with the loss of their land through foreclosure. With cattle at $3.42 per hundredweight, lambs at $4.30 per hundredweight, wheat at 33 cents a bushel and corn at 19 cents, with all the banks closed, what hope was there for a South Dakota farmer? Then, on March 4, 1933, came Franklin Roosevelt with his ringing cry of courage and his warning that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. And today, South Dakota farmers are more prosperous than they have ever been in their history. Yet, notwithstanding all this, some of these South Dakota farmers want to turn the country back to the Republicans.

Since I am speaking in a section of our country where there are many citizens of German ancestry, I want to drag out into the open and expose a peculiarly vicious and sordid type of propaganda that has been used by the Republicans. Naturally, people of German ancestry have an affection for German traditions, German music, German art, German culture, just as our citizens of English, Irish, Scotch, French, or Italian descent have an affection for the things that are deep in their own racial backgrounds. But with the rise of the Hitler menace, Republican politicians attempted to make Americans of German ancestry believe that every move made by a Democratic administration against world domination by Hitler was a blow aimed at the German people. Naturally, Americans of German ancestry hoped that some way could be found to defeat Hitler without the destruction of the old Germany, whose memories and traditions were dear to them.

When, however, this became impossible, these people stood loyally behind the American Government. Their sons went to war, their money bought war bonds. They resented attempts to play upon their racial emotions and treat them as anything but Americans. They know that today one of the thoughts uppermost in President Truman's mind is to bind up the wounds of this war. They know that the American forces who are occupying a part of Germany are being entirely fair to the German population. They know the President realizes that the Germans, along with the other peoples of Europe, must not be allowed to starve; that their peacetime economy must be reestablished and that everything possible must be done to hasten the day when the German people can take a place among the peace-loving nations of the world freed from the awful scourge of Hitlerism.

It is difficult to be tolerant with Republican politicians who would play upon the emotions of people of German ancestry just to get a few votes. Yet your two South Dakota Republican Congressman are outstanding examples of candidates who did this very thing. KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE opposed every move made by President Roosevelt to put this country in a position to defend itself in the event it was attacked by Hitler and Hirohito. MUNDT and CASE take the prize for voting wrong on more bills than any other two Members of Congress. They voted wrong on the bill for harbor improvements at Guam, wrong on the Arms Embargo Act, wrong on the bill to revise the Neutrality Act, wrong on the military airplane appropriation bill, and wrong on the conscription bill. They both voted wrong on lend-lease and wrong on the extension of the draft, which, had it not passed, would have rendered America helpless and impotent when the Japanese struck on December 7, 1941. MUNDT and CASE voted wrong on the bill to lift the belligerent port and combat zone bans, wrong on the WPA relief bill, and wrong on the self-liquidating public works bill. Both of them voted to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and both voted for the bill that would have hamstrung the Office of Price Administration in procuring competent personnel to carry on its work. MUNDT and CASE sought to destroy price control over oil by taking oil out from under the Office of Price Administration and turning it over to a Petroleum Administrator. They even tried to end food subsidies by voting to override the President's veto of the antisubsidy bill. They voted for the tax bill that President Roosevelt described as "providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy." Both of them even voted against the soldiers' vote bill.

It is difficult to imagine any State with Congressmen who so consistently voted wrong. But your South Dakota Republicans have produced them.

The election this fall is one of transcendent importance. The war has been won and now a large part of the world is struggling against famine, pestilence, and fear. The savage forces that the war let loose seem still to be on the march in many places.

The great task today is to bind up the wounds of war and have all men once again engaged in peaceful pursuits. The hungry must be fed, the naked clothed, the sick must be healed. In the midst of a world that is in chaos, it is of supreme importance that we of America have a government that can stand forth as the mouthpiece of a united America. This transcends all questions of party, of whether we are Republicans or Democrats.

Many of you remember the tragedy that followed the election of 1918, when Woodrow Wilson was President and the Republicans gained control of Congress. Having tasted blood in the elections of 1918, the Republicans decided that the best way to win the 1920 election was to attack whatever Wilson did. Measure after measure which President Wilson deemed vital to the welfare of the country was defeated by a hostile House and Senate.

When Wilson sailed for the peace conference at Paris, these words of Theodore Roosevelt preceded him: "Our allies, our enemies, and Mr. Wilson himself must know that Mr. Wilson has no authority whatever to speak for the American people at this time. His leadership has just been emphatically repudiated by them."

In the days to come, it is absolutely essential that when President Truman and Secretary Byrnes deal with Premier Stalin or Prime Minister Attlee, these gentlemen must know unmistakably that our President and our Secretary of State speak for a united America. If the Republicans were to elect a majority of the House of Representatives this fall our peace efforts and our efforts to bind up the wounds of mankind would be dangerously crippled.

Every man and woman who votes this fall must realize that under our form of constitutional government the team that runs our Government consists of the President, the

Senate, and the House of Representatives. If our history teaches us anything, it tells us that that team only functions effectively when the President, the Senate, and the House are all of the same political party. History shows that whenever the House of Representatives or the Senate has been of a different political faith from that of the Chief Executive then there is nothing but chaos and confusion in the machinery of our Government. This is bad enough in normal times, but in a time like this it could be fatal to the very life of our Nation.

I feel so strongly about this that if the situation were reversed and there were a Republican President sitting in the White House today, I would vote for Republican Congressmen and Senators this fall, just as I would have voted for Republican Congressmen and Senators when that great Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, sought to bind up the wounds of this Nation after the Civil War. Regardless of political differences, it is a duty of all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, to support President Truman in his efforts to secure a just peace and get the world back to normal.

When on April 12, 1945, a merciful God relieved Franklin Roosevelt of the heaviest burdens ever borne by mortal man, Harry S. Truman became President of the United States. The new President assumed his duties with deep humility. To the newspaper correspondents he said: "Boys, if you ever pray, pray for me now." In his first speech to the Congress and to the world, he closed with the words: "I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people."

Never in all history has a President needed the united support of this Nation as does President Truman. If we fail him, if the feeling gets abroad that America is divided, then we have weakened our country's influence at the conference table and paralyzed its voice in the discussions upon which the future peace and prosperity of the world depend. For our own sakes, for the sake of our children and our children's children, we must not let this happen.

Drafting of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Draft—A Crisis," published in the Tiger, student newspaper of Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College, Clemson, S. C., one of the honorary military colleges of the country. This editorial concerns the question of drafting students prior to the completion of their education, and was written by a former enlisted man, a veteran of World War II.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DRAFT—A CRISIS

Quotations from Newsweek in a recent article: "Congress had been thinking of an extension of the draft to catch 200,000 students when school terms end." These students are in the 18–19 age bracket. During the questioning by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, General Eisenhower conceded that 18-year-old youths do not make the best soldiers for the occupation of Germany and Japan. Also said Eisenhower, "Any gamble with the national security of the United States at this time is a gamble with the peace and security of the world." According to eminent engineering authorities the United States is in dire need of 50,000 trained engineers to maintain progress and leadership in technical and industrial fields. It is an acknowledged fact that the technical and industrial leadership of the United States won World War II.

In view of these facts, do the proposed action of Congress and the statements of General Eisenhower coincide?

Is not the decline of our progress and leadership in technical and industrial fields a threat to our national security and therefore to the peace and security of the world? Dr. Vannevar Bush, America's noted research expert, has stated that our leadership in that field is becoming more seriously threatened by other countries as each day rolls by. Russia and other foreign countries kept their universities going at full speed even during the war, producing as many trained men as possible. The United States did just the opposite, stripped the country of such men in the midst of their training, and appears to be set on carrying out the same mad scheme now, in the days of peace.

In many of our colleges and universities, as here at Clemson, there are many youths who, by attending school for 12 months out of the year, have only 9 months or so to go until they will have their degrees, and will be ready to enter technical and industrial fields. Are they going to have their education interrupted at such a crucial point both to them and to their country? Some steps should be taken immediately before the end of the current school terms to remedy this critical situation. Any college student doing satisfactory work to prepare himself for leadership in technical and industrial fields should be allowed to complete his education.

With the present short length of basic training offered by the Army, the youth being drafted into the Army actually learns little along the line of military preparedness. He is then sent to Germany, that notorious cesspool of immorality, to have any notions of morals that he may have swept away and his own active brain becomes dulled to infinite stagnancy.

And what of the ROTC? In March 1942 the Army had called 93,000 ROTC officers to active duty; they outnumbered the regulars almost three to one. They were undoubtedly the backbone of the Army.

Said General Marshall in his final report as Chief of Staff: "Just what we could have done in the first phases of our mobilization and training without these ROTC men I do not know." An Army survey has revealed that two out of every three company commanders in five typical combat divisions were ROTC men. One-third of the divisions' officers were ROTC-trained. A special War Department committee has studied plans for expanded and revised ROTC training which will improve the benefits of such training twofold. But apparently nothing can be decided until Congress makes some decision on compulsory military training.

Why?

Until compulsory military training is decided upon, why can't an amendment to the draft law be passed, which will allow men at ROTC colleges to enter the advanced course of the ROTC, instead of being drafted into the Army? While preparing themselves for leadership, in the technical and industrial fields, they could also be preparing themselves for leadership in military fields.

It was bad enough to take these ROTC men out of college in time of war, but perhaps then it was an emergency for replacements were desperately needed at the battlefronts. At such a critical period it was only right that everyone do what was most urgently needed to win the struggle. The same axiom should be used now; every man should be used to the fullest advantage. Certainly the drafting of college students, especially those in the ROTC category, is not following this axiom.

ROTC assignments could be easily linked with the student's civilian career, a civil engineering student could be commissioned in the Corps of Engineers, a chemical engineering student in the chemical warfare section. Those whose civilian career would not tie in with an Army assignment could be assigned to the Infantry, Armored Corps, or such.

A campus with terrain such as Clemson's offers a good training ground for any branch of the service; the Seneca River and rugged land is perfect for training engineers, and the woods and fields are good areas for small unit Infantry problems.

The existing rifle range could be renovated and rapid-fire weapons and mortar ranges could easily be set up. The nearby airports could be used for Air Corps training. No doubt many other colleges have the same advantages. Additional practical work could be obtained with the Army in the summer months.

But when will these programs be established? In May the educational institutions will be emptied of nonveterans, and it will take sometime to build up a group of such students again. Action should be taken now before this unfortunate happening occurs.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer of this article is a veteran with combat service as an enlisted man.)

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway Would Help All United States," published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of March 5, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY WOULD HELP ALL UNITED STATES

Governor Lausche's statement supporting construction of the St. Lawrence seaway goes to the heart of the matter when he says that "Basically I am of the belief that it is an error against the economy of our Nation to let go unused those natural resources that can contribute to a more abundant life for our Nation."

While Governor Lausche does not say so in so many words, what he must have had in mind was that the testimony in opposition to the seaway has all been selfish. It has come from people or from sectional groups who fear that the seaway will be detrimental to their personal interests. The railroads are afraid that they will lose traffic. Atlantic coast ports—Baltimore, New York, Boston—are afraid they will lose shipping. Ohio coal companies are afraid that the seaway will give them competition from other fields.

None of the opponents of the seaway has argued that it will not be a success. All have tacitly conceded that so far as they are concerned it will be too much of a success.

That the seaway will bring changes in American economic life goes without saying.

But there is equally good reason for believing that the changes will be for the better, and that even the objectors to it will gain from its construction.

Without question, the seaway will be of great advantage to the Middle West and the Northwest by giving them cheaper transportation and better access to the outside world. Anything that benefits a vast section of our country must be of help to the entire country. If the Great Lakes can be linked with the Atlantic, this immense region can bring in raw materials which it needs and which other nations need to sell, and we can open world-wide markets for our products. The railroads which are afraid of losing business will find their own traffic increasing through the growth of the territory they serve.

There has been much talk of late of the exhaustion of the iron ore mines at the head of the Great Lakes. The seaway would enable the steel mills of the Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Detroit, and Chicago districts to bring in foreign ores. The mines which were recently discovered in Labrador would be made accessible to these mills.

The Lake Erie-Ohio River waterway is a logical part of the St. Lawrence project. If the seaway is built, the canalization of our rivers should accompany it. In such an undertaking, Pittsburgh has as great an interest as Youngstown, for Pittsburgh needs cheaper ore and closer contact with the outside world as much as we do.

Address of Hon. Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on Sunday, April 7, 1946, on the occasion of the laying of the cornertstone of the Hebrew Academy, in Cleveland, Ohio:

I am happy to participate in the laying of the cornerstone of the Hebrew Academy. I am particularly happy because, as I am told, the Hebrew Academy is based upon a philosophy to which I, as a Catholic, most heartily subscribe—and that philosophy is that religion is of primary importance in American education. In accordance with that philosophy, Catholics have, since the beginning of our Nation, chosen to conduct their own school system in which that primacy of religion was recognized. It has been a costly venture for the Catholic Church, and has taken large toll of our meager resources, but we have gladly borne the extra burden because of the same conviction which motivates those who today are expanding the facilities by which the blessings of religious training may be brought to their youth.

The importance of religion in education for democracy was recognized in these United States even before the adoption of our Constitution. It should be noted that Northwest Ordinance of 1787 made provision for the maintenance of schools because religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary for good government and happiness of mankind. I have never been able to understand how religion can be left out of the curriculum of any school. Such action assumes that the things of God are not as essential to human well-being as are the things of the world. I hold not only with Catholics and many Protestants, but with those who honor me today by inviting me to take part in their ceremony, that religion is too important in human life to be treated as a mere accessory of living. All of us here today share the conviction that religion is of the very warp and woof of life and must, therefore, be the very warp and woof of education. Our relationship with God is the basis of every other relationship and our lives have meaning only in reference to our Creator and to his will.

It has been well said that better times await the coming of better men. We will never reconstruct society, shaken to its foundations by two recent wars, until we reconstruct the individual. That reconstruction must be done through education—an education which provides a preparation for a healthy family life, for fruitful living in the neighborhood, the community, the economic group, the Nation, and in the world.

If you will permit me, I should like to quote the newly elevated cardinal of Detroit, Cardinal Mooney, who spoke on the occasion of his return from Rome on the need of religious education in a democracy:

"The maintenance of this sound position (set forth in the Declaration of Independence) will, in a democracy, depend not only upon the Government but on the people. Indeed, it will depend upon one thing more than all else—a highly cultivated sense of right and wrong in the mass of our citizenry and a sincere disposition to follow that sense in our Nation and its component parts—in the Government, and in the people, in rich and poor, in employer and employee alike.

"Practically no people has kept a clear hold on these principles of right and wrong except through the medium of revealed religion.

"Experience forbids us to expect that religious principle can be generally inculcated in any other way than the way in which the principles of reading, writing, and arithmetic are inculcated—that is, by formal education which fits into the school training a child receives.

"No nation was ever blessed with the maintenance of religious principles in its citizens unless its educational system made possible the instruction of children in the religion of their parents."

It is of the highest importance that these truths be emphasized at the present time, when there are so many charges abroad that we have largely failed to develop adequate education for citizenship. All those who believe in the importance of religion in our democracy must insist over and over again that knowledge is not virtue. Without character, knowledge may become a menace, and character is something that resides in the will. It involves the discipline of impulse and emotion and guarantees that conduct will accord with principle. It develops with the strengthening of the will, and is brought to perfection under the influence of high ideals.

I need not tell you that it is my hope that within the walls which will soon arise where we now are standing, that you will develop such character in the students who will throng here for enlightenment. I hope that they will learn to abhor hostility to others because of race or color or religion or economic status. I hope that they will learn tolerance and understanding and generosity and kindness and patience and courtesy toward all, regardless of any contrary consideration.

I am convinced that what there is of greatness in America has come from training such as this. Men of all races, of all nationalities, have set up for themselves a society in which differences do not count. To be sure, this unity is still far from perfect. Discriminations are still practiced. Segregation has not completely disappeared. Distinctions are still observed, but we have gone a long, long way and have proved that the accident of birth really does not matter, and that individuals who live close together, who mingle daily with one another, come to achieve, bit by bit, a sense of common interest and reach a community of ideals and aspirations.

If we are to progress further toward the ideal America, we must reaffirm our faith in the importance of religion in our national life. We are striving desperately to bring about a universal acceptance of the fundamental principles of truth and justice that must govern the actions of individuals and nations if there is to be peace in the world. Before we can do this, we must have achieved that objective in our own national life and that, I submit, we cannot do unless we multiply such schools as this in which those principles are woven into the very texture of the students' lives, and that is why I rejoice that another school is being builded which shall give first importance to this task. What America stood for, what America strove for, what America fought for, has neither reality nor substance apart from belief in God. We talk much of the brotherhood of man, but only in schools such as this are we taught that men are brothers only because they have a common father in heaven. We dilate on the sacredness of the human personality, but only in schools such as this are we told that men are sacred because they are fashioned in the image and likeness of God. We denounce the tyrants and the totalitarians in the name of human liberty. Only in schools such as this are we taught that human liberty can exist only on condition that we recognize the authority of God and the supremacy of His law.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Answer to Mr. Hood" published in The Detroit News of March 3, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWER TO MR. HOOD

Answering the arguments of opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway is our favorite exercise, though, considering their quality, not one calculated to give anybody much of an intellectual work-out.

At the Senate hearings, a Mr. Hood, of the American Short Line Railroad Association, told the committee the Government is wrong in urging the seaway as vital to defense.

He said the seaway's "circuitous, seasonal and limited transportation is not adapted to the fighting of a war at high tempo."

We wonder how he would explain the part played by the seaway—or such of it as is now open—in the recent war.

Maybe that, in his view, was not a war at "high tempo." It would not have had any tempo, however, without the "circuitous, seasonal and limited transportation" provided by the Great Lakes, on which the whole Allied world depended for its steel and for much of its food.

Nor could that war have been won without the intensive use of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence route for shipments to the battlefronts abroad.

It would have been won a lot quicker, indeed, had it not been necessary to break cargo and resort to rail shipment to move goods past the 50 miles of rapids, which need only be flooded out by power dams to open the seaway all the way from Duluth to the Atlantic.

Is it just possible that some of Mr. Hood's short-line railroads were, and are, profitably busy at that St. Lawrence Rapids bottleneck?

The New York Post Office in War Time and Postwar Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years, the Honorable Albert Goldman, postmaster, and his staff at the New York Post Office, performed most outstanding and meritorious tasks, not alone maintaining satisfactory service to the millions of patrons they serve, but handling, distributing and preparing for onward dispatch millions and millions of letters, parcels, and other mail articles for members of the United States Army overseas.

It has been freely admitted by those in position to know, that the mail service to and from the members of our armed forces was the greatest morale builder provided. On practically all occasions, "mail call" took precedence over "mess call".

The peak of this great mail handling task occurred last fall when during the period September 15 to November 15 more than 48,000,000 Christmas parcels were distributed and placed into 2,770,927 sacks, with each sack labeled to a respective Army unit, and all turned over to the Army for dispatch overseas.

The handling of those Christmas parcels was a colossal accomplishment. And yet, such stupendous mail handling jobs were being accomplished all through the war.

During March 1945 the average number of letters distributed daily at the New York post office for the Army overseas was 2,413,000 air-mail letters, 1,284,000 ordinary letters, and 628,000 V-mail letters. And, 250,000 parcels, and more than 1,000,000 newspapers and other prints were also being handled daily.

Postal service is not a one-way proposition. Large quantities of mail originated at our Army post offices. An average of 1,500,000 letters were received at New York each week by way of steamers; 500,000 air-mail letters every day by way of Army bombers, and processed V-mail letters averaged more than 500,000 a day.

The personnel of more than 500 Army post offices or APO's had their mail addressed care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

Following cessation of hostilities, our boys and girls overseas sent back hundreds of thousands of packages containing souvenirs of the war or of their travels. The volume at times was so great that facilities were taxed to the utmost.

New York's postmaster had the additional task of seeing to it that required operating supplies were provided all these APO's, so that they could be operated efficiently. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, the value of the postage stamps and stamped envelopes sold at these APO's totaled more than $38,000,000. More than 11,897,000 money orders were issued at these overseas Army post offices during the year, and their amounts exceeded $605,000,000.

There were also assigned to the New York post office more than 4,000 Naval post office units located on warships—large and small, and at naval installations in all parts of the world. These Naval units did a postal business of $3,364,715 during the last fiscal year, and a money-order business which involved the issue of 4,251,610 money orders with an aggregate value of $209,658,913.10.

Status of the Shippers' Conference of Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Shippers' Conference of Greater New York.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHIPPERS' CONFERENCE OF
GREATER NEW YORK,
April 15, 1946.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Committee on Interstate Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Since I testified before your committee March 20, on behalf of the Shippers' Conference of Greater New York, in favor of the passage of the Bulwinkle bill, public reports have indicated that your committee has received testimony to the effect that little if any consideration should be given to organizations such as ours, because the railroads make a practice of dominating them through financial support or otherwise.

At a meeting of the membership of the Shippers' Conference of Greater New York, April 10, I was instructed to write this letter to inform you that under our constitution our membership is confined entirely to shippers and representatives of shippers. Our organization is financed entirely by membership dues received, with the exception of a few odd dollars received as interest on bank deposits and war bonds. The conference receives no revenue whatever from either the railroads, the steamship lines, the motor lines, the air lines, or the pipe lines.

The testimony submitted on behalf of this organization was compiled without any assistance whatever from any transportation agency and no transportation agency participated in any way in paying the expense of our witness in appearing before your committee.

In view of the testimony previously admitted into the record, we respectfully ask that this letter be incorporated in the record, and that the testimony submitted by the undersigned be accepted at its face value without discount.

Very truly yours,

G. E. MACE,
First Vice Chairman.

The Wolcott Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, administration spokesmen are making statements, which are being widely echoed in the press, that the Wolcott pricing amendment to the Price Control Act means a guaranteed profit to every producer and distributor on every article made and sold.

The amendment does not guarantee a profit to every producer and distributor. What it does is to direct the Office of Price Administration to fix price on a commodity so that the majority of the producers and distributors of that commodity have an opportunity to make a profit. It does the same thing for distributors.

The amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act, the Stabilization Act of 1942, or the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, no maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers and processors and distributors (including retailers) of such commodity the sum of (1) the current cost of producing and processing and distributing such commodity as determined by the established commercial accounting practices of the industry, and (2) a reasonable profit thereon.

This amendment will force OPA to cease its industry-wide pricing methods.

It will direct the agency to fix prices so that a commodity—which is defined in the Price Control Act as commodities, articles, products, materials, and services—will include conversion and distribution costs for the majority of an industry and a reasonable profit added to the conversion costs.

At present, OPA pricing standards are on an industry-wide basis. Most industries are multiple-product industries, that is, they make a number of commodities.

An example is the packing industry. This industry not only processes meats, it manufactures other foods. Many firms in the industry produce fats and oils. Some have activities which are not related to the packing of meat.

Many packers, particularly small packers, have found themselves losing money on their operations. They went to OPA for relief. OPA told them that the industry as a whole, taking into account all its activities, was making more money than it made in the 1936–39 base period. Therefore, the packers who were losing money on their operations had no

recourse. Some went out of business. The majority operated at a loss and the black market flourished.

This over-all approach by OPA, an approach that has penalized many businesses and firms, has curtailed production.

For example, if an industry could not make money on a particular commodity, it naturally stopped making it, or reduced production so that the article became scarce.

An outstanding example is in textiles. Because of the OPA pricing methods, it no longer is profitable to produce reasonably priced shirts and shorts. But it is profitable to produce high-priced shirts, sport shirts, and the like, and to put the cloth into other comparatively high-priced clothing. The public has to buy these high-priced goods or do without.

This in inflation.

The Wolcott amendment, if administered in the spirit in which it is written, would put a stop to this sort of thing.

In meat, for example, the industry would have a ceiling which would assure the majority of the producers of beef the cost of processing the beef and a profit in addition.

At present, OPA fixes prices for an industry by determining the industry's average processing costs and adding a profit to these costs.

The Wolcott amendment would place OPA pricing on a commodity basis.

The OPA would determine an industry's average conversion costs for a commodity. This would include the cost of the material plus the costs of processing it. The costs of the inefficient producers would not be covered at all.

Nor would the reasonable profit mean a profit for all elements in the industry. Some might operate at a loss even if they sold at ceiling price.

OPA BECLOUDS ISSUE

As is customary, OPA is beclouding the issue. The Administration spokesmen are raising the familiar cry—the ruinous spiral of inflation.

But Congressmen are asking: "How can we get goods produced unless we make it profitable to produce them?"

OPA has no logical answer to this question.

This explains the 259 to 137 vote for the Wolcott amendment.

In the minds of many Congressmen, the Wolcott amendment does not go far enough.

It does not disturb the base period, 1936–39, which is used by OPA to determine prices.

This period was a pretty poor one for industry as a whole.

Nor does the Wolcott amendment do away with the OPA's industry earning standard.

Under this standard, the OPA tries to hold industry to the dollars and cents profits made in the 1936–39 period.

To do this, OPA has to reduce the average profit per unit allowed since industry is producing much more than it did in 1936–39.

If OPA has its way, all corporate profits would be less—after taxes—than $3,500,000,000. This would be true even though the volume of business is more than twice as great as it was in 1936–39.

But the Wolcott amendment does put an end to a system which is curtailing production and penalizing business.

It is a sound and sensible amendment.

Status of Commerce and Industry Association of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., April 10, 1946.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Committee on Interstate Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Some of the testimony reported to have been given before your committee in its current hearings on the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536) may have created an erroneous impression as to the relations which exist between the railroads and the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc. According to published accounts, it has been stated that the railroads exercise a controlling influence over many chambers of commerce and other commercial organizations through the medium of financial support. It also has been stated that the railroads had paid the expenses of representatives of some chambers of commerce and shippers' representatives when appearing at congressional committee hearings, and that the testimony of such witnesses should be discounted for that reason.

The purpose of this letter is to place squarely before your committee the facts in this respect insofar as the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., is concerned. On March 20, 1946, George E. Mace, manager of our transportation bureau, testified before your committee on behalf of this association in favor of the passage of the bill.

I have had a check made of our records and it discloses:

1. That the financial support of all railroads, foreign as well as United States carriers, amounts to less than 2 percent of the revenues of Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., for the current fiscal year.

2. That the entire expense of our efforts to make known our views on the Bulwinkle bill, or on any other legislation in which we expressed an interest, either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate, was paid and borne by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

3. That in no instance was the whole or any part of such expense passed on to the railroads or to any other form of transportation.

It is our belief that the generalities which have been publicized in some quarters entitle us, with fairness, to have this explanation made a part of your committee's record in these hearings, so proper weight may be given to the testimony submitted on our behalf. Accordingly, we respectfully ask that this be done.

Yours sincerely,
THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary.

Enlisted Men Got Cheated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of January 6, 1946:

ENLISTED MEN GOT CHEATED

In the matter of terminal leaves for veterans quitting the service, there has been the most flagrant discrimination between commissioned officers and enlisted men.

Officers ready for demobilization are permitted to take terminal leaves, up to 120 days, figured on the basis of accumulated service leaves which they have not previously used. This is fair enough. It is like a civilian employee getting credit for vacations which he was unable to take because of the press of urgent duties. While the officer is still technically in the service and getting service pay, he is permitted to return to his home, don civilian clothes, and take a job. At the end of his terminal leave, he gets his final discharge.

But enlisted men have not been given terminal leaves, nor pay in lieu of unused leaves. If they did not or could not take their leaves before they reached the separation center, they simply lost out. So there is no wonder that this has been a sore point with the returning enlisted veterans.

The complaints have reached Congress, and there are five bills now in the two Houses that would rectify the situation and eradicate such indefensible discrimination. They would provide for terminal leave, or pay in lieu of terminal leave for enlisted men. But not one of the bills has yet reached the floor for action, and committees have shown no great enthusiasm for quick action.

The expense, of course, would be large. A Senate committee heard an estimate that the total would run to $2,000,000,000 or more. That approximates the total yield of the Federal income tax in 1940, or about $60 for every family in the United States.

But if the sum total of expense seems huge and cannot be treated casually even in times of colossal Federal expenditures, it can be argued that a single additional week of war would have cost more. Or, if demobilization had been more orderly and less precipitate, which many observers feel might have been wiser, the additional pay to the servicemen might well have run beyond the two billion mark.

Costly or not, the terminal leave bill only meets an obligation which must not be evaded, and from which there is no decent escape. It is in no sense a gratuity, but simple justice and equity to millions who served this country in its hour of need. The duty of Congress in the matter is plain.

State Department in an Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article in the New York Times of April 10, 1946, on the Research and Intelligence Unit of the State Department.

If the State Department is to do what we all hope and expect it will do in the field of foreign relations, it must be modernly equipped. To deprive the State Department of a research and intelligence division is to condemn it to the "horse and buggy" stage. We cannot go back to that even if we would. It would be like a chick trying to climb back into its egg.

The article follows:

INTELLIGENCE FUND FOR BYRNES BARRED—HOUSE MONEY COMMITTEE CALLS WORK OF PROPOSED UNIT POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REPORTING—CULTURE PROGRAM IS CUT—ESTIMATES OF COMMERCE AND JUDICIARY ALSO PARED IN ATTACK ON SPENDING PSYCHOLOGY

WASHINGTON, April 9.—The House Appropriations Committee voted today to deprive the Intelligence Unit of the State Department of its entire appropriation of $4,150,136 for 1947. Senate passage of this cut would not only kill the intelligence program but would knock out a major prop of the National Intelligence Authority created by the President on January 22.

The committee took the view that the intelligence work would amount to political and economic reporting and should be performed by other established units of the State Department.

A report was current that pressure, originating in some official circles opposed to a growth of State Department intelligence activity, influenced the committee. Secretary Byrnes asked the committee for the appropriation on February 16.

There was confidence in some official circles that the appropriation would be restored on the floor of the House or in the Senate.

It appeared to be well established that the committee was not influenced by recent allegations made by Representative MAY, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that Col. Alfred McCormack, formerly a corporation lawyer of New York, was employing officers with pro-Soviet sympathies in the State Department intelligence group which he heads.

Representative MAY has not taken up Colonel McCormack's challenge to withdraw his charges or investigate Colonel McCormack's staff. Colonel McCormack brought to the State Department several officers screened for General Staff service who had served with him in the Military Intelligence Service of the War Department.

ANOTHER UNIT SUGGESTED

The committee made this comment in killing the fund:

"If a separate unit is needed within the Department to analyze and correlate the information received from missions abroad, such a unit may be created with the personnel that had been allowed generally for the departmental and field services."

The Research and Intelligence Unit, as the State Department agency is called, was built up partly on units of the defunct Office of Strategic Services, a wartime world-wide intelligence organization. It has approximately 900 employees.

In testifying before the committee Colonel McCormack stated that 92 of the employees, with annual salaries totaling $330,953, were needed as the State Department's staff in the National Intelligence Authority. Under the Presidential order the State Department and the War and Navy Departments staff the Authority, whose mission is to coordinate and function as a clearinghouse for all governmental foreign intelligence activities.

The over-all mission of the State Department agency was described to the committee as follows:

"The function of the Office of Research and Intelligence is to provide evaluated and positive information on foreign countries as an aid to the formulation and implementation of foreign policy in the Department. This Office consists of the following Divisions: American Republics Intelligence; British Commonwealth Intelligence; Europe, Near East, and Africa Intelligence; Far East Intelligence; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Intelligence; International and Functional Intelligence; and Map Intelligence and Cartography."

In support of his program Secretary Byrnes stated:

"I cannot stress too strongly my belief that this research and intelligence service is essential to the modern conduct of our foreign relations. We could go back to the period when decisions were made without adequate background information, but this would be definitely a backward step. We now have an organization which is capable of bringing together and analyzing all the information bearing on a particular subject."

Army Still Uses Brass and Caste on Former GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the War Department has 35 staff houses at Plum Brook Ordnance Works up in my district formerly occupied by commissioned officer personnel.

War veterans are entitled to the first right for the occupancy of these houses.

But when the war veteran and his family trudge their way to the Government reservation to rent a house, the commanding officer says "We have nothing to do with the renting of these houses, the United States Corps of Engineers at Cincinnati, Ohio, have the renting, but as a favor we will send in your application for listing."

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine such treatment with the commanding officer sitting right in the actual houses on the reservation and tell the veteran he will send the application to Cincinnati, some 250 miles away. Such inefficiency and rank treatment to the former GI, permits a house in the reservation to be rented to a man with an income of $1,000 a month and not occupied by a veteran's family, but actually in occupation by a person who never saw service and who also has an income of $500 a month. In other words houses are occupied by persons having an income of $1,500 a month while the average veteran stands on the street with his family.

This is the shabby treatment given by the Army to war veterans. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that GI's complain of the brass and caste system of the Army especially when it is now handed out to war veterans no longer obliged to swallow the brass and caste of the Army.

Mr. Speaker, such treatment does not encourage young men to join the Army.

"Vengeance Is Mine, Saith the Lord"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on April 4, 1946, by Rev. George B. Wood, rector of the Christ Episcopal Church, in Austin, Minn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was on Hill 131, 8 miles north of La Hays du Puit, part of the offensive that was to culminate in the break-through at St. Lo. The Five Hundred and Fifth Parachute Infantry Regiment has just taken the hill, and at command the boys had dug in to hold this high point of ground. The enemy was covering the hill with a rain of shells, and not a head was to be seen above ground. Sergeant Krueger relaxed, pulled out of his pocket a crumpled piece of paper and a pencil, and wrote these words:

"DEATH AND I

"Gaunt, stark, naked death,
What an ugly loathsomeness thou do possess.
You creeping, crawling, cancerous thing,
In every worldly place is found your sting.

"Oh, spare me not, I'm not afraid,
You'll find me easily—all arrayed
In splendid attire to attend my grave.

"Seek ye some other ripened fruit,
Surprise and wrest them, gather your loot,
Your sickle, your scythe, mower of life—
I fear you not, my armor is Christ."

Sergeant Krueger died 6 months later in the Battle of the Bulge, fighting, with bazooka in hand, to stem the advancing tide of German Tiger tanks. Sergeant Krueger was no exception; he typifies for me the average American soldier, fighting calmly and coolly, steadily advancing, motivated and empowered by a belief in the American way of life, founded in the universal principles of justice and brotherhood. He was a brave warrior because there was a united nation in support of him and in support of those four great ideals set forth by our late President: Freedom of speech and religion, freedom from fear and want.

But he opposed a worthy antagonist. For nearly a full year the enemy fought in slow and stubborn retreat from the coast of France back to the Elbe River—fought with a zeal that was reminiscent of the early Christian martyrs in its enthusiastic response. But the Nazi motivation was a pagan one, founded on the mythology of the Teutonic gods of the Prussian forest, giving justice to a select few, brotherhood to one nation. Everything which the enemy had been taught was a denial of that which the American soldier had been taught.

At Wobbelin, Germany, 50 miles across the Elbe River, I saw that denial exemplified in its most horrible form. There we liberated one of the infamous concentration camps. There I saw man's inhumanity to man exhibited in its most cruel fashion. There I saw men who had lived in their own filth—in their own feces and vomit—for so long that they were then no better than animals. These were men whose crimes were not to be found on our statute books. Their only crime was a desire for freedom of speech and religion, freedom from fear and want. To all of them those "four freedoms" had been denied. They could then speak only in whispers; they could not move their lips in observable prayer; they cringed with fear at every audible footstep; they were sick unto death for want of food. In one building I found the bodies piled 4 and 5 feet high. In another building we could not tell the dead from the near-dead. Those who could speak cried out, "Is the war over? Are we free? Give us food!" And we felt so helpless in the face of this great need.

For 200 of these unburied atrocity victims I arranged a mass burial service in the public square before the castle of the Archduke of Mecklenberg, in which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish chaplains participated. By invitation and at our command over 5,000 German civilians attended this service. During the service I saw one woman faint; another was overheard by my interpreter to say, "It is a disgrace to be a German." And standing behind me there was a German Lutheran minister who only 3 weeks before had himself been released from a concentration camp, and he was representative of the 200,000 German priests, ministers, and laymen who had been incarcerated in concentration camps because of their opposition to Hitler and national socialism.

Here then was a man I wished to befriend; here was a man who was a champion of the "four freedoms," as was every American soldier; here then was a man who had risked martyrdom and suffered persecution in order that he might speak freely and worship freely. But that privilege was denied me. Our conduct was governed by the Army's strict rule of nonfraternization, and I could not give a pat on the back or a cheering word to a man who had fought Hitler and the Nazi regime as courageously as the American soldier.

In Berlin I found that the politically adept Russian Army had a different approach. On the lamp posts in the Russian zone in Berlin you could see huge signs in blue lettering bordered in red, and summarized they said, "Hitlers come and go but the German people go on forever." How sharp was the contrast to our propaganda which seemed to say that the only good German was a dead German. The Russian Army had no nonfraternization program. The Russian soldier was told that he could fraternize with the good German, and in terms of the Soviet that, of course, meant the Communist German. There I found we were at least consistent in our policy because when we first entered Berlin the refuse and remains from our Army messes were buried in its effects. Last August, by actual count, 60 percent of the babies born in Berlin died at birth, and the infant mortality rate in parts of Germany today is even higher. The folly of that policy was soon realized, and food was imported and distributed so that there might be an average of 900 calories per day per individual, and gradually we saw bread appearing in the shop windows and potatoes on the sidewalks to add to the one staple food which could be found throughout Berlin—horse chestnuts. Today, the average number of calories per person in Germany is 1,275, in contrast to the starvation diet of 1,850 calories as shown in the experiment conducted at the University of Minnesota a year ago, and in sharper contrast to the daily diet of 3,300 calories of the American citizen. And again in history the holy innocents are slaughtered in the name of Christ and the peace of God, and it surpasses all understanding.

This, then, is the spirit of our occupation policy—the occupation policy of a supposedly Christian Nation. It was displayed, perhaps, in even greater cruelty on the Feast of the Holy Nativity when the American soldiers were denied the privilege of holding Christmas parties for German children, with the intention of giving them gifts out of their own meager rations. This, too, was at the order of the United States Army and at the season when Christians everywhere are expected to express sentiments of brotherhood and good will to their fellow men.

What is the reaction of the German people? I know the reaction of the German clergy who fought so valiantly against Hitlerism. Bishop Wurm, head of the Evangelical Church, and one of these martyrs, stated, "It is not good when people say, 'Now everything that Goebbels' propaganda predicted will be brought about.' The Church cannot be drawn into this terrible cycle of vengefulness." And the people who are haunted by fear and dying of want at the rate of 4,000 a day in Berlin, what are they saying? You can see it in their faces, and if you listen, you can hear the bitter joke, "Hitler cured us of national socialism; Stalin cured us of communism; and now the Americans are curing us of democracy." Never has the world seen a harder peace forced on fellow men. Never has the world seen vengeance and vindictiveness so cruelly expressed. Hitler called on God and set up hundreds of concentration camps throughout his nation; we have called on God and have made of the whole German Nation a concentration camp where the grim reapers of famine and pestilence are gathering a great harvest.

Our policy makers in Washington tell us that this is the will and desire of the American people. They point to a Gallup poll taken last December in which over 50 percent of the American people were supposed to have said that we are not being tough enough on the German Nation. I cannot believe that this is true. I cannot believe that the American people know of this widespread starvation of women and children I cannot believe that the American people have so departed from their Christian and Jewish heritage that they no longer know the meaning of justice and mercy. We are not gods. Vengeance is not ours. "Vengeance is Mine, saith the Lord. I will repay. If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink."

But what about the rest of the world? The other day a friend of mine said, "After the First World War we had the hate of our enemies; now we have the hate of both our enemies and our allies." And that, sadly enough, is true—true because the world sees America as an oasis of abundance in the midst of a desert of famine. It is difficult for the well-fed and the well-clothed to be sensitive to the suffering of a hungry and cold world. Sensitivity to suffering comes from a personal experience. The men who were over there know what that means. Our Christmas dinners in our comfortable homes did not digest too readily this year. We could remember the people in France who were cold, whose children had no milk.

We could remember the people in Holland who were allowed 3 ounces of meat per person every 2 weeks and whose main dish is a potato and turnip hash. We could remember the people of England who have less to eat now than they had during the war itself because they are giving of their own short rations to the people of the Continent—people with hungry stomachs and therefore sharper memories—memories of their well-fed days under the so-called Nazi tyranny. These people rose as one to fight with us in the crusade for liberation, inspired by the same "four freedoms" which energized our own fighting men. They were promised not only freedom from fear of the tyrant, but they were promised freedom from want as well; yet today their great enemy is the tyrant of want.

There was an excuse a year ago. The fighting was still going on. We were too busy with the war to feed the hungry, but now there is a growing ugly murmur—the murmur of hungry voices ascending up before the throne of God—crying out to God for vengeance, a vengeance not on the German tyrant who fed them but on the Allied liberators who freed them but are not feeding them. The murmur for vengeance can be quelled, if we will but answer the cry for food. That answer must be founded in practical sacrifice, not in lofty sentiments. That sacrifice must be made on a national scale, and all of us must be willing to bear our share. America must return to the rationing of its food. Only thus can we share both spiritually and materially in the innocent suffering of this crucified world.

This, my friends, is the first and most important part of making the peace. Here we are failing, and if we continue to fail treaties will be no avail. This is the first and most immediate task in winning the peace. Ah, yes, you say, but we cannot feed the whole world. But, my friends, we cannot continue to live in such luxury and abundance with the cries of the starved and dying echoing and reechoing in our ears. The world does not ask us to play the part of Santa Claus. God asks us to play the brother, and if we hear not His voice, He is speaking to us as a nation in the prophetic terms of judgment when He says, "Vengeance is Mine. I will repay."

American Veterans Committee Endorses Recommendation of House Small Business Committee for Set-Aside of Surplus Property for Veterans—Asks War Assets Administration To Expand Facilities for Getting Sales Information to Veterans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Congress and the War Assets Administration have been showing a greater awareness of the rough road which veterans have been required to travel in order to secure their fair share of Government-owned surpluses.

The House Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has been working with officials of the War Assets Administration for several weeks past with a view to securing better service and more equitable treatment for these small businessmen.

Although we have found War Assets Administration officials very cooperative in making improvements when specific problems are brought to their attention, we have found that veterans calling on local offices of that agency have difficulty securing information concerning first, the available supply of the items in which they are interested; secondly, the minimum quantities they are expected to buy; and thirdly, the condition of items being offered for sale. Also, as has been pointed out by others, on certain types of scarce items, a disproportionately large

share of the supply is taken by Federal, State, and local agencies. Furthermore, we have found, in most cases, that the business needs of a veteran can be only partially taken care of out of surplus stocks. As a small businessman, he generally needs help as much on other matters, such as CPA priorities, OPA price schedules, and financing as he does on surplus.

To remedy these problems, we think the following changes are in order:

First. On surplus items which are so scarce that Federal, State, and local agencies are draining off an undue proportion of the supply, we believe a reserve should be set aside for the exclusive use of veterans.

Second. The War Assets Administration should be prepared to make clear to veterans who are applying for surplus property the following:

(a) The chance of the applicant obtaining the requested item because of supply and because of earlier applications already filed. It is realized that this cannot be done for every item but veterans' applications have tended to concentrate on certain surplus items.

(b) The general condition of the merchandise should be made clear to the veteran so that he is not led to expect that shoddy merchandise is, in fact, new merchandise.

(c) The veteran should be told the minimum quantities in which he can reasonably expect to buy.

Such information can be given to the veteran at the time he applies and can also be given to the veteran through veterans' organizations and through more explicit public information.

Third. To assist the veteran and the small businessman in filling their needs in other directions—priorities assistance, price schedules, financing, and so forth—our committee has consistently advocated the maintenance and building up, where necessary, of a strong, small business group in the executive branch, which would not only be able to represent the interests of small business in Washington but which would have well-trained field office personnel to render the veterans and other small businessmen real on-the-spot assistance. Such offices would help the veteran not only on surplus matters but on other matters which are often of equal importance to him.

I took the liberty of reflecting the foregoing views, on behalf of the Small Business Committee, to representatives of those veterans' organizations which have recently been calling this problem to the attention of Congress. It was a distinct pleasure, therefore, to receive a letter from the American Veterans Committee, which wholeheartedly endorsed our proposal. With permission, I am appending herewith a copy of the letter received from the American Veterans Committee, which reads as follows:

THE AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1946.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: The AVC is fully cognizant of your great interest in the question of surplus property for veterans.

The AVC has had under discussion for some time the question of veterans' preference on surplus property. There seems to be general agreement that something must be done to facilitate the acquiring of surplus property by veterans who wish to operate their own businesses. The present system, in spite of the commendable efforts of the War Assets Administration, is just not yielding the proper result. Standing in line after hundreds of Federal, State, and local agencies, veterans are simply not getting the surplus property they need for new businesses.

The AVC would like to recommend that reserves of 50 percent of certain surplus propery items be set aside for veterans. We recommend that reserves be set up in items in particular demand among veterans, such as motor vehicles, office furniture, medical and dental equipment, business machines, maintenance tools, photographic supplies, and construction equipment.

We feel that the reserve plan is the most feasible means of removing the present bottleneck which is making surplus property disposal a farce as far as the veteran is concerned.

The AVC understands that you have been instrumental in devising just such a proposal for setting up a surplus property reserve. Your proposal appears to be more practical than the proposal that (1) veterans be given a complete priority over Government agencies or (2) a 30-day moratorium be declared on the disposal of all surplus property. I don't see how (1), above, can work in view of the fact that Government agencies need badly certain surplus property items. As for (2) I can't see how this would help the veteran, no matter what type survey is made since he would be left in the same predicament after the 30-day period as he was before.

In addition to the reserve program discussed above it should be pointed out that in order to make such a plan work the War Assets Administration should have an expanded information program. This program would make it possible for the veteran to learn at the time he filed his application what chance he has to obtain a requested item, in view of the current supply and the applications on file.

I would appreciate very much receiving your reaction to these proposals and if possible introduce legislation which would incorporate the recommendations outlined above.

With sincere appreciation for your continued interest in attempting to simplify and clarify a difficult veterans' problem, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHAT PATERSON,
National Legislative Representative.

A Choice of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a political opponent, criticizing my acts as Congressman, announces, and I quote, "My platform will be common sense and no bickering." Just as everyone is against sin, so all of us should be advocates of the use of common sense in our individual and national life. The issue is clear. Evidently the gentleman believes that New Deal policies and the administration's method of applying them have been sensible and effective.

In my humble judgment, those policies have been fallacious and the administration of them designed to get votes rather than prosperity and security for either our citizens or our Nation. He calls opposition to the New Deal and its many and arbitrary agencies and bureaucrats bickering. To me, vigorous, constructive criticism is desirable and necessary if we are ever to have a firm, common-sense basis for our domestic and foreign policies.

Republicans lost the last two Presidential elections and a majority of the congressional contests in 1932 and in every subsequent election. They lost because, as was so accurately depicted in a recent cartoon, they just followed along in the footsteps of the New Deal. That cartoon showed the donkey wading through deep snow up the hill to the White House. In his wake was the GOP elephant, stepping carefully and in the donkey's footprints. The donkey was saying, "That fellow will never pass me so long as he follows in my footsteps."

Evidently my opponent thinks the New Deal policies are sensible. Even a casual consideration of what has taken place under the New Deal shows the unsoundness of, the lack of common sense in, their program of deficit spending and bureaucratic control.

My opposition has been something more than bickering. It has been vocal, vigorous, and persistent. It has been accompanied by constructive suggestions implemented by proposed remedial legislation.

As an illustration, long before OPA was born, I proposed the only common-sense way of preventing inflation, that is, the stabilization of both wages and prices. Even OPA now realizes that wages are an inseparable part of prices and that, when wages go up, prices follow. Unfortunately, price control as administered by OPA has not prevented increased prices—inflation—it has given us a scarcity of many items.

The New Deal has insisted, even in peacetime, upon borrowing and spending until it has created a deficit of billions, which the veterans and their children must shoulder. It has created a shortage of butter, flour, meat, shirts, clothing, lumber—a hundred and one items heretofore considered essential to our Nation's welfare.

Yesterday, the House, in an effort to insure production, drastically amended OPA. Without adequate production not only will prices go up but many of us will not be able to buy at all because of the scarcity of all those things which go into food, clothing, and shelter.

A former President said our men should not be sent to fight on foreign soil. But they were. We were told the war was being fought to carry the "four freedoms" throughout the world. Hitler conquered but lost Poland and the Balkan States. Today, those same nations are under the domination of Stalin. We

and our allies are now interfering in the internal affairs of other nations. Few of the smaller nations are free from outside domination. That policy does not make for world peace nor is it sensible.

Do you subscribe to the policy which conscripts the youth of America from their jobs and schools; puts them into an international police force, into an international army, under the command of a military staff, the overwhelming majority of which are neither citizens nor residents of our country?

The fighting over, just a few weeks ago Congress was overwhelmed with demands that our servicemen be brought home. Most of them were brought home. Now we draft millions of other young Americans for a similar purpose, force them to leave their homes, their opportunities in life, to police, to rebuild foreign countries.

If that service is necessary to bring peace to the world, then it should be done as General Eisenhower said—by volunteers. I voted to increase the compensation of those in the armed service so that men will volunteer.

Insisting that the Congress have first in its mind the welfare and the security of our Nation and of our people, to me is common sense.

Have always voted for measures to strengthen our national defense, and intend to follow that course so that we may continue to be the most powerful Nation in all the world.

Then, and only then, will our voice for world peace be heard and respected.

It is my purpose, as long as I am the people's representative, to openly, vigorously, and with all the strength I possess, oppose ruinous domestic policies, every policy which tends to involve us in foreign wars. To, at all times, on all occasions, offer what I believe to be constructive legislation which will bring us industrial peace and prosperity here at home, keep us out of foreign entanglements which lead to war.

I have not the slightest intention of trailing along after the New Deal on a me-too program or being a silent, acquiescing member of a "rubber stamp" Congress.

The people speak through their Representatives as they did yesterday when the House by an overwhelming majority told the bureaucrats that OPA must hereafter use a little common sense and good judgment.

The people are entitled to know the views, not only of those who now represent them in Congress, but of all who seek to represent them in Congress. Not in broad glittering generalities, not in the statement that a candidate is against sin, in favor of common sense and does not want to bicker, but what that candidate believes and intends to do upon every vital issue in which the people are interested. They want to know, too, whether he will make a vigorous, persistent, and determined effort in opposition to the things his people do not want; whether he will speak out without fear for the principles to which they adhere.

CAA Needs Funds for Towers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of April 11, 1946:

CAA NEEDS FUNDS FOR TOWERS

A House committee has recommended that Congress deny Federal funds to the CAA for the operation of control towers at airports. The matter is of importance to Milwaukee.

That denial is illogical. Major air lines are interstate and even transcontinental carriers. Their landings and take-offs in single communities are not mere local matters. Passengers traveling from Seattle to New York, for instance, are not interested in airport techniques at Minneapolis, Milwaukee, or elsewhere along the line except that they expect them to be safe.

To insure the greatest possible degree of safety, every major control tower in the United States should be operated by the most competent Federal agency that exists. The towers are so operated today, by the CAA.

To operate a tower means to take possession of it. It means to install costly equipment in it, to staff it with the chosen agency's employees, to determine who may or may not enter it, and to carry out all its functions.

When a tower thus is taken over by the Federal Government, the Government should pay for its operations. Travelers from Washington, Montana, Minnesota, elsewhere, are protected or endangered by the kind of tower operation there is at Milwaukee, for instance. The responsibility must be wider than local, and no mere supervisory endeavors by the CAA are enough. A local community might, in a general way, conform with the rules, yet be slovenly in its application of them or be financially unable to provide expert personnel, or improved equipment as rapidly as it is developed.

Navigational aids in the harbors of the United States, and most forms of shipping control, long have been accepted as a Federal responsibility. Navigation guides and controls for air traffic should be equally accepted.

Incidentally, not merely seven cities will be affected if Congress refuses appropriations for control-tower operation, as erroneously reported from Washington. Rather, virtually all cities having major airports will suffer. That should not be allowed to happen, the Congress ought to overrule the recommendation by the House Appropriations Committee.

Helping Our Senior Citizens To Meet the Higher Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in this period of high living costs we have recognized the need to increase the incomes of most of the American people, but there is one group which has been badly neglected. Our senior citizens have perhaps the greatest right of all to expect an adequate income since they are least able to increase their incomes through their own earning power. A splendid program for providing a more adequate living standard for our senior citizens has been developed by Dr. Francis Townsend and his organizations in California, and I should like to take this occasion to call the attention of the Congress to these seven steps to security:

First. Old-age assistance shall be paid to persons who qualify and who are 60 years of age or over.

Second. The minimum payment to recipients of old-age assistance and blind aid shall be $60 per month.

Third. The declared need of every said recipient of aged and blind aid shall be deemed to be $75 per month and no deductions shall be made from their respective grants until the "declared need" of $75 is met.

Fourth. The declared need and the minimum payments made to all recipients shall be raised at least semiannually in proportion to any increases in the cost of living.

Fifth. No relatives shall be responsible for the care of recipients of aid.

Sixth. The legislature shall increase the amount of personal and real property exemptions allowed recipients of aid to meet changing values.

Seventh. A spouse shall have a declared need of $75 per month for his or her personal requirements from his or her net income before being required to contribute toward support of husband or wife.

Without Food There Will Be No Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made by Herbert H. Lehman at the dinner given by the National Citizens Political Action Committee on April 12, 1946, in memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, the reckless action taken on the floor of the House yesterday should be viewed against the words of Herbert H. Lehman, recent Director of UNRRA. We cannot have peace just by wishing for it. America wants a democratic world. Well, we cannot have it if we ignore the staggering fact that 500,000,000 people, one-fourth of the earth's population today, are literally threatened with famine.

Inflation means soaring prices. Inflation means that UNRRA and the war-stricken countries can buy less food with their limited resources. Less food means more death. Inflation inevitably means

depression and unemployment in this country. It means that instead of world economic stability we will have world economic chaos, and that certainly does not insure peace.

The speech follows:

During the many years of my close association with Franklin D. Roosevelt, I was privileged to witness countless evidences of his great courage, his high idealism, and his broad vision. His place in history is secure. I believe that no single quality in this great man impressed me so deeply as his passionate belief in the compelling need and practicability of international cooperation and the development of realistic understanding between nations and peoples.

I have frequently marveled at the wisdom and statesmanship of President Roosevelt and leaders of other governments who in the midst of war conceived a world of united nations. This brave ideal has already had to withstand the onslaught of power politics which, alas, has inevitably developed with the ending of the war. But, like millions of other men and women throughout the world, I believe with all my heart that it is only by such united association of nations that lasting peace can be achieved. It is, indeed, fitting that the first organization created by the United Nations should have been devoted to the noble enterprise of giving help to those countless thousands who have been subjected to the full horrors of war.

I recall my talks with President Roosevelt early in 1942 when he first told me of his hopes for a joint effort by all of the united and associated nations to bring help to the suffering peoples abroad after the war and to bind up, at least to some extent, the cruel wounds of armed conflict. He told me of the efforts which were even then being made to survey postwar needs and to take the first steps toward the setting up of an adequate international relief organization. To carry to a successful consummation President Roosevelt's hopes and ideals required many months of effort and negotiation. These negotiations were carried on by Dean Acheson, now Under Secretary of State, under President Roosevelt's direction.

It is no easy matter to set up a structure which would meet the views and needs of 44 nations. It required patience and tact and perseverance. Finally, in November 1943, President Roosevelt and the representatives of 43 other nations affixed their signatures at the White House to the agreement which created the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, now known the world over as UNRRA. This body became the first international operating organization in the history of the world. As Director General of the organization, I have had the honor and the privilege of fashioning the operating structure of UNRRA and of guiding its policies, until today it has become a powerful weapon in the battle for peace and security. But the credit for conceiving this noble enterprise belongs to the great humanitarian leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the people of the world will always be grateful to him. I know what deep satisfaction he had throughout the remaining years of his life in having brought into being the first working instrument of international cooperation and of having achieved the first practical demonstration of understanding between nations and men.

The great work entrusted to UNRRA is known to all, and I do not need to elaborate on the vast quantities of supplies and services which have been made available to the war-stricken countries of Europe and Asia. UNRRA has been and remains a great and noble enterprise in which President Roosevelt, if he were alive, I am confident, would take pride. By the end of March much over 7,000,000 tons of supplies had been shipped abroad, including great quantities of food, medicines, clothing, trucks, tractors, farm animals, and fertilizers, seeds, transportation, communication, and shelter material. In addition to the work of sending direct relief and supplies to the liberated countries, UNRRA has provided many services in the fields of health and welfare and in the repatriation and care of millions of displaced persons. Where the need is so vast any quantities would be dwarfed more especially since world demand far exceeds available supplies. Even so, these supplies and services which UNRRA has furnished have been of vital importance in reducing the rigors of famine and in helping to bring about at least some semblance of economic and social recovery. But UNRRA has done more than merely furnish supplies and services. It has brought to the peoples of the war-torn countries tangible evidence that they were not forgotten by their neighbors and friends of other more fortunate lands. The supplies and services which have been sent to the starving and suffering people abroad were not the gift of any single nation, but represent the gratitude, sympathy, and good will of 48 nations. UNRRA and its great army of nearly 10,000 workers who are now operating in more than a score of lands and in hundreds of localities, camps, and assembly centers, has brought courage and hope for better things ahead. This great organization, as envisioned by President Roosevelt, has demonstrated that men and women of many nations can live and work together with good will and friendly understanding.

In evaluating the effect of UNRRA's operations to the present day, it can be said that it has already made a very great contribution to the restoration of the war-ravaged countries of Europe and is beginning similar work in the Far East. The lives of great numbers of people have been saved and many millions have been given a fresh hope for the future. Literally, it has been the only thing that has stood between millions of men and utter destruction.

But what has been achieved so far is now threatened by the food crisis that has developed in recent months—it is the greatest emergency that has faced the United Nations since the end of the war. I cannot understand why anyone should be surprised at the conditions with which we are confronted today. I have given frequent warnings of the situation over a period of many months. The premature removal of food controls in certain countries was, in my judgment, quite unjustified and has contributed greatly to the present tragic situation. I am glad that our country has in recent weeks taken a number of steps to help the tragic situation. They are, however, not enough.

Several facts appear to me to be clear: First, that no matter how vigorously voluntary conservation of food may be administered, it cannot meet the present tragic situation. Voluntary efforts are, of course, very useful—and we, of course, should be grateful for the sacrifice, self-restraint, and generosity which have been shown. They are, however, not a remedy, but merely an insufficient palliative. I am convinced that in every country, including the United States, there must be rigid control of food. This control should include, among other things, rationing, more liberal set-asides, control of movement, limitation in the use of scarce commodities for all purposes other than for essential human consumption, increased extraction, and greater efforts on the part of governments to capture the actual wheat at the source. Effective control can be exercised only through official channels. I repeat that, in my judgment, voluntary effort alone is wholly inadequate.

In the second place, a truly international agency should promptly be set up to allocate on a world basis food which is in short world supply.

Finally, I am deeply disturbed that people are proceeding on the erroneous assumption that the present food crisis can be disposed of or solved within a period of 90 days. The battle for food is not a sprint. It may be a very long race, requiring endurance and stamina and courage. Scarcity exists not only in wheat, but also in many other essential foods such as fats, oils, dairy products, and meat. Obviously, for a few months succeeding the next harvest there will be substantially increased supplies, and the pressure on this and other producing countries will, therefore, be relieved for a short period. I am certain, however, that unless the crops abroad are far better than now seems probable, the need during the next winter will not be substantially less than that with which we are now faced. And, if by any ill chance, there should be even a moderate falling off in the harvests of the great producing countries—the United States, Canada, Australia, and the Argentine—the situation might become calamitous beyond description. Every possible step must be taken not only to relieve the present situation, but we will be inexcusably negligent and callous if we do not now plan and actively prepare for the future. If it is true, as claimed, that it would take from 4 to 6 months to restore rationing, then it is essential that preparations be made now to meet the urgent needs with which we will be confronted.

We cannot prevent, we cannot cure the present situation. We can, however, mitigate it if we try hard enough, but we can do so only if every country plans and prepares now with wisdom and courage.

This emergency provides a striking opportunity to the leaders of all nations to act with the same determination and with the same feeling of responsibility that they demonstrated during the war. It is a true test of the ability of the United Nations to get together in order to prevent mass starvation. Failure to provide food to many millions must inevitably not only lead to a tremendous human suffering but will result in widespread political instability which may sow the seeds of further armed conflict. The foundation of a secure peace cannot be built on famine. Man cannot plan for the future while their children are starving. Men will not cast out hatred and suspicion while one-half of the world is living in luxury and they are unable to get even a crust of bread to sustain life.

UNRRA has demonstrated that governments and people can work together effectively and successfully. The fourth meeting of the Council of UNRRA which was recently held in Atlantic City furnished proof of this. There were many difficult and complex problems under debate. Representatives of governments always spoke frankly, frequently forcefully, sometimes bitterly. There was no disposition to hide viewpoints behind diplomatic language or protocol. The delegates did not pull their punches. A meeting of this character could not possibly have been held even a few years ago. But, it was only through frank discussion and honest exchange of views that problems were solved and a better understanding between governments attained. I am convinced that, even though at times feelings were severely ruffled, governments at the close of the session had a far better understanding of each other and a deeper appreciation of the need for joint action—even though at times they may have had to subordinate their own interests to the common good.

I believe that because of my association of more than 3 years with the governments of 44 nations and my day-to-day familiarity with many of their problems I have had an unusual opportunity of observing the possibilities and the need of international cooperation. And, so I want to proclaim again, with all the force in my being, my unshakable conviction that only by nations working together, as I have seen to be possible in the case of UNRRA, and only through increased

understanding between men can a lasting peace and true security be achieved. Men and nations must learn and understand the outlook of other men and of other nations. Only by this means can suspicion be cast out. UNRRA, which owes its inspiration to Franklin D. Roosevelt, has given the world the first proof that men and nations can work together. I am convinced that lasting world cooperation amongst nations is not only possible but absolutely essential if we are to attain the world of peace and security for which we all pray.

The Meat Crisis and OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of April 12, 1946:

THE MEAT CRISIS AND OPA

The meat situation in Milwaukee and thousands of other communities in the country has become desperate. Shops selling meats exclusively are closing one or more days a week. Shops selling meats along with groceries are closing their meat departments partly or entirely In hundreds of homes meatless meals are being served because the housewife has been unable, even after hours of search, to find any meat.

The simple fact is that OPA control of meat prices and meat distribution has collapsed. Why it has collapsed is not the important point at the moment. Right now the only really important question is whether the OPA can recapture its lost ground and bring order into the chaos it has permitted to develop.

The OPA admits the widespread existence of the black market in meat. It has explained what the elements of the situation are and what difficulties confront it. Its explanation is of little practical importance unless it can now find a way to bring the black market to a speedy end and give back the meat business to responsible and stable operators.

The OPA must either develop an adequate program and throw every possible agent into enforcing that policy or the whole meat business will go from legitimate into illigitimate hands. In fact, there are indications that, if meat is not brought under control, the whole price control mechanism may fall.

The indicated procedure is quick and firm action, not explanation. If OPA cannot provide that action, there is not much use in further talk about controlling the essentials of life.

The OPA has in the past made its mistakes. That was inevitable. So long as those mistakes can be kept relatively few and relatively minor, the country will still be better off for having a system of controls. If the OPA lets meat get away, as it let clothing, the time will not be far distant when its errors may outweigh its virtues.

This is not merely a meat crisis. It is also—and that is perhaps more important—a crisis for the OPA and for the whole program of preventing ruinous inflation through realistic and intelligently enforced controls.

New Interest Is Shown for Proposal to Extend Voting Privileges to 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, a new interest is being shown in the proposal to extend the right to vote to 18-year-old youth. The following broadcast by John Edwards, The Town Crier over WMAL, on April 16, was most interesting:

A little more than an hour ago—from 10:30 to 11 o'clock—the American Broadcasting Co., and the affiliated stations of the network, including WMAL, carried a program entitled 'Question for America." It's a weekly Monday-evening broadcast in which some issue before the Nation is discussed, and on which listeners are invited to mail in a post-card vote. A week ago, for instance, the discussion was on daylight saving time. Most listeners seemed to oppose this. Tonight the subject was: Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote? The network called upon five correspondents to report from various parts of the Nation, and followed this with talks by Governor Arnall of Georgia, who favors the vote for 18-year-olds—Georgia, you know, is the first State to lower the voting age—and Fannie Hurst, the novelist, who opposes it.

Well, I was asked to make the report from Washington—and I had to cram into 2½ minutes the results of about 3 or 4 hours of surveying this afternoon. Since I was dealing with Washington people, I thought I'd tell you more about this on tonight's Town Crier broadcast.

I started out today by making an informal survey of 10 of my friends in the radio and press business. What did they think? Five of them were emphatically in favor of giving 18-year-olds the vote. Just about all of them used the statement which seemed to me to be a refrain before I got through today—"If they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to vote." Two of these five added the comment that the average high school boy or girl of 18 is just as qualified on matters of American history and politics as the average adult. Four of the 10 were opposed, emphatically opposed. Three of them said, "They're too immature." That's the refrain you hear on the other side of the issue. The other was more blunt. "Ah," he said, "they're too dumb." The tenth person I queried—a former Marine now on the staff of one of the newspapers here—said, "No," but he qualified it, "unless they're servicemen; then it's O. K."

This survey was supposed to get some congressional and official opinion. So I went up to the Capitol to talk with several Senators. Everyone who was willing to be quoted was strongly in favor of giving the teen-agers the vote. Senator MEAD, the Democrat of New York, told me, "If 18 is the right age to let a man fight, it's the right age to let him vote." Senator MORSE, Republican of Oregon, phrased it this way, "Eighteen-year-olds have demonstrated their maturity of citizenship in war service, and suffrage should be extended on that basis." You see that refrain—"If they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to vote." Senator LUCAS, Democrat of Illinois, said about the same thing, and he also recalled how he had urged such rights during the soldiers' vote debate in Congress 2 years ago.

All this senatorial unanimity was a little surprising, but I found things different in a quick visit to the other side of the Capitol. I chatted with a half-dozen Representatives, and none of them wanted to be quoted. Oh, they were willing to talk off the record, but they didn't like the idea of raising what they considered to be a ticklish question with the home folks, especially now before the November elections. Of these six, however, four seemed to favor the vote and two were opposed.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace is probably the only Cabinet official who has publicly expressed himself in favor of the vote. He said this afternoon that he reaffirmed this view. At the Justice Department, Attorney General Clark prepared me a special statement which said, "I believe young men who are called upon to die for their country should have a voice in the affairs of their country. I have a boy 18 and I think the right to vote would add to his consciousness of civic responsibility, as it would to all boys and girls in that age group." This was a busy day for Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles, but he took time to put out this statement—a couple of sentences. The first was the same old refrain, "If they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to vote." Then he added, "This country needs all the youth and vigor and new ideas that we can produce."

At the office of the CIO President Philip Murray I learned that Mr. Murray was out of town, wouldn't be back until tomorrow. But his secretary recalled that in 1944 the CIO convention had gone on record as favoring the vote for 18-year-olds. To balance this view, I called the United States Chamber of Commerce to talk with Eric Johnston. But this was a busy day for him, too. He was tied up in a White House conference until late, and I never did reach him. However, Press Relations Boss Lamb, at the Chamber, explained that it was Mr. Johnston's policy not to comment on matters in which the Chamber of Commerce had not adopted some policy.

From what I've reported, there's a suggestion that most people are in favor of reducing the voting age. That's true among the Government leaders in Washington who were willing to express an opinion. But, obviously, there is a vast number who will not talk for quotation, like those Congressmen who are worried about the elections in November. So, behind all this informal surveying is the fact that there really is a wide diversion of public and official opinion.

Now—and I know that most Washington residents have thought of this point right along: What about the native Washingtonian or the Washington resident who can't vote, but who pays taxes and sends his sons off to war and watches while so many others come to the District to live, and to maintain their legal voting residences elsewhere? Many, many thousands in Washington are in that group. Well, the view of this Washingtonian is best summed up by Wilbur Finch. He's the president of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia. He's a fourth-generation Washingtonian. The first of the Finches arrived here only a few years after the capital was established. He doesn't particularly favor the vote for the 18-year-olds himself. But he says, "It's all right to talk about them, but someone here ought to think first about voting rights for the 88-year-olds."

That's undoubtedly the view of many in Washington, whether they favor the vote for the 18-year-olds or oppose it. First, they say, give us—the 28's, 38's, 48's, and 88's—the right of suffrage.

And, that's all for tonight.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this subject has held my attention for many years. I herewith present again for the RECORD the following House Joint Resolution 40 which I introduced January 3, 1945:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are 18 years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

I further desire to mention that Gov. Ellis Arnall appeared as a witness before the House Judiciary subcommittee in favor of the resolution. His testimony should be read by as many persons as possible, who are interested in the utilization of our youth for the responsibilities of the franchise. That hearing was held October 20, 1943, but no recommendation from Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, and his group, has been made to the full committee. I hope for some action in the near future. It was my privilege also to join with Governor Arnall in a radio debate over the American Forum of the Air on October 19, 1943, from Washington, when we took the affirmative of the following question: Should 18-year-olds vote? Our opponents were Mr. CELLER and Prof. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the department of higher education, New York University.

Murder of the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on April 18, 1946, entitled "Murder of the OPA":

MURDER OF THE OPA

Confidence in Paul Porter, the new Price Administrator, has been justified by action. During his brief tenure of office he has moved fast in response to legitimate criticism of OPA. He has raised ceiling prices when adjustments were required to increase production. He has inaugurated a decontrol program giving assurance that controls will not be retained any longer than is absolutely necessary to protect the public against inflationary price advances and to prevent the diversion of materials and manpower to relatively unessential lines of production. It was against the background of this record that Mr. Porter made his bow yesterday before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. If the committee is not entirely lacking in a sense of logic, his evidence in behalf of an extension of OPA without crippling amendments must have made a powerful impression. Mr. Porter's warning of what would happen if this were not done was, it seemed to us, irresistible.

However, the force of this warning seems to be lost on the House. For later in the day the House approved a series of amendments which would destroy, let alone mutilate, the OPA. Among these amendments is the Wolcott proposal to guarantee to every manufacturer and retailer his cost of production plus reasonable profits on every item sold under ceiling prices. This would put up all prices. It would, therefore, amount to a repeal of price control. This control is based upon the absorption of costs by maker or seller except in cases where a price increase is demonstrably needed to spur output. There were other buckshot amendments which would simply have the effect of burying the corpse left by the Wolcott amendment.

House action should serve to sound the alarm in every household in this country. Mr. Porter believes that living costs might well advance 30, 40, or 50 percent in the coming fiscal year if price controls are scrapped. His forecast has experience and circumstantial evidence back of it. Remember the case of citrus fruits. The same situation which made fruits skyrocket exists now as then: acute scarcity in many lines of goods and superabundance of money to buy them. A combination of these two conditions spells inflation, that greatest of all scourges. Mr. Porter gave the Senate a graphic picture of what inflation means to an average American family with an income of $2,500. He showed, also, what would happen to its savings as represented in bank accounts, life insurance policies, war bonds. The action of the House if sustained would be equivalent to the practice of medieval tyrants who indulged in clipping the coins held by the people when their private purses needed replenishment. A 50-percent rise in living costs would be coin-clipping with a vengeance.

It is said in defense of this attempted assassination of OPA that production, released from price control, would prevent this 50 percent inflation. The argument has no merit while present shortages exist. In numerous cases, as Mr. Porter points out, it is the scarcities of manpower and materials and equipment that are the immediate obstacles to enlarged output. Where that is true, price increases would merely swell profits at the expense of consumers without satisfying their needs. We must first get the increased production in the way that Mr. Porter has indicated. If we let the law of supply and demand operate while supplies are so scarce, production costs will zoom, and production itself would be stalled by the chase of wages after prices, with all the labor disturbance that this chase implies. The idea that greater profit incentives are all that the country needs to start goods flowing is another argument that Mr. Porter dismisses as a quack remedy. Most industries are producing, most are profitable, and the exceptions are getting price increases—and nowadays, thanks to Mr. Porter's administration, without delay.

To take only one example of the effect of scrapping OPA: meat. Removal of price ceilings would encourage feeding cattle to heavier weights. That would drain limited feed supplies from the dairy and poultry industries, increase price pressures on dairy products, bread, etc., and, moreover, interfere with our commitments to help the starving abroad. Thus, if we give up the fight against inflation at this critical stage of postwar reconversion activity, the Nation and the people we are pledged to help would both have to pay a fearful price. It would be the price of short-sightedness and stupidity.

Of course, Mr. Porter does not underrate increased production and adequate profits, or decry free markets. He is merely saying that control over prices must be retained until goods are being produced in such abundance as to make it safe to return to pricing under a free system of bids and offers. OPA's job is, in fact, twofold: (1) to protect consumers against present gouging and (2) to remove obstacles to increased production. We hope the Senate will confirm the OPA in this job, which is vital to the national stability, and that the House itself will review its nefarious handiwork of yesterday.

Pay Raise for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a part of the statement I made before the Post Office and Post Roads Committee on March 1, 1946, in favor of a pay raise for our loyal postal employees:

I am here today to recommend that the increase of 20 percent be given to these postal employees.

On July 6, 1945, when the Post Office Salary Reclassification Act of 1945 became law, the postal employees felt that they had received part of their just desert; and they had received, as you know, no increase since 1925. When the postal employees were paid time and one-half for all work over 40 hours a week they thought they were getting an increase in pay; but now the postal workers have gone back to a 40-hour week and consequently these material decreases have shown up in their take-home pay.

Everybody who works for the Post Office Department knows what has happened to the money he receives in hard cash. It is very much down while prices have gone up very much.

Being a member of the Committee on the Civil Service that is considering pay of Federal employees, I believe that we should have our Government employees feel that they belong to the best service in the world and they work for the best employer—Uncle Sam.

The trouble thus far has been that Uncle Sam has lagged behind industrial concerns and others in private enterprise in the matter of compensating his workers.

I want to see the Government service built up so that the efficient, the loyal, the ambitious may be properly paid and have inspiring prospects, so that Uncle Sam may successfully compete with private employers in acquiring and retaining the proper kinds of employees.

The Government has been very careful in seeing to it that the wages and conditions of employment of private industries went up to correspond with the cost of living; and it has even gone so far as to recommend certain price levels. Those price levels are to be added to other increases that have occurred since 1941. Therefore, we can see that the Government, while providing for the betterment of conditions of those in private

industry, has caused its own employees to suffer.

I am here today as a new Member of Congress from Pittsburgh, where many postal employees live, to say that we in Pittsburgh and its environs are of the opinion that the salaries paid the postal workers are not up to the wages and salaries paid by private industries. We want to see our post office properly administered, go ahead properly, because we think we have one of the best post offices and post-office buildings in the country.

Let me speak about what happens when veterans return to private life and want to resume their old jobs as employees of Uncle Sam. I am, as you know, a veteran of World War II, having served in the Pacific area, therefore, I have quite a fellow-feeling for veterans of this war and their problems connected with getting work when they return to civil life.

It is unbelievable to me that a newly married veteran coming back home and going into the postal service as a mail handler, senior grade, should get only $29.10 a week in actual take-home pay. If he be single, he would get only $27.27 a week in take-home pay. I ask, How can one live in Pittsburgh on that money and rear a family according to a decent, American standard?

I think we should use that American standard of living as one of the tape measures for setting the pay of per annum postal employees at not less than $500 more and the pay of hourly employees at least 20 percent more. I believe that this would be a step in the right direction toward bringing the pay of postal employees more in line with pay received by those in private industry.

* * * * *

I have a letter from a postal worker in Pittsburgh, and I want to quote part of it. He says, "I have a wife and two children, aged 11 and 7; my monthly budget is as follows: Rent, $45; gas and light, $10; food, $80; milk, $20; lunches, $12; carfare, $4; life insurance, $10; hospitalization insurance, $2; telephone, $4; union dues, $1; total, $188. My yearly salary is $2,500. That means that my semimonthly check is $94.45, after tax and retirement deductions; therefore, my monthly income amounts to $189.10, and I have $1.10 left for clothing, doctor and dentist bills, coal, and other household expenses."

How can Uncle Sam take care of that man better as an employee? The answer is obvious. I am asking that Uncle Sam be the type of employer that both Republicans and Democrats want; and I feel that this is the time to effect that. This proposal is only a step in the right direction. Therefore, I earnestly recommend immediate action by Congress for the benefit of our good postal employees and their families.

Opportunities for Veterans To Acquire Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER J. RESA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings conducted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the disposal of surplus property it became clear that confusion and misunderstanding regarding the lawfulness of transfers of property to governmental agencies without reimbursement or transfer of funds not only opened the way for the nullification of limitations imposed by appropriation acts, but in some respects led to a defeat of the legislative intention which the Congress supposed it had incorporated in the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. The present bill clarifies and definitely states the congressional intent in this connection and should preclude any further misunderstanding and uncertainty in the administration of the law.

It also aims to achieve another objective of equal importance.

Evidence received by the committee clearly showed that the priorities and preferences heretofore granted to veterans by the Surplus Property Act have been of little value to those whom it was intended they should benefit. To some extent this was due to the number of priorities preceding those granted to veterans; to some extent also this result was due to inept handling of sales.

Under the bill now offered to the House the Administrator is authorized to cause to be made available appropriate quantities and types of surplus property for exclusive disposal to veterans for their own personal use and to enable them to establish and maintain their own small business, professional or agricultural enterprises. In no event is the veteran's preference or priority preceded by any other preference or priority excepting, as to some property, the prior right of governmental agencies.

It is also a salutary provision of the present bill that it requires the adequate and timely publicizing of information as to the types and quantities of surplus property made available for disposal to veterans and provides that the Administrator shall prescribe a reasonable time of not less than 15 days after public notice during which property offered to veterans shall be held for disposal to them.

There should now be an end to the many futile journeys which veterans have been making to purchase surplus property only to find that the supply was exhausted shortly before their arrival at the place where the property was for sale. This bill when it becomes law should also put an end to the nullification of the veteran's priority by the exercise of superior priorities granted to others.

The consideration which we owe to the interests of war veterans demands the passage of this bill.

Enlisted Men To Get Accumulated Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer my sincere congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] on the fact that 218 Members of this House have signed the discharge petition to bring out his bill, H. R. 4051, dealing with proposed accumulated leave for enlisted men of the armed forces. It is my understanding it will be brought up for consideration and vote in this House on or about May 13. His bill, together with several similar measures have been sleeping peacefully in the Military Affairs Committee for several weeks. I might add that I was one of the first Members of the House to sign the discharge petition and I do not hesitate to predict that it will pass by an overwhelming vote. I have a similar bill sleeping in the same committee. The effect of both my bill, H. R. 6149, and the Rogers bill is the same, that is, to grant accumulated leave to all enlisted men, which has already been given to officers of all classes by the Army and Navy. In the Rogers bill, however, enlisted men are given only 3 months' time from the date of the passage of the act to make application for accumulated pay. Because of the fact that more than 10,000,000 enlisted men have already received their discharges, it would be humanly impossible in that time for all of them to find out that such a bill had become a law and therefore in H. R. 6149 it is proposed to extend the time to 1 year. Many Members of this Congress will recall that when the adjusted compensation bill was passed that a limited time was given veterans of World War I to make applications for same and yet during that period a surprisingly large percentage did not apply because they knew nothing about the final passage of the act.

It is a foregone conclusion that the Rogers bill will become law. To withhold accumulated leave to enlisted men after paying such leave to officers is unthinkable. When the bill is considered, I give notice now that I will offer an amendment to the bill to substitute a paragraph of H. R. 6149 as an amendment to the Rogers bill.

The section referred to reads as follows:

Section (c). In the case of enlisted personnel discharged or released from active duty prior to the date of enactment of this act such lump-sum payment shall be made only if application therefor is made within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. In the case of an individual discharged or released from active duty in the Army such application shall be made to the Secretary of War, and in the case of an individual discharged or released from active duty in any other branch of the armed forces application shall be made to the Secretary of the Navy.

Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Col. Bernard Bernstein, formerly financial adviser to General Eisenhower and Director of the Division of Investigation of Cartels and External Assets, Office of Military Government, United States—Germany—to the Con-

gress of American Women on March 8, 1946.

I find the remarks of Colonel Bernstein deeply disturbing and call them to the attention of the Members of this House:

MUST HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

"A page of history is worth a volume of logic." This well-known remark of Justice Holmes is profoundly apt today, as we witness increasing dissentions among the victorious Allies of World War II and view, with greater and greater concern, developments in Germany itself. What does the history between the two World Wars reveal?

In November 1918 the Allied forces defeated German military might, in what was hopefully described as a war that would end wars. Yet Germany, within 21 years, was able to throw the world into a second maelstrom of blood and devastation that far exceeded that of the First World War. Why was Germany able to do this?

After the end of the first war the divergence of political views and interests among the victorious Allies became increasingly apparent. It was first demonstrated in the shaping of the armistice and the Versailles Peace Treaty. In the years immediately following the Versailles Treaty, France, believing that the treaty had not given her the security she required, sought to protect herself against future German aggression by building a chain of alliances which would not only encircle Germany but would also enable France substantially to dominate the Continent. During these years British policy sought to conciliate Germany. Why? Because Britain feared the spread of bolshevism, considered the restoration of German economic prosperity essential to the reconstruction of British business interests, and feared a French military dictatorship of Europe. Our country at first supported moderate disarmament for Germany, but soon reverted to a policy of isolation, occasionally supporting world disarmament, and implicitly recognizing Germany's demand for equality of status. Russia and Germany began to establish close relations by the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922.

Germany's entrance into the League of Nations in 1927 as a great power marked the end of active enforcement of German disarmament. Germany then began its program of rearmament. Germany acted in concert with Russia and Italy in opposing French efforts to condition any revision of the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty upon the establishment of a system of international security. By 1928 Italy, under Mussolini, openly advocated treaty revision, and thereby established a solid basis for collaboration with Germany. The German-Italian friendship developed in proportion as the antidemocratic forces gained power in Germany. Britain, which, during these years, again held the traditional balance of power among the European states, pursued a policy whose net result favored Germany's objectives and obstructed those of the French. The complete failure of the Versailles Treaty to disarm Germany or curb its war-making powers was generally recognized, when in 1935, England signed a convention with Germany sanctioning a limited revival of German sea power. In 1936 Germany's military forces entered the Rhineland; in 1938 Germany was allowed to absorb Austria. The climax of this tragic course of events came with the Munich Pact in 1938, when the Western Powers sought to buy time and to direct German aggression to the east; and with the German-Soviet Pact of August 1939, when Russia sought to turn the tables on Britain and France.

A governmental report, in summarizing the reasons why Germany was able to rearm for a second world war, states:

"The lesson to be derived from this analysis of the political factor in the failure of the first experiment in German disarmament is clear. The permanent enforcement of a disarmament program requires the assurance of continued concerted action among the victorious powers in order to prevent the rebirth of balance of power arrangements from which Germany would be able to profit."

Germany helped successfully to defeat concerted allied action to curb her war-making powers by skillfully patterning her propaganda and diplomacy so as to organize the sympathy of the world for herself. In this campaign Germany made special efforts to win the sympathies and support of the United States. In the twenties the slogan current in Germany was: "We must squeeze tears from the eyes of the Americans and dollars from their pockets." All too soon after the end of World War I, a tremendous German propaganda campaign was launched in the United States, supported not only by the millions of German-Americans, but by numerous church leaders, politicians, and university professors. And that campaign was extremely effective. We very quickly forgot the crimes which the German armies and civilian administrators had committed in occupied territories during the years of the war. We very quickly forgot that Germany had been principally responsible for starting the war. We even expressed profound sympathy for Germany as the victim of the "French desire for revenge" and of "British imperialism."

All these bear a strange resemblance to the events and developments we are witnessing today. In May 1945 the Allied forces again defeated German military might. In August 1945 Britain, the U. S. S. R., and the United States agreed upon and set forth in the Potsdam agreement, their joint political and economic principles with respect to Germany. That agreement said flatly and unequivocably:

"German militarism and nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world."

The Potsdam agreement provided for the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany. It provided for the elimination or control of all German industries that could be used for military production. It provided for the decentralization of the German economy, for the purpose of eliminating excessive concentrations of economic power, such as cartels. The Potsdam agreement provided that the German economy was to be reorganized, with primary emphasis upon the development of agricultural and peaceful domestic industries.

The ink had hardly dried on the Potsdam agreement when fundamental differences between the great powers on the solution of problems throughout the world began to be revealed. In their respective occupation zones in Germany, the Allied Powers were soon, in fact, following divergent courses. Russia, seeking to so weaken Germany that that nation could never again threaten Russian security, proceeded substantially to carry out the provisions of the Potsdam agreement. Britain is seeking to rebuild Germany into a substantially prosperous and flourishing nation with important industrial strength. Britain is doing this because of its desire to become the leader of a bloc of countries throughout the world, including at least western Germany, that would enable Britain to maintain itself as a substantial equal of Russia and the United States. Britain is also motivated by its desire to maintain its traditional policy of balance of power in Europe. As a newspaper man has recently stated, "There is no British politician eloquent enough to persuade Soviet leaders that this does not imply an intention to use a revived Germany as a buffer state against Russia."

The French are renewing demands which are comparable to those they unsuccessfully made at the end of World War I. They insist that Germany's war-making potential cannot be effectively held in check unless Germany is deprived of control of the war-making industrial capacity of the Ruhr and Rhineland. France, accordingly, has been strongly urging the internationalization of control of the Ruhr and Rhineland.

Our country's administration of its zone in Germany has been vacillating. That vacillation has resulted from the wide differences of views among key officials as to what the American policy in Germany should be. The fundamental approach of many of those officials who are today responsible for administering our program in Germany was recently revealed in a speech by the former Deputy Director of the Economic Division of the Office of Military Government in Germany, who began by saying, "My thesis is that our policy in Germany is wrong." He then proceeded to attack at great length the American high command's policy directive for Germany and the Potsdam agreement.

Similarly, recent newspaper reports indicate that important American military government officials in Germany last week publicly expressed their opposition to the deindustrialization provisions of the Potsdam agreement and to the internationalization of control of the Ruhr and the Rhineland. On the following day a high Government official in Washington found it necessary to deny that the American Government had decided against the French proposals for the internationalization of the Ruhr. A few days ago, the New York Herald Tribune, in an editorial sharply rebuking the American economic adviser in Germany, concluded that he was lapsing into a 1919 mentality and that he was in effect proposing that "the Allies ride herd on the Ruhr until they become bored with the job or annoyed with one another * * * then the region would be free to work for any kaiser, fuehrer, or Reichs president who feels inspired to restore the ancient glories of the Hohenzollerns and the Hitlers."

Inspired by groups similar to those that fostered the German propaganda campaign after World War I, a minority group in the Congress has recently been making repeated attacks on the Potsdam agreement and linking these attacks with attacks on Russia. This congressional group is seeking to gain sympathy for the German cause and to weaken or defeat the Allied agreement to destroy Germany's war-making capacity. For example, they have alleged that widespread starvation exists in Germany and that this starvation is a result of the Potsdam program. But General McNarney, General Clay, and others have made clear that there has been no starvation in Germany. Moreover, the execution of the Potsdam agreement, rather than causing a food shortage in Germany, would expand Germany's agricultural production.

If Britain and the United States try to keep Germany strong, presumably as a buffer against Russia, Russia, already oversuspicious of the Western Powers, will make determined efforts to bring Germany into the Soviet sphere of influence. We are already viewing with concern, Russian efforts, through the German political parties and German trade unions, to win control over all of Germany.

Does all this mean a repetition of the jockeying between the great powers, as a result of which Germany will again be able to threaten the security of the world?

Nazism in Germany is not dead. Reports coming in from Germany every day make perfectly clear that we have failed thus far to win Germany over to real democratic principles. At most, Germany merely regrets the defeat suffered under Hitler. Germany dreams of the power it enjoyed under the Nazi state. Unfortunately too many people and organizations in the United States are

today indifferent to the continued strength of nazism in Germany and to the encouragement which this situation gives to the continued support of nazism and fascism throughout the world. It is encouraging to note that there is a Congress of American Women which recognizes the fact that fascism is not dead. It is encouraging that the Congress of American Women is preparing to fight fascism everywhere.

The Allies fought the war for the purpose of destroying fascism. The military battles have been won. Thus far the ideological victory has not been assured. Organizations such as yours can help our people become more conscious of this failure and of the urgency of the need for continued unity between the great powers. The French request for a four-power conference on Germany may furnish the opportunity for the great powers to agree finally on a program for Germany, and by so agreeing, to reverse the present frightening trend in world affairs.

The crises in international affairs and the threats of war that envelop us today suggest strongly that history is about to repeat itself. But history will not repeat itself and Germany will not become the cause of World War III, if the statesmen and the people of the great powers learn and apply promptly the lessons of the failures that followed World War I.

Wage Rates of Railroad Employees in Engine, Train, and Yard Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith a statement of Carl J. Goff, assistant president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, together with a copy of the special opinion of Board Members Felix H. Knight and E. E. Milliman:

STATEMENT OF CARL J. GOFF, ASSISTANT PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN

The increase of $1.28 per day awarded by the majority of the arbitration board is wholly inadequate. Engineers, firemen, conductors, trainmen, and yardmen are entitled, under the present economic conditions, to a higher increase. The amount awarded is based entirely upon the difference between the percentage of increase in wage rates since January 1, 1941, and the 33 percent increase in living costs since that date.

The award does not provide additional compensation to railroad workers to meet the increased standard of living, nor does it give them a share in the increased output per employee. It does not eliminate gross inequities resulting from greater increases in wage rates in nonrailroad industries as compared to transportation employees on the railroads prior to World War II.

The increase awarded (16 cents per hour) is lower than the pattern established in nonrailroad industries during the postwar period. That pattern is equivalent to 18½ cents an hour, or $1.48 per day.

It was for the reasons set forth above that I declined to join with a majority of the arbitration board in the award filed in the Federal court today.

SPECIAL OPINION OF BOARD MEMBERS FELIX H. KNIGHT AND E. E. MILLIMAN

With great reluctance we have joined with the members of the Board appointed by the National Mediation Board in making an award which, as the ensuing discussion will show, is made wholly arbitrarily, is not based on the evidence before the Board, and is made without consideration of the equities of the employees' claim. These characterizations of the award, grave as they are, are not made argumentatively, but are undeniable. We have joined in such an award solely because the only alternatives left to us by the attitude of other members of the Board were to have the proceedings end in failure to make an award, or to have the amount awarded subjected to a further arbitrary reduction below the amount considered proper by the arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board in order to induce the carrier representatives to join in it.

What the Board has done, in short, is baselessly to distort the stabilization policy of the Government into a barrier against giving any consideration to the gross inequities between railroad wages and wages in other industries. While the other members of the Board would dispute that this was a baseless distortion, the fact that the stabilization policy was treated by them as such a barrier not only cannot be denied but, indeed, was repeatedly asserted by them in the course of the Board's deliberations.

It is undisputed that under the stabilization policy in effect when the arbitration agreement was signed it was permissible by collective bargaining processes to make wage increases without limitation, provided that such amount of the increase, if any, as did not fall into the specified standards for approval be not used for a period of 6 months to increase ceiling prices or to resist otherwise justifiable decreases or to increase costs to the United States. Although common-carrier rates are not ceiling prices, the regulations of December 5, 1945, sought to impose on common carriers a waiver of the right to seek increases in rates on the basis of any increase not approvable as a basis for price increases.

Under the circumstances the carriers were unwilling to sign the arbitration agreement until they had secured from Judge Collet, the Stabilization Administrator, a letter under date of January 23, 1946, assuring them that they might put into effect any wage increase awarded in arbitration and they would not thereby waive the right immediately to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission and State commissions for increases in rates based on such increased wages. This assurance was in no wise conditioned upon the increase being of the so-called "approvable" character, and reserved only to the stabilization authorities their right to contend before the Interstate Commerce Commission, if they so desired, that the wage increase in whole or in some part should not be used as a basis of a rate increase until 6 months after its reflection in carrier pay rolls. By this action all issues as to whether the carriers could or should be required to absorb any part of the increase in wages became finally determinable by the Interstate Commerce Commission and, therefore, not determinable by the arbitration board. The arbitration board was accordingly left free to determine the equities of the employee wage claims on their merits.

On February 14, 1946, a new Executive Order (No. 9697) defining stabilization policy was issued. Fearing that this order might be interpreted to restrict the freedom of the arbitration board to consider the employee claims on their merits, the employees obtained a recess of the hearings at their inception and resumed the proceedings only after they had received the telegraphic assurance of Judge Collet that "any wage increases certified by the Arbitration Boards as being in accordance with the stabilization policy in effect when the arbitration agreements were made would be in accordance with stabilization policy under Executive Order 9697. My letter of January 23 addressed to the carriers conference committee is not changed or affected by Executive Order 9697."

The subsequent interpretation and application of Executive Order 9697 by the National Wage Stabilization Board in the case of the 19-cent increase in the aluminum industry (more fully discussed hereinafter) further made it plain that the fears the railroad employees had had were groundless; their claim was for the correction of gross inequities in wage rates as compared with other national industries and the aluminum case showed that under the stabilization policy such increases were not only permissible, but were approvable for price increase purposes.

Notwithstanding the events above summarized, notwithstanding the fact that the Executive orders defining stabilization policy both before and after February 14, provided for the approval of wage increases for the correction of gross inequities in specified circumstances, and notwithstanding the full trial of the merits of the employee claims in over a month of hearings reported in a transcript of over 3,600 pages, plus 46 exhibits, the carriers, in their closing arguments asserted that the provisions in the stabilization policy for the correction of gross inequities were inapplicable and that the Board was bound to disregard any inequities between railroad wages and wages in other industries shown by the evidence, and to limit itself to such increases as might be permissible as compensation for increased cost of living or for loss of take-home pay through reduction in working hours, whichever amount was found to be greater.

Had there been apparent substance to the carrier contentions, it would nevertheless have appeared inherently incredible that the stabilization policy had, for example, permitted employees in the automobile industry whose hourly wage rates last September were $1.21, and who had had increases of over 27 percent since January 1941, and employees in the steel industry whose hourly wage rates last September were $1.04, and who had had increases of over 40 percent since January 1941, to be granted increases of 18½ cents per hour, and yet the same stabilization policy would limit the nonoperating employees in the railroad industry to some lesser amount even though their average hourly rates last September, disregarding 2.4 cents paid in lieu of overtime, was only 80.6, and their increases since January 1941 had been but 26.7 percent. Nevertheless, the arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board indicated, early in the Board's deliberations, their disposition to accept the limitations asserted by the carriers and thus to exclude from their consideration all evidence of inequities between railroad wage rates and wages in other industries.

A further point should be noted. Even under the carriers' contentions the asserted limitations of stabilization policy are inapplicable if, and to the extent that, the Board might find the carriers capable of absorbing the wage increase without passing it on in increased rates. We think the carriers would concede, and in any event the evidence in the record is overwhelming that in consequence of unprecedented net income before taxes during the war years, the carriers emerged from the war financially much stronger than they have ever been in their history. Starting with this highly favorable condition, the ability of the carriers to absorb a substantial wage increase depends upon their postwar traffic prospects. It is not our

purpose to argue that question here. We believe that unless we are to assume that all efforts of national policy to avoid a complete collapse of our economy are doomed to failure, there is good ground for concluding that the carriers could absorb a wage increase that would do justice to the employee claims. The carriers themselves expect traffic levels well above their prewar experience in good years. But as to how much above, the evidence is conflicting. We doubt that this Board, in any of its components, has the expertise enabling it to pass a judgment worthy of respect on such an issue, and therefore would deem it wise to seek an approach that would leave that question to more expert determination. Concededly, however, the carrier contention as to stabilization policy requires that the Board first determine that question before it can know whether stabilization policy limits its freedom to consider the claim of inequities. Nevertheless, the Board has imposed upon itself rigid limitations excluding consideration of inequities, without ever having addressed itself in its deliberations to an appraisal of the evidence on this precedent question.

The arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board, without consideration of the evidence of inequities, and persisting in the assertion that stabilization policy precluded the consideration of such evidence, proposed an award of 16 cents. This amount was arrived at by applying the cost-of-living formula to the operating employees alone and then arbitrarily applying the same amount of increase to the nonoperating employees. The carrier arbitrators were unwilling to join in an award of even this amount.

The arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board indicated to us that our failure to join in such an award would move them to agree with the carrier arbitrators upon a lesser award. No corresponding suggestion was made to the carrier arbitrators that their failure to join would move the arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board to agree with us upon a larger award. We were thus confronted with the choice of joining in an award we believe to be grossly inadequate or of letting the proceedings end in failure to make an award or in an award further arbitrarily reduced to solicit the concurrence of the carrier arbitrators. Confronted with this choice we chose the course which appears to us to involve the perpetration of the least injustice upon the employees. In so doing we were influenced in major degree by the fact that under the arbitration agreement the employees are free at any time to move in accordance with the Railway Labor Act for a further increase, and thus again to press their claims of inequity, which have received no consideration in this proceeding.

Nevertheless, there should be a clear understanding of the magnitude of the injustice worked on the employees by the Board's arbitrary refusal to consider the inequities shown by the evidence. The emergency board which heard the wage claims of these employees in 1943, found itself precluded by the hold-the-line order issued practically at the conclusion of the hearings, from correcting the inequities which it found then existed. Then, as now, the employees' case was predicated upon inequities between railway wage rates and wage rates in other industries. The Emergency Board found that as of 1940, there were inequities between the hourly wage rates of these employees and those of employees in other industries ranging from 14.4 to 3.1 cents, depending upon the period embraced in the comparison and the industries with which comparison was made; it further found that notwithstanding the 1941 increase for nonoperating railroad employees these inequities had increased by 9.4 cents in the period from December 1940 to December 1942. (Report of May 24, 1943, pp. 8–9, pars. 29–33, inclusive.) Because of the hold-the-line order, however, that Board limited its recommendations for increases to 8 cents per hour, and even that amount was disallowed by the Director of Economic Stabilization. In the final settlement the employees were granted increases ranging from 4 to 10 cents for the correction of substandards of living and the maintenance of interrelated job differentials, together with supplemental increases in lieu of overtime after 40 hours ranging from 5 cents to 1 cent, the combined amounts ranging from 9 to 11 cents.

The evidence in the present proceedings shows that the inequities which had been only partially corrected in the 1941 and 1943 cases have continued to grow. The only comparative statistics going back as far as 1921, the average hourly earnings figures reported by the National Industrial Conference Board for 25 manufacturing industries, show that at that time the nonoperating railway employees averaged 6.6 cents per hour more than the manufacturing employees; by September 1945 they were earning 21.4 cents per hour less than these manufacturing employees. In terms of straight-time average hourly earnings, i. e. the closest measure of hourly rates of pay, they had by 1939 fallen 7 cents behind the hourly rates for durable goods manufacturing employees, with whom they are most directly comparable, and one-half cent behind the hourly rates for all manufacturing employees as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In September 1945 the straight-time average hourly rate of the nonoperating railway employees was 83 cents if the allowance in lieu of overtime after 40 hours is included and 80.6 cents if that allowance is excluded. By contrast, the straight-time hourly average for durable goods manufacturing employees was $1.037 and for all manufacturing employees was 94.9 cents. In other words, an increase of 20.7 cents or of 23 cents per hour (depending upon the treatment of the allowance in lieu of overtime) would be necessary to bring these employees to equality with durable goods manufacturing employees as of September 1945. Even if comparison is made with all manufacturing employees (which include many in no wise comparable to the employees here involved) and the comparison is confined to the period since 1939, and the allowance in lieu of overtime is included as straight time for the railway employees, still an increase of 11½ cents would be required to restore the 1939 relationship as of September 1945. Surely that is the minimum which would be allowed for the correction of inequities in hourly rates as of September 1945, had this evidence been considered.

Such is the evidence which the Board's action has excluded from all consideration. Be it observed, too, that this is not simply one view of conflicting evidence—it is the uncontroverted evidence of hourly wage rates. The carriers did not dispute it. Instead they introduced other evidence which they contend supports the proposition that these railway employees should work at lower hourly rates than manufacturing employees even though they formerly received higher rates than manufacturing employees. That evidence, insofar as it relates to earnings, is calculated to show that the disparity is not so great when weekly or annual earnings are compared. That contention is put forth despite the fact that the carriers' evidence itself shows that weekly and annual earnings of employees in all other industry taken collectively have increased percentage-wise nearly twice as much since 1939 as have those of the non-operating railway employees. More important, however, is the fact that the so-called weekly and annual earnings figures are hypothetical computations rather than averages of what individuals actually earn. The averages put forth by the carriers approximate the average actual earnings in 1944 by only 791,000 employees out of a total of 1,853,000 persons who worked in that year. Furthermore the basic work week of the railway employees is 20 percent longer than that generally prevailing in other industries. Thus, even if accurate earnings data for periods of weeks or years were available a comparison of total earnings requiring 20 percent more hours of work of the railway employees could scarcely be made with any pretense of equity.

The 1943 Emergency Board carefully analyzed the annual and weekly earnings data offered by the carriers. They concluded that "Wage earners, as distinguished from salaried employees in reality have no 'annual' wage." And for the reasons set forth above rejected such data in favor of giving primary consideration to hourly rates. (Supplemental report of May 29, 1943, pp. 71–74). But the present arbitration board undertakes no similar responsibility. It neither considers the evidence of inequality as shown by hourly-rate comparisons nor does it assume the burden of holding such inequalities to be justified by other factors. Instead it forecloses consideration of inequalities by its promulgation of a strained interpretation of stabilization policy at variance with that policy as applied in other industries.

The discussion thus far of the unconsidered evidence has been confined to the inequities as they existed last September, before postwar increases were granted in other industries. Obviously the establishment of currently equitable wage rates for the railroad employees requires not only the correction of inequities as of last September, but additional increases commensurate with postwar increases in other industries. This Board has, on the pretext of applying stabilization policy, excluded both from its consideration.

The record in these proceedings fully establishes 18½ cents as the prevailing measure of postwar increases in national industries. The other members of the Board defy both the record and common knowledge with a stubborn denial that a national pattern of postwar increases exists. They apparently base this denial on the unavailability of such a national pattern under the so-called pattern standard of approval set forth in the Executive order of February 14, 1946. Since that standard refers only to patterns in particular industries or local labor-market areas, the national pattern obviously has no pertinence to the application of the standard. But that a national pattern is not only recognized to exist but is controlling in the application of the alternative standard set forth in the same order, namely, the correction of gross inequities as between related industries, is clearly shown by the decision of the National Wage Stabilization Board with respect to the aluminum industry. (Decision of February 27, 1946, employees' exhibit No. 22, p. 20.) In that decision that Board approved a 19-cent increase for aluminum workers as necessary to correct a gross inequity arising by reason of the post-war increase in the steel industry. That Board said: "It seems a fair inference that the Aluminum Co., because of its size and importance in the national economy, may appropriately rely on Nation-wide patterns or trends of wage adjustments in other heavy industries, such as the steel industry, in determining its wage policy."

It thus appears that the provisions of the Executive order of February 14, 1946, for the correction of gross inequities between industries applies to industries related only by their size and importance in the national economy, and that other workers have derived the concrete benefits therefrom that are denied by this Board to railway employees.

If the correction of inequities as of the close of the war were calculated on even the lowest possible basis reconcilable with the evidence an increase of 11½ cents would be required on that ground. That amount added to the clearly established prevailing

national measure of postwar increases, 18½ cents, would require an award granting the employees' request in full. We believe that the other members of the Board recognize that a fair consideration of the evidence of inequity requires such an award. In fact we believe that it is precisely because of this recognition that an arbitrary barrier against its consideration has been erected. Although the power is not given to us to know the secret thoughts of other men, we do not believe that our associates felt driven against their will to hold that consideration of the evidence of inequities was not permissible. That the carrier arbitrators should be bent upon saving money for their principals and, therefore, should avail themselves of any barrier their imagination could conjure up is understandable enough, however lacking in foresight it may be. That they should be supported in such a subversion of the adjudicative process by the appointees of the National Mediation Board is tragic. We are deeply convinced that no greater disservice to the cause of the peaceful adjustment of industrial disputes could have been done. This demonstration of the incapacity of an adjudicatory tribunal to act in accordance with the evidence before it should be a subject of profound regret by all elements of our society.

Letters to Hon. Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, within the past several weeks it has been my good fortune to receive a large number of complimentary letters from many good friends in and out of Congress who have been good enough to compliment me very generously on my record in support of progressive and humane legislation for the people of my district, my State, and my country.

The lack of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will not permit the publishing of all of them. Under the leave granted me, I am submitting only a few of such letters. They are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1946.
Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR VICTOR: At the beginning of the new year I cannot refrain from dropping you this line to express to you my sincere appreciation for the splendid work you have been doing on the House Agricultural Committee. You have certainly been faithful and untiring in your efforts on behalf of the farmers of America. It has been indeed a pleasure to work with you.

Sincerely yours,
JNO. W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman.

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1946.
Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR VICTOR: Congratulations on your work, and I am glad to place myself on record as being highly appreciative of the support you have given during your 5 years of service in Congress to many points of the National Farmers Union program.

Furthermore, we have been greatly pleased by your support of measures to strengthen the Farm Security Administration, the principal Government agency working for the benefit of family farmers, and know that you can be counted on to continue that support.

We know, too, that you have consistently supported expansion of the program of the Rural Electrification Administration, strengthening of crop insurance, lower freight rates, low interest rates on loans to farmers, and soil conservation and irrigation and reclamation measures. Among the latter we especially commend your backing of the Poage bill providing for requisitioning of surplus machinery for use by soil-conservation districts.

It should be pointed out, too, I think, that your efforts in behalf of agriculture are rendered doubly effective by the fact that you rank eighth among the 28 House Agriculture Committee members, a factor that is always of considerable importance with respect to farm legislation.

In addition to these specific matters we have found you most cooperative in Farmers Union affairs. We have always found you willing to assist our efforts in securing additional allocations of farm machinery and other scarce items during the war. We are very proud to have you as a member of the Farmers Union, not only in Oklahoma, but in our Washington, D. C., local.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,
JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 4, 1946.
The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: Much remains to be done for the disabled veteran. We, who are very close to him, have many ideas of what should be done for him. But we would like to know what you feel is the most important thing that should be undertaken for him in the next year.

Your background and experience will be of tremendous value to us in planning our own activities for the next year. So we are asking you to write us 100 words telling us what you consider of first importance to the disabled.

Sincerely yours,
VIVIAN D. CORBLY,
National Adjutant.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1946.
Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WICKERSHAM: It is a pleasure to respond to your request for your record on agricultural legislation.

I enclose a statement showing your voting record to date during the Seventy-ninth Congress on various issues on which the American Farm Bureau Federation had a position.

As you will note, this tabulation of roll-call votes on 13 issues shows that you voted in accord with the position of the federation 12 times, which is a fine record.

As you know, there have been many other important issues considered but we are unable to report your position because no roll-call votes were taken on these issues. The same thing applies to actions taken in the House Committee on Agriculture, on which you have taken a very active part as a member of this important committee since 1941.

Trusting this will give you the information you desire, I am,

Sincerely yours,
EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1946.
Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: Through your aid, we have been able to obtain a hearing on various old-age-assistance bills. These hearings were the first that the Ways and Means Committee have given us in 7 years. Your untiring efforts in behalf of the aged are really appreciated.

You deserve commendation for being the first to be heard on your bill, the Wickersham bill, H. R. 4747.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,
PAT CANNON, M. C.,
Chairman, Townsend Steering Committee.
HOMER ANGELL, M. C.,
Cochairman, Townsend Steering Committee.
HARRY MCGREGOR,
Member, General Welfare Act Steering Committee.

OPA and the Lesson of Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce into the record an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 16, commending the OPA for restoring controls on cream and meat, and urging the retention of the OPA at full strength. Although it is too late now for this House to take further action, I believe that some of the Members who have had time to think it over, may be regretting the action they took on Wednesday to throw the country to the wolves of inflation:

OPA AND THE LESSON OF MEAT

The OPA is preparing to go back to stricter controls over meat and cream. The situation is such that these stern measures are definitely unavoidable. The country, which likes controls no better than the manufacturers, will nevertheless support this return to partial wartime regimentation as a clearly necessary, though distatesteful step. The chief criticism will be that the bad situation was allowed to develop to a point where more drastic controls are necessary.

Congress, it may be hoped, will learn from what has happened in meat and butter that it is unthinkable to end our restrictive program at this time or to hamstring the only agency in the control picture.

Congress itself is responsible for much of what is disturbing in the present price and production situation; for it was Congress which, by its delay in extending the OPA's life, created much of the confusion and diffidence. Producers, feeling that the OPA was "in bad" with Congress, have dared do things they would not have done if strong controls had been assured for the future. The OPA in turn, feeling that its very life was in danger, has proceeded less boldly in some directions than the situation demanded. What agency could act vigorously with a rope around its neck?

No control can be perfect. The OPA has not been perfect and probably will not be perfect in the future. There is, however, no hope that production can be brought to

the necessary high level without inflation unless this agency is given the "go" signal for the remainder of the present critical period. An agency which still does not know whether it will even exist in July cannot be expected to do the best possible, the needed, job.

Congress should extend the OPA's life and present powers for another year at the earliest possible moment. Uncertainty as to the country's control program can only increase the already extreme inflationary pressures and can only undermine the production progress we have so far made.

OPA may not be all that is to be desired but run-away inflation would be a thousand times worse.

Statement Before Rivers and Harbors Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, House of Representatives, April 17, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, the port of Coos Bay, Oreg., is one of the major ports for off-shore and intercoastal shipping on the west coast between Portland and San Francisco, Calif. The proposal before the committee at this time is a recommendation by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for channel deepening and harbor improvements to provide for the accommodation of vessels requiring up to a 30-foot draft. The tonnage originating at the port of Coos Bay is important in the commerce of this country as well as other nations of the world. Changes brought about by wartime shipping make it imperative that the proposed improvements in the harbor be made if the port of Coos Bay is to enjoy its past volume and continue its normal growth.

The importance of the products originating at the port of Coos Bay is amply demonstrated by the shipping to and from that port during the war. Because of the fact that the present channel depth is only 24 feet, Liberty ships and other large efficient vessels, built during the war, were unable to take on full cargo at this point, since their draft requirements were from 28 to 30 feet when loaded. It was essential that the materials available at Coos Bay be moved, and in consequence, these large vessels were forced to travel to Coos Bay with partially filled bunkers of oil, take on as much cargo as would still permit the vessels to leave the harbor, and back-track to another port to complete their cargoes and take on their full bunkers of oil. This was a wasteful and costly procedure, and much valuable time was lost. Approximately half of the vessels which called at Coos Bay during the later war years were compelled to do so under such circumstances.

The port of Coos Bay is located at the gateway of one of the most important lumber-producing areas in the United States. In the tributary area adjoining Coos Bay and southwestern Oregon, there is an estimated stand of prime lumber of 178,000,000,000 board feet. Located in the tributary area and the adjoining area are 60 operating sawmills, with an annual capacity of approximately 450,000,000 board feet. Savings in transportation costs alone to these mills average approximately $3 per thousand board feet. It is estimated that the annual lumber production, which would flow through the port of Coos Bay, will be 600,000,000 board feet. In view of the great timber reserves in this area, and the sustained-yield cutting program, the facilities afforded by the proposed improvements will be needed and fully utilized indefinitely.

Within the tributary area to Coos Bay, there are excellent potential mineral industry developments, and well-developed fruit, vegetable, and dairy-products industries, which production is principally canned or processed for shipment. These industries are expanding, and new industrial developments are in prospect at this time.

The need for the channel improvements is well justified by the Army engineers in their estimates, showing that, with the proposed improvements, the water-borne traffic at Coos Bay will increase from a prewar yearly average of 550,000 tons to a figure of 967,000 tons in the years following completion of the project. In further justification, the Army engineers show that the ratio of benefits to costs is exceedingly favorable, being 1 to 1.97. The district engineer, in his recommendations and report, estimated certain collateral benefits which would accrue to Coos Bay and the tributary area. When these collateral benefits are added to the direct benefits, the ratio of cost to benefits is 1 to 2.64.

In view of the favorable ratio of benefits to cost, the great potential increase in tonnage originating out of the port of Coos Bay, the demonstrated need for the harbor improvements and channel deepening and the careful survey and recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, I feel this project is amply justified and warrants favorable action.

High-School Students at Long Beach, Calif., Ask Congress How They Can Help Prevent Europe Starving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days I have received several letters from high school students at Long Beach, Calif., expressing wholesome anxiety for the hungry and starving people of the world.

They all ask the question of how they can best help do their share.

Such letters as these from the generation who will now furnish the leadership of one nation and world are inspiring and strengthening to me. What are they to you?

And, it sort of indicates these youngsters must have school teachers and associates who have their minds on bigger things than those which make folks selfish, greedy, and egotistical beyond usefulness. Following are four of such letters:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
April 3, 1946.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE:

Dear Sir: I am a junior high-school student in Long Beach, Calif. I feel that it is my responsibility to do my part in helping to relieve the food shortage in Europe. What can I do to contribute to the shortage?

Sincerely,

GORDON HAMILTON.

APRIL 9, 1946.

The HONORABLE CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a student of Lindbergh Junior High in Long Beach, Calif. We at Lindbergh are interested in the food situation of Europe.

We would like to know what is being done in regard to this condition. We would also like to know, specifically what we can do to help.

Yours truly,

ROBERTA EVANS.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *April 3, 1946.*

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE.

DEAR SIR: I am a student in the ninth grade at Lindbergh Junior High School, Long Beach, Calif. My classmates and I wish to contribute in some way to help relieve the famine in Europe. Will you tell us how we can best direct our efforts?

Sincerely,

MARCELLA RICE.

APRIL 3, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE.

DEAR SIR: I am a student of a junior high school in Long Beach, Calif. I feel that it is my responsibility to do my part in helping to relieve the food shortage in Europe.

What can I do to contribute my share?

Sincerely,

IRENE GRIMME.

Army and Navy Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HADWEN C. FULLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an editorial written by Paul B. Williams, editor of one of the leading papers of my district, the Utica Daily Press, Utica, N. Y., in reference to the Army and Navy merger:

TRUMAN'S DANGEROUS POLICY

At the end of his first year in the White House, President Truman has embarked on the most dangerous policy that the Nation has confronted in years. He has publicly warned leaders of the United States Navy to keep quiet about the proposed merger of the armed services and has proclaimed the unwelcome doctrine that they must "yes" him, as Commander in Chief.

The reckless foolishness of this course seems incredible. The President favored the merger when it was first proposed months ago. By his own statement he has not even read the bill, which has yet to be debated in Congress. And also, by his own statement, he is in favor of this measure and has told its naval critics to shut up.

For the present Secretaries of War and Navy, the bill provides a single official of Cabinet rank. Under him will be three subordinates, one each for Army, Navy, and Air. Then there are to be five more assistant secretarial posts. It establishes a single chief of staff and continues the joint chiefs, who operated so successfully during the war. It creates the single department which the Army wants, and also the council of defense which the Navy wants. As the New York Herald Tribune said, it has everything, including the kitchen sink.

Advantages of a single department of defense may be more apparent than real and

nothing in our history justifies the President in going overboard for this idea. It should be discussed fully and a decision reached on the merits of the case. That is up to the Congress, not Mr. Truman.

In believing that advantages of a merger are more apparent than real, the average citizen does not have to have military experience or set himself up as an authority on government. He can see the obvious difficulties without having them spelled out. Building and operating warships are different from creating armies. Both of them differ from air warfare. To lump these three highly specialized operations into one department is to take a chance on creating something so big and unwieldly that no living man can be expected to run it.

Furthermore, President Truman ought to see that the principle of a single Secretary for Defense, which he so blithely espouses, eventually will strip the President of his constitutional prerogatives as Commander in Chief. For if the President has to rely upon one man, representing all the services, he actually will be delegating his authority to that individual, instead of listening to the several departments and then making up his own mind, as is his duty now.

Speaking again of the assumed advantages in a merger, some economies probably can be made in purchases, but again they are more apparent than real. The Navy uses white blankets, for example, because that automatically promotes the cleanliness which life in the cramped quarters of shipboard, demands.

But the Army uses the familiar olive drab blanket so that it will not show the soil which is inevitable with a soldier's life in the open. The color was chosen years ago, to be as inconspicuous as possible. Imagine what a target white blankets would make for the enemy, if soldiers used them.

These are the simplest possible examples of the many ramifications which spread through the highly specialized services, as they exist today. The Navy's big guns are different from the Army's artillery because they serve different purposes. They both differ from the airplane's weapons. To think that all these intricate devices can be handled like items in a mail-order catalog is to insult the intelligence of the American people.

They should rise in their wrath and tell Congress to go slow with this Presidential obsession. Actually, there are only three main points of disagreement between the services today. The Navy wants to use air-based planes and the Army thinks it should control them. The Navy wants an enlarged Marine Corps and the Army has its doubts about that. There is a third point of difference among the three services, assuming that the air force is given a separate status, and that is—which shall control the new guided missiles, such as rockets? Those are the main issues among the professional military men, which President Truman thinks can be settled by dumping them all into one department.

It is an unfortunate coincidence that just 25 years ago next month the United States had an experience which resembles what is now proposed at Washington. Another amiable, poker-playing politician had moved into the White House by way of the Senate, the chief difference being that President Harding brought along the Ohio gang instead of the Missouri crowd, which is now in control.

In May 1921 President Harding proposed the Washington conference for limitation of armaments, which boiled down to the restriction of naval building on the 5–5–3 ratio, as between United States, Great Britain, and Japan. President Harding sold this bill of goods to the American people, who lived to regret it bitterly at Pearl Harbor. That is the record, but despite such a tragic lesson, President Truman is openly advocating impairment of the Navy's status.

No sensible citizen wishes to extol one service at the others' expense or would claim that any of them is perfect or infallible. But anyone who scans American history and especially the record of World War II must recognize that the Navy today comes as near as possible to a single defense arm.

The Navy uses planes as skillfully as the Army does, and has some specialties of its own.

The Navy uses ground troops equally well. Didn't the marines have something to do with winning battles in the Pacific?

Besides these functions, the Navy operates ships on or under water, wherever there is enough to float them, and that takes in five-sixths of the world's surface.

Presumably, President Truman does not intend to wipe the oceans off the face of the earth, but he has the temerity to say that the men who know most about our naval affairs mustn't talk. His position would be ridiculous if it were not so deadly dangerous to the people of the United States.

PAUL B. WILLIAMS,
Editor.

Long Beach Paper Approves President Truman's Action on Starvation Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as early as February 28, 1946, the far-seeing editorial staff of the Press Telegram in Long Beach, Calif., wrote the following editorial. It now seems additionally pertinent to share it with all others who may read it by reason of my having the privilege of placing it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WAR AGAINST MASS STARVATION

President Truman shows an understanding of the nature of the problem of providing food for nations in Europe and Asia which face the certainty of starvation for millions unless help in ample measure is given them by the only country which has the means to give it—the United States. By calling a conference of public-spirited citizens of humanitarian purposes, including former President Herbert Hoover, Mr. Truman recognizes that the task of feeding the hungry can be done only if the American people as a whole make it their job.

"Our national self-respect and our duties as human beings demand that we do all possible to stop the spread of famine," President Truman told the eminent Americans invited by him to meet with him tomorrow in the White House to discuss relief plans.

With the exception of ex-President Hoover, acknowledged authority on international food problems and organizer of the effective relief work in Europe after World War I, and Chester C. Davis, former Food Administrator, and possibly a few others, the men and women called to the White House conference evidently were chosen because they were in position to influence public opinion and to inform the public.

The President says frankly that the Government alone cannot prevent famine in large areas of the world. The American people will have to be mobilized for the new war, a war that is not against human enemies, but the ancient enemy of mankind—hunger.

Americans will have enough to eat after they have shared their food supplies with the starving peoples abroad. The sacrifice asked of them will be no more than to restrict their consumption of certain foods and to accept substitutes. It calls for some self-discipline and self-denial by Americans, but leaves them more than enough food for a balanced, health-giving diet. And the purpose is to prevent men, women, and little children, millions of them, from starving.

Mr. Congressman: Are You Whistling in the Dark?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter.

Inasmuch as the name has been requested as confidential, I can give only this information. The lady is the wife of a veteran of World War I, a former secretary of one of Ohio's largest industries, and one of Ohio's most clear-thinking women. Can her questions be answered?

MCCOMB, OHIO, *April 15, 1946.*

DEAR RUBY AND HOMER: I have received several greetings from you, all of which were appreciated and prized. It is so nice to be remembered. As to your comment "noble woman" I am reminded of a remark by an Irish friend of mine, that she never handed out blarney unless she meant half of it anyway, so may I take 50 percent of your compliment and keep it for my own?

When I noted your admonition—or was it a plea—that we have faith in our country and its destiny, I wondered if you might be saying that to bolster your own faith which might be wavering? Sort of whistling in the dark to keep from being so fearful?

I have so much on my chest that I'd like to get off that I must restrain myself, knowing you have more important things to do than take note of opinions of such an unimportant personage as myself. Yet, I am like so many millions that go to make up this Nation that maybe what I am thinking isn't to be completely disregarded.

The outstanding thing right now is the coal strike. When the American people are continually confronted with situations like that and nothing is done about it, one wonders what has become of the good old American brains and guts. Yet I know the old spirit is still there when I remember that a bunch of kids went out and licked the most powerful bandit nations the world has ever known. But the conditions they face upon returning home are not inspiring. We wept for those who lost their young lives on the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima. But I wonder sometimes if theirs was not the happier lot than to come back and have their most cherished ideals become as befouled as their mud-soaked, bloody boots.

All the veterans I have talked with are very bitter. A doctor friend of ours got back from the Pacific. He had just established a reputation and gotten to the point where he could cash in on his long years of effort when he gave it up to join the Navy. In service almost 4 years. He and his wife and child spent the week end with us after his release, and the conversation being general as it is in a group, I don't know just what it was that made him bitter, but I heard him recall to

Carl how he had criticized him for being bitter after the last war, really bawled him out, "because I did not understand then, but I do now, and I offer you my humble apology."

He said he saw them dump 10,000 jeeps, still in their shipping crates, into the ocean. He saw them dump cases of tinned food into the sea. All the soldiers have deplored the wanton waste in the face of terrible want. Another soldier told me he hauled truck loads of new clothing—waterproof jackets and things like that, the best of material—and when they had a mountainous pile of it, they were ordered to throw Diesel oil on it and burn it. This was in the Philippines, and there were the war-battered Filipinos running around without a shirt and asking when the Americans were going to do something about it. Just about the time I heard this, they had another clothing drive, asking us to share that suit, that coat and dress for people across the sea are freezing to death in caves and doorways.

A veteran got back from India. What's on your mind, soldier? Well, I saw them lay out fine watches, binoculars, precision instruments in long rows and order trucks driven over them. I saw fleets of trucks and jeeps taken to the cliffs and thrown over into the sea. These things could have been used, he thought, to rehabilitate the devasted countries, on farms and for transportation. The soldiers themselves begged to buy some of the watches and binoculars but were denied the privilege—the orders from the brass hats were to smash 'em. Did you see food destroyed, soldier? Oh, yes; all the time. Nobody thought anything about that.

And here at home. No butter, it was going to the Army. Nobody complained, nothing was too good for the boys. Then we learned that millions of pounds of rancid butter were going into soap. Washington denied it. A reporter went to Proctor & Gamble, and they said, "Yes; they had purchased 750,000 pounds of one batch and used it for soap." Again Washington denied it. Of course I realize there is always waste in war, so the butter isn't too important except when you think of millions with no bread let alone butter.

The black market. This just burns everybody to a cinder. Why isn't something done about it? With about 3,000,000 Federal employees, which is out of all reason in the first place, isn't there someone with enough initiative and guts and brains to go after them? They operate openly and with impunity. Right down here at Archbold there is a large cattle auction and the black market overbids the ceiling price and gets all the stock right along. Why can't they send the FBI to such places and arrest the law violators? It would seem that a stretch in Leavenworth for some of these law violators so brazenly thumbing their noses at the Government of the United States is long overdue. If the Government wants the people to keep the faith, let them merit that faith and not forever put us on the sucker list, making us think they all agree with Harry, the Hop, that we are too damned dumb to understand.

That OPA has been such a stench that I don't know just how to express myself in a few words, but their persecution of small business, their snooping and overbearing attitude toward American citizens is simply sickening. A man drove up to a farmhouse near McComb and asked to buy a dozen eggs. The woman said no, she sold them all to the egg man who called for them regularly. Then he said his wife was sick and wanted so much to have some fresh country eggs—wouldn't she let him have a dozen and he'd gladly give her 50 cents. (Ceiling price was 40 cents.) He got the eggs and he had her arrested and fined for violating the law. Yet the black market openly flouts the law from border to border and coast to coast and I haven't heard of any of them being apprehended. Recently a commentator gleefully told us the FBI was out to get the black market on nylons—you ladies will get your stockings and won't that be lovely? The world starves, and "youth grows old and spectre-thin and dies" and we concentrate our mighty brains on nylons.

The bleeding hearts are daily beseeching us to eat less bread (we are not eating much anyhow, with no butter or oleo) and if they'd do their job we'd make these sacrifices with a better heart and certainly have more respect for our Government. When a young man gets those greetings from the President, he gets into that uniform or goes to the clink. When he comes back, he sees that same Government flouted by a gang of bandits and nothing is done about it. Is it any wonder he feels bitter that he went through that bloody hell just so a lot of criminals could have a Roman holiday, seeing the ones he fought to protect the victims, himself included? Are we to assume that these thugs are too smart for our Government, or that those to whom we have entrusted our Nation's honor and welfare are too indifferent to bring to book those who are out to wreck it?

Last winter we had no decent coal—just coal dust and slack and stones. Much of it we didn't even try to burn, it being just stone, and after paying the high dollar for it, hired a man to haul it away with the trash. Several times a day we'd have to let the fire go out so we could pick the stones out and then rekindle it. We paid the same price as for good coal. Where was the OPA then? And now John L. Lewis tells us he'll get that fifty million a year or Americans won't have even a bucket of coal. If he gets his filthy paws on that much power he could just about elect whom he jolly well pleases for the next President of the United States.

This Lewis person beats his breast and proclaims himself the champion of labor. He gets for this a salary of $25,000 a year, he pays his daughter $7,500 a year, and a whole flock of his relatives are living fat by robbing these same miners he professes to love. I trust those bullet-proof windows he has in his office will be no more effective than Huey Long's iron vest.

When Congress wanted to pass a bill to make these gangster labor leaders account for the millions they are filching from the pockets of labor, Roosevelt put his foot down. They were to be immune from the laws governing other citizens—they were his own private little gang of vote-getters and all they had to do was play ball at the ballot box. Roosevelt, the great humanitarian—Roosevelt, the friend of Labuh and that faceless thing he called the common man. By the way, just who is the common man? Have we, then, a caste system in this country? And why didn't Congress pass that bill in spite of Roosevelt's objections? If they had clipped the wings of that gang who are bent on running this country Capone style and using the loot to cut its throat, maybe right now we wouldn't have a pipsqueak rabbit holding the exalted office of President of the United States. The highest seat in one of the mightiest nations, and look who's sitting on it. A pair of eyebrows has him hogtied and is putting the boots to him and every citizen as well, and what is done about it? Just some more nothing.

I saw a picture of Herbert Hoover holding the hands of little children somewhere in Europe. How touching! All I could see were the flames of Anacostia destroying the tin-can huts that sheltered (in a pitiful fashion) the children of the heroes of World War I and their parents. He was President then, and not only would he not help them—he drove them out into the wet fields at night and burned their pitiful possessions. And even the Red Cross had nothing for them, absolutely nothing. William Randolph Hearst out of decent pity set up a tent and equipped it with medicines and nurses to care for the sick veterans and their families. Herbert Hoover—and now he bursts out crying. I know all these things are true because I was there. I could not have believed it otherwise.

I recall the days when we were plowing under the crops and destroying livestock—hides and all—while American children from remote regions went to school with no shoes on their feet, and it was stated that one-fourth of the children of the Nation were undernourished. Why bring that up now—that's all over with? Is it? We were told that many draftees in this war failed to pass, their poor physiques due in many cases to malnutrition during that period. And right then we were maintaining missionaries in the "heathen" countries to teach the philosophy of Jesus, that we are all brothers and should love and help one another. We all know that in India and China, and no doubt other countries as well, there are millions who never have enough to eat from the cradle to the grave. Had I been one of those listening to the American parson tell of his love, I'd have given him the brown-skinned equivalent of "Oh, yeah," or "Sez you," topped off by a long and loud Bronx cheer. Yes; I know we're doing it now when it means sacrifice, and I heartily agree that we should and must do it, but where were our big hearts then while all the time the Harvard Accent was blowing that "good nayba" horn around and around the world.

While back, when Morgenthau was Secretary of the Treasury, a columnist said that he had instructed his collectors of internal revenue to gyp the taxpayers. When a man paid his tax he was to be told that there was a mistake, that he owed still more. For instance: A man paid his tax and was summoned back and told he owed $19 more. The man protested, as he was sure it was correct. He was told he'd better pay it as it wouldn't pay him to take it to court—he couldn't win anyhow and he'd only be out more money. So he paid it. This Government man told the columnist that the man had paid his tax to the very penny, but he paid the additional $19 rather than go to bat about it. This is unbelievable really, but it is equally amazing that a columnist could say such things about a member of the Cabinet and get away with it if it were untrue. This columnist is still doing his stuff. It would seem that for such a statement, if false, this columnist would have been prosecuted and prohibited forevermore from misleading the public with false statements. Also, we were told that during the war, when gasoline was rationed, Morgenthau had a Government plane and its crew for his own private use to take him to his country estate whenever he wanted to relax and have fun. This cost the American taxpayers $10,000 a month, we were told.

"Let's get off the gravy train" pleads Senator BYRD. We don't have much hope for that, as we all know, when a bureaucrat gets both feet in the trough he's going to keep them there, come what may. And every snoot means several votes. And the people get pretty tired of it—tired of being "a doormat with five senses."

Do I see you figuratively clutch your toga like Caesar and sadly murmur "Et tu, Brute"? Is Blanche, too, throwing brickbats? Oh, you know the dear people criticize first and save the compliments until later, and by that time we have run out of breath. I assure you there is nothing personal in my remarks. You have a good, clean record, it seems to us, and for this we thank you. But it would be good to see someone in Washington with a mighty voice bring a little more order out of the chaos. Could be you, Homer—just could be.

Sincerely.

The Farmer Always Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include herein an interesting editorial from the Beloit Daily News, Beloit, Wis., under date of April 11, 1946. I am certain the House Members will be interested in reading this timely editorial:

MR. FARMER WILL PAY

The International Harvester Co. and the union representing its 30,000 employees got together yesterday to end an 80-day strike which—

1. Cost the workers $13,500,000 in wages.
2. Deprived American farmers of 30,000 tractors, 6,500 combines, 23,000 mowers, and 45,000 harrows they desperately need to process crops to feed Americans and help save the rest of the world from starvation.

An International Harvester Co. spokesman said the increased wages granted the 30,000 employees will cost the company $25,000,000 more annually. That, said the spokesman, is $300,000 more than the company's entire profits in the year 1945.

In that case, will the company:

1. Continue in business at no profit? (It's a good trick if you can do it.)
2. Go out of business?
3. Or pass the increased cost (with the consent of Mr. Truman and Uncle Sam) along to the farmer who must buy the machinery and implements?

And if it should be No. 3—as it will be under the Truman formula—do you think the strike hurt most:

1. The International Harvester Co.?
2. Or the American farmer?

Watch for the same situation as regards the 12,500 J. I. Case and Allis-Chalmers implement employees. Now that the Truman formula has been applied in the IHC strike, the other two will be settled soon—and on a similar basis.

The farmer will pay their additional costs, too, in addition to being deprived of the tools he ought to have had many weeks ago.

There'll be some, of course, who think this a screwy bit of economics. But it isn't screwy to the farmer. He'll understand it perfectly when he buys the next farm machine.

It is the new economics fostered by Mr. Hannegan's Mr. Truman in the hope that happy (political) days are here again.

They aren't.

Decentralizing Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the farmer has the right idea. He lives and works in the uncrowded, healthy, open country, and he knows that his surroundings more than compensate for the sophisticated lure of metropolitan areas. Anyone who has lived both in the city and in the country will heartily second his judgment, if we bring the advantages of the cities to the country. It would greatly benefit our children and our adult population as well if we could find some means of bringing this healthy country life to the many many workers who must now live with their families in smoky cities and industrial centers in order to find employment. Schools, sanitation, and recreation can more adequately be developed in the rural area than in our present crowded cities.

My good friend, the noted California publisher, Manchester Boddy, has suggested a method for doing away with our present overcrowded, unhealthy city life, to which I should like to call the attention of the Congress today. In essence, the plan which he and I have discussed combines the benefits of both city and country life in the creation of a new American frontier. It would be desirable to encourage our veterans to build their homes in the rural areas to start the ball rolling toward decentralizing.

Decentralization of American cities is not a new idea, but it is for the first time becoming a necessity which we cannot well afford to ignore. Other countries with a much slighter problem of overcentralization have begun to move in this direction. Brazil, our Latin-American neighbor, for example, discovered one of the world's richest deposits of high-grade iron ore in a lightly populated area above Sao Paulo, and rather than ship this ore down the valley to some other city, she chose to develop it on the spot and thus stimulated the growth of a new city, Bella Horizante. From this example of modern ingenuity we can well take note.

In terms of the great West, which I represent in part, such a program of decentralization would open new frontiers for railroading, highway development, business opportunities, and employment. New industries located at the spot where essential resources are produced would attract workers and would stimulate the development of whole new communities and would help us toward that goal of full production and full employment which we seek. Our most expert engineers, architects, and construction men could build new cities which would be planned for the greatest possible health and comfort of the citizens. Meanwhile, our older cities could undertake the problems of slum clearance, and the building of the recreational facilities, traffic channels, and other needs for their smaller populations. Such a plan would utilize the resources of our Nation in the true interest of the people. Wealth, happiness, and health would spread throughout the Nation along the new twentieth century frontier.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. SHARP
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, quite a number of political speeches have been made on this bill since it came before us on Monday. The administration, through its spokesman, predict dire happenings if we attempt to translate here objectives that will in real and honest effect improve the condition of our people. Any attempt to force remedial changes in the price control law, any argument emphasizing that realism shall be a guide post in perfecting the law, are immediately challenged as efforts and attempts to hamstring the administration, to bog down the OPA law.

We are on notice of the barrage of propaganda being put out by the administration to rally support for its program. What this propaganda is really saying is simply this, and let us not forget it: "The administration of OPA is perfect, it cannot be improved upon, and all consumers and producers who claim they are suffering under our benign program, are either liars or potential profiteers."

They would have us believe that there is no meat shortage, no butter shortage, and that the black market is only a myth conjured up by political opponents of this administration. They would have us believe that we are not getting shoddy goods at a price for which we should be getting the best. That, in real effect, is what this administration is saying. The protests that are coming to all of us from veterans, housewives, manufacturers, producers, indicate sharply that unless the OPA administration is improved, that if proper price adjustments are not allowed, that if the necessaries of life are not forthcoming—that they would rather have the entire OPA program scrapped, risking what this would mean in the case of certain phases of the program which obviously should be continued.

I think the country is alert and appreciates that the present administration of the price-control law is defeating the objectives of the act. In all the necessaries of life, food, clothing, and housing, we are getting not increased production but dwindling output. Here we are, the greatest country on earth, with the largest potential production capacity in history, suffering from the lack of plain and everyday necessaries. Even the returning soldier is not able to buy a shirt and his family finds it increasingly difficult even to get him oleomargarine as a spread for his bread. And, so far as putting a roof over his head is concerned, that is only a plan on paper.

The whole emphasis of the OPA has not been to stimulate production and to get more and more output, but to try to ration and control a continuingly dwindling stock pile. What we need in this country more than anything else is to increase that stock pile so that the distributive shares may be made increasingly greater for each and every one of us.

The history of OPA is replete with inequities and unfairnesses. Not alone to the consumer who cannot buy even though he has the price, but to the man who produces.

I am not going to argue for the complete elimination of OPA. We have not yet arrived at that period where we can suspend all controls. There are still maladjustments and these must be met

not by a harsh and ruthless price-control system, but rather by one of sympathetic approach and which refuses to label every businessman as a profiteer. It is my strong feeling that the amendments adopted by the committee and included in the bill before us represent certainly the minimum that is necessary to improve present administration of the OPA. These amendments are long overdue.

Labor Law That Has Worked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the last of three articles from the Chicago Sun of April 17, 1946, describing the good results of the Minnesota labor-relations law in promoting industrial peace in our State:

PATTERN FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE—MINNESOTA ENJOYS PERIOD FREE FROM STRIKES, BUT DIFFERS AS TO ITS CAUSE

(By Milburn P. Akers)

ST. PAUL.—Minnesota's Labor Relations Act, a compromise achieved at a time of stress, appeared to satisfy no one upon its adoption.

Labor leaders expressed the fear that its provisions were too restrictive. Businessmen objected to the powers of the fact finding under which commissions could subpena their books and other records. Both regarded the act as inimical to their position in collective bargaining.

The act, now 7 years old, cannot be said to have won State-wide acceptance. But its opposition, except from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, appears largely to have dissipated in Minnesota's record of more-than-ordinary peaceful industrial relations since its enactment.

The extent to which the act is responsible for what in Minnesota has come to be regarded as an era of good feeling between labor and management may be debatable. Most Minnesotans, including some officials of the American Federation of Labor, credit the act, in whole or in part.

The CIO, however, vigorously dissents. Douglas Hall, its attorney, has another explanation. It is:

"Public opinion and the increasing strength of labor unions have compelled employers and their associates to abandon destructive policies and to negotiate in good faith."

Irrespective of the viewpoint, the record demonstrates that Minnesota, since adoption of the act in 1939, has been relatively strike-free; that most labor disputes are settled without resort to work stoppage; and that the violence of the thirties, which led to the act's adoption, has not been repeated.

Since its inception, the act has been administered by a union member.

George W. Lawson, secretary of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, credits that fact with much of the success of the act.

"We don't like it [the act]," Lawson said, "But it has not done us any harm. It may have accomplished some good, from the public viewpoint."

And then, noting that the act always has been administered by a union member, Lawson added:

"The result is that we have a good administration of a law which, if badly administered, could have caused a lot of trouble."

Lawson, stating that immediately after its adoption resolutions seeking its repeal were introduced at each session of the State federation, said that none had been offered at the last several meetings.

Hall, the CIO attorney, while not contending that the act has been especially harmful to organized labor, maintains that it fails to protect "labor's basic rights" and that it has not been responsible for industrial peace in the State.

He cites several instances in which, he contends, the act has been detrimental; maintaining that it contributes to an instability in collective-bargaining relations and that the public-interest clause has been invoked improperly in numerous cases where no such concern was present.

Such improper invocation of the public-interest clouse, which necessitates another 30 days before a strike legally can ensue, is, so Hall declared, "an unwarranted extension of that concept" and shows "the danger of unjustified encroachment into everyday fields of collective bargaining."

The CIO attorney claims that the State's figures of disputes settled and strikes averted are misleading—that "too rosy a picture is painted." He claims that the State takes credit for settlements that have been achieved by the Federal Conciliation Service.

"On the basis of these concrete experiences, the CIO," Hall said, "concludes that the Stassen Act does not contribute to the settlement of important labor disputes."

Minnesota's recent record of more peaceful industrial relations, he says, cannot be attributed to the workings of the act.

"The record of long, bitter and costly strikes in Minnesota in the period of 1930 to 1938 was due to the open-shop vigilante tactics and policies of Minnesota employers. Public opinion and the increasing strength of labor unions have compelled employers and their associates to abandon destructive policies and to negotiate in good faith."

Gov. Edward J. Thye, who has handled many disputes after they have been certified to him as being in the public interes asserts that the law has brought industrial peace, in large measure, to Minnesota.

"The act has served us well," the Governor declares. "It has reduced strikes materially, has brought labor and management together in a splendid relationship and has brought about an opportunity for a well-informed and unbiased public opinion to exert its influence in a way that could not have been done by any other type of legislation."

They believe that the act contains principles which well might be incorporated into Federal legislation. But both Hall and Lawson disagree.

Minnesota industrialists largely accept the law; probably, in many cases, on the theory that it has resulted in better conditions than those prevalent in the thirties.

Much more about the law will be heard nationally as the Governor who brought it into being, Harold E. Stassen, presses his campaign for the 1948 Republican Presidential nomination.

Some Facts About the Shortage of Men's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, there are some important firms that do not attribute all the woes in the world to the Office of Price Administration. Among them is the large clothing manufacturing firm of Cleveland, the Richman Bros. Co., whose statement as to the shortage of men's clothing is herewith reproduced:

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE SHORTAGE OF MEN'S CLOTHING

Every day people ask us, "Why is it so hard to get a suit of clothes now?" It's a fair question, and deserves an honest answer. First, it took months for the textile mills to reconvert from war to civilian production. Secondly, the needs of the millions of discharged servicemen, added to the normal requirements of civilians, have created a demand so far greater than the supply that it is impossible to take care of every customer at the exact time he wants new clothes.

You may have heard rumors that some makers were holding back clothes. We wouldn't know about that. We do know that Richman Bros. never held back garments for any reason whatsoever. In fact, we have for a long time been making as much clothing as the available supplies of raw materials would permit, rushing them to our stores as fast as we could, and putting them on sale just as quickly as they arrived. We've been giving priority to newly discharged servicemen, and in doing that we've been carrying out the wishes of the Government and right-thinking civilians.

What are we doing to increase the supply of clothes? The Richman tailoring family are working as hard as they can, without sacrificing the quality of Richman workmanship, to put an end to this shortage as quickly as possible. We are shipping each week's production to our stores, without a moment's delay. Our stores, in turn, are putting the clothes on sale as fast as they receive them.

If you've been disappointed by shortage of clothes at your Richman store, we're sincerely sorry. However, new shipments are being made right along, and we hope you'll try again, for Richman quality style and value are worth waiting for. Meanwhile, remember, we're doing our best. There never has been any holding back at Richman Bros.

RICHMAN BROS. CO.

Famine Conditions Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has just asked former President Hoover to return from Europe with his first-hand report on actual famine conditions abroad.

The authority and prestige of the President and former President may serve well to impress upon the Congress and people of the United States the truly desperate situation now existing among our allies and our late enemies. But there is no lack of witnesses to the fact; and there is a growing mass of evidence that a firm insistence by our State Department upon fulfillment of UNRRA promises by all the cosignatory nations would result in prompt alleviation of the most severe, immediate need in central Europe.

As seen from two different viewpoints, the hunger of Europe can be summed up by the following letters. One is a very fine and sensitive account of the situation as seen by a sergeant, Jacob Sheeskin of Washington, D. C., during his service in the Army of Occupation. The other is

an authoritative protest from Dr. Karl Brandt, now with the Office of Military Government, United States, in Berlin. Dr. Brandt's accusation is given circumstantial confirmation as to general Russian policy in occupied Europe by the Associated Press dispatch from Hungary, published in the April 17 issue of the Washington Star.

LIFE IN EUROPE

This is in answer to the kind housewife who complains that she is "sick and tired of hearing that we must feed the starving people of Europe."

Lady, have you ever been really hungry? Have you or your children ever delved into the garbage cans of an invading army to find just one little piece of bread?

Have you seen your home and every little item you hold dear destroyed in a single instant? The answer is an emphatic "No." You don't know what war is and you don't know what hunger is.

Since I spent close to 2 years in Europe during the recent fracas, I feel perfectly qualified to shoot my mouth off. You say, "If they would spend their time and energy in raising food, they would have plenty."

If you would stop to think awhile, you would realize that wars are not fought in one little fenced off area, but that they rage back and forth over entire continents.

It is a most significant fact that over four-fifths of Europe's total food producing area was completely destroyed by battles fought on the land.

Some of this land may not be able to produce its full quota of foodstuffs for 5 or 6 years. I don't claim to be an agricultural expert, but I believe it is safe to say that the fertility of some of Europe's ground may never be restored.

A large portion of Europe's manpower was destroyed in the war. Another large portion was shifted from their homes into Germany to work in the war plants as slave laborers. These displaced persons are being returned to their homes as rapidly as the UNRRA can get them there. When these people are finally settled, they will use their energies to producing food.

You must also take into consideration that many European agricultural methods would be considered primitive by American farmers. Very few European peasants know anything about tractors or mechanical harvesters, reapers, etc.

Another thing, most of Europe's factories were destroyed. It will take time to rebuild these plants and to produce the implements necessary to do the farm work.

In the meantime, most of the agricultural work will be done by peasants in much the same manner their ancestors used during the days of the feudal lords.

From my own experience in Europe, I can swear that practically every day, I personally saw little children and yes, even grown men and women hanging around our mess halls to beg what was left over in our mess kits.

We didn't have much to eat ourselves, but they had nothing.

They would wait outside near the garbage cans holding dirty tin cans in their hands. When a fellow came out with a few scraps left in his mess kit, they would mob and mill around him like a pack of hungry wolves waiting for the kill.

They would actually fight over who was going to get the scraps. I have seen grown men beat up women and little children in a fight over who was going to get the piece of bread left over in a GI's mess kit.

Many is the time I've seen people dig into garbage cans in hope of finding something edible. Lady, I hope you'll never have the misfortune of watching your children beg and scrounge for wood. Hunger is one sure method of making animals out of human beings.

You complain that you have no butter and no margarine. Well, that is really rough. I hope I can console you with the fact that you have plenty of meat, potatoes, bread, vegetables, fruits, eggs, fowl, milk, and I could go on and on. The people of Europe haven't seen butter in years and many little babies are dying every day because their mothers can't get milk to feed them. Sometimes I wonder what the hell has happened to the charity, generosity, and humanity of some of our so-called Americans.

JACOB SHEESKIN,
Ex-Sergeant, United States Army.

BERLIN, *March 18, 1946.*

MY DEAR DR. TAYLOR: The greatest famine catastrophe of recent centuries is upon us in Central Europe. Our Government is letting down our military government in the food deliveries it promised, although what Generals Clay, Draper, and Hester asked for and were promised was the barest minimum for survival of the people. We will be forced to reduce the rations from 1,550 calories to 1,000 or less calories.

If you could possibly use your influence to impress upon Senators and Congressmen, and perhaps upon Secretary Anderson, or the press, the appalling consequences for our foreign policy, I would be indebted. The few buds of democracy will be burned out in the agony of death of the aged, the women, and children. The British and we are going on record as the ones who let the Germans starve. The Russians will release at the height of the famine substantial food stores they have locked up (three to four hundred thousand tons sugar, large quantities of potatoes).

Aside from the inhumanity involved, it is so criminally stupid to give such a performance of incredible fumbling before the eyes of the world. It makes all the many hard-working officers of OMGUS, F & A Branch, ashamed.

Faithfully yours,

KARL BRANDT.

[From the Washington Star]

FOOD SENT HUNGARIANS FROM UNITED STATES REPORTED BLOCKED BY RUSSIANS

BUDAPEST, April 16.—United States military mission sources here said today the Russians were withholding clearance for food shipments from the American Catholic Welfare Conference and had stated clearance would not be given if the shipments were consigned to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty or any Hungarian Catholic organization.

(In Vienna, Thomas Fox, head of the Welfare Conference's relief service in the Balkans, said his organization had abandoned its plan to distribute 500 tons of food and clothing in Hungary because the "Hungarian" Government refused to permit distribution through Cardinal Mindszenty. Mr. Fox said Government officials suggested that the Minister of Social Welfare take charge of the distribution.)

Clearance for 250 tons of relief food was requested in March.

After some exchange of correspondence, the Russians were informed the shipment was consigned to Cardinal Mindszenty. They replied that clearance would not be granted under those conditions and would be granted only if the food was distributed by the Social Welfare Ministry.

Meanwhile, other United States military mission sources said yesterday Russian soldiers had been entering houses occupied by personnel of the United States Legation in Budapest and demanding that the occupants report immediately to Soviet military authorities and remove the American flag from their doors.

The United States military mission has sent a note to Lt. Gen. V. P. Sviridov, acting chairman of the Allied Control Commission, saying that the Russian troops "appear to be acting under official orders" and requesting that instructions be issued to these troops to "avoid repetition."

The note did not state how many homes have been entered. The latest was the residence of Harry Le Bovit, which was entered twice last week. The note said that on the second occasion the Russians "threatened drastic action" if a small paper flag pasted to the door was not removed immediately.

The Veteran Is Also a Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the American Veterans' Committee dinner, April 11, 1946, Lincoln Hotel, Indianapolis, Ind.:

Mr. Chairman, I shall not engage in that form of mental prostitution, which I call "foxhole digging." It is true that I am a veteran of the last war, but you know better than I the drudgery and the rigors of military service, and the physical and mental horrors of fighting—the sacrifices which the men and women who fight wars make.

A great majority of the people who fought this war came out of private life to do so. You have never completely submerged the idea of civilian citizenship while fighting the war, and you returned from the war to the role of citizen. This being true, you are now citizen-and-veteran and not veteran-and-citizen. The first concept is consistent with every theory of a democracy. The second concept is inconsistent with that theory. If we are to make progress as citizens, we must discard it, because it presupposes that 1 to 4 years of military service can change a person from his primary status of citizen into a person who is primarily a soldier. That, too, is not true.

A citizen and veteran, it is normal and logical that you should especially demand of a government composed of all citizens that it pay especial attention to disabled citizens and veterans; that it afford every facility for reestablishing those who have returned from fighting to their status as full citizens capable of participating in the economic, social, and political life of this democracy on an equal footing with those who did not serve in a military capacity.

Above all else, however, your major interests are those of a citizen. As a citizen veteran, you are keenly aware of the need for a sound national foreign policy, which not only recognizes the oneness of the world but also envisions the need for pushing international cooperation, as it presently exists, into international rule by law under a world federation. You know also that no foreign policy can succeed, however, unless it is based upon a domestic policy calculated to extend the democratic ethic into the areas of social, racial, and economic relationships, as well as improving it in the field of political relations. This is the only way we can create a way of life worthy of the sacrifices which have been made by those who have died, those who have been maimed, and those who have fought and returned.

It is proper to presume that these solutions may very often be solved more adequately, and pursued more ardently, by men who have served in this last war. But, this is a presumption which must be subjected

to the further test of individual capacity. It is proper, therefore, that I warn you against giving too much weight to the generality, and not sufficient attention to the capacity and sincerity of the individual. For, it is unfortunately true that some of our most reactionary, superficial, and, indeed, venal minds are still found in young bodies. Such men seek to hide their incapacity under the cloak of veterans' status. Actually, they are wolves in sheep's clothing seeking to betray their former comrades. Every reactionary force throughout history has thus debased patriotism by making it the strumpet of reaction. Can we forget so soon that Hitler and Mussolini were veterans? I charge you with the obligation to see to it that this time history does not repeat itself.

I have no right to steal your time, but I shall be guilty of doing so, unless I now give some attention to what I consider to be the basic issues which are affecting our foreign and domestic policies. In our foreign policy our relations with Soviet Russia are a matter of paramount importance. In our domestic policy the present stalemate, and consequent frustration, arising from the inability of either political party to put through the Congress of the United States a program either constructively conservative or constructively progressive is a matter of paramount concern. Over-all questions involving foreign and domestic policy we find impending the awesome and portentous effect of atomic energy, with its tremendous capacity for destruction, and for good. Therefore it is not surprising that the people of the world, and particularly people in our country, are confused. It is only surprising that they are not more confused than they are. Faced with this situation, it is the obligation of any person who has been placed in public office to assume the responsibilities of his office, and present to the public his thoughts and his own solutions of these problems, fundamentally, forthrightly, and therefore radically in order that discussion may be stimulated and the present confusion thereby reduced. This is not a time for slogans, for slogans are not a substitute for thinking. And I, for one, will not indulge in them.

The people of the United States have come out of the war faced with the existence of a Soviet Russia as a state whose system held up under the impact of war and survived that impact. It is true that much material assistance was given to Russia from this country and Britain, a fact which we should neither ignore nor overemphasize in appraising the capacity of the Soviet system to survive.

The existence of that nation operating under that system seems to have had a most peculiar effect upon the American people. In fact, it appears to have hypnotized some of them and destroyed their capacity for objectivity. One would think that the national emblem of the Soviet Union is not the prosaic hammer and sickle, but the deadly rattlesnake of our own Texas.

Among those people who occupy what we now call the extreme right we find the paralyzing fear that the existence of that nation with that system violently endangers their possession of, and their control over, the economy of this country. From this group spring the Russophobes, who find aggression in every act of the Soviet Union and communism in every proposal seeking to find a democratic solution for our domestic, social, and economic problems. They denounce all who propose or support such solutions as Reds and Communists. They throw these words around wildly and blindly, like a child throwing its fists when frightened from sleep. Such people are the greatest menace to the development of the democratic way of life and economy in America.

On the other extreme, we have the Russophile, who also renders disservice to American-Russian relations by becoming an apologist for every known act of Russian foreign policy, and every reported operation of Russia's domestic economy, to a degree which at times appears to the intelligent American, who is attempting to be objective, to be so irrational as to challenge the credulity of the most credulous. These people, by their apparently irrational apologies, furnish the Russophobes with ammunition which they in turn hurl violently at all of us who are honestly attempting to find, and create, a peace-producing American policy toward the Soviet Union—a policy which will enable that country to live in the world without fear of being subjected to external aggression, designed to force its people to abandon their way of life, or to prevent them from having the fullest opportunity for development of their theories and economic ideas within their own land.

Those of us who want this peace-producing policy are not appeasers, nor are we advocates of a "get tough" policy. Rather, we desire to be impartial if possible; to acknowledge once and for all that our country, and other countries, in the past have used methods which we do not want to see used by our own country, or by Russia, at this late date in history. We do not deny these past errors, but we firmly believe that nothing can be accomplished by justifying a new use of wrongful methods simply because they are no more wrongful than those which have been used in the past. We want to correct present errors of our own governments, and propose new methods calculated to eliminate any necessity on the part of Russia to resort to methods, in this present day, which experience of the past have proven imperialistic, antidemocratic, and conflict producing. We want to make every effort to convince the Russian people that we have no designs on them, and when we have done so, then we shall demand for ourselves the pledge that we shall enjoy a like freedom from aggressive Russian nationalism, and aggressive extension, by wrongful means, of Russian ideology into other lands, and particularly into our own.

In our land, we specifically do not admit that American proponents of communism have the only solution for our economic ills. We will not be driven from our support of legislation or proposals which we believe will extend the democratic ethic upon which our Nation was founded into new areas of social consciousness, economic activity, and racial understanding merely because American Communists ostensibly support these things, and because American reactionaries, therefore, scream "Red" and "Communist" indiscriminately at all supporters of such legislation.

Specifically, we ask of all Americans that Russian national needs, and, therefore, Russian foreign policy, be measured by a geographical or economic yardstick and not an ideological one. Both the Russophobe and the Russophile fail to separate Russia as a nation from communism as an ideology. The present confusion which exists in the American mind, when considering Russo-American relations, arises out of this failure to divorce these two things. Therefore, we ask the Russophobes to cease denouncing every Russian attempt to solve Russian national geographic and economic limitations as communistic aggression; and we ask the Russophile to cease justifying wrongful means, when they are adopted by Russia, to obtain these national objectives under the mistaken idea that they are thereby defending Russian social and economic ideology, and, incidentally, satisfying their own urge to believe that all things Russian are infallibly right.

On domestic issues, we ask the Russophobe to cease obstructing the development of an economic and racial democracy in America by screaming "foreign ideology" at every legislative effort to produce it. We ask the Russophile to get out from under our feet, and to quit cluttering up our way as we attempt, here, to see whether or not we can develop in this, our country, an economic and racial democracy based upon the Judeo-Christian ethic, which can be superior to that which they blindly worship as the Russian system, without too much real information as to its actual operation.

For, we also desire a better way of life; we also intend to eliminate the evils of monopoly capitalism and the economic feudalism it has produced. But, we demand that we be allowed to do so without having our every action tested by the hoary dogmas of the past; our characters assassinated, and our motives impugned by those who blindly accept these dogmas as immutable truth, and who live in mortal dread that here in this land we shall develop new truths and new lights, which will wrench them from their ancient anchorage and force them to use their encrusted brains.

What I am asking, and what I think the American veteran is asking, particularly the veteran who has but recently become a citizen again, is an opportunity for peace to exist in the world in which the peoples of this Nation, of Russia, and of every nation shall have an opportunity to get to work at the great task of producing a finer way of life. We also ask that all people with preconceptions, gross prejudices, and dogmas get out of our way as we work to produce this better world.

Therefore, if Russia needs oil, and it appears that the people of the United States, the British, and the Dutch have hogged all of the oil, to the extent that it constitutes a real, existing threat to the development of the economy of the Soviet Union, then these nations and Iran, through the facilities of the United Nations, should propose a more equitable distribution of this resource, together with a plan to give fairer treatment to the peoples who occupy the lands under which the oil exists.

In return for this, we should be entitled to ask the Russians to cooperate in an attempt to work out a twentieth century method for the solution of economic problems through the United Nations rather than resorting to nineteenth-century imperialistic aggression or the more subtle subterfuge of supporting a nationalistic autonomy of a small state. What the world needs is less nationalism—not more little nations to stoke its hate-breeding fires. I admit that the method to which I just referred has been the method which this nation, and other nations, have used in the past, but again the peoples of the world, and surely our veterans of this war, are entitled to ask that their governments shall dedicate themselves to using the United Nations, and the subordinate bodies incorporated within it, as the modern, twentieth century method of solving these problems. Let us admit, for the purpose of argument, that on this question of oil, we, the British, and the Dutch should have moved first. Nevertheless, I believe in the inherent fairness of the masses of the people of America, therefore, I believe that if it is oil Russia needs, then had the Government of that nation openly disclosed the facts, upon which they based their inadequacy of supply, to the peoples of this Nation through the use of the United Nations, the people of America would have forced our Government to openly negotiate an equitable solution of this problem.

The United Nations is, and should be used as, a forum to reach behind the governments of the world to the peoples of the world. It evidences lack of confidence in people, inconsistent with my belief in democracy, for any government of any nation to fail to use this forum as a means of reaching the sense of justice, and the great well of good will, inherent in the peoples of the world.

Likewise in the case of Manchuria, and the now generally accepted fact that many Manchurian factories were stripped of their machinery, it is impossible for me to rationalize this act as one of concern for or interest in

the Chinese people. It is for the people of China finally to determine their form of economy and their form of government, but the removal of machinery from factories, thereby destroying the means of production of things necessary to create a strong economy in China, was harmful to the Chinese people no matter what form their government might take. Therefore, it is impossible for me to justify it as an act beneficial even to a Communist China, assuming one arises. Furthermore, since we know that the original Japanese occupation of Manchuria was wrongful usurpation of Chinese authority over Chinese land, then we cannot accept as rational the explanation of Russia that the things which they took were Japanese; that the Japanese were an enemy nation and that, therefore, they were entitled to take these things under the right of conquest. Since we know that Japanese occupation of Manchuria originally was wrongful, it follows that the Russian explanation that this machinery was theirs because of their contribution to the conquest of Japan is illogical. An explanation, incidentally, which, considering the short period of time that Russia was engaged in the Japanese war, has had the effect of irritating the average American, furnishing fuel for the Russophobe, and handcuffing the American, non-Communist, supporter of good Russo-United States relations, upon whose support the whole hope for good relations lies.

But, here again, we must remember that one of the great needs of Russian economy is machinery; that we have recently learned the incredible fact that a Russian request for consideration of a loan of a billion dollars, with which to buy machinery from the United States, was lost in our State Department. Certainly, if I were a Russian, I would consider such an explanation just as insulting to my Russian intelligence as we Americans consider the Russian explanation of the Manchurian machinery situation as insulting to ours. And we, as citizens seeking to view American-Russian relationships objectively, are entitled to wonder whether or not we could trace the source of Russian activity in Manchuria, which cannot be justified, to an equally, if not more, aggravating and irritating act of our own State Department in its disdainful attitude towards this Russian request for a loan. The attitude must be defined as disdainful, because the explanation of a lost paper in the State Department, received from a friendly foreign government and a recent war ally, is so incredible as to shock the intelligence of every open-minded citizen.

Therefore, as a citizen, I call upon the Russophobes and the Russophiles to withdraw from the arena, and I equally call upon the Governments of the people of the United States and Russia, and of Great Britain, to abandon their acts of irritation; to abandon wrongful, anachronistic methods; to discard diplomatic practices which originated in an era of nationalism and distrust and to give to us, the peoples of the world, an open discussion of the economic problems which we, the world's people, are entitled to demand of our governments, whether they be those of Russia or those of the world's capitalistic nations. For those who would desire to govern us must show us, the people, that respect for, and confidence in, our ability to reach a correct result, which an honest belief in democracy establishes as our right.

For the few minutes that remain, let me touch upon domestic issues.

Many contemporary problems press urgently upon us, such as the control of inflation, which has contributed to the rise of fascism in the past; the need to house our people—within equitable limits, it is proper to give priority for this housing to the generation which has returned from the war so that they may begin their lives and the responsibilities of parenthood under circumstances which will give a hopeful augur for better future generations; the need to expand social security, including provisions for health and accident insurance, and medical care operated on a national basis, using methods which are consistent with our basic democratic ethics; the need to control atomic energy so that it may be retained as a resource of the people with emphasis upon its peaceful use, together with an unceasing attempt to control its destructive threat through the extension of the United Nations into a world federation, with powers originally limited and designed to cope with this specific threat. These are but a few of the urgent contemporary problems.

However, at best most of these urgent questions are but salves and unguents to rub upon the sores which are the most readily observable phenomena thrown out by monopolistic capitalism, which is essentially feudal in its character. Fundamentally and basically, we must evolve immediately a philosophy upon which to base the democratic economy which is a heritage prophesied for us by the Declaration of Independence, when it was stated therein that governments are created among men, derive their power from the consent of the governed, and exist only for the purpose of affording to people life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, since we operate our Government as a representative democracy—a republic—we must find in our country a political party dedicated to the extension of their principle as the means of implementing it and bringing it into existence. Since this need is more basic than the temporary problems, it is actually more urgent.

I am a believer in political action, since political action, by its name, itself indicates evolution by the use of democratic procedures as opposed to direct action which implies force and revolution. (Reactionaries please note.) But, political action, if it is to become something more than a mere outlet for emotional frustration, must be effective. To be effective, the means which are adopted must be those calculated to produce change by evolution. Such means must be those best able to persuade the great bulk of our unpersuaded people, particularly white-collar workers and farmers, that their condition will be better, when the forces of monopoly are limited or controlled so that they can be bent to serve the people, and not worsened by the program advanced as the alternative for the monopoly production and the quasi liberties which are the norm of today.

We must understand that people want progress, not change. So, if we are to persuade people to follow a course which we consider to be progressive, it is time for us to quit using slogans and to blueprint that course—to prove by the logic and weight of our argument, and the practicality of operation of our blueprint, that we can produce a higher standard of material well-being, more security, and more real freedom than they presently enjoy. I repeat, we must abandon the present method of approach which indicates to too many people that all we are advocating is a change of masters rather than a true progressive program which favors full fruition of men's inherent democratic desires.

Time is short, dreadfully short, and it requires a concentrated effort of those who are capable of the hard thinking necessary to produce the philosophy, to apply it to a blueprint, and then to draw the blueprint, and have the courage to present specific things to people. I urge the specific because I am convinced that people are growing weary of merely hearing about the "common man." They, as the common man, are now demanding that those who have aroused their interest and profess to be their friends shall not continue to ask them to take things on hope and faith alone, but that they shall lay out before them, as common men, the blueprint of the plan for the future, in order that they may test its effectiveness to produce the kind of world for which they have an instinctive longing.

I have tried desperately to lay before you the urgencies of the day. The forces of reaction do not want to hear them; they will never solve them. Nevertheless, there is a greater burden laid upon those of us who profess to see these problems and to be progressive and liberal. For just as in politics, it is true that, "You cannot beat someone with no one," so also we cannot get people to continue to accept words and promises, no matter how fully they may express their inherent longings and desires, until and unless we implement our words with a specific philosophy and a specific program.

I have given you the challenge of the present. It contains the hope of the future.

I pledge you my willingness to work in harness with all who courageously desire to face it.

The Case of Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the case of Gen. Draja Mihailovich, former Minister of Yugoslavia, is one that must command attention from the American people and their Representatives, if our future allies are to have any confidence in our pledged word as a nation.

There is no real question about the fact that General Mihailovich took arms against the German invaders of his country in April 1941, at a time when Soviet Russia was an ally of national socialist Germany. At that time the present dictator of Yugoslavia, Marshal Josip Broz, called Tito, was an expatriate, studying in Moscow as a faithful adherent of the Third International—the Comintern—which had adopted the alliance with Hitler's Germany as an international program of aggression for mutual benefit.

For two years and a half, during the darkest days of the struggle against Germany, Italy, and Japan, Draja Mihailovich fought on our side. No question was raised as to his loyalty or valor while there was a real doubt about the outcome of the war. Only after our victory was seen to be certain did other elements in Yugoslavia flock to the well-equipped and well-provisioned ranks of Tito, who then began to receive from the United States and Great Britain all that had been promised—but not delivered—to Mihailovich.

Now, as we all know, Marshal Tito alleges that General Mihailovich trafficked with the German enemy. Our State Department has asked that Mihailovich be given an open trial upon these charges, and that American officers and men who saw Mihailovich's troops in action be allowed to testify. This request has been categorically refused by Tito, whose supporters in the Kremlin now openly demand by radio that all Tito's claims be ratified without argument.

From every point of view of American law, customs, and instinct these proposals

go against the grain. They contravene our basic conception of fair play, of honest dealing, and of the right of every man accused to be allowed witnesses in his defense.

In evidence of American opinion upon this issue, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD the following editorials by Mr. William Philip Simms on April 9, from the New Leader of April 6, and from the Washington Daily News of April 11:

[From the Washington Daily News]

AN ALLY IN PERIL

(By William Philip Simms)

Secretary Byrnes said last night he had received no reply to his 10-day-old request that American Army personnel be permitted to testify in the "treason" trial of Gen. Draja Mihailovich, famed guerrilla leader and former Yugoslav War Minister. A Belgrade report last Friday said Marshal Tito had turned the United States down.

Meantime, in a statement to the writer, former Marine Capt. Walter R. Mansfield, of New York, called the threatened execution of an Allied commander without a fair trial "one of the greatest outrages in history." It was not, he said, the sort of thing he and other Americans were fighting for. He pointed out that we give Axis war criminals open trials lasting weeks or months. We even allowed the Jap General Yamashita to appeal to the Supreme Court. We can hardly stand by and see an ally "railroaded" to his death.

"I sincerely hope," said Captain Mansfield, who was parachuted into Yugoslavia in 1943 to report military intelligence and help coordinate guerrilla operations with general Allied strategy, "that our Government can see to it that Mihailovich gets a fair trial.

"I parachuted into the Chetnik area in August 1943 and spent 6 months with them. I saw a great deal of Mihailovich and visited his forces in nearly every part of Serbia. Other Americans with me and I can testify his sole aim was to get rid of the Germans and restore freedom to his country.

"I witnessed road ambushes on German truck columns and troops and the destruction of vital German railway lines. Our enemies were always the Nazi occupation forces and the prisoners we took (whom I saw) were German soldiers.

"General Mihailovich had been fighting this war of harassment on the Germans ever since his country had been occupied in 1941. His own supply of arms exhausted, he had to rely on what he could capture. But he continued to fight at a time when the rest of the world was verging on collapse under Axis pressure.

"Late in 1943, first Russia, then Britain, began singing the praises of Tito, former underground agent in Yugoslavia who had been trained for his job in Russia. Tito was no mystery to those of us who fought in Serbia. He stood for one thing above all others—communism.

"As the war went on and it began to appear that maybe the Allies might win, many Croats—who, in 1941, had laid down their arms and welcomed the Germans—began to flock to Tito, another Croat, as their only refuge. Sponsored by Russia, his little band began to expand. The Soviet Government set up a special radio station in Russia to advertise this new Communist leader. BBC in London followed suit.

"It was sickening to some of us Americans to sit in a Chetnik-held town and listen to BBC announce that Tito's partisans, in a glorious battle against the Germans, had just taken the town in which we were camped.

"At the moment when we Americans saw Mihailovich conducting major drives against the Germans, Russia and Britain were announcing to the world that he was a collaborator and traitor. In this way Tito insured his right to use Allied arms to fight his political enemy—Mihailovich.

"I am not a Yugoslav," Captain Mansfield concluded. "I am not of Yugoslav ancestry. I have no ax to grind. I am simply an American citizen who sees us standing by while one of the greatest outrages in history is being perpetrated."

[From the New Leader]

JUSTICE FOR MIHAILOVICH—TELEGRAM TO SECRETARY OF STATE BYRNES FROM CONSTANTIN FOTICH, FORMER YUGOSLAV AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

Reports from Belgrade announce the capture of Gen. Draja Mihailovich, leader of the first effective anti-Nazi guerrilla army in Europe, and state that he faces trial for treason before Tito's courts.

I appeal to you to use your influence with Tito's government to see that American officers who were attached to General Mihailovich from September 1943 until December 1944 be called upon to give their evidence. Also, to use your influence to see that General Mihailovich be given the right to choose American or other Allied counsel.

The contribution made by General Mihailovich to the Allied war effort was recognized by telegrams of appreciation addressed to him by the Allied Middle East Command in August 1942, by General Eisenhower in December 1943, and by other Allied commanders at various times.

Col. Albert Seitz, Capt. Walter Mansfield, Capt. George Musulin, Col. Robert McDowell, Col. Walter T. Carpenter, Capt. Nicholas Lalich, and a number of other American officers were witnesses of the struggle of General Mihailovich against the Germans. Since considerations of security no longer obtain, I would respectfully urge that, in order that the American public may be fully informed, the text of the various reports submitted by American officers attached to both Tito and Mihailovich be released for publication.

Mihailovich and his forces rescued and turned over to the American military authorities over 500 American airmen, in addition to many other Allied airmen, shot down over territory under his control.

If the American officers and airmen, who lived for many months with Mihailovich and his Chetniks, are not permitted to testify at the forthcoming trial, the whole procedure will be a mockery of justice, in which the sentence has been passed before the trial has been opened. Given such a trial, it may safely be predicted that Mihailovich will be found guilty of collaborating with the Germans, despite the fact of his loyalty to the Allied cause and despite the fact that up until the very end of the occupation the Germans had a price of 100,000 gold marks on his head.

Addressing this appeal to you, Mr. Secretary, I am certain that I am expressing the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the Serbian people for whom Gen. Draja Mihailovich has for almost 5 years now been the symbol of the struggle against tyranny, and for freedom and democracy.

[From the Washington Post]

GENERAL MIHAILOVICH

Marshal Tito's government has curtly rejected a formal request by the United States Government that some of the American officers who were saved by the Serbian Chetniks from death or capture be permitted to testify at the trial of Gen. Draja Mihailovich. The Yugoslav Government, in its reply, did not deny that General Mihailovich had sheltered American and British airmen shot or forced down over the Balkans and had aided them to escape. It merely pointed out that he had done this from selfish and unworthy motives, namely, the hope of getting Allied assistance and especially arms for his forces. Thus the implication is that any testimony American officers might give on this point would be ipso facto irrelevant to the main charge that General Mihailovich collaborated with his ostensible enemies, the Germans, for the purpose of making war against Tito.

This ingenious reasoning is echoed by the Moscow radio, which, while the case of Mihailovich is still theoretically sub judice, has been demanding the head of "one of the greatest Hitlerite criminals." Moscow, too, admits that Mihailovich "saved a certain number of American airmen" but goes on to ask: "Was it possible for him to act any differently, especially as he hoped to receive aid in food and arms under those conditions?" Indeed, the Moscow radio has hinted very broadly that the American and British officers who were with Mihailovich are themselves tainted with his guilt, for, though it must have been obvious to them that Mihailovich was doublecrossing his own people and his allies as well, "the Anglo-American mission stayed at his headquarters at the very time his forces were fighting the partisans." From all this it is easy to see what the Yugoslav Government means when it insists that "full justice will be done" in the case of General Mihailovich.

The truth, however, is that both the British and American Governments have a certain moral responsibility in seeing that full justice, according to our own understanding of that word, is done. Moreover, it would be dangerous as well as hypocritical to evade this responsibility. After all, it was not without diplomatic encouragement that the Serbian military leaders undertook the revolution which led to the invasion of their country and the destruction of their capital. It is also true that the many Allied promises of assistance to General Mihailovich were very imperfectly kept. Finally, it is true that, despite these promises, the bulk of Allied military assistance in Yugoslavia was given, for strategic reasons, not to Mihailovich but to his enemy Marshal Tito, thereby enabling him to seize and hold the power he now possesses. Thus the failure of Great Britain and the United States to insist upon open and impartial justice for General Mihailovich would vastly increase existing bitterness and suspicion among Communists and non-Communists everywhere in the world, and would make all future statements, promises, or pledges by either of these powers open to the deepest skepticism.

This being so, the case of General Mihailovich contains a serious threat to world amity and peace. As such it may properly be brought before the Security Council of the United Nations.

Report of the Economic Problems Division of the Federal Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am very glad to have an opportunity to insert the following statement of the Federal Council of Churches concerning our economic problems in the light of Christian principles:

The confusion and uncertainty which exist widely today in regard to desirable purposes, principles, and methods in the economic aspects of our common life lead u to express what we believe should constitute the approach of those who seek to be sincere followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are convinced—

1. That it should be the endeavor of Christian people to consider these matters on a

level higher than that of group partisanship and in the light of their understanding of Christian teaching.

2. That it is the duty of the churches, pastors and people, to seek to arouse the conscience of the Nation on all matters involving moral principles.

3. That the social ideals of the churches as previously adopted by the Federal Council constitute a general statement on these subjects which continues to be of enduring value.

4. That two specific actions are even more significant now than when they were originally adopted.

A. At the 1944 biennial, the council voted to "urge our Government to establish permanent procedures for securing the objectives which have been sought by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice," believing that "discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or national origin is one of the great moral issues before our Nation today."

B. In November 1945 the executive committee voted to favor "an increase of the minimum wage to 65 cents an hour with 75 cents an hour after 2 years, in order to provide for our lowest paid workers, under present conditions, an adequate American standard of living," believing that "the current provision of 40 cents an hour or $16 for a 40-hour week in the Fair Labor Standards Act is wholly inadequate under present costs of living."

5. That as investors of funds in substantial amounts and as employers of labor in considerable numbers, the churches have an opportunity to demonstrate the Christian ethic at vital points in the economic order. The fact that they are exempt from the pressures of competitive enterprise and largely exempt from taxation puts them in a favored position and invites them to exercise leadership in matters of investment and employment. Too often, however, the economic policies of the churches reflect an uncritical attitude similar to that of the less enlightened portion of the business community.

As stewards before God the churches carry a responsibility in the administration of their funds that includes but goes beyond prudence as to their financial soundness and the rate of return on their investments; it involves in a particular way the exercise of the Christian conscience and of understanding in relation to the social character of the purposes, policies, and practices of the economic undertakings in which the funds are invested. The freedom to choose from among investment possibilities is an important element in the choices that determine the effectiveness of the testimony of the churches to the Christian ethic.

The lives of many lay persons are joined to the churches in the employer-employee relationship. There are relatively few churches that do not have at least a part-time helper, and in many instances the denominations, in their national and area offices, in their printing establishments and elsewhere, employ large numbers of employees. This means labor practices based upon labor policies, which should reflect vigorous examination and revision in the light of the principles made manifest in the faith which the churches proclaim. The churches have an obligation to support by their own example the highest standards in such matters as wages, hours, vacation provisions, and labor-management relations.

6. That all Christians recognize the higher ethical value inherent in the cooperative as over against the competitive motive and that as cooperation is emphasized and competition subordinated we approach more nearly to the teachings of Jesus. We therefore encourage the extension of cooperative techniques and other similar means of bringing about economic justice and brotherhood.

7. That since our churches affirm both the priesthood of all believers and also the sacredness of all vocations proper for Christians, one of their major tasks today is to give vocational guidance in terms of God's activity through men in their various vocations.

All Christians, whether in lay tasks or in ecclesiastical service, share exactly the same necessity for sacrifice for the Christian cause and receive like spiritual rewards. Corporations and cooperatives also have responsibilities, commensurate with their powers, for serving the common good and for making it possible for their employees to do likewise through their labor.

Christian education should not only train students to serve humanity but it should reveal more clearly the need of a more equitable distribution of personnel to lands which now suffer from lack of Christian workers.

Inasmuch as many people tend to accept their vocational ethics from the secular world, the churches should help them reevaluate their vocations in terms of Christian service, putting human welfare before one's own profit. Christians of all vocations should be joined in a fellowship of sacrifice, distinguished from the secular world around them.

The churches should emphasize the sacredness of personality lest men become pawns, exploited for profit, or pushed about for convenience, instead of being regarded as having the right to be workers together with God, and should lay constant stress upon this principle of the stewardship of life.

In view of the tragic shortage of full-time Christian workers we would call to the attention of those who are responsible for vocational guidance in schools and colleges the desirability of their pointing out the possibilities of life service through the church, as well as of interpreting all vocations in Christian terms.

8. That the nature of man and the structure of modern industrial society have caused the right to an opportunity for employment at an equitable wage to become a basic right. The responsibility for assuring full employment therefore rests upon all people as members of management, organized labor, agricultural, consumer, and other groups and through their government. We welcome the recently enacted Employment Production Act as a significant step in the right direction.

9. That the strategy which labor and management follow in industrial disputes should be adopted in full recognition that consequences of their decisions may extend far beyond the locality or area immediately involved, and transcend the interests of the two parties. In our interdependent national economy the outcome of a major industrial dispute is so "affected with a public interest" that an early and constructive settlement is imperative. This calls for the maximum exercise of self-discipline on the part of both management and labor.

We reaffirm labor's right to strike, and we recognize the long-term benefits which the acknowledgment of this right has brought both to labor and to the public. But we urge the moral obligation that rests upon labor and management always to enter into and carry on collective bargaining in good faith, and to utilize fully such methods of settlement as conciliation, mediation, and arbitration. Furthermore, added democratic procedures should be established whereby the essential interests of labor, management, investors, and consumers may be better safeguarded.

10. That on the international level economic justice and brotherhood are essential to world peace and order. It is always easier to state these principles than it is to find the public response to implement them. Therefore the churches should seek more earnestly to discharge their responsibility of educating their people so that these principles will be established in the community, the nations, and the world.

11. That in addition to these matters, on which we believe a broad Christian consensus exists, other questions press upon the Christian conscience with new urgency, questions calling for earnest study. Among them are these: the role of government in maintaining economic and industrial stability; the problem of preserving a maximum of economic freedom while guaranteeing a "floor" of economic security; the ever-recurring question whether the pursuit of profit, in the sense of a reward beyond compensation for work done, can be reconciled with Christian principles; the extent to which wage determination properly involves assumptions concerning profit and price levels; the merits of organized labor's demand for union security; and ways in which conflict between economic groups can be kept within manageable limits without curtailing essential freedoms.

These questions are not external to Christian ethics; they are issues which the Christian conscience cannot evade. We therefore urge full cooperation by the membership of our churches in the currently announced study of the relation of Christianity to the economic order by the Department of Research and Education. Only by patient and conscientious inquiry, conducted in all humility and directed toward discovering the will of God, can we find our way through the complex issues of our day.

The Spiritual Understanding of Atomic Energy Can Bring Peace on This Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, atomic energy has appeared upon the world's horizon as a force which can glorify or destroy man. The choice is up to man himself. More than ever before, we, as decent citizens of whatever nation we may belong to, must take advantage of the wisdom of the great religious leaders to guide us into safe waters. Never before has the fate of the world depended so entirely upon the fulfillment of man's duty to man, the second great commandment to love thy neighbor.

In the days before Hiroshima world morality was constantly besieged by the use of power, physical power. Christianity can never reconcile itself to the false proverb that might equals right. Now we face the threat of a new kind of might, a power so much more terrible, so potentially devastating, that the godly all over the world have cause to fear for the life and goodness of mankind. This power can move in secret ways, it can strike before we know that evil is intended. We have now a perverted realization of the Biblical prophecy that the weak shall be made strong, the humble exalted, and the meek inherit the earth. It is not now just the strong who can destroy the world, the meek and the humble have been given that power too.

There is only one defense against the use of atomic energy by one nation against another. Our world organization, the United Nations, must be given the control of all destructive devices. It must have the authority to police, to in-

spect, to supervise. The churches of America can help by joining with the churches of other countries to throw their weight against the tragic race for armaments which may well begin. We must work together, one nation with another, to assure the world at large that brotherly love is not an empty phrase to be placed in a frame and forgotten. The cloud which rose above Hiroshima still hangs over the world. The United Nations is our only hope to dispell the shadow it has cast so that we may live in the sun again.

The churches who are the spiritual leaders of the world can, and I am sure will, take the lead in establishing permanent peace upon this earth by channeling this tremendous atomic energy for the benefit, health, and growth of the human race. Through the voice of the church the people will be informed and in turn their representatives in government will take heed. Let us all pray for peace.

Disposal of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, when demobilization of our armed forces commenced in earnest after VJ-day last year, we began to hear whispers of discontent from veterans that the priority given them by the Surplus Property Act of 1944 was not working out the way we had intended. The veteran was getting the cold shoulder from all the disposal agencies. Invariably he was told one of two things—either that the Federal Government, State agencies, local instrumentalities, and nonprofit organizations had beat him to the draw or that he could not have the equipment because it would not help him make a profit in his business.

I talked the situation over with the veterans as well as with our surplus property officials and introduced a bill, H. R. 4793, which I felt would remedy both of these situations. My bill provided that the veterans would have the top priority for purchase of surplus goods after the needs of the Federal Government had been taken care of and that he could buy surplus materials for his own use without proving their value to his business. These amendments seemed to remove the two restrictions which were making veterans' priority a sham.

Five long months have passed. During that time many of our colleagues joined me by introducing identical and similar legislation.

We finally have a bill before us to straighten out this mess. Although some additions have been made, this bill is basically the one I introduced last November. It corrects most adequately the two weaknesses of the Surplus Property Act which have plagued every veteran who had his eye on a jeep, a camera, a typewriter, or any of the million and one other items our armed forces found they could do without.

Action has already been too long delayed. The discontented whispers of last October have mounted into a tremendous clamor. Our returned heroes are disappointed, infuriated, and just plain fed up with excuses.

I hope the House will show overwhelmingly its desire to correct this injustice by approving unanimously today H. R. 6157, that the Senate will accord the bill's provisions its speedy concurrence, and that Presidential approval will be forthcoming at once.

Our Invisible Guests—Europe's Starving Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to you on the subject of the tragic conditions in Europe and the East at the present time. It is already too late, I am told, to save all the people who are now on the brink of starvation. To do the minimum necessary is just as much a problem of planning and logistics as was the war we have so recently won. Can we refuse to lend our genius to this new war? Do we dare to say that we can plan to destroy life but are not willing to plan to save life?

I know well that Americans are willing and anxious to share. But the crisis cannot be met by gestures of good will, no matter how earnestly intended. Our people must have Government help to assure that their sacrifices will be effective. They have a right to know that the bread they do not eat will mean bread in the mouths of the starving. Mr. Hoover's plan of voluntary rationing cannot possibly fulfill these obligations. The bread the housewife does not buy will go stale on the shelves. Can we then wrap it up and ship it overseas? It has been said that if every American man, woman, and child saved a teaspoon of fat a day it would mean a million pounds a day to feed the women and children of starving countries. But who is going around to collect it? Mr. Hoover's invisible guest, whom he wishes we would invite to every meal, would be well fed if he could actually sit at table with us. But he is thousands of miles overseas. Can this guest wait until the housewives' generosity is reflected back through her grocer, to the wholesaler, to the industry, and finally to the UNRRA purchasing agent? No, he will be dead by then.

There are two levels of action which will provide the relief we want to give. First, there must be set-asides at the source of fats, oils, and cereal grains. The Government must make these foods available to UNRRA and not force UNRRA to compete in the open market for the lives of little children. Second, to assure that we ourselves are fairly treated, that some of us do not continue in plenty and others in need, we must plan to resume some rationing. It has been said that this would be too difficult, that it would take too long. It has been said that the crisis is only a matter of a few months, so we do not need to take long-term measures. This is the wildest sort of optimism, based on political wishful thinking. The devastated areas cannot possibly be expected to produce enough food by the end of this year to carry them through another winter. We must face the fact that normalcy is a thing in the future and that we cannot yet go back to the days when our imagination was our only restriction. Certain foods will be scarce for another 18 months if we are to extend our help and our thanks to the people who need and deserve them.

There are many ways in which we could move to alleviate suffering and prevent death. Far greater quantities of rice could be allocated for export. Linseed oil and copra could be saved for edible use instead of being turned into paints and soap. There should be international allocation of cereal grains and flour.

The Combined Food Board should be expanded to include other countries which could supply food. Price control must be extended and remain a function of the OPA. Every rise in price means a devaluation of UNRRA's dollars.

America eats more richly and fully than any country in the world. This year we will eat 165 pounds of meat—40 more than before the war. Meat consumption in the average UNRRA country is 9½ pounds per person, and yet we have turned over to UNRRA only 3 percent of our commitments for the first quarter of this year. It is estimated that for every million tons of wheat withheld from the starving countries in the next 6 months 20,000,000 people will die. We are 50 percent behind on our commitments of wheat. Americans will get 45 pounds of fats for this year. Only 20 pounds are necessary to maintain life, yet Poland will have only 3 pounds per person.

While we sit here, people are dying. In the face of our plenty, of our desire and obligation to help, how can we say any measure is "not necessary"—that anything is "too difficult"?

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in discussion in the House today of the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, there was not sufficient time for every interested Member to speak. I was not able to do so. But I want to state here in the RECORD that my understanding of the provisions of the conference report for the Kings River

Dam in California is the same as that developed in the debate. I understood that the language of the Flood Control Act of 1944, together with that added by the conference committee, will assure that on the Kings River project the provisions of the reclamation laws will control the operation and repayment. The reclamation law will, as I understand it, be applied here, as it is another multiple-purpose water conservation and flood control project, already a part of the Central Valley project. It is clearly most important that a uniform policy govern all Federal water development projects in this area.

Same Old Bait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

SAME OLD BAIT

While admittedly honest men can disagree as to the desirability of further loans, subsidies, and grants-in-aid to the United Kingdom under its Socialist administration, there is no excuse for double dealing and for misleading the American public.

Specifically, as a quid pro quo for the $4,400,000,000 loan, in addition to effacement of the British $25,000,000,000 lend-lease obligation to the United States Government, it has been suggested that the British had more or less committed themselves to a course of reduction of tariff barriers and possible ultimate elimination of imperial preference.

Remarks on this subject have been oblique, rather than direct, but they definitely expose a propaganda technique.

For example, when the British loan was arranged on December 7 last, the New York Times reported:

"The British agree to a set of liberal trade principles, comprising a document analogous in the world trade field to the Dumbarton Oaks agreement in the international political field."

This observation was based on the joint statement of the United States and the United Kingdom regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy. The two countries agreed to negotiate for the purpose of developing concrete arrangements for relaxation of trade barriers of all kinds.

While Britain plainly retained some freedom of action and decision as to how much she wanted to liberalize her own trade barriers, much has been made in recent propaganda of the fact that Britain's adherence to this program represented a new achievement, and constituted a strong argument for making the loan.

But it was misleading to give the impression that a new concession had been wrung from Britain as an inducement to the United States to make the loan.

For in the master lend-lease agreement early in the war Great Britain had already committed herself in far more rigid terms to such an economic and trade policy.

For example, article VII of the master lend-lease agreements provides "for agreed action * * * open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed * * * to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

Thus, the December 1945 joint statement of the two Governments on reduction of trade barriers and discriminatory policies adds nothing to the commitment assumed earlier in the lend-lease documents.

The only significant addition is that a conference is to be called to discuss these subjects.

Yet, in face of the record, Secretary Vinson, propagandizing for the loan in a speech before the North Carolina Newspaper Institute at Chapel Hill, said:

"The repayment of the loan and interest, moreover, is not all of the consideration or benefit that the United States receives under this financial agreement * * *. Britain promises to avoid trade controls which would discriminate against American products."

It is fudging the record to make it appear that a foreign government, as a consideration for a new loan, is accepting a new principle, which in truth it already had embraced years earlier as an inducement for the huge lend-lease advances.

Yet, in face of such loose argument, some members of the British Parliament made it appear that, in making this concession, Britain was at this time losing its freedom of action.

In seeking to clarify the record, we are not at this time dealing with the broader question as to why we have to bribe a foreign country to adopt economic theories which their advocates contend are mutually beneficial.

The public will be subject to exploitation and abuse until politicians are held to standards of common accuracy and directness.

Farmers Need Air Development and Expanded Air Mail Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, leading farm organizations of the United States have recorded their recognition of the value of aviation developments, particularly as it pertains to the welfare of the farmers.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, representing 985,000 farm families, has taken a very definite stand in behalf of the expansion and development of air service and air power. They have placed emphasis on the fact that the time is not too far away when many perishable farm commodities will be transported by air.

The National Grange, which represents 750,000 farm families, has also gone on record in behalf of development of air transportation. A third great farm group, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, speaking in behalf of 2,300,000 farmer consumers, has recently passed a resolution stating that they favor the preservation and maintenance of technological improvement and scientific advances in all modes of transportation.

For many years I have been particularly interested in the development of air transportation and air-mail service, and during this session of Congress I introduced a bill (H. R. 5427) providing that all domestic air-mail letters mailed within the United States and its possessions and Territories be transmitted at the same rate for each ounce or fraction thereof as it now is within the country itself. This will mean that an air-mail letter can be sent to or from any one of our States, Territories, possessions, or the Canal Zone for the same price.

I also introduced a bill, H. R. 4735, to provide for a United States air-mail post card and to authorize the transmission by air mail of private mailing cards. This legislation has received a great deal of favorable comment from many authoritative sources.

I am also convinced that the rate of postage on air mail should be reduced because of the increased volume. For that reason, I introduced a bill to the effect that the rate shall be reduced from 8 cents to 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof. This bill is H. R. 4734.

The March issue of Planes carried a significant statement by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Planes is the official publication of the Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. Mr. O'Neal's article is reprinted herewith:

AMERICAN FARMER WANTS AIR LEADERSHIP—O'NEAL

(By Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation)

The United States farmer has a deep interest in aeronautical research, and he wants it continued at a high level; first, because he realizes that this country must maintain its leadership in aerial technology for security reasons, and second, because in the near future he will use air transport increasingly for travel and for shipping certain commodities.

I'm quite sure that farmers devoutly hope that this country will never again be caught so vulnerable to attack as we were on December 7, 1941. Farmers know that just a few billions spent on air power previous to that time would have saved uncounted billions in wealth and many precious American lives.

Fate has catapulted our country into a position of world leadership. We cannot discharge the responsibilities which that leadership imposes unless we maintain our position as the foremost air power of the world.

The course of world history during the next century will depend largely on what we do in this country. If anyone believes that the farmers of America favor a policy of living to ourselves alone, such a person is tragically mistaken.

The advent of the low-cost, safe, and easily flown plane means a lot to farm and ranch people. Farm boys, most of whom are mechanically minded to a notable degree, take to air travel as a duck takes to water. Planes are now in use for dusting, seeding, range patrol, coyote hunting, and many other uses. Plane transportation of high-quality, perishable foods offers some interesting possibilities. It's my guess that 10 years from now farmers will be using air transportation to a degree that few people envision today.

FARMERS BACK AIR DEVELOPMENT

Leading farm organizations of the United States have recorded their recognition of the value of aviation developments.

The American Farm Bureau Federation represents 985,000 farm families and says, "Transportation of farm and other products by air is here. Its relative importance will be measured only by time, vision, improvements and freedom of opportunity to expand. Speed, reduction in refrigeration and the constantly lowering rates with increased services are among the factors indicating that ever increasing tonnages will be moved by air."

The National Grange, speaking for 750,000 families, has said, "Transportation by air in the postwar period will assume an economic importance to agriculture and to the Nation as a whole far beyond that which existed prior to World War II."

A third great farm group, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, speaking for 2,300,000 farmer consumers, has passed a resolution stating, "We favor the preservation and maintenance of technological improvement and scientific advances in all modes of transportation."

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a peace and freedom loving Nation we have always held in abhorrence anything that might constitute militarism or compulsion. I share with my colleagues in the House reluctance to see compulsory military service continued even a day longer than is necessary. Nevertheless I am of the opinion that, in voting to suspend selective-service inductions for 5 months and to exempt the 18- and 19-year-olds from the draft, the House committed a grave error that endangers our national security and the peace we paid for so dearly. These two amendments have completely emasculated legislation that might otherwise be reasonably adequate.

It is important that we face the realities because the situation before us is not a theory. We have just completed a most bloody war in which we, as well as other nations of the world, have suffered a terrible loss. As in the case of World War I, so in the course of this war, we have vowed that it was a war to end all wars, that we would exert every effort to set up an international organization that might aid in outlawing wars in the future. Before the conclusion of the war we laid the groundwork for the United Nations Organization. We fought the war as United Nations; though the fighting is past the job is not yet complete. The United Nations as an organization has not yet begun to function smoothly. These first years while the attitude and machinery of accord are in the making, the fate of peace also depends upon some reasonable balance of power between the Big Three. The democracies of the world have witnessed uneasily America's scrapping of much of its military might. The words of our representatives in international councils lose power and weight as a result of our too rapid disintegration of our armed forces.

Until peace has been restored to the countries we have been obliged to conquer with arms, and responsible governments set up therein that will cooperate in our peaceful purposes, we shall need a fairly substantial Army and Navy to police this work. Until the United Nations as an organization has had an opportunity to demonstrate that it can handle some of the very difficult problems likely to face it, it is wise that we maintain a substantial force. It is far too great a gamble to trust to fate alone our national security. Our allies as well as our defeated enemies are watching to see whether Congress extends Selective Service. They are deeply concerned with Congress' decision as an index to our thinking, whether we will follow the course taken after World War I or whether we are willing to accept and assume the world responsibility of leadership that is ours.

For several months now we have been carrying on a volunteer program, hoping in that manner that we might obtain the necessary men to fill the ranks so that those who have served at home and abroad for long stretches of time might return to their families. Our experience has been that we have not been able to get enough volunteers to meet the needs. True, about 675,000 men have volunteered, but we have been falling short of our quota by more than 20,000 per month. This deficiency was filled with inductees from Selective Service lists.

The May amendment, which eliminated the 18- and 19-year-olds, automatically reduces the number of men who might be available for induction during the next 2 years to approximately 100,000 of whom about only 40,000 would be available for military service. In view of the fact that in the past 9 or 10 months about 20,000 men had to be drafted each month to meet the quotas, a mere pool of 40,000 for a year and a half to 2 years is obviously inadequate. Further the Vinson amendment wholly suspends induction up until October 15, thereby leaving no source from which the shortage in manpower can be drawn upon to meet the quotas. It is imprudent and unfair for the Congress to shift unto the President the burden and the obligation of deciding whether inductions should be resumed. This is purely congressional responsibility. I voted against both the May and the Vinson amendments.

The sponsors of these emasculating amendments rely on the hope that the number of volunteers will be sufficient to permit the Army to function without the draft. This is a dangerous gamble, since it has been heavily discounted by those in a position to know the facts. I voted for passage of the bill, though it falls far short of my approval, in the hope that when it reaches the Senate it may be resuscitated and given life so that it may fulfill its purpose and the needs of our national security. If the bill on final passage had been defeated selective service would have died, and it is for that reason, even though it did not meet with my approval, that I voted in favor of its passage.

On Monday last the House also passed the bill to increase the pay of the personnel in the armed forces. Frequent reference was made to this measure as the panacea for a volunteer army in the course of the debate on selective service. The position of many of the supporters of the May and Vinson amendments was that by offering higher pay to the enlisted men more volunteers would be attracted. The facts do not support this optimism that volunteering will be sufficient. One-half of the March enlistments were men who volunteered rather than be drafted, and yet the number fell 20,000 short of the quota. Remove the prospects of induction and the number of volunteers will fall notwithstanding the proffered bait of $25 extra a month. Combined with selective service the increase in pay might attract a few more volunteers but not sufficiently great to warrant the spending of $650,000,000 in extra pay at this time.

I do not believe that selective service should be extended indefinitely; however, I believe it is imperative that it be continued until such time as we are more certain of the events ahead of us. It is necessary that we continue selective service until we can evolve a more satisfactory method of filling the ranks of our armed forces to meet our commitments at home and abroad, and in order that the men who have already served for extended periods can be relieved. The seasoned volunteers in service are particularly suited to carry on the police work abroad; however, the 18- and 19-year-olds still have tasks to perform in other branches of the service.

It is my fervent hope that the Senate and the conferees will properly restore the Selective Service Act so as to give confidence and strength to our leaders now manfully striving to hold up our ideals so aptly expressed in the Atlantic Charter, so that it shall never again be necessary for our statesmen to resort to the appeasement of Yalta, Tehran, Moscow, and Potsdam. Let us adopt a course that will help us maintain our self-respect and assume due leadership and responsibility in world affairs, and thereby instill hope and confidence to the oppressed people of the world.

Retention of Camp Edwards as Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE SECRETARY OF WAR OF THE UNITED STATES TO RETAIN CAMP EDWARDS AS A HOSPITAL FOR THE CARE AND TREATMENT OF CONVALESCENT VETERANS, AND IN LIEU THEREOF TO RECOMMEND TO THE CONGRESS THAT SAID CAMP BE TURNED OVER TO THE COMMONWEALTH FOR THE CARE AND TREATMENT OF CONVALESCENT VETERANS

Whereas it appears that the War Department intends to abandon Camp Edwards as an institution for the care and treatment of convalescent members of the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas said camp has excellent facilities and extensive equipment for the treatment of wounded and convalescent veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorialize the Secretary of War to retain Camp Edwards for the treatment and hospitalization of veterans, and, in the event that such retention is not feasible or possible, that the Secretary of War recommend to the Congress that Camp Edwards with all facilities, furnishings, and equipment therein be turned over to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in order that the Commonwealth may continue said camp for the treatment of veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of the Congress, to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth, and to the Secretary of War.

In Senate, adopted, April 4, 1946.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

In House of Representatives, adopted, in concurrence, April 9, 1946.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Committee on Ways and Means:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am taking this opportunity to present to you very briefly my interest in, and my feelings concerning old-age security, a subject now under consideration by your committee.

Many injustices have been perpetrated upon our elderly American citizens whose energies have been spent in the building of this country of ours, and who now find themselves without means to maintain a decent livelihood.

Mr. Chairman, a vast majority of the people past 60 years of age of this Nation do not have sufficient means or income from private sources, such as insurance annuities, investments, or savings, to meet the minimum requirements of maintenance. Up to this time Federal old-age and survivors insurance or Federal-State old-age assistance payments have not been sufficient to make up the deficit in these family budgets.

I believe that all of our old people should have enough money to support themselves decently. The technological advances in industry has made it practically impossible for anyone over 60 to find employment. Particularly is this true among the manual laboring classes. It is a gross injustice to consign these elderly people to poverty, to heap misery on their declining years because of the progress of the Nation.

In order that this progress may continue, and jobs be made available for the young, it is my belief that we should so provide for these old people that they may live comfortably, and contribute their per capita share to the consumer purchasing power of the country.

It is a proven fact that national income is not determined by the amount of money in circulation, but by the turn-over of that money. I believe in a Federal old-age insurance program sufficient to maintain the consumer purchasing power of the aged, and to provide them with the comfort which a useful and profitable life has entitled them.

Long Beach Recognized by Newspaper in Largest City in State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the Los Angeles Times, April 14, 1946, tells of facts and trends in my beloved home city of Long Beach, which I am sure all my colleagues will enjoy reading, in this well-known newspaper in the "suburb of Long Beach to the north." I will stipulate and state that the story has been well told, but only as far as it goes.

Now, as to the population figures quoted. These do not include the figures for Lakewood or Signal Hill, which are both within the corporate limits of Long Beach. Furthermore, I am informed the recent special census showed at least 317,000 people. But what is 25,000 people, more or less, in California when we are talking of population?

Early in my membership in this great House, I stated that no artificial rates, tariffs, controls, or decision of mere man could keep back my native State of California and the far West from material progress and great population. I repeat it. It is just in the nature of things which are to be—that is all.

[From the Los Angeles Times of April 14, 1946]

LONG BEACH, AMBITIOUS CITY OF 279,588, PLANS ON RESORT TRADE ALSO

(By Ed Ainsworth)

If anyone who hasn't kept up with the times is preparing to twit Long Beach a tremendous twit about being a suburb of Des Moines, let him forever hold his peace.

Long Beach isn't a suburb of Iowa or anywhere else any more. It's a full-fledged, confident, aggressive, determined, ambitious big city with industrial red corpuscles coursing heartily through its vigorous veins. With ships, rubber, planes, bathing beauties, petroleum, graphs, charts, and an almanac tucked under its arm, it is headed full-tilt into a beckoning future.

It will still pause to brag of its mild climate or for an Iowa picnic in Bixby Park, but it's got big things on its mind.

POPULATION SOARS

As the second largest city in Los Angeles County it claims a population of 279,588 today, as contrasted with a paltry 164,271 in 1940, a gain of 47 percent. Anyone who goes atop one of its tall hotels and looks at the amazing panorama below can well believe it.

In the distance toward Los Angeles harbor—Long Beach wants it distinctly understood that it has its own gigantic bustling harbor, continually being improved and resents being lumped in under the title "Los Angeles Harbor"—are the gigantic new docks of the east basin. About $30,000,000 of a projected $77,000,000 already has been spent on this improvement. When it is finished a huge southeast basin will have been created, too. It will include a field and mooring facilities for flying boats.

BEACH BEING WIDENED

In the foreground, alongside the huge civic auditorium and lagoon as the onlooker peers down at the bay front, a gigantic pipe line runs along the beach. It is pumping sand to increase the width of Long Beach's famous strand to 700 feet. Off toward Alamitos Bay a small dredger is working, also, assisting in the task of creating a greater pleasure and yacht harbor there, adjacent to the marine speedway where boat races are held.

For Long Beach is determined, along with its industrial surge, to maintain its reputation as a resort city with manifold attractions. This is attested by the fact that once again it is seeking conventions. And a helicopter convention already has been scheduled for June. Even the famous Tuna Club is getting ready for action again, now that the wartime ban on civilian craft has been removed, and is polishing up its rods and its whoppers.

RUBBER BASIC INDUSTRY

General Manager D. W. Cameron of the chamber of commerce lists rubber as the basic industry around which Long Beach plans to build its economic future—southern California being second only to Akron as a rubber center, and the future of synthetic rubber being almost illimitable. Next in importance ranks automobile fabrication, with water transportation offering great advantage in cheap freight. The Kaiser-Frazer Co. already has taken over two of the buildings at the Douglas plant for assembly of its cars. The Douglas plant itself still is busy building sky giants.

The Hilton Hotel is going to double in size soon and have a helicopter roof. The Jergen's Trust is planning a 15-story building next to the Hilton. A huge apartment building is going in at Atlantic and Ocean Avenues. The Lafayette Hotel plans to double its capacity.

BOND ISSUES VOTED

Long Beach has voted $8,000,000 school bonds, $4,500,000 for bridges and drains and $2,000,000 in county sanitation district bonds recently.

The community is proud of its distinction as a permanent naval operating base of the United States Fleet. The great warships and their satellites dot the enormous roadstead now.

The city is proud, too, of its ultramodern 738-acre airfield, Daugherty Field, where the most modern installations contribute to safety and where 6,000- and 7,000-foot runways provide facilities for the world's largest planes.

On water, on land, in the air, Long Beach is looking to the future. And the future it sees is exceedingly bright.

Long Beach Sets Building Pace for Pacific Coast for March 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have unanimous consent to have printed the following item from the Long Beach Press Telegram of April 5, 1946. Long Beach is my home city and the largest of the several important cities in the Eighteenth Congressional District, other important communities in the State are Artesia, Bellflower, Compton, Downey, Clearwater, Haynes,

Linwood, Norwalk, Signal Hill, Southgate, Hollydale, Dominguez, Willowbrook.

Naturally, Long Beach with her natural resources for naval and commercial shipping is the hub of these other thriving prosperous cities.

And, the stated growth of Long Beach will be approximated throughout the neighboring cities and towns:

CITY LEADING IN PER CAPITA CONSTRUCTION

Long Beach, based on population, is setting the building pace on the west coast, a survey of the 10 largest cities reveals.

All previous building records on the coast were smashed last month, the Associated Press reported today, with a total of $74,000,000 in permits issued, doubling the former top mark for 1 month, made in 1941, and 20 times the slowest wartime gain of early 1943.

Los Angeles topped all cities with $30,000,000 in permits, San Francisco was second with $12,719,000. Long Beach placed third in the total amount with $6,625,000. On a per capita basis Long Beach ranked far ahead of those two cities.

The Long Beach permits issued last month were six times those for March of last year.

Seattle ranked fourth on the coast with $5,348,000 and Portland fifth with $5,058,000. Other cities:

Oakland, $3,340,000; San Diego, $3,050,000; Tacoma, $2,901,000; Sacramento, $2,674,000, and Spokane, $1,972,000.

The Long Beach building program was held down somewhat by the lack of some essential materials. When those shortages are eased many buildings will be started in construction.

Results of Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting copy of the questionnaire which, in February 1946, I attempted to place in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. It was humanly impossible to send such a questionnaire to each citizen of my district, but I believe the replies received fully cover the opinions of the majority of the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District which it is my honor to represent.

My district might well be considered the Main Street of our Nation. We have approximately 50 percent urban and 50 percent rural population; all labor and farm organizations represented, as well as large industries and small business; two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to each committeeman and committeewoman—both Democratic and Republican—labor groups, farm groups, attorneys, barbers, business and industry, housewives, newspapers, professional groups—doctors and dentists, and so forth—public officeholders, salesmen, and school teachers. A total of 1,150 questionnaires was sent and the number of individual returns received—732—proves to me that the people are anxious to express their views on issues before the Congress for consideration.

The questionnaire and results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE

(From Hon. J. HARRY McGREGOR, Member of Congress, Seventeenth Ohio District)

1. Do you favor the continuation of price controls (Office of Price Administration) for another year? (It expires June 30, 1946.)

Yes, 48 percent; no, 52 percent; total vote cast, 732.

2. Do you favor President Truman's proposed prepaid-medical-care program? (Health insurance, socialized medicine.)

Yes, 17 percent; no, 83 percent; total vote cast, 683.

3. Do you believe the Selective Service Act (draft) should be renewed? (It expires May 15, 1946.)

Yes, 35 percent; no, 65 percen'; total vote cast, 659.

4. Do you favor 1 year Federal compulsory peacetime military training?

Yes, 45 percent; no, 55 percent; total vote cast, 682.

5. Should a 30-day cooling-off period be required before a strike?

Yes, 89 percent; no, 11 percent; total vote cast, 665.

6. Do you favor a $4,000,000,000 loan to Britain?

Yes, 19 percent; no, 81 percent; total vote cast, 660.

7. Do you favor a $4,000,000,000 loan to Russia?

Yes, 11 percent; no, 89 percent; total vote cast, 671.

8. Do you favor the payment of subsidies by our Federal Government?

Yes, 13 percent; no, 87 percent; total vote cast, 681.

Signature _____

Address _____

Occupation _____

Date _____

Please write on the back of this page if you have any suggestions that might aid me in giving better service as your Congressman. Please return to 1534 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked my constituents to sign their names and give their occupations, and this information enabled me to secure the opinions of individual groups and how they feel about the legislation that is paramount at present. Following is the percentage distribution of replies to the questions, according to occupational classification:

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Question I. Do you favor continuation of price controls for another year?

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Attorneys	67	33
Barbers	50	50
Business and industry	42	58
Farmers	34	66
Housewives	54	46
Labor	62	38
Newspapers	69	31
Professional (doctors and dentists)	61	39
Public-office holders	33	67
Salesmen	56	44
School teachers	92	8
Total replies	48	52

Question II. Do you favor President Truman's proposed prepaid-medical-care program?

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Attorneys	13	87
Barbers	50	50
Business and industry	11	89
Farmers	15	85
Housewives	15	85
Labor	21	79
Newspapers	14	86
Professional (doctors and dentists)	27	73
Public-office holders	10	90
Salesmen	--	100
School teachers	46	54
Total replies	17	83

Question III. Do you believe the Selective Service Act should be renewed?

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Attorneys	35	65
Barbers	45	55
Business and industry	34	66
Farmers	22	78
Housewives	28	72
Labor	39	61
Newspapers	46	54
Professional (doctors and dentists)	34	66
Public-office holders	44	56
Salesmen	40	60
School teachers	69	31
Total replies	35	65

Question IV. Do you favor 1 year Federal compulsory peacetime military training?

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Attorneys	46	54
Barbers	45	55
Business and industry	49	51
Farmers	26	74
Housewives	40	60
Labor	54	46
Newspapers	73	27
Professional (doctors and dentists)	44	56
Public office holders	32	68
Salesmen	60	40
School teachers	54	46
Total replies	45	55

Question V. Should a 30-day cooling-off period be required before a strike?

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Attorneys	84	16
Barbers	87	13
Business and industry	90	10
Farmers	96	4
Housewives	85	15
Labor	80	20
Newspapers	100	—
Professional (doctors and dentists)	92	8
Public office holders	98	2
Salesmen	90	10
School teachers	83	17
Total replies	89	11

Question VI. Do you favor a $4,000,000,000 loan to Britain?

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Attorneys	34	66
Barbers	2	98
Business and industry	18	82
Farmers	17	83
Housewives	20	80
Labor	7	93
Newspapers	36	64
Professional (doctors and dentists)	30	70
Public office holders	21	79
Salesmen	30	70
School teachers	67	33
Total replies	19	81

Question VII. Do you favor a $4,000,000,000 loan to Russia?

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Attorneys	19	81
Barbers	3	97
Business and industry	10	90
Farmers	12	88
Housewives	7	93
Labor	7	93
Newspapers	18	82

	Percent Yes	No
Professional (doctors and dentists)	18	82
Public officeholders	7	93
Salesmen	10	90
School teachers	31	69
Total replies	11	89

Question VIII. Do you favor the payment of subsidies by our Federal Government?

	Percent Yes	No
Attorneys	13	87
Barbers	13	87
Business and industry	6	94
Farmers	9	91
Housewives	15	85
Labor	10	90
Newspapers	15	85
Professional (doctors and dentists	15	85
Public officeholders	18	82
Salesmen	10	90
School teachers	--	100
	50	50
Total replies	13	87

I also received opinions of various civic organizations, such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Lion's Clubs, political science classes, Government classes of high schools and colleges in my district. These groups distributed the questionnaire at their meetings and voted as a group. The results of the group voting are as follows:

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire by groups: Employees of a bank, labor organization, two high-school graduating classes, farm organization, high-school history class, two Ohio marketers' associations, Kiwanis Club.

Question 1. Do you favor continuation of price controls for another year?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	46	54

Question II. Do you favor President Truman's proposed prepaid-medical-care program?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	9	91

Question III. Do you believe the Selective Service Act should be renewed?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	28	72

Question IV. Do you favor 1 year Federal compulsory peactime military training?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	37	63

Question V. Should a 30-day cooling-off period be required before a strike?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	93	7

Question VI. Do you favor a $4,000,000,000 loan to Britain?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	12	88

Question VII. Do you favor a $4,000,000,000 loan to Russia?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	8	92

Question VIII. Do you favor the payment of subsidies by our Federal Government?

	Percent Yes	No
Total replies	26	74

Mr. Speaker, the total response indicates a vote cast on the questionnaire of approximately 1,200. I am one, Mr. Speaker, who firmly believes that the people back home are a part, and want to be a part, of our national Government. I will always welcome their opinions and their suggestions.

Export of Plastic Serving Trays to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

THE BOLTA CO.,
Lawrence, Mass., April 15, 1946.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have received inquiries from Evans Ltd., of Dublin, Ireland, relative to their purchasing plastic serving trays from our company.

They conducted negotiations with the Irish Government; but, at the present time, due to the unavailability of dollars in Ireland, their request to purchase these trays was refused.

We have received from them the enclosed letter which we feel would be of interest to you in connection with the proposed loan to Great Britain. We, of course, heartily endorse the loan to Great Britain, but feel that the provisions of it should be such as not to interfere with the right of individual countries or businessmen to purchase what they choose and from whom they choose.

Very truly yours,
THE BOLTA CO.,
DANIEL E. HOGAN, Jr.,
Vice President.

EVANS LTD.,
Dublin, April 8, 1946.

THE BOLTA CO.,
Lawrence, Mass., U. S. A.

GENTLEMEN: We thank you for your letter of the 28th March. Meanwhile our application has been refused by Irish Department of Finance on grounds that the limited amount of dollars at present available prevent their being any available for plastic trays, etc.

This puts "finis" to any immediate prospect of our doing business. However, if the loan goes through Congress, it is possible, but not probable that we may be allocated dollars to buy plastic trays from U. S. A., but please understand that such permission will still be discretionary, and if Great Britain is making and exporting plastic trays we may not be permitted to buy yours. This is a point that you might like to investigate with your Congressman or Senator, as we think we in Ireland should have the right to buy goods from U. S. A. irrespective of whether similar goods are manufactured in Great Britain or not, and if the power of discretion is vested in governments they (the sterling bloc) may make their own arrangements contrary to the desires of an Irish importer and the wishes of the U. S. A. manufacturer or exporter.

Some safeguard should, therefore, be introduced so that the businessman here will not be completely hamstrung by British and Irish government arrangements.

Glad to hear you have young Holch with you and please remember us to him and to his father. We are getting some slicing machines from Mr. Holch, Sr., after 5 months' negotiation for dollars.

Yours faithfully,
EVANS, LTD.,
F. G. EVANS.

Open Letter to United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson, from the Boston Globe:

AN OPEN LETTER TO UNITED NATIONS

(By Dorothy Thompson)

GENTLEMEN: You are sitting in New York with the support and consent of the people of the world from whom alone you derive any authority whatsoever. You have been entrusted by them to found this earth on peace. You are failing in that direction.

As I write these lines, we can anticipate the discussion of almost anything except that for which we wait with caught breath, namely, what any or all of you are doing to stop war. That is what you are there for—to stop war.

We clearly see through the "issues" and "menaces to peace" that you raise. We clearly see that the fate of small nations concerns none of you who represent great nations. The small nations are but pawns in your own schemes. Your moves are directed, not toward peace, but against each other.

Each of you is afraid.

My country's people, Mr. Gromyko, and those of Great Britain, have read the speeches of the Russian leaders. We watch as your country fights for exclusive control over vast non-Russian states and economies. We observe your delaying tactics on the peace conference. We take heed of the repeated cry that you are surrounded by enemies. We know that your armies are not diminishing but growing, augmented by new armies of vassal states.

Your country, however, also has reason to fear. You know that America has stores of atomic bombs, that Americans do not like communism, especially expansionist military communism. You justify expansion, secret plans, planting of agents to spy and confuse on the ground that you are not safe. And there is some truth behind your fears, as there is behind ours, and, as there is behind the fears of Great Britain.

Yet you hold the whole world between you. Your enemies are totally defeated, broken, and disarmed.

Why, then, do you not disarm yourselves? Your Government, Mr. Gromyko, once recommended to the League of Nations the abolition of all the armies, navies, and air forces of the world. Mr. Litvinov was rejected then. Then Russia was weak. Today she is strong. Is that why you do not recommend it again? Then you are a hypocrite.

Your Government, Mr. Byrnes, initiated a solemn treaty, signed by all governments, never to resort to force as an instrument of national policy. On the basis of that treaty you are trying the German general staff. But if force is never to be used as an instrument of national policy, why armies, navies, and air forces? Why do not you, Mr. Byrnes, call

for the universal abolition of armaments and UN inspection to support a single international law that not a tank or bomber shall be manufactured, nor a single ship or plane armed, nor a single laboratory given over to the production of bombs and poisons for the destruction of populations?

Do you think it is too early? Do you want to wait until after the next war?

Hypocrites.

Yes, gentlemen, I am angry.

Do you know anything of the anger of the mothers of this world?

Look around you upon the destruction of this war and the continuing destruction of your miserable "peace."

Your peace is murder. In Europe the very roots of life wither in the bodies of women; their children hunger; their infants cannot be suckled at famished breasts; they bury the still-born, thankful for their death; they take the food from their own famishing mouths for their young ones, the images of innocence.

You think, perhaps, that barracks and laboratories are the representatives of history? You are wrong. History begins with life, and life begins with the mother. Life admonishes you, and obliges you, to live, which means to fulfill, which means to answer—to answer to the mothers of life, who know that the supreme end of creation is the creature, the human creature.

Nature itself, gentlemen, will rise, against you. Famine will confound your plans; hunger and heartbreak will stare at you from maddened eyes; Communism will become banditry; democracy a word to evoke maudlin laughter; and UN will stand as the great negation—the unpeace, the uncooperation, the uncivilization, the unlife—unless you stop war.

This the mothers know. And woe unto him who is cursed of his mother; for he is cursed from the wellspring of life.

Importation of Swiss Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE ACTION RELATIVE TO LIMITING THE IMPORTATION OF SWISS WATCHES INTO THE UNITED STATES

Whereas for 5 years America's 6,000 watch workers have been out of the American domestic market because the United States Government and its allies needed the production of these American workers to produce timing mechanisms for war; and

Whereas Switzerland, with 60,000 watch workers, the only other source in the world of timing mechanisms, supplied the Axis with the timing mechanisms essential to carrying on warfare against the allies; and

Whereas 28,000,000 Swiss watches have been dumped into this country since the Pearl Harbor attack and as recently as April 3, 1946, the State Department of the United States concluded an agreement allowing Switzerland to import into the United States as many watches in 1946 as that country imported into the United States in 1945, when 9,200,000 Swiss watches were thrown into the American market; and

Whereas enforcement of this policy of the State Department of the United States poses the immediate threat of wiping out the American jeweled watch industry with consequent loss of livelihood to 6,000 Americans employed in that industry, including 2,000 employees at the 95-year-old plant of the Waltham Watch Co., in Waltham, Mass.: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the President of the United States to take immediate action within his authority, or, if necessary, recommend to the Congress legislation to limit the importation of Swiss watches into the United States to prewar levels, and thus enable the American jeweled watch industry, which is so essential to the national defense of the United States, to participate in the postwar market; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth.

In Senate, adopted April 11, 1946.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence April 11, 1946.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

The Lumber Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a series of letters written by a reputable businessman of Canyon, Tex., reflecting the complete inability of the average lumber dealer in my congressional district to secure building materials.

Competent testimony shows a staggering percentage of building materials are going into black-market channels, with the result that veterans desperately seeking to build homes are compelled to pay unreasonable prices for material.

The OPA has the power and authority to change the rules which are now encouraging black-market operations. The quicker they do so then the earlier we can expect action in relieving at least a part of the tremendous demand for housing:

BURROW LUMBER CO.
Canyon, Tex., March 1, 1946.

WM. CAMERON & CO.,
Lubbock, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: If available please send us: Two bundles Presdwood of whatever size you have; such fir plywood as may be available.

We have a job partially finished on which we need the following fir plywood: 8 pieces 4 by 6 feet by ¾ inch, 12 pieces 4 by 7 feet by ¼ inch, 15 pieces 4 by 8 feet by ¼ inch, which we would like if you have it and can spare it.

Also if available please ship us 10 kegs each, nails, 8D and 16d, either common or box. Also 10 kegs each 8d common and box.

Very truly yours,

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
C. R. BURROW.

DEAR MR. BURROW: We are sorry that we are unable to ship any of the above at present.

WM. CAMERON & CO.,
ELDON HEWETT.

TEXARKANA, ARK.-TEX., *March 19, 1946.*

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: We appreciate very much your order No. 13, but are more than sorry to have to say that due to a shortage of material we will not be able to furnish these items.

We don't know how long this condition will last, but ask that you bear with us until the supply situation improves.

Thanks again for thinking of us.

Yours truly,

TENNISON BROS., INC.
A. A. TENNISON.

ROSBORO LUMBER CO.,
Springfield, Oreg., March 21, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: Appreciate very much your letter of the 19th, with your order 18 enclosed, which we are returning herwith.

We wish that it were possible to handle this order, but with the heavy demand which covers our production for some time to come, it is simply impossible to take on more business at present.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT G. DAVIS,
Assistant Sales Manager.

ANGELINA COUNTY LUMBER CO.,
Keltys, Angelina Co., Tex, March 22, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: Attached you will find your order of March 20. We appreciate your order; however, it will be impossible to handle.

Yours truly,

E. L. KURTH, Jr.,
Sales Manager.

FROST LUMBER INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Shreveport, La., March 22, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Dalhart, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: We regret very much that it is necessary for us to return your purchase order No. 20 covering a car of yellow pine lumber.

Our production during the past few months has declined each month below the previous month with the result that we are unable to anticipate when shipment of this order could be made.

We are hopeful that production will increase before too long and, when possible, we will be glad to get in touch with you making an offer to supply a portion of your requirements.

Yours very truly,

H. D. JACKSON,
Pine Sales Manager.

EXCHANGE SAWMILLS SALES CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., March 21, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: We are indeed sorry that we cannot handle your order 21 for Happy, Tex., as our production is so low that we have not been able to spread our lumber to cover all of our former retail friends, as much as we personally would like to do. We have been forced to curtail our salesmen, and borderline territories, and as a sales department it was a sad day for us when we were forced to realize that our production is not sufficient to permit our former coverage of our prewar territory.

Yours truly,

A. F. VANICE,
Sales Department.

KELLEY MANUFACTURING CO.,
Houston, Tex., April 1, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: In reply to your letter of the 23d, we are entirely out of corrugated roofing. We do have a few nails in stock and if

you will send us your specifications, we shall be pleased to fill your requirements so far as it is possible for us to do so.

Yours truly,

H. L. SLAUGHTER,
Vice President.

SOUTHERN LUMBER CO.,
Warren, Ark., April 3, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex..

GENTLEMEN: This will acknowledge receipt of your order No. 30 which calls for one carload of yellow pine lumber of various workings.

We regret very much that we must return this order to you because of inability to handle. Our pine production has continued to decline to such an alarming extent that it is impracticable for us to accept additional yellow pine business at this time.

We are making very small headway in liquidation of orders that have been on our books for several months.

Yours very truly,

H. C. CLAYTON,
Sales Manager.

E. L. BRUCE CO.,
Memphis, Tenn., April 3, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: We have your letter of April 2, concerning the possibility of entering your order for one carload of twenty-five 32 by 2¼ oak flooring, and we regret to advise that it will be absolutely impossible for us to accept any business at the present time. We were forced to withdraw completely from the market some 4 to 6 months ago, due to our low production and heavily oversold condition, and until such time as we are in position to increase our production, thereby reducing this extremely heavy order file, we will be forced to remain completely out of the market and will not be in position to accept additional business.

Thanking you, however, for your inquiry, we are,

Yours very truly,

E. L. BRUCE CO.,
J. B. WISEMAN,
Flooring Sales Division.

EXCHANGE SAWMILLS SALES CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., April 5, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: The Clarks Mill sent us copy of your letter of the 30th and the flooring order.

We would just like the best way to be able to enter an order for you now, but the circumstances are such that we won't be able to do it and we have to return your order. We just haven't enough to go around and leave anything at the end. Our production has not been as big as we thought it would be for the first two months, and we are having trouble getting encugh flooring oak.

Incidentally, it is our impression that the rating you gave is not the proper one for oak-flooring orders. We believe that a buyer of oak flooring must have actual bona fide applications on HH houses for enough oak flooring to make a carload, and in that case it would be 30- or 35-house applications, which would have to be accumulated. This is just for your information. However, in case you find someone who can take care of you, you should look into it to see if we are correct.

Things are in considerable muddle now all down the line, and we can't see any daylight just yet. Maybe later it will open up, but it certainly isn't now.

Best regards.

Yours truly,

F. R. WATKINS,
Secretary.

MORROW-THOMAS HARDWARE CO.,
Amarillo, Tex., April 6, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

DEAR MR. BURROW: We thank you for your nice order of the 4th, for wire and steel products and want to assure you that as these items become available we will be sure to send you a quota promptly.

We have obtained no encouragement as yet regarding shipments of these items but feel that we will receive more all along since some price relief has been granted the mills.

Early this week we received a small quantity of nails and were glad to send you two kegs. We realize this is not much help but was the best we could do.

I will be calling on you within the coming week.

Sincerely,

J. STOCKING.

HILLYER DEUTSCH EDWARDS, INC.,
Oakdale, La., April 2, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: We are not producing any pine lumber and are sorry that we must return your order No. 28.

Thanking you for submitting this business to us, we are,

Yours very truly,

L. G. MCKINNEY,
Sales Department.

CHARLIE: This is the answer from all my mills. First time ever that I can get nothing nowhere.

R. H. K.,
Kelly Lumber Salesman.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex., April 8, 1946.

MORROW-THOMAS HARDWARE CO.,
Amarillo, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: We have a job in the making on which we shall need, within the next 30 days, about 50 kegs each 8d and 16d nails. How many of them may we depend upon you for?

Thanking you, we beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

C. R. BURROW.

MR. BURROW: Sorry we don't have any idea when we will get this many nails. Our last allotment was two kegs to a customer, and we have no promise of more.

D. P. S.

LUBBOCK SASH AND DOOR CO.,
Lubbock, Tex., April 9, 1946.

MR. BURROW: We certainly do appreciate and thank you for your nice inquiry covering nails, plywood, hardboard, galvanized roofing, and asphalt felt. These are the items that we are unable to help you with at the present time and we do not know when we will receive additional shipments ourselves.

We do appreciate any inquiries which you may send us and will at all times help you if we possibly can, and our only hope is that you will continue sending us these inquiries or orders and maybe some day we will make contact.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. BONNETT, JR.

CROWELL LONG LEAF LUMBER CO., INC.,
Long Leaf, La., April 8, 1946.

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: We have your order No. 22 for a carload of lumber and regret to advise that we are not in position to accept it at this time.

Various conditions have prevented resumption of a normal sawmill operation and we have, therefore, been unable to accumulate sufficient stock to justify the resumption of planing-mill operations. We will be glad to keep a memorandum before us and as soon as we are in position to resume shipment of lumber, will advise you accordingly.

Thanking you for your consideration, we are,

Yours very truly,

R. D. CROWELL, JR.,
Secretary.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *April 9, 1946.*

BURROW LUMBER CO.,
Canyon, Tex.

DEAR MR. BURROW: We regret that we cannot furnish any nails as requested in your letter of April 8, 1946. The only nails we have in stock are 40d and 60d common bright.

Neither are we able to furnish any plywood, pressed-wood, barbed wire, wire, corrugated roofing, or channel drain.

We are not getting in any of the material mentioned at the present; however, we do appreciate your inquiry.

Yours truly,

WM. CAMERON & CO., WHOLESALE,
H. O. CASSLE, JR.

Disabled Veterans' Compensation Is Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article that appeared in the Chicago Herald-American. The situation related in this article hardly seems to be true, and, Mr. Speaker, it bears investigation. The people in this country do not realize that these helpless heroes are receiving compensation at the rate of 68 cents per day. We have a primary obligation to these men notwithstanding conditions in other parts of the world. We are a generous people, but seem to have the happy facility of forgetting those who are very close to us. This Nation will forever owe a debt of gratitude to these men and the time has come for us to provide adequate compensation for them so they may live in security without fear of uncertain economic conditions. I trust that the proper committee of this House will give this matter some attention and report to the House action which they intend to take regarding these men.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a letter from a constituent and the article herein referred to:

PLIGHT OF VETS IN HOSPITAL BARED

(By Walter Naughton)

LOS ANGELES, April 13.—They fought and almost gave their lives under the Stars and Stripes on foreign battlefields.

And now they receive 68 cents a day from a Government which spends millions to clothe and feed starving persons in other lands.

They are the "forgotten men" of America's victorious fighting forces.

There are thousands of these men now in government hospitals through the land.

TWENTY DOLLARS A MONTH

Because they are in hospitals their compensation is automatically cut to $20 per month if their disability is service connected.

If it is not service connected they receive but $8 a month.

Out of this $20 they must provide their own smoking supplies, shaving equipment, candy bars, soft drinks, and other little things they might want to purchase at the hospital exchange.

If they want to make a telephone call home most of their allowance is gone if their home is any distance away.

FOES GET MORE

Jap and German prisoners of war, in camps or government hospitals, receive far more substantial allowances.

Veterans in hospitals which come under this $20-a-month classification are those who are unmarried and have no dependents.

Those who are married or have dependents receive their full compensation when hospitalized.

Public Law 144, enacted by Congress and effective on July 13, 1945, is responsible for the $20 and $8 a month allowances to hospitalized veterans.

Tersely, Public Law 144 says:

"Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, any pension or retirement pay shall not exceed $20 a month

"If the veteran's disability is non-service-connected, he shall receive not more than $8 a month."

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY HELPLESS VETS

Paralyzed veterans at the Government Birmingham General Hospital in Van Nuys, recently taken over from the Army by the Veterans' Administration, are a glaring example of the $20-a-month clause.

There are now approximately 170 paralyzed ex-fighting men there and many of them come within the $20 restrictions.

Their spokesman is former Sgt. Frederick G. Smead, whose home is in Yakima, Wash.

His case is typical of those whose war wounds left them paralyzed.

Fighting in Vere, France, with the Thirty-fifth Infantry Division, he was crushed beneath the wall of a building which was demolished by tank destroyers.

He hovered between life and death, and today, 27 years of age, he is paralyzed from the waist down.

Smead is ambitious. He now gets around in a wheel chair and waits for the new braces which the hospital has promised him but which have not arrived.

Because he is unmarried and has no dependents his allowance is $20 a month.

Under the veterans' bill of rights he attends school at the University of California, Los Angeles campus.

A friend takes him to classes and if it were not for this transportation he would have to abandon school due to his meager $20 a month allotment.

Lloyd Pantages and Will Rogers, Jr., both recently discharged following overseas service, are champions of the paralyzed veterans at Birmingham Hospital.

They visit them frequently and arrange parties in Hollywood for those who can attend, in wheel chairs.

How is the morale of these boys?

One of them answered for all of them when he said:

"It is about as good as it could be for any person who must stay in the hospital perhaps for years, and who has 68 cents a day to spend as he sees fit."

Others, by the thousands, are on the $20-a-month pay roll in other hospitals—blind veterans, amputees, and others with all types of injuries.

And the most their Government will allow them is 68 cents a day.

DELAVAN, WIS., *April 14, 1946.*

Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am taking the liberty of writing you and enclosing an article written in the Herald-Examiner, which in my estimation you should give some very serious consideration in the very near future. In fact especially when the gift, oh, pardon me, I mean the $3,500,000,000 loan comes before you for the Great British Empire. I certainly would like to see one of our statesmen have the courage to wave this in front of the rest of the House of Representatives before voting on the so-called loan; let us compromise and attach a rider on that bill, stating that if Great Britain is entitled to the loan give the same to these forgotten boys as they are the ones who made the sacrifice and not over a cup of tea in some ultra modern drawing room.

I am a veteran of World War I, my son a veteran of World War II. We both enlisted and were both honorably discharged, and we both saw our share of foreign service so you know we weren't coffee coolers. And the good Lord was very kind to both of us as we came back to our good old United States in fairly good shape outside of some very, very unpleasant thoughts in our minds, which articles the like I am enclosing doesn't help.

Now I am asking you as our Representative from Wisconsin for God's sake and these poor boys' see if you cannot do something to rectify this condition.

Also if I am asking you to kindly refer this to the Honorable Senator BOB LA FOLLETTE; do not judge me in the wrong light as I feel by putting this extra responsibility upon you it might carry a little more weight.

Thanking you very kindly and hoping, I remain,

Very truly yours,

WALTER ESSER.

Speech of Joseph N. Cridlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1946

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Mr. Joseph N. Cridlin, of Jonesville, Va., before the Ninth District Democratic Convention in Bristol, Va., on March 16, 1946.

Mr. Cridlin is a veteran, having served overseas with great distinction, and I believe the Membership of the House will read his splendid speech with a great deal of interest and satisfaction.

Chairman Carter, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, I count myself most fortunate in having the honor of acting as temporary chairman of a convention of Democrats of the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia.

I am told that in accepting this high honor, I am expected to make a speech, but at the same time I have been warned by some whom I had thought to be my friends to make it short, or take the consequences. Fearing the consequences, I have decided to make it short; well, comparatively short, and that is a promise.

Biennially, since 1928, the representatives of the militant democracy of this district, have met in the city of Bristol, Va., and named, not merely a candidate, but a Member of Congress to represent us in the National House of Representatives. Again today, you are met to name a Congressman. No one would be so foolhardy as to seriously assert that the choice of this convention will not have the overwhelming endorsement of the people at the polls in November.

This is an inspiring occasion. Assembled here are the true and tried representatives of the democracy of the great mountain district of Virginia, and one sees in your faces the purpose and determination that the principles of democracy and the policies pursued by the party of Thomas Jefferson, shall prevail in this end of the old Commonwealth.

Conditions which confront us today are far different from those which confronted your convention 2 years ago. Then, the dark clouds of war cast their somber shadows across the land. Then your thoughts were with the boys who were fighting valiantly in every quarter of the globe and their safety and the success of our arms were uppermost in your minds.

As we meet here today, you feel a deep sense of joy that the war is over, that we have won a decisive victory and that loved ones are no longer exposed to the discomforts and dangers of the battle front. Today we are looking forward hopefully to a long period of peace, progress and prosperity.

Your joy, however, is mixed with sorrow, for we remember those brave lads who went out and did not return, those who made the supreme sacrifice and sleep today in distant lands. In our deliberations today, let us pause to honor those heroes, who will not in this life, enjoy the fruits of the victory to secure which they gave their all.

Since you last met here, a great sorrow has come to our party, to our Nation and to the world. Our chief magistrate, the beloved commander in chief of our armed forces, a great Democrat, a peerless leader, the champion of the common people, the sincere friend of all the downtrodden of the earth, passed away. With heavy hearts, we mourn this irreparable loss, and together with all the freedom loving people of the world, reverently thank God for the life and service of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I am told that when the representatives of the Democrats of this district assembled here 2 years ago, that the leaders, with the approval of every member of the convention, pledged the people that if the Democratic party remained in power, they would do everything humanly possible to bring the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion and bring the boys home from foreign lands. It is my proud privilege to report to you here today that those pledges have been kept; the war is past history, the enemy on every front has surrendered, their arms are stacked, their guns are silent; and, you courageous mothers whose prayers followed GI Joe across the trackless seas and into the most distant lands, your boys are upon your doorstep.

By newspaper report (I was not present and cannot give first-hand information) but it is a newspaper report that the Republicans of this district recently held a convention in this city. It is claimed that they nominated a candidate, somewhere and by some means behind closed doors, which proceeding was denounced from the floor of the convention. On last account, the alleged candidate doesn't know whether he is running or not. Just let him wait until the night of next November 5 and he will then be certain that he was not in the race.

In this country we are committed to the two-party system, and as between the two dominant parties, it is up to the people to decide to which they will intrust the reins of government. In deciding between the two, the people must look to the nature of the

principles espoused, the policies pursued, and the history of past performances of each. It will not be amiss if we advert to history.

When World War I was thrust upon us, luckily the Government was in the hands of a true, just, and courageous Democrat, that great liberal and noble Virginian, Woodrow Wilson. No war was ever fought with greater vigor or with more honor to our Nation, and when victory was won and the United States stood the most powerful and potent influence for good in the world, Woodrow Wilson conceived and proposed a plan by which the nations should unite to banish war from the earth. Then it was that the Republican Party, through its leadership headed by Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, by devious ways and untiring efforts, defeated the adoption of the treaty, containing the covenant of the League of Nations, and committed this country to a policy of isolation which lost to the world the peace which we had rightfully won on the battlefield at the cost of thousands of American lives and billions of treasure.

Following the defeat of the treaty the Republican party preached, in season and out of season, its doctrine of isolation and blocked every effort to have the United States become a member of the League of Nations or even of the World Court.

The fact that the United States, then the most powerful and influential nation in the world, did not enter into the League of Nations, foredoomed that organization to failure and disintegration. To this defeat of Wilson's plan, we must charge the bloody world conflict now known as World War II, as well as the other wars of aggression that have been brought about since World War I.

Now that World War II has been won and we are in a position of political, economic, moral and spiritual leadership among the nations of the earth, will we intrust our fate to the leadership of a party that has heretofore so signally failed us, or shall we act with good common sense, and place in the hands of the Democratic party, whose leadership originated the idea of a world organization to maintain the peace, the power and authority to formulate the policies of this Government and direct our participation in the United Nations Organization, to the end that the world shall no longer be cursed by war, and that our sons shall not again be required to die upon distant battlefields.

At the conclusion of Wilson's administration, the Republicans gained control of our Government. The administration of Woodrow Wilson had been free from corruption; the war had been conducted without graft, so the lords of greed, avarice and dishonesty, having long been held in check, were eager and ready for the kill. Following the inauguration of the new President, there came down upon Washington a motley crew sometimes referred to as the Ohio Gang (they were not all from Ohio by any means). They infiltrated themselves into various governmental departments and agencies, some of them actually becoming members of the President's cabinet, and then began and was for too long continued, the most disgraceful period of corruption and theft that has ever blackened the pages of American history. We do not need to remind you of the Teapot Dome, and furtive figures out of the shadowy half-world, flitting about Washington with little black bags filled with currency.

President Harding died before the end of his term, his administration discredited by the dishonesty of his political associates. He was succeeded by Calvin Coolidge—"Silent Cal"—who saw nothing, said nothing, and did nothing. He sat in the White House collecting his salary and counting his pennies, while the stock gamblers were robbing the small investors of their savings by means of the sale of worthless stock and the money changers of the Nation were securing a stranglehold upon the business and financial interests of the country. The greatest service Coolidge ever rendered to his country was when he wrote that single line across a small strip of paper in which he said, "I do not choose to run in 1928"; and he managed to escape before the storm broke.

In the language of a distinguished Senator, "then came Hoover and then came hell."

In a campaign in which chiefly was employed religious prejudice and virulent intolerance, the people were induced to retain the Republican Party in power under the leadership of Herbert Hoover, a man who was so slightly conversant with political principles, that he did not know to which party he belonged until he was tendered the nomination for President by the Republican machine.

In the fall of 1928, the United States had been an independent Government for 152 years, and in all those years, its citizens had never made such a monumental mistake or committed a more grievous error, than when they elected Herbert Hoover President of the United States.

He was prodigal in his promises, thus showing himself to be a true disciple of the Republican organization. Gleefully he promised the people a chicken in every pot and two automobiles in every garage. With little conception of the duties that would devolve upon the President, with eyes blinded by a lack of knowledge of the conditions confronting the people, and having noted the fondness of Republicans for pie, he sought to engage their support by the promise of stewed chicken and a ride in his car. But alas, the promised chicken turned out to be dead feathers and the two cars were for a ride over the hill to the poorhouse.

The errors, abuses, mismanagement, and undemocratic policies and practices, which had characterized the two preceding administrations placed upon Hoover a burden which could be borne only by an able, independent, courageous, and resourceful man. Unfortunately for our country, he was unable to measure up to the requirement.

The utter failure of his administration was nothing more than the logical result of a blind application of the policies of the Republican Party to conditions in our country which had been brought about by his Republican predecessors. Mr. Hoover and his Republican advisers with whom he surrounded himself found themselves helpless as emergency after emergency arose. Conditions daily grew worse, until they were out of hand. They called it a depression, but they might well have called it a bottomless pit.

The stock market blew up, fortunes were swept away like chaff before the wind, bankruptcy was the portion of our business institutions, banks closed, and the savings of the people were lost. The farms and homes of our best citizens were sold on the block for a fraction of their former value, factories closed, and millions were without jobs or means of securing a living for themselves and families. Those were the times when your cattle and hogs sold for 3 cents a pound, your corn for 15 cents a bushel, and your wheat for 35 to 50 cents, and your tobacco didn't sell for enough to pay the fertilizer bill. Chaos reigned in the land, and through it all, Hoover with some kind of crooked vision thought he saw prosperity just around the corner, a corner he was never able to turn.

In November 1932 the people of this country, by overwhelming vote, decided to place the Government in the hands of the Democrats. That this was a wise decision, history will attest.

No man ever assumed the duties of a great office under such adverse conditions or trying circumstances as did Franklin D. Roosevelt when he became President on the 4th day of March 1933.

When he entered the White House, he found the country in the most deplorable condition that had obtained in its entire history. He found governmental agencies disorganized and helpless, he found the business interest of the country in ruins, the banks and financial institutions which had not already closed, to be tottering or at least of doubtful solvency. He found the people in a dangerous and sullen mood, and for the first time since the adoption of our National Constitution, many of them were losing confidence in our form of government. He found millions of unemployed men. He found the streets of our cities, the industrial areas of our country, and the highways and byways of our rural districts thronged with jobless, ragged men, pale faced hopeless women, and hungry children.

The people needed leadership and the Democratic Party gave them a great leader, not only a leader of great mental caliber, but also a leader with a great heart, not merely a political and economic leader, but a great spiritual leader as well.

The President called around him the great and unselfish men of the Nation and without hesitation and without delay he began to move. The people recognizing that a master mind was at the head of State reacted magnificently. Congress too, predominantly Democratic, responded to his leadership and such laws were speedily enacted as would enable the executive department to reestablish the financial institutions, to rehabilitate business and to provide jobs for the jobless. Confidence in the Government and in the soundness of our institutions was restored and fear was banished from the hearts of our people. The hungry were fed, and more rapidly than the most sanguine might have expected, business was resumed, and within a few months, the Nation was on the move toward a measure of prosperity, which was to grow into such proportions as the country had never before experienced.

As we emerged from this terrible experience of the depression, the Republican Party again began to show signs of life, and the leaders of their decimated ranks began a systematic line of criticism upon every forward-looking movement proposed by the Democratic leadership for the betterment of the conditions of our people. They attempted with ever increasing insistence, to block all measures for social reform and especially those which had for their object the liberation of the common people from the hindrances which had heretofore stood in the way of their advancement.

Upon these issues and upon the record of the Democratic Party in regard thereto, we went to the country and in three successive national elections since 1932, the Democratic Party and its policies received the overwhelming endorsement of the people. In these victories, the ninth district joined with a mighty voice.

Scarcely had the country, under the wise leadership, begun to substantially recover from the depression, until ominous clouds began to obscure the horizon in other quarters of the world. Dictators were arising who seemed to have in mind the subjugation of neighboring states and the practical enslavement of millions of people, and following a course of action which seriously threatened the peace of the world.

Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers saw the danger, not only to the nations of Europe and Asia, but to the safety and freedom of our own land. They recognized as true the statement of a wise man that "He that cannot see danger at a distance, may be overwhelmed by it before he is aware." He began at once to prepare for the worst that might happen. Today, everyone recognizes the wisdom of his course, but then, at every move he was fought and hindered by the Republican organization which continuously criticized and condemned every movement for our defense, without making a constructive suggestion. They opposed the repeal of the Arms Embargo Act, they fought lend-lease, and they condemned selective service at every step.

While the preparation was not all that was required and desired, it was enough to save us from defeat and ruin when the war came to us. How well our affairs of state were managed, how ably our military affairs were directed by our Commander in Chief, and the conduct of both parties with reference to our conduct of the war, are matters of such recent history as not to need comment at this time. The Democratic Party submits its record to the people, confident of approval.

Now that the war is over, we are confronted with the problems of peace. Shall we lose the peace as we did at the conclusion of World War I, or shall we save for mankind that which has been so dearly won and which is now in our keeping? Our people will take warning from past experience and entrust the conduct of our affairs to those who have proven able and worthy.

In the period of reconversion, we must not forget the contests of past years in which we have won much for social justice and for the betterment of our people. Profiting by our experience, in our transition from wartime conditions to peaceful pursuits, we should do so, holding fast to all that we have gained and with the purpose of embracing in our new establishment the most progressive principles and practices, socially as well as economically.

It is growing increasingly obvious that in a democracy, government is no stronger than the enlightened will of the people, and in this time of reconversion, we need to reconvert in a great many ways not directly connected with big or small business; in ways that to my mind are vital to the happiness and contentment of our people. The war has disrupted the course of our lives. Our habits of living and in many ways our habits of thought have been changed. Much is now being said of juvenile delinquency and much more could be said of adult delinquency.

It is time for all of us to go to work seriously to make this a great nation in respect to the quality of its citizenship.

We need to greatly develop a proper respect for the rights of all men, regardless of race or condition in life, and much we need to learn anew a wholesome respect for the law—all laws—for it is through the observance of law that we enjoy the greatest liberty and the most freedom from infringement upon our rights.

Our people need again to capture the spirit of self-reliance and a sense of individual responsibility which has in the past furnished the world with great and good men in every avenue of life.

We need not to overlook the old-fashioned idea of doing an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, and, remember, that to do less is to take that which is not rightfully ours.

We need to cease to live so largely on wheels and to reestablish our home life, for it is in the home life of our people that character is formed, which fixed the destiny of our Nation. We need to encourage the wise, courageous, and incorruptible among us to seek public office and encourage within the ranks of our own party—the selection as our candidates—men of ability and high character.

As I see it, the Democratic Party is the party of the liberals. It is not the party of the reactionary, nor is it the party of the Communist or Socialist.

Our party has based itself on the undying principles so ably expressed by Thomas Jefferson. We hail the Declaration of Independence as expressing the aspiration of a free people, and the Virginia bill of rights as the charter of our liberties. We take our stand upon the Constitution as the supreme law of the land. We recognize the doctrine that property rights are not superior to the duty of the Government to so provide that human beings shall not suffer or starve.

The Democratic Party recognizes the duty to encourage and protect honest business, large or small, and to protect capital invested in business enterprises to the extent that it may be safe with fair opportunity to produce a fair income, but it does not recognize the right of any business or financial institution to engage in illegal practices or to oppress the people.

It advocates the right of the laboring man to organize for the protection of his interest against unjust and oppressive practices, and to secure his rightful place in the economy of our country, with the right to collective bargaining and to demand and to receive for his labor a living wage and one which will insure to him a standard of living such as a self-respecting American should have.

We hold that the system of social security, unemployment insurance, and old-age assistance already inaugurated by the Democratic Party should be fully maintained, and that they be perfected, improved, and enlarged until they are fully adequate to meet the need.

The Democratic Party holds that farming is a basic and most vital industry. We realize that the workers in all of our other great industries, as well as the dwellers in all of our cities and towns and indeed all the people, are dependent upon the farmer for the production of food, and that the very life and destiny of all the people of this Nation as well as many in foreign lands, are dependent upon the success of the American farmer. Note this: When the American farmer is prosperous, everyone is prosperous. The Democratic Party has conceived and enacted all the legislation in this country which has contributed anything to the welfare and prosperity of the farmer.

It is the future purpose of the Democratic Party to foster and encourage every measure and every movement which will give to the farmer a better and more convenient market, and prices for his products which compare favorably with that of other workers, and we advocate means whereby he may be able to secure proper and adequate farm machinery and necessary fertilizer at a fair price; that he may have an opportunity to secure electric power and labor-saving devices; that more aid be given the rural schools and rural roads, so that those who live on the farm may have modern conveniences and such necessary advantages, as will make life on the farm comfortable and attractive.

Through the Hull trade agreements and other similar agreements, it is the purpose of the Democrats to encourage world trade, which will furnish our people a large market for the great surpluses from farm and factory and mine, which our country will soon be producing.

This country does not covet any of the territory of other nations, and the Democratic Party scorns every intimation of aggressive action toward other peoples. We desire to dwell in amity with all the world and to be good neighbors in real truth. We desire to deal openly, honestly, and frankly in all things, but we do not mean to yield our rights or to become appeasers. We believe that taking a firm stand for the right at all times is the best and, indeed, the only safe policy. We do not intend to interfere with the internal affairs of any other nation, or to permit any other nation to interfere with ours. We will not agree to or become a party to any act or acts of any nation to impose upon or restrict the freedom or liberties of a smaller nation.

We have taken a leading part in the establishment of the United Nations Organization, and it shall be our purpose to take our place in that organization and exercise all of our power and influence therein for the furtherance of the purposes for which it was formed. We shall advocate a strict adherence to the provisions of that great charter, and invoke the services of the organization in the prevention and settlement of all differences that may arise between nations, and through this organization, as well as by every other possible honorable means, we shall endeavor to prevent war and preserve the peace of the world.

Upon the passing of Mr. Roosevelt, there was elevated to the Presidency, by act of law, the man whom the people had elected to the Vice Presidency, Hon. Harry S. Truman. By great service he had distinguished himself as a Member of the United States Senate, and when he became President, he assumed office with the complete confidence of his fellow citizens. He is a plain, honest man, of southern background, hailing from the Central West. He has proven himself a sound, progressive Democrat and a capable leader and a man to whom the people may look to carry out the policies of his great predecessor.

Our leadership in Congress has been up to the highest standards and we feel proud of our entire Virginia delegation as men of ability, courage, and integrity; and while we are not now entering a State campaign, I will in passing say that the people of Virginia may well be proud of the outstanding administration of Gov. Colgate W. Darden during the difficult years of the war and of our newly elected chief executive, Gov. William M. Tuck, whose administration has done excellent work so far.

The Ninth Virginia District has good reason to be proud of its Representative in Congress. He has shown himself to be an able champion of the rights of the people and has worked untiringly for all forward-looking measures. He has a sympathetic understanding of the problems of men and women who toil, and he has ever shown himself to be their friend. He has given a large part of his time and attention to legislation favorable to our farmers and by sincere study of their problems has become an authority on matters pertaining to agriculture. He is now chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in Congress and in regard to legislation affecting farmers, he is the most influential Member of our National House of Representatives. I do not know who will be the nominee of this convention and I am not at liberty to predict. Permit me, however, to express the personal opinion that the people of this district, through this convention, should extend their thanks to the Honorable JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.

And now as I near the conclusion of my remarks, I trust you will not think me presumptuous if I rather pointedly address a few words to our party leaders who are present here. Today we enter a political campaign, the success of which means much. It matters little how sincere our thought and purpose, or how just and salutary the policies we advocate, if we are not successful in electing our candidate. We will make a fatal mistake if we allow ourselves to be inactive. We can't win this election sitting at ease.

Allow me to tell you a story. A railway company was training some new employees. After a few weeks of instruction, an examination was given. A question on that examination was as follows:

There was a track running from east to west and one running from north to south. The tracks crossed out in a desolate country. There was no telegraphic or telephonic communication within 50 miles of the crossing. There was a watch tower at the crossing and a short distance away was a small house occupied by an old woman who was bedfast. Now, in the problem given the students, a train was supposed to have left a point 50 miles west of the crossing at exactly 9 a. m., and was proceeding in the direction of the crossing at the rate of 50 miles per hour. Another train left from a point 50 miles north of the crossing at the same time, and was proceeding toward the crossing at the rate of 50 miles per hour. The student was to place himself in place of the watchman in the tower and state what he would do

under the circumstances. A young hopeful gave what I consider a rather ingenious answer. He said that he would leave the watch tower and go to the house nearby where lived the old lady; that he would carry her to the front porch and seat her comfortably in a rocking chair, and that he would tell her to keep her eyes on the railroad crossing, and if she did so, in a very few minutes, she would see one of the damnedest wrecks she had ever seen in her life.

This is not a rocking chair campaign and if we indulge in such, we shall soon see the wreck of the Democratic Party in the Ninth District.

Let us put aside factional or personal differences, if any there be and get together, every man of us, behind the candidate of the Democratic Party. I ask that each man and woman in this convention carry the message back home to all our faithful Democrats, that the fight is on, and that there is a clear call for every man to do his duty. I entreat you, organize your county, if not already thoroughly done and especially organize every precinct, and in each precinct, select with great care a precinct chairman who will be an active and enthusiastic worker and leader. By all means, do not minimize precinct organization for through such organization we can arouse the people, qualify our voters, and get them out on election day.

It is not only important that we win this election, it is also important that we elect our candidate by such a majority as will furnish to him a positive mandate which will strengthen his hand and greatly increase his influence in the councils of our Nation.

This is a great district, with unparalleled scenic beauty, rich in forest and in field, in mine and industry, and above all magnificient in its citizenship; a land and a people to be admired and loved

Recently I have had occasion to think of and more highly prize this my native land. It has been my fortune during the last 4 years to travel in far distant lands, and thus, far from home, I have dreamed much of the high mountains, beautiful streams, the smiling valleys and sun-kissed hills of southeast Virginia, and often I had brought to mind those lines learned in early youth:

"There is a land of every land the pride,
Blessed of heaven, o'er all the world beside,
And I have found where'er my footsteps roam,
That land my country,
That spot my home."

Our Public Schools Need Additional Financial Assistance Because of Increased Cost of Living and the Schools' Greater Responsibilities in This Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as a school teacher and as an administrator of schools, I have fought for years for the improvement of our free public schools in the State, and for the inclusion in the State constitution of a fixed charge for the support of our public schools. Through these years I have watched the growth and development of the school system in California, but I have been distressed to see that the salaries of public-school teachers have not shared in that growth. Neither have the funds necessary for the average daily calendar allotment increased in proportion to the burden of work which has fallen to the staffs of our schools.

In November there will appear on the California ballot a measure to provide for an increased appropriation for the average daily attendance of school children. This measure will make it possible to provide better salaries for all of the fine personnel who are responsible for our California schools. I am wholeheartedly in favor of this provision, which would increase the effectiveness of our schools and compensate more adequately the first-rate teachers and staffs which are necessary for good schools, and I intend to make a State-wide campaign in favor of this important measure.

Here in the Congress we are fighting for additional support for the public schools of the Nation. Mr. Boyd Comstock is in constant contact with myself and the other members of the California delegation, and we are all working to gain more support on the floor of the House for Federal aid to public schools to match State aid.

In this atomic age, free public schools will play a more important role than ever before, for only a well-informed and thinking citizenry can fulfill its full responsibility to realize a lasting peace in this high-power age. We cannot and must not have another world conflict. Only a well educated and alert public can guide our Nation safely along the road to peace. As our Nation has grown into new responsibilities among the nations of the world, so our people must take up their new responsibility to work with courage and with understanding for the well-being of the whole world. This is a task for education, and I shall work for the participation of the Congress and of the State of California in this vital preparation for peace.

As your State legislator, as your Lieutenant Governor I fought for better conditions in our schools, and now as your Congressman I pledge you my continued whole-hearted support of free public education.

Modernizing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the minority have said to me, in substance: "I see Representative MONRONEY and Senator LA FOLLETTE are carrying the ball for your committee—I mean your Committee To Organize Congress—don't you Republicans have anything to say about it, and if so what, and if not, why not?"

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer these questions, and briefly, to define my position. I do not undertake to speak for Representative MICHENER, of Michigan, nor Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois; both minority members of the committee, and more than perfectly able to speak for themselves.

I know the report is packed with worse and more powerful explosives than dynamite and to drop it into the lap of Congress took nerve and courage. However, Congress called for it, must handle it, and it is not a partisan report.

MODERNIZING CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, in my 12 years in Congress the work load on the individual Member and his office staff has grown enormously. Many Senators and Representatives who appeared before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress during our hearings last year, complained that they spent so much time with trouble-shooting details and nonlegislative matters that they could devote only a small fraction of their time to their legislative duties. Handling our mail, interviewing constituents, and callers, visiting departments on behalf of aggrieved groups in our districts, keeping committee appointments, and attending sessions of the House leave little time for the adequate study of complex legislative problems.

In our recent report, the joint committee on which I have the honor to serve, recommended a number of remedies for the rising burden of business. As steps toward reducing the work load, we proposed that Congress should cease to sit as a common council for the District of Columbia. We suggested that Congress should delegate to appropriate administrative and judicial agencies the settlement of private claims and pensions. And we suggested the creation of a stenographic pool to assist our office force with the mounting volume of mail during busy seasons.

The joint committee also recommended more efficient use of congressional time. We proposed that Congress provide for a regular recess period at the close of each fiscal year so that Members could return to their constituencies and refresh their contacts with the folks back home. And we suggested that the leadership of both Houses experiment with meeting schedules, reserving 3 days for morning and afternoon committee meetings and hearings, and 3 days for sessions in the Chambers for legislative work.

Although I do not necessarily subscribe to every recommendation in the joint committee's report, I am heartily in accord with these proposals for reducing the work load on individual Congressmen. I regret, however, that the joint committee did not see fit to recommend one other timesaving device which, I believe, would greatly expedite our proceedings. I refer to electric roll calls. Last Monday afternoon there were three roll calls in the House which consumed 2 hours of the time of each of us, or a total of 870 man-hours.

The record shows that during the Seventy-eighth Congress there were 300 roll calls in the House, of which 144 were quorum calls and 156 were yea-and-nay votes. Normally, it takes from 20 to 25 minutes for a quorum call in the House and from 30 to 40 minutes for a record vote. At a conservative estimate we spent

152 hours during the last Congress answering roll calls alone. This was equivalent to thirty 5-hour legislative days which Members might have spent more profitably in committee or at home in their districts.

The electric roll-call device has been adopted in several States to expedite voting and is reported to have met with general satisfaction among State legislators. Among the States using electric voting in one or both houses are California, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Modernization of our procedure in this respect would be a great time-saver to busy Congressmen. Why should we go on using hand tools in a machine age?

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all the Members of this House have read or will soon read the recent report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It is an historic document. This is the first time since the founding of the Republic that the Congress had made a thorough investigation of its own organization and operation. Our committee held extensive hearings last spring and summer. More than half of the witnesses who were heard or who submitted statements were members of this House and of the Senate. They spoke out of first-hand practical experience with the working of our legislative machinery. A review of all the testimony received reveals a wide area of agreement among the witnesses with respect both to the conditions that handicap Congress and appropriate remedies therefor.

After long and careful deliberation last fall and winter, the joint committee reached almost unanimous agreement upon its final report. Considering the scope and complexity of the undertaking, the diverse viewpoints among the committeemen, and the sweeping character of the proposals, this was a notable achievement. I have no doubt that the report of the joint committee will win an imperishable place in the annals of Congress and that it will be remembered and quoted long after most of us have joined the nameless host of our predecessors in this body. The committee is deeply gratified by the wonderful response which the report has received from newspaper editors, radio commentators, and the interested public. Every metropolitan newspaper in the Nation published long summaries of the report and many laudatory editorials.

I do not desire to detain the House, on the eve of the recess, with a review of the joint committee's recommendations. Copies of our report and published hearings have recently been distributed to every Member of the House. I hope they will not be discarded or mislaid. They would repay your examination during the recess. They are the result of a sincere and painstaking effort, based upon long and sympathetic study of Congress at work, to strengthen our institution. Adoption of our recommendations, we believe, will enable Congress to do a better job and regain its proper place in the American scheme of government.

Since the report of the joint committee was filed on March 4 an omnibus bill embodying our recommendations has been drafted. By wrapping them all up in one legislative package we shall avoid splintering a unified program. The bill is almost ready and I understand that Senator LA FOLLETTE plans to introduce it in the Senate in a few days. After that body has acted upon it the bill will come in due course to this Chamber. I hope that my friends on both sides of the aisle will rally to the support of this bipartisan effort for a stronger Congress.

In our daily preoccupation with price control, appropriations, and many other perplexing problems we must not lose sight of the underlying fact that representative government itself is at stake.

Public affairs are now handled—

As our report states—

by a host of administrative agencies headed by nonelected officials with only casual oversight by Congress. The course of events has created a breach between Government and the people. Behind our inherited constitutional pattern a new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. Meanwhile government by administration is the object of group pressures, which weaken its protection of the public interest.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will not forget the program for strengthening Congress during the coming weeks. The recommendations made by the joint committee are good as far as they go. Personally, I wish they had gone farther in certain directions. But to accept anything less than they have proposed would be to risk the future of our great institution and of our form of government. Some may be disposed in the spurious name of practical politics to put vested personal and local interests ahead of the welfare of our national legislature. If practical politics holds sway, Congress will protect vested interests—the seniority system, the errand-boy work for the home districts, and personal privileges. But I venture to predict that in the long run such politics will prove to be quite impractical so far as the survival of a strong and effective Congress is concerned.

Unless it chooses to modernize its machinery and equip itself with the tools it needs, a frustrated Congress may become a relic of the oxcart era in the age of the rocket ship.

Pearls From the Congressional Mail—Peace—As Dorothy Thompson Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, what a tragic comparison is found between the declaration of policies made in the Atlantic Charter principles, which humanity accepted in good faith and with such high hopes, when the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom announced:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. They respect the rights of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states great or small, victor or vanquished of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all the nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth. After the final distruction of the Nazi tyranny they hope to see established a peace which afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside their frontiers. They believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving people the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

And now comes the peace as Dorothy Thompson sees it. There is submitted the comments made in a column of Miss Thompson which I have taken the liberty to condense and rearrange:

OPEN LETTER TO UN

GENTLEMEN: You are sitting in New York with the support and consent of the people of the world, from whom alone you derive any authority whatsoever. You have been entrusted by them to found this earth on peace. Your enemies are totally defeated, broken, and disarmed. Look around you on the destruction of this war and the continuing destruction of your miserable "peace."

Your Government, Mr. Gromyko, once recommended to the League of Nations the abolition of all the armies, navies, and air forces of the world.

Your Government, Mr. Byrnes, initiated a solemn treaty, signed by all governments, never to resort to force as an instrument of national policy.

Your peace is murder. In Europe the very roots of life wither in the bodies of women, their children hunger, their infants cannot be suckled at famished breasts. They bury the stillborn, thankful for their death. They take the food from their own famishing mouths for their young ones, the images of innocence.

You think, perhaps, that barracks and laboratories are the representatives of history? You are wrong. History begins with life and life begins with the mother. Life admonishes you and obliges you to live, which means to fulfill, which means to answer—to answer to the mothers of life, who know that the supreme end of creation is the creature, the human creature.

For what aim can you justify to the mothers the continuation of murder? Of war against races—if the race be of the enemy?' Of war against classes, that affront to life which compresses the soul of man into his economic status; of war against idea—while the very ideas you have fought take possession of your own minds, and hate, lust, greed, and the passion for power grind the bodies of men into the ground to poison the very fields.

We observe your delaying tactics on the peace conference. We take heed of the repeated cry that you are surrounded by enemies. We know that your armies are not diminishing, but growing, augmented by new armies of vassal states. And over every decision hangs the fact of 400 armed Soviet divisions.

We clearly see through the issues and menaces to peace that you raise. We clearly see that the fate of small nations concerns none of you who represent great nations. The small nations are but pawns in your own schemes. Your moves are directed, not toward peace, but against each other. Each of you is afraid.

Nature itself, gentlemen, will rise against you. Famine will confound your plans; hunger and heartbreak will stare at you from maddened eyes; communism will become banditry; democracy a word to evolve maudlin laughter, and UN will stand as the great negation—the unpeace, the uncooperation, the uncivilization, the unlife—unless you stop war.

A House to Live in—Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest problems facing the Nation is the housing shortage. I am sure there is general agreement, even by some real-estate interests, that such a shortage exists. But the tragic aspect of the situation is that those who are suffering most are those to whom homes mean the most—our returning veterans and their families. The very thought of home and a family sustained hundreds of thousands of our fighting men during the agony of battle. Now they are returning to civilian life only to be told there is no place for them to live, no decent homes to be had within their means. The situation is acute now. It promises to get worse in the months ahead.

By the end of this year the National Housing Agency has estimated that 2,900,000 married veterans will have been discharged from the armed forces to join the mad scramble for homes and apartments which do not now exist. This includes 1,600,000 married veterans who have no established homes to which to return and another 1,300,000 who will marry during the time and seek homes for the first time. Another 560,000 nonveterans also will marry between now and next January 1—further to complicate the shortage which found 1,200,000 families already sharing quarters with others when the rapid rate of demobilization set in last October.

Many other American families besides those of veterans want and need decent homes, but clearly for the months ahead we must employ emergency measures because hundreds of thousands of families of veterans have no homes at all. That is why I am, without reservation, for the full veterans' emergency housing program proposed by Wilson W. Wyatt, the President's National Housing Expediter and the Administrator of the National Housing Agency. That program, bold in its conception and offering a challenge to all of us, calls for the construction of 2,700,000 low- and moderate-cost homes and apartments for veterans by the end of 1947—the greatest volume of home construction ever achieved in this or any other country during a comparable period of time.

I supported the Patman bill and cast my vote to include in it provision for the use of premium payments as a means to expand production of building materials, the scarcity of which presently presents the principal obstacle to be overcome in attaining the goals of the Wyatt program. It is encouraging that the Senate approved this provision. I hope that it will be accepted by the conference committee and ultimately approved by the House.

Despite all that has been said on the subject there still seems to be considerable misunderstanding about premium payments—the subject of considerable controversy. Such payments should be thought of in terms of building homes. Both President Truman and Mr. Wyatt have said without them the goals of the veterans' emergency housing program cannot be met.

Premium payments are in effect subsidies. There are those who see something sinister and evil in the word "subsidy." Yet much of this Nation's progress was made by Government subsidies. Steamship lines, railroads, and the aviation industry all have received Government help in the past, getting established and reaching a point where they could operate at a profit. It is simply a proposal to use a time-tested device to get homes for veterans built at prices the average veteran can afford, and that means homes and apartments selling for $6,000 and less and renting for $50 a month and below. This country spent around $300,000,000,000 for war. Now it is proposed to spend $600,000,000 on premium payments—one-fifth of 1 percent of the cost of the war—to help our veterans get decent homes.

It has been estimated that next year eight times the amount of materials will be needed than we used in home construction last year. No such volume can be achieved without the Government assuming some of the abnormal risk involved. Remember that it is proposed to use these incentive payments—for that is what they are—on the production of materials above existing levels and that they will be paid by the Government, not the veteran.

There are those who argue that price increases are the answer to the problem. But it must be remembered that premium payments would be made only on expanded production and not on production now carried on a profit. Price increases would be passed on to the consumer—in this case the veteran. Also passed along to the veteran would be the mark-up in price all along the line.

The National Housing Agency has warned that the cost of building materials and construction are now already near record highs. The agency has estimated that a flat 15-percent increase in building-material prices would increase the cost of a $6,000 home from $500 to $1,000. It would cost consumers—chiefly veterans—$2,000,000,000 as contrasted to less than one-third of that amount, the $600,000,000 for premium payments, to be paid by the taxpayers generally, not just the veterans.

Consider this, too, a War Department survey at separation centers showed that 84 percent of veterans cannot pay more than $6,000 for a home or pay more than $50 a month in rent. Certainly we must do all in our power to decrease building costs rather than permit them to rise further since it is obviously useless to build a lot of houses which veterans can't afford to buy or rent.

A word more on the subject from the long-range aspect. There are those who contend that if the building industry is stepped up to meet this present emergency that it will build itself out of a market. Nothing could be further from the truth. If the aims of the emergency program are met in full, the industry then would only be in a position to tackle the job of producing 1,000,000 homes a year which this country will need for years to come to catch up with the backlog of demand, get veterans and other families out of temporary housing, city slums, and rural shacks. Fortunately, the vehicle for doing that is well advanced in Congress. I speak of the General Housing Act — the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill — recently passed by the Senate. I have introduced a companion measure in the House and am hopeful it will receive prompt attention.

Under the provisions of this measure private enterprise would be encouraged and stimulated to do the largest possible job of home production, cities would be helped in clearing their blighted and slum areas and redevelopment of them at economic costs, and public housing would be provided for those families of very low income unable to pay more than slum rents. Surely the time has arrived when we must set forth with determination along the road leading to the ultimate goal of a decent home for every American family.

Ben Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, our old friend Ben Jones, keeper of the Republican cloak room died last Monday, after nearly 40 years' service on the Hill.

Ben was well liked in the Halls of Congress and was a credit to his race. He was intensely interested in public affairs and stayed informed on every issue before the Congress. This enabled him to predict with a high degree of accuracy the result of a vote on many measures before the House.

Uniformly courteous and consistently genial, Ben came to be highly respected by every Republican Congressman with whom he came in contact, and he will be greatly missed by all of us.

Born in East St. Louis, Ill., on August 5, 1879, Ben came to work at the Capitol on April 16, 1907, when "Uncle Joe" Cannon was Speaker of the House. He has served Republican Members of the House in the cloak room since May 1, 1911. During his many years of service Ben became known as a reliable source of information.

I know that every Member of the United States House of Representatives joins me in mourning the passing of Ben Jones, and extends with me condolences to the friends and relatives he leaves behind.

What Is Wrong With Government Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lewis H. Brown, president of the Johns-Manville Corp., who as a recognized authority was assigned by the late President Roosevelt to draft the National Housing Act of 1934, was recently asked to shed some light on the present housing problem. He issued a statement which was printed in a recent issue of the Delray Beach (Fla.) News. This statement is very enlightening and should be read by every person interested in the subject. Under permission to extend my remarks I include Mr. Brown's statement:

WHAT IS WRONG WITH GOVERNMENT HOUSING?
(By Lewis H. Brown, president, Johns-Manville Corp.)

Before answing this highly controversial question, let me make several points clear. Except possibly in 1941 there have not been enough homes built in any year since 1929. Hence, there is a great shortage of homes. The high marriage and birth rate during the war years and the sudden demobilization of 10,000,000 veterans have intensified the problem. Temporary shelter should be provided by the States and National Government for veterans' families—wherever possible—in order to help relieve the most serious cases no matter what the cost.

However, attempting to solve "housing for veterans" as a problem apart from "housing for all citizens" will only result in less houses instead of more.

No matter what either the construction industry or the Government does, it will take from 5 to 10 years to supply normal housing needs and make up the shortage of the past 16 years. The most acute shortages could be taken care of in 2 years.

For the Nation to find itself in such a condition may surprise some citizens. For years the newspapers have been filled with plans for Government low-cost housing. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent. Yet, as the net result of 15 years of Government planning only a minor fraction of all housing built has been Government built. Moreover, it is common knowledge in the construction industry that a great deal of housing constructed by the Government is not at all "low cost." It is in fact "high cost." Most of the so-called mass produced Government-built war housing is either so high in cost as to be uneconomical—or of such shoddy quality as to be far below par when compared to private construction. Thus, based on our past record, the prospect of the Government providing housing is, to say the least, not very promising.

The bureaucrats in Washington have produced an enormous amount of plans, newspaper headlines and political hokum—but comparatively few houses.

Ninety-nine percent of the houses in America have been built by small contractors, speculative builders and individual home owners—by private enterprise, not by Government.

In 1930 to 1932 the short term mortgage system previously in effect contributed to the deepening of the depression. The Government set up the Home Owners' Loan Corp., and took over $3,000,000,000 of distressed mortgages. That was a help to individuals and the industry. In 1932 and 1933 the theorists talked Government housing and urged direct loans to individuals by the Government. However, the practical advice of the construction industry finally prevailed, resulting in the Federal Housing Act which provided for loans to be made by private enterprise on long term mortgages—with payments on principal to be made yearly. The Government set up an insurance policy to guarantee the loan in case of foreclosure—or to tide it over in case of another depression.

The act broke the bottleneck of construction. It provided a solution to purchasing power. Billions of dollars of housing and modernization have resulted.

Today, the bottleneck in housing is not lack of purchasing power. Today, we have too much purchasing power. That is one of the main reasons of our war and post-war inflation and a 35 to 50 percent increase in prices.

Today, the bottleneck in housing is the OPA and the housing controls that have been predicated upon OPA policy.

Everyone agrees that price and wage controls are necessary in war. When VJ-day approached the construction industry, through the building material producers, asked the OPA not to eliminate price controls but to raise them moderately where necessary on some special items in order to get full production of materials.

This the OPA refused to do. Even today, 8 months after VJ-day the output of the factories making building materials is anywhere from 25 to 75 percent below the 1941 production level.

OPA policy, unemployment compensation, and strikes are the causes.

The building material factories of the Nation have the capacity to turn out materials to build 1,200,000 houses a year. In addition, they can produce enough for several millions of dollars of other construction.

The American people have a right to ask, "What's blocking production?"

When the veterans began to return, housing was no longer merely a critical housing problem. It became a political problem as well. The President appointed Mr. Wilson Wyatt, lawyer and youthful former mayor of Louisville, as Federal Housing Expediter.

An experienced politician, Mr. Wyatt unfortunately did not understand the construction industry.

On January 11, Mr. Bowles, OPA head and a former advertising executive, wrote to Mr. Wyatt outlining in detail a plan for solving the housing problem.

Unfortunately, Mr. Bowles is another top Government director whose knowledge and understanding of the construction industry is also—shall I say—limited. Mr. Bowles' letter, which later appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said in substance: "Reliance upon traditional methods is out. We cannot get housing by giving the construction industry its head. We must substitute Government controls and Government planning. The Government must build houses like we built ships and guns and planes. That is the only way to get housing."

After 30 days' study of the problem, during which Mr. Wyatt interviewed delegations from the construction industry, he presented a report accepting Mr. Bowles' plan—and rejecting the practical suggestions of the industry that had built America.

The President accepted Wyatt's report and recommended it to Congress. The papers are filled with Government propaganda for the plan. From these reports the average citizen would judge that all that is involved is a $600,000,000 subsidy which has been requested by Mr. Wyatt and the President—and which, if approved by Congress, will forthwith provide the needed housing.

Strangely enough, the construction industry has told Congress that the $600,000,000 subsidy is unnecessary; that there is ample plant capacity; that if OPA will open the bottlenecks by moderate price adjustments on special items—production of materials will flow; that the construction industry does not want the $600,000,000—nor the public responsibility of taking the money as part of an impractical plan which, in their opinion, if persisted in, will produce a minimum rather than a maximum amount of housing. In addition, the industry has told Congress that the Wyatt plan will unnecessarily halt—or greatly delay—large amounts of construction sorely needed to bring about true reconstruction and full employment.

Veterans can't buy homes if they don't have jobs!

Citizens ask: What is wrong with Government housing?

The answer: 1. It is predicated upon a basic fallacy.

2. It is designed and directed by men who do not know.

The fallacy is that the Government can build a million houses in peacetime as they did a hundred thousand planes in time of war.

In war, planes were used by the Government. In peace, houses are used by individuals.

In war, planes are bought by the Government. In peace houses are bought by individuals.

In wartime, the specifications of planes are determined by experts and standardized. In peace, in building a home, every woman wants to set her own specifications.

If the Government bought standardized houses in peacetime, how would they be distributed—unless we adopt the Russian system?

In war, the OPA did not fix the price of a plane. It was produced irrespective of cost. Later, when costs were reduced, any excess profits were returned to Uncle Sam!

When planes or ships or guns were designed during the war they were designed by experts. The famous ordnance-industry team was the basis for our successful production of fighting guns, tanks, and ammunition. The intensified cooperation between the Air Corps and industry, or shipping and industry, was the basis of our success.

The fighting forces sought and took advice from industry. They never assumed that Government could produce the weapons of

war. The procurement branches of the fighting forces trusted the experience of industry. They relied upon the industrialists to use untraditional means within the pattern of traditional principles.

Had the present housing plan been applied to planes or ships or guns we would never have won the war!

No one is more anxious to produce millions of homes than is the construction industry. That is where our bread and butter lies. Our industry is patriotic and wants to see these critical shortages relieved. The industry is also fearful that continued shortage of supply will permit black markets to grow and price structures to go too high—with the inevitable result of a buyers' strike.

From every angle, the construction industry would welcome the kind of cooperation that existed between the Armed Forces and industry. The Government could do so much to help our industry deliver the results that the public requires.

The construction industry wants to have the record clear. The Government exerting its full power in support of its "plan" will, in all likelihood, prevail.

Later on, however, when adequate housing is not produced to meet the political promises, the public should not put the blame at the doorstep of industry. To give all possible aid to our veterans in this national crisis as well as to serve its own self-interest, the building industry will do its best. But, even a great race horse cannot win with hobbled feet.

Easter in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Easter in the Atomic Age," recently delivered by me over radio stations in Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTER IN THE ATOMIC AGE

It is gladsome springtime again. All nature speaks to us of newness, of freshness, of beauty. Nature speaks through the budding flower, the leafing trees, the singing of birds of the renewal of life.

The message of nature is the message of Easter. That message is this: Life has continuity. Yes. There is no death. Every infant bud on the vine tells us this truth; so does every blade of green grass, every magnificent sunrise. The spirit of a man is indestructible; only the body disintegrates. There is no death.

THE FIRST EASTER

This message first came meaningfully to man 2,000 years ago. It was then that Man of Galilee walked forth from the tomb, thus showing to fearful humanity that there is no death, that life is eternal.

As Easter commemorates the resurrection of Jesus of Galilee, there come to us the words of the angel to Mary:

"Fear not ye. For I know ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here, for He is risen."

He is risen. No greater news has come to mankind in twenty centuries. He is risen. Death, which ignorant humanity thought was the end of existence, is exposed as a fraud. In death, man only lays the human shell away. His "Father continues to look after His own."

We remember also that the Way-Shower said:

"I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead yet shall he live."

Life, eternal, joyful, indestructible, was proved by the Nazarene. Easter commemorates His victory and our victory. It is the triumph of life over death, of the spirit over the flesh, of joy over sorrow. Easter proves that Golgotha and the cross were not the final act. Nothing can destroy an immortal creation.

MAN'S NEED FOR EASTER

What more important message has ever come to man? In that message is strength, reassurance, hope. Man can look forward expectantly, eagerly, to his tomorrow, not with dread, not with doubt.

By the Resurrection, man came to know the vitality of the Master's statement:

"I am the way, the truth, and the life."

Man learned that to follow in His way, in His truth, in His life was to live eternally and joyfully.

Two thousand years ago, at Eastertide, this light broke through the darkness of human thinking. It has brought since to countless millions the confidence that God lives, that He is available, that He is all-knowing, all-seeing, all-present, the same yesterday, today, and forever, and His creation, the spiritual man, is indestructible.

Man learned on that first Easter morn that man himself can roll the stone away from his own tomb. Yes; man—you and I—can clear away all obstacles of hate, of fear, of anxiety in our personal lives and in the lives of our brothers. We can break the man-made shackles that bind us—the man-made limitations. We can be free. Paul said, "I was born free."

We can awaken from our sleep and go on to greater achievement, to greater contribution individually and as a nation, if we truly see and make the meaning of Easter our own.

The Master said, "I am the light of the world." Man can follow that light through the darkness of man's prejudice, of man's distrust, of man's suspicion, so that the days of his years are days of limitless joy, growth, and accomplishment. At Easter time all nature is reaching for the sunlight; growth is in full swing, teaching man through action to work out his salvation.

THE WORLD'S NEED OF EASTER

I have spoken of the individual's need of Easter and of what Easter can mean to him. But there is a still greater need and meaning of Easter. It is the world's need of Easter and the meaning of the Resurrection to the world.

The nations have just come through their Golgotha. Hunger, misery, and devastation are everywhere. Bodies are broken, hearts embittered, minds clouded and confused in countless countries. Mankind is still in its tomb.

Yes; it is obvious that all the world needs the message of Easter today as never before. All the world must feel the glory of His presence, the strength of His spirit—the Easter message.

All the world must be encouraged to rise from its tomb, to roll away the stone, the national jealousies, obstructions, and impediments, to go forth, to rebuild, to repair, to establish bonds of friendship and peace with all countries.

The Galilean said, "Peace be unto you. As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

The world must clear away the roadblocks to peace. It must harness material atomic energy to peaceful purposes. But more important, it must tap the power of spiritual energy, the power of Easter and the Easter message—getting its true meaning.

The church can play and is playing a mighty role in helping mankind to fulfill the message of Easter, in teaching mankind that all individuals and nations can be resurrected from their man-made tombs.

In this hour of the world's anguish and need, each of us must in the words of Lincoln "rise to the occasion" and meet the great need of our brothers who live in other lands. This calls for personal sacrifice of material things.

Easter is the season of hope, faith, and true charity, when man learns more of the invisible support "in which he lives and moves and has his being."

Was it not Paul who said that "neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from the love of God"?

That was part of the Easter message which came to Paul after his experience on the road to Damascus.

The parable of the good Samaritan told by Jesus illustrates in this hour the obligation of all Americans to those in need.

Upon such a base—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—alone, can a lasting peace structure be built. Will the nations be inspired by the Christ spirit, the spirit of Easter? I have faith that they will, though many think it highly improbable. I have faith in the spirit of Easter and in the cement of brotherly love which it generates, the love of the great Comforter who rose on Easter morn.

Yes; war can indeed be banished from this planet. The Golden Rule, "to do as we would be done by," can become the international rule if men will it so. Poverty can be eliminated, and fear, and hatred, if all men follow His way, His truth, and His life.

CONCLUSIONS

This, then, is the meaning of Easter today, as I see it, to you and to me as individuals, and to our Nation, and to all nations.

Life has continuity; there is no death. The great Galilean has shown us the way of life eternal.

Rebirth can conquer death.

Joy can conquer sorrow.

The spirit can triumph over the flesh.

Life can be triumphant over death.

May I wish for all of you an Easter victorious.

Mr. Churchill Greets Army and Navy Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on March 9, at the invitation of the Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, and General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mr. Winston Churchill met informally several Army and Navy officers with whom he was associated in the Mediterranean and European campaigns and also a number of Army and Navy officers and War and Navy Department officials whom he had not met previously. The meeting was held in the Office of the Secretary of War.

Mr. Churchill was introduced by General Eisenhower, who expressed his

pleasure at having been closely associated with the former British Prime Minister during the campaign in north Africa and Europe. In a brief speech Mr. Churchill expressed his personal appreciation and that of the British Government to the American officers who organized and led the United States forces in the war.

It seems to me that these speeches should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In introducing Mr. Churchill, General Eisenhower said:

"Gentlemen, I am not going to consume time by needless introduction of our distinguished visitor today, but there is one personal quality in our friendship and association during the war to which I should like to bring your attention. Because of his position as Defense Minister in addition to that as Prime Minister, he was associated more closely with the operation of the British Chief of Staff than was the case of our own President. Because of that and because he was kind enough to invite me often to those meetings, there developed a very close association between the Defense Minister of Great Britain and myself with respect to the operations both in the Mediterranean and later in Europe.

"The only thing that I wanted to say was this: In the course of that association there never was a single instance when the full might of the British Empire, and I mean 'scraping the bottom of the barrel' was not available to an Allied operation once it had been agreed upon. That was due to the force, the determination and the leadership of the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Because most of you have not been privileged to have the close association that I did, I was very happy when at the request of the Secretary of War, Mr. Churchill consented to come today in order to renew World War contacts he made with many of us, and, in addition, to come a little closer to some of those that were affected by his decisions, but who did not have that privilege of his close association. So he has consented to be with us today and have a handshake with all of you."

Mr. Churchill said:

"General of the Army Eisenhower, Fleet Admiral Leahy, Fleet Admiral Nimitz, and General of the Air—am I right?—General of the Air Spaatz, it is, indeed, a very great pleasure and honor to me that the Secretary of War and General Eisenhower should have asked me here today and have given me an opportunity, before going home, to meet the high officers of the United States services and to express to them on behalf of my own country and of the British services our admiration and gratitude for all they have done in this great common struggle carried to absolute victory in arms.

"The prevailing feature of our work together was the intimacy of association. Language is a great bridge. There are many, many ideas we have in common and also practice, but there was a spirit of loyalty, of good will, of comradeship which never has been seen in all the history of war between allied armies, navies, air forces fighting together side by side.

"On General Eisenhower's staff, which I saw often and closely in Africa, in France and in Germany, it was carried to extreme perfection. And, as you know, the best people were picked for the various posts, and they gave orders and took orders without regard to which country their next neighbor or opposite number belonged to. I used the words 'opposite number' by mistake, because there were no opposite numbers—there was absolute intermingling of staff work, and the same was true in the commands in the field. Many British and American troops served with perfect confidence under the commanders of the other country. And speaking for our own people, we always had more than fair treatment and felt absolute confidence in those to whom we confided the lives of our soldiers.

"I am certain that our effective unity saved scores of thousands of lives—perhaps far more—and abridged the course of the struggle as nothing else could have done. That must be regarded as a precious possession which we have in common and which, whenever circumstances may require it—I cannot think they will do so in our lifetime—will be available to strengthen any joint efforts our Governments may order in some future period. No one was more the champion and embodiment of this unity than General Eisenhower. I never had a chance to visit the Pacific, but I am told the same conditions prevailed there as were established by him at SHAEF headquarters and in the field. Of course, when people are on different ships they don't come so closely together as they do in the camps and billets. But it was one great force that overthrew the mighty powers with which we were confronted and which were dashed to ruin and helplessness by our exertions.

"I have been thinking a great deal about the work of the United States' services. I will speak a little more of the Army than of the others because I saw more of it. I greatly admired the manner in which the American Army was formed. I think it was a prodigy of organization, of improvisation. There have been many occasions when a powerful state has wished to raise great armies, and with money and time, and discipline and loyalty that can be accomplished. Nevertheless the rate at which the small American Army of only a few hundred thousand men, not long before the war, created the mighty force of millions of soldiers is a wonder in military history.

"I was here 2 or 3 years ago and visited with General Marshall from whom I received a most delightful telegram just now—an Army Corps being trained in South Carolina, and we saw there the spectacle of what you may call the mass production of divisions.

"In great and rapid rotation they were formed, and moved on to further stages of their perfection. I saw the creation of this mighty force—this mighty Army, victorious in every theater against the enemy in so short a time and from such a very small parent stock. This is an achievement which the soldiers of every other country will always study with admiration and with envy.

"But that is not the whole story, nor even the greatest part of the story. To create great armies is one thing; to lead them and to handle them is another. It remains to me a mystery as yet unexplained how the very small staffs which the United States kept during the years of peace were able not only to build up the armies and Air Force units, but also to find the leaders and vast staffs capable of handling enormous masses and of moving them faster and farther than masses have ever been moved in war before.

"The United States owes a debt to its officer corps. In time of peace in this country, as in my own, the military profession is very often required to pass a considerable number of years in the cool shade. One of Marlborough's veterans wrote the lines, now nearly 250 years ago:

" 'God and the soldier we adore
In time of danger, not before;
The danger passed and all things righted,
God is forgotten and the soldier slighted.'

"Undoubtedly the military profession in the great western democracies, which wholeheartedly desire peace, is one which has required great sacrifices from those who devote themselves to it. All around them goes the busy exciting world of business and politics with all its varieties, but the officers frugally, modestly, industriously, faithfully, pursue their professional studies and duties, very often for long periods at a time, without the public notice. That you should have been able to preserve the art, not only of creating mighty armies almost at the stroke of a wand, but of leading and guiding those armies upon a scale incomparably greater than anything that was prepared for, or even dreamed of, constitutes a gift made by the officer corps of the United States to their Nation in time of trouble, which I earnestly hope will never be forgotten here, and it certainly never will be forgotten in the island from which I come. You will, I am sure, permit me to associate with this amazing feat, the name of General Marshall, the creator of this instrument of victory.

"I offer you gentlemen my most earnest congratulations on the manner in which, when the danger came, you were not found wanting. We talk a great deal about the future of armies, and we are studying this matter across the ocean ourselves, and the relation between the officers and the other ranks. I speak not entirely as an amateur. I went through 5 years of professional training at the beginning of my life, in those impressionable years, and I have had the good fortune to be in all the wars that Great Britain has been engaged in in one capacity or another during my lifetime. We now have to choose very carefully the line of division between the officers and other ranks upon which authority should stand. There is only one line in my view, and that is professional attainment. The men have a right to feel that their officers know far better than they do how to bring them safely and victoriously through terrible difficult decisions which arise in war. And for my part, as far as Great Britain is concerned, I shall always urge that the tendency in the future should be to prolong the courses of instruction at the colleges rather than to abridge them. And to equip our young officers with that special technical professional knowledge which soldiers have a right to expect from those who can give them orders if necessary to go to their deaths. It is quite clear that class or wealth or favor will not be allowed in the modern world to afford dividing lines. Professional attainment, based upon prolonged study and collective study at colleges, rank by rank and age by age—those are the title needs of the commanders of the future armies and the secret of future victories.

"I venture to use these few words to you this afternoon because I have had a very varied experience in peace and war, and have met so many men who have played great parts, and I felt it a high honor to be invited to meet you again this afternoon, and to revive old acquaintances and shake hands with new ones. I thought these few observations I ventured to make might not be thought unfitting or unacceptable."

Treatment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Vets' Bolstered Morale Shattered by New Blow," by Frances Langford. The article relates to a matter which was dealt with

in a bill (S. 2078) introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] yesterday on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from California in order to alleviate the conditions such as mentioned in the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETS' BOLSTERED MORALE SHATTERED BY NEW BLOW

(By Frances Langford, famous motion picture star and singer who is touring the United States to entertain the war wounded)

VAN NUYS, April 17.—How much can you take before your morale goes into a tailspin? Not much, I'll bet, unless you happen to be in the superman class.

For even the wisest and bravest of us suffer from periods of shattered self-confidence. At the bottom of it are our moods. When they're dressed in black, it's hard to duck their ill effects.

If this is true of able-bodied people, then think of what those black moods can do to invalidated war veterans. Think for a moment of what it can do to paraplegia victims.

Paraplegia (paralysis of the lower half of the body) is a life-long affliction. It springs from a severed spinal cord. It's beyond aid from nerve grafting surgery. For once the spinal cord nerve cables are cut, they will never grow together again.

Birmingham's paraplegics seemed to be giving those black moods quite a tussle when I last called on them. The shock of their terrible injury—the most devastating of the war—was beginning to lose its crushing wallop. Being bed ridden and wheel chair ridden had given them plenty of time to think. They had reached a state of balance. They had readied themselves for the stern realities of their disheartening futures.

STOUT ANCHOR

They drew strength from the feeling they weren't on their own; that they had a stout anchor in the home folks.

Well, they now know that anchor was made of cork. And it sure looks weak and inept as it bobs up and down on troubled waters.

It is called Public Law 144. Under it they, and other hospitalized, maimed, and disabled veterans, can't get a red cent more than $20 a month if they are unmarried and without dependents.

They had heard tell that things would be different for the vets in this war. They were led to believe that they could look forward to a decent future; a future in which they wouldn't become paupers because of the ingratitude of their beloved country.

For a while these promises seemed the real McCoy. With the pensions they were drawing in Army and Navy hospitals they could do a lot. It would give them a nice stake when they were released from hospital care. They would have a cushion against the unequal competition they'd meet in the able-bodied labor market. They could defray the cost of reconditioning their homes. You see, a wheel-chair existence calls for ramps, metal wall-rails, enlarged bathroom doors, etc. You can't buy that with peanuts, but you can purchase it with full war-disability pensions.

MERE PITTANCE

But all that was before the Veterans' Administration took over. When it did, and Public Law 144 automatically became operative, their pensions were abruptly shaved to a mere pittance of 68 cents a day.

Paraplegic patients are far from being superhuman. Bravely they have tried not to show it—but it's bringing a defeated look to their eyes. Anxieties and fears, felt only partially before, have swelled alarmingly.

Nazi and Jap alike tried to accomplish that very thing with bullets. Our national legislators, indifferent to the plight of our sick and disabled veterans, hit the target with an evil law. On the battlefield these 68-cents-a-day veterans scored brilliant victories, preserving law and order. Back on American soil they have been crushed and humbled by their own lawmakers. That's irony for you.

What can you do about it? Plenty. You can go back to writing letters. Write your Congressman and tell him how wrong Public Law 144 is. Remember how you bombarded these broken heroes with letters when they were still heroes to you? Well, just a small fraction of that correspondence now will make them feel like heroes again.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by P. Economou Gouras, counselor of the Greek Embassy at Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of Greek independence on March 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Greece has been from the dawn of history the cradle of freedom and democratic ideas.

There grew and spread all over the world the transcendent concepts of lofty moral values which are the foundation of our present civilization and give meaning and worth to human life.

And there, upon this small spot in the Mediterranean, have been confronted all who have sought to deprive the world of these priceless values.

Thermopylae, Marathon, and Salamis are outstanding reminders.

There again in modern times in a small monastery a Greek bishop raised on the 25th of March 1821 a banner, symbol and signal of the Greek revolution. This banner embodied the very soul of the nation which, rising as a single man, fought for freedom and gained its independence after unequal and desperate struggle.

There again after 120 years a new and powerful invader with all its modern mechanized might tried to subjugate this small country and to extinguish the sacred flame of freedom which Greece kept burning for thousands of years.

Faithful to their traditions and their cherished principles, Greeks of today faced again as a single man the invader in the most incredible, most unequal but also the most unyielding struggle the world has ever witnessed.

And this small country showed to the world that it knew how to die in defense of the ideals which were entrusted to it by centuries of history and glory.

The world saw new Marathons with other names: Argyrocastro, Corytsa, Klisoura, Tepeleni—unknown spots which will find a place in history.

Greece's sacrifice was not in vain. It contributed greatly to the final victory of the United Nations.

The official records of the German Army General Staff introduced at the Nurenberg trial prove that Greek fight threw the German war machinery off balance and the subsequent delay, in the opinion of the German General Staff itself, was the primary cause of the failure of the German attack upon Russia.

I am one of those who lived in this small country during all those hard years of blood and tears; one of those who experienced the totalitarian tyranny and terror; one of those who were imprisoned by the invaders, and so I am in a position to know that Greek indomitable spirit in its full connotation of all that is beautiful, precious, and noble, which will never tarnish.

The United Nations have in Greece deeply rooted in the soul of every Greek the strongest bulwark against the dark forces of tyranny which could threaten to shake the very foundations of civilization. Her devotion to the cause of freedom is as ancient as the world and will last as long as Greece lasts.

Today Greece commemorates the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of its independence day amongst ruins, sickness, and suffering. She has the sad privilege of being the most devastated country in Europe. But she looks with confidence toward the future. She is deeply convinced that she will be not left alone by the great allies in her tremendous task of reconstruction and that the fulfillment of the indispensable conditions of her economic and political life, that is her very existence, will be assurred, as well as will be assured the prevalence of the principles for which Greece fought: Freedom and justice.

Address by Hon. James P. McGranery at Graduating Exercises of the FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the graduating exercises of the thirty-first session of the FBI National Academy, on March 29, 1946, the Hon. James P. McGranery, Assistant to the Attorney General, delivered an address very much in keeping with and very appropriate to the work of that National Academy. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to address the thirty-first graduating class of the FBI National Academy. You have spent 12 weeks in arduous but most profitable study in the very latest in law-enforcement techniques. For many of you it meant great personal sacrifice to come here to Washington. You have worked hard. The knowledge that you have gained will more than compensate you for the time and effort that you have expended.

Director Hoover and his magnificent organization have gained the respect, admiration, and confidence of the American people. Their courage, their devotion to duty, and their scientific methods of crime detection have made the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation the most highly respected law-enforcement officers in the world among law-abiding people and the most feared and dreaded ones among members of the underworld.

By attending the National Police Academy and by successfully completing its course of instructions, you now become an integral part of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I congratulate you.

Law enforcement—in fact, all America—owes a debt of gratitude to Director Hoover for his foresight and action in founding the academy in 1935. He saw the need for this course of training and set about to meet that need. The rich contribution of the academy to our American life is unparalleled in the entire law-enforcement field.

Your profession is no longer local in nature. It is truly international in scope. In the ranks of the graduates of this great institution are those from every State in the Union, from foreign nations, and from a number of Territorial possessions. I am told that in your own class there are representatives from 33 States, Puerto Rico, Canada, and the Philippines. You have been fortunate in your associations with the FBI. Today should mark only the beginning of your close comradeship with this fine organization and with fellow officers throughout the United States and the world.

You have finished your course of training. Today you go home. But to what? Optimism is a noble virtue, but it can be fatal if we allow it to blind us to the actual facts of crime. Today, as you return to your respective communities, you face the greatest fight in your collective careers. And it is a fight which you must win if we are to spare the America of tomorrow the shame and degradation of crime. A wave of criminality, following in the wake of war, is now sweeping the land.

Last year all States but two reported an increase in crime. Serious offenses rose 12.4 percent, the greatest increase during the 15 years Nation-wide crime figures have been tabulated by the FBI. Over 1,500,000 major crimes were committed, not to mention the additional millions of less serious offenses.

But this is not all. Perhaps the most startling thing about crime last year, aside from its sheer magnitude, was the part played in it by youth—by young people not yet old enough to vote. The predominant criminal, from the standpoint of frequency of arrest, was not the hardened convict of middle age who has been in and out of prison time and again. He was rather the youth of 17.

Are we, as the adults of today, to turn our backs upon youth—upon the generation which will run America tomorrow? Hitler and others of his ilk recognized the value of youth to their causes and molded it to fit their diabolical purposes. Surely, in a great democracy, we cannot afford to temporize—we cannot fail our children. It is a supreme challenge; it is one which will test the best that is in you.

Police and other law-enforcement officers have faced dire challenges before. We well remember the early 1930's, when criminals ran rampant throughout the land—when kidnaping was the scourge of every American home. Law enforcement was put to the test, but with the able leadership of Director Hoover it came through.

The tragic war through which we have just passed likewise tested your mettle. Faced with insufficient appropriations and manpower, many agencies had a difficult struggle. But again they came through and did a superb job of protecting the home front against insidious enemies who might have nullified right here in America the heroic deeds of our armed forces abroad.

Today's fight can be won if we are determined to win it and will pay the price. It will not be easy. Hard work, devotion to duty, and full cooperation with others—these and much more will be necessary.

You cannot do the job alone. You must solicit and win the aid of law-abiding citizens everywhere. Fighting crime is their responsibility as well as yours. See that they understand your problems; be alert to obtain their good will and full cooperation in fighting the menace which threatens our land.

Training is also a powerful weapon at your command. Here at the hands of the FBI you have received expert instruction in your chosen field. Let this be only the beginning. Be eager in your desire to share your knowledge with others.

And then I would mention the importance of keeping your own houses clean. Nothing weakens your attack—nothing cuts down your effectiveness—so much as crookedness and corruption within the ranks of your profession. Don't blacken the good name of law enforcement by acts which can bring nothing but dishonor and shame upon you or your department. You represent the majesty of the law in your community. Yours is a position of trust. Don't violate it.

As you go back to your homes in widely separated parts of the world, I wish you great success. The future is yours. I can think of nothing better than to commend to you the motto of the FBI which you have already come to know and respect, "Fidelity, bravery, integrity."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the Mobile (Ala.) Register a criticism of the St. Lawrence waterway. Therefore, I wrote a letter to that newspaper. It had criticized the Detroit News for advocating the St. Lawrence waterway. I sent the article from the Mobile Register to the Detroit News. In an editorial which I hold in my hand the Detroit News has replied to the article in the Mobile Register. I ask unanimous consent that the reply of the Detroit News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I may say, Mr. President, that I should like to have the Mobile Register answer the argument made by the Detroit News, if it is possible for it to do so.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE INFORMATION OF DOUBTERS

The letter box today includes a letter from Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, who quotes from an editorial in the Mobile Register, which in turn quotes and challenges an editorial from the News of last February 25.

This becomes involved. However, our present editorial is by way of being a reply both to Senator LANGER's kind letter and to the Register's not-so-kind comment on our previous editorial.

What the Register objects to is this statement: "There can be no real doubt that the (St. Lawrence seaway) project's contribution to over-all national welfare would add to the prosperity of the opposing interests at least as much as it could possibly take away."

The Register says this proposition is widely, vigorously, and flatly challenged. We won't quarrel with that.

The seaway has been urged, in vain, by seven successive Presidents of the United States, a record unequaled and unapproached in American legislative annals. For much more than a generation, it has been blocked in Congress by the coalition of opposing interests referred to, whose time, energy, and money, naturally have not been spent just for the fun of it.

Naturally these interests have challenged the quoted proposition, widely, vigorously, and flatly; also interminably and, at times and as to some of them, cynically and mendaciously.

We now turn to the Register's significant fact that the News forgot to introduce supporting evidence.

Here we are stumped, indeed, not by lack of evidence but by the volume of it.

This question of the seaway's potential contribution to national welfare and its effects on this or that regional or industrial interest has been the subject of more official studies and reports than even we can remember.

The statement the Register objects to is a fair summation of these studies and reports, on the basis of which the mentioned distinguished jury of seven successive Presidents formed its judgment. These Presidents—Democrats and Republicans, easterners, middle westerners, and far westerners—looked upon the seaway in the light of this evidence and found it good.

If the News has forgotten to introduce the evidence, it is perhaps also because the whole history of the United States might be adduced as pertinent.

The seaway is both a power and a navigation project.

As a power project, it will produce more hydroelectric energy than TVA, at a lower cost.

As a navigation project, it has no parallel; the flooding out of 50 miles of St. Lawrence rapids will add all of the Great Lakes to the seacoast of the United States, bringing low-cost ocean transportation to the heart of the continent.

Has the Register heard of any addition to the national power supply, of equal or even remotely comparable efficiency, that has not proved beneficial?

TVA has benefited even its most inveterate former foe, the Alabama Power Co., which now sells more power, more cheaply, and also more profitably than before.

Has the Register heard of any comparable improvement in the efficiency of national transportation that has failed to benefit the Nation in its every part? The Panama Canal? New York Harbor? The very railroads that serve New York and Mobile?

Would any of us be better off without them?

The whole history of the United States is proof that more and cheaper power begets uses for still more power; that better transportation begets more trade for all and the need for more transportation.

The seaway will make a greater and more prosperous United States, of which Mobile and the Register, in case they have forgotten, are still a part.

Address by Hon. James P. McGranery Before the Catholic Parent-Teachers Association of Denver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on March 21, 1946, there was delivered by the Honorable James P. McGranery, Assistant to the Attorney General, a very

masterful and scholarly address to the Catholic Parent-Teachers Association of Denver, Colo. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Excellency, the Most Reverend Archbishop; Your Excellency, the Governor of Colorado; Mr. Mayor; reverend fathers and members of the religious; ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to be the guest today of the Catholic citizens of Denver and it is a special honor to attend a luncheon of women dedicated to Catholic action. You who are here represent the leadership, not only of your community, your State, but also of your Nation. Your chairman, Mrs. Morrissey, is president of the Colorado Catholic Parent-Teachers Association; and she is also national chairman of the Parent-Teachers Association under the National Catholic Welfare Council.

No wonder then that, in the presence of so much informed intelligence and charm, I feel a little reluctant to offer my views concerning juvenile delinquency and its prevention.

It is hard not to heed the cry of the child wrongdoer—phrased, as it might well be—in the words of Henry Adams: "It was not my crime, or if a crime, it was not mine alone."

More familiar to all of us is the statement frequently quoted: "There are no delinquent children—only delinquent parents."

This indictment, of course, can well be expanded to include schools and a delinquent community. A combination of all three undoubtedly contributes to the unhappy state of the child who had strayed from his brothers. The cooperation of all three must be gained if delinquency is not to become more and more widespread during these postwar years of readjustment.

You and I know that the responsibility of parents is as tremendous as it is happy. The infant entrusted to our care may have capacity for greatness—good or evil. During the first formative years, before the school's share the hours of his day, many of his habits and attitudes will be formed. We who love our little boy blue have feared lest his dreams, too, be interrupted by an angel song.

But what of the little boys who have no toy soldier, no toy dog, no trundle bed? The atmosphere and the influence which surround them may bar them from the side of the angels.

The children who share three or four crowded rooms with two or even three other families grow up without the most elementary privacy. It is hard, indeed, for their parents to develop in these children a sense of modesty and morality. A child whose ragged clothes are his only possessions can come to recognize property rights; but it is not too easy to teach him this idea or other ordinary social concepts. The child who comes into a little world of filth and squalor, who lacks an adequate diet, adequate shelter, adequate clothing, is not necessarily maladjusted even when he seems a bit resentful.

Of course, children who are born into homes materially more secure may in their turn, because of either the overindulgence or the neglect of parents, become estranged from society

The principles of child psychology and mental hygiene which must guide parents have been clearly phrased by His Holiness in an address to newly married couples when he said:

"If the punishment you mete out, proceeds from the impulse of the moment, from blind or thoughtless feelings, you will generally show yourselves to be arbitrary, incoherent, and, perhaps, even unjust and inopportune. If at any moment you do not feel master of yourself, put the punishment off to a later or a better hour."

The Pope warned against doing anything that would lessen one's authority toward children, such as nagging. He urged that father and mother show no difference in their treatment of their children, as the latter would soon learn to play one parent against the other. He counseled in his wisdom that, although authority must be manifest from babyhood, it should ever be "authority born of love."

Much harm can be done to the child before it reaches school age, but even, nay, especially, when a child is old enough to attend school, he needs such joint action of home and school as your associations strive for.

The increase of delinquency during the war years cannot be blamed completely on the war. Rather, as one educator has well expressed it, "Wartime conditions * * * provide a fertile field in which latent social tendencies could manifest themselves." Modern warfare brought the battle front into the home, endangered its stability, made more tenuous the family ties. In many families one parent was in military service and the other in defense work. The "latchkey" children were free to find their own amusement on the street corners or with the "neighborhood gangs." During these years divorces multiplied; and in the months since they have again increased and multiplied. A child's personal interpretation of his total life experiences is necessarily biased by the lack of wholesome family life resulting from a broken home.

For the old essential elements of successful parenthood have not changed even though we find them described in technical terms by psychologists and social workers today. If the father and mother have good moral character, reasonable intelligence, emotional stability, and sincere love for their children, then they will be aware of their children's requirements. Insofar as they understand themselves, they will understand and guide their children.

It is true that: "All children wander with the truant, time," but it rests with the parents whether their children will wander closer to God or farther away from His welcoming arms.

If the spirit of sacrifice illumines the home, if a proper self-discipline is learned there, children go forth strong and direct to meet a changing world.

The influence of such parents cannot be limited within the walls of their home, however, if they are truly conscious of their duty to their children. For it is also their responsibility to cooperate with the school authorities and to make sure of the kind of discipline, the kind of educational stimulus, the kind of religious training offered there.

Their children's companions are their concern, too. And if, of necessity, these companions must be drawn from among those whose home environment is not as fortunate, then the right-thinking parents must join with educators, social workers, governmental agencies, and religious authorities to remedy community conditions.

By united influence a well-rounded community program in certain cities can be made universal in our communities. If the plan is coordinated, it will achieve, step by step, a permanent reduction of the number of our youth who will need curative care in the juvenile courts.

The religious forces of each community must be enterprising and active in leadership, seeking adult interest and translating it into concrete activity. The fourth R, religion, should be taught as a part of the school curriculum; if necessary, by the "released time plan."

School authorities should be given the opportunity to exercise discipline. The popular (and soon to be outmoded) philosophy, "Let the child express himself," should be changed to, "Let the child be taught to express himself correctly."

The homes of all should be protected through adequate economic measures; the payment of a living wage, adequate housing, low-cost health care, and hospitalization.

Recreational facilities with proper supervision on playgrounds and in neighborhood clubs should be established and supported in each district with programs planned to supplement home life and not to substitute for it.

Newspapers, magazines, movies, radio programs, and stage productions should eliminate stories of obscene conduct and those glamorizing the principals in divorce and criminal cases.

Rigidly and consistently, public places of entertainment and of refreshment should be supervised and penalized for offenses against minors.

Public and private agencies should provide any needed aid to old or new families without discrimination against those who happen to fall within the classification labeled "minority groups."

If this type of program had been in effect during the decades just past, the arithmetic of juvenile delinquency today might not be as tragic as it is. For today 21 percent of all arrests are of persons under 21.

"Twenty-one percent of all arrests are of persons under 21. More persons aged 17 are arrested than in any other age group. Those under 21 years of age represent 15 percent of all murderers, 36 percent of all robbers, 51 percent of all burglars, 34 percent of all thieves, 26 percent of all arsonists, 62 percent of all car thieves, and 30 percent of all rapists.

"The whole problem becomes more serious when we observe the shocking spectacle of the rise in youth offenders during the war years. They are the ones who are now becoming the postgraduates of crime and are committing the more despicable offenses. The arrests of girls under 18 years of age have increased 198 percent since the last peacetime year of 1939, while arrests of boys under 18 years of age have increased 48 percent for homicide, 70 percent for rape, 39 percent for robbery, 72 percent for assault, 55 percent for auto thefts, and 101 percent for drunkenness and driving while intoxicated."

The rising tide of juvenile delinquency has caused the Department of Justice to take vital and effective preventive measures on a national scale. The Attorney General recently appointed an advisory panel on juvenile delinquency problems. The membership of this panel includes outstanding educators, churchmen, and other citizens vitally interested in the youth of the Nation. You will be interested to know that Monsignor Flanagan, of the famed Boys Town, is one of the most active members of the panel. At a recent meeting this group, after emphasizing the vital need for enlightened cooperation of public and private agencies, National, State, and local, set up a specific agenda for consideration of larger and more representative conference planned within the near future.

Most of you are familiar with the 11 points of this agenda:

"1. The establishment in the Federal Government of an interdepartmental committee to make possible the current interchange of information and material relating to the various Federal programs and to improve and implement the many relationships which the Federal Government, through its agencies, has with the States and localities and private groups working in the field of juvenile-delinquency problems.

"2. Make recommendations with reference to legislation dealing with or relating to juvenile-delinquency problems.

"3. Recommend the organization or continuation in the community of councils composed of governmental and private agencies to encourage cooperation in the field of juvenile-delinquency problems.

"4. The development of specific recommendations respecting standards for the creation and operation of correctional institutions

and establishment of minimum qualifications for probation and parole officers and the expansion of probation and parole.

"5. The improvement of Federal, State, county, and local detention facilities for children.

"6. Creation in county and municipal police departments of special bureaus for the handling of juvenile delinquency problems and recommendations relating to the improvement of police facilities and techniques, and the training of personnel.

"7. Recommendations relating to the establishment of community recreation facilities.

"8. Recommendations relating to facilities, such as schools, playgrounds, housing projects, etc., in connection with Federal, State, and local building programs.

"9. Specific recommendations for participation by the juveniles themselves in all appropriate programs developed for their benefit, in order to ascertain, from the children themselves, their actual needs and to instill in them a sense of responsibility for the solution of their own problems.

"10. Development and training of volunteer leadership.

"11. Emphasis on parents' responsibility in relation to juvenile-delinquency problems."

A study of these 11 points shows the recognition by the panel of the necessity for reemphasis of moral and spiritual values. In the youth of our country lies the hope of its future and the guidance of our youth today, as always, must be the church, the school, and the home.

A child coming into this world and before it is marred by material conditions of the world as we have made it has a yearning for happiness here and for happiness ever after in the arms of its eternal Father. We can determine whether this natural longing of a child will continue in its natural harmony instead of being translated into mere restlessness of spirit charactertistic of the delinquent child.

For, as I have stated before, there are no delinquent children. We alone are delinquent. Children today are not unlike the children of 1900 years ago.

The plea so beautifully phrased by Mary Dixon Thayer is the prayer of any child. We can make it the prayer of every child.

"Dear God, I wish I could have been
Among those girls and boys
You called to come and talk with you
And who left all their toys,
And ran and climbed up on your knee
And held your hand, and sat
Around you, learning lovely things—
I wish I had done that!
But God! I know that even now
I can get close to you.
I know you still love children—Yes
Indeed; I know you do.
And so I often slip away
Into the church and kneel
Down at the altar where you are,
And tell you all I feel.
I cannot see your face, and yet
I know that you are there.
I know I'm just as close to you
As all those children were!"

Must Restrict Future Flight Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago this House almost unanimously voted to substantially increase the pay of enlisted men now serving or who shall hereafter serve in the armed forces.

This was done, I am sure, on the theory that the increase, ranging from 50 percent raise in pay of buck privates to 30 percent increase for sergeants, will be a mighty factor not only in raising the morale of the Army but in the determination of Members of this body that the Army and Navy must make every reasonable effort to raise a peacetime army without having to resort to a peacetime draft. I am heartily in accord with that proposal, as I stated at the time the bill was pending.

At that time I also discussed some of the inequalities between Army officers and the enlisted men. Now I desire to discuss one matter in particular that ought to receive the immediate and careful attention of this Congress. I refer to the 50-percent additional flying pay given officers of the armed forces during the war and just previous thereto. This Congress, in order to encourage aviation, allowed the 50-percent increased flying pay. It was justified then. All honor to the gallant aviators who made such effective contribution to the war. But with an overabundance of well-trained aviators, many of whom are anxious to remain in the Army and who are being told there is no place to be found for them, it is a gross extravagance, indefensible, and utterly absurd to continue the 50 percent flying pay now.

Moreover, it is known that too many Army officers are abusing this extra flight-pay privilege. I have in mind, for example, several Army officers, some of whom are now stationed here and officing in the Pentagon Building, who make a practice of going to Florida, or elsewhere, fishing almost every week end. By so doing they get in their minimum number of flying hours. It is reported to me, upon what I feel is excellent authority, that some high-ranking officers actually draw flying pay for sleeping on the plane while a young lieutenant sits at the controls.

With the enormous debt of $270,000,000,000 facing us, for which generations yet unborn must pay, this flying-pay matter has reached a point where, in some instances, it could be classified as a racket. We must not only stop such abuses, but we must stop the extra flight pay except possibly to officers who are assigned to regular or hazardous flying. In so doing we can make a sizable contribution to the long over-due pay raise to the enlisted men of the armed forces.

Tribute to Texas Servicemen by Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] before the Texas A. & M. Club in Washington, on San Jacinto Day, April 21.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Texas A. & M. men, and distinguished guests, on this Easter Sunday afternoon, we are gathered in this historic memorial service to honor Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College men who made the supreme sacrifice and poured out their lifeblood in World Wars I and II. We pay our tribute of admiration and affection for their gallantry and heroism.

No poor words of mine can carry the sweep and tenderness of the majesty of their magnificent service to their beloved country and to their fellow men. Their names will be enrolled in the battle abbey of the Republic. Their glorious achievements will enrich the traditions of the State of Texas and of the United States of America.

This day is the one hundred and tenth anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto, which gave to Texas her independence as a nation and to her citizens the liberty and the right to determine their institutions for which they battled and struggled. At the time of the battle of San Jacinto, there were only about 30,000 inhabitants residing within the territory of Texas. The victory achieved on the banks of the San Jacinto was the climax to the Texas revolution which had its first armed conflict at Gonzales, on October 2, 1835. On December 5, 1835, brave Ben Milam had led his courageous little band into San Antonio and liberated the people of that city. Fannin and his unfortunate forces had faced the tragedy and heroic martyrdom at Goliad. On March 5, 1836, the embattled occupants of the Alamo under the leadership of Travis and Bonham and Davey Crockett poured out their blood as a sacred liberation upon the altar of freedom and independence.

The Texan army under the leadership of Gen. Sam Houston traveled eastward, recruiting forces as it went. Caravans of women and children and old men followed the army in search of safety from the horrors of invasion. Finally the little army reached Harrisburg. Passing still farther to the eastward, it camped upon the banks of the San Jacinto. Facing it was a hostile army of 1,350 men, well armed and equipped. The Texans numbered only 800.

Just at the hour that I am now speaking, General Houston led his fighting forces in determined attack. The enemy rallied and resisted with all the power at its command. With yells of "Remember Goliad" and "Remember the Alamo," the Texans swept on to victory and superb triumph. Within 20 minutes the battle had come to an end. The forces of the enemy were scattered and in flight. The day following the battle, the general in chief of the enemy was captured in hiding and made a prisoner of war. The independence of Texas was acknowledged and declared. A new nation was born. For 9 years, Texas existed as a republic until it voluntarily entered the Union as a new State.

These heroic achievements, entwined within the finest traditions of Texas, are part of the background of the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College. The college was opened 70 years ago in October 1876 for the training of young men in agriculture and in engineering and in military science. Before the last war the college had an enrolled student body of 6,500, with a plant valued at $18,000,000, located upon a campus of 4,000 acres. It has had a most distinguished career in the life of Texas and the Nation.

In World Wars I and II, slightly less than 800 Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College men made the supreme sacrifice—52 in

World War I, and in World War II over 700 brave men gave their lives.

In World War II, the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College gave more officers to the Army of the United States than any other military college, exceeding in numbers West Point.

The brilliant achievements of its sons have enriched and glorified the thrilling and compelling history of the State of Texas and of the Republic. They have magnificently maintained the martial chapters of Texas history. Today we salute them. Today we lay upon their last resting places tokens of our affection, and admiration, and reverence. How inadequate are words to express the sentiments which stir our hearts or the thoughts that throb in our minds.

It has been well said that San Jacinto was one of the decisive battles of the world. Measured by its consequences, that is true. The Battle of Chalons halted the blighting march of Attila and decreed that the Huns from the deserts of Asia should not dominate Europe. At Tours Charles Martel denied mastery of western Europe to the scimitar and the Koran. In the English Channel, British navies broke and scattered Philip's Spanish Armada and turned the tide of commerce and conquest. Wolfe, on the heights of Quebec, vanquished Montcalm and ended French power in the north. Washington's ragged battalions at Yorktown drove royal armies from our shores and established the independence of the American colonies. At Waterloo Wellington sent down in the gloom of defeat the inordinate ambition of Napoleon and freed Europe from the rule of an imperial master. On the Battle of San Jacinto hinged mighty issues.

Six hundred years of struggle for liberty and self-government—600 years that flowed in Anglo-Saxon veins—were challenged on the plain of San Jacinto by another civilization, by another conception of government. Above the smoke and the tumult of battle there grappled two mighty spirits—one that reached back to Runnymede, the other coming down from the crown of Charles V.

The battle of San Jacinto not alone gave to Texas her independence. It assured the marvelous development that has made a mighty, rich, and progressive Commonwealth of nearly 6,000,000 souls. It gave to the Anglo-Saxon the mighty territory of the Southwest; brought the gold fields and the orange groves of California within the boundaries of the Union; it secured to millions whose footsteps are not yet heard upon a mighty domain the blessings of American institutions; it turned the course of Anglo-Saxon civilization into the Southwest; and, stretching it to the distant sea, at once enriched the United States with its marvelous resources and made secure the national safety.

How great is the poverty of phrase and the feebleness of tongue to bring to you a message of the majesty of San Jacinto. Where is bronze stout enough; where is granite firm enough; where is marble white enough in chiseled figure or molded form to portray its grandeur? Where can literature find a pen powerful enough; where can oratory find a tongue eloquent enough; where can the poet find lines lofty enough; where can history find a page bright enough to tell of the titanic triumph of Houston and his hardy and gallant army on the banks of the San Jacinto and of the lofty souls from Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College that with their swords wrought new and brilliant chapters in the military annals of the Republic and sealed them with the red tide of their life's blood.

The Zionist Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Zionist movement delivered by me on April 14, 1946, before the Toledo, Ohio, Zionist district, at the Collingwood Avenue Temple, in Toledo, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to take the opportunity at the outset to pay my personal respects to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, Rabbi Leon C. Feuer, Mr. Melbourne Harris, Mr. Leo R. Sack, and others of your organization who have frequently cooperated with me on legislative problems. I am happy to be able to attend your meeting tonight and to participate in the discussions of Zionism and the Palestine situation.

The aims and philosophy of Zionism are not new to me. I learned them from the greatest of all American Zionists—a beloved friend of the La Follette family—Mr. Justice Brandeis. It is my opinion that Palestine would now be populated as an established Jewish nation if others had heeded his sound advice that rapid steps be taken under the Balfour Declaration to colonize and develop Palestine. To this day, Justice Brandeis remains a powerful symbol of the kind of model society which could be established in Palestine if the international political barriers were removed.

In my many years in the United States Senate, I have become accustomed to the fact that some issues require a long, hard fight before an objective is won. I know that it sometimes takes unlimited patience and perseverance to obtain passage of a meritorious bill. Frequently, an issue may bound and rebound within the legislative walls for many years before it is decisively settled. Insofar as the Congress is concerned, this is partially due to the obsolete legislative methods. More often, it is due to a close balance of power between proponents and opponents of a measure. Or, it may be simply a situation wherein the facts or support for a proposition have not been adequately marshaled.

However, an ordinary explanation of delay does not suffice for the international issues involved in the Zionist movement. The movement has had able leadership. The leaders have put a strong case before the public. They have effectively mobilized support from political leaders representing diverse viewpoints on other subjects. They have obtained commitments from parties and government administrators. Anyone who conscientiously studies the facts surrounding this problem comes to the inevitable conclusion that the Jewish people have been truly long-suffering in this matter. Again and again they have been subjected to violent miscarriages of justice. National and international leaders familiar with the facts have continually expressed their sympathy. But oppressed people need more than sympathy. To date they have received neither justice nor satisfaction.

Why? What is the explanation? Obviously, the movement cuts across many political and economic problems, both national and international. Those who oppose it have exploited many cross-currents. A new rationalization is pulled out of the bag for every new occasion. Too often the arguments are tainted with the politics of oil and empire.

We as Americans must guard against complacency concerning the predicament of the refugee Jews in Europe. We should not give lip service to the problem and then forget about it. As I see it, the real issue at stake in this Palestine situation is much more than that of obtaining justice for an oppressed people—important as that is. The more important issue involves the international morality among nations and the integrity and courage of national leaders in administering avowed policies.

When Theodore Herzl in 1896 wrote The Jewish State and laid the real foundations for the Zionism movement, he was motivated by two primary factors. First, he had ambitions that his people might join to form a political entity in which homogeneous religious and cultural backgrounds could be combined with new economic opportunities. Second, he wanted to provide a haven for Jewish refugees who were being unjustly persecuted. Herzl's essay was written against the backdrop of the Dreyfus affair and the anti-Semitic uprisings in eastern European countries in the previous decades.

There were some dissenters then among Jewish groups even as there are some dissenters now who do not subscribe to his proposition for a Jewish national state. But it seems to me that any argument based on the lack of complete unanimity of the Jewish peoples in their desire to establish a national home completely misses the two main points involved in this question. First, that many homeless, persecuted Jewish people do want to establish a home in Palestine, and, second, that by every criterion of justice and reasonableness, those who want to find a home in Palestine are morally and legally entitled to go there.

This is not a proposition of finding a solution to a problem. The solution was found and agreed to many years ago in the adoption of a basic policy to permit Jewish migration to Palestine with the view toward ultimately establishing a Jewish national home. It is now a proposition of abiding by a formal promise and policy. It requires the frank and open administration of that avowed policy—not duplicity, subterfuge, and expediency.

Even if there were a situation which required a basic change of policy—and no one has brought forth good reasons for doing so—such change should be made only in a manner consistent with the sanctity of international agreements among responsible nations. Political wisdom, justice, humanity, and plain respect for the letter of the law—all point to a course of action that was honorably promulgated but then drastically altered by unilateral action of the British Government. Our Government and others who clearly have rights in the matter have protested only half-heartedly and ineffectively.

Let me review briefly some of the facts from history. A quarter of a century ago, this question came before the councils of the leading statesmen of the world. They, with the support of world opinion, weighted the Jewish claim to Palestine, considered all possible objections to the matter, and passed favorable judgment upon it. They decided, at a time when the principle of national freedom and self-determination was affirmed as a right of all small and persecuted peoples, that the Jewish people too were entitled to certain rights in their ancestral homeland.

As a result of extensive negotiations in 1917, the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour, wrote as follows to Lord Rothschild:

"DEAR LORD ROTHSCHILD: I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of

His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet:

"'His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which shall prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country.'

"I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation."

Other governments, including ours, joined in this Balfour Declaration. France concurred formally in February 1918; Italy in May 1918. President Wilson publicly expressed satisfaction, and the Congress several years later, in 1922, passed unanimously the Lodge resolution which resolved: "The United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

After the war, and after 3 years of negotiations between 1920 and 1923, Great Britain was given the mandate over Palestine, including Trans-Jordan. The terms of the mandate were signed by 52 nations of the world. The United States Government did not become a participant in the League of Nations, but it did reserve for itself the right to approve the mandate over Palestine. Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, then Secretary of State, negotiated a convention with the British on the mandatory policy in Palestine. The convention was approved by the Senate of the United States on February 20, 1925. It was ratified by Great Britain on March 18, 1925, and proclaimed to be law on December 5, 1925.

This treaty between the United States and Great Britain is the legal basis upon which the United States Government is both entitled and obligated to concern itself with Palestinian affairs. Several facts should be emphasized in connection with this treaty.

In the first place, the Balfour Declaration was specifically reaffirmed in the preamble. In the second place, the United States was specifically given the rights and benefits involved in the mandate, notwithstanding the fact that the United States was not a member of the League of Nations. In the third place, by the terms of the mandate incorporated in the convention, the administration in Palestine was specifically obligated to "facilitate Jewish immigration" and in cooperation with the Zionist organizations "to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land." Under article 5 of the mandate, Great Britain was held responsible "for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased, or in any other way placed under the control of the government of any foreign power." Finally, under article 7 of the convention, no modification of the mandate was permissible without the formal consent of the United States.

In other words, Great Britain is the executor of an international agreement, Great Britain does not own Palestine. Palestine is not a colonial dependency. Great Britain is not a free agent to do as she pleases. Under the terms of the mandate and her treaty with the United States, she has certain obligations as well as privileges in Palestine. Great Britain was charged with a great responsibility under the mandate. She was entrusted with a policy to develop Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews.

In May 1939 the British Government issued the white paper on Palestine which abruptly changed the policy. It permitted only a very restricted Jewish immigration at a time when the wave of anti-Semitism in Europe made it more desirable than ever that access be had to the promised homeland. Three questions immediately come to mind. Was there justification for a change in policy? Did the United States give consent? If not, what did our Government do?

A consideration of the first question—whether or not there is a justification for the reversal of policy—provokes several lines of thought. Has the lot of the Jews been so improved that their need for a national homeland has disappeared? Was an injustice imposed on the Arabs? Have they been deprived of their chance for national independence in the countries which were assigned to them after the First World War? Have they only Palestine to look to as a national center? Has the physical power of the Arab nationalists become so great that Jewish rights must be sacrificed to maintain peace? Did the Zionist project prove to be impracticable on economic grounds? Did the country prove to be too small to absorb a large Jewish population? Did the coming of the Jews to Palestine interfere with the welfare of the Arabs living there? Did the Jews expel the Arabs from the country or deny them equal rights? Or did the Jews disregard the position of the various religions which are attached to the holy land?

The answer to each of these is an emphatic "no."

The fate of the Jews in recent years has become worse than it was before. Today we know the shocking facts about Oswiecim, Birkenau, Lublin-Maidenek, Dachau, and the other infamous institutions of mass murder. We know in sorrow and shame of the more than 6,000,000 Jewish civilians who were brutally murdered because anti-Semitism rose in Germany, and because these people were not allowed to go to the place which was officially recognized as their national homeland. If the Jews needed a homeland in 1917, how infinitely more do they need it now.

Nor did the powers fail to keep their bargain with the Arabs. The Arabs today have more freedom and independence than they were given after the First World War. In contrast, the Jews are in a much worse position.

Economically, and as a venture in colonization, the success of Zionism was remarkable. In the face of a hostile regime, which did everything in its power to hinder rather than help, the Jewish population in Palestine grew from approximately 50,000 to 600,000. Taking over some of the most desolate parts of the country, and paying exorbitant prices for much of the land they acquired, the Jewish immigrants developed an up-to-date agriculture, unrivaled anywhere in the east. Citrus fruits, wheat, barley, melons, grapes, figs, and tomatoes are grown extensively with scientific reclamation of the land. Foreign Jewish capital was brought in to establish oil tanks and refineries, public utilities, many types of manufacturing enterprises, and other components of a thriving industrial economy. Educational and public-health facilities were expanded; highways were constructed; a university was founded; common schools were established. Jewish enterprise has raised the standards of living for the Arab communities far beyond what it was in 1917, and far beyond the standards prevailing in neighboring Arab countries.

So obvious was the benefit to the Arabs of participating in the improvements wrought by the Jews that hundreds of thousands of Arabs from neighboring countries migrated to Palestine to share these benefits. It is a fact, for example, that during the period 1922–43 when the Jewish population increased 420,000, the population of Moslems and Christians increased by more than 500,000.

These statistics immediately raise the question: "Has Palestine reached a saturation point for new population?" This is one of the excuses given in the British white paper. Experts who have studied this particular phase of the Palestine situation completely blast the British allegations. Dr. Lowdermilk of the United States Department of Agriculture, who made a thorough study of the absorption capacity of Palestine, writes in his book: "There is ample proof that full utilization for reclamation and power will in time make possible the absorption of at least 4,000,000 Jewish refugees from Europe in addition to the 1,800,000 Arabs and Jews already in Palestine and Transjordania."

Prior to this discussion of the justification—or lack of justification—for the British policy enunciated in the 1939 white paper, I posed the two questions: Did the United States give consent? If not, what has been the policy of our Government?

Obviously, the United States Government did not give formal consent. So far as I know, request for our assent under article 7 of the convention between the United States and Great Britain was never formally made. When pressed for a statement on the matter in 1944, President Roosevelt authorized the cochairmen of the American Zionist Emergency Council, Drs. Silver and Wise, to say that "the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939. * * *" In view of the fact that the document had been unanimously rejected by the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, it is amazing that it should take our Government almost 5 years to recognize that the white paper violated our treaty with Great Britain. Furthermore, this was a statement for home consumption; it was not a formal representation to Great Britain.

British rule in Palestine is no longer based on law. It is a rule of force only, a rule of bayonets. At present, the legal status of a Jew in Palestine—in the country which is presumed to be his home—is inferior to his legal status in most other countries of the world. A Jew is not permitted to live or to pursue an occupation—any occupation—or to own a home, or cultivate a piece of land in over 95 percent of the area of Palestine. He is permitted to exercise ordinary civil rights in a zone no greater than about 1,000 square miles. This is due in part to the British political maneuvering in Trans-Jordan. I shall have more to say about the Trans-Jordan issue before concluding my remarks. Before doing so, I want to discuss briefly several other facts with reference to the reactions of our Government to the infamous British white paper of 1939.

In 1943, Senators WAGNER and TAFT introduced a Senate resolution to reaffirm the position of the United States on the Palestine situation. It had the support of many members of the Foreign Relations Committee, to which it was referred. When the committee was about to take action, letters were received from the Secretary of War and Chief of Staff objecting on military grounds to the passage of the resolution. The committee was requested not even to hold hearings on the ground that it might endanger our military. No action was taken because the majority of the committee decided it could not in time of war ignore the request of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff.

In June and July of the following year—1944—both the Republican and Democratic national platforms gave unequivocal support to the historic position of this country. Governor Dewey and President Roosevelt endorsed their respective planks during the campaign in October. President Roosevelt wrote Senator WAGNER, saying, "If reelected, I shall help to bring about (the) realization * * * of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth." The following March, President Roosevelt said, "I made my position on Zionism clear in October. That position I have not changed and I shall

continue to seek to bring about its earliest realization."

It is difficult to reconcile these statements with the attitude of the administration when action was again sought on the Senate resolution in December 1944, immediately after the elections. The Secretary of State opposed the resolution before the committee, and it was again shelved, despite much support in the committee.

It was in the fall of 1944, too, that President Roosevelt went to Yalta and had his dramatic meeting with ibn-Saud. Not until many months thereafter were the American public permitted to see the subsequent exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and King ibn-Saud—notwithstanding the direct bearing on the avowed policy of this country. As you know, the Congress finally passed the Palestine resolution last December over the objections of the Department of State.

Insofar as I am concerned, I can read no other conclusion into these facts but this: While the Jewish leaders and the American public are given the impression that the administration stands foursquare on the policy toward Palestine, the administration has casually given the impression to Britain and other foreign powers that we are not much concerned. British imperialists and Arab nationalists have taken advantage of this situation.

I sincerely hope that it is nothing more than a coincidence that the Truman administration went on record just prior to the last New York City elections as favoring the immediate admission of 100,000 refugees from Europe into Palestine—and then capitulated shortly thereafter to the British proposal that this be postponed pending yet another committee of inquiry. Newspapers in London made the shocking claim that American acquiescence was purposely delayed until after the New York elections. I sincerely hope that the committee maneuvers do not foreshadow a report which will ruthlessly ignore and banish Jewish rights in Palestine.

Before concluding, it is appropriate to give some attention to several current issues. First, how does the Trans-Jordan issue fit into this general background?

Several months ago, on January 17, the British Foreign Secretary announced that it was the intention of the British Government to bring about the permanent separation of Trans-Jordan from Palestine and its recognition as an independent state. Britain's proposed unilateral action is particularly confusing because it came at a time when Britain has argued that other issues concerning Palestine should be held in abeyance while the joint commission is examining the Palestine problem.

Britain's rights in this matter have been clouded somewhat by those who assert that Trans-Jordan was independent prior to the granting of the mandate. Actually, the facts are that for administrative purposes the High Commissioner for Palestine did grant certain autonomy on September 1, 1922; but, as previously pointed out, Trans-Jordan was definitely included within the mandate by article 25 and so treated by the League of Nations. As a party to the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, the United States has every reason and every basis to protest this intention. It could do so as a partner in the joint Palestine inquiry which is now proceeding. But it has not done so, and by its inaction our Government has become a party to a breach of trust.

As an indication of how far the policy has gradually been shifted against the Jews, consider these facts: The original program contemplated the entire area as a Jewish national home. Then a Royal Commission in 1937 recommended a division of territory with the Arabs, with independence for each. Finally, we come to a policy where division and independence is offered the Arabs, and nothing for the Jews. Actually, as far as the Jews are concerned, this latest proposal would require the Jews to give up three-quarters of the entire territory included in the mandate, and would give them no special benefits whatsoever in the remaining area.

Another situation should be cited: Soon after the United Nations Charter went into effect, with its provisions against economic aggression, the Arab states, recently admitted to the United Nations, proclaimed an economic boycott of the Jewish population of Palestine. As far as I know, nothing has been done by this country to raise the question of inadmissibility of such a boycott.

Secretary of State Byrnes in a speech last February explained that this Government is opposed to the "unilateral gnawing away of the status quo." He said: "As a great power and a permanent member of the Security Council, we have a responsibility to use our influence to see that other powers live up to their covenant, and that responsibility we intend to use."

I respectfully submit that so far as Palestine is concerned, those splendid, lofty purposes have not been upheld by our Government. And, I am sorry to say, it appears that our Government is giving indirect support to violations of international law.

The will of the people and public opinion on this question are clear. As a matter of public record, both parties are united and the Congress is agreed. The program is there. In the words of the recent Senate resolution, which was also approved by the House, it is the duty of our Government "to use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to a maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race and creed, shall have equal rights."

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, sometime ago the President of the United States recommended a so-called Presidential succession bill, and along that line bills were introduced in the House and in the Senate. I introduced one in the Senate and one was introduced in the House, which passed the House and is now before the Senate committee. In turn the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections reported and there was passed by the Senate a resolution which provided for investigation of the whole subject of Presidential succession. I think this is a very important subject, because in the case of a tragedy happening to the President of the United States or to the Vice President in the event he had become President, there should be no question as to who would succeed to the office and there should be no opportunity for technical or legal considerations or difficulties.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of April 18, 1946, by Arthur Krock, entitled "No Action Yet on Presidential Succession."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—NO ACTION YET ON PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 17.—The end of the President's first year in the White House evoked many lists of his legislative recommendations on which Congress has not acted. But little attention was paid to one item of potential importance as great as that of any other in the catalog. This concerns the matter of Presidential succession.

As is always the fact when a Vice President succeeds by death, there is no official whom the people specifically placed first in the line of next succession by their vote at a national poll. There is a statute, dating from 1886, which provides that, beginning with the Secretary of State, certain heads of the executive departments shall in turn act as President in the event of a White House vacancy that occurs when there is no Vice President. But numerous objections have been lodged against this law.

President Truman stressed one when he asked Congress to pass a new statute. He pointed out that generally the effect of the current law would be to permit a President to name his own successors, since the Cabinet officers who are listed as the eligibles derive their commissions from the incumbent of the White House. But it abounds with other flaws and fails to provide for a number of very possible contingencies which would leave the Nation without a head.

Mr. Truman thought the Speaker of the House of Representatives most nearly met his specifications. So the House rapidly passed a bill which provides that, if or when the Presidency is vacant (because of death, resignation, removal, inability to serve or failure to qualify), and there is no Vice President, the Speaker shall resign as Speaker and as a Member of Congress and serve until the President's disability is removed or a new President is elected. There are other provisions—that the President pro tempore of the Senate shall act as President if there is no Speaker, or he fails to qualify; and that, if there is no such Senate officer, the 10 Cabinet members headed by the Secretary of State shall successively be next in line.

AN IMPERFECT BILL

The Senate put the House bill in a committee pigeonhole, and there it lies. Its frosty reception can be traced to several causes. When the original Succession Act was passed in 1792 the President pro tempore of the Senate was made the heir apparent, with the Speaker only heir presumptive, and the Senate does not approve the reversal of this order. Also, Speakers do not bulk as large in American history as Secretaries of State. The present succession law makes that official the first eligible, and he—James F. Byrnes—chances to be a former Senator and a very popular one. So the Senate showed no interest in the Truman formula which the House legislated, and, after Mr. Byrnes succeeded E. R. Stettinius, Jr., in any formula at all.

The Senate did, however, decide that the matter was important enough to warrant full study on which sound legislation could be based. Therefore the Senate passed a concurrent resolution for the study of this and other constitutional problems created by the failure of current and proposed laws to pro-

vide for many serious possibilities. Then it was the House's turn to use a pigeonhole. The Senate resolution has not been called up in the other branch; there is no prospect of a special rule for that purpose; and some members of the House Rules Committee said today they did not even know the measure had entered their jurisdiction.

Except for a few students of American history in and cutside Congress, apathy on the subject is total. The President has done nothing more about it, despite an occasioned prod from Judge Rosenman. Charles Warren carefully expounded the whole question and its historical background for the benefit of interested committees at the Capitol. But the results thus far have been two documents gathering dust in the Capitol.

PROFESSOR MARTIN'S SURVEY

Nevertheless, it remains true that a series of disasters such as occurred when President Tyler took his Cabinet on a Potomac River cruise in 1844 could leave the White House vacant, or establish as President until 1949 a fairly obscure Cabinet Minister whom the voters of his own State would not elect to high office. A cannon exploded during the cruise, killing the Secretaries of State and War and narrowly missing the President, who had no Vice President, having succeeded on the death of President Harrison.

This is one of the arguments for orderly legislation made in the April issue of The Social Studies, a magazine for teachers, by Prof. Asa E. Martin, of Pennsylvania State College. If all Members of Congress, and the President also, would read this article, action might be stimulated, though Mr. Warren's failure to do that by his impressive review of history makes this an improbable assumption.

Professor Martin writes that an outstanding national need is to change the conception of the Vice Presidency by the people. This, he believes, would impel the nomination of men of Presidential stature for this office, which is not the usual circumstance, and produce pressure for a sound and modern succession law. "Whereas in 1796 and 1800 a Vice President in the preceding Administration (John Adams and Jefferson) had been elected to the Presidency," he notes, "in the ensuing 144 years only one * * * was ever elected (Van Buren). There is little to justify the continuance of the office of Vice President as it is constituted today."

Pauperizing the Disabled War Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week I introduced on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself, Senate bill 2078, a companion bill to House bill 4464, designed to restore the full rates of pensions to hospitalized veterans without dependents. In this connection, there has just been carried in the Hearst newspapers an editorial on the subject of the plight of these disabled veterans. The Hearst newspapers have been carrying an illuminating series of articles on this subject. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is my earnest hope that Senate bill 2078 will receive early and favorable attention in the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUPERIZING THE DISABLED VETERAN

The American people have been genuinely shocked by the disclosure in the Hearst newspapers that thousands of sick or disabled war veterans requiring hospital care must be paupers in order to obtain it.

It is an amazing but inescapable fact that the Government of the United States, which has built up a public debt of $300,000,000,000 through lavish expenditure for the benefit of foreign nations and in behalf of its own partisan political interests, limits the hospitalized war veteran in certain circumstances to an income of 26 cents a day.

That is the total compensation the Government will pay a veteran during all the weeks or months or years he is a patient in a Government hospital if he has no dependents and if his sickness or disability is not service connected.

If the hospitalized veteran without dependents suffers from sickness or disabilities actually incurred in the service of his country, including combat, the most his pinch-penny Government will pay him from the time he enters the hospital until he leaves it—no matter how many weeks or months or years are thus spanned—is 68 cents a day.

It is not enough for the American people to be shocked by such a disclosure.

They should be thoroughly shamed by it.

The law which sets up this rule of pauperism for the hospitalization of war veterans is not a new law, but came into being in 1933 as one of the so-called economy acts of the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That and the succeeding New Deal administrations never pretended interest in economy—with the solitary exception of this discriminatory rule against veterans.

Before the recent war the New Deal squandered many billions of dollars to perpetuate itself in power.

During the war it poured out many more billions of dollars in lend-lease to nations all over the world, most of them utterly and admittedly unable to repay and none of them willing to repay or expected to do so.

Only in the care of our own American war veterans, particularly the sick and disabled, has the New Deal shown any disposition to tighten up the purse strings of public expenditure.

It has always paid its political debts out of the public purse.

Even prisoners of war taken by American forces in the course of the war have fared better and been paid more in compensation than the American fighting man who came out of the conflict in shattered health.

"No graver injustice has been done to the men with war-shattered bodies than that of pauperizing them while being treated for their wounds and disabilities," charges National Commander Dow V. Walker, of the Disabled American Veterans' organization.

"These men still suffer from the agonies of war," says Col. John Thomas Taylor, national legislative director of the American Legion, "and to hold back from them, during the long months or years they must spend in hospitals, the compensation they earned defending their country, is both unjust and cruel."

"A Congress and administration which has been so liberal with additional compensation for some elements of industry and labor should give first thought to those men who shed their blood and gave their health for the Nation," declares Commander in Chief Joseph M. Stack, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It is time for the American people to be shocked by this incredible disclosure, and it is time for them to feel a sense of shame and to compel Congress to treat the American war veteran with justice.

The Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Famine Truman Helped Make," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Saturday, April 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAMINE TRUMAN HELPED MAKE

The food crisis which now confronts Chicago, the United States, and the world is not the result of recent developments and unforeseen causes. It is the consequence of programs and policies deliberately planned and executed. The responsibility for the suffering elsewhere and the deprivation of Americans of food essential for good health can be definitely placed.

So much of the productive capacity and transportation facilities were destroyed during the war that every encouragement to all-out food production was necessary if severe shortages were to be avoided. But that was not the attitude with which the Allied leaders approached the problem. President Truman discussed postwar plans with the heads of the Russian and British Governments in the Cecelienhof, near Potsdam, from July 17 to August 2 last year. At the conclusion of the Conference a statement was issued of what had been agreed. The stated objective was to reduce the German standard of living so that it would not exceed the average of that of European countries.

There was considerable doubt about what the policy meant. The standard of living in Germany before the war had been the highest in continental Europe. Was the objective to bring it down to the average level that existed in antebellum days, heavily weighted by population in the low-standard countries? Was the end in view to make life as hard in Germany as it was during early reconstruction years? Or did Truman, Stalin, and Attlee have in mind the conditions that might prevail at some date in the future? It wasn't clear. But what was clear was that governments meant to make life harsh for the ordinary man in the defeated nation. A 1,550-calorie basis, half of the American diet, came to be taken as the target.

The Potsdam policy cutting down the standard of living was "implemented," as the saying is, by the restrictions on German industries. To keep down the standard of living of the Ruhr miners it was necessary to keep wages low. There was no incentive to work longer than was necessary to earn enough to pay for the reduced ration. So coal production has been less than 25 percent of the potential of the mines not destroyed.

The shortage of coal interfered with the functioning of industries, including German processing plants. It prevented the operation of industries turning out equipment

and fertilizer badly needed for expanding food production in other European countries.

The harsh peace destroyed the incentive of German farmers to do their utmost. The Potsdam agreement, with its loose language interpreted as best it could be by the generals of the occupation armies, had the effect of reducing food production all over Europe, and will continue to do so unless it is modified.

Meanwhile, policies of the national administration have reduced the supply of food at home and are continuing to do so. In the face of the present desperate meat supply, when everything possible should be done to increase the number and size of meat animals, Government officials are at work on a new order aimed at reducing the fall pig crop by 5 percent. The Government can keep down the supply of pork and ham if it tries. It proved that by an order which cut the spring pig crop of 1944 to 52,000,000 from 74,000,000 the previous year.

The black market is not the only reason why there is virtually no beef to be had in big city butcher shops. The Government policy during the war was to reduce both the number of cattle and their weight when marketed. Just after Pear' Harbor Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard appealed to cattle raisers to "increase their marketings now as much as possible, particularly their marketings of aged cows and she stock." Killing off the females in the herds, he said, would have the desirable effect of cutting down the cattle population. Mr. Wickard retired from the Agriculture Department on May 23, 1945, but Mr. Truman gave him another well-paying job.

A second step reduced the supply of beef still more. The Government price differentials between partly developed, skinny cattle and finished beef were so narrow that it was unprofitable to operate feed lots. Animals which could have been fed to a weight of 1,200 pounds were marketed at 700 pounds, resulting in a loss of 500 pounds of meat per animal.

About a year ago the Truman administration announced a program to stimulate cattle feeding. But it pegged the price of corn at so low a price that the cattle feeders were unable to buy the grain they needed. Hence more cattle have been coming to market only partly fattened. Cattle feeders told a Senate committee Thursday that they are unable to make their normal large contribution to the beef supply under existing conditions and would be handicapped even more under the new OPA bill requested by President Truman.

Other administration measures have had similar effects upon other food items. There is an acute shortage of butter and other dairy products, although the number of dairy cows is at a record high. There is a shortage of wheat and rumors of bread rationing after two of the biggest wheat crops ever known.

The evidence is clear. The shortage of food in Europe has been greatly aggravated by Potsdam. The shortages of all kinds of food here are due to Government action. President Truman's theatrical gesture, asking Americans to go on a European diet, cannot hide the fact that he is largely responsible for the world famine.

Veterans Come First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the veterans should come first. I am talking today about the discharged veterans of World War II. I am talking for our armed forces everywhere I am talking to the wives and children, the fathers and mothers, and the brothers and sisters of the soldiers and veterans of America.

I am not talking to any foreign nation or any element with foreign ideologies. I am not talking to the international manufacturer or banker who would betray our Nation, chasing the almighty dollar in foreign lands. I am not interested in those that want our 18-year-old sons to give up their homes, to surrender their education and their ambitions in order to have them police the internationalists' ill-gotten goods throughout the world.

America, watch your step. There are some things going on in Washington that are not healthy for democracy. We are just beginning to realize that as a people we have been sleeping at the switch. We have allowed our form of government to slip away from us. We have substituted regimentation for democracy.

Our Nation today is rumbling along on a strange highway in an international vehicle. Our people are sitting carefree in the rumble seat—in a "what do I care" attitude. They are the easy victims of the hyphenated, hybrid Americans—an international bureaucracy—who think more of other nations than of their own.

Our Nation is in a transition. We are again creating wealth in place of destroying it. Our armed forces won the most destructive, the most inhuman, and brutal war the world ever witnessed. The war is over, but legally we are still in a state of war. The President has not yet declared that the war is over. Neither has Congress.

This make-believe war is a fraud upon our servicemen. The war has been over for 7 months. The men were drafted for the duration and 6 months. Except for the dishonesty of continuing this war on paper, every man inducted into the armed forces would have been discharged over a month ago. The Nation ought to be as honest with its defenders as it expects them to be with it.

Since the surrender of Germany there have been over 670,000 volunteer enlistments. That is more than sufficient for military and occupational purposes. In addition, there are at least 300,000 that have been rejected because of the too stringent enlistment requirements. Thousands have been rejected just because they had flat feet.

We demand that the Nation keep faith with its servicemen. There must be prompt and complete demobilization of the draftees. Unless this is done, the Nation will lose part of a generation. These boys are all grown up now. Some are getting along in years. They should be allowed, without further delay, to rejoin their families, and again adjust themselves into civilian life.

World War II veterans find not only a huge public debt—which they will have to help pay—but also a Nation poorer in natural resources. They find a Nation depleted in some of its resources and greatly reduced in others. They find that while they were fighting the world's battles, we armed and fed half the world, not only at their expense but at the expense of unborn millions.

They find a Nation with less food, less wearing apparel, less furniture, less and deteriorated homes—a Nation with worn-out farms and transportation equipment. They find a Nation with soil depletion producing food for other nations at the expense of future generations. They find a Nation with five times more money in circulation than ever before—but with less wealth.

The change from war to peace is not an easy one. There will be many agonies. Fifteen million civilians, formerly employed in war work, are now readjusting themselves. In addition, 12,000,000 veterans will have to do likewise. The situation is a challenge not only to Congress but to the Nation.

So far Congress has done little for the men who fought to save other nations. We gave them the GI bill, but outside of the disabled and those who wish to continue their education, this bill does little for the able-bodied veteran. The unemployment insurance of $20 a week for 52 weeks does not furnish employment or enable the veteran to establish himself in industry.

The GI bill does guarantee a $4,000 loan to the lender with 4 percent interest, but if the veteran fails he, his wife and children, will have to take to the highway. They will have to say "good-by" to the home or the business they temporarily occupied or engaged in under the GI bill.

But history repeats itself. Cheers for the boys when they are inducted—the cold shoulder when they are discharged. In World War I, after our soldiers had made the world safe for so-called democracy—after they won the war that was to end all wars—their Uncle Sam, whose banner they carried to victory, handed them a miserly check for $60 with which to buy civilian clothes and get a new start in life.

Unless the veterans, their friends, and relatives talk plainly, the sacrifices that they made in World War II will again be forgotten. When they entered the armed forces they were given from $50 to $55 a month. Out of this they had to pay for life insurance and help support their dependents. They were forced to buy bonds, donate to the Red Cross and the USO. They had to risk and sacrifice their lives, their limbs, and their health. On occasions they worked for 24 hours a day. There was no 40- or 48-hour week.

While our servicemen were fighting and dying, their Uncle Sam dished out $50,000,000,000 for lend-lease—part of it for the war effort and part for foreign civilians. While they were doing the fighting and dying, we plunged their Nation $300,000,000,000 into the red—some of it for the war effort, much of it wasted, some dissipated in graft, and the rest of it went to the cost-plusers.

Then we assumed another $342,000,000,000 future obligations. This makes a total of $642,000,000,000. This is the national debt and obligation. It is more than twice the value of all the property in the United States. We, 140,000,000 people, possessing less than 10 percent of the world's resources, owe more than

all the other nations together, more than the 2,000,000,000 people that possess 90 percent of the world's resources.

In addition, we printed $28,050,000,000 of inflationary currency. All this the veterans and unborn generations must help pay. This is only the beginning of the financial price that we paid and are paying for World War II.

We did more than our share in World War II. We paid $2,700,000,000 to UNRRA—to a billion by all the other 43 nations. We gave 72 percent to their 28 percent. This to rehabilitate people that they impoverished with their—not our—war.

We furnished more than half the implements of war to win. We did more than half of the fighting. We lost 270,000 killed in battle—another 200,000 died from sickness—another million disabled, physically or mentally, for life.

The 12,000,000 men in the armed forces lost on an average 3 years of their productive energy—wealth that they would have created. In addition, we have lost part of a generation of people. This is just part of the human sacrifice that we have and are making in World War II—a war that others started and we finished.

America's program is to build, ever, a greater and stronger nation, to raise, not to lower, its standard of living. We believe in cooperation and collaboration for a just and permanent peace. We do not believe in permanent oppression of other nations' people by communistic, imperialistic Russia, nor by capitalistic, imperialistic Britain.

Now that this devastating war is over it will be our duty to help rebuild the ravaged nations. We must feed the hungry of other nations. We must provide them with material to rebuild their productive enterprises. This out of our surpluses—not out of our necessities.

These problems can be solved by dealing justly with all nations, but never forgetting that charity begins at home. Our first consideration must always be our veterans—the veterans who were willing to give their lives for their country if necessary. The nation that does not protect its protectors cannot long endure. No nation is great enough to ignore its defenders.

Therefore, I am going to discuss with you the all-important subject, Veterans' Rehabilitation — Veterans' Readjustment.

There is now pending before Congress the veterans' rehabilitation bill, H. R. 1215, which I have introduced and which has the approval of many veterans and Army officers. If this bill or a similar bill is passed, it will taper off inflation and prevent deflation and a financial collapse.

This bill would give to the veterans of World War II a paid-up life-insurance policy. The amount of this policy would be at the rate of $150 a month for home and $300 for overseas services. That is less than those who worked at home received for shorter hours and less strenuous work. It provides that the veterans may borrow 75 percent of the policy's face value to engage in productive enterprise. This enterprise is defined as building a home, obtaining an education, or engaging in any commercial, agricultural, industrial, or professional undertaking.

This bill provides that veterans may form a partnership or a corporation and that the proceeds from such enterprise shall be exempt from State and Federal income tax for 5 years. No interest is to be paid for the first 2 years, after that 2 percent. This gives the veteran time to get started and an even break with those who remained at home. No honest person can object to that.

It would give the able-bodied and the partially disabled veterans an opportunity to engage in businesses of their own, and create jobs for themselves and for others in place of asking for jobs that will not exist. It will not only help the veterans but the Nation.

You must not confuse this paid-up insurance with the soldiers' term insurance. That insurance was only for the duration of the war. It was cheap insurance while the war lasted, but, now, that the war is over, the premiums have gone up. The veteran must now convert it into another form of insurance.

In World War I the amount of such insurance was over $39,606,000,000, but, it dropped to less than $3,000,000,000. The reason for this was that veterans did not have the money to pay the higher premiums. In this war the amount of this term insurance is over $140,000,000,000. If the drop in World War II is at the same ratio as in World War I, then it will drop from $140,000,000,000 to less than $12,000,000,000.

We paid every civilian for every war effort. We again made millionaires out of cost-plus contracts—out of the blood, tears, and agony of a war-mad world. We pay interest on war bonds. We permitted waste and graft in the name of war. We even gave consumers' subsidies so that now the veterans are taxed to help pay the board bill of the stay-at-homers.

But when it comes to appreciating the sacrifices that our servicemen made on all battle fronts, in order to save the honor and glory of our Nation, then we hear talk about red-blooded Americanism and patriotism not being for sale. No; not for sale, but it can, at least, be appreciated.

The time has come that we take care of our veterans in place of playing Santa Claus to all the world. In place of loaning $4,400,000,000 more, and canceling the $34,000,000,000 Great Britain already owes us, let us remember that the veterans come first. If Great Britain would pay us what she owes us, we could hand to every World War II veteran a check for $3,600.

Here is the agreement that our State Department entered into with Great Britain. We are to loan her $4,400,000,000 at about one and a half percent interest. She is to make no payment for 5 years. After that she is to pay $50,000,000 a year when and if she feels like it. If she does make a payment, we agreed to spend it in Great Britain for buildings, installations, and education. Not a cent to come back to the United States.

In addition, we are to cancel the $34,000,000,000 Great Britain already owes us, for $650,000,000. That is less than 2 cents on the dollar. This $650,000,000 is to be deducted from the $4,400,000,000 loan. In other words, we settle the $34,000,000,000 that Great Britain owes us with six hundred and fifty million of our own taxpayers' money.

If we are to judge Great Britain by the past, she will not pay back one penny. She will again call us Uncle Shylock instead. By this method she will get the things that we need, such as farm implements, wearing apparel and other necessary goods, and we will continue to deplete our natural resources. At the same time, the international bankers and manufacturers will get the $4,400,000,000 of the taxpayers' and veterans' money.

In the meantime, our Uncle Sam will continue to call upon us to buy more and more bonds to furnish the credit to Great Britain and other nations so that they can turn it over to these international horse traders. I do not blame Great Britain or these nations.

The British Government and its citizens have billions and billions invested throughout the world. They have billions invested in the United States. They own and control many of our insurance companies. They made billions out of lend-lease by selling products, we gave them for war purposes, to civilians, and then forgot to turn over the cash.

If that is not highjacking us by our State Department, then I do not know the meaning of that word. It is a fraud and a deception upon America. On top of this we are to make her a gift of about four or five billion dollars' worth of surplus property and installations, that we have and have built in the United Kingdom and that belong to us.

The veterans are complaining because they are being juggled out of their priority on surplus war property. Rank favoritism to the big fellow and the foreign exporter is the order of the day. There are rumors of waste and destruction of surplus property—especially of wearing apparel and medical supplies. There are more rumors of waste and corruption in the disposal of trucks, tractors, and other heavy equipment.

The veterans' rehabilitation bill provides that all this surplus property be turned over to the veterans, and the proceeds used to carry out the provisions of the bill. If this bill had been passed, it would have put an end to waste, destruction, fraud, and corruption in the handling of surplus property. The veterans then would have taken a keener interest in the disposition of this property. We now know that the disposition of surplus war property is an ugly picture.

Millions of GI's have returned. Congress has made provisions for the disabled, but I repeat aside from a little education and guaranteeing a loan for the lender up to $4,000, with 4 percent interest, it has done nothing for the able-bodied veterans. Yes; foreign loans at 1½ percent, but 4 percent for the GI. Settlement of billions for less than 2 cents on the dollar but 100 cents for the returning GI.

In place of a bond issue to finance foreign nations, let us have a bond issue for the GI's. Let us give them a new start in life. Let us compensate them at the same rate that the stay-at-homers

received. I express the sentiment of every patriotic American when I say "billions to rehabilitate the returning GI's, but not one penny for sponging nations." Veterans come first.

Emergency Breeders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I incorporate therein an editorial appearing in the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., of April 5, 1946, entitled "Emergency Breeder."

I thoroughly agree with the sentiments therein expressed and I only hope that the Office of Price Administration will take heed and listen. Suspicion is as bad as fear and OPA should somehow put a ceiling on suspicion and should make plain certain it is determined to die not later than June 30, 1947. That would hearten the country.

EMERGENCY BREEDERS

One of many troubles with Washington these days is that those in charge of governmental policies apparently do not take enough time to diagnose popular concepts and opinions and as a result base their programs upon the wrong psychology. For example, we are convinced that much of the opposition to extension of price-control measures for another year hinges upon the fear that one extension will lead to another, and so on, ad infinitum.

There is, quite likely, a general consensus that price control should be carried on in certain items wherein there are obvious shortages. But wherever supply meets demand, price control should immediately end. That is the public attitude and not blind opposition to OPA as Washington seems to think.

As for the fear that the same plea for another extension will come up next year, and the year after, and so on, there is sound justification. The New Deal taught us that emergencies can be rigged to fit the political occasion.

It all boils down, you see, to the undeniable fact that the general public is suspicious of Washington, and particularly of that element which seeks to regiment industry through threatened emergencies, real or fancied. If there were absolute public confidence that when OPA says its task will be completed within a year it meant exactly that, the extension would go through tomorrow with a whoop and a holler.

Air Lines Can Conserve Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following observations. About 10 days ago I was traveling by plane from Birmingham to Washington via Eastern Air Lines. I had a seat near the rear of the plane. Before lunch I had been reading newspaper accounts of the horrible plight of millions of people throughout the world because of the shortage of food. Where I was seated I could observe the trays as the attractive hostess carried them to and from the passengers. Each passenger was given two rolls; I noticed on three trays that only one of the two rolls had been eaten. Two passengers did not eat any bread at all. I asked the hostess what was done with the rolls which were not eaten. She said they were thrown out with the rest of the unused food.

I wrote Captain Rickenbacker a letter, suggesting that only one roll be put on each tray; and that a notice be placed on the tray advising the passenger that if he wanted another roll to notify the hostess. I have not as yet heard from Captain Rickenbacker, but I am certain he will give consideration to this suggestion. Just think how many millions of starving children could be fed if this practice were put into effect by the air lines and the dining cars.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the debate, Tuesday April 16, on the report of the Committee on Un-American Propaganda all the time allowed the opposition was 11 minutes. I was offered 2 minutes, which I refused, preferring that it go to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] as I could not have begun to explain, in 2 minutes, my position on the citation of all the members of the executive board of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. I am, therefore, taking advantage of the privilege of extension of my remarks to state my position.

Mr. Speaker, the present Committee on Un-American Activities represents a violent departure from the traditions of this House. The committee has been clothed with dual and vast powers. It is both an investigative committee and a legislative committee. Never before in the history of our country has either House of Congress made such a broad grant of its jealously guarded powers to any committee.

You will all recall the history of the various special committees empowered to investigate un-American propaganda activities.

M'CORMACK COMMITTEE SUCCESSFUL

The most successful, the most objective, and the most fruitful of all of them was that headed by our own respected majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

That committee actually did investigate, without fear, favor, or prejudice, un-American propaganda activities, and it succeeded in exposing to the light of truth violent and revolutionary activities of nazism, communism, and fascism; and it made legislative recommendations which were logical, reasonable, and desirable. One of those recommendations is embodied in the Voorhis Act for registration of foreign agents; some were expressed in the wartime powers of the Department of State and the Department of Justice.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY ME

I was responsible for the passage of that resolution, Mr. Speaker—House Resolution 198 of the Seventy-fourth Congress—and I desire to repeat the language of the first paragraph of that resolution, which contains the scope of the authority of the committee:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven Members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and object of Nazi propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

That resolution was adopted by the House on March 20, 1934. The final report was submitted on February 15, 1935.

DIES COMMITTEE SUGGESTED BY ME

By 1937 it was obvious that the United States, despite the exposures of the McCormack committee, was still the propaganda battleground of foreign ideologies, and the matter came up for discussion in the Committee on Rules. It was at my suggestion that the former Representative from Texas, Mr. Dies, submitted House Resolution 282 on July 21, 1937. That resolution empowered a seven-member committee to investigate—

(1) The extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the form of government as guaranteed by our form of government, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Dies committee, after a few weeks of replowing the ground previously cultivated by the McCormack committee, and having put some genuine and dangerous pro-Fascists and pro-Nazis on the witness stand for the sake of the record, abandoned all pretence of impartiality and furnished a rostrum from which Pelley and other native revolutionaries preached their doctrine of hate and poison, and gave their libels privilege in the committee hearings. By 1942 the Dies committee had become thoroughly discredited. It devoted itself, not to the investigation of activities constituting a "clear and present danger" to the United States, but to smearing and attacking organized labor and liberal organizations

and all liberals and progressives. On the one hand, the Dies committee had played into the hands of the Nazis and Fascists; on the other, it had become, to all intents and purposes, an auxiliary of the Republican National Committee, and in effect the Congress was subsidizing the propaganda mill of the Republican Party to the extent of the annual appropriations for the Dies committee, totaling well over a half million dollars.

COUNTRY WAS FED UP

The House and the country were fed up. Mr. Dies wisely determined not to run for reelection, and there was no doubt but that the committee would die an easy and natural death. Then, on the day on which this Congress met and organized, by a clever parliamentary maneuver the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] presented an amendment to the rules creating a legislative committee on un-American activities. No one had read the proposed Rankin amendment. Few had any concept of what the effect of it would be. The House was just in process of organizing. There was no proper consideration or examination of the rules. Caught by surprise, the House adopted his amendment 207 to 186. Many Members who voted for it have told me since privately that had they known what they were doing they would have voted against it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the language of the definitive clause of rule X, paragraph 40 (c):

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

NEVER OPPOSED TO PROPER COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to the fact that the definitive phrases of rule X, paragraph 40 (c), are identical with the same phrases in House Resolution 282, Seventy-fifth Congress, which created the Dies committee, and differ from the same phrases in House Resolution 198, Seventy-third Congress, which created the McCormack committee, by only eight words. In the very first resolution, we used the word "Nazi." Then, when we were discussing the new committee, we decided to broaden it a little, and we changed "Nazi" to "subversive and un-American," and we inserted the phrase "or of a domestic origin" after "foreign countries."

I have gone through all this, Mr. Speaker, to show that not only have I not been opposed to a proper and judicious committee investigating un-American propaganda, but that I was in favor of and advocated and was instrumental in passage of resolutions for special committees to investigate subversive propaganda activities.

No, Mr. Speaker, what I object to is the perversion of the power we have granted, the one-sidedness, the lack of proper safeguards to protect the character of individuals and of organizations. No one, Mr. Speaker, familiar with the powers of the Congress will argue for a moment that the Congress does not have, and should not have, the right to ask questions about any conceivable thing. We have, time after time, empowered special committees, or special subcommittees of standing committees, to make all kinds of investigations.

But we have always held that such committees have a duty and a responsibility to confine themselves to the proper scope of their authorization, and to seek facts.

WITNESSES MUST BE PROTECTED

Let me go back again to the McCormack committee. From its final report I quote this paragraph:

In undertaking to comply with this resolution and to make the investigation ordered by it, your committee has made every endeavor to act with extreme caution and prudence in obtaining pertinent evidence, employing special investigators to make preliminary examinations into such matters, and conducting executive hearings, with the twofold object of securing proper evidence to be developed in its public hearings, and of protecting the reputation and character of any person from unwarranted reflection in connection with such activities.

I want to quote also from the statement made by the chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, at the first public hearing on June 5, 1934, when he laid down the future policy of the committee in these words:

In the conduct of this investigation the committee holds no brief for any group or class of our citizens. It has no preconceived views of what the truth is respecting the subject matter of this inquiry. Its sole purpose is to discover the truth and report it as it is, with such recommendations, if any, as to legislation on these subjects as the situation may require and as the duty of the Congress to the American people may demand.

RANKIN COMMITTEE IGNORED THOSE ADMONITIONS

In those words, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader laid down the principles which should govern the conduct of every investigating committee of the Congress.

But, Mr. Speaker, has the Rankin committee—I will not refer to this as the Wood committee because of my respect for the gentleman from Georgia—followed those admonitions of the gentleman from Massachusetts? We know it has not. It has no fixed standards of conduct. It has treated some witnesses—for instance, the rabid racist and ultranationalist, Gerald L. K. Smith, who has openly preached a doctrine of revolution and sedition—with the utmost gentleness and consideration, and has given them a forum from which to attack minority peoples shamefully, just as Dies did for Pelley, now generally known as the tool of Viereck.

No such consideration has been given individuals or organizations of liberal tendencies.

By insinuation, innuendo, deliberate news leaks, and in many other ways the impression has been given publicly that various individuals disliked by the gentleman from Mississippi are disloyal, subversive, and un-American, when frequently the facts are quite different.

I do not, I will not, and I have never defended any known Communist from the consequences of his unlawful acts; nor have I ever defended the un-American activities of the Communist Party. I believe the American form of government to be the best form of government ever devised, and I yield to no man in my loyalty to this country.

"LIBERTY DOES NOT MEAN LICENSE"

Once more, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the final report of the McCormack committee, in the summary paragraphs, where it is stated:

To the true and real American, communism, nazism, and fascism are all equally dangerous, equally alien, and equally unacceptable to American institutions. * * * Your committee has exercised extreme care to protect the constitutional rights of any individual. * * * The moment he advocates (change of government) by force and violence, and the substitution of the bullet and the bomb for the ballot, he becomes an enemy of our social and political order, a criminal, and he ought to be dealt with as such. Freedom of speech does not authorize insurrection or rebellion against the government. Liberty does not mean license.

I could not state my position, Mr. Speaker, more succinctly. I doubt if any true American in this Chamber would take exception to a single word that I have quoted.

But the present Committee on Un-American Activities has not acted in accordance with those principles, nor with the earlier admonitions I have quoted.

NO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED

I have a high regard for the majority of the members of the committee; but unfortunately the gentleman from Mississippi seems to have the dominant voice and to force actions which I am sure are abhorrent to most of the Members. Time after time the committee appears to have proceeded on the basis of unsupported assertions by persons of doubtful reliability. In the instant case, the committee has brought in a report asking for a citation of contempt against the board of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, a charitable organization recognized and licensed by the Federal Government, devoted to the succor of the unfortunate men and women driven out of Spain by Franco. The House voted the citation without having seen any evidence as to whether or not this committee has been guilty of un-American activities. Although it has been testified under oath that only the executive secretary has custody of the financial records, the entire membership of the board of directors has been cited. Any lawyer will admit that such action is in violation of our Constitution; it is unjust, unfair, and unwarranted. I went along with the committee in the citation of Dr. Barsky, even though I had no sympathy with the investigation on which it was based, because he had failed to comply with a subpena in proper form.

A FISHING EXPEDITION

The issue here was different. No proof of un-American propaganda activities has been offered. This was a fishing expedition, which had and could have only the purpose and the effect of destroying the work the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee

Committee has been doing. The committee has been led into the embarrassing position of doing the work of Dictator Franco, who is the head of a revolutionary government which had the open military support of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy to overthrow the constitutional republic.

On this motion, 292 voted for, and 56 Members were brave enough to vote against. There were 82 who did not vote, and I venture to say nearly all abstained because they could not bring themselves to countenance such outrageous actions. I know that had the dismissal of the contempt proceedings against Rumely been known the membership would not have voted as they did.

The Committee on Un-American Activities appears in the instant case to have relief upon the unsubstantiated testimony of an admitted ex-Communist, a person who, had he not suddenly announced himself as a reclaimed brand from the burning, might well have been under investigation. I do not know how the committee could have any confidence in such a person. We are told he has a position with some institution—I do not now recall where—at a high salary. It is obvious he is being used for the purpose of disseminating and issuing defamatory statements and charges that are not and cannot be supported by reliable legal evidence admissible in a court.

WHY ARE PRO-NAZI ACTIVITIES IGNORED?

May I ask why the gentleman from Mississippi, who seems to lord it over the committee, has never given any attention to the Nazi and pro-Fascist activities in the United States? Every day we hear or read of some new activity which is, beyond any doubt, revolutionary, subversive, and seditious. Even during the war those activities went on, but the gentleman did not raise his voice against them, even when they cried out to overthrow our Government by force while we were locked in the death grip of world war. Many of those convicted of seditious activities, or still under indictment, have continued their nefarious, vicious, and seditious propaganda from under the shadow of Federal prison unrebuked by the gentleman or his committee.

If the gentleman from Mississippi is anxious to expose and combat un-American propaganda activities, why does he not devote some of the time and the money of the committee to those actually guilty of plotting the violent overthrow of this Government, or of so weakening our moral and physical defenses against Fascist theories that we will succumb to foreign propaganda or military attack? Instead of harassing committees, organizations, and individuals which aim to combat such un-American manifestations as anti-Semitism, anti-Negroism, anti-Catholicism, and other bigotries, or to protect citizens in exercise of their constitutional rights of free opinion and petition, or to collect small sums of money for the starving, sick, and wounded victims of falangism, why does he not turn his searchlight on the falangists of America who plot revolution? Why does he not look into the illegal violence of the Ku Klux Klan, or of the Synarchists, American Crusaders, and many similar vicious organizations? There are many, many groups actively at work, right now, preaching un-American hatreds, seeking to divide and weaken our unity, and open the way for conquest or revolution.

OPPOSED TO UNFAIR AND IMPROPER TACTICS

But no, no. The gentleman's mind is obsessed with communism. He sees communism everywhere—even in the Constitution, which guarantees freedom of speech, of religion, of the press, of the right of petition, and of conscience. If he disapproves of the activities or of the teachings of any group or of any person, however legal, however free from any suspicion of revolutionary conspiracy or of un-American tendencies, or which actually seeks to serve this country by extending and strengthening our democratic way of life, the gentleman calls it communistic, and actually attacks those acting in full accordance with the constitutional guaranties of human liberties.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up, I refused to vote to sustain the citation of contempt on the specific legal issue that the subpena issued exceeded the grant of power to the committee and was in itself violative of the Constitution; but on broader grounds, I oppose the unfair, improper, and arbitrary conduct of the present committee. I oppose the almost unlimited grant of power of the rule.

We have a great investigation division, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the envy of all modern nations, headed by John Edgar Hoover, who is world famous. The Army has its Military Intelligence Division. The Navy has the Office of Naval Intelligence. The State Department has a Bureau of Investigation. The Treasury has its T-men and the Secret Service. Most of the other large executive agencies have investigation divisions. All of them are staffed with trained men of the highest integrity, and some are famous throughout the world for their skill and daring.

The activities of the Rankin committee, with its staff of amateurs, rushing into all kinds of sensitive areas involving high policy, tend to discredit the FBI and the other investigative agencies. It gives the suggestion that the regular executive agencies are incapable of doing the work for which they are trained and paid, when I am afraid that just the opposite is true.

The present Committee on Un-American Propaganda is using the files of the old discredited special Dies committee. The Dies committee, as I have pointed out before, did not carry out its mandate of investigating "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities"; instead it devoted itself to smearing the administration, Members of Congress, and officials and employees of the Government, and organized labor; it did not hesitate to vilify and attack those who attempted to defend its victims, as can be testified by anyone who heard the statement made on this floor by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Members of Congress and the country as a whole were convinced that the outrageous conduct of the former chairman, Mr. Dies, and of his highly paid hirelings had passed all tolerance, and were prepared to let the committee die. The Dies committee spent $645,000 out of total appropriations of $652,000 during its existence. In the 15 months of the present committee, they have spent $28,842 out of a total appropriation of $50,000; despite the publicity given, they have been unable to submit facts to any proper prosecuting agency on which an indictment or conviction could be obtanied, although there are known to be Nazi and Fascist groups in this country, at this moment illegally plotting the violent overthrow of this Government, which are guilty, beyond any doubt in my mind, of subversive and even seditious activities.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] does not give credit for their loyalty and devotion to our democratic way of life to Americans who happened to have been born abroad, or whose parents were born abroad. He has appeared to question the loyalty of millions of loyal Americans who, by the accident of birth, were not sprung from America's earliest settlers. Again I inform the gentleman, if he is not aware, that except for that small portion of Americans descended from aboriginal Indians without dilution, all Americans are descended from "foreigners"—from foreigners who have proved their loyalty and devotion to this Nation in their life's blood and in the sweat of their toil. Without foreigners America might well still be a trackless wilderness living in a stone-age culture.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a proper place for a special congressional committee in this delicate and controversial field of political propaganda, where the regular investigative agencies lack statutory power; but the conduct of such committees should be in the high tradition and in the image of the McCormack committee.

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, combat un-Americanism by indulging in un-American procedures.

Artificial Stimulation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "Artificial Stimulation?"

ARTIFICIAL STIMULATION?

There are cynics who will tell you that war with Russia is being made a more fearsome possibility by persons in authority in Washington who would utilize our alarm to extend certain war controls and expand others. These persons cite in this connection the proposed extension of the draft, compulsory military training of our youth, renewal of food rationing, and extension of OPA controls.

Some of these national programs may be good and some may be bad; there is on each issue a strongly divided opinion. But that to achieve these goals high officials are purposely pumping up a war scare, we seriously doubt.

There undoubtedly have been occasions in the past when propaganda bogies were deliberately put up, and a large portion of the American citizenry was taken in thereby. We recall, for instance, when we were told we might lose the war if we did not draft all nurses. And farther back, it may be recalled, we were to revert to "horse and buggy days" if we did not at once pack our Supreme Court with New Deal appointees.

Now, we do not feel that the war scare now prevalent is puffed up to make it look worse than is actually the case, merely to frighten the public into acceptance of military programs which otherwise we would discard. That is not in line with the characters of such men as Eisenhower and Marshall and Byrnes and Truman. They must know that even a threat of war is too grave to twist for propaganda purposes.

Arbitration in Cases Affecting Railway Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, there is widespread interest in the problem affecting the railroad industry which is now being considered by the National Mediation Board. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, for the enlightenment of the Senate, an editorial entitled "Arbitration Fumbles" from the Machinist of April 11, 1946; a case filed in the United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railroad Conductors, Switchmen's Union of North America, and Eastern, Western, and Northeastern Carriers' Conference Committee, Docket No. A-2215, Arbitration 61; a case filed with the National Mediation Board, Docket A-2215, Arbitration No. 62, by the Employees National Conference Committee, 15 cooperating railway labor organizations, and Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers Conference Committee, Docket No. A-2215, Arbitration 62; and a statement of Carl J. Goff, assistant president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, who served as employee arbitrator in the wage scale involving employees in engine, train, and yard service.

Mr. President, I ask that all these matters be printed in the RECORD in the order in which I have stated them, so that those who may be interested in arbitration affecting railroad employees and the system of arbitration employed under the Railway Labor Act may be informed accordingly.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer which indicates that the printing of the material herewith furnished will exceed by three-fourths of a page the two pages allowed under the rule without an estimate and that the cost will be $165.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Machinist of April 11, 1946]

ARBITRATION FUMBLES

The cause of arbitration has taken a severe beating in the inequitable awards handed down in the railway wage movement case in Chicago during the past week.

Arbitration had its chance to prove to workers that they could get fair and just awards through the regular processes of collective bargaining and through use of the machinery set up under the Railway Labor Act. It had its chance to prove that the workers could obtain as much by peaceful means as they could through strikes and direct action on picket lines. It fumbled the chance. The action in Chicago will make labor in other fields more wary than ever of moves to place labor relations in industry under regulations patterned after the Railway Labor Act, when they see strike action win concessions far beyond those obtainable under such an act.

The labor members of the arbitration board in the Chicago travesty were forced into voting for the 16-cent wage increase in order to get any award. They condemned as "great injustice" the failure of the "neutrals" to "consider the inequities shown by the evidence" and their basing the award on a "pattern." The action of the neutral arbitrators, they added, amounts to "a subversion of the judicial process."

"We are deeply convinced that no greater disservice to the cause of peaceful adjustment of industrial disputes could have been done," they declared. They made it clear that this experiment in voluntary arbitration had proved a failure, and that direct and militant means would have to be taken by the workers to get a "square deal," over and above the 16-cent award.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN, ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS, SWITCHMEN'S UNION OF NORTH AMERICA AND EASTERN, WESTERN, AND SOUTHEASTERN CARRIERS' CONFERENCE COMMITTEES—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

(Docket No. A-2215, Arbitration 61)

On January 26, 1946, an arbitration agreement was entered into by and between the above-named parties. The agreement is set forth at large in the record.

Pursuant to the agreement, R. W. Brown was designated arbitrator for the above-named carriers, and Carl J. Goff was designated arbitrator for the above-named employees. The first meeting of the arbitrators chosen by the respective parties was held February 1, 1946, and such parties failed to name the remaining arbitrator, notified the National Mediation Board to that effect, and requested that Board to appoint the remaining arbitrator. The National Mediation Board, acting in accordance with the authority conferred upon it by the Railway Labor Act, did appoint Richard F. Mitchell as neutral arbitrator.

Thereafter, on February 18, 1946, and within the time provided by law, the three arbitrators convened at Chicago, Ill., and organized themselves into a statutory board of arbitration, at which time Richard F. Mitchell was designated as chairman.

On February 18, 1946, the board commenced its hearings at the designated place in the city of Chicago and, at the request of the employees, recessed the hearings until February 22, 1946. The parties entered into a stipulation which is set out in the record extending the time for filing the report to and including April 3, 1946.

On the 22d of February 1946 the hearings were resumed. Twenty-five days were consumed by the parties submitting evidence and argument.

The record consists of 3,660 pages and numerous exhibits offered by both parties. All evidence and exhibits that were offered were admitted by the board and no objection was made by either party to the evidence or the exhibits.

The following specific question was submitted to the board by the arbitration agreement for decision, to wit:

"Request of the employees that all existing basic daily wage rates shall be increased $2.50."

The arbitration agreement further provided:

"* * * if the board finds that the request of the employees should neither be granted nor denied in its entirety, the board may award such amount of increase within the limits of the request as it finds, under the evidence, to be justified."

Appearances for the parties are set out in the record.

All witnesses were duly sworn.

Oral arguments were made and written briefs were filed with the board.

Findings

With respect to the question submitted for arbitration, this board finds from the evidence offered and the showing made that the award should be and hereby is as follows:

Award

The board awards the sum of $1.28 per basic day as justified under the evidence and a uniform increase in that amount per basic day, applicable to all employees parties hereto, shall be added to all existing rates of pay, in accordance with said arbitration agreement.

The wage increase granted under this award shall become effective January 1, 1946, in accordance with the arbitration agreement.

Finding and certification

This board specifically finds and certifies that the award herein rendered and the wage change thereby made is consistent with the standards now in effect established by or pursuant to law for the purpose of controlling inflationary tendencies, and is approvable in its entirety for the purposes of price increases.

Award rendered and filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, this 3d day of April 1946.

RICHARD F. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

R. W. BROWN.

I dissent:

CARL J. GOFF.

EMPLOYEES' NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE, FIFTEEN COOPERATING RAILWAY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND EASTERN, WESTERN, AND SOUTHEASTERN CARRIERS' CONFERENCE COMMITTEES—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

(Docket No. A-2215, Arbitration 62)

On January 26, 1946, an arbitration agreement was entered into by and between the above-named parties. The agreement is set forth at large in the transcript of the record herein.

Pursuant to the agreement, Ralph Budd and J. Carter Fort were designated arbitrators for the carriers represented by the above-named committees, and Felix H. Knight and E. E. Milliman were designated arbitrators for the employees represented by the above-described railway labor organizations. The first meeting of the arbitrators chosen by the respective parties was held February 1, 1946, and within the time allowed by law such parties failed to name the

remaining arbitrators, notified the National Mediation Board of that fact, and requested that Board to appoint the remaining arbitrators. The National Mediation Board, acting in accordance with the authority conferred upon it by the Railway Labor Act, appointed Herbert B. Rudolph and Ernest M. Tipton as neutral arbitrators.

Thereafter, on February 18, 1946, and within the time provided by law, the six arbitrators convened at Chicago, Ill., and organized themselves into a statutory board of arbitrators, at which time Ernest M. Tipton was designated to act as chairman, and Herbert B. Rudolph as vice chairman.

The following specific question was submitted to the board for arbitration:

"Request of the employees for an increase of 30 cents per hour to be added to all existing rates of pay."

The arbitration agreement further provided:

"* * * if the board finds that the request of the employees should neither be granted nor denied in its entirety the board may award such amount of increase within the limits of the request as it finds under the evidence to be justified, but any increase awarded shall be a uniform increase in cents per hour, applicable to all employees parties hereto, and added to all existing rates of pay in accordance with paragraph sixteenth hereof."

Said paragraph 16 provides for the manner of application of the increase.

Witnesses were sworn and testimony, oral and written, was submitted to the board.

Oral arguments were made and written briefs were filed with the board.

Findings

With respect to the question submitted for arbitration, this board finds from the evidence adduced and the showing made that the award should be and hereby is as follows:

Award

The board awards 16 cents per hour as justified under the evidence and a uniform increase in that amount in cents per hour, applicable to all employees parties hereto, shall be added to all existing rates of pay in accordance with said arbitration agreement.

Finding and certification

This board specifically finds and certifies that the award herein rendered and the wage change thereby made is consistent with the standards now in effect, established by or pursuant to law, for the purpose of controlling inflationary tendencies, and is approvable in its entirety for purposes of price increases.

Award rendered and filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, this 3d day of April 1946.

ERNEST M. TIPTON.
HERBERT B. RUDOLPH.
FELIX H. KNIGHT.
E. E. MILLIMAN.

SPECIAL OPINION OF BOARD MEMBERS FELIX H. KNIGHT AND E. E. MILLIMAN

With great reluctance we have joined with the members of the board appointed by the National Mediation Board in making an award which, as the ensuing discussion will show, is made wholly arbitrarily, is not based on the evidence before the board, and is made without consideration of the equities of the employees' claim. These characterizations of the award, grave as they are, are not made argumentatively, but are undeniable. We have joined in such an award solely because the only alternatives left to us by the attitude of other members of the board were to have the proceedings end in failure to make an award, or to have the amount awarded subjected to a further arbitrary reduction below the amount considered proper by the arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board in order to induce the carrier representatives to join in it.

What the board has done, in short, is baselessly to distort the stabilization policy of the Government into a barrier against giving any consideration to the gross inequities between railroad wages and wages in other industries. While the other members of the board would dispute that this was a baseless distortion, the fact that the stabilization policy was treated by them as such a barrier, not only cannot be denied but, indeed, was repeatedly asserted by them in the course of the board's deliberations.

It is undisputed that under the stabilization policy in effect when the arbitration agreement was signed it was permissible by collective bargaining processes to make wage increases without limitation, provided that such amount of the increase, if any, as did not fall into the specified standards for approval be not used for a period of 6 months to increase ceiling prices or to resist otherwise justifiable decreases or to increase costs to the United States. Although common carrier rates are not ceiling prices the regulations of December 5, 1945, sought to impose on common carriers a waiver of the right to seek increases in rates on the basis of any increase not approvable as a basis for price increases. Under the circumstances the carriers were unwilling to sign the arbitration agreement until they had secured from Judge Collet, the Stabilization Administrator, a letter under date of January 23, 1946, assuring them that they might put into effect any wage increase awarded in arbitration and they would not thereby waive the right immediately to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission and State commissions for increases in rates based on such increased wages. This assurance was in no wise conditioned upon the increase being of the so-called approvable character, and reserved only to the stabilization authorities their right to contend before the Interstate Commerce Commission, if they so desired, that the wage increase in whole or in some part should not be used as a basis of a rate increase until 6 months after its reflection in carrier pay rolls. By this action all issues as to whether the carriers could or should be required to absorb any part of the increase in wages became finally determinable by the Interstate Commerce Commission and, therefore, not determinable by the arbitration board. The arbitration board was accordingly left free to determine the equities of the employee-wage claims on their merits.

On February 14, 1943, a new Executive order (No. 9697) defining stabilization policy was issued. Fearing that this order might be interpreted to restrict the freedom of the arbitration board to consider the employee claims on their merits the employees obtained a recess of the hearings at their inception and resumed the proceedings only after they had received the telegraphic assurance of Judge Collet that "any wage increases certified by the arbitration boards as being in accordance with the stabilization policy in effect when the arbitration agreements were made would be in accordance with stabilization policy under Executive Order 9697. My letter of January 23 addressed to the Carriers Conference Committee is not changed or affected by Executive Order 9697."

The subsequent interpretation and application of Executive Order 9697 by the National Wage Stabilization Board in the case of the 19-cent increase in the aluminum industry (more fully discussed hereinafter) further made it plain that the fears the railroad employees had had were groundless; their claim was for the correction of gross inequities in wage rates as compared with other national industries and the aluminum case showed that under the stabilization policy such increases were not only permissible, but were approvable for price increase purposes.

Notwithstanding the events above summarized, notwithstanding the fact that the Executive orders defining stabilization policy, both before and after February 14, provided for the approval of wage increases for the correction of gross inequities in specified circumstances, and notwithstanding the full trial of the merits of the employee claims in over a month of hearings reported in a transcript of over 3,600 pages, plus 46 exhibits, the carriers, in their closing arguments, asserted that the provisions in the stabilization policy for the correction of gross inequities were inapplicable and that the board was bound to disregard any inequities between railroad wages and wages in other industries shown by the evidence, and to limit itself to such increases as might be permissible as compensation for increased cost of living or for loss of take-home pay through reduction in working hours, whichever amount was found to be greater.

Had there been apparent substance to the carrier contentions, it would nevertheless have appeared inherently incredible that the stabilization policy had, for example, permitted employees in the automobile industry whose hourly wage rates last September were $1.21, and who had had increases of over 27 percent since January 1941, and employees in the steel industry whose hourly wage rates last September were $1.04, and who had had increases of over 40 percent since January 1941, to be granted increases of 18½ cents per hour, and yet the same stabilization policy would limit the nonoperating employees in the railroad industry to some lesser amount even though their average hourly rates last September, disregarding 2.4 cents paid in lieu of overtime, was only 80.6, and their increases since January 1941 had been but 26.7 percent. Nevertheless, the arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board indicated, early in the board's deliberations, their disposition to accept the limitations asserted by the carriers and thus to exclude from their consideration all evidence of inequities between railroad wage rates and wages in other industries.

A further point should be noted. Even under the carriers' contentions the asserted limitations of stabilization policy are inapplicable if, and to the extent that, the board might find the carriers capable of absorbing the wage increase without passing it on in increased rates. We think the carriers would concede, and in any event the evidence in the record is overwhelming that in consequence of unprecedented net income before taxes during the war years, the carriers emerged from the war financially much stronger than they have ever been in their history. Starting with this highly favorable condition, the ability of the carriers to absorb a substantial wage increase depends upon their postwar-traffic prospects. It is not our purpose to argue that question here. We believe that unless we are to assume that all efforts of national policy to avoid a complete collapse of our economy are doomed to failure, there is good ground for concluding that the carriers could absorb a wage increase that would do justice to the employee claims. The carriers themselves expect traffic levels well above their prewar experience in good years. But as to how much above the evidence is conflicting.

We doubt that this board, in any of its components, has the expertise enabling it to pass a judgment worthy of respect on such an issue, and therefore would deem it wise to seek an approach that would leave that question to more expert determination. Concededly, however, the carrier contention as to stabilization policy requires that the board first determine that question before it can know whether stabilization policy limits its freedom to consider the claim of inequities. Nevertheless, the board has imposed upon itself rigid limitations, excluding consideration of inequities, without ever having addressed it-

self in its deliberations to an appraisal of the evidence on this precedent question.

The arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board, without consideration of the evidence of inequities, and persisting in the assertion that stabilization policy precluded the consideration of such evidence, proposed an award of 16 cents. This amount was arrived at by applying the cost-of-living formula to the operating employees alone and then arbitrarily applying the same amount of increase to the nonoperating employees. The carrier arbitrators were unwilling to join in an award of even this amount. The arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board indicated to us that our failure to join in such an award would move them to agree with the carrier arbitrators upon a lesser award. No corresponding suggestion was made to the carrier arbitrators that their failure to join would move the arbitrators appointed by the National Mediation Board to agree with us upon a larger award. We were thus confronted with the choice of joining in an award we believe to be grossly inadequate or of letting the proceedings end in failure to make an award or in an award further arbitrarily reduced to solicit the concurrence of the carrier arbitrators. Confronted with this choice we chose the course which appears to us to involve the perpetration of the least injustice upon the employees. In so doing we were influenced in major degree by the fact that under the arbitration agreement the employees are free at any time to move in accordance with the Railway Labor Act for a further increase, and thus again to press their claims of inequity, which have received no consideration in this proceeding.

Nevertheless, there should be a clear understanding of the magnitude of the injustice worked on the employees by the board's arbitrary refusal to consider the inequities shown by the evidence. The emergency board, which heard the wage claims of these employees in 1943, found itself precluded by the hold-the-line order, issued practically at the conclusion of the hearings, from correcting the inequities which it found then existed. Then, as now, the employees' case was predicated upon inequities between railway-wage rates and wage rates in other industries. The emergency board found that as of 1940 there were inequities between the hourly wage rates of these employees and those of employees in other industries ranging from 14.4 cents to 3.1 cents, depending upon the period embraced in the comparison and the industries with which comparison was made; it further found that notwithstanding the 1941 increase for nonoperating railroad employees these inequities had increased by 9.4 cents in the period from December 1940 to December 1942. (Report of May 24, 1943, pp. 8–9, pars. 29–33, inclusive.) Because of the hold-the-line order, however, that board limited its recommendations for increases to 8 cents per hour, and even that amount was disallowed by the Director of Economic Stabilization. In the final settlement the employees were granted increases ranging from 4 to 10 cents for the correction of substandards of living and the maintenance of interrelated job differentials, together with supplemental increases in lieu of overtime after 40 hours ranging from 5 cents to 1 cent, the combined amounts ranging from 9 to 11 cents.

The evidence in the present proceedings show that the inequities which had been only partially corrected in the 1941 and 1943 cases have continued to grow. The only comparative statistics going back as far as 1921, the average hourly earnings figures reported by the National Industrial Conference Board for 25 manufacturing industries show that at that time the nonoperating railway employees averaged 6.6 cents per hour more than the manufacturing employees; by September 1945 they were earning 21.4 cents per hour less than these manufacturing employees. In terms of straight-time average hourly earnings, i. e., the closest measure of hourly rates of pay, they had by 1939 fallen 7 cents behind the hourly rates for durable goods manufacturing employees, with whom they are most directly comparable, and one-half cent behind the hourly rates for all manufacturing employees as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In September 1945 the straight-time average hourly rate of the nonoperating railway employees was 83 cents if the allowance in lieu of overtime after 40 hours is included, and 80.6 cents if that allowance is excluded. By contrast, the straight-time hourly average for durable goods manufacturing employees was $1.037 and for all manufacturing employees was 94.9 cents. In other words, an increase of 20.7 cents or of 23 cents per hour (depending upon the treatment of the allowance in lieu of overtime) would be necessary to bring these employees to equality with durable goods manufacturing employees as of September 1945. Even if comparison is made with all manufacturing employees (which include many in nowise comparable to the employees here involved) and the comparison is confined to the period since 1939, and the allowance in lieu of overtime is included as straight time for the railway employees, still an increase of 11½ cents would be required to restore the 1939 relationship as of September 1945. Surely that is the minimum which would be allowed for the correction of inequities in hourly rates as of September 1945, had this evidence been considered.

Such is the evidence which the board's action has excluded from all consideration. Be it observed, too, that this is not simply one view of conflicting evidence—it is the uncontroverted evidence of hourly wage rates. The carriers did not dispute it. Instead they introduced other evidence which they contend supports the proposition that lower hourly rates than manufacturing employees even though they formerly received higher rates than manufacturing employees. That evidence, insofar as it relates to earnings, is calculated to show that the disparity is not so great when weekly or annual earnings are compared. That contention is put forth despite the fact that the carriers' evidence itself shows that weekly and annual earnings of employees in all other industry, taken collectively, have increased percentage-wise nearly twice as much since 1939 as have those of the nonoperating railway employees. More important, however, is the fact that the so-called weekly and annual earnings figures are hypothetical computations rather than averages of what individuals actually earn. The averages put forth by the carriers approximate the average actual earnings in 1944 by only 791,000 employees out of a total of 1,853,000 persons who worked in that year. Furthermore the basic workweek of the railway employees is 20 percent longer than that generally prevailing in other industries. Thus, even if accurate earnings data for periods of weeks or years were available a comparison of total earnings requiring 20 percent more hours of work of the railway employees could scarcely be made with any pretense of equity.

The 1943 emergency board carefully analyzed the annual and weekly earnings data offered by the carriers. They concluded that "wage earners, as distinguished from salaried employees, in reality have no annual wage." And for the reasons set forth above rejected such data in favor of giving primary consideration to hourly rates. (Supplemental Report of May 29, 1943, pp. 71–74.) But the present arbitration board undertakes no similar responsibility. It neither considers the evidence of inequality as shown by hourly rate comparisons nor does it assume the burden of holding such inequalities to be justified by other factors. Instead it forecloses consideration of inequalities by its promulgation of a strained interpretation of stabilization policy at variance with that policy as applied in other industries.

The discussion thus far of the unconsidered evidence has been confined to the inequities as they existed last September, before postwar increases were granted in other industries. Obviously the establishment of currently equitable wage rates for the railroad employees requires not only the correction of inequities as of last September, but additional increases commensurate with postwar increases in other industries. This board has, on the pretext of applying stabilization policy, excluded both from its consideration.

The record in these proceedings fully establishes 18½ cents as the prevailing measure of postwar increases in national industries. The other members of the board defy both the record and common knowledge with a stubborn denial that a national pattern of postwar increases exists. They apparently base this denial on the unavailability of such a national pattern under the so-called pattern standard of approval set forth in the Executive order of February 14, 1946. Since that standard refers only to patterns in particular industries or local labor market areas, the national pattern obviously has no pertinence to the application of the standard. But that a national pattern is not only recognized to exist but is controlling in the application of the alternative standard set forth in the same order, namely, the correction of gross inequities as between related industries, is clearly shown by the decision of the National Wage Stabilization Board with respect to the aluminum industry. (Decision of February 27, 1946, Employees' Exhibit No. 22, p. 20.) In that decision that Board, approved a 19-cent increase for aluminum workers as necessary to correct a gross inequity arising by reason of the postwar increase in the steel industry. That Board said: "It seems a fair inference that the Aluminum Co., because of its size and importance in the national economy, may appropriately rely on Nation-wide patterns or trends of wage adjustments in other heavy industries, such as the steel industry, in determining its wage policy." It thus appears that the provisions of the Executive order of February 14, 1946, for the correction of gross inequities between industries applies to industries related only by their size and importance in the national economy, and that other workers have derived the concrete benefits therefrom that are denied by this board to railway employees.

If the correction of inequities as of the close of the war were calculated on even the lowest possible basis reconcilable with the evidence an increase of 11½ cents would be required on that ground. That amount added to the clearly established prevailing national measure of postwar increases, 18½ cents, would require an award granting the employees' request in full. We believe that the other members of the board recognize that a fair consideration of the evidence of inequity requires such an award. In fact we believe that it is precisely because of this recognition that an arbitrary barrier against its consideration has been erected. Although the power is not given to us to know the secret thoughts of other men, we do not believe that our associates felt driven against their will to hold that consideration of the evidence of inequities was not permissible. That the carrier arbitrators should be bent upon saving money for their principals and, therefore, should avail themselves of any barrier their imagination could conjure up is understandable enough, however, lacking in foresight it may be. That they should be supported in such a subversion of the adjudicative process by the appointees of the National Mediation Board is tragic. We are deeply convinced that no greater disservice to the cause of the peaceful adjustment of industrial disputes

could have been done. This demonstration of the incapacity of an adjudicatory tribunal to act in accordance with the evidence before it should be a subject of profound regret by all elements of our society.

E. E. MILLIMAN.
FELIX H. KNIGHT.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 3, 1946.*

STATEMENT OF CARL J. GOFF, ASSISTANT PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN, WHO SERVED AS EMPLOYEE ARBITRATOR IN THE WAGE CASE INVOLVING EMPLOYEES IN ENGINE, TRAIN, AND YARD SERVICE

The increase of $1.28 per day awarded by the majority of the arbitration board is wholly inadequate. Engineers, firemen, conductors, trainmen, and yardmen are entitled, under the present economic conditions, to a higher increase. The amount awarded is based entirely upon the difference between the percentage of increase in wage rates since January 1, 1941, and the 33 percent increase in living costs since that date.

The award does not provide additional compensation to railroad workers to meet the increased standard of living, nor does it give them a share in the increased output per employee. It does not eliminate gross inequities resulting from greater increases in wage rates in nonrailroad industries as compared to transportation employees on the railroads prior to World War II.

The increase awarded—16 cents per hour—is lower than the pattern established in nonrailroad industries during the postwar period. That pattern is equivalent to 18½ cents an hour, or $1.48 per day.

It was for the reasons set forth above that I declined to join with a majority of the arbitration board in the award filed in the Federal Court today.

Jackson Day Address by Hon. James M. Tunnell, of Delaware, at Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] at a Jackson Day dinner at Birmingham, Ala., on April 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We hear so much partisan criticism these days of everything done by the present administration that it might be well to pause long enough to speak a few words of praise to the America that won this war. Our soldiers and sailors, our farmers and manufacturers, our white-collared men and our laborers, our women in service and our housewives at home did their part nobly and fully. The world has never seen a war conducted as brilliantly as World War II. The world has never seen a war in which the whole people participated to the extent that they did in World War II. One has only to see the destruction which our armed forces dealt out to our enemies to appreciate what America did. Our civilians produced the food, the clothing, the ships, the war materials and equipment, and sent them forth freely because they realized that either the Axis Powers or the United Nations would emerge from that war as defeated and destroyed, or as victors with unlimited power over the conquered. When the war was begun on us in 1941 we all realized that the war that was impending would be costly, bloody, and final as to a part of its victims. Yet, today, after the great triumph of our Nation and our Armies, we constantly hear American citizens bemoaning the cost of that war. Men and women of America, I say to you tonight after viewing the prosperity of America and the destruction of our enemies, that there is not a man, woman, or child in America who would exchange places with the defeated powers. All honor to America, to our armed forces, our civilians, to our producers and our consumers, to our men and our women. They all participated, and they are all entitled to the greatest praise which is due them. Our allies and our enemies were not such by lot or by chance. They were allied as they were constituted, as their sympathies and their teachings caused them to be allied. The Allies attracted to their banners all those who recognize that individuals and individual nations have rights, as well as duties and responsibilities.

America is divided as clearly as nations were ever divided. Conscientious Democrats would be only Democrats. Conscientious Republicans would be only Republicans. Each man and woman in America can and should ask himself or herself the question not to what party shall I belong, but to what party do I belong? Thomas Jefferson said in 1824, "Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: (1) Those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them; (2) those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them. * * * The cherishment of the people, then, was our principle; the fear and distrust of them, that of the other party." Thomas Jefferson did not overdraw or wrongly emphasize this distinction. The distinction which he drew then is still the difference between the Democratic Party and its opposition. The cherishment of the people then was our principle, the fear and distrust of them that of the Federalist. Since that time the cherishment of the people has been the principle of our great party, the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, and Roosevelt. The fear and distrust of them has distinguished the opposing parties from it, the Federalist and the Republican.

Jackson was a man of sound business and governmental sense. He was ready to defend a position with reference to a law, fight an enemy, or if necessary a duel. However, he never varied from the consistency of his course of conduct as to honor and fairness to his fellowmen. He was opposed to the idea of special favors to particular elements of the Nation. The Hermitage was his home, Old Hickory was his name, and his profanity consisted of "by the Eternal." Millions of people have benefited, and are still benefiting, because Andrew Jackson dared to obey the promptings of his conscience and to use intelligence in his conduct of public affairs. He worshiped no man, he feared no man—he loved mankind.

In 1932, there arose in the Democratic Party a great champion of human rights. At that time the Government was in the hands of the Republican Party. That party had, as usual, entirely forgotten human rights, and had failed in its effort to protect property rights. In the year 1922, approximately 20,000 businessmen went bankrupt. The bottom fell out of corporation profits. In 1919, the last year of the Woodrow Wilson administration, corporation profits had been about $6,500,000,000. In 1921, there was a total net loss of $55,000,000. Factory pay rolls decreased by almost 50 percent, and almost 6,000,000 workers lost their jobs. In 1921, the first year of the Harding administration, the country reaped the dire results of Republican folly. After a brief spree, the hang-over came. Prices fell within a few months as follows: Milk, 32 percent; beef, 58 percent; lamb, 61 percent; hogs, 69 percent; eggs, 73 percent; cotton, 75 percent; corn, 77 percent; potatoes, 85 percent; sugar, 82 percent. The results were devastating to every segment of life in the county—business, agriculture, labor, consumers. Net farm income dropped from $8,800,000,000 in 1919 to less than $3,000,000,000 in 1921. The average income fell from $1,360 in 1919 to $460 in 1921. Nearly 500,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures between 1922 and 1926. The Republican Party is the party of the full dinner pail, the party of prosperity, so it claims. It was after this terrible condition had arisen that Franklin Roosevelt came to the Presidency. I heard him when he stood within a few feet of Herbert Hoover, and told the American people that what they needed was leadership. Everyone realized that there had been an entire lack of such leadership during the Hoover administration, and the country felt that there was in fact a new American leader. You all remember how the new President closed every bank in the United States, and caused business to start over on a sound basis. He then insisted upon a guaranty of bank deposits, and we have that guaranty today. There is a Federal guaranty of each deposit in banks, taking advantage of the FDIC to the extent of $5,000. This is not a law for the benefit of the bank. It is for the benefit of the depositor. It is for the benefit of the small depositor. The Republican Party opposed such a guaranty. The Democratic Party favored such a guaranty. Can any American today justify any opposition to the Federal guaranty of bank deposits?

The condition of the country being such as it was, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was recommended and adopted by the new administration. Under the leadership of this great American, rural electrification spread its benefits over the rural sections of our country. Soil conservation was sponsored and adopted, and became a part of the Nation's program. We had our Farm Mortgage Act, our crop insurance, our parity payments. We had our public works to furnish employment to those in need of employment. The youth of the country, being in need of training, of employment, felt the benefits of the National Youth Administration. Old-age retirement insurance and unemployment insurance added their tremendous influence and help to the veteran. Who has not seen the vocational training for the crippled and the blind? Who has not realized that under the leadership of this great American there was slum clearance and Federal aid to starving and undernourished. Loans were made to individuals that they might build their own homes. Our war workers were furnished comfortable quarters. Child labor was forbidden by Federal law. Minimum wage and maximum hour legislation was for the first time placed on the statute books. The Securities and Exchange Commission for the protection of the unwary from the solicitation of the dishonest stock salesmen was established. Under the high protective tariff policy of the Republican Party, 37 nations had taken steps to prevent or curtail trade with the United States. Our neighbors to the south of us had lost confidence, and no longer considered themselves beneficiaries as a result of the relationship with the United States, their powerful neighbor to the north. One of the most satisfactory situations in the world today is the relationship existing between our Latin-American neighbors and ourselves. America is nearer united in its democratic hopes than ever before in its history. Each one of these laws emphasized the difference between the Republican Party and the Demo-

cratic Party of today. Oh, we are told that a very large part of the Republican Party now favors these laws which recognize the justice of human rights as against property rights. The Republican Party could not have placed on the statute books these laws. It has surrounded itself by rich contributors, or corporation officials, who expect special benefits and favors, and each of the laws I have enumerated crossed and offended certain large contributors to the Republican Party of the Nation. The best proof is that they never favored these bills when they were in power.

You may look in vain at the newspapers of that period, or the public documents, or the Republican performances in the Federal legislation, for any sincere effort to place upon the statute books, laws for the benefit and protection of the average men and women. The Democratic Party is not antagonistic to wealth. It is not averse to those who are in position to accumulate capital. It is a party of the whole people, and in 1936 cast a majority of the votes in 46 of the 48 States, showing that the Democratic Party is not a sectional party. It is a national party. There is no need for me to tell the people of the South that the Republican Party is a sectional party, and antagonistic to the people of your section of the United States. I need not remind you of the reactionary attitude of this party in reconstruction days. I need not suggest to you the attempted use of the so-called force bill. I need not remind you that as late as 1944 this party refused to cooperate in Congress with the effort to furnish a means for our soldiers in foreign lands to be accorded the privilege of franchise. The Democratic Party has always been the party of the people. We are told that there is a bird which always flies backward. It has no interest in what is ahead of it, because it is not going that way. I am unable to name this bird, as I have never been able to properly describe the Republican Party as it is today constituted. Its mind is in the past. It strives to return America to the past.

Prior to World War II, an effort was made by the Democratic Party to prepare the Nation for defense. This was resisted by Republican opposition. Guam could not be defended because we might offend Japan. As I drove around Guam during the early part of this year, I saw there the destruction which had taken place. I saw the foundations of numerous homes that had been destroyed. I saw the remains of towns that could scarcely be identified as such, and I thought of the difference between a party interested in the people and a party interested in property. The effort to prevent the fortification of Guam was successful. Then the plan to add 2,500 airplanes to our force was voted against by partisan zealots. After the war was begun, cold water was thrown upon the claim that we could build 50,000 airplanes per year. The man who had been the Republican candidate for President in 1944 did not have sufficient faith in the ingenuity, perseverance, and ability of the American people to believe that our plans with reference to the airplanes could ever become effective. Every effort of President Roosevelt to prepare the Nation for defense before the war had begun was heralded as the move of a war monger. This position was persisted in by the Republican Party whenever any effort was made to prepare America for the coming war. This attitude on the part of the so-called loyal opposition no doubt cost America hundreds of thousands of casualties, sorrow in hundreds of thousands of homes, and the life blood of hundreds of thousands of American boys. The Republican Party and its predecessors, the Whig and Federalist Parties, have never trusted the people. This is true to such an extent that it is a matter of common knowledge that the Republican Party has not sponsored any form of reform since shortly after its organization.

You ask why the Democratic Party favored liberal laws I have just mentioned. You ask why the Democratic Party favored an opportunity for the soldier to vote at the last election. Why did the Republicans in Congress oppose it? Both parties were running true to form. The Democratic Party was liberal. The Republican Party was and is reactionary. New conditions require consideration from time to time. There must be changes. There must be progress. There must be a party capable of going forward. We must not always fly backward. The Democratic Party still remains the party which identifies itself with the people, has confidence in them, trusts their motives, and cherishes and considers them. This underlying principle of the Republican Party largely explains the fact that only three opponents of the Democratic Party from the days of the adoption of the Constitution have ever been elected to a second term to the presidency. Only one of those three, Ulysses S. Grant, has ever served two full terms in the presidency. The history of our Nation has little of which to be proud from the administration of Ulysses S. Grant. In view of these facts, it is entirely understandable that the Republican Party favors a one-term amendment to the Constitution with reference to the election of Presidents. The Nation, as well as their own party, has usually been tired of their Presidents at or before the ending of one term.

A short time ago President Truman set out the principles of his administration, and of the party he represents. On January 21 last in a message to the Senate, he mentioned 21 objectives of the national administration.

There are those who believe that there is no distinction between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. This cleavage between the two parties is so distinct and so well known that anyone who is at all familiar with the names and the principles represented by the members of the two parties can sit in the Senate and tell while the roll is being called how the Senators will vote, and they will make few errors as to any bill involving property rights or human rights. There is a fundamental difference between the viewpoint of a Republican and the viewpoint of a Democrat. The viewpoint of a Republican is one built around the theory of government for business and property. The Democratic Party is built around the principle of human rights, and not property rights. A person with Democratic principles cannot be confused with one who has Republican principles. When the President included in his 21 recommendations 1 for full employment, the Democratic Party generally favored it, and the Republican Party generally opposed it. It was passed by the Senate, and emasculated in the House of Representatives. The Republican Party is still the party that fears and distrusts the people, and wishes to draw all powers from them. The Republican Party opposes liberal legislation. The Democratic Party favors it. The President recommended legislation installing a health and medical-care program. This is generally favored by Democratic legislators, and generally opposed by Republicans. Democrats generally favor the Federal-aid-to-education bill, including one for school lunches. The Republican organization in the Senate opposed the school-lunch bill, and attempted to reduce the appropriation from $100,000,000 to $57,000,000. One of their leaders made a determined fight to reduce the amount that would be paid out for poor children in order that they might have sufficient nourishment to carry into their adult life strong bodies and strong minds. The party of Jefferson favored this sort of aid to the people, and a great many of the party of Hamilton opposed it. President Truman advocated legislation providing an adequate salary scale for all employees in all branches of the Government. This will undoubtedly be opposed by the Republican organization.

In Chicago, in December of last year, members of the Republican Party met and attempted to set out the principles upon which that party should make its appeal to the electorate of the United States for increased power. The Republican platform as written at Chicago was not received with any enthusiasm. The New York Herald Tribune called it "vague where it ought to be specific. It avoids vital national issues." The New York Sun stated that the Republican platform was "a statement of limited usefulness." The Washington Star called it "a masterpiece of evasion." The Washington News called it "a sorry apology for a program * * *. A jumble of vague promises, shabby phrases, glittering generalities, and vacant viewings with alarm." Tom Stokes, Scripps-Howard political commentator stated, "It is a mass of generalities lacking even glitter." Lowell Mellett, commentator, called it "a truly tasteless bit of spinach."

After every war there has been inflation, but this time it has been held in check. After the Revolutionary War, the dollar fell to 33 cents. After the Civil War, it fell to 44 cents. After World War I, it fell to 40 cents. Lacking any strong conviction for which the Republican Party really stands, its representatives in Congress content themselves with abuse of whatever is sponsored by the Democratic Party. Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, calls OPA and price regulations, "dumbells." Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, calls them "square pegs in round holes." Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma, ex-Democrat, calls OPA "the essence of a socialistic state." Representative PHILLIPS, of California, states, "The OPA is using Hitler propaganda methods." When the Republicans obtained a majority of Congress in 1918 during a Democratic administration, controls were quickly abolished and prices hit out for the stratosphere. Rents soared. Living costs rose by June 1920 to 108 percent more than the 1914 level. Clothing went up 200 percent. Rents went up 54 percent; house furnishings, 179 percent; sugar, 300 percent. The Republicans were able to obtain in 1919 and 1920 exactly what they want now—a brief period of runaway prices and high profits. They are willing today to sacrifice economic and business stability in order to gain for themselves unconscionable profits.

But we are told that the country is passing through a terrible slump. The word "strike" has been used in the Republican papers so much that the type is worn out in old-style presses. However, we are told in Washington that there are 52,000,000 people now employed in the United States, which is the highest employment in peacetime ever reached by the American people. In the United States, for the year 1945 as nearly as can be calculated, the income was $161,000,000,000. In 1932, the income of the whole United States was less than $40,000,000,000. For the year 1943, which is the last year accurate figures are available, national income for manufacturing was over $48,000,000,000, and for agriculture over $13,000,000,000. The people of the Nation are in excellent condition from a financial standpoint. A public-opinion poll recently conducted by the Gallup Institute showed that 75 percent of the people favor price control as protection against inflation. Democrats who were polled showed a 3-to-1 majority in favor of controls. Republicans showed a margin of 2 to 1 in favor of controls. In the history of the Nation each depression has been longer and more disastrous than the last. The 1929 stock-market crash was followed by the most disastrous panic in the history of the Nation. There must be no panic to follow the Second World War.

The Democratic administration has not forgotten its duty to veterans, not alone with reference to housing but with reference to cash benefits for disability higher than any other country of the world; certain educational benefits, employment compensation

benefits, and special loan assistance have been made available to the veterans. Medical care for service-connected disability is freely available to all veterans.

Our opponents say that this administration has no foreign policy. For the first time in the history of the world, there is what we all believe to be a reliable organization to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent a repetition of World War I and II. Every step which led to the United Nations organization has been bitterly opposed by the reactionary elements of the Nation. In November last, when the United Nations organization plan was brought before the Senate, a determined effort was made by 16 Republican Senators who joined with Senator Taft, of Ohio, in an attempt to put through amendments which would have emasculated the United Nations organization bill. If the UN should have to come to the Congress of the United States to get permission to put down force, the damage would be done before the prevention could be used. The Republican Party has been dominated by the isolation element in its membership. However, it must be admitted that the Republicans have been consistent in their attitude toward the Roosevelt administration, and toward the Truman administration. They do not consider the merits of any question. If they know that it is suggested or is supported by the Democratic administration, or by the Democrats in Congress, it opposes the suggestion, regardless of merit. This attitude has caused the Republican opposition to have little or no constructive value. If it agrees to any suggestion of the administration, it seems to feel that it has broken its consistent record, and changed its policy of continuous opposition. This attitude of continuing a consistent opposition to every progressive measure will continue this party as a one term, or no term, Presidential party. There are great problems to solve. There are great questions that must be discussed and determined. A party that can take no straightforward position on the great problems of the day cannot gain or retain the confidence of the people. The people still have faith in the bluff-gruff outspoken policy of such leaders as Jackson. General Jackson did not establish the principles of the Democratic Party. Those principles were a part of the man, part of mankind. He attracted to him those who felt and believed as he did. He was imbued with those principles. Others imbued with those principles from that day to this have been followers of the principles with which he was imbued, and which were a part of his and their very lives. As the American people have instinctively and intuitively felt and believed that the Republican Party was not their friend, they have for the same reason and in the same manner believed in the Democratic Party.

The Sensible Approach to Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Sensible Approach to Price Control," delivered by Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, on April 19 last, and broadcast over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. This address is a reply to the talk by Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles on Wednesday, April 17, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, everybody, we in the Congress are intensely interested in sensible and effective price control. We are sincerely grateful to the National Broadcasting Co. for the time which has been allotted to me tonight. Everyone is intensely interested in price control, and the effect which it has on our national economy, and it does tremendously affect our national economy. It has a beneficial effect when sensibly and intelligently administered. It has a serious and detrimental effect when confusion and uncertainty result from its administration.

In discussing the question of price control tonight, I am expressing the opinions of a large majority of the Members of Congress, irrespective of party. Members who represent a large majority of the American people. None are so quick and ready to reflect accurately public sentiment as are the Members of Congress, the direct representatives of the people of America. They are in constant and close contact with the people whom they represent. Their acts and policies are voted on by their constituents every 2 years. They have faith in the intelligence and good judgment of the American people, and when anyone questions the motives of a large majority of the Congress of the United States, he is at the same time impugning the motives of the American people.

This country has become great because the American people can think out their problems and express themselves freely through their elected representatives on all matters. This is the advantage of our American system. Gradually there has grown up a vicious practice on the part of certain individuals who, although we do not like to think it, appear to be influenced by selfish motives. Apparently they want to establish and maintain a system whereby, through propaganda, demagogy, superficiality, and downright dishonesty, the people can be persuaded because of hysteria created by such actions, to respond negatively to representative government, and affirmatively to arguments for regimentation and collectivism, the direct antithesis of our form of government.

Mr. Chester Bowles, lately Price Control Administrator, and now the Administrator of the Office of Economic Stabilization, unfortunately has contributed much to fear and confusion in his public statements and particularly in his broadcast of night before last. Our people have always been able to solve their problems when given the clear facts. It is my desire tonight to contribute to an understanding of the price-control problem by telling you the actual facts in connection with the action taken yesterday and day before yesterday by the House of Representatives. All of these facts are substantiated by the testimony taken by the House Banking and Currency Committee, which conducted the hearings on the price-control bill, and in the debates in the House of Representatives as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 17 and 18. First let me say that at no time did a majority of the House of Representatives give even passing thought to discontinuance of effective and sensible price controls. At no time did more than a very few of the Members give any consideration to the discontinuance of rent controls. Therefore, Mr. Bowles knew at the time of his hysterical statement that there was never for a moment any threat to proper rent controls. He must have known that hours before he took the air.

The bill as passed by the House provides most definitely for the continuance of sensible and effective price and rent controls, Mr. Bowles' arguments to the contrary notwithstanding. As a matter of fact, the action of Congress specifically directs the President, through the Office of Price Administration, to control prices, wages, and rents, and this directive contained in the law is in no wise rescinded by the action taken in the amended price-control extension bill. The House did not, as Mr. Bowles asserts, and as Mr. Paul Porter, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, reiterates, provide for any formula which would weaken the clear intention of the Congress of the United States, that price and rent and wage controls should be continued with sensible and intelligent administration and enforcement.

Distortion or misstatement of this fact in order to arouse hysteria in the public thinking is a grave and dangerous disservice to the Nation. It arouses fear when we need confidence. It promotes disunity when we need unity. It creates national confusion when we need calm comprehension on the part of the people concerning this vast and vital problem. It promotes panic when we need to nurture clear public thinking and national understanding. The earnest men and women who voted the price-control amendments have studied price control just as carefully, they are just as sincere, just as patriotic, just as concerned for their Nation's welfare as Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter possibly can be. Price controls affect Members of Congress and their loved ones just as much as Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter. To distort facts and mislead the people on this matter is, I repeat, a grave and dangerous disservice to the Nation.

When the hearings were being conducted before the House Banking and Currency Committee, that elder statesman, Mr. Bernard Baruch, appeared as a witness. Now, I do not think that Mr. Bowles would care even to attempt to dispel the confidence and esteem in which Mr. Baruch is held by the American people. He has served as consultant, and in other capacities, under Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. He enjoys the confidence and respect of the American people. He has specialized in the fields of economics and sociology. His views are respected the world over. In denouncing the action taken by the House of Representatives, Mr. Bowles is in fact, denouncing much of Mr. Baruch's philosophy. The action of the House was in line almost in its entirety with Mr. Baruch's views. If Mr. Baruch was justified in making statements he did before the House Banking and Currency Committee, then the House of Representatives had to take the action it did in respect to the price control bill.

Let me quote a few of the statements made by Mr. Baruch. On pages 1349 and others, of the committee hearings, he said:

"To those who paid little attention to the OPA and used the black markets during the war, there are now being added many good citizens who are just beginning that practice. If a wise course is not pursued, that practice will be extended. Prices and disrespect for law will mount, and quality of goods and respect for law will decrease."

Parenthetically, let me say that the generally accepted fact is that by far the greater bulk of all the meat and meat products which you buy pass through the black markets. I wish now to quote Mr. Baruch further:

"It cannot be said too often. We must have production to save ourselves and the world. But, if a close-fisted policy squeezes every bit of profit out of industry in order that some segment of society apparently may be advantaged—the Government being the sole judge of this, we will arrive at an economy with our industries nearly all nationalized without a vote of the people—an economic and social revolution of greater proportions than we now realize—one that American labor will rue as much as others."

Again parenthetically, let me suggest that you ponder that warning in connection with your own local community industries. I quote Mr. Baruch again:

"Any type of control should be directed first toward food, clothing, civilian services, housing, and transportation for everyone. If you will give the American people an opportunity to function, not by fear nor yet by favor, and let every segment of society feel that it is not disfavored to the advantage of another, in a few months you will see an amazing change.

"I heard much during the war of an endeavor to protect the little businessman. How can he live under the present schedules? Prices must be set up not for each particular one in the business, but for a whole industry. People will not work without profits.

"To the prophets of evil, I would like to say that I have faith in American institutions and the common sense of the American people. We must close our ears to those who try to turn us to stateism by indirection. We are good-natured people who can be pushed around but only so much. * * *

"* * * I believe the condition of this country is that its potentialities are so huge that if we could get producing in a few months, you would see a change that would astonish everybody. We did so much in the war, we can do at least that—and much more—in peace. That is the reason I say I am willing to increase prices somewhat—and I am swallowing everything, including my Adam's apple, when I advocate the increase in prices now—but I want it done with a firm and wise hand. I want profits, but not profiteering."

Now, the House of Representatives amended the bill in accordance with Mr. Baruch's long-considered doctrines. I will not attempt to review all amendments in detail but I should like to list some of them:

1. Effective price, rent, and wage controls are continued for 9 months, to March 31, 1947. Before that time the Congress can act to continue these controls so long as may then appear desirable.

2. Mr. Bowles talks about what he calls guaranteed profits. No such thing. The amendment upon which his misstatement seems predicated guarantees production, and only permits reasonable profits to make possible that production without private industry having to be socialized under the Government. Again, think of your farmers and community industries. Who of you believes agriculture and business, big or small, can produce for us without reasonable profits?

3. The provision for progressive termination of price controls and subsidies adopted by the House was generally in accordance with an administration-sponsored policy. Subsidies have been costing American taxpayers around $2,000,000,000 a year. Because of them, the national debt has been increased by over $8,000,000,000. We in the Congress feel that it would be reprehensible to compel our veterans during the best years of their lives, and their children after them, to pay huge unnecessary taxes to provide such subsidies even to get production which they, of all people, are so richly entitled to and can get under free enterprise. The House provided for the progressive termination of these subsidies.

The American people should insist that these amendments be kept in the law. They must be enacted if America is going to get back onto its feet agriculturally, industrially, and commercially.

There is carved on the Archives Building here in Washington the statement, "What is past is prologue." We must be sure price control is not made the prologue to a socialized America. Consider Britain, consider France, both gone socialistic—ponder Russia. We must look to past performance to determine what we may expect in the future. Congress provided for efficient price control. Its administration has been terribly at fault. Production, vital to our readjustment to peace, has been paralyzed. Everybody in this country lacks necessary goods and services as a result of inept, bungling, oppressive price controls. Many have believed the objectives being sought were not speedy production of goods and services but subjugation of American business, American agriculture, and American labor to an over-swollen governmental bureaucracy at Washington seeking to perpetuate its power under an entrenched political monopoly; headed for wider controls over the lives and activities of our people. The House, therefore, wrote in specifications by amendments to prevent such a trend, and point our national economy back to our traditional free American enterprise system. Certainly, Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter should be in favor of that policy. Was production being paralyzed?

Why were we not getting hardwood flooring or siding for the construction of veterans' homes? Because OPA in its wisdom set a maximum price on finished flooring, less than the cost of the block from which the hardwood flooring was cut. We are surely not simple or gullible enough to believe that any manufacturer in possession of his senses would go to the expense of cutting the block into hardwood flooring to be sold for a lower price than he could sell the unfinished block.

Shirt manufacturers, who ordinarily would manufacture men's shirt to sell under $3, under OPA regulations and encouragement added a half inch to the length of the collar, put a second button on the sleeve, called it a sport shirt and sold it from $8 to $18.

I could multiply these examples a hundredfold. Where are the refrigerators, radios, automobiles, electrical appliances, men's suits, shirts, underwear, women's dresses, hosiery—thousands of items needed by all, not to mention butter and meat? Where are they? Unproduced today because of oppressive price regulations under Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter. If Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter have not the ability or the desire to administer the Price Control Act as amended, then they should step aside and let someone else do it who is more sympathetic to its purposes and objectives.

Effective price control can be wrecked by incapable or unsympathetic administration. The deficiencies in price control are not the fault of Congress. Congress has given the Administrator every reasonable authority to control prices and get production. If the Price Administrator won't do it, then it becomes the constitutional obligation of Congress to rewrite the rules and more clearly define its intent, in order to safeguard our economy. This the House has done. Under the bill passed by the House, with proper and intelligent administration, we can and should have effective price and rent control, with maximum production assured. The fear should not be that Congress will emasculate price control—the fear should be that our economy, through the misadministration of price control, will not only be emasculated, but destroyed. What Mr. Bowles inferentially says is that we cannot have both price control and adequate production. This a majority in Congress cannot agree to. Now, in essence, what does this amended price control bill actually do, if the Administrators efficiently and sympathetically enforce it? It will assure that price control can be used as an effective block against inflation as it always has been, but at the same time it will make possible and encourage production heretofore paralyzed by faulty administration. It will help stabilize the United States dollar and thereby operate powerfully to aid stability of world currencies and trade. It will assure efficient production under reasonable profits. It will preserve our free economy. It will make millions of new and permanent jobs. It will, in short, return America to the basis of government, industry, agriculture, and labor which in 150 years have given us the highest living levels, wages, working conditions, the most luxuries, the richest culture ever attained by any people on the globe in all history. I am certain all the American people are for that.

The United States must be kept safe, free, sound, solvent, and productive. Only through production and more production can this be done. Only through maximum production can we meet our domestic and foreign demands for food, shelter, and clothing. Only through production and more production can we guarantee full employment and adequate wages for that employment. Only thus can agriculture survive, industry thrive, labor prosper, and liberty live.

Fascism in Argentina and Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and informative address entitled "Fascism in Argentina and Spain," delivered by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury, on April 17 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There was a little item in last Sunday's papers that may have caught your eye as it did mine. It said that the bodies of 200,000 American men killed in action in Europe were to be brought back to the United States for interment in final resting places here.

Why did these men, and other thousands like them, have to die? It was because the world is too small a place for the American democratic way of life, and the concept of slavery, degradation, and war represented by Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito. That is why those men are dead.

Who would think, after a war as terrible as the one just ended, that this lesson could possibly be forgotten by any American—and certainly not by those entrusted with the Nation's foreign policy. On the basis of our present policy toward Spain and Argentina, it is the only conclusion I can reach. This policy is one of appeasement of fascism—the same old appeasement of Munich that brought on this last war, and will bring on another war even more terrible—if we don't get to work and do something about it.

Spain and Argentina are to this day infested with Nazis, and their banks and industries are the secret reservoir of vast sums of Nazi capital.

A little more than a month ago, the State Department made public confidential information which proved that Franco Spain gave aid and comfort to the Axis during the war. In the case of Argentina, there is a whole series of State Department documents covering a period of several years, and ending with the famous blue book on Argentina, published in February of this year. This blue book demonstrates with fact piled upon fact that—and I quote, "Those in control of the Government of the Argentine Republic, from the day of Pearl Harbor to the present moment, have engaged in grave complicity with Nazi Germany." I urge that you buy a copy of this blue book at any book store.

Well, that was last February—2½ months ago. Who was "in control behind the scenes

of the Argentine Republic" in February? Col. Juan Peron and his gang—the self-same individuals who are in control of Argentina today. But today the State Department has a new policy for this Fascist government of Argentina—a policy in direct contradicition to that symbolized by the blue book; a policy of ingratiation; a policy, in one ugly word, of appeasement. In the name of so-called hemispheric solidarity, we are falling all over each other to cultivate Colonel Peron and his henchmen as friends and allies.

Earlier this month the vacant post of American Ambassador to Argentina was filled by the appointment of Mr. George Messersmith. A few days later Secretary of State James Byrnes made public a note which had been sent to the governments of the other American Republics. This note began with a sort of apology for having issued the blue book in the first place and ended with the hope that the present Argentine Government might soon give proof that it had given up its evil ways. Mr. Byrnes also hoped Argentina might be induced to return to the American family of nations and to join in an inter-American pact of mutual defense. Immediately after the publication of this note the United States lifted most of the controls over exports to Argentina.

Between the publication of the blue book in February and the announcement of this new kiss-and-make-up policy in April, had the government of Peron and his gang undergone some cataclysmic change of heart and become democratic? Not at all. An election had been held in something less-than-ideal conditions, and the Fascist dominance of Argentina by the Peron clique had been consolidated. The results of this election are simply the final proof of the colossal failure of our policy toward Fascist Argentina—a policy of vacillation, of fits of indignation never implemented by action, a policy of accepting Argentina's innumerable broken promises with no more than a reproof and a picus hope that she would do better next time.

But no such lesson as this has been drawn by the State Department from Peron's election victory. On the contrary, the elections are now being seized upon as a good excuse to call off the whole fight against Argentine fascism, as an opportune moment to help Peron whitewash himself in the eyes of the world, and to propagate the notion that from here on in any action of ours against Argentina would have to be construed as interference in her internal affairs.

I submit to you that this is the height of dishonesty. Is Peron any less Fascist today than last February? Not in the least. Hitler, too, piously held an election after he became chancelor. Was nazism any more palatable to us after that election than before? And to crown our folly, we now propose to invite Fascist Argentina to join in an inter-American mutual-defense pact. To me, the only hemispheric defense pact that would make any sense, would be one in which all the democratic American Republics were directed against Fascist Argentina.

I do not suggest any such pact; I simply mean to say that where there is fascism, there is the danger of war, and there is fascism in Argentina today. If there was any lesson to be learned from the history of the tragic 30's which gave us the Munich pact, that was it.

As for the lame pretense that action against Argentina or Spain would constitute "interference" in their internal affairs, let me put it this way: If a Nazi-Fascist state like Argentina were situated where Mexico and Cuba are, instead of 5,000 miles away, would we have these same timid inhibitions about so-called interference in her internal affairs? I hardly think so. But in any future war, the 5,000 miles that separate New York from Buenos Aires might be traversed by an Argentine rocket in a matter of minutes—and there is no reason to suppose that these rockets could not carry atomic warheads, manufactured for Colonel Peron by Nazi scientists.

Once we are at war, we do not hesitate to intervene in the internal affairs of enemy states. Must we have war again before we take the necessary steps to purge the world of fascism? If Spain and Argentina were world sources of smallpox, the United States Public Health Service would have put them in quarantine long ago. Why can't the State Department act with similar decision?

The answer, I believe, is that a policy of eliminating fascism runs counter to the deeply ingrained patterns of thought of our State Department and the British Foreign Office.

For today it's reported in the New York Times that Sir Samuel Hoare is in Buenos Aires. He is there ostensibly representing British railroad investments which are said to total $700,000,000. But we know what we can expect from Sir Samuel Hoare, when we remember that he was British Ambassador to Spain—and coauthor of the infamous Hoare-Laval pact.

So much for the moment about Argentina.

I have not had much to say about Franco. We have good reason to believe that the State Department has in its possession an abundance of proof of Spain's Nazi-Fascist character and conduct over and above the documents already made public. At the San Francisco Conference we publicly concurred with the condemnation of Spain by the Mexican delegate; at the Potsdam meeting Spain was openly characterized by Truman, Attlee, and Stalin as a focus of world fascism which had to be destroyed. But this afternoon, when Poland charged before the United Nations Security Council that Franco Spain threatened world peace, here's how we met the issue. Our delegate, Mr. Stettinius, said that the United States Government had always been against the Franco regime. But the United States wanted Franco ousted by the Spanish people. For we did not want to cause suffering for the people of Spain by a renewal of civil war. Well, I don't want to see a renewal of civil war in Spain, either. But I would like to know how the helpless Spanish people can overthrow the tyranny of Franco without outside help—to be specific, without the help of the United States. We must give them that help.

This is something which can be changed if American public opinion will make itself heard on the subject. I believe that action by the United Nations on Franco should be followed immediately by United Nations action on Peron. I believe that the Argentine delegation must be expelled from this world body as one would expel a leper, and permitted to reenter only when a truly democratic regime has been established there.

It is the only way we can guarantee peace in this hemisphere and solidify peace on an international scale. It's the only way we can assure curselves that still another generation will not have to die fighting fascism.

Sveinbjorn Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, one of the great statesmen of America is Judge J. F. T. O'Connor, formerly Comptroller of the Currency under the late President Roosevelt. Mr. O'Connor is now a Federal judge in the State of California with headquarters at Los Angeles. He hails from the State of North Dakota. He is a graduate of our State university. Later he graduated from Yale University and subsequently was a professor of oratory there. He has a very distinguished record of public service.

A few days ago, following the death of a former supreme court justice of my State of North Dakota, Hon. Judge Sveinbjorn Johnson, I telegraphed Judge O'Connor and requested him to prepare a tribute to the memory of Judge Johnson. I now have such tribute in my hands, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF JUDGE SVEINBJORN JOHNSON

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: In response to your telegram of April 2, I am pleased to comply with your suggestion that I prepare a statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, commenting upon the life work of Judge Sveinbjorn Johnson.

Sveinbjorn Johnson came to North Dakota with his parents from Iceland when he was 4 years of age. A great part of his active life was spent in the State of North Dakota. Sveinbjorn and I entered the University of North Dakota in the fall of 1899, enrolling in the preparatory department. This department was similar to the high schools of the State. We remained close friends up to the hour of his passing. We both took active part in the activities of high school and college—we were both rather green timber from the farm—he from Pembina County and I from Grand Forks County. We were members of Pre Gradus Debating Society, and upon reaching college rank we organized Ad Altiora. Each of us won the Palmer diamond medal awarded by the members of Ad Altiora each year—the gift of Mr. A. E. Palmer, one of the leading jewelers of Grand Forks and, of late years, of Glendale, Calif.

Sveinbjorn, after graduation from the University of North Dakota law school, practiced law for a short time in Cavalier, N. Dak., and then came to Grand Forks, N. Dak., and was associated with me in the practice of law from 1913 to 1921, at the same time lecturing in the law school of the university. For 1 year he was a member of the law firm of McIntyre, Burtness & Johnson. He managed my campaign for the governorship in 1920. In 1921, at Devils Lake, N. Dak., I nominated Sveinbjorn Johnson for attorney general of the State and also nominated R. A. Nestos for Governor—the only two nominations made at that convention—and both were elected. I had been defeated for Governor the previous year. The change of one vote in each precinct of the State would have given me the election. This very narrow margin, together with the division in the ranks of the opposition, encouraged those who opposed the State administration at that time to hold a recall election; the governor was recalled and the attorney general and commissioner of labor and agriculture, and the three men nominated at the Devils Lake convention were elected.

Sveinbjorn was elected justice of the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota for a 6-year term commencing in 1922, but he resigned in 1926 to become legal adviser and professor of law at the University of Illinois. He performed outstanding work,

carrying several cases in which the university was interested, to the Supreme Court of the United States.

He was appointed by President Hoover a member of the American Commission to Iceland in June 1930 to represent the United States at the parliamentary millennial, at which time he delivered the principal address on behalf of the United States and presented a statue of Leif Ericson to Iceland, pursuant to a resolution of Congress.

During the banking crisis of 1933 I appointed Sveinbjorn Johnson special counsel in the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, where he assisted in the reorganization of unlicensed banks in the Fourth Federal Reserve District, directing this work from Pittsburgh, and the following summer he was again called to assist in the organization of unlicensed national banks.

From 1935 to 1942 he served as Director of the Office of Government Reports for Illinois, having been appointed to this post by the Honorable Frank Walker. He was a member of the American, North Dakota, and Illinois Bar Associations, the Academy of Political Science, the Bokmentafjelag, Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Sigma Rho, Phi Delta Theta, Gamma Eta Gamma, Pi Gamma Mu, Scabbard and Blade, and he was decorated Knight of the Order of the Falcon by the King of Iceland and Denmark in 1939. He was the author of Pioneers of Freedom and A Story of the Icelanders and the Icelandic Free State, and contributed also to various legal magazines, and was editor of Richards Cases on the Law of Corporations (third edition).

He married Esther Slette in 1917, and their children were Helen Barbara, deceased, and Paul Sveinbjorn, a captain in the present war, who made an enviable record.

Sveinbjorn Johnson was another illustration of the opportunities that unfold in this country to those who come to our shores from other lands. His splendid service as attorney general, and as a member of the supreme court, and as legislative counsel drafting many important bills, in the State of North Dakota, and as counsel for the University of Illinois, is a record of outstanding service, unblemished in any manner. North Dakota suffered a great loss when he accepted a professorship at the University of Illinois. In that State he won high praise as a professor and a public servant. Resigning this post to accept the nomination of his party for attorney general of Illinois, he made another sacrifice, which was characteristic of his entire career. At the time of his death he was engaged in active practice of law in Chcago with Charles F. Short, Jr. As a practitioner, in just a few years he had won high recognition before the great bar of Chicago, and was engaged in much important litigation.

Sveinbjorn Johnson was, in every sense, a self-made man. He was always a hard worker, applying himself with great energy and ability to every task assigned to him.

Our close association at the university and later in the practice of law for 8 years enabled me to know his fine character, his unselfishness, his devotion to high principles, and his thoroughly sound progressive ideas. When we terminated our partnership in law, we looked back over those 8 years with great interest—during that time we had never had a single misunderstanding, and neither of us had ever spoken a sharp word to the other; two men with fullest confidence in each other, two men with a common aim, two men with different ancestry but looking at a common goal and traveling a common road.

I received a letter from Sveinbjorn written February 5, 1946, and it is hard now to believe that this is the last touch I shall have with this great soul. He died at Champaign, Ill., on March 19, 1946. I never knew another man possessed of such great ability and such great modesty. Our country is indebted to Iceland for having given us one of her sons who made so valuable a contribution to our national life. His imagination leaped the boundaries of a nation; his generous heart bled for every people in the world who suffered injustice; his fine mind and his seemingly unlimited energy always responded to the call of humanity.

When a great soul like Sveinbjorn Johnson passes to the Great Beyond, an emptiness is left in the hearts of those who knew and loved him that can never be filled. It seems that a part of us has gone with him to eternity.

He could have filled any position in our Nation, and would have been an ornament and a valuable member of the Supreme Court of the United States; he would have been outstanding as a Member of our Congress.

In closing, I must again make reference to your telegraphic request. You were of a different political faith in North Dakota, yet the generous instinct of your heart has found its expression in this request. It is grand to know that men can oppose each other in great campaigns in this democracy of ours, and then submerge, or even forget, the bitterness generated in those campaigns. I feel this tribute is due you.

Indeed, I might say the three of us have crossed pathways during all the years since our college days—if recollection serves me correctly, you and Sveinbjorn and I were all products of the University of North Dakota, knew one another as students, battled for causes we felt were just in that State, and I recall when you were attempting to enforce the laws of the State as attorney general, an attempt was made to practically destroy your efforts by greatly reducing the appropriation for your office. As a member of the legislature, after going over the matter with you, I addressed the members of the house and went before the committee, and succeeded in saving most, if not all, of the appropriation that was necessary for the continuation of your work as attorney general.

Since taking my place on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, I have given little thought to those things which memory brings forth in this modest and inadequate tribute to the memory of Sveinbjorn Johnson. As I sit in the quiet of my chambers, it is extremely difficult for me to believe that so many years have passed and so many friends have gone, but it is consoling to know that men like yourself, busy with legislative matters, can stop to pay tribute to a truly great American.

With every good wish, I am

Cordially yours,

J. F. T. O'CONNOR.

Congressional Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "La Follette Resolution," published in the Washington Post of April 21, 1946. The editorial deals with the reorganization of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA FOLLETTE RESOLUTION

What is delaying the congressional reorganization movement? To our way of thinking the enactment of legislation to carry out the recommendations of the La Follette-Monroney committee is an obligation of the utmost urgency. In the long run it may prove more significant and momentous than any other act by the present Congress. For what is sought is nothing less than an overhauling of our national policy-making system to bring it abreast of the great new responsibilities that have come to it. Obviously the reaction of Congress to this undertaking will profoundly affect its ability to legislate in the public interest—even the ability of American democracy to survive in an age of infinite complexity.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress made its report 6 weeks ago. It was widely and warmly praised. We get the impression that nothing Congress could do in the weeks ahead would be more heartily indorsed by the public than ungrudging acceptance of the reforms proposed in this report. Surely Congress ought to take advantage of this floodtide of public support to put its house in order. But days stretch into weeks and the good work of the joint committee is not yet in the hands of a group with the authority and understanding required to transform it into legislation.

The first step, of course, is to approve Senator LA FOLLETTE's resolution to create a special six-man committee with authority to consider and report out legislation for effective organization of Congress. It may seem strange that Senator LA FOLLETTE, the advocate of drastic reduction in the number of committees of Congress and elimination of special committees, should be seeking a special committee to effectuate his purpose in this instance. But that seems to be the only feasible way of achieving the suggested reforms. We understand that a bill to carry out the joint committee proposals has already been drafted. But a special group of experts is needed to get that measure onto the Senate floor in proper shape. The Senate should not hesitate to revamp its study committee into an action committee.

It is not a question of taking a job away from any standing committee, for no regular committee has the background for dealing with this legislation. Rather it is a question of entrusting a legislative task to the group of Senators who are best qualified to deal with it. To give this assignment to any other group would be an exhibition of the gross inefficiency in Congress which the joint committee's report exposes. The important thing is to get the new system into operation. Congress has urgent need of the expert assistance proposed. Policy committees in both houses are in great demand to facilitate the making and enactment of a joint Presidential-congressional program.

To be sure, there are some reforms for which the committee did not speak, such as the elimination of seniority as the test of committee leadership. But its positive recommendations are thoughtful, practicable and far-reaching. They go as far as a congressional committee can be expected to go in one jump. We are thoroughly convinced that the best course is to get on with the business of putting these approved changes into effect with the least possible delay.

St. Lawrence Waterway Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "St. Lawrence power demand seen as heavy," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 20, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE POWER DEMAND SEEN AS HEAVY—FPC ESTIMATES CALL FOR UNITED STATES PORTION OF ENERGY WILL TOP POSSIBLE SUPPLY

Demand for power in the area within transmission distance of the hydroelectric developments planned under the St. Lawrence waterway development program will represent more energy than would be available from the United States portion of power developed by the project, according to a study of the generating capacity, cost, and marketability of power from the proposed new source by the Federal Power Commission.

The report, which has just become available here, was prepared by the FPC's Bureau of Power and was submitted to the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during recent hearings on the waterway program. It differs from reports made available earlier in which figures on power arising from the Niagara Falls redevelopment were combined with those on the St. Lawrence plan.

The report points out that a total of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric power would be available from the powerhouse at Barnhart Island, on the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, 1,100,000 of which would go to the United States, for distribution in the industrial area of New England, excluding Maine, all of New York State, northeastern Pennsylvania, and portions of New Jersey. This is equivalent to a generating capacity of 940,500 kilowatts.

This power could be manufactured and distributed at costs ranging between 1.66 mills a kilowatt-hour, delivered, at Oswego, N. Y., and 2.61 mills at Providence, R. I., Somerset, Mass., or North Weymouth, Mass. By comparison, the report says, steam-electric power production, based on 1944 cost figures, cost 4.71 mills at Oswego, and 6.52, 6.58, and 7.04 mills in the other localities.

The report states that wartime capacity additions in this area did not keep pace with normal peacetime requirements, amounts of power needed for wartime operations having been obtained through diversions of water at Niagara Falls, imports of power from Canada, and imports from other regions through pooling interconnections. The assured capacity that could be depended upon to carry the load in the area, after reserve allowances to maintain service in December 1945, was 6,363,077 kilowatts, while the estimated peak demand was 6,461,020 kilowatts, leaving a deficit of 97,943 kilowatts, it declares.

Opposition by United Federal Workers of America to American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Party Line," published in today's Washington Evening Star.

The editorial discusses the rather amazing spectacle of an organization of Federal employees banded together in a union which does not attack the Government on any ground of compensation or working conditions, but adopts the Communist Daily Worker's party line in denouncing our Government as being imperialistic in our dealings with the rest of the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PARTY LINE

It is to be expected that a union, even a union of Federal workers, would seek to attract new members by attacking the working standards of the employer, and this despite the fact that the employer happens to be the Government. But when this same union of Federal employees attacks the employer's foreign policies, and uses as its text a theme which could have been lifted bodily from the Communist Daily Worker, it is time to ask whether the employer should sanction or in any way recognize such a union.

The United Federal Workers of America, CIO, are meeting in Atlantic City, and have voted there to merge with the CIO State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, resulting in a probable total membership of something less than 100,000.

This means that the new organization has a strength that is not inconsequential, and lends added significance to the charge, contained in a report submitted by the UFWA officers, that the Truman administration as well as Congress "is actually carrying out a program of aggressive imperialism in foreign affairs and of attacking labor and lowering living standards at home."

Such an accusation is the rankest sort of nonsense, but it faithfully echoes the Communist Party line. And if it could be assumed that it has the endorsement of upward of 100,000 Federal, State, county, and municipal employees, there would be no escaping the conclusion that the Communists are indeed strongly intrenched in this country's governmental structure. It is to be hoped that the views of the UFWA officers are not representative of the views of its members, yet it seems clear enough that, in any event, this merged governmental union will bear close watching.

Priorities to Veterans and Schools in Purchase of Surplus Electronics Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week Congress passed and sent to the White House Senate bill 1757 to grant a higher priority to veterans in the purchase of surplus property.

It remains to be seen whether the will and intent of Congress in passing this law will be fulfilled any more than the will and intent of Congress have been fulfilled with regard to veterans' and schools' priorities in buying surplus under the original surplus property law.

I invite attention to my correspondence with General Gregory, of the War Assets Administration, regarding the failure of WAA to supply veterans and schools with surplus electronics equipment which they desire. I have commented upon this matter on the floor of the Senate on several occasions, including April 2 and April 9.

I should now like to introduce into the RECORD some correspondence between the distinguished president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Karl T. Compton, and Mr. W. Stuart Symington, former Surplus Property Administrator, regarding this crucial matter of surplus electronics equipment for schools. At the present time I am awaiting a reply from General Gregory in response to my latest communication to him on this subject, and particularly with regard to my suggestions for the overhauling of the surplus disposal machinery so that the Nation's ex-servicemen and their educational institutions get the fair break in buying surplus which Congress intended for them.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that this correspondence between Dr. Compton and Mr. Symington be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
March 23, 1946.

Mr. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Surplus Property Administrator,
War Assets Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

Re Surplus electronic equipment for educational institutions.

DEAR MR. SYMINGTON: It has come to my attention, through the committee on education of the Institute of Radio Engineers and a United States Office of Education Advisory Committee on Surplus Property Utilization, that the schools and colleges of the country thus far have not succeeded in receiving any significant amounts of surplus Government electronic equipment notwithstanding the fact that over $130,000,000 worth of communication and radar equipment and components already have been declared surplus. Their only success has been dependent on finding a jobber who happens to have what they want—a rare circumstance—and paying the jobber's profit price. This is not what was intended in the regulations issued by the Surplus Property Administration. The matter is critically urgent for the following reasons:

Owing to circumstances created by the war our schools and colleges now need substantial quantities of electronc apparatus and parts. Educational laboratory equipment worn out through intensive use in war training programs must be replaced; new apparatus must be provided to keep instruction abreast of wartime technical advances; and in many cases facilities must be greatly enlarged to meet adequately the growing postwar demands for instruction and student research.

This is extremely urgent right now because electronics is a glamor subject of study sought by so many returning veteran students, and our institutions are unable without help to get an adequate amount of instructional equipment. It is difficult to see how surplus electronic equipment, as well as many other kinds of surplus property, can be better utilized now for national security and welfare than by making it readily available to our educational institutions.

The United States Office of Education, in cooperation with the War Assets Corpora-

tion and State governments, is endeavoring to establish means for distributing surplus electronic equipment to needy schools and colleges. This move should be supported and expedited in every possible way, for with present disposal methods the schools and colleges are not receiving electronic equipment, and early modification of regulations and procedures must be accomplished if the needs of education are to be served adequately.

Under existing regulations of the Surplus Property Board public and nonprofit educational institutions are entitled to purchase surplus property with a discount of 40 percent from the fair value. Also, under certain conditions property having no commercial value may be donated to schools. Recently there have been a number of disturbing cases in which surplus radio equipment of the kind required by schools has passed into the hands of retail distributors who have sold it to the public at substantial profit.

The armed services and other Government agencies owning electronic equipment can help to improve the present situation:

1. By making promptly available to the United States Office of Education detailed information regarding the kinds and quantities of electronic equipment likely to be declared surplus.

2. By liberalizing their policies governing the donation or loan of surplus electronic equipment to educational institutions.

In the interests of our national welfare, I urge you to do everything within your power to assist our educational institutions in acquiring surplus electronic equipment and components for use in their postwar programs, and especially right now when we are struggling to handle the peak load of returning veterans.

Sincerely yours,

KARL T. COMPTON.

APRIL 8, 1946.

Mr. KARL T. COMPTON,
President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR MR. COMPTON: Thank you for your letter of March 23.

Unfortunately, I am no longer in the surplus picture and therefore, am taking the liberty of sending your letter to Lt. Gen. E. B. Gregory, head of War Assets Administration, who would have authority in this matter.

I want you to know, however, that I believe the future of America depends upon the Government doing everything in its power to help people like yourself, Dr. Draper and Dr. Brown, with whom I was associated before I went into Government, maintain a directive interest in the scientific future of new weapons.

If I can be of any service to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely yours,

W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Assistant Secretary of War for Air.

Tribute to Chief Justice Stone by H. C. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very beautiful eulogy on the late Chief Justice Stone in the form of a poem by Horace C. Carlisle.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF JUSTICE STONE

The serene Supreme Court of the United States
Sits in sackcloth and ashes today;
Her Chief Justice has silently passed through the gates,
At the end of the straight narrow way.
A great scholar, wise statesman, just jurist, true man,
From the earth, which he loved so, is gone;
It would not have been thus had it not been God's plan,
To promote the great Chief Justice Stone.

"Equal justice," vouchsafed, "under law," truly he
Preached and practiced, in his daily life,
And its principles crystalize every decree
That he rendered, in this age of strife.
"Justice, guardian" angel "of liberty," was
His own guardian, which led him on,
In the glorious wake of the Stripes and the Stars—
Every Justice loved Chief Justice Stone.

Every Justice upon the Supreme Court bench must,
In submission, to providence bow,
And pledge renewed allegiance, for "In God We Trust"
Has a stronger significance now,
Since he's called to the bench on the high court above,
By the Great Judge, to serve Him alone,
In the beauty of holiness, justice, and love—
God had need for His Chief Justice Stone.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

British Action With Regard to Trans-Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter published in the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1946. The letter was written by our former colleague, Senator Guy M. Gillette, now president of the American League for a Free Palestine, Inc. I bring this letter to the attention of the Senate since it deals with a subject which we discussed a few days ago, concerning the illegality of Britain's action in separating Palestine and granting independence to a section of that country called Trans-Jordan. Senator Gillette's letter contains a point-by-point confirmation of this assertion.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The editorial discussion in the Star are always eminently fair and instructive. It therefore, was with surprise that I read the statements of your editorial entitled "End of a Mandate," which appeared in the edition of April 1. May I call your attention to the following statement of facts as I believe them to be?

1. By the terms of article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, certain colonies and territories, as a result of World War I, have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the states which formerly governed them and were placed in a mandatory system under the control of the League of Nations. It was asserted that these territories formed a sacred trust of civilization and should be placed by the League under the supervision of mandatories with a degree of authority and control "explicitly defined in each case by the Council."

2. By the terms of the treaty of peace signed by the principal Allied and associated powers with Turkey after World War I, the boundaries of Turkey definitely were established, and the remaining territories of the former Turkish Empire passed to the Allied and associated powers, and from them to the League of Nations.

3. On July 24, 1922, a mandate was granted to Great Britain which came into force September 29, 1923, and which nominated Great Britain as the mandatory for the territory of Palestine, and Great Britain accepted the mandate under its clearly defined terms.

4. The territory of Palestine was defined as territory formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire within "such boundary as may be fixed" by the League of Nations. Article 25 of the mandate specifically referred to the territories lying between the Jordan River and the eastern boundary of Palestine as "ultimately determined" by the League. The territory reportedly established as the free and independent state of Trans-Jordan clearly was included in the Palestine mandate.

5. The only authority which Great Britain has over Palestine derives from the mandate she received from the League of Nations.

6. In article 25 of the mandate for Palestine, the mandatory was authorized "with the consent of the Council of the League to postpone or withhold" application of certain provisions of the mandate as the mandatory might consider inapplicable to the existing local condition and to administer the territory under rules suitable to conditions then existing, provided that no change in administration should be made inconsistent with the provisions of specified articles of the mandate. Great Britain has no authority to terminate her mandate over this portion of Palestine nor to separate it in any way from the territory of Palestine. Even changes in rules for the administration of the area east of the Jordan could be made only with the consent of the Council of the League for postponement or withholding of the application of certain provisions of the mandate.

7. Article 27 of the mandate requires the consent of the League of Nations for any modification of the terms of the mandate.

8. Article 5 of the mandate explicitly provides that the mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestinian territory shall be in any way placed under the control of a foreign power. If the news reports are correct, Great Britain has violated this provision by delivering to a foreign potentate, for the exercise of governmental authority, this portion of Palestine.

9. Under a formal treaty between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain, entered into December 5, 1925, the terms of the mandate for Palestine were set out word for word and consented to by the United States with the definite provision under article 7 of the treaty that no change in the terms of the mandate should be made unless the change shall have been assented to by the United States.

10. According to article 3 of the Anglo-American treaty (referred to in 9 above), "vested American property rights in the

mandated territory shall be respected and in no way impaired." Certainly the amputation of two-thirds of the territory of any country inevitably must impair the opportunities for economic development and hence the value of investments in the residual portion. Large amounts of American capital have gone into the development of Palestine. The separation of Trans-Jordan completely changes the economic and agricultural prospect of the entire territory of Palestine and jeopardizes these American investments. Obviously, American rights have been disregarded in this action of the British Government. The present arbitrary division cuts across the economic and financial backbone of the country and depreciates the value of the capital which was invested by American interests in the past generation. Furthermore, such unilateral disregard of treaty obligations creates a dangerous precedent when one considers the present scope of American investments abroad.

11. The League of Nations, for which Great Britain has been acting as mandatory agent, is in process of effecting its own dissolution. In the United Nations Charter adopted at San Francisco there was set up under chapter XII an international trusteeship system designed to administer certain dependent areas including territories already under mandate. In chapter XII of the charter there appeared the following applicable provisions: (a) Territory shall be placed under trusteeship by trusteeship agreements negotiated by the states directly concerned including the mandatory power in the case of territories now held under mandate, and shall be approved as provided in articles 83 and 85; (b) article 80 provides that nothing in this chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples under the terms of existing international instruments; (c) article 85 provides that in areas not designated as strategic approval of the terms of trusteeship agreements shall be exercised by the General Assembly.

GUY M. GILLETTE,
President, American League for a Free Palestine, Inc.

The Supreme Issue in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Supreme Issue in Spain," by William Henry Chamberlin, which was published in the New York Journal and American on April 20 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPREME ISSUE IN SPAIN

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

There is one issue in connection with the Spanish situation, and only one, which is of supreme importance to the safety and national interests of the United States.

This is whether Moscow-directed Red fascism is to gain a foothold on the shores of the Atlantic and a bridgehead for aggressive anti-American infiltration into the countries of Central and South America.

The points which are often raised in order to obscure or conceal this main issue—such points as the dictatorial character of the Franco regime, or its war record, or the alleged activities of German scientists in Spain—are trivial or irrelevant.

It is to be hoped that the men responsible for the direction of our foreign policy will keep their eyes fixed squarely on the issue of American security, and will refuse to be pushed into action detrimental to American interests by the noisy clamor of groups which often combine extreme hostility to the Franco regime with an extremely tolerant and even enthusiastic attitude toward any dictatorship which is run by Communists.

The sponsorship of the recent proposal to the UN to oust Franco is extremely revealing.

It is nominally that of Dr. Oscar Lange, representative in Washington of the Soviet-dominated puppet regime in Warsaw, which is indignantly and contemptuously repudiated by more than 90 percent of Poles and people of Polish origin in America and elsewhere, who are free to express their opinions.

Dr. Lange is a left-wing Polish Socialist who renounced his Polish citizenship in order to become a United States citizen and more recently forsook his American allegiance in order to become Ambassador of the Moscow-sponsored, Communist-dominated Polish regime.

Everyone who has followed up the United Nations session in New York could observe how eagerly he has played the role of errand boy for the Soviet Ambassador, Andrei Gromyko.

His vote has always been at Gromyko's disposition and when the Soviet envoy staged his walkout from the Council, Lange remained, apparently for observation purposes.

The voice in this latest maneuver may be the voice of Lange but the hand is the hand of Moscow.

It should be noted that the present regime in Poland is about the last government in the world which could plausibly indict another government on the charge of dictatorship.

Reliable independent American correspondents report a hundred thousand inmates of Polish concentration camps. Soviet military authorities control all important decisions.

The Yalta promise of free speech, free press, free elections has remained a dead letter.

Of these two regimes, the Polish and the Spanish, both are ruling by arbitrary methods, and without benefit of American ideas of political and civil liberty.

But it may at least be said of Franco that he is not sitting on foreign bayonets.

Much of the hue-and-cry that has been raised against Franco in this country would be logical only if we were willing to go all out on a crusade against dictatorship everywhere in the world.

There is no convincing evidence that Franco, since the end of the sanguinary civil war, has killed, tortured, or jailed as many people, in proportion to population, as has Stalin in Russia or such Soviet satellite rulers as Tito in Yugoslavia and Bierut in Poland.

Yet there is no proposal to exclude the Soviet Union and its satellite regimes—most of them quite as ruthless as Franco's government in Spain—from membership in the United Nations.

Does it make sense, in morals, logic, or American self-interest, to direct our foreign policy on the assumption that Communist or Communist-controlled dictatorships are admirable, while anti-Communist dictatorships are utterly wicked?

Discriminatory treatment for Franco is sometimes advocated on the ground of his expressions of sympathy with the Axis cause during the war.

But a careful examination of Franco's war record, even in the light of the documents which were released by the State Department a few weeks ago, reveals extremely little positive aid to Germany after America's entrance into the conflict.

Former Ambassador Carlton Hayes, in his excellent book on his wartime mission to Spain, cites repeated instances in which Franco was deliberately unneutral on the United Nations side after the tide of war had turned.

What the Spanish dictator apparently tried to do, and with some skill and success, was to keep his country out of the war.

If this involved some appeasement and some flowery speeches at the time when large German armies were at the Pyrenees, one should not forget that Stalin and Molotov paid Hitler in the same coin during the period of the Soviet-German pact.

It is high time for some officials in Washington to realize that the war is over.

The Polish note to the UN accuses Spain of being a menace to international peace. This is absurd on the face of it.

The Franco regime is politically isolated in an industrially backward country. It could not conceivably launch an aggressive war.

One could only wish that the peace of the world were equally secure against aggression from other quarters.

It has been loosely charged that German scientists are working on atomic research in Spain. The Spanish Government has offered to submit this charge to foreign investigation.

As Spain is not an advanced country in scientific research or in industrial capacity it is highly probable that the hundreds of German atomic scientists who are working on atomic research under Soviet control would be much more worth watching than the few who may be in Spain.

The American attitude toward the Spanish issue should not be determined by emotional like or dislike of the Franco regime. Almost all Americans (a few Communists and fellow travelers being the most conspicuous exceptions) prefer our free institutions to any brand or shade of totalitarianism, whether it be Communist or Fascist.

Most Americans would welcome progress toward democracy and liberalism in Spain, just as they would welcome such an evolution in Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and in the Soviet Union itself.

But the point which our diplomats must never lose sight of is that Spain under Franco is not and cannot be a threat to our security, to our way of life.

It is just one of many modern dictatorships, impotent for aggression outside its own frontiers.

On the other hand, a Soviet-dominated Spain, ruled by Communists behind the familiar false front of a "democratic coalition," would be a deadly threat to European reconstruction, to the vital interests of Great Britain, to the order and security of the American atmosphere.

For such a Spain would not be an isolated dictatorship, but a part of the vast and growing Soviet Red Fascist empire.

This Red empire has already swallowed up by annexation a dozen countries and regions with a population of 25,000,000, and has acquired a dominant position in a dozen others, with a population of 150,000,000.

One need only use a map and a little imagination to realize what a tremendous prize Spain would be for the Red empire.

The Communist movement in France, already strong, would receive a powerful new impetus.

What remained of Europe would be caught in Red pincers from the east and from the west. The British lifeline in the Mediterranean would be cut.

The shipments of gold and foreign currency which have been coming into France from Moscow by air to finance French Communist activities would soon be flowing into Spain.

An assorted variety of international Communist agents, duly provided with Spanish passports certifying them as wine merchants, coffee purchasers, and what-not would soon be flooding South and Central America.

It could, of course, be argued that a non-Communist democratic regime would be a desirable successor to Franco.

But is such a regime to be had for the asking?

Should the United States and Great Britain allow themselves to be duped by this Soviet-inspired Polish-sponsored move into resorting to economic sanctions or armed intervention the result might well be civil war, bloodshed, and chaos in Spain.

The Spanish pendulum would be apt to swing widely from right to left.

Fanatical, well organized, well financed, and strongly backed by their comrades across the French border, the Spanish Communists would seem to stand a strong chance of being the main ultimate winners from a new period of civil disorder in Spain.

And once a Communist-controlled type of dictatorship is clamped down on a country, it is not easy to get rid of.

We should certainly use our diplomatic influence with the Franco government to promote release of political prisoners and other measures which would eliminate its more objectionable repressive features and pave the way for the development of a more representative type of government in the future.

But we would commit a cardinal mistake, and one which we might regret for generations to come, if we helped to bring the Red fascism, which is called communism, right up to our Atlantic frontier.

For it is only this Red brand of totalitarianism that today possesses sufficient military power and industrial resources to represent a genuine threat to world peace.

United States Should Be World's Banker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Should Be World's Banker," written by Ralph W. Page, and published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 27, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD BE WORLD'S BANKER

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—The nature and extent of the rivalry between Russia and the United States is almost wholly obscured by dwelling upon the danger of armed conflict and the war of words over ideologies. The issue is not military strength, and will not be settled by explosives. Neither is it an intellectual debate to be determined by logic and arguments.

It is a world-wide clash of economic systems. The peoples of the world are asked to choose between a socialized collective economy and capitalism, American style.

This contest cannot be decided either by guns or by rhetoric. The populations will be compelled to adopt the system which in fact produces the best—or the quickest—results in terms of food, clothing, shelter, and means of material survival.

It is not hard to demonstrate that private enterprise as developed and practiced in this country provides our own people with incomparable production of wealth and also with personal liberties and cultural standards incompatible with the centralized power and regimentation inherent in the collective system.

But all this is beside the point. The great masses throughout China, India, and the Orient are not concerned with civil liberties. They are in a deadly race with starvation. And in devastated Europe the necessity for organizing to produce a bare subsistence is so imperative that the most practical and immediate means will be embraced, regardless of precedents or theoretical arguments.

In this situation the Soviets have an ace in the hole. They can put a population to work on material resources to produce at once without the aid of machinery or accumulated capital. And they have another appeal. They accept all races as their own equals—and however tyrannical their regime, they release the individuals from the sense of inferiority which is imposed upon them by our Western system.

It has been our wont to meet the expanding influence of this Russian method by ridicule and the assertion that it does not and will not work. Certainly it cannot compete here. But the fact is that it does work to the advantage and satisfaction of rejuvenated millions of Russians, to the envy of untold myriads of their neighbors still in despair.

The difficulty of selling and expanding our capitalist system, with its manifest advantages of personal and political freedom, is that it requires capital. You can't have a capitalistic system without capital. And practically speaking the United States has emerged from the holocaust with all the capital.

Free enterprise cannot operate without credit. We found that out ourselves in 1933. Shut down the banks, and people perforce revert to collectivism in some form.

It follows that if we hope to maintain, not to mention expand, our conception of free enterprise, we have no alternative but to become the bankers of the revival.

The very minimum requirement is support of the capitalist system in the British Commonwealths, France, and China by adequate and liberal loans. It is absurd to exhort people to embrace capitalism and at the same time deny them the only possible means of doing so.

Failure to understand this is resulting in the frantic efforts of our most confirmed devotees of Americanism to insure world-wide increase of socialistic practices and the Russian credo by denying these loans and blocking the flow of capital throughout the world.

Retroactive Pay to Discharged Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, at the request of Mr. Leib of the Amvets, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Civil Service Commission signed by Commissioner Flemming referring to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1946.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
Legislative Director, American Veterans of World War II, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: I have your letter of April 18, 1946, in which you ask me whether "in the case of a civil-service employee, who is discharged for some alleged irregular act on his part and should the findings of the Investigation Board prove his innocence, does he receive any remuneration for his public disgrace? Is his pay retroactive to the time of his discharge?

I assume that you are referring to cases adjudicated by the Commission under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. This section provides that where a permanent or indefinite preference eligible is to be discharged certain procedures must be followed, and if the discharge is effected the preference eligible shall have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission and to make a personal appearance through a designated representative. The section further provides that after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies to the appellant or to his designated representative.

You will note that the section gives the Commission authority to make a finding and recommendation to the employing agency with respect to the action to be taken but contains no provision for the enforcement of the Commission's recommendation or for the payment of salary for the period during which the preference eligible is out of the service.

As to the matter of enforcing its recommendations, the President of the United States, in a letter under date of August 23, 1945, addressed to the heads of executive departments and agencies, indicated his desire that the heads of all departments and agencies arrange to put into effect as promptly as possible the recommendations which the Civil Service Commission makes under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

The President stated that this constitutes another way in which the Federal Government can demonstrate that it intends to live up to both the letter and the spirit of the Veterans' Preference Act.

Concerning the matter of pay for the period during which the employee is out of the service, the Comptroller General had ruled on several occasions that no order can operate retroactively to restore pay for any period of suspension. The Comptroller General stated that a suspended officer or employee is in a nonpay status for the period of suspension whether the order of suspension specifically states that it shall be without pay or is merely silent on the question. The Comptroller General has also ruled that the fact that the charges were disproved and the employee restored to duty does not authorize payment of salary during the period of suspension lawfully made.

The foregoing decisions of the Comptroller General were made long prior to the enactment of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. In connection with appeals under section 14, and restorations as a result of such appeals, the Commission submitted certain questions to the Comptroller General. Under date of March 4, 1946, the Comptroller General replied to the Commission's inquiries, adhering to his former decisions that when an authorized separation from the service has

become an accomplished fact it cannot thereafter be rescinded or set aside by administrative action. The Comptroller General further stated that with respect to appeals under section 14 his former rulings apply and that in the absence of specific statutory authority compensation may not be paid an employee for the period covered by an authorized suspension during which no duty is performed, regardless of whether the employee subsequently is restored to duty, except that, in cases of unjustified suspensions, the annual leave to the credit of the employee at the date of the suspension may be substituted for a corresponding period of the suspension. The Comptroller General also held that when the preference eligible is restored after appeal the restoration must be made as of the date of such restoration and not as of the date of separation.

The Commission has for some time been concerned with the matter of pay where the preference eligible is restored after appeal to the Commission and a finding in his favor. In its sixty-second annual report covering the year 1945, the Commission made recommendation in the following language:

"Where a veteran's appeal of his dismissal is upheld by the Civil Service Commission, and the head of the agency, acting on the recommendation of the Commission, restores the veteran to his position, the head of the agency should have the authority to compensate the veteran for the time lost from work. Also where a veteran or nonveteran employee is suspended by the head of the agency pending action on charges, and the employee is later restored to his position, the head of the agency should have the right to authorize back pay for the time lost."

Section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 provides, among other things, that when a veteran has been dismissed from the service, he may appeal to the Civil Service Commission from such action. In some cases, the complicated nature of the issues involved in an appeal results in unavoidable delays during which time the veteran may be off the pay roll. In our judgment, if the Commission's decision is favorable to the veteran and the head of the agency restores the veteran to his position, the agency should have the authority to compensate the veteran for the time he lost from work during the handling of his appeal.

In cases of suspensions pending action on charges, the head of an agency should have the right to authorize pay for time lost when the employee is to be restored to his position, whether the employee is a veteran or not.

Pending action by Congress, it does not appear that there is any relief in the case of an employee under the circumstances cited in your letter.

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner.

Production of Wheat in Connection With World Food Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of wheat production in connection with the world's food program by Gordon Roth, director of public relations, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening from GTA.

This is an appeal for wheat.

Before we begin our broadcast we want to ask a few simple questions. Maybe some of you can answer them. Do you know how many loaves of bread you can make from 10,000,000 bushels of wheat? Do you know how far they would go in a hungry world? Do you know how many people they would feed and help to keep alive? These answers will never be known, for that much wheat was never shipped, so the loaves of bread were never baked, and the hungry were not fed. That 10,000,000 bushels is how much the United States is behind on its wheat commitments for the first 3 months of this year. That is not to say that the deficit brought on actual starvation. There is no way of knowing whether it did or not, but it did cause a further pathetic cutting down of food for millions of hungry people in Europe and Asia.

There is no use to blink our eyes to the critical situation. The threat of famine already is kindled. It can sweep like a prairie fire over one-half the world. But this is what is encouraging: The lag in wheat shipments abroad does not mean that the race with starvation is lost. Headway is being made. The next 30 to 60 days will decide the race. It is a race against time which has started on the wheat farms of the Northwest and will end in Europe and Asia. It is a race between a hundred million bushels of wheat and starvation.

Wheat is not all that is needed to keep millions of people alive. The United States must send fats to supply calories in concentrated form. The United States must supply evaporated milk and eggs and cheese and even some meat. These foods are all needed, but what is needed most of all and first of all is wheat. When the main purpose is to keep people alive, the first need is always wheat. It can be shipped and stored and rationed to large numbers of people more readily than any other food. It is the one life-saving food that can be obtained in volume. Right now wheat is the major weapon of peace. Every granary and bin is an arsenal. It must be moved to the front lines in a great world offensive against mass starvation.

The Government says that there are 204,000,000 bushels of wheat still on the farms. There is over 100,000,000 bushels still on the farms here in the Northwest. The job, the biggest single job right now, is to get it off the farms and into the elevators and boxcars and to the markets and from there, ready to load into the waiting ships. This is mercy wheat on an errand of mercy. Wheat is the need of half the world today.

Your Farmers Union GTA has put all its people into this drive to get the wheat. The Farmers Union Central Exchange and Farmers Union Livestock are also working. The State Farmers Union groups in Minnesota and North Dakota and South Dakota and Montana are back of the drive. North Dakota already has started a personal farm-to-farm canvass in all of the wheat-producing counties. Not a single bushel of wheat is too little. Every bushel of wheat will go to help save lives.

This letter from Fiorello LaGuardia, the new Director General of UNRRA, tells how serious the need is for wheat. It was sent to Mr. Thatcher, as general manager of Farmers Union GTA, and says: "I want to thank you (and through you, the Farmers Union) for the encouragement given to millions of hungry people throughout the world. The new grain delivery plan will afford full and complete protection to the American farmer. If the wheat is delivered at once it will save (and I can assure you I am not exaggerating, Mr. LaGuardia declares) the lives of a million people who otherwise face death by starvation by the end of May and through June and July. The food in some countries is so low that it does not permit men to work in the mines, in the forests, and in industry. UNRRA is providing subsistence food for 200,000,000 people in Europe and 300,000,000 in China. I know that the American wheat farmer will come through, as he has never failed his country and he has never failed humanity. The wheat delivery plan gives every advantage to the wheat grower. This time the city-slicker speculator cannot horn in (says LaGuardia), and that suits me fine. So I appeal to all God-loving citizens to come to the rescue of hungry people and earn their everlasting gratitude and the blessing of God Almighty."

That is the letter from LaGuardia, the Chief of the world food relief organization, who knows what the Farmers Union organization and cooperatives can do and are doing. It came after a series of emergency conferences in St. Paul last week to explain how serious the need is and to give the details of the wheat-certificate plan to protect the farmer who delivers his wheat now.

Now, what is the wheat-certificate plan and what has it to do with the need for wheat? We explained it briefly last week and have been asked to explain it again this Sunday. The United States Government wheat certificate or wheat-loan plan was offered last February by Mr. Thatcher. It was backed by the farmers union, and the GTA, and other cooperatives, and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, and the trade in general. It was adopted by the Government on April 5 in its present form. Under this plan all the farmer has to do is this: Deliver the wheat now on your farm to the country elevator, just as you always have done. When you turn over your wheat, you get a United States Government wheat certificate. The wheat certificate is the Government's pledge to pay you the prevailing market price for all the wheat you have hauled in on any day you choose to redeem the certificate. The certificate is a contract for sale. The Government's guaranty is that the farmer is protected on any possible price increase on his wheat, up to April 1, 1947, that the farmer wishes to take advantage of. All the farmer has to do to get his cash is to fill out section 2 on the Government certificate the day he wants to redeem the certificate and notify Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government agency, handling the program. GTA is willing to do this for you farmers.

What is the wheat certificate worth? We want to repeat again that the Government wheat certificate is worth exactly what the market price of the wheat is at your local elevator on the day you want to cash the certificate in.

The need is for wheat, but quite frankly a number of farmers are holding their wheat in the hope of a better price. You have been told that wheat prices will go up. Some of you believe, according to your letters, that the price of wheat will go up as much as 50 cents a bushel. Maybe you are right. Maybe it will. But we want to repeat again—GTA does not know. However, GTA does know that under the Government wheat certificate plan, every farmer who hauls in his wheat now is protected. Every farmer is protected against losing out on any possible price increase, whether it is just a couple of cents or 50 cents a bushel, because you can cash in the certificate and get the going market price.

It takes time to do the big job of moving a hundred million bushels of emergency wheat, but it already is starting to move. The key to whether or not this program succeeds is North Dakota. The Government reports that there still is about 65,000,000 bushels on the North Dakota farms. It is too early to tell

you how much wheat is moving, but we can tell you that a lot of it is ready to move, and some of it already has been loaded into boxcars and is on its journey of mercy.

We wish that we had the time to read you some of the telegrams pledging support, telegrams from farmers and co-op elevators, not only in North Dakota, but Minnesota, and South Dakota, and Montana, as well. Some of the promises are for 30,000 and 40,000 and even 50,000 bushels. Others are just around 500 or 1,000 or 2,000 bushels, but these smaller promises are important too. You would be surprised how quickly a thousand bushels here, a thousand over there, a few thousand more on another farm, add up to millions of bushels. We do not have the time to read these telegrams to you but we want you to see them. A lot of them, nearly a whole newspaper page full of them, are being printed in the special wheat extra of the Farmers Union Herald which goes to press tomorrow. You will want to read your copy from front to back when you get it this week. Nearly 250,000 copies of this issue of the Herald have been printed. Just about every farmer will get one.

This edition of the Herald also contains a lot of information about the wheat certificate plan. You should read it and study it. There is also a copy of the United States Government wheat certificate, exactly the same thing that elevator managers have for you to fill out when you haul in your wheat. You should study the certificate. It is simple and easy to understand. It protects you. Do you understand what the plan is all about? Do not be afraid to ask questions about it. Get all the answers, and when you understand the whole program, and what every bushel of wheat means in terms of human lives, you will want to do your part.

Down in Washington somebody told the President that getting this wheat is the biggest job of building good will and helping the people of all time. The famine that faces other lands has brought all of us face to face with the biggest job of doing the right thing and the decent thing and being rewarded for our humanitarian efforts. Not only the lives of millions of people, but the future security of all of us—every one of us in the world—is involved in getting wheat and food. To save lives and to strengthen the hope for a lasting peace are the reward.

Now, when we talk about these things, we know that the big job will not be done in New York, or Washington, or the Twin Cities. The real job can only be done by you folks at home. It can only be done at the grass roots. It can only be done by people who take the time and effort to go out and tell the story. It can only be done by farmers who have the wheat. Washington and New York are thousands of miles from where the wheat is. Chicago and the Twin Cities and Duluth are hundreds of miles from where the wheat is. The wheat is on your farm.

We want to repeat what LaGuardia and Thatcher and Government officials in Washington all recognize. We feel that we must repeat to you what these men have said, men whose job it is to get the wheat. They know that to do the job they need the 100 percent backing of people out on the farms. They said: "We are helpless unless every farmer understands how serious the need is. The farmers are the only ones who can make this drive work."

The big job must be done in every county and township and local community, done by people like you, done by people who will go out and see that every bushel of wheat that can be scraped together is hauled in to the local elevator now. This is the planting season and there is work to be done in the field. There are always a thousand different chores on a farm, but the appeal of millions of people is that you do find time to give them a helping hand. They will not forget.

How many loaves of bread will a hundred million bushels of wheat make? How many lives will a hundred million bushels of wheat save? Let the people of the world give us the answer. Their survival is at stake. The dead can never answer, but the living will know and understand and tell the story.

This appeal for wheat comes from thousands of farmers who make these broadcasts possible. So when you haul your wheat they ask you to remember that GTA is the co-op way.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Action on America's No. 1 Need," written by me, and published in the Progressive for Monday, April 22.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION ON AMERICA'S NO. 1 NEED

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

Housing for veterans is the No. 1 job in America today. It is a big job that requires immediate action—not words, alibis, or explanations.

This is one problem where the solution is obvious. Everyone agrees to the policy: "Build as many houses and dwelling units during the next few years as our economy is capable of building. Cut all the red tape and the financial and economic hindrances to actual construction."

Putting this policy into effect is 99 percent of the job. In broad legislative strokes Congress is signing approval. Tremendous powers are being delegated to the executive branch of the Government insofar as the emergency housing program is concerned. Whether or not we get housing on the scale we want it—whether or not the plans are drafted, the materials supplied, the lumber cut, the bricks laid, the concrete poured—will depend squarely now on those who are designated to administer the program.

The construction industry has been insisting—not without some justification—that bureaucratic bungling is hampering new construction, especially with regard to pricing policies on certain building materials.

Congress cannot administer production and pricing programs; effective legislation cannot be written which will take the place of rules and regulations which an administrator must issue periodically. But Congress can insist on the prompt handling of complaints and should insist on reviewing from time to time any major matters of administration.

The men and women returning from the hell of war are in no mood to accept, and should not be required to accept, any variety of civilian fox holes—the converted garages, chicken coops, and other disreputable dwelling places which have been featured in the press in dramatizing the severe housing shortage existing throughout the country.

The veteran does not underestimate the job to be done. But he does know that he was assigned a near-impossible job on the battlefield. He did it. Now it should be turn-about for his benefit, by Government, the building industry, and our entire economy.

The over-all housing program with which Congress has been struggling for many months includes a long-range program as well as several emergency programs. Immediate housing for the veterans is the most urgent problem. Yet, it is only part of a larger program involving nonveterans, rural housing, and subsidized low-rent housing for the very lowest income groups. It also involves various schemes to provide financing and encourage private capital to enter this field.

According to the best estimates, it will take an investment of at least $70,000,000,000 in the next 10 years for conservative new requirements and minimum housing repairs. We will have to build more than 12,000,000 housing units in the next 10 years to catch up on accumulated demands.

Why, you may ask, do we have this sudden housing pressure now? Is it due to the war? The answer is: Partially. The long-range housing problem goes back for 20 years, not just the war years. Not since 1925 have we built enough homes in any one year for normal demand.

The economic depression of the 1930's and the war years tended to camouflage the situation. Families who would normally live separately tended to double-up or triple-up in accommodations intended for a single family. In depression years it was because of the economic necessity of "stretching" available income. In wartime, it was either for the same reason, when the breadwinner of the family had a much reduced income in the armed services, or simply for the reason that some broken families found it less lonely or more convenient to live together.

Now, with the return of millions of veterans, most of whom are anxious to establish or reestablish their own homes, in contrast to the rigid communal life in the armed services, we have a terrific housing pressure that is everywhere evident, and is becoming worse. Spot checks indicate that more than one-third of the married veterans are finding it necessary for lack of available housing facilities to double up with other families when they are discharged.

According to official estimates, about 1,200,000 families were living in doubled-up accommodations at the beginning of this year. Of course, many of these would continue to live this way even with a surplus of housing, because they simply cannot afford separate housing. But here is a fact that will make the prospective apartment or home-hunter cringe: even with the complete realization of the ambitious Wyatt program—which is considered fantastic by some—about 4,000,000 families will be living under conditions of doubling up at the end of 1947.

In other words, under the most favorable conditions in the construction industry, the pinch of housing can be expected to become steadily worse for many months to come. Barring a serious depression or other economic dislocation which drastically alters the current demand for housing, no substantial reduction in housing pressures can be anticipated until well into 1948.

The deficit in number of housing units is only half of this gloomy picture. The other disheartening facts concern the quality of existing units.

Almost one-fourth of all our dwelling units are more than 40 years old. Obviously, age of housing is not necessarily a sign of disrepair. But it can be pointed out that the housing census in 1940 showed then about 6,500,000 dwelling units needed major repairs. Almost 10,000,000 other units were deficient with respect to modern housing standards in that they failed to have running water or essential plumbing facilities.

It is true that many of these are farm homes, where a special condition prevails. But even excluding all farm homes from consideration, it is an appalling fact that almost 40 percent of all nonfarm units that require major repairs or are substandard.

Such a miserable condition simply does not square with American genius for production and construction. What is being done to improve the situation?

Some people contend that the private builders can handle the situation without any governmental housing program. To the credit of private builders, it should be pointed out that they have expanded substantially, approximately doubling the rate of building of homes that existed 6 months ago. Last month private builders spent about $188,000,000 for new housing and $37,000,000 for additions, alterations, and repairs. This is an excellent record in the face of some of the material shortages that have plagued the industry, but it is only one-fourth of the rate that must be reached if the Wyatt program is to be attained.

The Wyatt program contemplates about 1,200,000 units for 1946 and 1,500,000 units for 1947. The figures are made to appear larger than they actually are by expressing the numbers in terms of housing units on which construction will be started in each of these years. Actually, at least 400,000 of these units will still be incomplete at the end of 1947. If these schedules are met, it will mean a rate of construction in 1946 about 50 percent greater than the all-time peak reached in 1925. At present price levels, the program will involve an expenditure for new housing alone of almost $10,000,000,000.

Statistics in the millions and billions may not mean much to some readers. For the reader who likes his facts in down-to-earth comparisons—the proposed 2-year Wyatt program would provide enough dwelling units to house roughly the equivalent of three cities, each the size of Chicago.

The Wyatt program hopes to accelerate home building by placing emphasis on:

1. Channeling construction into proper channels. By use of emergency powers delegated by Congress, less essential construction would be retarded in favor of home building.

2. Providing a greater supply of building materials. The Wyatt program proposes to use price adjustments but also places great reliance in premium payments to bring forth additional production of building materials. The House of Representatives disapproved this part of the program, but the Senate allowed an appropriation of $600,000,000 for this purpose. Undoubtedly the difference between success and failure of this program will depend on how well this part of the program is administered.

3. Getting prefabricated housing into mass production. The Senate approved provisions which will guarantee a minimum mass market for the prefabricators.

4. Obtaining the consent of States and localities in revising obsolete building codes which hamper new types of construction.

5. Obtaining the cooperation of the building industry to insure an adequate managerial and labor supply. Of incidental interest in this connection is the finding of Fortune magazine in its current housing issue that the much-publicized featherbedding in the building industry has been very much overexaggerated.

Two other housing programs under consideration in the Senate last week were buried deep in the middle pages and columns of most newspapers. Actually, in many respects these programs are more important than the Wyatt program. One of these bills was the extension and expansion of the emergency relocation program begun last December under the so-called Mead resolution. This is a program of moving surplus Army, Navy, and war-housing facilities to areas where veterans' housing is most urgent. Colleges and universities, as well as many communities hard pressed for housing, are making good use of these facilities. Congress originally made an appropriation of $190,000,000 after a subcommittee (on which I served as chairman) made a favorable recommendation for the program. Last week the Congress added another $250,000,000 for the same general purpose.

As a long-range housing program, the Senate passed last week a measure introduced jointly by Senators WAGNER, TAFT, and ELLENDER. It is a comprehensive measure on all phases of the housing problem. Although I am not a member of the Banking Committee, I am very much interested in this legislation, and helped to formulate some of the provisions of the bill.

Primarily, the bill is concerned with various governmental financial arrangements that will encourage and enable the construction industry to get together with those desiring housing.

The bill would strengthen and liberalize the operations of the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank System. It provides for the consolidation of national housing agencies, gives financial aid to local communities for participating in housing research and planning, and makes provision for land assembly purchases for slum clearances.

The Wagner-Taft-Ellender bill deals with the long-neglected problems of rural housing, sets up a new system of yield insurance whereby it is hoped to encourage insurance companies and fiduciary institutions to make large investments in housing. By other provisions it seeks to lower the costs of good housing and to obtain the economies of mass production

In addition, the bill has provisions for subsidized low-rent housing for a limited number of families in the very lowest income classes.

The bill contemplates about 12,000,000 new homes in the next 10 years: about 6,000,000 to meet accumulated requirements, and 6,000,000 to replace obsolete dwellings. About 10 percent of the total program in the next 4 years is proposed to be in the category of subsidized low-rent housing. In other words, about 125,000 units per year.

In my opinion, this is a rock-bottom minimum as a national housing program. Housing is a national responsibility that must be adequately recognized. Government must accept the responsibility for setting a minimum standard for housing, just as is done for health and subsistence.

It would be foolhardy not to do so, for the alternative social costs in such factors as reduced national income, direct public assistance, and the attendant costs of crime which can be associated with housing neglect, are infinitely greater. Over-crowded housing is a direct menace to national health.

The solution of the housing problem in the long run is mainly a matter of economics and finance. We have a need for the housing. We have the ability to build. We have to find a way of building homes that are good enough and cheap enough so that prospective buyers and renters can afford them. At the same time, contractors, laborers, and suppliers of building materials must have prices adequate ta keep supplies rolling and houses built.

One of the chief complaints at present by builders is that building supplies are not available at the price ceilings fixed by the OPA. On the other hand, the average price of houses now under construction is reported to be in excess of $7,000.

Spot checks of the financial ability of discharged veterans indicate that only 10 percent can afford to pay $50 or more per month for rent.

Building costs are about 40 percent above the 1935–39 average and we cannot hope to reduce this by any considerable amount unless and until we get into large scale production of housing.

The present emergency situation requires aggressive action to break the bottlenecks of supply; just as we did in war when we surprised the world, and even ourselves, with our rapid expansion of war production industries.

The House and the Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune entitled "The House and the Draft Act":

THE HOUSE AND THE DRAFT ACT

The House of Representatives devoted a 6-hour session on Saturday to a full-dress demonstration of what is wrong with itself, with the Congress as a whole, and to a large extent with the present processes of American government. The medium for this particular demonstration was the House's action upon its own committee bill for the extension of the Draft Act. But the slip-shod irresponsibility thus elaborately exposed goes far beyond the Draft Act, and even beyond the larger complex of questions concerning American foreign and military policy with which it is intimately related. It is running in a dangerous current right through the whole of our national effort to meet the gravest problems of our times

The Representatives, it will readily be granted, have been caught in the most painful way between terrific popular pressures for abandoning the draft (a part of the general pressure for demobilization, for dropping all war controls and war responsibilities and for a headlong flight into the status quo ante) and the onerous responsibilities of the actual future before us. The dilemma is painful; but it is exactly the kind of dilemma which the popular branch of the National Legislature exists to meet and to resolve, by achieving a rational adjustment of the facts to the popular desires. Instead, the House has sought to evade it in a shoddy exhibition of second-rate politics.

It was possible to continue the draft; it was equally possible to revert frankly to the volunteer system, cutting the cloth of our international obligations and influence and our national defense to what that would permit. Eschewing the tremendous difficulties of the latter course, the House Military Affairs Committee, after much travail, finally reported an extension of the draft act in reasonably adequate terms. Thereupon Mr. MAY, the committee chairman, promptly brought in one amendment which would hamstring the draft by deferring 18-year-olds, and Mr. VINSON, the Naval Affairs chairman, brought in another which would eviscerate it by suspending its operation for 5 months and then leaving upon the President the onus of deciding whether it should be resumed at that time, 2½ weeks befor the congressional elections. The House adopted both and presumably will today adopt the bill, which it has thus reduced to a travesty.

This is not legislation; it is simply an evasion of responsibility of the worst sort. It is precisely the kind of thing which backed us, muscle-bound and unprepared, into the disastrous beginning of the war. It is the kind of thing which is now enormously increasing our difficulties of foreign policy, of reconversion, of wage-and-price policy, which is making "slovenly muddle," as one acid critic observes, the "normal climate" of government. In the case of the draft the House is now leaving its own responsibility to the Senate (as it has so often done in the past), and it may be that the Senate will insist upon a more honest facing of this really critical national issue. But the Senate, even

though less completely under the harrow of the elections, has scarcely shown itself a tower of strength on other matters—in the related question of military service reorganization, for one example, it has been vacillating and procrastinating—while beyond the legislative branch the vices of indecision, of meretricious compromise and inability to define clear courses, are spreading through the Federal structure. They are poisonous to effective policy, but they will not be checked unless the Congress, primarily charged with the control of policy, can fulfill its responsibilities.

Newspaper Terms Housing Methods After World War I a Shameful Record—Cites 1930 Collapse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the lessons of history are usually of little profit to succeeding generations because of the short memory of mankind, but within our own lifetime, in the period following World War I, we had an experience with the same type of housing situation that faces us today—experience by which we could profit greatly if we would but pause and look at the record.

I refer to the tragic failure of the business-as-usual methods in meeting the housing crisis that followed World War I. A tremendous back-to-normalcy urge swept the country in those years, logic and reason were pushed aside, and our Nation earned the reward of poverty, depression, and bankruptcy in the mortgage field. It destroyed the savings of hundreds of thousands of our middle-class people.

This lesson, which was written in bold and tragic letters across the history of our country, should drive home to us now the single fact that our Government must take swift and adequate steps to meet our present housing crisis. The President has an answer in his courageous housing plan, which must be energized by legislation if we are to avoid a repetition of the shameful record we made in the postwar 1920's.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a news story by the able financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American, Mr. Robert P. Vanderpoel, because it sets out the plain facts of the World War I housing lesson which we must relearn today:

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor)

A discharged vet, who had been having trouble finding a place to live dropped in at the office this morning and asked us if there was a housing problem following the other war, and if so, how had it been solved. Had private enterprise, he inquired, done the trick, had the Government been called in, or just what had happened?

The youngsters may not know, but old-timers certainly will never forget the record. Unfortunately, it is not one of which we can be proud.

Yes, there was a housing shortage following World War I. It was pretty acute, too. It was not quite as fast an age as the present, and, as far as we know, people did not haunt the undertakers for possible clues for vacancies. But they did tramp the streets, frequently without success, hunting for places to live, and they did double up.

A SHAMEFUL RECORD

Private construction did solve the problem, and the Government was not called in, but the manner in which private business accomplished the job is one of the most shameful pages in its history. It did it by selling several billion dollars' worth of first-mortgage bonds to the thrifty people of America, and probably 90 percent of these bonds went into default. Certainly that was the record in the big cities like Chicago.

The housing shortage was solved not by the building of any great number of homes but by the erecting of a large number of apartment buildings, ranging from two and three flats to the huge structures so well known in this city. They were erected during a period of high cost and frequently under the most slipshod of financial methods.

SURPLUS ALREADY IN 1929

The housing shortage was solved so effectively that even before the market crash in the fall of 1929 there was a surplus of apartments available here in Chicago and generally throughout the country.

The day of reckoning came beginning in 1930 when widows and orphans and just plain Mr. and Mrs. America suddenly awoke to the fact that the first-mortgage real-estate gold bonds which they had bought on the representation of "60 years without a single loss to an investor" were defaulting so rapidly that it became an avalanche. The debacle in real-estate securities served to accentuate the depression that was ushered in with the collapse of the stock market.

SHORT MEMORIES

So today we are once more attempting to solve a housing shortage. This time we are relying more heavily on the Government. There are many of us who do not like the constant encroachment of the Government upon private business, but unless we have very concrete and constructive ideas as to how the matter should be handled we cannot talk too loudly.

Those, for example, who merely say let private business alone and it will do the job, either have short memories or hope that the rest of us have.

Private business did the job the last time, but at such a terrific cost to the very heart of the private enterprise system—the savings of the people—that it is only natural to find the majority of Americans today unwilling to give the private business spokesman a carte blanche order to go ahead.

The International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The International Labor Organization: A Going Concern," by Carter Goodrich, professor of economics at Columbia University, and former chairman of the governing body of the International Labor Organization. The address was delivered at the American Academy of Political and Social Science, at Philadelphia, Pa., on April 5, 1946.

Mr. President, I understand that under the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing material occupying two pages of the RECORD may be printed in the Appendix without a statement of cost. An estimate I have received from the Public Printer indicates that the manuscript submitted herewith will exceed the two printed pages by one-fourth of a page, and, therefore, a statement of cost is necessary. The cost of printing the material is estimated to be $135.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The topic this morning is "the present and the past." The International Labor Organization, on which you have asked me to speak, has a past that stretches back to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. It has a present, and it has a future also. Your program stresses "the importance of background knowledge in building for the future" of international organization. The experience of the ILO is a part of the background relevant to this question, and that is why your committee wished it discussed in this part of the program. But the ILO is part of the foreground also, and that is why I have chosen to refer to it in my title as a going concern.

The justification for this phrase is not far to seek. As we are meeting here today, an American regional conference of the International Labor Organization is in session in Mexico City. The governments, employers, and workers of 18 American nations are represented. Our own Government delegation is headed by Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. The American employers are led by their representative on the governing body of the International Labor Office. The United States workers' delegate is the secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, and his advisers include representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. This is the third American regional conference. Their experience indicates that regional planning may add realism to international efforts for raising the standard of living. It is hoped that these American meetings will serve as a precedent for similar regional conferences in the Far East and in the Near East.

Later this month, at Cleveland on April 23, the first meeting of the Industrial Committee on the Steel Industry will be held. Representatives of the governments, workers, and employers of the principal steel-producing countries will sit down together to consider ways and means of improving the condition of life in their industry. It is, I think, encouraging that this international cooperative effort should be launched in an American steel center so soon after the settlement of the steel strike. The Steel Committee, together with similar committees in six other great international industries, represents a new departure in ILO policy. Their creation was first proposed by Ernest Bevin, now British Foreign Secretary. He based his proposal on what he called the "value of occupational groups." "Let miners meet, whatever their race or language, and they will be bound together by coal and their common interests; let railwaymen meet, or seamen * * * or any of the great occupational groups that enter into international trade. Once they are brought together in a room and have discussed common problems,

the racial distinction sinks into the background and the common interest of their trade rises uppermost."[1]

In May a similar international committee on the metal trades will hold its first meeting, also at Cleveland. Later in the same month, the governing body of the International Labor Office will meet at Montreal to vote the 1947 budget. It will consider a proposal for an increase over the 1946 figure of $3,000,000.

In June, across the continent at Seattle, the International Labor Conference will meet in special session devoted to action on the problems of the maritime industry. The International Seamen's Code, adopted in previous maritime sessions, constitutes one of the major achievements of the organization. The Seattle conference will act on proposals to add to this code nine new conventions or labor treaties setting international standards for the conditions of work of seamen. I will mention only one of these, but one that deals with a matter of real human interest on which I am certain that a definite advance will be registered. That is the proposed convention setting standards for crew accommodations on board ship. Recognizing that the ship is not merely the seafarer's place of employment, it is his home for a very large part of his life, the proposals contain specific minimum standards for the size, arrangement, and facilities of the quarters in which seamen live and sleep.[2] Wartime improvements in American shipbuilding laid the basis for this advance. When ILO action on this point was first proposed, a London newspaper carried the headline "Slum ships must be scuttled."

This report of the current program could be extended, but this is enough to indicate that the ILO is busily at work on specific labor issues. It is alive and vigorous. It is not, as some may have suspected, marking time while waiting settlement of the question of its relations with the United Nations. I hasten to add, however, that everyone concerned with the ILO is most eager for the establishment of fully cooperative relations with the United Nations at the earliest possible date. On this, the International Labor Organization has been clear in its policy and forehanded in its preparations. Here in Philadelphia 2 years ago, even before Dumbarton Oaks, the ILO set up its negotiating delegation to serve in discussions with other international organizations. At London in January 1945 the governing body expressed the desire of the ILO for affiliation with the international organization in process of formation and gave its instructions to the negotiating delegation regarding the terms on which it thought that this affiliation should be based. Representatives of the governing body carried this assurance to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. The Paris Conference by unanimous vote reaffirmed the desire of the ILO for fullest association in the common effort. The negotiating delegation stands ready to act. It consists of three government representatives, three workers, and three employers, together with the chairman of the governing body, Mr. Myrddin-Evans, of the British Ministry of Labor, and Mr. Phelan, the Acting Director of the International Labor Office.

From the side of the United Nations, the San Francisco Charter, as you all know, instructed the Economic and Social Council to make arrangements to bring into association with the United Nations "the various specialized agencies established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities" in economic, social, and related fields. At its first session in January of this year, the Economic and Social Council appointed an 11-man subcommittee to carry out this instruction. It is specifically commissioned to prepare an agreement with the International Labor Organization as well as agreements with the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Monetary Fund, the International Bank, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The two committees—that of the Economic and Social Council and that of the International Labor Organization—are expected to meet together toward the end of May. This is as far as a factual account can go. But since I no longer have any personal responsibility for the course of the negotiations, I will go further and express the confident expectation, first, that an agreement will in fact be reached and, second, that its terms will be such as to enable the International Labor Organization to make its full contribution to the great common effort, while retaining, in the language of the Paris resolution, "the authority essential for the discharge of its responsibilities under the constitution of the Organization and the Declaration of Philadelphia."[3] I hope that this agreement will be reached in time to be ratified at the September meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations and of the International Labor Conference.

The ILO will go forward into the future, no longer as what its original constitution called it, a part of the ensemble of the institutions of the League of Nations, but as a member of the family of organizations of the United Nations. In saying this and in saying it with full confidence, I do not mean to suggest that there are no problems and no difficulties ahead. Far from it. Let me suggest some of the questions that must be faced. That of the relationship with Russia is still unresolved. The ILO has invited the Soviet Union to resume membership. Moreover, the Paris Conference adopted a constitutional amendment to insure that no member of the United Nations could ever be denied admission to the International Labor Organization.[4] Its work will fall short of the fullest effectiveness unless the Soviet Union decides to join or, failing that, adopts an attitude of friendly cooperation. Questions have been raised of the proper division of functions between the ILO on the one hand and the organizations, international and national, of the trade-unions themselves. On this there has been some confusion in the public mind, though I believe that those immediately concerned will find no great difficulty in drawing the line between what can be done by an organization created and financed by governments and charged with specific functions in preparing legislation for adoption by governments and what can be done by organizations which by their very independence of governments have the important function of speaking to them as "the voice of labor." No doubt, also, certain questions of jurisdiction will arise between the ILO and the other specialized intergovernmental organizations or with the Economic and Social Council in its important function of overall coordination, though I am confident that there are no problems here that cannot be successfully met on the basis of good will and intelligence.

The setting and the opportunities for the ILO's work differ from those of the inter-war period. They represent a new challenge to its leadership. It is a challenge which could not be successfully met if the organization's policy were to be too cautious or merely conventional, if the support of governments should become merely perfunctory, if the employers should cease to take an active part, or if workers should cease to give the organization vitality by the demands they make on it. There is no room for complacency. No one who has lived intimately with the work of the ILO can fail to recognize that there have been opportunities missed as well as opportunities taken. No one who is conscious of the problems and needs of labor throughout the world can fail to realize how much remains to be done.

But these, after all, are questions primarily for the International Labor Organization itself. For your purposes this morning, the point is rather to ask what may be learned from the experience of the ILO that may be of use in planning for the future of the United Nations and its related organizations. What factors in the history and the nature of the ILO may be thought of as accounting for its survival in strength and vigor?

Certain of these factors are political in character. The decision of the United States Government to join the organization in 1934 was a fact of capital importance. So is the ILO's war record. In 1940, after the fall of France, John Winant, the director, moved his staff from Geneva in neutral and hard-pressed Switzerland to Montreal, in belligerent Canada. The action was more eloquent than any words. In 1941, before Pearl Harbor, before a majority of the member nations had entered the war, the New York Conference of the ILO declared by unanimous vote that the victory of the free peoples was an indispensable condition of the attainment of the ideals of the organization. This was part of the setting which made it possible for President Roosevelt in 1944 to send to the great International Labor Conference that met in this city a message declaring that the United Nations had no need to extemporize a new organization in the field of the ILO's work. Senator ELBERT THOMAS, in a notable speech made in the Senate last December after his return from the Paris Conference, declared that the ILO's "long history [had] infused it with profound political wisdom." As evidence of this, he referred to "the quiet disbarment of the Argentine workers according to law," to the readmission of Italy to membership in the organization, and to steps taken toward affiliation with the United Nations.[5]

There are, however, three factors of a different order which seem to me important in accounting for the strength of the ILO. The first is, its concern with the questions of everyday life. When there was danger that the Paris Peace Conference would bog down in the job of creating the International Labor Organization, the British delegate, George Barnes, wrote a peremptory letter to Lloyd George. Labor, he said, cares "about getting on with those things that concern the daily life of working folk."[6] These are the things with which the ILO has been concerned since its foundation. They are not spectacular things, but they are human ones. An employment service for finding jobs, the shortening of hours of work, social insurance against the common risks, the prohibition of child labor, vacations with pay, safety on the docks, wages for a ship-wrecked sailor, a fair contract for an African worker brought from his kraal to the gold mines in the Rand—these and similar problems have been the business of the ILO. On each of them, it has prepared detailed agreements, in the form of conventions or labor treaties, embodying minimum standards for adoption by the nations. The terms of these conventions or treaties are hammered out by the government, employer, and worker delegates attending the conference. Adoption requires a two-thirds vote. The conventions themselves

[1] International Labor Office, Official Bulletin, vol. XXVI, No. 2, December 1, 1944, p. 138.

[2] International Labor Office, Crew Accommodation on Board Ship, report III to the twenty-eighth session of the International Labor Conference, 1946. The quotation is from p. 2.

[3] International Labor Office, Official Bulletin, vol. XXVIII, December 15, 1945, pp. 17–18.

[4] Ibid., p. 2.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 12, 1945.

[6] James T. Shotwell, ed., The Origins of the International Labor Organization, vol. I, p. 206.

take effect and attain the force of law only when ratified by the individual nations. All this is the slow process of discussion, compromise, and consent. Sometimes it is exasperatingly slow. Certainly it is incomplete in its results. Yet 67 conventions have been adopted and they have received more than 900 national ratifications. This represents a substantial achievement in the formulation and acceptance of an international labor code. These specific and concrete measures have been the main job of the ILO, but the delegates from many countries who have come together in the annual conferences have discussed these issues in a wide setting of social and economic policy. In recent years these discussions have shown an increasingly clear realization that the raising of specific labor standards depends on general economic progress and on the achievement of international economic cooperation. As the declaration of Philadelphia recognized, "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere."[7]

A second major source of ILO strength lies in its provision for direct and independent representation of employers and workers. To the international labor conference, each nation is entitled to send two government delegates but also one employer and one worker delegate. All delegates have equal status. The employer and worker representatives are free to speak and vote against the spokesmen of their governments, and they frequently exercise that freedom. Similarly, the governing body, or executive committee, has seats for 16 government representatives, but also for 8 workers and 8 employers. These nongovernmental elements are represented in every policy-forming organ of the ILO. This fact has given the organization much of its special character and, I believe, much of its special strength. The presence of employers and workers has helped to keep the terms of the conventions close to industrial realities. Their independence has given to the debates of the conference greater vigor and reality than have been customary in international assemblies. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is not out of place to point out that Ernest Bevin obtained a significant part of his international experience as a workers' delegate to ILO conferences. Participation of workers and employers has provided for the organization continuing interest and support outside of government offices and in the great occupational groups. The system has broadened the base of international cooperation.

A third source of strength is more administrative in character. It lies in the tradition of an active directorship. This tradition was set by the first director, Albert Thomas. Coming to the ILO from the post of French Minister of Munitions, he brought to the work the talents of a great statesman and extraordinary personal vigor and determination. Under the practices he established, the ILO Director presents on behalf of the office a specific recommendation on every item coming before the conference or the governing body. These proposals of course cannot be purely personal; normally, indeed, they are based on careful prior consultation. Nor are they always adopted; the policy-making bodies of the ILO frequently modify them and sometimes reject them with full democratic vigor. Nevertheless, the source of the initiative is of great importance. No meeting of the ILO opens without having before it specific propositions, based on the experience of the permanent staff, into which it can put its teeth. In the League of Nations, by contrast, the implications of the title, secretary-general, were taken somewhat literally, and those who held the office carried over to it a good deal of the tradition of the inconspicuous civil servant. As a result, the initiative for making proposals within the organs of the League rested—at least in form—purely with national representatives despatched to particular meetings. A number of competent observers, including men who worked in the League secretariat as well as officials of the labor office,[8] have agreed that the greater initiative taken by the Directors of the ILO has been an important source of the strength of the organization.

We come then to the immediate question. If these three factors have contributed to the survival of the ILO, can anything from them be used to contribute to the success of the United Nations and the other new organizations? The answers on the three points differ.

The question of administrative initiative is, in my judgment, of distinct relevance. The makers of the new constitutions have shown that they are aware of the problem. The United Nations Charter instructs the Secretary-General to make an annual report to the General Assembly. The Charter further authorizes the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. The proposals put forward by our State Department for an International Trade Organization contain the provision that the Director-General and the Deputy Directors-General should have the authority to initiate proposals for the consideration of any organ of the organization.[9] This is clear recognition of the principle. I urge its importance on all those responsible for the new organizations in these crucial days in which their traditions and working methods are in process of formation.

On the second point, that of nongovernmental representation, the answer is a different one. So far, no one of the new constitutions gives votes to representatives of interest groups. Farmers do not vote, at least as such, in Food and Agriculture. It is not proposed that traders should vote in the International Trade Organization. In this respect the ILO, which was unique in 1919, remains unique in 1946. Perhaps its precedent cannot be followed. In the fields covered by the new specialized agencies, the conflicting interests that must be reconciled are not as neatly paired as are employers and workers in the labor field. At least I have heard no suggestion to pit teachers and pupils against each other in UNESCO or doctors and patients against each other in the proposed International Health Organization. No doubt there are more serious objections to be raised. But if the new specialized organizations do not employ the method of nongovernmental representation—and I am not here to argue that they should—there lies on them a special responsibility to find other ways of bringing representatives of the public and of the great professional and vocational organizations into participation in their work. This much, at least, of the ILO lesson must be taken over. Successful international cooperation—economic, social, cultural—cannot be a matter of government officials alone.

I return to the first point, the strength derived by the ILO from its concern with the questions of daily life. Can this principle be applied in the building of the new organizations? The answer is very clear. It not only can be applied; it has been in fact applied. Those who framed the original plan for the Economic and Social Council intended to create an agency that would serve the practical and everyday needs of mankind. This was in the minds of the delegates at San Francisco when they raised the Economic and Social Council to its place as one of the principal organs of the United Nations. This was the basis of the popular enthusiasm and hope with which that decision was received. This is the common purpose on which the new specialized organizations—for nutrition, for finance, for education, for health, for trade—are being built. For the most part the effective means are largely still to be worked out, but the intent is clear.

The constitution of the ILO declares that lasting peace can be established only on the basis of social justice. The Declaration of Philadelphia says that "the war against want requires * * * continuous and concerted international effort." This is the faith not of the ILO alone but of the entire enterprise of the United Nations. Its most lasting hopes rest in cooperative effort to remove the causes of war by improving the conditions of daily living. To say this is to repeat a commonplace, but it is one which will bear repeating in a week during which our attention and that of the world have inevitably been fixed on the grave and spectacular problem with which the Security Council has dealt.

In the common effort toward this great end, the International Labor Organization will continue to play an honored and an effective, but not an exclusive, part. To this effort, it brings a rich experience and a vigorous tradition.

[7] International Labor Office, Official Bulletin, vol. XXVI, No. 1, 1944, pp. 1–3.

[8] See particularly E. J. Phelan, Yes—and Albert Thomas, and E. F. Ranshofen-Wertheimer, The International Secretariat. Mr. Phelan has been an official of the International Labor Office since it was founded and is now Acting Director. Mr. Ranshofen-Wertheimer was for 10 years a member of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

[9] U. S. Department of State, Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment, November 1945, p. 28.

Statement to League of Women Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of our State has a very commendable custom of calling the candidates of both parties together before a primary election and affording each an opportunity to make any statement he may care to offer in reference to his candidacy.

I present herewith for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement I shall submit in response to the invitation of the league:

STATEMENT BY LOUIS LUDLOW TO THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

I regret very much that a tremendous volume of work will make it impossible for me to attend the meeting for candidates to be held at Cropsey Auditorium on April 26, and I am sending this statement in absentia to be submitted in my behalf by my kind friend, Mrs. Thomas J. Beasley, Jr. The League of Women Voters rates very high in my estimation as an organization that accomplishes a great deal toward the clarification of issues and in giving direction and momentum to sound public thinking. I have the greatest respect for its aims and purposes, and I regard its invitation as it distinct compliment. However, the people of the Eleventh District have given me a job to perform, and with work piled high in front of me, I feel that it is my duty to stay here and attend to it.

When I first ran for Congress in 1928, we candidates for public office traipsed around over Marion County, as is the custom, and there was one bright young candidate for the legislature who received more applause

than all of the rest of us combined. His speech consisted of this one sentence:

"I thought I would come out and show myself to you, and I hope it won't ruin me."

I sincerely hope that this statement submitted by Mrs. Beasley in my behalf will not ruin me. I think I can make known to you in very brief space my conception of the office of Representative in Congress and the kind of service it calls for. In my opinion no finer recognition can come to any man or woman than to be chosen as a Representative of the people in the Congress of the United States. To know that half a million people have placed their confidence in one by electing him to represent them is a challenge to devotion and a never-ceasing inspiration to consecrated effort. To my way of thinking, it is the highest honor of public office.

The office of Representative in Congress is preeminently an office of service, and by that I mean service to all of the people of the district. Under our political systen the first step toward a seat in Congress is nomination by some political party, but when a candidate is elected he becomes the servant, not of a party but of his entire constituency comprising all of the people of his district. If he is a true Representative, he serves all of the people faithfully and well, without the slightest trace of partisan bias and regardless of politics, race, or creed. He becomes the agent of everyone of the half million people in the district in their dealings with their Government and its far-reaching agencies.

The Government of the United States is a vast complicated mechanism. When a problem is presented to the Congressman by a constituent, he should know what contact to make and what lever to pull, as it were, to get results. To serve his constituents practically and efficiently a Congressman should have virtually a lifetime of intimate acquaintanceship with the far-reaching ramifications of the Government. Even ther he finds every day that there is something to be learned in opening new ways of service.

Today, vastly more of our people are in touch with Government through the congressional office than ever before. When I began service in Congress in 1929 as the Representative of Marion County, my outgoing mail was 100 to 200 letters a week. Now, as the Representative of Marion County my outgoing regular mail is 1,400 letters a week and the volume is constantly rising. My telegrams have increased in about the same proportion. In my first years of service I did not receive a long-distance telephone call a week. Now I receive as many as half a dozen or more a day. All of this goes to show how the congressional office has expanded in usefulness, I hope, as well as in volume. Every request that comes to my office gets the most meticulous attention and the best service I can render, whether the constituent is rich or poor and regardless of the magnitude of his problem, for it often happens that what appears to be a little thing to a casual observer may be a great tragedy to the one who presents it.

The next 2 years will be a crucial era—perhaps the most crucial in the history of the world. We are faced with one inescapable alternative. We will lay foundations of world peace that will be broad and strong and everlasting or we will yield to power pressures and misunderstandings that will usher in a third world war, which in this atomic age will mean the utter destruction of civilization. I would like to return to Congress in order that I may be a humble instrument in the establishment of the peace of the world on firm and secure foundations. Our President sounded the rallying cry that should guide every human being of good intentions when he said at Caruthersville, Mo., on October 7, last:

"We can't stand another global war. We can't even have another war unless it is a total war and that would mean the end of our civilization and we know it. We are not going to have that. We are going to accept the Golden Rule and we are going forward to meet the destiny which I think the Almighty God intended us to have, and we are going to be the leaders."

I hope the President's views will prevail and that we will carry the Golden Rule, instead of the atomic bomb, to all the corners of the earth. If all the nations of the world would accept the Golden Rule as the common denominator of their international relations, wars would cease and peace would reign forever.

If I could earn and deserve the title of a Golden Rule Congressman, I would be supremely happy. On the wall of my office is a motto I wrote many years ago. It reads:

"We can do nothing better, we can do nothing finer, we can do nothing grander than to help our fellow mortals over the rough places of life."

In all humility let me say that is the kind of a Congressman I would like to be.

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Taxpayers' Billions to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the obligation of the United States at the present time, for which the taxpayers of this country are responsible, amounts to practically $650,000,000,000. Even if we were to take the debt of $274,000,000,000, which is the amount usually published, the load upon the taxpayers of this country during the years to come would be formidable and cause for the utmost prudence in the expenditure of public funds. With these figures before the taxpayers of the country it is difficult to imagine those who have to meet these obligations favoring a loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain. There are those who have apparently been maneuvered into a position where they have to shout loud and long in favor of the British loan, but to those who have the interest of this country at heart such a move cannot be defended as an act of wisdom.

Merger or Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Merger or Unification," broadcast by the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] over Station WHN, of New York City, on April 25, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be at this microphone, and have the opportunity to speak to you on a very important matter.

A bill has been reported to the Senate for merger of the armed services. I want to discuss this legislation with you, for it is of greater significance to you citizens than it is to either Army or Navy.

I am opposed to this merger bill, Senate 2044, because merger of our armed forces is militaristic, it has been a failure in every country that has it, it can lead to dictatorship and it is against the sound principles of national defense.

I am in favor of maintaining the defenses of our country, and I am in favor of a unified defense system. We had such a unified system in Europe under Eisenhower, in the South Pacific under MacArthur, the Central and North Pacific under Nimitz. I want, as we all do, the Army, Navy, and Air Force to work as a powerful team.

Merger and unification are not synonymous. They do not mean the same thing. I am satisfied that the word "merger" as applied to the War Department's bill S. 2044 is a correct interpretation of the word "merger."

If you will look the word up in your dictionary, you will find that the definition of the word "merger" is, and I quote: "to be, or cause to be swallowed up; to absorb" unquote. That is just what this bill does. It permits the Army to swallow up—to absorb—the Navy and Air Force.

Let us apply the same analysis to the word "unification." Mr. Webster says of unify, and I quote: "To cause to be one; to make into a unit; to unite."

That, I believe, is the thinking, not only of the Navy, but of the great majority of people of this country.

In the interests of national defense, the people of the United States are not going to permit their Navy and their Marines to be "swallowed up," or to be "absorbed" by any political, militaristic organization.

There is no teamwork in merger. Merger will make our defense system a one-man show. It is the opposite of teamwork.

The Navy Department has been pictured to the public as opposing "unification." This is not true: The Navy asked for it—the Army asked for "merger." Both Departments were invited to submit a plan. The Army came through first, with a strictly "military merger" program. It was simply this: Put the Army, Navy, and Air Force into one basket and give it to one man—an Army man—to carry.

The Navy, utilizing civilian experts, presented a comprehensive "unification" plan to integrate and unify all the factors entering into national defense.

Some of the Navy unification program is included in this bill S. 2044. The Army merger plan did not call for "unification" of intelligence, logistics, planning, and research. That part of this bill was taken from the Navy plan. But the Army bill is bad because it retains the militaristic, undemocratic, and wholly inefficient Army proposal of one boss for all the services.

The bill would grant Presidential authority to transfer men and equipment from one branch of the service to another. The Marine Corps could be wiped out over night and transferred bodily and be merged or absorbed in the Infantry; and there is little doubt in my mind that this would be the first thing to happen if S. 2044 was ever permitted to become a law.

As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, I have spoken on the threat to the Navy and Marine Corps in this merger bill. I point out that every country that neglected its Navy or put the

Navy in a subordinate position was—as a result—destroyed: France under Napoleon, Germany under the Kaiser and again under Hitler, and Japan under its army war lords.

But aside from external dangers, there is the threat to our own liberties in magnifying the authority of the military and subordinating civilian control of the armed forces. Yet that is just what this merger bill does.

The great men who founded this country disagreed at first on almost every phase of the new government they were trying to create. They definitely agreed on one thing: that militarism would never be allowed to grow and flourish on these shores.

Indefinite as our military policy has been over the years—it remained historically consistent on this one point—that military considerations must be subordinated to major national aims in securing for our citizens a life of liberty and freedom.

In time of war we have repeatedly demonstrated our ability to meet the maximum needs of a nation in arms. We have conquered foreign military aggression, and then, with the return of peace, we have reclaimed the historic safeguards of a liberty-loving people.

Is it to be different this time? Today the choice lies between the alternatives of liberty or militarism. Which is it to be—unification or merger?

The effect of the Army bill—if not its objective—is the extension of military authority into every aspect of government and every walk of civil life. If it becomes law, the military will become not the servant of government but a large and powerful factor in government, and, what is worse, with the potential power of becoming the government.

Science, labor, industry, education—all will feel the weight of military argument and the long shadow of the military policeman will fall across every threshold in the land.

All of the praiseworthy features of unification are possible under the present form of military establishment. In seeking legislation for merger, this Army proposal creates the military as a thing apart with all power centralized in the person of one man in the Cabinet.

This is the well-defined road to militarism. It is easy to follow, for the descent is plainly marked by the tombstones of once free countries which have preceded us, although the full cycle of events may require 5, 10, or even 50 years. This is the concise formula for the transmutation of free America into militaristic tyranny. We should note it well, and recoil from it. The American people must go on record now rejecting it.

FIRST QUESTION

Question. Senator ROBERTSON, for the purposes of this broadcast I should like to present in my questions some of the viewpoints of those who favor merger of the armed forces. Let's go back to Pearl Harbor—during the hearing on the Pearl Harbor investigation it seemed to be the consensus of opinion that lack of unification in command at Pearl Harbor was largely responsible for the disaster. Isn't that in itself a point in favor of the unification?

Answer. Billy, your question mixes up "merger" with "unification." What happened at Pearl Harbor is an example of the things that can happen under merger, because on the morning of December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, a merger was in reality in effect. It is a fundamental law or rule that when the Navy is in port, the protection of all the ships of that Navy is the responsibility of the Army commander in that area.

But the responsibility for the disaster at Pearl Harbor was not out there in the Central Pacific, but right here in Washington. Somewhere between the State Department—the Executive and the military—the wheels of National Defense and security slipped one or two cogs.

Question. Those who favor the merger point to the war in the Pacific, where General MacArthur was in supreme command of both the Army and Navy forces as an outstanding example of the efficacy of the unification plan. How would you answer that, sir?

Answer. Why limit your question to General MacArthur's command, which, until after the fall of the Philippines, was the Southern-Pacific? Our listeners will readily recall that Admiral Nimitz was supreme commander in the Central Pacific, and that General Eisenhower did a little job of supreme commanding in Europe. Every one of those commanders had under his command, the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force in his particular area. They also had complete units of the British Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as various token units of our other allies. There was never a merger of our Army with our Navy, or either one with the armies or navies of our allies—but there was complete collaboration and unification. That was unity of command, and collaboration and integration of all the necessary services, such as procurement, logistics, and intelligence. There was never a merger. The supreme planning board of all these operations was the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington and London, and in each case the answer to the victory achieved was—teamwork and collaboration—never merger.

Question. Senator ROBERTSON, the Army claims that one of the strongest arguments in favor of merger is the fact that it would save taxpayers millions of dollars through the elimination of duplication of purchases and facilities. What is your view on that?

Answer. Savings come from two sources: First. You can buy less and, second, you can pay less for what you buy. Undoubtedly unification of logistics would save us money, but a common department of procurement and supply has already been agreed to by both the Army and the Navy, and is not an issue. The economies can all be achieved without merger. With the merger one huge military bureaucracy—provided in the bill, would absorb most of, if not all, the savings which unification would have had.

Question. You have said that all of the praiseworthy features, but none of the objectionable features in the War Department's merger bill are obtainable under the present form of military establishment. To what features specifically do you refer?

Answer. To those obvious necessities which grew out of the war just past. The coordination of procurement and logistics, scientific development, the integration of industry and productive power with our overall security program, and the coordination of every possible intelligence-gathering agency in order that never again shall we be caught napping, as we were at Pearl Harbor.

Rather than eliminate the Secretaries of the Army and Navy as members of the President's Cabinet, I would increase the Cabinet by the inclusion of a Secretary of Air. I believe we owe it to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Justice Department, and to the Labor Department, that the Cabinet should have the benefit of the constructive advice and criticism from the civilian heads of each of these services which are responsible for our national defense. This thought is held by many others, and has been included in a bill recently introduced by Senator BRIDGES in the United States Senate.

FINAL QUESTION

Question. Now, another question, Senator. Military might seems to be much more important in other countries than it is in the United States. I mean by that, many other countries, particularly across the waters, have put emphasis on the military. How did powers like Russia, Great Britain, France, and Germany, and Japan operate before the war. Were they under one command or divided?

Answer. Russia had and has, in effect, a merger, because it has no navy to speak of, and is a dictatorship. Only in Great Britain and the United States has the naval service been considered of equal or even of greater importance than the army. In other countries the army war lords have dominated, and the navies of those countries have been merged under army control; with what results we all know.

It is significant that the domination of naval warfare is almost wholly the product of Great Britain and the United States, and it is also significant that the other nations, the nations who have subjugated their navies to army control or merger, have been decisively defeated—largely because of the lack of an adequate navy.

Address by General Eisenhower to American Newspaper Publishers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered in New York City on April 25 by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Kansas, Chief of Staff, at the annual meeting of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American newspaper, as a recorder of national achievements and of the counsel of our country's leaders, is a repository of much wisdom applicable to fundamental problems of today. Tonight, with that thought in mind, I go back 51 years to a New England newspaper reporting an 1895 Memorial Day address by a citizen-soldier whose name is now enrolled emong our immortal great. He said:

"Although the generation born about 1840, and now governing the world, has fought two at least of the greatest wars in history, and has witnessed others, war is out of fashion, and the man who commands the attention of his fellows is the man of wealth. Commerce is the great power.

"We do not save our traditions in this country," he continued. "The regiments whose battleflags were not large enough to hold the names of the battles they had fought vanished with the surrender of Lee, although their memories inherited would have made heroes for a century. It is the more necessary to learn the lesson afresh from perils newly sought, and perhaps it is not vain for us to tell the new generation what we learned in our day, and what we still believe."

WORDS THOSE OF HOLMES

Those are not the words of a saber-rattling brass hat. They were spoken by one of the greatest democratic figures our country has produced, the younger Oliver Wendell Holmes, three times wounded in combat as a captain of infantry, for a generation Justice of the Supreme Court.

What I must commend to you from the quotation in Holmes' stress on our widespread tendency to ignore, in time of peace, the basic military problems of our country.

Intelligent familiarity with our military problems is as essential to good citizenship as is knowledge of public schools or public

finance. In a country with 20,000,000 war veterans—one out of every seven of our population—it should be the normal thing. But objective interest in our own military affairs has never been a peacetime characteristic of our Nation.

In the thirties, for instance, there were people in our country who asserted that Hitler was driving Germany into powerless bankruptcy, who were voluble experts about Japan's complete lack of oil. At the same time they did not know that our own Air Forces often had to suspend training and our own Ground Forces could not hold mechanized maneuvers because of lack of funds for gas and oil.

Today, our generation, just as did Justice Holmes', has witnessed two terrible wars within the span of a single lifetime. Yet, in the shadow of the most costly conflict of all time, we ignore the lessons of our past history and of events daily recorded in the American newspaper. We do not see military problems clearly, since they come into our range of vision only as an irritating distraction to our view of a goal that beckons brightly on the horizon of our hopes—the attainment of universal and enduring peace.

FAIL TO FACE PROBLEM TODAY

That peace, once achieved, will eliminate the need for maintaining military establishments. And so, by wishful conversion of hope into accomplished fact, we refuse to look at the problem of today. We brush aside the long years of future trial and error and experiment and compromise, the solution of problems deep-rooted in human nature, the conquest of historic prejudices and antagonisms, all of which will be necessary to build a world cooperating for peace. An old Latin proverb counsels: "To the stars, through difficulties." It does not deny realism in urging constancy to a vision.

Progress toward universal and enduring peace, as I see it, lies along three roads—organized international cooperation, mutual international understanding, and progressive international disarmament. All must be traveled simultaneously.

The first path, that of organized international cooperation, is under survey by the United Nations. That organization must have our active support, a support as tireless and effective as that which sustained our vast fighting forces through more than 4 years of bitter conflict. The United Nations eventually must guarantee, both to major and small powers, security against unwarranted infringement of national rights—a common cause of war.

In this hemisphere we, with the other independent nations of the Americas, have worked out relationships in which mutual cooperation for the solution of common problems is the keynote. We live by the axiom that arbitration is a more effective means of settling disputes than is war. Years of development have been necessary to attain our present position, and while perfection has not been attained our degree of success is proof of the possibilities on a global scale.

Progress along the second path—mutual international understanding—is of particular significance because each of us, as individuals, can contribute it. My own war experience with numerous Allies convinced me of one fundamental truth in human relations—that mutual knowledge tends to eliminate mutual fear, suspicion, and prejudice, the prolific breeding grounds of dissension and quarrels. Through every means open to us, we must strive for comprehension of the history, the problems, and the aspirations of others, just as we must assist others to gain similar comprehension of ourselves.

HUGE GULF SEPARATES PEOPLES

Vast gulfs of social, economic, and political differences still separate the peoples of the earth. Centuries and generations have gone into their development. We cannot expect to bridge them by wishful thinking or to abolish them in a few conferences.

Again, our own conception of democracy, no matter how earnestly venerated by ourselves, is of little importance to men whose immediate concern is the preservation of physical life. With famine and starvation the lot of half of the world, food is of far more current importance to them than are political ideas. The degree of our sacrifice in feeding the hungry is the degree of our understanding of the world today. And by our conduct toward the hungry now, our country and its institutions will not only be judged tomorrow, but our own progress toward a peaceful world will be measured.

To return to the issue of political understanding: time and again Americans have proved their readiness to fight and die in defense of certain basic principles of life and freedom. Obviously others, adhering to different philosophies, can be quite as ready to fight and die in defense of their convictions. As we make gains in mutual understanding, there will inevitably follow greater mutual tolerance in composing those differences that so often loom importantly in the more material fields of finance, trade, and territory—sources of international conflicts.

A CHALLENGE TO NEWSPAPERS

Here I think it important to remember that we can be firm without being offensive in support of principles that are sacred to us. We must realize that good humor, patience, and tolerance are as important internationally as they are individually. While Lincoln's house could not stand, if divided, we know that two houses differently constructed can exist on the same street. Good neighbors do not pry into the domestic life of each other's families even while they observe common standards of conduct in their daily association. A people whose entire history is steeped in different doctrine may give to such words as democracy and freedom a totally different meaning than do we.

Progress along this path, it seems to me, should be a particular concern of the newspaper world. Here, I think, there is for you gentlemen both an opportunity and a challenge. No single group can do more to facilitate progress along the road of mutual understanding than those who direct the publicity media of the world.

The third path to enduring peace—progressive international disarmament—is the one that engages the soldier's special attention. To believe that uncoordinated disarmament can liberate us from fear of war is a fatuous notion, as the files of the American newspaper bear witness. In World War II, four great nations paid a ghastly price for failure to preserve coordination. For France the result was Hitler's jig in Compiegne Forest. For Britain it was Dunkerque. For Russia it was the long and bloody retreat to Stalingrad. For us it was Bataan and Corregidor.

On the record, uncoordinated disarmament by itself is a treacherous road toward our goal. The caution to be observed is that disarmament is not unbalanced. But this truth does not lessen the importance of insisting upon progressive, universal disarmament. The results will be universally beneficial. First, the resources now poured into organizations whose purposes are essentially negative and sterile will be devoted to the constructive purposes of peace. But more than this—the effect of progress along this path will engender mutual confidence and so promote a more rapid movement along the two others. That progress will, in turn, permit further disarmament. Thus, there will develop a reciprocal effect that will hasten full attainment of the ultimate goal.

SECURITY MEANS READINESS

In the meantime, until the day when the United Nations can guarantee our international security, we ourselves must assure our national security. But our security program, if it is to be a bulwark of democracy, must be the concern of every citizen and not merely the vocation of a small professional group.

National security, as I see it, is a state of organized readiness to meet external aggression by a quick and effective mobilization of public opinion, trained men, proved weapons, and essential industries, integrated into the most efficient instrument of armed defense, and reinforced by the support of every citizen in the measure and form necessary for the preservation of our way of life.

The security establishment comprises all the people, all our enterprises, all our Government if it is to be adequate in this atomic age. But it must so engage their efforts as to permit the full development of every aspect of peaceful life.

The security establishment of our democracy must always remain representative of our way of life. It must not be a belligerent and noisy horde, screaming threats of atomic destruction, disrupting world harmony. It must not attempt to build the country into a warehouse or stock pile for war. Belligerent is the hallmark of insecurity—the secure nation does not need threat to maintain its position.

Moreover, there is no guaranty of security in military machines alone—twice in our lifetime we have broken the most powerful military machine in Europe and, during the latest war, we reduced its Pacific counterpart to a huge but helpless skeleton.

In the final analysis, whether or not the Army can do its part for democracy depends on the citizen's interest in the service and, reciprocally on the Army's understanding of its relations with the citizen. The American newspaper can bridge the gap that has too often separated them in the past.

Upon my return to this country, I was confronted by an emotional surge that was both normal and understandable. Revulsion against war was instantaneous and almost total in its scope. It was natural, and in the view of any thinking man, to be expected. Emotion has its place in the scheme of things—it is a priceless ingredient to action. However, emotion tends always to swing to the extremes of the pendulum—logic and judgment seek to find the mean between them.

PRESS MUST POINT PATH

The newspaper, of course, must reflect the day-to-day attitude—even the emotions—of the people it serves. But equally the newspaper must strive to point out the path of logic. This, the bulk of our own press has never failed to do. It is doing so today. Perhaps emotion is subsiding and we are about to face reality.

During the war you bolstered our armed strength by supporting national unity. Since the victory, the free press of America has exercised its right and its duty to criticize defects discovered in the structure of our military establishment. That was as much a part of your essential function as your wartime effort. You have not permitted us to neglect the problem of human relations within the Army. The War Department is reaffirming by word and action that the discipline required in the military establishment is not an authorization for abuse of personal prerogative. While there must be different degrees of authority, there are no different degrees of justice. All must understand that military rank is a recognition of responsibility and not a ration book of personal privilege.

Just as we must improve human relations within the Army, so we must improve our relations with the citizens we serve. We need continual contact with the social, scientific, and industrial development outside the Army. We must in turn improve our information services to keep the country informed of our problems and our progress. And we must keep ever in mind our role within the

democracy—that our mission is national security—and we must not torture it into a caste of privilege or machine of aggression. But this is not, and has never been, even a remote danger in the United States.

The danger lies, as Justice Holmes said, in the fact that "we do not save our traditions in this country." The dangers of forgetting the lessons of our past increase tremendously. We have seen the frightening speed with which the mechanics of military force become more complicated. The great mobilization of 1917 seems leisurely compared to the efforts we have just been through.

NO TIME TO PREPARE AGAIN

And yet, in this last war, we took 2½ years to begin the offensive in western Europe and more than that to bring our first forces back to the Philippines. Should future threats arise, no one will contend that we shall again have time for comparable preparations. The newspaper can make our people effectively conscious of the lesson they must not again forget.

More specifically, I believe that the newspaper can bring to our people definite understanding of the immediate roles that our security forces must play in establishing and perpetuating the peace.

Today our security responsibilities are of transcendent importance and the national interest demands that every citizen understand their nature. The campaign that engages us now—the campaign to disarm and reorient our late antagonists, to stimulate and hearten millions of hopelessly confused peoples, to stand as a bulwark of lovers of freedom as we understand the word—is the closing action of the war. It is just as essential now to provide the necessary military strength and to distribute those forces properly as it was during the critical days of the shooting war. This is the ad interim force that I have been discussing for the past few months before Congress, the press, and the people. It must be sustained and maintained, and the methods used must be certain of success.

I hold that a resolute, intelligent, and frankly displayed determination to live up to our present position in the world is vital to our current and future welfare. To do less—to look to chance or personal whim for the provision of the necessary strength—is to risk abandonment of those that look to us for influential leadership and, more than this, it is to gamble senselessly with the sacrifices with which military victory was bought.

SECURE UNITED STATES CAN BE EXAMPLE

We of the United States, joined with the other free nations, are striving for a united world in which there shall be no war. While we work for the greatest human goal men can set before themselves, we must be able to do so in security, free from external threat or menace. A secure United States will stand as a shining example of the strength of democracy and effectively hasten the peace of the world.

But weakness on our part, compelling us to desert our commitments, to violate our pledges and even to invite aggression, can bog the world in a turmoil of fear and doubt and destroy belief in our concepts of freedom. To prevent that possibility the Army is engaged in its most important peacetime enterprise—the carrying out of its prescribed missions in enforcing the peace.

I reaffirm my conviction that the peace and prosperity of our own Nation is a part of the peace and prosperity of the family of nations. We must realize that we can do the most good through the possession of the strength demanded by our world responsibilities. As in all other worth-while efforts, to discharge these responsibilities will require sacrifice on the part of all of us.

We need again to take inspiration from our pioneer fathers who allowed no danger—no privation—no risk, to block the way to the freedom and independence they sought. We need to reabsorb the homely virtues that forced upon them a feeling of guilt if they avoided a road leading to their goal because it was difficult. Here in the United States they built national unity—in the Americas their sons are building hemispheric unity. With God's help we, with the other powers, will build unity in the world.

Senator McKellar Champion of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Truth and Herald, published at Winchester, Tenn.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR M'KELLAR CHAMPION OF TVA

It is a matter of public knowledge that some time ago United States Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR took the position, and has consistently held to the view, that the Tennessee Valley Authority should operate just as all other Government agencies; that its funds should be turned into the National Treasury; and that it should receive appropriations for its operation from Congress.

Now, this is not a new and untried system. Every governmental agency since the founding of our Nation has operated in such a manner. But when Senator MCKELLAR proposed that TVA be placed on such a sound business basis, Chairman Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, immediately countered with the claim that TVA should have certain special privileges in handling its funds, not accorded to other governmental agencies.

That Senator MCKELLAR'S stand is sound, in the light of precedent and common sense, there appears to be no reason for doubt. On the other hand, considered in the same light, it would seem that Mr. Lilienthal's position is both unreasonable and unsound.

Just as simple, as uncomplicated, as this, is the issue which has developed between Senator MCKELLAR and Chairman Lilienthal.

Quite naturally, the political enemies of Senator MCKELLAR, both in Tennessee and outside of the State, have attempted to make political capital of this divergence of view. These newspapers and individuals—who would be opposed to Senator MCKELLAR if TVA had never even been imagined—have attempted to picture Tennessee's senior Senator as an opponent of TVA. They have worked and written mightily in their efforts to convince the people of Tennessee that Senator MCKELLAR spends most of his time hatching dark plots to deprive the people of the South of the Valley Authority.

And it is natural, too, that in the course of such efforts the bitter enemies of Senator MCKELLAR have gradually pushed into the background the real points of controversy between Senator MCKELLAR and Mr. Lilienthal. For it would not suit the purposes of MCKELLAR'S opposition to have the people of Tennessee fully aware of the real issues involved.

There is, therefore, a growing realization on the part of most people that Senator MCKELLAR'S purpose to bring TVA under congressional control the same as other governmental agencies, has been grossly misrepresented by his enemies for political purposes and, in some instances, may have been misunderstood by well-meaning men and women not familiar with the facts as revealed by the record.

Let's look at the record. Senator MCKELLAR was sent to Washington by the people of Tennessee quite some time before the full development of the Muscle Shoals area was even a dream; therefore, since the National Congress has been entirely responsible for the origin and development of TVA, it is not too difficult to determine exactly what the relationship between Tennessee's veteran Senator and the Tennessee Valley Authority has been.

Passing over the many evidences of Senator MCKELLAR'S early interest in the development of the Muscle Shoals area, which are permanently registered in the annals of the House of Representatives and the Senate, we find:

That on February 10, 1925—7 years before the Tennessee Valley Authority was established—a bill was proposed by Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee (S. 3081, 69th Cong., 1st sess.), which embodied almost every detail of the organization we now know as TVA.

This was the first comprehensive measure dealing with the establishment of a valley authority. It was not favorably considered by the Republican majorities in the House and Senate, but it drew the broad outline for TVA, which was later to be filled in by the Roosevelt administration. And it was introduced by Senator MCKELLAR.

In passing, let us consider for a moment this comment from a Republican Member of Congress, B. CARROLL REECE, who was recently elected chairman of the Republican National Committee:

"Those of us in Tennessee and in the South who are interested in the TVA and its continued development have looked upon Senator MCKELLAR as the greatest friend that TVA has had."

Remember, this is the same Senator MCKELLAR who has so recently been portrayed in lurid word pictures as the fire-breathing monster who would destroy TVA and crumble to dust the dams it has constructed.

Speaking of those dams, Congressman REECE said: "Of the eight or nine dams that are now embraced in the TVA, as I recall the facts, all except three were authorized in the Senate upon Senator MCKELLAR'S initiative, in the committee or on the floor of the Senate." Incidentally, it might also be well to note just at this point that the last seven dams constructed by TVA—Pickwick, Gunersville, Chickamauga, Tennessee, Hiwassee, Watts Bar, North Loudon, and Gilbertsville—can be attributed directly to funds appropriated by Congress through the efforts of Senator MCKELLAR.

Here is one example of the type of work that Senator MCKELLAR has done for TVA in the Senate. In 1939, Senator Adams, then chairman of an appropriations subcommittee, attempted to block construction of the Watts Bar Dam by eliminating the appropriation for such construction work. Only the most strenuous efforts by Senator MCKELLAR saved the Watts Bar Dam, and he finally obtained a 13-to-11 vote in favor of the project from the full Senate Appropriations Committee. Senator Adams, speaking on the Senate floor, said of Senator MCKELLAR'S work:

"In considering the item the committee divided, 13 to 11, and then only after most persuasive and effective efforts by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who is sometimes down but is never out. Twice during the committee's deliberations the Senator from Tennessee lost, but he always came back with another vote. The result was that our efforts to strike out this authorization for a new dam were defeated by a vote of 13 to 11."

And this is the same Senator McKELLAR who is now presented to the people of Tennessee by his enemies as the last-ditch foe of the TVA.

The official records of the United States Senate are available to anyone who wishes to inspect them. Without a single exception they present the strongest possible proof that it has been almost entirely due to the efforts of Senator McKELLAR that the TVA is today a multi-million-dollar operating agency of the Government.

Speaking of millions, Senator McKELLAR was appointed to the Senate Appropriations Committee, which very definitely controls the purse strings of the National Government, in 1923. In 1931 he was the second ranking minority (Democratic) member of the committee. In 1933, when the administration of President Roosevelt came into power, he was the second ranking majority member. He has continued to hold that position until the present time, and during the 4-year absence of Chairman CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, has served as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It is this committee which has passed upon each TVA appropriation since the inauguration of the Valley Authority.

Is it not logical to assume that if Senator McKELLAR had been the enemy of TVA that his political opponents would now have you believe that he is, he would have exercised his immense powers to block appropriations for TVA? And yet, when the record is consulted, it reveals that instead of blocking such appropriations for the Valley Authority, he has actually been the sponsor of all of them.

The foregoing is a brief history of the relationship, down through the years, of Senator KENNETH McKELLAR to the TVA.

It is likewise an explanation of why Mr. David Lilienthal is opposing the senior Senator at this time.

It all boils down to this: If the enemies of Senator McKELLAR want to make a campaign issue of TVA, it appears quite likely that they will be inviting a duel with a buzz saw.

For one fact is clear in all the muddle that the enemies of Senator McKELLAR have attempted to create with regard to TVA, and it is this:

That Senator McKELLAR has been, since his entrance into Congress in 1910, the chief spokesman for and advocate of the establishment of a Tennessee Valley Authority; that he has been almost solely responsible for the many appropriations it has received; that he has earned and today highly merits the title, "Champion of TVA."

Review by Elmer Davis of the Book, One World or None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of the book One World or None. The review is by Elmer Davis, and is entitled "No World, If Necessary." It appeared in the March 30 issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. Under the rule, I have obtained an estimate of the cost of printing the article in the RECORD, which is $1.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO WORLD, IF NECESSARY

(By Elmer Davis)

"The advent of the atomic bomb," says Professor Urey of the University of Chicago, "has caused endless confusion in the thinking of men." The book (a quickie) in which this observation occurs[1] is itself an instance; less in its content than in the hiatus between the content and the apparent objective of its publication. It is strong on the whereases, but nobody has coupled them up with the be-it-resolved. It gives a detailed and persuasive account of the perils of the atomic bomb—the most dangerous situation, says Urey, that humanity has ever faced. But when humanity, overcome by conviction of sin, asks, "What shall we do to be saved?" the answer is by no means so clear.

True, the epilog of the book says that it states the problem, not the solution; but a solution is implied by the very title, and an editor's note tells us that all the authors are united in desiring "one world," and that all of them urge fair and careful consideration of the proposals herein made for achieving it. Unfortunately, no proposals are made; it is taken for granted that a league of states won't do, that we must have a world government, with limited authority but paramount in its field over individuals; in other words, there ought to be one world, and a particular kind of one world. But there is virtually no examination, of the sort that you might expect from scientists used to dealing with practical problems, of the possible methods of reaching this objective or of the difficulties in the way. It is generally recognized that one of the compensations of the atomic bomb is that it has set large numbers of scientists to thinking, for the first time, as citizens; but political thinking that gets anywhere requires certain disciplines of its own, which few scientists yet appear to have mastered.

When the authors talk as experts in their own field, however, they are convincing. No wonder, for here are most of the great names of nuclear physics—Bohr, Compton, Einstein, Langmuir, Oppenheimer, Szilard, Urey, Wigner, and half a dozen others; with a postscript ascribed to the Federation of American (Atomic) Scientists collectively. (Why the parenthesis, by the way, in the title? Are there no American scientists except atomic scientists? That is probably not what was intended but that is the way it reads.) From all this you get a pretty complete account of what the atomic bomb is and does, as well as some gratifying reassurance about what it won't do. It won't says Oppenheimer, break loose and destroy the earth, nor make it uninhabitable; on the other hand several writers point out that the commercial utility of atomic energy, regarding which much has been said, is still some distance in the future.

Of its deadliness in war, however, there can be no question. Ridenour pretty conclusively proves that there is no effective defense; and General Arnold, Saul turning up among the prophets, takes a dim view of the possibilities of defense by counteroffensive, if the enemy hits first. All that holds back the lay reader of these chapters from complete despair is the occasional suspicion that some of the writers may be engaging in the scientific pastime of extrapolating the trends. Some of them, for instance, seem to take for granted the trans-Atlantic (or transarctic) rocket. This is not at present feasible; but nobody can say that it will not be within a few years, and it may be felt that in a crisis of this sort a few years more or less make little difference.

The suspicion of extrapolation is perhaps strongest in connection with E. U. Condon's discussion of "the new technique of private war"—the bomb smuggled in, looking perhaps like a crated piano, perhaps like a crated typewriter, and hidden in a store room till it is time to touch it off. Obviously you can't open every package and every suitcase in the United States to see if there is a bomb in it; nor does Condon help much by saying that while the saboteur cannot be caught the factory that makes his bomb needs never exist. This implies a large, an unconcealable factory; but the talk about private war, as well as some hints in other articles, suggests that manufacture may become much easier. I do not know whether Condon set out to scare us; if so he scares us too much, for it all his implications are correct there is no hope; even through all governments became virtuous there would still remain wicked men, and—pouf! up we go.

However, this is only one of the 11 chapters which set forth the facts about the bomb and its consequences, as a preliminary to the discussion of what to do about it. The common characteristic of most of these chapters is a terrifying unawareness of politics, of the difficulty of getting things done in a field more complex than nuclear science. The outstanding exception is Langmuir; and Langmuir is the one man, in this section of the book, who talks not about world government but about agreement between sovereign states, specifically between the United States and Russia; he is the one man, in short, who realizes that Russia is the problem. Even he seems a little on the optimistic side. He would find a basis for cooperation in matters of common agreement, to wit: "No nation desires world conquest" (maybe the Russians don't desire it, but they seem to be making pretty good progress with it in a fit of absentmindedness); "each desires security, freedom of unemployment, better conditions for labor" (and if the Congress of the United States desires these latter blessings, many of its members fail to make themselves clear).

Nevertheless Langmuir's program seems sensible—international agreement, international inspection, destruction meanwhile of all atomic bombs and of all large plants for making their materials. (Small plants, of no military value, could take care of the needs of research.) Substantially the same program is advocated by Szilard, in the first of the chapters on what to do about it. He is hopeful of what can be done through inspection by international agreement provided that it is possible to rule out secret violations—a considerable exception; but the most effective inspectors, he thinks, in any country would be native scientists and engineers, not intrusive foreigners. Suppose the United States and Russia (he, too, has no illusions as to the real problem) reciprocally agreed to make no atomic bombs; and the President called on all American scientists and engineers to report to an international agency any violations of the agreement discovered in our country. Most of them, he believes, would do it.

But would the Russians do it? Szilard admits he doesn't know much about the Russians, but he believes "differences between men in general and between scientists in particular are matters of degree," so the Russians might behave about as we would. Well, maybe; but one need not be a militarist to want better assurance than that, nor does Szilard enhance optimism by suggesting that scientists who told on their own government might be compensated by an asylum and an income abroad. However, he thinks

[1] One World or None. A report to the public on the full meaning of the atomic bomb, edited by Dexter Masters and Katherine Way. By 17 individual authors, and the Federation of American (Atomic) Scientists collectively, New York: Whittlesey House, the McGraw-Hill Co., 1946.

inspection might work well enough to give us a breathing spell, in which we might be able to establish a world community, and a real world government with police powers—something he evidently regards as impossible at this stage.

Einstein is in more of a hurry; he says we must have "a supranational organization supported by a military power that is completely under its control," and that this cannot "wait for a historical development to take its course." He realizes that it cannot be done instantaneously; he would start with a steadily increasing interchange of personnel among the various national armies. This and subsequent steps, he acknowledges, would require "the utmost sagacity and tolerance"—which is hardly an overstatement.

Somebody among the scientists seems to have felt that specialists stepping outside their field had better enlist help among the specialists in the field they invade, so they have added Walter Lippmann as a guest artist "to inquire into the prospects of solving this problem, given our present knowledge of politics, government, and law." It cannot be said that he contributes much—perhaps because his article, though containing some reference to later events, appears to have been written several months ago, at a time when it was still possible to speak of "the preeminence of American military power."

Lippmann thought then that if the American people decided to make the formation of the world state the principal objective of their foreign policy, many nations would immediately go along with us; and more and more of the people in all nations. He seems less hopeful now.

Why must the world state be the answer, anyway? Because, says Lippmann, collective security—enforcement by nations upon nations—doesn't work; nobody was ever willing to try it in the past, and the veto power in the United Nations Charter guarantees that it will never be tried in future against a nation big enough to need much coercing. Fortunately, however, there has in the meantime been "a revolutionary development in human relations"—the recognition of individual responsibility and liability for offenses against world peace and international law; UNO is "the constituent association of a world state already directed to establishing a universal order in which law, designed to maintain the peace, operates upon individual persons." For proof, he cites the trials of the war criminals at Nuremberg. But those men are citizens of an outlaw nation, whose government has been destroyed and whose territory has been occupied. To suppose that a procedure generally accepted in their case would be as readily accepted against Russians, Frenchmen, Englishmen, Americans who violated the regulations of an international security organization is to take a hardly discernible trend and extrapolate it clear off the chart.

Well, what shall we do to be saved? In The Saturday Review of March 2 Mr. Lewis Mumford offers a sawdust trail for us to hit. We are all crazy, he says, except the atomic scientists; they have been crazy but have got over it, they are now "the awakened ones." They have been gagged by the madmen in the White House, the State Department, the Pentagon, the Capitol; but if they were not gagged they would say, "stop making the atomic bomb—abandon it completely!" All right; in this virtually ungagged book, they have said it. * * * Further we must say to all the world (it is not clear whether this is the awakened ones talking or just Mumford, but he may be regarded as awakened for purposes of argument), "Come in and see everything we have got, to be sure we aren't holding out on you." (We ask no reciprocal privileges.) Then let the awakened ones be ungagged, and one of them set at the elbow of every man holding high public office; to whisper in his ear, as often as may be necessary, the word "humanity," the words "one world."

All right again; in this book the awakened ones not merely whisper but shout the word "humanity," the words "one world or none." But if you ask them, How do we get one world? What are the obstacles to getting it? Who runs it after we have got it? Are there any bugs in the design that ought to be ironed out before we put it into quantity production? Why, on those points the awakened ones have little to offer. Yet, those are questions that must be answered before we can be sure that the world state is the only exit, or even the best exit, from our predicament.

The present reviewer professes no competence to answer the foregoing questions, but he may at least set up a few guide posts that may keep better men from going off the path into mudholes. As Marshal Foch used to say, "De quoi s'agit-il?—What is the problem?" It has recently been fashionable to say that there are two problems. First is the mere existence of the atomic bomb. Its destructive capacities are so dreadful that the only answer is to abolish war; and the only way to abolish war (this is quite a standing broad jump, but a lot of my friends have made it) is the immediate establishment of a world government—a real government, with teeth in it. The second problem, transitory but more immediately urgent, is the exclusive (for the moment) possession of the bomb by the United States. This arouses fear and suspicion among other nations, notably the Russians; the answer is to share the secret with them—with or without safeguards, according to the extent of your confidence in human nature—pending their joining with us in the establishment of the world state; following which we shall all live happily ever after.

Some observations on the first point. The atomic bomb is not the most dreadful weapon that may be employed in the next war, nor the one in whose use the United States would be at the worst disadvantage. The atomic bomb can wipe out a middle-sized city, compressing into a single instant the horrors that a B-29 fire raid spreads over some hours; but for the next city you must use another bomb, and to paralyze a continental nation you would need quite a lot of them. Biological warfare—bacterial warfare—knows no such limits, in either time or space. The influenza epidemic of 1918-19 was a mild example of what could be done by a sufficiently active agent; and such agents could be developed by any nation with adequate scientific and technical equipment, if it thought they might be useful.

They could not be used by any European nation in a European war, for the sufficient reason that a biological weapon used on the enemy would almost certainly infect one's own army, and presently one's home population. The United States could not use it against an enemy in Europe or in Asia; for we should have friends, if not allies, in those continents, who would be involved with our enemies in a common catastrophe. Biological warfare is really effective only against an island—a blockaded island, from which the infection could hardly spread. And in the next war the Western Hemisphere could conceivably be an island. Well, enough of that. The point is that it is not sufficient to control the atomic bomb. What you have got to control is either the inclination of the capacity to use it—that is, the inclination or the capacity to make war, in the course of which a nation that wanted to escape destruction might use the atomic bomb, or biological warfare, or any other weapon that came to hand.

Capt. Liddell Hart has lately appealed in Harper's for a return to the limited war of the eighteenth century. Such a return would undoubtedly give us a safer and a happier world. But eighteenth-century wars were limited because their objectives were limited; nobody but kings and their ministers really cared much about them. When there began in 1792 a war in which a people was fighting for its liberty against desperate odds, the limitations began to disappear; the French did what they had to do in order to win, and so, in due course, did everybody else. War between individual nations now seems to have become an anachronism; the one between Bolivia and Paraguay in the thirties may have been the last. Modern wars are fought for world conquest or for survival, and it is futile to expect either an aggressor to neglect anything that might bring him victory, or his victims to reject any weapon that might enable them to survive.

Most of the discussion of the atomic bomb seems to start from the premise that atomic warfare is the worst thing imaginable. Well, it is bad enough; biological warfare would be worse; but there is something that is worse than either. The French can tell you what it is; or the Czechs, or the Greeks, or the Norwegians, or the Filipinos; it is subjection to an alien oppressor. If that is not worse than war—any kind of war—then our ancestors who fought in 1776 were wrong; and the blood of the martyrs—in Warsaw and Rotterdam and Manila, in Lidice and Kalavryta, and Oradour—has been shed in vain. If the time ever comes when men feel that liberty is not worth fighting for, then we shall have the world state; and it will pretty closely approximate Aldous Huxley's forecast.

Well, we have not got that far yet and I see no reason why we need ever get there; the point is that what you have to control is not the weapons, but the men who might use them for an evil purpose. Some of the scientists, talking about the readiness with which other nations can acquire the atomic bomb (and evidently wanting not to seem to be looking at Russia), point out that even minor industrial nations may soon be able to produce it—Sweden, for instance, or Argentina. Which makes the point.

If the Swedes announced tomorrow that they were making atomic bombs, I doubt if anybody would be much scared; for nobody supposes that the Swedish Government or the nation to which it is responsible would use them for any aggressive purpose. If German scientists hiding out in Peron's Argentina started to make them, that would be something to worry about. It might be remembered that the Swedes, 250 years ago, had all their neighbors scared; all they had to fight with, then, was pikes and muskets; but it was what they did with the pikes and muskets that made the difference. So with the atomic bomb. Is all the world shivering in terror at the fact that America has it? I see little sign of such panic except in the American liberal press. Foreigners do not seem worried, because they know we have no aggressive intentions; indeed their chief worry about America seems to be whether we have any intentions at all.

You cannot intelligently discuss the atomic bomb except against the background of present political realities; and the biggest of those realities—the biggest, most enigmatic, and most ominous—is Russia. The scientists here under discussion may have felt that this was a problem outside their field; Langmuir and Szilard, who did touch on it, contented themselves with the perhaps not too confident hope that the Russians are men of like passions with ourselves. But other persons, whose good intentions are beyond question, seem to think that the problem of Russia depends on the atomic bomb rather than (as it seems to me) quite the other way about.

By keeping the secret to ourselves, they tell us, instead of immediately passing it around, we have poisoned the world atmosphere of friendship and trust, have aroused Russian fears and suspicions, compelled the Russians to take measures for their own security.

We don't seem to hear that very often lately, perhaps because the people who used to tell it have been reading the papers. For,

suppose that the Russians were really afraid we might use this dreadful weapon of ours, what sort of policy would they pursue? If the Russian leaders were realists—and nobody has ever accused them of being anything else—they might be expected to be as friendly and even conciliatory as is consistent with self-respect; to do their best to avoid arousing suspicion of their own intentions, to try to persuade this terrible armed colossus that the solution to world problems was to be found in a patient attempt at understanding. Instead of which they have gone around kicking at everybody's door and stepping on everybody's toes. If a man from Mars were told that one of the nations had just acquired an irresistible weapon, and were asked to guess from their foreign policies which one it was, he would say that the Russians had it, not we.

It is not the atomic bomb which has overshadowed international relations in these past months; it is the menace—the more menacing because nobody knows how much it really amounts to—of Russian aggression. Ah, says your friend of mankind, but it is not aggression, it is only the search for security. Security against whom? This is not 1941; Hitler is dead, the Wehrmacht is pulverized. In all the triple continent of Eurasia-Africa—the World Island, Mackinder called it—there is no force that could stop the Russian Army; nor is any likely to arise in our time. Security against us, and the atomic bomb? But the Russians know geography; they do not protect themselves against us in Kars and Azerbaijan. What they are doing looks very much like what Peter the Great and Catherine and the first Nicholas used to do, with no pretense that they were looking for security against the atomic bomb or anything.

So what? Only this, that the Russians do not behave like people to whom we could safely confide the secret of the bomb. Maybe they have got one of their own, or are on the way to getting it; if so, we can't help it. But we can—and apparently, thank God, we intend to—avoid the suicidal folly of giving away what we have until there have been established those "effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards" that Truman, Attlee, and Mackenzie King have called for. The problem of the bomb is no longer what it will do—we know that—but who would use it for what purposes; a political problem, calling for a political solution.

Just what we have been telling you, say my friends triumphantly; the only answer is the world state. Anything else means balance of power, an atomic-arms race, ultimate catastrophe. * * * Well, we have not sufficiently explored other possibilities to be sure of that; anyway, what does the world state mean? It could mean a number of things; but one thing it must mean if it is to be a world government at all—it must have an armed force big enough to lick the armed forces of any single one, or any probable combination, of its component states. Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? No doubt that question must, and perhaps will, be answered some day; but I can think of no satisfactory answer against the background of present political realities. (Ely Culbertson talks more sense on this point than anybody else; but he plays a good game of bridge, so nobody listens to him.)

It is argued that to combine the nations of the world into a federal state, with plenty of home rule for its component units, would require an effort differing only in degree, not in kind, from that required to federate the thirteen original States of this Union. But those States, whatever their differences had a common language for all public affairs, even if some of the inhabitants spoke Dutch or German at home; more important, they had a common background of English political institutions, political traditions, and political thinking. The planet as a whole is somewhat more complex. Conceivably, by a good deal of wrenching and twisting, we might federate everybody but Russia and its satellites; but a world state that left out the Russian bloc would mean two world states, and a rivalry whose probable outcome anyone can predict.

Why not Russia? Not because of its economic system; I should think there would be no insuperable difficulty in adjusting that to the various economic systems of other states. It is the Russian political system that is the obstacle—the totalitarian police state, with few civic liberties and no popular controls; with a blank curtain that not only cuts off the rest of the world from more than the scantiest knowledge of what goes on in Russia, but (much more serious) keeps the Russian people from finding out what is going on in the rest of the world, except as their government chooses to tell them; a monolithic state, all of whose resources can be mobilized and directed toward whatever end may be determined by the small group of resolute and secretive men who run the country. If Pennsylvania, say, had been such a State in 1787, and if Delaware and Maryland, under somewhat similar systems, always voted the way Pennsylvania told them to, our Federal Government could never have got started.

It would be hard to fit such a state into a world federation, even if the objectives of its leaders were clear. Unfortunately they are not; all we can be sure of is that Russia at present seems to be what is called a dynamic state. Germany was dynamic under Hitler, the United States was dynamic under James K. Polk, and neither was a comfortable neighbor. (No, never mind that beam that once protruded from our own eye; we are trying to solve a problem of 1946, not of 1846; and it doesn't help much to say that maybe in another hundred years the Russians, too, will have settled down.)

And one thing more, the last and worse—this monolithic nation is also the home office of a world religion, with adherents in almost every component state of the federation. Look at the behavior of the Communist minorities in the united fronts of the eastern European states; or ask any American labor-union official how much trouble even a few Communists can make for him. They would use the same tactics, make the same kind of trouble, in a world state. No, I do not think that communism must win in any contest with democracy; not at all. What I am afraid of is that there would be no contest; that the democrats, convinced that, whatever our minor differences, we were all working for the same ends, would trust their associates to feel the same way and would go on about their business while the Communists, with the zeal of true believers, would go on working all the time to insure the triumph of their faith. Just that has happened over and over again in labor unions; it could happen in a world union, too.

No world state like that, thank you; the alternative may be perilous, but at least, choosing the alternative, we know enough to be on our guard. A year or so ago most of us supposed that Russian objectives, in the main, were the same as ours; and extensive concessions were made to them on that hypothesis. It now seems to have been mistaken; we do not want another disillusionment, on a grander scale, which might come too late. Possibly the Russians want the same things we want, but let us wait for a little more evidence. Time is short, say the atomic scientists, and survival is at stake. Well, survival is at stake both ways; another war would be a catastrophe for all concerned—especially for the losers. But the wrong kind of world state would be a catastrophe for the winners, as well as the losers.

Mr. Norman Cousins, in a striking figure, has compared our present plight to that of a man standing on the edge of a canyon, 10 feet wide but abysmally deep, with a forest fire coming up behind him and safety on the other side. He has never jumped 10 feet in his life, he doesn't know whether he can do it now; but he had better do it, and do it quickly. * * * But suppose, when the smoke blows aside so that he can see more clearly—and we can see somewhat more clearly now than when Mr. Cousins wrote that last fall—he perceives that the canyon is not 10 feet wide but 40. It might then make sense, so long as the forest fire is not actually licking at the seat of his pants, to see if there isn't some other way out before he tries that standing broad jump.

I cannot see the way out yet; but I am willing to go on looking awhile before we try to jump 40 feet. One world or none, say the atomic scientists. Has it occurred to them that if their one world turned out to be totalitarian and obscurantist, we might better have no world at all?

Farmers—Man Against Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Farmers—Man Against Hunger," from Time magazine for April 29, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS—MAN AGAINST HUNGER

Where was the food for the hungry world coming from? Most of it would come from the United States heartland, the valley of the 2,000-mile-long Mississippi River and its tremendous tributaries, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Arkansas, the Red River of the North, the Red River of the South.

This was the main battleground of United States food production—enormous plains stretching without a relieving ripple beyond vision; rolling prairies, like the heaving surface of the ocean congealed to earth; vast uplands lifting slowly with no barrier but a barbed-wire fence to the terminal barrier of the Rocky Mountains. In good years, this vast food factory poured out some 800,000,000 bushels of wheat, some 2,800,000,000 bushels of corn, 1,200,000,000 bushels of oats, 63,000,000 hogs, 33,000,000 beef cattle, 36,000,000 sheep, 82,000,000 pounds of milk, 3,200,000,000 pounds of butterfat.

This week, as it would be for months to come, the mind of the world was on wheat—bread for the hungry, from the Rhine to the Yangtze. But in the great United States food factory corn-and-hog farmers did not change over their fields to wheat production, nor did cattlemen plow up their rich pastures. Each in his individualistic way was tooled for his specialty and subject only to the weather and the vagaries of a controlled economy. Each knew that if he did his part, and if the other farmers of the world could once again do theirs, the world would be properly fed once more—and that it would take much more than wheat to feed it properly.

MAN AGAINST THE SKY

Against the vast arable United States earth and the vaster sky over it, one man might stand as an epitome of the task and the hopes which the hungry world has placed upon some 6,000,000 United States farmers,

the great mass of whom, like him, live between the Rocky and the Appalachian Mountains. He is Gustav Theodore Kuester (rhymes with Easter), 58.

Gus Kuester is a corn, oats and hog farmer, and has been for 42 years. These days, while the battle for food thunders loudest on the wheat sector, he fights on his own position in the line, confident in his farmer's knowledge that the battle must be fought on many fields, with many crops. The field that Gus Kuester and his slight, tough-fibred son Dale, 28, hold against hunger, is 240 acres of fat, black Iowa earth. Their citadels are two farmhouses and their outworks—barns, farrowing sheds, chicken houses and consumptively coughing windmills.

Dale's house, on the back 80, is a prosperous middle-western farm home with all possible conveniences. Gus's house, like a thousand Cass County farmhouses, is a seven-room frame structure weathered to a faded ocher with trim the color of last year's canned peas. (Like thousands of Iowa farmers, the Kuesters are patiently waiting for supplies to repaint the house and to put in a bathroom.) A mile away the world goes by on busy Highway U. S. 71 (Canadian border to Baton Rouge). That mile is a dirt road which spring thaws or rains soften to a greasy gumbo, navigable only by Dale Kuester's "mudwhopee," a 1929 Ford roadster that he has cut down into a pick-up truck.

To sidewalk farmers, who suppose that a ridgeling is the peak in a barn roof and a freemartin a species of swallow,[1] some of Gus's outbuildings and his hog runs might well give the jimjams. But Gus and Dale Kuester are among the best and most prosperous of Cass County farmers. Gus's homely barns and sheds are decisive outworks in the battle for food.

Last week, at Gus Kuester's, that battle was in full swing and its center was the farrowing shed. For food comes off Gus Kuester's farm on four trotters and squealing like a buzz saw. Poland China and spotted Poland China hogs are the crop to which his whole farm economy is geared. The acres of corn, the acres of oats, the acres of hay exist chiefly to cram the maws of pigs and finish about 280 hogs a year as efficiently (that is, as quickly and cheaply) as possible to meet the exigencies of marketing and the OPA.

Every winter the Kuesters carry over as breeders about 40 of the likeliest looking gilts (young females) and sows. Some are at Dale's, more than half at Gus's. In early April, at evening feeding, the Kuesters begin to sidle up to these elite pigs and delicately strip their swelling teats. If a drop of milk shows, the sow will probably farrow during the night. So she is rushed into the farrowing barn, which, jauntily topped by a weather vane in the form of a pig, has pens for 16 expectant gilts and sows.

MATERNITY WARD

There begin long sleepless nights during which Gus Kuester may pace the center aisle of the farrowing barn like an expectant father. Often he beds down wakefully in an unoccupied farrowing pen. Most pig births are normal, but sometimes a little pig needs to be helped into the hungry world. Sometimes one is born in a covering caul which has to be ripped off by a profit-motivated finger. Sometimes the heaving, grunting sows, from weakness, clumsiness, or distress lie or roll on their farrow. Sometimes they try to eat them. Sweeter to a pig farmer's ear than the ethereal fluting of the prairie lark is a sow's "pumping," the regular ugh, ugh, ugh, which means that the litter has discovered how to suckle and that the sow, heaving over with a sigh to expose her batteries of teats, has taken on the thankless task. In a fortnight the pig population on the Kuester farm may bounce from about 40 to something like 320.

The ardors and hazards of pig farming do not end in the maternity ward in April. At first sows and piglets have to be hand-fed with ground feed (chop) prepared according to a dietary formula as carefully worked out as a human baby's. At present, when the protein ingredients (chiefly soy and linseed meal) are often practically impossible to get, pig feeding is not only an endless labor but a perpetual headache.

It is also an art and a mystery. The art consists chiefly in knowing what to do and how much; the mystery, in knowing when. That knowledge, largely intuitive, can be acquired only by a lifetime of handling animals. But Gus Kuester claims, and few pig farmers would deny, that a pig's future depends chiefly on how he is brought up in the first months.

THE BATTLE OF THE FIELDS

This is the battle of the pig barns. The battle of the fields begins earlier, lasts longer, is muscularly tougher. If it is lost the battle of the pigs cannot be won.

The first crop in is oats. Oats cannot tolerate hot weather. As fast as the ground dries in March it must be plowed—usually in a race between rains. Up at 4 or half-past, Dale Kuester turns on the lights of his Massey-Harris "101" senior tractor, rockets out to the gang plow, and buzzes off for a working day that often ends, as it began, in darkness. Last March, Dale Kuester plowed 20 acres of oat land in 18 hours—something like making a 500-mile automobile trip in 10 hours. By the second week in April the Kuesters' 47 acres of oats were green and blowing, an inch or so high, in a wind that made people pile on jackets.

After the oats are in there is time out for the farrowing. Then it is high time to plow for corn. On the Kuester farm every kernel of corn is used for feed. Of the thousands of bushels he has grown over the years, Gus claims that he has marketed not more than 150 bushels. He has sometimes had to buy more corn.

Corn is planted (with a horse-drawn planter) about the second week in May. As soon as the green spikes pierce the black soil, it is cultivated with a rotary hoe. Dale Kuester claims that, when in form, he can hoe 80 acres between sunup and sundown. After three hoeings, there are two more complete cultivations with regular corn cultivators.

After corn-cultivating comes hay harvest and oat harvest (oats are threshed). Corn harvest begins in October with a mechanical picker owned in common by Dale and two of Gus's brothers. The Kuesters heave the corn from the first ripe field into Gus's barnlike crib, the next field into Dale's, and turn and turn about until the job is done. It is usually done in time for the strenuous work of loading the first finished pigs for market.

Meanwhile, 365 days a year, twice a day, morning and night, the Kuesters put in an hour or two doing chores—feeding the hogs, feeding, watering, and bedding the horses, feeding and watering the twenty-odd beef cattle, feeding, watering, bedding, and milking the three cows. The farm day is not done until Gus ties back the vane of the windmill, pulls off his overshoes, and sets them neatly in a little casement near the back steps, washes (after pumping water in a basin at the kitchen sink), and sits down at the kitchen table to one of his wife's suppers—a county byword for good cooking.

The Gus Kuesters have a small flock of chickens which are part of Mrs. Kuester's job. The Dale Kuesters are raising several hundred chicks (an Australorp-Leghorn cross). Dale's wife, Ilene, a pretty, lively farm girl, who is as up-to-the-minute as if she had just stepped off Michigan Avenue, "has a hand with chickens," often has a box of underprivileged "peeps" warming over the register in her parlor.

Sometimes, between the great actions in the yearly battle for food, Gus will putter about his fruit trees. He likes to look off east toward the Evangelical Church, where, as a boy, during the interminable sermons, he traded jackknives behind the pews, and where rain, snow, or shine, the Kuesters still worship every Sunday. He likes to see the pine- and cedar-sheltered church graveyard, a tranquil reminder that the life which the earth gives must in the end return to the earth. There two generations of his neighbors and family are buried.

THE RECORD OF THE LINE

At such times, Gus, if he has a listener, will discuss in a low, soft-spoken, drawling voice and with a sudden illuminating smile and chuckle when he makes a good point, the things that interest him. They are his family, farming, politics (as with many farmers, his second love), the evils of drinking, the record of his line.

In the second year of the American Civil War, Christopher Kuester and his family fled to the United States from the hardship and ever-menacing hunger of peasant life in Germany. The year the Franco-Prussian War broke out (1870), they reached Cass County, where a heavy German population had begun to put down American roots.

With three horses, a 14-inch plow, an ingrained fear of debt, and an ingrained faith in God, old Christopher's son Charles began to break the tough prairie sod for his well-to-do neighbors. In time he became such an artist with the plow that he earned as much as $1 an acre. When not plowing, Charles Kuester worked out for $15 a month in summer, for his board and keep in the stiff Iowa winters. Before he had saved enough to buy land, he married. By the time Gus, his seventh child, was born (1888), Charles and his wife owned 80 acres and were adding every year to their holdings. The Kuesters were becoming, like their land, American. Gus was the first child to learn English first, German (which he seldom speaks) second. From his father, whom he worshipped, Gus learned his basic view of life: "He taught us to be thrifty, to believe in God, and not to shoot our mouths off unless we had something to say."

BOY AND MAN

Farming began for Gus Kuester when he was 8. At 11 he was doing a man's job day in and day out with the threshing gang. School (he attended only the winter terms) ended for Gus with the eighth grade when his father died (1904). Gus, then 16, managed and farmed 400 acres for his mother.

At 27 Gus asked Elda Weaver to marry him. Like the Kuesters, the Weavers were of German stock. Says Elda's mother who, though eightyish, is still rugged, still speaks with a German accent: "God guided every step of our way to this blessed country."

Gus and Elda bought the old Weaver homestead, which had passed out of the family. The early years were hard, but the Kuesters pulled through, says Gus, "by chickens, hogs, and going without." They pulled through also thanks to the patient devotion of Elda Kuester. Over the years hogs paid the mortgage—today the land is worth $225 an acre—and the Kuesters received the final patent of ownership; the neighbors began to call the old Weaver place the Kuester farm. There were born Dale and a pretty daughter, Shirley, now 19, who sometimes acts as her father's official secretary, now lives and works in Atlantic, 12 miles away, as an operator for the telephone company.

Gus achieved the greatest success a farmer can have, he kept his son on the farm. He did it by letting Dale earn his own money

[1] A ridgeling is a cryptorchid or a half-castrated animal; a freemartin is a sexually imperfect heifer.

from boyhood on. A few years ago Gus cut Dale in on the hogs. Now they are in partnership, 50–50 on costs and profits. When Dale married Gus sold him the back 80 and the house on it. This year Dale will finish paying his father the mortgage.

THE LEGISLATOR

In 1932 the neighbors claimed Gus Kuester for politics. Gus is a politician's dream. He is a big—6 feet 4 inches—impressive, grey-haired man, stooped with outdoor labor and powerful with outdoor strength. He feels most at ease in overalls but looks just as much at home in city clothes. Integrity and gravity are written in the character lines of his face. He is deeply religious. He does not swear, but, no prude, he does not hesitate to quote other men's oaths. His fiercest epithet, uttered with terrifying inflection about people who drink too much, is: "Dirty bats!" Gus has never tasted liquor.

Gus, a Republican, was first asked to run for the legislature against a Democrat named Charley Malone. Gus was horrified. Says he: "Charley was a good friend of mine. As far as I could see, he was doing a good job." But 2 years later he ran, was elected, has spent 100 days a year in the Iowa Legislature ever since. Part of that time he has been chairman of the powerful appropriations committee and has been a member of 15 committees at once.

Last year Republicans wanted to elect him speaker of the house. Gus refused. He has been loudly mentioned for governor. He is widely believed to be absolutely lobby- and pressure-proof. One powerful lobbyist was so confident that a bill he wanted would pass the house that he showed up for the final action. Just before the vote, Gus unwound his 6 feet 4 and drawled into the microphone: "Boys, this ain't such a good bill." The lobbyist walked out, wringing his hands. The bill was voted down.

ENLIGHTENED REPUBLICAN

Kuester is an enlightened Republican. In 1932, he voted for Franklin Roosevelt, in protest against the Republican farm program or lack of one. He is afraid of a runaway market, and his most outspoken beef against OPA is the inability of the Washington planners to understand some of the difficulties of farming. He is friendly to labor. But he is an implacable foe of promiscuous spending of public funds. Gus wants the State's finances run as efficiently as he runs his farm. When legislators start throwing money around, he unfailingly gets up and drawls: "I want the taxpayers at the crossroads to know that the State's fiscal affairs are being developed in an unsound condition."

Gus is well aware of the basic issues in the world today and thinks long and doggedly, as only a farmer can, about them. He knows that one of them is food. But he knows his land, he knows his kind of people. Says Gus Kuester: "I know that a lot of folks are counting on the American farmer. I don't think folks got nawthin' to worry about."

Address by John S. Knight on Occasion of His Acceptance of the Poor Richard Club Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered recently before the Poor Richard Club by Mr. John S. Knight, publisher of the Knight newspapers and president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

I have an estimate of $180 as the cost of printing a speech which I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel deeply honored in accepting the Poor Richard Club award for "distinctive achievement in journalism." Undeserved as the honor may be, it represents a tangible recognition on your part of the notable accomplishments of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in advancing the cause of world freedom of information.

I will not dwell at length upon freedom of the press in this country because it is universally recognized that here in America we have absolute freedom of the press, and the degree to which that freedom is exercised rests entirely upon the ability and courage of individual editors and publishers.

The charge is often hurled by professional critics of the press that we are subservient to large advertisers, financial interests, and organized pressure groups. Granting that a few timorous newspaper publishers have been known to bend the knee to these influences for a temporary reward in either circulation or advertising, the life of such newspaper properties is a short one at best.

Ultimately they shrivel up and disappear for the very same reasons that the people eventually reject dishonest men in public life and refuse to trade with merchants who sell shoddy wares packaged in attractive labels.

The press of America today has as much freedom as it cares to exercise. Fortunately, it is in the main employing that freedom for the fullest discussion of public issues, for social advancement, for informative journalism, and vigorous, hard-hitting commentaries.

No newspaper can ever be any greater than the stature of the man who is responsible for its publication. When it is pointed out that some editors and publishers are mental pygmies, the same charge can be leveled against their contemporaries in politics, religion, the social sciences, radio, education, business, and industry.

The fact remains, however, that in America, the freedom of expression is theirs to exercise. If our constitutionally granted privilege is abused or refused by a few, we must remember that in a democracy such as ours, individuals are human and the millennium has yet to be achieved.

Turning to the world scene, it seems almost elemental to state that universal freedom of expression is essential to world peace. I first sensed this need while serving in London as director of censorship. It was there that I witnessed the diabolical efficiency with which Propaganda Minister Goebbels was able to influence and direct the course of German thought. Under Hitler, no German newspaper or press service was permitted to print anything to which the government took exception. In fact, newspaper editors were told in advance what their comment should be. The few who remonstrated found themselves dispossessed of their properties and invited to spend the rest of their days, if they survived, enjoying the dubious delights of a concentration camp.

In a lesser way, the people of England had no true idea of the policies being formulated for them at No. 10 Downing Street. Military security dictated that the press conform to a voluntary censorship code, but the penalties for breaking the code were so severe as to include imprisonment and even death for treasonable violations.

The United States voluntary code of censorship contained no such teeth and all American newspapers joined together in withholding military information which, if published, might jeopardize the lives of our men and women in the armed forces.

At no time during the war did our Government ever attempt to restrict editorial opinion that was critical of the Government or the over-all direction and strategy of the war.

American newspapers have every right to be proud of their war records and it is a tribute to to our form of government that freedom of expression was never curbed during those terribly critical days.

In the fall of 1943, in Manchester, England, I advocated the right of press associations to gather honest news in the liberated and reconstructed nations of Europe. I went further and recommended that the freedom of the press should be incorporated in the peace treaties so that newspaper correspondents would be guaranteed the right to send uncensored dispatches from any part of the world.

To my surprise, the Manchester statement attracted widespread attention which indicated that a great many other people had been thinking along the same line.

But, as is the case with all desirable objectives, they simply cannot be attained by merely talking about them. Upon my return to America in the spring of 1944, I set out to see if some very real progress could not be made.

The first feeble steps were taken in June 1944 when the directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors adopted resolutions urging both major political parties to adopt planks calling for world freedom of information and unrestricted communications for news throughout the world.

I am proud to say that through the efforts of the society, members of which appeared before the resolutions committee of both parties, we were successful in persuading both the Republican and the Democratic Parties to adopt planks in keeping with our recommendations.

The ASNE then formed a comprehensive committee on world freedom of information headed by Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution. Largely through the work of this committee, both Houses of Congress adopted a concurrent resolution in September 1944 which favored affording "equality of opportunity and treatment in connection with obtaining, transmitting, and publishing news, irrespective of its source, without governmental or private restriction, including transmission of news over national and international facilities at uniform and nondiscriminatory rates and charges."

At a meeting of Mr. McGill's committee with representatives of the Associated Press and the United Press in the fall of 1944, I was authorized as president of the ASNE to name a committee of three to "visit various world capitals to confer with the proper governmental bodies, press associations, and radio executives, in order that the committee may acquaint these individuals and agencies with the aims of the society and learn their views on postwar freedom of information."

This committee, comprised of Wilbur Forrest, assistant editor of the New York Herald Tribune; Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution; and Carl Ackerman, dean of the graduate school of journalism of Columbia University, left New York on January 10, 1945, and first proceeded to Great Britain for conferences with editors and government officials in London; thence to Paris, to Brussels, Rome, Athens, Cairo, Ankara, and Istanbul; to Tehran, thence to Moscow, Chungking, New Delhi, and to Australia, with conferences in Melbourne, Sydney, Canberra, and Brisbane. One member of the committee, Dean Carl Ackerman, also visited the Philippines.

In their 40,000-mile trip around the world, the committee visited 22 cities in 11 major countries.

In my humble estimation, this was one of the finest achievements in the history of American journalism and Messrs. Forrest, McGill, and Ackerman did more to advance the cause of freedom of information than a thousand newspaper editorials or speeches could have accomplished in this country.

When the committee returned, it reported that a strong argument for press freedom in the treaties is contained in the following point, which was stressed in their many conferences. It is:

Had not Nazi and Fascist forces in Germany and Italy seized and dominated the press and all communication facilities at the start, the growth of these poisonous dictatorships might well have been prevented and the indoctrination of national thought in the direction of hatred and mistrust might have been impossible.

It was constantly emphasized in their conferences that the ability of political leaders to seize power and black out the minds of whole peoples must be prevented in the future if peace is to be maintained with the aid of international tolerance and understanding.

The mission was gratifyingly successful and there was virtually no dissent anywhere from the view that freedom of expression and a freer flow of news throughout the world are vital to a lasting peace.

I know that you must be primarily interested in the views held by the Russian editors with whom the members of our committee conferred on a number of occasions.

The Russians have the idea that the American press is heavily sprinkled with wealthy and often undemocratic ownership which seeks power at the expense of international, national, or local advancement.

At a large dinner meeting with all of the Moscow editors present, Ambassador Averell Harriman stated that both the United States and Russia had been more or less isolated countries, that the United States did not care for communism; that because of its long century of domestic growth it had not paid much attention to foreign affairs and resented foreign criticism.

The surest way to popularize a politician in the United States, he said, was for a foreign country to criticize him. But now, he added, the United States was casting off its isolationism and was interested in press comment in the Soviet Union for which it had an undoubtedly friendly feeling. Our countries have never fought a war, he continued, and said there existed an inclination to take too seriously some of the articles in the United States press, just as we in America sometimes took too seriously the Soviet press.

He hoped there would be more argument and discussion because these were the weapons friends used to settle their problems.

A reply was made by S. A. Lozovsky, Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, in which he stated that the chief thing the Soviet peoples and papers couldn't understand was the constant criticism of an ally by a portion of the American press.

Editors Pospelov, of Pravda, and Ilyichev, of Izvestia, declared in almost identical speeches that their system was most representative of the wishes of the people and was a free press because it represented only the people.

Of course, it is difficult for an American to keep in mind or to rationalize the fact that the Soviet newspapers are not merely owned by the Government but are in fact an integral part of the Government.

The Russian editors insisted that the American papers could not represent the wishes of the people, pointing to the Roosevelt elections as an example. They expressed their displeasure over critical items about the Soviets which later proved unfounded, they could not understand our custom of permitting columnists to take opposing views to the editor and the revelation that American newspaper readers will continue to buy a paper which disagrees with their own views was completely baffling to them.

One of Russia's noted essayists, Illya Ehrenburg, concluded by demanding to know why Americans didn't freely marry Negroes and Jews and would hear no other argument but that we were Fascist at heart; he said also that the Hearst press trust was dripping Fascist poison into the soul of America and that we could not escape a Fascist future.

Our editors replied most vigorously but I am afraid the Russians weren't convinced.

Unquestionably the Russians may have had good reason at that time to be suspicious of the United States but we have certainly demonstrated our good faith throughout and since the war.

The whole problem of better understanding gets back to the basic principles advocated by the ASNE—world freedom of information. As I have said upon many occasions, the murky clouds of ill feeling will begin to clear the moment Russian censorship is abolished and the Russian people have an opportunity to understand the real America.

At the invitation of the ASNE, three distinguished Russian editors will attend the forthcoming conference of American editors in Washington on April 18, 19, and 20. One of them is the fiery Ehrenburg mentioned a moment ago. He is now a commentator of Izvestia. The others are Mikhail Romanovich Galaktinov, military critic of Pravda, and Konstantin Mikhailovich Simonov, editor of the Red Star.

It seems to me that this will be an unparalleled opportunity for these Russian newspapermen to exchange ideas with American journalists and observe the American scene. Just how much of their observations will ever come to light in Russia is a matter of conjecture but certainly their visit is a step in the direction of better understanding between the two countries.

There is much hopeful evidence that the nations of the world are beginning to encourage greater freedom of informaiton.

The bonds of censorship have been relaxed in Austria, Belgium, Great Britain, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Iran, Iraq, Australia-New Zealand, China, India, Korea, Philippines, Brazil, Bolivia, Columbia, Canada, and Ecuador.

Censorship still prevails in Russia and the Russian satellite nations, portions of South America and there are diplomatic restrictions in Palestine, Egypt, Turkey, Spain, and Portugal.

At the moment a sharp controversy is raging between William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, and two of our major press associations regarding the use of their news for export by our Government.

Some months ago both the Associated Press and the United Press discontinued their news services to the State Department because of their fears that the Government cannot engage in newscasting without creating the fear of propaganda which necessarily would reflect upon the objectivity of the news services from which such newscasts are prepared.

The foreign informational activity in which the State Department is currently engaged is a hold-over from the days of the OWI. The program consists of nine points, including exchange of persons engaged in intellectual activities, maintenance of libraries of information abroad, distribution of texts of official announcements, documentary material and information about life in America to diplomatic missions abroad, publication of the magazine America for distribution in Russia, documentary films for noncommercial showing to foreign audiences, development of staffs in our missions in 62 countries to provide tactful, well-informed and capable personnel to carry out the program and finally the operation of short-wave broadcasting covering virtually the entire world.

Actually our Government has been engaged in short-wave broadcasting since 1942, when it took over the direction of international voice casts from private operators and expanded the operation considerably.

Mr. Benton is convinced that these short-wave broadcasts are essential if the peoples of the blacked-out areas of the world are to understand the American point of view.

Mr. McLean, of the Associated Press, and Mr. Hugh Baillie, of the United Press, are unwilling to have such a Government service prepared from the wire services of the AP and UP on the ground that the reputation of these two great services for complete objectivity will suffer if they are utilized in a propaganda reports sponsored by the Government.

When the controversy first flamed into the open, Mr. Benton asked me in a telegram dated January 31 of this year if I would be willing to have a committee of the ASNE undertake an objective study of the State Department's informational program.

I replied immediately that we should be glad to make such a study and requested an early decision so that we could get underway at once. With all respect to Mr. McLean and Mr. Baillie, I felt that possibly both press associations had acted precipitately before all the facts were known and offered the use of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service to the State Department for the interim period in which the investigation was being conducted.

Meanwhile, Mr. Benton publicly assailed both the AP and the UP for dog-in-the-manger tactics and accused them of competitive jockeying for sales positions abroad.

This barrage drew heated replies from Mr. Baillie, of the United Press, who stated that "Mr. Benton's service is a Government news service and as such will be regarded abroad as propaganda. That is why we want no United Presss dispatches used in it. Mr. Benton says the real issue is propaganda. As far as we are concerned, it most definitely is."

Up to this time, I had heard nothing from Mr. Benton concerning the objective study of his information activities which he had requested on January 31. Upon repeated requests from me for a firm answer, he finally replied that he felt that an editorial I had written seemed to question the entire program and that unless Mr. McLean, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Baillie should display an interest in the study which he had originally suggested, he did not see how such a study would yield helpful or constructive results, of the kind that would resolve our present dilemma.

Mr. Benton likewise shied away from a full study of his department by saying that the ASNE offer would hold real promise only if (1) the news agencies invite or welcome it; and (2) it specializes on the handling of news.

Frankly, I do not understand Mr. Benton's reasoning that such a study must have the blessings of the press associations. He has not hesitated to assail them publicly from time to time; yet he persists in attempting to win their cooperation through what he evidently believes to be persuasion. That's just a bit like beating a man over the hind end to get him to agree with you.

As recently as March 29, Mr. Benton accused the board of the Associated Press for not living up to their responsibility to the people of the United States and their obligation to their country by their decision to prohibit the use of their service in our short-wave voice broadcasting.

Moreover, he undertook to tell the AP and the UP that it is their responsibility to expand their volume and greatly improve their news files.

I am willing to grant that Mr. Benton made a considerable success of the advertising business but it seems to me that he is taking in entirely too much ground when he attempts to tell the AP and UP how those agencies should be conducted.

I have endeavored not to be dogmatic about the desirability or undesirability of short waving the American point of view to the areas of the world in which our customs and peace-loving tendencies are little known.

Still, I cannot refrain from putting up a red light as a warning against a propaganda race between nations. In many ways, it could be quite as ominous as an armament race in which each major power attempted to outdo the other.

Just why are we so interested in converting other nations of the world to our point of view? Is it that we fear the spread of the Russian philosophy or do we honestly believe that sixty or seventy thousand receiving sets distributed among 193,000,000 Russians will enable the huge Russian populace to better understand and appreciate America?

I wonder also if Uncle Joe would welcome the short-wave broadcasting of American propaganda, for that is what it must ultimately become, from American transmitters in occupied Germany? Can we improve relations with Russia by short waving dramatic skits depicting the American way of life into a country which has religiously forbidden its own soldiers to read American newspapers and magazines?

As Arthur Hays Sulzberger, of the New York Times, said in his rebuttal to Mr. Benton's remarks of March 29, our approach to a better understanding with the Russians does not lie in forcing American-sponsored news upon those who might suffer physical harm for giving heed to it, but rather in doing our utmost toward the development of our own free press into a truly responsible one.

In the State Department's memorandum on the Postwar International Information Program of the United States, the statement is made on page 12 in connection with the distribution of films that by the display of nontheatrical films, the Government will seek to alter or supplement certain impressions created by the commercial showings of other media.

Is this portraying the American scene as it actually exists or is it a case of the State Department's saying, "Papa knows best."

On page 13 of the same memorandum, the State Department sees the United States at a "disadvantage and a relative loser in the downward spiral of standards likely to attend an unbridled competition between governmental information programs." Here, at least, the State Department recognizes the possibility of an unbridled propaganda race.

On page 29 of the memorandum, Mr. Benton's department suggests that the Department's radio news bulletin should be enlarged and the time of delivery adjusted to meet the needs of information officers who "provide interpretations of current news."

I may be overly suspicious, but that statement sounds remarkably like a set of instructions to a governmental propaganda bureau.

On page 3 of the memorandum's introductory analysis, the State Department stresses the point that "the United States as a society gains by being truthful about itself in its foreign information." I could not agree more, but I will leave the question with you as to whether foreign countries would get a more truthful account of the United States as a society through the news reports distributed by the AP, UP, and the INS or whether they could find more factual information in a processed State Department report depicting the American scene as it is viewed by a Government bureau.

We have seen too many times what happens to the free flow of news when it comes under the scrutiny of the military or the diplomatic corps. Recently, in Germany, Marshal Gregory K. Zhukov, then chief of the Soviet military administration in Germany, was unable to see John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath because a United States general thought it showed too much of the seamy side of American life.

In Manchuria, Consul Gen. O. Edmund Chubb denied transmission facilities to American correspondents because, as he expressed it, "The political situation is ticklish." Chubb told Chicago Daily News correspondent, George Weller, that he had been ordered by Washington to "go slow," if "stories go out which are strongly critical of either Chinese political party or of the Soviets." "People will say," Chubb continued, "that we are helping one side or the other."

These two are fair examples of what happens when government tries to put a false face on Uncle Sam. The truth always comes to light eventually and such patent self-deception is as juvenile as it is ridiculous.

Unhappily, as David Lawrence said in a recent dispatch, "there are a good many Americans who, while denying vehemently that the Nazis did anything worth while, are inadvertently imitating the Nazis."

It is likewise true, as Lawrence says, that the innocuous words issued by the press associations take on an entirely different significance when issued by the Government of the United States.

In a processed news report such as is contemplated by the State Department, is anyone so ingenuous as to believe that it will reflect a true description of American life?

Will accounts of our race riots, strikes, and black-market operations be carried in such a report?

Will it contain editorials against communism or even those which differ with Russia's bull-necked attitude in the assemblage of the United Nations?

The answer is fairly obvious. How then, can it be regarded as a true reflection of American daily life?

While in England, I was constantly disturbed over the manner in which the British press misinterpreted the American scene. The trivialities of Hollywood were invariably given prominent display and it was not uncommon to meet the proprietors of British provincial newspapers whose interest in America seemed to begin and end with legends of Al Capone and the bright lights of filmland.

We have had a free and uncensored exchange of news with England for generations, but evidently have never succeeded in convincing the English people that America is anything but a land of milk and honey.

Like many portions of the American press, a London newspaper editor is always looking for the sensational, and his readers evidently enjoy the juicy tidbits from this side of the Atlantic.

American films, too, have given the British public a fanciful conception of life in America and a false evaluation of our blessings and shortcomings.

If, with the freest exchange of news between the two English-speaking nations, we have been unable to portray correctly the American scene as it actually exists through the medium of the British press, what possible chance have we of reaching the Russians through a few thousand radio sets scattered among 193,000,000 people?

I applaud Mr. Benton's ardent desire to give the world more information about our country, but as yet I remain unconvinced that it can be accomplished through Government publicity agencies.

The American Society of Newspaper Editors has extended to Mr. Benton the privilege of expressing his viewpoint in our forthcoming conference in Washington.

Perhaps we shall all be convinced by the logic of his argument, but at this time I am of the firm opinion that the story of America can best be told by our own press associations and the correspondents of foreign newspapers who enjoy complete freedom of expression in the dispatches they file from our shores.

Another ominous development which threatens the liberties of individual reporters and correspondents is contained, ironically enough, in the first report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press.

This is known in the trade as the Leigh-White report its authors being Dr. Robert D. Leigh and Llewellyn White, working under the auspices of the University of Chicago and Henry Luce, of the Time-Life publications, who provided the money for the commission's study.

This report, in effect, recommends a number of desirable objectives upon which we can all agree, such as equality of access to news, equality of access to transmission facilities at equal rates and elimination of censorship. In fact, all of these desirable objectives were first advocated by the ASNE committee on world freedom of information.

The danger lies in other of the recommendations which should be subjected to the closest scrutiny by all lovers of freedom. I refer specifically to the commission's advocacy of a "permanent international agency functioning as an autonomous part of UN to deal with mass communications."

Duties of this unit would be to "receive, consider carefully, and report individual or collective violations of the multilateral treaty and investigate (by aid of monitoring broadcast, examination of printed material and pictures) areas in which distortion of facts and fomenting of international discord are being carried on."

Actually, that means the creation of a supervisory body which would attempt to pass judgment upon the activities of our press associations abroad and the shackling of correspondents, who in the eyes of this international czar, were filing dispatches that jeapordized the peace of the world.

The same hazard to freedom of reporting is contained in the commission's suggestion that under the ideal set-up they have in mind, all foreign correspondents would be accredited to the UN under a code of self-discipline in which a violator of the code would be tried by his fellow journalists.

In practice, this would mean that a reporter who filed a story which the French Government considered to be tendentious or even false, could be tried by his fellow correspondents and the credentials lifted if they found him guilty.

It is the first time that anyone has ever suggested that a reporter should be under the thumb of his competitors or the correspondents of other nations who might have reasons to be sympathetic to the complaining nation.

In time of war, it is customary for reporters to be accredited to the military. This is done for reasons of security and to avoid undue crowding of facilities in a military zone. But we would indeed be taking a headlong plunge into the darkness if correspondents could have their credentials lifted for alleged violations of a peacetime international code of ethics.

It would mean that since the UN is dedicated to maintaining the peace of the world, correspondents would write under the infirmity of having to consider, "Will this story tend to stir up feeling against a member of the UN?" Or, "Will the UN approve of this story and should I send it?"

This would amount to a polite form of supercensorship equal to that now practiced by the countries who insist upon certain diplomatic approval of correspondents working within their boundaries.

Any code of discipline, no matter under what label it may be offered, is a step in the direction of government control of news.

The authors of the Leigh-White report say that "the directors of mass communication media everywhere must come to regard

themselves as being no less responsible for the shape of the world than foreign offices and parliaments." They say also that "whether they like it or not, those engaged in the export of mass communication media have come to be regarded as adjuncts of diplomacy and national policy."

In my humble estimation, that is something that our press associations must avoid at all costs. United States newspapermen were expelled from Germany, Italy, and even Russia for refusing to file doctored accounts of what they saw in those countries.

To brand any of our press associations as adjuncts of diplomacy and national policy would be to write their death sentence as agencies of truthful, uncolored information.

The strength of our press associations lies in the fact that all foreign countries recognize that they have no official connection with our Government.

Reuters, the British agency, was nearly wrecked because for years it was regarded as the official voice of the British Empire. Its new head, Christopher Chancellor, is today working valiantly to remove that stigma from the service and it is most encouraging to note that he is making remarkable progress.

Another sinister note is sounded in the Chicago University report: It says that "nineteen-twentieths of the globe did not have easy access to truthful, abundant news until the United States and British Governments began to supply it."

Doctors White and Leigh mean, of course, the OWI and the British MOI. Having worked in close liaison with both agencies during my service with the Office of Censorship, I cannot help but wonder if the peoples of the world would like to have the wartime activities of those two propaganda agencies used as the yardstick to measure the standards of truthful news?

Doctors Leigh and White dwell at some length on the sins of the press and the movies for having given a distorted and incomplete portrayal of America to foreign lands. They say what is needed is "true information" and "the unhindered flow of information."

Well, who shall do the deciding as to what constitutes "truthful" news? Personally I would rather trust the directing heads of our American press associations to make that decision than to have a public body determine which news story is right and which is wrong.

The great strength and value of any good reporter and his sole responsibility is to serve his readers with factual, accurate news and not to have his efforts approved or disapproved by any Government or international copy desk.

Naively enough, the authors of this report suggest that "a list of provisos involving freedom of the press might be tied to Russia's request for rehabilitation loans." This statement reveals that their conception of freedom of the press is something to be forced if necessary, upon a stubborn nation, like dosing a child with castor oil.

On the question of what news is suitable for export, the report says that "the answer to this problem would appear to be simply a matter of wise selection by competent, well paid press association editors familiar with the peculiar needs of various areas."

It is apparent from this observation that the Chicago pedagogues haven't the slightest conception of the inner workings of the AP, UP, or the INS. All of these organizations have highly trained personnel who are engaged in the production of a news report, not a nicely buttered-up fairy tale based upon what the high-minded gentleman of the State Department thinks is proper for benighted inhabitants of the rest of the world to read.

Efforts of the ASNE committee on world freedom of information are dismissed with the paragraph that:

"A committee of United States newspaper editors has toured foreign countries for the same desirable but vague objectives and has produced an optimistic account of its encounters with foreign statesmen and the press leaders."

The vague objective they refer to is the world freedom of information.

In conclusion, may I say that I sometimes wonder if the rest of the world is as eager to hear the American story as we think it is. Isn't it just a bit presumptuous on our part to assume that our customs and our way of living comprise the proper pattern for other nations to follow?

We have attempted to force our political views on the Argentine with results that seriously affected our prestige in South America. Now we are backing up as gracefully as we can.

Has it occurred to us that our traditional conceit may be as repulsive to Russia as their stubbornness is distasteful to us?

John Foster Dulles said recently that "If I were to be granted one point of foreign policy and no other, I would make it the free flow of information."

With that statement I agree most heartily but the free flow of information means removing censorship, giving free access to correspondents everywhere and affording unhampered transmission facilities.

It does not mean an unchecked propaganda race between the Big Three in which America, Russia, and Great Britain will endeavor to sell their wares in competition with each other.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address at York, Pa., by Hon. Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, before the Jefferson-Jackson dinner given by the Young Democratic Club Society, of York County, Pa., on Saturday night, April 27.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am here at this Jefferson-Jackson dinner because the fight is now on—the fight to elect a progressive Democratic Congress in 1946.

And right here and now in this fight, I want to give my unqualified endorsement of your senior Senator from Pennsylvania—my very good friend, JOSEPH GUFFEY.

The candidacy of JOE GUFFEY for reelection to the Senate this year well exemplifies this national fight for a really progressive Democratic majority in Congress. For no man in the Senate has been more faithful to the cause of the progress of all the people than he; and no progressive Democratic Senator, up for reelection this year, faces a more determined opposition from those who do the bidding of Republican reaction.

JOE GUFFEY never once faltered in his support of that greatest of all disciples of Jefferson and Jackson—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

And just as steadfastly he has supported the progressive legislative program urged upon Congress by Franklin Roosevelt's successor—Harry S. Truman.

Also here tonight I want to pay my hearty respects to another of your public servants from Pennsylvania who serves the progressive cause in the Democratic Party—your junior Senator, FRANCIS MYERS.

In his 2 years in the United States Senate, FRANCIS MYERS has demonstrated thoroughly that he, too, well understands the national interest of all the people. And it is this national interest which demands, from you here in Pennsylvania, the fullest support now and always for legislators like FRANCIS MYERS—the national interest which demands now the reelection of JOSEPH GUFFEY.

You here in all of the Twenty-first Congressional District—and especially those of you who live right here in York County—are in the fortunate position of seeing in your own home area the fact that there is no real conflict between so-called sectional interests and the interests of the Nation as a whole. You can see here in one compact area the interrelationships of all sections of our economy.

For here in this area you have as fine a farming community as exists anywhere in the world. I say this as one who comes from a farm family which, after first settling in this country, tilled the land for many years in western Pennsylvania—and I might have been a native of your State had not my grandfather decided to pull up stakes for Iowa.

Here in this area, your agricultural excellence is balanced by a fine industrial community—with a high percentage of local ownership and local control. The label, "Made in York," advertises the healthy economic fact that the true measure of our industrial greatness is found over all the Nation—and not just in those centers of concentrated corporate magnitude typified by Pittsburgh and Detroit.

Here you have a thriving commerce—a commerce that lies immediately between the farm and the factory and depends upon both for its existence.

And here too, you have a substantial labor unionism deeply imbedded in the good life of the whole community—and you long since have learned that organized labor is as much of an asset to the social economic life of the community as agriculture, industry, and commerce.

These interdependent elements of your community are also the elements of the national interest. They thrive together—or they fail together. One section can prosper for a time at the expense of the others—or by exploitation of the others—but not for long. Given the proper balance between the elements, the whole of the community, or of the Nation, can prosper together continuously. To provide and maintain this balance is the function of the Federal Government, serving the national interest—the general welfare of all.

If every community in the Nation were as well-ordered and well-balanced as yours, the balancing function of the Federal Government would be a much easier task. But most of the Nation does not enjoy, as you do, the close day-to-day interrelationship of all the elements in our social-economic life.

But despite your fortunate position in these respects, you people of York County and all of the Twenty-first Congressional District face the same problems as do those in all the rest of the country in winning the peace.

In winning the war, the name of no city, in the record of accomplishment, stands above that of York, Pa. Here you showed the Nation what farming-out meant in terms of mobilizing a whole community for war production. You made the words, "The York Plan," a synonym for mobilizing our resources for victory.

Now you here in York are up against the hard fact of mobilizing your own resources

for winning the peace—a job even more demanding of all the people's effort than the job of winning the war. For during the war the task of the Federal Government was, of necessity, very much more than that of a balancing function. In the war, Government was forced to control all of the economy from the top down. And without this control the processes of war would have wrecked the very economic life of the Nation overnight.

But the end of our all-out war effort could not mean also an immediate end of all the controls that the Federal Government was forced to impose for the protection of the national interest.

The national interest in a time of crisis—whether it be a crisis of peace or war—demands the protective hand of a government that belongs to all the people. And you here in York—where a people's revolutionary government once found safety—should well know the meaning of the people's government.

Our transition from war to peace, I well know, is trying and arduous. All the people, understandably, are sorely tried in their effort to grasp all the details of this transition. But one fact remains clear.

This fact is that certain people who represent the narrow sectional interest as against the national interest are doing their utmost to wreck the economic stability of the whole Nation. They are doing their best to wreck the good life that belongs to you here in York County.

Just last week this issue of the national interest again came up for a decision in the House of Representatives. It came up on the question of continuing the work of one of those necessary emergency agencies of Government—the Office of Price Administration.

I feel confident that you here tonight believe in the basic fact that the OPA must continue its price controls to prevent a horrible aftermath of an uncontrollable postwar inflation. But what happened?

Your own Representative in the House of Representatives in Washington voted straight down the line—just a week ago—to wreck the OPA. And the name of this Representative of yours is CHESTER GROSS, a Republican reactionary who completely deserted the national interest.

Not only did CHESTER GROSS desert the national interest on this issue of price controls—but he also has deserted the national interest on virtually every basic issue before the House of Representatives—ever since he was elected to serve the interests of you citizens of the Twenty-first Congressional District. He has opposed virtually every legislative proposal that stood for the welfare of all the people. And in standing against the interests of the whole of the Nation, he has also stood against the interests of his own constituents.

The responsibility for Representatives who band together to cripple or halt the progress of the whole of the Nation rests with the citizens in their districts. In recent weeks I have discussed at some length the responsibilities of political parties to the people. Tonight I should like to mention another responsibility—the responsibility of the people to their political system.

Political freedom is not a luxury to be enjoyed for a few days out of every 2 years or every 4 years. Political freedom has a price. And that price is constant political vigilance and political action. And this is one of the lessons we must learn now to win and to maintain the peace of abundance that can be ours.

All too often in the past we have become excited along around the end of October—only to become complacent again after the first week in November. The challenge to democracy today cannot be met by this kind of dabbling in politics. The national interest demands that the people constantly exercise their privileges of citizenship right down to the precinct level.

The people must be particularly alert in the off-year elections. For even though there is no President to be elected, there are still national issues of the greatest importance to be decided—and all too often in the past too many people have slumbered in these off-year elections to the detriment of their own interests.

You have a case in point right here in your own district. For some years, you were represented in Washington by a good progressive Democrat—Harry Haines. Then in the off-year election of 1938, too many of you people in the Twenty-first Congressional District were asleep at the switch of our national well-being. Mr. Haines lost that election by just two-tenths of 1 percent of the total vote. Just 200 more votes would have returned him to Washington. And again in the off-year election of 1942, Mr. Haines lost by an even smaller percentage of the vote.

In the voting record of your present Representative, you can add up the cost to your own interests and to the national interest for this lack of political vigilance and political action.

We are now in another off-year election—at a time of great crisis. If the people give too little of their time and effort to political action, and give it too late, we shall again have boom, bust, and chaos.

The course ahead is clearly defined. You can have reaction or you can have progress. And our history clearly shows that, as a nation, we have made our greatest social and economic progress with the Democratic Party.

I do not need to tell you people here in York what Republican reaction would mean again to all the Nation. You know all about idle factories. You know that even your own well-balanced economy cannot survive national stagnation. And from recent events, you know that the Republican leadership still represents everything that is reactionary in our national life.

But you will get Republican reaction if you do not give your time and effort to effective political action.

The time for this action is now. And to you here in York, and in all of Pennsylvania, this action means not only the reelection of JOE GUFFEY to the United States Senate, it means that you should elect as governor that progressive farmer and manufacturer—John Rice. It means that you should elect to the House of Representatives another good Democrat from Gettysburg, John Brehm.

In recent weeks I have been over quite a bit of the country, speaking in behalf of a progressive Democratic Congress. I intend to keep it up until election day and I will be back again in Pennsylvania. I want to go to Philadelphia to speak in behalf of the solid Democratic block of Representatives from that city, who, like JOE GUFFEY, have gone down the line for progress. And I intend to speak elsewhere in Pennsylvania in behalf of a bigger Democratic representation from your State. I am doing this because of the heritage which Franklin Roosevelt left to the Democratic Party—the heritage of political and economic freedom for all.

Liberalism Abroad and at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Liberalism Abroad and at Home," which I delivered at the commencement exercises at Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Sunday, April 28.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States is facing today a tremendous array of complex international and domestic issues. Finding the proper and democratic solutions to these problems is a confusing and difficult task, even for legislators in Washington who devote their full time to the job. Unfortunately, our task is further complicated by the existing confusion in political principles and labels.

It is my purpose this afternoon to define political liberalism and then to discuss the application of liberal principles to some of our major international and domestic issues. While I speak only for myself, I do believe that the principles of liberalism as I define them are those held by that large group of Americans who belong neither to the political right nor the political left, even though we may differ on their application to specific issues.

If the United States is to meet realistically the vast issues we face, it is imperative that the people of America understand and agree on a few fundamental political principles which currently have become obscured and confused. This effort of mine at definition grew out of my own urgent need to develop a fundamental yardstick which I could apply to the scores of perplexing issues pending in Congress.

We speak of our Government as a democracy. Actually, it is not a pure democracy, where the people decide issues directly and the majority decision is final and absolute. Ours is a representative democracy, wherein the people govern through elected representatives. It is also a constitutional democracy. Neither Congress, the Executive, nor the courts have absolute power in their respective jurisdictions. They are limited to the powers specifically granted to them in the Constitution, and even in the exercise of those powers they may not encroach on the rights and freedoms of individuals guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. The framers of our Constitution were convinced, I believe rightly so, that too great concentrations of political power are dangerous to freedom, and that a bare majority can be as tyrannical as an absolute monarch. Therefore they wrot into the Constitution only limited powers, and protected individual rights even against those powers of government. And then they provided that the Constitution could not be amended except by vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States. They were taking no chances on the liquidation of individual freedoms by a bare majority.

The resulting system of checks and balances does slow down government in a democracy. It cannot change the rules by the stroke of one man's pen. Major decisions generally are not made except after months and sometimes years of public discussion, which have built up an overwhelming—not merely a bare—majority, public support for the decision made. That is the price we pay for freedom and democracy

Two things are essential if our democratic system is to meet effectively the challenge it faces. One is that the electorate know the facts and hear both sides of every issue. The second is political leadership that is willing to really give leadership, based on fundamental principle, rather than following whatever appears to be the majority opinion of the moment. We are deficient in both today. Too many individuals are hearing only that side of any issue which the particular pressure group with which they are affiliated

wants to present to them, and they make no real effort to hear the other side. And far too many politicians who know the facts and could help us make the right decision on issues are instead following the path of expediency and exploiting rather than helping to dispel ignorance, bigotry, and prejudice.

Every believer in democracy and liberalism must practice what Voltaire preached when he said, "I disagree with everything you say, but I will defend with my life your right to say it." It is all too apparent from the reactions to the recent speeches of Winston Churchill that some Americans have forgotten this fundamental precept of democracy.

Against that background of the democratic process, let's try to define political liberalism.

There are a great many groups in America today which apparently judge a public official's liberalism on the basis of whether he is willing to support any and all legislation which purports to give additional rights, immunities, privileges, or benefits to some particular group in our society I notice that those who use this formula to determine whether a politician is liberal always insist that the group receiving these special benefits or privileges must be a very large group with plenty of votes. If the recipient group happens to be a small one which does not carry too much weight at the polls, then voting for special privileges, immunities, or benefits becomes a symbol of reaction. This formula seems to be based on the theory that simply by passing a law in Congress we can give a great many people something for nothing. It seems to me very much the same kind of political philosophy as that on which the early Caesars of Rome operated when they kept the people acquiescent with bread and circuses.

I do not agree with the theory that we ever get something for nothing. We always pay in some coin for progress, and for benefits received, whether by additional mental or physical effort, by some curtailment of the freedoms which we have enjoyed previously, or by the restriction of the freedoms of the members of some particular group in society.

The industrial revolution, for instance, brought about a tremendous increase in material living standards of the people wherever it occurred. We paid for that increase in a rapid growth of city slums, in curtailment of economic freedoms and psychological maladjustments of individuals which have filled State mental hospitals to overflowing.

Many proposals are being advanced today under this false label of liberalism, designed to assure all the people in this country a high standard of living, regardless of what the individual does for himself, simply by passing a law. All history should prove to us that such a guaranty to individuals will be paid for eventually in a very precious coin indeed—the coin of individual human freedom.

It is my conviction that to be a political liberal, one must be devoted to liberty. I mean liberty, not for any particular group in society, whether it be workers, farmers, business or professional men, but liberty for all individuals as individuals. I don't think freedom means anything in relation to any group. Freedom has meaning only as it applies to individuals. A political liberal in my dictionary has two primary objectives. One is to assure the greatest degree of economic and political freedom for all individuals consistent with enjoyment of the same degree of freedom by all other individuals. The second objective is equality for all individuals. I do not mean absolute equality, which is impossible among human beings and could be achieved only if we turned into robots, but equality of opportunity and equality before the law for all individuals. The key word in this definition of a liberal is the individual. A liberal judge issues as they arise primarily on whether their net effort will be to expand or contract the sum total of opportunities and freedoms enjoyed, not by any particular group in society, but by all of the people as individuals. You will never find a liberal according to my definition talking about "the masses" or "the common man" or even "the average man." To my kind of liberal every individual is very uncommon. He is a human being with a soul, not merely a complex assembly of appetites and fears.

The political opposite of liberalism is not conservatism. A political conservative is merely one who says, "Let's go slow about destroying or changing our present institutions." The opposite of a conservative is a radical, who is always ready to try almost any experiment. Both conservatives and radicals may be liberal in their basic philosophy or they may be the opposite of liberal, which is authoritarian. The authoritarian in politics is the one who believes that a particular group, whether it be in government, in labor, or in business, has a special mission to plan the whole pattern of society and to require all individuals, whether they like it or not, to fit into that pattern. The authoritarians may be very well-meaning people who want nothing more than to do good for everybody. Or they may be individuals who want power simply because they love the exercise of power, in which case they are tyrants. You will notice that under my definition of liberalism and its political opposite—authoritarianism—both Fascists and Communists fall into the latter category. They are as like as Tweedledee and Tweedledum in their determination to force all individuals in society to fit into their particular theory of what is a perfect society, and they are as one in their opposition to freedom and dignity for the individual.

One more thing: Liberals must be constantly on guard against tyranny and authoritarianism wherever and whenever they show their heads. Liberals have learned that there can be no compromise in the centuries-old struggle between tyranny and human freedom, and consequently they are vigilant against any abuse of justice or the principle of equality before the law wherever it occurs, whether it is the denial of civil rights or economic opportunity to Negroes in America, the appeasement of a dictator at Munich, or the appeasement of a slightly different kind of tyranny in Iran.

Today the major objective of United States foreign policy is to support and strengthen the United Nations. How do our principles of liberalism square with that primary objective of our foreign policy? Immediately I think, we find several difficulties in squaring the United Nations Charter and procedures with our liberal principles. In the first place, it is an organization of separate, sovereign nations and not of individual people. It draws what authority and power it has, not from the people but from the governments in the various nations. Some of those governments in turn do draw their power and authority from the people, but many of them do not. Second, the Charter, with its veto power for each of the five permanent members of the Security Council, violates the principle of equality of nations under international law, which principle any liberal who believes in equality of individuals before the law must support in the international field. With each of Five Great Powers having a veto on any action to enforce international law on itself or any of its particular friends among the nations, equality of nations before the law as proclaimed in the Charter is only theoretical. It cannot actually be enforced if any one of the great powers decides against enforcement.

The third major difficulty which liberals encounter in the United Nations and in all international relations is the great conflict of political ideologies in the world today. The fact appears to be that only the United States, the nations of the British Commonwealth, and a handful of other democratic states really are devoted to the fundamentals of democratic political procedure and to the freedom and dignity of the individual. Among the great powers, France, Britain, and the United States do have this concept of freedom, democracy, and liberalism; and China, although she still has a long road to travel, seems to be moving in that direction. However, one of the Five Great Powers, namely Russia, is devoted to the opposite political philosophy from liberalism, namely authoritarianism. The individual's freedom, dignity, and rights count for little or nothing in Russia, and the principles, policies, and programs decided upon by a small ruling group count for everything. I believe myself that this ideological gulf in political thinking between the democracies and Russia is the greatest and most difficult obstacle in the path of maintenance of world peace and justice. It is a conflict in political philosophy not confined to the international field because we have very substantial groups in this country who are advocating for us, either directly or indirectly, very much the same sort of authoritarian system which prevails in Russia. One of these groups, the Communist Party, advocates such a change openly, and works toward it under cover in many organizations not directly affiliated with the party. International cooperation between nations with such completely opposite political philosophies obviously presents grave problems.

In spite of these difficulties which liberals find in the United Nations, that organization offers the only hope of finally establishing international law and justice on a firm foundation of government, and for that reason we should support it with all the influence at our command. It is only as the peoples and nations of the world can organize in such institutions as the United Nations Assembly and Security Council, agree on a common interpretation of international law, and establish the means to enforce that law equally on all nations that we can hope eventually to see the principles of liberalism prevail in the world.

While we support the United Nations as it exists, it is also our obligation to press at every opportunity for the changes needed to transform it into an instrument capable of preserving the liberties and equalizing the opportunities of individual people on the world level. Our concept of liberty is freedom under law which applies equally to all, and it is only through the eventual extension of that concept to the world that we can hope for any permanent peace with justice. We need not be precipitate about seeking these changes, but the opportunities to propose them clearly will develop—some of them very soon. For instance, if this concept of equality of nations under enforceable international law is to be achieved, one of the first steps will have to be elimination or drastic modification of the veto power of the great nations. We have established a United Nations Commission to study the possibilities for international control of atomic weapons. I think all scientists and politicians who have studied the question are agreed that one essential for effective international control of atomic weapons is complete freedom of inspection for the international agencies charged with control. Obviously, there cannot be such complete freedom as long as any nation is free to exercise a veto power. Likewise, the freedom of inspection would mean little if, when the inspectors found a great power violating the rules, it was still possible for that nation to veto any action by the Security Council to stop the violation. So, again, the veto must go if we are to control effectively the threat of a third world war fought with atomic weapons. When the veto goes, of course, some system of proportionate representation of nations must be devised.

Secretary Byrnes is absolutely right, by liberal principles, in resisting the Russian demand that the veto power be extended to preclude even open discussion of issues by the Security Council if one of the great powers opposes it. By insisting that Iran be given a hearing before the Security Council, despite Russia's objection, the United States was following the course of true liberalism. Perhaps we should have carried it even further, as Australia's delegate desired, and insisted on a real review of the facts before pigeonholing the whole question until May 6.

The United States, along with other liberal nations and leaders, should seek to implement completely those expressions of concern for individual rights and freedoms now in the United Nations Charter, and should press at every opportunity for a real international bill of rights for individuals which is capable of enforcement.

In our insistence, so far, at least, on retaining national sovereignty over island bases scattered across the Pacific, I believe we have departed from the principles of liberalism. We are arrogating to ourselves as a great power special privileges which we would not concede to any other nation, large or small. It seems to me the only course a true liberal could advocate in this particular field is internationalization, under the United Nations, of these key strategic bases, not only in the Pacific but throughout the world. Even though we may be sure in our own minds that we never contemplate any aggression, when we demand national sovereignty over these Pacific bases 6,000 miles from our shores on the basis of national security, we weaken the grounds of principle on which we oppose Russian attempts to gain control of strategic bases on the Dardanelles and in the Middle East which she considers vital to her national security.

In the economic field the liberal approach is to seek the elimination of high tariffs, exchange controls, and other barriers to free multilateral trade among the individuals of the various nations. If we do not move in that direction, quite clearly we will have more and more bilateral trade deals between governments. Governments will tend to dominate, control, and eventually run international trade and commerce, with little or no freedom or opportunity for individuals. That would mean authoritarianism, and not liberalism, in the international economic field.

Basically, that is why liberals supported the Bretton Woods agreements establishing an International Bank and Monetary Fund for the purpose of gradually eliminating these barriers and facilitating free multilateral trade among individuals again of various nations. I believe liberals should support the British loan agreement. It is clear to anyone who has studied Britain's very difficult balance of international payments problem that it is only if the United States and the dominions extend these credits that Britain can hope in the next 5 years to balance her international payments without resorting to very drastic controls, barter deals, and other devices which would further restrict the freedom of international trade and commerce. The agreement by England to eliminate present exchange controls and to go along on a program of free multilateral trade, even though it means a 5-year "austerity" program for the British people, appears to me a very substantial quid pro quo for the loan. The loan is essentially a device to share with our ally, on a credit, and not a gift, basis, the raw material and other resources needed for England's reconstruction and also needed for our reconversion. I believe such a sharing of material resources for reconstruction in the next few years is as essential to future world stability as is the immediate sharing of world food resources to prevent famine.

Above and beyond this appeal of logic for the loan, extending a helping hand to England now is small repayment for the debt which we and all free peoples owe to the English people for their gallant stand alone against the forces of tyranny in those dark months from June of 1940 until June of 1941. While our future armies still trained with broomsticks and our factories were still tooling up for war production, Britain held the line against odds that appeared overwhelming. Dollars alone cannot measure the debt which freedom owes to her.

But the real $64 foreign-policy question for American liberals is: What should the United States do to remain strong enough to fulfill our world responsibilities?

I think most Americans are agreed that the United States should stand firmly for liberal principles of equality of nations before the law and justice for all peoples in international affairs. However, when it comes to making sure that we are prepared to support that position in the only way that a great many nations can understand our support, many of us, including some leaders in my own Republican Party, fall into an old fallacy. We want to have our cake and eat it, too. We want the United States to talk tough, but we balk at the measures needed if our Government is to be ready to act if action becomes necessary. The only possibility of avoiding the necessity of military action—fighting—is for the United States to be strong enough so that we can act, if necessary, and make sure that the whole world knows we are prepared.

As soon as possible, we should remedy the mistake we made by a too rapid demobilization of our armed forces, and once again have the United States strong enough to really support these liberal principles for which we stand. Despite the public-opinion polls, there is tremendous opposition, not only to extension of the Selective Service Act, but also to universal military training, as measures to keep the United States strong enough to fulfill our world responsibilities. Americans do not like the idea of 1 year of compulsory military training for all young men. I don't like it myself. But I think the main argument against it—that it is a form of conscription which leads to militarism whereas depending upon a volunteer army is more democratic—is completely illogical. A conscript army is a citizen army and is far less likely to be militaristic than is a so-called volunteer army which is in reality a professional army.

General Eisenhower, General Marshall, and Admiral Nimitz did a magnificent over-all job of organizing, equipping, and leading the armies, navies, and air forces which won the war. Their devotion to human freedom and democracy is just as great as is that of civilian leaders who are too ready to cry "militarism" and take the easy path. As a liberal, I believe it is essential to the cause of freedom that the United States remain strong. I support the basic recommendations of our military leaders and the President for extension of selective service, for universal military training, and for merging many of the functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. If we really want America to exert world leadership in furtherance of liberal democratic principles then we must see to it that America remains strong enough so that her voice in international affairs will be respected. Otherwise we are inviting another period of disgraceful appeasement of aggressors such as marked the 1930's. That is not the easy, pleasant course, but who claimed liberalism was easy?

Liberals are devoted to peace and justice. But liberals also are prepared to fight if necessary for freedom and justice.

Finally, I think that throughout the world we have a responsibility as liberals to be active missionaries for the principles of liberalism and democracy. I would like to see our State Department and our political leaders less bashful about proclaiming the meaning and values of democracy and freedom throughout the world. I intend to support appropriations for the State Department to continue in peacetime such activities of the Office of War Information as will further that objective. It is quite true that we have no right to intervene unilaterally in the internal affairs or choice of government of any nation. I think we made a mistake in attempting that kind of intervention in Spain and Argentina, even though I also dislike the types of government established in those two countries. But refraining from direct intervention in any nation does not mean that we cannot advocate the principles of individual human freedom and dignity. We can and should seize every opportunity to tell people what democracy means to individuals. Our policy never should support or lend economic or political assistance to regimes in any country which trample roughshod over individual rights and freedoms.

After all, this conflict between tyranny and freedom is not a new one. It has been going on for centuries, and freedom has been gaining ground all the time. In spite of the dynamic appearance which both the Fascist and Communist dictatorships have given in recent years, the fact is they are the same old brand of tyranny operating under different labels. Human freedom and individual rights and dignity still have a vitality and an appeal to people throughout the world which tyranny never can have.

Our chance of expanding the freedoms and opportunities of individuals here at home will be much easier if we can achieve stability, justice, and a reasonable assurance of peace in the world. The continual threat of war, like war itself, tends to push peoples and nations into authoritarian forms and controls. Here in the United States we moved a long way in that direction during the recent war.

That is why liberals today are primarily concerned about foreign policy issues. They realize that unless we and our allies can so organize the world that the threat of a third world war is eliminated, or at least minimized, democracy and liberty will be the first casualties in such a war. But in our concern with the international scene, we dare not overlook the authoritarian challenge to liberalism which we face here at home. If liberalism does not prevail in the United States, it will stand little chance in the world. So let's turn now to a discussion of how these principles of liberalism apply to some of our major domestic problems.

If I may be permitted a political statement, a very mild one, I would like to draw what I consider to be the real distinction between liberals and the present and preceding national administrations in this field. I believe the present administration has adopted as its primary goal the achievement of a more abundant life and as nearly complete economic security for all citizens as is possible, to the exclusion of a proper consideration of individual freedom. The administration's approach is authoritarian rather than liberal. Its proposals on any issue always are that the Government take over the whole job, leaving very little to individual initiative, and sharply curtailing individual freedom.

The primary goal of liberals, on the other hand, is not complete economic security for all, but the greatest possible degree of equality of opportunity for all in the economic field, with an insistence that measures to achieve this goal must expand rather than curtail individual freedoms. The administration's approach basically is that Government should guarantee everyone a high standard of living regardless of what the individual himself does.

The liberal approach is that Government's obligation is to make sure that every individual has a fair and equal opportunity to achieve his own economic destiny, and then leave it up to the individual.

There is a real danger today that in our discussion of political issues we will place so much emphasis on achieving economic

security for everyone, that we may achieve it at the expense of freedom, both political and economic, for the individual. We have a tendency to confuse economic security with freedom. Actually the most secure individual in our society is a prisoner serving a life sentence, but he is hardly free. The people of Germany in the early 1930's were so intent on achieving economic security that they permitted their liberties to be liquidated without even a fight.

Minor children do not have the freedom of adults. They have all the economic and social security their families can give to them, but they are not equipped to assume the responsibilities and risks that go with freedom, and consequently we recognize the necessity of parental authority. Every time in history when men and women have turned over to an outside agency all their individual responsibilities and risks, whether they turned them over to a Julius Caesar, a feudal baron, an Adolf Hitler, or an omnipotent state, they have also in the end relinquished their individual freedoms.

My whole concept of freedom—and I think it is basically the American concept—includes the willingness to assume the obligations and risks inherent in being free. It was men and women imbued with this concept of freedom, accepting its risks and obligations along with its rights, who left the safe and civilized East to push west across the wild mountains and untamed prairies of this great country, who built our railroads, our mines, and our great factories, and who, during the past 5 years, invented, produced, and used the weapons that won us victory in war.

It is apparent that tremendous disparities in living standards among families mean inequalities in opportunities for children coming out of such homes. Where all members of a family must struggle constantly to achieve the bare necessities of life, the children do not get a fair break on educational, economic, or social opportunities. The demagog's stock answer to this problem—"Let's soak the rich"—is rejected by the liberal. He knows that in the final analysis, by destroying incentive to individual initiative and enterprise, such a solution will tend to pull down the living standards of everyone. It might equalize opportunities but it would do it by curtailing opportunities for everyone, instead of expanding them for all individuals. In the end, it would be destructive of freedom. The liberal solution is not to pull down the more fortunate, but to raise the less fortunate to a minimum standard, leaving it to the individual's own enterprise to rise above the minimum.

Fortunately, America is productive enough so that we can afford a relatively high minimum standard for all without destroying individual initiative and freedom. The proper and liberal function of our social-security system and minimum-wage law is to place a floor beneath the living standards of all the people and to take care of the inevitable casualties in a free economic system. The standards of such a social-security system should not be so high that they will discourage any large proportion of individuals from exerting themselves to achieve higher standards. If they do that then the United States will soon become weak economically and the living standards of everyone inevitably will fall. At the present time our social-security system, with its old-age retirement annuities, pensions for widows, and provision for dependent children and handicapped persons, covers only those individuals who are employed. Those who are self-employed, professional people and farmers as well as many other groups, are not covered by the system. There are great administrative difficulties in working out the coverage of such groups but that should be the next and imperative step in expanding this system. Similarly, instead of proposing immediately to nearly double the present statutory minimum wage, our effort should be directed toward applying it to all employment by extending the coverage. It might be necessary to keep the minimum wage at only 40 or 50 cents an hour in order to do that, particularly to cover farm labor. But it seems to me that is a far more liberal approach than to try to raise the minimum wage so high that in order to avoid severe economic consequences we are forced, instead of broadening the coverage, actually to restrict it, thereby promoting inequality instead of equality.

There is pending now in the Senate a revised version of the Labor Disputes bill, known as the Case bill, which passed the House some months ago. I am a member of the minority which has proposed six specific amendments to that bill. The amendments are designed to strengthen Federal mediation machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes between management and labor, to require both parties to give that machinery a reasonable opportunity to function before they resort to strike or lockout, and to equalize the legal responsibilities of labor and management in this field. They would do the latter by making unions legally responsible for violation of their contracts, and by outlawing secondary boycotts which are in restraint of trade in exactly the same way such monopoly practices by employers are outlawed under the antitrust laws.

I submit that these proposals, seeking to make great, powerful labor unions and their leaders responsible in some small measure to the public interest, are in fact liberal proposals. Liberals have always opposed the exercise of vast concentrations of either political or economic power without some regulation, control, and responsibility. That is why 40 and 50 years ago liberals were in the forefront of the fight for the antitrust laws, for Government supervision of securities exchanges, and for regulation of public utility rates. It was because concentrations of capital then exercised such vast and uncontrolled economic power that the public interest had become vitally affected and individual rights, opportunities, and freedoms were being curtailed. Today labor unions and their leaders exercise economic powers which are far greater than those of the so-called captains of industry, both in their impact on the public welfare, and in their impact on the individual freedoms and opportunities not only of union members but of unorganized workers. Yet under Supreme Court interpretations of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, unions today are above and beyond the law. The Supreme Court has held specifically that when a union is involved in a labor dispute, whether its objective is licit or illicit, wrong and harmful to society or not, the Federal courts have absolutely no power to impose any responsibility. Unions today are by court decree completely free to impose on communities or other geographical areas absolute monopolies on the types and kinds of materials which the consuming public can buy and use. I submit that such a condition is intolerable to any liberal. Liberals today should be in the forefront of the fight demanding a reasonable regulation of this vast economic power in the interest of individual freedom and opportunity and the general public welfare.

It is my own conviction that only individuals who are strong, with trained minds and healthy bodies, can be truly free. They are fully capable of assuming the risks and responsibilities that go with freedom. Likewise, they have the best security of all: that which comes from inner confidence in their own ability to meet whatever issues may come. That kind of security doesn't have to be conferred or guaranteed by any outside agency.

Our emphasis as liberals, therefore, in seeking greater opportunities and freedoms for individuals, should be on measures and policies which will strengthen the individual and free his mind from fear by giving him knowledge, training, and health. Only thus can individuals win the most precious freedom of all, freedom from fear—the confidence that he can and will measure up to any test that may come and remain true to his own inner creed. Under that policy, the Government has an obligation to see to it that in health and training, all individuals start as nearly equal as possible in our society. That in turn means that whatever excess Federal funds are available when we finally achieve a balanced budget should be earmarked first for programs and projects which will in the long run raise the health and educational standards of the Nation and which particularly will give those who are less fortunate economically a better chance at healthy bodies and trained minds.

Top priorities in any liberal program to equalize and expand individual opportunities should go to scientific research and housing. Scientific research, both fundamental and applied but chiefly the former, is essential to keep our economic system dynamic and to solve the inevitable problems which progress brings with it. We accumulated a very large deficit, both in research and in trained scientists, during the war. Private bequests for scientific research are diminishing to the vanishing point as a result of high individual income and inheritance taxes, and it is imperative that Government step into the breach, not only with grants for research but also with scholarships and fellowships for outstanding students, if we are to avert eventual stagnation. I believe myself that it is just as imperative that Government support research in the social sciences. The Federal Government spent over $2,000,000,000 to develop atomic bombs, and it seems to me simple common sense that we spend a small fraction of that sum to help develop social and political institutions that may keep the atomic bomb from destroying our civilization.

The real problem in housing is not the current deficit, which American industry will make up fairly soon when it gets rolling, but the 6,000,000 substandard homes occupied by families which cannot afford at present to pay an economic rent for decent housing. The so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill which the Senate has just passed provides a sound, liberal solution to that problem. That bill liberalizes credit for housing for lower income families, both for those who buy homes and for those who rent them. In addition, it grants a direct Government subsidy to provide decent housing for families whose incomes are so low they cannot afford to pay an economic rent for decent homes and consequently are forced now to live in slums.

I am opposed to Government subsidies which are broadcast over the whole economy, benefitting the wealthy and the needy alike. They are inflationary and they corrupt a free economy. But a Federal subsidy which goes directly to the family which needs it to give children a halfway decent home environment is a different thing entirely. It fits perfectly into our liberal goal of expanding and equalizing opportunities of individuals.

In our efforts to raise health and educational standards there are two possible approaches. The administration proposes that the Federal Government step in with an elaborate compulsory health insurance program covering everyone regardless of need or desire and virtually forcing all physicians and dentists to join in the program in order to live. That is the purpose of the administration bill introduced by Senators WAGNER, of New York, and MURRAY, of Montana. A different approach is proposed under a Republican bill drafted largely by Senator TAFT of Ohio. It would expand and give Federal support and impetus to the organization in every State of general health programs modeled

largely on the Blue Cross hospital service plan which now is in effect in most States in the Union. That is a voluntary plan under which individuals, by paying a nominal sum each month, can repay the major portion of any hospital expenses incurred by themselves or their families. I believe that kind of a program accords much more with liberal principles than a compulsory, Nation-wide program which inevitably, however much its sponsors may desire otherwise, will tend to build up a tremendous Federal bureaucracy and regiment the medical profession into it. A basic proposal in the Republican bill is that the Federal and State Governments contribute funds to pay subscriptions to these voluntary health service plans for needy persons in the various communities.

The same principles apply to equalization of education opportunities. The bill which was defeated twice in past years in the Senate simply proposed a flat grant based on school population to each State, to be used primarily for teachers' salaries. Now a bill has been worked out whereby about two-thirds of the Federal funds originally proposed would be used to equalize educational opportunities in the various States, with a strict requirement that it be used for that purpose. This again is a sound liberal rather than authoritarian approach.

Although we have won the war against Nazi tyranny and authoritarianism, we have by no means won the ideological fight for liberalism as I define it, either here in the United States or in the world. That will be no easy fight. I know men who have devoted their lives to public service who today are discouraged, and fearful that democracy cannot long survive the tremendous political pressure and clamor of this group and that group, demanding that Government do this and that and the other thing for them, but rejecting every effort of Government to impose on them some minimum obligation of citizenship. The cry in political circles today seems to be special privileges and benefits for all and responsibility for none. I do not believe that is an accurate reflection of the true sentiment of the American people. I cannot believe it, because if it is, then the cause of liberalism is indeed a hopeless cause.

During Senate debate on the full employment bill, several Senators asked on the floor in effect, "What does liberty mean to a man whose wife and children are hungry?" Patrick Henry must have turned over in his grave. That a Senator of the United States can ask seriously such a question is a clarion call to action for all liberals.

It is time for the liberals of America, those who believe in individual human freedom and dignity, to forget the little unimportant differences which have so often divided them in the past politically, and to close ranks and fight for their basic principles. Liberals cannot overlook the dangers which still exist on the extreme political right, the chief of which is economic monopoly. But let's also face the clear fact that the great threat to freedom today is not from the political right but from the extreme political left.

A significant fact, which many of us forgot during our wartime cooperation with Communist Russia, is that both the Fascist and Nazi dictatorships grew out of the political left. Mussolini was a Socialist. In Germany, Hitler led the National Socialist Party. Their appeal was primarily to those people suffering economic privations. They won support by extravagant promises of economic rewards, if only all power were turned over to them.

Communists and Fascists are alike in their devotion to the proposition that the end justifies the means. On that basis, they justify lies, cheating, murder, concentration camps, and secret police as necessary steps on the road to a rosy utopia which always seems to be in the distant future. To a liberal, on the other hand, the means are as important as the end. Neither can be destructive of individual freedom.

That is why liberals must fight communism as bitterly as they fight fascism, even though it means being called red baiters. That fight is more difficult because liberals must always defend the very freedoms which Communists abuse to achieve their end, which is the destruction of freedom. It is more difficult because conservatives in the past have too frequently cried "Communist" simply to defeat liberal and not authoritarian proposals, and consequently many people refuse to believe there is really a wolf there this time.

Let's not permit our understandable desire for economic security to blind us to other values even more vital. We are seeking here in America not just jobs, any kind of jobs, for 60,000,000 Americans, but 60,000,000 opportunities for free Americans to work and produce. We seek here at home and in the world a system under which every individual has an opportunity to develop his own individual capacities to the limit compatible with the same freedom for all other individuals.

There is no easy path to that goal. The easy path is that which the people of Germany, of Italy, of Russia took when they closed their minds and surrendered to the siren call of the dictators: "Give us the power, and you'll have bread and jobs and security. What do freedom and democracy mean if you and your children are hungry?" Not only did these deluded people who took the easy path give up their freedom, but today, despite all the efforts of the free world, they are starving.

No; being a political liberal is not easy. It is just as risky and dangerous as being a free man. The liberal can expect to be called a Communist by the extreme political right. He is sure to be smeared as a Fascist by the extreme political left. He must fight authoritarian proposals that have wide popular appeal. He will incur the enmity of powerful vested interests. He can hope for no reward except that he has fought the good fight for freedom.

If that great cry "Give me liberty or give me death!" still lives in your heart and mind, then you can be a liberal.

Address by Dr. Frank Kingdon at Roosevelt Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Frank Kingdon at the Roosevelt memorial dinner, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York, April 12, sponsored by the National Citizens' Political Action Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Morgenthau, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here to remember the life and work of the President of the United States who carried this country through to victory over the greatest threat to its independence that was ever presented to us by a foreign power. We are met here tonight to remember a President who led us through the greatest depression that this country ever faced and gave our national society a new stability and a new faith in itself. Either of these accomplishments would have established him as one of the superb leaders of America. Both of them together undoubtedly place him in the constellation of the four greatest Presidents, alongside Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

It may very well be that when historians write the record of the first 175 years of our Nation's life they may say that Franklin Roosevelt was the greatest of them all.

It is given to all generations to read about greatness. It is given to a few generations to live with greatness. We have walked with a great man. There are others here who will bring their tributes, eloquent and moving, and it is not part of my responsibility tonight to add to those tributes. I will simply exercise the happy prerogative of associating myself with all of them so that they become the expressions of the affection, the deep, moving affection, which I felt and still feel for the man who was the greatest inspiration of my generation.

To me falls what is perhaps the more sober, more arduous task of suggesting how we shall carry through the ideals of Franklin Roosevelt in terms of political action. I speak for carrying forward in practical ways the program that he so bravely began.

The National Citizens' Political Action Committee is an organization inspired by the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, originally created to aid in his reelection and now dedicated to the completion of his unfinished work. Franklin Roosevelt is not dead as long as his spirit lives in any of us, and all of us together, with joined hands and hearts, may make sure that this spirit continues to inform and guide our national destiny. The leader is gone; the host of his followers can continue to fight for his ideals. We here raise the standard of Franklin Roosevelt and call upon all who loved him to rally around that banner to complete the fight.

We are not a political party; we have no intention of becoming a political party; we are the spokesmen for social progress, in advance of all parties, and ready everywhere to support all men and measures, regardless of party, which will forward the cause of liberty and assure justice and security for all. Let no party and no leader of a party think that he owns or controls the National Citizen's Political Action Committee. We have no intention of becoming an instrument of a party that retains in its membership such men as BILBO and RANKIN, and men of that stripe who deny, by every speech they make and every act they perform, the principle and inspiration of our leader. We have no intention of becoming the instrument of a party which finds apparently its most enlightened leadership in a VANDENBERG and a TAFT. We are an independent committee dedicated not to any partisan ends, but dedicated only to a program and a memory, and in that memory we shall carry the program through to its completion.

All that has happened since the death of President Roosevelt has underlined the necessity for our existence. Men greedy for wealth by the exploitation of their fellows took new courage because the champion of the people had passed on and they at once moved with all their force into every channel of political action in order to stifle and, if possible, destroy the social gains which Roosevelt had won. Men who had been reared in regional traditions of racial prejudice and of intolerance against certain other groups at once moved, upon the death of President Roosevelt, with a new audacity into our public places to attempt to fight every effort that was made to establish equality for all our people.

Once more, the voices of racial hatred and group prejudice have been raised amongst us, mouthing with bitter zeal their angry propaganda and lies, destined to build distrust and hatred of other groups who worship

at different altars or have a deeper pigment in their skin. Still others, poisoned by fear and suspicion, are proclaiming that there cannot be friendship among the nations who were allies in this war and are thus trying to stir the embers of an old war to create an even more dreadful conflagration and catastrophe.

As long as any of these shout their slogans of privilege and division, we know that we are in a fight and we are ready to fight them, anywhere and everywhere their voices are raised. We wrestle for the soul of America and for the peace of the world. Our strength is tireless because we know that right is on our side, and in our ears there is the echo of the fighting voice of Roosevelt urging us on.

The principle which directs our activity on the domestic front can be simply stated. We desire the organization and the management of our national wealth to serve all our people justly and generously. We are for free enterprise that is really free—free from monopoly as well as free from Government tyranny. We are for a free enterprise that sets men free—free from fear, free from discrimination, and free from every form of exploitation that is rooted in the special privilege of a few.

Men were not made for property; property was made for men. We believe that to every man should come an adequate reward for the work that he does, but we do not believe that any man should dwell in poverty or that there should be insecurity amongst any Americans in this most prosperous of all nations.

Our political program calls for the defeat of the fear of unemployment to a national policy of full production and full employment, guaranteeing every worker a job and putting under our whole economy a mass purchasing power which will keep all our wheels turning. We call for the defeat of the fear of sickness through a national program of health insurance. We call for that program of health insurance which will bring to every home and individual that care which will overcome the hazards of health and raise the physical standards of all our people.

We call for the defense of the American home through a national program of housing which will give every citizen a chance to live under his own roof and raise his family by his own fireside. We call for the payment of our heaviest and most pressing national debt through a program of help for our veterans which will care adequately for the disabled, supply jobs for those who want to work, and provide opportunity for education to those who desire to pursue their training further.

We call for the universal application of the principle of social security by extension of the Social Security Act to include every person employed in all trades and in all occupations, whether in big firms or small. We call for the defeat of prejudice by opening the doors of all educational institutions and all business opportunities to all our citizens equally regardless of race or creed.

We call for the recognition of the dignity of the workers by the strengthening and extension of the principle of collective bargaining through strong unions of their own choosing. We believe that we can have an America in which all may work and enjoy in security the blessings of liberty under a standard of living higher than any mankind has ever known. We are not afraid of abundance; we believe in organizing it and making it the prosperity of all.

In the international field, we seek security and justice under law. To this end, we pledge support to a foreign policy which will put all our national strength behind the United Nations. We repudiate the theory that we cannot work in accord with Russia and that we cannot work in accord with Great Britain, or that we cannot work in accord with any other nation. We are for a full and free association of all nations in the adventure of peace. To this end, we urge the speediest possible international agreement on control of atomic energy, so that this gravest of human achievements may become the instrument of a more humane world society. The split atom demands a united world. We propose that this Government take every step not only to share our knowledge but our food, that men everywhere may live and know that liberty is generous as well as strong. We serve the vision of Roosevelt by dedicating ourselves to world unity.

We urge that this not be left to any voluntary appeal to the people. Five hundred million of our fellow human beings this night are hungry. Many millions of them face starvation. This is no time to talk of sacrifice, when we give up a little wheat in our bread or an extra slice of bread on the breakfast table. This is the time for the conscience and intelligence of America to rise and say: "Organize us, discipline us, do what you will. Only give to those who need and feed the hungry."

There are those who call us radicals. We are; we are as radical as the ideal of freedom. We are as radical as the tradition of American radicalism has been since the founding of this country, and we take the word they hurl at us with disdain. We wear it as a man might wear a decoration because it puts us in the company of Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt.

Our goal is the "four freedoms." Our charter is the economic bill of rights. Our inspiration is the American dream of universal liberty, and our program is the achievement of security and prosperity for ourselves and all people everywhere in the world.

Our instrument is the ballot. Our immediate task is to take our part in every campaign district where we have a chance to replace a reactionary with a progressive. The practical need is to put men with the ideals of Franklin Roosevelt into public office, and we intend, by every legitimate means, to help accomplish this.

Practical political results can come only through a combination of three factors: people, money, and organization. We call for the association of people dedicated to progress in a citizens' committee amply supported by funds which can be spent efficiently and directly in the field to support candidates pledged to the fulfillment of the Roosevelt policies.

The people of America want no return to the inequalities of yesterday. They are looking for a bold leadership to show the way to a more stable economy, fuller equality, and greater democracy. The congressional elections of 1946 offer an opportunity for the people to register their will, and I am sure that at this point I have the deep sympathy of most of you who know me very well because they have told me that I can make no appeal for funds. I would be only too glad tonight to press this thing home not only upon your hearts, as with a thorn against your flesh, but against your pocketbooks.

We've got to have people; we've got to have organization; we've got to have money, and we can use the money where it will count: in these congressional districts where men are elected. I cannot ask you for money because you have been told that none will be raised, but I am sure that all of you will be delighted to hear that you will be hearing from me within a few days. I am going to lay that matter on your hearts. Let us have a Roosevelt political fund that will put the fear of God into the heart of every reactionary in this country.

The forces of reaction are organizing. They have almost unlimited funds. They are now building war chests so great that even the Roosevelt fights did not see anything like the war chests which are being built for 1946 and 1948. They actually believe that they can take the country away from the principles of Roosevelt and from Roosevelt's friends. They believe that the death of Roosevelt has given them a new chance to regain control of the country.

They have the money; we have the people, and the people must be aroused. They can be aroused. There is a sort of bewilderment; there is a sort of confusion; there is a sort of disorganization among the liberal forces of this country. We have not yet pulled ourselves together from the shock that came to us when the great voice and the great leader was taken from us. But confusion is beginning to pass. In the steadier moments that are coming now, at the end of this first year of his absence, we are beginning to realize that everything that he was—and which we lost with his passing—we can make up by our own concerted effort and by a strong and great leadership.

We have the people; the people want leadership. There is a stirring beneath the surface of this Nation's life demanding a more progressive leadership than we have ever had. If we stand together, share our brains, share our ideals, share our money, we can keep this country the great, progressive country that Franklin Roosevelt made it and that, in Franklin Roosevelt's memory, it must, it absolutely must, continue to be.

As we are gathered here tonight, I have been thinking, looking at you. Somebody has said it is like old home week. It is, indeed. Here we are. Some of us were young when Roosevelt came in. The years have moved upon us. There are gray hairs, and on some of us not very many of those. There have been years of a great companionship under a great leader. The thickets have been broken aside; the new trail has been blazed. We have met. I hope that we can meet every April 12, renew our pledge to each other every year, and keep the spirit of this great comradeship moving in our national life.

Ladies and gentlemen, we who loved Roosevelt must not let him down. We have not finished our work, nor can we lay aside our weapons until his vision is fulfilled and every American walks in security, in a land that is free, whose borders are protected by an international security because we have unity among all the nations. We have met, we have pledged ourselves. Let us rise up from this place and march. The banner is still high; the voice still rings. There is yet a cause, a great, ringing, singing, moving, human cause to be served and to be won.

Savings From the Renegotiation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of War, Mr. Robert P. Patterson, to me, of April 5, 1946, in reference to the savings from the Renegotiation Act.

Mr. President, this act was passed early in the war and has brought about gigantic savings to the Government in the renegotiation of many war contracts. The total of refunds as of March 8, 1946, was $9,390,233,000. It is said that it might have been gotten back in some other way, but this is the way that a large amount of money was obtained.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 5, 1946.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: This is in response to your request for a summary of the results of the renegotiation of contracts under the renegotiation statutes.

The renegotiation of contractors assigned to the War Department for the 1942, 1943, and 1944 fiscal years has been substantially completed. It is expected that most of the War Department cases for the subsequent fiscal periods will be completed by November 1946.

In the renegotiation cases completed by the War Department Price Adjustment Board as of March 8, 1946, refunds of $6,262,393,000 had been determined. As of that date the Navy and Treasury Departments, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration had completed renegotiation cases involving refunds of $3,127,840,000. The total of refunds determined was, therefore, $9,390,233,000 as of March 8.

According to the best available estimates, Federal income and excess-profits taxes would have recovered approximately 70 percent of excessive profits determined through statutory renegotiation, leaving an estimated net recovery from renegotiations conducted by the War Department of $1,878,718,000 and from all departments $2,817,070,000.

In addition to the above, the Office of the Chief of Finance of the War Department reports contract-price reductions in War Department contracts in the amount of $3,252,194,000, and similar adjustments by other departments are known to be very large. Some of these reductions resulted directly from statutory renegotiation, and others were brought about by the independent activities of contracting officers or through the coordinated action of contracting and renegotiation officers.

It should be noted that neither the refunds in renegotiation nor the price reductions on existing contracts include the amounts reflecting the lowering of prices on reorders and successive procurements. It is impossible to arrive at even an approximate estimate of the aggregate of such amounts, but it is known to be tremendous and in substantial measure has resulted from the influence exerted by the existence of the renegotiation statute and of the policies followed in its administration.

The renegotiation recoveries are after allowances of deductions for amortization of war facilities under certificates of necessity except to the extent that the refunds may be modified through the renegotiation rebate on recomputed amortization.

A very important utilization of the renegotiation activity has been in connection with the termination of war contracts. In the administration of the Renegotiation Act, a policy was adopted to consider in a renegotiation the situation resulting from the use of the so-called no-cost settlement of contract-termination claims. Through the no-cost termination-claim settlement procedure, contractors in a great number of cases have waived their claims to compensation on account of the termination of their war contracts and have been allowed appropriate credit therefor in renegotiation. This method has obviated the necessity of making individual settlements in tens of thousands of such claims and has saved the Government and contractors untold accounting work and administrative detail. The recoveries effected through statutory renegotiation have therefore been substantially decreased because of the propitious inclusion of this procedure in the renegotiation activity.

As of March 8, 1946, the renegotiation of 1942 assignments to the War Department was 99.95 percent completed, assignments for 1943 were 99.80 percent completed, and those for 1944 were 96.40 percent completed. Of the 59,764 assignments completed for these 3 years 41,308 were canceled or cleared as having no excessive profits. Voluntary refund agreements have been entered into in 17,785, or 96.36 percent, of the 18,456 assignments in which excessive profits were found. The remaining 671 assignments have resulted in unilateral determinations. Data relating to periods subsequent to December 31, 1944, are not included in the figures presented in this paragraph as the number of cases completed for these periods is not sufficient to be statistically informative in the matters here referred to.

Although the monetary saving to the Government is impressive, it is perhaps the least important result of the Renegotiation Act. Through the act and its administration, efficiency of industry has been fostered, procurement and production of war material has been enhanced, inflationary tendencies of the wartime period have been combated, and the system of free enterprise has been protected against the accusation of retention of excessive and unconscionable profits out of war.

The accomplishments of renegotiation from April 28, 1942, the date of the enactment of the first renegotiation statute, through December 31, 1945, were achieved at an estimated expense to the War Department of $22,581,000. This is thirty-eight one hundredths of 1 percent (0.38 percent) of the gross recoveries of excessive profits for that period of one and twenty-seven one hundredths of 1 percent (1.27 percent) of the net recoveries after deduction of estimated taxes. Estimated expenses through December 31, 1945, of the renegotiation activity of all departments, including the War Department, aggregate $29,772,000, which is 0.34 percent of the total gross recoveries or 1.13 percent of the total net recoveries for that period. As low as these percentages are, they do not adequately emphasize the low cost of the renegotiation activity even in relation solely to monetary savings, as the price reductions resulting directly or indirectly from the influence of renegotiation, both on existing contracts and on reorders and successive procurements, are not included in this consideration.

I feel that the Congress can justly take pride in the farsighted, comprehensive, and effective renegotiation statutes, in the enactment of which you took so substantial a part.

Sincerely yours,

R. P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Food Parcels for Germany and Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Father Alcuin Heibel, of the Sacred Heart Church, of Portland, Oreg., pleading that private charity in this country be permitted to send food and clothing to Germany and Austria.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRED HEART CHURCH,
Portland, Oreg., April 9, 1946.

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: Here I am again with one of my pet problems: relief for the innocent victims of war in Europe. I have two requests. Will you help again to find out why, after all this time, we still cannot send parcel-post packages to Austria. Weeks ago we were promised that surely within the very near future parcels could be sent to individuals where the address was definitely known and to institutions. So far nothing has happened. From many letters coming from Austria I know how much good could be done with these 11-pound parcels of concentrated food and medicines. Second, it has been publicly announced, and now even admitted by the peculiar General Clay, that food rations in the American zone in Germany are dangerously low. Yet all the private charitable agencies in the United States combined may send no more than 2,000 tons of food or clothing into Germany per month. There are hundreds of thousands of Americans of German ancestry who would gladly deprive themselves of luxuries in food if they knew that it could be sent to the undernourished in Germany. I have just received a letter from Rome where a German priest attending the ceremony of German bishops being made cardinals described for us the suffering in parts of Germany, especially Berlin.

Senator CORDON, I am writing also to Senator MORSE as well as a few other Senators whom I met when last in Washington. Would you be willing to make an appeal to the President's War Board to permit more than 2,000 tons of food and clothes to go to Germany per month from our various relief organizations? If our people are willing to sacrifice for the sake of Christian charity why should that be prohibited?

Our commanding general in Germany, according to reports in this morning's Oregonian, has admitted again that we are doing a very inefficient job in Germany because of the zones and lack of cooperation and unity between the zones. I had hoped that this time we were going to build for peace in Europe. Can we build for a future peace by letting innocent victims, children, women, and old people suffer and die because we are not organized to take care of the problem?

There is another thing I would like to mention to you. I have known a number of German prison camps in the Middle West and far West. According to the testimony of chaplains visiting these camps, more than 50 percent of these German prisoners were Catholics or Lutherans who did not and never had subscribed to the Nazi philosophy. They had known only intimidation and force from the Nazi government and from their Nazi fellow prisoners (especially as long as there seemed to be a chance that Germany might win). Nevertheless these Catholic and Lutheran boys were handed over by our Government to the French, where they have to do forced labor and continue their exile from home. Why did we not take these dominating Nazis in our prison camps and send them to France and allow the non-Nazis to return to their homes in Germany where they could and would be a help to us in rebuilding normal lives for future Germany and a decent government? Surely we are in Europe to rebuild the good rather than just to punish those who were really enemies of democratic or just government.

I shall be glad to hear from you. Speak to Senator MORSE and to the other Senators

who took such a fair stand in the Senate on January 29 in the famous discussion of Senator WHERRY's resolution.

Very sincerely,

Rev. ALCUIN HEIBEL,
Order of St. Benedict.

Continuation of the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial published in the Seattle Star of Friday, April 19. The editorial is entitled "We Don't Believe You Want OPA Really Ruined."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DON'T BELIEVE YOU WANT OPA REALLY RUINED

Inflation starts a good deal like a binge. The world looks rosy. We're all good fellows. Let's have another all around. And if some passer-by doesn't like the way the gang does Sweet Adeline, he's just a cockeyed prohibitionist sour puss.

It will be only natural if there is much rejoicing, in varied circles, over the manner in which the House of Representatives has slashed up OPA. For OPA has stepped on many toes—upon the toes of upright, legitimate business groups in many instances as well as upon the toes of the profiteers and black marketeers.

There has been a studied effort on the part of some of its enemies to make CPA seem something like prohibition, infringing upon personal liberties, keeping everyone from having a good time.

But we don't believe for a minute that the majority of Americans have been moved by this propaganda to want OPA butchered, and that is just what the House bill proposes to do.

If the OPA extension bill should be enacted into law in the form in which it was passed by the House it would mean higher prices immediately, and a pyramiding of profits, with everyone from primary producer to ultimate distributor adding a little bit more to what the consumer would pay. Higher prices for one item would justify higher prices for another. And with OPA's death at an early date assured, black-market operators would be encouraged to break through any restraints still provided by law and regulation, confident that their derelictions would be forgiven or forgotten.

The Seattle Star has no brief for OPA. We sympathize with merchants and manufacturers who have suffered from unjust regulations and procedures. We have frequently publicized these shortcomings, with a view toward having them corrected, and long steps in this corrective process have been taken.

We recognize, however, that the United States stands in the shadow of an inflationary menace far more threatening than any this country ever faced before.

Citizens in their forties or older surely remember what happened after the last war—the prices for many commodities far beyond those of today, then the sharp crash of the early 1920's, with unemployment and high prices side by side, next the boom of the later twenties, leading up to 1929, finally the real depression.

The inflationary pressures of World War I do not begin to measure up to those in existence today. This country came out of World War I with a debt of twenty-six billions. The figure is more than 10 times that now.

We want to see Seattle, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation prosper—not go through another boom and bust experience that might be 10 times worse than the one we went through before.

There's another angle about this urge for inflation that needs to be considered. By and large it is true to say that most Americans are well off. That is the case with industry and agriculture, with management and with labor, as a whole. But it doesn't apply to everyone.

Perhaps you noticed, among the people interviewed by the Seattle Star as to their Easter plans, that not all of them boasted new finery. Some said they couldn't buy what they wanted at the stores. Some didn't have the dollars to spend. There are in the State of Washington today in the neighborhood of 75,000 unemployed. A considerable number of them are returned servicemen. It is easy to say that if the lid is lifted there will be jobs for all, but sober reasoning indicates that the immediate increase in prices would bring hardships to many long before everyone would be on the pay roll. And in galloping inflation wages are never able to keep up with prices.

We believe the United States Senate must take hold of the price control bill and make honest legislation out of it. We say honest legislation, because we do not believe the Members of the House were honest with the American people or with themselves in passing the bill in the form they did.

This is an election year—all Members of the House must stand for reelection. There is an open invitation, under the circumstances, to practice the sort of demagoguery that consists in voting for anything that will please any important group, with the expectation that the Senate will take the bugs out of the legislation later. It is the sort of demagoguery that is practiced by some individual Congressmen in voting for all appropriations and against all taxes and some Senators are not above practicing it also.

But we have more hopes of the Senate in this particular instance. It should be possible to correct injustices under OPA without inviting galloping inflation to move in. It ought to be possible to throw out the bath water without throwing the baby out, too.

Venezuela in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Venezuela in Transition" by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, appearing in the magazine World Affairs of March 1946. In suggesting that the article be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to record my gratification that the author, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and special lecturer on sociology in the Catholic University of Chile, has been a recent recipient of the national decoration of the Republic of Ecuador. Friends of the good-neighbor policy are happy about this gesture of a sister republic. The article on Venezuela is constructive and valuable at this time, when we are all eager to understand developments in the other American republics and Canada.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VENEZUELA IN TRANSITION

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil)

One of the most hopeful signs for true democracy in the other American Republics is that, in all likelihood, a world-famous novelist, Rómulo Gallegos, as a result of free elections, will be chosen the next president of Venezuela.

At first blush, this may appear to be a paradox. Why should the selection of an eminent man of letters be interpreted as a victory for humanity, freedom, and good government on the southern fringe of the Caribbean? What significance, if any, does successful literary creation possess for the orderly, peaceful development of the richest (and most expensive!) country which, like an arc of black gold, flanks the American Mediterranean? Is there a key to the paradox?

The answer, like the solution to numerous problems, is discoverable in Venezuelan history. In the central plaza of Caracas, capital of Venezuela, rises, proud in grandeur, the monument to Gen. Simón Bolivar, the liberator. The figure of this paladin of independence continues to radiate glory as well as inspiration to all quarters of the Republic. Bolivar's passion for democratic liberties vivifies the soul of each Venezuelan patriot, just as the liberator's ideal of inter-American friendship quickens the pulse of every worker for the good neighbor policy.

At the same time, one must remember that the tradition of military leadership, exemplified by Simón Bolivar in Greater Columbia (Venezuela, Colombia, and Ecuador) did not die with the disease-ridden body of the relatively youthful South American genius on December 7, 1830. Exiled though he was at the moment of his departure from this world, the great captain, 47 years of age, bequeathed to his countrymen as well as to the world a rich legacy.

No better description of the Bolivarian treasure-chest has been written than that available in Venezuela by Erna Ferguson. In the climactic chapter of her study of Venezuela and the Venezuelans, this lady records her dominant impression in these words:

"Venezuelans have kept for a century the Liberator's belief in intrinsic human worth and the possibility of human betterment. Old men may falter, but five generations of youth trained to idolize Simón Bolivar have kept alive a faith which may be suppressed for a time, but never conquered. The miracle for which all Venezuelans hope actually exists in her young men and women. Alert and intelligent, fully aware of the backwardness which hampers their every step, they are bound this time to free their country and make possible her development. They are fortified to wait and to achieve a democracy by constitutional means, if possible, but grim in their readiness to use other means if they must."

These intimations of the future were typed out in 1939. Each word of the prediction, tentative as it was, would seem to have been fulfilled in October (not Red) in 1945. After 26 years of the brutal dictatorship of Juan

Vicente Gomez (1909–1935) and the moderate, fairly constructive reforms of two succeeding Andean generals (Eleazar López Contreras and Isaias Medina Angarita), a group of civilians, supported by almost all the younger Army officers, produced a week-end revolution, with a handful of lend-lease planes (without power-driven bomb-racks) and toy-like, baby tanks. Although desultory rifle fire continued for a week or 10 days in Caracas and a few other populous centers, it hardly created a ripple beneath the surface of Venezuela's political and industrial life. While the venerable military chieftains, mostly Andinos, scattered to the four winds, largely in the direction of the palatial Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, the young men, led by the 37-year-old Provisional President Rómulo Betancourt, moved into the position of responsibility and power in their national capital.

At this point, it should be noted that the revolutionary junta is, avowedly and sincerely, a caretaker government. Rómulo Betancourt and his new cabinet look upon themselves, not as another clique that has, for its own selfish interests and those of its class, seized the machinery of administration, but simply as a transitional committee of trustees, whose stewardship will cease once the people, next April (1946), shall have been given an opportunity of registering their will. The author of this article, by suggesting that Rómulo Gallegas, Venezuela's dean of letters, will be the popular choice is simply anticipating the verdict of history. The attempted prophecy has a double interest, because in the last Federal elections (1941), General Medina, the recently ousted dictator or President, received a total of 120 electoral votes to the 13 cast in favor of President-to-be Rómulo Gallegas. By one of those sudden turns in the wheel of fortune, the vanquished seems destined to emerge the victor.

In the meantime, Señor Betancourt has surrounded himself with young, liberal ministers. The handsome, alert Secretary of Agriculture, Juan Mendoza, in a continent where land is the core of most problems, is just 26, while four of his colleagues are in their thirties. Only two top the age of 50. Viewing the Cabinet composition from Washington, D. C., one cannot overlook the fact that 7 of the 11 in the ruling group received their education in the United States. Can it be that youth and inter-Americanism go hand in hand? Is it an historical accident or just one of those picturesque anomalies that sometimes crop up in the unfolding of the human drama that the new Minister of the Interior (not War) is Senor Luis Valmores Rodriguez, whose career includes a tour of duty as a United States Army sergeant? To be sure, peace breaks out from time to time in Latin America, and it is the impossible that happens unexpectedly.

What are the policies, domestic and foreign, of the new administration? Replies to this interrogation are important, because what happens on the shores of the American Mediterranean has an impact not only on North America, but also throughout the West Indies, in Central America, and in the vast continent that stretches from the Republic of Panama to the Antarctic tips of Chile and the Argentine. Perhaps Venezuela will prove to be either a vital catalytic agent in the violent chemico-political reactions that are beginning to flare up in the other Americas or else perform the function of a cork or stopper brusquely removed from the neck of a bottle filled with precious liquids. The mixtures, racial, social, and economic, are already in the alembic.

On the home front, oil-wealthy Venezuela has been startled to hear that 168 members of the richest families will be required to give an account of their land-stewardship before a seven-man tribunal, whose members include a Catholic priest, a Communist official, and representatives of both army and navy. Although no far-reaching distribution of the vast estates has as yet been ordered, it is taken for granted that the huge properties, mobile and immobile, that were accumulated in the hands of favorites under the Gomez regime, will be transformed into model dairy and cattle farms of reasonable size. Definitely, the millionaire ranch owner, with his holiday merrymaking in Paris and Monte Carlo, is on the way to oblivion. The people, on the other hand, now half-starved and riddled with tuberculosis-malaria, have been promised something more sustaining (and appetizing) than black beans and rice.

This land revolution, which, it is hoped, will prove fair and evolutionary, cannot succeed without a wealth of high-minded morals, intelligence, and technical skill. The dashing, gallant Minister of Agriculture, J. Mendoza, has invited a corps of foreign experts to formulate plans for the future. The program of Secretary Mendoza, who gained his own considerable specialized knowledge of farming in Argentina, now depends upon the integrity and ingenuity of a freshly organized staff headed by 24-year-old Mauricio Baez, a trained agronomist, and Claudio Muskus, who learned his lessons in livestock production at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. Acting on the advice of these two experts, both his own countrymen, Secretary Mendoza is also deriving valuable help from all parts of the Western Hemisphere, starting with the United States Embassy in Caracas.

The reallocation and more efficient exploitation of farm land, if it develops according to plan, will represent triumph of inter-American cooperation. In that case, too, it can easily set the pattern for similar reforms or redistribution that are long over-due and sadly needed from Hudson Bay to Tierra del Fuego. What a miracle of initiative, technical skill, honesty, and spiritual friendship would it be, if the inter-American century and its inter-American generation could adopt as a watchword: "As goes Venezuela, so marches the new world."

This is the hope; this is the challenge. In the heart of America, a new ferment is at work. Neither extreme right, nor extreme left, the Republic of Venezuela, groping its hazardous way from the old to the new, is engaged upon a magnificent adventure.

Rómulo Betancourt, a one-time Marxist and a full-fledged member of the Communist Party in his salad days, is now a champion of "democratic unity" among left-wing groups and left-wing Governments. As odious to the Moscow-dominated Third International as he would be to any recrudescence of the pulverized Axis, he and his associates, standing just left of center, are preparing the ground for a gifted, literary, chief magistrate.

What is the best evidence of reconstruction? The fact, emphasized by the minister of education early in 1946, that, for the first time in history, the budget for popular instruction overshadows the sums allotted for the ministry of war and marine. With some land and more education, the masses of South America can forge forward into the light. Peace can enjoy her victories, much "more renowned than war."

Those Government Blues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the April 1946 issue of the Texas magazine, Gist, carries an article by me in which I comment upon Government shortcomings which have injured the morale of private enterprise, discouraged production, and hurt reconversion. This Government blundering has, in effect, given businessmen "those Government blues," which, incidentally, is the title of my article. I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE GOVERNMENT BLUES

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

American businessmen have "those Government blues."

The morale of American free enterprise has suffered disastrously. It has been hit hard by a long series of inept and downright dangerous words and deeds on the part of Government officials. The genius of American industry has been stymied again and again by bureaucratic "square pegs in round holes." Businessmen have been plagued by "long-haired" men and "short-haired" women—Federal officeholders—who are woefully deficient in practical business experience and respect for free enterprise.

The above are not mere generalities or empty accusations. They are borne out by the anguished pleas to me for aid from countless small and large businessmen in my own State, throughout the Midwest, the East, the South, the Southwest, and the far West. These men of industry and commerce all over the country are justifiably fed up with Government bungling and blundering, with Government gestapo tactics and collectivist scheming.

LEGITIMATE COMPLAINTS

Just what are the many legitimate complaints of business? Here are 10:

1. Government's labor policy, or, rather, its lack of policy—its favoritism to organized labor, its one-sidedness against management; Government's pussyfooting with labor racketeers who have brought on strike after ruinous strike.

2. Government's pricing policy, which has condemned business to produce at a loss, which has apparently regarded profits as something sinful and unnecessary, which has granted price relief at a snail's pace, but has imposed fast and fantastically large fines in the event that honest businessmen innocently violate the incomprehensible price orders.

3. Government's octopus bureaucracy, 3,000,000 strong, which has strangled business in red tape, bogged it down in answering verbose Federal questionnaires, which has set an army of snoopers spying into American enterprise and which has drained the Federal Treasury of funds.

4. Government's unbalanced Budget, with its almost $300,000,000,000 national debt weighing heavily on free enterprise, with one crackpot scheme after another for more deficit spending.

5. Government's throttling tax system, which punishes private initiative instead of encouraging it, which takes from investors the fruit of their investments, which fails to stimulate the growth and expansion of free enterprise.

6. Government's centralization of authority, which deprives State and local authorities of their constitutional right to solve their own problems by dint of their own efforts.

7. Government's competition with private enterprise, its unfair entry through tax-free Federal organizations into spheres, nominally belonging to private enterprise, forcing private companies to the wall.

8. Government's bungling of surplus disposition, its failure to get the vast accumulation of surplus, farm machinery, industrial machinery, etc., speedily into the hands of those who can use it best now.

9. Government's internal dissension, its chaos of quarreling, jealous agency heads, pulling at cross purposes, confusing business, dismaying the public.

10. Government's corruption and favoritism, the all-too-numerous instances of violation of the creed of a great Democratic President, "Public office is a public trust."

WHAT TO DO

Well, what ought to be done about these 10 blots on our national picture, these 10 reasons for "those Government blues"? May I suggest these remedies:

1. Let Congress enact a labor policy with guts, a policy which will protect the public interest as well as the great rank and file of honest American labor and management. Let this policy amend the one-sided Wagner Act, provide for democratic union elections, publicized union finances, elimination of coercion in connection with strikes. Let this policy prohibit strikes in Nation-wide industries and public utilities and provide for compulsory arbitration as a last resort.

2. Let Government change its pricing policy so as to get full production. I have introduced an amendment to the Price Control Act which would assure industry a profit normal to high-level operation, which would speed up price relief and which would provide for elimination of all wartime controls as soon as the natural laws of supply and demand can operate.

3. Let Government demobilize its bureaucratic army, particularly those incompetents and menaces who are activated by a master complex.

4. Let Government balance its budget, live within its means, and reduce the national debt.

SIMPLIFY TAXES

5. Let Government reform and simplify its tax structure so that maximum incentive is provided to private enterprise.

6. Let Government decentralize and return to the States and localities powers which were taken over by Uncle Sam during the depression and war emergencies.

7. Let Government get out of those spheres belonging to private enterprise and in the case of Government corporations like TVA, make them pay their way in taxes to the people of America as a whole.

8. Let Government streamline its surplus disposition system so as to insure a speedy square deal for our veterans and others pleading to use surplus in producing new jobs and wealth.

9. Let Government set its whole house in order, eliminate duplication and overlapping jurisdictional conflicts between agencies, instability in program.

10. Let Government rid itself of all those lacking in a sense of public responsibility and replace them with men of proven integrity, of proven civic achievement.

Let's get Government out of the red and Reds out of Government.

Let's change those Government blues to a song of hope and confidence in the hearts of the American people.

Transworld Air Lines Contract With the Italian Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Transworld Air Lines signed a contract on February 11, 1946, with the Italian Government, relating to the establishment of internal civil air lines in Italy, and I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the TWA's story of its contract with the Italian Government.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AIR LINE CO.'S STORY OF ITS CONTRACT WITH THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT AND BRITISH GOVERNMENT

The sad plight of the Italian people in a country devastated by war, short of food and fuel, is too well known for recitation here. The economy of the country was wrecked by the fighting and one of the principal handicaps to the reestablishment of internal economy and sound governmental administration is the lack of transportation. The Italian railways and highways suffered extensive damage by bombardment and even now the central Government in Rome has serious difficulty in keeping in touch with provincial and municipal administrations. For many months there has been a crying need for means of transportation of persons, goods, and mail in order to allow the Italian Government to get on its feet and to assist in the relief of the suffering of its people.

The instrument of surrender, signed by the Italian Government in 1943, contained a provision forbidding the Italians to operate either civil or military aviation. With the conclusion of the fighting in Europe, and in the light of the desperate need of Italy for air transport, the Italian Government applied, in August of 1945, to the Allied Control Council in Rome for permission to reestablish their internal civil aviation. This request was forwarded by the Supreme Allied Commander in the Mediterranean to the Combined Chiefs of Staff.

The Combined Chiefs of Staff is the agency of the American and British Governments, charged with the administration of the Italian surrender terms on behalf of the two Governments. From the time of the Italian surrender the Combined Chiefs of Staff has been the agency through which the two Governments jointly issue directives to the Supreme Allied Commander with respect to the control of Italy. The Combined Chiefs of Staff declined to grant permission at that time, based on the prospect, it is understood, of the early conclusion of a peace treaty with Italy. However, the Conference of Foreign Ministers held in London, which was expected to deal with the Italian peace treaty, did not succeed.

In December 1945, the Italian Government again applied for permission to reconstitute internal civil aviation. This request was forwarded by the Supreme Allied Commander (a British officer) to the Combined Chiefs of Staff, who, in reply, issued a directive to him dated March 16, 1946, granting the request and approving, without qualifications, the reestablishment of internal civil air lines by the Italian Government.

In the meantime, competent Italian authorities had approached TWA with a proposal that a plan be worked out, by which this company would assist them and participate in the reestablishment of national civil air service within Italy.

The Italian Government considered it advantageous to avail itself to the technical knowledge and assistance of TWA. No doubt one consideration which prompted the Italian Government to approach TWA was the fact that a few months before this company had been certified by the President of the United States and the Civil Aeronautics Board as the sole United States air carrier to engage in the transportation by air of passengers, goods, and mail from the United States to Italy and beyond. As soon as TWA learned of the above desire of the Italian Government, the chairman of the board, T. B. Wilson, went to Rome to explore the situation. Discussions followed, culminating in the signing of a contract between the Italian Government and TWA on February 11, 1946, in Rome. The contract provides for the establishment of a national Italian aviation company, Linee Aeree Italiane—LAI—60 percent Italian owned and 40 percent TWA owned. Under this agreement, TWA, as a shareholder, has the power to prevent specific action by the company in that a two-thirds majority of the shareholders' votes must be obtained for a decision. This provision does not give TWA control of the company. It is a provision any sound businessman would require in unsettled and economically difficult times to protect a large financial investment abroad. It should be noted that the Italian interests enjoy the same protective authority. The contract also provides that the Italian Government shall grant the Italian national company—LAI—for a period of 10 years the exclusive right to operate a network of internal air routes in Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia.

It is the practice in Europe for governments to grant exclusive franchises for the operation of air routes within their national areas. Good examples of this practice are Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and others.

At the time of signing of the contract the Italian Government did not yet have the permission of the Allied Governments to engage in civil air transport. Consequently, the contract carried a provision that it could not go into effect until such permission to do so had been granted. There was a further provision that both parties agreed that the contract could be modified as to other participation in order to comply with any directives from the Combined Chiefs of Staff. It will be noted that the directive of the Combined Chiefs of Staff to the Supreme Allied Commander subsequently issued contained no qualification with respect to other participants, or otherwise.

The important thing to remember is that the Italian Government, having requested permission to recommence internal civil aviation and such permission having been formally granted by the British and American Governments, with respect to the operation of internal civilian air service, the Italian Government thus regained its full sovereign right and freedom of action. It thereupon, of its own volition, entered into a simple, straight-forward commercial arrangement with an American company as being the most practicable and effective means of acquiring as speedily as possible, desperately needed air transport.

It is interesting to note that the State Department, the War Department, and the Civil Aeronautics Board had concurred in backing TWA's participation in an Italian national company. Moreover, the United States Embassy and United States military authorities in Rome were continually and fully informed of all negotiations.

The Acting Chief Commissioner of the Allied Control Council in Rome formally notified the Italian Government, on March 20, 1946, that permission was granted to recommence internal civil aviation. This act placed in full force and effect the contract signed on February 11, 1946.

The validity of the contract having been accomplished by the official action of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, the Italian Government proceeded to draw up a decree for submission to the Council of Ministers which would constitute the Italian aviation company (LAI) and would permit the Italian treasury to take a share interest in the company.

Toward the end of March TWA, to its great astonishment, was informed by its representatives in Rome that the British Ambassador to Italy had delivered to the Italian

Government on March 15, and again on or about March 30, notes stating that the British Government opposed the legislative steps about to be taken to implement the Italian Government's contract with TWA. On April 2, 1946, he delivered a third note to the Italian Air Minister, saying that the British Government insists on participating in Italian aviation, through BOAC with an interest of 20 percent, and that the Italian Government refrain from taking any steps to activate the agreement with TWA.

On April 3, 1946, TWA addressed a letter to the Secretary of State setting forth the history of negotiations for the contract, calling the Department's attention to the pressure being put on the Italian Government by the British Ambassador in Rome and requesting that "steps be taken to protect our legitimately acquired interest in Italy from this pressure on the part of the British Government." It was later learned that the British Ambassador in Rome had sent another communication to the Italian Government in which he specifically requested modification of the TWA agreement by reducing the company's participation to 20 percent. To this note was attached a written proposal by BOAC which would amend the contract and provided for BOAC participation. A second letter was sent to the Secretary of State by TWA respectfully urging that vigorous action be taken to afford the company the protection to which it believed itself entitled.

We understand that during the US-UK Civil Aviation Conference at Bermuda there was simultaneous discussion of matters not primarily connected with the main work of the conference but which would have arisen for discussion between the two countries whether or not a conference was being held. During these discussions the British indicated their desire to participate in any development of Italian domestic aviation. This view of the British was "noted," but there was no agreement, secret or otherwise. We have been informed that on April 13 the State Department received an aide-memoire from the British Embassy referring to the above-mentioned expression of their views in Bermuda and taking the position that the United States Government had thus been officially on notice of the British desire to participate in any arrangement for the rehabilitation of Italian internal air services. The British Government stated that they had done their best to promote local settlement of this discussion through conferences between representatives of British Overseas Airways Corporation and TWA in Rome without success, that the British do not consider the matter as an ordinary commercial transaction; that they do not regard the Allied Council or the Combined Chiefs of Staff as the appropriate channel for dealing with it and that they now ask the United States Government to intervene with TWA and the Italian Government so as to insure that the contract is modified to provide for BOAC participation along the lines suggested in the proposed contract amendments attached to the aide memoire.

TWA cannot agree to enter into a business partnership with the British Government. Among the reasons why such an arrangement is out of the question are the following:

TWA is a corporation owned by 20,000 individuals. It is certified to operate the only United States international air line through Italy. It is interested in the early recovery of the Italian economy and in promoting good will for the United States and its interests in Italy. It is also interested, if it is to have an investment in Italian air lines, in properly setting up these air lines on an efficient, economical, and profitable basis. We have good reason to believe that these things would be difficult if not impossible to accomplish under the requested British participation. It is generally known that there is a great difference between the manner in which air transport has developed in the United States and in that which it has developed in British territories. United States air carriers have perfected equipment, developed management, operational and technical procedures largely on their own with the objective of giving service to the public and making a profit for their owners. United States air carriers have been little influenced in their development and progress by any political or strategic considerations.

The British suggestion of a 50-50 participation with TWA in the Italian company would make the whole arrangement unwieldy, inefficient, and uneconomical. They would no doubt insist on partial use of British equipment, personnel, methods, etc. These differ so widely from American practices that it would be next to impossible to reconcile them in one company. These factors together with the differences in objectives make the proposal unacceptable.

It should be recalled that TWA has had friendly and cooperative relations both with the British Government and BOAC over a number of years. Early in 1941, TWA took some of its four-engine Stratoliners out of service to train British crews for ferrying the first Flying Fortresses to England. More recently BOAC crews have been trained and qualified in flying Constellations at TWA's training field at Reading Pa. These crews were trained by us to fly Constellations in competition with us across the North Atlantic. We have gone ahead in friendly business competition with BOAC, particularly in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. In many cases we have not been successful in meeting British competition and have taken our losses, we believe, in good grace. There has never been any suggestion that TWA call on the United States Government to bring pressure to bear to obtain for it participation in any contracts which BOAC may have had in negotiation or concluded.

In the light of the foregoing, TWA takes the position that it is not feasible for it to participate as a partner with the British Government in the Italian air-line enterprise.

TWA has stated to British representatives several times that it would, of course, have no objection to the formation of another Italian air line with British participation. This, of course, would be a matter between British and Italian interests.

The Need for Liberalized Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House has recently been holding hearings on the need for extending and liberalizing old-age-assistance payments and pensions. Under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the statement which I submitted to the Ways and Means Committee during these hearings in support of proposals to deal more equitably and generously with our elder citizens.

At a time when we are talking freely of making multibillion dollar loans to England, France, and Russia, as well as many other loans running into the hundreds of millions of dollars to Poland, Italy, Holland, and the countries of South America it seems to me we should reexamine the treatment which the elderly people of America are receiving here at home. It is generally admitted that there is strong likelihood that much, if not all, of the money President Truman is now asking us to loan abroad will never be repaid. All that is not repaid must be made up by American taxpayers. Much of it will never even be spent in this country.

Of one thing we can be certain, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the money which we make available to America's war veterans and to the elder citizens of this Republic will be spent here at home where it will revolve many times and help promote and perpetuate our national prosperity. Before adjournment the present Congress should act to grant greater benefits to the war veterans of World Wars I and II and it should also act to grant greater justice to our civilian veterans of advanced age who are finding the pressure of rising costs of living steadily forcing them into living conditions which are unjustifiable in a great Nation like the United States.

Unfortunately, President Truman and the New Deal majority seem to be afflicted with the difficulty that "they are so close to the forest that they cannot see the trees." The executive agencies continue to come to Congress with requests for more and more money to spend in foreign lands and to loan foreign governments to improve living conditions abroad, but they have consistently failed to bring in proposals for extending old-age assistance to the many who are now ineligible to receive it or for liberalizing old-age pensions so that those who are eligible for assistance can maintain themselves in conformity with the American standards of living. I again urge that the Ways and Means Committee report favorably legislation to achieve these purposes before the end of the present session of Congress.

Before the United States gives or loans too many of its assets abroad, let us provide more generously and justly for our own war veterans and for our aging citizens.

MUNDT'S STATEMENT BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

The statement referred to follows:

Mr. Chairman, as one of the Members of Congress who signed the petition urging your honorable committee to hold hearings on pending legislative proposals for the liberalizing of old-age-pension payments and assistance checks, I am happy for this opportunity to submit to you some of the arguments which I feel will enable us to deal more generously and more equitably with the elder citizens of this Republic.

First of all, however, permit me to express my personal appreciation to your committee for having decided to hold public hearings to consider the testimony and evidence in support of adequate and equitable consideration of the aged people of America who now find their purchasing power steadily decreased by rising costs and whose contributions to the development of this Nation so richly entitle them to fair treatment in their advanced age.

There are at least three important aspects of prevailing old-age benefits to which I trust your committee will give its careful study and attention. Corrective legislation is indicated as necessary on all three.

LIVING COSTS ARE RISING

First, there is the immediate necessity of recognizing the effect of rising living costs upon old-age assistance checks. Senior citizens are finding their pension dollars reduced from what was intended to be 100 cents of purchasing power for every dollar to as little as 65 cents and 70 cents in actual purchasing power, and in some cases it is even less. A sharp reduction in purchasing power has been felt all along the line. Thus, in order even to carry out the intent of Congress in passing existing legislation, it is necessary that we increase the size of these assistance payments.

MANY ARE EXCLUDED FROM BENEFITS

Secondly, there is the highly important fact that under existing arrangements social-security benefits are available to certain classes of retired workers, while they are denied to others. Such inequalities should be eliminated. For example, the annual report of the Social Security Board for last year said this: "Limitation of coverage continues to be the most serious single shortcoming of old-age and survivors' insurance. Because of coverage restrictions, only about three-fifths of all gainfully employed civilians were in jobs covered by old-age and survivors' insurance in an average week in 1944." Mr. Chairman, in a rural State like South Dakota we find that a large percentage of our elder citizens find it impossible to establish eligibility for old-age and survivors' insurance under the present social-security set-up.

BENEFITS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE AT SIXTY

Thirdly, I hope you will examine carefully the reasons indicating the necessity of reducing to the age of 60 the time when benefits can become available to old people. Especially in the case of women, statistics show that in this modern machine age the strains and stresses are so great that at the age of 60 a great many people find themselves unable to hold steady jobs. Furthermore, the more people who retire at 60 the more job opportunities of value there will be for war veterans seeking employment.

Under present legislation, there is a great and unjust discrepancy in the payments received by old people in our various States. Average monthly allowances for the aged range all the way from a high of $49.25 to a low of $12.79. Obviously, costs of living are not four times as high in some States as they are in others. I urge your committee to take the necessary action to correct these injustices. A program operated by and under the Federal Government should be equally fair to all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the old folks of America have been very patient in waiting for the National Government to enact legislation in their behalf. Now that the war is over, the time for action is at hand. My mail contains many letters from elderly couples or from single individuals of advanced age who find themselves alone and without means of support in this land of plenty. Surely, we who have loaned and given billions of dollars to foreign countries cannot permit conditions to exist here at home whereby our senior citizens must exist in misery and sorrow because of the failure of our National Government to enact a pension program which will protect those who need and deserve generous treatment by the Republic which they have done so much to develop and preserve.

INADEQUACIES AND INJUSTICES SHOULD BE CORRECTED

At the present time, we have a social-security program which provides security for some but which provides absolutely nothing for many others who are equally elderly, equally needy, and equally deserving. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to deal honestly and fairly with our senior citizens on an equitable basis regardless of where they live, for whom they have worked, and what has been the nature of their earlier occupations. The legislation you are now considering includes provisions for correcting these inadequacies and these injustices. I hope this corrective program will meet with your approval.

In closing, let me quote from an editorial in the New York Times. This great newspaper said, "It is a central aim of social progress to mitigate the hazards of unemployment, need, sickness, disability, and old age for the individual. Every step is to be welcomed by which this aim can be done without itself introducing equal or greater hazards." Mr. Chairman, progress is the keynote of this Republic. When we cease to move forward in progress we are certain to start slipping backward in retrogression. Out of these committee hearings, it is my sincere hope that there will come recommendations and legislation which will carry America forward up the trail which leads to justice and equality for our elder citizens.

A FAIR CHANCE FOR A FREE PEOPLE

When I was first elected to Congress, I announced as my goal for the Federal Government that it should provide "A fair chance for a free people." That goal has always continued to be the rule of thumb by which I judge legislative proposals or Executive decrees. As my record shows, I have always been a supporter of Federal pensions for the senior citizens of America. Now that part of our population finds itself protected by a Government operated social-security system and another portion of our population of like age and merit finds itself left entirely out in the cold, the time has come to pass legislation which will deal alike with all and which to the full measure of our ability will provide a comfortable and respectable old age for the fine Americans of advanced age who have by their efforts and their talents done so much to pass on to us this great American way of life which we all cherish and enjoy.

Suffrage for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting statement by Jesse C. Suter, written by him for the Washington Evening Star with respect to suffrage for the residents of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs will be held in Chicago June 17 to 22, 1946, with national representation for the District of Columbia among the subjects to be considered. The District of Columbia Federation, which for many years has been supporting this movement, is confronted by opposition of a persistent minority group. This minority has filed with the General Federation what superficially appears to be a rather formidable statement against the Sumners-Capper proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That proposed amendment is as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President, members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

It is a simple enabling provision to be added to the Constitution, under which Congress would be empowered to provide that the voteless and unrepresented individual Americans living at the seat of the Government should be given a status of American citizenship and be represented by members of their own choice in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. They would also be given the privilege of voting for Presidential electors.

The passage and ratification of this amendment, together with subsequent legislation thereunder, would in no way change the political status of the District of Columbia as the seat of the Government, which would continue to operate under the provisions of section 8, clause 17, of article I of the Constitution. This provision gives Congress the power "to exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square * * *." From the beginning the Congress has exercised over the District of Columbia this power of exclusive legislation though for many years varying forms of elective local government were operating.

Throughout the entire period of 146 years since this area was taken over as the Capital of the United States, the bona fide residents have been denied completely any participation in the National Government, which taxes them and sends them to war.

A careful reading of the various specifications contained in the statement of the opposition indicates a number of objections which might apply to the setting up of a local elective government, called by some present advocates home rule. But throughout the statement there is nothing whatever of substance against granting to this large number of intelligent, loyal individual Americans their natural-born right to participate through representatives of their own choice in the Government of the United States of America.

The paragraph in the statement of the minority which refers to so-called city-States answers itself. In the first place, by no stretch of the imagination could the proposed constitutional amendment or any subsequent legislation thereunder make the District of Columbia a State of any kind.

If these voteless and unrepresented people were granted the required recognition as American citizens and were permitted to elect their Representatives, Senators, and Presidential electors, they would still, as a community, be under the absolute and exclusive legislative control of the Congress and would not "create a precedent whereby other cities that are comparable in wealth, area, or population will seek to divorce themselves from their respective States." It is inconceivable that any of the people of the great cities would be so dumb as to be willing to exchange their present political status for that which exists today in the District of Columbia and would continue under the proposed amendment.

The important and fundamental principle involved in this movement is granting to a large number of voteless and unrepresented people their natural-born right to participate as American citizens in the Government of their country. Just recognition of this principle should naturally outweigh any mere

academic twaddle. Organized civic Washington is hopeful that the Washington delegation to the General Federation of Women's Clubs will rout their minority opponents completely.

Complete arguments in support of the Sumners-Capper amendment and answers to objections are to be found in the record of the hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. J. Res. 9, September 25, 1945.

Speech of Hon. W. Kingsland Macy Following His Reelection as President of the National Republican Club, New York City, Tuesday Evening, April 23, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR A. SHARP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, it is my great privilege and pleasure to introduce into the RECORD the speech of Hon. W. Kingsland Macy, made on April 23, 1946, on his reelection as president of the National Republican Club.

As State senator from the first New York senatorial district, regent of the State of New York, former chairman of the New York State Republican Committee, and chairman of the Suffolk County Republican Committee, Mr. Macy's speech is one that I am sure will provoke wide interest and discussion. It follows:

Officers and members of the National Republican Club, again you have honored me by election, this time to serve a second term as president of this club. Upon assuming office last year I spoke of the club's honorable history and its traditions and ventured to hope despite errors and oversights which occur periodically in most clubs, that its potentialities might again be realized as a unifying force of and for Republicans in city, State, and Nation. You will recall that a year ago a veritable pall hung over the country because of the passing of one who had dominated the dozen fateful years preceding, and I bespoke the sportsmanship for his successor which has since for the most part been displayed.

I will not claim that all I would have been glad to see accomplished in and by the club during the year has come to pass. It is not good ever to be completely satisfied. Through dissatisfaction comes progress. This I can say, however, that our finances have been on the right side of the ledger. There has also been activity in and about the club. Plans are in the making for further modernization and there has been improvement in the various services. The committees have functioned as not in many years. Some say too many resolutions have been adopted and that discussions at meetings have been too prolonged. These are not bad faults, for we are not the party of regimentation, rather are we receptive of ideas from the floor through the free expression of our members.

Not to unnecessarily extend the proceedings this evening I will not mention names, but it would be unbecoming in me and entirely unfair did I not acknowledge before you my deep appreciation for the whole-hearted cooperation and support of the officers, the chairmen, members of committees and individually interested members of the club, without which such success as we have enjoyed would never have been possible. There has been a fine spirit abroad throughout the club's spacious halls and rooms. Even the complaints have been good-humored and for the most part constructive. All of which has been conducive to attracting the new membership evidenced by our constantly mounting rolls. Let us proceed with more of such.

Now as to the work immediately impending. And there never was a time in the history of our party when opportunity of service to our country was greater or more important to the future of every one of us. The reelection of Governor Dewey is immediately paramount, and upon his fine record we have additional confidence in success. But we must leave nothing to chance. Until the last vote is counted on November 5 we should not rest content in any overconfidence. Governor Dewey will head our ticket in this State and, with the distinguished candidates which our party will have nominated in any of the other States, will exercise a powerful influence in the election of Republican Congressmen this fall. Change of control in the House of Representatives in the so-called in-between elections almost invariably presages change of administration in Washington 2 years thereafter. That is our aim and objective. We attempted it in 1932, 1936, 1940, and 1944, but it is in 1948 that it will be achieved. Let us therefore look well to our preliminaries and prepare the way carefully and cautiously so that nothing is overlooked. Frequently in the past we have assumed that we might have windfall victories for which we had not labored and which we had not earned. This is futile philosophy.

It is well every now and then to take stock. The fact that we are here meeting under Republican auspices presumes that we believe in party government, and it follows logically that, inasmuch as our party is one of the two great parties in this country, we believe in the two-party system under which we have functioned successfully through the years. When, in 1930, I became chairman of our party's State committee, I made a formal statement expressing my personal beliefs. It contained the following passage:

"I have but to call attention to the difficulties now encountered by some European governments to demonstrate that the alternative to the two-party system is a system of relatively small political groups under which government sometimes almost ceases to function."

Demonstrating that my views had undergone no change, I can quote from a campaign letter which I wrote in 1942:

"Surely this is no time to break away from our moorings, but rather is it a time for us to think clearly, not lose our heads, or what is more important still—the representative characteristics of our government. In simple truth, it is our two-party system of government with responsibility resting on the majority that permits the considered will of our people eventually to prevail."

More than ever am I of the same opinion today, and I might add that while fundamental truths and policies in party management as in government never change, adjustments may be necessary in their application to suit changing conditions.

I spoke in Troy on Washington's Birthday against pressure groups and the strike-bound situation in which this greatest Nation on earth now finds itself. I emphasized the importance of truth and real understanding. I do so again tonight. The sensible, thinking people of our country, and fortunately these are still in the vast majority though sometimes I think they lack organization, are heartily sick of being constantly conditioned by this or that bureaucrat imbued with a strange whim or notion that he was ordained by some higher power to improve our American form of government. My own feeling, and I think I am not alone, is that most of us are entirely content with the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and would be relieved beyond measure if a speedy and convenient method could be devised to broom-sweep clean much of this newly improvised regalia into the proverbial ashcan.

I was in the legislature myself this year, where I found many distinguished and congenial associates. It was gratifying to have participated in a session conducted by the wise leaders of the two Houses in conjunction with such an able Executive. One of the ever-present dangers that I especially observed when serving there this winter was the reluctance of even some of our own officials to allow the emergency powers to lapse with the passing of the emergency. Perhaps that is a very natural acquisitiveness not uncommon to the species. Public officials like power, and legal curbs are irksome to many. So, also, they prefer lump sum to appropriations for specific purposes, and legislation of the blank-check variety. Legislators should be jealous of their prerogatives and be very chary of turning over to public officials the right to make regulations having the same force and effect of law. Of course the plea always is of an emergency and superficially the purpose appears to be good. That is why I put forth the suggestion earlier this evening that we should not be too easily satisfied and that is what Demosthenes meant when he said that the greatest protection to democracies lay in distrust.

But, mark this, the distrust invoked by Demosthenes might be caused to exist in exaggerated extreme to the point where confidence in government might be seriously disturbed or even destroyed. Lack of frankness and honesty and concealment of the truth breeds just that sort of extreme distrust. If the Republican Party dedicated itself to the elimination of the vices of concealment, misrepresentation and propaganda by the representatives of government, the polls would give approving answer at every succeeding election. To those who raise the cry "Get rid of politicians," I may only refer them to the pages of history which seem to indicate indelibly that this is like trying to dam up the ocean. Politics is the business of government and government is politics, and has been since the beginning of time. We must have leaders, but pinning all faith on one man has not proven sound. Safer it is by far to utilize our party machinery and operate through it in orderly fashion to accomplish what is generally the desire of the majority of our people. Talented leaders moving in different directions, no matter how good their purpose, produce schisms within our party and thereby negate accomplishment. A group of earnest citizens engaged in our party management and dedicated to high purpose and good cause can bring real accomplishment.

Presently there will be report on Pearl Harbor after prolonged investigation and taking of testimony which I venture to say leaves most of us bewildered. That the truth was not told to us at the time, again "due to emergency," appears very evident. We have heard discussed the sneak attack and that has been carried over and over again in the press and on the air. We were told that one battleship was sunk and one turned over on its side, whereas it appears that many times that damage was done and the battleship strength of the United States Navy very seriously impaired. The answer does not lie in what the late Secretary of the Navy is quoted as saying to Admiral Richardson: "Richardson, we have never been ready, but we have always won."

The evidence shows that Admiral Halsey's task force left Hawaii on November 28, 1941, more than a week before Pearl Harbor, with orders issued to attack any Japanese warship on sight. Logic arouses the query as to whether a Japanese warship fired upon and

sunk under these orders would have been labelled an attack, sneak or otherwise. The distinguished Secretary of War in the notes submitted to the Investigation indicates clearly that war was imminent, if not already existing, prior to Pearl Harbor. Able strategists concede that an enemy geographically located as Japan was, must be assumed to have planned an attack on their opponent's base at Hawaii to eliminate the force there in order to more safely carry on operations extensively to the southward. Then there was the "letter interchange" between Governor Dewey and General Marshall during the political campaign of 1944. The breaking of the Japanese code must have been known to the Japanese, probably to many other Nations as well, but for some reason or other it was deemed inadvisable for the people of the United States to be possessed of this information. Perhaps I may say more of Pearl Harbor on a subsequent occasion. The inexpressibly tragic episode and the circumstances that preceded and followed it deserve thorough and frank discussion.

There were the conferences at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Deals were made, but information regarding them apparently had to be concealed from the people of the United States, not only at the time but for long periods thereafter, way beyond any safety justification, and the truth has only leaked out spasmodically and grudgingly, and even yet it is not all known. There were the Kuriles Islands and the lower half of Sakhalin, Poland, and the countries bordering on the Russian Soviet Empire. It is even thought bad now for the people of the United States to have a full accounting of the stewardship of the appointees of their own elected officials who had much to do with such arrangements.

Least to be understood of all is the curious tenderness which many of our elected and appointed officials exhibit toward communistic infiltration in this and other countries. So far as I know the present Russian Government has never disproved or even taken the trouble to disprove her connections with communistic movements here and elsewhere. In fact there was time when she was operating some kind of an internationale all over the world to bring the benefits of communism to others while completely shrouding the benefits of her own communistic government internally. It would seem that the logical way to fairly convince others that this communistic business is beneficial would be to give an open internal demonstration which all the world could view and size up for themselves. Quite the contrary, everything within Russia is most carefully concealed. Russia seems suspicious of everybody which logically would subject her to suspicion from without. The way to convince is to be open and above-board and to tell the truth. My recollection tells me that Russia was perfectly content to sit down with the Nazis and divide Poland. Russia was not suspicious of the matériel supplied so bounteously by the United States. Now it is patent that the present Polish Government, like the states surrounding Russia, is completely under Soviet domination. Vast numbers of the brave Polish people who stood in the way of the full fury of the Nazi machine blitz, and who contributed mightily to affording the Allies opposing Germany the opportunity to gird themselves for battle, seem to want nothing of the present Polish Government. To the average American this does not look fair or just.

The sheer impudence of the communistic movement in this country has been so brazen that, had our people not been so bedeviled and bewildered by super emergency regulation, they would have thrown its supporters out long since, as I believe they will shortly when the full facts are known. The Hillman left-wing groups represent a species with which up to now we have had little experience in this country. They have taken advantage of our sportsmanship and predelection for free and untrammeled exercise of the franchise to gang up and endeavor to destroy our form of government. Theirs is not a constructive operation within its framework but one that is diabolically destructive. They use all the techniques familiar to the dictator movements abroad over the past two decades. They seek to create dissension by promising the people what they know to be economically impossible and, while pretending to be nondiscriminatory racially, they are actually inciting every possible race prejudice and hatred, or in other words they are the expert conditioners who would prepare the way for overthrow of the Government. The pattern is nothing new; it is simply "create dissension and take over." If there were any sincerity in them, they would go back and locate on Russian soil and practice what they preach. That is what many of us would like to have them be allowed to do, and if they pursue their nefarious practices it may be necessary for some arrangement to be made to have them do it, willingly or unwillingly. It is certain that this Government cannot carry on part Red and be the same America that most of us know and want. Certainly the Republican Party cannot afford to give Communists any place within its ranks, and if the Democratic Party feels that the votes of this group are enough to keep Democratic officials in office, let us have no hesitancy in accepting the challenge; let us make it crystal clear to the people and have no doubt of the decision.

There are many more instances of expert minds concealing the business of the United States from the people of the United States upon the specious theory that the people of the United States must be conditioned prior to being given the whole truth. I, for one, resent being conditioned and I think hundreds of thousands or I should say millions of American citizens do also. No greater cause could the Republican Party serve than to put a stop once and for all to this furtive and illogical line of reasoning which is entirely repugnant to American intelligence and every tradition of our country. Hitler said in his book, Mein Kampf, that a lie told loud and long enough the people would believe. I am firmly convinced that the truth has equally if not far greater penetrating qualities. I would advocate that the Republican Party and its leaders take a solemn vow individually and severally through all its party organizations to tell the truth loud and long enough and I think they will hear a response on election day that will be as surprising to them as it will be disappointing to their opponents.

America has never been without a high moral consciousness, witness its overgenerous response for understandable warranted appeals for succor. Within my time I recall the aid given China at the time of the Boxer incident and right down to the present America has never turned a deaf ear to a genuine cry for assistance either among her own people or among the other peoples of the world. Nor will America be unresponsive for what is considered its legitimate share of relief for the starving of today, facts regarding which are being surveyed by former President Hoover, than whom there is no abler authority on this subject.

The close of World War II brought us surcease from fighting but no peace. There is not one of us who feels the issues have been determined. The thing we fought for was a settled future for ourselves and our sons. Today the future seems less certain than ever and it is a grave and terrible indictment of our elected representatives and the men who operate the political mechanics of the world that so many honorably discharged fighters feel they are merely enjoying an armistice. We have won the war but we bargain with the vanquished; victory is dissipated in deals. We grow stridently vocative with our wartime allies without making it clear that the end of battle terminated what were temporary alliances. We are incapable of acting with dispatch and while we vacillate about the proper way to attack the hydra, another head grows and current complexities complicate last year's problems.

Bernard Baruch Questions Wisdom of Proposed British Multi-Billion-Dollar Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bernard Baruch is admittedly one of the best financial brains in the United States. He is also an expert in the problem of increasing foreign trade. As an adviser to four Presidents, the counsel of Bernard Baruch, of New York City, is highly pertinent in connection with the proposed multi-billion-dollar loan to Great Britain. It is significant that Mr. Baruch like his Texas counterpart, able Jesse Jones, for years the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, feels that the proposed loan to Britain should not be approved and that it would, in fact, prove injurious both to Great Britain and the United States.

In this connection, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a recent editorial appearing on this subject in the Chicago Herald-American:

TAKE STOCK BEFORE LENDING

The dubious character of the foreign loans contemplated by the American Government, and now at issue before the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate, should be sufficient to persuade the Congress against the loans.

There is little prospect of their repayment in most cases, and in the case of the British loan there is actual consent to nonrepayment in circumstances of Britain's own choice.

There is past and recent history of debt default and repudiation in most cases, including the case of Britain.

So it is plain enough that foreign loans made in such circumstances will not serve the interest and advantage of the United States, but will further deplete the dwindling resources of the United States and further increase the enormous debts burdening the American people.

However, if it is the intention and disposition of the American Government to make these foreign loans, despite their dubious character, there certainly should be an appraisal of our ability to make them before it is done.

Let us at least, as Mr. Bernard Baruch suggested to the House Banking and Currency Committee in his recent thoughtful analysis of the Nation's postwar economic situation:

"Take stock before blindly lending—make inventories of our goods, our cash, our credit, before we increase the pressure on these."

Without the slightest consideration for our own debts, or for our impeded production ever since the war, or for our stringent scarcities of essential goods, as Mr. Baruch said:

"We make promises to other nations of loans for purchases generally to be made here; and if not here, then in other places in the world where we compete."

With American production entirely insufficient for our own needs, why should we loan money to other nations for purchases here which, if made, would only further and perhaps tragically deplete our inadequate domestic stocks?

While not opposed to helping foreign nations in their urgent and dire emergencies resulting from the war, Mr. Baruch well said:

"Until production warrants it, I am opposed to lending them money or assisting them—except for direct needs—to make purchases when we knew they cannot be made here or elsewhere.

"At this time, that would be to increase demand.

"It would be cruel to hold out hopes that will not be realized.

"I would keep the goods necessary to prevent inflation and then allocate the balance, as they come to hand, where it would help the most."

And how are we to know what our helping and lending capacities are, suggested Mr. Baruch, unless we take stock of them?

"Do we know what our resources are?" he demanded of the House committee.

"Do we know what our debts are?

"Do we know how we stand and what we have with which to help others as well as ourselves?

"Do we know how much the others really need?"

Of course, we do not know any of these things, for there has never been an authentic inventory of American lending capacity—but only an emotional urging of foreign loans, without consideration for either our own needs or debts, or for our short supply of goods and our impaired productivity.

Mr. Baruch is right that we should determine the facts about the American economic and financial situation, before we undertake international obligations which are beyond our capacity to fulfill—and which in the attempted fulfillment would only enhance world despair, and at the same time impoverish America.

Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD, today, a letter from a soldier from my district who is now serving in the occupation forces in Tokyo. His attempt to enlist in 1941 was rejected because he was classified as II–A. He operated his own farm until he was drafted, after the war was over. The criticisms he makes are those of an intelligent man and cannot be considered "gripes." In view of the fact that the Army is insisting on the continuance of the draft and the adoption of compulsory military training as a permanent policy, I have sent a copy of this letter to General Eisenhower hoping the particular situation will be corrected and the Army will come to realize the importance of telling the American citizens, subjected to its discipline the "what, how and why as well as the where and when."

TOKYO, JAPAN, *April 23, 1946.*

To Whom It May Concern:

I understand occupational troops are supposed to be given every consideration within reason, especially draftees. I think that is no more than right for the following reasons:

I am a draftee. I tried to enlist in 1941 and can obtain written proof of that. I was refused because I was classified II–A due to my occupation as a farmer. Four years later, after I had succeeded in building up my farm and equipment to where it was producing enough that I felt I was doing something, I was drafted. I think my military record will show that even then I have tried to perform my duty to the best of my abilities. I'll go on doing the same. The point I want to make is, the draftees in the Army here today are men who were deferred, as I was, for several years. They held responsible positions. They were capable men, respectable citizens of communities all over the United States. Now they are in the Army. Should they lose every right and consideration they have earned as such citizens? Should they be subject to the whims of a superior who doesn't even desire their respect and friendship? As for the rest of the draftees, boys 18, 19, and 20, have they had a chance to live and develop any certain desire or to know what their life work will be? I claim there are only a few who could possibly know definitely what plans best suit their future needs. I don't say they shouldn't serve now; what I am protesting is the conditions they serve under. We have every convenience one could expect here in Japan, but I feel there is a lack of proper leadership here in this troop. Can you put a man where he has a club, theater to enjoy, and Tokyo with all there is to see there close at hand, then to make him polish his shoes and rifle, keep a tie straight, sew on a button, or wipe a spot of dust off of a vehicle, threaten to restrict him from the above-mentioned privileges and pleasures? Some men have had their rank taken from them for small errors. They say we must be taught occupational duties. We've all had basic. Is the nomenclature of an M–1 and 30-caliber machine gun necessary for our occupation, especially since we've all had it? Why not, if we must have instruction, give the men something they haven't had, but need. We have two armored cars to a line platoon section here. A large percentage of the men don't know the first thing about a 37–mm gun or a 50-caliber machine gun. Why not some practical instruction on those? I've been on so-called patrols checking Japanese meetings. The boys almost always ask, "What the h— are these for?" Couldn't those things be explained to the men on Army time so they would know what they are doing here? Can't the officers make their men want to do their job through a complete knowledge of the same and information as to the results of their own immediate efforts? They tell us we must set an example for the Japanese people. In this troop I have seen men put on extra duty for wearing an incomplete uniform inside the day room to attend a movie. Isn't there some place we can relax? If we can't relax here plenty will when they feel they are out of sight of officers. We need officers who are interested in their men's personal welfare as well as spit and polish. This is not all Regular Army and the boys here should be given some consideration. Give them a job and a reason and then honest credit for a good job and I'll wager you get better results than giving restrictions for failure to do something you see no reason for at all. Let's have some "why" around here. We're in the Army but we've been taught to do our work with a reason behind it. Most of us will soon return to that life, and are we going to be able to go home and tell what the Army is doing or will we go home and say they are using Japan for a drill field and the Army as an instrument to drill young men into the military instead of an instrument of peace?

Once more, many of the boys in this Army today have proven themselves capable and responsible in civilian life and a lot more of them need the chance to see what they are doing so they can understand responsibility that will be theirs when they go home. We'd like to know what, how, and why as well as where and when.

Pegler Says Rankin Has Thankless Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article written by Westbrook Pegler with reference to my services in connection with the Committee on Un-American Activities, which I hope every Member of the House will take the time to read.

The matter referred to follows:

AS PEGLER SEES IT

(By Westbrook Pegler)

RANKIN HAS THANKLESS TASK ON UN-AMERICAN COMMITTEE

There is a campaign running now for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whose chairman, JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, has, in practical effect, abdicated the job and turned over a thankless and bitterly trying task to JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi.

The source of this organized propaganda is New York, where political hysteria has been carefully fomented over a period of years to the end that, as now, the people are incapable of calm, objective, political judgment and candidates and managers constantly flout the principles of the cherished Fair Employment Act to emphasize racial and religious divisions, ignoring all normal considerations, including even loyalty to the United States and the Constitution.

Among those who have joined this campaign directed against RANKIN, there are some, including a few editorial voices, who should stand by him but have unconsciously sunk into a state of intellectual and political intimidation so abject that they lack the stamina to resist certain K-ration thoughts issued by the Communists and the Political Action Committee of the CIO.

This kind acquiesces to the extent of saying that, of course, we do need a Committee on Un-American Activities but that, of course, again, Mr. RANKIN is impossible just as Martin Dies, before him, also was impossible in the same position.

The flat acceptance by so many Americans, including editorial writers and package-goods commentators, of the proposition that Dies was impossible was a cowardly injustice to a man who began absolutely green, fumbled a while, but, by persistent study and through experience became really learned in the perfidies and personalities and the interlocking associations of the Communist conspiracy against the existence of the United States

He did not seek the job but accepted it in the pathetic manner of the comic-strip slob standing on a corner who agrees to mind

a stolen satchel for a fugitive thief. More experienced and less courageous Congressmen would have no part of it for they foresaw painful troubles around the corner.

Dies could not foresee, but he soon learned that as soon as he turned his attention from the conspiracies of the Italian Fascist organizations in the East, which were more comic and contemptible than dangerous, and the operations of the Hitler bund, to those of the Communist traitors and their accomplices, he would become the object of a savage, ruthless, and sustained war of personal abuse.

Few men in public life in the United States have been beaten so wickedly for the performance of a valuable public service.

In strict accordance with the Communist and, if you will, Nazi method, Dies was held up to the Nation as a Jew hater, although no record ever was found of any single utterance to support the charge nor any person who could say he had heard Dies express this sentiment.

However, he had found many persons with Jewish names among those with Anglo-Saxon, Irish, and Latin names, among the Communists and fellow travelers. Naturally, Dies exposed their activities and so it followed in the Communist propaganda that he was anti-Semitic and many Jews and others sincerely believed that he was.

Nevertheless, the files and reports which he accumulated were a contribution of great value, the importance of which would be freely acknowledged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and, under honest conditions, the espionage services of the Army and Navy.

He was discredited in his home district by the greatest money power ever organized in American politics, the Political Action Committee, and so withdrew with no recognition of his excellent work which far outweighed the informalities and unimportant irregularities of method which were charged against him.

These errors, incidentally, were trivial by comparison with the shocking improprieties of Hugo Black in the conduct of a Senate investigation, but the same forces that damned Dies embraced Black, a former member of a gang of night-riding terrorists, when Roosevelt sent him to the Supreme Court merely because he was a Roosevelt man.

Upon analysis the worst offense charged to RANKIN, of Mississippi, is that he has the sort of manly personal temper that most Americans respect in their friends and fellowmen. Call him a dirty name and he will call you a dirtier one back and keep on raising you or see you outside if you prefer.

He has been the victim of vile abuse, as Dies was, but, unlike the patient and often rather forlorn member from Texas, he takes his own personal part and no man can say that his outbursts were either gratuitous or incorrect. The epithets that he has uttered in response to filthy personal slanders have not been condemned as inappropriate or excessive but only on the ground of indecorum.

The same propaganda has condoned, even lauded, the totalitarian policies of Senator WAGNER and Representative MARCANTONIO of New York and has accepted as nothing worse than amusing repartee the disgusting obscenities without which Fiorello LaGuardia often finds it impossible to express himself.

However, the place to inquire how a Congressman stands is not in the guttersnipe sector of the radio, the press and politics, which is largely localized in the East, but in his own home State. And, in Mississippi, Rankin is highly respected, as his long record of reelections strongly suggests, for his congressional record on many issues, including an effective fight for rural electrification.

This has won him gratitude among backcountry farmers, who also respect his stout, personal manhood in controversy. They like him in Mississippi as the election returns prove and many another Congressman who has held his tongue and resorted to personally humiliating soft answers under abuse envies his courage in answering personal attacks.

There can never be a perfect Committee on Un-American Activities nor a perfect chairman, but most other committees share the same imperfections.

In judging RANKIN, however, the public is asked to look only at the propaganda of the Communists and those who have been influenced by it. Not one in a million has ever looked at the record which is the only proper basis for judgment.

How To Make OPA Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

HOW TO MAKE OPA WORK

There is not much doubt that the attempt to maintain price controls under the pressure of increases in wage rates and material costs has been a failure.

OPA has not prevented price increases. It has not stimulated production but has retarded it. It has encouraged black markets and under-the-counter sales. And it has not prevented inflation because the prices paid for black-market goods are just as inflationary as though there were no price ceilings in existence.

On the surface, the debate in Congress is whether OPA should be extended or abolished. Actually, the problem before Congress is how to end price controls and regulations with as little dislocation of the price structure as possible.

In theory OPA would be a fine thing if it accomplished everything its advocates claim for it, that is, if it encouraged production, eliminated scarcities, held down prices, prevented inflation, and abolished black markets. But there is only one way in which these results could be attained, and that would be to abolish free enterprise entirely and have the Government take charge of everything, including labor unions.

The way to make OPA work would be for the Government to tell each factory what to manufacture and each farmer what crops to raise, to assign industrial and agricultural workers to specific jobs and to establish uniform wage rates for every occupation and uniform prices for every commodity and service.

These regulations naturally would have to be coupled with severe penalties for violations and the establishment of an army of supervisors and inspectors to enforce them. There would be no place for labor unions, farm organizations, chambers of commerce, or manufacturers' associations in this set-up because the functions they now exercise would be in conflict with the Government and the Government would be required to suppress them.

The trouble with the advocates of Government controls is that they want the Government to control everyone but themselves. But this Nation cannot long endure half controlled and half free. If the controls are going to be effective, they must cover everybody, just as they do in Russia.

When this happy millennium has come about, and the standard of living in the United States has been reduced to that of Russia, we can then solve all our remaining problems by abolishing what is left of the Constitution and becoming a member of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Extension of UNRRA To Include Hebrew Nationals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter addressed to Mr. T. F. Tsiang, chairman of the fourth session of the UNNRA Council recently held in Atlantic City, by Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation. In this letter Mr. Bergson asked for admission to the UNNRA Council for the Hebrew nation so that the shocking situation which exists today, whereby almost a million Hebrews who reside in former Axis countries are not receiving aid from the UNRRA, could be alleviated. A memorandum attached to the letter, which I would also like to insert, explains clearly and concisely the urgent need and the desirability of such action:

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1946.

T. F. TSIANG,
Chairman, the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Atlantic City, N. J.

SIR: Under article II of the agreement for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration providing for admission of "such other governments or authorities" as may apply for membership, we respectfully submit this application for admission of the Hebrew nation to membership in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

We further submit herewith our memorandum offering just and sufficient reasons why this application of the Hebrew nation for participation in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration should be accepted.

Respectfully submitted on March 16, 1946.

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

MEMORANDUM OF THE EXTENSION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION TO INCLUDE HEBREW NATIONALS

(Submitted by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, March 16, 1946)

It is submitted that the moral right of the Hebrew people to relief and rehabilitation cannot be disputed or questioned.

The Hebrew people is one of the chief victims and sufferers of World War II. In proportion to its total population, it has suffered a greater number of casualties than any other nation involved in the war.

Throughout Europe its people have been uprooted, deprived of their possessions, rights, and liberties, and left in the perilous condition of utter destitution and starvation.

It is submitted that the dictates of humanity and justice demand that the Hebrew people be formally and officially admitted to membership in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in order that it may represent and protect the interests of Hebrew nationals just as the interests of other people are now represented and protected within the UNRRA.

While it is being universally accepted that any problems of political nature or recognition should be eliminated from the framework of UNRRA, it must, at the same time, be acknowledged that the withholding of adequate relief from a people in distress on political grounds is equally inadmissible and constitutes in itself political interference incompatible with the basic fundamentals of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Furthermore, the unique situation in which the Hebrew people finds itself creates a number of specific and peculiar problems in bringing relief and rehabilitation to the Hebrew nationals of the devastated countries of the Old World, problems that have not as yet received specific consideration.

We respectfully call the attention of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to three distinct categories of human beings who constitute part of the Hebrew people:

1. The so-called stateless Jews.

2. The Jews who are regarded as citizens of Axis countries.

3. The displaced Jews of Poland and other liberated countries who have indicated their determination not to return to their former homes, which are now either shattered and destroyed or held in possession by others, homes that are haunted by the tortured and murdered victims of Nazi and native bestiality.

For the sake of clarity, we refer to the people in these categories as Hebrews, members of the Hebrew nation composed of the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine and thus distinguished from the millions of American, British and other nationals of Hebrew descent and/or Jewish faith. They are also separate and distinct from those Jews who voluntarily choose to remain nationals of the countries of their origin or former residence, and must be regarded not as Hebrews but as nationals of their respective countries and consequently treated as such.

It is respectfully submitted that in the present structure and program of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, no provision has been made to cope with the specific problem of rehabilitating the homeless Hebrews, aside from resolutions of the council Nos. 57 and 60 which have not been implemented. It is further submitted that any additional procrastination is tantamount to exposing those survivors of Nazi torture chambers to death from starvation and exposure, and that each day claims new victims among the surviving Hebrews whose physical and moral resistance was brought to a breaking point through 7 years of ordeals and sufferings. Failure to act swiftly even at this late hour will constitute a flagrant denial of the very principles of humanity which are the foundation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In view of the foregoing, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation feels compelled to urge the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to take speedy and effective steps toward bringing immediate relief to the homeless Hebrew people of the Old World and to make the necessary preparations for their repatriation to Palestine and their rehabilitation in that country.

To devise and carry out a program of relief and rehabilitation of the Hebrews is a task which calls for a great deal of study and for involved practical operations. The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation will be happy to submit to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration detailed data in connection with such a program, as well as to delegate its representatives and experts to deliberate with the appropriate agencies of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in the consideration and discussion of such a program. The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation will be glad to be advised with what official or committee of your organization contact may be established for a preliminary discussion of these points.

In addition to the foregoing, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation wishes to place on record its conviction that the Hebrew nation should not figure in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in the sole part of a beggar. On a par with other oppressed nations which are fighting for their future freedom, it should also be fully represented as an equal partner in the councils of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Pending the formation of a Hebrew government or other agency more fully representative of the Hebrew nation, this committee would be glad, if such arrangements would suit the convenience of your organization, to assume the representation of Hebrew interests within the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix the text of a thoughtful and splendid address entitled "Inflation," broadcast from Station WMCA, New York, on April 24, by Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I want to talk to you about the OPA and what Congress is trying to do to it—and to you. I am particularly anxious to talk to you about this because the question of the OPA is directly tied up with that of inflation—and the battle against inflation is not a new one to me. I am a veteran of it. It was uppermost in my mind from 1933 to 1945, and it still is.

Why was the OPA established in the first place? Its narrower purpose was to maintain the living standards of the American people in the face of inevitable wartime pressures to raise prices. Its broader purpose was to provide a first-line defense against inflation and to keep the economy of this country from exploding.

Those were its purposes during the war, and now the war is over. But we are not out of the woods yet, not by any means. Nevertheless, the House of Representatives has passed an OPA bill whose net effect is not to extend the OPA, but actually to deprive it of any vitality that it has.

Now, I do not mean to say that everything is rosy under OPA as it now stands. Quite the contrary. Prices on many items of prime necessity have risen to levels which I consider unhealthy, despite the OPA. There are shortages. There is the black market. White shirts have been hard to find. Building materials are not yet plentiful. Women's shoes that used to sell for $6 and $7 are now up to $16 and $17. Men's suits that used to be $35 now sell for somewhere around $50. If you are living on an average salary, I don't have to tell you what this means.

Who's to blame for this? Congress, in the first place, because Congress has not provided the OPA with sufficient funds to do the kind of enforcement job that is necessary. The OPA itself is at fault; it could certainly function more efficiently than it has sometimes in the past. And you yourselves, my friends, are to blame, because you did not make yourselves heard in Washington with as loud a voice as that of the powerful lobbies that have been pressing from the very outset for the death of the OPA.

All this is true. But is the cure to abolish the OPA altogether? You can get your answer from your own memory or from American history books. We had no OPA after the First World War. Do you remember price levels in 1920? Sugar was 26 cents a pound. Eggs cost 8½ cents apiece. Clothing had more than doubled in price. The cost of living had gone sky high.

If the OPA is killed or maimed, as the present House bill maims it, we are going to have the same thing in 1946, and probably worse. Food prices will jump 50 percent. Low-priced clothing will disappear from the market. Apartment rents will skyrocket. Conditions are anything but ideal now, but within 6 months you will look back and think this was paradise. With all its deficiencies, the OPA is essential to help us get by until this period of reconversion is over and all goods become fully plentiful again. The OPA is as vitally necessary today as it ever was to keep Americans from going hungry and without roofs over their heads and to act as a line of defense against inflation.

I am not exaggerating the danger; on the contrary, I am being conservative about it. But I have had enough experience with the finances of the Nation to warn you that once inflation takes hold, there is no telling where it will end. In Hungary today, the pengo, once worth 20 cents, is now rated at 80,000,000—yes, 80 million—to the dollar. The Chinese dollar is worth 2,000 for one American dollar. But in America inflation need not go anywhere near that far to cause catastrophe. Simply imagine a dollar worth about half what it is today. What would you be able to buy with your wages? What value would your bonds or insurance policies have in an America where inflation was eating at the very heart of our economy?

It is hard to conceive of any normal American actively desiring this state of affairs. Yet there must be such people. If they did not exist, 265 Congressmen would not have voted for the OPA bill in a form which converts it into an actual instrument of inflation.

It is possible, of course, that some of these Congressmen voted for the bill without fully understanding its fearful implications. But there are undoubtedly others, less candid with themselves and their constituents, who must have reasoned something like this: "I will vote for the OPA bill with all its vicious amendments, as it stands. This amounts to killing OPA, anyway. But if the electorate ever calls me on it, I will always be able to point out that I really did vote for OPA, after all."

I do not believe that the public can be fooled by that kind of hypocrisy. Congress knows full well that the American people

want the OPA. They did not dare kill the OPA outright because of what they would have to face back home in their own districts. So they have concocted this monstrous bill, hoping that the American public would be taken in by it. This bill is a colossal sneer at the intelligence of the public.

If the OPA bill in its present form is not stopped dead in the Senate, the United States will have taken its first long step not merely toward inflation but also toward the inevitable retribution of inflation—economic collapse, depression, and possible chaos. Every single American will suffer as he has never suffered before—all, that is, except those selfish groups whose lobbies in Congress forced the present OPA bill through the House of Representatives. They, and they alone, will ride triumphant through the shambles of inflation into which they want to plunge this country. The Three Horsemen—the Speculator, the Profiteer, and the Hoarder—these alone stand to gain by an America where inflation runs wild.

For 12 years, these selfish interests were held in check by the administration in Washington. They were forced to relinquish their control of the Government and the economic life of the Nation. A new course was charted for this country—one which called for a sustained and persistent effort to iron out the peaks and valleys of inflationary booms and deflationary depressions—one which called for steady progress toward a balanced and healthy prosperity, with full employment as the goal.

In the past year, these obstinately selfish groups have been working like beavers to recapture the control they lost to the people in 1933. I believe that the current drive to kill the OPA is the central part of their plan. Their motive in killing the OPA is not merely inflation itself—although inflation will bring them enormous profits. For them, inflation will have other results as well. Not only will it rob the wage earner of his earnings; not only will it load the farmer with debts he can never pay. It will also divide the country; it will set producers against consumers, workers against employers, debtors against creditors. In a word, inflation will demoralize the country—and that is exactly what these groups are driving at.

To understand this, just remember what the terrible inflation that followed the last war did to Germany. The German people never forgot that experience, and Hitler made the most of it in his propaganda.

A period of inflation inevitably ends in one way—in a crash. The end product of inflation is depression—and the kind of depression the selfish interests in this country are cooking up will make anything we've had in the past look like a picnic. And when the inevitable happens, the hour will have struck for these interests to take over. Their demagogs will use the general misery to hoist themselves into power. New Huey Longs, Gerald K. Smiths, and Father Coughlins will ride the crest of popular discontent and demoralization. It almost happened once before, in the early thirties. Franklin D. Roosevelt stood in the way. Who will stand in the way next time?

These are the perspectives before us if inflation is permitted to take hold in this country. The drive to kill the OPA is part of a gigantic pattern, carefully wrought by men who know what they are doing. Its purpose is to snatch the reins of control in this country from the people—to rule through ruin. If you follow the vote in Congress, you know that the men who oppose the economic bill of rights, the FEPC, and every other piece of progressive legislation, are by and large the very same men who are now out to finish off the OPA. Surely this is more than coincidence. There is design in it, and whether the Congressmen and Senators who are involved in it know this or not, their blindness or willfulness is setting the stage for the arrival of an American Hitler.

I say that it is essential to the future of our democracy that we stave off inflation by every means at our disposal. A vigorous OPA, armed with the financial and legal requisites to do the job, is our basic weapon in this fight. But we are not going to have this kind of OPA unless the plain citizens of this country—you and I—act immediately and with decision. The need for you to make yourself heard in Washington has been magnified a thousand times.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two very fine editorials from the Denton Journal of Denton, Md., on the OPA, one called Principle—Not Prices, and the other entitled "Too Many Political Slaves," and strongly advocating return to congressional independence.

The editorials in question follow:

TOO MANY POLITICAL SLAVES

There is a lot of complaining throughout the country because the legislative branch of the Government does not put the okeh on more recommendations of the executive branch of the Government.

The President of the United States follows the established custom of sending messages to Congress. There is only one reason why President Truman has not been more successful in securing the approval of his recommendations and that is due to the fact that Congress is more independent than it was under the rule of Roosevelt. A lot of Democratic politicians have supported President Truman for the sake of the party. Others have jumped the party traces. The National Committee of the Democratic Party has done a lot of "cracking the whip" and demanding that the President must be obeyed.

Henry A. Wallace frequently butts in on political controversies, and a short time ago he suggested that the Democrats should stick together while "something has to be worked out within the parties, so that the electorate will know what they are voting for." Having been raised in a Republican printing office, he covered, as usual, too much waste land when he said: "Those who would not go along on the points of party regularity would no longer receive committee appointments." Practical Senator HAWKES of New Jersey insisted that Wallace was advocating that party members should be "purged" if they did not obey orders from the White House.

The safety of the American Government and its people is secure as long as Senators and Representatives in Congress work at their own jobs and acquaint themselves of the purposes behind thousands of new laws that they are grinding through the hopper. What these men need is more intestinal fortitude. The people must come first.

QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE—NOT PRICES

When the Government sets out to control prices and supply and demand—the natural forces of the free market—it must reach ruthlessly into the lives of all the people. There can be nothing democratic about it. The United States is trying to straddle the fence. It is trying to control inflation painlessly for as many people as possible with a strong show of democratic justice, which may sound like good political strategy but which simply will not work. The corollary to price control is wage control. Under the Government's fence-straddling policy it has not been expedient to control wages. Such a step is unpopular with too many people. On the other hand, the OPA is a splinter of European dictatorship. It rules prices by decree, it sends people to jail, its spies sift through the affairs of thousands of businesses—and the private citizen is effectively barred from seeking relief from its decisions in the regular courts. If OPA is continued, the principle it represents—government by unquestioned decree—must be broadened promptly. Wages, too, must be controlled, and strikes must be barred. The present half-and-half system—half free, half controlled—is leading to production demoralization.

In deciding the future of OPA, the first question to be answered is, What kind of a system of government do we want in this country? This is a question of principle, not prices. By comparison, prices are irrelevant. Today no one can talk about prices with any certainty. Inflation may continue its course regardless of the system of government we decide to follow. The point is we must choose a form of government and stick with it, or face anarchy. If the decision is in favor of the traditional American Government of checks and balances under which coercion by decree is prohibited, the OPA and the authoritarian principle it represents must be abandoned. If prices go through the roof during the readjustment to the free market, the country will have to grin and bear it, with the knowledge that the path of freedom is sometimes hard, although in the end its rewards are worth the sacrifice—something that Americans have known since 1776.

A Veteran's View on Real Estate Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of the argument by Lt. Comdr. Clarence Kolwyck, of Chattanooga, Tenn., in favor of the price ceiling on existing dwellings. This address was delivered at the Chattanooga Civitan Club on April 19, 1946. Commander Kolwyck has taken a great interest in securing adequate housing for veterans in his section and his views are entitled to full consideration:

RESOLVED, SHOULD THERE BE A PRICE CEILING ON EXISTING DWELLINGS?

I am told that I am to have the affirmative side of a debate on the subject Resolved, Should There Be a Price Ceiling on Existing Dwellings?

Since this discussion is in the form of a debate and since I have been arbitrarily assigned to the affirmative side of the question, it should go without saying that any similarity between my personal opinions and my arguments are purely coincidental. Although I will state that my worthy opponent must produce some mighty forceful argument to convince me that ceiling control on existing dwellings is not justified. But at the same time this question is of such vital importance that I am personally open to conviction either way.

Since no effort has been made by or through Congress to establish any form of ceiling on existing dwellings except by fixing the first sale price as the ceiling, it is assumed that we are to discuss ceilings fixed in that manner. The shortage of homes being so well known doubtless my opponent cannot deny that fact and we may safely proceed accordingly.

Right off, I would say that a ceiling based on first sale price would seem to be its own best argument. Who can say in these times of housing distress that anyone should be permitted to buy a house and then turn around and sell it for a profit? A dwelling is a home. There are less dwellings than seekers of homes. When this situation prevails dwellings should be sold as homes and not for unearned profits which may become a penalty on the home buyer. Let us stop speculation until there is a surplus of dwellings.

In civil actions involving the value of property the law says that the value should be fixed on the assumption that the seller is willing to sell but doesn't have to sell and the buyer is willing to buy but doesn't have to buy. With a national shortage of homes running into the millions, we do not have an open market in the legal sense of determining values. True, the seller is willing to sell but doesn't have to sell and the buyer is willing to buy—in fact eager to buy—but he has to buy, buy at the mercy of the seller on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Consequently no court can follow the law by fixing values of real estate on the basis at which it is now selling and none to my knowledge are doing so.

Ceilings on prices presuppose scarcity and are aimed at preventing inflation. Inflation is the natural result of uncontrolled prices on scarce commodities. Inflation in practical terms means that those with the most money will buy all the scarce articles and the poor will get none. In most instances only the speculator will be the gainer. His sole contribution is to make scarce commodities more scarce and the needy more in need.

No one can deny that ceilings in any form are undemocratic and repugnant to the American way of life. But by the same token no one can deny that ceilings as a general proposition were necessary to the winning of the war in much the same way as selective service. Selective service meant equality of obligation to serve. Ceilings meant equality of opportunity to buy scarce necessities at a reasonable and fair price. Now that the war is over some may argue that ceilings are no longer necessary, especially on dwellings which were not placed under ceilings during the war.

To argue this is to ignore what has turned out to be the worst economic result brought about directly by the war—a housing shortage unequalled in the history of this country. The President says 5,000,000 are needed. The National Association of Home Builders says one and one-half million would relieve the extreme shortage. Expeditor Wyatt says 2,700,000 must be built in 1946 and 1947. Chester Bowles says there is a cash-on-the-barrel-head market for 2,000,000 right now.

The results of war can oftentimes be almost as bad as war itself—witness the human derelicts overflowing our veterans' hospitals. It is believed a safe assertion that there is a greater shortage of housing at the present time than of any nonmilitary commodity during the war, not excepting wartime rental requirements. If there was a need for rent ceilings during the war, and ceilings on most other staples of life, there is a correspondingly greater need for ceilings on dwellings now. As a matter of fact the emergency is not over and cannot very well be declared over so long as our civilian economy remains maladjusted as the result of war. Controls are the best answer so far advanced.

It cannot be emphasized too much that the main significance of the housing shortage lies in the fact that, next to food, it is the most important commodity in our everyday life. Of course, there is a shortage of automobiles, but no satisfactory way has been discovered that will permit the use of an automobile for sleeping, eating, bathing, or the free exercise of junior's perambulator. The home is the foundation stone of society. With millions without homes society as a whole must suffer.

Let us consider finally the veteran, who, after all, has a vital stake in the housing situation, at least an equal chance with civilians. Over a million are in the market for homes. They are the least able to pay cash. Granting the advantages of guaranteed loans, a pay day is coming which may be disastrous for buyers exceeding their earnings. Nor can we be sure that the generosity of Congress in permitting veterans to borrow more than the real value of the homes is not sowing seeds of bitter disillusionment in days to come. Of course, veterans are protected by conservative appraisals. But, again, conservative appraisals mean no homes in an inflated market. The veterans' problem is further complicated by the effect of inflated home values on the rental situation. When investors in dwellings for rental purposes turn speculators the renter is soon out in the street. Veterans, being predominantly renters, are the ones to suffer most. Viewed from any angle, without controls the veteran is caught in a squeeze in a speculative market. He cannot buy because he cannot pay the price. He cannot rent because others have paid the price.

In conclusion let me say that a ceiling based on first sale price can harm no one but the speculator. It cannot prevent inflation—we already have that, but it can and will stop further inflation. It will not totally solve the housing shortage, but will permit those willing to pay the price to acquire homes without fattening the speculator's purse. Perhaps its most useful result will be at least a partial preventative of the inevitable crash with all the attendant foreclosures and heartaches. Can we so soon forget the early thirties? Without controls the veteran must suffer. Under ceilings he may suffer less. Since under ceilings the speculator alone can lose by ceilings and the home buyer stands a chance to gain, who but the speculator can object?

OPA Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very fine article on the amendments recently adopted by the House to the OPA bill by Raymond Moley.

I want to commend Mr. Moley for his fairness in this article, something which is frequently lacking in similar articles by other writers.

The article follows:

HOUSE OPA AMENDMENTS

(By Raymond Moley)

The House of Representatives set off a big furor by amending the OPA. One side hailed the action as the dawn of a new day. The other predicted black ruin. A calm appraisal of the revised set-up justifies neither claim.

The most talked-of amendment is that which says, "No maximum price shall be established or maintained without allowing a reasonable profit." A former official of the OPA, who worked with Leon Henderson, points out that the Price Control Act itself provided that the Administrator should establish fair and equitable prices which, by any interpretation, should mean fair profits. The major question in the interpretation of this provision is whether this fair profit shall be given to the high-cost producers.

Before the publication of the over-all price freezing, in the spring of 1942, Mr. Henderson and his staff discussed for a long time the question whether there should be followed an old custom of fixing only about 200 to 300 maximum prices and of prescribing for all other merchandise a "fair price," which would allow the seller a cost-plus per unit not higher than prewar times. This plan was generally used in Europe in the First World War and it worked well in Scandinavia in the recent war. It is undoubtedly preferable where cost elements are widely different, as in such transition as the present. It was not adopted.

At the present time, new commodities get a price entirely different from that of old commodities, even if the goods in question are virtually the same. The method of price fixing on this principle is cumbersome, and sellers are greatly dissatisfied with it. On the other hand, the records show that under the current method of control by multitudes of ceilings, profits in some industries have become 5 to 10 times those of prewar days. In big stores and big plants, price ceilings are adhered to because employees have no interest in higher prices, and the institutions themselves cannot afford trouble and publicity through any violations. It is probable that the new House formula will bring lower, rather than higher prices.

So the disaster predicted by Messrs. Bowles and Porter is not likely to take place. The OPA might well try to operate under the simpler formula described above, which was considered in 1942 and rejected. That formula would be likely to work much better than the plan now in force. At present, sellers have to fix prices according to the competitor closest to him or the commodity comparable with the new commodity. That means that he can choose anything which seems to be comparable and which is to his advantage.

The procedure of making a fair price with a fair profit is much easier than is allowed by present methods of the OPA. In some cases, the fixing of prices under current formulas has taken as much as 4 months. Such delay is intolerable to business and very unfair to the consumer.

The decision of the House to abolish rollback subsidies is also sound. Subsidies on meat are paid, but we do not get much of the available meat. And for what he does get, the consumer pays more above the maximum price than the amount of the subsidy. From the slaughterhouse to the dining table, the subsidy has long since lost its value completely.

If the OPA is to expire next spring, the subsidies must lapse then at the latest. They should not be taken off all at once. They should be removed piecemeal, but not too slowly. The situation will improve in the process.

The OPA has been overstressing the importance of controls. And it is now wholly misrepresenting the effect of the House amendments. They are several steps in the right direction.

Federal Expenditures and Balancing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address which I gave in Hartford, Conn., last week on the subject of Federal expenditures and balancing the Budget.

I wish to call the attention of Members of the House to the fact that during the months of February and March of this year the Federal Treasury showed a budgetary surplus.

For tonight I have chosen the subject of Federal expenditures because a number of people have written of late asking the why and wherefore of Government spending. Why, they ask, has the President announced that the Budget may not be balanced before next year? Since the war is over, they ask, why have we not made larger cuts in Federal expenditures? And some wonder, too, why the wartime tax schedules were reduced, since business and industry and people are able to continue to pay higher taxes while there is work and production is high.

Everyone, of course, fully appreciates the necessity of a balanced Budget. The housewife knows that she cannot run her family into debt and have peace of mind. She is given a certain amount of money and must plan her household expenses accordingly. The businessman knows that and so does the manufacturer. So does the Budget Director of our country. There do come emergencies when a family or a business or a government has to run into debt. But so long as there is the capacity for production, so long as there are tangible assets which can be turned to income production, the debt need not be alarming. It is only when there is no hope of being able to produce, to pay off the debt, that bankruptcy ensues, or insecurity, or chaos. That is definitely not the situation so far as the United States is concerned—far from it.

By way of illustration, let me give you a bit of very encouraging information. Our Federal expenditures, swollen by war costs, reached a peak last year in June of nearly $10,000,000,000. That was one month after VE-day. By March this year Federal expenditures had fallen to under $4,000,000,000, a cut of nearly 60 percent. These rapid decreases will continue until we are on a peacetime basis.

In the meantime, while expenditures have been rapidly decreasing, revenues have held up remarkably well. For example, as against expenditures of under $4,000,000,000 for last month, the receipts of the United States Government amounted to $5,700,000,000. That represents a decline of 17 percent from the income the Government received in March of 1945, but as I said before, the total expenditures declined almost 60 percent for the same month.

Full production, and that I must add, means full employment, is imperative for the maintenance of stable and prosperous economic conditions. And as the President observed a couple of weeks ago, "We are well on the highroad to full peacetime production."

Now let us briefly review the circumstances which form the immediate background for the budget for which the Congress is now appropriating.

The United States was fortunately spared direct property damage from the war. But the money cost of waging the war was enormous. We were able, by spending more money than our opponents, to give our armed forces greatly superior equipment, and so reduce our casualties. We were able to speed the victory by supplying our allies with goods and equipment they were not able to supply themselves. We spared no money in experimenting with new equipment, with miraculous instruments of warfare which would bring defeat to the enemy. The $2,000,000,000 spent in developing the atomic bomb dramatically shortened the war and saved countless American lives.

All that required an immense industrial and financial effort at home, greater than ever before in peace or war. At the peak of the war, nearly one-half of the total product of the country was being devoted to war purposes. At the height of World War I, only one-quarter of home front production was directly devoted to the war's prosecution. Compare also, the period of 19 months which represented our actual fighting period for World War I with 44 months for our actual fighting period of World War II.

The war from which we are emerging belonged to a vastly different age than the last one. New weapons, devices, training, had to be worked out for new distances, strange lands, and fighting conditions. This was an air war as well as a land and sea war. We were fighting also against the greater period of time the enemy had for preparation, the tremendous inroads through conquest he had made before the first American shot was fired—indeed before the first Allied shot was fired.

Those facts, which are well known to every American, bear repeating now when the fervor of war has died down, and some people are prone to forget that an economy which was revolutionized over a period of 4 years cannot be brought back to normal with one stroke.

In the fiscal year which ended in June of 1945, total Federal expenditures amounted to $100,000,000,000, 90 percent of which were directly spent for the war.

With the beginning of the demobilization period last fall, our major attention naturally turned to the liquidation of the war. This has its human side as well as its financial side.

The human side was naturally given priority. During the 8 months since the surrender of Japan, about three-quarters of all those in the armed forces on VJ-day have been demobilized. The greater part of our troops had to be returned from abroad. Before they could be returned to civilian life, their records had to be placed in shape, so that the country will be able to discharge any obligation it may owe them in the future for service-connected disabilities. They have been given their mustering-out pay and have been paid their fare back to their homes. Human demobilization has been costly, in terms of dollars.

Next there are the expenses in connection with the demobilization of supplies. Not only our superiority in manpower but also our superiority in equipment and supplies spelled victory. It will go down as one of the miracles of this generation that this Nation, so unprepared for war, was able in so short a time to train and send to 70 theaters of war throughout the world trained fighting troops and the equipment and supplies they needed to fight to victory. The jeeps and ducks, the guns and tanks, the radios and telephone wires, the food and clothing, sheets, bandages, and medicines, fire-fighting equipment, cigarettes and toothpaste, anything and everything a soldier was provided in the States had to be transported to him wherever he was sent to fight. All that, in addition to the tremendous amount of fighting weapons. Of course, at times we provided more than was needed. Some of our supplies never reached their destination. Much was lost at sea. Much more was destroyed during battle, before it was put to full use.

I remember Ernie Pyle's vivid description of the beaches of Normandy during the first few days after the invasion, when he wrote of quantities of ammunition and personal supplies dropped by dead and injured soldiers, left behind by fighting soldiers as they advanced on the expanding front. That was repeated over and over and over again wherever our soldiers fought.

There was a period during the war when contracts for certain armaments were canceled because it was felt there was a sufficient supply. A few months later those contracts were resumed in a mad race for more ammunition as our men approached Germany. Do you remember the Battle of the Bulge and Eisenhower's frantic appeal for more arms? We learned then we could take no chances on sufficiency. We could not let down until the enemy's last gun was laid down. Better to have enough to waste than let one single American soldier, one single American unit, have one bit less than was needed.

So our factories continued to produce at top speed. Many supplies already delivered to the Government before VJ-day had not been paid for at that time. Many other supplies which had not yet been delivered were in various stages of manufacture.

The contracts for the delivery of most of these supplies were canceled. But their manufacturers and the subcontractors and the sub-subcontractors of these manufacturers had incurred many costs for which they had to be reimbursed. Much of this cost will come back to us as this property is disposed of as surplus. But the initial expense had to be paid for just the same. It will interest you to know also that more than 75 percent of war plants have been cleared of Government machinery.

Another war expenditure is in connection with the occupation of enemy countries and with relief of the destitution which has followed in the wake of war. These are necessary to secure the peace for which so many lives have been lost.

The expenditures of demobilization and the termination of war contracts will, for the most part, be over by the end of this fiscal year. But those in connection with occupation of enemy countries and relief of destitution abroad will last longer. And for a long time we will be faced with the expenditures incident to caring for the veterans and paying the interest and principal on the public debt. There will be other expenditures incident to keeping the peace through United Nations collaboration. The wonder is that we have been able to cut our spending as much and as rapidly as we have.

But, as I said earlier, high public expenditures are not cause for alarm so long as they can be offset by sufficient Government revenue. And the answer to that is full production. Despite labor disturbances, the production of civilian goods is now proceeding at the highest rate which the country has ever known. As a result of swiftly declining Federal expenditures and well-maintained revenues, the Federal Treasury showed a budgetary surplus in February and again in March. There will still be some deficit months, months in which no major taxes fall due. But the signs are already definite that we are on the way to a balanced budget, and if our amazing production can be maintained, there is no reason why we cannot begin to reduce our public debt within another year. As a businessman, I want to see the public debt reduced as quickly as anyone, and as much as anyone I feel a relief that business and industry have turned the corner from the chaos of war.

And so has our Government. Our chief danger today is inflation. If we can exert enough will power and responsibility to continue to fight off the snare of inflation, we will come through the still critical days ahead of us on a much sounder financial and economic basis than we did the last time. Through this policy America can look forward to its greatest prosperity, and security for all.

Who Says House Crippled the OPA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, it is rumored that many Members of Congress are being flooded with mail criticizing the amendments adopted in the House to the bill to extend the life of the Office of Price Administration. Of course, this is true, but who is backing this barrage of mail?

It has been charged that the amendments adopted were the result of selfish pressure groups, and by an unholy coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

I believe it would enlighten the Congress and the public to make a study of the so-called pressure groups. On the evening when the House was voting on the amendments to the OPA, a high Government official on a national radio hook-up started a high-pressure campaign to get people to write to their Representatives and Senators to defeat the House amendments. I am sure an investigation would find that thousands of telephone calls at Government expense, and many miles of driving public vehicles have been used during the past 2 weeks in the campaign to get support for the OPA's position. Of course, the millions of dollars spent in propaganda publicity, telephone calls, and automotive transportation, come out of all the taxpayers, and are not usually referred to as money spent by selfish pressure groups.

I am including in my remarks two editorials from the New York Times, one dated April 19, 1946, Congress and Price Control, and another dated April 29, Price Decontrol, and also an article in the April 19 issue of the New York Times analyzing the votes on the price-control amendments. I think these editorials are worthy of careful consideration by Members of Congress.

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1946]

CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROLS

It would be naive to suppose that the amendments piled on so lavishly by the House of Representatives in extending price control were all well considered. But most of them, if not right in detail, were right in principle. Price control is at best a secondary and transitional weapon against inflation. It has in many cases already outlived its usefulness. It deals with the symptoms and consequences of inflation, not with its causes.

Those who have been in direct control of OPA have failed to recognize this fact. They have talked and acted as if price control were the central or sole method of combating inflation. They have failed to recognize its obvious effects in intensifying or prolonging shortages. They have failed to see any danger to a free economy in placing the fate of every industry and firm at the mercy of administrative decision.

They failed utterly to acknowledge that the whole problem they had to solve changed completely last August, when Japan capitulated. It was then no longer necessary to restrict and discourage civilian production, but, on the contrary, to speed as rapidly as possible a reconversion to civilian output. But the official price controllers continued to put more emphasis on prices than on production. They failed to recognize that the time had come to taper off price control in an orderly manner. They professed, it is true, not to wish to continue price control "a day longer than was necessary." They promised to remove controls "as soon as supply comes into balance with demand." But they forgot that supply comes into balance with demand only at a price, and that it was within the power of OPA under this formula to perpetuate the supposed need for itself.

They failed, in short, to give Congress any clear standards for decontrol. On the contrary, the President and Mr. Bowles asked for the extension of OPA for another year "without amendment." When it became clear that Congress could not in peacetime reasonably be expected to give the Executive the same blanket powers over prices and wages that were embodied in the wartime stabilization acts, this was changed to a request to extend price control "without crippling amendments." But so far as OPA was concerned this second phrase seemed to mean the same as the first; for that agency objected to every amendment proposd to limit or taper off its purely discretionary powers.

Congress was therefore compelled to draft tapering-off amendments without guidance from OPA. It could hardly be expected to do a perfect job. Indeed, in this particular task, it may be doubted whether any such thing as a perfect job is even theoretically conceivable. But if some of the House's main amendments are dubious in detail, they are none the less right in principle. There is a psychological advantage, for example, in extending OPA for only 9 months instead of for another full year. It puts OPA more clearly on notice that it cannot expect an indefinite series of annual renewals and that it had better prepare this time for its own liquidation.

The House was right, again, in seeking to taper off the subsidy program, beginning immediately. The method it proposes may not be the best one possible; but the House was right in sensing the dangerous and inflationary nature of subsidies, which OPA authorities have been expanding instead of contracting. The House may not have the perfect formula, once more, in requiring OPA to lift price ceilings from a commodity when its annual production rate equals that from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941. But some definite, reasonably attainable standard for releasing controls automatically from one commodity after another had to be found; experience showed that Congress could not rely on mere administrative discretion. It is not easy to see, finally, how the amendment that OPA must price goods to yield cost-plus a reasonable profit will work out; but the OPA's own formula has been in many cases so inflexible and indifferent to producers' problems that some congressional compulsion on OPA to act more liberally was thought necessary.

The Senate, let us hope, will consider these problems more carefully, to see whether better criteria for liberalization and termination of price control can be evolved. But when Congress does this, it must remember that it is more necessary than ever to deal with the real causes of inflation. Its first task in that direction must be to curb expenditures, to bring deficit financing to an end, and to stop the further increase of money and bank credit.

[From the New York Times of April 29, 1946]

PRICE DECONTROL

OPA officials have been particularly critical of the House amendment which provides that price control should be lifted from items for which production has reached the 1940–41 level. They fear that if this standard is adopted, price control would be lifted from items which account for "over half of the cost of living." However, neither Mr. Bowles nor any of his associates seems willing to suggest any alternative standard which would result in a more rapid decontrol of prices than has thus far taken place.

The key to administration thinking on this matter is found in Mr. Bowles' statement that "we can't take the lid off for half the economy and hold it down for the rest." He refers to "the unfairness and practical impossibility of telling some business groups that the sky is the limit, while at the same time restricting other business groups and curbing landlords rigidly." In other words, it is claimed that whenever price control is lifted from any group of products the producers of items remaining under control are to that extent discriminated against. This is undoubtedly true, but it is not an argument against decontrol. In fact, as we entered into the war period prices were fixed on a selective basis despite the "unfairness" to which Mr. Bowles refers.

The logical implications of Mr. Bowles' philosophy is that we either control all prices or we control none—with no halfway situation. But if such a policy were followed, price control might never be eliminated. It would be much more helpful for OPA to propose realistic decontrol standards than to describe every proposal as crippling. Congress seems determined to make sure that price control does not last more than another year at most. OPA officials will make their most constructive contribution by pointing out how, in their judgment, controls can be lifted promptly without too many adverse repercussions. Some maladjustments are inevitable as we return to a free economy. The problem is how to minimize them.

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1946]

TRACE OPA DEFEAT BEYOND COALITION—ANALYSTS FIND VOTES OF SOME DEMOCRATS OUTSIDE SOUTH HELPED CARRY AMENDMENTS—THEIR SWITCHING PIVOTAL—EAST, WEST, AND BORDER AID TO REPUBLICANS PREVAILED WHEN SOUTHERNERS WERE SPLIT

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, April 18.—The Republican-Democratic coalition in the House, by its drastic amending of the price control bill, again demonstrated not only strength but also the versatility of operations, which continue to harass the administration leaders.

Although it has been viewed widely as a coordinated group of only northern Republicans and southern Democrats functioning on signal, observers found today that in yesterday's voting it was more than that.

Reaching beyond the solid South, it attained its objectives even when southern Democrats were badly split. Rather than being organized, its members appeared to be taking only their own signals.

Records showed that the Flannagan amendment, to eliminate meat subsidies and permit compensating price increases, would not have been adopted on the votes of Re-

publicans and southern Democrats alone. Votes from nine border, eastern and western States put the amendment into the bill, 214 to 182.

While 54 southern Democrats supported the amendment, 34 voted against it. Had 22 Democratic votes from Maryland, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kentucky, California, New Mexico, West Virginia, Delaware, and Wisconsin supported the administration, the subsidy cut would have been rejected, 204 to 192.

The records indicated also that extension of the Office of Price Administration for 1 year from June 30 would not have been cut to 9 months except for the opposition votes of 11 Democrats from Ohio, California, Maryland, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and West Virginia.

Fifty-six southern Democrats voted against the reducing amendment, offered by Representative WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, as against 33 who supported it. Instead of adoption by 209 to 189, records indicated, the amendment could have been rejected, 200 to 198.

An amendment, adopted by the House in committee status, would have eliminated all marketing controls on livestock and on edible products from livestock. It was finally rejected by a vote of 233 to 172, with the 56 southerners voting "no." Had they functioned as a coalition then, the amendment would have been adopted, 228 to 167, the tally indicated.

The coalition did function with full force, however, on a Wolcott amendment to guarantee cost-plus a "reasonable profit" to producers, processors, distributors, and retailers of each commodity handled. This proposal, described as dangerous to the stabilization program, was adopted 259 to 137.

Of the 88 Democrats supporting it, 67 were from Southern States. The other 171 supporters were Republicans. Opposing it were 126 Democrats, of whom 24 were southerners, 9 Republicans, and 2 members of minor parties.

With slightly less force, similarly conclusive divisions were noted in the adoption of the amendments which, as a whole, were likened by Chester Bowles, Director of Stabilization, to "a joy ride to disaster."

Disposal of Surplus Government Equipment and Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, coming daily to the desk of every Member of this House are letters from GI's throughout this country. Most of them have to do with the difficulties these defenders of our country are having in securing equipment and supplies from our surplus war stocks. Every Member of this House believes that first call on these surplus goods should be given to those who on the battlefields have fought to perpetuate this Nation and all it stands for. Just why it is that those having in charge the disposal of these goods fail to function as the law passed by the Congress provides is more than a reasonable person can understand.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter from a former constituent of mine in which he discusses the situation clearly and most comprehensively. I invite the attention of every Member of this body to this timely communication.

ST. HELEN RESORT ASSOCIATION,
INC., ST. HELEN, MICH.,
Flint, Mich., April 10, 1946.

Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: Both my sons have recently been discharged, one from the Army and the other from the Navy, and one has applied for and has received certificates for purchase of surplus Government equipment in the form of trucks, tractors, etc., his idea being to take over that portion of our work suitable for this type of equipment.

The results of trying to make such purchases have been very discouraging, and he, as well as myself, are finally convinced that it is impossible to get such equipment that is even in fit shape to drive away.

About every 10 days he gets a list of equipment, but in about every case the equipment is located so far that the trip of inspection plus the trip to Chicago to make the purchase and then the expense of going back to the location after the equipment has been prohibitive. Twice in the past month he has received notices of equipment located at Battle Creek, but in each case the notice has not been received by him until the last day of the sale. This same thing has happened with two of his friends, thus discounting the possibility of the mail going astray.

Last week he got a notice of material located in Chicago, and we were prepared to go to Chicago and look this stuff over, and if anything suitable was found, to attend the sale also held in Chicago. However, our general property manager, who formerly lived in Chicago, had to leave to attend to some business in Chicago. I asked him to look this stuff over and to telephone me as to what he found before we went ourselves.

This man, Mr. Nichols, knows machinery, having for the past 20 years been employed as service manager of some of the larger garages in Chicago. He telephoned me Monday night, April 8, to the effect that he had spent most of the day going over the equipment at the yard located at Ninety-fifth and Constance, in Chicago. He reported that this yard alone had thousands of pieces of various equipment, some of it new with less than a thousand miles registered, but that not a single piece of equipment listed on the sale could even be driven away, flat tires or none at all, no batteries, broken windows, and the condition generally such that it was not fit for sale. He also reported that he overheard part of a conversation whereby he knows that a deal was being made whereby this party was getting his pick of equipment in the yard. He was a dealer and was buying a considerable number of trucks, etc. Just how much the "under the table" consideration was he didn't know.

Our banker here informed Kenneth when he was making the loan to purchase the equipment that he was wasting his time, as he had been informed by very reliable source that no equipment could be purchased at these sales that was fit to drive away without getting in touch with the proper persons and "taking care" of them.

The city officials of Flint also attended a sale to buy trucks for the city and an article appeared in the paper that they had been unable to buy anything that could be driven away.

I am writing you all this because I believe that if enough persons wrote their Congressman of the rotten situation that Congress would take some action to change things as they now exist. Congress attempted to take measures that would enable the ex-GI to buy excess Government material. However, further action must be taken if the ex-GI is to get the benefits Congress attempted to give them. As it now stands, it is nothing but a racket with plenty getting their "palms greased" and if the serviceman wants to buy anything he must go to a dealer and pay the long price.

I was informed by a dealer in Saginaw, who has at various times plenty of good equipment, that it would be more or less useless for Kenneth to attend one of these sales and that if he did and was fortunate enough to find something that he thought he could drive away, that it would probably cost him more in the end than it would to buy the equipment from a dealer, and anyway "why shouldn't the dealers be entitled to an honest $200 to $400 profit."

I believe a serious mistake is being made and that something must be done to protect the servicemen in the purchase of surplus. Either give them protection or let it be known that they can only buy through established dealers.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD C. CARTER.

Growing Russian Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 21, 1946:

GROWING RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

Satisfactory relations with the Soviet Union must be based on facts frankly faced. We cannot build on the sands of fiction. The ever clearer and most outstanding fact about the USSR today is a rapidly expanding policy of imperialism, or what at least looks mighty like imperialism.

With characteristic and often effective strategy, the Soviets keep up a constant cry condemning British imperialism and charging that America is imperialistic. This is the cover behind which Soviet imperialism is spreading in all directions and with a speed seldom matched, even in the bygone days of Portuguese, Spanish, British, and French imperialistic growth.

The most unfortunate part of the scene is, of course, that this Russian imperialism comes at a time when the rest of the world has pretty much come to the decision that imperialism must go. We see the Philippines gaining their independence. We see a reversal of imperialism in French Indochina, as the native peoples gain steadily in autonomy. We see growing political freedom—we don't know the degrees yet—for the people of Indonesia. We see India verging on autonomy within the British Empire, or freedom outside. We see Egypt negotiating for less British guidance. We see the British and French leaving Syria and the Lebanon. The important thing is not the evils that still remain in these imperialisms but the gains that are being made toward freedom.

At the same time we see a contrary Russian policy, thinly veiled by the oft-repeated excuse that the Soviets need friendly neighbors on their borders. What the world begins to ask is: Where are those borders? What about the neighbors of the neighbors of the neighbors? Where ends the right of the U. S. S. R. to impose, by Soviet arms or through minority Communist parties kept in

power by Soviet arms or prestige, its imperialism upon these neighbors, and neighbors of neighbors?

The Iranian issue sharply focuses world attention upon Soviet imperialism. So do Soviet claims to border territories with Turkey, to the right to fortify the Dardanelles—as contrasted with the right to use them. We see Soviet imperialism in the recent attempts to secure vast land grants in Austria for permanent military occupation and settlement, above and beyond any Austrian law or control.

We see it in Soviet insistence, now delaying any allied peace treaties, that all of eastern Europe be in a sort of closed Soviet zone, politically and commercially, without freedom of international trade for non-Soviet (or noncontrolled) countries, and without freedom of international waterways.

We see a Soviet-dominated Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Albania. We see a Czechoslovakia, happier than the others, because it has never had material hostility of the USSR or vice versa, but in the Soviet imperialistic orbit just the same, from which it could not depart if it wished. We see a Poland deprived of all right to act independently of the USSR, a Finland whose military bases are in Russian hands. We do not see an Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania any more—because they have been incorporated in the Soviet Union.

In Asia, we see an Outer Mongolia in firm Soviet control, an Inner Mongolia moving in that direction, and increasing Soviet influence in Chinese Turkestan. We hear Soviet claims for the Dodecanese Islands in the Aegean and Tripolitania in north Africa.

There is neither time nor space here to analyze each of these examples, to state the merits or weaknesses of the Soviet claims. It is the sum total that gives the picture of Soviet imperialism. And, thus far, it is a kind of imperialism which soon stifles the dissident and stills their voices.

There are no Gandhis in Russia.

The problem of the United States and other powers in dealing with the Soviets has always been difficult, due to the ideological gap and the mutual suspicions. The rise of a dynamic Russian imperialism does not make the problem easier. But the first step is to recognize it.

Shades of Lincoln and Jefferson in an O'd Log Cabin in Hodgeville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial, entitled "Past and Present," which appeared in the Portland Homebildor, published in Portland, Oreg., April 20, 1946:

PAST AND PRESENT

Shades of Lincoln and Jefferson in an old log cabin in Hodgeville, Ky.:

Lincoln: "Tom, I regret that General Washington and Andy Jackson could not be with us today and I appreciate the fact that you came over, especially as your birthday was this month. A great deal has happened since 1743, the year of your birth, and the fact that we are meeting in the little old log cabin where I was born should be a reminder of our down-to-earth philosophy and viewpoint."

Jefferson: "Yes, Abe, and another thing, meeting at this Easter season is significant. This is a glorious season as you can see by looking out the door. The flowers are viewing the world through the blue grass, the trees are in bud and leaf, the birds carol the springtide, and all nature awakes. By the same token the people of the Nation are awakening to a full realization of their rights and responsibilities with respect to their government and are making their determination felt in the halls of Congress. This year should be a year of destiny, a year of accomplishment, a year of action in governmental operation for the highest good of all."

Lincoln: "I think it will, Tom; I think that the theory of deficit spending, artificially induced scarcity, and waste of tax money and resources will be curbed drastically by the voice of the taxpayers and the statesmanship of those Senators and Congressmen who place the welfare of the country above political machinations."

Jefferson: "Yes, I am optimistic but we must be vigilant. Spending and waste are going on at a terrific rate and must be stopped. With regard to our material resources just look at the waste of surplus war materials overseas, look at the proposal to subject 100 ships, that cost millions of dollars, to destruction in an atom-bomb test, the ships to be laden with tanks, trucks, jeeps, and other material. Just the other day they took the famous old cruiser *Boston*, the ship that fired the first shot in the battle of Manila Bay in 1898, out in the Pacific, set her on fire and sank her.

"This enormous waste of steel, when builders can't get nails, soil pipe, hardware, and other materials, when foundries lack scrap iron, when farmers can't get trucks, tractors, combines, plows, and cultivators, when people can't get cars and trucks, when housewives can't get refrigerators, washing machines, and other metal household necessities, is subject to the most severe condemnation.

"The Congress should call those responsible on the carpet and not alone censure them, but discharge them from all positions of authority and responsibility."

Lincoln: "Absolutely. These ships, trucks and equipment belong to all the people, they were paid for by taxes wrung from toil and deprivation. No man or set of men in government should have the right to destroy or give away the property of our citizens. When we were in control we did not countenance waste and reckless, open-handed spending; we felt that we were the servants, not the masters, of the Nation; that economy, not prodigality, should govern our actions. And another thing, we didn't believe in subsidies as a means of concealing the cost of living. Today it seems that the philosophy of fairy tales to the public, to lull them into supine docility, obtains in the minds and operations of far too many of our administrative heads.

"They take the money away from the taxpayers, pay it out in subsidies and then tell the people that they are holding down the cost of living. They try to keep the right hand from knowing what the left hand is doing. Why aren't they politically honest, why don't they lay the cards face up on the table for those who pay the bills to see? The American people have always been able to stand reality. I'll tell you the reason for this double dealing; if the truth about what goes on was known to all the people a wave of righteous indignation would sweep the country and there would be a much-needed housecleaning in Washington. We need less froth and more substance, less star-gazing and more reality, less theorizing and more common sense, less double talk and more clear-cut, out-in-the-open honesty."

Jefferson: "Abe, you've hit the nail on the head. We want free enterprise which will develop abundant production and abundant production will mean prosperity for all.

"Well, I reckon I'll have to leave this wonderful State of Kentucky and get back to Monticello. In a couple of weeks I hope to have you, George, and Andy over for another conference on the state of the nation."

Lincoln: "Before you leave, I want you to go down to the pasture with me and see some mighty fine thoroughbreds, that are being trained for the Kentucky Derby this year."

The Shades stroll down the lane leaving the little log cabin to the birds, the bees and the whispering trees.

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

The Case of 1,500,000 Armenians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is today my privilege and honor to submit to the membership and the country a statement of the case of 1,500,000 Armenians who ask no more than the reuniting of the territories of their ancient fatherland under a flag of their own choosing, in the realization of which they ask the support of the American people, their faithful allies in war, our traditional friends in peace.

As there can be no peace perpetual on this earth until the national boundaries are drawn in accordance with the will of those who inhabit it, I respectfully commend this most timely statement to our President and to those who will assist him in the writing of the peace treaties that are to bring this frightful war to its legal termination as a document well worthy of his and their careful and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the statement to which I have just referred follows:

THE CASE OF 1,500,000 ARMENIANS

The case of the Armenian people posesses a special significance by virtue of their long and noble history and their contributions to world civilization and culture. The Armenians are one of the few ancient peoples of the world who have survived to the present day. Their history goes back to the very beginnings of civilization on the plains of Mesopotamia. They were organized into a strong political state in very early times, and had important ties with the great states and empires of the ancient world. Through their long history they have demonstrated that they are a freedom-loving people. They were among the pioneers of the civilization and culture which the modern world inherited from the ancient world. They were the first nation to accept Christianity. Ever since they have stood as a bulwark against the invading hordes from the interiors of Asia. Against a background such as this, the claim of the Armenian people deserves special consideration at the bar of international justice.

THE ADVENT OF THE TERRIBLE TURK IN HISTORY

It is a notorious fact in history that the Turks, ever since their appearance in the Near East, the Balkans, and central Europe, maintained their rule over the countries they overran through a system of ruthless, calculated, sustained terror. Against Christian peoples especially, their wrath was loosened with unmitigated fury. Over them they im-

posed and maintained their rule through such instruments of terror and domination as periodic massacres, officially sanctioned lootings, discriminatory taxations, deportations, starvation, disease, rape, abduction, prohibition of the use of native tongues, and the abrogation of other fundamental political and civic rights. The long, black record of the terrible Turk is there for all to see. No word of apology can expunge one single line from its bloody pages.

During the First World War, Turkish barbarism sank to its lowest and most hideous depths. Goaded and guided by the Germans, the Turks conceived and attempted to carry into execution the total extermination of the Armenian people. And they almost succeeded in doing so. Through deportations, starvation, disease, and outright slaughter they succeeded in reducing by more than one-half the Armenian population in the Armenian provinces of Turkey—a net loss of more than one million souls. Those who survived found themselves poverty-stricken, homeless immigrants in Iran, Iraq, Syria and the Lebanon, Egypt, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, France, the Americas, and in various parts of the Soviet Union. One million five hundred thousand Armenians from Turkish Armenia with few exceptions, and despite the generous efforts of their host countries to rehabilitate them, are still refugees looking forward to the day when they will be united in the historic land of their forefathers, to work out their own salvation and make their distinctive contribution to the life of the world.

THE ARMENIANS AND THE ALLIES OF WORLD WAR I

The Armenians did not resign to the fate meted out to them by the Turks. They fought back. The history of their heroic resistance in many sections of the country forms one of the glorious chapters in the annals of our people. They brought their moral and material support to the cause of the Allies. Their sons enlisted by the thousands in the Allied armies and distinguished themselves in battles against the armies of the common foe.

The Allies, in return for the contributions which the Armenian people brought to the great cause of freedom and democracy, promised their liberation and their establishment as an independent state. And in accordance with that promise the League of Nations authorized President Woodrow Wilson to draw the boundaries of a free and independent Armenia. This was accepted by all the powers of the day, including Turkey. It was ratified by the Treaty of Sevres.

That treaty, however, was never enforced. The sacred promises so solemnly made were forgotten or sacrificed one by one to the selfish interests of the great powers. And so would have ended, as the final act of the tragedy of the Armenian people, had not the great Russian people and the other peoples of the USSR come to the rescue and salvaged the remnants of the Armenian people.

THE ARMENIANS AND THE UNITED NATIONS OF WORLD WAR II

During World War II, the Armenians once more gave proof of their devotion to democracy and the cause of the United Nations. They fought once more with distinction within the armies of the United States and the United Nations. Sixty-four generals and over a quarter of a million Armenian soldiers of various ranks were within the Red Army alone. Army General Ivan Ohanes Bagramian, of the First Baltic Army, overran East Prussia, captured Koenigsberg, and became one of the outstanding generals of the Red Army.

WHAT DID THE TURKS DO?

In World War I, they allied themselves with Germany and fought to the bitter end against the Allied Nations, including the United States, and caused the prolongation of that war at the cost of the lives of millions of Allied soldiers. In World War II, they sought shelter under the cloak of spurious neutrality, extending meanwhile to the Nazis assistance of every description which lay within their power. They went further and shamelessly proclaimed their desire to see a German victory. And they continued to oppress and liquidate the few hundred thousand Armenians who were still living in their borders.

AMERICANS ALWAYS INTERESTED IN THE WELFARE OF THE ARMENIAN PEOPLE

The American public has always been interested in the fate and welfare of the Armenian people, and they have generously contributed close to $150,000,000 during the past 50 years, through the American missionaries, and through the Near East relief agencies.

President Woodrow Wilson in a letter addressed to the President of the Council of the League of Nations on November 20, 1920, says:

This country has repeatedly declared its solicitude for the fate and welfare of the Armenian people in a manner and to an extent that justifies you in saying that the fate of Armenia has always been of special interest to the American people.

Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby in a letter addressed to the French Ambassador, dated March 20, 1920, says:

There can be no question as to the genuine interest of this Government in the plans for Armenia, and the Government of the United States is convinced that the civilized world demands and expects the most liberal treatment for that unfortunate country.

The Secretary of State in a letter addressed to the Italian Ambassador, August 10, 1920, says:

Finally, while gladly giving recognition to the independence of Armenia, the Government of the United States has taken the position that the final determination of its boundaries must not be made without Russia's cooperation and agreement. Not only is Russia concerned because a considerable part of the territory of the new state of Armenia, when it shall be defined, formerly belonged to the Russian Empire; equally important is the fact that Armenia must have the good will and protective friendship of Russia, if it is to remain independent and free.[1]

WHAT IS AMERICA GOING TO DO NOW?

The American citizens of Armenian origin and the millions of their friends in this country are distressed to notice a drift toward a pro-Turkish policy in the governmental circles. Are we going to reverse our traditional policy of championing the cause of the minorities and the oppressed and side with the oppressor? If we uphold Turkish tyranny and perpetuate her seizure of the Armenian provinces, will it not amount to condoning the murders, the massacres, and all the woes and destruction brought by Turkey throughout the ages?

TO SERVE ARMENIA IS TO SERVE CIVILIZATION

The case of Armenia has also attracted the interest and sympathy of such honorable and illustrious men as James Bryce, William Gladstone, Georges Clemenceau, Woodrow Wilson, Nikolai Lenin, Anatole France, Fridtjof Nansen, Jean Jaures, and Joseph Stalin. These men demonstrated with their deep interest and active support of the case of Armenia that they agree in spirit with the words of one of them, William Gladstone, when he said, "To serve Armenia is to serve civilization." Of all the Christian peoples who at some time or other in the past have been under Turkish rule, the Armenians are the only ones who have as yet not secured their freedom and homeland from Turkey.

In conclusion we rest our case on the following facts:

First. The Armenian people have been our allies in both World Wars and fought with us, side by side, and brought their full share of sacrifice in the victorious ending of both wars.

Second. There are 1,500,000 Armenians scattered throughout the world, most of them still refugees from the First World War, who are anxious to return to their historic fatherland. The Soviet Union has given back the lands belonging to the Armenians by setting up an independent Republic of Soviet Armenia.

Third. That this republic is not large enough to receive these scattered Armenians who want to be repatriated. President Wilson has determined the boundaries for the Armenians, a determination which contemplates the return of the Armenian provinces now under Turkish rule. This was determined at the request of the League of Nations and accepted and recognized by it and by Turkey as well.

CAN WE BE INDIFFERENT OR REFUSE THIS MORAL SUPPORT?

We speak on behalf of 1,500,000 victims of a tyranny and a terror, which neither in degree, nor in extent differs from the vials of wrath, which the Nazis poured in this war, on the innocent and helpless peoples of Europe. And we speak on behalf of the just and constructive aspirations of a people who have every right to express the hope that this time they will not be made pawns on the international chessboard of power politics.

These are our reasonable demands: so long as these aspirations of the Armenian people remain unrealized, so long will the Armenian people remain at odds with Turkey. Until a new justice is born out of the centuries-old injustices done to the Armenians, there can be no permanent peace between them and the Turks. The Armenian people want to live at peace with their neighbors, even with Turkey, and they believe that a just and honorable peace is in the interest of all parties concerned.

AMERICAN NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
BEDROS LERZIAN,
President.

[1] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1920, vol. III, pp. 804, 751, and 465.

Movement to the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 12, 1946, headed "Movement to the land," as follows:

The annual report of the Jewish Agricultural Society presents much interesting information on the growth of a movement from urban to rural areas. The society, supported by funds derived from Baron de Hirsch foundations, has existed for 46 years. Its purpose is to expand and strengthen the Jewish farm group. Its efforts at present tend to center on aiding returning veterans, displaced workers, and white-collar men who seek a livelihood in farming. The society has never urged a mass movement of American Jews to the soil. It anticipates no such development. But it does believe, in the words of Dr. Gabriel Davidson, executive

head of the organization, that "the stronger the agricultural base of American Israel, the stronger will be the house resting on it." In the slow but sure building of that base the society has been singularly successful. Once settled on the soil, the Jewish farmer tends strongly to remain there.

The Jewish Agricultural Society has granted 14,629 farm loans aggregating more than $10,000,000. In 1945 it loaned $188,231 to Jewish farmers in 11 States. Repayment on such loans has been consistently high. The society's farm-employment department has placed about 20,000 young men. In the more populous Jewish rural areas society agents move from farm to farm, giving advice on all phases of agriculture. The society conducts farm classes in this city and publishes a magazine. It aids Jewish refugees to settle on farms. It has helped to develop the thriving Jewish farming community at Ellenville, N. Y. It has recently opened a branch office in Los Angeles, where the Jewish community is rapidly expanding. The year ahead, continuing the work of agricultural reconversion to peace under encouraging conditions, is expected to be one of the most active in the society's long and useful record.

People Protest Against Government Food Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I get letters of protest against Government restrictions and Government policies. Right now every effort is being made to save food for famine-stricken people in the old world Such a program is laudable and will meet with universal approval. No one wants America to fail in its high traditions of help for the unfortunate over the period of its existence. When there was a famine in Russia around about 1920, this country came to the rescue. Such has ever been the story when unfortunate people were involved.

It is sad to contemplate, Mr. Speaker, our present inability to render a full measure of help to the unfortunate starving people. In this land of abundance why do we find it necessary now to dislocate all of our economic processes in order to help our unfortunate neighbors in foreign lands? The American people are going to be asked this question more and more. They are entitled to an answer. For 13 years the New Dealers and brain trusters have been in full control of our Government. They have shaped its policies, decreed its laws, and had everything their own way. They have taken full opportunity in this land of plenty to overlook a constructive course of action that would help not only Americans, but other people so sadly in need of assistance now.

These people in control of the administration have deliberately established as part of their Government policy the doctrine of scarcity. This means scarcity of food. It dates back to the Henry Wallace days when it was fashionable to burn up the pigs and plow up the corn. Then along comes this thing called OPA, and their policy makers follow through perfectly. They have made it impossible over a period of years for agricultural folks to produce food unless they were willing to do so at a loss. The result has been a curtailment of food production. This foolish and tragic policy has been followed in spite of the fact that in the aftermath of every war famine always follows. Yet, these pink-parlor "do gooders" failed to recognize these facts and just did nothing. They remind me of the old days when the hogs wallowed around in the mud hole down on the Indiana farm in the summer dog days of August. Our present Government policies have been just about as constructive as the hog episode—play around and do nothing.

I call attention to these patent conditions because when people want to know who is to blame, they are entitled to an answer. We are going to have a shortage of bakery products very shortly. It all could have been avoided if the doctrine of scarcity had been abandoned a long time ago. The following memorandum was furnished me and will be of interest:

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE MAKERS OF FLOUR AND THE BAKERS OF BREAD?

These are just a few facts which will be of interest when bread disappears from the table of the American housewives. Recently, and on February 15, 1946, the Secretary of Agriculture announced the promulgation of War Food Order No. 144, which required all concerns manufacturing flour to change their methods of manufacture as of March 1. They were required to use 80 percent of the whole wheat grain in flour instead of the customary 72 percent formerly used.

There was a lot of protest against this order. Some people claimed that the dark bread which would result was not as good as the standard white bread. However, the announcement of this order on February 15 had two direct results. First, it encouraged the housewife to lay in all the extra flour she could find money to buy, and she did exactly that. One firm which manufactures flour tells me, and figures show, in one town a change as follows:

As of January 1946, they sold 1,500 sacks of flour.

In February 1946, they sold 6,620 sacks of flour.

In March 1946, after the so-called dark flour was manufactured, they sold 662 sacks of flour.

The other interesting development had to do with the food furnished from the so-called byproducts of flour for food to animals. This was known as mill feed. This would, of course, cut down the amount of mill feed made from wheat from 28 percent of the wheat to 20 percent of the wheat. This meant about 30 percent less of what we call bran, standard middlings, and other feeds for the chickens, cattle, and the hogs. Mark you, this was taking place at the time when there was and still is an acute shortage of corn and other feed grains for livestock.

The purpose of this war food order No. 144 was to make available more wheat for export for the purpose of feeding people in famine-stricken sections of the Old World. It was estimated that 25,000,000 bushels of wheat would be saved by this plan for export purposes. People in the milling industry pointed out that no actual saving would result. No one has yet pointed out where there was a saving.

Then in order to make confusion more certain the Secretary of Agriculture promulgated amendment No. 6 to war food order No. 144 and this amendment was to take effect April 22, 1946. It restricted the production of flour for domestic distribution to 75 percent of a like amount shipped for a corresponding period of time in 1945. In plain language, the purpose of the order was to cut down the consumption of flour for bread and other baking purposes to 75 percent of the 1945 use and the man who manufactures the flour ! left to do the rationing or the distribution, without any regulations or procedure established. The purpose of this further order was to increase the amount of wheat available for export purposes. At the same time that this order was made effective there was another order known as amendment No. 7 which forbid the millers to have more than a 21-day supply of wheat for purposes of making domestic flour. Any wheat in excess came within the jurisdiction of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In this connection it should be noted that the Commodity Credit Corporation which has been designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as the wheat export agency for foreign countries was authorized to pay 30 cents per bushel more than the established market price of wheat, otherwise known as the established ceiling price of wheat. Some people say that this put the Government in the black market. This means, of course, that the Government will get all the wheat if it needs all of it, and nobody else will get any wheat, so long as the plan to export wheat under these conditions shall prevail.

What does this mean to the housewife and other people who eat bread? It means that when a flour mill has used up the 21-day maximum supply of wheat it can get no more wheat except from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation has said that no more wheat will be allotted for domestic flour production until the commitments for export wheat have been filled.

This means that the rather modest-sized flour mill which has agreed to sell flour in May and June to veterans' hospitals, for example, simply cannot make delivery of more than a portion of the amount which they agreed to deliver pursuant to orders taken before these regulations were established. These orders were taken in good faith and in normal course of trade delivery would be made in full.

A representative of the milling industry consulting with Department of Agriculture officials made the proposition that the milling company would like to keep its men employed and therefore would like to make flour for export purposes. He further pointed out that the standard specifications for flour sacks for export purposes required the use of heavy jute sacks which could be supplied only from Calcutta and which could not be delivered before July or August. This, of course, means that there would be no object in grinding flour for export purposes during May or June because there would be no jute sacks or standard containers. The manufacturers of flour sacks have stated that while cotton sacks would meet the requirements, and cotton is a domestic product, on account of Government restrictions, they would not be able to supply those sacks until July or August. Same result.

It is said to be a fact, by strange coincidence, that Great Britain has her flour mills in good condition and is ready, able, and

anxious to grind all the export wheat that we ship and put it in the jute sacks which she has on hand, for delivery to famine-stricken sections. Someone was unkindly enough to suggest that the sacks would bear British labels even though it were American wheat and flour.

The story of the flour sacks indicates that somebody does not want to have flour manufactured in this country for export purposes and, of course, that leaves more wheat to be sent abroad with the results above suggested.

Under these existing orders the typical mill which I have been discussing will have to stop the manufacture of flour by the middle of May. It is true that some of its customers will have flour on hand to run them for sometime. Some customers who have not laid in stock will not have any flour to sell. The economic dislocation of this is far-reaching and will be widespread. The small bakeries which have been supplying you with pies and cakes and pastries, unless they have laid in a supply of flour, will simply have to quit because there will be no flour available after the middle of May. These facts could be amplified and worked out more in detail but the American public when it is not able to get bread in May, June, and July should be told now that these Government orders are going to be responsible for a bread famine which is predicted by well-informed people at this time.

It is apparently the purpose of the administration to suspend temporarily the manufacture of flour for domestic purposes in this country, so that more wheat will be available for export purposes during the coming weeks.

There will be no relief from these conditions until a new wheat crop is available in the United States. That means that there will be an acute shortage of flour products, bread, pastry, and so forth, until fall when our new crop of wheat is available for the millers.

The people ought to know that this policy of the Government regarding wheat appears to be based on the idea that they are going to take all available wheat now and during the next 2 or 3 months, regardless of what happens, and ship the wheat to Europe. If this is true, the American people ought to be told the facts and they ought to be given the reasons. Everyone in America wants to help those who are facing starvation. If this procedure is the only way out, the American people will gladly cooperate.

However, questions will be asked and we are entitled to have them answered fairly and accurately. It will be pointed out that this procedure is so drastic as to work untold hardship on our milling industry and on the consuming public. Bread is our cheapest food and this policy of taking bread off the market will boost the cost of living for man, woman and child in America. The administration can tell us whether it would be more sensible to allot a percentage of wheat to the millers to be made into flour for domestic use and then export all the balance of the wheat available for famine stricken Europe. If that procedure is not possible, it will be interesting to know why it is not possible.

Following World War I, if my memory is correct, Herbert Hoover was Food Administrator and used a rather simple method of meeting the famine requirements in Europe. Briefly stated, the Government through its agency handled all wheat and allotted so much to domestic use and so much for export. There was no great confusion or hardship and the record shows that Mr. Hoover did a marvelous job of rendering help to the unfortunate in other lands. We hope that the present top-heavy set-up as disclosed in their war food orders will not defeat their own purpose but will in some way make more wheat available, without completely disrupting our orderly American processes.

International Duplicity and Intrigue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I see that a new journal devoted to diplomacy and international cooperation is now being published in Washington, D. C. The Times-Herald of Sunday, April 28, 1946, refers to the first copy as "the journal of diplomacy in action." Volume 1, No. 1, of the International Journal is dated May 1. In an editorial which gives its purpose and aim it says that it makes its appearance at a critical juncture in world affairs. It states:

Devoted to the promotion of international cooperation, it firmly believes that diplomacy, properly conducted is our first line of defense against war, and that diplomats, freed of the corroded shackles of an antiquated tradition, are the best guarantors of peace.

The editor of this new International Journal is Mr. Ladislas Farago, so the Sunday Times-Herald of April 28, 1946, states, who has been making his home in Washington since 1942 with his wife. Both are Hungarian born. The article in the Times-Herald further states with reference to Mr. Ladislas Farago:

From 1942 until March 4, 1946, Mr. Farago, who is past 40, has been in a war job with the Navy in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations. All the work in the publication has been done since then. For the 15 years prior to that time he has been a foreign correspondent, covering the League of Nations, Ethiopian war, the civil war in Spain, and other news-headlining events. He has worked for American press associations and leading newspapers as well as European publications.

Mr. Ladislas Farago, aside from being the author of Arabian Antic, Palestine at the Crossroads, the Riddle of Arabia, Abyssinia on the Eve, and German Psychological Warfare, also contributed an article to the magazine Ken under date of November 3, 1938, which, if an accurate statement of fact, and not a figment of fancy, is an astounding disclosure. I hope that if Mr. Ladislas Farago discovers and reveals another piece of international villainy comparable to the one he presented in Ken in 1938, one as likely to involve the United States in war, that such revelation will be widely published for the benefit of the people and not be suppressed by the international warmongers and money changers as was done in the case of the Ken magazine article.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the article by Mr. Ladislas Farago published in the magazine Ken, November 3, 1938:

INSIDE THE FOUR-POWER PACT

(By Ladislas Farago)

(At Berchtesgaden, der Chamberlain tried to extend the Axis to take in Paris and London. But the British and French people couldn't be taken in. So they had to be chloroformed with fear. Thus London's Wall Street, dragging France by the franc, could at last join the Fascists openly, as it has planned secretly for 4 years. Here's the scenario of history's boldest farce.)

In spite of Britain's frenzied war preparations, in spite of the trenches dug in the Royal Park, of the calling up of reserves, of the rationing of foodstuffs and of the Royal declaration of a state of emergency, Arthur Neville Chamberlain was determined to keep out of war at any price rather than to fight Germany as a partner of Russia. In this the British Prime Minister was following not only his own policy, but was acting under direct, unmistakable instructions from Montagu Collet Norman, for 18 years governor of the Bank of England. Shortly before the Czechoslovakian crisis became acute, Norman had warned Chamberlain that under no circumstances was he to commit Britain to join the Soviet Union against Germany. On the contrary, Chamberlain was to do everything in his power to get Germany into a united front against Russia.

While there can be no doubt of the sincerity of Mr. Chamberlain's love of peace, this ultimate aim was the guiding motive which induced him to fly to Berchtesgaden and to Godesberg. The Four-Power Conference in Munich, a long desired dream of Herr Hitler, was the climax of a scheme prepared 4 years ago by the directors of the Bank of England, in cooperation with an influential Carlton Club clique and with the heads of Britain's armament factories.

Whatever Chamberlain told the people of England about his frantic endeavors and self-sacrificing efforts, he did not tell the complete story. He failed to mention the warning of Montagu Norman, the pressure of certain city circles, and his own preference for even the most humiliating peace to avoid alliance with the Soviet.

In the spring of 1934 a select group of city financiers gathered around Montague Norman in the windowless building of the Bank of England in Threadneedle Street. Among those present were Sir Alan Anderson, partner in Anderson, Green & Co.; Lord (then Sir Josiah) Stamp, chairman of the LMS Railway system; Edward Shaw, chairman of the P. & O. Steamship Lines; Sir Robert Kinderslay, a partner of Lazard Bros.; Charles Hambro, partner in Hambros Bros., and C. F. Tiarks, head of J. Schroeder Co.

Mr. Norman spoke of the political constellation of Europe and of the future outlook. In his opinion the issue which has dominated British politics during the past 15 years was still the burning one: the destruction of the Soviet regime in Russia. For the past 15 years, he argued, Britain had been conducting a campaign to this end, alone. He counted out France, a declining power, and Italy, burdened with too many domestic difficulties, as possible partners, in the successful completion of the program. But now a new power was established on Europe's political horizon, namely: Nazi Germany. Hitler had disappointed his critics. His regime was no temporary nightmare but a system with a good future, and Mr. Norman advised his directors to include Hitler in their plans.

There was no opposition and it was decided that Hitler should get covert help from London's financial section until Norman will have succeeded in putting sufficient pressure on the government to make it abandon its pro-French policy for a more promising pro-German orientation.

Immediately the directors went into action. Their first move was to sponsor Hitler's secret rearmament just about to begin. Using their controlling interests in both Vickers and Imperial Chemical Industries, they instructed these two huge armament concerns to help the German program by all means at their disposal. Both Vickers and I. C. I. were quite willing to cooperate, especially since this now official policy of London's City was in line with their own anti-Russian plans. Long before Montagu Norman decided to use

Hitler, Vickers had created a ring of armament factories in all countries which seemed Russia's potential enemies. They controlled the Societé Polonaise de Matérielle de Guerre in Poland, the Mitsui Japanese Steel Works in Japan, the Vickers Terni and the Armstrong Pozznoli in Italy, and were working in close contact with Krupps and a number of other armament factories in Germany. In fact they were represented everywhere along the future front against Russia. This anti-Soviet ring was well established already before Japan, Germany, and Italy agreed upon their own political anti-Komintern pact.

Soon, the British Navy was won over to the Banks' pro-German policy.

The first success in this positive German orientation was the Anglo-German naval agreement, which was the actual start of Hitler's realization of his crusade against the provisions of the Versailles Treaty. There was much more in that agreement than the mutual limitation of England's and Germany's naval strength. It was agreed that the admiralty and the German naval command would work in the closest possible cooperation: secret clauses provided for an exchange of naval intelligence: diverse information and details of inventions concerning naval construction. Shortly after the agreement was signed an English commission consisting of six high admiralty officials journeyed to Berlin, set up headquarters in a boarding house in Berlin's In den Zelten, and surveyed Germany's naval strength. It was suggested to Germany that it abandon the metric system on its naval units and to adopt the English linear system in order to enable English armament manufacturers to supply ammunition promptly should the German Navy be engaged against Russia in the Baltic Sea. Simultaneously Germany placed at the disposal of the British admiralty an invention by the staff of the Berlin Technical College for use in submarine construction.

The London war office followed suit. They agreed to a Berlin suggestion to exchange officers of the fighting forces, and in 1934 three German officers came to London, while three English officers were sent to the German War Ministry. On the same year English armament firms placed huge advertisements in the Militaerisches Wochenblatt, offering for sale tanks and guns, prohibited by the Versailles Treaty. A statement made by General Sir Herbert Lawrence, chairman of Vickers, furnished the necessary evidence that the British Government knew about and approved these advertisements. When, at his company's annual meeting, he was asked to give the assurance that Vickers arms and munitions were not being used for secret rearming in Germany, he replied: "I cannot give you an assurance in definite terms, but I can tell you that nothing is done without the complete sanction and approval of our own government."

Between 1934 and 1937 Montagu Norman made several attempts to win Baldwin over to his anti-Russian front. But this "elder statesman" stubbornly resisted the Governor's persistent attacks; for even though he was no friend of Russian orientation, when faced with a choice he considered Hitler worse than Stalin. Nevertheless, Norman succeeded in planting the idea in the minds of several members of Baldwin's Cabinet. The first minister to join Norman's anti-Russia, pro-German front was Sir Thomas Inskip, Minister of Coordination of Defense, whose anti-Russian attitude was a family affair. Sir Thomas, oft described as the most pious Englishman, was an old hand at anti-Russian activities; his father-in-law, the Earl of Glasgow, is the founder and leader of the "Christian Campaign Against Russia." The second Cabinet member to come into line was Sir John Simon, who later was rewarded for his support by elevation to the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer, an office most closely connected with the bank. The greatest victory was scored when Arthur Neville Chamberlain, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, was also won for Montagu Norman's plan. This decision made him Baldwin's successor, when Britain's elder statesman resigned after the coronation. With Chamberlain's moving into 10 Downing Street, the bank's anti-Soviet policy made its triumphant entry into Whitehall.

It is easy to understand Chamberlain's decision to adapt this policy when one considers how closely he is connected with the financial clique and the armament industry. Among his extensive financial holdings is a considerable block of Imperial Chemical Industries shares, 833 preferential and 5,414 ordinary ones. His son, Francis Chamberlain, is on the staff of Imperial Chemical Industries' sales organization at the main office in Birmingham.

At the time Chamberlain replaced Baldwin at No. 10, Germany had an able and popular spokesman in London: Field Marshal Werner von Blomberg. The then German War Minister had come to London to represent Hitler at the coronation and stayed for several weeks after the ceremonies were ended. He utilized his stay to good advantage for momentous conferences with city circles as well as with the new masters in Downing Street. In his meetings with Chamberlain he is known to have proposed closer Anglo-German cooperation along the following lines:

Hitler was to annex Austria and dismember Czechoslovakia; in addition England would, in due course, return to Germany some of her lost colonies. Moreover the British would use their influence in Paris to break up the Franco-Russian alliance and to force Czechoslovakia to sever her connection with the Soviet. In return Hitler would join the British anti-Soviet front, agree to a certain limitation of armaments, and enter into a four-power pact including France and Italy.

Chamberlain agreed to the proposals, and the complete reorientation of Britain's foreign policy began.

Early in June 1937 he summoned Anthony Eden to his office, and instructed him to abandon the traditional Foreign Office policy based on Anglo-French-Russian cooperation. He cautioned him to avoid anything which might be construed as an affront against Germany. Finally he told Eden to suggest to the French Government, that they make a gesture indicating a departure from Franco-Russian cooperation. The Foreign Secretary attempted a tepid resistance, but Chamberlain confronted him with the alternative: yield or resign. Eden yielded. The first overt act in this new British policy came a few days later, when the Foreign Office convoked a miniature four-power conference to discuss the patrolling of Spanish coastal areas. Present in Mr. Eden's office were Conte Grandi, the Italian, the French, M. Corbin and Herr von Ribbentrop, the German Ambassador; the Russian Ambassador, Ivan Maisky was ignored.

Then and there a new diplomatic precedent was created. Previous to June 1937, M. Maisky was persona grata with Mr. Eden, and among the first to be informed of every British move in Europe. Now information was refused to him. On the occasion of Daladier's first visit to London, when the Franco-British agreement was signed, this practice nearly brought an open break in Anglo-Russian diplomatic relations. Both the German and Italian Embassies were constantly kept informed by the Foreign Office, yet the Russians were left completely in the dark. M. Maisky himself dashed to Downing Street, at first he asked, then demanded the same information that was handed to his Fascist colleagues, but he was unable to obtain anything other than the official communique. He turned to the French delegation, referred to the then still existing Franco-Russian pact, but M. Daladier, too, refused to disclose to him what the Germans and Italians were permitted to learn.

At last the desperate Ambassador contacted French newspaper correspondents camping in the Savoy Hotel, and got from them the inside story of the agreement which he wired to Moscow. At the same time he informed Stalin of the circumstances. His report drove Stalin into a fury. Stalin summoned his own inner cabinet and told them he would accept Chamberlain's challenge and recall Maisky from London. Litvinov, however, pointed out that such a withdrawal in these extremely tense times would be a serious mistake and that it was vital to have a first-rate diplomat in London. Maisky remained as an observer rather than an Ambassador.

Eden's other assignment—the breaking up of the Franco-Russian pact—turned out to be a more difficult task. Leon Blum flatly refused to act upon Eden's "friendly advice," and—for awhile—the situation remained unchanged. Then the Bank of England stepped in. She decided to buy France out of her Russian commitment on the installment plan. A bear raid was made on the franc, and soon the Blum government was compelled to ask financial aid from England. Vincent Auriol, the Finance Minister, contacted Montagu Norman and asked for a loan of $600,000,000 but was told point blank that the Bank of England did not consider a France under Blum sufficient guaranty. With the loan refused, Blum was unable to maintain his position and was succeeded by Camille Chautemps, whose Finance Minister, Bonnet, was Norman's man. Then a loan of $200,000,000 was advanced and more promised subject to the following conditions: A gradual departure from the popular front; a new government with Daladier as Premier; the abandonment of the Franco-Russian pact. Even though Daladier advanced to the premiership, the bank still refused to pay over the second installment, chiefly because Paul-Boncour, who had been made Foreign Minister, was suspected by the bank of pro-Russian sympathies. Norman then advised Daladier that he would be given another $200,000,000 only if Bonnet were to replace Paul-Boncour at the Quai d'Orsay. The French yielded again, and now Montagu Norman could direct France's foreign policy in the anti-Soviet manner, decided at the fateful meeting in Threadneedle Street 4 years before.

Not until late spring of 1938 did France receive the third installment, this time for agreeing to disregard the Russian commitment. After Hitler annexed Austria, Daladier and Bonnet flew to London. Desperately in need of money and scared by Hitler's steady expansion, they submitted to everything Norman dictated through Chamberlain.

Under normal circumstances this painless dissolution of the Franco-Soviet pact would never have bothered Stalin, who was disgusted with France's attitude in the Spanish civil war. During my stay in Moscow in the summer of 1937 I was told by a high official of M. Litvinov's commissariat that the Kremlin was considering Russia's withdrawal from the pact, and a complete redirection of the Soviet's foreign policy. However, in the decision to sacrifice Czechoslovakia to the interests of the Fascist and semi-Fascist powers, Stalin saw an opportunity to raise the stature of the Soviet Union before the public opinion of the world. While the democracies with London as their headquarters were sketching the mutilation of Czechoslovakia, Stalin instructed Litvinov to assure President Benes that Russia would honor her obligations and stand by whatever happens.

Two alternative Russian plans were submitted to Benes. If Russia were able to reach an agreement with Rumania for the passage of her troops and material, help would be sent immediately. Should Rumania, under pressure from London, fail to agree, then

Benes was to move the Czechoslovak Army into Russia whence operations against the invaders would be started. This unexpected assurance stiffened the Czechs' attitude and upset the plans of London.

A new plan toward the construction of the western pact—as London camouflages this anti-Russian alliance—was evolved in Kiel (Germany), where Sir Alan Anderson, director of the Bank of England, Sir Malcolm Campbell, a member of Lloyd's, Ronald Olaf Hambro, of Hambros Bros., Sir Alexander MacCormick and Charles A. Proctor, of the City, met with their German counterparts at the Deutscher Auslands Club in June of this year. It was hoped that the Czechs would supply the incident which would take the onus of aggression off Hitler. Runciman was sent to Prague, where his staff purposely clouded the issues and by contradictory advice to leaders of opposing factions, managed to produce increased discord instead of bringing about a settlement. It is noteworthy that Runciman was the man who, in 1934, authorized the first export of aero engines to Germany in open violation of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty.

On September 12, Hitler made his speech at the Nuremberg party congress before 300,000 Germans and 44 English lords, who journeyed to Germany to be present when Der Fuehrer made his declaration to annex the Sudetenland.

Czech resistance was brutally broken by Chamberlain and Daladier.

But Stalin interfered once more and insisted upon fulfillment of the treaty obligations calling for the defense of Czechoslovakia. This latest and boldest Russian move forced Chamberlain out into the open.

An artificial war scare was created, dramatic pleas for peace were made to deceive public opinion, which had been aroused after Berchtesgaden and by Litvinov's Geneva speech. At the psychological moment, when the world believed war was inevitable, the Four Power Conference was called to Munich—a conference which appeared to be spontaneous, but which, in fact, had been decided upon 4 years ago in Montagu Collet Norman's private office.

OPA Extension Bill Called Revolution by Both Phelps Adams and Samuel Grafton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most alert and discerning commentators on public affairs today is Samuel Grafton, whose editorial column appears in the Chicago Sun. I do not always agree with Grafton; but I find his comments refreshing, original, and trenchant. His point of view is liberal and progressive.

I read with special interest his comments on the House murder of OPA. He quotes Phelps Adams of the New York Sun as calling the vote a revolution in American politics, and agrees with Adams, though from a different point of view.

Under leave previously extended to me, I am inserting Mr. Grafton's column of April 22 as it appeared in the Chicago Sun under the heading, "Price bill a decisive turn in 13-year war for power":

REVOLT OF THE RIGHT MATURED

What happened in the House of Representatives last week far transcends the matter of price control. It was a revolution. The revolt of the right, long nurtured in an incubator kept warm by the steam heat of oratory, has matured at last. Price control was not really the issue; price control merely happened to be the point at which the redoubt was stormed, the angle at which the walls were breached.

The Government of the United States is now divided, and is being operated from two hostile centers, one in the House of Representatives, and the other in the Executive Mansion.

That the opposition is well aware of the importance of last week's events is shown in an ecstatic report to the ultraconservative New York Sun, by Mr. Phelps Adams, who writes that the last vestige of administration control over Congress is being wiped out, and that the triumph of the conservative bloc now assumes the full proportions of a revolution. Though the means used were legal, the intent and the effect of last week's proceedings are indeed revolutionary, and the vote on price control represents a decisive historical turn in the 13-year-old struggle for power which has been going on since Mr. Roosevelt brought the liberal idea to Washington.

FOCUSED ON POWER

The right has seized power, if not over the whole Government, at least over one important bastion. And one cannot shame or shake the Republicans and the dissident southern Democrats by warning them that the housewife is now going to have to pay more for pins and beef, because their eyes are focused on another question entirely; the question of who is to have power, who is to run the Government of the United States.

That is the issue as they see it, and, since they have been victorious, they have established that as the issue for everybody else. The question of what the change will cost the people is, to them, incidental, and so it is idle to accuse the members of the coalition of being obtuse in failing to see the obvious merits of price control; just as it is idle and soft and somehow almost too kind to charge them with having fallen victim to the wiles of lobbyists.

No one can understand this story who tries to see it as a tale of weak men, or misled men, or stupid men; it is a story of strong and determined men who, in a critical period, have seized the initiative.

They have led a triumphant charge against a philosophy of government which has prevailed for 13 years; they have written a new chapter in the long story of the American struggle that goes back to Jefferson and Hamilton.

FINALLY FOUND ISSUE

The House of Representatives has been like an armed camp for months; it has fired volley after volley at the President; it has flung the Case antilabor bill at his head; it has stunned him by dismantling Selective Service; but now, at last, in price control, it has found the appropriate issue for finally making it manifest that one major branch of Government is firmly in the hands of men who are opposed to the welfare state and the social service state; men who desire the Federal organism to be, at most, a sleepy umpire of the swarming struggle between the strong and the weak. The vote on price control ends the Roosevelt era; the other side carries the ball, for the first time since 1933.

The country must now orient itself to the fact that its Government is split into hostile halves; that the White House and the House of Representatives are opposing camps. With that realization, the struggle will move out into the open, and will perhaps be conducted at a higher level, as labor and liberal groups recover from their stunned surprise. For we may be sure that the quarrel will not end at this point.

Those House Members who have taken the initiative in this fight must expect to be answered. They may find they are cheering over a victory in a battle, not in a war, as our America slowly wakes up to the fact that, like so many other nations, it has come out of the world conflict with deep questions to answer concerning its future, and what manner of nation it is to be, and how it is to become what it is to be.

Inspiring Appeal for Freedom, Progress, and Peace in China and the World, by Mme. Sun Yat-sen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I would like to include in the RECORD, a copy of a recorded speech made by Mme. Sun Yat-sen in China for the Spotlight on the Far East dinner sponsored by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in New York in April 3.

Widow of the founder of the Kuomintang and the Chinese Republic, Mme. Sun has always been a rigid supporter of the principles Dr. Sun advocated: a politically independent China, constitutional government of, by, and for the people, and a decent standard of living for all. Her plain speaking has repeatedly been a thorn in the side of those Kuomintang leaders who, while paying lip service to these principles, have betrayed them in spirit and protected the feudal backwardness that Dr. Sun fought. Mme. Sun is a member of the party's Central Committee, and the leading member of its democratic minority.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives this significant political statement by Mme. Sun, the first she has made in this country for many years:

Friends of China and democracy, this is Soong Ching-ling speaking to you from across the Pacific. This evening, as the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy sponsors a salute to China, I wish to extend to you the greetings of your democratic friends in this land.

The bonds which unite you to us are much stronger than ever before. They have withstood the violent trials of the 8-year war against fascism. They have been strengthened by the common sacrifices of our peoples to assure the "four freedoms" to all peoples.

It is good that our bonds are stronger, for we know that fascism did not automatically die with the cessation of the shooting. We know it will take the same, if not greater, common efforts of all democratic forces to win the peace. We also know that peace means continuing the lessons of this long war—unity, cooperation, and tolerance among the Allies.

The peace has to be made in a small world, a world shrunk by war and quickened communications. These encompassing facilities have sped the meaning of the "four freedoms" to every corner of the world. Having heard the immortal phrases of your great

Franklin D. Roosevelt, promising freedom of expression, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, the people of the world are demanding the actual thing.

This applies to the people of the Far East as much as it applies to the people of the Americas. Freedom in the Far East is indivisible from the freedom which you uphold in your own country. We here know that in America this thought is backed by the action of such organizations as the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

The principles of freedom have yet to be applied in China. China has emerged from the war as one of the pivots of world peace. This position has conferred upon her great responsibilities which are inseparably linked with the many internal problems facing her today. Among these problems is the achievement of political and economic democracy within the land. Without political democracy there can be no internal stability. These are China's immediate goals; these are the prerequisites of a solid reconstruction.

The past 7 months have seen the leaders of our country, with the invaluable aid of General Marshal, backed by the American people, clear the ground for a new foundation. We have been passing through China's most critical periods. At the end of the war both Nationalist and Communist armies began to move or be moved in areas occupied by the surrendering Japanese and the treacherous collaborators. These armies clashed at several points. The insistence of the Chinese people themselves prevented those conflicts from spreading into out-and-out civil strife.

On the political scene our people have struggled for a voice in the government of their country. Up to that time they had had none. At the same moment economic hardships were great. Farmers in many provinces were starving. Industrial workers in the cities demonstrated against unemployment and skyrocketing prices.

The trying times served a warning that many problems must be solved simultaneously. Gigantic steps are necessary to meet this crisis. Some of those steps have been taken. In quick order the world received news from China of the cease-fire order, the work of the executive headquarters in carrying out that order, and the decisions reached at the meeting of the Political Consultative Council.

For these far-reaching accomplishments, due credit should be given to all parties involved. At the same time it should be recognized that they were merely the beginning. We must outdistance them by even greater acts if we are to see democratic progress in every corner of this land. So far the goals have been put to paper, the general outlines have been drawn. Now the actions to complete the outlines must be forthcoming. They must fit into practical frames. They must involve China's economy. There must be planning for full rice bowls—for all the people, not just a few.

We must raise health standards as rapidly as possible, in the cities and farms. Education must be liberally spread to every part of the land. Most important of all, such action must be undertaken in an atmosphere of freedom. Otherwise it will not thrive.

Naturally, all these activities must have their roots in the people of China. It is not only the leaders of China and those who are sent here to give aid, but also the people of the world must understand what the Chinese people feel and want. The Chinese people, above all else, want peace and freedom. They want peace and freedom in the rest of the world. They want the United Nations to work.

The Chinese people are particularly interested in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. They want friendship between these two great countries. They understand that they will become mere pawns unless America and Russia work together on a friendly basis. They understand that upon this relationship will depend the extent to which the Chinese people will have an opportunity to institute democracy. Therefore, they want unity and understanding.

With unity China will have a chance to achieve her aims; Russia and the United States their aims; the United Nations its aims.

The Chinese people want the welfare of one nation to work for the welfare of all other nations. They want the basis of that welfare to be the application of the "four freedoms" all over the world.

Building Material Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to quote below an article from the Improvement Bulletin for April 18, 1946, which sets forth the building and material situation in this country in a factual and understandable manner. I concur in everything that is said and commend its reading to my colleagues. The article follows:

IN PERSPECTIVE

Whether the ban on commercial building will alleviate the shortages and speed the construction of homes still remains to be seen. Everyone except the Government experts concerned with the order seem to think other means would accomplish the same end without curtailing commercial and industrial construction.

In this, as in all other problems which they have attempted to solve in the past decade, our Government planners approach the problem obliquely instead of objectively. Further, in this as in all others, their approach is from the viewpoint of lack or shortage rather than from the more stable foundation of an unlimited supply.

Planned work, great public construction projects, power authority, and other grandiose plans * * * all attempted or created to supplement a shortage. An ever-normal granary to assure the farmer of constant "supply" of income, butter subsidies, payments for not raising corn or pigs, payments for raising them, these are all part and parcel of the same kind of thinking which aims, always, at selling the voters on the effective paternalism of the new order.

The plain and unvarnished truth of the matter is that we will have shortages of material, and ultimately of employment, until these economic tinkerers permit the law of supply and demand to operate and give industry an opportunity to produce on that basis. Prices and supply will adjust themselves quickly under that law.

Our great industrial capacity was not built on any ruthless gouging of the public by the manufacturers. The simple fact is that it came into being as a result of a successful effort to produce great quantities of everything at extremely low prices. In no other nation on earth is it possible to buy anything so cheaply as it is here, wages and other factors considered. In no other nation on earth are things produced so abundantly.

Until 1933, when governmental agencies, bureaus, and individuals in positions of authority started their program of planning every function of our living, the law of supply and demand kept our industrial economy pretty well ordered. It had its "ups and downs," to be sure, but these were not the fault of industry.

During the war, when the need was grave, industry was again given its head and production totals were accomplished beyond even the dreams of the procurement agencies.

How can we produce anything but shortages when on one hand the Government persists in maintaining price controls that make profitable operation impossible and on the other restricts all building to that of private homes, thus curtailing volume on which lower prices are based. Almost anyone knows that a lumber mill cannot operate profitably unless it produces all kinds of lumber for only thus is the entire log utilized. Neither can it offer full employment when only partially operating, and this fact also carries on through all the branches of the construction industry.

Our Government has persistently ignored the advice or offers of counsel on the part of industry. In fact, it has consistently attempted to discredit industrial leaders and accused them of selfishness when they have offered their assistance. Even during the war it preferred politicians to businessmen in high positions.

It is a sorry spectacle of political bungling and guessing that persists from the lowest to the highest office in the Government, and it is threatening to smother the life out of our tremendous industrial effort to get this Nation back on its economic foundations.

Communism and Capitalism Can Live in the Same World but Fascism and Capitalism Cannot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Robert Lasch from the Chicago Sun.

Mr. Lasch says what we all know but sometimes forget: That the American system of capitalist democracy could not survive in the same world with nazism and fascism because the Nazis had to conquer and kill to live.

Though he does not express it, it is a necessary corollary that those who say we have to choose between nazism and fascism and communism deliberately lie. The fathers of our country acted with profound wisdom when they established a democratic form of government. This Nation has survived civil and foreign wars, panics, droughts, floods, and an industrial revolution, and has grown always stronger. Our choice is clear, and every true American has made it, to preserve our free American democracy at all costs. It is not necessary to be anti-Russian or anti-British to prove one's Americanism; it is enough to be pro-American, first, last, and all the time.

I hope Members will read Mr. Lasch's interesting, stimulating, and provocative article.

TWO QUESTIONS ON RUSSIA'S COURSE

(By Robert Lasch)

Everybody who wants to make up his mind on our policy toward Russia must base his decision on two judgments. First, he must satisfy himself on whether the Communist system and various non-Communist systems can exist side by side in the world; and next he must make up his mind as to whether Soviet Russia's actions, taken in context with history and the behavior of the western powers, constitute evidence that Russia has embarked on a course of imperialist expansion.

The answer to the first question, it seems to me, is clearly "Yes, if both sides want to get along together." We lived in the same world with czarism; we live now with various forms of feudalism and imperialism.

There is no inherent reason why the state cannot own industry in one part of the earth while elsewhere the means of production are privately owned or subject to one degree or another of social control.

We could not live in the same world with fascism because fascism was inherently and unavoidably aggressive. Fascism represented the integration of national life in a totalitarian state for the purpose of conquest. Without conquest, fascism could not survive, because it contained no other overriding aim or idea.

COMMUNISM AND CONQUEST

But communism is an idea that does not require conquest to survive. Unless we take the position that it must be killed off simply because we do not like the idea, we must conclude that Communist and non-Communist systems can exist peaceably side by side.

This implies, of course, that each system may possibly influence the other—that Socialist ideas may be transferred by osmosis to the capitalist democracies, while communism is subjected to the same process.

In this sense the two systems will be directly competitive. But the contest will be one of ideas rather than of power. Whatever the Communists may feel about such a contest, we on this side should not fear it, for our democracy is based on the proposition that the free circulation of ideas is not only tolerable but desirable.

The second question, whether Russia has embarked on imperialist expansion, is more difficult to answer because one never can be sure he has all the facts. But a person who is willing to look at the facts he does have, and who tries to imagine how a Russian would look at them, must conclude that Russia is seeking, not indefinite expansion of power, but the same degree of strategic security which the other great powers, including the United States, already possess.

RECORD OF WESTERN POWERS

It must be remembered that Soviet Russia has been subjected to armed intervention from abroad, while the Western democracies have not; that the Western democracies did not trouble themselves too much about fascism so long as they thought it possible to turn the Fascist menace against communism; that Soviet Russia has an internal problem which makes a certain amount of external swaggering understandable. These considerations point strongly to the conclusion that Russia is after security and not conquest.

It does not follow that we must acquiesce in everything Russia wants to do, whether in Manchuria or Iran or some place else. The important thing is the frame of mind in which we arrive at our decisions; whether we accept or reject a change in world power relationships.

If we start from the assumption that Russia must be hemmed in, that the power relationships must remain unchanged, then we find ourselves acting as if Russia were an aggressor to be curbed—and thereby induce Russia to act like one.

If, on the other hand, we assume that Russia is acquiring a new status and that we are ready to share power with her, then we are in much stronger position to make effective protest against any treaty violations, and to insist that all decisions at the points of friction be made by agreement, inside the United Nations framework.

Basically the question is whether we are willing to accept Russia as an equal partner in world affairs. Peace may hinge upon our answer.

The Lumber Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a lumber dealer in my District which seems to me to point out very clearly what is the matter with the housing situation. I believe that it should be read by every Member of Congress before the conference report comes back on the veterans' housing bill. For that reason I am submitting it herewith as an extension of my remarks:

APRIL 13, 1946.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: I am not in entire sympathy with the lumber association's desire to abolish the OPA entirely but I believe it would produce lumber for housing in large quantities where we are getting practically none now.

I think the idea of giving one man, probably inexperienced and maybe incompetent, more power than any potentate ever had is entirely wrong. If anything is necessary Congress should designate just what it is.

The $600,000,000 subsidy will cost the buyers many millions. It is to be spent on prefabricated houses. If you never saw one of them you should try to get to see one or at least a picture and specifications. They are just glorified chicken houses.

If nothing else is available people will buy them but in a short time when other material is available they will be moved to the back of the lot and another house built. I cannot believe we can destroy wealth that fast and prosper. I have before me a picture and specifications of one now. The price is $2,850 f. o. b. Detroit. The items not furnished such as foundation, chimney, wiring, plumbing, etc., would probably run the cost with the freight and labor up to over $5,000.

If we had the material we can build a far better conventional type home for much less than this.

About the only worthy thing about all of these housing bills is the desire to build homes. The need is great, but I think it is greatly exaggerated. Here the estimate needed is from 1,000 to 2,000. It is my own opinion if we had 300 new homes we would hear very little of any housing shortage. With the material available we can build 300 houses or more here in a year. If the subsidy is passed it means we will get very little material and our workmen will either have to remain idle or go to the places where they are building prefabricated houses, and their take-home pay will be very small when they have to leave home to work.

You can lead a horse to drink but you cannot make him water. You may have heard that the other way but to me it seems to illustrate just about what's wrong with the lumber production today. We are going through the stubborn age and it isn't limited to one side. Many directives of the agencies are entirely wrong it seems to me. We have just unloaded the first car of lumber we have received this year. When we buy lumber now we don't get to specify just what we want. Any order now is just a blanket order for the mill to ship anything they have. The car we just received contained 5,000 feet of 1 by 4 B V. G. fir flooring; 5,000 feet of 1 by 6 C V. G. fir flooring; 12,000 feet of 2 by 6, several grades; 26,000 feet of 2 by 12, several grades.

This car of lumber was bought on P33 certificate to be used only for veterans' housing.

If you know anything about building you will readily see that there isn't any of this material that is used in housing except possibly some of the 1 x 4 flooring. If oak flooring is available none of this fir flooring would be used. And yet with no prospect to sell this material for housing we must offer it and hold it for 60 days. We could have 2 x 12's ripped to 2 x 4's at a cost of probably $130 but we would have no chance to get this $130 back. In addition to the loss of $130 we would have to sell the 2 x 4's for about $8 per thousand less than the 2 x 12's. Our total loss to rip these would be about $300. We stand it to take that much loss.

The above-mentioned lumber is very desirable for farmers; in fact a number of farmers have seen it and they are begging for it to repair and floor grain bins, truck beds, and for other farm use. But we cannot sell it to them. We will have to hold it for 60 days. Sixty days from now will be a little late for the farmers to buy lumber needed before harvest. Some things like this might be corrected but what's the use; others come up all the time, just as inconsistent as this.

Mr. HOPE, if you could stay in our office a few hours and learn of some of these difficulties and hear the "cussin's" we take that are intended for the Government, I believe you would vote against the six hundred million subsidy and try to figure out some other way to run the lumber business. Many organizations, veterans, etc., are passing resolutions favoring the subsidy but they do not understand what's wrong and their whole desire is for more housing. They do not realize they would get housing better and quicker without the controls.

I could write many pages citing specific things that seem to be handled in the wrong way but I have burdened you enough now.

Yours truly.

Up, Up With the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, again calling attention to the measure I recently introduced to define as a Federal offense the desecration of the flag of our country, legislation, though frequently introduced during the life of the Republic, has never reached the Chief Executive's desk, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD a poem from the inspired pen of a former Member of this legislative

body, the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, a poem which he has entitled "Up, Up With the Flag," one well worthy of the consideration of the membership.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thatcher's poem is the following:

UP, UP WITH THE FLAG

(By M. H. Thatcher)

Up, up with the flag! Let its colors be gleaming
Wherever, by right, its colors should be!
Let us show to the earth, while our standard is streaming,
That we are united, undaunted, and free!

Up, up with the flag, o'er the homes of the people,
From north unto south, from east unto west!
Let it blazon the sky from schoolhouse and steeple—
The flag of our fathers, blood-purchased and blest!

Up, up with the flag! It is Heaven's creation;
The glorious sun of liberty's land!
'Tis the badge of our worth, our seal of salvation:
Let's raise and defend it, wherever we stand!

Up, up with the flag! Let its marvelous glory
Be unto the world a beacon of light!
Let it carry anew to the nations the story
Of blessedness wrought through liberty's might!

Up, up with the flag, for Washington wills it!
His spirit commands: be quick to obey!
So long as the breath of loyalty fills it,
No power can pluck that banner away!

WASHINGTON, 1943.

Young Democrats on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Acey Carraway, executive director, Young Democratic Clubs of America, delivered before Young Democratic Clubs of North Carolina, Winston-Salem, N. C., April 27, 1946:

I am grateful for this opportunity to be here tonight. It affords me a pleasurable hour to mingle with old friends and to make new friends among the Democrats of North Carolina.

I have the pleasure of acquaintance with your great Governor. I have also met many of his aides and friends. I have been privileged to know for a period of many years a number of your fine Representatives in Congress, including those able statesmen, Senator BAILEY and Senator HOEY.

It was my honor to have served in the original organizatior of the Young Democratic Clubs with one of your native sons, Tyre Taylor, founder and now honorary president for life of the Young Democratic Clubs of America.

I have also looked forward to seeing Lon Eolich and Mrs. Stratton Coyner and other old friends in the Young Democratic Clubs of North Carolina. I have worked since my return from the service with that fine young executive in Washington, Kidd Brewer, on many of the problems of young democracy throughout the country, and I take this opportunity to express the appreciation of your national officers for the splendid work done by Mrs. Henrietta Price Gillespie and her State and local officers.

This opportunity of addressing you also offers an occasion for all of us, for you and me, to take searching, critical stock of ourselves and our party organization, to give a selfless look to the directions in which we are going and to the great aim which is our positive end product—the winning of the forthcoming elections.

Any speech by anybody to any group of Young Democrats should be prefaced with the observation that our organization, the Young Democratic Clubs of America, is open only to men and women with the will to win.

The clubs were not conceived and organized for any social or lawn party disportment. The clubs are and must be the long and perpetually cracking bull whips of the Democratic Party, an unceasing driving force, in season and out, the mediums through which young men and women are converted to the faith of our party, are registered into the ranks of our party, and vote for the candidates of our party.

That is our function. And it is upon such occasions as this that we should take stock of ourselves and our organization, of our leaders and our plans, and ask the simple questions:

Am I giving to this organization what it has the right to expect of me?

Is this organization, my club, carrying its part of the party's burden?

To such questions there can be no justifiable equivocations.

When clubs are inactive, they should be made to function. When leaders are indifferent, they should be replaced.

All of us would agree to such a policy. It is not a policy of high-handedness nor of toughness. It is simply realistic. And it is imperative, urgent, and compelling because 1946 is a critical year and will become an historic year for the Democratic Party and the Nation.

The issues have been clearly drawn. The Democratic Party, on the one hand, stands for constructive action. Through its responsible leadership, it has blue-printed and announced the precise course it would follow in keeping the country on a sound economic footing. It has taken every possible step to bring about such international relations as would leave us at peace in a world at peace. On the other hand, we have from the Republican Party a long, depressing and extremely disturbing record of do-nothingness, all out of keeping with the urgencies of these times.

Ever since 1932 millions of young men and women have taken a keen and active interest in public affairs. They have concerned themselves with the serious problems of National, State, and municipal government. Much of this enthusiasm has been inspired by the leadership of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. But, lest we forget, it was a Democratic administration that gave our young men and women every opportunity and every advantage which was denied them prior to 1933.

When the Roosevelt administration began, local agencies, the State, cities, and counties, had well-nigh exhausted their resources, and charitable organizations were unable to meet the constantly growing demands upon them. Hundreds of thousands of young men, and women too, many of them college or high-school graduates, were entering life without prospect. The professions were overcrowed and the immediate future held little promise for the youth of America.

What has happened since then, of course, is now history. Suffice to say a Democratic administration proved that it was possible for the Government to provide education, job training, and even physical rehabilitation for young men and women who, through no fault of their own, had been denied these fundamental rights of American youth. Youth has not and will not forget those things.

Since VJ-day, several million young men and women have been released from the armed forces. Thousands more are returning to civilian life to pick up where they left off.

We are proud that the Young Democratic Clubs of America contributed thousands of these young men and women to the armed forces of our country. We are equally proud to notice the tremendous response that has been received by our national headquarters in Washington from former members of the Young Democratic Clubs. It proves that our Young Democrats have not forgotten 1933. It further proves that Young Democrats throughout the country are on the march again. Many of these young Democrats, both in person and by correspondence, are today inquiring about the Young Democratic Clubs and the important role they play within the ranks of the Democratic Party and our national life.

All possible assistance must be given to these young men and women who so faithfully served us all. Each and every one of them has a real personal stake in the future of our great country. These young men and women must learn today how to cope with the heavy responsibilities and serious problems of tomorrow. The Young Democratic Clubs of America is a natural outlet and we must show them the way. We must give them light and they, in turn, will follow.

What have the Young Democratic Clubs to offer the veteran and war worker? We offer them an open opportunity to once again participate actively in the politics of their community, as well as in State and national politics. It is a proving ground, so to speak, for leadership and a direct means of developing organizing ability.

Further, our organization offers the veteran and war worker an unusual opportunity to make their needs and requirements known both locally and nationally. That they are meeting with Democratic approval is exemplified in all Nation-wide polls today, proving conclusively that the veteran and the war worker want to be in the Democratic Party.

Why do they want to be in the Democratic Party? Because our party is, indeed, the party of youth. The policies of our party during the past 14 years have coincided generally with the philosophies of young men and women. Our party's inherent creed of progressiveness, of ardently striving to improve and perfect our social and economic order has endeared it to the minds and hearts of young Americans.

It is the responsibility and obligation of our organization to give the veteran and other youths of our country every opportunity, every advantage of joining and staying in the ranks of the Democratic Party.

There has never been another period in the history of our Government where the interests and opportunities of the youth of America have been so vitally affected by the policies of Government. The events of today will determine the kind of a country that will be theirs, and their children's, too, to inherit. The most effective way by which youth can make an enduring contribution to sound and good government is through education and actual participation in the processes of democracy. That is also part of the program of the Young Democratic Clubs of America.

Ours is a grand opportunity today, fellow Democrats. The enthusiasm and idealism of youth should go hand in hand with an honest realism and a strong desire to get something constructive accomplished in behalf of their own general welfare and the welfare of their families. This means practical conception and understanding of our existing institutions as well as a realization

that our country needs no "ism" except Americanism.

It is your duty and my duty to help educate these young men and women to the principles and ideals of the Democratic Party, and to preserve the liberal and constructive traditions of that party. It is our duty to provide a forum for young men and women so that they and we can study and discuss important economic and social problems of the day.

It is our further duty to give young men and women an opportunity to become acquainted and associate with candidates seeking office at local, State, and National elections; to give them an opportunity to participate in party affairs generally; to develop their talents, help them to gain the experience and training necessary to prepare them for leadership in political and government activity.

The main object of the Young Democratic Clubs of America is to interpret and express the social and economic needs of our American youth. The immediate and highly acceptable task for all of us is to lend all aid in the reelection of the Democratic administration initiated by our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and carried forward so ably by President Harry Truman.

It is the paramount purpose of our organization to be crusaders for those social and economic objectives which President Truman has set as his goal for the American people and from which there can be no retreat. His cause is our cause; his ideals are our ideals, and his program is our program.

We young Democrats have a great cause in the accomplishments of the Democratic Party. There never has been, so far as I am able to read the chronicles of our party, a day when we could not fly our banner in pride. There is nothing for which we have to apologize. I can think of no time at which we should have rallied more strongly to our party than now.

We stand upon a mighty record of accomplishment. And that record of accomplishment is strongly threatened in this politically embattled year. What we must have is the continuation of a Democratic-controlled Congress in order to press forward President Truman's program for the American people. What we must combat is the desperate attempt by the Republican Party to seize control of the Congress and thus halt the progress our party has made. Here is a fight which should excite the fighting spirit of every Democrat.

The battle calls for a strong organization and for fighting wills within the organization. Above all, we must believe in our party and those positive things for which it stands. I do not say that every one of us must agree in toto on everything, on every issue. It is the simple right of free Americans to disagree—whenever we feel like it. But I think that we can disagree among ourselves. I think we can argue things out without giving aid and comfort to the Republicans. I think that we can disagree about this or that step in a program, while keeping in mind that the great and lasting objectives of the Democratic Party are sound and desirable.

The Young Democratic Clubs of America have lived up in splendid fashion to the ideals of those who brought them into being. The primary purpose was to fuse the energy, the zeal and the courage of youth into the party councils and to create a means by which young voters could cooperate with their elders on a common footing. This purpose has been realized and the outcome has been fortunate both for the Democratic Party and for the Nation.

So, fellow Democrats, let me remind you that we are entering the toughest elections in the history of the Democratc Party. Let each and every Young Democrat jump to his battle station and start fighting for the continued success of the Democratc Party.

Every man and woman who votes this fall must realize that under our form of constitutional government, the team that runs our Government consists of the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. If our history teaches us anything, it tells us that that team functions effectively only when the President, the Senate, and the House are all of the same political party.

History shows that whenever the House of Representatives or the Senate has been of a different political faith from that of the Chief Executive, then there is nothing but chaos and confusion in the machinery of government. That is bad enough in normal times, but in a time like this, it could be fatal to the very life of our Nation.

Letter to the Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism a request to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following wire sent by Mr. Augustus L. Richards to the chief counsel of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I am glad to comply with the committee's request, as I believe the Members will be amused as well as instructed. I omitted from this letter the twenty-first question, as it reflects indirectly upon a Member of our body:

APRIL 10, 1946.

Mr. ERNIE ADAMSON,
Chief Counsel, House Committee on Un-American Activities,
Washington, D. C.:

Hearing you are in search of all sources of financing of National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism beg to advise I have just sent check for $5 to that organization, together with petition to Congress signed by self and family on form No. 2531, praying that body to repudiate your committee by passing Dickstein House Concurrent Resolution 89 condemning the un-American activities you are engaged in.

Glad any time to submit myself to examination by your committee, but to save you trouble and expense of coming up here will answer your questionnaire by wire, as follows:

1. Full name: Augustus Loring Richards.
2. Age: Sixty-six.
3. Color of skin: White.
4. Color of hair: Ditto (when last seen).
5. Color of eyes: Blue.
6. Hair straight or kinky?: Neither. None.
7. Occupation: Lawyer (retired).
8. Business address: None. Formerly 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
9. Religion: To best of my recollection, Protestant.
10. Are you of American or foreign stock? Foreign.
11. If foreign, from what country or countries immigrant? On father's side, Wales. On mother's side, England.
12. Names of immigrants, dates and ports of entry? Mother's side, Thomas Loring, Plymouth, December 23, 1634. Father's side, Owen Richards, New York, ——— ———, 1815.
13. Have you any Catholics in your family? Not at present, but deceased maternal grandmother's middle maiden name was Kelly.
14. Are you Jewish in whole or in part? I hope so, but can't prove it.
15. Have you any Jewish names in your family or ancestry? Yes.
16. If so, state each such name with relationship. Paternal grandfather named Benjamin; paternal uncle's Joseph, Jonathan; father's and grandson's names David; mother and sister named Esther.
17. Do you subscribe to or read any Jewish, Negro, or Catholic newspaper, periodical, or other publication? Yes.
18. If so, state names of each such publication. Jewish—New York Times; Catholic—the Commonweal; the Catholic Worker; Negro—the Journal and Guide, of Norfolk, Va.
19. Have you any Catholic, Negro, or Jewish books in your dwelling house? Yes.
20. If so, state titles and names of authors. Too numerous to list. Sample are: Catholic—author, Frederick W. Faber, title, Hymns. Negro—author, Alexander Dumas, title, The Three Musketeers. Jewish authors, Moses, Solomon, David, Saul of Tarsus, and other Jews, title, The Holy Bible.

AUGUSTUS L. RICHARDS.
REMSEN, N. Y.

Let Us Keep the Record Straight on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the adoption by the House of Representatives recently of certain amendments to the price-control law has been followed by considerable comment by certain radio commentators as to the nature and probable effect of these amendments. Following their usual line, these self-elected guardians of the public welfare have indulged in wild predictions and glimmering generalities without in most cases presenting an intelligent discussion of the real issues involved. Their conduct has shed considerable heat upon the subject, but very little light. Nor have they been hesitant in attacking the intelligence and patriotism of all those who disagree with them. Many of them have concluded with the admonition, "Write your Congressman—write your Congressman and tell him what I think."

Letters I receive indicate that the people are entirely aware of the dangers of inflation and will willingly support any intelligent and well-directed effort to prevent it. The question is, How can we prevent inflation? What policies, either of Government, labor, business, or the consumer, are contributing to the danger? The answer to these questions will be found in an atmosphere of calm debate and not in the hysterical chattering of kept propagandists and public payrollers.

The price-control law has been extended several times, and on each occasion certain amendments were adopted which are now a part of the law. Uniformly, Chester Bowles and his cohorts took to the air shouting that OPA was being ruined. For example, the original law provided a penalty against anyone violating a regulation, order, or price

schedule prescribing a maximum price. In 1944 the House adopted an amendment providing that—

It shall be an adequate defense if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful, nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation.

Mr. Bowles denounced this very just and decent amendment as a "legislative booby trap" which would bring about inflation.

I wish to set out a brief statement of the amendments actually adopted by the House of Representatives. They will be considered in the order in which the final votes were taken.

AMENDMENT NO. 1—EXTENSION OF THE LAW

The committee bill, H. R. 6042, provided for an extension of the Emergency Price Control Act and of the Stabilization Act from June 30, 1946—the present expiration date—until June 30, 1947.

The amendment provides that these acts shall be extended until March 31, 1947.

The Congress will undoubtedly be in session on March 31, 1947, and will be in position to appraise the situation at that time and to take such further action as may be necessary.

AMENDMENT NO. 2—FIXING OF PRICES

This amendment provides that prices established shall reflect to the producers, processors, distributors, and retailers the current cost of producing, processing, distributing, and a reasonable profit.

Many of us have been under the impression that under a capitalistic economy it is necessary to secure for the product the cost plus a reasonable profit. Any business failing to get such a price must eventually go bankrupt. Incidentally, under the amendment, the OPA would determine what is a reasonable profit. It could follow the policy recommended by Bernard Baruch of "profits but not profiteering."

Has the OPA fixed prices below cost plus a reasonable profit? The answer is yes. In many cases it has fixed the price at a figure actually below admitted cost. What happens in such cases? Many times the manufacturer ceases making that particular item, or goes out of business entirely. This does not necessarily mean that the item is no longer manufactured. Sometimes it is made by other manufacturers who have, for some unexplained reason, been given a price higher than that asked by the first manufacturer and for an inferior article.

I quote the following from the eighth intermediate report of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies:

For example, the largest volume low-priced awning manufacturer in the country produced prewar a window awning which retailed in tremendous quantity at $1.59. Manufacturing costs having risen, he required an increase which would have resulted in a retail price of $1.79. Unable to get it, he abandoned that product. A vastly inferior awning of the same size, made by a newcomer to the field, sells at retail for $3.26 with OPA approval.

A large-volume manufacturer of low-priced electric irons was given authority by War Production Board in May 1944 to manufacture 58,000 irons. Application was made to OPA for a price which would permit these irons to be manufactured and retailed at less than $3. Seven months elapsed before any price was granted. The price then granted was not sufficient to cover manufacturing costs. In consequence, these irons were not produced. In contrast, a newcomer to the field was granted permission by OPA to price an inferior and inherently dangerous electric iron to retail at $5.50.

A large-volume manufacturer of home medicine cabinets, whose products wholesaled prewar at 70 cents and $1.50, needed an adjustment to cover increased costs of manufacture. He could not get the adjustment and was forced to discontinue these items. In contrast a newcomer to the field, whose own business had been the manufacture of lamp shades, obtained OPA approval of wholesale prices of $1.30 and $2.30, respectively, for identical medicine cabinets.

Many other similar instances have been called to the attention of various committees of Congress.

In many cases the fixing of prices below cost has been covered up by the payment of subsidies.

It has always been my view that the authorization of subsidies by Congress was meant to apply only to differential or production subsidies. For example, the payment of a subsidy to a high cost copper mine to get the necessary increase in wartime output is no doubt cheaper than to increase the price to all producers alike. But the administration soon embarked upon a program of consumer subsidies. For example, it rolled back the price of butter 5 cents a pound and made up the difference by direct payment from the Federal Treasury. The effect of this was not to increase production but rather to pass on part of the consumers' grocery bill to succeeding generations. Expenditures already made and now contemplated for food subsidies alone will increase the national debt by over $6,000,000,000, or $200 for each family of four in America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

The bill provided that the Price Administrator shall formulate a comprehensive plan for the progressive removal of price controls and subsidies in order to effectuate a return to a free market.

The amendment simply requires the reporting of this plan to Congress not later than October 1, 1946.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

The bill required the President to report to Congress not later than April 1, 1947, a list of commodities determined to be in such short supply as to necessitate continuance of control after June 30, 1947.

This amendment simply changed the date for this report from April 1, 1947, to January 2, 1947.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

The bill provided for removal of price controls on particular commodities as follows:

The President shall determine at least once each month whether the demand for each class of commodity has been satisfied. If he so finds, he shall certify that fact to the Price Administrator who shall then take off the controls.

The amendment directed the removal of price controls as follows:

First. Nonagricultural commodities not represented by an industry advisory committee.

The President shall determine at least once each month whether the production equals the monthly share of production for the 12-month period from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941. If he so finds, he shall certify that fact to the Price Administrator, who shall thereupon remove controls.

Second. Nonagricultural commodities represented by an industry committee.

The same procedure as in the first, except that the committee makes the determination and certifies to the Price Administrator.

Third. Agricultural commodities: The Secretary of Agriculture shall determine whether the supply of a commodity is equal to the demand. If he so certifies, the Price Administrator shall remove the control.

Fourth. When the production of any agricultural commodity for the past 12 months equals the production during the 12-month period from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify such fact to the Price Administrator, who shall lift the controls.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 6 AND 7

The bill provided for progressive reductions of subsidy payments beginning not later than October 1, 1946, and a corresponding adjustment of prices.

The amendment directs a 25-percent reduction in subsidies not later than 45 days after the effective date of the act, and a similar reduction at the end of each 45 days thereafter.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

The bill provided for subsidy payments for meat totaling $715,000,000.

The amendment would eliminate this subsidy payment entirely and adjust meat prices accordingly.

Incidentally, this matter was surveyed at length by the House Agricultural Committee and a recommendation that subsidies on meat be removed was unanimous. The OPA has repeatedly indicated its intention to remove price controls and subsidies on any commodity when the supply became sufficient. In the case of meat that point has been reached. It is admitted that the cattle population is the largest in the history of the country and that the packing plants are able to produce the meat. Nevertheless, many of these plants are operating at about 25 percent of capacity due to inability of the packers to buy cattle at prices which would enable them to sell at the ceilings. The cattle are being bought by black-market operators. It is conservatively estimated that 50 percent of the meat in the country is being sold in the black market and that it is costing purchasers substantially $1,250,000,000 annually.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

The amendment reads as follows:

In the case of any wholesale industry, the principal sales of which consisted during the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, of sales of a commodity or commodities the production or wholesale distribution of which has been reduced for a period of 3 years beginning on or after March 2, 1942, by 75 percent or more below such production or wholesale distribution for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, as the result of the operation of any governmental regulation or restriction, the Administrators shall not in establishing maximum prices under this

section reduce established wholesale trade discount or normal wholesale mark-ups for any such commodity prevailing on March 2, 1942, before the wholesale unit of sales for such commodity for a period of 6 months shall have reached the average annual wholesale unit of sales thereof for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive.

Twenty-two amendments were rejected by the House.

A study of the amendments which were adopted and a comparison of them with the provisions of H. R. 6042 will not substantiate the reckless claims that price control was being emasculated. The amendments were in the interest of increased production. They sought not to terminate controls, but to apply them in a realistic and practical manner having due regard for long established business practices. They laid down a pattern for the gradual tapering off of Government control—the same to be superseded by increased production in a free competitive market.

When the subject of price control was first examined in the House, consideration was given to the Baruch plan which called for a freezing of all elements entering into prices, such as cost of raw material, wages, and so forth. This simple and effective plan was rejected, due largely to the influence of the administration and the CIO. Thereafter the Congress and the country gave full support to the OPA. Congress appropriated vast sums of money, including large sums for enforcement and for subsidies. Patriotic citizens everywhere served on local rationing and price control boards and rendered a valuable service. Drastic controls were necessary because the exigencies of war had turned our vast production from the demands of peace to those of war.

When the war ended, the administration apparently guessed there would be a deflation rather than an inflation. Government economists predicted widespread unemployment. Consequently, we had marches of the CIO on Washington, coordinated with urgent demands from the White House for a full employment bill. All this time, mind you, there was a continuing clamor in the factories and on the farms for help to produce the very goods which would be a bulwark against inflation. A continuation of the Government spending program was advocated, thereby encouraging further idleness and creating more spending money to bid up prices. It was solemnly announced by those in authority that wages could be increased without a corresponding increase of prices. So there were strikes, thus further delaying normal production. Now the worker finds that in spite of the increases, his effective take-home pay is less. And it will grow still less and less until our present unsound policies are abandoned.

The causes of inflation are lack of production and excessive Government spending, which constantly cheapens the buying power of the dollar. High prices are a symptom rather than a cause of inflation. The Administration persists in treating this symptom rather than in removing fundamental causes. The OPA can fix the price of a suit of clothes, but it cannot guarantee that a suit of clothes can be produced at that price. Unfortunately, volumes of statutes and regulations will not repeal the law of supply and demand. We fought a high-priced war and we seem determined now to maintain a high-priced peace. Sometime, somehow, the war must be paid for. It can only be paid by hard work and sacrifice. England is trying to postpone payment by going to a Socialistic economy—insisting that such a course will bring about a more equitable distribution of her wealth. Just how she can distribute something she does not possess will be interesting to see. Of course for a while she may borrow from us. We are trying to postpone the evil day of payment by subsidies, by bonuses, and by Government grants.

Strangely enough all these things have been tried before. Rome and France particularly had experience with the attempt to create prosperity by money from the Government treasury, rather than by producing it the hard way. Impartial historians have recorded the tragic results of these quack remedies. For years we have been running from one patent medicine to another, ignoring the advice and experience of previous generations. It is time to wake up. It may be later than we think.

Speech of Hon. A. J. Sabath, of Illinois, at the Opening Session of the Win-the-Peace Conference

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, who are the men who requested that I lend my name to the Win-the-Peace Conference?

There are some newspapers which aim to belittle and smear those of us in Congress who consented to lend our names to the cause of peace. They have questioned the good faith of those who led the way to meet the humane and world-wide demand for permanent peace. Therefore I feel I should make clear the circumstances of the calling of the conference, and who the individuals were who first approached me.

The Win-the-Peace Conference met in the city of Washington on April 5, 6, and 7. It was praised by most, but criticized by a few. Heat does not necessarily give light, and so much heat was generated that the facts became obscured.

It is my purpose to throw a little light on the whole subject by insertion under leave in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the speech I delivered on Saturday morning, April 6, and other pertinent facts in connection with the conference.

THE PEOPLE WANT PEACE

There is nothing sinister, nothing secret, nothing un-American about the deep desire of the American people, and of the people of all the world, for peace. War is destructive. It is an anachronism in the age of atomic energy, jet planes, and radar. Another world war can and may destroy the world. It certainly will destroy the people, and set civilization back a thousand years.

We won one world war and lost the peace.

The inevitable result was 5 years of death, destruction, starvation, cruelty, rape, and murder in the war against Nazi aggression.

We must not and cannot, Mr. Speaker, allow history to repeat itself. We cannot stand still; we must go forward or we shall go backward.

CRITICS STAND SELF-CONVICTED

Critics of the Win-the-Peace Conference stand self-convicted, if not of sympathy with the Nazi blight, then certainly of opposition to a just and permanent peace for which all humanity can work in common effort.

When I was first approached by representatives to lend the weight of my name to the conference, I made inquiries as to the background of Abbott Simon and Robert T. Leicester, who presented the conference to me.

Robert Leicester is a veteran of 36 months' overseas service with the United States Army Air Forces in Africa and Italy. He was graduated from the Army with the rank of captain. Since his discharge he has established a prosperous private business in New York. That does not sound very un-American.

Abbott Simon entered the Army in 1941. He served in the United States Army 4½ years, and 22 months of that was overseas in the Pacific theater, where he took part in the D-day landings on Leyte and Luzon, and in four campaigns—New Guinea, Bismarck Sea, Leyte, Luzon, and was awarded the Bronze Star medal for meritorious service against the enemy. In that 4½ years he received no efficiency rating less than superior, and in May 1945, he received a direct commission as second lieutenant. He received his promotion to first lieutenant as soon as legally possible. He has received numerous letters of commendation, and is entitled to wear the Combat Infantryman's badge. That does not sound very un-American to me. I need not say much of the man this conference selected as a co-chairman—Col. Evans F. Carlson, leader of the Marine Corps' famed Carlson's Raiders, and one of America's outstanding military heroes—Colonel Carlson's record is known to all of you—he, too, fought for the American way—not with words but with deeds.

SPONSORS WIDELY KNOWN

I was informed that the nucleus of the organization included such well-known figures as Bartley Crum, a San Francisco attorney who was California campaign manager for Wendell Willkie; Jo Davidson, chairman of the Independent Citizens Committee; Bishop Edward Parsons; Bishop Lewis Hartman; Rev. Stephen Fritchman; Rabbi Joseph X. Cohen; Robert Kenney; Julius Emspak; Paul Robeson; and others.

A number of Members of Congress, including myself, consented to the use of our names as sponsors of the conference. A press conference was held in my office to initiate the call to the conference.

Other sponsors were added. Most of them I do not know. I do not believe any group or party dominated the sponsorship, however, nor do I believe that any group or party has a monopoly of civic virtues and love of peace.

The congressional sponsors include Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia; Senator GLEN TAYLOR, of Idaho; myself; and Representatives DOUGLAS, of California; DE LACY, of Washington; OUTLAND, of California; GREEN, of Pennsylvania; POWELL, of New York; CELLER, of New York; GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania; GALLAGHER, of Minnesota; COFFEE and SAVAGE, of Washington; PATTERSON, HEALY, MILLER, and DOYLE, of California; and MARCANTONIO, of New York.

Many public figures—Senators, Representatives, officials, and leaders of organized labor and of liberal opinion—spoke at the conference, which drew more than a thousand delegates from every part of the United States.

I will not burden the RECORD with a list of the speakers, Mr. Speaker, nor with a list of the sponsors. I do insert the full text of my own remarks:

ADDRESS BY HON. A. J. SABATH AT THE WIN-THE-PEACE CONFERENCE, SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1946

Introduction by Chairman Russell Nixon. It is a very special privilege for all of us to be able to listen this morning to that symbol of American freedom, American democracy, of American determination to win the peace, Congressman SABATH.

[The audience rose and applauded.]

Congressman SABATH. Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, I am inclined to admit the charges made against me here by the chairman of this meeting. I am even willing, if pressed, to admit the good things he has said. Frequently I receive more credit than I am really entitled to. Whatever I have done in Congress, and in my life, and in my 40 years of service in Congress, I have always felt I was only performing my duty, as I saw it, to my people, and above all else to my country.

I shall not detain you with a long speech. I am, of course, immensely pleased to be here, and to see that so many have taken strong interest in this great cause.

I wish I could deliver a speech that would do justice to the subject, as could the outstanding American who preceded me; but I have been informed that you heard many excellent speeches last night, and therefore you will be able to stand one not so good. You are here for work, and I shall not keep you long from that work.

Mr. Chairman, my fellow Americans, this is not the first time I have been in the fight for peace. After his first return from Europe President Wilson called for a conference of Members of the House and Senate Committees on Foreign Affairs, of which I had the honor to be one, and I am the only one remaining in Congress. Even before his report on the League of Nations, I had become a strong advocate of the League of Nations and urged continuously, to the best of my ability, that our country should become a member of that great institution; and ever since that time, as one who has been opposed to wars from my childhood, I have urged peace, which means contentment and prosperity for all.

All the Members of the two Committees on Foreign Affairs of the House and Senate favored the League of Nations, with the exception of Senator Lodge, and even then I realized that his reason for opposing the League was not a just one. Shortly thereafter, the Republicans started violent opposition to the League of Nations, and they succeeded in destroying it.

SAME FORCES OPPOSE WORLD PEACE AND ORGANIZATION

It seems to me that those same forces and ideologies which were responsible for defeat of United States participation in the League, and who thus killed the League as an effective world organization, are now, unfortunately, trying to emulate the same regrettable action. Knowing, as we all do, that after each war the nations sit down at a conference table to try to arrange a peace, I feel that now it should be done before the war, and before the killing and the maiming and the suffering of millions upon millions.

As I stated, all my life I have been opposed to war, and naturally I have advocated at all times the peaceful adjustment of any and all differences that may develop between nations. Consequently, when I was informed that an organization was being formed to win the peace, I consented to cooperate.

Before and during the war, I supported with all my heart the policies of the great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt [applause], first to avoid war and later to win it. After winning, at such great sacrifice of life and property, a war that brought about such terrible want, misery, and starvation, I feel that the price was too great to permit some people to defeat the hopes and prayers of people who are advocating, yes, even praying, that a permanent peace may be brought about; and I shall continue, with all my strength and with all the influence that I possess, to advocate and urge and support every effort that is being made to win the peace. [Applause.]

It is unfortunate that we have in our midst men who, through reckless statements and charges, create prejudices in the American people which may even affect the stability of United Nations. They are the men who, even during the war, talked and acted as if we were at war with Russia rather than with Germany and Japan.

My colleague, Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, as is his custom, and like some reactionary writers, has charged that some of the officers of this organization once belonged to left-wing or Communist-influenced organizations. To him, unfortunately, every one who disagrees with his views is a Communist.

For my part, it seemed to me rather that those who had fought to win the war were now fighting to win the peace.

I will say that no one can or should charge that these men, after the great service they have rendered to our country, are not true and loyal Americans. [Applause.] I know they have rendered greater service than many of those who attack them and assail them, and I wish to God we had more men who had served our Nation as well as they have to assist in winning the war and now in endeavoring to bring about a permanent and lasting peace, which the mothers of this country are praying for and dreaming of. I hope that every loyal American will do his share to bring about such a peace so that the fear of war will be eliminated from the minds and the hearts of all. [Applause.]

You have read and heard a great deal about why this organization has been formed and the need for such an organization. These men who started it and who are devoting all of their time to this noble cause, instead of being criticized, should be acclaimed as performing a great service to our country.

Now, in conclusion, let me say this, my friends: I myself am sometimes charged as being a little too much to the left, and sometimes they think I am too close to the so-called pinks. Well, I am not connected with any other organization than the one of which I have been a member for so many years; I am a progressive and an aggressive Democrat [applause]; I have supported all progressive candidates for President, Governors of various States, and for other offices; and I have refused to support men, even on the Democratic ticket, if they were not loyal Americans, progressive, and did not have the interest of the common people at heart.

I think our country is the most wonderful country in the world. Not only do I think so; I know it is the most wonderful country in the world. Only an America under a democratic form of government, such as we have, makes it possible for you to be here and give expression to your views. That freedom is not enjoyed by people of other lands.

You have heard the chairman state that I have been in Congress for 40 years. Yes, I came here as a boy from across the sea at the age of 15. Tell me of any other country that would make possible the things America has made possible for me. Could I, would I, be a man if I did not show my appreciation to such a great country?

I have, to the best of my ability, tried to build up and strengthen our democratic form of government, and that shall be my aim as long as I am capable of serving. As long as I continue to be in public office, I shall continue, as I have in the past, to safeguard the interests of America and the people who deserve aid and assistance, those underprivileged and underpaid workers of America. [Applause.]

Notwithstanding that I have been attacked and criticized, I am appreciative that those who have been and are instrumental in advocating the cause of permanent peace have called on me to join the movement. I hope that all honest, sincere, loyal American people who have the best interests of our country at heart will realize that the movement is nothing more and nothing less than an aid to prevent another world war.

Most of you know that there are forces in the United States who will continue, as they have in the past, to talk and act in a way that had endangered us and created a condition that might involve us in another world war. That cannot be permitted, and I call upon all the men and women who are real Americans to continue their efforts and increase their activity to bring about and make sure and positive a lasting peace and preclude the horror of any future war.

With that, I thank you for the privilege of being able to cooperate with you and wish you success. I hope that we will never again, for centuries and centuries, be visited with the horror of war, and that your work will be an aid to permanent peace.

I thank you. [Applause.]

DECLARATIONS OF PRINCIPLES MAKE GOOD SENSE

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to add to what I have said a brief word about the declaration of principles adopted by the Win-the-Peace Conference. I ask you and the Members to read it through, and find, if you can, any subversion, or any favoritism to any foreign country. To me, this declaration makes good sense. Put into practical action as a broad guide for American policy, it could and should prevent any more outpourings of our life's blood in defense of the democratic way of life—of the American way of life.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES ADOPTED BY WIN-THE-PEACE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 5, 6, 7, 1946

We are met to win the peace. We are met to create a pattern for action to that end. It is proper, therefore, that we should indicate those basic principles to which we are all subscribed—that we should make clear the signposts of action which will mark the road we shall travel together.

Franklin Roosevelt looked to the future with confidence, seeing a world free from the scourge and terror of war for many generations. The Anglo-American-Soviet coalition

he helped to shape has defeated fascism in battle. The peace he did not live to see is here. But already this war-racked generation is threatened with the scourge and terror of a third world war, preparation for which is well advanced.

The tree of liberty needs only the sunshine of peace to make it flower; it has been watered with enough blood.

The little group of willful men who conspire against the world's peace and the Nation's security think not of freedom, though they take its name in vain. Their dreams are of empire and world domination. They are the economic royalists, the old enemies of peace to whom Roosevelt gave battle more than once.

It is they who are sowing division among the victorious Allies. They mount guard over the growing stock pile of atom bombs, seeking to keep atomic energy as the weapon of their private diplomacy and to bar its use in the service of mankind.

Their press beats the drums for war against the Soviet Union. Their congressional spokesmen, on both sides of the aisle, urge that the United States renege on the commitments made at Yalta, Potsdam, and Moscow.

These economic royalists are not without influence in high places. Unless they are soon curbed, they will sacrifice American democracy on the altar of their lust to rule the world, and lead the Nation to suicidal war.

The people of the United States are sovereign in this land, and their will is firm for peace. President Roosevelt, who led the Nation to victory in the anti-Fascist war, charted the road to just and enduring peace. His policy of Big Three unity was and is the policy of the American people.

These, our principles, are a restatement of that policy for which our sons fought and died, to which our whole Nation is pledged, and to whose practice the American people will win our Government's assent.

A democratic American foreign policy can stop a third world war.

The friendship and unity of all the United Nations is the guaranty of peace.

The unity of the Big Three is paramount, and must be restored on the basis of the Yalta, Potsdam, and Moscow agreements. Friendship with both the Soviet Union and Great Britain is vital to the American interest and indispensable to the effective working of the United Nations Organization.

War threatens wherever fascism remains. Its last vestige must be destroyed.

A Security Council which lives by the unity principle is the only trustworthy custodian of atomic energy and of every atom bomb.

The colonial peoples everywhere, and the new democracies of Europe, shall be permitted to exercise their right of self-government without outside interference.

American troops must be withdrawn from the United Nations and all friendly lands, that the peoples of those lands may achieve democracy and unity.

The disrupters of Big Three unity, the pro-Fascists and the power-mad who are preparing a third world war, must be driven from public life.

An America which pursues this democratic foreign policy provides full employment, respects the rights of labor, gives first-class citizenship to the Negro, and outlaws anti-Semitism and all forms of race discrimination, will not covet the territory nor provoke the enmity of any other nation. It will have no need for a large standing army.

These are our principles. Our purpose is organized action to assure that they are put in practice. We call on all Americans whose hearts are turned to peace—the working men and women, the veterans of World War II, the young sons who prepare for useful life in a nation at peace, the mothers and wives whose love is a force for peace—to join with us in common cause. Together we can and will prevent a third world war.

Regulation and Control of Bank Holding Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter which I have received from Hon. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and a statement in regard to a bill which I have introduced this day to provide for the regulation and control of bank holding companies and for other purposes:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, April 23, 1946.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: On March 26, 1945, and at the request of the Board, you introduced a bill (H. R. 2776) to strengthen and to make effective the powers which the Congress vested in the Board in 1933 dealing with bank holding companies. Since this bill was introduced the Board has received numerous expressions of opinion concerning it from representatives of banks and bank holding companies, as well as from Government officials engaged in other bank supervisory activities. In the light of these many expressions of opinion, the Board has concluded that, in order to deal effectively with the problem, it is not necessary for the proposed legislation to be as sweeping in its terms as is H. R. 2776, nor is it necessary to "freeze" existing bank holding companies at their present size or prevent the creation of new ones.

Accordingly, the Board has prepared a revised and much more simplified draft of a bill with the intention that it be substituted for that previously introduced by you. The Board has asked that I deliver a copy of this draft to you for your consideration, with the hope that you will offer it as a substitute for H. R. 2776. It is enclosed herewith. The Board will be glad to respond to any request for further information and to assist you and your committee in any appropriate way.

There is also enclosed a statement concerning the revised bill which may be helpful to you if and when you offer it in substitution for H. R. 2776.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES,
Chairman.

STATEMENT CONCERNING REVISED LEGISLATION AFFECTING BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

On March 26, 1945, a bill to regulate and control bank holding companies, which had been prepared under the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was introduced in the Congress by Senator WAGNER (S. 792) and Congressman SPENCE (H. R. 2776), chairman of the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and House, respectively. In introducing the proposed legislation both Senator WAGNER and Congressman SPENCE explained to the Congress that the bill had been drafted in the light of the Board's experience in administering the totally ineffective provisions of the Banking Act of 1933 dealing with bank holding companies, and to supply the framework of legislation recommended by the Board in its Annual Report to Congress in 1943.

Since this bill was introduced, the Board received numerous expressions of opinion concerning the bill by representatives of the banks and bank holding companies, as well as by Government officials engaged in other bank supervisory activities. After considering fully these many expressions of opinion, and particularly those which suggested certain revisions of the bill, the Board concluded that, to accomplish its fundamental objectives in respect of the holding company situation generally, it is not necessary for the proposed legislation to be as all-inclusive as it is in its present form, nor is it necessary to "freeze" existing bank holding companies at their present size or prevent the creation of new ones. Accordingly, the Board has prepared a revised and streamlined version of its original bill and it is offered as a substitute for S. 792 and H. R. 2776.

In its revised bill the Board has recommended that Congress treat bank holding companies in much the same manner as it has dealt with banks themselves. It recognizes that bank holding companies, if limited solely to managing, operating, and controlling banks and placed under appropriate governmental supervision, including control over their creation and expansion, are and can be legitimate and efficient forms of banking enterprise.

The bill as revised, therefore, like that now before the Congress, requires all bank holding companies to register with the Board; to supply the Board with such relevant information as may be required from time to time in order to disclose fully their relations with their subsidiary banks; to divorce themselves from all nonbanking subsidiaries; to submit to examinations from time to time; and to obey such rules, regulations, and orders as the Board may make as being necessary for the protection of investors or depositors. In addition, however, the bill authorizes the Board to permit new bank holding companies to come into existence and to permit expansion of existing bank holding companies through acquisitions of stock or assets of banks if it finds that such a result would not be detrimental to the public interest.

As in S. 792 and H. R. 2776 the revised bill would prohibit upstream loans and intercompany sales of securities, except as they may be authorized under certain conditions by the Board. It would prohibit bank holding companies from exacting exorbitant or unreasonable managerial fees from the banks they control. Penalties are set up as well as means of enforcement; but there are also appropriate provisions for court review of all orders which the Board may be authorized to issue. Finally, the Board would be required to report back to the Congress before the expiration of 5 years the results of its administration of this act.

Clearing the Fog on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, after observing the flood of propaganda about crippling amendments and emasculating the OPA, it is gratifying to read the attached editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Waterloo Daily Courier, of Waterloo, Iowa. In all the voluminous debate on this subject, I have

not read a clearer statement of the real issues involved.

The editorial is as follows:

CLEARING THE FOG ON OPA

Concentrated propaganda is being directed at the American public by both sides in the controversy over alteration of the OPA. Charges are so extreme and the amount of common ground so small that the public tends to make its decision on the basis of emotion and prejudice rather than fact.

Polls have shown that the great majority of the people favor a continuation of OPA. Naturally. No consumer is going to say that he wants price increases. And most observers who try to disassociate their thinking from any sympathies they have with either consumer or manufacturing groups likewise believe that continuation of modified price control for another 9 months or a year is desirable.

But Government propagandists are attempting to exploit and mislead the public, playing on the natural desire of consumers to avoid price increases. They are encouraging the development of unsound and irresponsible ideas on the part of the unthinking consumer. It is similar to a broad breakdown in realistic thinking in other fields of politics.

When someone, for instance, proposes spending a few more billions on lunches for school children or beautiful hospitals in every county, everybody says what a wonderful idea it is, the pressure groups whoop it up, and anybody who opposes the idea is classed as a bad, old reactionary who wants to see children go hungry and the sick go unattended.

Then when Congress considers a tax bill to pay for these wonderful things, everybody howls to high heaven, complains about burdening the unfortunate "common man" with taxes, and threatens to vote against any legislator who wants to increase taxes. So the country issues some more bonds, the debt goes on skyrocketing, and temporarily the public thinks it is getting a lot for nothing.

So it is with the OPA. When wage increases are proposed, everybody thinks how nice it would be to have workers making high wages and the Administration, fearing to take the political consequences of opposition, forces the employer to grant these increases.

Then, after costs have climbed rapidly, the public demands that prices be held down by OPA regardless of the increased costs. To hear some of the advocates of stricter price control talk, one would think that the only factor working for higher prices is the demands of greedy businessmen for exorbitant profits. It is the old story of "kidding" the public into believing it can get something for nothing. If it is possible to increase wages 20 percent and hold down prices by OPA, why stop there? Why not increase wages 300 percent?

These things sound complicated; but common sense has not been repealed by Government regulation. The Nation cannot lift itself into prosperity by a process of lavish spending without taxation and cost-increasing wage boosts without compensating price raises. And because this process does bring a temporary and phony prosperity, the public is all too inclined to believe that the irresponsible policies advocated by certain politicians will work over the long run. Having our cake and thinking we can eat it, too, has become a national habit.

So the OPA propagandists are telling the country that the issue of price control is a contest between the greedy businessman and the beneficent Government which wants to control exorbitant profits. But it is significant that this same Government, faced with a break-down in production, is today gradually raising the general price level to parallel increased costs. Yet the men who advocated this identical policy a few months ago were branded predatory capitalists who didn't know the facts of economics.

Now the target of Government propaganda is the individual who would defend the amendments which the House of Representatives has written into the Price Control Act. These amendments were designed to eliminate the illegal, unfair, uneconomic, and unrealistic policies of the OPA.

Take, for example, a single OPA policy. Clothespins of like quality, the consumer will agree, should have like price ceilings regardless of who manufactures them. But that has not happened. The OPA imposes one ceiling (for this grade) on a manufacturer who was in business before the war and grants another, much higher ceiling based on actual costs and a reasonable profit for a manufacturer who recently entered the field. If the established manufacturer complains that this would force him to operate at a loss, the OPA says that is too bad but he can afford to take a loss. So the new manufacturer takes over the field and the public has to pay higher prices which the old manufacturer would be contented to receive. And a scarcity results because the full productive capacity of the country is not being utilized.

This is an example of the kind of abuse that the House of Representatives voted to eliminate when it imposed certain restrictions on the OPA. These will no more cripple the agency in the performance of its legitimate functions than a provision that a physician must have a license to practice medicine hampers him in the performance of his duties. Congress has the task of prescribing the rules under which a Federal agency shall function. A perversion of the democratic process results when the chief of that agency changes from an administrator of congressional laws to a professional propagandist and lobbyist and launches a Nation-wide campaign to discredit Congress for doing what it thinks is best.

Let us continue price control; but let us grant to Congress the right to set up the fair rules under which the agency shall operate. And let us not be misled into chaos by the attractive but unsound theory that we can spend without taxing and that we can go on granting wage increases without suffering an increase in prices.

Keeping the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, just as a simple proposition of keeping the record straight, I am still wondering what the answer is to the question as to what kind of a foreign policy, if any, we have in this country. Last Thursday there was a news item which many may have overlooked but which gives a lot of food for thought. I quote from the Duluth Herald for Thursday, April 25, as follows:

RUSSIAN REMOVALS PUT AT HALF BILLION

NANKING.—American mining experts estimated on arrival from Manchuria today that the Russians have removed at least $500,000,000 worth of machinery.

The experts said it would take at least 2 years for China to replace the machinery. They represent an internationally known firm which serves many nations and have been surveying mineral needs for the Chinese National Resources Commission.

Now, the above news item ought not require much comment. To my mind it describes an act of highway robbery and I do not think any other designation would be accurate. This may be a sample of the four freedoms or some other idealistic tommyrot that has been fed to the American people for a long time, but I am putting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the "do gooders" can be helped to keep the record straight. They can be better able to tell the people what the late World War was all about.

In the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., for Saturday, April 27, I find this news item:

REDS REJECT OUR NOTE ON MANCHU LOOT—NOT UNITED STATES BUSINESS, THEY BLUNTLY REPLY

The State Department confirmed last night that Russia has rejected in blunt terms an American protest against the Soviet seizure of Japanese industrial equipment in Manchuria.

Acting Secretary of State Acheson told a press conference the Soviet reply failed completely to meet the objections raised by this Government to the industrial "looting."

CLAIM LEGITIMATE BOOTY

Informed sources said the Russians contended their actions in Manchuria were no concern of the United States and that the confiscated Japanese assets were legitimate war booty.

Acheson said the Soviet note was unsatisfactory and failed to advance the situation at all.

In this connection it is interesting to note that Joe Stalin, through his spokesmen, has been accusing General MacArthur of stealing everything he could get in Japan. Of course, General MacArthur has very outspokenly said that was not true. The suggestion, of course, has been made that the diplomats of Russia think that by accusing General MacArthur of misdeeds they can cover up their own acts of perfidy. I do not like this kind of politeness.

The ugly facts are that the rulers of Russia are marching forward in their planned designs of plunder, deceit, and treachery and conquest. I say this because I was extremely nauseated the other night when one of the radio commentators kept repeating a lot of nonsensical notions to the effect that all we had to do was to trust Joe Stalin. In my opinion, the commentator should have his head examined. He needs it badly.

FATE OF FINLAND

In passing, let me say that I had a letter the other day in which my friend told me of the humanitarian activities of Russia in Finland. Of course, this is just a bit of irony, because Russia is busy looting Finland, and the Finnish people do not dare say a word about it. This letter told of the Finnish people last winter cutting firewood and otherwise getting ready for the rigors of winter. They did that because no other procedure was available, and they laid in their fuel supply before zero weather came. Along came the Russians and confiscated all of it and forced these people, in the dead of winter, to struggle to get firewood to keep from freezing. Does our Government approve of this? What is it doing about it? This incident is only one of

hundreds which illustrates the despotical, tyrannical, and inhuman policy which is followed by the rulers of Russia.

RUSSIAN OCCUPATION IN CONQUERED GERMANY

I need only remind you of the newspaper and radio statements recently made that from 2,000 to 4,000 die each week amid "horror" conditions in camps in the Russian occupation zone of Germany. According to the newspaper items, the eastern half of the Russian zone has been plundered and the Russians did not even leave seed to be planted for the purpose of raising crops for the coming year. Does our country condone that sort of brutality? Is that part of our foreign policy? Was that a part of the program to follow the winning of World War II?

The time has long since passed when this country should take a definite position on acts of this kind. These people who talk learnedly and who think they are learned and who have the answer to every question may well turn their attention, either on the radio or in the commentators' columns, to facts such as I have set forth herein. This brief description does not exhaust the list of crimes with which the rulers of Russia stand charged before the bar of world opinion. What answer does the administration in control at Washington have to make to these facts?

The OPA Swindle

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the OPA has not "held the line."

It has contributed to inflation.

It has added to the cost of the necessities of life.

It has created black markets.

It has taken billions from the pockets of the taxpayers to be used as subsidies to conceal the fraud as to the prices actually paid by consumers.

Its system of "queuing"—standing in line—has robbed millions of persons of their time, the value of which if added to the OPA prices would amount to several billions of dollars lost to consumers each year.

It has forced the manufacture of shoddy, inferior goods and compelled them to be sold upon the market, thus driving legitimate manufacturers out of business and in so doing has cheated and robbed the consumers of both quality and price.

The OPA has prevented the construction of houses for veterans and others by driving private enterprise from the field of operation.

The tie-in sales regulation which requires the purchaser to take another product not wanted at a price above its free market price has added to the cost of things wanted by consumers, thus committing a bare-faced fraud upon the consumers.

The OPA prattle about sugar selling at 7 cents a pound at retail is another piece of deception when analyzed. This low price discouraged production. Notwithstanding large subsidy payments from taxpayers' pockets, beet-sugar production in this country declined every year from 1941 to 1944, a loss of at least half our normal production. Consumers turned to substitutes. The retail price of seven common sugar substitutes, including sirup and honey, averaged four times that of the sugar equivalent.

The OPA forced upgrading, another fraud perpetrated upon the public. Thus by sewing some metal gadget on a standard style of dress its selling price became a $4.98 model instead of $2.98, the price for which it sold before OPA meddling.

The price-control agency demanded a lowering of quality, as for instance the butterfat content of milk, the dilution of ice cream, and inducing the makers of sausage to use cereal and water in place of meat.

OPA has ushered in an era of law violation, black markets, adulteration of foods, inferior goods, a lower standard of living, and a totalitarian system of legalized deception foreign to a system of individual freedom, a free market, and full production.

Under leave to extend I am inserting a letter from Mr. Gabriel S. Kaye, president of the Credit Checker:

THE CREDIT CHECKER,
New York, N. Y., April 24, 1946.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The composite picture from employers, employees of our varied mills, plants, converters, and dealers' firms shows satisfaction with the action taken by the House—that an end to the OPA business is in sight within the next 9 months.

Industry cannot function with the feeling that by some method the OPA is to become a permanent fixture in our Government.

The "pressure campaign" foisted by Chester Bowles, Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell, the PM to get the citizens to write, phone, or wire you will no doubt react as a boomerang.

You have received factual data and letters from your business constituents. You know personally many cases—first hand—how CPA works. Facts cannot be brushed aside once you know them.

Industry has been called many unsportsmanlike names by Chester Bowles and those few officials that would like to perpetuate the unbusinesslike 60,000 regulations permanently upon our American economy. Think of the countless paper, print, postage, talent all at our Government expense that OPA is spending to keep itself in power.

The sensational OPA sponsored propaganda endeavoring to compare the Chinese scarcity and its resultant inflation to the situation in our United States is beyond any idea of honest official sincere endeavor for the American citizens.

To combat the Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell radio listeners' pressure on you—to get the people that are not in business—that do not have to read and live up to the 60,000 OPA regulations is certainly contrary to the best interests of our national economy.

As distasteful as the action of Chester Bowles and the mentioned radio commentators and the newspaper is to you and us, we must call attention, that whenever industry has become factual with you—immediately a hue and cry went up that you were being attacked by industry pressure groups.

We ask you, can Mr. Bowles, Drew Pearson, or Walter Winchell (he just bragged about paying $280,000 income tax) operate at 7½ percent of $100,000 annual business and pay overhead of 9 to 12 percent and be law abiding? Could they work on 15-percent markup but absorb a 15-percent rise in a basic part of the goods to be converted? Could they manufacture goods in competition with firms that have a cut-back arrangement with supply sources? Note please:

"By the Associated Press, Philadelphia, April 23, William H. Chestnut, Pennsylvania's secretary of labor and industry, said today it is high time workers get meat, butter, shirts, and a home without 21,000 pages of OPA regulations telling them they can't. Mr. Chestnut, in a prepared radio address, said production is the key to prosperity because it gives workers jobs, but 'how can industry produce when its machinery is clogged with 21,000 pages of don'ts.' "

We wish to repeat: Cost absorbing plans do not work—make for temptation of doing business with a total disregard for all regulations. Cost absorption plans preclude honest dealings. Inequalities of merchandise price make for substandard goods. Tie-in abuses cannot be avoided in a strangulated production.

Illustrations:

Plastic patent leather was introduced and priced first as a substitute for genuine leather at 44 cents per foot. Only a few were in the game. Just as soon as many entered the plastic field a better product than was first brought out sold through the competitive method at 31 cents per foot. Competition always levels off prices.

Plastics printed in box calf, alligator, lizard, pin morocco, pin grain first sold at 32 cents—competition of newcomers brought the price down quickly to 20 cents. Some lighter makes that first sold at 28 cents sell now at 14 cents.

Prices come down when many enter the field. Open competition is good for our national economy.

Without benefit of price control—the hens got busy this last season and laid a plentiful amount of eggs—prices dropped from 63 cents to 42 cents—OPA did not do this—nature did it.

Continued OPA controls make for shortages.

Shortages make for black markets.

But production makes for plenty of supplies.

Plenty of supplies make for competitive markets.

Competitive markets make for reasonable prices.

Removal of price controls means production.

Production makes for jobs.

You of course know our sentiments—we do not include rentals—because the lifting of rent controls will not make places to live or work. We must build more homes.

We rest our case for American free enterprise with you. This is your country as well as ours—if everyone is productive our country remains the best place to live, work, and play.

"God bless America—always."

Most sincerely yours,

GABRIEL S. KAYE,
Editor.

Justice to Armenia and Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to draw attention to the necessity of righting two ancient wrongs, the

righting of wrongs which is so essential to the maintenance of the peace of the world, I have written a letter to the President of the United States to direct his attention to and to invoke the aid of his high office in the search for a solution of the yet-unsolved problems of Greece and of Armenia.

As I have in this communication stated the case for each of these countries, both faithful allies of ours in World War I and World War II, as succinctly as I could, and have recited facts which should also be called to the attention of the Congress and of the country, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Chief Executive may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to the President to which I have just referred is the following:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As there are two great questions of an international nature in which I am most deeply interested, that is, in the reuniting of the traditional territories of ancient Armenia in a single governmental agency of their own choosing, and in the return to Greece of all of the neighboring territories in which the population is predominatingly Hellenic, I am constrained to address you in the hope that, by calling your attention to these two Middle Eastern and yet unsolved problems, the influence of the Government of the United States might in some way be brought to bear, through the United Nations or among the countries whose interests are involved, to the end that the so long unsatisfied aspirations of these two great peoples may be achieved within a reasonable time.

In regard to Greece: In view of the incomparable contribution of the people of this nationality to our dearly purchased victories of World War I and World War II, the unwavering devotion to the Allied cause of their sons and daughters, wherever they chanced to reside or at whatever corner of the earth to which they may have roamed, simple justice requires that the adjacent islands and contiguous territories in which the population is predominatingly Greek, be returned to the mother country in the peace settlements which, it is understood, are now being formulated.

Whatever is to be done should include the cession to Greece of northern Epirus and the Dodecanese Islands, and the rectification of the Bulgarian boundary line, the latter to improve the defensive capacity of this heroic ally of ours.

To do less than this would not fall far short of a betrayal of those Greek patriots who, in the war, fought, bled, and died in the cause which was as much ours as theirs.

About the Armenians: In view of the fact that the now Turkish Vilayets of Erzeroum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitalis are traditionally a part of the ancient Armenian homeland, sections from which the Turks as late as 1917 drove the native Armenian population at the point of the sword, the peace of the world will never be secure nor will a great wrong done to a great people ever be righted until these provinces are detached from Turkey and are reincorporated in the ancient motherland of this long-suffering people.

If a permanent peace of justice is to follow in the wake of the signing of the peace treaties which the world awaits with mixed hopes and fears, nothing short of the return of these provinces to the Armenian Socialist Soviet Republic will serve those ends so devoutly to be wished for, a culmination which will not only accomplish the reconstruction of an ancient nation wantonly destroyed by a ruthless aggressor but will make possible the return to the land of their birth and of their childhood memories of hundreds of thousands of the Armenian people who at this moment roam the world all but forgotten, and, what is sadder still, all but forsaken.

As I am completely convinced, my dear Mr. President, that these two great questions, involving, as they do, simple justice for two great peoples who have every claim to our sympathetic consideration, one which we can hardly with comfort disregard, must be solved and solved without delay if the peace and security of the world is to be served, I urge upon you with all of the intentness of a conviction derived from mature meditation upon the subject over a long period of time, the adoption of each of them as a cardinal principle in our American foreign policy.

Since I feel quite certain that if it should become known throughout the world that the reuniting of the Greek and Armenian peoples, each under a flag of their own choosing, were diplomatic objectives of the American Government, the realization of these aspirations would not be long delayed. Of this, I am quite certain.

Trusting that I am not imposing in writing to you in this informal fashion in respect to these two great international questions in which I find myself so deeply interested, I beg to remain, my dear Mr. President, with every good wish for your continued success,

Faithfully and sincerely yours,
BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
Member of Congress.

The Washington Hospital Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it appears highly important that the entire Congress know the true situation in reference to Washington hospitals, whenever the measures dealing with the District of Columbia are before us. Congress has the responsibility for the government of the District of Columbia and I am sure that if the hospital condition is as bad as it is sometimes reported, that it is not the intent of any Congressman to have it so. I do not think the committees of Congress are to blame. Full information has not been given them. I wish to extend my remarks by including an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, April 21, written by Mrs. Helen McEntyre.

THREE WEEKS SPENT IN GALLINGER WERE NIGHTMARE, SAYS REPORTER

(By Helen McEntyre)

That 267 premature babies died needlessly at Gallinger Hospital because there were not enough nurses to care for them is no surprise to me.

I spent 3 weeks of nightmare in that hospital's isolation building recently as a patient. A mother myself, I saw things that would turn any mother's hair white.

I sincerely believe that other children with the bad luck to be committed to Gallinger may also die because of things like these:

A child patient, suspected of the dread meningitis, is permitted to wander in and out of isolation rooms among scarlet fever and measles patients.

An actual meningitis patient lets a 4-year-old tubercular drink from his cup, then takes a swallow himself.

Young scarlet-fever patients, facing possible permanent injury to heart or kidneys, jump about and climb in and out of cribs, though distraught nurses have ordered them to remain quiet.

Sick children go wading with bare feet in water spilled on the cold floors.

I saw these things happen. And they cannot be blamed on the overworked nurses. There are just not enough nurses to go around. They do what they can.

I saw a newly admitted 3-year-old boy, a possible scarlet fever or measles case, walk up and down the chilly corridors barefooted, in a little, backless nightshirt. For half-an-hour he sobbed for his coat, hat, and shoes so "I can go see my mamma." The corridor where he walked was used by visitors, any of whom might have carried his sickness into their homes.

Children and adults with raging fevers often lie for 12 hours at a stretch without a glass of water or other needed services in this isolation building.

Most shocking to me was a 9-month-old baby trying to feed herself meat that had not even been cut. She managed to get a little dessert in her mouth and a few swallows of milk. Her food was smeared in her hair and over the bed. Would this bit of nourishment give her body strength to heal infected burns?

Sick-room equipment at Gallinger includes dangerous playthings for unwatched youngsters. Little boys practice pitching heavy enamelware water mugs. They crash delightfully on the hard floors, but adult patients are frantic, listening for the tinkle of glass from nearby windows. They listen, too, for the cry of pain that means a cut from flying glass.

Nurses are harassed by calls from adults when medications are long overdue. But—does a child ever remind anyone to give him his medicine?

Boys of 2 and 3 years are left alone for hours at a time, day and night. What mother would allow this?

Often no one is even within call, for children up and down the hall, morning and night, are calling "Nurse! Nurse!"

Horrifying, shocking? I hope so. I hope these things will shock Congress into giving the city hospital the nurses it has promised. Or will there be more unnecessary infant deaths?

Unification of Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. on last Friday evening, April 26, on the subject Unification of Our Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last Sunday a P-80 Army fighter flew from New York to Washington, 250 miles in 29

minutes. Think of it! Twenty-nine minutes! When I first heard of this I asked myself: "How far do I live from my office?" There is no longer a simple answer to this simple question. I live 10 miles away. It takes me half an hour to drive it—yet New York is now less than half an hour away.

This revolution in time and space affects every one of us much more deeply than a mere question of personal travel time. It lies at the very heart of the whole question of unification of our armed forces. Anyone who understands this fully is bound to agree on the urgency of action to unify our armed forces now. This same revolution in space and time has outdated even World War II concepts of warfare. Kansas City may well be the Pearl Harbor of tomorrow with the atom bomb taking the place of the torpedo. If a 1941 Zero raid can sink a fleet, what cannot an atomic attack of 1961 do to our vital resources at home?

Make no mistake. There is no military expert in the world who does not agree that our home resources, the source of our potential strength, which has twice saved the world must be knocked out first by any would-be world conqueror.

Our frontier is now a global one of air, land, and sea. It must be defended by a single cohesive unified armed force capable of striking back at any time, at any place, in any element.

Our present permanent statutory military organization is absolutely incapable of doing this job.

A full realization of this fact by the late war President caused him to institute action over 2 years ago looking to true unification of our armed forces as soon as the pressure of shooting-war should cease. This could not be done during the war because there simply was no time to take out to reorganize. Unification was obtained by makeshift to a degree sufficient to win World War II. The most unified, cohesive, efficient combination of armed forces of all elements will win any future war in its earliest stages. Unless we possess that combination we will be the first victims.

We did not win World War II with the old form of separate military organizations of land and sea to which some would now have us return. We had to discard the old system of a separate Army and a separate Navy and adopt unified command over the three arms, land, sea, and air. In every theater of operations we were compelled to set up one commander over all the fighting forces. But this was action born of necessity. Here at home we were forced to improvise by means of agreements reached only after needless hours lost in tedious debate. We suffered the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor. We lost precious time that meant loss in money and in lives. We had to wait while coordinators tried, often unsuccessfully, to coordinate the coordinators. At the war's close we were still appointing coordinators. We were still attempting to substitute a bureaucratic piling up of boards for true unity of command. We won in spite of these handicaps—but at what a cost.

There is not one consideration which forced us to adopt unified command for the actual conduct of the fighting in the field in World War II that does not compel the acceptance of over-all administration of our armed forces here at home for efficient preparedness and for national defense. We cannot have teamwork and effective unity down the line if we have separation at the top. We cannot fight as a unit if we are not directed as a unit. We cannot direct unified action unless we have a single and direct authority. Boards composed of representatives of contending services cannot direct because they often cannot agree.

In the winning of the past war we willingly spent nearly $300,000,000,000—almost without question. But now that we are at peace the American people will demand and are entitled to count the cost—to have the best for each dollar they spend. I, for one, will not ask them to continue to pay for duplications and waste. Overlapping facilities, duplicating activities and installations just aren't sound business. We all know that two hospitals, two air fields, two systems of supply and procurement, two air transport services are more expensive than would be one of each doing the same job.

To insure that the horrible waste and delays of World War II need never again be repeated, the President has asked the Congress to pass unification legislation and has urged the people of the country to support it as the underlying basis for the whole postwar plan for national security.

This proposal has not been unopposed. History has shown conclusively that every effort to consolidate Government departments to increase efficiency and economy has always run head-on into bureaucratic self-interest in direct opposition to the Nation's interest. This is no exception. It is up to the American people and the American Congress to insure that departmental self-interest does not kill unification, either by delay or by befogging the real issue. Opponents of unification are playing on the very natural tendency of all of us to turn away from anything remotely connected with war. They are urging us to stall with the hope that we will eventually drop the whole matter. This would be a tragic error.

This country has had to fight for its life twice in a single generation—because we "let the matter drop." You all know—every American family knows—to its bitter sorrow—what this has meant in bloody sacrifice. The national defense is no longer a matter which we can forget between wars. We must act now. This may well be our last chance.

The Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, has thoroughly explored unification of our armed forces under a single department. After examination of several previous studies which have been made available to the committee, and after listening to many witnesses representing the viewpoints of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, business, industry, and Government, your committee has reported out, by a vote of 13 to 2, a bill for unification. This bill is the culmination of over 2 years of congressional consideration. It is not a hasty makeshift as are some of the misleading so-called compromises thrown together by the opponents. It reflects the experience of war and the thorough study given the subject in the light of that experience.

Under the bill the American idea of strong civilian control is vested in the Secretary and Under Secretary of a single Department of Common Defense. The Air Forces are given coequal status with the land and sea forces and each of these three forces is administered by a civilian secretary.

On the military side there is provided a Chief of Staff of Common Defense, a Commanding General for the Army, a Fleet Admiral in command of the Navy, and a Commanding General for the Air Forces.

The bill is not a merger bill. It merely brings under single direction at the top of the armed forces, into an integrated and coordinated team. Let me emphasize that the Army, the Navy with its Marine Corps, and the Air Forces each retain its own individuality. Opponents of unification and backers of so-called compromise bills, directed to killing true unification, have sought to enlist public opposition to unification by implying that the splendid record and traditions of the Navy are somehow being sacrificed by this bill. This is simply not so. The Navy remains, as before, the "gem of the ocean." The morale of the Navy will not be impaired. The record of the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard as independent forces within the framework of a single Department of the Navy is proof positive that the morale of a fighting force need not suffer because it is under a single over-all administration.

The bill likewise fills another long-felt need in bringing together other agencies of government charged with the national security by the creation of a Council of Common Defense, composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Common Defense, and the Chairman of the National Resources Board. Thus, our foreign policy and domestic economy are for the first time coordinated with our armed forces, in time of peace as well as in war. However, these provisions are not directed to unification of forces. They integrate the civilian effort with the military effort. Other proposals to accomplish this at the expense of unification are not compromises on unification. They are designed to kill unification under the guise of "total mobilization for national security."

The unification bill is not a guaranty of peace. Our hope for peace lies in the United Nations. But our assurance to survive still rests upon the will to defend ourselves. This requires the closest possible coordination of all of our protective forces.

Our duty to America is clear, the urgency is great, the time for the passage of the bill to unify the armed forces is now. America cannot afford another and far greater Pearl Harbor.

Let's Avoid the Road to Serfdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Norris K. Carnes at the Minnesota Employers' Association annual meeting, Radisson Hotel, March 27, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Minnesota Employers' Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am not unmindful of the special privilege that has been extended to me through the invitation to address this distinguished and highly successful group of business executives on this occasion.

We assemble here this afternoon at one of the most critical times in the history of our Nation. This Nation is currently engaged in the process of making a decision that is probably one of the three most fundamental decisions of its history. The first of these fundamental decisions was made in the year 1776, when the Colonies decided not to continue in a servile status and fought for national freedom. The second fundamental decision was made in the year 1865, when this country fought for the freedom of slaves, or person from person. The current question the American people must decide is whether or not the individual is to have freedom from state. I think that the time is now at hand when our American democracy must decide whether the Government control of our lives and livelihoods, accepted by our people as war measures, shall become a permanent part of our social and our economic structure.

To those of you who fear that you may find yourselves living on an island of democracy in a totalitarian world, allow me to remind you that our ancestors created this island of democracy in a totalitarian world, and I believe that it is our patriotic duty to reestablish and maintain that which they created—a society where the individual is

master and the state the servant—and when and if this situation is permanently reversed and the state becomes the master and the individual the servant, we will find ourselves on the road to progressive degeneration and disaster.

Some groups in our society are now demanding a correction of inequities involving wages, prices, and profits. The responsibility for this undertaking cannot safely be shifted from person to State. The individual American must assume this responsibility and maintain a state of eternal vigilance, and keep his Representatives in the Congress of these United States informed as to his desires, because I believe that the Congress is the last defendant of American democracy—a democracy that is swiftly retreating down the twilight "road to serfdom" and totalitarianism.

During the war-emergency period all the people of America, including representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture, responded patriotically and wholeheartedly to pleas by their Federal Government for increased production. The leadership for these groups should be commended on its flexibility, its ingenuity, and its ability to get things done. It manifested genius and imagination; it made a production record that was envied by the entire world. Marshal Stalin, at the banquet at Tehran, rose, raised his glass, and solemnly said, "Without American production the United Nations could never have won this war." It is my opinion that this was the finest tribute that could have been paid to American industry and American agriculture and, indirectly, to our American form of government.

Speaking of postwar, I want to remind you that three international gangsters missed, by only a hair, re-creating a world in which they would be masters with several hundred million slaves. That particular issue has been resolved, but again, although the gangsters have lost their war, I want to remind you that we have not yet won a permanent and satisfactory peace, and that much hard diplomatic fighting, both at home and abroad, lies ahead. I believe that the time is now at hand when representatives of industry, business, labor, and agriculture must apply the same genius and the same imagination to the problems of peace that they have applied to the problems of war. I should like to record my faith in the long-term wisdom of the American people. The patriotism, courage, energy, and resourcefulness—so outstandingly evident in meeting the problems of war—may be relied upon in the solution of peacetime problems.

We had full employment and full production during the war and it meant full pay envelopes and full profits. Having accomplished this feat—and I use that term advisedly—for a destructive purpose, why can't we do it for a constructive purpose? I am cognizant of the fact that changed conditions and circumstances may necessitate a different technique, but I do believe that this can be accomplished if the different groups in our society, representing industry, labor, and agriculture, will cooperate, or work together, with that one purpose in mind. These different groups are interdependent. A fundamental mutuality of interests exists between them. This relationship is too often obscured or overlooked in handling the problems that confront them from day to day. Industry must recognize that business cannot be conducted without employees and that workers are entitled to full and fair compensation for their labor. On the other side, employees must realize that industry cannot long continue as an employer unless the owners of the businesses are permitted to recover their costs and receive a fair return on their investments.

Agriculture is largely dependent on industrial profits and productive employment for its markets. The farmer is not sympathetic to industry's long-practiced policy of maintaining prices by cutting production. Bolstering prices and wages by this method does not maintain income, and it robs society of goods and services. Under this program the farmer pays the same amount of produce for a greatly reduced supply of industrial products. Farmers will aprove higher wages when accompanied by higher labor output. Wage increases should be allowed only if productivity is increased.

Generally speaking, we here in the Northwest are enjoying a very satisfactory relationship between industry, labor and agriculture. The millers, meat packers, and canners are busily engaged in processing the products grown on our Northwest farms. They are not far removed from the farmers or the farmers' agents. This is a healthy situation. The civic organizations, such as the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, the St. Paul Association of Commerce, Duluth and others recognize the importance of agriculture in our economy, as evidenced by their support of 4–H Club activities, the Future Farmers of America, and other institutions that have been sponsored and developed by farm people. Each group in our society must respect the rights of the other, if all are to endure and prosper. Our national economy might well be likened to a three-legged stool with industry, labor and agriculture constituting the three legs. If one of the three is weakened or fails to do its share, our whole economy is unbalanced and may fall. Improper concepts, unnecessary apprehension, unwarranted suspicion on the part of all groups have hindered the sound development of this valuable co-operative technique.

If short-sightedness on the part of those responsible for shaping labor policies compels labor relationships to be conducted in such a manner as to impair the prospect of a proper return for risking one's savings and devoting one's energy in undertaking new production, then it is not probable that there will be any such new undertaking. If the source of new jobs is thus constricted, there will be more unemployed and the competition for existing jobs will increase. The important thing is to refrain from the erection of unnecessary barriers that will prevent the creation of new jobs.

I believe we can solve the problem of providing fifty-five to fifty-eight million jobs in America if we can direct our full attention to finding work for men instead of finding men for work. As a nation, we must solve this problem or lose not only the fruits of our victory, but the very foundation of our national economic independence.

The No. 1 problem confronting the people of America today is the one of wage and prices. What does it gain us to destroy totalitarianism in the world today if we cultivate totalitarianism here at home? Never before in the history of this great Nation has an individual's right to work been made subject to the arbitrary whims of private organizations—all with the implied sanction of Government itself. Here, indeed, is the real logjam of our readjustment and reconversion program. It can be cleared away only when this administration decides and announces in clear and unmistakable terms a national labor policy based on something more than day to day expediency.

This country needs to return to basic principles. The people of America need to think more about America as a whole—not capital, industry, labor, or the farmer, but America—all 140,000,000 of us.

During the past decade organized labor has gained in strength and influence. The right to collective bargaining has been established by law, but to be successful, collective bargaining must be genuine bargaining and it cannot be a loaded gun in the hands of one of the bargainers, backed by the power of the Federal Government.

To illustrate what I have in mind, I should like to call your attention to the case of Montgomery Ward & Co., our own Twin City Milk Producers Association, a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled milk-marketing organization serving the Twin City area, the steel companies, the automobile companies, the electrical equipment companies, and the meat-packing companies.

Farm people are naturally very much interested in these cases, because they realize that we cannot have an independent agriculture and at the same time a Government-regimented industry and a Government-dominated labor movement. It is just as impossible as it would be to attempt to maintain this country half slave and half free. If we are to maintain a free society in which to live, it seems to me that agriculture is one section of our society that is still independent enough to furnish a rallying point against complete bureaucratic domination. Agriculture should reiterate its stand of opposing by all legitimate means unwarranted interferences by labor unions with all their record of violence and coercion with the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities. Labor organizations should be made responsible not only to their membership, but to society in general, and amenable to courts of justice where they can be met on equal terms.

Where do we go from here? What can we do to remedy these inequities? I believe the first step should be toward true education, or the right kind of education for our people. If the American people possess the truth rather than propaganda—I use this term in its modern derogatory sense, the spreading of untruths for a specific purpose—and if the American people really understand our present situation, so that they will not be misguided down "the road to serfdom," I will have no fear as to the future of this country.

I think it can be fairly said, and without criticism, that we in America are an economically, socially, and politically illiterate people, even as measured by our understanding of some of the more simple truths. We have made a great deal of progress in research. We have established a great many facts or truths, but we have been extremely negligent in devising effective ways and means for the transmission of this information to our people, and unless this situation is corrected within the comparatively near future, I am very much afraid that our very scheme of things is in jeopardy—our standard of living, our system of free enterprise, our right to freedom of thought and action—the things for which our forefathers fought—the things for which our young men have been fighting the past 4 years.

With improvement in understanding among the people of this country, I think it would be possible to effectively amend some of the laws on our statute books that have served as false supports for labor to the disadvantage of society in general. As long ago as 1938, after the National Labor Relations Law (the Wagner Act) had been in effect 3 years, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, introduced seven amendments which were widely regarded as necessary to mutualize this legislation. Despite the great hue and cry that went up from Senator WAGNER, the National Labor Relations Board, and the two large labor organizations, these amendments are undeniably sound. They recognize that our country as a whole has certain legal rights which the Wagner Act in its present form effectively denies.

The National Association of Manufacturers is now urging the Congress to eliminate "the special privileges granted labor" in legislation that would protect "labor's rights." This association, which lists members employing 75 percent of the Nation's industrial workers, asked for measures providing "specific responsibilities and obligations for labor as well as management."

This country is now engaged in the process of shifting from a wartime to a peacetime

economy. Unfilled demand is in evidence everywhere. The prospect seems good for a satisfactory outlet for an increased production for a short time at least. As to how well we will fare in the long-term future will depend largely on how successful we are in organizing and planning our productive efforts and how well we keep our economy in balance.

During the war-emergency period the farmers and ranchers of this country surmounted many difficulties, including labor shortage, machinery shortage, high wages, rising feed costs, and confusing governmental controls and regulations, to produce a record amount of food for the armed forces, lend-lease, and the civilian population.

The farm people fully realized the importance of their industry to the welfare of this Nation, and they were willing and anxious to exert every effort within their power, and under adverse conditions and circumstances, to bring World War II to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible moment. They felt that they were duty bound to do this, but at the same time they realized that at some future date following the cessation of hostilities they would probably find themselves with peacetime markets incapable of absorbing their production at satisfactory or remunerative prices. Today American agriculture is producing from 33 to 38 percent more food for sale and use on farms than the average yearly production from 1935 to 1939.

Temporarily, during 1946 and possibly part of 1947, American agriculture is in what may be termed an "intermediate phase of reconversion and readjustment. This phase is one of large food exports for relief and of large but decreasing military demands for food. Eventually, these special demands for food products will decline. The development of a definite farm program at the earliest possible date would be helpful to farmers and ranchers in their decisions as to what adjustments are most useful and necessary to meet the new and prospective conditions.

Generally speaking, the producers of livestock and dairy products believe that rollback subsidies and emergency price controls should be removed at this time while the consumer demand is strong, so that the improvement of market prices can offset the loss of subsidies. If subsidies and price controls are kept on until demand has slackened and farm prices are too weak to rise, the entire burden of removing the subsidies will fall on the farm people.

Farmers and ranchers fully realize the disastrous effects of a runaway inflation, but they believe that the production of goods and services is the most satisfactory and effective means that can be employed to check inflationary tendencies. The emergency controls of the Office of Price Administration are retarding production. The case of butter is a splendid example.

I believe that farm people fully realize that we cannot have a free economy without free prices. They realize that we cannot have increases in the wages of labor unless they are accompanied by increases in productivity or the prices of commodities raised to compensate. Holding price ceilings in the face of rising wages, without increased productivity, will result in the squeezing of invested capital out of the picture, and the road will then be open and clear for the deevlopment of the nationalization of business in a socialized economy. This is strong talk, but at this time we must be realistic.

It has been said "that the greatest thing we have to fear is fear itself." Is our reluctance to remove emergency price controls immediately based on evidence now in our possession, or is it based on the fear of uncertainties? I believe the latter. Present prices are artificial prices. True prices are not in existence. Present prices have not been established by the old law of supply and demand.

It is true that the American farmers and ranchers have not fared too badly during World War II. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, the farm population at the beginning of 1945 had accumulated nearly $17,000,000,000 in liquid assets and had reduced their total indebtedness by more than a billion dollars. It is estimated that farmers had total assets of around $100,000,000,000 on January 1, 1946, but this wartime prosperity, such as it has been, is being followed by serious postwar problems. The farmers' gains during wartime are already being offset to some extent by peacetime difficulties. The expenses of farming are rapidly catching up with high prices. Although the costs of carrying farm indebtedness have declined, the trend of costs of labor, machinery, fuel, fertilizer, insecticides, taxes, and construction materials is continuing upward. An inflation of land values is under way. Many farm spokesmen are now frank in warning that a period of low prices is on the way, but it may not appear, and probably will not appear immediately.

The farmer now finds himself between a continued rise in costs and a trend toward lower prices and income. That squeeze on the farmer between high costs and declining revenue is the essence of the farm problem that lies ahead.

Those of us engaged in the field of agriculture should bear in mind that the more we try to protect the producers of this country by national and international policies against the always painful process of adjustments, the more we will face an overexpanded production. This statement can be verified by examining the historical record. Please do not misunderstand this statement. It is my opinion that help should be extended to the farm people, if necessary, to prevent disaster in the industry during the reconversion and readjustment period, but not to such a degree that overproduction will be encouraged. We should also realize that protection against the hardships of readjustment inevitably involves political regimentation. If the farm people desire less of the latter, they must think more in terms of adjustment by private initiative.

If we continue to operate under a controlled economy, the controls must be made equitable as applied to all groups in our society. We cannot, and we must not, apply controls to some groups and allow others to go free. If we continue under the emergency-control system, agriculture must be placed on a basis of economic parity with other groups. To accomplish this purpose the obsolete parity formula must be revised to include all farm-labor costs.

Generally speaking, the demand for agricultural products depends largely on national income, on the distribution of national income, and on effective foreign demand. Let us consider for a moment our export prospects. Following World War I European agriculture was rapidly and effectively rehabilitated. Isn't it quite possible, even though the devastation has been much more severe, for the same thing to happen following World War II? It is true that many foreign countries are in need of food and short of food, but the shortage is due not only to set-backs in production but also to the disruption of transportation and distribution facilities.

With the war won I think it is safe to say that, during the years 1946 and 1947, more of the waterways, railways, highways, and airways of the world will undoubtedly be open to the shipping of food than have been available for several years. Purchases of food for the armed forces, lend-lease, and other exports have taken an increasing share of our total production during the war. In 1944 approximately 9 percent of our total food production was taken for lend-lease and other exports, and around 14 percent for military purposes. This is nearly one-fourth of our total food production. Huge quantities of food will continue to be used for a short time at least for rehabilitation purposes.

During the relief period, which will probably extend for 1 or 2 years following the close of the war, all European nations will be primarily interested in the rehabilitation of their domestic agricultures. They will purchase only necessary food and feed supplies with the greatest possible economy. They will undoubtedly ration supplies or a balanced-diet basis to assure only existence and maintenance to encourage production.

When the purchases of food for the armed forces and for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration are discontinued, I do not believe that those of us engaged in the livestock and meat industry, the dairy industry, or, in general, agriculture, can well afford to plan for much assistance from our export markets. I am afraid that our production costs will be enough higher than those of other countries to eliminate us as a competitor or, at least, place us in a position where we will be laboring under a serious handicap. By this statement I do not mean that we should cease to try to rehabilitate our foreign markets as rapidly and as extensively as possible. It is difficult to satisfactorily develop a set of policies for our domestic economy without taking into consideration the effects of those policies on our relationship with the rest of the world. Despite all that has been said and written to the contrary in recent weeks, we cannot build a price and wage structure without regard to conditions in the rest of the world and at the same time maintain any sizable volume of trade. However, I do believe that whatever is done to rehabilitate foreign markets should be based on sound business principles. I am one of those individuals who still believes that we will always have a United States of America if we do not give it away.

Whether we like this dilemma or not, I am afraid we must conclude that our domestic market is the most reliable basis and offers the greatest possibility for a satisfactory outlet for an increased agricultural production. American civilians in general tend to increase their consumption of meat, eggs, fluid milk, cream, fresh fruits, and vegetables when their incomes are relatively high. On the other hand, the consumption of wheat, potatoes, beans, and some other foods is relatively stable regardless of changes in income. Therefore, it should be obvious to everyone that the agricultural price outlook will depend to a considerable extent on the level of consumer purchasing power and employment.

I must conclude that the farm people are naturally very much interested in the productive employment of labor, just as labor and industry should be interested in a high agricultural income. The 25,500,000 farm people in America today are consumers of the first class. The employment of many laborers is, therefore, dependent on a prosperous agriculture. The reconversion and readjustment program is a cooperative program, and no one group in our society can be considered alone, because they are interdependent.

To the well-trained and well-equipped young men who have risked their lives to bring this World War II to a successful conclusion, we owe a debt of gratitude far beyond our ability to ever repay. They have won this war for us. They will help us to win the peace. The thing we must make certain is that they shall have an opportunity to do so. Those of us who have labored on the home front—those of us assembled here today—can lose this war for them quickly and irrevocably if we offer them upon their return an America facing mass unemployment or an America facing regimented governmental employment. The least we can

offer them—the one thing we must offer them, is an America wide open to productive employment and economic opportunity.

Today's world is full of painful things. The hopes for mankind which once were universal have come to seem illusory. In place of progress there has been a revival of ancient savagery. How can we avoid becoming discouraged and hopeless? What incentive is there for us to bring children into this world and develop them to manhood and womanhood when their very existence here may be intolerable? Is all hope for future happiness and improvement merely self-deception? I do not believe that the answer to these questions is to be found in despair. It may seem to you conceited to assume that you, as individuals, can do anything to improve the situation of mankind. That is a fallacy. You must make yourselves believe that you can do something to bring about a better world. If you are an eminent statesman your environment is broad. If you are obscure, it is small. In one case you can do much; in the other very little, but in every case you can do something, and to those of you who may become discouraged, allow me to remind you that the world today is what we make it, and in the making of it each one of us can contribute something.

If our program for today is to be successful, we must have broadminded statesmanship in government, wise and sincere leadership in industry, labor, and agriculture, and friendly, constructive co-operation between the Government, these groups which I have mentioned, and society in general.

Definition of a Liberal by Hon. Joseph H. Ball, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a hundred miles west of my home town of Chippewa Falls, Wis., is the city of St. Paul, Minn. In that city lives our distinguished associate in the Senate, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

No doubt Senators noticed, as I did, that Syracuse University has conferred upon our colleague the degree of doctor of laws. In the Evening Star of yesterday, in a column by Gould Lincoln, there appeared some gems of thought from the address of the Senator from Minnesota before the Syracuse University on the subject of what constitutes a liberal. I wish to read merely one or two excerpts from the Senator's address:

> Many proposals are being advanced, under a false label of liberalism, designed to assure all the people in this country a high standard of living, regardless of what the individual does for himself, simply by passing a law.

The Senator from Minnesota further said:

> Let's face the clear fact that the great threat to freedom today is not from the political right but from the extreme political left.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Gould Lincoln be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

The definition of a liberal—1946 variety—made by Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, constitutes an arresting document which is worthy of study. Boiled down, a liberal, Mr. BALL said, stands for the freedom of the individual, in opposition to control by capital, by organized labor, or by government. Too great concentrations of power in the hands of any group or government are dangerous to that freedom of thought and action for which mankind has struggled through the ages.

Speaking at the commencement exercises of Syracuse University—during which Senator BALL was given a doctor of laws honorary degree—he cut sharply across the usual, haphazard definition of a liberal in this country today.

"Many proposals are being advanced," he said, "under a false label of liberalism, designed to assure all the people in this country a high standard of living, regardless of what the individual does for himself, simply by passing a law."

What Mr. BALL stands for—and other liberals like him—is the greatest possible degree of equality of opportunity for all in the economic and political fields. What measures are necessary to achieve this goal must expand, not curtail, individual freedoms. In a scramble for economic security for everyone, this goal is lost sight of by many of the so-called liberals.

"We have a tendency," he said, "to confuse economic security with freedom. Actually the most secure individual in our society is a prisoner serving a life sentence, but he is hardly free. The people of Germany in the early 1930's were so intent on achieving economic security that they permitted their liberties to be liquidated without even a fight." And this, in the opinion of Mr. BALL, could be the fate of American liberties.

The true American liberal is faced with the problem of maintaining liberal policies in both the international and domestic fields. Mr. BALL does not regard conservatism as the opposite of liberalism, certainly from the political point of view. A conservative, he insists, is merely one who would go slow about destroying present institutions. The opposite of a conservative is a radical—and both conservative and radical may be liberal—or they may be the opposite, which is authoritarian. The authoritarian is one who believes that a particular group, in government in labor or in business, has a special mission to plan "the whole pattern of society and to require all individuals, whether they like it or not, to fit into that pattern." Both Fascists and Communists fall into the authoritarian category.

Getting down to cases in the international field, Mr. BALL asserts that among the great powers only France, Britain, and the United States have the democratic concept of liberty—with China moving in that direction. Russia, on the other hand, is committed to the authoritarian state, where a small group counts for everything.

The United States, he contends, must fight against the extension of the veto power in the Security Council of the United Nations and seek its eventual elimination. It must seek to implement those expressions of concern for individual rights and freedoms now written into the United Nations Charter and press for a real international bill of rights for individuals, capable of enforcement.

In order to make it possible for the United States to exert its influence on the side of true liberalism, this country, according to Mr. BALL, must do two things. It must first be strong, militarily and industrially. And here Mr. BALL breaks with some of his Republican colleagues, for he supports military training for Americans and a unified department of national defense.

Secondly, the country must protect the individual freedom of its citizens. They need protection from the present administration which is seeking to force on them so-called complete economic security—at the price of individual liberties.

"Let's face the clear fact," Mr. BALL said, "that the great threat to freedom today is not from the political right, but from the extreme political left."

In the last decade in this country a man has been dubbed "liberal" if he supported any and all legislation favored by labor and subsidies for all kinds of people. Mr. BALL is not opposed to labor, but he insists that labor must not dominate the people any more than capitalistic monopoly.

To be a liberal under Mr. BALL's definition is the desire of many—but few have the courage it takes.

OPA Promotes Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, so much misleading propaganda is being spread by the OPA-CIO-PAC combine to the effect that the battle against the OPA is a battle of so-called big business versus the common people. I believe it is well to get down to the grass roots for the facts from the men who deal with the common people.

The National Small Businessmen's Association is composed of merchants who deal with our citizens day in and day out and who are in a position to know some of the things in the minds of our people. The association is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization formed to give the small-business men a voice in national affairs and preserve free enterprise.

In the recent issue of its official publication Pulling Together this organization presents a close-range examination of OPA activities by Lawrence Sullivan, well-known journalist who has written outstanding articles for some of our leading magazines as well as being the author of several books dealing with government.

The study, prepared for the Small Businessmen's Association, is entitled "OPA Promotes Inflation" and follows:

OPA is the most powerful factor in American life today making for inflation.

In industry after industry it has fixed postwar ceiling prices far below the actual cost of production and distribution—thus choking off that tidal wave of new goods for which our war-starved markets are panting and screaming.

Returning veterans can't buy civilian clothes.

Five-million families can't find houses to shelter them.

Housewives can't buy butter, sugar, or bacon.

Schoolgirls can't buy simple frocks, stockings, or undergarments.

Businessmen can't buy new trucks or tires, can't obtain delivery of new tools and machinery needed to expand production.

In the words of the Smith committee, in its most recent report on administrative procedures in the emergency agencies—

"Your committee's investigation revealed that the continuing policy of OPA is rigid adherence to outdated and inapplicable formulas which are too inflexible to stimulate the vital production increase so urgently required."

This faulty bureaucratic procedure in OPA, the committee added, has retarded reconversion, prevented production, especially in low-priced commodities, has restricted opportunity for full employment, and has, at least in some instances, actually caused prices of cost-of-living commodities to rise.

The Brookings Institution of Washington reports that in the 4 years following December 1941 the wholesale price of industrial raw materials advanced approximately 28 percent, and labor costs in manufacturing industries increased 33 percent, as measured by average hourly earnings. But in the same period the wholesale prices of manufactured products advanced by only about 8 percent.

In the face of these increases in production costs, OPA adopted the fatal policy of attempting to hold postwar ceiling prices at approximately the 1942 level—the price at which civilian production was stopped for the switch to war goods.

BUTTER

Single-handed, OPA has all but driven butter from the market during the last 6 months.

The wartime subsidy of 5 cents a pound was abandoned last fall. At the same time, the butter ceiling was advanced. The theory was to let the consumer pay the full cost of his butter.

But, at the same time, OPA abandoned the ceiling on cream.

Then cream moved upward in a free market, while butter was frozen under a ceiling far below the actual cost of production.

Cream went to ice cream, whipping cream, fancy cheese, candy, soda-fountain specialties, cakes, pies, and vastly expanded table use.

Butter disappeared from the market. Why? Because the real price of butter, as measured in the wholesale cream price, had advanced to something between $1.00 and $1.25 a pound.

The OPA ceiling price of butter was about 60 cents a pound.

That's how OPA made the butter shortage.

And now the higher cost of living, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is given as a reason for another round of wage increases in all industries.

This is automatic and self-perpetuating inflation.

By making shortages, OPA advances living costs every day.

Then, higher living costs are advanced as an argument for higher pay.

WHY NYLON HOSE ARE SCARCE

Representative CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, of North Dakota, recently devoted himself to a little basic research on the scarcity of nylon hose. His findings were presented in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A858.

"Because of the price policies of OPA," he said, "there is constantly recurring a greater shortage of many materials * * * Now the war is over and nylon is still not available for women's hose—neither nylon nor rayon hosiery in fine qualities is available."

The Congressman then presented the case of one nylon distributor (Strutwear, Inc.) in Minneapolis. This firm applied to OPA on November 27, 1945, for a wholesaler's registration number, as required under Maximum Price Regulation 602, issued on November 15. Under the regulation a registration number must be obtained from OPA before any shipment of nylon hose may be made lawfully.

Two weeks after the Strutwear application was mailed from Minneapolis, the Washington office of OPA, on December 12, asked for additional information. (The firm had been in the hosiery business for 29 years.) The additional information was submitted on December 18. No reply having been received, the wholesaler wired OPA on January 4, 1946. Still no reply. On January 14, Strutwear wired again. Up to January 25, the firm still had no answer—when they wrote to Congressman ROBERTSON:

"In our application we told OPA we buy nylon hosiery from Hanes Hosiery Mills, Winston-Salem, N. C., and asked OPA to find out from Hanes whether or not they consider us a qualified wholesaler. Hanes, of course, has tried from their end to get Washington to act on this matter. We just phoned Hanes' New York office and are informed by them that they cannot get OPA in Washington to answer the telephone.

"Hanes has shipped us nylon hosiery because they consider us one of their distributors, and we have in our possession 14,000 pairs which we are forbidden to distribute to the retail stores until the OPA gives us a number.

"Many of our customers have no ladies' hosiery to sell, not even rayons.

"Can you do anything to help us get through this red tape, so we may conduct our business the same way it has been conducted for 29 years?"

On the day this instance was made public in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Stabilization Director Chester Bowles appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives to urge a year's extension of the OPA Act. In his statement before the committee, Mr. Bowles said, in part:

"Clearly, this program of economic stabilization—or any program of economic stabilization which might have a chance of success—will be attacked by every irresponsible pressure group in the land."

That's the story of OPA in a nutshell. Anyone who presumes to resist or oppose its bureaucratic incompetence is summarily dismissed as part of an unpatriotic and ignoble pressure group.

The merchant who has 14,000 pairs of nylons on hand, but can't sell them until he gets a numbered certificate from OPA has no complaint worthy of a hearing, according to Bowles.

This economic tyranny soon could destroy every business in the land.

MEATS

When the House Committee on Agriculture investigated the meat shortage it learned that retail outlets were getting only about 55 percent of their normal supply.

But at that time (June 1945), Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, of Oregon, told the House of Representatives:

"Our normal prewar inventory of cattle was 66,000,000 head. Present statistics reveal that we now have 82,000,000 head on the ranges. Why, then, are we unable to purchase a steak or roast? Why is beef not moving to the markets in greater quantity, and why is the quality so poor?

"The statement repeatedly made that military needs are the cause of the beef shortage is not true."

The true explanation lies in the fact that OPA ceiling prices were so fixed that there was no longer any profit in fattening up range cattle in feeder lots to produce prime beef.

As a result, we have lost an average of 400 to 700 pounds of beef on every head slaughtered, during the last 2 years—tens of millions of pounds of beef lost through OPA's pricing policies.

A similar situation developed in pork. Congressman ELLSWORTH speaking:

"At the beginning of 1944 there were 84,000,000 hogs on the farm; at the beginning of 1945, there were only 60,000,000, a reduction of more than one-fourth. Recently the farmers have been guaranteed a satisfactory price on hogs, and production of pork will increase; but the increase will not be reflected in the butcher shops for many months.

"The story on mutton and lamb is even simpler. Sheep raisers have been going out of business at such a rapid rate during the last several months that the rate of decline in the sheep population of the country cannot be given statistically. The best estimate I can obtain is that the sheep population now is lower than it has been in 15 years, and is still declining.

"The reason is simply that producers have discovered the ceiling prices on wool, mutton and lamb will not yield them the cost of production. Hence, they are quitting the business.

"Our present shortage of poultry is the direct result of conflicting and senseless Government orders and directives."

Congressman ELLSWORTH buttressed his statement with Government statistics, proving in every case that OPA is actually creating shortages in all the basic foods.

Now we see this whole process working out again in the baking industry—where shortages of bread and bakery products are in early prospect because of Government rules and regulations touching wheat, lard, sugar, and shortening.

Who will save America from OPA—the creator of shortages?

A CHALLENGE TO ALL AMERICA

Under existing law, OPA will cease to exist on June 30, 1946.

Will Congress extend the Price Control Act for another year?

If it does, the American system of production and distribution will become so badly snarled, so crippled by bureaucratic confusion and official conflict, that free markets and free enterprise may fall into total eclipse for a generation.

Well may we recall the words of Rousseau:

"Free people, remember this maxim: We may gain liberty but it is never recovered if it is once lost."

A like sentiment was uttered by Abraham Lincoln at Chicago, July 10, 1858:

"Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage, and you prepare your own limbs to wear them * * * you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subject of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

President Truman has referred to 1946 as a "year of decision."

The foundations we lay this year will determine the character of our national economy for perhaps a decade.

Does reconversion mark a road toward restoration of free enterprise, or a movement toward a permanent scheme of national socialism?

Price control is the very essence of managed economy or national socialism.

If the Government is to control peacetime prices, it soon will discover—as it did in wartime—that it also must control production specifications, wages, raw-material standards, distribution margins.

"Price control is throttling reconversion, curtailing employment opportunities, demoralizing established business methods and practices," cry the defenders of the American enterprise system. "The only preventive of inflation is production, production, and then more production. Take OPA off our necks and let's get going."

PERPETUATING THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

In housing, as in perhaps no other field, has the continuation of wartime controls aggravated a critical disequilibrium in the supply-demand equation.

Although the shortage today is estimated to be 4,000,000 to 6,000,000 dwelling units, new construction is barely creeping.

Construction alone offers the basis of a business boom which might spark a robust national prosperity for 10 years. But what has happened since VJ-day?

As long ago as September—about 30 days after the end of the war in the Pacific—Mr. Bowles announced publicly:

"We are at present working on plans to set specific dollars-and-cents prices on building materials, adjusted area by area across the country, much as we have done for groceries."

Construction controls under the WPB's wartime order L–41 were removed as of October 15, 1945.

But a month before that date, Chester Bowles had announced his plan to price-control the construction industry clear across the boards.

Free enterprise was not to be given even a chance.

When the decision to relax wartime material controls was announced, the Associated General Contractors of America hailed October 15 as the beginning of a new boom era in home construction.

"In the judgment of the leading general contractors," said H. E. Foreman, managing director of the AGCA, "it would be impossible for the Federal Government to attempt to bring about the reconversion of the construction industry through centralized controls."

But now we are back to centralized controls more rigorous and more demoralizing than any attempted during the critical war years.

Why?

Because the Washington bureaucrats have decided once more that free enterprise must not be even tried.

In greeting the revocation of the war controls, Mr. Foreman said that his association aimed at "getting the industry into operation at the rate of $12,000,000,000 annually 1 year after the end of the war. * * * Indications are that such a rate can be attained."

But before 2 months had passed, the Federal housing bureaucracy was launched on a new "emergency" campaign to keep the construction industry in the shackles of regimentation and control.

First, a housing expediter was appointed. Then a 2-year emergency-housing program was launched. This, in line with Chester Bowles' prediction in September, brought every piece of housing material under Government allocation.

The result, as we already have seen, was to freeze out every form and type of construction activity save projects approved or sponsored by Government agencies. Instead of moving toward freedom, competition, and expanding production, the postwar construction controls introduced an era of material allocations, priorities, price limitations, subsidies, and interdepartmental red tape far more rigorous and crippling than the wartime measures. Six months after the end of the war it was more difficult for an individual builder to start building a house than at any time during the war.

All of these measures, as Mr. Bowles explained, were to prevent a building boom.

They did.

CLOTHING AND TEXTILES

The continuing shortage of all types of clothing, more acute in most markets now than during the war, has fallen principally on returning veterans. Four committees of Congress have inquired into the textile shortages in cotton, wool, and synthetics. In each case, faltering, confusing, and conflicting Government orders are cited by the industry as the root cause of delayed production.

Speaking for the National Association of Retail Clothiers, W. O. Swanson, of Omaha, told the Senate Small Business Committee on December 13, 1945, that in many sections of the country about 45 percent of the returning servicemen cannot buy civilian clothing to replace their military uniforms.

"In my store today I have 5 percent of the suits that I normally have at this time. Overcoats are only slightly better. Our stock of heavy underwear—none. We get enough overalls to sell them for 2 hours each month. Work gloves are almost extinct. Regular underwear is sold as soon as it comes in, so there is no inventory. Our situation is typical of men's stores, both large and small. In spite of promised relief, the situation is growing steadily worse."

Mr. Swanson presented statistics on a survey of 174 men's stores in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. In December 1945 suits on hand were 70 percent below December of 1944. An earlier survey showed shirts 84 percent below a year ago, pajamas 87 percent below, underwear 68 percent below.

"With millions of returning servicemen coming home there should be increased supplies. The veterans are the victims. Within the past 10 days a survey of 77 men's stores showed that the GI is suffering in his return to civilian life and his efforts to find clothes to work in. This survey shows that over 50 percent of the customers in these stores are returning servicemen. And it shows that nearly 45 percent are walking into the stores and out again, unable to buy what they need to become civilians.

"A very important feature of this survey is that disappointed GI's are pointing the finger of blame at the number one reason for shortages—dissatisfaction with Government controls which are retarding production. You go into your favorite men's store and what do you find? Not suits, shirts, and overcoats, but perfumes, pipes, fancy sport shirts, hand-painted neckties, and all sorts of frilly items—which we are selling because we cannot get good staple merchandise."

A similar case was cited by Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska, in a national broadcast. Standing before the microphone in New York, he exhibited to the studio audience two peach-colored slips. The first was designed to sell prewar at $1.95. Now ceilinged below production cost, it had been driven from the market.

"So what happened?" the Senator asked. "Another manufacturer makes a shoddy garment, calls it a new design, and is able to sell it for $3.95—and you can't tell the front from the back. That's the kind of sacks Chester Bowles is hanging on the women of America."

A Kentucky manufacturer of nylon parachutes for the Navy was directed by telegraph to stop production last August. Having great quantities of beautiful nylon on hand, he hastened to New York and obtained firm orders for 3 months' production of nylon slips, at $51 a dozen. He recalled 125 employees to his plant.

Then word came from OPA that the postwar ceiling on this garment would be $10.50 a dozen.

Taxing Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A1767, an article by Alfred D. Stedman, a writer and for a long time assistant editor of the United States News, and at the present time agricultural editor of the St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press. In that article he enumerates the reasons why farm cooperatives should not pay an income tax. I have since received a letter from William C. Blethen, chairman of the Minnesota Small Business and Employees' Committee, taking a position opposite from that of Mr. Stedman. Mr. Blethen has asked me as a matter of fairness to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his letter to me and also an editorial concerning the subject in controversy, from the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA SMALL BUSINESS
AND EMPLOYEES' COMMITTEE,
Mankato, Minn., April 24, 1946.

Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an insert in the Appendix, page A1767, which was placed there by you.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, through your action, reprinted an article in defense of the tax exemption of the cooperative enterprises. Its appearance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of course, permits widespread reproduction and can be sent out under a franking privilege, if you so choose.

While this article pretends to be a news story, I am confident you will recognize that it is strictly an editorial attack on the Minnesota Small Business and Employees' Committee.

As chairman of this committee, I am obliged to call your attention to the many misstatements which appear in Mr. Stedman's article. I am confident that you must have inserted this article in the RECORD as a courtesy to some trusted associate. If so, you have been seriously misled.

All of us engaged in small business in Minnesota are greatly disturbed by the exemption of the co-ops from Federal income taxes because this tax exemption is used by the co-ops to devour our businesses. As you know, in the wartime period, we paid Federal income taxes ranging up to as high as 65 percent of our profit. The co-ops completely escaped this Federal income tax.

Let me ask your opinion on where you think we are eventually going to land in Minnesota? The small businessmen, wage earners, everyone on salary is keenly aware of the Federal income tax we pay into the

Treasury from our income and our wages, at a very high rate. True, this recently has been reduced, but everyone who works for wages in Minnesota knows that he is paying a part of the Federal tax burden which the co-ops escape.

The co-ops are prospering in this State at the expense of every business and every wage earner who pays a Federal income tax.

They have mustered the greatest propaganda machine in the history of the State. They use the radio and the newspapers consistently to pretend that they pay taxes just like we really do.

These co-ops are expanding at a tremendous rate—so are the mutuals. So are Government-operated businesses. It seems clear to me and to my thousands of associates in small business, that eventually we will be extinguished by this cooperative movement, with a consequent loss to the Federal Treasury that will present a very serious problem to those in charge of the Treasury policies of the Federal Government.

I am attaching an editorial which I think is significant and is thoroughly accurate. It is from the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel.

May I hear from you at your earliest convenience because all of us in small business are determined to follow this problem through to a conclusion.

Very truly yours,

MINNESOTA SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYEES' COMMITTEE,
By WILLIAM C. BLETHEN,
Chairman.

P. S.—I believe it is only fair to request that you act to have this editorial inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our members are insisting that I make this request.

W. C. B.

[From the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel]

THIS WILL MAKE SOMEONE MAD

The inland seas of Minnesota are flecked with the foam of turmoil over the question of cooperative businesses paying or not paying income tax on their profits.

The perfect defense offered by the co-ops is that they themselves make no profits, all gains being distributed pro rata to patrons and thus become taxable income.

Let's look at a case. Suppose the Sentinel was a co-op. Suppose it makes a dollar a year profit from each of its 7,000 subscribers. Suppose it distributed this profit back—a dollar to each subscriber. How much income tax do you suppose would accrue? Mighty little, probably none. Most of the subscribers are not even in the income-tax-paying bracket.

But the Sentinel Co. is heavily taxed on this profit total, and no kick coming. Passing the tax on to patrons would possibly yield dimes where it now yields dollars.

No, good gentlemen of the co-ops, the only way we can see any fairness is for the co-ops to pay the income tax on all profits before any return to patrons. Then the driblets, becoming personal income, can be taxed again, the same as is the case with the stockholders of this and similar industries.

Of course, the silly notion some may have that co-ops pay no taxes at all is just ignorant hooey. On real estate, personal property, and in other forms of taxation they pay the same as anyone else. It's just the evaded income-tax payments that stick in people's craws.

Answer this question and you uncover the crux of the whole matter. Why are patrons of co-ops so insistent in passing the potential tax on to themselves instead of the concern paying it?

Isn't the motivation the common one—trying to pass the tax burden onto someone else?

What Is the Significance of Browder's Present Visit to Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, when Professor Budenz, of Notre Dame University—reformed Communist who for many years was editor of the Daily Worker, official publication of the American Communist Party—appeared as a witness before the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities, he emphasized the fact that the decisions and policies of the Communist Party in this country are directed and dominated by the Communist Party leadership in Russia.

One point of evidence which Professor Budenz gave the committee to demonstrate his thesis was the strange manner in which Earl Browder was ditched as head of the American Communist movement and the unanimous vote by which the executive committee of the Communist Party in this country read Browder out of the party. Long and loud were the denunciations which his former comrades heaped upon the head of Earl Browder after a Communist from France had visited this country and informed the local party cohorts that the order had been handed down, "Get rid of Browder."

Now something strange is happening in Communist circles. All agencies of the Government which are charged with safeguarding the security of this country such as the FBI, Army, and Navy Intelligence, and the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities will follow with extreme interest the outcome of Earl Browder's present visit to Russia. Will he come back with the blessings of the Kremlin and with authority to depose the ageing and acriminous Foster? Will he come back embittered and disillusioned by his inability to convince his superiors that he should never have been given the bum's rush? Will he come back to work under Foster for a while as a returning prodigal trying to reestablish himself in the good graces of the party? Will he come back at all?

Mr. George E. Sokolsky, noted newspaper columnist and political analyst discusses the strange trek of Earl Browder in an interesting and understanding manner in the following reprint from his column of yesterday. It is worth reading:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Earl Browder, for many years the Koba of the American Communist movement, was deprived of his authority and expelled from his party by order of the Third International, using Duclos, the French Communist, as a mouthpiece.

He is now either on his way to or actually in Soviet Russia to appeal his case.

Curiously, this happened before. Back in 1929, Jay Lovestone and Ben Gitlow, Browder's predecessors, rushed off to Soviet Russia to appeal their cases.

Stalin had decided that the American Communist Party had to have an American facade. No more foreign names—Anglicize them. No more foreign accents in the top leadership.

American communism had to be led by someone who looked like a typical American—Browder was born in Kansas of authentic Anglo-Saxon stock.

Of course, he was not to be trusted too much: He might revert to the American type. He would be put in charge of unpublicized GPU agents who would watch and instruct, watch and instruct.

So Jay Lovestone and Ben Gitlow were practically imprisoned in Russia until they were helped to escape by Henry Yagoda, of the GPU, who was then already scheming against Stalin, for which he was ultimately purged.

And Browder became the America Koba—the American Stalin, boss of those little creatures who shriek and shout on parades and who blindly follow the dictates of a foreign master, who denounce and betray their country, its traditions, its history, its ideals; who change their names to confuse their fellow citizens; who creep into Government positions to spy and trick and confuse.

Browder had a good job while it lasted.

Then a curious thing happened to Browder. The war came and Browder went patriotic. That, of course, was the party line and no one could question Browder's rigid adherence to the dogma handed down from the throne of Peter the Great.

But the unexpected psychological change that occurred in Earl Browder was that when the war was over, Browder found it difficult to switch out of his patriotism fast enough. He really believed in America. If anything, he reverted to Kansas.

So they kicked him out of the American Communist Party. They put in charge, William Z. Foster, a weak and faltering man, with Eugene Dennis as the real master.

No man has ever had to take the beating that Earl Browder was made to take. Every former associate, every subordinate, every personal friend, every party member who had ever had anything to do with him was required to write a letter to the Daily Worker and the New Masses, denouncing Browder in the most vicious and abject terms.

Men whom I have seen groveling before the master now swatted him over the head with the nastiest accusations and denunciations.

Had I not witnessed, in America, where men can be free, this debasement of every human quality in obedience to orders from an alien political party, fearful of the purge, fearful of the GPU, fearful of the fate of Juliet Poyntz, Krivitzky, Tresca, I might not have understood the self-denunciation, the self-emasculation, the reduction of man to a thing, so vividly described by Kravchenko in his book, I Chose Freedom.

These Communists were Americans. They were free. They could stand up. But they whined, "I am a bum because I listened to Browder." It was a pitiful, disgusting spectacle. For weeks, each morning, I read these autodenunciations by men who switched their views and loyalties on a 24-hour notice.

Browder was denounced as an American bourgeois, a revisionist, a tool of Wall Street, a believer in private enterprise. He tried to defend his patriotism, his socialism, his marxism, his loyalty to Stalin. They would not listen. Duclos had ordered his expulsion; he must be crushed.

So Browder now goes to the seat of the most high. How he ever got so far is a puzzle, but one that will be known in time.

Maybe Stalin feels that the American Communists have antagonized the American people against Soviet Russia.

If so, Browder may be restored and all those who denounced him will apologize to him.

Maybe it is something even more dramatic and ugly. We shall soon know.

Another American commentator upon whom the significance of Browder's quick trip to Russia has not been lost is William Philip Simms, able writer for the Washington Daily News. The following article by Mr. Simms sheds some additional light upon the travels and torments of the man who would be king—once more—of the American Communists. If Browder comes back with the go-ahead order in his hands, this country will once again be treated to the strange phenomenon by which—upon orders from Moscow—the American Communists can change their party line and their party leadership faster than a strip-tease artist getting ready for a Saturday night bath.

BROWDER'S TRIP

(By William Philip Simms)

Earl Browder's surprise trip to Moscow is believed to foreshadow a turn not only within the Communist Party in the United States but throughout what used to be called the Communist International.

Not that the one-time leader of communism in this country rates any such distinction as that statement would seem to imply. Whether William Z. Foster, present head of the party; Earl Browder, or some entirely new figure is in charge, probably matters little to Moscow. What it is after is results.

Today, the Soviet Union is on the march—in Europe, Asia, and Africa. It has become tremendously important, therefore, that Communists everywhere tighten their ranks in order to take instant advantage of postwar developments.

Generalissimo Stalin attaches supreme importance to the Communist Party in this country. He told the American delegates to the presidium of the executive committee of the Comintern in Moscow, in 1929:

"I think that the American Communist Party is one of the few Communist parties in the world upon which history has laid tasks of a decisive character from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement.

"You all know very well the strength and power of American capitalism. Many now think that the general crisis of world capitalism will not affect America. That, of course, is not true.

"I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will develop in America that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism as a whole. It is essential that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting that historical moment fully prepared, and of assuming the leadership of the impending class struggle in America. Every effort and every means must be employed in preparing for that.

"For that end, the American Communist Party must be improved and bolshevized. For that end we must work for the complete liquidation of factionalism and deviations in the party. For that end we must forge real revolutionary cadres, and a real revolutionary leadership of the proletariat, capable of leading the many millions of the American working class toward the revolutionary class struggle."

In the twenties, during the fierce fight for leadership among Ruthenberg, Lovestone, and Foster, Browder was Foster's man Friday. In 1926 he went to Moscow to attend the Red International. From there he was sent to China as a sort of trouble-shooter to help organize the Chinese. And when Foster's health gave way in 1930, he became the party's general secretary—some say at the direct intervention of Stalin.

Now Browder is again on his way to Moscow. He says he is going to study political life. And the followers of Foster are seething. Having made a party pariah of Browder, they are wondering what possible business he could now have in Moscow.

But Browder could not go to Moscow unless the Kremlin wanted him there. What his real mission is, of course, remains to be seen. Maybe the Generalissimo doesn't agree that he deviated during the war. Maybe the Red chieftain wants to study political life in the Americas through Browder's eyes. Maybe Moscow believes the predicted revolutionary crisis in America is now at hand and with it the moment for American Communists to do their historic job. Which, according to Mr. Stalin, is to be the spearhead for the end of world capitalism as a whole.

Shortage of Office Space in California for Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I wrote to Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Budget, requesting information regarding office space held by Government departments in California, and a copy of the reply to my letter, signed by Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, to whom my letter was referred.

I wish to point out that in large sections of California the point has been raised by returning veterans and others that it is very difficult for them to obtain office space for the practice of law, medicine, or any other business, because of the vast amount of space being occupied by Government departments. The reply to my letter gives some of the figures with respect to Los Angeles and San Francisco.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1946.

Mr. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
State Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: The reports from all sections of California indicate a very serious shortage of office space. This is being felt particularly by returning servicemen who desire to reenter the practice of law, medicine, or to go into some other business requiring an office.

I would like to know whether the Bureau of the Budget has called for a survey of the amount of space now being used as compared with that used during the war period. Also, I would be interested to know just how soon and how much space could be released without adversely affecting the operation of the necessary Government agencies.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

APRIL 18, 1946.

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has recently forwarded to this office copies of correspondence which that officer had exchanged with you, relative to the amounts of office space rented by the Government in California.

In the process of answering some of the questions you raised, this office recently conducted a survey of leased space in 15 of the larger cities throughout the country. The results from two of these cities, Los Angeles and San Francisco, might be of interest to you, and I am pleased to send them to you herewith.

As you will note, the information covers, by different agencies, the amounts of leased space occupied on January 1, 1945, and on March 1, 1946. Some downward trend is already noticeable, but as will also be observed, the hoped for, more decided decrease in leased space had not yet set in on March 1.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, would you please feel entirely at liberty to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. REYNOLDS,
Commissioner of Public Buildings.

Federal leased space, occupancy office space, Los Angeles, Calif.

Agency	Area		Personnel	
	Jan. 1, 1945	Mar. 1, 1946	Jan. 1, 1945	Mar. 1, 1946
Agriculture, Department of	40,154	32,794	213	203
Civilian Production Administration	20,130	3,220	200	29
Commerce, Department of	9,441	2,606	76	63
Defense Transportation, Office of	5,788	403	55	2
Fair Employment Practice Committee	481	0	4	0
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	300	300	4	4
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	883	873	16	13
Federal Housing Administration	21,330	22,853	171	165
Federal Security Agency	4,168	4,168	29	36
Federal Works Agency	98,044	99,013	922	885
Inter-American Affairs, Office of	1,744	0	14	0
Interior, Department of	5,303	5,537	21	28
Justice, Department of	44,942	44,942	493	495
Labor, Department of	15,004	12,637	129	75
Maritime Commission	2,758	2,786	35	25
National Housing Agency	1,866	1,237	12	
National Wage Stabilization Board	5,130	5,130	23	2
Navy Department	300,621	109,781	2,489	933
Price Administration, Office of	123,417	73,715	958	664
Railroad Retirement Board	1,414	1,414	12	10
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10,267	23,139	86	270
Scientific Research and Development, Office of	800	0	5	0
Smaller War Plants Corporation	4,052	1,267	52	14
Treasury Department	85,035	89,585	466	774
U. S. Marine Corps	6,047	7,014	437	350
Veterans' Administration	0	66,186	0	498
War Assets Corporation	4,319	38,223	51	588
War Information, Office of	6,373	0	68	0
War Relocation Authority	2,518	8,406	16	99
Total	822,389	664,289	7,057	6,233

Federal leased space, occupancy office space, San Francisco, Calif.

Agency	Area		Personnel	
	Jan. 1, 1945	Mar. 1, 1946	Jan. 1, 1945	Mar. 1, 1946
Agriculture, Department of	61, 828	53, 003	510	414
Alien Property Custodian	7, 530	3, 435	32	27
Bureau of the Budget	1, 626	1, 626	7	7
Civilian Defense, Office of	720	0	5	0
Civilian Production Administration	25, 875	3, 920	211	28
Civil Service Commission	3, 534	0	20	0
Defense Transportation, Office of	11, 513	740	99	7
Fair Employment Practice Committee	1, 210	0	5	0
Federal Power Commission	6, 098	6, 098	35	40
Federal Security Agency	36, 294	40, 567	202	273
Federal Trade Commission	1, 958	1, 550	8	9
Federal Works Agency	6, 368	1, 880	55	28
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	28, 682	21, 190	138	101
Inter-American Affairs, Office of	4, 153	0	33	0
Interior, Department of	14, 297	17, 972	92	113
Interstate Commerce Commission	3, 283	3, 031	20	18
Justice, Department of	7, 090	7, 665	46	51
Federal Bureau of Investigation and Immigration and Naturalization Service	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Labor, Department of	245, 680	46, 231	362	279
Maritime Commission	46, 797	60, 227	447	572
National Housing Agency	80, 207	86, 627	696	724
National Labor Relations Board	3, 538	3, 538	13	19
National Wage Stabilization Board	20, 171	10, 920	132	44
Navy Department	(1)	195, 179	(1)	2, 610
Industry Cooperative Division	1, 560	0	11	0
Petroleum Administration for War	810	270	5	1
Price Administration, Office of	67, 663	78, 105	739	941
Railroad Retirement Board	4, 030	4, 030	30	38
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	17, 097	45, 377	165	596
Securities and Exchange Commission	4, 028	4, 028	14	18
Smaller War Plants Corporation	6, 660	0	53	0
Treasury Department	61, 946	71, 967	549	782
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	0	568	0	3
U. S. Marine Corps	78, 695	84, 488	413	326
Veterans' Administration	11, 410	120, 978	101	387
War Assets Corporation	0	48, 147	0	660
War Information, Office of	72, 202	52, 604	940	392
War Relocation Authority	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Weather Bureau	1, 048	1, 048	4	4
Total	945, 601	1, 077, 009	6, 192	9, 512

[1] Not available.

Swiss Get the Cheese—We Get the Holes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article published in the Washington Post Monday, April 29, 1946, by Mr. Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watchworkers' Union, concerning importation of Swiss watches and watch works into the United States:

SWISS GET THE CHEESE, WE GET THE HOLES—RECIPROCAL TRADE THAT COSTS US $2,500,000 FOR EVERY MILLION WE GET IN RETURN IS AS FULL OF HOLES AS A SWISS CHEESE, SAYS WALTER W. CENERAZZO, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN WATCHWORKERS UNION

Keen, astute foreign diplomat, Henry Bruggman, Minister from Switzerland, has so consistently outsmarted Dean Acheson of our State Department as to violate President Truman's pledge that no American worker or industry would be hurt by extension of reciprocal trade pacts. Reciprocal trade that makes us lose $6,000,000 out of every $10,000,000 in business is as out of balance as a flat tire.

While we imported $491,125,000 in trade from Switzerland we got only $181,187,000 in trade from the Swiss. This leaves a deficit of $309,938,000 as a loss to American workers and American industry. The precedent set by this kind of diplomatic juggling under the guise of reciprocal trade is a threat to every worker and every industry in the United States of America.

Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watch Workers Union, has suggested that since the Swiss have so consistently outsmarted our Dean Acheson of the State Department on a two and a half to one basis, that we do some reciprocal trading of diplomats on the same basis * * * we taking Henry Bruggman from the Swiss and giving Dean Acheson and a couple of others in return. They trade ball players that way so why not trade diplomats.

There are 3,500,000 watches sold annually in the United States. This is based on a 16-year prewar average. This is a normal, honest figure based on facts. About two million of these watches were Swiss, leaving about one and one-half million to be supplied by American manufacturers. There has been no shortage of watches during the war because greater quantities were imported from Switzerland during the war period in spite of the fact that Switzerland was supplying all of its military timing devices and precision timing fuzes for the Axis.

During the war the entire facilities of the American jeweled watch industry were devoted to the production of timing devices and precision time fuzes for our own country and our allies. At this time Swiss watches flooded the American market so that there is now no backlog of orders piled up for us as we reconvert to the manufacture of civilian watches.

Now, in spite of the fact that the normal watch sales in this country in normal years average only 3,500,000 watches, our State Department, under the guise of reciprocal trade which is neither reciprocal nor mutual nor honestly fair, is to allow over 7,500,000 watches to be brought into this country this year. This can put the entire American watch industry out of business, a fact which may not seem particularly important until you realize that there are only two sources of military timing devices in all the world—Switzerland and the United States. No war can be successfully fought without precision timing devices and no other industry in the entire Nation is capable of setting up and training workers for this precision work in less than 6 years.

Now, of course, there are those who may argue that we will never have another war. We hope these people are right, but until we are ready to scrap all our ships, guns, planes, and tanks * * * yes, even the atom bomb, and all other means of defense, let's not let the State Department kill a vital American defense industry under the guise of reciprocal trade which takes $2.50 for every $1 it gives in return.

LET'S KEEP THE RECORDS STRAIGHT

On April 6, the American Watch Workers Union sent a letter to the President of the United States, urging the President to keep his pledge that no American industry and no American worker would be hurt by the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. That letter was published in newspapers throughout the United States. In rebuttal the Swiss watch importers group, who parade under the name of "The American Watch Assemblers Association," published an advertisement entitled "This Is a Statement of Facts About Watches." We challenge the veracity of the statements contained in that advertisement. We ask you, the American public, to be the judges. 1. Shall Swiss watch importers be allowed to continue their lucrative business at the expense of a national defense industry? 2. Shall American jobs go to Swiss workers?

WALTER W. CENEROZZO,
National President,
American Watch Workers Union.

FACTS IN ANSWER TO RECENT MISLEADING AD BY THE SWISS WATCH IMPORTERS

FACT

The Swiss watch importers avoid the fact that the American Jeweled Watch Industry is vital to national defense. The Swiss watch importers avoid the fact that Switzerland produced timing mechanisms used by the Axis to kill and maim American boys.

Swiss watch importers utilized metals for cases and attachments and labor for assembling Swiss movements when such metals and use of such labor was denied the American manufacturer for civilian production. War bonds should have been purchased instead of Swiss watches.

Here is the American record

The entire American Jeweled Watch Industry converted to the making of military timing devices for the United States and our allies. Not one watch was made for civilian use. Among the millions of items produced were railroad watches, aircraft watches, navigation watches, hack watches, chronometers, chronograph stop watches, break circuit chronometers, marine chronometers, elapsed-time clocks, time fuses, civil date indicator clocks, millisecond recorders, hang-fire recorders, map measures, jewel bearings, compasses, and many airplane instruments. The Swiss importers who operate under the name of American Watch Assemblers' Association did not convert for war production here. Instead they flooded the market with Swiss watches which were shipped into this country with the help and consent of the Axis. Attracted by exorbitant profits the number of importers grew from fifty to five hundred, who now seek to dominate the whole industry in the United States.

We challenge the Swiss watch importers to produce their record. We further ask them to publish the black record of Swiss military production for the Axis. During the war we shipped essential metals to Switzerland. How much of this metal went into Axis timing mechanisms?

FACT

The movement is the most important part of the watch—it is the watch. About two-thirds of the average cost of an American watch is in the movement.

The Swiss importers claim that they are American manufacturers.

1. Are shoes manufactured in Czechoslovakia, with American shoelaces and packed in boxes made in the United States, American shoes?

2. Is perfume imported from France, bottled in American bottles, an American perfume?

3. Is an automobile with a body made in the United States, which has an English engine and transmission an American car?

4. Is pottery made in Japan, packed in hay grown in the United States, American pottery? The Swiss subterfuge is obvious!

There are only three American jeweled watches, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham.

Will the Swiss watch importers tell the American public where the United States would obtain military timing mechanisms for the national defense if the American jeweled watch industry went out of business? Could the Swiss supply us? The Axis did not permit them to supply us during World War II.

FACT

The Swiss watch importers said: "In truth and in fact, in the manufacture of watches in this country, with imported movements commonly called assembling, there are purchased cases, straps, or bracelets, and boxes—all produced in the United States."

Department of Commerce records, Washington, D. C., prove this untrue. In 5 years, 11,044,199 watch cases were imported. In 1945, 3,734,008 cases were imported—10 times the number imported in 1941. Many Swiss-watch importers get their watches complete, they employ no labor other than office help.

FACT

During the past 5 years, 34,308,306 movements were imported.

1941	4,408,968
1942	5,691,304
1943	7,996,286
1944	6,912,332
1945	9,398,716

It takes 12 hours of American labor to produce a jeweled watch movement in the United States. Every watch imported means 12 hours of labor not available to an American worker; 34,308,306 movements imported means that American workers lost 411,699,672 hours of labor opportunity—205,849 years. Forty-one thousand one hundred and sixty-nine American workers would have had 5 years' employment producing these watches if they had been made in the United States.

Henry Wallace says: "We need 60,000,000 jobs for a prosperous America." This idealistic concept will never be achieved if Mr. Wallace's brother-in-law, Henry Bruggman, Swiss Minister to the United States, continues to out-negotiate our State Department.

Forty-one thousand one hundred and sixty-nine American workers have been already deprived of the opportunity to be employed for 5 years producing timepieces for the American public. This employment went to Switzerland, which, though supposedly neutral, produced most of the military timing mechanisms for the Axis.

FACT

The Swiss-watch importers claim that 88 percent of every Swiss-watch dollar, at the retail price level, remains in the United States, and that only 12 percent goes abroad. What an indictment the Swiss importers make upon themselves when they admit that only 12 percent of the retail price represents the cost of Swiss works. What a lucrative profit they have made during the past 5 years.

The Swiss watch worker didn't get the benefit. The American consumer didn't get the benefit. Swiss importers and their distributors cashed in on cheap labor and high prices. The American watch worker is paid a wage three to four times higher than the Swiss watch worker.

Again we repeat—the movement is the most important part of the watch—it is the watch. About two-thirds of the average cost of an American watch is in the movement.

FACT

The Swiss watch importers claim that both the CIO and the AFL vigorcusly protested against the imposition of any quota on the importation of Swiss watch movements and watches.

We do not know who was present at the Swiss watch importers' meetings, or if any union official affiliated with the AFL or CIO was present at any of these meetings. If any were present, we charge that such union leader betrayed his membership if he did advocate the entry of foreign products into the United States market at far less than the cost of production in the United States.

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, his assistants, Mr. Herbert Marks and Mr. Winthrop Brown, Chief of Commercial Policy, United States Department, were asked for a transcript of the hearings at which the Swiss watch importers presented their case. The American Watch Workers Union was refused this information as the Committee on Reciprocity said that it was confidential.

FACT

Reciprocity: We believe that foreign trade is essential to the prosperity of the United States. We believe that we should buy the products of foreign countries, provided that they in return buy our products, and that the purchase of these products does not interfere with national defense.

President Andrew Jackson in 1824 was the original advocate of foreign trade, but he specifically stated that if an industry was essential to national defense, it should be protected by the United States Government.

The existing Swiss-American trade agreement is and has been a one-way street.

1. From 1930 to 1945, the United States imported from Switzerland $491,125,000 worth of goods.

2. In the same period, Switzerland imported from the United States only $181,187,000 worth of goods, leaving a deficit of $309,938,000.

That is not reciprocal trade as it was intended.

Let's balance the trade and return it to the normal prewar level. Let's establish a quota on Swiss watches based upon the prewar average sales from 1926 to 1941. The average annual imports during this 15-year period were 2,100,000 watches per year.

The Swiss watch importers say that the sales of watches in the United States for 1946 will be 12,000,000. This is fantastic. It is intended to cloud the issue. All we can go by is the record which shows average sales of foreign and domestic watches together were 3,475,000 watches per normal year. Let's limit the imports to that prewar figure of 2,100,000, save a vital defense industry, protect American jobs, and make reciprocal trade really reciprocal.

Preservation of Birthplace of President Andrew Johnson at Raleigh, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the joint resolution which I introduced on April 18, 1946, to establish the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the preservation of his birthplace at Raleigh, N. C., together with an editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer with reference to this resolution, entitled "Belated Recognition."

Hon. Josephus Daniels, one of the great American editors who is familiar with the life and history of Andrew Johnson, wrote this editorial.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 154

Joint resolution to establish the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace, at Raleigh, N. C., of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission, and to be composed of five commissioners, to be appointed by the President of the United States. Such Commission shall consider and formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace at Raleign, N. C., of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Commission may, in its discretion, accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. The commission shall report its recommendations to Congress as soon as practicable.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000, which will be available to defray the necessary expenses of the Commission in the performance of the duties herein prescribed.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer]

BELATED RECOGNITION

In the early sixties no man was more hated by the leaders of the Confederate States, led by Jefferson Davis, than Andrew Johnson who had opposed secession and who was the Federal Governor of Tennessee during the War of the Sixties and opposed the Confederate government. He was a southern Democrat but believed the South ought to seek its rights within the Union. When Southern States seceded, Johnson upheld the Lincoln policies, but in politics was never anything but a Democrat. This was true even though he accepted the nomination for Vice President on the Lincoln ticket in 1864. However, that ticket was not called Republican in that campaign but the Union Party, a designation that brought it large support in the border States.

In the late sixties, the tables were turned. Andrew Johnson was the worst hated man in America in those northern sections which wished to impose harsh reconstruction measures upon the Southern States before they were restored to their rightful place as "indestructible States in an indissoluble Union." Because Johnson held that a State could not lawfully secede and stood against secession, he took the position after Appomattox that they had the right to take their old seats in the Union upon acceptance of the freedom of slaves proclaimed during the war. When Johnson vigorously opposed Stanton and Thad Stevens, whose chief object in giving full suffrage at once to the emancipated slaves was to insure Republican control at Washington, they set about to impeach Andrew Johnson, and came very near to succeeding in that partisan undertaking. John-

son held his ground and sought with "malice to none" to restore the Union without hate and bitterness, though he had not been free from it in the war days.

It was a long time after the sixties before Raleigh and North Carolina fully appreciated the greatness and courage of the only President born in the capital city of North Carolina. Not a few did not believe the boy of humble and honorable parentage, who had left Raleigh as a bound boy to Selby, the tailor, could attain the heights. However, more than a score of years ago, the patriotic people of Raleigh and others, aided by a gift from George Foster Peabody and the generosity of Mrs. Julius Lewis, who owned the cottage in which Andrew Johnson was born, came into possession of the cottage. They moved it from the fire hazard and it now stands in Pullen Park adjacent to the State college grounds. But it is exposed to the weather. The general assembly started a plan to erect a brick or stone building for its protection from the weather and to make it a Johnson museum.

And now Senator HOEY, with a wise and patriotic impulse, has introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for the appointment of five Members "to formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace of Andrew Johnson." It is to be hoped that the Hoey resolution will pass.

Belatedly there has come recognition to the foremost native of Raleigh and the State will cooperate with the Hoey committee to do honor to one of the ablest Chief Executives of the country.

Amvets File Appeal for Unemployment Compensation Under GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement made by J. H. Leib, national legislative director of the Amvets, and copy of appeal filed by the organization before the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission on April 24, 1946:

Attorneys for the Amvets Michigan Department have intervened in behalf of two veterans who were involved in the recent General Motors strike and were denied unemployment benefits under the GI bill of rights.

These veterans were employed by GM only 2 days before the strike was called and did not participate in or were they directly interested in the strike dispute.

Under provisions of the GI bill, chapter 8, section 800, an unemployed veteran is entitled to unemployment compensation and/or readjustment allowances within certain limitations provided in said bill, which deals with labor disputes. Great leeway is provided in determining the right to payments to veterans in the event of a labor dispute which leads to a strike and consequent unemployment for union and nonunion veterans. Veterans, who were employed for a few days, found themselves idle through a labor-management dispute, which irrespective of its merits, deprived them of their labor, and the Veterans' Administration deprived them of their readjustment payments.

Amvets at this time is not concerned with the issues which caused said strike and we are not promoting the general idea of a Government payment to veterans who are out on strike. Amvets simply feels that in such cases the GI bill of rights is completely inadequate and that this provision distinctly works to the veterans' disadvantage. There are a number of bills now pending before the Congress to correct this unfair situation, and we hope that suitable action will be taken as soon as possible to help those veterans who find themselves in such an unfortunate dilemma.

The appeal follows:

MICHIGAN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COMMISSION—BENEFIT APPEAL HEARING BEFORE REFEREE JOHN STACKPOOL—CLAIMS OF WILBER F. WESTON AND ROBERT L. HOAG FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EENEFITS UNDER THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944—BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, AMVETS, DEPARTMENT OF MICHIGAN, ON BEHALF OF CLAIMANTS

Because American Veterans of World War II, Department of Michigan, believes that the cases of claimants Weston and Hoag present extremely strong cases for granting compensation, and because of the vital interest to veterans generally, the Michigan State Department of Amvets applied for leave to file a brief amicus curiae.

Amvets submits that compensation should be granted in claimant's cases for the following reasons:

I. The characteristics of the allowance for unemployment provided for by Congress in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act are such that claims filed therefor must be construed in the light of that act and the intention of Congress in passing it, rather than in the light of the purposes and policies of State unemployment compensation acts.

II. The particular facts presented by the Weston and Hoag claims require compensation in these cases to effectuate the policy of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

III. Because competent proof was presented that parts and materials shortages did exist in sufficient degree to have been a cause, by itself, of claimants' unemployment, the fact that a labor dispute did exist should not disqualify these claimants.

REASON I

As distinguished from general unemployment compensation acts, the servicemen's readjustment allowance is financed solely by an appropriation by Congress from the Treasury of the United States. The readjustment allowance does not depend upon specific contributions or specific taxes paid by an employer. Furthermore there are no experience indices, contribution rates, or reserves which will be adversely affected if compensation is granted.

Amvets maintains that the underlying purposes of Congress in providing for the unemployment readjustment allowance are twofold: (1) To provide a minimum standard for the readjustment of veterans to civilian life during any period of unemployment, not exceeding 52 weeks, as a reward for those who made major sacrifices in the defense of their country and the American way of life; and (2) an adjustment allowance was necessary to compensate veterans who, because of their service, were prevented from earning the rates of income enjoyed by nonservicemen and who consequently were unable to amass any savings during the wartime period of high production and employment.

We are dealing with funds appropriated by Congress to carry out a law passed under the general welfare powers of Congress to alleviate the stringent economic conditions of a particular group. The right to this readjustment allowance is a personal one and peculiar to veterans of World War II. No employer's interest is involved. It follows that the act must be liberally construed to carry out the obvious intention of the Congress.

Amvets submits that similarly worded State unemployment compensation acts and interpretations thereunder should not be controlling when the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is construed. Amvets maintains that the disqualifying sections like that for labor disputes, section 800 (b), must not control whenever there is competent proof that the unemployment was due to causes other than a labor dispute.

REASON II

The testimony submitted at the hearing shows that claimant Hoag worked 2 days and claimant Weston worked 2½ days. Weston was honorably discharged from the Army October 20, 1945, and Hoag was honorably discharged from the Army on November 2, 1945. Both claimants were unsuccessful in securing employment with any employer other than Buick Motor Division, both prior to the date of the walkout and subsequently thereto. As a result, claimants' ability to readjust themselves to civilian life was greatly hampered by unemployment. The proofs show that Weston is married and has a child 3 months old and that he earned no money whatsoever from November 21, 1945, up to the date of his hearing on February 13, 1946, and we believe that he continued unemployed and without earnings thereafter. As a result, if Weston is denied compensation due to factors arising out of his employment at Buick Motor Division for 2½ days, a serious forfeiture will take place.

A similarly serious forfeiture will take place in Hoag's case due to his working only 2 days. If compensation is denied, it means that by working for a 2-day period he will be disqualified from receiving an allowance of $20 per week for a period of upward of 16 weeks.

Unless compensation is granted, both Hoag and Weston will be denied the readjustment allowance accorded to other veterans simply because they diligently and promptly reported for work at their prewar employment and worked for 2 and 2½ days, respectively. Amvets submits that this is an unreasonable discrimination and a complete derogation of the obvious intention of Congress to grant the allowance to veterans in exactly the same circumstances as those of claimants Weston and Hoag.

REASON III

A just result can be obtained in these two cases without running afoul of the labor disputes disqualification of section 800 (b), by holding that the unemployment was due to parts and materials shortages as brought out by competent proof. As long as some proof exists that there was a parts and materials shortage cause for unemployment, every doubt should be resolved in favor of compensability in order to carry out the obvious intention of Congress. The proofs show further that both claimants were advised when they originally applied for employment that there was no work, due to shortages of materials, and that the whole plant was expected to shut down in a few days for lack of frames.

A decision holding that unemployment in these two cases was due to parts and materials shortages would permit the referee to grant compensation without straining the labor disputes disqualification section. Furthermore, substantial justice would be achieved and the intention of Congress would be carried out.

CONCLUSION

Amvets submits, therefore, that compensation should be granted in the cases of claimants Weston and Hoag.

Justifiable Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of April 26, 1946:

JUSTIFIABLE PROTEST

The rising protest against the Swiss watch trade, which threatens to engulf one of America's finest and oldest industries, must be heeded by our State Department.

The announcement the other day that the Swiss Government had agreed to limit watch exports to the United States to 7,500,000 for the year ending next March 31, is preposterous.

One would think that Switzerland was making a great concession. Yet, in 1944, she sent to this country only 6,912,332, and in 1941 shipped only 4,408,968.

What sort of reciprocity is there to a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Switzerland, in the interest of world peace or for any other reason, if thousands of skilled watchmakers, who require years of training, are thrown out of work in America?

What sort of reciprocity is it if, in the period of 1930 to 1945, we imported $491,125,000 worth of goods from the Swiss and they in turn imported $181,187,000. The difference there is $309,938,000, and that's a difference in the earnings of Swiss workers and American workers.

But it is more than a difference in just wages. It means jobs. In 1941 there were 8,200 skilled watchmakers in the United States. Today there are 6,000 employed. In 50 years 56 watch industries were started up in America and today there are only 3.

President Walter F. Cenerazzo, of the American Watchmakers Union, makes a challenging statement. He points out that in 5 years 34,308,306 Swiss movements were imported into this country. Since it takes 12 hours of labor to produce a jeweled watch, he contends that the same number of watches, imported in the last 5 years, would give 41,169 American workers 5 years of work.

He further argues that normal watch sales in normal years in this country averages only 3,500,000, yet the State Department will permit more than twice that number to be imported from Switzerland.

There is more to this than wages and work, however. The American watchmaker, uncelebrated and unsung, was one of the silent, outstanding heroes of the war of machines and science. His skilled fingers made possible the intricate precision timers which gave our forces the jump on the Axis by land, sea, and sky.

While engaged as a watchmaker in making these timers and giving up the making of watches because the life of his Nation was at stake, neutral Switzerland piled in watch movements, during the war years. At the same time, Mr. Cenerazzo charges, the Swiss were making delicate timing instruments for the Axis.

Some months back, America, in the field of foreign affairs, adopted a stiffened attitude toward Russia, an ally. The American people applauded this firmness with such vigor that the policy is still being pressed by our State Department.

It would be a pity if our policy was supine in another direction, if thousands of skilled workers were put on the pavement and if those skills, so valuable in one war, were lost to this Nation, should we ever face another one.

Let us be tolerable and reciprocal with other nations if we will. But let us not carry it beyond reasonable limits. Let us not bend over backward so far that we bump our heads.

The Stake in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of April 22, 1946:

THE STAKE IN PRICE CONTROL
(By Samuel Crowther)
ARTICLE II. HARBINGERS OF HUNGER

The shocking contrast between what the Office of Price Administration pretends to be and what it is shows up nowhere so glaringly as in the family market basket.

When the Office of Price Administration was first organized, it was the intentions of the managed economy boys who have always dominated it, to use the law to destroy private business and to put our country on a permanently rationed economy under Government control.

That was the reason for the rush of intricate regulations upsetting most of the customs that had grown up in the food trade, including even a revolution in the cutting of meat.

That was the reason for the move from another quarter for the abolishing of private brands in food and the substitution of Government grading. For the controlled state cannot work unless human ingenuity and initiative are blacked out and the people treated as though they were an institution.

The OPA operatives have not succeeded in knocking out private ownership or in establishing a managed economy.

But they have succeeded in knocking out or crippling responsible private ownership and in so mismanaging our economy that today our food production and distribution are in chaos with malnutrition everywhere and hunger in sight.

The moral chaos is even worse than the physical.

The rewards go exclusively to those who evade the law.

The honest merchant is faced with going black or going broke.

The OPA is a partner in crime, whether a voluntary or an involuntary partner remains to be brought out.

In food alone its snarling ineptitude and vindictiveness have cost the American people, directly and indirectly, so many billions of dollars in so many ways that the total monetary damage growing out of its assault upon the American system will never be truly estimated.

The OPA has not held down the cost of living, insofar as foods are concerned.

The figures which it presents on this point are utterly dishonest.

In part they are made up by assuming that the housewife bought at ceiling prices foods which in fact are not on the top of the counters to buy.

And in part, by not taking into account that the foods bought at ceiling prices are in most cases of a quality which ordinarily would not be bought at such prices.

And of course the official figures on the cost of living do not say anything about the more than a billion and a half dollars that were paid out by the Treasury as subsidies in 1945 in order that food might be produced to sell at ceiling prices.

In a special report made by Senators WHERRY, BUCK, CAPEHART, WILSON, and CAPPER as members of the Small Business Committee, they set out after hearing days of testimony:

"Reports of the rise in the cost of living expressed in percentage figures whether by Government or by Government officials are therefore wholly deceptive and entirely misleading—for the actual and experienced increase is substantially higher than that which is so reported."

Contrast that considered statement with these paragraphs taken from a propaganda-folder issued by the OPA and broadcast by the millions at taxpayers' expense:

"As a smart woman and a good citizen, use this folder to help protect your bank account, your home, your friends and relatives' jobs and your community's business people from the devastating effects of runaway prices—and the depression which would follow inflation.

"Price control is for the people and by the people. Read this folder, fill out and send in the shopping list and help yourself and the Nation toward security."

Now take a look at the meat. The statistical Research Company and the C. C. Chappelle Company, both experienced and reputable concerns, shopped at the butcher shops—not the black markets—for meat.

They visited 1,803 stores located in New York; Providence, R. I.; Newark, N. J.; Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Memphis, Tenn.; Houston, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

They bought 3,495 cuts of meat. That is a fair sampling. Of these stores 83.2 percent sold one or more cuts above ceiling prices ranging from a high of 94 percent in Houston to a low of 77.1 percent in Providence. The average percentage of overcharge was: Beef and veal 35 percent and pork 24 percent.

Butchers, generally speaking, can now buy only a fraction of their meats through their regular established sources of supply. That is why some butchers have meat and some have not.

The responsible houses observing ceilings cannot pay the prices for live animals that the new irresponsible OPA slaughtering trade pays.

In 1939 there were 1,942 meat-packing companies doing a business of $5,000 or more a year. In July 1945 there were 26,655.

That is the new vested interest which the OPA has created in the Nation's meat supply.

The great reputable meat-packing industry with an investment of many millions of dollars, owned by thousands of persons and normally employing about a half million people, returned to the farmer about 74 percent of the wholesale meat dollar.

That industry is on its way out.

Swift, for instance, during the week ending March 26, out of 36,429 cattle offered in the Chicago market could buy only 1,983 head. At East St. Louis, out of receipts of 10,750, it could buy only 266.

A small old-established packer in Tennessee testified that during the same week at an auction in Chattanooga his company was able to purchase 1 head out of 150 sold and 3 days later was able to buy 8 out of 300 sold.

The industry had, through research over the years, created byproducts which were the raw material for other industries employing thousands of people.

All of this has been nearly wiped out.

The new OPA industry just slaughters the animals and cuts up the meat. There are no byproducts. Often not even the hides are saved. There is little sanitation.

Over and beyond this market is the black market proper in which health and morals count not at all.

The OPA itself has estimated that the public is paying about a billion dollars a year over ceiling prices for its meat. This does not take into account the more than half a billion dollars paid in meat subsidies.

Some experts believe that the public, including the subsidies, is paying at least $3,000,000,000 above the ceiling prices for meats alone and that the indirect cost to the Nation, through upsetting the meat trade from packer to retail butcher, will run to another billion.

The story of meat is pretty much the story of what is happening in all our foods. Only the details differ.

Feed and Butter Situation in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from the Governors of the New England States, as well as letters from the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation and the New England Milk Producers Association, both of Massachusetts, concerning the feed and butter situation:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 26, 1946.*

Hon. PEHR HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Our farmers unable to produce sufficient food in current food production and conservation program. Liquidation of poultry flocks already under way; will become increasingly critical within 2 weeks. Cow numbers decreasing steadily for lack of income incentive and because of uncertainty of feed supply. Thirty-cents bonus program for export has completely debarred our feed trade from the market. Immediate allocation of corn and other feed grains to deficit area essential. Situation desperate. Substantial increase of returns to dairymen essential to prevent further liquidation of dairy herds on the basis of feed on hand. Prospects for the immediate future will be drastically below receipt of the past several months. The liquidation of poultry that has been going on at a rapid rate inevitably will be followed in the dairy industry, making the milk situation for the coming year in this area one that will result in acute distress on the part of the consuming public. New England normally produces enough milk and substantial percentages of eggs and poultry meat for its own consumption. However, in this food and feed deficits area we must expect relatively less meat, butter, and flour than some other parts of the country. For this reason it is of vital importance to receive our fair share of feed supply upon which our home-produced foods depend.

CHARLES M. DALE, *Chairman,*
HORACE A. HILDRETH,
MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
MAURICE J. TOBIN,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Governors of New England States.

MASSACHUSETTS FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Waltham, Mass., April 29, 1946.

The Honorable PEHR G. HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLMES: Each week our feed situation gets worse. Somebody must find an answer or our poultry industry will receive a setback from which it will never recover.

The more orders come out of Washington the less feed we get. Drastic reductions in feed deliveries are again being reported this Monday morning.

Dairy herds here and there are beginning to suffer. Unless relief is found quickly, cows will actually be killed off.

The 30-cent bonus on export grains just means we cannot compete with Government for grain.

I dont believe you realize just how serious this situation is. It is no longer a question of protecting income for the poultry and dairy industry. It is a question of losing forever a great source of taxation, a great market for goods and equipment and supplies. It is a question of whether you are going to allow other sections of the country to displace our business.

No matter how great the need for food in Europe, can we allow ourselves to follow programs which tend to dangerously lower our food supply, cut down drastically the number of jobs available, remove from both property tax lists and income tax returns, hundreds of thousands of dollars, and give up the place in the poultry and dairy business it has taken Massachusetts generations to build?

Our Government is proceeding in utmost folly to send grains to Europe because the visible costs are cheap. The actual costs are dear indeed. Thousands of our own people will be ruined. It would be far better to give Europe pork and beef and chickens, eggs and milk, no matter what the initial cost.

Such a procedure would place us squarely on a program of abundance. We are headed now for a period of scarcity.

Respectfully yours,

CARLETON I. PICKETT,
Secretary.

NEW ENGLAND MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., April 23, 1946.

Hon. PEHR G. HOLMES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLMES: We wish to make vigorous protest to the Bowles' announcement of April 15 to the effect that wartime restrictions would be restored on fluid cream and ice cream, together with a roll-back in cream prices, and higher subsidy payments to milk producers.

Having removed all quotas and limitations on the sale of milk and butterfat in the low-production months of the year, it is now proposed to restore them in the season of heaviest milk production. We know of no better way to aggravate the shortage and to aggravate the surplus than to remove all restrictions in the short, and restore them in the flush, season of the year.

Instead of raising butter to a point where it could compete for a share of the milk supply, Bowles now proposes to force milk into lower-priced uses through limitation orders and to force down cream values and class II prices to producers. Then, having forced down returns to producers through a lower price for butterfat, the subsidy payment is increased to compensate for higher costs of labor and feed.

In a market like Boston the increased subsidy payment for May and June will be more than offset by lower returns to producers for class II milk going into cream and ice cream. The arithmetic is fairly simple. The proposed restrictions on fluid and ice cream will knock $4 to $5 per can off the cream price and about 50 cents per hundredweight off the class II price. With about 54 percent of the milk in May and June going into class II use, this will reduce the blended price to producers by about 27 cents per hundredweight. The increase of 20 cents in the subsidy rate leaves producers with a minus 7 cents to cover the higher costs of labor and feed. This will not get much added milk production.

This is a sleight-of-hand performance, apparently generated by the need to do something about butter. The Department of Agriculture has been fighting off such a program for months, but has now been overruled by Bowles and OPA. Producers in New England depend on the market for fluid milk and cream, and only very limited facilities exist for production of butter and other manufactured dairy products. If it is necessary to restrict outlets in fluid cream and ice cream in order to do something about butter, such restrictions should be postponed at least to the end of June in order to permit the efficient utilization of milk supplies during the flush season of the year.

Very truly yours,

W. P. DAVIS,
General Manager.

H. R. 6260

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 6260, a bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of July 1, 1944, relating to contract settlement and designed to furnish relief to producers of critical and strategic metals and minerals whose claims have not received adequate consideration under the law as it now stands.

The present Contract Settlement Act makes it almost impossible for mining claimants to obtain relief even though the act was apparently made so as to cover mining operations. I am of the opinion that this bill will do justice to those producers of critical and strategic metals and minerals who responded to the Government's urgent plea for all-out production of these materials—many of which were not required for peacetime use—and who, upon the termination of the Government programs found themselves with great losses due to their investments and no further markets for their products.

This bill covers net losses which may have been made by a producer conducting an eligible operation, defined as follows:

(b) An eligible operation is any operation (1) of mining, milling, or otherwise recovering or concentrating, or (2) of preparing to mine, mill, or otherwise recover or concentrate, the ores, including those from any mineral deposit, lode or placer, mine dump, tailing dump, slag pile, or other source of any mineral or metal declared by the Army and Navy Munitions Board, during the emergency proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, but not after August 31, 1945, to be strategic or critical, if the operation was undertaken or continued, with or without a contract, in good faith response to an

act of Congress or to any verbal, written, or published request, demand, solicitation, or appeal, or any act of stimulation, by the President or any official, agency, or corporation of the Government, or duly appointed agent thereof, whose functions at the time were connected, directly or indirectly, with the production, supply, or acquisition of any such mineral or metal in connection with the national defense, the conduct of war, or essential civilian supply.

In effect, this bill is based upon the legislative and legal history of the War Minerals Relief Act of 1919, expanded to cover the strategic and critical minerals and metals used during this war, and using the authority of the Office of Contract Settlement as set up in the present act to provide quick and equitable settlements.

This measure remedies an inequitable situation among comparable war contractors. All persons who supplied or arranged to supply materials, services, or facilities for the prosecution of the war, except the small mine operator producing strategic or critical minerals and metals, have been, or under the provisions of Public Law No. 395, may be adequately compensated. This proposed bill will cure this unanimously admitted inequity in properly compensating those who undertook to supply materials, services, or supplies for the war.

By utilizing the settlement procedure now prescribed, eligible mining claims may be settled in the same manner as other termination claims. Thus the delay experienced by claimants under the War Minerals Relief Act and its five separate amendments, which extended over a period of more than 20 years following World War I, will be avoided. There are many small producers in my State who undertook difficult and expensive mining operations at the Government's request and who have suffered severe losses in the performance of a patriotic duty and through no fault of their own. This bill will give them an opportunity for a legitimate settlement of their claims. I hope it can be pressed to speedy passage.

The Stake in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of April 23, 1946:

THE STAKE IN PRICE CONTROL

(By Samuel Crowther)

ARTICLE III. HARBINGERS OF HUNGER

The OPA with its rigid ceilings has upset the normal relationships established through the years in which natural prices based on supply and demand direct the distribution of wheat and feeds such as corn, oats, barley, and sorghum.

There would be plenty of cereal foods for man, beast, and fowl, so say the real experts, had not the OPA by its pricing redirected these foods.

In consequence, and in order to avoid the ceiling, barter in many sections is replacing money sales.

One artificially scarce commodity—with or without something on the side—is being traded for another artificially scarce commodity.

The black market in feeds is everywhere and the bribes are even becoming standardized—$150 for a carload of good corn and $300 for a carload of soybeans.

The same practices run through dairy products. The ice-cream makers with their ceiling prices can afford to pay more for cream than the butter makers with their ceiling prices. And so we do not get butter.

Some prices, because of the $700,000,000 paid out on dairy products, are artificially low. This makes other prices artificially high and in consequence ruin and chaos stalk through the whole dairy industry.

The ceiling prices on coffee have had both national and international consequences.

They have strained our relations with Brazil, our hereditary friend, and have further hurt our relations with Colombia and the coffee-producing states of Central America.

The Treasury is now paying a subsidy of 3 cents a pound on coffee, so the price you pay is not the real price.

But at that we are getting only the lower grades of coffee. The better and higher-priced grades are being held by the producing countries or sent to other markets.

The story on sugar is slightly different. We are short on sugar today because of the control policies instituted by Messrs. Wallace and Tugwell when they were running the Department of Agriculture.

What would happen if all the controls were taken off food?

Let us forget the inflation stuff—the OPA is not controlling inflation and cannot control inflation. That is bare-faced propaganda bunk.

The OPA has one prize example of what would happen if controls were taken off. Coconuts are one. In 1941–42 coconuts sold for around $15 per thousand. During the war shipping space was hard to get—the consumption of whole nuts is very small, and we got our supplies as copra from the South Seas.

In 1944, the OPA established a ceiling price jumbled to $250 a thousand. That is not remarkable or evidence of anything at all except that it was possible to buy an item which was supposed not to be imported at all. At that price, coconuts would shortly have been coming in overland on the backs of men and mules.

After World War I when sugar, on the speculative market, rose to a dollar a pound, sugar poured into New York from all over the world—sugar that not even the brokers had heard of—and prices dived into the cellar. The problem was then to get prices up to the cost of production.

The prices of foods are now high and they probably will go higher—with or without the OPA, for we have monetary inflation.

But in the opinion of the men of long experience in food trades, the clearing out of the OPA would bring back the forces of competition and, although prices in some lines where scarcities have been created would rise, the customer would have the choice of buying or not buying over a wide range and that would bring all prices into their proper relationship—with some probably lower and a few higher than they now are.

At any rate, they would be natural prices, founded on freedom and morality. And common sense teaches us that prices will and must reflect both the value of the dollar and the demand as compared to the supply of goods.

We are only making trouble for ourselves if we try to postpone the inevitable.

The OPA is now breaking down the only machinery that can put us on a stable basis.

Denazification in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter which I have received from Capt. Hunter Morrison, United States Army, a resident of Seattle, Wash., who has just returned after 2 years of Army service in western Europe. In this letter he speaks of the workings of the denazification policy in the American zone in Germany:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 23, 1946.*

HON. HUGH DE LACY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DE LACY: After more than 2 years in western Europe, the last 6 months of which were with the trade and commerce branch of the economics division of the United States military government headquarters at Berlin, I hope you will be interested in the significant developments I saw in the American zone of Germany up to March.

PROBLEM

As I returned at the end of March from Germany, two events were reported which would discourage even a cynical observer. Nevertheless, they are not surprising to one familiar with military government. A widespread well-financed movement to revive nazism was discovered in western Germany; and 200 German policemen, entering a Jewish DP camp in Stuttgart under authority of our military government, had brutally killed a Polish Jew and wounded four others. These events are symptomatic of the really frightening weaknesses in our program to eliminate nazism. I recently had occasion to observe the program at close range. Much must be done immediately to prevent western Germany from becoming once again a breeding ground of nazism and war.

Further, this is important because our ineffectuality in eliminating nazism in characteristic of the failure of the State and War Departments to decartelize Germany, to encourage the growth of democratic organizations such as political parties and trade unions, and to support democratic forces throughout the world. The aims for which the war were fought have had no perceptible effect on the power politics of the State Department.

We are turning denazification over to the Germans without providing the most elementary safeguards. (a) We are not making certain that the Germans to whom we give the job are anti-Nazis. (b) We are not providing for close and continuing military government supervision of the Germans. These developments will be described in greater detail.

HISTORY OF PROGRAM

The original directive of July 7, 1945, to all military government detachments in the American zone provided a sound interim

policy for segregating several million Nazis and members of affiliated organizations and punishing them to the extent of removing them from public and private employment above that of ordinary labor. The most serious cases numbering some 200,000 in the United States zone were to have been arrested and subjected to confinement. All were to have their property blocked. But this excellent policy, predicated upon the Crimean and Potsdam declarations and United States Joint Chiefs of Staff Memorandum No. 1067, has not been carried through. It has met effective opposition at all levels of military government

On March 5, 1946, the denazification program was officially converted from an interim to a long-run program when the law for liberation from national socialism and militarism was approved by United States military government headquarters at Berlin (OMGUS). This decree, prepared by the three German minister presidents of the United States zone, ranking officials appointed by the United States military government, provides for the establishment of special German courts to determine (a) the degree of culpability of each German over 18 in the Nazi regime and (b) penalties therefor ranging from internment in a labor camp and confiscation of property to loss of the right to vote.

The new law permits flexibility of administration which may be used, as intended, to render greater equity than is possible from the use of a detailed and rigid classification designed to weed out quickly into one group those who were more than nominal members of the Nazi Party, regardless of the varying degree of participation therein above this minimum. The classification was a list of over 100 Nazi institutions in which membership prior to May 1, 1937, or some other date, automatically required removal from public or private employment. The weakness of this procedure was that some of the most influential Nazi followers avoided membership. On the other hand, the new law can be administered in such a lax manner as to defeat its objective, i. e., eradicating all Nazi and militaristic influences as promised to the peoples of the world at Crimea and Potsdam.

GERMANS NOT PREPARED TO DENAZIFY

In conformity with the general policy of returning governmental functions to the Germans as rapidly as possible, administration of the denazification program is to be taken over by the Germans. Are the Germans prepared to assume responsibility for the administration of the denazification program? They are not. Military government officials have appointed reactionaries as key German governmental officials. Dr. Shaeffer, ex-Minister President of Bavaria under General Patton, has been only one of many errors. Only a few days ago it was reported that his successor, Dr. Wilhelm Hoegner, one of the few prodemocratic Germans in an influential position, would ask the United States for a new law for the protection of Bavaria because the Nazis are so deeply entrenched in the political, social, and economic structure that they will remain for years a threat to any democratic regime. Reinhold Maier, now Minister President of Wuerttemberg, voted in March 1933 as a Reichstag deputy representing the German State Party to give Hitler unlimited powers in the enabling law. It is not surprising, therefore, that he is opposed to vigorous denazification. Until required by the new law, Maier did not even want to appoint a minister for denazification. The Minister President of Greater Hessen condones the continued use of chambers of commerce as quasi-governmental agencies in some cities contrary to military government regulations. However, labor unions and persons affiliated with less conservative political parties have been precluded from participation in local governments by the conservative elements. These elements are enthusiastically supported by military government officers at all levels because of administrative expediency and the political illiteracy of these officers. One cannot but concur with what Brigadier General McSherry, director of the manpower division of Germany, said at a press conference on February 5, 1946, that the new Germany must be built around the working classes—that virtually all German industrialists were contaminated with the philosophy of superiority and aggression. Until there is participation of the anti-Nazi elements of the poorer classes is most German agencies one can expect at best only a token cleansing and punishment of Nazis whose ideology, politico-economic background and aspirations are shared by those Germans to whom we have given responsibility for carrying out the liberation of Germany from nazism.

A frightening number of Germans continue to show the effects of Goebbel's propaganda. In their actions and in their statements, they demonstrate the retention of Nazi ideology. The students of Erlangen, drowning out Pastor Niemoeller as he talked to them of war guilt, are a clear example. A striking demonstration of the present unfitness of the Germans to handle their own denazification is the fact that the Bavarian Minister of Denazification, looking for 1,500 qualified anti-Nazi, prodemocratic persons required to administer the new law, could find only 250 after scouring all Bavaria for 4 months.

It is no wonder then that at the time this proposal was under consideration, the Chief of the United States Public Safety Branch, in charge of administering the program, stated that operation by the Germans would be a "hazardous undertaking."

INADEQUATE MILITARY GOVERNMENT MACHINERY

Denazification by the Germans is worth trying only if strictly supervised by military government. Despite glib assurances, this supervision is now utterly inadequate and getting weaker all the time. What is the truth? The personnel of the United States Public Safety Branch of military government who must handle this supervision is being curtailed just as (a) the scope of the denazification program is being expanded on a permanent basis and (b) the initial operations of German administration require most careful scrutiny.

Supervision in general by our headquarters in Berlin of land (state) military government has been very inadequate and that of the land military government over kreis (county and city) military government has been even more so. Worse is the failure throughout the Army to hold responsible officers accountable for violations of crucial directives. Until there is significant improvement in the system of recruiting and training of military government personnel, there is no reason to believe that the striking ineffectuality and indifference pervading the present organizational structure from top to bottom will be corrected.

One way to enforce directives is to send inspection teams into the field. United States Public Safety Branch of Berlin has been fighting to get a staff of 100 for field inspection teams. But they could get only 9 in February.

Strict field inspection has been impeded by an OMGUS memorandum of January 16, 1946, which states that instructions from OMGUS will be limited to establishing broad policy and should avoid detailed instructions as to its execution. The action of military government on German plans should be only on the compliance of the proposed plans with United States policy and not on the efficiency of the plan. Recognition is not given to the necessary interconnection between policy and administration. If the authorities frown upon strong action for a given problem, it may escape adequate supervision by being classed as an enforcement or administrative problem. It has had the effect of reducing visits in the United States zone by United States personel to check upon and assist in the enforcement of policies. Thus when subordinate offices of the Economic Division failed to discharge German employees found to be "mandatory" discharge cases, the division failed to take effective action to assure prompt compliance. This is referred to below.

Under these arrangements, the Germans are going to have quite a free hand in denazification. Insofar as military government fails to supervise the activities of the German administrators of the denazification program and thereby nullification of that program, the United States law allocating administration to the Germans violates the Allied Control Council Directive No. 24, January 12, 1946, agreed to by OMGUS. The latter states that the removal of Nazis is the responsibility of the division having jurisdiction over the field in which they are employed, acting on the advice of the public-safety unit of military government.

UNSYMPATHETIC ATTITUDE TOWARD ENFORCEMENT

Effective denazification is dependent not only upon good administrative machinery, but more importantly upon the attitudes of our administrators. Even if the military continued to administer and be responsible for the program, present failures would continue until (1) personnel at all levels of operation were selected who would zealously carry it out, and (2) anti-Nazis were encouraged to participate actively in bringing the guilty before the law.

Personnel of all ranks and of all levels of government of functional divisions, i. e., economic, transport, finance, etc., are unsympathetic to denazification objectives. They worship at the sterile shrine of action and efficiency, regardless of whether they lead in the right or wrong direction. Since only the Nazis and black-market operators can afford to entertain Americans in a manner to which they are accustomed, the Nazis quickly ingratiate themselves with American personnel who can be useful to them. Such Germans also make good secretaries. Too many Americans have allowed themselves to be influenced by these reactionary Germans and have forgotten the purposes for which we fought the war and occupied Germany. Also, at the lowest levels officers may be harassed by a wide range of day-to-day operating problems and details, all seemingly requiring immediate decisions. Headquarters have not issued instructions as to the relative importance of their various assignments. The typical American officer considers his main job as getting things going and regards denazification as an unreasonable obstruction. Even the handful of officers who have the inclination to evaluate their role and relate their actions to the long-run effects of denazification might lack the time or guidance.

Let us take some examples. A Nazi, Doctor Donner, was requested by OMGUS to perform professional services. High officials sought over a period of several months to have him released from custody at the ministerial collecting center, Kassel. Fortunately, the will of those who had investigated him finally prevailed. How many others have slipped through the net can only be conjectured.

Contrary to regulations, for the United States zone, on December 31, 1945, 5,800 Nazis were admitted to be in public or responsible private employment from which their removal was to have been compulsory. This break-down of administration may have prompted the theater commander to issue an order that all such Germans be removed forthwith and that monthly reports be submitted to headquarters on the status of removable Germans. Some improvement can be seen in that 2,000 were reported on February 15, 1946.

More specifically, no less than 42 Nazis whose removal was to have been compulsory

were still employed by the United States military government for the Berlin sector as of February 13, 1946. Thirteen officers assumed responsibility for their retention. It is interesting that they cut across all ranks. One lieutenant colonel retained 3 persons, 4 majors 16 persons, 3 captains 10 persons, 3 lieutenants 11 persons, and 2 United States civilians 2 persons.

One of the ranking generals declined to discharge two maids whose dismissal had been recommended by the Public Safety Branch. Its function is to recommend and to advise officers of the Nazi status of their employees.

As an example of the failure to properly utilize experts, it is important to note that while the OMGUS Denazification Policy Board and its staff considered various proposals for 3 months prior to the decision to place denazification in the hands of the Germans, it did not request the services of the denazification officer of the Manpower Division who, because of his experience with the problem for over a year during which he had demonstrated his zealousness in carrying out the Crimean and Potsdam declarations, was among the best qualified to assess these proposals. Most of the experienced personnel of the Finance Division which in its own field accomplished the most thorough cleansing to date had returned to this country by the end of 1945. In general, officials in charge of denazification policy today exclude those who led the fight in 1945 to put teeth in this part of our occupation program.

I brought to the attention of the Economics Division that 1,000 persons under its jurisdiction, who were required to be discharged, were still in public and private employment in the United States zone at the end of 1945 and that the Public Safety Branch had recommended that an additional 2,400 be discharged for Nazi affiliations. Thereupon, the division appointed a denazification committee on which would be a representative of each of its four branches. As the Trade and Commerce Branch representative I learned in only a few days that this was not a priority job. Apparently, no vigorous measures were to be taken. Telegrams and letters were to be sent to the zone in the familiar, routine, ineffective manner. This, despite the fact that such an outstanding administrative failure appeared to call for the more direct and effective action of visiting the responsible offices in the zone.

It is clear from the history of nazism and fascism that its stronghold was among the large businessmen in industry and commerce. The indifference of the Trade and Commerce Branch to intensive denazification appears also true of the Industry, and Food, and Agriculture Branches. Only the price-control section of trade and commerce sought to supervise the elimination of nazism from public employment. However, it did not take the same action with respect to private enterprise. The internal-trade section and export-import section took no supervisory action to bring about denazification in their fields of public and private employment. Job specifications were written up and approved last fall for a denazification officer in each section. These jobs had not been filled up to February 15, 1946.

Anti-Nazis have not been encouraged to participate in government in general nor in denazification. Despite orders that anti-Nazis shall be given priority of employment, seldom are they sought out directly by military government or tactical units of the Army. If this source were tapped, the program would proceed much more swiftly and justly. To date, they have been discouraged by our administration. United States officers have regarded anti-Nazi denunciations as irksome.

SUMMARY

To summarize, the Germans are not yet prepared to take over the administration of and responsibility for denazification because German reactionaries have been entrenched in strategic positions at all levels of government by various United States military government officers. Furthermore, anti-Nazis have neither been encouraged to report Nazis to the Public Safety Branch, nor to accept employment with military government. While administration of denazification by military government has been very unsatisfactory, still it would be superior to German operation with presently appointed personnel. Several months ago the State Department announced that it was not prepared to take over the functions of military government until January 1947, 6 or 7 months later than was scheduled last fall. This delay in turning over the denazification program to United States civilian control is a serious mistake. The Army has demonstrated its inability to fulfill our commitments under the Potsdam protocol. It is hoped that the State Department with a new, vigorous administration will do better.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, I suggest that:

1. Responsibility and administration of denazification be returned to United States Government representatives until sufficient anti-Nazis are brought in participation in government and are permitted to demonstrate their ability to assume responsibility. Responsibility should rest solely with public safety; no longer with the functional divisions.

2. Military government be turned over to United States civilian control at a more rapid rate, particularly key positions which are retained by generals and colonels. These should be held by civilian experts in governmental affairs who are dedicated to stamping out nazism and who do not think in terms of power politics as do many of our State Department experts.

3. The provisions of the new law requiring use of anti-Nazi, prodemocratic Germans should be mandatory. Where German officials are trying to do a good job, as in the case of the Bavarian Minister for Denazification, we must protect German officials from attack by the Nazis and give them the police powers required to stamp out the underground Nazi movement.

4. To minimize fraternization and its reactionary effect on United States personnel and to create more normal living, movement of wives and children to their husbands should be accelerated.

5. Shipment of more American goods and better services for the more normal development of small American communities, including American schools for children of occupational authorities. English library facilities are needed as well as current American newspapers and periodicals in order that personnel may be informed of affairs in the States. The better grade American movies are needed for good entertainment.

HUNTER MORRISON,
Captain, United States Army.

The Way To Help Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE WAY TO HELP GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. Jesse H. Jones, former head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and New Deal Cabinet member, makes the challenging suggestion that if the American Government really desires to help Great Britain in its postwar financial emergency there is a sound way to do it.

The impeding "loan" of billions of dollars to Britain without the slightest expectation of repayment is not the way to do it, says Mr. Jones.

Moreover, he warned, it would "start the United States down a financial road that is likely to lead to disaster."

"I should like to remind the Congress that lending Britain dollars as is proposed in the present loan agreement does not insure that she will spend those dollars with our farmers, manufacturers, and exporters," wrote Mr. Jones.

"She will be free to spend them in competition with us in world markets, and will.

"The United States, with 5.8 percent of the world's land area and 6.1 percent of the world's population, cannot single-handedly finance and rebuild a war-torn, confused world, and the time to recognize this is now."

However, it is entirely possible and reasonable for the American Government to render financial assistance to Great Britain in her postwar emergency, he continued, without either humiliaton for Britain or disaster for the United States.

While Mr. Jones was Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1941, Britain was loaned nearly half a billion dollars under ample security and it has been paid off on schedule.

It is well known that the British Government still has valuable and tremendous assets in this country and elsewhere in the world, available as security for loans sufficient for her needs.

The British Government and other British interests hold substantial ownership in many American industries and enterprises.

The British Government, if it chose, could utilize and pledge its own colonial and insular possessions in a manner to amply secure necessary loans and to guarantee their repayment.

Accordingly, Mr. Jones urges upon Congress as an alternative to British humiliation and American disaster:

"I suggest that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation make further loans to the United Kingdom on British investments and operations in this country, up to the earning value of the security."

This way, Britain would not borrow beyond her ability to repay.

She would be under the compulsion of her own self-interest to meet the terms of her obligation, the penalty of failing to do so being the loss of security having greater value than the loans.

This way, too, the financial integrity of the United States as well as the moral integrity of Britain would be preserved.

The United States should not push Britain any further along the road to financial disaster than she has already gone, and at any rate the United States should not recklessly and blindly follow Britain down that road to ruin.

Statistics on the Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Minneapolis Star-Journal of April 2, 1946:

STATISTICS ON THE SPOT

Convenient statistics have become a more than occasional administration device to excuse or promote its political and economic policies. During the General Motors strike the Commerce Department issued some figures purporting to show wages could be raised considerably without causing a rise in prices. Secretary Wallace later had to repudiate the statement. During the steel strike, the Federal fact-finding board held no hearings but came out after the settlement with an announcement supposed to reflect statistical justification for the President's wage-price pattern on which the dispute was settled.

When the so-called dark bread order was announced, the administration issued some rosy predictions as to the amount of wheat that would thereby be freed for world relief. Such optimism has been found unjustified. Official forecasts of reconversion unemployment were found unduly pessimistic; production expectations under price controls and subsidies turned out to be overly optimistic.

Latest controversy in the latter department was stirred by Reconversion Director Snyder when he reported civilian production at more than $150,000,000,000, which President Truman characterized as being greater than ever before in the Nation's history in war or peace. When the statements met with a great deal of skeptical criticism, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion issued some explanatory figures.

It developed that Snyder's figures were in terms of inflated dollar values and not in terms of units of production. Such booming products as those of farms and fisheries, plus expanded services, including tranportation, electric power, and even laundries, movies, and hotel housing, gave a much more optimistic impression than justified by many consumer goods in wide demand.

Thus such items as clothing, autos, radios, refrigerators, washers and ironers, vacuum cleaners, electric irons and ranges, sewing machines, clocks and watches, and many other consumer durable goods still lag well behind prewar production.

There is a tendency on the part of the public to regard official statistics as something absolutely reliable. The attitude stems partly from the prestige of the Government as such, and partly from the habit of considering the Government as something above and independent of the special interest groups which cluster around the national capital. That is an outmoded idea, however.

Statistical statements from men like Wallace, Snyder, or the President are just as surely designed to support a particular point of view as those of the pressure groups administration spokesmen belabor. They make up a very special interest group, and their one interest in quoting statistics is to advertise those which will best justify the adminitration record and convince voters to keep their party in power.

Black Market in Building Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 26, 1946:

RACKET HOLDS 90 PERCENT OF MATERIALS—CONTRACTORS BUY AT DOUBLE PRICES OR GET NOTHING

(By Ray Sprigle)

Ninety percent of all current building construction in the Pittsburgh area is strictly black market from cellar to roof—take that from the men who are doing the building.

A few builders will disagree. They insist that 99 percent of all construction now under way is black market.

Biggest black-market item is, of course, lumber. Only a very small percentage of the lumber reaching western Pennsylvania moves in legitimate channels.

Retail lumber dealers watch houses going up in the Pittsburgh area in puzzled amazement—at least they did at first.

"That lumber never went through our yards," they'll tell you sadly.

BUILDERS PAY DOUBLE PRICES

Contractors are paying twice the OPA ceiling prices for many grades of lumber. Even at prices like that the supply of black-market lumber is only a fraction of the demand.

The Nation's entire lumber industry, from Oregon to Georgia, is one vast madhouse. Everyone in the industry, from millionaire producer to the little two- or three-house contractor, admits it. Leaders of the industry even are finding themselves boasting about the chaos in their field. No other industry can touch it for utter and complete disregard of the law, for unbelievable screwball evasions of all Federal regulations and for general, all-around failure of production.

INDUSTRY BLAMES OPA

Also, everybody in the industry, all the trade publications, western and southern lumber producers, wholesalers, brokers, retailers, and builders, all unite in attributing the chaos in the lumber industry solely to OPA and its price controls.

Western Pennsylvania building contractors readily admit that they depend on black-market lumber to keep their operations going. They tell you frankly that they pay from $90 to $120 a thousand feet for lumber which is priced by OPA from $45 to $70.

One builder found himself up against the immediate necessity of putting a group of houses under roof to protect construction already in place. And there just wasn't any lumber in the market. Finally he managed to get a few carloads of rough, green, random length and width hemlock at $120 a thousand. Ordinarily it's worth about $45. He took it with a smile of heartfelt gratitude.

Pittsburgh retail lumber yards, which always carry 50 to 60 carloads of lumber in their sheds, now are glad if they have 5 or 6 carloads on hand.

Another Pittsburgh builder finishing a group of houses had a contract with his lumber dealer for oak flooring, No. 1 Common, at $90 a thousand feet. When delivery time came, the dealer said he was sorry but he was all out of No. 1 Common. But he had some "select," the highest grade of oak flooring, at $120 a thousand. The builder took it. What he got, though, was flooring four grades below No. 1 Common, priced by OPA at $60 per thousand. He didn't like it, but he took it. And for that matter was glad to get it.

HONESTY PASSES BY

Honest grading of lumber, once a must in the industry, is practically a thing of the past now. There is only one grade of lumber—Select—the highest. That goes even when it is green, dripping with sap—cull stuff that a few years ago would have been turned down for crating material.

When the cash that closes nearly every lumber deal doesn't pass in the back room, after a check covers the OPA ceiling price, then the lumber is either up-graded or overbilled. Nowadays in the lumber racket 800 equals 1,000—when it's board feet on a bill you're talking about.

READY TO BACK OPA CHARGES

Every builder in western Pennsylvania can match or surpass those stories. They're the rule. The sensational story is when a builder manages to get a few thousand feet of properly graded lumber at the ceiling. Mighty few of them ever do. Lumber isn't sold that way.

Both lumber dealers and builders in Pittsburgh can back up their charges that OPA regulations are responsible for the chaos and the lawlessness in the industry. Take one instance from the ceiling price lists of a leading Pittsburgh lumber retailer:

Flooring and siding are the essential lumber items, aside from bill-stuff in building. B and better, 1 by 4, flat grain, random length dry fir can be sold by the producing mill under an OPA ceiling of $53 per thousand feet.

PRICES DON'T JIBE

But when the producer takes that flat-edged stuff, mills it into flooring with tongue and groove, culls some of it from necessity, bundles it after handling some of it four times—then OPA lets him sell it for—get this, $8 a thousand less than the original square-edge board, or $45 a thousand.

Similar fir boards, 1 by 6, bring $57 per thousand by OPA ceiling prices. Milled into No. 106 pattern siding, OPA sets a price on those same boards of $50 per thousand.

The whole OPA ceiling price list on lumber is a succession of similar inequities.

Retail lumber prices fixed by OPA give the retail lumber dealer an adequate and fair profit—although some retailers will dispute that. But since the retailer can't get any lumber because OPA ceilings cut the producer right off at the pockets—the retail ceilings don't make much difference.

Both in the Northwest and the South the producer, therefore, just bypasses the wholesaler and retailer.

MILLS CUT PRODUCTION

Many of the bigger western mills just aren't producing. Or they are just producing sufficient lumber to feed a few carloads to their customers in the Midwest and East. But Oregon, Washington, and California are in the throes of gigantic building booms. And the builders are getting the lumber, too. All sorts of rackets flourish.

A big builder goes to a mill and lays down from $5,000 to $75,000 for an option on the mill for 3 months. For that 3 months the entire output of the mill goes to the option holder. Then the option is dropped. The purchase price, incidentally, is upped to a point which makes purchase impossible.

THERE ARE WAYS AND MEANS

Or the company which wants lumber buys a tract of standing timber, sells it to the mill at a price far below its actual value. So the stumpage seller gets finished lumber in an amount equal to the timber sold—at OPA ceilings.

Again, the buyer who wants lumber, no matter what it costs, buys up logged-over land belonging to the mill at prices far in excess of value. Then he gets lumber—at the ceiling.

Still another dodge! The buyer leases the entire mill on a contract calling for payment on the basis of output—so much per thousand. On the side he takes over the owners on his pay roll at exorbitant salaries—and gets the lumber.

Down South they don't do it that way. In the southern pine country they just don't bother about this OP and A as they call it.

SURE THEY VIOLATE THE LAW

There's no deceit, no subterfuge. Trucks from all over the South, from Detroit, from Chicago, from New York drive up to any one of hundreds of mills. They load green yellow pine lumber and pay the retail ceiling for

it. It's as easy as that. Of course, it's a violation of the law, but who cares? Southern wholesalers who have been out of business for more than a year estimate that 90 percent of all southern production goes into the black market in this fashion.

And Pennsylvania produces lumber, too. Not much, but some. That also goes into the black market. At Pennsylvania sawmills you buy sawed lumber by "fourths." Four-fourths is 1 inch thick—five-fourths is 1¼ inches thick. Pittsburgh dealers buy it when they can. The mill man won't sell them four-fourths stuff, which is what they want. He sells them five-fourths at the higher OPA ceiling. Then he rips off the extra "fourth."

At a nice price of course.

OPA Stymies Foundations for Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 27, 1946:

OPA STYMIES FOUNDATIONS FOR HOMES—WAGE-COST SQUEEZE DRIVING CONCRETE BLOCKS OFF MARKET

(By Ray Sprigle)

Concrete-block manufacturers are in revolt throughout western Pennsylvania. So now, concrete block, essential foundation material and for months critically short, are likely to disappear from the market.

Four futile years of battling OPA price regulations have finally worn out the block men and early this week several of the largest manufacturers in the Pittsburgh area announced that they had quit making 10- and 12-inch block—the sizes required for foundations under most building codes.

Concrete-block prices were frozen by OPA in 1942 at the 1937 price. And despite the fact that the block makers have increased wage rates by 40.8 percent, their repeated appeals to OPA for price revisions have been consistently turned down.

MORE DOUBLE TALK

Last February 15 the block makers tried it again. They appealed to OPA for an increase of 3 cents a block. Last week came the first word from the OPA lads in New York. In a typical double-talk letter from OPA regional officials, the block men were notified that in the event they were, sometime in the future, allowed a price increase, the increase would be retroactive to the date of the letter. Then the iron curtain dropped again and nothing more has been heard from OPA.

And so concrete block, long a scarce material, has already become even more difficult for the builder to obtain.

AND THE COST GOES UP

Pittsburgh's building code originally called for 12-inch block. During the war the code was eased to permit use of a 10-inch block. Now production of both 10- and 12-inch blocks has practically ceased, and builders who want to comply with the building code or with FHA regulations will have to combine 8-inch and 4-inch blocks to build a 12-inch wall. With increased construction costs of around 30 percent.

But at least the block manufacturers have the satisfaction of being turned down or ignored by OPA officials.

The building-supply industry, the men who distribute block, sewer pipe, brick, lime, rock lath, and other building materials other than lumber, are unable to even ask for an increase in prices.

CAN'T EVEN ASK FOR INCREASE

For 4 years the building-supply men have been unable to even ask for price adjustments.

OPA officials calmly inform them that there is no provision in OPA regulations whereby an application for price adjustment from the industry can even be received and filed.

"There's nothing in the act covering your industry; there are not even any forms which you can fill out to make application for an increase," the building-supply men have been told again and again. And as of today they are right where they started years ago.

True, National Housing Administrator Wilson W. Wyatt has agreed with the building-supply industry that "something ought to be done." And that's all. There are no indications that anyone is going to do anything. Just another little angle to the national housing famine, and why the much-publicized national housing program hasn't even gotten off to a start.

NEW MACHINES HELP SOME

Building block would have long since disappeared entirely from the market had it not been for a program of mechanization with new types of machinery that has been slowly getting under way.

With these new machines, production can be stepped up to 5,000 units a day over former production of 1,500 to 2,000 units with no increase in manpower. But the machinery is hard to get. One Allegheny County block maker got his new machinery the other day. It had been on order a full year. But when it arrived it was without motors. Motors can't be had. So the block maker still is using his old equipment. Block makers, all of them, are at least a month behind on orders.

NO BLACK MARKET—YET

Unlike the lumber industry, the concrete-block industry hasn't developed any widespread black market. But the block men predict that if OPA officials insist on holding the industry to 1937 prices in 1946 that the concrete-block business will go into the back room on a cash-in-hand basis along with the lumber racket.

Brick supplies, say the building-supply men, are easing up a trifle. What that means, they explain, is that where previously you had to wait 90 days for enough brick to build a house, you only have to wait 60 days now. And here and there a builder gets his brick in 30 days.

Of course, maybe he can't get any lime for either mortar or plaster, but that's just part of the 1946 new housing madhouse. Building-supply men have been notified by the lime manufacturers that all shipments will stop soon because of the coal strike. And even with resumption of coal production, lime production will be a long time getting started again.

OTHER MATERIALS ALSO SCARCER

Building material like rock lath, composition sheathing, and other gypsum and paper products are becoming more and more difficult to get.

The manufacturers blame the paper shortage for dwindling production. But the building-supply men point out that these products were all low-profit items when caught by the OPA freeze of building materials and maybe it's a money shortage that is actually to blame for the slow up in production.

Dave Kirk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, Dave Kirk, editorial writer for the Spokane Chronicle, has been many times commended for the depth and clarity of his editorials. I am pleased to include as a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD his splendid editorial on the Easter spirit:

THEY KNOW NOT WHAT THEY DO

Who are these legions standing in the shadows of Golgotha?

There is a bearded Russian, he and his loved ones newly released from the shackles of tyranny. There is a man in the tunic of stricken Poland, and one from Greece, and others from Germany and Italy. Here is a toil-stained American and here a Briton, strong with the thews of freedom. There stands a Chinese and there a man from India, asking of the stars of destiny, "Why was I born to die of hunger?" And there stands a Japanese in the mire of humiliation asking of himself, "Why did I seek to rule the world?"

Hatred is in their hearts, a strange, nameless hate that only yesterday had them killing one another, laying their sons on the altars of futile sacrifice, why, they did not know.

Who are these legions standing in the gloom of Golgotha? They are the common people of the earth, whose champion and hope 19 centuries ago died there on a cross, an outcast.

What are they saying, these men who do not know one another, yet rise up to kill. The confusion of tongues has made them strangers. The shameless leaders whose prototype stood on Calvary shouting, "Crucify him," their soldiers casting lots for the raiment of the Man who was dying in their behalf, are stirring the guileless millions up again, while the mounds still are green above their sons.

They are saying, "Another war must come." They are saying, "We suspect Russia." "We suspect America." "Watch Britain." They are saying, "I must kill my neighbor, I know not why."

When will this grim folly cease? When will man stop following blindly the battle penons of schemers and egotists? The tragedy will end when mortals stop looking for complex diplomatic formulas and turn to the teachings of a Carpenter who came out of Nazareth almost 2,000 years ago with the simple counsel, "Love one another."

Who are these milling, weary hosts, waiting in the shadows of Golgotha for the towering Easter dawn?

They are the millions of common people throughout the world who are sick unto despair of war and violence. They have seen decency die upon the tree. They have seen the things for which they have wrought and dreamed for centuries tracked to Gethsemane and crowned with thorns. They will surely perish unless they put their faith in leaders who are fine enough and strong enough to go to the tomb where the hopes of man lie buried and roll the stone away.

New York State Endorses St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, despite a lot of noise by the opposition, occasionally, the fact remains that the people of the State of New York are in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This has been made convincingly clear by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey on several different occasions. The people of New York State recognize that this project will be of direct benefit to every person in the State who believes in utilization of our natural resources. People who use electric power will be able to get it cheaper when the big power dam at Massena, N. Y., becomes a reality.

Of course, some particular groups may past resolutions condemning the seaway and power project, but they do not speak for the people of my State. I was greatly interested, Mr. Speaker, in a resolution adopted on April 24 by the Community Councils of the City of New York, Inc. I am submitting herewith as part of these remarks the resolution adopted at a meeting of this parliament of community councils. This meeting was held at the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 45 East Sixty-fifth Street, New York City, N. Y., on Wednesday, April 24, 1946.

The resolution strongly endorses the St. Lawrence project and recommends prompt enactment of legislation which will authorize the construction thereof.

It is of interest to note that the community councils include representative citizens of the city of New York from each of the boroughs. The following are a few of the names: The Honorable Frank Peer Beal, president of the organization; the Honorable George Gordon Battle; the Honorable John J. Bennett; the Honorable Adolph A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State; and the Honorable Maurice P. Davidson.

The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMUNITY COUNCILS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, INC., HELD AT WOODROW WILSON FOUNDATION, 45 EAST SIXTY-FIFTH STREET, NEW YORK CITY, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1946

Whereas on October 2, 1945, at the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was introduced by United States Senators BARKLEY, WAGNER, AIKEN, LA FOLLETTE, FERGUSON, LANGER, VANDENBERG, SHIPSTEAD, HILL, and TAYLOR; and

Whereas said resolution was referred to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which committee, after hearings duly held, has recommended the approval of said joint resolution; and

Whereas the joint resolution as proposed approves the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin subject to certain exceptions and conditions; and

Whereas said agreement between the United States and Canada dated March 19, 1941, was entered into pursuant to article XIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Great Britain; and

Whereas the enactment of said joint resolution will authorize the full development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project providing for navigation improvements in the International Section of the St. Lawrence River and the consummation of the New York public power project, making available low-cost electricity for the use of private consumers, farmers, farms, municipalities, and industry at reduced rates and involving great savings to the public in the stimulation of industry; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River for power and navigation is in accordance with the public policy of the State of New York as set forth in the Power Authority Act of 1931, and is consistent with recommendations of President Harry S. Truman in his special message to Congress of October 3, 1945, and the recommendation of Governor Thomas E. Dewey in his annual message to the legislature, January 3, 1945, and the recommendations of a long line of Presidents of the United States and governors of the State of New York, Republican and Democratic; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Community Councils of the City of New York, Inc., in parliament assembled, as follows: That the St. Lawrence seaway and power project be and the same hereby is approved; be it further

Resolved, That Senate Joint Resolution 104, proposed in the Senate of the United States on October 2, 1945, by Mr. BARKLEY and his associates be and the same is hereby endorsed and urged for passage; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and the chairman and members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to all the Members of Congress.

Don't Disagree With Henry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

DON'T DISAGREE WITH HENRY

Henry A. Wallace continues to peddle, where he can, his peculiar brand of political totalitarianism.

In a Washington speech recently he called for a purge of Democratic Congressmen who do not adhere 100 percent to the party's line. He has followed this up in San Francisco by demanding immediate punishment of any Member who has turned his back upon his party by denying him committee appointments.

On the subject of turncoats, Mr. Wallace speaks with authority. He turned his own back upon the Republican Party to yield to Democratic lures. Just a few weeks ago he turned the same back upon the Democratic Party to support an American Labor Party candidate for Congress in New York.

Mr. Wallace's kind of party loyalty is intolerant of anyone who disagrees with Mr. Wallace.

Many members of Mr. Wallace's current party do not, fortunately, accept his theory and Democratic Congressmen continue to vote as they want, without consulting Mr. Wallace about it. The Secretary of Commerce does not ask that these recalcitrants be burned at the stake or sent to concentration camps. He merely wants them denied committee appointments and other privileges pending the elections when he hopes the voters will turn them out of Congress.

This latter item is a big flaw in the Wallace plan. He can only demand a purge of those who disagree with him. He can't force the voters to reject any candidate. If a man that Mr. Wallace dislikes is nominated as a Democrat and elevated to Congress, just what can the Secretary do about it? No more than he is doing today: yell himself blue in the face.

Aid for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a telegram from the Honorable Alfred N. Phillips, Jr., former Member of Congres from the Fourth Connecticut District, who has a large dairy farm in my district, who emphasizes the need of farming equipment if the whole world is to be saved from starvation, including ourselves, and including the strikers who are holding up production of all kinds and causing complete economic chaos to our economy.

The telegram follows:

PHILLIPS URGES AID FOR FARMERS

Alfred N. Phillips, Jr., of Stamford and Worsell Manor, Cecilton, Md., last week in a telegram to Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Director General of the UNRRA, appealed for aid to the farmers, asking that plows and other needed pieces of farm equipment be made available for the farmers.

Mr. Phillips' telegram follows:

"Hon. F. H. LAGUARDIA,
"Director General, UNRRA,
"Atlantic City, N. J.

"DEAR SIR: You are quoted in Friday's evening papers as saying people of the world want bread and not advice and that you want plows, not typewriters. That's fine.

"Please help us get three mold boards for our three-plow Case tractor plow, as also an Allis-Chalmers tractor long on order. These and other needed pieces of farm equipment not available for our Maryland farm because of strikes, yet we need them to raise corn, soybeans, and other crops for milk, hog, and beef production, along with planting barley and wheat later. Other farms in similar plight.

"Farmers are asked to produce food, yet farmers are denied tools of production, and now a coal strike threatens more delay in producing necessary farm machinery, parts, and replacements, hence, and irrespective of the merits of the contestants in these controversies and with tempers wearing thin because of all of this, many farmers are threatening a national farmers' strike and producing with their worn-out machinery only enough food for consumption by their own immediate farm families. Also they are threatening to ask doctors and undertakers

to join them in such strikes against controversies longer holding up production of needed farm machinery.

"Therefore, I earnestly hope you may be able to help remedy this situation and before it becomes more desperate, so that Americans and starving foreigners dependent on us can eat.

"Best personal regards,

"ALFRED N. PHILLIPS, Jr."

United Nations Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that is more important to the United States today than the success of the United Nations Organization. It is encouraging to read that the young people in our schools are cognizant of this fact and are doing what they can to foster that success by writing and debating on the subject.

A contest was held recently in the Durango High School, of Durango, Colo., and students were urged to write essays on the subject How We Can Make the United Nations Succeed. The contest was sponsored by the Durango League of Women Voters, and $50 in cash prizes was contributed by Mrs. C. C. Perkins and other members of her graduating class of 1896. Jim Childress, a sophomore, son of Dr. and Mrs. T. E. Childress, received first price. His essay is so good, and his ideas so well expressed, that I wish it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it will have a permanent place in the annals of our country:

HOW WE CAN MAKE THE UNITED NATIONS SUCCEED

(By Jim Childress)

The only way the United Nations Organization or any other organization which has an object, the peace of the world, can succeed is by having a friendly, understanding people behind it. No matter how well two Ambassadors get along or what fine treaties they may make, the peace cannot stick if the people at home are too ignorant or prejudiced to get behind it. Teach the people. A wide-spread program of education, touching everyone in the whole world, is the answer to the great problem of another war.

Have the people get the facts straight. If the newspapers and radios would tell the facts unaltered in a manner understandable to all, the common man would not be so mixed up as he is. How can anyone expect John Doe to know the truth when he has heard the same story five different ways? Yes; if he knew the truth many of the barriers would be torn down.

Another of the problems is the ill feeling between the peoples. This man doesnt' trust the Russians, and that man hates the English. Thinks like this are ever hindering world peace. Explain to all the nations, and especially the litle children, that the people of other lands aren't strange monsters lurking to stab us in the back but are just friendly neighbors. The schools could intensify the study of geography, world history, and foreign languages. Maybe if troupes of entertainers from the different countries would tour the world, lecturing, performing, and teaching, it would show the individual that a foreigner isn't a weird creature in a far-away land but that friendly guy that's cracking jokes up on the stage.

Athletics would have a big part in this drive for understanding of other people. An athletic program patterned after the Olympic games, only on a much larger scale, would do worlds of good. In this new age of lightning travel it would be easy to fly to Europe for a Saturday afternoon ball game. Athletics can do a great deal to break down silly prejudices, for the everyday man admires, likes, and trusts the athlete.

It would be a good idea to give as a contest prize to men, women and students, a trip through this country or that. The world traveler is not half as eager to jump into war as the stay-at-home. These trips with a well lectured tour through some country, might be given to honor students. There the student could meet the people and learn what they have that is better than what he has, and also could learn the foreigner's problems and help him to overcome them.

And let's look at that most traveled of characters, GI Joe. He surely knows the make-up of the minds of those foreigners he fought with and against. He saw not only the fighting man but also the poor peasant over whose land the battle was waged. If these young veterans just out of the armed forces could be enlisted to help keep the peace they fought for, we would have super diplomats. Many of these men are just full of splendid ideas, but have no outlet for them. One GI who is expressing himself is Bill Mauldin. His ideas on both our own troubles and foreign needs, are excellent. Every American should read his book, telling about his and a soldier's life in the war, and illustrated with the many cartoons that help tell the story. Mr. Mauldin should be induced to write more books on the subject of peace.

There should be movies of various lands made especially for this purpose. There should also be recreational programs among countries to foster the good will of tourists. No educated person wants to dive headfirst into a war against that swall guy he went fishing with last summer. These are some of the keys to peace. A good feeling between neighbors and a knowledge of their problems will go a long way toward making a perfect world.

Our Civilian Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item of April 29. This newspaper is well known for reflecting the sentiments of its readers and therefore I believe it furnishes pretty clear evidence that the people back home, while hearing much about closing the ranks of our armed forces, are not a little disturbed at wondering what Congress is doing to bring about a demobilization of our civilian army. The editorial follows:

OUR CIVILIAN ARMY

While the country is worrying about too rapid demobilization of the armed forces and the weakening of our physical defense through possible failure to rebuild the Army, it would be well if we gave some heed to demobilization of our army of Federal civilian employees.

At the last report there were 2,508,000 on the Federal civilian pay roll. This figure was hardly 100,000 less than the strength of the Army at that time. Also, the Army is being reduced 10 times faster than the civilian pay roll.

Today the Federal debt is $274,000,000,000. That means a mortgage of $5,330 on every employed worker in America.

It means an annual interest expense of $5,000,000,000, a sum that 15 years ago ran the whole Government for a whole year. Now it pays only the interest on the cost of government.

The soldier who is discharged is likely to think kindly of and vote for the government which lets him out, but not so with the civilian pay rollee. Continuation of his job is good for his vote. Fired, he is likely to blame the administration in office, so the Army we need is dissipated and the army we don't need stays in service.

Food Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of April 24, 1946:

HOW TRUMAN'S PALS CONSERVE THE FOOD UP IN THE BRONX

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, April 24.—President Truman tells us to take it easy on the vittles. We eat too much anyhow, while all over the world people are starving, and where they aren't starving they are on such thin rations that nobody ever gets a chance to pat his belly and rear back, replete.

To help prevent starvation, our Government says, we must curtail our gluttony, stop wasting food, and curb our appetites with simpler selections of grub. Fine.

Except I don't see how the American people, who can read, will want any part of this program when they get a quick look at the menu which is to be served Thursday night, at $100 a plate, to members of the Bronx County Democratic Committee at their annual fund-raising dinner.

While Washington tells us to starve ourselves slightly to help the starving, Senator James Mead, County Chairman Ed Flynn, National Chairman Bob Hannegan, Senator Robert Wagner, Mayor William O'Dwyer, and a flock of other political high shots will gormandize on the following fare:

Hors d'oeuvres, oysters, whole pineapples filled with fruit and cordials, bowls of relish, nuts, and petite marmite.

There will be lobster thermidor, orange sherbet, and filet mignon with Bearnese sauce.

There will be stuffed tomatoes, green peas, potatoes lovette, and green spring salad.

For dessert the gentlemen will pick daintily at ice cream molded with fresh strawberries,

glazed petit fours, and coffee. Bread and butter aren't mentioned, but chances are the diners will not be forced to smear margarine or cottage cheese on their rolls. It's estimated that $85,000 will be grossed by the dinner, which will only cost about $15,000.

Possibly Mr. Truman has not been apprised of the menu, but since several of the guests are party leaders, they will undoubtedly report to the President that the Bronx is squarely behind his urgent plea to conserve food. It is to be hoped that the other Democratic clubs around the Nation, when they throw a shindig to fatten the treasury, will cleave as rigidly to the Bronx Democrats' selfless regulation of their diet.

It's probably a narrow-minded view to take, but I feel no inclination to dine off a can of soup and a grated carrot while Mr. Hannegan stuffs himself on lobster and steak to raise funds to combat the Republicans. It seems to me a common man's stomach is just as important to the common man as a politician's stomach is to the politician.

Nor do I see how our Chief Executive can say to his people: "Try starving a little bit, folks" and then allow his top employees to stuff themselves publicly, while the taxpayers figuratively press their noses against the window.

Personally, I hope Mr. Hannegan and Senator Mead and Senator Wagner and Mayor O'Dwyer get the bellyache Thursday, and dream all night long about little kids with dark smudged eyes and knobby knees and little bellies distended by malnutrition.

And I wish to hear no more talk about self-limitation of diet until the directive goes down from the boss to his hired hands.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a resolution of the Townsend Clubs of the Twenty-second Congressional District of Illinois. This resolution was adopted at a meeting of all the Townsend Clubs of the Twenty-second District in Belleville, Ill., on April 14, 1946:

Whereas two Townsend bills, H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, were introduced in Congress January last and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, where they were put to sleep. Under the rules of the House to withdraw a bill from a committee requires a petition signed by a majority of Congressmen (218 of the 435). Thus far 218 have not signed. On behalf of 5,000 or more Townsendites in this district we do now call upon Congressmen to sign such petition and without further delay.

We wish the Ways and Means Committee might of its own volition report the bill out. In any event, the two bills should be restored to the House, where they may be considered, amended if deemed advisable, then passed and made the law of the land.

It is our belief that the Townsend plan is the only thing that will solve the unemployment problem, relieve distress, and close the poorhouses. Today untold millions are living—trying to live—on small amounts received from social security or the State old-age assistance and 800,000 old men, and women in poorhouses—Maine to California. This we say is a national disgrace. The Townsend plan will close every poorhouse. When Congress puts the Townsend plan into effect there will, indeed, be great rejoicing throughout the land.

Townsendites of the Twenty-second Illinois Congressional District do now call upon our Illinois United States Senators and Congressmen to make every effort possible to have the Townsend bills considered; yes, passed.

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon our records and the president-secretary send a copy to Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Congresswoman at Large EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, and Congressman MELVIN PRICE, all Washington, D. C.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK C. SMITH.

The above-named resolution was introduced, read, discussed, and on motion adopted by a unanimous and rising vote this the 14th day of April 1946.

J. A. WHITTEN, *President.*
E. L. LUNTZ, *Vice President.*
J. W. READFERN, *Secretary.*
PHILIP WILLICH, *Treasurer.*

House OPA Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley:

HOUSE OPA AMENDMENTS

(By Raymond Moley)

The House of Representatives set off a big furor by amending the OPA. One side hailed the action as the dawn of a new day. The other predicted black ruin. A calm appraisal of the revised set-up justifies neither claim.

The most talked-of amendment is that which says, "No maximum price shall be established or maintained without allowing a reasonable profit." A former official of the OPA, who worked with Leon Henderson, points out that the Price Control Act itself provided that the Administrator should establish fair and equitable prices which, by any interpretation, should mean fair profits. The major question in the interpretation of this provision is whether this fair profit shall be given to the high-cost producers.

Before the publication of the over-all price freezing, in the spring of 1942, Mr. Henderson and his staff discussed for a long time the question whether there should be followed an old custom of fixing only about 200 to 300 maximum prices and of prescribing for all other merchandise a "fair price" which would allow the seller a cost-plus per unit not higher than prewar times. This plan was generally used in Europe in the First World War and it worked well in Scandinavia in the recent war. It is undoubtedly preferable where cost elements are widely different, as in such transition as the present. It was not adopted.

At the present time, new commodities get a price entirely different from that of old commodities, even if the goods in question are virtually the same. The method of price fixing on this principle is cumbersome, and sellers are greatly dissatisfied with it. On the other hand, the records show that under the current method of control by multitudes of ceilings, profits in some industries have become 5 to 10 times those of prewar days. In big stores and big plants, price ceilings are adhered to because employees have no interest in higher prices, and the institutions themselves cannot afford trouble and publicity through any violations. It is probable that the new House formula will bring lower, rather than higher prices.

So the disaster predicted by Messrs. Bowles and Porter is not likely to take place. The OPA might well try to operate under the simpler formula, described above, which was considered in 1942 and rejected. That formula would be likely to work much better than the plan now in force. At present, sellers have to fix prices according to the competitor closest to him or the commodity comparable with the new commodity. That means that he can choose anything which seems to be comparable and which is to his advantage.

The procedure of making a fair price with a fair profit is much easier than is allowed by present methods of the OPA. In some cases, the fixing of prices under current formulas has taken as much as 4 months. Such delay is intolerable to business and very unfair to the consumer.

The decision of the House to abolish rollback subsidies is also sound. Subsidies on meat are paid, but we do not get much of the available meat. And for what he does get, the consumer pays more above the maximum price than the amount of the subsidy. From the slaughterhouse to the dining table, the subsidy has long since lost its value completely.

If the OPA is to expire next spring, the subsidies must lapse then at the latest. They should not be taken off all at once. They should be removed piecemeal, but not too slowly. The situation will improve in the process.

The OPA has been overstressing the importance of controls. And it is now wholly misrepresenting the effect of the House amendments. They are several steps in the right direction.

Balancing of the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Governor of North Dakota, the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, that he stands a sponsor and endorser of the principle of balancing the Federal Budget, and that he asks the people of the several States to support the Members of Congress to stand committed to this fundamental and far-reaching principle.

Under unanimous consent, I include the letter from the Governor of North Dakota:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, April 18, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: By April 15, the governors of 23 States had agreed to issue a press release encouraging the balancing of the Federal Budget and asking the people of their respective States to support the Members of Congress in a program of economy. Perhaps additional governors have now issued similar

statements. For your information I am quoting below the statement that I released to the press here in North Dakota:

"As Governor of the State of North Dakota, I endorse the principle that a balanced Federal Budget is essential to national solvency.

"I am convinced—

"That further deficit spending and continued borrowing are major threats to the Nation's welfare;

"That the alarming growth of inflationary trends is increasingly aggravated by unsound Federal fiscal practices;

"That the further use of such practices is a constant menace to the constitutional position of our State and local governments, and a threat to their fiscal solvency; and

"That, if these trends and practices continue, they will lead inevitably to increased cost, increased prices, and increased taxes, and thus affect adversely every individual in this country.

"I, therefore, sincerely hope that Congress will provide a balanced Federal Budget beginning July 1, 1946, and I urge the people of this State to support their Congressmen in the achievement of this important result."

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Governor.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

"Whereas the United States is confronted with the most acute housing shortage in its history; and

"Whereas by reason thereof thousands of returned veterans and servicemen's families are unable to acquire shelter of any kind; and

"Whereas the housing shortage is due in a great measure to the shortage of building materials and supplies; and

"Whereas it has been brought to our attention that much of the stock piles of building materials, supplies and equipment located in the United States is being shipped to foreign countries; and

"Whereas it has also come to our attention that both the Army and Navy stock piles, consisting of building materials, are being held out of normal channels by those branches of the armed forces, which if released could be immediately used to alleviate the acute housing shortage: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee*, That it request the Congress of the United States to place an embargo on all building materials being shipped out of this country for use elsewhere except those being used for our armed forces until such time as the acute housing shortage as it affects the housing of veterans and servicemen's families has been alleviated; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That all stock piles containing building materials under the control of the military forces be immediately released and so channelled that such materials may be used to build homes for veterans and servicemen's families; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., and to Congressmen THADDEUS F. WASIELEWSKI and ANDREW J. BIEMILLER."

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Milwaukee, April 5, 1946.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee.

WALTER A. KLEIN, *City Clerk.*

State Department Trade Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing letters, which I believe are self-explanatory. These letters present another example of the procedure seemingly adopted by the Department of State which certainly is not in accord with the opinions of the majority of the people in our Nation. This shows beyond a doubt this Department has no consideration for the working man and woman, or those who produce in the United States. The State Department letter indicates they are attempting to set up a program whereby products manufactured by the wage earner will be manufactured and produced in a foreign country, then shipped to the United States in direct competition with the goods produced by our working men and women, farmers, and industries.

I call upon every Member of Congress to check and ascertain if the State Department is following the same procedure relative to the products manufactured in their respective districts, and I hope you will join me in protesting this practice.

The American people, including labor, industry, and farmers, certainly want definite action which will give them the protection they rightfully deserve.

THE POPE-GOSSER CHINA CO.,
Coshocton, Ohio, April 24, 1946.

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: Today it was brought to our attention by the secretary of the United States Potters Association, a letter received by one of our members from the State Department. A photostatic copy of this letter is enclosed, as well as a copy of the letter sent to the State Department in reply to their letter.

We heartily endorse the statements contained in the Homer-Laughlin letter of April 1 addressed to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of the State Department, Washington, D. C. As our Representative from this State and in behalf of the men and women employed in the pottery industry, we beseech you to use your best efforts to nullify any suggestion offered on the part of our State Department.

It is unfair to the citizens of the United States as taxpayers, to the young men who fought and gave up their lives during World War II, as well as the labor employed in the United States.

We hope that our request will have your serious consideration.

Yours very truly,

THE POPE-GOSSER CHINA CO.,
By F. P. JUDGE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 19, 1946.

Mr. HOMER LAUGHLIN,
American Domestic Pottery Manufacturing Co., East Liverpool, Ohio.

DEAR MR. LAUGHLIN: We are seeking your assistance in the selection of two ceramic engineers to serve as advisers to the Chief of the Economic and Scientific Section of the Military Government and Control Activities in Japan regarding technical problems of the Japanese ceramic industry.

We do not have full details regarding the duties but we understand that these positions require highly qualified technicians with a broad experience in the various fields of ceramics. The salaries will range up to $7,800 per annum.

All positions in the military government activities are, of course, under the jurisdiction of the War Department. In accordance with a cooperative arrangement, however, the Department of State is responsible for recruiting and recommending personnel for certain specialized positions such as these. The minimum period for an assignment of this nature is 9 months, though it is hoped that an appointee may remain for an indefinite period. Transportation is provided at Government expense, and living costs are exceedingly low since the Army provides living quarters and meals similar to those of officers at a nominal charge of approximately $40 per month. Families cannot accompany civilian appointees at present, but there is a fair prospect that they may be able to follow later on in the summer or fall.

We would greatly appreciate any suggestions which you may be in a position to make regarding personnel who may be qualified for and interested in these positions.

Very truly yours,

T. M. BREWER,
Recruitment Officer, Special Recruitment Section, Division of Departmental Personnel.

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
Newell, W. Va., April 1, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary, the State Department,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Several days ago I received a letter addressed to: Mr. Homer Laughlin, American Domestic Pottery Manufacturing Co., East Liverpool, Ohio, and signed by T. M. Brewer, recruitment officer, Special Recruitment Section, Division of Department Personnel. The letter requested that we recommend two experienced and competent ceramic engineers for service in Japan at the expense of the State Department to teach the Japanese how to improve and increase their production of ceramic products.

This is the most brazen example I have yet encountered of the State Department's consuming desire to spend our people's tax money to take their jobs away. It is particularly galling that the beneficiary of this incredible plan should be the vicious, bloodthirsty Japs who were responsible for the killing and maiming of so many thousands of our fine young men—many of them from our ceramic industry. Just what answer can there be to our question, "Why does our Government spend our money to make jobs for the members of this despicable race, which will mean that our men, who fought and suffered in defeating them, will be walking the streets jobless?

Now please don't insult my intelligence by dragging out the old and absurd bromide that we must buy their competitive merchandise so that our workmen will have employment in making the things they will buy from us in return.

Let us take a single simple example and see how we Americans make out. First of all, as you are well aware, the Department of Commerce, in reporting the balance of trade figures, uses the indefensible and wholly fal-

lacious method of balancing imports at foreign values against exports at American values. So we accept a thousand dollars' worth of china dinnerware (Japanese value) to balance a thousand dollars' worth (American value) of automobiles, business machines, farm machinery, or what have you. In manufacturing the china dinnerware in an American factory, that such an import displaces, there would be paid out in wages to American workmen more than $1,200. The wages paid out for producing the balancing export of automobiles, or what not, would be less than $200. And you ask us, as though it was a patriotic duty, to assist you in spending the pottery worker's tax money to improve and increase the dishes made in Japan for export to the United States. Fantastic.

You will admit, I am sure, that it is inconceivable Great Britain or any other of the United Nations would give a moment's consideration to a plan so prejudicial, to the welfare of a large number of its nationals, as is this. Is our State Department then, the only one that is right and all the rest of the world wrong?

Another question. On what information, and by what reasoning, did the State Department determine that American ceramists could teach anything to the Japanese potters? Before the war, they were making and selling in this country just as fine china as any made here and at less than one-half the American cost of production. At that time, according to the Tariff Commission reports, Japan was shipping more than 80 percent of all of the china dinnerware used in the United States. England furnished about 15 percent and, of the balance, only 3 percent was produced in American factories.

If the State Department must spend money on ceramic technicians, would it not be the most ordinary kind of common sense to pay them to work with the American potters in an effort to produce china that could compete in price with the imports? But I presume it would be pure isolationism to suggest that the State Department should show some remote interest in job opportunities for the people who supply the funds to carry on its activities.

It is probably too much to expect that this letter might actually reach your hands, Mr. Byrnes; but, if it should, will you please advise Mr. Brewer that his request is respectfully but very definitely refused.

Very truly yours,

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
J. M. WELLS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Wyatt Housing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

"Whereas Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt, National Housing Administrator and National Housing Expediter, has advanced a plan before the Congress of the United States which has been denominated the Wyatt plan and which in the opinion of its supporters will produce the building of 2,700,000 dwelling units during the next 2 years; and

"Whereas the special features of the so-called Wyatt Plan have been adopted by the United States Senate and the bill is now before the joint House and Senate committee for consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it go on record favoring the adoption of the Wyatt plan by the Congress of the United States as one of the methods which presently can be used in alleviating the acute housing shortage; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the joint House and Senate committee, to ALEXANDER WILEY, and ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., United States Senators from Wisconsin, and to THADDEUS F. B. WASIELEWSKI and ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Representatives for the Fourth and Fifth Districts of the city of Milwaukee."

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Milwaukee, April 19, 1946.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee on April 15, 1946.

WALTER A. KLEIN,
City Clerk.

Massachusetts Dairymen Face Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the critical situation facing Massachusetts dairymen and poultrymen, I append hereto a letter which I have received from the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc.:

MASSACHUSETTS FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Waltham, Mass., April 29, 1946.

The Honorable ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOODWIN: Each week our feed situation gets worse. Somebody must find an answer or our poultry industry will receive a set-back from which it will never recover.

The more orders come out of Washington the less feed we get. Drastic rductions in feed deliveries are again being reported this Monday morning.

Dairy herds here and there are beginning to suffer. Unless relief is found quickly, cows will actually be killed off.

The 30-cent bonus on export grains just means we cannot compete with Government for grain.

I don't believe you realize just how serious this situation is. It is no longer a question of protecting income for the poultry and dairy industry. It is a question of losing forever a great source of taxation, a great market for goods and equipment and supplies. It is a question of whether you are going to allow other sections of the country to displace our business.

No matter how great the need for food in Europe, can we allow ourselves to follow programs which tend to dangerously lower our food supply, cut down drastically the number of jobs available, remove from both property tax lists and income tax returns, hundreds of thousands of dollars, and give up the place in the poultry and dairy business it has taken Massachusetts generations to build?

Our Government is proceeding in utmost folly to send grains to Europe because the visible costs are cheap. The actual costs are dear indeed. Thousands of our own people will be ruined. It would be far better to give Europe pork and beef and chicken, eggs and milk, no matter what the initial cost.

Such a procedure would place us squarely on a program of abundance. We are headed now for a period of scarcity.

Respectfully yours,

MASSACHUSETTS FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION,
C. I. PICKETT, *Secretary.*

Causes of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bureaucrats in Washington apparently believe that they are the only persons who have been educated to the point of realizing that the world is round. Convinced that all other citizens in the United States still believe the world is flat, the 45,000 New Deal propagandists on the Federal pay roll, with a budget of $74,000,000 taken from the taxpayers to spend, are filling the air, the press, the magazines, and the movies with moronic phrases relating to the alleged virtues of the OPA as an agency of New Deal infallibility in the realm of economics.

The OPA is propagandizing the thought that the only way to save the consumers is to fix a ceiling price below the cost of production. If this method is sound why not save the consumer his worries by fixing the price at zero? Under such a plan, the people could get food and goods for nothing; consumption would be unlimited; but, would the production of food and goods be continued? With the stoppage of the production of the necessities of life, what result would follow? Would there be employment? No, obviously there would not. Would such a scheme raise or lower the American standard of living? The answer is apparent to any normal mentality except to the New Deal bureaucratic mind that now infests the OPA. But, say the OPA officials, all we propose to do is to keep prices moderately low, which means that a bureaucratic edict can with infallibility determine the price ceiling which will not retard production. As Mr. F. A. Harper, professor of marketing, Cornell University, states in his excellent book, The Crisis of the Free Market:

> A plea for price controls, whether administered democratically or by an autocrat, is a veiled plea for the individual to give up his rights in a free society. It may be veiled by statements that its purpose is for the "general welfare," or for "collective security," or for "national defense," or for "only the duration of the emergency." Nevertheless, this is essentially a plea for a degree and form of dictatorship and slavery. Such devices—

Says Prof. F. A. Harper—

cannot be tolerated if we are to have a free society. If we are to improve the general welfare, it can be done only by increasing total production rather than by price controls, which have the effect of decreasing the national welfare.

The OPA wants the public to sit on the lid of prices, while every New Deal inflationary force is put in operation to cause

an economic explosion. What are some of these inflationary forces? Increase in currency circulation from $7,000,000,000 in 1939 to approximately $28,000,000,000 at the present time. The danger inherent in this increase as an inflationary force is shown by the fact that since 1939, currency in circulation has increased nearly three times in the United States, compared with two-and-a-third times in France and about five times in Germany during World War I. The present policies of the New Deal are mostly inflationary.

Deficit spending is inflationary. The unbalanced budget is inflationary. The proposal for unlimited spending, as set forth in the President's Budget is inflationary.

The statutory authority vested in the President to further devalue the dollar, and also the Silver Purchase Act are inflationary potentials.

The New York Times in an editorial entitled "Anti-Inflation Program" which appears in the issue of April 28, 1946, calls attention to a four-point anti-inflation program proposed by the American Bankers Association, as follows:

For the purpose of holding down inflationary spending, the program recommends: (1) The sale of Treasury savings bonds by the banks and persuading bondholders to hold their bonds; (2) using Government war loan balances in the banks to redeem Government debt; (3) refunding bonds to be offered to nonbank investor; and (4) a reduction in speculation in Government securities.

I agree with the New York Times that—

A drive to transfer securities now held by the banks to nonbank investors would have been a logical fifth point in this program. Such action—

Says the editorial—

would reduce the large volume of deposits and currency and would counteract in part the large expansion in money supply.

The editorial further points out that:

One important gap in the program is omission of any reference to interest rates, the decline of which has had a tremendous inflationary impact upon capital values.

The editorial then continues:

While this program—the American Bankers Association program—is a step in the right direction, it falls far short of what is required to meet the serious situation now facing us. Every effort must be made to balance the Federal Budget. This calls for a determination to reduce Government expenditures whenever possible and a limit on commitments for new expenditures. A balanced budget will stop the creation of new money at the source. But we must do still more. If under today's conditions of high-level incomes we cannot develop a budgetary surplus, when can such a surplus be expected to materialize? To the extent that such a budgetary surplus can be developed, the wartime inflation in currency and bank credit can be reversed in part. That is the first and most essential step in any anti-inflation program.

I believe, however, that one of the most essential steps to stop inflation is to take the OPA strangle hold off the throats of the producers and permit them to breathe the unpolluted air of freedom under our system of free enterprise, unregimented, de-Hitlerized, and free to produce without the fear of bureaucratic punishment for engaging in full production in a free competitive market.

Farmer's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, without complaint the farmers of America, with inadequate help and worn out machinery, produced the food that won the war. Today they are called upon to feed the world.

It would be expected that our Government would help, not hinder, them.

A Kansas farmer, and a successful one, tells his story, gives his views, and asks some pertinent questions, in the following letter I have just received:

APRIL 25, 1946.

Mr. SCRIVNER: As our Congressman from this district, I am writing you to get busy and work, as you have never worked before, to do something about this feed situation. Talk about black market. If the Government isn't the biggest and boldest black market at this time, I would like to know why? They can go out and pay 30 cents a bushel more for grain than feed men or farmers can pay, then I ask you, Where and how are the feed mills and farmers going to get grain to feed to livestock and poultry on the farm? You can't feed $1.40 corn to hogs at the ceiling price of pork without losing money. The farmers have been the goat long enough, but they aren't going to throw their money away in a plainly losing game like this.

So the thing that will happen is that poultry and livestock will be sold off the farms, and then what? It is well to talk about feeding the hungry peoples of the world, but if you dry up the resources of feeding, where is the food coming from? I can't see the Government doing to organized labor what it has done to farmers. Because we aren't organized and have trusted to fate that we would be able to hold out, the administration has dealt the final blow. Farmers worked, as they never worked before, during the war, with no overtime and a very meager wage, compared to war workers who had nothing invested, to support the men in the armed services and help in the war, but I can say that their patriotism is beginning to wear thin.

In the first place, why can't they see farther than a few days ahead? This situation existed, or they knew it would exist last August when the war ended. Why drift along until now and then begin tearing their hair about it? Because of the administration's lack of foresight and their bungling, the farmer gets the beating. In the first place, I doubt very much if there is any great amount of wheat left on the farm. They get so excited and put out such rosy crop reports about harvest time, and then in a short time we have a scarcity. Your bureaucrats and statisticians in Washington put out figures and estimates that so little concern or fit the true picture.

Another thing I would like to know is how do they figure parity prices for farmers without figuring labor costs? Is organized labor's parity figured on the same scale? We are paying our men more than twice what they were getting 10 years ago and why should parity for farmers be figured in the horse and buggy period from 1941 to ——?

As badly as we all hate the word "inflation" it is here and will be and the OPA might as well go for you can't hold the line on a few things—and those are chiefly what the farmer produces—and let go on others. The time to have curbed inflation was before the strikes and raise in wages. After all, I didn't think wages ever were, or supposed to be, as high in peace as in war.

The farmer has to be the biggest fighter on earth to survive and combat the elements, insects, and politicians in Washington, and he is getting mighty fed up. It has been a new deal for some 13 years past, but for farmers especially a "dirty deal."

To get the true perspective and beauty of a picture, one likes to view it from a distance. If you Congressmen want to get a true perspective of the situation, get away from the noise of Washington and get out among the farmers and learn and see the true picture.

CHAS. E. ROBERTS.
WOODSONIA FARM, DE SOTO, KANS.

Mr. Speaker, this farmer's views but reflect those of millions of other farmers. What answer does the administration have to his questions? More regulations? There are too many now. More subsidies? The greenback poultices cure nothing. More promises? Too many have been made. More advice? Advice does not produce crops.

What the farmer needs is less bureaucratic bungling, less Government control and competition.

Such relief is not in sight under the present administration, whose only remedy for control is more Government control and whose only panaceas for any economic ill is a poultice of greenbacks taken from the pockets of the taxpayers.

It May Take a Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith a most excellent and thought-provoking editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram:

IT MAY TAKE A DEPRESSION

It's high time America paused for a moment to take stock; to ask ourselves whither our folly is leading us; and, most importantly, to count our many blessings.

The race of selfishness is on and is being run at breath-taking, neck-breaking speed. The dust it has stirred up seems to have blinded us to the reality that of all the peoples in the world we are the most fortunate. But are we humble and grateful? The answer is a tragic but emphatic "No."

Aside from the irreplaceable loss of thousands of our sons, our fair and bounteous land bears none of the scars of war; other lands, once as fair and bounteous as our own, are in ruins. Survivors in those devastated areas will be occupied for a generation or more with the task of carting away the rubble and rebuilding what has been de-

stroyed. In our national smugness we rarely find time to cast them a pitying glance.

Millions of human beings in war-wracked and famine-ridden countries are slowly starving. Appeals to America for succor fall on deaf ears. We have not been asked to sacrifice—only to save and to share. Even that we have not done. Instead of prayerfully thanking the Great Provider who has seen fit to make this a land of plenty, we thoughtlessly cram our garbage cans daily with food for which the dying plead, but in vain.

America should take heed. We are not immune to drouth. Nature has not endowed us with a positive guaranty against famine. "And willful waste, depend upon it, brings, almost always, woeful want," may be more truth than poetry. If it is, we ourselves may be headed for want, although it may be hard to visualize it on a well-filled stomach.

It is not only toward the unfortunates of other lands that we seem in our mad materialism to have lost our sense of charity and fairness. It finds expression in our dealings with our fellow Americans. In his remarkable statement before a congressional committee the other day, Bernard M. Baruch stated that whole segments of our society have lost their perspective as to the rights of others, and many have lost their capacity for indignation over their own wrongs and the wrongs inflicted upon others.

That is a terrible indictment of a supposedly intelligent, Christian nation, but America has no choice but to plead guilty.

There was a time when live and let live was the unwritten law of our land. Now dog eat dog and the devil take the hindmost seems to be the order of the day.

There was a time when public officials were chosen because of the principles they espoused. Nowadays we vote for those who promise the most. We seem to have an especial weakness for those who pledge themselves to vote for bigger and bigger appropriations and fewer and fewer taxes. We seem unable to distinguish between pure political hokum and the unyielding laws of economics.

Meanwhile, pressure groups are on the march. Those who possess an unfair advantage over others fight to keep what they have and strive to acquire more. Public officials who dare to move in the public interest and against one of these groups are threatened with reprisals at the polls.

As Mr. Baruch also said, the shooting war may be over, but its aftermath—military, economic, and spiritual—is still here. Yet, even before peace terms are set, we are adopting a scuttle-and-run policy on all fronts, eager to get home and back to normal. "To get ours while the getting is good."

There is more material wealth in America today than ever before and the dent made by the war in our store of natural resources is hardly noticeable. We have more food than any other country on earth, and more money than we know how to use wisely. But we are not satisfied. Instead of realizing our good fortune and being thankful for it, we fight each other for more. We contrive black markets to circumvent price control, oblivious to their awful consequences in the destruction of character and the disrespect for law and order which they engender.

Labor, already the highest paid in the world, demands more and is abetted by crackpot economists who preach the bunk that wages can be raised and prices held stationary or lowered. Management resists and production halts. Meanwhile, the people cry out for goods they need that are not being made.

But industrial strife cannot be blamed solely on labor. Some of labor's grievances are just and can be traced to the greed and shortsightedness of management's policies in the past. Management, therefore, bears its share of responsibility for today's disturbed conditions.

To quote Mr. Baruch again, "the whole world is watching us, amazed at the exhibition of a giant who cannot pull himself together even to take care of his own needs."

We should commence trying to live with each other. There is a vast difference between living off of a community and in living in it on a live-and-let-live basis. Industry should pay labor a fair wage. And labor in return should deliver a full, honest day's work as it used to do.

There is much that Congress and our Federal officials can and should do that would be helpful. Congress should see to it that OPA is reorganized on a horse sense basis, and pass whatever laws may be necessary to prevent it from wrecking the Nation's business with its silly, uneconomic theories and formulas.

The Government should get out of business and stay out, particularly the business of trying to conduct the collective bargaining negotiations of both labor and management. Government-fixed wages and Government-fixed prices are not in accord with the American way of life and will not work in a free economy. If let alone, labor and management could solve their problems as they did for years before the Government took a hand. Whatever labor relations laws there must be should be fair and applicable to both.

It also would be enormously helpful if the Government would stop trying to regiment the people. Efforts to enact such legislation as the FEPC bill and the antipoll tax measure and all other proposals which invade the rights of the States should be dropped. Officials should cease catering to minority groups and fostering racial discord for the selfish purpose of trying to garner a few more votes.

The overburdened Federal pay roll should be relieved of every employee not essential to the proper functioning of the Government. Nonessential bureaus should be liquidated and the national budget should be balanced.

As nature has not guaranteed that this Nation never shall suffer the pangs of hunger, likewise we have no insurance against another economic depression. Nobody wants either, but it may take a depression to end this strife, bring us to our senses, and to a realization of how well off we are, despite all of our troubles, real or otherwise.

Let's just be real Americans again.

It Was Their Money!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I append hereto an editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item of April 29 which seems to me to be a valuable contribution to the current discussion as to what constitutes justifiable presentation to the public of arguments for or against the continuation of price control. Here is the editorial:

LEGITIMATE AND JUSTIFIED

The National Association of Manufacturers is being excoriated, mostly by bureaucrats and their misguided friends or sympathizers, because the NAM has allegedly raised a fund of $400,000 to combat OPA.

This may not be the highest-minded way to accomplish a given object, but it is the way it is generally done in this country, and—

Is it any worse for the business interests to spend $400,000 to relieve the noose around their necks than it is for the OPA and other Federal bureaus to spend the taxpayers' money to keep it there?

After all, that $400,000 did belong to the members of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Price-Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the very thoughtful and excellent testimony presented to the Banking and Currency Committee by Mr. Chat Patterson, national legislative representative of the American Veterans Committee, on the pending price-control legislation. It is a forthright statement of the issues from the viewpoint of the millions of veterans who ask only for a stabilized economy in this critical period while they are adjusting to civilian pursuits.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am presenting this testimony today on behalf of the American Veterans Committee as its legislative representative in Washington. The AVC is an organization of World War II veterans which is working to achieve a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world. One of the greatest dangers to a prosperous America and a stable world is that of a disastrous inflation. We are already experiencing a measure of inflation and thousands of veterans are having a hard time because of this limited inflation. It is not fair to the veteran during his difficult period of readjustment and initial insecurity for you gentlemen to permit an uncontrolled inflation to take hold of our Nation and shake the monetary foundation upon which so many hopes have been built.

If I were to ask any member of this committee whether he wanted to do all in his power to aid the veteran, I am sure there would be a resounding "of course." Because of your membership on the Banking and Currency Committee, you are in the unique position of being instrumental in protecting the veteran from a worse inflation and in making sure that his dollars buy the goods and services which he and his family need. In most cases he must buy these goods and services on a very limited income.

There are four simple reasons why the veterans need price control if they are going to be given an even break in getting back to civilian life:

1. Veterans just don't have much money now, and they probably won't have much money for a long while. They have been away from civilian work for several years. It's going to take time to get back into paying jobs. General Bradley has already stated that approximately 4,000,000 veterans will return with no civilian occupation or training. Recent reports are that the total may even reach 6,000,000 by October 1946. These

veterans, during their period of training and job-seeking, will not be able to pay the cost of a decent living if prices go up.

They didn't get much money for fighting the war, and in most cases have no savings upon which they can draw for any length of time. Their $300 mustering-out pay won't buy much food or clothing or pay rent very long. Even a slight increase in prices would mean that they would have poorer food and live in cheaper houses. I don't think any of you want the American way of life to which they return to be one of poverty and increasing bitterness.

2. Veterans want steady jobs. A run-away inflation, such as followed the last war, will create job insecurity and bring on unemployment. There are several members of this committee who served in the last war. After the 1918 Armistice you saw prices shoot so high in less than 2 years that fewer and fewer people could pay them. What was called a "buyers' strike" developed. You must remember how stores cut down their orders. That meant factories slowing down and closing. That meant 5,500,000 jobs disappeared. Thousands of your buddies tramped the streets looking for jobs. Do you want the same to happen to the veterans of today? Inflation can do it. Price control can help prevent it.

3. A lot of veterans want to go into business for themselves. With the GI loan and some help from their families and friends, they can start in a small way now. But you gentlemen all know what would happen to these small nest eggs if inflation started operating costs upward. They probably couldn't even start in business and if they did most of them would soon lose out to bigger and better established firms when they went to bid for high-priced materials and labor.

4. And finally, gentlemen, most veterans want families and homes. They gave a lot of thought to that aspect of American life while they were overseas. A lot of them already have wives and children, the rest of them are human and want them. But what are their chances if prices go up and put expenses beyond their reach?

I see a lot of stories in the papers that OPA is causing business to go broke. I remember hearing a lot of these stories when I was in Europe. One day in early 1944, while overseas, I picked up a copy of Business Week which contained a tabulation of profits (after taxes) of the major corporations for 1943. I was astounded at the millions of dollars of profits that these corporations were cleaning up. Upon returning in late 1945 I found the New York Times and the Journal of Commerce printing tabulations of even more immense profits. These things do not look to me as if OPA has bankrupted business. And I would be willing to bet that most of these same corporations expect record production, record sales, and big profits in 1946 even with price control.

We have heard a lot of stories about how price control, during the war, was interfering with production. Most veterans who saw the avalanche of provisions, munitions, and equipment that rolled to our fighting fronts would never believe that price control hurt production. We just don't understand these tall tales being circulated to destroy the price-control program. We saw in Europe and China what inflation means and the misery it brings. Higher prices don't necessarily mean greater production.

There is one point on which the record should be kept absolutely straight. No one wants to perpetuate OPA indefinitely. We do not want red tape or business restrictions continued a day longer than they are necessary, but we do want protection from inflation for our living standards and for our chances to work and maintain our families.

Debate in the House and testimony before this committee have indicated that this country has $225,000,000,000 bulging in its pocket. The argument is then advanced that there is no reason why people shouldn't pay more for goods. However, I would like to point out that a relatively small share of that buying power rests in the hands of the veteran. Approximately six and a half million men who served in the Army had the rank of sergeant and below and it doesn't take much calculation to conclude that men earning between $50 and $80 a month did not save much for a postwar spending spree. Also I am not convinced that these sizable savings are shared alike by those millions who lived on a fixed income during the war years.

There has been talk in veterans' circles and in Congress of special privileges and bonuses for veterans. No self-respecting individual wants a hand-out and fewer yet like the idea of raiding the Treasury. But the veterans of this war represent almost one third of the total working population of the Nation. If, through inflation and the resultant depression, they are driven to desperation, their raid on the Treasury may well dwarf the thirties'. I think it is not unfair to say that at present the veteran is the forgotten man in the mad scramble for greater speculative profits.

How much more practical and farsighted it would be to bend all efforts now to keeping prices in line, as difficult as that may be. The biggest indirect bonus you could give to the veteran population and the Nation as a whole would be a strong price-control program which would keep up the purchasing power of their dollar.

Representative PATMAN, of Texas, in the debate on OPA in the House pointed out the inconsistency of voting $100 a month for a man who has lost a leg in battle and then taking off price controls so that $100 will not buy $25 worth of food. What good are disability pensions, living allotments, liberal loans, and other forms of financial assistance if the veteran can't buy anything with the money when he gets it.

Asking for an adequate price-control program is a far cry from asking for a hand-out. That is what the American Veterans Committee means when it says the battle against inflation should be the major concern of all veterans. Price control is the basis upon which their whole future economic well-being will be built. They may not all realize it now, but if price controls are removed and inflation really takes hold, then it will be too late to stem the tide.

The Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, day after day, has been filled with letters, editorials, resolutions, and speeches alternately denouncing or praising OPA. Mostly it's damning because the good work goes unnoticed. The Appendix reminds one somewhat of the B-Bag column in the Stars and Stripes. All the gripes, self-pity, misunderstandings, and major and minor hatreds eventually turned up there. And in some cases something was done about it. In others you just gritted your teeth and muttered about the unmitigated stupidity of some people. But you didn't abolish the Army. You didn't abolish the Army because there was a real danger—a danger to everyone.

Inflation has been one of our greatest enemies. In order to cope with it OPA had to be given power, at times totalitarian and arbitrary. Mistakes are bound to be made in enforcing almost 8,000,000 price ceilings. Both the Army and OPA were fighting deadly enemies and both committed injustices in pursuing a hard course. If the war were still on, there would be no thought of relaxing the strong control which disciplined millions of men. The war against inflation is still on. You don't demobilize when the enemy is at peak strength. OPA should not be weakened. It should be strengthened.

It is now up to you gentlemen to strengthen OPA. H. R. 6042, as passed by the House, in effect, kills price control because it makes "control" impossible. The sole consideration in amending S. 2028 should be, Does this particular amendment keep down the cost of living for the American people as a whole? The problem is not obtaining greater profits for certain privileged groups. Both profits and production have for several years been at an all-time high. The problem is preventing a run-away inflation which will make worthless everyone's dollars, be he a worker, manufacturer, or a veteran.

There must be an effective price-control program during the coming year and, if necessary, for a longer period of time in fields where production does not come up to demand and where normal competition cannot prevent an inflationary spiral. The amendments passed in the House are not the ticket to a stable economy but a joy ride to disaster.

The AVC therefore urges the Senate to reject the following amendments to H. R. 6042 as inflationary and crippling:

1. Time limitation of OPA to March 31, 1947. Section 1 and section 3 should be extended a minimum of 1 year.

2. Item-by-item cost-plus pricing for producers, processors, and distributors (including retailers) (sec. 2): This amendment would put an impossible administrative burden on the OPA. With OPA's limited staff, the problem of redetermining such prices and enforcing them would be impossible.

3. Removal of price controls as soon as the production of any commodity reaches the 1940–41 level (sec. 4, par. b (1), (2), (3), (4) (A) and (B)). The standard for decontrol should be not only production but also demand, which is now several times 1940–41 levels. Too much power is given the industry advisory committees. Their decisions should not be binding. In effect all prices would be lifted on agricultural commodities since most agricultural commodities are at the moment in excess of the base year 1940–41.

4. Termination of agricultural subsidies after January 1, 1947, and elimination of meat subsidies after June 30, 1946 (secs. 6 and 7). The reduction of subsidies and systematic price increases where necessary should be determined by the Administrator.

Before closing this testimony, I would like to pay tribute to Chester Bowles. He is a successful businessman. He has proven in the practical business world that he understands the problems of business. Right now he could be out making a fortune for himself, but he isn't doing that. He is practically donating his time and energy to do a tough job because he knows it means security for millions of American citizens and for hundreds of thousands of businesses. Veterans admire that kind of fight.

The AVC looks to the Members of Congress for help in holding down inflation. The veteran has not been able, during the years of war, to organize and operate lobbies to protect his interests. He has had to rely on you gentlemen. For several sessions of this committee, you have been hearing the pleas and complaints of the organized lobbies. I am sure you realize they cannot all have their own way. If they did, the result would be disastrous. The veteran has a bigger stake in preserving a strong price-control program than any lobby has in increasing its already swollen profits.

I am sure you want to avoid the disillusionment and resentment which will follow inevitably if the veteran finds that, through no fault of his own, the Senators elected by himself and his fellow citizens chose to give way to inflationary pressure rather than

stand up and fight for a Price Control Act unencumbered by crippling amendments.

Don't worry about whether the veterans are behind you in keeping prices down. At present they are very busy finding a place to live and locating a job which will give them initial security in civilian life. You can expect them to react as the vast majority of citizens, overwhelmingly in favor of men who protected their interests and keenly aware who their friends were in protecting them from a disastrous inflation. Inflation is no friend of the veteran and the veteran is no friend of inflation. The veteran's best weapon against inflation is a strong price-control program.

Labor, Wake Up! It's Getting Late!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor, Wake Up! It's Getting Late!" This editorial was written by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers' Journal, and published in the issue of April 1946. He is a labor leader who is sincerely and devoutly interested in the welfare of all working people of the United States. I recommend the reading of this editorial to all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR, WAKE UP! IT'S GETTING LATE!

It's about time for the American worker to start facing the fact that his position as such is in high jeopardy. Not only is the worker being jeopardized, but our American way of life is also being so manipulated by certain individuals that the time may not be far off when we shall have exchanged our system for another way of life. Yes; the Communistic way of life.

And believe you me, the fellow travelers have certainly been doing a lot of traveling of late into every section of this land and into every walk of life. They are disseminating their Communistic propaganda for the natural purpose of attaining their ultimate objective. And that, my dear friends, is not going to be one for the protection of our American way of life as we know it today.

There was a time some few years ago when we could spot a Communist or fellow traveler. In fact, he was easily identified. True to his ilk of that time, he invariably was a bushy-haired, starry-eyed, soap-box orator type. He could be found on almost any public square where he would be shouting the virtues of communism at the top of his voice. The more he shouted the more real Americans he made. His line of talk against Americanism was so obviously ridiculous that his listeners didn't have to be endowed with an Einstein brain to make two and two add up to four. And when they got the answer, they generally came away from such gatherings as better Americans because of what they had heard.

But mark you, the present-day promoters of communism are fully aware of the shortcomings of yesteryear's strategy. They understand, as well as do you and I, how ineffectual it was. So, in lines of strategem, they have given their "pill" of communism a new coating. They have dressed up their travelers, and today it is indeed a task to distinguish a good American from a bad Communist, by outward appearance alone. At the moment, these men of exotic leanings are to be found in almost every walk of life. They are among gentlemen of the press, educators, Government officials, ministers, and labor leaders. In fact, they have made inroads at every point of vantage that has to do with the forming of public opinion and public authority. These fellow travelers have a definite program to accomplish, and, let there be no doubt about it, their program is not lagging! In the promotion of this program, they know no scruples. They wave the flag of the red, white, and blue in their right hands while they keep the plain red hidden in their hearts. Yes, they are cunning and will stop at nothing in pursuing their objective, which is definitely the ultimate overthrow of our Government.

Yes, it is high time to wake up, because, unless we do, we may be caught "asleep at the switch." We Americans still retain the right to freedom of speech under our present way of life, but, unless we take advantage of this American heritage, we stand to lose not only this right, but likewise every other right that is inherent and precious to the American. The propaganda of the Communist is clever. Indeed, it is ingenious. It paints a beautiful picture of an earthly Utopia for everyone—especially for the worker. The guaranty looks good until properly challenged by people in a position to know the actual situation.

Those who know what they are talking about can always show up communism for what it really is by setting up a contrast. When comparison is made of conditions prevailing in Russia, the mother of communism, it is evident that we are fully 100 years ahead of their way of life. Our workers are free, not regimented. They have the right to work for whom they please and when they please. They have the right to voice themselves for their own betterment, whether unionized or not. If necessary, the American workers have a right to rebel against oppression by striking. The Communist speaks of full freedom, and yet, in the motherland of this system, there is no such thing as freedom for the worker. He either accepts the directives of the dictator or he is sent to prison. And cases are on record where he has been made to stand against a wall and shot for refusing to carry out a directive. That is a fair comparison between the freedom of the American worker and the freedom of the Russian worker.

The "fellow travelers" are praising to the high heavens the virtues of unionism, and yet, in the motherland, unionism as we Americans know it is practically nonexistent. And there is real reason for its being so. Under communism there can be only one head, a dictator, who recognizes no other authority, not even that of God. And let me tell you, without God, irrespective of denominational religion, there is nothing for us humans to live for. Naturally, communism in Russia, to the Russian, is a forward step for his well-being as compared to the treatment meted out to him under the system of the Czar, but, by comparison to our system under the American way of life, it falls far short of meeting human demands as we Americans appreciate them.

Unless labor wakes up, and soon, we are going to find ourselves at the mercy of these "gods," who are as godless as the very devil himself and whose vocabularies contain no word to express the meaning of our word "truth." By this I mean that, in order to attain their objectives of world dictatorship, they will resort to every subterfuge, including the overthrow of the very unions they purport to be friendly with. Proof of this statement is borne out in the fact that their strategy has been aimed at the ultimate weakening of the unions. Oh, if some of our weak-minded labor leaders only realized the extent of the communistic activity aimed at their own destruction, they would not hesitate in coming out openly against these "slickers."

The labor leader who understands his business knows that to have unions, and effective ones, we must have the means of effective collective bargaining. This being the case, how can we have collective bargaining under a communistic system that recognizes no authority other than the dictator, the "god" of the land? How effective would a railroad brotherhood be in its legitimate demands under Government ownership? Or how effective would a union covering power-plant workers, telephone workers, and the like be under a dictatorship? The answer to this is—zero. The Communist knows this in advance, and, since he does, he is making for the destination of complete government control over all industry, particularly over our vital industries. He knows that under government ownership, under a social economy, labor unions cannot exist very long. The reason for this is quite simple. Under government control the right to strike is eliminated. That is number one in severing the jugular vein of unionism.

The Communist also knows in advance that, if a worker can secure by Government decree short hours, long wages, and other social-security protection by merely asking the Government to give it to him, it is foolish to pay a union for these concessions. It is just as foolish as a railroad man, who carries a pass, to pay for a ride on a train. In short, it would not take the worker long to realize that, if he can get everything he wants by Government decree, it is foolish to pay union dues. When the union worker does not pay dues, there is no means of supporting the union. Thus comes the extinction of unions, a condition brought about by the very so-called friends of this most worth-while American prerogative.

The scheme is diabolical. It is well planned and no detail is slighted. No man is fit to be classed as a leader if he does not avail himself of the facts surrounding this concerted effort aimed at the destruction of our American system of collective bargaining, which is today recognized as an integral part of our American way of life. If I had my way about it, I would encourage every labor leader in this country—and every industrial leader, if you please—to make a first-hand study of how the slickers are operating. I mean, by visiting the Soviet Union. When these leaders would return to this country, even though they had been pink or red when they left, they would come back as real red-white-and-blue Americans, waving the American flag in their right hands and cherishing it in their hearts.

I do not wish to create the impression that all of our labor leaders are not worthy of being such, because this is far from the fact. We have many leaders who realize that communism and Americanism, like water and oil, are not good mixers. These men are taking the fight right out into the open and showing up communism for what it really is as applied to the American worker, and particularly to the American unionist. In their line of strategy, they are pursuing the course of unionism independent of governmental directives, independent of governmental coddling, and are hewing to the line in the procedure of legitimate collective bargaining.

If we are to save unionism, more leaders of labor must step up and meet the challenge

of communism; because, if they don't, they will wake up some day, and maybe soon, to find that the fellow travelers have reached their own front door. Let us bring these travelers out into the open. Let's give the American, and especially the American unionist, the opportunity to make a comparison between Americanism and communism. Let's afford them the opportunity of examining the facts as they really exist. When placed in this position, the American workman will not be found wanting in the intelligence to add two and two and make it sum up to four. And when he does, he will be a foursquare American. Therefore, in great alarm I say, labor, wake up; it's getting late!

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

Can World Peace Be Secured Through the Allied Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an essay written by one of my constituents, Zane Duncan, of Nankin, Ohio, who is one of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

I congratulate Mr. Duncan on being one of the winners and upon his achievement, and I respectfully urge the membership of the House of Representatives to read this essay, "Can World Peace Be Secured Through the Allied Nations."

I also compliment the American Legion of Ohio for sponsoring such a worthwhile program. Some time ago they brought these winners as their guests to the greatest capital of the world. The essay follows:

I'm not a potential President, not even a Congressman; I'm just a plain American boy, but somebody wanted to know my opinion. It's a tough question: Can peace be preserved by the Allied Nations, the UN?

I don't want another war; I don't want to go to war; I don't want my children to go through what many boys and girls of my generation went through.

I want the UN to prevent war, but deep down inside I don't think that an organization so packed with jealousy and politics can succeed.

Let's just take the first UN meeting at San Francisco. By radio, newspaper, and magazine we heard of the trouble in the organization of the UN. Then we heard of Russia's making trouble over the Argentine problem. I am not pro-Russian, but let's look at Russia's objections. Were they fair? In my opinion, yes. Russia's Premier Molotov was no fool; he wasn't asking anything impossible in refusing a pro-Nazi country such as Argentina admittance to the UN. Molotov asked for time to think, question, argue, before the deciding vote on the Argentine question was taken. How, then, could he be expected to feel when our Secretary of State, Stettinius, rose right after him and asked for an immediate vote, and got it.

Did the United States want Argentina in the UN for Argentina's sake, for the UN? No, I don't think so. The United States wanted Argentina a member because it gave our hemisphere one more vote in the UN. It is my opinion that the United States, every nation's friend, fighter for world peace and fellowship, wanted more votes with which to boss its fellow nations. Is that working for the world peace?

In the Balkans, Russia has been getting a little out of line, causing trouble, wanting more land, wanting perhaps to protect certain Caspian Sea railway terminals and oil refineries. England, wanting an inspection to these actions, asked the UN to inquire about them to Russia. Russia is a member of the UN, but did she agree to inspection of England's actions in Greece? To me it sounds like a group of small children having an argument, each throwing the blame on the other. Oh, yes; great progress, wonderful cooperation.

Originally the UN was to be an organization or family of nations working together for a continued world peace. That's a fine idea, a group of nations working together; but it hasn't lived up to expectations as yet. Basically the UN is a sound organization founded by good, well-thinking men, and, I believe that it can be made, through hard work, to do as was expected by its organizers.

If the United States will work harder for the UN and a little less for the United States, if the other nations will follow through with this policy, if politics can be cleared out of the international organizations, then the UN can succeed.

That, I realize, is a lot of "if's" for a plain American boy, but that's my opinion. Yes; peace can be preserved by the UN.

Some Fundamental Truths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of Monday, April 29, entitled "Some Fundamental Truths."

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult for the American people to know the truth, because they have available some $73,000,000 in appropriations for the purpose of publicity and propaganda purposes. The last 2 weeks has seen an outpouring of hysterical remarks by Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and a half dozen radio commentators, who depend upon the Government for their inside information. Hitler, in his book, Mein Kampf, says that if you tell a lie often enough people would soon begin to believe you. Chester Bowles and his cohorts have not been telling the people the truth. The governmental agencies use dollar figures to prove that production is high and that the OPA is doing just fine. By counting prices instead of goods, Germany, at the peak of inflation was also the peak of prosperity.

The OPA has, through their methods, promoted hundreds of thousands of the fly-by-night outfits who turn out any old thing and sell to certain kinds of wholesalers at an inflated price. These wholesalers foist their goods on half-starved retailers with tied-in buys of reputable merchandise. Many of these people are making more money than they ever knew was in the world. They are operating wholly within the law, under the special privileges granted them by the OPA. These black-market boys depend upon continuing the OPA. They give their wholehearted support to the OPA.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the country should be told the truth. They are not getting it through the radio propaganda of Chester Bowles and company. I commend the following editorial to the House for their consideration:

SOME FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS

It seems high time that Mr. and Mrs. Average American—the people who, by their majority votes, elect our lawmaking officials—were allowed to become acquainted with some of the facts of economic life. For instance, they need to be told that every time any of the costs of producing any of the things they use go up the cost of living goes up. Those costs which, by their rise or fall, determine the true cost of living include raw materials, manufacture or processing, labor, transportation, and distribution. Hence, every time wages in any branch of business are increased the cost of living rises just as much as though the increase had been in the price of raw materials or one of the other essential items. That increased cost must be paid by the consumers of the Nation, either in the form of price to the merchant from whom they buy or by a combination of price plus subsidies out of Federal Treasury funds which, in turn, are raised by taxes upon all the people. Moreover, there is an added charge when subsidies are paid because it costs the Government quite a neat sum to administer them, and it also costs the merchant, the manufacturer, and the producer a pretty penny to keep the records necessary to apply for them.

Another chapter of this economic primer, and an important one in these days of shortages, is that when returns from all sources fail to meet the cost of growing or manufacturing and distributing a product, plus a reasonable margin of profit, the production of that item halts, or at least is severely curtailed. That is what has happened in recent months with regard to many products and it is one of the big reasons why meats, shirts, dresses, building materials, suits, machinery and repair parts, and a lot of other items are short.

Cold facts though these be, they aren't generally known or regarded because people have been willfully taught to disbelieve them. Labor leaders, politicians, and other people more interested in jobs and offices than in the economic welfare of the Nation have preached false gospels which have been blindly accepted because they were pleasanter than cold truth. Some of the harvest from the folly thus sowed already is here and more is to come. Production has sagged pitifully, not only depriving people here at home of things they urgently need, but embarrassing officials who have made commitments abroad which they cannot fulfill.

This, we may as well recognize, is only the beginning, because economically, America is sick and out of balance. Artificial stimulants, more powerful than those already administered, may bring another short surge of life and effort, but it will be followed by a still greater sag in production and morale. The only way out is a return to sanity, to living according to natural economic laws. It is time that our leaders began telling people this truth.

British Government Denies Responsibility for Churchill's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a letter direct from the British Government to me, confirms the fact that Winston Churchill did not speak for his government in his address at Fulton, Mo., on March 6.

I think this assurance is due the American people and that it is especially opportune at this time. I believe it will improve the prospect for the British loan.

In effect, Churchill's speech proposed that America and Britain form a power bloc to rule the world. Not satisfied with reported denials of responsibility by the British Government, I sent an air-mail special-delivery letter to Premier Attlee inviting a categorical expression as to whether Churchill in making the address was speaking for his government. My letter and the reply follow:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 18, 1946.*
Rt. Hon. CLEMENT RICHARD ATTLEE,
Premier of Great Britain,
London, England.

DEAR MR. ATTLEE: I am now, and have been for almost 18 years, a Member of the Congress of the United States. I am English by descent, and I have always understood that my ancestry goes back in a more or less shadowy line to Ludlow castle in England. I had the pleasure of meeting you when you addressed the two Houses of Congress in joint session in the Hall of Representatives at Washington.

I am moved to write to you because of the address delivered by Mr. Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo., on March 6, when he boldly advocated what would amount to a military alliance between the British Empire and the United States to rule the world.

Mr. Churchill's address shocked America and its repercussions will be felt for a long, long time. The American viewpoint is that in that speech Mr. Churchill was proposing that Britain and America torpedo the United Nations and was using America, his hostess, as a soundingboard to drum up another world war.

His proposal for a complete or a quasi military alliance has been universally construed this side of the ocean as a singular disregard of our traditions of freedom and independence and as an affront to our people who place full faith and credence in the United Nations and who want to see it maintained and developed as the world's only hope for permanent peace. You need have no doubt that America has unanimously and emphatically repudiated Mr. Churchill's proposal. As far as I am aware not one of the 531 Members of Congress is for it, and I believe I am correct in saying that not one of the thousands of American newspapers has printed a single line approving it. His utterance, I sincerely believe, is deprecated by everybody in our country.

I cannot imagine anything that could have happened that would be more disturbing to Anglo-American relations than the speech made by Mr. Churchill, judging by the immediate reaction and the probable after effects. The suggestion is often heard that Mr. Churchill probably was speaking by the card and was sent here by the British Government to feel out America on the question of a military alliance to dominate the world.

I think it is important both to Britain and to America that this situation should be clarified without delay and I am writing to ask you, as the head of the Government of Great Britain, these questions:

1. Did Mr. Churchill speak by authority of the British Government at Fulton, Mo., on March 6?

2. Does the British Government endorse Mr. Churchill's views as expressed in his speech at Fulton, Mo., on March 6?

I think your answers to these questions are due in justice to the American people, and in justice to the British Government as well, and if you see your way clear to reply to this letter I will see that your reply receives the publicity in Congress and in our press which the importance of the subject matter deserves.

Very sincerely yours,
LOUIS LUDLOW.

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1946.
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Mr. Attlee has forwarded your letter of March 18 to this embassy and has suggested that I should draw your attention to the following statement which he made in the House of Commons on March 11, 1946, concerning Mr. Churchill's speech at Fulton.

"The British Information Services in the United States are well aware that the policy of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom is to be found only in the statements of His Majesty's Ministers, and the right honorable Member for Woodford—Mr. Churchill—stated very clearly that he spoke for himself only. Of course, His Majesty's Government had no previous knowledge of the content of the speech. His Majesty's Ambassador was not called upon to approve or disapprove the speech beforehand."

You will see from this statement that Mr. Churchill did not speak with the prior consent or approval of the British Government.

Yours very sincerely,
JOHN BALFOUR.

The diplomatic directory states that Mr. Balfour is Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Great Britain.

New Union of Public Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, there appeared in today's Washington Post a special article by Jerry Kluttz, a reliable newspaperman, a factual account of the organization of a left-wing CIO union in Atlantic City last week composed of Federal, State, and municipal employees. From this report it will be seen that this organization has a definite communistic line and it should be a source of grave concern to our Government that one group of its employees are becoming identified with organizations whose first loyalty is to a foreign country. This cannot be dismissed as Red baiting for the action of the organization itself establishes its character and indicates the objects of its allegiance. The American Government, and the other units of State or local governments, should not continue to retain in their service any person who adheres to the Communist line and practically acknowledges its first allegiance is not to our Government or its ideals and principles.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD this article by Mr. Kluttz to be followed by an editorial from the Washington Post commenting upon the action of this newly organized union of Federal and other government workers.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Thursday, May 2, 1946]

PUBLIC WORKERS' UNION LEANS TO LEFT, REPORTER FINDS

(A new CIO union was born at Atlantic City a week ago. Known as the United Public Workers, it is an amalgamation of the old United Federal Workers of America and the State, County, and Municipal Workers, both CIO. Since his return from covering the Atlantic City convention, Post reporter Jerry Kluttz has been flooded with requests from interested Government workers to tell the real story of what happened at the sessions. Kluttz in today's Federal Diary presents a behind-the-scenes picture of events at Atlantic City.)

(By Jerry Kluttz)

This is the story of the extreme left-wing policies and actions of the United Public Workers of America, the newly created CIO union which has 75,000 members among Federal, State, county, and municipal employees.

I arrived at the Atlantic City convention at noon a week ago yesterday, April 24. I was promptly told—as were other reporters—that nothing newsworthy would happen for the remainder of that day as the convention had to go through the time-consuming process of merging the two CIO unions, the United Federal Workers of America, and the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America into UPWA.

As the afternoon wore on, George Morris, of the Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, and another New York reporter came into the convention hall at the Hotel Chelsea. Abram Flaxer, SCMWA president who was later elected president of UPWA, told them what he had told me earlier—that nothing newsy was on the schedule.

Morris, however, told Flaxer that he was concerned over the sharp criticism directed at the Russian foreign policy by Emil Rieve, president of CIO's textile workers and a leader of the right wing in the CIO, at the opening of the union's convention several blocks down the boardwalk. In so doing, Rieve indorsed the policies of both the President and State Secretary Byrnes.

This had made Morris most unhappy and he frankly told Flaxer that he needed a story from the public workers to offset Rieve's speech. Finally, the Daily Worker correspondent suggested to Flaxer that he "pull out the foreign policy resolution and get it passed." (Obviously, Morris knew what it proposed or he wouldn't have made the suggestion.)

Flaxer returned to the platform and took over the gavel. It was only a matter of minutes before the foreign policy resolution was called up for action.

The resolution in effect charged the demobilization of American troops throughout

the world is being deliberately delayed to further the imperialist ambitions of the United States and Britain and to isolate Russia. It called for the immediate withdrawal of American and British troops from all friendly countries including China, the Philippines, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Belgium, and Iceland.

RED WITHDRAWAL SUGGESTED

What became the real issue was stated clearly by Peter N. Demas, an employee of the Jamesburg, N. J., school for boys. Demas suggested a line be added to recommend the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, and other friendly countries. He paid high tribute to the Russian Army but he asked the delegates to play the game both ways. He said what was good for the United States was also good for the Soviet Union.

"I like the Russians," he said, "but I put the United States first."

He warned the convention that the CIO was losing members because many workers say it is communistic.

Demas was answered by obvious spokesmen for the union administration who came right out and charged the United States and Britain were plotting to destroy the Soviet Union by atomic bombs before the Russians could get themselves prepared. One speaker—Frank Herbst, of New York—even went so far as to set the date he said he was told when it would happen, sometime in June.

OPPONENTS BRANDED

The opponents of the resolution were called reactionaries and Red baiters.

In the end, Demas was shouted down and the resolution as proposed was approved by an overwhelming vote. Union officials say the vote was unanimous. However, several delegates told me they voted against it. They didn't make themselves heard very far if they did.

George Morris, the Daily Worker correspondent, was happy. He had his story to offset the Rieve speech.

(NOTE.—A foreign policy resolution similar to the one which was approved was voted on by many locals before the Atlantic City session.)

But at the opening of the convention on the day before, observers detected the Communist Party line in certain sentences of the officers' reports of both organizations. For example:

The UFWA report had this sentence which could have been taken from a Communist publication: "The present administration and Congress are actually carrying out a program of aggressive imperialism in foreign affairs and of attacking labor and lowering living standards at home."

POLICY DISCUSSION

The first 10 pages of the SCMWA officers' report discussed foreign policy and in it were typical left-wing phrases such as:

"We insist that the UN renounce their championship of the imperialistic-minded groups in our own country * * * The universal denunciation of Churchill (for his Fulton speech) did not stop the British and American tories in their drive for world domination * * * whatever the decisions of this convention all perspectives and plans will be swept away in a maelstrom of atomic destruction if the warmongers succeed in their scheme."

And this incident, I believe, is worth noting as it also indicates the line some members of the UPWA are following.

I made it a point to buy copies of the Daily Worker to read stories on the UPWA convention. On Friday morning I went up to the hotel newsstand to ask for a copy. Before the girl had a chance to answer me, a young fellow jumped up from a nearby chair and told me in an apologetic manner that the copies hadn't arrived but that they would be in at any minute. And then he asked me:

"Have you contributed to the fund?"

FUND TO BUY DAILY WORKER

I told him I had not and I asked him about it. He explained that some of the delegates had thought it vital that a Sunday copy of The Worker be given to each of the 600 delegates and that they had collected a fund to buy several hundred extra copies. He insisted I come back in half an hour and get a free copy. I agreed.

I did return within the hour and I found a stack of Daily Workers at least 3 feet high. I picked up a copy. The same young man came up and, again apologetically, he asked:

"You told me you hadn't contributed to the fund?" I nodded in agreement. Then he explained:

"We've had a little meeting and we've decided that those who haven't contributed should buy a copy." He went on to say that it was agreed the delegates would be likely to throw away the paper if it were given to them, but they would be sure to read it if they paid for it.

ON UNION MEMBERSHIP

Certain sections of the UPWA constitution which was adopted at the convention also give a clue to the new union's attitude. Many unions specifically bar Communists from either membership or from holding office. Section 2, article 3, of the UPWA constitution, in effect, welcomes Communists along with everyone else. It reads:

"Membership in the international union shall not be denied by reason of sex, race, creed, color, nationality, or religious or political affiliation or belief."

The constitution also leaves the door open to strikes against municipal, county, State, and the Federal Governments. SCMWA has had several strikes.

In defending the strike language in the constitution, Don Murray, of Washington, told the convention that Attorney General Tom Clark had recently written a letter in which he said there was no prohibition to keep Federal workers from striking.

REPORT NOT CONFIRMED

A check at the Justice Department revealed that Clark wrote no such letter. The Attorney General did answer a letter from Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, who asked if any Federal agency is barred from bargaining collectively with its employees. Clark said he did not know of any such act, but he cited an opinion of the late President Roosevelt in which he said collective bargaining could not be transplanted into the public service.

Off the convention floor, a distinct minority of the delegates added up the officers' report, the foreign policy resolution, and some parts of the constitution as acts of an extreme left-wing group. They charged the union was following the Communist line.

But the only concrete step taken by the opposition was Friday afternoon at a caucus of New Jersey delegates. Delegate Joseph F. Hambrose, of Camden, an Internal Revenue employee, suggested the New Jersey group back an amendment to the constitution which would say:

"We oppose all that is un-American, whether it is nazism, fascism, or communism."

His proposal lost by a voice vote of the New Jersey caucus.

I don't mean to suggest or even hint that every delegate at the convention except Demas and Hambrose were Communists, or even fellow travelers. If anything, it's the other way around, as I believe very few of the delegates were outright Communists.

But on its record at Atlantic City the union has had an extreme left-wing label pinned on it. It must change that record on foreign policy and other issues before it can shake off the label.

[From the Washington Post of May 2, 1946]

UNION IN THE RED

We should like to tap the administration and Congress on the shoulder and call attention to what appears to have been a successful effort by our Stalinist friends to gain complete control of the new United Public Workers of America, and to exploit it in the interest of the Communist Party line. This UPWA came into being as the result of the recent merger of the United Federal Workers of America and the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, both affiliates of the CIO, and is said to represent a combined membership of about 75,000.

Communist influence, to be sure, was not exactly unknown in either of these organizations before the merger was consummated. The extent to which it has been consolidated, however, is manifest in some actions of the Atlantic City convention last week. The convention, for example, called upon the United States to cease its recent policy "of attempting to isolate the Soviet Union in the UN and world affairs" and demanded that the administration not only withdraw American troops from "all friendly countries" such as China, the Philippines, France, Belgium, and Iceland, but also that it call upon the British to withdraw from Greece, India, and Indonesia. An effort to amend this resolution so that it would also call for the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland and other "friendly countries" in Europe failed. The report by the officers of the United Federal Workers approving and urging the merger with the SCMWA also took occasion to attack both the administration and Congress "for carrying out a program of aggressive imperialism in foreign affairs."

These evidences of a carefully organized intention to steer the union along the various twists and turns of the current party line become significant only when taken in connection with the change of attitude concerning strikes and bargaining rights. Hitherto, organizations of Government workers have acknowledged that they had not the same right of strike as workers in private industry and also that a sovereign government cannot be expected to bargain with unions on terms of equality as private employers are obliged to under the terms of the Labor Relations Act. The constitution of the UPWA, however, while stating that "it shall not be the policy of this organization to engage in strikes as a means of achieving its objectives," nevertheless sanctions strikes by a local union, subject to the approval of the international president, when it has "exhausted all other methods to obtaining its collective-bargaining objectives."

Thus it is by no means inconceivable that the strike weapon may become a device superior to the ballot whereby a tireless and disciplined minority will seek to alter or modify the policy of the Government. Of course, in such circumstances the Government would cease to be a government in any real sense of the word. It is time for the Government to stop pussyfooting with this and other marplots, as, for instance, John L. Lewis and James Caesar Petrillo, and wake up to its obligation to the citizenry to give them a real, protective, and comprehensive labor law.

We Are All Losers

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, recently I saw some figures which startled

me, as I believe they will startle you. They set me thinking, and I am still thinking—thinking what a tragedy it is—and how dangerous it is—that we should all be losers in an economic disorder that is sweeping the country. I want to make it clear at the outset of this talk that I am not trying to place any responsibility, or to assess any blame. I am discussing a condition which is causing every man, woman, and child in the Nation to lose wealth and opportunity, and I am wondering if there cannot be found some way to stop it.

Since VJ-day an epidemic of strikes has stalled the reconversion of our domestic industry, big and little, from the war effort to peace status. Strikes started to become epidemic in September 1945, during which month some 3,650,000 man-days of work were lost because of walk-outs. Since that time the curve has continued upward until, in January 1946 the incredible total of 19,200,000 man-days were lost because of strikes in that month alone. The daily wage loss—think of it—the daily wage loss for each working day of that month was $13,500,000, or a total wage loss for the month of $378,000,000. That much in wages never reached the pockets of the workers and their families. The loss in business caused by these strikes is more than $60,000,000 a day. Of course the loss in national income is impossible to calculate at this time.

There are some developments which have a significance far beyond the immediate factors causing them. For instance, during 2 days, February 11 and 12, all the activities of the 7,000,000 people in New York were stopped, business was tied up, health was menaced, rights were violated in total defiance of the Government, and of the interests of their coworkers, by 3,500 tugboat men. Now, regardless of who was right or who was wrong in that strike, nobody—neither tugboat men if they were wrong, nor owners if they were wrong—had any moral right to interfere with the business, the livelihood, the health, the schooling of 7,000,000 other people who were not parties to the dispute and had nothing whatever to do with it.

In Philadelphia 3,000,000 people were denied the right to pursue their various labors because 9,600 transport workers called a strike. Again, regardless of who was to blame, of the merits or demerits of either side of the case, one thing is certain; a few pepole in one line of work—in this case transportation—have not the moral right to interfere with the welfare of 3,000,000 of their fellow citizens who were not parties to the dispute, and who had no responsibility in the matter. They were simply the victims of opposing forces considering only their own interests to the exclusion of all public interests.

In the same period some 2,000,000 residents of Pittsburgh were compelled to do without enough electricity because 3,400 powerhouse workers went on strike. Again, regardless of the rights and the wrongs of that dispute, no group of employers or employees has any moral right to penalize 2,000,000 innocent citizens because of a dispute concerning the selfish interests of a small segment of the population.

Millions of families in America are being compelled to do without refrigerators, radios, automobiles, washing machines, homes, and clothes by these strikes. Soldiers and sailors who went overseas to fight to keep this Nation free are being deprived of jobs, of homes, of all the comforts they desire because of strikes concerning which they have not the slightest responsibility. They simply are the helpless victims.

Now the question arises: What are we going to do about this situation? We have seen labor and management deadlocked for weeks and months because they were unable through any existing agency to compose their differences.

The first thing that must be done is for the great American public to rise up and demand that both management and labor register a new sense of obligation to the public welfare. The moral laws are higher and longer lasting than statutory laws. Wrong does not cease to be wrong because a law has been bludgeoned or sneaked through Congress calling it right. Unfairness and the victimizing of the people do not cease to be unfair and vicious merely because one group or another group feels that by making the public suffer enough they can gain their demands regardless of the logic or the equity of the demands.

Whatever rights of collective bargaining labor has does not mean that it is right for labor to bargain away the rights of all the rest of the people in a strike over wages, working conditions, or smoking privileges.

No industrial management has the right to penalize the general public to win a point or a strike against its employees. If this false concept is not curbed and cured, there will be nothing to prevent different groups striking—not against the management, but against the public interest. The wider the public interest is outraged and injured, under such conditions, the sooner the strikers might hope to win their struggle against management by the public outcry.

Both management and labor would be well advised to remember that the American people are slow to anger, but when they do flame into anger under injustice, abuse, and insolence, they turn and rend—and it is possible that labor and management can lose all that has been gained when finally the general American public becomes aroused.

No group of managers has any moral right for instance, to lock out their employees, pull the switches in the power houses, leave patients half operated on in hospital operating rooms, trap people between floors in elevator shafts, compel people to walk 6 or 8 or 10 or 20 flights of stairs to get to their homes and beds—many of them to die of overtaxed hearts. And by the same token no group of employees has any right to pull power switches and produce the same calamitous results. Where such widespread public interests are involved both management and labor should be compelled to recognize the public interest and refrain from penalizing thousands or millions of innocent men, women, and children.

The irony of all this is that when one group of people, managers or employees, lock out or strike, they are penalizing their own fellow workers.

Now this does not mean to say labor should not have the right to bargain collectively. I believe in collective bargaining, and most managers do, too. But I don't believe labor or management—or both—should have the right to collective bargaining to the utter exclusion of all rights to life, liberty, property, work, health, education of everybody else.

Certainly the right to legal and orderly picketing does not carry with it the right to beat up innocent citizens, destroy property, or commit murder. Certainly the right of property does not carry with it the right to oppress workers, underpay them, overwork them, endanger their health. But the strange part of all this grotesque picture is that the elevator operators and the tugboat men in New York, the Philadelphia and Detroit transportation men, the Pittsburgh powerhouse men, in striking for their own increases in wages, or for better working conditions, did not hesitate to stop for the time being the wages of fellow workers, to injure the working conditions, the means of transportation, stop the current to heat the homes and make the breakfast toast of their own fellow workers, members of other unions. When any man pulls a power switch that stops elevators between floors or darkens a hospital operating room he does not know but what the son or the daughter or the wife of some one of his neighbors may pay for that pulled switch with his life.

The condition of strikes, of industrial disputes is intolerable. The United States cannot go on with this sort of menace hovering over the lives of all of us. I am for giving labor the last ounce of legal and moral right to protect wages, working hours and conditions. But I am also for enforcing the law concerning the property rights of industry, of management, of investors, as well as the property rights of working men and women, and men and women on the farms, in their homes, also.

This is not a question of whether labor shall have adequate bargaining right. It is not a question of whether management shall have proper legal protection in properties and means of production. It is a question of providing those rights of labor and management in such a way, and with such due and alert regard for the general public welfare, that millions of innocent citizens will not be penalized by a handful of men who decide to have a strike, or a few managers who determine to have a dispute with their employees.

I am addressing myself in this talk to the constitutional, the moral, the legal, and the inalienable rights of the masses of citizens which ought not to be violated by industrial disputes, strikes, and picket lines.

If this sort of thing continues the limits will keep moving further and further away until chaos will result. We saw in the last war strikes and stoppages which cost lives. We saw 14,731 strikes during the war after labor leaders had promised

there would be no strikes during hostilities. That was wrong and no group of managers or workers has any moral right to condemn their own sons or other men's sons to death or injury for lack of adequate machines or supplies—but that happened in the war just ended.

I am fully aware that all the Communists who have infiltrated into labor unions will condemn me for these words—but anyhow they will condemn anybody who does not agree with them.

I am convinced that a fair, equitable way can be found under which to conduct collective bargaining and settlement of disputes, without strikes and lock-outs suddenly bringing idleness, cold, loss of wages, lack of food, lack of water, lack of heat to millions of innocent persons.

Samuel Gompers, still the Nation's all-time outstanding leader of labor declared in many different phrases what he once said in these words: "Nobody has any right to strike against the public safety."

CIO-PAC Organization in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an article from the May issue 1946 of the Republican News.

The political confusion brought about by the CIO-PAC and the Democratic chairman, Mr. Hannegan, is so in line with the general confusion of the present administration that I thought the article should be preserved by being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for future generations.

It appears Mr. Hannegan is in for considerable trouble, especially with the able and real Democrats from the South in trying to team up with them their enemies, the CIO-PAC who are boasting that they will spend $2,000,000 in organizing in the South to overthrow the leadership of these men from the South. It will be interesting to note future developments.

"SORRY" IS THE WORD FOR "DISSIDENT" DIXIE DEMOS

Somebody's always putting grit in a Dixie Democrat's grits and then apologizing. One of these days, maybe, somebody is going to get insulted, perhaps, if at all.

The recent chain of apologies began a few weeks ago when Commerce Secretary Wallace suggested that Democrat Congressmen should be "put out of the party" if they voted against Truman-PAC proposals. Democrat Chairman (Off-again, On-again, Gone-again) Hannegan, echoed the sentiments. President Truman thought both fellows had made fine suggestions.

After a few days, these remarks began to arouse some dyed-in-the-wool Democrats from the pone provinces who had nayed loudly nearly every vote on Truman-PAC bills. They began pouting in cloakrooms together.

Naturally, Wallace, Mr. Truman, and Hannegan were contrite—sorry, that is. Wallace even said, suppressing any emotion, that he didn't mean a "purge" for the dissidents, just "discipline."

This gentle statement by the PAC spokesman seemed to settle the dither in Dixie enough for CIO-PAC to announce it would spend $2,000,000 in organizing southern labor and $6,000,000 in the 1946 elections to elect favorable candidates—millions, that is.

Came April and the April issue of Democratic Digest which itemed that a vote for the Case labor bill "was a vote against the American people." It was like saying that 109 Democrats who favored the Case bill had "voted against the American people." You all should have heard the commotion on Capitol Hill.

Indignant Democrats caucused; a Miss Jane Heldt, writer of the item who had gone too far with the Wallace trend, resigned; Hannegan was sorry indeed, and audibly said "unfortunate" to the press.

The next time Hannegan was sorry was on April 10. Unknowingly, he sent a letter to county chairmen asking them to select proper candidates for Congress—chaps who would go along with Truman and PAC. Somehow, Democrat Congressmen, being Democrats, thought they were proper enough, that the chairman didn't need to do any further selecting.

HANNEGAN ON THE WIRE

Hannegan got this point of view somehow and sent a "sorry" telegram to the county chairmen advising them to disregard his letter he sent without his knowledge. The Postmaster General intimated there was a mistake in the mailing.

Sorrow next visited the Democrats on the Hill, because in calling a caucus they invited in some Republicans by mistake.

And Mr. Truman got sorry again, too, after telling a Chicago school girl he thought States could iron out their own poll-tax problems. This didn't please PAC, and Mr. Truman made it clear that he still favors Federal laws ending poll taxes. But then, the Dixie crowd got the misery again for fear that Mr. Truman actually wanted southern Negroes to have a chance to vote.

EAT HEARTY, MATES

Meantime, Hannegan was jumping into the breeches. He invited all Democrats in Congress to dinner, 60 at a time, to get unified with the Truman-PAC program.

And just when the epidemic of foot-in-the-mouth disease had run its course, Wallace stood up at San Francisco last week and said again that all Democrats who voted against Truman-PAC bills should be denied appointments on congressional committees.

This seems to be just about where we came in, dear reader, so let's leave the land of magnolia, black-eyed peas, and apologies with the parting style note, that no matter what breeches Hannegan jumps into, bloomers definitely are back.

Back to the Grind Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times of April 30, 1946:

BACK TO THE GRIND AGAIN

The 10-day recess taken by Congress ends today and Representatives and Senators return to the daily grind of legislation. Most of the Members spent the recess back home patching up political fences, doing a little spade work for the coming fall elections, and trying to find out what legislative course in the next few months will best please the most people.

President Truman, National Chairman Bob Hannegan and others of the dyed-in-the-wool administration group hope that Representatives will have been read the riot act back home for voting in favor of the House bill to continue OPA only with considerable lopping of its past dictatorial powers. Mr. Truman, Mr. Hannegan et al, may as well quit hoping. Representatives, with few exceptions, have not been read any riot act about their own act on OPA. On the contrary most of them have met with considerable praise—plus a slight warning that the House bill may have to be toned down a bit here and there. The Senate is certain to do this.

What the people want is for the House readily to agree to a little toning, but not to let the Senate run haywire in keeping OPA in its present form of stupid dictatorship. The keystones of the House bill must be retained. The public's mind seems thoroughly made up on OPA: It doesn't want the family budget given atomic bomb jolts by removal of controls, but it does want whatever controls are retained to be of a nature to permit production and to end scarcities of goods for which plenty of material is available; and it wants OPA controls to end when production of any line reaches the demand for that line.

Mr. Truman and Mr. Hannegan—particularly the latter—and Mr. Wallace doubtless also are hoping that Democrats who voted with Republicans to block some of the CIO-PAC legislation will have been spanked back home. Mr. Truman should have learned long ago—when he demanded that fires be built under Congress and found they were built only under himself—that southern Democrats are not going to swallow the Hillman-Wallace-CIO-PAC program of communistic and socialistic legislation any more than they'd vote for a national ticket of Hillman and Wallace, or vice versa. As for Mr. Hannegan, he should know by this time that southern Congressmen have had enough of silly mistakes in his national committee office and that instead of hoping the Congressmen have been spanked he should take some steps to see that he himself does not require further spankings. As for Mr. Wallace and all of this, he should have known a lot of things long ago and didn't, so why bother about him now?

In other words, the old legislative grind is on again and if the White House eaders are going to keep on demanding that Congress legislate a liberal Nation into a politically leftist and ultraradical discard there'll be the same old drubbings—legislatively—for the administration forces.

There is one thing we hope recessing Congressmen have learned, however. That is that simply voting down harmful administration legislation isn't enough to do anything worth while about the Nation's present ills. Some beneficial legislation is needed also and we suggest that Congress quit trying to patch up administration bills and write a few of its own—particularly in the industrial labor relations field.

A Fair Trial for Gen. Draja Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am

inserting in the RECORD some material relative to the case of Gen. Draja Mihailovich. It is my sincere hope that Mihailovich will be given a fair trial and that all the evidence will be made public. I am also very desirous that all American witnesses will be allowed to testify so that they can contribute of their first-hand knowledge to the aid and assistance rendered to them during their service in Yugoslavia.

COMMITTEE FOR A FAIR TRIAL FOR
DRAJA MIHAILOVICH,
New York, April 29, 1946.

The Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington. D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: I enclose a copy of an appeal which will be given to Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson next week with the additional signatures which will have been received by then. We earnestly hope that you will join us in this plan for elementary justice.

Our committee does not presume to pass judgment on General Mihailovich, but we believe that Mihailovich is entitled to a fair trial and that a fair trial entails the right to choose counsel and the right to subpena witnesses. This position has been taken in strong editorials in such independent newspapers as the New York Times and the Washington Post, which are enclosed. It was also expressed in the United States Government's request to Marshal Tito which he rejected. But we believe that if public opinion makes itself heard our Government can bring enough diplomatic and economic pressure to bear to reverse Marshal Tito's decision. If not, his government itself would stand condemned.

The confession which the Yugoslav prosecutors claim to have obtained from Mihailovich does not, in our opinion, obviate the necessity for an open trial to which all material witnesses are subpenaed. Such confessions have been the rule rather than the exception in totalitarian countries ever since the Reichstag fire trial. As a matter of fact, American liaison and intelligence officers, who were at General Mihailovich's headquarters, are in a position directly to refute certain of the charges against him to which some of his followers are alleged to have confessed.

Six hundred rescued American airmen, who feel that they owe their liberty and perhaps their lives to General Mihailovich's forces, are presenting a petition to President Truman asking that their testimony be considered by any court which tries General Mihailovich.

Since time is pressing and a man's life hangs in the balance we would appreciate hearing as early as possible whether we may use your name as a signer of this appeal, and in addition to signing, we are confident that you will speak out on the floor of the House against this miscarriage of justice. We hope you will join us.

Sincerely yours,
DAVID MARTIN, *Secretary.*

MAY 1, 1946.

Mr. DAVID MARTIN,
Secretary, Committee for a Fair Trial for Draja Mihailovich, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 29 and also copy of your communication to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, relative to your desire to bring about a fair trial for Draja Mihailovich. I have read a great deal of material about the case of General Mihailovich, and I want you to know that I agree with you wholeheartedly in your statement that he is entitled to a fair trial and that a fair trial entails the right to choose counsel and the right to subpena witnesses.

No one should presume to pass judgment upon General Mihailovich before such a trial is held, and I am gratified to note that the American State Department has exemplified the American sense of justice and honor involved in this particular case and has taken the initiative in providing that American personnel be permitted to testify at the trial.

I am of the opinion that the case of General Mihailovich is an Allied, rather than an exclusive Yugoslav, concern and I am therefore happy to join with you in urging that the American Government request that the Yugoslav Government turn over to an international tribunal General Mihailovich and all the evidence against him, to be considered under the jurisdiction of the UNO or in some other mutually satisfactory manner.

Like you, I do not presume to declare General Mihailovich either guilty or innocent, but I do believe that if our State and War Departments possess documents bearing on the guilt or innocence of General Mihailovich, then in whatever manner the trial takes place it is morally incumbent upon the American Government to make these documents available.

I should like to see to it also that American officers who were attached to Mihailovich during the course of the war, as well as the American airmen who were rescued by him, be subpenaed to testify for him in the forthcoming trial.

You may be certain of my interest in this matter and my desire to bring about a fair trial for Gen. Draja Mihailovich.

Must close now, but with best wishes always, I am

Most sincerely.

To the Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

MR. SECRETARY: We, the undersigned, are addressing this appeal to you, Mr. Secretary, because we feel that the American sense of justice and American honor are involved in the case of Gen. Draja Mihailovich, who, according to reports from Belgrade, is shortly to be brought up on trial for treason. We congratulate you on the initiative which you have already taken in requesting that American personnel be permitted to testify at the trial. We do not believe, however, that the American Government can let the matter stand at the blunt refusal of the Yugoslav Government to permit such testimony.

The "confession" which the Yugoslav prosecutors claim to have obtained from Mihailovich does not, in our opinion, obviate the necessity for an open trial to which all material witnesses are subpenaed. Under totalitarian law, a man can be convicted on the basis of his confession alone. Democratic law on the other hand, recognizing the possibility that confessions may be obtained under duress, takes the stand that a case can be decided only on the basis of all available material evidence. The confession of Van der Lubbe at the Reichstag fire trial is only one of several modern instances which have provoked the skepticism of the democratic world.

In view of these facts: That General Mihailovich was the leader of the first effective anti-Nazi guerrilla army in Europe; that he served for almost 3 years under the direct command of allied middle east headquarters; that his forces contributed signally to the Allied victory in Africa by disrupting Axis traffic on the vital Belgrade-Nish-Salonika line; that his services to the Allied cause were recognized in telegrams of appreciation addressed to him by Admiral Sir Alan Cunningham, Air Marshal Tedder, and finally by General Eisenhower on New Year's Day, 1943; that American officers attached to Mihailovich at various times have submitted positive reports on his movement and his activities; that General Mihailovich has turned over to American military authorities over 600 American airmen rescued by his forces in areas under his control; that the case of General Mihailovich has already been prejudged by the Yugolsav Government which announced long ago that the General, when captured, would be "executed after a fair trial"; in view of all these facts, Mr. Secretary, we believe that the case of General Mihailovich is an Allied, rather than an exclusively Yugoslav concern, and we would therefore urge that the American Government request of the Yugoslav Government that General Mihailovich, together with the evidence against him, be turned over to an international tribunal, which could be constituted under the jurisdiction of the UNO, or in some other mutually satisfactory manner.

We do not presume to declare General Mihailovich either guilty or innocent. But we believe that if the State Department and the War Department possess documents bearing on the guilt or innocence of General Mihailovich, then, in whatever venue the trial takes place, it is morally incumbent upon the American Government to make these documents available. In order to put at rest any fear that such documents are being withheld for diplomatic reasons, and in order that the American public may be fully informed, we would urge that all information on General Mihailovich and the Chetnik movement, together with all information on Marshal Tito and the Partisan movement, be released for publication immediately.

We also believe it to be morally incumbent on the American Government to insist further that American officers who were attached to Mihailovich and American airmen who were rescued by him be subpenaed to testify at the forthcoming trial.

If such testimony is not permitted, then we must declare in advance that it will be impossible to have any confidence in the findings of the court.

The undersigned are convinced, Mr. Secretary, that the case of Gen. Draja Mihailovich is not a matter on which the American Government or the American people can afford to remain silent. To recapitulate, we would urge that the American Government use its strongest influence to see that General Mihailovich is turned over to an inter-Allied tribunal; that he be given the right to choose American or other Allied counsel; that the defense be permitted to subpena as witnesses American officers and airmen; and that the State Department and the American Military Intelligence place at the disposal of the court whatever information they may have bearing on the case.

In doing these things, the American Government would be acting in the spirit of that section of the Yalta Agreement which guaranteed the maintenance of constitutional rights and the safeguarding of personal and political freedom. It would also be acting in harmony with the conditions of the Tito-Subasich agreement, which stated that "the organization of a judiciary system based on democratic principles is to be one of the first tasks of the Government."

Sumner Welles; John Dewey; William Green; Dorothy Thompson; Roger Baldwin; Oswald Garrison Villard; Capt. Walter Mansfield, member of American Military Mission to General Mihailovich; the Right Reverend Bishop William T. Manning; the Very Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J.; the Reverend Dr. John Haynes Holmes; Senator Millard Tydings; Norman Thomas; Edgar Ansel Mowrer; Eddie Dowling; Miriam Hopkins; Ray Brock; Dr. William C. Bohn; Christopher Emmet; George Creel; Fred Vanderschmid; William Philip Simms; Representative Clare Boothe Luce; Virginia C. Gildersleeve; Senator Thomas C. Hart; Thomas K. Finletter.

PRESS SEEKS IMPARTIAL TRIAL FOR MIHAILOVICH BEFORE INTERNATIONAL COURT

(From an editorial in the New York Times, March 27, 1946)

A loser in the Balkans, whether it be merely in a palace revolution or in a global war, can expect short shrift from the victor. Such probably will be the fate of Gen. Draja Mihailovich. Five years ago he was called a hero by most of the democratic world as he rallied a guerrilla army to fight the Germans after Belgrade had fallen. Then he became a legend. Now he is a prisoner, hunted down and captured in a cave with the 11-man remnant of what once was reported as an army of 300,000. * * *

* * * Mihailovich is too important a historical figure for the world to permit his summary trial and execution. If for no other reason than his early resistance to the Germans—and there does not appear to be any ground for believing that it was not sincere and important to the Allied cause in 1941—Mihailovich deserves a fair and exhaustive trial before the world. Appeals to this end are being addressed to the UNO. Traitor or patriot? The world has a right to know beyond any shadow of a doubt. Yugoslavia would be well advised, we believe, to turn over Mihailovich and its evidence against him to an international tribunal.

(From an editorial in the Washington Post, April 10, 1946)

Marshal Tito's government has curtly rejected a formal request by the United States Government that some of the American officers who were saved by the Serbian Chetniks from death or capture be permitted to testify at the trial of Gen. Draja Mihailovich. The Yugoslav Government in its reply did not deny that General Mihailovich had sheltered American and British airmen shot or forced down over the Balkans and had aided them to escape. It merely pointed out that he had done this from selfish and unworthy motives, namely, the hope of getting Allied assistance and especially arms for his forces. Thus the implication is that any testimony American officers might give on this point would be ipso facto irrelevant to the main charge that General Mihailovich collaborated with his ostensible enemies, the Germans, for the purpose of making war against Tito. * * *

* * * The truth, however, is that both the British and American Governments have a certain moral responsibility in seeing that full justice, according to our own understanding of that word, is done. Moreover, it would be dangerous as well as hypocritical to evade this responsibility. After all, it was not without diplomatic encouragement that the Serbian military leaders undertook the revolution which led to the invasion of their country and the destruction of their capital. It is also true that the many Allied promises of assistance to General Mihailovich were very imperfectly kept. Finally, it is true that, despite these promises, the bulk of Allied military assistance in Yugoslavia was given, for strategic reasons, not to Mihailovich but to his enemy Marshal Tito, thereby enabling him to seize and hold the power he now possesses. Thus the failure of Great Britain and the United States to insist upon open and impartial justice for General Mihailovich would vastly increase existing bitterness and suspicion among Communists and non-Communists everywhere in the world, and would make all future statements, promises or pledges by either of these powers open to the deepest skepticism.

This being so, the case of General Mihailovich contains a serious threat to world amity and peace. As such it may properly be brought before the Security Council of the United Nations.

GALVESTON, TEX., *October 18, 1944.*

Hon. CONSTANINE FOTITCH,
Yugoslavia Ambassador,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter in answer to an article that I read in a recent copy of News Week, in relation to Gen. Draja Mihailovich, to whom I owe my life. Allow me to introduce myself: I am Gus T. Brown, Jr., I was in the first crew of American airmen to parachute in the Free Mountains of Yugoslavia, and was rescued by the Chetniks. When I read the article, saying that the Chetniks were collaborating with the Germans, it made me angry, because I lived with them for a period of 5 months. They saved me from the Germans not only once, but six or seven times, and I do not think that I would be here today if General Mihailovich's forces were collaborating with the enemy.

Sir, I wish that I could tell the right people that the Chetniks are on the right side. I was the only American airmen to have the honor of meeting and talking to General Mihailovich. He gave me pictures of himself, which I requested, and I told him when I got back to America that I would try to see the right people and do all I could for him and his wonderful organization, by telling the people that he was fighting for the common cause.

Sir, I was in the first crew of American airmen to fall in your country, and I have never been treated better in my life. The people gave us all they had: clothes, food, beds, and friendship that I will never forget. Sir, I made a promise, and I would like to hold good to it if possible, and you know what the promise is, sir. If you see fit to have me come to Washington, I will be at your service. If you request it I am sure the Army would approve. I am in hopes that you will answer this letter, and I remain.

Respectfully yours,
STAFF SGT. GUS T. BROWN, Jr.,
Two Hundred and Second Base Unit,
GAAF, Galveston, Tex.

From Clay to Roses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, Ohio is a great State agriculturally, industrially, and intellectually. We have produced in Ohio during the years many men of letters whose writings have been widely read. There is, Mr. Speaker, living in my district at the present time, a man who has written a great deal in verse and who has taken for his inspiration many and varied subjects. His name is Judge Harry Brokaw, and he lives in the city of East Liverpool, the pottery center of the United States. The pottery industry has been the inspiration for a very beautiful poem which he has written depicting the process of the transformation of the clay into the beautifully furnished and decorated potteryware. His poem is entitled "From Clay to Roses" and is as follows:

FROM CLAY TO ROSES

(By Harry Brokaw)

While walking through the shop one day,
I saw the men there loading clay.
They took it from the bins, this crew,
And added flint and feldspar, too.

The load, when weighed, by car was sent,
And straight into the blunger went,
Where clay, and flint, and feldspar, too,
Were mixed with water through and through.

It crossed the sifters, working fast,
And through the agitators passed,
Then filter press, the next in line,
Received the "slip" so soft and fine.

They pressed the water out with skill,
And fed the clay to pugging mill.
The product then, without a stop,
Was passed into the old clay shop.

There next by batter-out 'twas caught,
And very thin like pie crust wrought,
Then flung upon the jigger wheel,
And finished with the tools of steel.

In form it then was like a plate,
But only mud, at any rate
Until they dried it through and through,
For slightest moisture would not do.

A sagger next it helped to fill,
And went into the biscuit kiln,
To there receive the intense heat
That such a plate must always meet.

In biscuit ware-room then we learn,
They brushed and stamped the plate, in turn,
And next applied a glaze so white
In dipping room, to make it right.

Again in sagger, as before,
It goes to get the fire, once more,
For firing makes the color true,
And firing brings the luster new.

A dinner plate so round and true,
A dinner plate of beauty, too.
For half the world it now would do,
But watch it one more process through.

The Decorator, for his part,
Applies the lessons of his art,
And leaves there clustering round its brim,
A dream of roses neat and trim.

A touch of fire, 'tis understood,
Then ties the roses on for good,
And we behold a dinner plate
On which a queen might dine in state.

From clay to roses is the span
That fills the life of truest man.
Some folks remain but lumps of clay
Through all the time they're on life's way.

Most men will pass beyond the "slip,"
And even reach the whited dip;
Are shaped a bit upon the wheel,
And finished with the tools of steel;

But some are broken ere the day
The luster comes upon the clay;
Not meant for kilns of fiery heat,
Nor fit for crucial tests to meet.

A goodly few the luster white
Will have to make the world more bright,
But who will get the final touch
That adds the beauty, Oh, so much?

The Master Decorator's touch,
That smoothes and brightens life so much;
That brings the roses into view,
And makes the man so good and true.

It will be he who stands the test,
Endures the things of life the best;
Who renders service where he can,
And lifts the load of fellow man.

Our Future Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a

thoughtful editorial appearing in the Millville Republican on April 11, 1946, dealing with our future Army, the reading of which, I feel, may benefit the membership. The editorial follows:

Legislators are weighing the advisability of increasing the pay of men in the armed forces in order to make military service attractive enough to entice capable and responsible men into uniform. The plan has merit.

At the present time there is talk of increasing the pay of all men in the armed forces $400 per year, plus board, clothing, and medical care.

At first thought it might seem to some that $1,000 per year for a common soldier is exorbitant. Under the present base rate of $50 per month, American soldiers are the best paid in the world. On the other hand, soldiers in the American Army are the best in the world and as such are entitled to the higher rate of pay. But there is more to the problem than that.

America, whether we like it or not, must compete in war and in peace with nations which sport professional armies. If those around us have a standing professional army, then the United States must have one, too. And the only way to get the kind of an Army we want and need is to pay enlisted men enough money to cause them to weigh an Army career against one in civilian life. The armed forces will be compelled to compete with civilian employers in the future and, in order to do so successfully, the Army must pay comparable wages.

The highly trained men needed in a modern army must also be taken into consideration. During the war years many sergeants were doing a job requiring specialized training which could have netted them $100 or more weekly as a civilian. A sergeant's pay is $78 a month, plus 50 percent, if he flew and 20 percent for overseas service. Meanwhile, the sergeant was risking his life every minute while the civilian job would have provided security.

The American reaction to a large professional army has never been good. It is not good now. But there is no choice. We need a large standing army now and we will no doubt need one for years to come. There are only two ways to provide the men to staff such an organization. Either Selective Service will have to continue for years, or military service must be made attractive to the young men of the Nation. This is a democracy and in a democracy compulsory military service is not looked upon with favor.

Saving Our Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 27, I released an open letter to those concerned with the existing world food crisis which I shall include with these brief remarks. On Tuesday it was announced after a conference at the Department of Agriculture that distillers are to be cut to 3 days' operation and limited to a use of not more than two and one-half million bushels of grain in the month of May. If they use no more than two and one-half million bushels, this will be only about one-third the amount they used in February and will represent a substantial gain in saving grain. In my opinion, however, and under the present desperate circumstances, two and one-half million bushels is just two and one-half million bushels too much. Admitting that this will be low-grade grain, and that some of it might not be fit for human consumption, nonetheless it certainly could be used for livestock feed, thus relieving the acute shortage of such feed and possibly releasing some better grain for human uses.

I am glad of the progress made, but hope very earnestly we may follow this matter to its logical conclusion. Incidentally, two and one-half million bushels per month is approximately equal to the total prewar use of grain by the distilleries of the United States.

The open letter previously referred to follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE HONORABLE HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; THE HONORABLE CLINTON P. ANDERSON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; THE HONORABLE FIORELLA H. LAGUARDIA, DIRECTOR GENERAL, UNRRA; THE HONORABLE HERBERT HOOVER, DIRECTOR OF THE EMERGENCY FAMINE COMMITTEE; AND EVERYONE ELSE CONCERNED ABOUT THE EXISTING WORLD-FOOD CRISIS, FROM REPRESENTATIVE JERRY VOORHIS OF CALIFORNIA

GENTLEMEN: Today's newspapers have revealed the tragic fact that we are falling farther and farther behind in our commitments to feed the world's starving peoples. For the first 20 days of April, we fell short of our goal by 193,000 tons (7,425,000 bushels). The cumulative deficit since January 1 now amounts to 512,000 tons (19,200,000 bushels).

We must, now, immediately, do everything that we can possibly do to make more grain available—no longer, regrettably, to prevent starvation, but to limit starvation as much as possible. Restrictions on flour milling, bread, livestock feeding, and other major uses of grain are undoubtedly necessary. But such restrictions are increasingly difficult to justify so long as we continue to neglect the tremendous savings possible by halting at once the excessive use of foodstuffs and feedstuffs in alcoholic-beverage manufacture.

Beer production has been reduced to 70 percent of last year's level, and it may be that further reduction would be difficult; but in the case of hard liquors, there is an ample supply in warehouses to maintain sales without further production, and a complete stoppage of production for the next 90 to 120 days is both desirable and feasible, if we are really to do everything that we can to feed the starving.

Whisky distillers used 13,000,000 bushels of precious grains in January and February, and it is estimated that since then they have been using substantially in excess of 4,000,000 bushels per month. Thus, from January 1 to April 20, they used about 20,000,000 bushels of grain. Distillers alone account for the entire deficit in our grain shipments to date.

Distillers are now believed to hold an inventory of about 6,000,000 bushels of grain which could immediately be made available to release an equal quantity of wheat for shipment overseas. Distillers' stocks of grain, if immediately dispatched to Europe, would nearly make up our April deficit to date.

Distillers are now authorized to use at least 8,000,000 bushels of grain in the next 60 days, if they are not stopped.

Some distillers have been waging a vigorous campaign to remain in production, but their arguments are specious, as the following facts clearly show:

1. Congressional proposals simply call for the temporary halting of the wasteful use of grains for whiskey production. Distillers have about 400,000,000 gallons of whiskey and spirits on hand, according to Alcohol Tax Unit statistics, which is enough to maintain sales at present rates for years to come.

2. As for employment in the distilling industry, the great bulk of labor is employed in the rectifying, bottling and distribution ends of the business, which would be little affected by a temporary shutdown. The relatively few employees directly engaged in production could undoubtedly be retained for maintenance, repairs, and other important work. It should also be noted that newspaper and magazine advertising would undoubtedly be maintained at present levels, along with sales.

3. The amount of grain consumed by distillers is significant. Not only is it equivalent to our deficit to Europe to date, but also it is important in terms of human lives. The 8,000,000 bushels distillers are scheduled to use in the next 60 days would feed 14,000,000 people for that 60 days, according to the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Human Nutrition.

4. The types of grain consumed by distillers can be used to feed human beings or livestock, which are the two principal jobs for grain today. Most of the grain being used by distillers is low-grade corn, which, however, is entirely suitable for livestock feeding, and which has been used in tremendous quantities to feed livestock in recent months. If distillers' use of such corn was stopped, it would be fed in place of wheat, which could then be used for bread or shipped abroad. All grains used by distillers could similarly be used to feed livestock and thus would make more wheat available for human beings. Moreover, because of the shortage of wheat, we are now forced to ship both corn and oatmeal abroad, and undoubtedly much of the distillers' grains could be used directly for human consumption.

5. As for the production of by-product feed in distilleries, the facts are that distillers recover less than one-third of the original grain, and principally the protein content in a form that can be used only for livestock and poultry feeding. This is valuable and desirable, but two-thirds of the grain used in making whisky are totally lost both for animals and human feeding.

There can be no justification for permitting any longer the diversion of precious grains from human feeding to whisky making. It is regrettable that it has been permitted so long. The gain in human lives by temporarily shutting down whisky distilleries is certainly well worth the small price in terms of minor dislocation of the distilling industry.

Very truly yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Labor Relations in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently I included with my remarks a summary of the labor laws and practices which have been operating on the whole so successfully in Sweden. Under leave to extend my remarks today I wish to include a summary of the labor relations

regulations which were put into effect in Canada during the war and which are currently in effect and expected to continue for an indefinite period.

It is interesting to note that in the section entitled "Unfair Practices" and the section "Enforcement and Penalties," both unions and employers are made responsible under the law for carrying out faithfully contracts arrived at by collective bargaining. Whenever such proposals are suggested in this country, some groups insist they are "Anti-labor" and are intended to crush unions. Apparently laws to that effect have not been so regarded in either Sweden or Canada. What they have done is not to destroy unions, but rather to outline a pattern along which both unions and employers must proceed in pursuing their legitimate objectives, with results which are in the long run bound to be beneficial to both groups and to the public interest, which must always be paramount.

LABOR RELATIONS IN CANADA

Labor relations in Canada have been conducted since March 20, 1944, under the provisions of the "Wartime Labor Relations Regulations" (P. C. 1003), which provide for machinery and procedure for the recognition of trade-unions and the establishment of collective bargaining. These regulations are administered by the Minister of Labor for Canada through the Wartime Labor Relations Board created by the regulations and conciliation officers and conciliation boards which the minister is authorized by the regulations to appoint. The regulations remain currently in effect. There follows a summary of the provisions of these regulations.

COVERAGE OF REGULATIONS

Employees covered by the regulations are those (1) who are employed on or in connection with operations essential to the efficient prosecution of the war; (2) who are engaged in work that is ordinarily within the legislative authority of the Canadian Parliament, including such work as has been or may be declared by Parliament to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces; and (3) who are ordinarily under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of a provincial legislature but to whom the provincial legislature has applied the national regulations.

The term "employee" as defined specifically excludes a person employed in a confidential capacity or having authority to employ or discharge employees. No employee ceases to be such by reason only of his ceasing to work as a result of a lockout, strike or his wrongful dismissal.

CERTIFICATION OF BARGAINING REPRESENTATIVES

Bargaining representatives for the employees of any employer are certified by the Wartime Labor Relations Board after the board determines that such representatives were regularly and properly chosen by the employees involved. The employes of any employer may elect bargaining representativs by a majority vote of the employees affected, or, if more than one employer and their employees wish to negotiate a collective agreement, the employees of such employers may elect representatives by a majority vote of the employees affected of each employer. If the majority of the employees of any employer are members of one trade-union, that union may elect or appoint its officers or other persons to be the bargaining representatives. Likewise, if more than one employer and their employees desire to negotiate an agreement and the majority of the employees affected of each employer are members of one trade-union, that union may elect or appoint its officers or other persons as bargaining representatives for all the employees affected. Employees are deemed to be members of a trade-union if they have in writing requested the union to elect or appoint bargaining representatives on their behalf. Trade-unions composed of members of a craft may elect or appoint representatives for employees belonging to the craft if under established union practice they are distinguishable from the employees as a whole. Two or more trade-unions may, by agreement, join in electing bargaining representatives.

Following the election or appointment of bargaining representatives, application may be made to the Wartime Labor Relations Board for their certification as bargaining representatives of the employees affected. After the board determines by an examination of records, by a vote or otherwise, that the representatives were properly and regularly elected or appointed, and that the unit of employees concerned is one appropriate for collective bargaining, it certifies them as the bargaining representatives and specifies the unit of employees on whose behalf they are authorized to act. The collective-bargaining agreement negotiated by such representatives becomes binding on every employee in the specified unit of employees.

New bargaining representatives may be elected at any time after 10 months of the term of the collective agreement have expired. If new representatives are certified, they are substituted for the previous bargaining representatives as a party to the agreement in question, and as such may give notice of the termination thereof as provided in the agreement or by the wartime labor relations regulations.

NEGOTIATION OF COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

Following the certification of the bargaining representatives, the parties may be required to enter into negotiations by 10 days' clear notice served by either party. They are then required to negotiate in good faith and make every reasonable effort to conclude an agreement. If negotiations have continued for 30 days and either party believes that an agreement will not be completed in a reasonable time, it may request the Wartime Labor Board to intervene. Upon receipt of such a request, the Board refers the matter to the Minister of Labor, who, within 3 days, instructs a conciliation officer to confer with the parties. Within 14 days or such longer period as the Minister may allow, the conciliation officer reports to the Minister the matters, if any, upon which the parties cannot agree and his recommendations as to whether a conciliation board should be appointed. If a conciliation board is recommended, the Minister appoints a three-member board, after securing from the parties to the negotiations their recommendations of persons to be members of the board. The conciliation board then attempts to effect an agreement between the parties and, in any event, reports the results of its efforts and its findings and recommendations to the Minister within 14 days of the appointment of its chairman, or such longer period as may be agreed upon by the parties or allowed by the Minister. If such report shows that the board has been unable to effect an agreement, the Minister sends a copy of the report to the parties, and he may publish it in such manner as he thinks fit.

Every party to a collective agreement and every employee upon whom a collective agreement is made binding by the regulations is bound to do everything he is, by the agreement, required to do and to abstain from doing anything he is required not to do.

Every agreement entered into is deemed to run for a period of not less than 1 year and may not be canceled within that period without the consent of the board. When any agreement is by its terms to run for more than 1 year, it must contain or is deemed to contain a provision for termination at any time after 1 year on 2 months' notice by either party. Upon 10 days' notice within the period of 2 months prior to the date of expiration, either party may require the other to enter into negotiations for the renewal of the agreement.

SETTLEMENT OF GRIEVANCES

Every agreement entered into is required to contain a provision establishing a procedure for the final settlement, without stoppage of work, of differences concerning its interpretation or violation.

UNFAIR PRACTICES

Employers may not (1) dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of a union or employees' organization; (2) refuse to employ any person because of membership in a union; (3) impose any condition in the contract of employment seeking to restrain an employee from exercising rights under the regulations; (4) seek by any means to compel an employee to refuse to join or continue to be a member of a union. Coercion or intimidation of any kind to compel a person to join a union is not permitted. This provision, however, does not prohibit the inclusion of any provision relating to union membership in an agreement.

Unions may not, except with the consent of the employers, attempt, at the employee's place of employment during working hours, to persuade an employee to join a union. Unions may not support, encourage, condone or engage in a slow-down or other such activity designed to restrict or limit production.

STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS

As defined in the regulation, the term "lockout" includes the closing af a place of employment, a suspension of work, or a refusal by an employer to continue to employ a number of his employees, done to compel his employees, to aid another employer to compel his employees, to accept terms of employment. "Strike" or "to go on strike" includes the cessation of work by a body of employees acting in combination or a concerted refusal or a refusal under a common understanding of a number of employees to continue to work for an employer, done to compel their employer, or to aid other employees to compel their employer, to accept terms of employment.

Employees may not go on strike until (1) bargaining representatives have been elected or appointed, and (2) an attempt has been made to effect an agreement and 14 days have elapsed since the Conciliation Board reported to the Minister. Likewise, where application has been made for certification of bargaining representatives, the employer may not declare or cause a lockout until 14 days have elapsed since the Conciliation Board reported to the Minister.

No employer who is a party to a collective agreement may declare or cause a lockout, and no employee bound thereby may go on strike during the term of the agreement.

Where an employer proposes a change in the existing terms of employment and a dispute arises by reason thereof, the employer may not, without the consent of the employees affected, make such change effective until 2 months have elapsed from the date when the employer notified the employees of such proposed change.

INFORMATION

Each party to a collective agreement is required to file a copy of the agreement with the Wartime Labor Relations Board. The regulations also require every employers' organization, trade union, and employees' organization to furnish to its members within 3 months of the end of its fiscal year a statement of its income and expenditures. The Board may require a copy of such statement to be filed with it.

The Board is authorized to require organizations affected by an application for certification of bargaining representatives or by an existing agreement to file with the Board a statutory declaration stating the names and addresses of its officers or a copy of its constitution and bylaws.

ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

The regulations prescribe specific penalties for any employer, employee, trade union, employees' organization or employers' organization who contravenes any of the provisions of the regulations. Penalties prescribed, upon summary conviction, are:

1. For every employer who causes a lockout contrary to the regulations, a fine of not more than $500 for each day or part of a day that the lockout exists.

2. For every employee who goes on strike contrary to the regulations, a fine of not more than $20 for each day or part of a day that he is on strike.

3. For every trade union and other employees' organization that authorizes a strike contrary to the regulations, a fine of not more than $200 for each day or part of a day that the strike continues.

4. For every person or organization who contravenes any of the provisions of the regulations and for which contravention no express penalty is provided, a penalty of not more than $100 in the case of an individual; and if a corporation, employers' organization, employees' organization or trade union, a penalty of not more than $500.

The regulations prescribe as an indictable offense the attempt of any person to corruptly influence a person concerned in the administration or enforcement of the regulations, or the acceptance by any such person charged with the administration of the regulations of any such corrupt offer, compensation, etc. A fine of not exceeding $5,000 and imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years is prescribed for such offense.

If an employers' organization, corporation, trade union, or employees' organization is guilty of an offense under the regulations, any officer of such organization, corporation, or union who assented to the commission of the offense is a party to and guilty of the offense.

Prosecution for an offense under the regulations may not be instituted unless the Wartime Labor Relations Board gives its consent. In determining whether such consent should be granted, the Board may take into consideration disciplinary measures taken by an employers' organization or a trade union or employees' organization against the accused.

Armenian Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the mass meeting held under the auspices of the American Committee for Armenian Rights at Carnegie Hall, New York, on Sunday afternoon, April 28, 1946:

The Chinese symbol for crisis is composed of two elements—one signifies danger and the other opportunity. Mankind faces a crisis today—on an international level—which will tax the ingenuity of every human. We are attempting to negotiate—with wisdom and integrity—the painful transition between two areas. The atom bomb has blown the normal standards of power politics to smithereens. Old problems have assumed new proportions; new problems have arisen—world problems, humanity problems.

It may be said with certainty that this crisis has the two elements of the Chinese symbol—it is fraught with danger and equally laden with opportunity.

Inasmuch as Americans played a great part in the pioneering that resulted in the solution of atomic fission, we are faced with the very special obligation of creating an environment wherein peace may flourish and endure. Otherwise treaties will be as tissues and all formulas in vain. As everyone recognizes, the two world wars which were fought within the life span of one generation have caused deep disturbances which forecast profound and fundamental changes in the economic, social, cultural, and psychological relationships of nation with nation—man with man.

Europe is staggered by the magnitude of reconstruction problems. Russia was overrun by the enemy, Great Britain clung on hazardously through many a dark hour, France was nearly shattered by the impact of the long occupation. War, with its terrible leveling process, did not reach us here. We are unscarred—the enemy's destructive power was never unleashed against us. Our deep, vital forces remain unimpaired; we are younger, more vigorous, and most fortunate. We still enjoy vast resources, despite our generosity as the arsenal of democracy. America stands today, in the sight and mind of many, as the colossus of the world, a position we did not seek, yet a responsibility we cannot, dare not, shirk.

It seems natural to me, therefore, that every small nation, every nationality with a grievance—political, economic, or cultural—turns to us, in a spirit of touching confidence, to enlist the support of American public opinion in their proposed solution of their varied dilemmas.

Armenians, among the downtrodden and victims of massacre and racked by the fiendish machinery of Mars, have a right to appeal to us. We dare not refuse to give them a renewal of hope. A consciousness of our world leadership and international responsibility will forbid a return to any former "ivory tower" type of isolation and aloftness and we will bend to this task of the renovation of the human spirit.

Not very many Americans today are aware of the sorry plight of a small nation which has served for centuries as a gateway to Asia Minor. For hundreds of years, Armenia has been clutched breathless in the insatible maw of ruthless aggressors, ravished and tormented by the schemes of the imperialistic powers. Her earth has trembled beneath Xenophon, and Alexander, Mongolians, Romans, Arabs, Persians, Kurds. As a result, her people have grown discouragingly familiar with devastation, starvation, degradation, impoverishment, and death. In the last century, it was Czarist Russia and the Ottoman Empire which dominated. Thousands upon thousands were scourged and martyred. And in this our time, it is the Turks who still exercise control over the land, causing incalculable misery to countless thousands, instigating continuous racial and religious persecutions.

Blazing headlines have made Americans Iran-conscious, Balkan-conscious, Manchuria-conscious. Americans of Armenian origin and Americans interested in Armenia anxiously desire to focus the attention of the American public on this little country that is so strategically located between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea and draw attention to the fact that there too, you will find courage, leadership, and tenacity to the ideals of freedom and justice and self-government, despit the long hard years of suffering, premeditated murder, and the racking flights into exile. With its backdrop of tyranny and violence, the rapine of Armenia has been a sordid spectacle of territorial booty, implemented callously and ruthlessly, by the proposed and despised Lausanne Treaty.

In 1920, Woodrow Wilson, at the request of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, defined the boundaries of Armenia to include substantial portions of territory historically Armenian which then were and still remain in Turkish hands. Nothing was done by the League of Nations to supplement this decision, although by the Treaty of Sevres Turkey agreed in advance to accept Wilson's defining of her boundaries. Meanwhile, at that time, American sympathy for the hapless and destitute Armenians was generously expressed in donations of money and food and the churches of America made a significant and unforgettable contribution to this cause. But that was all.

In December 1923, the Honorable James W. Gerard, ex-Ambassador to Germany, sent to former President Woodrow Wilson, a copy of a memorandum, signed by 110 prominent American citizens, against ratification by the United States Senate of the Lausanne Treaty—the treaty that condones Turkey's cruelty to Armenia. Wilson, just prior to his death, asknowledged its receipt to Mr. Gerard, stating that he "was very glad indeed that you and those associated with you had undertaken to show the Senate the iniquity of that treaty. It is indeed iniquitous, and I sincerely hope that your protest will be effectual."

But power politics prevailed. Our Government then remained indifferent to the plea of justice for the Armenians. On Turkey was bestowed an accolade in the form of 40 percent of Armenian land. Thus Turkey was rewarded for her treachery as an ally of Germany. Meanwhile both the Moslem and Christian worlds let Armenians suffer.

But this is not merely a problem of boundaries and, for the Armenians, does not resolve at this point. More than a million of their countrymen are living as rootless refugees in Europe and the Levant and elsewhere. These homeless unfortunate compatriots serve to illuminate and dramatize the issue as does the fate of the Jews in Festung Europa. Each group has tasted every deprivation, yet with an indomitable faculty for survival, cling to their pitiful lives in the hope that their dream will be fulfilled—that they will return rejoicing to their homeland—that their despair will soon end. These displaced Armenians, forced into exile as were the Jews, deprived of their natural heritage, are haunted by apprehensions due to rapidly increasing nationalist trends in Europe and elsewhere.

As the Armenian National Council of America has so aptly stated, the creation of the United Nations Organization provides the occasion for new consideration and final solution of the Armenian question.

Through their American spokesmen, the Armenian people besiege the United Nations to assume the unfinished business of the defunct League of Nations and place their case on the agenda to the end that an equitable settlement may be made, granting Armenians the opportunity to resettle within the borders of their historic homeland.

My research disclosed that aside from the moral need for action, there is plenty of legal grounds for relief.

As a result of continued protest, the United States Senate, although belatedly, refused ratification of the Lausanne Treaty and formally rejected it January 18, 1927.

Therefore, the Treaty of Seyres of 1920, with the Wilsonian boundaries of Turkey embraced therein, becomes the keystone of our campaign. We rejected the Lausanne Treaty and with it the incorporation of Armenian provinces into Turkey. Thus the United States stands committed to the return to Armenia of the land stolen by Turkey.

This is a problem which cannot be reviewed in a strange half-light. The stalemate must begin to dissolve and the Armenians must be reassured that they may look forward to the day when they will enjoy complete self-expression, freedom, and national dignity.

The only equitable settlement would compel Turkey to relinquish that part of Armenia which she now dominates and where a million and a half Armenians exist as enforced refugees, homeless and helpless, like one on a sea without a shore. The Armenian provinces of Turkey, like lost children, must be united again with mother Armenia.

Common humanity demands this, but over and beyond that we must not forget our debt of gratitude for their devotion to democracy and the cause of the United Nations during World War II. As in World War I, they fought again with distinction within the armies of the United States and the United Nations. Fifty generals and over a quarter of a million Armenian soldiers of various ranks were in the Red Army. The Armenians made their sacrifice of "blood, sweat, and tears" for the allied victory.

Armenia has the inalienable right of a small nation to complain to seek freedom and justice. This should be understandable to every American. We Americans fought this war with a clear and well-defined purpose and we must not permit our principles to be mocked a second time. We solemnly subscribed to the aims and aspirations of the Atlantic Charter and affirmed that we "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and we wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

The new position of the United States, as that of the most powerful nation on earth, the arbiter in the community of nations, is one of service and leadership. The powerful impetus of the Atlantic Charter must not be dissipated. Performance must measure up to our profession or the hope that flickers in man's breast will fade out as a guttering candle and he will fall prey to all the fears that flesh is heir to—a cynical husk without a soul, living from moment to moment as best he can wherever he can. There is only one humanly bearable alternative—to establish and defend real freedom for all peoples. "Beaten paths are for beaten men"—not to go back will be to go forward in peace and progress toward the goal we all cherish—unfettered civilization in global terms.

The OPA's Shoddy Goods Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to note the anxiety of large department stores of this country in the preservation of the OPA. The full-page advertisements which some of these large concerns are carrying urging the retention of the OPA fail to disclose the real purpose these clever merchandising agencies have in trying to persuade the people to urge upon Congress the extension of the OPA.

It would be more in the interests of the consumers, especially the housewives, if these merchants, with their large warehouses, would disclose the fact that these warehouses, as well as the shelves of these merchants, are stored to the limit with inferior and shoddy goods made under OPA regulations. It is perfectly obvious that until these merchants can unload these inferior goods upon the consumers of the country they do not want to have the legitimate manufacturers begin to produce high-grade fabrics and goods at a lesser price to the consumers.

The manufacturers of high-grade fabrics and consumers goods have been driven from the field of production, and many of the large merchants in the metropolitan centers, some of whom have a vested interests in the industries making inferior goods, hope that through propaganda they can force the great masses of the people to urge Congressmen to vote against their constituents' interests. A few of the emotional and hysterical people who listen to the wild screams of Chester Bowles and Paul Porter over the radio may have been stirred to frenzy over the prospects of inflation, but the thoughtful people who, after all, are the backbone of this great Republic, are not so credulous as to be misled by the barrage of propaganda laid down by the OPA. The fact that 45,000 publicity agents are on the Federal pay roll, ready and anxious to do the bidding of every New Deal agency, at the tremendous cost to the taxpayers of $74,000,000 a year, is now well known to the citizens of the United States. It is my opinion that as time goes on this attempt to govern the people by propaganda will be as objectionable to the taxpayers of this country, in fact to all patriotic citizens, as the philosophy of Hitler and the agencies by which he sought to disseminate it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a statement by Mary Latham, released by the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 1206 Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.:

The mother who goes shopping for her children finds that in spite of all she has heard about price controls and preventing inflation, she is having to pay much higher costs for poor quality than she used to pay for good things.

And, often, she finds that shortages in many necessary items of clothing for children are so acute that she cannot buy what she needs at any price.

Baby shoes and baby shirts are very scarce. And diapers are terribly hard to find.

A visit to children's departments of department stores shows that the merchants are worried about the cheap goods that are flooding the market to the disgust of themselves and their customers and about the shortage of the old, reliable standard things that mothers have been buying for their children through the years but can't find today.

They apologize for the materials and the workmanship of the garments, but they say that their regular sources of merchandise are not able to supply what the American woman is accustomed to buying because they cannot produce such items on the prices they are allowed to charge.

A buyer in one store brought out a baby dress which sells for 95 cents. The material was little better than cheesecloth and the less said about workmanship the better. Next, she brought out a dress of very nice quality nainsook, very well made, that she used to sell for $1. Now the price is $2.50. She had a dotted swiss, lovely with embroidery and pretty lace, which used to sell for $1.19. Today the price is $2.95. Another baby dress, selling for $3.75, was made of coarse but good material. It used to sell for $1.95. She said other dresses now selling for $4.95 used to bring $2.50.

The stores reported little boys' suits selling for $1.95 today are about the quality of $1 ones a few years ago. In one store, it was reported that for many years the children's department featured a table with play clothes for $1.19. These garments were made by fine manufacturers who had more expensive lines for their main business but turned these out as a side line. Now, what these manufacturers are able to make to sell at that price is so shoddy that the store will not handle them, and the women who used to buy them are struggling to buy higher-priced items because they're accustomed to dressing their children in good clothes.

Another store reported that it had always sold a special type of pajamas for children at $1.95. For special sales, it offered them at $1.19. They were good pajamas and mothers liked to buy them. Today, the store offers pajamas described by the merchant as of "peculiar" quality at $1.95 and doesn't feel at all happy about it.

From one buyer, it was learned that it used to be possible to buy all kinds of cotton dresses for teen-age girls at $2.95 and $3.95. The dresses at this price that are available now are so inferior in quality that the buyer refuses to handle them. In prices of less than $16.95, cotton dresses for girls of this age cannot be counted on for style, material, or wear, it was declared.

In surveys of conditions in food and in women's clothing, it has been found that the consumers are having to pay prices that often range up to 100 percent or more in comparison to those of 5 years ago. The costs of children's clothing have gone up in the same proportion with the result that, when quality is considered, the American housewife is having to spend about twice as much or more today to clothe her children as she did in the months just before America entered the war. The manufacturers of the cloth operate under rigid price ceilings. The retailers conform to Government regulations set up for them. Both are trying to serve their customers satisfactorily. But they say that somewhere between the cloth and the merchant's display counter, poor judgment, lack of knowledge, or other circumstances have created a condition in which the American housewife is unable to get her value for her money. Many business leaders are convinced that the solution to the problem is for the Government to get out of the price control business and let the honest businessmen of the country have a chance to produce in quantity and quality. Then, they believe, the problem of price will take care of itself.

OPA and the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Honorable S. Denmead Kolb, a very distinguished member of the Maryland House of Delegates for many years from Wico-

mico County, in which he sets forth specifically what the OPA is doing to our veterans.

The letter follows:

SALISBURY, MD., *April 25, 1946.*

Hon. DUDLEY G. ROE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There may be some small argument in favor of the continuance of the OPA, but certainly the great menace to the liberties of the American people far outweigh any advantage. I urge you to do everything within your power to eliminate OPA in its entirety or, at least, curtail and restrict its powers and, certainly, not continue its life beyond a period of 6 months.

As you well know, I have always argued that there was no necessity for rent control in Wicomico County, as we had no military establishments and no war manufacturing plants or industries to any extent. Yet, in order to extend their autocratic powers, control was established.

The OPA has about worn down the average individual to the point where he offers no resistance, and they have now turned their efforts toward the serviceman. As you know, the purchaser of a home cannot gain possession of his property unless he waits a period of 6 months and then, oftentimes, the OPA will grant extensions so that he never knows just where he stands. In order to temporize the complaints that had been made against the OPA, they did condescendingly grant the ex-serviceman or woman a 90-day waiting period before gaining possession of any home, which they might purchase.

Just recently, the OPA has arbitrarily ruled, as is usually the case, that even a serviceman, unless he can show extreme hardship, the decision of which is left entirely to the OPA, cannot gain possession of his home without waiting for a period of 6 months or longer.

I cite you a very specific case of Louis N. Shank, 108 West Town Street, Norwich, Conn., a veteran of three wars, a man in his sixties, who served his country in the Spanish-American War, again in World War I, and then in World War II. He came to Salisbury in March and purchased a home. He was advised by the local OPA office that due to his previous service connections he could obtain possession within 90 days. This man, due to release from service, had to give up the quarters which he was occupying, expecting fully to gain possession of his house within the 90-day period. He received a notice from the OPA within the past week, advising him that "action to remove or evict the tenant shall not be commenced sooner than the expiration of 6 months after March 29, 1946." This is Docket No. II-ES-K-S179.

Can you imagine anything more of a discredit to the people of the United States as to remain docile or condone the continuance of such a pernicious organization? Certainly a no more intolerable situation existed in Germany or Italy, for which so many of our boys gave up their lives, believing that the free, democratic way of life that they had known in this country prior to the war would be continued.

I have given you absolute details which you can verify upon investigation at the Salisbury rent control office; also, at headquarters in Baltimore, from which the order was issued.

If you, as a representative of the people of Maryland, do not take immediate steps to eliminate and abolish for all time the OPA, I am certain that you cannot expect to merit the continued respect and admiration that has been yours in the past.

Sincerely yours,

S. DENMEAD KOLB.

On OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks I wish to include an excerpt from my current semimonthly report to Illinois. It follows:

Last week there was a knock-down, drag-out fight over price controls. In the end the OPA was amended by taking an ax and chopping it off just beyond the tail. It would have been more forthright if the opponents had killed the measure, but only a handful of them wanted to be counted in that way.

The OPA has made mistakes and has been slow in giving relief to industries whose costs have risen. But to try to legislate flexibility by way of the Wolcott amendment won't work.

The Wolcott amendment provides that every producer and distributor must receive costs of production plus a "reasonable" profit on every item at every stage of production and distribution. This may seem fair at first thought but a little reflection shows the crucial weaknesses of the plan.

1. The "idle" overhead costs of a plant, however great, will be charged to the output, however little.

2. When a plant turns out a large number of items it is almost impossible to tell how much of this overhead should be charged to each of the items.

3. No matter how inefficient a producer is, the price must be raised not only to meet his high costs but to guarantee him a profit as well. We all know how "cost plus percentage" contracts put a premium upon inefficiency when firms produce for Government order. The Wolcott amendment extends arguments as to what is a "reasonable" profit and OPA will be tied up for years in the courts by such disputes. But time is of the essence in this whole problem.

In contrast to this, the present OPA practice of providing each industry as a whole with the average past profits is fair and workable. If the Wolcott amendments go into effect, we may expect a big increase in prices which will cripple those with fixed incomes and will pave the way for a hectic price "boom" and then an even more frantic "bust."

Wheat Situation in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I cannot permit to pass unnoticed the fact that the State of North Dakota alone has more wheat in storage on the farms than all the rest of the country put together, as of this date. This is especially important when one realizes that many Members of this Congress view the State of North Dakota as rather unimportant. It might be well to recognize sometimes that even States with small populations make a valued contribution in the United States Congress to the national well-being and probably should be recognized more often as a part of the United States.

Mayor LaGuardia and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson have been up in the Northwest and staged quite a demonstration in an attempt to drag the wheat from the farms of North Dakota into the elevators to be shipped abroad to starving people. The farmers of North Dakota are patriotic; they will meet every demand that is put upon them in this crisis, just as they oversubscribed for war bonds in every drive during the war.

As a great effort is being made by this bambastic gentleman, Mr. LaGuardia, to obtain wheat, let us not overlook some fundamental facts. First, there was ingenuity on the part of the farmers to conserve this wheat. The farmers in North Dakota in many respects showed a greater knowledge of world conditions than some of our talkative administrators. And while the effort is now being made to siphon off this wheat, I surmise there will be many farmers who will not be readily moved by these dramatic appeals.

The farmers of North Dakota are going to be concerned about selling their wheat down to the last kernel. They will need it to sustain their families in the months ahead, and more than that they will need it for future plantings.

The State of North Dakota lies in what is generally referred to as a semiarid region. Upon occasions there is not adequate rain to produce a crop, and so caution must of necessity be used here in order that there may be wheat available for another planting should this crop fail. If all the wheat is sold down to the bottom of the bin, where can the Government turn to buy seed wheat acclimated to that territory for another planting?

It is my belief that North Dakota farmers will move with caution, even under the pressure of the mighty LaGuardia.

Under unanimous consent, I include here a statement taken from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., dated April 28, 1946. Of necessity, I must forego the introduction of the map which accompanies this statement.

SPOTLIGHT SWINGS UPON WHEAT FARMERS

The world food crisis, rushing to a swift and terrible climax, brought the spotlight of world-wide publicity beating down upon the farmers of the Nation's spring-wheat States last week.

Suddenly these quiet, hard-working producers of one of the most essential cereals find themselves, not only in the front-center position on the world's stage but in something of a spot.

As the United Nation's Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—now headed by the ardent and fiery Fiorella LaGuardia—combs the world to find food to save millions who are facing starvation, it is belatedly discovered that only remaining sizable reserves of wheat left in the world are on the farms of North and South Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana.

So terrific pressure is being put upon the farmers to get this wheat into the markets for quick shipment abroad.

Mr. LaGuardia, and Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, believed this wheat of so great importance in the world food crisis that they came to this area in person to stage a dramatic show designed to impress the farmers with the urgency of getting the remaining wheat marketed without delay.

They put on quite a display, largely engineered by W. M. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, at the little village of Climax, Minn. It might be said in passing that a much better place to have staged the demonstration would have been about 150 miles farther west—where the large reserves of wheat are concentrated.

That, however, is a minor consideration. It was staged in, if very close to the eastern edge of, the spring-wheat country, and undoubtedly it will do what it was intended to do—bring home to the farmers in this area the extreme urgency of the need of the world's desperately hungry people.

But now the farmers, who may have some wheat left in their bins from last year's crop, are engaged in another pressing enterprise. They are planting this year's crop, which also will be desperately needed by a food-short world.

The largest concentration of the wheat reserves left in North Dakota are in 18 counties in the northern part of the State. A map, reproduced on this page, presents a picture of this situation, a study of the figures released by the United States Department of Agriculture's estimates of the wheat left on farms as of April 1.

And that is the part of the State where the largest amount of the spring seeding and planting operations remains to be done.

While late reports indicate that fine progress has been made in the wheat seeding throughout the State, anyone familiar with the diversified operations on North Dakota farms in late years will realize that it will be weeks before all of the planting of oats, barley, flax, corn, and potatoes has been finished.

The farmers are short of help and equipment.

That is a situation that Mr. Anderson and Mr. LaGuardia should not overlook.

There has been a lot of bungling in this world food crisis, as the Fargo Forum has shown in recent presentations. It has been tragic bungling.

This embarrassing situation in which the farmers of North Dakota now find themselves is very largely the result of the failure to provide grain cars to move this wheat into commercial channels last fall and through the early winter.

It is well that Mr. Anderson has recognized and scotched the loose talk about wheat "hoarding." A whale of a lot of this wheat is on the farms of North Dakota now, because those who should have been farsighted enough to see this world food crisis coming failed to measure up to their responsibilities.

That, however, was not the fault of the people who are starving to death and the farmers of North Dakota and the other spring wheat States recognize that fact.

They will do everything they can to get this precious wheat into the elevators.

But they cannot do the impossible.

We might witness another great blunder here. North Dakota has enjoyed weeks of exceptionally fine weather. It may be that this weather will continue for another month. There is always the possibility, however, that heavy rains may come at this time of year, particularly in the northern areas where the most of the wheat remains.

If precipitation came in such quantities as to make country roads impassable for a lengthy period it could prove calamitous.

Mr. Anderson and Mr. LaGuardia should see to it, where farmers cannot possibly take time off to haul wheat and they are prepared to sell it, that something is done to get the wheat to the elevators.

This map shows where the reserves of wheat are on North Dakota farms, as nearly as may be determined from the available information. The figures are from the records of the United States Department of Agriculture.

The larger figures represent the estimates of the wheat remaining on farms as of April 1, for each of the nine districts into which the Department's Bureau of Agricultural Economics divides North Dakota, in working out its statistical data. The smaller figures represent the estimated wheat production in these districts in 1945.

The three districts in the northern part of the State in which there are 18 counties, produced last year 72,084,000 bushels of wheat, and as of April 1 had 34,530,000 bushels, almost half of it still in farm bins.

The 35 counties in the other 6 districts produced 89,804,000 bushels and had 33,323,000 bushels, about 38 percent, left on April 1.

The 18 northern counties held more than half of the 67,853,000 bushels remaining in the State as of April 1.

Roads through much of this northern area were blockaded by snow through all of the late winter months, after which they became impassable for weeks when the breakup came. This may be the reason there is so much more wheat left in that region.

Review of First Year of the Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from my home town paper, the Cape May Star and Wave, which I deem to be worthy of attention:

WE BEG TO DIFFER

President Truman last Thursday completed his first year as the Nation's Chief Executive, and marked the occasion by telling interviewers, figuratively, that the Nation is on an even keel and that still brighter days are ahead.

The President's statement, which was widely quoted in metropolitan newspapers and on the radio, indicates one of two things. Either Mr. Truman is viewing America through rose-colored glasses or that Mr. Truman doesn't know very much about the 1946 version of the United States of America.

How any man, reviewing the events of the last year, can honestly say that "we have good reason to be gratified" is a mystery that few besides President Truman can fathom.

It is mystifying to 140,000,000 Americans who are fed up with needless but acute shortages of everyday necessities, shortages of products which should have been back in circulation months ago, shortages which have been fostered and directly caused by the bureaucratic fumbling of Mr. Truman's administration and that of his predecessor.

It is mystifying to big business, which is prevented from operating by ridiculous Government restrictions, which is being strangled by Federal agency red tape, which is taxed to the hilt, and which is hamstrung by the administration's alleged labor policy.

It is mystifying to little business, which can get neither merchandise nor workers, which apparently is never considered by the administration in any thing, and which is being shoved nearer extinction by the unsound policies of the Federal Government under Mr. Truman's leadership.

It is mystifying to labor, which was promised the world with a fence around it in return for political support, only to find out that the workers, who are really labor, never win anything out of strikes.

It is equally mystifying to farmers and others who are bedeviled by a multitude of Government edicts and regulations, all of which add up only to confusion, utter, hopeless, dangerous confusion.

Assuming the Presidency, Mr. Truman faced a cooperative America which discarded political feeling in the face of a war crisis, an America which recognized his great challenge and leaned over backward to help him meet it. Today, he faces an America which is a model of disunity, of internal strife, and dissatisfaction.

If, as President Truman indicated on Thursday, America is now on an even keel, won't somebody please rock the boat?

Honesty Is the Lifeblood of a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial which obviously contains a serious falsification of my voting record. I also include herein a copy of my reply to the publication requesting that it correct the false statement in the editorial:

[From the Trades Unionist, Washington, D. C.]

MARCANTONIO AND THE OPA

The substantial majority vote in the House of Representatives against the OPA was answered by the CIO leadership with the threat that "any Congressman who voted to cripple the effectiveness of the Office of Price Administration will be driven out of political life."

Said Louis Hollander, high ranking officer of Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union and president of the New York State CIO Council: "Every New York Congressman who joins the coalition of reactionary Republicans and southern Democrats to scuttle the gains labor has won and increase the profits of big business will be snowed under in the November election and will join the forgotten men in political life." This statement has been reechoed by others high in the ranks of the CIO.

So far so good. We find no fault with the CIO, or any other group for that matter, taking issue with the Nation's legislators on matters of public concern. That is democracy. That is the right and the duty of every American citizen.

But what about the "champion of the masses," Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, lone American Labor Party Member in the House? A check of the roll-call vote on the OPA shows Mr. MARCANTONIO's name among the majority that voted so overwhelmingly for the defeat of the bill. Does the CIO threat apply to him? Or do MARCANTONIO's Communist views and party-line maneuvers

make him immune against attacks and purges aimed at other Congressmen?

We don't know. All we know is that the CIO, the ALP, the CP and the follow travelers who elected him ought to insist upon an explanation. This is America, and the record should be kept clear.

MAY 2, 1946.

Mr. FRED S. WALKER,
Manager, the Trades Unionist,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I read your editorial entitled "MARCANTONIO and the OPA." In it you state: "A check of the roll-call vote on the OPA shows Mr. MARCANTONIO's name among the majority that voted so overwhelmingly for the defeat of the bill." This statement is untrue. The RECORD speaks for itself.

Roll call No. 97 contained on page 4054 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, April 18, shows me listed as voting "Aye" on final passage of the bill. It is to be noted that among the 356 of us who voted "Aye" will be found all consistent friends of OPA. Among the 42 who voted "No" will be found those who consistently have opposed OPA. Further, may I call your attention to the RECORD of April 17. Roll calls 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, and 95 were all on crippling amendments. You will find my name listed on each one of these roll calls in the negative.

Friends of OPA had no other recourse but to vote "Aye" on final passage. A "No" vote would have meant opposition to OPA in any form. An "Aye" vote meant to send the bill to the Senate in the hope that it will eliminate the crippling amendments. A "No" vote would have meant a refusal to even do this much for OPA.

In view of these facts I do hope that you will correct the editorial and print one stating the truth.

Very truly yours,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

Address of Hon. Oren Harris, of Arkansas, on National Transportation Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 1, my colleague, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, addressed a meeting of the annual convention of the United States Chamber of Commerce in Atlantic City on the subject of the national transportation inquiry, being conducted by his Subcommittee on Transportation of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives. He was invited to speak to that group of outstanding citizens from throughout the Nation on the national transportation problems facing the Nation, which I believe worthy of attention of the Members of Congress and all who have opportunity to read it. Under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks this interesting address as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the United States Chamber of Commerce, representing a cross-section of the business of this great Nation, when I received an invitation to address this fine meeting I accepted with more eagerness than I usually accept invitations to make speeches. Speech-making for a Congressman off the floor of the House and outside our committee room is generally a busman's holiday. But I look upon this gathering as supplying a golden opportunity to present to a representative body of users of transportation, men whose business life is vitally dependent upon transport services, some of the considerations that influence the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives to undertake an investigation of the Nation's transportation problems.

I do not have to tell you, perhaps, that shippers and transportation agencies must face these problems in a long and difficult period of readjustment to an economy of peace. We Members of Congress who serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and particularly the Transportation Subcommittee of that committee, of which I am a member, are daily hearing from our constituents and from leaders of industry in all parts of the country about the Nation's transportation problems that cry for solution. They are problems that must be solved if we are to settle down to the job of peace which, as we have realized, is in many respects a harder job than preparing the Nation for war.

You must understand that I come to you not as a representative of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Opinions that I may express here are therefore my own and are not necessarily those of any other member of the committee. These members, as I have frequent cause to realize, differ widely on many questions. But fortunately there is great unanimity of opinion on one point. We all realize that transportation, rail, highway, water, air, and pipeline must be the servant of the public. It is a tool. It is either a benign instrument or, if it is inefficient, it is an instrument for the destruction of the interests of the people that it was created to serve. This inefficiency might arise from errors of the operators of transportation, from mistakes of regulatory bodies or from the neglect of Congress to provide satisfactory statutory structure for the operation of this great public service. But no matter where the mistakes occur it is the duty of Congress to find out what they are, who is responsible for them, and provide remedial measures.

I think that I am safe in saying also that our committee is in unanimous agreement in approaching the solution of our many perplexing transportation problems with the interests of the users of transport services our prime consideration. Next we are solicitous for the real owners of transportation facilities—not merely the officials but the hundreds of thousands of holders of transportation securities, either those who own them directly or those who own them through their insurance policies and deposits in savings banks.

THE PROBLEM OF THE USER AND INVESTOR

Considering transportation then as the problem of the user and the real investor we are considering a service that affects the welfare of practically the whole American public.

This thought was clearly the one which influenced Congress when it wrote its declaration of transportation policy in the preamble to the Transportation Act of 1940. While there may be some justifiable criticism of the manner in which this act has been applied to transportation and while there may be conflicts of policy in various acts for the regulation of different segments of the transportation industry, I doubt if it would be possible to put into the English language words that would more clearly express the predominant public interest in transportation than those which formulate their national transportation policy.

Let me quote a portion of that act. I find that Congress as it expressed itself in the preamble intended to, and I quote, "provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions."

THE GROWTH OF TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

Now that act, of course, was written 6 years ago. Transportation is a growing industry. It has never ceased to grow from the earliest days when the stone-age man discovered, probably from a rolling stone, what a benign servant a wheel could be. The newer forms of transportation, the motor vehicle, the airplane, in the last half of the last decade have achieved new heights in their service to the people. They have likewise posed problems of a magnitude that could not possibly have been foreseen even 6 years ago. They are sharply challenging the predominance of the older, far-flung system of rail transportation. Their competition, particularly in view of the fact that it is greatly aided by Government funds, poses problems that are stupendous in many of their implications. The nature of this competition has, in my opinion, brought us to a sharp realization that the very thing that has made this Nation great—freedom of competition—may, if permitted to run an unbridled course in the field of transportation, destroy the efficiency of a most important public service.

I firmly believe that if Congress cannot devise a formula that will permit privately financed transportation to serve the people, and make a profit for investors, in competition with Government-aided transport, we must face a most unpleasant alternative—the nationalization of transportation with the nationalization of other industries to follow as surely as night follows day.

I wonder if many of us realize that there is a total of $85,300,000,000 of capital invested in transportation in this country? Forty billions of which have been spent by the Government for tax-free facilities which need earn no return on the investment? Contrast this with the slightly more than forty-five billions of private capital invested in facilities which are taxed and which must earn a return for the investor. A study of these figures reveals the extent to which Government is competing with its own people.

And let us not forget that this citizen-supplied capital, which comes from taxpayers, must pay taxes, in addition to operating costs, before any earnings can accrue to those who have invested their funds.

We may well ask what has become of the theory upon which this Republic was founded? Was not the idea of the framers of our Constitution that the Government was to be the servant of the people and not their master?

There was a time when the notion was prevalent that a few rich railroad tycoons were the only sufferers from competition of Government capital. Whatever may have been the sins of the plunderers in the past, we today are not punishing the old sinners by policies that take away reasonable profits from private investors. The real owners of transportation today are life-insurance policyholders, savings-bank depositors, beneficiaries of trust funds, educational and charitable foundations, colleges and hospitals and hundreds of thousands of relatively small investors.

The heads that roll into the basket when the dread blade of bankruptcy falls are not

those of brass-hatted tycoons but are the heads of our friends and neighbors who are the real owners of transportation or are the beneficiaries of foundations, colleges, and hospitals that own the securities.

A PATH TO THE NATIONALIZATION OF ALL INDUSTRY

There is another fact that we should not overlook. There is no more certain path to the nationalization of such an essential public service as transportation than the drying up of the sources of private capital through bankruptcies or the continued threat of widespread insolvencies. However, the users of transportation are right when they demand continuance of service. If this service cannot be supplied by private capital the Government must move in. There is no other way.

Now, in the interest of the public, I favor all necessary Government aid to air lines, highways, and waterways. My record on these questions is clear. I have not changed my position and I do not expect to do so. I do insist, however, and I think there are many others in Congress who agree with me, that when an infant industry grows into manhood it should be weaned. In supplying subsidy to promote an essential public service in its infancy we should always hasten the day when we can pluck away the Government nipple and bid the growing industry to sharpen its teeth on the hard food of competition to be found in the Nation's capital markets. Private capital should replace Government capital at the earliest possible moment.

This threat of nationalization is not merely a threat to transportation. It reaches much deeper. Counting the employees of transportation companies and their families we find a group of from nine to twelve million voters. Nationalization of transportation therefore would make a huge addition to the Government pay roll and would provide a political party enough Government pay-roll voters to swing any election.

A party that nationalizes transportation would find itself entrenched in power for many generations. It should be remembered always that nationalization of transportation may come from another cause than political theory. It can come from necessity enforced by widespread bankruptcies in transportation. When it is realized that the purchasing power of transportation is probably the largest of any segment of our economy it seems clear that this, plus the millions of votes of Government employees and their families, would make it practically impossible to retrace steps toward nationalization back to freedom of enterprise.

Does not industry, other than the transportation industry, see in this picture the threat of general nationalization? I haven't reached the point of looking under my bed every night to see if Karl Marx has crawled in, but I can tell you, with deep conviction, that the greatest threat of socialism in this country today lies in transportation and that what happens to it in the next half decade will determine the fate of private enterprise in this Nation.

PUBLIC INTEREST FIRST, SELF-INTEREST SECOND

I hope that the legislation which we expect to frame as a result of our pending investigation will clearly place upon transportation—and by this I mean all forms—the responsibility to serve the public first and its own interests second. Public service and not self-interest is the only reason for the existence of transportation and certainly it is the only excuse for the investment of government funds to promote transportation service. It is this public service and not the self-interest of any segment of the industry that has influenced our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to undertake this investigation. The committee is composed of some of the ablest men in Congress. They think for themselves. I repeat and I believe that the record of our committee is such that it must be clear to the public that this investigation will not be controlled or dominated by any transportation agency or group of transportation agencies.

We expect the agencies of transport, as well as the users of transport, to approach their common problems from the standpoint of this predominant public interest. We have sought from thousands of users of transport and the operators and experts in the transportation field constructive suggestions looking toward the solution of our common national problems. The replies which we have received indicate to a very satisfactory degree that there is widespread recognition among leaders in all branches of business that our transportation problems cannot be met unless we submerge self-interest. The economy of this Nation is in such a state, following its complete devotion to the waging of war, that we cannot permit self-serving pressure groups to approach our common problems with little or no regard for the needs of the whole people. This is true of practically every segment of our economy but it is particularly true when we are dealing with a public service so essential to the welfare of our people as transportation.

In the words of the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of our committee, this problem is vital because "transportation is the connecting link between our producing machine and the consuming public." He truly stated further that without efficient and economical transportation our whole economy can bog down no matter what our industrial executives and the investment of private capital may do toward converting our economy from war to peace.

TO BUILD ON PRESENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK

We are not planning to rewrite the Interstate Commerce Act, or the CAA Act. We are, however, hoping to do a good job toward the solution of our transportation problems by trimming here and there and adjusting this policy and that policy within the statutory framework that has been created over the many years that these acts have been on our statute books.

I would be faithless to my responsibility to my fellow members in the Interstate Commerce Committee if I did not urge upon you the fullest possible cooperation that you can give us toward the solution of the problems that certainly mean much to you as shippers and receivers of freight. You are the people who pay the Nation's tremendous transportation bill, you are the ones who first feel the effects of inefficiency in our transportation service.

I have no doubt that many of you have already replied to the questions which the committee has sent out, but I feel that I should take a moment or two for a brief summarization of these topics. This will serve to indicate to you the scope of our inquiry and its objective nature.

These topics are grouped under nine main headings. The first is quite general and is entitled "National Transportation Policy." Here we seek criticism of the statement of policy in the Transportation Act of 1940.

Under the heading of "Regulation" we hope to evoke constructive comment on the advantages and disadvantages of separate regulatory agencies for each mode of transportation; the advantages and disadvantages of a single regulatory body and comment on the suggestion frequently advanced that the Interstate Commerce Commission be reorganized in the light of present-day conditions and postwar transportation problems.

We have tried to make these suggested topics something different from the ordinary questionnaire. They are topics for discussion. They are subjects for comment. And, furthermore, if anyone has anything to say on any subject not covered by the committee document, he can just let himself go.

Finally, I wish to emphasize again that there is a very strong feeling among the members of our committee that failure to recognize that self-interest is merely a part and not the whole of any problem cannot be tolerated in this complicated economy of ours, particularly at this time when we are all but submerged in problems created by world chaos.

It would be unrealistic not to recognize the fact that the war has not changed human nature very much. I do believe, however, that there is a growing recognition of the fact that a democracy can live only if the people composing it are willing to adjust their aims and ambitions to the common good. In the conduct of this investigation we seek your cooperation in applying this principle to our transportation problems.

To End an Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. LINK
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, April 27, 1946:

TO END AN INJUSTICE

Action of the House Civil Service Committee in scheduling a hearing for May 6 on a bill to make retroactive certain retirement benefits that were liberalized in 1942 serves again to direct attention to an injustice that long ago should have been corrected by Congress. Under the liberalization amendment of January 24, 1942, annuities for Federal employes were increased substantially through adoption of a formula which took into account the size of employees' contributions to the retirement fund. Previously employees in the higher brackets received no greater annuity than the maximum of $1,200 a year provided for all employees, regardless of the fact that the higher salaried workers made larger payments to the fund than those in the lower brackets.

But in voting these increased benefits Congress failed to insert a retroactive clause such as had appeared in all prior retirement laws. The result was that employees in the higher brackets who retired at any time before passage of the January 1942 act—even a day or two before in some instances—continued to draw not more than a $1,200 annuity, whereas employees who retired on or after January 24, 1942, received the full benefit of the increased allowances. This was manifestly an arbitrary and unwarranted discrimination against more than 5,000 faithful Federal employees of the higher brackets who had gone on the retired list prior to amendment of the law. Meanwhile about 750 of these retired employees left the retirement rolls and returned to active service during the war emergency, thereby earning the right to benefit from the liberalized annuity law. Others who were disabled or otherwise could not obtain reemployment have not been so fortunate. Their case is all the more persuasive.

These retired employees rightly have protested this unfair treatment and the Civil Service Commission has vigorously supported their protests. Several efforts to correct the injustice through legislation have failed,

largely because of apparent indifference on the House side. The Senate twice has unanimously approved bills designed to rectify the error. The first bill expired in the House. The second is pending before the House Civil Service Committee. Justice requires that this bill be reported promptly and passed by the House before expiration of the present session of Congress.

Report From Central Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 25, 1946:

REPORT FROM CENTRAL OHIO

In an effort to obtain the views of his constituents on current issues, Congressman J. HARRY MCGREGOR recently sent a questionnaire to a cross section of the voters in his district.

MCGREGOR represents the seventeenth district, an area in central Ohio comprising Ashland, Richland, Knox, Coshocton, Delaware, and Licking Counties.

Although this is generally regarded as rural territory, it contains a number of small cities in which there has been considerable industrial development in recent years and approximately half the population of the district is urban.

MCGREGOR sent out 1,150 questionnaires and received 732 replies, a high percentage of returns for a poll of this kind. The results, as announced by the Congressman, follow:

Continuation of price controls: 48 percent yes, 52 percent no.

Payment of subsidies by the Federal Government: 13 percent yes, 87 percent no.

Federal medical care program: 13 percent yes, 87 percent no.

Draft extension: 35 percent yes, 65 percent no.

Compulsory military training: 45 percent yes, 55 percent no.

Thirty-day cooling-off period before strikes: 89 percent yes, 11 percent no.

Four billion dollar loan to Britain: 19 percent yes, 81 percent no.

One billion dollar loan to Russia: 11 percent yes, 89 percent no.

The replies to this questionnaire help explain why some Congressmen vote the way they do. Not all Congressmen are influenced by pressure groups and selfish lobbies. Some of them happen to reflect the wishes of their constituents.

Hidden Price Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, how well some of our New Deal inflation has been concealed is exposed in an article in the current edition of the monthly publication of the National Small Business Men's Association.

It follows, in part:

HIDDEN PRICE INCREASES

Inferior products, through substitution, dilution, and skimping, have been one notable result of OPA policies in the reconversion period. The reports of the Smith committee itemize several hundred instances in which high-quality products of the prewar days were driven from the postwar market by OPA ceiling prices lower than postwar production costs—only to be replaced, in the course of a few months, by an inferior product officially ceilinged at a higher price.

One long-established firm, the hearings disclose, sold a quality bathrobe recognized in the trade as "a superior garment." OPA set the ceiling price at $3. The manufacturer cannot make a profit at that price. OPA practically put it off the market. But a new manufacturer who came in with no prewar cost experience then got a ceiling of $3.25 for his robe, "with a poorly finished collar, careless seams, cheap binding, and a sleazy cord."

With a higher price for an inferior item, the new producer can supply plenty of robes at a profit, and that is what the trade now gets. Meanwhile the established and experienced producer of the quality product is "ceilinged" out of business.

When you pay $3.25 for a $2 bathrobe, OPA calls it holding the line. Economists call it inflation. The American people simply call it a gyp.

A returned Army officer told the Senate Small Business Committee a similar story. He owns a chain of 15 small variety stores in Georgia and Florida. Released from the service, he went to New York to buy baby dresses. But the company he sought had gone out of business. He placed an order with a new firm. A month later he got samples of the new product. The cloth was "not even suited for baby dresses, and the workmanship was the poorest." Yet prices were much higher.

Another manufacturer of infants' dresses got a ceiling of $8.50 a dozen—too low to allow a profit. But a newcomer in the field got a ceiling of $10.50 for an inferior product.

In men's shorts, two different producers got ceilings of $3.50 and $3.55 per dozen for standard prewar garments. But a new starter in the field got a ceiling of $7.35 a dozen for a garment "made of white sheeting."

An established toy maker was ceilinged at $1.92 for a sturdy rubber-tired scooter; but a newcomer who used scrap metals exclusively got a ceiling of $3.75.

In women's apparel, the deterioration of quality has been especially marked. In one case of record, a manufacturer sold a standard house dress for $1.30 in 1942. On the basis of 1945 costs he petitioned for a price of $2.18 for the same item. This, OPA denied. But a new producer got a ceiling of $4.37 for a competing dress, "although better material was used in dresses selling for 79 cents in 1942."

Summarizing testimony covering hundreds of these cases, the National Retail Dry Goods Association said: "Too often reliable manufacturers are not allowed reasonable ceilings for their honest merchandise, but newcomers can sell inferior goods for twice as much—with the OPA's blessing. That is why the American housewife cannot find good moderate-priced dresses in the market."

Similar exhibits were presented in behalf of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers in kitchen equipment, furniture, toys, handbags, shoes, and many other items.

One long-established producer of shoe bags got a ceiling of $7.20 a dozen. As soon as his carry-over inventories of materials were exhausted he stopped production. But a new producer in the field then got a ceiling of $13.50 a dozen.

All these dislocations in civilian production and distribution during the last 6 months have tended to reduce employment, continue wartime shortages, and limit production in many factories. In the words of the Smith committee, in its report of October 22, 1945, OPA "has compelled manufacturers to discontinue and abandon production of prewar low-priced commodities they were skilled in making in great volume and has permitted newcomers to manufacture such commodities at higher prices than were necessary to enable those already in the field to stay in business."

Six weeks after this report was published Congress still was being bombarded with telegrams from merchants in all parts of the country. Typical was the demand of A. L. Killian, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, that OPA be terminated:

"We have a strong feeling this would eliminate much shoddy merchandise made by fly-by-night manufacturers at ridiculously high prices approved by OPA. We are getting dribble shipments from old established firms while getting many offers by new firms we never heard of with prices approximately double those of reputable firms.

"If legitimate manufacturers are turned loose to produce, competition will soon level prices off and quality will improve rapidly. * * * Unless we get immediate action of some kind to encourage production of dependable merchandise, scarcity of goods will become so acute that the situation will not be manageable."

By mail, telegraph and phone, appeals of this general tenor reach Congress by the hundreds every day.

Many opponents of continued price control express the fear that another 6 months of OPA would so disorganize and dislocate the normal pattern of American business that permanent regimentation would appear perhaps irresistible. In convention after convention during the last 6 months business associations have given voice to the challenge that the defenders of OPA seek its continuance, not so much as a weapon against advancing wages and prices, but chiefly as a permanent beachhead of national socialism on the world's last citadel of free enterprise.

CITRUS FRUITS

When oranges and grapefruit came into plentiful supply, in July 1945, prices fell below the OPA ceiling. At 10 different markets, these items (on average) moved at 50 cents to $2.24 a box below the ceiling for a period of 18 weeks, up to November 17, 1945.

OPA had promised the industry advisory committee that price controls would be removed as soon as citrus fruits began to move in volume at below-ceiling prices. But this promise was not kept in July.

Suddenly, on November 19, when the California crop was about all cleared, and the Texas crop not yet moving in real volume, OPA removed the citrus ceilings on a tentative basis for 60 days.

By picking the week before Thanksgiving, when seasonal demand is at a peak, and between crops, when supply is at the seasonal low for the year, OPA spotted the one situation which would bring a price increase the moment ceilings were removed.

The Department of Agriculture strongly urged that the ceilings be not abandoned until the Texas citrus crop began to move to market in full volume.

By selecting price movements on certain specialty varieties of citrus fruits, OPA then made a perfect exhibit demonstrating to Congress, "this is what happens when ceiling prices are removed."

On January 3, 1946, OPA reestablished ceilings on citrus fruits just as the great Texas crop was really moving to market. Out of this experience OPA now has a specific chart showing that when ceilings are removed prices go up sharply. With that chart Mr. Bowles scares Congressmen and Senators to death when they inquire about winding up OPA.

Actually, the average retail price of citrus fruits during the free-price period was still below the ceilings.

But by selecting only specialty varieties, and using prices from several selected markets then experiencing transportation difficulties, Bowles and his public-enlightenment staff were able to graph a "skyrocketing" price movement.

Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, traced out this bit of statistical jobbery for the House in a speech delivered on February 4, 1946:

"I think it should be said to the credit of the Secretary of Agriculture, that he at no time was a part of this conspiracy. Correct figures were at all times available in the Department of Agriculture. I now say, in the simplest language possible, that the figures which Mr. Bowles credited to the Department of Agriculture are not the figures the Department of Agriculture uses to represent citrus prices. I also say that the order announced about January 3, which returned price ceilings, was not favored by the Secretary of Agriculture. He only approved it when directed to do so by the Office of Economic Stabilization."

On appearances before the committees of Congress considering extension of the price control law, Mr. Bowles has stated repeatedly that the guiding policy of his staff is "to remove all controls as soon as possible. * * * It is the policy of the agency to drop controls a little too early, rather than too late."

But this policy was repudiated for 18 consecutive weeks when citrus fruit was plentiful—until OPA could pick the one period in the year which likely would show a sharp price increase after suspension of the ceilings.

For a time this citrus fruit experience served as the classical "horrible example" of what might happen to the country if OPA were tossed into the Potomac River, lock, stock and barrel.

But it was compounded of phony figures, which quickly were exposed before both the House and Senate. Then Mr. Bowles' "grapefruit chart" became a thrilling comedy item on Capitol Hill.

At length the Department of Agriculture presented a year-round price chart on citrus fruits covering the last 11 years. In each year the highest price recorded for the year came in November-December, when the holiday demand was at peak.

That's why OPA removed the ceiling on November 19. It wanted to show an immediate price increase after suspension of the ceiling. It picked the precise spot in the calendar for that operation.

As Congressman PHILLIPS explained to the House:

"Throughout the period of price suspension, OPA utilized every medium of propaganda to capitalize on the increase in the price of specialty citrus fruits, which had been brought about by its own action. This started with simultaneous and almost verbatim press releases from OPA regional offices throughout the country the day after ceilings were removed, and continued throughout the period of price suspension, in the form of statements by Mr. Bowles, by regional and local OPA press agents, and by other inspired spokesmen. * * * The statements uniformly pointed to the increase in citrus prices as an example of what happens when ceilings are removed, and exploited this incident as a major argument in favor of the indefinite continuation of price controls."

The full flower of this propaganda campaign came in a statement by Administrator Bowles on December 6, 1945, when he said:

"Some grades of oranges, lemons, and grapefruit moved up 50 to 100 percent in the first few days following the action of OPA in removing the price restrictions. If this occurred on food products which seemed to be in adequate supply, what would happen to meat, vegetables, milk, cereals, and all the other dozens of food products which are in more scarce supply?"

Nowhere in all American history is there to be found a more shocking example of intrenched bureaucrats jobbing the official statistics in a coordinated propaganda campaign to obtain from Congress a renewal of their evil power and unwholesome authority over the lives and fortunes of the people.

MORE REGULATIONS THAN IN WARTIME

Two days after Mr. Phillips' delineation of OPA's techniques in self-perpetuation, Mr. Bowles appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in support of a plea for additional funds for the current fiscal year.

Congress already had authorized OPA to spend $148,571,000 during the year ending June 30, 1946. That amount now spent or committed, Mr. Bowles sought a supplemental appropriation of $1,854,000 to piece out the year.

He explained that with the end of rationing in gasoline, fuel oil, shoes, tires, meats, and many canned foods, OPA found it possible to reduce its paid staff after VJ-day (August 15, 1945) from 63,274 to 32,838 as of February 1, 1946. The liquidation schedule called for a further reduction to 30,917 as of June 30, 1946, when, with the expiration of the law, OPA would die a natural death.

Then it was discovered, in February this year, that OPA had many pressing new duties to administer postwar.

From "Other People's Assets" OPA became "Onward Postwar America."

Mr. Bowles' adjusted schedules provided for 750 additional people in his housing division, 181 in building materials, 1,100 in rent control, 80 in accounting, and 53 in the information bureau—an increase of 2,174 employees requested 6 months after the end of the war.

In the course of the hearings Representative LUDLOW, of Indiana, asked Geoffrey Baker, Deputy Administrator for Price, how many price orders had been abandoned since the war.

Mr. Baker replied: "Our peak has not yet been reached, sir. We have today more regulations than we had, let us say, on VJ-day, and we will have more."

HOW IT ALL BEGAN

OPA began in April 1941, as the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, created by Presidential Executive order.

The staff consisted of Leon Henderson and eight assistants. President Roosevelt allocated $75,000 from emergency funds. But the work expanded prodigiously. War came on December 7, 1941.

The Price Control Act was approved January 30, 1942. In April, 1942, OPA's first annual budget went to Congress. It contemplated a Nation-wide organization of 90,000 employees. Total funds requested for the first year were $110,000,000, to last through June 30, 1943.

The next budget, to June 30, 1944, requested $177,335,000.

The 1945 budget was $190,462,739.

Then came the first postwar year—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Total OPA budget authorizations for this year now stand at $150,425,000—an amount just equal to the total funds appropriated for the United States Navy for the year ended June 30, 1916. At that time the Navy comprised 346 vessels of 1,500,000 tons displacement. Officers and enlisted personnel numbered 66,653 men.

So the postwar OPA following World War II is bigger than the prewar Navy before World War I.

That's where the money goes.

The Real Estate Lobby Gloats Over Its Murder of the Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 I introduced House Resolution 557, which if adopted by the House will create a special committee to investigate the powerful legislative lobbies which infest Washington and defeat the public interest by bringing about passage of legislation favorable to special privilege and entrenched greed, or by preventing passage of legislation which would protect the public.

Under leave, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the "confidential letter" sent to members of the Chicago Real Estate Board which, over the name of the president, Floyd G. Dana, gloats over the murder and mayhem performed on the Patman housing bill, and foretells what the lobbies will do to the OPA bill and to the Wagner-Taft-Ellender public housing bill.

This letter is dated April 18, and I naturally did not receive it until after the emasculation and dismemberment of the OPA bill in the House; I regret that I did not have it to read on the floor during the debate. I wish to call special attention of Members to the statement that funds for the Washington committee—meaning, I presume, the Washington office of the National Association of Real Estate Boards—have been received in gratifying volume.

There is a great deal of talk about pressure groups on the liberal side of politics. I wish some of the gentlemen would show me a union or a liberal group with the money to spend for this kind of lobbying; and this, remember, is only a sample from one business group. My resolution is drawn to authorize a thorough investigation of every lobby, without fear or favor or prejudgment, because I am confident that an impartial investigation will show clearly who is spending vast sums for special favors, and I do not mean the consuming public represented by unions and civic or liberal organizations.

There follows the text of that part of the "members' letter" of the Chicago Real Estate Board dated April 18 which appeared over the name of Floyd G. Dana, together with that of my letter to Mr. Dana:

PRESIDENTIAL PARAGRAPHS—THE WASHINGTON PICTURE

Congratulations are due every Member who participated in the spendid fight against the Patman bill in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Unquestionably, this has been a grand victory for our side. The response that we received from our Senators and Representatives was tremendous. Senator BROOKS should be very highly commended for the stand he took on the floor of the Senate. If you have not already done so, telegrams and letters of appreciation should be sent to him at once.

However, the big battle is still to be fought. The extension of the Price Control Act is in the process of hearings in the House at the moment, and will go to the Senate probably next week. This is our opportunity, if ever, to get some relief in the way of rent increases for Chicago. You will be kept informed on this legislation, both through the Board and the National Association, and we hope that the response from all of you will be as satisfying as it has been the last few times. We don't intend to keep our members continuously aroused, but it so happens that the fight is a long-drawn-out affair. If we show the proper spirit, we can win.

The W-E-T bill is up for a vote in the Senate today. I have been informed that the Senate will pass the bill. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient time for us to show our strength. Our only hope of defeating this drastic legislation is on the floor of the House. When the bill reaches the House, your efforts will be needed.

Again I want to thank each and every contributor who responded to our call for funds for the Washington committee. It has been gratifying to see the numerous checks which have been mailed in, and we are very near reaching our goal. I am confident that it will be attained in the next few days. Any personal effort expended has been well repaid by the support shown by all of you.

The committee on realtor is in the midst of developing a very extensive advertising campaign which will be presented to the entire membership at some time in the future. For many months, we have felt the need of a broader public relations program for our board. This plan ties in with the findings of a number of other committees. It may be a year before the project can be properly presented. However, you should be informed of our plans, and will be so informed from time to time. NAREB is seriously considering a very extensive radio program which will be Nation-wide and for a period of a year's duration. This proposed publicity may possibly tie in with the future program of our own board. Our committee on realtor, under the chairmanship of Whitney Wall, deserves a lot of credit for the many meetings that have been held and for the time spent by each individual member.

This will be the last letter during the present regime. It is fitting that appreciation should be here acknowledged to all committee chairmen and members who have worked so industriously this past year. The success, if any, for this administration is entirely due to their credit. It has been marvelous to see the work which has been done, and the kind consideration given by the entire membership is highly appreciated by your outgoing president.

FLOYD G. DANA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1946.

Mr. FLOYD G. DANA,
President, Chicago Real Estate Board, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. DANA: I have received a copy of the confidential letter mailed to members of the Chicago Real Estate Board in which you tell gloatingly of how property and special privilege brought about emasculation and murder of the Patman housing bill, and of your plans to perform the same rites for the extension of the Price Control Act, and for the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill.

It is my purpose to extend this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as justification for my insistence on early action on my resolution calling for a thorough investigation of lobbying activities. I have also obtained evidence of violation of the Price Control Act by firms in the lumber business, whose lobby has been very active in opposition to all controls in the public interest, showing that it is impossible for the ordinary operator to build because of the bribes demanded by dealers.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

NAM ANTI-OPA CAMPAIGN COST ALMOST $400,000

In view of this attack, Mr. Speaker, I shall press vigorously for passage of my resolution, House Resolution 557, in its original form, and I am inserting the text of that resolution so that Members may be informed as to its provisions. I am inserting, also, the text of House Resolution 608, which I introduced on April 30, and which would direct the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a thorough investigation of the activities of the meat-packing industry, especially as represented by the American Meat Industry, and which, I have been convinced by the facts available to me, has gone on strike against the Government and the consuming public.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I also am inserting a news story written by Oliver Pilat of the Washington bureau of the New York Post, and published in the Post of April 24, which points out that by its own estimate the National Association of Manufacturers has spent almost $400,000 in its campaign to kill OPA, and which goes on to name and describe nine of the powerful national lobbies, all of them well financed by profits which came only from the consuming public, which have led in the fight to kill or scuttle the Office of Price Administration and all effective price control.

[From the New York Post of April 24, 1946]

HERE THEY ARE: THE LOBBIES TRYING TO ABOLISH OPA

(By Oliver Pilat)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—The whole question of industry's right to spend hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, to break down price control was thrown wide open today when Senator MITCHELL, of Washington, pointed out that the National Association of Manufacturers' own estimate of its anti-OPA campaign was $395,850.

"The average consumer who wants prices held down couldn't hope to duplicate that amount," said MITCHELL, adding that he considered it "out of line."

For the benefit of the consumer, here are the chief lobbies which have spent freely to raise scares in the press and push amendments in Congress emasculating OPA for their own benefits:

National Automobile Dealers Association, W. L. Mallon, president. Four months ago this outfit showed what it could do by bringing no less than 350 Congressmen to a House Small Business Committee hearing on the problems of retailers facing what was described as an OPA squeeze.

National Retail Dry Goods Association, Robert Seidel, chief lobbyist, with help from Dr. Paul H. Nystrom and others. Hyman T. Fischbach, counsel for this association, wrote a couple of the House-approved amendments to the Price Stabilization Act. He is former counsel to the Smith Committee in the House, which periodically "investigates" OPA in the interests of business.

National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, Charles Holman, secretary. This outfit is fighting for across-board price increases for milk, no subsidies.

The American Meat Institute, Wesley Hardenbergh, president, representing the big four packers; and the National Independent Meat Packers Association, represented by William C. Holmes.

Outright elimination of controls on meat, as proposed by Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, was licked on a roll-call vote in the House, but the meat lobbyists are chuckling privately; they say the Gossett amendment, which provides lifting of controls on any commodity whose production equals 1941 levels, exempts all meat except pork.

They hope the public doesn't get wise to this before Congress puts the OPA bill in final shape.

The Producers Council, Douglas Whitlock, advisory board chairman. This outfit is the core of the housing lobby, most dangerous lobby ever to work on Congress, according to Housing Expediter Wyatt. Objective: No controls on building materials, no ceilings on houses.

National Association of Wool Manufacturers, Arthur Besse, president; Underwear Institute, Roy A. Cheney. They want to cut the controls on clothing.

Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee of New York, Arthur Koppel, New York builder, front man's most active lobbyist for wiping out rent control.

These are just a few of the business groups who will be asked to say how much they have put into the anti-OPA fight, following the precedent established yesterday before the Senate Banking Committee with the NAM.

House Resolution 557

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee of five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be designated by the Speaker as chairman.

It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full, complete, and impartial investigation of all groups, associations, committees, organizations, or combinations thereof, who have sought or are seeking, by use of any means, and directly or indirectly, to influence the consideration of legislation in the Congress of the United States; or any matter deemed by the committee to be of public interest and relevant to the main purpose of the investigation.

Subjects of the investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to, any or all groups which have or are engaged in the present propaganda campaign or lobby to defeat legislative measures for the relief of the acute housing shortage; any or all groups which have or are engaged in the disruptive propaganda campaign or lobby to abolish or weaken price control; all groups which have or are engaged in the power lobby; any or all groups which have or are engaged in similar propaganda campaigns or lobbies intended to influence legislative consideration by the Congress.

It shall be the duty and within the powers of the committee to examine the nature, financial resources, receipts and expenditures, names of contributors and amounts contributed, publications, activities, motives, nature of expenditures, membership lists, techniques, methods, means used, and objectives sought of all organizations under investigation; and to make any examination or determination found by a majority of the committee to be relevant to the inquiry.

The committee may make such interim reports as it deems advisable, and shall make its final report to the House of Representatives on January 3, 1947, and shall make such remedial recommendations as a majority approves. In the course of the investigation the committee shall bear in mind the constitutional and statutory guaranties of the privileges, rights, and immunities of citizens of the United States to hold and express opinions and to petition the Government. The committee shall adopt rules

of conduct governing the actions of its members and employees, and no investigation shall be made nor hearing held without due notice having been given all members and without approval of a majority of members of the committee.

The committee, or any authorized subcommittee thereof, may sit and act at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned; require the presence of such witnesses and the production of such books, record, paper, accounts, and documents; and take such testimony, by subpena or otherwise, as it deems necessary.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to employ such clerical, expert, or legal assistants and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable, and to fix the compensation for its employees on a basis in conformity with the Classification Act of 1924. The cost of stenographic service for reporting hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. Expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and by the Committee on Accounts. The committee may authorize any one or more persons to conduct any part of the investigation or hold public hearings or to issue subpenas. All hearings shall be public, and all reports, documents, and records shall be public records. The committee is further authorized to utilize the services, information facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by the committee, or an authorized subcommittee or agent thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

House Resolution 608

Whereas the American Meat Institute, representing the major packing companies in the United States, has disseminated information, issued releases, and published advertisements and statement charging the Office of Price Administration with being responsible for black-market conditions; and

Whereas there is positive evidence that the packers are endeavoring to discredit the Office of Price Administration and have disseminated misleading information to bring that about; and

Whereas it appears that the packers have gone on a sit-down strike to weaken and destroy not only the effectiveness of the administration of the Price Control Act but the confidence of the public in the Government's forced operation of the packing plants, and that they actually have brought about conditions which are aiding the black market: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to make an immediate and thorough investigation of the activities of such groups, individuals, and organizations engaged in dissemination of propaganda tending to influence legislation, including any groups, organizations, and persons employed by them to carry out such activities. The committee shall ascertain the amounts of moneys contributed and collected by such groups, organizations, and persons, from whom contributed and collected, and an accounting of the expenditures of such funds. The committee shall investigate the underlying causes and reasons for the action of the large packers in discontinuing direct purchases from farmers, feeders, and cattle dealers and obtain evidence as to why they have failed to purchase in normal quantity when reports showed that livestock was available in the Chicago Stock Yards. The committee shall investigate the effects of the reduced purchases and production by the large packers with respect to byproducts which their plants are equipped to manufacture and shall ascertain whether the reduced production of byproducts is tending to create a shortage of same to consumers. The committee shall ascertain whether these activities are intended to discredit the Government's forced operation of large packing plants and whether there is a deliberate agreement between the packers to create a meat shortage which has been of aid to the black market. The committee shall investigate all unfair practices and tactics and acts of omission and commission and ascertain if they are directed with a view to discrediting the Office of Price Administration or other Federal agencies. The committee shall ascertain whether the action of the packers in reducing their purchases of livestock and amount of slaughtering is due to the protection afforded them against loss through guaranty of refund of 1945 excess-profits taxes covering any losses incurred in 1946, and shall investigate such other matters as the committee deems appropriate.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

The said committee is hereby authorized to request and secure, for the purposes of this resolution, the cooperation of, the production of records and rules and regulations of, and the assistance of such personnel of any department or bureau, as may be deemed necessary by the committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is sitting or has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony and records, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Speaker of the House at the request of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by the Sergeant at Arms of the House or by such person or persons as may be designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member of the committee may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, or having been required to produce necessary books or papers or documents or vouchers by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the study and investigation heretofore authorized, or who fails to produce such books or papers or documents or vouchers as required by subpenas, shall be held to the penalties provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192), as amended.

"American Mother" Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I congratulate the American Mothers Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation of my great State of Ohio upon their choice of a State mother, Mrs. Harold H. Burton, wife of the Supreme Court Justice. No woman in Ohio typifies more beautifully the qualities of America's finest motherhood than does Selma Burton. Known from one end of the State to the other her radiant personality receives no more than a just recognition. Gentle and gracious this State mother has a quiet strength that draws its force quite simply from the Eternal One upon whom she depends in hours of keenest joy and deepest anxiety. The Ohio committee has chosen well.

Not satisfied with a perfect choice in my home State, the Golden Rule Foundation has made an outstanding choice nationally in honoring Mrs. Emma Clarissa Clement, of Louisville, Ky., mother of seven children, all of them occupying outstanding positions in the fields into which they have gone. The first Negro woman to be given this Golden Rule Foundation award, Mrs. Clement demonstrates in every phase of her living the highest standards of motherhood.

I consider it a very real privilege to put into the RECORD of the United States Congress the data furnished by the committee who chose her to represent American motherhood for this year of 1946. I wish it were possible to include her picture that all who read might sense the spirit that radiates from her, as I have done. Granddaughter of a slave, Emma Clarissa Clement is a former national president of the Women's Society of the African Methodist Church. A native of Providence, R. I., she is a graduate of Livingstone College, Salisbury, N. C. She is a charter member of the southern commission on interracial cooperation, secretary—Negro division—of the Kentucky Division of the American Field Army Cancer Society, and a statistician of the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs.

Her children, all graduates of Livingstone, are: Mrs. Abbie Jackson, executive secretary of the Women's Home and Foreign Mission Society, A. M. E. Zion Church; Rufus E. Clement, president of Atlanta University; Frederick A. Clement, professor of physics at West Virginia State College; Ruth G. Bond, wife of the director of the Inter-American Education Foundation in Haiti; George W. Clement, a Red Cross recreation director in Italy; Maj. James A. Clement, Army chaplain on leave from Hood Theological Seminary; and Emma C. Walker, Tuskegee Institute English professor.

What a testimony of true motherhood.

The Palestine Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of Wednesday, May 1, 1946:

THE PALESTINE REPORT

For 4 months an Anglo-American committee has been conducting an exhaustive inquiry into the problem of whether Palestine can provide a haven for the Jewish survivors of the Nazi-Fascist reign of terror. Its answer, delivered to the world last night, is an emphatic "yes."

The committee recommends, without ifs or buts, that 100,000 certificates be authorized immediately for admission of Jews to Palestine; "that these certificates be awarded as far as possible in 1946 and that actual immigration be pushed forward as rapidly as conditions will permit."

Neither Britain nor the United States is legally bound to accept these proposals. But the moral obligation to follow the committee's recommendations is very strong. It will be difficult indeed for the British to refuse to open the gates of Palestine after the publication of this report.

The Arab world is certain to react as violently to this report as it has to similar suggestions in the past. One Arab leader has already threatened to resist Jewish immigrants as invaders, and this threat cannot be ignored. But the committee's findings that the doors of Palestine can and should be opened will put the heaviest kind of pressure on the British to accept this risk for the sake of doing justice to the homeless and stateless Jews of Europe.

The Challenge to the Christian Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge to the Christian Press," which I delivered before the Associated Church Press at Washington, D. C., on April 25, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO THE CHRISTIAN PRESS

I am happy to speak to a segment of the Fourth Estate of which it has been said that it is the press' function "to comfort the afflicted and to afflict the comfortable."

Goethe, speaking of liberty of the press in 1809, said:

"What have the Germans gained by their boasted freedom of the press, except the liberty to abuse each other?"

I do not think that Goethe's criticism characterizes you gentlemen. Rather, you are pledged to sustain religion, liberty, and law.

Carlisle said on one occasion:

"The true Church of England at this moment lies in the editors of its newspapers. These preach to the people, daily, weekly."

Wendell Phillips on one occasion said:

"The papers of New York do more to govern this country than the White House at Washington."

The importance of a free press was stressed by our own Thomas Jefferson, when he said:

"Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

There have been those, like William Pitt, who, because of the lambasting which he received, said:

"The press is like the air, a chartered libertine."

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESS

On the other hand, how true it is that "man does not live by bread alone, but by every word of truth that procedeth out of the mouth of God."

Each of us is a conveyer of things of the spirit or things material. The only difference between men in that respect is the size of the audience they contact. The responsibility of one who manages a newspaper or publication, who edits a sheet that goes into the home where growing minds are impacted, is a great responsibility indeed. For every newspaperman or publisher, I would cite the words of Paul:

"Follow after the things which make for peace wherewith one may edify another."

The words "make for peace"—peace in the family, the home, among neighbors, in the State, and internationally—are quite a challenge. Those things certainly fall into the second category: "Things wherewith one may edify another."

Paul gives a clear and definite definition of those things when he says:

"Whatsoever things are true, whatsover things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsover things are pure, whatsover things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report: if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, think on these things."

What a directive to put at the masthead of a paper! Certainly these ideas, if made dynamic in a newspaper, would make for peace and the edification of another.

THE EASTER MESSAGE 365 DAYS A YEAR

We have just celebrated Easter. The message of Easter is that life has continuity. There is no death. On Easter morn, 2000 years ago, death, which ignorant humanity thought was the end of existence, was exposed as a fraud. We know now that God looks after His own.

At the first Eastertide, light broke through the darkness of human thinking, and it has continued to break through to befogged humanity. We know that the spirit of man is indestructible; ultimately, man only lays aside the shell.

But we know also that it is the job of each of us to clear away hate and fear and anxiety in our personal lives—to break the man-made shackles and limitations that would enslave man. It is our function to resurrect our spirit from the debris of mortal living and mortal thinking.

Was not that what the Galilean meant when He said,

"I am the Light of the World."

Did He not tell us that by His Light—"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life"—man can break through the darkness of man's prejudices, man's distrust, man's suspicions, of man-made conditions and situations—yes, of war itself—and could fill his days with joy and growth and accomplishment.

The world needs the message of Easter not simply one day in the year but 365 days. It must find the way to rise from its tomb and roll away the stone, the national jealousies, obstructions, and impediments, in order to go forth and rebuild and repair and establish peace among the nations.

The world must clear away the road blocks to peace. It must tap the power of spiritual energy that is here.

You will remember Moses was told to "go down into Egypt and free My people." And he said: "Who am I, Lord?" But something happened to him and it must happen to us of this day and generation. He was told "My presence shall go with thee," and he sensed the power and did the job.

The religious press can play a great part (and I believe it is now playing such a part but that it can play a still greater part) in helping mankind to be resurrected from man-made tombs—famine, crime, and war.

CHRIST CONFRONTS INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The world today has been contracted; it is a small world now. It is filled with anguish and need, and we of this blessed Nation must not forget the injunction: "Feed My sheep."

This may call for personal sacrifice of material things. But such sacrifice will be simply throwing bread upon the water which will return a thousandfold.

Today we are very much concerned with our international relations. You remember that when the Master walked the earth, He recognized that His job here was to impact the individual. He said:

"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

He realized that only as the individual is lifted up are the nations and the world lifted up. And by lifted up we mean an appreciation of and a demonstration of the great verity of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Two thousand years have gone by, and in every generation the human race has witnessed wars and rumors of wars, and down through the years nations have sought by compacts, treaties, and leagues, to find a solution to international conflicts through such mechanism.

Always through these generations we have had the teachings of Christ, but apparently mankind has had only a flimsy grasp on their real meaning.

Today we are confronted with the same situation. No human mechanism will do the job until the nations have become imbued with the will and desire and purpose to not only live up to their contractual obligations, but to demonstrate a deeper appreciation of the great truth taught by the Master Galilean—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

This calls for a spiritual rebirth that will make us Americans competent to meet the tremendous pressures at home and the tremendous pressures from abroad—a world hungry, in chaos, with the old fears and hatreds at a boiling point, and where restrictions in trade and unfair practices obtain.

What is needed is a spiritual renaissance in all of us. This means straight thinking. We can't become mentally unpoised or panicky. It is a good thing to follow the Master's directive to "Fear not and rejoice always."

We have to get rid of our prejudices and our intolerances. We have to recondition our faith so that it will be adequate to meet those forces which would tear this country apart, as well as break the international cords that we hope now are being woven into international ties which will never break.

Woodrow Wilson found that it was very difficult to translate into concrete human action great spiritual principles among the nations. The same difficulty confronts us today, and yet I believe the problem is not insuperable if mankind will become filled with the spirit of the Nazarene.

In the Song of Solomon we read:

"Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines, for our vines have tender grapes."

That is a mighty good suggestion for each and all of us—to get rid of the "foxes" that destroy our own equanimity and make life miserable for each of us at times. It is these same foxes working on the international scale that destroy the tender grapes of international cooperation and collaboration. Green, distrust, bigotry, class hatred, selfishness, smugness are some of those forces about which we are talking.

Our big problem today can be phrased in this manner: How to maintain vital and dynamic Christianity and the Republic. They are two in one. Destroy one and the other is gone.

REALIZING THE KINGDOM OF GOD WITHIN US

During trouble or stress, such as we experienced during the recent world conflict, mankind turns to God for help and guidance like the sunflower turns to the sun. The channel used is prayer. There is nothing comparable to it for easing pressure and strain on men. Mankind has left the source of all power—prayer and Christian action, miserably undeveloped. We have forgotten the directive: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all things shall be added."

In the past we Americans have come through every crisis in our history. Why? Because of the American character made up of self-reliance, industry, ingenuity, and faith. We need a rebirth in that direction in order to meet adequately those forces which would tear this country apart and destroy the Republic.

The problem is ours. We can't "pass the buck" to others or to future generations. It is here for solution. It is an individual problem and a national problem. So let us individually and nationally destroy the "little foxes." Let us know and act accordingly on the established verity that it is not by legislation, but by increased spiritual knowledge and activity, that the way will be opened for us to advance. This is the way that the race can be uplifted and our problem solved.

Other nations have gone down in our day. We have seen their economic and political structure evaporate. Ours must not go that way. And it will not if we pursue the way given us by the Galilean. We know His presence is available, as it was with Moses, to guide us individually and as a nation. If we follow that course, we will demonstrate to the world the leadership which I believe God Almighty has chosen for this people. The problem is ours. We must meet it head-on.

Lady Astor of Britain, speaking several weeks ago to the congressional women, said that the most important thing for mankind is a greater knowledge of God.

The Bible is replete with this directive to mankind, and time and time again the Scriptures speak of those "who knew God." It also tells of those who knew not the Lord.

You remember the prophet looking into the future hails the coming of the day when "truth and righteousness shall triumph."

Such he characterizes as a day "when the knowledge of the Lord will fill the earth as the waters cover the sea." It is for such a day that we hope. Yes; it is for such a day that we work.

CONCLUSION

And so, it is particularly the job of you publishers to siphon into the body politic and economic, the cement—the Christian concept and the concept of the Republic—that will strengthen this Nation and make it the leader that she was set apart to be.

Is the British Loan Good Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Is the British Loan Good Business?" delivered by Mr. William L. Batt, president, SKF Industries, Inc., Philadelphia, and former vice chairman of the War Production Board, on May 2, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have always felt that the American people would overwhelmingly favor the British loan if they saw the whole picture clearly, and particularly, if they saw it to be in our own interest.

Fortunately, more and more of us are understanding the problems of world trade and realize that the United States has the biggest stake of any nation in world prosperity. Most of us are ready to accept the conclusion that we cannot have maximum employment here at home for any considerable time unless we also have a large volume of export and import trade.

You and I do not have to be experienced international economists to know that over half of the world's trade is handled between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States, and to agree that if this half of the world's trade goes ahead soundly, the other half is likely to follow suit. Just as sure as shooting, if our half is disorganized in the way it almost certainly would be if the loan to Britain were rejected, economic disorder everywhere is sure to fester and grow. The British loan is a form of insurance against war, for we all know that would-be Hitlers and Mussolinis are the first to thrive in the soil of economic discontent.

Now why is Britain's foreign trade so dependent on getting this loan from the United States, and how does it directly concern us? I shall try to highlight the principal reasons as simply as I can in these few minutes.

Britain depends heavily on her export trade to live because she is not nearly so self-sufficient as we are. A third of her food, all of her cotton and her iron ore and other equally vital essentials, she must buy abroad. The principal way she can pay for these things is through the things she is able to produce and sell abroad. If she has large exports, she will be a large buyer; if her exports are low, her purchases are low.

Though the war in Europe has been over 1 year this week, the people of Britain at this very moment are voluntarily denying themselves of clothing, food, and many other necessities in a desperate effort to build up the foreign trade they sacrificed during the war.

You and I had a considerable part in cutting Britain's export trade. When Pearl Harbor hit us, Britain's war production was in full swing. Ours was just beginning. We still had a civilian economy. So the combined economic boards on which I served as an American representative made a proposal to the British. We asked them to transfer the manufacture of a great many items required by the British market to American factories already producing such items.

That freed many British factories, located virtually on the battle front, to produce more materials for the Allied armed forces. It saved shipping and accelerated deliveries to the fighting fronts. In addition, it released many British factory workers for military service who had been tied up on civilan production.

You may be surprised to know that Britain cut her export trade about two-thirds during the war period while ours became larger than ever before, although, of course, much of that was financed by lend-lease.

Of course, Britain could have taken another line. She could have said to us, "You are in the war now, and it will be up to you to supply munitions of war faster and in larger amounts, and a larger percentage of your manpower for the armed forces, because the amount of your national income and the percentage of your population which you are devoting to the war is far less than ours." Britain could have said, "It is too much to ask us to give up the export markets which have always been so important to us and will be again after the war. Why should we let you build up an export trade at the expense of ours?"

But the British did not take that line. The result was that when the war was over her export trade was only a small amount of what it had been normally, and she had seen the business go to us. And with the quick termination of lend-lease she was left with desperate needs at home, with something over 2,000,000 houses destroyed and damaged, her shelves bare, her belt already about as tight as it could be. Don't let's forget that this was all a part of Britain's contribution toward winning the war, and it was a contribution as material as the Battle of Britain and the victories in north Africa.

Today Britain has not the dollars to buy the things so badly needed for her reconstruction and reconversion, or even to eat as well as before the war. To the British housewife with two fresh eggs a month, dried eggs from America were a godsend during the war. With the war over and lend-lease terminated, how were they to be paid for? They had to be cut from the ration. I could go on at great length, but the end would always be the same: Britain had not enough dollars.

On our side, as a matter of Government policy, we are keenly anxious to have the rest of the world cooperate with us in wiping out as many of the wartime restrictions on trade as quickly as possible. We want trade to flow freely in the good old American tradition. We don't like "sterling blocs" or "dollar blocs" or "ruble blocs." We want the world bank and the world fund to begin operating, and we want international agreements for freer trade that will help us and our people immediately and directly.

British tradition is soldily behind these things because free trade has made Britain great. With the support of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States we can probably bring these things about. But if Britain's financial condition is such that she cannot afford to join with us in such a program, there is no hope of success.

The loan to Britain is not a gift any more than the credit that any businessman extends to his customers. I am convinced that Britain can pay back this loan if we let her, and I haven't any doubt but that she will be determined to pay it back. Don't be misled by those who point to the fact that Britain did not fully repay her First World War debts. America had a large part in making it impossible for Britain to pay those earlier debts because we would not take her goods.

I'm glad to see that the leaders of organized labor are now the first to go on record in recognizing the value of import trade as well as export trade in furnishing more employment, and in agreeing that the principal way that trade can be financed is by the acceptance of goods. I think the American people have learned a lesson.

So I say to you with all the sincerity of which I am capable and based upon years of intimate experience with the British, that they will be just as anxious to pay that loan back as we are to have it paid. They know it will make employment for them at home. They are anxious to help us liberate the trade of the world because that will make a more prosperous Britain. I say also that it will be a good investment for the American taxpayer who knows now from bitter experience that a prosperous world is the only kind of world in which the United States can live in peace.

There is no sentiment in this conclusion—no desire to help the British just because

they are nice people or because they were our allies. It is simply my judgment that the loan to Britain is good business for all Americans.

Corregidor—Four Years After

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago Old Glory was slowly pulled down behind the ramparts of "The Rock." Corregidor—the guardian fort of Manila Bay—had surrendered after 6 days of merciless shelling and bombing.

On this, the anniversary of that solemn tragedy of the American and Filipino peoples, I might speak of the greatness of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur—the man who left the Philippines in defeat only to return in triumph. I might speak of Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, whose patriotic zeal to live for his country survived the bestiality of Japanese prison camps. Yes. I might speak for these men; but, should I speak for them, my voice would be a whisper, unheard above the echoing praises of history.

So it is not of MacArthur or for Wainwright that I would speak today. It is of the men under their command: The American privates and noncommissioned officers, the Filipino Scouts. This day belongs to them. It is for Scout Juan Mendoza, who watched the Flag of Freedom descend as he unashamedly wept. It is for Sergeant Pinckney, of South Carolina, who writhed in malarial fever in the hospital catacombs of Corregidor as the Japanese swarmed ashore. It is for Pvt. Gus Anderson, of Nebraska, who did not see our flag being lowered because he had died on duty during the enemy bombardment.

It would be a presumption for us—yes; even a sacrilege—to assume that it is within our poor earthly power to honor these men. They have honored themselves. The honor of all Americans has been preserved by what they did and by what they gave.

Let us then reverently remember the men in the ranks at Corregidor on this, their day.

Let us never forget the debt eternal owed to the veterans of Corregidor who walk among us today. Let us treasure the memory of those who are not here, those who left their b'ood upon the Rock.

Four years after Yorktown, graves in Massachusetts and in Virginia were marked with the name of the engagement in which the heroes fell. Four years after Gettysburg, the last green home of fighting men from Louisiana and Vermont told of Pickett's charge. Yet, today, 4 years after one of the most crucial defenses in the life of this Nation, no cemetery—above a busy city or beyond a quiet hamlet—has within it the name "Corregidor." This shall, this must, be remedied.

In the stormy seas of controversy at home and abroad Americans need an abiding firmness to which to cling. I present to you the firmness of sacrifice and service—Corregidor, the Rock—where men in the ranks died that their fellow men might rise from the ranks.

The Navy's Divergence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World Herald, one of the most important newspapers in the Midwest.

The question of the unification of our armed forces is one of the most controversial questions pending before Congress today. It is important that the matter should be fully explored and debated not only by the Members of Congress but also by the citizens of this country whoever they may be. Certainly those who are better informed on this very imporant subject than any other group of our citizens, namely our naval authorities, should not be denied the right to express their convictions on a matter of such far-reaching importance to the safety of our country and our people.

In view of the fact that this matter is now being discussed in the Senate, this editorial is very timely. It expresses very clearly, I believe, the point of view and the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

The editorial follows:

THE NAVY'S DIVERGENCE

Suppose you were an officer in the United States Navy and had played a part, to the best of your ability, in the destruction of the Japanese Empire.

Suppose you had watched the submarines take their deadly toll, task forces smash Japanese outposts, carrier-based planes drive the once-feared Zeroes from the air.

Suppose you had been convinced by your experiences that, in the present state of world affairs, a strong Navy was essential to the security of the Republic—the Republic for which you had seen so many young men give their lives.

Then suppose some civilian—perhaps the President of the United States—were to advance a plan for the reorganization of the armed services which, in your opinion, would cripple the Navy as a fighting force.

What would you do?

Would you say, Oh well, let it go, it's none of my business, I am just a fighting man?

Or would you, as a patriot, do your utmost to call the attention of your countrymen to what you deemed to be a terrible mistake?

President Truman thinks you should keep your mouth shut. Or at any rate not to say or do anything that could be ascribed as "propaganda" or "lobbying." It is all right, he said at his recent press conference, for naval officers to express honest opinions, but they must not agitate. Must not do anything that could be interpreted as insubordination or lese majesty.

The distinction between "propaganda" and expressing "honest opinions" is a thin one. Probably most naval officers won't try to draw it. Either, one may surmise, they will shut up or get out of the service.

That will make matters very comfortable for Mr. Truman. The best informed opposition to his little plan will be silenced. "Divergence," to borrow an expression from the Russians, will be quelled. No doubt Premier Stalin will be filled with admiration. Perhaps the ashes of Adolf Hitler will stir a little in the wind.

But one wonders whether Mr. Truman's way is the best way, the way most likely to result in a sound decision for America. In this country we have always cherished our right to disagree on political matters, our right to raise particular hell in any manner that, to us individually, seems warranted.

And now—discipline. If the boss wants it, you better go along. Even if you are an expert on the science of modern naval war you better defer to the judgment of an ex-artilleryman of World War I. Or else.

Mr. Truman's point of view is easily understood. But the point of view of the Nation and its future security ought to have some consideration too.

Communism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Boston on April 27, 1946, before the New England Conference of Republican Women:

From time to time I hear someone ask: "Well, are there really as many Communists in the United States as claimed, and, if so, are they really so dangerous to our liberties as they are reported to be?"

These questions are just as vital to our welfare and the welfare of our children, and our children's children as the question:

"Are there really atom bombs, and are they really so dangerous and destructive as they are reported to be?"

Our American system of government, our whole system of economy, all we have, our liberties, our religious and political freedom—all are wrapped up in the answer to that question of whether or not there are many Communists in the United States, and whether they are so dangerous as they are reported to be or not.

I am convinced there are many Communists, grim, fanatical, determined, ruthless, cunning schemers, in the United States, and I believe, further, that they are more dangerous than most persons suppose them to be.

The time was—and we are still prone to think of Communists and the communistic movement in that light—when Communists were a furtive band of men and women who were without funds, who met secretly in cellars or in garrets, or in dim, smoky, unclean dives and restaurants to plot fanatical and hopeless plans against the Nation. That time has passed, communism in the United States today is a cleverly planned, bold, insolent, well-financed, skillfully managed political and revolutionary movement, reaching out in every direction, sending out propagandists; using the most scientific methods

of persuasion over the radio, through the press, through magazines, by means of lectures, and even in a dangerously large section of our pulpit and our schools and colleges.

There are not dozens, nor hundreds, nor thousands of these trained and fanatical Communists. There are hundreds of thousands of them and although they are fanatical it is with a cool, deep determination that they are going to overthrow our American system of government, economy, and society. They have their training centers, their schools for agitators, their indoctrination system.

These Communists are reaching out to try to contaminate the ranks of labor, of the veterans, as well as of the church-going people, the students and their teachers everywhere.

It is an alarming fact, too, that there are many very cleverly organized and operated Communist front organizations which appear more or less innocent but which are deadly serious in their purpose to wreck our system of government bring chaos in our economy and reduce our people to the status of slaves of the State—as they are today in Russia. These active full-colored red organizations mean to overthrow our American political, economic, social, and religious system by the ballot boxes if they can, but if they fail in that, they are determined upon bloody revolution to accomplish their ends.

At the outer edge of this communistic movement are many sincere and innocent, but completely deceived and misled individuals, many of them high in the social scale. Some even are preachers; some are public officials; some are teachers; some are just earnest rank and file citizens who have been persuaded and defrauded into believing that communism will mend all the ills and injustices they see around them and against which they instinctively rebel.

In this process of attempting to communize this country these alien ideologists have perfected the most remarkably clever techniques. Today communism as politics is "big politics." As an infiltrating group movement it is "big" movement. These Communists are no longer content to meet in cellars and dives and get out smudgy, gray printed sheets and pamphlets. They issue well-written, well-printed, beautifully typed, cleverly designed literature that would deceive the very elect.

Now, where do they get the money to do all this?

First, they have deluded a good many wealthy persons in this country who have provided them with millions of dollars, not realizing what these Communists actually mean to do. Then they have received such recognition in high places that they have become not only respectable, politically, but actually sought after. They have insinuated their henchmen into key places in government. Much patronage, many favors, much control over business is exercised by men and women who have wormed their way into posts of influence, power, and authority in the Government.

Then, too, since the United States of America—your America and my America—is the richest prize on the face of the globe today, foreign schemers have sent their best brains into this country and have sent over funds to finance this dreadful movement to wreck our American system, take over our country, and reduce us to a condition of slaves to a minority who will call themselves the State if their plans succeed.

Believe me, if these statements sound incredible, they are nevertheless still true. This Communist movement in America is a game, the greatest history ever saw, for a prize—the control of the riches, the Government, and the people of the greatest nation history ever saw.

Why do these Communists want to wreck this Nation, our Government, our economy, our society instead of becoming part of it? It is because they are obsessed by a lust for power and riches—not merely a few dollars, not just financial security and an estate—but the riches of a whole state, the riches of an entire nation. Hitler, Mussolini—they are two of the same ilk who were so insatiably lustful for power and riches that they were willing to rule or ruin their own countries, and, having ruled, they did ruin their own countries.

Let me say to you that the first step toward communism is socialism—the abolition of the right of property, of your right to own your own homes, an automobile, a washing machine, or a radio. The second step is communism—and the third step is fascism. They are all of a piece; they are every one the deadly enemy of our American system of government, of our American system of economy under which the poorest boy or girl may aspire to become rich, of our American system of society, under which, generally speaking, there is more understanding, kindliness, tolerance and cooperation among the different stratas of society than in any other nation on earth.

In this ruthless, grim fight that is being waged by these Communists, terminological distortions in our very language have taken place. There are liberals, of course. There are liberals who perhaps disagree with us as to many things about our Government or our economy or our society. But they are willing to attain their aims of reform—or what they may believe to be reforms—by our American process of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. That is the essence of our system of government under the Constitution. That is the essence of our governmental system of checks and balances. That is the system by which men may most nearly arrive at the exact truth—that system of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. That system gives due consideration and adequate hearing to the rights of minorities. But the Communists want none of that. They want to sit at the top and issue the orders, and any disagreement or discussion does not lead to compromise under Communist rule as it is practiced, but to a concentration camp, the noose, or the firing squad before the wall.

These Communists who want to deceive the people all call themselves liberals. They want to overthrow our government. They want to wreck our economy. They want to destroy our system of society. But let anyone oppose them or criticize their intentions and objectives and they promptly howl "reactionaries." The modern definition of a reactionary is anybody who disagrees with a Communist.

Now let us see what real liberals and liberalism are, actually:

The heroic men and women who crossed the stormy ocean in cockleshell boats to find liberty from autocratic oppression and totalitarian tyranny were liberals.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence were liberals.

The framers of the Constitution were liberals. They founded the most liberal government ever conceived by man and planted upon the face of this globe.

On the other hand, totalitarianism and tyranny by an individual or a group at the top is the oldest form of oppression known to man. Yet these Communists want to go back to what they call "a dictatorship of the proletariat."

The fact is no such communism exists in Russia. The effort to operate communism was abandoned years ago in Russia. Today, and for years, Josef Stalin and his little group of top administrators are and have been absolute despots. There is no common equality of citizens except the common term of "comrade." Foremen get much more than the rank and file workers receive. Faster workers actually get more money per piece in piecework than the slower workers do. In the American Army a lieutenant receives three times the pay of a private. A recent report revealed that in the Russian Army a lieutenant receives 13 times the pay of a private. I am speaking of second lieutenants, of course. To a Russian soldier the possession of a cheap wrist watch is something he will empty his pockets to achieve. You and I know that there was hardly a boy or girl in our armed services who did not have a very accurate wrist watch and thought little about it.

So instead of the lovely, gentle communism which these agitators in this country paint as a beneficent communism in Russia, concentration camps, oppression, the Ogpu and terrorism cover the land and are a part of the everyday life of those who live behind the iron curtain.

If communism were working so well in Russia, just exactly why, do you suppose, the Russian rulers keep that iron curtain about Russia. Why would they not rather display to the world the blessings, the accomplishments, the fine results they claim for the communism which these American Government wreckers preach?

So then, our forefathers—the founding fathers, who were true liberals—founded upon this continent the most liberal government man ever knew.

In 150 years under our liberal American system we have achieved the highest living levels, the highest wages, the best working conditions, the greatest production, the most luxuries for the masses, the best system of railroads and highways, the most automobiles, refrigerators, and other material comforts, the greatest degree of religious, political, and social liberty ever achieved by any people in any length of time anywhere on the earth. Why should we let these scheming Communists persuade us to give up all of that to embrace a form of absolutism which inevitably would wreck every one of those advantages?

These Communists argue that we must change our system of government, economy, and society because it is outmoded. A democracy such as ours cannot wage war or defend itself against the more efficient dictatorships either of fascism or of the proletariat, they assert. Our economy has matured they insist—whatever that may mean—and we must change to a new one. Let's look at the facts about all this and see whether or not there is a shred of truth in these communistic assertions.

Not only have we achieved all of the wonderful advantages and comforts of life, all the liberties and the privileges which I outlined a moment ago, but we have proved the efficiency of our American system in war. Let me remind you that for 40 years the war lords of Japan were preparing for the struggle they knew they would one day wage against the western world. For 20 years Mussolini drove Italy, boot and spur, getting ready for the war he knew was coming. For 20 years Joseph Stalin drove Russia to prepare for a war he knew would come. For 12 years Hitler and his Nazi thugs drove the enslaved German people day and night getting ready for the war against civilization Hitler knew he would one day wage.

What of America? In three short years, under our free Government, free industry, free labor, free agriculture, our free people of every religious faith, every political creed, every race and color turned to, overcame that lead of 40 years and 20 years and 12 years and put us on an offensive war basis. What else did we do? We fought two wars, one in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific. The Pacific war we fought lone-handed without any help from any other nation, and at the same time we sent billions piled upon billions of dollars' worth of lend-lease help—

gifts—to Britain, Russia and all other nations fighting on our side. We sent more than $9,000,000,000 worth of arms, munitions, machines, material and foodstuffs to Joseph Stalin in Russia. We sent more than $30,000,000,000 of the same kind of lend-lease gift supplies to Britain. And even that is but a small part of the miracle we performed. While we did all that we kept up our own living standards.

Now what is happening?

The despised America, the inefficient governmental, economic, and social system these Government-wrecking Communists prate about, scorn, and berate is being asked to lend billions—I should say give—to Britain, to Russia, to France, to China, to all the other countries, at the very same time we are undertaking to carry probably half the burden of feeding a distressed and starving world. That is the kind of government, that is the kind of an efficient economy, that is the kind of an efficient social system these scheming plotters would like to overthrow in order to get their greedy clutches on the riches, the property, the loveliness that is America, in order to become dictators over our people. Whenever you hear anybody talking about the advantages of communism over Americanism, about the advantage of a dictatorship of the proletariat, about the superior efficiency of the Russian system over the American system, you tell him that every fact of history—recent history—of the very things that are happening now in the world—give the lie to all he says to belittle the United States.

We have the most magnificent, the most efficient, the most progressive, the most liberal, the most scientific system of production, of government, of society, of politics in this whole wide world, and every fact of history in the First and Second World Wars proves it, as do all the peacetime accomplishments we have achieved. We are the most blessed people in the most blessed land on God's footstool.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. We must be more vigilant against the wicked, dangerous menace of these Communists. These anarchists would wreck our Nation to produce chaos so they can take over and loot and enslave and rule. It must not be, and we, the citizens, are the ones who must prevent it.

The heroic men and women who have come back from the wars in which they endured indescribable horrors and trials to defend liberty and free government abroad now are compelled to fight for it at home. They won the war; now they must win the peace—and we must help them.

You ask, "What can we women do about all this?"

We women, the special guardian of religion, which communism brags about, more in peace than in war.

We vote; we can support candidates who stand for—I mean actually stand for—the continuation of our American system of government, economy, and society.

We can speak out and speak with authority, knowing we are right, whenever and wherever we hear some Communist, some Communist sympathizer, or some deluded citizen who thinks communism is what it is not, tries to cry down our American system.

You must speak up, you must defend your democracy whenever the question is raised. If the majority of the citizens do not stand firm in defense of our system, then we will lose that system.

If ever our American system of freedom is extinguished, the light of the world will truly go out and the hope which lights the hearts of all who love liberty, godliness, and progress will become darkness.

Communism would stamp out religion. We women must uphold religion. We must stand by our faith for the sake of the world.

We must stand by America for the sake of the world.

Democratic Party Dissensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the country, and particularly Washington, was highly entertained as well as enlightened by the turmoil within the Democratic National Committee and the ever widening breach between the left-wing element within the party and the conservative group spearheaded by the southern congressional delegation. The troublesome pot boiled over when a young lady, an employee of the committee, writing in the party organ of the women's section, said:

> Those who voted for the Case bill (labor bill) voted against the American people.

Inasmuch as a hundred or more Democrats voted for the Case bill, this statement coming out of the Democratic National Committee caused many good Jeffersonian Democrats in Congress to be incensed with anger and cry out for the liquidation of Bob Hannegan as national chairman.

But after admitting mistakes and due apologies and the discharge of the young lady who wrote the article, the matter quieted down. Then after a few short days it happened again. Out of the national committee came a letter to all Democratic county chairmen of all congressional incumbents in Congress, admonishing them to select good men as candidates for Congress.

You can well understand why this action would cause the blood pressure of the Democratic Members of Congress to rise above the boiling point, and it did just that. A caucus was called for the consideration of the acts of the committee and party leaders were loud in their condemnation of the national chairman. However, and again, after many apologies and the assurance that it was a mistake, political murder and mayhem were averted. The significance of the whole show is plainly evident.

While we know that Bob Hannegan is too smart politically to pull such a boner, the fact remains that it did occur and the parties who were responsible knew exactly what they were doing. The young lady was on the pay roll of the committee, wrote from her heart, and her words run true to the left-wing pattern. The same is true of the person who sent out the letter. It was an honest effort on the part of the responsible party to begin a purge of all Democrats who dared to vote their convictions. It all adds up to this: The Democratic National Committee is filled up with representatives of the Political Action Committee—the spearhead of the communistic political movement in this country. The influence has been there for a long time. Now it is bursting out at the seams and can no longer be laughed off.

A bit of news from Wisconsin is further evidence of dissension within the party. Out in Milwaukee, Charles J. Michalak had resigned as president of the Young Democrats of Wisconsin and announced that he was joining the Republican Party. Michalak called on "all liberal-minded Young Democrats to join the Republican Party as the party that now stands for government by the people."

He went on to say that the Democratic Party was being taken over by left-wingers, and that the Young Democrats group itself was loaded up with members who were loyal to Russia first and to the United States second, if at all.

To continue on this subject and present the Republican Party as one of true liberalism and as representing sound American thinking and traditions, I submit to you an editorial from the Jackson Herald, published in Ripley, W. Va.

The editorial follows:

REPUBLICAN LIBERALS

Most impressive was the opening radio talk by B. CARROLL REECE, the new Republican national chairman on last Saturday night. We were rather glad that Mr. REECE chose to proclaim the Republicans as the true liberals of modern days.

"From its very beginning," said Mr. REECE, "the Republican Party has been dedicated to the freedom and preservation of human freedom. The party came into being for the express purpose of freeing a large element of our population from outright chattel slavery. The party is determined that no new forms of slavery shall succeed the old. The Republican Party is the liberal party in America.

"In recent years there has been a tendency to confuse liberalism with radicalism. A real liberal fights for the rights and liberties of the individual against any attempt to disregard or destroy them, whether by a monarch, a self-anointed dictator, or a ruthless political machine in Washington. Certainly the record of Republican Members of Congress, and of Republican governors in many of our States during the past decade and more, proves conclusively the Republican Party has remained true to its liberal tradition.

"This is true liberalism in contrast to the philosophy and practices of the Red reactionaries of today who have sought to steal the name liberal.

"The men who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution certainly were liberals. The Republican Party still believes in that Declaration of Independence and in that Constitution as did George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. All of these men made it clear that any monopoly of power in the central government would be dangerous, if not fatal, to American freedom."

Such an impressive statement by the new GOP chairman is bound to win him the respect of the members of his own party and it doubtless will be attractive, also, to the Jeffersonian Democrats who are galled by having their traditions and principles flouted by Communist-minded invaders of their party.

For Communists and fellow-travelers to style themselves "liberals," is a mockery. A Communist totalitarian dictatorship which regiments every man and woman is just about as liberal as a thumbscrew. Totalitarian government is not liberal, it is not radical but reactionary, because it is a harking back to tyranny such as was old when Caesar Augustus was in his heyday.

Mr. Reece is therefore quite correct when he hails the Republicans as the true liberals of modern times. Our republican form of government with freedom guaranteed to the individual man is but a little more than 150 years old. It is still the youngest and most radical idea in the world. Nearly every other

segment of the world has reverted to some kind of totalitarianism or regimented socialism such as has been practiced so frequently in Washington in the last 14 years, and which we see in effect today in the liberty-destroying OPA. Far from being radical, the OPA is reactionary and is just going back to the practices of the Emperor Diocletian 1,500 years ago.

Expediting Roll Calls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the recommendations contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and under permission heretofore granted, I wish to insert the following editorial, which appeared in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of April 26, 1946:

WHERE IOWA IS AHEAD OF CONGRESS

In the last Congress, each Member of the House spent the equivalent of 30 five-hour legislative days just answering roll calls, according to Representative PLUMLEY, of Vermont. He suggests that the House adopt a modern electrical roll-call device to save time.

Congressmen complain of the tremendous burden of time-consuming demands now laid upon them—demands that make it difficult for them to familiarize themselves with proposed legislation, attend committee sessions, handle essential correspondence, perform special services for constituents, tend their political fences, and participate in regular sessions of the house.

Yet the house, like the senate, clings to a fusty tradition that it must or should be a slow-moving deliberative body, and it wastes almost countless man-hours to preserve that tradition.

An electrical roll call installation, such as has been in highly successful operation in the Iowa House of Representatives for many years (where the roll is less than a fourth as long as in the lower house of congress, and where attendance is probably much higher in percentage), would be a valuable addition to the congressional reform program offered by Senator LA FOLLETTE'S committee.

Congressmen don't ride to Washington from their districts on mule back, as they did a century ago or more. But they still vote as they did then.

First Mutiny on Alcatraz Island Occurred in 1936—Interesting Incidents in the History of the Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the First World War for a while I was stationed at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., near San Diego. At that time, under instructions, I delivered a prisoner to Alcatraz Island. While there, I learned something about the island.

Today one of the worst mutinies in prison history in the entire world is going on at that historic place. In view of the interest in Alcatraz Island at this time, I am inserting herewith a copy of an address delivered by me April 1, 1936, concerning my second visit to this island, which was 18 years after I had delivered a prisoner to Alcatraz Prison and during the time this first mutiny was in progress.

The address is as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. This bill provides for an appropriation for Federal prisons, including Alcatraz Island prison.

MY FIRST INTEREST IN ALCATRAZ ISLAND

In 1917, during the World War, I was in the Regular Army, and one morning received substantially the following written order:

"Corporal PATMAN. You are directed to take charge of prisoner (John Doe), who is sentenced by a general court-martial to serve 20 years at hard labor for evading the draft, and proceed at once with him to the United States Disciplinary Barracks, Alcatraz Island, San Francisco, Calif., and deliver him into the custody of the warden of said institution."

When we left the dock at San Francisco going toward the 12-acre rock prison 1½ miles from shore, the island was not visible, as the fog was exceedingly heavy and fog horns were blowing in every direction. After going through this dense fog for a while we landed at the island, and taking the prisoner 175 feet as near straight up as one can go, he was delivered into the custody of the warden. Considering the fact that one could see only a few feet and the fog horns were making such a terrific noise that one could hardly hear anyone speak, I was anxious to leave the island as quickly as possible.

I did, however, learn something about the history of this place. I was told that only one prisoner had ever escaped from the island. Many had tried to swim to shore but never succeeded. Their bodies were always found.

THE ONE PRISONER TO ESCAPE

The one prisoner who escaped was a trusty. One of the military officers on the island had died and his widow had ordered from San Francisco appropriate mourning clothes. The trusty was sent to the boat to receive this package. Immediately he went into the nearest hiding place in one of the buildings, put on the widow's clothing with black hat and black veil, and went back on the returning boat and sat with the other passengers until the boat landed at San Francisco, where he escaped.

This was more than 18 years ago. The island is now a Federal prison. At that time it was in charge of the War Department. There were trusties then. There are no trusties there now.

SIZE OF ISLAND

The "rock" as it is often called or the "gray pile" as some refer to it, is exactly 12 acres in size. Swirling tides and deep water surround it. There is not a grain of soil on the island that was not carried there in a sack nor vegetation of any kind except that grown in soil carried to the island. It is a solid rock, the top of which has been worked and chiseled down to the size of 12 acres and the apex is 175 feet above the level of the water.

VIEW FROM ALCATRAZ

From Alcatraz Island most any day except during a fog, the following places are plainly visible: The city of San Francisco, about 1½ miles away; the Golden Gate 2 miles away—Golden Gate Bridge is under construction. It has a 4,200-foot span with towers 746 feet high and will cost $35,000,000); Goat Island, a Navy training station, 2½ miles away; Oakland, another beautiful California city, 4 miles away; Berkeley, where the University of California is located, 4 miles away; the longest and most expensive bridge in the United States, extending from the mainland of California over San Francisco Bay, across Goat Island, through a long tunnel, to San Francisco (it is 8¼ miles long and will cost $70,000,000); Mount Tamalpais, a few miles to the northwest; the great redwood forest to the north, with the giant trees sufficiently large at the trunk for a roadway through which automobiles may be driven directly, and Sausalito to the northwest.

MOST SUCCESSFUL PRISON SYSTEM IN WORLD

I believe that we have the most successful prison system of any country in the world. Its success is due principally to the efforts of two men, the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Homer S. Cummings, and the Honorable Sanford Bates, Director of the Bureau of Prisons.

In 1930 Congress authorized the establishment of a Bureau of Prisons in the Department of Justice, together with several new institutions. In connection with this legislation it stated:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the said institutions be so planned and limited in size as to facilitate the development of an integrated Federal penal and correctional system which will assure the proper classification and segregation of Federal prisoners according to their character, the nature of the crime they have committed, their mental condition, and such other factors as should be taken into consideration in providing an individualized system of discipline, care, and treatment of the persons committed to such institutions."

In pursuance of this mandate the Bureau of Prisons has constructed and is administering a group of classified institutions. Boys of immature age are placed in the National Training School for Boys in Washington or in appropriate local juvenile institutions. Young men of the reformable type may be sent to the reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, or to the Southwestern Reformatory at El Reno, Okla. Women are in a separate institution at Alderson, W. Va. Prison camps have been established where prisoners who can be trusted are obliged to work at hard labor in the open air. One of the five penetentiaries has been reserved for persons convicted of the Drug Act, or suffering from drug addiction. Another penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., has been planned with the emphasis upon the educational requirements of the prisoners and is suitable for the more reformable type of penitentiary inmate. Even a hospital presided over by officers of the United States Public Health Service has been set apart at Springfield, Mo., for the treatment of insane Federal prisoners, those suffering from tuberculosis and other chronic degenerative diseases.

It was realized that a further classification should be made to provide for that small number of prisoners who do not readily accustom themselves to the discipline of the ordinary penitentiary, and especially for the agitators and disturbers—those who have led the life of crime and cannot be reconciled or resist the temptation to escape and are continually plotting to accomplish that end. These men are all guilty of serious crimes and their activities make it difficult for prison authorities to maintain discipline, and they retard the efforts of authorities to rehabilitate the greater percentage of our prison population. Therefore the Bureau of Prisons felt the need of an institution with maximum security devices where this group could be safely quartered. Alcatraz Island was converted into a place of safekeeping of America's most dangerous public enemies. Al Capone, "Machine-Gun" George Kelly, Harvey

Bailey, Albert Bates, John Paul Chase, and others are imprisoned there. A structurally escape-proof prison to serve the purpose was constructed.

AUTOMATIC GUN DETECTOR

The 600 old soft steel cell fronts in place while the institution was a disciplinary barracks for the Army were removed, and tool-proof steel with automatic locking devices replaced them. Tool-proof steel bars were installed in the windows. Tear-gas outlets were provided and a special group of trained, experienced guards were recruited from the other Federal penitentiaries. A zone in the water was marked out with buoys into which boats are forbidden to enter. A new invention known as the automatic gun detector was placed at the dock and in the doorways to the cell blocks, which records the presence of any secreted metal on the person of any individual who passes through these openings. New guard towers were erected, floodlights put in place, and additional barriers built around the steep cliffs of the little island. Maintenance shops and the laundry provide work opportunities. Gun galleries at each end of the cell block control the interior of the building, while the island is controlled by a system of towers connected by overhead walks. The Alcatraz Island Penitentiary is intended as a place of maximum security for the incarceration of the worst type of Federal prisoner.

WARDEN JOHNSTON

I believe that the Department was fortunate in being able to secure the services of James A. Johnston, of San Francisco, as warden of the new prison. He has had experience in both of the large California State penitentiaries, San Quentin and Folsom, and later was a successful businessman and respected civic leader in the bay section. He has been warden of Alcatraz Prison since it was established, after being taken over by the Department of Justice from the War Department.

RECENT VISIT TO ISLAND

Less than 90 days ago, along with Hon. James A. De Paoli, vice mayor of Oakland, and the Honorable Chris N. Jespersen, member of the State Senate in California, I visited this prison again. Warden Johnston, at the request of Attorney General Cummings, showed us through the institution, and I was very much impressed with the following:

First. Cleanliness and beautiful appearance of grounds and buildings.

Second. Adequate hospital facilities with all up-to-date, modern equipment, with good doctors and nurses in charge.

Third. The good, well-prepared food that was served to the prisoners.

Fourth. The comfortable, single-cell quarters.

Fifth. Proper rules and regulations for the management of an institution that has in its charge 259 of the worst criminals on earth.

Sixth. The sympathetic and kindly spirit manifested by Warden Johnston for the prisoners consistent, however, with safety, prevention of trouble, and escape.

Seventh. The absolute impossibility of prisoners escaping.

Naturally the discipline at Alcatraz Penitentiary is more onerous than at the other prisons, but Warden Johnston can be relied upon to carry out the instructions of the Bureau that no brutality or inhumanity shall be practiced. The prison has a chaplain and library books are available. Steady work is provided for the prisoners. Although the prison is built for more than 500 inmates, it is now occupied by only 259. This is a hopeful sign since there are now more than 14,000 prisoners in the Federal system.

THE FIRST MUTINY

At the time I was on the island, the first mutiny since the prison was established was in progress. Over 100 inmates were in sullen rows of the Nation's one-time top racketeers, crouched in darkened cells on this rock island, fighting the work-or-starve ultimatum. As boats would come by the nearest point allowed to this grim island, these 100 and more inmates, the Nation's most desperate criminals, would scream and shriek out in unison, often shouting curses. The leaders were placed in solitary confinement and the others were kept in special isolation cells. No violence occurred. The uprising involved almost half the prison population. It was soon stopped and no disorders or disruption of routine have occurred since.

NO PUBLICITY

Newspapers are not permitted on Alcatraz Island. There is only one outside telephone, and it is in the warden's office. The prisoners may read books and magazines considered suitable for them to read, but all articles relating to crime and sex are eliminated. Removing their public and applause is part of their punishment.

The prisoners are furnished their meals cafeteria style. The food is good—the same food that is eaten by the well-trained officers of the island, and if a prisoner takes more food than he consumes, the next day he must do without that particular meal.

PRISON RULES

It is my understanding that the principal rules are substantially as follows:

First. Alcatraz Penitentiary is maintained on the principle of maximum security with every precaution taken to insure safekeeping of prisoners and to prevent possibility of escape.

Second. Privileges are limited.

Third. The privilege of having visitors has to be earned. During the first 3 months no prisoner allowed visitors. Subsequently one visit per month is permitted, visiting days being semimonthly, staggered throughout the year.

Fourth. No group visiting with prisoners.

Fifth. Not more than two persons are permitted to visit a prisoner at the same time.

Sixth. At time of entrance each inmate is required to furnish names and relationship of persons with whom he would like to correspond and from whom he expects visits.

Seventh. Former inmates of any penal institution are not permitted to visit prisoners.

Eighth. Facilities for religious services and opportunity for spiritual advice is afforded under the direction and control of the resident chaplain and accredited representatives of established churches, in accordance with schedule approved by the warden.

Ninth. There are no direct commitments from the courts to Alcatraz Island. Persons are sent to that institution by transfer only.

Tenth. Lawyers employed by and desiring to visit inmates must obtain written permission for such visits from the director of prisons.

Eleventh. The usual institutional library is provided, and educational facilities are furnished.

Twelfth. Mail privileges are limited. No original letters are delivered. Such letters as are permitted are typed and copy given prisoners. No newspapers are permitted.

Thirteenth. Radio and motion pictures are not used for entertainment but may be employed by the warden for education and improvement of the inmates when he deems it advisable in the interest of good discipline.

Fourteenth. Arrangements have been made so that a representative of the institution has an office on the mainland. Visits of salesmen and other representatives of the various industries are prohibited on the island, facilities being given at the mainland office for persons who wish to transact business.

Fifteenth. No floating equipment is permitted to land at the island except that owned and operated by the Government, unless specific written authority is granted by the warden in each special case.

ESCAPE PROOF

As one enters the main door of the prison, if he has on his person the tiniest piece of metal, an indicator will disclose it; the person will then be told to remove all metal and go back through the door again for another test. A prisoner attempted to carry with him into the institution a small watch spring concealed in his ear. The detector caused it to be discovered. No one person can go through the prison, not even the warden himself, without help from others. There are double doors at every entrance and exit. The outer guard has a key to the first door which he can place in the keyhole of the large prison door lock, but he cannot turn the key and unlock the door until he looks at the one in charge in the warden's office, is recognized as the proper person to unlock the door, and the switch is turned in the warden's office, which permits the key to be turned by the guard in the lock and the door opened. The outer guard, accompanied by ourselves the day of my visit, then went into the corridor between two doors. The inner guard inserted the key in the door, and after the proper switch was turned in the warden's office the door was opened and we were allowed to enter.

The guards among the prisoners do not carry weapons of any kind. There are guards above, well armed and well protected from the prisoners, who could, if necessary, take the life of any prisoner at any spot in the prison. No prisoner in the building can possibly protect himself from the fire of the guards above, although circumstances have never caused a prisoner to be injured by these armed guards.

RIGID RULES NECESSARY

If prisoners are good, they can see visitors occasionally and can write and send about one letter a week. Each letter is tested to determine if it contains invisible writing, signs, and so forth. The original letters received at the prison for prisoners are not delivered to them. Such letters and such parts of them as the warden believes the prisoner should see are copied on typewriter and given to them.

The most modern devices and expertly trained personnel have been installed to guard against escape and to quell disturbances. Extreme care is taken in the matter of visitors. A prisoner cannot touch a visitor nor can the visitor touch the prisoner. The visitor occupies a chair opposite the prisoner with a steel wall between. There is a glass, however, which permits the visitor to see the prisoner, but one cannot touch the other. By talking as one usually talks in ordinary conversation one can hear the other. To some, possibly this seems hard, but the fact that these men are our worst criminals must be considered. They have violated paroles and pardons, escaped from penitentiaries and jails, and committed the most heinous crimes, including murder and kidnaping, and usually are members of dangerous gangs. They cannot safely be kept elsewhere, and it is in the interest of the entire prison population and the safety of the public that the rules be rigid and properly administered as Warden Johnston is administering them.

EFFECT ON OTHER PRISONERS

The very fact that this prison is there has a wonderful effect on the other Federal prisoners. It is the best evidence that the Department of Justice is not going to permit a small number of prisoners to defeat it in its larger and more important purpose of deterrent punishment for the gangster and the rehabilitation of the reformable type of prisoner for the better security of society.

OTHER TYPES OF PRISONS

Certain institutions have been set aside for the care and treatment of special groups

which are marked by one outstanding characteristic and inmates showing these characteristics are transferred to these centers as follows:

(a) Offenders against the narcotic laws and other offenders addicted to the use of narcotics, to Leavenworth Annex.

(b) Selected narcotic addicts from Leavenworth Annex to the United States Narcotic Farm, Lexington, Ky.

(c) Narcotic informers to United States Detention Farm, Milan, Mich.

(d) Insane, tuberculous, and prisoners suffering with chronic, degenerative diseases, to the Department of Justice Hospital for Defective Delinquents at Springfield, Mo., within the limits of the custodial facilities of Springfield and with the exception of tuberculous and chronically ill narcotic addicts who are either held at Leavenworth Annex or transferred to Lexington.

(e) Persistently intractable prisoners and prisoners with serious records of violent crimes, to Alcatraz.

GENERAL POPULATION

The Department is working toward a simple division of the remainder of the general population into those who seem to offer favorable prospects for rehabilitation and those who do not. In making this differentiation there is no single characteristic upon which to rely as there is in the case of the special groups listed above. Judgment is based upon the careful consideration of all factors, including age, previous criminal record, personality characteristics, and social background. Although we are still far short of our requirements in terms of personnel, we have what is probably the most complete set-up in the country for obtaining this necessary information. The responsibility for weighing the information about each case and determining which class an individual prisoner belongs in is exercised jointly by the institution staffs through the classification committees and the Department of Justice.

On the basis of this simple subdivision of the general population the Department is working toward a distribution, through transfers, which will place the most hopeful offenders in those institutions which offer the best rehabilitative opportunities. For the present their efforts are directed principally toward the eastern section of the country and involve Leavenworth, Atlanta, Camp Lee, Northeastern Penitentiary, and the United States Industrial Reformatory, as follows:

(a) The most hopeful cases, with special emphasis being given to youthfulness, lack of major previous record, ability to take vocational training, and suitability for medium or minimum custody, to Chillicothe.

(b) Men capable of profiting by intensive rehabilitative treatment but not suitable for Chillicothe because of age, previous record, or custodial requirements, to Northeastern Penitentiary.

(c) Men suitable for medium or minimum custody but lacking the native ability to profit by the education and vocational training offered at Chillicothe, to Camp Lee.

(d) Men showing a history of habitual criminality at a professional level, and who do not appear to belong in the group of more hopeful rehabilitative prospects, to Atlanta and Leavenworth.

El Reno, at present, is not a classified institution. Because of the overcrowded conditions at Leavenworth, El Reno is forced to house all but the most dangerous inmates committed there. This, together with the demand for camp men from that institution, has held back the development of the reformatory program. It is expected that as soon as additional institutions are acquired, thereby relieving Leavenworth, that the Department will be able to redistribute the Leavenworth and El Reno populations to give El Reno the hopeful, reformatory group for which it is intended.

On the west coast McNeil Penitentiary is taking care of all except the special groups listed under I. Because of the expense involved in sending prisoners from McNeil to either El Reno or Chillicothe, the proper treatment of reformatory cases must necessarily await further contemplated development of the island.

FOUR MAIN POINTS CONCERNING ALCATRAZ PRISON

Alcatraz is considered one of the world's most scientific prisons. According to one of its few former prisoners, it includes four main points—maximum security, minimum of privilege, complete isolation of its convicts from the outside world, and 100-percent humanity.

At the time Alcatraz prison was ordered established Attorney General Cummings authorized the following statement:

"It has been wisely said that the people of this country can have as much or as little crime as they really want. It is likewise certain that the present unwholesome and dangerous conditions in many of our communities will not be materially improved until all of our citizens are prepared to make their share of sacrifice to bring about such a situation and to cooperate with the States and the Federal Government in the accomplishment of the important and difficult task of crime reduction.

"On many sides it is being reluctantly admitted that law-enforcing agencies in many of our States have fallen down, and the demand is being made with increasing emphasis that the Federal Government take a hand in the situation. The power of Federal agencies in the detection, apprehension, and treatment of criminals has long been respected. Through its freedom from local affiliations, its greater resources, and its generally trained personnel, the Federal Government is being recognized as an efficient ally of the local law-enforcement agencies and the present campaign by the Department of Justice to curb the activities of racketeers is a natural development.

"In the last two decades many Federal statutes have been passed broadening the scope of Federal activities in the apprehension of offenders. Twenty years ago there were 2,000 in Federal prisons; today there are 11,000, and the tendency today is to pass more Federal statutes, on the insistent demand of the communities themselves, giving greater power and opportunity to the Central Government along these lines.

"In the case of its convicted offenders and in their reformation and rehabilitation, wherever possible, it is of fundamental importance that prisoners be properly classified and segregated. First offenders, boys, victims of circumstances, men with families, persons who have broken under the economic strain, and others who make up the great bulk of our criminal population should not be housed in the same institution with those who may be classed as enemies of society. The establishment by the Department of Justice of a Federal prison at Alcatraz Island is a necessary part of the Government's campaign against predatory crime.

"Much misunderstanding has been engendered with reference to the operation of this prison. It will not be a Devil's Island. It will be an integral part of the Federal prison system, operated in conformity with advanced ideas of penalogy, and with the ultimate object in view of protecting all of our communities. Compared to the large State institutions, such as San Quentin and Folsom, it will house but a mere handful of men. The Department of Justice pledges itself to take every possible precaution, structurally and administratively, to prevent escapes."

Attorney General Cummings prepared the following article on Alcatraz prison:

"In years past those who violated Federal criminal laws were sent to the penitentiaries at Atlanta, Ga., Leavenworth, Kans., or McNeil Island, Wash. However, in 1929, after a congressional investigation, an integrated Federal penal system was established, with the object, according to the statute, of 'assuring proper classification and segregation of Federal prisoners according to their character, the nature of the crime they have committed, their mental condition, and such other factors as should be taken into consideration in providing an individualized system of discipline, care, and treatment of the persons committed to such institutions.'

"The problem of separating the less tractable prisoners from the more orderly has long been a matter of serious concern. Such a process of segregation accords with sound principles of penology. It also tends to diminish the difficulties incident to prison discipline. Certain types of prisoners are a constant menace. They create an atmosphere of tension and unrest wherever they are confined. They break down the morale of the more promising inmates and are constantly plotting violence, sabotage, riot, or escape.

"A secure place for the segregation of such prisoners has for a long time been an imperative need. Our new penitentiary at Alcatraz is, therefore, an essential part of the prison system. It is admirably adapted to the purposes in view. Alcatraz Island is a precipitous rock, jutting out in San Francisco Bay. In 1775 the bold explorer, Don Manuel Ayala, sailing through the Golden Gate, passed by this islet. The only inhabitants on its 12 acres of craggy surface were pelicans, from which the name Isla de Alcatrices (Isle of Pelicans) is derived. It is about a mile and a half from the mainland, in the current of a swift tide, and among the swirling eddies between the ocean and the great bay. It is relatively inaccessible, and the chance of escape is reduced to a minimum.

"Until very recently it has been the site of a military prison. The buildings on the island, which are now being remodeled, are modern and sanitary. The 600 cells are arranged in three tiers. Each cell is for one prisoner and is furnished with a bed of strap steel, a mattress, blankets, pillows, sheets, and pillowcases. It is also equipped with a washbasin, toilet, and a shelf. Prisoners on good behavior may read and write in their cells, and will have access to a library. An overhead light in each cell burns until 9 p. m. There is an exercise ward. Most of the prisoner's time will be spent in the industries buildings on the west end of the small island.

"Over the men there will be a staff of prison officers who have graduated from the prison officers' training school. These officers have chosen this work as a life occupation and obtain their positions on merit only.

"In general, our Federal prison system may now be regarded as well-founded and reasonably complete. It is under the skilled and competent direction of Sanford Bates, a recognized expert in such matters. While improvements are desirable and will from time to time be made, it is fair to assert that our prisons are well-conceived, excellently planned, and honestly administered."

DO NOT REPRESENT AVERAGE

Do not consider that the prisoners on Alcatraz Island represent the average prisoner. They do not. These, the toughest and most dangerous criminals on earth, represent only about 2 percent of the Federal prison population. They represent the exceptions, not the general rule. The knowledge among prisoners that Alcatraz Island is a place to which they can be transferred has a salutary effect on the prisoners in addition to the good effect of removing the hardened convict who cannot be reformed from the side and association of those who can be reformed.

NECESSITY FOR SIMILAR ARRANGEMENTS IN STATES

How obviously salutary it would be if each State should have a place of the type of Alcatraz to which it could send its worst criminals, the troublemakers, the jail break-

ers, the incorrigible, and the like. If all the bad prisoners in the State prisons know it is possible for them to be transferred to an institution of this kind, in complete isolation and under rigid though humane discipline and treatment, it would certainly lighten the problem of prison management throughout the country and would have a much-to-be-desired effect upon the prisoners themselves.

GRATITUDE

The people of this Nation owe Attorney General Cummings, Hon. Sanford Bates, Director of the United States Bureau of Prisons, and Warden Johnston a debt of gratitude for the constructive work they are doing in behalf of the prisoners and the country.

Leftist Purge in State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a news release entitled "State Department Leftist Purge Hits Hundreds," from the Chicago Sun.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT LEFTIST PURGE HITS HUNDREDS

(By Vance Johnson)

The House was told yesterday that hundreds of undesirable people have been fired by the State Department in recent weeks in a purge of leftist elements among its employees.

This report was made by Representative Cox, of Georgia, frequently a bitter administration critic, during the course of an eloquent plea for House approval of a $10,000,000 appropriation for the State Department's cultural relations program.

Later the House turned back a series of attempts to limit the funds, but the program nevertheless suffered a serious setback at the hands of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

That committee in a secret session yesterday morning voted to bar the Department from using the services of the Associated Press, United Press and other news-gathering facilities to spread information about the United States to the rest of the world. This has been regarded as the heart of the Department's program.

TO GET CLEARANCE

It was clear that the committee agreed to this move in order to get clearance from the House Rules Committee on basic legislation authorizing the cultural relations program. Cox has been the main stumbling block on that committee.

Cox told the House that the State Department has "for weeks now" been engaged in an endeavor to "clean out the Department from top to bottom."

He did not specifically mention Communists, but there was no doubt—from his previous attacks on the set-up—that he was out for so-called Reds.

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation was called in and given a free hand in screening personnel," Cox said. In addition, the Department "set up a security board."

A State Department spokesman yesterday afternoon admitted that a "screening committee" had been formed and that since September 1945 a total of 4,180 persons in the Department's Office of International Cooperation had been discharged. He did not classify these employees, however, and would not comment on Cox's report.

Most of these persons, the spokesmen said, formerly were employed by the Office of War Information and the Office of Inter-American Affairs, formerly headed by Nelson Rockefeller. Those discharged since September, he said, included 2,180 Americans and 2,000 nationals of other countries employed abroad.

From other sources it was learned that the "screening" had in fact revolved principally around the question of whether employees had "Communist tendencies."

Cox defended William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the cultural relations program, declaring that Benton "is as much opposed to Red influences getting into it as I am myself."

Shortly after he spoke, the House approved 141 to 133, a rule which prohibited striking out of the appropriation—on points of order—funds for which basic authorizations had not been passed. It was practically a straight party vote—only Representative RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi) voting against the rule, and only two Republicans voting for it.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Today is May 3—Polish Constitution Day.

Throughout our land Polish citizens and Americans of Polish descent are uniting to honor the event, and I am sure that millions of Americans wish to unite with me in tribute to a brave and glorious ally on this occasion.

In the Congress of the United States may well rest the hope of a new Poland, free to return to its cherished constitution. To that end, let us who are Poland's friends pledge our untiring devotion.

In today's observance Poland's citizens and friends are uniting in deep disillusion and bitterness. Theirs was the first of the lands to resist the invasion of Hitler, the first to experience his orgies of slaughter and inhumanity. Poland had been guaranteed aid and political and territorial integrity. Yet today no land suffers under worse extremities. Its territory is partitioned. Its people languish under a terror of secret police and under a government not of their own choosing. They suffer famine conditions worse even than those of the conquered Axis. Our fellow citizens of Polish descent are terrified for the fate of their relatives and friends—if, indeed, they do not already mourn that fate.

No nation fought more gallantly; in no country was resistance to the oppressor more complete and vigorous.

Poland was the only conquered nation in which the German could find no quisling; could set up no puppet government. On the contrary, a secret Polish state remained in being in spite of the death camps and the cunning torture and the campaign of atrocities of the Gestapo. That secret state had its armies, its assembly, its judicial procedure, and its schools. Every member of it walked in danger of his life.

This was in the Polish tradition. Through an unhappy history, though the battleground of Russia and Germany, Poland always has been gallant in her adversities. No power ever has been able to shake Poland's will to resist and maintain her tradition and culture.

This country of ours shares in the responsibility for Poland's misery. The decision of an American President, taken alone and in secret, determined the fate of Poland. There was never a chance given to the American or Polish people to express their feelings as to the justice or the iniquity of the course pursued. That course was taken for expediency, and a gallant and faithful ally was sacrificed.

We feel the guilt for this share in responsibility because the decisions were taken in our name. This is the earnest: we will not be indifferent to the fate of the Polish people; we will be alert to every possibility for the righting of their wrongs; we will maintain this purpose until Poland is free—until Poland can follow her peaceful pursuits under a government genuinely of the choice of her people.

For my part, I share with our fellow citizens of Polish descent the sadness they feel today. I urge all Americans to join with me in the pledge of unremitting purpose to aid wherever I can in bringing Poland to a happier existence—to her share in the victory for which she already has paid so dearly.

The Westinghouse Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including excerpts from an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic under date of April 18 on the continuation of the Westinghouse strike at East Pittsburgh. This strike is now in its one hundred and ninth day and apparently there is no progress being made in settlement. The company is expending vast sums of money in advertising their position in the newspapers, yet they refuse to consent to the wage increase granted by the other electrical manufacturing companies. I need not enlarge on this, for the editorial which follows states the position and feelings of thousands of people in western Pennsylvania:

NEW "VALLEY FORMULA"

The title "Mohawk Valley Formula" appeared in one of the most shameful chapters of American industrial relations to describe a scheme developed some 15 years ago by a New York State corporation for breaking a strike of its employees; the Wagner Act put an end to most of the unfair practices which that formula found effective. Now it looks as if our own Turtle Creek Valley, which takes its name from the stream of near-sulphuric acid flowing past the Westinghouse plants in East Pittsburgh might come to stand for a distinct strategy of strike-breaking, revealed in successive tactics used by the Westinghouse Electric Corp. as the strike of its employees goes into its third month.

Items in this "Turtle Creek formula" would include:

1. The getting out of an injunction against mass picketing and violence, when there had

been no violence. This gives the community the impression that the union members are dangerous characters.

2. Run plenty of large, expensive advertisements in the daily papers, with deceptive, confusing statements about the company's wage offers and the union's demands. Some readers may believe the company must be right or it wouldn't spend so much money in advertising its case.

3. Instead of the flat increase of 18½ cents an hour for all employees which the union is demanding, offer a raise which averages considerably less, but would give higher increases to some employees and lower, or none, to others. This may cause a split in the union ranks, as those offered the higher increase should be more anxious to return to work. (Since the union is asking for a "cost-of-living" increase, to offset the higher prices which every employee, no matter what his wage, has to pay, it is obvious that the general increase is the only fair one.)

4. Call in to their desks and offices all the "white-collar" workers, who are not on strike as they belong to a different (independent) union; this may have a divisive effect on the strikers as some of them may feel like ending the strike when they see so many fellow-workers going in; moreover, the newspapers can use headlines about a "back-to-work movement" (they did); or there may be outbreaks of trouble between the strikers and the other workers going into the plant, with the State police on hand to protect the latter.

This part of the formula did not work out, as might have been expected, to the tactical advantage of the company, for the heads of the two unions adopted an agreement by which the white-collar employees agreed to do no production work and the strikers agreed not to interfere with their entry into the plant.

5. Refuse to renew the provision in the former contract by which union stewards received their regular wages while engaged in adjusting grievances as covered by the contract, and insist that the stewards be paid from the union treasury. This is an attempt to revive a shabby old "union-busting" device; it was long ago settled that the collection of union dues and the payment of shop stewards form part of the normal cost of production, and should be paid by the company; the proposal that the stewards be paid by the union would give the company an opportunity to exhaust the union treasury, simply by delays and postponements in dealing with grievances.

The development of this "formula" has meant a lot of expense and effort for Westinghouse; it has cost the strikers and their families dearly; it has seriously affected the commercial life of the Turtle Creek Valley and other sections where the workers live. And the company has not yet given any convincing evidence why it should not have settled the strike, before it started, by granting the 18½ cent general increase according to the "national pattern." Certainly the "strikebreaking" tactics it has used must be vigorously condemned as contrary to the common good.

Little Rock Post of the American Legion Urges Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the M. M. Eberts Post, No. 1, of the American Legion in Little Rock, Ark., urging the continuation of OPA. The resolution is an eloquent appeal on behalf of the veteran for the extension of the Price Control Act without crippling amendments. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas there are over 1,500,000 veterans in the United States, upward of 50,000 of whom are veterans in Arkansas, who have been unable to find jobs and are now forced to subsist on the $20 a week readjustment allowance provided for under the GI bill of rights; and

Whereas the present increased cost of living is presenting a great problem not only for this group but practically all veterans; and

Whereas an uncontrolled continued rise in prices of the everyday things of life will make it extremely difficult for the returned veterans to rehabilitate themselves; and

Whereas the sole responsibility and hope of a fair control of living costs is dependent upon the continuation of the OPA; and

Whereas the Representatives in the Congress of the United States have this week voted a bill that would render the OPA unable to effectively control prices, which would thereby bring untold hardships not only on millions of returned veterans and to their families, but also on many more millions of our citizens; and

Whereas it is the main purpose of the American Legion to advocate those policies that would protect the welfare of the veterans: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That M. M. Eberts Post, No. 1, American Legion, go on record as being in favor of the extension of governmental price controls until such a time when this discontinuance will not work undue hardships on the returned veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of the United States Congress from Arkansas, the press, and the Arkansas Legionnaire in the hope that the real needs of our veterans be called to their attention.

I also include the following letter from Mr. R. S. Sanford, a successful businessman of Searcy, Ark.:

I realize that you have a lot of difficult problems before you at all times, and in writing you this letter please do not think I am trying to tell you what to do.

I just want to mention a few things about the OPA in relation to the small business or small retailer. It is probably true that if the OPA prices were taken off all retail prices would go up considerably. In fact, there are a lot of items that would double in price and some of these are the necessities of life. Of course, most of the retail merchants would make more money for a year or two on account of the fact that their profits would be much larger but we, as retail merchants, feel the outcome of it. Men's shirts which sell today for around $2.25 would immediately sell for at least $3 to $3.50 if the OPA prices were taken off. Dresses, shoes, hats, and all clothing would rise immediately. Grocery items would advance materially and quickly. The investment in the same number of articles in our little store would be probably 50 percent more with the same number of items on our shelves.

During the last war we saw prices go very high, indeed, and if the OPA were removed today, we believe we would have the same situation. Of course, if these prices all went up in this proportion the customers would be the ones who would have to pay the higher prices. Please understand we are not trying to tell you how to act or what to do but thought maybe you would like to have the opinions and views from the average retail concern. If it were from a selfish viewpoint that we were writing you, we would ask that the OPA price be taken off but we would prefer to see prices stay somewhere near like they are today, if possible, a slight increase in some commodities. We might mention to you that our sales volume has been around $500,000 for the past 3 years so you would have an idea of the type of store that we have. Our belief is that nearly everyone, especially the average person, wants to keep the OPA but would prefer that some small corrections be made in its organization.

Compulsory Conscription Will Not Prevent War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, among the hundreds of letters which I have received in recent months relative to compulsory military conscription in time of peace, was a letter from Mr. Irvin T. Williams, of Gainesville, Mo.

He stated, among other things, that "men do not prepare for peace, they prepare for war." Because I feel he is expressing the viewpoints of a great many people throughout the Nation, I am asking for permission to reprint his communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

GAINESVILLE, MO., *March 23, 1946.*

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: When a bank robber goes into a bank for the purpose of robbing it he does not consider the fact that the law may be stronger than he is or that he may find himself lodged in the penitentiary. He is quite sure he can get away with it. Therefore, we would have had to fight the Japs and Germany even though we had been well prepared, and thousands of American boys would have been killed and injured anyway. Germany attacked Russia although the Russians have been preparing for years. Even as far back as 1927 I heard talk of "the great Red Army" the Communists were building up. Even then the so-called Red Army was said to be the world's largest.

Some citizens have a foolish theory that just being well prepared will keep us out of another war. But when a gangster fights a group of policemen he doesn't stop to consider that he may be outnumbered or that he may get the worst of it. He believes he can win the fight. A "gangster nation" would not stop to consider that the United States was well prepared or not.

Anyway, who is this terrible foe who is apt to attack the United States? The answer is obvious. But Russia today is bled white in her terrible struggle with the German "steamroller." The Russians are eating black bread and that is strictly rationed. She is in a poverty-stricken condition and it will take several "5-year plans" to get her back on her feet.

Russia could not engage in a major war now or in the near future unless vast amounts of food and equipment were supplied by America. And it is quite certain that we will not give Russia material with which to fight us or Britain.

The Communist leaders of Russia put up a bold front in a diplomatic way, but we know (or should know) that they have nothing with which to support such a front. Not

unless we will supply them with war materials.

All this "hate Russia" talk and "hate the Communist Party" is rather out of place at this time when we are trying to establish a friendly relation with Russia and try to get them to cooperate with us and the Allies to restore world peace and world economy.

If the compulsory military training law goes over, it may start an armament race among the nations. What the people want and need is a disarmament race. A disarmament race would be the answer to the taxpayers' prayers. Also the answer to the prayers of the disabled veteran, for then some of the billions needed to train every young man or keep a huge Army and Navy could be used to pay more pensions and give more needed medical attention to the veterans.

The cost of giving military training to all young men or keeping a huge Army and Navy is absolutely prohibitive. It would lower our standard of living instead of raising it, as we all want. Such a program would spell the ruin of any nation without exception.

We must request and insist that Russia and all nations disarm and we must reduce our armaments likewise. We must keep pounding away till we get the job done. Let us have peace and let us have a disarmament program so we may all have a higher standard of living and better treatment for disabled veterans. "Men do not prepare for peace, they prepare for war." But suppose we do have the military training law, with "every man a soldier" (like Germany was). It would mean that we would be "just one big army." Naturally we would become a military government instead of a people's government—I mean a representative government as we have now. Germany had a military government for generations, and the power of government—the power to make laws—was always in the hands of top-ranking army generals or their puppets. We must remember that compulsory military training means military government also, and in such a government a Congressman would be something even worse than a "rubber stamp."

Let us work to preserve our representative form of government. The power of government, the power to make laws, must continue to rest in the hands of the people and their elected Members of Congress! Let the generals and admirals be servants of the people; not masters of the people.

There are many well-meaning patriotic citizens who may do their country more harm than they realize by insisting on a compulsory training law, especially in this atomic age.

I want to thank you for your efforts in behalf of the disabled veterans and I hope you will do all possible to pass H. R. 3908.

With best of luck to you.

Yours respectfully,

IRVIN T. WILLIAMS.

Price Controls on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release entitled "Truman Backs Anderson on Meat Prices" from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN BACKS ANDERSON ON MEAT PRICES—SENATE GROUP ALSO FAVORS IMMEDIATE LIFTING OF CONTROLS

(By John W. Ball)

Prompt reaction from several quarters yesterday followed Secretary Anderson's proposal Wednesday for early abandonment of price controls on meat if present measures to halt black-market sales fail.

First, Anderson was supported by President Truman. In answer to a question as to his agreement with Anderson on the subject, the President answered with a short affirmative.

Shortly thereafter, the Senate Agriculture Committee recommended that controls be lifted immediately. Anderson's proposal Wednesday was made before the Senate Banking Committee.

Further interest was added to the tempest stirred up by Anderson's testimony, when the National Farmers Union made public a letter to the President in which it demanded Anderson's removal from the Cabinet because of his tetsimony. Its president, James G. Patton, wrote the President that Anderson's proposal was "in flagrant disregard for the welfare of the people of the Nation and the policies of your administration."

The three actions were followed shortly by announcement that a release from the office of Price Stabilizer Bowles, promised earlier in the day, would not be issued.

This release, it was understood, was in answer to Anderson's testimony. In it Bowles was reported to have declared his opposition to the Anderson declaration.

Growing intensity in the row over meat price controls has been noticeable for more than a week. The Senate committee's action gave no heed to Anderson's expressed desire for a 90-day test of measures just put into effect to control the black market. Anderson had declared himself certain that slaughtering quotas put into effect this week by the Government would prevent black marketeers from getting meat.

But the Senate Agriculture Committee was not inclined to wait. It charged that Government controls and price regulations of livestock and meat have completely broken down. Price ceilings were termed fiction, and the black market and subsidies together are costing the public $2,000,000,000 a year in excess of ceiling prices it said.

NATION'S HEALTH IN PERIL

"The black market in meat is imperiling the national health through insanitary slaughtering and curtailed production of essential byproducts," it said.

"Black market slaughtering has caused a complete economic loss of many millions of pounds of critically short byproducts such as fats, protein feeds, and hides.

"Four years of experience with Government control, culminating in the present scandalous situation, show conclusively the impossibility of controlling livestock and meat prices and meat distribution through Government laws, regulations, and directives."

THOMAS FILES REPORT

Chairman ELMER THOMAS, Democrat, of Oklahoma, filed the committee report. The report charged that:

1. Reliable surveys show that five out of six stores are selling meat at overceiling prices. The average was 20 percent above ceilings.

2. Although there is no shortage of livestock in the country, the black market, price controls, and subsidies have created severe shortages and have impeded production by creating fear and uncertainty among producers and feeders.

3. A "price squeeze" placed on slaughterers by OPA since 1942 has forced many legitimate slaughterers to close or curtail their operations. This has "fostered the black market."

4. Legitimate slaughterers are unable to buy livestock at legal maximum prices "because black market operators pay higher prices, with the result that livestock is being diverted from the normal channels into the black market."

EMOTION NOT INVOLVED

The attack upon Anderson by the National Farmers Union was not made, Patton wrote the President, "in heat of emotion."

"The whole price-control structure already is staggering under the attack of the meat packers. There is a strong indication that much of the present crisis in meat is a manufactured crisis," Patton said. "The statement of the Secretary can only encourage indefinite continuation of this so-called crisis.

"The statements that Mr. Anderson made are the culmination of a long series of actions that force me to urge you to ask for his resignation from your Cabinet."

In a six-point attack, Patton blamed Anderson as being "principally responsible for the failure of the United States to produce enough and procure enough food to fulfill its responsibilities abroad."

"I submit," he said in closing, "that his melancholy record justified me in withdrawing the support that I earlier accorded Secretary Anderson."

While the row was stirring about the national situation on the meat front Washington was experiencing a steadily worsening meat supply. Wholesale and retail dealers united in saying the local supply has dwindled from 60 to nearly 100 percent in recent weeks.

There is far less meat now than during rationing, they said, and there is no relief in sight.

Housewives are bearing the brunt of the shortage, with restaurants and some hospitals now beginning to feel the effects, a survey showed.

With only a bare supply of meat for each day's sales, many grocers in the neighborhood and chain stores are voluntarily rationing sales to take care of their regular customers. Even then it's "first come, first served," with most counters bare by noon, retail dealers explained.

The Men Who Know Prices, the Buyers, Furnish Best Arguments for Retention of Price Controls—Monthly Survey of National Association of Purchasing Agents Should Be Required Reading for Opponents of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the finest arguments for the retention of price control has just been made public by an organization of businessmen whose daily actions are geared to price trends.

The National Association of Purchasing Agents, many of whose members are employed by large concerns enjoying membership in the National Association of Manufacturers, recently issued one of its monthly surveys on price trends. This survey expresses fear at rising prices and described the present situation as an "escalator economy."

The survey points out that buyers' investigations of shortages show that the increased wartime productive capacity in some important industries has not been

readily transferable to postwar requirements. For instance, the buyers point out, war production of steel ran to heavy sections and plates, while peacetime requirements run to light sections, nails, and sheets in much larger proportions. With mill capacity for producing sheets increased little, if at all, during war years, present capacity is now inadequate to handle the demands which greatly exceed those of prewar.

While the titular heads of many of the larger industrial concerns have been laying down a barrage of anti-OPA propaganda on the Congress, this factual study by those in their employ who really have the first-hand knowledge of prices and price trends shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that price controls are needed today more than ever before.

The April 29 issue of the New York Journal of Commerce contains an analysis of the purchasing agents' survey which I believe will serve to illustrate my point. The article in question is as follows:

PRICE PRESSURE HELD SETTING UP NEW ESCALATOR ECONOMY—PURCHASING AGENCIES SEE POLITICO-ECONOMIC FORCES VYING TO PUSH ADJUSTMENTS UPWARD—INSTABILITY CALLED WORST EVER IN REPORT

Asserting that prices are currently in the most unstable state ever encountered in purchasing experience, the Nation's purchasing agents are characterizing the present situation as an "escalator economy."

The present uncertainty on prices is over how high—not which way—prices will go, the buyers declare in the monthly business survey issued over the week end by the National Association of Purchasing Agents.

Economic and political forces seem to be contending for leadership in forcing upward price adjustments, the buyers state, and the trend is being reflected in price adjustment or escalator clauses in many contracts and purchasing orders. Moreover, it is stated, many long dormant and almost forgotten price-adjustment provisions will also be put into motion by advancing costs and prices.

POSTWAR BOTTLENECKS

Also plaguing the buyers are postwar bottlenecks encountered in some vital materials. Buyers' investigations of shortages show that the increased wartime productive capacity in some important industries has not been readily transferable to postwar requirements.

For instance, the buyers' point out, war production of steel ran to heavy sections and plates, while peacetime requirements run to light sections, nails, and sheets in much larger proportions. With mill capacity for producing sheets increased little, if at all, during the war years, present capacity is now inadequate to handle the demands which greatly exceed those of prewar.

"This is not so much a reconversion problem as it is a postwar bottleneck that may affect many consumers until production becomes balanced on peacetime needs," the purchasing agents say.

BUYING CONDITIONS DIFFICULT

Similar unbalance in postwar production may be found in other metals and materials, the survey reports, and consequently purchasing agents are cautioning production and sales executives that availability of the scarcest essential material or component must finally determine the production schedule for manufactured articles in the absence of substitutes.

Buying conditions are reported more difficult now than during the war, when many nonessential users of scarce critical materials were curbed or barred. The deferred 1942–45 needs are pyramiding current demands and only continued high production can relieve the pressure on prices, the buyers state.

Because of the uncertainty of material and labor costs, purchases for any extended delivery are generally being on the basis of price in effect at the time of delivery, the buyers report, adding that this use of escalator clauses may have a beneficial effect in discouraging speculative purchases for future delivery.

Industrial inventories are reported to be the same as, or lower, than a month ago, except where curtailed plant operations have permitted some accumulation. Many plants report unbalanced inventories and buyers indicate they would welcome an even flow of materials that would permit obtaining maximum stocks permissible under CPA regulations.

Shortages created by strikes have not been replaced, it is reported, and few purchasers are optimistic about the possibility of a comfortable inventory position in the near future.

BUYING POLICY EXTENDED

With high demand contributing to the difficulty of obtaining materials purchasing policy in many instances is reduced to the basis of "get what you can when and if you can," the buyers report. The general policy reported averages from 3 to 9 months for commitments, with deliveries schedules as the materials are needed.

Many reports of the buyers indicate that purchasers watch suppliers' schedules closely to determine whether commitments must be extended to assure future deliveries when required, and one extreme instance is reported of enameled magnet wire being ordered 18 months ahead.

PRICES CONTINUE UP

The buyers report that the general trend of prices continues upward, with commodity price increases "too numerous to list." With wage rates and prices of major basic materials advancing, everything they go into is following their lead, it is pointed out. While the OPA has already authorized numerous advances and removed many items from price controls, the purchasing agents are expecting even more of this action in the future.

With the ending of major strikes, employment is reported the same as, or higher than, a month ago—excluding the cumulative recent effects of the coal strike. Common labor and help for the service trades is reported generally easier, with some reports indicating that such employees are being selected. Skilled labor is in demand in all sections of the country, especially in the construction trades.

General business during April is reported at least as good as it was a month ago, when record peacetime proportions were being approached. Instances where business is lower than last month are attributed to strikes and shortages of material and labor.

Further expansion is forecast by the purchasers, provided that labor and price difficulties do not interfere, "but it seems apparent now," the buyers state, "that scarce materials and products cannot be produced in sufficient quantities to meet the immediate all-out home and export demand."

Price Cuts Probable Under House OPA Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, since the action of the House of Representatives on the subject of price control extension, there has been a tremendous campaign of misinformation conducted by Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles and Price Administrator Paul Porter. They have been aided and abetted by numerous channels of New Deal and radical propagandists. We find the same minority groups which made so much noise for and about other types of legislation which were inimical to the best interests of the American people. Some of our fine citizens are misled by this noise and believe it to be public opinion.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Raymond Moley, associate editor of Newsweek, and one of the original New Dealers, takes a much different view of the House action on OPA. As a matter of truth, the House did extend OPA for 9 months; it did define how OPA should conduct itself. This it did for the best interest of the American people.

It is generally acknowledged that while price control has done some good, it has also done much harm by the maladministration and by the deliberate misinterpretation of the congressional intent of the Price Control Act. Mr. Moley's article is fair—it is analytical—and it represents a much more intelligent approach than we have had in the propaganda which has come out of OPA since the House action.

It is further interesting to note that the very newspapers which have made the most noise about this OPA issue and, accordingly, have been guilty of misleading the people, are themselves, not bound by any OPA price ceiling on either their advertising space or their rate of charge for the newspaper. In St. Louis, for example, they have raised their prices 66⅔ percent to the readers. A newspaper which formerly sold for 3 cents now sells for 5 cents.

The following article was published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat as of April 26, 1946:

RAYMOND MOLEY COMMENTS: PRICE CUTS PROBABLE UNDER HOUSE OPA PLAN

The House of Representatives set off a big furor by amending the OPA. One side hailed the action as the dawn of a new day. The other predicted black ruin. A calm appraisal of the revised set-up justifies neither claim.

The most talked of amendment is that which says: "No maximum price shall be established or maintained without allowing a reasonable profit." A former official of the OPA, who worked with Leon Henderson, points out that the Price Control Act itself provided that the Administrator should establish fair and equitable prices, which, by any interpretation, should mean fair profits. The major question in the interpretation of this provision is whether this fair profit shall be given to the high-cost producers.

At the present time, "new" commodities get a price entirely different from that of "old" commodities, even if the goods in question are virtually the same. The method of price fixing on this principle is cumbersome, and sellers are greatly dissatisfied with it. On the other hand, the records show that under the current method of control, by multitudes of ceilings, profits in some industries have become 5 to 10 times those of prewar days. In big stores and big plants price ceilings are adhered to because employees have no interest in higher prices, and the institutions themselves cannot afford trouble and publicity through any violations.

It is probable that the new House formula will bring lower, rather than higher, prices.

The procedure of making a fair price with a fair profit is much easier than is allowed by present methods of the OPA. In some cases the fixing of prices under current formulas has taken as much as 4 months. Such delay is intolerable to business and very unfair to the consumer.

The decision of the House to abolish "roll-back" subsidies is also sound. Subsidies on meat are paid, but we do not get much of the available meat.

If the OPA is to expire next spring, the subsidies must lapse then at the latest. They should not be taken off all at once. They should be removed piecemeal, but not too slowly. The situation will improve in the process.

The OPA has been overstressing the importance of controls. And it is now wholly misrepresenting the effect of the House amendments. They are several steps in the right direction.

Oh, for a Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Times of April 15, 1946:

OH, FOR A FARLEY

Democrats in Congress at least will soon be wishing they had Jim Farley back running the affairs of the party. Mr. Hannegan recently hasn't seemed to be doing so well.

A little while ago the party's magazine ran an article denouncing members who voted for the Case labor bill as casting "a vote against the American people." When Congressmen protested that they had a right to vote their convictions, an "apology" was forthcoming which was somewhat less than that. It suggested that if Members had differences with the executive branch they should talk them over with the President and not gang up with Republicans to defeat him. There was no retreat from the idea that the President was right and the Congressmen wrong.

On top of that comes a letter signed by Hannegan advising county chairmen to select "proper candidates for Congress" who will "courageously support President Truman's program of progress." When it went into some districts now having Democatic Representatives, those Representatives resented it as an effort to drive them out of office. They demanded a caucus to give opportunity to air their grievances and talk of causing heads to fall at national headquarters.

Official explanation is that the letter was intended to be sent only into districts now represented by Republicans and that a "mistake was made by a mailing room clerk."

Viewing the furor, Speaker RAYBURN called it "a gruesome mistake" and set about trying to restore peace.

It may have been a mistake. Party-wise it is gruesome enough. Probably it more or less represents the view of President Truman. A straight party man himself, he thinks Democrats ought to stay in line and he has said so publicly. The kickers about what has been done are not likely to get much sympathy at the White House. Mr. Hannegan isn't likely to be reprimanded by his official boss.

If the incidents and the situation are causing any sorrow among Republicans, that fact has not yet become evident. A more skilled hand might not only avert such mistakes, but also win more votes for the President's legislation. Persuasion beats a club in dealing with Congressmen.

The United States and Canada Continue As Friendly Nations With an Undefended Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the excellent address delivered last evening by Lt. Comdr. J. S. Bremner. He is the naval communications officer with the Canadian Joint Staff Mission. Lieutenant Commander Bremmer made his speech before the members of the Kiwanis Club at Charles Town, Jefferson County, W. Va. It was my privilege to introduce our Canadian guest. The address follows:

Canada and the United States are countries with common historical origins and fulfilling a common historical plan. The common origin lies in the fact that both countries began as colonies of western European powers. Both are the products of the movement by which the Old World set out to populate, to exploit, and to organize the vast territories of this continent. Out of a common past the United States and Canada have been moving by parallel roads toward a similar goal.

In terms of boundaries the United States and Canada have ones which are common, the boundary on our west being the Pacific Ocean, and on the east the Atlantic Ocean, the forty-ninth parallel which we call the border is merely a line of political demarcation.

For more than a century speakers and writers on both sides of the international boundary have eulogized the undefended border. Undefended is it? One finds it is not quite so undefended as the orators and tourist associations would have you believe. When a citizen of Canada attempts to enter the United States for a vacation he finds it very defended. Defended by officials in Ottawa who state, "Oh, you must have a passport." Then the American consul takes up where they left off, and says, "You must have a visa," then the Canadian Labor Department gives you a labor exit permit, next the selective-service office scrutinizes your credentials, just in case you may be slipping out on the draft, and finally the Foreign Exchange Control Board—like a Shylock—offers you only sufficient American currency to house you and feed you. Then, of course, the customs officer on both sides of the border gives you a feeling that all is not well as they examine your luggage after—and with a very solemn expression—you have confessed to personal effects only. This sounds like medieval torture but actually it only takes 10 minutes. However, you who may be anticipating a vacation in Canada this year will find a really undefended border because all you need is proof of American citizenship and you are in.

Yes, the undefended border is one of the great factors in the understanding and cooperation between United States and Canada, and remains a magnificent example to nations that may be slowly moving toward international amity of what can be accomplished by good neighbors. Think what could be achieved if in Europe, or, as a beginning even two countries in Europe would agree to a permanent undefended border. What seeming miracles could not be wrought in a suspicious world by the forthright proof of friendly intentions by stripping frontiers of fortifications. Border incidents, wars of nerves, and saber rattlings result inevitably from the mere show or display of force along international boundaries.

The agreement to leave the Canadian-American border undefended is to be found in the Rush-Bagot treaty signed in 1817. Mr. Richard Rush and Sir William Bagot, in their wisdom and foresight, created, with the support of their respective governments, the greatest imaginable influence for the maintenance of good will between our countries. It is interesting to remember that this model agreement was reached following the conflict of 1812.

Now as part of the Canadian-United States border runs through the Great Lakes, that agreement naturally included the dearming of vessels operating in those lakes, and so successfully did the Rush-Bagot treaty dissipate the ill feeling of those days that by 1941 only a polite exchange of notes was necessary to authorize the arming of the vessels of the American Navy operating in the Great Lakes.

Looking in retrospect at the staking of territorial claims, the United States and Canada have solved some very complex problems. You may recall the eastern boundary dispute, the Alaskan boundary dispute, and the Oregon boundary dispute—disputes that in some countries would have entailed an exhibition of force at the respective borders. But here in North America, all disputes between our two countries were settled amicably by boards of arbitration.

In 1914 the Governments of the United States and Canada established the International Joint Commission as a permanent tribunal to deal with such disputes and particularly those relating to the preservation of boundary water and the Great Lakes area. Because, when you realize that 1,800 miles of the Canadian-United States boundary runs through lakes and rivers many special problems arise. The problem of navigation and hydro installation, the diversion of water for agricultural purposes, and the pollution of water by cities or industries must be controlled. The Commission consists of three representatives from each country and it is with interest and pride that we note that it has never been divided along purely nationalistic lines. The findings of the Commission are binding on both parties and no appeal can be taken against its judgment.

Probably, in all the fellowship of the United Nations there is no finer example of the common people of two lands working together to achieve common ends. This has resulted not only in the International Joint Commission, but the International Niagara Board, who are charged with the responsibility of keeping the scenic beauty of the falls intact. The International Pacific Salmon Fishing Commission was established to protect the salmon on the west coast, to ensure adequate spawning grounds, and to control the depletion of the waters.

We also have the International Board of Enquiry for Great Lakes Fishermen, the North American Council on Fishery Investigation, the International Fishery Commission. Our association from the beginning of the war was a partnership that extended through all phases of economic and military collaboration and included the establishment of the Permanent Joint Defense Board, the Joint Economic Commission, the Joint War Aid Commission, the Combined Food Board, and the Alaska International Highway Commission.

We exchanged technical and scientific knowledge. We even helped each other harvest crops in the West by bringing farm-help teams and harvesting machinery across the border to cut and thresh grain that fighters and workers might be fed. For the first time in history the Dominion of Canada and the United States signed a military agreement making a defense commitment with a country outside the British Commonwealth, and it is interesting to note that this

agreement was implemented 60 minutes after the first bomb fell on Pearl Harbor—for the Canadian Cabinet was called into session and the articles of war were signed by the Prime Minister.

The Ogdensburg and Hyde Park agreements created what amounted to free trade in war matériel across the border. In projects such as the Alaska Highway and the Canol project, the affairs became completely integrated and the identity of the American and Canadian armed forces in the Aleutian operation were completely merged.

This war phenomenon came as no surprise to experienced observers as it was simply a logical projection of the 150-year-old project disclosed in the book, The Mingling of the Canadian and American People.

This mingling has developed to not only an exchange of citizens, but an exchange of populations. Some 5,000,000 Americans are of Canadian origin, and 1,500,000 Canadians are of American origin. Included in that 5,000,000 Canadians was your famous Admiral Snowden Sims, who was born in Ontario, and the Secretary of the Interior in the Wilson administration, Franklin K. Lane, who was formerly from the prairie Province of Saskatchewan. Today in the Canadian Cabinet the Honorable C. D. Howe was born an American.

In this intermingling of peoples we can also mention the intermingling of cities. Along the eastern international border are the two communities of Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick. The population of the Canadian town is 3,306, and its neighbor 5,161. They lie close to each other but on opposite sides of the border. In other lands or on other continents this fact might seriously interrupt communications between them, but not so here.

Calais, in search of a good source for its municipal waterworks, selected a site 10 miles within the Canadian border. The two communities are served by a common gas and electric company with the plant on the United States' side. Housewives of both communities shop in either at their own discretion and no customs guard risks the righteous indignation of the womenfolk by denying a woman's right to seek a bargain whether in Calais or St. Stephen. Each community maintains its own fire department, but both attend fires without regard for boundaries. When the birth rate of Calais dropped suddenly, investigation revealed that expectant mothers, ignoring the possible international complications, were having their children born at a new and modern hospital in St. Stephen. Some little boys and girls will grow up ineligible to become Presidents of the United States, but they will grow up as living examples of neighborliness which is the true manifestation of international cooperation.

This intermingling has developed two almost indistinguishable peoples. Americans, expecting to find a novelty in Canada, find the ordinary population. Perhaps they imagined Canada was populated by broad "A" Britishers, differing in custom, manners, and habits than their own. Instead, they find Canadian people like themselves, and Canada an extension of the States of Washington, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, and all other border States.

The American is as much at home in Toronto, Winnipeg, or Vancouver as he is in Cleveland, St. Paul, or Seattle—so much at home that the last two American vice consuls appointed to Vancouver have retired in that city. The people speak the same language, use the same idioms, talk the same current continental slang. If the coffee is poorer, the tea is better. The women look the same, live the same, and wear the same New York clothes. The men avoid the same neckties, belong to the same luncheon and breakfast clubs. The same magazines are sold in the same drug stores where the same soda fountain dispenses the same coca-cola. The same traffic problem created by the same cars in the same kind of cities give the same traffic officers the same kind of headaches.

If he is a Kiwanian, Rotarian, or Shriner he learns that the Canadian is the same confirmed joiner that he himself is. If he belongs to the AFL or CIO he will find affiliated unions whose problems are identical to those he left across the line.

Often, it is only when the American visitor by sheer accident comes across a scarlet-coated Mountie that he can really convince himself that he is actually in Canada.

Despite the one-thousand-and-one similarities, Canada is another country, and Canadians are different. Wherein that difference lies is almost impossible to determine, but it is there and can be sensed the moment one crosses the line.

It may be that there is more time for leisure and a less hectic use of leisure time—that life is more deliberate.

However, these are pure speculations. The task of interpreting and identifying the Canadian belongs to the dramatist and novelist, not to the amateur historian or casual speaker. Canada exists with its four populated regions, its economic and racial sectionalism, and its unifying beckoning Laurentian shield brooding in the background. It is inhabited by Canadians 50 percent of British stock, 30 percent French, and 20 percent other. They are American, too, but not American-Americans, although they eat the same food, breathe the same air, speak the same language, read the same books, and fight side by side against the same enemies.

No one in his proper senses objects to the fact that the Canadian people are different nor do they question their right to remain different. Who will even ask them to change the manner in which they have chosen to govern themselves? Some people are under the erroneous impression that because we accept a Governor General, a representative of the Crown or King's representative, that we are under the Government of England. While you may quote as evidence that in religious Canada we pray that the Governor General may govern well, the prayer is offered, of course, with the understanding that Heaven will never be so unconstitutional as to grant the prayer.

One might wish that Canadians become more Canadian, that they become more Canadian-Canadian than American-Canadian; that they find and embrace a point of view more distinctly and affirmatively Canadian.

Such a point of view would recognize and take pride in the existence of a Canadian people, differing within itself as the American people to the south differ from those in the north, but conscientiously and thoroughly Canadian.

This need not lead to narrow nationalism with which the world is already too lavishly endowed, but simply the recognition of Canada as a nation by Canadians and of their own achievements.

Considering, however, the sectional differences, cultural duality, and geographical difficulties, the mere existence of Canada as an important political and economic entity is one of the world's interesting phenomena.

When one remembers the smallness of its population, the accomplishments represented by the physical development of the country, the high degree of technological advancement, and on top of all else the fact that 30 percent of Canadian stock has been drawn into the United States, the Canadian story becomes somewhat fabulous.

It is as Canadians we can make our best contribution not only to Canada but to peoples of the Western Hemisphere and the United Nations.

We, Canadians and Americans, rejoice in a priceless heritage!

Nature has been bounteous to us over all other peoples. Geography has separated us for over 100 years from the horrors and ravages of invasion. Our own good sense and keen judgment has enabled us to live together as neighbor and friend for over a century without resorting to the use of arms. But, enjoying as we do, much of the world's bounty we in turn owe a duty to the world.

Friendship between peoples and good relations between countries cannot be legislated, nor will a twenty year—or even a fifty year—friendship pact be of any value unless borders are opened for the interchange of citizens and the communication of information and ideas.

We, in Canada and the United States, have compounded no special formula that isn't available to the world. We adhere to a common and fundamental philosophy exemplified by that great American President, Mr. Thomas Jefferson.

In Canada and the United States, Mr. President, we believe there is no substitute for freedom of the press, freedom of person by means of the habeas corpus, trials by juries impartially selected, religious tolerance, and also free elections.

And by maintaining a civilized state in our relations we set an example for other nations to follow. We embody the principles of freedom by which other nations can get along with each other.

In the war-shattered world, Canada and the United States have proven and must continue to prove that peace is not an impossible ideal, that countries can best maintain their national honor, dignity, and respect not by resorting to the law of the jungle or the breaking of pledges or agreements, but by reasoned and constructive friendship, conditioned by understanding, governed by justice, and founded on peace.

Our traditions fit us to serve this purpose. We have freely entered into open agreements with each other and have honored our pledges. By leadership and example we can fulfill our responsibilities to the end that all nations may enjoy the blessings of freedom and peace. For, in the words of Prime Minister King, "We have a profound faith that the way of freedom is also the path of peace."

National Grange Supports House Joint Resolution 325

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am most proud to include a letter from Mr. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, expressing full support of that great organization for my House Joint Resolution 325:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1946.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VOORHIS: I appreciate receiving a copy of House Joint Resolution 325, which you introduced on March 7, 1946. We have given it careful study.

Farmers generally will wholeheartedly endorse a prohibition against the conversion of badly needed grains into liquor during this emergency. So long as food is desperately needed to prevent starvation by so many people there can be no excuse for conversion into alcoholic beverages.

Farmers throughout the Nation are critically short of feed grains to meet dairy, meat,

and poultry goals calling for maximum production of food. They find it hard to reconcile the continued use of grains for liquor while the world pleads for more food.

It is difficult to convince housewives of the necessity for making sacrifices in the use of bread and other cereal products so long as the Government permits the use of large quantities of grain for nonfood purposes.

We hope that Congress will act promptly and favorably on House Joint Resolution 325.

Yours sincerely,

A. S. Goss, *Master.*

Careless Columnist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Careless Columnist," from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of March 12, 1946:

CARELESS COLUMNIST

This newspaper justifiably prides itself on the quality and variety of its columnists. But, though it holds that those writers ought to have full freedom to tell their news and express their views, it correspondingly maintains that every columnist is in duty bound to substantiate what he says before he says it. So we call particular attention to a paragraph in today's Washington Merry-Go-Round, retracting a statement made by the same column last month.

Here was the case as Mr. Drew Pearson originally presented it:

James A. Farley aspires to the Democratic candidacy for Governor of New York. He wanted to get the bulge on the similar ambition of Senator MEAD. Therefore, when Archbishop Spellman started for Rome, where he was to become a cardinal, Mr. Farley, in Mr. Pearson's words, "created the impression that he was invited by Spellman to make the trip," whereas, Mr. Pearson continued, "the fact is that Farley asked to attend, thus putting the hierarchy on the spot."

This meant that Mr. Farley was using his church for his personal-factional advantage.

Even his political enemies were amazed. Such an action was totally out of character for Mr. Farley, a radical departure from his whole record. He has always fought hard, but he has always shot square. He has always respected the integrity of his own church and punctiliously avoided any injection of religious issues into political disputes. Yet Mr. Pearson topped his column with the juicy morsel on February 13.

Now, a long 27 days after, Mr. Pearson retracts the allegation, briefly, in the next-to-last paragraph of his column. He retracts it with the casual statement: "Jim Farley was invited by the Cardinal himself, when Jim dropped in to congratulate him. The column is convinced, contrary to a previous report, that Jim took no initiative in securing the invitation. Apologies to Jim Farley."

Mr. Pearson is tardy, and he is cavalier. The charge was presented as a "fact"; in the apology, it is dismissed as a mere "report." Mr. Pearson owes more of an atonement than that to Mr. Farley—more of an explanation to the readers of the Merry-Go-Round.

The whole mess ought to be a lesson for the columnist, teaching him to verify rumors before rushing them into print as truths. The more sensational the rumor, the more it demands meticulous verification.

What They Think of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, following are five letters, typical communications, which came to my desk. To those of us who are familiar with the hearings at which employees, employers, producers, and retailers have testified, these letters are typical of those who on the one hand adhere to theories and of those who on the other represent consumers and producers:

ORCHARD BLUFF RESORT, INDIAN LAKE,
Dowagiac, Mich., April 26, 1946.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Representative from Michigan,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: It is time that we farmers make plain to the men representing us in Congress how we feel about OPA. We certainly resent OPA regulations and subsidies which have brought about disastrous results, such as shortage of food and machinery, etc. OPA has held prices down on producers at less than cost—experts at our agricultural college have proved that no one can produce food at these low prices. There should be taken into consideration the scarcity of help and the increased labor costs—this year 15 cents per hour over last year.

Now they talk of advancing the price of corn when all corn has gone out of the farmers' hands. What prospects will there be for pork in the future? I just had occasion to make a trip down through Michigan and Indiana, and where I had previously seen 400 and 500 hogs per farm, I saw 4 or 5 and none in many places.

It is evident that you in Washington do not realize the critical situation of the farmer and producer held down by the absurd OPA prices. The farmers are the backbone of our country and we have been producing without fertilizer, farm machinery, and paid excessive wage costs which must be taken into consideration as in any other business if we are to maintain our land in a shape to continue production.

It is going to take the farmer years to accumulate enough to put his farm back in the same fertile condition it was before the war, also to replace equipment which now costs a great deal more, if he can ever get it.

Trusting this will help you to realize the seriousness that confronts the farmer and that you will not be influenced by the propaganda put out by OPA, I am,

Yours very truly,

PAUL G. CONKLIN.

NASHVILLE, MICH., *April 25, 1946.*

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to ask that you change your opinions on price control and represent us common people who have elected you to office.

If you want to represent the large manufacturing interests and vote to do away with Government price control then I will do my utmost to get a new Congressman from our district.

There are thousands that feel the same way, as you would learn if you would and could talk to the majority of the voters in our district.

Sincerely,

BENN H. HAINES.

OSTRANDER'S FOODS,
Niles, Mich., April 23, 1946.

FRIEND HOFFMAN: I run a small market here and have tried to have meat for my customers 3 days a week. I opened the store for meat at 9 today. At 11 a. m. the meat is all gone. The workingmen coming in this evening will have no meat for their kids and themselves.

I tell them you voted for it. Don't crab about it.

I tell you it is hell when a man can be fined or sent to jail for earning a dollar then going out to the black market to find a small piece of meat to feed his wife and kids and spending the money he has worked hard to earn.

The land surely has a severe case of Bowlitis or delirious Trumans.

Stay with them and give them the same old battle, and we're always for you and your American spirit.

Don't answer this if you're busy.

L. W. OSTR..NDER.

HOLLAND, MICH., *April 27, 1946.*

The Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AND HONORABLE SIR: Of all classes of people, there are none that hate the OPA worse than the small businessmen. It is very characteristic for the New Dealers to lie in this fashion. I am positive that there is no such "new council of American business," an "organization claiming members in 'scores' of businesses throughout the Nation." Just a specimen of New Deal propaganda. They are not fooling us.

Our Nation is well over a century and a half old and in these years it has become the wealthiest nation of the world, and that without an OPA. Now with the OPA we have no sugar, no butter, no meat, no shirts, no suits of clothing, no materials for building houses to live in, and no machinery for our farms.

* * * * *

All this talk of his that such a loan will better our economic status is the sheerest bunk. Suppose a merchant has a customer that never pays his legitimate accounts and is deeply in debt with the merchant. Who would now advise that merchant to loan that deadbeat customer several thousands of dollars so that this customer could then do a larger business with him? Only a crackpot who should undergo a psychopathic examination. That's VANDENBERG's logic.

It is indeed very pathetic that many of our politicians, when they are sent to England and are there feted, eating off golden plates with golden knives and forks and spoons, and get into the swirl of that imperialistic court that gets well over $300,000,000 per year to maintain its trumpery, its tin-horn magnificence, and its snobbishness, will become so infatuated that they will soon imagine it to be up to their plebeian countrymen to support them. Incidentally, also to strengthen the imperialistic grip of those snobs upon their colonies who are becoming all too restive under their domination. Perhaps VANDENBERG thinks it would be just fine if these English would be our junkers with himself feted and knighted by them.

JOHN VANDERBEEK.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
SETTLEMENT,
Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1946.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to thank you for your courteous answer to my inquiry of why you voted against the OPA, when you voted for the crippling amendents to the bill.

Your statement that you know more about the OPA than I do makes me wonder, because I have devoted the last 27 months to an exhaustive study of economics, particularly a study of our national tax situation, pursuant to writing a thesis on same this

summer. Not only do I understand the subject theoretically, but, by actual poll, I represent 80 percent of the veterans on this campus when I say that the OPA should be continued in its previous form. I fully realize that there are several small portions of the OPA program which are unfavorable to the general good of the Nation, but in view of the great amount of good that the entire program would have on the Nation it would seem sheer folly to destroy the entire program in order to do away with the trivial sore points. If your finger hurts would you cut off your arm? Inflation with all its accordant terrors would destroy our national prosperity and so-called wealth.

I hope that realizing that the great majority of the voting public favors the retainment of the OPA you will, in the future, vote the way your constituents want rather than the way you see fit. The days when the "enlightened" few were the only ones considered worthy of voting are past.

In answer to your query, I am very much a registered voter of Weesaw Township, county of Berrien, State of Michigan, which is, you will recognize, a definite part of your district. My only purpose in further "enlightening" myself here at the University of Chicago is so that I may return to Michigan, enter into and, with other veterans who feel the same way as I do, clean up our politics. My ultimate goal will be obtained when we have a working "one world" where we are all "citizens of the world."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH J. WOOD,
Lieutenant (AI) U. S. N. R.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune]

RESENTFUL VETERAN

To the EDITOR of the SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE:

During my time overseas my wife purchased a home, in order that we might have a place to move to with our two kids when I came back. The house was rented when my wife bought it and the people living there understood they would have to move when I came back. It is now almost 10 months since my return to this country and the same people are still living in my house and my wife, myself, and our two boys are "sweating them out" in a two-room apartment.

In January of this year the OPA gave me the right to immediate occupancy, but the "local law" with which I was forced to comply still keeps me out of my house. The hearings of my request for eviction have been heard in a local justice of the peace court. Now I am waiting for another court to hear it. Just when the hearing will be held in that court is a matter of guess, so I believe.

I am working on a job where it is necessary for me to have a car. I have had an order in for a long time and find now that my car is being held in the dealer's place of business. I can't have it until OPA tells them how much they can sell it to me for. Anybody's guess as to when that will be is as good as mine.

During my time outside this country I learned of some pretty raw deals that the governments of various other countries put over on their natives. It was always a good feeling that came over me when I realized that our country was not like that one. At home we live in a free country; one can buy a home and go into business. That time seems to have passed. You can still buy a home but you may not live in it until you have the law say O. K. You may go into business but you will have to comply with a lot of nonsense such as OPA, CPA, FHA, and a dozen other alphabetical organizations whose meaning and function no one is sure of, but they will be with you.

Why can't a case like mine be heard in court at once. The judges and lawyers talk about the dockets being full; and it is small wonder that they are.

You know this kind of treatment makes a guy a little mad.

HARRY T. BADGER.

SOUTH BEND, *April 25 1946.*

Yesterday, the President in effect, by his endorsement of the Secretary of Agriculture's admission of the necessity of abolishing OPA's control on beef, conceded that some of us were right in our opposition to the OPA, in our contention that it had not only failed to prevent an increase in the cost of living, but had created a scarcity.

Today, on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN] in effect conceded that OPA's policy had not held down the price of meat, but had created a scarcity.

Government Grain Purchase Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a huge special tax is being levied against a part of our people for the purpose of supplying food to the starving countries overseas. The United States has always risen to the need of distressed peoples, and in the present emergency we are willing and anxious to sacrifice in order to alleviate the misery and suffering of the world.

The present program, however, of siphoning wheat and corn from the market has the effect of placing an unjust burden of the cost upon only a part of our people, when the country, as a whole, should assume the responsibility.

The payment by the Government of a 30-cent bonus for wheat and corn has removed these grains from the market. The farm wife has no feed for her chickens and is thus forced to sell her flock.

The feed processor is unable to obtain merchandise and must either close his business, discharge his employees, or at least suffer considerable loss in his income.

The miller and baker experience a reduction of income, if not an actual shutdown of operations.

The dairy industry is confronted with the probable forced sale of much of its assets.

The livestock industry, having been assured of a ceiling price for feed, now discovers that it must market, at a sacrifice, the stock which is not ready.

It is quite apparent that drastic measures are needed if we are to meet our obligation to help the starving peoples of the world. It is also apparent that, in attempting to do so, we are levying a special tax upon these industries and the country at large is not assuming the burden.

I have noticed recent statements in the press concerning the ability of the "well-fed farmer" to assume this responsibility. This attitude smacks of pure demagoguery and attempts to shield the negligence, inefficiencies, and lack of planning on the part of those in charge of the relief program. The farmer is ready and willing to do his share, but certainly no one would suggest that he or the miller or the baker or the feed processor should assume a greater proportion of the cost of this program.

I suggest three possible remedies:

First. Immediate installation of emergency measures to channel grains for distressed cases.

Second. Reexamination of the possibility of the use of dehydrated foods.

Third. The examination of the possibility of the payment of damages to those people who have suffered extraordinary loss by reason of the Government grain-purchase program.

Address of Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which was delivered by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER at the annual dinner of the Bronx Democratic County Committee at the Concourse Plaza Hotel on April 25, 1946:

My friends, we meet here to prepare the way for victory in November.

In the words of Governor Dewey, it is time for a change. It is time for a change in Albany. We must restore the government of the great State of New York to the tradition of Smith, Lehman, and Roosevelt. This means that we must elect a Democratic governor.

We also need a change in Washington The Republican minority in Congress is too large, too noisy, and too obstructionist. We need a much bigger Democratic majority in Congress. We need this to complete the unforgettable program of Franklin D. Roosevelt. We need it to help another great President, Harry S. Truman, carry forward his own great program.

I cannot come back to the Bronx without thanking you, from the bottom of my heart, for the loyal and wonderful support that you have always given to me. Two years ago, when I was reelected for a fourth term in the Senate, you helped me obtain a stupendous majority in this borough. My appreciation is just as keen now as it was on election night.

I could not say "no"—despite the pressure of work in Washington—when Ed Flynn asked me to be here. Ed Flynn is my friend—and he is a great democratic leader in State and Nation. I welcome this chance to express my esteem and admiration for this friend of yours and mine.

When I commenced my campaign for reelection in 1944, I received a good deal of free advice. All sorts of new formulae were suggested, as the way to make victory certain. But if some of these new and untested formulae had been followed, the victory could not have been won.

My friends, there is only one formula for a Democratic victory in the city of New York, in the State of New York, or in the Nation. That formula may be summarized in the one word—"liberalism."

We of the Democratic Party have been defeated with conservative candidates and conservative platforms. We have almost always been victorious, when we have had liberal platforms and liberal candidates.

Let no one tell you that things are different today. Never before were the American people more progressive, more liberal, and more intently determined upon humane and sensitive government. They will elect those whom they confidently expect to provide that kind of government. They will elect Democrats so long as we stand by our record of providing that kind of government.

That kind of government is terribly difficult to achieve, so long as there is a large and powerful Republican minority in Congress.

The best evidence of this is the recent action of the House of Representatives, calculated to cripple and dismantle the OPA.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I have looked forward eagerly to the time when wartime controls can be safely and completely abandoned. We all want that, at the first safe moment. But that time is not yet.

In view of the critical shortages which now exist, to wreck the OPA would deal a devastating blow to every housewife buying food and clothing for her family. It would lead to a cycle of inflation and deflation, whose chief victims would be businessmen of average size. It would cause prices to skyrocket, so that professional men and women with fairly fixed incomes would find it harder and harder to make ends meet. It would make the worker unable to cover the cost of living with his wages.

Now, what excuse or justification does the Republican leadership in Washington offer for its efforts to bring the OPA to a dangerously premature end? Their only apology is that there were some Democrats who voted with them. And what a lame excuse that is.

The Democratic Party in Congress is composed of free men. No Democrat is forced to vote a party line. In the past, there have been some Democrats, although very few, who voted against social security, against collective bargaining, or against getting ready to resist the Nazis and the Japs. But the fact remains that the majority of Democrats were in favor of all these necessary measures. And the fact remains that the Democratic majority had to overcome the party line of the Republicans, to enact these beneficial laws.

And so it is now with the OPA. The responsibility for what was done to the OPA in the House of Representatives rests squarely upon the shoulders of the Republican leadership. The only hope for the salvation of reasonable price control, until the critical reconversion period is over, rests with the Democratic majority in Congress. And every housewife, every small businessman, every worker, every person concerned about the economic welfare and security of our country—every such person could breathe more easily, if the Democratic majority in Congress were much larger than it is today.

I am happy to say that your Representatives from the Bronx voted soundly and well on the OPA, and sent the bill on to the Senate to give us a chance to save it.

Here in New York, and everywhere in America, the housing shortage is extremely serious. Veterans, returning from the fox holes, cannot find places in which to live. President Truman has recommended to Congress a tremendous housing program to meet this tremendous need.

The Republican Party line in the House of Representatives has been to defeat this program—and in the House they succeeded in doing so. The voting record is available for all who care to read it. Now that the Senate has restored the vital provisions in the veterans' emergency housing program, the Republican Party line is to prevent the House from agreeing to these amendments.

I hope and believe that the Republican leadership will not be successful. But every veteran's family, living under conditions of terrible overcrowding, or forced to pay more for their housing than they can afford—every such veteran's family could breathe more easily, if the Democratic majority in Congress were much larger than it is today.

Under such circumstances, we here have one clear responsibility to the American people. It is our responsibility, not only to win a Democratic victory in November, but also to make the victory so tremendous that there will be no fear or doubt about the future welfare of the people.

Time passes quickly. It will not be long before 1948 is here. Then we shall have on our hands an election struggle of supreme consequence to us all. This struggle in 1948 will determine whether all the affairs of state are to be turned back to the reactionary Republican leadership, or whether the affairs of state shall be happily retained in the sure and competent hands of Harry S. Truman.

Upon this decision, the welfare and prosperity of America will rest.

Upon this decision depends whether we shall have an economy of abundance, with full employment, good wages, and prosperous business conditions.

This decision will determine whether we shall maintain a humanitarian outlook toward the rest of the world, which is the only sure foundation for lasting peace.

That is why we must—and that is why we shall—reelect Harry Truman in 1948. In this, New York will lead the way.

My friends, the first round in the battle of 1948 will be fought in the State campaign here in New York next fall.

Thomas E. Dewey has been Governor of New York for almost 3½ years. During that time, he has been a true liberal for about 3½ nights. These 3½ nights occurred during some of his Presidential campaign speeches, when he sought to confuse the electorate with his gaudy promises. But the attempted confusion was unsuccessful, because the 3½ nights could not black out the true record of Dewey in Albany.

Compared with the sound business measures and the enlightened social legislation which three Democratic Governors wrote on the statute books from 1918 to 1942, the record of Dewey has been one of negation through the appointment of commissions. He has made himself the little hero of the right wing of the reactionary Republican leadership. He has talked big about housing for veterans, but he has matched his big talk with little actions—while the Truman Administration has come forward with the biggest housing program in history.

The Republicans in New York State cannot reelect Dewey in the fall. But we Democrats can reelect Dewey, if we oppose him with a nondescript candidate and a nondescript platform. We are sure to defeat him with a liberal candidate and a progressive platform.

The Democratic Party, in State and Nation, means just four things in the minds of the American people:

First, social justice and economic reform.

Second, equality of opportunity, reinforced by law, for every race and creed and color.

Third, business prosperity, founded upon the economic health of the whole community rather than upon privilege or exploitation.

Fourth, lasting world peace, based upon the principles of the United Nations, with insistence upon the rights of all nations and peoples, small as well as large—so long as they are upright in their dealings with others.

Through loyalty to these four principles, the Democratic Party has won victory after victory.

Through loyalty to these four principles, the Democratic Party can continue to win victory after victory.

Victory for the DAR Committee Against Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, by unanimous vote of the executive committee, the DAR agreed to invite the Tuskegee Institute Choir to sing in Constitution Hall on June 3, thereby completely reversing their stand against Negro artists. This was, in fact, a victory for the DAR Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Constitution Hall and the thousands of members of the DAR in chapters throughout the country who have not in the past agreed with the Washington leadership.

It is with confidence that Daughters of the American Revolution look forward to eradicating from the books the "white artists only" clause at the convention in Atlantic City on May 20th.

To keep the record straight, the background of the exchange of telegrams between the DAR Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Constitution Hall and Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, president general of the National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution, is as follows:

April 15, 1946: Telegram to Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, president general of NSDAR, Washington, D. C.:

"It has been brought to the attention of our committee that the Tuskegee Choir has made an application to appear in Constitution Hall on June 1 in the concert in tribute to Booker T. Washington. The eyes of every thoughtful American are focused on the Daughters of the American Revolution today, wondering what action will be taken by the national board in this matter. Will the white artists only clause once again bar artists of international fame from appearing in that auditorium over whose entrance there is engraved the motto: 'Let us set standards to which the wise and honest may repair; the event is in the hands of God'? The loyal Daughters who are members of this committee, and others who have expressed their accord with our stand, feel that truly we have in these words of General Washington an ideal of doing justly even if opposed to the pattern of intolerance and bigotry set by forces in a community.

"Lest once more DAR's all over the country are forced to apologize for the action of the national board, we would urge you to grant this request of the Tuskegee Choir to appear in the Nation's Capital in the auditorium which is owned by an organization pledged to 'cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country; to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty.'

"It is significant that this appearance should be made in Washington while these singers are en route from their engagement to sing at the unveiling of the Booker T. Washington bust in the Hall of Fame in New York University. To meet a refusal on their trip would be incongruous with the treatment due these fine young Americans on so noteworthy a mission."

This telegram was signed by CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, for the Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Constitution Hall.

April 16, 1946: The following telegram came in reply, addressed to Mrs. LUCE:

"I have your telegram of April 15 in which you inject yourself into the request of the renowned Tuskegee Choir to appear in Constitution Hall on June 1 for a concert in tribute to Booker T. Washington. Tuskegee Institute and its founder stand high in the esteem of every American, and since the request was received last week we have been endeavoring to work out ways and means to have the choir appear in Constitution Hall so that as many of the citizens of the Nation's Capital as possible could enjoy such a distinct privilege. Your antagonistic message, however, with its threats and un-American insinuations, has seriously complicated the matter. You are the leader of a few misguided and misinformed DAR members who at your instigation have set themselves up as members of the self-constituted 'DAR Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Constitution Hall.' You have taken no part in DAR work during your 4 years as a member except to stir up discord. But if you will read article VIII of our by-laws you will find that your committee is illegal and is masquerading under false pretenses. No group of DAR members has the right to constitute itself as a 'DAR committee' and conduct its activities under such misrepresentation. Your little band of nine DAR members, with a secretary who is not even a DAR member according to our records, is attempting to incite our members to revolt against my administration and the national board of management over the carefully considered operation of Constitution Hall. You now attempt to use such a fine institution as Tuskegee to attain your political ends and cause strife. I doubt if Tuskegee Institute wants your support or has asked for it. If its request for the use of Constitution Hall is finally denied, it can charge that refusal to your interference. The DAR is trying to operate Constitution Hall for the best good of all the people and in line with prevailing customs. Because the DAR is vulnerable to such attacks it has been made a political football by publicity seekers and disturbers who desire to destroy this great patriotic organization or use it for their private advantage. You quote the motto over the entrance to Constitution Hall, 'Let us set standards to which the honest may repair.' I commend that motto to you and your committee for earnest study. Your group, parading as a 'DAR committee,' has greatly harmed the present request. We hope that Tuskegee Institute will publicly disavow any connection with your pressure group. We also hope that the president of that institution will deny that Tuskegee Institute requested such a telegram or had any part in its composition. If this request can be granted, it will be, not because of your interference, your intimidating phrases, but in spite of them. A copy of this telegram is being sent to the president of Tuskegee for his information."

Signed by Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, president general, NSDAR.

April 18, 1946: A telegram addressed to Mrs. Talmadge read as follows:

"Your telegram of April 16 received in which you say that because of the insistence of our committee of loyal DAR's that Constitution Hall be opened to the Tuskegee singers you are contemplating denying their request. We are very sorry to learn that our telegram had such a disturbing effect upon you, but what we do want to hear from you is that you have accepted our urgent request and have granted the application of the Tuskegee Institute for the Booker T. Washington memorial concert on June 1. To do so will be in the best interest of the DAR. We hope for your prompt and favorable reply in order that there may be no further incidents in Constitution Hall damaging to your reputation and ours."

Signed by CLARE BOOTHE LUCE for the Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Constitution Hall.

April 19, 1946: Mrs. Talmadge, addressing Mrs. LUCE by wire, said:

"Tuskegee negotiations will be handled direct with President Patterson. No request from any pressure group acting without authority will be given consideration."

Signed by Mrs. Julius T. Talmadge, president general, NSDAR.

April 25, 1946: Newspapers heralded the news that Tuskegee Choir was to be permitted to sing in Constitution Hall on June 3, free of charge.

April 25, 1946: Wire to Mrs. Talmadge from CBL as from committee:

"There is joy in camp today over the decision to allow the Tuskegee Choir to appear in Constitution Hall. This is a good beginning in the right direction. May it indicate an evolving enlightenment which speedily will lead to the deletion of the 'white artists only' clause unhampered by personal prejudice."

ASSOCIATED CHURCH RESOLUTION

I would also like to include at this point the resolution passed by the Associated Church Press in Washington on April 26, 1946:

Whereas this organization has several times in the past condemned the DAR for its policy of racial discrimination; and

Whereas an exception in that policy has been made in the case of the Tuskegee Institute Choir: Be it

Resolved, That we congratulate and applaud the DAR on its action and urge that this presage a permanent action to delete the "white artists only" clause from the Constitution Hall lease at the forthcoming Continental Congress. This action would represent the accepted traditions of our democracy.

The following article appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on April 27, 1946:

CHURCH EDITORS PRAISE DAR FOR LIFTING COLOR BAN

The Associated Church Press, an organization of Protestant journal editors, last night congratulated the Daughters of the American Revolution for admitting Negro artists to Constitution Hall, at the close of their 3-day convention here.

T. Otto Nall, president, said that while the organization several times had condemned the DAR for racial discrimination it now lauded the organization for its decision to permit the Tuskegee Institute Choir to appear in the Hall.

The congratulatory resolution read in part: *"Resolved,* We congratulate and applaud the DAR on its action, and urge that this presages permanent action to delete the 'white artists only' clause from the Constitution Hall lease."

SECRETARY OF THE DAR COMMITTEE AGAINST RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Dr. Maenna Cheserton-Mangle, the secretary of the Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Constitution Hall, who was referred to by Mrs. Talmadge with thinly veiled contempt as "not even a member" of the DAR, is a distinguished editor and writer of church and religious magazines and articles. She has also for many years specialized in racial and religious problems. In a talk before the Associated Church Press in Washington, on April 26, she gave her reasons for accepting this position and some remarks about the work of the committee to date and in prospect:

Every bush and tree in Boston Common sheltered a man. The British had decreed that their soldiers be billeted in Boston homes. The Americans would have none of it. The air was tense. A shot rang out. A man fell—an American—a Negro. It was Crispus Attucks, the first American to lay down his life during the American Revolution, in the cause of freedom.

The scene flashed across my mind as I heard Marian Anderson's voice clear and mellow, floating across the airways, thrilling her audience with America the Beautiful. This young woman once had been denied the right to sing in Constitution Hall because of the color of her skin; denied by the Daughters of the American Revolution—that same Revolution in which one of her own race was the first to die. My blood boiled. I wanted to cry out, "She, too, is a daughter of the American Revolution." But I had no right to do that. I wished that day, as never before, that I were eligible to be a member of the DAR; for the wrong, I knew, must be righted at its source.

Many months later my chance came, not to be a DAR but to fight with some of the more enlightened members to cleanse the blight which had tarnished their good name. As in that fateful day in the eighteenth century, many hearts had been beating in bitter resentment against a decree they knew to be un-American. The air again was tense. It needed only a spark to cause the flame. It came when Congresswoman CLARE BOOTHE LUCE made an address over the radio, on the DAR and racial discrimination in Constitution Hall. Inside a week hundreds of DAR's all over the country wrote to Mrs. LUCE asking what they could do to get the "white artists only" clause out of the Constitution Hall lease. Without exception, these letters were from loyal Daughters who held staunchly to the principle on which the organization had been founded. To them, as to the rest of the world, it seemed incongruous that such situation should exist despite their pledge "to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country; to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty."

It was at this point that I was approached. By common consent the committee felt that its secretary should be nonpartisan and yet personally concerned with the problem. I welcomed the opportunity and started with high hopes. But at the very first move we were stumped. Although the files of letters that had come in were voluminous, naturally they were incomplete if the entire Nation's interest was to be solicited. In my naive way I thought all we had to do was to get a list of the regents of all the chapters in the country and write to them. But even to the members and to Mrs. LUCE, as a Member of Congress, they were not available. Another ruling of the national board. However, due to the indefatigable energy and enthusiastic work on the part of Mrs. LUCE and other members of the committee, a sizable list was compiled and letters were sent out. These letters merely asked the members to give voice to their own convictions in the matter and to make public their resolutions concerning the offending clause in the Constitution Hall lease.

When the work of the committee came to the attention of the national board, the fireworks began. The members were denounced in no uncertain terms and threatening actions were taken regarding the legality of such a committee although it had been clearly stated that it was composed of a voluntary group of members of the DAR. Still everything ran merely as an undercurrent. The real bombshell came when the Tuskegee Institute wrote to the manager of Constitution Hall requesting its use for the performance of the Tuskegee Choir, en route from an appearance at the unveiling of the Booker T. Washington bust in the Hall of Fame of New York University. This came to

the attention of our committee and, lest once again the "white artist only" clause work to the detriment of the DAR, we wired the president general of the NSDAR urging her to facilitate the engagement. Loyal Daughters all over the Nation had had to drop their eyes in shame for previous actions of the governing board and now they were ready to stand up against the powers that ruled in the national society. In reality, of course, the board exists only to act in the name of 3,000 chapters throughout the country.

Through an exchange of telegrams which were made available to the press, the committee urged the president general of the NSDAR to grant the request. There was considerable hedging but the committee was adamant and finally in view of public sentiment the request hardly could be denied. So this morning when the word came that the request had been granted I was delighted but not too surprised.

In reply to your question as to whether or not we are satisfied with this victory I say no. A thousand times no. We will not be content to rest on the laurels of this victory, however great it may seem. For we know that behind the doors of the offices of the DAR there still exists on the books the "white artists only" clause. Exceptions to a rule are laudable when that rule is not worthy of its existence, but by that very virtue we want to have it eradicated so that that unworthiness will be cleared and that exceptions to the law will not be necessary in the future.

You have asked me if it is so that there is such a law governing the segregation of whites and blacks in Washington—such a law as was claimed at first by the DAR. No. There is no such law. But the national board has fallen back continually on the old claim of custom. But as Mrs. LUCE so aptly pointed out in her first telegram to Mrs. Talmadge, over the portals of the Constitution Hall there is engraved the motto, "Let us set standards to which the wise and honest may repair." The loyal Daughters members of this committee, and others who have expressed their accord with our stand, feel that truly we have in this admonition of General Washington an ideal of doing justly even if opposed to the pattern of intolerance and bigotry set by forces in a community.

Insulting of a GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, an ex-sergeant has expressed himself concerning the insulting of a GI when he was asked where he bought his discharge button. I include as an extension of my remarks a letter written by this serviceman to the editor of the York Dispatch and published in that newspaper under date of April 30, 1946:

TO THE EDITOR:

So "Ole JOE" GUFFEY showed his true colors when recently interviewed by your ex-GI reporter. "What did you pay for that discharge emblem that you are wearing in your lapel?" Why, that old stinker! Too bad I'm prohibited from using the vernacular of an ex-sergeant in voicing my opinion of this political parasite who has been subsisting on the sweat and honest toil of the taxpayers of this Commonwealth.

This is the same JOE GUFFEY who 6 years ago refused to pay his back income tax only to ride back into office again on the coattails of the late FDR. Oh, yes; he has plans for the veteran! He's no doubt scheming whereby he can compel the veteran to pay off the debt incurred by the war he had to fight and win.

What was Senator GUFFEY doing when ammunition was being rationed to the GI's on the beaches of Normandy because there wasn't enough to go around? He was one of the clique promoting labor strife and unrest on the home front. How well we remember the labor "missionaries," who were sent to the European battle front to tell us that these strikes back home were only Republican propaganda.

The job of ridding this Nation of punks and little Hitlers rests on the shoulders of the returning veteran. You may be assured that only a "Sad Sack" would waste his vote on the likes of JOE GUFFEY!

X-SERVICEMAN.

Rationalizing Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for April 28, 1946, entitled "Rationalizing Rubber," commenting upon George H. Hall's article appearing in that newspaper of the same date under the heading "Huge synthetic rubber plant an asset Nation isn't likely to give up":

RATIONALIZING RUBBER

As George H. Hall, of the Post-Dispatch Washington staff, points out today, America's war-born synthetic rubber manufacturing capacity now virtually enables this Nation to set the world price for rubber. This means that we have a great new economic club over the British, Dutch, and French natural rubber interests and over the lives of the natives in Java, Sumatra, and other lands where natural rubber is produced.

A Government Inter-Agency Policy Committee, headed by William L. Batt, properly is studying this situation and already has issued statements for long-run and short-run policies, broad in form, but including a continuing, governmental responsibility. Since our synthetic rubber industry was built, for the most part, by the Government, this responsibility cannot be avoided.

The old question of national security vs. international order is involved here. Only the Government can determine the wisest compromise between use of synthetic and natural rubber. On the one hand we must consider the advantages of maintaining a synthetic rubber industry for our national security, and, on the other, we must consider the bad effect on world trade, and on the rubber industry, if it should be almost fatally crippled by loss of the American market.

Use of natural and synthetic rubber should be determined on a rational—including but not wholly a national—basis. Ideally, technical considerations should weigh heaviest in the decision as to proportions. Rubber engineers estimate that the ideal automobile passenger tire would contain about 75 percent natural rubber. If passenger tires continue to be made almost wholly of synthetic rubber, after the natural product becomes available, we will be paying tribute to economic nationalism out of our consumer pockets.

Federal Government Loses Key Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, important to Congress, in our study of efficient Federal Government administration, is the separation from service of those in the so-called upper brackets who are going into private industry.

April 4, when the House was considering H. R. 5939, which is now S. 1415, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] differed with my contention expressed in debate that—

The facts are that each and every day we are losing key personnel of the class mentioned by the gentleman. We are also losing men within the House of Representatives. We do not need to call the names. You know men who have retired voluntarily from this body and who have said themselves they were doing it because of the lack of pay for the job they were doing. Is the gentleman saying we are not going to lose within the Congress, voluntarily, as well as within the Federal executive structure, men who believe that they are entitled to more than the $10,000 they receive for their jobs?

Mr. VORYS said:

I think the Members we lost from the House might well be like the men Mr. Bowles referred to before the gentleman's committee. He mentioned people who would get three to five times as much outside the Government as they are getting with the Government. My point was merely to have the gentleman's committee give us names, or at least one name, the name of some man in the bracket above $10,000 who is leaving the Federal service because of his low salary but who will stay if he gets 18.5 percent more.

I replied "We cannot say who will stay but we can put in the record those men who are leaving the Government. Of course, we cannot say who is going to stay."

Now I wish to give the House a partial answer. April 30 newspapers carried the following story:

The Treasury is losing five top men, it was disclosed tonight, at a farewell party given in their honor. Resignations of some of them had previously been announced.

Those leaving are:

Harry D. White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who will become full-time executive director of the World Bank.

John W. Pehle, an assistant to the Secretary, who will enter private law practice.

Josiah E. Dubois, Jr., an assistant to the Secretary, who will enter private law practice.

J. H. Randolph Feltus, an assistant to the Secretary, who will open a public-relations office in New York City.

Sol Lesser, an attorney for Treasury Procurement, who will be Pehle's law partner.

It was also reported that Roy Blough, now an assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, may resign within the next few weeks to go with the University of Chicago.

A Treasury spokesman said that Feltus, prior to his resignation 2 weeks ago, had declined the post of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

I have made no effort, as yet, to get official information on the number of employees who have left the Government service, but there is herewith submitted, for the information of the Members, a partial list of policy-making positions in which key personnel have left Federal employment during the past month:

Month of April

Department or establishment	Number of employees	Range of salaries of positions vacated [1]
Agriculture	11	$5,180-$7,437.50
Commerce	5	5,390- 9,012.00
Interior	20	5,180- 7,437.50
Justice	26	5,180- 7,700.00
Labor	13	5,180- 9,012.50
Navy	22	5,180- 8,750.00
Post Office	1	5,000
State	27	5,180- 8,750.00
Treasury	16	5,180- 9,800.00
War	11	5,180- 8,750.00
Bureau of the Budget	1	6,440
Civilian Production Administration	12	5,180- 8,750.00
Federal Security Agency	3	5,600- 6,230.00
Federal Works Agency	11	5,180- 6,650.00
Interstate Commerce Commission	2	5,180- 7,070.00
Maritime Commission	13	5,180- 8,750.00
National Housing Agency	3	5,180- 9,012.50
National Labor Relations Board	1	7,170
Office of Price Administration	8	5,180- 8,750.00
Veterans Administration [2]	20	5,180- 9,800.00
War Shipping Administration	24	5,180- 9,800.00
Total	250	

[1] Positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, are in grades CAF-12, P-5 and above.
[2] Month of March 1946.

Roy Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bob McCracken:

THE CROW'S-NEST
(By Bob McCracken)
ROY MILLER

As long as the Lookout knew him, Roy Miller was Corpus Christi's best-known and most prominent citizen. Even in later years, when his work required him to be elsewhere most of the time, he retained that recognition. There was scarcely the time in the 41 years that he called this his home, the Lookout supposes, that he wasn't looked to for leadership and assistance in the efforts, large and small, to make Corpus Christi a bigger and better city.

He labored unselfishly to that end. If ever, in all that time, he considered personal profit or gain where the interests of Corpus Christi were concerned, the Lookout doesn't know about it. He loved his city, the country in which it was located, and the people who comprised its citizenship. Devoted to it as he was, he saw its possibilities clearer than the most and he never missed an opportunity to steer the breaks its way. He was a dreamer who made his dreams come true. Practically every major undertaking that has contributed so materially to the growth and prosperity of Corpus Christi bears its own tribute to the effectiveness of his interest and effort. His prominence in this community was anything but the stuffed-shirt kind.

MEN MADE IT

In the attempt to muster strength for the many tasks that confront us today, we of Corpus Christi have fallen into the habit of abusing both ourselves and those who have gone and labored before. We say that bountiful nature and lavish fortune have dumped into our laps the opportunities and advantages that have contributed so materially to our prosperity and happiness. We don't give men any credit, and that's where we are mistaken.

For whatever Corpus Christi is or isn't, was or can be, people have made it so. Roy Miller and those who labored with him certainly are due the credit for the inspiration and effort that turned adversity and tragedy into promise and achievement and laid the groundwork for the city of tomorrow.

Lesser men would have given up, surrendered to fate and packed up and moved after the hurricane of 1919 that all but wiped out this community. But not them. With faith and ambition fired with imagination and touched with the dramatic, they stood among the wreckage and launched the effort that resulted in the establishment of the port of Corpus Christi, officially opened and dedicated on the seventh anniversary of the hurricane.

On that day Corpus Christi's future was assured. Whatever development has come later is attributable directly to the port's existence. To give the credit to any one man would be rank folly, of course, but there is no discounting the leadership and strategy of Roy Miller in that effort. It is well for all of us who live here today that Corpus Christi was his home.

NEVER QUIT

It was the remarkable thing about him that he never ceased dreaming and planning and working for improvements that would keep Corpus Christi and south Texas on their march of progress. Roy Miller never lost the zest and enthusiasm that characterized his every undertaking where his home city and section were concerned. One of the last memories the Lookout has of him is associated with the picture he drew for this country as a result of the Intracoastal Canal's completion all the way to Brownsville. That was several years ago, before it had reached Corpus Christi.

It was equally as important as the port, he declared, the oil fields and the naval air station. In fact, it would contribute to the stability of them all, and aid in their development, as well as opening new and fertile fields for progress and endeavor. It would bring coastal Texas in direct contact with the more important inland cities, making for cheaper freight rates for this section's business and industry, and increasing traffic through the Port of Corpus Christi. It would serve to open a new tourist frontier by making it possible for yatchsmen up and down the Mississippi and even on the Great Lakes to visit this section regularly. The bayfront development, then being completed, fitted naturally into such a scheme of things. To hear Roy Miller talk, one who didn't know would have thought he had just discovered the canal project. He was even more enthusiastic for its possibilities than when he took it on as his No. 1 hobby a quarter of a century earlier.

The Lookout, along with everyone else who knew Roy Miller, cherished his friendship and placed the proper value on his contributions to Corpus Christi, can't help but derive a certain satisfaction from knowing that, at least, he lived to see the Intracoastal Canal built to this city. At the same time Corpus Christi never will seem the same without him.

When something big and important is in the making, when a fine touch and an extra shove are needed, when tired minds and lagging spirits require a revived optimism, he really will be missed.

Lord Halifax Goes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, of all the British Ambassadors who have represented that Government in the United States, none has been more deservedly popular with the American people than Lord Halifax.

His early departure from the United States, after 5 years' service in Washington, will be a cause of regret to the American people who have learned to love and admire him for his qualities of mind and heart.

Under leave granted, I submit herewith an editorial appearing in the New York Times, in its issue of May 3, which pays just and deserved tribute to Lord Halifax and his wife, Lady Halifax:

LORD HALIFAX GOES HOME

Within the next few days Edward Frederick Lindley Wood, first Earl of Halifax, retiring British Ambassador to the United States, will sail for England after 5 years in Washington. He was a remote figure to most Americans when he steamed up Chesapeake Bay on H. M. S. *King George V*, Britain's newest battleship, in the menacing spring of 1941. The American people know him now. They know that in him there is a deep sincerity, a prodigious knowledge, and ability for work, and that he is as sincere a friend of us and of our way of life as Britain ever sent to our country to represent her interests here. He probably knows more about us than many of us know about ourselves. How many Americans, for instance, have visited all 48 States, or even studied them seriously? Lord Halifax has. How many United States Ambassadors, we wonder, would lay aside diplomatic affairs to talk for an hour and a half with a group of demonstrators protesting this country's policy toward, say, Argentina? Lord Halifax did this to an American group protesting Britain's actions in Greece.

The British Ambassador has served his country well, as a reporter to Downing Street about our affairs and as an interpreter of his own land to Americans. He has shown us that the typical Englishman is not too dissimilar from the typical American, holding the same fears, the same high hopes, basically the same loyalties to the same principles and standards. This kinship he never expressed better than in his farewell address before the Pilgrims. He saw in the chapel of St. Paul's in London, dedicated to those Americans who died defending Eng-

land, and their own land, a symbol of the basic understanding that exists, and must exist, between our two great English-speaking countries. "Let us then go forward," he said, "into the years of peace in that same comradeship which it was our salvation to find in war."

Continuing, he expressed, perhaps, his own philosophy of life when he closed with the quotation from Lincoln: "With malace toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in." He conducted himself to that rule while he was among us. He leaves with our respect, affection, and best wishes.

We shall miss, too, Lady Halifax, who has made as many friends as her husband. She, too, was a symbol in a way, a symbol of the indomitable England that could lose its sons and still face the world bravely and even serenely. Here was no easy task, with one son killed and another desperately crippled by the war. She never shirked it. She, too, was a good soldier and a good ambassador to us and for her own people.

The Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Labor:

HOUSING CALLED ATROCIOUS—WASHINGTON PAPER PICTURES TERRIBLE PLIGHT OF MINERS—MANY MAIMED BY ACCIDENTS OR "BURNED OUT" BY TOIL, WITH LITTLE OR NO INCOME TO LIVE ON

It's rare that newspapers concern themselves with the sordid conditions under which many American workers must toil and live. That's why several exposés carried during the past week in Washington dailies are of unusual interest.

One of the surveys was made by Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, wife of Eugene Meyer, millionaire publisher of the Washington Post. Labor carried a story last week on some of her initial findings in which she reported being "horrified" at the miserable conditions of migrant workers in agricultural areas of the South.

The Washington Star, one of the Nation's richest newspapers—and most conservative—followed up with an investigation of the lot of coal miners. It sent a reporter and photographer into the mining towns of Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky. The paper's published account, written by James Y. Newton, is even more shocking than the picture of migrant labor portrayed by Mrs. Meyer.

Newton told of unbelievably wretched housing in mine areas. He reported interviews with miners who had been crippled for life by underground accidents and left with practically no income to support themselves and their families. He described middle-aged coal diggers "burned out" by exhausing toil and unhealthy working conditions.

"TUMBLE-DOWN SHACKS"

"The coal industry has done its worst job in housing," Newton said. "Much of it is atrocious."

Down at Pineville, Ky., where 25 miners were killed in a mine explosion last December, "the houses are blackened, tumbled-down shacks that appear never to have been painted or whitewashed," the reporter declared.

Only 25 percent of the homes in mining towns could be classified as good, Newton wrote. "Many houses do not have running water, and a bathroom is a luxury in most places," he said. Some continue to be inhabited, he declared, "until they fall down around the ears of their occupants."

Even worse, Newton revealed, is the industry's neglect of disabled workers.

"The lines of crippled and diseased, of men burned out before their time, and the stories they tell as they file into union coal field offices, seem to testify to the inadequacy of the industry's schemes for caring for its unfortunate employees," Newton asserted.

He hastily went on to repudiate any thought that he meant to imply any indorsement of the demand by President John L. Lewis of the Mine Workers for a health and welfare fund to be financed by a royalty on coal.

However, his graphic description of the plight of many of the miners constituted a better argument for the fund than even the union put forward in negotiations with operators.

He told of many cases of miners maimed and paralyzed in subsurface accidents, drawing either meager accident compensation or none at all. Such benefits as they do get are "too small to enable them and their families to live decently."

"BURNED OUT" AT 50

"Also, coal mining is rough, hard work," Newton wrote. "The miner is knocked about, he breathes impure air, and works under artificial light. Consequently, he is burned out at 50 to 60 years of age, and more often than not he has no means of support until his Federal old-age pension comes at 65."

Newton declared, too, that there are many disease cases "where help is needed," but where compensation boards have ruled that the ailments are not traceable to mine injuries and so not compensable. Many can do no work and have to live on charity.

Their plight is aggravated by the fact that wages, at least until the last few years, have been too low to enable the miners to accumulate savings. "Too few have money to tide them over a rainy day," Newton explained.

Address of Hon. James M. Mead, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in my remarks under the unanimous consent granted me, an address given by the distinguished junior Senator from New York, Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, at a dinner of the Democratic Committee of Bronx County on April 25, 1946, at the Concourse Plaza Hotel, in Bronx County, New York City.

Senator MEAD spoke as follows:

During the past quarter of a century, you and I have witnessed profound changes in the government of our State and of our Nation. These changes in government—necessitated by the times—were brought about under the administrations of three great Democratic leaders.

These three political giants filled the Governor's chair at Albany, and one of them went on to become the President of the United States.

Under their able direction, the economic security of our people has been improved, and our living standards have been advanced.

You can take pride in the record of this fine accomplishment, because of the support of the people of the Bronx, because of the voice and vote of your legislators, and because of the consistent and continuous cooperation that was given to all three of those men by your leader, the Honorable Edward J. Flynn.

By your loyal and determined support you contributed mightily to the success of the administrations of those three outstanding leaders, Mr. Alfred E. Smith, Herbert H. Lehman, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is appropriate on this occasion that we pay fitting tribute to one of them who passed away just a year ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. At Hyde Park recently our Government accepted his ancestral home as a permanent shrine to his sacred memory. This shrine now takes its place with Mount Vernon, dedicated to the sacred memory of George Washington; with the marble monument dedicated to the honored name of Abraham Lincoln; with the Jefferson Memorial, and with the other deserved memorials to the great men of history who have made this a better world in which to live.

President Roosevelt's mortal remains lie forever enshrined in the hallowed ground looking down upon the clear waters of the Hudson River. He was back home once again with his neighbors, back to the familiar scenes of his boyhood; to the scenes which he had cheerfully surrendered that he might make his contribution to the public service.

He was the leader—the victor in two wars. The first war was the struggle to prove that our Constitution is a living, breathing document—something more than parchment and ink, and signatures of inspired men. He carried with him to the White House something more than routine experience in the affairs of government. He took with him the burning faith that this country, under the Constitution, can and must make men free. He was endowed with the leadership to make men free. He opened the door for us, and with head high and step firm, we walked forward and onward with him. He showed us the way to win the war against the economic ills which beset our country. We emerged victorious and triumphant from that war.

But that war was barely won when we were faced with another war, a war which threatened the very life of civilization itself. A war which had its roots in the vile seeds of intolerance, of racial hatred, greed for power.

Franklin Roosevelt aroused us from our slumber, and from reliance upon the false notion that the two great oceans separate us from the rest of the world.

Under President Roosevelt's leadership we won the second war as we did the first. We won because of faith in the principles which he enunciated so clearly for the world.

He took the lead in a third war, a war to establish a world organization to use the instrument of governments to insure for all peoples, of every land, the same blessings which we enjoy in America. He dedicated his life to the cause of permanent peace. He opened a new field for the world to enter. We have entered this new field, with the seeds of peace planted deeply in the furrows so recently turned by his hand. It is ours to nurture these seeds with the sunshine of understanding, of tolerance, and of good will.

We should keep his memory fresh in our hearts. If we do, we will enjoy the sunshine of the life which Franklin Roosevelt envisioned for us all.

Address of Hon. Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER A. QUINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. QUINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by the Honorable Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee at the annual dinner celebrating the thirty-second anniversary of Bronx County at the Concourse Plaza Hotel, New York City, on Thursday evening, April 25, 1946:

Our party has always been something more than an aggregation of citizens interested in winning an election. Of course, defeating the Republicans is a detail that we have not neglected since 1928, and we do not propose to overlook that detail in 1946 or 1948.

A regular Democrat is a busier person than a regular Republican. That is because the Democratic party has a program for this Nation, has met its promises to the people, and is as good as its word. And a regular Democrat cannot allow himself to forget his party promises, not in 2 years, or 3, or 4, or 8.

In 1944 as in previous election campaigns our promises to America constituted a program of action. The Republicans had a program of waiting for America to get tired of the Democrats. They hoped that some future generation of Republicans might have public office thrown at them.

The Democratic promise of 1944 was clear-cut. Our candidate for the Presidency was the greatest American President that any of us had ever known, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

But our promise was more than the return of one man to office. It was to finish a job. It was to carry on as a party, as a people, as a Nation, toward the objectives that Roosevelt's leadership had set for us. We proposed to see it through. And today we can thank God for the wisdom and foresight that moved Roosevelt to indicate a preference for Harry S. Truman for the Vice Presidency. In doing so in the summer of 1944, a finer, better, safer America was insured against fate itself.

In peace, as in war, the American people have shown that they want a progressive, a humanitarian, a responsible government. Since 1930 they have demanded it and since 1930 they have been getting it.

For that kind of government the electorate has been grateful. You cannot explain the precedent breaking record of four terms for one man save by the gratitude of the people.

Now let us not misinterpret the tragedy that overtook us on April 12, 1945. On that day President Roosevelt died. But the America that had grown by his hand did not die with him. And the millions of our citizens who believe that it is a finer, better, safer America for the kind of leadership he gave it, have not disappeared from the scene.

If our party continues to give this great majority of citizens the kind of government it wants, it will go an earning the gratitude of the people—of labor, of management, of farmer and factory worker, of Americans in all walks of life—and again we shall be rewarded. For that is the kind of gratitude that is expressed at the ballot box.

It will not be so expressed if it is not earned. The fact that the Republican Party has nothing to offer except its own hopes of winning an election is, in itself, no guaranty of a Democratic victory.

We Democrats are not going to let the people down simply because we face an opposition that would let them down and out.

We do not propose to abandon the promise Franklin D. Roosevelt held out to America.

We are not going to release ourselves, individually or as a party, from the pledge we gave, the obligation we assumed, when government was entrusted to us again in 1944. The Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Truman, will finish the job that Roosevelt began, and we are going to win this fight because we have a vast majority of the people with us.

I believe the Republicans are beginning, after 14 years, to realize this. I notice the chairman of the Republican National Committee has started vigorously proclaiming that his party is the "liberal party of America."

He does not say why. He does not explain the claim to liberalism of a party that has tried to block every step in a progressive program for postwar America, a program that a great majority of the people want. He does not explain away his party's responsibility for obstructing a minimum wage adjustment, housing for veterans, price control, and other proposals in the Truman program.

The Republican national chairman has lately discovered which way the wind blows, but he is a little too late in making that discovery. The leaders of his own party have already come out, and all out, for what they themselves describe as "old-fashioned conservatism."

I do not know where that leaves him, but I do know that the people judge political parties by their actions—by the things they do, not the names they call themselves.

That is how America will judge the Democratic Party. And that is why America will again reward Democratic support of the programs of President Roosevelt and President Truman.

Russians, the West, and Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, most of man's difficulties and the world's ills are due to misunderstanding.

There are few people or countries in the world whom we do not like when we really come to understand and know them. In our present-day world, so filled with suspicion, fear, distrust, and hate, all men and nations should possess more of Will Rogers' philosophy of life, when he once said: "I never met a man I didn't like." Never in the history of mankind did we need this tolerance, faith, understanding, and appreciation of others as we do today.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by William H. Harrison, in which he pleads to Russia to give our American newspapermen and the representatives of our Government the same free access to a knowledge of her country and her people as we have extended to the Russians. We do not demand or request from others anything which we deny to them. It is only in the hope of developing better relationships between our two great powers that I submit the following article, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of April 28, 1946:

RUSSIANS, THE WEST, AND UNDERSTANDING—MOSCOW'S "IRON CURTAIN" MUST BE LIFTED TO CLEAR THE AIR

(By William H. Harrison)

When he and two of his distinguished colleagues met in this city recently with the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Ilya Ehrenburg, the celebrated Soviet writer, made a point which nobody can deny. Russia, he said, is like the Gulf Stream: It is here to stay, and the other nations of the world must concede the foolishness and unreasonableness of expecting it to commit suicide to please its enemies.

There will be no disagreement among sane people over such a thesis. The Gulf Stream is one of the most important currents in the world, and Russia one of the most important nations, and to the extent that there can be any degree of certainty in this life, it is hardly to be doubted that both will last as long as the earth itself lasts. With that said, however, it must be added that these two great physical realities, in addition to their durability, have another trait in common which involves, in the one, an element of uncertainty for shipping, and in the other an element of uncertaity—to put it mildly—in the field of international relations.

Thus, as one authority describes it, the Gulf Stream, when it meets the cold Labrador current, causes powerful whirls, and at some points it is so indefinite as to vary with the winds. Nevertheless, since it is not made up of ideas, personalities, or a government that refuses to let observers study it and report upon it freely, the countries interested in it have no trouble understanding it or getting along with it, despite its caprices.

The same, obviously, cannot be said of the Soviet Union. Like the Gulf Stream, it causes powerful whirls when it comes in contact, as in Iran, with certain political currents, and like the Gulf Stream again, its actions—to western eyes at least—appear often to vary with the winds. But unlike the Gulf Stream, it does not give any outsider much of a chance to study it and to report upon it freely, to the end that its seeming capriciousness may be better explained and mutual understanding thus promoted between itself and other countries.

Under the best of circumstances, of course, it is always difficult for one nation to see eye to eye with another, even when, like Britain and the United States, they share a common heritage of language, law, and political philosophy. The fact that there are many Americans who still tend to regard the English in terms of 1776 and that there are Englishmen who continue to look upon Americans as a race of grasping boors—this despite the free reporting and free exchange of information between them—is enough to make clear that the problem of achieving genuine international understanding does not lend itself to any easy solution.

It is certainly safe to assume, however, that the gap between Britain and America would be far wider than it is were it not for their unrestricted reporting and information exchange. And by the same token it may be said that the mental gulf between Russia and the Western Powers would now be much narrower if the Moscow Government would pull aside the "iron curtain" in front of it and let American, British, French, Belgian, and other correspondents travel as freely in that great country, and report what they see as freely, as accredited Soviet correspondents are welcome to do in the United States and lands similarly enjoying freedom of the press.

To be sure, such a reciprocal gesture on Russia's part would not at once clear the air of the potentially dangerous irritations and

mutual suspicions that exist now. But it would be an all-important first step toward bringing about an era of more sympathetic understanding. Once taken, for instance, it might make it much easier for Americans to develop a broader appreciation of the fact that many of Moscow's recent moves are not innovations, but have their origins in the distant past, when the czars pursued an imperialistic course—clashing with Britain's—to win outlets to the sea for the vast Russian land mass. Similarly, by means of free reporting, the outside world might acquire a new insight into the reasons why the Soviet Union looks so suspiciously beyond its borders. It might come also to comprehend better the traditions, the culture, the religious background, the political, social, and economic thought, and the frequently bitter and tormented history—all basically unlike that of the west—that have so conditioned the Russian mind that it sees things quite differently from the way the western mind sees them.

Finally, within this broadened framework of understanding, Americans, Britons, and others now baffled by it might be able to find an answer to this enigma: How so many Russians, despite what seems to us to be their rigid totalitarian dictatorship, can insist with apparent sincerity and honest conviction that their land is truly free and democratic—more so, in fact, than ours. (Different minds define the same things differently; even in the United States there are those who argue eruditely, if narrowly, that we are a Republic, not a democracy.)

When Mr. Ehrenburg spoke of his country and the Gulf Stream, he went on to complain of the volume of malicious anti-Russian slanders appearing in certain sections of the free American press. The complaint was justified, but as he must know, anti-American fabrications appear not infrequently in the government-controlled Soviet newspapers, and this poison will continue to be exchanged between the two nations as long as one of them keeps on hiding itself and its intentions behind a wall of secrecy and censorship. The United States and Russia differ fundamentally in their political and economic systems, but that does not mean that they cannot live together in full friendliness. As the Rockefeller Foundation declares in its latest report, they can do that if only they will but act reciprocally in seeking to understand each other's ideas and motivations.

Given that—and Moscow is the key to it at the moment—hysterical talk about how the present Russian-American controversy is leading inevitably to a cataclysmic war could perhaps best be disposed of in Emerson's words—"a popgun is a popgun, though the ancient and honorable of the earth affirm it to be the crack of doom."

The Stake in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Samuel Crowther:

THE STAKE IN PRICE CONTROL

(By Samuel Crowther)

(This is the fourth of a series of articles on price control by Samuel Crowther, author and economist, written expressly for the Hearst newspapers.)

ARTICLE IV. WHY ARE THE SHELVES BARE?

Many previously unscented males were surprised last Christmas to receive from loving friends attractive looking bottles of toilet water, usually with a half apology that there seemed nothing else to buy. The brand was usually a new one.

In most cases the contents turned out to be a liquid resembling water that had gone wrong.

Women, according to the purses of the givers, get furs, perfumes, and what is known as costume jewelry.

The furs usually turned out to be as represented but sharply upgraded in price; the perfume, unless from a recognized maker, was apt to be a mate of the toilet water, and the jewelry was high-priced junk.

Those who wanted to give something sound and useful at Christmas only rarely could pick up anything to suit them. No one complained much, taking for granted that the manufacturers had not been able to shift from war to peace.

But now, 8 months after the Japanese surrender, sound merchandise is hard to buy at any price and the sturdy medium or low-priced goods, on which most of our people depended, are simply not to be had.

Women's rayon and nylon hosiery has been dramatized and the rushes and line-ups for them have become a part of life. But nylons can be bought in the night clubs and other hangouts of the black market at from $5 a pair up.

The counters and shelves of the stores are filled with new sorts of goods and most of it is high in price and low in quality.

In the less expensive clothing for women, the prices have at least doubled, not taking into account the lower quality. The large sizes are not being made.

Everyone knows the situation in men's clothing, underwear, and shirts, and the more observant have noted that a considerable portion of the fabrics and many of the finished articles bear the import labels of Latin-American countries and Switzerland, and with here and there something from England.

According to the figures as given out, retail and especially department store business is booming, therefore everyone ought to be happy.

But reputable manufacturers and merchants are anything but happy, while the customers with money in their hands and unable to fill their desperate needs are most unhappy. It all seems puzzling.

It need not be puzzling.

The booming figures on business are dollar figures.

The volume figures, if they could be assembled, would from all the evidence be startlingly low and, if the upgrading could be exactly appraised, the figures would be even more startling.

Reputable manufacturers are shifting their lines or going out of business.

Reputable merchants, because they lack the goods they have been accustomed to sell, are compelled to stock high-priced, shoddy stuff and to get by on furs, perfumes, cosmetics, and costume jewelry.

The whole great area of making and distributing consumers goods is in turmoil and the honest man is either flirting with his honesty or being displaced by the man who never was honest.

The reason for this is the new pattern for business established by the Office of Price Administration which set out to control consumer goods industries by price control from cradle to grave and has ended up by stifling honest production and promoting a new, great vested interest in shoddy productions.

The OPA is not controlling prices. It is just messing them up. It is diverting production from standard to substandard goods and, by creating shortages, is forcing those who must buy to buy the sort of goods that in free market they would not buy.

The OPA is grossly bumptious and incompetent, but even if it were urbane and competent, its methods could not under any circumstances work.

The nearest approach to success in price control was under Hitler.

The Nazis scheduled production and every item entering into production and distribution, including human beings.

If we want that sort of control, we should stop trying the men at Nuremberg and bring them over to direct our economy.

THE STAKE IN PRICE CONTROL

(By Samuel Crowther)

(This is the fifth of a series of articles on price control by Samuel Crowther, author and economist, written expressly for the Hearst newspapers.)

ARTICLE V. WHY ARE THE SHELVES BARE?

The OPA controls prices, but it does not control costs.

The largest cost entering into prices is wages.

In this absurd position, it had the choice of setting prices high enough to cover all costs and a profit. That would be just an elevator going up.

The other choice was to set prices at or below costs and wipe out private business.

It has chosen a course in between of great complexity, which puts every manufacturer and merchant in the air and also at the mercy of the OPA officers.

In general, prices of established concerns are fixed at the 1942 levels with some adjustments and also with what is known as the maximum average price regulation.

The celebrated or notorious OPA stipulates that, while a manufacturer or a merchant may vary the prices of specific articles, the average price must not exceed the average price of the base period.

On the side is another calculation in which the profits of the 1936–39 period are taken as fair profits and it is held that a concern must be refused price relief unless over a period it demonstrates that it cannot earn its average 1936–39 profits.

That is, one must be able to lose money over a period before one will be permitted prices at which one might earn money if one could see the goods.

No manufacturer in his right senses will lose money for 3 or 6 months in order to demonstrate to the satisfaction of a bureaucracy that he is losing money.

All of this sounds complicated.

It is infinitely more complicated in practice than in statement, for all of the OPA regulations are written in that new form of involved English invented in Washington.

For instance, an amendment making the pricing of men's wear "easier" is expressed in 82 pages of fine print.

And finally there is cost absorption, which means that where a manufacturer is allowed an increased price, the retailer is not allowed an increased price but is expected to absorb the increase out of profit. In most cases this works out to selling at a loss.

The theory is that manufacturers and merchants will stay in business as usual, matching losses against profits. But in most cases the profits do not match the losses.

However, if a concern were not in business in 1942, it can usually get price schedules based on costs. That has brought in a big "gray" market of newcomers—the new vested interest.

It has also stimulated shoddy imports, for imports are somewhat obscurely priced on importers' statements.

The legitimate, old-line company is driven to finding some goods that it can make at a profit.

The most striking example is that of the largest manufacturer of work socks in the world.

He formerly produced 60,000,000 pairs of them a year.

He tried for 9 months to get a price that would let him continue production, but such a price was refused him because he had a profit on his war operations. He turned to a new number of dress hose on which he had an adequate price.

Now he is operating only 20 percent of his plant and earning more money than if he was producing the cheaper socks. The public is not getting work socks.

These examples are endless.

The National Retail Dry Goods Association took a remarkable exhibit to Washington of standard goods that are not being made or are being made in only small quantities and lined up against them goods from the new gray market which the OPA had created.

The OPA fought this exhibit fiercely with all the smear it could command.

It has not been able to shake the fact that where an established manufacturer was allowed only $8.50 a dozen for good quality infants' dresses—which is below his cost of production—a newcomer got a price of $10.50; or that an established maker of men's shorts was restricted to $3.50 a dozen for broadcloth shorts, while a newcomer was allowed to charge $7.35 a dozen for material commonly used in chenille bedspreads; or that a standard maker of scooters with good rubber tires was held to a price of $1.92 while a newcomer with a shoddy affair made of scrap was allowed $3.75.

This sort of thing is going on everywhere throughout the consumers goods industry. The people are not getting the goods they want and are willing to pay for. Everyone from manufacturer to customer, is becoming demoralized.

As Maj. Benjamin H. Namm, the president of the National Retail Dry Goods Association and the head of a large department store, puts it:

"The customers are going on their knees to us. We are going on our knees to the wholesalers and manufacturers, and the moral tone is leaving business. It is the OPA's destruction of moral values that most frightens us."

Desperate Dairy Feed Situation in Northeast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append a letter from the commissioner of agriculture of Massachusetts and a statement by the commissioner and secretary of agriculture of the Northeastern States on the present shortage of feed. Unless something is done promptly to move feed supplies into this area the resulting famine in milk, eggs, and poultry will bring much suffering to the consumers. The situation is critical and demands the immediate attention of every agency of Government in position to help:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Statehouse, Boston, May 1, 1946.

Hon. ANGIER LOUIS GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN: Attached is a copy of a statement prepared yesterday by the commissioners and secretaries of agriculture of the Northeastern States.

The grain supply for Massachusetts is steadily dwindling, and with no greater opportunity of purchasing needed replacements of food now being distributed.

It is our belief that every effort should be made to secure distribution of some grain and feed into New England channels of trade in the interest of maintaining our supply of milk, eggs, and poultry for the consumers of the Commonwealth.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK E. COLE,
Commissioner.

STATEMENT BY THE ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS AND SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE OF THE NORTHEASTERN STATES MEETING IN ALBANY, N. Y., APRIL 30, 1946

The present shortage of feed in Northeastern United States constitutes the gravest threat yet to the supply of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry for the millions of consumers in this area.

There is no doubt that the United States must do everything possible to help feed starving people of Europe and Asia. But at the same time, the health and welfare of consumers in Northeastern United States must be safeguarded through sufficient production of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry.

Northeastern farmers have been able to barely get by thus far while feed supplies were being used up at a rapid rate in the areas where they are produced. Now, with the Nation's livestock at a high level and supplies of feed steadily dwindling, it is more imperative than ever that the Northeast receive its fair share of available feed.

Recent renewed efforts to get grain moving off farms where it is produced emphasize the fact that the Northeast is not getting its proper amount of feed for cattle and poultry.

The situation has been brought about by inequitable price relationships which make it more profitable for a farmer in the Grain Belt to feed grain to livestock than to sell it as grain.

Proof of the seriousness of the situation lies in the wholesale cancellation of hatchery orders. These cancellations are proceeding at an unprecedented rate. The number of chicks booked for delivery during May and June was 55 percent less than the number booked for delivery during these months last year. There is just cause for alarm.

Northeastern feed distributors are unable to secure feed from their suppliers, many of whom have stopped booking orders and cancelled earlier orders. There must, however, be no public criticism of the feed industry which has done an almost superhuman job in obtaining feeds under extremely adverse conditions.

Producers and consumers in this area will suffer unless prompt steps are taken to speed up the flow of feed into the Northeast.

Approved by Commissioner Frank H. Peet, Connecticut; Secretary Ralph C. Wilson, Delaware; Commissioner A. K. Gardner, Maine; Commissioner Frederick E. Cole, Massachusetts; Commissioner Andrew L. Felker, New Hampshire; Secretary W. H. Allen, New Jersey; Commissioner C. Chester Du Mond, New York; Secretary Miles Horst, Pennsylvania; Commissioner Stanley Judd, Vermont.

Address of Hon. Edward J. Flynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. LYNCH. Under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to include an address made by the Honorable Edward J. Flynn at a dinner of the Bronx County Democratic Committee held on April 25, 1946, in the Concourse Plaza Hotel in New York City.

His long years of public life, his outstanding service as chairman of the Bronx County Democratic Committee for over a quarter of a century, his wide experience in national political affairs as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, his recognized statesmanship and diplomacy manifested as the special representative of the late President Roosevelt to Russia and other European countries give the words of Mr. Flynn greater weight and stronger emphasis. He said:

Just a little over a year ago we lost our great leader, President Roosevelt. It would ill become me, or in fact anyone, to pronounce in words a eulogy of this great man. His life and his deeds are eulogy enough. However, he did leave a testament. This testament consists of the liberal and forward-looking views that he stood for. There is probably no one in the country today who was associated with President Roosevelt in a political way more closely than I was. Our association goes back for a great many years. I always believed in what he stood for. The progressive legislation that was placed on the statute books, both in Albany and in Washington, was put there because of an aroused public sentiment which he was able to harness and to make effective. He was able to do this because he had the faculty of associating together what sometimes appeared to be many diverse elements. There were individuals in every walk of life and organizations of various complexions who supported what he stood for because they themselves believed in it. It was because all of these different elements united behind him that he was able to accomplish what he did. I am not in any way belittling what these organizations contributed. However, it is always well to remember that all of his aspirations for the people became laws under the sponsorship of the Democratic Party.

Since his death certain groups have been attempting to monopolize the heritage that he left. In their attempts, they seek to avoid the Democratic Party. Today there are just as many Democrats within the party who stand for the things that President Roosevelt stood for as when our party sponsored and supported his program. Perhaps they are not as vocal as they might be—perhaps they are not attempting to capitalize as much as they should on what was accomplished by him through the medium of the Democratic Party.

At this point it is well to pause and to consider what may happen if there is a division among the followers of President Roosevelt. No one group should set itself up as the sole custodian of the ideas and the ideals President Roosevelt believed in. They should always remember that in order to accomplish further results, such a program must necessarily have the sponsorship of the Democratic Party.

While President Roosevelt lived, there were many men within the party who did not agree with him, but notwithstanding that, he did accomplish what he set out to accomplish. There are many men and women within the Democratic Party today who do not agree with the principles and progressive ideas that he advocated, but I must emphasize that the overwhelming majority within the party are as strong today for what he stood for as in the past. I am saying this because I am very fearful that some independent groups, from purely selfish motives, are likely to wreck the coalition of liberals that President Roosevelt so carefully

built up. In all our thinking, if we hope to build upon the foundations which he laid we must remember that the medium for accomplishment always was and still is the Democratic Party.

Our country has a two-party system. In my opinion, we can make no progress toward our goal except through the operation of that system. The organization of a third party would serve merely to divide the forces of the Roosevelt supporters and gladden the hearts of the reactionaries who so feared and maligned him. True, a great amount of work can be done by those outside the party to arouse public sentiment in behalf of legislation that would seek to carry out President Roosevelt's ideas, but any liberal group that sets itself up alone and apart from the Democratic Party is doing more to wreck the heritage of Roosevelt than to aid in what we all hope to accomplish.

The Cavalier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, much long suffering and outraged public opinion recently forced the House of Representatives to rise in its righteous indignation and clip the wings and curtail the powers of the OPA.

Immediately there went up much squawking from these battered and bruised bureaucrats. Many commentators over the radio and columnists in our newspapers have joined Government officials whose toes were tramped on in spreading a vicious propaganda and maliciously assailing certain Members of Congress who voted to correct many obvious evils.

Because of its complicated and contradictory rules and regulations, the OPA has retarded recovery and we find ourselves, a year after VE-day, bogged down in our reconversion program.

OPA has created scarcities in a land of abundance. There is no lumber in the lumber yards. There are no white shirts in our clothing stores. Pants are hard to find and the price of them is high. Butter and cheese are hard to get and meat is purchased at exorbitant prices on the black market, though we have more cattle on the hoof than ever before in our history.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that when you create a scarcity you increase the price of any commodity; black markets flourish and the Government loses revenue; income taxes are evaded, and liars are made of ordinarily honest people. Legitimate business, such as the packing industry, which is trained, skilled, and capable of inspecting meat, is pushed aside and the public purchases products that have not passed Government inspection under our pure food and drug laws. Are we getting wholesome or tubercular meat? The subsidies paid to our farmers are largely paid by the farmers in the form of hidden taxes. The farmer works long hours for low wages, but the highly paid industrial worker in our consuming centers goes on strike for still higher wages. Our whole economy today is out of balance. We should stop penalizing thrift and industry instead of rewarding extravagance and idleness.

It is significant, sir, that the vote in the House of Representatives to correct these injustices was overwhelming. There was nothing partisan, because Republicans and Democrats voted together to end an intolerable situation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Thomas Lomax Hunter, which appeared in a Democratic paper, the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch, of April 22, 1946:

Mr. OPA Bowles, the banisher of butter, is now intent upon making everything nice again by increasing milk subsidies. A UP dispatch from Washington dated April 15 says: "Economic Stabilizer Chester W. Bowles tonight ordered an increase in Federal subsidy payments on fluid milk and butterfat, in a move to break supply bottlenecks, and prevent retail price increases in butter, milk, and cheese."

What saving results will come to the users of milk products by keeping the prices of dairy products below profit levels, and keeping the dairy business running by subsidies, is a secret the answer to which is known only to bureaucrats. We have seen the result of Mr. Bowles' efforts. He has shown the American people on which side their bread is buttered—neither side.

If Federal subsidies can put dairying back on a paying basis, what has been saved in the cost of the butter to the butter user? If an increased price of butter which the dairymen would make if allowed to charge profitable prices must come out of the pockets of the butter consumer, so must the bonus payments come out of his pocket. From what other source could it come?

Instead of the increase in the cost of the butter going direct to the dairyman, it goes indirectly through Mr. Bowles. Mr. Bowles may be able to persuade some of the people that they are getting cheaper butter through the generosity of the Economic Stabilizer, but only Simple Simon can be naive enough for such faith.

We yokels who know Bossy personally know that she is quite unmoved by the seductions of Bowles' bonus. Bonus does not move her to let down her milk. Milk, believe it or not, comes from cows, and not from bottles which the milkman leaves shortly after we have retired from the festivities and revels of our night life.

The cow is the principal milk-maker of our American life, but goat's milk and mare's milk are used in many lands. By stirpiculture, which, unhappily, cannot be applied to humans, we have largely increased the milk capacity of the cow.

A well-cared-for cow comes in at evening from lush pastures to a clean barn where she is fed on the proper concentrates. Her immense udders are fairly bursting with milk. To the man in the dairy business the cow which falls below an established minimum of production is a liability and is disposed of.

When the dairyman had a fair profit out of his herd, there was butter for everybody's bread. Scarcity is the child of the conquering tricks of OPA. Many dairymen have gone out of business, unable to continue at a loss. These defunct businesses cannot be raised from the dead by Bowles' bonuses.

OPA has cultivated scarcities in a land of abundance. It has practically done away with the land we once lived in.

Senator BYRD, himself a farmer, is complaining to our bureaucratic bosses of the shortage of farm machinery. Today our food supply is dependent on highly mechanized farming. Under this method of farming, and with the high price of farm labor, the farms of borderland fertility have gone out of production and are growing up in young forests. The horse-and-plow farmer farms now only for himself, to produce enough food for his own family. This sort of farming he is able to do after the short hours of his work at the government stations is over. He will have potatoes and canned vegetables to keep him through the winter and enough hogs to supply the necessary meat. He will pack away five or six hundred salt herrings to supplement these things.

If we have corn meal in the barrel and fish on the fish stick, we look on life with an easy mind. Some days ago visitors at my house asked what my fish stick was. The fish stick is a familiar sight to the old-timers. It is generally made of a cedar sapling not larger than your thumb. This is peeled and the branches cut off about 6 inches from the pole. These branches are sharpened and on them are put the salt herrings when they have been soaked. Here they are hung up to dry, and in the morning the scent of the frying excites our breakfast appetites.

Subsidies Are a Political Dodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unsound and illogical policies adopted during the war was the payment of subsidies by the Federal Government. The payment of subsidies to producers and processors of food commodities created the impression that the price line was being held. However, price ceilings cannot be defended when it is necessary to pay subsidies to reduce the prices to the consumer, and thus add billions of dollars to our national debt.

I have consistently opposed subsidies and believe the Federal Government should discontinue this policy and permit consumers to pay their own grocery bills. It is gratifying to note that my views on this subject are in accord with those expressed in the following editorial which appeared in the Idaho Statesman on April 28, 1946:

STOP SUBSIDIES

One of the threatened cornices in OPA's beleaguered structure is subsidies. Whether to continue Federal subsidies beyond June 30, or terminate them, is a hot question before Congress.

Subsidies represent the worst termite-ridden, Jerry-built attachment of OPA architecture, a political lean-to that should never have been started and should be summarily razed. We've always been against subsidies, and we're more adamantly opposed to them every day.

Here's why. In the first place they're a fraud and a deception, even though they're strawberry sundae to politicians. The patent claim in subsidies' behalf is that they increase production without increasing consumer prices. The theory is beautiful: High prices to producers, low prices for consumers, votes for a benevolent administration.

The practical efforts are not so pretty. In actuality, subsidies are a political dodge. When the Federal tight-rope walkers have thrown themselves off balance through salving organized labor with wage boosts or through allowing a few cost-of-production

cracks in price ceilings, they fall back on subsidies to regain the impression of sapient equilibrium. If they scatter a few millions' worth of painless allurement to processors and producers, they will be able to maintain before consumers the fiction that the price-line is being held.

The unpublicized part is that subsidies are costly. On food subsidies alone, the total passed out for 3 years ending June 30 will be nearly five billion dollars, and the administration wants one and three-quarter billions more to continue these payments a year longer. Nor is food the only subsidized subject. Since the beginning of war subsidies have snowballed from a relatively innocent and inexpensive stabilization device into an economic tumor costing many billions and covering scores of items from foods to metals.

They are expensive in a delusive and indirect way. Subsidies have added their billions to the Federal debt and heavy taxes are staring present and future generations in the face. That's the insidious aspect. Somehow too many citizens have formed the besotted and benighted idea that if their money is spent by Washington's magical manna men, it doesn't count—that they still can eat the cake they don't have. By contrast, The Statesman's conception is that it takes money to pay expenses, taxes to pay government bills, and that the taxpaying American people, to their surprise and perhaps anger, will learn momentarily that subsidies have been expensive expenses.

More than that, subsidies are habit-forming, like a narcotic. Prospective recipients at first disapprove of their druglike aspects and decry them, but soon they get used to them, and after they are accustomed to Uncle Sam's handing over a monthly wad of velvet, they come to demand it. The habit then has become difficult to break; and another wrench has been given the people's moral fabric, already badly bent by Government spending fetishes.

With price administrators, subsidies also are a lure. To try to shore up failures represented by permitted breaks in the price line, the policy-makers resort to a dose of subsidy. For a time they get a chimera of controlled prices, and the Federal economists' own pangs seem relieved; so, presently, when they have a headache in another field to contend with, they again run for the subsidy bottle. They have the habit. And that's why we have subsidies galore today, too.

At first subsidies were advertised only as a wartime expedient, needed to counteract the abnormalcies of war economy. So! Now, in peace, Housing Expediter Wyatt is beseeching Congress for $600,000,000 to subsidize housing-material makers. It's anybody's guess what product the bureaucrats next will choose on which to supplement price control with subsidies in order to get production.

This seems to be an awkward, unnatural, damnable way to turn, or tinker, with the tremendous manufacturing wheels of a supposedly free-enterprise nation. Congress should stop this sappy subsidies business, the sooner the better.

American Legion Button

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VINCENT B. COSTELLO POST, NO. 15,
INC., THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1946.

Hon. JOHN STELLE,
Commander, the American Legion,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. STELLE: May I at this time call your attention to an obvious oversight in the issuance of the American Legion button to veterans of World War II.

As you undoubtedly know the Legion emblem carries a reproduction of the Victory Discharge Pin of World War I, and it seems to me that Legionnaires of this war wear the organization's button somewhat inappropriately if not illegally.

Obviously the American Legion should do something to correct this unfortunate situation.

With best wishes and kindest regards.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH LEIB,
Past Vice Commander, Past Service Officer.

ARLINGTON, VA.

Feed Shortages in Northeastern United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Trenton, N. J., May 2, 1946.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: Enclosed is a copy of a statement of the commissioners and secretaries of agriculture of the Northeastern States, passed after a thorough discussion of the situation affecting the Northeast. I might add that the statement is a true picture of New Jersey conditions as well.

The feed situation is very critical, as you naturally know and appreciate. It is the hope of everyone here that everything will be done by the Federal administration, particularly the United States Department of Agriculture and Congress, to see that it will be unnecessary to reduce the numbers of poultry and dairy cattle on the farms of the Northeast, not only in the interest of the farmers, but also in the interest of the consumers of this area, who depend upon the farmers of this area for milk, dairy products, poultry and poultry products.

Yours very truly,

W. H. ALLEN.

STATEMENT BY THE ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS AND SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE OF THE NORTHEASTERN STATES, MEETING IN ALBANY, N. Y., APRIL 30, 1946

The present shortage of feed in northeastern United States constitutes the gravest threat yet to the supply of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry for the millions of consumers in this area.

There is no doubt that the United States must do everything possible to help feed starving peoples of Europe and Asia. But at the same time, the health and welfare of consumers in northeastern United States must be safeguarded through sufficient production of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry.

Northeastern farmers have been able to barely get by thus far, while feed supplies were being used up at a rapid rate in the areas where they are produced. Now, with the Nation's livestock at a high level and supplies of feed steadily dwindling, it is more imperative than ever that the Northeast receive its fair share of available feed.

Recent renewed efforts to get grain moving off farms, where it is produced, emphasize the fact that the Northeast is not getting its proper amount of feed for cattle and poultry.

The situation has been brought about by inequitable price relationships, which make it more profitable for a farmer in the Grain Belt to feed grain to livestock than to sell it as grain.

Proof of the seriousness of the situation lies in the wholesale cancellation of hatchery orders. These cancellations are proceeding at an unprecedented rate. The number of chicks booked for delivery during May and June was 55 percent less than the number booked for delivery during these months last year. There is just cause for alarm.

Northeastern feed distributors are unable to secure feed from their suppliers, many of whom have stopped booking orders and canceled earlier orders. There must, however, be no public criticism of the feed industry which has done an almost superhuman job in obtaining feed under extremely adverse conditions.

Producers and consumers in this area will suffer unless prompt steps are taken to speed up the flow of feed into the Northeast.

Approved by Commissioner Frank H. Peet, Connecticut; Secretary Ralph C. Wilson, Delaware; Commissioner A. K. Gardner, Maine; Commissioner Frederick E. Cole, Massachusetts; Commissioner Andrew L. Felker, New Hampshire; Secretary W. H. Allen, New Jersey; Commissioner C. Chester Du Mond, New York; Secretary Miles Horst, Pennsylvania; Commissioner Stanley Judd, Vermont.

Many Senators Have Served in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I have received inquiries from constituents for information as to previous service in the House of Representatives by Senators who are Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress. I have requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to compile these statistics.

It is significant that 22 incumbent Senators were formerly Representatives. It is also noteworthy that the majority leader, Senator BARKLEY, and the minority leader, Senator WHITE, each served seven terms, or 14 years, in the House prior to beginning senatorial careers. It is apparent that House experience has proved valuable to these Members of the Senate.

Three members of President Truman's Cabinet also were United States Representatives. Of these, Secretary Byrnes was a Member of the House for 14 years before being elected Senator in 1931, which position he held for 12 years.

I submit the following statement prepared by the Library of Congress:

SENATORS OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS WHO HAVE SERVED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WITH THE LENGTH OF THEIR TERMS

LISTER HILL (Alabama): Sixty-eighth to Seventy-fifth Congresses (1923–39).

CARL HAYDEN (Arizona): Sixty-second to Sixty-ninth Congresses (1911–27).

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN (Arkansas): Seventy-fourth to Seventy-fifth Congresses (1935–39).

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Arkansas): Seventy-eighth Congress (1943–45).

SCOTT W. LUCAS (Illinois): Seventy-fourth to Seventy-fifth Congress (1935–39).

ALBEN WILLIAM BARKLEY (Kentucky): Sixty-third to Sixty-ninth Congresses (1913–27).

JOHN HOLMES OVERTON (Louisiana): Seventy-second Congress (1931–33).

WALLACE HUMPHREY WHITE (Maine): Sixty-fifth to Seventy-first Congresses (1917–31).

OWEN BREWSTER (Maine): Seventy-fourth to Seventy-sixth Congresses (1935–41).

MILLARD E. TYDINGS (Maryland): Sixty-eighth to Sixty-ninth Congresses (1923–27).

CHARLES W. TOBEY (New Hampshire): Seventy-third to Seventy-fifth Congresses (1933–39).

DENNIS CHAVEZ (New Mexico): Seventy-second to Seventy-third Congresses (1931–35).

JAMES M. MEAD (New York): Sixty-sixth to Seventy-fifth Congresses (1919–39).

CLYDE R. HOEY (North Carolina): Sixty-sixth Congress (1919–21).

ELMER THOMAS (Oklahoma): Sixty-eighth to Sixty-ninth Congresses (1923–27).

FRANCIS JOHN MYERS (Pennsylvania): Seventy-sixth to Seventy-eighth Congresses (1939–45).

PETER G. GERRY (Rhode Island): Sixty-third Congress (1913–15).

KENNETH D. MCKELLAR (Tennessee): Sixty-second to Sixty-fourth Congresses (1911–17).

TOM CONNALLY (Texas): Sixty-fifth to Seventieth Congresses (1917–29).

ABE MURDOCK (Utah): Seventy-third to Seventy-sixth Congresses (1933–41).

CARTER GLASS (Virginia): Fifty-seventh to Sixty-fifth Congresses (1902–18).

WARREN G. MAGNUSON (Washington): Seventy-fifth to Seventy-eighth Congresses (1937–45).

PRESENT CABINET MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WITH THE LENGTH OF THEIR TERMS

James F. Byrnes (Secretary of State): Sixty-second to Sixty-eighth Congresses (1911–25) (United States Senator, 1931–43).

Fred M. Vinson (Secretary of the Treasury): Sixty-eighth to Seventieth; Seventy-second to Seventy-fifth Congresses (1923–29; 1931–39).

Clinton P. Anderson (Secretary of Agriculture): Seventy-seventh to Seventy-ninth Congresses (1941–45).

Sources: Congressional Directory, January 1946, Who's Who in America, 1944–45.

Europe's Small Countries Slowly Lose Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Sunday Star of May 6, 1946:

EUROPE'S SMALL COUNTRIES SLOWLY LOSE INDEPENDENCE—NO STRONG NATIONS LEFT TO STEM EXPANDING RUSSIAN INFLUENCE ON CONTINENT AS BRITAIN CENTERS ATTENTION ON EMPIRE.

(By Constantine Brown)

Europe today is like a precious antique piece of pottery which has fallen from a shelf and no one is particularly interested in whether it ever will be mended.

The destinies of the people of Europe are in the hands of the statesmen of three powers—America, Russia, and Britain—whose principal interests are outside the continent's geographical confines.

Russia is interested in what is politely termed "her security." But, in fact, this semi-oriental empire is interested in territorial acquisitions which she hopes to obtain either by outright domination of certain portions of Europe through military force or through the most active and insidious fifth column the world has ever seen.

The fate of the people in her orbit is of little consequence to the leaders in Moscow and to the handpicked governments established in Russia's direct zone. The centuries-old institutions of the republics and kingdoms extending from the Bothnian Gulf to the Black Sea and the Adriatic are being ruthlessly suppressed. The native populations are being coerced into adopting a new political creed—communism, which is being rammed down their throats with all the means devised by the political police regardless of whether it is called the Gestapo, the NKVD, the Ozna or any other.

TWO MILLION EAST OF ODER

In order to establish this new order, hundreds of Dachaus and Buchenwalds have been opened up again throughout the Russian-dominated sections of Europe. In Russia itself they preceded the horror camps of the Nazis because the Russian totalitarianism was established many years before that of the Reich. The 2,000,000 soldiers forming the Soviet armies of occupation may remain in the area east of the Oder River for an indefinite time. They are living on what ironically may be described as the fat of the land. The best of everything in the regions from the Baltic States to the Turkish borders is earmarked for the Red army, regardless of the effect it might have on those in the occupied countries.

Occasionally there is some spectacular announcement that the Moscow government, out of the kindness of its heart, has decided to lend Rumania or Bulgaria a quantity of wheat. This is correct. The seed, wheat, rye, or barley is to be planted by the new slaves, so that the armies of occupation do not suffer any privations. A few crumbs may be left for the civilian population and are to be dispensed to those who have a record of nonopposition to the puppet governments.

The educational systems have been entirely revamped. Only those who obtain the approval of the Communist youth organization can follow the courses of the various institutions such as high schools and universities. Those deeply religious people are now being education to consider Stalin and his representatives as the supreme power; God comes next.

JAILED FOR POLITICAL CRIMES

This is being brought home to them forcefully. All those who doubt the new religion are sent to concentration camps. Even in the strife-ridden Balkans, where there has always been a corrupt officialdom, there formerly were courts and a great feeling of security for the individual because he knew he could not be thrown in jail for an indefinite time without a hearing. All that has now disappeared and the individual is jailed for a political crime which may be nothing more than a remark about the Russian leaders or their puppets.

Moscow is little concerned with what is happening to the people who have become her wards against their own will. She is leaving them in the hands of the Russian-sponsored puppet governments, whose chief concern is to make their countries into obedient subjects of the Russian Empire. Unpopular themselves, these governments are using terroristic methods to keep themselves in Moscow's good graces.

The British are being eased out of Europe. The major concern of the British Government is the maintenance of the Empire, which faces a greater threat than ever before in the hundreds of years of its history. Militarily and politically, Britain is weak. Her leaders do not know where to turn. Before the Second World War there was always the possibility, whenever the Empire was threatened, of forming combinations with other European powers and thus ward off the appetite of any nation for slices of Britain's colonial empire.

When the Germans under Wilhelm II began to worry the British they formed the Entente Cordiale with France and Russia. Earlier, when Napoleon appeared to desire the conquest of the world they created a coalition with all the other European powers and led a fight to the finish against the little Corsican. When Hitler became a menace they appeared, after France's collapse, to be hopeless. But the Fuehrer's blunder in attacking Russia before he had defeated Britain saved the Empire again. And at all times since 1915 they have relied on the inevitable American support.

NO POWERS IN EUROPE

There are no more powers in Europe. The Continent is prostrate. Germany has disappeared as a power. She is not even a nation any longer. Italy is down and out, without any fighting ability—except for internal struggle. Turkey, which during the nineteenth century could be used as a threat to Russia, will be thankful if she emerges after this Second World War as a sovereign nation. She is looking to Britain for eventual assistance, but certainly can do nothing for her ally.

Under these conditions the interest of the British in the section of Europe not directly under Russia's domination is academic. The London government has played its cards in France badly. Today Soviet influence, exercised through extremely active and able men such as Maurice Thorez and other Moscow-educated Communists, is at its peak, and it would be surprising if at the forthcoming elections France did not elect an overwhelming number of Communists for its new Parliament.

Britain feels alone, facing a country which has coveted parts of her vast empire for nearly a century. Her interest in Europe is waning and her political men are said to be prepared to make whatever deals may be considered necessary at the expense of Europe, provided she can ward off the Russian menace. Britain's political leaders in 1938 sacrificed Czechoslovakia to appease Hitler's growing lust for power. The situation is worse now. The forces which she may have mobilized then to stop the Nazis have vanished in thin air. She will be willing to reach any compromises provided her supremacy in the Mediterranean—the life line to the Empire—is not disturbed.

UNITED STATES TRIES TO HELP

The people of Britain, accustomed for centuries to freedom and to living under a constitutional monarchy, deplore the deterioration of liberalism in Europe but feel they can do nothing to help the situation. It is a matter of the shirt being closest to the skin,

and if they have to choose between the maintenance of the Empire and letting the continental nations of Europe follow their inexorable fate, they will certainly choose the Empire.

America, a mixture of all European races which have sought refuge because they found greater liberty and opportunity here, is alone attempting to do its best for that moribund continent. With what success no one can yet say.

In order to defeat Hitler we waged war to the limit in Europe. And this is being exploited by the pro-Soviet propagandists in Europe for all it's worth. They point to many ancient monuments our air force has destroyed in areas packed with history. They point to the sixth century Monte Cassino monastery, which was destroyed during the Rapido campaign as an indication of America's ruthlessness. They are propagandizing the emotional Frenchman with stories of the destruction wrought in France in the early days of the invasion and have convinced the average Frenchman that whatever he receives from the United States is an insufficient payment of America's destructive policies, while the gifts received from Russia represent only the intense love of Moscow for the French.

The anti-American campaign is in full swing. The sacrifices made by the American people in the shape of UNRRA assistance—most of the food and other necessities are of American origin—are being minimized, while the indiscretions of the GI's are being exaggerated and exploited.

SMALL NATIONS SOLD OUT

At the end of the First World War an American passport was highly respected. To most of the people of Europe, particularly in the eastern and southeastern areas, America was a mythical country from which rich and kind-hearted visitors came to relieve the sufferings of the others. Today an American passport is generally good for a few hard kicks. Americans are highly unwelcome. The anti-American propaganda work has been excellent. We are called the selfish capitalists who care only about filling our pockets at the expense of the starving Europeans.

The past policies of the administration are partly responsible for this situation. We went into the war to destroy totalitarianism and establish the right of all nations, regardless of size, to lead a free and independent life. Then, because the Soviet threatened to give up the battle against Hitler and we were deeply concerned over what might happen in the Pacific if the war in Europe was prolonged, our leaders began to compromise with our principles. The result has been that we have sold down the river all the nations who had fought because they wanted to remain free.

We sold out Poland, over whose independence the war started. We sold out the freedom of the Yugoslav people although they went to war against Germany because they accepted our assurances that once more they would become free and independent.

In the frantic desire not to offend the USSR which characterized our diplomatic actions until last February, we even abandoned the careful distribution of the UNRRA supplies to the totalitarian governments which used them as a political weapon against their own citizens. This was done in spite of the clear provisions of Congress, which demanded that no racial or political prejudice should be involved in the distribution of food to the hungry.

The First World War damaged Europe severely. But there was a chance for recovery. The Second World War has completed the destruction, which started in 1914, and has brought about a situation which only a miracle can remedy.

Only America seems to want to piece together the broken antique vase which was Europe. And the American craftsmen so far have shown themselves to be clumsy and unimaginative in spite of their willingness to do their best.

Russia's Neo-Communism, the greatest political conspiracy ever established in the world, follows its own selfish aims without regard to the welfare of the people it has subjugated. Britain, which would like to see order and law reestablished in Europe, is powerless and concerned only with the saving of her Empire and the United States, which would like to do everything possible to save something out of the European wreckage, is in a position which renders her impotent in spite of her good intentions. On August 3, 1914, the British statesman, Earl Grey, said, "The lamps are going out all over Europe; we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime." It looks now as if his words may have been even more prophetic than he himself believed at that time.

The People Want Price Control, Without Crippling Amendments, Strong Enough To Protect the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, someone remarked that now that the House has murdered OPA everyone is happy but the people. In that connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in condensed form the statement presented to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency by Mrs. Carolina Ware on behalf of 24 organizations representing millions of people.

The statement says so clearly what the people of the United States want in the way of protection against a disastrous inflation that I do not feel I can add anything to it.

Statement in support of extension of the Emergency Price Control Act before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, April 29, 1946, by Caroline F. Ware, on behalf of:

American Association of University Professors.
American Association of University Women.
American Home Economics Association.
Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches.
Consumers Union of United States, Inc.
Department of Christian Social Relations, Women's Division of the Methodist Church.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
League of Women Shoppers, Inc.
National Board, YWCA.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Consumers League.
National Education Association.
National Federation of Settlements.
National League of Women Voters.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League.
Non-Partisan Council on Public Affairs, A. K. A. Sorority.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
Union for Democratic Action.
United Council of Church Women.

The national organizations which join in this statement urging the Senate to pass a genuine Price Control Act are representative of the great mass of the American people. In speaking for their members, they speak for the Nation's consumers—the people who will have to pay the prices which destruction of price control would bring; the people whose standard of living will be pressed down by inflation. The interest which we represent is the public interest.

Our members are distressed by the action of the House in scuttling price control in the face of overwhelming evidence of the peril which confronts the Nation and the desire of the people for continued protection against that danger.

To us it appears that special interests seeking speculative gain at the expense of the American people are the ones who will profit from the destruction of price control.

Business in general has enjoyed unprecedented prosperity and profits under price control. Prosperity and profits for the coming years are assured by the tremendous demand for all types of goods, if only economic stability can be maintained.

BUSINESSMEN WANT OPA

The mass of American business stands to gain, along with the rest of the people, from effective price control in the coming year. Only those who have confidence that they can outguess the market, make a killing on the boom, and get out from under before the break have reason to rejoice over the bill as passed by the House.

On behalf of our members, we call upon the Senate to act in terms of its responsibility for the Nation's economic security and the welfare of the people. We ask that the Senate extend the present Price Control Act without weakening amendments, not only to restore the protection which the House has sought to take away but to strengthen the people's confidence in their representative government.

The so-called price control bill passed by the House, in our judgment, not only fails completely to provide genuine price control; it positively invites inflation. We ask you to reject each and every one of the wrecking amendments introduced on the floor of the House or by the House Banking and Currency Committee. Specifically, we ask you to reject:

PLEA TO REJECT CRIPPLING AMENDMENTS

1. The Gossett decontrol amendment, requiring that ceilings be removed altogether from anything whose production for 12 months has been at the 1940–41 level.

This amendment would take virtually all food out from control on June 30, 1946, together with wool and rayon fabrics, shoes, most women's clothing, house furnishings, petroleum products, coal, tires, cigarettes, and most basic industrial materials. It would be far more honest to repeal price control outright.

2. The Wolcott cost plus profit on every product amendment, requiring that ceiling prices reflect current costs plus a reasonable profit on each product. This would immediately require increases of many price ceilings and would invalidate most regulations until it could be demonstrated that the profit conditions required by the amendment were met. It would insure that every immediate cost increase, including temporary "bulge" costs on reconversion products, would become the basis for an upward spiral as it was passed on in an increased price. It would be impossible to administer.

The more limited Crawford amendment by the House Banking and Currency Committee forbidding OPA to require cost absorption by distributors on such items as radios, refrigerators, automobiles, etc., would jump prices on low-priced cars some $85 per car, and on other products correspondingly.

3. The Flannagan and Wolcott subsidy elimination amendments, removing meat

subsidies immediately, reducing other subsidies rapidly, and eliminating all subsidies by January 1, 1947. If virtually all food is taken out from control by the decontrol amendment, it does not much matter what happens to subsidies, for they cannot keep food prices down. If the attempt to keep the principal part of the cost of living, food, within bounds is continued, however, adequate subsidies are essential for the coming year.

4. The maximum average price elimination amendment. Until clothing supplies are far more plentiful, the maximum average price regulation is the only way to secure production of low-priced clothing. At the present time, men will suffer most, especially veterans trying to outfit themselves with civilian clothes. Removal of MAP will simply invite all producers to concentrate on higher priced lines where profit margins are higher.

5. The 9 months' limitation on price control. If Congress passes a meaningless price control act, it is immaterial for how long the act extends. But if the act is real, and Congress is prepared to carry its responsibility to protect the Nation against inflation, it should provide price control authority for a full year, and rent control authority for 2 years.

AMENDMENTS DESTROY PRICE CONTROL

As we examine the amendments to the price control act which the House has enacted, it is plain that they do not modify price control, they destroy it. The choice, therefore, seems to us clear—genuine price control, or no price control worth the name. We ask you to make a clearcut choice, and to give us the present price control law unweakened, for another year.

We cannot believe that you do not realize the seriousness of the inflationary danger that faces the country.

The minute price control is removed we can expect to be informed that the price is sharply increased.

We are sure that you realize that shortages of supplies will not be overcome in the immediate future and that it will take well over a year to satisfy the pent-up demand in nearly every line. In respect to food we now realize that famine conditions in the world are even more desperate than we thought them to be, and starvation and malnutrition will continue to make heavy demands upon our supplies at least through the 1947 crop year. Clothing supplies will continue seriously below demand for the coming year. It would be idle to dream that the pent-up demand for durable goods can be met in a year, even if production reaches unprecedented heights. When it comes to housing, and all the many goods that go into housing production, our present goal is only to keep the situation from becoming worse in the next 2 years.

We do not believe that you can think that removing price controls would bring a general increase in production and hasten the day when the shortages will be met, or that price control since VJ-day has held production down. The evidence of the past 8 months speaks for itself. Under price control, and even in spite of the shut-down in steel and in other industries, production is above its 1941 peak. Full employment, of course, requires a far greater volume of production than ever before in peacetime. Men have been taken into industry almost as fast as they have come out of the service and become available. Employment is above any peacetime level. Unemployment is only two-and a half millions. Individual firms could increase their production immediately, in most cases, only by taking labor away from other firms and curtailing their production. It is the limitations of manpower, equipment, and materials that have stood, and now stand, in the way of even greater production.

The ability to plan on the basis of relatively steady prices has been an important factor in this rapid reconversion—more rapid and successful than most people dared to hope on VJ-day.

Common sense and the previous postwar boom-bust experience tell us what will happen if the price lid is taken off. You know the story well—a mad scramble to pile up inventories before materials prices go out of sight, jacking up prices to charge all that the traffic will bear while the boom is on, and then, when somebody guesses that the speculative peak has been reached, the equally mad scramble to get out of the market before the inevitable bust—with mass lay-offs, failures of thousands of small firms, farm-mortgage foreclosures, loss of mass buying power, and the nose dive into depression.

As we see it, the Senate stands between the people of this Nation and disaster.

Our members are the great mass of American people. They do not have millions of dollars to spend on full-page advertisements. Their pennies and their dollars go into grocery bills, rent, clothes for their children. Individually they do not have prestige or power. They are simply the millions of plain people who work, play, live, and vote.

You are their Congress. We urge that you act on their behalf. We urge that you give them what they desperately need and earnestly desire—a genuine, unweakened Price Control Act.

Coal Supply Critical in Northwest

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of telegrams within the last 24 hours indicating that there are only about 10 days' supply of coal in our section of the country, which is most unfortunate, coming at this particular time when we are entering into the lush production period so far as dairy products are concerned. Creamery operators wire me that they will be forced to suspend unless coal is made available. If coal is not made available it means that the American people are going to go without butter and milk, which would be a calamity of unknown proportions.

The administration must realize that dairy production is now entering maximum production for the year and if the creameries and other food-processing plants are compelled to shut down for the lack of coal it will cause suffering among children and invalids as well as all others. The time has come for the administration to demonstrate to the country that the Federal Government is yet supreme.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to incorporate some telegrams which portray the situation far better than can I.

SARTELL, MINN., *April 30, 1946.*
Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We have been advised by our fuel supplier, Northwestern Hanna Fuel Co., that they have only 10 days' supply of coal on the docks for us. This will definitely mean a shutdown. We have contacted other distributors and they are unable to divert any tonnage to us if the Government is withholding supplies for fair distribution. We trust you will use your good offices to see that we are assured our proportionate share. A very large part of our people in this territory are dependent on the mill for their support and can ill afford a shutdown. We are strongly opposed to the creation of labor monopoly and royalty payments and the unionization of managerial employees, and trust you will work to that end. May we hear from you.

WATAB PAPER CO.
C. F. WITHERELL.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 30, 1946.*
Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal companies advise us that only 10 days' supply of coal remain in Minnesota. Highest dairy production of year here now and will continue through May and June. Outputs of manufactured dairy products and handling of market milk and cream depend largely on coal. Catastrophic losses to dairy farmers and deplorable waste of vital dairy foods will inevitably result if immediate action is not taken by the Congress to secure coal for operation of our dairy plants. What can we do?

TWIN CITY MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 30, 1946.*
Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Reports from fuel companies indicate that coal supply will be completely exhausted in 10 days' time. This situation will soon close down the operation of hundred of creameries and cheese factories and soon all factories and industrial organizations in the Northwest. Necessary Congress take action immediately to curb actions of few men who may soon strangle the economic life of America.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES, INC.,
JOHN BRANDT, *President.*

BERTHA, MINN., *May 1, 1946.*
HAROLD KNUTSON,
Member of House of Representatives:

This milk plant faces complete shutdown in 10 days due to coal shortage. Manufacture 125,000 pounds of butter monthly. Shutdown will cause farmers $90,000 loss monthly. Action urgent.

BERTHA COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION.

PINE CITY, MINN., *April 26, 1946.*
Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON,
Washington, D. C.:

The coal strike must be settled at once or Duluth docks will be clean in 3 weeks. It will take 3 weeks to get coal here after strike is settled. Creameries will be shutting down and millions of gallons of milk will be wasted. Our supplier says he can only supply us for 3 weeks.

PINE CITY COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION.

Address of Most Rev. Henry J. O'Brien, D. D., Bishop of Hartford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address of

His Excellency the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien, D. D., bishop of Hartford, at the annual conference of the Catholic Association for International Peace held in Hartford on April 23, 1946. This address impressed me because I, too, believe the people must take an active participation in the affairs of our country, if we are to establish throughout the world a lasting peace, based on justice, the moral law, and the observance of the rights of every man.

I deem it very fortunate for us that the Catholic Association for International Peace chose to have its annual conference this year in our midst. I am very grateful to all those who cooperated so graciously with the officers of the association in preparing and arranging for the several meetings and panel discussions. We are the richer for your presence here.

In all your conferences you have endeavored to give those assisting a clearer understanding of the teachings of our Holy Father on international peace. In your discussions you have endeavored to stimulate thought on the papal teachings and to show their practical application. You have shown the papal teachings on peace are capable of fostering harmonious relations between nations respecting their individual characteristics and the rights of their people in accordance with justice and charity. They demand the recognition of the law of God in any effective effort toward establishing a lasting peace among nations.

Today the world is technically at peace. Yet no one deludes himself that all is well. It is not the calm that a victory normally affords. Though all of the late Allies profess to be united in a single purpose, that of building a world where we all can hope to live in peace and security, it is evident all do not look upon the problems of peace in the same light. Recent developments have shown what we suspected: Britain, Russia, France, and others look upon the problems of peace with different eyes than do we.

It is difficult to foresee the shifts in relation to nations that may take place. But whatever may issue in this regard, we feel the exploration of the past and the complexities of the future will demonstrate that it is essential that the principles and methods of peace be threshed out and clarified in our minds. Conferences such as the one we have been privileged to have here these past 2 days serve that purpose well. They help us to consider these problems in the light of Christian principles.

The campaign to win a lasting peace for the world is before us. Victory alone does not give peace. It is chiefly important for the privilege it gives us to cooperate in sharing an era of peace for the world. Nations can blunder in war. They can also blunder in peace. Wisdom, courage, and strength of conviction is needed in making peace today for the peace that is made will determine the fate of humanity for long years to come.

In 1919 we went to the peace conference animated by the loftiest and most disinterested ideals, but we were totally unprepared to meet the specific problems that had to be met. We did not secure a lasting peace. There must be just as much preparedness for making the peace as there was for war. It demands the same application, the same diligence, the same cooperation. It means the setting up of moral, intellectual, economic, and political forces over the whole world that will produce and hold a lasting peace. This can't be accomplished simply by lofty expressions of aims and ideals. It demands a concentrated effort to make these ideals realized.

The United Nations at the present time is dealing with the mechanics of peace. It can make serious blunders unless it is guided by public interest. We need intelligent public interest and discussion if we wish to make our aims and ideals clear in our own mind and understood by the public.

There is no doubt that the tribulations of the world today are in large measure due to the acceptance of material standards and the loss of spiritual ones. Political solutions, however realistic, will not suffice to give us a peaceful world unless they are accompanied by a return to a faith in higher things and to a sense of spiritual values.

We agree there must be some organization of the nations of the world for the preservation of peace. But this organization must be guided by an enlightened and interested public opinion. The American people must begin to think of the problems of peace as their own. Our hope is that conferences such as this may help to stimulate, clarify, and inform the public to give it a clearer idea of what the church thinks is necessary if the world is to have a lasting peace. This world organization must not flounder in the seas of greed, self-interest, and vindictiveness. If it is to produce peace, it must be guided by the dictates of justice and charity.

In your conferences and discussions, I think you have tried to establish that fact. May they be productive of much good.

Improved Air Service for Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal for May 4, 1946:

MILWAUKEE—STATE'S IMMEDIATE AIR FUTURE MAY HANG ON 20 MINUTES

Francis W. Brown, chief examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board, has granted Milwaukee's earnest request to be given 20 minutes, instead of the usual 10, to present its appeal at Washington for improved air service.

The immediate future of air transport in Milwaukee, its county, and at least the eastern part of this State, may depend on those 20 minutes.

Five major air lines want to come into Wisconsin's metropolis to give this area, and a large part of the State, connections with the communities of the West, the Southwest, the Southeast, and the South, including Mexico City.

A CAB examiner has denied these applications. He said, in effect, that the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin have good rail connections with Chicago and can make an 80-, or a 100-, or a 150-mile train trip to Chicago and then board planes at that traffic center.

They can. But is this what air service and the air age should mean? Should the CAB wish to perpetuate, in the air, the barriers and concentrations that of necessity are inherent in surface travel? Or should the Board rather wish to direct that the great flexibility of air operation be made full use of, giving the people of every major community and every State the fullest opportunity to get direct plane service to all other communities and States, without discomfort?

Milwaukee will need every second of its 20 minutes to explain, through experts, not public officials, how concentrated transit facilities at Chicago have, in the past, stifled the industrial, commercial and residential development of the Wisconsin metropolis and a large contiguous area. That Milwaukee has become the thirteenth largest city, the tenth in industrial economic status in the Nation, despite this stifling, is a tribute to her industrial and commercial energy and vitality rather than evidence that the system is even tolerable as applied to the air.

Feeding Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Val J. Peter, publisher of the Omaha Daily Tribune. This letter deals with the great necessity of getting food and clothing to the starving millions of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what the great enemy of the world today is famine. It is said that there are only nine meals between man and revolution. If we fail to feed the starving peoples of Europe, we will lose the victory our boys have won on the battlefield. It will be difficult, indeed, to build a good foundation for peace and prosperity, if hunger and discontent stalk the world. Hunger provokes despair; despair provokes hate; hate makes war.

The people of Europe are hungry. You cannot escape extreme hunger. It stays with the individual night and day. It dominates his thinking, his mind, and even haunts him in his dreams. Long, continued hunger makes man despise and hate, not only his fellow man, but ways of life.

The State and Post Office Departments should make it possible for individuals in this country to send food, clothing, and medicine to those in Europe. The decency, charity, pity, and pride of the American people know no limit. I believe that if we appeal to the finer sensibilities of the American people without force, and without government dictation, with a huge staff, that the American folks would send much food to help feed the starving peoples of the world. If peace, and the type of government we desire, is to be established, we must furnish food.

The following letter from Mr. Peter further establishes the great necessity that now exists in Europe:

OMAHA DAILY TRIBUNE,
Omaha, Nebr., April 30, 1946.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
United States Congressman From Nebraska, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: As far back as the fall of 1945 there were many indications that millions of people in Europe would starve this past winter and spring. Men and women of every walk of life interested solely in humanity and the establishment of democracy throughout stricken Europe, after personal investigations, made statement after statement predicting the terrible consequences that would result if certain American policy makers, pledged to a program of hatred and revenge, were successful in keeping the lid of silence tight on the true conditions of central Europe, which were daily be-

coming more aggravated and which meant ultimate mass starvation for millions of innocent civilians.

Churchmen of all denominations, leaders in business, labor, and the professions, heads of social agencies, Senators and Congressmen, and congressional committees all told of the terrible suffering that would result from our policy of making the defeated peoples look after their own needs even after having stripped them of more than one-fourth of their food-producing areas, and, in addition, having taken from them the farm machinery necessary for proper, intensive, food production. All of these men and groups because of their Christian attitude were vilified, and all their organizations were prevented from sending even 1 pound of food to starving civilians in Germany.

Finally, when public opinion became so aroused at the terrible consequences of our policy of hatred and revenge, and after a resolution was introduced in Congress to send a senatorial investigation committee to Germany, the President's War Relief Control Board in March of this year granted a license to church organizations to begin shipments to and relief work in the American zone of occupation in Germany. But all these agencies combined, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Lutheran World Relief, Federal Council of Churches, American Society of Friends, and others, were limited in their relief work to a total of 2,000 tons of food a month. This is about as much food as would fill one-fifth the cargo space of a Liberty ship, or about 8 ounces of food per person per month. These relief organizations without exception recognize that the 2,000-ton limit placed upon them by the President's War Relief Control Board is wholly inadequate, and nothing more nor less than an attempt to quiet the demands and consciences of truly Christian Americans of all faiths who cannot go along with a program which has and continues to result in the mass starvation of millions of civilians. These organizations are making every effort to persuade the President's War Relief Control Board to increase the monthly allotted shipments, but all their efforts to this time in that regard have come to nothing. Furthermore, these relief organizations are still prohibited from operating in the zones of our allies—namely, the British, French, and Russian zones of occupation.

Only during the past four months has there been a growing recognition of the appalling problem that is facing our country as a result of the unmoral and immoral position taken by certain of our Government leaders in relationship to our defeated and now wholly dependent enemy peoples. Only now are we beginning to realize that democracy cannot flourish on empty stomachs and that when people are starving they will turn to any form of government and give up their liberties and human rights for a crust of bread that will help to keep body and soul together. In their desperation, many German people are drifting from one form of totalitarianism to another in an effort to keep alive. Only 6 weeks ago it was announced in Berlin that former members of the Nazi Party in the Russian zone of occupation could now join the Communist Party. As a result, members of the Nazi Party in the American, British, and French zones of occupation, will, of course, also if they believe it necessary to protect their own skins and to keep from starving, switch from the banner of the swastika to that of the hammer and sickle. In all zones, outside of the Russian zone, they will probably do this secretly through the formation of secret communist cells. Those millions who never belonged to any political party may, too, find it expedient to join the Communist Party if that means getting food to remain alive. Unless American aid in sufficient quantities comes quickly, our efforts to create a democratic Germany may be lost forever, and America's plans for a democratic central Europe will disappear like the dew before the rising morning sun. For us to do less than to feed the starving civilians is to sabotage America's plans for a democratic central Europe.

Through your efforts and those of your colleagues, after many months of pleading, the President's War Relief Control Board finally announced that on April 1, American citizens would be permitted to write to their relatives in Germany. It took 11 months after the close of hostilities in Europe before American citizens had restored to them their human family rights to find out if their mothers and fathers and other relatives were alive or dead, well or sick, getting enough to eat or starving.

But still today these millions of American citizens were denied their human right to send food, clothing, and medicine to their starving relatives no matter how urgent the appeals may be that they receive from their fathers and mothers across the sea.

Inhumanness has never been a characteristic of the American people. A man who lets his dog starve is quickly brought before a court of justice and put in jail for cruelty to animals. He deserves and receives the condemnation and contempt of his fellow citizens. And yet there are men in our administration in Washington who force thousands of American citizens to let their mothers and fathers starve to death simply because they live in Germany and simply because these hate-blinded men have assumed the powers of dictators.

Now that we are no longer at war and all our European enemies have surrendered unconditionally more than a year ago, by what authority of law can American citizens be prevented from fulfilling their human and moral obligations to their parents? And who is responsible for that perversion of justice and of human rights?

Those in our Government responsible for the starvation of even one father or mother of an American citizen by continuing to withhold from him his right and duty to aid his parents is morally guilty of murder. America has no room for dictatorships of any kind—least of all one that forces American citizens to let their parents starve to death.

In the past the excuse has been given that permission cannot be granted to American citizens to send food to their relatives because the matter of feeding the civilian population is under the control of the Army. The American military government has within the past 6 months repeatedly requested shipments of food which would permit a minimum standard of living and even these shipments have been curtailed.

Under date of April 18, the press of the Nation carried a story from Berlin, that Maj. Gen. Morrison C. Stayer, Chief of the Health Division of the American Military Government in Berlin, had on that day requested the administration in Washington to grant permission to American citizens to send a 15-pound package of food or clothing to their relatives in Germany each month. Because of the tragic situation, Major General Stayer also recommended that American citizens be given the right to send such a package not only to their relatives but also an additional package each month to unknown and unrelated starving civilians who have no connections in America. Major General Stayer is quoted in the press as saying, "The 2,000 tons of food being sent monthly by American relief organizations to the American zone of occupation could in that way be doubled."

Now that the Army has requested the Government to permit American citizens to send food to their starving relatives in Germany, is there any reason why the President's War Relief Control Board still refuses to grant this right?

It is also said that the Trading With the Enemy Act is still in full force and effect; however, the enforcement of the Trading With the Enemy Act is in the sole control of the Secretary of the Treasury, and under the act he has the right to issue licenses exempting certain transactions from the act. An exemption was granted when the mails to Germany were opened. Similar exemptions can be granted for the sending of food and clothing.

In view of the fact that every appeal made by the Members of Congress to the President's War Relief Control Board and the Treasury Department to grant such a license has been to no avail, we urge you to immediately pass in the House, Senate bill 2101, which is an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, introduced by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, on April 22, 1946, and on that day referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Within 1 week after the bill was introduced, on April 29, 1946, the Senate passed the same without a single dissenting vote. This bill is now before the House, and we urge you to take steps for the immediate passage of the same in the House. This bill, as soon as it becomes law, will permit any person in the United States to sell, donate, or otherwise dispose of to, and to transport or deliver to, any person in Germany any article or articles (including food, clothing, and medicine) intended to be used solely to relieve human suffering.

Millions of German civilians are awaiting word from their American relatives. They look to them for guidance and help in their hour of need—they look to them for food and clothing. It is those German civilians who if aided now will help carry out our policy of establishing a democratic Germany if only given the opportunity. In the interest of humanity, Christianity, and democracy, we plead for your cooperation. We also appeal to you to use your influence to the end that all zones of occupation be open immediately so that relief shipments by the churches and relief organizations can be made to the starving people in the zones outside of American control.

Your constituents, regardless of creed or politics, realize that a lasting peace cannot become a reality if we continue to follow a policy that results in a starved and emaciated people which in the end will breed only hatred and which may turn out to be the seed from which will grow a third world war. They are in accord that only by following a policy of humaneness and Christian charity can our defeated enemies be led to recognize and practice the principle of the brotherhood of man, which is the basis of our democratic society.

All will be deeply indebted to you for your efforts. Hoping that we may receive from you assurance of your cooperation in this humanitarian cause, I remain,

Sincerely,

OMAHA DAILY TRIBUNE,
VAL J. PETER, *Publisher.*

No Easy Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News:

NO EASY WAY

New Dealers attempted to solve, during the depression, the Nation's economic problems through the application of a cure-all.

They desperately sought some magic formula which would instantly rout the forces of the world-wide depression and bring about national prosperity with a minimum of effort.

Their theory was that it was not necessary to work our way out of our difficulties; we could legislate and spend our way out.

In pursuit of this theory, the New Dealers spent the taxpayers' dollars like water; they legislated in support of all sorts of strange theories.

The net result was the accumulation of a tremendous debt and a dangerous disarrangement of the powers of our Federal Government.

The magic formulas didn't whip the depression. It took a world-wide war to end industrial stagnation and start the wheels of industry to spinning at top speed.

Despite the lessons of the depression era, however, the dependence on magic formulas hasn't been dropped.

The reconversion era is attended by almost as many critical problems as was the depression.

But is the current administration, which is following New Deal policies in general, telling the American people they must work their way out of these difficulties?

It most certainly is not.

It is endeavoring, through use of Federal controls, subsidies and a conglomeration of undemocratic principles, to ease our way into a peacetime economy without causing any one the least inconvenience.

It is espousing the theory of the most radical of the labor leaders that work hours should be reduced at a time when there is the greatest need for hard work.

It is the universal agreement that our domestic problems rest on production. Attain full production of the commodities so greatly in demand, and we will have solved practically all of these problems.

The approach is in line with New Deal policies in general, that you can become prosperous without working, that there is more merit in spending than saving, that destruction of farm crops is an economic asset, even though there may be millions of hungry human beings in the world, that a gigantic public debt is of no consequence, and that use of Federal subsidies—to be paid off by succeeding generations—is holding down the cost of living.

Energy and thrift were among the assets which enabled American pioneers to build a great republic out of a wilderness. The pioneers sought no easy way around their problems. They met them head-on, and worked their way out.

Old-fashioned, say the New Dealers; the modern way is to let us spend your money, and that of succeeding generations, denude you of your personal liberties, let us manage your affairs for you. All the public is supposed to do is sit down, fold its hands and wait—patiently—for the miracle.

An American Assays His Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Burns Strader, from the Rotarian for July 1945:

AN AMERICAN ASSAYS HIS HERITAGE[1]

(By Burns Strader, Rotarian, Independence, Mo.)

Dowered with the wealth of the world, I am rich beyond any computation.

I stand upon the verge of the Grand Canyon. Before me is the great panorama of sunken cliffs and mountains and elevations glowing in the color of dull red, like the banked fires of primeval creation, while over all is cast the tenuous veil of impalpable blue; I traverse the winding ways of Carlsbad Caverns with their frozen poetry of graceful shape and form and outline wrought into detail by the divine chisel of the Master Craftsman; for me are the witchery and charm of the geysers of the Yellowstone.

I stand at a distance and view Mount Shasta, the great peak which the Indians called The Mountain That Was God, and view it towering above its companions, its summit and shoulders robed with eternal snows. For my delectation are the beauty and appeal of form and color of the indescribable gardens of Charleston, S. C.; for me are the thunder of the surge upon the rocky coasts of Maine and the hoarse roar of the Pacific upon the shores of Oregon.

I have my heroes and my great men: DuGuesclin, Bayard, Robert Emmet, Patrick Sarsfield, Gustavus Adolphus, Erasmus, DeWitt, van Tromp, Winkleried, John Hampden, Alfred the Great, Garibaldi and Cavour, Robert Bruce, Hunyadi, Kosciusko, and John Sobieski—all of them inspire me, for they are a part of my heritage.

I am the heir of constructive legislation. For me was written the Magna Charta, for me were composed the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights. For me men endured the rigors of Valley Forge and Morristown. For me the lawyer of Baltimore in the night of doubt and hope and indecision wrote the words of my national anthem. I am moved by the forces that inspired Rutledge and Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson.

For me are the art and the poetry and the music of the races that have combined in their efforts to create a new order of the ages. The poetry of Shakespeare and Robert Burns are mine by right of appreciation; the poetry of Whittier, of Paul Lawrence Dunbar, of Longfellow, is woven into the fabric of my being. Dickens and Dumas, Cervantes, Björnson and Trugenev, pour out before me the treasures of their imagination as they would pay tribute to a prince. For me are the glory of the Messiah of Handel, the majesty of Beethoven, the melodious harmony of Tchaikovsky.

To the possessions I hold have come the contributions of the Negro, the Chinese, the Italian, the French, the Scandinavian, the German, the English, the Pole, the Bohemian, and to these have come the further contribution of the Irish and Scot. The art and inspiration I enjoy have been enriched by such contributions.

I am a Roman Catholic. I attend the communion of my church free from interference in the manner and method of my worship. I thrill with the heritage of the deeds of the great men and women—St. Augustine, Father Damien, St. Catherine, Leo XIII—whose devotion to my church has made its record beautiful and great. I am a Protestant and the service of my church is free from outside influence. My life is illumined by the deeds of Latimer and Ridley, of Roger Williams, of Wesley and Asbury, of Knox and Campbell. I am a Jew and in the protected ritual of my synagogue I learn again the significance of the pronouncement of the psalmist, "The God of Jacob is our refuge."

I live and move in the light of a great tradition. Free am I to come, to go, to act, to think. I am a subject, but yet a sovereign. I am a citizen, yet a prince. I live under the law and yet at the ballot box I wear the purple robe of power.

For me men delve and strive in mine, for me men labor in shop and field. For me men fight and struggle and die.

I am the freest creature in the universe, with a freedom that carries the concomitant responsibility to work out my destiny and the destiny of my land under the purposes of Almighty God.

Who am I?

I am an American.

[1] Still vivid in the memory of many readers is the day recently observed as I Am an American Day, to honor those who had become citizens of the United States in the past year through naturalization and by reaching their majority.—EDITORS.

The House Vote on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over OPA is well illustrated in two thoughtful editorials from the Mankato Free Press and the New Ulm Daily Journal which are published in my congressional district. The people out in the country are fully aware of what goes on.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include these editorials:

[From the Mankato (Minn.) Free Press of April 23, 1946]

THE HOUSE VOTE ON OPA

Chester Bowles, bewailing what he terms the virtual wrecking of the OPA by the House last week, warns that "this Nation cannot live half regulated and half unregulated."

That, very possibly, is true.

Still, it was Mr. Bowles and his impractical, theoretical aides who advised and counseled President Truman to abolish wage controls last fall, at the same time keeping a rigid curb on prices. Wage raises of up to 30 percent, they foolishly announced publicly, could be absorbed by industry without increasing the price of manufactured products. That brought on a flood of extravagant demands, a flood of paralyzing strikes, and as a result a flood of increases in the prices of virtually everything that average citizens have to buy and that OPA is attempting to regulate.

Also, that stalled production for six precious months or more and made just that much more acute the dangers of inflation.

It must be remembered, too, that it is Mr. Bowles, Henry Wallace, Wilson Wyatt, and others of the "spend and lend" school of thought who are constantly advocating more deficit spending by the Government. This is another primary incentive to inflation. There is too much money in circulation now. Deficit spending that is financed largely by bank loans, constantly increases the money supply, provides more fuel on which the flames of inflation feed.

OPA price curbs are mere palliatives that treat this economic ailment, they are not permanent cures that will make our economic system sound. Most sound economists will agree that a continuance of OPA is necessary for a temporary period and it is probable the Senate will provide this ex-

tension without too much limitation of the price control agency's powers.

At the same time there should be accompanying legislation to encourage capacity production by both wage and price ceilings over the emergency period and to balance the budget during the coming fiscal year. Once we have capacity production and a balanced budget, the real cures for inflation will have been provided. Mr. Bowles' price fixing is a mere stop-gap program that many people fear he would make a permanent part of our economic life if he could gain the legislative support to do so.

The vote of the House against OPA last week was basically, a rebuke of the attempted power-grabbing of Mr. Bowles and his followers.

[From the New Ulm (Minn.) Daily Journal of April 20, 1946]

CONGRESS BLOWS OFF

One extreme usually produces another extreme.

When Members of Congress reacted from the extreme of bureaucracy in the OPA and the price regulation and subsidy agencies they were expressing the growing resentment of the country against the needless meddling and production throttling agencies. They were expressing the growing belief that the OPA, like prohibition, was creating more black markets than it was solving and in spite of OPA claims, it was not holding the price line of inflation. What Congress believed it was doing was to stimulate black marketing, emptying shelves and counters at the stores, creating inferior merchandise, and holding back production.

Voting these feelings Congress probably went too far and it appears much farther than the Senate will go. Out of it all will undoubtedly come some compromise between the extreme high-stepping tactics of the people in Government offices who believe Government must regulate everything and the other extreme that we can take off all controls and let supply and demand go to work.

In these days of shortages and dislocations caused by the war neither program will work out without a hardship to many people. Everything was artificially stimulated during the war and supply and demand are so abnormal that it is necessary to exercise some control to get things back to normal.

All our troubles stem from a silly, unrealistic approach to the whole problem. If on December 7, 1941, when we went to war we had frozen the prices of everything, raw materials, wages, salaries, retail prices, and everything as Canada did, then it would have been possible to develop some real price control. Instead we froze part of the wage and business structure and allowed increases to others. Wages were allowed to increase but the prices were held in line under a ceiling program. As a result the stores began to empty their counters of good merchandise. Cheaper products began to come to the shelves instead. In some lines of merchandise such as meats the black markets began to flourish like the bootleggers of the prohibition era. OPA could say it held the price line against inflation, but actually it was not holding the line because cheaper merchandise was being made at the old prices, new manufacturers were allowed new and higher ceilings than the old producers, and many people were patronizing the black markets at much higher prices.

The action of Congress indicates that the OPA is on its way out. Its passing probably will be more gradual than the hot-headed attitude of Congress would seem to indicate. OPA will have to go when supply begins to catch up with demand. The answer to our problem is not a permanent OPA. The answer is more and more production and when OPA interferes with that production it is hopelessly wrong.

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in a Nation-wide essay contest conducted by a business institution of Minneapolis, Minn., entitled "Food Plank for Peace," Hugh Lewis, student of the Hubbard High School, of Hubbard, Tex., in my congressional district, has been selected as one of the two Texas winners.

The essay of this young man is so excellent and deals with a subject so vitally important, not only in the United States but throughout the world at this time, that under leave granted I submit same herewith.

Surely feeding the hungry of the world and preventing mass starvation is one of the responsibilities of the American people at this time and this high school student, in a logical and convincing manner points out the necessity for such assistance and its relation to the future peace of the world.

A FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

(By Hugh Lewis, Hubbard High School, Hubbard, Tex.)

To a steadily greater degree we have watched the modern world become a single community. It is for this reason that we in the United States are interested in the welfare of foreign peoples.

In attempting to answer the question, Should America help Europe and Asia to recover from economic paralysis? let us first bear in mind the extremity of conditions in foreign countries.

Throughout nearly all of Europe there is severe, and in many places unbearable, hunger and exposure. In Asia the crisis is worse. In Chungking people are dropping dead in the streets, and millions of the Chinese are expected to die within a few months.

From the standpoint of humanitarianism and the American policy of world friendship, we cannot doubt what the answer to our question will be. Neither can we doubt that what we face is actually a world crisis and that we, the richest nation in the world, possess the greatest power to deal with it.

Too, the extremity of the situation emphasizes certain selfish arguments for American leadership in the relief and rehabilitation of hard-pressed and destitute countries:

1. Its value to us in foreign trade: The sooner the welfare of the peoples of war-torn countries is insured, the sooner they can reestablish industry and increase their production for export. Then not only can we import more goods from them, but, since they will have more goods to sell, their wealth will increase, and their demand for American goods will become greater. That means greater wealth and employment and less chance for economic insecurity in this country itself. Also, foreign investments will be more secure and more profitable, increasing from another source our own production and employment.

2. Its value to world peace: The atomic bomb has made imperative farther advancement toward peace. There are two ways in which our leadership in relief and rehabilitation would aid in that advancement: First, the peoples of war-torn countries will not forget the utter devastation of the past war and with increasing economic security could share with us a greater interest in world peace. Until starvation and extreme suffering are checked, however, peace will be subordinate to survival. Secondly, to aid in the recovery of such countries will be to gain friendship for America and influence for American principles, which will guarantee us greater hopes for our own security and prosperity. If, by our abandonment of the policy of international cooperation and friendship, we do not help them, we shall lose the respect of the rest of the world, a loss which we cannot afford.

The practice of humanitarianism and world cooperation will be encouraged among all nations by the participation of peoples in a policy of mutual aid in recovery from war and want, a participation in which we can share the fullest part. I believe that in the hope of national prosperity and national and world security, reason, as well as American principles, stands in favor of our aid to the nations impoverished by war.

Letter of Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter received from the Honorable Robert E. Hannegan, of the Democratic National Committee, in response to a letter that I wrote to him a few days ago:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, April 29, 1946.

Hon. WALTER K. GRANGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRANGER: I was very happy to receive your nice letter of April 19 with reference to the recent caucus called by the Democratic majority in the House.

I assure you at no time did the national committee have any intention of engaging in a purge, nor will it do so while I am chairman. But we are vitally interested in seeing that our party's pledges are kept to the people who have constantly returned our party to office since 1930, and only by doing so can we continue to earn the gratitude of the majority of the American people.

I want you to know that I very sincerely appreciate your writing me as you did and you may be assured of our continued cooperation and pleasant relations at all times.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

BOB HANNEGAN.

Food for Famine Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following famine statement issued by the administrative

board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

WASHINGTON, May 4.—The text of the famine statement issued by the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference was as follows:

"Famine is killing millions of people. Its victims, weakened in body and in spirit, increase in number each day. We who know not the pangs of hunger must hearken to the pitiful cries of our brothers in Christ. Self-discipline and self-denial on our part will save countless lives.

"From our overflowing granaries, yea, from what we wantonly waste, we can do much to relieve their utter destitution. Bread must become for us a holy thing; for it means life to a multitude of God's children.

"Mindful of this dire need, the bishops of our country are appealing to the faithful to give unstintingly in the campaign for food for the children of Europe and the Far East during the week, beginning on Mother's Day, May 12. We are confident that the response will be a fitting testimony of Christlike love for our neighbors in need.

"Moreover, we earnestly urge our fellow Americans to heed the plea of our Government to release their reserve stores of wheat that the hungry may eat.

"Relief of hunger is indeed the pressing need of the moment. We know that the shortage of food is due in large measure to the terrible devastation wrought by war. Yet, thinking men will not limit their vision to this fact. They will look beyond to find deeper causes for the chaos that now afflicts suffering humanity.

"Europe's misery has been aggravated by moral and economic disorders that could have been prevented. Undue delay in reaching peace settlements has fostered instability and paralyzed reconstruction.

"Eastern or 'bread' Europe has been artificially walled off from Western Europe. Multitudes of civilians and prisoners of war have been deported and degraded into forced labor unworthy of human beings.

"Occupying soldiery, living off the land, are consuming already depleted food stores. Great masses of unfortunate people have been stripped of their goods and then driven like cattle from their native soil into strange areas where they are homeless, helpless and friendless. Inevitably, famine breeds fear and unrest; and unrest jeopardizes the hope of peace for which mankind is longing.

"Justice cries out against these violations of the moral order. There can be no peace while they endure. Injustice is the helpmate of famine and their offspring is chaos.

"Order among men and nations can come only from the practice of justice and mercy in human relations. The moral order set down by the Maker of the universe is the only charter given to men whereby they may find peace and security."

Radio and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Fred Brenckman, from the National Grange Monthly:

RADIO AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST—SOAP OPERAS AND ADVERTISING CHATTER CROWD SUSTAINING PROGRAMS OFF THE AIR

(By Fred Brenckman)

Preliminary reports made to the Federal Communications Commission indicate that the four major radio networks of the country during 1945 had revenues from the sale of radio time aggregating $128,533,000. This refers to the earnings of the National, the American, the Mutual, and the Columbia broadcasting systems. If the revenues of all networks and radio stations were included, the total would be in the neighborhood of $300,000,000.

While every well disposed person should be glad to see the radio broadcasters prosper, the conviction is growing throughout the country that the radio is being commercialized to an extent that is entirely unwarranted.

To put it mildly, there is too much "advertising chatter" and too many soap operas, but not enough "sustaining" programs, with educational, religious, labor, agricultural, and civic organizations getting due recognition.

TWENTY-SIX TO ONE

Granting that those who are engaged in radio broadcasting have an investment upon which they have a right to expect reasonable dividends, the fact remains that the listening public also has an investment, which the Federal Communications Commission estimates is 26 times higher than that of the broadcasters. Here are the figures, and they are convincing:

Original cost to the public of 53,800,000 receivers manufactured during the 8-year period prior to December 31, 1944, $2,078,000,000.

Original cost of all tangible broadcast property to licensees of all stations and networks, as of December 31, 1944, $82,997,650.

Excess of public investment over industry investment in tangible broadcast property, $1,995,002,350.

No argument is needed to prove that without the investment which the public has made for radio sets, the broadcasting facilities of the stations and networks would be as useless as an automobile without wheels.

It follows, therefore, that the public has rights which the broadcasters would do well to respect. It should be clearly recognized by all concerned that nobody has a vested interest in the air, because the air is common property. All radio stations are licensed for a period of not more than 3 years. At the expiration of that period the licensee, if he wishes to remain in business, must make application for the renewal of his license. The standard governing the granting of licenses is public interest, convenience, or necessity.

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

On April 10, 1945, the Federal Communications Commission announced that it proposed to follow a policy calling for a more detailed review of broadcast station performance when passing upon applications for license renewals.

During the previous months, Paul A. Porter, then chairman of the FCC, set forth the need for such a policy in an address to the National Association of Broadcasters. He said:

"Briefly, the facts are these: An applicant seeks a construction permit for a new station and in his application makes the usual representations as to the type of service he proposes. These representations include specific pledges that time will be made available for civic, educational, agricultural and other public service programs.

"The station is constructed and begins operations. Subsequently the licensee asks for a 3-year renewal, and the record clearly shows that he has not fulfilled the promise made to the Commission when he received the original grant. The Commission has in the past, for a variety of reasons, including limitations of staff, automatically renewed these licenses, even in cases where there is a vast disparity between promises and performance."

Continuing, Mr. Porter threw out a warning that it will pay broadcasters to heed.

"We have under consideration at the present time," said he, "a procedure whereby promises will be compared with performance. I think the industry is entitled to know our concern in this matter and should be informed that there is pending before the Commission staff proposals which are designed to strengthen renewal procedures and give the Commission a more definite picture of the station's overall operation when the license comes up for renewal."

In accordance with this anouncement, a procedure involving more detailed review of renewal applications was instituted in April 1945.

In other words, the Federal Communications Commission is keeping a watchful eye on radio stations throughout the country to see that the licensees live up to their promises to give a proper proportion of time to "sustaining" programs.

FUNCTIONS OF SUSTAINING PROGRAMS

"The carrying of sustaining programs," says the Commission in a recent report, "has always been deemed one aspect of broadcast operations in the public interest. Sustaining programs perform a five-fold function in (a) maintaining an over-all program balance, (b) providing time for programs inappropriate for sponsorship, (c) providing time for programs serving particular minority tastes and interests, (d) providing time for nonprofit organizations—religious, civic, agricultural, labor, educational, etc., and (e) providing time for experiment and for unfettered artistic self-expression."

The report of the Commission very properly sets forth that if sustaining programs are to perform their traditional functions in the American system of broadcasting, they must be broadcast at hours when the public is awake and listening. It follows, therefore, that the time devoted to sustaining programs should be reasonably distributed among various segments of the broadcast day.

REJECTING NETWORK PROGRAMS

It has frequently happened during the past few years that when one of the networks puts on a sustaining program, most of the stations affiliated with it refuse to carry it, devoting their time to local commercial programs.

For example, on a given day the Columbia Broadcasting System's Country Journal, one of the most popular farm programs on the air, was carried by 53 stations affiliated with the system and rejected by 83.

During the progress of the war, the National Broadcasting Co. carried a program dramatizing current books relating to the war. A check on a certain date showed that this program was carried by 52 NBC stations and rejected by 61.

The NBC also had a program called Labor for Victory, which brought authoritative speakers to discuss labor's part in the war effort. These programs were produced by the American Federation of Labor alternating with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. On a certain day in April 2 years ago, this program was carried by 35 NBC stations and rejected by 104.

No figures have been available from the Blue Network, now the American Broadcasting Co., to show how many of its stations rejected sustaining programs put on by that network.

The Federal Communications Commission has this to say on the subject:

"The extent to which network sustaining programs have been neglected is well illustrated by this failure of the Blue Network even to determine whether or not its sustaining programs were being carried."

The truth is that the broadcasters have grown so callous and neglectful of their duty to the public, so greedy for gain, that many stations are now devoting from 80 to 90 percent of their time on Sundays to commercial advertising.

AGRICULTURE FARES BADLY

Agriculture, the fundamental industry of the country, has fared badly at the hands of the broadcasting interests during the past few years.

For many years the National Broadcasting Co. had as one of its most popular features the National Farm and Home Hour. For 5 days a week this hour was given over to the United States Department of Agriculture, and on Saturdays the several national farm organizations alternated in putting on the program. Under this arrangement each of the farm organizations was given an hour once a month on the air. To enliven its programs the National Grange regularly had the United States Army Band, which was given nearly half of the time. To show that this feature was appreciated, not only in this country, but in Canada, a poll conducted by the Toronto Star disclosed that the Army Band was the most popular musical organization on the air in the Dominion.

However, early in 1942, the National Broadcasting Co. cut the National Farm and Home Hour down to 30 minutes, explaining that it was the purpose of the company to give the other 30 minutes to the Government for war purposes. About 6 months later, the Farm and Home Hour was entirely abolished.

Under present arrangements the farm organizations as such get practically no recognition from the radio networks, although every station was licensed with the understanding that it would give a due allotment of time to agriculture along with other groups in discharging its public service responsibilities.

While agriculture gets less recognition on the air than any other segment of our population of comparable size and importance, other groups are also given but a niggardly allotment of time on a sustaining basis.

Every sensible person knows very well that without advertising revenues the broadcasters would not be able to stay in business, and an industry that is properly financed can naturally serve the public more effectively than would otherwise be the case.

BALANCE SHEETS TELL STORY

But that the broadcasting interests could deal more generously with the public and still get a good return on their investment is indicated by their own balance sheets.

During 1944, the last year for which complete figures are available, the total revenues of all networks and radio stations amounted to $275,298,611, after deducting $41,303,215, which was paid out in the form of commissions to regularly established agencies and brokers.

Total broadcast expenses amounted to $185,025,760, giving the industry net earnings of $90,272,851 before the payment of Federal income taxes.

No one can dispute the fact that this was a generous return for 1 year's operations on a total investment of less than $83,000,000.

San Francisco Bay Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1946, the House unanimously passed House Resolution 529, which I introduced on February 20, 1946, calling for the appointment of a joint Army-Navy board to hold hearings, investigate, and report to Congress on the feasibility and need of a bridge from the city of San Francisco to Bay Farm Island on the eastern shores, or continental side, of San Francisco Bay, or a system of dams and causeways as provided in the so-called Reber plan.

One of the greatest values of such a bridge will be the additional link it will provide in connecting the great number of military and naval establishments located in the area as a part of our future national defense.

But aside from this, there is an urgent need—an imperative need—for early approval of such a project to meet the continuously increasing traffic requirements for proper highway facilities between San Francisco and the east side of San Francisco Bay. That the present single San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge is wholly inadequate to meet even present-day requirements is forcefully indicated in a recent editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I invite attention to the following editorial to which I have referred:

ANOTHER BAY BRIDGE—EASTER TRAFFIC JAM ON OAKLAND SPAN SHOWS NEED FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN ADDITIONAL CROSSING

The last holiday week end (Easter) produced a jam of autos on the San Francisco-Oakland bay bridge which experienced highway patrol officers regarded as the heaviest in the history of the span. Autos were backed up almost to Richmond, and, at times, barely were able to move.

We can expect this sort of thing to occur with increasing frequency from now on, impeding traffic and aggravating the hazards of highway travel—to say nothing of the wear and tear upon the patience of thousands of motorists.

Nobody who uses the present bridge will question the fact that it now is called upon, at peak traffic periods, to handle more vehicles than it can comfortably and efficiently accommodate.

It is pertinent to call attention now to the fact that Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, of San Francisco, has offered a resolution calling for the appointment of a joint Army-Navy board to investigate the need for another bridge across the bay, and that the House of Representatives has voted unanimously in favor of Congressman WELCH'S proposal.

WELCH has suggested study either of a bridge extending from San Francisco, in the vicinity of Hunters Point, to Bay Farm Island on the East Bay side, or of the principles of the so-called Reber plan calling for a system of dams and causeways.

Congress acted despite an adverse report from the Navy Department. Acting Secretary W. John Kenney signed a report in which it was suggested that the Navy's objections, originally set forth in 1941, not only still held good but were even more valid because of the increased Navy activity in the bay area.

The House, as demonstrated by its vote on the Welch resolution, thinks otherwise. We agree. We believe that another bay crossing, far from interfering with national defense (we will presume, for the sake of argument, that the Navy is thinking in the larger, long-range terms of national defense and not basing its viewpoint on any selfish interest in pet projects) will improve it.

Another crossing would improve facilities for transporting men and materials; it would ease the construction of the transportation bottleneck caused by any bridge, by its very nature; caused by the present bottleneck; and it would add just that much more in the way of communications lines.

The Army and Navy most certainly have nothing to lose by giving this subject serious and open-minded study.

We believe that an honest and intelligent inquiry into the idea will convince the armed services they have much to gain from another bay crossing.

And, most assuredly, the civilian public, in its peacetime activities of commerce and pleasure, would benefit vastly from another crossing. The Army and Navy, which after all are creatures of the American public, should bear this in mind. To this end, they should respond favorably to the Welch resolution.

Broaden the Social Security Act—Increase Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, the following statement has been made to the Ways and Means Committee of the House for its consideration in connection with the broadening of the Social Security Act:

At this time I desire to make a statement in reference to the Social Security Act. Many constituents of mine are deeply interested in seeing the Social Security Act amended so as to include a larger number of the people in the older age brackets. Many persons now in employment are not protected. Some statistics seem to indicate that about two out of every five jobs in the United States are excluded from OASI although about 70,000,000 individuals have wage credits, but less than 40,000,000 have an insured status. It would seem, therefore, that a greater number of persons should be covered than now exists under the present law. A good many arguments could be given to justify old-age benefits from social security at the age of 55, and I should like to see the age lowered to 60, if 55 will not be considered. May I urge your attention to and favorable consideration of a broadening of the Social Security Act.

A Doctrine for Modern Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech of the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., delivered on Saturday, April 27, in Portland, Oreg., before the State convention of the Young Republican Federation of Oregon. I heard this speech when it was given and it aroused such favorable comment that I wish to

place it in the RECORD and make it available for all Members of Congress. It is as follows:

It is a real pleasure to come here to the Pacific coast to address this fine Republican gathering. When your able Senator MORSE invited me to come I was eager to accept for many reasons. First, because of my high regard for him. I do not need to tell you that he has won an outstanding position in the Senate because of his independence, his forward-looking approach to our current problems and the courage with which he battles for his convictions. With his colleague, Senator CORDON, Oregon is well represented. Then there was another reason, which springs from the deep attachment which I had for the late Senator Charles L. McNary. When I first came to the Senate at the age of 34 he befriended me and helped me in more ways than I can possibly enumerate. He had sure political wisdom, deep love of country and a wonderful capacity for friendship. I shall always remember him and, to come now to his home State of Oregon, which he served so long and with such loyalty, gratifies me deeply.

To one who has within the last few months returned from Europe, there is something deeply satisfying—and wonderful—about a gathering like this one tonight. There are so many contrasts. One very obvious one is that tonight we are warm and have plenty to eat. In Europe very few buildings are heated; coal is so scarce that electric light is rationed, and food is a terrible problem for millions of sickly, tired, and emaciated people. Those are a few of the differences—the materialistic ones.

There are other contrasts. Here we are among friends. We greet each other with smiles. In many places abroad the expressions on people's faces are those of worry, sadness, or hate—hate which springs from new causes as well as from the inherited brutalities of centuries. Over there you see hatreds stemming from the fact that you speak a different language or that you worship in a different faith or that you live in a different region or that you belong to a different social class—they are hatreds which weaken, debilitate, and rend society. We Americans, thank heaven, are not torn by these violent hatreds. We have been able to work together and build together, and, yes, in this war die together, on the common ground that we were Americans. Indeed we are not perfect and there is much to be done. But we have not been shattered by animosities springing from race, religion, language, region, or class.

In addition to the material and spiritual contrasts between the United States and the Old World, there are political contrasts, which interest us especially tonight. In Europe, countless people dare not call their souls their own. They have lived in constant fear under an oppressive dictatorship in which the government was supreme. No one could criticize the government. We now know that it is a great weakness not to be able to criticize the government. In fact, Hitler might have been more successful if there had been an independent agency which could criticize his mistakes. Under our system we retain the power to criticize ourselves. We have our Congress, which is free to criticize and restrain the Executive. And we have our two-party system in which the party which is out of power restrains the other.

That is where you and I come in. We are not only Republicans; we are actively interested Republicans. Otherwise we would not be here. It is not necessary to tell you that your participation in Government is important. But when you have been in countries where it would mean immediate death or torture in a concentration camp to belong to an opposition party, it freshens your sense of how important it is in our country to keep the opposition alive and how vital it is for us as the active members of the opposition to understand this one thing:

That the reason why democratic government exists here, although it has disappeared in so much of Europe, is because in this country democracy, broadly speaking, has been able to translate the aims and aspirations of the rank and file of the people into deeds; whereas in much of the old world it was not able to do so.

This means that we, as Republicans, must always remember that we exist to promote the aspirations of the rank and file of the people. We do not exist in order to cater to the ambitions of any minority or vested interest no matter how powerful it may appear to be. We must in the future, as in the days of our great past, be a popular party—a party of the people. As Lincoln said, "This country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it." If we forget that fact and seek to make our party the private preserve of a small few, we simply find ourselves faced with the practical fact that we can nominate, but cannot elect. And on the higher ground of patriotism and principle we would be untrue to everything for which the Republican Party really stands.

We know, therefore, that the American people, regardless of party, more than ever before believe in the need for a two-party system. Those who have seen foreign countries during this war are especially aware of it. And there are many independents who belong to no party who will tell you that a two-party system is essential to effective popular government.

We also know that the American people, regardless of party, have no use at all for the outdated, stale kind of narrow partisanship—the kind in which you "point with pride" and "view with alarm"; the kind in which your side has all the virtues and the other side has all the faults. People know that that's bunk. They know that political contests are not sporting events, but are clashes involving not only the bread and butter, but, in this day of atomic bombs, the very lives of the men, women, and children of America.

We can, therefore, in this spirit, give the other party credit for having a public program which contains many good intentions. It has proclaimed certain broad goals which conform to age-old human aspirations. Full employment, care of the sick and of the aged, provision for the veteran, the allaying of industrial unrest, the avoidance of ruinous inflation, and a military establishment which will effectively discourage and repel aggression—these are all sound objectives. But no political party, Democrat or Republican, has a copyright on the proposition that it opposes sin and defends virtue.

This proposition may seem obvious, but there seem to be persons who are satisfied with a resounding declaration written in ringing words and never look to see how the declarations are being carried out. It is a sort of split personality, with the words going bravely in one direction and the deeds—if any—going nowhere at all. That type of claptrap may not have been dangerous in bygone days, but it won't do today. Yet there are still many in high places who haven't awakened to this fact.

It isn't enough for a public official just to come out for a bill with an appealing label on it. When he's done that he's only just begun to fight. It isn't enough to say: "I'm for full employment" or "I'm for doing something about housing" or "I'm for a good military establishment." If that were all there were to it, the job of being a political leader would be easy. We all know that there is much more to it than that. A real leader must learn the views of others, strive to meet their objections and actually direct while appearing to obey. We do not, therefore, criticize those in power for giving verbal advocacy to a program of full employment, care of the sick and aged, provision for the veteran and effective national defense. In fact we agree with the purpose of this program. We criticize the lack of effective leadership, the bungling, the inability to get things done. We say that they don't go far enough with their own program.

And we know some of the reasons for it. We know that the Democratic Party is hopelessly divided between a group of southern leaders, on the one hand, who are animated by a sunset philosophy with overtones of bourbonism, and certain northern leaders, on the other, who, recklessly attempting to shout with the loudest crowd, will try anything once—with vast indifference to the practical and humanitarian consequences. How can you expect effective and progressive public action under those all too well known circumstances? Of course we Republicans don't always agree among ourselves. It's healthy that we shouldn't. But the schism in the Democratic Party is something special which far transcends a normal difference of opinion.

That disunity in the Democratic Party is one reason for the failure to achieve constructive action. There are others. I suggest that an unwillingness to go for advice outside of a small circle of old, regular-party wheel horses is another reason. Governing this country is a complex business. Those who govern need all the good advice they can get from our huge reservoir of talent. Yet is the Government at Washington today using this reservoir of talent? It is not. In fact the vast aggregation of able men who worked in Washington, regardless of party, during the war is leaving the Capitol in droves. Mr. Ickes is not the only one. Their services apparently are not wanted just when they are critically needed. I do not speak of the shocking Pauley episode, destructive of one's faith in the integrity of government. It is yet another reason why the machine in Washington has broken down.

Regardless of party, Americans can agree, therefore, that the stated aims of the Administration are aims which the human race has always applauded.

Regardless of party, Americans can agree that the party in power has almost completely failed to carry them out and therefore, by the great test of effectiveness, has failed.

Regardless of party, Americans will agree in condemning bungling, indecision, ignorance and a failure to take the long view. By the same token they will deplore the unwillingness to take competent advice.

From any standpoint you are driven to the conclusion that the party in power was utterly unprepared for this postwar era.

So much by way of preface, to clear the ground. Having talked about the party in power, let's talk about the Republicans. How would we act if we were in power? For one thing we would call on the best brains in the country to help us run the Government.

But what about Republican doctrine? What is our body of principle, our guiding ethic? We all hear a lot about this. I know many Republicans who think that our choice is between trying to outdeal the New Deal on the one hand or standing for what they call "the fundamental rights of the individual" on the other. I have read a letter which is being circulated rather widely these days which says: "I believe the Republican Party should take a firm stand on one side of the street or the other, and, as the left side is pretty well occupied by the New Deal, the only room available is on the right side of the street." I differ with that version of republicanism.

If we are restricted to these two alternatives, I feel sorry for the Republican Party—and the Democratic Party. And I would feel particularly sorry for the United States of America. We would be in the military situation of troops caught in a tunnel—they could only go either north or south and in either direction the machine guns would get them.

Fortunately, we are not shackled and limited by merely having the choice between a will-o'-the-wisp new dealism on the one hand and an inert assertion of individual rights on the other. We have plenty of room for maneuver and—to continue the military simile—plenty of opportunities to go around the flank. We confront a rich variety of opportunities and do not have to choose partners between the advocates of destruction and the fighters of desperate rear-guard actions.

To be sure, we do uphold the "fundamental rights of the individual"—yes. We do so more enthusiastically and more effectively than any other party. But it would be sterile and inert to stop there. We recognize the importance of using government effectively to deal with matters which can only be dealt with—or which can best be dealt with—by government.

The fundamental cleavage between our two major parties lies in this fact: That there is the widest kind of difference between favoring social legislation as a supplement to your economy and favoring governmental action as your chief source of jobs. In seeking the universally acclaimed goal of full employment, for example, we would proceed on the theory that the best way to get it is through a dynamic economy which creates large-scale production. We say that because we think it is the quickest and easiest way to spread lots of good jobs throughout the land. We think it is a much better way than by Government-made work programs—although we would not hesitate to use the power of Government to combat depressions if one should ever come again. We are for all types of social legislation on a decent, generous, and efficient basis—but we do not place our chief reliance on it as a producer of well being for the American people. In New England the Republicans in the days following the Civil War invented much of the social legislation which is now standard throughout the country. But we believe in it as a matter of humanitarian justice, as a matter of decency, as a device with which to fill in the chinks which our dynamic economy does not reach. We do not contemplate that it can possibly become a substitute for large-scale production as a creator of jobs and prosperity.

We don't think it can. And we don't think it should. Because when every person in the country depends on the Government for his living, democracy is thereby assassinated, freedom is gone, and the arrival of the dictator is just around the corner. So-called socialism, in which the government is benevolently depicted as the provider of all jobs, usually precedes the dictator. Remember that in Germany the official name of Hitler's party was the National Socialist Party. Figure it out for yourself. If you're employed by the government and you quarrel with your employer and get fired, where are you going to go for another job? In our country there are lots of different employers and you can shop around among them all. But if all jobs are controlled by the government you're out in the cold completely. What happens to your political liberty then?

That is why we do not enthuse about any attempt to make the people believe that the Government can, by itself, promise or guarantee prosperity. We don't think it can in the first place. And in the second place, we don't think it should because this would mean the end of freedom and democracy.

And our whole domestic program—everything we say or do—must be seen in that light—in the faith that a man's economic condition is inextricably tied up with his political liberty; that the way he earns his living is the foundation upon which is built his freedom to choose his government, to speak his mind, and to worship in the faith of his fathers.

That is why we advocate an end to deficit spending, the elimination of duplication in the bureaus of the Government, the removal of unnecessary persons from the pay roll, the balancing of the budget, the elimination of much of our present bureaucracy, an orderly system of organizing the retirement of the debt, and a complete audit of all our commitments, foreign and domestic. We advocate these things because we know that a waste of the people's money in the Government creates business uncertainty and discourages the creation of new business.

That is why we favor an encouragement of world trade and close American support of the UN because our free system can exist so much better in a peaceful and prosperous world.

That is why we defend labor's right to strike and labor's and capital's joint obligation to realize their responsibilities as the two key figures in our system of free enterprise. A prohibition of strikes would lead to forced labor and an equally rapid destruction of capitalism and democracy. But it is equally certain that Government must effectively take the lead in steps to allay industrial unrest and that it must be done on a broad, thorough, deliberate, and nonpartisan basis. The task has never even been attempted in this way.

In this time of international turmoil we are uncertain and ignorant of many things. We must think and talk with restraint, distrust propaganda, and suspend judgment. We must in every possible way strengthen the UN. But of one thing we can be sure. And that is: That pending the arrival of world disarmament and world government, a strong America is our best security. No foreign policy can be stronger than the national strength behind it. As General Eisenhower said, "Our armed forces have but one purpose—to discourage or to repel aggression." This means Army, Navy, and Air Forces—yes. It means full industrial production on the home front—yes. Those are two ways for a nation to be strong.

But, above all, it means enthusiastic faith in our way of living and doing—in the validity of the American dream. Let me ask: Have we forgotten those words of thunder which proclaimed the self-evident truth that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"? Have we forgotten that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men"? Are there many Americans who don't know that these lines are from the Declaration of Independence? Do we make fun of them and say they are old-fashioned? Then we no longer understand America—her past performance, her future promise, and her miraculous intertwining of economic, political, and religious freedom. For this faith in the American dream is our first line of defense and the armature of all the defense lines which follow.

So it is that this question of a free economy is the touchstone to everything—to material wealth, to individual freedom along economic, political, and spiritual lines and to the vast deadly issue of war and peace. It is no party question, the possession of no faction. No manufacturer and no labor leader has any copyright on it. Neither has any politician. Because it involves everything which the American people hold dear, it is at the highest pinnacle of all our public questions and is broad enough in its scope to include all our people.

"All our people"—that is what is needed. Look at our recent history in terms of our national unity. Look at the disunity in the United States and in the Hawaiian Islands at the moment of Pearl Harbor. What a price we paid for division at that time. Then came the tremendous teamwork of the war. Colossal unity on the home front, in factories, on farms, and in the halls of Congress. There was stupendous unity on the fighting fronts—everyone selflessly overlooking his personal angle for the common cause. Then the war stopped and the unity disappeared in thin air. You see what has been happening. Supposing we had the same faith and the same unity which existed here during the war. Supposing we agreed that we would all of us leave no stone unturned to make a resounding success of our great expanding, competitive American system of individual initiative with its independent workmen, its private capital, and its sure promise of social justice. Do any of you doubt that we could put it across? And do any of you doubt that such an economic system would richly and generously reward every single man, woman, and child in this country and be of lasting and growing value to the world?

You and I know the answers to these questions. So in his innermost heart does every American. There need be no delay. There is no excuse for doubt or discouragement. Only a touch of the right leadership is required for the United States to resume its onward march. For it is our free competitive economic system, interwoven with our free political system, which preserves our sources of inner spiritual strength and which has made America the great oasis in the world Sahara, and the hope of humanity everywhere.

There is the challenge and there is the opportunity confronting the Republican Party.

Stalin Wars on the Pope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an article which I read in the May 4 issue of the Washington Times-Herald, and found of deep interest. I believe it provides "food for thought" for anyone interested in the future of democracy, and that should include all of us. Incidentally, a check into Who's Who in America will prove that Father Parsons, S. J., the author, is well qualified from every standpoint—education, background, and integrity—to speak out on this subject. Perhaps some of you have read his book, Which Way Democracy.

STALIN WARRING ON POPE, SAYS FATHER PARSONS

A war on the Pope and the Catholic church has been declared by Joseph Stalin to further his program of world communism with Soviet Russia at its head, Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., of Catholic University, asserted yesterday.

The priest, addressing the First Friday Club at its monthly luncheon at the Willard Hotel, said that Russia has infiltrated into every country on the globe but finds itself opposed at every hand by Catholic influences.

"Although the Red steamroller has smashed in all countries adjacent to its boundaries, the Soviets are doomed to failure unless the minds and souls of men in these nations surrender to Communist reasoning.

"For this reason," he said, "Stalin has declared war on the Pope and the Catholic church."

Father Parsons said that several parties are competing in Russia for supremacy, one of which, under Molotov, is aimed at world revolution, while another and the strongest,

under Litvinov, wants to build a powerful state. The latter, he added, would get along amicably with capitalistic nations.

The Genesis of the Present Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen are hearing from back home these days. A flood of letters and telegrams are pouring into the office of each Congressman asking why the Congress does not do something to curb the power of John L. Lewis. I answer my mail on this subject, as follows:

DEAR MR. ———: Thank you for your wire of May 5 relative to the present coal strike.

The Congress has no police powers. It has no way to enforce the laws that are on the statute books. The enforcement power, under our Constitution, comes under the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government, and is centered in the President.

The Congress is a legislative body and as such is responsible for making the laws. The House of Representatives in the past 5 years has passed four different bills (the last one being the Case bill which passed the House on February 7, 1946) which would have corrected many of the present labor troubles and excesses, and would have made labor responsible for its acts. These bills were sent to the Senate where they were pigeonholed as the result of White House influence.

You will, therefore, see that so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, it has demonstrated at every opportunity its willingness to enact legislation to correct the present labor evils. I, personally, have voted for these measures. President Roosevelt threatened to veto any restrictive labor legislation that was presented to him and President Truman also threatened to veto the Case bill in the form in which it was passed by the House. Therefore you can see that the Senate has listened to the President rather than to the American people. I agree with you that it is high time that something is done about the situation. I would suggest that you and your friends lose no time in contacting United States Senators who have the power to bring corrective labor legislation to the floor of the Senate and vote upon it. Then when the bill is sent to the President for his signature we shall know whether or not he is as anxious to correct the situation as he led the public to believe in his January 3 radio address.

My thoughts and opinions are well known on this matter, as you can see by the enclosed speech that I made on the floor of the House on February 1 of this year.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very sincerely,

N. M. MASON.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the present national crisis that John L. Lewis has brought about, perhaps we should review the causes that led up to the present situation. Mark Sullivan has done this job much better than I can in an article entitled "Background of the Crisis," carried in today's issue of the Washington Post. I am, therefore, including that article in my remarks and recommend it to my colleagues as must reading:

MR. LEWIS' CHALLENGE

(By Mark Sullivan)

BACKGROUND OF THE CRISIS

Mr. John L. Lewis' coal strike is a crisis of our time. It is related to things which are supposed to compose the power of the people, their supremacy over any individual or group. These are: The Government, the administration, which at any time carries on government, and the public interest.

With the public interest, Mr. Lewis is plainly in conflict. Because of his strike, public services are curtailed—railroad travel and freight shipments, electric power and light. These curtailments in turn ramify into other deprivations. Mr. Lewis' conflict with the public interest is flagrant.

Is Mr. Lewis in formal conflict with the administration, which is supposed to defend the public interest and give effect through its supremacy? After this, it is not quite possible to say. While President Truman has publicly called the strike a national disaster, we do not know what formal demand, if any, the administration has made upon Mr. Lewis. However, Mr. Lewis defied the Roosevelt administration, refused to obey orders of its agencies, showed disdain for it. Is Mr. Lewis in conflict with government? He is not in conflict with Congress, for Congress passed the laws, particularly the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which confers on Mr. Lewis the power to do what he is now doing.

On a former occasion, Mr. Lewis had an experience with Government which may account in part for some of his self-confidence in following his present course. Any present condition has roots in past events.

In 1937 Mr. Lewis, then head of CIO, conducted a strike of a CIO union, the United Automobile Workers, at Flint, Mich. It was a sit-down strike, sensational in itself and in the manner in which it was carried on.

The owners of the plant, the General Motors Co., took the ground that the strikers' occupancy of the plant was a violation of the law against trespass. It said it would not negotiate with the union so long as the strikers maintained occupancy of its premises. The strikers continued in occupancy.

General Motors asked the Flint Circuit Court to issue a writ of injunction, directing the strikers to quit their occupancy of the plant. The court issued the writ and directed the sheriff to serve it. The sheriff, with some difficulty, read the writ to the strikers. The strikers booed the sheriff, and gave out a message saying, "We have decided to stay in the plant."

The court, following the steps of legal procedure, issued a second writ directing the sheriff to evict the strikers. The sheriff knew he could not evict several hundred men. He asked the Governor of the State, Frank Murphy, for help by the National Guard to carry out the court's order.

To this request, Governor Murphy made no reply. Following a different course, saying he wished to avoid violence, he promoted conferences between General Motors and the union heads, including Mr. Lewis. General Motors, with legal procedure frustrated, yielded, and came to agreement with the union. Thereupon the sit-down strikers left the plant, carrying placards saying "Victory is ours."

To Governor Murphy, President Roosevelt sent a message saying, "I thank you for myself and for the country." Later, Mr. Roosevelt gave more substantial appreciation. After Governor Murphy was defeated for reelection, partly it was presumed because of his attitude toward the sit-down strike, President Roosevelt appointed him to the highest law-enforcing post in the Federal Government, Attorney General; later made him a Justice of the Supreme Court.

Here was a court in the performance of a high function of Government, issuing an order to striking members of Mr. Lewis' union, and these not obeying. And here was the Governor of a State not giving the help without which the order of the court could not be enforced. And here was the President of the United States approving the Governor's position.

That the 1937 event contributes to the present condition is tenable to assume. What now faces the Truman administration is the problem of reasserting and establishing the supremacy of government.

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an essay written by Rose Okawaki, a student in the Mitchell High School, Mitchell, Nebr., which made her the Nebraska winner of the Nation-wide contest sponsored by the Pillsbury Institute of Flour Milling History on the subject Food Plank for Peace. The essay was submitted through her teacher, Miss Helen Strachen.

FOOD PLANNING FOR PEACE

(By Rose Okawaki, Mitchell High School, Mitchell, Nebr.)

If the world does not meet the winter's minimum food requirements and millions of displaced people are not reestablished at profitable pursuits, if the world cannot overcome the obstacles of shortages of all kinds, peace may be short-lived and the opportunity to create trade on a wide international basis—one of the necessary adjuncts to a prosperous, peaceful world—may be lost.

The major food commodities—sugar, rice, tea, fats, oils, fish, wheat, canned meats and dairy products—have been produced by all the United Nations to the utmost of their ability and they have been distributed fairly among all of the needy nations conquered in the war.

Up to August, UNRRA had received requests from Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Greece, Italy Austria, and Czechoslovakia for food, machinery, seeds, medicine, fertilizer, and other strategic commodities.

Like sugar, both rice and tea are international foods. Fats and oils are also needed by all, but are not produced by all in sufficient quantity to take care of individual needs. Because of international cooperation, it was made possible to meet the United Nations' needs.

War has taught us the value of close interdependence. Producer and consumers alike know that an international exchange of goods among free nations is one of the most important contributions to a peaceful and prosperous world. Hand in hand we must fight this war on food. Many of our ex-service men and women will want to get away from the busy movements in the city, to return to the quiet peaceful farms and ranches. Not being impressed by what they see done on Government show-farms, they are profoundly impressed by what they themselves achieve. Many fields of work can be found in the production on food.

Having the aid from and with the guidance of the Almighty, may we achieve and attain a peaceful, happy world.

The Stake in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Crowther, from the New York Journal-American of April 26, 1946:

THE STAKE IN PRICE CONTROL

(By Samuel Crowther)

(This is the sixth of a series of articles on price control by Samuel Crowther, author and economist, written expressly for the Hearst newspapers.)

ARTICLE VI. EMERGENCY BY ORDER

The housing situation gives a perfect example of how Government interference can create an emergency out of what would otherwise be just one more problem for men to tackle and solve.

Government officers, by their lurid pronouncements on housing shortages, on prices and on inflation, and by their rigid rent and material controls, have made black markets in rents and building materials, scared tenants and builders into paying heavy graft, and forced honest landlords and builders to all but stop renting and building.

The housing situation also gives a perfect example of how the failure of bureaucratic control can be twisted and sentimentalized so that the failure appears not as a reason for chucking the controls but as a compelling reason for more and wider controls.

The administration is now using the failures of a dozen years of Government dabbling in houses, the failure of rent control, and the failure of price control as proof that it needs to be given more power.

Using the returning veterans as scenery, it has put forward a grandiose program under which it proposes, by peeling from a big wad of printing-press money, to provide fine, low-cost housing for everyone.

The men who are making these proposals may or may not know that, in the name of helping the needy and promoting the general welfare, they are asking for the socialization of housing. This translates into asking for the control of nearly a third of our economy.

If the Congress continues the present OPA controls and enacts the administration's housing bill, it will have started us down a road of regimentation from which there can be no turning.

This analysis may seem harsh and unsympathetic, but it is safe to say that there is not a presently crowded city or community which would not find accommodations for everyone, if profit were restored to renting.

With controls off, tenants would have a freedom of choice which they do not have, and, considering the bonuses which are now nearly everywhere being paid aside and under the table, rents would be bound to adjust themselves, in some cases upward but in most cases downward, to the worth of the premises.

The plain fact is that in renting and building, the people are being persuaded to ask for the impossible, and so they are getting less than the possible.

The Government is not making an honest representation.

It has printed vastly more dollars than there are things to buy with the dollars, and so dollars are gradually losing their buying power—that is, prices are rising.

A man who is getting twice as much today for the same kind of work that he did 5 or 6 years ago cannot expect that his dollar will buy as much as it did 5 or 6 years ago.

The 1946 dollar will not buy housing at 1940 prices. Everyone knows that and nearly everyone knows that where materials are available—which is now seldom—it costs a builder from ten to twelve thousand dollars to duplicate a house he put up for $5,000 in 1940, and the new house will not be made of as good material as the old one.

A $10,000 house cannot be rented for the same price as a $5,000 house.

The same holds true for apartment houses. In New York City the old $60 apartment in a new building has to be a $100 apartment. And about the same rule holds true throughout the country.

The decent, low-priced apartment has gone the way of the 5-cent shine and the 15-cent haircut.

The Government cannot change this situation. It can put up housing and rent it for less than cost. But that only means the tenant pays less at the rent window and more at the tax window.

There is a housing shortage, but no one knows how great the shortage is and no one can know, for the adequacy of housing depends upon the standard of living.

During the war period, more than 15,000,000 people shifted their residences. An unknown number of families who doubled up during the deep depression would like to separate again.

From 1942 through 1945 there were 6,500,000 marriages, including those of 1,500,000 servicemen, with a gain in new households of 1,500,000.

The National Housing Agency estimates that 39 percent of the housing in the Nation is substandard, and the 1940 census shows that about 46 percent of the 37,000,000 dwelling units then in existence were in need of major repairs.

One may do anything one likes with these figures. The Federal Public Housing Administration estimates that 16,000,000 new dwelling units will be required within the next 10 years to conserve the health of the Nation.

It is always possible to get together the facts on which to proclaim some kind of housing emergency.

Mrs. Roosevelt and Dr. Tugwell found one in the early days of the Roosevelt administration when they began putting up little communal villages.

President Roosevelt found one-third of the Nation ill-clothed, ill-housed, and ill-fed. The Federal Housing Administration was organized to promote building by guaranteeing mortgages.

The Federal Government has for many years been closing in on the financial side of residential building, and the old speculative builder is pretty much a thing of the past—that is, much of the individual incentive has long since been taken out of building.

A war order issued April 1942 practically stopped residential building and there would today, in any event, be an acute shortage of desirable new residences. The OPA has turned this shortage into an emergency by practically tying up the manufacture of building material through ceiling prices that did not cover costs. In some cases, as in the lumber industry, the ceiling prices were such as to divert the mills from making the sizes of lumber used in building.

The situation is fairly set out in these extracts from a letter written in January of this year by the Lewis Manufacturing Co., of Bay City, Mich. Mr. T. P. Dixon, the president, writes:

"In the face of the greatest demand for moderate priced homes this country has ever known, our factory stands practically idle. Up until 1942, at which time civilian home-building was practically stopped to conserve materials for war purposes, we manufactured and shipped from 600 to 750 complete homes annually.

"Our factory employment ran around 200 men and our office personnel was around 50. Today our factory employment is 35, most of whom are doing nonproductive work, and whom we are only retaining because they have worked for us continually for from 15 to 40 years. The same exists in our office.

"The same price set-up that was created during the war for the specific purpose of stopping or discouraging production of lumber items for house construction remains in effect.

"As a consequence, the mills continue to produce premium-price items suitable for ship decking, heavy construction, airplane stock, etc., and refuse to produce such items of small dimension, flooring, ceiling, siding, trim, etc., as the ceiling prices on same are too low to allow their production on a profitable basis."

Exactly the same conditions obtain—or have obtained most of the months since VJ-day—in soil pipe, gypsum lath, asbestos cement, and asphalt products, shingles, insulating board, radiators, radiator valves, and in practically all of the supplies needed for building. Some of these supplies can be bought at higher prices in the black markets and some builders have had to truck 500 or a thousand miles for minor items.

In addition to this, wage rates have gone very high, while the skill and efficiency of the workers available seem to have dropped. One builder reports that a job which three men used to do in a day now takes seven men from 2 to 3 days.

The OPA, by its price policy on materials, shut off private building when it was most needed and, by its rent-control policy, made renting a hazard at a time when quarters to rent were most needed. It is these actions which have created the emergency.

The administration plan advanced by Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt, with the attractive title of Housing Expediter, is complicated and its exact provisions are not here important.

The important point is that it seeks through subsidy behind the scenes to present a $10,000 house as a $6,000 house and to rent it for not over $50 a month—that is, it seeks to preserve the appearance of things and to present the Government as a fairy godmother by shifting the cost of building and renting from the home owner or tenant to the general public, either directly by taxes or indirectly through the public debt.

That is government by mirrors.

Statement by the Association of Commissioners and Secretaries of Agriculture of the Northeastern States, Meeting in Albany, N. Y., April 30, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal creators of scarcity, confusion, and emergencies are not interested in the production of food and other necessities of life, but instead they seek to throttle production of these essentials by means of innumerable and conflicting regulations.

It would seem that the appeal of the Commissioners and Secretaries of Agriculture of nine sovereign States would be given some weight by the OPA and CPA functionaries in a critical time like the

present; however, such is not the procedure of the bureaucratic minds. Food, coal, and wearing apparel for the masses do not concern the New Dealers.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a statement by the Associations of Commissioners and Secretaries of Agriculture of the Northeastern States meeting in Albany, N. Y., April 30, 1946:

The present shortage of feed in northeastern United States constitutes the gravest threat yet to the supply of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry for the millions of consumers in this area.

There is no doubt that the United States must do everything possible to help feed starving peoples of Europe and Asia. But at the same time, the health and welfare of consumers in northeastern United States must be safeguarded through sufficient production of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry.

Northeastern farmers have been able to barely get by thus far while feed supplies were being used up at a rapid rate in the areas where they are produced. Now, with the Nation's livestock at a high level and supplies of feed steadily dwindling, it is more imperative than ever that the northeast receive its fair share of available feed.

Recent renewed efforts to get grain moving off farms where it is produced emphasize the fact that the northeast is not getting its proper amount of feed for cattle and poultry.

The situation has been brought about by inequitable price relationships which make it more profitable for a farmer in the Grain Belt to feed grain to livestock than to sell it as grain.

Proof of the seriousness of the situation lies in the wholesale cancellation of hatchery orders. These cancellations are proceeding at an unprecedented rate. The number of chicks booked for delivery during May and June was 55 percent less than the number booked for delivery during these months last year. There is just cause for alarm.

Northeastern feed distributors are unable to secure feed from their suppliers, many of whom have stopped booking orders and canceled earlier orders. There must, however, be no public criticism of the feed industry which has done an almost superhuman job in obtaining feeds under extremely adverse conditions.

Producers and consumers in this area will suffer unless prompt steps are taken to speed up the flow of feed into the northeast.

Approved by Commissioner Frank H. Peet, Connecticut; Secretary Ralph C. Wilson, Delaware; Commissioner A. K. Gardner, Maine; Commissioner Frederick E. Cole, Massachusetts; Commissioner Andrew L. Felker, New Hampshire; Secretary W. H. Allen, New Jersey; Commissioner C. Chester Du Mond, New York; Secretary Miles Horst, Pennsylvania; Commissioner Stanley Judd, Vermont.

There Is a Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in mass-production industries unions and collective bargaining are a necessity. Without them workers would be at the mercy of a few profiteering employers who fail to recognize the axiom that a contented, well-paid worker is essential to profitable production.

The true purpose of a union is the betterment, either through wage increases or improved working conditions, of its members. But when union officials forget that objective, that is, increases in wages, improved working conditions, and shorter hours, and, by force, coercion, or intimidation levy tribute upon free Americans, they will sooner or later bring down, not only upon themselves, upon their unions, but upon innocent workers, the wrath of an outraged public.

The power to tax is vested in the Federal Government, the State government, and its various municipalities. No individual nor group of individuals has either the legal or the moral right to tax the small businessman or his clerk by forcing them to pay either an initiation fee, dues, or special assessments, in order to exercise their God-given, their constitutional right to carry on business, to earn a livelihood for themselves and their families.

Officials of the teamsters' union have arrogantly forced the farmer, using his own truck, driven by his own son, delivering a load of food to workers in the city, to pay $8.41 for the right to drive on the public highway; to pay another union man, who sits or stands by when the food is unloaded by the farmer's boy at the warehouse platform. Teamsters' unions have refused to deliver food to the small corner stores until the proprietor or his clerks joined their union.

That is extortion. A Justice of the United States Supreme Court described it as "highway robbery." But it has been sanctioned and condoned by State, county, and city governments and by a large portion of the metropolitan press, which has heretofore cowardly refused to condemn it.

The Detroit Free Press, getting an overlarge dose of the teamsters' union which is refusing to deliver supplies to independent merchants until they force their clerks to join and pay up, on April 30, among other things, had this to say:

Detroit's citizens are faced with the choice of keeping control of the city's political and economic life in their own hands, or of supinely surrendering that control to a small group of lawless union leaders.

The issue involved here transcends even the legal aspects of the union racket. * * * The small, independent merchant does not exist in an economic vacuum, hanging on to a precarious existence through direct competition with big business as represented by the chain stores.

The independent merchants are open in the evenings to take care of the late workers and those who are unable to do their shopping during regular business hours. * * *

It is these merchants to whom the mother turns when her child needs milk and her regular supplier's place of business is closed. These are the merchants whom the teamsters are going to force out of business unless Detroit rises in its wrath and calls an abrupt end to this union ruthlessness.

* * * * *

And, if carried to its possible conclusion, it means that every citizen will be a vassal of the union hierarchy.

What is to prevent the teamsters, as their next step, from moving in on private motorists? The driver of his own car could be told that he must either join the union as an associate, nonvoting member at $2 a month, or employ a union chauffeur. * * *

The danger to this city is not exaggerated. It has happened in Seattle, where every phase of community life is directed and controlled by the notorious Dave Beck, head of the teamsters' union there. Beck acquired his power by moving in on private business in exactly the same manner that Jimmy Hoffa is moving in on Detroit.

The teamsters are able to make this threat to our liberties because of their political power. Our authorities are afraid to check them in an election year, when they think union support is so important to get them elected.

The union man working in a factory will sooner or later realize that, if the small storekeeper, his clerk, and the farmer are forced to pay tribute to the teamsters' union, the amount paid will be added to the factory worker's grocery bill. And if this indefensible practice is carried to its logical conclusion, the city worker and his neighbors may find themselves without food—yes, perhaps without a job.

What would union men and their wives say, if, refusing to cross a picket line when the teamsters' union went on strike, the merchants of the city retaliated by refusing to sell the milk, the meat, the bread, the groceries, which they did manage to obtain, to union members and their families?

What would union members and their wives say, if, when they refused to let the farmers have free access to city markets, the farmers retaliated by withholding all food supplies from the cities?

FEWER JOBS

For 30 days, the United Mine Workers have refused to dig coal and John L. Lewis says they will not dig any until the operators pay a royalty on every ton dug. John has not yet said how much. If he gets away with it, the operators will add the amount—whatever it is—to the price and the consumer will pay it.

In the meantime, factories are closing; workers are out of jobs. The pay increases they won by their own strikes will not do them any good because they will not get a wage check. Travel on the railroads is being limited. There is talk of black-outs in the cities. Unless this strike is settled quickly, the Government will be forced to operate or purchase the mines, throw open the jobs to men who will work, to men who must work if they and their families are to eat.

It seems a shame that, living in one of the most productive and richest countries in the world, we are all looking for an additional dollar; just running around in circles, getting nowhere; creating and submitting to bureaucratic agencies which have not prevented an increase in living costs; which have actually created a shortage of food, clothing, and shelter; stalled reconversion.

Some day more of us will have to do more work, practice a little thrift, use a little common sense—the sooner that day comes, the better.

A Plebiscite for Self-Determination in Puerto Rico—Radio Interview With Senator Luis Muñoz-Marín

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a radio interview of the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, president of the Senate of Puerto Rico, broadcast over the Washington Post radio station WINX on April 17, 1946:

THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS OF PUERTO RICO

This is Ed Hart speaking to you from Washington. It is my privilege at this time to discuss with Senator Luis Muñoz-Marín, president of the Senate of Puerto Rico, the political and economic rights he hopes to obtain for Puerto Rico. Senator Muñoz-Marín is a true democrat spelled with a small "d". Let me illustrate what I mean.

During a recent political campaign in the island he found himself amidst a gathering of underprivileged people who had been in the habit of selling their votes around election time. The Senator said to them: "If you want to sell your vote for $2, that is your democratic privilege. But you can't have justice and $2. You either have justice or $2. Which do you prefer?" The wise people of Puerto Rico preferred justice.

So they elected Senator Muñoz-Marín and the party that he heads, the Popular Democratic party, in a veritable landslide. Only two opposition senators and two opposition representatives were elected.

Senator Muñoz-Marín attended Georgetown University. He has written on Puerto Rican affairs for the Baltimore Sun, American Mercury, the New Republic, and the Nation, and like many writers, he is quiet and unassuming and something of a chain-smoker. In appearance, I liken him unto Edouard Herriot when that great burly good-natured democratic leader was the toast of France.

Senator, would you tell us what is the main purpose of your present visit to Washington?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. I am here with a commission representing all political parties and our purpose is to work for abolishing the colonial system of government in Puerto Rico.

Mr. HART. Does that mean you are going to ask the Congress of the United States for Puerto Rican independence?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. Not necessarily. We are all pledged to work for a referendum in which the Puerto Rican people themselves can directly express their preference as to their future political status. It may be independence. It may be statehood. It may be some form of dominion status similar to Canada's, or it may be some other form of permanent status. We want Congress to submit to the vote of the people of Puerto Rico—the whole people—all the alternatives of political status that Congress may be willing to approve upon a favorable vote by our people.

Mr. HART. That seems a reasonable and democratic request.

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. It is, and it is in line with the basic reasons for which World War II was fought. Sixty thousand Puerto Ricans served in the armed forces. They defended to the best of their ability not only the national integrity of the United States, but the moral integrity of their word pledged to democracy, self-determination and the "four freedoms." Even the Germans and the Japanese will have these rights later on. It seems clear that we Puerto Ricans ought to have them now. We've earned them.

Mr. HART. You mention self-determination—that is, the right of the people to decide for themselves, democratically, under what kind of government they want to live. And you mentioned the "four freedoms." Now, let's see. Is there any of the "four freedoms" that you Puerto Ricans do not enjoy at this time?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. Definitely. The mass of our people do not enjoy now the freedom from want, or the freedom from the fear of want.

Mr. HART. Then your troubles assume economic aspects as well as political.

Mr. MUÑOZ-MARÍN. That is correct. That is why we are asking Congress to allow our people to vote on different alternatives of political status, with a clear description of the economic conditions for the maintenance of life and development of civilization that would go with each form of political status. There is no sense in voting merely for the name of a political status, as many real restrictions of freedom may exist under any name by which a political status may be called. Our people should know exactly what kind of life, what kind of opportunity, what kind of civilization they are voting for when they come to decide their political future at the polls. That is why I mentioned the "four freedoms." There is no democratic sense in using one form of freedom to destroy other forms of freedom.

Mr. HART. Our President Roosevelt used to remind the American people that if any one of the freedoms was missing, there was danger of losing all of them.

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. President Roosevelt was a great man, and he understood that basic fact; that all "four freedoms" must go together or at least the people should have a fair opportunity to work them out together.

Mr. HART. Do you think the United States should be held responsible for seeing to it that self-determination and the four freedoms, including the economic freedom from want, are established all over the world?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. Well, I am not presuming to speak for the whole world, but only for my island of Puerto Rico—although the confidence that the United States enjoys among the dependent peoples of the world is founded largely on the belief that the United States has an interest in self-determination and the "four freedoms" everywhere.

Mr. HART. Specifically, let us speak of Puerto Rico, the United States record there.

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. The United States has been in political control of Puerto Rico since 1898. Through this political control the United States has assumed a very serious responsibility. Although we had had a degree of self-government, the final determinations have never been in our hands. Therefore, economic developments in Puerto Rico have not been as we would have made them during the last half century if we had had normal political authority to plan carefully for our future. The United States Government has provided us with some economic means for the use of which in careful planning for the future we have been denied the political authority.

Mr. HART. Senator Muñoz-Marín, let us suppose that the United States Government grants you Puerto Ricans the political authority in some form that you people want. If you get that political authority, would that alone solve your problems?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. If we now get the political authority, without being deprived of the economic means, yes, it would solve our problems, or, if it didn't, then no one would be to blame but ourselves.

Mr. HART. I see. And suppose you get the political authority and at the same time you would be deprived of the economic means, then what would be the end result?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. The responsibility would continue at the door of the United States Government. If first we have the means without having the authority to use them in safeguarding our future, that leaves the responsibility with the United States. If we get the political authority and are deprived of the means, obviously the same responsibility in the same place continues. It is as if a man could have his tools so long as his hands were tied and would be deprived of his tools as soon as his hands were untied. We must have the tools and the use of our hands for a while. Then, whatever we may fail to do with both should be plainly our responsibility and nobody else's. But not otherwise.

Mr. HART. Well, now, let's get down to some detail. Suppose for example that Puerto Ricans would choose independence outright. Do you think that the Congress of the United States should grant at the same time special trade arrangements similar to those obtained in the Philippine Trade Act now under discussion on Capitol Hill?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. Obviously, after 50 years of economic development basically controlled from outside, we would have to have special trade and economic and financial arrangements. But they would have to be very different from those you would approve for the Philippines.

Mr. HART. Why should there be a difference?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. I read the Philippine trade bill carefully. I am in no position to say whether it is workable for the Philippines or not. But I can say that a similar bill would be completely unworkable in Puerto Rico. American public opinion should not be confused by the historic similarity of the manner in which both the Philippines and Puerto Rico came under the jurisdiction of the United States at the same time after the Spanish-American War. The similarity stops there. It is true that the Philippines have suffered greatly from the Japanese occupation. It is true that this fact deserves the greatest consideration. But it is also true that the Philippines have enormous natural resources which Puerto Rico lacks.

Mr. HART. You are poorer than the Philippines, even after they have been crippled by World War II and Japanese savagery?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. Much poorer, Mr. Hart. The Philippines have 33 times more territory than Puerto Rico and only 8 times more population. That is, there are 4 times more Puerto Ricans per square mile than Filipinos. We have but half an acre of tillable land for each Puerto Rican. The Philippines have mines and other subsoil resources of which Puerto Rico has practically none. The economic differences are so great that trying to solve the economic problems of Puerto Rico in the same way as the economic problems of the Philippines, would be a mistake of incalculable consequences to Puerto Rico.

Mr. HART. Tell me, Senator Muñoz-Marín, just what are the especial or specific needs of Puerto Rico at this time?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. We have a population of 600 per square mile. This population is growing at the rate of 55,000 every year. It is clear that such a large and growing population cannot subsist on an agricultural economy. It can, however, subsist on an intensively industrialized economy. Populations relatively as great or greater than Puerto Rico's do subsist reasonably on industrialized economies, as, for instance, in Rhode Island, or England, or Belguim. Therefore, what we need is the largest possible opportunity for industrialization—twentieth century industrialization.

Mr. HART. Would your limited resources stand for such industrialization? You stated a moment ago that the Philippines has many

more resources than Puerto Rico. Now, with your limited resources, can you really have industrialization?

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. Yes; if we are given the opportunity, because manpower is our chief resource. That is the way England, another island, became industrialized in the nineteenth century. We have an able and intelligent population, but we must give them the industrial tools to work with. Whatever conditions provide for this opportunity will solve the problem of Puerto Rico. Whatever conditions destroy this opportunity will sooner or later bring about a collapse in Puerto Rico. You see, we must increase production, mainly through industry, fast enough to do away with present large unemployment. And still faster, to keep up with population growth. And still faster, to diminish and finally wipe out the need of Federal aid. And still faster, to attain that minimum standard of living at which the birth rate begins to go down and population numbers are stabilized.

Mr. HART. Senator, your problem is tough and complicated. Some even claim it is insoluble.

Senator MUÑOZ-MARÍN. Mr. Hart, the Puerto Rican problem is complicated, but let me emphasize, it is by no means insoluble. Release us from the colonial form of government we suffer in Puerto Rico. It is harmful not only to us but to the good name of the United States of America among the dependent peoples all over the world. It is particularly harmful psychologically and spiritually to the Puerto Rican people. You, Americans and we, of the island, therefore, have a genuine interest in abolishing the status quo or colonial system. Perhaps we are both faced with economic difficulties in doing so. But neither of us should be beaten by these economic difficulties. Creative statesmanship, I am certain, both here and in Puerto Rico, will find a way. It has got to find a way. I feel confident that a way will be found. Let's make it soon. Letting it ride will only make the solution—which is going to be found anyway—more difficult to carry out.

Mr. HART. Thank you, Senator Muñoz-Marín, for your splendid, and, I might say, even brilliant presentation of the Puerto Rican issue. This is Ed Hart saying good-by from Washington, D. C.

Phony War on Inflation Not Fooling Nebraskans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the irresponsible and hysterical campaign of the OPA to browbeat Congress is not fooling the people of Nebraska. I have tabulated my OPA mail from the district from April 18 through Monday morning, May 6, after House action on OPA April 17:

For OPA: Twenty-two original letters, including three from one household.

Against OPA: Twenty-five original letters and three copies.

For partial elimination now and tapering off: Three originals, one copy.

Petitions: One petition for OPA—twenty names.

This sparse mail averaged less than three original letters a day from a district of 315,000 people, including the industrial city of Omaha. It indicates that frantic radio rabble rousing by radicals has not confused the people of Nebraska. The situation is a genuine tribute to the common sense and sound thinking of the Middle West.

From similar radio propaganda the people of Europe were led into serfdom. The sound and steadfast reaction of Americans to these radical tactics is wholesome and inspiring. It shows that Americans at the grass roots "know the score."

They are not going to be sucked into totalitarianism by a phony war against inflation. They know inflation can only be stopped by stopping deficit spending.

Probably they also are convinced that neither this administration nor its radical supporters have either the honesty or courage to make that genuine fight against inflation.

Can World Peace Be Secured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the prize-winning essay submitted by high-school students of the State of Ohio. Miss Patricia Findlay, of Toledo, Ohio, was the winner among 7,000 competitors. Our country extends congratulations to this forward-looking young lady of well-balanced judgment.

CAN WORLD PEACE BE SECURED THROUGH THE ALLIED NATIONS

(By Patricia Findlay, Toledo, Ohio)

Can the 51 nations who signed the San Francisco Charter yield enough of their own desires for power and world prominence to keep the machinery set in motion by that document running smoothly? After the sting of war has been alleviated, will the lesser nations accept the increasing domination of the Big Five Powers? Not if they possess the human urge for eminence. Since the sovereignty of each nation-state would remain supreme under the UNO plan, isn't it feasible for the smaller countries to band together for more influence?

Rivalries and conflicts between nations are as natural as a small boy's desire for his sister's playthings. While the UNO is attempting to prevent these rivalries and insure world security, the factor of dominance on the part of the large powers will invite such powers to increase their dominance in settling international questions, and this will lead back to the balance of power program which preceded the establishment of the UNO. The organization, as it stands today, puts too much stress on the opinions of representative officials regarding world security. If unrest is to be erased from the earth, the influence must be shared by all people. Colonial peoples must be educated before any true peace can be achieved. They must know and understand what is being done for them; then give voice to their opinions. An educational program that would ordinarily require several hundred years to complete must be accomplished in ten. This would be the first step and one of the most important toward world peace.

The UNO does not provide the strong military power necessary for a successful world organization. At the present time, the United States has the largest navy and mighties air force in the world. These could, almost immediately, upon necessity, be converted to war use. The world organization must have sufficient power to suppress any nation's attempt at a third world aggression. With the invention of the atomic bomb came a greater fear of war than has ever before existed. Therefore, we must consider the UNO in the light of its possibilities for controlling the use of atomic energy. As presently constituted, the UNO cannot effectively deal with this subject as no provisions exist for authority to police the nations of the world sufficiently to prevent the creation of armaments involving this new and terrible weapon. A world government would make possible the establishment of policing power and penalties that would, under law, control actions of individual nations.

This leads to the only sensible alternative—a world government. This government would be to national governments as our National Government is to our State governments. One of the basic reasons that some form of law must be established is the fact that living standards and social and economic conditions vary radically in different parts of the world. As the UNO has been planned, votes will decide issues as they arise. Is any nation going to approve a proposal which would be ideal for others but inconvenient for itself? History has proved that no power will submit to another's wishes so easily. Obviously then, a unanimous vote will be difficult to obtain on any issue. A just set of laws which would protect all nations, large and small, weak and powerful, appears to be the logical answer.

They Don't Like It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in days gone by, the Detroit Free Press and some other Detroit publications have called me a labor baiter, questioned my good sense, intimated that I was dumb, because I called attention to the methods of a few union politicians which I considered unfair and destructive, but the Detroit Free Press seems to have seen the light.

It is getting a dose of the same medicine that a few union leaders had been handing out for, lo, these many days. In an editorial of April 26, under the caption "Robbing the little people—Extortion is a crime—Why, then, no prosecutions?" the editor writes:

ROBBING THE LITTLE PEOPLE—EXTORTION IS A CRIME—WHY, THEN, NO PROSECUTIONS?

The little guy is being pushed around. Five thousand small grocers and meat dealers have been told by a bunch of union racketeers that they will have to pay $5 apiece a month for the privilege of doing business—or else.

They are not union men.

They are owners of little independent stores.

There is no direct controversy between them and the union.

Most of them do not even hire help.

Yet they have been bluntly told by James Hoffa, of the AFL teamsters' union, that they cannot remain in business in Detroit unless they pay his union.

In return for this they will be made "associate members" of his union.

It is raw extortion of money from decent, innocent citizens too weak to defend themselves.

The laws against extortion are plain upon the books. To extort means "to wrest from a person by force or any undue and illegal power, to wring from, or exact."

Jim Hoffa has no more legal right to take this money from these little people than he has to walk into their stores with a gun and rob their tills.

The real purpose behind the teamsters' organizing drive is, in the words of its own officers, "to regulate the wages, hours, and working conditions" of the independent merchants and their employees.

This type of union regulation will have no other result than to drive thousands of small grocers, butchers, and confectioners out of business.

The claims made to the merchants that the object of the organizational drive is to force meat packers to resume deliveries are sheer nonsense.

Many packers have never discontinued their delivery services and have no intention of doing so. In fact, some houses charge the retailer for delivering his meat, and will not permit him to save this small fee by picking up his own orders at the packing plant.

This is where the $5 "permit" comes in. The "permit" is a temporary arrangement, pending complete unionization of the retail trade, which grants the merchant the privilege of picking up his own merchandise, regardless of whether or not he wants to avail himself of that right.

Early in the week, Hoffa, appearing at mass meetings of grocers and butchers, told the merchants that they would have to join the union "or else."

He waved a "model contract" in their faces and told them they would have to sign it.

It was not read to them, and up to Thursday night no merchant knew what it contained or on what terms he would have to become a union member.

Under the general terms of this contract, each store proprietor and all of his employees must joint the Retail Clerks Union, a Teamsters' affiliate. Each will have to pay dues of $2 per month.

The store proprietor is given a nonactive membership which entitles him to all the privileges of belonging to the union except the right to vote on contract terms which is the only real business of any union.

Thousands of small grocers and butchers employ no regular help. They are assisted by their wives or members of their families. Yet the union says each member of the family must join. It will then dictate to them and to the store owner the wages each shall receive and the number of hours that each may work.

The store owner gets no benefits from union membership. All that he gets is regulation of his business.

The union claims to have some 8,000 members employed by the large chain-store systems.

To protect these members, it says, the independent merchant must be regulated.

The independent neighborhood storekeeper, in many cases, is only able to meet the competition of the chain stores by remaining open evenings and on Sundays. It is the object of the union to force the independent to conform to the chain-store hours.

The result will be that thousands of these independents will have to go out of business.

If the union is successful in its drive, it will have control of all of the city's food business, and will be in position to regiment all small businessmen.

After that, what?

If they can throw aside the law and practice open extortion against the helpless little fellows, how long will it be before they tackle the big ones?

How long, in fact, before they take over all business?

Here is Hitlerism being openly advocated in Detroit. The common law is being flagrantly violated. Private citizens are being robbed of their constitutional rights.

Yet there does not seem to be any law-enforcement official in the city, the county, or the State with guts enough to issue warrants and launch prosecutions.

Extortion is extortion.

Where is the prosecutor, the attorney general, the mayor, the governor?

The political power of the AFL teamsters' union is the answer. The politicians are afraid of losing votes.

We fought a world war and sacrificed millions of lives and billions of dollars against just such a philosophy of life in Europe, to save ourselves.

But we let the seeds grow here undisturbed.

The little guy is being pushed around, robbed, crushed out of business.

It's always the little guy first.

Who is next?

Yes, Mr. Editor, your citizens are now getting a dose of the same medicine which long ago I insisted was destructive of our economic well-being. Thank the Lord you have seen the light.

Relief for Starving Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter which I have received from the school children at St. Xavier Academy, Latrobe, Pa. These children are 16 years and younger. The letter expresses a deep feeling for the suffering children of the world, and the length to which they say they would go to deprive themselves of food is worthy of everyone's attention. For this reason, I am inserting it into the RECORD:

ST. XAVIER ACADEMY,
Latrobe, Pa., April 11, 1946.

The Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
Representative From Pennsylvania,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It grieves us to know that the suffering children of Europe and the Orient are neglected by those who could and should help them.

We are soliciting your aid to open the way not only for us but also for other private relief agencies so that these starving children may be fed. For the concessions recently made in favor of Germany we are grateful, but our endeavor is to have the privilege extended to every country where children are in need of food.

To follow President Truman's suggestion we stand willing and ready to eat dark bread and to deprive ourselves of other foods so that the hungry may have sufficient to supply their bodily needs.

The children of our schools are making small sacrifices so that other children may live. It is our hope that soon we may have the good news that obstacles to our willingness to help will be promptly removed.

The following pupils await this report:

Jo Anne Smith, Anna Frances Becker, Mary Louise Hanan, Rita Grace, Mary Margaret Murtha, Sara Essey, Teresa Rauso, Virginia Harrison, Mary Ellen Shinetts, Mary Imogene Waltz, Dorothy Miller, Mary Yellenic, Mary Ann Susa, Mary Jane Gumbita, Louise Holnaider, Frances McAtur, Rachel Monico, Dolores Nolan, Betty Lou Waltz, Mary Ann Semler, Marjorie Bray, Catherine Angras, Marian Weet, Jeanne Durso, Eleanor Mazzoni, Geraldine Burke, Teresa Shanefelter, Lois Ann Odendahl, Joan Masury, Joan Whitehead, Janet McGuire, Jacqueline Benak, Patricia Hensler, Aida Logan, Susie Semans, Mary Helen Coan, Mary Alice Burkhart, Virginia De Felice, Mary Werner, Anna Mae Zurick, Patricia L. Patterson, Carolyn Lil Duncan, Margaret Lawlor, Kathleen Mathias, Bette Lou Davis, Patricia McWade, Antoinette Trott, Felicia Grace, Joanne De Luca, Lois Rosen Hoover, Mary Lou Whalen, Yvonne Ford, Rose Menni, Anne V. Metil, Dolores Schiller, Margery Tohl, Dorothy Stepanovich, Dolores Zamorosky, Mary Catherine Pry, Joanne Schlegel, Bernice Schneider, Dolores Coyne, Dolores Benson, Scholastica Kovach, Mary E. Hurd, Corrine Fleming, Paul Lizza, Barbara Rossi, Anthony Georgiana, Thomas McInerney, Evelyn Diamonds, Joseph Kane, Raymond Levay, Adelaide Kelly, Ronald Vittone, Elinor J. Kintz, Geraldine Myers, Jomay Pattison, Katherine Hughes, Joseph Niedermeier, Sallie Hauser, Ann Portman, Leo E. Brady, Florence Oranecz, Edward Celento, Barbara Jane Reed, Mary Angela Bell, Rosemarie Greb, Dennis Cassidy, George Brumfield, Paul Graciano, Nancy Neel, Connie King, Joseph Sheridan, Janet Funk, Joseph C. Bailey, William Rader, August Cacolice, James Russell, Joseph Regis Jackson, Kay Deal, Nancy Ann Erny, Hilda Friskey, Margaret Giron, Manola Felger, Mary Louise Ludwig, Vivian Louise Droske, Barbara Tomajko, Jo Ann Walton, Patricia Myering, Marcia Lizza, Helen McInerney, Patricia Magaro, Charles Dennis, John J. Rich, Larry Morrissey, Richard Janik, Irene Nesti, Luitgarde Dupre, Marilyn Monsour, Maureen Krill, Maureen Baird, Joan Henderson, Nancy Derek, Susan Grimshaw, Virginia Nealon, Maryellyn Harvey, Janet Lechman, Charles Lizza, Ruth Saffer, Louise Hughes, Robert Kintz, Dennis Livi, Nancy Ault, Rudy Jazdzejewski, John Kintz, Teddy King, Edward O'Rourke, Mary Ellen Matteo, Regis Monsour, Edna Mae Morrissey, Kenneth Conforti, Raymond Pedro, Joan Bailey, Fillmore Shepler, James Morrissey, John Notaro, Donna Cassiday, Emet Diamond, Audrey Sheller, Barry Heskin, Joseph Saber, Billy Bell, Donald Leaphart, Patrick McDermott, John Schneider, Robert Barton, Arthur Reitz, Regis Kintz, Raymond Kintz, Arthur Bridge, Tom Bailey.

A Word From Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that not everyone accepts at their face value the theories put out by the New Deal economists is shown by an editorial in the Georgia Farmer's Market Bulletin of May 1, 1946, written by Tom Linder, commissioner of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Georgia.

The editorial reads as follows:

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES

(By Tom Linder)

"He answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, it will be fair weather, for the sky is red.

"And in the morning it will be foul weather today; for the sky is red and lowering. O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"—Matthew xvi: 2, 3.

After every great war in history there has been an acute shortage of food.

The effect of these food shortages have been somewhat confined to the countries involved in the wars. For that reason other countries who had not engaged in the war were in position to furnish food to prevent starvation in the warring nations.

The great world conflict in which we have been engaged involved practically the entire globe.

With the history of the past before us, we should have known this great famine was coming after the war.

Knowing that like causes produce like results, we should have known that a world-wide war meant a world-wide famine of food.

There are a few men in the United States who have tried to warn the country for the past several years of this great shortage of food that was bound to come. Those who have spoken this warning have been treated as cranks and have been looked upon as calamity howlers.

The great and mighty bureaucrats in Washington and a subservient press have been the blind leading the blind masses in a fool's paradise. These so-called progressive leaders have been totally unable to read the signs of the times.

They have looked upon the superficial appearances just as the Pharisees looked at the sky to discern tomorrow's weather, totally unaware of the signs of the times which should have told them that the Messiah was walking in their midst.

A few years ago these bureaucrats decided there was too much food being produced in America.

They ignored the fact that 12,000,000 unemployed men meant that millions of people were going without as much food as they needed.

These bureaucrats were unable to read the signs of the times.

They looked at the wheat fields, at the hogs on the farm, at the corn, and the cattle and they said there is too much food.

They burned wheat and corn, they killed cattle and hogs and plowed under the cotton in the fields.

The common people of America had enough native wit to know that this destruction was sinful, wasteful, and a violation of Divine law.

Public sentiment forced the bureaucrats to discontinue this open destruction of food and fiber.

"And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time."—Daniel vii: 25.

The bureaucrats were not to be outdone. They thought to change times and laws.

They were still determined to reduce American production. They were still determined to import foreign foods and fibers.

Accordingly, they rented the farmer's lands, they hired him to let his land lie out. They paid him not to produce.

When this method of destroying crops by hiring the farmer to let his land lie out became old, when people became tired of it, they hit upon another plan.

They were still determined to change the times and the laws.

Congress passed an act that is called the Price Stabilization Act and they created the office of Price Administrator.

By the simple expediency of fixing ceilings on the farmers crops so that the farmers could not make a profit, they again stifled production.

This stifling of production by OPA is going on at full blast today in the face of world famine.

The administration encourages industrial workers to strike for higher pay with the result that the farmer cannot buy equipment with which to produce food.

The OPA sets ceilings on farm crops which discourages the farmer from producing.

They still cannot read the signs of the times in which they live.

Listening to the radio a day or two ago, I heard of an expert from the United States Department of Agriculture who told Congress that the farmers would not feed cattle and hogs on corn if the price of corn was increased.

Think of a Government expert, presumably a college graduate, taking up the time of the United States Congress to propound such an elemental truth.

The trouble of this expert's testimony was that he told a half truth.

He should have said that if the price of corn is increased, the farmers would not feed it to cattle and hogs unless the price of cattle and hogs are also increased.

The price of corn in Argentina is $1.83 per bushel. The freight on it to the United States is 50 cents per bushel, making the cost laid down in the United States port $2.33 per bushel.

A bushel of Argentina corn has a feeding value, according to corn millers, of only 80 percent of that of a bushel of United States corn. Consequently we must add 25 percent to the price of Argentina corn to find the feeding value of United States corn.

Twenty-five percent of $2.33 is 58 cents. When we add 58 cents to $2.33, we find that a bushel of American corn is worth $2.91.

The OPA ceiling price on the United States farmer's corn is about $1.21 per bushel.

Thus we see that the United States farmer is paying a special tax of $1.70 on every bushel of corn that he sells.

The American corn grower is in effect paying a tax of 58 percent on all the corn that he sells.

This is a tax that is levied and collected through the operation of OPA.

It is taxation without representation at the rate of 58 percent. The OPA is doing the same thing to the American corn grower that King George was doing to the American Colonies when he provoked the War of the Revolution.

King James thought to change times and laws, but he could not read the signs of the times.

The OPA, with its army of employees and its wasteful subsidies, is costing the American taxpayers about $3,000,000,000 per year out of the Federal Treasury.

In addition, it is costing farmers, business, and industry other billions each year through hidden taxes like the 58 percent on corn.

If looks now as if Congress is beginning to see the light on OPA.

It seems that Congress is beginning to read the signs of the times.

Either with or without OPA, the people of this country are to experience the most terrific economic crisis in all our history.

There is no difference in the basic philosophy of a controlled economy whether we call it Fascist, Nazi, communism, or New Deal, it is all the basic philosophy of totalitarianism and dictatorship. The outgrowth of this philosophy in Europe has been the destruction of organized government. It has brought the peoples of Europe to cry across the ocean for bread. The people of the United States today, like Saul of old, have ringing in their ears the Macedonian cry. If the same philosophy is persistently pursued in this country, then it is only a question of a few years until this country, too, will be in a state of helpless confusion.

As Jonah said, "Yet 40 days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." So real statesmen of America, as faithful watchmen on the wall, must say to the American people today, "Yet a few years and American constitutional government shall be lost unless you repent and return to the faith of your fathers."

We had better learn to read the signs of the times.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Is Communism Compatible With Christianity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Notre Dame University, my attention has been called to the thought-provoking address of our colleague from Connecticut, Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, given on the occasion of the dinner at the Biltmore Hotel on April 29, 1946, on the universal Notre Dame night. The speech follows:

Distinguished guests and alumni of Notre Dame, I am happy and honored to be here this evening. Notre Dame has always had a special meaning for the women of America. It is the only great university dedicated to a woman, the loveliest woman that ever lived, and the patroness of our beloved country.

Everyone knows of the valor that the men educated under her sweet protection showed in this war. And I will not try to add to Anne O'Hare McCormack's eloquent analysis of what that same courage, conviction, and leadership, which was shown on the battlefield, can mean and must mean in the arena of public opinion and all public matters in the years ahead.

I have always felt that there was something rather special about Notre Dame men. Now, at last, I know what that something was: it was the courage and resourcefulness that God always gives those who believe in His truths. I sensed this even in my teens. For when observing the behavior of Notre Dame men in contact with a football, it was impossible not to realize that the power of the Lord had surely gotten into them and in a very special way.

Today we are living in an age of unprecedented faith—of a faith so boundless in millions of individuals, and widespread in many nations, that not since creation has

man seen the like of it. That faith is in the religion of materialism. And the promise of its many theologians, of whom Marx and Lenin are the best known to the common man, is the establishment of heaven on earth. Comes heaven on earth to be sure, only after the somewhat bloody apocalypse of world revolution. This faith has produced, in remarkable abundance, its own saints and martyrs, who are canonized in Moscow rather more rapidly than is the custom in Rome, which is strangely cautious in the matter of bestowing sainthood, sometimes taking centuries before pronouncing any mortal so superior to his neighbors.

There have been many sects and denominations in the ancient religion of materialism, but its true faith, I think we must all agree, is communism, and its titular head is Joseph Stalin. As befits a worldwide religion of great power and persuasion, this supreme pontiff is considered infallible. But there is nothing half-hearted about that avuncular gentleman's avowed infallibility. Within Russia and Russian dominated zones Stalin's infallibility is questioned only at the cost of life itself. Outside of Russia, for example in the left wing drawing rooms of Chicago's millionaire publishers, or in some offices in the chamber of commerce and the State Department, it is questioned only on pain of being called a dirty reactionary, or a Fascist beast. The devotee of communism believes in many mystic propositions and even miracles which you and I cannot understand how any reasonable person can subscribe to; he believes that man—or as he prefers to call him—the common man, lives by bread alone, and that only when his stomach is full, and his senses satisfied is he, so to speak, in a state of grace. He passionately believes that all will be good and happy when all have two cars in every garage, two chickens in every pot, and two pairs of nylons on every chicken. Do not ask him please, why, if it be so that bodily comfort and material prosperity are the true conditions of virtue, many men who today have houses honeycombed with Crane plumbing are not necessarily good and happy, but have even been known to dodge the draft, falsify their income tax, beat their wives, commit suicide, and otherwise behave abominably. Nor must you ask him why, if material prosperity is the sine qua non of civic virtue, America, which has the most frigidaires and radios should not be considered the happiest and best of countries, instead (as he believes) the most evil? For the Communist religionist will scowl and say, "I said no men could be good and happy unless all men have everything." But then if you ask, "But the Russians have the least of these things. Are they therefore the most evil and unhappy of men?" Such reasonable questions simply irritate the faithful Communist, whose catechism begins with "Up with everything that is down, and down with everything that is up," a proposition you might think he would have some difficulty squaring with Einstein's relativity, which he much admires in his logical moments.

Don't ask the Communist why it is wrong for a Russian to strike in a Moscow factory as a protest against bad working conditions, but right for an American to strike in America for the same reason. Or why freedom to disagree with the American press is a human right for a Communist in America, but a mortal crime for the same man in Russia. Or, why it is sheer superstition for you and me to make the sign of the cross—in memory of Him who was crucified and lives—and the height of rationality for him to make the sign of the clenched fist passing Lenin's tomb on Red Square. Since a Communist does not believe in the immortality of the soul, his performance in saluting what he himself believes is just a hunk of dead meat, should, for even the most simple minded, seem ridiculous. Don't ask him logically to prove that despite the fact that thousands of years of hate and war and looting and rapine by the conquerors of eastern Europe have never brought peace or happiness to anyone. in that area of the world, the hatred and looting and rapine of Russian armies there may be expected to usher in a millennium of brotherly love and prosperity. Don't ask him why, if he really believes that the sole end of man is to keep himself warm, well fed, and secure, so many of his own heroes have sacrificed these to bring about the revolution. The truth about the religion of communism is that it is, of all the Christian heresies that the world has ever seen, the silliest and most irrational, and it has rightly been called the opiate of the intellectuals. It demands of the believer acts of surpassing faith which we would never be capable of. Indeed, no Christian saint ever had more faith in the power of God's grace to transfigure his own nature, than a Communist has in the power of State ownership of electricity and plumbing to transfigure all human nature. When nobody has anything, everybody will have everything. And when everybody has everything, nobody will have more than anybody. But if anybody has more than anybody, somebody will liquidate him, and then everybody will be happy, except the relatives of the somebody who got liquidated.

I have just said that communism is a Christian heresy. So, for that matter, is nazism and fascism, and that branch of totalitarian liberalism which believes in our country that forced social planning is the final answer not only to the toothaches and stomach aches, but all the heartaches of mankind. Perhaps this needs a little explaining. All the religions—and most of the isms—that have sprung up in the shadow of the cross in western civilization during the past thousand years are heresies of the church. That is to say, they have been founded on some tenet or belief, or dogma or article of the faith which the founders felt had been in their time neglected, or underemphasized or obscured by the priesthood. To rip, so to speak, one dogma or tenet from its full Christian context and to make of it a complete faith is always a process which results in perversions and ultimately disaster. For the part can never be greater than the whole. And only a whole faith can save man and make and keep him free.

Still it seems to me that the heretics in every age have often been justified in pointing out some contemporary failure of the church, to emphasize and put into the foreground something in the faith which had been abused or misinterpreted or forgotten. What has needed emphasizing in all the Christian churches of the western world for the past several hundreds of years was certainly the Second Commandment: Love thy neighbor. The neglect by the west of the brotherhood of man was noted by Karl Marx, and taking the Second Commandment, disregarding all else in Christian theology, he made of it alone a religion. His success is the measure of our failure. Until most recent years so-called Christians all over the world had tended more and more to forget that Second Commandment in the time of swift and unruly material expansion and under the terrific impact of the industrial scientific discoveries. Yes, there is no doubt that western man for a hundred years increasingly tended to exploit his neighbor and trample on his human rights. More and more he forgot our Lord's only new commandment, to love one another as He loved us. The resultant suffering of what has come to be called the common man was, and still is, a shame to all western democratic society. The downtrodden masses, wherever they were downtrodden were right, and are right, to protest against exploitation or, when protest fails, to revolt against it. And it was and is the duty of Christian churches to back such protests. Many of them failed lamentably in that Christian duty.

Now, anyone who has seen the other countries of the world knows that America today is comparatively a Shangri-La among nations. Nevertheless, our own Nation today is full of injustices which are so widespread and so serious that if they are not rectified by the communities, the States, and the Federal Government men's minds will increasingly incline toward the false panaceas and false religions which so seductively promise them relief. Communism must succeed if Christianity fails.

Wherever there is big industry in this country there is much filth, oppression, gloom, despair, disease, degradation, crime, and misery. The treatment of minorities, such as the Negroes, falls appallingly short of any Christian ideal. Three-quarters of the world's gold still lies buried in Kentucky—and men are hungry and fear for their futures. Inventions that would be a vast, incalculable boon to the comfort of millions are undeveloped, because no one knows how to put them on the market without throwing millions out of work. The land, so thinly populated compared with Europe and Asia, is wastefully farmed; and on the farms and in hinterland hills there are whole societies who live violent and ugly lives, in squalor and ignorance. Our understaffed hospitals overflow with the victims of industrial strain, industrial accidents, industrial diseases, and there are not enough of them. Juvenile delinquency is rampant. The statistics on insanity are enough to shake the reason of a sane man, and the statistics on crime might make a just man tremble for justice. And over all the country there is a feeling that under the outward orderliness of the American scene disorder is invading us. We are frustrated by a lack of spiritual cohesion in our culture.

Yes, against all this—men have the right—indeed, the duty to protest, and if need be, to revolt. But there is a vast difference between revolution and the reforms proposed by many revolutionists. To demand the cessation of abuses and to remove the abuser, to advocate better ways of bringing about the welfare and happiness of men, and to place in position of authority those who will carry them out, is the proper end of democratic political action. Such action must never be controverted. But, according to what plan, what philosophy, what religion, shall men act in order to perfect their human situation?

Even the most starry-eyed of Red Fascists will admit that Russia is not altogether perfect, but he will swear to the death that his religion, communism, will perfect not only it, but the entire world if given a chance. Indeed, such is the nature of any religion which possesses a theology that it is always universal in its intent. However, nationalistic the men in the Kremlin may be, their own theories commit them to supranationalism in the application of Communism to world problems.

And since America is not perfect, what will then help to perfect America? Our answer here tonight is, another religion—Christianity. Today, in all the world, these two religions are in conflict, mortal conflict for communism, immortal, for Christianity.

I am often asked by friends what is the difference between a Communist and a capitalist. And in America, the answer is likely to be simple, an American Communist is generally a man who has given up hope of becoming an American capitalist. If there were only American Communists to worry about, the problem would not be too serious; we would have only to make this country reasonably secure and prosperous in material terms to change most of our Communists into Republicans. The American Communist is not a menace. What is a menace is the religion of communism, as it opposes, not our economic ideas, but our religious ones And it does so on a wide and ever deepening

front everywhere in the world. For these two religions are irreconcilably opposed.

Communism is fundamentally material. Christianity, spiritual. Christianity is dedicated to love and peace among all men, communism to hatred and war. Christianity glorifies God, communism denies Him. Communism denies individual human rights, Christianity exalts them. Christianity insists on the rights of private property, insofar as they are not exercised to abuse the community, the other denies property rights, however much this hurts or hampers the individual. Communism says that man and all his institutions and enterprises are the tools, agents, and the slaves of the states. Christianity teaches that the state is the servant of man and his institutions. One says the state is omnipotent, the other that God only is all-powerful. One denies the validity of the family unit, the other says that it is the fundamental unit of every society. One disrupts the home, the other preserves it. One demands class warfare, the other seeks to ameliorate all group or racial frictions. One says that the peoples only participation in politics shall be to point an ordered finger at a prechosen candidate, and call him elected. In a Christian democracy, every man is a politician, who simply allows some to hold office. In a Communist state all political powers are delegated from above to a few individuals. In a democratic state, every man is a policeman who pays a few to wear a uniform. Communism says man has the right to say what he's told, and do what he must. Christianity says he has the right to say what he will, and do what he ought.

But above all communism denies absolute truth. Truth in all matters, in press, politics, even in matters of Communist theology, is always what infallible Stalin says it is on any given morning, in any mood that siezes him.

Christianity subscribes to these absolute truths—that man is the child of God, created in His image. That our Lord came into this world to show what a child of God could and should be, that all law is based on morality, that morality comes of God.

I fear that, as a Congressman and a legislator, I have not been very informative in this talk. I have not given you any newsworthy items concerning the way in which our Soviet neighbors have been spreading their particular brand of light and joy throughout Europe and Asia.

But it seems to me that you are probably quite as familiar as I am with the news which finds its way into our press about the practices and purposes of communism here and abroad.

The statements of the men and women arrested in Canada as spies for Moscovite fascism illustrate clearly my point that communism is supernational, and that every Communist, that is, every accepted member of the Communist community, gives his entire allegiance to his official Communist superiors and obeys their orders without question.

Logically it is impossible for one of these Red Fascists to be a loyal member of any other community, whether it be religious or political, or even a group of friendly neighbors. It is this fact, borne out by indisputable proof in hundreds of instances and places, which has led many nations, including from time to time our own, to prohibit from holding public office any person known to be a member of the Fascist-Communist militia.

Such regulation is the common sense, self-protective action which comes from recognition of the fact that every Communist, like every bundist and every Fascist, has taken an oath as a soldier, enrolled in a military organization, the purpose of which is the destruction of all other military, religious, political, and social organizations.

Here, in the United States, we know that this Red fascism is straining every effort at the present moment to discredit and bring about the destruction of our armed forces, of our foreign policy, of our domestic economy, and of our faith in our churches. They have made some progress by means of agents in all these organizations, some of whom even hold places of high responsibility and trust.

Why, if the religion of communism is so strong and persuasive, as I have painted it, are the Communists in such a hurry? Because they know that once Americans wake up to the true nature of communism, and its fundamental antagonism to Christianity, their success may be delayed for many years, and possibly postponed forever.

Today communism sprawls all over eastern Europe and nearly half of Asia. And at last many people are beginning to see that it is a twin brother of the Hitler nightmare. The realism about which Stalin boasts is the realism of slavery.

Victor Kravchenko, a former Soviet industrial official, gives the figures of Soviet slavery in his book I Chose Freedom.

In 1938, he says, the number of slave laborers in concentration camps were more than 15,000,000. Between 1940 and 1945 this had risen to nearly 20,000,000. And this does not include children, which are now being regularly herded for training, as helots were in ancient Greece, or untouchables in Imperial Mogul India. Kravchenko dates the first decree for child mobilization in October 1940. This provided for immediate forcible enlistment of from 800,000 to 1,000,000 city and village children from 14 to 17 years old for industrial training. By 1943 the child-labor contingents were raised to 2,000,000 a year. Kravchenko states: "The cruel scenes of separation, with youngsters sobbing and struggling, with relatives wailing and lamenting, became more and more familiar. * * * The conscripts were put into uniforms, housed in government barracks, and subjected to rigid discipline and a virtually military regime. Their time was apportioned for work, study, and physical training along lines calculated to turn them not merely into obedient but into fanatic servants of the Soviet supersate. Political indoctrination was naturally the important consideration in their training."

During the war there were five different mobilizations of children in Soviet Russia. Today the aggregate of these uniformed, regimented young men and women is 9,000,000. If this system continues, as Kravchenko says there is every indication it will, there will be thirty to forty million regimentally trained workers within 15 years. They will have no memories of a home, of any kind of freedom or individual life. Like the Janissaries of the Seljuk sultans, their whole energies will be devoted to one aim: the military maintenance and the extension by force of Soviet power, and the evangelizing of the Communist religion. To them must be added the 20,000,000 forced-labor slaves, and the standing Soviet Army of from twelve to fifteen million conscripts indoctrinated with Communist dogma and Stalinist theories of a world revolution to be followed by a proletarian millennium. The religion which asserts the brotherhood of man, and denies the fatherhood of God, has resulted in the unclehood which devours and destroys even the children of his own nation.

This is the kind of government and a kind of religion offered by Moscow as an alternative to the one described in our own Declaration of Independence as deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed, and instituted to secure for all men their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under God.

Now the devil himself quotes scripture, so it is natural enough that Stalin, noting the alarm of the Christian world, should seek to abate that alarm by a belated show of friendly interest in the Christian church. To be sure, his most lively interest is in the Orthodox churches of America.

We would be negligent in our own self-preservation if we overlook entirely such flagrant violations of our hospitality as the recent visit of the Soviet Orthodox Church representative to various Russian churches in our country. The purpose of this visit, as described by the Metropolitan Theophilus of North America, in his patriotic and vigorous denunciation of the Soviet representative, was: to secure an oath of allegiance to Moscow from the faithful communicants in America. This was rejected in all but a few cases last year.

However, very recently, a number of parishes have reconsidered their decision, due to shrewd propagandizing from Soviet agents, and to hints of savage reprisal and torture upon relatives now in the occupied areas under Soviet domination.

There are 400 Russian Orthodox parishes in the United States and Canada. About 340 of them have congregations of Carpatho-Russian ancestry, that is, or persons whose relatives now live in the area most recently taken over by the Soviet Union. Some 80 of the parishes are located in Alaska, a region which the controlled Soviet press occasionally mentions as having been robbed from the Soviet people under the Tsarist regime.

There is no secret about the fact that Alaska would be the continental beachhead for any Soviet colonization in North America. There is no secret, either, about the fact that next October at the meeting of the Council of Russian Orthodox Churches in America, the Moscow Government expects to secure the allegiance of a majority of the delegates, bishops and priests to the spiritual overlordship of the patriarch of Moscow.

This act, if it occurs, will be represented by our left-wing press as of no more political significance than the spiritual fealty given by Catholics in America to the Holy Father in Rome. Many will accept this ingenuous falsehood, because without knowing the whole truth it seems plausible.

The fact is, that the patriarch of Moscow holds office, and the church itself functions in Russia only at the pleasure of the executive committee of the Communist Party. Without warning, every priest in Russia can be seized, and every church liquidated. Under these conditions, should the patriarch be given authority to appoint and remove priests in the American parishes of the Orthodox Church, it would be a marked deviation from regular Soviet practice if the new appointments were otherwise than very friendly to the Soviet Government.

In Alaska, this might easily have serious consequences for our security. The congregations there are largely simple people; hunters, fishermen, predominantly of Eskimo descent. They would not likely question the statements or actions of a new pastor. Nor would they be aware if reports supposedly made to the patriarch, included extra bits addressed to the general staff of the Red armed forces, and to the secret police—the NKVD. In Soviet Russia, there is no separation of state and church. The state is the church, the church the state. All things, including God must serve the mammon of Moscow.

All these problems raise new and serious questions. Americans are reluctant to question the good faith of any man, particularly the good faith of any minister or priest of any creed. Thus, our tradition and guaranty of religious freedom could be used against our security in this instance.

If the question were raised publicly, certainly a great many Americans would ask whether there is any basis for doubting Soviet good faith. And the answer to that would properly include a list of the treaties made by the Soviets during the past 15 years, all of which—with one exception: the pact for dividing Poland with Nazi Germany in 1939—have been violated by the Soviets.

On the specific question of Soviet perversion of the Orthodox church to its own political purposes, Prof. Nicholas Timasheff, of Fordham University, writes in his authorita-

tive book, Religion in Soviet Russia: "Concessions have been many. * * * How do we know that they were concessions and not steps in the (Soviet) government's gradual but basic acceptance of human values? We know it, because all reforms have been half-reforms, repealing only so many of the revolutionary measures as seemed unavoidable. * * * As atheism is at the heart of Marxism, any concession to religion was much more difficult than concession to art. * * * For the very soul of the Christian church, the reason of its being, is just what is categorically denied by communism."

In the matter of Alaska, I give you only one instance of a Russian victory which may be won without our statesmen either knowing or informing our people. I could tonight make many another criticism of the way the so-called Russian question has been handled in Washington, and might be expected to be handled at Paris. But I note by the papers that Jimmie Byrnes, before he went, quoted the Negro spiritual, Standing in the Need of Prayer. If Jimmie Byrnes and his whole delegation have at long last been driven to their knees by the seriousness of the situation, we may all begin to take heart. For a man who falls to his knees for guidance has a very good chance of rising a wiser man. Those who refuse to fall on them in the world in which we live will be driven to them by a tyrant. For God lets us rise from our knees freemen. Dictators never.

Tonight, in closing, rather than tell you what our Government should do to combat communism here and abroad, I would rather tell you—although you already know—what each of us can do.

We can all fight communism simply by being Christians. I say, simply by being, but unhappily it is not so simple to be a Christian, which incidentally is precisely why there are so many Communists.

There is a vast personal excitement and even joy in living in an age where our beloved faith is so much challenged. This was the joy and exultation that the early Christians knew. We can emulate them by being militant and faithful Christophers—or Christ bearers, every day, in every way in all of our thoughts, and each of our actions. Every man and woman who ever meets us will, as he must, judge our religion by its effect on us. One of the great strengths of the Communist is the way he incessantly propagandizes, talks, and agitates for his beliefs—and even sometimes tries to live by them. Let us do likewise; let us live and talk Christianity. I do not for a moment hesitate to say that probably 10 out of 10 decent people who claim to have no religion, coming into contact with a real Christian, who both lives and talks and acts his religion, will find that man infinitely more agreeable and persuasive than a Communist doing exactly the same thing.

First, a real Christian will go around trying to spread a little hope, faith, and charity; he will be polite, patient, smiling, peaceful, restrained, tolerant, forgiving, and above all generous. Now, all the Communists I have ever known have been rude, loud, intolerant, cynical, angry folk who have audibly yearned to liquidate somebody. Their bitter tongues wag in their heads like bloody pickles. They all seem to live in a perpetual swizzle of rancor. They are always making trouble, setting one person against another. Even if you walk down a quiet street with one, he will try to make you feel like a betrayer of the masses because you don't instantly grab a brick and bash in the nearest Irish cop's head with it. They are most remarkably uncomfortable companions.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the final analysis, the only effective argument for communism is that Christianity has failed. Christianity has not failed. It has hardly been tried. Let each of us try a little harder to be real Christians in all our dealings with our neighbors, and in all our conversations, and in our attitudes toward the problems of the day, and see who gets the most fellow travelers, us or the Communist on the block.

Let us forget about the defeats which our statesmen have suffered at Potsdam and Yalta and London, and may yet suffer at Paris. Let us count on ourselves, not them, to secure America against all possibility of becoming Communist, by each of us being a Christian, and like all good Christians, making converts. There is no other rational way to proceed, if we wish to achieve peace on earth for our children.

No Loan to China Until Fighting Stops and a Representative Government Is Established

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to express the hope that Members will read the memorandum I am asking to have printed herewith, on the proposed loan to China.

My own view is that we should follow President Truman's policy, as laid down in his December 14 statement. He announced there that America is ready to loan funds to China, but is urging the erection there, by agreement, of a representative government which will include spokesmen for all groups in China. Such a government should rest upon free elections and be devoted to long-overdue land and tax and governmental reform.

The memorandum below is the work of a close student of Chinese life, an American who has lived many years in China, and while we may not agree with all of her conclusions, her views are set forth clearly and in a challenging manner:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROJECTED LOAN TO CHINA

The press has reported that Gen. George Marshall recently proposed a $500,000,000 loan to the present Chinese Government. Many leading Chinese liberals, as well as the Chinese Communists, have protested this loan until there is a representative Chinese Government in power, plans for which were drawn up during the past few months in Chungking.

As an American citizen with 12 years' experience in China, and with rather extensive background of American relations with China since 1910, I wish to add my protest to every plan, however or by whom proposed, for this loan to the present Chinese Government.

Americans in responsible position should approach this loan only against a background of past loans given various Chinese Governments, practically every one of which caused discord and some of which caused national disasters in China.

In May 1911, be it recalled, the Four Power Consortium (America, Britain, France, and Germany) signed, secretly, with the representatives of the old Manchu dynasty, the two loans known as the Hukuang Railway, and the currency loans. These loans were bitterly opposed by the Chinese public and even the very restricted Provincial assemblies established in 1909 by the Manchu dynasty warned against the loans, saying that, if signed, they would result in national revolt. Dickering went on throughout 1910 and until May 1911, when they were finally signed. So great was national hostility to them that they had to be secretly signed, the chief negotiators being Williard Straight (representative of the J. P. Morgan Co., the First National Bank, the National City Bank, and the Kuhn, Loeb & Co.) for the foreigners, and Sheng Hsuan-huei, Minister of Posts and communications in the Manchu government.

When these loans became public knowledge, a fierce struggle began in Szechuen Province, where there were massacres of the people, and where provincial fighting broke out and continued until October 10, when the 1911 revolution began. Even the Imperial Assembly under the Manchus protested the loans and impeached Sheng Hsuan-huei for signing them, and condemned him to death. Sheng fled to the foreign legation quarter in Peking, from which place armed guards and members of the British and American Legations escorted him to Tientsin and put him on a boat for the German-controlled port of Tsingtao.

These loans, made despite Nation-wide hostility, precipitated the 1911 revolution, and American representatves took their place, in the minds of Chinese, as imperialist aggressors.

After the Chinese Republic was founded on New Year's Day, 1912, with Dr. Sun Yat-sen as president, the various foreign powers, including the United States, alternately proposed international armed intervention against the revolution and "neutrality." Preoccupation of the powers with threatened war over north African colonies at the time prevented foreign military intervention against the 1911 revolution. Unable to come to the support of the tottering, corrupt Manchu Dynasty which foreigners had helped keep in power both during the Taiping Rebellion in middle nineteenth century, and after the Boxer Rebellion, the foreign powers then set to work to abort the 1911 revolution and the republic which it had established in Nanking. Since the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen was an incorruptible man dedicated to the interests of the Chinese people, he was unacceptable to the foreign powers with investments in China.

These foreigners finally announced their "neutrality" in the struggle for a new form of government, but their "neutrality" did not mean their acceptance of any government that the people might wish. Instead, they assured General Yuan Shih-kai, (monarchist and reactionary whom they had placed in power as military dictator of the old Peking monarchist government) that if he would negotiate peace with the republicans and become president of the republic in place of Sun Yat-sen, that he would receive immediate foreign recognition and loans to support his regime.

Dr. Sun Yat-sen and his republican government, too weak to stand against foreign pressure, and unable to prevent the powers from granting a big loan to Yuan Shih-kai to crush the revolution and maintain the dynasty, therefore resigned as president in favor of General Yuan Shih-kai.

Gen. Yuan Shih-kai was the chosen "strong man" of the foreign powers, a crafty reactionary and feudal-minded man who was linked with the foreigners and supported by their banking consortium. From the day he was installed in power as the provisional president of the Chinese Republic, he intrigued against the republic, had a number of its representatives assassinated, and finally disbanded the national assembly and Parliament and engineered support of a new dynasty with himself as emperor.

General Yuan did this because the foreign financial Consortium (to which both Russia and Japan had been added) had granted him a so-called "reorganization loan." He used this loan to install his war-lord supporters in

various provinces to crush any opposition to him, thus introducing into China a decade of war lordism with nation-wide fighting. He further took this action at the suggestion of the American "constitutional adviser" to Peking, Dr. Frank Goodnow, of Johns Hopkins University, who repeatedly stated that China was not ripe for a republic and that a monarchy was the best form of government for China. Yuan acted on Goodnow's suggestion and with the aid of the reorganization loan of the five-power consortium.

In 1915–16 the Chinese people again revolted and overthrew Yuan Shih-kai and his proposed monarchy. But evil had already triumphed and the war lords which Yuan had installed in various provinces practically divided the country up between them. These war lords were connected with the various foreign powers, some supporting the British in the Yangtze Valley, some the French in the southwest, some the Germans in Shantung, some the Japanese in Manchuria. Banditry and chaos resulted, and the foreigners fastened their grip more tightly on China.

Dr. Sun Yat-sen, together with every Chinese patriot, protested the reorganization loan to the strong man, Yuan Shih-kai, and when it was granted Dr. Sun again had to flee into exile. Dr. Sun had repeatedly appealed to the governments of the interested powers against this loan. Throughout his more than 40 years of struggle for the Chinese Republic, Dr. Sun received no aid, sympathy, or support from the foreign powers. He received no aid or support from the democratic western powers, of which America was one. And in 1922–23 he turned to the Soviet Union which alone of all the powers had proclaimed a policy of equality of races and the independence of colonial and semi-colonial countries. With Russian advisers attached to him he organized China for the great revolutionary period, 1924–27.

In early 1927 the foreign powers, together with Chinese bankers and industrialists, induced General Chiang Kai-shek, commander of the new Nationalist Army which Sun Yat-sen had organized (Dr. Sun died in March 1924) to break with Russia, suppress the labor unions and peasant leagues which made the great revolution possible, and establish his own dictatorship in Nanking, which was almost immediately recognized—and given loans to keep it in power.

Gen. Chiang Kai-shek stepped into the shoes of the dead Yuan Shih-kai, favorite of the foreign powers. And out of this catastrophe came another national struggle, led by the Chinese Communists. Once more the Chinese revolution had been aborted, and a new force arose to oppose the new dictatorship whose practices were modeled on those of Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany. German military advisers, some of them Nazis, were invited by Chiang to come to China, where they remained until July 1938, when they were withdrawn by order of Hitler, who acted on demands of Japan. During their presence in China, for years, these Germans had the full sympathy of the foreign powers, America included. These Germans designed the strategy of civil war against the rising people's army led by the Communists, and many German officers commanded Chiang's Kuomintang armies in the field. Mussolini sent advisers for Chiang's air force and Chiang had Mussolini's biography translated into Chinese and distributed to each of his army officers with orders that it be read. America and Britain gave Chiang's dictatorship a number of loans. The wheat loan, given in 1930–31 (as I recall), was allegedly to aid the victims of flood and famine, but it was used by Chiang to feed his armies which were waging war on the Communists.

In those years of civil war, upward of a million Chinese were killed. Labor unions were suppressed, peasant leagues wiped out in mass slaughters, leading intellectuals publicly beheaded in the streets, and leaders of the National Salvation Association—an organization of democrats—arrested and held in prison for years.

Foreign support of Chiang was responsible for appeasement of Japan in Manchuria from 1931 until 1936. During that time the Japanese Government repeatedly warned the Nanking Government of Chiang that if it did not suppress the Chinese Communist-led armies, that Japan would march into China and take care of the matter itself.

National hostility to Chiang's policy—which was supported by the foreign powers, America included, was so fierce that student demonstrations broke out in many cities, and the Chinese police fell upon the students with whips and clubs. China's death toll mounted. There was widespread unrest among Chiang's own troops, many armies of which simply deserted to the Communist-commanded armies, while others were on the verge of revolt. Finally, in December 1936, one of these armies arrested Chiang Kai-shek and held him prisoner, and forced him to agree to stop civil war and turn his guns against the Japanese menace. Only then was there unity, which lasted for only 2 years, after which time the Chungking Government blockaded the Communist-commanded armies in the hopes that they could be starved to death by Chungking while the Japanese exterminated them at the front.

This also failed, for the Communists introduced democratic regimes in all territory liberated from the Japanese.

Shortly before Pearl Harbor in 1941 America granted another loan of $100,000,000 to the Chungking government, and while it was on the way high Kuomintang officials in that government sent an accumulated private fund of $300,000,000 to the United States to be deposited in American banks. Dr. Ma Ying-chu, member of the Legislative Yuan of the Government and dean of a college in Chungking—and a very mild liberal—thereupon informed his students that China did not need foreign loans because Chinese officials had enough money in American banks to finance the government and the war. Dr. Ma secretly disappeared and was held in prison for a number of years, then released for a day and told to appear before his college and retract his statement. He indeed appeared before his student assembly, but repeated his previous statement, after which he was again imprisoned. He was finally released, but when he passed through the streets of Chungking his old friends or acquaintances hurried away and pretended not to see him when he passed. No one dared associate with him. Yet Dr. Ma was one of the mildest of men, hardly called even a liberal. Other professors suffered a far worse fate, were arrested secretly by the Chinese Gestapo, and never heard of again. The concentration camps of the Government were filled with untold thousands of political prisoners whose only crime was their opposition to the dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek.

Over a year ago the United States again gave the Chungking Government a loan to stabilize the currency and check mounting inflation. In the late spring of 1945 there was a roar of criticism when it became known that high officials made fortunes overnight out of the funds sent to bolster Chinese currency. The loan did not stop inflation and it had no effect on currency.

The situation in China today, when Chiang Kai-shek is asking for another American loan, is almost identical with the situation in early 1912, when Yuan Shih-kai was asking for a foreign loan to bolster his power and crush the republic. At that time a representative of the Chinese Republic (Mr. Wu Ting-fang) wired the American Secretary of State that the projected loan to Yuan Shih-kai would be regarded by the Chinese people as a loan to finance civil war against the liberty for which China was fighting. This warning, with countless others, made no impression whatever on the foreign powers, and the American Minister to China (Calhoun) cabled long reports to the American State Department urging recognition and loans for Yuan Shih-kai which, he said in words that sound like our present policy toward Chiang Kai-shek, headed the "only recognized government." Calhoun further stated (Dec. 11, 1911) that Yuan "is out of money and his government may collapse at any moment" if he did not get foreign support.

At that time only one American voice was raised in our Congress in defense of the Chinese Republic. (January 4, House of Representatives.) It was not heeded and soon died a still birth. During this same period headlines in the American press screamed: "Yuan may fall unless propped up by white man bayonets."

Today, in 1946, Chinese patriots protest the projected American loan of $500,000,000 to the Chinese Government, and, like the Republican spokesman in early January, 1912, the Chinese Communists and Chinese liberals today have warned America that this American loan will be regarded as a loan for civil war to circumvent the plans for a democratic coalition government and the establishment of a representative people's democracy. The situation is almost identical with that of 1911–12, except that the Communist-commanded armies (they include men and women of every shade of political thought) are not so weak or politically unenlightened or inexperienced as the Republican forces in 1911–12.

The chief difference between 1911–12 and 1946, however, is this: America has intervened with military forces, on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek, and war equipment made by American workers is being supplied to Chiang's government. The Chinese people are also much better informed today than in 1911–12, much better organized, and they have had long experience in fighting for democracy. They have ways of struggle which can offset the tremendous advantage which American arms give Chiang's dictatorship.

Chiang Kai-shek's conduct in the past few months seems to follow, step by step, the conduct of Yuan Shih-kai in 1911–12. As Yuan agreed to head the Chinese Republic, so Chiang today agrees, on paper only, to introduce a coalition democratic government and permit the development of a people's democracy. But no sooner had Gen. George Marshall departed from China for the United States, where he asked for a loan of $500,000,000 for Chungking, than Chiang began to undermine the agreement for a coaltion democratic government and for a united national army to replace the Kuomintang and Communist Party armies. As Yuan Shih-kai was the chosen strong man of Britain and the United States in 1911–12, so Chiang Kai-shek is today the strong man of the same foreign powers, of the United States in particular. The foreign powers carried out their plans behind the front of Yuan Shih-kai, and they plan to carry out their plans today behind the Chiang Kai-shek front.

The granting of this new loan to the Chinese Government until there is a true coalition democratic government, can lead only to civil war. The loan will again fill the pockets of corrupt Chinese officials, and be used to strengthen and bolster up Chiang Kai-shek's army and fake democratic regime. Among other armies to benefit from it will be the some 800,000 puppet troops who fought for Japan throughout the war and whom Chiang Kai-shek incorporated into his armies when Japan surrendered last September.

As an Americain citizen and as a democrat, as one who knows China and who simultaneously adheres to traditional American democratic principles, I oppose the projected loan to the present Chinese Government.

AGNES SMEDLEY.

YADDO, *Saratoga Springs, N. Y., April 22, 1946.*